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ABBREVIATIONS

The titles of Ancient Near Eastern, classical, biblical, apocryphal and early Christian literature, the Dead Sea Scrolls, rabbinical texts, and secondary sources (journals, periodicals, reference works, and series) are abbreviated according to the guidelines of the Society of Biblical Literature described in the SBL Handbook of Style. See Patrick H. Alexander et al., eds., The SBL Handbook of Style: for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999).


The versions of the English translation of some biblical passages used in this dissertation are noted according to the above-mentioned guidelines of the Society of Biblical Literature. If no version is indicated, it is the translation of the author himself.

The sources of translations of Classical texts and of Jewish sources are specified in the footnotes. If not otherwise indicated, the translations are the author’s.
INTRODUCTION

The Problem under Discussion

Among the Synoptics Luke seems to provide more information about his views on the afterlife than Mark and Matthew. Apart from some passages mentioning this issue retained from Mark and Q with some significant elaborations (in the first place, Luke 8:41–42, 49–56, 13:22–30; 20:27–40; 22:30), he also gives more accounts in his own material (e.g., Luke 16:19–31; 23:39–43). In addition, Luke presents some important points in the Book of Acts (Acts 1:25; 7:55–60; 9:36–41; 20:7–12; 23:8; 24:15). Moreover, in some passages he uses such expressive, rare or even unique images as paradise (occurring elsewhere only in 2 Cor 12:4 and Rev 2:7 in the corpus of the texts that later was recognized as the canonical New Testament) or Abraham’s bosom (unique for this corpus). Therefore, the issue of the language used about the hereafter and particularly the afterlife reflect Luke’s heightened interest in this topic and its significance.

Given Luke’s evident interest in the afterlife, it is remarkable that the gospel and the Book of Acts contain various episodes with seemingly incompatible ideas on it. For instance, in Luke 14:14 and 20:35 he speaks about the eschatological resurrection of the righteous only, but in Acts 24:15 he refers to the resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked. It seems that Luke 20:36 equates the risen ones with angels and then uses the notion of the immortality of the soul in Jesus’ argument about resurrection in 20:37–38. What is the reason for Luke to use the same resurrection language (e.g., the forms of the verbs ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω) in the discourse about the eschatological or individual resurrection and the stories about the resuscitation of the dead to physical life? Furthermore, there is a superficial discrepancy between the postmortem existence in the Kingdom of God (Luke 13:28–29) or in paradise (23:42–43) and the destiny of Lazarus being taken by the angels into Abraham’s bosom (16:22). Furthermore, there is a difference between the episode of Stephen’s martyrdom (Acts 7:59), which focuses on the fate of Stephen’s spirit, and the episode of Eutychus (Acts 20:10), which describes the death and

---


Although the author of Luke-Acts, whom we will call here “Luke” for convenience, tells us very little about himself, most modern scholars consider him to be a well-educated person, probably Greek by birth.² He certainly had not been an eyewitness of Jesus, since he based himself on the traditions handed down by the earlier generation of followers of Jesus (Luke 1:3). He knows Greek better than the other evangelists and uses various literary styles.³ As is seen from Acts, he is familiar with Greek rhetoric as well as with Greek literature and thought (e.g. Acts 17:16–31). The remark that a ghost does not have flesh and bones in Luke 24:39 also points to his acquaintance with pagan traditions (cf. Homer, Od. 11. 205–222). On the other hand, he definitely knew the Septuagint (the LXX), as he not only quoted it but also used its style (e.g., Luke 1:5–25). He was familiar with the Jewish world and Scriptures as, for instance, the images of paradise and Abraham’s bosom demonstrate. All this enhances the likelihood that he was a Gentile, who had converted to Judaism as a proselyte or sympathized with it as a “God-fearer” and later became Christian.⁴ Therefore, he apparently belonged to the eastern Mediterranean cultural milieu with its various beliefs and traditions about the afterlife, both Jewish and pagan. From a religious and ideological point of view, the culture to which Luke belonged can be called Hellenistic, or in a chronological and geographical sense, Greco-Roman, covering as it does the period from

---

approximately 300 B.C.E. to 300 C.E. It includes numerous beliefs and practices existing in the eastern Mediterranean region. *Hellenistic* in relation to this culture is not identical with so-called *Hellenistic period* (ca. 323–31 B.C.E.), because chronologically it covers a longer time.

As the survey of scholarly literature below will demonstrate, some passages from Luke-Acts relevant to the study of the afterlife have already been extensively discussed. However, these passages have usually been treated separately from one another and so far have not been the subject of a specialized study focusing on the views of the afterlife represented by Luke-Acts as a whole. This research, therefore, is designed to tackle the topic in question in a broader perspective in order to arrive at results for Luke-Acts as a whole.

It thus appears that there are four main points that lead to the present study: (1) Luke's attentiveness to the issues of the afterlife, (2) the variety of views on the afterlife contained in Luke-Acts, (3) the diverse traditions inherited by Luke, and (4) the relative lack of a general study focusing on the most relevant passages regarding the afterlife in Luke-Acts.

In the Introduction, first of all a survey of the most important scholarly works on the afterlife in Luke-Acts will be given, and then the purpose of this dissertation will be stated. The chapter will go on to discuss the date of Luke-Acts, which defines the range of sources for the study of Luke's cultural environment, and will offer a short sketch of these sources. Finally, the approach and method of the present study will be laid out.

---

5 Dale. B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University, 1995), xiii. It could even be extended so as to start from 323 B.C.E. (the death of Alexander the Great) and to end at 330 C.E. with the foundation of Constantinople and thus the beginning of the Byzantine period.


Research on the representations of the afterlife in Greco-Roman pagan sources, the Hebrew Bible and cognate Jewish literature, as well as Early Christian writings has been a subject of particular interest for biblical scholars and has resulted in a huge amount of literature. In modern scholarship much emphasis...
is laid on the great diversity of views on the hereafter in pagan, Jewish, and early Christian documents.

Moreover, no one explanation for death encompassed the whole Greco-Roman cultural sphere. For instance, while some Jews believed in a form of resurrection, not only in corporeal but also in a certain angelomorphic existence, others saw life after death as an incorporeal form of immortality of the soul. Yet a few Jewish groups like the Sadducees and some others, who were influenced by popular Epicurean philosophy, had no faith in any postmortem existence at all. Such beliefs were often mixed and moulded into more complex concepts, even within one text. The early Christian authors indubitably inherited such a diversity of Jewish and pagan beliefs in the afterlife. For instance, although a large number of texts in the New Testament deal with the resurrection of the body, traces of other concepts are also evident in some accounts. Luke-Acts is no exception here.


---

8 Bernstein, The Formation of Hell, 91.
on death and possessions. Several studies have been done on the parable of
the Rich Man and Lazarus. In addition, some scholars, such as George W. E.
Nickelsburg, Jan N. Bremmer, Alan F. Segal, and Casey D. Elledge, while dealing
with the afterlife in the broader context of the Hellenistic world, have taken
into account some of the relevant passages from Luke-Acts in their analysis of
the afterlife issues. However, none of these works gives an analysis of the
whole picture of Lucan ideas on the afterlife and none takes into consideration
the bulk of the passages that deal with this topic.

A few notable exceptions should be mentioned here. In this history of
research we have to discuss a number of important works that treat the issue of
the hereafter in the overall context of Luke-Acts. The works selected are
publications by Jacques Dupont, A. J. Mattill Jr., Joseph Osei-Bonsu, Outi
Lehtipuu, and Dennis J. Horton.

An important contribution to the study of the afterlife in Luke-Acts was
made by Dupont in his article “L’après-mort dans l’œuvre de Luc.” Dupont

---

Conversations on Death and Possessions (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011).

14 Hugo Gressmann, Vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus: eine literargeschichtliche
Studie (Berlin: Verlag der königlich Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1918); Karl Bornhäuser,
“Zum Verständnis der Geschichte vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus: Lukas 16,19–31,”
NKZ 39 (1928): 833–843; Joachim Jeremias, Die Gleichnisse Jesu (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag,
Textes. Textsemiotische Bemerkungen zur Erzählung ’Vom reichen Mann und armen
with Dives and Lazarus,” ExpTim 105 (1993): 7–12; Martin O’Kane, “he Bosom of Abraham’
See some more important titles in Bovon, Evangelium nach Lukas, 3105–108.

15 Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in the Intertestamental
Judaism and Early Christianity, 238–242, 294–297, 302–304; Bremmer, The Rise and Fall of the
Afterlife, 42–43, 58; Segal, Life after death, 384–385, 458–467; Elledge, Life after Death in Early
Judaism, 33–36.

indicates that Luke is concerned not only with the destiny of people at the end of time but even more so with that of the individual after death.\(^{17}\) He discusses the issue of afterlife in the context of Lucan eschatology. In doing so, he argues that while Luke retains the view on collective eschatology (“l'eschatologie générale”), he also emphasizes the significance of individual eschatology (“l'eschatologie individuelle”), i.e., the postmortem fate of the individual, which for Luke is not only an intermediate state between death and final destiny, but virtually a separate type of eschatology.\(^{18}\) At the same time, Dupont admits that these two types of eschatology do not contradict each other. He discusses the most important passages about life after death which, as he argues, relate to individual eschatology: the parables of the Rich Fool (Luke 12:16–21), the Unjust Steward (16:1–8), and the Rich Man and Lazarus (16:19–31), as well as Jesus’ promise to the repentant criminal (23:43).\(^{19}\) He also refers to other passages, such as Jesus’ eschatological discourse (Luke 21:19), the fate of Judas (Acts 1:25), and Paul’s words of encouragement in Antioch (14:22). Dupont indicates that individual eschatology also occurs in Jewish literature, especially in the book of 1 Enoch. However, Luke neither seeks to find a connection between the afterlife destiny of an individual and the end of time, nor harmonizes individual eschatology and collective one, nor makes the former an aspect of the latter.\(^{20}\) In Dupont’s view, this is probably due to Luke’s Hellenistic environment (“sa formation hellénistique”).\(^{21}\)

Certainly, the format of this article does not allow Dupont to go further in his investigation of the afterlife in Luke-Acts. As a result, some important passages (e.g., Luke 13:22–30 and 20:27–40), other aspects of life after death, and tradition-historical overview are left without attention. In sum, Dupont has

---


\(^{19}\) Some details of Dupont’s argumentation will be given below.


argued that the various views of the afterlife in Luke-Acts do not contradict each other, but he did not work this out in a full scale monograph. For this reason his article should be seen as a point of departure for research on the afterlife in Luke-Acts. Dupont’s contribution has indicated the need for a comprehensive study of Lucan views of the afterlife in which the consistency of these views is questioned.

