HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
NEW YORK SCHOOL

INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES

AUTHOR Douglas S. Slotnick

TITLE "An Analysis of Resurrection and Body-Soul Problems As Presented in Rabbinic Literature"

TYPE OF THESIS: D.H.L. ( ) Rabbinic (X)

Master's ( )

1. May circulate ( )

2. Is restricted (X) for 10 years. HUC-JIR Students may read thesis.

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. ___ yes X no

March 28, 1988
Date

Douglas S Slotnick
Signature of Author

Library Record

Microfilmed
Date

Signature of Library Staff Member

AN ANALYSIS OF RESURRECTION AND BODY-SOUL PROBLEMS AS PRESENTED IN RABBINIC LITERATURE

Douglas Stewart Slotnick

Thesis Submitted In Partial Fulfillment Of
Requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
Graduate Rabbinic Program
New York, New York

March 28, 1988

Referee: Professor Eugene B. Borowitz

Acknowledgments

I would like to note with affection the virtues shown by the following individuals, who have aided me in the completion of this thesis.

Amanda's care and interest

EBB's patience and sagacity

My parents' support and love

*

This thesis is dedicated to three individuals, each of whom had a hand in its genesis.

My paternal grandmother:

Lena Kosokoff Slotnick

My teacher and catalyst of this thesis:

Rabbi Herschel Matt

One whose example embodies the lessons found herein:

Ari Ullendorff Gorfinkle

Zikhronam Livrachah

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The classic instance in biblical literature of the mentioning of body and soul is one of God breathing life into Adam.[1] There are far more historical parallels concerned with resurrection images than with body and soul images.

We find images of waking in the visions of the Psalms.[2] Many of these visions may be considered beatific experiences, or cultic experiences.[3] We also find the bible speaking in the tone of world judgment.

> Your dead shall live, my dead bodies shall arise--awake and sing you who dwell in the earth!--for your dew is as the dew of light, and the earth shall bring to life the shades.[4]

It is not necessarily clear whether this can be termed a resurrection text, because there remain many images in biblical language that speak more of restoration, than of resurrection as it was understood in the rabbinic period.

One may also see in the biblical text a standard view of death-- that of a final state.[5] This final state may also be seen with great power and poetry.[6] When we note these passages, it becomes fairly clear that there is no room for any kind of resurrection imagery.

Implications of resurrection imagery may be seen in earlier texts.[7] This text, with its reference to God's slaying and making alive, wounding and healing,

---

[1]Genesis 2:7
[2]Psalm 17:15
[3]Psalm 27:4, 63:3
[4]Isaiah 26:19
[5]II Samuel 14:14
[6]Job 7: 7-9
[7]Deuteronomy 32:39

can be easily read to mean resurrection and body-soul imagery. Similarly, we find texts concerned with bringing one down to Sheol, and being raised up.[1] The power to raise up through resurrection is illustrated by Elijah.[2] Being saved from a peril associated with Sheol, the netherworld, is occasionally illustrated.[3]

Two classic texts which illustrate allegorical views of body and soul, and the power of resurrection are applicable to our subject.[4] The Ezekiel text is the famous tale of the dry bones, a classic resurrection allegory. The Daniel text is the first articulate appearance of a clear resurrection theology, and it is also applicable to notions of body-soul relationships.

---

[1] I Samuel 2:6
[2] I Kings 17:17
[3] Psalm 30:4
[4] Ezekiel 37:1-14, Daniel 12:2-3

Chapter One, Section One

In the rabbinic period it is clear that the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is one of the core issues of Jewish belief. Scholars such as G. F. Moore have suggested that this doctrine is the core doctrine in all of eschatology of the rabbinic period.[1] It is notable that the rabbis placed belief in the resurrection of the dead in a prominent place in the eighteen benedictions of the 'Amidah. The idea of resurrection was, for the rabbinic scholars of their day, strictly corporeal and focused on questions of how the dead shall be resurrected--with or without physical ailments, clothed or unclothed, how the bodies should travel to the land of Israel.[2]

However, once past these initial statements, much contradiction and controversy rises up. There is no agreement whatsoever on the historical standing of the resurrection. That is, when will it occur? At the very end of time, or before? How will it be heralded? Will resurrection precede the end of all time? Indeed, some say that the resurrection will come, followed by the final redemption. Despite the fact that many sources claim that resurrection is for the righteous alone, a few say that everyone is included.

Yet we may define some areas of agreement. In suggesting that there is a doctrine of resurrection, we may make clear that there are essentially two parts to the doctrine. First, the notion of reward or retribution applying to the entire people Israel. Second, the belief in body and soul as one unit, together forming the human being.

The first point focuses on the necessary (from the rabbinic view) idea of a redemption that applied to the entire people. This idea of a future time

---

[1]G.F. Moore, Judaism . . ., II, p. 323
[2]Ketubot 11a, Sanhedrin 90a

was colored with the ideals of peace and justice. The rewards of this world would come to those righteous who had earned existence there through their deeds in the former world.

The second point focuses on the notion of body and soul necessarily being judged together.[3] Such a judgment could only occur at a time when body and soul were to be rejoined, as in life. Therefore, if one accepts the idea of the judgment coming at the end of time, then body and soul could be seen as one, and prepared for judgment. Death, in this view, is a pause before the true task of judgment is fulfilled.

---

[3]Sanhedrin 91a-b

We will begin by noting the different ways in which the tannaitic and amoraic rabbis addressed the problem of the resurrection of the dead.

The wide spectrum of rabbinic views of resurrection is well presented in the Babylonian Talmud.[1] Rabbi Samuel bar Nahmani, in Rabbi Jonathan's name, argued that the righteous are to be resurrected. This statement was made in the context of talking about Elijah's and Elisha's abilities at resurrection.[2] Samuel bar Nahmani extends the gift of resurrection to common people--those elderly recognized as righteous by God.

Ulla continued explication in this fashion. He suggested, through a comparison of two verses from Isaiah,[3] that although God promises both the destruction of death, and the giving of great age, this is not a contradiction. It is the righteous Jew who is to receive eternal life. And resurrection is seen as an extension of the more limited gift of earthly life granted to human beings.

Rabbi Hisda also explicates two verses from Isaiah.[4] Both speak with the imagery of the light of the sun and the moon. In both cases, God's presence is made known to the people Israel. Yet, in one case, the light of each is confounded; in another, the light is greatly increased. Rabbi Hisda felt that the former referred to the world-to-come, the latter to the days of the Messiah. Hence he presents the interesting notion of the righteous shining more brightly than the sun and the moon, yet being overshadowed by the eventual coming of the Messiah. So a very high value is placed on righteousness, with reference to the world-to-come. Samuel, in explicating the same texts, claims that the former verse and the latter verse refer to the world-to-come, but that the first refers to the righteous, and the second, to

---

[1]Pesahim 68a
[2]I Kings 17, II Kings 4
[3]Isaiah 25:8, 65:20
[4]Ibid. 24:23, 30:26

God's presence. So Samuel again stresses the role of the righteous in effecting the reward of the world-to-come, yet without the distinguishing between the world-to-come and the messianic age.

Rava also set up an opposition between two phrases within a biblical verse.[1] It says there "I deal death and give life; I wounded and I will heal." Here Rava notes the parallel between resurrection and healing. Yet he also concentrates on this linkage--that healing and resurrecting are more than just closely linked ideas. The linkage says something powerful about God's nature. The person healed and the person resurrected are one and the same. The following passage illustrates this idea beautifully.

> Our rabbis taught: 'I kill, and I make alive.'[2] You might say, I kill one person and give life to another, as the world goes on. Therefore is it stated, 'I have wounded, and I heal.'[3] Just as the wounding and the healing refer to the same person. This refutes those who maintain that resurrection is not intimated in the Torah.[4]

What is the spectrum of belief that this text has presented us?

The righteous are to be resurrected, in the end of time.

God's power is presented in the giving of eternal life to Israel, and in long life to some selected non-Jews.

The righteous deserve resurrection, indeed, their deeds outshine the physical world.

There is a difference in quality between the world-to-come and the messiah's coming.

Resurrection is akin to healing.

---

[1]Deuteronomy 32:39
[2]Ibid.
[3]Ibid.
[4]Pesahim 68a

Death and the gift of life are innate in each person.

Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer repeats many of the above points, but with even greater aggadic skill. Sleep at night, and waking in the morning are like the world-to-come. One's spirit wanders over the earth at night, during sleep. So too, with the dead, their spirits wander over the earth, and tell the living what are the secrets of the world. The dead give thanks to God for being given such vision. Hence awakening in the morning is like awakening in the future world.

The implication of these later texts is that the physical reality of the world is undercut by another reality that the living may not sense. The editor presents a number of examples of this manner of perception. There are five objects of creation whose voices go from one end of the world to another, yet their voices are inaudible.[1] They are a) the tree which yields fruit, b) the snake shedding its skin, c) a woman divorced from her husband, d) an infant coming forth from its mother's womb, and e) the soul departing from the body. The soul does not go out of the body until it beholds God's presence. In comparing these different matters of creation, the editor suggests that the process of the disembodiment of the soul may indeed be reversible. The imagery seems to suggest that.

> Rabbi Ze'era said: All the souls go forth and are gathered, each man's soul to the generation of his fathers and to his people. The righteous to the righteous, the wicked with the wicked, for so the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Abraham: 'You shall go to your fathers in peace.'[2] And when the soul goes from the body,

---

[1]Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, Ch. 34
[2]Genesis 15:15

> then the righteous come to meet them, and say to them: Come in peace![1]

The reuniting of souls at death seems to be in contradistinction to the continual processes of separation and dispersion, in life. So one might expect the rabbis to extend such a lesson (of reuniting) to resurrection, in the understanding that resurrection is but another reuniting.

It is worth noting that the thematic associations of resurrection are spread to, and apply to, the earth itself.[2] The imagery that is suggested here in Pesikta Rabbati is powerful in its ability to affect all listeners. As Petuchowski has mentioned,[3] there is here a link between the revelatory and cosmological functions of God's word. Although the hearer of the lessons of resurrection would perhaps hear them as lessons of revelation, the midrash here reminds us that the earth, too, (the cosmological) hears the lessons of resurrection. The activity of revivification necessarily involves the earth's cooperation. In this midrash is heard the undeniable lesson of the physicality of the resurrection. Try as one might, one cannot intellectualize the language of resurrection and revivification. The promise and demonstration of resurrection are undeniable signs of God's power, be it subtle or brazen.

It is also intended that those desirous of bodily resurrection force themselves to look beyond their current earthly states. The following text illustrates that.

> Now, is the Land of Israel really the land of the living? Do not men die in it? For that matter, cannot the world outside the

---

[1]Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, Ch. 34
[2]Pesikta Rabbati 21:4
[3]Ibid., Braude translation, note 16

> Land of Israel be more accurately called 'the land of the living'? As for the Land of Israel--in it people dying (of hunger) are common. However, when David spoke of 'the lands of the living. . .'[1] he meant the land whose dead will be the first to come to life in the days of the Messiah.[2]

The special nature of the land of Israel, as well as that of resurrection itself, must be appreciated through the thematic techniques of witnessing. Witnessing does not necessarily mean seeing the event in question happen. Rather, one witnesses to the possibility of its happening. The author of our text suggests that the area outside the land of Israel could be better termed "the land of the living." And at the time under consideration, people dying of hunger were common. Yet, the author asks the reader to witness the possibility of "life" as referring to that time, when the Messiah arrives. Hence, this process of witnessing indicates a faith in events that had not occurred.

It is also necessary to ask "how was it that the rabbis felt that the theme of resurrection was to be shown thematically sound?" They felt that this could be done through reference to biblical texts, in order to show that the concept was rooted in Torah.

