

IMMORTALITY AND RESURRECTION:
THE CLASH OF IDEAS WITHIN GRAECO-
HEBREW AND RABBINIC LITERATURE

Rabbi Robert A. Raab

Thesis submitted in partial
fulfillment of requirements
for the Doctor of Hebrew
Letters Degree.

Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
June 1959

Referee, Professor Samuel Sandmel

ref

August Mahaly

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to some wonderful people I dearly love -- to my dear wife who inspired me to push ahead and to complete the job -- to my dear parents who have given me encouragement every step of my life. And, my very special thanks to Dr. Samuel Sandmel who was so extremely helpful in guiding me toward the completion of this manuscript. Without his wise counsel the task could not have been finished.

CONTENTS

I.	Introduction to the Problem	1
II.	The Old Testament	5
III.	Philo, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and New Testament	13
IV.	Rabbinic and Other Related Utterances	33
V.	Conclusions	51
VI.	Analysis of Bibliographical Material	53
Notes	i

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction to the Problem

The materials on Biblical and Rabbinic eschatology have been collected and worked over many times by scholars.¹ In this dissertation I do not seek merely to go over the ground that has been explored by others. Rather, I address myself as far as it is possible to one single facet: To scrutinize the Tannaitic materials on the after-life in the light of the broad differences known to have prevailed in the general period.²

Josephus³ informs us that the Sadducees denied the doctrine of resurrection, while the Pharisees believed in it. The scholarly literature on this ancient controversy is quite ample,⁴ but the literary sources are limited to two passages in Josephus,⁵ a conflict story in the Synoptic Gospels⁶ and some allusions in the Acts of the Apostles.⁷ My thesis tries to throw light on the controversy, not necessarily between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, but rather on the issue itself of resurrection versus immortality.

My intent can be clarified by the asking of some hypothetical questions. Did the age of the Sadducean controversy understand resurrection and immortality to be one and the same thing? Or, was there some sharp difference in conception? Is it possible that the Sadduceans, who apparently were open to Greek influences, espoused, with the Greeks, immortality, but, like Greek dualists, were disinterested in or opposed to resurrection? The evidence in Christian circles for such differences and even controversies is known from I Corinthians 15. What were the implications in broadest terms of the related though diverse doctrines of immortality and resurrection? How, in particular, did facets of variegated approaches to speculations of the after-life become crystallized into distinct and contradictory emphases?

Before analyzing and evaluating the scholarly work already done on this problem, it would be well to define "immortality" and "resurrection." For the purposes of this dissertation, let us say that immortality is a state in which

death does not intrude between the now and the hereafter. Immortality holds that man does not die. Rather, he continues to live after "death." Resurrection, on the other hand, implies that man does die but later is born again. Death intrudes, but it is not permanent. Because scholars have in most instances refused to define these terms, they tend to use them interchangeably or in an obscure and unclear way. This confusion can best be shown by an analysis of the scholarly opinions on the Pharisaic -- Sadducean dispute over immortality and resurrection. Let us examine the issues.

To Robert Henry Charles, resurrection in Jewish thought usually refers to the resurrection of the Jewish community to a new earthly life as citizens of a Messianic kingdom.⁸ Immortality in Jewish thought began with the idea of the body and soul remaining together in a permanent state.⁹ Later the idea arose that the soul would leave the body to be judged in Sheol.¹⁰ In terms of chronology, Charles believes that immortality must precede resurrection.¹¹ He holds that the final synthesis of the two doctrines is to be found in Christianity.¹² When the synthesis of immortality and resurrection occurs, the individual will count for very little. He will be part of the resurrected group.¹³ When considering specifically Jewish dogma, Charles holds as authentic Pharisaic thought the idea that souls are sorted out in Sheol.¹⁴ The righteous souls are reborn again in human bodies, while the unrighteous souls remain in Sheol, which is a type of hell.¹⁵ He rejects as non-Pharisaic and Greek in content the idea that after death the souls of the righteous go to heaven and later are sent into pure bodies.¹⁶ When Charles speaks of resurrected, rather than immortal, souls, it makes us wonder whether the Pharisees affirmed immortality or resurrection or a combination of these two ideas.¹⁷ Although Charles discusses Pharisaic thought on the hereafter, he says nothing about the Sadducean ideas concerning this problem.

In 1904 Kaufman Kohler wrote an article in which he raised

the question as to whether the Sadducees, while denying resurrection, also denied the immortality of the soul.¹⁸ Unfortunately, he does not elaborate on his doubts in this article. A year later he wrote on the same subject and still did not clarify the Sadducean position.¹⁹ According to Kohler, resurrection refers to the soul being united with the revived body, while immortality refers to an independent future life for the soul alone.²⁰ He believes that the Pharisees, while holding to a hope for resurrection, did not have a clearly defined conception of immortality:

Certain it is that the Pharisaic belief in resurrection had not even a name for the immortality of the soul. For them, man was made for two worlds, the world that now is, and the world to come, where life does not end in death.²¹

Solomon Schechter makes scant mention of the subject. In one book he refers briefly to the controversy over resurrection in Sanhedrin 91b.²² In another work he refers to Pharisaic thought only once, as follows:

I need hardly say that in the days of Hillel and Shammai, the doctrine of immortality was fully developed, and universally accepted by all the Pharisaic schools.²³

Thus, no new light is thrown on the problem by Schechter.

An article in the E. R. E. indicates that, even though resurrection satisfied the Hebrew demand for justice, the Sadducees denied such a concept.²⁴ The article discusses the development of the idea in religious thought,²⁵ but fails to enlighten us on the Pharisaic -- Sadducean controversy.

R. Travers Herford holds with the opinion of Josephus that the Pharisees accepted resurrection while the Sadducees denied it.²⁶ He feels that Pharisaic belief was in resurrection only, and not in immortality.²⁷ He defines resurrection in terms of the divinity of both body and soul, and immortality as referring to an earthly (non-divine) body containing a divine soul that is liberated when the body dies.²⁸

George Foot Moore accepts the prevailing view that the

Pharisees believed in the revival of the dead, whereas the Sadducees opposed this doctrine.²⁹ He further states that the resurrection of the dead was a party issue between the Pharisees and the Sadducees in the New Testament.³⁰ Further, he agrees with Josephus that the Pharisees affirmed the survival of the soul and that the Sadducees denied it.³¹ Jacob Z. Lauterbach says, with Moore, that the Pharisees believed in both the resurrection of the dead and the immortality of the soul.³² Lauterbach, however, makes no mention of Sadducean thought on the subject.

As shown above, the scholars seem to skirt the implications of the controversy. They state only that a disagreement is evident on the matter of immortality and resurrection. All of the scholars agree that the Pharisees affirm some sort of resurrection, while the Sadducees reject it. The matter of Sadducean opinion on immortality remains an open question.

Let us now turn to the backgrounds of the historical situation to throw more light upon the controversy.

CHAPTER TWO

The Old Testament

The debt which post-biblical Judaism owes to biblical religion makes it relevant for biblical views on the question of the fate of the individual in after-life to be taken into our perspective. This material has been studied and re-studied, and there is no dearth of secondary literature on the question. The principal scholarly works which have seemed to me to have the merit both of accuracy and of enduring worth will be referred to as we examine the biblical material related to the problem at hand.

To reflect every shade of the biblical views would be to obligate oneself to a task as large as the rabbinic subject under discussion. Moreover, the truly decisive age is the post-biblical period, not the biblical period itself. Accordingly, it suffices for our purposes to summarize briefly the leading rubrics from the fine volume by Otto Justice Baab, titled The Theology of the Old Testament. This summary can focus on the key words: Ruah (spirit), nefesh (soul), leb or lebab (heart), basar (body), and Sheol (Hades). I limit myself here strictly to a summary.

Respecting ruah, we find that it "...means variously 'breath, wind, temper, disposition, spirit of living beings, the spirit of God.'"¹ As prophetic spirit it came from God.² The ruah elohim (Gen. 1:2) is God's spirit that was the creative principle of life.³ At death the ruah departs from man, but does not always return to God.⁴ At times it is merely equated with the event of death.⁵ Ruah is that part of man most closely associated with the nature of God; and, although it is God-given, it "...is not mechanically implanted in the body of man."⁶ Ruah is connected with emotional drives, though it is not identical with the drive itself.⁷

Nefesh, too, has a number of translations: e.g., "...soul, living being, life, self, person, desire, appetite, emotion, passion."⁸ The nefesh departs at death, but can return when life is restored.⁹ Then, too, "...in Job (18:22, 28, 30; 33:18) a strong desire is expressed that the nephesh be delivered

from Sheol, the place of death."¹⁰ Seventy times in the Bible the word nefesh means man himself as a living personality.¹¹ The nefesh appears to be the seat of the emotions and personal desires:¹²

It is not "soul" in the metaphysical Greek sense, where a sharp dichotomy is required. The nephesh is not ultimately separable from the living bodily organism, whereas the soul of classical Greek philosophy is thought to be.¹³

Nefesh refers to the whole life of man in his nonbodily form.¹⁴

When I consider leb or lebab, I find that in the Bible its literal meaning is "heart."¹⁵ In context, however, it may also refer to the mind:

The Hebrews, along with other peoples, thought of the psyche as residing, not in the brain, but in the heart, kidneys, liver, or bones. There was no hard and fast differentiation between the function of these organs. In any case, lev was by far the most important.¹⁶

Leb is linked with heart in a number of biblical passages:

"In David's prayer on behalf of his people he mentions the 'thoughts of the heart' of his subjects (I Chr. 29:18). A psalmist speaks of the 'imagination of the heart' (73:7)."¹⁷ Then, too, God promises to give Solomon a wise heart (I Kings 3:12).¹⁸

Because man is a human creature, he is basar (body, flesh). Being basar, he is weak and is subject to sickness and death (Job 14:1, 2):¹⁹ "Men are flesh in contrast with God, who is spirit (Isa. 31:3). For this reason reliance upon man is futile."²⁰ Baash points to biblical illustrations to show that man's great weakness is his physical make-up, his basar, which eventually brings him to the grave. In being a creature of basar, he resembles the animals and thus will share their eventual earthly fate of death.²¹ Both man and beast are children of nature.²²

Although biblical man is composed of ruah, nefesh, leb, and basar, we see that "...from the standpoint of a psychological approach to his nature, (he) is a unitary being. He is body, spirit, self, feeling, mind, and heart.

He is all of these, yet none of these in particular if one tries to identify him with any single category."²³ Because the Bible rejects a thorough-going dualism of basar and nefesh, both (body and soul) will share the same fate.²⁴

Baob holds that biblical man ultimately will go to Sheol, a lower place deep in the earth.²⁵ All the dead are destined to go there, and it is a dark land of no return.²⁶ In this place the dead appear as refaim, weak shade-like shadowy forms. The shades are grouped according to social strata and are to remain forever in this pit-like location.²⁷ Sheol is not the realm of God, since God is only the deity of the living.²⁸ Death through biological decay is an accepted principle of the Old Testament.²⁹ Man is mortal; so he is destined to die because of his physical weakness and not because of Divine punishment.³⁰ The concept of Divine judgment is not clearly presented in the Bible. All I find are statements like "The soul that sinneth, it shall die!" (Ezek. 18:4) Death was controlled by God, often as a result of the nation's sin. The best that man can hope for is a lengthening of his days on earth, because eventually he will go to Sheol.³¹

Despite the pessimistic view of man's fate, I do find the possibility of rescue or resurrection from Sheol in apocalyptic passages in the Bible: "But God will ransom me from the power of Sheol when it seizes me." (Pss. 49:15) References to actual resurrection are to be found in Isaiah 26:19 and in Daniel 12:2. Isaiah 26:19 declares:

But thy dead will live, their bodies will rise,
Those who dwell in the dust will awake, and will
sing for joy;
For thy dew is a dew of light,
And the earth will bring the Shades to birth.

The same thought is echoed in the apocalyptic visions of the book of Daniel, where a similar hope is voiced:

"Many of those who sleep in the land of the dust shall awake, some to everlasting life" (12:2). Others will also arise "to everlasting reproach and contempt." In Sheol these faithless renegades who denied Israel's God in fear of torture and death cannot receive the punishment they so richly deserve. Therefore they will "awake" and suffer everlasting contempt in the land of the living. The risen martyrs who set the example of courageous fidelity will shine "like the stars forever and ever."³²

Thus, I find that in the later apocalyptic passages of the Bible a resurrection of all the inhabitants of Sheol is envisioned, with the righteous to be rewarded and the wicked to be punished. It appears that a combined material and spiritual kingdom will arise.³³ Baab holds that the faith in resurrection as expressed in Isaiah and in Daniel "...rests upon repentance for sin committed against God, a full acceptance of His sovereignty over the personal and social life of man, and obedience to the divine will."³⁴

A basic question to be considered is whether or not the Old Testament raises the issue of immortality and resurrection. Generally speaking, the scholars deal with resurrection in the Bible in terms of definite steps. E. R. Bernard finds three stages in resurrection: The first stage is the resurrection of the nation and not of the individual (Hos. 6:2; Ezek. 37; Isa. 53:10).³⁵ The second stage involves the idea of individual and national resurrection appearing side by side (Isa. 26:14, 19).³⁶ The third stage is individual resurrection of the just and the unjust (Dan. 12:2).³⁷

In Dan. 12.2 the resurrection of individuals stands out alone and clear. The passage probably refers to the faithful and the apostates of Maccabean times (cf. 11.32ff.) and resurrection is predicted for both classes, without, however, any implication of resurrection for gentiles.³⁸

By the side of the previously mentioned stages of thought are the reflections of psalmists and wise men. These emerge as lines of thought with regular divisions. First, comes communion with God, despite the popular belief that Sheol was the end of the relationship to Him (as seen in Pss. 6:5; 30:9).³⁹ A hope for life after death is expressed in an ambiguous way in Pss. 16:10 and 17:15. Bernard believes that the psalmists held to the notion that there is more to life than the continuance of the soul in the body.⁴⁰ The second line of thought involves the need for retribution. At times this need was related to Messianic hopes. The gathering of the living (Isa. 60) was but one step away from the gathering of the dead from the netherworld. This promise

was seen in Isaiah 26:19 and Daniel 12:2.⁴¹ Retribution for the wicked, however, was also a necessity. The unfaithful Israelites were to be punished (Dan. 12:2). Thus, a judgment on mankind would proceed from a starting point such as Daniel 12:2.⁴² This leads me to the third consideration, which is the hope for a higher tribunal of God's judgment to reverse mistaken human judgments. This hope for rescue from Sheol and a final judgment is found in Job:

He rises to the thought, and throws out the wish (14:13ff.), that there may be release from Sheol, and later is assured that "his redeemer (goel) lives," and that he himself will see God (19:25). All this implies, first of all, literal death, and then restoration to life after death, i.e., resurrection in the proper sense of the word.⁴³

A. B. Davidson agrees with Bernard's earlier notion that the first step is national revival (Hos. 6; Isa. 65:17; Ezek. 37), but disagrees with the idea of the second step being both individual and national, since he (Davidson) holds that Isaiah 26:19 deals only with individual restoration.⁴⁴ Davidson also agrees with Bernard that the third stage is the resurrection of the just and the unjust as individuals.⁴⁵ Davidson stresses national restoration rather than individual revival. He points out that the idea of the revival of the people of Israel (Isa. 65:17) was gradually extended to include all nations (Isa. 25:6ff.).⁴⁶ Kohler, too, stresses the nationalistic side of resurrection, as reflected in Hosea 6, Ezekiel 37, and Isaiah 26:⁴⁷ "The Jewish belief in resurrection is intimately bound up with the hope for the restoration of the Israelitish nation on its own soil...."⁴⁸

While the idea of resurrection can be discerned in the Old Testament and discussed in its various steps by scholars, the concept of immortality is not so clearly defined. The very idea of "immortality" appears to be somewhat vague and elusive. In the E. R. E. article on "Eschatology," the word "immortality" is mentioned only once and in that instance in connection with the prophecies concerning a rebuilt Zion as reflected in Isaiah 2:2, 4:5, 11:5ff., Jeremiah 30:18, Amos 9:13f., and Ezekiel 34:14:⁴⁹ "Throughout these prophecies the blessings of the future are on this earth and for the righteous remnant of Israel -- the living in whom the nation finds its true

immortality, a future rather than present generation."⁵⁰ Immortality, according to this opinion, would apply to a future living generation and not concern an other-worldly event. Davidson comes to a similar conclusion when he interprets Isaiah 65:17 to refer to the immortality of the people in a transfigured world that will contain a new heaven and a new earth.⁵¹ He raises the question as to whether or not the people as individuals are immortal, but fails to come to a conclusion on the matter.⁵² There is no definitive answer because of contradictions in the Bible, e.g., Isaiah 65:20ff. only promises a long life, while Isaiah 25:8 speaks of God swallowing up death forever.

