

**Who's Idea Was This?**  
**An Endeavor to Determine Whether or not the Liberal Jewish Notion of**  
**Interpreting the Liturgical Use of *T'chiyat HaMeitim* (The Doctrine of Resurrection)**  
**as Metaphorical is Historically and Jewishly Authentic**

BY EMMA GOTTLIEB

**Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Ordination**

For the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion,  
Graduate Rabbinical Program, New York, New York

2010

Dr. David Sperling: Advisor

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Who's Idea Was This?</b> <b>An Endeavor to Determine Whether or not the Liberal Jewish Notion of</b> <b>Interpreting the Liturgical Use of <i>T'chiyat HaMeitim</i> (The Doctrine of Resurrection)</b> <b>as Metaphorical is Historically and Jewishly Authentic</b></p>
--

## INTRODUCTION: THE QUESTION OF LEGITIMACY

The Reform movement's newest prayer book, *Mishkan T'filah: A Reform Siddur*, states that, "the metaphor of reviving the dead is widely used rabbinically." The *siddur* also quotes Judith Z. Abrams' claim that, "the resurrection of the dead, which may be taken literally, is best understood as a powerful metaphor for understanding the miracle of hope." Thus, the Reform Judaism seems to encourage its adherents to consider a metaphorical understanding of the Doctrine of Resurrection when reading the traditional Hebrew words in the *G'vurot* prayer – a prayer that speaks of a God who "revives the dead".<sup>i</sup>

While the *siddur* does provide some textual evidence that *some rabbis may have* used the language of resurrection metaphorically, anyone who has studied the history of the doctrine of resurrection or the theology of the Rabbis of the Talmud knows that the Reform prayer book is only alluding to one piece of a much more complex tradition. Is the *siddur* correct in its representation of Rabbinical theology? Is the movement really presenting a legitimate precedent for its adherents? Has the language of resurrection always been understood as a metaphor or have Reform Jews abstracted a few key statements to allow for a more comfortable modern reading and interpretation of what has become an uncomfortable theological component of prayer?

The following pages will present an overview of the biblical, rabbinic, modern and post-modern Jewish understandings of resurrection as well as how these understandings have translated into usage in Jewish liturgy. A careful examination of the

development of the Doctrine of Resurrection and of how rabbis throughout the centuries have understood its theological implications will, I hope, make it easier to answer to these questions.

## CHAPTER 1: CLASSICAL BIBLICAL UNDERSTANDINGS OF RESURRECTION

### What Do Jews Mean By Resurrection?

Before discussing about Jewish understandings of resurrection, one must first define the term resurrection itself. *The Interpreter's Dictionary Of The Bible* (IDB) defines Resurrection as “a blanket term covering three different, but related beliefs.”<sup>ii</sup>

- a) The belief that the essential self or “soul” of an individual is returned to life shortly after its physical death
- b) The belief that the bodies of the dead will be resuscitated at the end of the present world
- c) The belief that the righteous among the dead will be raised together, after a Last Judgment, either to a mysterious, everlasting existence in some other realm, or to rebirth in a world which will succeed this one.

Resurrection is thus thought of either as an individual experience or as an eschatological event involving all of or a selective group of humanity. It is an awakening either from the body or *of* the body. It is either a certain continuation in perpetuity or a privileged birth in a new and/or different world. As there is no real way of knowing anything more than the various possibilities, settling on a decisive and unambiguous definition of resurrection is virtually impossible.

This diversity of beliefs about resurrection is due to the fact that the doctrines of resurrection developed within different philosophies attempting to address different theological challenges. For example, where death was regarded as a sleep – as was often the case in primitive and ancient thought – resurrection was seen as an awakening, and where time was considered to be cyclical, rather than a linear, resurrection provided an answer to the question of what would happen to the selves or “souls” of the dead when the current cycle of time ended and a new world came into being. Finally, during times of

religious persecution and martyrdom, the idea of resurrection acted as a crucial reassurance to the faithful that they would be rewarded, if not now, than in the future, and that their wicked tormentors would be duly punished.<sup>iii</sup>

## **Biblical Understandings of Death & the Afterlife**

Once we understand the range of forms that resurrection can assume, we can explore how resurrection fits into the biblical understandings of death. Death in the Bible is understood in three different ways: Symbolically, as a metaphor for the things which detract from a full and complete life, mythologically, as a force in opposition to the created order, and biologically, as in a technical cessation of life.<sup>iv</sup>

The question of where death comes from (i.e. is it part of creation or an entity that came into the world after creation?) is answered by two possible readings of Gen 2-3. The first reading is that death is a consequence of disobeying God. The second possibility is that death is part of the original plan for humanity. Either reading is possible, as the Bible does not signify exactly which etiology is correct. However, either way, YHWH is understood to be the source of life *and* death, as differentiated from a polytheistic theological system where there are multiple gods ruling over life and death respectively. Overall, there seems to have been little indication by the biblical writers about the origin of death. The question for Israel was much more focused on *how* to understand the “invasion” of death into life.<sup>v</sup>

The various writers of what became the Bible understood the end of life to mean the end of all existence. It was generally thought that the dead continued to subsist, either

in *Sheol* or in the family crypt, however this was a non-active existence. According to *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (ABD), “The most significant theme for Israel was the understanding that life provided an opportunity for the individual and community to praise (YHVH).” The inability to pay tribute to God was a signal of death, even in life (i.e. during times of illness or injury). Life was not simply a biological or natural occurrence but was a spatial phenomenon, formed in the cultic places of worship. The ancient Israelites understood life to be the greatest of gifts. As ABD explains, “Life...implies piety, success, fecundity, happiness, and peace (while) death is associated with everything that comes to disturb this harmony: a setback, injustice, sterility, war, sickness, misery.” For example, to be ill was to be in the hold of death with at least one foot already in *Sheol*. At the same time, ancient Israelites understood that living things died; that they were mortal and contained no divine spark destined for immortality. The images of the underworld (for example, *Sheol* or “The Pit”) however, were not designed to help the ancient Israelites grapple with the question of “what happens after I die?”, but rather assisted in their understanding of death as something *versus life*, occurring in the spaces *apart* from YHVH.<sup>vi</sup>

*The Anchor Bible Dictionary* describes *Sheol* as a place inhabited by the dead.

What characterized *Sheol* was that it was peopled by shades (Heb *repa'im*) whose existence – which shares nothing in common with the life that had been led formerly – unfolds without purpose and without communication...(the dead) have no contact with the world of the living and still less with the living God. The world of the dead was a ‘country of no return’ (Job 7:9-10; 16:22), a prison with its own portals and guards; normally one never left it, and although some texts affirm YHWH’s hold of *Sheol*, the God of Israel, in general, did not intervene – even on behalf of his own – in this gloomy and pitiful territory, which nonetheless had not yet become a place of judgment and punishment, as hell would become in Christian texts, but rather was the place which awaited the living.<sup>vii</sup>

Additionally, life, for the ancient Israelites, was often characterized by the *nefesh* while death was epitomized by the disappearance of this *nefesh*. However, the “departure” of the *nefesh*, spoken of in the Bible ought to be viewed as a figure of speech, for the Bible does not understand the self as continuing to exist independently of the body, but as dying along with it. There is no biblical text supporting the idea that the “soul” becomes detached from the body when one dies. Rather, the ancient Israelites believe that the *ruach*, or ‘spirit’, “which makes man a living being, and which he loses at death,” is not actually an anthropological reality, but is a gift of God which is returned to God at the time of death.<sup>viii</sup>

Thus the conception of the ancient Israelites was that life comes to an end at the moment when the breath loaned by God is taken back. The body, from that time forth is inanimate and destined to return to the earth. They saw death as an absolute rupture between the deceased and the world of the living and most importantly God. This seemed to be accepted as a reality that was rarely questioned but that was more easily tolerated if three conditions were met:

- 1) One’s death had to come at the end of a long and rich existence
- 2) The deceased had to leave behind descendants or at least one son
- 3) The funeral rites, especially the burial of the corpse, had to be scrupulously undertaken

Thus one was understood to have survived through his or her descendents and was able to maintain contact with kin through burial rites. Though the individual dies, the People of Israel carries on and continuity is assured. The reverse of such circumstances – a

shortened life, lack of progeny, and/or an abandoned corpse – was seen as Divine punishment.<sup>ix</sup>

Thus, Divine retribution was understood in the Bible to manifest itself through the circumstances relating to one's death rather than the circumstances occurring afterward. That said, notions of an afterlife were still extant at that time and can generally be organized into four categories: the notion of immortality, belief in a future life, the beginnings of the concept of bodily resurrection, ideas relating to a final Divine passing of judgment. Narrowing these different types of beliefs down to one biblical understanding of the afterlife is impossible because of differences in the diverse peoples living together in a small geographic area at that time. Both “folk” and “official Yahwistic” views coexisted, melded together, and were ultimately absorbed into the Bible as we have it today.<sup>x</sup>

### **Different Ways to Understand Resurrection in Biblical Texts**

As we have demonstrated, resurrection was part of a complex of many beliefs relating to death and the afterlife in biblical times. Thus, biblical texts relating to resurrection are rare and dissimilar, and occur only in obscure texts.<sup>xi</sup> Most often in these texts, resurrection is used as a metaphor for Israel's national restoration from a state like death, such as the Babylonian exile, rather than the physical raising of an individual's previously dead body.<sup>xii</sup> In fact, there are only a few passages in the Bible that specifically refer to bodily resurrection and of these, only Daniel 12:2-3 makes reference to the dead being returned from death and granted either eternal life or consigned to damnation.<sup>xiii</sup> All of these texts however, deal in some way with the disjunction between

human experience and belief in divined justice.<sup>xiv</sup> Over time, this incongruity manifested itself in the development of the belief in resurrection as it is reflected in biblical texts, moving from a symbolic reference of national vindication to the idea that righteous individuals or groups can expect post-mortem redemption through resurrection of body and/or soul.

### **Historical Evolution of the Doctrine of Resurrection**

Some scholars assert that the belief in resurrection made its way into to the Israelites via their Ancient Near Eastern neighbors. This view however, may be erroneous. IDB explains that this theory is based on (a) the recurrent labeling of Mesopotamian gods as those who “bring the dead to life” or those who retrieve souls from the underworld, and (b) the pervasive dissemination of rituals and myths surrounding so-called “dying and reviving gods” (e.g. the Babylonian Tammuz and the Ugaritic Baal). However, that designation only refers to the preservation of the life of one who is at the point of death, not to actual revival of the dead. The Tammuz-type god is, in actuality, just a representation of the rhythm of nature. Thus the depiction of him as dying and reviving has no real relation to the doctrine of human resurrection. Furthermore, such gods - though mourned as if dead – have not really died and been resurrected, but rather, like Persephone, have been trapped alive in the underworld and then retrieved, or else they have withdrawn from the earth and been subsequently appeased, as in some versions of the Hittite Telipinu myth. As well, no doctrine of a general resurrection may be inferred from the fact, as some suggest, that in the Mesopotamian tale of the Descent of Ishtar the dead are said to have risen along with Tammuz. In fact, this poem seems to

have been meant for use in annual festival celebrations, and is merely a reference to the common belief that on such occasions the ancestral dead briefly rejoin their living relatives.<sup>xv</sup>

Yet it is undeniable that certain ideas relating to resurrection which later became woven into Judeo-Christian texts do come out of Semitic and Egyptian myth and legend, although in less systematic form. These were likely incorporated from time-honored popular lore current that made its way into Ancient Israel. The idea of widespread bodily resurrection is foreshadowed by examples of heroic characters who met their deaths through dismemberment and were afterward restored to life by the miraculous reassembling of their limbs. This narrative theme is found in the Egyptian myth of Osiris and in the Ugaritic Poems of Baal and Aqhat. However, in each of these ancient tales, the event of resurrection is something unusual and extraordinary, not the standard and predestined fate of ordinary humanity. Additionally, in some of these cases, the resurrection is simply a metaphoric dramatization symbolizing the cycle of the harvest, rather than a true revival of deceased humans.<sup>xvi</sup>

Certainly, the Biblical notion that man is created of perishable substance and that his natural condition is mortality is a belief shared by all the Semitic peoples of the Ancient Near East. It is clearly expressed in the declaration of Siduri to Gilgamesh. However, Israelite tradition differs in that the Biblical myth of the tree of life indicates that the boundary between the domains of the living and the dead was not absolute. “Had man persevered in obedience to God by respecting the divine commands, God would have reserved the right to change man’s condition and to grant him immortality as a favor.”<sup>xvii</sup>

Additionally, the notion of a final judgment can be found mainly in ancient Iranian teachings. Such inquiry into the afterworld is also copiously demonstrated in Egypt and can be seen in intermittent traces of Mesopotamian belief, as well as being mentioned in the assorted Babylonian funeral inscriptions found in the Elamite city of Susa. It is not certain, however, that these ideas were absorbed into the Israelite tradition during Biblical times, however, as similar ideas could just as easily have been assimilated from Greek lore during the Hellenistic period.<sup>xviii</sup>

In term of themes and language however, Ancient Near Eastern culture does seem to have had a clear influence on biblical tradition, although their notion of “a return to life, conceived in quasi-automatic fashion and lived out within the framework of an agrarian ritual” was clearly rejected by the Yahwism of the prophet Hosea, as will be shown below. For example, in the case of Hos. 6:1-3, a passage which was likely a penitential song that the priests sang in times of danger, linguistic elements point to the popular piety that had been influenced by the Canaanization of the cult of YHVH.<sup>xix</sup>

An examination of the text reveals that the people of Northern Israel were deeply influenced by Canaanite religiosity and were addressing YHVH with allusions to the theme of death and resurrection, as the Canaanites were known to have addressed Baal, whose destiny regularly followed the cycle of the seasons. In particular, the imagery dawn and dew, highly significant in Ugaritic tradition, indicate that the authors were speaking as if they were worshipping forces of nature rather than a god who rules all things.<sup>xx</sup> Clearly, the God of Israel absorbed many of the characteristics of the sun god, thus language appropriate to the sun is often used in the Bible to describe YHVH. However, despite the linguistic similarities, Hosea has clearly put his own twist on the

Caananite imagery, as it is not God who needs renewal in this passage, but God's worshippers who need new life.<sup>xxi</sup> Regardless of where one traces the beginnings of the idea of resurrection, notions of *bodily* resurrection were decidedly rejected by the Israelites until the doctrine had been "subjected to a rigorous purification process" by the prophet Ezekiel.<sup>xxii</sup>

Over time, as the ancients contemplated death, its destructive aspect became more of a dominant concern. At first, premature death was thought to be a punishment meted out by a hostile, divine power. This was not originally considered to be the power of YHWH, as can be seen by various pleas made for YHWH to take his adherents back from the grasp or the prison of death. Such imagery is likely suggestive of the time when the kingdom of the dead had its own divinities, such as Sheol and Mot, the latter being commonly associated with death in Ugaritic texts. In biblical texts, these divinities are reduced to images, or to the inferior powers of angels of death or demons.<sup>xxiii</sup>

Definitely by Ezekiel's time, the notion of life after death was not unheard-of, the cult of a dying and rising god having forced its way into the Temple itself (as seen in Ezek. 8:14). The biblical stories about Enoch and Elijah, and their 'ascensions' also reflect a development in the conceptualizing of the afterlife. As the reality of the world came more and more into conflict with earlier understandings, Israelite theologians naturally began to explore possibilities that could set them free from the tensions between their faith in God and their experience of reality.<sup>xxiv</sup>

The ancient belief in death's ending all existence, or in a dreary afterlife in *Sheol*, thus gives way to an increased interest in the status of the dead. Concerns over the impurity of corpses clearly did not deter the living from taking pains with burial of the

dead, as demonstrated by the great burial chambers cut out of the rock, dating back to the postexilic period. These chambers indicate that the dead were no longer treated as anonymous; rather their individuality was preserved. References to the misery of the inhabitants of *Sheol* begin to diminish. In their place, texts referring to the “sleep of the dead” become more frequent. From this it can be inferred that death had begun to be viewed as an impermanent state of being, although some of these texts clearly consider the sleep of death to be eternal. In any event, this idea had clearly begun to develop, and by the time the Book of Daniel comes into being, biblical texts shift easily from the mention of sleep to that of resurrection – the hope of such being a natural and inevitable response to the horror inspired by death<sup>xxv</sup>

