

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF DIVINITY

Resuscitated Indeed:  
Paul and the Resurrection Age

A dissertation submitted to the committee  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the completion of

DISS 990  
Dissertation Defense

by

C. P. Davis

December 2, 2017

## Contents

### Chapter 1: The Bodily Resuscitation of Christ

Introduction .....	1
Literature Review .....	27
Methodology .....	38
Summary .....	41

### Chapter 2: Survey of the Second Temple Literature

Introduction .....	44
Pseudepigraphal Writings Prior to the Fall of the Temple .....	46
The Ethiopic Book of Enoch (1 Enoch) .....	46
The Lives of the Prophets .....	62
Psalms of Solomon .....	66
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs .....	70
Pseudo-Phocylides .....	74
Pseudepigraphal Writings Shortly After the Fall of the Temple .....	76
The Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch (2 Enoch) .....	76
The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch (2 Baruch) .....	80
Testament of Job .....	83
Apocryphal Writings .....	84
Second Maccabees .....	85
Conclusion .....	89

### Chapter 3: Survey of the Patristic Literature

Introduction .....	92
Church Fathers from c. AD 70-200 .....	93
Clement of Rome .....	94
Ignatius of Antioch .....	97
Polycarp of Smyrna .....	100
Didache .....	103
The Epistle of Barnabas .....	105
Justin Martyr .....	107
Irenaeus of Lyons .....	112
Conclusion .....	116

### Chapter 4: Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 15

Introduction .....	118
Paul and the Old Testament .....	119
Paul and his Conceptual Milieu .....	134
Conclusion .....	147

### Chapter 5: Conclusion

Summary .....	149
Implications and Further Research .....	152
Conclusion .....	154

Bibliography .....	156
--------------------	-----

## CHAPTER 1: THE BODILY RESUSCITATION OF CHRIST

### Introduction

What does it mean to be resurrected? Is there some a priori reason why this concept should entail not simply a return from the dead, but rather a transformation into some other form of existence? If the answer is based solely upon the words used for resurrection such as *anastasis* and *egeirō* then it is obviously no. Each of these words means simply to “rise up” and can be used to refer to rising up in action (Acts 5:17; Matt 24:7), or coming back from the dead (John 11:23; 12:1). The idea is the same in each case. The notion of an alteration in being is an onto-theological nuance that cannot be sustained upon the basis of these word choices. This means that when the reader comes to passages in the New Testament where Jesus raises someone from the dead, the initial response should be to take the statement at face value.

Take the following pericope for example from John 11:38–44:

<sup>38</sup>Then Jesus, deeply moved again, came to the tomb. It was a cave, and a stone was lying against it. <sup>39</sup>“Remove the stone,” Jesus said. Martha, the dead man’s sister, told him, “Lord, there is already a stench because he has been dead four days.” <sup>40</sup>Jesus said to her, “Didn’t I tell you that if you believed you would see the glory of God?” <sup>41</sup>So they removed the stone. Then Jesus raised his eyes and said, “Father, I thank you that you heard me. <sup>42</sup>I know that you always hear me, but because of the crowd standing here I said this, so that they may believe you sent me.” <sup>43</sup>After he said this, he shouted with a loud voice, “Lazarus, come out!” <sup>44</sup>The dead man came out bound hand and foot with linen strips and with his face wrapped in a cloth. Jesus said to them, “Unwrap him and let him go.”<sup>1</sup>

It is hard to believe that those who were in attendance would have thought that what had just occurred was anything less than a resurrection from the dead. A few observations strengthen this

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture quotations are either my own translation or they are taken from the Christian Standard Bible®, Copyright © 2017 by Holman Bible Publishers. Used by permission. Christian Standard Bible® and CSB® are federally registered trademarks of Holman Bible Publishers.

contention. First, when Jesus dialogues with Martha he is intent on extracting from her a confession of the faith in his ability to raise people from the dead. He begins by telling Martha that her brother will rise (Ἀναστήσεται) again. To this, Martha responds that she is aware that he will rise along with every other believer ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (“in the resurrection in the last day”). Jesus, however, wishes to bring this eschatological notion into the present since he is the resurrection. The implication, of course, is that with Jesus on the scene even Lazarus could return to life now.<sup>2</sup> And this is precisely what happens. When Lazarus returned to life Martha would have not thought, “Well, since this did not take place in the last day, it is not a resurrection.” What Martha may have thought, though, was that this resurrection was not the same as what will take place “in the resurrection in the last day.” Yet, this has no bearing on the actual event of Lazarus coming out of the grave. Sure the world is not ending and all believers are not raising from their graves, but does this entail that Lazarus’s resurrection is any less of an actual return to life from the dead? Second, John does not introduce language into this pericope that would allow for any other notion other than a return from the dead. Jesus’ mention of Lazarus rising again is only the first place that John utilizes “raising” language. In the next chapter (12:1) John records the return of Jesus to Bethany ὅπου ἦν Λάζαρος, ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν Ἰησοῦς (“where Lazarus was, whom Jesus raised from the dead”). A straightforward reading of this verse will lead one to think that Lazarus was resurrected. Of course, this assumes the reader knows what is meant by the term “resurrection.” Depending on one’s definition, what has just been presented is either mundane—with the ensuing “Duh” that is deserved—or it is

---

<sup>2</sup> It is important to note, though, that Jesus’ intent here is more focused on the life that Lazarus and all believers are granted through belief in Christ. See D. A. Carson, *The Gospel according to John* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1991), 414.

radical in terms of breaking a reigning paradigm—with the ensuing “Is this guy even saved?” that is a bit less deserved, but typically follows anyway.

The issue that has developed in the discussion of the resurrection is that the term has been given a technical definition that applies only to Christ. Rather than a resurrection being understood as a raising from the dead, it is to be thought of as a transformation that took place in the being of Christ as he was brought back from the dead. “The raised Christ is the crucified Christ and no other, but he is the crucified Christ in transfigured form,” writes Jürgen Moltmann.<sup>3</sup> This much is agreeable: as of this moment, Christ is in a glorified (= transfigured) state, and is dwelling in heaven. Still there is a flaw with Moltmann’s statement; a step has been skipped. As the worship song goes, “From the grave to the sky, Lord I lift your name on high,” so does Moltmann’s concept. But where in all of this is the actual resurrection body of Christ? Though the term “resurrection” is used, the idea of a Christ who died and then went to heaven does not adequately address the state of Christ’s body directly after his resurrection. Instead, the song—albeit not very melodic—should go, “From the grave to life, from life to the sky, Lord I lift your name on high.”

Some scholars argue that this distinction is invalid. Carey C. Newman for instance argues, “The resurrection, ascension, and exaltation to God’s right hand cannot be separated into distinct events.”<sup>4</sup> Each of these notions is conveying (metaphorically) the one reality of the risen Christ. The problem, of course, is that the NT offers multiple reasons to think that these events are indeed separate. Luke records the ascension as taking place after the time that Jesus was

---

<sup>3</sup> Jürgen Moltmann, *The Coming of God: Christian Eschatology*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 29.

<sup>4</sup> Carey C. Newman, “Resurrection as Glory: Divine Presence and Christian Origins,” in *The Resurrection: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Resurrection of Jesus*, ed. Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O’Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 82n78.

“with them [the disciples]” (Acts 1:4). The implication is that there was a point where Jesus left the disciples and this is what Luke records as his ascension into heaven. Luke summarizes this event in his Gospel as well. In this case, he clarifies that “while he was blessing them, he left them and was carried up into heaven” (Luke 24:51). Again, it is clear that he views Christ’s ascension as occurring as a separate event from his resurrection. John also records Jesus’ own ideas about his resurrection versus his ascension. When Mary found Jesus alive she grabbed him in such a way that caused Jesus to respond, “Don’t cling to me . . . since I have not yet ascended to the Father. But go to my brothers and tell them that I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God” (John 20:17). It is difficult to conclude from this verse that Jesus or John would have been comfortable with equating his resurrection with the ascension. Both Luke and John go to lengths to point out a series of events that took place after the resurrection, so collapsing them all into one event is not the best option. It is important not to do this so that theological precision can be maintained. It is necessary to speak specifically about a resurrected versus a glorified body. The two are not equivalent. The latter occurs only after the former. Moreover, “glorification” should not be viewed as a synonym for “resurrection.”

According to 1 John 3:2, ἀγαπητοί, νῦν τέκνα θεοῦ ἐσμεν, καὶ οὐπω ἐφανερώθη τί ἐσόμεθα. οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἐὰν φανερωθῆ ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα, ὅτι ὁψόμεθα αὐτὸν καθὼς ἐστιν (“Beloved, we are already the children of God, but it has not yet been made known what we will be. However, we know that when it is made known, we will be like him, since we will see him as he is”).<sup>5</sup> John makes it clear that whatever the final state of the child of God may be, it is not yet known to him or his audience. This is most intriguing, since John is likely writing long after Paul

---

<sup>5</sup> The causal ὅτι entails that we will be changed into the likeness of Christ because we *know* that we will be able to behold his glory. John is making a logical inference based upon the fact that Christ, whom he is clearly equating with God here, cannot be seen in his current glory without an alteration of the flesh. This is reminiscent of Paul, who writes that “flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God” (1 Cor 15:50).

has completed his material. This means that John is assuming that nothing within the works of Paul (which I am convinced John had access to), reveals the nature of this final state. Habermas makes an interesting comment in relation to this verse: “[John] teaches that there is still *much* that we do not know about our future state” (emphasis added).<sup>6</sup> It is hard to see how Habermas can conclude from καὶ οὐπω ἐφανερώθη τί ἐσόμεθα (“but it has not yet been made know what we will be”) that there is “much” that is unknown about this final state. Unless John is mistaken, there is *nothing* one may ascertain about this final state, save perhaps the fact that it will be patterned after Christ’s glorious being. If John concludes that the transformed state has not yet been revealed, and his are among the last writings—if not the last writings—of the New Testament, it is strange to think that there should indeed be some form of knowledge about an unrevealed mystery.<sup>7</sup> To talk of such a state would require further revelation.<sup>8</sup> For John, the glorified state is simply that: the glorified state. According to him, nothing beyond this knowledge has yet been revealed.<sup>9</sup>

The question then arises, what about the resurrection appearances of Christ? If the Gospel accounts of Christ’s appearances are taken as accurate, then John saw Christ in his resurrected state numerous times (Matt 28:16-20; Luke 24:32-53; John 20:19-31). Yet, even after seeing him in such a state, John can later conclude that what the believer shall be cannot be known yet. This requires that John does not think the final state of the believer is consonant with the resurrection

---

<sup>6</sup> Gary R. Habermas, *The Resurrection*, vol. 1 (Joplin, MO: College Press, 2000), 77.

<sup>7</sup> For a discussion on the dating of the epistles see Robert W. Yarbrough, *1-3 John*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Baker Academic, 2008), 16–17.

<sup>8</sup> For a discussion of φανερώω and its consistent Johannine use for divine revelation see *Ibid.*, 177.

<sup>9</sup> It is possible that the Apocalypse could be a source for this further revelation. The issue here, though, is the nature of the imagery. One may be able to conclude that the future believer will shine brilliantly, but it is not as clear that each believer will have white hair and fiery red eyes. It is also questionable that we will look like a slaughtered lamb. The point is that whatever we will be, will be *like* Christ.



body of Christ. John would not advocate extrapolating knowledge from Christ's resurrection body and applying it to the future state of believers. Indeed, if this were possible it is unlikely John would have neglected to discuss the nature of the future state, given his extensive interaction with the resurrected Christ. Only if the future state is not yet known does it make sense for the apostle to be silent on this point. John Stott summarizes nicely: "So here John confesses that the exact state and condition of the redeemed in heaven had not been revealed to him. This being so, it is idle and sinful to speculate or to pry into things which God has not been pleased to make known."<sup>10</sup>

Turning to Paul, we find a similar bifurcation between resurrection and glorification. Philippians 3:21 reads, ὃς μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ("who will transform our lowly body, to be made into the same form as his glorious body"). For Paul, whatever the state of the believer will be, it will be comparable to the glorified body of Christ. There is a possibility that Paul has in mind Christ's resurrection and preascension form.<sup>11</sup> However, this option does not seem likely given the location of the glorious Christ within the context of Philippians 3:20. Paul is expounding upon the citizenship that the believer has ἐν οὐρανοῖς ("in heaven"). It is from this location, as contrasted with the earthly examples during the resurrection appearances, that Christ is used as the example for the future state of the believer's body.

---

<sup>10</sup> Stott is incorrect to speak of this as the state of the believer in heaven, since this is the state of the believer in the new heaven and new earth. But the result is the same: one ought not to pry into unrevealed mysteries of God. John R. W. Stott, *Letters of John*, vol. 19, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2009), 122.

<sup>11</sup> Daniel L. Migliore holds this view in a later part of his work on this passage. Yet, at an earlier point, Migliore seems to divide the concepts. This is the issue with such a nuanced understanding: there is the potential to ignore initial impulses that seek a division in later areas of theological discussion. Daniel L. Migliore, *Philippians and Philemon*, *Belief: A Theological Commentary on the Bible* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014), 60; cf. 134.

Jesus also likely made it clear that there was a distinction between his resurrection body and his glorified state. In the first case, he says, “Now, Father, glorify me in your presence with that glory I had with you before the world existed” (John 17:5). The latter segment of this verse τῆ δόξῃ ἣ εἶχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί (the glory that I had beside you before the world existed) implies that Jesus was in some sense without his glory during his residence on earth. The best way to understand this is in relation to his form and not his nature before the Incarnation. In other words, Jesus had in the beginning, had during the Incarnation, and now has glory, in the sense of his divinity necessitating honor and glory; but he emptied himself of his glorious *form* taking on human flesh (Phil 2:7). The question is, at what point did Jesus regain such glory? According to D. A. Carson, “When Jesus is glorified, he does not leave his body behind in a grave, but rises a transformed, glorified body . . . which returns to the Father (*cf.* 20:17) and thus to the glory the Son had with the Father ‘before the world began.’”<sup>12</sup> This seems a bit strained. If the Son is glorified when he is raised, and yet the glory is received in the return to the Father, when exactly does the searing hot brightness of glory appear? Surely, this did not occur in front of the apostles, for there would be no Gospels of which to speak. It is better to understand the regaining of the glory that Jesus once had at the moment after his ascension. Only at this point in time would it be capable for a true metamorphosis to take place that rendered Christ so magnificent that it would be worth calling his form “glorious.” The resurrection body of Christ would not qualify for such a change, since every one of the apostles looked upon Christ without fear and trembling. This is assuming, of course, that the glory that Christ regained, was equivalent to the stature of the one that was with God in the beginning, being God himself (John 1:1; *cf.* Exod 33:20; Rev 1:14).

---

<sup>12</sup> Carson, *The Gospel according to John*, 557.

It could be argued that the glory the Son received was not equivalent to the death-dealing face of God. This would mean that the Son's glory, though incredible, would still be lesser than the Father's glorious appearance.<sup>13</sup> In fact, this may even be a preferable position to the one just advocated. Yet, there is still a problem here: is it not odd that the apostles did not mention anything spectacular about this glorious resurrection body of Christ? They were fully capable of making such points. And lest one interjects here that this is an argument from silence, it is necessary to make mention of one more event in the Gospel of Matthew. In Matthew 16:27–28 Jesus speaks of the glory that he will have when he comes in his kingdom. The first implication of this is that he will not have such glory until his kingdom comes to earth. Since it is most probable that this kingdom has not yet come to earth it would follow that such glory has not yet been revealed—at least not in its fullest sense. This, however, is not the most pressing point of this pericope. In verse 28 Jesus tells his disciples that “there are some standing here who shall not taste death till they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom.” Obviously, this is a controversial passage, which has yielded numerous interpretations.<sup>14</sup> Still, the best available option is to see the following pericope as the fulfillment of Christ's statement. According to David L. Turner, “The transfiguration will be a glorious experience (17:2, 5), but it will be only a temporary preview of what will come with permanence when Jesus returns to the earth.”<sup>15</sup> In this temporary experience ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένοντο λευκὰ ὡς τὸ φῶς (“his face shined like the sun; his garments were brilliant like light”). It is

---

<sup>13</sup> It is necessary to distinguish between appearance and nature. As mentioned above, the glory due the Son is equivalent to the Father according to nature. However, this scenario is speaking of the appearance of the persons of the Trinity. That is, Jesus could conceivably have a glorious appearance that can be beheld by men without their destruction.

<sup>14</sup> Excellent work establishing this position has been done elsewhere. See David L. Turner, *Matthew*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 412–14.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 413.

important to remember who was present during this event: Peter, James, and John (17:1). If ever there were an event that revealed the future nature of Christ's glory this would be it; and yet, John is still capable of saying that such glory has not been revealed (1 John 3:2). Turner is correct to argue that this event was but a sampling of the eschatological glory that will be revealed in Christ.

This is the point at which the argument from silence must be availed: in the resurrection appearances of Christ no mention is made that Christ μετεμορφώθη (“was transformed”) as it was at the transfiguration. In fact, the transfiguration receives its title from the presence of this word; it is what sets it apart from all other appearances of Christ on earth. Rather than speaking of a transformation in the resurrection body of Christ, it is as if the evangelists argued for the direct opposite. Here is what Norman L. Geisler says concerning this: “The sum total of this evidence [i.e., the twelve appearances] is overwhelming confirmation that Jesus rose and lived in the *same visible*, material body he possessed before His resurrection” (emphasis added).<sup>16</sup> It is astounding to think that the weight of evidence could point in the direction that everyone who saw the risen Lord saw him in a way that looked *exactly* like his form on earth, when in actuality he was glorified in a manner comparable to the transfiguration. “Anybody who had been there (I hold) could have seen Jesus. It would even have been possible (I suggest) for an unbeliever—one, let’s say, who happened to know Jesus—to have recognized him,” writes Stephen T. Davis.<sup>17</sup> Surely at least one person would have mentioned the fact that ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος (“his face shined like the sun”).

---

<sup>16</sup> Norman L. Geisler, *The Battle for the Resurrection* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1989), 141.

<sup>17</sup> Stephen T. Davis, “‘Seeing’ the Risen Jesus,” in *The Resurrection*, ed. Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O’Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 147.

Instead of descriptions of glory, the resurrection appearances are described in rather mundane terms. Although Christ manifested himself within a closed room, as if a ghost, he was still not a ghost, since he retained his scars (John 20:24–27). He appeared to a large crowd and apparently no one thought he was a spirit (1 Cor 15:6). The one time he is accused of being a ghost he puts the thought to rest by saying, “Look at my hands and my feet, that it is I myself! Touch me and see, because a ghost does not have flesh and bones as you can see I have!” (Luke 24:39). Even with this moment of doubt, there is at least one instance prior to his resurrection that Jesus’ disciples thought he was a ghost (Matt 14:22–33). It would be most unusual to make a doctrinal position based upon this misguided understanding of a few scared disciples. How much more frightening would it have been to see someone whom they had thought to be dead? Nevertheless, Scripture assures us that Christ’s resurrection body was no ethereal entity, but rather it was flesh and bone.

It is necessary to find some other place to speak of Christ in a transformed state. This understanding adequately reflects the progression of glorification of which Paul writes. For Christ, and for the believer now, the progression, according to 2 Corinthians 3:18, is ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν (from glory into glory). There is never a time when the believer is without glory; nor is there a time when Christ is without glory in some sense (see above). However, there will be a time when the glory alters not only the status of the believer, but the form. Paul is clear on this matter; he is equally clear that this form will be patterned after Christ. Hence, when he writes, in Colossians 3:4, ὅταν ὁ Χριστὸς φανερωθῆ, ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν, τότε καὶ ὑμεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ φανερωθήσεσθε ἐν δόξῃ (“whenever Christ is revealed, who is your life, then you also will be

revealed with him in glory”), he is making a specific claim as to the timing of glorification.<sup>18</sup> The point of the revelation is *unknown*; but, what is known is that when this time comes the believer will be made the same as Christ. Paul confesses ignorance of the timing, whereas John confessed ignorance of the nature. In both cases, however, the point is that the believer will take on the same form of glory that has been granted to Christ, to be revealed at a later point in time. Within the context it is clear that this glory is already possessed by Christ, in whom the life of the believer—that which is waiting to be revealed—is hidden in heaven.<sup>19</sup>

To corroborate this notion of glorification in heaven, one only needs to turn to another biblical scene involving Paul. As Luke records in Acts 9:3, when Paul was heading to Damascus “suddenly a light shone around him from heaven.” After this, he heard the voice of Jesus calling him out of his present sinful life to follow him (vv. 4–5). The result of this encounter was blindness (vv. 8–9). Stott comments, “[I]t was an objective appearance of the resurrected and now-glorified Jesus Christ. The light he saw was the glory of Christ.”<sup>20</sup> Though it is possible to argue that the light was a separate manifestation from Christ, it seems likely that Stott is correct on this point. In any case, the glorious appearance of Christ was presumably so magnificent that Paul could only see light. So, whether the light was the actual radiance of Christ or some ambient light from heaven, Jesus’ appearance was such that it resulted in trembling and blindness. This is much different than the records of Christ’s resurrection appearances—even if those appearances

---

<sup>18</sup> This meaning is obscured in most translations, since they render “whenever” as “when,” and “revealed” as “appear.” In the former instance, “whenever” accurately captures the subjunctive use following ὅταν. The idea is one of uncertainty: Paul does not know when this will happen. In the latter case, the voice is passive, which is better understood as “made known.” The emphasis is on something or someone being made known, not simply appearing.

<sup>19</sup> Even though Curtis Vaughan maintains that this is the resurrection body the believer is after, he still places the location of Christ in heaven at the right hand of God. Curtis Vaughan, in *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), 210.

<sup>20</sup> John R. W. Stott, *The Message of Acts*, The Bible Speaks Today (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1994), 170.

were only to disciples. The differences should alert the reader to the fact that this is not to be lumped in with all of Christ's "postresurrection" appearances.<sup>21</sup>

With the distinction between resurrection and glorification being made, we are now in a position to offer a definition: *a resurrection is the miraculous resuscitation of the body after it has been long enough to determine that the body was actually dead*. No transformation of the body is necessary in order for this to take place. Assuming severe trauma was the cause of death, rigor mortis sets in (thus diminishing portions of the body), or some other malady such as a tumor caused death to occur, a second miracle of healing is necessary to bring a body back from the dead (or at least maintain life once revived). However, because it is assumed that in order for someone to be resurrected he must also be healed of previous death inducing problems, this can be added to our definition as an imbedded assumption. This brings up the issue of resuscitation. Is there a difference between being resuscitated and resurrected? The answer to this depends upon one's definition of resuscitation. If we follow Webster's definition—"to revive from apparent death or from unconsciousness"—then it would be better to retain a distinction. The inclusion of both "apparent" and "unconsciousness" renders this definition unhelpful for our purposes. The problem, of course, is that we are only here concerned with cases that actually included death. "Apparent" death is a rather squishy way of saying the person was more than likely just unconscious. The problem is that there are numerous cases within the OT, NT, and the modern world, where death is not apparent but actual. In these cases, such as the dozens of

---

<sup>21</sup> Though this is technically accurate, since the appearance takes place after Christ's resurrection, the goal of this title is to include this appearance within the group of those appearances right after his resurrection. Peter F. Carnley, "Response," in *The Resurrection: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Resurrection of Jesus*, ed. Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O'Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 32. I am in agreement with Alston's assessment that Paul's experience was of a different order than the previous appearances. William P. Alston, "Biblical Criticism and the Resurrection," in *The Resurrection: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Resurrection of Jesus*, ed. Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O'Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 160–61.

modern instances recorded by Craig S. Keener, it is odd to find the term “resuscitation” attractive unless it is understood as a raising from the dead.<sup>22</sup>

If we understand the term as a raising from the dead, then what is the difference between a resuscitation and a resurrection? There is no difference, and it is for this reason that I embrace the position that Jesus was resuscitated—not in Webster’s sense of the word—but in the sense of the word that entails a simple raising from the dead. Ideally, I would like to utilize the term “resurrection,” but this term has been loaded with more meaning than a straightforward reading of the biblical concept can bear. Rather than holding the meaning “being raised from the grave,” “resurrection” has become a technical term for the supposed transformation of the body of Christ as he came out of the grave. That is, what went into the ground was not the same as that which came out of the ground. This is what is typically meant by “resurrection.” The correct understanding, though, is that the same Jesus who was crucified and buried was also raised in his same body. A good way to get a handle on this issue is to briefly analyze the way terminology has led scholars to conclude in ways that are not logically consistent and are incapable of adequate historical study.

Ernst Troeltsch “developed” principles for historical inquiry that he believed would safeguard the study of the biblical material from dogmatic concerns.<sup>23</sup> Regardless of how much he has been critiqued, his ideas have pervaded NT studies. It is therefore impossible to disregard his notions as passé; they are very much alive and working today. Troeltsch was also not shy in

---

<sup>22</sup> Keener has no problem with using this word, and so long as he is clear (which he is) that a resuscitation is to be equated with “raising” from the dead I have no issue either. Craig S. Keener, *Miracles: The Credibility of the New Testament Accounts*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 536–79.

<sup>23</sup> Technically he was borrowing concepts from other realms of historical study and applying them to the study of the NT.



pointing out that his method would lead to some less than adequate results for those who still held a conservative view of Scripture:

I refer to the historical method purely as such, to the problem of “Christianity and History.” By this problem I do not mean the protection of Christianity from particular results of historical scholarship and from particular ways of looking at historical events but rather the effect of the modern historical method on the whole conception of Christianity. Once the historical method is applied to biblical studies and to church history it becomes a leaven that permeates everything and that finally blows open the whole earlier form of theological method. I have expressly taken up this point of departure, and I have fully established the conception of the consequences that follow from it.<sup>24</sup>

The reworking of the traditional picture of early Christianity was a natural outworking of this method.<sup>25</sup> The issue, of course, is that those who desire to retain the traditional picture must now be aware of the fact that they are holding onto a dogmatic picture. When set beside actual history, however, this picture cannot remain. Those who have the courage to set their minds to the task of historical research will not turn away when their results challenge events recorded even in the NT.

Those who are critical of this “pure” historical method, often note that the criteria that Troeltsch (and others) developed create a situation in which the NT material will necessarily have to be reworked. In particular, Troeltsch sought to remove the ability of theologians to appeal to a special type of history wherein the miraculous events found in Scripture were above reproof. Troeltsch believed that this maneuver signaled the tacit approval of the historical method, but the inability of the theologians to meet the criteria. Hence, they needed to figure out a way around the problem. According to Troeltsch it is “boredom with the efforts of apologetics”

---

<sup>24</sup> Ernst Troeltsch, *On the Historical and Dogmatic Methods in Theology*, trans. Jack Forstman, vol. 2 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1913), 1–2.

<sup>25</sup> It is not surprising that those who followed this method in whole often put out works that radically altered the traditional picture of early Christianity. For an example see Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel (Mifflintown, PA: Sigler Press, 1996).

that has led to these decisions.<sup>26</sup> Again, his point is that the theologians he is referencing have seldom been convinced by the historical arguments for the miraculous. So, rather than seek to prop up those miraculous events with evidential proofs they have figured out ways to ignore the historian's critiques. Rudolf Bultmann's project of demythologizing is an appropriate example of this.<sup>27</sup>

What exactly led Troeltsch to posit that there was simply no way to include the miraculous as truly historical? One might argue that he was operating from a naturalistic presupposition. This could, of course, be true, but there is something a bit more subtle going on. Rather than expressly arguing that miraculous events are ruled out due to God's nonactivity in this world, Troeltsch is saying that even if the miraculous does take place it cannot be established as *history* because it transgresses the primary axiom of his method: the principle of analogy. "For the means by which criticism is made possible is the application of analogy. Analogy with the things that happen before our eyes and take place in our midst is the key to criticism," writes Troeltsch.<sup>28</sup> The idea is that only those things that can be ascertained as still happening in our day and age can be considered valid parallels for historical research. This is not a novel opinion. In fact, this was the first prong of David Hume's philosophical argument against the miraculous. Hume argues, "But it is a miracle, that a dead man should come to life; because that has never been observed in any age or country."<sup>29</sup> Most criticisms of Hume attempt to show how this assumption against the miraculous is flawed from the start.

---

<sup>26</sup> Troeltsch, *On the Historical and Dogmatic Methods in Theology*, 2:11.

<sup>27</sup> See, for instance, Bultmann's explanation of why the fourth Evangelist utilized a "miracle account" to get Jesus from one side of the lake to the other. Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), 216–18.

<sup>28</sup> Troeltsch, *On the Historical and Dogmatic Methods in Theology*, 2:3.

But what if one were to adopt the principle of analogy, and seek to offer evidence from both past and modern experiences to satisfy it?<sup>30</sup> Both of these men argued something along these lines: *people simply do not raise from the dead; there is no analogy for thinking of a resurrection as historical; therefore, the resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth cannot be considered historical.* However, if there is enough data to challenge the first and second premises of this argument, then it seems as though it would be possible to include a resurrection within historical research. Of course, there are other a priori assumptions that the critic will utilize to denigrate this evidence, but this is not our concern. If the problem with analogy can be remedied, it is one cog in the historical objection to miracles that can be removed.<sup>31</sup> This then is the question: can the resurrection of Jesus Christ satisfy the requirements of the principle of analogy?

One consistent theme throughout the literature is that the resurrection of Jesus Christ was unique. This uniqueness does not usually concern the fact that Jesus rose a few days after death, but rather that his resurrection was qualitatively different than a resuscitation of his body. There was some sort of alteration to his physical existence that renders this event something far from ordinary. The irony in this should not be missed: even a resuscitation is not an ordinary event. The point (I suppose) is that as a resuscitation is beyond ordinary, a resurrection is beyond a resuscitation—one might say it is two steps removed from the ordinary.

---

<sup>29</sup> David Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning the Human Understanding: And An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals* (Clarendon Press, 1894), 115.

<sup>30</sup> This is essentially Keener's goal in *Miracles*. What I am doing here is clearing the way for the inclusion of the Resurrection, something that is conspicuously missing from Keener's work. For the only note about the uniqueness of the Resurrection in his first volume see Keener, *Miracles*, 1:538.

<sup>31</sup> A valid alternative to what I am doing here is to challenge the principle of analogy based upon its flaws. I am in agreement with Beckwith's critique, for instance, but I think there is another way to address this as well. If we can assume the validity of the principle for the sake of the argument and then present data that satisfies it, then we have won on two accounts. Francis J. Beckwith, "History and Miracles," in *In Defense of Miracles: A Comprehensive Case for God's Action in History*, ed. R. Douglas Geivett and Gary R. Habermas (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1997), 96–98.

N. T. Wright argues in this manner. It is interesting to see how he gets to his conclusion, though, because he begins by noting that the idea of a resurrection was always understood as simply the raising up of the body that went into the ground.<sup>32</sup> This argument is utilized to crush the opposing position that the resurrection of Jesus could have been conceived of in less than literal terms. If the Greek terms used for “resurrection” were known to always have had attachment to a physical raising from the dead, then it makes little sense to assert that a nonphysical sense is what these terms are meant to convey.<sup>33</sup> However, when speaking of the resurrection of Jesus, it is not enough to retain this basic meaning. One must move forward to include the Pauline concept of transformation. Wright notes, “Resurrection has a concrete referent . . . ; but it always means *transformation*, going through the process of death and out into a new kind of life beyond, rather than simply returning to exactly the same sort of life, as had happened in the scriptures with the people raised to life by Elijah and Elisha, . . . .”<sup>34</sup> It follows from this that there has never been a resurrection aside from Christ’s. Many have been said to have come back from the dead, but in the act of dying once more they are shown to be still of the same make-up (i.e., mortal).

Habermas agrees that Jesus’ resurrection included a transformation:

As I just hinted, the body in which Jesus rose from the dead may be a further indication that no natural law can be made to account for this event. Paul and others reported that Jesus returned in a supernatural body with powers that also transcended natural laws, including that of never having to die again. . . . This separates Jesus’s resurrection from resuscitations. . . . Such a transformation would provide another strong indication that this was not a freak occurrence in nature but an event performed by God.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, vol. 3, Christian Origins and the Question of God (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), 204.

<sup>33</sup> These terms are *anastasis* and *egeirō*, both having the connotation of “arising.” Timothy Friberg, Barbara Friberg, and Neva F. Miller, *Analytical lexicon of the Greek New Testament* (Victoria, BC: Trafford, 2005), 52, 126.

<sup>34</sup> Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, 2008, 3:273.

<sup>35</sup> Gary R. Habermas, *The Risen Jesus & Future Hope* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003), 68–69.

This is a powerful argument for the intervention of God and the resurrection of Jesus. The goal here is to avoid the charge that there might be a way to account for the resurrection of Jesus on naturalistic terms. But even a resuscitation that took place multiple days after the burial of Jesus would make it difficult to find naturalistic answers: people simply do not come back from the dead (even to die later) after being dead for over two days! Unfortunately, it is necessary to go to great lengths to overcome these objections since some scholars seem to be willing to embrace anything but a miracle. Still, it is not clear that moving to a radical transformation of the body is necessary to account for the miraculous in this event. Suppose a person had just been beaten nearly to death, crucified, and then had a spear shoved into his side; this person was then buried, and somehow without miraculous intervention he came back to life: what are the odds that this person would survive for more than a few moments? In order for him to be capable of appearing to people he would have to have been healed along with rising. Hence, Habermas could argue at this point that a healed Jesus is sufficient to showcase divine intervention. But recall that we make allowance for this in our definition of resurrection/resuscitation.

Davis explicates even more elements of the transformed Jesus. In his survey he uses the term “physical” to denote those areas of continuity between Jesus’ body prior to and after his resurrection; he uses “spiritual” to denote areas of discontinuity.<sup>36</sup> This is a much needed discussion due to the objection that Paul believed that Jesus was raised “spiritually.” For instance, James D. G. Dunn contrasts Paul’s spiritual view with the physical view of resurrection that was held by other NT authors.<sup>37</sup> Davis stands against this trend and argues that simply

---

<sup>36</sup> Stephen T. Davis, *Risen Indeed: Making Sense of the Resurrection* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993), 54.

<sup>37</sup> James D. G. Dunn, *The Evidence for Jesus* (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press, 1985), 74.

because Paul utilizes the notion of “spiritual” with his idea of resurrection does not entail a denial of a physical body. Instead, the spiritual elements are conjoined with a physical element.