Indeed, the passages dealt with by Dupont are extremely important for understanding Luke’s views on the afterlife. However, they can be interpreted in different ways. Mattill dedicates a whole chapter (“’The Happy Side of Hades’ [Luke 16:19–31]: The Platonizing of Luke-Acts”) of his book Luke and the Last Things: A Perspective for the Understanding of Lukan Thought to criticism of Dupont’s arguments and offers his own approach to these passages. In this chapter Mattill takes issue with those scholars who regard some passages from Luke as conveying the Greek ideas of the immortality of the soul. First, as some earlier scholars who indicated the similarities between the Lucan parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus and 1 Enoch, he too compares Luke 16:19–31 with 1 Enoch 22 and 103:5–8. In addition, he justly points out that Dupont although indicating possible parallels between Luke and 1 Enoch, does not elaborate this issue in detail. Mattill argues that Luke 16:19–31 reflects a popular view on the intermediate state between death and final destiny, which is found in the 1 Enoch passages he discusses. Indeed, 1 En. 22:3–4 speaks about the

---


23 Apart from Dupont he also criticizes, inter alia, J. Wellhausen and A. Bruce, who argue that Hades in Luke 16:23 is an equivalent of Gehenna as the final place of the wicked, and that the individuals are judged immediately after death. See J. Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Lucae (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1904), 90–91; Alexander B. Bruce, The Synoptic Gospels (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897), 589. Cf. C.G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels Edited with an Introduction and a Commentary (vol. 2; London: Macmillan, 1909), 1003.


26 Mattill emphasizes his position about the intermediate state of Lazarus and the rich man in the very title of his chapter: “The Happy Side of Hades.”
intermediate state of the souls of the dead divided into three “hollow places” until the last judgment. Then, according to Matill, the scene of the Lucan parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus also takes place in this age. Further, Lucan Hades is divided into several sections similar to that of 1 Enoch, even more with the mention of the great chasm (Luke 16:26; cf. 1 En. 18:11). While Lazarus occupies the blessed part of Hades reserved for the righteous (cf. 1 Enoch 22:2, 9) of which Abraham’s bosom is a part, the rich man (Dives in Mattill’s book) is put into the part of Hades similar to the second section of Enoch’s to be in scourging and torment until his final destiny (1 En. 22:10–11; cf. 103:5–8). Thus, Mattill argues that “Dives and Lazarus experience preliminary blessing and punishment and await the resurrection, when the souls in Hades will be united with their bodies to stand in the last judgment.” He concludes that for Luke as well as for the rest of the New Testament Hades is only a temporary abode of the dead, referring to the interpretation of Ps 16:10 in Acts 2:31. Mattill postulates the following logic of Luke’s thought: although Jesus’ body was buried in a tomb (Luke 23:50–56), God preserved it from decay (Acts 2:27,31), while Jesus’ soul descended to Hades (Acts 2:27,31). Then, he was raised on the third day after his death in a unity of flesh, bones, and spirit (Luke 24:36–43; Acts 10:41). Luke, therefore, is far from a Platonic view of immortality as a liberation from the corrupt body. For Mattill it means that the souls of Lazarus and the rich man are temporarily in Hades waiting for their final reunion with their bodies buried in the earth in this age. Further, in contrast to Dupont, who regards paradise, another term for the abode of the dead, which occurs in Luke 23:43, as the final reward and the abode of the righteous like Abraham’s bosom, Mattill conceives it as a happy part of Hades (again, similar to Abraham’s bosom) referring to Jesus’ and the thief’s intermediate state (cf. 27 Mattill, Luke and the Last Things: a Perspective for the Understanding of Lukan Thought, 29–30.

28 Ibid., 31.

29 Ibid., 31–32. However, the problem of this argumentation (deducing conclusions about the fate of an individual from a comparison with the fate of Jesus) is that, according to it, Jesus and other individuals have a similar postmortem destiny. It might be so, but for Luke the postmortem existence of Jesus is a special case (see p. 24 below).

In a similar way, Gehenna in Luke 12:4–5 is not a threatening abode of the individual immediately after death, as Dupont puts it, but a place for the punishment of the wicked after the last judgment (cf. Luke 12:46), i.e., hell.

In addition, Mattill rejects Dupont’s individual interpretation of the parable of the Rich Fool (Luke 12:13–21). Dupont argues that 12:21 has to be interpreted in the context of 12:33–34 (cf. Matt 6:19–21). The rich man is a fool not only because he does not think about death but also because he does not consider its consequences. Meanwhile, his afterlife destiny depends on how he distributes his earthly possessions (presumably he has to give them as alms; cf. 12:33) in order to obtain treasure in heaven. However, Mattill argues that Luke’s intention is not to focus on the individual’s afterlife destiny without relation to the end of time, but, on the contrary, on the point that we have to give money to the poor in order to be justified at the last judgment, because our life is based not upon earthly possessions but upon God’s will. The core point of Mattill’s argument is that Luke 12:13–21 as well as 12:4–5 belong to the section 12:1–13:35 focused on the last judgment and related issues. Besides, 12:33–34 and 16:9 do not speak about the soul going to heaven immediately after death.

---


32 Dupont argues that Luke speaks here about the destiny of the individual, which is contingent on God’s power to cast into Gehenna or to bestow a salvation; see Dupont, “l’après-mort dans l’œuvre de Luc,” 11–12.


35 This point is connected with Mattill’s intention to demonstrate that Luke-Acts is apocalyptic in nature. He criticizes Conzelmann’s three epoch division of Luke-Acts; see Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St Luke (trans. Geoffrey Buswell; London: Faber & Faber, 1960). As his own view, Mattill suggests the two epoch program for Luke’s double work: the old age (the Law and the Prophets as an era of preparation and promise) and the new age (the Kingdom of God as the fulfillment of the promises) starting with the appearance of John the Baptist and continuing up to the parousia; see Mattill, Luke and the Last Things: a Perspective for the Understanding of Lukan Thought, 13–25. Thus, for Mattill Luke’s gospel may be divided into seven “mini-apocalypses”: (1) The river of fire apocalypse (Luke 3:3–18); (2) the falling fire apocalypse (10:1–24); (3) the fire upon the earth apocalypse (12:1–13:35); (4) the fire of agony apocalypse (16:16–31); (5) the fire and brimstone apocalypse (17:20–18:8); (6) the signs in the stars apocalypse (21:5–36); (7) the judgment by fire apocalypse (23:27–
Next, Mattill criticizes Dupont’s individualistic approach to the parable of the Dishonest Manager (Luke 16:1–9) connected with 12:33 as well as with 12:13–21 and 16:19–31.³⁷ In contrast to the foolishness of the rich man in 12:16–21 and the carelessness of the rich man in 16:19–31, the manager wisely uses money for the poor preparing his eternal abode after death (16:9). According to Dupont, the eternal tents in 16:9 correspond to the unfailing treasure in 12:33, whereas “eternal” does not mean “eschatological” but refers to duration (“durée”).³⁸ Thus, it is not a contrast between this world and that to come but between the earthly (“d’ici-bas”) and heavenly realities. However, as Mattill holds, Greek ἐκλίπῃ in 16:9 refers not to wealth, but to this world (in his interpretation “mammon” means this present world).³⁹ Furthermore, the eternal tents refer to the eschatological rewards rather than to the heavenly abode of the individual after death.

Finally, in the other chapters of his book Mattill discusses Acts 7:55–56 and 14:22. Jesus’ standing posture on the right hand of God in Stephen’s vision of the Son of Man in 7:55–56 differs from his traditional sitting (cf. Mark 14:62; Matt 26:64; Luke 22:69; Acts 2:34). Mattill adopts H. P. Owen’s idea that Luke depicts Jesus’ way from the cross to his second coming through a series of words that constitute an imaginative picture. In this view Jesus’ standing posture refers to his preparation for the parousia,⁴⁰ i.e., his readiness to come. Then, in the context of Mattill’s understanding of Lucan eschatology, this parousia is not personal but a universal one.⁴¹ In addition, this scholar argues

³¹). According to this scholar’s view, the idea of 12:1–13:35 is that disciples have to be indifferent to earthly possessions while seeking the Kingdom; ibid., 6–9.

³⁶ Ibid., 35–37.


³⁸ Ibid., 14.

³⁹ Mattill seeks a support for his argument in the Greek text of 1 En. 100:5, where ἐκλείπω refers to all wickedness and sin; Mattill, Luke and the Last Things: a Perspective for the Understanding of Lukan Thought, 38–39.


against Dupont’s view of Acts 14:22 as related to individual eschatology. Mattill views the great persecution against the church, which arose after the martyrdom of Stephen (Acts 8:1), as an indication of the great distress preceding the end of time and perceives 14:22 in an eschatological perspective.\(^4\)

Mattill concludes his analysis with the assumption that Luke may not have adopted the Greek idea of the immortality of the soul, but even if he did, it does not mean that he rejected the collective eschatological (apocalyptic) perspective. Here, Mattill is in agreement with Dupont who also declares that Luke does not exclude collective eschatology and does not strive to replace the last judgment with that of the individual at death. Even more, Luke could mix two types of eschatology as the author of the Wisdom of Solomon does (cf. Wis 31–6 and 3:18; 4:20–5:13, 16, 17–23). Finally, in Mattill’s view, Luke believes that the end of time is near but not immediate and gives attention to the fate of the individual after death, referring to an intermediate state that is followed by the last judgment. Thus, the individuals who die before the parousia experience preliminary rewards or punishments, while at the end of time they together with those who remain alive will be given eternal salvation in the Kingdom of God or else punishment in hell (Gehenna).\(^4\)

Thus, Mattill’s work is a more comprehensive investigation of the afterlife issues in Luke-Acts. However, the study of the afterlife is not its main purpose and is discussed only in the context of eschatology, and the specific understanding of it by the author at that: the twofold division of Luke’s eschatological scheme; the replacement of the thesis of the delay of the parousia in Luke-Acts by that of Luke’s switch from its immediate expectation to its imminent hope. These circumstances make Mattill’s interpretations of the passages with which Dupont deals speculative and force him to put aside some relevant passages about the afterlife in Luke-Acts. After all, it seems that the main purpose of his explanation of Lucan passages about the afterlife which are difficult to interpret, is to harmonize them. This makes the results of his research oversimplified.


\(^4\) Ibid., 52–53.

