

“I BRING DEATH AND GIVE LIFE, I WOUND AND HEAL”  
(DEUT. 32:39)  
Two Versions of the Polemic on the Resurrection of the Dead\*

YIFAT MONNICKENDAM, *The Hebrew University, Jerusalem*

“And these are they that have no share in the world to come: he that says that there is no resurrection of the dead in the Torah.”<sup>1</sup>

“Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there is no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen? and if Christ is not risen, then our preaching is vain, and your faith is also vain.”<sup>2</sup>

These foundational words articulate the extreme importance of one of the basic principles in Judaism and Christianity in the first centuries of the Common Era. Jews and Christians, who in many cases pointed their arrows at one another, in this case shared a belief in the resurrection of the dead, and defended it, using similar claims and rhetoric, against various groups in their surroundings.

The evolution of this belief in resurrection, and the polemic it created, have been discussed in numerous studies. Separate studies on this theme in Judaism<sup>3</sup>

---

\* This article is a revised and translated version of my article, “‘I Will Put to Death and Bring to Life, I Will Smite and Heal’- Two Versions of the Polemic on the Resurrection of the Dead,” *Tarbiz* 76 (2007), pp. 329-351 (Hebrew). The Hebrew article was adapted from my MA thesis, written under the supervision of Prof. Menahem Kister and Dr. David Satran: *Resurrection of the Dead: Jews, Christians and Pagans* (MA thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2005). I would like to thank Profs. Menahem Kister, Vered Noam, Robin Darling-Young and Daniel Stoekl Ben-Ezra for their comments on this paper. Responsibility for any and all errors of form or substance is of course mine.

<sup>1</sup> *m. Sanh.* 10,1.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. 15:12-14.

<sup>3</sup> For some of the vast literature, see G. Stemberger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung: Studien zur Anthropologie und Eschatologie des palästinischen Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (ca. 170 v. C[h]r.-100 n. Chr.)* (Analecta Biblica 56; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1972); G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity* (Harvard Theological Studies 56; Cambridge: Harvard University, 2006); H. Sysling, *Tehiyat Ha-Metim: The Resurrection of the Dead in the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch and Parallel Traditions in Classical Rabbinic Literature* (Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 57; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996); C.D. Elledge, *Life after Death in Early*

and Christianity,<sup>4</sup> as well as comparative studies on the origin of the belief in the resurrection of the dead and its relationship to ancient Judaism on the one hand<sup>5</sup> and to Greek philosophy on the other,<sup>6</sup> have contributed to our understanding of this belief. Nevertheless, while the similarities and differences between the Jewish and Christian claims have been mentioned, they have not been used to aid in the understanding of the sources themselves. They have not been applied to the philological discussion on the development of the talmudic text<sup>7</sup> or been used to aid in the reading of the Christian texts.

The talmudic text is often characterized by elliptical phrasing and opaque language. It has been left ambiguous and unclear by the processes of oral transmission and continuous editing, as well as by the preservation of several

---

*Judaism: The Evidence of Josephus* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 208; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006); J.D. Levenson, *Resurrection and the Restoration of Israel: the Ultimate Victory of the God of Life* (New Haven: Yale University, 2006).

<sup>4</sup> C. Farina, *Die Leiblichkeit der Auferstandenen: ein Beitrag zur Analyse des paulinischen Gedankenganges in 1 Kor 15, 35-58* (Inaug -Diss, Würzburg, 1971); P. Perkins, *Resurrection: New Testament Witness and Contemporary Reflection* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984); G. Sellin, *Der Streit um die Auferstehung der Toten: eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung von 1 Korinther 15* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des alten und neuen Testaments 138; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986); H.E. Lona, *Über die Auferstehung des Fleisches: Studien zur frühchristlichen Eschatologie* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 66; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1993); C.W. Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336* (Lectures on the History of Religions 15; New York: Columbia University, 1995); J. Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre: Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen als Rahmenerzählungen frühchristlicher Dialoge* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 146; Berlin: Akademie, 2000).

<sup>5</sup> H.C.C. Cavallin, *Life after Death: Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor. 15* (Thesis, Gleerup, Uppsala, 1974); É. Puech, *La croyance des esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le Judaïsme ancien* (Études bibliques 21-22; Paris: Lecoffre, 1993); N.T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 3; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003); A.F. Segal, *Life after Death: A History of the Afterlife in the Religions of the West* (The Anchor Bible Reference Library; New York: Doubleday, 2004); C. Setzer, *Resurrection of the Body in early Judaism and early Christianity: Doctrine, Community, and Self-Definition* (Boston: Brill, 2004); G. Vermès, *The Resurrection* (New York: Doubleday, 2008). For a survey of methodologies in the research of the resurrection, see C.D. Elledge, "Future Resurrection of the Dead in Early Judaism: Social Dynamics, Contested Evidence," *Currents in Biblical Research* 9 (2011), pp. 394-421.

<sup>6</sup> O. Cullman, "Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?," in K. Stendahl (ed.), *Immortality and Resurrection* (New York: Macmillan, 1965), pp. 9-53; H.A. Wolfson, "Immortality and Resurrection in the Philosophy of the Church Fathers," *ibi*, pp. 54-96; A.J.M. Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection: Studies in Pauline Theology against its Graeco-Roman Background* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 44; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987).

<sup>7</sup> For the use of external literature for solving textual questions in talmudic literature, see D. Rosenthal, "חקל-דמא' – 'שדה-בוכין' על השימוש בספרות החיצונית לקביעת נוסח," *בספרות חז"ל* in *Mehqerei Talmud 2*, eds. M. Bar Asher - D. Rosenthal (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1993), pp. 490-516.

versions.<sup>8</sup> The early Christian texts, at least the texts cited in this paper, were written down closer to the time of their composition, thus putting them on safer ground in terms of their attribution, dating, and textual history. As a result, the comparison between rabbinic writings and early Christian writings may contribute to textual and philological discussions and offer new answers to questions regarding the creation and development of talmudic literature.

In this article I will discuss two versions from the Babylonian Talmud of a polemical statement on the resurrection of the dead. Both versions address the question of the corporeality of the resurrection, using a Midrash on Deut. 32:39. The similarity and difference between the two versions raises the question: is one an adaptation of the other, or are they independent statements? In an attempt to answer this question, I will study the talmudic versions in comparison with parallels from Jewish and Christian literature. This comparison will explain the relations between the two versions and position them in the wider context of the polemic on the resurrection of the body. This, in turn, will shed light on the textual relation between these two versions and ultimately present them as independent statements.

Thus, the comparison between Jewish and Christian sources will prove significant not only for understanding the evolution of the polemic on the resurrection, but also for understanding the development and editing of the talmudic text. By using a comparative discussion to shed light on a textual problem, this article will offer a new method in textual criticism.

### *Two versions in the Babylonian Talmud*

Tractates *Pesaḥim* and *Sanhedrin* of the Babylonian Talmud each contain a sequence of amoraic sayings discussing contradictions in verses on the world to come and the resurrection of the dead.<sup>9</sup> Each concludes with a

<sup>8</sup> For some of the vast literature on this topic, see J.N. Epstein, *Introduction to the Mishnaic Text* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2000), pp. 7 ff. (Hebrew); E.S. Rosenthal, "The History of the Text and Problems of Redaction in the Study of the Babylonian Talmud," *Tarbiz* 57 (1987), pp. 1-36 (Hebrew); S. Friedman, *Talmud Arukh: BT Bava Mezi'a vi* (Jerusalem: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1990), Text, pp. 7-23 (Hebrew); S. Friedman, "On the Origin of Textual Variants in the Babylonian Talmud," *Sidra* 7 (1991), pp. 67-102 (Hebrew); R. Brody, "ספרות התלמודי והגאונים והטקסט התלמודי," in *Mehqerei Talmud* 2, eds. M. Bar Asher - D. Rosenthal (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1993), pp. 237-303; A. Schremer, "Between Text Transmission and Text Redaction: Fragments of a Different Recension of TB Mo'ed-Qatan from the Genizah," *Tarbiz* 61 (1992), pp. 375-399 (Hebrew); Y. Sussmann, "תורה שבעל פה: פשוטה כמשמעה - כוחו," in *Mehqerei Talmud* 3, eds. Y. Sussmann - D. Rosenthal (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1993), pp. 294-384.

<sup>9</sup> This sequence originated in *Sanhedrin*, as indicated from the context. It belongs to a list of amoraic sayings that address contradictory eschatological verses, similar to the saying discussed here. The end of this list is also related to *Sanhedrin*, but not to *Pesaḥim*, since it closes with the sentence, "From here there is a refutation to those who say: The resurrection

Midrash by Rava<sup>10</sup> on Deuteronomy 32:39 and associates it with the resurrection. The various textual witnesses of this Midrash present two stable versions of a saying of Rava, different in wording and content, in both tractates *Sanhedrin* and *Pesaḥim*.<sup>11</sup>

of the dead is not from the Bible,” which, in *Sanhedrin* is immediately followed by a group of answers to the question, “Whence do we know resurrection from the Torah?” It seems that the opening of this section is the reason for its transfer from *Sanhedrin* to *Pesaḥim*: it begins with Ula discussing the verse, “for the youth (נער) shall die at a hundred years old” (Isa. 65:20), and previously in *Pesaḥim* we find a saying of R. Samuel the son of Naḥmani in the name of R. Jonathan, claiming that the righteous will resurrect the dead. He proves it from the story of Elisha and the child, that uses the verse, “and place my staff on the face of the youth (נער)” (2 Kings 4:29). The appearance of the same word (נער) and the similar subject in both discussions could have led to the transmission of this amoraic sequence from *Sanhedrin* to *Pesaḥim*.

<sup>10</sup> All mss. attribute this Midrash to רבא, a fourth century Babylonian Amora, who lived slightly after רב, also from Babylon. The different orthography of these names is a gaonic distinction, which did not exist in the talmudic period, see S. Friedman, “Orthography of the Names Rabbah and Rava,” *Sinai* 110 (1992), pp. 140-164; E. Wajsberg, “כתיב השמות רבה ורבא: שיטת רב האי גאון ושיטת חולקת ספר הלכות גאונים למסכת לרבה,” *Mehqarim be-Lashon* 5-6 (1992), pp. 181-214 (Hebrew); id., “The Spelling of the Name of Rava bar Yosef in the מסכת לרבה,” *Lešonenu* 57 (1992), pp. 157-173; A. Shweka, *Studies in Halakhot Gedolot: Text and Recension* (Dissertation, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2008), pp. 71-73 (Hebrew). For our purposes the exact identification is not significant.

<sup>11</sup> Tractate *Sanhedrin* is cited according to MS Jerusalem, Yad Harav Herzog 1, which is a Yemenite MS. I wish to thank Dr. Mordechai Sabato for sharing a synoptic edition of the textual witnesses of tractate *Sanhedrin* with me. For the description of the MSS, see M. Sabato, *A Yemenite Manuscript in Tractate Sanhedrin and its Place in the Text Tradition* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University and Yad Ben Zvi, 1998), pp. 7-14 (Hebrew). I followed the symbols Sabato used to designate the MSS of tractate *Sanhedrin*: **T** = MS Jerusalem, Yad Harav Herzog 1; **M** = Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek hebr. 95; **K** = Karlsruhe, Staatsbibliothek Cod. Reuchlin 2; **F** = Florence National Library 7-9 1.11; **S** = Soncino 1498; **Y** = *Yalqut Shimoni*; **H** = *Midrash HaGadol*; **A** = *Haggadot HaTalmud*, Constantinople 1511. The symbols for the MSS of tractate *Pesaḥim* are: **G** = Genizah Fragment, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York ENA 2071.13; **B** = Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek hebr. 6; **L** = Bologna, ebr. 495; **O** = Oxford, Bodleian Library opp. add. fol. 23 (Neubauer 366); **T** = Yemenite, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York Rab. 1623; **V**<sub>1</sub> = Vatican, Apostolic Library ebr. 109; **V**<sub>2</sub> = Vatican, Apostolic Library ebr. 125; **V**<sub>3</sub> = Vatican, Apostolic Library ebr. 134; **M** = Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek hebr. 95; **D** = Venice 1521. For full description, see S.G. Wald, *BT Pesaḥim III* (Jerusalem: Jewish Theological Seminary, 2000), pp. 276-281 (Hebrew); Friedman, *Talmud Arukh*, Text, pp. 57-69, 73-74 (Hebrew). I will only mention textual differences which are significant to this discussion.