Davis lists numerous items on the spiritual side of Christ’s resurrected body. The disciples who saw Jesus on the road to Emmaus were struck by the oddity of the risen Christ’s ability to simply disappear (Luke 24:13–35).<sup>38</sup> In a similar way, Jesus was said to have appeared within a room of disciples without using the door (John 20:19–29).<sup>39</sup> And Acts 1:6–11 should be included “because of the curious way Jesus is said to be lifted up into a cloud.”<sup>40</sup> Davis holds these spiritual elements together with the physical element of having a body that was continuous from Jesus original body. The resurrection, though, was not simply the resuscitation of the body of Christ. In the act of raising Jesus from the dead, God altered Jesus’ physiology to the point that he could do things that he could not do in his previously limited body. The problem with each of these articulations of the transformation of Christ is that they remove the Resurrection from historical analysis—at least in terms of the criterion of analogy. There is nothing in our present mode of existence that would allow for a historical account of a transformation of one’s body into some new entity.

One of the issues that has led to the inclusion of supernatural elements with the resurrected body of Jesus is the blurring of lines between postresurrection appearances of Jesus that occur before and after his ascension. Daniel Kendall and Gerald O’Collins make this error in their article *The Uniqueness of the Easter Appearances*. It is important to note this title because the article proceeds to discuss every appearance of Jesus after the Resurrection as though they

---

<sup>38</sup> Davis, *Risen Indeed*, 54.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

are all on the same level with one another—i.e., “Easter” or resurrection appearances.<sup>41</sup> The problem, of course, is that once you get to the appearances to Paul, Jesus has already ascended to heaven. To assume that the heavenly state of Jesus is the same as that which it was on earth ignores passages like 1 John 3:2, which indicate that the glorified state of Jesus is different than his risen state.

Davis makes this same error by presenting the material of Revelation as though it is on a par with the material of the Gospels. Although he notes that John’s vision of Christ in Revelation is a post-ascension revelation, this is immediately negated by his association of this with earlier appearances.<sup>42</sup> In both cases, Jesus is already said to be transformed into “a new mode of existence.”<sup>43</sup> This creates an awkward tension of which Davis does not seem to be aware. If the two are to be equated then what is the point of the brilliance that John sees in Revelation versus the mundane appearances when Jesus had just arisen? Although this is an argument from silence, it is pretty powerful. When the disciples first saw Jesus after his resurrection they did not fall at his feet in fear of his shining splendor; yet, this is precisely what we see happening later with John (Rev 1:17). Are we to believe that a secondary further alteration took place once Jesus got to heaven? An affirmative answer to this question seems to be the direction that some wish to go.

---

<sup>41</sup> Granted, the point of their article is not to argue for a theological point about the nature of the resurrection body. However, the lack of differentiation between the types of appearances continues the improper practice of lumping everything under the title of “appearances of the risen Lord.” It is almost as if the doctrine of a glorified Lord has vanished completely. Daniel Kendall and Gerald O’Collins, “The Uniqueness of the Easter Appearances,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54, no. 2 (April 1992): esp. 295-303. See also n21 above for mention of Carnley, who does this same thing.

<sup>42</sup> Davis, *Risen Indeed*, 57.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*

The idea is that the risen Jesus was raised in a transformed, but not yet completed state. In fact, Millard J. Erickson comes dangerously close to what I am proposing, but stops just shy of the logical implication of his own statement. He writes,

If we are to reconcile this seeming conflict [i.e., Jesus was still flesh and blood, but flesh and blood cannot enter heaven], it is important to bear in mind that Jesus was at this point resurrected, but not ascended. At the time of our resurrection our bodies will be transformed in one step. In the case of Jesus, however, the transformation occurred in two events, resurrection and ascension. So the body that he had at the point of resurrection was yet to undergo a more complete transformation at the point of the ascension. It was yet to become the spiritual body of which Paul speaks in 1 Corinthians 15:44.<sup>44</sup>

The problem with this assessment should be obvious: there is no explicit reference to Jesus going through multiple stages of transformation. This is an ad hoc attempt to reconcile conflicting data that Erickson finds in Scripture. Why ought one accept this? If the material of Scripture seems to indicate that the resurrected body of Jesus was the same flesh and blood body that went into the grave, and Paul teaches that an alteration must occur before entering heaven, the logical conclusion is that Jesus needed to go through that alteration at his ascension. Why posit a secondary and incomplete transformation prior to the ascension? Doing so complicates an otherwise simple explanation of the data.

Davis also thinks the NT does not support a bodily resuscitation of Jesus because of the fact that unlike others, Jesus never died a second time.<sup>45</sup> But Jesus never had a chance to die a second time. It is entirely illicit to make the inference that Jesus was immortal in his resurrected state based on upon the fact that he did not die twice. Suppose Elijah had been murdered and then raised subsequently to call down fire upon his killer. If he was then still taken up in the chariot, few would conclude from this that he was somehow immortal in his bodily state. Yet,

---

<sup>44</sup> Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013), 710.

<sup>45</sup> Davis, *Risen Indeed*, 56.



when the picture shifts to Jesus there is an immediate assumption that he was raised immortal. An appeal to Paul at this point (1 Cor 15:53) is inappropriate for we have seen that Erickson has accurately denied this passage's application to the resurrected body of Jesus.

The only data left after this are a few instances of Jesus' ability to "'come and go' at will (Luke 24:31, 36; Acts 1:21) even despite closed doors (John 20:19, 26)."<sup>46</sup> Yet, none of this is necessarily indicative of an altered state. Indeed, Philip was caught away and transported to Azotus (Acts 8:39–40). What is more fascinating is that there is actual testimony of this phenomenon occurring today. Craig S. Keener notes, "I even received an unexpected and unusual testimony from Dr. Kay Fountain of her experience in June 1975, with several other persons, of suddenly finding herself and her colleagues in a different location after she prayed (cf. John 6:21)."<sup>47</sup> Assuming that this took place, no one would conclude from this phenomenon that Dr. Fountain had been transformed. Likewise, Philip was not transformed when his transportation took place. And if we include Keener's reference to John 6:21, then transportation included not only Jesus prior to his transformation, but also a group of his disciples and a boat!

Assuming there are no other objections—save for perhaps the vulgarity of asserting that Jesus could have theoretically died a second time—the biblical material seems to indicate that Jesus was resurrected in the normal sense of the word, i.e., resuscitated.<sup>48</sup> That is, the same body

---

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 57.

<sup>47</sup> Keener, *Miracles*, 1:594. I too know of a scientist that teaches at a relatively well-known college in California, who has related to me that he was transported along with two other scientists following a presentation of their material. After leaving the venue, the three men were robbed in the back alley of the location where they were presenting. The scientist who told me this closed his eyes to pray for help and he found himself at home by the time he opened his eyes. He immediately called his colleagues, who had just experienced the same phenomenon.

<sup>48</sup> There is the possible objection of the unrecognizability of Jesus at times. Yet, I have never found this convincing since it is so easily explicable on account of facial scarring that remained, or psychological factors such as the fact that no one was expecting to see Jesus again. So, if someone just so happened to look like him after he had been buried, then the most natural response of a rational adult would be to think, "Wow, that looks a lot like Jesus. I sure miss him, but that just can't be him since I saw him put in a tomb a few days ago."

that went into the grave was raised. This means that there is no need to offer a theologically nuanced version of the terms *anastasis* or *egeirō*. Also, as noted in reference to Habermas above, there is no reason to infer a lesser act of God from this form of a resurrection. The thing that shocked the disciples was not Jesus' ability to walk through walls—why should this shock those who had witnessed Jesus walk on water (Matt 14:22–33) or raise others from the dead (John 11:38–44)? What shocked the disciples was that Jesus himself had been raised.

The upshot of this is that the bodily resuscitation of Jesus Christ can successfully fulfil the principle of analogy. Rather than avoid this principle, we can embrace it headlong and silence both Hume and Troeltsch—at least on this one point. When Hume says that someone coming back from the dead has never been observed, we ought to answer: “False!” When Troeltsch claims that a resurrection fails the test of analogy for the same reason, the response is again: “False!” Still, the term “resuscitation” is extremely slippery. If by resuscitation we mean that event that occurs when a person's heart stops and a defibrillator brings him back after only a few minutes, then it is inappropriate for application to Jesus' resurrection. As Richard L. Purtill notes, “Some writers prefer the term *resuscitation* for miracles such as the raising of Lazarus. . . . However using the word *resuscitation* for what happened to Lazarus implies that this event is of the same general type as my own case: my heart had stopped beating, but was able to be restarted again as a result of natural causes.”<sup>49</sup> Because this is the case, he opts for using the term “resurrection” in relation to Lazarus.<sup>50</sup> This is entirely agreeable, but it seems that the present state of resurrection studies is not ready to think in these terms. So, we are forced to use the awkward term “bodily resuscitation” to make our point.

---

<sup>49</sup> Richard L. Purtill, “Defining Miracles,” in *In Defense of Miracles: A Comprehensive Case for God's Action in History*, ed. R. Douglas Geivett and Gary R. Habermas (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1997), 63.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

With these qualifications being noted, it is possible to include hundreds of accounts of bodily resuscitations. The point of the following brief list is not intended to prove that Jesus' was bodily resuscitated, but rather to show that there is indeed data that merits the inclusion of this type of event as a possible candidate for historicity according to the principle of analogy.

The biblical material houses numerous examples. The accounts of Elijah (1 Kings 17:17–22) and Elisha (2 Kings 4:32–35; cf. 13:20–21) have already been mentioned above, but they should be noted here as three ancient accounts to bodily resuscitations. There is the case of Lazarus (John 11:42–44). Also, numerous individuals were said to have risen when Jesus died (Matt 27:50–53).<sup>51</sup> It is recorded that Jesus raised others from the dead, albeit in less dramatic fashion (Luke 7:11–15; 8:41–55). Even after Jesus had ascended, both Peter (Acts 9:36–41) and Paul (Acts 20:9–10) are recorded as raising people. Modern examples of testimony for bodily resuscitations have literally multiplied into the thousands, a few of which are noted in the footnote.<sup>52</sup> To argue that there is *no* analogy for historical study is utterly disingenuous.

So, where does this leave us? When discussing the future resurrection from the dead it is often overlooked that there are a complex of events to which this refers. It is not simply a resuscitation of the body, but a resuscitation of the body unto a glorified existence. John tells us “We know that when he appears, we will be like him because we will see him as he is. And everyone who has this hope in him purifies himself just as he is pure” (1 John 3:2–3). This, then, is the hope that is found within the hearts of those who are in Jesus Christ. A hope that cries out to the believer to look beyond the present hardships found in this world, to a time when we will

---

<sup>51</sup> Although this passage is listed as inauthentic in numerous translations, there is no textual evidence of this verse ever being absent. See notations in Eberhard Nestle and Erwin Nestle, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, ed. Barbara Aland et al., 28th revised edition (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015), 98–99.

<sup>52</sup> The following are some of the best supported modern witnesses Keener, *Miracles*, 1:551, 553, 557, 561, 568, 577.

be like the one we so earnestly desire to be like even now. But none of this would be possible without that one event in history that paved the way for man's ability to be glorified: the bodily resuscitation of Jesus Christ.

I am not writing for those who need to find this hope. I am also not writing for those who have yet to set themselves aside for the purpose of purifying themselves. The intent here is to aid those who already have this hope, to better envision just what it is that is one day to be theirs. Much discussion about the resurrected body has begun with talks about what Jesus did during his postresurrection appearances, but this is extremely misleading. Not only is an extrapolation of the resurrected body of Christ to the future state of believers theologically inaccurate, it is also philosophically problematic. Assuming that the resurrection of Jesus somehow resulted in a complete transformation of his being ignores the definition of "resurrection." A resurrection is that act by which one comes back from the dead. Indeed, this was the hope of most intertestamental Jews.<sup>53</sup> But *the* resurrection involves so much more!

Two men in white stood by the disciples at the ascension of Christ and said, "Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking up into heaven? This same Jesus, who has been taken from you into heaven, will come in the same way that you have seen him going into heaven" (Acts 1:11). What a shock this must have been for the disciples. Not just the fact that Jesus had ascended in front of their eyes, but the idea that he was now gone was sure to send them into a bit of a panic. How could it be that he had just come back from the dead but was now leaving them again? What was all this talk about being with them until the end of the age? The end of the age was supposed to be now. The kingdom was supposed to begin with Jesus after his resurrection. But why would the Lord simply abandon his disciples to wander about without

---

<sup>53</sup> J. Julius Scott, *Jewish Backgrounds of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2000), 278–79.

him? The answer made little sense to the disciples at the time. Jesus said, “if I don’t go away the Counselor will not come to you. If I go, I will send him to you” (John 16:7).

Like the first disciples, one of the temptations of modern theologians is to focus upon the resurrected Jesus prior to his ascension. As though it were a necessary corollary to rising from the grave, many argue that Jesus was raised in a state that we can look forward to having one day.<sup>54</sup> The issue seems to be that if we do not maintain that Jesus’ resurrected body was somehow transformed from its original state, then he cannot truly be said to have raised.<sup>55</sup> What is interesting about this is that there is no distinction in either of the Greek terms used for the resurrection of Christ. Plainly put, Jesus is said to have risen bodily from the grave.<sup>56</sup> The distinction between a resurrection and a resuscitation is a philosophical point that is not required by the grammar of the NT.

The answer comes from noting the specific way in which the term “resurrection” is used by Jesus: “For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage but are like angels in heaven” (Matt 22:30). Our focus should not drift to “being like angels,” since this is clearly intended as an example of those who do not marry.<sup>57</sup> The pertinent issue is the usage of the definite article with “resurrection.” It is in *the* resurrection that we will be a certain way. Jesus is speaking of a complex of events that is to take place. The resurrection is that time when believers

---

<sup>54</sup> This has become so common that to list every writer here would take a paper in itself. A sampling will suffice. Davis, *Risen Indeed*, 23; Habermas, *The Risen Jesus & Future Hope*, 163; Mike Licona, *The Resurrection of Jesus: A New Historiographical Approach* (Downers Grove; Nottingham: IVP Academic; Apollos, 2010), 378.

<sup>55</sup> In fact, this is the specific reasoning given by Davis. Davis, *Risen Indeed*, 23.

<sup>56</sup> After a thorough linguistic analysis, Wright concludes in a manner that supports this contention. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, 2008, 3:204.

<sup>57</sup> Perhaps it is from this verse that the misguided notion arose that believers will be granted wings in heaven. Not only does this overlook the point of the passage, but it also misunderstands the believer’s state in heaven. This is an intermediate state that believers experience until the resurrection. For a more detailed analysis see C. P. Davis, “Revisiting the Afterlife: The Inadequacies of ‘Heaven’ and ‘Hell,’” *Fidei et Veritatis: The Liberty University Journal of Graduate Research* 1, no. 1 (July 20, 2015).

are resurrected, but there is so much more. Paul tells us that we will all be radically changed within a moment (1 Cor 15:52), but this will not happen until the dead in Christ have *first* risen (1 Thess 4:16). Resurrection (viz., bodily resuscitation) is just the first stage in a series of things that will be granted unto those who have placed their faith in Christ. Glorification is what we are after. This is the finale to that event that started with the resuscitation of Jesus from the dead. Just as he rose bodily, and then ascended to the Father where he was glorified (John 17:5), we too will taste of this glory (2 Pet 1:4).

### **Literature Review**

Norman L. Geisler

In the *Battle for the Resurrection* Geisler offers a number of crucial and valid apologetic arguments for the reality of the resurrection. However, when his discussions shift to the nature of the resurrection, he makes a few interesting comments that need to be addressed. In the first case, there seems to be some equivocation on the abilities of the resurrected body. Geisler writes, “If He had chosen to pass through closed doors, Jesus could have performed this same *miracle* before His resurrection with His *unglorified* material body” (emphasis added).<sup>58</sup> This statement assumes two different things that do not necessarily relate to the issue of the resurrected body. First, assuming that Christ came through a wall Geisler holds that this is a miracle, which would allow for this to take place prior to the resurrected body. Second, the resurrected body, for Geisler, is glorified material. Yet, one must ask if it is necessary to posit a miracle for an event that could have taken place due to the nature of a glorified state. Would it be a miracle if an

---

<sup>58</sup> Geisler, *The Battle for the Resurrection*, 118–19.

angel appeared in the room? Technically the answer is no. This would be considered a natural event, which occurred according to the nature of the angelic being. Geisler agrees when he writes, “[W]hile the resurrection body as such has *more* powers than a preresurrection body, it is not *less* physical.”<sup>59</sup> According to this understanding, it is possible to allow the nature of the resurrected (= glorified) body to have the ability to walk through walls. Both of these ideas are capable of answering the objections to the resurrection, but both of them cannot be held together. Either Jesus performed a miracle when walking through walls, or he had a new nature that allowed him to do so unmiraculously. If the former is the case then there is no need to refer to this resurrected body as glorified, and if the latter is preferred then claiming consonance with the preresurrected flesh is awkward at best.

The second issue that needs to be addressed is Geisler’s concept of particles. According to him, there is no need to argue that the particles of the preresurrected body and the resurrected body are identical.<sup>60</sup> Geisler is addressing the same objection that the church fathers faced—namely, there is no way the body that is raised is the same as that which dies. Although, he allows for the typical patristic answer (i.e., God can do anything), Geisler believes this is unnecessary. Particles change even in the present body, so there is no need for them to be the same in the future. However, like the Fathers, Geisler seems to be missing the thrust of this objection. Though the language is easy to address because “particles” are part of precritical vocabulary, the underlying objection still remains: how can the future body be consonant with the present body, if a radical alteration has taken place? There is little difference between allowing God to account for every particle, and saying that particles do not need to be the same

---

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 119.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 120.

based upon a modern understanding of particles. The end result is a sidestepping of the actual objection. Either what is raised in a resurrection is the same “stuff” as what went into the grave or it is not. Trying to argue it is both the same and yet different militates against the definition of a resurrection.

Finally, in order to distinguish between the resurrection of Christ and other resurrections, Geisler argues against a resuscitation view. That is, only Christ has been truly resurrected because every other resurrection has resulted in the eventual death of the raised individual. The distinguishing feature is immortality. According to Geisler, “Resuscitated corpses die again, but Jesus’ resurrection body was immortal. He conquered death (Heb 2:14; 1 Cor 15:54–55), whereas merely resuscitated bodies will eventually be conquered by death. For example, Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead (John 11), but Lazarus eventually died again.”<sup>61</sup> As noted above, this appeal, though a common enough understanding of the resurrected state, is based upon insufficient data. Jesus did not have a chance to die again because he ascended into heaven. Theoretically, had he remained on earth he would have been subject to the decaying process again. Furthermore, if Lazarus is to be seen as an example of resuscitation, it is odd to find him used as a proof of the future resurrection at a later point in Geisler’s work.<sup>62</sup> If Lazarus is a proof of a future resurrection of believers, but that future event is of the order of the one true resurrection of Jesus Christ, then this involves some equivocation that needs to be worked out. It is better to retain the biblical language used for Lazarus and Jesus, and view both of them as being raised from the dead in their same body.

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 123.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 180–81.



Gary R. Habermas

Like Geisler, Habermas has offered an enormously helpful apologetic for the resurrection. At the same time, he also has not adequately dealt with a number of concepts pertaining the nature of the doctrine. First, Habermas maintains that Jesus' resurrection is the only bodily resurrection that is known to have occurred. Presumably, this argument is based upon the acceptance of making a distinction between resuscitation and resurrection.<sup>63</sup> The issue with this is the assumption of such a distinction. The argument is that only by separating these two concepts can Christians adequately speak of Christ as the firstfruits of the resurrection. If Lazarus was actually raised, then Jesus cannot be the firstfruits. As will be seen below, however, such a distinction is not clear in Scripture, and it is also unclear that it is necessary to answer the "problem" of firstfruits in this manner.

The second issue is Habermas's association of Jesus' resurrected body and the resurrected form of believers. According to him, "We are given the blueprint for our resurrection bodies—and they are not patterned after the angels."<sup>64</sup> This implies, of course, that Christ is the model. Elsewhere he writes, "Here we will look once again at the phenomenon of the resurrected Jesus as the ultimate model of and certainty for what life in a resurrected state will be like."<sup>65</sup> There is no doubt that believers will one day be in the form of what Christ is now, but it is not clear that such a close connection to Jesus' resurrected state is justifiable.

---

<sup>63</sup> At this point, Habermas does not mention other resurrections in Scripture, but appeals to non-Christian resurrection claims. This makes it necessary to infer his position with regards to resuscitation versus resurrection in Scripture. The inference seems justifiable, however, given his insistence that Jesus' resurrection is the *only* resurrection, regardless of the source. Habermas, *The Resurrection*, 2000, 1:45; Gary R. Habermas, "Resurrection Claims in Non-Christian Religions," *Religious Studies* 25, no. 2 (June 1989): 167–77. In a personal correspondence with Habermas I have confirmed that my understanding of him here is indeed accurate.

<sup>64</sup> Habermas, *The Resurrection*, 2000, 1:67.

<sup>65</sup> Gary R. Habermas and J. P. Moreland, *Beyond Death: Exploring the Evidence for Immortality* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1998), 255.

Finally, Habermas argues, “After three days he rose alive from the dead *in a transformed state*” (emphasis added).<sup>66</sup> Again, this makes it difficult to adequately account for the continuity from the actual Jesus that was buried and the Jesus that was raised. If the same Jesus rose, how can there be a transformation? What does such a transformation look like? Initially, it seems Habermas is concerned only to make sure that Christ is immortal when resurrected.<sup>67</sup> Though difficult to grasp how Christ could be raised in the flesh and be immortal, this does make some sense, given the fact that Jesus never died again. However, one wonders if there is not a better answer. At the same time, by maintaining this position Habermas has difficulty clearly and consistently articulating his view of the glorification of Christ. He writes, “Later when He appeared to Paul, He had already ascended to heaven and was glorified.”<sup>68</sup> So, it is clear that Habermas sees a gap between the resurrection of Christ and his glorification. He confirms this: “So the resurrection event began the process that led to Jesus’ appearances, ascension, glorification, and exaltation . . . .”<sup>69</sup> All of this brings up more questions: what is the difference between a resurrected state and a glorified one? Is it correct to place immortality under resurrection or would it be better under glorification? If there is a distinction in Christ as the model should this not be reflected in believers? The answers to these questions are never addressed by Habermas, but a number of positions are still assumed. Interestingly, Habermas does not see a problem with these concepts for he writes, “We will have [resurrection] bodies

---

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

<sup>67</sup> Habermas, *The Resurrection*, 2000, 1:68.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 1:73.

<sup>69</sup> This statement is particularly interesting to me because later I will argue that he is correct to speak of this as an “event.” The problem is that he never develops this concept. Gary R. Habermas, *The Resurrection*, vol. 2 (Joplin, MO: College Press, 2000), 94.

that are patterned after Jesus' glorious body."<sup>70</sup> That is, believers will have resurrection bodies like the glorified body of Christ. But if this is the case (which I believe to be so), according to Habermas's distinctions, it is inappropriate to base the future resurrection body upon the *resurrection* body of Christ. Such a pattern is best identified with his glorified body. This means that it is unnecessary to think of Christ's resurrection in terms of a transformative event, but rather as a bodily resuscitation.

### N. T. Wright

An important element of this discussion is the distinction between resurrection and exaltation of Christ. Wright believes that this concept can be found in the earliest material of Scripture, and thus concludes that it is necessary to include it in the doctrine of the resurrection.<sup>71</sup> That is, this idea was not a later invention of the church, but rather it is found in such early canonical material that Wright believes it must be accepted as biblical. This much is to be applauded, but as his writing progresses it becomes clear that Wright does not maintain as strict a line between these two concepts as one would like. At certain points there is a blurring of the concepts, much like was seen in Habermas's material. The question still remains: why make such a distinction if the lines are blurred when dealing with the nature of the future resurrection of the saints? In this case, it is unclear that one can legitimately argue for such a distinction at all.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> Habermas, *The Resurrection*, 2000, 1:88.

<sup>71</sup> Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, 2008, 3:24.

<sup>72</sup> This, of course, is referring to Wright's understanding of the future state of believers based upon the hope of Christ's resurrection. If, as he maintains, Christ is exalted, what exactly is the nature of existence of future believers? Are they fashioned after the preexalted Christ or the exalted Christ? If the latter, then it seems inappropriate to maintain a distinction between exaltation and resurrection—inasmuch as we are assured by Wright that this is the resurrection body of the believer. It is not clear that Wright ever answers this problem. Though the distinction is made according to Christ, it is not clearly and consistently applied to the believer. *Ibid.*, 3:25.

Other pertinent elements of Wright's understanding of the resurrection come from his section on the Pauline corpus. He writes,

However, since he [Paul] uses Jesus' resurrection again and again as the model both for the ultimate future, and for the present anticipation of that future, we can conclude that, as far as he was concerned, Jesus' resurrection consisted in a new bodily life which was more than a mere resuscitation. It was a life in which the corruptibility of the flesh had been left behind; a life in which Jesus would now be equally at home in both dimensions of the good creation, in "heaven" and "earth."<sup>73</sup>

This understanding of Paul's thought is typical enough, but one wonders if there is not an inherent contradiction in this conception. This is the insistence that Christ was raised in a state that would allow him to dwell in heaven and earth, viz., in an incorruptible (or shall we say glorified) body. But if this is so, it is odd that Jesus would require Mary to let go of him "since I have not yet ascended to the Father" (John 20:17). Furthermore, if Wright believes Paul taught a distinction between the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, there seems to be a necessary alteration in the resurrection body of Christ. Yet, if this is the case, then it is not likely that Paul understood Jesus as being raised incorruptible. Jesus was raised, and then Jesus was glorified. Only if his glorification is sneaked into his resurrection is Paul in danger of contradicting himself. This is serious issue since the language of 1 Corinthians 15 is capable of being viewed in support of Wright's contention.

Later Wright concludes, [Paul] believed, and articulated in considerable detail, that the resurrection would not only be bodily . . . , but that it would also involve *transformation*. The present body is corruptible decaying and subject to death; but death, which spits in the face of the good creator God, cannot have the last word."<sup>74</sup> There is so much that is agreeable here that it is almost a shame to even engage in the pedantry involved in the nuance advocated here. Yet, the

---

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., 3:310.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., 3:372.

issue still remains: if Paul did indeed teach this, then Scripture is in danger of offering a double-minded position on what the future state of believers will be. Surely, death will not have the last say, nor will the future state of believers be subject to decay; but it is not proper to require the concept of individualized resurrections to possess the qualities of perfection. Surely, the events of the eschaton will include perfection. But even Wright acknowledges that Paul typically speaks of the resurrection in corporate terms. So, it is a wonder that there has been little attempt to think on what Paul may be meaning when he speaks of *the* resurrection.

#### Gerald O'Collins

O'Collins comes close to an appropriate answer to the issue of speaking of *the* resurrection. He argues that Paul was thinking in terms of the general resurrection when he wrote 1 Corinthians 15. O'Collins finds this to be fairly obvious due to the fact that Paul was a Jew, who despite becoming a Christian still thought in Jewish categories. This means that when Paul had his experience with Jesus on the road to Damascus he was forced to alter a few of his preconceptions about the general resurrection—in particular, at least one person had already experienced the event.<sup>75</sup> O'Collins is correct to note that Paul has the general resurrection in the back of his mind, and in our chapter on Paul we will add a bit more evidence to support this. The issue, though, is the way in which O'Collins addresses the notion of resurrection. Almost immediately after detailing this background data for Paul, O'Collins begins to explain how this means that Paul had a nuanced definition of what a resurrection was. Rather than allowing there to be a general resurrection as an event and a resurrection as the thing that happens to the body (two separate ideas), apparently O'Collins believes the former must dictate the definition of the

---

<sup>75</sup> Gerald O'Collins, *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ* (Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1973), 112.

latter. He writes, “It is *this* mortal body which must experience the transforming change of resurrection (I Corinthians 15:53; Philippians 3:20f.; Romans 8:11). . . . Simultaneously, resurrection means for Paul neither the reanimation of a corpse nor the reconstitution of some scattered remains, but a profound transformation, a radical, almost total difference: ‘Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God’ (1 Corinthians 15:50).”<sup>76</sup> Yet, if this is the case then the term “resurrection” has been effectively emptied of its meaning. O’Collins notes this problem, but argues that believers must live with this tension. Even though the idea of a resurrection entails that the same body must rise, because there is going to be a transformation just how much will be the same is left to speculation.<sup>77</sup>

In a more recent work, O’Collins updates his language by utilizing the phrase “risen existence.”<sup>78</sup> He also nuances his understanding of the continuation of the person in such a way that the reanimation of the same body is no longer necessary. Continuity, for him, is based upon the soul that will be attached to whatever flesh it is given.<sup>79</sup> But this is precisely the trajectory we wish to avoid. This is the logical conclusion of continuing to define “resurrection” as transformation regardless if O’Collins’s Protestant counterparts are unwilling to follow through like he is. Making this move opens the door to numerous issues that can be avoided by simply defining “resurrection” in a more traditional sense. Sure this brings back the philosophical problems noted above about the continuity of the body, but the church has never had a problem with acknowledging that God is capable of doing what he says he will do. Furthermore,

---

<sup>76</sup> Ibid., 113.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., 114–15.

<sup>78</sup> Gerald O’Collins, *Believing in the Resurrection: The Meaning and Promise of the Risen Jesus* (New York: Paulist Press, 2012), 140.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., 147.

transformation does not need to be discarded. It simply needs to be discussed in its proper place. Transformation is what happens to the believer after he is resurrected; it is not to be equated with “resurrection.”

Stephen T. Davis

Davis has offered the most thorough defense against the position advocated here. I have already addressed much of his material above, so I will not repeat it at this point. The important element yet to be discussed is his strongest argument against the resuscitation view. Like Wright, Davis finds Paul’s argument in 1 Corinthians to be definitive. He writes, “Paul does insist that ‘flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God’ (1 Cor. 15:50). But this means that the old, earthly body cannot enter the kingdom of God as it is (this is one of the powerful theological arguments against resuscitation), that it must first be transformed into a glorified body (Phil 3:32).”<sup>80</sup> I heartily agree with Davis that the body must first be glorified in order to inherit the kingdom of God, but it is not immediately clear how this is supposed to powerfully diminish the resuscitation view. Is it not possible that a body is raised from the grave, and then glorified? In a scenario like this—which seems to have Paul’s support in Phillipians 3—it is entirely possible to retain the concept of glorification without awkwardly requiring a resurrection to be more than the biblical terminology relates.

But this is not the difficulty that must be overcome. Paul speaks of the body that comes back from the dead as a body that is no longer corruptible (1 Cor 15:53). Like a seed that goes into the ground so is the body, and what comes later is a new thing from the same seed. Davis believes that this is a clear indication that the raising of Jesus from the dead cannot be a simple

---

<sup>80</sup> Davis, “‘Seeing’ the Risen Jesus,” 140.

raising from the dead. “In other words, the relationship of material continuity that obtains between Jesus’ earthly body and his resurrection body is like the relationship that obtains between grain and wheat and the plant that grows from it. Thus Paul’s view, both here and elsewhere in his writings, is not, as is sometimes suggested, the *exchange* of one sort of body for another; it is that the one body *becomes* or is transformed into the other.”<sup>81</sup> Once again Davis is correct to note that there will be a transformation from one into another, but attaching this to a “resurrection body” is inappropriate. In fact, by utilizing “resurrection body” Davis has loaded the dice. One cannot read his statement without automatically thinking that there must be a difference between the body that goes into the ground and a resurrected body. As we have seen above, though, there is no reason to accept this assumption. The body that goes into the ground when raised up is still the same body. With this as the basic structure, when one turns to 1 Corinthians 15 one must ask if Paul is intending to speak about a resurrected body in the sense that Davis is portraying or if he is after something else. Is it possible that what Paul is speaking about is the glorification of the body that is raised? That is, after the body is brought back from the dead it is then transformed, perhaps even ἐν ῥυτίδι ὀφθαλμοῦ (“in the twinkle of an eye” 1 Cor 15:52). For Davis, Paul’s statement (among other arguments) is why he explains that “perhaps some unlettered believers accept it [the resuscitation view], but as noted earlier, I am aware of no scholar who defends it.”<sup>82</sup> This project is an attempt at redressing this lacuna.

---

<sup>81</sup> Davis, *Risen Indeed*, 50.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 45. With much less condescension Alston makes the same point that no one has defended this view. Alston, “Biblical Criticism and the Resurrection,” 157n23.



## Methodology

There are numerous ways in which a project of this nature might be undertaken. One may launch a full-scale attack against every objection against a resuscitation view. However, I believe the brief discussion above is sufficient to expose the weaknesses of the transformative resurrection view. The only troubling argument comes from 1 Corinthians 15, and it is for this reason that I will devote my effort to offering a reasonable exegesis of this passage that permits a resuscitation view. In order to do this, it must be argued that Paul does not intend to argue that the body that comes out of the ground is necessarily transformed prior to or as it comes forth, but rather that the body can be brought back and then changed. This would introduce the doctrine of the glorification into a passage that is typically used to argue for the resurrection. Simply exegeting this passage, though, would be like one trying to make Scripture say whatever one wishes. This should be avoided at all costs. If there is insufficient data to support such a conclusion then I will conclude that 1 Corinthians remains a difficult passage to reconcile with a resuscitation view of the raising of Christ and believers from the dead. This does not change the fact that all other arguments against such a view are biblically and philosophically weak.

One way to go about a study of this nature would be to analyze the material of the Second Temple period in order to see if there is a reason Paul might be including the glorification in a segment typically understood as speaking of the resurrection. One problem here is that the extent to which Paul was indebted to the Second Temple milieu has been debated for quite some time now.<sup>83</sup> The issue is that one might find an obscure mention of some idea in one of the many

---

<sup>83</sup> Though I disagree with Zetterholm's conclusions I find his discussion of the current state of Pauline studies relatively accurate. Zetterholm rightly points out that the NPP tends to repackage traditional beliefs under different terminology. Rather than embrace the RNPP, I am inclined to retain the traditional picture of Paul. Magnus Zetterholm, "Paul within Judaism: The State of the Questions," in *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle*, ed. Mark D. Nanos and Magnus Zetterholm (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), 31–52. Fisk also highlights this issue by beginning with the agreement that all scholars think Paul is somehow to be fitted within Second Temple Judaism, and then contending that Paul should be understood along the lines of a narrow segment of

writings of that time and conclude that somehow Paul had that view in mind. This can be avoided, as seen in A. Chadwick Thornhill's book *The Chosen People: Election, Paul and Second Temple Judaism*. In this work Thornhill seeks to view Paul's notion of election through the lens of Second Temple material. At least two different streams of thought existed in this time period, but Thornhill argues that Paul lands on the side of corporate election with a noticeable tinge of conditionality.<sup>84</sup> This is a valid methodological procedure, and Thornhill argues his point forcefully. The difficulty for this project is that the resurrection was merely a developing concept during the Second Temple period. Therefore, it would be hard to bring forth enough data to satisfactorily place Paul within a certain stream of Second Temple thought.