> 'From the Writings': as it is written, 'And the roof of your mouth, like the best wine of my beloved, that goes down sweetly, causing the lips of those that are asleep to speak.'[3] But perhaps it means merely that their lips will move, even as R. Yohanan said: If a halachah is said in any person's name in this world, his lips speak in the grave, as it is written, '. . .causing the lips of those that are asleep to speak?'[4] [He did not satisfy them] until he quoted, '. . .which the Lord your God swore to your

---

[1]Psalm 116:9
[2]Pesikta Rabbati 1:4
[3]Song 7:9
[4]Ibid.

> fathers to give to them'[1]; not to you, but to them is said; hence resurrection is derived from the Torah. . .Just as you are all alive today, so you will all live again in the world-to-come.[2]

The first verse does not satisfy those who wish to see that resurrection is derivable from the Torah, because only a halachah's recital may cause the lips of the dead to move. The verse is not comprehensive enough, explaining how the theme of resurrection may be justified. The text's power lies in the next part, which contains a historical justification for resurrection. As God swore to the patriarchs, so will He swear concerning resurrection to the dead. The justification is based on a former deed of God's, swearing to the Israelites about their survival. Therefore, the promise of resurrection in the world-to-come is based on the fact of one's existing today, witnessing to God's existence, and life-giving powers.[3]

Resurrection is powerfully associated with the natural processes of earth. It is thematically associated with all events that affect human beings.

> GEMARA. 'THE MIRACLE OF THE RAINFALL IS MENTIONED IN THE BLESSING OF THE RESURRECTION. . .' What is the reason? R. Joseph said: Because it is put on a level with the resurrection of the dead, therefore it was inserted in the blessing of the resurrection.[4]

This text is a sign of the thematic connection between resurrection, and other events that affect all earthly activities. The importance of this fact cannot be overstressed. Texts speaking about resurrection tend to be mixed together with those that deal with more mundane activities. There seems to

---

[1]Deuteronomy 11:21
[2]Sanhedrin 90b
[3]Ibid. 64b
[4]Berachot 33a

have been no split in rabbinic thinking between issues of "pure" eschatology, and issues having to do with day-to-day human life.

The polemics supporting the notion of the resurrection of the dead make use of two essential techniques: proofs and principles. The tannaitic rabbis embarked on a campaign to prove and to justify the idea of resurrection. It is clear that they did not see themselves as attempting to prove an entirely new teaching. Since resurrection was--as they pointed out--mentioned in the text of the Torah, their polemic took on the characteristics of teaching from the natural world (parables interpreted as proofs) and of exegetical expansion on certain biblical verses (exegesis transformed into principle). It is also necessary to mention principles having to do with who was eligible to be resurrected.

> An emperor said to Rabban Gamaliel:'You maintain that the dead will revive; but they turn to dust, and can dust come to life?' Thereupon the emperor's daughter said to the Rabbi: 'Let me answer him: In our town there are two potters; one fashions [his products] from water, and the other from clay: who is the more praiseworthy?' 'He who fashions them from water,' [the emperor] replied. 'If he can fashion [man] from water, surely he can do so from clay!'[1]

This first parable focuses on the ability of God to bring life to the dust of the dead. If God has power, as the potter does, to shape from water, then He can certainly shape man from clay.

> The school of Rabbi Ishmael taught: It can be deduced from glassware: if glassware, which, though made by the breath of human beings, can yet be repaired when broken; then how much the more so man, created by the breath of the Holy One, blessed be He.[2]

---

[1]Sanhedrin 91a
[2]Ibid.

The second parable suggests a parallel with human creation: the dead, although broken like glassware, certainly may be mended. One must consider the talents of God, an infinitely greater former and mender.

> A min (sectarian) said to Rabbi Ammi: 'You maintain that the dead will revive; but they turn to dust, and can dust come to life?' He replied: I will tell you a parable. This may be compared to a human king who commanded his servants to build him a great palace in a place where there was no water or earth [for making bricks]. So they went and built it. But after some time it collapsed, so he commanded them to rebuild it in a place where water and earth were to be found; but they replied, 'We cannot.' Thereupon he became angry with them and said, 'If you could build in a place containing no water or earth, surely you can where there is!'[1]

This text concentrates on the difference between the materials available for the crafting of creation, or the renewal of resurrection. If man could be created by God without initial materials, then certainly resurrection could take place, for the material necessary already exists.

These parables explore the possible parallels inherent in human crafts; these crafts may with ease be applied to a divine Maker. Buried in the texts are the unavoidable references to primitive beliefs about creation. To the essential materials earth and water, fire and air are added the elements of work and design. Each parable treats these essentials in a different manner, but a similar thought process is at work. There is, seemingly, a direct reference to God's work of resurrection whenever human creation is cited. Moreover, it must be noted that these texts function as proofs. It is clearly believed that one may convince oneself of the correctness and comprehensiveness of resurrection through reference to the human world.

---

[1]Ibid.

These proofs function through analogical, not deductive, thought. It is evidently assumed that one's beliefs about resurrection are rooted in this world.

> 'Yet,' [continued Rabbi Ammi], 'if you do not believe, go into the field and see a mouse, which today is but part flesh and part dust, and yet by tomorrow has developed and become all flesh. And should you say, "That takes a long time," go up to the mountains, where you will see but one snail, while by tomorrow the rain has descended and it is covered with snails.'[1]

These beliefs throw light on the scientific thought of late antiquity. All living things maintained a close link to the earth, and indeed, were composed of earth even while alive. Creation (and resurrection) were not seen from the perspective of eons through the lens of progressive change. Resurrection as a belief was only a challenge if one refused to accept the evidence of one's senses. On these bases were the rabbinic proofs constructed. It was believed that those who argued against resurrection were, in the end, proving the opposite case. Their proofs were taken from the world of creation; they could not construct proofs outside of that world.

> [A heretic said:] 'An earthen vessel is made from water and finished off with heat, while a glass vessel is made from fire and finished with fire; the one [glass] when broken may be repaired, whereas the other [man] when broken cannot be repaired!' '[The glass vessel can be repaired] because it is made by blowing,' said [R. Yose ben R. Halafta]. 'Let your ears hear what your mouth speaks!' retorted [R. Yose ben R. Halafta]. 'If what is made with the breath of a mere mortal can be repaired, how much the more what is made with the breath of the Holy One, blessed be He!'[2]

---

[1]Ibid.
[2]Genesis Rabbah 14:7

Next we must consider proofs based on the exegesis of biblical verses. These proofs are presented in a wide variety of ways. The first might be called "direct presentation" of text, with exegesis.

> 'And he said: let me go, for the day breaks.'[1] It is written, 'They are new every morning; great is your faithfulness.'[2] Rabbi Simeon b. Abba interpreted: because You renew us every morning, we know that great is your faithfulness to redeem us. Rabbi Alexandri interpreted: from the fact that you renew us every morning, we know that great is your faithfulness to resurrect the dead.[3]

This midrashic text, based on Jacob's struggle with his opponent at Jabbok, is a clear explication of the biblical text. From the conclusion of the wrestling match, at dawn, the midrashic author draws out the theme of faith in God, renewed every morning. The Lamentations text demonstrates that. It is driven home by R. Simeon's statement, saying that our arising in the morning is evidence of redemption. R. Alexandri caps the argument of the text, through saying that resurrection of the dead may be concluded from the gift of arising from sleep in the morning.

Most notable about this text is how directly, how pointedly the editor goes for his point. The exegesis seems almost superficial. Yet what has been expressed here is the core of belief about resurrection: that faith in God renews us daily, and that therefore, we shall be renewed after death. The power of this text lies in its concentrated presentation of very subtle truth. One might outline the text: trial, then recognition of faith, then realization of

---

[1]Genesis 32:27
[2]Lamentations 3:23
[3]Genesis Rabbah 78:1

daily redemption, and finally, recognition of redemption in the promise of resurrection.

> 'All of them wait for You.'[1] The dead wait, their eyes hanging on the resurrection. Of the resurrection it is written, 'The inhabitants of the rock will sing, they will shout from the top of the mountain, they will give glory to the Lord.'[2] In this psalm it is also written, 'The glory of the Lord shall endure forever.'[3] Therefore as glory refers in one verse to resurrection, so in the other glory refers to resurrection. At that time the dead will sing a song to You as it is written, 'Sing unto the Lord a new song.'[4] [5]

One might term this text "indirect response." The theme of waiting is taken up with the psalm text, and in the text of the midrash is converted to the idea of human praise of God's glory. We perceive "waiting" as waiting for resurrection only because it has been stated. The text does not move as inexorably toward its end as the previous text. What we have is a more subtle exposition of text, in which each link--each verse contained in the text--must be seen as relating to resurrection, for the entire text to succeed. If one is able to accept the unit as a whole, then the message of the text is a very powerful one.

Then we have what could be called "a historical appeal" for the case of resurrection.

> If a man tells you that the Holy One, praised be He, will in the future bring us resurrection, tell him it has already occurred through Ezekiel, Elijah, and Elisha.[6]

---

[1]Psalm 104:27
[2]Isaiah 42:11-12
[3]Psalm 104:31
[4]Isaiah 42:10
[5]Midrash Tehillim 104:23
[6]Leviticus Rabbah 27:4

Although opinions differ as to whether these three men performed acts of resurrection, one can still find in the rabbinic mind the possibility of a general resurrection. Therefore, a historical argument is admissible. The exegetical proof here is not complex, but there is a great weight of tradition submerged here. The assigning of deeds to biblical characters is a claim, stating "there is a possibility that resurrection took place here, and therefore one must be cautious in dismissing it.

Finally we will examine the classic text concerned with determining who is eligible to be resurrected.

> Three groups are established for the Judgment Day (when the dead are resurrected). One is made up of righteous individuals, a second of wicked individuals, and a third of those who are neither all righteous nor all wicked. The righteous will forthwith be inscribed for eternal life, the wicked will be inscribed and sealed as doomed to Gehinnom as it says, 'And many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awaken, some to eternal life and some to eternal shame.'[1] Those who are in the middle class of neither the righteous nor the wicked go down to Gehinnom, but when they scream (in prayer) they will be permitted to come up again as it says, 'And I will bring the third part through the fire, and I will refine them as silver is refined and try them as gold is tried. They shall call on my name and I will answer them.'[2] And concerning them Hannah said, 'The Lord kills and makes alive, brings down to the grave and brings up.'[3] The School of Hillel says, 'He that abounds in grace inclines toward grace.' Concerning them David said, 'That the Lord should hear my voice.'[4] On their behalf, David composed the whole of the passage, 'I was brought low and he saved me.'[5] [6]

---

[1]Daniel 12:2
[2]Zechariah 13:9
[3]I Samuel 2:6
[4]Psalm 116:1
[5]Psalm 116:6
[6]Rosh Hashanah 17a

It is clear enough from this single passage, that when the editor spends as much space as he does on the third group, then it must be sure that most human beings are to be included in this group. It is unclear, but there seems to be a purification process for this third group, after which they would attain the reward of the righteous. Yet this is unfortunately imprecise, because the question of Jew vs. non-Jew is never resolved. One is struck, after the analysis of this, and related passages, that the opinions rendered about the eligibility of one for resurrection are strictly those of individuals. Nowhere does one find a systematized detailing of the requirements for resurrection.

Aggadic literature suggests a number of different ways of looking at the physical process of resurrection. We are faced, here, with the basic questions regarding how resurrection was to occur. It is important to stress--and, indeed, difficult to overstress that the rabbis viewed resurrection as a bodily event. After death, the body was separate from the soul. Next, the body was restored to life, followed by the restoration of the soul to the body. We will examine a number of aggadic texts, in order to better understand this process.

> Hadrian--may his bones rot-- asked Rabbi Joshua b. Hanania: ' From what part will the Holy One, blessed be He, cause man to blossom forth in the future?' 'From the nut of the spinal column,' he replied. ' How do you know that?' he asked. 'Bring me one and I will prove it to you,' he replied. He threw it into the fire, yet it was not burnt; he put it in water, but it did not dissolve; he ground it between millstones, but it was not crushed; he placed it on an anvil and smote it with a hammer; the anvil was cleft and the hammer split, yet it remained intact.[1]

This midrash gives us a good idea of how the process of resurrection was to begin. It is fair to say that resurrection may be seen as something other than new creation. What was left was reused in the re-creation. The order of the re-creation was an issue that concerned the authors of aggada a great deal. The following difference, between the schools of Hillel and Shammai, illustrate the rabbinic concern for the establishment of an acceptable idea.