\(^4\) Ibid., 40.
the individual and does not support Dupont’s thesis about Luke’s adaptation of Hellenistic pagan views on the afterlife.\textsuperscript{44} Making a sketch of the New Testament usage of the terms Hades and Gehenna, he concludes that Hades in 16:23 refers to the intermediate state of the soul before the last judgment.\textsuperscript{45} He also rests his thesis on Acts 2:27 (cf. Ps 16:10) as clear evidence of Hades as a temporary abode, and supports it by the parallels with 4 Ezra 4:41–42 and 1 Enoch 22. Then, he makes a clear distinction between Hades as a temporary abode of the dead and Gehenna as a place of the punishment of the wicked.\textsuperscript{46} Moreover, Abraham’s bosom is also located in Hades as its blessed section reserved for the righteous separated from the rest of Hades by an unbridgeable gulf.\textsuperscript{47} Then, Osei-Bonsu regards paradise in Luke 23:43 as a place similar to Abraham’s bosom and locates it not in heaven (cf. 2 Cor 12:2; 2 En. 8:1–4) but in the blessed part of Hades to serve as the temporary “paradisiacal” abode of the righteous. Again, for Osei-Bonsu Acts 2:27, 31 appears as a crucial text for supporting his view.\textsuperscript{48} However, as Forbes rightly indicates, this scholar puts too much weight to this passage in which Hades is rather an ambiguous term.\textsuperscript{49} After all, Osei-Bonsu’s article can be regarded as another representative of the tendency to harmonization of Luke’s views on the afterlife.

Further, both Mattill and Osei-Bonsu discuss the afterlife in Luke-Acts with two presuppositions: (1) they are against the argument that Luke introduced the idea of the delay of the parousia and used individualized eschatology, and (2) they strive for avoiding any possible influence of Hellenistic pagan ideas on Luke (however, they limit their study of Jewish views

\textsuperscript{46} In doing so, Osei-Bonsu disagrees with Boyd who argues that there is no clear distinction between these two terms in the New Testament and takes them as synonymous; see W. J. P. Boyd, “Gehenna—According to J. Jeremias,” in Studia Biblica 1978: II. Papers on the Gospels (ed. E.A. Livingstone; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), 9–12.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., 125.
on the afterlife only to *1 Enoch* and *4 Ezra*).50 Indeed, some scholars attempt to make a strict distinction between the idea of the resurrection of the body and that of the immortality of the soul and treat them as clear Jewish and pagan ones, respectively. In doing so, they consider the belief in the resurrection of the body to be a single New Testament approach to the question of the afterlife, opposed to the pagan idea of immortality. Such an approach was well known long before Mattill's book. A prominent example can be found in the work of the famous Lutheran theologian Oscar Cullmann, who argued that the Christian view on immortality, which he considered similar to the Jewish one, is opposed to the pagan (Greek) view.51 In essence, Mattill and Osei-Bonsu push for harmonizing Luke's afterlife picture according to this approach.52 According to Oscar Cullmann, the victory over death began at a specific time and will be completed at a single point in the future.53 Therefore, the existence after death before the final resurrection is a temporary intermediate state or the “shadowy

50 Osei-Bonsu also uses *Test. Abr.* 20a.

51 Oscar Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?: The Witness of the New Testament* (London: Epworth Press, 1958). His essay on Immortality and resurrection was developed from his Ingersoll Lecture on the Immortality of Man at Harvard University's Andover Chapel, delivered on April 26, 1955. It was subsequently reprinted several times. Here the further references to his article are according to Oscar Cullmann, “Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?: The Witness of the New Testament” in *Immortality* (ed. Terence Penelhum; Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1973). 53–85. For Cullmann, the point of contrast lies in the difference between the interpretation of creation and a relation to death in Christian (and, correspondingly, Jewish) and Greek pagan thought. For example, while for Greeks death is a gate to eternity and the liberation of the soul from the trouble of the present life, for Jews and Christians it is a terrible enemy, because in death one does not gain immortality, but really dies. Further, Cullmann contrasts the Jewish-Christian and pagan anthropologies. He shows that the difference between body and soul in the New Testament does not imply such an opposition or dualism of body and soul that is peculiar to Greek pagan thought. The next point of Cullmann's is the supposition that while for Greeks the soul is intrinsically immortal and the new existence is attained by a person immediately at his/her death, for the Christians immortality is the resurrection of the body, which is gained by a new creative act of God and has been inaugurated by the resurrection of Jesus.


53 Cullmann, “Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?,” 75.
existence,” but not a real life.\textsuperscript{54} In Cullmann’s view, the metaphor of sleeping used in the accounts about the dead refers to their interim state before the parousia.\textsuperscript{55} However, Cullmann’s way of understanding the relation between Jewish and pagan views on the afterlife is too simplistic and has been criticized by some other scholars.\textsuperscript{56} Moreover, in the case of Luke who, as has been indicated above, shared the eastern Mediterranean cultural milieu, the thorough study of both Jewish and pagan ideas is crucial for understanding his view on the hereafter.

Besides, Dupont, Mattill, and Osei-Bonsu seek for understanding Luke’s views on the afterlife from an eschatological perspective. There are two problems with such an approach. On the one hand, the passages these scholars deal with can be interpreted in different ways.\textsuperscript{57} It is uncertain whether Luke 12:16–21; 16:1–8; 16:19–31; 23:43 refer to the intermediate state of an individual after death or to his or her final destiny (although without explicit mention of the last judgment). Individual eschatology, which is present in Luke, as Dupont argues, or the intermediate state in the case of Mattill and Osei-Bonsu, is not a complete picture of the afterlife in Luke and cannot be correctly interpreted without considering its relation to collective eschatology, the evidence of which is very well attested in Luke-Acts (e.g., Luke 10:12, 14; 11:31–32; 50–52; 12:39–40, 42–46; 13:25–27; 21:32–36; 22:24–30).\textsuperscript{58} On the other hand, as will be shown below (see p. 80), it is not easy to find an adequate eschatological model to describe the eschatological picture of Luke-Acts. Moreover, as Lehtipuu has

\textsuperscript{54} For Cullmann, the state of Lazarus and the repentant criminal is a state of “waiting” (ibid., 79).
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 84.
later convincingly demonstrated, it is doubtful that eschatology can be used as the key for understanding Luke.59

A major step in research on the ideas of the afterlife in Luke-Acts without any attempt to put them into the frame either of a simplified dichotomy between Jewish and pagan views on the hereafter, or of their harmonization; and on the other hand with a consistent approach to the relation between individual and collective eschatology in Luke's double work is presented in Lehtipuu's already mentioned book *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*.60 In her research which focuses on Luke 16:19–31 she is much more specific about this parable than the scholars discussed above and provides a careful study of Luke's story, discussing it in the wider context of the views on the destiny of the dead in both pagan and Jewish sources. Lehtipuu chooses to study the passage mentioned as the most important example of afterlife imagery in the gospel of Luke. Indeed, this passage contains some details about the afterworld that are rare or unique for the rest of the corpus of the New Testament texts: immediate reward or punishment after death, angels carrying the dead to their abode, the fiery torments of the wicked, the importance of the figure of Abraham, an ability of the dead to recognize each


60 Ibid. This book is the revised version of her Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Helsinki. The subject she discusses has been stated earlier in her article “The Imagery of the Lucan Afterworld in the Light of Some Roman and Greek Parallels,” which was later developed into a section of her book; see Outi Lehtipuu, “The Imagery of the Lukan Afterworld in the Light of Some Roman and Greek Parallels,” in *Zwischen den Reichen: Neues Testament und Römische Herrschaft. Vorträge auf der Ersten Konferenz der European Association for Biblical Studies* (TANZ 36; hrsg. Michael Labahn und Jürgen Zangenberg; Tübingen: Francke, 2002), 133–146. In this article Lehtipuu emphasizes Luke 13:28–29 derived from Q as the core of the Lucan imagery of the afterlife. However, she sees the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19–31) as “a more elaborated picture of the conditions in the hereafter” that strongly influenced later Christian theology; Outi Lehtipuu, “The Imagery of the Lukan Afterworld in the Light of Some Roman and Greek Parallels,” 133–134. Indeed, some aspects of Lucan ideas of the afterlife have influenced later Christian theology and authors who interpreted them in several ways. For instance, Hippolytus of Rome (3rd century C.E.) in his *De universo* regards Abraham's bosom as the abode of the righteous in Hades awaiting the final judgment to be brought to eternal life in heaven (*Univ.* 33; cf. Tertullian, *An.* 7.3; *Marc.* 4.34.11–14).
other in the otherworld, a great chasm between the righteous and the wicked, the appearances of the dead, and some others. In Lehtipuu's opinion, two extremes present in scholarly literature on this passage need to be avoided. On the one hand, the parable cannot be dismissed as a fantastic illusion of reality related to some popular beliefs and not intended to be taken seriously as a picture of the afterlife. On the other hand, neither should the parable be seen as an attempt to give an actual, real account of life after death. She asks two basic questions: (1) how does Luke 16:19–31 relate to the other accounts of the fate of the dead in Mediterranean culture? (2) How does it fit Lucan eschatological views and the other references to the afterlife in his double work?

Lehtipuu investigates the elements of Luke's account rooted in the Hellenistic (both pagan and Jewish) cultural matrix and concentrates in the issue of dividing the dead. She demonstrates a great diversity of views on the afterlife in the Hellenistic and Roman period, even in texts from a single author. Lehtipuu indicates that new ideas were not developed in a linear manner and often occurred side by side with older concepts. Besides, she is quite critical of the use of Greco-Roman epitaphs for proving the idea that ordinary people were unconcerned about the afterlife or held an archaic view about the existence of the dead. In her opinion, epitaphs functioned as a commemoration of the dead, using widely circulated formulae, and concentrated rather on earthly life than on the postmortem destiny. For this reason, they do not give us very much information about the expectations of ordinary people. Lehtipuu concludes that in the Hellenistic world different ideas, images, and motifs were freely borrowed from several sources and then used with different functions and for different purposes. She also demonstrates that the beliefs in personal rewards and punishments, immortality and reincarnation, peculiar to the esoteric cults and some philosophical schools, were also shared by the uninitiated and the illiterate masses. The idea of the differentiation of fates was also a common place in a number of Jewish accounts, though some of them imply the notion of a judgment at the end of time (e.g., 1 Enoch 22; 4 Ezra 7; 2 Bar. 30:2–5). Other elements and details of the
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62 Ibid., 40.
63 Ibid., 102–108.
64 Ibid., 99–117.
Lucan parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus as its structural themes are also connected with ideas found in pagan and Jewish sources.

Lehtipuu deals with Lucan eschatology in this passage and overall in his double work and with the postmortem fate of the individual. She consistently discusses the passages that Dupont treats as related to individual eschatology (Luke 12:16–21; 16:1–8; 16:19–31; 23:39–43; Acts 1:25; 14:22) and adds the passage about the martyrdom of Stephen (Acts 7:54–60). Lehtipuu indicates that in spite of the fact that Luke supports the traditional Jewish collective eschatology (e.g., Luke 10:12–14; 11:31–32; 14:14; 20:27–40, 47; Acts 2:415, 25), he also uses elements of individual eschatology with an immediate entry into the otherworld. This is clear not only from the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, but also from the account of Judas’ fate (Acts 1:25); the story of Stephen’s death (Acts 7:59–60), and Jesus’ words to the penitent thief on the cross (Luke 23:43). In addition, Lehtipuu admits the possibility that Luke also promotes a certain realized eschatology: it is already partly fulfilled and the believers already participate in the new life. Indeed, it seems that Luke 20:35–36 indicates that the righteous are in some sense already resurrected. Thus, Luke’s eschatological views may include aspects of all the eschatological expectations, the individual, the realized (present), and the future eschatology.