On the other hand, one might look to the Fathers to see how they addressed issues surrounding the notion of the resurrection. In a study like this, one could then look back to Paul and see if the patristic insights offer some clarity. Ben C. Blackwell has recently done this in order to see what Paul was thinking about theosis. He analyzes the works of Irenaeus and Cyril of Alexandria and argues that based upon their understanding of theosis and their usage of Paul's material to support the concept, Paul can be better understood for the modern theologian.<sup>85</sup> This too is an attractive methodology. However, there are two notable weaknesses to this method that keep me from fully adopting it here. Blackwell presents Irenaeus and Cyril as standard

---

"rewritten Bible" (also advocated by Vermes). Bruce N. Fisk, "Paul Among the Storytellers: Reading Romans 11 in the Context of Rewritten Bible," in *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation*, ed. Christopher D. Stanley, Early Christianity and Its Literature (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 56.

<sup>84</sup> A. Chadwick Thornhill, *The Chosen People: Election, Paul, and Second Temple Judaism* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2015), 211–12.

<sup>85</sup> Blackwell notes, "However, by holding a conversation between Paul and his Greek patristic interpreters, we have the opportunity for our understanding to be challenged so we can reshape our horizon of expectation." Ben C. Blackwell, *Christosis: Engaging Paul's Soteriology with His Patristic Interpreters* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2016), 18.

representations of Christian thinkers at that time.<sup>86</sup> But there is no way to validate such a claim. This period of time is known for its diversity in thought, so it is hard to think of offering a representative view based upon two thinkers alone.<sup>87</sup> Second, even if these men were representative of the whole, this is no guarantee they got Paul right.

By bringing these two methods together we can limit the issues that each has individually. For instance, if it can be shown that there was a concept of resurrection in the Second Temple period that (1) accounts for what Paul is doing in 1 Corinthians 15, and (2) continues into the patristic era, then we can conclude upon surer ground that Paul may have had these ideas in mind. To further offset the limited data of the Second Temple period we will expand this first procedure to include Jewish texts shortly after the fall of the temple as well. Something similar to this methodology has been articulated by Matthew W. Bates. He describes this method as “diachronic intertextuality.”<sup>88</sup> The only major difference here is that I am not interested in tracing the historical use of OT material and its mutations through the Second Temple period per se. Rather, I wish to look at this material from a conceptual (not textual) angle. Let us call this project a *diachronic interconceptual analysis* of the resurrection in the Second Temple period, Paul, and the patristic age. The goal is to find the conceptual overlap that accounts for the inclusion of the glorification within areas that are normally classified as resurrection material.

---

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 26–29.

<sup>87</sup> For one of the best treatments of this time period see Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, trans. John Bowden, 2nd ed., vol. 1 (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975). The fact that this volume is almost 600 pages and deals only with the Christology of the Fathers up to Chalcedon should be enough to deter us from simplifying any theological doctrine by appealing to one or two Fathers alone.

<sup>88</sup> Matthew W. Bates, “Beyond Hays’s Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul: A Proposed Diachronic Intertextuality with Romans 10:16 as a Test Case,” in *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation*, ed. Christopher D. Stanley, *Early Christianity and Its Literature* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 271.

In order to make this project manageable, the only sections of the Second Temple material that will be addressed are those that clearly speak of resurrection. There are a few areas where the existence of such material is debated. Only those portions with a realistic chance of counting toward resurrection material will be discussed. However, in areas that deal with the afterlife alone—e.g., musings about Sheol—I will place relevant discussions in the footnotes. The same standards will apply to the patristic material. This should allow for a healthy amount of data from numerous sources, rather than a sampling of one or two from each category.

### Summary

Numerous passages in the NT have led me to believe that there is something missing in the way we discuss the resurrection today. There is little doubt that the earliest Christians believed and taught that Jesus was raised bodily from the grave. There is also no reason to deny that these same believers looked forward to their own return from death in a bodily state. What is missing, though, is the way in which being raised from the dead takes place within a period of time that has more going on than just being raised. That is, early Christians seem to have thought of the resurrection as less of a solitary event and more of a description of a time in the future that was characterized by the first event—viz., the raising of the dead.

In John 11:24 Martha responds to Jesus' question about her belief in the resurrection by saying, Οἶδα ὅτι ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ("I know that he [Lazarus] will rise again in the resurrection in the last day"). In this case, Martha does not speak of a particular act of raising from the dead, but rather that her brother will rise again ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει. The attachment of ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ indicates that Martha is thinking of a much broader concept of resurrection than we are familiar with. Likewise, Jesus speaks in a similar manner. In this case, though, it is interesting that not only he speaks like this, but also his Jewish

interlocutors do so. In Matthew 22:28 the Sadducees put before Jesus a question about a certain woman who had been the wife of several men: ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει οὗν τίνος τῶν ἑπτὰ ἔσται γυνή; (“in the resurrection, then, whose wife will she be of the seven?”). Once again we find the mention of ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει, giving the impression that this was a common way for Jews in general to speak of this time period.<sup>89</sup> This is only strengthened by Jesus’ reply (Matt 22:29–30): Πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἄγγελοι θεοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ εἰσιν· (“You are mistaken, because you don’t know the Scriptures or the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage but are like angels in heaven”). Utilizing the same formula, Jesus is able to render their complaint null by explaining that this period of time (viz., ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει) will be characterized by a certain ethereal nature that renders marriage superfluous.<sup>90</sup>

Between the usage of ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει by Martha, the Sadducees, and Jesus there is a healthy sampling of how this term was used at during the Second Temple period. The goal of this project is to extend this evidence in two new directions. Chapter 1 will survey the extant collection of Second Temple material to see if it is indeed possible to extrapolate from these three voices to that broader milieu. If this can be done, then, it can be safely assumed that it is no longer necessary to think of the resurrection as an individualistic event in the mind of the Jews, but rather as a phrase designated for that end time reality that houses much more than a raising from the dead. Ideally, we will be able to craft new terminology by this point, speaking of that last age as the Resurrection Age. Chapter 2 will expand the horizon to the material of the church Father’s. Our interest is only with the first two hundred years or so, since after this point it is

---

<sup>89</sup> ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει is repeated in the parallel passages of Mark 12:23 and Luke 20:33.

difficult to maintain that Paul would have been operating with the same mentality. However, if it can be shown that the Fathers also utilize the same terminology, then we are in a good place to return to 1 Corinthians 15 to see if Paul could have been thinking in the same way. Chapter 3 will move back to this passage and place Paul within the proper framework for understanding his mention of incorruptibility. We will briefly overview his usage of the OT in this passage to highlight his indebtedness to such a background, and then move into an exegetical analysis that is reoriented with this and the data of the previous two chapters. The thesis of this project is that Paul is utilizing the concept of the Resurrection Age to explicate certain events that take place within this time period. His eye is not fixated on simply the raising of the dead, but assuming that the dead are raised he is looking at what that period of time entails. The result is that one can no longer utilize Paul's material to argue that Jesus was raised in an immortal state. Immortality, instead, is a characteristic of another stage of the Resurrection Age, of which Christ is the first among many brethren to partake.

## CHAPTER 2: SURVEY OF THE SECOND TEMPLE LITERATURE

### Introduction

It has been noted that the idea of a resurrection from the dead was not a central or even clearly established idea in the OT.<sup>91</sup> With Isaiah 26:19 and Daniel 12:2 being the only explicit references to a resurrection, it is no wonder such a claim has been made.<sup>92</sup> At some point, however, the idea of a resurrection became a central hope for the Jewish people. This is often said to be caused by a shift in mindset during the intertestamental period.<sup>93</sup> With the hope dwindling that Yahweh would establish a robust Jewish kingdom soon, a new hope was necessary. The added focus on the resurrection aided in this area. This specific idea finds itself nestled within the general framework of the apocalyptic material of Second Temple Judaism. With a focus toward the future, this material was able to look to a time when the true people of God would be brought back to life.<sup>94</sup> Robin Routledge finds a nice middle point when he writes, “This [resurrection hope] may be anticipated by some OT passages, but comes into much sharper

---

<sup>91</sup> Thomas D. Lea and David Alan Black, *The New Testament: Its Background and Message*, 2nd ed. (Nashville: B & H Academic, 2003), 57; Robin Routledge, *Old Testament Theology: A Thematic Approach* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2012), 309.

<sup>92</sup> The former is debatable as an explicit reference, since it is found within what is typically designated as apocalyptic. This would allow for a certain amount of ambiguity that could render this passage a metaphor of restoration, rather than future resurrection. D. Brent Sandy, *Plowshares & Pruning Hooks: Rethinking the Language of Biblical Prophecy and Apocalyptic* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2002), 125.

<sup>93</sup> J. Julius Scott, *Jewish Backgrounds of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2000), 280–81; F. F. Bruce, “Inter-testamental Literature,” in *What Theologians Do*, ed. F. G. Healy (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1970), 97.

<sup>94</sup> Mitchell L. Chase has challenged this position by arguing that there are allusions to a resurrection all throughout the OT. His thesis is that the resurrection does not simply pop up in Daniel and later material, but rather it can be found at least implicitly throughout much of the OT. What can be said is that even if many of Chase’s allusions are not valid, there is little reason to doubt that Jews during the Second Temple period thought of themselves as articulating an idea that was in their Scriptures. His focus is on Genesis, but it seems possible to expand this type of study into other areas as well. Mitchell L. Chase, “The Genesis of Resurrection Hope: Exploring Its Early Presence and Deep Roots,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 57, no. 3 (September 2014): 467.

focus in the intertestamental literature.”<sup>95</sup> Likewise, N. T. Wright notes, “It would be easy, and wrong, to see hope for resurrection as a new and extraneous element, something which has come into ancient Israelite thinking by a backdoor or roundabout route.”<sup>96</sup>

The reality is that Second Temple Jews thought of themselves as faithful to the OT. So, when there is discussion of a resurrection it is important to ascertain what they meant. Wright has already done extensive work in this area, concluding that bodily resurrection is the assured sense of “resurrection” when used in reference to the raising of believers in Yahweh.<sup>97</sup> His analysis and conclusion in this regard is superb; there is no need to add to it with this study. At the same time, not enough attention has been given to the second sense of “resurrection” that Wright finds. This “metaphorical” sense is said to include notions of restoration and new creation, much like the images found in Isaiah.<sup>98</sup> Wright is correct to note this metaphorical usage of “resurrection,” but he overlooks one aspect. Second Temple material often speaks of the resurrection not simply as a metaphor for restoration concepts, but rather as the time period in which that restoration *and a bodily resurrection* take place. The goal of the following study is to establish new terminology within which to understand the Second Temple concept of the final age. In this final age, the bodily resurrection is such a clear hope that it is possible to characterize the whole period as the *resurrection age*. Here we will work our way through the pseudepigraphical and apocryphal writings.

---

<sup>95</sup> Routledge, *Old Testament Theology*, 309.

<sup>96</sup> Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, 2008, 3:121.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 3:209–10.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, 3:204.



### Pseudepigraphical Writings Prior to the Fall of the Temple

The division of this material can seem a bit arbitrary based upon the various dates given to the texts. However, there are numerous writings that fit better in a time prior to the fall of the temple, and they will be addressed here. This material is important because it is likely that later Second Temple texts developed upon their ideas. It will not be surprising to find the ideas to be more detailed the closer we get to AD 100.

#### The Ethiopic Book of Enoch (1 Enoch)

First Enoch is typically broken into five sections. For the sake of convenience each subheading will follow this outline even though this suppresses some of the technical discussions on dating.<sup>99</sup> Whether or not there are late interpolations in this material is irrelevant since the goal of this study is to ascertain the general milieu of the period from before and up to the time of Paul in other Second Temple material. The majority of scholars have rejected the thesis that the last sections of 1 Enoch are Christian additions.<sup>100</sup> If this were the case it would be important only since we would need to move this material into our discussion of the patristic era. Regardless, the material would still form part of the backdrop for understanding Paul. The standard dating for this collection of material is between the second century BC and the first century AD.

---

<sup>99</sup> I am aware of the debates about this, but it is convenient for organizing material. Hence, this layout is adopted simply for pragmatic purposes. The discussions of the composition of this text are rather technical, as demonstrated by Randall D. Chesnutt, "Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 2069 and the Compositional History of 1 Enoch," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 129, no. 3 (September 2010): 485–505. But for a brief overview see Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ.*, ed. Geza Vermes, vol. 3 (London: T & T Clark International, 1986), 250–68.

<sup>100</sup> The argument for this is extremely weak, being based on no text critical basis, but rather on the mention of "Son of man." Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, 1986, 3:250–68.

## The Book of the Watchers

In this section of 1 Enoch, the author portrays his engagement with a number of heavenly intermediaries (i.e., Watchers), who reveal to him many vivid images of things past, present, and future. At times, the way in which each of these visions are strung together makes it difficult to discern whether the focus is on present events from the perspective of Enoch or if the gaze is to the future. However, it is possible to pull out a number of clear eschatological references. The most notable is the consistent mention of a future judgment. At the time of this judgment such cataclysmic events will take place that everyone on the earth will be filled with terror (1 Enoch 1:5). Mountains will be rent in two (1:6) and Yahweh himself will be revealed (1:3). No one will escape this time of judgment, not even the righteous (1:8). Yet, it seems that in the midst of such chaos those who belong to the Lord will not be submitted to the same type of judgment as the wicked. Rather than fearing, the elect can be assured that God is not out for their blood.<sup>101</sup> Instead, “to all the righteous he will grant peace” (1:8).<sup>102</sup> And rather than being cursed along with the wicked, the righteous will receive wisdom (5:8). While the parallel does not seem adequate—that is, one would expect to find blessing at the other end, not wisdom—the point is clear: those who trust in Yahweh will be preserved even during the time when his wrath burns against the earth and those who have perverted it. This time is appropriately termed “the great day of judgment” (19:1; 22:5, 11, 14; 25:4).

No less important is the occurrence of imagery that harkens back to the Isaianic new Jerusalem.<sup>103</sup> Though there is still an eye toward judgment, there is a more notable focus on the

---

<sup>101</sup> For a discussion of how the Book of Watchers utilizes the language of election see Thornhill, *The Chosen People*, 34–35.

<sup>102</sup> All quotations from 1 Enoch are taken from E. Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983).

bliss in which the righteous will partake toward the end of this book. Enoch tells us, “Then they shall be glad and rejoice in gladness, and they shall enter into the holy (place); its fragrance shall (penetrate) their bones, long life will they live on earth, such as your fathers lived in their days” (25:6).<sup>104</sup> The last portion of this apocalyptic insight is interesting because it seems to be reworking Isaiah’s negative statement that those who die young in this age will be known to be unrighteous (Isa 65:20), to now say positively that the righteous will live for hundreds of years. Presumably this long life is due to access to the tree of life (1 Enoch 25:5). Veronika Bachmann argues that it is not necessarily the tree of life that is in view at this point. She notes that most scholars too readily assume that Genesis is in the background here.<sup>105</sup> But given the inclusion of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (which admittedly goes by another name) a few verses later (32:6), it is likely that Enoch intends to illicit Edenic motifs in support of the idyllic conditions about which he is writing. He even seems to go a bit overboard with these allusions, since at this future blessed time, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is reworked into the tree of wisdom, which is now available as part of the idyllic backdrop (32:5). One might suppose this implies that even what was once forbidden will be part of the inheritance of the righteous.

---

<sup>103</sup> This is noted by Nickelsburg, who thinks that 1 Enoch 24–27 is a recasting of the Isaianic prophetic material in the form of apocalyptic. George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 123.

<sup>104</sup> This is one of those odd moments when the narrator seems to forget that he is supposed to be writing as Enoch. If “your fathers” is intended to refer to Enoch’s ancestors, the point of such encouragement is useless given the fact that the long lifespan of the antediluvians apparently continued until Noah, who was 500 years old when he had his children (Gen 5:32). The point is that Enoch would not have been comforted by such a hope since he already lived within a time of such longevity.

<sup>105</sup> Veronika Bachmann, “Rooted in Paradise? The Meaning of the ‘Tree of Life’ in 1 Enoch 24–25 Reconsidered,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 19, no. 2 (December 1, 2009): 91. Even in this case, my point is simply that there is a link between this tree and the longevity of the righteous: “And the elect will be presented with its fruit for life” (1 Enoch 25:5). It is pedantic to note that the Enochic tree *that* gives life may not actually be the tree *of* life from the garden in Eden.

So, there is coming a day of great judgment and a day of great blessing. Although at times it seems as though both of these ideas are taking place together in one future ongoing time, it is more likely that this is due to the frenetic nature of apocalyptic writing. Just as the author gets a glimpse of the judgment of the wicked angels that took wives from among men, he then sees the righteous receiving bliss. The angels who guide Enoch show him glimpses of both fates within the same vision (27–36). However, it is possible to find a logic to what is presented. Judgment seems to be *an* event that takes place, characterized by swift action on God’s behalf. Whether this takes place over a short period of time or in a literal one day period, it is no surprise that this event is characterized as the (great) *day* of judgment. What is interesting, though, is that the period of idyllic blessedness that is portrayed is not given the same title—that is, there is no mention of the *day* of blessing. Instead, the only titular comment comes as a chronological appendage to the day of judgment. Those wicked angels and their perverted seed will continue to wreak havoc on the earth “until the day of the great conclusion, until the great age is consummated, until everything is concluded (upon) the Watchers and the wicked ones” (16:1). The great age cannot be consummated until judgment has been concluded.<sup>106</sup> And though this is the only mention of the “great age” in this portion of 1 Enoch, it is appropriate as a title for the period of eschatological blessing for the elect since it is set against the day of judgment in the same manner as the imagery of continued bliss. The former is swift and decisive, appropriately titled a “day of judgment;” the latter is continuous and everlasting, making it a “great age.”

---

<sup>106</sup> Nickelsburg notes the ambiguity with this reference. It is possible that this “great age” points to the time mentioned in 10:12, as a time of confinement for wicked angels. However, the inclusion of all the wicked men and angels at this later point implies that after the judgment a new age is dawning. Indeed, it would be odd to refer to a period of judgment as the great age, as that would ignore the cadence of this verse. It reads naturally as *from judgment to blessing*, rather than an expanded discussion of judgment. George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*, ed. Klaus Baltzer, Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 274.

But is a resurrection envisioned at this point? When Enoch is taken to observe the dwelling place of the unembodied dead, he asks what will happen to these people. The angel Rufael replies that the results will be different depending upon the righteousness of the individual. The wicked “shall be together with (other) criminals who are like them, (whose) souls will not be killed on the day of judgment but will not rise from there” (22:13). The wicked apparently stand condemned already and after their judgment they will continue to languish in their disembodied state.<sup>107</sup> The fact that they “will not rise from there” is an interesting comment that implies that others will rise.<sup>108</sup> The condemnation is worsened, then, since others will be brought out of their disembodied captivity, but they will be left to exist as phantasms. It is possible that this phrase simply means that there will be no transfer of the trapped spirit of the unrighteous. In this case, there is no reference to a bodily resurrection, but rather those who are righteous are transferred (or raised) from the place of the dead. If this line of reasoning is followed, then the righteous will also remain unembodied, but their spirits will enjoy the bliss of the location to which they are transferred. George W. E. Nickelsburg implies that this is the view he takes, but it is interesting that he does not drop the terminology of resurrection. He writes, “[Enoch] envisions a resurrection of *the spirits* of the sinners; their spirits, not their bodies, will be punished (v. 11, cf. v. 13).”<sup>109</sup> The problem with this assessment is that it extrapolates from the fate of one group of the wicked, to the fate of all the dead. The last part of Nickelsburg’s

---

<sup>107</sup> Where exactly this is, is not stated in the text. Some equate the location with Sheol. Routledge, *Old Testament Theology*, 310.

<sup>108</sup> This is presumably how Wright takes the passage, since he uses it to support the notion of a bodily resurrection in Second Temple material. N. T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, vol. 4, Christian Origins and the Question of God (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013), 164.

<sup>109</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*, Expanded, Harvard Theological Studies 56 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), 170.

statement is correct since those who are left within the cave as spirits are indeed punished as spirits. But this seems to be the point of contrasting this punishment with resurrection, rather than being a support for a spiritual resurrection. In fact, the two verses Nickelsburg references pertain to the same group of individuals that will not rise. So, it is difficult to see how he can infer that those who are said to never rise, can be examples of those whose spirits are resurrected and then punished.<sup>110</sup> At the same time, it does appear that the author includes this idea of raising more as a negative reinforcement than a positive confession of bodily resurrection for some. His goal is to make it clear that at least some wicked people will never be brought out of their torment. Still, his usage of *μετεγείρειν* is of interest, and it is the reason Nickelsburg retains “resurrection” language here. I am inclined to agree with Wright that the usage of resurrection terms denotes bodily resurrection, hence, it is tempting to enlist this passage in support of such a view.<sup>111</sup> The reality, however, is that this verse by itself does not give us enough information to make a firm decision. Regardless of what it looks like, though, some form of resurrection is present in this passage, and certain wicked people will not partake in it.

### **The Book of the Similitudes**

One of the interesting issues with the book of the Watchers is that when the eschatological time of bliss—that “great age”—is in view, it often sounds as though only the righteous who are alive at that time will partake in it. It is never directly stated whether or not the

---

<sup>110</sup> The issue is a bit more complex than I have made out above. Nickelsburg sees a contrast at work in v. 10 between the location of present torment and a future one into which the wicked will be transferred. The problem with this is that he rests his conclusion upon the usage of *ὧδε* (“here”) and *ἐκεῖ* (“there”), without commenting on the appended phrase “even if from the beginning of the world” of verse 11. This phrase makes it seem as though the *ἐκεῖ* to which it is attached is the same as the *ὧδε* of the supposed earlier locale. It is hard to see how a transfer at some eschatological moment can be described by this phrase. *Ibid.*, 169. This should not be taken to deny that a transfer of *some* people will take place. It is only that the present group will not be moved.

<sup>111</sup> Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, 2008, 3:204.

righteous who have died prior to that time will be there as well. One may infer from hints of the judgment of some unto retribution that others will be allowed to enter into the idyllic great age. But, of course, this is only an inference. The book of the Similitudes retains some elements of this ambiguity, but it also makes it clear how the deceased righteous can partake in this time: they will be resurrected.

Before getting to this clarifying addition, the author continues in much the same frenetic manner as the previous section. The major difference is that not only does Enoch have a say, but also Noah is introduced as a speaking character. This makes for an awkward read at times since it becomes difficult to tell who is supposed to be recording this revelatory material.<sup>112</sup> Nevertheless, the message is the same. Those who are wicked can expect to be “driven from the face of the earth” (38:1), and they will never “ascend into heaven” (45:2). Conversely, the righteous will be given of the light of the “Righteous One” (38:2), and they will see God and partake in life (47:3–4; 48:7). There is a much clearer focus upon the state of the elect in this section than in the book of the Watchers. The picture that is painted is one of hope for those who have been oppressed in this world: “In those days, there will be a change for the holy and the righteous ones and the light of days shall rest upon them; and glory and honor shall be given back to the holy ones, . . . .” (50:1).

At the climax of these idyllic images, one can almost hear the question: but how exactly will those who have died already partake in these things? There is a clear tension here. On the one hand, the righteous dead can be found in a separate (intermediate?) place from the wicked.<sup>113</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> See especially 1 Enoch 65, where Noah is asking Enoch for insight within a passage that is apparently being recorded by Enoch himself. The narrator even lapses into speaking as Noah (v. 5): “Then Enoch, my grandfather, came and stood by me, saying to me, ‘Why did you cry out so sorrowfully and with bitter tears?’” Note the awkward transition into first person pronouns, as though the narrator is now Noah, not Enoch.

<sup>113</sup> Bonsirven overstates the distinction between the place of the wicked versus the righteous. The problem is that 1 Enoch is inconsistent in numerous areas. In the book of the Watchers it is fairly clear that the wicked are in

As shown in the book of the Watchers the wicked are located in compartments in a mountain of unknown location. At this point, however, the righteous are also seen in an unembodied state somewhere between heaven and earth. Enoch is taken to a place “between two winds” where the righteous are currently dwelling (70:3–4). The conditions of this place are not described, however, so one may only infer that though it is not horrible like the location of the wicked, it is still not permanent. On the other hand, the idyllic setting in which the future bliss takes place is clearly understood as physical. There is little reason to think that the author envisions millions of unembodied spirits roaming around a pristine newly fashioned physical earth (45:5). But if this newly fashioned earth is meant for the elect, then surely there must be a way for the currently unembodied righteous to partake in it. Since spirits roaming around a physical location makes little sense, the author opts for a revivification of the bodies of the saints (51:1–5):

In those days, Sheol will return all the deposits which she had received and hell will give back all that which it owes. And he shall choose the righteous and the holy ones from among (the risen dead), for the day when they shall be selected and saved has arrived. In those days, (the Elect One) shall sit on my throne, and from the conscience of his mouth shall come out all the secrets of wisdom, for the Lord of the Spirits has given them to him and glorified him. In those days, mountains shall dance like rams; and the hills shall leap like kids satiated with milk. And the faces of all the angels in heaven shall glow with joy, because on that day the Elect One has arisen. And the earth shall rejoice; and the righteous ones shall dwell upon her and the elect ones shall walk upon her.

Allusions to Daniel are apparent in this passage. The general structure has affinities to Daniel 12 and verse 5 seems to be a direct citation of Daniel 12:1.<sup>114</sup> Given the mention of the Son of Man (46:3; cf. Dan 7:13) in earlier passages and the direct link between him and the

---

some place like Sheol; here the righteous are seen in some pseudo-heaven arena. But as noted below Sheol is generically for the place that gives up the dead, both wicked and righteous. Joseph Bonsirven, *Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Jesus Christ*, trans. William Wolf (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), 165. See also Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, ed. Geza Vermes, vol. 2 (London: T & T Clark International, 1986), 541.

<sup>114</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*, ed. Klaus Baltzer, *Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 185.



Chosen One (48:6), it makes it even likelier that Daniel is being utilized.<sup>115</sup> However, there is clearly some expansion happening. The author appears to be answering one of the curiosities piqued by the Danielic material: what happens to those who have been raised? All Daniel tells us is that some will arise to everlasting life, and others will arise only to be condemned (Dan 12:2). But Enoch wants to know what that everlasting life looks like. With only a few comments the author intimates that all the idyllic imagery that he relates is what that everlasting life looks like. The poetic imagery of mountains dancing and the elect walking upon the earth are meant to provoke the reader to attach all the previous and subsequent new creation imagery to this time when the righteous will be selected out from among the dead. The resurrection is the key that unlocks the eschatological and terrestrial hopes of this author. Every righteous person, dead or alive when the Elect One is revealed (45:4), can be assured that he will partake in the future paradise. Nickelsburg writes, “The resurrection functions as a means by which the righteous and holy receive the just reward of their deeds and compensation for their suffering under the kings and the mighty, and the wicked are punished by being deprived of a joyful life on a renewed earth.”<sup>116</sup> In other words, without the resurrection the idyllic setting in which Enoch places the elect is void of relevancy for his audience.

Enoch continues to unpack the logic of his theological expansion on the resurrection in chapter 61 (v. 5): “And these measurements shall reveal all the secrets of the depths of the earth, those who have been destroyed in the desert, those who have been devoured by the wild beasts, and those who have been eaten by the fish of the sea. So that they all return and find hope in the

---

<sup>115</sup> This is a fascinating issue in itself, but one that would take us too far afield. For a collection of essays on the usage of the Son of Man in 1 Enoch see Gabriele Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2007).

<sup>116</sup> Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 183.

day of the Elect One.” This passage is not intended to be an exhaustive list of ways people die. The purpose of these different forms of death is clearly to point out that no matter how one has died, one will be brought back to life. Even those who have not been properly buried can rest assured that God will restore them.<sup>117</sup> This restoration will come during “the day of the Elect One.” Nickelsburg notes that this phrase takes the place of the biblical motif of the “day of the Lord.”<sup>118</sup> This seems accurate, but it should be kept in mind that within this context “day” is being used to speak of the installment of the Elect One in his position of judgment. The debates about the duration of the day of the Lord in the OT should not be repeated in this portion of 1 Enoch.<sup>119</sup> The author is clear that this day is the time when the Elect One is placed by God “on the throne of glory” (61:8), his judgment is poured out on the angels and wicked men (62:9). The hope of the elect is established mainly via the negative imagery of what will not be theirs. The righteous are to rejoice both because God’s wrath is being poured out on the wicked (62:12) and because they will not be “eliminated from before his [the Elect One] face” (62:2), for they “shall be saved on that day” (62:13).

### **The Book of Astronomical Writings**

A notable shift takes place in this section of 1 Enoch. No longer is the focus strictly upon the wicked and their destruction, or the righteous and their blessing, but now Enoch is shown how God operates all the heavens, with special attention being placed on the movement of the

---

<sup>117</sup> For a brief discussion of Jewish burial techniques see Jürgen K. Zangenberg, “Archaeology, Papyri, and Inscriptions,” in *Early Judaism: A Comprehensive Overview*, ed. John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2012), 331.

<sup>118</sup> Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 246.

<sup>119</sup> For a thorough and clear overview of the issues with the biblical motif of the day of the Lord see Craig A. Blaising, “The Day of the Lord: Theme and Pattern in Biblical Theology,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 169, no. 673 (January 2012): 3–19.

sun and the moon. The angel Uriel, who is in charge of these astronomic bodies (75:3), is said to reveal all of this to the author, but the purpose is not clear at first. Is the goal simply to show the author's insight into astronomical events? It does seem this way in the first few passages. The sky is opened up to Enoch and he now knows that there are "openings through which the sun rises" (72:3), and the moon utilizes only a few of these same openings at certain times of the year, thus accounting for certain irregularities in its pattern (74:7). Yet, there seems to be a subtle polemic going on at this point. The angel is in charge of the stars and everything operates according to God's timing. It is not surprising then that one finds the author mentioning the foolishness of those who worship these stars as gods (80:7). "Don't you know," he is asking, "these heavenly bodies are clearly in the control of the one God?"<sup>120</sup>

For the purposes of this study, however, there is little that can be said for this section. There is no direct mention of a resurrection, and there are only scant comments relating to judgment and blessing. What is mentioned, though, is helpful in understanding the length of the great age spoken of earlier. We are told that when this new creation comes about it "abides forever" (72:1). James C. VanderKam argues that this should not be taken to mean that the present world is not everlasting. He writes, "It is worth noting that 72:1 says nothing about the decay or destruction of the present creation."<sup>121</sup> Although this is true, there is enough stated within other areas of 1 Enoch that renders it likely that this is what the author has in mind here. It is too stiff a requirement to force the author to clarify at each point that he envisions a destruction of the present earth prior to the new creation.<sup>122</sup> Indeed, the very mention of "new

---

<sup>120</sup> It is interesting, though, that even while generating this polemic, the author speaks of the stars as though they are living things that can "make errors in respect to the orders given to them" (80:6).

<sup>121</sup> Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 415.

<sup>122</sup> VanderKam is arguing against Siegbert Uhlig, who thinks that 1 Enoch 45:5 is a possible background for this passage. I find Uhlig's assessment to be reasonable, since even if this is a completely different author, it is

creation” requires at the very least a reworking of the present world order. For our purposes, though, it is sufficient to note that whatever this new creation is, it carries the same type description as the idyllic imagery from previous sections—namely, it is everlasting.

### **The Book of Dream Visions**

This section of 1 Enoch often goes by the name *Animal Apocalypse*, and it is obvious why this title has stuck. There are a series of visions given to Enoch, and they are all cast in a world of symbolic animals. The visions portray the ensuing flood of Noah’s day, and then look to the Maccabean period and beyond. In fact, this book seems to be a rewriting of Israel’s history via the means of apocalyptic animal imagery. A number of interesting symbols are used in these visions, with perhaps the most important being sheep. The sheep are said to be wrongfully handed over for destruction by wild beasts (89:68), which is interesting given the mention of those who were devoured by beasts earlier.<sup>123</sup>

The sheep play the role of the elect who are constantly being oppressed and devoured by the other stronger animals of this world (e.g., eagles and vultures who take on the role of shepherds only to eat the sheep in the end in 90:2). It is no surprise, then, that those animals that have gone after the sheep will eventually be destroyed. This destruction will take place in “the great day of judgment” (84:4). The progression of events is remarkably similar to what we have

---

difficult to believe that he would have been ignorant of this destruction/restoration motif, in other areas of 1 Enoch and the OT in general. Ibid., 415n25.

<sup>123</sup> Is it possible that the symbol of sheep is interlaced with literal elements of some being devoured by beasts? Tiller sees this as a summary of the Babylonian exile that is portrayed in earlier chapters. I am not denying that this is the case, I simply find it interesting that the focus is upon shepherds handing these sheep over to be eaten by wild beasts. Given the literal comment about this at 61:5 it may be possible to connect the two passages in this way. Patrick A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*, Early Judaism and Its Literature 4 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 333.

seen above. After painting the picture of the wickedness of men from the time of Noah, and “prophetically” of the Second Temple period, Enoch sees

all of them [wicked shepherds] bound; and they all stood before him [the Lord of the sheep]. Then his judgment took place. First among the stars [i.e., wicked angels], they received their judgment and were found guilty, and they went to the place of condemnation; and they were thrown into an abyss, full of fire and flame and full of the pillar of fire. Then those seventy shepherds were judged and found guilty; and they were cast into that fiery abyss (90:23–25).

It is interesting that ignorant sheep are not excused; even they are found guilty and thrown into the fire (90:26).