Although this belief was not fully articulated until the emergence of the Book of Daniel, the idea of resurrection was known prior to the Exile, as evidenced by its existence in Hosea’s time (8<sup>th</sup> cen; see Hosea 6:1-3). Early textual mentions of resurrection however, were generally used in a metaphoric sense, primarily to point to the political renewal of the People of Israel.<sup>xxvi</sup> Gradually, references to resurrection began to reflect the belief that God could and would limit the power of death, and the hope that close fellowship with God was so strong that death could not overpower it. The period of Ezekiel knew nothing of a general eschatological resurrection of the dead, but did affirm the YHVH’s ability to awaken the dead if God so desired. Similarly, the texts of 1 Kgs 17:17-24 and 2 Kgs 4:31-37 recount how the prophets, with the power instilled in them by YHVH, were able to effect the revival of deceased individuals.<sup>xxvii</sup>

A more literal belief in the resurrection of individuals and God's judgment after death emerged in apocalyptic writings dating to the time of the Maccabean wars in the 3<sup>rd</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> centuries B.C.E.<sup>xxviii</sup> Ecclesiastes 3:19 indicates that by the 3<sup>rd</sup> century at the latest the hope of resurrection was being discussed among wisdom teachers in Jerusalem, though they disagreed with it. This literal understanding however was deeply rooted in the Yahwistic tradition, particularly among the *Hasidim* of the time who saw themselves as awaiting their salvation through God's post-mortem intervention, rather than something that would be seen in this lifetime.<sup>xxix</sup> The *Hasidim* expected that as Jewish worship was re-established in Jerusalem, an eschatological event would simultaneously occur, bringing history - as it had been understood at until that point - to an end, and ushering in the new kingdom of God. An important part of this developing notion of resurrection was that it was to be a communal experience - unlike the examples of prophetically assisted revival of dying or deceased individuals - shared only by those deserving of God's redemption. This form of resurrection as something to be experienced by the righteous adherents of YHVH was first envisioned in the Isaiah canon relating to what scholars call the Isaianic Apocalypse.<sup>xxx</sup>

As the history of the Jews brings them more and more tragedy, with the fall of the Northern Kingdom in the 8<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E., the fall of Jerusalem and Judah in the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E., the Exile and the reconstitution of the Jewish community under the Persians, the situation of the individual amid their national and religious community came to take a predominant place of importance and henceforth, questions were posed regarding the fate of the faithful. This become especially pronounced in crises during the fall of the Persian Empire and under Antiochus Epiphanes as factions of Jews were set

against one another in a political power struggle, and as persecutions against those who desired to remain faithful to YHWH became rampant.<sup>xxx</sup> At that time, it was becoming obvious that a righteous person could be murdered while an apostate could keep his or her life. This led to questioning whether the God who had demanded unconditional loyalty and obedience from Israel was no longer fulfilling the promises made to the righteous. As one scholar explains, “if experience is in radical conflict with ethical faith, but man must still take ethical demands seriously, he must either abandon belief in God’s righteousness or accept that God’s righteousness is exercised within a horizon which goes beyond the limits of a single life.”<sup>xxxii</sup> The solution is found in the doctrine of resurrection and the notion of God’s final judgment. At the same time, the biblical idea of creation, which grew out of the idea of cosmic order, was evolving into that of creation *ex nihilo*, creation from nothing. As such, it became a supporting argument for the doctrine of resurrection as proof of what God can do for humanity in regards to death.<sup>xxxiii</sup> With rising martyrdom came the need to have it not be in vain. Thus, the doctrine, strongly attested to by the prophecy in Daniel allowed people to face the theological challenge brought about by the circumstances they were forced to endure.<sup>xxxiv</sup>

Some scholars however, assert that Dan 12 does not actually represent a natural development of previous Hebrew thinking, but rather is a clever manipulation of popular pagan notions designed to reassure the devout and to put their enemies’ own apostate beliefs upon them.<sup>xxxv</sup> While Persian teachings may have stimulated this biblical vision of the afterlife, the Persians understood the resurrection to be a part of the re-creation of the universe, while the biblical text envisioned it as an occurrence concerning only faithful Jews. Clearly, its roots are found in the Yahwistic tradition proclaiming God’s power,

which could be countered by no force. “God masters death as God masters life. God has created and thus can re-create...Thus, belief in the resurrection of the dead is based on YHWH’s power, on his justice, and on his love, as these have been revealed in the course of the history of Israel.”<sup>xxxvi</sup> Therefore as we have seen, resurrection is on the one hand a foreign graft on earlier Israelite/Jewish thinking, which is why such conservative groups like the Sadducees opposed it. On the other hand it helped to bolster both early teachings about divine justice and power.

Regardless of whether the text of Daniel 12 was a natural evolution of Israelite understandings of life after death or whether it was adapted from the Persian beliefs of its time, the theme of resurrection clearly asserts itself into the theological milieu at the same time as apocalyptic views were developing in response to the distress of the faithful Jews of that time. Victory over death was understood by these Jews as YHWH’s justice for those who gave their lives for the sake of the Holy Name in order that they might henceforth partake of the new age which they believed the God of Israel was preparing for them. Thus, the biblical authors of the exilic period, while still employing the language of death and resurrection as a metaphor for Israel’s revival and return from Exile, were mainly focused not on the immortality of the soul or the salvation of the individual but on the idea that God’s martyrs would experience redemption and the ultimate triumph of their God in the glory of the age to come. The resurrection doctrine provided the God of Israel with the last word, and thus God’s justice, affirmed throughout the Bible, sooner or later would become manifest.<sup>xxxvii</sup>

## Biblical Texts Envisioning Resurrection

When discussing the small number of biblical texts that make reference to resurrection, it is important to distinguish between texts that speak of resurrection and texts that speak of “ascension to the heavens”. For example, there are examples in the Bible of individuals who escape death, not through bodily resurrection but as a result of ‘translation’ to the heavens (i.e. they ascended without actually experiencing death, as is the popular Talmudic and Midrashic opinion).<sup>xxxviii</sup> Enoch (Gen 5:24) and Elijah (2 kgs 2:1-9) were both such individuals, having been granted an exceptional destiny unlike that of other mortal beings. This theme of the transfer of a human being into the heavenly realm, a familiar theme in antiquity,<sup>xxxix</sup> should not be confused with the theme of resurrection. As resurrection is an event occurring sometime *after* the time of death, cases of individuals who ascend to the heavens without experiencing death should not be counted among instances of resurrection. In the same vein, texts such as Ps. 73:24, which are linked to the ascension tales of Enoch and Elijah through the use of the same Hebrew verb *lqh* (‘received’),<sup>xl</sup> should also be dismissed.

Similarly, one might be tempted to dismiss texts which deal only with the fate of one’s *soul* after death be discounted. Immortality, or the living-on of the soul after death may be considered one element of resurrection and as such, a discussion of *biblical* understandings of resurrection would be incomplete without them. In truth, eliminating such texts from a discussion of biblical notions of resurrection would only leave one text, that of Daniel 12, to be examined.

Finally, one must also determine whether or not to include the well-known examples of “resurrections” or “salvific interventions” facilitated by the prophet Elisha and his disciple Elisha (1 Kgs 17:17-24 and 2 Kgs 4:31-37 respectively). On one hand, these could be viewed as instances of resurrections as they were miraculous healings, serving to authenticate the prophetic ministry and affirm God’s power over death, especially in the face of the cult of Baal, which attested to their God being able to do the same.<sup>xli</sup> On the other hand, some modern scholars question whether the individuals who were revived had actually died (despite the explicit statements in both 2 Kgs 4:20 and 4:32 that death occurred), and suggest that perhaps they were on the brink of death but had not yet perished.<sup>xlii</sup> It has also been suggested that the biblical editors included this story as a metaphor pointing to Elijah’s job as God’s prophet being to “breathe new life” into God’s child (Israel) who was in danger of a spiritual death.<sup>xliii</sup>

Either way, these texts may be discounted in a discussion of biblical understandings of resurrection as a) a resurrection of a dead body didn’t actually happen or b) these texts are concerned with affirming the powers of God and God’s prophets rather than with answering questions of what happens to an individual after death. The case of a dead body reviving after coming into contact with the corpse of Elisha (II Kin 13:20-21) can be discounted for the same reasons. Thus a discussion of biblical understandings of resurrection can be focused in on just five examples.

## **I. Ps 49:16 – “God will redeem my life from the clutches of *Sheol*...”**

To begin with, this passage may not constitute a valid example of a text relating to resurrection. While some scholars see it as a literal plea for salvation from the finality of death,<sup>xliv</sup> others posit that the author is not hoping to be *revived* from death but saved *from the event* of death (i.e. God is being petitioned to *prevent* death, not rescue the author post-mortem). These scholars call to attention the biblical understandings of death as discussed above, in that the ancient Israelites saw no clear hope of life beyond death. “The psalm is too early in the development of Israel’s thought to formulate such a belief.”<sup>xlv</sup>

This verse, however, ought to be included in the discussion of biblical notions of resurrection since one could argue that the psalmists often asserted the faithfulness and justice of God. Thus, it can be expected that they might speak of a future with God more glorious than existence in gloomy *Sheol*. Even if this poet was *not* asking to be saved from the eternal reality of death, the psalmists often addressed the problem of the unfairness of life, a theme that, as has been shown above, ultimately leads to the development of the doctrine of resurrection, particularly in response to persecution and martyrdom.<sup>xlvi</sup> Thus, in terms of development, this psalm can shed light on the thinking of ancient Israelites as they began to demand God’s justice in the face of harsh realities.

## II. Hosea 6:1-3 – “...On the third day God will raise us up...”

This text is one of two examples (the second being Ezek. 37:1-14) of passages that use the image of resurrection to call to mind the future restoration of God’s people after a period of difficulty or national disaster.<sup>xlvi</sup> Here too however, there is the question of whether or not this text actually refers to resurrection. Some scholars argue that the *piel* form of *ch.y.h* in verse 2 should not be understood to mean “make alive” but rather “to preserve alive” one who has been wounded but is not yet dead. If this is true, the passage can be understood to be about those who are wounded but will “rise up” from their sickbeds and continue to live in God’s presence. The text is not predicting future events, but merely voicing the hope that a sickly nation will soon find itself on the road to recovery.<sup>xlvi</sup>

## III. Ezek 37:1-14 – “...Can these bones live again?”

This is the second of the two texts concerned with the restoration of the people after the nation’s demise, in this case with the taking of Jerusalem and the downfall of the kingdom of Judah in 587 BCE. “To a nation bruised and quasi-moribund, the prophet foretold a resurrection which consisted concretely in the reconstitution of the ‘house of Israel.’”<sup>xlvi</sup> Ezekiel is assuring the people of an extraordinary regeneration. He describes an event that he had witnessed in a vision, which was not rooted in a naturalistic mysticism but in the traditional teachings of YHVH. Just like with humanity’s creation, the resurrection would also take place in two stages: the strewn bones are first brought back together and then flesh and skin are added to form complete bodies, lacking only the breath of life. These bodies will rise up at the summons of the ‘spirit’ or ‘the breath’ of

God, to testify to the renovation of Israel. In this way, Ezekiel appropriated the idea of resurrection but with a perspective that fully conformed to the cult of YHVH.<sup>l</sup>

This passage is also the most vivid of the metaphorical uses of the idea of resurrection in the bible. Here the metaphor is explicit: “these bones are the whole house of Israel” (v.11).<sup>li</sup> Unlike many of the biblical texts referring to resurrection, which are understood differently by rabbinic and modern scholarship, this text has always been viewed as a reference to national revival. Rabbi David Kimchi noted as much, understanding the metaphor to be pointing to how the Jewish people will emerge from exile after having been like dry bones, although he does leave the door open for a literal reading as well.

#### **IV. Isa 26:19 – “Oh, let Your dead revive! Let corpses arise!”**

There are two passages in the bible that do seem to envision a resurrection of the dead that is non-metaphoric - an actual liberation from death, although an inclusion of the first verse, Isa 26:19, in this category could be debated. Both Isa 26:19 and Dan 12 are among the latest dated texts in the Bible (Isa 26 is dated to the end of the Persian period by some commentators and Daniel is dated to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE). As well, both are reflective of the influence of apocalyptic thinking.<sup>lii</sup>

Isa 26:19 is part of a larger unit (Isa 24-27), a postexilic text known as “the Great Apocalypse”. There are some scholars who think this verse is a latter addition or an independent declaration in response to verse 14 (“They are dead, they can never live; Shades, they can never rise”). This “Apocalypse” dates to the 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E. and is seen as a prediction of salvation following the lament in vv 7-18. However, the Hebrew

text of verse 19 raises a measure of difficulty, as it can be understood to be either an expression of desire or of prophecy. Here too, it is possible to read a metaphor for national restoration into the text,<sup>liii</sup> one coming after an unfortunate time for the Jewish community during the decline of the Persian period. It must be acknowledged however that the majority of critics do consider this verse to be announcing a *real* resurrection of the dead, one that was not universal, but was accorded only to the “dead of YHWH”, i.e. those who had died for the sake of God’s name. This resurrection therefore, was not promised to all of humanity but solely to those believers who had been faithful even to the point of giving their lives for God’s cause.<sup>liv</sup>

The language of the passage is similarly hyperbolic, as, “the desired regeneration of a spiritually inert and virtually ‘dead’ community of Israel is likened metaphorically and poetically. (The verse expresses) a desperate hope for the impossible – a *cri da coeur* – rather than a confidence in the inevitable.”<sup>lv</sup> This language however, is not indicative of a definite belief in bodily resurrection. A similar example is Ps. 17:15, which does not actually refer to waking from the sleep of death, but simply voices the prayer of one who has sought refuge in a sanctuary – “that he will, indeed, be safe overnight and wake to see his divine ‘host’ in the morning!” Therefore this passage may be interpreted in the context of asylum rather than of physical resurrection.<sup>lvi</sup>

Here it is important to note that the recurrent refutation of a meaningful afterlife acts as polemic against ancestor cults and necromantic practices abandoned by Deuteronomic and Priestly practices, though perhaps observed in earlier biblical times. This is arguable due to the fact that the Israelite religion was characterized by a lack of belief in meaningful postmortem existence, in accordance with Mesopotamian thinking

and in antithesis to ancient Egyptian notions. It is also arguable that, although a belief in individual resurrection was not directly attested before the persecutions of Antiochus IV, it seems a less clearly defined assurance of life beyond death was forming long before then.<sup>lvii</sup> Blenkinsopp further suggests that the declaration that “*your* dead” will live but “*their* dead” will not implies that the notion of God’s people returning from the dead was intended metaphorically but that later editing may have replaced the word *rephaim* “shades” with the word *neveilim* “corpses” in order to bring the belief in physical resurrection more clearly to the forefront. A textual corruption of this sort would hardly be surprising considering such seems to be the fate of passages deemed to be religiously controversial.<sup>lviii</sup>

That there is ambiguity about who is speaking and who is being addressed is cause for further consideration as some theories points to a literal reading while others point to one that is based in metaphor. As Kaiser explains,

(If the verse is) uttered by the praying community or an individual leading the prayer, then the dead are departed Israelites who are particularly close to him, or perhaps even the righteous. Then the phrase that follows, if the Hebrew word *nebela* is to be understood as a collective, says the same thing from the point of view of the person or persons who are praying, and also emphasizes the reality of the bodily resurrection. In this case, the interjection would be addressed to the dead themselves, and the prayer that follows would be addressed once again to Yahweh and would describe the dew, by means of the pronoun, as coming from him. On the other hand if Yahweh is the speaker, as most modern commentators accept, what we have is a promise in reply to the praying community, and all the subsequent relationships are simply reversed.<sup>lix</sup>

In the later case therefore, the dead are not being addressed and an argument for a literal understanding of resurrection in this passage is harder to make. One other reading is possible, where after YHVH gives a brief promise of the resurrection and has awakened the dead, the community replies by proclaiming and marveling that the impossible has

been realized, thus pointing back to a literal reading. However, harmonizing the various extant manuscripts leads Kaiser back to the same conclusion as Blenkinsopp - that the original text was likely amended in order to reconcile theological tensions.<sup>lx</sup> Thus it remains unclear whether or not Isa 26:19 is truly indicative of a biblical belief in the physical resurrection of a community of righteous adherents of YHVH.