Finally, Lehtipuu treats the questions which, as we have seen, are important for previous scholarship on the afterlife in Luke-Acts: (1) whether the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus tells about the immediate fate of the individual as a final destiny or only as a temporary one (the intermediate state) and (2) whether its characters are both in separate parts of Hades or the rich man is in the underworld, while Lazarus is in heaven. As opposed to Mattill and Osei-Bonsu and some other scholars, she concludes that in this Lucan parable it is more plausible to regard Hades as a place of a final punishment. Lehtipuu admits the parallels between Luke 16:19–31 and 1 Enoch 22 but marks a significant difference: while 1 Enoch speaks about a two-stage judgment (preliminary and final ones), Luke’s parable does not. Thus, Luke may have
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65 Ibid., 253–255.
66 Ibid., 255–264.
67 Luke 16:1–9 can be included to this list, though with less certainty, according to Lehtipuu; ibid., 253.
68 Ibid., 256–262.
used the motif from *1 Enoch* 22 only for describing the afterlife imagery but not for implying an intermediate state. In addition, it is impossible, in Lehtipuu's view, to make a clear distinction between Hades and Gehenna in Luke-Acts since the latter occurs only once in Luke 12:5, while the former occurs only four times (Luke 10:15; 16:23; Acts 2:27,31). On the other hand, Luke may be using these words “as rough equivalents denoting the place of punishment for the wicked immediately after death.” Further, Lehtipuu regards the place where Lazarus enjoys fellowship with Abraham (this fellowship is represented by the image of Abraham’s bosom) as that of consolation similar to paradise, which she sees as the final abode of the righteous. Thus, for Lehtipuu, Luke 16:19–31 implies final bliss for Lazarus and final punishment for the rich man. Nevertheless, as she admits, in the other passages from Luke-Acts the final destiny of the righteous and the wicked is associated with the collective eschatological picture and the last judgment. These contradictions in Luke's eschatological views cannot be reconciled, just as diverse imagery of the afterlife in Luke-Acts cannot be harmonized: Hades and Gehenna, paradise and eternal habitations.

Thus, in contrast to some scholars, including Mattill and Osei-Bonsu, who try to see a consistent eschatological picture in Luke-Acts, Lehtipuu believes that Luke did not have a clear picture of the destiny of the dead in mind and, moreover, did not develop a systematic eschatological doctrine in Luke-Acts, since the eschatological expectations do not form a central theme in his work and are not its main focus. He uses eschatological motifs more practically, for instance, in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus as an exhortation to repentance through the proper use of possessions that leads into a blessed life. Therefore, in Lehtipuu’s view, eschatological ideas are not the key for understanding Luke.

Lehtipuu's work is undoubtedly an important contribution not only to the study of Luke's story about the Rich Man and Lazarus and other passages about the afterlife in Luke-Acts, but also to the study of Jewish and early Christian views on the afterlife and eschatology. Moreover, her approach to the study of
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the issues of the afterlife in the overall view on life after death in the wider eastern Mediterranean intertextual milieu is very productive. Indeed, the Judaism of the 1st century C.E. can be called Hellenized Judaism and almost every Jewish author directly or indirectly shared various Hellenistic concepts and symbols. It is often hardly possible to make a strict distinction between pagan and Jewish origins for the ideas of the afterlife prevailing in that time, since those authors, including Luke himself, lived in a traditional society that shared a more or less common worldview. Such an approach allows avoiding an opposition of “Hellenistic” and “Jewish” ideas (e.g., the immortality of the soul marked as “Greek” and the resurrection of the body as exclusively “Jewish”) or the terms “Palestinian” and “Hellenistic” as different linguistic and cultural concepts.

A few short critical notes should be added to this review of Lehtipuu’s work. In her sketch of pagan and Jewish views on the afterlife, she does not extensively interrogate the coherence of or interaction between the various forms of the afterlife existence (immortality, resurrection, association with the stars, etc.). Moreover, the correlation between these forms of the afterlife in Luke-Acts in her book is examined only superficially. Further, the purpose of her book (the analysis of the particular passage about the Rich Man and Lazarus) conditions and limits Lehtipuu’s attention to the exegesis of other important Luke-Acts passages about the afterlife (Luke 9:9–7; 13:23–30; 24:36–43; Acts 24:15), despite being in dialogue with some of them.

In addition, she does not take into her discussion the passages about the restoration of physical life in Luke-Acts (Luke 8:41–42, 49–56; 7:14; Acts 9:36–41; 9:36–42). No doubt they do not directly relate to the afterlife, but nevertheless,

---


74 While the first distinction is a characteristic feature of O. Cullmann’s approach, the second one is offered by H. C. C. Cavallin in H. C. C. Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15. Part I: An enquiry into the Jewish Background (ConBNT; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1974), 34.

they do touch the issue of death and contain some afterlife language (the resurrection [ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω] and death [καθεύδω] vocabulary, and imagery [calling and awaking of the “sleeping” dead, cf. John 5:25; 11:43; Acts 9:40; 1 Thess 4:16]).

Furthermore, considering the issue of the eschatological resurrection, Lehtipuu correctly emphasizes the tension between the resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked and that of the righteous only.76 Trying to resolve this tension, she discusses extensively Luke 20:27–40, which she sees as a key passage for the interpretation of Luke’s position. However, although mentioning Acts 24:15, which seems to reflect an opposite view, she virtually does not discuss this verse any further.

Finally, in her analysis of the fate of the individual after death, Lehtipuu evaluates various views on the role of Hades, paradise, and other postmortem destinations used in Luke-Acts.77 Her conclusion that Luke is inconsistent with his terminology for the abodes of the dead but nevertheless indicates blessed or condemned states of the dead, seems to be correct. However, she does not discuss possible relations between these abodes. How do these various terms correlate with each other in the spatial picture of the afterlife in Luke-Acts?

Thus, Lehtipuu’s book satisfactorily resolves some basic tensions in the studies of the afterlife in Luke-Acts: the correlation between collective and individualized eschatology; the use of pagan and Jewish ideas in Luke-Acts; the description of Hades, paradise, Abraham’s bosom, and the other representations of the otherworld in Luke’s double work. However, at least the following basic issues are still open for further discussion: the relation between (a) various forms of afterlife existence in Luke-Acts; (b) several representations of the abode of the dead, and the connection of these subjects (the forms of afterlife existence and the representations of the abode of the dead and their variety) with Lucan eschatology. As will appear below, these issues are of crucial importance for the present study and will be treated further below.

Another recent work related to the present study is Horton’s Death and Resurrection: The Shape and Function of a Literary Motif in the Book of Acts.78 In

76 Ibid., 256–257.
77 Ibid., 265–294.
his book, Horton discusses the shape and function of the literary motif of death and resurrection within the Book of Acts. In doing so, he applies William Freedman's criteria of a literary motif to the narrative of Acts. Freedman underlines five specific characteristics of a motif: frequency, avoidability, occurrence in significant contexts, coherency, and symbolic appropriateness. In addition, Horton discusses the issue in the broader context of scholarly dispute on Luke's theology as that of glory (theologia gloriae) in contrast to Paul's theology of the cross (theologia crucis). Next, he analyses the references to death and resurrection and the examples of the "death-resurrection" experiences of major and minor characters in the Book of Acts. He also demonstrates how this motif is intensified through contrast with a secondary motif of death and decay.

Horton examines references to Jesus' death and resurrection in the Book of Acts (Acts 1:3; 17:2–4) and the references to his death alone (Acts 8:32–33, 35; 14:22) directly spoken by the narrator above the primary narrative (he called them "hyperdiegetic statements"). Then, he brings into consideration the comments made by the narrative characters about the death and resurrection of Jesus (called "intradicetic": 2:14–40; 3:11–26; 4:8–12; 5:29–32; 10:34–43; 13:16–41; 25:14–21; 26:1–23), references to Jesus' death alone (7:37, 52), and references to his resurrection alone (17:22–31; 23:3–10; 24:10–21). Horton concludes with the statement that in Acts "the characterization of Jesus equally emphasizes his passion and resurrection." Horton examines references to Jesus' death and resurrection as "showing" (he calls it "mimesis") in the lives of the major characters of Acts: Peter, Stephen, and Paul. Horton argues that they participate in events parallel to Jesus' death and resurrection and partake of "resurrection-type experiences in accordance with the resurrection of Jesus." Horton first treats Peter's imprisonments and releases (4:1–21; 5:17–41; 12:1–19), Stephen's death and anticipated resurrection (7:55–59), Paul's conversion experience (9:1–19),

81 Ibid., 27–37.
82 Ibid., 37.
83 Ibid., 39.
stoning and recovery at Lystra (14:1–20), and his shipwreck and rescue (27:14–44). Then he deals with minor characters and connects the accounts of their death and restoration of physical life (Tabitha [9:36–42] and Eutychus [20:7–12]), as well as their sickness and miracle healing (the temple beggar [3:1–4:31]; the lame man at Lystra [14:8–11], Aeneas [9:32–35]), and conversion (Cornelius [10:1–48]) with the pattern of Jesus’ death and resurrection recalling and stressing this motif. Finally, Horton examines the accounts of the deaths of Herod Agrippa (12:20–23), Judas Iscariot (1:16–20), and Ananias and Sapphira (5:1–11), as well as those of death and decay in the episodes of Simon Magus (8:9–24) and Elymas the Magician (13:6–11).

For Horton, death and resurrection appear as “a clear example of a biblical motif.”84 It functions to enhance the aesthetic quality of the story and at the same time to reinforce its basic message for Luke’s audience. Then, it creates a theological balance between suffering and renewed life combining the diegetic and mimetic parts of this motif.

There are some important points at which this work contributes to the study of the representations of the afterlife in Luke-Acts. While discussing how the death and resurrection of Jesus are significant for Luke and his audience, Horton also demonstrates the implications of the resurrection-type experiences of the other characters. It is especially important for the story about Stephen and for the accounts of the restoration of the physical life of Tabitha and Eutychus that will be discussed below in the present study (see p. 73, 160–162, 221, 223). Thus, the author emphasizes that Luke patterns the martyrdom of Stephen on the story about Jesus’ passion. While this martyrdom corresponds to the first part of the death-resurrection motif, its second part is implicitly shown through Stephen’s vision of the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God (7:55–56) as his anticipated resurrection. Horton argues that Jesus’ standing position indicates hope for Stephen’s resurrection. The author provides three possible scholarly proposals about the reason for Jesus’ upright position but does not give enough support to this suggestion. Besides, Horton rightly signifies the importance of the idea of sleeping and rising up in the death-resurrection motif expressed by means of the verb ἀνίστημι (cf. 9:40; 20:9).85 Unfortunately, he does not elaborate on this idea either.

