

JOHN GRANGER COOK

Empty Tomb, Resurrection, Apotheosis

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament
410*

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber / Editor
Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors
Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)
Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg) · J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

410



John Granger Cook

Empty Tomb, Resurrection, Apotheosis

Mohr Siebeck

JOHN GRANGER COOK, born 1955; 1976 B.A. in Philosophy, Davidson College; 1979 M.Div., Union Theological Seminary (VA); 1985 Ph.D. at Emory University; Professor of Religion and Philosophy, LaGrange College, LaGrange, GA.

ISBN 978-3-16-156503-8 / eISBN 978-3-16-156584-7

DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-156584-7

ISSN 0512-1604 / eISSN 2568-7476 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2018 Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Gulde Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Patri dilectissimo

WALTER GRANGER COOK

Acknowledgements

The genesis of this project on resurrection in Mediterranean antiquity was a recommendation made by my father, an honorably retired pastor in the Presbyterian Church (P.C.U.S.A.), after I had published a number of articles and a 522-page tome on crucifixion. He asked me, “Why not write about something more positive – resurrection?” The idea intrigued me, and I perceived a gap in the scholarship. It is to him that I dedicate this book. Pursuing the topic has been a difficult but pleasurable experience. My readers will undoubtedly not have a similarly pleasurable experience, but I hope that the evidence I have gathered and the arguments sketched in the monograph are worthy of attention. During the course of my research I summarized some of the results of the investigation in three publications: “The Vocabulary for Resurrection in Paganism,” in: *In mari via tua. Philological Studies in Honour of Antonio Piñero*, Estudios de filología neotestamentaria 11, ed. I. M. Gallarte and J. Peláez, Cordoba 2016, 197–216; “Resurrection in Paganism and the Question of an Empty Tomb in 1 Cor 15,” *NTS* 63 (2017) 56–75; and “The use of ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω and the ‘Resurrection of a Soul’,” *ZNW* 108 (2017) 259–280.

Those who have kindly answered my many queries and discussed issues of interpretation include: James P. Allen, the late Tjitze Baarda, Hans Dieter Betz, Jerker Blomqvist, Markus Bockmuel, John Bodel, Corinne Bonnet, Jan Bremmer, Michael Broyde, Jorunn Jacobsen Buckley, Vincenzo Carlotta, Manfred Clauss, Kathleen M. Coleman, John J. Collins, Adela Yarbro Collins, Christopher Horton Cook, Dan Dana, Werner Eck, Dag Øistein Endsjø, Alexandra Eppinger, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Robert L. Fowler, Steven J. Friesen, Richard Goulet, Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, Lieve van Hoof, Carl R. Holladay, Hugh A. G. Houghton, Ana Isabel Jiménez San Cristóbal, Aaron Johnson, F. Stanley Jones, Jan Joosten, Martin Karrer, Steve Kaufman, Erkki Koskenniemi, Roy Kotansky, Homer Lanier, Matteo Martelli, Felicity Harley-McGowan, Tryggve Mettinger, Richard C. Miller, Margaret M. Mitchell, Ian Morton, Carol A. Newsom, Andrei A. Orlov, Jaume Pòrtulas, Vernon K. Robbins, Arthur Robinson, Jörg Rüpke, Donald Schley, Mark J. Smith, Seda Stamboltsyan, Michael Stausberg, Antonio Stramaglia, Michael E. Stone, Emanuel Tov, James VanderKam, Eric R. Varner, Henk S. Versnel, Yuhan Sohrab-Dinshaw Vevaina, and Norbert Zimmermann. John Bodel, Jan

Bremmer, Tryggve Mettinger, James VanderKam, and Yuhan Sohrab-Dinshaw Vevaina graciously read parts of the manuscript. Philologist Jerker Blomqvist was always available to assist in matters of Greek syntax and semantics. I am particularly indebted to historian of religion Jan Bremmer for reading many chapters and answering numerous queries. Of course, any errors are my own. I read two papers incorporated into the manuscript at the *Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* section at the Society of Biblical Literature national meeting in Atlanta (2015) and at the *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* general meeting in Montréal (2016); the comments at those meetings were quite helpful. I very much benefited from a sabbatical leave my own institution (LaGrange College) granted me in 2016, which allowed me to explore the mysteries of ancient Ethiopic and to write a substantial portion of the chapter on resurrection in Second Temple Judaism. At my institution, librarian and Latinist Arthur Robinson has been indefatigable in his assistance. I have spent many hours in the Pitts Theology Library at Emory and in the Robert W. Woodruff Library, and I thank the librarians there for their generous assistance. I thank my students Alan Gage Bailey and John Dale Giefing for helping me proofread the MS.

For his guidance and acceptance of this manuscript into the *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament I* series I thank Professor Jörg Frey. I also thank Dr. Henning Ziebritzki, the Director of Mohr Siebeck, and Dr. Katharina Gutekunst, Program Director for Theology and Jewish Studies, for their constant encouragement. Herr Matthias Spitzner of Mohr Siebeck generously provided his expert help with the production of the book.

For permission to use images I thank the following: the British Museum; the Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg; the Bibliotheca Hertziana Max-Planck-Institut für Kunstgeschichte; the Bibliothèque nationale de France; the Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University; the Soprintendenza Speciale per il Colosseo, il Museo Nazionale Romano e l'Area archeologica di Roma; the Vorderasiatisches Museum. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin; the Preussischer Kulturbesitz. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin; the Yale University Art Gallery, the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut; wildwinds.com, ex-CNG Coins; Numismatica Ars Classica NAC AG, Zürich; Bridgeman Images; Roger B. Ulrich; Egisto Sani; and Roberto Piperno.

Most of all I thank my partner in life, Barbara T. Horton, ἡ γυνὴ μου, for putting up with the long hours it took to produce this monograph.

Reprinted by permission of the publishers and the Trustees of the Loeb Classical Library from Harvard University Press:

THEOCRITUS, MOSCHUS, BION, translated by Neil Hopkinson, Loeb Classical Library Volume 28, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University

Press, Copyright 2015 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College. Loeb Classical Library © a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Reprinted by permission of the Society of Biblical Literature Press:

Flavius Philostratus, *Heroikos*, Translated with an Introduction and Notes by Jennifer K. Berenson Maclean and Ellen Bradshaw Aitken, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press 2001.