#### **V. Dan 12:1-3 – “Many of those that sleep in the dust of the earth will awake...”**

The Daniel text therefore is the only uncontested reference to a literal belief in communal, physical resurrection, and the first example of resurrection being mentioned in connection to reward and punishment.<sup>lxi</sup> Although it clearly marks an evolution from prophetic writings to apocalyptic writings, the fact of Daniel’s inclusion with the prophets in the Septuagint indicates that it came to be seen as having a message consistent with that of the prophets. For the most part however, the book is recognized as the earliest example of apocalyptic writing, pointing to the type of environment resulting from the crisis provoked Antiochus Epiphanes’ persecution of the Jews opposed to Hellenization.<sup>lxii</sup>

Unlike contemporary and later examples of apocalyptic writers, Daniel does not seek to provide a complete picture of the end of time. He is focused on what is most important to him, which seems to be the destiny of the *maskilim* and the hope of life in fellowship with God and angels after death.<sup>lxiii</sup>

(He) foretold a time of anguish that would surpass any imagined horrors and simultaneously promised divine protection to the faithful Yahwists. Then the fate of the dead, particularly those who had fallen during the persecutions, is addressed. Again, this is not a resurrection that will be extended to the whole of humanity, but would be limited to the opponents of Antiochus’ partisans, bound for ‘eternal life’.<sup>lxiv</sup>

It seems that retribution would, in the end, come about via resurrection as well, although whether or not the damned would physically return to life, “to experience an unending opprobrium” is unclear.<sup>lxv</sup>

What is also unclear is the meaning of “eternal life”. Is this truly a bodily resurrection or are the dead simply being raised from *Sheol* to some better place, to “live on” close to God and the angels instead of removed by them? The description of their being “radiant like the bright expanse of sky” is telling. In other examples of apocalyptic writings, such as Enoch, the stars are identified with the angelic host. Shining like the stars is understood not only as a metaphor for brilliant grandeur, but also as a promise that the righteous will actually become companions to the hosts of heaven.<sup>lxvi</sup> In light of this “emphasis on the star-like transformation of the wise”, it seems possible to argue that this text is speaking of a resurrection to eternal life in the heavens rather than a new existence of the body on earth.<sup>lxvii</sup>

## Conclusions

While there are clear biblical references to resurrection, none of them can truly point to a belief in literal, bodily resurrection. Most are metaphors for the Israelite nation’s ultimate comeback, some are narratives designed to highlight the power of YHWH and his prophets, and few, though clearly painting an evolved theory of life-after-death, are vague enough that one cannot truly say whether they point to bodily resurrection or to an eternal existence of another sort.

For the purposes of this thesis, it is particularly important to note the predominant theme of the Bible's metaphoric use of resurrection. One could clearly argue that modern thinkers, in claiming *techyat hameitim* as a metaphor in order to justify its reincorporation into liberal Jewish liturgy, have a biblical precedent to point to.

## CHAPTER 2: CLASSICAL RABBINIC UNDERSTANDINGS OF RESURRECTION

### Historical Overview

During the Second Temple Era (536 BCE–70 CE), the veracity of resurrection was in dispute between the Sadducees and the Pharisees.<sup>lxxviii</sup> The Sadducees completely rejected the idea of postmortem reward and punishment entirely, along with belief in any type of bodily resurrection. Instead, they thought that the soul ceased to exist at the time of death.<sup>lxxix</sup> On the other side of the debate, Josephus recounted the Pharisees as having argued,

Souls have an immortal vigor in them...Under the earth there will be rewards and punishments according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life...The latter are to be detained in an everlasting prison...The former shall have power to revive and live again.<sup>lxxx</sup>

After the Jewish Wars against Rome (66-135 C.E.), the Pharisee view of resurrection is imposed.<sup>lxxxi</sup> The arguments of the Sadducees were dismissed, and the Pharisaic belief in resurrection became an uncontested dogma of the Jewish religion.<sup>lxxxii</sup>

Political tensions prompted the early Rabbis to place this religious concept at the center of their system of beliefs.<sup>lxxxiii</sup> According to the Jewish historian Salo Baron, Celsus, an informed writer in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century C.E., seemed not to know about the Sadducean denial of the doctrine, stating that the Jews shared the Christian belief in the ultimate resurrection of the dead.<sup>lxxxiv</sup> In order to strengthen adherence to this belief, the Rabbis identified directly in the Talmud those who would be denied this eternal privilege.<sup>lxxxv</sup> The fact that this was necessary also indicates that there were Jews, even in rabbinic circles, who questioned the reality of resurrection.<sup>lxxxvi</sup> By making salvation conditional upon belief, the Rabbis were breaking radically with the Jewish thinking of

the past. Until then, only ones' actions had determined eligibility for God's kindness or, alternately were cause for divine retribution. The Israelites had always been told all would be well as long as they observed the laws and practices that YHVH had commanded them. The Rabbis had made belief as important as deed, and, "to question resurrection was to forfeit eternal life."<sup>lxxvii</sup> The Rabbis were thus similarly concerned with there being clear textual evidence for the doctrine. The Talmud reflects their detailed arguing that the idea was clearly evident in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>lxxviii</sup> Indeed, through the process of homiletical textual exegesis, the Rabbis repeatedly authenticated the truth of their belief in resurrection.<sup>lxxix</sup>

Additionally, the Rabbis linked this belief to practice through their developing prayer liturgy. The Rabbis integrated the topic of resurrection into their daily prayers and it became an essential element of the *Tefillah*. By incorporating the doctrine into this prayer, the Rabbis caused it to be a central pillar in their theological worldview, while at the same time, effectively excluding those who did not accept the belief in resurrection from communal worship. The Rabbis were successful in their endeavors. For over two thousand years this doctrine has been a primary tenet of Judaism. Today, the prayer for resurrection, *tehiyyat ha-metim*, is still recited daily in traditional Jewish liturgy.<sup>lxxx</sup>

## What the Rabbis Believed

It was generally accepted by the Rabbis that in the world to come the righteous would be rewarded and the wicked would be punished. They taught that the former would go to *Gan Eden* and the latter to *Gehinnom*. Beyond this basic system of belief, however, individual rabbis offered varied and imaginative scenarios. Some argued that the righteous and the wicked would go to their respective places *only after* resurrection and final judgment. Others upheld that the deceased would receive their portions immediately after death. Some believed that the soul would remain within the body for a brief period and then ascend to a heavenly realm, while others thought that after death the soul would return to a heaven and wait until the time of resurrection to be reunited with its physical body.<sup>lxxxix</sup>

Throughout rabbinic literature, resurrection takes on different functions – “as recompense for the lack of divine justice in this world, as a reward for one’s deeds, or, in special cases, to exalt and glorify the persecuted leaders of the community.”<sup>lxxxix</sup> These themes continued to be motivated by persecution and oppression.<sup>lxxxiii</sup> In the Babylonian Talmud the Rabbis debated physical concerns relating to resurrection<sup>lxxxiv</sup>, although often they failed to resolve these matters.<sup>lxxxv</sup> The Rabbis also debated the questions of who would be resurrected and when.<sup>lxxxvi</sup> According to the dominant view, bodily resurrection would occur at the end of time, following the arrival of the Messiah. The majority of the Rabbis also maintained that body and soul would be revived together, and together would stand for the final judgment.<sup>lxxxvii</sup> It is also important to note that for the most part, a literal understanding of bodily resurrection was unquestioned by the Rabbis.

The sages of the rabbinic period and many of the medieval Jewish scholars who affirmed belief in bodily resurrection did not have a problem fathoming resurrection because they already believed in God's omnipotence and creation ex nihilo...If God could create the world out of nothing, God could very well arrange it so that bodies and souls would be united miraculously at the time of resurrection.<sup>lxxxviii</sup>

Discussions and debates relating to the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead continued on after the Talmudic era. As conversations continued over the centuries, the concept of resurrection maintained its position of importance even though there were considerably different opinions among Jewish thinkers as to its definition.<sup>lxxxix</sup> The Geonim and Medieval thinkers continued to engage in theological questioning about resurrection because they wanted to offer "practical guidance to those who lived with that expectation," as many found faith in resurrection to bring them comfort and hope that they otherwise would not have.<sup>xc</sup>

In the 10<sup>th</sup> century, Saadia Gaon restated the classical rabbinic views of the Doctrine of Resurrection. Like the Rabbis, Saadia used a series of biblical proof texts to show the reasonableness of a belief in physical resurrection. He upheld the notion that there would be a messianic redemption after which the dead would be resurrected and body and soul would be reunited. In his great work, *Emunot Ve-Daot*, Saadia declares that there will be not one but two separate phases of resurrection. In these phases, an individual's body will not return to life twice, but rather, there will be two distinct periods of communal resurrection – first in the messianic era, and afterward, in the World to Come. The primary eschatological belief essential to Saadia's philosophy was the rabbinic view that the soul - after death - would disconnect from the physical body and

wait in a transitional state until the time of resurrection, at which point it and the physical body would come back together.<sup>xci</sup>

In addition to outlining the basic beliefs about the doctrine, Saadia also raised some practical questions and discussed a number of hypothetical situations such as: “Will these individuals who are destined to be resurrected in this world eat and drink and marry, or will they not do any of these things?”<sup>xcii</sup> Saadia also raised the questions such as: Will there be enough room for all those resurrected? Will the resurrected persons recognize their family members? Will those who died with blemishes be cured? What will happen to those whose life is about to end at the time of redemption? In some cases, Saadia sided with the Talmudic views while in others, he opposed rabbinic opinion.<sup>xciii</sup>

In the 12<sup>th</sup> century, Maimonides included the Doctrine of Resurrection, which he called a “cardinal doctrine”<sup>xciv</sup> in his Thirteen Articles of Faith, faith in resurrection of the dead being the thirteenth article. Despite its prominence of place, Maimonides provided “scant description” of the details surrounding resurrection. As well, in his, *Guide for the Perplexed*, Maimonides failed to even mention resurrection, while writing repeatedly that the final reward would be, “the disembodied soul basking in the spiritual presence of God.”<sup>xcv</sup> Confusion also arose over his championing of “a Jewish version of Aristotle’s view” that a person’s acquired intellect is what lives on eternally, joining with God’s own intellect.<sup>xcvi</sup>

Maimonides was motivated to elaborate however, by the developing controversy in the Judeo-Arabic world surrounding the topic. In 1191 he wrote his *Treatise on Resurrection* responding to a letter he had received from Yemen indicating that many of his coreligionists were denouncing belief in physical resurrection and claiming that both

biblical and rabbinic statements on the resurrection had been intended to be allegorical. To support their view, they had cited specific passages from Maimonides' writings, such as his claim *that Olam Ha-Ba* was an ethereal spiritual realm. Further contention surrounded Maimonides' view that in the World to Come there would be no physical bodies - How would it be possible for reward and punishment to take place without physical bodies?

Maimonides responded by addressing the question at length and providing a more detailed explanation than before. He clarified the relationship between resurrection, the Days of the Messiah, and the World to Come. He explained that there would first be a physical resurrection followed by a reentry of souls into their former bodies. Individuals would then function normally in the physical world and live a long life. However, Maimonides stated that this would be a temporary existence and that after a time, the resurrected dead would once again return to dust. At that point, only the immortal soul would continue to exist. This, Maimonides explained, would be the *Olam Ha-Ba* – a state of spiritualized existence.<sup>xcvii</sup>

Maimonides' critics, including some of the leading rabbis of Europe, challenged his description of resurrection as "a radical departure from the traditional faith in resurrection as the final reward."<sup>xcviii</sup> In contrast, Nahmanides (1194-1270) presented the more accepted perspective of resurrection. In his essay, "The Gate of Reward," he challenged Maimonides directly, and wrote that the final reward necessitates reunification of soul and body. However, a close reading of Nahmanides' essay shows that his use of "body" was not meant as the same body one inhabits in this life. In the

messianic era, Nahmanides believed, the body would not need food or water but would be nourished by God's light.<sup>xcix</sup>

Along with the main-stream thinkers, the Kabbalists (13-15<sup>th</sup> century) also incorporated resurrection into their system of beliefs and contemplated it myriad details. For the Kabbalists, the doctrine of resurrection of the dead was an innate component of their mystical and metaphysical worldview. Early forms of Jewish mysticism do not cast any doubt on the notion of collective physical resurrection and redemption at the end-of-days. The early Kabbalists believed that after "the great day of judgment," the perfected soul would rejoin a completely resurrected body. They believed this resurrected body would be totally spiritualized and transformed from what it had been in its former life<sup>c</sup>.

The Kabbalists also believed in reincarnation. They linked it to resurrection by asking and answer the following question: if human beings have lived numerous *gilgulim* (incarnations) in different physical bodies, into which body will the resurrected soul enter? The Zohar asks: "What will happen to a number of bodies which shared in succession the same soul?" It answers: "Only the last that had been firmly planted and took root will come to life."<sup>ci</sup> In the Kabbalistic belief system, the resurrected body, after the time of messianic redemption, will be seen as a physical body totally infused with the glow of the reawakened soul. "According to Kabbalah, in this life it is the soul that invigorates the body. But in the future life of resurrection the body will then be invigorated by the soul." The Kabbalists believed that because the physical body is capable of procreating, creating new things and doing mitzvot, it is thus closer than the soul is to God.<sup>cii</sup>

In Safed, the Kabbalists evolved guidelines for the individual soul's postmortem journey. In these guidelines however, the notion of resurrection was downplayed. Lurianic Kabbalah had difficulty harmonizing the belief in a physical resurrection with their spiritual and metaphysical cosmology. For similar reasons, the early Hasidim also deemphasized the doctrine of bodily resurrection. Over time, the doctrine of resurrection was interpreted in a more spiritual sense. Regardless, resurrection itself was never considered to be the ultimate state of being for the Kabbalists. For them, "the fully awakened soul within a spiritualized, resurrected body is actually divinity itself fully realized. This soul merges with the source of the Divine Being...this is the ultimate attainment."<sup>ciii</sup>

The debates about resurrection raged on over time, in both mystic and mainstream circles, and by the fifteenth century, thinkers such as Crescas and Joseph Albo<sup>civ</sup> had relegated the notion to a "specific doctrine" rather than a fundamental tenet of faith.<sup>cv</sup> Over the centuries, as rabbinic conceptions of life after death changed and evolved, an eventual integration of the notions of individual immortality and resurrection of the dead successfully came about. Eventually, the common belief was that upon death, the individual soul first entered *Gehinnom*. After twelve months, the soul entered a higher realm to wait for the collective resurrection of the dead at the end-of-days.<sup>cvi</sup> For the most part, this is the rabbinic view that still persists in traditional circles today.

## ADENDUM I: POST-BIBLICAL UNDERSTANDINGS PRIOR TO THE CLASSICAL RABBINIC PERIOD

The Book of Daniel is far from the only apocalyptic work detailing beliefs about resurrection. The Book of Enoch (3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.E.) is considered by some to be the earliest Jewish expression of literal belief in resurrection.<sup>cvi</sup> In I Enoch, chapters 20-36 narrate Enoch's journey through the cosmos where he sees a great mountain with three vast gulfs of space where "all the souls of the sons of men" are sorted and separated for the purpose of judgment.<sup>cvi</sup> Each of these voids described by Enoch is administered through a different reward or punishment. In the first, a fountain of water rejuvenates the righteous; in the second, the wicked are tormented; and in the third, the souls of persons who have been murdered appeal for divine retribution.<sup>cix</sup>

Although Enoch deals primarily with a vision of life after death on an unearthly plain, resurrection also features in this universe. Chapter 22 portrays the tormented sinners being revived for the purpose of final judgment, while the righteous are born again to a new life in the rebuilt city of Jerusalem described in chapter 25 (derived from descriptions of the New Jerusalem in Isaiah 65-66). This text also references the bones of the righteous (I Enoch 25:6), thus indicative of a resurrection to some kind of physical existence for the righteous. It is unclear however whether the fate of those who are ultimately punished will take a physical or ethereal form.<sup>cx</sup>

The later chapters of I Enoch (92-105) are dominated by descriptions of injustice in the world of the living. The solution to this theological challenge is reached in I Enoch 102:4-104:8 with a description of postmortem reward and punishment. The souls of the righteous, who are found grieving in *Sheol*, are assured of a rebirth, at which time they will collect the rewards that were withheld in their former lives. This rebirth will not be

to the physical realm, however, but to heaven with the angels who have pleaded their case before God.<sup>cxii</sup> Thus, while notions of resurrection clearly featured in the Book of Enoch, it was not always clear whether or not a bodily resurrection was being described, neither was a physical resurrection the only or the ultimate fate for humanity.