**Version A**

Rava challenged: It is written: *I bring death and give life* and it is written: *I wounded and heal*.

The Holy one blessed is He said:  
to what I bring death I give life,  
as what I wound I heal.<sup>13</sup>

רַבָּא רַמִּי: כְּתִיב אֲנִי אֲמִית וְאֲחִיָּה  
וְכִתִּיב מִחַצְתִּי וְאֲנִי אֲרַפֵּא.

אָמַר הַקְּדוֹשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא: מָה שְׂאֲנִי מִמִּית  
אֲנִי מַחִיָּה,  
כְּמוֹ שֶׁמִּחַצְתִּי וְאֲנִי אֲרַפֵּא.

**Version B**

Rava challenged: It is written: *I bring death and give life* and it is written *I wounded and heal*.

If He gives life, why is healing needed?  
but so said the Holy one blessed is He:  
to what I bring death I give life,  
and afterwards what I wound I heal.<sup>12</sup>

רַבָּא רַמִּי כְּתִיב אֲנִי אֲמִית וְאֲחִיָּה  
וְכִתִּיב מִחַצְתִּי וְאֲנִי אֲרַפֵּא.  
אִי חִיּוּי מַחִיּוּ אֲסוּיִי מִבְּעִיָּא

אֵלָּא כִּךְ אָמַר הַקָּב"ה מָה שְׂאֲנִי מִמִּית אֲנִי  
מַחִיָּה  
וְהִדְרָה מָה שֶׁמִּחַצְתִּי וְאֲנִי אֲרַפֵּא

In the Bible, the first half of this verse – “See now that I, even I, am He, and there is no God beside Me” – stresses the oneness of God; the second half – “I bring death and give life, I wounded and heal, and there is none that can deliver out of My hand” – emphasizes the power of God to determine both death and life.<sup>14</sup> According to the literal meaning of this verse, the words

<sup>12</sup> *b. Pesah*. 68a according to MSS **M**, **V**<sub>1</sub>, **V**<sub>3</sub>. Though the genizah fragment of this section is torn at this point, it supports this version as well, since there is insufficient space for all the words in the question according to Version B, and the part of the answer that did survive in this fragment indicates a text similar to Version A: ...אֲנִי מַחִיָּה מָה שֶׁמִּחַצְתִּי... MS **V**<sub>2</sub> is a hybrid version, since the inner text suits Version A, but a vague gloss from a later hand: הַשְׂתָּא אַחֲרָיִי... is similar to the question according to Version B. **D**, the *editio princeps*, combines both versions and includes both the question ...הַשְׂתָּא אַחֲרָיִי... from Version B and the answer מָה מִמִּית... from Version A. The prints of tractate *Sanhedrin* and *Yalkut Shimoni*, Ha'azinu 946 (in opposite order) also added the sentence: דְּבַר אַחֲרָיִי: בְּתַחֲלָה מָה שְׂאֲנִי מִמִּית אֲנִי מַחִיָּה; וְהִדְרָה מָה שֶׁמִּחַצְתִּי וְאֲנִי אֲרַפֵּא. This sentence was added according to Rashi *ad loc*. Lemma: הַכִּי גְרַסִּינָן, who cites Rava's Version B. For Rashi's versions which have become integrated into the talmudic texts and their early sources, see V. Noam, “Early Version Traditions in Rashi's Emendations of the Talmud,” *Sidra* 17 (2000-2002), pp. 109-150 (Hebrew).

<sup>13</sup> *b. Sanh*. 91b according to MSS **A**, **H**, **T**. Other MSS lack the question: אִי חִיּוּי מַחִיּוּי מִבְּעִיָּא, but have an identical answer. **T** is the Yemenite textual witness to *Sanhedrin* and **H** is the version of *Midrash HaGadol*, which also represents a Yemenite tradition. **A**, the version found in *Haggadot HaTalmud*, is a single textual witness of a Sephardic tradition. According to Sabato, all three are witnesses of an early tradition of tractate *Sanhedrin*, see M. Sabato, *A Yemenite Manuscript*, pp. 333-343. In the MSS of *Pesahim* this version appears with minor changes in MSS **B**, **L**, **T**.

<sup>14</sup> Compare with the exegesis which is implied from the punctuation of the *Masorah*, R.I.

“I bring death and give life” describe the power of God to rule life and death, i.e., to govern human existence.<sup>15</sup> The same conclusion can be deduced from other biblical verses which use this expression<sup>16</sup> and refer to humans.<sup>17</sup> Though the literal meaning of the verse does not refer to the resurrection of the

---

Zer (Singer), “‘See then, that I, I am He’ (Deut. 32:39),” *Beit Mikra* 48 (2003), pp. 137-143 (Hebrew).

<sup>15</sup> For a discussion of this verse in its biblical context, see S.R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965), p. 378; E. Baumann, “Das Lied Mose’s (Dt. XXXII 1-43) auf Seine Gedankliche Geschlossenheit Untersucht,” *VT* 6 (1956), pp. 414-424; G.E. Wright, “The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deut 32,” in B.W. Anderson - W.J. Harrelson (eds.), *Israel’s Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg* (London: SCM, 1962), pp. 57-58; D. Rappel, “The Song of Moses,” *Beit Mikra* 13 (1968), pp. 44-45 (Hebrew); C.J. Labuschagne, “The Song of Moses: Its Framework and Structure,” in I.H. Eybers (ed.), *De fructu oris sui. Essays in honour of Adrianus van Selms* (Pretoria Oriental Series 9; Leiden: Brill, 1971), p. 97; P.C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (The New International Commentary on the Old Testament; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), pp. 388-389; J.T.A.G.M. Van Ruiten, “The Use of Deuteronomy 32:39 in Monotheistic Controversies in Rabbinic Literature,” in F. García Martínez et al. (eds.), *Studies in Deuteronomy in Honour of C.J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 53; Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 223-227 and bibliography in note 4; P. Sanders, *The Provenance of Deuteronomy 32* (Oudtestamentische Studiën 37; Leiden: Brill, 1996), p. 240, note 804; J.P. Fokkelman, *Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible: at the Interface of Hermeneutics and Structural Analysis* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 37; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1998), pp. 124-126; C.H. Williams, *I am He: The Interpretation of Aní Hú in Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 113; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), pp. 46-50. For a discussion of the complete Song of Moses and its dating, see W.F. Albright, “Some Remarks on the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy XXXII” *VT* 9 (1959), pp. 339-346; S.A. Nigosian, “Linguistic Patterns of Deuteronomy 32,” *Biblica* 78 (1997), pp. 206-224; Williams, *I am He*, pp. 42-46; R.L. Bergey, “The Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32.1-43) and Isaianic Prophecies: A Case of Early Intertextuality?” *JSOT* 28 (2003), pp. 33-54, and bibliography in note 9; M. Thiessen, “The Form and Function of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:1-43)” *JBL* 123 (2004), pp. 401-424 as a response to Wright, “The Lawsuit of God,” pp. 26-67; cf. the claim that this verse reflects a biblical belief in resurrection, L.J. Greenspon, “The Origin of the Idea of Resurrection,” in B. Halpern - J.D. Levenson (eds.), *Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1981), pp. 310-313. For further discussion of the first half of the verse, see N. Walker, “Concerning Hú and Aní Hú,” *ZAW* 33 (1962), pp. 205-206; R. Pinchover, “R. Judah says, Ani VaHu, Save Us We Pray,” *Beit Mikra* 41 (1996), pp. 168-170 (Hebrew).

<sup>16</sup> See, for example 2 Kings 5:7. For further discussion on this expression, see M. Kister, “‘Let Us Make a Man’- Observations on the Dynamics of Monotheism,” in *Issues in Talmudic Research: Conference Commemorating the fifth Anniversary of the Passing of Ephraim E. Urbach, 2 December 1996* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 2001), p. 32 (Hebrew).

<sup>17</sup> A similar expression is used in the song of Hannah: “The Lord brings death, and gives life; He brings down into Sheol, and brings up” (1 Sam. 2:6). M.H. Segal, *Sifrei Shemuel* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1968), p. 18 (Hebrew); Greenspon, “The Origin,” pp. 313-316; Cavallin, “Life after Death,” p. 23; M. Albani, “Der Herr tötet und macht lebendig: er führt in die Unterwelt hinab und wieder darauf,” *Leqach* 1 (2001), pp. 22-55, claimed this verse indicates the biblical belief in resurrection of the dead. This claim was rejected by M. Weinfeld, “The Pagan Version of Psalm 20:2-6 – Vicissitudes of a Psalmic Creation in Israel and its Neighbours” *Eretz*

dead, the words “I bring death and give life” could be easily associated with resurrection, and the verse was in fact discussed this way in the Palestinian Targumim<sup>18</sup> and possibly in the Wisdom of Solomon.<sup>19</sup>

Rava’s Midrash has two main versions. In Version B, Rava contrasts the two parts of the verse and asks why it should be written that the Lord heals if he can resurrect, since resurrection is more difficult than healing and, in any case, includes it. The answer Rava suggests solves this problem by presenting a chronological order of the acts: first God will resurrect the dead, and

---

*Israel* 18 (1985), pp. 136-137 (Hebrew); H.J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (Kommentar zum Alten Testament 8.1; Gutersloh: Mohn, 1973), p. 104. They argued that this expression refers only to the power of God to save. For a survey and discussion on belief in resurrection in the Old Testament, see Puech, *La croyance des esséniens en la vie future*, vol. 1, pp. 37-85, 303-306; Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, pp. 85-127 and notes 3-4; Cavallin, “Life after Death,” pp. 23-31; Segal, *Life after Death*, pp. 120 ff.

<sup>18</sup> See A. Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1: Targum Palestinense ms. de la Biblioteca Vaticana* (Seminario Filológico Cardenal Cisneros del Instituto Arias Montano Textos y estudios 11; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1978), p. 279 (translation: *ibi*, pp. 428, 564; M. McNamara, *Targum Neofiti 1, Deuteronomy* [The Aramaic Bible; The Targums 5A; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1997], p. 159); M.L. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch: According to their Extant Sources* (Analecta Biblica 76; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1980), vol. 1, p. 229. For a synoptic display and discussion, see Sysling, *Teḥiyyat Ha-Metim*, pp. 242-246. For further discussion, see Cavallin, “Life after Death,” pp. 186-190; Van Ruiten, “The Use of Deuteronomy 32:39,” p. 233; M.J. Bernstein, “The Aramaic Versions of Deuteronomy 32: A Study in Comparative Targumic Theology,” in P.V.M. Flesher (ed.), *Targum and Scripture: Studies in Aramaic Translations and Interpretation in Memory of Ernest G. Clarke* (Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 2; Leiden: Brill, 2002) p. 43; P.V.M. Flesher, “The Resurrection of the Dead and the Sources of the Palestinian Targums to the Pentateuch,” in J. Neusner - A.J. Avery-Peck (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity: Part 4, Death, Life-After-Death, Resurrection & The World-to-Come in the Judaism of Antiquity* (Handbuch der Orientalistik 49; Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 314-315, 322-323.