In addition to the doctrine of the immortality of the nation, another type of immortality considered by scholars concerns the pious hope that life will win out over death.⁵³ There appears a demand for eternal life: Psalm 16:10 declares, "For Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol."⁵⁴ The nefesh here refers to the person of the man, containing soul and body.⁵⁵ Still another approach was not so much a protest against dying as it was a protest that dying was not really death.⁵⁶ Through this approach it was felt that the godly soul would by-pass Sheol and go directly to God (Pss. 49, Job 19).⁵⁷

In the Bible, immortality was a hope rather than an accomplished fact. Kohler flatly denies that the Old Testament teaches a doctrine of the separate existence of the soul.⁵⁸ The belief in a continuous life of the soul as reflected in I Samuel 28:13ff. was discouraged by the prophets (Isa. 8:19), since eternal life was ascribed only to God and those who eat of the tree of life in the Garden of Eden (Gen. 3:22).⁵⁹ Man was driven out of the Garden of Eden before he could taste of the fruit of immortality.⁶⁰ Kohler, does, however, see a hope for immortality as reflected in the psalmist's faith in God's omnipotence and omnipresence.⁶¹ Job, on the other hand, demonstrates only a desire rather than a real faith in life after death (14:13; 19:26).⁶² The I. C. C. to Job 14:13-15 even denies that he had a desire for a future life:

...Job here considers the idea and the meaning as if it were real, though he still dismisses the reality, of a future life of communion with God: previously (7.8, 21) he has simply doubted the existence of such a future, without contemplating its significance as if it were real.⁶³

Kohler discusses two theories about the immortality of the soul. According to one interpretation, the soul enters man as a breath (ruah) and flies to heaven upon death: "The dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit (ruah) returns to God who gave it." (Eccl. 12:7)⁶⁴ This theory led to the idea that the soul would experience a separate future life apart from the body.⁶⁵ Kohler's other theory is that the soul descended to the nether-world to continue a shadowy existence after death:⁶⁶ "...there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in Sheol whither thou goest (Eccl. 9:10b)." But this shadowy existence would eventually end, and the dead would be resurrected (Dan. 12:2), since they were only in a deep sleep.⁶⁷ The souls would be united with the bodies on the day the dead would rise (Isa. 26:19).⁶⁸

Generally speaking, the concept of immortality in the Bible emerges more as a hope or desire than as a concrete fact. Immortality is expected for the nation (Ezek. 37), and the hope is expressed that the people as individuals (Isa. 26:19) will also share in this future life. Resurrection of the body (Ezek. 37) seems to point the way to the soul's entrance into the newly restored person. Most Old Testament scholars are of the opinion, as shown earlier, that the soul cannot be considered apart from the body.⁶⁹ So, the total personality will be resurrected to some immortal state in the apocalyptic vision of the future (Dan. 12:2). This total personality will be both basar and ruah. It appears that the hoped for immortal nefesh will be composed of flesh and spirit.

Resurrection in the Old Testament serves as a proof-text for the post-biblical idea of the independent immortality of the soul, apart from the body. What the Old Testament may be indicating is that if resurrection is possible, might there not also be a future independent life for the soul? As far as most

scholars are concerned, however, the Old Testament does not present such a thought.⁷⁰ It remained for the post-biblical writers to move in this new direction.

CHAPTER THREE

Philo, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and New Testament

PHILO'S CONTRIBUTION

Among the earliest interpreters of biblical thought was an Alexandrian Jew named Philo. No study of the question at hand could be complete without a consideration of his writings. It is not my purpose to explore every facet of his philosophy, nor to discuss in detail the scholarly opinion as to what extent Hellenism or rabbinism influenced the vast body of his work. The summation of scholarly outlook on Philo has been done by others.¹ Within the framework of thought on the resurrection -- immortality question, my main concern will be to determine to what extent he presents Greek ideas and to what extent he transmits Jewish ideas. What does he say about resurrection and immortality? I shall now deal with the scholarly findings on this important question.

One of the few scholars who uses the term "resurrection" in connection with Philo's writings is Wolfson. In his opinion, Philo took all references to resurrection as being only a figurative way of discussing immortality:

Throughout his writings, Philo speaks of the immortality of the soul rather than of the resurrection of the body. No direct or indirect reference to resurrection as distinguished from immortality is ever made by him, though the belief in resurrection was common among the Egyptians of his own native country and though also it is mentioned in the Sibylline Oracles. But it is quite evident that all references to resurrection found in the traditional literature of his time were understood by him as being only a figurative way of referring to immortality.²

Wolfson emphatically dismisses references that might be interpreted as applying to resurrection:

The question "Where was my body before birth, and whither will it go when I have departed?" (*Cher.* 32, 114) has no reference to the problem of resurrection. It only expresses a general state of wonderment, just as the subsequent question "Where is the babe that I once was?"³

When I turn to a consideration of the doctrine of the

immortality of the soul, I find that Philo has definite opinions and is largely influenced by Greek thought concerning the dualism of body and soul.⁴ Turning aside from the biblical idea of the unity of body and soul, Philo deals at length with an elaborate system whereby one of man's souls (or his only soul) escapes from the body to attain immortality.⁵ The scholars do not agree on terminology regarding Philo's views concerning the soul and the mind of man. Wolfson feels that Philo ascribes both an irrational corruptible mortal soul to man (that dies with the body), as well as a rational immortal soul or mind that survives the death of the body.⁶ Goodenough feels that Philo speaks of only one soul in man, and that that soul is identified with man's higher mind. This higher mind is an extension of God or the Logos.⁷ He identifies Philo's lower sensory earth-bound mind⁸ with Wolfson's concept of the corruptible mortal soul.⁹ Further disagreement is seen among the scholars over the question of whether the highest part of the soul is called mind, or whether the soul is actually the higher mind. Drummond holds to the former opinion,¹⁰ while Goodenough champions the latter contention.¹¹

Samuel Sandmel summarizes the essence of Philo as follows:

Man, a mixture of body and soul, requires the salvation of his soul out of the body. The Bible is a vehicle of that salvation.... Our soul before birth was like the first Adam of Gen. I, generic man, made by God. On being born, that is, mixed with body, we become the "fashioned" individual, the second Adam of Gen. 2. We go through stages in our life. We are initially neither good nor bad in our souls, but are rather blanks, until we mate with sense perception, Eve. Thereafter pleasure, the serpent, may incline us to lowly things. Should we want to rise, we need first to go through the preliminaries. First, we become Enos, we arrive at hope. Next, like Enoch, we need repentance to translate us out of our previous bad existence. Thereupon we attain the stage of Noah, rest, a relative righteousness which conveys to us a limited tranquility.¹²

Earlier in the same article, Sandmel shows how overtones of allegory creep into Philo's interpretations. Speaking of Philo's view of Scripture, Sandmel says, "...he tells us in several places that the literal is the body of Scripture, and the allegorical is its soul. His dualism is sufficiently extended that he regards soul as much higher than body, and this attitude obtains even towards Scripture."¹³

Philo's concept of the destiny of the soul after death is a matter of scholarly controversy. Wolfson detects three places the soul might go:

First, to heaven to be among the angels, which is the place for all the immortal souls. Second, to the intelligible world to be among the ideas, which is the place to which Isaac and Enoch went. Third, to the presence of God above the intelligible world, which is the place to which Moses went.¹⁴

Drummond, on the other hand, does not detect three possible destinies for the soul in Philo's writings. Rather, Philo's goal for the soul is ultimately to commune alone with the Alone (God) in the mystical Jerusalem.¹⁵

Wolfson catalogues the Greek ideas of immortality found in Philo,¹⁶ though he makes his cataloguing general because Philo is at variance with some Greek thinkers. For example, Philo holds the soul to be generated, while Plato believes it is ungenerated.¹⁷ The Greek ideas found in Philo can be listed as follows: First, Philo says, with the Greeks, that the individual soul was created (setting aside the argument concerning the question of its possible pre-existence).¹⁸ Second, Philo accepts the Greek notion of the soul as being separable from the body, while being a more or less distinct entity in that body.¹⁹ Third, Philo saw immortality as "...the continuance of the existence of the soul as an individual and distinct entity...."²⁰ Fourth, this "...immortality was considered not as something due to the soul by its own nature, but rather as a gift from God, which can be taken away, and hence the soul was considered as something destructible, though there were various explanations as to what is meant by the destructibility of the soul."²¹ A fifth

factor, not listed by Wolfson, might well be Philo's use of the Greek idea of "Logos," a term first used by Heraclitus the Ephesian (500 B. C.).²² While Logos might apply to many things,²³ in its highest sense it denotes the mind itself.²⁴ The divine Logos raises man to God and endows him with immortality.²⁵ Also, it could act as God's intermediary,²⁶ since the Logoi were God's servants in the form of angels.²⁷

While the preceding passage illustrates Philo's use of Greek ideas, I must also consider to what extent Jewish thought influenced his writings. At the outset I note the penetrating observation of Sandmel, who points out that the Bible was the common starting point of both Philo and the rabbis.²⁸ The difference between Philo and the rabbis lies in how they interpret the Bible.²⁹ Wolfson indicates that Philo seeks scriptural proof-texts in support of his belief in the immortality of the soul.³⁰ The proof-text which he adduces is the verse in which God says to Abraham, "But thou shalt go to thy fathers nourished with peace, in a goodly old age." (Gen. 15:15) Wolfson continues:

Commenting on this verse, Philo says: "He here clearly indicates the incorruptibility of the soul, when it transfers itself out of the abode of the mortal body and returns as it were to the metropolis of its fatherland, from which it originally migrated into the body," for "what else is this but to propose to him and set before him another life apart from the body?"³¹

Another point reflecting Philo's Jewishness is that while he believed the soul to have an independent life, after the death of the body, the soul's path to salvation was through the observance of the laws of Judaism: "The essential difference between this point of view and that of Palestinian Judaism is that Palestinian Judaism never conceived of man as requiring such salvation."³² Sandmel goes on to say that "Philo paved his road to salvation with an allegorical midrash on the meaning of Jewish Law."³³ As far as Jewish Law was concerned, according to Goodenough, Philo was unfamiliar with Oral Law and dealt only with the Written Law.³⁴ Goodenough agrees with Heinemann, who

"...concluded that Philo's references to the 'unwritten Law' cannot be taken in any case as a reference to the 'oral tradition' of Pharisaic Judaism."³⁵ Philo was a follower of the written word of the Pentateuch.³⁶ To him "...Judaism had no history or development or fundamentally important literature between Moses and his own time...."³⁷ I shall have more to say about this matter later when I take up the Sadducean -- Pharisaic controversy.

Philo believed that the soul would have a future independent life, but while on earth it was part of the body.³⁸ The unity of body and soul on earth was a biblical view.³⁹ And, according to Philo, man's body was not intrinsically evil as the Greeks believed: "...Philo recognized the fact that there are other things which are more destitute of soul than the body, such as glory, wealth, dominions, honours...."⁴⁰ While he believed, with the Greeks, that the body was a prison, he also felt that the mind could control it by reason.⁴¹ Since Philo believed that the body could be influenced toward good, he does express, at least in part, a Jewish attitude. This mixing of Jewish and Greek ideas is characteristic of his approach: While he considers angels to be real beings, as they are in the Bible,⁴² he gives us also a Greek approach in identifying them with Logoi.⁴³ We also note that Philo draws upon the traditional vocabulary of resurrection as found in Scripture to express his idea of immortality.⁴⁴ Resurrection, thought of as new life in Isaiah 26:19 and Daniel 12:2, is considered as new birth by Philo and applied by him to his expressions on immortality.⁴⁵ Finally, I note that Philo does feel he is within the bounds of Judaism in drawing allegorical interpretations from Scripture, e.g., in his treatment of the name Samuel: "'Now Samuel,' he says 'was perhaps in reality only a man, but here he is conceived, not as a compound living being, but as a mind which rejoices only in the service and worship of God.'"⁴⁶ In another instance I see that "When speaking of Enos, Enoch, and Noah, he remarks, 'whether we think of them as men or types of soul,' he implies that they are both."⁴⁷ Philo in

his very use of the allegorical method is employing the same technique as that used by the rabbis in Talmudic literature.⁴⁸

Both Philo and the rabbis began with the Bible. However, Philo parted from biblical tradition with his Greek-tinged interpretations of Scripture. This is especially true when he ascribes to the soul or higher mind a future life released from the prison house that is the body. The Greek idea of the duality of basar and nefesh, as opposed to the biblical idea of their essential unity, marks Philo's departure from biblical thought.