Many Scripture quotations are from the *New Revised Standard Version Bible*, copyright © 1989 National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved worldwide.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|--------|
| <i>Introduction: Resurrection Language</i> | 1 |
| 1 The Question of Apologetics for (or Subversion of) the Gospel | 3 |
| 2 The Semantics of <i>yqs</i> , <i>qys</i> , <i>qûm</i> , and <i>hyh</i> | 7 |
| 3 The Semantics of ἐγείρω (<i>egeirō</i>) and ἀνίστημι (<i>anistēmi</i>)..... | 13 |
| 3.1 Meaning and Usage..... | 13 |
| 3.2 Usage for Bodily Resurrection and the Passive of ἐγείρω | 21 |
| 3.3 Not Used with ψυχή or πνεῦμα for Res. until Gnosticism | 30 |
| 4 The Semantics of ζωοποιέω and ζάω | 37 |
| 5 Latin Expressions for Resurrection..... | 46 |
| 6 Resurrection in Zoroastrianism..... | 50 |
| 7 Scribenda | 53 |
| <i>Chapter one: Resurrection of Divinities</i> | 56 |
| 1 Some Methodological Reflections | 56 |
| 1.1 Dying and Rising Gods..... | 57 |
| 1.2 Myth and Ritual..... | 62 |
| 1.3 Justin and Other Patristic Writers on Jesus and Greek Myths | 63 |
| 2 Dumuzi (Tammuz) | 69 |
| 3 Baal | 73 |
| 4 Osiris..... | 74 |
| 5 Adonis..... | 87 |
| 5.1 The Myth of Adonis..... | 88 |
| 5.2 The Adonis Gardens..... | 91 |
| 5.3 Lucian and the Resurrection of Adonis..... | 96 |
| 5.4 Christian Traditions about Adonis | 102 |
| 5.5 The Levantine Background | 107 |
| 5.5 Iconography | 109 |
| 6 Attis | 110 |
| 6.1 Classical Sources..... | 110 |
| 6.2 Hippolytus, Firmicus Maternus, and Servius Auctus..... | 112 |
| 6.3 The Hilaria and the Iconography of Attis..... | 115 |
| 6.3 The Attis Cult in Late Antiquity | 122 |
| 7 Melqart / Heracles | 124 |
| 8 Dionysus | 132 |
| 9 Asclepius Eshmun..... | 140 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 10 Mithras | 142 |
| 11 Conclusion..... | 143 |
| <i>Chapter two: Resurrection Accounts in Greek and Latin.....</i> | <i>144</i> |
| 1 Classical Greek Texts | 144 |
| 1.1 The Improbability of Resurrection..... | 144 |
| 1.2 Heracles and Alcestis, and Epiphanius's Response..... | 152 |
| 1.3 Heracles, Theseus, and Pirithous | 156 |
| 1.4 Glaucus | 157 |
| 1.5 The Magi..... | 159 |
| 1.6 Democritus | 160 |
| 1.7 Alexander the Great and Resurrection..... | 161 |
| 1.8 The Germans and Resurrection | 162 |
| 1.9 Asclepius..... | 162 |
| 1.10 Pelops..... | 170 |
| 1.11 Aesop | 171 |
| 1.12 Er, Antyllus, and the Man from Soli..... | 172 |
| 1.13 Aelian..... | 174 |
| 1.14 Aelius Aristides: Eupolis and other Examples of Resurrection | 174 |
| 1.15 Crates | 181 |
| 1.16 Polyaeus (II C.E.)..... | 182 |
| 1.17 Artemidorus..... | 182 |
| 1.18 Aeneas of Gaza..... | 183 |
| 1.19 Iolaus..... | 184 |
| 1.20 Tylos | 185 |
| 1.21 Lucian | 186 |
| 1.22 Achilles Tatius..... | 190 |
| 1.23 Apollonius of Tyana | 190 |
| 1.24 A Magic Recipe for Resurrection..... | 192 |
| 1.25 Favorinus (ca 85–155 C.E.) | 193 |
| 1.26 Cyranides | 194 |
| 1.27 Libanius..... | 195 |
| 1.28 Proclus..... | 197 |
| 1.29 The Resurrection of Jesus in Paganism | 201 |
| 2 Resurrection in Classical Latin Texts | 208 |
| 2.1 Terence | 208 |
| 2.2 Cicero | 209 |
| 2.3 Livy..... | 211 |
| 2.4 Ovid | 211 |
| 2.5 Vitruvius..... | 213 |
| 2.6 Valerius Maximus..... | 213 |
| 2.7 Pliny the Elder..... | 214 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 2.8 Hyginus..... | 218 |
| 3 Resurrection in Early Christian Inscriptions | 224 |
| 4 The Hypogeum on via Dino Compagni (Via Latina Catacomb) | 229 |
| 5 Conclusion..... | 246 |
| <i>Chapter three: Tombs and Post-Mortem Appearances</i> | <i>247</i> |
| 1 Empty Tombs with Subsequent Appearances | 247 |
| 1.1 Aristetas | 247 |
| 1.2 Romulus | 254 |
| 1.3 Zalmoxis..... | 272 |
| 1.4 Callirhoe | 279 |
| 1.5 Xenophon, Anthia and Habrocomes | 284 |
| 1.6 Antonius Diogenes, The Wonders Beyond Thule | 285 |
| 1.7 Philinnion of Amphipolis | 287 |
| 2 Occupied Tombs and Subsequent Appearances..... | 291 |
| 2.1 Protesilaos..... | 291 |
| 2.2 Eunostus | 302 |
| 3 Empty Tombs with no Subsequent Appearances | 303 |
| 3.1 Numa Pompilius..... | 303 |
| 3.2 Cleomedes | 310 |
| 3.3 Alcmena..... | 315 |
| 3.4 The Apostle John | 318 |
| 3.5 A Christian Dyer..... | 319 |
| 3.6 Symeon the Fool | 319 |
| 4 Conclusion | 321 |
| <i>Chapter four: Translations and Apotheoses of Heroes</i> | <i>322</i> |
| 1 Immortal Bodies..... | 323 |
| 2 Translations | 329 |
| 2.1 Legendary Figures | 330 |
| 2.2 Historical Figures | 390 |
| 2.3 Vibia and Vincentius: Tomb in the Catacomb of Praetextatus | 407 |
| 3 Conclusion | 411 |
| <i>Chapter five: Apotheoses of Emperors.....</i> | <i>413</i> |
| 1 <i>Consecratio</i> and Funeral | 413 |
| 1.1 <i>Consecratio</i> | 413 |
| 1.2 Funerals..... | 417 |
| 1.3 The Missing Funeral of Germanicus | 419 |
| 1.4 Poppaea Sabina's Funeral | 419 |
| 1.5 Funerals for Slaves and Permitted Second Funerals | 420 |

| | | |
|---|--|---------|
| 1.6 | Pertinax's Funeral..... | 421 |
| 1.7 | The Funeral of Septimius Severus | 423 |
| 1.8 | The Significance of the Wax Images..... | 424 |
| 1.9 | Eagles and Witnesses of Apotheoses | 426 |
| 2 | Apotheoses of Emperors | 428 |
| 2.1 | Julius Caesar | 428 |
| 2.2 | Augustus | 433 |
| 2.3 | Claudius | 438 |
| 2.4 | Nero..... | 445 |
| 2.5 | Vespasian | 445 |
| 2.6 | Titus | 447 |
| 2.7 | Trajan..... | 448 |
| 2.8 | Hadrian and Sabina..... | 450 |
| 2.9 | Antoninus Pius | 452 |
| 3 | Conclusion | 454 |
| <i>Chapter six: Resurrection in Jewish Texts.....</i> | | 455 |
| 1 | Hebrew Bible and Septuagint | 456 |
| 1.1 | Psalm 87 LXX | 457 |
| 1.2 | Isaiah | 458 |
| 1.3 | Jeremiah..... | 463 |
| 1.4 | Daniel | 464 |
| 1.5 | Hosea..... | 468 |
| 1.6 | 2 Maccabees | 470 |
| 1.7 | Job..... | 472 |
| 1.8 | Thisworldly Resurrections..... | 474 |
| 2 | Inscriptions | 474 |
| 3 | Ethiopic Enoch | 478 |
| 3.1 | The Book of Watchers | 478 |
| 3.2 | The Similitudes of Enoch | 483 |
| 3.3 | The Epistle of Enoch..... | 489 |
| 3.4 | 108: The Final Enochic Book..... | 492 |
| 4 | Other Pseudepigrapha | 493 |
| 4.1 | Psalms of Solomon..... | 493 |
| 4.2 | Jubilees | 494 |
| 4.3 | Syrian Baruch | 496 |
| 4.4 | 4 Ezra..... | 498 |
| 4.5 | Sibylline Oracles | 500 |
| 4.6 | Lives of the Prophets | 501 |
| 4.7 | Testament of Abraham..... | 501 |
| 4.8 | Life of Adam and Eve..... | 502 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 4.9 | Pseudo Philo, The Biblical Antiquities | 505 |
| 4.10 | The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides..... | 506 |
| 4.11 | Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs | 509 |
| 5 | Josephus..... | 511 |
| 6 | Qumran | 513 |
| 7 | The Eighteen Benedictions | 516 |
| 8 | Targumic and Rabbinic Literature | 518 |
| 8.1 | Targums | 518 |
| 8.2 | Mishnah and Tosefta Sanhedrin..... | 523 |
| 8.3 | Abot de Rabbi Nathan: The Origin of the Sadducees | 525 |
| 8.4 | Elijah and the Resurrection of the Dead..... | 527 |
| 8.5 | Tosefta Berakhot and b. Ketubbot: The Blessing of the Dead | 528 |
| 8.6 | Sifre Deuteronomy | 529 |
| 8.7 | Sifra | 530 |
| 8.8 | Babylonian Talmud: Tractate Sanhedrin..... | 531 |
| 8.9 | The Self Evidence of Resurrection in b. Berakot | 535 |
| 8.10 | Genesis Rabbah on Resurrection and Healing | 536 |
| 8.11 | Talmudic Texts on Resurrection in Jerusalem | 537 |
| 8.12 | Rabbi Jacob: Rewards in the Torah and Resurrection..... | 539 |
| 8.13 | Resurrection for the Righteous | 540 |
| 8.14 | Hosea 6:2 and the Resurrection of the Dead..... | 541 |
| 8.15 | Resurrection and the Pangs of the Messiah | 553 |
| 8.16 | The Dew of Resurrection in the Seventh Heaven..... | 553 |
| 8.17 | The Days of the Messiah: Pesiqta Rabbati | 555 |
| 8.18 | Midrash Aleph Bet: The 7 Trumpet Blasts and the Resurrection .. | 556 |
| 8.19 | The Sufferings of the Messiah and Resurrection..... | 557 |
| 9 | Resurrection and the Frescoes of Dura Europos..... | 559 |
| 10 | The Toledot Yeshu | 563 |
| 11 | Conclusion | 568 |