<sup>19</sup> The combination of the verbs “to bring death” and “to give life” in other biblical verses was associated in some of the apocryphal books with resurrection, for example in the reading of 1 Sam. 2:6 according to Wisdom of Solomon. In Wis. 16:13-15 the power of God is compared to the power of man: σὺ γὰρ ζωῆς καὶ θανάτου ἐξουσίαν ἔχεις καὶ κατάγεις εἰς πύλας ᾧδου καὶ ἀνάγεις. ἄνθρωπος δὲ ἀποκτέννει μὲν τῇ κακίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐξελεθὼν δὲ πνεῦμα οὐκ ἀναστρέφει οὐδὲ ἀναλύει ψυχὴν παραλημφθεῖσαν. τὴν δὲ σὴν χειρὰ φυγεῖν ἀδύνατόν ἐστιν. This wording resembles the Septuagint of 1 Sam. 2:6: Κύριος θανατοῦ καὶ ζωογονεῖ κατάγει εἰς ᾧδου καὶ ἀνάγει, thus indicating that the author of Wis. was influenced by 1 Sam. or maybe even paraphrased it intentionally, attributing to it the discussion regarding the ability of God and man to resurrect the dead. Likewise, Wis. also links the words τὴν δὲ σὴν χειρὰ φυγεῖν ἀδύνατόν ἐστιν, referring to Deut. 32:39: “and none can deliver from My hand.” Even though this does not preserve the version of the Septuagint, it might indicate that Wis. associated Deut. 32:39 with the resurrection of the dead. For the claim that Wis. discusses resurrection here, see Cavallin, “Life after Death,” p. 132. For discussion regarding the similarity between Deut. 32:39; 1 Sam. 2:6; Wis. 16:13-15 (and Tob. 13:2), see U. Schwenk-Bressler, *Sapientia Salomonis als ein Beispiel frühjüdischer Textauslegung* (Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums 32; Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1993), pp. 86-88; Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, pp. 172-173. For the claim that according to the Septuagint, Deut 32:39 refers to resurrection, see Cavallin, “Life after Death,” p. 103. For further sources associating 1 Sam 2:6 with resurrection, see *b. Sanh.* 92b; *Mekhilta D’Rabbi Ishmael* Amalek 1 (H.S. Horovitz, *Mekhilta D’Rabbi Ismael* [Jerusalem: Shalem Books, 1997], p. 178); *Pesikta Rabbati* 5 (M. Ish Shalom [Vilna: J. Kaiser, 1880], p. 15a), 21 (109b).

only later will he heal them. As we shall see, this answer seems to be a response to a heretical claim opposing the belief in the resurrection of the dead.

In Version A, Rava contrasts the two parts of the verse as well, and probes the connection between the phrases “I bring death and give life” and “I wounded and heal.” He argues that the second part of the verse explains the first – from healing we should learn about resurrection. According to Rava, just as God heals whomever he wounded, so will he resurrect whomever he killed. The purpose of the repetition is to show that the identity of the dead and resurrected person, as with the wounded and healthy person, is one and the same.<sup>20</sup>

This Midrash has several tannaitic parallels which may explain the relationship between the two versions of Rava’s saying. In both *Sanhedrin* and *Pesahim*, Rava’s teaching is followed by a *baraita*, a tannaitic source:

It was also taught: *I bring death and give life*. Could death be for one and life for another as is customary in the world? Therefore the verse states: *I wounded and heal*. Just as wounding and healing are for one, so too are death and life for one. From here there is refutation to those who say: The resurrection of the dead is not from the Torah.

תניא נמי הכי: ‘אני אמית ואחיה’ יכול תהא מיתה באחד וחיים באחד כדרך שהעולם נוהג? ת”ל: ‘מחצתי ואני ארפא’ מה מחיצה ורפואה באחד אף מיתה וחיים באחד. מכאן תשובה לאומריין אין תחיית המתים מן התורה

This *baraita* comments on the biblical verse which was the subject of Rava’s Midrash, presenting in full the claim which is the subject of this debate: that the words “I bring death and give life” suggest that God killed one person and gave life to another, as is regular in the world – one person dies and a different person is born. The commentator therefore asks whether this verse refers to the common reality in the world, and God’s responsibility for it, thus describing God as the power responsible for death and birth of two different people, or whether it refers to a miraculous occurrence, in which God is responsible for death and birth of one and the same person, i.e., the resurrection of the dead.<sup>21</sup> The commentator’s answer is that the verse describes the latter, namely the power of God to resurrect the dead. God resurrects whomever died, and does not simply take the life of one person and bring another one to life.

This *baraita* is closer to Version A because it focuses only on the identity between the dead and the resurrected, as does Version A, and lacks the question regarding the ability to heal, or the solution consisting of two stages, which Version B includes. It seems, therefore, that the editor of the talmudic discussion was familiar with a text closer to Version A than to Version B, and this is the text he edited along with the *baraita*. This conclusion highlights questions regarding the status and origin of Version B. Is it merely a different

<sup>20</sup> Rashi, *Pesah. ad loc.* Lemma: כתיב אני אמית ואחיה מחצתי ואני ארפא.

<sup>21</sup> Rashi, *Sanh. ad loc.* Lemma: כדרך שהעולם נוהג.

version of the same statement, resulting from an adaptation or expansion of Version A, either early or medieval, or does it have independent status?

An early source for this Midrash is found in *Sifre Deuteronomy* on Deut. 32:39:

[a] *See now that I <even I>, am He* (Deut. 32:39): This is an answer to those who say: “There is no authority in heaven.”

One who says “There is <no authority> in heaven,” they answer him and say to him: “*And there is no God beside Me* (Deut. 32:39).” Or maybe He has no power to bring death or give life, to harm or to benefit, [therefore] the verse states: *See now that I, even I, am He... I bring death and give life* (Deut. 32:39), and it is also written, *Thus says the Lord, the King of Israel and his redeemer, the Lord of hosts: I am the first and I am the last* (Isa. 44:6, 41:4).

[b] *I bring death and give life*: This is one [of the four assurances] given to them which hint at the resurrection of the dead: *I bring death and give life; Let me die the death of the righteous* (Num. 23:10); *Let Reuben live and not die* (33:6); *After two days He will revive us* (Hos. 6:2). I might think that death here refers <to one> and life <to another> therefore the verse states: *I wounded and I heal* (Deut. 32:39) – <just as> wounding and healing refer <to one> so death and life refer <to one>.

[א] ראו עתה כי אני <אני> הוא – זו תשובה לאומרין אין רשות בשמים האומר <אין רשות><sup>22</sup> בשמים משיבין אותו ואר' [מרין] לו ואין אלים עמדי או שמא אין יכול לא להחיות ולא להמית לא להרע ולא להטיב ת"ל [תלמוד לומר] ראו עתה וג' אני אמית ואחיה וג' כה אמ' יי' מלך ישר' וגאלו יי' צבאות אני ראשון ואני אחרון.

[ב] אני אמית ואחיה – זה אחד שניתן להן רמז לתחיית המתים: אני אמית ואחיה. תמות נפשי מות ישרים. יחי ראובן ואל ימות. יחינו מ'מ'ים. שומע אני מיתה <באחד> וחיים <באחד> ת"ל מחצתי ואני ארפא – <כדרך> שמכה ורפואה <באחד> כך מיתה וחיים <באחד>.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Omitted in MS Marshall Or. 24 (Bodl. Or. 150; Uri 119), Neubauer 151/5 and added by M.I. Kahana in his “Pages of the Deuteronomy *Mekhilta* on *Ha'azinu* and *Wezot Ha-Berakha*,” *Tarbiz* 57 (1988), p. 191 according to other MSS. L. Finkelstein, *Siphre ad Deuteronomium* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1969), p. 379, note 8, corrected the words אין רשות (no power) to שתי רשויות (two powers) because this version matches the answer and its parallels. However, this version appears only in *Yalkut Shimoni* and the corrections of R. Suliman Ohana, whereas the other textual witnesses write, אין רשות (no power). Kahana, “Pages,” p. 191 note 13 added that this version should be further researched. Given the absence of direct witnesses supporting the “two powers” version, the fact that this section is missing from the best known MS of *Sifre Deuteronomy* (MS Vatican ebr. 32.3), and the lack of any genizah fragments containing this paragraph, it seems that the “no power” version should be accepted.

<sup>23</sup> *Sifre Deut.* 329. Cited from Kahana, “Pages,” pp. 191-193 (cf. Finkelstein, *Siphre ad Deuteronomium*, p. 379). Additions to the Hebrew text either from a later scribe or from Kahana are in diamond brackets. Additions which were inserted for clarity are in square brackets. The translation follows R. Hammer, *Sifre: a Tannaitic Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy* (Yale Judaica series 24; New Haven: Yale University, 1986), p. 340, with changes.

In part [a] of this Midrash there are two arguments regarding the existence of God and his power: there is no God, and God can neither take nor give life.<sup>24</sup> The link between these arguments and Deuteronomy 32:39 is clear and suits both the literal meaning of the verse, which discusses the unity and power of God, and the Jewish and Christian exegetical traditions accompanying it. In the *Mekhilot* on Exodus, this verse is used as a proof text in an anti-dualistic Midrash;<sup>25</sup> early Christian writers cited it in their polemic with Marcionite and Gnostic claims, using it as a proof text for their claim that the same God is responsible for both good and evil, and thus rejecting their opponents' claim that one God is the source of good and another the source of evil.<sup>26</sup>

The second section cites four verses that demonstrate the resurrection of the dead, including Deuteronomy 32:39. This verse is later discussed separately. The words, "I might think that death here refers to one, and life to another," reflect the claim that the person who died is not the person who

<sup>24</sup> Most scholars treated this Midrash as an anti-dualist Midrash, according to Finkelstein's version – "two powers" (note 20), see A.F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (Boston: Brill, 2002), pp. 84-89; cf. H.W. Basser, *Midrashic Interpretations of the Song of Moses* (American University Studies 7; New York: P. Lang, 1984), pp. 240-242. For further discussion, see A. Marmorstein, "The Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead in Rabbinic Theology," *American Journal of Theology* 19 (1915), pp. 582-583 = id., *Studies in Jewish Theology: the Arthur Marmorstein Memorial Volume*, eds. J.B. Rabinowitz and M.S. Lew (London: Oxford University, 1950), pp. 150-151; id., "The Unity of God in Rabbinic Literature," *HUCA* 1 (1924), p. 488 = id., *Studies in Jewish Theology*, p. 94; id., "The Background of the Haggadah," *HUCA* 6 (1929), p. 201 = id., *Studies in Jewish Theology*, p. 68; A. Büchler, "The Minim in Sepphoris and Tiberias in the Second and Third Centuries," in I. Brodie - J.B. Rabinowitz (eds.), *Studies in Jewish History: The Adolph Büchler Memorial Volume* (Jews' College Publications N.S. 1; London: Oxford University, 1956), p. 267; Van Ruiten, "The Use of Deuteronomy 32:39," pp. 235-241 and lately A. Schremer, "Midrash, Theology, and History: Two Powers in Heaven Revisited," *JSJ* 39 (2008), pp. 230-254.

<sup>25</sup> *Mekhilta D'Rabbi Ishmael*, *Shira* 4 (ed. Horovitz, pp. 129-30); *Ubahodesh* 5 (ed. Horovitz, pp. 219-220); *Mekilta de Rashbi* 15:3 (J.N. Epstein and E.Z. Melamed, *Mekhilta D'Rabbi Sim'on b. Jochai* [Jerusalem: Sumptibus Hillel, 1979], p. 81). See also Van Ruiten, "The Use of Deuteronomy 32:39," pp. 227-241.

<sup>26</sup> Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, pp. 252-255 and note 20. For examples, see Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 1.16.4; *ibi*, 2.14.1; *ibi*, 4.1.10; *ibi*, 5.11.4 and the discussion of Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, pp. 241-243. Tertullian used this verse in his polemic against the Jews as well, *ibi*, 3.24.1 and to encourage persecuted Christians, see Tertullian, *de Fuga* 3.2. The use of this verse in anti-dualistic polemics continued in later Christian writings, for example, see Origen, *Lucas* 16.4-5; *Contra Celsum* 2.24; *Heraclides* 2-4. See also id., *Jeremiah*. 1.16. In this homily, Origen states explicitly that he does not accept the Gnostic exegesis which interprets this verse as a proof for dualism; rather he claims it is a proof for resurrection. Origen's teacher, Clement of Alexandria, also used this verse in *Protrepticus* 79.1; *Stromata* 5.126. It was also used by Ps. Clement, *Recognition* 2.43, and Ps. Clement, *Homilies* 17.4; 20.3 to describe the contradictory powers of God. Following Origen, Didymus the Blind used this verse in his anti-Manichean polemic, see B. Bennett, "Didymus the Blind's Knowledge of Manichaeism," in P.A. Mirecki - J. BeDuhn (eds.), *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean studies 50; Leiden: Brill, 2001), pp. 51-52.

came back to the world, but that one person dies and another is born. In response, the commentator claims that the verse describes a situation in which one individual dies and subsequently returns to life. He bases his claim on a comparison between the words “I wounded and I heal” and the words “I bring death and give life.” Just as wounding and healing refer to one person, since the one who needs healing is the one who was wounded, so too, the one who died is the same person to be resurrected.