Before concluding our consideration of Philo, I must ask whether he was closer in spirit to the Sadducees than to the Pharisees. Wolfson does not shed much light on this problem. According to him, Philo tried to combine the traditional Pharisaic method with the Greek allegorical approach, in an effort to harmonize the two techniques.⁴⁹ Philo was trying to maintain a middle ground.⁵⁰ Wolfson indicates that Philo was at times critical of both the Sadducean and the Pharisaic approach to Scripture.⁵¹ Sandmel notes, however, that Wolfson "...sees Philo at every turn dependent on the rabbis."⁵² The J. E. article on "Philo," indicates that he (Philo) had two approaches to the Bible: First, the literal approach, which serves human needs; and, second, the allegorical approach, which is the real meaning and which only a few can comprehend.⁵³ But this article fails to place Philo in either the Pharisaic or the Sadducean tradition.

Goodenough feels that Philo was in agreement with the spirit of Sadducean thought.⁵⁴ Agreeing with Heinemann, he finds that Philo had much in common with the Sadducees. Goodenough detects in Philo an extreme concentration on the Written Law of the Pentateuch, together with a lack of knowledge of the oral tradition of the Pharisaic rabbis.⁵⁵ The Sadducees were the exponents of the written, as opposed to the oral, Law:

The points where Heinemann finds him (Philo) in agreement with Palestinian tradition, the actual usages of the temple cultus, the strict conception of the oath, the dating and nature of certain offerings, the use of God's name in the temple, the regulation of the temple ordeal for a woman accused of adultery, are all matters that were largely the concern of the Sadducean group as high-priests.⁵⁶

Then, too, in such matters as his penal code and his handling of the Talon, he reflects the Sadducean legal approach.⁵⁷

Also, the Sadducees were men of wealth and distinction, as was Philo.⁵⁸ Of special interest is Goodenough's analysis of the future life in Philo's thought:

The Sadducees denied the resurrection of the body, an idea which also does not appear in Philo. He does not go so far as they in saying that souls perish with their bodies, but his Greek notion of immortality, and all his ethical teaching, are quite without a sanction of rewards and punishments at a divine tribunal after death.⁵⁹

While Goodenough realizes that the evidence may be too slight to prove that the Sadducees influenced Philo, "...it is at least striking that Philo agrees with every one of the positions they are known to have taken."⁶⁰ Further support for this line of thought is found in Kohler, who points to the Book of Wisdom as describing a Hellenistic Sadducean type of aristocracy in Alexandria.⁶¹ Philo would seem to fit into that circle.

I might infer that Philo, as an aristocratic Greek Jew, was a member of the top echelon of the Hellenistically oriented Alexandrian community. That he was not a complete Hellenist is clear from the fact that he defends Judaism with Greek ideas derived from the Septuagint. While one does not know for certain of an actual Sadducean party existing in Alexandria,⁶² the ruling class there might well have resembled the aristocrats of Palestine. "Spiritually," it appears that Philo was close to Sadducean thought, as Goodenough and Heinemann maintain.⁶³ If this is so, his denial of resurrection while espousing immortality might have been the emerging thinking of the leaders of the Alexandrian Jewish community. Whether a

parallel independent line of thought (affirming immortality and denying resurrection) was developing among the Sadducees of Palestine remains to be shown. Did Philo, a Sadducee in spirit, influence the Sadducees of Alexandria and Jerusalem? Did they in turn influence him? Might not his idea of espousing the Greek dualism of body and soul have appealed to the priestly Sadducees, who denied the Pharisaic doctrine of resurrection? If I accept the notion that Philo was a literalist in saying that every word of Scripture is sacred and immutable (and in a different category than his flights of allegorical speculation),⁶⁴ might not he have found support among the Sadducean schools that stressed the written word as unalterable and binding? Is it not a natural step from this point to suppose that either Philo influenced the Sadducees to accept the idea of immortality, or that they influenced him in that direction? There is also the possibility that the Sadducees, being so closely associated with the Greeks, picked up the idea on their own. The evidence at this point is beginning to show a direction. I hope to show clearly whether other sources (e.g., apocalyptic material, New Testament, and rabbinic utterances) support this estimation of the controversy.

APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

It is not my intent to give a book by book summary of the many ideas on resurrection and immortality to be found in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. I shall refer to the scholarly works in this field as our study continues. As a general observation I hold with Klausner's view that while the Apocrypha do not give an important place to apocalyptic and eschatological speculation on life after death, the Pseudepigrapha abound with such references.⁶⁵ If definite conclusions elude me it is understandable, in view of the often confusing, obscure, and fragmentary nature of these works. I now take a sampling of scholarly opinion on the matter under discussion.

R. H. Charles attempts to show a systematic development of the idea of resurrection and immortality from the second century B. C. E. to the second century C. E.⁶⁶ However,

he uses the terms "resurrection" and "immortality" in the same breath. In the index of his book, for example, he refers to a discussion on the Book of Wisdom under both the headings of resurrection and immortality.⁶⁷ Here he speaks of the first century C. E. idea of the resurrection of the spirit to immortality immediately after death without waiting for the final judgment.⁶⁸ In the previous century, said Charles, the cultural Pharisees had a doctrine of resurrection that was spiritual in nature, as shown in I Enoch.⁶⁹ Again, from his point of view, Jubilees 23:31 refers to a resurrection of spirit.⁷⁰ Since Charles does not define his terms, he leaves one with the impression that a resurrected spirit is the same as an immortal soul. Charles maintains that by the first century C. E. the growing dualism between national and individual resurrection is reaching its final development.⁷¹ This final development involves either the resurrection of the spirit (apart from the body) as seen in Jubilees, Assumption of Moses, the Book of Wisdom, and IV Maccabees, or the concept of the earthly body being transformed into an angelic nature.⁷² Further difficulty is evident when Charles tries to isolate the soul in apocryphal literature. Attempting to trace the historical development of the soul, he claims that prior to 200 B. C. E. the soul and spirit were identical in essence but not in function.⁷³ Then, in the period of 200 to 100 B. C. E., as reflected in I Baruch 2:17 and Tobit 3:6, "...the spirit and the soul are regarded as essentially different. The spirit goes back to God and the soul continues to subsist in Sheol. By this century, soul and spirit are the same."⁷⁴ Further confusion appears when Charles declares that the soul and spirit have the same function and are essentially the same in the first century C. E.,⁷⁵ whereas in an earlier reference he held that in that century spirit and soul were different.⁷⁶

Pfeiffer disagrees with Charles in his evaluation of the Wisdom of Solomon. Whereas Charles felt that "Wisdom" reflected the idea of the resurrection of the spirit,⁷⁷ Pfeiffer felt

that it ("Wisdom") taught immortality of the soul in the fashion of the Greek thinkers of Alexandria.⁷⁸ Pfeiffer contrasts "Wisdom" with II Maccabees, which did teach the doctrine of bodily resurrection.⁷⁹ Moore concurs with Pfeiffer that "Wisdom" teaches the idea of the immortality of the soul.⁸⁰

The confusion in attempting an intelligent evaluation of apocryphal literature is further compounded when one tries to assign a book or even a fragment of a book to a certain school of thought. In an article by Charles C. Torrey I find the idea that while the Jewish apocalyptic writings were not the product of any particular sect or school, they did reflect a point of view identified with the Pharisees, who were the exponents of Palestinian orthodoxy.⁸¹ On the other hand, Herford denies Pharisaic authorship to apocryphal literature and ascribes these works to the writing of the Zealots.⁸² Herford does concede, however, that both Pharisaic and apocryphal writings do have some ideas in common, e.g., the belief in resurrection.⁸³

Scholars tend to assign to the Sadducees those books of apocryphal literature that are void of a concept of a future life. Kohler felt that I Maccabees, Judith, and Tobit must belong to Sadducean thought because they never allude to a life beyond death.⁸⁴ Charles agrees with Kohler that I Maccabees is Sadducean because all the rewards listed in that book are limited to this life.⁸⁵ Moore labeled Sirach's conservative view of the finality of death as Sadducean.⁸⁶ Since most scholars evaluate as Sadducean all apocryphal literature that is this-worldly, they would then tend to evaluate much of the other-worldly material as Pharisaic. This may account for Charles's failure fully to distinguish between resurrection and immortality. As shown earlier, he often combines his references to immortality and resurrection. When he does get into such a question as "resurrection of the spirit," he attributes this notion to a cultured Pharisee.⁸⁷ Perhaps by the same token he would feel that an "uncultured" Pharisee would be responsible for writings reflecting the

resurrection of only the body.

Charles and Pfeiffer agree that the Wisdom of Solomon is Alexandrian.⁸⁸ While Pfeiffer says this book teaches the Greek idea of the immortality of the pre-existent soul imprisoned in the corruptible body,⁸⁹ and Charles says a resurrected immortal spirit is found there,⁹⁰ I can see that the notion of bodily resurrection is absent. Rather than crediting the book to Greek Hellenists, could I not ascribe this work to aristocratic Sadducees of Alexandria who sought to justify Judaism to their friends, as did Philo? Could not this emerging idea of a form of immortality be Sadducean? J. A. MacCulloch is one of the few scholars who sees a Sadducean influence on apocryphal writings of the Alexandrian school. In his article titled "Eschatology" he points out that the Alexandrian Jewish schools taught the ideas of Philo and the Sadducees, and their influence is seen where the spirits of the righteous are glorified, e.g., in Jubilees 23:30, 31 and in Assumption of Moses.⁹¹ While MacCulloch ascribes the belief in spirits to Philoian and Sadducean influence, he does place the belief in soul, e.g., as found in Secrets of Enoch 22:8f., within the realm of Pharisaic influence. J. W. Lightley, too, believes that the Sadducees believed in immortality. He says, in part, that "...it is pure assumption to suppose that because the high-priestly party rejected the new belief in the resurrection they had made no advance at all beyond the Sheol-conception. The 'Zadokite Fragment' certainly stands as a witness to their belief in immortality...."⁹²

Although definite conclusions cannot be reached as to whether apocryphal literature gives conclusive evidence that, while the Pharisees espoused resurrection, the Sadducees championed immortality, there is room for speculation that such might have been the case. It is not farfetched to state that Sadducean influence was felt in the writings of the Alexandrian Jewish schools. The evidence in apocryphal literature against a Sadducean influence in the development of concepts of immortality seems very weak.

NEW TESTAMENT

Earliest Christianity, being Palestinian, probably contained Palestinian ideas.⁹³ Hence, the earliest Christians not only accepted resurrection, but also it became the central motif in their beliefs. To comprehend this phenomenon fully, I must now consider the scholarly opinions on this subject.

Of paramount importance is the contribution of Paul. In him one encounters a Greek Jew who brings Philo-like preconceptions to the central motif. Sandmel points out, however, that Paul is not completely of one mind with Philo and the Greeks:

Paul...speaks of a "spiritual body," a term which seems to denote a paradox, but which may be taken to mean that the individual, though without his body, remains an entity at resurrection. What Paul is doing here is rejecting both the physical resurrection and also certain Greek notions, known from the Stoics and Philo, that the immaterial part of man loses its identity, and is simply reabsorbed into the immaterial source out of which man's soul came prior to union with the body. Rather, Paul is insisting that the spiritual entity abides in its individuality.⁹⁴

Sandmel sees in I Corinthians 15:44 Paul's Graeco-Jewish reinterpretation of resurrection.⁹⁵ J. C. Lambert says that at the resurrection these new bodies will be "...no longer psychical merely, i.e., moving on the line of man's natural experience in the world, but pneumatical...because (they are) redeemed from every taint of evil and (are) fitted to be the perfect organs of a spiritual and heavenly life."⁹⁶

The very question of the terms "body" and "flesh" disturbs the scholars. Cullman sees in Paul's general view a sharp distinction between body and flesh.⁹⁷ To him, deliverance consists in a release of both body and soul from the flesh.⁹⁸ John Robinson, too, stresses the importance to Paul of the body. He feels that Paul believes flesh to be transient and perishable, but body to be personality.⁹⁹ Paul promises resurrection for the body, but not for the flesh.¹⁰⁰ Cullman supports Robinson in this matter by reminding us of I Cor. 6:19,

where the body is described not as the soul's prison, but rather as its temple, that is, the temple of what he terms the Holy Spirit.¹⁰¹ Wheeler Robinson also sees Paul's use of "flesh" as something that denotes physical or intellectual weakness, even though in this scholar's opinion Paul fails to give us a fundamental ethical dualism of "flesh" and "spirit."¹⁰² John Robinson gives perhaps the fullest scholarly exposition on the body. He holds that ultimately Paul was expressing the idea that the Church was the literal resurrected body of Christ.¹⁰³ The stress in his thinking is that all bodies are one in Christ.¹⁰⁴ The Spirit is the instrument by which the resurrection of Christ and all men takes place.¹⁰⁵ He sees in Paul a social resurrection of the community, not from the body but of the body.¹⁰⁶ The Church is not to be built up through an elect group out of the body of history; rather, the resurrected body of history itself will be redeemed.¹⁰⁷ The resurrection hope, then, is a social rather than individual aspiration. I Corinthians 15 suggests collective resurrection.¹⁰⁸ John Robinson says, further, that the spiritual body of the resurrection will have definite physical characteristics.¹⁰⁹ Other scholars are not as certain about this, e.g., Wheeler Robinson speaks of the "pneumatic" body,¹¹⁰ agreeing with Lambert in the use of this term.¹¹¹

What more can be said of "soul" and "spirit" in Pauline thought? Wheeler Robinson downgrades the soul (nefesh), while exalting the spirit (ruah). According to him, Paul considers the soul to be merely the animating principle of the body of flesh.¹¹² However, spirit (ruah) is the most important word in Paul's psychological vocabulary "...whether as denoting supernatural influences (Ro. 15.13), or the higher nature of a Christian man under the influence of the spirit of God... or as a normal element in human nature...."¹¹³ Cullman¹¹⁴ and Sandmel¹¹⁵ stress the idea of a spiritual body's being resurrected. Cullman summarizes his thoughts by declaring that after Jesus died and expiated sin, he experienced a resurrection of body and soul.¹¹⁶ This resurrection was a rising of

the spiritual body, whereby the Holy Spirit took possession of the inner man.¹¹⁷ The spiritual body emerged from the fleshly body to break the power of death.¹¹⁸ Cullman, like Wheeler Robinson, fails to exalt the soul.¹¹⁹ Cullman sees the soul and body imprisoned by the flesh, awaiting release together by the Holy Spirit.¹²⁰ So, if the soul lacks an independent existence after the flesh expires, it loses the exalted position it had in Greek thought. Therefore, in Pauline thought the resurrected spiritual body (using the term "body" to include the soul as well) is to attain immortality. Lambert, too, recognizes the unity of body and soul at the resurrection, but he tends to give the soul a slightly higher position than the body, even though they are united. He thinks that in Pauline thought the body links man to nature, while the soul links man to God.¹²¹ In any event, in Paul one finds the idea that resurrection becomes immortality. Resurrection is immortality.