Chapter seven: Empty Tomb, Resurrection, and Translation... 570

| | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| 1 | Resurrection in 1 Cor 15 and the Problem of an Empty Tomb | 570 |
| 1.1 | 1 Thess 4:17: Bodies not Abandoned on the Ground..... | 570 |
| 1.2 | 1 Corinthians 15 | 572 |
| 1.3 | Phil 3:21 | 588 |
| 1.4 | Summary of the Argument..... | 591 |
| 1.5 | Possible Objections | 591 |
| 2 | Empty Tomb and Resurrection in Mark..... | 593 |
| 3 | The Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus in Q and Luke | 601 |
| 3.1 | Q 13:34–35 | 602 |
| 3.2 | Resurrection in Luke 24..... | 604 |
| 3.3 | Luke's Ascension Narratives..... | 612 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 4 Conclusion..... | 618 |
| <i>Conclusion: Empty Tomb, Resurrection, and Apotheosis</i> | 619 |
| <i>Images</i> | 625 |
| <i>Bibliography</i> | 647 |
| Ancient Sources | 647 |
| Databases, CD Roms, Websites..... | 654 |
| Scholarship | 655 |
| <i>Sources</i> | 673 |
| 1 Greco-Roman Texts | 696 |
| 2 Biblical Literature | 673 |
| 3 Second Temple Literature..... | 701 |
| 4 Targumic and Rabbinic Literature..... | 702 |
| 5 Magica and Other Papyri | 705 |
| 6 Coins, Inscriptions, and Other Archaeological Resources | 705 |
| 7 Near Eastern Texts | 708 |
| <i>Images Index</i> | 710 |
| <i>Ancient Individuals</i> | 711 |
| <i>Modern Authors</i> | 714 |
| <i>Subjects and Terminology</i> | 716 |

Introduction

Resurrection Language

Ancient and modern scholars have written many thousands of pages on resurrection in the New Testament. Fewer have done studies which examine the theme in both pagan and Jewish texts, however, and the topic remains inherently fascinating.¹ My monograph will focus on resurrection in the Mediterranean world and its relation to the NT. I began the project with two primary hypotheses: First, there is no fundamental difference between Paul's conception of the resurrection body and that of the Gospels; and second, the resurrection and translation stories of Greco-Roman antiquity probably help explain the

¹ For a selection of monographs on resurrection in Judaism see chap. 6 n. 1. For the theme in paganism, cf.: J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough. A Study in Magic and Religion*. Part IV.1–2. Adonis Attis Osiris, London ³1914; J. Leipoldt, *Sterbende und auferstehende Götter. Ein Beitrag zum Streite um Arthur Drews' Christusmythe*, Leipzig 1923; E. Fascher, *Anastasis-Resurrectio-Auferstehung. Eine programmatische Studie zum Thema „Sprache und Offenbarung“*, ZNW 40 (1941) 166–229; G. Bertram, *Auferstehung I (des Kultgottes)*, RAC I (1950) 919–30; A. Oepke, *Auferstehung II (des Menschen)*, RAC I (1950) 930–8; idem, ἐγείρω, κτλ, TDNT II (1964) 333–9; idem, ἀνίστημι, κτλ, TDNT I (1964) 368–72; E. J. Bickerman, *Das leere Grab*, in: idem, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History. Part One*, Leiden 1986, 70–81; A. J. M. Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection. Studies in Pauline Theology against its Graeco-Roman Background*, WUNT 44, Tübingen 1987; A. Yarbro Collins, *Apotheosis and Resurrection*, in: *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism*, ed. P. Borgen and S. Giversen, Peabody, MA 1987, 88–100; J. Z. Smith, *Drudgery Divine. On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity*, Chicago 1990; T. N. D. Mettinger, *The Riddle of Resurrection. “Dying and Rising Gods” in the Ancient Near East*, CB.OT 50, Stockholm 2001; D. Zeller, *Hellenistische Vorgaben für den Glauben an die Auferstehung Jesu*, in: idem, *Neues Testament und hellenistische Umwelt*, BBB 150, Hamburg 2006, 11–27; idem, *Erscheinungen Verstorbener im griechisch-römischen Bereich*, in: *ibid.*, 29–43; J. N. Bremmer, *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife. The 1995 Read-Tuckwell Lectures at the University of Bristol*, New York 2002; idem, *Ghosts, Resurrections and Empty Tombs in the Gospels, the Greek Novel, and the Second Sophistic*, in: *The Gospel and Their Stories in Anthropological Perspectives*, ed. J. Verheyden and J. S. Kloppenborg, Tübingen 2018, 231–50; D. Ø. Endsjø, *Greek Resurrection Beliefs and the Success of Christianity*, New York 2009; R. C. Miller, *Resurrection and Reception in Early Christianity*, New York 2014; M. D. Litwa, *Iesus Deus. The Early Christian Depiction of Jesus as a Mediterranean God*, Minneapolis 2014; M. T. Finney, *Resurrection, Hell and the Afterlife. Body and Soul in Antiquity, Judaism and Early Christianity*, New York 2016; J. G. Cook, *Resurrection in Paganism and the Question of an Empty Tomb in 1 Cor 15*, NTS 63 (2017) 56–75, and idem, *The use of ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω and the “Resurrection of a Soul,”* ZNW 108 (2017) 259–280.

willingness of Mediterranean people to gradually accept the Gospel of a crucified and risen savior. Whether the monograph succeeds in showing either or both of these hypotheses to be correct is an evaluation I must leave to the patient reader. Even if sympathetic readers judge that I have failed to demonstrate either hypothesis, I hope that the selection of texts and accompanying discussions will provide the guild of NT scholars, those interested in Second Temple Judaism, historians of religion, and others with something of lasting value. I am not seeking to write a comprehensive history of resurrection in the western world (for which see Caroline Walker Bynum's indispensable survey) nor am I seeking to write a history of conceptions of the afterlife in the West (for which see Philip C. Almond's compelling and beautifully illustrated narrative).²

In the discussions below, "physical resurrection" is a resurrection in which the body of a dead individual returns to life in some sense (e.g., a return to mortal life or immortal life; *Wiederdasein* in German).³ Usually the risen individual appears near his or her tomb. "Physical" or "bodily resurrection" is consistent with a transformation of the earthly body (e.g., into a *σῶμα πνευματικόν* [spiritual body]). In the monograph, I will attempt to distinguish between such resurrections and the immortality of the soul and variations thereof, including texts such as Jubilees 23:29–31 where spirits are "happy."⁴ In addition, I will distinguish as clearly as possible between accounts of translation and resurrection, although they are related, since translated individuals usually possess immortal bodies.⁵ Greek resurrection accounts are usually characterized by verbs that describe the vertical movement of a body (*ἀνίστημι* [*anistēmi*], for example) or the awaking and rising of a dead individual (*ἐγείρω* [*egeirō*]). In other words: a fundamental marker for the concept "resurrection" in the New Testament and elsewhere, based on the meaning of *ἀνίστημι* and *ἐγείρω*, is the bodily motion upward of a formerly dead individual.⁶ This corresponds to the etymological origin of "resurrection" in English, which is the Latin verb "*resurgo*" ("to rise from recumbent position, get up") that was

² Cf. C. W. Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200–1336*, New York 1995 and P. C. Almond, *Afterlife. A History of Life After Death*, Ithaca, NY 2016. Three important surveys of resurrection in early Christianity are: F. Altermath, *Du corps psychique au corps spirituel. Interprétation de 1 Cor. 15,35–49 par les auteurs chrétiens des quatre premiers siècles*, BGBE 18, Tübingen 1977, O. Lehtipuu, *Debates over the Resurrection of the Dead. Constructing Early Christian Identity*, OECT, Oxford 2015, and T. G. Petrey, *Resurrecting Parts. Early Christians on Desire, Reproduction, and Sexual Difference*, London 2016.