Are the two amoraic versions of Rava’s statement two adaptations of one and the same tannaitic claim? According to this claim, as found in the *baraita* and *Sifre Deuteronomy*, the person who died also came back to life, thus indicating one rather than two separate people. It seems that both amoraic versions assert this tannaitic claim and though it is not apparent from the texts themselves, it might nevertheless be read into both versions of Rava’s teaching: Version B solves the identity problem by describing a chronological order of the acts, and Version A uses deductive reasoning, from healing to resurrection. If both versions refer to the same tannaitic claim, then the difference between them is a result of adaptation and editing processes, and Version B is probably later than Version A. This conclusion is reinforced in light of the resemblance between Version A and the *baraita* following it, which favors Version A. On the other hand, the two versions might be expressing different, independent sayings. This hypothesis is supported by solid evidence from the manuscripts of both versions. In this case, what is the difference between these two sayings?

Further questions that arise from this source refer to the relationship between the argument and the Midrash. Does the Midrash reflect an independent claim that was part of a polemic on resurrection and only later attached to the verse, or was this claim originally composed as a biblical commentary?<sup>27</sup> And if it was originally composed as a biblical commentary,

<sup>27</sup> The question of whether the Midrash is a result of biblical interpretation or of attaching independent claims to biblical verses has generally been discussed in regard to the halakhic Midrash. For some of the main views, see J.N. Epstein, *Prolegomena ad litteras tannaicas* (Tel-Aviv: Magnes and Dvir, 1957), pp. 501-515 (Hebrew); C. Albeck, *Introduction to the Mishnah* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1959), pp. 40-62 (Hebrew) or C. Albeck, *Einführung in die Mischna* (Studia Judaica 6; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1971), pp. 56-93; E.E. Urbach, “The Derashah as a Basis of the Halakhah and the Problem of the Soferim,” *Tarbiz* 27 (1958), pp. 166-182 (Hebrew); S.D. Fraade, *From Tradition to Commentary: Torah and Its Interpretation on the Midrash Sifre to Deuteronomy* (Albany: State University of New York, 1991), pp. 14 ff.; M. Elon, *Jewish Law: History, Sources, Principles* (trans. B. Auerbach and M.J. Sykes; Philadelphia and Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994), Vol. 1, pp. 283-290; A. Schremer, “[T]he[y] Did Not Read in the Sealed Book’: Qumran Halakhic Revolution and the Emergence of Torah Study in Second Temple Judaism,” in D.M. Goodblatt et al. (eds.), *Historical Perspectives: from the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 27-31 January, 1999* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 37; Leiden: Brill, 2001), pp. 105-126; and lately V. Noam, “Creative Interpretation and Integrative Interpretation in Qumran,” in A.D. Roitman et al. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference*

can we conclude that its claim addressed a discussion within the Jewish community or one with external groups? Can we find parallels to Rava's saying in other sources from the first centuries C.E., either contemporary or earlier? Were there other groups employing similar arguments or responses? In order to answer these questions, similar discussions should be examined from both Jewish and Christian sources of the era. These sources will shed light on the Jewish sources and offer a new reading of the two versions of Rava's Midrash in the Babylonian Talmud.

*Brought death to some and resurrected others*

The order of actions – first raising and then healing,<sup>28</sup> which solved the exegetical question arising from Deuteronomy 32:39 according to Version B of Rava's saying, appeared for the first time in a Jewish source from the beginning of the second century – *2 Baruch*.<sup>29</sup> The composer of *2 Baruch* asks God about the resurrection of the dead and thus reveals a range of different views regarding this subject:

But further I ask you, O Mighty One, and I shall ask grace from he who created all things: In which shape will the living live in your day? Or how will their splendor be sustained after that? Will they, perhaps, take again this present form and will they put on the chained members which are currently [still] in [a state of] evil and through which evils are accomplished? Or will you perhaps change these things which have been in the world as well as [change] the world itself?

And he answered and said to me: Listen Baruch to this word and inscribe in the memory of your heart all that you shall learn. For the earth will surely return the dead at that time, it receives them now in order to keep them, not changing anything in their form. But as it has received them so it will give them back, and as I have delivered them to it, so it will raise them. For then it will be necessary to show those who are alive that the dead are living again, and that those who went away have come back; at the moment when those who know [each other] now [in life] recognize one another again,<sup>30</sup> then my judgment will be affirmed and those things

*Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 93; Leiden: Brill, 2011), pp. 363-376 and the further bibliography mentioned there, in note 4.

<sup>28</sup> This order of actions also appears at the beginning of the talmudic discussion of *b. Sanh.* 91b, to resolve a contradiction between two verses (Jer. 31:7 and Isa. 35:6). It lacks any reference to denying the resurrection of the dead or identifying the resurrected.

<sup>29</sup> For dating of *2 Baruch* and a survey of research, see R. Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch* (Early Judaism and its Literature 20; Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 1-15 esp. notes 9-10; G.S. Oegema, *Apokalypsen* (Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 5; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001), pp. 58-75.

<sup>30</sup> For an alternative translation, see L.I. Lied, "Recognizing the Righteous Remnant?"

which have been spoken of before will come to be. Only after the day of resurrection passed, will the shapes of those who are found guilty as also the glory of those who have been proven righteous be transformed.<sup>31</sup>

Baruch asks how the dead will return: will they appear as they did before their deaths, or will they have changed? A similar question already appears in 1 Corinthians,<sup>32</sup> and later, in both Jewish and Christian sources.

The answer Baruch receives is similar to Version B of Rava's saying, but it also includes the purpose of this order of actions: the fact that the dead will return as they were during their lives and be healed only afterward shows that the person who died is the same person who returned to life. This message is aimed at a question that was not asked here: how will we know that the one who died is the one who was resurrected?

This question can be understood in two ways. One might take it as a veiling question, resembling the rejection of the resurrection of the dead. The inquirer thinks that resurrection is impossible and seeks to prove his claim by differentiating between the sick person who died and the healthy person who came back to life. The text, however, does not indicate that this question is the result of polemic. Therefore, it may simply be an innocent question resulting from interest in the process of resurrection and the healing of people after their deaths. In this case, this question does not reflect the rejection of the idea of resurrection, but an inner discussion, and the composer of 2 *Baruch* added to the description of the resurrection a moral message aimed at strengthening his disciples in their belief in the resurrection.<sup>33</sup>

---

Resurrection, Recognition and Transformation in 2 Baruch 49-51," in T.K. Seim - J. Økland (eds.), *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity* (Ekstasis 1; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), pp. 311-335.

<sup>31</sup> 2 *Baruch* 49:1-51:1; S. Dederling, *Apocalypse of Baruch* (The Old Testament in Syriac IV, 3; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973), pp. 26-27; A.F.J. Klijn, "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch," in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), Vol. 1, pp. 637-638, with changes.

<sup>32</sup> 1 Cor. 16:35: "But some *man* will say: how are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" This question does not disclose the argument in its background.

<sup>33</sup> For further discussion on this source, see Stemberger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung*, pp. 87-91; Cavallin, "Life after Death," pp. 87-91; F.J. Murphy, *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch* (SBL Dissertation Series 78; Atlanta: Scholars Press, Harvard University, 1985); Lona, *Über die Auferstehung des Fleisches*, pp. 14-15; R. Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 93; Leiden: Brill, 1998), p. 283; W.S. Vorster, *Speaking of Jesus: Essays on Biblical Language, Gospel Narrative and the Historical Jesus*, ed. J.E. Botha (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 92; Leiden: Brill, 1999), p. 106; J.J. Collins, "The Afterlife in Apocalyptic Literature," in J. Neusner - A.J. Avery-Peck (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity: Part 4, Death, Life-After-Death, Resurrection & The World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity* (Handbuch der Orientalistik 49; Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 130-131; D.J. Harrington, "Afterlife Expectations in Pseudo-Philo, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch and Their Implications for the New Testament," in R. Bieringer et al. (eds.), *Resurrection in the New Testament: Festschrift J. Lambrecht* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 165; Leuven: Leuven University - Peeters, 2002), pp. 30-32; Nir, *The Destruction*, pp. 161-164; Segal, *Life after Death*, pp. 494-497.

During the first and second centuries several groups, both within the Jewish community and outside of it, rejected the idea of the resurrection of the dead. In the Jewish community the Sadducees rejected the resurrection, as is evident from the New Testament<sup>34</sup> and the writings of Josephus.<sup>35</sup> These groups, however, did not leave behind sources detailing their theology. Outside of Judaism, Gnostic and pagan groups rejected the resurrection. From this paragraph it is not clear whether Baruch's saying was originally intended as an answer to claims rejecting the resurrection or not, but it is clear that such a teaching could be used as an argument in such a polemic. The question is, therefore, was this type of answer used in a similar polemic about the resurrection of the dead.<sup>36</sup>

In a Midrash attributed to Amoraim<sup>37</sup> on Deuteronomy 32:39 preserved in *Ecclesiastes Rabbah*<sup>38</sup> a question resembling the one in *2 Baruch* is discussed:

<sup>34</sup> Luc. 20:27-40; Matt. 22:23-33; Mark. 12:18-27; Acts 4:2, 23:8.

<sup>35</sup> *Jewish Wars* 2.8.14; *Jewish Antiquities* 18.1.4. For further discussion, see J.J. Kilgallen, "The Sadducees and Resurrection from the Dead: Luke 20, 27-40," *Biblica* 67 (1986), pp. 478-495; E. Main, "Les Sadducéens et la Résurrection des morts: comparaison entre Mc 12, 18-27 et Lc 20,27-38," *Revue Biblique* 103 (1996), pp. 411-432, and bibliography in notes 3-4; Cavallin, "Life after Death," pp. 193-196; Setzer, *Resurrection of the Body*, pp. 23-36; Elledge, *Life after Death*.

<sup>36</sup> Questions regarding the identity of the dead and the resurrected were raised in a source prior to *2 Baruch*. The *Sibylline Oracles*, a Judeo-Hellenistic source from the first century C.E., describes the resurrection thus: "But when everything is already dusty ashes, and God puts to sleep the unspeakable fire, even as he kindled it, God himself will again fashion the bones and ashes of men, and he will raise up mortals again as they were before (*Sib. Or.* 4.179-182, J.J. Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), Vol. 1, pp. 388-389; J. Geffcken, *Die Oracula sibyllina* (GCS 8; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1902), pp. 101-102. According to this description, at the resurrection people will rise as they were before their deaths. This could be referring to claims against the belief in resurrection; however this understanding is not obvious, because it is not necessary to claim that the dead will come back as they were *physically*, without their wounds and diseases. Therefore, this source should not be categorically viewed as an earlier witness to the claim found in *2 Baruch*. For dating the Sibylline Oracles, see J.J. Collins, "The Development of the Sibylline Tradition," in W. Haase (ed.), *Hellenistisches Judentum in römischer Zeit, ausgenommen Philon und Josephus* (ANRW II.20.1; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1987), pp. 427-429 and note 28. For the source of this oracle, see D. Flusser, "The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and the Book of Daniel," *Israel Oriental Studies* 2 (1972), pp. 148-175; J.J. Collins, "The Place of the Fourth Sibyl in the Development of the Jewish Sibyllina," *JJS* 25 (1974), pp. 365-380; cf. M. Hengel, "Messianische Hoffnung und politischer "Radikalismus" in der 'jüdisch-hellenistischen Diaspora'; zur Frage der Voraussetzungen des jüdischen Aufstandes unter Trajan, 115-117 n. Chr.," in D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), pp. 655-686, note 2.