> The school of Shammai maintains: His formation in the next world will not be like that of this world. In this world skin and flesh are formed first, the sinews and bones last; but in the future he will commence with sinews and bones and finish with the skin and flesh, for thus it says in connection with the dead

---

[1]Genesis Rabbah 28:3

> of Ezekiel: 'And I beheld, and, lo, there were sinews upon them, and flesh came up and skin covered them above.'[1] Rabbi Jonathan said: We cannot learn from the dead of Ezekiel, for what did they resemble? A man who enters a bath: what he takes off first he puts on last. The School of Hillel said: Just as he is formed in this world, so will he be formed in the next world. In this world the skin and flesh come first, the sinews and bones last; so in the future will he begin with the skin and flesh and end with the sinews and bones. For thus says Job: ' Will you not pour me out like milk and curdle me like cheese? You will clothe me with skin and flesh, and knit me together with bones and sinews. . . '[2] [3]

This debate gives us information about more than just the issue of resurrection. There is also a great deal of material here about the rabbinic conception of the body, and anatomical theory. Yet, for us the most important point is the process of re-creation. What are the two views? The two different formations are based on two anatomical models. Either the body will be built up again as a process from embryo to complete person, or the reconstruction will be based on an internal structure, like the skeleton. It is important to note that both views accept the notion that resurrection is based on a form that the body, before death, had held. Yet it is Shammai's view that seemingly was believed, in later centuries. The rabbis strive to avoid any sense of seeing resurrection as "multiple" creation--the return to life after death is predicated on having lived before. The following text makes reference to the sense of the indivisibility of God's creation.

> 'You have fashioned me before and behind. . .'[4] This verse is interpreted as referring to two fashionings, a fashioning for the world and a fashioning for the World to Come. Therefore, God

---

[1]Ezekiel 37:8
[2]Job 10:10
[3]Genesis Rabbah 14:5
[4]Psalm 139:5

> will not need to fashion man anew at the resurrection because at the beginning of time, He prepared man by two fashionings.[1]

Having established some of the elements of rabbinic belief pertaining to the re-creation of man by God, we may explore some issues having to do with the purity of the resurrected body. What was the relationship between that body, and the former, original body? Was the body clothed upon resurrection? Let us look at a few relevant midrashim.

> It is the garment in which he grew in which he was buried, in which he rose up. It is taught in the name of Rabbi Nathan, 'The garment in which a man is buried in the future, at the resurrection he will rise up clothed in it.[2]

> Queen Cleopatra asked Rabbi Meir, 'I know that the dead will revive for it is written, "and then (the righteous) shall blossom forth out of the city like the grass of the earth"[3], but when they rise will they rise naked or clothed?' He said to her it is proved by an a fortiori argument from wheat that they rise clothed.[4]

What one notes here is that there is a plain acceptance of the body, as it was received into the grave. This is most notably stressed when we note that the rabbis also believed that that although the resurrected would arise with whatever wounds or defects the body originally had, they would eventually be healed. The promise of improvement, during resurrection, never overwhelmed the sense of respect for what the body had originally represented. We must also ask, after having noted the physical aspects of resurrection, what kind of personal inclination would the resurrected person have? What role would good and evil play for this person? It appears that

---

[1]Midrash Tehillim 139:6
[2]Tanhuma, Emor, par. 2
[3]Psalm 72:16
[4]Sanhedrin 90b

whatever evil inclination the person had, upon resurrection, the evil would not be remembered.

> 'Lo, he remembered that they were but flesh, a wind that passes away and comes not again.'[1] Is this to be taken as a confirmation of the notion that people have that the dead will not be resurrected? That flesh is a wind and passes away and comes not again? God forbid! This refers to the evil inclination which passes away with man at the time of death and will not return with him at the time the dead are resurrected.[2]

With this text we are led to consider how the soul is to be rejoined with the body. The rabbis cross this bridge in noting that there is a limit to human understanding of the processes of resurrection. Inquiry, as we have seen, was vital to the rabbinic understanding of death and its attendant myths, but they also cautioned those who wished to know too much.

> As to the dead who will rise in the future will they have to establish their purity by sprinkling on the third and seventh days after rising, or not? The rabbis are not able to arrive at an answer and treat the matter very lightly, as if it was a foolish question, by saying, 'When they rise we will be told; when Moses, our teacher, comes with them we will know.'[3]

The joining of the soul to the body is seen by the rabbis as a contest of free agents who must cooperate in order to function. Indeed the rabbis note that soul and body cannot be judged (at the end of time) unless they are joined. The classic parable that explains these ideas is extraordinarily clarifying for us.

> To what may this be compared? To a human king who owned a beautiful orchard which contained splendid figs. He appointed two watchmen there, one lame and the other blind. One day the

---

[1]Psalm 78:39
[2]Midrash Tehillim 78:8
[3]Niddah 70b

> lame man said to the blind, 'I see beautiful figs in the orchard. Come and take me upon your shoulder, that we may procure and eat them.' So the lame climbed the blind, procured and ate them. Some time after, the owner of the orchard came and enquired of them, 'Where are those beautiful figs?' The lame man replied, 'Have I then feet to walk with?' The blind man replied, 'Have I then eyes to see with?' What did he do? He placed the lame upon the blind and judged them together. So will the Holy One, blessed be He, bring the soul, replace it in the body, and judge them together. . .[1]

This text illustrates for us the rabbinic view of body and soul as necessarily combined through the process of resurrection. Revealingly, the parable gives us a rabbinic view of human endeavors and human failings. Body and soul may wish to cooperate, to trick their Maker, but their stage--the place where they play out their drama--is determined from the outside. It is painful to realize the degree of human dependence on God, yet it is also true that God agrees to judge and punish the two elements of the person as one unit. If this is so, then resurrection is a necessary step. Death is but a moment between life and ultimate judgment.

It is also worth noting that the place of resurrection is considered to be the land of Israel--there is no substitute for it. As I have noted elsewhere, the rabbis felt that it would be possible for the righteous who had died outside the land of Israel to be resurrected in the land. There would exist cavities, or tunnels underground, through which the righteous could roll to Israel.[2]

The rabbinic view was that those first to be resurrected would be those who were buried in the land of Israel. However, the conception of this

---

[1]Sanhedrin 91a-b
[2]Tanhuma, Vayehi, par. 3

ideal was occasionally explicated even more clearly. It seems that the souls of the dead, having returned, would be sorted according to generation and nation, and the righteous would sit with the righteous, the wicked with the wicked. The righteous would remain in the land of Israel, and the wicked would be sent away.[1]

Finally we may speak of the time of the resurrection. Texts seem to suggest that resurrection would occur in the time of the Messiah. It must be noted, however, that the exact placement of the event varied according to sage and conception of the "end-time." The rabbis seem less concerned with placing the event precisely, than making the order of events acceptable metaphorically. Note the following talmudic text, to this end.

> The resurrection of the dead by the Holy One praised be He will be between the 'Days of the Messiah' and the 'World to Come'. Something similar to the resurrection of the dead for the righteous occurred in this world, with Elijah, Elisha, and Ezekiel ben Buzi, the Priest.[2]

It is necessary to emphasize, in conclusion, that rabbinic opinion accepted the processes of resurrection, but with the strict proviso that the stress be laid on the "bodily" aspects of the event. The body was to be renewed, the soul rejoined to the body, and the combination judged as the former human being might have been judged. This concentration on using earthly life as emblem and metaphor for resurrection denotes rabbinic theories of resurrection.

---

[1]Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, ch. 34
[2]Sanhedrin 92a

It is interesting that the rabbinic literature abounds with different expressions for resurrection. Let us take note of the following text. This is an explicit example of what could be called a symbol system. Information about resurrection is presented in a manner that associates the data (rabbis' opinions) with symbols that already have associations for the reader. For example, in this section:

> You will find that the Holy One, blessed be He, anticipated in this world through the agency of the righteous everything that He will do in the world-to-come. Thus God will resurrect the dead, and Elijah resurrected the dead; God shuts up the rain, and Elijah shut up the rain. . . God resurrects the dead, and Elisha resurrects the dead; God remembered childless women, and Elisha remembered childless women.[1]

A strict parallelism is described, in which the deeds of the righteous (the prophets Elijah and Elisha) are compared to the assumed deeds of God, in resurrecting human beings. Yet each parallel has symbolic value. Resurrection has value for the reader of the midrash, because he understands the references to the human prophets, and the earth-bound references, also. Elijah's deeds in resurrecting the dead are made plausible through his symbolic agency of stopping the rain; in the same way his abilities are buttressed by his remembering childless women. This system may be applied in the opposite direction. God's deeds of resurrection are linked in a system with His deeds of rain-stopping and remembering the childless woman. It is clear that the symbolic purpose within these parallels is one of making an inexplicable process (resurrection) explicable through

---

[1]Genesis Rabbah 77:1

reference to activities of human agency. The symbolic value of the deeds remains on the human level, a level more easily approached.

Other comparable systems may be found.[1] Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba said that rain was as important as resurrection. Rabbi Abba noted that the prayer for rain was inserted in the blessing for the resurrection of the dead. Much of the remainder of the section is devoted to explication of particular word parallels between the two themes. So "hand of the Lord", "opening" (of heaven, or of graves), and "song" are given biblical citations, and compared. Finally, Rabbi Hiyya bar Ba said "[Rain] is greater than resurrection, for whereas resurrection is for man alone, [rain] is for man and beast; again, resurrection is for Israel, whereas this is for Israel and the nations."

As before, this passage suggests a mating of two different ideas. The nesting of the prayer for rain within the blessing for resurrection is a construction of a complementary symbol system. The biblical exegesis, pairing words that refer to both rain and resurrection, underlines the necessity of seeing the two ideas as paired--yet with long association and relationship. The concluding remark (R. Hiyya bar Abba) suggests beautifully how the understanding of rain as an expression of God's grace helps us better to understand resurrection as an idea.

A similar symbol system exists elsewhere, in a very different text.[2] The stress here is on a historical interpretation of different biblical personalities and situations. For example, if one would tell you that if Adam had not sinned and eaten from the tree he would have lived forever, one

---

[1]Genesis Rabbah 13:6
[2]Leviticus Rabbah 27:4

ought to say that there was Elijah, who did not sin, and lives forever. Similarly, if one were to say that God will in the future bring a resurrection of the dead, one could reply "It has already occurred through Elijah, Elisha, and Ezekiel." Again we see in this passage the historical and spiritual comparisons that we have seen before. Adam is seen as inferior to Elijah, who did not sin, and endures forever. Resurrection of the dead is to some extent undercut, because it had already taken place through prophetic means. The symbolism of resurrection is stressed strongly through the use of these parallels. Rabbi Aha summed this up neatly: "All that the Holy One, blessed be He, intends to perform or to make afresh in His world in the time-to-come He has already partly performed in anticipation in this world. . ."[1]

Elsewhere in Leviticus Rabbah,[2] a rabbinic disciple revives a servant of a Roman emperor through the simple expedient of pointing out to the servant that the emperor stood before him. This simple story supports the contention that there were strict parallels between the human revival through dying and the divine revival of the dead. Both revivifications suggest a rabbinic system for examining claims of resurrection.

There are other examples of a historical association that helps prove the plausibilty of resurrection.[3] This passage notes the patriarchs, and their close interest in the land of Israel. Why did they care about it so? In the passage is embedded their care about their eventual resurrection. Their concern about not being buried outside the land of Israel demonstrates a link between the idea of resurrection and an understanding of the land.

---

[1]Ibid.
[2]Leviticus Rabbah 10:4
[3]Exodus Rabbah 32:2

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish's utterance, to the effect of their wishing resurrection, underlines the associations and symbology at work here. The land stands for the idea of resurrection.