³ Zeller, *Erscheinungen*, 39 argues that "resurrection implies an empty grave." That characteristic distinguishes resurrections from the epiphanies of heroes who are buried nearby.

⁴ Cf. chapt. 6 § 4.2.

⁵ Cf. chapt. 1 § 1.proem, chapt. 4.proem, chapt. 4 § 2.proem, and chapt. 7 § 2 (a critique of Elias Bickerman's criteria for "resurrection").

⁶ Clearly not all occurrences of a resurrection need one of these verbs. Such markers are shared by many examples, but not all. Cf. the discussion of polythetic classification and family resemblances in chapt. 4 § 2.proem. Context is key.

adopted by the early Latin translators of the NT as the basic expression for the resurrection of Christ and others.⁷

1 *The Question of Apologetics for (or Subversion of) the Christian Gospel*

The monograph is not intended to be a contribution to Christian apologetics, nor is it intended to be an attack on the Christian faith. Although there is evidence for belief in the resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth (e.g., 1 Cor 15:1–8), I am convinced that David Hume’s dictum is not without warrant:

So that, upon the whole,⁸ we may conclude, that the CHRISTIAN Religion not only was at first attended with miracles, but even at this day cannot be believed by any reasonable person without one. Mere Reason is insufficient to convince us of its veracity: And whoever is mov’d by *Faith* to assent to it, is conscious of a continued Miracle in his own person, which subverts all the principles of his understanding, and gives him a determination to believe what is most contrary to custom and experience.⁹

Although Hume does not say it, Harold Noonan notes: “His interest, as all his contemporary readers knew, was solely in the Christian revelation and its supposed certification by the miracle of the resurrection.”¹⁰ J. C. A. Gaskin suggests that Hume’s conclusion “should be unpacked as ‘The Resurrection can never be proved in such a way that it can function as a good reason to accept the Christian revelation’.”¹¹ What subverts the principles of understanding is a buried body that somehow disappears from a tomb; an event immediately followed by the affirmation of multiple ancient sources in the New Testament that Jesus appeared alive to his disciples. To believe in such events, one has to assume the existence of a God who acts in history.¹² I find it intriguing that David Flusser, a renowned Jewish scholar, affirmed that the reports of Jesus’s post-

⁷ Cf. OLD s.v., § 5 below, and see: resurrection, n., OED Online, Oxford University Press, March 2018, <www.oed.com/view/Entry/164104>. This corresponds with the original meaning of the Young Avestan verbs for resurrection (“get up, rise”) in Zoroastrian texts (cf. § 6).

⁸ At this point, Hume has shown that veridical prophecies are also miracles.

⁹ D. Hume, *Of Miracles*, in: idem, *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*. A Critical Edition, ed. T. L. Beauchamp, Oxford 2000, 83–99, esp. 99 (first ed. London 1748).

¹⁰ H. Noonan, *Hume*, Oxford 2007, 188.

¹¹ J. C. A. Gaskin, *Hume on Religion*, in: *The Cambridge Companion to Hume*, ed. D. F. Norton and J. Taylor, Cambridge 2009, 480–514, esp. 500 (and cp. 501–2).

¹² Thomas’s “Five Ways” (*Summa Theol.* I^a, quaest. 2, art. 3), assuming for the moment that they are cogent, do not demonstrate the existence of such a God. Peter Williamson notes that one unacceptable bias of some [confessional] practitioners of the historical critical method is a “presupposition” which excludes “from the outside the possibility of divine intervention in history.” Cf. idem, *Catholic Principles for Interpreting Scripture*. A Study of the Pontifical Biblical Commission’s *The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church*, SubBi 22, preface A. Vanhoye, Roma 2001, 50.

mortem appearances (with reference to 1 Cor 15:3–8) were “reliable.”¹³ It is the reliability of such witnesses that Hume impugned.

Hume would not be persuaded by the following remarks of Chrysostom addressed to hypothetical pagan critics, but they may reveal some of the philosophical and historical argumentation of late antiquity:

How is it, therefore, that while Christ was alive, they did not endure the Jewish attack, but when he died, was buried, and did not rise, as you say, nor speak to them, nor put courage into them, did they stand side by side in battle with such a world? ... He did not help himself while he was alive, but dead he will stretch out a helping hand to us?

Πόθεν οὖν οἱ ζῶντος τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν Ἰουδαϊκὴν ὁρμὴν οὐκ ἐνεγκόντες, τελευτήσαντος καὶ ταφέντος καὶ μὴ ἀναστάντος, ὥς φατε, μηδὲ διαλεχθέντος αὐτοῖς, μηδὲ θάρσος ἐνθέντος, πρὸς τοσαύτην παρετάττοντο οἰκουμένην; ... ἐαυτῷ οὐκ ἤμυνε ζῶν, καὶ ἡμῖν χεῖρα ὀρέξει τετελευτηκώς;¹⁴

Something happened, according to Chrysostom, to change the lives of the apostles desolated by the crucifixion. One can well imagine that Hume would respond: many people have experienced delusions with regard to matters of religion in antiquity.¹⁵

The confident assertion of Gerd Lüdemann in an article in *Spiegel* reflects the modernity of the debate: “The church’s unwearyingly preached new reality of salvation, indicated by Jesus’s resurrection from the dead, is a Nothing, because Jesus never rose from the dead.”¹⁶ This is a transformation of David Friedrich Strauss’s polemic:

¹³ D. Flusser, in collaboration with R. S. Notley, *Jesus*, Jerusalem 1997, 154–5.

¹⁴ Chrysostom Hom. 4.4 in epist. i ad Cor. (PG 61.36). In Hom. 5.4 in epist. i ad Cor. (PG 61.44), he continues with similar argumentation (speculating about how the apostles would have acted, had Christ not risen from the dead). No existent Greco-Roman author explicitly attacks the Christians’ belief in the resurrection of Jesus until Celsus during the reign of Marcus Aurelius. Celsus’s conceptual objections are in Origen C. Cels. 5.14. For his historical objections (to the witnesses) see 2.55, 63, 70. Cf. J. G. Cook, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco Roman Paganism*, STAC 3, Tübingen 2000, 55–8, 59–61 and chapt. 2 § 1.29 below. I imagine Lucian satirized the resurrection in his *Peregrinus*. Cp. J. N. Bremmer, *Peregrinus’ Christian Career*, in idem, *Maidens, Magic, and Martyrs in Early Christianity*. *Collected Essays I*, WUNT 379, Tübingen 2017, 65–79, esp. 79 and chapt. 4 § 2.2.9.

¹⁵ Cf. Hume’s historical, psychological, and anthropological explanations for polytheism and theism in *ibid.*, *Four Dissertations*. I. The Natural History of Religion. II. Of the Passions. III. Of Tragedy. IV. Of the Standard of Taste, London 1757, 1–117, and idem, *A Dissertation on the Passions*. *The Natural History of Religion*. A Critical Edition, ed. T. L. Beauchamp, Oxford 2007, 224–5 (Beauchamp’s discussion of “psychological explanation”), 225–8 (his discussion of “historical explanation”). I thank Ian Morton for his comments on the treatise.