Other parts of the New Testament have relevant things to say about the question at hand. I now turn to scholarly evaluation of some key ideas. C. Harris, in the E. R. E., gives an analysis of a few leading rubrics. Regarding bodily resurrection, he finds that Jesus teaches basically of a spiritual life in the resurrection, where "...man will have outgrown his lower animal propensities, such as the appetite of sex (Mt. 22.30, Mk. 12.25, Lk. 20.35) and the desire of eating and drinking (Ro. 14.17). Allusions to feasting in the next world are certainly to be understood symbolically, as is especially evident from Mt. 26.29."¹²² Harris does not feel that the earthly and the resurrected bodies are the same:

Although the identity of the resurrected body with the earthly body is often suggested or even insisted on in the NT...the identity thought of was probably one of continuity, rather than of identical materials.... At the moment of resurrection the buried body rose and was transformed into a spiritual body.¹²³

The resurrected bodies were to be like the bodies of angels (Matt. 22:30).¹²⁴ S. D. F. Salmond agrees with Harris that

resurrection is of the body, as reflected in the synoptic records and the Fourth Gospel.¹²⁵ The just and the unjust will be resurrected at the same time, although they may experience a different ultimate fate.¹²⁶

As to the concept of heaven, Harris says that the New Testament teaches the following:

At present, owing to the imperfection of the universe, God's glory and majesty cannot be fully manifested in it. The boundaries of heaven...are consequently restricted. But in the consummation and regeneration of the universe...which will accompany the resurrection, when the whole creation, which, being enslaved in the bondage of corruption, groaneth and travaileth in pain together (or together with man) until now, shall be delivered into the liberty of the glory of the children of God (Ro. 8.21), then the glory of God, at present manifested within a limited heaven, will be manifested throughout the entire universe, and the boundaries of heaven and of creation will be coterminous....¹²⁷

Harris then makes this point: The distinction between heaven and earth will then have no meaning. Wherever God's servants may be, on whatever employment, God will be with them, and they will see His face....¹²⁸ Heaven and earth will become one, and all will see God's face (Matt. 18:10).¹²⁹

When I turn to a consideration of the concept of salvation in the New Testament, I find that Harris holds that the bulk of mankind will experience it:

God willeth that all men...should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth (I Ti. 2.4); He "is the saviour of all men, especially of them that believe" (I Ti. 4.10). The Son of God came to seek and to save that which was lost (Mt. 18.11), and to be the Saviour of the world....¹³⁰

Most will find salvation, but a few will experience eternal doom.¹³¹ Some would go through purgatory (Matt. 12:32):¹³² "The fact is that purgatorial ideas were well established in Judaism long before Christ, and that Christianity simply adopted them."¹³³

Regarding eschatology, Salmond says as follows:

The eschatology of the NT is not given in systematic form, neither is it expressed in the precise and measured language of metaphysics or theology. It appears in the shape of a number of ideas which are common to the NT books, but which are presented in different aspects and connexions by the several writers.¹³⁴

Christian eschatology in the Synoptic Gospels centers on the important idea of the kingdom of God. This idea presupposes the reality of a future existence.¹³⁵ Jesus will return (Matt. 24:3, 37, 39), although the exact time of his coming is not known:

...Christ connects the completion of the Kingdom with a decisive occurrence, the great event of His own Parousia (Mat. 3, 37, 39). The time of this new interposition is not declared, it is not known even to the Son.... But it is to come when the times are ripe for it, and there are preclusive tokens of it.¹³⁶

The destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world are near (Matt. 24 and 25).¹³⁷ With the second coming there will be a Final Judgment (at the end of the world) of individuals (Matt. 22:1-14), which will be a judgment of universal scope (Matt. 13:36-42) in which the Messiah himself will be the judge (Matt. 25:31).¹³⁸ The author does mention a present and subjective judgment in John 3 and 12, but he does not feel that it is inconsistent with an objective judgment of the future.¹³⁹ Quite naturally, resurrection -- as discussed earlier -- will take place at the end of the world.¹⁴⁰ In his article, Salmond summarizes Apostolic eschatology.¹⁴¹ I shall not attempt to delineate the subtle nuances of thought he sets down other than to note that he does feel that each New Testament writer makes a contribution to the eschatological system.

As to the New Testament idea of the body, J. C. Lambert has a very fine summary in an article in the E. R. E.¹⁴² Lambert denies the presence of an open dualism of body and soul in New Testament thought, since the New Testament ideas are so firmly rooted in the Old Testament teachings of Genesis 2:7, Psalm 63:1, Ezekiel 44:7, 9, and Micah 6:7.¹⁴³ He speaks of the unity of the human personality of man "...as

resting upon an underlying duality; man is conceived of as a complex being with a lower and a higher part, by one of which he is linked to the life of nature, and by the other to the Spirit of God."¹⁴⁴ Since the Old Testament did not have an exact term for body but used basar, the New Testament, being based on the Old Testament, also used a term practically synonymous with flesh.¹⁴⁵ Lambert feels that the Gospels tend to exalt the body more than the Old Testament did, e.g., John 1:14 speaks of the Word made flesh, and "...the Son of God becoming the man Christ Jesus."¹⁴⁶ Lambert holds that Jesus's resurrection gives proof of the dignity and value of the human body.¹⁴⁷ In the resurrection the body will be subordinated to the soul (Matt. 10:28; Luke 12:4).¹⁴⁸ At that time, the body will be more spiritual than physical (Mark 12:25).¹⁴⁹

H. Wheeler Robinson's article titled "Soul" in the E. R. E. discussed the terms soul, spirit, heart, and flesh.¹⁵⁰ In thirty-seven instances in the Synoptic Gospels the nefesh denotes physical life, e.g., Matthew 2:20, "...or the subject of emotional states (Mk. 14.34), as in the OT, but in eleven cases (as Mt. 10.28) it refers to the continuance of life after death, a usage to which there is nothing corresponding in the use of nephesh."¹⁵¹ The Greek term for ruah appears seventy-eight times and "...is used chiefly of the Holy Spirit...and of demonic influences...but in three instances it denotes the principle of life (Mt. 27.50, Lk. 8.55; 23.46)."¹⁵² The Greek term for leb is used forty-nine times to denote personality, inner life, and character (Mark 7:21).¹⁵³ Also, it can denote "...emotional...intellectual...volitional...life."¹⁵⁴ Basar (flesh) "...is used of the physical part of human nature, with the suggestion of weakness and limitation (Mk. 14.38; cf. Lk. 24.39), and thus in contrast with divine power (Mt. 16.7)."¹⁵⁵ Except for the use of nefesh (soul), "...all these usages could be directly classified under the corresponding OT terms, the connotation of which they continue, though the Christian emphasis on the inner life in contrast with the outer...is naturally marked in NT teachings."¹⁵⁶

After taking up Paul's ideas, which were explored earlier,

Robinson then goes on to John, and he points out that in his thought the usage of nefesh "...offers no marked difference from that of the Synoptics, except that it once includes the inner life on its higher side (3 Jn. 2), as nephesh also can (Job 16.4)."¹⁵⁷ The Greek term for ruah (spirit) "...is almost confined to supernatural influences, whilst never used of demons. In one instance it is used of the principle of life (Jn. 19.30), and in two psychically, of anger...and of trouble...."¹⁵⁸ The Greek word for leb (heart) "...follows the Synoptic usage."¹⁵⁹ The Greek term for basar (flesh) is contrasted with ruah (spirit).¹⁶⁰

Robinson finds another use of these terms in Peter's writings: "I P. is interesting by its contrast with the Pauline...."¹⁶¹ For Peter, nefesh (soul) "...denotes the whole personality, including its higher aspects (1.22)...."¹⁶² Ruah (spirit) "...is used of the soul or spirit after death (3.18f. 4.6); in one instance (it) denotes a meek and gentle 'disposition' (3.4), as imparted by the Holy Spirit, but never a normal element in human nature, as it does in Paul's usage."¹⁶³ The Greek word for leb (heart) "...follows the usual Hebrew and Pauline usage, with reference to the inner life as contrasted with the outer...."¹⁶⁴ The Greek term for basar (flesh) "...is used in a purely physical and non-ethical sense, unlike the characteristic Pauline connotation. The usage of the term in James follows that of the OT."¹⁶⁵

After giving this fine summary, Robinson says as follows:

From this survey it will be clear that the fundamental ideas of personality in the NT are derived from the OT; the most important advance is in the belief that essential personality (whether called soul or spirit) survives bodily death. This continued personality, however, still implies a body...whether the present body (its ghostly counterpart? Mt. 5.29f., 10.28) or the "pneumatic" body of Pauline anticipation (I Co. 15.35-38), more adapted to the needs of the spirit....¹⁶⁶

Our examination of the New Testament cannot be complete without a consideration of what light the idea of resurrection and immortality sheds upon the Pharisaic -- Sadducean controversy.

Keeping in mind that the New Testament held resurrection and immortality to be essentially the same, what does this mean in terms of our problem? First, I see that the Sadducees are described as non-believers in resurrection. They taunt Jesus by asking him about marriage in the age of the resurrection (Matt. 22:23-30):

The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection, and asked him, Saying, Master, Moses said, If a man die, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother.

Now there were with us seven brethren: and the first, when he had married a wife, deceased, and, having no issue, left his wife unto his brother: Likewise the second also, and the third, unto the seventh.

And the last of all was the woman who died also. Therefore, in the resurrection, whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her.

Jesus answered and said unto them. Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.¹⁶⁷

Thus, the Sadducees mock the idea of resurrection, but they do not reject immortality. Also, the Sadducees are grieved that Jesus's followers teach the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead (Acts 4:1-3):

And as they spake unto the people, the priests, and the captain of the temple, and the Sadducees, came upon them, Being grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead.

And they laid hands on them, and put them in hold unto the next day: for it was now eventide.

On the other hand, the Pharisees are said to believe in resurrection (Acts 23:8): "For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit: But the Pharisees confess both." An interesting comment on Acts 23:8 is made by Lightley, one of the few who believes that the Sadducees accepted immortality. Speaking of the Sadducean attitude, Lightley says:

"Immortality" itself was for them a difficult enough doctrine, but they could not go so far as to accept the popular belief that dead men were transformed into angels and might even appear to their friends on earth (as in Acts XII.15). It is in this sense, then, we ought to understand the statement that "the Sadducees say there is no resurrection, neither angel or spirit."¹⁶⁸

Lightley seems to say that while the Sadducees deny resurrection, they do not deny immortality. Is it not possible that the Sadducees believed in a form of immortality of the soul that was not bound up with angels or spirits?

I note that while the Sadducees deny resurrection, nowhere does it say that they denied immortality. No mention is made in the New Testament of their view on immortality.¹⁶⁹ Even though the New Testament understood resurrection and immortality to be the same, could one not assume that the Sadducees, influenced by the Hellenists and Philo, separated these two concepts? While an argument from Sadducean silence on immortality may not be conclusive, it does indicate the possibility that the Sadducees, while denying resurrection, may, with the Greeks, have affirmed immortality. At least the New Testament does not rule out the chance that this may have been the case.

CHAPTER FOUR

Rabbinic and Other Related Utterances

In this chapter I shall investigate the rabbinic utterances on immortality and resurrection in order to throw light on the actual dispute between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. Did the Pharisaic rabbis hold to resurrection, while rejecting immortality? What did the Sadducees believe concerning resurrection and immortality? When the Sadducees mock the Pharisees about the doctrine of resurrection, as they do in Abot de R. Natan, chapter five, do they also reject immortality? It has been shown that the New Testament failed to indicate the Sadducean view on immortality. All that I found was a controversy in which the Sadducees rejected resurrection (Matt. 22; Acts 4) and the Pharisees accepted it (Acts 23). Does the Sadducean silence on attitudes to immortality in the New Testament also prevail in rabbinic literature? If so, how does this silence affect our evaluation of the dispute?

My procedure in this chapter will be as follows: First, I shall examine what Josephus has to say. Second, I shall undertake a detailed analysis of the Pharisaic position on resurrection and immortality. For, if I understand Pharisaic thought clearly, then the Sadducean attitude (which opposes Pharisaic doctrine) will possibly emerge. I will know, at least, what the Sadducees are against. Is it resurrection or immortality they oppose? Which of the doctrines is Pharisaic? Finally, in the light of the previously considered evidence, I shall analyze the specific rabbinical dispute between the Pharisees and the Sadducees over the immortality-resurrection question.

I now turn to Josephus, who discusses the matter at length. He says:

...the Pharisees...say that all souls are incorruptible, but that the souls of good men only are removed into other bodies, but that the souls of bad men are subject to

eternal punishment. But the Sadducees are those that compose the second order, and take away fate entirely, and suppose that God is not concerned in our doing or not doing what is evil.... They also take away the belief of the immortal duration of the soul, and the punishments and rewards in Hades.¹

S. Zeitlin agrees with the sentiments of Josephus, as found quoted in the foregoing passage. On the basis of that passage, he holds that it is an error to say that the Pharisees believed in bodily resurrection: "....The Pharisees did not believe in bodily resurrection, they believed in the immortality of the soul; in this they differ from the Sadducees who denied immortality of the soul."²

Kohler takes a different point of view: "But it was not the immortality of the soul which the Pharisees believed in, as Josephus puts it, but the resurrection of the body as expressed in the liturgy...."³ Thus, Kohler's view challenges Zeitlin's.

In another passage, Josephus continues his discussion of the controversy:

They (the Pharisees) also believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them, and that under the earth there will be rewards or punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life; and the latter are to be detained in an everlasting prison, but the former shall have power to revive and live again.... But the doctrine of the Sadducees is this, that souls die with the bodies; nor do they regard the observation of anything besides what the law enjoins them....⁴

Here Josephus attributes a belief in immortality to the Pharisees, while denying such a concept to the Sadducees.

