

Q and the Merging of Traditions Concerning the Afterlife

Background:

This paper is a continuation of a study I began last year for the Historical Jesus Section. In that presentation I attempted to place the historical Jesus on a continuum between views of the afterlife current in the Judaisms of his day and those found in Christianity (broadly conceived) in the years that followed.¹ One of my basic conclusions was that the afterlife was not a major focus of Jesus' teaching and that he had more to say about the judgment and restoration of the living than the dead. Another interesting realization was that the question of the afterlife is a very effective "backdoor" for exploring the various Jewish and Christian eschatologies current at the beginning of the Common Era. For this reason I was excited to see that the Q Section was discussing Q's eschatology this year, so I could develop my thoughts on that particular "chapter" of the question.

Introduction:

Before I begin, however, there are a few introductory matters I need to address. First of all, I should define what I mean by the term Q. Not surprisingly, I will define Q in this paper as those traditions that Matthew and Luke have in common but which are absent from Mark. Although I suspect these traditions were in written form, it would not detract from my purposes if Q had been a lengthy oral tradition.² I also broadly assume Markan priority, although I will not commit myself to what that Markan exemplar exactly looked like.

¹ The first paper was what?

² Address Kloppenberg's comment

Quite a bit of work has also been done recently to argue for various reconstructions of Q's compositional history.³ Due to the highly tentative nature of such discussions at present, I will simply assume that there are various "layers" of teaching in Q, including a range of material from sayings that go back to the historical Jesus to redactions that are particular to Matthew and Luke themselves. In between these two termini lies material in various stages of development as well as pericopae originating in various early Christian Sitze im Leben.

The most important introductory matters for this paper, however, are its premises about the spectrum of belief among Second Temple Jews in regard to the afterlife.⁴ I presented these conclusions last year for the Historical Jesus Section and so will only defend them this year as appropriate in the argument of the paper. As I have surveyed the literature of the Second Temple period, it appears to me that there were at least three or four basic streams of thought in regard to the afterlife.

The first we might call the Sadducean perspective, which was basically a denial that there is such a thing as an afterlife – at least not one in which you are conscious and personally existent. We cannot really say whether those who fall into this category would have been comfortable with the idea that the dead are mindless "shades" in the underworld or not, although this common Mediterranean notion does not seem to me to contradict what we know of the Sadducees' belief.

The second stream of thought I will call the "Enochic," although I do not wish thereby to commit myself to a particular reconstruction of the history of Essenism or of

³ Mention Kloppenborg and Allison

⁴ Mention the two classics: Nickelsburg and Cavallin?

any Jewish group in the Second Temple period.⁵ Rather I refer mainly to the view of the afterlife indicated sporadically in 1 Enoch. In 1 Enoch 22, for example, the dead are not resurrected, but those who have not met their just deserts in this life (or their just reward) are “rewarded” appropriately in the underworld. These are not individuals with bodies but rather disembodied spirits. Such a conception is not really that different from the pictures of the afterlife we see in the Odyssey or the Aeneid.

By and large I would place the literature discovered at Qumran in the Enochic category, even though the afterlife does not feature prominently in the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is my contention that the communities behind these documents were so focused on vindication by God in this life and in this world that the afterlife, while a part of their belief, did not play a prominent role. I would argue as such that these communities provide us with an important parallel to the teaching of the historical Jesus.

We might distinguish a third conception of the afterlife among Jews like Philo and Josephus, namely, the belief in an immortal soul. In my opinion, however, the notion of an immortal soul does not differ much ideologically from the Enochic position. The recent work of Dale Martin has helped us see the extent to which Descartes has interfered with our reading of ancient authors like Plato.⁶ To be disembodied was not to be immaterial. I therefore see more of a social than an ideological distinction between the view of 1 Enoch and that of Philo. One is more systematic and philosophical; the other is less well defined and grows out of myth and real life experiences of the problem of evil.

⁵ Beyond the Essene Hypothesis

⁶ The Corinthian Body (New Haven: Yale University, 199*) *.

