The general resurrection of the dead in the synoptic gospels*

Carlos Blanco-Pérez**
Universidad Pontificia Comillas
Madrid, España

Para citar este artículo: Blanco-Pérez, Carlos. «The general resurrection of the dead in the synoptic gospels». *Franciscanum* 177, Vol. 64 (2022): 1-29.

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to analyze the idea of general resurrection of the dead at the end of times in the synoptic Gospels. We intend to clarify whether this concept can be interpreted as a transposition of the parallel belief contained in some intertestamental writings, or if the singularity of the religious experience expressed in the synoptic Gospels establishes an inexorable moment of discontinuity with the previous apocalyptic framework, making it impossible to understand this doctrine on the sole basis of its Jewish precedents. In order to accomplish our goal, we shall first study the general resurrection of the dead in the Q source, the references to this notion in the gospel of Mark, and its meaning in both Matthew and Luke. We will exclude from our treatment all the topics related with the resurrection of Jesus, and we will be focused on the explicit mentions of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead as such. Since implicit beliefs are always difficult to assess, especially in the context of eschatological ideas, in which vagueness and absence of a systematic effort of exposition often prevail, we will not allude to other synoptic passages which have been regarded as potential expressions of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead at the end of times.

Keywords

Resurrection, synoptic, eschatology, apocalypticism, Judaism.

La resurrección general de los muertos en los evangelios sinópticos

Resumen

Este artículo tiene como objetivo analizar la idea de la resurrección general de los muertos al final de los tiempos en los Evangelios sinópticos. Pretendemos esclarecer si este concepto puede interpretarse como una transposición de la creencia paralela que aparece en algunos escritos intertestamentarios, o si la singularidad de la experiencia religiosa recogida

* This paper is the result of a Visiting Fellowship at Harvard University (2009-2011), funded by Caja Madrid scholarship, and the following study of the philosophical and theological dimensions of Jewish eschatology.

** Doctor en filosofía, doctor en teología, licenciado en química. Universidad Pontificia Comillas, Madrid (España). Orcid: 0000-0002-8161-6178. Contacto: cbperez@comillas.edu.

en los sinópticos marca un punto de discontinuidad con el marco apocalíptico previo, lo que imposibilitaría entender esta doctrina sólo desde sus precedentes judíos. Para ello, primero estudiaremos la resurrección general de los muertos en la fuente Q, las referencias a esta noción en Marcos, así como su significado en Mateo y Lucas. Excluiremos de nuestro estudio todos los temas relacionados con la resurrección de Jesús, para centrarnos en las menciones explícitas de la doctrina de la resurrección de los muertos en cuanto tal. Dado que las creencias implícitas siempre son difíciles de evaluar, especialmente en el contexto de las ideas escatológicas, donde la vaguedad y la ausencia de un esfuerzo sistemático suelen prevalecer, no haremos alusión a otros pasajes sinópticos que han sido contemplados como expresiones potenciales de la doctrina de la resurrección de los muertos al final de los tiempos.

Palabras clave
Resurrección, sinóptica, escatología, apocalíptica, judaísmo.

1. Terminological clarification: the meaning of resurrection

First, it is necessary to offer a terminological remark[1]on the different eschatological doctrines[2] which can be found in late II Temple Judaism[3]. We will be working with the following classification[4]:

[1] References to intertestamental literature will be based on J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Biblical quotations will be taken from the *New King James Version* (1982). References to the Hebrew Bible will be taken from R. Kittel (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. References to the Septuagint will be taken from A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes edidit Alfred Rahlfs*. The Greek and Hebrew words are taken from Bible Works 5.0.

[2] B. Rigaux distinguishes two methods of study of Jesus' preaching on the resurrection of the dead: the analysis of those texts which explicitly mention the resurrection of the dead and the examination of the central doctrines of the message of Jesus which «*encadrent*» these mentions: *Dieu l'a Ressucité. Exégése et Théologie Biblique* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1973), 23. However, since the second methodology essentially works with a hypothetical statement, we think that it is more convenient to limit our analysis to the explicit, terminological mentions of the general resurrection itself. Given the vagueness of eschatological doctrines in late II Temple Judaism, it would be extremely risky to postulate statements of one of the different possible eschatological doctrines, like resurrection, in those passages in which we only have an affirmation of some sort of existence after death, with no greater specification on the ways in which such a new form of life could be achieved.

[3] For an alternative classification into sixteen categories, cf. J.H. Charlesworth ed., *Resurrection: the Origin and Future of a Biblical Doctrine* (New York: T and T Clark, 2006), 1-19. However, Charlesworth's classification is excessively detailed. For example, it differentiates between the various types of resurrection on the basis of their *Sitz im Leben*. We think that it is more didactic to offer a conceptual classification, although it is true that the vagueness with which many intertestamental authors approach the topic of the afterlife seems to suggest that they tend to be concerned with the general statement about some sort of survival after death, not so much with an «analytic» penetration into the implications of their assertions.

[4] See Carlos Alberto Blanco, *Why Resurrection? An Introduction to the Belief in the Afterlife in Judaism and Christianity* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2011); Carlos Alberto Blanco, «Hipótesis principales sobre el origen de la idea de resurrección de los muertos en el judaísmo», *Estudios bíblicos* 4, Vol. 68 (2010): 429-472; Carlos Alberto Blanco, «La escatología apocalíptica y sus posibles influjos exógenos», *Cristianesimo nella storia* 2, Vol. 32 (2011); Carlos Alberto Blanco, *El pensamiento de la apocalíptica judía. Ensayo filosófico-teológico* (Madrid: Editorial Trotta, 2013); Carlos Alberto Blanco, «Resurrección, apocalíptica, historia:

1) Collective restoration: eschatology, from this perspective, means the return of the people of Israel to life, without a direct reference to the fate of the individual human being.
2) Individual resurrection (of spirit and/or flesh): eschatology is focused on the return of the individual to life. At the end of times, a victory over death will take place. Death is not denied: it is overcome. Individual resurrection may affect the spirit alone (the person dies but her spirit revives) or the body, too (the whole person revives).
3) (Spiritual) persistence: there is a continuation of life after death, but it is circumscribed to the spirit or soul (which we shall take as equivalent concepts in their broader meanings) in a rather vague way (normally, there is no accuracy concerning the issue of whether this persistence is due to a victory over death –recalling resurrection- or to the intrinsic capacity of the spirit itself –immortality of the soul). Death is relativized, given that it only affects the corporeal element.
4) Realized eschatology: eschatology is anticipated in the *hic et nunc* of the present life. The future dimension is eclipsed by the present experience of the fullness of the *eskhaton.*

It is important to notice that the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead adopts different levels of meaning in intertestamental literature:[5]

1) Resurrection as expression of divine sovereignty (as in 2 Baruch).
2) Resurrection as response to the longing for justice (as in Daniel).
3) Resurrection as instrument for enjoying divine presence, may it be through future or realized eschatology (as in the Testament of Job).

emergencia y desarrollo de la idea de resurrección en el judaísmo del II Templo», *Excerpta e Dissertationibus in Sacra Theologia* 3, Vol. LX (2013): 188-275.

[5] For a detailed analysis of the principal intertestamental writings with references to the belief in the resurrection of the dead and the levels of signification played in each case, cf. R. Martin-Achard, *De la Mort à la Résurrection, d'aprés l'Ancien Testament* (Delachaux et Niestlé, 1956); G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity* (Cambridge: Harvard Divinity School Theological Studies, 2006); H.C.C. Cavallin, *Life after Death: Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead*, vol. I (Lund: Gleerup, 1974); K. Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986); É. Puech, *La Croyance des Essèniens en la Vie Future: Immortalité, Résurrection, Vie Éternelle? Histoire d'une Croyance dans le Judaîsme Ancien* (Paris: J. Gabalda et compagnie, 1993); S. Raphael, *Jewish Views of the Afterlife* (North Vale: J. Aronson, 1994); J.D. Levenson, *Resurrection and the Restoration of Israel* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006); R. Martin-Achard, «Résurrection (A.T., Judaïsme)», (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1985); H.C.C. Cavallin, «Leben nach dem Tode im Spätjudentum und im frühen Christentum. I: Spätjudentum», *Aufstieg und Niedergang der romischen Welt II*, 1, Vol 19 (1979): 240-345; G. Stemberger, «Auferstehung. I/2: Judentum», *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 4 (1979/1993): 441-450; J. Kremer, «Auferstehung. IV: Im Neuen Testament», *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche 1* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993); P. Hoffmann, «Auferstehung. I/3: Im Neuen Testament», *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 4 (1979/1993): 450-467; F. Bovon, «The Soul's Comeback: Immortality and Resurrection in Early Christianity», *Harvard Theological Review* 4, Vol. 103 (2010): 387-406.

4) Resurrection as step towards the final consummation of history (as in the Book of Biblical Antiquities).
5) Resurrection as condition for the radical transformation of the world (as in the Sibylline Oracles).
6) Resurrection as exaltation of the just (as in 1 Enoch 51).
7) Resurrection as exaltation of the martyrs (as in 2 Maccabees).
8) Resurrection as exaltation of Israel (as in Testament of Judah).
9) Resurrection as tool of consolation in times of disturb (as in 4 Ezra).

Many of them often overlap (e.g. the exaltation of the just usually includes the exaltation of the martyrs), and most texts, like Dan 12, tend to adopt different levels of signification. The most immediate one is that of resurrection as response to the fundamental problem of theodicy (the longing for justice). In fact, the reinterpretation of Ezek 37 in terms of individual resurrection might be as early as the Pseudo-Ezekiel in Qumran (4Q385-388, 391), generally dated back to the 2nd c. B.C., whose principal theological motivation is the problem of the reward of the just people.[6]

Given the lack of accurateness and systematicity which is often found in intertestamental eschatology, it seems reasonable to pose at least three questions concerning each of the specific citations of the idea of resurrection that may be the subject of our analysis:

1) Is it the expression of the collective restoration of the people of God, or does it refer to an individual act of resurrection at the end of times?
2) Does it affect the corporeal dimension of the human being, or can it be understood as expression of some sort of spiritual resurrection, which does not elucidate the fate of the body?
3) Even if it constitutes a form of resurrection in an individual sense, is it meant to be universal, or only a selective group of people (like martyrs, patriarchs, and *maskilim*) will participate in it?

Thus, we have three principal categories to which we must pay attention: the reality of the resurrection, its nature, and its scope.

2. Resurrection in the Q source

[6] Cf. F. García Martínez, «The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Dead Sea Scrolls», in F. García Martínez – M. Vervenne eds., *Interpreting Translations: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 170.

It is almost generally agreed[7] that eschatology plays a central role in the Q source[8]. Together with the sapiential speeches of Q, we find an important number of sayings related with «the announcement of judgement»[9].