84 Ibid., xv.
85 Ibid., 63–66.
As Horton’s book concentrates only on the issues of death and resurrection as a literary motif, it does have significant limitations for the study of the afterlife in Luke-Acts. Indeed, it does not deal with symbolic and metaphorical expressions of death and resurrection and their implications for any individual apart from the case of Jesus. Concentrating only on resurrection, Horton does not pay attention to any other forms of the afterlife and their relation to the way Luke understands salvation. After all, this researcher is focusing only on the Book of Acts, while losing some important material from Luke’s gospel.

Thus, the most productive results of the study of Luke’s views on the afterlife have been found in Lehtipuu’s work. To this book consistent reference must be made in the present volume, in dialogue with Lehtipuu’s research. Meanwhile, since her study focuses mostly on Luke 16:19–31, an attempt at a more systematic analysis of several relevant passages regarding the views on the afterlife in Luke-Acts will have to be undertaken in the present research.

The Purpose of the Present Research

This research defines the concept of the afterlife as a belief in the continued existence of human beings after physical death in a specific realm or on earth and discusses it in a general sense, i.e., in relation to the individual’s afterlife. The concept of the afterlife is represented in various forms including an intermediate state of a deceased person between the moment of death and his or her final destiny, various ideas of judgment and eschatology, and the abode of the dead.

Further, this research deals with the variety of representations of the afterlife in Luke-Acts and investigates only the ideas regarding afterlife in general. This means it will not be particularly focusing upon Jesus’ postmortem existence.

---

86 This concept can also be called “life after death,” “the hereafter,” or “the postmortem existence.”

87 Various pagan and Jewish texts deal with encounters between the world of the living and the otherworld. This fact illustrates the existence of the belief that the dead would appear in the world of the living. This belief can be regarded as a part of the concept of the afterlife as well. However, in the present research it will not be discussed as a separate subject. See the study of this issue, e.g., in Outi Lehtipuu, The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, 186–196.
existence due to its special character and representation in Luke-Acts.\(^{88}\) However, this will be discussed in connection with individual resurrection and its effect on the destiny of Jesus’ followers.

Lehtipuu concludes her research with the statement that Luke uses many different kinds of images for describing the afterlife that cannot be plausibly harmonized. Luke therefore does not have a clear picture about the destiny of the dead in his mind and moreover does not develop a systematic eschatological doctrine.\(^{89}\) This conclusion presupposes the fact of the variety of ideas of the afterlife in Luke-Acts and serves as a starting point for the present research. Lehtipuu, however, does not focus on this variety itself in her study. The core of this matter resides in three basic issues: (1) various forms of afterlife existence; (2) several representations of the abode of the dead, and (3) the

---


relation of these subjects to Lucan eschatology. The focus of the present study will therefore be on investigating the variety of these ideas in Luke-Acts and their interrelation with each other. Thus, the purpose of this research is to describe the main characteristics of Lucan representations of these main issues and to answer the question: how do we account for the apparent variety in ideas found in Luke-Acts? The answer to this question presupposes the discussion of (1) several forms of afterlife existence (such as the individual and eschatological resurrection and their connection with the restoration of physical life, the immortality of the soul and angelomorphic existence) in Luke-Acts; (2) the various representations of the abode of the dead (e.g., Hades and Gehenna, paradise, Abraham's bosom, the Kingdom of God, and the eternal habitations); (3) the interrelation of these forms of afterlife existence and of the representations of the abode of the dead to each other in Luke-Acts; (4) the connection between this interrelation and the eschatological issues in Luke-Acts (immediate, future, and present, collective and individual eschatology); (5) the relation between these issues in the wider cultural context of the ancient Mediterranean world to which Luke belonged, in order to investigate which beliefs and traditions Luke shared and adopted from his cultural-religious environment. Then, on the basis of the results obtained from this analysis, a conclusion will be drawn about the possible reasons for the combination of seemingly incompatible views on the afterlife in Luke-Acts.

The Date of Luke-Acts

The range of sources selected for the present research on Luke's cultural environment depends on the date of Luke's double work. Therefore, this issue must be treated first. There are two extremes in the scholarly dating of Luke-Acts: the early date and the late one. At first glance, the absence of any reference to the deaths of either Paul or James the Just in the Book of Acts or any obvious mention of the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E., as well as the lack of any clear references or allusions to Paul's letters in Luke-Acts might indicate a date in the 60s, as some scholars believe. However, these arguments

leave a number of scholars unconvinced. On the other hand, some researchers claim that the Lucan writings can be dated to 100–130 C.E. or even as late as 150 C.E. The main arguments of this group are as follows (1) the Book of Acts may have parallels with Josephus’ *Jewish War* (75–79 C.E.) and *Jewish Antiquities* (ca. 94 C.E.); (2) it is connected with the texts of the Apostolic fathers, with Marcion (as a response to Marcionism), and Justin Martyr, or even with the pseudo-Clementine texts. The notion of the late date of Luke-Acts has been recently developed by Richard I. Pervo and Joseph B. Tyson. Pervo argues that Luke and Acts were written by the same author but were probably distant in
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time. He dates Acts up to 110–120 C.E. and, using the intertextual evidence from
the datable texts, claims that it depends on the late sources that were not
known until the 1st century C.E. Pervo investigates Lucan use of the LXX and
Mark, his probable acquaintance with Paul’s letters (especially the Pastoral
letters, which he dates at 125 C.E.) as well as with Josephus’ writings (especially
Jewish Antiquities, dated 94 C.E.). He maintains that Luke, while never explicitly
citing Paul, uses his terminology and language. He also underlines some
supposed parallels between Acts and the texts of the Apostolic Fathers (e.g., 1
Clement [95–100 C.E.]; Ignatius’ writings [115–125 C.E.]; and Polycarp’s [125–135
C.E.]). Besides, Pervo finds some important similarities between Acts and the
theological, ideological, and ecclesiological issues emerged in the church of the
2nd century C.E. Finally, he argues that the Lucan characterization of Jews as a
separate group indicates the 2nd century situation when early Christianity and
Judaism were already divided. He assumes that, although these arguments are
not of equal value, they have a cumulative effect and indicate Luke’s
acquaintance with these sources. Finally, he defines a terminus a quo for Acts at
100 C.E. referring to Paul’s letters and Josephus, and a terminus ad quem at 180
arguments are very well presented but nevertheless are insufficient. In short,
the parallels between Luke-Acts and the sources Pervo discusses are sometimes
no more than slight lexical or syntactical similarities. Luke’s dependence on
Josephus is more speculative than on Paul’s corpus and cannot be proved from
the literary dependence perspective. Besides, Lucan possible reliance on the
collection of Paul’s texts that was not available until 100 C.E. does not
automatically mean that Luke knew these texts only as a collection. Moreover,
Pervo’s late dating of 2 Corinthians and the Pastoral Epistles (125 C.E.) is far
from being a scholarly consensus. 98 Finally, Pervo’s argument about Lucan use
of church organization as reflecting the 2nd century C.E. setting is not very
cogent. Indeed, Luke uses such terms as bishop (ἐπίσκοπος; Acts 20:28),
presbyter (πρεσβύτερος; Acts 15:14), or widows (χήρας: Acts 9:41). However,
διάκονος (cf. 1 Tim 3:12) as the third member of the later ecclesiastical
hierarchical structure is absent from Acts. It seems Luke depicts a church

98 For instance, Brown dates the Pastoral Epistles from 80 to 100 C.E., while Pokorny
and Heckel in about 100 C.E. See Brown, An Introduction to the New Testament, 668; Petr
Pokorny und Heckel, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 669.
organization in which these positions had not yet been fixed and reflects the church situation of the second part of the 1st century C.E.

After discussing these extreme scholarly positions concerning the date of Luke-Acts, it is more reasonable to accept the position of those who prefer an intermediate date for Luke-Acts in 80–90 C.E. Acts may have been written a few years later than the Gospel but it is difficult to define an exact period. There are several indications for a post-70 C.E. dating of these texts that are not unreasonable. For instance, Luke transforms Mark’s notion about the abomination of desolation (Mark 13:14) into the saying about the siege of Jerusalem (Luke 21:20); Luke 13:34–35 also can be regarded as an indication of Luke’s awareness of the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem. On the other hand, as has been stated above, Luke’s probable familiarity with Paul’s letters does not automatically indicate that he had the whole collection of these writings at hand; the argument about Luke’s dependence on Josephus’ Jewish Antiquities (94 C.E.) is rather weaker than that of Luke’s dependence on Paul. Proof of references to the 2nd century sources discussed above is still problematic and is subject to further discussion. In addition, in Acts Luke does not intend to provide a detailed chronological account of the lives of Peter, Paul, James the Just, or other apostles of the early church. He rather strives for dramatizing the spread of Christianity that symbolically culminates in Rome as the capital of the Gentile Empire. This may well explain why the Book of Acts does not explicitly mention the death of Paul or James the Just.

---


Sources for the Study of Luke’s Cultural Environment

As has been stated above, the answer to the main research question of the present study can be obtained by investigating Luke’s views on the afterlife in the wider cultural context of the ancient eastern Mediterranean culture (Hellenistic) to which Luke belonged. This discussion will help to shed light on the beliefs and traditions Luke shared and adopted from his cultural-religious environment. For instance, it will be demonstrated how the perception of the human standing posture in ancient world correlates with his representations of resurrection. Indeed, the Mediterranean culture produced a mass of ideas about the afterlife, i.e., beliefs in the continued existence of human identity after physical death. As Dale B. Martin states, the Judaism of this period, especially in Greek and Roman cities, was thoroughly affected “by the dominant culture of Hellenism and to a lesser extent that of Rome”\(^{103}\) and was “an ethnic subculture within the hegemonic culture of the Hellenistic Mediterranean.”\(^{104}\) However, for convenience of presentation, the Jewish views on the afterlife will be discussed separately from the pagan ones in order to demonstrate the more specifically Jewish monotheistic ideas, even if some of them were influenced by the hegemonic Hellenistic views.

Further, for convenience of presentation, the present research unites pagan views under the title *Paganism*. However, the use of this word does not imply that Greco-Roman paganism existed as a readily definable entity with uniform views, beliefs, and practices. On the contrary, it was a broad group of cultural, philosophical, cosmological, and polytheistic religious traditions. Thus, when in the 1st century C.E. Christianity entered the eastern Mediterranean world, Hellenism had been the most important and influential cultural, religious, and ideological system for this whole area for centuries.\(^{105}\) The fundamental aspects of Greek culture and thinking, the traditional Greek gods and goddesses, the understanding of their relations to humans, the cosmology and cosmogony, as well as the philosophical ideas, rituals, and

\(^{103}\) Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, xiii.