¹⁶ G. Lüdemann, ... voll Blut und Wunden, *Spiegel Special* 7 (01.07.1998) 122–7, esp. 127. See his prayer to Jesus that begins his small book entitled *Der grosse Betrug*. Und was Jesus wirklich sagte und tat, Lüneberg 1998, 16 (“aus dem Humbug Deiner ‘Auferstehung’” [from the humbug of Your “resurrection”]). Colleague Lüdemann is an instance of John H. Hayes’s dictum: “A whole lot of biblical scholars are driving backwards from Damascus” (personal conversation; cf. *Remembering John H. Hayes*: Feb. 6, 1934–July 11, 2013, *Marginalia*. Los

So the disciples by the production of the idea of the resurrection of their dead master saved his work; and indeed, it was their sincere conviction that they had really seen the resurrected one ... Historically speaking, that is, combining the tremendous effects of this faith with its complete groundlessness, the history of the resurrection of Jesus can only be described as a humbug of world history [*ein welthistorischer Humbug*].¹⁷

This is Strauss's confession written shortly before his death.

Although interested in NT theology, I will not pursue it either in this monograph. In the spring of 1983, I was in the home of Hans Conzelmann in Göttingen and posed this query to the great scholar: "Is the Communist Party's proclamation that 'Lenin lives' the logical equivalent of Rudolf Bultmann's 'Jesus is risen into the kerygma'?"¹⁸ Conzelmann, my generous host, became furious. Of course, Bultmann actually wrote, explaining himself:

It means that Jesus is truly present in the kerygma, that it is *his* word that meets the hearer. If that is the case, then all speculations about the modes of existence of the Resurrected one, all stories about the empty tomb, and all Easter legends, whatever elements in respect to historical facts they might contain, and however true they are in their symbolic content, are of no concern. To believe in the Christ who is present in the kerygma is the meaning of the Easter faith.

... er besagt daß Jesus im Kerygma wirklich gegenwärtig ist, daß es *sein* Wort ist, das den Hörer trifft. Ist das der Fall, so werden alle Spekulationen über die Seinsweise der Auferstandenen, alle Erzählungen vom leeren Grabe und alle Osterlegenden, welche Momente an historischen Fakten sie auch enthalten mögen, and so wahr sie in ihre symbolischen Gehalt sein mögen, gleichgültig. An den im Kerygma präsenten Christus glauben, ist der Sinn der Osterglaubens.¹⁹

Another mentor, Martin Hengel, responded to Bultmann's perspective in a discussion in his home in Tübingen in March of 2006: "Bultmann was right dogmatically, but wrong historically!" In any case, the two statements about Lenin

Angeles Review of Books, August 7, 2013 <<https://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/remem-bering-john-h-hayes-feb-6-1934-july-11-2013>>. On the theory of Christianity as "the original fraud," see H. D. Betz, *The Birth of Christianity as a Hellenistic Religion*, JR 74 (1994) 1–25, esp. 10–5.

¹⁷ D. F. Strauß, *Der alte und der neue Glaube. Ein Bekenntniß*, Bonn 1873, 72–3. The trans. of the last sentence is from G. Lüdemann, *The Resurrection of Jesus. History, Experience, Theology*, Minneapolis 1994, 190.

¹⁸ For the Central Committee's statement that "Lenin lives in the soul of every member of our party [etc.]," cf. N. Tumarkin, *Lenin Lives! The Lenin Cult in Soviet Russia*, Cambridge, MA 1997, 148. "Kerygma" means "[public] proclamation." Cf. BDAG s.v. § 2: "a public declaration, *something proclaimed aloud, proclamation*." See 1 Cor 1:21, 2:4, and 15:14.

¹⁹ R. Bultmann, *Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus*, in: idem, *Exegetica. Aufsätze zur Erforschung des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen 1967, 445–69, esp. 469 (originally in SHAW.PH Jhg. 1960,3 5–27). Jörg Frey (communication of 22 April 2018), with regard to the curious phrase "Momente an historischen Fakten," makes the following perceptive comment: "his wording only touches from far away the possibility that there are such facts."

and Jesus are not logical equivalents, because one can be true and the other can be false and vice versa.²⁰

One can posit a middle way (*via media*) between Hume's unbelief and Christian proclamation. The delightful little book of Géza Vermès on resurrection is well worth perusing in that regard. Although Vermès, as a faithful Jew, did not believe Jesus of Nazareth rose from the dead in the "historical" sense,²¹ he did understand the reality of resurrection in the hearts of the disciples. And he ended his book on this note:

Resurrection in the hearts of men may strike a note of empathy even among today's skeptics and cynics. Whether or not they adhere to a formal creed, a good many men and women of the twenty-first century may be moved and inspired by the mesmerizing presence of the teaching and example of the real Jesus alive in their mind.²²

The Talmudic scholar and historian of religion Daniel Boyarin ends his reflections on *The Jewish Gospels* with some equally compelling remarks:

... the notion that some kind of experience of the risen Christ preceded and gave rise to the idea that he would rise seems to me so unlikely as to be incredible. Perhaps his followers saw him arisen, but surely this must be because they had a narrative that led them to expect such appearances, and not that the appearances gave rise to the narrative.²³

He then describes the centuries of reflection on "a new king, a son of David" who would free them from oppression: "they had come to think of that king as a second younger, divine figure on the basis of the Book of Daniel's reflection of that very ancient tradition." He concludes, "The exaltation and resurrection experiences of his followers are a product of the narrative not a cause of it." With regard to the question whether his "followers saw him risen," he notes, "I am not denying the validity of the Christian view of matters. That is surely a matter of faith, not scholarship. I am denying it as a historical, scholarly, critical explanation."²⁴ The New Testament's proclamation of faith in a crucified and risen Lord is more than what Vermès and Boyarin describe here, but their words are worth reflecting on for those looking for a response to the question of Jesus's resurrection that lies between faith and the view that it is nothing but a "world historical humbug."

²⁰ On the concept see, e.g., R. Lover. *Elementary Logic. For Software Development*, London 2008, 154, 159 (and any elementary logic textbook).

²¹ The cautionary quotes are mine. An examination of this category would take one far beyond the bounds of this investigation. But if the tomb was empty, that was a historical event – whatever the explanation. And if 500 people saw the risen Jesus (1 Cor 15:6), then that was a historical event – whatever the explanation. Cf. chapt. 7 § 2, in particular the references to Lane Fox's work. X. Léon-Dufour's reflections on the topic remain useful (*Resurrection and the Message of Easter*, New York 1974, 195–249).

²² G. Vermès, *The Resurrection. History and Myth*, New York 2008, 149–52, esp. 152.

²³ D. Boyarin, *The Jewish Gospels*, New York 2012, 159.

²⁴ Boyarin, *The Jewish Gospels*, 159–60.

My interest in the monograph, instead of apologetics or critique, is a historical investigation of resurrection and analogies for resurrection in the Greco-Roman world (including Second Temple Judaism) and the origins of the language for resurrection. The authors of the New Testament were able to draw on the rich linguistic resources of Greek-speaking Judaism to express the concept of resurrection.²⁵ That vocabulary itself, however, emerged from the surrounding culture of Hellenism. Subsequent to the emergence of Christianity in Palestine, the early Christians for the most part themselves were of pagan origin. A close investigation of Judaism's and paganism's vocabulary for resurrection can illuminate how those converts might have understood the New Testament's proclamation of resurrection. A detailed philological analysis of the Hellenistic vocabulary, which to my knowledge has not been carried out since the seminal article of Erich Fascher, is an essential component of New Testament philology.²⁶ Some remarks on the Semitic background of the Septuagint's vocabulary for resurrection are in order.