What we are after here is the timing. This is viewed as an event that takes place in order to give way to something better for those sheep who were faithful to the Lord of the sheep, even though they had wicked shepherds. Once judgment has been meted out and the wicked have been confined—this time in a specified location that some would label Gehenna—blessing may be poured out on the faithful.<sup>124</sup> In this case Jerusalem is pictured as a house that is “being transformed” (90:27), presumably into a new Jerusalem. Everything is being refitted and expanded so that all the innocent sheep, and now even other pure animals (e.g., Gentiles) can dwell in it together.<sup>125</sup> But what has been overlooked in the literature on this section is that these sheep are the same sheep that have been devoured previously. Whether actually eaten by beasts or not, the reality is that many of these sheep have been killed and are now awaiting this time when the house (=Jerusalem) is made into a new dwelling on earth. In fact, there is a reference to the “sheep that survived” in verse 30, but this is referring to the survival of the judgment—i.e.,

---

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, 372. I notice the parallel to Gehenna, but the term is not used here. So, like my comments on Sheol and the mountain from the book of the Watchers, I think it is better to simply say that the wicked are consistently shown to be tormented wherever that may be.

<sup>125</sup> There is an interesting reference here about those other animals being made to worship the sheep. Perhaps this is an incipient form of theosis, or more likely it is simply a way to note the favored status of the faithful Jews even in the new creation. Nickelsburg takes it in the latter sense. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 404.

they were not condemned along with the wicked. It appears as though at some point a resurrection has taken place. Although it is not clearly stated it is the only way to account for the way in which the once dead sheep are now said to be brought in the expanded house of the Lord of the sheep. Of course, it is possible to argue that this is all symbolic of the heavenly bliss in which the sheep are partaking, but this ignores Enoch's clear reference to the restructuring of a previous earthly reality. He writes (90:27–29),

Then I stood looking at that ancient house being transformed: All the pillars and all the columns were pulled out; and the ornaments of that house were packed and taken out together with them and abandoned in a certain place in the South of the land. I went on seeing until the Lord of the sheep brought about a new house, greater and loftier than the first one, and set it up in the first location which had been covered up—all its pillars were new, the columns new; and the ornaments new as well as greater than those of the first, (that is) the old (house) which was gone. All the sheep were within it.

It is no surprise that there is debate over whether this is speaking about a new Jerusalem or a new temple. However, Tiller rightly notes that the author is clear when speaking of the temple and that it is invalid to think he changed his pattern at this point.<sup>126</sup> Hence, it is most likely that a new Jerusalem is being pictured. Even if this were a new temple, however, the point still stands: the hope is for a terrestrial house that is to be built, not a celestial home in the sky. This means that once again the resurrection is the key to understanding how those who have died already may partake in this restored house of the Lord of the sheep. In fact, this image is incoherent if it is not picturing the resurrection. The only way for “the Lord of the sheep [to rejoice] with great joy because they had all become gentle and returned to his house” is if those sheep are given a new life in which to return from whence they had been removed.

---

<sup>126</sup> Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch*, 376.

### **The Book of the Epistle of Enoch**

Role reversal is the name of the game in this segment of 1 Enoch. What the wicked had in this life, the righteous will have in the next; what the wicked did to the righteous in this world, will be permissible for the righteous to do to the wicked in the world to come (95:3, 7). Also, the fate of the wicked is expounded upon in a much more vivid manner than before. Not only will the wicked be cast into everlasting fire (91:9), but chapters 94 through 104 are essentially lists of woe on the wicked and explanations of the way in which they will be punished. Once again, the reader will notice that the hope of the faithful is mentioned mostly in passing throughout the scary images of fiery torment. The righteous one is reminded to hope in his future because “the eternal judgment shall be (far) away from you” (104:5). It is this reversal of fates that is supposed to generate the most security for the believer: there will be a day when the righteous will see the wicked being tormented, rather than living in luxury.

In certain places, however, we do catch a glimpse of what the blessed state of the righteous will look like. Just like previous segments of 1 Enoch, one of the most important elements of this great age is that it is everlasting. Likewise, it comes after judgment has been poured out on the wicked: “The first heaven shall depart and pass away; a new heaven shall appear; and all the powers of heaven shall shine forever sevenfold” (91:16). As if forever is not long enough, it must be made clear that this time will be forever “sevenfold.” The following verse expands this notion even more: “Then after that [after a forever of sevenfold nature?] there shall be many weeks without number forever: it shall be (a time) of goodness and righteousness, and sin shall no more be heard of forever” (91:17). The contrast between the day of judgment that comes quickly (94:7) and then takes place in a short manner (96:1), is meant to bring a sense of comfort to the elect. They must realize that the wicked will be cut off in an instant, almost in a

manner that makes them irrelevant to end time events. But the righteous will never be forgotten; they will “shine like the lights of heaven” (104:2). If left at this point this comment may seem completely metaphorical, but an addition to this last segment seeks to explain what is meant. The elect will be transformed in such a way that they will be shining (108:11–12).<sup>127</sup> It is not simply that they will be seen by the wicked, but that something radical will occur in the structure of their being. Furthermore, it is made clear that these righteous individuals are brought forth from the dead. This is a promise given to those who have passed off earth’s scene without the good things of the world. Yet, even if this passage is removed from consideration due to its later addition to 1 Enoch, our author does not leave us guessing as to the fate of those who have already died. In fact, Enoch turns his gaze as to speak to the dead and tells them, “Your lot exceeds even that of the living ones” (103:3), for they “shall live and rejoice” (103:4). The resurrection, once more, is seen as the key piece for the hope granted to the elect. And not just for momentary pleasure, but for a life on the new earth that will last forever.<sup>128</sup>

### Summary of Findings

From the earliest portions of 1 Enoch it is clear that the author views the world as heading toward an end time with two realities available. It is not clear whether the righteous partake in the day of judgment, as some passages indicate yes (38:1) and others no (81:4), but what is consistent throughout 1 Enoch is that the righteous will live beyond that day (104:5). The

---

<sup>127</sup> On the late inclusion of this material see Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*, 111. Stuckenbruck also makes note that this exaltation passage is Jewish, rather than being a Christian interpolation Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” in *Early Judaism: A Comprehensive Overview*, ed. John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2012), 199.

<sup>128</sup> Nickelsburg notes that the phrase εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τῶν αἰώνων is intended within this context to point to the everlastingness of either the fate of the blessed or the fires that will burn the wicked. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 523.



wicked, however, will be judged virtually in an instant (19:1; 56:8; 80:2; 84:4; 96:8), in order to make way for the righteous to inhabit the new earth (60:6; 95:3). The contrast is clear: the wicked will be judged in an instant; bliss will continue for the righteous forever. At least in one place the author refers to this time period as that “great age” (16:1), but usually he speaks of it simply as a time after the judgment of the wicked (25:5–6; 61:2–6). In either case, he makes it clear that this time period has no end (91:17).

There is a problem, however, inasmuch as this future great age is, well, in the future. What about all of those who have long since died? Enoch assures his readers that these saints actually have a better hope than those living now (103:3). Although it cannot be said that 1 Enoch is focused upon the resurrection from the dead, there is a real sense in which much of its material makes no sense without such a concept. Whether it is the restored Jerusalem within which the dead will be allowed to walk (90:27), or the transformed state of those who are brought back from the land of the dead (108:12), the resurrection is either implied (22:13–14) or explicitly stated (51:1) as the means by which the righteous partake in the future age of blessing. Although it is unclear that the author(s) of 1 Enoch would have spoken in such a manner, it is likely that he would agree with an attempt at calling this great age the *resurrection age*. Perhaps not in the sense that that age is characterized by the resurrection, but at least in the sense that the age is made possible only by bringing back to life the saints who have been devoured by death.

### The Lives of the Prophets

Very little has been written about The Lives of the Prophets, and it is unlikely that this will change due to the content of the book. The goal of the author(s) of this text was to relate short biographies of the prophets from the OT. Information such as places of birth and burial is

included, along with an occasional theological note. The historical accuracy of each account is uncertain. In some cases the author merely repeats OT accounts; in others we hear of unknown feats like the angel that supposedly repeated every word of Malachi to the people (16:3). A further problem is that some areas of the text have clear signs of Christian interpolations. For instance, shortly after the author writes of Jeremiah's prophetic activity among the Egyptians, Jeremiah is said to give them a sign involving "a savior, a child born of a virgin, in a manger" (2:8).<sup>129</sup> This is supposed to explain why the Egyptians still "revere a virgin giving birth and, placing an infant in a manger, they worship" (2:9). Like this interpolation, most of the textual alterations are equally obvious. There are also numerous MSS from which to construct an original text. One MS in particular (Q) is so free of mutilations that D. R. A. Hare follows it in his translation almost verbatim.<sup>130</sup> Such issues are important for the process of dating; however, there are sufficient flags within the undisputed material to date this writing to the first century AD. One of these is the usage of certain geographical markers that would not have been known in the second century (cf. 21:1). Another flag is the mention of memorials for the prophets. Hare writes, "Although demonstration is impossible, it would appear that the most probable date is the first quarter of the first century AD, when interest in the erection of monuments for prophets, . . . , began to gain momentum."<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>129</sup> All quotations of *The Lives of the Prophets* are taken from D. R. A. Hare, "The Lives of the Prophets," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983).

<sup>130</sup> Hare is reflecting the standard view about the primacy of this MS. *Ibid.*, 379.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*, 381.

## The Life of Jeremiah

What is interesting about the mention of the resurrection in this section is the way in which it is simply assumed that the reader is familiar with the terminology. Jeremiah, in an act of judgment, removes the ark of the covenant prior to the temple's destruction. He then tells the people that what he is doing is to portray to them via an action what has happened in reality. He causes a rock to open up and absorb the covenant into itself, just as God has been hidden from the people (2:11). But this is not forever: "And in the resurrection the ark will be the first to be resurrected and will come out of the rock and be placed on Mount Sanai, and all the saints will be gathered to it there as they await the Lord and flee from the enemy who wishes to destroy them" (2:15). The imagery is clear: as one who was dead and placed in the grave the ark will come back to life.

Not only do we find here the usage of the phrase "in the resurrection," but there is also a clear progression of events. It is as if the author speaks of *the* resurrection as a time where the ark (and the faithful) are resurrected and then gathered to Mount Sanai. This is made clearer when the author speaks of this period of time as the "consummation" (2:16). The proximity of this word to the usage of *in the resurrection* indicates that the two are being viewed as one event. When the consummation comes about, the hidden message God has placed in the rock that houses the ark will be made known to the faithful. Everyone will partake in the blessedness that will return along with the ark. Although this passage lacks the overt idyllic imagery of other apocalyptic material, the association of the ideas of resurrection and the final age are clear. At the very least, the author of this work would agree with 1 Enoch that the great age is both characterized by the resurrection and cannot begin without it.<sup>132</sup>

---

<sup>132</sup> One can even include the notion of transformation at a later point based upon 12:13, which associates those who are fleeing from their enemy in 2:15 with those who will be "illuminated."

## The Life of Ezekiel

After recording how the people of Israel murder Ezekiel because of his testimony against them (3:2), the author mentions a few prophecies that Ezekiel supposedly gave to the people. There is some similarity here to the OT narratives, but it is mostly with regard to the background of events like the well-known vision of dry bones (Ezek 37). In this text the dry bones scene is referred to, along with other miraculous events, in order to give a bit of context to the message being preached. In this case, we find the resurrection implied as a means to convey hope to the discouraged people: “He used to say this to them: ‘Are we lost? Has our hope perished?’ and in the wonder of the dead bones he persuaded them that there is hope for Israel both here and in the coming (age)” (3:12). Hare is correct to highlight this passage as a hope of the resurrection, since the imagery of bones coming to life is surely meant to convey that even those who have perished may still hold on to hope of a future kingdom.<sup>133</sup> This is similar to the logic of 1 Enoch, where there must be a way for those who have died to partake in the promises.

## Summary of Findings

Although the connection of the resurrection and the final age are not abundantly clear in Ezekiel’s biography, the story of Jeremiah amply illustrates a conceptual link. If read chronologically, it is likely the author felt little need to explicitly state once again what he meant by the “coming age,” since he just did so in the previous chapter. This is also our first clear example of the usage of *in the resurrection* as a technical term referring to that great age. We should also mention there are two other times resurrection language is used, both referring to miraculous deeds the prophets performed by raising people from the dead (see 10:6; 22:9).

---

<sup>133</sup> Hare, “The Lives of the Prophets,” 382.

## Psalms of Solomon

The Psalms of Solomon is a compilation of psalms that speaks to the despair of those who have been left in a time when it seems like Yahweh is not active among the Jews—most likely the first century BC. There are plenty of reminders by the psalmist that such an abandoning is none other than Israel’s fault for disobedience (7:9; 17:19); there is also plenty of encouragement that Yahweh will remain faithful to the righteous (4:23; 5:18; 10:5–8; 16:15). Not everything is focused upon the current situation: there is either retribution or continued life after death, and everyone is exhorted to submit to Yahweh in order to avoid the former. R. B. Wright notes, “Life after death is concentrated entirely in the hope for bodily resurrection (viz. 2:31; 3:12) and betrays no certain trace of a belief in an immortal soul.”<sup>134</sup> This is accurate insofar as it pertains to the righteous, but as we will see below it is unclear that the psalmist could not envision an immortal soul for unbelievers versus a resurrected body for believers. In any case, scholars are agreed that the Psalms of Solomon align closely with the theology of the Pharisees. This alignment is so close that it led many to assume that this work was written by that sect. Jerry O’Dell wrote against this idea, armed with new information from the Qumran texts. He shows that at each point where scholars identified the theology of the Psalms of Solomon with that of the Pharisees, it could just as readily be associated with the Qumran community.<sup>135</sup> This has been followed by most scholars today, with the result that the ideas represented in this document could be reflective of a much wider milieu.<sup>136</sup>

---

<sup>134</sup> William L. Lane, “Paul’s Legacy from Pharisaism: Light from the Psalms of Solomon,” *Concordia Journal* 8, no. 4 (July 1982): 133.

<sup>135</sup> In particular, he shows that the belief in the resurrection does not have to be attached solely to the Pharisaical party. Jerry O’Dell, “The Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon (Re-Evaluated in the Light of the Qumran Texts),” *Revue de Qumrân* 3, no. 2 (10) (1961): 245–47.

## A Psalm of Solomon Concerning Jerusalem

One issue with psalms is the lack of narrational material. This means that most times theological concepts will appear without any detailed explanation. Still, it is possible to highlight a main theological motif such as the “mercy of God toward the righteous,” as William L. Lane has done.<sup>137</sup> Although the psalmist notes the numerous iniquities of Israel, he never ends there. Each psalm has at least an element of hope for the faithful. In this particular psalm we find this hope directed toward the psalmist himself. The implication is that all those who are faithful like the psalmist will partake in the same fate. Even though God will judge “kings and rulers” (2:30), he will raise “me up to glory, but [put] to sleep the arrogant for eternal destruction in dishonor, because they did not know him” (2:31).<sup>138</sup> The contrast between being raised up and eternally destroyed is important because it seems to imply that the wicked may not be raised at all. The notion of glory is also of interest here because it is set against the idea of dishonor. There is no need to infer from this a transformative notion behind “glory,” but merely that the psalmist envisions the resurrection as a contrast to the dishonor that is found in eternal destruction. That is, those who are wicked will be perpetually embarrassed at their lowly eternal state, whereas the faithful will be brought back from the dead.

---

<sup>136</sup> Susan E. Docherty, *The Jewish Pseudepigrapha: An Introduction to the Literature of the Second Temple Period*, 2015, 71. Though see William L. Lane, “Paul’s Legacy from Pharisaism: Light from the Psalms of Solomon,” *Concordia Journal* 8, no. 4 (July 1982): 132.

<sup>137</sup> Lane, “Paul’s Legacy from Pharisaism,” 133. Embry also makes note of this theme, but takes it to a point that I think goes too far: “I assert that the author intended it as a literature of assurance, on meant to produce hope in his readers and to encourage them to faithful adherence to the Torah in spite of recent historical events.” Bradley Embry, “The Psalms of Solomon and the New Testament: Intertextuality and the Need for a Re-Evaluation,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 13, no. 2 (October 2002): 134. The problem with this is the stilted focus on one intention. There is clearly more going on than giving hope. Embry is correct to question the traditional titling of this material as “crisis literature,” but this does not mean that a pendulum swing to the other end of the spectrum is necessary. Perhaps we can call this a work of *hope and judgment in the midst of crisis*.

<sup>138</sup> All quotations of the Psalms of Solomon are taken from R. B. Wright, “Psalms of Solomon,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983).

### **A Psalm of Solomon Concerning the Righteous**

The idea of resurrection as glory is continued in this next psalm with the notion of eternal life. In this passage the psalmist clearly defines the intent of the resurrection by once again contrasting it with the fate of the wicked: “This is the share of the sinners forever, but those who fear the Lord shall rise up to eternal life, and their life shall be in the Lord’s light, and it shall never end” (3:12). P. N. Franklin aptly summarizes the psalmist’s opinion of the wicked in the previous verses: “It would be better if the sinner had been an abortion, but if born, his plunge into sin is proportionately matched by his descent into eternal forgottenness.”<sup>139</sup> Here the faithful are set against this as those who not only will receive God’s mercy presently, but in the eschaton they will be raised and never forgotten. It is as if the righteous and the wicked are on a perpetual path of opposites. Even if it does not appear like the faithful are receiving the mercy of God they ought to know they are. Everything is to be viewed from the perspective of heaven. God is pleased with the righteous now, and it is visible in subtle ways—inasmuch as the wicked are judged in subtle ways. In the future all subtlety will be abandoned and sinners will be destroyed vividly and the righteous will bask in new life characterized by the reflection of God upon them. This may even carry theotic notions where the believer partakes in the very life of God, as is found in later Christian material. The point, though, is that this will go on forever. This idea is also mentioned elsewhere, but without the explicit linkage to a resurrection (13:11). In both cases, though, life is continuing in some form. The importance of this is the inference that a new age is being envisioned. In fact, due to the consistent contrast between the wicked and the righteous, other psalms can be utilized to show that the resurrection and the final age go together.

---

<sup>139</sup> Paul N. Franklyn, “The Cultic and Pious Climax of Eschatology in the Psalms of Solomon,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 18, no. 1 (June 1987): 10.

## A Hymn of Solomon

Once again the psalmist speaks of the wicked who will receive their eternal destruction, “and they will not be found on the day of mercy for the righteous” (14:9). Rather than mercy in the present, the psalmist now speaks of a day when mercy will be meted out to the righteous. Based upon the previous material it is likely he is thinking of the resurrection as a part of this day. In fact, he comes close to an explicit reference of this idea again when he writes, “But the devout of the Lord will inherit life in happiness” (14:10). There is little doubt that inheriting life has been attached to resurrection from the dead in these psalms. This means that it is not a stretch to also think of this inheritance in terms of the day of mercy. But the day of mercy is extended perpetually for the faithful, whereas the day of judgment is extended for the wicked. The same notion is found in the next psalm as well (15:10–13). This means that whatever we wish to call that period of time in which the righteous live it is characterized by the mercy of God. Indeed, the righteous “shall live by their God’s mercy” (15:13).<sup>140</sup>

## Summary of Findings

Although there is no usage of the phrase *in the resurrection*, it is clear that the psalmist thinks of a time of blessing for the righteous that can be characterized by certain events. In this case, mercy is the identifier. That age can be thought of as the age of mercy. What is also clear is that the resurrection is set against eternal damnation in a way that makes us think the author views resurrection as a more expansive concept than the initial point of coming out of the ground. The resurrection is utilized in much the same way the notion of mercy is. In fact, the two

---

<sup>140</sup> It is no coincidence that this psalm has been compared to *Pss Sol 3* by others. Rodney A. Werline, “The Formation of the Pious Person,” in *The Psalms of Solomon: Language, History, Theology*, ed. Eberhard Bons and Patrick Pouchelle, Society of Biblical Literature. Early Judaism and Its Literature, no. 40 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 146.



seem to be the same thing: those who find mercy from the Lord have found eternal life—that is, resurrection unto a life that will never again end.

### Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is typically dated to the second century BC, and is structured as a series of sayings that the twelve sons of Jacob uttered just prior to each of their deaths.<sup>141</sup> The reader is supposed to glean theological insights from the patriarchs such as the nature of spirits (TReub 2–3) and the variety of bodies within the heavens (TLevi 3). While operating as a pedagogical tool, this material also fills in narrational details that are lacking in the OT. For instance, Reuben tells us that he was struck with a disease due to his sexual sin that he committed against his father (TReub 1:7; cf. Gen 35:22).

#### **Testament of Judah**

After offering numerous portents of judgment against Israel, Judah turns his focus to discussing the kingdom of God. As is common in apocalyptic material, judgment is laced with hope for the faithful.<sup>142</sup> In this case, the faithful should be alert and keep their eyes open for the coming of the Messiah who will establish his kingdom and rule in righteousness (24:5–6). “And after this Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob will be resurrected to life and I and my brothers will be chiefs (wielding) our scepter in Israel” (25:1).<sup>143</sup> For Judah, coming back to life is the first step in

---

<sup>141</sup> A few voices have raised concern about this date, but DeSilva reestablishes a more traditional understanding of these texts. David A. DeSilva, “The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs as Witnesses to Pre-Christian Judaism: A Re-Assessment,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 23, no. 1 (September 1, 2013): 21–68.

<sup>142</sup> Nickelsburg terms this a “pattern sin-punishment-repentance-salvation” George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), 238.

the Messiah fulfilling his promises to Israel. There is once again a logical element to all of this. How exactly will Judah get to partake in the kingdom if he has died? The answer is he will be brought back to life. After this, he will presumably continue business as usual. There is no talk of an ethereal or angelic existence, but a rather mundane reanimation that leads to ruling over a terrestrial kingdom.

This does not mean that idyllic language is missing. The difference, though, is that such language has a much more muted tone. Rather than envisioning the kingdom as a mystical paradisiacal land, Judah sees it as a place where “you shall be one people of the Lord, with one language” (25:3). He continues, “And those who died in sorrow shall be raised in joy; and those who died in poverty for the Lord’s sake shall be made rich” (25:4). The resurrection is here viewed as a righting of the wrongs committed in the present. It is the event that will restore things to such a point that man can live forever. How this will be possible is not addressed.

### **Testament of Zebulon**

Rather offering numerous comments about judgment like Judah, Zebulon is related as one who gives advice for piety. Those who wish to be faithful to Yahweh ought to be compassionate and merciful because this is pleasing to him (5:1). Joseph becomes the paradigmatic example of such a pleasing disposition because he did not have his brothers killed even when it was in his power to do so (8:4). Those who are not like Joseph, though, incite the wrath of God against them. And just before offering a note of comfort, Zebulon sneaks in a prophecy of judgment against those who act wickedly. What is interesting about this note of condemnation is that though it is shorter and less detailed than other sections of the Testaments,

---

<sup>143</sup> All quotations of the Testaments are taken from H. C. Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983).

it has an ominous, almost hopeless tinge to it. Here we read that “you will be rejected until the time of the end” (9:9). So much for trying to please God here and now! The problem is only exacerbated because the note of hope that follows seems so out of place that anyone reading this must have questioned if the author realized what he just wrote. Rather than saying something like, “do not worry, because God will be good to the faithful,” Zebulon leaves off and starts a completely different idea: “And now, my children, do not grieve because I am dying, nor be depressed because I am leaving you. I shall rise again in your midst as a leader among your sons” (10:1–2). Everyone in this generation is cut off until the end, but they are not to fret because Zebulon will rise again in a new generation. This is an odd way to comfort those who are perishing, but the idea seems to be that the reader should place himself in Zebulon’s future blessing because he too is faithful. In this vein, it appears that the author views the time of the end as that time when he will rise.

### **Testament of Benjamin**

In the previous two testaments, not much has been added to our understanding of the resurrection in the thought of the second temple period. However, in the Testament of Benjamin we stumble upon an interesting development. After encouraging his children to walk in righteousness Benjamin explains that for those who heed his advice there is a great reward. Not only will the faithful get to see Enoch and other righteous men standing before God (10:6), but “Then shall we also be raised, each of us over our tribe” (10:7). New life will be granted to all who follow the path of righteousness. Yet, Benjamin does not stop here: “Then all shall be

changed, some destined for glory, others for dishonor” (10:8).<sup>144</sup> Here we have an explicit case separating the resurrection from a transformation. Also, the author clearly contrasts glory with dishonor. We have seen this before, but in the previous case there was no mention of transformation. Although the notion of glory does not necessarily entail a transformation, this verse is unique because it indicates that both the righteous and the wicked will be changed. Perhaps it is that the wicked will need a new form for their punishment to last forever. Since this is the case, one can dislocate the idea of glory from transformation. Because the wicked will be transformed too, it is inappropriate to call them glorified. For this author, it seems that glory is a thing that happens to the faithful in their transformed state. It is apparent, though, that if one were to ignore the fate of the wicked this transformative event could be summarized as a glorification. This would make our thesis more likely, given the fact that various theological ideas may be summed up in one or two words.

### **Summary of Findings**

For the most part the Testaments offer little in the way of development on the resurrection. It is presented as that great event that right the wrongs of this age. There is no usage of the phrase *in the resurrection*, but it does seem like the “time of the end” is linked with the resurrection at least as an event to another event. In the Testament of Benjamin, however, there is a notable development that places the transformation of the faithful into a glorious state *after* a resurrection has occurred. This means that it is at least conceivable that Paul could have thought of a similar division without standing alone in the Jewish milieu of his day.

---

<sup>144</sup> One should note the similarity between this terminology and that of Pss Sol mentioned above. This causes us to ask if it is possible to interpret the Pss in light of this passage, which has more detail. Does the psalmist also think of the contrast in terms of transformation?

### Pseudo-Phocylides

This work is one of those oddities where the date of the original text is placed early, but mention is made of some late Christian interpolations. The only MSS available for this document come from the tenth century, but the standard dating for the original content is still placed within the first century BC and first century AD. The work reads very much like the book of Proverbs blended with Deuteronomy, and has noticeable elements of both Jewish and Greek wisdom. In certain areas it is clear that Deuteronomic material is simply being reshaped and related in new ways (12; 70). There are also many added laws such as locking a virgin in a room so as to keep her pure until she is married. (215–6). The blending of Greek and Jewish ideas comes to a head when discussing the afterlife. The author blends numerous ideas together with the result that scholars are divided as to whether this can be used as an adequate reflection of a single author.<sup>145</sup>

### Death and Afterlife

The author's discussion of the resurrection begins with a standard appeal to the hope that in the future the body will return from the ground (103). Because of this one is to treat the deceased with respect. There should be no tampering with graves, because God will become incensed with those who so disrespect the bodies that he will one day resurrect (100–1). At the same time, the author argues that the soul is immortal and "Hades is (our) common eternal home and fatherland" (112).<sup>146</sup> It is not clear how the author thinks these two ideas can go together. On the one hand, a future body is hoped for; on the other, Hades is a location for the eternal soul.

---

<sup>145</sup> Pieter van der Horst, "Pseudo-Phocylides on the Afterlife: A Rejoinder to John J. Collins," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 35, no. 1 (January 1, 2004): 70.

<sup>146</sup> All quotations of Pseudo-Phocylides are taken from P. W. van der Horst, "Pseudo-Phocylides," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983).

Peiter van der Horst notes, “Most scholars find it very difficult, if not impossible, to interpret these 13 lines as a systematic exposition of a consistent view on life after death, especially so since, *inter alia*, the author seems to defend the immortality of the soul as much as the resurrection of the body and, moreover, does not clarify the relations between body, soul, and spirit.”<sup>147</sup> However, it is still possible to isolate various ideas from this passage even if they are not consistent. For instance, the author expands on the simple notion of a resurrection by noting that “afterward they will become gods” (104). This is interesting for two reasons: (1) it clearly places a division between the resurrection and a transformation; and (2) it is the earliest mention of theosis (at least in a Jewish text) that I have been able to find. This idea becomes prominent in later patristic material, and is an interesting area of study that would eventually need to be pursued if the thesis of this project is accurate.<sup>148</sup>

### **Summary of Findings**

Once again we find a division between the physical raising of the body and a transformation of being. However, there is no mention of the resurrection as an event, but rather it is viewed as a thing that happens to the body. Given the inclusion of transformation as a separate event, though, it seems necessary to think of this as a complex of events. The terminology to define this series of events is something that one could develop in different directions. Perhaps it is thought of as the last age, or the glorification age, or in our case the resurrection age.

---

<sup>147</sup> van der Horst, “Pseudo-Phocylides on the Afterlife,” 70.

<sup>148</sup> For two good introductions to the concept see Blackwell, *Christosis*; Michael J. Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul’s Narrative Soteriology* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2009).

### **Pseudepigraphal Writings Shortly After the Fall of the Temple**

One of the difficulties this project faces is placing the resurrection material in specific timeframes. Even some of the material in the previous section can be dated to later periods than have been assumed. But in each of the cases above, I am persuaded that the best arguments rest on the side of early dating. This section is necessary because there are numerous writings that have been dated late, but could still have roots to earlier times. Moreover, even those items that have been dated to shortly after AD 70 (say within fifty years) are still valid for understanding the various conceptions of the resurrection in the intertestamental period. By limiting the date this will allow us to bypass some of the more technical dating issues and be content with works that are within a reasonably close proximity to early Second Temple texts. An added problem is that these writings appear to have been edited more often by Christian scribes. This means that in some cases the material may reflect developed theological ideas that would have only been arrived at based upon other Christian texts. For this reason, conclusions drawn from this section will be more tentative than any other portion of this project.

#### The Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch (2 Enoch)

Second Enoch has notable problems due to its transmission history. At least two text forms have been preserved, with one being substantially shorter than the other. While there is debate as to which form is closest to the original text, we can avoid this discussion because the relevant material is available in both versions.<sup>149</sup> This means that it is likely the original form of the text housed something similar to what is given below. What is more important is the matter of dating. The only available MSS come from the fourteenth century, which means that any

---

<sup>149</sup> F. I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 93.

guess as to the date of the original will only remain a guess. Most seem content to date this to sometime in the first century AD, though with notable redactional activity at later points.<sup>150</sup>

Dating 2 Enoch to this period rests upon the author's mention of the temple in Jerusalem.

Because this is only present in the longer version, though, this date must be selected tentatively.

However, there does not seem to be much development on the concept of the resurrection from 1

Enoch. Given the fact that the resurrection became a much more discussed doctrine during the middle ages (the other possible date for 2 Enoch), it is odd to find the resurrection mentioned

only briefly in one location.<sup>151</sup> Furthermore, the ideas noted in this section are so close to 1

Enoch that it is difficult to argue for a large gap in time between the two writings. Perhaps 2

Enoch was intended to play off of the more popular 1 Enoch, which was likely completed in the first century AD.<sup>152</sup>

## Second Enoch 65

It is not surprising to once again find Enoch speaking of a blessed state for followers of God. Idyllic imagery returns, but in this case there is much closer attachment of the resurrection to new creation imagery. The new creation motif likely harkens back to Isaiah 65. It is interesting that within the context of a new cosmological reality, Isaiah's focus is mainly upon humans and their relationships to one another and to God. Out of the nine verses of the new creation portion

---

<sup>150</sup> Larry R. Helyer, *Exploring Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period: A Guide for New Testament Students* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 382.

<sup>151</sup> I include only one here even though some discuss resurrection language at 2 Enoch 22:8-9, e.g., Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 139n22p. However, there is no mention of resurrection, or even a hint that this is what the author is getting at. Instead, Enoch is said to be taken to heaven where he is given glory.

<sup>152</sup> Although Reed supports an early date from a different angle she notes the development on Enochic material and how it fits nicely within a first century context. Annette Yoshiko Reed, "2 Enoch and the Trajectories of Jewish Cosmology: From Mesopotamian Astronomy to Greco-Egyptian Philosophy in Roman Egypt," *The Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 22, no. 1 (January 24, 2014): 9.



of Isaiah 65, seven pertain explicitly to anthropological concerns. One of the other two verses (v. 17) also deals with this concept implicitly, with its reference that “the past events will not be remembered or come to mind.” Within the context, God is referring to the wicked “events” done by his people in the past. So even in this verse that refers explicitly to the new heavens and new earth, the actual creation of the new heavens and new earth seems to be incidental. That is, the main point is not that God is going to recreate the earth, but rather *within* the newly created earth men will also be refashioned. In his appropriately titled “The Destiny of God’s Servants in a New Creation” Gary V. Smith captures the essence of Isaiah’s new creation motif nicely: “The *basis for the distinctive destiny for God’s servants is God’s marvelous promise of the creation of a new heavens and a new earth*, where things will be dramatically different from the dreadful circumstances these people were enduring (65:17-25)” (emphasis added).<sup>153</sup> Second Enoch echoes this same mentality. The author sets the stage by bringing the reader to the edge of God’s new creation, in order to explain what this new time will hold for the faithful. Cosmology is the background to the main event of human transformation.

The shorter version of the text reads:

<sup>6</sup>When the whole of creation, which the LORD has created, shall come to an end, and when each person will go to the LORD’s great judgment, <sup>7</sup>then the time periods will perish, and there will be neither years nor months nor days, and hours will no longer be counted; <sup>8</sup>but they will constitute a single age. And all the righteous, who escape from the LORD’s great judgment, will be collected together with the great age. And (the age) at the same time will unite with the righteous, and they will be eternal. <sup>9</sup>And there will be among them neither weariness nor suffering nor affliction nor expectation of violence nor the pain of the night nor darkness. <sup>10</sup>But they will have a great light for eternity, (and) an indestructible wall, and they will have a great paradise, the shelter of an eternal residence. <sup>11</sup>How happy are the righteous who will escape the LORD’s great judgment, for their faces will shine forth like the sun.<sup>154</sup>

---

<sup>153</sup> Gary V. Smith, “Isaiah 65-66: The Destiny of God’s Servants in a New Creation,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 171, no. 681 (January 2014): 48.

<sup>154</sup> All quotations of 2 Enoch are taken from Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch.”

The similarity between this material and 1 Enoch is apparent, especially with regard to the logic of the resurrection: every righteous person will be brought into this new age with Yahweh. But as noted above the terminology for this period was never explicitly stated. Though we offered “great age” as a possible title for what 1 Enoch envisioned, 2 Enoch makes it more likely that we were correct to assess this period in such a way. The “great age” is explicitly noted here, and the concepts are the same as before.<sup>155</sup> Only now the faithful are said to merge with the great age itself. Obviously, the author is not trying to say that humans will become time, but rather that time will cease to exist. Man will become *like* the age in which he inhabits. Just as man is conditioned by time today (with the consequence of death), man will one day be conditioned by the new age of timelessness (with the consequence of eternal life).