The text of Jubilees (135-105 B.C.E) also references ideas relating to resurrection (23:11-13). However in this text too, the resurrection envisioned is not a bodily one as it reads: “their bones will rest in the earth, and their spirits will have much joy.”<sup>cxii</sup> The 2<sup>nd</sup> Book of Maccabees, chapter 7 (2<sup>nd</sup> – 1<sup>st</sup> cen. B.C.E) relates the narrative of martyrs who, “condemned to death in a human court, await vindication in the supreme court of their God, who will restore the life and limbs that Antiochus has destroyed.” Here, bodily resurrection serves as the counterpart to bodily destruction. The text employs images from Second Isaiah, originally referring to Israel’s return from Exile (see Chapter 1) but used here to refer to redemption of the plighted individual.<sup>cxiii</sup>

In the text of Baruch, written after Jerusalem’s destruction ca. 100 CE, the author considers God’s justice and the legitimacy of God’s promises. The tribulations experienced by the author are explained by a dualism between the corrupt age he is living in and the honorable age that will come after God’s final judgment of humanity. It is in this context that resurrection is discussed in chapters 49-51. Here, resurrection is apparent as the souls of the dead are raised up from *Sheol* “in their original form, so that the living may recognize them.” After this occurs, similar to the views expressed in Enoch, the righteous will be freed from “the limitations of this age” and transformed “into glory like the stars and the angels, with whom they will inhabit paradise in the age to come.”<sup>cxiv</sup>

The Jewish mystics in Qumran also recorded their beliefs relating to resurrection. In the Qumran Hymn Scroll (3:19-23; 11:3-14), hymns can be found which give thanks to God for having brought them from death to life. Thus, it seems their view of resurrection was not a literal one as the mystics were known to describe the world outside their sectarian community as *Sheol*, and entrance into the community was construed to be like resurrection into the realm of eternal life.<sup>cxv</sup> Neither the Qumran hymns nor the *Rule of the Community* specified whether the authors anticipated an actual resurrection. However, these scrolls rarely refer to physical death rather their imagery often stressed the continuity between one's present situation and future reward. This suggests they believed that at the time of physical death one would pass directly to eternal life. On the other hand, some argue that the uniform orientation of the graves at Qumran may attest a belief in a future communal resurrection.<sup>cxvi</sup>

**TABLE A:**  
**RABBINIC TEXTS AFFIRMING TORAH ORIGIN OF DOCTRINE OF RESURRECTION**

TEXT SOURCE	DATE	HEBREW TEXT	ENGLISH TEXT
Mishna Sanhedrin 10:1	c. 300 C.E.	ואלו שאין להם חלק לעולם הבא, האומר אין תחית המתים מן התורה, ואין תורה מן השמים, ואפיקורוס.	And these are they who have no share in the world to come – he that says there is no resurrection of the dead laid down in the Law, and [he that says] the Law is not from Heaven, and a heretic.
Talmud Sanhedrin 90b	c. 500 C.E.	המתים לתחיית מניין (י' יוחנן רבי אמר) ונתתם (י"ח במדבר) שנאמר התורה מן וכי, הכהן לאהרן ה' תרומת [את] ממנו לארץ נכנס לא והלא? קיים לעולם אהרן מלמד, אלא. תרומה לו שנותנין, ישראל - תרומה לו נותנין ישראל, לחיות שעתידי התורה מן המתים... לתחיית מכאן לתחיית מניין: אומר סימאי רבי, תניא (ו' שמות) שנאמר התורה מן המתים את להם לתת אתם בריתי את הקמתי וגם - להם אלא, נאמר לא לכם. כנען ארץ התורה מן המתים לתחיית מכאן מניין: גמליאל רבן את מינין שאלו אמר? מתים מחייה הוא רובך שהקדוש ומן, הנביאים ומן, התורה מן להם - התורה מן. ממנו קיבלו ולא, הכתובים משה אל ה' ויאמר (ל"א דברים) דכתיב וקם אבתיך עם שכב הנך... יחיו (כ"ו ישעיהו) דכתיב הנביאים מן שכני ורננו הקיצו יקומון נבלתי מתוך רפאים וארץ טלך אורת טל כי עפר לתפי... (ז' השירים שיר) דכתיב הכתובים מן למישרים לדודי הולך הטוב כיון וחכך ישנים שפתי דובב... (י"א דברים): זה מקרא להם שאמר עד לכם, להם לתת לאבתיכם ה' נשבע אשר המתים לתחיית מיכך להם אלא נאמר לא הזה המקרא מן: אומרים ויש. התורה מן קים הדב ואתם (ד' דברים): להם אמר פשיטא) היום כלכם חיים אלהיכם בה' שכל ביום אפילו אלא, היום כלכם דחיים מה. (חיים אתם מתים כולם העולם הבא לעולם אך קיימין כולכם היום רבי את רומיים שאלו. קיימין כולכם ברוך שהקדוש מניין: חנניה בן יהושע	R' Yochanan said: <b>Where to the Resurrection of the Dead in the Torah?</b> For it states: <i>And you shall give from it God's terumah to Aaron the Kohen</i> . Now, is Aaron alive forever? Why, he never entered Eretz Yisrael – that they should give him <i>terumah</i> ! Rather, this teaches that [Aaron] is destined to live [again] and Israel will [then] give him <i>terumah</i> . <b>Here to the Resurrection of the Dead in the Torah...</b> It was taught in a Baraisa: R'Simai says: <b>Where to the Resurrection of the Dead in the Torah?</b> For it is stated: <i>And I have also established my covenant with them to give to them the Land of Canaan</i> . To "You" is not stated, but rather to "them". <b>Here to the Resurrection of the Dead in the Torah...</b> The sectarians asked Rabban Gamliel: <b>From where that the Holy One, Blessed is He, resurrects the dead?</b> He cited to them from the Pentateuch and from the Prophets and from the Writings, but they did not accept from him. From the Pentateuch that is written: <i>And God said to Moses: "Behold, you will lie with your forefathers and rise."</i> ... From the Prophets that is written: <i>May Your dead live. [O, command:] "My [people's] corpses shall rise! Awake and sing, you who dwell in the earth!" For a dew of lights is Your dew...</i> From the Writings that is written: <i>And your palate shall be like the choicest wine; going to my Beloved with sincerity, stirring the lips of those who sleep [in the grave]...</i> Until he cited to them this verse: <i>that God swore to your forefathers to give to them</i> . To "you" is not stated, but rather to "them". <b>Here to the Resurrection of the Dead in the Torah.</b> And some say from this verse that he adduced to them: <i>And you who cleave to YHVH your God are alive all of you today</i> . Obviously, all of you are alive <i>today</i> . Rather, even on the day when all the world are dead, you are alive. Just as today you are all alive, so too, in the World to Come you will all be alive. The Romans asked R' Yehoshua ben Chananiah: <b>From where that the Holy One, Blessed is He, resurrects the dead</b> and He knows what will be in the future? He said to them: Both from this verse: For it is stated: <i>And God said to Moses, "Behold you will lie with your forefather and rise</i>

		<p>שעתיד מה ויודע, מתים מחיה הוא להו אמר? להיות: שנאמר, הזה המקרא מן ווייהותר הנך משה אל ה' ויאמר (ל"א דברים) וזנה זה העם וקם אבתיך עם שכב... רבי משום יוחנן רבי אמר, גמי איתמר ברוך שהקדוש מניין: יוחאי בן שמעון להיות שעתיד מה ויודע, מתים מחיה הוא וגו' וקם אבתיך עם שכב הנך, שנאמר בדבר: יוסי ברבי אליעזר רבי אמר, תניא אין אומרים שהיו, כותים ספרי זיפתי זה: להן אמרתי. התורה מן המתים תחיית בידכם העליתם ולא, תורתכם זיפתם המתים תחיית אין אומרים שאתם. כלום (ט"ו במדבר) אומר הוא הרי, התורה מן הכרת בה עונה ההיא הנפש תכרת הכרת בה עונה, הזה בעולם תכרת הבא לעולם לאו? לאימת... רבי את מלכתא קליאופטרא שאלה דכתיב, שכבי דחיי ידענא: אמרה, מאיר כעשב מעיר ויציצו (ע"ב תהלים)... הארץ</p>	<p>will this nation and stray"...Similarly, it was stated: R' Yochanan said in the name of R' Shimon ben Yochai: <b>From where that the Holy One, Blessed is He, resurrects the dead</b> and knows what will be in the future? For it is stated: <i>Behold you will lie with your forefathers and rise etc.</i> It was taught in a Baraisa: R' Eliezer the son of R' Yose said: <b>In this matter I showed the books of the sectarians to be false. For they would say that there is no Resurrection of the Dead in the Torah.</b> I said to them: You have falsified your scriptures, but you have accomplished nothing for you say that there is no Resurrection of the Dead in the Torah but surely it states: <i>That soul shall be utterly cut off, its sin is upon it. It shall be utterly cut off</i> in this world. When <i>its sin is upon it</i>? Must it not be to the world to come?... Queen Cleopatra asked R' Meir. She said: <b>I know that the dead live [again] as it is written: And they shall blossom forth from the city like the grass of the earth.</b><sup>1</sup></p>
Talmud Sanhedrin 91b	c. 500 C.E.	<p>שתהא יכול ואחיה אמית אני: רבנן תנו שהעולם כדרך באחד וחיים באחד מיתה ארפא ואני מחצתי לומר תלמוד נוגה מיתה אף באחד ורפואה מחיצה מה אין לאומרין תשובה מיכן. באחד וחיים אמר, תניא. התורה מן המתים תחיית מן המתים לתחיית מניין: מאיר רבי ישיר אז (ט"ו שמות) שנאמר התורה לה' הזאת השירה את ישראל ובני משה לתחיית מכאך ישיר אלא, נאמר לא שר התורה מן המתים. אז (ח' יהושע): אומר אתה בדבר כיוצא נאמר לא בנה, לה' מזבח יהושע יבנה מן המתים לתחיית מכאך יבנה אלא התורה... לתחיית מניין: לוי בן יהושע רבי אמר (פ"ד תהלים) שנאמר רההתו מן המתים סלה יהללך עוד ביתך יושבי אשרי</p>	<p>The rabbis taught in a Baraisa: <i>I put to death and I make live.</i> It would be possible that death is upon one and life upon one in the manner that the world functions. [Therefore] the Torah states: <i>I have wounded and I will heal.</i> Just as wounding and healing are in one so too death and life are in one. <b>From here a refutation to those who say there is no resurrection of the dead in the Torah.</b> It was taught in a Baraisa: R'Meir said: <b>Where to the Resurrection of the Dead in the Torah?</b> For it is stated: <i>Then will Moses and the Children of Israel Sing This Song to YHVH. He sang</i> is not stated, but rather: <i>he will sing.</i> <b>Here to the Resurrection of the Dead in the Torah.</b> Similarly You may say: <i>Then will Joshua Build an Altar unto Hashem. He built</i> is not stated, but rather: <i>He will build.</i> <b>Here to the Resurrection of the Dead in the Torah...</b>R' Yehoshua the son of Levi said: <b>Where to the Resurrectio of the Dead in the Torah?</b> For it is stated: <i>Happy are those who dwell in Your house; yet again shall they praise You, selah.</i> It does not say they</p>

		<p>מכאך יהללך אלא נאמר לא היללך התורה מן המתים לתחיית...          יוחנן רבי אמר אבא בר חייא רבי אמר שנאמר התורה מן המתים לתחיית מניין יחדו קול נשאו צפיק קול (נ"ב ישעיהו) ירננו אלא, נאמר לא ריננו, וגו' ירננו התורה מן המתים לתחיית מכאך.</p>	<p><i>have praised you, but rather they will praise You. Here to the Resurrection of the Dead in the Torah...</i> R'Chiya bar Abba said in the name of R' Yochanan: <b>Where to the Resurrection of the Dead in the Torah?</b> For it is stated: <i>The voice of your seers – they have shouted! In unison shall they sing!</i> It is not stated <i>they sang</i> but rather, <i>they shall sing. Here to the Resurrection of the Dead in the Torah.</i><sup>2</sup></p>
Talmud Sanhedrin 92a	c. 500 C.E.	<p>מן המתים לתחיית ניין: רבא אמר ראובן יחי (ל"ג דברים) שנאמר התורה ואל, הזה בעולם ראובן יחי, ימת ואל מהכא אמר רבינא. הבא לעולם ימת עפר אדמת מישני ורבים (י"ב דניאל) לחרפות ואלה עולם לחיי אלה יקיצו מהכא אמר אשי רב. עולם לדראון ותנוח [לקץ] לך ואתה (י"ב דניאל) הימין לקץ לגרלך ותעמד...          מאי: יאשיה רבי אמר טבי רבי אמר ארץ רחם ועצר שאול (ל' משלי) דכתיב אצל שאול ענין מה וכי, מים שבעה לא מכניס רחם מה: לך לומר אלא? רחם והלא. ומוציא מכניס שאול אף ומוציא בו שמכניסין רחם ומה: וחומר קל דברים ותקול בקולי ממנו מוציאך בחשאי דין אינר בקולות בו שמכניסין שאול מיכן? קולות בקולי ממנו שמוציאין מן המתים תחיית אין לאומרין תשובה התורה.</p>	<p>Rava says, <b>Where to the Resurrection of the Dead in the Torah?</b> For it is stated: <i>May Reuben live and not die.</i> This means: <i>May Reuben live</i> in this world, <i>and not die</i>, in the World to Come. Ravina says from the following: <i>And many of those who sleep in the dusty earth shall awaken; these for everlasting life, and these for shame – for everlasting abhorrence.</i> Rav Ashi says from the following: <i>And as for you (Daniel), go to the end; and you will repose, and you will arise to your lot at the end of days...</i> R' Tavi said in the name of R' Yoshiyah: What is the meaning of that which is written: <i>The grave, the narrow part of the womb, and the earth that is not sated with water?</i> Now, what connection is there between the grave and the womb? Rather, it is to tell you just as the womb takes in and sends forth, so too does the grave take in and send forth. Now, is the matter not a <i>kal vachomer</i>? If the womb, which takes in in silence sends forth amidst great noise, is it not evident that the grave, which takes in amidst great noise, will eventually bring forth amidst great noise?! <b>From here is a refutation to those who say there is no (allusion to) the Resurrection of the Dead in the Torah.</b><sup>3</sup></p>
Talmud Sanhedrin 92b	c. 500 C.E.	<p>הגלילי יוסי רבי של בנו אליעזר רבי לארץ עלו יחזקאל שהחיה מתים: אומר בנים והולידו נשים ונשאו, ישראל על בתירא בן יהודה רבי עמד. ובנות והללו, בניהם מבני אני: ואמר רגליו תפילין</p>	<p>R' Eliezer the son of R' Yose Haglili says: The dead that Ezekiel resurrected went up to Eretz Yisrael, married and fathered sons and daughters. R' Yehudah ben Beseira rose to his feet and declared: I am one of their descendants, and these are the tefillin that my father's father left me from them.<sup>4</sup></p>

		מהם אבא אבי לי שהניח.	
<i>Sifrei D'varim</i>	2 <sup>nd</sup> cen. C.E.		<b>There is not section of the Torah which does not imply the doctrine of Resurrection</b>

**TABLE B:**  
**RABBINIC TEXTS DETAILING BELIEFS ABOUT RESURRECTION**

TEXT SOURCE	DATE	QUESTION OR ISSUE BEING RAISED	HEBREW TEXT	ENGLISH TEXT
Y. Talmud Ketubot 12:3, 35b	c. 300 C.E.	Is one resurrected in the clothes in which one was buried?		<p>There is a saying implying that Rabbi was buried in only a single wrapping. For Rabbi said, "It is not in the garb in which a man goes (to the grave) that he comes (from the grave, at the resurrection of the dead)." But rabbis say, "Just as a man goes to the grave does he come from it." It has been taught in the name of R. Nathan, "In the garment with which a man goes to the grave he comes up from it." What is the scriptural basis for this statement? "It is changed like clay under the seal, and it is dyed like a garment." Antolinus asked Rabbi, "What is the meaning of the following verse of Scripture: 'It is changed like clay under the seal'?" He said to him, "He who will bring the generation (back to life) is the one who will clothe (it, at the resurrection of the dead)." ...R. Jeremiah gave instructions, "Shroud me in white shrouds. Dress me in my slippers, and put my sandals on my feet, and place my staff in my hand, and bury me by the side of a road. If the Messiah comes, I shall be ready."<sup>5</sup></p>
B. Talmud Taanit 7a	c. 500 C.E.	Is resurrection only for the righteous?	<p>הגשמים יום גדול: אבהו רבי אמר תחיית דאילו, המתים מתחיית גשמים ואילו, לצדיקים המתים - ופליגא. לרשעים בין לצדיקים בין מתוך: יוסף רב דאמר, יוסף דרב - המתים כתחיית שקולה שהיא המתים בתחיית קבעוה.</p>	<p>R. Abahu said: A day of rain is great than the Resurrection of the Dead, for the Resurrection of the Dead is only for the righteous, whereas rain (benefits) both the righteous and the wicked. (R' Abahu) is at variance with Rav Yosef, for Rav Yosef said: Since (rain) is equivalent of the</p>

