

ABSTRACT

Redefinition of Immortality of the Soul with Respect to the Resurrection of the Body

Erin M. Russo

Director: David L. Jeffrey, Ph.D.

The immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the dead are two of the most widely treated topics among early and medieval Christian writers. I argue that the foundational Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body is not reconcilable with the Platonic concept of the immortality of the soul; likewise the idea of the soul's immortality seems to shift and eventually diminish in value throughout the early and medieval periods, as shown through the prayers and teachings of the church. Looking at the origins of somatic resurrection and its difference from Platonic immortality, the New Testament and Patristic teachings on the two, the prayers and funeral traditions of the post-schism Church, and the *Speculum Humanae Salvationis* manuscript, I will attempt to redefine Christian immortality with respect to Christian resurrection from a philological perspective. While the resurrection of the body is an uncontested doctrine among believers, the immortality of the Christian soul takes on different meanings over time, and requires standard definition. I find the term "immortality" insufficient for relating Christian immortality and psychosomatic resurrection. Therefore, I shall endeavor to create a new term for Christian psychosomatic eternal life, with the resurrection of the body acting as the focal point for redefinition – a term that encompasses the properties of the soul, the truths of Christian resurrection, and an eschatological hope for the Second Coming of Christ.

APPROVED BY DIRECTOR OF HONORS THESIS:

Dr. David Jeffrey, The Honors Program

APPROVED BY THE HONORS PROGRAM:

Dr. Elizabeth Corey, Director

DATE: _____

REDEFINITION OF IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL WITH RESPECT TO THE
RESURRECTION OF THE BODY

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

Baylor University

In partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Honors Program

By

Erin M. Russo

Waco, Texas

May 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	iii
Chapter One: Immortality and Resurrection in the Old Testament, Apocrypha, and Pre-Christian Literature.....	1
Chapter Two: The Immortality of the Soul and Resurrection of the Dead in the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers.....	22
Chapter Three: Immortality of the Soul and Resurrection of the Body in the Writings of the Patristic and Medieval Authors.....	52
Chapter Four: The Immortality of the Soul and the Resurrection of the Body in Renaissance Liturgical Practices.....	76
Conclusion.....	97
Bibliography.....	102

INTRODUCTION

Most people in Western culture are familiar with the general concept of immortality. Resurrection is also a familiar doctrine, given the influence of Christianity and the importance of resurrection as the cornerstone of the Christian faith. This project describes the development of thought surrounding these terms. Specifically, I address the Platonic concept of the immortality of the soul and the Christian belief in the resurrection of the body. These two facets of the broader ideas of immortality and resurrection have been misunderstood and misappropriated throughout the centuries.

Chapter One considers immortality, resurrection, and their relation to one another in the Old Testament, pre-Christian pagan writings, and Jewish intertestamental literature. Chapter Two addresses this same topic throughout the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers. Chapter Three continues to trace the development of the doctrines and their relation to each other in the Patristic and Medieval authors. Finally, Chapter Four discusses these ideas in Renaissance Christian liturgy.

I became interested in the broader topic of eschatology at a young age, and in my early college years I also began to think about the human attributes and limitations that people often ascribe to God both scripturally and theologically. As I thought about the possibility that God may not actually have hands, a nose, feet, and more (with which to "hold us in his hands" as the song states, smell the pleasing aroma of offerings in the Old Testament, walk in Eden with Adam and Eve, etc.), I wrestled with the concept that Heaven and Hell may not be physical places. I thought about the descriptions of Heaven

and Hell throughout the Bible and subsequent writings, yet I struggled with the possibility of God being contained within the bounds of space. Within the topic of Heaven and Hell I came across the ideas of body and soul as parts of a whole person; in my classical studies I noted that immortality was frequently associated with the soul, and I knew from Scripture that Christian resurrection was related to the body.

The goal of this thesis is to show that the Platonic concept of immortality, which is what most people think of when they hear "the immortality of the soul," is irreconcilable with the Christian concept of somatic (and psychosomatic) resurrection of the dead. I shall also endeavor to invent a new term for the proper relation of immortality and resurrection. This conclusion will be useful for differentiating between immortality and resurrection in Christianity; this differentiation is necessitated by a general misunderstanding of the two doctrines and the subsequent misappropriation that occurs – people often read immortality into discussions of resurrection and vice versa. I am hopeful that the results of this project will be beneficial both in personal devotions and theological studies.

CHAPTER ONE

Immortality and Resurrection in the Old Testament, Apocrypha, and Pre-Christian Literature

The resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul are two of the most widely disputed and generally misunderstood concepts in philosophy and "theologies of postmortem reward and punishment" (Levenson 79, Stendahl 9). The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is integral to Christian belief and practice, but it was a divisive issue among the Jews as early as the Second Temple Era – Pharisees and Sadducees differed in opinions on resurrection; Pharisees accepted it, while Sadducees did not (Setzer 21). However, the immortality of the soul, because it attested to primarily in pagan literature, remains mysterious. Accordingly, I shall first provide working definitions of immortality and resurrection, in order to refine and redefine them as this project progresses.

In its most basic form, the immortality of the soul is a pre-Christian, pagan doctrine most often associated with Plato's *Phaedo*. The soul acquires undying-ness upon conception in the womb, and does not ever die – separation from the body liberates the soul. The body, however, merely a physical house for the soul, eventually passes on. Greek terms that embody this quality are ἀφθαρσία, which means "incorruptibility",¹ and

¹ In the New Testament and other early Christian texts, this comes to mean "incorruptibility of resurrected bodies to decay" (Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811).

ἀθανασία, which means "deathlessness."² The resurrection of the body, on the other hand, is a Judeo-Christian belief that arose during the intertestamental period, also known as Second Temple Judaism (Bromiley "Resurrection," IV.145-150; Levenson 39). According to this doctrine, the body and soul, although the two shall part at the death of the body, will one day be reunited – the body itself shall rise in a renewed state, a perfected home for the purified soul; Jewish literature specifies that "The World of Resurrection is thus the ultimate reward...the wicked and unbelieving, however, are consigned to Genenna, a place of torment" (Parsons). Greek terms used to describe resurrection are ἀνάστασις, a standing up, and ἔγερσις, a rising up.³ Associated Hebrew terms are *tehiyyat ha-metim* (resurrection) and *al-mawet* (immortality; Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811).

As shown through a philological approach in the Old Testament, intertestamental literature, and pagan pre-Christian writings, the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul are not wholly reconcilable – there is a missing link necessary for complete agreement. I shall examine the aforementioned genres of text by reviewing the words ἀθανασία, ἀφθαρσία, ἔγερσις, ἀνάστασις, *tehiyyat ha-metim*, and *al-mawet* in context, with other inferences drawn from passages dealing heavily with the afterlife of the soul and body (Skolnik and Berenbaum "Life and Death," XIII.5-6).

² This comes to mean "immunity from death enjoyed by believers," also rendered as *posse non mori* (man is able not to die; Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811).

³ These two nouns have associated verbs, ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω, that appear quite frequently in all genres of Greek literature. However, due to the constraints of this thesis and the sheer volume of available nouns, I do not have the opportunity to address the word fields associated with these verbs.

In Jewish writings, which include the Hebrew Old Testament, the Apocrypha, and the Jewish Talmud, there are few references to either immortality or resurrection (of which there are various smaller schools of thought; as Setzer states, "resurrection is...part of an ever-shifting constellation of ideas," 20). This is mostly due to a lack of developed doctrine until later times (Bromiley "Resurrection," IV.145-150), but also shows lack of theological interaction with other cultures during the first millennium B.C. (granted, Israel was frequently exiled or enduring internal or external strife; likewise the Bible indicates a lack of religious integrity during that time, which is necessary for serious theological development). What doctrines did exist were centered around the present time, so there was not much concern for the afterlife of the soul (Bromiley "Resurrection," IV.145-150). There are mentions of Sheol and Hades, which modern writers argue is an intermediate state of the soul. Because the Old Testament does not often pair these words with the words "soul" or "body" in a complete sense, it is hard to discover the true extent of Jewish thought on the afterlife. There are some references to resurrection, found in intertestamental literature, which emphasize that the body and soul are united at some point after death. The Talmud seems to indicate that souls become spirit-like after death, and that there is no final soul-state (such as Hades or Sheol, if in fact these can be considered "final"; Skolnik and Berenbaum "Immortality of the Soul," XIX.35-38).

The Hebrew Old Testament is extremely inexplicit on the subject of immortality and resurrection, because of the lack of developed doctrine and the foreign nature of immortality as we understand it today; oftentimes any mention of an afterlife is grouped into the unspecific term "everlasting life" which appears to refer to immortality as late as

4 Maccabees (Skolnik and Berenbaum "Afterlife," I.441-442; Levenson 90; tr. Brenton).

The few references to an afterlife, such as Heaven, Hell, and Sheol, are very metonymic and focused on present behavior in the spiritual, familial, and national arenas (Levenson 66). The Greek Septuagint, however, is more liberal with its use of the words ἀφθαρσία, ἀθανασία, ἀνάστασις, and ἔγερσις. The first recorded use of these words in the Septuagint occurs as the subtitle of Psalm 65 (66). The psalmist wrote, "for the end, a song of a psalm of resurrection" (εἰς τὸ τέλος, ᾠδὴ ψαλμοῦ ἀναστάσεως; 65:1).⁴

However, despite the occurrence of the word ἀνάστασις, the Psalm is not eschatologically minded. Instead, the writer praises the goodness and faithfulness of God in His works towards humankind and vows to worship Him in word and deed. In this instance, it seems that the word ἀνάστασις, which in later literature became the word for resurrection, means a getting up from a seated position. The psalmist clearly intends immediate action with the constant use of future and imperative verbs ("Come, hear, and I will tell"; Δεῦτε ἀκούσατε, καὶ διηγήσομαι; 65:16). The action is not eschatological in nature, but is motivational for the present day.

This morally motivational nature of resurrection is made more evident in Psalm 138 (139). The Psalmist writes, "Thou knowest my down-sitting and mine up-rising" (Σὺ ἔγνωσ τὴν καθέδραν μου καὶ τὴν ἔγερσίν μου; 138:2). The use of the word ἔγερσις in this passage is directly opposed to sitting down (καθέδρα), which signifies the conscious, daily, necessary act of rising up. Resurrection, in this sense, does not require the person to be dead, nor does it seem to directly foreshadow the resurrection of Christ from the dead, nor does it contain any eschatological implications. Rather, ἔγερσις is focused on

⁴ All translations are my own unless another translator is cited.

the present day and an active choice. The concrete, immediate nature of ἔγερσις is also strengthened by the aorist verbs, which tense implies a relationship begun and ongoing with the subject (ἐδοκίμασας, ἔγνωσ, συνῆκας). The writer of Lamentations uses a very similar word choice to convey the same idea of getting up and sitting down. He writes, "Their sitting down and their rising up: look thou upon their eyes" (καθέδραν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀνάστασιν αὐτῶν: ἐπίβλεψον ἐπὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν; 3:63; tr. Brenton). Although the author uses ἀνάστασις instead of ἔγερσις, it still references daily, present action and has no implications for the afterlife; these three passages illustrate the undeveloped state of Christian ideas of resurrection (which involves eschatological belief and influences current practice) among the pre-Christian Jews.

The idea of daily "rising up" is not attributed to humankind alone. Zephaniah says, "Therefore wait for me, says the Lord, until the day when I rise up for a witness: because my judgment shall be upon the gatherings of the nations" (Διατοῦτο ὑπόμεινόν με, λέγει Κύριος, εἰς ἡμέραν ἀναστάσεώς μου εἰς μαρτύριον: διὸ τὸ κρίμα μου εἰς συναγωγὰς ἐθνῶν; 3:8). The Lord shall rise up to dispense judgment upon all the nations; this mention of resurrection can be construed as pertaining to an afterlife, but not to the resurrection of humans. Those who believe that the Lord's judgment shall affect the fate of humanity may be influenced to change their daily behavior to reflect the coming verdict.⁵ This chapter in Zephaniah both warns of the punishment of disobedient nations, but also describes the love of God towards his children; the rising up regards future time (as opposed to the present) and signifies a slow shift toward the Christian

⁵ The idea that the righteous could hope for resurrection as an extension of God's justice originated in the Near East (Levenson 71).

doctrine of resurrection. In the Old Testament, particularly in the early books, death was a spiritual consequence of sin, irreversible in nature; only the grace of God can reverse one's natural fate (Levenson 39).

The shift is not completely developed until the resurrection of Christ, however. Although the concept of Judeo-Christian resurrection of the body does not appear in the Old Testament until Daniel 12, further uses of ἀνάστασις and ἔγερσις occur in intertestamental literature, which contain references to physical and spiritual actions (Skolnik and Berenbaum "Immortality of the Soul," XIX.35-38). 1 Esdras states, "singing songs to the Lord upon the rising up of the house of the Lord" (ὕμνοῦντες τῷ Κυρίῳ ἐπὶ τῇ ἐγέρσει τοῦ οἴκου Κυρίου; 5:62). The connotation of ἔγερσις in this passage is twofold. Not only does it refer to the rising up of the people of God, having returned from exile in Babylon and rededicating their lives to Him, but it also refers to the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem, which all the people were celebrating in this chapter. At this time, the notion of "rising up" is primarily centered on present, physical action.⁶

Later deuterocanonical books show the Hebrew interaction with Greek doctrines concerning immortality and resurrection. Since immortality is attributed to the Greeks and there are no references to it in the canonical Hebrew text, it is evident that information had spread and Jewish doctrines had developed during the centuries immediately preceding Christ. The earliest chapters of the Wisdom of Solomon are full of references to the Greek ideas of immortality (Goodspeed 177). It states,

⁶ ἔγερσις seems to have acquired an additional metaphorical sense by this time, but in other texts and contexts.

For God created man to be immortal...for though they be punished in the sight of men, yet is their hope full of immortality...better it is to have no children, and to have virtue: for the memorial thereof is immortal...and the giving heed unto [wisdom's] laws is the assurance of incorruption; and incorruption maketh us near unto God...moreover by means of [wisdom] I shall obtain immortality, and leave behind me an everlasting memorial to them that come after me...how that to be allied unto wisdom is immortality...for to know Thee is perfect righteousness: yea, to know they power is the root of immortality.

ἽΟτι ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισε ἐπ' ἀφθαρσία...Καὶ γὰρ ἐν ὄψει ἀνθρώπων ἐὰν κολασθῶσιν, ἡ ἐλπίς αὐτῶν ἀθανασίας πλήρης...Κρείσσων ἀτεκνία μετὰ ἀρετῆς, ἀθανασία γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐν μνήμῃ αὐτῆς...προσοχὴ δὲ νόμων βεβαίωσις ἀφθαρσίας, ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ Θεοῦ...Ἐξω δι' αὐτὴν ἀθανασίαν, καὶ μνήμην αἰώνιον τοῖς μετ' ἐμὲ ἀπολείψω...ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀθανασία ἐν σθγγενεῖα σοφίας...Τὸ γὰρ ἐπίστασθαί σε ὀλόκληρος δικαιοσύνη, καὶ εἰδέναι τὸ κράτος σου ρίζα ἀθανασίας (2:23; 3:4; 4:1; 6:18-19; 8:13, 17; 15:3; tr. Brenton).

According to these texts, which exclusively mention immortality, immortality from a Hebrew perspective is directly related to belief in God and obedience to Him. Those who follow the devil in his unrighteousness shall find death, but those who are "righteous are in the hand of God, and there shall no torment touch them" (Δικαίων δὲ ψυχὰι ἐν χειρὶ θεοῦ, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἄψηται αὐτῶν βάσανος; 3:1; tr. Brenton). Those who follow His commands, their souls, which the Greeks consider the chief part of existence, shall not die (and thus are incorruptible; ἀφθαρσία). Those who hope in the Lord likewise, despite any misfortune, they hope for their souls to remain undying, even after the death of the body (ἀθανασία; 3:4). It is here that sacred Hebrew texts begins to associate immortality with the soul (previously it had extrapolative connotations with Eden and the perfection of God's Temple), which is a uniquely Greek idea (Levenson 98). The Hebrews also shift the meaning of immortality slightly, since the soul clearly derives any divine quality from acting rightly and believing truthfully in God (2:23-3:4). From what has been shown thus far, resurrection and "rising up" are faculties of the body, while immortality is a faculty

of the soul; intertestamental authors began to contemplate both (Skolnik and Berenbaum "Afterlife," I.441-442).

As the book of Wisdom continues, immortality of the soul is further espoused. However, in these instances immortality is tied to one's memory after death and familial legacy. Jewish tradition long held that people lived on after death through their work and offspring. In fact, homes were sometimes built to accommodate the remains of ancestors, which eventually led the practice of necromancy described in 1 Samuel 28 (Saul contacts the spirit of Samuel; Levenson 48, 51). The author of Wisdom claims that one should live on after death not through offspring, but through virtuous acts and beliefs; he specifically uses the word that denotes undyingness (*ἀθανασία*). Virtue was a concept widely discussed among the Greeks, and it modifies the previous Jewish tradition of children carrying on one's legacy. According to Wisdom 4:1 and 8:13, the memory of one's virtue, which among Greeks requires the cooperation of soul and body, yields one's immortality.

The author further ties virtue with immortality in chapter six, when he states that obedience to the laws of wisdom guarantees immortality, which in turn draws us closer to the Lord (6:18-19). Wisdom, another widely discussed attribute of the soul by the Greeks (although in canonical Scripture it is also evident), those who are wise and obedient to God shall reap His rewards and shall not perish by fire, famine, or sword (consider the promises to Israel of safety and prosperity if they follow Him, as well as the warnings against following foreign gods in the Old Testament). This passage uses the term "incorruptibility" (*ἀφθαρσία*), which further emphasizes that right action (obedience to the laws), and subsequently an incorruptible soul, is necessary for personal communion

with God – "for to be in an alliance with wisdom is immortality" (ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀθανασία ἐν συγγενείᾳ σοφίας; 8:17).⁷ To know and understand the power of God to determine the fate of the soul, which implies belief in Him, is "the root of immortality" (Τὸ γὰρ ἐπίστασθαί...καὶ εἰδέναί τὸ κράτος σου ρίζα ἀθανασίας; 15:3). These references again show the shift from belief in everyday action with few consequences for the future of the soul or body to the direct correlation between belief, practice, and the future state of the soul.

The Maccabees are the first books to mention immortality and resurrection together. 2 Maccabees references resurrection, and 4 Maccabees immortality (Skolnik and Berenbaum "Afterlife," I.441-442; Nickelsburg 110). One modern scholar remarks,

The function of immortality [in 4 Maccabees] is broader than that of resurrection in 2 Maccabees 7. In the latter, resurrection is God's answer to the brothers' murder...[in] Fourth Maccabees...the brothers are rewarded because they die for the Torah...it is a reward for obedience like the reward that the patriarchs received for their righteousness (Nickelsburg 110-111).

The author of the Maccabees recounts in the well-known account of the martyrdom of the seven brothers, "It is good, being put to death by men, to look for hope from God to be raised up again by him: as for thee, thou shalt have no resurrection to life" (αἰρετὸν μεταλλάσσοντας ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων τὰς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ προσδοκᾶν ἐλπίδας πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ· σοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωὴν οὐκ ἔσται; 7:14; tr. Brenton; Goodspeed 443). This passage illustrates the philological shift in meaning of the word ἀνάστασις – in the Old Testament it referred to a literal getting up from sitting down; in this context and later ones it refers to resurrection from the dead. The speaker, the fourth

⁷ In his *Apology*, Plato also declares that it is not wise to fear death, since the gods do not torment virtuous men in the afterlife (41c).

brother, claims that belief in the Lord and obedience to Him result in future resurrection from the dead. It is unclear whether this resurrection concerns the soul, the body, or both, but the doctrine of resurrection is clearly in the earlier stages of development. One thing is clear, however: those who do not believe in God and obey him have no resurrection from the dead into future life, but remain hopeless – hope for resurrection is given from God Himself (τὰς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ προσδοκᾶν ἐλπίδας, πάλιν ἀναστρήσεσθαι ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ: σοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωὴν οὐκ ἔσται; 7:14).

Further mixture of Jewish and Greek ideas of resurrection, belief, and atonement occurs later in 2 Maccabees. Judas Maccabeus, after discovering the idolatry of his allies slain in battle, provides the sin offerings for the dead in hope of their atonement and future resurrection (12:43-45). He repented of the sins of the dead in the hopes that they would be fully cleansed (have pure souls and bodies before God) and thus be candidates for the future resurrection of the dead. The Jewish doctrine of resurrection from this book forward has an eschatological implication – belief and practice on earth among the living determines the fate of the person (again, it is not explicit in Jewish theology whether the person is wholly soul, body, or both) after death; no longer is one only concerned with the present day, nor does one live on only in memory after death.

4 Maccabees, often not considered an Apocryphal book, draws references to immortality into the discussion (Goodspeed 443).⁸ The author writes, retelling the aforementioned story of the martyrdom of the brothers, "But, as though transformed by fire into immortality, he nobly endured the rackings..." (Ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ ἐν πυρὶ

⁸ Only certain churches within the Eastern Orthodox tradition consider it canonical (“4 Maccabees”).

μετασχηματιζόμενος εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν ὑπέμεινεν εὐγενῶς τὰς στρέβλας; 9:22; tr. Brenton).

This passage implies that, although the body is being killed, immortality is still possible through some avenue. That avenue, although it is not expressly stated, perhaps is the soul. The author does not use immortality or soul with relation to each other, but clearly speech, acknowledged by the Greeks as a faculty of the soul, did not forsake the youth although all his bones were broken (9:21-22). This passage again shows the interaction with Greek ideas without the complete adoption of them into Jewish culture.

This story of the seven martyred youths is a pivotal text for immortality and resurrection in deuterocanonical literature. ἀθανασία, ἀφθαρσία, and ἀνάστασις are all used in the 2 and 4 Maccabees accounts of the story, although ἀνάστασις is particular to 2 Maccabees, and immortality to 4. By the time 4 Maccabees was written, immortality of the soul, a basic Greek doctrine professed by Plato, was a familiar idea, while the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was still being formed. The greater frequency of ἀθανασία and ἀφθαρσία show that immortality was a more familiar for scholars and scribes. In 4 Maccabees, immortality is closely tied to Jewish belief and practice, especially in reference to martyrdom. The mother of the seven brothers is said to have urged them to die for their religion in exchange for immortality (14:5, 16:13). Immortality, in this book, is a gift given by God to those who believe in Him, not an inborn quality of all people (which Plato states). Immortality was reappropriated (or perhaps was a source of theological and philosophical confusion) during this intertestamental period, and acquires prerequisites in the context of religion.