\(^{104}\) Ibid., xiv. One may trace this idea back to the important work of Martin Hengel, arguing that Judaism was affected by Hellenistic culture already in the Hellenistic period; see Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (trans. John Bowden; 2 vols.; Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1974).

\(^{105}\) Ensdjø, *Greek Resurrection Beliefs and the Success of Christianity*, 16.
festivals had been successfully introduced to the non-Greek populations of this area. Greek tradition was the ultimate cultural link between the nations, aiding them to express themselves and to communicate, or in other words, their “unifying cultural ideology.” It included education, literary culture, mythology, and philosophy. Some basic and traditional Greek views on the afterlife had already arisen in the archaic time of Homer (ca. the 8th century B.C.E.) and Hesiod (active between 750–650 B.C.E.). Later authors continued using their terminology and imagery but often with different meanings. Philosophical ideas, especially Plato’s, sometimes tried to undermine the traditional beliefs by the reinterpretation or rationalization of the ancient myths, and to reject similar miraculous events from more recent times. For instance, Plato and Plutarch created their eschatological myths for paraenetic purposes. On the other hand, these myths contain some traditional material, such as the details of the description of the underworld. Nevertheless, the philosophical treatises were of limited consequence and had relatively little influence on Greek society. On the contrary, popular practices often affected the intellectual life of the Greek elite; the traditional ideas continued to exist and many people, even in the highest social circles, still held to the older ideas of the afterlife. After all, the traditional Greek religion from the writings of Homer and Hesiod, with their comprehensive worldview was still alive a millennium later and related to some Hellenistic pagan views. Meanwhile, as Lehtipuu demonstrates, such ideas as the belief in personal rewards and punishments, immortality and reincarnation, peculiar to the esoteric cults and

110 Cf. Endsjo, *Greek Resurrection Beliefs and the Success of Christianity*, 15. However, the interest in the afterlife found in the written sources describing the postmortem issues differently from the previous literature had been growing since the 5th century B.C.E. See Sarah Iles Johnston, *Restless Dead. Encounters between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 29–30. This new manner of representation of the afterlife was most likely due to a shift in collective beliefs; Lehtipuu, *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*, 109.
some philosophical schools as well as to those who combined traditional and philosophical beliefs (e.g. Virgil’s *Aeneid*, Book 6), were also shared by the uninitiated and illiterate masses.\textsuperscript{111} Bearing all this in mind, the present study will pay attention not only to the sources that are directly attributable to the period discussed, but also to some of those texts from archaic and classical times, which still circulated in the Hellenistic world and influenced its thought and culture.

Meanwhile, the present research will have to look at a number of the pagan sources of various genres, such as poetry, drama, and prose, myths, philosophical treatises, and tombstone epitaphs. Although the written sources do not give us the whole picture of the views on the afterlife, especially of those peculiar to the ordinary people many of whom were illiterate, a critical reading of these texts can reveal some basic trends in these beliefs.\textsuperscript{112} Of course, the pagan literature has certain common features, but the written sources of the different genres reflect the view on hereafter in different ways. For instance, the epic poetry of Homer and Hesiod includes, \textit{inter alia}, the retold ancient cosmological and eschatological myths in a special poetic style and rhythm.\textsuperscript{113} These epics gave birth to numerous poems and provided themes for lyric, tragedy, and other Greco-Roman literary forms. To this tradition belong several hymns (e.g., Homeric Hymns) that could be used for several cults and reflect some beliefs about the destiny of the initiated.

Greek tragedies, which were one of the most influential literary forms created in Greece, while not reflecting real life and having a tendency towards exaggeration, nevertheless somehow give certain descriptions of life after death and the otherworld, and refer to the dead. Most of the extant tragedies are based on Greek mythology and epic poetry with which the audience was well acquainted. Moreover, tragedians often intended to make their plays interactive and relevant to the important problems of the contemporary

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., 99–117.


\textsuperscript{113} Hesiod, however, gives some information about himself and has a tendency to think for himself and to systematize the material he has at hand; H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Greek Literature: from Homer to the Age of Lucian* (4th ed.; London: Methuen, 1950), 57–58.
society.\textsuperscript{114} Therefore, one way or another, this kind of literature mirrors the views of their authors and their audiences.

Further, the philosophical treatises provide the views of individual philosophers and philosophical schools. Sometimes, the philosophers used their own eschatological myths (e.g., Plato and Plutarch) borrowing themes and concepts from the epics, the esoteric teachings, or from the popular beliefs, but using them for their own purposes, for instance, for the explanation of the idea of the immortality of the soul and that of postmortem retribution.\textsuperscript{115} Besides, earlier traditions and schools, which sometimes contradicted with each other, often influenced the later philosophers. In the Hellenistic and Roman periods, the traditional terminology and imagery of Homer and Hesiod were still in use but they often had a different and more developed meaning.

In addition, the genre of consolation (\textit{consolatio mortis}) serves as a good source for discovering the beliefs in the hereafter. This genre had started to be used systematically since the late 5\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.E.\textsuperscript{116} and was intended for people who had various troubles and problems such as the death of relatives or friends. Consolations sometimes emphasize the issue of personal immortality, referring to the widespread beliefs or philosophical ideas.\textsuperscript{117}

Greco-Roman satire also reflects the afterlife. This type of literature is associated, first of all, with the name of Lucian of Samosata (ca. 125–after 180

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{115} As Lehtipuu puts it, these myths in the philosophical writings (e.g., that of Er) were created not as a revelation about the otherworld, but as a tool for “paraenetic purposes, to promote a philosophical way of life” and virtuous life; Lehtipuu, \textit{The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus}, 110.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{116} Paul H. Holloway, \textit{Consolation in Philippians: Philosophical Sources and Rhetorical Strategy} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 56.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{117} The authors of such consolations often used the rhetorical handbooks, which may have contained popular views on the afterlife. The rules of rhetoric required the use of popular beliefs instead of the creation of new ones; see Wayne A. Meeks, \textit{The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul} (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1983), 241, n. 44. On the other hand, Cicero in his \textit{De Consolatione} brings together the arguments from Stoic, Epicurean, Peripatetic, and Platonic schools; Holloway, \textit{Consolation in Philippians: Philosophical Sources and Rhetorical Strategy}, 58.}
\end{footnotes}
He inherited some of the basic techniques of the Greek prose and rhetoric of his time, such as “the practice speech” (μελέτη), a declamation on a historical or fictitious theme (cf. Phalaris), “the display speech” (λόγος ἐπιδεικτικός), a wide range of occasional oratory (cf. Muscae laudatio), or the “introductory speech” (προλαλιά), which is a more informal talk before a public performance. However, it is generally agreed that Lucian also invented a new genre of the comic dialogue, which he used in most of his works. Some of his texts are clearly dialogues; others include dialogue as part of a combination of several genres. The dialogue itself was often a part of philosophical treatises (e.g., in Plato or Cicero). Lucian, however, has transformed this genre and made it a vehicle for his humor. Lucian’s satire is intended for well-educated and intellectual readers who could share his mockery of hidebound philosophers, charlatans, pseudo-historians, and uncouth folklore beliefs.

Beside the literature, several types of inscriptions indicate the pagan beliefs in the hereafter. The majority of the texts inscribed on gold leaves found in the graves in Southern Italy and Greece reflect the views on the afterlife of the so-called Orphic circles. In addition, some pagan epitaphs can also give us some understanding of the beliefs in life after death of those circles of Greco-

---

118 Lucian was not committed to any particular philosophical school but was most sympathetic to the Epicureans (e.g., Alexander), some Stoics, and Cynics. On the other hand, he did not support the views of Platonic and Pythagorean philosophers; Desmond Costa, “Introduction,” in Lucian: Selected Dialogues (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), vii–xiv, xi.


120 For instance, in Philopseudes dialogue serves as a framework for the main narrative with a series of stories; Costa, “Introduction,” x.

121 He adapts “from Plato the Socratic method of insidious questioning and demolition of an opponent” (e.g., Hermotimus; Costa, “Introduction,” ix–x).

122 See, e.g., Fritz Graf and Sarah Iles Johnston, Ritual Texts for the Afterlife: Orpheus and the Bacchic Gold Tablets (New York: Routledge, 2007). It is worth indicating, however, that the term “Orphic” is rather ambiguous due to many overlapping ideas from so-called Orphism, Pythagorean, and Bacchic teachings. Orphics probably did not have strongly organized communities around their priests, but followed a certain lifestyle, performed several rituals, and read special literature. See the discussion about Orphism in Lehtipuu, The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, 75–80.
Roman society that could afford gravestones for their deceased. However, these inscriptions often repeat certain traditional conventional formulae about the afterlife, for instance, using the traditional Homeric view of the underworld. The others are silent about the hereafter. As Lehtipuu demonstrates, the funeral inscriptions functioned as a commemoration of the dead and concentrated on earthly life rather than on the postmortem destiny. On their own account, they cannot give us very much information about the expectations of ordinary people and have to be analyzed in connection with the literary evidence.

Further, it is noteworthy that the subject of the afterlife is far from being a central issue in the Hebrew Bible. Eventually, as Segal rightly states, this corpus of the texts (especially, the Pentateuch) provides the idea of moral discernment, defined by the concept of the covenant and the fullness of life as its reward without the allusions to the afterlife that were characteristic of Israel’s neighbors. On the other hand, the later Jewish beliefs in the afterlife can be connected with the central sacred traditions of the Hebrew Scriptures. For instance, as R. Bauckham argues, the origin of the hope of the resurrection can be traced to the Israelite understanding of God’s sovereignty over life (cf. Deut 32:39; 1 Sam 2:6; 2 Kgs 5:7) and the belief in God’s justice and faithful love (Ps 49:15; 73:24). Since God’s justice and love would be fully realized beyond death, such a belief in God led to the hope of the resurrection. Indeed, while humans are mortal, according to the Hebrew Bible, God is represented as

---


125 However, some more optimistic views on death, such as a “good” and “bad” death or several explicit revivifications (1 Kgs 17:17–24; 2 Kgs 4:18–37; 13:20–21) occur in the Hebrew Bible; Segal, *Life after death*, 138–140.