A final stream I would term the “Pharisaic” view, which involved the idea of physical resurrection or reconstitution. Rising out of the Maccabean era when the righteous died not only in spite of their covenant faithfulness but because of their loyalty to God’s Law, the idea of resurrection was politically charged and carried with it the promise of Israel’s restoration.⁷ Unlike the Enochic view, the Pharisaic view involved an afterlife on earth and not necessarily in an underworld. At least initially, this Pharisaic resurrection was a physical reconstitution with intestines and all.⁸

If the above four “streams” can be identified in various sources of the period, there are also several other permutations that should be kept in mind. There is, for example, the distinction between a personal and individual afterlife versus an impersonal and corporate survival as a collective “soul.” Secondly, there is the question of whether all individuals will experience the afterlife or only those who in one way or another have not met with justice in this world. It is possible that some strands even foresaw only the resurrection of those righteous individuals who had been martyred. Thirdly, what will happen to those who are resurrected? Will they simply live out a normal life and die again, or will they live forever, perhaps in some transformed state? It is likely that all the possible positions were held at some time within the Judaisms of the period.

Finally, just as Pharisaism almost exclusively survived the destruction of Jerusalem among the above ideological groups, so its stream seems to have formed the basic framework of post-70 C.E. Judaism. Political realities pushed the idea of an “age to

⁷ 2 Maccabees, which I view as a product of the Pharisaic movement, would be the best illustration of this connection between resurrection and politics.

⁸ Cf. 2 Maccabees **

come” into the distant future, while the idea of an intermediate state of consciousness before a final resurrection replaced the previous shadowy sense of “sleep” after death. Instead of a portion of individuals rising from the dead, resurrection comes to involve all or at least most persons. These individuals then experience eternal bliss of some sort or another. The book of 4 Ezra is one of the best examples of the full-blown eschatology that many think of as normative Jewish belief.

I realize that the framework I have just presented could be (and has been) the subject of a book long study. Since I cannot be certain such conclusions are “common ground” with my audience today, I will attempt to show the heuristic power of these categories in a way that convinces you as I proceed with today’s question. The following study will attempt to peel back layers of Q starting with obvious redactional features of Matthew and Luke. The study will then take up the matter of previous traditions and conclude with comments on the historical Jesus.

I. Lukan Redactions to Q Material

There are a number of ways in which Luke-Acts, along with the Apocalypse, represents a coalescing of traditions concerning the afterlife in first century Judaism. Perhaps it is no coincidence, therefore, that these two works both come from the post 70 C.E. period, the same period in which 4 Ezra was written.⁹ Within a framework of two ages (Luke 18:30), the present age ends in all three with the reign of the Messiah, while the age to come commences with the resurrection and judgment of both the righteous and the

⁹ That Luke-Acts comes from this post-70 C.E. period seems beyond question in light of the way in which it has redacted the eschatological discourse of chapter 21.

wicked (Acts 24:15).¹⁰ Like 4 Ezra, there is a clear intermediate state of existence before the final resurrection, and in that interim the dead experience either reward or punishment (Luke 16:22-23). The resurrection of the righteous involves eternal life (18:30), while the resurrected wicked are brought down to Hades (10:15).

As familiar as the above breakdown is, it is not the only image of the afterlife that we find in the New Testament. For example, there are very few passages elsewhere that imply an intermediate state of existence after death, particularly one involving immediate reward or punishment.¹¹ Paul is even unclear about whether the wicked will be raised at all in addition to those who are in Christ. And Mark 9:42-48 seem to envisage Gehenna as a place where one's body is placed. In fact it is difficult to rule out the possibility that Mark is referring to the literal Valley of Hinnom and the trash heap outside of Jerusalem where the bodies of the wicked who die in the eschatological battle will be placed (cf. Is 66:24).

Luke-Acts' understanding of the afterlife, like 4 Ezra, looks like the end of a process in which various elements have merged together into a comprehensive synthesis. The basic conception looks rather like the view most typically associated with the Pharisees, but the mention of Gehenna and an intermediate existence for the dead has affinities with

¹⁰ Revelation does not explicitly speak of two ages, but its two resurrections with an intervening thousand year Messianic reign is analogous to the Messianic rule in 4 Ezra that takes place before the resurrection of the dead inaugurates the age to come (Revelation 20). Similarly, Luke does not make the relationship between the rule of the Messiah and the general resurrection clear, but they are associated.