				Resurrection of the Dead (the Sages) placed (the mention of rain) in (the blessing of ) the Resurrection of the Dead. <sup>6</sup>
Talmud Ketubot 111a	c. 500 C.E.	Can one be resurrected if one is buried outside of Eretz Yisrael?	<p>לארץ שבחוץ מתים: אלעזר א"ר (כ"ו יחזקאל): שנאמר, חיים אינם ארץ, חיים בארץ צבי ונתתי שאין, חיים מתיה בה שצביוני מתיב. חיים מתיה איך בה צביוני יחיו (כו ישעיהו): ממל בר אבא ר' יחיו לאו מאי, יקומון נבלתי מתיך נבלתי, שבא"י מתים מתיך לארץ שבחוץ מתים יקומון... לארץ שבחוץ צדיקים, אלעזר ולר' ע"י: אילעא רבי אמר? חיים אינם סלא אבא ר' לה מתקיף. גלגול הוא צער לצדיקים גלגול: רבא להם נעשות מחילות: אביי אמר ונשאתני (מ"ז בראשית). בקרקע אמר בקבורתם וקברתני ממצרים יעקב היה יודע, בגו דברים: קרנא מתים ואם, ההי גמור שצדיק אבינו הטריח למה, חיים לארץ שבחוץ למחילות יזכה לא שמא? בניו את בראשית): אומר אתה בדבר כיוצא ישראל בני את יוסף וישבע (ג' יודע, בגו דברים: חנינא א"ר, וגו' היה גמור שצדיק בעצמו יוסף היה, חיים לארץ שבחוץ מתים ואם מאות ארבע אחיו את הטריח למה יזכה לא שמא? פרסה למחילות.</p>	<p>"R' Elazar said: The dead who are outside of Eretz will not be resurrected, as it says, <i>and I will place tzevi in the land of the living</i>. The land in which My favor is there – its dead will come to life – in which My favor is not there – its dead will not come to life. R' Abba bar Mammal challenged: <i>Your dead will come to life, my corpses will arise</i>. Is it not <i>Your dead</i>, the dead in Eretz Yisrael, <i>will come to life</i>; <i>my corpses</i>, the dead outside of Eretz, <i>will arise</i>...And according to R' Elazar the righteous persons outside of Eretz will not be resurrected?! R'Il'a said: through rolling (i.e. their bones will roll until Eretz Yisrael and they will come to life there). R' Abba Sala the Great objected: The rolling is an ordeal for the righteous. Abaye said: There will be tunnels formed for (the righteous in the earth): <i>and you shall transport me out of Egypt and bury me in their tomb</i>. Karna commented: there are issues in (this verse). Our forefather Jacob knew that he was a completely righteous man. Now if the dead who are outside of Eretz will be resurrected, why did (Jacob) trouble his sons? Lest he not merit the tunnels. Similar to this matter you can say: <i>Then Joseph adjured the children of Israel, etc</i>. R' Chanina commented: There are issues in (this verse). Joseph knew himself to be a completely righteous man, and if</p>

				the dea outside of Eretz will be resurrected, why did (Joseph) trouble his brothers for hundred <i>parsaas</i> ? Lest he not merit the tunnels. <sup>7</sup>
Talmud Ketubot 111b	c. 500 C.E.	Will "ignoramuses" (those ignorant of Torah knowledge) be resurrected?	אינן הארצות עמי: אלעזר ר' אמר מתים (כ"ו ישעיהו): שנאמר, חיים מתים: הכי נמי תניא. וגו' יחיו כל רפאים: ת"ל? לכל יכול יחיו כל מדברי עצמו במרפה, יקומו כל: יוחנן ר' א"ל. מדבר הכתוב תורה, הכי להו דאמרת למרייהו ניהא לא לעבודת עצמו במרפה ההוא מקרא: א"ל דכתיב הוא כוכבים ישעיהו): דכתיב, דורש אני אחר וארץ טליך אורות טל כי (כ"ו באור המשתמש כל, תפיל רפאים שאין וכל, מחייהו תורה אור תורה אור איך תורה באור משתמש דחזייה כיון. מחייהו תורה להן מצאתי, רבי: א"ל, דקמצטער ואתם (ד' דברים), התורה מן תקנה בה' הדברים היום כולכם חיים פאליהיכ.	R' Elazar said: Ignoramuses will not be resurrected, as it says: <i>dead, never to come to life</i> etc. This has also been taught in a Baraisa: <i>Dead, never to come to life</i> . One might think scripture therefore teaches us never to arise. This verse is speaking of someone who makes himself lax of words of Torah. R' Yochanan told (R' Elazar): It is not pleasing to the master of (those ignoramuses) that you speak of them so. That (verse) is written in regard to someone who makes himself lax concerning idolatry. He said to (R. Yochanan): There is another verse that I can expound for it is written: <i>For Your dew is like the dew that (revives through) light and You will let the ground fall (to) the lifeless</i> . Whoever makes use of the light of the Torah, the light of the Torah will revive him; but whoever does not make use of the light of the Torah, the light of the Torah will not revive him. As soon as (R' Elazar) saw that (R' Yochanan) was troubled he said to him: My teacher! I have found a remedy for them from the Torah: <i>But you who cling to YHVH, your God – you are all alive today</i> .
		Where will the righteous be resurrected?	צדיקים עתידין: יוסף בר חייא א"ר בירושלים ועולין שמבצבצין מעיר ויציצו (ע"ב תהלים): שנאמר אלא עיר ואין, הארץ כעשב (י"ט ב' מלכים): שנאמר, ירושלים	Rav Chiya bar Yosef said: The righteous are destined to sprout and arise in Jerusalem, as it says: (they) <i>will sprout from the city like the grass of the earth</i> . And "city"

			וגנותי הזאת העיר אל.	(means) none other than Jerusalem, as it says: <i>I shall protect this city.</i>
		Are bodies resurrected naked or clothed?	עתידיים: יוסף בר חייא וא"ר ק"ו, במלבושיהן שיעמדו צדיקים ערומה שנקברה חטה מה: מחטה צדיקים, לבושין בכמה יוצאה על בלבושיהן שנקברו וכמה כמה אחת.	And Rav Chiya bar Yosef said: The righteous are destined to stand up in their clothes. A <i>kal vachomer</i> based upon wheat: If a (grain of) wheat that is buried, bare, emerges with many "garments" the righteous who are buried in their clothes, how much more so. <sup>8</sup>
Talmud Sanhedrin 90b	c. 500 C.E.	Are bodies resurrected naked or clothed?	רבי את מלכתא קליאופטרא שאלה שכבי דחיי ידענא: אמרה, מאיר מעיר ויציצו (ע"ב תהלים) דכתיב עומדין כשהן אלא, הארץ שבכע בלבושיהן או ערומין עומדין וחומר קל: לה אמר? עומדין שנקברה חיטה ומה, מחיטה לבושין בכמה יוצאה, ערומה על בלבושיהן שנקברים צדיקים כמה אחת וכמה.	Queen Cleopatra asked R' Meir. She said: I know that the dead live [again] as it is written: <i>And they shall blossom forth from the city like the grass of the earth.</i> But do they rise naked or do they rise in their clothes? He said to her: an <i>a fortiori</i> analysis of a wheat kernel: If a wheat grain, which was buried naked emerges wearing several garments, then how much more so will the righteous, who are buried in their clothes! <sup>9</sup>
Talmud Sanhedrin 91b	c. 500 C.E.	What happens to disabled bodies at the time of resurrection?	ירמיהו) כתיב: רמי לקיש ריש וילדת הרה ופסח עור במ (ל"א אז (ל"ה ישעיהו) וכתיב, יחדיו לשון ותרן פסח כאיל ידלג... במומן עומדין? כיצד הא ומתרפאין... אני (ל"ב דברים) כתיב: רמי רבא (ל"ב דברים) וכתיב, ואחיה אמית הקדוש אמר. ארפא ואני מחצתי אני ממית שאני מה: הוא ברוך שמחצתי מזה והדר, מחיה ארפא ואני...	Reish Lakish contrasted: it is written: <i>among them the blind and the lame, the pregnant woman and the woman who has given birth, all together;</i> Yet it is written: <i>Then the lame will leap like a hart and the tongue of the mute will sing...</i> How is this? They will rise [at the time of the resurrection] with their defects and they will be healed....Rava contrasted: it is written: <i>I [God] put to death and I make live.</i> Yet it is written: <i>I have wounded and I will heal.</i> In the Holy One, Blessed is He, said: What I put to death I bring to life, and then what I have wounded I will heal. <sup>10</sup>

Talmud Sanhedrin 92a	c. 500 C.E.	Will the resurrected return to dust between the Messianic Era and the World to Come?	שעתיד צדיקים: אליהו דבי תנא אינן להחיותן הוא ברוך הקדוש (ד' ישעיהו) שנאמר, לעפרן חוזרין והנותר בציון הנשאר והיה כל לו יאמר קדוש בירושלים קדוש מה, בירושלים לחיים הכתוב לעולם הם אך קיים לעולם קיימין.	A Baraisa was taught in the academy of Eliyahu: The righteous that the Holy One, blessed is He, is Destined to resurrect will not return to their dust, as it is stated: <i>and it shall come to pass that the remnant will be in Zion and the left over will be in Jerusalem – “Holy” shall be said of him; everyone inscribed for life shall be in Jerusalem.</i> Just as the Holy One endures forever, so too they endure forever. <sup>11</sup>
Talmud Sanhedrin 92b	c. 500 C.E.	Can the resurrected marry and procreate?	יוסי רבי של בנו אליעזר רבי שהחיה מתים: אומר הגלילי ונשא, ישראל לארץ עלו יחזקאל עמד. ובנות בנים והולידו נשים רגליו על בתירא בן יהודה רבי והללו, בניהם מבני אני: ואמר תפילין מהם אבא אבי לי שהניח.	R' Eliezer the son of R' Yose Haglili says: The dead that Ezekiel resurrected went up to Eretz Yisrael, married and fathered sons and daughters. R' Yehudah ben Beseira rose to his feet and declared: I am one of their descendants, and these are the tefillin that my father's father left me from them. <sup>12</sup>
Genesis Rabbah 28:3	4 <sup>th</sup> cen. C.E.	Regarding the <i>luz</i> (“nut” of the spinal cord)		Hadrian – may his bones rot! – asked R. Joshua b. Hanania: ‘From what part will the Holy One, blessed be He, cause man to blossom forth in the future?’ ‘From the nut of the spinal column,’ he replied. ‘How do you know that?’ he asked. ‘Bring me one and I will prove it to you,’ he replied. He threw it in the fire, yet it was not burnt; he put it in water, but it did not dissolve; he ground it between millstones, but it was not crushed; he placed it on an anvil and smote it with a hammer; the anvil was cleft and the hammer split, yet it remained intact. <sup>13</sup>
Genesis Rabbah 95:1	4 <sup>th</sup> cen. C.E.	Do bodies come back the same as they were or changed?		Why does a man return as he went? So that the wicked of the world should not say: After they died God healed them and then brought them back! Apparently

				these are not the same but others. 'If so,' says God to them, 'let them arise in the same state in which they went, and then I will heal them.' <sup>14</sup>
Leviticus Rabbah	5 <sup>th</sup> cen. C.E.	Are the body and soul reunited at the time of resurrection?		What will the Holy One, blessed be He, do to them? He will bring the soul and force it into the body, and judge both as one, as it is said, <i>He will call to the heavens above, etc. 'He will call to the heavens above,'</i> to bring the soul, <i>And to the earth</i> to bring the body, <i>For judgment before Him.</i> Rav Hiyya taught:...Even so will it be in the Time to Come. The soul and the body will be standing for judgment. What will the Holy One, blessed be He, do? He will let the body alone, and take the soul to task. <sup>15</sup>
		Regarding the <i>luz</i> ("nut" of the spinal cord)		<i>And the almond shall blossom</i> refers to the <i>luz</i> (nut) of the spinal column. Hadrian, may his bones be crushed, asked R. Joshua b. Hananiah, saying: 'From which part of the body will the Holy One, blessed be He, in the Time to Come, cause man to sprout forth?' He answered: 'From the nut of the spinal column.' Said he: 'How can you convince me?' He thereupon brought one before him; he put it in water, but it was not dissolved; he let it pass through millstones, but it was not ground; he put it in fire, but it was not burnt; he put it on an anvil and began beating it with a hammer, but all this had no effect. <sup>16</sup>
Rashi to Sanhedrin 90b	11 <sup>th</sup> cen. C.E.	How will those buried outside of Eretz Yisrael be resurrected?		

**TABLE C:**  
**RABBINIC TEXTS THAT SUPPORT AN ARGUMENT FOR A METAPHORIC**  
**UNDERSTANDING OF RESURRECTION**

<b>SOURCE</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>ENGLISH TEXT</b>
<b>Y. Talmud B'rachot 4:2</b>	c. 300 C.E.	Those of the academy of R. Yannai would say: One who arises from his sleep is required to say: Blessed are You, God, Who resuscitates the dead. <sup>cxvii</sup>
<b>B. Talmud B'rachot 58b</b>	c. 500 C.E.	If one sees ones friend after 30 days he says: Blessed is the one who has kept us alive, sustained us, and brought us to this season. If he sees him after a lapse of 23 months, he says: Blessed is the one who resurrects the dead. <sup>cxviii</sup>
<b>Teshuvot HaRashba h 4:76</b>	13 <sup>th</sup> cen. B.C.E	Once a friend has been gone for twelve months one tends to forget about him. Thus when the friend reappears it is as though he has returned from the dead. [It is consequently appropriate to say (this blessing)]. <sup>cxix</sup>
<b>Mishna Berurah</b>	19 <sup>th</sup> cen. B.C.E.	An alternative explanation: On Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur each person is judged acts to whether he deserves to die or to live out the year. Therefore, if one sees his friend after the Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur of one year and does not see him again until after the next Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, he should give thanks that his friend was spared from a sentence of death.

### CHAPTER 3: MODERN AND POSTMODERN UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE DOCTRINE OF RESURRECTION

As Jews emerged from the ghettos into the Enlightenment, they found traditional ideas increasingly challenged by modern science<sup>cxx</sup>, and replaced their time-honored doctrines with the budding secular myths of liberalism, rationalism and universalism.<sup>cxxi</sup> From the inception of the Enlightenment, the reigning paradigm had been *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, “the science of Judaism”. *Wissenschaft* thinking emphasized the critical, dispassionate, and scientific approach to the study of Jewish texts. Judaism was subjected to the same scholarly criteria that were imposed on other cultures or bodies of literature. As contemporary Jewish theologian Neil Gillman writes, “The more personal, subjective, faith-oriented stance of the academician was to be ignored.”<sup>cxxii</sup>

Thus, over time, the belief in resurrection lost its significance for many prominent Jewish thinkers. In fact, by modernity the entire issue of was largely ignored.<sup>cxxiii</sup> However, even today many Jews still believe in resurrection. Among modern thinkers, Will Herberg is one who argues in favor of the belief in resurrection. He writes that the doctrine, “expresses the depth and dimension of Hebraic religion in relation to the destiny of mankind more adequately perhaps than any other concept...it is a doctrine with which we cannot dispense.”<sup>cxxiv</sup> Similarly, Modern Orthodox Rabbi Maurice Lamm, writes that, “the belief in a bodily resurrection appears, at first sight, to be incredible to the contemporary mind. But when approached from the God's-eye view, why is rebirth more miraculous than birth?... Surely resurrection is not beyond the capacity of an omnipotent God.”<sup>cxxv</sup> Thus, Orthodox and most Conservative Jews still affirm the doctrine in their daily prayers to this day.