It is worthwhile at this point to note that this understanding of symbols and their use in agada suggests that different texts have dsifferent levels of meaning. It is clearly not implied that a direct argument is made by the rabbis, in any systematic way, for the notion of arrayed symbols being at the heart of the idea of resurrection. This clarification may be found in Urbach,[1] where he argues that images of redemption can be foreshortened or extended. The words stand; however they must be explicated. There is a high level of suggestiveness of the various images used for resurrection. There are many different ways of reading the same agadic passage, and the variety of imagery extends the range of meaning of a particular topic, such as eschatology. If, as G. F. Moore claims,[2] Jewish eschatology is representative of religion's need to individualize faith, then one can see the rationale for allowing agadic thinking to be as wide-ranging and as all-encompassing as it is. There are many different associative processes in texts of resurrection.

The following passage illustrates how two different resurrection ideas are reconciled, and their symbols clarified.

> . . .whoever walks four cubits in the land of Israel is assured of a place in the world-to-come. According to Rabbi Eleazar, would not the righteous outside the land be revived? Rabbi Elai replied: [They will be revived] by rolling [to the land of Israel]. Rabbi Abba Sala the Great demurred: Will not the rolling be

---

[1]E. E. Urbach, The Sages, pp. 650-651

[2]G. F. Moore, Judaism . . ., vol. 2, p. 377

> painful to the righteous? Abaye replied: Cavities will be made for them underground.[1]

We have heard that the righteous are deserving of resurrection, and that those living in the land of Israel are to be revived. Yet the two claims appear to be competing. In this passage the righteous outside the land are noted (and by extension, all righteous) but they are allowed to take part, through joining that other allowed group--living in the land of Israel. However the reconciliation is more complicated than it appears on the surface. These are two different resurrection ideas. It is as if here the notion of the righteous being revived is embedded within the idea of those being revived who are within the land of Israel. Eleazar's question and Elai's answer are quite necessary, in order to keep the righteous within the framework that has been constructed. Moreover, the symbolism applied here is all based on the land theology. It is as if the cavities described by Abaye are an image drawn on the capital of land theology, but intended specifically for that neglected group, the righteous. Through such reconciliation is the symbol structure kept in balance.

How else are the images and symbols suggested? Let us examine the following passage:

> . . .how comes the grave next to the womb? It is to teach you that just as the womb takes in and gives forth again, so the grave takes in and will give forth again. Have we not here a conclusion kol v'homer? If the womb which takes in silently gives forth with loud noise, does it not stand to reason that the grave which takes in with loud noise will give forth with loud noise? Here is a refutation of those who deny that resurrection is taught in the Bible.[2]

---

[1]Ketubot 111a
[2]Berachot 15b

The contrast here is a clear one--the womb and the grave. In simple language the contrast and parallel are set up. The womb takes in silently (at conception) but gives forth a baby with loud noise. The grave takes in with the noise of mourning, and will give forth (resurrection) with a loud noise. There could be no more direct language. Womb and grave are precise images, and symbols, for life and death.

The power of a symbol system that is related to resurrection derives its power from how skillfully it takes the bits of recognizable elements having to do with life and death, and weaves them into a plausible midrash. It is often surprising when we find that, as in the last text, symbols of life and death are mixed together, yet, nonetheless, come together for the reader to form a working system of emotional equivalents for resurrection that are very affecting. There is almost a conscious avoidance of abstraction when a text is speaking effectively about resurrection. This literature has its effects because, and not in spite of, its images and powerful symbols.

It is interesting that the rabbinic view of resurrection tends to regard the event in an almost denigrated fashion, at least when it is compared with the process of healing. The following text sets the tone for our discussion by asking what theological weight the act of resurrection has.

> For it is written, 'I kill and I make alive. . .'[1] --having declared that He performs the more difficult act, He then declares that He performs the easier act! For 'I kill and I make alive. . .' is the harder act, so how much more is it with the easier act, 'I wound and I heal?' But [the meaning is]: I raise them from the grave with their blemishes, so that people shall not say, Those He allowed to die are different than those He restored to life.' 'I kill and I make alive, I wound,' then I will heal them [after resurrection].[2]

Healing is seen as the far more difficult task. Or, put in an alternative way (so as not to violate the sense of the midrash), resurrection is more difficult, but healing is conceptually more challenging. This remarkable midrash displays the rabbis' open thought processes. As important as resurrection was to them, they nonetheless allowed themselves to compare that event to events that were closer to human understanding. This is more than an assertion of perception and of human need. It is a theological statement. Our midrash describes God's powers in terms that allow our powers--for we too may help others to be healed--to be seen reflected in the event of resurrection. God and man form, in their relationship, episodes of mutuality and concern for each other.

> Rabbi Levi and the rabbis [read the verse 'What profit has a man of all his labor? . . . That he is under the sun.'[3]]. According to Rabbi Levi, the verse implies that no matter how greatly men in this world extend themselves in the performance of religious

---

[1]Ecclesiastes 32:39
[2]Ecclesiastes Rabbah 1:4, par. 2
[3]Ecclesiastes 1:3

> duties and good deeds, it is reward enough for them that the Holy One causes the sun to shine for them, 'That the sun arises, and the sun goes down. . .'[1] According to the rabbis, the verse implies that no matter how greatly men in this world extend themselves in the performance of religious duties and good deeds, it is reward enough for them that [in the world-to-come] the Holy One will renew their countenances as the disk of the sun [is renewed each day]--'They that love Him be as the sun when he goes forth in his might. . .'[2] [3]

This midrash recapitulates much of what we found in the previous text, but in a different light. The first text from Ecclesiastes speaks of earthly life--that when people here work for religious ends and do mitzvot, the reward of the sun's light should be enough for them. Similarly, when the time of resurrection comes, renewal of the human body suffices as reward to those persons who performed according to Jewish strictures and did mitzvot. The image of the sun's disk is not chosen haphazardly. The astronomical image is an admittal of the necessity of making the theological complexities clear for human comprehension. Solar strength is a concrete power that human beings contend with most days. It is always there; even in absence. So too, the promise of eventual resurrection of the dead, albeit a promise difficult to comprehend, is made an element of concrete theology here. This idea can be expressed in near formulaic precision. Those that love and obey God are to the physical world as the elements of that changing world are to God when they return before God in seeming eternal precision. Resurrection is made precise, and more human.

Yet it is important to note the demands placed on the heads of those human beings who desired resurrection. Note the following text.

---

[1]Ecclesiastes 1:5
[2]Judges 5:31
[3]Pesikta Rabbati 18:1

> Rabbi Eliezer said: Repent one day before your death. His disciples asked him, does then one know on what day he will die? Then all the more reason that he repent today, he replied, lest he die tomorrow, and so his whole life is spent in repentance. And Solomon said too in his wisdom, 'Let your garments be always white; and let not your head lack ointment.'[1] Rabbi Yohanan b. Zakkai said: This may be compared to a king who summoned his servants to a banquet without appointing a time. The wise ones adorned themselves and sat at the door of the palace, 'for,' they said, 'is anything lacking in a royal palace?' [the call to enter may come soon] The fools went about their work, saying, 'can there be a banquet without preparations'? Suddenly the king desired [the presence of] his servants: the wise entered adorned, while the fools entered soiled. The king rejoiced at the wise, but was angry with the fools. 'Those who adorned themselves for the banquet,' he ordered, 'let them sit, eat, and drink. But those who did not adorn themselves for the banquet, let them stand and watch.' Rabbi Meir's son-in-law said in R. Meir's name: Then they too would look as being in attendance. But both sit, the former eating and the latter hungering, the former drinking and the latter thirsting. . .'[2]

The demands placed on human shoulders are very great. The beginning of this text, justly famous, notes the necessity of being in a continuous state of repentance. It is important to note that although this text does not speak directly of resurrection, through the means of the parable it does comment. The parable is in the context of a long sugya that speaks in detail of death and resurrection.[3] The parable constructs a clear, black-and-white distinction between those who obey and prepare, and those who disobey and ignore. The banquet without an assigned time stands for any number of things that God might promise to His people. It is clear, however, that one of its clearest references is to the promise of resurrection and

---

[1]Ecclesiastes 9:8
[2]Shabbat 153a
[3]Shabbat 152b

renewal. In order to receive a reward such as resurrection one must tend to one's behavior during one's life. The wise in the parable recognize that there is no way to tell when the king will call for them. Similarly, one can never know when one is going to die. The lesson of the wise is to follow R. Eliezer's dictum of being prepared; in their case, they wait patiently. The fools, believing that there could not be a banquet without warning, go about their lives. The message for those who seek resurrection is clear: there is no set time for it, for we cannot enter God's mind. However the demands for preparation and correct living are always in force. The theology behind the implied promise of resurrection is that of a continuing relationship with God, despite human doubts about His messages. The human being must recognize this relationship even in its apparent absence. The rules for eventual resurrection never change; they are observed by persons who are even unaware of them.

The theology of divine reward is necessarily related to our discussion of resurrection. The following text discusses reward from a number of angles.

> Rabbi Menahema said in Rabbi Bibi's name: Three keys are in the hand of the Holy One, blessed be He: the keys of burial [i.e., resurrection], rain, and the womb. The key of burial: 'Behold, I will open your graves.'[1] The key of rain: 'The Lord will open to you His good treasure the heaven, to give the rain. . .'[2] The key of the womb: 'And God opened her womb. . .'[3] [4]

---

[1]Ezekiel 37:12
[2]Deuteronomy 28:12
[3]Genesis 30:22
[4]Genesis Rabbah 73:4

Reward, in the relationship with God, is displayed clearly here. Each of the keys that God holds here represents a gift, without which human beings could not live. Let us examine them in reverse order. It is in God's power, the rabbis tell us, to allow women to conceive children. Hence, the first moments of life are not possible without divine intercession. Second, rain--the gift that enables plants to grow--is seen as the property that allows life to continue. All the continuing crises in which life is caught are dependent upon God for their resolution. Finally, burial is seen as a gift, because it can lead to resurrection. These "end-moments" are also dependent on God's will. The theology of reward is one in which all the moments taken for granted on this earth are given divine meaning and resonance. The implication, in the ordering of the text, is that resurrection is no more strange than growth or conception. Each is beyond direct human comprehension, although they are not beyond our understanding, if we use the lens of reward. Reward we appreciate, because we encounter it daily on our earth. Reward we may define as "the successful working out of a human-divine relationship." In this phrase is contained the sense of human will encountering divine will. Resurrection is granted to human beings along the same lines that life and continuance are granted--it has no hidden agenda.

> Rabbi Jacob says: There is no precept in the Torah, where reward is stated by its side, from which you cannot infer the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. Thus, in connection with honoring parents it is written, 'That your days may be prolonged, and that it may go well with you.'[1] Again in connection with the law of letting [the dam] go from the nest it is written, 'That it may be well with you, and that you may prolong your days.' Now, in the case where a man's father says to him, 'Go up to the top of the building and bring me down some young birds', and he went up to the top of the building, let

[1]Deuteronomy 5:16

> the dam go and took the young ones, and on his return he fell and was killed--where is this man's length of days, and where is this man's happiness? But 'that your days may be prolonged' refers to the world that is wholly long, and 'that it may go well with you' refers to the world that is wholly good.[1]

The rabbis warn that if one is to accept the theology of reward, one must accept it fully, with all the attendant problems that are created when an impossible situation is created. All places in the Torah, where reward is mentioned, are potentially texts supporting resurrection. The implied assumption here is that resurrection--indeed any mention of the "end-time"--has a corresponding relative event in earthly life. This assumption is what gives resurrection its great power as doctrine. It has answers for all challenges. One need only look at the remainder of our text to see that when a challenge is brought, Rabbi Jacob accepts it head-on. If one's son had gone to perform the precept of letting the dam go free, and was killed in the process, the only answer that one may make is to rely on the doctrine of the world-to-come. One could call this seamless theology. Indeed, it is claimed that the son's length of days and happiness, since they may not take place in this world, are all the more valuable, since they rely upon the necessary doctrine of resurrection and renewal for their fulfillment.