Immortality is also equated with eternal life, by which reappropriation

misunderstanding about immortality increases– "for at that time virtue presided over the contest, approving the victory through endurance, namely, immortality, eternal life" (Ἡθλότει γὰρ τότε ἀρετὴ δι' ὑπομονῆς δοκιμάζουσα τὸ νίκος ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ ἐν ζωῇ πολυχρονίῳ; 17:12; tr. Brenton). The New Testament clearly defines eternal life, immortality, and resurrection as different ideas (although they do closely relate), but this passage shows the lack of sure doctrine and emphasizes the process of development of the Jewish ideas of immortality (not just the Greek ideas) and the beginnings of resurrection.

The Jewish Jerusalem Talmud contains references only to resurrection. This signifies the Jewish congregation's interest only in studying traditional Hebraic ideas; in addition, the written Talmud was "concerned mainly with *halakhah* – i.e. discussion and rulings about how to obey the commandments" (Instone-Brewer 7). The references to resurrection in the Talmud (third order Ketubot) relate to the principles of marriage, but also have implications for life after death. It was written, "The garment that went with a person to the grave will come back with him...when the Messiah comes I shall be ready" (Ketubot 12.34d.64-12.35a.14; 534-536). The first statement implies that a person's clothing, which surrounds the body, will be useful to him in the future, thus suggesting the existence of a belief in the resurrection of the body. Post-Christian literature does not maintain the necessity for clothes, since we will be given new bodies (but bodies nonetheless; Bromiley "Heaven," II.645-655), but this resurrection in reference to only the body is a developmental step to what is now considered the fundamental Christian doctrine. In addition, those buried in their clothes were dressed in a way to receive the Messiah upon His coming (12.35a.14; 536). This demonstrates clear belief the

resurrection of the body from the dead as part of eschatological belief. The body must be dressed and buried in order to be ready for the coming of a future heavenly king.

The Jerusalem Talmud contains another reference to resurrection, not only concerning death and burial, but also regarding the soul. The writer states, "I will walk before the Eternal in the Land of Life...the Land whose dead will live again in the days of the Messiah...[who] gives soul to the people on it" (Ketubot 12.35b.6; 543-544). While this passage is difficult to follow, it states that those who are truly alive are those who will rise again when the Messiah or Anointed One, comes to earth, ensouls them, and sets up the "world to come" (Skolnik and Berenbaum "Life and Death," XIII.5-6). This is the first time in Jewish literature that both soul and body are explicitly included in the doctrine of resurrection. Also, the use of the word "eternal" shows the eschatological component of belief in the coming Messiah and the subsequent resurrection of believers. It can also be inferred that souls, associated in Greek thought with immortality, are granted to those who believe and have been resurrected – resurrection and immortality can be linked through the Messiah Himself; this comes to fruition in the New Testament with the coming of Christ and His resurrection.

Moses Maimonides, a prominent Jewish theologian during the Middle Ages, authored a "Treatise on Resurrection," which attempts to refute claims against the resurrection of the body, trace the foundations of the doctrine, and define the medieval Jewish idea of immortality and resurrection. While he did not live during pre-Christian era, he frequently quotes the Torah, Mishnah, and other such literature. He frequently affirms that the belief in the resurrection of the dead was widely held, calling it a "cardinal principle of the Torah" (V.27; 35), even if it was not explicitly confirmed by

later scholars such as Levenson (IV.21, 32). Contrarily, Levenson questions the legitimacy of the argument that there are direct references to the resurrection of the dead in the Torah, and claims that the potential reversibility of death (such as the Enoch narrative) was monumental for the Jews. He does agree that there are some "intimations of immortality," such as references to the depths of Sheol, which "are only that – intimations" (Levenson 30, 71, 98). However, Maimonides does state, adversely to the customary Judeo-Christian doctrine of resurrection, that the immortality of the soul (which earlier we established as an originally Greek concept) is "part of the natural course of events" (VII.36; 40), with which modern critics such as Cullman strongly disagree. Levenson agrees, however, in that the belief in resurrection connotes an inward "longing for immortality" (Levenson 107). To clarify, it is Maimonides' belief that the portion of the body that houses the intellect reunites with the undying soul and lives eternally after death; the rest of the body returns to dust (VIII.40; 43). The body is made up of organs with three categories of faculties, eating, procreation, and perception (IV.24; 33). Maimonides claimed many times that the treatise was meant to "elucidate" the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead (II.6; 24-25) by talking about resurrection with respect to the soul, body, and an afterlife. However, he does not believe in the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body, per se, but in the future unification of body and soul into a quasi-incorporeal form (Skolnik and Berenbaum "Life and Death," XIII.5-6).

In summary thus far, the resurrection of the body, a doctrine originating in Judaism before Christ, entails the physical rising of the body from the grave (there is no division for the Jews between the soul and the body, and thus no consideration of reunification) when the Messiah establishes a kingdom. *ἐγερσις* mostly retains its literal

sense of getting up from a seated position, while ἀνάστασις shifts from that meaning to the concept of the resurrection of the body from the dead. ἀφθαρσία and ἀθανασία remain contextually relevant (spiritual purity of ἀφθαρσία, life after death through memory or an innate quality of the soul in ἀθανασία). Jews and early Christians, faced with the reality of the resurrection of Christ and the knowledge of the immortality of the soul (widely attested by the Greeks), first attempted to reconcile the two; in earlier Jewish literature the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul were mutually exclusive, implicitly known of, yet not considered reconcilable. Philo, an early Jewish philosopher from Alexandria, seems to equate immortality with resurrection in his *De Aeternitate* (rendered in Greek as ἀφθαρσία, or incorruptibility) *Mundi* (Skolnik and Berenbaum "Life and Death," XIII.5-6). He reasons that things rise again which are immortal, the gods are immortal, the one true God has the power to impart immortality to believers, and thus believers are immortal and thus can rise again (Yonge; VI.30, IX.46-47, XIII.69). However, the two doctrines (with two difference provenances) are not simultaneously treated in Christian literature until the writings of the Apostolic Fathers (Stendahl 112).

The most extensive and most well-known pre-Christian treatise on the immortality of the soul is attributed Socrates, whose teachings were recorded by his student Plato. In his dialogue *Phaedo*, one of the four dialogues that took place just before his execution, he enumerates the tenets of the soul and its immortality. Socrates was unique in that he looked forward to death, rather than feared it. The reason for his attitude is that he believed that, as a seeker of wisdom, truth, and virtue, “something much better [is in store] for the good than for the wicked” (Plato 123). Old Testament

texts similarly allot future life to the righteous. Plato states that if death is separation from the body, and the goal of life is the purification of the soul, which is hindered by the bodily impulses, then death is a final step toward total purification and moral bliss (Plato 124, 128-129). He uses arguments for the immortality of the soul such as the presence of memory, the ability to empathize, the conception of the soul from the living (and thus it continues), invisibility and indestructability, and undyingness. Socrates argues, in a delightful *modus ponens* form, that the soul is undying, and is therefore immortal. He converses with his interlocutor Cebes, “What do we call that which does not admit dying?’ ‘Undying.’ ‘And soul does not admit death?’ ‘No.’ ‘So soul is undying’” (184). His listeners up to this point accepted his previous major and minor premises arguing for the immortality of the soul, since he states that the soul is undying. *De ipso facto*, that which is undying is constantly alive, and is therefore immortal. Socrates and Plato were adherents to the concept of immortality but were ignorant of Jewish resurrection of the body; likewise Jewish theologians, aware of immortality (although perhaps to a lesser extent), chose to focus on the traditional, uniquely Jewish doctrine of the resurrection of the dead.

Other well-known Classical, pre-Christian authors such as Ovid, Cicero, and Homer were familiar with the immortality of the soul, and their definitions shed light on our working definition of the concept; they do not refer at all to the resurrection of the body, which again emphasizes its unique origin in Judaism.⁹ According to Cicero, the

⁹ In his play *The Eumenides*, Aeschylus states in accordance with Platonic thought that "But once the dust has drained down all a man's blood, once the man has died, there is no raising of him up again" (ἀνδρὸς δ' ἐπειδὴν αἷμ' ἀνασπάσει κόνις ἅπαξ θανόντος, οὔτις ἔστ' ἀνάστασις; *Eumenides* 648-649, tr. Lattimore).

soul is most alive when it is out of the body; the body weighs it down as if a magnetic force, even after death (III.2; Cicero and Stahl 71). He correlates cosmology with immortality, saying that everything below the moon is mortal, except for the soul which longs for freedom from the body and thus immortality in the farthest spheres of the universe (III.6, IV.3; Cicero and Stahl 72-73). Aristotle, in his treatise on the soul, thought that the intellective part of the soul was the only imperishable and thus incorruptible (ἀφθαρσία) part (Aquinas and Pasnau 369). Homer, although he does not use the words in question (ἀφθαρσία, ἀθανασία, ἀνάστασις, ἔγερσις) believes in the afterlife of the soul as a shade in Hades. Hades is not directly comparable to Hebrew Sheol or Judeo-Christian Hell, but it shows the early Greek belief in the continuation of the existence of the soul after the death of the body (Harris 134). Ovid, in his treatment of the myth of Orpheus and Eurydice, also attests to the afterlife of the soul after the death of the body (the souls in his Hades can move, but cannot talk, are bloodless, yet are not entirely corporeal; Met. X-XI, Innes 225-226). From these authors it is evident that the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was either unknown or considered most inferior to the widely held Greco-Roman belief in the immortality of the soul.

Modern theologians are varied in their opinions on the subjects of immortality and resurrection, but there are two basic schools of thought. This discrepancy is mostly a result of misunderstood definitions – Judeo-Christian immortality varies within itself, and is hardly comparable to Greco-Roman immortality. It is widely acknowledged that the

Although technically post-Christian, Lucan states that the last gift of death is not to be able to die ("extremum cui mortis munus inique eripitur, *non posse mori*"; *Pharsalia* 6.724-725, Weise, emphasis is mine). This *posse non mori* doctrine of immortality is the same as ἀθανασία (Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811), and evidently is still prominent among Roman scholars even into the first century A.D.

immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body are two separate doctrines, but some think that the two are complementary to one another, while others consider them completely irreconcilable from a theological standpoint. George Nickelsburg was one of the first in recent scholarship to discuss the relationship in Jewish literature between resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul. He writes that Jewish deuterocanonical literature focuses on the coming judgment by God, a judgment of "the dead as well as the living" (Nickelsburg 40). The body only rests after death, but in the end times, according to Daniel, those who "sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to reproach and everlasting shame" (τῶν καθευδόντων ἐν γῆς χώματι ἐξεγερθήσονται, οἱ τοῖς εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ οἱ τοῖς ἐν δόξῃ καὶ εἰς αἰσχύνην αἰώνιον; 12:2). The word ἀνάστασις is not found, but the word ἔγερσις is identifiable in the verb form ἐξεγερθήσονται, which entails a physical, somatic rising up not from sitting down in this case, but from the grave.

He continues to enumerate the relationship between resurrection, judgment, and immortality when he emphasizes, "Immortality is the state in virtue of which this vindication [of former conduct], authentication [of claims], and exaltation [in heavenly glory] take place" (Nickelsburg 68). In relation to the early books of Wisdom, resurrection can be taken in two ways: if one is righteous, one will rise to glory; if unrighteous, to judgment and gloom. Immortality was familiar to the deuterocanonical writers, according to Nickelsburg, and reflects the Greek traditions of the virtue, the soul, and immortality. In this case, Nickelsburg reappropriates the Greek definition of immortality as an innate quality and instead makes it conditional upon belief in and obedience to the Torah (Nickelsburg 68). Already in Jewish intertestamental literature

the Judeo-Christian concept of the immortality of the soul begins to shift from the Greek idea after encountering the other prevalent afterlife concept of resurrection. Jewish thought was and is heavily based in tradition; the intertestamental writings of the Jews, although they do incorporate new concepts, are framed by an existing belief in the resurrection of the body (Nickelsburg 78).

The frequency of immortality and resurrection in intertestamental literature, according to Nickelsburg, correlates bodily resurrection with vindication for torturous persecution. He states in his commentary on 2 Maccabees 7, "Resurrection functions as the means by which God will deliver the brothers from the destruction...the brothers' resurrection is also their vindication...the brothers' resurrection will be bodily, and this is appealed to specifically as a remedy for their bodily tortures" (Nickelsburg 94). For the Maccabees, a people oppressed by foreigners and under religious persecution in the few centuries before Christ, somatic resurrection was reward of the righteous for obedience to God's law, which virtue Nickelsburg previously described as immortality. The idea of the resurrection of the body after death was familiar to the Jews, but the Greek idea of immortality was not fully grasped, as Nickelsburg shows (although perhaps unintentionally) through the use of Greek philosophical vocabulary (virtue, vindication). He concludes by the end of his book that immortality, closely associated with eternal reward, and resurrection, associated with God's judgment, are somewhat juxtaposed and reappropriated in the Apocrypha, showing the textual interactions among and theological developments of Judeo-Christian doctrines regarding the soul and the body (Nickelsburg 123-124, 131).

In a series of lectures on the subject of human immortality, several modern theologians wrote and discussed on the effects of resurrection and immortality on Christianity. Their responses were quite variegated at times. On one hand, Werner Jaeger stated that the immortality of man, taken from Platonism discussed above, was a founding concept of a Christian church and civilization, alongside resurrection (Stendahl 97). He claims that immortality anticipates Christian resurrection because Greek and Hebrew societies similarly valued national and familial remembrance as central to the immortality of the soul – memory lives on, so the soul of the dead lives on (Stendahl 102).

Directly in opposition to him is Oscar Cullmann, who believes that the Greek ideas of the immortality of the soul and the Judeo-Christian belief in resurrection of the body are irreconcilable (Stendahl 9). He argues that because Greek immortality is based on the division of soul and body at death and Hebrew resurrection hopes for the unification of body and soul after death, the two cannot be reconciled – Jesus fully died on the cross; if His soul were immortal he could not have fully died; if he had not fully died he could not have fully risen (Stendahl 18-19). He also states that personal identity depended only on the soul for Greeks, but was more inclusive (the inner man and the outer man, *σάρξ* and *πνεύμα*) for the Hebrews (Stendahl 24-25). As such, because the physical death of man requires the death of his parts, the Greek person did not die (immortality), while the Hebrew person did, but hoped for new life in the world to come (resurrection; Stendahl 25). According to Cullmann, clear semantic and religious differences between immortality and resurrection are too dissimilar to overcome. Perhaps the two concepts can be analogized, but they cannot be equalized (Stendahl 44).

I find Cullmann's argument the most extensive and compelling, which is why this thesis focuses on creating a single definition that encompasses the Judeo-Christian take on immortality and the foundational doctrine of resurrection.

In conclusion, as shown in Old Testament and pagan pre-Christian literature, the resurrection of the body (Jewish) and immortality of the soul are not wholly reconcilable or mutually exclusive, or understood from a single perspective. Different sects of various religions and cultures, which interacted primarily through military conquest, held various beliefs regarding resurrection and immortality, which subsequently funnel into the miraculous reality of the resurrection of Christ from the dead in the first century A.D. While Christian thought is wrapped up in the Christ event and not in pre-Christian teachings, it is important to trace the foundations of the doctrines from an earlier point in order to attempt to understand the concepts at hand to the fullest extent – a rather elusive task. As such, the remainder of this project shall continue to show the irreconcilability of common threads of immortality and resurrection and shall point to a new definition of Christian resurrection of the body and the subsequent immortality of the Christian soul. With this purpose, the next chapter will focus philologically on New Testament, Apostolic, Patristic, and other early Christian writings (through the early Middle Ages) concerning immortality and resurrection.

CHAPTER TWO

The Immortality of the Soul and Resurrection of the Dead in the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers

The previous chapter investigated the origins of the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the dead, based on Old Testament, intertestamental Jewish, and pagan writings on the topics before the birth of Christ. It was established that the immortality of the soul was a distinctively Greek idea, in that the soul was regarded by some Greeks as innately immortal and merely lives in the physical body.¹ The resurrection of the body, subsequently, is a uniquely Jewish idea, developed primarily in the intertestamental period; it affirms that the body and soul, separated at death, will reunite at the second coming of Christ. The former relies on the separation between body and soul, the latter on their unification. From a philological perspective, we examined the words for immortality – ἀφθαρσία, which means "incorruptibility," and ἀθανασία, which means "undyingness" (often equated with the Latin phrase *posse non mori* – one is able not to die; Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811) – as well as the words for resurrection – ἔγερσις, which entails a physical arising from a settled position, and ἀνάστασις, which refers to one rising from the dead.

The New Testament, of which the doctrine of the resurrection of the body is tantamount, contains many more philological occurrences of these words (Stendahl 116). The writings of the Apostolic Fathers also reflect this focus on resurrection, since

¹ Some non-Platonic philosophical sects, such as the Stoics and Epicureans, did not share these beliefs about the nature of the soul.

Christianity holds Christ's resurrection of the dead as its foundational event. Not only did Jesus rise from the dead, but he raised many others from the dead – Lazarus, a girl, and a boy, not to mention the saints who rose upon Jesus' death on the cross. After the resurrection of Christ, many also began to view immortality in a new way, borrowing similar vocabulary from pagan literature (primarily Platonism), yet superimposing the knowledge of the resurrection; hence the need for a redefinition of Christian immortality of the soul with respect to the resurrection of the body.²

But first, a brief paragraph on the frequency of the words *ἐγερσις*, *ἀνάστασις*, *ἀφθαρσία*, and *ἀθανασία*. In the New Testament, *ἐγερσις* is the least mentioned (one time), since the discussion on resurrection is framed by the resurrection of Christ from the dead (rather than getting up from a chair), for which the word *ἀνάστασις* is apt (and indeed, it appears over forty times). In the Apostolic Fathers, *ἐγερσις* is never mentioned, and *ἀνάστασις* appears nearly thirty times. This decrease in frequency is due mostly to the shift in focus from miraculous resurrection, which the writer of Hebrews considers "elementary teachings about Christ" to the development of doctrine concerning the afterlife and the condition of the soul and the body post-Christ (*NIV*, 997, Heb.6:1-2).³ The words *ἀφθαρσία* and *ἀθανασία* appear ten and three times, respectively, in Apostolic

² Cadbury states that although people like to read immortality into the New Testament in place of resurrection (hence the conflation, misappropriation, and misunderstanding), in his opinion immortality is the avoidance of death while resurrection is revival after death (Stendahl 119-121).

³ "Therefore let us leave the elementary teachings about Christ...the resurrection of the dead..." (διὸ ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον...ἀναστασεῶς τε νεκρῶν; *NIV*, Heb. 6:1-2).

texts, whereas they occur only seven and three times, respectively, in the New Testament; this shows more emphasis on the development of Christian doctrine.

The New Testament and Apostolic usages of the words for immortality and resurrection show a vocabulary borrowed from both Judeo-Christian and pagan texts; discrepancies in understanding of the concepts both now and then requires a redefinition of the two, which can yield to a proper Christian unification. I shall first examine immortality in the New Testament, then resurrection; followed by the same examination in the Apostolic Fathers.

There are ten total mentions of immortality (the noun forms ἀφθαρσία and ἀθανασία) in the New Testament, all of which are in writings by Paul. Paul was widely educated as a Pharisee leader before his conversion to Christianity, and his studies in rhetoric and philosophy may have brought him into contact with Platonic ideas of immortality (Bromiley "Resurrection," IV.145-150). He wrote in his letter to the Romans, "to those who seek glory and honor and immortality by enduring in good work, [God will give] eternal life" (τοῖς μὲν καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσιν ζωὴν αἰώνιον; 2:7).⁴ In this passage, Paul berates the Roman church for passing judgment on others, yet not examining themselves for spiritual errors. In this case, ἀφθαρσία is sought by believers and confirmed by good works (ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ... ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσιν). However, it is also mentioned in connection with glory and honor, which suggests the early Jewish idea of immortality and resurrection through

⁴ All translations are my own unless otherwise stated.

one's family or city (Bromiley "Resurrection," IV.145-150). Paul clearly borrows vocabulary to create a new understanding of Christian immortality – ἀφθαρσία, the incorruptibility of resurrected bodies to decay, is not innate as Plato suggests, but is something at which one aims on a spiritual journey. Immortality is tied to salvation and eternal life, which turn is tied to the Resurrection.

Another example of this redefinition and reappropriation of the immortality of the soul occurs several times in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians. He writes,

σπείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ, ἐγείρεται ἐν **ἀφθαρσίᾳ**...τοῦτο δέ φημι, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσαι οὐ δύναται οὐδὲ ἡ φθορὰ τὴν **ἀφθαρσίαν** κληρονομεῖ...δεῖ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι **ἀφθαρσίαν** καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν. ὅταν δὲ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσῃται **ἀφθαρσίαν** καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσῃται ἀθανασίαν, τότε γενήσεται ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος, *Κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νῆκος* (15:42, 50, 53-54; emphasis is mine).

One is sown⁵ in corruptibility, and is raised in incorruptibility...I say this, brothers, that flesh and blood are not able to inherit the kingdom of God, nor does corruptibility inherit incorruptibility...for it is necessary that this corruptible thing put on incorruptibility and this dead thing put on undyingness. And whenever this corruptible thing has put on incorruptibility and this dead thing has put on undyingness, then the word that has been written will happen: Death is swallowed up unto victory.

Chapter fifteen is entirely a discourse on the resurrection, which makes the occurrences of ἀφθαρσία (and ἀθανασία, which I will examine later in this chapter) all the more interesting. Not only does Paul borrow vocabulary to augment the truths made evident by Christ's resurrection, but he creates nuance in the doctrine of resurrection that allows for the distinction between immortality and resurrection be made. In the first instance, immortality is mentioned in direct reference to resurrection – when one believes in Christ, even though he dies in a perishable body, he is raised (from the dead) into an

⁵ Interestingly, the verb σπείρω, "to sow," can refer to both birth and burial (Garland 732-733).

imperishable body (one that will not decay). Immortality in this sense is not a faculty of the soul, but is a property of a body resurrected unto Christ. This is further confirmed in verse fifty, which ties salvation to resurrection. What is mortal and corruptible (τὸ θνητὸν, τὸ φθαρτὸν) cannot inherit what is immortal (ἀφθαρσία).⁶ Thus the belief in Christ and his resurrection, a necessity for salvation, is tied to immortality. In a sense, Paul seems to chiasmatically enumerate doctrines of the immortality of the body and the resurrection of the soul; this is due, however, to a borrowed vocabulary as opposed to a misunderstanding or failed attempt at a reappropriation of the terms.