On the other hand, Reform, British Liberal, Reconstructionists, and some Conservative Jews have come to reject the belief in bodily resurrection and replaced it with faith in the immortality of the soul.<sup>cxxvi</sup> This line of thinking began with the early 19<sup>th</sup> century thinkers of non-traditional leanings who dismissed bodily resurrection in favor of spiritual immortality as, “the sole acceptable doctrine for modern Jews.”<sup>cxxvii</sup> Gillman explains that the Reformers of the 19<sup>th</sup> century rejected the doctrine of bodily resurrection because it, “offended the rationalist, critical temper of their time. The only way they could understand it was as “the literalistic pseudo-biological” fantasy dismissed by [Herberg] – which of course was the way it had been understood and accepted by traditionalist thinkers throughout the ages.”<sup>cxxviii</sup>

Moses Mendelssohn, the great Jewish thinker of the Enlightenment, is a clear example of this 19<sup>th</sup> century thinking. Mendelssohn emphatically rejected the notion of *Gehenna*, claiming that such a belief was irreconcilable with Judaism's understanding of God's merciful nature. Similarly, the early Reformers cast off the concepts of hell and paradise. Abraham Geiger (1810-1874), one of the leaders of German Reform Jewry, recommended that any hope in an afterlife should be expressed, not through the suggestion of a future revival, a resurrection of the body; but rather, the immortality of the human soul should be stressed.<sup>cxxix</sup> In 1869, the Philadelphia Conference of American Reform Rabbis affirmed: "The belief in bodily resurrection has no religious foundation."<sup>cxxx</sup> This change in belief was repeated in the 1885 Pittsburgh Platform of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. It stated: "We reject as ideas not rooted in Judaism the belief both in bodily resurrection and in *Gehenna* and Eden (hell and paradise) as abodes for everlasting punishment or reward."<sup>cxxxi</sup>

On the whole Jewish modernists have favored the doctrine of the immortality of the soul over that of the resurrection of the dead. Between the beginning of the Jewish Enlightenment and the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century however, serious consideration was not given to the notion of bodily resurrection by thinkers from the liberal wing of the Jewish community.<sup>cxxxii</sup> Reform Jewish thinkers were not alone in this liberal community. The writings and liturgical innovations of Mordecai Kaplan and the writings (and some liturgies) of members of the Conservative movement similarly denied a belief in bodily resurrection. These modern Jews felt they had a, “good Jewish warrant for denying the classic views of the afterlife.”<sup>cxxxiii</sup> Having rejected other traditional Jewish beliefs which reflected an earlier world view, and having acknowledged that a, “mature view of reality” required giving up the belief in personal survival after death, modern Jews chose to emphasize, “the good that people need to do while they are alive”, over questions of resurrection and immortality.<sup>cxxxiv</sup>

As these liberal Jewish movements changed their views on the Doctrine of Resurrection, they began to change the liturgical blessing that speaks of God as one "who revives the dead" since they found the blessing's repeated assurances of resurrection to be problematic. There were, in the era of Classical Reform Judaism, and continued to be throughout modernity, many arguments in favor of these liturgical innovations. Prominent Jewish thinker Richard Levy outlines them as follows:

Biologically, [the Doctrine of Resurrection] violates our understanding of the natural, irreversible process of decay and disintegration of the body. Psychologically, it impedes what is perhaps the most important part of grief-work, accepting the finality of a loved one's death and resisting fantasies about the person's return. Ritually, it gives weight to the seemingly brutal funeral practices of traditional Jews, such as the stark pine coffin and filling the grave with earth. Theologically, it forms part of the supernatural complex of messianic ideologies, including the necessary return of all Jews to a state governed by a Jerusalem which will again become the center of the universe.<sup>cxxxv</sup>

With the rise of what many term the "postmodern era" however, the doctrine of resurrection once again comes to the attention of Jewish thinkers. There are many reasons for this change of attitude toward the doctrine. Before one looks at them however one must be able to identify the difference between the modern and postmodern eras.

According to Neil Gillman, postmodernism implies, "a renewed humility about human powers and impulses, a vision of science and even mathematics as themselves resting on fragile and arbitrary foundations, and a recognition of the limits of reason as a resource for dealing with the most significant dimension of human experience."<sup>cxxxvi</sup> Postmodernism is marked by a religious romanticism, a suspicion of rationalist methods of theological inquiry, and, "an emphasis on the emotional, affective dimension of the individual's relationship with God over the more rational or structured expression of that relationship."<sup>cxxxvii</sup> Postmodernists are seeking to "re-enchant" the world. Accordingly, "talk of the end of days and of the ultimate destiny of human beings after death seems almost inevitable." A reappraisal of the doctrine of resurrection is similarly inescapable since it deals with postmodernism's central issues such as death, the human body, and the "mythical, enchanted realm that follows the end of history".<sup>cxxxviii</sup>

Similarly, the failures of modern, technological society to embody good added to society's disappointment with various forms of rationalism and their inability to deliver salvation has left the masses feeling "bereft".<sup>cxxxix</sup> At the turn of the century, society lacked, "the mythic concepts by means of which our premodern ancestors pursued redemption and aspired to personal immortality. Similarly, we no longer possess the secular myths that had replaced them." The millennium is identified as the point in time that, like other significant chronological milestones, was bound to generate new or renewed eschatological visions.<sup>cxl</sup>

In addition, there has been an unanticipated flowering of traditionalism in religious communities leading to a renewed concern about the meaning of life. Gillman writes that, "the reigning scientific/technological/ rationalist temper of the past two centuries has been exposed as a singularly inadequate resource for dealing with the twin issues that lie at the core of human existence: What is the meaning of life? And, how are we to live it?"<sup>cxli</sup> Because of this, the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century brought with it a renewed interest in eschatology, where the tension between the doctrines of bodily resurrection and spiritual immortality were being reappraised and the theological and religious power of the Doctrine of Resurrection was being acknowledged anew ("there are those who even claim it to be preferable to spiritual immortality"),<sup>cxlii</sup> even by modern liberal Jews.<sup>cxliii</sup>

Once again, the statements and platforms of the Reform Movement reflected the turning of the tides of liberal Jewish eschatological thought. The 1976 Centenary Perspective, the composition of which was largely driven by Eugene Borowitz,<sup>cxliv</sup> reflected a minor change in emphasis from a corresponding statement in the earlier

Columbus Platform of 1937. The 1937 statement affirms that, “man is created in the Divine image. His spirit is immortal.” The 1976 statement in contrast - stated that, “Amid the mystery we call life, we affirm that human beings, created in God’s image, share in God’s eternity despite the mystery we call death” - removes the affirmation of spiritual immortality in favor of a more ambiguous form of eternal life.

In neither of these statements however is the doctrine of bodily resurrection specifically mentioned or encouraged. The seemingly continued discomfort with the idea is challenged by Richard Levy<sup>cxlv</sup> who points out that Reform has never, “attempted to abrogate” the belief in the miracle of the Exodus or the notion that God “rested” on Shabbat (a notion he called “blatantly anthropomorphic”). Levy questions why then the Reform Movement has eliminated the doctrine of resurrection, “Why are past miracles more acceptable than future ones?” Levy believes Reform Jews should “rescue” this “embarrassing but profound belief” for three reasons. 1) It is true to the nature of our being as creations of God; 2) It is attuned with the basic covenantal promise that has tied our people to God since the days of Abraham; 3) By its connection with the messianic promise, it binds us to *Eretz Yisrael* in a way that political and cultural Zionism fail to do.<sup>cxlvi</sup>

Seemingly, postmodern thinking among liberal Jews exists on a spectrum somewhere between what is reflected in the statements of the Reform Movement and the sentiments expressed in Levy’s article. Gillman writes that the transformation of American Reform is, “but one instance of a much broader change in the character of American Jewry as a whole.”<sup>cxlvii</sup>

Finally, in terms of postmodern influence on Jewish consideration of the doctrine of resurrection, a word must be said about post-Holocaust thinking. In terms of the, “consequences of the growing impact of the Holocaust”, Gillman wrote, “I...cannot but believe that the sight of the emaciated bodies in the liberated concentration camps, alongside the mound of ashes in the crematoria, contributed to a renewed appreciation of the reality and finality of death, specifically our own inevitable death.”<sup>cxlviii</sup> As will be further explored below, the Holocaust led to a renewed appreciation for the preciousness of the human body and our understanding of the connection between body and soul.

In postmodern Jewish thinking, according to Gillman, “the principle arguments for the recent reaffirmation of the doctrine of bodily resurrection are both theological and anthropological.”<sup>cxlix</sup> The theological argument implies that if God is “God”, God must be stronger than death. Although this is really an argument for life after death rather than bodily resurrection, Gillman suggests that it is more an argument for resurrection than it is for spiritual immortality. “In the later case,” he writes, “God does not have to do anything; the soul is immortal because of its very nature... But resurrection demands an aggressive expression of divine power.” The anthropological argument, for its part is more directly related to resurrection. It asserts that we are fundamentally related to our bodies, and that without our bodies we, “simply would not be.” Thus, whatever happens after we die must surely affect our bodies as well. This argument, Gillman explains, “affirms our psychosomatic identity; it is a deliberate regulation of any dualistic view of the human person.” Borowitz exemplifies this type of thinking when he writes, “I do not know...what sort of judgment awaits me, or what I shall do in eternity. I am, however,

inclined to think that my hope is better spoken of as resurrection rather than immortality, for I do not know my self as a soul without a body but only as a psychosomatic self.”<sup>cl</sup>

Another example of this anthropological type of thinking can be seen in the writing of Rabbi Hershel Matt who tried to answer the question of why one should stress the doctrine of bodily resurrection over that of spiritual immortality. He felt that the notion of immortality tends to deny the reality of death and of God’s power to take away and restore one’s life. The doctrine of immortality, according to Matt, implies that one’s body is, “less precious, important, even “pure,” while resurrection affirms that [one’s] body is no less God’s creation and is both necessary and good.” Furthermore, the notion of a bodiless soul runs counter to our experiences of self and of others. As Matt claimed, “Immortality implies the absorption of my soul into an All-Soul, thus denying my individuality.”<sup>cli</sup> Richard Levy, similarly, wrote that, “there is something unsettling about the view that at our death our *neshama* loses all the individuality provided by our bodies, and is absorbed by God.” Whether or not one believes in the transmigration of souls, Levy asserts that, “from the first breath that created Adam...the *neshama* and the body went together.”<sup>clii</sup>

Gillman’s understanding of how the Holocaust changed Jewish eschatological thought also fits into the category of anthropological thinking. Gillman believes that the Holocaust has taught us something about the preciousness of the human body. “We may not be *only* our bodies,” he writes,

there may be dimensions to our selves that are not reducible to bodily existence, and we may choose to call that dimension of our selves “soul.” But we are clearly incarnate beings, and our experience of our bodies is very much integral to our experience of our selves. We may want to [believe] that something of us persists after the death of our bodies. But the doctrine of bodily resurrection can become one way of acknowledging the simple truth that when our bodies die, *we* die, and that if God is to affect our destiny even after we have died, God must deal with our bodies as well.<sup>cliii</sup>

With the creation of *Mishkan T'filah*, the Reform movement attempted to acknowledge and incorporate the myriad Jewish theologies and perspectives relating to bodily resurrection and the immortality of the soul. As the *siddur*'s editor, Rabbi Elyse Frishman explains,

Rabbinic liturgy offers this opportunity; the Reform challenge to rabbinic theology, though, equally challenged our receptiveness to that liturgy. Although some metaphorically reinterpret difficult material...for many the literal sense of the text is an insurmountable roadblock. For generations, Reform liturgy offered alternatives to the traditional.<sup>cliv</sup>

Frishman also discusses the challenge of a single liturgy to be not only multivocal, but polyvocal by inviting full participation as well as interpretation. It needed to include, in any given module of prayer, many theological perceptions: “The transcendent, the naturalist, the mysterious, the partner, the evolving God” The editors of *Mishkan T'filah* defined this phenomenon as “integrated theology”. The intention was that one wouldn't look to each page to find his or her particular voice, but that over the course of praying, many voices would be heard. “As a worshipper,” Frishman writes, “I must be certain that I am not excluded; yet, it is not my particular belief that needs to be stated each moment.”<sup>clv</sup>

In relation to the Doctrine of Resurrection, *Mishkan T'filah* reflects how contemporary Reform theology continues to wrestle with oppositional beliefs. Work on the *siddur* was intensifying at the same time as the CCAR's Pittsburgh Principles (adopted in 1999) were being debated. The same "tug of war" between Reform heritage and Jewish tradition that was reflected in *Gates of Prayer* was still at work and *Mishkan T'filah* was shaping up to be as theologically inconsistent as its predecessor. Although the Editorial Committee of *Mishkan T'filah* encouraged conversations with the leadership of the CCAR about resurrection (along with retribution and redemption), ultimately nothing was concluded from these forums.<sup>clvi</sup>

In the end, *Mishkan T'filah* provided its users with the option to read either *m'chayei hameitim* or *m'chayei hakol* (given in parenthesis). As well, on the bottom of the page with the alternate English reading, the *siddur* provides readers with commentary on the Talmudic texts that support a metaphoric understanding of the prayer (see Adendum II below).<sup>clvii</sup>

## ADENDUM II: LITURGICAL CHANGE RELATING TO ACCEPTANCE OF THE DOCTRINE OF RESURRECTION OR ITS REJECTION

The responses to this challenge were not always the same. Leaders of the liberal movements of Judaism adopted different strategies at different points in the benediction and within different services or editions of their prayer books. In some cases, they simply removed the Hebrew altogether. Isaac Mayer Wise left *m'chayei ha-metim*, the traditional Hebrew, in his 1866 High Holy Day service but opted to change the English translation, leaving open the question of whether life after death is resurrection of the body or spiritual immortality. Even so, his beliefs are clearly indicated by the fact that elsewhere he provided *m'chayeh nishmot hametim* instead of the traditional Hebrew, and offered an English translation of, “Thou art faithful to the living and the dead. Praised be Thou, O God, who keepest alive the souls of dying mortals.”<sup>clviii</sup>

Almost a century later, the Reform movement's *Union Prayer Book* devised a completely unambiguous solution that followed David Einhorn in replacing *m'chayeh meitim* with another traditional phrase. Einhorn had employed a line from the blessing that is recited after reading Torah - *Noteia b'tocheinu hayei olam* (“who has implanted within us immortal life”) - thus testifying to his preference for the idea of spiritual immortality and his rejection of the doctrine of bodily resurrection. More recently, many liberal liturgies have shied away from any mention of an afterlife at all. In the 1970's, two “pioneer prayer books”, the CCAR's *Gates of Prayer* and the British *Service of the Heart* – both of which were edited in part by Chaim Stern, substituted *m'chayeh hakol* (“who gives life to all”) for the traditional *m'chayeh hameitim* (“who gives life to the dead”). Alternately, some liturgies bypass the issue altogether by offering an entirely different prayer in the English suggested by the theme of the Hebrew. Reconstructionist

liturgy has been particularly cautious to steer clear of any ideas that are not in accordance with its founders' rationalistic sensibilities. Their *Daily Prayer Book* (1963) removed the traditional language from both the Hebrew text and English translation and substituted the geonic utterance for the Ten days of Repentance, *zocheir yetzurav l'chayim b'rachamim* ("who in love rememberest Thy creatures unto life"). In all of these changes, the idea of bodily resurrection - and sometimes even spiritual eternity - is purged, and instead God is praised as the force that sustains all life.<sup>clix</sup>

In a naturalistic vein similar to that of the Reconstructionists, Marcia Falk's *The Book of Blessings* compresses the entire benediction into two lines: "Let us bless the well eternally giving - the circle of life ever-dying, ever-living." Falk writes,

The substitution of *hakol*...or *kol chai*...for *meitim*...is, of course, a euphemism - for, after all, what can be "given life" or "revived" except that which is lifeless or dead?...Presumably, contemporary objections to the phrase...have to do with the literal interpretation of it as referring to the resurrection of the dead in messianic times. While that may once have been its primary meaning, there are a number of other ways to read it and to reconstruct the idea behind it...especially meaningful when it is understood to be an affirmation of death as an integral part of life. For what is life without death? And what life is not part of the circle of dying, and what death is not part of the circle of living?... To celebrate life is to acknowledge the ongoing, dying, and ultimately to embrace death. For although all life travels toward its death, death is not a destination: it too is a journey to beginnings: all death leads to life again. From peelings to mulch to new potatoes, the world is ever-renewing, ever-renewed...The understanding of *t'chizat hameitim* as life in continuous regenerative movement, continually dying and renewing itself, is neither apocalyptic nor fantastic, rather, it is based on simple observation of the natural world.<sup>clx</sup>

In a different vein, the Israeli Movement for Progressive Judaism's *Ha'avodah Shebalev* demonstrates a Reform tendency for keeping hold of the underlying emotional content of the service through reproducing the rhythm of the traditional text, notwithstanding different Hebrew words. Instead of *m'chayeh metim atah*, they use

*mashpil af m'romem atah* (“You humble even as You elevate”), which comes from the First Book of Samuel 2:7.<sup>clxi</sup>

It is important to note that, though many liberal Jews are still struggling with the idea of and belief in resurrection, some very recent liberal *siddurim* have restored the original language of the doctrine. While the Conservative movement’s 1974 *Weekday Prayer Book* appears to be comfortable with the notion of bodily resurrection, the other Conservative precursor to *Siddur Sim Shalom*, the *Sabbath and Festival Prayer Book*, seems to opt for spiritual immortality over bodily resurrection by using an ambiguous English translation (“who callest the dead to life everlasting”). Elsewhere, the same book calls God “Master over Life and Death,” a strategy adopted by *Siddur Sim Shalom* as well. Similarly, the British Union of Liberal Progressive Synagogues’ *Siddur Lev Chadash* (1995) includes the traditional Hebrew but translates it as “source of eternal life”, according to the current inclination of the Reform and British Liberal Movements toward retaining, “an old Hebrew text for emotional reasons while employing translation to mute or transform ideologically objectionable elements.”<sup>clxii</sup>