It is interesting that although no claim for comprehensiveness or systematized theology may be made in the scattered mentions and fuller texts having to do with resurrection, one may still see a constellation of related ideas that seemingly interact. This is due in part to the texts' extreme allusiveness--they draw all issues together--but there is also the undeniable fact of textual precision. That is, almost all resurrection texts speak in the

---

[1]Hullin 142a

insistent, quotidian terms of this world. These aggadic texts speak to the point, fully, and with full awareness of the reader.

We find that the major sources for information about body and soul in the rabbinic period are difficult to point to as evidence of normative doctrines. Moreover, these texts are not systematic, and it is difficult to find interpreters who agree on their interpretation. In addition, texts that focus on body and soul per se are unusual indeed. One usually finds these texts as subsets of discussions about other issues. It is possible to find these texts related to, for example, the issues of resurrection of the dead, or concern about God's powers of redemption.

It is important to note that many rabbinic texts having to do with body and soul issues address the problem elliptically and refuse to be abstract about the problem.[1] Many texts address the problem through seeing that that the soul is a guest in the body. It may be safely said that rabbinic authorities felt that body and soul formed a unified whole; the Gnostic idea of the body as a prison of the soul was rejected. A rewarding parallel is that of the soul occupying the body as God fills the world: God sees but is unseen, and the soul, too, sees but is unseen.[2] The rabbinic literature views man as the caretaker of the soul; God will take the soul from him if he behaves poorly.[3] The soul appears as the body's accuser when God judges the two, and it is made clear that God will judge them as one. One need only think of the famous parable of the orchard owner who hires a lame man and a blind man to guard the orchard for him. Yet the two contrive to steal fruit from the orchard, despite their liaibilities. When accused of this crime, the two men each proclaim his innocence, saying that it was impossible for them to

---

[1]Leviticus Rabbah 34:3
[2]Berachot 10a
[3]Niddah 31a

have stolen the fruit. Yet the orchard owner judges them together, as the body and soul will be judged together.[1]

On the eve of the Sabbath God gives man an extra soul, which is returned at the end of the Sabbath.[2] One may see this as a special emphasis on the importance of the soul, and a stress on its inwardness. The soul represents a quality of purity in the same way that God is pure.[3] It is unclear whether the soul, itself, can live a life of its own, apart from the body. These ideas--which have to do with the soul's conscious existence, apart from the body--are often stated vaguely.[4] Usually these ideas are stated as simply as "the body cannot survive without the soul, the soul cannot survive without the body. There are some opinions which state that the soul can exist apart from the body, when disembodied.[5] Yet all these opinions contain difficult anecdotal material, and are not all convincing. Much depends on how one views the physical imagery used when speaking of body and soul. One basic difficulty is that the physical imagery may lead the reader to believe that the rabbis are formally speculating about ideas of body and soul, while their intent may merely be a homiletical one.

The classic positions of the aggada when referring to the soul have much to do with how the soul, separated from the body, was given to Adam at his creation.[6] The soul departs the body at death, only to be reunited with it at the time of the resurrection.[7]

---

[1]Sanhedrin 91a
[2]Betzah 16a
[3]Niddah 31a
[4]Tanhuma Vayikra 11
[5]Ketubot 77b
[6]Ta'anit 22b
[7]Sanhedrin 90b-91a

We wish to expose our theme by presenting guf and neshama, body and soul, for what they are: two components of the human being. E. E. Urbach suggested that the Tannaim believed that man was composed of various parts. One cannot appreciate this idea without knowing the intended parts.

> The first man was entirely created by God, but the making of a man that is born is shared by partners: 'The white is from the male, out of which brain and bones and sinews are formed; and the red is from the female, out of which the skin and the flesh and the blood are made; and the spirit and the life and the soul are from the Holy One, blessed be He. Thus all three have a share in him.'[1] [2]

Thus one rabbinic conception of the body-soul relationship is founded on the desire to become aware of the differing elements of body and soul, all of which have a hand in the marriage of one element to the other. Other texts note this quite clearly.

> Rabbi Levi said: The voice of three things travels from one end of the world to the other, yet no creature hears it, e.g., the day [sun], the rain, and the soul when it departs [from the body]. From where do we know it of the day? R. Judah b. R. La'i: You may think that it glides in heaven, but it is not so, being rather like a saw which saws through wood. From where do we know it of the rain? R. Levi said: it is written, 'Deep calls to deep at the sound of your cataracts.'[3] And from where do we know it of the soul? From the story of Rabbi Samuel, the brother of Rabbi Pinhas b. Hama. [Rabbi Samuel] was a poor man and died in Sepphoris. Now his colleagues were sitting with [R. Pinhas], when something ludicrous happened and they began to laugh. [R. Pinhas] said to them: 'How unhappy is the soul of [my] brother! it breaks down cedars, it breaks down oaks, yet you sit here and do not know!'[4]

---

[1]Yerushalmi Kil'ayim 8:4
[2]Urbach, p. 218
[3]Psalm 42:8
[4]Genesis Rabbah 6:7

The rabbinic conception of body and soul draws heavily--as we note from this text--on naturalistic ideas. Sun and rain are the parallel images for the soul's departure from the body. They are seen as events that cleave the texture of creation, in the process of their happening. It is interesting that these natural phenomena are given so much weight. We seem to sense that there is much beyond human perception, especially the soul's separation from the body. The story of Rabbi Pinhas supports this thesis. He, because of his relationship with his brother, is able to sense the soul's flight from his brother's body. In his statement, R. Pinhas notes the qualities of the soul; they are very close to the description of the sun and the rain.

We also note the understanding that soul and body must exist in one place for them to succeed.[1] Indeed, in rabbinic literature, one rarely finds the two subjects mentioned separately. When one sees the subject of body mentioned alone, it is usually because the topic under consideration (ritual purity, for example) will not allow a full discussion of soul issues with it. It is also true that often when the body is mentioned the soul is an implied topic.

> Rabbi Ammi b. Abba also said: What is the meaning of, 'There is a little city. . .'[2] 'A little city' refers to the body; and 'a few men within' to the limbs; 'and there came a great king against it and besieged [it]' to the evil urge; 'and built great bulwarks against it', to sin; 'Now there was found in it a poor wise man,' to the good urge; 'and he by his wisdom delivered the city, to repentance and good deeds; 'yet no man remembered that same poor man', for when the evil urge gains dominion, none remember the good urge.[3]

---

[1]Moore, vol. 1, p. 488
[2]Ecclesiastes 9:14
[3]Nedarim 32b

The imagery here is particularly apt. The city attacked from without represents very well the hazards the body faces in attempting to defend against the assaults of enemies that have nothing to do with the soul. The citizens of the city are seen as the limbs of the body; when the king besieges the city, it is seen as a forceful attack of evil upon good. Here the role of the soul enters the scene of the story. The poor wise man is viewed as representative of the aspects of the soul: his is an implied presence, but yet very much part of the text. Through the deeds of the wise man the city is saved, but he is not remembered. Appropriate, when one considers the emphasis here on body, to the near exclusion of soul. As an appendage to the parable, the editor adds the following.

> 'Wisdom strengthens the wise more than ten mighty ones which are in the city.'[1] 'Wisdom strengthens the wise' refers to repentance and good deeds; 'more than ten mighty ones,' i.e., the two eyes, two ears, two hands, two feet, penis and mouth.[2]

A clear dichotomy exists here between the realm of the soul: that of repentance and good deeds, and the realm of the body. The elements of the body are seen as powerful, but ultimately difficult to control.

Yet despite this split, rabbinic literature makes it clear that soul must be judged for deeds committed while in harmony with the body. A difference of natures certainly exists; but the two elements work in concert.[3] Significantly, it is noted that neither soul nor body is capable of recognizing its own responsibility while apart. The rabbis note that when isolated, the two elements betray each other, and deny what appears to be the truth.

---

[1]Ecclesiastes 7:19
[2]Nedarim 32b
[3]Leviticus Rabbah 4:4

> . . .Even so will the Holy One, blessed be He, in the time to come, say to the soul: 'Why have you sinned before me?' and the soul will answer: 'O Master of the Universe, it is not I that sinned, but it is the body that sinned. Since leaving it, I am like a clean bird flying through the air. As for me, how have I sinned?' God will also say to the body: 'Why have you sinned before Me?' and the body will reply: 'O Master of the Universe, I have not sinned, it is the soul that has sinned. Since it left me, I am cast about like a stone thrown upon the ground. Have I then sinned before You?' What will the Holy One, blessed be He, do to them? He will bring the soul and force it into the body, and judge both as one. . .[1]

This dramatic passage underlines the necessity of viewing the body-soul question as a linked question. The soul protests that it was actually the body that had sinned while it remained like "a clean bird." The body protests that it was actually the soul that had sinned while it was like a "stone thrown upon the ground." There is a recognition here that there is no accurate perception on either side. One realizes that the two descriptions of the different states of being after soul and body were separated work as condensed versions of soul and body. Soul may be considered a bird only if it is free of obvious earthly constraints. Body is like a stone on the ground only if it is unenlivened by living spirit, uninspired by God. The situation that forces us to consider them together is sin. In this agadic situation, it must be explained and dealt with. Therefore soul and body are brought together. Such a unification is seen as a combination of earth and heaven.[2]

Rabbinic opinion notes clearly that human intervention is necessary in order to bring about initial (this world) combination of body and soul.[3] What is implied here is the religious duty of propagation; the activities of

---

[1]Leviticus Rabbah 4:5
[2]Ibid.
[3]Note Avodah Zarah 5a, Niddah 13b

conception and birth. Such a duty is fulfilled even if the child survives a short time. There is one opinion, however, to the contrary of this.

> If a man had children and they died, he has fulfilled, said Rabbi Huna, the duty of propagation. Rabbi Yohanan said: He has not fulfilled it. 'R. Huna said: He fulfilled' because [he follows the tradition] of Rabbi Assi. For R. Assi stated: The Son of David [Messiah] will not come before all the souls in Guf [region inhabited by souls of unborn] will have been disposed of, since it is said, 'For the spirit that unwraps itself is from Me. . .'[1] [2]

Hence, human beings may (depending on one's interpretation) take an active part in the assigning of souls to bodies. This passage is also fascinating in its view of infants as whole human beings, with both body and soul. Also, one notes the locution "guf" as a proposed mythic area where unborn souls are kept. Developing this usage, it is possible to understand that souls go from the general region of "guf" at birth, to individual bodies that also encase each soul. The activity of human beings here is seen as obviously essential, for only they can conceive the bodies into which the souls are placed. In this understanding, there is a strong partnership with the Divine in achieving His ends. The commonality of soul before birth becomes a community of souls once birth has taken place.

Rabbinic caution leads the sages to avoid overstressing the beauty of the soul encased in a body. There is a heavy emphasis on how many ways a soul may not be represented well by the fallible body. Also the soul may testify against the body.

> A man's soul testifies against him, for it is said: 'Keep the doors of your mouth from her that lies in your bosom.'[3] What is it that

---

[1] Isaiah 57:16
[2] Yevamot 62a
[3] Micah 7:5

> lies in a man's bosom? You must say, it is the soul. Rabbi Zerika said: Two ministering angels that accompany him testify against him, for it is said: 'For He will give His angels charge over you, to keep you in all your ways.'[1] But the sages say: A man's limbs testify against him, for it is said: 'Therefore you are My witnesses, says the Lord, and I am God.'[2] [3]

There is a mutuality of suspicion here, a sense that both body and soul are eternally at odds, offering up evidence against the other. There is also the sense--if one notes the prooftexts--that witnessing and keeping charge are appropriate duties for body and soul. The pitting of one against the other is seen as correct, needful. Man is seen as in eternal danger of sinning, and the body-soul relationship is a set of checks and balances.