There is a third passage from Josephus:

Do you not know, that those who depart out of this life according to the law of nature, and pay that debt which was received from God, when he that lent it us is pleased to require it back again, enjoy eternal fame: that their house and posterity are sure; that their souls are pure and obedient, and obtain a most holy place in heaven, from whence, in the revolutions of the ages, they are again sent into pure bodies; while the souls of those whose hands have acted madly against themselves are received by the darkest place in Hades, and while God, who is their father,

punishes those that offend against either of them in their posterity; for which reason God hates such doings, and the crime is punished by our most wise legislator.⁵

In this latter passage Josephus speaks of the law of nature. Was he referring to Jewish law, which was basically Pharisaic? Or, is Charles right in asserting that Josephus is here referring to Greek thought?⁶

Lightley convincingly challenges the validity of the statements of Josephus. He points out that Josephus was trying to please his Greek friends by claiming that the Pharisees believed in a doctrine of the removal of souls into other bodies.⁷ Such a doctrine of the immortality of the soul would be more acceptable to Josephus's Greek and Roman readers than the idea of resurrection, which was basic Pharisaic thought.⁸ Then, too, Lightley notes that while in the War Josephus speaks of souls being reborn (metempsychosis), in the Antiquities he speaks merely of a continuance of the soul's life after the body dies.⁹ Lightley states that since Josephus is so inconsistent in his development of the Pharisaic idea of the soul,

Probably his reference to the Sadducees was on no higher level of veracity. He knew that his readers loved symmetry, and so having stated the doctrine of the Pharisees as occupying one extreme, and that of the Essenes as the intermediate doctrine of immortality, nothing remained save that the Sadducees should keep the balance by holding the other extreme, viz. the complete destruction of soul and body at the same time.¹⁰

To substantiate his position, Lightley shows how Josephus organizes the material on the abstract question of Fate, a thought that Segal and other scholars feel to be foreign to the Jewish mind.¹¹ What Lightley is saying is that if Josephus's writing on Fate is done with a view to pleasing his Greek and Roman readers (by putting Greek ideas into the mouths of Pharisaic rabbis), can one not challenge his analysis of Jewish thought on the immortality-resurrection controversy?

Lightley also feels that Josephus constantly categorizes things in a very neat fashion in an attempt to imitate the Greeks.¹² In my opinion, Lightley presents ample evidence to make one very skeptical of the reliability of the way in which the Greek-oriented

Josephus examines the Jewish view of immortality and resurrection.

Having shown Josephus to be unreliable as an authority on the controversy, I now turn to my next consideration, the Pharisaic attitude toward the future life as found in rabbinic literature.¹³ It will be my purpose to determine whether the Pharisees believed in resurrection or immortality. To do this, I must examine the major concepts.

First, I consider the rabbinic material regarding the body (guf). In contrast to the Greeks who considered the body to be merely the fleshy prison house of the soul,¹⁴ the Pharisaic rabbis considered the body to be extremely important. A. Cohen says:

Although the Rabbis dwelt much upon the spiritual nature of man in their discourses, they did not belittle the value and importance of the body. It was God's masterpiece and proved His infinite goodness as well as His boundless wisdom. The fact that each man was a different individuality exercised their wonder.¹⁵

He goes on to note the following:

The marvelous construction of the body excited the wonder of the Rabbis and called forth from them exclamations of praise. "If a bladder is pricked by only a needle all the air in it comes out; but man is made with numerous orifices and yet the breath in him does not come out." (Gen. R. I. 3)¹⁶

However, the Mekilta emphasizes that the body is not as pure as the soul (nefesh):

Antoninus asked our teacher, the holy one: "After a man has died and his body ceased to be, does God then make him stand trial?" He answered him: "Rather than ask me about the body which is impure, ask me about the soul that is pure."¹⁷

The concept of the body cannot be considered without discussing the soul (nefesh), since the Talmud indicates that both will stand in judgment after death.¹⁸ This truth is seen when, after concluding the parable of the lame and the blind, Rabbi says: "So will the Holy One, blessed be He, bring the soul, place it in the body, and judge them together."¹⁹ The rabbis, then, credited human beings with dual natures. Cohen says:

"Man's soul is from heaven and his body from earth" (Sifre Deut. 306; 132a). The body is described by them as "the scabbard of the soul" (Sanh. 108a); and they taught that the soul holds the same relationship to the body that God does to the Universe.²⁰

It should be noted, however, that the term nefesh is elusive and lends itself to a variety of meanings in rabbinic thought. For example, it was equated with energy in relation to Moses:

There were three things to which Moses devoted himself with his whole soul...to the Torah...to Israel...to justice.²¹

Some doubt was expressed in the Mekilta that all souls would enjoy future restoration to the body and eternal life. The rabbis discussed the danger of a soul being "cut off." This is seen in the following passage:

"Shall be cut off." To be cut off merely means to cease to exist. "That soul." This means the soul acting presumptuously -- these are the words of R. Akiba. "From Israel." I might understand it to mean, that soul shall be cut off from Israel, but go to live among another people. But it says: "From before men; I am the Lord." (Lev. 22:3) My dominion is everywhere.²²

And the soul could perish because of man's evil, e.g., those who maintain that the Torah is not from Heaven will find their souls cut off.²³ Entrance into the next world could be denied to those souls who neglect circumcision, although here the term "soul" is apparently equated with the whole person.²⁴ It could be seared by flames: "R. Johanan said: 'Three destroying angels appeared before Doeg: one caused him to forget his learning, one burnt his soul....'"²⁵ There were rabbis who believed that some souls were eternally doomed. Speaking of the fate of the generation of the flood,

R. Judah b. Bathyra says: "They will neither revive nor be judged.... Their soul shall not return to its sheath." R. Menahem, son of R. Jose, said: "Even when the Holy One, blessed be He, restores the souls to the dead bodies, their soul shall grieve them in Gehenna...."²⁶

According to the Mishnah, certain vows will afflict the soul,²⁷ and it is definitely affected by how a person acts:

Moreover R. Hanin B. Gamliel said: "If he that commits one transgression thereby forfeits his soul, how much more if he performs one religious duty shall his soul be restored to him."²⁸

Although the rabbis disagreed as to the nature,²⁹ function,³⁰ and fate of the soul,³¹ most seemed to be of the opinion that it was intimately linked to the body and would (along with the body) experience resurrection.³² Kohler points out that "...the prevailing rabbinical conception of the future world is that of the world of resurrection, not that of pure immortality."³³ The rabbis could not conceive of a future life for a soul free of the body.

Since the rabbinic teachers reject the idea of an independent immortal soul, what can be said about their belief in resurrection (tehiyyat ha-metim)? Mekilta, Shirata I discusses details of resurrection when it comments on Exodus 15:1:

And there are instances in which the word "then" refers to what is to come in the future: "Then thou shalt see and be radiant" (Isa. 60:5); "Then shall thy light break forth as the morning" (Ibid., 58:8).... These refer to what is to come in the future. Rabbi says: "It is not written here: 'Then Moses sang (Shar)' but, 'Then Moses will sing (Yashir).'" Thus we find that we can derive the resurrection of the dead from the Torah.

The future salvation is to last forever. Never again will Israel be subjugated:

Just as a male does not give birth, so also the salvation which is to be in the future will not have any subjugation after it, as it is said: "O Israel, that art saved by the Lord with an everlasting salvation." (Isa. 45:17)³⁴

The Mekilta says that God was Israel's salvation in the past and that He will be her salvation in the future.³⁵ Habakkuk 1:12 is quoted by the Mekilta to indicate that since God is everlasting, Israel shall not die.³⁶

A sentence mentioning the importance of observing the Sabbath reaffirms the idea of the resurrection of the dead:

Rabbi says: "How can you prove that if one keeps but one Sabbath properly, it is accounted to him as if he had observed all the Sabbaths from the day God created His world to the time of the resurrection of the dead?" It is said: "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations."³⁷

In the Mishnah, Rabbi Phineas b. Jair describes the steps leading

to resurrection of the dead:

Heedfulness leads to cleanliness, and cleanliness leads to purity, and purity leads to abstinence, and abstinence leads to holiness, and holiness leads to humility, and humility leads to the shunning of sin, and the shunning of sin leads to saintliness, and saintliness leads to (the gift of) the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit leads to the resurrection of the dead. And the resurrection of the dead shall come through Elijah of blessed memory.³⁸

According to R. Akiba, some wicked persons, such as the company of Korah, would never rise up again; however, R. Eliezer disagrees with R. Akiba and gives the sinners hope that they are not eternally lost.³⁹ Resurrection was to be for both the individual and the nation. This is seen in a Midrash, where "R. Hiyya b. Abba said...resurrection is for man alone...."⁴⁰ He then goes on to say, "...resurrection is for Israel."⁴¹ This would indicate that resurrection has application for the nation as well as for the individual.

The rabbis strove mightily to find indications of the future life in biblical texts that made no actual mention of such a concept. In Sanhedrin the evidence of this is seen:

How is resurrection derived from the Torah? -- As it is written, "And ye shall give thereof the Lord's heave offering unto Aaron the priest." (Num. 18:28) But would Aaron live forever; he did not even enter Palestine, that terumah should be given him? But it teaches that he would be resurrected, and Israel give him terumah. Thus, resurrection is derived from the Torah.⁴²

Another example of the same sort of straining of the words of the Torah is found as follows:

It has been taught: R. Simai said: "Whence do we learn resurrection from the Torah? -- From the verse, 'And I also have established my covenant with them, (sc. the Patriarchs) to give them the land of Canaan.' (Ex. 6:4) (to give) you is not said, but 'to give them' (personally); thus resurrection is proved from the Torah."⁴³

The Romans apparently were interested in this doctrine of resurrection:

The Romans asked R. Joshua b. Hananiah: "From what do we know that the Holy One, blessed be He, will resurrect the dead and knows the future?" He replied: "Both are deduced from the verse, 'And the Lord said

unto Moses, Behold thou shalt sleep with thy fathers...." R. Johanan said on the authority of R. Simeon b. Yohai: "From what do we know that the Holy One, blessed be He, will resurrect the dead and knoweth the future?" From, "Behold, Thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, and...rise again, etc."⁴⁴

It appears that the dead, according to the rabbis, will be resurrected with their blemishes. At the moment of resurrection, however, they will be healed of their imperfections:

It is written, "I kill, and I make alive"(Deut. 32:39); while it is also written, "I wound and I heal." -- The Holy One, blessed be He, said, "What I slay, I resurrect (in the same state), and then, what I wound, I heal (after their revival)."⁴⁵

In the future world songs shall be sung in the praise of God:

R. Joshua b. Levi also said: "Whoever uttereth song(of praise to God) in this world shall be privileged to do so in the next world too..."⁴⁶

There will be the teaching of the Torah in the age of resurrection,⁴⁷ and leadership ability will not be wasted in the new age.⁴⁸ The resurrection will not be a temporary state, according to one of the rabbis:

Tanna de be Eliyahu (says): "The righteous, whom the Holy One, blessed be He, will resurrect, will not revert to the dust.... Just as the Holy One endures forever, so shall they endure forever."⁴⁹

The righteous mentioned in the above passage will not revert to dust "...in the interval between the Messianic era and the time of the world to come; but their flesh will remain intact upon them until they live again in the future."⁵⁰

Another concern of the rabbis was the resurrection of the dry bones as envisioned by Ezekiel: "R. Eliezer said: 'The dead whom Ezekiel resurrected stood up, uttered sound, and died.'⁵¹ Then, a few sentences later, the same rabbi says, "Thy dead whom Ezekiel revived went up to Palestine, married wives and begat sons and daughters."⁵² The rabbis had various opinions as to who was to be revived: "Rab said: 'They were the Ephraimites....'⁵³ On the other hand, Samuel declared: "They were those who denied resurrection."⁵⁴ Another sage, "R. Jeremiah b. Abba said: 'They were the men who lacked the (vitalizing) sap of good deeds....'⁵⁵ Thus, there were differences of opinion as to

the identity of those involved in the coming resurrection as envisioned by Ezekiel.

Although there is confusion about the fate of the wicked and the righteous, Cohon makes this fine observation:

The view generally adopted is taught in the baraita: "During the first twelve months after death the body wastes away and the soul ascends and descends no more." Rabbi Akiba explicitly limits the judgment of the wicked to twelve months. R. Johanan b. Nuri reduces it still more to the amount of time from Passover to Shabuot, i.e., to seven weeks. Endless torment appears intolerable to the believers in God's compassion. "The righteous whom God will resurrect will not return to the dust anymore, for it is said: 'And it shall come to pass, that he that is left in Zion, and he that remaineth in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, everyone that is written unto life in Jerusalem. Even as the Holy One abides forever so shall they abide forever.'"⁵⁶

While there is disagreement concerning the exact nature of resurrection, the Pharisaic rabbis did agree that it will take place in the future life. As mentioned before, resurrection of the body containing the soul, rather than immortality of the independent soul, appears to have been their belief.

Resurrection would be incomplete without Zidduk Haddin (Divine Judgment). The Mishnah examines this concept at length: God judges the world four times a year, at Passover, Pentecost, New Year's day, and Shavuoth.⁵⁷ God watches our actions, records our deeds in a book,⁵⁸ and then He judges the world by the standard of tob, the goodness of man.⁵⁹ R. Eleazar ha-Kappar, a contemporary of R. Judah, the Patriarch,⁶⁰ averred that the dead are destined to be made alive, and that when this happens they will stand before God to be judged.⁶¹ Cohon summarizes this concept as follows:

Judgment and retribution in the hereafter form cardinal doctrines of Rabbinic Judaism. They are embodied in the Zidduk Haddin, spoken in the burial service. The benediction which is spoken also when visiting a Jewish grave reads: "Praised be the Lord our God, King of the Universe, who created you in justice, who caused you to die in judgment, who knoweth the number of all of you in judgment, and at a future time will restore you to life in judgment. Praised be Thou, O Lord, who quickenest the dead."⁶²

The judgment of God determined the fate of those resurrected. Cohon says:

The completely righteous will enjoy eternal life. The completely wicked will be consigned to everlasting reproach and abhorrence. The intermediary class will descend to Gehinnom, will be purged. But the Hillelites hold that God's attributes "abundant in mercy" means that He inclines toward mercy.⁶³

Thus, according to the rabbis, God could be a merciful judge who might be kindly rather than severe in meting out judgment to those resurrected.

Before leaving the topic of Divine Judgment, it should be noted that angels (malakim) have a function here. R. Ishmael says, for example, that when a man stands up for heavenly judgment, an angel can save him from doom by interceding on his behalf.⁶⁴ It was seen in a previous chapter that in Philo's thought the Logoi could function as angelic messengers of God. But, whereas the Philonic Logos could endow man with immortality,⁶⁵ the angel of Talmudic thought lacked such power.