[7] However, according to J.S. Kloppenborg, in Q, «the dominant mode of address is sapiential, not prophetic», *The Formation of Q. Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 321. The original composition of Q would have been in terms of a wisdom book, whereas the redaction (or redactions) would introduce apocalyptic sayings. cf. J.S. Kloppenborg, «Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q», *Harvard Theological Review* 3, Vol. 80 (1987): 287-306. Authors like Ch. Carlston also suggest that wisdom is a basic element of the theology of Q. Cf. «Wisdom and Eschatology in Q», In J. Delobel ed., *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus = The Sayings of Jesus: Memorial Joseph Coppens* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982), 101-119, as it had been remarked by J.M. Robinson. Cf. «Logoi Sophon: On the Gattung of Q», in J.M. Robinson – H. Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 71-113. According to Kloppenborg, «Q is not an apocalypse nor does it contain one», «Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q» 291. It is clear, in any case, that there is no sufficient reason to equate apocalyptic to eschatology (even without endorsing all of his conclusions, a merit of Ch. Rowland's work is to have been able to draw a solid distinction between apocalyptic –emphasising the element of revelation from above- and eschatology; cf. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982); for a critique of Rowland, cf. A.Y. Collins, «Review of *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*», *Journal of Biblical Literature* 3, Vol. 103 (1984): 465-467. According to Kloppenborg, a «present eschatology» prevails in Q, «Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q», 296, and the centrality of this «realized eschatology» is more important than the occasional references to elements which, prima facie, might suggest an apocalyptic background (like the mention of angels in Q 12:8-9, daemons in Q 11:14-26, Parusia in Q 3:17 and 17:26-30, the eschatological meal in 13:28-29, etc.). In any case, it seems that Kloppenborg is clearly underestimating passages like Q 17:23-24, 17: 37, 17:26-27, 17:34-35, which, according to him, do not necessarily correspond to an eschatological struggle but to a criticism of «the security of the everyday», «Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q», 305, so that «while Q employs apocalyptic language, it does not fully share the situation of anomie which impels apocalypticism towards its vision of a transformed future» and «in Q, apocalyptic language becomes the servant of an ethic of antistructure and a tool for boundary definition», «Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q», 306. However, the fact of acknowledging the difficulties associated with the attribution of Q to the apocalyptic genre is different from admitting the centrality of the eschatological element itself, which can be hardly denied.

[8] Qualifying Kloppenborg's thesis, H. Koester remarks that it is «unlikely that Q was a wisdom document with a pure wisdom message that stood at the beginning of the redaction history of Q», H. Koester, *From Jesus to the Gospels. Interpreting the New Testament in Its Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 254, for the inaugural sermon (Q 6:20-49) «shows a tension between eschatological prophecy (as distinct from 'radical wisdom') and the designs of wisdom instruction», H. Koester, *From Jesus to the Gospels. Interpreting the New Testament in Its Context*, 254. And, as Koester points out, «it is hardly possible to assume that an ancient author (…) would strictly adhere to a definition of a literary genre that is, after all, the product of modern scholarship». H. Koester, *From Jesus to the Gospels. Interpreting the New Testament in Its Context*, 254. The strongest argument against Kloppenborg's thesis is, precisely, the abundance of eschatological passages, not only in quantity (an aspect that, methodologically, might be persuasive, yet not definitive in the attempt at identifying the genre of Q) but especially in «quality»: they reflect a combination of prophetic (like Q 7: 18-19.22-23) and apocalyptic (like 17:23-24) theological elements. Against any possible attribution of these and other pericopes to a later redaction which would have been added to the earlier, sapiential form, Koester argues that three observations seem to support the idea of a more explicitly eschatological orientation of the earliest composition of Q: sayings that are not characteristic of the theology of the redactor are found in these 'secondary sections', sayings with parallels in the Gospel of Thomas appear not only in sections assigned by Kloppenborg to the first stage of Q, but occasionally in the sections assigned to the redactor, too, and a number of sayings in Kloppenborg's original wisdom book Q are in fact prophetic sayings (cf. op. cit., 257). An example of the last statement is Q 12:8-9 (with parallels in Matt 10:32-33 and Luke12:8-9, similar to Mark 8:38, too), which

Nevertheless, the pre-eminence of eschatology does not entail an equally binding prevalence of the belief in the resurrection of the dead at the end of times[10]. Eschatology may be focused on the importance of divine judgement, without explicitly mentioning resurrection as the way of accessing such a final judgement. The relevance of the eschatological element in Q is visible in passages like 3:7-9, 3:16-17, 6:43-45, 10:14, 11:16.29-30.32, 11:48.49, 12:49.51-53, 12:56, 13:24, 13:29, 13:30, 13:34-35, 14:27, 17:20-21, 22:28.30. The coexistence of these verses with passages of ethical nature and, within eschatological ideas themselves, the ambivalence of the «eschatological model» makes it difficult to elucidate the kind of eschatology that the author is endorsing[11]. For example, we find, in some cases, a theology which is reminiscent of the so-called «theology of the two ways»[12], in others, a more apocalyptic tone about the imminence of divine judgement that is, nonetheless, qualified by passages like Q 17:21, in which we are told that the kingdom will not come in a spectacular way).

Kloppenborg attributes to the redacto. Cf. J.S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q. Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*, 207-208, among other reasons because it uses the title of «Son of Man», but Koester shows that in Q there is no identification between Jesus and the Son of Man. Unlike Matthew -10:32-33- and Mark -8:38; cf. H. Koester, «Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels» 112-114; H. Koester, *From Jesus to the Gospels. Interpreting the New Testament in Its Context*, 257; H. Schürmann, «Beobachtungen zum Menschensohn-Titel in der Redequelle», in R. Pesch – R. Schnackenburg eds., *Jesus und der Menschensohn: für Anton Vögtle* (Freisburg im Bresgau: Herder, 1975), 124-197. As Koester remarks, «the original version of Q insists that the ways of the kingdom of God are becoming a reality in the conduct and experience of the disciples because they fall on the voice of an eschatological prophet who announces the presence of the kingdom in the midst», *From Jesus to the Gospels. Interpreting the New Testament in Its Context*, 261-262. Jesus is, therefore, an eschatological prophet. Kloppenborg himself has admitted the relevance of the eschatological orientation in the original composition of Q. Cf. «The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus» 337-339, something that leaves room for acknowledging the «diversity of the tradition of Jesus' sayings and for the wide distribution at an early formative stage». H. Koester, *From Jesus to the Gospels. Interpreting the New Testament in Its Context*, 252, as the fact that sayings present in Q 6:20-46 are also found in the letters of Paul. Cf. H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: their History and Development* (London: SCM Press, 1990), 52-55. Even such a hypothetically quintessential example of a sapiential text in the original composition of Q as the inaugural sermon includes explicit references to the similarity of the disciples of Jesus with the prophets of ancient times (cf. Q 6:23), in analogy with the image of a prophet-martyr, like in Daniel and 2 Maccabees.

[9] Cf. J.S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q. Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*, 102-170.

[10] For a discussion of the problem of the scope of eschatology in Q, especially in relation with the Easter faith, cf. J.S. Kloppenborg, «'Easter Faith' and the Sayings Gospel Q», *Semeia* 49 (1990): 71-100; E. Schillebeeckx, *Jesus: An Experiment in Christology* (New York: Seabury Press, 1979), 409ss. For an alternative view, cf. N.T. Wright, «Resurrection in Q?». In D.G. Horrell – Ch. M. Tuckett eds., *Christology, Controversy and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 85-97.

[11] A vivid contradiction occurs between the statements contained in a pericope of the so-called «Logia Apocalypse» that of Q 17:23-24, in which it seems that the coming of the kingdom will take place in spectacular ways, and Q 17:20-21, a passage that explicitly denies this possibility. Could it constitute an attempt at integrating different conceptions about the coming of the kingdom? It is difficult to know.

[12] Examples of the so-called «theology of the two ways» in intertestamental literature can be found in Testament of Aser 1:3-8 and Testament of Judah 20:1-5. Cf. K.M. Woschitz, *Parabiblica. Studien zur jüdischen Literatur in der hellenistisch-römischen Epoche* (Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2005), 384-388.

The only explicit mentions of the term «resurrection» in the Q source appear in Q 7:22 and Q 11:31-32.

a) Q 7:22: «Go report to John what you hear and see: the blind regain their sight and the lame walk around, the skin-diseased are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised, and the poor are evangelized»[13]. This text has parallels in Matt 11:2-6 and Luke 7:18-19.22-23[14].

In all three cases, the word used to express the notion of resurrection is ἐγείρονται. In the Septuagint translation of Dan 12:2, the term was ἀναστήσονται, which also appears in Isa 26:19 (together with ἐγερθήσονται), 2 Macc 7:9, 7:14, Testament of Judah 25:1-4a.4b, Psalm of Solomon 3:12, Testament of Job 40:4, and in some other Septuagint readings of passages of the Hebrew text which, in principle, lack eschatological connotations, like Ps 1:5 and Job 19:26[15]. The verb ἐγείρω appears in texts like Isa 26:19, Testament of Abraham[16], and Testament of Job 4:9. The profusion of terms regarding the action of «raising» and its potential eschatological connotations which can be found in the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint, and intertestamental writings indicates that there was no systematic effort to unify the lexical field in accordance with a well defined set of theological categories.

There is an inherent lack of accuracy in many texts, so that it is very complicated to clarify whether they are referring to a physical resurrection or to a vague spiritual resurrection of the dead[17]. Passages like Isa 26:19 have been usually included under the label of «collective restoration of the nation», rather than being understood as formal expressions of

---

[13] Cf. J. M. Robinson – P. Hoffmann – J. S. Kloppenborg eds., *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 7:22.

[14] «And when John had heard in prison about the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples and said to Him, "Are You the Coming One, or do we look for another?" Jesus answered and said to them, Go and tell John the things which you hear and see: The blind see and the lame walk; the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear; the dead are raised up and the poor have the gospel preached to them. And blessed is he who is not offended because of me» (Matt 11:2-6). «Then the disciples of John reported to him concerning all these things. And John, calling two of his disciples to him, sent them to Jesus, saying, Are You the Coming One, or do we look for another? (…). Jesus answered and said to them, Go and tell John the things you have seen and heard: that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, the poor have the gospel preached to them. And blessed is he who is not offended because of Me» (Luke 7:18-19.22-23).

[15] For analysis of the «suspicions» generated by a hypothetical «pro-eschatological» reading of certain passages of the Hebrew Bible in the Septuagint, cf. J. Schaper, Eschatology in the Greek Psalter (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995), 143ss.; H.C.C. Cavallin, *Life after Death: Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15*, vol. I, 103ss.; D.H. Gard, «The concept of the future life according to the Greek translation of the Book of Job», *Journal of Biblical Literature* 73 (1959): 137-143; R. Tournay, «Relectures bibliques concernants la vie future et l'angélologie», *Révue Biblique* 69 (1962): 489-495.

[16] D.C. Allison, *Testament of Abraham* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 2003), recension B, chapter 7: τοτε γαρ εγερθησεται πασα σαρξ. Cf. É. Puech, *La Croyance des Essèniens en la Vie Future: Immortalité, Résurrection, Vie Éternelle ? Histoire d'une Croyance dans le Judaïsme Ancien*, vol. I, 145.