### **Summary of Findings**

It is important that the author conceives of numerous alternations to mankind that take place under the umbrella of a “great age.” Entrance to the great age comes by surviving the judgment, but entrance is just the beginning. One can almost be said to become a “great ager.” The person is so characterized by that period of time that “human” simply does not work any longer. By the time the alteration is complete those who experience this will shine with brilliant light. Moreover, the notion of stages in eschatological transformation is visible. Returning to life, however, is the key motif that makes the next stages possible. Second Enoch offers speculations on what that life will look like. The transformation can be said to be the next step in the new life.

---

<sup>155</sup> Nickelsburg notes the clear overlap in concepts with numerous other Second Temple writings. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 187.

### The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch (2 Baruch)

This work comes close to moving beyond our delimiter for time frame. However, A. F. J. Klijn argues that there are sufficient time markers to place it close to AD 100.<sup>156</sup> This has also been supported more recently by Matthias Henze, who notes the many similarities between 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra. Unlike other scholars, though, Henze concludes that the two works were created independently and shared a similar conceptual matrix, rather than one depending on the other.<sup>157</sup> This means that 2 Baruch is a good example of apocalyptic material in general, rather than being a case of rewritten literature.

The book opens with a message of destruction for Jerusalem and the prophet Baruch's intercession for the people. Unfortunately for Jerusalem, God allows them to be overtaken by the Chaldeans as Baruch watches from afar (6:2–3), and eventually mourns with Jeremiah (9:2). After this Baruch is told to wait in Jerusalem because God has a special message to reveal to him about “the end of days” (10:3). The book continues with a series of visions that Baruch receives, wherein the remainder of the nations are judged (13:5). There is also no lack of encouragement to the faithful, who are promised divine protection if they remain loyal to God (32:1). At the end of the work the people are even said to respond to Baruch with a request for him to write to their Jewish brethren who remain in Babylon (77:12). Baruch responds by writing a letter to the Babylonian Jews by attaching it to a great eagle who will carry it to them (87:1).

---

<sup>156</sup> A. F. J. Klijn, “Second Baruch,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 617. All quotations from 2 Baruch are from his translation.

<sup>157</sup> This essentially pushes Klijn's date back a bit, since he argues that 2 Baruch came after 4 Ezra. Matthias Henze, “4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: Literary Composition and Oral Performance in First-Century Apocalyptic Literature,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 131, no. 1 (2012): 198.

## Prayer of Baruch

Throughout this work Baruch offers a number of prayers asking for further revelation from God. In the second of these prayers we find a detailed discussion of the future state of both the righteous and the wicked. In each case they must first be resurrected (50:1–51:6). This is an important deviation from other material we have noted, since there is now a clear need for the wicked to have bodies just like the righteous.<sup>158</sup> But in each case “as it [the ground] has received them so it will give them back” (50:2). The author assures his audience that the body that dies will be the same one raised in the future. The issue of continuity being addressed in this manner should not be overlooked. In this section Baruch makes it clear that the resurrection is the key to judgment for those who are living at that the time of its occurrence. When the inhabitants of the world see the dead coming out of the graves they will know the time is at hand. Moreover, there will be those alive who will be able to recognize some of the people that have died (50:4). It would be difficult to argue for a transformative view in this case.

In the next section Baruch makes it clear that he views resurrection and transformation as two separate concepts: “And it will happen after this day which he appointed is over that both the shape of those who are found to be guilty as also the glory of those who have proved to be righteous will be changed” (51:1). Rivkah Nir notes, “*Baruch* anticipates a transitional period between the bodily resurrection and the changing.”<sup>159</sup> Those who were righteous on earth will undergo a transformation that will render them even more righteous (51:3). Likewise, the wicked

---

<sup>158</sup> Vermes presents 2 Baruch as continuing the idea that the wicked will not be raised, but here is an explicit witness to the contrary. Geza Vermes, *The Resurrection* (New York: Doubleday, 2008), 34. To be fair, 2 Baruch houses seemingly contradictory information, as noted by others. See John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd ed., The Biblical Resource Series (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998), 214. Still it is odd to find no mention of this is Vermes’s material.

<sup>159</sup> Rivkah Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*, *Early Judaism and Its Literature*, no. 20 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 162.

will be rendered even more wicked (51:2). It appears that the life of the final age must be lived in an appropriate body. Those who have transgressed God's law cannot simply remain in a disembodied state and be tormented, but they must have a transformed body in order for this to happen (51:2). The righteous can only enjoy the fruits of the kingdom if they have a new body by which they can participate (51:3). The torment of the wicked will only be worsened because they will finally see the righteous in a state far superior to their own.

### **Summary of Findings**

Second Baruch offers the clearest example of Second Temple material with a division between resurrection and transformation. The overlap between eschatological notions of judgment on the great day is standard and as was therefore not related above. However, due to the placement of the resurrection in that period of time along with a transformation unto either bliss or torment Baruch offers a nuance to the resurrection that Tom W. Willet has called a "two-stage resurrection."<sup>160</sup> Though I do not think this is the best way to capture Baruch's ideas, since it is unlikely that he would think of the transformation as *a* resurrection. It is clear that the ideas are so closely linked, that one could easily subsume one notion under the other. In Willet's case he has chosen the resurrection, but one could just as easily call this a two-step transformation. The point, though, is that Baruch has taken the common hope of a resurrection and explained it in a way that calls for new terminology.

---

<sup>160</sup> Tom W. Willett, *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*, *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 4 (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1989), 117.

## Testament of Job

This work is dated between the first century BC and the end of the first century AD. R. P. Spittler notes that the work was most likely originally written by a Jewish author, and later underwent some revision in the second century.<sup>161</sup> However, most of the possible Christian activity is identifiable and occurs at the end of the work.<sup>162</sup> This should not cause too much concern since the relevant material is from the earlier portion of the work, and causes little suspicion of scribal activity anyway. The Testament of Job is another intertestamental work that seeks to fill in the details of one of the OT figures. In this case, Job's children are named (1:3), Satan's anger toward Job is explained as a response to Job ignoring him when he came to his door disguised as a beggar (7:1), Job's sacrificial habits are delineated by the number of animals used (15:4), his friends defend their discussion as attempts to ascertain whether or not Job is mentally unstable (38:6), and upon Job's recovery his charitable deeds are recorded to make note that he continued to be a righteous man even until his death (44:4–45:1).

### **The Angel's Disclosure of Impending Calamities**

In this section Job is given insight into what is about to befall him. An angel (or light) encourages him by revealing to him that God is the one about to test him. If Job is faithful God will "make your name renowned in all generations of the earth till the consummation of the age" (4:6). This passage (along with numerous others) has been used to argue that the Epistle of James was fashioned along the lines of this writing, inasmuch as both emphasize patiently enduring

---

<sup>161</sup> R. P. Spittler, "Testament of Job," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 834. All quotations of Testament of Job are taken from his translation.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid., 134. Also, Nickelsburg finds little Christian material (only the Epistle to the Hebrews) to which this work can be compared Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 247..

struggles.<sup>163</sup> Whether or not this is the case, it does seem clear that the ideas in this particular section of the Testament reflect a general milieu, from which Christians could have easily borrowed. For instance, we have met the phrase “consummation of the age” elsewhere above, and it is not a coincidence that this phrase comes right before the angel offers Job hope via another familiar concept: “And you shall be raised up in the resurrection” (4:9). The close association of these two ideas once again makes it likely that the resurrection is being used in a way that parallels “consummation of the age.”

### **Summary of Findings**

The Testament of Job utilizes the phrase “in the resurrection,” in such a way that it flags our attention as a possible parallel to the “consummation of the age.” Although there is no further description of this period of time, the proximity of these ideas to one another makes it difficult to argue that it is a mere coincidence. Whether the resurrection is viewed as the initiatory event of the final age, or as a descriptor of that age is unclear. But the mention of being raised *in the resurrection*, leads in the direction of the latter. If this is not the case, then the locution is simply redundant.

### **Apocryphal Writings**

The division between pseudepigraphal material and apocryphal writings is not as clear as the difference in titles suggests. The reality is that most of the works of the Second Temple period could fit nicely in either category. By using the title of “apocrypha,” I am referring to

---

<sup>163</sup> For an overview of this debate see David A. deSilva, *The Jewish Teachers of Jesus, James, and Jude: What Earliest Christianity Learned from the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 240–51.

those works that have been retained as an appendage to the OT in certain translations (namely, the LXX).<sup>164</sup> Although 2 Esdras mentions resurrection, it falls beyond the time period of our survey. This leaves only 2 Maccabees to be discussed.

### Second Maccabees

This book is an attempt to condense a five volume work of Jason of Cyrene into one volume (2:23).<sup>165</sup> The editor makes it clear that he intends to convey as much detail as possible, but the goal is to make the massive work readable to a wider audience (2:25). This is not to be viewed as a continuation of 1 Maccabees, since it covers the same time period but as through a different lens. Some material may actually come from Judas Maccabeus himself, though this is debated.<sup>166</sup> The text has been divided in various ways, with some focusing on the motif of three threats against the temple, and others noting a simple introduction-body-conclusion format.<sup>167</sup> However, the best way to view this book is in two parts, with the first painting the picture of the a problem, and the second explaining how God fixes the problem via Judas.<sup>168</sup>

---

<sup>164</sup> On the reasoning behind the usage of this title see Michael David Coogan, ed., *The New Oxford Annotated Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 3. All quotations of apocryphal works are taken from this translation.

<sup>165</sup> For more on this editorial activity see Francis Borchardt, “Reading Aid: 2 Maccabees and the History of Jason of Cyrene Reconsidered,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 47, no. 1 (2016): 71–87.

<sup>166</sup> DeSilva seems to indicate that this is the case, but notes that certainty is not possible. David A. DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 270.

<sup>167</sup> *Ibid.*, 268; Otto Kaiser, *The Old Testament Apocrypha: An Introduction* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), 18.

<sup>168</sup> This is the structure advocated by Schwartz. Michael David Coogan and Daniel R. Schwartz, eds., “2 Maccabees,” in *The New Oxford Annotated Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 241.



The author of this work begins by setting out the depraved conditions that were flourishing in Judea. For a while things were going well with Onias as the high priest. Because of his influence the people were keeping the laws and God favored the land by having King Seleucus pay for the some of the sacrifices of the temple (3:1–3). This was not to last. In the aftermath of Seleucus’s death, his son Antiochus allowed Jason, Onias’s brother, to purchase the position of high priest for himself (4:7). Not long after this, though, Jason was outbid by Menelaus and forced to go into hiding (4:26). Apparently in an attempt to pay what he had promised, Menelaus sold some of the treasures of the temple, which Onias exposed to the people (4:32–3). As a result of this, Menelaus had Onias killed (4:35), which led Antiochus to kill the one who murdered Onias (4:37). In the meantime, Jason tried to regain the priesthood for himself again. Only this time he went about killing those who opposed him. Because of the fighting that was now occurring Antiochus returned to Judea to crush the rebellion. When he did this he murdered women and children (5:13) and even stole from the temple (5:16). Judas Maccabeus is first introduced here, as one that escaped the murderous event and hid in the wilderness for a time (5:27). But this is the only bright spot at this point, since now Judea is said to be corrupted by the ruler that Antiochus set over them. The temple has become a place for Gentiles to fornicate (6:4) and numerous Jews were being forced to eat pigs or die (6:18). All of this, though, is said to be because of the sin of Israel, and it is only God’s discipline that is being experienced (6:12). Those who stand against God chosen will be judged (7:34–5).

The second portion of this work changes the tone by bringing Judas back into the picture. This time he is rallying an army that will fight back against the invaders, with the result that Judas and his forces kill over nine thousand men and send Nicanor (their leader) running in defeat (8:24). The demise of Antiochus follows swiftly after this defeat, when God gives him a

disease (9:28), and in his absence Judas purges the Temple and sets things right in the city (10:1–9). This restoration even including killing some Jews who had become traitors in Judas’s sight due to their love of money (10:22). The victories of Judas continue on, paralleling in some cases the successes of OT figures like Samson. Kings begin to treat Judea as a country to be negotiated with, rather than a place to be conquered (11:34), insurrections in the land are dealt a fierce blow by Judas’s forces (12:10), and eventually even Nicanor is killed (15:32) and the Jerusalem is no longer controlled by foreign hands (15:37).

## 2 Maccabees 7

In the midst of torment is often the best place to find out what someone truly believes. In this section the author relates a story where a mother and her seven sons are murdered by Antiochus. Each of the sons is tortured and killed before the mother’s eyes, and in each case they encourage one another to submit to the torture, rather than give in to eating swine or other temptations like wealth for renouncing Judaism. Prior to his death the first son cries out, “You accursed wretch, you dismiss us from this present life, but the King of the universe will raise us up to an everlasting renewal of life, because we have died for his laws” (7:9). Bartlett translates this differently with “everlasting life made new.”<sup>169</sup> The distinction is important because this allows us to think in terms of a possible transformation along with the resurrection. Also, εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς ἡμᾶς ἀναστήσει can be somewhat awkwardly translated “he will raise us living again into everlasting life.” The point is that the life that will be given will no longer be capable of taken away by death. This does not mean that the resurrection itself must

---

<sup>169</sup> John R. Bartlett, ed., *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees*, The Cambridge Bible Commentary: New English Bible (Cambridge: University Press, 1973), 272.

transform the person, but something must take place in order for life to continue perpetually.<sup>170</sup> This new life, though, is only for the faithful. As if to complete the thought here, the fourth son retorts, “But for you there will be no resurrection to life” (7:14). There is no extended explanation, but one can assume that this likely refers to the Second Temple notion that the wicked will remain disembodied and tormented.

## 2 Maccabees 12

In this chapter Judas goes out to collect the dead that have fallen in battle. When he does so, however, he finds out that the reason they had been slain was because they had sinned by having idols (12:40). In response to this Judas collects funds in order to pay for a sin offering, and then the editor of this work gives the following explanation: “In doing this he acted very well and honorably, taking account of the resurrection” (12:43). He continues, “For if he were not expecting that those who had fallen would rise again, it would have been superfluous and foolish to pray for the dead” (12:44). Whether or not Judas was actually thinking this is beside the point, but what it is interesting is that the editor seems to believe that the resurrection is salvation. Those who are wicked will not be rewarded, and for this reason Judas wishes to cover the sins of those who fell battle. The reward is the resurrection, at least, from the editor’s perspective. It is also worth noting that the resurrection is mentioned in passing, like other place in the Second Temple period, but it is mentioned in terms of an abstraction—i.e., *the*

---

<sup>170</sup> Although Doran sees this as a reference to taking place on earth because elsewhere God’s life giving breath is compared with his creation of Adam (cf. 7:23), there is little reason why this should be required from the text. It is correct that the author likely thought in terms of new life on a new earth, but the mere comparison of these concepts is not able to bear the weight of such an assessment. R. Doran, “2 Maccabees,” in *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, ed. John Barton and John Muddiman (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 7:7–9.

resurrection. The editor clarifies that those who are righteous will be raised up, and this raising occurs in the resurrection.

### **Summary of Findings**

Two things are apparent in 2 Maccabees. First, when the resurrection occurs it will involve the raising of people unto a life that will never end. Whether or not this involves transformation, is not discussed. Second, the resurrection is viewed as an event in which individuals will be raised. That is, there are both corporate and individual elements to this concept.

### **Conclusion**

First Enoch clearly argues that the world is heading toward an end time with two realities available. The righteous will receive a blissful new existence, whereas the wicked will either continue in disembodied torment or be given new bodies in which to be then be tormented. But in either case the wicked will be dealt with quickly, whereas the state of the righteous will be one that loses sight of its own beginning. For the righteous the day of resurrection is the day of eternal perpetual bliss. This is referred to as that “great age” and it is without end. It would be an overstatement to argue that 1 Enoch was focused on the resurrection; however, the concept is mentioned enough to have included in this survey and it is a logical necessity for the eschatological outlook of the author of 1 Enoch. The resurrection is either implied or explicitly mentioned as that event that opens the door unto everlasting bliss.

The idea of the resurrection leading into or even being part of the final age continues into the Lives of the Prophets. When discussing the prophet Jeremiah, the author makes note of the

coming age in which the righteous will be blessed. Then he utilizes the interesting phrase “in the resurrection,” with a description of attached events. That is, the resurrection seems to be used as a term conveying the notion of the future age. Although the author did not use the phrase in the precise manner of Resurrection Age, one could hardly hope for a much closer parallel.

The attachment of various idyllic ideas to a final (or great) age is continued in the Psalms of Solomon. In this case, the final age is designated as a period of time when mercy is the characteristic. This mercy, though, only extends to the faithful, who are contrasted with the wicked. The wicked are damned but the faithful find mercy. In fact, mercy is so closely aligned to the resurrection in this work that it is likely that the two are pictures of the same reality. The life that is given by a resurrection can become characteristic of that final age in the same way mercy can. There is no direct textual link to attach these ideas, but conceptual overlap is clear.

The Testaments of Twelve Patriarchs explain that the resurrection is parallel to the time of the end. Whether it is an event that leads into that time or can be characteristic of that time is not discussed. At the same time, a division between being raised from the grave and transformed is noted. It seems reasonable if one were to call this entire complex of events “the resurrection.” Indeed, it seems as though the author presents this distinction as his description of what that OT promise will look like. With the addition of Pseudo-Phocylides, who appears to be doing the same thing, it becomes apparent that coming back to life may be only one phase of the resurrection.

Characterization of the final age takes on a new phase when looking at 2 Enoch, where the author presents those who are dwelling in the end time as “end timers.” Whatever one wishes to designate that period of time is secondary to the way in which the situation is described. If one were to call it the age of life, the inhabitants would be those who have life. If one were to call it

the resurrection age, the inhabitants would be those who have been resurrected. In any case, there is a clear progression from raising from the dead and then becoming something else, even to the point that the inhabitants of the new order will shine brilliantly.

If there were any doubts about a progression, 2 Baruch puts them to rest. It is here that we found the most explicit case of a resurrection leading into a glorification. Other have tried to explain this in terms of a two-stage resurrection, which is quite friendly to our thesis. The resurrection definitely takes on a larger role than just that point at which one returns to life. It would be difficult, at least without introducing late Christian systematic categories, to think of this in a different manner. For instance, one might like to categorize these ideas under a resurrection and then a glorification. Although this is something that we would like to see, it comes at a later stage of theologizing. Reflecting upon 2 Baruch alone, it seems as though “resurrection” serves his purposes just fine. And if Testament of Job and 2 Maccabees are added one begins to think that the terminology just was not an issue for these authors: Testament of Job likely could have substituted “in the resurrection” with “consummation of the age;” 2 Maccabees views the resurrection as an even in which people are raised from the dead. In fact, if our thesis is correct one can have his cake and eat it too—inasmuch as we might call the resurrection age that period of time when believers are first raised and then glorified.

### CHAPTER 3: SURVEY OF THE PATRISTIC LITERATURE

#### Introduction

The doctrine of the resurrection is a necessary element of the Christian faith.<sup>171</sup> There is ample evidence of this not only from the early creeds, but also from the numerous writings of the Fathers. What is not as clear, however, is what the early church thought about the nature of the resurrected body. It took only a little while for a debate to ensue concerning this matter, and like many doctrines, the discussion surrounding this one was also provoked by heretics. In this case, it was those who denied that the original body would be raised. As Brian E. Daley notes, the common response to this was the simple reply, “God can do all things.”<sup>172</sup> Surely, this is an adequate response, given the biblical data that warrants the notion of the resurrection. There is no requirement to be able to explain the “hows” of God. But when Scripture says that Christ was the model for the future resurrection (1 Cor 6:14), one is in the interesting position of having to acknowledge that it was clearly his original body that was raised. Therefore, those who die in Christ, will also be raised in like manner. The logic seems clear enough: if Christ was raised like this, so too will the believer be raised.

At some point, however, the discussion shifted and the result was a combination of two concepts—resurrection and glorification. The problem for pinpointing this shift is that the majority of the earliest Fathers simply speak of the resurrection as an assertion of a reality. In other words, it is possible that from the earliest moments of the early church these two ideas

---

<sup>171</sup> Even Schwarz assents to this while refashioning the concept of resurrection in a way that makes one wonder if the term should even be used to describe his position. It is a most undeniable element of the Christian faith. Hans Schwarz, *Eschatology* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2000), 290–92.

<sup>172</sup> Brian E. Daley, *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 160.

were one. Yet, this does not seem likely given the division of these concepts in the NT material and the Second Temple material. For this reason, it is necessary to get an idea of when the first elements of this combination occurred. As we search the patristic material it will also be important to keep an eye out for the usage of the phrase “in the resurrection.” The usage of this phrase will go a long way toward creating a bridge between the Second Temple material and the Fathers. It may also allow a deeper understanding of the way the phrase was used since many of the patristic discussions are more detailed than the material surveyed in the previous chapter. Not all of the material below needs to include a detailed discussion of dating, since most scholars are content with early dates. However, some writings, like the Didache, need a bit more attention. Because of this introductory material for each work will vary more than in the previous chapter.

### **Church Fathers from c. AD 70–200**

The writings surveyed in this section come the closest to touching the Second Temple material in time. Some of these works are even dated to the same time period as those of the later pseudepigraphal writings mentioned above. If one can isolate data from this portion of the patristic material, then one will be in a good position to argue for a conceptual bridge between both thought-worlds. We have limited our survey to between AD 70 and AD 200, with a few years of slack on either end. One of the issues with this material is that not all the works come from clearly named church fathers. Some of the works are pseudonymous and others simply anonymous. Regardless, they have all been considered authoritative in some sense by the early church so it is important that they each be mined for doctrine.<sup>173</sup>

---

<sup>173</sup> Metzger notes that some of the earliest of these works even competed for a place in the NT canon. Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1997), 63.



## Clement of Rome

Though one cannot be sure, it is possible that Clement of Rome was the same Clement mentioned by the apostle Paul as a “coworker” (Phil 4:3). This is important only because of the close link between the two, since even if this is not the same Clement the date of his writings are still early. Furthermore, Clement of Rome was clearly in a position of power in the church of Rome, since his first letter is addressed as coming from the church in general. Clement was the representative for the whole body as he notes in the prologue to his first letter.

### **First Clement**

One of the earliest patristic writings dealing with the resurrection is Clement of Rome’s *First Epistle to the Corinthians*. There is little discussion of the future resurrection. However, Clement does write, “Let us consider, beloved, how the Lord continually proves to us that there shall be a future resurrection, of which He has rendered the Lord Jesus Christ the first-fruits by raising Him from the dead.”<sup>174</sup> In the context of his letter, this sentence is being used as a defense of the doctrine of the resurrection in general. He goes on to defend it further by appealing to a number of events that occur in nature like seeds going into the ground and dying. This particular example is important because it parallels Paul’s analogy in 1 Corinthians 15:37. He also argues that the phoenix that rises from the ashes in Arabia is a good example of the future resurrection.<sup>175</sup> Obviously, one can discount his usage of the phoenix (inasmuch as he relates this not anecdotally but as if the bird actually exists), but the point remains: Clement is concerned

---

<sup>174</sup> Clement of Rome, “First Epistle to the Corinthians,” in *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*, ed. Philip Schaff, Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson, vol. 1, Ante-Nicene Fathers (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1885), 24.1.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*, 24.2-25.6.

with proving the resurrection will occur, but not what the resurrection will look like per se. The closest we get to the nature of the resurrection from Clement is his association with Christ as the firstfruits. But even this is not truly dealing with the nature of the resurrected state. Instead, Clement seems to be saying that just as Christ was raised from the dead, we too will be raised.

The problem with collecting specific data on the resurrection is that Clement is not writing a treatise on the subject, but a response to a church with problems. Apparently, the Corinthians had continued to live in a disorderly state like Paul had addressed in his epistles (1 Cor 5:1; cf. 13:2). At this later time Clement not only had to deal with issues of immorality, but also the resurrection. In fact, the two issues are related for Clement. The Corinthians were apparently unaware of a good reason why they should live holy lives. Clement writes, “Do we then think it to be a great and marvelous thing, if the Creator of the universe shall bring about the resurrection of them that have served Him with holiness in the assurance of a good faith . . . ?”<sup>176</sup> The resurrection is for those who have lived a righteous life. The exhortation is to live a moral life or one will fail to be included in the resurrection. For Clement, the resurrection is a return from the grave; there is no mention of transformation.

## Second Clement

It is unlikely that Clement wrote this letter, but it is typically named after him due to a clear overlap in theological material.<sup>177</sup> For instance, as Christopher A. Hall notes, “[2 *Clement*] links a future resurrection with the necessity of repentance, and the reality of future rewards and

---

<sup>176</sup> Ibid., 26.1.

<sup>177</sup> Schaff places this with the later Fathers, but others are content to keep it at an early time with the caveat that the letter remain from an unknown author. For the latter view see Boudewijn Dehandschutter, “The Epistle of Polycarp,” in *The Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction*, ed. Wilhelm Pratscher (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2010), 88.

punishments.”<sup>178</sup> This is simply an expansion on the notion we saw in *1 Clement*. Those who are moral will attain to the resurrection, but those who are not will receive punishment. It is not clear how the parallel works out in this letter, though. Is it that the wicked will never be raised? Or will the wicked be raised only to receive punishment? This is not clarified within the letter, but Joanne E. McWilliam Dewart argues that the logic of Clement’s argument seems to entail that the future punishment must take place in the flesh.<sup>179</sup> This would require that the wicked are first resurrected and then submitted to torment. The problem here is that Clement only speaks of the eternal torment the wicked will receive (*2 Clem* 17), and places the resurrection as the hope of the faithful (*2 Clem* 19). We are satisfied with leaving this as a possible support for either view, especially since the Second Temple material houses both views.

After speaking of the necessity of righteousness, Clement notes, “Even if for a little time they suffer evil in the world, they shall enjoy the immortal fruit of the resurrection .”<sup>180</sup> Because there is no more information, it is difficult to figure out exactly what Clement meant by couching the resurrection in these terms. It seems possible to understand this as the resurrection being equated with immortality, but it is also possible that he is thinking of the actual fruit that will be given to believers in the resurrection. The NT speaks of a time when believers will freely eat of the tree of life (*Rev* 2:7) and some OT scholars have discussed Edenic “immortality” in terms of conditions allowed by access to the tree of life (cf. *Gen* 3:22).<sup>181</sup>

---

<sup>178</sup> Christopher A. Hall, *Learning Theology with the Church Fathers* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 250.

<sup>179</sup> Joanne E. McWilliam Dewart, *Death and Resurrection*, Message of the Fathers of the Church 22 (Wilmington, DE: M. Glazier, 1986), 43.

<sup>180</sup> Clement of Rome, “Second Epistle to the Corinthians,” ed. Philip Schaff, Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson, vol. 1, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1885), 19.3.

<sup>181</sup> John H. Walton, *Genesis*, The NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 170.

Clement does not make this clear, but whatever is in view is set against the toil of this earth. The resurrection is the antithesis of the vanity and brevity of this life.

### Summary of Findings

In *1 Clement*, the author's goal is apologetic: he desired to defend a resurrection, whatever it might look like. He is also concerned with the sin of the Corinthians. Clement's two-pronged purpose for speaking of the resurrection relates directly to his pastoral function. One should not be surprised that he was not concerned with nuancing his understanding of the nature of the resurrection. His goal was much more practical: "Having then this hope, let our souls be bound to Him who is faithful in His promises, and just in His judgments."<sup>182</sup> The result of believing in the resurrection should be a present life of holiness. This notion is perpetuated by the author of *2 Clement*. However, there is an added mention of the resurrection being that event whereby death never occurs again.

### Ignatius of Antioch

Ignatius was the bishop of Antioch in the latter part of the first century.<sup>183</sup> There is no information about him until his letters, which come from the end of his life. In fact, the five extant letters come from a time when Ignatius was on his way to be martyred. He is well-known for asking his readers to not interfere in his trials, so that he can be killed. He is also known for the ecclesiastical developments mentioned in his *Epistle to the Ephesians*, where the bishop and

---

<sup>182</sup> Clement, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 27.1.

<sup>183</sup> The date is not certain because two sources place him at different times. One says he replaced Peter, and the other that he replaced Euodius. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament*, 43.

presbyter are viewed as separate positions within the church.<sup>184</sup> Not much attention, however, has been given to his understanding of the resurrection. Like other Fathers, Ignatius mentions the resurrection of Christ often, but only briefly addresses the future resurrection that is the hope of those who follow Christ.

### **Epistle to the Trallians**

Ignatius begins his letter with a note of hope for believers based upon the resurrection. Because Jesus was raised, believers can look forward to a blessed future “through our rising again to Him.”<sup>185</sup> The inclusion of “again” is important because it identifies the body of the believer with that body that will rise in the future. There is also a parallel being made between the resurrection of the believer and that of Christ. This is made explicit at a later point in his letter when Ignatius writes, “He was also truly raised from the dead, His Father quickening Him, even as after the same manner His Father will so raise up us who believe in Him by Christ Jesus, apart from whom we do not possess the true life.”<sup>186</sup> There is no mention of special abilities in the resurrection, or what exactly this will look like. Instead, Ignatius is content to argue that because Jesus rose from the dead believers can be assured of their own resurrection, regardless of what the heretics having been telling them.

---

<sup>184</sup> Henry Chadwick, *The Early Church: The Story of Emergent Christianity from the Apostolic Age to the Dividing of the Ways between the Greek East and the Latin West*, vol. 1, *The Penguin History of the Church* (London: Penguin Books, 1993), 46.

<sup>185</sup> Ignatius of Antioch, “Epistle to the Trallians,” in *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*, ed. Philip Schaff, Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson, vol. 1, *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1885), Prologue.

<sup>186</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.2.

## Epistle to the Smyrnaeans

Like Clement, Ignatius also has an apologetic concern when speaking of the resurrection. In this case, those whom he is arguing against deny that Jesus rose from the grave.<sup>187</sup> Rather than simply denying a future resurrection, this group challenged the very foundation of Christianity. Ignatius writes, “[C]ertain unbelievers maintain, that He only seemed to suffer, as they themselves only seem to be [Christians]. And as they believe, so shall it happen unto them, *when they shall be divested of their bodies, and be mere evil spirits*” (emphasis added).<sup>188</sup> The latter portion of this statement is important because of its link to the Second Temple concept of the wicked never returning in the resurrection. It is not obvious that Ignatius is making a statement of fact; he may be attempting to discount heretical beliefs. In essence, he would be saying, “Let us hope it is as they say for them, but not for us. That way the heretics will languish forever without bodies.” Still, the way in which Ignatius renders this as a curse upon the wicked supports the position that he does indeed believe they will not receive a resurrected body. Also, in the letter mentioned previously, Ignatius thinks of life in terms of the resurrection hope.

In order to prove his point, however, Ignatius does elsewhere engage in a discussion of the nature of the resurrected body. He writes, “For I know that after His resurrection also He was still possessed of flesh, and I believe that He is so now. When, for instance, He came to those who were with Peter, He said to them, ‘Lay hold, handle Me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit.’”<sup>189</sup> This can be stretched to the believer because, like Clement, Ignatius also

---

<sup>187</sup> Litfin notes that the overarching doctrinal issues Ignatius was dealing with were Christological. Bryan M. Litfin, *Getting to Know the Church Fathers: An Evangelical Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2007), 44.

<sup>188</sup> Ignatius of Antioch, “Epistle to the Smyrnaeans,” in *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*, ed. Philip Schaff, Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson, vol. 1, Ante-Nicene Fathers (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1885), 2.1.

<sup>189</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.1.

believed that Christ was the firstfruits. Also we saw above that Ignatius thinks in terms of Christ as the blueprint of the believer's resurrection. The point he is trying to make is that just as Christ was raised in his body, so too will the believer be raised.<sup>190</sup>

### **Summary of Findings**

We can see the beginnings of a discussion of the nature of the resurrection in Ignatius. Yet, this is just a beginning, and such a discussion was prodded only by the necessity of the situation. It remains unclear if Ignatius viewed the resurrection as an altered state. His goal was to support the notion of a physical raising from the grave that allows the person to move around as if life continued where it left off.

### **Polycarp of Smyrna**

Polycarp was the bishop of Smyrna during the lifetime of Ignatius. Ignatius wrote one of his letters to Polycarp, and spoke highly of him in a letter to the Smyrnaeans. Polycarp is one of those interesting figures in the early church when it comes to martyrdom, for he is said to have been burned at the stake, but when the fire would not touch him, he was stabbed to death. Whether or not this actually happened, it is clear that Polycarp was martyred and that he looked upon such an end to his life as a crowning achievement. Martyrdom for him was simply one more way to follow in the footsteps of his Lord.<sup>191</sup> Prior to his death, Polycarp wrote numerous letters to surrounding churches, but only one has survived to this day.<sup>192</sup> In this letter, Polycarp

---

<sup>190</sup> Hall finds this to be the best sense of the argument as well. Hall, *Learning Theology with the Church Fathers*, 251.

<sup>191</sup> González traces the development of this notion of martyrdom. Justo L. González, *The Story of Christianity: The Early Church to the Reformation*, vol. 1 (New York: HarperCollins, 2010), 54–55.

encourages the Philippian church to persevere in the faith, while also offering some theological advice, and asking for information about the fate of Ignatius.

### **Epistle to the Philippians**

“Resurrection” is used only one time in this letter, and it is used in reference to Polycarp’s interlocutors. He tells the Philippians to be on guard against the man who “says that there is neither a resurrection nor a judgment.”<sup>193</sup> This is followed by a condemnation of such a person.<sup>194</sup> What is interesting about Polycarp’s warning, is the way the resurrection and the judgment are linked. It is likely that he has in mind here the idea that these two concepts are related. In order for there to be a judgment there must be a body in which to receive the penalty. If this is the case, it seems like there are two possible early opinions. Ignatius would be representative of the judgment as disembodiment; Polycarp would be a supporter of a judgment in the resurrected body.

Although Polycarp does not frequently use the term “resurrection,” he does discuss it in numerous other places. However, only one of these deals with the future resurrection. This section is important because it links Christ’s resurrection and the believer’s. Polycarp begins by noting that Jesus was raised from the grave, but then he mentions that God also gave Jesus “glory and a throne at His right hand.”<sup>195</sup> The resurrection is separated from the moment of glory, with

---

<sup>192</sup> Johannes Quasten, *The Beginnings of Patristic Literature*, Patrology 1 (Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1992), 79.

<sup>193</sup> Polycarp, “Epistle to the Philippians,” in *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*, ed. Phillip Schaff, vol. 1, Ante-Nicene Fathers (Christian Classics Ethereal Library, 1885), 7.1.