The next two uses of ἀφθαρσία, which also occur in First Corinthians 15, also point to Judeo-Christian resurrection instead of pagan immortality of the soul.⁷ To paraphrase the aforementioned passage, death is conquered once one chooses to put on immortality (ὅταν δὲ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσῃται ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσῃται ἀθανασίαν, τότε γενήσεται ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος, *Κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νίκος*; 1 Cor. 15:54). This language of putting on (ἐνδύσῃται), or clothing oneself, reflects conscious thought and action – immortality of the soul is not innate, as Plato argued.⁸ To achieve immortality, as a Christian idea closely tied with but not identical to

⁶ For the Christian concept of "inheritance," cf. the Lord's Prayer, in which believers ask to be adopted as sons of God, so they may be co-heirs with Christ of eternal life (*Expositio orationis dominicae*).

⁷ Some Hellenistic Jewish sects may have preferred the immortality of the soul over the resurrection of the body (Lacoste "Soul-Heart-Body").

⁸ The writer of Hebrews also records the Jewish works-based sentiment regarding resurrection, saying, "and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance, so that they could obtain a better resurrection" (ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν; Heb. 11:35). It confirms the

resurrection, one must choose to follow Christ; only then can one receive an incorruptible body after death. Salvation relies on Christ's resurrection, belief in which, for Christians, also connotes immortality – although it is in reference to the body instead of the soul.

The next use of ἀφθαρσία appears in Paul's letter to the Ephesian church. He states in his final greetings, "Grace be with all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in immortality" (ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγαπώντων τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ; 6:24). In the NIV, ἀφθαρσία is translated (I think wrongly) as "with an undying love" (976, Eph. 6:24). The prepositional phrase ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ, if taken with ἡ χάρις, indicates that grace is found in immortality; if it is taken with Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, it suggests that immortality is an attribute of Christ. If ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ goes with both, it provides a fuller understanding of the Christian idea of immortality (which, as previously stated, is different from the pagan concept) – Christ is immortal and his body did not see decay (Acts 2:31), thus to those who love him, grace is given to achieve that same incorruptibility.

The final occurrence in the New Testament of ἀφθαρσία, which emphasizes salvation as a prerequisite for immortality, is in Second Timothy. Paul writes, "and now having been revealed through the appearance of our savior Christ Jesus, who both brought death to naught and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel..." (φανερωθεῖσαν δὲ νῦν διὰ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωῆν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου;

corporeality of resurrection – the body is not removed so that the immortal soul can be free; rather, one must put something on the body to make them immortal (Garland 744).

1:10).⁹ In this passage, immortality is not an innate quality of the soul, but is something made known by Christ through the gospel – that is, the good news that he came to earth, died, and rose again (1 Cor. 15:3-4). Christ both defeated death, which makes undyingness possible, and made known [eternal] life and immortality that is made possible through belief in the gospel. In this case, immortality is conflated with the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, although Paul uses a borrowed vocabulary.¹⁰ Hence the immortality of the soul, a distinctly pagan doctrine in its origins and oldest understanding (the soul is born immortal), is not the same as the Christian idea of immortality (immortality is achieved through belief in the resurrection of Christ), which is tied to the concept of the resurrection of the body, made manifest through Christ.

To conclude the discussion on the philology of immortality in the New Testament, I shall examine the three uses of ἀθανασία, also only found in Paul's epistles. In the previously examined passage First Corinthians 15:53-54, Paul claims, "For it is necessary that this corruptible thing put on incorruptibility and this dead thing put on undyingness. And whenever this corruptible thing has put on incorruptibility and this dead thing has put on undyingness, then the word that has been written will happen: Death is swallowed up unto victory" (δεῖ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν

⁹ Μὲν...δὲ is not usually translated as "both...and," however, since the destruction of death and the revelation of eternal life are not exclusive nor have any reason to be juxtaposed (especially in context of this project), I have chosen to render it as "both...and" in order to convey the relationship between Christ's death and the subsequent reality of immortality.

¹⁰ This vocabulary was taken from Greek philosophy and reappropriated in order to describe new Hellenistic Jewish doctrine, i.e., resurrection. However, by the middle and later parts of the first century A.D., this reappropriation invites later confusions, which result in inaccurate conflation and misunderstanding.

καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι **ἀθανασίαν**. ὅταν δὲ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσῃται ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσῃται **ἀθανασίαν**, τότε γενήσεται ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος, *Κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νῆκος*; emphasis is mine). Ἀθανασία, or the immunity from death enjoyed by believers, is directly correlated to ἀφθαρσία, the "incorruptibility of resurrected bodies to decay," thus rounding out the philological potential of immortality (Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811). The word ἀθανασία, although it is analogous in English to immortality, also shows the vivific quality of resurrection, which confirms the idea that immortality in the New Testament is closely tied with the body and Christ's resurrection.¹¹ It also conveys a sense of choice, since it is the dead thing that must take charge of putting on immortality – just as one puts on a garment (one is not born clothed), one has the choice to put on undyingness through belief in Christ and the Resurrection.

The final occurrence of ἀθανασία, before turning to words that mean "resurrection," appears in First Timothy. Paul writes in his personal remarks to Timothy, "...the king of those ruling and lord of those having mastery, who alone possesses immortality, who lives in unapproachable light, which no man has seen nor can see" (ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευόντων καὶ κύριος τῶν κυριευόντων, ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν, φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον, ὃν εἶδεν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ ἰδεῖν δύναται; 6:15-16). This passage directly attributes immortality to God, the only one who is innately immortal (ἔχων shows ownership and possession in this passage, instead of recent acquisition). However,

¹¹ Because the soul and body are separable only in death, victory over death requires vivification (Lacoste "Resurrection of the Dead").

it is not just the innate immortality that makes God great; the immortality attained through resurrection is what gives Christians an eschatological hope.¹²

There is only one use of *ἐγερσις*, which the Septuagint frequently uses to describe getting up from a seated or lying down position. Matthew records, "and tombs were opened and many bodies of saints who had fallen asleep were resurrected, and having come out from the tombs after his resurrection, they entered the holy city and they were shown to many" (καὶ τὰ μνημεῖα ἀνεώχθησαν καὶ πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἁγίων ἠγέρθησαν, καὶ ἐξελθόντες εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν καὶ ἐνεφανίσθησαν πολλοῖς; Mt. 27:52-53). This passage describes the events that occurred at the moment Jesus died, including the earthquake, the torn temple partition, and the resurrection of the saints. In this case, the resurrection is not of the body of Jesus, on which Christianity depends, but of the bodies of previous holy people (σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἁγίων). The language of falling asleep, which becomes synonymous with death for believers, is similar to that which was seen in Psalms – "you know my sitting down and my rising up" (σὺ ἔγνως τὴν καθέδραν μου, καὶ τὴν ἐγερσιν μου; 138:2). In this case, resurrection is a physical act similar to getting up from seated or sleeping, and is the first suggestion of somatic resurrection in Scripture – they appeared to many in Jerusalem.

¹² The eschatological aspect of the resurrection is explained in 1 Peter, saying,

εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ...ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν, εἰς κληρονομίαν ἄφθαρτον...τετρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐτοίμην ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ (1 Pet. 1:3-5).

Blessed be the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who...having beget us into a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, into an incorruptible inheritance....guarded in heaven for you, who by the power of God are guarded through faith unto salvation that is ready to be revealed in the last time.

The remaining word for resurrection, ἀνάστασις, appears roughly forty times in the New Testament; I will not be able to examine each of them due to their sheer volume and lack of space in this chapter. I will look at the Gospels first, followed by several uses of ἀνάστασις in a variety of New Testament genres.

The Gospel of Matthew, written primarily for a Jewish audience (Cory and Hollerich 100), mentions ἀνάστασις (which literally means "standing up") four times, each before the actual resurrection of Christ.

ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ Σαδδουκαῖοι, λέγοντες μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν, καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες, Διδάσκαλε, Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν, Ἐάν τις ἀποθάνῃ μὴ ἔχων τέκνα, ἐπιγαμβρεύσει ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναστήσει ὁ ἀδελφῶ αὐτοῦ... ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει οὖν τίνας τῶν ἐπτὰ ἔσται γυνή;... ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονταε, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ εἰσιν. Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ; (Mt. 22:23-24, 28, 30-31).¹³

On that day the Sadducees approached him, saying there was not a resurrection, and they questioned him, saying, 'Teacher, Moses said, *If anyone died not having children, his brother shall marry his wife and shall raise offspring for his brother...* in the resurrection therefore whose of the seven [brothers] will the woman be?'...for in the resurrection they neither marry nor are married off, but they are like angels in heaven. And concerning the resurrection of the dead do you not know what was said to you by God...

In this often quoted passage regarding heaven and the nature of resurrection, Jesus tells those testing his spiritual authority that the final resurrection has no familial ties. On one hand, this negates the Jewish belief that one lives on through family. Yet on the other hand, it does not talk specifically about the tenets of Christian resurrection, since Christ had not yet died and many Jews (not the Sadducees, with whom Jesus was conversing;

¹³ This story is also found in Mark 12:18-27 and Luke 20:27-40.

also cf. Acts 23:8)¹⁴ believed that all the dead would rise up on the Last Day for judgment; some would go to eternal punishment, others to eternal glory. This passage reflects a vague knowledge of the concept of resurrection, but it is not well-developed at this point.

Luke's Gospel adds clarification to this narrative, by mentioning the nature of resurrection in more detail. He writes, "And Jesus said to them, 'Sons of this age marry and are married off, but those deemed worthy of obtaining that age and the resurrection from the dead neither marry nor are married off. For they can no longer die, for they are equal to the angels and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection'" (καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται, οἱ δὲ καταξιοθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται, ἰσάγγελοι γὰρ εἰσιν καὶ υἱοὶ εἰσιν θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες; Luke 20:34-36). In this account, the resurrection of the body entails being worthy (καταξιοθέντες), although the requirements for this are not listed. It does state, however, that those who are sons of God (which believers are; cf. the Lord's Prayer – "our Father") shall not die and are equal to the angels. Not dying is analogous to the concept of immortality; ἀθανασία in fact means "undyingness." However, as we saw in our examination of ἀθανασία, that this seems to refer only to the body, not the soul, which is characteristic of Platonic immortality. Being equal to the angels (ισάγγελοι)

¹⁴ Polycarp strongly condemns the Sadducees and other anti-resurrectionists in his letter to the Philippians, saying, "Whoever...says there is neither resurrection nor judgment, this one is the firstborn of Satan" (καὶ ὃς ἀν...λέγῃ μήτε ἀνάστασιν μήτε κρίσιν, οὗτος πρωτότοκός ἐστι τοῦ σατανᾶ; *Phil.* 7.1). For the Pharisees after the resurrection of Christ, the doctrine of the resurrection of the body remained central (Lacoste "Resurrection of the Dead").

raises questions of the corporeality of the resurrected body and its faculties (which there is not space here to enumerate) such as: do angels have physical form? If so, do they dwell in heaven? Is heaven a physical place?

Luke further attests to the Jewish idea of resurrection and an afterlife. Jesus states when talking with a Pharisee, "it will be repaid to you in the resurrection of the righteous" (ἀνταποδοθήσεται γάρ σοι ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν δικαίων; 14:14). In this passage, Jesus correlates good works, the evidence of a strong Jewish faith, with the reward of the righteous. This hearkens back to discussions of the nature of Sheol in the Old Testament – is it a physical place? Is it similar to Hades? Is it only for the wicked? Levenson suggests that all were resurrected on the Last Day unto judgment; the righteous and wicked then "went" to different places (70). He also mentions a Near-Eastern idea that only the righteous receive resurrection and that Sheol is only for the wicked, a notion that Jesus may have been familiar with – he only attributes resurrection to the righteous (ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν δικαίων); this reference however does not mean that both the righteous and the wicked cannot both resurrect (Levenson 69).

The Apostle John confirms the Rabbinic thought that both the righteous and the wicked will resurrect during the last judgment (Skolnik and Berenbaum "Body and Soul," IV.30-31). Jesus states, "Don't marvel at this, since an hour will come in which all who are in tombs will hear his voice and will come out, those who have done good things unto a resurrection of life, and those who have done bad things unto a resurrection of condemnation" (μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο, ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα ἐν ἣ πάντες οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις ἀκούσουσιν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκπορεύσονται οἱ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες εἰς ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως; John 5:28-29). This passage explicitly states the two possible "fates" for the

body – one good, one bad. Although Jesus never says "resurrection of the body," bodies are buried in tombs (ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις), which means that their resurrection would be somatic. Luke and Paul also confirm this Jewish belief in (and eschatological hope for) "resurrection...of both the righteous and the unrighteous" (ἀνάστασιν...δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων; Acts 24:15). Further evidence for somatic resurrection occurs in Matthew 27, which we previously examined, since the bodies of the saints who were resurrected from the grave were seen in bodily form by many. Jesus also was touched and seen by thousands following his resurrection and before his ascension.

John then associates resurrection unto life with the power and grace of God. He writes when describing the death of Lazarus, "I know that he will rise in the resurrection in the last day.' Jesus said to her, 'I am the resurrection and the life. He who believes in me shall live, even if he dies, and every one who lives and believes in me will certainly not die unto eternity" (οἶδα ὅτι ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωὴ. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ καὶ ἀποθάνῃ ζήσεται, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ζῶν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα; John 11:24-26). In this instance, resurrection is again somatic – a physical resurrection and reunification is expected as part of the last days: resurrection of the body is an eschatological hope.¹⁵ Jesus also is the resurrection, in that those who believe in the

¹⁵ Although eschatology is not the focus of this thesis, it is interesting to note philologically that the Book of Revelation mentions the Resurrection, for which Jews and Christians alike hope, as part of the end times. The Apostle John records, "The rest of the dead did not come to life until the 1000 years had ended. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is the one who has a share in the first resurrection. The second death does not have power over them" (οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔζησαν ἄχρι τελεσθῆ τὰ χίλια ἔτη. αὕτη ἡ ἀνάστασις ἡ πρώτη. μακάριος καὶ ἅγιος ὁ ἔχων μέρος ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ πρώτῃ. ἐπὶ τούτων ὁ δεύτερος θάνατος οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν; Rev. 20:5-6).

resurrection will perpetually live (καὶν ἀποθάνη ζήσεται, οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνη εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα). Although it is implicit that the resurrection is somatic – and subsequently confirmed by Lazarus' physical rising up from the dead – it also suggests the possibility for immortality. This possibility is unstated, due to the lack of Jewish doctrine and thus limited vocabulary, but living eternally and never dying is very similar to ἀθανασία. As previously described, Paul uses ἀφθαρσία, a Platonic word for a characteristic of the immortality of the soul, to mean the "incorruptibility of resurrected bodies to decay" (Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811) – again, correlating thoughts of immortality (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα) with words for resurrection (ἀνάστασις).

The remaining twenty references to resurrection in the New Testament occur in writings by Paul and Luke, with a few mentions in Hebrews. The book of Acts was written by the Apostle Luke as an account of the spread of Christianity through the apostles after the ascension of Christ. Of the eleven appearances of ἀνάστασις in Acts, most of them are in reference to the apostles (Peter and Paul, rarely others) describing the basis for their faith;¹⁶ there is very little new "information" on the doctrine of the resurrection of the body apart from what is found in the four canonical Gospels. There are three occurrences of ἀνάστασις in Acts, however, that merit especial comment.

Luke writes as Peter was addressing a crowd, "Foreseeing, he spoke about the resurrection of Christ, that *he was neither abandoned to the grave, nor did his flesh see corruption*" (προῖδὼν ἐλάλησεν περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὅτι οὐτε ἐγκατελείφθη εἰς ἄδην οὐτε ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ εἶδεν διαφθοράν; 2:31). The body (and soul – the word ἄδην,

¹⁶ See Acts 1:22; 2:31; 4:2, 33; 17:18, 32; 23:6, 8; 24:15, 21; 26:23.

or Hades, is traditionally where Greek souls go after death) of Christ neither remained buried, nor was he subject to corruptibility – διαφθοράν and ἀφθαρσία share the same root, "φθορ-/φθαρ-." Therefore, because οὔτε διαφθοράν is etymologically analogous to ἀφθαρσία, Luke seems to conflate the resurrection of the body, a doctrine previously well-attested to in both the Old Testament, intertestamental literature, and the Gospels, with immortality using a borrowed vocabulary – showing a willingness to adapt the language from the original Platonic concept of immortality in order to describe resurrection; unfortunately, this reappropriation encouraged later writers to wrongly conflate immortality and resurrection.¹⁷

When Peter, Paul, and the rest of the apostles were on their missionary journeys in the primarily Greek-speaking eastern Mediterranean, they encountered doubt regarding the legitimacy of a somatic resurrection, since a great portion of their audience was familiar with the pagan concept of the immortality of the soul – which Christians did not attempt to define or rationalize until the Apostolic Fathers. Luke records this doubt, saying, "And hearing about the resurrection of the dead, some scoffed, but others said, *we shall hear you concerning this again tomorrow*" (ἀκούσαντες δὲ ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν οἱ μὲν ἐχλεύαζον, οἱ δὲ εἶπαν, ἀκουσόμεθά σου περὶ τοῦτου καὶ πάλιν; Acts 17:32). Many people groups, particularly under direct Greek control, were reticent to grasp the doctrine of somatic resurrection and often chose to hear more, due to their unfamiliarity with the uniquely Judeo-Christian doctrine (and recent eyewitness accounts).

¹⁷ In light of this frequent conflation, Bromiley records that resurrection leads to eternal life or judgment (depending on whether one is righteous or wicked), which then leads to immortality – incorruptibility and immunity from death (Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811).

I shall return briefly to First Corinthians 15, which mentions ἀνάστασις frequently, in addition to ἀφθαρσία and ἀθανασία, which were treated previously. It is here that Paul ardently defends the resurrection of Christ as the reason for belief in him.¹⁸ He argues, "And if it is preached that Christ was resurrected, how do some among you say that there is not a resurrection of the dead? And if there is not a resurrection of the dead, Christ was not resurrected. And if Christ was not resurrected, our preaching is empty, and your faith is also empty" (εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται ὅτι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγήγερται, πῶς λέγουσιν ἐν ὑμῖν τινες ὅτι ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν; εἰ δὲ ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν, οὐδὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται. εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐγήγερται, κενὸν ἄρα τὸ κήρυγμα ἡμῶν, κενὴ καὶ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν; 15:12-14). If Christ had not resurrected bodily, then Christianity would be fruitless; however, there were many eyewitnesses to his death and resurrection, which makes evangelism and discipleship fruitful. This affirmation further sets Christians apart, since psychosomatic resurrection is neither found in any other religion nor fully compatible with the Platonic concept of the immortality of the soul (cf. Garland 699).

Paul also differentiates resurrection from immortality in this chapter, albeit by proxy. He writes, "For since death was through man, also resurrection of the dead was through man" (ἐπειδὴ γὰρ δι' ἀνθρώπου θάνατος, καὶ δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν; 1 Cor. 15:21). One would think that the opposite of death (θάνατος) philologically speaking would be deathlessness (ἀθανασία). However, resurrection requires death first, unlike immortality (one aspect of which is deathlessness), which allows man to not die.

¹⁸ Paul's emphasis on resurrection as the foundational doctrine for Christianity is attested in Acts 23:6 and 24:15; it was Paul that connected Christian death with resurrection, triumph, and redemption (Hemer 193, 426).

For resurrection, the Christian hope for which Paul advocates, death is not final – the body is raised on the last day; he avoids addressing the pagan idea of the immortality of the soul.

The Apostolic Fathers, who had direct contact with and received teaching from the apostles of Christ, were the first to attempt to reconcile the resurrection of the body with the immortality of the soul. As previously seen, the terms are often conflated in Greek, and thus immortality and resurrection are frequently considered the same. The Apostolic Fathers use the same four words (rather, three, since ἔγερσις never appears) found in the Christian canon, but with more clarity and differentiation. Hence, the two doctrines began to separate once again.

As previously stated, ἀθανασία etymologically indicates deathlessness. The first instance of this word occurs in Clement's first letter to the Corinthians. When discussing the rewards of the righteous in heaven, he exclaims, “So blessed and marvelous are the gifts of God, beloved ones. Life in immortality, splendor in righteousness, truth in outspokenness, faith in confidence, self control in holiness” Ὡς μακάρια καὶ θαυμαστὰ τὰ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀγαπητοί. Ζωὴ ἐν ἀθανασίᾳ, λαμπρότης ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ἀλήθεια ἐν παρρησίᾳ, πίστις ἐν πεποιθήσει, ἐγκράτεια ἐν ἁγιασμῷ; 35.1-2). In this passage, Clement teaches that life is a gift from God (τὰ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀγαπητοί. Ζωή). More specifically, he indicates that life after death is something that is granted by God and accomplished only by His omnipotent will (τὰ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀγαπητοί. Ζωὴ ἐν ἀθανασίᾳ).

The sentiment that immortality was not a given, but a gift by the power of God was an accepted view among the Apostolic writers (Fahlbusch and Bromiley

"Immortality," II.809-811). The writer of the Didache prays, "We give thanks to you, O holy Father, for your holy name which you make dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which you made known to us through Jesus your son" (Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἅγιε, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματός σου, οὗ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου; 10.2). By tying ἀθανασία to Christ, immortality is connected to Jesus' resurrection, which Jaeger affirms is the foundation of Christianity (although he also considers Greek immortality to be fundamental; Stendahl 97). Cullman accurately states that "immortality is bound up in the Christ event; the soul is not intrinsically immortal, but it becomes so only in the belief in Christ's resurrection" (Stendahl 11); this concurs with Bromiley's observation that the New Testament places resurrection and immortality on a time scale – first one believes in the resurrection, then one is resurrected to judgment or eternal life, after which the righteous are granted immortality ("Immortality").

To connect immortality and Christ even further, Ignatius writes in his epistle to the Ephesians, "...breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote in order to not die but to live in Jesus Christ forever" (...ἓνα ἄρτον κλώντες, ὅς ἐστιν φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν, ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ διὰ παντός; *Eph.* 20.2). Ignatius demonstrates that immortality shall be enjoyed by the one who is in communion with Christ, i.e., a Christian. By believing in Christ, the Christian receives ἀθανασία, which involves spiritual immortality – life forever with Jesus Christ (ζῆν ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ διὰ παντός). In each of these accounts, immortality is not a somatic quality, but an attribute of the soul; it is introduced by the psychosomatic

resurrection of Christ, affirmed by conversion, and realized by the soul in Heaven when it communes eternally with Christ. The soul may not be inherently immortal, but it attains that quality through union with Christ (Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811).