<sup>37</sup> R. Jacob of Gebel גרולאה/גבולאה/בבולאה, as detailed in M. Hirshman, *Midrash Qohelet Rabbah: Chapters 1-4, Commentary [Ch. 1] and Introduction* [Dissertation, Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1983], p. 36), is mentioned citing R. Hanina also in *y. Hal.* 59a, 3:1 (Hebrew Academy, 322:22; גבולייא) and R. Yohanan in *y. Qidd.* 65d, 4:3 (Hebrew Academy, 1182:15; גבולייא). According to C. Albeck, *Introduction to the Talmud, Babli and Yerushalmi* (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1969), p. 186, he is from the second generation of Palestinian Amoraim; R. Levi is from the third generation of the Amoraim (*ibi*, pp. 256-257); R. Hanina is from the first generation of the Palestinian Amoraim (*ibi*, pp. 155-157), thus dating all three to the third century C.E..

<sup>38</sup> Several scholars discussed the dating and editing of *Ecclesiastes Rabbah*. Hirshman,

R. Levi and R. Jacob of Gebel in the name of R. Ḥanina: *As a generation goes, a generation comes.*<sup>39</sup> One who goes lame, comes lame; [one who] goes blind, comes blind, so they would not say: Those he caused to die are not those he brought to life, *I bring death and give life.*

*See now that I, even I am He and there is no God beside me. I bring death and give life, whoever says the hard act [also] says the easier [one]. I bring death and give life is the harder act, all the more so I wounded and heal which is easier. But I raise them with their wounds so it would not be said: Those he killed are not those he brought to life – I bring death and give life, I wounded and I return and heal them.*<sup>40</sup>

R. Ḥanina cites the claim that those whom God has resurrected are not the same ones to whom God brought death, because those who were lame or blind before their deaths will return healthy. He explains that in order to solve this problem, God will divide the resurrection into two stages. First he will resurrect the dead, with their faults and diseases, so that whoever died lame or blind shall rise in the same condition. Then, after the dead have been recognized, God will heal them. As a proof for this order of actions R. Ḥanina cites Deuteronomy 32:39 and explains it in accordance with Version B of Rava's saying: if God can resurrect the dead, God can surely heal them, but healing is postponed and will happen only after resurrection.<sup>41</sup>

The present version does not reveal whether the deniers of the resurrection are groups outside or inside of the Jewish community, since they are referred to with the phrase "they say" (אומרין), a phrase common in rabbinic and especially Palestinian sources referring both to groups within the rabbinic community and outside of it.<sup>42</sup> However, later parallels to this Midrash

"Midrash Qohelet Rabbah," pp. 16-25 studied the parallels between *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* and Jerome, and concluded that a kernel of this composition was already known to Jerome (ca. 347-420 C.E.). He also showed a link between *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* and the Palestinian Talmud (*ibi*, pp. 58-107). This conclusion was supported by Kiperwasser, who discussed the mutual early kernels of *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* and *Ecclesiastes Zuta* and their later redaction, see R. Kiperwasser, "The Comparative Study in Midrashim on Kohelet," *Sidra 22* (2006-2007), pp. 153-176; *id.*, "Structure and Form in Kohelet Rabbah as Evidence of Its Redaction," *JJS 58* (2007), pp. 283-302; *id.*, "Toward a Redaction History of Kohelet Rabbah: A Study in the Composition and Redaction of Kohelet Rabbah 7:7" *JJS 61* (2010), pp. 257-277. Because of the names cited in this pericope, especially that of R. Jacob of Gebel, who is unlikely to have been the subject of false attribution, and its preservation of Hebrew, it may be assumed that this is an Amoraic pericope, no later than the fourth century.

<sup>39</sup> According to Ecc. 1:4: "One generation goes and another generation comes" – דור הלך ודור בא.

<sup>40</sup> *Ecc. Rab.* 1.2 (Hirshman, "Midrash Qohelet Rabbah," pp. 35-37).

<sup>41</sup> For further discussion, see G. Stemberger, "Zur Auferstehungslehre in der rabbinischen Literatur," *Kairos 15* (1973), pp. 255-257.

<sup>42</sup> The expression יהו אומרין is found mostly in Palestinian sources, and mostly refers to Jews, but also to non-rabbinic groups. Regarding Jews, see *y. Peah* 18b, 4:5 (Hebrew Academy, p. 96:22); *y. Ma'as.* Ṣ 54b, 3:9 (Hebrew Academy, p. 296:38); *y. Ḥal.* 60a, 4:8 (Hebrew Academy, p. 329:1-3); *y. Šeqal.* 48d, 5:1 (Hebrew Academy, p. 620:20); *y. Ta'an.* 67b, 4:1 (Hebrew Academy, p. 724:31); *y. Meg.* 72b, 1:9 (Hebrew Academy, p. 753:43); *Mekhilta*

add an attribution to the “the nations of the world”<sup>43</sup> and, in the *Tanhuma* in *Genesis Rabbah*, “the evil ones of the world.”<sup>44</sup>

Even though it appears only in later versions of this Midrash, this attribution is reinforced when the polemical statement in *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* is compared to corresponding claims by earlier non-Jewish groups. During the second and third centuries, a century or two before this Amoraic Midrash, but after the time of *2 Baruch*, Christians were troubled by the argument that a person who returns healthy is not the same person who died.<sup>45</sup> They cited this claim in detail, even quoting directly from the deniers of the resurrection themselves. In 206/7 C.E. Tertullian published his *Treatise on the Resurrection*.<sup>46</sup> In its opening, he presented questions from a philosopher who rejected the resurrection:

---

*D'Rabbi Ishmael, BeShalah* 6 (ed. Horovitz, p. 113); *Sifre Numbers* 105 (M.I. Kahana, *Sifre on Numbers: An Annotated Edition* [Jerusalem: Magnes, 2011], p. 263); *ibi*, 115 (ed. Kahana, p. 19\*); *b. Pesah.* 8b; *b. Sanh.* 38a. Regarding *minim*, see *m. Sanh.* 4:5; *t. Sanh.* 8:7. Regarding Sadducees, see *t. Par.* 3:7. Regarding non-Jews, see *Mekhilta D'Rabbi Ishmael, BeShalah* 6 (ed. Horovitz, p. 113).

<sup>43</sup> *Ecc. Zut.* 1.4. The identification of אומות העולם with various groups has been discussed by several scholars in different cases, identifying them as Christians, Gnostics, or Romans and others. An example of this discussion can be found regarding the tannaitic Midrashim on Dualism, in which, according to D. Boyarin, “Two Powers in Heaven; or, the Making of a Heresy,” in H. Najman - J.H. Newman (eds.), *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James Kugel* (SupplJSJ 83; Leiden: Brill, 2004), p. 347, the term אומות העולם refers to Christians, whereas Schremer, “Midrash,” pp. 249-250 claims it refers to Romans, and similarly Van Ruiten, “The Use of Deuteronomy 32:39,” pp. 239-240. A similar expression refers to Romans in the *Deuteronomy Mekhilta*, see Kahana, “Pages,” p. 171.

<sup>44</sup> *Tanhuma Vayigash* 9; *Genesis Rabbah* 95.46 (J. Theodor and Ch. Albeck, *Bereschit Rabba mit Kritischen Apparat und Kommentar* [Jerusalem: Wahrmann Books, 1965], pp. 1185-1186). Chapters 95-96 which appear in the prints of *Genesis Rabbah* are not originally part of this Midrash but are a *Tanhuma*. They are absent from MSS Vatican ebr. 30, chapter 95 is absent from all genizah fragments and chapter 96 appears only in one, see M. Sokoloff, *The Geniza Fragments of Bereshit Rabba* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Science and Humanities, 1982), pp. 176-183 (Hebrew); Theodor and Albeck, *Bereshit Rabba*, p. 1185, notes to chapter 95; *ibi*, vol. 1, Introduction, pp. 103-104 (Hebrew). For further discussion, see Marmorstein, *Studies in Jewish Theology*, pp. 153-154.

<sup>45</sup> For a partial summary of this question in Christian sources, see Wolfson, “Immortality,” pp. 17-18.

<sup>46</sup> For further discussion regarding the doctrine of Tertullian, see C. Moreschini, “Polemica antimarcionita e speculazione teologica in Tertulliano,” in G. May - K. Greschat (eds.), *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung: Vorträge der Internationalen Fachkonferenz zu Marcion, gehalten vom 15.-18. August 2001 in Mainz* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 150; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2002), pp. 22-27. I would like to thank Dr. Claudia Rosenzweig-Kupfer who helped me translate this article. See also E.F. Osborn, *Tertullian, First Theologian of the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1997), pp. 214-224; E. Evans, *Tertullian's Treatise on the Resurrection* (London: S.P.C.K., 1960), pp. xi-xxiii; Setzer, *Resurrection of the Body*, pp. 133-143; Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, pp. 510-513. For the dating of the writings of Tertullian, see T.D. Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1985), pp. 30-56; cf. F.J. Cardman, “Tertullian on the Resurrection” (Dissertation, Yale University, Department of Religious Studies, 1974), pp. 210-31, who dates the writing of this treatise in 208-212 C.E.

Do you then, as a philosopher, wish to persuade [us] that [this flesh], once it has been removed from your sight and touch and remembrance, will ever be restored to wholeness from corruption, to concreteness from vacuity, to fullness from emptiness, to something from nothing; and that even the fire or the waves or the bellies of wild beasts or the crops of birds or the intestines of fishes or the gluttony unique to time itself will give it back again? And will you expect this same lost [flesh to recover itself] as [for example] the lame and the one-eyed and the blind and the leprous and the palsied would return as they had been, which of course they would not wish to do; or that they would be whole, will fear suffering the same things a second time?

What then are the consequences of the flesh? Will it have needs as it did before, and particularly food and drink? And will it again have to breathe with lungs and heave in its intestines and be shameless with its private parts and have trouble with all its members? Must it again expect sores and wounds and fever and gout and death?<sup>47</sup>

The question Tertullian raises here is similar to the question posed in the Jewish sources: will the dead return healthy or sick and wounded as they were prior to their deaths? Tertullian divides the question into two situations: a body that was ruined after death, because of the circumstances of natural decomposition or the circumstances of its death,<sup>48</sup> and a body which was damaged during life due to some kind of ailment. In both cases the pagans ask how the dead will rise: Will they be healthy or will they be as they were when they died? Will the body be exposed to damage as in life or will it be different? Later in this treatise Tertullian raises the question again, this time with the reasoning of the critique.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Tertullian, *Resurrection* 4.3-6; E. Evans, *Tertullian's Treatise on the Resurrection* (London: SPCK, 1960), pp. 12-15, with changes. I would like to thank Dr. Peter Wyetner for discussing the English translation with me, here and in the following Latin citations.

<sup>48</sup> Sources from the Second Temple period link the discussion of resurrection with the destruction of the body, as Kister has shown, see M. Kister, "'Behind and Before': Aggadot and Midrashic Methods in Apocrypha and Rabbinic Literature," in J. Levinson et al. (eds.), *Higayon l'Yona: New Aspects in the Study of Midrash, Aggadah and Piyut: in Honor of Professor Yona Fraenkel* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2006), pp. 231-234 (Hebrew). In early Christianity this link is more pronounced, in light of the historical reality: the Christians were persecuted because of their belief and sometimes no corpse remained for resurrection, because it had either been eaten by beasts in the stadiums or drowned in the sea. On martyrdom during the time of Tertullian, see P. Keresztes, "Tertullian's Apologeticus: A Historical and Literary Study," *Latomus* 25 (1966), pp. 124-133; Barnes, *Tertullian*, pp. 143-186; D. Rankin, *Tertullian and the Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1995), pp. 9-16 and bibliography in notes 4, 9; Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body*, pp. 43-51, and note 93 W. Bähnk, *Von der Notwendigkeit des Leidens: die Theologie des Martyriums bei Tertullian* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 78; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), pp. 28-39; Segal, *Life after Death*, pp. 480-481, 547-555. On martyrdom and resurrection in early Jewish sources, see *ibid.*, p. 424-428; Vermès, *The Resurrection*, pp. 29-38.