Indeed, these checks seem to suggest that no human being was enabled to alter his soul. One was allowed to recognize it, perceive it, make use of it, but not to change or destroy it. Moses's mortality is used as an example of this concept--his gifts were bound by the length of his life.[4] It is not possible to alter the soul because one cannot locate or name it.

> Another explanation: Rabbi Eliezer b. Jacob said: No man has power over his own soul to destroy it. Why? Because God has caused it to permeate the whole body. Had God concentrated it into one limb, then if a man found himself in trouble he would cut off that limb and die. Therefore it is spread throughout the whole body, that he should not be able to destroy it. This is the force of, 'There is no man that has power over the spirit.'[5] [6]

---

[1]Psalm 91:11
[2]Isaiah 43:12
[3]Hagigah 16a
[4]Sotah 13b
[5]Ecclesiastes 8:8
[6]Deuteronomy Rabbah 9:3

The inability of the human being in locating the soul suggests that he is caught up (from the rabbinic perspective) in an ongoing clash of opposites. Although man has the ability to cooperate in placing soul within body, through the mechanics of conception and birth, he cannot change it. The rabbinic notion of consciousness is dependent on the recognition of all the safeguards placed against human discovery of what cannot be altered. It is clear that part of the desire on the rabbinic side was to restrict human self-definition. The underlying assumption is that God is the definer.

In this section it is necessary to explore the conjunctive images of body and soul that appear in rabbinic literature. "Conjunctive" here means the sense of two paired images, that are by meaning interrelated. Body and soul are often viewed by rabbinic authority as conjoint, inseparable. It is this "married" sense of the body-soul relationship that is vital to explore.

> [The origin of God's knowledge should be clear to them] from the following parable: One who was wedded to the king's daughter used to rise every day early in the morning and salute the king, and the king would say to him: 'Thus and so you did in your house. At such and such a time you were angry. At such a time you struck your servants,' and so on, concerning every single act. The man would then go forth and say, to the people of the palace: 'Who told [the king] what I have done? How does he know?' Thereupon they would reply: 'Fool, you are wedded to his daughter, and you ask, "From where does he know?" His daughter tells him.[1]

This parable occurs in a passage concerned with the process of God's discovering what human beings have done. Records of men's doings are received by God from His messengers. The purpose of this reporting is the acknowledged eventuality of God's judging men. Reprovement must be received with astonishment on man's part.[2] The marriage envisioned in the parable is one between body and soul. The husband represents the body, and the king's daughter, the soul. The soul is ever in communication with God, despite the body's ignorance of this fact. There is no possibility of keeping one's doings from the soul, and by extension, from God.

The important point here is that the relationship presented in the text is a conjoint one; body and soul are not presented as separate entities. There

---

[1]Pesikta Rabbati 8:2
[2]Ibid.

is a continual interplay between body and soul, with the focus of the interplay placed on the wrongs the body may commit. It is clear that everything the body does in connection with the soul must ultimately be heard by God.

This pattern of oversight on God's part leads, in other texts to a strongly deterministic cast in God's judgement.[1] We might have foreseen this in our previous text, because of the strong stress on misdeeds in human behavior. It is almost predicted that man's behavior will be along these lines.

> 'For the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth. . .'[2] Rabbi Yudan said: This is written (from his awakening), which means, from when he awakes to the world. [Antoninus] asked [R. Judah ha-Nasi] further: 'When is the soul planted in man?' 'When he leaves his mother's womb,' he replied. 'Leave meat without salt for three days,' [Antoninus] said, 'will it not putrefy? Rather, when his destiny is determined.' [R. Judah ha-Nasi] agreed with him, for Writings too support him: 'All the while my soul is in me, and the spirit of God is in my nostrils,'[3] while it is written, 'And Your providence has preserved my spirit'[4]: when did You place the soul in me? When You did determine my fate.[5]

The rabbis are troubled by the unequal balance between body and soul, and the apparent necessity of keeping such a close watch on man's urges. Human evil is implanted in the body with the soul, according to our text. There is disagreement as to the time of the planting. The soul's accession to the body either occurs at birth, or as is later commonly agreed, at the time when one's destiny is determined. The mention of the salting of

---

[1]Note Numbers Rabbah 13:4, Kiddushin 30b
[2]Genesis 8:21
[3]Job 27:3
[4]Ibid. 10:12
[5]Genesis Rabbah 34:10

meat is made to suggest that even the fetus in the womb has a soul. The agreed point-of-view, that the soul enters the body when the destiny is determined, presents us with a body-soul relationship heavily weighted in the direction of divine influence. Yet it is also abundantly clear that the body-soul relationship itself is one of very close cooperation. Struggle as they might, body and soul are irrevocably tied together. Judgment is intended to fall on both elements, as a unit.

Many texts teach also, that full consciousness is only attained through the willing combination of body and soul. This problem is usually approached from a historical perspective.

> Rabbi Aha said: When the righteous wish to dwell in tranquillity in this world, Satan comes and accuses them: They are not content with what is in store for them in the world-to-come, but they wish to dwell at ease even in this world! The proof lies in the fact that the patriarch Jacob wished to live at ease in this world, whereupon he was attacked by Joseph's Satan; thus 'Jacob dwelt in the land of his father's sojournings. . .'[1] 'I was not at ease, neither was I quiet. . .'[2] 'I was not at ease'--from Esau; 'Neither was I quiet'-- from Laban; 'Neither had I rest'-- through Dinah; 'And trouble came'-- through Joseph. . .[3]

Although cooperation is suggested here between body and soul, tranquillity is not mentioned. The textual suggestion here is that Jacob was a righteous man, and thus promised tranquillity in the world-to-come. Yet yoked to that suggestion is the intimation that body and soul will not provide ease in this world. In the ever watchful communication between body and soul, the historical inevitability is that Jacob will experience

---

[1]Genesis 37:1
[2]Job 3:26
[3]Genesis Rabbah 34:3

unease. The relationship between body and soul is a dynamic one, working itself out through human history, human events and emotions.

Rabbinic opinion stresses the incapability of man, through his senses, to perceive his world clearly. Moreover, this problem affects human ability to understand God's will and what is intended for the human soul. Though body and soul are yoked together, most human beings are unaware of it.

> Rabbi Judah b. R. Simon interpreted the verse ('If a woman has an issue of her blood many days. . .'[1]) as referring to the disciples of the wise. One verse says: 'Black like a raven. . .'[2], while another verse says, 'His aspect is like Lebanon [i.e., white], excellent as the cedars.'[3] It is, moreover, written, 'The appearance of them is like torches, they run back and forth like the lightning.'[4] All these descriptions refer to disciples of the wise. They may appear ungainly and black in this world, but in the world-to-come their appearance will be like that of torches.[5]

The apparent impurity of the woman during menstruation is used as an image that is deceptive. It seems like an entirely bodily issue, but is not. So, too, with the various descriptions of the appearances of the disciples of the wise. In this world, no human being may perceive clearly essences of divine creation. It is only in the next world that appearances will match essences. This text bears heavily on the body-soul relationship, because we are forced to ask, "How is the soul to be perceived by the fallible body?"

> Rabbi Samuel b. Isaac interpreted the verse as referring to some sections of the Torah which, though they appear too repulsive and somber for reciting in public, such as the laws

---

[1]Leviticus 15:25
[2]Song 5:11
[3]Ibid. 5:15
[4]Nahum 2:15
[5]Leviticus Rabbah 19:3

> relating to issues, leprosy, and childbirth, 'they are'--so says the Holy One, blessed be He--'pleasing to Me,' as it is said, 'The offering of Judah and Jerusalem shall be pleasant to the Lord.'[1]
> [2]

The answer appears to be that the body is not expected to perceive the soul precisely. This text is yet a reassuring one, suggesting that despite the manifold fallibilities of the body, serving divine rule is in itself an answer. Body and soul are not intended as perfect matches, indeed the imagery informs us that the soul is the superior entity. In addition, every text drills home the reflexive need of body for soul. This contradiction is not truly answered--we get a text telling us that the reality of the problem is beyond human ken.

Elsewhere there are suggestions of the soul being an eternal creation, while the body was created separately. There is again the sense of God's creation of human beings as a work of craft, while the creation of the soul is on a different level entirely.

> He took counsel with the souls of the righteous, as it is written, 'These were the makers, and those that dwelt among plantations and hedges; there they dwelt with the king in his work.'[3] 'These were the makers': they are so termed on account of the verse, 'Then the Lord formed man. . .'[4] 'And those that dwelt among plantations' corresponds to 'And the Lord God planted a garden eastward. . .'[5] . . .'There they dwelt with the king in his work': with the supreme King of kings, the Holy One, blessed be He, sat the souls of the righteous with whom He took counsel before creating the world.[6]

---

[1]Malachi 3:4
[2]Leviticus Rabbah 19:3
[3]I Chronicles 4:23
[4]Genesis 2:7
[5]Ibid. 2:8
[6]Genesis Rabbah 8:7

It is unclear who the "righteous" are who are mentioned here. It is fitting, with the many texts dealing with body and soul from the point of view of after death, that the identity of these souls remain obscure. Yet, for us, the most important point is the apparent superiority of soul over body, in that the creation of the body is seen as far more complex--it must be combined with the soul. This issue of creation remains a very difficult one throughout all of rabbinic literature.

> Said the Holy One, blessed be He: 'Behold I will create him in [My] image and likeness, [so that he will partake] of the [character of the] celestial beings, while he will procreate, [after the nature] of the terrestial beings.'[1]

The creation of man, using both body and soul, seems to reflect this conflict. Body and soul have very different qualities: the body necessary in order to procreate, but also very inaccurate, and the soul bearing the stamp of the divine, of the celestial. In addition, there is the issue of the requirements that God is setting up for His creation.

> R. Tifdai said in R. Aha's name: The Holy One, blessed be He, said: 'If I create him of the celestial elements he will live [forever] and not die, and if I create him of the terrestial elements, he will die and not live [in a future life]. Therefore I will create him of the upper and of the lower elements: if he sins he will die; while if he does not sin, he will live.'[2]

This text sets up the essential problems inherent in the creation of a non-divine creature, who, nonetheless, would have a soul partaking of the divine realm. The human being cannot live forever, yet if he is only body, then he will die. One of the requirements is that the human being live and be

---

[1]Genesis Rabbah 8:11
[2]Ibid.

able to have another existence in the world-to-come. Therefore, the compromise: a conjoined creation of both terrestial body and celestial soul, its life dependent on its avoidance of sin.

The relative paucity of texts concerned with strictly body-soul issues (with no recourse to other themes, such as resurrection or redemption) suggests that it may be possible to view those texts that exist within the grouping of body-soul issues as a set apart, standing on their own. If we do so, what theological lessons may be drawn from them?

First, if one views these texts as central to any discussion of rabbinic thought then one might be able to make theological constructs that depend on the pairs' (body and soul) necessity for each other. In most of the body-soul texts we have examined, there is an insistence on a vital communication between the two elements in the relationship. This pair structure remains an unusual one (note the larger number of texts that resolve themselves into triadic structures). Yet when they are considered alone, these pair structures have their own stability. The relative fewness of these texts may reflect a disinclination on the part of the rabbis to use thinking that does not lead to applications.

Second, we find body and soul usually discussed with reference to resurrection. One might be led to believe that ideas about body and soul were generated by discussions of resurrection, simply because we don't find the terms body and soul occurring alone very often. A theological construct based on this idea might focus on the primary doctrine of eschatology for the rabbis, resurrection. One might be led to think that it is a theologically invalid statement, to consider resurrection without including in that discussion mentions of body and soul. A construct such as that suggests a highly rigorous thought pattern on the part of the rabbis.

Third, it is possible that the focus on finding links between the three elements being considered is ultimately incomplete. Since many rabbinic texts operate within a world view that commonly agreed upon, the choice of the three elements being studied may only make sense within an even larger frame of reference. (such as eschatology in rabbinic times)

This chapter will be concerned with the thematic connections between the subjects of resurrection of the dead, and ideas about body and soul. There are close ties in rabbinic thinking between these two areas, because discussion about resurrection necessarily leads one to talk about the connection between body and soul, and most discussion of body-soul issues will confront the issues of resurrection of the dead. Yet a discussion of thematic connections is bound to be enriching, because the rabbis were wont to make comments about body and soul that did not necessarily impinge on other, larger issues. In deriving the doctrine of resurrection from the Torah, the rabbis let their ideas about body and soul come out.