[17] Cf. H.C.C. Cavallin, *Life after Death: Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15*, vol. I, 199-201.

the belief in the individual resurrection of the dead at the end of times[18], whereas Dan 12:2 is, for most scholars, a statement of the resurrection of the dead in an individual and corporeal sense[19]. Testament of Job could be interpreted as endorsing an individual resurrection of the dead[20], whereas Testament of Abraham poses serious questions on whether there is an actual allusion to the act of «resurrecting», not only a vague expression of some sort of spiritual persistence (which does not necessarily entail dying and rising from the dead later)[21]. A similar remark could be done about the Psalms of Solomon[22].

Within the Q source, the verb ἐγείρω appears, in addition to the already quoted 7:22, in the following cases: Q 3:8 (with parallels in Matt 3:7-10 and Luke 3:7-9), 7:28 (with parallels in Matt 11:7-11 and Luke 7:24-28), 11:31 (with parallels in Matt 12:41-42 and Luke 11:31-32), and possibly Q 13:25 (with parallels in Matt 25:12 and Luke 13:25). In all the cases, it has a «physical» connotation, referring to the act of «rising», although in Q 11:31 it seems to point to an eschatological dimension, as we shall examine later.

In Q 7:22, the resurrection of the dead appears as one of the six signs of the arrival of the «coming one». Since the act of «rising from the dead» is put next to a set of physical healings and before the evangelization of the poor, it is reasonable to suppose that the idea of resurrection has no eschatological dimension. Rather, it points to a resurrection within the parameters of the current life, as those performed by Elijah and Elisa: the ability to revive people, without releasing them from the chains of death into a final, definitive life. Cf. 1 Kgs 17:17-24, 2 Kgs 4:18-37[23]. There seems to be a clear subordination of the act of resurrection itself to the inauguration of the kingdom that has taken place through the ministry of Jesus. Therefore, resurrection would be subordinated to the announcement of the kingdom, fulfilling a «subsidiary» role: that of expressing the power of the new life in the kingdom.

[18] Cf. W.R. Millar, *Isaiah 24-27 and the Origin of Apocalyptic* (Cambridge: Scholars Press for the Harvard Semitic Museum, 1976), 103-120; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*, 42. For the criticism of an interpretation in terms of «collective restoration» cf. É. Puech, *La Croyance des Essèniens en la Vie Future: Immortalité, Résurrection, Vie Éternelle ? Histoire d'une Croyance dans le Judaïsme Ancien*, 71.

[19] Cf. J.H. Charlesworth ed., *Resurrection: the Origin and Future of a Biblical Doctrine*, 24-26.

[20] However, the Testament of Job seems to combine, in a rather ambiguous way, both the statement of corporeal resurrection and that of spiritual persistence of the soul, mixing different eschatological approaches without any clear attempt of integration. Cf. H.C.C. Cavallin, *Life after Death: Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15*, vol. I, 162.

[21] Cf. É. Puech, *La Croyance des Essèniens en la Vie Future : Immortalité, Résurrection, Vie Éternelle ? Histoire d'une Croyance dans le Judaïsme Ancien*, 145.

[22] G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*, 167.

[23] A similar remark could be done not only about the synoptic episode of the daughter of Jairus but also regarding texts like Mark 6:14-16, Matt 14:1-2, and Luke 9:7-8, in which we are told that Herod thought that Jesus was John the Baptist who had risen from the dead. Cf. A. Torres Queiruga, *Repensar la Resurrección. La Diferencia Cristiana en la Continuidad de las Religiones y de la Cultura* (Madrid: Trotta, 2003), 71. On the resurrections of the daughter of Jairus and the son of the widow of Naim, cf. S. Sabugal, *Anastasis: Resucitó y Resucitaremos* (Madrid: BAC, 1993), 90-207. Since we are primarily interested in the general resurrection of the dead as such, we shall not analyze these and similar passages.

Also, the fact that this resurrection is accompanied by a series of physical prodigies (like allowing those who are blind to see) might recall a physical act, not just a spiritual «healing», an implication which is not necessarily entailed by the use of the verb ἐγείρω (at least from the perspective of intertestamental literature, because Testament of Abraham uses it, even though it is not clear whether it is actually referring to a physical resurrection *stricto sensu*)[24].

As Kloppenborg remarks, the pericope of Q 7:22-23 depends on Isa 61:1-2[25], 42:7[26], 35:5[27], and 29:18-19[28]. The acts of restoring sight and evangelizing the poor are prophetic signs, according to Isa 61:1-2[29], as it is raising the dead and healing the lepers (cf. 1 Kgs 17:17-24, 2 Kgs 4:18-37). However, the cleansing of lepers does not appear in Isaiah at all. Kloppenborg suggests that the pericope might be a «post-Easter interpretation of Jesus' deeds as evidence of the presence of the kingdom»[30]. In any case, and beyond the problems associated with any attempt of attributing this pericope to Jesus himself, it seems clear that its reference to the resurrection of the dead is not necessarily connected with an eschatological meaning. Rather, it is a sign of prophetic authority inspired by the great prophets of the Hebrew Bible (like Elijah and Isaiah). Any potential eschatological element would have become present in the preaching of the kingdom by Jesus, who is «the expected one»[31]. The prophet serves the announcement of the kingdom, and his deeds operate in function of such a reality.

b) Q 11:31-32: «The queen of the south will be raised at the judgement with this generation and condemn it, for she came from the ends of the earth to listen to the wisdom of Solomon, and look, something more than Solomon is here! Ninevite men will arise at the judgement with this generation and condemn it. For they repented at the announcement of

[24] G. Rochais speaks in terms of intra-historical, not eschatological resurrection. Cf. *Les Récits de Résurrection des Morts dans le Nouveau Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 190. Rochais offers a detailed analysis of the episodes of the resurrection of the widow of Naïm and Jairus' daughter in comparison with Elijah's and Elisa's miracles.

[25] «The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor; He has sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to those who are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all who mourn».

[26] «I, the Lord, have called You in righteousness, and will hold your hand; I will keep you and give you as a covenant to the people, as a light to the gentiles, to open blind eyes, to bring out prisoners from the prison, those who sit in darkness from the prison house». Cf. also Isa 42:18: «Hear, you deaf; and look, you blind, that you may see».

[27] «Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped». Cf. also Isa 35:6a: «Then the lame shall leap like a deer, and the tongue of the dumb sing».

[28] «In that day the deaf shall hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind shall see out of obscurity and out of darkness. The humble also shall increase their joy in the Lord, and the poor among men shall rejoice In the Holy One of Israel».

[29] Cf. R. Pesch, *Jesu ureigene Taten? Ein Beitrag zur Wunderfrage* (Freiburg: Herder, 1970), 36-44.

[30] J. S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q. Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*, 108.

[31] Cf. S. Schulz, *Q-Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972), 229-230.

Jonah, and look, something more than Jonah is here»[32]. The synoptic parallels are Matt 12:41-42 and Luke 11:31-32[33].

In Q 11:31-32, we are told that «the queen of the south» will be raised (ἐγερθήσονται) in the judgement (ἐν τῇ κρίσει), and the men of Nineveh will also arise (ἀναστήσονται). The alternation of both verbs keeps resonances of the Septuagint version of Isa 26:19[34]. However, in the latter the order is the inverse: ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροί, καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις. The use of one verb or the other seems to be indifferent, thereby showing that both are interchangeable in similar contexts, so that the choice of one or another does not add any significant theological variation[35].

The most relevant feature of this passage is the strong connection that it establishes between resurrection and ethics. Resurrection is subordinated to divine judgement, in which justice will be finally delivered. However, it is not clear whether the explicit reference to certain specific personalities (the queen of the south and the men of Nineveh) involves the idea of a pre-eminent order in the resurrection, as we shall see later in the dispute with the Sadducees in the Gospel of Mark. The mention of both the queen of the south and the men of Nineveh may act as illustration of the magnitude of present faults, the insurmountable nature of divine judgement, and the inexorability of conversion.

The fact that the eschatological element plays a significant role in Q, together with the relative absence of clear references to the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead in an equally eschatological sense (that is to say, as resurrection at the end of times), indicate that the source of sayings used by Matthew and Luke did not attribute a central role to this belief.

---

[32] Cf. J. M. Robinson – P. Hoffmann – J. S. Kloppenborg eds., *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas*, 11:31-32.

[33] «The men of Nineveh will rise up in the judgment with this generation and condemn it, because they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and indeed a greater than Jonah is here. The queen of the South will rise up in the judgment with this generation and condemn it, for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and indeed a greater than Solomon is here» (Matt 12:41-42). «The queen of the South will rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation and condemn them, for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and indeed a greater than Solomon is here. The men of Nineveh will rise up in the judgment with this generation and condemn it, for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and indeed a greater than Jonah is here» (Luke 11:31-32).

[34] Isa 26:19, as we have noticed earlier, is generally interpreted in terms of the collective restoration of Israel, not as expression of the idea of individual resurrection. Unlike it, Q 11:31-32 offers a less ethnocentric perspective, as the reference to the queen of the south and the men of Nineveh suggests.

[35] In Matthew, when Jesus «predicts» his own resurrection he uses the verb ἐγειρω (cf. Matt 16:21; 17:9.23; 20:19; 26:32), whereas in the dispute with the Sadducees he speaks in terms of ἀνάστασιν (ἀνιστήμι; cf. Matt 22:23-32). The prevalence of ἐγειρω over ἀνιστήμι, which only appears in Matt 9:9 (with no direct reference to the idea of resurrection), 12:41, 22:31, and 26:62 (with no allusion to resurrection) is clear in Matthew. On the contrary, in the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles we find ἀνιστήμι more times than ἐγειρω. Cf. J. Clark-Soles, *Death and Afterlife in the New Testament* (New York: T and T Clark, 2006), 172, note 35. It is reasonable to deduce that the alternation of terms indicates, at least in Matthew and Luke, that none of them offers a special theological meaning with respect to the other.

Its principal eschatological concern seems to be divine judgement, not the specific way in which to access it.

3. Resurrection in Mark

Although eschatology does certainly play a central role in the Gospel of Mark[36], there is no systematic attempt at integrating the different elements implied by the eschatological narrative into a coherent, theological structure. The consequences of the resurrection of Jesus regarding the eschatological fate of humanity (concerning the idea of a general resurrection at the end of times) are not elucidated at all. Unlike Paul, for whom the resurrection of Jesus anticipates the general resurrection of the dead (something that H. Koester calls «resurrection in two stages»[37] as in 1 Co 15), the Gospel of Mark does not offer an account of the eschatological *iter* involved in the very idea of resurrection of the dead and its instantiation in the case of Jesus of Nazareth.

Nevertheless, the fact that Marks participates in the eschatological atmosphere that prevails in many Jewish intertestamental works is confirmed by the dispute between Jesus and the Sadduccees, as appears in 12:18-27, perhaps the most important synoptic text on the resurrection of the dead[38]. This discussion is normally included under the label of that which Bultmann named «*Streitgespräch*»[39]. It reads as follows:

18 Then some Sadducees, who say there is no resurrection, came to him; and they asked him, saying: 19 Teacher, Moses wrote to us that if a man's brother dies, and leaves his wife behind, and leaves no children, his brother should take his wife and raise up offspring for his brother. 20 Now there were seven brothers. The first took a wife; and dying, he left no offspring. 21 And the second took her, and he died; nor did he leave any offspring. And the third likewise. 22 So the seven had her and left no offspring. Last of all the woman died also. 23 Therefore, in the resurrection, when they rise, whose wife will she be? For all seven had her as wife. 24 Jesus answered and said to them, Are you not therefore mistaken, because you do not know the Scriptures nor the power of God? 25 For when they rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven. 26 But concerning the dead, that they rise, have you not read in the book of Moses, in the burning bush passage, how God spoke to him, saying, 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of

[36] Cf. The eschatological discourse in Mark (13:1-37).