<sup>49</sup> For the structure of this treatise, see R. Sider, "Structure and Design in the 'De Resurrectione Mortuorum' of Tertullian," *Vigiliae Christianae* 23 (1969), pp. 177-196. On the structure of the opening of the treatise, see Cardman, "Tertullian on the Resurrection," pp. 12-25.

Next we have the argument commonly associated with disbelief: “If,” they suggest, “the very same substance is recalled [to existence], along with its own shape, outline and quality, then it will also retain the rest of its distinguishing marks; and so the blind and lame and palsied and anyone else who died with some distinguishing mark, will return as he was.”<sup>50</sup>

The pagans add here an explanation for their argument: if the Christians claim that the same substance will return, then it must return with the same characteristics it had during its lifetime, including its faults and diseases.<sup>51</sup>

Only a few years later, Minucius Felix attributes this claim to pagans.<sup>52</sup> In his book *Octavius*, Minucius Felix described a dialogue between the Christian Octavius and the pagan Casilius.<sup>53</sup>

But I would like to ask whether or not the resurrection is with bodies, and if so with what bodies, the same ones or new ones? Is it without a body? That means, so far as I know, that there would be neither mind, nor soul, nor life. With the same body? But that has already gone to pieces. With another body? In that case a new man is born and not the former man renewed.<sup>54</sup>

Casilius rejects the idea of the resurrection of the dead and supports his argument by describing three scenarios: the return to life without a body is impossible because then the resurrected one would be lifeless; the return to life in the old body is also impossible, because it was destroyed in death; and the return to life in a new body is also impossible, because then it would not

<sup>50</sup> Tertullian, *Resurrection* 57.1 (ed. and trans. Evans, pp. 168-169, with changes).

<sup>51</sup> Cardman, “Tertullian on the Resurrection,” pp. 123-124; Marmorstein, *Studies in Jewish Theology*, pp. 155.

<sup>52</sup> *Octavius* by Minucius Felix contains many parallels to the *Apology* of Tertullian, and this raises the question whether Minucius Felix based his book on Tertullian’s, or vice versa. Schmidt and later Axelson claimed that Minucius Felix based his book on Tertullian’s *Apology* and that it is therefore a later work. They dated *Octavius* to the middle of the third century or even the early fourth century, see J. Schmidt, *Minucius Felix oder Tertullian? philologisch-historische Untersuchung der Prioritätsfrage des Octavius und des Apologeticum unter physiognomischer Universalperspektive* (Dissertation, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München, Borna-Leipzig: Noske, 1932); B. Axelson, *Das Prioritätsproblem Tertullian-Minucius Felix* (Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskaps-societeten i Lund 27; Lund: H. Ohlssons boktryckeri, 1941), pp. 61-72. De Jong had a similar view, but claimed that Minucius Felix wrote *Octavius* in the twenties or thirties of the third century, see J.J. de Jong, *Apologetiek en Christendom in den Octavius van Minucius Felix: with a summary in English* (Dissertation, Boosten & Stols, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden, 1935). Only Quispel claimed that Tertullian based his *Apology* on *Octavius*, see G. Quispel, “Anima Naturaliter Christiana,” *Latomus* 10 (1951), pp. 163-169.

<sup>53</sup> For further reading regarding this composition, see I. Opelt, *Die Polemik in der christlichen lateinischen Literatur von Tertullian bis Augustin* (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften 63; Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1980), pp. 71-73.

<sup>54</sup> Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 11.7; G.H. Rendall, *Minucius Felix* (LCL 250; London: Heinemann, 1964), pp. 342-345, with changes.

be resurrection but the birth of a new person. Casilius therefore concludes that resurrection is impossible.<sup>55</sup>

The possibility that a person might return to life in a new body, and therefore as a different person, which is attributed here to the opponents of Tertullian and Minucius Felix, is very close to the claim found in *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* from those who reject the possibility of resurrection, and is implied by Version B of Rava's saying in the Babylonian Talmud. This striking resemblance raises the possibility that "they" who were mentioned in *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* are a group similar to the pagan opponents of Tertullian and Minucius Felix. If so, the Amoraic sources, both the Palestinian Midrash and the Babylonian Talmud, preserve a polemic claim already known and used in North Africa at the beginning of the third century.<sup>56</sup> Furthermore, the resemblance between the claim in *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* and Casilius' claim indicates that the polemic described in *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* and implied in Version B, reflects not only a polemic between Jews and pagans, as the Jews understood it, but also a polemic between Christians and pagans, as the Christians saw it. It seems therefore that Version B in the Babylonian Talmud is neither a simple chronological answer to an exegetical problem in a biblical verse nor a reflection of a debate taking place only within the Jewish community regarding the nature of resurrection; rather, it reflects a struggle against a widespread claim regarding resurrection and a common argument used by both Jews and Christians.

This conclusion is based on the assumption that the Christian sources reliably record the positions of their opponents, since there are no known pagan sources referring to this claim. Even without this assumption, however, we can at least conclude that Jews and Christians attributed the same claim to the pagans, which suggests that they shared a similar view of "the other," in this case, opponents of the concept of the resurrection.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>55</sup> For further discussion, see Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, pp. 508-9; Setzer, *Resurrection of the Body*, pp. 105. Irenaeus, about a quarter century prior to Tertullian, had a similar response to the same problem, see Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 5.13.1. At a later time, the Samaritans also discussed this question, see Sysling, *Tehiyat Ha-Metim*, pp. 78-79.

<sup>56</sup> For the relations between Tertullian and the Jews and Jewish traditions, see C. Aziza, *Tertullien et le judaïsme* (Publications de la faculté des lettres et des sciences humaines de nice 16; Paris: les belles lettres 1977).

<sup>57</sup> For the claim that the rabbis knew only little about the Gnostics, see I. Gruenwald, "The Problem of the Anti-Gnostic Polemic in Rabbinic Literature," in R. van den Broek - M.J. Vermaseren (eds.), *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions: Presented to Gilles Quispel on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain 91; Leiden: Brill, 1981), pp. 171-189. For the claim that the term Gnosticism represents a wide range of views and not a unified theology, see K.L. King, *What Is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2003); M.A. Williams, *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1996).

*To what I bring death I give life*

A closer study of the Christian sources may also explain Version A of Rava's saying and its relationship to Version B. A thorough examination of Tertullian's treatise will show that he did not focus on the question of healing the dead but on the general question regarding the possibility of the resurrection of the body. He did not offer a technical solution as in Version B, but claimed that healing is included in resurrection, and therefore that whoever believes in resurrection will automatically believe in healing of the dead.

In his *Treatise on the Resurrection*, Tertullian deals mainly with the question of changes in the body during resurrection and the comparison of the resurrected body with the body known from this world. He opposed the view that envisioned only a spiritual resurrection,<sup>58</sup> and attempted to defend his own view with a careful use of vocabulary and with references to select verses from the Old and New Testament. When Tertullian cited the heretics, he used the words *ipsa eademque substantia* – the very same substance. The word *substantia* is frequently found in philosophical discussions on the relationship between substance and essence, between body and soul.<sup>59</sup> Tertullian actually emphasized his choice of this word when he presented the Marcionite theory regarding resurrection:

But concerning this [resurrection of the body] we have to take issue with the others, namely Marcion who entirely refuses to admit the resurrection of the flesh and instead promises the salvation of the soul alone; and he makes this a question not of attribute but of substance [*non qualitatis sed substantiae*].<sup>60</sup>

The opponents of Tertullian, in this case Marcion, argued about the substance from which the resurrected will be made, but did not ask about the flesh and its healing. They, following Neoplatonic traditions, argued that the soul is separate from the body. The soul is immortal and therefore any resurrection can refer only to the soul and not to the body.<sup>61</sup> Tertullian rejected

<sup>58</sup> These views were attributed to the Gnostics by J.G. Davies, "Factors Leading to the Emergence of Belief in the Resurrection of the Flesh," *JTS* 23 (1972), pp. 453-454; W.C. Van Unnik, "The Newly Discovered Gnostic 'Epistle to Rheginos' on the Resurrection 1-II," *JEH* 15 (1964), pp. 141-152, 153-167. See also: *Epistle to Rheginus* 45-46 published by B. Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures: A New Translation with Annotations and Introductions* (London: SCM Press, 1987), p. 321. However, van Eijk claimed that the distinction between Gnostics and orthodox Christians is not so clear, see A.H.C. Van Eijk, "The Gospel of Philip and Clement of Alexandria," *Vigiliae Christianae* 25 (1971), pp. 94-120.

<sup>59</sup> For the meaning of this word in the writings of Tertullian, see J.F. Bethune-Baker, "Tertullian's Use of Substantia, Natura, and Persona," *JTS* 4 (1903), pp. 440-442. For its general use, see A.C.L. Jacobsen, "The Philosophical Argument in the Teaching of Irenaeus on the Resurrection of the Flesh," *Studia Patristica* 36 (2001), pp. 256-261.

<sup>60</sup> Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 5.10.3 (E. Evans, *Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1972], p. 571, with changes).

<sup>61</sup> E.g. Tertullian, *Resurrection* 2-4.

this opinion and emphasized the positive nature of the body. He claimed that the body too will rise and not only the soul; however, even though this body will be corporeal as in its previous form, it will also be incorruptible.<sup>62</sup> He argued that resurrection of a corrupted or corruptible body is not appropriate because the body would then be punished for its sins twice – before its death and after it.<sup>63</sup>

Tertullian based his claim that the resurrected body will be spiritual on his understanding of the parable of the seed in 1 Corinthians 15:35-49. In this parable Paul compares the resurrection of the dead to the sprouting of a seed after it has been sown and deteriorated in the ground. On the one hand, this parable might be taken to teach that following resurrection the body will be as it was during its lifetime; however, it might also highlight the changes in the seed from the time of its sowing to the time of its sprouting.<sup>64</sup> The expression Paul used is ambiguous as well: σώμα πνευματικόν, or in the Latin version: *corpus spiritale*.<sup>65</sup> He says that the person will be resurrected in a state of ἀφθαρσία or *incorruptione*. Tertullian clarified this description by claiming that resurrection will be physical, though the body will change, receive spiritual characteristics, and be better than its original form.<sup>66</sup> He states that this parable can refer to the body alone, because only the body is sown in the ground and decays there as a seed.<sup>67</sup>

Tertullian was not the first to claim that resurrection will be corporeal and that the body will receive spiritual characteristics.<sup>68</sup> Neither is the use

<sup>62</sup> Tertullian, *Resurrection* 57.13; 51; *Apology* 48.2-3.

<sup>63</sup> Tertullian, *Resurrection* 57.12.

<sup>64</sup> For further discussion of the meaning of this parable, see H.-J. Klauck, *1 Korintherbrief* (Neue Echter Bibel Neues Testament 7; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1984), p. 118; C. Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 7; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1996), pp. 401-405, note 304; R.J. Sider, "The Pauline Conception of the Resurrection Body in 1 Corinthians xv. 35-54," *NTS* 21 (1975), pp. 428-439; W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (EKK 7.4; Düsseldorf: Benziger Verlag, 2001), pp. 279-303; Farina, "Die Leiblichkeit der Auferstandenen," pp. 22-51; Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body*, pp. 2-17, and notes 9-10; Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, pp. 342-346; Segal, *Life after Death*, pp. 428-431.

<sup>65</sup> For discussion of the double meaning of the parable, see M.E. Thrall, "Paul's Understanding of Continuity between the Present Life and the Life of the Resurrection," in R. Bieringer et al. (eds.), *Resurrection in the New Testament: Festschrift J. Lambrecht* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 165; Leuven: Leuven University and Peeters, 2002), pp. 283-300.