2 The Semantics of *yqs*, *qys*, *qûm*, and *hyh*

A brief summary of the linguistic approach I will adopt below should be useful. The methodology comprises a straightforward semantics based on usage, in which words can have multiple meanings. Context helps determine which meaning (or "sememe" in the terminology of semanticist Kurt Baldinger) is correct in a given example. The basic (or minimal) components of a word's given meaning are "semes." The conceptual meaning of a word and its reference (or "class") should be distinguished.²⁷ Gathering together the words most commonly associated with the concept resurrection is an exercise in "semantic

²⁵ Some of this material is indebted to my study: The Vocabulary for Resurrection in Paganism, in: *In mari via tua*. Philological Studies in Honour of Antonio Piñero, *Estudios de filología neotestamentaria* 11, ed. I. M. Gallarte and J. Peláez, Córdoba 2016, 197–216.

²⁶ Fascher, *Anastasis*, passim, Oepke, *ἐγείρω*, 333–39 and idem, *ἀνίστημι*, 368–72 devotes minimal attention to resurrection in Hellenism. Endsjø, *Greek Resurrection Beliefs* collected much excellent data, but did few linguistic investigations.

²⁷ K. Baldinger, *Semantic Theory. Towards a Modern Semantics*, New York 1980. Cf. the summary in J. G. Cook, *Structure and Persuasive Power of Mark. A Linguistic Approach*, *Semeia Studies*, Atlanta 1995, 89–99. See also K. Heger, *Monem, Wort, Satz, und Text*, Tübingen 1976, and B. Garza-Cuarón, *Connotation and Meaning, Approaches to Semiotics* 99, Berlin 1991. One could add many names here, but that is not my goal. The traditional example for sense and reference is: "Venus" and "the morning star" both have different conceptual meanings, but have the same referential meaning. Cf. G. Frege, *Über Sinn und Bedeutung*, *ZPPK* 100 (1892) 25–50, esp. 32, 37–8. Sextus Empiricus attributes this distinction to the Stoics (*Math.* 8.11 = *Adv. Log.* 2.11 = *SVF* 2.166 Chrysippus); cp. Cook, *ibid.*, 89–90.

fields” or “semantic domains,” and the lexicon of Johannes P. Loew and Eugene A. Nida is an example of such research.²⁸

Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, the authors of the standard lexicon of Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic (HALOT), argue that *yqs* (“to awake”) is an “alternative form” of *qys*, and that the Hiphil form of *yqs* means “awaken from sleep.”²⁹ Gerhard Wallis’s definition of the Hiphil of *yqs* is more accurate than that of HALOT, since he is aware that the form is always “used intransitively in the sense of ‘awaken’.”³⁰ HALOT makes the clearly erroneous claim that the Hiphil form of *yqs* means “to arouse persons from sleep.”³¹ All the usages listed by HALOT mean “wake up,” and not “arouse persons from sleep.”³² GKC call this usage “inwardly transitive” – “entering into a certain condition and, further, the being in the same” and define the Hiphil of *yqs* to mean “to become awake.”³³ Ronald J. Williams simply describes such usage as the “intransitive Hiphil” (“exhibiting a state or quality or ... entering into a remaining in a state or condition”).³⁴ Bill T. Arnold and John H. Choi describe this usage of the Hiphil as “intransitive causation” – “it designates an entry into a state or condition and the continuation of the state or condition.”³⁵ Wallis presents some interesting statistics concerning the translation of the Hiphil in the verbs in the LXX: “In rendering *yqs/qys* hiphil, the LXX uses *egeirō* or *egeirōmai* 3 times, a translation it also uses for *ʾwr* (once);³⁶ it uses *exegeirō* or *exegeirōmai* 14 times, as well as 19 times for *ʾwr*, for which it is actually a better translation in its original sense of ‘rouse, stir up’.”³⁷ I think a better explanation for the use of forms of *ἐγείρω* and *ἐξεγείρω* in the LXX for the

²⁸ L&N, vi–xi (theory). O. M. Bakke, ‘Concord and Peace.’ A Rhetorical Analysis of the First Letter of Clement with an Emphasis on the Language of Unity and Sedition, WUNT 2/143, Tübingen 2001, 65–68 summarizes the concept and its history.

²⁹ Cf. HALOT s.v., G. Wallis, *yqs*; *qys*, TDOT 6 (1990), 274–9, and J. F. A. Sawyer, Hebrew Words for the Resurrection of the Dead, VT 23 (1973) 218–34, esp. 223, 225–6. Sawyer’s claim (230) that there are twenty passages in the HB that refer to resurrection is doubtful.

³⁰ Wallis, *yqs*, 275.

³¹ HALOT s.v.

³² HALOT s.v. *yqs*: (from sleep) 1 Sam 26:12, Isa 29:8, Jer 31:26, Ps 3:6, 17:15, 73:20, Prov 6:22, 23:35; (from drunkenness) Joel 1:5, Prov 23:35; (from death) 2 Kgs 4:21, Isa 26:19, Jer 51:39, 57, Job 14:12, Dan 12:2; (God) Ps 35:23, 44:24, 59:6; (wood) Hab 2:19; and Ezek 7:6. All these texts are intransitive, that is, none imply that someone woke another up from sleep.

³³ GKC § 53d–e (cp. 78b).

³⁴ Cf. R. J. Williams and J. C. Beckman, Williams’ Hebrew Syntax, Toronto³ 2007, § 150.

³⁵ B. T. Arnold and J. H. Choi, A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax, Cambridge 2003, § 3.1.6b, p. 51.

³⁶ HALOT s.v. *עור* define the Qal form to mean “be awake, stir.”

³⁷ Wallis, *yqs*, 275. I have omitted “III” after *ʾwr*.

Hebrew verbs (*yqs/qys* Hiphil) is that the Greek verb can mean both “wake up” and “get up” as will be argued below.³⁸

The image of death as sleep in Dan 12:2 probably motivated Theodotion to translate יָקִיצוּ (awake) with ἐξεγερθήσονται (awake/rise), although the Old Greek translator used the more straightforward ἀναστήσονται (rise, stand up).³⁹ In Isa 26:19 הִקְיִצּוּ (awake)⁴⁰ and יָקִימוּן (they will rise) are also translated by ἐγερθήσονται, which is in parallel with ἀναστήσονται. ἐγερθήσονται not only has the connotation of “rising up,” but also of “waking up.” But clearly it also does not simply mean “wake up,” since the English usage would not necessarily imply a physical motion upward.⁴¹ The LXX translates יָקִיצוּ (awoke, roused up) in 1 Sam 26:12 with ὁ ἐξεγειρόμενος (woke up, roused up) in 1 Kgdms 26:12. Gehazi’s failure to raise the dead child is expressed similarly: for הִקְיִצּוּ in 2 Kgs 4:31, the LXX in 4 Kgdms 4:31 uses ἡγέρθη (awoke/got up).⁴² The Psalmist (3:6) “rouses up” (הִקְיִצּוּ; ἐξεγέρθη) because the Lord will uphold him. Movement upward is clearly implied by the prior statement that “I lay down” (שָׁכַבְתִּי; ἐκοιμήθη). In Jer 31:26, the prophet awakes (הִקְיִצּוּ), which the LXX (38:26) renders with ἐξεγέρθη (I woke/roused up). A text from Habakkuk is instructive (2:19),

Alas for you who say to the wood, “Wake up!” to silent stone, “Rouse yourself!” (Hab 2:19 NRSV)

הוּא אָמַר לַעֵץ הַקִּיֶּצָה עוֹרֵי לֶאבֶן דּוֹמֵם

Woe to the one who says to the wood, “Sober up, rouse yourself up!” and to the stone, “Exalt yourself!” (Hab 2:19 LXX)

οὐαὶ ὁ λέγων τῷ ξύλῳ Ἐκνηψον ἐξεγέρθητι, καὶ τῷ λίθῳ Ὑψώθητι

The sense of ἐξεγέρθητι is parallel to that of ὑψώθητι, and consequently cannot be limited to “wake up” in English. LXX practice clearly explains the NT’s frequent use of ἐγείρω for resurrection.