<sup>194</sup> Dehandschutter argues that this is a way of referring to the opinion of a group, not just a single person. This would mean that there is a schismatic group that Polycarp is addressing. Dehandschutter, “The Epistle of Polycarp,” 127.

<sup>195</sup> Polycarp, “Epistle to the Philippians,” 2.1.



the latter being that time when Jesus sat at the Father's right hand (cf. Eph 1:20). Interestingly, the notion of glory is not ascribed to the believer in the next segment, but just as Christ was raised by God he will "raise up us also."<sup>196</sup> The picture is the same as Ignatius: to the extent that Christ was raised, the believer will be also.<sup>197</sup> The conspicuous lack of comment as to what that would be like seems to be indicative of the apologetic or pastoral concern at hand. There is little reason for Polycarp to talk about the difference between being raised and being glorified, when the only thing that is being attacked is the resurrection. It is also possible that there was some concern to keep the glory that Jesus received distinct from that which the believer will receive later. Since Christ's glory and his session are equated here it would be awkward (if not blasphemous) for Polycarp to comfort believers with the same future.

### **Summary of Findings**

Much of Polycarp's discussion of resurrection pertains to simple assertions that Christ rose from the grave. Yet, in two instances he refers to the believer's hoped for resurrection. Three items of interest present themselves. First, the resurrection will be bodily, just like Christ's was bodily. In fact, Jesus was the paradigm for the believer's future. Second, the glorification of Christ was viewed as separated from his resurrection. Third, judgment seems to necessitate a risen body. There is nothing radical here, but it implies that both believers and unbelievers will be raised.

---

<sup>196</sup> Ibid., 2.2.

<sup>197</sup> Papandrea agrees with this assessment. James Leonard Papandrea, *Reading the Early Church Fathers: From the Didache to Nicaea* (New York: Paulist Press, 2012), 28.

## Didache

Most critical notes on the *Didache* place it from sometime within the early second century. There are at least three reasons for this. First, the Didachist appears to depend upon the Shepherd of Hermas, which is typically dated to the second century. It might be argued that the Shepherd borrowed from the Didache, but this is unlikely due to the authority often given to the former and the nature of the latter as an exposition of authoritative texts. Second, the material seems to come from a time when the known apostles had passed from the scene. With their passing, a need developed for practical guidance as to whom to accept as an apostle or prophet. Third, inclusion of expansions like the negative form of the Golden Rule, are familiar in second century Christian works.<sup>198</sup>

The theological issues that brought forth this document are much clearer than the specific time frame. But there is some question as to whether or not this document was written by a Montanist. However, the problem seems to stem from a specious translation of λαλῶντα ἐν πνεύματι as “ecstatic utterances.”<sup>199</sup> Though the Montanist prophets are known for their ecstatic and frenetic trances, this translation reads Montanism into the Didache. A better translation would be “speaking in the spirit,” which adequately reflects NT practices.<sup>200</sup> Other than this, it is clear that the Didachist was concerned with believers being taken advantage of by false prophets and apostles. Due to the detail of what to look for in false prophets it is likely these dubious

---

<sup>198</sup> For a discussion on dating see Quasten, *The Beginnings of Patristic Literature*, 36–37.; for a discussion of the Jewish-Christian milieu in which this writing appears to take place see Jonathan A Draper, “Pure Sacrifice in Didache 14 as Jewish Christian Exegesis,” *Neotestamentica* 42, no. 2 (2008): 223–52..

<sup>199</sup> Cyril C. Richardson, ed., “Didache,” in *Early Christian Fathers*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953), 11.7.

<sup>200</sup> Lake’s translation is superior in this regard. Kirsopp Lake, ed., “Didache,” in *Apostolic Fathers* (Loeb Classical Library, 1912), 11.7.

individuals were quite active within this period. Like the other material from this time period, we see an apologetic and pastoral purpose behind the writing of this document.

### **Didache 16**

This section of the Didache has been labelled the “apocalypse,” since it relates the Didachist’s views on the end times. In some MSS there are expansions to the material that speak of the end time judgment in more detail. Although there was likely a longer ending, these expansions filled the blank space when the original was lost.<sup>201</sup> At the end of this section the Didachist turns his attention to the resurrection, with some comments that sound similar to one motif in the Second Temple material. After “prophesying” numerous signs and wonders and a period of trial for mankind, the Didachist mentions the resurrection as another sign for the wicked.<sup>202</sup> He writes, “Then ‘there will appear the signs’ of the Truth: first the sign of stretched-out [hands] in heaven, then the sign of ‘a trumpet’s blast,’ and thirdly the resurrection of the dead, though not of all the dead.”<sup>203</sup> Whoever edited the Didache was not satisfied with this ending, and he sought to explain this comment by speaking of the saints returning with the Lord. If the Didachist was standing in line with previous material from the Second Temple period, then he could be understood here as thinking in terms of a resurrection only for the righteous.

However, Alan John Philip Garrow argues that this was added in order to bring this in line with

---

<sup>201</sup> Garrow notes that there is debate about verse 7, but clearly 8 and beyond are unoriginal. Alan John Philip Garrow, “The Eschatological Tradition behind 1 Thessalonians: Didache 16,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32, no. 2 (December 2009): 202–3.

<sup>202</sup> Prophesying is in quotes because it is not clear to me that the Didachist is actually undertaking this stance. It seems entirely plausible that he is simply relating his understanding of the biblical material. This is especially the case if he had access to Revelation. In a similar vein, Varner traces the Didachist’s usage of Matthean eschatological imagery. William Varner, “The Didache ‘Apocalypse’ and Matthew 24,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 165, no. 659 (July 2008): 317.

<sup>203</sup> Richardson, “Didache,” 16.6.

Paul's material in 1 Thessalonians.<sup>204</sup> Moreover, the material of Didache 16 parallels 1 Thessalonians in other ways. Though it would be nice to find a bridge between the two thought-worlds here, it is likely that Garrow is correct. In this case, the resurrection is being divided. There is a resurrection for the righteous, and a resurrection for the wicked at a later time.

### **Summary of Findings**

At first glance the Didache seems to indicate that the wicked will not be raised from the dead. However, the text ends right after his comment "not all of the dead" will be raised. Because other elements of the text seem to follow Paul's theology, it is not judicious to deviate at this point. For this reason, the Didachist does not offer a clear conceptual link to the Second Temple concept of a one-sided resurrection.

### **The Epistle of Barnabas**

Internal factors of the *Epistle of Barnabas* give only slight clues as to the historical circumstances of the text. The author mentions the destruction of the temple, so it must come from after AD 70. Clement of Alexandria claimed that this letter was written by Barnabas, the companion of Paul; however, no name is given within the text and no mention of this is made prior to Clement's time. Therefore, it is best to see this work as an anonymous second century document. The author (whom I will refer to as Barnabas) felt his audience needed clarification of doctrine, especially as it related to the OT. He speaks as one that has superior knowledge of spiritual truths and seeks to impart much of this wisdom unto the reader. Discussion has focused on whether or not Barnabas was influenced by Paul. There has been no consensus on the matter,

---

<sup>204</sup> Garrow, "The Eschatological Tradition behind 1 Thessalonians," 209.

but because Barnabas utilizes Pauline motifs, but also appears to go against Paul's insights, I have found James Carleton Paget's position to be most apt. He argues that it is "better to explain the origins of Barnabas' own theology by reference to a Jewish-Christian milieu."<sup>205</sup> This means that Barnabas is wrestling with theological issues and seeking to offer his own answers. In some cases, he may even be dealing with the implication of what he thought Paul intended. This can be seen in chapter 13 where we find the church replacing Israel.

### **Barnabas's Conclusion**

In the final chapter of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, we are given a glimpse into the eschatological picture of which Barnabas conceives. In a previous passage, Barnabas explains that the future kingdom of God will be one thousand years long (15.4). Here at the end he writes of the Christian's existence in this kingdom: "It is well, therefore, that he who has learned the judgments of the Lord, as many as have been written, should walk in them. For he who keepeth these shall be glorified in the kingdom of God; but he who chooseth other things shall be destroyed with his works. On this account there will be a resurrection, on this account a retribution."<sup>206</sup> Barnabas stands clearly within two lines of thought. On the one hand, he continues the patristic argument of morals leading to a resurrection; on the other hand, he views the resurrection as a one-sided event. For those who are unfaithful only retribution follows. It is also fairly clear that Barnabas views glorification as a separate notion from the resurrection. The parallel is resurrection leads into the kingdom, where glorification takes place; retribution (or the

---

<sup>205</sup> James Carleton Paget, "Paul and the Epistle of Barnabas," *Novum Testamentum* 38, no. 4 (October 1996): 381.

<sup>206</sup> Philip Schaff, Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson, eds., "Epistle of Barnabas," in *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*, vol. 1, Ante-Nicene Fathers (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1885), 21.1.

judgment; cf. 21.3) leads to destruction. It is possible that glorification does not entail transformation, but at a different point Barnabas uses the same terminology for the glorification of Jesus in heaven (6.16). If it is assumed that Jesus was transformed at his glorification, then the same would follow for the glorification of believers in the kingdom. If this is not assumed then it is difficult to understand what Barnabas means by the glorification of the Lord.

### **Summary of Findings**

The Epistle of Barnabas views the resurrection as the event that leads into the kingdom of God. Glorification comes only after entrance into the kingdom. Judgment is for the wicked, and there is no mention of them being resurrected. Instead, it appears that Barnabas views them as been destroyed without their bodies.

### **Justin Martyr**

Justin was a seeker for many years. Until becoming a Christian, he was a disciple of Socrates and Plato, which is apparent by his familiarity with philosophical material in his *First Apology*. It is debatable whether this book, though addressed to the emperor, was actually intended to reach him. However, given the pointed nature of many of Justin's comments, the inclusion of the emperor's philosophically minded progeny, and the appended letters of previous emperors to support his case, it does seem plausible that this was indeed sent to Caesar.<sup>207</sup> Once converted to Christianity, Justin donned the philosopher's robe in an effort to show that he had found the true philosophy. And judging by the material in his *First Apology*, he believed himself to be one of only a few true philosophers. It is probably because of these ideas that he was

---

<sup>207</sup> His apologies were "addressed to the emperor Antonious Pious (138-161)," as Quasten notes. Quasten, *The Beginnings of Patristic Literature*, 199.

persecuted by the Cynics, with the inevitable result that he was martyred. No doubt there was also a certain level of persecution taking place around the empire in general, for Justin is concerned with appealing for just judgment to be rendered. He has no problem being punished for doing things that are truly illegal, but simply bearing the name of Christ was no legal reason for reprimand.

### **First Apology**

Although Justin's goal in this work is not to clearly define the doctrine of the resurrection we do get a glimpse of what he believed in two sections. He begins by explaining how strange it is that the emperor is capable of tolerating beliefs about gods that border on the ridiculous, but when it comes to Christians there is no mercy for their belief in a resurrection. The problem is not an afterlife, but rather the actual return of the body from the ground. This is a common objection in this time period. Christians stood against the grain in the Greco-Roman world due to the latter's insistence that the afterlife consisted solely in the continuity of the soul.<sup>208</sup> But Justin does not find such a belief to be ridiculous because "we maintain that with God nothing is impossible."<sup>209</sup> In the next section, Justin continues to explain what he means by this. The only reason a resurrection seems ridiculous is because it has never been observed by his interlocutors. In response to this, Justin asks if one would have ever guessed that a child could be made from the seed of man. The only way that belief in this even occurs is that a child does indeed come

---

<sup>208</sup> Daley explains how virtually every Greek philosophy (with all their differences) stood against the notion of a bodily resurrection. Brian E. Daley, "A Hope for Worms: Early Christian Hope," in *Resurrection: Theological and Scientific Assessments*, ed. Ted Peters, Robert J. Russell, and Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Pub, 2002), 138–39.

<sup>209</sup> Justin, "The Writings of Justin Martyr," in *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*, ed. Philip Schaff, Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson, vol. 1, Ante-Nicene Fathers (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1885), *First Apology* 18.

about from the sexual activity of a man and a woman. Simply because one cannot observe the potential in the semen is no excuse for disbelieving in its ability to produce. In like manner, one has no reason to disbelieve that the body cannot come back from the ground. Justin asks why it is not possible for God to do what he wishes. Given the premises, those who object should be willing to acknowledge that “it is not impossible that the bodies of men, after they have been dissolved, and like seeds resolved into earth, should in God’s appointed time rise again and put on incorruption.”<sup>210</sup> What is important here is that Justin believes it is the same body that will rise “again.” Furthermore, putting on incorruption happens *to* that body. The body comes back from the grave in order to never die again. The Greeks are correct to note the corruption of the flesh, but they must allow for God to remedy this situation by reconstituting the body in a way that removes such impurities.

### **On the Resurrection**

Although there are only fragments of this work, Papandrea notes, “there is enough available to get the sense of Justin’s teaching on the resurrection of the body.”<sup>211</sup> Indeed, even in fragmentary form Justin touches on issues that are central to our discussion. He begins with an epistemological treatise, wherein he explains that the revelation of God is the source of our knowledge in the realm of belief. If one were to speak to unbelievers (which he will do later), then one may simply tell them that Christians believe certain things. However, when objections come from within the household of faith (as there are in this case), then one must offer reasons in order to cast down such thoughts. To Justin it is obvious that the resurrection of the body is

---

<sup>210</sup> Ibid., *First Apology* 19.

<sup>211</sup> Papandrea, *Reading the Early Church Fathers*, 39.



something to be believed by Christians, but since it has been challenged by others who claim to be believers, he offers the first evidence in favor: “And the Word, being His Son, came to us, having put on flesh, revealing both Himself and the Father, giving to us in Himself resurrection from the dead, and eternal life afterwards.”<sup>212</sup> The proof of the resurrection of all is said to reside in the Christ event. It is important to note the progression here: resurrection comes first and then everlasting life. This will become a platform for a later point where believers are explicitly said to follow Christ’s example.

Those who object to the resurrection were apparently doing so on the basis that the flesh is corrupt and God would not wish to restore a corrupt thing. They appealed to Christ’s words about not being given in marriage (Mark 12:25), and claims that Christ was raised spiritually, to argue that there is no need for a physical resurrection. Justin notes that these are distractions from the true faith, but he will offer some counter-arguments nonetheless (chap 2). Rather than thinking that Christians will need to operate in the exact same manner as they do now, Justin thinks there are ways to understand the future human body in purely physical terms without problems. For instance, if the body is the same, then it would follow that procreation would be a viable option even though Jesus said it would not happen. However, Justin argues that simply because the anatomical parts will still remain does not mean that they must be utilized to their fullest extent. Both men and women have remained virgins in this life, thus debunking the claim that humans must give birth in the kingdom (chap 3).

The next problem is what the body will look like: is it necessary for a deformed person to rise deformed? Justin responds, “if on earth He [Christ] healed the sicknesses of the flesh, and made the body whole, much more will He do this in the resurrection, so that the flesh shall rise

---

<sup>212</sup> Justin, “The Writings of Justin Martyr,” *Resurrection* 1.

perfect and entire. In this manner, then, shall those dreaded difficulties of theirs be healed.”<sup>213</sup>

The resurrection is being spoken of as a more expansive event than just the event of coming out of the ground. This is noticeable because of Justin’s usage of “in the resurrection,” which is also used in the sentence prior to the one cited here. The reasoning behind viewing this as a complex event is because previously Justin notes that it is the Father that will raise believers, just as he raised Christ. In this present text, however, we find Jesus healing the deformities of those who are raised. Interestingly, there is no appeal to an alteration in the original constitution of the person, as might be expected given a transformative view of resurrection. In fact, Justin makes it clear that he does not think in these terms at all. He proceeds to defend the resurrection of the same flesh in the resurrection on the grounds that man was created in the image of God. Because of this there is nothing inherently wrong with the flesh, and there is no need for God to destroy it (chap 7). This is Justin’s way of combating the dualism of the soul and the body. The hope he is after must take place in the body along with the soul: “But, in truth, He has even called the flesh to the resurrection, and promises to it everlasting life.”<sup>214</sup> Once again, everlasting life is separated from the resurrection.

Finally, Justin puts to rest any claims that other resurrection accounts in the Gospels and the OT are of a different order than Christ’s and the believer’s: “If He had no need of the flesh, why did He heal it? And what is most forcible of all, He raised the dead. Why? Was it not to show what the resurrection should be? How then did He raise the dead? Their souls or their bodies? Manifestly both. If the resurrection were only spiritual, it was requisite that He, in

---

<sup>213</sup> Ibid., *Resurrection* 4.

<sup>214</sup> Ibid., *Resurrection* 8.

raising the dead, should show the body lying apart by itself, and the soul living apart by itself.”<sup>215</sup>  
 He then concludes by noting that Jesus was raised in the flesh in order to prove the same thing.

### Summary of Findings

Justin seems to be at an extreme end on the spectrum of views on the resurrection. If we had to label his understanding it would be “purely physical.” There is no mention of glorification or transformation, outside of the healing of deformities. And everlasting life is not something different than present life, but an extension of life as it is. At the same time, he speaks of the resurrection as both a rising from the dead and a complex event. Jesus is said to heal everyone in the resurrection in the same way he did on earth.

### Irenaeus of Lyons

Irenaeus’s *Against Heresies* was written between the middle and the end of the second century AD. This is made clear by the state of the Gnostic belief and the campaign of Marcion as portrayed by Irenaeus. Rather than being a simple set of beliefs founded by one or two men, by this time second and third generation followers of the original heretics had turned Gnosticism into a full-fledged religion with little in common between each sect. So expansive was their reach that numerous Christians had fallen prey. It is for this reason, perhaps more than any other, that Irenaeus endeavored to defeat the heretics. It is clear that he loves the flock of God and hates the accursed heretical factions. An interesting element about the heretics was their secretive manner of sharing their doctrines. Only those taken within their confidence were truly given γνῶσις. Therefore, one is justified in asking how Irenaeus came about such a thorough

---

<sup>215</sup> Ibid., *Resurrection* 9

knowledge of these heretical beliefs. It is possible to imagine him skulking about secretly within the gatherings of these secret societies, as well as interviewing those who came back to the church once disillusioned. In any case, Irenaeus addresses Gnostic ideas directly, with an interesting array of material in relation to the resurrection.

### **Against Heresies V**

Irenaeus begins his final volume by noting that Jesus is the fullest revelation available to mankind.<sup>216</sup> Because of this, he alone is the source of our information about theology. He is also the power behind the resurrection. When the appointed time comes it is “the Word of God granting them resurrection to the glory of God, even the Father, who freely gives to this mortal immortality, and to this corruptible incorruption.”<sup>217</sup> It is not clear at this point if Irenaeus equates the immortal body with the resurrected state, or if it comes later. The separation between the Word and the Father seems to indicate that he is thinking in terms of the latter. That is, if it is the Word that raises the dead, and the Father that grants immortality, then the two are separate events. The Word brings the dead back to life, and the Father is the agent in charge of transforming the flesh into some other state. In the next section this notion becomes clearer because it is the raised body that is to receive new life. Once again, the objection against the resurrection is that there is no way the same body could come back after decomposing. Irenaeus follows his predecessors in asserting that God can do anything, but he also adds that the very existence of mankind in his current state is miraculous enough to silence such an objection. If

---

<sup>216</sup> Shelton is correct to note that Irenaeus utilizes many sources for knowledge, but in each case Irenaeus views the information as revealed from God. W. Brian Shelton, “Irenaeus,” in *Shapers of Christian Orthodoxy: Engaging with Early and Medieval Theologians*, ed. Bradley G. Green (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2010), 27.

<sup>217</sup> Irenaeus of Lyons, “Against Heresies,” in *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*, ed. Philip Schaff, Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson, vol. 1, Ante-Nicene Fathers (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1885), 5.2.3.

God could bring together man's current form from the dust of the earth, then it follows that in the future "that flesh shall also be found fit for and capable of receiving the power of God."<sup>218</sup>

Irenaeus is speaking of the power of God in a sense that goes beyond the normal capacity of the human form. Though the believer now possesses the Holy Spirit, in the resurrected state Irenaeus sees a fuller embodiment of God's power in the believer.

At another point, though, Irenaeus seems to view immortality as a duration, rather than alteration.<sup>219</sup> In one place he argues that the longevity of those mentioned in the OT, should be proof enough that God could allow men to live on in the flesh indefinitely. Against those who deny that man can be immortal, Irenaeus explains that God has "power to confer upon them eternal duration."<sup>220</sup> Irenaeus continues this line of reasoning by equating the spiritual nature of the raised body with the body that already exists for Christians. What makes the body spiritual (and he is interpreting Paul at this point), is the addition of God's Spirit to our bodies. This means that Christians are already spiritual beings. The difference between now and at the resurrection is a matter of degree: "Now, spiritual men shall not be incorporeal spirits; but our substance, that is, the union of flesh and spirit, receiving the Spirit of God, makes up the spiritual man."<sup>221</sup> Irenaeus's concept does not really account for how one will be able to live forever at a later point, but it does serve his apologetic purpose of showing how Paul's mention of a spiritual body can be understood without appealing to some phantasmal form. This creates a tension of

---

<sup>218</sup> Ibid., 5.3.2.

<sup>219</sup> In some instances, consistency is not Irenaeus's forte. This makes it difficult to isolate a single concept for some doctrinal issues. His goal seems to have been defeating the Gnostics at all costs, rather than precision on every point. Richard A. Norris Jr., "Irenaeus of Lyon," in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, ed. Frances M. Young, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 50.

<sup>220</sup> Irenaeus of Lyons, "Against Heresies," 5.5.2.

<sup>221</sup> Ibid., 5.8.2.

which Irenaeus never seems aware. If the resurrected body is spiritual in this sense, then there is no reason for Paul to bring up the concept of being raised incorruptible. The whole point is that the body is somehow different than it is now. Irenaeus does not appeal to a transformation to account for this, but instead mutes the point by saying that incorruption is possible in the flesh.

Regardless of how this is accounted for, Irenaeus begins to utilize “in the resurrection” in a way that would allow us to nuance his position a bit: “If, therefore, in the present time, fleshly hearts are made partakers of the Spirit, what is there astonishing if, in the resurrection, they receive that life which is granted by the Spirit?”<sup>222</sup> The problem for Irenaeus is that he has the vocabulary to allow for a second stage after a bodily resurrection, but he does not allow any wiggle room for the original flesh. Even though “in the resurrection” gives him the opportunity to argue that more will happen than coming back from the grave, he uses this chance to explain that the Spirit will once again give life. The life of the Spirit *is* a secondary experience from the return of physical life. Hence, Irenaeus is inserting another element into the resurrection, but he is seeking to do so without minimizing the fleshly existence that must characterize that period. At the same time, Irenaeus uses “in the resurrection” to speak of that time when God restores the earth to pristine conditions where “all the animals should obey and be in subjection to man, and revert to the food originally given by God.”<sup>223</sup> It seems like Irenaeus is willing to allow for an expanded definition of resurrection, so long as no one challenges the notion that the raised individual is the same person that went into the ground.

---

<sup>222</sup> Ibid., 5.8.4.

<sup>223</sup> Ibid., 5.33.4

## Summary of Findings

Though Irenaeus does not envision a transformation in being, but rather immortality is the continuation of life with the Spirit, he does seem willing to allow for an expanded definition of resurrection, so long as no one challenges the notion that the raised individual is the same person that went into the ground.

## Conclusion

In this early segment of the patristic era glorification or transformation of believers is either not addressed at all or it is relegated to a separate point beyond the resurrection. We have been unsuccessful in our attempt at isolating the shift in this discussion where being resurrected is explicitly equated with the transformation. In fact, at least Justin and Irenaeus go to lengths to avoid this association. For them, the body that is raised must be a fleshly body. To allow an ontic restructuring would deny such a reality, and therefore they speak of immortality as a thing that happens to the flesh rather than an alteration in the flesh. This is clearly so because of the apologetic concern of their day—i.e., denial of a bodily resurrection. In order to establish the shift in discussion one might expand the window of sources to include later Fathers like Tertullian and Origen. However, doing this entails an alteration to the methodology adopted in this project. The primary concern was to see if the Fathers spoke of the resurrection in a similar manner to the Second Temple period. Although it is not clear in most of the writings, at least in Justin and Irenaeus there is a resemblance that is worthy of notice. The usage of “in the resurrection” in both of their material indicates that this terminology was being used to represent a time period where believers were raised from the grave and *then* receive everlasting life. These two concepts are always distinct. Everlasting life is something that is given to the risen body. Of

course, the way in which I will account for this is different from these two Fathers (i.e., there is an alteration in being after the resurrection); however, the conceptual background for thinking of 1 Corinthians in terms of a resurrection age is here as well. We do not wish to overplay our evidence, since there are clearly only a few instances noted above. Yet, we are only looking to establish a possible interpretation of Paul. For this, the data is sufficient.



## CHAPTER 4: EXEGESIS OF 1 CORINTHIANS 15

### Introduction

First Corinthians 15 has become a favorite passage for apologetic material that can historically validate the resurrection of Jesus.<sup>224</sup> It is here that Paul records what is thought to be an early Christian tradition relating the content of the death, burial, resurrection, and postresurrection appearances of Jesus (vv. 1-8). This is indeed an important element of this passage. However, what seems to have happened, perhaps as a result of this apologetic focus, is that 1 Corinthians 15 has been largely understood as relating material that pertains to the resurrected body. The idea is that as Jesus was raised from the grave believers will be also. This, of course, is true at a basic level, but what has been missed is that Paul is relating a much larger picture than what it will look like to be raised from the dead. If this were Paul's purpose in writing then presenting his material as a mystery (v. 51) seems odd given the background material Paul would have been operating within. Since there were clearly numerous Jews of the Second Temple period who believed in a resurrection, what exactly is so mysterious about Paul reaffirming this belief? The answer comes when one realizes that Paul is relating an element of the resurrection age, rather than the common belief of a resurrection of the body. Paul is describing a second stage within the resurrection age. He is not speaking strictly about the physical resurrection of the body, but rather what takes place after this event occurs. This has properly been termed the glorification, and we will retain this terminology here. The novelty of this assessment is not in the terms utilized; it is to be found in the placement of this concept

---

<sup>224</sup> For an extensive treatment in this regard see Philip Schaff, Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson, eds., "Epistle of Barnabas," in *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*, vol. 1, Ante-Nicene Fathers (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1885), 21.1.

within 1 Corinthians 15. One particularly important point will be to show that in relation to the resurrection of the dead, Paul begins with the OT as his guide only to show that this doctrine is far more complex and central to the Christian faith than his interlocutors make it out to be. Rather than direct quotations, Paul often relies upon his understanding of the importance of certain biblical motifs.

### **Paul and the Old Testament**

This section will proceed as a survey of the various sections where OT material is found in 1 Corinthians 15. The goal is to offer a concise overview to situated Paul clearly in the OT thought-world.

#### 1 Corinthians 15:3–4

Paul opens this section of his letter with a clear focus on the OT background for the Christ event. We are told in verse 3 that the sacrifice Christ made on behalf of sinners was *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς* (“according to the Scriptures”), and the same phrase is used in verse 4 in reference to Christ’s resurrection.<sup>225</sup> Clearly these are general statements, but Paul must have some OT passages in mind since he uses the plural.<sup>226</sup> Is it simply that the OT conveys the idea that the Christ will be killed and rise from the dead, or are there a few passages to which Paul is likely alluding? Of course, given the technical definitions of “allusion” requiring the usage of at least a

---

<sup>225</sup> Unless otherwise noted all Scripture quotations are either from the CSB, or my own translation.

<sup>226</sup> Taylor thinks that Paul is referring to the OT in general, so that identifying passages is not really a necessity. The problem with this notion is that if Paul is referring to the OT in general then there ought to be at least one or two identifiable passages to which he has in mind. If there are no identifiable passages in the OT, then appealing to the whole OT is useless. Mark Taylor, *1 Corinthians*, vol. 28, New American Commentary (Broadman & Holman, 2014), 15:3–4.

word or two from the OT, it is probably better to use a more generic term like “referring.”<sup>227</sup> To what passages, then, might Paul be referring?

For Christ’s death the clearest reference would be Isaiah 53, where Yahweh is said to take pleasure in crushing the one he sends as a guilt offering (v. 10). With the inclusion of Isaianic material in other sections of 1 Corinthians 15, it is natural to include this passage as one possible reference for the death of the Christ.<sup>228</sup> But one should not neglect Psalm 22:16–17 or Daniel 9:26. Given that Christ applied Psalm 22 to himself (Matt 27:46), the former passage is readily available for Paul’s usage. The passage was also used by Matthew and John as a background for the dividing of Jesus’ clothing; Paul could have been thinking in a similar manner. The latter passage is a bit more ambiguous, but it is not difficult to think of it in the context of the messiah’s death, especially when viewed after the event has happened.<sup>229</sup> The point is that there is little reason to assume that Paul only has one passage or the OT in general in mind when he points to τὰς γραφάς that presumably prophesy the death of Christ.

The second usage of κατὰ τὰς γραφάς in verse 4, is a bit more difficult to address. The problem is that it comes at the end of a clause that includes not only Christ’s resurrection, but also that he would rise on the third day. Gordon D. Fee argues that because of the placement of this prepositional phrase that it must include the three days.<sup>230</sup> This, however, introduces a

---

<sup>227</sup> For a helpful summary see Russell Meek, “Intertextuality, Inner-Biblical Exegesis, and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Ethics of a Methodology,” *Biblica* 95, no. 2 (2014): 289–90; also Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 31.

<sup>228</sup> Both Taylor and Morris note that it is possible that this passage is in Paul’s mind, but in light of Paul’s τὰς γραφάς, it is odd that it would only be this one passage. Taylor, *1 Corinthians*, 28:15:3–4; Leon Morris, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2008), 15:3.

<sup>229</sup> For a defense of this passage as prophesying the death of Christ see Stephen R. Miller, *Daniel*, The New American Commentary 18 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 267.

problem: there is no mention of the resurrection occurring on the third day in the OT. Fee writes, “that it happened ‘on the third day’ was probably seen in terms of the variety of OT texts in which salvation or vindication took place on the third day.”<sup>231</sup> But if this is the case it is difficult to see how Paul would have felt comfortable simply noting that the Scriptures testify to the event. Paul seems to have in mind here something different. Rather than just finding a pattern in the OT to which the resurrection fits, he presents the material as though the OT required that the messiah be raised. The real difficulty is with the inclusion of τῆ ἡμέρα τῆ τρίτη (“the third day”). If κατὰ τὰς γραφάς refers to the resurrection then there is little trouble identifying the passages that Paul might have in mind. But how else could Paul have packed all of this traditional material into a sentence? It would be awkward if he had separated τῆ ἡμέρα τῆ τρίτη from the resurrection, since this was such an important piece of the early Christian tradition. It seems better to follow B. M. Metzger at this point, and have κατὰ τὰς γραφάς refer only to the resurrection.<sup>232</sup> With this in mind, Paul could be “referring” to Psalm 16:10 (cf. Acts 13:35) and Psalm 22. The result is that within the first few verses of 1 Corinthians 15, Paul is making it clear that the material he is presenting does not begin with him, or even the Christ tradition he is relating here.

#### 1 Corinthians 15:21–22

These two verses are set up in clear parallel to one another:

ἐπειδὴ γὰρ δι’ ἀνθρώπου θάνατος, καὶ δι’ ἀνθρώπου ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν· (“For since on account of a man is death, so on account of a man is the resurrection of the dead”)

---

<sup>230</sup> Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Revised Edition, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2014), 727.

<sup>231</sup> *Ibid.*, 727–28.

<sup>232</sup> B. M. Metzger, “A Suggestion Concerning the Meaning of 1 Cor. XV. 4b,” *The Journal of Theological Studies* 8, no. 1 (1957): 121.

ὡςπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν, οὕτως καὶ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιηθήσονται. (“For just as in Adam everyone dies, so too in Christ everyone will come to life”).

Rather than mere reference at this point, Paul alludes to the OT with his mention of Adam. The obvious place to begin is in Genesis where Adam eats of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, subsequently being banned from eating from the tree of life (Gen 3:22). However, there is no mention of *everyone* dying in this passage. Also, to leave it here assumes that the Corinthians would not only be familiar with Genesis, but also with the theological implications of all men dying from Adam’s sin. Admittedly, this is not very difficult to envision, and a number of scholars think this is the case.<sup>233</sup> Yet, there is another OT passage that Paul may have in mind. In Psalm 90:3 God is said to “return mankind to the dust, saying, ‘Return, descendants of Adam.’”<sup>234</sup> Perhaps, Paul is alluding here to Genesis 3:19 through the lens of this psalm. That is, rather than offer an extended discussion about how Adam’s disobedience to God led to death entering into the world for *all*, he points his readers to a verse that has already consolidated this theological baggage into a pithy statement. The real question is whether the reader is supposed to understand Paul’s logic as implying that everyone is equally in Christ in the way they are all in Adam.

Regardless of exactly where Paul is alluding to, it is clear that he is utilizing this OT material in a typological manner. Fee notes, “This is the first use of the Adam-Christ analogy in Paul’s extant letters. . . . His varied use of this theme suggests that it is a commonplace with

---

<sup>233</sup> See for example Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, “1 Corinthians,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009), 745.

<sup>234</sup> The LXX reads simply υἱοὶ ἀνθρώπων (“sons of men”). But even without the possible mention of Adam (אָדָם) as brought out by the CSB, the point is still the same: men are subjugated to the dust from whence they came. See Tremper Longman, *Psalms: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, Volumes 15-16 (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2014), 328.

Paul, for whom Christ stands at the beginning of the new humanity in a way analogous to, but not identical with, the way Adam stood at the beginning of the old order, both temporally and causally.”<sup>235</sup> Although, this is accurate in general, one of the issues Fee is arguing against is the ability to link the ideas of “in Adam” and “in Christ.” The former is granted to all mankind simply by their very existence as a descendant of Adam; the latter, it is said comes only by exercising faith in Christ. The problem with this reasoning is not that being “in Christ” comes by faith alone—for surely this is the case—but it is with requiring this theological truth at this juncture of Paul’s argument. Doing so creates a breakdown in his parallel structure, not to mention his OT usage. On the first count, taken at face value everyone is being included in the one sin of Adam. This is not selective; πάντες means everyone. On the second point, the material from Genesis and Psalm 90 makes it so that everyone’s inclusion in Adam is made obvious by the fact that they are going to die. One might imagine Paul noting: “if you think you will never die, then please ignore my argument. But for those of you who are on their way to the grave, I have the reason right here.” When these two issues are ignored the back end of the parallel is misunderstood. What ensues are comments like, “Paul speaks about Christians only, since only Christians may consider themselves as being *represented* by Jesus,” and “All those bound to Christ receive reconciliation and will share his resurrection and heavenly blessings. Not all humans are in Christ, however.”<sup>236</sup> But it is not at all clear that this is the point Paul intends to make with his usage of this typological parallel.