<sup>66</sup> For the exegetical methods of Tertullian, see O. Skarsaune, "The Development of Scriptural Interpretation in the Second and Third Centuries – except Clement and Origen," in M. Sæbø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament - The History of its Interpretation* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), vol. 1, pp. 429-434; G.D. Dunn, "Tertullian and Daniel 9:24-27: A Patristic Interpretation of a Prophetic Time-frame," *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 6 (2002), pp. 330-344.

<sup>67</sup> Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 5.10.5-6.

<sup>68</sup> Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body*, pp. 34-43; H.E. Lona, "Ps. Justin 'De resurrectione' und die Altchristliche Auferstehungsapologetik," *Salesianum* 51 (1989), pp. 691-768. See also Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 2.33.5; 5.7.2; 5.12.3. For further discussion regarding the views of Irenaeus on the resurrection, see E.F. Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons* (Cambridge: Cambridge

of the parable of the seed unique to Tertullian; it was used earlier as a proof for resurrection. The first to cite it after Paul was Clement of Rome at the end of the first century C.E.,<sup>69</sup> followed by Justin Martyr,<sup>70</sup> and Theophilus of Antioch;<sup>71</sup> it also appears in the *Acts of Paul* in the second century.<sup>72</sup> In the rabbinic corpus there is a similar parable on resurrection: the dead will return dressed just as the seed is sown naked and grows covered.<sup>73</sup> The claim that the sick will be healed during the resurrection is also found prior to Tertullian, as in the writings of Irenaeus and Justin Martyr. Irenaeus connected this to the general possibility of the resurrection;<sup>74</sup> Justin Martyr and Pseudo-Justin linked it to Jesus' ability to resurrect the dead and heal the sick.<sup>75</sup>

The debate regarding the corporeality of the resurrected body took place not only between Christians and pagans, but within the Christian community as well.<sup>76</sup> In the fourth century, Methodius of Olympus (d. 311) discussed and opposed Origen's views, articulated earlier.<sup>77</sup> Methodius claimed that Origen believed in spiritual resurrection,<sup>78</sup> and used against him claims similar to

---

University, 2001), pp. 136-137, 225-230; Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, pp. 513-517; Setzer, *Resurrection of the Body*, pp. 125-133. For the polemic of Irenaeus with the Gnostics, see Osborn (above), pp. 22-24, 32-38. For similar sayings of Tatian, see *Oratio ad Graecos* 6.2. See also R.M. Grant, *Greek Apologists of the Second Century* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988), p. 114; Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, pp. 531-532; M. Kister, "Behind and Before". For similar sayings, see also Justin Martyr, *Dialogues* 69.7; Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 34.6-9.

<sup>69</sup> Clement of Rome, *Epistle to the Corinthians* 24.4. For discussion, see Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, p. 482. For the use of this parable in the days of Clement, see Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body*, pp. 22-27.

<sup>70</sup> Justin Martyr, *Apology* 1.19. See also Pseudo Justin, *Resurrection* 5.

<sup>71</sup> Theophilus, *Ad Autolyicum* 1.13, 2.14. For discussion, see R.M. Grant, "Theophilus of Antioch to Autolykus," *HTR* 40 (1947), p. 233.

<sup>72</sup> *Acts of Paul* 8.24-27; W. Schneemelcher. "Acts of Paul," in W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *New Testament Apocrypha* (Cambridge and Louisville: J. Clarke & Co. and Westminster/John Knox, 1991), Vol. 2, p. 256.

<sup>73</sup> *b. Sanh.* 90b; *b. Ketub.* 111b; *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* 5.1.10. The resemblance between these source and the Pauline parable was discussed by Sellin, *Der Streit*, pp. 211-212; Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, p. 403 note 321; Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, pp., 281-282; Cavallin, "Life after Death," p. 180; Farina, "Die Leiblichkeit der Auferstandenen," pp. 53-66; Stemberger, "Zur Auferstehungslehre," pp. 239-242.

<sup>74</sup> Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 5.12.6.

<sup>75</sup> Justin Martyr, *Dialogues* 69.5-6; *Apology* 1.48; Pseudo-Justin, *Resurrection* 4. For later sources, see Origen, *Contra Celsum* 2.48; Lactantius, *Institutes*, pp. 134-137.

<sup>76</sup> For another example of an anti-pagan argument that turned into a Christian argument regarding the resurrection, see Kister "Behind and Before," pp. 254-259.

<sup>77</sup> For the polemic of Methodius and Origen, see L.G. Patterson, *Methodius of Olympus: Divine Sovereignty, Human Freedom, and Life in Christ* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1997), pp. 170-186; J.F. Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen* (Patristic Monograph Series 13; Belgium and Macon, GA: Peeters and Mercer University, 1988), pp. 112-114, 349-390; Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body*, pp. 63-71.

<sup>78</sup> Origen claimed that resurrection will be spiritual but also include corporeal qualities. This claim has led scholars to two understandings of the views of Origen. Crouzel, and following him Edwards, claimed that Origen too believed in some type of substance which will

those used by Tertullian against the pagans. He too discussed bodily changes after death and used the parable of the seed.<sup>79</sup> However, Origen himself used the same parable to prove his own views – for him the parable proves the spiritual aspects of resurrection.<sup>80</sup>

When Methodius and Tertullian argue against the claim that only the soul will survive after death, they use a similar argument: only that which has previously fallen can rise. Ton van Eijk has shown that until the fourth century this formula was used to prove corporeal resurrection.<sup>81</sup> Tertullian used it in his *Treatise on the Resurrection*:

Let us then consider first under what heading this hope has been set before us. One divine edict is, I suppose, readily apparent to everyone: “The Resurrection of the Dead [*resurrectio mortuorum*].” Two words, sharp, concise, and clear. These I shall confront, these I shall discuss, [to discover] the substance to which they refer.

---

house the soul at the time of resurrection. He summarizes this research in H. Crouzel, *Origen* (trans. S. Worrall; Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1989), pp. 235-266. For a detailed presentation, see H. Crouzel, “Mort et immortalité chez Origène,” *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* 79 (1978), pp. 19-38, 81-96, 181-196; H. Crouzel, “Différences entre les ressuscités selon Origène,” in *Jenseitsvorstellungen in Antike und Christentum: Gedenkschrift für Alfred Stuiber* (Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum Ergänzungsband 9; Münster: Aschendorff, 1982), pp. 107-116; H. Crouzel, “Les critiques adressées par Méthode et ses contemporains à la doctrine Origénienne du corps ressuscité,” *Gregorianum* 53 (1972), pp. 679-716. Edwards agreed with Crouzel regarding the corporeal aspect of the soul, but differed on Origen’s definition of the two resurrections, see M.J. Edwards, “Origen’s Two Resurrections,” *JTS* 46 (1995), pp. 502-518; M.J. Edwards, “Origen no Gnostic; Or, on the Corporeality of Man,” *JTS* 43 (1992), pp. 23-37. See also H. Chadwick, “Origen, Celsus and the Resurrection of the Body,” *HTR* 41 (1948), pp. 83-102; Wolfson, “Immortality,” pp. 14-17; Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, pp. 517-527. On the controversy among the Christian interpretations of Origen, see E.A. Clark, “New Perspectives on the Origenist Controversy: Human Embodiment and Ascetic Strategies,” *Church History* 59 (1990), pp. 145-162. For Origen’s writing on the corporeal nature of resurrection, see Origen, *Contra Celsum* 5.23, 7.32.

<sup>79</sup> In the fourth century C.E., Epiphanius collected the writings of Methodius and included them in his book *Panarion*, where this controversy is found. For the response of Methodius to Origen, see Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 64.13.1, 64.14.1-9. For the commentary of Methodius on the parable of the seed, see *ibi*, 64.45.6. Methodius argued that though the resurrected body will change after its resurrection and will not include the identical substance known during its lifetime, this change does not render it as the body of a different person. He reinforced his claim by saying that everything is possible for God. Origen was aware of this claim and he rejected it, see *Contra Celsum* 5.23; H. Chadwick, “Origen, Celsus,” pp. 83-86. After citing Methodius, Epiphanius too discussed this question and claimed that the improvement of the body does not indicate that a different person was resurrected, see *Panarion* 64.67.1-12. He also comments on the parable of the seed: *ibi*, 64.67.14 – 64.68.4. For further discussion, see Patterson, *Methodius of Olympus*, pp. 151-152; Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism*, pp. 352-357.

<sup>80</sup> For the view of Origen, see Epiphanius, *Panarion* 64.10.2-7; 64.12.1-5. For a similar presentation of his view, see *ibi*, 64.17.6.10. Origen also discussed the parable of the seed in *Contra Celsum* 5.18-24.

<sup>81</sup> A.H.C. Van Eijk, “‘Only that Can Rise Which has Previously Fallen’: The History of a Formula,” *JTS* 22 (1971), pp. 517-529.

When I hear that a man is about to be resurrected, I must ask what part of him was fated to fall, since nothing will expect to rise again unless it has previously fallen. Only one who is unaware that the flesh falls by means of death can fail to know that it stands back up by means of life.<sup>82</sup>

Tertullian used a logical argument to prove the possibility of the resurrection of the body. He claimed that if the words *resurrectio mortuorum* describe a person, one should ask what part of the person died, because only what has died has been promised resurrection. Since the flesh is what fell and died, not the soul, the flesh is what shall rise again. The soul, on the other hand, is immortal; it never fell and died, and therefore it cannot be resurrected.<sup>83</sup>

Van Eijk showed that the earliest version of this formula is in a source from the middle of the second century C.E. in Egypt. The *Epistula Apostolorum*, an anti-Gnostic composition preserved partially in Coptic, presents a discussion between Jesus and his disciples on resurrection. The author attributes to Jesus the following:<sup>84</sup>

Then he said to us: Does the flesh or the spirit fall away? And we said to him: The flesh. And he said to us: Now what has fallen will arise and what is lost will be found<sup>85</sup> and what is sick will be sound that my father may be praised therein.<sup>86</sup>

<sup>82</sup> Tertullian, *Resurrection* 18.4-5 (ed. Evans, pp. 48-49, with changes).

<sup>83</sup> For further discussion, see A.H.C. Van Eijk, “Only that Can Rise,” pp. 520-522. Methodius used this argument in Epiphanius, *Panarion* 64.43.9. Epiphanius used this argument himself in: *ibi*, 64.63.10-13. It was also used by Origen in his discussion of the resurrection: *Principles* 2.10.1.

<sup>84</sup> This composition has two main textual witnesses, a full translation into Ge‘ez (Ethiopic), and a Coptic version of which only fragments were preserved. Schmidt published the Coptic fragments and discussed the history of its composition, which he dated to 160-179 C.E., see C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung ein Katolisch-apostolisches Sendschreiben des 2. Jahrhunderts* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 43; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1919). His opinion was followed by C.D.G. Müller, “Epistula apostolorum,” in W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *New Testament Apocrypha* (Cambridge and Louisville: J. Clarke & Co. and Westminster/John Knox, 1991), Vol. 1, pp. 249-251; J.V. Hills, *Tradition and Composition in the Epistula Apostolorum* (Harvard Dissertations in Religion 24; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), pp. 1-9; W. Rebell, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen und apostolische Väter* (München: Kaiser, 1992), pp. 114-119; Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre*, pp. 97-107; H.-J. Klauck, *Apocryphal Gospels: an Introduction* (London: T&T Clark, 2003), pp. 152-160; cf. E. Duensing, “Epistula Apostolorum,” in E. Hennecke - W. Schneemelcher (eds.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1959), pp. 126-127 who dated the composition to the first half of the second century; and M. Hornschuh, *Studien zur Epistula Apostolorum* (Patristische Texte und Studien 5; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1965), pp. 116-119, who dated the composition to 120 C.E..

<sup>85</sup> The version in Ge‘ez does not include the words, “what is lost will be found.” Since this version may not be a direct translation, its reliability is subject to doubt. The claim that what was lost will be found was used in the end of the second century by Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 5.12.3.

<sup>86</sup> *Epistula Apostolorum* 25 (36) / 19-20; Schneemelcher, p. 264. I would like to thank Prof.