Johann Gamberoni notes that the Qal of the verb קָם (*qûm*) “refers to physical ‘rising,’ ‘getting/standing up,’ ‘leaving a place’ (‘with *min*’ [from])” while Hiphil “says the same thing from the perspective of the external cause.”⁴³ One of the earliest examples of a use of the verb in the context of resurrection is 2 Kgs 13:21, in which a man rises from the dead after touching the bones of Elisha:

³⁸ Cf. § 3.

³⁹ Cf. the discussion in chapt. 6 § 1.4. b. San. 92a (cf. chapt. 6 § 8.8) uses Dan 12:2 in a discussion of how resurrection is derived from the Torah.

⁴⁰ Or some similar grammatical form. Cf. chapt. 6 § 1.2.

⁴¹ Cf. chapt. 6 § 1.2.

⁴² Cf. chapt. 6 § 1.8.

⁴³ J. Gamberoni, קָם *qûm*, TDOT 12 (2012) 589–612, esp. 593.

As a man was being buried, a marauding band was seen and the man was thrown into the grave of Elisha; as soon as the man touched the bones of Elisha, he came to life and stood on his feet (2 Kgs 13:21 NRSV).

ויהי הם קברים איש והנה ראו את הגדוד וישליכו את האיש בקבר אלישע וילך ויגע האיש
בעצמות אלישע ויהי ויקם על רגליו

And it happened, when they were burying the man, that behold, they saw the lightly armed man, and they threw the man in the grave of Elisaie, and he went and touched the bones of Elisaie, and he revived and stood up on his feet (4 Kgdms 13:21 NETS, *kaige* recension).

καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτῶν θαπτόντων τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ ἰδοὺ εἶδον τὸν μονόζωνον καὶ ἔρριψαν τὸν ἄνδρα ἐν τῷ τάφῳ Ελισαιε, καὶ ἐπορεύθη καὶ ἥψατο τῶν ὀστέων Ελισαιε καὶ ἔζησεν καὶ ἀνέστη ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (4 Kgdms 13:21 *kaige*).

And it happened, as they were burying a person, that the group of attackers came near, and they threw the man into the grave of Elisaie and fled. And he came and touched the bones of Elisaie, and he revived and stood on his feet (4 Kgdms 13:20, recension of Antioch).

καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτῶν θαπτόντων ἄνθρωπον ἓνα, καὶ ἤγγισε τὸ πειρατήριον αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔρριψαν τὸν ἄνδρα ἐν τῷ τάφῳ Ἐλισσαῖε καὶ ἔφυγον. καὶ ἦλθε καὶ ἥψατο ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ θαπτόμενος τῶν ὀστέων Ἐλισσαῖε καὶ ἔζησε καὶ ἔστη ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (4 Kgdms 13:20 Antiochene recension).⁴⁴

Although the LXX translation was probably made soon after 200 C.E., the Hebrew text was probably written (or compiled) in the sixth century B.C.E., during the exile.⁴⁵ It is possible that the Antiochene recension stands closer to the Old Greek translation.⁴⁶ Marvin Sweeney writes that “the resurrection motif is common to the Elijah and Elishah traditions in 1 Kgs 17:17–24 and 2 Kgs 4:8–37.”⁴⁷ The construction, “he stood on his feet” (יקם על רגליו), otherwise only appears in 1 Chron 28:2.⁴⁸ The same verb is used in the negation of the possibility of resurrection in Ps 88:10, where יקומו (will rise) is translated by

⁴⁴ N. Fernández Marcos and J. Ramón Busto Saiz, ed., *El texto antioqueno de la biblia griega*. II 1–2 Reyes, TECC 53, Madrid 1992, 120.

⁴⁵ M. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, JSOTS 15, Sheffield 1981, 4–25 [first ed. 1943] dates the Deuteronomistic material (Deut–2 Kgs) to the middle of the sixth century. See J. Barton, *How the Bible Came to Be*, Louisville, KY 1997, 31 and M. A. Sweeney, *I & II Kings*. A Commentary, OTL, Louisville, KY 2007, 4–5.

⁴⁶ W. Kraus and M. Karrer et al., ed., *Septuaginta Deutsch*. Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung, Stuttgart 2011 (LXX.De), 301. One cannot conclude that the Antiochene text always represents the Old Greek according to N. Fernández Marcos, *Translating the Historical Books*, in: XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Helsinki, 2010, ed. M. K. Peters, Atlanta 2013, 219–30, esp. 227: “The Old Greek can only be reached through the examination of all the evidence at our disposal submitted to the rules of textual criticism.”

⁴⁷ Sweeney, *I & II Kings*, 360.

⁴⁸ Gamberoni, *qûm*, 601. He compares it to Ezek 37:10: ויעמדו על רגליהם (and they stood on their feet). Standing (עמידה) becomes a term used in the inscriptions for resurrection. Cf. chapt. 6 § 2.

ἀναστήσουσιν (will rise).⁴⁹ The same Hebrew and Greek verbs are used for the denial of the resurrection of the enemy in Isa 26:14.⁵⁰ Amos 5:2 also includes a metaphorical usage of קם, in which the resurrection of Israel is denied:

Fallen, no more to rise, is maiden Israel; forsaken on her land, with no one to raise her up (Amos 5:2 NRSV).

נפלה לא תוסיף קום בתולת ישראל נטשה על אדמתה אין בוקמה

She has fallen, no more to rise, the maiden Israel; she slipped upon her land; there is no one to raise her up (Amos 5:2 LXX NETS).

Ἐπεσεν οὐκέτι μὴ προσθῆῃ τοῦ ἀναστήναι παρθένος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ· ἔσφαλεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτῆς, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἀναστήσων αὐτήν.

The insistence that “she will rise no more” is parallel to “she has fallen” and indicates that the corpse of a person will not stand up again.⁵¹ The corpse imagery is also an allegory (or metaphor) for the state of Israel.⁵² In the LXX, in the vast majority of usages of ἀνίστημι, the Hebrew equivalent is קם. The verb is used occasionally in various later texts to refer to the resurrection of the dead.⁵³

חיה (*hyh*) in the Qal form, as defined by HALOT, means “be alive, stay alive,” and in the context of resurrection means “to return to life, revive.”⁵⁴ Elijah’s resurrection of the dead son of the widow of Zarephath illustrates this usage:

⁴⁹ Cf. chapt. 6 § 1.1.

⁵⁰ Cf. chapt. 6 § 1.2. Isa 26:19 LXX is somewhat more problematic. Cf. chapt. 6 § 1.2.

⁵¹ See A. J. Bjørndalen, *Untersuchungen zur allegorischen Rede der Propheten Amos und Jesaja*, BZAW 165, Berlin 1986, 167 and HALOT s.v. קם § 5 (Hiphil). J. L. Mays, *Amos*, OTL, Philadelphia 1969, 85 writes: “The fall of the nation is tragically hopeless; there is none to help, for her no national ‘resurrection’.”

⁵² Bjørndalen, *Untersuchungen*, 166.

⁵³ Cf. *Midrash Tannaim Deut 32:39* in chapt. 6 § 8.14.6, *Tg. Ket. Job 14:12* in chapt. 6 § 1.7, *Tg. Ps-J. Gen 3:19* in § 8.1, and 4Q521 frgs 7 1–8 + 5 Col. ii 7–16, line 6 in § 6.