[37] Cf. H. Koester, «The Structure and Criterion of Early Christian Beliefs» in J.M. Robinson – H. Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity*, 226. Koester interprets the Pauline connection between the resurrection of Jesus and the general resurrection of the dead as a result of Paul's past as a Pharisee.

[38] Cf. O. Schwankl, *Die Sadduzäerfrage (Mk 12,18-27 parr): eine exegetisch-theologische Studie zur Auferstehungserwartung* (Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1987), 297-299: «Die Sichtung des terminologischen und statistischen Befunds ergibt also, dass die Totenauferstehung ausserhalb des Sadduzäergesprächs nicht nennernsweit behandelt wird». Cf. also N.T. Wright, *La Resurrección del Hijo de Dios. Los Orígenes Cristianos y la Cuestión de Dios* (Estella: Verbo Divino, 2008), 516.

[39] Cf. R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1961), 24.

Jacob'?[40] 27 He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living. You are therefore greatly mistaken.

As J.P. Meier has pointed out, the whole pericope is «structure and balanced»[41] in two parts:

1) Part 1: verses 18-23, in which the Sadducees are the grammatical subject of the speech.
2) Part 2: verses 24-27, in which Jesus becomes the grammatical subject.

This is the only appearance of the Sadducees in the Gospel of Mark[42]. The argument with the Sadducees would be plausible if we were to believe Josephus' account of their endorsement of a more conservative Jewish theology, reluctant to some II Temple ideas, such as the belief in the afterlife[43]. In this sense, there is no sufficient reason to suppose, as several authors (Bultmann included)[44] have done, that it constitutes the addition *ad hoc* of a debate occurring inside the primitive Christian community, for it is unlikely that this kind of discussions might have taken place with a group, the Sadducees, almost utterly extinguished after 70 CE. However, it seems clear that Mark is also willing to show to his audience the superiority of Jesus as a teacher over the Sadducees. The pericope therefore combines historical and purely theological elements[45].

This debate must be framed within the context of the activity of Jesus[46]. In fact, the definition of the Sadducees as those who «say there is no resurrection» (λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι) indicates that the audience of Mark was no longer familiarized with this Jewish group[47]. The dispute between Jesus and the Sadducees would fit into the larger context of the II Temple discussions about certain eschatological ideas that had become prominent in some circles, especially those of apocalyptic nature, since the 3rd c. B.C. onwards, seen by some factions as a challenge to a more traditionalistic interpretation of the religion of Israel. Even if the dispute as such had been elaborated *a posteriori* by the redactor

[40] Cf. Ex 3:6.
[41] Cf. J.P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. III (New York: Doubleday, 1991-2009), 416-418: «the pericope is a marvellously compact structure composed of balanced parts and subsections and sustained by straightforward and inverted (chiastic) parallelism».
[42] In addition to this passage from Mark (and its parallels in Matthew and Luke), the Sadducees only appear in Matt 3:7; 16:1.6.11-12 (in all these cases, together with the Pharisees). They appear neither in Paul nor in John, perhaps because the Sadducees were circumscribed to the area of Jerusalem, so that their relevance for communities outside this city was smaller. Cf. A.J. Hultgren, *Jesus and His Adversaries: the Form and Function of the Conflict Stories in the Synoptic Tradition* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1979), 123-126; J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, vol. II, (New York: Doubleday, 1981-1985), 1299.
[43] Cf. Josephus, *The Jewish War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 2: 162-166; *Jewish Antiquities* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 13: 172-173.
[44] Cf. R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 24ss.
[45] Cf. A. Y. Collins, Mark: A Commentary (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 559.
[46] Cf. J.P. Meier, «The Debate on the Resurrection of the Dead: an Incident from the Ministry of the Historical Jesus?», *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 77 (2000): 3-24 3-24.
[47] Cf. J.P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. III, 419.

of the Gospel, it could still correspond to a realistic situation in the time of Jesus. Also, the fact that the exposition of the general resurrection of the dead comes before the Passion narrative may be due to the redactional intentions of the evangelist, who is willing to offer a coherent structure of his account of the ministry of Jesus, but it does not automatically disqualify its historicity, especially since, as we shall see, this pericope participates in the typical intertestamental ambiguity concerning eschatological doctrines, in which mutually contradictory beliefs (like those of resurrection and immortality of the soul) are combined without any systematic explanation.

In any case, it is disturbing to realize that the doctrine of the general resurrection of the dead, which is nowhere else explicitly treated in the entire Gospel, is accepted here as a «given». It does not contradict the levirate law (as expressed in Deut 25:5)[48], and it is theoretically based upon solid biblical foundations. The attempts at «proving» the doctrine of resurrection from the Hebrew Bible are particularly important in rabbinical literature[49]. However, rabbinical texts, unlike Mark, never use Ex 3:6[50] as standing in favour of resurrection[51], and the original sense of Ex 3:6 has nothing to do with the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, for it is referred to the hope that, just as God has delivered the patriarchs from their distresses, He will «now liberate and succor their enslaved descendants»[52]. Thus, it is associated with a temporal liberation, not with an eschatological reality. The fact of quoting a passage from the Book of Exodus, while the Sadducees are referring to a text from the Book of Deuteronomy, might have to do, as several commentators have noticed, with the idea of «temporal priority» in exegesis, as developed by rabbinic literature. This could be the reason why Jesus (or Mark), instead of alluding to a passage with more direct connotations of the resurrection of the dead (like Dan 12:2), decides to quote a verse from Torah[53].

Mark seems to be taking the doctrine of the general resurrection of the dead for granted. The very belief in the resurrection of the dead at the end of times poses no theological difficulty for the evangelist at all, who puts in Jesus' words a hypothetical attempt at demonstrating that such a notion is already latent in the Hebrew Bible. A similar example of

---

[48] «If brothers dwell together, and one of them dies and has no son, the widow of the dead man shall not be married to a stranger outside the family; her husband's brother shall go in to her, take her as his wife, and perform the duty of a husband's brother to her».

[49] Cf. Tractate Sanhedrin 90b-91a. For a detailed analysis of the rabbinical doctrine of resurrection and its connection with biblical theology, cf. J.D. Levenson, *Resurrection and the Restoration of Israel*.

[50] «I am the God of your father -- the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob».

[51] Cf. O. Schwankl, *Die Sadduzäerfrage (Mark 12,28-27 parr). Eine exegetisch-theologische Studie zur Auferstehungserwartung*, 396-403; D.M. Coh-Sherbok, «Jesus' Defense of the Resurrection of the Dead», *Journal of the Study of the New Testament* 11 (1981): 64-73.

[52] J. Marcus, *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 2000-2009), vol. II, 835.

[53] Cf. Schwankl, *Die Sadduzäerfrage (Mark 12,28-27 parr). Eine exegetisch-theologische Studie zur Auferstehungserwartung*, 319; J. Marcus, *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, vol. II, 826-836. The formulation of their rabbinic principle may be found in Mekilta Bahodesh 8. Cf. Z. Lauterbach, trans., *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1976), 2. 259, and it would have been accepted by some New Testament authors, like Paul (cf. Gal 3:17).

the non-problematic character of the doctrine of resurrection can be found in some passages of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (usually dated back to c. 2nd c. B.C., although the many Christian interpolations indicate that they did not reach their final form until the 2nd c. CE)[54] , as Testament of Judah 25:1, in which an order in the resurrection is established (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob shall rise first), too. Although the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs are still impregnated with the imagery of the collective restoration of the people of God,[55] there is also a tension with a more universalistic approach[56]. However, there is no unified eschatology in these intertestamental writings[57].

The pre-eminence that the Testaments attribute to the patriarchs suggests a narrow connection with the Markan pericope. Passages like Testament of Simeon 6:2.5-7, Testament of Benjamin 9:6-7, and Testament of Judah 25:1.4a.4b speak about the resurrection of the people of God, granting a primordial role in it to the biblical patriarchs (including Enoch, Noah, and Sem in Testament of Benjamin 9:6). The problem of this potential association lies in the vagueness of their references to the resurrection. Recalling the three questions that, as we have said in the introductory section, constitute an essential step in any disquisition on the biblical doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs elucidate neither whether they are alluding to a real, individual resurrection (not just to a restoration of the people of Israel), nor if it is corporeal (not merely spiritual) and universal (beyond the frontiers of the people of Israel). The exception to this could be Testament of Benjamin 9:6-7, in which there seems to be a real, corporeal resurrection. However, its universality is not obvious. In spite of the fact that it explicitly states that all shall rise, it is difficult to be sure, given the highly «Israelite context» that prevails in the whole book, of whether there is a real universalistic, not simply ethnocentric, approach to the doctrine of resurrection. Thus, we cannot know if this text is actually endorsing the resurrection of other peoples[58]. In Testament of Judah 25, resurrection is linked to the restoration of Israel[59]. Resurrection, in all cases, is the reward for those who have been just[60]. The relevance of the

[54] Cf. J.M. Vanderkam, *An Introduction to Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: William Eerdmands Publishing Company, 2001), 100-101.
[55] Cf. G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*, 36.
[56] Cf. A. Hultgard, *L'Eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarchs*, vol. I (Stockholm: Uppsala Universitet, 1977-1981) 261.
[57] Cf. É. Puech, *La Croyance des Essèniens en la Vie Future: Immortalité, Résurrection, Vie Éternelle? Histoire d'une Croyance dans le Judaïsme Ancien*, 129.
[58] Cf. A. Hultgard, *L'Eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches*, vol. I, 233.
[59] Cf. G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*, 36.
[60] On the reward of the just people, cf. C. Milikowski, «Which Gehenna? Retribution and Eschatology in the Synoptic Gospels and in Early Jewish Texts», *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 238-249. On the Hades in Matthew, cf. 11:23; 16:18; J. Marcus, «The Gates of Hades and the Keys of the Kingdom (Matt 16:18.19)», *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 443-455. In Luke, we find references to Hades in 10:15; 16:23. The only Q mention of Hades is Q 10:15 (par Matt 11:23 and Luke 10:15). Gehenna appears in Q 12:5 (par Matt 10:28 and Luke 12:5) and Matt 5:22.29.30, 18:9, 23:15.33. In Mark, it appears in 9:43.45.47. The text of Q 12:5 poses an interesting question regarding the scope of the eternal punishment. According to it, in Gehenna, God destroys both the body and the soul. Does this mean that there is no eternal punishment, but simply the complete

corporeal element is not clear at all. In all of them, the doctrine of resurrection seems to be accepted without any attempt at offering a theologically systematic vision[61].