As an answer to the question “what shall rise, the body or the soul?” Jesus says that the body will rise because it is what has fallen. To this he adds two other examples: what was lost will be found and what is sick will be sound.<sup>87</sup> What is the role of the clause “what is sick will be sound”? Is it only an additional illustration of the statement “what has fallen will arise” and “what was lost will be found,” or is the link between these clauses stronger? Comparison with subsequent uses of this argument makes this question more pertinent, since Tertullian, Origen, Methodius, and Epiphanius each used the formula “what has fallen will arise” without mentioning healing the sick or finding the lost. Did they consider this a superfluous addition?

The clause “what is sick will be sound” might also be understood in light of the controversy debated in the writings of Tertullian and Methodius. They both related the resurrection of the dead to the healing of the sick and claimed that healing is part of resurrection, though it is not part of proving the resurrection. It is possible that the writer of the *Epistula Apostolorum* made the same connection. However, the question attributed to Jesus in the *Epistula Apostolorum* does not raise the issue of healing and does not take the topic of the corporeality of the resurrection to its logical end, as in the cases of Casilius and the pagans cited by Tertullian or Origen. Furthermore, this option does not explain the logical role of this addition or show how it supports the argument that resurrection will be corporeal as well. Healing, as Methodius and Tertullian presented it, is a component part, but not a proof, of resurrection, yet here it seems that healing is part of the proof.

We may therefore offer another possibility: reading this sentence in light of Rava’s saying from the Babylonian Talmud. His Version A includes a sentence that is almost identical to the one found in the *Epistula Apostolorum*. According to Jesus: “What has fallen will arise and what is lost will be found and what is sick will be sound,” whereas Rava stated: “to what I bring death I give life, *as* what I wound I heal.” Rava argued that the dead body is the same one that will return to life. To prove his point, he compared resurrection to healing – just as the body that is wounded is the one to be healed, *so too*, the body which died is the one to be resurrected. In this case the analogy between the healing of the body and its resurrection proves the resurrection of the body. It seems that this is how the saying attributed to Jesus in the *Epistula Apostolorum* should be understood as well – the body will be resurrected because it is the body that fell, *just as* the body that was wounded is what will be healed, and what was lost will be found.<sup>88</sup>

---

Christoph Marksches of Humboldt University and Ms. Renate Dekker of Leiden University for discussing this source with me.

<sup>87</sup> For resurrection in *Epistula Apostolorum*, see Lona, *Über die Auferstehung des Fleisches*, pp. 79-90; Hornschuh, *Studien zur Epistula Apostolorum*, pp. 58-60; Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, pp. 499-500.

<sup>88</sup> Echoes of Jewish traditions can be found in *Epistula Apostolorum*, but they usually refer to Qumranic traditions, see Hornschuh, *Studien zur Epistula Apostolorum*, pp. 67-80.

If Rava's Version A really does match the saying in the *Epistula Apostolorum*, we may conclude two things. First, that Rava's claim, which was attached to a biblical verse and presented as a Midrash, was known two centuries earlier, as an independent claim in the polemic concerning resurrection. It continued to circulate in the following centuries, as seen in the writings of Tertullian and later Methodius. Second, that the argument about the belief in the resurrection of the body which Version A addresses is different from, yet related to, that of Version B. In Version A, Rava does not deal with the question of healing after resurrection, which exists in Version B and *Ecclesiastes Rabbah*, but with the question of the corporeality of the resurrection. He claimed that just as the body which was wounded is the one to be healed, so too, the body which was killed is the one to be resurrected. The *Epistula Apostolorum* has led to a new reading of a talmudic selection, and the talmudic saying has explained a perplexing sentence in a Christian composition.

### Conclusions

I opened this work with two unclear versions of a saying attributed to Rava in the Babylonian Talmud. Each was clarified by comparison with sources from both Jewish and Christian literature. The two versions turned out to be distinctly different responses to two arguments rejecting the idea of the resurrection of the dead.

Version B, "to what I bring death I give life, and afterwards what I wound I heal" appears to be a response to the claim that if the dead will return healthy they must be different people and not those who died. This argument is clearly stated in the amoraic Palestinian source – *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* – and implied in Rava's Version B in the Babylonian Talmud. Earlier Christian sources (second and early third century C.E.), as the writings of Tertullian and Minucius Felix show, attributed this same claim to their pagan contemporaries. The answer offered in Jewish sources such as *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* and Version B is that the dead will first return with their faults and wounds, and be cured only after they have been identified.

Despite the fact that in *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* and Version B the description of the order of the actions in the resurrection is an answer to a pagan argument, it may have been devised as an internal Jewish question. The first appearance of this series is found in a description of resurrection in an earlier Palestinian source – *2 Baruch*. This description, however, lacks any indication of polemical or theological significance of this order or of questions posed by heretics. There is no discussion regarding the relations between body and soul or substance and essence, and no questions regarding the corporeality of the resurrection, as found in the writings of Tertullian and Minucius Felix. There are only questions regarding the identity of the dead and the resurrected person. It is therefore possible that this tradition did not result from a response to pagan claims that pushed the polemic with Christians *ad*

*absurdum*, but from an innocent question regarding the identity of the dead and the resurrected person.

The claim Rava responded to in his Version A is similar to the pagan charge that only the soul will rise and not the body. This claim is focused on the philosophical aspects of the resurrection and questions regarding the relationship between the body and the soul. It is hard to answer such questions with technical solutions as in the order of actions, and Tertullian responded with a logical argument, by asserting that the body too will be resurrected since it is what has fallen and died. This argument appears first in the *Epistula Apostolorum*, and from it we deduced the meaning of Rava's Version A: "to what I bring death I give life, as what I wound I heal."

Even though the two claims are independent, they are not completely distinct, but are related to each other as two aspects of a single general position. According to the pagans, the body cannot rise during resurrection, only the soul. This view led to the derisive question about the identity of the dead and the resurrected, which pushes *ad absurdum* the claim that the body could be resurrected, and resulted in the answer provided by Rava's Version B and *Ecclesiastes Rabbah*. Nonetheless, the pagan viewpoint also led to a discussion regarding the relations between body and soul and to an answer from Christians, as presented in the *Epistula Apostolorum* and later Tertullian, that the body must be resurrected because the body fell. This answer is also conveyed in Rava's Version A.

The thematic separation between these two discussions, one on the relations between body and soul and the other on healing the resurrected, suggests that the two versions of Rava's saying are two distinct though related teachings. Though Version B is clearer than Version A, it is neither an adaptation of it nor a later refinement of it. The two versions are not dependent on one another, but each presents a different aspect of the argument against the pagan rejection of the resurrection. The pagan arguments and the responses to them are well attested in both Jewish and Christian literature, and they shed new light on these ambiguous talmudic versions.

Nevertheless, even though both versions of Rava's teaching are well attested in the different manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud as well as in external sources, their status is not identical. Version A is closer to the *baraita* that follows Rava's saying, and therefore it seems that the editor of the talmudic discussion was familiar with this version. Version B could only have been added to the talmudic discussion after its initial stage of editing, as we can tell from its linguistic and thematic resemblance to version B.

Another conclusion is the relationship between the verse and the Midrash attached to it. In 2 *Baruch* and *Epistula Apostolorum*, two sources that are not based on biblical commentary, we found arguments similar to those in *Sifre Deuteronomy* and the Babylonian Talmud. This may indicate that the tannaitic and amoraic Midrash on Deuteronomy 32:39 did not result from biblical commentary and is not dependent on it. It resulted either from a discussion on the resurrection of the dead and its corporeal nature or from a

question on healing of the dead; but in any case, it did not originate from an exegetical problem.

The separation between the Midrash and the claims in it is also significant for the dating of these positions. Following rabbinic sources only, both claims could be dated from early in the third century, when *Sifre Deuteronomy* was edited, and where the earliest rabbinic attestation of this Midrash is found. However, both positions appear in earlier sources as well. One claim is found in *2 Baruch*, from the early second century C.E., and another in *Epistula Apostolorum*, from the middle of the same century. It seems that the amoraic sources – Rava in the Babylonian Talmud and R. Hanina in *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* – as well as tannaitic sources such as *Sifre Deuteronomy* reflect a polemic that preceded the time of their editing.

Moreover, if the Christian sources present a reliable picture of the pagan sayings of their era, that comparison may help in identifying the heretics whom the sages opposed and to explain their theological arguments. The sages did not generally name their opponents or articulate their views, whereas the Christian sources regularly identified their rivals and even cited them, thus testifying to the views of the pagans of their time.

It should be noted, however, that though a genealogical<sup>89</sup> link between these sources is possible in this case, it is not possible to determine whether these polemical stances originated in a Jewish community or in a Christian community; nor is it possible to determine what kind of relationship between Jews and Christians enabled a shift of ideas between the communities. The variety of sources, from the second century through the fourth, merely reflects how common was the polemic on the resurrection, and how similar arguments circulated among both Jews and Christians in defense of the same pagan claim. Furthermore, the earliest evidence of these two claims is from the second century, a time during which Judaism and Christianity had only begun the process of separation and self-identification. It seems therefore that the question of where these polemic stances originated is not relevant. We should rather ask how the same arguments developed in each community, in their mutual struggle against a common enemy.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>89</sup> On the difference between genealogical and analogical parallels, see J. Z. Smith, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity* (Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion 14; London and Chicago: School of Oriental and African Studies University of London and University of Chicago Press, 1990); G. Seelig, *Religionsgeschichtliche Methode in Vergangenheit Und Gegenwart: Studien Zur Geschichte Und Methode Des Religionsgeschichtlichen Vergleichs in Der Neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft* (Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 7; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2001).

<sup>90</sup> The methodological claim that Judaism and Christianity should be seen as sister religions, rather than a mother and daughter, was recently discussed by Y. J. Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 31-91; D. Boyarin, “The *Diadoche* of the Rabbis; or, Judah the Patriarch at Yavneh,” in R.L. Kalmin - S. Schwartz (eds.), *Jewish Culture and Society under the Christian Roman Empire* (Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Culture and Religion 3; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), pp. 285-347. This claim was taken to extreme by Peter Schäfer,

Furthermore, Rava's Midrash is found in the Babylonian Talmud, while the majority of our sources, both Jewish and Christian, are from different parts of the Roman Empire – Palestine, Egypt, North Africa, and Asia Minor. Their earliest attestation, and therefore the places from which they are more likely to have originated are Palestine (2 Baruch) and Egypt (*Epistula Apostolorum*). The fact that Rava's two versions are similar to claims which originated two centuries earlier, in Palestine and Egypt does not mean that Rava had any direct contact with these communities or their traditions. He simply knew arguments which evolved from these early polemical stances and continued to circulate in Jewish communities of his time.<sup>91</sup>

The primary importance of the comparison of rabbinic and patristic sources is found in its contribution to solving textual problems in each source, sometimes reciprocally, as has been demonstrated here. Rava's saying in Version A is unclear and its purpose vague, but its meaning was elucidated by the parallel source from the *Epistula Apostolorum*. On the other hand, the wording of the *Epistula Apostolorum* raised questions regarding the connection between three sequential clauses, and its comparison to Rava's saying led to both resolution and clarification.

#### ABSTRACT

*The polemic over the resurrection of the dead thrived through the first centuries of the Common Era. It is a unique example of a similar opinion held by both Jews and Christians and defended in similar ways against various pagan opponents. These similarities are important not only as historical evidence to the ties between Jews and Christians in late antiquity, but also as a tool for solving literary and philological problems in both Jewish and Christian sources. The Babylonian Talmud preserved two versions of a polemic stance defending the belief in resurrection. A comparison to early Christian sources shows that these versions are not two adaptations of one statement, but rather two independent positions, responding to pagans claims denying the resurrection of the body. It thus provides us with a tool for solving an enigma in the development of the Talmudic text, and adds to our understanding of some of the ways the Talmudic text evolved.*

---

see P. Schäfer, *Die Geburt des Judentums aus dem Geist des Christentums* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

<sup>91</sup> On the difference between Palestinian and Babylonian sources referring to Christianity, see P. Schäfer, *Jesus in the Talmud* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).