During the development of the Reform movement’s most recent *siddur*, *Mishkan T’filah*, the debate as to whether or not to include *t’chiat hameitim* revolved around two clear arguments: 1) Physical resurrection defies reason and thus does not belong in a Reform Jewish prayer book; 2) The language of resurrection is metaphorical, even to the sages of the Talmud,<sup>clxiii</sup> and the prayer is testimony to God’s ability to overcome anything and therefore *should remain* in the liturgy. These arguments seemed irreconcilable, but after much discussion of options, the first draft of the *siddur* contained a “compromise text” that began and ended with *hakol*, but included “*meitim*” in the

middle two references. This was, according to Rabbi Frishman, the *siddur*'s editor, "meant to emphasize the metaphor rather than the literal sense of the prayer." However, responding to incredibly varied feedback, the second draft of the *siddur* included two complete versions of the *G'vurot* prayer – the same text used in *Gates of Prayer* on one side of the page, and the traditional wording as "midrash" on the other side of the page. While this was thought to be a "clever solution", it eliminated the possibility of including a "truly creative midrash", since there was no room remaining on the page.<sup>clxiv</sup> Thus, the final draft returned to a Hebrew text and English alternative reading more consistent with the rest of the prayer book. In its final form, *Mishkan T'filah* provides both options of *hakol* and *meitim* by employing a parenthetical form (i.e. *hakol [meitim]*), an idea previously rejected by the Editorial Committee.<sup>clxv</sup>

**TABLE D: LITURGICAL CHANGES TO T'CHIYAT HAMEITIM**

SIDDUR/MACHZOR	DATE	HEBREW RENDERING	ENGLING RENDERING
High Holy Day Service (Isaac Mayer Wise)	1886	Traditionally rendered	...who killeth and reviveth. ...Blessed be Thou who grantest perpetual life after death.
Isaac Mayer Wise	1880's	<i>m'chayeh nishmot hametim</i>	Thou art faithful to the living and the dead. Praised be Thou, O God, who keepest alive the souls of dying mortals.
<i>Olath Tamid</i> : Book of Prayers for Jewish Congregations (David Einhorn / Emil Hirsch)	1896	<i>Atah gibor l'olam Adonai. Rav L'hoshiah... podeh nefesh avadav mimavet.</i>	With infinite kindness Thou redeemest the souls of Thy servants from death spiritual... dispenser of life eternal
The Union Prayer Book (CCAR)	1945	<i>mechayei hakol... Baruch Atah Adonai Noteiah b'tocheinu hayei olam.</i>	...who has implanted within us immortal life.
Daily Prayer Book (Reconstructionist Press)	1963	<i>Baruch Atah Adonai, zocheir yetzurav l'chayim b'rachamim.</i>	Titled: God as the Source and Sustainer of Life ... who in love rememberest Thy creatures unto life.
Gates of Prayer (CCAR; Chaim Stern)	1975	<i>M'chayeh hakol</i>	...all life is your gift; ...gives life to all; ...Source of Life English alternative readings
Sabbath and Festival Prayer Book (Conservative)	1970's	Traditionally rendered	Faithful art thou, O Lord, who callest the dead to life everlasting...Master over Life and Death.
<i>Siddur Sim Shalom</i> (Conservative)	1985	Traditionally rendered	...Master over Life and Death.
<i>Siddur Lev Chadash</i> (ULPS)	1995	Traditionally rendered	You are the Source of eternal life...You grant eternal life...Trusting in You, we see life beyond death. We praise You...Source of eternal life.
<i>Kol Haneshamah</i> (Reconstructionist Press)	1996	<i>M'chayeh kol chai</i>	...nurturing the life of every living thing...the fount of life, who gives and renews life.
The Book of Blessings (Marcia Falk)	1999		Let us bless the well eternally giving – the circle of life ever-dying, ever-living.
<i>Ha'avodah Shebalev</i>	1999	<i>Mashpil af m'romem atah</i>	... You humble, even as You elevate.
<i>Mishkan T'filah</i> : A Reform Siddur	2007	<i>M'chayeh hakol (M'chayeh meitim)</i>	...giving life to all (reviving the dead)...who gives life to all (who revives the dead).

## CONCLUSION

The idea of understanding resurrection metaphorically, is one that is not only advocated for in *Mishkan T'filah*, but one that is also embraced elsewhere in liberal Judaism. Conservative theologian Elliot Dorff writes,

Most (liberal) Jews prefer to interpret "life after death" as living on in the influence that they have on others, possibly through their children...Even those who doubt that God's power extends to restoring life to the dead can appreciate the assertion here that God is manifest in the many things that transcend our understanding and control.<sup>clxvi</sup>

Similarly, Rabbis Kushner and Pollen write that, in thinking of resurrection metaphorically, “we are able to bring those who seem to be hopelessly lost, spiritually dead, “back to life”...we share (God’s) life-giving energy with “sleepers in the dust.” Rabbis Kushner and Pollen explain that by shifting our attention to the individual Hebrew letters rather than the words of the prayer - as the Chasidim were wont to do - we become, “agents of the divine in spreading god’s life-giving power in and through the letters.”<sup>clxvii</sup>

On a more rational level, Rabbi Richard Address relays the words of a congregant who had returned to congregational life after a bout with severe depression. She said, “I never understood, nor could I say, the traditional form of the second blessing of the *Amidah*, ‘who gives life to the dead,’ until I recovered from severe depression.”<sup>clxviii</sup> Clearly thinking of resurrection as a metaphor for other manifestations of rebirth, revival, and healing is a model for prayer that has potential for profound meaning.

However, while *Mishkan T'filah* is not incorrect in its assertion that there were rabbis in the Talmudic age who used the language of resurrection metaphorically, a stronger precedent can be found based in what modern biblical scholarship has to say

about the ancient Israelites' usage of resurrection as a metaphor for national revival (see Chapter 1). Reform Judaism has often jumped back in time over the teachings of the Talmudic sages to root its ideological developments in biblical texts and/or values. Thus, the argument that the bible's use of resurrection language as primarily metaphorical should be a comfortable precedent-setting statement for a Reform Jew looking for authenticity in a metaphorical understanding of the *G'vurot* prayer.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Address, Richard F. *Caring for the Soul: R'fuat HaNefesh: A Mental Health Resource and Study Guide*. New York, New York: UAHC Press, 2003.

Alexander, Daniel S. "Is God Stronger than Death?: Tehiyyat Hemetin Reconsidered." *CCAR Journal: A Reform Jewish Quarterly*, Winter 1997.

Anderson, A.A. *New Century Bible: Based on the Revised Standard Version: The Book of Psalms [Volume 1: introduction and Psalms 1-72]*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972.

Anderson, A.A. *New Century Bible: Based on the Revised Standard Version: The Book of Psalms [Volume 2: Psalms 73-150]*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972.

Baron, Salo Wittmayer. *A Social And Religious History Of The Jews: Ancient Times: Volumes I-II*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1937, 1952.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *The Anchor Bible [Vol. 19A: Isaiah 40-55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary]*. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland: Doubleday, 2000.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *The Anchor Bible [Vol. 19: Isaiah 1-39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary]*. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland: Doubleday, 2002.

Borowitz, Eugene B. "Is There Life After Death?" *Liberal Judaism*. New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1984.

Cogan, Mordechai and Hayim Tadmor. *The Anchor Bible: II Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1988.

Collins, John J. *Old Testament Message: A Biblical-Theological Commentary [Vol. 16: Daniel, First Maccabees, Second Maccabees, with an Excursus on the Apocalyptic Genre]*. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1981.

*Daily Prayer Book: With A Supplement Containing Prayers, Readings and Hymns and With a New Translation*. New York: The Reconstructionist Press, 1963.

Eaton, John. *The Psalms: A Historical and Spiritual Commentary with an Introduction and New Translation*. London, New York: T & T Clark International, 2003.

Elman, Yaakov. *The Living Nach: Early Prophets: A New Translation Based On Traditional Jewish Sources*. New York, Jerusalem: Moznaim Publishing Corporation, 1994.

Einhorn, Dr. David. [*Olath Tamid*]: *Book of Prayers for Jewish Congregations: A New Translation After the German Original*. Julie Einhorn, 1921.

Freedman, David Noel, Ed. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* [Vol. 2: *D-G*]. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland: Doubleday, 1992.

Freedman, David Noel, Ed. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* [Vol. 5: *O-Sh*]. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland: Doubleday, 1992.

Freedman, Rabbi Dr. H. and Maurice Simon. *The Midrash Rabbah: Translated into English with notes, glossary and indices* [Vol. 1: *Genesis*]. London, Jerusalem, New York: The Soncino Press, 1977.

Freedman, Rabbi Dr. H. and Maurice Simon. *The Midrash Rabbah: Translated into English with notes, glossary and indices* [Vol. 2: *Exodus, Leviticus*]. London, Jerusalem, New York: The Soncino Press, 1977.

Frishman, Rabbi Elyse D. "Entering *Mishkan T'filah*". *CCAR Journal: A Reform Jewish Quarterly*. Fall 2004.

Fritz, Volkmar. *1 & 2 Kings: A Continental Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.

[*Shaarei T'fillah*]: *Gates of Prayers: The New Union Prayerbook: Weekdays, Sabbaths, and Festivals Services and Prayers for Synagogue and Home*. New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1975, 1983.

Gillman, Neil. "Beyond *Wissenschaft*: The Resurrection of Resurrection in Jewish Thought Since 1950." *Who Owns Judaism?: Studies in Contemporary Jewry* [Vol. XVII]. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Gillman, Neil. *The Death of Death: Resurrection and Immortality in Jewish Thought*. Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights Publishing, 1997.

Hammer, Raymond. *The Book of Daniel*. Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Hanson, Paul D. *Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching: Isaiah 40-66*. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1995.

Hochberg, Rabbi Reuven and Rabbi A. J. Rosenberg. *1 Kings: A New English Translation: Translation of Text, Rashi, and Commentary*. New York: The Judaica Press, Inc., 1980.

Jacobs, Louis. *Principles of the Jewish Faith*. New Jersey: Jason Aaronson Inc., 1988.

Jensen, Joseph. *Old Testament Message: A Biblical-Theological Commentary [Vol. 8: Isaiah 1-39]*. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1984.

Josephus, Flavius. *Antiquities*, xviii, 1:3,4. trans. W. Whiston Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel, 1963.

Josephus, Flavius. *Complete Works*, trans. W. Whiston Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel, 1963.

Josephus, Flavius. *Wars*, ii, 8:14. trans. W. Whiston Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel, 1963.

Levy, Richard. "Upon Arising: An Affirmation of Techiyat Hametim." *Journal of Reform Judaism*, Fall 1982.

McKeating, Henry. *The Cambridge Bible Commentary: The Books of Amos, Hosea, and Micah*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

*[Mishkan T'filah]: A Reform Siddur*. New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 2007.

Plaut, W. Gunter. *The Growth of Reform Judaism*. New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, 1965.

Plaut, W. Gunther. *The Rise of Reform Judaism*. New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, 1963.

Raphael, Simcha Paull. *Jewish Views of the Afterlife*. Northvale, New Jersey, London: Jason Aaronson, Inc., 1994.

Roberts, Rabbi Matis. *The ArtScroll Tanach Series: Trei Asar: The Twelve Prophets [Vol. I: A New Translation With A Commentary Anthologized From Talmudic, Midrashic, and Rabbinic Sources]*. Brooklyn, New York: Mesorah Publications, Ltd., 1995.

Robinson, J. *The First Book of Kings*. London, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Rogerson, J.W. and J.W. McKay. *Psalms 1-50*. London, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Rogerson, J.W. and J.W. McKay. *Psalms 51-100*. London, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Rosenberg, Rabbi A. J., Ed. *Mikra'ot Gedolot: II Kings: A New English Translation*. New York: The Judaica Press, Inc., 1980.

- Rosenberg, Rabbi A.J. *Mikraoth Gedoloth: Ezekiel [Vol. Two: A New English Translation]*. New York: The Judaica Press, 2000.
- Rosenblatt, Samuel. *Book of Beliefs & Opinions Saadia Gaon*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Schaefer, Konrad, O.S.B. *Berit Olam: Studies In Hebrew Narrative & Poetry: Psalms*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2001.
- Scherman, Rabbis Nosson and Meir Zlotowitz. *Artscroll Tanach Series: A traditional commentary on the Books of the Bible: The Book of Ezekiel: A New Translation With A Commentary Anthologized From Talmudic, Midrashic, And Rabbinic Sources [Vol. 2]*. Brooklyn, NY: Mesorah Publications, Ltd., 1980.
- Scullion, John S.J. *Old Testament Message: A Biblical-Theological Commentary [Volume 12: Isaiah 40-66]*. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1982.
- [Siddur Lev Chadash]: Services and Prayers for Weekdays and Sabbaths, Festivals and Various Occasions*. London: Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues, 1995.
- Siddur Sim Shalom For Shabbat And Festivals*. New York City: The Rabbinical Assembly & The United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism, 1985, 1998, 1999.
- Soncino, Rifat and Daniel B. Syme. *What Happens After I Die?: Jewish Views of Life After Death*. New York: UAHC Press, 1990.
- Spitz, Rabbi Elie Kaplan. *Does The Soul Survive?: A Jewish Journey to Belief in Afterlife, Past Lives & Living with Purpose*. Woodstock, Vermont: Jewish Lights Publishing, 2000.
- The Interpreter's Dictionary Of The Bible: An Illustrated Encyclopedia: In Four Volumes [Vol. 1]*. New York, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- The Interpreter's Dictionary Of The Bible: An Illustrated Encyclopedia: In Four Volumes [Vol. 4]*. New York, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- The Talmud of the Land of Israel [Vol. 22: Ketubot] (Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism)*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 1985.
- The Union Prayerbook for Jewish Worship: Newly Revised Edition*. Cincinnati: The Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1945.
- Westermann, Claus. *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969.

Wolff, Hans Walter. *Hosea: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Hosea*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

Whybray, R.N. *New Century Bible: Based on the Revised Standard Version: Isaiah 40-66*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott (Publications) Ltd, 1975.

Yerushalmi, Rabbi Shmuel. *The Book of I Kings: Me'am Lo'ez*. New York, Jerusalem: Moznaim Publishing Corporation, 1994.

Yerushalmi, Rabbi Shmuel. *The Book of Yeshayahu: Me'am Lo'ez*. New York, Jerusalem: Moznaim Publishing Corporation, 1999.

Zimmerli, Walther. *Ezekiel 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 25-48*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

## NOTES

---

### INTRODUCTION

<sup>i</sup> *Mishkan T'filah*, pp. 78-79, 246-247, 348-349, 472

### CHAPTER 1

<sup>ii</sup> IDB vol. 4, p. 39, "Resurrection"

<sup>iii</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>iv</sup> Anchor Bible Dictionary (ABD) vol. 2, p. 110, "Death"

<sup>v</sup> *ibid.* p. 109.

<sup>vi</sup> IDB vol. 1, pp. 802-803, "Death"

<sup>vii</sup> ABD vol. 5, pp.680-681, "Resurrection"

<sup>viii</sup> IDB vol. 1, p.802, "Death"

<sup>ix</sup> ABD vol. 5, pp. 680, 683, "Resurrection"

<sup>x</sup> ABD vol. 2, p. 108, "Death"

<sup>xi</sup> ABD vol. 5, pp. 680, 683, "Resurrection"

<sup>xii</sup> Collins, p. 110

<sup>xiii</sup> ABD vol. 5, p. 680, "Resurrection"

<sup>xiv</sup> *ibid.* p. 185.