These deficiencies are also present in Mark 12:18-27. Instead of a real resurrection, which must inevitably affect the material dimension of the subject, Mark seems to support the immortality of the soul or a vague spiritual persistence together with God[62]. If the patriarchs are alive with God, it is difficult to interpret resurrection as an eschatological event destined to occur at the end of times. Rather, it is viewed as the «continuation» of earthly life in a spiritualized form in the presence of God[63]. The Gospel might be referring to a kind of resurrection which takes place immediately after the death of the individual, without any eschatological projection to the end of times, as opposed to apocalyptic writings like Dan 12:2.

Mark seems to justify the possibility of the resurrection of the dead on the basis of both the Scriptures (v. 24: τὰς γραφὰς) and the power of God (v. 24: τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ), which prove that God is «God of living». Mark points to the idea that the patriarchs are already enjoying divine presence. The topic of the «eschatological joy» of the patriarchs can be found in passages like Testament of Simeon 6:7, Testament of Levi 18:5, Testament of Judah 25:5, Testament of Nephtali 6:10, and Testament of Benjamin 10:6. It suggests that the patriarch shall rise in joy, praising the Most High for his wonders. However, if some of the passages from the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (particularly Testament of Benjamin) speak in terms of a real resurrection (an overcoming of death), not of some kind of spiritual persistence which is ambiguous regarding the reality of death and the centrality of the body, this is not the case with Mark.

The Markan ambivalence between resurrection and spiritual persistence keeps a close connection with the Testament of Abraham, which simultaneously defends the doctrine of the resurrection of the body and that of immortality of the soul[64]. This work describes the last

annihilation of the person who has been condemned to Gehenna? Again, there is obviously no attempt at a systematic development of the principal eschatological ideas. Cf. J. Clark-Soles, J. Clark-Soles, *Death and the Afterlife in the New Testament* (New York: T and T Clark, 2006), 184.

[61] Cf. A. Hultgard, *L'Eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches*, vol. I, 233.

[62] Cf. P. Perkins, *Resurrection: New Testament Witnesses and Contemporary Reflection* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1984), 74ss. According to Perkins, while Jesus is defending the idea of spiritual resurrection, his adversaries understand corporeal resurrection.

[63] Cf. R. Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, vol. II (Freiburg: Herder, 1976-1977), 234.

[64] Of course, such apparent contradiction may be solved through the idea of an «intermediate step», as proposed by standard Catholic eschatology, which claims to stem from a legitimate interpretation of certain biblical passages. According to it, death only affects the body, yet temporarily, before the final resurrection; the soul is intrinsically immortal, so it cannot perish. However, it is difficult to liberate this conception from the suspicion of «dualism», as it implicitly considers that soul and body can remain separated without affecting the integrity of the personal subject. And, in any case, one may wonder what kind of existence the soul would have while persisting in that intermediate state in which it lives without its body. Indeed, if it can subsist, at least for a while, without the body, why does it later need the body? Does it remain at a state of intrinsic «incompleteness» until the body resurrects? Yet, if one adopts a unitary conception of the human subject, how can a soul subsist

moments in the life of Abraham, who, before dying, initiates an apocalyptic journey in which he receives a series of revelations on the fate of souls and divine judgement. According to the Greek version of this work (the so-called «B version»), generally dated back to 1st century B.C. or 1st century CE[65], Abraham will be «lifted» (ἀναλαμβάνησαι) to heaven (paraphrase of the exaltation of the righteous man, who shall enjoy divine presence), whereas his body will remain on earth for seven thousand years. After that, «all flesh shall rise» (τὸτε γαρ ἐγερθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ). According to É. Puech, the expression «all flesh» refers to the totality of the person[66], including the corporeal dimension. This may suggest that in some Jewish circles of apocalyptic nature it was accepted that the great biblical patriarchs were, in some way or another, pre-eminent in enjoying divine presence in the afterlife, without having to await the general resurrection of the dead at the end of times[67]. This is what Mark seems to be evoking when incurring in the apparent contradiction of stating, on the one hand, the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, while at the same time supporting, on the other hand, the idea that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are already enjoying divine presence, «life» with God[68].

Why does the idea of resurrection that is inferred from this dispute not show a well-defined eschatological orientation in terms of resurrection? Why is the eschatological vigour absent here, while it is present in other passages from this Gospel? Is there an attempt at reconciling a future eschatology with the idea of the spiritual persistence of the person after death? Does Mark have an «eschatological» conception of the afterlife, comparable to the Q source (cf. Q 11:31-32), or, rather, he is committed to the notion of a mere spiritual persistence of the just after death? The answer to this and other questions might lie in the realization that Mark is not trying to bequeath upon his audience a systematic treatment of the topic of resurrection, but he simply wants to defend the existence of life after death. In light of this text, it is possible to recognize two perspectives on the resurrection: the divine one, which is, so to speak, «eternal» (the patriarchs are already alive for God, for He «sees»

without its corporeal dimension? These questions pertain to some of the deepest controversies of Christian eschatology, and their adequate treatment would require a more systematic study in a different paper.

[65] Cf. D.C. Allison, *Testament of Abraham*.

[66] Cf. É. Puech, *La Croyance des Essèniens en la Vie Future: Immortalité, Résurrection, Vie Éternelle? Histoire d'une Croyance dans le Judaïsme Ancien*, 145.

[67] This idea is, for example, absent in a work which is, in many ways, similar to the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: the Testament of Job. According to 4:9, Job will «rise» (εγερθηση) in the resurrection (αναστασει), but we are never told that Job enjoys divine presence right after his death. On the composition and reception of the Testament of Job, cf. R. P. Spittler, «The Testament of Job: A History of Research and Interpretation», in M.A. Knibb – P.W. van der Horst eds., *Studies on the Testament of Job* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 17-19. This text also seems to incorporate, without any attempt at a systematic integration, the ideas of persistence of the soul and resurrection of the body. Cf. K.M. Woschitz, *Parabiblica. Studien zur jüdischen Literatur in der hellenistisch-römischen Epoche*, 399-414.

[68] This idea is also connected with the fact, of great importance for apocalypticism, that, according to Gen 5:21-24 (P), Enoch, the seventh patriarch before the Flood, did not die, but was taken to heaven by God, in a similar way as Elijah was not subject to the natural process of death, but was lifted up to heaven in a whirlwind (cf. 2 Kgs 2:11). On the Old Testament references to Enoch, cf. H.S. Kvanvig, *The Roots of Apocalyptic. The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 119-126.

everything), and the temporal one, in which resurrection has not yet taken place, for it is an eschatological event which will happen at the end of times.

In our opinion, the most important feature of the Markan account of the dispute between Jesus and the Sadducees is the ambiguity of the idea of resurrection which underlies the discussion. This ambivalence is visible in two aspects. First of all, the reader cannot be sure whether Jesus is actually referring to a real resurrection (in the sense of overcoming death at the end of times through returning to life, be it in body, spirit, or both forms) or to some kind of spiritual persistence after death, as he seems to suggest by alluding to the fact that the patriarchs are alive (for God is not the God of dead, but the God of living). Second, the vagueness of the terminology is equally noticeable: whereas ἀνάστασιν is certainly used, the term ἐγερθήσονται also appears. This linguistic ambivalence echoes that of many biblical and intertestamental texts[69].

As a final remark, there seems to be no clear connection between the general resurrection of the dead in this passage and the figure of the Messiah. If in different intertestamental texts, like 1 Enoch 51:1-5, 61:1-2.5.8, and Testament of Judah 24:5-6.25:1-5, there is an association between the coming of the Messiah and the resurrection of the dead, this idea is entirely absent in the dispute with the Sadducees. The resurrection of the dead seems to have no messianic connotations, in a way which resembles texts such as Dan 12:2, 1 Enoch 10:17, 25:4, 91:10, 92:3, Psalm of Solomon 13:10, 14:1, and Sibylline Oracles 4: 181-187[70].

It is reasonable to suppose that Jesus' disciples had some degree of knowledge of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, for we have no evidence of Jesus instructing them about this idea, which nonetheless appears as a «given» in the dispute with the Sadducees. The lack of understanding that they show in Mark 9:9-10[71], during the episode of the Transfiguration, could be related to the specific event of the resurrection of Jesus, not to the doctrine of the general resurrection of the dead as such. This hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that the compound «ἐκ νεκρῶν», used in Mark 9:10, normally refers, in the New Testament, to the resurrection of Jesus, whereas the resurrection of the dead, in its general scope, is rendered by the formula ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν[72]. In any case, the disciples'

[69] In the more traditional formulations in the New Testament, resurrection is a transitive action performed by God (cf. Rom 4:25, 1 Co 15:4, Gal 1:1, 1 Thess 1:10, 1 Pet 1:21, Acts 2:24). The intransitive ἀνέστημι, «to rise», «to arise», is less frequent (cf. 1 Thess 4:14, Mark 8:31. 9:31. 10:34, John 20:9, Acts 17:3), but in the 2nd century CE the use of the intransitive form becomes widely extended. Cf. H. Koester, «The Structure and Criteria of Early Christian Beliefs» in J.M. Robinson – H. Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity*, 227, note 49).

[70] Cf. G. Rochais, *Les Récits de Résurrection des Morts dans le Nouveau Testament*, 176.

[71] «Now as they came down from the mountain, He commanded them that they should tell no one the things they had seen, till the Son of Man had risen from the dead. So they kept this word to themselves, questioning what the rising from the dead meant».

[72] Cf. Among others, Rom 4:24, 6:4.9, 7:4, 8 :11, 8:34, 10 :9, Gal 1:1, 1 Cor 15:12.20, all of them using ἐκ νεκρῶν and referring to the resurrection of Jesus. A graphic illustration may be found in 1 Cor 15:20, which uses ἐκ νεκρῶν, while in 1 Cor 15:21 we have ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, now in a general sense (the idea of the

understanding of the very notion of resurrection would have been rather vague, especially if we take into account the great variety of eschatological conceptions of the afterlife that existed in Judaism by the time of Jesus, and the difficulties involved by offering a unified interpretation of the meaning of resurrection in intertestamental literature.

4. Resurrection in Matthew and Luke

Matthew's parallel to the dispute with the Sadducees goes as follows (Matt 22:23-32):

23 The same day the Sadducees, who say there is no resurrection, came to Him and asked Him, 24 saying: Teacher, Moses said that if a man dies, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife and raise up offspring for his brother. 25 Now there were with us seven brothers. The first died after he had married, and having no offspring, left his wife to his brother. 26 Likewise the second also, and the third, even to the seventh. 27 Last of all the woman died also. 28 Therefore, in the resurrection, whose wife of the seven will she be? For they all had her. 29 Jesus answered and said to them, You are mistaken, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God. 30 For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels of God in heaven. 31 But concerning the resurrection of the dead, have you not read what was spoken to you by God, saying, 32 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.

There are no significant variants over Mark 12, probably with the exception of the use of «περὶ δὲ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν» (Matt 22:31), instead of ἐγείρονται (Mark 12:26)[73], aside from the lack of an explicit mention of the «book of Moses», as opposed to Mark 12:26 (τῇ βίβλῳ Μωϋσέως). Matthew uses the verb ἐγείρειν in 11:5, parallel to Q 7:22. The absence of an explicit reference to the book of Moses might be related with the specificity of the audience that Matthew is addressing, more familiarized with the Hebrew Bible[74].