Unlike ἀθανασία, ἀφθαρσία, which is the incorruptibility (of the flesh) enjoyed by the immortal person, has somatic associations (as part of the full understanding of immortality). In Clement's second letter to the Corinthians, he likens ἀφθαρσία to a contest, in which simile there is much somatic language (...ἐὰν εὐρεθῆ φθείρων, μαστιγωθεῖς...τί δοκεῖτε; ὁ τὸν τῆς ἀφθαρσίας ἀγῶνα φθείρας τί παθεῖται... καὶ ἔσονται εἰς ὄρασιν πάσῃ σαρκί; 7.4-6). The one who cheats in the heavenly contest (τὸν τῆς ἀφθαρσίας ἀγῶνα) will become a spectacle for all flesh (ἔσονται εἰς ὄρασιν πάσῃ σαρκί). In this passage, immortality clearly has a fleshly consequence. In this same letter, Clement further connects immortality with the flesh. The one who competes well in this life will be granted immortality and freedom from the flesh in the next life.¹⁹ He declares, “This same flesh is able to receive such great life and immortality, with the Holy Spirit being joined fast with it, nor is anyone able to proclaim nor tell the things which the Lord prepared for his chosen ones” (τοσαύτην δύναται ἡ σὰρξ αὕτη μεταλαβεῖν ζῶην καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν κολληθέντος αὐτῇ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὔτε ἐξειπεῖν τις δύναται οὔτε λαλῆσαι, ἃ ἠτοίμασεν ὁ κύριος τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ.; 14.5). He explicitly states that the flesh (σὰρξ is often different from σῶμα) can receive immortality when it is joined with the Holy Spirit. When in constant communion with God, the flesh may become

¹⁹ According to Cullman, the soul is composed of the inner self (πνεῦμα) and the outer self (σὰρξ, not σῶμα). As such, he suggests that death delivers us from the flesh into immortality; the body (σῶμα) will be refreshed and reunited with the immortal soul at the *eschaton*; Stendahl 25). Philologically speaking, σὰρξ and σῶμα, while not equivalent, can sometimes metonymically refer to one another.

incorruptible, but only by the power and gift of God, who is the “Founder of immortality” (καὶ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ἀφθαρσίας; 20.5).

Ignatius also uses ἀφθαρσία four times in his seven genuine letters. First, he emphasizes incorruptibility as a gift of God, brought about by His power alone. He remarks, “For this reason the Lord received ointment upon his head, so that he might breathe incorruptibility on the church (Διὰ τοῦτο μύρον ἔλαβεν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος, ἵνα πνέῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀφθαρσίαν; *Eph.* 17.1). Christ was sent in order to bestow the incorruptibility of immortality upon those who would believe upon Him and His resurrection; as such, it is the result of the omnipotent, voluntary gift of the Almighty God (Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811). Second, Ignatius emphasizes that immortality entails unity with God. He writes, “...but become one with the bishop and with those who lead, unto a type and teaching of incorruptibility” (...ἀλλ’ ἐνώθητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τοῖς προκαθημένοις εἰς τύπον καὶ διδαχὴν ἀφθαρσίας; *Magn.* 6.2). Just as the fleshly body (again, σὰρξ is unequal to σῶμα) should be united with the church, so the spiritual body shall be united with God and the saints who have gone before (ἐνώθητε ...προκαθημένοις; Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811). Third, Ignatius declares the gospel to be the completed work of incorruptibility (τὸ δὲ εὐαγγέλιον ἀπάρτισμά ἐστιν ἀφθαρσίας; *Phil.* 9.2). The gospel, that Jesus Christ came, suffered, died, and rose again, shall exist forever, as will those who believe in it. The fact that Jesus himself is resurrected and is fully immortal is the most powerful argument in favor of a belief in immortality (Wilken 15, 91-93). Finally, Ignatius emphasizes once more that ἀφθαρσία is a reward from God for those who believe upon Him. He writes, “Be sober, as an athlete of God. The prize is immortality and eternal life, concerning which you are also

convinced” (Νῆφε ὡς θεοῦ ἀθλητής· τὸ θέμα ἀφθαρσία καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, περὶ ἧς καὶ σὺ πέπεισαι; *Poly.* 2.3). By echoing the Clementine simile of incorruptibility and an athletic contest, he further suggests that mortal actions have immortal consequences. He also declares once and for all that incorruptibility is a reward for believers (τὸ θέμα ἀφθαρσία). Only by the will of God is the soul granted immortality and eternal communion with Christ (Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811).

Polycarp himself, in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, believed that immortality was a gift to the righteous by the power of God. The unknown author writes, “...so that I might receive a share in the number of the martyrs in the cup of your Christ, unto the resurrection of eternal life, of the soul and body, in the incorruptibility of the Holy Spirit” (...τοῦ λαβεῖν μέρος ἐν ἀριθμῷ τῶν μαρτύρων, ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς αἰωνίου ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος ἐν ἀφθαρσία πνεύματος ἁγίου; 14.2). From this passage it is clear that immortality is something that belongs only to those in whom the Holy Spirit has made its dwelling (ἐν ἀφθαρσία πνεύματος ἁγίου). Immortality is granted by God to those who are righteous in his sight, and thus is the sign of a true Christian (Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811).²⁰ The author of this work also likens ἀφθαρσία to a reward, affirming the earlier statements of Clement and Ignatius. The text says, “...seeing the greatness of his martyrdom and his blameless way of life from the beginning, [saw] that he had been crowned with the crown of immortality and had carried off an incontrovertible prize...” (...ιδὼν τό τε μέγεθος αὐτοῦ τῆς μαρτυρίας καὶ τὴν ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ἀνεπίληπτον πολιτείαν, ἐστεφανωμένον τε τὸν τῆς ἀφθαρσίας

²⁰ Lacoste also states that only the righteous resurrect, which implies that only the righteous receive immortality ("Resurrection of the Dead").

στέφανον καὶ βραβεῖον ἀναντίρρητον ἀπηνεγμένον; 17.1). The author declares that immortality is a prize to be won in the contest of life, a gift to be given by the power of God, and a reward for those who believe the gospel. Soon after this occurrence, the author affirms that Polycarp did in fact receive the “crown of immortality” (τὸν τῆς ἀφθαρσίας στέφανον; 19.2). With regard to the soul and the body, these passages indicate that immortality is granted by God according to the condition of the soul (and is thus an attribute of the soul in life after death), as demonstrated by the acts of the flesh (and subsequently rewarded by God; Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811).

The final mention of incorruptibility in the Apostolic corpus for our consideration occurs in the Epistle to Diognetus. This passage is very illuminative as to the early Christian beliefs surrounding the immortality of the body and soul. The anonymous author writes, “The immortal soul dwells in a mortal dwelling. And Christians dwell among corruptible things, expecting the immortality in heaven” (Ἀθάνατος ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν θνητῷ σκηνώματι κατοικεῖ· καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παροικοῦσιν ἐν φθαρτοῖς, τὴν ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀφθαρσίαν προσδεχόμενοι; 6.8). Concerning immortality, he notes that immortality exists only in heaven, in the dwelling of God, who is surrounded by His saints. From this, it is evident once again that immortality is under the jurisdiction of God, who is the demiurge of all (Ὁ γὰρ δεσπότης καὶ δημιουργὸς τῶν ὅλων Θεός; *Diog.* 8.7). Concerning the body and soul, the author of this epistle believed that the body was mortal, and the soul consequently immortal (ἀθάνατος ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν θνητῷ σκηνώματι). At this point, there were several theories as to the union of the body and soul as the whole “self,” as well as on the mortality of each. Greek philosopher Plato had argued for the immortality of the soul using four primary arguments in the *Phaedo*, while Hebrew

philosophical and theological writers were primarily concerned with the doctrine of the resurrection of the body (Stendahl 20-21). From here, it is evident that by this time the Apostolic Fathers had been exposed to both theories, and could thus interact with both in their writings. From this passage, it can be gleaned that the soul is immortal (“deathless”; ἀθάνατος), and thus it can enjoy the heavenly (if the soul is Christian) incorruptibility that ἀφθαρσία entails (καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παροικοῦσιν ἐν θφαρτοῖς, τὴν ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀφθαρσίαν προσδεχόμενοι; *Diog.* 6.8). The immortal is housed in the mortal, but in the end it remains true to its nature.

As for resurrection in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, ἀνάστασις appears roughly twenty-five times. Each occurrence confirms the doctrines enumerated and intimated in the New Testament, but with a more definite understanding of ἀνάστασις. However, some passages are reminiscent of ἔγερσις, even though the noun itself is never used. Clement says in the first letter to the Corinthians,

Κατανοήσωμεν, ἀγαπήτοί, πῶς ὁ δεσπότης ἐπιδείκνυται διηνεκῶς ἡμῖν τὴν μέλλουσαν ἀνάστασιν ἔσεσθαι, ἥς τὴν ἀπαρχὴν ἐποίησατο τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστήσας. ἴδωμεν, ἀγαπητοί, τὴν κατὰ καιρὸν γινομένην ἀνάστασιν. ἡμέρα καὶ νύξ ἀνάστασιν ἡμῖν δηλοῦσιν. κοιμᾶται ἡ νύξ, ἀνίσταται ἡ ἡμέρα. ἡ ἡμέρα ἄπεισιν, νύξ ἐπέρχεται (24.1-3).

Let us consider, beloved ones, how the Master continually shows us the resurrection that will happen, of which he made the Lord Jesus Christ the offering, having resurrected from the dead. Let us see, beloved ones, the resurrection that happens in season. Day and night make clear to us the resurrection. Night falls asleep, day rises. Day departs, night comes.

Later, Clement also compares the resurrection to the growing of crops. This passage, while not doctrinally significant, shows both the growing familiarity with the concept of the resurrection of the body – now people could interact with the teachings (transmitted orally for most) and explain them to others in fulfillment of the Great Commission – as

well as the reticence of the Greek world to accept the doctrine. Nevertheless, ἀνάστασις in this sense means a literal rising, hearkening back to the early Old Testament usages of the word. The New Testament use of ἀνάστασις becomes more evident as Clement writes. Just two chapters later, he claims that resurrection is not such an outlandish idea – if a phoenix can rise from the ashes, then certainly God in his omnipotence can raise Jesus and the saints from the dead (μέγα καὶ θαυμαστὸν... οὖν νομίζομεν εἶναι, εἰ ὁ δημιουργὸς τῶν ἀπάντων **ἀνάστασιν** ποιήσεται τῶν ὁσίως αὐτῷ δουλευσάντων ἐν πεποιθήσει πίστεως ἀγαθῆς, ὅπου καὶ δι' ὀρνέου δείκνυσιν ἡμῖν τὸ μεγαλεῖον τῆς ἐπαγγελίας αὐτοῦ; 1 Clem. 26.1; emphasis is mine). In this instance, Clement is searching for analogues to the resurrection, in order that he might help churches in the Greek sector of the ancient world understand what spiritual ἀνάστασις is. By helping the Corinthian church, not originally Jewish (and thus not having a background in resurrection ideology) understand at a fundamental level the source of their faith – "...being fully assured by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ...they went forth...preaching the good news..." (πληροφορηθέντες διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ...ἐξῆλθον, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι...; Holmes 101, 1 Clem. 43:3).

But alas, Clement too falls prey to conflating resurrection and immortality. In his second letter to the Corinthian church, he exhorts, "Blessed are those who heed the commands...they will gather the immortal resurrection" (μακάριοι οἱ τοῦτοις ὑπακούοντες τοῖς προστάγμασιν....τὸν ἀθάνατον τῆς ἀναστάσεως καρπὸν τρυγήσουσιν; 19.3). On one hand, perhaps he is merely referring to the harvest metaphor for the resurrection he used in his first letter, thus continuing his comparative approach to doctrinal development. Perhaps he uses ἀθάνατον, the adjectival form of ἀθανασία, to

subconsciously connect the significance of the immortality of soul with the paramount nature of the Resurrection for his audience. Or on the other hand, he himself could be struggling to reconcile immortality and resurrection; he could also be trying to encourage the Corinthians to fix their minds on higher concepts.

Ignatius, on the other hand, has a greater understanding of the difference between immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body. His doctrine of the immortality of the soul has been previously elaborated, and his thoughts on the resurrection of the body concur with those in the New Testament, although with much more focus on the flesh. He writes in his letter to the Ephesians, "I will make clear to you all the divine plan which I have begun, unto the new man Jesus Christ, in his faith and in his love, in his suffering and resurrection" (προσηλώσω ὑμῖν ἧς ἠρξάμην οἰκονομίας εἰς τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ πίστει καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ἀγάπῃ, ἐν πάθει αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναστάσει; *Eph.* 20.1). In this passage Ignatius clearly alludes to the resurrection of Christ's body from the dead with his clarification "new man Jesus Christ...in his...resurrection" (εἰς τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν...ἐν...αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναστάσει). Jesus suffered in body, died in body, and rose from the dead in body; he became a new fleshly man post-resurrection, which Ignatius emphasizes in his later letters.²¹ Ignatius promises to enumerate in his next letter to the Ephesians (which he did not have a chance to complete) the doctrine surrounding the resurrection of the body and its implications for faith (ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ πίστει).

²¹ He even refers to Christ as the "perfect human being" (τελείου ἀνθρώπου; *Smyr.* 4.2; Holmes 253).

Ignatius further emphasizes the human experiences of Jesus in his letter to the Magnesians. He exhorts, "But be fully assured in the birth and suffering and resurrection that happened in the time of the governorship of Pontius Pilate" (ἀλλὰ πεπληροφορηθῆσθαι ἐν τῇ γεννήσει καὶ τῷ πάθει καὶ τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ γενομένη ἐν καιρῷ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Ποντίου Πιλάτου; *Magn.* 11).²² In this passage, Ignatius urges the Magnesian church to remember the things that happened before eyewitnesses during their lifetime – Jesus was born, lived, suffered, died, and most importantly resurrected – which can be confirmed by a specific date – the governorship of Pilate.²³ This makes the resurrection physically undeniable for the Magnesians, which shows Ignatius' emphasis on the corporeality of Christ's resurrection. He writes in his letter to the Trallians, "...to the holy church...being at peace in the flesh and spirit through the suffering of Jesus Christ, our hope in our resurrection to him" (ἐκκλησίᾳ ἁγίᾳ...εἰρηνευούσῃ ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ πνεύματι τῷ πάθει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναστάσει; *Trall.* Preface). He mentions the flesh, ἐν σαρκὶ, in conjunction with the resurrection of believers and Christ as our resurrected hope (τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναστάσει). Although this correlation is less explicit than that found in the letter to the Magnesians, the language of body with regard to resurrection is still pervasive. He even calls Christ's physical life, death, and resurrection "unalterable archives" (τὰ ἄθικτα ἀρχεῖα; *Phil.* 8.2; Holmes 243), continually asserting in his ministry the corporeal reality of Christ's suffering, death, and resurrection.

²² This desire for the Church to be "fully assured" (πεπληροφορημένος) occurs again in his letter to the Philadelphians (*Phil.* Preface).

²³ Ignatius again refers to the time of the resurrection by mentioning Pontius Pilate (and Herod the tetrarch) in his letter to the Smyrneans (*Smyr.* 1.2).

The most explicit doctrine of the resurrection of the body in the Apostolic Fathers is found in Ignatius' letter to the Symneans. He confidently states,

Ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα. Καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς. Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον. Καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἤψαντο καὶ ἐπίστευσαν, κραθέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ αἵματι. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ θανάτου κατεφρόνησαν, ἠυρέθησαν δὲ ὑπὲρ θάνατον. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ σθνέπιεν ὡς σαρκικός, καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἠνωμένος τῷ πατρὶ (*Smyr.* 3.1-3).

For I know and believe he was in the flesh after the resurrection. And when he came to those with Peter, he said to them, "Seize me, feel me, and see that I am not a bodiless spirit." And immediately they felt him and they believed, being united with his flesh and blood. For this reason they hated death, and they were found to surpass death. And after the resurrection he ate with them and drank like a fleshly person, although spiritually united with the father.

In the first line of the passage it states that Christ had bodily form after the resurrection, hence the term resurrection of the body (καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα). He was touched and felt as a physical being, not "disembodied," ἀσώματον, by his followers (Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον; Holmes 251). It is interesting that Ignatius uses πνευματικός, since that word is used to describe the resurrected body, which is although fully body, has been re-ensouled (πνεῦμα; Bromiley "Resurrection," IV.145-150).²⁴ It is also noteworthy that he clarifies that the body and soul are not separate – the soul, although spiritually united with God, does not desert the living body; the soul is not a person without the body and vice versa (Wilken 159). In the final resurrection, our souls and bodies will be reunited.²⁵

²⁴ Cullman states that σάρξ and πνεῦμα are the "outer man" and "inner man" respectively – Jewish meanings, which affirm the psychosomatic resurrection proffered in the Ignatius (Stendahl 25).

²⁵ Skolnik and Berenbaum attest to this originally Rabbinic idea ("Body and Soul"). Ignatius repeats this at the end of this letter, again affirming the physical component of

Even Christ's digestive system was functional after his resurrection – he had a fleshly body (μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπιεν ὡς σαρκικός). Hence Ignatius has illuminated the doctrine of the resurrection of the body both for Christ and for believers: after death, which Christ defeated and which we surpass (ὑπὲρ θάνατον), Christ's body retained its physical form (united in flesh and blood; κραθέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ αἵματι) and certain faculties, which our resurrected bodies shall obtain when soul and body are reunited in the final resurrection (blood is occasionally metonymous for the soul; Christ's soul and body were not separate, thus in the final resurrection our bodies and souls will be reunited after death).²⁶

Finally, the last few significant uses of ἀνάστασις in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers appear in the Epistle of Barnabas. The author states, "And he himself submitted, so that he might nullify death and demonstrate the resurrection from the dead, since it was necessary that he be made manifest in the flesh...since he himself will judge [earth], having caused the resurrection" (αὐτὸς δὲ ἵνα καταργήσῃ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν δείξῃ, ὅτι ἐν σαρκὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν φανερωθῆναι, ὑπέμεινεν...ὅτι τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐτὸς ποιήσας κρινεῖ; *Barn.* 5.6-7). Not only does the unknown author consciously emphasize the correlation between resurrection and the body (καὶ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν

Christ's suffering and resurrection: "...in the name of Jesus Christ and in his flesh and blood, in his suffering and resurrection, both physical and spiritual..." (ἐν ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ αἵματι, πάθει τε καὶ ἀναστάσει σαρκικῇ τε καὶ πνευματικῇ...; *Smyr.* 12.2). Death delivers the whole person, inner and outer man, from the flesh, but not the body (Stendahl 52).

²⁶ At death, the body remains on earth in its decaying form, while the soul departs. At the final resurrection, the decayed bodies will be restored and transformed into imperishable bodies, and the soul will again inhabit the body. The final resurrection is mentioned briefly in *Didache* 16.6). Setzer asserts that believers will resurrect like Jesus (91-98).

ἀνάστασιν δείξει, ὅτι ἐν σαρκὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν φανερωθῆναι), but he also points to the Old Testament belief that the final resurrection will be accompanied by judgment (Levenson 70). The Epistle of Barnabas concludes in rather Judaistic way, saying:

Καλὸν οὖν ἐστίν, μαθόντα τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ κυρίου ὅσα γέγραπται, ἐν τούτοις περιπατεῖν. ὁ γὰρ ταῦτα ποιῶν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ δοξασθήσεται. ὁ ἐκεῖνα ἐκλεγόμενος μετὰ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ συναπολεῖται. Διὰ τοῦτο ἀνάστασις, διὰ τοῦτο ἀνταπόδομα (*Barn.* 21).

"Therefore it is good, having learned the righteousness of the Lord which are written, to walk in them. For he who does these thing will be glorified in the kingdom of God. The one who chooses other things will perish with their works. For this reason there is a resurrection, for this reason there is recompense.

The resurrection of Christ is tied to righteousness; those who are righteous will be glorified in the resurrection (δοξασθήσεται... διὰ τοῦτο ἀνάστασις), while those who do not believe and act thusly are subject to condemnation and perishing (συναπολεῖται...διὰ τοῦτο ἀνταπόδομα). This is Judaistic in the sense that it reaffirms the belief of the resurrection of the righteous to glory and the wicked to judgment (Levenson 70).

In conclusion, the New Testament and the Apostolic corpus contain numerous references to the immortality of the soul (ἀφθαρσία and ἀθανασία) and the resurrection of the body (ἀνάστασις). These two terms were often conflated in the New Testament, and are often taken to correspond to the modern, false equalization of immortality (originally pagan) and resurrection (originally Jewish). The Apostolic Fathers managed to separate the two doctrines and discuss them individually, and they kept their respective philosophical foundations intact. However, there was little to no reference to the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body in relation to each other in order to form an explicit, developed Christian idea of immortality and resurrection (devoid of pagan ties) – the two theories collide in the writings of the Church Fathers (Stendahl

112). This shows how resurrection and immortality, although they are complementary (Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811), are irreconcilable in their original forms, which requires a new definition of the Christian immortality-resurrection hybrid that develops from the Apostolic age to the Patristic age. The next chapter shall focus on Patristic responses, sentiments, and arguments regarding the Judeo-Christian concept of resurrection and the pagan, quasi-proto-Christian concept of immortality.

CHAPTER THREE

Immortality of the Soul and Resurrection of the Body in the Writings of the Patristic and Medieval Authors

Immortality and resurrection, soul and body, heaven and hell are three of the most widely discussed theological dichotomies by Christian writers, and the early Church Fathers were no exception. The Gospel was relatively new, Christianity was developing as its own religion apart from Judaism, and many began to embark upon missionary efforts, subsequently encountering local religions or even Christian sects. Because of these factors, the Apostolic writers had many doctrines to flesh out. Most writers chose to focus on either immortality or resurrection, but a few, like Tertullian, tackled them both. This chapter will be less philologically focused than the previous chapters, but more philosophically and theologically inclined. I shall examine the writings of Irenaeus, Tertullian, Augustine, Athenagoras, and others on these foundational issues for Christianity.¹

The previous chapter discussed the separation of the doctrines of immortality and resurrection in the New Testament and in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. The Apostolic Fathers kept the two separate, preserving the integrity and irreconcilability of the two; however, we still lack a developed, uniform understanding of the relationship between the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the dead. The Patristic and

¹ Because of the philosophical nature of the content, well-established English translations, and lack of available original language resources, only occasionally do I look at the original text; most translations are not my own and have been accordingly attributed.