¹¹ 2 Cor 5:1-10 is a rare candidate, but Paul clearly uses the image of "sleep" for the interim period elsewhere (e.g. 1 Thess 4:15).

apocalyptic and what I have called the “Enochic” tradition, perhaps even with a little of the philosophical tradition mixed in as well.

Some of these elements in Luke’s eschatology were simply not present in Q. There is, for example, no clear logion in Q that indicates an intermediate state of existence for the dead, although this belief is part of Luke’s understanding of the afterlife. Luke’s presentation of the crucifixion, for example, includes a discussion between Jesus and one of the thieves in which Jesus promises the thief that he would be with him that very day in “Paradise” (Luke 23:43). Mark, of course, not only does not mention such a conversation; he notes that both thieves mocked Jesus on the cross (Mark 15:32).

Another example of this view of the afterlife in Luke is the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31). This pericope only occurs in Luke and fits in well with his Tendenz regarding what happens at death, not to mention Luke’s emphasis in general on Jesus’ vindication of the poor over and against the rich. It thus has significant correlations with distinctive Lukan themes. It would be unique, on the other hand, if it had been among the source material he had in common with Matthew. A logical conclusion is that he has either taken the parable from some other source or that it is a Lukan contribution to the tradition.

In fact, the only logion in Q that could possibly imply an intermediate state of existence for the dead is Q 12:5. Here are the parallel passages in Matthew 10:28 and Luke 12:5:

Luke: fobh/qhte to\n meta\ to\ a0poktei=nai e1xonta e0cousi/an e0mbalei=n ei0j th\n ge/ennan.

Matthew: **fobei=sqe ... to\n duna/menon kai\ yuxh\n kai\ sw=ma
a0pole/sai e0n gee/nnh |**

The relationship between bodies and Gehenna is particularly interesting in these two redactions of the Q material. In Matthew 10:28, both soul and body are destroyed in Gehenna. In Luke, on the other hand, it is after one's body has been killed that presumably one's spirit is thrown into Gehenna.

In this particular instance, it is likely that Matthew is the one that preserves the more original wording of the logion, for Luke in general seems to avoid associating Gehenna with physical bodies and their parts.¹² Luke may even have preferred the connotations of Hades to those of Gehenna when he thought of the afterlife. These conclusions are plausible because of Luke's omission of Mark 9:42-48 (=Matt 5:29-30; 18:9), where Jesus says it is better to enter into the kingdom of God without various body parts rather than to be thrown into Gehenna with a whole body. As I will argue later in the paper, I regard this pericope as one of the clearest indications of the historical Jesus' eschatology. It does not, I would argue, fit in as well with the eschatology of Luke-Acts, and so Luke does not retain it.

The difference between Luke's eschatology and the original connotations of Q 12:5 and Mark 9:42-48 is reflected in the way in which Luke in general has turned the focus of judgment away from the living to the dead. The traditions that Luke inherited expected the judgment to occur while the first generation of Christians was alive and thus while they had bodies. But Luke refocuses judgment in terms of those who would be

resurrected at some indefinite time in the future. It was thus understandable that Luke would include teaching on what would happen to the departed spirits of the righteous and wicked in the intervening period before they are resurrected for judgment.

This shift is quite apparent in the way Luke interprets Mark 9:1 (= Matt 16:28; Luke 9:27). The coming of the kingdom of God in Matthew and Mark, like the coming of the Son of Man, involves the parousia of Christ and the judgment of the world. Both Matthew and Mark seem to believe that such things will take place within the lifetime of the disciples, before the passing of that generation (Mark 13:30; Matt 24:34). Matthew and Mark, for example, picture angels collecting God's elect within the lifetime of their audiences (Matt 24:31; Mark 13:27). For Matthew and Mark, as for Paul, God's coming judgment, as well as his coming kingdom, is something they expect to arrive soon. Their eschatologies, therefore, are focused on the living rather than the dead.