---

resurrection of the dead as such). Cf. E. Fascher, «Anastasis, Resurrectio, Auferstehung», *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 40 (1941): 166-229; R. Schnackenburg, «Zur Aussageweise 'Jesu (von der Toten) auferstanden», *Biblische Zeitschrift* 13 (1969): 10-11; H. Braun, «Zur Terminologie der Acta von der Auferstehung», *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 77 (1952): 533-536; J. Kremer, «Auferstehung. IV: Im Neuen Testament», 1195-1198. However, we should be careful about understanding the expression ἐκ νεκρῶν as a «formulistic», canonical statement of the fact that someone has risen from the dead, for although it appears in texts like Mark 6:14-16 and Luke 9:7-8, their parallel in Matt 14:2 reads ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν in an analogous context and using the same verb (ἠγέρθη). In any case, it seems that formulae which do not include ἐκ νεκρῶν are older. Cf. G. Kegel, *Auferstehung Jesu – Auferstehung der Toten. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn 1970), 24.

[73] The fact that Luke uses ἐγείρονται in 20:37 does not prove that he is being more faithful to Mark than Matthew. In fact, Matthew, just as Mark, says that «the Sadducees» approached Jesus (Matt 22:23, parallel to Mark 12:18), whereas Luke qualifies this statement by including «some Sadducees» (20:27).

[74] For an examination of the general characteristics of the Gospel of Matthew, cf. U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, vol. I (Zürich: Benziger, 1985-2002).

According to J. Clark-Soles, Matthew's eschatology is impregnated with strong ethical connotations, which serve a «sectarian» goal: that of separating the righteous from the wicked (cf. Matt 13:49-50.25:32-33.25:46). In fact, the distinction between bad and good people acquires great importance in this Gospel (cf. Matt 22:10: πονηρούς τε καὶ ἀγαθούς)[75]. This attempt at a self-definition is common to many apocalyptic writings, even if universalistic language prevails[76]. The pre-eminence of the ethical dimension could lead to the conclusion that Matthew is primarily interested in resurrection as some sort of vindication of the just. As we have seen in the analysis of the dispute with the Sadducees, it seems that resurrection is understood as expression of the omnipotence of God, which cannot be defeated by death. This suggests a more spiritualized representation of resurrection as such. However, this point is contradicted by the importance of the corporeal element in Matthew, a vivid proof of which is the enigmatic statement in Matt 27:52, right after Jesus yields up his spirit:

«And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised (ἠγέρθησαν)».

The association of sleeping with death seems clear in light of intertestamental literature (cf. Dan 12:2, Jubilees 23:1.36:18, Testament of Judah 25:1, 1 Enoch 49:3, 91:10, Book of Biblical Antiquities 3:10. 11:6.19:12, 4 Ezra 7:32, 2 Baruch 11:4.21:4. 30:1.36:10.85:3) and certain passages of the New Testament itself (cf. 1 Co 15:20, which uses, just as Matt 27:52, the term κεκοιμημένων, «those who have fallen asleep»). Nevertheless, the situation becomes more complicated if we take into account that in Mark 5:39, during the episode of the daughter of Jairus, there is a clear differentiation between being dead and being asleep: «The child is not dead, but sleeping τὸ παιδίον οὐκ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει)». In any case, this verse might imply a literalistic reading of «to sleep», as opposed to a metaphorical interpretation of this verb as an allegory of death. According to G. Rochais, to sleep and to be asleep can be replaced, in general terms, by to die and to be dead, but they alone do not clearly point to the idea of resurrection. Their reciprocal connection should be elucidated by the examination of the specific contexts for the different passage[77].

Also, the importance of the ethical element in Matthew's eschatology is visible in light of his insistence on the «day of judgement» (ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως), which, in passages like Matt 10:15, 11:22.24, 12:36 seems to presuppose some sort of «revival» of those who are

[75] Cf. J. Clark-Soles, *Death and the Afterlife in the New Testament*, 156.
[76] In Matthew, this ethical term concerning goodness appears sixteen times, while it is present only four times in Mark and three in John. Cf. J. Clark-Soles, *Death and the Afterlife in the New Testament*, 159. Also, the centrality of ethics in Matthew can be appreciated in the abundance of the term «hypocrites» in this Gospel (thirteen out of seventeen in the New Testament; cf. J. Clark-Soles, *Death and the Afterlife in the New Testament*, 177).
[77] Cf. G. Rochais, *Les Récits de Résurrection des Morts dans le Nouveau Testament*, 197. Cf. O. Michel, «Zur Lehre vom Todes schlaf», *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 35 (1936): 285-290; O. Cullmann, *Immortalité de l'âme ou Résurrection des Morts. Le Témoignage du Nouveau Testament*, 65-79.

dead (like the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah) in order to be judged by God. It would be, nonetheless, excessively hypothetical to understand these sayings in terms of the doctrine of the general resurrection of the dead, for there is no evident link between the belief in divine judgement and the idea of the resurrection of the dead at the end of times. In fact, in several intertestamental texts, both the affirmation of the eschatological divine judgement and a vague idea of persistence of the personal identity (which does not allow to be associated with the specific thematization in terms of resurrection -this is, overcoming of dead, not a mere spiritual permanence) simultaneously coexist. Some instantiations of this claim (e.g. the independence of the ideas of eschatological judgement and resurrection) are 1 Enoch 1:8-9, 1 Enoch 22:1-23:4 (especially 22:6-11)[78], 1 Enoch 61:6-8, 1 Enoch 104:1-5, Testament of Levi 18:10-14[79].

Concerning Matt 27:52, the apocalyptic background seems clear in light of Dan 12: the reference to «many bodies» (πολλὰ σώματα) is reminiscent of Dan 12:2, «many of those who sleep (πολλοὶ τῶν καθευδόντων in the Septuagint)», with an allusion to the corporeal element (those who are sleeping in the dust of the earth). In this sense, Matthew might be highlighting the role of Jesus in the fulfilment of apocalyptic expectations[80]. This conjecture would be confirmed by the abundance of terms referring to death and destruction in this Gospel[81].

Although several commentators have drawn the connection between Matt 27:52 and Ezek 37 (the vision of the valley filled with dry bones), and there is evidence that this biblical passage was subject to an interpretation in terms of resurrection of the dead in Qumran (as early as the 2nd c. B.C., in the so-called «Pseudo-Ezekiel»)[82], in the *Targumim*[83], and in some iconographic representations (most notably the Synagogue of Dura Europos in Syria)[84], the most obvious textual reference is Dan 12:2 (whose Septuagint version dates back to 140 B.C.)[85]. The sentence «πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων» is parallel to «πολλοὶ τῶν καθευδόντων», even if the verbs change[86].

In any case, the apocalyptic substrate (with a strong emphasis on the eschatological element) of the doctrine of resurrection in Matthew should not make us underestimate the

[78] Cf. K.M. Woschitz, *Parabiblica. Studien zur jüdischen Literatur in der hellenistisch-römischen Epoche*, 624.
[79] Cf. A. Hultgard, *L'Eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarchs*, vol. I, 255.
[80] U. Luz emphasizes that this text is related with the fulfilment of a series of earlier prophecies, as it is clear from Matt 27:51 (the veil of the Temple is torn), in connection with Matt 23:38-24:2. Cf. U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, vol. IV, 364.
[81] Cf. J. Clark-Soles, *Death and Afterlife in the New Testament*, 164-170.
[82] Cf. F. García Martínez, «The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Dead Sea Scrolls», 163-176.
[83] Cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel*, vol. II (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 899f.
[84] Cf. E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Graeco-Roman Period*, XI (New York: Pantheon Books, 1953-1968), 21. In any case, the paintings from the Synagogue of Dura Europos belong to the 3rd c. C.E.
[85] Cf. É. Puech, *La Croyance des Essèniens en la Vie Future: Immortalité, Résurrection, Vie Éternelle? Histoire d'une Croyance dans le Judaîsme Ancien*, 83.
[86] For the analysis of both verbs in the New Testament and their eventual divergences but general convergence, cf. G. Rochais, *Les Récits de Résurrection des Morts dans le Nouveau Testament*, 192-199.

intense prophetic dimension that is present, too. Resurrection, just as in Q 7:22, is associated with a series of prophetic signs that recall the prodigies performed by Elijah and Elisa and the statements from Isaiah (which we have already highlighted). Thus, in Matt 10:8 the disciples are commanded to «raise the dead» (νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε), together with healing the sick, cleansing the lepers, and casting out daemons, in the context of the explanation of their mission and with a clear relationship to Matt 11:5[87].

The tension between the prophetic and apocalyptic elements subsists in Matthew. It is therefore very difficult to elucidate the accurate meaning that the evangelist was giving to the idea of general resurrection of the dead at the end of times. Just as in Mark, there is no systematic effort to offer a coherent eschatological doctrine. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to conclude, as Clark-Soles does, that «Matthew has (…) inherited the notion of resurrection and he reflects contemporary debate in his first-century Jewish context»[88].

Luke's parallel to the dispute with the Sadducees goes as follows (Luke 20: 27-38):

27 Some Sadducees -- those who argue that there is no resurrection -- approached
him and they put this question to him, 28 «Master, Moses prescribed for us, if a man's married
brother dies childless, the man must marry the widow to raise up children for his brother. 29
Well then, there were seven brothers; the first, having married a wife, died childless. 30 The
second 31 and then the third married the widow. And the same with all seven, they died
leaving no children. 32 Finally the woman herself died. 33 Now, at the resurrection, whose
wife will she be, since she had been married to all seven?» 34 Jesus replied, «The children
of this world take wives and husbands, 35 but those who are judged worthy of a place in the
other world and in the resurrection from the dead do not marry 36 because they can no longer
die, for they are the same as the angels, and being children of the resurrection they are
children of God. 37 And Moses himself implies that the dead rise again, in the passage about
the bush where he calls the Lord the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob.
28 Now he is God, not of the dead, but of the living; for to him everyone is alive».

One outstanding difference with respect to the versions of Mark and Matthew is found in the sentence «those who are judged worthy of a place in the other world» (οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν), put together with «and in the resurrection from the dead» (καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν). Does this variation imply that, for Luke, to be worthy of a place in the other world constitutes a separate reality from the resurrection of the dead? Both the place in the other world and the resurrection come as the complement of «those who are worthy» οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες), but they seem to be juxtaposed as two distinct elements.

[87] These prodigies are also found in Hellenistic literature, as in the Life of Apollonius 4:45, by Philostratus. On the examples of dead people who come back to life in the classical world, cf. D. Zeller, «Erscheinungen Verstorbener in griechisch-römischen Bereich», in R. Bieringer – V. Koperski – B. Lataire, eds., *Resurrection in the New Testament. Festschrift J. Lambrecht* (Dudley: Peeters, 2002), 1-19. Cf. also K. Hoherseil, «Apollonius von Tyana», *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* 1 (1993): 831-832.
[88] Cf. J. Clark-Soles, *Death and Afterlife in the New Testament*, 175.