---

<sup>235</sup> Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 750–51.

<sup>236</sup> The former is from Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000), 1227.; the latter is from David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 707.

Instead, the natural conclusion of the parallel ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες and ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες, is that Christ is the recapitulation of Adamic humanity. He is the new head of all mankind, not just the elect. This will be reinforced in the next few verses. But even before getting to those it should be clear that Paul did not waste his time structuring this passage in the way he did. It is here that a possible third allusion, or better a “metaleptic echo,” becomes possible.<sup>237</sup> Daniel 12:2 speaks of a resurrection in which some are raised unto “eternal life, and some to disgrace and eternal contempt.” Paul utilizes the typology of Adam-Christ to answer the question that is apparent in the Daniel passage: how exactly can everyone be raised? If resurrection is the hope of the faithful, then it is strange to find others resurrected, even if they do end up in everlasting torments. It is ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ that this is possible. Paul uses this phrase elsewhere to denote those who are part of Christ by faith (e.g., Rom 8:1), but here he is using it in a less technical manner. The idea is that Christ has now replaced Adam in *general*. Perhaps, it is for this reason that some will be raised unto eternal contempt, for by their rejection of the means of their new life, there is nowhere to be found for them in his kingdom.

That Paul is viewing the general resurrection in these two verses is supported further by the immediate context. In verse 12 Paul relates the question of his interlocutors: “how can some of you say, ‘There is no resurrection from the dead?’” The objection here is not to the resurrection of the righteous, but the resurrection in general. Paul argues that this argument may have sounded good at an earlier time, but now that Christ has been raised it fails. Because Christ has raised from the grave, a resurrection is clearly possible. Fee’s association of ὅτι ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν (“that there is no resurrection of the dead”) with believers only is

---

<sup>237</sup> This is a less than clear allusion that harkens back to a previous text, in the light of which the present text should be understood. Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 20.

theologically, not exegetically, motivated.<sup>238</sup> This creates an awkward moment for Fee later in verses 23–24 where he argues forcefully that Paul intends an analogy between Adam and Jesus, only to then write, “Paul is less concerned with the outworking of this analogy per se . . . than he is with the *fact* that Christ’s resurrection makes absolutely necessary the resurrection of believers from the dead.”<sup>239</sup> But if the general resurrection is allowed in from the start, one does not have to turn Paul into such a weak logician. We can have our cake and eat it too! Paul’s analogy works just fine, unless a prefabricated theological structure is forced upon it. Through his allusions to Psalm 90:3 (and Gen 3:22), coupled with an echo from Daniel 12, Paul is able to pack two huge theological notions into two small verses: (1) all men die because of Adam, and (2) the resurrection of all men will come about because of Jesus.

#### 1 Corinthians 15:25, 27

Paul continues his theme of everyone or everything being seen differently through the lens of Christ. This Christocentric focus becomes even more pronounced in this section, as Paul alludes and directly quotes from Psalms 8 and 110. “Paul offers the earliest documentation of a christological exegesis of these psalms,” writes Hays.<sup>240</sup> And once again Paul expands upon the earlier context of the OT by explaining the relevance for theological issues that were likely not thought of before. For instance, because everything is going to be placed under the feet of God’s messiah, even death must be part of this “everything.” But before looking closer at his theological explanations let us look at how Paul relates the OT material.

---

<sup>238</sup> Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 740.

<sup>239</sup> *Ibid.*, 751.

<sup>240</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 84.



Hays rightly points out how odd it is that most translations do not think of the OT usage in verse 25 as a direct citation.<sup>241</sup> The reason this is strange is because those same translations have Psalm 8:6 as directly quoted in verse 27, even with altered grammar.<sup>242</sup> The parallels below should help to alleviate this problem:

<p>Verse 25</p> <p>δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν ἄχρι οὗ θῆ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθρούς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.</p> <p>“For it is necessary for him to reign <b>until he places all his enemies under his feet.</b>”</p>	<p>Ps 110:1 LXX</p> <p>εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου</p> <p>“The Lord said to my Lord ‘Sit at my right <b>until I make your enemies the footstool of your feet.</b>”</p>
<p>Verse 27</p> <p>πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ</p> <p>“<b>for he subjected everything under his feet</b>”</p>	<p>Ps 8:6 LXX</p> <p>σου πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ</p> <p>“<b>you subjected beneath his feet</b>”</p>

I have brought out the subtle differences in these passages with my translations, but it should not be difficult to see what Paul has done with the OT material. In verse 25 he adds “all” and removes “footstool.” The imagery of the footstool is replaced with a prepositional phrase. In both cases, however, the point is the same: enemies are subjected. There is little reason to discount this as a legitimate citation from Psalm 110. In verse 27 Paul has once again utilized ὑπὸ in place of another expression in the LXX. But again, “under the feet” is a legitimate

<sup>241</sup> Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians*, Interpretation, a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1997), 265.

<sup>242</sup> It is also interesting because some are quick to mention a conflation of texts here, when in reality all that is necessary is for a slight reworking of Psalm 110, as noted below. Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2010), 771.

translation in both cases. What is more important is that in both verses Paul changes the references from first person in Psalm 110, and second person in Psalm 8, to third person. Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner suggest that this is due to the needs of the literary setting.<sup>243</sup> Since 1 Corinthians 15 consistently utilizes the third person, these two passages are simply adjusted to fit. This is plausible, but it seems better to think in terms of theological nuance. Paul is clarifying that it is the Father speaking to the Son in these contexts. If Paul retained the ambiguity of the OT passages, they would not serve his purpose in the way he desires. This is more likely given the fact that even Ciampa and Rosner note, “A messianic interpretation of Ps. 8 and Ps. 110 is not evident in the Jewish literature.”<sup>244</sup> Paul is breaking away from this, and asserting the christological point by means of his shift in pronoun and verb usage.

But what is Paul doing with these verses? According N. T. Wright, this section is one of the keys to understanding Paul’s eschatology.<sup>245</sup> Rather than focusing upon the end times, Paul is pointing out how the implications of Christ’s victory begins now. There is both a present and future aspect to what God has promised to those who belong to Christ. What is important for Wright is that Paul not be misunderstood as one who is teaching “an ‘imminent expectation’ of the end of the world, but of the way in which the future has already burst into the present.”<sup>246</sup> Couched in precisely this fashion, Wright’s concern is justified. What is not clear, however, is that Paul is so concerned with the “now” elements of the Christ event. Wright’s inclusion of the notion of the imminent end is foreign to what Paul is doing here. At least in this context, Paul is not concerned with the timing of events, but rather with what *will* be the case. If we lose sight of

---

<sup>243</sup> Ciampa and Rosner, “1 Corinthians,” 745.

<sup>244</sup> Ibid.

<sup>245</sup> Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, 2008, 3:333.

<sup>246</sup> Ibid.

the proleptic nature of his material here, then Paul's OT usage becomes very strange. Can it be said that all of Christ's enemies have been subjected under his feet? Can it be affirmed that everything is *now* ruled by Jesus? Before answering in the affirmative one must take into account the fact that Paul does not think this is the case. He clarifies, "The last enemy to be abolished is death" (15:26). The implication, of course, is that death has not yet been abolished. Moreover, what else is in mind but the future when Paul writes, ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ("But when everything is subjected to him")? Although Wright's point is that there are both elements of the present reality and the future, Paul's gaze is decidedly set on the latter.<sup>247</sup> Perhaps this will not take place "imminently," but who can tell if this is what Paul thought or not—it is simply not within the passage. But if Paul is harkening back to Psalms 8 and 110, then it is as if the believer is being told to think about the greatness of the control their Lord will one day have. Paul's inclusion of "death" as something that is subjected to Christ, is his way of expanding upon the already vast arena of control that Christ will have. His allusions to the OT is his way of getting his readers' minds fixed upon eschatological imagery, only to expand upon it in a way that most would not see coming. Raymond F. Collins rightly notes, "The ultimate purpose of the entire eschatological scenario is expressed in Paul's final purpose clause."<sup>248</sup> The goal (v. 28) is for God to be πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν ("all in all").

---

<sup>247</sup> Wright is focused on the way in which Paul intends us to live in light of the resurrection life available to us because of Christ's resurrection. But this completely ignores the question that Paul is addressing. Paul's point is that a resurrection *will* occur, because Christ rose. *Ibid.*, 3:334.

<sup>248</sup> Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, ed. Daniel J. Harrington, Sacra Pagina Series, v. 7 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2006), 555.

## 1 Corinthians 15:32

Identifying the OT allusion in this verse is the easiest so far in this chapter. Paul writes, Φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν, αὔριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν (“Let’s eat and drink, for tomorrow we die”), which is a direct citation—this time word for word—from Isaiah 22:13.<sup>249</sup> Although it is not clear to which event Isaiah is referring, it was a time when the doom of the Israelites seemed imminent, but then things turned around momentarily.<sup>250</sup> The threat, however, still looms and it appears as though the people have ignored the fact that it was God who had delivered them (22:11). God’s desire is simple. He wishes for the people to repent and ask for his help. But when he asks for them to do this, the people respond with indifference toward him. Rather than “weeping” and “wearing sackcloth,” God finds them full of merriment, “eating of meat, and drinking of wine” (22:13). And at the height of this we find them saying “Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die!”

John Goldingay believes that these are not necessarily the exact words spoken by the people, but rather Isaiah put the words in their mouths.<sup>251</sup> Although this is likely correct, the sense Goldingay gives to this phrase is not accurate. Isaiah is said to be marking the implications of their actions, rather than representing something they would actually be thinking. Yet, the context seems to require that the people were thinking just what was written. It is not that they were truly joyful, but that when they surveyed the current situation things seemed hopeless. Because God had apparently abandoned them, the best course of action was to take advantage of everything that was left in the city.<sup>252</sup>

---

<sup>249</sup> The LXX reads φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν αὔριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν.

<sup>250</sup> John Goldingay, *Isaiah* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2012), 198.

<sup>251</sup> *Ibid.*, 200.

Understood in this way, it is clear what Paul is doing with his own use of the material. He is recasting himself and his audience in the role of the ancient Israelites. It is for this reason that it is better to see Paul's quotation not as an *ad hoc* completer of a philosophical argument, but rather as a way to place himself in the OT narrative.<sup>253</sup> But it might be worth clarifying how such disparate contexts can be brought together like this. If the OT context is about ensuing judgment, and the NT context is about a lack of a resurrection, how exactly can they be linked without the accusation of *ad hoc* exegesis? What is missing in this contrast is the fact that in both cases the contexts are dealing with a promise from God. Judgment is really not the point of Isaiah's passage; God's promise of delivery is. In the same way, the resurrection is God's vindication of Christ, and in this event the vindication of all God's people.<sup>254</sup>

Paul is making the point that if the Israelites were correct, then they were taking the right course of action. Suppose, for instance, there were no God to help them escape judgment. The best thing they could do at that point is pillage their own land and live as though there would be no tomorrow. Doing otherwise would actually be foolish, since they would simply be adding sorrow upon sorrow. One can only pity the fool who spent the last few days of his life on his face repenting before a god that does not exist. The parallel is superb: if there is no resurrection, then there is no point in living a life worthy of the God who raises the dead. Such a God simply does not exist. This would render all of Paul's suffering completely useless. Actually, "useless" is not quite the right word; "foolish" would be better (1 Cor 15:19).

---

<sup>252</sup> This is in line with Hays's understanding Hays, *First Corinthians*, 268..

<sup>253</sup> Fitzmyer sees this as a recitation of a phrase from Isaiah, that completes Paul's philosophical argument. The problem I have with this is that it makes Paul's usage completely *ad hoc*. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, ed., *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, The Anchor Yale Bible 32 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 583.

<sup>254</sup> Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 4:1259.

## 1 Corinthians 15:45

In this verse Paul once again draws a parallel between Adam and Christ. As before, he now appeals to the OT text to make his case.<sup>255</sup> He opens his citation with οὕτως καὶ γέγραπτα (“as it is written”) to make it clear that he is about to base his reasoning upon a scriptural passage. He then creates the first portion of his parallel by citing the last part of Genesis 2:7, with a few minor changes (marked with bold-type): Ἐγένετο ὁ **πρῶτος** ἄνθρωπος **Ἀδὰμ** εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν “The first man Adam became a living soul.” It seems that the inclusion of πρῶτος and Ἀδὰμ are intended to make a neater parallel as Bernardin Schneider notes.<sup>256</sup> The immediate context of Genesis 2:7 has Adam being created and then God breathing into him. Once this happens Adam comes to life. Philo understood this life as not the animating of the body, but the animating of “the mind which is to be infused into the body.”<sup>257</sup> That is, Adam became a living soul because his mind had been given life. The body is not given life, but rather contains life. Although it is not clear that Paul has this same understanding, Ciampa and Rosner too quickly discount the possibility.<sup>258</sup> Philo’s point is still that something was animated by Yahweh. Ciampa and Rosner, on the other hand, seem to think that this life given to the mind equates to a heavenly being. This means that Adam was an earthly and heavenly being all at once. But this

---

<sup>255</sup> An interesting study would be to look at the way Paul establishes his parallels with his own thoughts as the second portion thereof. It may be that Paul is setting his own words beside Scripture in an attempt to place them on the same level. This would be a subtler way of establishing his apostolic authority than outright stating it (cf. 1 Cor 9:1).

<sup>256</sup> I am convinced neither that this must be understood in light of rabbinic exegesis, nor that these ideas are in reference to corporate being. It is Adam versus Jesus here not humanity versus Christianity. Bernardin V. Schneider, “Corporate Meaning and Background of 1 Cor 15:45b,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29, no. 3 (July 1967): 149.

<sup>257</sup> Philo, “Allegorical Interpretation,” trans. Charles Duke Yonge (London, 1890), 1.12.

<sup>258</sup> Ciampa and Rosner, “1 Corinthians,” 746. For a more balanced discussion see Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1282–83.

makes little sense of what Philo is getting at. Even if Adam is “heavenly,” he is not heavenly in the sense that Paul will attach to Christ, but heavenly in the sense that there is a *spiritual* aspect to man. Regardless of what Paul may have thought was animated in Adam, God is still the animator.

The issue of animation of the soul becomes important for the way in which Paul uses the Genesis passage. Numerous scholars have made note of the method Paul utilizes here. David E. Garland summarizes, “The statement in 15:44a introduces the principle that an opposite presupposes its counterpart.”<sup>259</sup> When used in verse 45 ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν (“the last Adam became a life-giving spirit”), is anticipated almost in a prophetic sense: since there was a first Adam, there was bound to be another Adam; if the first Adam had quality x, then the next Adam must have quality x+y. Whatever is first in the parallel calls out for its completion by a counterpart that is “opposite” to it.<sup>260</sup> This may very well be what Paul is doing here, but the discussion in the literature has been so occupied with his method that the theological conclusion has been muted.

At the other end of the parallel we are told that Paul views Jesus as one that stands above Adam because he gives life in the sense of raising the dead.<sup>261</sup> Or as another author mentions, Jesus represents to new spiritual being that believers will be fashioned after.<sup>262</sup> While both of these notions are true, they overlook the way in which Paul has set up his parallel. In the original context the life-giving force is Yahweh, and the one receiving life is Adam. The contrast is that

---

<sup>259</sup> Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 734.

<sup>260</sup> One of the problems with this, though, is that calling these pairs opposites brings up the question: to what extent? Ought we to conclude that Jesus is of a completely different order than the first Adam? Is he human at all? If not, what exactly is the point of calling these opposites?

<sup>261</sup> Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 735.

<sup>262</sup> Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1284–85.

the second Adam is not the receiver of life, but is instead a πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν. By setting this in a parallel with Genesis 2:7, Paul is cleverly attesting to who Jesus is, not just what he can do. For Paul, Jesus is Yahweh, the giver of life (Ps 36:9).

### 1 Corinthians 15:54–55

In these two verses Paul brings together two different sections of the OT, the first portion of which has generated more discussion than the latter. Κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νίκος (“Death has been swallowed up in victory”) does not appear verbatim in any form of the OT text. However, it does come close to a few translations, which creates some uncertainty about what Paul is citing. Anthony C. Thiselton finds the closest material to be the text of Theodotion because it includes the word “victory.”<sup>263</sup> The MT does not have this word, so it is best to follow Thiselton here, rather than think of Paul as altering the Hebrew (per Hayes).<sup>264</sup> In any case, the verse that Paul is citing is from Isaiah 25:8. The second citation has similar issues, but most seem content with Paul altering two words of Hosea 13:14 for rhetorical purposes (as noted below).<sup>265</sup>

<p>Verse 55</p> <p>ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ νίκος; ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον</p> <p>Death, where is your victory? Death where is your sting?</p>	<p>Hosea 13:14 LXX</p> <p>ποῦ ἡ δίκη σου θάνατε; ποῦ τὸ κέντρον σου</p> <p>ἄδη</p> <p>Death, where is your judgment? Hades, where is your sting?</p>
---	--

<sup>263</sup> Ibid., 1299.

<sup>264</sup> Hays, *First Corinthians*, 275.

<sup>265</sup> Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1299.



It is also possible that Paul is working with a theological construct that renders judgment the equivalent of victory.<sup>266</sup>

What is important for our purposes is the way in which Paul uses these texts. The eschatological trajectory has been noted by others, but what has not been recognized is the way Paul intends to expand the discussion from the topic of a resurrected body to the time period in which this occurs.<sup>267</sup> It is no coincidence that Paul attaches Hosea 13:14 to Isaiah 25:8. The former verse is a way for him to comment on that age when all will be set right. The resurrection is the way God will destroy death, but this merely opens the door for the reader to think deeper about what will be had when death is destroyed. For instance, there will be no more tears or shame (Isa 25:8).

### **Paul and his Conceptual Milieu**

One of the benefits of the new perspective on Paul is the emphasis that has been placed on understanding the apostle in the light of his historical situation. Although this has been the stated goal of the historical-grammatical hermeneutic, it is not always carried through in a thorough manner. Fortunately, the last thirty years of discussions from scholars working in the new perspective has afforded much material that can be readily co-opted for a brief presentation of the contextual world in which Paul would have found himself. The key issue for our purposes is the nature of the resurrection as seen through the lens of the Second Temple period and the overlap in the patristic period.<sup>268</sup>

---

<sup>266</sup> Ciampa and Rosner discuss a possible background where victory and sting work together in a parallelism. Ciampa and Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 834.

<sup>267</sup> Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1300; Ciampa and Rosner, "1 Corinthians," 748.

This is where N. T. Wright both aids and hinders the discussion as far as 1 Corinthians 15 is concerned. Wright has adequately emphasized that Second Temple Judaism should be the place to find concepts with which Paul was working. This is important when thinking in terms of eschatological hopes since Paul would have plenty of options to choose from. There are views that thought of the messiah as coming and crushing Israel's enemies (*Wisdom* 3:1-10). Some thought of apostate Israel as being included in the wrath to come; their small faithful group, however, was to be blessed in the next age (*Pss. Sol.* 9:7). But in either case the material seems unified around one notion: there will be a second age.<sup>269</sup> What Paul does with this common notion of a second age is what sets him apart. Wright accepts Ladd's concept of inaugurated eschatology, and argues that Paul believed that this second age had already begun. This modification to the Jewish hope is what set a stumbling block up for the Jews of that time. If the hope had been for a future age that would dawn with all of the blessings at one time, there would be little desire to jump on board a second age teaching that argued that the second age had begun, but it is only the beginning. This much of Wright's analysis is beneficial. However, there is an area of ambiguity that must be filled by prior theological concerns: how much of the eschatological vision of the Second Temple (and OT) period was reworked in this fashion?

Although Wright begins his penultimate section of his two-part fourth volume on Christian origins, with the stated goal of explicating the eschatological elements of the Pauline

---

<sup>268</sup> It may be beneficial to look at the Greco-Roman influences on Paul in this regard, but it seems apparent that the notion of the resurrection is best thought of in relation to Jewish eschatological hopes. Although I do not doubt that Paul may have included notions from his Greco-Roman surroundings, he seems to understand himself as one who is explaining the hope of Israel. Jackson's analysis of Paul utilizing the new creation motif of Rome seems plausible enough. However, the question still remains: with the clear Isaianic background and Second Temple material corroborating such ideas, why is it necessary to move beyond Paul's own people to find influences? Chapters 2 and 3 of Jackson's book showcase the extent to which Paul was utilizing the OT and Second Temple material. For his analysis of Roman influence see T. Ryan Jackson, *New Creation in Paul's Letters: A Study of the Historical and Social Setting of a Pauline Concept* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2016), 60–63.

<sup>269</sup> Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 4:1059.

new age, one finds a sustained emphasis on the present aspects. It is as if almost every element, save for a literal future bodily resurrection, of the Second Temple vision has been reworked into a present reality. While we are assured that there are future elements in this Pauline reenvisioning, any attempt to explain what this may look like is scoffed at and considered “‘End-Times’ fancy.”<sup>270</sup> There is no arguing with Wright that Jewish eschatology has been reworked around the person of Jesus Christ, but why should this distract from a future vision? Overemphasizing the “now” in the “now, not yet” paradigm seems antithetical to viewing Paul in the light of his Jewish background. In fact, if Paul has reworked Jewish eschatology to the extent that Wright envisions, it is hard to see how Second Temple Judaism played little more than the role of a springboard for Paul. It is for reasons like these that I am sympathetic to the radical new perspective, which accuses Wright and others of claiming to think of Paul as a Jew, but then bringing a non-Jewish Paul in via a different route.<sup>271</sup>

If the Second Temple material is unified in its hope of a second future age, does it not seem odd that all of the future elements would be misguided save for the one about a resurrection? Certainly one would be justified in pointing out that the Second Temple material was concerned with speculating about what the second age would look like, but what if Paul was doing this same thing? Of course, we would need to remove the bit about speculation, but the point is that Paul could very well have been presenting his material as the answer to what that second *future* age would look like. In fact, Wright is not necessarily against such an understanding. Again, the issue is what elements of this second age should be placed in the

---

<sup>270</sup> Ibid., 4:1130.

<sup>271</sup> Although I do not agree with Nanos’s own position, he is correct to note that the portrait of Paul that Wright and Dunn paint is only a shade different from the traditional picture. Mark D. Nanos and Magnus Zetterholm, eds., “The Question of Conceptualization: Qualifying Paul’s Position on Circumcision in Dialogue with Josephus’s Advisors to King Izates,” in *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), 144–52.

future. Jesus becomes the bridge in an assessment like this. Since Paul says Jesus is ἀπαρχή (the firstfruits), it is reasonable to look to him as the example of what is to come. This is impetus for Paul's reworking of Jewish eschatology. The implication that Wright draws from this is that Paul was refocusing the point of all those speculative hopes. He writes,

What he does is to teach his hearers to think theologically: to think forward from the great narrative of Israel's scriptures into the world in which the Messiah had established God's sovereign rule among the nations through his death and resurrection, inaugurating the 'age to come', rescuing Jews and gentiles alike from the 'present evil age', and establishing them as a single family which was both in direct continuity (through the Messiah himself) with the ancient people of Abraham and in a radical and cross-shaped discontinuity with Abraham's physical family and its traditions.<sup>272</sup>

This is the "new creation" of which Paul speaks (cf. 2 Cor 5:17).<sup>273</sup> Wright is advocating that Paul was intent on refocusing the gaze of his readers. Rather than looking to the future age, they must realize that age has begun and they are partakers in such a new reality.

There are at least two good aspects of what Wright is doing. First, Paul certainly does wish for believers to embrace the hope that is presently their possession (Gal 2:20). Second, Wright hints at a connection between the new creation motif and the second age. The problem with the first point, though, is one of emphasis. Although Wright makes room for future elements of the second age, his continued attempt to underplay such ideas renders such a hope virtually nonexistent.<sup>274</sup> In order to do this Wright sidesteps numerous passages, with 1 and 2 Thessalonians being considered too debatable to include within his discussion. But if one cuts off these two letters then it is no wonder that Paul can be made out to be "now" focused. Yet, even

---

<sup>272</sup> Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 4:1260.

<sup>273</sup> Ibid.

<sup>274</sup> One good example can be seen in Wright's insistence that the glory of God that Jews hoped to see once more Jerusalem (based upon an interpretation of Isaiah 66), was actually to be understood as the glory that is now indwelling believers. Ibid., 4:1506. This is quite humorous when one notices that Wright criticizes Thomas R. Schreiner for ignoring the eschatological glory of believers in his own book on Paul. Ibid., 4:1092–93.

without these we must return to our previous question of just how Jewish Paul's thought was. If we are to say that he was operating within the Second Temple milieu, there is no reason to require Paul to downplay futuristic ideas simply because they offend our modern ears.

The linking of new creation with Paul's understanding of the new age, makes the first issue even more pronounced. T. Ryan Jackson has done an excellent job of noting how one can find both anthropological and cosmological elements within the new creation motif of Second Temple Judaism.<sup>275</sup> Wright, on the other hand, seems unduly focused on the anthropological aspect, to the point that for all intents and purposes Paul could have abandoned the cosmological. That is, so long as believers are made new in Christ, there is no need for Paul to envision a future state wherein everything is recreated. The future state may in fact look the same as the modern world, with the subtraction of the wicked among us. This, of course, is reading into Wright's material at points that he does not take his discussion. These just seem like realistic results given the trajectory of his consistent "now" focused Pauline eschatology. What is clear, is that Wright does not make this connection although it is possible given a number of his ideas.

In his third volume on Christian origins, Wright offers a thorough discussion on the Greek terms used for the resurrection. The result of his findings is that whenever the terms are used there is either a bodily resurrection in view, or the resurrection is being used as a metaphor.<sup>276</sup> What is important about this study is that there is never an association of "resurrection" with a nonphysical body. The implication is that Paul's σῶμα πνευματικόν (spiritual body) must not be understood in a docetic fashion, since the term is never used this

---

<sup>275</sup> As I noted above, I am unconvinced of his parallels with Roman society, but his analysis OT and Second Temple material is superb. Jackson, *New Creation in Paul's Letters: A Study of the Historical and Social Setting of a Pauline Concept*, 17–59.

<sup>276</sup> N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, vol. 3, Christian Origins and the Question of God (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), 209–10.

way. The main issue, though, is how Wright utilizes what he sees as a metaphorical sense for “resurrection.” He notes, “His [Paul’s] way of addressing the matter [the incongruity of present circumstances and Jewish resurrection hopes] demonstrates that he has taken the existing metaphorical meaning and has allowed it to be redefined by the events he believed to have taken place concerning Jesus.”<sup>277</sup> This is foundational for what we have noted in Wright’s fourth volume. Paul feels free to load the metaphorical meaning of “resurrection” in such a way that it deals a death blow to it. The upshot is that out of this we get a clear affirmation of a bodily resurrection as seen first in Jesus Christ. That is, Paul takes the metaphorical usage of “resurrection” and turns it into a nonmetaphorical term. But why ought we to accept this reasoning? Does it not seem possible that Paul could have retained the metaphorical usage of “resurrection,” while placing the bodily resurrection as one aspect within it? Rather than collapsing the metaphorical sense of “resurrection” perhaps it would better to link this term with the second age motif.

In this way one can talk about a “resurrection age.” Wright never makes this association, but it is a possible outworking of his terminology. F. F. Bruce, on the other hand, seems to have thought of Paul’s concept in this manner. He writes, “Temporally, the age to come, the resurrection age, still lies in the future; spiritually, believers in Christ have here and now been made partakers of it, . . . .”<sup>278</sup> Jackson, though not adopting the same terminology, notes that there is a “resurrection formula” being utilized to speak of this age of the new creation.<sup>279</sup> For him, the new creation is a large part of that *future* hope of the believer. Paul is not just (or evenly

---

<sup>277</sup> Ibid., 3:221.

<sup>278</sup> F. F. Bruce, *Epistle to the Galatians*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2013), 76.

<sup>279</sup> Jackson, *New Creation in Paul’s Letters: A Study of the Historical and Social Setting of a Pauline Concept*, 98.

mainly) focused on the here and now aspects of that age, but he is pointing to that second age. The point is that “resurrection age” is an appropriate term to characterize the future time in which the resurrection of the body will take place. Wright’s metaphorical usage can house the literal, without removing the complex nature of such an age. The implication of this for 1 Corinthians 15 is that Paul does not have to be speaking about an individual’s bodily resurrection when mentioning the resurrection.

#### 1 Corinthians 15:47, 50–55

Beginning with the notion of the inability of this current body to enter into the kingdom of God, Paul seeks to explain how it will be possible for believers to inherit that which is heavenly.<sup>280</sup> In verse 47 Paul explains that whatever believers will one day be (note the futuristic overtones), they will be ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (“out of heaven”). The order of being will be completely different from the present one. Man (Paul qualifies even this term with “second”) will no longer be ἐκ γῆς (“out of the earth”), or of the order of earthly manhood (i.e., first-order humanity). He will instead be—to borrow another Pauline category (cf. Gal 6:15)—a καινὴ κτίσις (“new creation”).<sup>281</sup> Prior to explaining why this is necessary, Paul desires his readers to fix their gaze upon what will one day be theirs. It is for this reason, that Wright’s desire to look at the present realities of what this means moves too quickly from the initial point of Paul’s material. There are clear “now” implications, but they are just that: implications of another more basic point that

---

<sup>280</sup> One should note the similar objection that Justin Martyr has to address at a later date. Whereas Justin opts for a physical-only view, Paul speaks of a transformation.

<sup>281</sup> In Owen’s study of this phrase 1 Corinthians 15 gets only brief mention as a possible area of extension of this concept. This is unfortunate because this passage houses the explanation of why a new creation is necessary in the first place. Mark D. Owens, *As It Was in the Beginning: An Intertextual Analysis of New Creation in Galatians, 2 Corinthians, and Ephesians* (Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2015), 96.

Paul is trying to make. One wonders what such a passage would look like if the Corinthians were more focused upon spiritual matters than on the carnal pursuits for which Paul has to rebuke them. In any case, it is hard to force a *present* new creation reading on this passage since Paul has the eschaton in mind as the usage of the future tense later indicates.<sup>282</sup>

The kingdom of God cannot be inherited by σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα (flesh and blood), i.e., by first-order humans (v. 50). Paul explains what he means with a parallel example, this time via metonymy: that which is subject to decay (φθορὰ) cannot inherit that which is everlasting (ἀφθαρσίαν). The parallelism is clear. First-order humanity is decaying in the way second-order humanity will be everlasting. Anthony C. Thiselton makes a helpful note with regard to inheritance: “The verb **to inherit** is often used **of coming into possession of** eschatological existence, with all that this implies.”<sup>283</sup> Inheriting should not be thought of in simplistic terms of something that is given to another, but rather as the stepping into the reality of the one giving the inheritance. When a father leaves his son an inheritance the goal is not simply to give the son riches, but rather for the son to take on the life of the father with the goods at his disposal. Paul’s point is that a radical change must take place in order for first-order humans to step into the role of second-order humanity.

The problem at this point, is that the bodily resurrection that is promised to believers is simply assumed to fit the description for the event that accounts for anthropological new creation. Assuming, however, that Paul is still standing within the milieu of the Second Temple period (as supported by some Fathers), it is likely that he is thinking of a resurrection age. In

---

<sup>282</sup> There is debate as to whether the future tense is indeed used in v. 49, but I am in agreement with Metzger and the UBS committee. Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York, NY: American Bible Society, 1971), 502.

<sup>283</sup> Bold-type is in the original. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1291.



fact, the substitution of this phrase fits well as a paraphrase for this first verse: “A believer will not be able to enter the resurrection age (i.e., the kingdom of God), without being altered so that he is of the same stuff that characterizes the resurrection age.” A resurrection of the body is assumed as part of this concept within the Second Temple material. But it is here that Paul breaks with the tradition. New revelation has come and Paul has what was once a μυστήριον (mystery) to relate to the Corinthians (v. 51).<sup>284</sup>

Although it was once thought that all must die before entering into the resurrection age, Paul tells us that this is not actually the case. There are some who will never taste of death, but will still be changed (ἀλλαγησόμεθα) into the stuff of the resurrection age. An interesting study would be to look at the Second Temple material to see if there were any hopes of this type of alteration in the elect. There is clearly material that speaks of the kingdom coming, seemingly while thousands of believers are still alive (cf. Acts 1:6). The answer may lie somewhere within the idea that those who have died will not necessarily partake in the kingdom that is to come, but the resurrection age as a later time. In reality, though, it seems like the two are one and the question was simply never posed. Here Paul claims divine insight, and tells his readers that the resurrection age will be inhabited by those who are not strictly speaking *resurrected*. This is an extremely important piece of information. If Paul does not think of all being resurrected and yet the promise of resurrection is to *all* God’s people, then he must think that this alteration qualifies as satisfying the promise of a resurrection, at least for some. The best way to view this is that Paul is thinking of a complex of events that take place within the resurrection age.

At the end of verse 52 Paul makes a statement that must be explained properly if the thesis of this paper is to stand. Rather than speaking of a change that will take place to those who

---

<sup>284</sup> I am on the side of those who see “mystery” as new revelation, rather than something that remains a mystery even for Paul. See the discussion in Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 111–14.

are resurrected, Paul says οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται ἄφθαρτοι (“the dead will be raised everlasting”). This awkward translation is important because “everlasting” is being set against that which was subject to decay. The point is that those who are raised will never again be subject to this process; they will continue to *exist*. It is common, however, to assume that the resurrected body has been altered by making ἄφθαρτοι indicative of a radical change in constitution.<sup>285</sup> What is being proposed here is that Paul is not yet making the point of an alteration or transformation in being. His point is that those who will be raised will never again be subject to the process of decaying. Thiselton is correct in one sense when he argues, “The σῶμα will be raised **without degenerating decay** at the very least; . . . .”<sup>286</sup> The problem with this statement is the focus of the decay. It would be better to say that the σῶμα will not be subject to decaying influences, rather than not decaying.