Luke, however, has focused this eschatological language on the destruction of Jerusalem as well as on other events that had already taken place by the time he wrote. In the eschatological discourse of Luke 21, for example, there is nothing that cannot be understood in relation to the events of 70 C.E. Luke omits the comment in Matthew and Mark that the distress of those days will exceed all the tribulations that ever have or ever will occur (Matt 24:21; Mark 13:19). He omits the statement that God would shorten those days so that the entire human race is not destroyed (Matt 24:22; Mark 13:20). Instead, he introduces the idea of "the times of the Gentiles" – a construct that indicates an intervening period in history before the final transition to the next age.

¹² Cf. Dale Allison, Millenium Prophet 139.** This conclusion is also reached in the Critical Edition of Q.**

We need not go to the extremes of Conzelmann, however, to recognize that Luke has made significant changes to the tradition in a way that postpones the dawning of the new age and sometimes (but not always) reinterprets phrases like the “kingdom of God” and the “coming of the Son of Man” so that they can refer to events that have already taken place. No longer does Luke’s Jesus tell the high priest that he will see the Son of Man seated at God’s right hand of God and coming on the clouds in power (Matt 26:64; Mark 14:62). Now Jesus only says that the Son of Man will be seated at God’s right hand from now on (Luke 22:69). He neither mentions the parousia nor does he indicate the high priest will see it.

Arguably for Luke the darkening of the sun and the reddening of the moon are no longer signs of Christ’s literal return (Matt 24:29; Mark 13:24) but symbolic representations of the coming of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2:20). And no longer will the disciples see the coming of the kingdom of God with power (Mark 9:1) or the Son of Man coming in his kingdom (Matt 16:28). Now they will simply see “the kingdom of God” (Luke 9:27). This is the same kingdom of God that Luke uniquely says is “inside of you” (Luke 17:20), spiritualizing what seems to be a quite devastating arrival in Matthew and Mark.

And so Tom Wright seems at least to be right in his interpretation of the coming of the Son of Man in relation to Luke’s version of it in chapter 21: it is a metaphorical way of referring to the destruction of Jerusalem. All the indications are, however, that it is Luke that has redacted the material in this direction. Matthew and Mark understood this language literally. And this fact does not mean that Luke does not believe in the literal coming of Jesus in the future or that he does not believe in a future resurrection of the

righteous and the wicked. He does. It is just that he pushes these events off into the undefined future. As such it is understandable that he, along with 4 Ezra and other Jewish traditions, would develop their understandings in regard to the intermediate state of the dead.

The purpose of delving so much into Luke's theology and redaction is so that we can see the direction in which he is taking these eschatological traditions. It is characteristic of Luke's redaction of eschatological material to take the traditions he has inherited and to bifurcate them in two directions. Some, on the one hand, he pushes off into the indefinite future. Others – and this observation is most important for our current context – he either refocuses strictly in terms of 70 CE or he transforms them within a matrix of realized eschatology. Given that Q scholarship leans heavily on Luke's presentations, we have a rather significant caveat here.

We have argued that he postpones the coming of judgment and presents us instead with places of intermediate reward. These patterns seem to manifest themselves in what Luke has done with Q 12:5 and Mark 9:42-48. The Mark passage was discordant enough in its suggestion that one might enter the age to come without eyes and hands that Luke omitted it. Even though Q 12:5 is still about the final judgment in its Lukan context, Luke has still colored the logion with imagery reminiscent of the intermediate state of the dead – a place where one's spirit experiences torment after one's body is killed.

On the other hand, as sure as these are Lukan redactions, it is likely that the association of physical bodies with Gehenna goes back far in the tradition, not only because it is an association made in both Mark and Q but also because it seems so

discordant with what would come to be the standard eschatology of early Christianity. We believe it goes back to the historical Jesus.

II. Matthean Redactions

We find imagery in Q that makes reference to both Gehenna and Hades (one each). Luke's Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus adds an additional image of Hades to Luke's presentation. There it seems primarily to be a place of intermediate torment in the period before the final judgment. Paradise or "Abraham's Bosom" is arguably in one of the various layers of heaven above the earth and not a part of Hades (cf. 4 Ezra?***).¹ It would be difficult to prove on the basis of one omission, but we have suggested that the image of Hades may in fact have been more appealing to Luke than that of Gehenna. While Luke does retain one logion involving weeping and gnashing (Luke 13:28) and one Gehenna logion (Luke 12:5), he omits Mark 9:42-48.