128 Like the other peoples, the Israelites were aware of their mortality and therefore appreciated life (cf. 2 Sam 14:14). Indeed, life is a gift from God for humans as well as for the whole creation (cf. Gen 2:7) and was regarded as of the greatest value (cf. Job 2:4).
living and immortal (אֵל חַי, Jos 3:10; cf. θεὸς ζῶν in Bel 1:25) and the One who
gives life (Gen 2:7; Deut 32:39; 1 Sam 2:6; 2 Kgs 5:7). The typical formula of oath,
חַי־יְהוָה (“the Lord lives!”), in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Judg 8:19; Ruth 3:13; 1 Sam
14:39, 45; 2 Sam 4:9; 12:5; 1Kgs 17:1; Jer 12:16; 44:26 etc.) can be also connected
with this belief. Thus, God is the source of life for all creation and a sovereign
over the lives of the creatures. Moreover, God’s sovereignty over life and death
expressed Deut 32:39: אֲנִי אָמִית וַאֲחַיֶּה (“I kill and I make alive”; NRSV). Later, in
the LXX, it came to be apprehended not only as God’s judicial rule over Israel
but also as an ability to resuscitate: ἐγὼ ἀποκτενῶ καὶ ζῆν ποιήσω (“I will kill and
I will make alive”).

Therefore, although the bulk of the texts from the Hebrew Bible related to
the afterlife do not directly speak about eternal life, later Jewish writers
extracted this potential meaning from these sources. Thus, the idea of God’s
sovereignty can cohere with the understanding of God as Creator. This notion
is reflected in the story of 2 Maccabees 7, where the martyrs trust in God, who
can give them their lives back.

Jewish beliefs in the afterlife had appeared to be expressed in a more or
less clear-cut manner only since the Hellenistic period (from ca. 323 B.C.E.
wards) and continued their development through the centuries. From this
time on, Judaism started to be incorporated into the Hellenistic culture and
was in constant interaction with the surrounding cultural and religious
environment. Certainly, some Jewish views on the afterlife (as well as other
ideas and the Jewish worldview in general) had changed in the course of time.
However, the older concepts and beliefs could easily have co-existed with later
ones, as in Greco-Roman pagan and other ancient cultures.

Thus, the analysis of Jewish views on the afterlife as they are found in the
1st century C.E. presupposes not only an investigation of the texts and traditions
of the Hellenistic and Roman periods reflected in Jewish apocalyptic works,

ancient Israelites perceived life and vitality (חַיִּים), first of all, as physical existence, the
period between birth and death (cf. Gen 23:1; 25:17).

129 Martinus C. de Boer, The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15
and Romans 5 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 43.
several Midrashic narratives,\textsuperscript{132} Qumran sectarian texts, Josephus’ and Philo’s works, or Jewish inscriptions, but also an examination of their development from the earlier periods.

Below, a short description of the most important texts under discussion is provided. First, it is the 1\textsuperscript{st} Apocalypse of Enoch (the 1\textsuperscript{st} Book of Enoch). This complex Jewish text consists of the Book of Watchers ( chapters 1–36), the Astronomical Book ( chapters 72–82) or the Book of the Luminaries, the Epistle of Enoch ( chapters 91–104), the Book of the Dream Visions ( chapters 83–90), the Additions to the 1\textsuperscript{st} Book of Enoch ( chapters 106–108), and the Book of Parables or the Similitudes ( chapters 37–71).

The Book of Watchers along with the Astronomical Book is considered to be the oldest part of 1 Enoch. It could have been written at the beginning of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C., though the narrative itself may have originated in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} or even in the 4\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.\textsuperscript{133} The core of this section is the so-called Watchers’ Story, which is probably a nuclear piece of the Enochic tradition, centering on the angels-Watchers’ rebellion. This is a story about the angels who descended from heaven to the earth reflecting the story of Gen 6:1–4 as well as some other events of Gen 6–9. However, it also adds many nuances and explanations, developing the narrative far beyond that of Genesis. It is a myth attempting to respond to the question of the origins of evil and corruption in the world.

The Astronomical Book in its present form speaks about the revelations given to Enoch by the angel Uriel about the movements of the Luminaries and demonstrates how the world created by God is arranged. It also includes some eschatological details. The earliest copy of this part of 1 Enoch is dated about 200–150 B.C.E., hence it may have been written in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century B.C.E.\textsuperscript{134}

\textsuperscript{132} Here it relates to the works fully or partly written in the form or genre of Midrash in the broader sense (e.g., Jubilees, Life of Adam and Eve), but not to the later rabbinical Midrashim. See the discussion of this issue in e.g., O. S. Wintermute, “Jubilees: a New Translation and Introduction,” OTP 2:39–41.


The Epistle of Enoch deals with Enoch’s exhortation to his sons about the righteous life before his final departure. The exact date of this part of the Enochic corpus is problematic and depends on many factors. It can be set any time from the first third of the 2nd century B.C.E. to 105–104 B.C.E.\(^{135}\)

The Book of the Dream Visions can be dated ca. 165–161 B.C.E. and consists of two dream visions of Enoch.\(^{136}\) While the first vision describes the destruction of the world in the flood (chapters 83–84), the second one (chapters 85–90) allegorically portrays the history of the world.

The Additions to the 1st Book of Enoch contain chapters which are only loosely connected with each other. The story about the birth of Noah appears in chapters 106–107, while the summary and the conclusion of the whole corpus of 1 Enoch is presented in chapter 108. The story of Noah is dated between the first half of the 2nd century B.C.E. and the last third of the 1st century B.C.E.\(^{137}\) The terminus post quem of the present form of chapter 108 may be around the turn of the era, while 100 C.E. may be the terminus ad quem for it.\(^{138}\)

Finally, the Book of Parables is the latest part of the 1 Enoch collection. It can be dated sometime around the turn of the era.\(^{139}\) It is divided into three

\(^{135}\) See the survey of the setting of time for the Epistle of Enoch in George W. E. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1–36; 81–108 (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 427.

\(^{136}\) See Milik, The Books of Enoch, 44.

\(^{137}\) Milik, The Books of Enoch, 542.

\(^{138}\) It has some parallels with 1 Peter; ibid., 554.

\(^{139}\) See VanderKam and Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 6. It is worthy of note that the Book of Parables was not found among other parts of the Enochic collection at Qumran. Referring to this fact, Milik argues that this part of 1 Enoch did not exist in the pre-Christian era. In his view, it is probably a Christian composition written in Greek and inspired by the New Testament writings. By 400 C.E. this text replaced the so-called Book of Giants which existed in the Qumran version of 1 Enoch; Milik, The Books of Enoch, 58, 91–92. However, Milik’s idea has been severely criticized and is rejected by many scholars as not being supported by any solid evidence. See E. Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch: a New Translation and Introduction,” OTP 1:7; James H. Charlesworth, “The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch,” NTS 25 (1979): 315–323; Michael A. Knibb, “The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review,” NTS 25 (1979): 345–359; Cristopher L. Mearns, “Dating the Similitudes of Enoch,” NTS 25, no. 3 (1979): 360–369. In this case, the Book of the Parables was originally written in a Hebrew or Aramaic like the rest of 1 Enoch.
sections called “parables” (chapters 38–44; 45–57; 58–69) and deals with the coming judgment with its rewards for the righteous and the punishments for the wicked.

The Book of Jubilees is a rewritten version of the book of Genesis and some chapters of Exodus. It is dated between the time near the beginning the Maccabean revolt (160s B.C.E.) and 140 B.C.E. The Book of Maccabees is an abridged account of history of Israel in the period of 180–161 B.C.E. based on the five volumes of the historical work of one Jason of Cyrene (cf. 2 Macc 2:24–32). The book was composed in Greek by an anonymous abridger probably in Egypt not earlier than 124 B.C.E. and not later than 63 B.C.E, when Pompey captured Jerusalem.

The Wisdom of Solomon is a pseudepigraphical Jewish work that was originally composed in Greek and included into the LXX. The date of the Wisdom of Solomon is a matter of debate among scholars and ranges from the late 2nd century B.C.E. to the second part of the 1st century B.C.E. The author of this text was probably an Alexandrian Jew addressing his book to the Jewish

---

Milik indicates that the LXX could have been used in the Greek version of this text; J. T. Milik, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4, 91.


141 Epistle 1 (2 Macc 1:1–10a) was written in 124 B.C.E. by the Jews of Jerusalem and Judea. According to 2 Macc 15:37 Jerusalem was in Jewish hands at the time of the writing of this text. Goldstein argues that Jason of Cyrene wrote his work by 86 B.C.E. and 2 Maccabees was composed between 78 and 63 B.C.E. See the discussion on the date of the writing of 2 Maccabees in Jonathan A. Goldstein, II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB41A; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 71–83.

142 It is ascribed to King Solomon as the greatest sage from Israel’s past, to whom wisdom from the Lord had been given (1 Kings 3:5–12). Certainly, in the Hebrew Bible the books of Proverbs, Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes are traditionally ascribed to Solomon.

143 See Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 133. n.1; Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah, 212.
community in Alexandria in order to encourage them in their faith in God and their adherence to Judaism as he understood it.\footnote{See the analysis of his views on Judaism, e.g. in David Winston, \textit{The Wisdom Of Solomon: A New Translation With Introduction and Commentary} (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1964), 25–46; John J. Collins, \textit{Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora} (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000), 195–202.}

The 4\textsuperscript{th} Book of Ezra is also a pseudepigraphical work. The core of this text is chapters 3–14, while chapters 1–2 and 15–16 are later Christian additions.\footnote{In the later Latin manuscripts these additions are called 2 Ezra and 5 Ezra respectively. In modern scholarly literature they are sometimes named 5 Ezra and 6 Ezra; see Bruce M. Metzger, “The Fourth Book of Ezra: a New Translation and Introduction,” \textit{OTP} 1:517.} Its apocalyptic material is collected in seven revelatory visions given to Salathiel or Ezra and held together by a narrative framework.\footnote{Nickelsburg, \textit{Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah}, 270.} 4 Ezra can most likely be dated to the end of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century C.E. As it preoccupies with the theme of the destruction of Jerusalem, the \textit{terminus post quem} of its composition is after 70 C.E., probably during the reign of Domitian (81–96 CE).\footnote{Scholars suggest this date, referring to the 30\textsuperscript{th} year after the destruction of Jerusalem in 3:1. This time marker indicates that the book was written after 70 C.E. See, e.g., Metzger, “The Fourth Book of Ezra,” 1:520.}

The 2\textsuperscript{nd} Apocalypse of Baruch is a composite pseudepigraphical work, closely related to 4 Ezra and Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum. Second Baruch was written partially or completely after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. The parallels of 2 Baruch with Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum are too incidental to be directly connected with one another or to have a common source. On the other hand, 2 Baruch shares with 4 Ezra a similarity of content. However, these books treat their common material in different ways. For instance, 4 Ezra deals with theodicy as a response to the destruction of the temple, while 2 Baruch provides some consolation and exhortation concerning the reconstruction of the temple.\footnote{Moreover, the direction of their dependence is still under debate among scholars. See Nickelsburg, \textit{Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah}, 283.}

\textit{Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum} (\textit{Pseudo-Philo}) is a pseudepigraphical Jewish text having some literary parallels with 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. It is dated to the 1\textsuperscript{st} century C.E. D. J. Harington considers the time of Jesus to be the most
likely time for its composition.\textsuperscript{149} *L.A.B.* is dedicated to the history of Israel from Adam to David retelling some parts of the Biblical story.\textsuperscript{150}

*Life of Adam and Eve* is a pseudepigraphical work existing in Greek and in Latin (*Vita Adae et Evae*) versions.\textsuperscript{151} There are also Armenian, Georgian, and Slavonic versions of this book. Here, however, the analysis of this text will be well confined to the Greek and Latin ones.\textsuperscript{152} The *Life of Adam and Eve* is written in the form of a Midrash on some episodes of Genesis 1–5 concerning the life of Adam and Eve. Scholars try to date this book according to its relation to other Pseudepigrapha (such as *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *2 Enoch*), the Qumran literature, Josephus’ writings, early rabbinic traditions, Paul’s epistles, other early Christian writings, and even the Quran.\textsuperscript{153} The date of its composition is estimated from 100 B.C.E. to 200 C.E., most probably toward the end of the 1st century C.E.