This nuance is important for two reasons. First, Paul makes it clear that the alteration that will take place is for “all” (πάντες). It would be odd here to think that Paul envisions a resurrection for some and then an alteration for those who have not died by this point. Instead, both resurrected saints and living saints will be changed. Second, it is more likely that Paul is thinking in terms of timing. Assuming that the alteration is a second stage of the resurrection age, it would seem that such a change will happen quickly. So quickly, indeed, that it can be characterized as ἐν ῥιπῇ ὀφθαλμοῦ (“in the blink of an eye”). Following his logic, it seems likely that the reason the dead will be raised “everlasting” is simply because they will never have a chance to die again. This means that the resurrection of the body itself is not the alteration.

---

<sup>285</sup> Leon Morris, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries 7 (Leicester; Grand Rapids: Inter-Varsity Press; Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1983), 228.

<sup>286</sup> Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1296–97.

Rather, it is the return of the same body that went into the ground. This is strengthened by the inclusion of the third person plural when speaking of the change that will take place. Whether it is a resurrected saint or a living saint ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγησόμεθα (“we will be changed”).

This interpretation creates a problem for those who see the altered state of future saints as “a physical body like the resurrected body of Christ.”<sup>287</sup> The issue is not with the resurrection of Jesus, but rather with the contradiction that this creates with Paul’s usage of “mystery.” If Paul is offering a new revelation to the Corinthians—i.e., we will all be changed—how exactly is equating this with the resurrection body of Jesus appropriate? Jesus, to be sure, is the “firstfruits” of the resurrection (v. 23), but this must also be understood in the light of the resurrection age. Jesus, that is, is the first to experience the fullness of the resurrection age. That whole complex of events that will take place in and to the believer has already happened to Jesus. To equate the alteration of the body with the resurrection qua resurrection of the body is to overlook the fact that Jesus too underwent an alteration after his own bodily resurrection. Gordon D. Fee brings this out nicely: “The contrasts that have been set up, however, are not between the corpses of the dead and their reanimated bodies, but between bodies in their present earthly expression vis-à-vis their transformation into the likeness of Christ’s glorified body.”<sup>288</sup> There is room here to insert a “reanimation,” to use Fee’s term, and then an alteration. This alteration has classically be termed “glorification.”<sup>289</sup> The problem, though, is that the glorification is often muted by collapsing it

---

<sup>287</sup> Kenneth E. Bailey, *Paul Through Mediterranean Eyes: Cultural Studies in 1 Corinthians* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011), 467.

<sup>288</sup> Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 884–85.

<sup>289</sup> Most evangelical theologians make note of the glorification of the saints, but apologetic concerns surrounding the resurrection of the body of Jesus have unduly influenced theological precision on this point. The fear is that if the resurrected body of Jesus was only a reanimation, it was not immortal, and therefore Jesus was not “perfected” at his resurrection. This is the philosophical debate about a physical resuscitation versus resurrection. The reality is that no such nuance exists in the biblical material. A resuscitation (a wholly modern term) is a

into the resurrected body. The remedy to this problem is placing the resurrection of the body properly (i.e., as the first step) within Paul's complex understanding of the resurrection age.

The contrast that Fee points to is necessary for understanding v. 53. The first segment seems to be a repetition of the idea of being removed from the realm of decay, but it is important to note what Paul is saying. He is not saying that the everlastingness is the quality of a resurrected body, but rather whatever is of the stuff of *this* (τοῦτο) body—pre or postresurrection—must be altered. The emphasis is in a different area. Rather than restating that the current body is decaying, Paul is saying that those who are alive at the time of the resurrection age *and* those who are resurrected, ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν (“must be everlastingly clothed”).<sup>290</sup> That is, the resurrection itself is not the moment of everlasting clothing.

Paul explains himself further by moving from the quality of stuff (i.e., everlasting) of the glorified being, to the main point: τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν (“this that is subject to dying must be immortally clothed”). Not only is the second-order humanity not subject to decay, it will never cease to be as a whole. Assuming that Paul was some sort of dualist (2 Cor 5:8), the reality is that death only affects the physical self. But in the resurrection age, second-order man will be constructed in such a way that his whole being will endure forever. This change in being is highly debated, and it is often objected that to create such a substantive change in the being of man renders the “resurrection body” ephemeral or not a physical resurrection body. The problem with this objection, though, is that this is not a requirement of Paul's language here.

---

resurrection. Jesus was glorified after he was raised; we too will be glorified after we are raised. Davis is therefore incorrect to assert that a resurrection must entail a transformation. Davis, *Risen Indeed*, 45–46.

<sup>290</sup> I am taking ἀφθαρσίαν to be an adverbial accusative, since it is conveying the manner in which the new clothing will not be subject to decay.

The area of ambiguity that is inserted at this point comes from Paul's previous mention of σῶμα πνευματικόν.<sup>291</sup> The reality, though, is that the very notion of a resurrection entails a physical body (see my note on Wright's material above). Also, there is some overlap with the concept of immortality and the divine life. Ben C. Blackwell notes that language that relates to the glorification (and deification of man) is focused upon "the experience of immortal life rather than luminous bodies."<sup>292</sup> Although Blackwell overstates his point—luminous bodies are side-by-side with immortal life—there is no reason to doubt that there is a substantial alteration to the very being of first-order man. James Ware's position is noteworthy, but the concern for an unduly laced Aristotelian background for this alteration overlooks theotic notions that are now being considered seminal to Paul's thought.<sup>293</sup> That is, if theosis is a viable theological option for Pauline material, then there is even more reason to think of the changes that take place in the resurrection age as essential alterations.<sup>294</sup>

The point is that in verse 53 Paul is envisioning a change in the structure of first-order humanity. To argue for less leads to the conclusion that the resurrection is a return of the present body with perhaps the conditions altered. In fact, there are some who seem to be going in this

---

<sup>291</sup> I leave this untranslated here because I do not have the space to engage in this debate. My opinion, though, is that even if translated "spiritual body" removing the idea of physicality, is simply a category that Paul would have never entertained. For a good discussion of this see James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998), 55–61.

<sup>292</sup> "Deification" is that process whereby man will be conformed more into the likeness of God. Believers will be like what Christ is now. Whether this pertains to ontology or merely physical characteristics is debatable. Blackwell, *Christosis*, 159.

<sup>293</sup> He argues, "Paul's series of oppositions does not describe two different bodies, distinct in substance, but two contrasting modes of existence of the same body, one prior to and the other subsequent to the resurrection." But this is precisely the muting of the glorification that we are arguing against. The resurrection becomes little more than a continued existence in this flesh without the possibility of death. James P Ware, "Paul's Understanding of the Resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15:36-54," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 133, no. 4 (2014): 831.

<sup>294</sup> This is also why I think it is important to bear in mind luminous qualities of the glorified state, since if taken literally these tend to militate against Ware's (and other's) resurrection body (i.e., muted glorified body).

direction with their notion of a return to the Edenic state.<sup>295</sup> But this also mutes the point of Paul's "clothing" language. It is not enough to be in an environment that keeps one from the possibility of death. For instance, was Adam immortal before he ate of the tree? The answer to this question is no. Immortality requires the *incapability* of destruction. This is why theotic notions are beginning to be noted in Paul's material. Immortality is the stuff of gods, or in this case the God. Only God has the ability to endure with no possibility of destruction. Paul's point here is not that our environment will be rendered such that we will be able to exist like Adam once again. His point is that we will be radically changed into something that shares with God, at the very least (!), the clothing (i.e., the stuff) of immortality.

Without this sharing in real immortality, the threat of death will always loom heavy over man's head. This is why once the glorification of man has taken place (v. 54) Paul can confidently assert that "the scripture will be fulfilled" (γενήσεται ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος): "Death has been swallowed up in victory. Where, death, is your victory? Where, death, is your sting?" (vv. 54–56).

### **Conclusion**

Paul's understanding of the resurrection clearly stems from the OT. Yet, where Daniel offers little explanation, Paul expands upon it in a detailed manner. What is not as clear is the extent to which Paul was indebted to his Second Temple background. However, interpreting Paul in the light of the resurrection as a descriptor of the eschaton, allows for a clearer understanding of what he means by raising incorruptible. Like those of the Second Temple Period, Paul too was

---

<sup>295</sup> Owens, *As It Was in the Beginning*, 172.

interested in what that period of time looked like. The difference is that God revealed to Paul what he desired to look into. The result is a multifaceted “resurrection.”

## CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

### Summary

The methodological procedure for this study was to identify a conceptual bridge that would place Paul in the middle of the Second Temple period and the early church Fathers who interpreted Paul's material. Three notions from the Second Temple period presented themselves as viable candidates for such a conceptual link. First, the idea that there would be an end time age that is characterized by various ideas is ubiquitous. Some of the material from this period speaks of this final as the "great age," and other material thinks in terms of "a consummation of all things." Second, there is the notion that only the righteous will be allowed "in the resurrection." The wicked will be left in a disembodied state to suffer torment. This is not the only view in the literature, but it is the most prominent. Third, in those areas where a transformation is in view, the Second Temple material seems to agree that this is a separate event from returning from the dead. Those who will rise again, will then be made into the likeness of angels, for example.

With these common ideas isolated we then set about surveying the earliest literature of church fathers. By delimiting the material by the date of AD 200, we sought to provide survey that could conceivably be linked precursors in the Second Temple period. Unfortunately, the evidence for such a conceptual link was not as robust as one would like. However, there are at least two ways in which the Fathers did overlap in their views of the resurrection. First, there is an entirely physical emphasis placed on the concept, to the point that one will have a difficult time finding the notion of "glorification" at all. In the areas that mention a transformation, it seems like the two ideas are separated, but the reasoning for this appears to be apologetic, rather than theological. Still, the idea the emphasis on a physical return from the grave as the same



human being, is clearly represented in the Second Temple period. The second area of overlap is in the usage of the phrase “in the resurrection.” Although the usages of the phrase as a period of time are not as clear in the Fathers as in the Second Temple material, at least in two places the correlation is clear. Ignatius, for instance, believes that the wicked will be left out of this time, and Irenaeus argues that it is “in the resurrection” that believers will *then* receive new life. The point is that the resurrection from the grave is not the point of whatever new life will be, but the initiatory point into this age.

It is apparent that each period of theologizing concerning the resurrection was addressing different problems, but in each case similar terminology was utilized. What appears to have happened is that Jews and Christians filled in the blanks of the terminological outline with their own ideas. The former thought in terms of idyllic restoration of the kingdom begun with a return from the dead; the latter thought in terms of everlasting life granted unto the body that returned from the grave. In both cases, though, the period of time they were discussing held the resurrection as the common point. For both groups, the resurrection was not simply a return from the grave, but also the beginning point of the new age. For this reason, we endeavored to create terminology that would account for the variety of concepts for this age. In so doing we settled on “resurrection age,” which is convenient for numerous reasons. First, though, the exact terminology is nowhere found in the literature, the usage of “in the resurrection” as an expanded period of time is a close parallel to what we are envisioning. Second, notions of a “two-stage” resurrection can be accommodated without adjusting the definition of “resurrection.” This means that believers will be resuscitated, and then a second event will occur in which they are transformed. Both of these elements are found throughout the literature, but to call the latter a resurrection ignores the meaning of the word.

It is apparent that whatever one wishes to call that end time age, both the Second Temple and patristic material wrestled with what it would look like. It is within this conceptual matrix that we sought to place Paul. The difference, of course, is that for the apostle the issue was not theologizing, but how to express the revelation that he was given on the matter. We began by showing that he stood upon the shoulders of the OT, with Daniel in view, as well as numerous other intertextual links. There is no doubt that he viewed himself as continuing the trajectory of the OT discussion on the resurrection. But Paul does not stop with commentary. Instead, he explains how the simple mentions of resurrection in the OT are not fully representative of the complex nature of the doctrine. This is where he is best understood in the light of the conceptual notion of the “resurrection age.” In 1 Corinthians 15 Paul is seeking to explain how one can believe simultaneously in a physical return of the body from the grave, and that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. The answer is that resuscitation of the body is just the initial point of God’s promise for believers. The characteristic of a resuscitation is life, and it is this reason that the period in time which this will happen can be thought of in terms of new life. Life is granted to believers, and then a radical alteration will occur. What exactly we will be is not discussed by Paul, but it will be no less than an addition to the life we currently have. In this way, one is justified in thinking in terms of a resurrection age, where the return of the body is the characterizing event for the ensuing idyllic existence. Everything from the point of the return of the body is new life, inasmuch as life is given once again to the body. This means that whatever we will be changed into will be nothing less than a glorified *life*. The resurrection age, then, is that period of time in which believers are first brought back from the grave, and then granted everlasting life in an altered state. For Paul, there is no such thing as a “resurrected body,” but rather a body that is resurrected, and then transformed.

### **Implications and Further Research**

The thesis of this dissertation is that Jesus is the paradigm for the believer's future resurrection, but that he did not rise in an altered state. What we have attempted to show is that the move to use Paul's material to argue against this is not valid. One of the implications of this is the state of the actual body that is raised, prior to being changed. For example, would a blind man return from the grave blind? Irenaeus answered this question negatively, and I believe this is a possible option. However, it does not seem necessary to invoke a healing of this ailment in the resuscitated body. If the transformation is to happen in such a short window from the resuscitation that Paul can call it a twinkle of the eye, then the question is almost pointless. If one wishes to malign God for not raising a person in a perfected manner, when he is going to perfect the person within a few seconds after their resuscitation one is merely engaging in pedantic criticism. This might seem odd, but given the fact that Jesus retained his scars during his period of postresurrection appearances, the evidence is in favor of a resuscitation with only those items necessary for the return of life.

A second implication of this project is that the eschatological discussions of the academy should not be focused on the so-called "resurrected body." Instead, the field should move toward the discussion of the glorification of man. Returning from the dead was never the end result of God's plan for man. Man is to become something else entirely. This has typically been discussed under the heading of theosis. And though Protestants have largely been leery of such a doctrine, the fact remains that "We know that when he appears, we will be like him because we will see him as he is" (1 John 3:2). As we have noted in the first chapter of this project, theologians are typically willing to acknowledge that Christ was glorified in a transformative sense. John is in simply in agreement with Paul, that what happened to Christ will happen to believers. The extent

to which one is willing to take this, is the theological discussion that should be taking place. The goal should at least be to acknowledge that we will be like Christ. Instead of noting similarities to his risen body, one should think in terms of his glorified body.

At the same time, the methodology employed in this project has the potential for much fruitful scholarship in NT studies. There is no reason to limit it to the concept of the resurrection. The limitations of the method have been clearly seen, as there was little material with which to work from the patristic period. Also, there are numerous strains of thought to be found in the Second Temple material. Isolating one of them is a chore that even a conceptual bridge cannot do with certainty. Still, if there are areas of agreement between the Second Temple period and the early Fathers, there is a good chance that the apostles thought in a similar manner. This is because the apostles would be working within a familiar milieu, and the Fathers would be continuing such thoughts likely based upon their interpretations of the apostles. One might even expand the one's search into other areas. For instance, the Qumran material had nothing relevant to the current discussion, but if the topic is altered then this material could easily be included. There is also a possibility of searching in Gnostic material for overlaps in concepts. This would be an important area since so much of the material is at variance with typical orthodox understandings of Scripture. If, however, there are significant areas of overlap, then one may argue that they too were indebted to a certain traditional position that could help elucidate difficult doctrines. Finally, if one wished to include more patristic data, it is conceivable to move our dates by a few years. Yet, beyond AD 250 it becomes very questionable whether the Fathers were faithfully capturing an original understanding of a doctrine. This is mainly because the Jewish epicenter of the faith had by this time been replaced.

## Conclusion

Two men in white stood by the disciples at the ascension of Christ and said, “Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking up into heaven? This same Jesus, who has been taken from you into heaven, will come in the same way that you have seen him going into heaven” (Acts 1:11). What a shock this must have been for the disciples. Not just the fact that Jesus had ascended in front of their eyes, but the idea that he was now gone was sure to send them into a bit of a panic. How could it be that he had just come back from the dead but was now leaving them again? What was all this talk about being with them until the end of the age? The end of the age was supposed to be now. The kingdom was supposed to begin with Jesus after his resurrection. But why would the Lord simply abandon his disciples to wander about without him? The answer, though simple, made little sense to the disciples at the time. Jesus told them, “. . . if I don’t go away the Counselor will not come to you. If I go, I will send him to you” (John 16:7).

Like the first disciples, one of the temptations of modern theologians has been to focus upon the resurrected Jesus prior to his ascension. As though it were a necessary corollary to rising from the grave many argue that Jesus was raised in a state that we can look forward to having one day. The issue seems to be that if we do not maintain that Jesus’ resurrected body was somehow transformed from its original state, then he cannot truly be said to have raised. Instead, we would be required to think of Jesus as only being resuscitated. What is interesting about this is that there is no distinction in either of the Greek terms used for the resurrection of Christ. Plainly put Jesus is said to have risen bodily from the grave.<sup>296</sup> The distinction between a resurrection and a resuscitation is a philosophical point that is not required by the grammar of the

---

<sup>296</sup> After a thorough linguistic analysis, Wright concludes in a manner that supports this contention. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, 2008, 3:204.

NT. Besides, it is unnecessary to posit a fundamental alteration to Christ's make-up based upon a philosophical point, especially when a biblical answer rests so close at hand.

The answer comes from noting the specific way in which the term "resurrection" is used by Jesus: "For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage but are like angels in heaven" (Matt 22:30). Now, our focus should not drift to "being like angels" since this is clearly intended as an example of those who do not marry.<sup>297</sup> The pertinent issue is the usage of the definite article with "resurrection." It is in *the* resurrection that we will be a certain way. Jesus is speaking of a complex of events that is to take place. The resurrection is that time when believers are: yes, resurrected, but there is so much more. Paul tells us that we will all be radically changed within a moment (1 Cor 15:52), but this will not happen until the dead in Christ have *first* risen (1 Thess 4:16). The resurrection, then, is just the first stage in a series of things that will be granted unto those who have placed their faith in Christ. Glorification is what we are after. This is the finale to that event that started with the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. Just as he rose bodily, and then ascended to the Father where he was glorified (John 17:5), we too will taste of this glory (2 Pet 1:4).

---

<sup>297</sup> Perhaps it is from this verse that the misguided notion arose that believers will be granted wings in heaven. Not only does this overlook the point of the passage, but it also misunderstands the believer's state in heaven. This is an intermediate state that believers experience until the resurrection. For a more detailed analysis see C. P. Davis, "Revisiting the Afterlife: The Inadequacies of 'Heaven' and 'Hell,'" *Fidei et Veritatis: The Liberty University Journal of Graduate Research* 1, no. 1 (July 20, 2015).

## Bibliography

- Alston, William P. "Biblical Criticism and the Resurrection." In *The Resurrection: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Resurrection of Jesus*, edited by Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O'Collins, 148–83. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Andersen, F. I. "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Bachmann, Veronika. "Rooted in Paradise? The Meaning of the 'Tree of Life' in 1 Enoch 24—25 Reconsidered." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 19, no. 2 (December 1, 2009): 83–107.
- Bailey, Kenneth E. *Paul Through Mediterranean Eyes: Cultural Studies in 1 Corinthians*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011.
- Bartlett, John R., ed. *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees*. The Cambridge Bible Commentary: New English Bible. Cambridge: University Press, 1973.
- Bates, Michael W. "Beyond Hays's Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul: A Proposed Diachronic Intertextuality with Romans 10:16 as a Test Case." In *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation*, edited by Christopher D. Stanley, 263–91. Early Christianity and Its Literature. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.
- Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel. Mifflintown, PA: Sigler Press, 1996.
- Beale, G. K. *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Beckwith, Francis J. "History and Miracles." In *In Defense of Miracles: A Comprehensive Case for God's Action in History*, edited by R. Douglas Geivett and Gary R. Habermas, 86–98. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1997.
- Blackwell, Ben C. *Christosis: Engaging Paul's Soteriology with His Patristic Interpreters*. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2016.
- Blaising, Craig A. "The Day of the Lord: Theme and Pattern in Biblical Theology." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 169, no. 673 (January 2012): 3–19.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2007.
- Bonsirven, Joseph. *Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Jesus Christ*. Translated by William Wolf. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.

- Borchardt, Francis. "Reading Aid: 2 Maccabees and the History of Jason of Cyrene Reconsidered." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 47, no. 1 (2016): 71–87.
- Bruce, F. F. *Epistle to the Galatians*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2013.
- Bruce, F. F. "Inter-Testamental Literature." In *What Theologians Do*, edited by F. G. Healy. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1970.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.
- Carnley, Peter F. "Response." In *The Resurrection: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Resurrection of Jesus*, edited by Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O'Collins, 29–40. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Carson, D. A. *The Gospel according to John*. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1991.
- Chadwick, Henry. *The Early Church: The Story of Emergent Christianity from the Apostolic Age to the Dividing of the Ways between the Greek East and the Latin West*. Vol. 1. The Penguin History of the Church. London: Penguin Books, 1993.
- Chase, Mitchell L. "The Genesis of Resurrection Hope: Exploring Its Early Presence and Deep Roots." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 57, no. 3 (September 2014): 467–80.
- Chesnutt, Randall D. "Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 2069 and the Compositional History of 1 Enoch." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 129, no. 3 (September 2010): 485–505.
- Ciampa, Roy E., and Brian S. Rosner. "1 Corinthians." In *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, 695–752. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.
- . *The First Letter to the Corinthians*. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2010.
- Clement of Rome. "First Epistle to the Corinthians." In *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*, edited by Philip Schaff, Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson, Vol. 1. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1885.
- . "Second Epistle to the Corinthians." edited by Philip Schaff, Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson, Vol. 1. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1885.
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2nd ed. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998.



- Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. Edited by Daniel J. Harrington. Sacra Pagina Series, v. 7. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2006.
- Coogan, Michael David, ed. *The New Oxford Annotated Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Coogan, Michael David, and Daniel R. Schwartz, eds. "2 Maccabees." In *The New Oxford Annotated Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Daley, Brian E. "A Hope for Worms: Early Christian Hope." In *Resurrection: Theological and Scientific Assessments*, edited by Ted Peters, Robert J. Russell, and Michael Welker, 136–64. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Pub, 2002.
- Daley, Brian E. *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.
- Davis, C. P. "Revisiting the Afterlife: The Inadequacies of 'Heaven' and 'Hell.'" *Fidei et Veritatis: The Liberty University Journal of Graduate Research* 1, no. 1 (July 20, 2015).
- Davis, Stephen T. *Risen Indeed: Making Sense of the Resurrection*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993.
- . "'Seeing' the Risen Jesus." In *The Resurrection*, edited by Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O'Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Dehandschutter, Boudewijn. "The Epistle of Polycarp." In *The Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction*, edited by Wilhelm Pratscher, 117–33. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2010.
- DeSilva, David A. *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- deSilva, David A. *The Jewish Teachers of Jesus, James, and Jude: What Earliest Christianity Learned from the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- DeSilva, David A. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs as Witnesses to Pre-Christian Judaism: A Re-Assessment." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 23, no. 1 (September 1, 2013): 21–68.
- Dewart, Joanne E. McWilliam. *Death and Resurrection*. Message of the Fathers of the Church 22. Wilmington, DE: M. Glazier, 1986.
- Docherty, Susan E. *The Jewish Pseudepigrapha: An Introduction to the Literature of the Second Temple Period*, 2015.

- Doran, R. "2 Maccabees." In *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, edited by John Barton and John Muddiman. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Draper, Jonathan A. "Pure Sacrifice in Didache 14 as Jewish Christian Exegesis." *Neotestamentica* 42, no. 2 (2008): 223–52.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Evidence for Jesus*. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press, 1985.
- . *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998.
- Embry, Bradley. "The Psalms of Solomon and the New Testament: Intertextuality and the Need for a Re-Evaluation." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 13, no. 2 (October 2002): 99–136.
- Erickson, Millard J. *Christian Theology*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Revised Edition. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2014.
- Fisk, Bruce N. "Paul Among the Storytellers: Reading Romans 11 in the Context of Rewritten Bible." In *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation*, edited by Christopher D. Stanley, 55–94. Early Christianity and Its Literature. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A., ed. *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Yale Bible 32. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Franklyn, Paul N. "The Cultic and Pious Climax of Eschatology in the Psalms of Solomon." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 18, no. 1 (June 1987): 1–17.
- Friberg, Timothy, Barbara Friberg, and Neva F. Miller. *Analytical lexicon of the Greek New Testament*. Victoria, BC: Trafford, 2005.
- Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.
- Garrow, Alan John Philip. "The Eschatological Tradition behind 1 Thessalonians: Didache 16." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32, no. 2 (December 2009): 191–215.
- Geisler, Norman L. *The Battle for the Resurrection*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1989.
- Goldingay, John. *Isaiah*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2012.
- González, Justo L. *The Story of Christianity: The Early Church to the Reformation*. Vol. 1. New York: HarperCollins, 2010.

- Gorman, Michael J. *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology*. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2009.
- Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*. Translated by John Bowden. 2nd ed. Vol. 1. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.
- Habermas, Gary R. "Resurrection Claims in Non-Christian Religions." *Religious Studies* 25, no. 2 (June 1989): 167–77.
- . *The Resurrection*. Vol. 1. Joplin, MO: College Press, 2000.
- . *The Resurrection*. Vol. 2. Joplin, MO: College Press, 2000.
- . *The Risen Jesus & Future Hope*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003.
- Habermas, Gary R., and J. P. Moreland. *Beyond Death: Exploring the Evidence for Immortality*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1998.
- Hall, Christopher A. *Learning Theology with the Church Fathers*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2002.
- Hare, D. R. A. "The Lives of the Prophets." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- . *First Corinthians*. Interpretation, a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1997.
- Helyer, Larry R. *Exploring Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period: A Guide for New Testament Students*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2002.
- Henze, Matthias. "4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: Literary Composition and Oral Performance in First-Century Apocalyptic Literature." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 131, no. 1 (2012): 181–200.
- Horst, P. W. van der. "Pseudo-Phocylides." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Horst, Pieter van der. "Pseudo-Phocylides on the Afterlife: A Rejoinder to John J. Collins." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 35, no. 1 (January 1, 2004): 70–75.
- Hume, David. *An Enquiry Concerning the Human Understanding: And An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*. Clarendon Press, 1894.

- Ignatius of Antioch. "Epistle to the Smyrnaeans." In *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*, edited by Philip Schaff, Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson, Vol. 1. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1885.
- . "Epistle to the Trallians." In *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*, edited by Philip Schaff, Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson, Vol. 1. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1885.
- Irenaeus of Lyons. "Against Heresies." In *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*, edited by Philip Schaff, Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson, Vol. 1. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1885.
- Isaac, E. "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Jackson, T. Ryan. *New Creation in Paul's Letters: A Study of the Historical and Social Setting of a Pauline Concept*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2016.
- Justin. "The Writings of Justin Martyr." In *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*, edited by Philip Schaff, Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson, Vol. 1. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1885.
- Kaiser, Otto. *The Old Testament Apocrypha: An Introduction*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004.
- Kee, H. C. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Keener, Craig S. *Miracles: The Credibility of the New Testament Accounts*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Kendall, Daniel, and Gerald O'Collins. "The Uniqueness of the Easter Appearances." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54, no. 2 (April 1992): 287–307.
- Klijn, A. F. J. "Second Baruch." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Lake, Kirsopp, ed. "Didache." In *Apostolic Fathers*. Loeb Classical Library, 1912.
- Lane, William L. "Paul's Legacy from Pharisaism: Light from the Psalms of Solomon." *Concordia Journal* 8, no. 4 (July 1982): 130–38.
- Lea, Thomas D., and David Alan Black. *The New Testament: Its Background and Message*. 2nd ed. Nashville: B & H Academic, 2003.
- Licona, Mike. *The Resurrection of Jesus: A New Historiographical Approach*. Downers Grove; Nottingham: IVP Academic; Apollos, 2010.

- Litfin, Bryan M. *Getting to Know the Church Fathers: An Evangelical Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2007.
- Longman, Tremper. *Psalms: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, Volumes 15-16. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2014.
- Meek, Russell. "Intertextuality, Inner-Biblical Exegesis, and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Ethics of a Methodology." *Biblica* 95, no. 2 (2014): 280–91.
- Metzger, B. M. "A Suggestion Concerning the Meaning of 1 Cor. XV. 4b." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 8, no. 1 (1957): 118–23.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. New York, NY: American Bible Society, 1971.
- . *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Migliore, Daniel L. *Philippians and Philemon*. Belief: A Theological Commentary on the Bible. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014.
- Miller, Stephen R. *Daniel*. The New American Commentary 18. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994.
- Moltmann, Jürgen. *The Coming of God: Christian Eschatology*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.
- Morris, Leon. *I Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2008.
- . *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*. The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries 7. Leicester; Grand Rapids: Inter-Varsity Press; Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1983.
- Nanos, Mark D., and Magnus Zetterholm, eds. "The Question of Conceptualization: Qualifying Paul's Position on Circumcision in Dialogue with Josephus's Advisors to King Izates." In *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle*, 105–52. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015.
- Nestle, Eberhard, and Erwin Nestle. *Novum testamentum Graece*. Edited by Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger. 28th revised edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015.
- Newman, Carey C. "Resurrection as Glory: Divine Presence and Christian Origins." In *The Resurrection: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Resurrection of Jesus*, edited by Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O'Collins, 59–89. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*. Edited by Klaus Baltzer. Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- . *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- . *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
- . *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*. Expanded. Harvard Theological Studies 56. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E., and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*. Edited by Klaus Baltzer. Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Nir, Rivkah. *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*. Early Judaism and Its Literature, no. 20. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- Norris Jr., Richard A. “Irenaeus of Lyon.” In *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, edited by Frances M. Young, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth, 45–52. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- O’Collins, Gerald. *Believing in the Resurrection: The Meaning and Promise of the Risen Jesus*. New York: Paulist Press, 2012.
- . *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*. Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1973.
- O’Dell, Jerry. “The Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon (Re-Evaluated in the Light of the Qumran Texts).” *Revue de Qumrân* 3, no. 2 (10) (1961): 241–57.
- Owens, Mark D. *As It Was in the Beginning: An Intertextual Analysis of New Creation in Galatians, 2 Corinthians, and Ephesians*. Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2015.
- Paget, James Carleton. “Paul and the Epistle of Barnabas.” *Novum Testamentum* 38, no. 4 (October 1996): 359–81.
- Papandrea, James Leonard. *Reading the Early Church Fathers: From the Didache to Nicaea*. New York: Paulist Press, 2012.
- Philo. “Allegorical Interpretation.” translated by Charles Duke Yonge. London, 1890.

- Polycarp. "Epistle to the Philippians." In *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*, edited by Phillip Schaff, Vol. 1. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Christian Classics Ethereal Library, 1885.
- Purtill, Richard L. "Defining Miracles." In *In Defense of Miracles: A Comprehensive Case for God's Action in History*, edited by R. Douglas Geivett and Gary R. Habermas, 61–72. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1997.
- Quasten, Johannes. *The Beginnings of Patristic Literature*. Patrology 1. Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1992.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "2 Enoch and the Trajectories of Jewish Cosmology: From Mesopotamian Astronomy to Greco-Egyptian Philosophy in Roman Egypt." *The Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 22, no. 1 (January 24, 2014): 1–24.
- Richardson, Cyril C., ed. "Didache." In *Early Christian Fathers*, Vol. 1. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953.
- Routledge, Robin. *Old Testament Theology: A Thematic Approach*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2012.
- Sandy, D. Brent. *Plowshares & Pruning Hooks: Rethinking the Language of Biblical Prophecy and Apocalyptic*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2002.
- Schaff, Philip, Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson, eds. "Epistle of Barnabas." In *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*, Vol. 1. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1885.
- Schneider, Bernardin V. "Corporate Meaning and Background of 1 Cor 15:45b." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29, no. 3 (July 1967): 450–67.
- Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*: Edited by Geza Vermes. Vol. 3. London: T & T Clark International, 1986.
- . *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*: Edited by Geza Vermes. Vol. 2. London: T & T Clark International, 1986.
- Schwarz, Hans. *Eschatology*. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2000.
- Scott, J. Julius. *Jewish Backgrounds of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2000.
- Shelton, W. Brian. "Irenaeus." In *Shapers of Christian Orthodoxy: Engaging with Early and Medieval Theologians*, edited by Bradley G. Green, 15–63. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2010.
- Smith, Gary V. "Isaiah 65-66: The Destiny of God's Servants in a New Creation." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 171, no. 681 (January 2014): 42–51.

- Spittler, R. P. "Testament of Job." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Stott, John R. W. *Letters of John*. Vol. 19. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2009.
- . *The Message of Acts*. The Bible Speaks Today. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1994.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." In *Early Judaism: A Comprehensive Overview*, edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow, 179–203. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2012.
- Taylor, Mark. *1 Corinthians*. Vol. 28. New American Commentary. Broadman & Holman, 2014.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000.
- Thornhill, A. Chadwick. *The Chosen People: Election, Paul, and Second Temple Judaism*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2015.
- Tiller, Patrick A. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch*. Early Judaism and Its Literature 4. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Troeltsch, Ernst. *On the Historical and Dogmatic Methods in Theology*. Translated by Jack Forstman. Vol. 2. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1913.
- Turner, David L. *Matthew*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Varner, William. "The Didache 'Apocalypse' and Matthew 24." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 165, no. 659 (July 2008): 309–22.
- Vaughan, Curtis. In *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Resurrection*. New York: Doubleday, 2008.
- Walton, John H. *Genesis*. The NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001.
- Ware, James P. "Paul's Understanding of the Resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15:36-54." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 133, no. 4 (2014): 809–35.
- Werline, Rodney A. "The Formation of the Pious Person." In *The Psalms of Solomon: Language, History, Theology*, edited by Eberhard Bons and Patrick Pouchelle, 133–54. Society of Biblical Literature. Early Judaism and Its Literature, no. 40. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.



- Willett, Tom W. *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha 4. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Wright, N. T. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. Vol. 4. Christian Origins and the Question of God. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.
- . *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Vol. 3. Christian Origins and the Question of God. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.
- . *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Vol. 3. Christian Origins and the Question of God. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.
- Wright, R. B. "Psalms of Solomon." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Yarbrough, Robert W. *1-3 John*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Baker Academic, 2008.
- Zangenberg, Jürgen K. "Archaeology, Papyri, and Inscriptions." In *Early Judaism: A Comprehensive Overview*, edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow, 322–66. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2012.
- Zetterholm, Magnus. "Paul within Judaism: The State of the Questions." In *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle*, edited by Mark D. Nanos and Magnus Zetterholm, 31–52. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015.