If Luke did not prefer reference to Gehenna, it was exactly the opposite for Matthew. Matthew takes the four references to Gehenna he inherited from his sources and expands them to seven, while he takes the one Q logion regarding weeping and gnashing (Q 13:28) and expands it to six occurrences. On the other hand, Matthew only makes one additional reference to Hades beyond the one he inherited from Q 10:15, and in that saying he arguably uses it in the more traditional sense of the place of death rather than as a place of torment (Matt 16:18). Matthew clearly prefers the more dramatic and eschatologically oriented image of Gehenna, as well as that of the weeping and gnashing of teeth, to the more "sterile" image of Hades that Luke may prefer.

It is not difficult to see why Matthew might prefer Gehenna and Luke Hades, particularly if we are correct in thinking that Hades in Luke relates primarily to the intermediate place of judgment and Gehenna to the place of ultimate judgment. Matthew still functions more on the paradigm of a soon coming cataclysmic invasion of judgment into history while Luke is focused more on the eventuality of death in an interim period.² Gehenna is thus the more apocalyptic and eschatological picture, while Hades does not have connotations concerning the proximity of the final judgment.

Matthew is rife with such apocalyptic imagery in his allusions to the final judgment. We have already mentioned the way in which Matthew expands and duplicates phrases he has inherited from Mark and Q, also adding additional imagery of fire (Matt 13:29, 42). He takes material from the pericope regarding removing one's eye to avoid Gehenna (Mark 9:47) and reproduces it in conjunction with Jesus' teaching on adultery in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5:29). He takes the one Q logion on the weeping and gnashing of teeth (Q 13:28) and reproduces it in his unique Parable of the Weeds (Matt 13:50). Both in passages he has taken from Mark (e.g. the eschatological discourse in Matt 24:51) and from Q (e.g. the Parable of the Wedding Banquet in Matt 22:13), Matthew includes the formulaic weeping and gnashing of teeth where it is absent from his sources. This fact makes it almost certain that these are Matthean redactions to the tradition and that the image of Gehenna with its weeping and gnashing was a motif Matthew particularly favored.

The Parable of the Weeds (Matt 13:24-20, 36-43) and of the Wedding Banquet (Matt 22:1-14) provide us with good pictures of some of Matthew's eschatological tendencies. In the Parable of the Wedding Banquet, a pericope he seems to have inherited from Q

(14:15-24), Matthew takes what apparently was a parable about a banquet in general and places it in the context of a wedding.³ His most significant redaction, however, is the way he makes the parable into a commentary on the fact that there are both true and false “guests” in the church. As in the Parable of the Weeds, Matthew does not believe that all of those in the church of his day are legitimate “sons of the kingdom” (Matt 13:38). Not everyone who says, “Lord, Lord” on the Day of Judgment, even if they have performed miraculous deeds in Christ’s name, will turn out to be true sons (Matt 7:21-23). Many of Matthew’s redactions, therefore, take sayings originally directed at groups within Israel and reapply them in the context of the church. And everywhere his redacting hand went in regard to judgment, weeping and gnashing was sure to go.

If Luke’s conception of judgment and the afterlife looked basically Pharisaic, Matthew’s looks much more like the Enochic tradition. Although Matthew incorporated material from Q that implies a judgment for all the dead, the uniquely Matthean imagery of judgment deals solely with the fate of those living at the time of judgment. Matthew uniquely refers to the role of angels in the gathering of the elect at the time when the Son of Man returns to earth (e.g. Matt 13:40-43; 16:27; 24:31; 25:31). In each incidence where Matthew adds such comments to the tradition, there is no indication that the angels have any role in relation to the dead. The implication seems to be that it is those living wicked individuals that are placed into the fiery furnace (of Gehenna) and the living elect that are gathered from the earth. For these Matthew specifically mentions a place of eternal punishment and reward (Matt 25:46).

limited resurrection of Matt 28, similarities with the Similitudes, demonstrating Enoch connection, renewal of all things

III. The Historical Jesus?

It may seem odd to discuss a greater unknown in order to clarify a known. But since the whole process of determining a trajectory requires us to weigh various possible points and to draw, in the end, the line with the most dots on it, there are two places involving Mark that are worth consideration. I have in fact already mentioned both in the course of this paper. The one is Mark 9:42-48, which I have argued Luke omits, while the other is Mark 9:1.