But what of the world to come ('olam ha-ba) where God will render judgment on the resurrected individuals? The Mekilta states that God will be there: "It is He who is in this world, and He who will be in the world to come...."⁶⁶ The wicked who turn away from God will be punished: "He will break them down in this world; and not build them up, in the world to come."⁶⁷ Israel's enemies will lose their portion, not only in this world, but also in the world to come:

Let all men learn proper conduct from the case of Amalek. He came to harm Israel but God made him lose the life of this world and the life of the world to come.... Likewise, every nation or kingdom that comes to harm Israel God always judges according to this rule.⁶⁸

The Mishnah discusses those who are denied a share in the world to come: "The generation of the Flood has no share in the world to come...."⁶⁹ On the other hand, "All Israelites have a share in the world to come, for it is written, 'Thy people also shall be all righteous, they shall inherit the land forever; the branch of my planting, the work of my hands that I may be glorified.'"⁷⁰ The Bertinoro to Sanhedrin 10:1 goes so far as to say that even Israelites sentenced by the Bet Din will have a place in the world to come. Through confession of sins one could merit

a place in the future life (San. 6:2). It was felt that during our days on earth we should prepare ourselves for what is to come:

R. Jacob said: "This world is like a vestibule before the world to come: prepare thyself in the vestibule that thou mayest enter into the banqueting hall."⁷¹

Another rabbinic problem concerns the nature of the world to come, where the resurrected individuals will reside. It could be a heaven or a hell. I first consider heaven (shamayim). In Mishnah, Abot 4:11 it is designated as the place where God dwells. And not only God dwells there, but also the Divine Presence (Shekinah) that shines forth: "The saints enjoy the light of the Shekinah in heaven...."⁷² Then, too, it is the place where the heavenly court (din shel shamayim) metes out punishment.⁷³ The various divisions of heaven are summarized by Cohon:

The seven divisions of heaven are named; Presence, Courts, House, Tabernacle, Holy Mountain, Mountain of the Lord, and Holy Place.... Rab maintained that "in the world to come there will be no eating and no drinking, no procreation and no business, no jealousy, hatred or competition, but the righteous shall sit with crowns on their heads enjoying the splendor of the Shechinah."⁷⁴

Even as there is a heaven, so too is there a hell. The Mekilta says that in hell (Gehinnam) God has a special time of the day to punish the wicked:

And you also find that in the future God will punish the wicked ones in Gehinnam only in the morning. For it is said: "Morning by morning will I destroy all the wicked of the Lord."⁷⁵ (Pss. 101:8)

When speaking of Nebuchadnezzar, the Mekilta says that God will punish him because of his pride. Isaiah 14:15 is quoted to indicate that he will be brought down to Sheol, often called Gehinnam, to the sides of the pit.⁷⁶ In the future God will send his wrath against the enemies of Israel and burn them with fire.⁷⁷ In another tractate of the Mekilta, Gehinnam is referred to as a "smoking furnace."⁷⁸ As noted earlier, Gehinnam may be called Sheol. The Mishnah tells us that God can bring man down to Sheol, and He can also raise man up again.⁷⁹ According to the Talmud, Sheol was a place where the wicked go.⁸⁰ It was a place of suffering and grief:

R. Menahem, son of R. Jose said: "Even when the Holy One, blessed be He, restores the souls to the dead bodies, their soul shall grieve them in Gehinnam, as it is written, 'Ye shall conceive chaff, ye shall bring forth stubble: your soul, as fire, shall devour you.'" (Isa. 33:11)⁸¹

The above passage indicates that bodies containing souls exist in Gehinnam. This differs from the biblical view of the nether-world as a place of soul-less shades (Isa. 26:19).

Before turning to the actual dispute between the Pharisees and the Sadducees over resurrection and immortality, a few words should be said about Messianism. Rabbinic literature abounds with Messianic speculation.⁸² However, Messianism is germane to our problem only in that it is involved with the Pharisaic notion of resurrection. It is one of the stages in Pharisaic eschatology. According to Kohler, these stages are as follows: first, the travail and distress of the Messianic time; then, the coming of a human Davidic Messiah who defeats Gog and Magog; next, the Messiah's gathering together of the tribes of Israel with the help of Elijah. Following the age of the Messiah comes the resurrection, which is in the world to come. At that time the last great judgment of the resurrected souls takes place. The soul and body will be reunited and judged. Then, the wicked will be punished, and the righteous will be rewarded.⁸³ It is important to see that Kohler does not mention an independent immortality of the soul bound up in Messianism. The Messiah fails to herald an age of the soul's immortality. I continue to see resurrection as the main concern of the Pharisaic rabbis.

THE ACTUAL DISPUTE

It is now clear that resurrection, rather than immortality, is basic to Pharisaic Judaism. Evidence is lacking in rabbinic Judaism of a doctrine of the soul existing apart from the body.

I now turn to the actual dispute concerning resurrection and immortality as it is found in rabbinic literature. To do this, I can examine some classical passages which will aid me in interpreting the controversy. The Mishnah V, to Berakot IX, says as follows:

At the conclusion of every benediction in the Sanctuary they used to say "Forever"; but when the Minim (Sadducees)

perverted the truth and declared that there is only one world, it was ordained that the wording should be "From everlasting to everlasting."

"Everlasting to everlasting" seems to suggest a belief in two worlds, that is "from world to world." At first glance it might appear that the Sadducees denied immortality in clinging to a belief in one world. There is, however, no direct evidence here that they reject the idea of the immortality of the soul. All they seem to reject is a future world of resurrection as envisioned by the Pharisees. Then, too, the passage is open to suspicion on another point. Might not the Sadducees, in saying there is only one world, mean that they believed there is only one physical world? Nowhere does it say in this passage that they specifically rejected immortality. They might have believed in a non-physical world -- a world of immortal souls.

Further refutation of the Minim (Sadducees) is found in Berakot II:

R. Tabi also said in the name of R. Josiah: What means that which is written, "There are three things that are never satisfied...the grave, and the barren womb," etc. (Prov. 30:15f.) -- what is the connection between "the grave" and "the barren womb"? Its intention is to tell thee that as the womb receives and yields up, so the grave receives and yields up. And may we not use the a fortiori argument? As the womb receives (the seed) in silence and yields up (the child) with loud cries (of lament), yield up loud cries! Hence a refutation of those who assert that resurrection of the dead is not taught in the Torah.

Here again one leading rabbi indicates that the Sadducees deny resurrection. He does not say that they deny immortality.

In the Sifre to Numbers 15:31, section 112, is found a discussion of the wicked soul and its fate. The Sifre declares that there are those who deny that the dead shall live, referring apparently to the Sadducees who have not correctly interpreted Numbers 15:31. The cut-off soul filled with iniquity will be called to account on the Judgment Day (Yom Ha-ddin). Nefesh is used here, however, in an all-inclusive sense, that is, body and soul. This is seen when the Sifre leads to Sanhedrin 90b,

where R. Eliezer refutes the Minim by showing that the concept of resurrection is derived from Numbers 15:31:

R. Eliezer b. Jose said: "I have shown the falsification in the books of the Minim, who used to say that there is no hint about resurrection in the Pentateuch. And I said to them: 'You have falsified your Torah, but you have nothing in your hand to say that there is not a hint of resurrection.'"

Again, all I find is that the Sadducees deny resurrection. No hint is given that they reject immortality.

Another passage in Sanhedrin 90b discusses the position of the Minim:

There was a Min who said to R. Ami: "You say that the dead will be restored. Does not the corpse become dust? How, then, can dust be restored?"

Although the question raised here shows the doubt of the Sadducee that bodies can be raised from the dust, yet he might not have been dubious about a soul raising itself to heaven.

A reference in Sanhedrin 91a continues the controversy:

A Min said to Gebiha b. Pesisa, "Woe to you, ye wicked, who maintain that the dead will revive; if even the living die, shall the dead live!" He replied, "Woe to you, ye wicked, who maintain that the dead will not revive: if what was not, (now) lives, surely what has lived will live again!" "Thou hast called me wicked," said he, "If I stood up I could kick thee and strip thee of thy hump!" "If thou couldst do that," he retorted, "thou wouldst be called a great doctor, and command large fees."

This shows the violence of the argument between the Pharisees and the Sadducees over the question of resurrection. But not a word is said here about immortality.

Still another argument arises in a debate between the Sadducees and Rabban Gamaliel. I turn to Sanhedrin 90b:

Minim asked Rabban Gamaliel: "Whence do we know that the Holy One, blessed be He, will resurrect the dead?" He answered them from the Torah, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa, yet they did not accept it (as conclusive proof). "From the Torah": for it is written, "And the Lord said unto Moses, Behold, thou shalt sleep with thy fathers and rise up (again)." "But perhaps," said they to him, (the verse reads) "and the people will rise up?" "From the prophets": as it is written, "Thy dead

men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out its dead." "But perhaps this refers to the dead whom Ezekiel resurrected?"

The foregoing passage shows that the Sadducees were well versed in Scripture and were not averse to quoting it to prove a point. Once more the Sadducees deny resurrection, but fail to say how they feel about immortality.

The Pharisees believed that the Sadducees stood in danger of losing their portion in the world to come by their denial of resurrection. This is seen in Sanhedrin 90b:

The following are those who have no portion in the World to Come: Whosoever says that the revivification of the dead is not (proved) from the Torah; or the Torah is not from Heaven (God)....

However, the Sadducees might not have viewed the world to come in the same way as did the Pharisees. To the Sadducees, resurrection was impossible. Perhaps to them immortality was possible.

In Abot de R. Natan the Sadducees mock the Pharisees as follows:

The Pharisees hold on to their traditional belief; accordingly they deprive themselves of the pleasures of this world. But they will get nothing in that future world of theirs.⁸⁴

This passage shows that the Sadducees denied the Pharisaic belief that man would have pleasures (perhaps earthly enjoyment) in the future world. Kohler believes this legend to be incorrect from an historical standpoint:

Obviously neither the character of the Sadducees nor that of the Boethians was any longer known at the time the story was told in the rabbinical schools.⁸⁵

Moore, on the other hand, treats the account as historical:

In the Abot de R. Nathan (c.5) it is narrated how the twin heresies of the Sadducees and the Boethusians about retribution after death started in the schools of the two disciples of Antigonus of Socho named respectively Zadok and Boethus. They reasoned that Antigonus would never have exhorted men to serve God without hope of reward if he had believed that there was another world and resurrection of the dead.⁸⁶

Setting aside the question of the historicity of the passage, it does seem that all that the Sadducees are doing is mocking the traditional stand on resurrection. In the passage from Abot de R. Natan the Sadducees deny the Pharisaic belief in resurrection and future delights for the restored body. Again, I emphasize that they do not specifically deny the immortality of the soul.

Still another discussion of the problem is found in the Sifre to Deuteronomy 53 (Friedmann 86a), where the Pharisees answer the Sadducean disbelief in resurrection by quoting from the words of Moses:

Moses said to them, to Israel: "You see the wicked ones that they prosper...in this world, but his end is to be pushed aside (struck down) in the latter time, as it is said, 'for you will see the righteous ones that are suffering in this world...and their latter end is to rejoice at a future time....'"

Thus, the Pharisees expect, despite the opinion of the Sadducees, a future reward to be given to the righteous. Again, no mention is made of immortality.

The controversy is further explored in an interesting story of an encounter between a Sadducee and a Pharisee as found in Sukkah 48b. The Gemara says:

A certain Min (Sadducee) whose name was Sason once said to R. Abbahu: "You are destined to draw water for me in the world to come, for it is written, 'Therefore besason shall ye draw water.'" (Isa. 12:3) "If," the other retorted, "it had been written le-sason (for joy) it would be as you say, but as it is written be-sason (with joy) the meaning must be that a water skin will be made of your skin, and water will be drawn with it."

Here the Sadducee debates with the Pharisee about life in the future world. The debate concerns the resurrected body performing physical labor (drawing water) in the world to come. I do not find the Sadducee denying immortality of the soul. He is silent on his opinion of immortality. But this silence does not mean that he rejects immortality. By laughing at physical labor as performed by a resurrected body, the Sadducee may be implying that he believes in an immortal soul that would not perform human labor in the future life. He may be belittling

resurrection to imply that it is a lowly concept not in the exalted realm of immortality.

I discussed earlier the New Testament acceptance of resurrection as the central motif of Christian belief. In Matthew 22 the Sadducees are described as individuals who reject resurrection. Matthew 22, then, is in agreement with the rabbinic sources examined in this chapter of my thesis. Acts 23:8 makes it very clear that the Pharisees believe in resurrection, while the Sadducees reject it: "For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit: But the Pharisees confess both." Thus, I find that both the New Testament and the rabbinic sources are in agreement that the Pharisees accept resurrection and the Sadducees deny it.

Neither the New Testament nor the rabbinic material tells in a positive way what the Sadducees did believe about the future life. Nowhere do I find the statement that the Sadducees believe in immortality nor that they reject it. But silence by the Sadducees on the subject of immortality cannot be interpreted to mean that they did not accept the idea. Actually, the accumulated evidence of this thesis would indicate that they might very well have believed in immortality, while rejecting resurrection.

Before concluding this chapter, I would like to advance the idea that there might have been a good reason for the Sadducean silence on immortality. Is it not possible that they were afraid to voice an opinion so Greek in nature and so abhorrent to the thinking of the Pharisaic rabbis? Perhaps they feared that by voicing such a belief they would be too closely identified with the theology of the rulers of Palestine. Philo spoke out as a proponent of immortality, and my research showed that he influenced Sadducean thought. However, Philo was in Alexandria, and such Greek-tinged notions were readily acceptable to the Jews of his country, who probably welcomed his attempt to harmonize Judaism with Greek thought. Philo did not have to contend with strongly entrenched Pharisaic rabbis. The Sadducees of Palestine, on the other hand, had to confront a powerful rabbinical authority. It would not have been easy for them to preach a new doctrine

in the stronghold of Pharisaism. Rabbinic authority in Palestine was so dominant (in matters of Jewish belief), that no one felt free to express a new heretical doctrine. It was bad enough that the Sadducees opposed resurrection. To take the next step and proclaim immortality might have been too dangerous. Might one not accept the notion that the Sadducees embraced the concept of immortality as a private belief, fearing to profess it openly? Might not their constant sniping at the Pharisaic doctrine of resurrection indicate that since it (resurrection) was impossible, some other approach (perhaps immortality of the soul) was more logical? If they could discredit resurrection, they might then be in a position of later advancing immortality. However, in the period of early rabbinic Judaism, they could not successfully challenge the Pharisaic rabbis on the matter of resurrection. The Pharisaic doctrine was too strongly held, to be successfully uprooted. Still, by their opposition to resurrection, the Sadducees did pave the way for the development (at a much later date) of the idea of immortality of the soul, apart from the body. Today, Reform Judaism accepts immortality and rejects resurrection. This places the Reform Jew in the Sadducean camp, along with Philo and others. Modern ideas of immortality, then, owe a debt to the Sadducees who opposed the Pharisees on this very basic issue.

In the first chapter of this thesis I discussed the fact that the scholars avoided the immortality-resurrection problem when considering the attitude of the Pharisees and the Sadducees. Now, I will briefly summarize my material and restate my final conclusions about this controversy in early Judaism.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions

My thesis opened with an attempt to focus on the immortality-resurrection question in early Judaism. At once it became evident that the leading scholars have shied away from meeting the issue and from defining the very words "immortality" and "resurrection." No one seemed willing to try to solve the problem of whether the Sadducees (who denied Pharisaic resurrection) might have believed in immortality.