Another important difference is the expression ἰσάγγελοι (a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament), which has parallels in Philo of Alexandria (*De Sacrificio Abel* 1: he applies it to Abraham), 2 Baruch 51:10, and 1 Enoch 15:6. Although, as J.A. Fitzmyer notices, the presence of this expression in Luke shows that this Gospel is «less Semitic» than Mark[89], we should not forget the relevance of angels in eschatological frames in the Hebrew Bible and several intertestamental writings[90].

The explicit mentions of the idea of general resurrection of the dead in Luke generate, just as in Mark and Matthew, great confusion regarding the scope of this doctrine in the mind of the evangelist. Luke 14:14 speaks in terms of «the resurrection of the just»: «Then you will be blessed, for they have no means to repay you and so you will be repaid when the upright rise again (ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν δικαίων)», in the context of a series of parables (like the one on the guests and the wedding feast) that Jesus pronounces during his trip to Jerusalem, which are connected with the kingdom of God (cf. Luke 14:15). According to J.A. Fitzmyer, the background to this passage is Dan 12:2 and the conception of the resurrection as a reward for those who have suffered in the name of God[91].

Resurrection, at least according to Luke, seems to be restricted to the just people. It is therefore a reward resulting of good ethical behaviour, not just a means so that divine

[89] Cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, vol. II, 1305. On the parallels to this expression, cf. also 1QSb 4:25; 4 Macc 16:25 (in which the idea of immortality of the soul prevails). Cf. F. Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, vol. IV (Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1989-2009), 119, note 65; cf. J.J. Kilgallen, «The Sadducees and Resurrection from the Dead», *Biblica* 67 (1976): 487-495.

[90] Cf. Isa 63:9, 1QS 4 :22-2; 1QS 4:24b-25, 1 Enoch 50 4, 104:4-6, 2 Baruch 51 :10. The speculations concerning the nature of angels in intertestamental literature are particularly relevant in texts such as 1 Enoch 6-11, 15:6-7, Jubilees 5:1-2, and in Qumran writings like 4Q 180. It is also present in the Damascus Document 2:16-21.

[91] Cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, vol. II, 1048. Together with the features of the pericope of the discussion with the Sadducees which are reminiscent of both the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and Testament of Abraham, there are other elements that keep resonances of Dan 12:3, in which we are told that «those who are wise shall shine Like the brightness of the firmament, and those who turn many to righteousness Like the stars forever and ever». This «stellar immortality» of the just is also present in texts like 1 Enoch 104:2, Wisdom 3:7, 2 Baruch 51:10, 4 Ezra 7:97, and Book of Biblical Antiquities 33:5. Here, the evangelist would be endorsing a conception rather extended within apocalyptic circles, according to which a series of people (most notably martyrs) will shine like the stars of heaven after their death. But, again, we cannot know how this stellar immortality fits with the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead at the end of times and with the teachings about the kingdom of God. The evangelist may be echoing different intertestamental doctrines, which had become popular by the time of Jesus, but nowhere else in the Gospel we have a clue on how all of them should be integrated into a coherent theological picture. In this sense, it seems reasonable to suppose (based, at least, on its lack of importance in the Q source and its ambiguity in Mark) that the idea of the general resurrection of the dead did not play a central role in the preaching of Jesus. Even if he had accepted it, he might have simply assimilated this notion in the rather vague connotations that it offered in the majority of intertestamental writings in which it appears. As B. Rigaux writes, «Le judaïsme tardif connaît une espérance en la résurrection des morts. La diversité des assertions prouve que la doctrine ne peut être regardée comme centrale dans la pensée religieuxe au temps de Jésus (…). La résurrection reste un objet d'hésitation, de spéculation, d'imagerie apocalyptique. Il est exagéré de soutenir que la foi en la résurrection était de première importance pur les Juifs au temps de Jésus», *Dieu l'a Ressucité. Exégése et Théologie Biblique*, 15.

judgement may take place. This probably stands in close association with the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, in which, as we have seen, resurrection, although in some cases (like Testament of Benjamin) may adopt universalistic connotations, appears as a prerogative of the people of Israel, with a clearly defined «taxonomy» in which the patriarchs (model of the just person) enjoy a preferential role. Resurrection, in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, is intertwined with a set of vivid admonitions about a good ethical life, faithful to divine Law. Resurrection is, itself, the sign of a divine prize for the just. It is, by its very concept, a salvific act[92], especially addressed to those who have suffered in life. Thus, Testament of Judah 25 promises a joyful resurrection for those who have lived in sadness. It is interesting to notice that just as Testament of Judah 25 insists upon the importance of the eschatological future as a contradiction to the present (those who suffer sadness will rise in joy, those who have lived in poverty will be reach, the weak shall be strengthened…; cf 25:1-5), the parable of the guests in Luke 14 contain a challenge to the present time, which is opposed, in a colourfully contradictory way, by the reality of an eschatological future that radically differs from the current state of things: «For everyone who raises himself up will be humbled, and the one who humbles himself will be raised up». (Luke 14:11).

The eschatological future, as a challenge to the present, implies that those who will be invited to the heavenly meal are the poor, the crippled, the lame, the blind (Luke 14:13). In a similar way, the man who organizes the great banquet in Luke 14:15-24[93] faces rejection from his initial guests, and he decides to invite unexpected people to participate in his feast. The kingdom of God contrasts with the present and its concomitant assumptions. As we have remarked earlier, this perception of contradiction was already latent in intertestamental literature, associated with the notion of eschatological life as reward for those who deserve it on account of their faithfulness to God. It is therefore difficult to assess whether resurrection really entailed a universalistic scope. As F. Bovon notices, there were at least two representations of the idea of resurrection by the time in which the Gospel of Luke was written: the first depiction was more universalistic, while the second one conceived of resurrection as the exclusive reward of the just people, without any defined attempt of reconciling the two of them[94]. In this particular passage, the author seems to be endorsing a more restrictive sense, whereas in Acts 24:15 there is a clear universalistic stance[95].

---

[92] As E. Schillebeeckx notices, the resurrection of Jesus is a salvific act in itself, not simply, as in intertestamental literature, a means for appearing before God's throne in order to be judged (*Jesús. Historia de un Viviente*, 496; cf. also P. Hoffmann, *Die Toten in Christus. Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung zur paulinischen Eschatologie* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1966), 180-185). However, this statement should be qualified. Although in several cases it is true that resurrection plays a subsidiary role with respect to divine judgement, there are some examples in which it seems clear that resurrection is a reward for just people, so that they may enjoy divine presence. Resurrection would therefore be a salvific act. A good illustration of this can be found in Testament of Judah 25:4a.

[93] On this parable, cf. F. Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, vol. II, 499-523.

[94] Cf. F. Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, vol. II, 495.

[95] «I have hope in God, which they themselves also accept, that there will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust».

In Luke 16:19-31 (the story of Lazarus), we read that the poor beggar was taken by the angels to the bosom of Abraham (εἰς τὸν κόλπον Ἀβραάμ). This idea is reminiscent of 4 Macc 13:17 (associated with the belief in the immortality of the patriarchs)[96]. The whole episode of Lazarus and the rich man comes before a series of apocalyptic admonitions (17:22-37), transmitting the idea that ethical behaviour in the present is influential for the future life. This might confirm the fact that Luke had in mind a restricted idea of resurrection, constrained to just people. Resurrection would be linked to the fundamental ethical distinction between the just and the wicked[97]. Although this could be understood as a rejection of a more «materialistic» or even «eschatological» view of resurrection (as the notion which was present in several works of apocalyptic literature), we should not forget that intertestamental literature itself, in particular in the case of certain apocalyptic writings, gave a rather similar degree of importance to the ethical distinction between the just and the wicked in its eschatological dimension. This frame is already visible in late prophetic books, like 3 Isaiah, and it gradually led to a more universalistic picture, in which the centrality of ethnic factors was replaced by the ethical behaviour of every individual in the eyes of God. Ethical dualism (the distinction between the just and the wicked), not ethnic membership in the nation of Israel, would therefore become the primary criterion to distinguish one individual from another in the light of eschatological, divine judgement[98].

Conclusions

Q offers significant eschatological elements that nonetheless do not necessarily affirm the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead at the end of times. The messianic time seems to have arrived through the announcement of the kingdom of God by Jesus of Nazareth. The eschatological dimension does not require a concrete thematization in terms of the general resurrection of the dead as the *conditio sine qua non* for divine judgement.

It is reasonable to suppose that the earliest movements of followers of Jesus integrated the apocalyptic expectations shared by different groups within late II Temple Judaism into a vision of the inauguration of the messianic era, subordinating the faith in the general

[96] To see the full list of parallels, cf. H.L. Strack – P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, vol. II (Munich: CH Beck, 1926-1956), 225-227. Cf. also F. Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, vol. III, 105-130 (especially 121, note 84); J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, vol. II, 1124-1136. In any case, the exact precedents for the expression «the bosom of Abraham» are not clear at all. Some texts of the Hebrew Bible speak in terms of «resting with his fathers» (1 Kgs 1:21, 2:10, 11:21). Cf. F. Planas, «En el seno de Abraham», *Cuaderno Bíblico* 15 (1958): 148-152. On the divine vindication of the prophets in 4 Macc, cf. K. Berger, *Die Auferstehung des Propheten und die Erhöhung des Menschensohnes: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Deutung des Geschickes Jesu in frühchristlichen Testen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1976), 15-22.

[97] On the reward of the just, cf Ch. Milikowsky, «Which Gehenna? Retribution and Eschatology in the Synoptic Gospels and in Early Jewish Texts», 238-249.

[98] Cf. J. Kaminsky- A. Stewart, «God of All the World: Universalism and Developing Monotheism in Isaiah 40-66», *Harvard Theological Review* 2, Vol. 99 (2006): 141. Cf. J. Blenkinsopp, *Judaism. The First Phase: The Place of Ezra and Nehemiah in the Origins of Judaism* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009), 222. On ethical dualism, cf. Testament of Aser 5:1-3, 1 Enoch 25:4; 58.

resurrection to the belief in the kingdom which has been initiated by the preaching of Jesus. This might be the reason why, in the synoptic tradition, the topic of the resurrection is focused on the resurrection of Jesus, which practically «eclipses» and even reshapes the doctrine of the general resurrection as such. Unlike Paul, who in 1 Co 15 has a clear image of the eschatological order of resurrection (the resurrection of Jesus anticipates the universal fate that the whole of humanity shall experience at the end of times), the synoptic tradition was fundamentally concerned with the fact that «the new age had been ushered in»[99].

The doctrine of the general resurrection of the dead seems to be taken for granted in the synoptic tradition, as follows from the dispute with the Sadducees in Mark, Matthew, and Luke. However, it is intrinsically ambiguous. It is difficult to know —at least if we constrain the matter of our analysis to the explicit references to this idea— whether the evangelist is speaking in terms of a real resurrection (the overcoming of death at the end of times by the power of God) or some form of vague spiritual persistence which denies the very fact of death (at least regarding the spiritual dimension of the human person).