Medieval writers, who often wrote and thought in response to their Apostolic predecessors, began to interact with immortality and resurrection in the same text; yet, the emphasis still remains on resurrection. The writers often questioned the legitimacy of the Platonic idea of the immortality of the soul and its incompatibility with somatic resurrection, just as I am doing on a broader scale. I shall attempt to examine the authors, both Eastern and Western theologians and philosophers (both pre- and post-schism), and their thoughts from a chronological perspective – from Justin Martyr to Aquinas.

One of the earliest Christian theologians after the Apostolic Fathers was Justin Martyr. He lived and wrote during the second century A.D., and focused mostly on somatic resurrection. He affirmed that belief in the resurrection of the body and the resurrection of believers was the mark of a true Christian (Setzer 74, 82). Apparently, he is also the first to explicitly relate resurrection and the flesh (Setzer 75). He also stated that the body and soul were in fact connected. Since the soul alone is from God, Jesus resurrected in the flesh so the body became immortal like the soul; hence, psychosomatic resurrection shows the uniqueness of Jesus to unify the body and the soul in immortality (Setzer 76-77).² Regarding the soul, Trypho states that the soul is not immortal because it is not necessarily existent (contrary to Platonism); however, all souls do not die – the good souls exist in a happier state, and those of the bad in a worse state (Kaye 74-75). "God alone is incorruptible...all other things, including the soul, are created and corruptible" (75). The soul and body separate at death (75). According to Kaye, Justin

² The concept of psychosomatic resurrection (as opposed to simple somatic resurrection, which only refers to the body) entails the unification of soul and body upon resurrection unto judgment and eternal life. This facet of resurrection becomes more common throughout the Medieval period, and is the most widely attested today.

believed in the immortality of the soul to the degree that immortality is a gift of God, not an innate property, remarking, "His notion seems to have been, that God conferred upon our first parents the gifts of incorruptibility and immortality, which they lost by their transgression; but which may now be regained by us if we believe, and lead virtuous and holy lives" (76). It necessarily follows that if we believe, we will resurrect psychosomatically in the last days; hence the necessary connection between the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body. Justin speaks of punishment as eternal; "previously to the final judgment, the soul will be reunited to the body, which, in the case of the good, will not only be rendered immortal and incapable of suffering, but even if, during this life, it labored under any deformity or defect, it will then be raised in a state of complete integrity. The bodies of the bad will also be rendered immortal, in order to endure the eternity of suffering to which they are destined" (76-77).³

In his *First Apology* and *Dialogue with Trypho*, Justin fleshes out the meaning of immortality. He states toward the beginning of his *First Apology*,

...if they, by their actions, show themselves worthy of His design, they are accounted worthy, so we have received, of reigning with Him, being delivered from corruption and suffering...so we consider that those who likewise choose what is pleasing to Him, are, on account of their choice, counted worthy of incorruption and of fellowship with Him (Barnard 28, *1 Apol.* 10).

When talking about the supremacy of God and our dependence upon Him for existence, Justin affirms that those who are pleasing to the Lord shall receive incorruptibility and fellowship. Incorruptibility (Justin uses the word ἀφθαρσία), as previously discussed

³ Augustine further attests that although soul and body are one, they cannot become one another, and the soul does not occupy space since it is incorporeal – its "presence" in the body is a gift of God, the supreme Being (*De Immortalitate Animae* 15.24, McMahon and Schopp 43-45).

with regard to its uses in the Bible and the Apostolic Fathers, is the ability of the body not to decay (Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811).⁴ To be pleasing to Lord, one must believe upon Jesus' death, resurrection, and power to save; having chosen to believe, each person chooses to act upon that faith. The reward, as stated above, is "of incorruption and of fellowship with Him" in Heaven – a place for the souls of the righteous (Barnard 28, *1 Apol.* 10). This passage shows Justin's belief in one tenet of the immortality of the soul. The soul, upon belief in the Gospel, shall no longer be susceptible to the decay that comes with death; those who do not believe must endure eternal suffering. The incorruptibility that accompanies immortality, then, is not an innate quality, but is acquired through belief.

He declares later, that believers "...[petition] that we may live again in the incorruption through faith in Him" (Barnard 31, *1 Apol.* 13). One petitions for incorruption out of faith in its fulfillment and a desire to please the Lord, not out of doubt or fear. Again, this shows the necessity of new life in Christ for the acquisition of incorruptibility, a facet of immortality.

Further, Justin states that the gift of immortality by God is a demonstration of His power. His argument is that just as men and women can beget children, "so also consider that it is not impossible for the bodies of men and women, dissolved and like seeds resolved into earth, to rise again in God's appointed time and put on incorruption" (Barnard 36, *1 Apol.* 19). This passage appears to correlate immortality with resurrection, since it is the bodies that are clothed with incorruption. This shows a shift

⁴ All Greek texts have been taken from the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae unless otherwise noted.

away from the Platonic concept of immortality, which relates to the soul, and movement towards an emphasis on resurrection and the properties of the resurrected body. The soul of the believer leaves the body after death, yet the body is raised in incorruption instead of the soul.⁵ Yet, is the incorruption manifested in the soul, since body and soul are reunited for the Last Judgment? This remains to be seen, and contributes much to the confusion between body and soul, immortality and resurrection. Incorruption is the ultimate reward for the believer, be it limited to either soul or body, it is still immeasurable pleasure to live forever with God. As Justin aptly remarks, "...it were truly ridiculous if we, who desire incorruption, should not endure all things in order to receive what we desire from Him who is able to grant it...there is joy afforded to those who look forward to the immortality promised by Him" (Barnard 50, 52; *1 Apol.* 39, 42).⁶ We pray and live earnestly for that which is promised to us – eternal life⁷ with Christ and the ability not to decay.

Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* has more material on immortality, incorruptibility, and the resurrection of the body. Very early in the text Justin states outright his stance on Platonic immortality of the soul. He declares, "But there are others who think that the soul is immortal and incorporeal, and therefore conclude that they will not be punished

⁵ Cf. *1 Apol.* 52: "He will come from heaven with glory with His angelic host; when also He will raise the bodies of all the people who have lived, and will clothe the worthy with incorruption, but will send those of the wicked, eternally conscious, into eternal fire with the wicked demons" (Barnard 59).

⁶ It seems odd that Barnard renders ἀφθαρσίαν as "immortality" in *1 Apol.* 42, since it is in all other places (and most other texts) rendered as "incorruptibility."

⁷ Cf. Chapter One of this thesis, in which I stated that eternal life is not equal to either the immortality of the soul or the resurrection of the dead, nor is it an appropriate substitute for the relationship between them.

even if they are guilty of sin; for, if the soul is incorporeal, it cannot suffer; if it is immortal, it needs nothing further from God" (Slusser 4, *Tryph.* 1.5). When claiming that the soul is both incorporeal and immortal, he uses the words "ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀσώματον τὴν ψυχὴν" (*Tryph.* 1.5). Related to the previously examined word ἀθανασία, the adjectival form ἀθάνατος suggests that the modified noun possesses the deathlessness characteristic of ἀθανασία, the second component of Platonic immortality of the soul.⁸ Its proximity to ἀσώματον suggests that part of the immortality of the soul involves its absence from the body, something that is irreconcilable with the Christian doctrine of psychosomatic resurrection. Hence, since neither ἀθάνατος nor ἀσώματος as components of the immortality of the soul are compatible with the Christian doctrines of resurrection and Justin's earlier defense of acquired incorruptibility, the Platonic concept of immortality does not complement the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

He continues along this vein of the Platonic concept immortality of the soul, saying, "Nor should we call the soul immortal, for, if it were, we would certainly have to call it unbegotten⁹...souls, then, are not immortal...whatever exists or shall exist after God has a nature subject to corruption...for only God is unbegotten and incorruptible" (Slusser 11-12, *Tryph.* 5.1-2, 4).¹⁰ This further shows his belief that Platonic immortality is in no way reconcilable with Christianity as it stands – one must define Christian immortality,

⁸ In chapter one, I described this deathlessness as *posse non mori* – the ability of man not to die (Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811).

⁹ One of Plato's arguments for the soul's immortality in the *Phaedo*.

¹⁰ It is interesting to note that many believe that Adam and Eve, begotten of God and thus incorruptible, were immortal; however, their disobedience ended that reward for themselves and all of their offspring (Slusser 187, *Tryph.* 124.3).

which Justin did in his *First Apology* (see above).¹¹ It should be noted that by this time it was universally believed that at the second coming of Christ, when souls are reunited with their resurrected bodies, that "some will be sent to the judgment and sentence of fire, to be punished eternally, while others will dwell with [God] free from suffering, corruption, sorrow, and death" (Slusser 69, *Tryph.* 45.4). Eternity, then, is a time frame not limited to the body or the soul, the righteous or the wicked; immortality belongs to all, but incorruptibility is granted only to those worthy to dwell with God.¹²

Justin then begins to relate incorruptibility not to immortality, but to resurrection. He states, "...we believe that one day God will raise us up again through Christ and will make us free forever from corruption, pain, and death" (Slusser 71, *Tryph.* 46.7).¹³ The verb he uses, ἀναστήσει, is related to the New Testament noun for resurrection, ἀνάστασις. In this passage, he describes our resurrected selves as "καὶ ἀφθάρτους καὶ ἀθανάτους" – both incorruptible and deathless (*Tryph.* 46.7). Originally terms limited to the discussion of immortality, now Justin has suggested that the two tenets of immortality are in fact characteristics of the resurrection of the body – a reappropriation of terms. He does this later on his *Dialogue*, claiming that, "...when he raises all of us up, and

¹¹ He is even so bold to state that those who deny resurrection but affirm Christian immortality of the soul are not real Christians; "whereas I, and all other wholeheartedly orthodox Christians, feel certain that there will be a resurrection of the flesh..." (Slusser 126, *Tryph.* 80.4-5).

¹² It is part of our inheritance as believers (Slusser 169, *Tryph.* 113.4). He also states, "Therefore, men...who believe in Christ...fully realize that they will one day be united with him in that land, to inherit imperishable blessings for all eternity!" (Slusser 209, *Tryph.* 139.5).

¹³ Justin uses the trio "death, corruption, and pain" several times elsewhere in this discourse. Some passages include 69.7, 117.3, 124.3, and others.

makes some incorruptible, immortal, and free from pain in an everlasting and indissoluble kingdom, and banishes others into the eternal torment of fire" (Slusser 175, *Tryph.* 117.3). Once again, he correlates resurrection with incorruptibility and immortality and affirms the belief that all will be raised either to Heaven or to Hell.¹⁴ Not only does this show that resurrection is psychosomatic, due to the reappropriation of language, but it also requires that the Christian doctrine of immortality be set forth – preferably in relation to resurrection. The former was accomplished, the latter, not so much. The language continues to be mixed and unmixed throughout the centuries, even until today.

Irenaeus of Lyons, a later contemporary of Justin's, also had some thoughts on the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body. His writings are based more on Biblical exegesis and less on philosophical inference and interaction. In the fifth book of *Against Heresies*, he provides much evidence for the resurrection of the body and the Christian's reward of immortality. As Roberts and Rambaut summarize, "The power and glory of God shine forth in the weakness of human flesh, as He will render our body a participator of the resurrection and of immortality, although He has formed it from the dust of the earth; He will also bestow upon it the enjoyment of immortality, just as He grants it this short life in common with the soul." Irenaeus himself argues,

Those men, therefore, set aside the power of God, and do not consider what the word declares, when they dwell upon the infirmity of the flesh, but do not take into consideration the power of Him who raises it up from the dead. For if He does not vivify what is mortal, and does not bring back the corruptible to incorruption, He is not a God of power (*Against Heresies* 5.3.2, Roberts and Rambaut).

¹⁴ The wicked acquire immortality only "so as to be a spectacle to all flesh" (Slusser 196, *Tryph.* 130.2, cf. Isa. 66:24).

It is interesting that Irenaeus has allocated the terms usually reserved for Platonic immortality to indicate psychosomatic resurrection. This further emphasizes the idea that the benefits of immortality for Christians is achieved through faith, rather than being an innate quality. The resurrection of the body and the gift of incorruptibility is a testament to the power of God; as Creator of originally immortal and incorruptible things (which soon became mortal and corrupted), He alone has the power to reverse the consequences of His justice.

He widely treats the subjects of incorruption and resurrection in chapter seven when he fully examines 1 Corinthians 15 (which I have examined in chapter two of this project) and its analogues. He questions, "...souls are incorporeal...what is more ignoble than dead flesh? Or, on the other hand, what is more glorious than the same when it arises and partakes of incorruption?" (*Against Heresies* 5.7.1, Roberts and Rambaut). His brief treatment about the incorporeality of the soul emphasizes the mortality of the body and the power of God to vivify it. He does not mention immortality regarding the soul afterwards, but turns to the resurrection body described in 1 Corinthians 15 – "So also is the resurrection of the dead: it is sown in corruption, it rises in incorruption" (1 Cor. 15:42). This shows a further development of the doctrine of the resurrection of flesh; yet, the immortality of the soul looms, misunderstood, in the background. This aforementioned incorruption, in earlier times understood as a facet of Platonic immortality, is at this point attributed to the Holy Spirit in preparation for the resurrection. Irenaeus writes, "But we do now receive a certain portion of His Spirit, tending towards perfection, and preparing us for incorruption..." (*Against Heresies* 5.8.1,

Roberts and Rambaut). The Spirit of God is given only to believers; this hearkens back to Justin's discussion of incorruption as a reward of those who please God. Those who have the Spirit have what is pleasing to God, and thus can attain incorruption – no longer tightly attached to Platonic immortality, but still creating some misunderstanding in such formulations.

Irenaeus continues to espouse this view, declaring, "Now God is He who gives rise to immortality. That he uses these words with respect to the body of flesh... he declares to the Corinthians manifestly, indubitably, and free from all ambiguity: "...For if we who live are delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, it is that the life of Jesus may also be manifested in our mortal flesh" (*Against Heresies* 5.13.3-4, Roberts and Rambaut). He uses John 5:28 to back this up: "The hour shall come, in which all the dead which are in the tombs shall hear the voice of the Son of man, and shall come forth; those that have done good to the resurrection of life, and those that have done evil to the resurrection of judgment" (Roberts and Rambaut). Whereas Justin attributed the outcomes of the Last Judgment to the immortality granted to all those resurrected, Irenaeus takes it farther by eliminating the aspect of immortality. This further obscures the role of the soul and immortality in Christianity, and allows for future conflation of immortality and resurrection. The use of incorruption as an intermediary term for qualities of immortality and resurrection is the greatest demonstration of this perspective. Despite the implicit, perhaps unintentional efforts to condense immortality and resurrection, other such dichotomous topics have arisen that also often are inappropriately conflated or deeply separated. These dichotomies include the soul and body, Heaven and Hell, intermediate stages of death, and the inner and outer man (*Against Heresies* 5.31.1-2; the inner-outer

man dichotomy becomes common in medieval philosophy; Athenagoras addresses this in his *De Resurrectione*).

Athenagoras thought that Christianity was compatible with a philosophical search for truth – which it is – and that, like the earlier writers, God's power was sufficient for resurrection – it shows His creation, justice, and unification of the body and soul (Setzer; *De Res.* 14.2, 15.5; Schoedel 121, 123).¹⁵ An Athenian philosopher turned Christian theologian, Athenagoras was a later contemporary of Irenaeus (Schoedel ix-x). Although not well known, his treatise on the resurrection challenges Christians and pagans alike to find evidence for their worldviews.¹⁶ The idea that immortality and resurrection are expectantly hoped for by believers underlies his text.¹⁷

Athenagoras confirms some of the earlier sentiments expressed by Justin and Irenaeus. For example, he quotes the power of God as sufficient proof for the resurrection (*De Res.* 3.1, Schoedel 95). He states,

For the power which can give shape to substance regarded by these thinkers as shapeless, can arrange in many different patterns that which is unstructured and disordered, can gather into one the parts of the elements, can divide seed which is one and simple into many, can make an articulated organism of that which is undifferentiated, and can give life to that which is not alive – **such a power can also unite what has been dissolved, can raise up what has fallen, can restore**

¹⁵ He states that "...the greater work – the making of an incorruptible and impassible body – [is] not unworthy of God" (*De Res.* 10.6, Schoedel 113). The Greek οὐκ ἀνάξιτον contains litotes which gives emphasis to the thing (the worthiness [ἄξιτος]) being doubly negated.

¹⁶ Athenagoras frequently references classical works, both mythological and philosophical, in his quest to prove the legitimacy of the Christian concept of resurrection.

¹⁷ Cf. "...We firmly hope for survival in an incorruptible form" (*De Res.* 13.1, Schoedel 119); "...both the wages and the peril depend on the issue of the resurrection" (*De. Res. Carn.* 21, Evans 57).

the dead to life, and can change the corruptible into incorruption (*De Res.* 3.2, Schoedel 95; emphasis is mine).

This quotation, coming early in his discourse, foreshadows his exposition on the tenets of psychosomatic resurrection. God can reunify body and soul (separated at death), physically heal and resurrect those who have died, and can grant incorruptibility to those who believe upon Him (cf. the previous iteration of Justin Martyr). Notably, incorruptibility, ἀφθαρσία, appears in this text as "incorruption" – a change translators seem to have made (albeit unintentionally) after the disappearance of Platonic immortality in religious discourses (Irenaeus also displays this). At this point, resurrection seems to have swallowed immortality – inheriting some of its functions but leaving others obscure. This very obscurity and theological dominance shows that the Church Fathers recognized the irreconcilability of Platonic immortality with psychosomatic resurrection; however, they fail to enumerate the Christian concept of immortality, instead falling prey to a conflation of terms.

Despite this conflation, Athenagoras begins to discuss the soul with reference to the resurrection. He states,

The resurrection of men could not wrong purely rational natures...and it surely could not wrong those creatures who have no reason or soul; for they will not exist after the resurrection, and there can be no injustice in the case of that which does not exist...and it certainly cannot be said that any injustice is to be seen in regard to the man himself who is resurrected. For he consists of soul and body, and no wrong is inflicted on either his soul or his body...if the soul is not wronged now when it dwells in a corruptible and passible body, much less will it be wronged when it lives with an incorruptible and impassible one...for if the corruptible body has not been wronged now when linked with an incorruptible soul, much less with the incorruptible body be wronged when linked with an incorruptible soul (*De Res.* 10.2, 5; Schoedel 111).

First, he claims that only ensouled beings shall experience resurrection – the soul is necessary for the true existence of the body (the Greek word ψυχή can mean both "soul" and "life"). Second, he states that man, unlike animals, has a soul, and thus can be corrupted and suffer pain at a spiritual and intellectual level. This is important, for God may grant incorruptibility through the conviction of the Holy Spirit, which requires spiritual and intellectual awareness – faculties of the soul. Third, he differentiates between the incorruption of the soul and the incorruption of the body. The soul is incorruptible only for believers, and it is for believers that psychosomatic resurrection is most pertinent.¹⁸ The body, however, does not attain incorruptibility until the final resurrection – it is corruptible while it is subject to worldly passions; however, all shall be resurrected for the sake of judgment.¹⁹ Therefore, the soul is not innately incorruptible, yet the body is; all shall rise in new bodies either to eternal joy or eternal misery, contrary to Platonic thought that only the soul could achieve incorruptibility.

Athenagoras continues to correlate body and soul to the resurrection, using the "whole man" model. He affirms, "It is man – not simply soul – who received understanding and reason. Man, then, who consists of both soul and body must survive

¹⁸ There seems to be some confusion about the nature of the soul for Athenagoras' translators, since later on Schoedel states that "...human nature...is constituted by an immortal soul and a body which has been united with it at its creation..." (*De Res.* 15.2, Schoedel 123). The Greek word used is ἀθάνατος, which means "deathless" – not to be confused with the immortality association with incorruption (ἀφθαρσία). In the sense that an ἀθάνατη ψυχή does not die, this Platonic tenet of a soul's immortality is not contradictory.

¹⁹ Athenagoras clarifies that resurrection does not occur because of judgment, but that it is an element of the resurrection and the will of God – "...all men who die arise, whereas all who arise are not judged" (*De Res.* 14.6, Schoedel 123).

for ever; but he cannot survive unless he is raised" (*De Res.* 15.6, Schoedel 125). As Athenagoras seems to conflate immortality and resurrection, so he conflates the properties of body and soul. Soul and body, the whole man, are necessary for survival; at the final resurrection, soul and body will reunite (having been separated at death) and enjoy incorruption together. However, the body must first undergo a transformation. He declares, "...whereas men were created to survive unchanged only in respect to the soul, but in respect to the body [men were created] to gain incorruptibility through a transformation...nor ought one to deny the resurrection just because separation of soul from the body...interrupts the flow of life" (*De Res.* 16.2, 4; Schoedel 127).²⁰ The soul and the body, which man needs for true existence, must separate at death so that the body may achieve the incorruption of the believer's soul.²¹ This temporary separation is just that – temporary – and is part of what makes Jesus' resurrection so remarkable. His soul and body did separate, He did in fact die, yet he was raised whole on the third day – soul and body, deathless, impassible, and incorruptible. The soul and body must reunite for judgment, since "...it is man, the combination of both [soul and body], who receives judgment for each of his deeds (*De Res.* 18.5, Schoedel 133). To reiterate, resurrection does not occur because of the judgment, but judgment accompanies psychosomatic resurrection. It determines whether man is incorruptible and deathless or whether, unable

²⁰ This passage, along with many other aforementioned excerpts, invites its readers to ask, "what is the soul, its properties and functions?" This confusion carries on (and probably will continue) even today; this project shall not be able to tackle it.

²¹ Athenagoras uses the argument of sleep and dreams as a temporary disjunction between soul and body to show the possibility of resurrection (*De Res.* 17.1, Schoedel 129).

to die, he must endure ultimate corruption, death, and pain. It follows that the body, to achieve incorruption, must reunite with its incorruptible counterpart – one cannot exist simultaneously in both Heaven and Hell (cf. *De Res.* 18.5, Schoedel 133).²²

Athenagoras went a step further than both Justin and Irenaeus by emphasizing the role of the soul in resurrection. The soul, while still attached to the definitions of Platonism, is indiscriminately used between incorruption and deathlessness – a detriment to theological and doctrinal clarity. In all of this one thing remains certain: the Christian doctrine of psychosomatic resurrection is not compatible with Plato's definition of an immortal soul.