Then, I turned to an examination of the backgrounds of the historical situation as reflected in the Old Testament, Philo, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and the New Testament. I found that the Old Testament view of the future life was one of resurrection, rather than immortality.¹ So, the Old Testament could be utilized as a stepping stone to what I would consider a loftier notion -- the immortality of the soul. At a later time, Philo drew upon the Old Testament and evolved the notion of an immortal soul that would exist after the body perished.² Goodenough offered convincing arguments to prove that Philo was in agreement with Sadducean thought.³ This being the case, both Philo and the Sadducees believed in immortality, while apparently rejecting resurrection. The Sadducean belief in immortality is also reflected in the apocryphal literature of the Greek schools of Alexandria. These schools, according to MacCulloch, reflected Sadducean thought.⁴ And, since Charles and Pfeiffer agreed that a work such as "Wisdom of Solomon," which teaches the Greek idea of the immortal soul imprisoned in the body, is Alexandrian,⁵ it is but an easy step to the notion that the Sadducees espoused immortality (with Philo and the Greeks), while the Pharisees held to the older tradition of resurrection.

Turning to the New Testament, I find that while the Sadducees reject resurrection (Matt. 22; Acts 4), the Pharisees believe in it (Acts 23). Nowhere in the New Testament does it say that the Sadducees accepted or rejected immortality. However, since the Pharisees accepted resurrection and the Sadducees rejected it, it is not too daring to say that the Sadducees, influenced by Philo and

the Greeks, did espouse immortality. Evidence, as reflected in Philo and apocryphal literature, points toward a belief in immortality on the part of the Sadducees.⁶ Since the Sadducees of the New Testament period were imitators and admirers of Greco-Roman culture, they might have also accepted the idea of immortality.

The issue is further explored in the writings of Josephus. Lightley convincingly shows that because Josephus wrote to please his Greek audience, we cannot accept as valid his notion that the Sadducees denied the immortality of the soul, while the Pharisees accepted it.⁷ Josephus, then, fails to solve the problem.

When turning to rabbinic Judaism, which is Pharisaic, I find that resurrection and not immortality is the basic concept. Ample evidence of this preoccupation with the resurrection of the body housing the soul is discovered in the rabbinic sources.⁸ As far as the actual dispute between the Pharisees and the Sadducees is concerned, all we learn is that the Sadducees mocked the Pharisaic concept of resurrection (Abot de R. Natan, chap. 5; Sukkah 48b). The Sadducees do not deny immortality, even though they apparently oppose resurrection. The Sadducean silence on immortality does not mean that they rejected the idea. Rather, in the light of the evidence considered in this thesis, they probably believed in it. Perhaps their silence indicated they were afraid to voice an opinion so Greek in nature and so abhorrent to the thinking of the Pharisaic rabbis. They may have held to a private belief in immortality, fearing to openly oppose the powerful Pharisaic authorities in Palestine.

On the basis of all the sources and scholarly opinion examined in this paper, I conclude that the Pharisees accepted resurrection and rejected immortality; the Sadducees, agreeing with Philo and the Greeks, accepted immortality and denied resurrection.

CHAPTER SIX

Analysis of Bibliographical Material

I shall now briefly evaluate the main scholarly material I utilized for this thesis. R. H. Charles's Eschatology proved to be an ambitious but confusing attempt to set down in systematic fashion the history of the doctrine of a future life as found among the early Jews and Christians. His monumental work was, though, valuable in my consideration of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Equally disappointing were Solomon Schechter's Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology and his Studies in Judaism, Second Series. His writings did nothing to clarify the controversy under study. Likewise, R. Travers Herford's The Pharisees contributed little to my main concern. All he does is agree with Josephus's examination of immortality and resurrection in Jewish thought. His Judaism in the New Testament Period, while well-written, adds nothing to our knowledge of the dispute. George Foot Moore's Judaism is a definitive work but fails to offer evidence of creative and original thought. Moore compiles but does not clarify the rabbinic controversy. His treatment of Abot de R. Natan, chapter five, sheds no new light on the Sadducean position. Kaufman Kohler writes with greater clarity, depth, originality, and conviction than these authors. His articles in the J. E., "Immortality of the Soul" and "Resurrection," are valuable because he suggests the possibility that the Sadducees might have accepted immortality while rejecting resurrection. And in another article in the J. E., "Pharisees," he skillfully limits Pharisaic theology to a belief in resurrection rather than both it and immortality. These articles in the J. E. by Kohler are well-written, but too brief. Kohler's excellent delineation of the stages in Pharisaic eschatology as reflected in Messianism is to be found in his fine volume, The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church. His Jewish Theology, a classic in its field, discusses the Pharisaic view of resurrection, but fails to clarify the Sadducean dispute.

Jacob Z. Lauterbach's Rabbinic Essays is written in an interesting style but is of little help, e.g., he merely repeats Moore's belief that the Pharisees believed in both resurrection

and immortality. He says nothing constructive about the Sadducean approach. He does mention in his article "The Pharisees and their Teachings" the Sadducee who mocks the Pharisee in Abot de R. Natan; however, he fails to analyze the situation in terms of a possible approach to the future life. When considering the material of the biblical period, I found that Otto J. Baab's The Theology of the Old Testament provides a well organized summary of the chief concepts of biblical eschatology. His well-documented and concise use of material lays the basis for a better understanding of the controversy in the post-biblical period.

Samuel Sandmel's Philo's Place in Judaism presents, in the first thirty pages, a good summation of how the leading scholars have handled Philo's ideas. Sandmel's article "Philo's Environment and Philo's Exegesis" gives a fine analysis of Philo's idea of man's body and soul as reflected in Scripture. His A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament is a pioneer work at a popular level. I especially liked his comparison of Paul's ideas with Philo's approach. Wolfson's Philo is well organized and broad in scope. He goes out of his way, however, to deny any idea of resurrection to Philo, while crediting him with complete adherence to the concept of immortality. Drummond's Philo Judaeus is written in a difficult style, i.e. his ideas do not flow smoothly and are lacking in direction. I had trouble locating pertinent material in his work. Perhaps the book on Philo most useful to this thesis was Goodenough's By Light, Light. The author is very convincing when he places Philo in the stream of Sadducean thought.

Some articles in the E. R. E. were also very helpful. For example, J. A. MacCulloch's "Eschatology" gives a fine account of how much the Sadducean influence was felt in Alexandria. Then, too, H. Wheeler Robinson's article in the E. R. E., "Soul," develops the notion that the origin of the basic ideas of immortality in the New Testament can be seen in the Old Testament. The article in the E. R. E., "Body (Christian)," by J. C. Lambert yielded a wealth of material on Pauline resurrection, while C. Harris's "State of the Dead" gave a good picture of non-Pauline New Testament theology regarding resurrection.

Oscar Cullman's "Immortality of the Soul and Resurrection of the Dead: The Witness of the New Testament" is an absorbing treatment of the New Testament approach to the future life. Cullman's lecture is well organized and concise. John A. T. Robinson's The Body -- A Study in Pauline Theology is of special interest, since it gives a fine scholarly exposition of "body" and "flesh" in Pauline thought. Salmond's article "Eschatology of the New Testament," as found in A Dictionary of the Bible, I, clearly delineates the eschatology of the Synoptic Gospels. J. W. Lightley's Jewish Sects and Parties in the Time of Christ is an informative volume that presents a convincing argument for the notion that the Sadducees may have accepted a form of immortality. His handling of the Josephus material is extremely well done, especially when he challenges the validity of Josephus's views on immortality and resurrection.

When evaluating the rabbinic material, I found that A. Cohen's Everyman's Talmud presented a good summary of rabbinic thought on many of the concepts concerning the future life. Samuel Cohon's Man and His Destiny was very helpful in that the author organized much of the pertinent material on rabbinic eschatology. The rabbinic references cited by Cohon were of great aid in preparing my thesis, and his summaries of leading concepts of rabbinic thought were particularly valuable.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

- 1 In this thesis the opinions on the controversy of scholars such as Charles, Schechter, Kohler, Moore, Herford, and Lauterbach will be examined.
- 2 The Tannaitic materials will be examined in detail in chapter four of this thesis.
- 3 "Antiquities," The Works of Flavius Josephus (trans. William Whiston) (London, 1828), IV, Bk. XVIII, chap. 1, vss. 3, 4.
- 4 See note 1.
- 5 "The Jewish War," The Works of Flavius Josephus, Bk. II, chap. viii, vss. 14.
- 6 Matthew 22:23-33; Mark 12:18-27; Luke 20:27-40.
- 7 Acts of the Apostles 4:13; 23:7, 8.
- 8 Robert Henry Charles, A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, in Christianity, (London, 1913), 164, 165.
- 9 Ibid., 56.
- 10 Ibid., 241-243.
- 11 Ibid., 78.
- 12 Ibid., 79.
- 13 Ibid., 80.
- 14 Ibid., 354.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 Ibid., 354, 355.
- 17 If I assume that Josephus (see note 4) believed that the soul survived in Sheol after death and is either reborn or tortured, according to our original definition the Pharisees would be affirming immortality rather than resurrection (despite the opinion of Charles).
- 18 Kaufman Kohler, "Immortality of the Soul," The Jewish Encyclopedia, (New York and London, 1904), VI, 566.
- 19 Kaufman Kohler, "Resurrection," The Jewish Encyclopedia, (New York and London, 1905), X, 382.
- 20 Kaufman Kohler, Jewish Theology, (Cincinnati, 1943), 287.
- 21 Ibid.
- 22 Solomon Schechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, (New York, 1923), 124.
- 23 Solomon Schechter, Studies in Judaism, Second Series, (Philadelphia, 1908), 70.
- 24 S. H. Mellone, "Immortality," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, (New York, 1918), VII, 843.

ii.

- 25 Ibid., 842, 843.
- 26 R. Travers Herford, The Pharisees, (London, 1924), 171.
- 27 R. Travers Herford, Judaism in the New Testament Period, (London, 1928), 115.
- 28 Ibid.
- 29 George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era -- The Age of the Tannaim, (Cambridge, Mass., 1946), I, 68.
- 30 Ibid., II, 317.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Jacob Z. Lauterbach, Rabbinic Essays, (Cincinnati, 1951), 151.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

- 1 Otto J. Baab, The Theology of the Old Testament,
(New York and Nashville, 1939), 39.
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 Ibid., 41.
- 4 Ibid., 64.
- 5 Ibid.
- 6 Ibid., 65.
- 7 Ibid.
- 8 Ibid.
- 9 Ibid., 66.
- 10 Ibid. I prefer the transliteration nefesh, even though
Baab follows a different system which results in nephesh.
- 11 Ibid.
- 12 Ibid.
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 Ibid.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 Ibid. Again I differ with Baab on transliteration. He
employs lev, while I prefer leb.
- 17 Ibid., 67.
- 18 Ibid.
- 19 Ibid., 62.
- 20 Ibid.
- 21 Ibid., 62, 63.
- 22 Ibid., 63.
- 23 Ibid., 68.
- 24 Ibid.
- 25 Ibid., 209.
- 26 Ibid.
- 27 Ibid., 212.
- 28 Ibid., 210.
- 29 Ibid., 212.
- 30 Ibid.
- 31 Ibid., 218. See also the deeds of Elijah and Elisha,
discussed by Baab, 217.
- 32 Ibid.
- 33 Ibid.

- 34 Ibid.
- 35 E. R. Bernard, "Resurrection," A Dictionary of the Bible, (New York, 1911), IV, 231-233.
- 36 Ibid.
- 37 Ibid.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 Ibid.
- 40 Ibid.
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 Ibid.
- 43 Ibid.
- 44 A. B. Davidson, "Eschatology," A Dictionary of the Bible, (New York, 1909), I, 734 ff.
- 45 Ibid.
- 46 Ibid.
- 47 Kohler, Theology, 392, 393.
- 48 Ibid., 393.
- 49 J. A. MacCulloch, "Eschatology," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, (New York, 1918), V, 377.
- 50 Ibid.
- 51 Davidson, 738.
- 52 Ibid.
- 53 Ibid., 739.
- 54 Ibid.
- 55 C. A. Briggs and E. G. Briggs, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms, (New York, 1906), I, 121.
- 56 Davidson, 739.
- 57 Ibid.
- 58 Kaufman Kohler, "Immortality," The Jewish Encyclopedia, (New York and London, 1904), VI, 564.
- 59 Ibid.
- 60 Ibid.
- 61 Ibid. Kohler referred to Psalms 16:11 and 17:15.
- 62 Ibid.
- 63 S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job, (New York, 1921), I, 129.
- 64 Kohler, Theology, 287.
- 65 Ibid.
- 66 Ibid.

- 67 Ibid., 288.
- 68 George B. Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary
on the Book of Isaiah, (New York, 1912), I, 446.
- 69 However, Kohler does discuss this possible dualism in
Old Testament thought in his Jewish Theology, 287.
- 70 I do note that in Eccl. 12:7 the ruah does have a
separate existence. This could lead to the idea
that the nefesh, too, might survive on its own. See
Kohler's Jewish Theology, 287.

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

- 1 Samuel Sandmel, Philo's Place in Judaism,
(Cincinnati, 1956), 1-30.
- 2 Harry A. Wolfson, Philo, (Cambridge, Mass., 1947),
I, 404.
- 3 Ibid. See 404, footnote 66.
- 4 It was natural for the Greeks to have influenced
Philo on the idea of the dual nature of body and
soul, because he (Philo) was receptive to concepts
that he could harmonize with Jewish theology.
- 5 Wolfson, I, 395, 396.
- 6 Ibid.
- 7 Erwin R. Goodenough, An Introduction to Philo Judaeus,
(New Haven, 1940), 149.
- 8 Ibid.
- 9 Wolfson, I, 395, 396.
- 10 James Drummond, Philo Judaeus, (London, 1888), I, 322.
- 11 Goodenough, An Introduction, 152.
- 12 Samuel Sandmel, "Philo's Environment and Philo's
Exegesis," The Journal of Bible and Religion,
(October, 1954), 251, 252.
- 13 Ibid., 249.
- 14 Wolfson, I, 404.
- 15 Drummond, I, 323.
- 16 Wolfson, I, 416, 417.
- 17 Ibid., 396.
- 18 Ibid., 416.
- 19 Ibid., 417.
- 20 Ibid.
- 21 Ibid. In the same volume, 411, Wolfson says that
although individual men and individual wicked souls
might perish, there is in Philo's philosophy a type
of universal immortality: "...the immortality of
the universal idea of the mind as well as the immortality
of the image of the universal idea in the human species
as a whole." This idea is found in Aristotle, says
Wolfson (411). Since Philo could foresee the possible
destruction of wicked souls, it would follow that he
conceived of reward and punishment after death. The
Bible, on the other hand, held generally that reward
and punishment was administered to the living (Ezek. 18:4).
- 22 An extensive discussion of the Logos in Greek thought
is found in Drummond, Philo Judaeus, I, 27-47, II,
156-273.