> It has been taught: Rabbi Meir said: From where do we know resurrection from the Torah? From the verse, 'Then Moses and the children of Israel will sing this song to the Lord.'[1]: not sang but will sing is written; thus resurrection is taught in the Torah. Similarly, one reads, 'Then Joshua will build an altar to the Lord God of Israel.'[2]: not built but will build is written: so resurrection is taught in the Torah. If so, 'Then did Solomon build a high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab.'[3]: does that also mean that he will build? There the Bible regards him as though he had built.[4]

These basic activities in praise of God are all physical in the extreme; from singing to building an altar. But the concentration on the tense of the verb suggests that we are looking at a historical examination of these particular activities. Looking both into the past and far into the future may allow us to say that the concentration in this text is not on the physicality of the activities, but on the weight bodily activities have when viewed from a

---

[1]Exodus 15:1
[2]Joshua 8:30
[3]I Kings 11:7
[4]Sanhedrin 91b

perspective of soul.[1] That is, although resurrection of the dead has been defended and justified here, the text inherently comments on the relationship between the active body (in praising God) and the passive soul (in providing justification of the body's activities).

Other texts note the simultaneous activities of reward (for the righteous) that fall both upon the shell of the body and the soul that awaits rebirth, at the end of time.[2] The emphasis on praise is continued, so that one may view the time of death as a time of separation, but with the recognition of the ultimate unity of body and soul.

> Rabbi Tanhuma bar R. Abba began his discourse as follows: 'Holy men exult in glory; they sing for joy upon their beds. . .'[3] On account of what glory will men who are holy presume to exult? On account of the glory which the Holy One, blessed be He, bestows upon them at the time of their departure from the world. In the world's use, when a man dies, his sons, if he has sons, attend him. But the Holy One, blessed be He, would not have it only thus, for as R. Isaac said: The Holy One Himself. . .attends the holy. And the proof? 'Your righteous one will go before you. . .'[4] [5]

The praise that has been associated thus far with resurrection is extended here. When the righteous die, God provides glory as a bestowal to them--this glory is what provides us our theme. Within this aura of God's presence, the righteous die and praise God. As much as the initial Psalm text seems to speak of bodily praise, i.e., singing--one also gets the message that body and soul, although separated at death, are linked in a sympathetic

---

[1]Note Yalkut Shimoni, Ps. 889
[2]Midrash Tehillim 30:3
[3]Psalm 149:5
[4]Isaiah 58:8
[5]Pesikta Rabbati 2:3

pairing, foreseeing the eventual resurrection. The text notes that a man's sons usually care for him at the time of his death. Yet it is also true that God Himself will care for the righteous, at the same time, recognizing the soul present in the failing body. This activity could be seen as a foreshadowing of the care that will be bestowed, at the time of the eventual resurrection and revivification.[1]

> Rabbi Bisni, Rabbi Aha, and Rabbi Yohanan in Rabbi Meir's name said: The soul fills the body, and when man sleeps it ascends and draws life for him from above. Rabbi Levi said in R. Hanina's name: It repeatedly ascends. For every breath which a man takes he must give praise to the Holy One, blessed be He. What is the reason? 'Let every neshamah (breath) praise the Lord.'[2], which means, for every breath [let one praise Him].[3]

This text reiterates many of the themes we heard previously. However, this particular text does not openly speak of resurrection. Rather, it is one of the more uncommon texts that speaks only about the body-soul relationship. During life, the soul fills the body, but the soul escapes the body and revivifes both itself and the body. This is clearly a parallel of the previous text, with its discussion of what happens at the moment of death. Hence our relating the body-soul relationship of the living person to that of the dying is quite appropriate; indeed, it seems to be an inevitable extension. The further relation of soul to breath makes it possible to extend the imagery of connection between soul and body to thematic concerns. In life a person must praise God for the breaths he takes, the text tells us. How much the more (we could say) that a similar body-soul relationship pervades death and the moments after that event.

---

[1]Prps. similarly, Ecclesiastes Rabbah 9:5
[2]Psalm 150:6
[3]Genesis Rabbah 14:9

> Rabbi Isaac said: [God promised Abraham]: 'I will set you as a blessing in the Eighteen Benedictions. Yet you do not know whether Mine is first or yours is first.' (Gevurot is Mine; 'Avot is yours) Rabbi Aha said in R. Ze'ira's name: Yours is before Mine; after having recited 'the shield of Abraham', we then recite 'who resurrects the dead.'[1]

Using the example of one of the patriarchs, the text at hand notes the promise that rabbinic literature says God made to Abraham. The judgement of Rabbi Aha, placing "Your" blessing before "My" blessing, suggests a natural progression. Abraham must have existed before the lessons of resurrection may be applied to him. The deferral of God's blessing to Abraham's blessing stresses the importance of resurrection in the rabbinic world-view. The placing of the two blessings at the head of the Eighteen Benedictions could be read as an equating of the bodily promise of resurrection with the divine emphasis on the inclusion of the divine part of that human soul in the eventual resurrection.

We find places in rabbinic literature where the two themes--that of resurrection, and that of body-soul questions--come together, and there is no clear distinguishing between the strands of belief. When that happens many of the attendant issues of the two themes become clear.

> So with the Holy One, blessed be He: concerning the bodies of the righteous He says, 'He enters into peace, they rest in their beds.'[2], while concerning their souls He says, 'yet the soul of my Lord will be bound up in the bundle of life with the Lord your God.'[3] But concerning the bodies of the wicked He says, 'There is no peace says the Lord, to the wicked.'[4], while concerning their

---

[1]Genesis Rabbah 39:11
[2]Isaiah 57:2
[3]I Samuel 25:29
[4]Isaiah 48:22

> souls He says, '. . . and the souls of your enemies, he will sling them out, as from the hollow of a sling.'[1] [2]

This is a very clear presentation of the division between those who will be resurrected, and those who will not. It hinges on the difference between the righteous and the wicked. Yet what we wish to notice here is the erasure of any distinction among the themes of resurrection, and of the body-soul relationship. The situations for the righteous and the wicked are neatly laid out, but it is a drama in which body and soul are defined by two aspects of the drama. First, there is the immediate desire to see body and soul in a situation that does not necessarily depend on a resurrection theme. That is clearly achieved, for the text can be read as a discussion of the different qualities of body and soul, without recourse to discussion of resurrection. Second, one may read the text as being entirely about resurrection. That is possible because of the intent of the text, and the passage's context, being in a larger passage whose subject is the resurrection of the dead.

> Rabbi Simeon b. Halafta went to greet Rabbi every new moon. When he had grown old he was no longer able to go. One day he did go. Rabbi asked him: 'What is the matter that you have not been coming up to me as you used to do?' R. Simeon answered: 'The distant have become near and the near have become distant, two have turned into three, that which makes peace in the home has ceased. (he describes the physical ailments of aging) . . . 'Because man goes to his eternal home.'[3] It says not 'eternal home', but 'his eternal home' which teaches us that every righteous man has an eternity of his own.[4]

---

[1] I Samuel 25:29
[2] Shabbat 152b
[3] Ecclesiastes 12:5
[4] Leviticus Rabbah 18:1

In the description here in this text of aging and its maladies, Rabbi Simeon appears to be speaking of purely physical ailments, and from the immediate point-of-view of the text, he is. However, his aim is to describe also that, for the righteous, the difficulties of aging are a foretelling, a promise, of the eventual rebirth and resurrection at the end of time. The reward of eternal life is seen here as a reward for each righteous individual. The reward comes upon both body and soul, for our text here does not distinguish between the two elements. This lack of distinguishing leads to a unification of the themes we have been discussing. As before, what we read is the explication of a steady belief in a resurrection in which body and soul, although separate elements, may be viewed as one. From our point-of-view, we can see this text as a thematic simplification, yet preserving other ideas of body and soul.

> 'If what is made with the breath of a mere mortal can be repaired, how much the more that which is made with the breath of the Holy One, blessed be He!' R. Isaac said: It is not written, 'You shall dash them in pieces like earthen vessels,' but, 'Like a potter's vessels,'[1] which means, those which have not yet been baked, so that they can be reformed [when broken].[2]

This text, which concentrates on the probability of resurrection, uses the imagery of craftswork to make its point. For our purposes, there is the insistence on God's creation being radically unlike that of human purposes. Yet, as we have read, rabbinic opinion suggests that body and soul will be resurrected, intimating to us that the repair of the vessels mentioned above includes both themes that have been under discussion here.

---

[1]Psalm 2:9
[2]Genesis Rabbah 14:7

In this chapter the notion of shared theological constructs between the two themes of body-soul relationships and resurrection of the dead will be discussed. In rabbinic literature, the understanding of body and soul relations standing both apart from, and within, the idea of the resurrection of the dead may be found.[1] What must be understood from the outset is that the sense of limits that one might expect to see between the two themes is largely an artificial construction. What can be proposed in its place is an understanding of common theology that the two themes do share.

> What is the implication of the text, 'The Lord of hosts; He is the King of glory. Selah.'?[2] It signifies that He gives a share of his own glory to those that fear Him. How do you prove this? He is called God, and He called Moses a god; 'See, I have set you in the role of god to Pharaoh.'[3] He revives the dead, and He gave a share of His glory to Elijah so that he also revived the dead; as is proved by the text, 'And Elijah said: See, your son lives. . .'[4] [5]

This text is ostensibly about resurrection, and how God controls it. But it is also interested in the granting of power to human beings. When the text speaks of glory to be imbued in human beings, it is possible to recognize that this language is very close to that used when rabbinic literature speaks of the soul being placed in the body. For this text can be read on both levels--both that of God's, and some human beings' abilities at resurrection, and also as a description of the soul-body relationship. For when the soul and body are described, we learn something of the theology inherent here.

---

[1]Sanhedrin 90b-91a
[2]Psalm 24:9
[3]Exodus 7:1
[4]I Kings 17:23
[5]Numbers Rabbah 15:13

Resurrection as it is described here carries a flavor of God's glory, and does not communicate to us very well how the human role is to be viewed. Yet by stating that there were human beings who perhaps had the power to revivify people, we are given the message that often what is meant in rabbinic texts as resurrection, is really a sharing of God's power. The body and soul are at the heart of this sharing; resurrection is to include the inclusion of soul into body, as it was during life.

> Rabbi Tifdai said in Rabbi Aha's name: The celestial beings were created in the image and likeness [of God] and do not procreate, while the terrestial creatures procreate but were not created in [His] image and likeness. The Holy One, blessed be He, said: 'Behold, I will create [him] in [My] image and likeness; [so he will partake] of the [character of the] celestial beings, while he will procreate [as is the nature] of the terrestial beings.'[1]

It is made clear through this text that there are very significant differences between celestial and terrestial beings. This text gives us a background for the rabbis' thinking about both resurrection and body-soul issues.[2] The celestial creatures have the advantage of being in God's likeness, while the terrestial creatures have the advantage of being able to procreate. This text is useful because it becomes clear that in the human arena, any body-soul relation is the result of a compromise between two different modes of creation. Resurrection, too, requires compromise; it is not enough to consider merely the body, or just the soul.