⁵⁴ HALOT s.v. with the following as examples of “to return to life, revive” in Qal § 4: 2 Kgs 13:21, Isa 26:14, 19, 39:1 (1Q Is^a), Ezek 37:3, 5, 9–10, 14, 47:9; in Piel Hos 6:2. Some of these are questionable. For example, Hezekiah had not died in Isa 39:1 (1Q Is^a). Ezek 47:9 mentions no specific resurrection. In addition, 1 Kgs 17:22–3, which HALOT places in Qal § 3 “revive, recover” [from illness] surely belongs in § 4, since the boy was dead and not sick or weak (which is what their examples from Qal § 3 include: Gen 20:7, 45:27, Josh 5:8, Judg 15:19, 2 Kgs 1:2, 8:8, 10, 14, 20:7, Isa 38:1, 9 [where the LXX has ἀνέστη “he rose”], 16, 21). For the use of the verb to refer to recovery from illness cf. W. W. Graf von Baudissin, *Adonis und Esmun. Eine Untersuchung zur Geschichte des Glaubens an Auferstehungsgötter und an Heilgötter*, Leipzig 1911, 390–5, and with ref. to resurrection see *ibid.*, 480–5 (where he includes 1 Kgs 17:22 and 2 Kgs 13:21). Cp. H. Ringgren, *חַיָּה chāyāh*, etc., TDOT 4 (1981) 324–44, esp. 334: 1 Kgs 17:22, 2 Kgs 13:21 (in both “a dead man is restored to life”); 341: Isa 26:14, 19 (“national existence is meant”); 337: Hos 6:2 (see chapt. 6 § 1.5 for his views on the verse).

The Lord listened to the voice of Elijah; the life of the child came into him again, and he revived (1 Kgs 17:22 NRSV)

וישמע יהוה בקול אליהו ותשב נפש הילד על קרבו ויחי

And it happened thus, and the lad cried out (3 Kgdms 17:22 LXX NETS)

καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως, καὶ ἀνεβόησεν τὸ παιδάριον.

And the Lord listened to the voice of Elijah, and the life of the child returned to him, and he revived (3 Kgdms 17:22 Aquila)

✠καὶ ἤκουσε κύριος ἐν φωνῇ Ἡλίου, καὶ ἐπεστράφη ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ παιδαρίου πρὸς ἔγκατον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔζησεν.⁵⁵

The LXX translation may have depended on a different Hebrew source. In 17:23, Elijah presents the boy to his mother “alive”: וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלֶיהָ רֵאִי הִי בֶנִךְ (and Elijah said, behold, your son is alive), for which the LXX translation in 3 Kgdms 17:23 is: βλέπε, ζῆ ὁ υἱός σου (see, your son is alive). Sweeney remarks that the narrative’s depiction of God’s restoration of “the lifeless boy plays upon” and “undermines” a “mythic pattern” – including Dumuzi’s descent into the underworld and his subsequent rescue by Inanna.⁵⁶ נפש (*nephesh*) and ψυχὴ (*psychē*) here refer to the child’s “breath of life” and not his immortal soul.⁵⁷ The verb appears in the negation of the possibility of resurrection of the enemies in Isa 26:14 (“they will not live” מֵתִים בְּלִיַּחַי) where the LXX translates with “they will never see life” (οἱ δὲ νεκροὶ ζῶην οὐ μὴ ἴδωσιν).⁵⁸ The presumably metaphorical affirmation of resurrection in Isa 26:19 (“your dead will live” יַחַי מֵתִךְ) is translated as “the dead will rise” (ἀναστῆσονται οἱ νεκροί) in the LXX, while the versions use ζήσονται (will return to life).⁵⁹ Hos 6:2 uses the Piel form of the verb (“bring back to life”) in a metaphorical reference to the resurrection of Israel (“he will revive us after two days” יַחַיֵנוּ מִיָּמַיִם).⁶⁰ The rabbis later understood the text as a literal reference to resurrection, and Paul probably alludes to it in 1 Cor 15:4 – there is no better alternative.⁶¹ Texts

⁵⁵ The symbols indicate that Origen added these words to the LXX from the versions. Text from F. Field, *Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt* ... 2 vols., Oxford 1875, 1.632. The Syro Hexapla marked καὶ ἀνεβόησεν with an obelus, a sign indicating the LXX text was longer than the Hebrew.

⁵⁶ Sweeney, I & II Kings, 214–5 (he focuses on Baal and his consort as responsible for the land’s fertility). On Dumuzi and Baal, cf. chapt. 1 § 2 and 3.

⁵⁷ Cf. HALOT s.v. § 7 “breath (life) of the child.”

⁵⁸ See chapt. 6 § 1.2.

⁵⁹ See chapt. 6 § 1.2.

⁶⁰ Cf. HALOT s.v.

⁶¹ Cf. chapt. 6 § 1.5 and 8.14 and D. Häusser, *Christusbekennnis und Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus*, WUNT 2/210, Tübingen 2006, 102 with ref. to W. Rudolph, *Hosea*, Gütersloh 1966, 137), H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*,

from Qumran and the Cairo Geniza (the second Benediction) also use the Piel form of the verb to refer to resurrection.⁶² The Tosefta and other rabbinic texts likewise employ the expression.⁶³

3 The Semantics of ἐγείρω (egeirō) and ἀνίστημι (anistēmi)

Below I will focus on the NT's two primary verbs for resurrection, although in classical Greek ἀναβιώω, ἀναβιώσις, and a number of other terms could express the return of a dead person to life.⁶⁴ ἀναβιώω and ἀναβιώσις, however, were inherently ambiguous and could be used for the return of a hero's soul to life on earth.⁶⁵ Consequently, the NT avoids those two words to refer to the resurrection of Christ and the general resurrection.⁶⁶

3.1 Meaning and Usage

James Ware, in a recent analysis of ἐγείρω, distinguishes three senses, the first two of which are closely related: 1) awaken, raise from sleep or wake up, rise from sleep; 2) rouse up, stir up; and 3) raise up, set up right or rise up, stand upright.⁶⁷ In the first and third senses "the basic semantic meaning of *getting up* or *arising to stand* is present."⁶⁸ This seems correct in general, although

Hermeneia, Philadelphia 1975, 256 ("it can only be Hos 6:2"), H. Wolff, Hosea. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Hosea, Hermeneia, Philadelphia 1974, 118 (with ref. to 1 Cor 15:4 [and cp. Lk 24:7] "hardly another passage was as appropriate as Hos 6:2").

⁶² Chapt. 6 § 6 and 7.

⁶³ t. San. 13:3 (Zuckerman). Cf. Chapt. 6 § 8.5 etc. מְחַיֵּה מֵתִים (who gives life to the dead) occurs fairly often in rabbinic literature including b. Ketub. 8b: מְחַיֵּה מֵתִים בְּמַאמְרֵי (who gives life to the dead with his word). See the examples in the Bar Ilan Responsa Database (<www.responsa.co.il>).

⁶⁴ See Artapanus apud Eusebius, P.E. 9.27.25 and 2 Macc 7:9 in chapt. 6 § 1.6 for two examples.

⁶⁵ This is the case in Philostratus's *Heroikos* where Protesilaos returns to life as a heroized soul and a *daimōn*. Cf. chapt. 3 § 2.1.

⁶⁶ They are found, however, in several Jewish sources including the LXX. Cf. chapt. 6 § 1.6 and § 1.8: 2 Macc 7:9 and Artapanus apud Eusebius P.E. 9.27.25.

⁶⁷ J. Ware, The Resurrection of Jesus in Pre-Pauline Formula of 1 Cor 15.3–5, NTS 60 (2014) 475–98, esp. 492–5. See also my investigations: Resurrection in Paganism, 56–75; and The use of ἀνίστημι, 259–280.

⁶⁸ Ware, Resurrection, 494. Etymologically, for ἐγρήγορα, the Sanskrit origin is *jāgāra* (P. Chantraine, Dictionnaire étymologique, Paris 1968–80, s.v., F. Montanari, The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek, Leiden 2015, s.v. ἐγείρω), a 3 sg. perfect form from a root that means: "to wake," "to watch over," "to be roused." See T. Benfrey, A Sanskrit-English Dictionary ..., London 1866, 328 (*jāgr*). Cp. M. Monier-Williams, Sanskrit English Dictionary ..., Oxford 1899, 417 s.v. *jāgr* for other meanings. Chantraine (ibid.) indicates how ἐγείρω developed from the aorist ἔγρετο. The entry in R. Beekes, Etymological Dictionary of Greek, Leiden 2010, s.v. does not differ essentially from the results of Chantraine.