Tertullian, a Latin theologian, decided to tackle both resurrection and the nature of the soul. His *Apology*, although not specifically about resurrection or immortality, mentions a few key points. First, Christ's flesh was ensouled (*Apol.* 21.14, Arbesmann et al. 64). Not only was Christ the unification of God and man, but as a man he was the perfect, incorruptible human that God originally created Adam to be.²³ Second, he mentions those who have theories about the nature of the soul, that when "they argue about the condition of the soul...each has introduced and formulated his doctrine" (*Apol.* 47.7-8, Arbesmann et al. 116). He says this in order to discuss how philosophy has distorted the interpretation of the Bible – especially the Old Testament. His comment that everyone has a separate theory reflects upon the confusion surrounding the nature of the soul – perhaps it is better to focus on clearer matters than on matters subject to wild

²² Just as two parts are necessary for a whole, so body and soul must be reconstituted to their exact counterparts for satisfaction in salvation, judgment, and eternity (cf. *De Res.* 25.1, 3; Schoedel 147; Lacoste "Resurrection of the Dead"); "Now the soul by itself is not man...nor is flesh without soul man" (*De Res. Carn.* 40, Evans 111).

²³ Cf. *De Res. Carn.* 2, Evans 7.

speculation. Contrary to Athenagoras, Tertullian states that the restoration of the soul and its reunification with the body at the resurrection is for the purpose of judgment, since "the soul cannot endure anything without a firm substance, that is, the flesh" (*Apol.* 48.4, Arbesmann et al. 118). This implies that the soul is tied both to the concept of the resurrection of the body, since resurrection occurs for the sake of judgment and eternal life, and both of those require the existence of the whole man: body and soul. Yet in this instance the body seems almost auxiliary to the soul, since it is the soul that requires physical manifestation for judgment to occur. Psychosomatic resurrection depends on the presence of soul and body equally. However, in light of his extensive work on the nature of the soul and its individuality from the body, Tertullian seems to suggest that the soul cannot in fact realize its full potential without the body. In keeping with the earlier writers, every soul is indivisible, yet only the Christian person possesses the incorruptibility associated with immortality; the incorruptibility applies to the whole person: the reunified body and soul at the final resurrection.

In his treatise *The Testimony of the Soul*, Tertullian puts the soul, as presented and defined by philosophers of all kinds, on trial. In the beginning he is unsure of its exact nature, yet he states confidently, "Thou art not a Christian...for, as a rule, the soul is not born Christian; it becomes Christian" (*De Test. An.* 1, Arbesmann et al. 133). This confirms Justin's belief that immortality is acquired through right faith. Immortality is closely tied to the soul for most ancient philosophers; the soul is not born Christian, and thus is not born incorruptible. In the end, he concludes that the soul is a medium of God's goodness and glory. He says, "...the soul comes as a gift from heaven...God and the goodness of God are everywhere, and everywhere is the testimony" (*De Test. An.* 6,

Arbesmann et al. 143). While this may seem an unsatisfactory ending to his treatise – the soul was not clarified as to faculties and essence, but it was, still importantly, shown to be God's method of inward communication with man. Without a soul, man would be no greater than beasts, who have no hope of resurrection or eternal communion with God.

In his work *On the Soul*, Tertullian confronts the facets of the soul offered by Classical philosophers (especially Plato), and he concludes that not only does Plato contradict himself and the truth by not seeking divine revelation, but that the soul is not immortal in the Platonic sense. Only through belief in the Gospel – note that all of Tertullian's arguments borrow from both theology and philosophy (instead of just philosophy, as Plato did)²⁴ – can one achieve the fullness of the immortal soul. He also claims that dreams, a subject of later interest with respect to the soul, reflect the divine immortality characteristic of souls (*De Anima* 45.1, Arbesmann et al. 280). With regard to the unification of soul and body, he declares, "But, that power of the soul which contains all its native potentialities gradually develops along with the body, without any change in the initial substance which it received by being breathed into the man in the beginning" (*De Anima* 37.5, Arbesmann et al. 267). The soul is a gift of God, the immortal one, and He grants it faculties as it develops alongside the body in accordance with nature.²⁵

²⁴ Tertullian wrote on the differences between Gnosticism and Orthodoxy, which required both philosophical and theological arguments (Lacoste "Resurrection of the Dead").

²⁵ Interestingly, in *De Resurrectione Carnis*, he states that the soul is the governor of the flesh since it is closer to God; nevertheless he acknowledges the co-responsibility of the flesh temporally and eternally (7; Evans 23, 35).

He then uses an interesting metaphor to relate immortality and resurrection.

Tertullian writes,

In sleep, the soul acts as if it were present elsewhere...meantime, the soul dreams...the soul does not altogether give in to rest and idleness nor surrender its immortality to the power of sleep...when the body awakens, it portrays before your eyes the resurrection of the dead by returning to its natural functions (*De Anima* 43.12, Arbesmann et al. 278).

One argument for the immortality of the soul is that it moves and is movable; if it ceases to move it loses its immortality. Just as when the soul and body slightly detach from each other during sleep, so to speak, so the soul and body must separate at death.²⁶ Only after this can reunification and rejuvenation occur – just as one feels rested after sleep and all "natural functions" return, so the body and soul, literally revived by Christ, return to their intended purposes after the resurrection: praising God for eternity.

However, that treatise was merely a treatment of various teachings about the nature of the soul. From a spiritual standpoint, his work on the resurrection of the body may prove more insightful.²⁷ He begins by once again affirming the reason for Christian faith – the resurrection of the dead (*De Res. Carn.* 1, Evans 5). Interestingly, Tertullian,

²⁶ The correlation between sleep, dreams, and the soul are thoroughly examined by Macrobius in his commentary on Cicero's *Dream of Scipio*. Unlike Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Augustine, and others, he believed in Plato's concept of the immortal soul – that to be free from the body was the ultimate goal (blissful immortality); happiness was being in harmonic orbit with the stars (1.1.6, 1.9.4-10, 1.10.7; Stahl 82, 125-127). He also, as per the title of his work, believed that Cicero put it best, that the soul never dies but becomes subdued at times; throwing off corruption, it can "return to the splendor of everlasting life" (not a Christian "eternal life"; 1.12.17, Stahl 137). Other major influences on Macrobius include Aristotle, Porphyry, and Plotinus. Macrobius' work shows that although Platonic immortality had almost disappeared from Christian writings, it was no means exempt from works of "rational philosophy" (2.17.15-16, Stahl 246).

²⁷ Tertullian's *De Resurrectione Carnis* was written earlier than his *De Anima* (Evans ix).

contrary to Athenagoras, believes that "judgment...[is] the whole purpose, yea the necessity, of the resurrection, such a provision of judgment as is most appropriate to God" (*De Res. Carn.* 14, Evans 39). Since the soul and body coexist and constitute the whole man, without their unification it is impossible to judge mankind. Hence, the resurrection serves as a reunification of body and soul so that man may live eternally and incorruptibly with God. In this treatise, Tertullian also takes a stance on the immortality of the soul and of the flesh.²⁸ He asserts, "Here then is an acknowledgement that the soul is immortal by nature, seeing it cannot be slain by men, and that mortality is of the flesh, which is what is slain, and that thus also the resurrection of the dead is of the flesh..." (*De Res. Carn.* 35, Evans 97). This seems Platonic, and thus contradictory to this entire thesis, yet the Latin text can in fact be viewed as a refutation of the Platonic view. The Latin *immortalis* does not preserve one specific Greek meaning between ἀφθαρσία and ἀθανασία; rather, it is translated as "immortality" – with the reader left in doubt whether *immortalis* means "deathless" or "incorruptible." I have chosen to read *immortalis* as "deathless," since it has the negative prefix in front of *mors*, or death.²⁹

²⁸ He continues to use "immortal" words to describe psychosomatic resurrection, stating, "There is nothing everlasting until after the resurrection... 'and there shall be no more death': and therefore no more corruption, since it will have been driven away by incorruption precisely as death with have been by immortality" (*De Res.* 58, Evans 173). Death and deathlessness, corruption and incorruption (*mors per immortalitatem, corruptela...per incorruptelam fugata*; *De Res.* 58.6-7, Evans 172) are words previously associated with Platonic immortality, but by this time are becoming used to describe facets of psychosomatic resurrection – a quasi-conglomeration of the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body.

²⁹ Later on Tertullian uses the word *incorruptibilitatis* to mean "incorruptibility" (*De Res. Carn.* 36, Evans 100-101). This also appears when he states, "...but to those to whom it appertains to approach to the kingdom of God will, before they are able to obtain it, have to clothe themselves with that principle of incorruptibility and immortality (*vim*

This dichotomy between body and soul, despite his efforts to clarify the roles of each, seems to negate the unification they apparently possess. Classical writers spoke either of immortality or resurrection, early Christian authors spoke of both but not in relation to one another, early Church Fathers reappropriated certain facets of Platonic immortality to psychosomatic resurrection. However, writers such as Tertullian began to dissect the essence of each facet – which distracts from the unification Christians supposedly value – the unity of the Trinity, the unity of body and soul, and the unity of Christ and the believer. Towards the end of his *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, Tertullian does seem to relate body and soul in a more unifying way, which refocuses the reader toward the unification with God that is the last judgment and resurrection.³⁰ To once again highlight their unification, he states, "...Adam the author of death, Christ the author of the resurrection, and yet, by bringing together the authors under the name of 'man', to determine that the resurrection is of the same substance as the death was" (*De Res. Carn.* 48, Evans 139). Adam was the first ensouled flesh, the first "man" (the whole man is both body and soul), yet he did not achieve immortality or incorruptibility in his parts. Christ however, was fully God (and thus immortal and incorruptible) and fully man – soul and body, which he did not soil with sin and the death that accompanies it. Hence that just as through the flesh came death (Adam was made flesh, then was ensouled), so through the flesh came resurrection; resurrection requires prior death, the

incorruptibilitatis et immortalitatis) without which they cannot approach to the kingdom of God" (*De Res. Carn.* 50, Evans 146-147).

³⁰ Sections 46-48 are all about the relation of soul and flesh with respect to salvation, sin, death, and eventual resurrection. In addition, section 53 extensively treats the story of Lazarus, whom Tertullian calls "the pre-eminent instance of resurrection," since his flesh was sown very much corrupted, yet it was raised with an incorrupt soul (Evans 157).

substance of which is the flesh (since the soul is incorporeal; *De Res. Carn.* 53; Evans 159, 161).

Augustine of Hippo, one of the most foundational Christian theologians, chose not to treat immortality and resurrection as thoroughly as Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian. For the most part, he affirms the basic properties of the body and soul. He writes, "...the body that is corruptible burdens the soul..." (*Tract.* 69.3, Rettig 69). The soul is incorporeal and incorruptible (through Christ alone, as established in later Apostolic and earlier Patristic writers), and the fleshly body is corruptible – it is not immortal, and is susceptible to decay (*posse mori*, if you please). He also affirms the resurrection of the body, since Jesus as the Word made flesh was psychosomatically resurrected; all future resurrection thus follows the precedent of dead flesh being made alive (cf. *Tract.* 69, Rettig 70).

Finally, one of the last pre-Renaissance (or earliest Renaissance) theologians was Thomas Aquinas. A lover of Aristotle and Augustine and author of numerous theological and philosophical works, he wrote a commentary about the Christian perspective and faculties of an Aristotelian soul. By this time, it seems that psychosomatic resurrection was not as widely discussed, since it was more easily comprehensible, more thoroughly treated by earlier writers, and contingent for salvation (and thus was one of the first doctrines to be cemented in the Church). He did not necessarily believe in the immortality of the soul, but his lack of discussion on the topic suggests that the Philosopher's (Aristotle's) view on the subject was not his focus (*Comm. De Anima*

1.14.27-57 [202-203], Pasnau 110-111).³¹ By extension, however, he does relate soul and flesh: the souls can vocalize, sound is the striking of air in the lungs (breath), breath is related to blood, and blood (in the Bible) is often matched with flesh (cf. Eph. 6:12; *Comm. De Anima* 2.18 [466-478], Pasnau 242-247).³² While this commentary does not discuss the resurrection of the body in any way, it does illuminate the status of Classical doctrine of the immortality of the soul – it had become more philosophical and focused on the person, rather than on the eschatological hope of Christianity. This, however, is not surprising, given that authors adopted the vocabulary of immortality when discussing and evaluating the development of psychosomatic resurrection.

In conclusion, the doctrine of immortality with respect to resurrection underwent many changes between the second and thirteenth centuries. Justin Martyr argued that incorruptibility, still a tenet of the Platonic concept of the immortality of the soul, was acquired only through belief in the Gospel – incorruptibility, then, was not innate as Plato suggested but was a result of being reborn in Christ. Conversely, all people are

³¹ Interestingly, Aquinas matter-of-factly writes in response to the *Metaphysics*, that "...that part of the soul alone, the intellective part, is imperishable and everlasting...passive intellect, on the other hand, is perishable – i.e., ...the sensory part" (*Comm. De Anima* 3.10.202-249 [743-745], Pasnau 369-370). He later states that Aristotle wrongly deduced that bodies cannot have souls (Tertullian would argue that this is true, since it is souls that possess bodies); Aquinas states that "no mobile body that has soul lacks sense" (*Comm. De Anima* 3.17.96-172 [854-857], Pasnau 421-422). By this he means that sensory perception is a faculty of the soul, and that bodies are moved by souls, hence an immobile body is not ensouled (dead) and senseless. The soul endows the body with materiality (Lacoste "Resurrection of the Dead").

³² The Lord's Supper encapsulates the Medieval relation between soul and flesh, and is incorporated into the liturgy of Christian funerals. Just as Christ suffered, died, and resurrected in body (bread) and soul (associated with blood; wine), thus Christians get a foretaste of the psychosomatic reunion at the resurrection when they partake of Communion.

ἀθάνατος, the other tenet of Platonic immortality. Irenaeus takes it a step farther in order to reduce the theological association of immortality with resurrection – he claims that incorruption and deathlessness, words previously ascribed to the soul's immortality, are physical rewards of the resurrection, thus arguing for psychosomatic resurrection (resurrection and reunification of both soul and body; the body inherits the traits once limited to the soul). Athenagoras then takes the disjunction further, using the "whole man" model for body and soul and reducing immortality to a facet of resurrection – perhaps in an effort to simplify doctrine, yet resulting in more uncertainty. Tertullian then manages to completely separate body, soul, and the immortality and incorruption attributed to them in the resurrection. By the time of Augustine, the soul was merely a component of psychosomatic resurrection, with few vestigial hints of Platonic immortality.³³ The writings of Aquinas reflect the ultimate disjunction between the Platonic immortality of the soul and the Christian resurrection of the body – he treated the Platonic concept and acknowledged the flesh as important for the life of the soul, yet neglected to mention the resurrection in his *Commentary on Aristotle's De Anima*.³⁴

These texts and many others show how the Platonic concept of the soul's immortality is not compatible with the Christian idea of the resurrection of the body. Instead, the authors chose either to focus on the properties of the soul regarding Classical philosophy or the resurrection of the body, which doctrinally acquired some of the

³³ Aquinas and Augustine disagreed in the nature of soul and body, but agreed that the soul was immortal insofar as it was indivisible; spiritual immortality was granted only by God (Fahlbusch and Bromiley "Immortality," II.809-811).

³⁴ This is not to say that he was unaware of it, but he vigorously treated the topic of the soul and its qualities instead of the more common, well-attested doctrine of psychosomatic resurrection.

deathlessness and incorruptibility enjoyed by the souls of believers for the early Church. Immortality and resurrection, while not equivalent or exchangeable, must be studied in relation to one another since their elements are deeply philosophically, theologically, and philologically intertwined. As such, the next chapter shall continue to show the unfortunate disjunction between body and soul, immortality and resurrection, and more through the examination of Renaissance liturgical practices surrounding burial.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Immortality of the Soul and the Resurrection of the Body in Renaissance Liturgical Practices

The previous chapter discussed the Medieval philosophical and theological approaches to resurrection and immortality. Some authors focused on the properties of the soul, while others discussed psychosomatic resurrection, which had acquired some of the vocabulary of Platonic immortality. However, no one yet agreed upon a Christian immortality of the soul with reference to the resurrection of the dead. This disparity continues to grow throughout the Renaissance. Platonic immortality is almost completely cast aside by the Church in favor of psychosomatic resurrection, and the use of "immortal" vocabulary begins to fade.¹ Instead, the Church focuses more on issues such as Heaven and Hell, body and soul; from its treatment of these we can deduce their thinking on the reconcilability of Platonic immortality and the resurrection of the body.

In this chapter I shall examine the liturgy of the Church from the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries philologically and theologically. Within the liturgy, I will focus especially on eschatologically significant documents, prayers, funeral rites, burial practices, and services for the dead.

The *Speculum Humanae Salvationis* manuscript, written by an Austrian monk in the 14th century, is a typological document comparing Gospel accounts of the life of Jesus with Old Testament and Deuterocanonical narratives that prefigure them. It has two

¹ In this chapter, the Church includes Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy, and Anglicanism.

columns of text, 25 lines each, on each page, above which are two illustrations of the text, so that the illiterate could look at them and recall the biblical stories which they had first encountered orally in many cases.² There are multiple levels of understanding available in such narratives – illustrative, literal, allegorical, and perhaps more. From a philological standpoint, however, there are no mentions of immortality in the *Speculum* text; when it does address the afterlife, it focuses primarily on psychosomatic resurrection.³

First, as a liturgical document, it frequently affirms that Christ did in fact rise from the dead – the cornerstone of Christianity. It states, "Because although Christ was killed, nevertheless he was resurrected from death" (*Quia licet christus occideretur tamen a morte resurrecturus erat; SHS 2r.B.7*). While this is not an uncommon claim, it establishes the manuscript as an orthodox Christian document. In discussing Jesus' resurrection further, it says, "Thus Christ rose from the sleep of death in the middle of the night" (*Sic Christus media nocte de somno mortis surrexit; SHS 3v.A.3*). In this instance, *resurrexit* holds two levels of meaning. First, it refers to the physical act of getting up, much like the Old Testament word *ἐγερσις* discussed in the first chapter of this project. Its physicality is emphasized by the time given the reader, "in the middle of the night" (*media nocte*), as well as by the preposition denoting the separation of the body from something else (*de*). Second, it refers to death as a kind of sleep; this is congruent

² When discussing the role of illumination in Medieval manuscripts, Dr. Michelle Brown frequently quotes Gregory the Great, saying, "In images the illiterate read" (Brown 234).

³ All translations are my own unless otherwise attributed.

In the *Speculum* manuscript, forms of *resurrectio* and *resurgere* appear 26 times in total.

with the Old Testament and Gospel beliefs surrounding the death of believers. If believers "slept" in death, then it was possible for them to physically and spiritually be resurrected. This passage, located in the prologue of the work, signifies the emphasis on the bodily nature of resurrection demonstrated in the remainder of the text. Throughout the manuscript, the author focuses on the physicality of resurrection – Jesus' body was resurrected, as were the bodies of several dead men. This increased amount of physical description, highlighting the effects of suffering, death, and psychosomatic resurrection reflects the desire for physicality and the accessibility of liturgical traditions.⁴

Chapter 28, which describes the Harrowing of Hell and its Old Testament prefigurations, contains numerous references to the doctrine of the resurrection of the body and its development. It states,

*Hora nona quando christus animam mittebat,
statim anima unita deitati ad inferna descendebat...
In isto inferno fuit anima christi ab hora sue expirationis
Usque ad horam sue gloriose resurrectionis.
Sciendum autem quod sed anima fuerit a corpore separata
Tamen deitas neque ab anima neque a corpore fuit segregata.
In lybo fuit deitas unita anime corpore separata.
In sepulchro erat deitas unita carne mortificata (SHS 27v.A.3-4, 29v.B.20-25).*

When Christ gave up his soul at the ninth hour,
immediately his soul, united with the divine nature, was descending into Hell...
The soul of Christ was in that Hell from the hour of his death
Up to the hour of his glorious resurrection.
And it ought to be known that although the soul had been separated from the body
Yet the divine nature had been removed neither from soul nor from body.

⁴ The book itself is a tangible and venerable object, it contains pictures which make it even more accessible, and the text contains well-known stories and vivid physical descriptions. For example, physical actions and emotions are constantly emphasized, such as weeping, crying, kneeling, eating, and the like. In addition, the author uses these physical descriptions to explain why certain spiritual and moral practices should occur, such as contrition and confronting sin.

In Limbo the divine nature was united with the soul, having been separated from the body.

In the tomb the divine nature was united with the dead body.

It is especially fascinating that the body and soul are both associated with the resurrection of Christ; this reflects the views of the Latin Church on the subject. This passage indicates that they believed that when Christ died, his soul and body, united not merely by flesh but by a divine nature (*deitas*), were physically separated – "...although the soul had been separated from the body, yet the divine nature had been removed neither from soul nor from body" (*autem quod sed anima fuerit a corpore separata tamen deitas neque ab anima neque a corpore fuit segregata*; SHS 29v.B.22-23). This suggests a belief that *deitas* is required for psychosomatic resurrection. Jesus resurrected, and his *deitas* was joined to both body and soul; by implication, those who possess his divine nature, such as believers, will psychosomatically resurrect as well.

Chapter 28 is also very clear that bodies are buried, while souls go to Heaven or Hell.⁵ The author mentions not only Christ's soul going down to Hell (*ad infernum*), but also that of the robber crucified next to Jesus – "For the soul of the robber was entering Limbo with the soul of Christ" (*Anima enim latronis cum anima christi lymbum ingrediebatur*; SHS 30r.A.9). This indicates a belief that souls separated from the body at death; only believers could resurrect since they possessed a divine nature, and thereby unbelievers would not experience a final, psychosomatic resurrection. This is

⁵ The author of the manuscript actually believed in four realms of the afterlife – "Yet Hell is fourfold or rather, there are four levels of the depths, that is, the place of the damned; of the children; of the cleansed; of and the saints" (*Est autem quadruplex infernus siue quatuor loca infernorum uidelicet dampnatorum puerorum purgandorum et sanctorum*; SHS 29v.A.5-6).

incongruent with all earlier beliefs, since they thought that all bodies and souls would be reunited in their proper selves for the final judgment of the righteous and the wicked.

This shows either a departure from or misunderstanding of doctrine, or perhaps the author is more concerned with the physical aspects of life, spirituality, and the reality of suffering – after all, the manuscript was used liturgically by a primarily illiterate audience whose devotion was at a lower, more physical level, not at a higher, mystical one.