<sup>xv</sup> IDB vol. 4, p.40, "Resurrection"

<sup>xvi</sup> *ibid.* p. 41 and Wolff, pp. 117-118

<sup>xvii</sup> IDB vol. 1, p. 803, "Death"

<sup>xviii</sup> IDB vol. 4, p. 41, "Resurrection"

<sup>xix</sup> Wolff, pp. 116-117

<sup>xx</sup> ABD vol. 5, p. 681

<sup>xxi</sup> McKeating, p. 109

<sup>xxii</sup> ABD, vol. 5, p. 684

<sup>xxiii</sup> IDB vol. 1, p. 802, "Death"

<sup>xxiv</sup> Anderson, pp. 535-536

<sup>xxv</sup> IDB vol. 1, p.803, "Death"

<sup>xxvi</sup> Zimmerli, p. 261

<sup>xxvii</sup> *ibid.* p. 261

<sup>xxviii</sup> Collins, p. 110

<sup>xxix</sup> ABD vol. 5, p.683, "Resurrection"

<sup>xxx</sup> *ibid.*, p. 685, "Resurrection"

<sup>xxxi</sup> *ibid.* p. 684, "Resurrection"

<sup>xxxii</sup> Kaiser, pp. 215-220

<sup>xxxiii</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>xxxiv</sup> ABD vol. 5, p. 684, "Resurrection"

<sup>xxxv</sup> IDB vol. 4, pp.39-40, "Resurrection"

<sup>xxxvi</sup> ABD vol. 5, p. 684, "Resurrection"

<sup>xxxvii</sup> *ibid.* pp. 185, 683-684

- 
- xxxviii Rosenberg, p. 244  
xxxix *ibid.* p. 681  
xl Schaefer, p. 180 and Fritz, pp. 235-336  
xli ABD vol. 5, p. 681, "Resurrection" and Robinson, pp. 203-204  
xlii Hochberg & Rosenberg, p. 181 and S. Yerushalmi (Kings) p. 394  
xliii Robinson, p. 203  
xliv Rogerson & McKay (*Psalms 1-50*), p. 49 and Anderson, pp. 379-380  
xlv Schaefer, p. 124 and Eaton, p. 200  
xlvi Rogerson & McKay (*Psalms 51-100*), p.119, 123  
xlvii ABD vol. 5, p. 681, "Resurrection"  
xlviii Wolff, p. 117-119  
xlix ABD vol. 5, p.681, "Resurrection"  
l *ibid.* p. 682, "Resurrection"  
li Collins, p.110  
lii ABD vol. 5, p. 682, "Resurrection"  
liii ABD vol. 5, p. 682, "Resurrection" and Jensen, p. 206  
liv ABD vol. 5, p. 682, "Resurrection"  
lv IDB vol. 4, p. 40, "Resurrection"  
lvi *ibid.*  
lvii Blenkinsopp, pp. 370-371 and Kaiser, pp. 215-220  
lviii *ibid.*  
lix Kaiser, pp. 215-220  
lx *ibid.*  
lxi Leaney & Packer, p. 116  
lxii ABD vol. 5, p. 682, "Resurrection"  
lxiii Collins, p. 110  
lxiv ABD vol. 5, p. 683, "Resurrection"  
lxv *ibid.*  
lxvi Collins, pp. 108-109  
lxvii *ibid.* pp. 110-111

## CHAPTER 2

- lxviii ABD, vol. 5, p.681, "Resurrection"; see also Mark 12:18-27; Matt 22:23-34; Luke 20:27-45; Acts 23:6-9  
lxix Raphael, p. 156  
lxx Josephus, *Antiquities XVIII, i, 4*  
lxxi ABD, vol. 5, p.681, "Resurrection"; see also Mark 12:18-27; Matt 22:23-34; Luke 20:27-45; Acts 23:6-9  
lxxii Soncino & Syme, p.22  
lxxiii Spitz, p.50  
lxxiv Baron, p. 311  
lxxv Soncino & Syme, p.22; see also Mishnah San. 10.1a (Table A)  
lxxvi *My People's Prayerbook* (MPP), vol. 2, p.81

- 
- lxxvii *Ibid.* p. 23  
lxxviii *Ibid.* p. 22; See also Table A  
lxxix Raphael, p. 157  
lxxx *Ibid.* pp. 157-158  
lxxxi Soncino & Syme, p. 25  
lxxxii ABD, vol. 5, p. 584, "Resurrection"  
lxxxiii *Ibid.* p. 685  
lxxxiv See Table B and Rashi Translations (separate documents)  
lxxxv Spitz, p. 51  
lxxxvi See Table B and Rashi Translations (separate documents)  
lxxxvii Soncino & Syme, pp. 29-30  
lxxxviii *Ibid.* p. 30  
lxxxix Spitz, p. 51  
xc Soncino & Syme, p. 32  
xci Raphael, p. 244  
xcii Saadia Gaon, as quoted by Soncino & Syme, p. 30  
xciii Soncino & Syme, pp. 30-32  
xciv MPP, vol. 2, p. 81  
xcv Spitz, p. 52  
xcvi MPP, vol. 2, p. 81  
xcvii Raphael, pp. 255-257; and see Maimonides "The Epistle on the Resurrection of the Dead" in Rosner's translation of *Treatise on Resurrection*  
xcviii Spitz, p. 52  
xcix Spitz, p. 53  
c Raphael, p. 324  
ci *Ibid.* pp. 324-325  
cii *Ibid.* p. 325  
ciii *Ibid.* p. 326  
civ See *Ikkarim*, i.iv. 35-41, xxiii.  
cv Spitz, p. 53  
cvi Raphael, p. 160

#### ADDENDUM I

- cvii Collins, p. 111  
cviii See *I Enoch*, Chapter 22  
cix ABD, vol. 5, p. 685, "Resurrection"  
cx *Ibid.*  
cxii *Ibid.* pp. 685-686  
cxiii *Ibid.* p. 686  
cxiv *Ibid.* p. 687  
cxv *Ibid.*  
cxvi *Ibid.*

---

## CHAPTER 3

- cxvii Translation c/o Artscroll Talmud Series, *The Jerusalem Talmud, Berachos*  
cxviii Translation c/o Artscroll Talmud Series  
cxix Translation c/o Artscroll Talmud Series  
cxx Borowitz, p. 218  
cxi Alexander, p. 47  
cxii Gillman, *Beyond Wissenschaft*, p. 95  
cxiii Spitz, p. 53  
cxiv Herberg, p. 229  
cxv Lamm, p. 230  
cxvi Ellenson in MPP, p. 76  
cxvii Gillman, *Beyond Wissenschaft*, p. 88  
cxviii *ibid.* p. 97  
cxix Plaut, *Rise of Reform*, p. 158  
cxx Plaut, *Growth of Reform*, p. 31  
cxxi *ibid.* p. 34  
cxxii Gillman, *Beyond Wissenschaft*, pp. 88-89  
cxxiii Borowitz, p. 219.  
cxxiv *ibid.* pp. 218-219.  
cxxv Levy, *Upon Arising*, p. 13.  
cxxvi Gillman, *The Death of Death*, pp. 216-217  
cxxvii Gillman, *Beyond Wissenschaft*, p.95  
cxxviii Gillman, *The Death of Death*. p. 220  
cxxix Alexander, pp. 47-48  
cxl Gillman, *The Death of Death*, p. 215  
cxli *ibid.* pp. 215-216  
cxlii Gillman, *Beyond Wissenschaft*, p. 88  
cxliii Gillman, *The Death of Death*. p. 215  
cxliv Gillman, *Beyond Wissenschaft*, p. 90  
cxlv Levy, *Upon Arising*, p. 13  
cxlvi Soncino & Syme, p. 33  
cxlvii Gillman, *Beyond Wissenschaft*, p.94  
cxlviii *ibid.* p. 98  
cxlix *ibid.* p. 91  
cl Borowitz, p. 339  
cli Gillman, *The Death of Death*, p.238  
clii Levy, *Upon Arising*, p. 16  
cliii Gillman, *Beyond Wissenschaft*, pp. 98-99  
cliv Frishman, p. 1  
clv *ibid.* p. 4  
clvi *ibid.* p. 5  
clvii See Table C

---

## ADDENDUM II

- clviii Ellenson in MPP, p. 76 and see Table D
- clix *ibid.* pp. 76-79 and see Table D
- clx Falk in MPP, pp. 78-79
- clxi Ellenson in MPP, p.76 and see Table D
- clxii *ibid.* p. 79
- clxiii See Table C
- clxiv Frishman, p. 6
- clxv *ibid.*

## CONCLUSION

- clxvi Dorff in MPP, p. 76
- clxvii Kushner & Pollen in MPP, p. 79
- clxviii Address, p. 5

## TRANSLATION OF RASHI TO SANHEDRIN 90b

<p><b><i>Rather to them</i></b> – It is understood that <i>HaKadosh Baruch Hu</i> promised our ancestors Abraham, Isaac and Jacob to give them the Land of Israel, and thus “they were given” - - Is it not it was given to their sons, only to teach that <b>their future will be to live and the future of <i>HaKadosh Baruch Hu</i> will be to give them the land of Israel.</b> [*]</p>	<p><b>אלא להם</b> - דמשמע שהבטיח הקדוש ברוך הוא לאבותינו אברהם, יצחק ויעקב שיתן להם ארץ ישראל, וכי להם ניתנה - - והלא לבניהם ניתנה אלא מלמד שעתידין לחיות ועתיד הקדוש ברוך הוא ליתן להם את ארץ ישראל.</p>
<p><b><i>You will lie with your forefathers and rise</i></b> - <b>Behold, you are lying dead, and behold, you arise – that you will live in the World to Come</b>, but this “and rise” I will lead you upright. Perhaps <i>and rise will this nation and wander</i>, that they will stand upright, and not from on high, and we were one, from the biblical verses <i>that they don't have the majority</i>.</p>	<p><b>הנך שוכב עם אבותיך וקם</b> - הנה אתה מת שוכב, והנה אתה קם - שתחיה לעתיד לבא, והאי וקם אהנך קאי. דילמא וקם העם וזנה - דלקמיה קאי, ולא אדלעיל, והיינו אחד (מג') (מסורת הש"ס: מחמשה) מקראות שאין להם הכרע.</p>
<p><b><i>May Your dead live</i></b> - <b>The Dead that are in the Land of Israel will live</b></p>	<p><b>יחיו מתיך</b> - דמתים שבארץ ישראל יחיו.</p>
<p><b><i>My corpses shall rise</i></b> - <b>even those that fell will live, as in Tractate K'tubot.</b></p>	<p><b>נבלתי יקומון</b> - אפילו נפלים יחיו, במסכת כתובות.</p>
<p><b><i>But perhaps the dead whom Ezekiel resurrected</i></b> – One should read <i>Your dead will live</i> Isaiah said, and he preceded Ezekiel, that he prophesized in the days of Hezekiah, and <b>he</b></p>	<p><b>ודילמא מתים שהחיה יחזקאל</b> - דההיא קרא יחיו מתיך ישעיה אמרו, והוא קדם ליחזקאל, שנתנבא בימי חזקיה, והיה מתנבא פסוק זה על שהיה עתיד יחזקאל להחיות מתים,</p>

<p>prophesied this verse that in the future Ezekiel was to raise the dead, but in The World to Come - no.</p>	<p>אבל לעולם הבא - לא.</p>
<p><i>Stirring</i> - ...foreign language (to move), as it says, moving and rocking the lips of those who sleep in the dust, of all that will live.</p>	<p><b>דובב</b> - פרונמיי"ש בלעז (להתנועע), כלומר נעות ומתנודדות שפתי ישיני עפר, מכלל שיחיו.</p>
<p><i>Their lips will merely move</i> - <b>their lips will move a little in the grave but not when they live and go out into the air of the world</b>, as R' Yochanan (taught), etc</p>	<p><b>מרחשן שפוותיה בעלמא</b> - שפתותיהן נעות מעט בתוך הקבר אבל אין חיין ויוצאין לאויר העולם, וכו' יוחנן וכו'.</p>
<p><i>And they did not received from him</i> - until he told them, etc.</p>	<p><b>ולא קבלו ממנו</b> - עד שאמר להם וכו'.</p>
<p><i>All of you are alive today</i> – that this day is additional, that it was drained from the writing <i>all of you are alive</i> , what teaching does the biblical passage mean to convey?</p>	<p><b>חיים כלכם היום</b> - דהאי יום מיותר הוא, דמצי למכתב חיים כלכם מה תלמוד לומר</p>
<p><i>Today</i> – As today, whereas <i>today</i>, etc. Thus, I heard.</p>	<p><b>היום</b> - כהיום, מה היום וכו' כך שמעתי.</p>
<p><i>Behold, you will lie with your forefathers and rise</i> – <b>Here to the doctrine of resurrection</b></p>	<p><b>הנך שוכב עם אבותיך וקם</b> - הרי תחיית המתים</p>
<p><i>And this nation will go astray</i> – Behold what will be in the future.</p>	<p><b>העם הזה וזנה</b> - הרי מה שעתיד להיות.</p>
<p><i>Half in your hands</i> – That from this is read an opening into knowing what will be in the future.</p>	<p><b>פלגא בידך</b> - דמהאי קרא נפקא דידוע מה שעתיד.</p>
<p><i>You have falsified but you have not accomplished</i> – you have failed in speaking and there lacks substance in</p>	<p><b>זייפתם ולא העליתם</b> - כזב אתם אומרים ואין ממש בדבריכם.</p>

your words.	
<b><i>Must it not be to The World to Come - hence there is resurrection.</i></b>	לאו לעולם הבא - אלמא יש תחיית המתים.
<b><i>From “it shall be utterly cut off” – hakareit - in this world, Tikareit - the next world.</i></b>	מהכרת תכרת - הכרת - בעולם הזה, תכרת - לעולם הבא.
<b><i>They would have replied to him the Torah speaks the language of men – and so it is said it is for them, because how can it not be for them an excuse for wrongdoing?</i></b>	אינהו הוו אמרי ליה דברה תורה כלשון בני אדם - ולהכי אמר להו הכי, כי היכי דלא להוי להו פתחון פה.
<b><i>Cutting off it shall be cut off – in idolatry it was written.</i></b>	הכרת תכרת - בעבודה זרה כתיב.
<b><i>But it is already stated – through idolatry it is God whom he is blaspheming, and he shall be cut off – that he should think: blaspheming - we were a slave to idolatry.</i></b>	והלא כבר נאמר - בעבודה זרה את ה' הוא מגדף ונכרתה, דסבירא להו: מגדף - היינו עובד עבודה זרה.
<b><i>And there are three worlds etc. - R. Akiva held that through blaspheming we were blessing God.</i></b>	וכי שלשה עולמים יש וכו' - ור' עקיבא סבירא ליה דמגדף היינו מברך השם.
<b><i>Now both R. Ishmael and R. Akiva (say) what do they do with “its sin is upon it?” – for they asked him, etc.</i></b>	והשתא בין לר' ישמעאל בין לר' עקיבא עונה בה מאי עבדי ליה - מבעי ליה וכו'.
<b><i>Its sin is upon it – that it does not return before a death brought about by divine punishment, but not returned.</i></b>	שעונה בה - שלא שב קודם מיתה הוי בכרת, אבל שב לא.
<b><i>The dead will live - that the dead will live.</i></b>	דחיי שכבי - שהמתים חיים.

*They shall blossom forth from the city* – Israel will, in the future, sprout and flourish from the city of Jerusalem, and as they taught (Ketubot 111a) *HaKadosh Baruch Hu* makes the righteous revive and they will walk and they will go up to Jerusalem.

**ויצו מעיר** - שעתידין ישראל לציץ ולפרוח מעיר ירושלים, וכדאמרינן (כתובות קיא, א) הקדוש ברוך הוא עושה להם מחילות לצדיקים והולכין ועולין לירושלים.

[\*]

Red lettering indicates phrases that highlight Rashi's belief in the Doctrine of Resurrection

## TRANSLATION OF RASHI TO SANHEDRIN 91b

<i>among them the blind and the lame</i> – that you will live with afflictions.	בם עור ופסח - שחיין עם מומן.
<i>It is written: Then the lame will leap like a ram</i> – that it indicates that they will be healed.	וכתיב אז ידלג כאיל פסח - דמשמע שמתרפאין.
<i>They will rise with their afflictions</i> – and afterwards they will be healed.	עומדין במומן - ואחר כך מתרפאין.
<i>He will conceal death forever</i> – that in the World to Come from after they life they will not return to being dead.	בלע המות לנצח - דלעתיד לבא מאחר שחיין שוב אינן מתין.
<i>For the youth</i> – As it says that when one dies in the future and dies at the age of one hundred years they will say a youth it was that died.	כי הנער - כלומר כשימות אדם לעתיד ומת בן מאה שנה יאמרו נער הוא מת,
<i>For the youth will die one hundred years old</i> – if indeed they will die.	כי הנער בן מאה שנה ימות - אלמא מתין.
<i>It is written: I put to death and I make live</i> – there it might indicate that <i>I put to death</i> the same person that I made live, should he die with an affliction – he will stand and live with an affliction.	כתיב אני אמית ואחיה - דמשמע כשם שאני אמית את האדם כך אני מחייהו, כשמת בעל מום - עומד וחי בעל מום.
<i>And it is written: I have wounded and I will heal</i> - that when he should be revived he will be healed of his wound and he will stand complete.	וכתיב מחצתי ואני ארפא - שכשהוא מחיה מרפא את המחץ ועומד שלם.
<i>And then what I have wounded</i> – that after it will be healed, and as above: they will stand with their afflictions and they will be healed.	והדר מה שמחצתי - שלאחר כן מתרפא, וכדלעיל: עומדין במומן ומתרפאין.

<p><b><i>Death is upon one and life is upon one</i></b> – so he says: I put this person to death - and I revive another person.</p>	<p><b>מיתה באחד וחיים באחד - והכי</b>  <b>קאמר: אני ממית אדם זה - ומחיה</b>  <b>אדם אחר.</b></p>
<p><b><i>In the manner that the world functions</i></b> – That this one dies and this one is born.</p>	<p><b>כדרך שהעולם נוהג - שזה מת וזה</b>  <b>נולד.</b></p>