The reason why these two places are interesting is because they quite radically meet the criterion of dissimilarity. The first is the passage saying that it is better to amputate parts of one's body rather than enter into Gehenna as a whole body. While some have suggested that this passage refers to one's resurrection body, such an image is difficult.¹³ When Razis is dying a martyr's death in 2 Maccabees 14:46, he tells his captors that he will receive his intestines back again one day. Unless the passage in Mark be taken as a piece of hyperbole, the most literal way to take it seems to be a situation in which God judges the living and then either rewards them in their dismembered state or destroys them in Gehenna. This could mean that they are thrown both body and soul into the underworld (Q 12:5), but another possibility is that their dead body is placed in the trash heap outside Jerusalem after God has killed them.

What is so striking is that they enter into the kingdom in their dismembered state. Mark 9:1 is similarly striking. Jesus says that there are some standing with him who will not taste death until they see that the kingdom of God has come with power. A quick

¹³ Allison

perusal of Mark shows that he is thinking here of the literal return of Christ in judgment. What is interesting about this passage is its implication that all of Jesus' disciples will go on to die after the coming of the Son of Man! In other words, traditional Christian eschatology does not envisage there ever being a death for the righteous after the judgment. How is it, then, that some of the righteous will still die after the eschaton arrives?

The answer might be that Jesus' message focused on the judgment of the living rather than the dead. Among those who are alive when Jesus returns, some will be judged and cast into the outer darkness of the below. Others will see God's rule established on earth, but they will still die as all humans do. Does this exclude resurrection? No, since on one Maccabean model, the righteous dead are simply resurrected to live out the life they were meant to have. They are presumably resurrected, live out the rest of their life and then die again. Is this what Matthew's limited resurrection is about?

These two logia seem so discordant with their contexts that they make two fairly significant dots from which to draw a line. They represent a focus in Jesus' preaching that aimed itself at the living rather than the dead. They imply that Q 12:5 might actually go back to the historical Jesus or at least be a fairly early component to the tradition. They may also help us assess on what level we should understand other Q logia about the afterlife.

IV. Intermediate Stages of Afterlife Traditions

There are four, perhaps five passages in Q that in one way or another relate to the afterlife. We have already dealt with Q 12:5, which originally presented the image of

both body and soul being destroyed in Gehenna. We have also suggested that it has a primitiveness to it that probably implies it either goes back to the historical Jesus or that it came into being fairly early on among the Q traditions.

Of the four afterlife traditions we mentioned at the beginning of the paper, the one to which this logion has the greatest affinities is the Enochic tradition. It envisages a judgment under the earth after the living have been judged (e.g. 1 Enoch 14:5). The matter of resurrection does not need to be raised because judgment takes place primarily after death.

Another possible passage dealing with the afterlife is Q 22:30, which states that Jesus' disciples will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.¹⁴ This appears to be the final logion of Q. It would be natural to read it in reference to the resurrection. Certainly this is how it must be read in the light of its current literary context, and whatever stage of Q that included Q 10:8-15; 11:31-32; and 13:28-29 would have similarly taken it to refer to the final judgment, perhaps a fitting end to Q corresponding to its beginning.

The saying potentially takes on a different life, however, if it comes from the historical Jesus. Marius Reiser has argued that Matthew presents the more original form of the logion in saying that Jesus' disciples will sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. His argument is that because of Judas, it not likely that anyone in the post-Easter church (like Matthew) would have added the number twelve (259). On the other hand, it is reasonable to suggest that Luke saw the problem with the number 12 and omitted it.

¹⁴ Debate over whether it is the 12 tribes or not (Reiser 259, etc...)

If our comments on the historical Jesus hold any validity, then it is possible to claim that this logion originally did not imply anything about the afterlife. Rather, if Jesus believed the kingdom would arrive while his disciples were still living, it could have referred to what would take place when God restored the kingdom of Israel with Jesus as viceroy. Without reference to an interim period involving death, the statement is made strictly in terms of the living.