- 23 Drummond, II, 160.
- 24 Ibid., 157.
- 25 Ibid., 280.
- 26 Samuel Sandmel, A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament, (Cincinnati, 1956), 50.
- 27 Wolfson, I, 376 ff. While angels do act as God's advisors (Job 1) and messengers (Gen. 22), they are not pictured as the means God employs to bring man immortality. Therefore, angels as Logoi is a Greek oriented notion.
- 28 Sandmel, Philo's Place, 25.
- 29 Ibid., 26, 27. Sandmel discusses how the rabbis, Philo, and Josephus begin at a common starting point in their discussions, e.g., of the patriarch Abraham, but then branch out into individual interpretations.
- 30 Wolfson, I, 398.
- 31 Ibid. When Scripture says Abraham was going back to his "fathers," Philo felt he was rejoining the angels. Isaac was to go to the realm of ideas (Wolfson, I, 403). This is further evidence that Philo, like the rabbis, started with the Bible and used it to develop his philosophy.
- 32 Sandmel, A Jewish Understanding, 50, 51.
- 33 Ibid., 51.
- 34 Erwin R. Goodenough, By Light, Light, (New Haven, 1935), 75.
- 35 Ibid.
- 36 Ibid.
- 37 Ibid.
- 38 Drummond, I, 315.
- 39 Baab, The Theology of the Old Testament, 68.
- 40 Drummond, I, 299.
- 41 Ibid., 298.
- 42 Wolfson, I, 419.
- 43 Ibid., 375, 376.
- 44 Ibid., 404.
- 45 Ibid.
- 46 Ibid., 126.
- 47 Ibid.
- 48 Ibid., 133, 134.

- 49 Ibid., 57.
- 50 Ibid.
- 51 Ibid., 58-61.
- 52 Sandmel, Philo's Place, 23.
- 53 Carl Siegfried, "Philo Judaeus," The Jewish Encyclopedia, (New York and London, 1905), X, 10.
- 54 Goodenough, By Light, Light, 78.
- 55 Ibid.
- 56 Ibid., 78, 79.
- 57 Ibid., 79.
- 58 Ibid.
- 59 Ibid.
- 60 Ibid., 80.
- 61 Kaufman Kohler, "Sadducees," The Jewish Encyclopedia, (New York and London, 1905), X, 633.
- 62 Ibid.
- 63 Goodenough, By Light, Light, 114.
- 64 Siegfried, 10.
- 65 Joseph Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel, (New York, 1955), 249.
- 66 Charles, A Critical History, 240 ff.
- 67 Ibid., 300.
- 68 Ibid.
- 69 Ibid., 295.
- 70 Ibid., 240.
- 71 Ibid., 298.
- 72 Ibid., 299, 300.
- 73 Ibid., 241.
- 74 Ibid.
- 75 Ibid., 288.
- 76 Ibid., 241.
- 77 Ibid., 300.
- 78 Robert H. Pfeiffer, The Apocrypha, (London, 1953), introd. xiv.
- 79 Ibid.
- 80 George F. Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era -- The Age of the Tannaim, (Cambridge, Mass., 1946), II, 293.

ix.

- 81 Charles C. Torrey, "Apocalypse," The Jewish Encyclopedia,
(New York and London, 1901), I, 673.
- 82 R. Travers Herford, The Pharisees, (London, 1924),
188.
- 83 Ibid., 189, 190.
- 84 Kaufman Kohler, Jewish Theology, (Cincinnati, 1943),
287.
- 85 Charles, 266.
- 86 Moore, II, 317.
- 87 Charles, 295.
- 88 Ibid., 300. See also Pfeiffer, The Apocrypha, introd. xiv.
- 89 Pfeiffer, The Apocrypha, introd. xiv.
- 90 Charles, 300.
- 91 J. A. MacCulloch, "Eschatology," Encyclopaedia of Religion
and Ethics, (New York, 1951), V, 381.
- 92 J. W. Lightley, Jewish Sects and Parties in the Time
of Christ, (London, 1925), 95, 96.
- 93 H. Wheeler Robinson, "Soul," Encyclopaedia of Religion
and Ethics, (New York, 1951), XI, 734. Robinson dis-
cusses the idea that the basic ideas of immortality in
the New Testament are derived from the Old Testament.
- 94 Sandmel, A Jewish Understanding, 85, 86.
- 95 Ibid. Sandmel notes that not flesh but spirit is the
true nature of God (Phil. 3:20). As far as the Messiah
was concerned, "...the Christ to Paul is a divine
spirit; the Christ Jesus is the interval in which the
Christ became transformed into the man Jesus." (54)
- 96 J. C. Lambert, "Body (Christian)," Encyclopaedia of
Religion and Ethics, (New York, 1951), II, 762.
- 97 Oscar Cullman, "Immortality of the Soul and Resurrection
of the Dead: The Witness of the New Testament," Harvard
Divinity School Bulletin, (1955, 1956), 34, footnote 18.
- 98 Ibid., 19.
- 99 John A. T. Robinson, The Body -- A Study in Pauline
Theology, (Chicago, 1952), 31.
- 100 Ibid.
- 101 Cullman, 15.
- 102 H. Wheeler Robinson, 733, 734.
- 103 John A. T. Robinson, 51.
- 104 Ibid., 72.
- 105 Ibid.

- 106 Ibid., 82.
- 107 Ibid., 82, 83.
- 108 Ibid., 81.
- 109 Ibid., 52.
- 110 See especially H. Wheeler Robinson's "Soul," 734, where he speaks of "...the 'pneumatic' body of Pauline anticipation (I Co. 15.35-38), more adapted to the needs of the spirit...."
- 111 Lambert, 761 ff.
- 112 H. Wheeler Robinson, 733.
- 113 Ibid.
- 114 Cullman, 21.
- 115 Sandmel, A Jewish Understanding, 54.
- 116 Cullman, 21.
- 117 Ibid.
- 118 Ibid., 24. Since the Messiah has already been resurrected, says Cullman, all men live in an interval of time between Jesus's resurrection, which has taken place, and our own which will not take place until the End.
- 119 Ibid., 15.
- 120 Ibid., 19.
- 121 Lambert, "Body (Christian)," 761, agrees with H. Wheeler Robinson that Paul does not have a thoroughgoing idea of the dualism of basar (flesh) and ruah (spirit). Lambert sees in Paul's teachings "...a psychophysical unity of soul and body, in which, however, the body as the part that links man to nature, takes a lower position than the soul or spirit, by which he comes into relation with heaven and God." At the resurrection, new bodies will replace the older earthly ones, and these new bodies will be adopted to a heavenly condition of existence (I Co. 15:47 ff.). See 762.
- 122 C. Harris, "State of the Dead," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, (New York, 1951), XI, 834.
- 123 Ibid.
- 124 Ibid.
- 125 S. D. F. Salmond, "Eschatology of the New Testament," A Dictionary of the Bible, (New York, 1911), I, 752.
- 126 Ibid.
- 127 Harris, 834.
- 128 Ibid.

- 129 Ibid.
130 Ibid., 837.
131 Ibid.
132 Ibid.
133 Ibid.
134 Salmond, 750.
135 Ibid.
136 Ibid.
137 Ibid.
138 Ibid., 751.
139 Ibid.
140 Ibid., 752.
141 Ibid., 753-756.
142 Lambert, 760-763.
143 Ibid., 760.
144 Ibid.
145 Ibid.
146 Ibid. Lambert points to the New Testament idea that Jesus lived as a man and enjoyed this life (Mt. 11:19). He tried to preserve men through a ministry of healing.
147 Ibid.
148 Ibid.
149 Ibid., 761.
150 H. Wheeler Robinson, 733 ff.
151 Ibid., 733. Here again I find the author transliterates nefesh as nephesh.
152 Ibid.
153 Ibid.
154 Ibid.
155 Ibid.
156 Ibid.
157 Ibid., 734. See note 151 above.
158 Ibid.
159 Ibid.
160 Ibid.
161 Ibid.
162 Ibid.

163 Ibid.

164 Ibid.

165 Ibid.

166 Ibid.

167 W. C. Allen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew, (New York, 1907), Allen comments here on Matthew 22:30 as follows: "The point seems to be that, in the life which follows the resurrection, men will then be as the angels in heaven now are, immortal, and without need of marriage to propagate their kind."

168 Lightley, 100.

169 I see that immortality is not mentioned in any passages referring to either the Sadducees or the Pharisees. And, as far as the Pharisees are concerned, Acts 23:8 would indicate that they did hold to a spiritual resurrection, having, perhaps, Pauline over-tones of the revival of a spiritual body. It would seem that the New Testament fails to credit the Pharisees with having a pure concept of the survival of the soul -- without the physical body -- after death. So, it may be that the Sadducees (while denying resurrection) did believe in immortality.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

- 1 "The Jewish War," The Works of Flavius Josephus
(trans. William Whiston) (London, 1828), V, Bk. 2,
chap. 8; 84, 85.
- 2 Solomon Zeitlin, "The Idolatry of the Dead Sea Scrolls,"
The Jewish Quarterly Review, (January, 1958), 262, 263.
- 3 Kaufman Kohler, "Pharisees," The Jewish Encyclopedia,
(New York and London, 1905), IX, 661-666.

; 52.

8; 231.

299.

arties in the Time of

noted that Lauterbach,
ightley. They do hold
ect and theologically
nd immortality in

this thesis, I have
uch as Danby's Mishnah,
s Talmud, except when
where clarity demanded

tion of the soul imprisoned
evious chapter. See
, 396.

York, 1949), 70.

10 Fiftyfour -
indications -
7 no -
2 day - index 51
1000 for Sem 50
413 - 22 49

- 20 Cohen, 76.
- 21 Mekilta, Shirata, I.
- 22 Mekilta, Pisha, X.
- 23 San. 94a.
- 24 Ibid., 99a.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 Ibid., 106b.
- 27 Mishnah, Nedarim 11:2.
- 28 Mishnah, Makkot 3:15.
- 29 The biblical idea of identifying the soul with the blood is cited in Mishnah, Makkot 3:15.
- 30 According to Gen. R. VIII, 11, the function of the soul is to link man to heaven (while the body links him to earth).
- 31 In Mishnah, Oholot 1:6 it is stated that the soul does depart from the body, leaving it unclean: "Man conveys uncleanness (as a corpse) only after his soul is gone forth...."
- 32 San. 91a-91b.
- 33 Kaufman Kohler, "The Immortality of the Soul," The Jewish Encyclopedia, VI, 566.
- 34 Mekilta, Shirata, I.
- 35 Ibid., III.
- 36 Ibid., VI.
- 37 Mekilta, Shabbata, I.
- 38 Mishnah, Sotah 9:15.
- 39 Mishnah, San. 10:3.
- 40 Gen. R. XIII, 16.
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 San. 90b.
- 43 Ibid.

- 44 Ibid.
- 45 Ibid., 91b.
- 46 Ibid.
- 47 Ibid., 92a.
- 48 Ibid.
- 49 Ibid.
- 50 Ibid.
- 51 Ibid., 92b.
- 52 Ibid.
- 53 Ibid.
- 54 Ibid.
- 55 Ibid.
- 56 Samuel Cohon, Man and His Destiny, (Cincinnati, 1954), II, 58.
- 57 Mishnah, Rosh Ha-Shanah 1:2.
- 58 Mishnah, Abot 2:1.
- 59 Ibid., 3:14.
- 60 Herbert Danby, The Mishnah, (London, 1933), 455.
- 61 Mishnah, Abot 4:22.
- 62 Cohon, 57, 58.
- 63 Ibid.
- 64 Mekilta, Nezikin, X.
- 65 Drummond, Philo Judaeus, II, 280.
- 66 Mekilta, Shirata, IV.
- 67 Ibid., VI.
- 68 Mekilta, Amalek, II.
- 69 Mishnah, San. 10:3. Cohon, 58, says that the reason so many in Mishnah, San. were excluded from the hereafter, e.g., the wicked generation of the flood, the generation of the wilderness, the company of Korah, etc. was a reaction against the Gnostics.

- 70 Mishnah, San. 10:1.
- 71 Mishnah, Abot 5:19.
- 72 Ludwig Blau, "Shekinah," The Jewish Encyclopedia,
(New York and London, 1905), XI, 260.
- 73 Mekilta, Nezikin, X.
- 74 Cohon, xx, note 258.
- 75 Mekilta, Beshallah, VI.
- 76 Mekilta, Shirata, II.
- 77 Ibid., VI.
- 78 Mekilta, Bahodesh, IX.
- 79 Mishnah, San. 10:3.
- 80 San. 105a.
- 81 Ibid.
- 82 Numerous references to Messianic speculation are found in the Mekilta, e.g., in Pisha, XVI, Vayassa, V, VI, Amalek, II, Nezikin, XVII, and Shirata, VIII. See also Mishnah, Sota 9:15. Then, too, see Talmudic references in Sanhedrin 91b., 93b., 94a., 97a., 97b., 98a.
- 83 Kaufman Kohler, The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church, (New York, 1929), 166-169. However, not every scholar would agree with his arrangement of the stages in Messianism, e.g., Joseph Klausner's The Messianic Idea in Israel (New York, 1955), 249, lists the links in the chain of Messianic eschatology in a different order.
- 84 Jacob Z. Lauterbach, "The Pharisees and Their Teachings," Hebrew Union College Annual, (Cincinnati, 1929), VI, 152. He refers to Abot de R. Natan, version A, chap. 5.
- 85 Kaufman Kohler, "Sadducees," The Jewish Encyclopedia, (New York and London, 1905), X, 631.
- 86 Moore, Judaism, I, 69.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

- 1 Resurrection, as seen in Daniel 12, Isaiah 26, and Ezekiel 37, was basic to Old Testament theology regarding the future life. The point is made in chapter two of this thesis that no clearly defined concept of immortality emerges in Jewish Scripture.
- 2 Samuel Sandmel, "Philo's Environment and Philo's Exegesis," The Journal of Bible and Religion, (October, 1954), 251, 252.
- 3 Goodenough, By Light, Light, 78.
- 4 MacCulloch, "Eschatology," 381.
- 5 Charles, A Critical History, 300. See also Pfeiffer, The Apocrypha, intro. xiv.
- 6 See references in footnotes 2 and 5 of this chapter.
- 7 Lightley, Jewish Sects, 96.
- 8 San. 91a-91b; 38a end.