Chapter 32 describes Christ's resurrection itself, and its prefigurations. It is here that the resurrected body is described. The author asserts,

*Quia corpus glorificatum ipsum lapidem pertransiuit
Post hoc angelus domini in forma hominis de celo descendit.
Et uidentibus custodibus lapidem de hostio reuoluit
Cuius facies sicut fulgur et uestes albe erant (SHS 35v.B.1-4).*

Since his glorified body passed through the rock itself,
Afterwards he descended from heaven with the angels of the Lord in the form of a man.
And he rolled back the stone from the doorway with the guards seeing,
Whose face was like lightning and the clothes were white...⁶

Once again, the author emphasizes the physical, tangible elements of the resurrection; namely, the body and its capabilities. He focuses on the body of Jesus during and after the resurrection – it can pass through rock (*quia...pertransiuit*), dwell in Heaven (*post...descendit*), has great strength (*et...reuoluit*), and a celestial appearance (*cuius...erant*).

⁶ This contradicts Matthew's account, which mentions one angel; Mark's account mentions a young man, Luke's two men, and John's two angels. Perhaps this is a combination of all four accounts. As for an ascension pre-Ascension (Acts 1, Luke 24), the author seems to draw upon the qualities of a resurrected body described in 1 Cor. 15 and in Jesus' passage through walls (John 20.19).

While many earlier writers addressed some abstractions of the resurrected body – i.e., clothed or unclothed, ensouled or unsouled, possessing matter and mass or not, etc. – this anonymous monk described the physical characteristics of the resurrected body, further showing a belief in a psychosomatic resurrection (with no mention of immortality). He asserts, "Moreover in the middle of the night with Hell destroyed, the soul returned to the body, and thus Christ, who had been killed, arose" (*Media autem nocte destructo inferno anima ad corpus rediit et sic christus qui mortuus fuerat resurrexit*; SHS 35v.B.22-23). Here it is evident that resurrection requires the reunification of the soul and the body as a reward of possessing *dietas*; immortality is certain for no one and nothing. Jesus' soul and body, rejoined in flesh and in spirit, subsequently resurrected, as well as many saints ("Many bodies of the saints resurrected with him"; *Multa corpora sanctorum cum ipso resurrexerunt*; SHS 35v.B.24). At this point, immortality is hardly a concern or even a considered topic within the Christian Church, given the increased emphasis on the tangibility of psychosomatic resurrection.

I shall now focus on funeral rites and masses for the Catholic (Roman and Sarum Rites), Eastern Orthodox, and Anglican churches. Christianity as a whole emphasizes the importance of resurrection. This is evident especially in their funeral masses, although each denomination has differing views on body and soul,⁷ as well as varying levels of emphasis on mercy, rest, and communion. I shall begin with Catholicism (starting with the Roman Rite), then examine Orthodoxy, ending with Anglicanism.

⁷ The Greek Orthodox Church adds a third component, spirit, saying that a tripartite unity of spirit, soul, and body most accurately describes the capabilities of human existence and avoids confusion between soul and spirit (which is often considered a faculty of the soul; Kallistos 60-61). Spidlik calls spirit "the presence of an invisible Breath in the human soul...the soul of our soul" and the soul "the seat of the Spirit" (31, 91, 94).

The Roman Rite was a liturgical guide endorsed by the Roman Catholic Church and practiced widely across Europe. Today, most Catholic churches adhere to the Roman Rite for both Latin and English masses.⁸ This tradition in particular emphasizes the need for mercy, desire for rest, importance of the Eucharist, and the certainty of final judgment. When a person dies, the funeral consists of three parts: Vigil, Mass, and Committal. The Funeral Mass, although it cannot be called "Mass of the Resurrection" – the person's body is still lifeless – is meant to be "the memorial of Christ's death and resurrection" (Guidelines 2). The Mass itself is the central event of the funerary rites, and the homily is central event of the Mass. Interestingly, the homily is meant to "...[relate] Christian death to the paschal mystery of our Lord's death and resurrection" (Guidelines 2). This shows that the funeral service has a strong foundation in the hope of a resurrection, since it lies at the heart of the funeral rites. Further emphasis on the bodily nature of resurrection occurs in the Church's respect for the body. Today, cremation is only occasionally permitted, since "the Church has followed the practice of burial or entombment after the manner of Christ's own burial. This expresses respect for the human body as a member of Christ and faith in the resurrection of the body" (Guidelines 4). Although earlier writers did not even consider cremation as a possible method of burial, the modern Church allows cremation as long as the remains are not scattered

⁸ There is now no single Roman Rite, many changes have occurred throughout centuries and civilizations. The prayers and liturgies I address can be found beginning in the 15th century.

(Guidelines 5).⁹ They believed that God would restore each soul to its proper body, and each body to its intended, perfected form (i.e., no disabilities or dismemberments). This view of psychosomatic resurrection is irreconcilable with the Platonic concept of the immortality of the soul, since the Platonic soul cannot achieve immortality without complete separation from the body – the exact opposite of psychosomatic resurrection.

In the text of the Roman Rite traditional mass there are references to psychosomatic resurrection, but absolutely no mentions of immortality.¹⁰ Many instances of resurrection in the text come from doctrinal statements established in the early centuries after Christ. It states, quoting the Nicene Creed, "And he resurrected on the third day, according to the Scriptures...and I await the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come" (*Et resurrexit tertia die, secundum Scripturas...et exspecto resurrectionem mortuorum et vitam ventura saeculi*; Ordinary 5-6). Historically, *resurrectio* (and *resurgo*) carry the significance attributed to ἀνάστασις (and καθίστημι), its Greek counterpart; it implies, congruently with the writings of the early Church Fathers, that resurrection is somatic, and that the soul and body will reunite for God's final judgment. However, it shows a greater emphasis on the liveliness of the body rather

⁹ If the remains are scattered, then the body is no longer "together" in one place like a buried body. If the ashes are buried or placed in a container altogether, then the body can be one with its soul during the final resurrection.

¹⁰ There are numerous mentions of eternal life (*aeterna vita*; Ordinary 2,6, 10, 13-15), but this is not the same as immortality, as previously stated in Chapter One of this project.

The Roman Rite funerary Mass does not contain the Nicene Creed, but does include the other prayers and texts I examine.

than its association with the soul; hence the dichotomy between death and life (*mortuorum et vitam*).¹¹

Interestingly, resurrection also becomes associated with remembrance – the earliest, original Jewish form of immortality discussed in the first chapter. The offertory reads,

*Suscipe, sancta Trinitas, hanc oblationem,
Quam tibi offerimus ob **memoriam** passionis,
Resurrectionis, et ascensionis Jesu Christi
Domini nostri: et in honorem...
...omnium Sanctorum...
...et illi pro nobis intercedere
dignentur in coelis, quorum **memoriam**
agimus in terris... (Ordinary 7; emphasis is mine).*

Receive, holy Trinity, this offering,
which we offer to you for the remembrance of the passion,
resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ
our Lord: and in honor of...
all the Saints...
and may they deign to intercede to him for us
in heaven, whose memory
we hold on earth...

This "immortal" remembrance is then tied to the Eucharist, since the bread and wine are Christ's body and blood. This continues throughout the consecration of communion, which uses similar phrases to correlate the Christ's body and blood with His suffering,

¹¹ In other places in the funeral Mass, the dead and the living are explicitly dichotomized; for example, *vivos et mortuos* (Ordinary 5). Jesus is also no longer the object of the resurrection, but is also an agent – He is called "life-giver" (*vivificantem*; Ordinary 5, 13).

As for the soul, the Mass text translation uses *anima*, *mens*, and *viscus* (*anima* is the most common). It also attributes some functions of the soul (as believed by medieval writers) to the heart (*cor*). These conflation of terminology result from both the lack of specificity in the Latin language as well as an emphasis on physical things (such as the body) and an increased desire for spiritual tangibility as demonstrated in the *Speculum Humanae Salvationis* text.

death, and resurrection. The body, as we have seen in this thesis, is most often associated with resurrection, while the soul, which philosophically and etymologically possesses life and blood and breath is related to immortality (and hence memory).¹² In this excerpt from the offertory portion of the Mass, resurrection is used to refer to a physical, tangible practices such as the receiving of communion, despite the philological allusions to Jewish and medieval Christian doctrines. Once again, the resurrection of the body is not reconcilable with Platonic idea of the immortality of the soul, since they contradict each other regarding the role of the body.

Other liturgies in the traditional and funeral Masses and associated prayers shed light on the Renaissance Christian fear of suffering. The Commemoration of the Dead states, "Remember also, Lord...[those] who preceded us with the sign of faith, and who rest in the sleep of peace...a place of coolness, light, and peace...we beseech [from you]" (*Memento etiam, Domine...qui nos praecesserunt cum signo fidei, et dormiunt in somno pacis...locum refrigerii, lucis et pacis...deprecamur*; Ordinary 11). Even though this passage does not mention the body, soul, or psychosomatic resurrection, it shows that Renaissance-era Christians were more concerned about their immediate fate after death. That is why they beg for mercy, peace, and rest in the afterlife, the locus of which contrasts with Medieval and Renaissance conceptions of Hell as a place of darkness, vermin, and often fire (cf. Dante and *SHS* Chapter 28). Two famous Latin prayers also show this fear of suffering after death, instead of focusing on the promise of a glorious

¹² *Anima* is equivalent to ψυχή, often translated as "soul" and "life," but also is closely tied with πνεύμα, "breath" and "spirit"; memory is a function of the soul; see Aquinas' *De Anima* and previous chapters. The soul is also often tied to blood, so the commingling of bread and wine shows the reunification of body and soul, and thus psychosomatic resurrection (Jungmann 318).

resurrection (Rutherford 28, 88-89). A very short prayer, "Requiem Aeternam," reads, "Grant eternal rest to him/her/them, Lord, and let perpetual light shine on him/her/them. May he/she/they rest in peace. Amen" (*Requiem aeternam dona ei/eis, Domine, et lux perpetua luceat ei/eis. Requiesca(n)t in pace. Amen*; preces-latinae.org). Like the Commemoration of the Dead, this prayer contains vestiges of belief in an eternal future (*aeternam, perpetua*). However, the object of the first verb is rest, the subject of the second verb is light, and the last sentence shows desire for rest and peace (*requiescat[n]t in pace*)¹³ – all qualities of an afterlife lacking suffering and other Hellish attributes. In the Requiem Mass itself, the phrase *requiescat[n]t in pace* replaces many other prayers or liturgical texts (Fortescue et al. 90).

A Gregorian chant melody composed in the 13th century, known as the Dies Irae, or "Day of Wrath," describes the final judgment and the events surrounding it, including the final resurrection.¹⁴ Originally part of the Mass and Office of the Dead, now it is used in the last week of Ordinary Time (preces-latinae.org). In conjunction with earlier beliefs, the chant affirms, "Death and nature will stand amazed when creatures will resurrect to respond to the Judge...that day is tearful which resurrects [people] from ashes...merciful Lord Jesus, grant them rest" (*Mors stupebit et natura, cum **resurget** creatura, iudicanti responsura...lacrimosa dies illa, qua **resurget** ex favilla...pie Iesu Domine, dona eis requiem*; preces-latinae.org; emphasis is mine). This song is clear that

¹³ In the modern Roman Rite, the plural form of the verb is always used, even if the funeral is for just one person (Fortescue et al. 251-252).

¹⁴ The "Requiem Aeternam" and "Dies Irae" texts are read or sung at every funeral, as well as the "Munda cor meum" (Fortescue et al. 228).

Christians believed in a resurrection at the final judgment, but not exclusively as a glorious thing.¹⁵ By describing the impending resurrection as tearful (*lacrimosa*), it indicates that fear of death and an unhappy afterlife extends beyond the immediate future into the time after the final judgment when all fates are sealed. In addition to this, the fear of suffering and of Hell are shown through several key phrases: "day of wrath," "may I not burn in eternal fire," and "with the sharp fires assigned" (*dies irae, ne perenni cremer igne, flammis acribus addictis*; preces-latinae.org). Resurrection, at this point, is no longer a joyous occasion, but a dreadful one.¹⁶ These texts show that Renaissance Christians were exceedingly aware of their mortality, fearful and despairing of suffering, despite the promise of a glorious psychosomatic resurrection.

The Sarum Rite, which was followed by English Catholics prior to the Protestant Reformation, places a greater emphasis on the resurrection of the body in its liturgy. It was written in Latin, like the Roman Rite, and had great influence on Anglicanism and the Book of Common Prayer. Like the Roman Rite, traditional masses often contained a

¹⁵ Nowadays, the Mass for the Dead contains more hopeful prayers and scriptures in addition to the ones examined above. It also contains references to the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul; examination of the modern Mass is beyond the scope of this chapter (sanctamissa.org)

¹⁶ The Church itself seems to promote this view. In the 1558 and 1560 editions of the Roman Missal only, a blessing was included: "May God, the life of the living, the resurrection of the dead, bless you forever and ever" (*Deus, vita vivorum, resurrectio mortuorum, benedicat vos in saecula saeculorum*; Jungmann 446). This passage asks God for the blessing of resurrection and does not beg for mercy like other passages. It was removed from both earlier and later editions of the Roman Missal because a blessing for the living was deemed too joyful for a Mass for the Dead (Jungmann 446, Fortescue et al. 90). Now, ministers are commanded to "strengthen the hope of those present and to foster their faith in the paschal mystery and the resurrection of the dead" instead of highlighting the possibility of suffering and fostering fear and despair (Rutherford 28, 252).

vigil (*vigilia*) for the dead, and used the "Requiem Aeternam" prayer extensively (and thus emphasizing a hope for peace and rest also shown in the Roman Rite; Warren 174). Regarding resurrection, which the Sarum Rite emphasizes more than the Roman Rite, there is one responsive passage that affirms it: "The Lord has risen; Just as He said to you, alleluia" (*Resurrexit dominus; Sicut dixit vobis, alleluia*; Frere I.275). This is a direct quote of Matthew 28:6, and it affirms the distinctive basis of Christianity. While this seems like a simple phrase and does not reflect on the nature of the soul or body at the resurrection, it is important for all Christians to know what sets them apart from other monotheistic religions.¹⁷ Unlike the Roman Rite, the Sarum text does not create a sense of dread regarding resurrection unto the final judgment. It describes there being "happiness in the last day of the blessed resurrection" and "eternal glory of the future resurrection" (*in novissimo die beatæ resurrectionis lætitiã...futuræ resurrectionis gloriam sempiternam*; Officium). The Sarum Rite also mentions the soul more frequently, which shows vestigial awareness of Platonic immortality, but not agreement with it – immortality belongs to God alone.

The text of the Sarum funeral Mass reveals awareness of psychosomatic resurrection, hope for a bliss-filled eternity, some fear of judgment, and concern for the soul. It states, "God, for whom it is fitting to always have compassion and forgive, we pray to you as suppliants for the soul of your servant which today you have ordered to cross over from this world" (*Deus, cui proprium est misereri semper et parcere, te supplices deprecamur pro anima famuli tui quam hodie de hoc sæculo migrare jussisti*;

¹⁷ Rutherford asserts that Christian funerals are set apart by the belief that the souls of Christians will be taken to Heaven to await reunification with their bodies at the resurrection of the dead (117, 251).

Officium). This reflects an underlying belief in the migration of souls (*migrare*), which Plato espoused. The soul, in order to achieve Christian immortality, must depart from this world and the earthly body (*de hoc saeculo*) and eventually receive a resurrected body and dwell in Heaven. Despite the connection with Plato's idea of "soul" and its immortality, this passage shows that the Sarum Rite does not endorse metempsychosis, but rather a Christian idea of immortality and the desire for reunification of soul and body at the final resurrection.¹⁸ In addition to this prayer, several excerpts are read that emphasize the true reality of the resurrection; there are selections from the Thessalonians, the Maccabees, the Corinthians, John, and more.¹⁹

There are other assorted responses and prayers in the funeral Mass that affirm belief in psychosomatic resurrection, as well as illuminate the Renaissance idea of immortality. One such response states, "Receive [an offering] for these souls whose memory we hold today: make it that they cross over from death to life" (*Tu suscipe pro animabus illis quarum hodie memoriam agimus : fac eas, Domine, de morte transire ad vitam*; Officium). This reiterates a familiarity with the Platonic concept of transmigration of souls – the suppliant asks that the soul go across (*transire*). The mention of the memory of souls (*pro animabus illis quarum hodie memoriam*) also hearkens back to the Jewish idea of immortality – one is made immortal by the memorials observed by family

¹⁸ Rutherford affirms when describing the Christian view of death, "At the promised resurrection the all-powerful God, Lord of all nature, would restore all, for belief in an everlasting Christ-life pertained, of course, not to the soul only the climax of redemption belongs both to spirit and to flesh; hence Christians paid care and respect to the mortal remains of the faithful dead while they remembered their souls in prayer; 9).

¹⁹ I have examined these in detail in Chapter Two.

and country.²⁰ Despite the intimations of immortality, there is a lack of understanding about the nature of the soul; hence *anima* is often translated (albeit too loosely, in my opinion) as "person" in order to avoid philosophical confusion.

Another short prayer shows a misunderstood awareness of immortality and hope for the resurrection. It reads,

Suscipe, quæsumus, Domine, misericors Pater, oblationem quam tibi offerimus pro anima famuli tui N. quam hodie de carnali corruptione liberasti : et concede, ut ab omnibus humanæ conditionis excessibus his remediis expietur ; et in requie sempiterna diem resurrectionis præstoletur (Officium).

Receive, we beg, O Lord, compassionate Father, the offering which we offer to you for the soul of your servant [NAME] which today you have freed from the corruption of the flesh: and grant that by these remedies he be atoned from all the excesses of the human condition; and may he await the day of resurrection in eternal rest.

First, the beginning of the prayer mirrors the previous two excerpts. However, it differs at the end of the first clause by referencing the corruption of the flesh (*de carnali corruptione*). Corruption and corruptibility are explicitly associated with immortality, as seen in the previous chapters of this thesis (ἀφθαρσία, which means "incorruptibility," is often translated as immortality; it is actually a facet of Christian immortality).

Conversely, the flesh is usually associated with the resurrection of the body, yet here it is appropriated to the soul. The explicit mention of the resurrection confirms the centrality of the doctrine in the Sarum tradition (especially for funerals); however, resurrection is used as a vague term for the physical action of rising up, not the quality of the glorified body reunited with the soul. This passage indicates both an awareness of the immortality of the soul and the belief in psychosomatic resurrection, yet it lacks clarity due to the

²⁰ The Jewish concept of the immortality of the soul is more congruent with the Christian idea; after all, we are children of God (family) and members of His kingdom (country).

misappropriation of vocabulary and lack of specificity. Perhaps the vagueness of terms reflects an emphasis on physicality and easy-to-understand beliefs previously addressed in the *Speculum* manuscript.

Just as the Sarum Rite for funerals was more celebratory and more focused on the resurrection (with hints of immortality) than the Roman Rite, so the Book of Common Prayer, the focal liturgical text of the Anglican tradition, emphasizes human mortality and the need for mercy in light of the promise of resurrection and Christian immortality – thus displaying the highest concern for immortality and resurrection among the various Catholic Rites. In the Order for the Burial of the Dead, the priest prays and preaches,

Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God of his great mercy to take unto himself the soul of our dear brother here departed: we therefore commit his body to the ground...in sure and certain hope of resurrection to eternal life, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body that it may be like to his glorious body...for one star differeth from another in glory: so is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it riseth again in incorruption...for the trump shall blow, and the dead shall rise incorruptible...we give thee hearty thanks...that we with this our brother, and all other departed in the true faith of thy holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in thy eternal and everlasting glory (Booty 310-313).

This passage speaks of both resurrection of the body and the Christian immortality of the soul (not the Platonic concept, although some of the text is taken from 1 Cor. 15, which does admit some intimations of Platonic immortality). The first section of the excerpt emphasizes the physical nature of the resurrection – the soul departs the body and is taken up by God, while the body remains interred in the ground (this strengthens the argument against cremation, since a cremated body has lost physicality and is likely not interred). The second section addresses the characteristics of a resurrected body – treated rather extensively by medieval philosophers but not by the Roman and Sarum Rites. The

body is no longer "vile," but is "glorious." This causes the hearer of the prayer to think of Jesus' body post-resurrection – it could go through walls, move rocks, eat and drink, and dwell in Paradise.²¹

The second half of the excerpt above concerns the concept of the soul's immortality, but in reference to the body, showing disregard for Platonic immortality in favor of a Christian view. Taken directly from 1 Corinthians 15, the officiant iterates that the body shall achieve the incorruptibility associated with immortality through belief in Christ; the resurrected body, once united with the soul, is incorruptible. This shows a comprehension of Christian immortality with respect to resurrection; it is not reconcilable with the Platonic concept, but it is a result of belief in Christ. This is not a development of the doctrine, *per se*, but rather a confirmation of belief in the ideas established and espoused in the early, Church, Patristic, and Medieval writers. In true medieval fashion, the burial service concludes with the acknowledgement of Heaven and Hell, body and soul, bliss and suffering – all in the light of immortality and resurrection.

The Eastern Orthodox tradition uses a more philosophical approach to body and soul, immortality and resurrection. Like the Catholic tradition, the liturgy can be considered quite gloomy; yet in this case the funeral vigil is not "simply the solemn contemplation upon death's tragic character, its horrid reality...The realization of these facts...is the absolute condition for the full appreciation and celebration of the victorious resurrection of Christ and his gracious gift of eternal life to mankind" (Hopko 52).

Spidlik confirms this, stating, "Christian preaching on death must be focused on faith in

²¹ "Final resurrection and restoration of the body was imperative, for the perfect life in Christ was unthinkable without the reunion of the complete person, understood as union of soul and body" (Rutherford 15).

the resurrection of the flesh" (114). While the services may appear incredibly morose, death should not be feared, since believers have nothing to fear from the separation of soul and body – the righteous will all be raised in glorious, psychosomatic resurrection (Coniaris 109, 116; Ware, *The Orthodox Church* 261).²² Like the beliefs of the early Church, Coniaris asserts the Greek Orthodox belief that because the soul and body sinned together, they shall be raised and judged together (115; Ware, *The Orthodox Church* 232-233). Resurrection is universally espoused by the Orthodox Church, while immortality is attributed to and imparted by God alone – man forfeited immortality when he sinned, incurring physical and spiritual death (Ware, *The Orthodox Way* 77, *The Orthodox Church* 223; Spidlik 98). Similar to the Catholic and Anglican funerals, Orthodox funerals relate resurrection to Communion; by partaking of the incorruptible, glorified, and unified body and blood of Christ, we experience a small taste of our psychosomatic resurrection to come (Ware, *The Orthodox Way* 146).