Although our study is restricted to the doctrine of the general resurrection of the dead as such, without examining the resurrection of Jesus, an important remark must be made: if the very belief in resurrection may be considered ambivalent in the synoptic tradition (at least from a purely conceptual point of view), given that it sometimes incorporates different underlying conceptions of afterlife, how should we understand the meaning of the resurrection of Jesus? Does it participate in this ambiguity, too? Does it categorically reshape the very idea of general resurrection, thus contributing to shedding new light on its deepest meaning, or there is reasonable ground to suspect that the resurrection of Jesus assumed the same degree of conceptual obscurity as the doctrine from which it emanated (the general resurrection of the dead in its late II Temple background)? How does the eschatological idea of an intermediate state help solve these conceptual problems, even if through a predominantly dualistic perspective, in which soul and body may be temporarily separated?

Bibliography

Allison, D.C. *Testament of Abraham*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 2003.

Berger, K. *Die Auferstehung des Propheten und die Erhöhung des Menschensohnes: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Deutung des Geschickes Jesu in frühchristlichen Testen.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1976.

Blanco, C. A. «Hipótesis principales sobre el origen de la idea de resurrección de los muertos en el judaísmo», *Estudios bíblicos* 4, Vol. 68 (2010): 429-472.

Blanco, C. *Why Resurrection? An Introduction to the Belief in the Afterlife in Judaism and Christianity*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2011.

Blanco, C. «La escatología apocalíptica y sus posibles influjos exógenos». *Cristianesimo nella storia* 2, Vol. 32 (2011): 501-525.

[99] Cf. H. Koester, «The Structure and Criteria of Early Christian Beliefs», in J.M. Robinson – H. Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity*, 224.

Blanco, C. *El pensamiento de la apocalíptica judía. Ensayo filosófico-teológico*. Madrid: Editorial Trotta, 2013.
Blanco Pérez, C.A. «Resurrección, apocalíptica, historia: emergencia y desarrollo de la idea de resurrección en el judaísmo del II Templo». *Excerpta e Dissertationibus in Sacra Theologia* 3, Vol. LX (2013): 188-275.
Blenkinsopp, J. *Judaism. The First Phase: The Place of Ezra and Nehemiah in the Origins of Judaism*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009.
Bovon, F. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1989-2009.
Bovon, F. «The Soul's Comeback: Immortality and Resurrection in Early Christianity». *Harvard Theological Review* 4, Vol. 103 (2010): 387-406.
Braun, H. «Zur Terminologie der Acta von der Auferstehung». *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 77 (1952): 533-536.
Bultmann, R. *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1961.
Carlston, Ch. «Wisdom and Eschatology in Q». In J. Delobel ed. *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus = The Sayings of Jesus: Memorial Joseph Coppens*, 101-119. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982.
Cavallin, H.C.C. *Life after Death: Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15*. Lund: Gleerup, 1974.
Cavallin, H.C.C. «Leben nach dem Tode im Spätjudentum und im frühen Christentum. I: Spätjudentum». *Aufstieg und Niedergang der romischen Welt* II, 1, Vol 19 (1979): 240-345.
Charlesworth, J.H. ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. I Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments. Vol. II Expansions of the «Old Testament» and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalsm and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1985.
Charlesworth, J.H. ed. *Resurrection: the Origin and Future of a Biblical Doctrine*. New York: T and T Clark, 2006.
Clark-Soles, J. *Death and the Afterlife in the New Testament*. New York: T and T Clark, 2006.
Coh-Sherbok, D.M. «Jesus' Defense of the Resurrection of the Dead». *Journal of the Study of the New Testament* 11 (1981): 64-73.
Collins, A.Y. «Review of *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*». *Journal of Biblical Literature* 3, Vol. 103 (1984): 465-467.
Collins, A.Y. *Mark: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
Cullmann, O. *Immortalité de l'âme ou Résurrection des Morts. Le Témoignage du Nouveau Testament*. Paris: Delachaux and Niestle, 1956.
E. Schillebeeckx. *Jesus: An Experiment in Christology*. New York: Seabury Press, 1979.
Fascher, E. «Anastasis, Resurrectio, Auferstehung». *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 40 (1941): 166-229.
Fitzmyer, J.A. *The Gospel according to Luke*. New York: Doubleday, 1981-1985.
García Martínez, F. «The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Dead Sea Scrolls». In F. García Martínez – M. Vervenne eds. *Interpreting Translations: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005, 163-176.

Gard, D.H. «The concept of the future life according to the Greek translation of the Book of Job». *Journal of Biblical Literature* 73 (1959): 137-143.
Goodenough, E.R. *Jewish Symbols in the Graeco-Roman Period*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1953-1968.
Hoffmann, P. *Die Toten in Christus. Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung zur paulinischen Eschatologie.* Münster: Aschendorff, 1966.
Hoffmann, P. «Auferstehung. I/3: Im Neuen Testament». *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 4 (1979/1993): 450-467.
Hoherseil, K. «Apollonius von Tyana». *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* 1 (1993): 831-832.
Hultgard, A. *L'Éschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches*. Stockholm: Uppsala Universitet, 1977-1981.
Hultgren, A.J. *Jesus and His Adversaries: the Form and Function of the Conflict Stories in the Synoptic Tradition*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1979.
Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
Josephus. *The Jewish War*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
Kaminsky, J.-Stewart, A. «God of All the World: Universalism and Developing Monotheism in Isaiah 40-66». *Harvard Theological Review* 2, Vol. 99 (2006): 139-163.
Kegel, G. *Auferstehung Jesu – Auferstehung der Toten. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament*. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn 1970.
Kilgallen, J.J. «The Sadducees and Resurrection from the Dead». *Biblica* 67 (1976):487-495.
Kittel, R. ed. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990.
Kloppenborg, J.S. *The Formation of Q. Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
Kloppenborg, J.S. «Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q». *Harvard Theological Review* 3, Vol. 80 (1987): 287-306.
Kloppenborg, J.S. «'Easter Faith' and the Sayings Gospel Q». *Semeia* 49 (1990): 71-100.
Koester, H. *Ancient Christian Gospels: their History and Development*. London: SCM Press, 1990.
Koester, H. *From Jesus to the Gospels. Interpreting the New Testament in Its Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
Kremer, J. «Auferstehung. IV: Im Neuen Testament». *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* 1, 1195-1998. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993.
Kvanvig, H.S. *The Roots of Apocalyptic. The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.
Lauterbach, J.Z. tr. *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1976.
Levenson, J.D. *Resurrection and the Restoration of Israel*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.
Luz, U. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Zürich: Benziger, 1985-2002.
Marcus, J. «The Gates of Hades and the Keys of the Kingdom (Matt 16:18.19)». *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 443-455.
Marcus, J. *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 2000-2009.

Martin-Achard, R. *De la Mort à la Résurrection, d'après l'Ancien Testament*. Neuchâtel : Delachaux et Niestlé, 1956.
Martin-Achard, M. «Résurrection (A.T., Judaïsme)». *Dictionnaire Biblique Supplement* X. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1985.
Meier, J.P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. New York: Doubleday, 1991-2009.
Meier, J.P. «The Debate on the Resurrection of the Dead: an Incident from the Ministry of the Historical Jesus?». *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 77 (2000): 3-24.
Michel, O. «Zur Lehre vom Todes schlaf». *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 35 (1936): 285-290.
Milikowski, C. «Which Gehenna? Retribution and Eschatology in the Synoptic Gospels and in Early Jewish Texts». *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 238-249.
Millar, W.R. *Isaiah 24-27 and the Origin of Apocalyptic*. Cambridge: Scholars Press for the Harvard Semitic Museum, 1976.
Neusner, J. tr. *Tractate Sanhedrin*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1984.
Nickelsburg, G.W.E. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.
Perkins, P. *Resurrection: New Testament Witnesses and Contemporary Reflection*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1984.
Pesch, R. *Jesu ureigene Taten? Ein Beitrag zur Wunderfrage*. Freiburg: Herder, 1970.
Pesch, R. *Das Markusevangelium*. Freiburg: Herder, 1976-1977.
Philostratus, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2005-2006.
Planas, F. «En el seno de Abraham». *Cuaderno Bíblico* 15 (1958): 148-152.
Puech, É. *La Croyance des Essèniens en la Vie Future : Immortalité, Résurrection, Vie Éternelle ? Histoire d'une Croyance dans le Judaïsme Ancien*. Paris: J. Gabalda et compagnie, 1993.
Rahlfs, A. *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes edidit Alfred Rahlfs*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
Raphael, S.P. *Jewish Views of the Afterlife*. North Vale: J. Aronson, 1994.
Rigaux, B. *Dieu l'a Ressucité. Exégése et Théologie Biblique*. Gembloux: Duculot, 1973.
Robinson, J.M. – Hoffmann, P. – Kloppenborg, J. S. eds. *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.
Robinson, J.M. – Koester, H. *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
Rochais, G. *Les Récits de Résurrection des Morts dans le Nouveau Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
Rowland, Ch. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
Sabugal, S. *Anastasis: Resucitó y Resucitaremos*. Madrid: BAC, 1993.
Schaper, J. *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995.
Schnackenburg, R. «Zur Aussageweise 'Jesu (von der Toten) auferstanden». *Biblische Zeitschrift* 13 (1969): 10-11.

Schulz, S. *Q- Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972.
Schürmann, H. «Beobachtungen zum Menschensohn-Titel in der Redequelle». In R. Pesch – R. Schnackenburg eds. *Jesus und der Menschensohn: für Anton Vögtle*, 124-197. Freisburg im Bresgau: Herder, 1975.
Schwankl, O. *Die Sadduzäerfrage (Mark 12, 18-27 parr): eine exegetisch-theologische Studie zur Auferstehungserwartung*. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1987.
Senior, D. *Matthew*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998.
Spittler, R.P. «The Testament of Job: A History of Research and Interpretation». In M.A. Knibb – P.W. van der Horst (eds.), *Studies on the Testament of Job*, 7-32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
Spronk, K. *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East*. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1986.
Stemberger, G. «Auferstehung. I/2: Judentum». *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 4 (1979/1993): 441-450.
Strack, H.L. –Billerbeck, P. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. Munich: CH Beck, 1926-1956.
Torres Queiruga, A. *Repensar la Resurrección. La Diferencia Cristiana en la Continuidad de las Religiones y de la Cultura*. Madrid: Trotta, 2003.
Tournay, R. «Relectures bibliques concernants la vie future et l'angélologie». *Révue Biblique* 69 (1962): 489-495.
Vanderkam, J.M. *An Introduction to Early Judaism.* Grand Rapids: William Eerdmands Publishing Company, 2001.
Woschitz, K.M. *Parabiblica. Studien zur jüdischen Literatur in der hellenistisch-römischen Epoche.* Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2005.
Wright, N.T. «Resurrection in Q?». In D.G. Horrell – Ch. M. Tuckett eds. *Christology, Controversy and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole*, 85-97. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
Wright, N.T. *La Resurrección del Hijo de Dios. Los Orígenes Cristianos y la Cuestión de Dios*. Estella: Verbo Divino, 2008.
Zeller, D. «Erscheinungen Verstorbener in griechisch-römischen Bereich». In R. Bieringer – V. Koperski – B. Lataire eds. *Resurrection in the New Testament. Festschrift J. Lambrecht*, 1-19. Dudley: Peeters, 2002.
Zimmerli, W. *Ezechiel*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.

Enviado: 23 de abril de 2021
Aceptado: 1 de junio de 2021