Q 10:12-15 and 11:31-32 share certain similar characteristics. Primarily, both invoke curses on that generation of Israel on the basis of non-Jewish figures from the Old Testament. In Q 10:12-15, curses are invoked on Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum for their lack of receptiveness to Jesus' mission. It will be better for Sodom, Tyre, and Sidon on the Day of Judgment than for these cities. In 11:31-32, that generation is put up in shame against people like the Ninevites and the Queen of Sheba. Those individuals repented, whereas these villages did not.

It would be easy to place these sayings within a context in early Christianity where the gospel was beginning to expand to the Gentiles and yet when the very cities where Jesus had done most of his ministry rejected the news of his resurrection. Indeed, Q 10:13-15 has the flavor of hindsight rather than that of a mission about to take place.

With regard to what these two passages have to say about Q and the merging of afterlife traditions, they give early witness to the Christian belief in the judgment of both the righteous and wicked dead. It is an early witness because it targets specific cities in Galilee, with regard to two of which we have no gospel testimony to the effect that Jesus ever did anything there. The picture of Capernaum's demise as it is brought down to

Hades fits in well with our understanding of the historical Jesus' teaching concerning coming judgment. It is not dissimilar to Q 12:5.

The final Q saying that relates to the afterlife is Q 13:28-29. There is some general agreement that Matthew presents the more original wording of the logion. Luke's version is even somewhat reminiscent of the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Those in Gehenna may be able to see Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob from where they are. The reference to the weeping and gnashing of teeth is something we have seen before. It coheres well with the image of Gehenna and is an Enochic picture of judgment.

What may or may not be as familiar is the presence of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The verse most likely implied a resurrection of these patriarchs, although they could be taken as a metaphor for a restored kingdom. It is difficult to say with confidence where this saying fits best in the development of the tradition. In its Q form, it presents us with a resurrection of at least all the righteous and a casting of the living wicked into Gehenna. The historical Jesus may well have believed in a resurrection of those who might die in the eschatological battle (Mark 8:35), but it is not clear that this is a resurrection of all the righteous. Nevertheless, the casting of the living wicked coheres well with what we have argued is the earliest tradition.

V. Conclusion

The teaching of Q regarding the afterlife can be located on a trajectory between the historical Jesus and the full blown eschatology of Luke. In Luke, there is a point in the indefinite future when all will be resurrected, both wicked and righteous. The righteous

will live forever while the wicked are consigned to Gehenna forever. In between death and that future date, torment is experienced in an intermediate state.

For the historical Jesus, on the other hand, the focus of eschatological language is the coming judgment of the living, both righteous and wicked. The wicked are consigned to Gehenna while little is said of the fate of the righteous dead, although Jesus may have taught a resurrection of either those martyred or perhaps of all the righteous. Given that he may have still envisaged death as an occurrence for even the righteous in the coming kingdom, a resurrection of just the righteous seems more likely.

The four or five sayings in Q that can be understood to refer to the afterlife fall at one point or another along this spectrum. Q 12:5 we consider to be a logion going back to the historical Jesus. Q 22:30 may go back to the historical Jesus, but it may not have originally been about the afterlife. When placed in the context of Q 10:8-15 and 11:31-32, however, it has come to refer to the afterlife in Q. These two verses probably represent logia from Christianity very early on, after the Christian mission to those places where the historical Jesus had ministered most rejected the Christian gospel. The imagery of Q 13:28-29 has the flavor of the historical Jesus, although the implication that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob will be present at the eschatological banquet strikes us as something that comes from the same time as Q 10:8-15.

In short, the progression of logia concerning the afterlife looks a lot like what we have suggested previously, as well as with Gabriele Boccaccini's reconstruction of the development of the view's of Enochic Judaism with regard to the afterlife. It suggests something that is not new in the world of scholarship, namely, that the early Christian movement had its greatest affinities with Essenism.

¹ Explain why the Acts references to Hades don't count. He lifts up his eyes in Hades – assumed he is being punished.

² Mitigating passages (a long time...)

³ Note also that the Parable of Ten Virgins is unique to Matthew.