In the prayers and funeral liturgies of the Eastern Orthodox tradition, resurrection is highly emphasized. The Orthodox burial consists of five ritual services: Ablution, Vigil, Conveyance, Ceremony, and Burial (Morrow). In the *Trisagion* for the Dead, the worshipers express their "belief in the reality of Christ's death and Resurrection and of the benefits that [they] derive from them, namely, the resurrection of [their] bod[ies] on the last day, and the promise of incorruption and immortality" (Morrow). They frequently name God as the author of immortality, stating,

Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal...

²² Bishop Kallistos describes the separation of soul and body as "unnatural," and that psychosomatic resurrection on the Last Day is a restoration of God's original plan (Ware, *The Orthodox Way* 64).

For You alone are immortal...
Christ, our immortal King and our God...
for You are the Resurrection...
May Christ our true God, Who rose from the dead, have mercy on us;
He Who as Immortal King has authority over both the dead and the living
(Trisagion, goarch.org).

From this passage it is clear that God (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) alone possesses immortality and incorruptibility. The mention of resurrection in the midst of the references to immortality shows that immortality is a consequence of the resurrection; Christ alone "has the authority" to grant immortality to those who hope in His resurrection. In this excerpt, there is no mention of the soul or body in relation to immortality or resurrection. This suggests that while the Eastern Orthodox liturgy was more aware of the theological and philosophical components of immortality and resurrection, they completely separated the body and soul from the two concepts.²³ The resurrection of the body is widely attested in Orthodox literature, yet another portion of the *Trisagion* shows an awareness of the Jewish immortality of memory exhibited in other Rites. It states, "Everlasting be your memory, O our brother/sister, who are worthy of blessedness and eternal memory" (goarch.org). These passages from the *Trisagion*, which is said repeatedly in the funeral rites of the Eastern Orthodox tradition, show an awareness of Platonic immortality (through the use of borrowed vocabulary) accompanied by a Christian understanding of the idea – immortality, granted only by God, is made possible through belief in His glorious resurrection.

²³ It was acknowledged that the soul went to Heaven or Hell, while the body remained lifeless and buried on Earth. However, they did not often correlate immortality with the soul (body and resurrection were more commonly associated with one another).

In the funeral Mass itself, during the prayers of Absolution, there is an explicit reference to the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body. It reads,

...To prevent evil from becoming immortal, decreeing that his composite and mixture, this bond which You made for joining body and soul unbreakably, should be sundered by Your divine Will, and be dissolved; so that the soul would withdraw where it had required existence, and there abide until the general Resurrection; whereas the body would break up into the elements... (Funeral, goarch.org).

God made man immortal and incorruptible in both body and soul, which are inseparable in human existence, yet sin rendered man's deathlessness and incorruption invalid, causing the death and corruption of the body at the expense of the soul (where the spirit is said to exist; the spirit is where spiritual growth and realization occurs). Hence the soul is no longer immortal from a Platonic point of view, yet it acquires the ability to not die through salvation. The body likewise "puts on incorruption," as Paul says, at the final judgment in order to reunite with the spiritually immortal (again, this immortality is granted by God alone) soul. This further illustrates the incompatibility of Platonic immortality with Christian psychosomatic resurrection, as seen throughout this thesis. The Orthodox Church was more aware of the philosophical differences between resurrection and immortality, body and soul, Heaven and Hell, while the Catholic and Anglican Rites emphasize the inevitability of judgment and the possibility of suffering. All three traditions prayed for mercy, rest, peace, and refreshment for the souls of the deceased; the Orthodox tradition focused on the mystical implications, while the others were more aware of the tangible applications.

Renaissance Christian liturgy is focused almost entirely on the resurrection of the body, without reference to the Platonic concept of the immortality of the soul; the two are

irreconcilable. In the Anglo-Catholic tradition, there is a shift from a morose funeral service to a more celebratory one over time; there is also a decreasing desire for physical, practical manifestations of faith. The *Speculum* manuscript does not mention immortality, but it emphasizes the physicality of Christ's resurrection. The Roman Rite does this, but emphasizes the mortality of man and the possibility of suffering, creating a tone of fear and despair. The Sarum Rite is much like this, but with greater emphasis on resurrection. The Anglican tradition has a more joyful funeral Mass, and preaches that immortality of the soul is granted by God to believers, and that the resurrection of the body is a glorious promise for believers. The Eastern Orthodox funeral liturgy likewise acknowledges the immortality of the soul as a reward for believers who will also partake of psychosomatic resurrection in the last days. All these traditions pray for peace, rest, refreshment, and mercy for the dead, and share in Communion at the funeral service. The body and soul (blood) of Christ, symbolized by the bread and wine, foreshadow the blessed reunification of body and soul for believers. And since the reunification of body and soul is fundamental to the Christian doctrine of psychosomatic resurrection, it is irreconcilable with the Platonic concept of the the soul's immortality, since that concept relies on the utter separation of body and soul. Given that resurrection is the basis for human salvation, the Book of Common prayer asserts, "...by thy glorious resurrection and ascension, and by the coming of the Holy Ghost. Good Lord deliver us" (Booty 69).

CONCLUSION

The first chapter of this thesis project considered the origins of the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul, the Jewish concept of the resurrection of the dead, and the development of these ideas both separately and relating to one another in prominent pagan literature, the Old Testament, and Jewish intertestamental literature. The perspective here was largely philological. We observed that the Platonic idea of the immortality of the soul relies on the soul's constant intellectual action, indivisibility, and incorruptibility; the words for immortality are ἀφθαρσία, incorruptibility, and ἀθανασία, the ability not to die. The originally Jewish concept of resurrection relies on a belief in the power of God, an afterlife, and final judgment; I examined the Septuagint words ἔγερσις, which connotes physical rising up from a seated position, and ἀνάστασις, used exclusively to refer to somatic resurrection. Pagan pre-Christian literature contained many references to immortality, but none to resurrection, the distinctive basis of Judeo-Christian belief. By contrast, the Hebrew Old Testament contains many references to the resurrection of the dead, but few to immortality. Intertestamental Jewish literature mirrors this sharp divide between the doctrines of immortality and resurrection, yet it addresses both extensively, showing a greater awareness of Greek philosophy than existed before the Second Temple era. Because the Platonic concept of the immortality of the soul depends on the soul's ability to permanently separate from the body, it proves to be irreconcilable with the doctrine of resurrection, which states that the whole person

is body and soul and thus to achieve perfection in the afterlife the two must be reunited after death.

The second chapter mirrors the philological approach taken in the first chapter, and catalogues the development of doctrines in relation to one another throughout the New Testament and the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. When taken in light of Christ's resurrection which animates the discussion from this point on, ἀφθαρσία, incorruptibility, begins to apply to the state of a resurrected body, and ἀθανασία begins to refer to the deathlessness enjoyed by believers. Ἀθανασία and ἀφθαρσία are viewed as rewards granted only by God to believers; immortality is thus not inherent in the soul. The Apostolic Fathers in particular treat immortality more thoroughly than the New Testament authors, and it is primarily from them that that we begin to acquire a notion of Christian immortality. Ἐγερσις falls out of use since its Old Testament context was more physical than mystical (i.e., more about getting up to do something than resurrecting at the final judgment); ἀνάστασις, as previously stated, becomes the *de facto* word for somatic (i.e., of the body) resurrection for the New Testament writers onward. Given the decreased use of immortality as an innate quality and the emphasis on resurrection of the body, immortality begins to acquire a Christian meaning (which, due to the resurrection of Christ in body and soul, includes the reunification of body and soul) and thus is irreconcilable with the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

The third chapter of this project shows the continual development and use of immortality and resurrection through the Middle Ages. The Apostolic Fathers began to hint at a Christian idea of immortality, which the Church Fathers (and Medieval philosophers) noticed and expounded upon. The doctrine of Christian immortality attests

that the incorruptibility and deathlessness associated with immortality is not innate for the soul, but is given by God to those who believe – not only shall believers receive incorruptible bodies like Christ (which coincides with the doctrine of somatic resurrection), but they shall not truly die. A new facet of resurrection is also introduced during this time period. The authors begin to espouse psychosomatic resurrection, which is the belief that the soul and body will reunite at the resurrection and shall achieve the incorruptibility formerly attributed to the soul alone. The immortality of the soul is less widely discussed, while the subject of resurrection is still frequently treated. Within these two topics, there is also an increased focus on the characteristics of the soul and body, both natural and resurrected. While these extensive discussions on soul and body are fascinating, they often obscure the beliefs on resurrection and immortality. Because resurrection now relates philosophically and philologically to body and soul, the Platonic concept of the soul's immortality is once again shown to be irreconcilable with the Christian doctrine of psychosomatic resurrection, and subsequently falls into disuse.

The last chapter, which encompasses a wide variety of traditions and documents, highlights the belief in psychosomatic resurrection and the disuse of the Platonic idea of the immortality of the soul. Especially in liturgical works intended for lay use, the authors emphasize the physicality of the resurrection – the body, its suffering, death, and resurrection. There is a marked increase in fear of an unhappy afterlife, coupled with increased prayers for mercy and a desire for eternal life. Traces of residual belief in Platonic immortality at this point is almost nonexistent in the prayers and funeral rites of the Catholic, Orthodox, and Anglican churches. The increased emphasis on the physicality of death and resurrection also manifests in the practice of communion and the

realization of the Paschal mystery. Just as Jesus lived, suffered, died, and resurrected in body and soul, thus believers, despite the threat of suffering, would resurrect psychosomatically. This shift toward psychosomatic resurrection, which began in the writings of the authors examined in the third chapter, reaches its height in Renaissance Christian liturgy all over the world. In a desire for physicality and demystification, the Platonic concept of the immortality of the soul was entirely lost in the church in favor of psychosomatic resurrection – which, as previously shown, is irreconcilable with Platonic immortality.

Before I propose a new rendering of Christian immortality in reference to the resurrection, I will describe the misunderstanding incurred by observing two relatable yet not identical doctrines as well as the lack of specificity in modern nomenclature. Because immortality and resurrection were both prevalent theories regarding the afterlife in the Mediterranean region, people were aware of both but did not often fully understand them – this led to a lot of confusion which still exists today, as well as an "undefinition," per se, of the terms used to describe immortality. Ἀφθαρσία and ἀθανασία become sprinkled throughout early Christian literature, showing an awareness of the Platonic concept, yet they refer to the Christian idea of immortality stated above. These errors multiply throughout the ages, eventually resulting in the most common misunderstanding that resurrection and immortality are equivalent concepts in biblical literature. Another phrase, "eternal life," does not suffice either, because it reflects a length of time that a believer shall experience after the final resurrection and the incorruptibility of the resurrected body (given by God). Since resurrection and immortality are prerequisites of eternal life, it is insufficient (and rather vague) as a descriptive term.

Having shown the irreconcilability of the Platonic concept of the immortality of the soul with the uniquely Christian idea of the resurrection of the body, I now propose an alternate phrase for the proper relation between the two: *incompactibilis resurrectio animae et corporis*, or *incompactibilis resurrectio* for short. This phrase includes both the Christian idea of immortality and the concept of psychosomatic resurrection. The soul is not inherently deathless and incompactible, but the gift of God to believers is eventual deathlessness, the freedom of the resurrected body from decay (*incompactibilis*). Psychosomatic resurrection overlaps with this, stating that the soul and body of a believer will reunite at the final judgment and the believer will be judged as a whole person – the body and soul together will possess the impassibility, incompactibility, and deathlessness of the resurrected Christ (*resurrectio animae et corporis*). While it is probably not possible to invent a phrase that perfectly encompasses the idea that an incompactible and deathless (qualities given by God to believers) soul and body shall resurrect, united unto eternal life, the phrase *incompactibilis resurrectio animae et corporis* includes the most significant elements. Resurrection is the foundational doctrine of Christianity, and the whole person – body and soul – shall rise incompactible for the final judgment. Given this new phrase, there should no longer be the equation of immortality and resurrection in the Church. Rather, the two have a unique relationship in Christianity that merits its own definition and understanding – it is an often overlooked object of faith that believers should not be afraid of death, but should look forward to the reformation of human existence in the light of God's perfection and the incompactible resurrection of soul and body (*incompactibilis resurrectio animae et corporis*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

“4 Maccabees.” *New World Encyclopedia*. N.p., n.d. Print.

Aeschylus, Richmond Lattimore, and David Grene. *Aischylos. David Grene [Hrsg.]; Lattimore, Richmond. Vol. I: Oresteia ; Agamemnon ; The Libation Bearers ; The Eumenides*. 28. Aufl. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 1983. Print. The Complete Greek Tragedies.

Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland, eds. *The Greek New Testament*. 4., rev. ed., [4. Dr.]. Stuttgart: Dt. Bibelges. [u.a.], 1998. Print.

Alexander Roberts, and William Rambaut, trans. “Church Fathers: Against Heresies.” *newadvent.org*. N.p., 2009. Print.

Augustine. *Tractates on the Gospel of John*. Washington, D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 1988. Print. The Fathers of the Church v. 78-<79, 88, 90, 92.

Battles, Ford Lewis. *Irenaeus, Against Heresies, Clement of Alexandria, The Exhortation to the Greeks and Quis Dives Salvetur?* Allison Park, Pa: Pickwick Publications, 1993. Print. Study Outlines #2-3.

Boethius, and Joel C. Relihan. *Consolation of Philosophy*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Pub. Co, 2001. Print.

Brenton, Lancelot Charles Lee. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*. 8. pr. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999. Print.

Bromiley, Geoffrey William, ed. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Fully rev. Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans, 1979. Print.

Brown, Michelle. *The Lindisfarne Gospels: Society, Spirituality and the Scribe*. Toronto ; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2003. Print. The British Library Studies in Medieval Culture.

Carolus Hermannus Weise, trans. “M. Annaeus Lucanus, Pharsalia.” *perseus.tufts.edu*. N.p., n.d. Print.

- Catholic Church, and Walter Howard Frere. *The Use of Sarum the Original Texts Edited from the Mss.* Westmead, Eng.: Gregg International, 1978. Print.
- C.D. Yonge. "The Works of Philo Judaeus: The Eternity of the World." *earlychristianwritings.com*. N.p., n.d. Print.
- Church of England, and John E. Booty, eds. *The Book of Common Prayer, 1559: The Elizabethan Prayer Book*. Charlottesville: Published for the Folger Shakespeare Library by the University Press of Virginia, 1976. Print. [Folger Documents of Tudor and Stuart Civilization no. 22].
- Coniaris, Anthony M. *Introducing the Orthodox Church, Its Faith and Life*. Minneapolis, Minn: Light and Life Pub. Co, 1982. Print.
- Cory, Catherine A., and Michael J. Hollerich, eds. *The Christian Theological Tradition*. 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Prentice Hall, 2009. Print.
- David Instone-Brewer. "Eternal Punishment in First Century Jewish Thought." 2014: n. pag. Print.
- "Dies Irae: Day of Wrath." *preces-latinae.org*. N.p., 1962. Print.
- Edgar J. Goodspeed. *The Apocrypha: An American Translation*. New York: Random House, Inc., 1959. Print.
- Edward Schillebeeckx, and Boniface Willems, eds. *The Problem of Eschatology*. Vol. 41. New York: Paulist Press, 1969. Print. Concilium: Theology in the Age of Renewal.
- Elliott, Peter J. *Ceremonies of the Modern Roman Rite: The Eucharist and the Liturgy of the Hours: A Manual for Clergy and All Involved in Liturgical Ministries*. 1st ed. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1995. Print.
- Ernest Evans, ed. *Tertullian's Treatise on the Resurrection*. London: S.P.C.K., 1960. Print.
- Fahlbusch, Erwin, and Geoffrey William Bromiley, eds. *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Grand Rapids, Mich. : Leiden, Netherlands: Wm. B. Eerdmans ; Brill, 1999. Print.
- Fortescue, Adrian, J. B O'Connell, and Alcuin Reid. *The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described*. Farnborough, Hampshire: Saint Michael's Abbey Press, 2003. Print.

- Frederick E. Warren, trans. *The Sarum Missal in English*. Vol. 9. London: The De La More Press, 1911. Print. The Library of Liturgiology and Ecclesiology for English Readers.
- Fr. Nektarios Morrow. "The Funeral Service of the Orthodox Church." *goarch.org*. N.p., 2005. Print.
- "Funeral Service." *goarch.org*. N.p., n.d. Print.
- Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Academic, 2003. Print. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament.
- George W. E. Nickelsburg. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972. Print.
- Guggenheimer, Heinrich W., ed. *The Jerusalem Talmud =: [Talmud Yerushalmi]*. Berlin ; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2000. Print. *Studia Judaica* Bd. 18, 31, 34, 39, 43, 45, 51, 61, 68, 74, 80.
- "Guidelines for Funerals and Burials in the Catholic Church." 2 May 2012: n. pag. Print.
- Hemer, Colin J. *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History*. Ed. Conrad H. Gempf. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1989. Print. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament* 49.
- Holmes, Michael W., ed. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Updated ed. Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Books, 1999. Print.
- Holy Bible New International Version Premium Value Thinline Bible, Orchid, Italian Duo-Tone*. Zondervan, 2005. Print.
- Hopko, Thomas, John Matusiak, and Thomas Hopko. *Worship*. 4. printing. New York: Department of Religious Education [u.a.], 1992. Print. *The Orthodox Faith* Thomas Hopko. Ill. by John Matusiak ; 2.
- Jeffrey, David L. *Houses of the Interpreter: Reading Scripture, Reading Culture*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009. Print.
- Johannes Wagner, ed. *Reforming the Rites of Death*. Vol. 32. New York: Paulist Press, 1968. Print. *Concilium: Theology in the Age of Renewal*.
- John J. McMahon, S.J., and Ludwig Schopp, trans. *Saint Augustine: The Immortality of the Soul and the Magnitude of the Soul*. Vol. 4. New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1947. Print.

- John J. Parsons. "Chayei Olam -- The Wonder of Eternal Life." *hebrew4christians.com*. N.p., 29 Apr. 2014. Print.
- John Kaye, ed. *The First Apology of Justin Martyr*. Edinburgh: John Grant, 1912. Print.
- Joseph Hugh Crehan, S.J., trans. *Athenagoras: Embassy for the Christians and the Resurrection of the Dead*. Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1956. Print.
- Jungmann, Josef A. *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development (Missarum Sollemnia)*. Westminster, Md: Christian Classics, 1986. Print.
- Justin, and Leslie W. Barnard. *The First and Second Apologies*. New York: Paulist Press, 1997. Print. Ancient Christian Writers no. 56.
- Justin, and Michael Slusser. *Dialogue with Trypho*. Washington, D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 2003. Print. Selections from the Fathers of the Church v. 3.
- Krister Stendahl. *Immortality and Resurrection; Four Essays by Oscar Cullman, Harry A. Wolfson, Werner Jaeger, and Henry J. Cadbury*. New York: Macmillan, 1965. Print.
- Lacoste, Jean-Yves, and Paul Beauchamp, eds. *Dictionnaire Critique de Théologie*. 1re éd. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1998. Print.
- Levenson, Jon Douglas. *Resurrection and the Restoration of Israel: The Ultimate Victory of the God of Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006. Print.
- Macrobius, Ambrosius Aurelius Theodosius. *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*. Trans. William Harris Stahl. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952. Print.
- Maimonides, Moses, and Fred Rosner. *Moses Maimonides' Treatise on Resurrection*. 1st Jason Aronson Inc. ed. Northvale, N.J: Jason Aronson Inc, 1997. Print.
- Maximus the Confessor. *Expositio Orationis Dominicae*. TLG: TLG. Print.
- Melinda Nielsen, David Jeffrey, and Michelle Brown, trans. *Speculum Humanae Salvationis: A Mirror of Human Salvation*. 14th c. Austria.
- "Missa Defunctorum Ex Missali Romano Desumpta: Ordo Missae pro Defunctis." 2010 1962. Web. 12 Mar. 2016.
- "Officium Defunctorum." Web. 14 Mar. 2016.

- “Ordinary of the Traditional Latin Mass in Latin and English.” Web. 23 Feb. 2016.
- Ovidius Naso, Publius. *The Metamorphoses of Ovid*. Trans. Mary M. Innes. repr. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1979. Print. Penguin Classics.
- Plato, and Hugh Tredennick. *The Last Days of Socrates*. London ; New York: Penguin Books, 2003. Print. Penguin Classics.
- “Requiem Aeternam: Eternal Rest Grant unto Them.” *preces-latinae.org*. N.p., n.d. Print.
- R. Laird Harris. “The Meaning of the Word Sheol as Shown by Parallels in Poetic Texts.” *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 4.4 (1961): 129–132. Print.
- Rudolph Arbesmann, O.S.A., Sister Emily Joseph Daly, C.S.J., and Edwin A. Quain, S.J., trans. *Tertullian: Apologetical Works and Minucius Felix Octavius*. Vol. 10. New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1950. Print.
- Rutherford, Richard. *The Death of a Christian: The Rite of Funerals*. New York: Pueblo Pub. Co, 1980. Print. *Studies in the Reformed Rites of the Catholic Church* v. 7.
- Setzer, Claudia. *Resurrection of the Body in Early Judaism and Early Christianity: Doctrine, Community, and Self-Definition*. Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2004. Print.
- Skolnik, Fred, and Michael Berenbaum, eds. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. 2nd ed. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA in association with the Keter Pub. House, 2007. Print.
- Špidlík, Tomáš. *The Spirituality of the Christian East: A Systematic Handbook*. Kalamazoo, Mich: Cistercian Publications, 1986. Print. Cistercian Studies Series no. 79.
- Thomas, and Robert Pasnau. *A Commentary on Aristotle’s De Anima*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999. Print. Yale Library of Medieval Philosophy.
- Timothy Ware (Bishop Kallistos of Diokleia). *The Orthodox Church*. 3rd ed. New York: Penguin Books. Print.
- . *The Orthodox Way*. Rev. ed. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1995. Print.

“Trisagion for the Dead.” *goarch.org*. N.p., n.d. Print.

West, Thomas G., and Plato. *Plato’s Apology of Socrates: An Interpretation, with a New Translation*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1979. Print.

Wilken, Robert Louis. *The Spirit of Early Christian Thought: Seeking the Face of God*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003. Print.

William Harris Stahl, trans. *Macrobius: Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952. Print.

William R. Schoedel, ed. *Athenagoras: Legatio and De Resurrectione*. Trans. William R. Schoedel. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972. Print.

Wright, Nicholas Thomas. *Christian Origins and the Question of God. Vol. 3: The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Nachdr. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008. Print.