> Rabbi Tifdai said in Rabbi Aha's name: The Lord reasoned: 'If I create him of the celestial elements he will live [forever] and not die; while if I create him of the terrestial elements, he will die and not live [in a future life]. Therefore I will create him of

---

[1]Genesis Rabbah 14:3
[2]Note also Leviticus Rabbah 14:9

> the upper and the lower elements; if he sins he will die, and if he dies he will live [in the future life].'[1]

The compromise is baldly stated here. There are many considerations having to do with creation that had to be outlined. God's reasoning was that there was no possibility of allowing man to live forever; yet he must be allowed to die, and to be reborn. The theology that lies between these two positions is the essence of the problem between body and soul. Man is created out of a compromise, and his body and soul represent this compromise. The mechanics of resurrection suggest that there were a number of possible ways to interpret the compromise as outlined here. Soul had to be given its place in a revivified body, but the process of that resurrection had many options, dependent on the rabbis speaking. They were also insistent on seeing a soul that was independent of the body during life, but they reined this in through also insisting on the inseparability of life if one of the two elements were missing. We can envision the outline of rabbinic thought if we consider a three-footed table, supported by body, soul, and resurrection. These three elements had to be considered simultaneously.

> Another comment: 'And the Lord remembered Sarah.'[2] There are three keys that the Holy One, blessed be He, entrusts to no creature--not to an angel, nor to a seraph, nor even to a troop [of seraphim]--but are kept in His own hand: the key of rain, as is said 'The Lord will open to you His good treasure the heaven to give the rain of your land in its season.'[3] ; the key of resurrection, 'Behold, I will open your graves. . .'[4] ; and the key

---

[1]Genesis Rabbah 14:3
[2]Genesis 21:1
[3]Deuteronomy 28:12
[4]Ezekiel 37:12

> of the womb, 'And the Lord remembered Sarah.'[1] And further, 'And God remembered Rachel. . .and opened her womb.'[2] [3]

It is not insignificant that God, in remembering Sarah, remembers items that are important to all human beings. The theological construct, the triplet that was mentioned before, of body, soul, and resurrection, is reflected here in a construct, a triplet built for parallel, albeit different reasons. Here they are the keys that God entrusts to no creature. All of them have some bearing, in a direct way, on the survival or conduct of human life on earth. Rain, without which no living thing could survive; the womb, on whose fertility and safety human life depends; and resurrection, because in rabbinic thinking this activity was seen to extend from the two other elements.

The three elements we have just viewed in the text stand in close relationship to each other, because they are all related to life or life-giving activities. So too, the three elements of body, soul, and resurrection may be seen to stand together, either because they are mentioned together, or because they imply each other. Our triads represent varying patterns of thought in rabbinic thinking. In the case of body, soul, and resurrection, the triad represents an implied theology, an agreed communication between the divine level and human beings.

> Rabbi Simai used to say further: Both the soul and body of creatures created from heaven are from heaven; both the soul and body of those creatures created from the earth are from earth, except for that one creature, man, whose soul is from the heaven and whose body is from the earth. Therefore, if man lives by the Torah and performs the will of his Father in

---

[1]Ibid.
[2]Genesis 30:22
[3]Pesikta Rabbati 42:7

> heaven, he is like the heavenly creatures, as it is said, 'I said, you are godlike beings, and all of you sons of the Most High.'[1] But if he does not live by the Torah and does not perform the will of his Father in heaven, he is like the creatures of the earth, as it is said, 'Nevertheless, you shall die like Adam.'[2] [3]

The early part of this midrash reiterates what we have heard, but defines the soul-body relationship even more clearly. Man's soul is from heaven, his body from earth. Yet what is more interesting is the instruction on how human beings are to earn heavenly rewards. The contrasting rewards are stated clearly, and one would not be exaggerating to say that a reward of keeping the Torah and God's commands would be resurrection. At one end of the scale, human beings are capable of being like heavenly creatures, and at the other end, one may die like Adam, the first man. What is not said is the judgment of Adam that places him on a lower level than human beings at other times. It seems that Psalm 82 is making a judgment of what Adam was not morally capable of, and applying it to all other men. The author of Sifre then extends it into an aggadic composition.

This text links the triadic theological construct that has been mentioned into even tighter connection. When body and soul are placed in close relationship, as happens in the previous text, we may expect to find some evidence or expectation of the concept of resurrection. Yet it is also true that in rabbinic literature we may find signs of those who violated this triadic relationship.

> While he (a traveller) was eating some bread he observed two birds quarreling with one another. One of them killed the other, then went at fetched some herb and, placing it on its mouth,

---

[1]Psalm 82:6
[2]Psalm 82:7
[3]Sifre Deuteronomy, Piska 306

> brought it back to life. The man went and, taking that same herb as which had fallen from the bird, set out to resuscitate the dead. On reaching Tyre he found a prostrate lion lying dead. He placed the herb on his mouth and and brought him back to life. The lion rose and devoured him.[1]

The account here demonstrates a misunderstanding of the act of resurrection and the subsequent punishment of the person who violates this trust. The construct that was demonstrated before, that of body, soul, and resurrection, was clearly violated on the part of the traveller. As human being, he had body and soul, but he was not entrusted with resurrection. In a sense the traveller was set up as an example of one who did not have enough training to understand his place in the world, and to see where God's place was. The validity of the construct as I have presented it depends on human recognition of the theological background of the elements.

> Rabbi Tanhuma Berabbi began his discourse by quoting 'The spirit of man is the lamp of the Lord, searching all the inward parts. . .'[2], and then citing R. Aha's comment: As to kings of flesh and blood come agents who inform each king of each and every matter, so, likewise, to the Holy One, blessed be He, come agents who report each and every matter that a man does, whether in secret, or in the dark, or at night.[3]

Soul's relationship to the body is sketched out here, in the sense that there is truly nothing that is hidden from the soul, or from God. Yet this text also extends the idea of the joining of resurrection to the two other elements, because the revivifying quality of God's ability is reflected in what superintending powers He presents during the earthly lives of human beings. Indeed, the extent of the theological construct that I have presented

---

[1]Numbers Rabbah 18:22
[2]Prov. 20:27
[3]Pesikta Rabbati 8:2

is a very wide one, and the text just presented reflects much of the potential of that construct.

I believe that this study has suggested three clearly definable conclusions.

First, the texts presented have suggested the extent and complexity of rabbinic ideas about eschatology. The method was a selective winnowing of aggadic texts, in order to arrive at a clear picture of rabbinic opinion having to do with two themes: resurrection of the dead, and body and soul ideas. I chose texts that were most representative, without leaving out any vital area of discussion. In the course of my study, I found that there was an enormous amount of repetition of the same or similar themes. In the interest of clarity, I chose to find the most representative texts. The lack of systematized thought has been surprising to me. These aggadic texts present a number of different, competing ideas about eschatology.

Second, what I had thought would be a thesis about rabbinic speculation in intellectually stimulating fields became, rather, a thesis about the application of rabbinic thought to a problem that was for those rabbis a day-to-day problem, as real as the rain or the birth of a child. Resurrection was not for rabbinic thinkers a possible theory; it was a reality. Body and soul speculation, although occasionally found on its own, represents, more accurately, a subset of the resurrection problem. These findings suggest a working theory that is also a contradiction of sorts: speculation about resurrection was a non-systematic, non-unified progression of ideas that was not averse to adopting common cultural thought patterns and parables that helped to explain resurrection more clearly.

Third, I have been struck by the felicity of many of the ways in which resurrection, body and soul, and their interconnections have been presented.

This aggadic material succeeds both on a rhetorical and literary level. The authors were interested both in plausibility and, most oddly, fantasy of the most stunning sort. That combination was a very bracing one. I found the entire experience to be work of the most joyful and exercising kind.

Bibliography

1. Baab, Otto J., The Theology of the Old Testament, New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949.

2. Bialik, H. N. (editor), Sefer Ha Agadah, Tel Aviv: Devir Publishing, 1956.

3. Bible, The New Testament, Revised Standard Version, New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1957.

4. Birnbaum, Philip (translator), Daily Prayer Book, New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, 1949.

5. Boros, Ladislaus, The Mystery of Death, New York: Herder and Herder, 1965.

6. Braude, William G., (translator), The Midrash on Psalms, (2 vols.), New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962.

7. Braude, William G., and Kapstein, Israel J., (translators), Pesikta de-Rab Kahana, Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1975.

8. Braude, William G., (translator), Pesikta Rabbati, (2 vols.), New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.

9. Braude, William G., and Kapstein, Israel J., (translators), Tanna Debe Eliyyahu, Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1981.

10. Buber, S., (editor), Midrash Mishle, Vilna.

11. Buber, S., (editor), Midrash Tanhuma, Vilna, 1913.

12. Buber, S., (editor), Midrash Tehillim, Vilna, 1890.

13. Buber, S., (editor), Pesikta de-Rab Kahana, Vilna, 1925.

14. Bultmann, Rudolf, Life and Death, London: Block, 1965.

15. Burrows, Millar, An Outline of Biblical Theology, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946.

16. Cohen, A., (editor), Everyman's Talmud, New York: E.P. Dutton, 1949.

17. Danby, Herbert (translator), The Mishnah, London: Oxford University Press, 1958.

18. Encyclopedia, The Jewish (12 vols.), New York: Funk and Wagnall, 1905.

19. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Hastings, James, (editor), New York: Scribner, 1916.

20. Finkelstein, F., The Pharisees, New York: 1962.

21. Friedlander, Gerald (translator), Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1916.

22. Friedman, M. (editor), Pesikta Rabbati, Vienna, 1880.

23. Friedman, M. (editor), Sifre, Vienna, 1864.

24. Gaster, Moses, The Samaritans, London: Oxford University Press, 1925.

25. Ginzberg, Louis, The Legends of the Jews, (7 vols.), Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1961.

26. Glatzer, Nahum, Hammer on the Rock, New York: Schocken Books, 1962.

27. Goldin, Judah, (translator), The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955.

28. Gross, Moses David, Otzar Ha Agadah, Jerusalem: 1944.

29. Hammer, Reuven, (translator), Sifre: A Tannaitic Commentary to the Book of Deuteronomy, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

30. Ish Shalom, Meir, (editor), Pesikta Rabbati, Israel.

31. Ish Shalom, Meir, (editor), Tanna de Be Eliyyahu Raba and Tanna de Be Eliyyahu Zutra, Vienna.

32. Jastrow, Marcus, (compiler), A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, New York: Pardes Publishing House, 1950.

33. Kadushin, Max, The Rabbinic Mind, New York: Maurice Jacobs, 1952.

34. Kasowski, Chaim Joshua, Otzar Leshon Hatalmud, New York: The Ministry of Education and Culture, Government of Israel, and The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1961.

35. Kohler, Kauffman, Jewish Theology, New York: Macmillan Company, 1918.

36. Lauterbach, Jacob Z., (translator), Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael, Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1933.

37. Luria, David, (editor), Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, Vienna: David Bomberg.

38. Mandelbaum, Jacob (editor) , Pesikta de Rav Kahana, New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1962.

39. Midrash Rabbah, H. Freedman and M. Simon (editors), (10 vols.), London: Soncino Press, 1939.

40. Midrash Rabbah, Vilna edition, 1918.

41. Montefiore, C. G., and Lowe, H., A Rabbinic Anthology, Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1961.

42. Moore, George Foote, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, (2 vols.), Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

43. Otiot de Rabbi Akiva, Warsaw: Lewin Epstein Pub., 1927.

44. Pelikan, Jaroslav, The Shape of Death, New York: Abingdon Press, 1961.

45. Rahner, Karl, On the Theology of Death, West Germany: Herder and Herder, 1964.

46. Schechter, S., (editor), Abot de Rabbi Nathan, Vienna: 1887.

47. Schechter, S., Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, New York: Schocken Books, 1961.

48. Stewart, Roy, Rabbinic Theology, London: Oliver Boyd, 1961.

49. Strack, Hermann L., Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, New York: Jewish Publication Society, 1959.

50. Talmud, Babylonian, New York and Berlin: Horeb, 1925.

51. Talmud, Babylonian. New York, Shulsinger Bros., 1946.

52. Talmud, Palestinian. Krotoschin edition, New York: Shulsinger Bros., 1948.

53. Tanakh: A New Translation of the Holy Scriptures. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1985.

54. Urbach, Ephraim E., The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.

55. Von Rad, Gerhard, Old Testament Theology. New York, Harper Bros., 1962.

56. Yalkut Shimoni. New York: Title Publishing, 1944.