*Joseph and Aseneth* is most likely a Jewish novel about the biblical story of the marriage between Joseph, the son of Jacob and Aseneth, the daughter of Potiphera, the priest of On (Gen 41:45).\textsuperscript{154} It is dated from 100 B.C.E. to 135 C.E. and perhaps contains some Christian interpolations.\textsuperscript{155}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[149] Its close relation to *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* may indicate the same period; see D. J. Harington, “Pseudo-Philo,” *OTP* 2:299–300.
\item[150] This book has been preserved in Latin and was transmitted along with the Latin translations of Philo’s texts, being ascribed to Philo. However, there are several objections to his authorship. First of all, at some points it contradicts the views of Philo. Again, the manner in which this book deals with the biblical text also points to a different author. Moreover, *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* was apparently written in Hebrew and could have been composed in Palestine. Indeed, it uses the Palestinian type of the biblical text and shows a good knowledge of Palestinian geography. It is interested in the issues of the Temple, the sacrifices, the covenant, eschatology, and angelology.
\item[151] The Greek version of the *Life of Adam and Eve* known as the *Apocalypse of Moses* is abbreviated as *L.A.E.* in the present study, and the Latin version as *Vita*.
\item[152] See the description of these versions, e.g., in Marinus de Jonge and Johannes Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).
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The *Psalms of Solomon* is a collection of poetic texts created by a group of pious eschatological Jews as a response to the capture of Jerusalem by the Romans.\(^{156}\) Although these psalms are attributed to king Solomon, they are considered to be the pseudepigraphical work of a devout author or authors, or even the redactors who shaped its final form. The book is usually dated from 63 to 30 B.C.E. or even to the early 1\(^{st}\) century C.E.\(^{157}\)

Pseudo-Phocylides is a pseudonymous Jewish work ascribed to an Ionic poet and author of proverbs Phocylides (the middle of the 6\(^{th}\) century B.C.E.), but indeed written sometime between 50 B.C.E. and 100 C.E. However, the Alexandrian provenance of Pseudo-Phocylides suggests the time of the emperors Augustus (30 B.C.E.– 14 C.E.) and Tiberius (14–37 B.C.E.) as a period of good relations between Jews and Greeks to be the most likely date of its writing.\(^{158}\) Its author is probably an Alexandrian Jew,\(^{159}\) who wrote his poem for the Gentiles not in order to convert them to Judaism, but to inform them about Jewish religion, values, and habits.\(^{160}\)

The 4\(^{th}\) Book of Maccabees is a Jewish text related to the content of 2 Macc 6–7, written as a philosophical discourse. It was composed outside of Palestine (probably in Alexandria, Antioch, or somewhere else in Asia Minor) by a Hellenistic Jew influenced by Greek philosophical thought with the use of many tools of Greek rhetoric such as metaphors, symbols, antitheses, climaxes, and apostrophes. The presumed date of the writing of 4 Maccabees is varied from 63 B.C.E. to 70 C.E.\(^{161}\)

---


\(^{159}\) Ibid., 567–568.


\(^{161}\) *Fourth Maccabees* was translated into Syriac early on and was included in the Peshitta as *ܦܪܐ ܕܐܪܒ ܣܒܝܐ ܘܐܡܗܘܢ ܥܐ ܕܥܠ ܡܩ* (“The Fourth Book of the Maccabees and Their Mother”).
The *Sibylline Oracles* is a large collection of eschatological predictive oracles of Jewish and Christian origin written in Greek hexameters and dated between the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C.E. and the 7\textsuperscript{th} century C.E. The 4\textsuperscript{th} Book of *Sibylline Oracles*, which is a subject of particular interest for the present research, is a Jewish work composed sometime in the Hellenistic period and then edited in the late 1\textsuperscript{st} century C.E.\textsuperscript{162}

The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is a collection of pseudepigraphical texts written as the final utterances of the twelve sons of Jacob and based on Jacob’s deathbed speech in Genesis 49. In their present form they can be regarded as a Christian work with Jewish origins. Several scholars date this book from 200 B.C.E. to 200 C.E. These Testaments received their present form in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century C.E. in certain Christian circles.\textsuperscript{163}

The *Testament of Abraham* is the pseudepigraphical text dating from the end of the 1\textsuperscript{st} to the beginning of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century C.E. Though it has Jewish origins this text was edited by Christian copyists who incorporated into it some Christian phraseology and doxology.\textsuperscript{164}

The 2\textsuperscript{nd} Apocalypse of Enoch (the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Book of Enoch) is a kind of midrash on the events of Gen 5:21–32 with several cosmological speculations, ethical instructions, and prophecies preserved only in Slavonic. The date of this book varies from the 1\textsuperscript{st} century B.C.E. to the late Middle Ages. It is difficult to define its character as Jewish or Christian since it bears some features of both of them. However, some resemblance with Qumran ideas and the absence of the

\textsuperscript{163} H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 85. See also, e.g., Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 315. In addition, the portions of the Aramaic Levi Document and the Hebrew Testament of Naphtali found in the Cairo synagogue genizah and in the Qumran caves have several parallels with the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. These parallels indicate that the author of this book could have used them either in Semitic form or in a Greek translation. There are also some other parallels between this book and ancient Jewish traditions and texts; see Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 314–315.
mention of the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem may indicate the early origin of 2 Enoch. It is not improbable, however, that this text is a syncretistic compilation of various Jewish, Greek, Egyptian, and Near Eastern ideas from the turn of the era.\textsuperscript{165}

The 3\textsuperscript{rd} Apocalypse of Baruch is a pseudepigraphical work preserved in Greek and Slavonic, which reports Baruch's heavenly journey to the five levels of the heavens. It is probably a Christian composition written sometime between the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries C.E., and which incorporates some Hellenistic Jewish and even pagan traditions.\textsuperscript{166} For this reason, the present research will refer to this text for the discussion of some important details.

In addition, the present research will treat some Qumran documents and the works of Philo of Alexandria and Flavius Josephus. The Qumran library is a repository of the works written not only by the Qumranites (e.g., 1QS, 1QH), but also those borrowed from other places and groups (e.g., 1 Enoch, the Book of Tobit, the Book of Sirach, Jubilees). This group existed for about two centuries beginning from about the middle of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C.E. and ending by 70 C.E.

Philo was a Jewish philosopher who lived between 20 B.C.E. – 50 C.E. in Alexandria and was a member of the largest Jewish community of the Diaspora.\textsuperscript{167} This Hellenistic Jewish thinker wrote in Greek and produced a number of philosophical and exegetical works. His views on the afterlife have a certain inconsistency (that also appears in his views on God, human, and the world), which is due to the influence of various philosophical systems (Neo-Pythagoreanism, Platonism, Stoicism, and Middle Platonism) as well as Jewish


exegetical traditions.\(^{168}\) However, it seems these different views do not contradict in the mind of this Jewish thinker.\(^{169}\)

Finally, Titus Flavius Josephus (Yosef ben Mattityahu; henceforth referred to as Josephus) was a Jewish historian, priest, and politician who lived ca. 37–100 C.E. He was the author of the most extensive volume of historical works on the Jews from the Persian to early Roman periods. He wrote in Greek for a Hellenistic non-Jewish audience, aiming to present Judaism as an ancient and respectable religion with high moral standards, comparable with those of the religions of other peoples. For instance, in case of the *Jewish War* his audience primarily was not Jewish, but Greek-speaking people in Rome. Only his secondary readers would have been Jews or Gentiles from around the Roman Empire.\(^{170}\)

**The Research Methodology and the Outline of This Study**

The research on the views of the afterlife in Luke-Acts on which this study is based combines a traditio-historical enquiry with textual analysis at a synchronic level. Elements of a source- and redaction-critical analysis will be used to discover various forms of afterlife existence, representations of the abode of the dead, and Luke’s eschatological issues in Luke-Acts. Then, as the traditional *Literarkritik* (e.g., source- and redaction-critical) methods have a limited use for the interpretation of Lucan views on the afterlife, a traditio-historical analysis of these issues in the context of Hellenistic pagan and Jewish sources will be given.

A brief word needs to be said about the method of this analysis. As Lehtipuu states in her study of the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, the extra-biblical parallels to the Lucan account of the afterlife do not explain the afterlife imagery they use.\(^{171}\) Moreover, it is hardly possible to demonstrate Luke’s literary or textual dependence on any particular Hellenistic text or tradition (apart from his use of the LXX). It is safer to speak about his

---


acquaintance with certain ideas, images, and beliefs that were widespread in his cultural environment. Then, as she argues, and the present research agrees with her argumentation, it is better to indicate the intertextual relations between Luke’s double work, and pagan and Jewish sources, as well as their linguistic, cultural, and sociological interaction. \(^{172}\) Lehtipuu, therefore, prefers to speak about “the wider Greco-Roman intertextual milieu” adopting the term “intertextual milieu” in the sense of the overall Hellenistic environment. \(^{173}\) This intertextuality “does not form a fixed or clearly defined category but refers to the complex and multiform set of beliefs that were current at the time.” \(^{174}\)

Further, as Richard Valantasis indicates, it is not sufficient to deal with intertextuality only on the literary level. In a broader sense, intertextuality can be comprehended as a cultural interaction including performances, concepts, images, and metaphors. \(^{175}\) Moreover, “intertextual investigation concerns itself with the effects of meaning that emerge from the references of a given text to the other texts.” \(^{176}\) In the present research, these meaning-making aspects of intertextual relations between Luke-Acts and Hellenistic sources will be investigated by means of the elements of cognitive linguistics, which deals with the cognitive processes and conceptual structures of human thinking. \(^{177}\) Specifically, the present research will scrutinize some metaphorical aspects of the conceptualization of afterlife issues, and will use the Cognitive Metaphor Theory (CMT) for analysis of the interaction between Lucan social and cultural issues and his afterlife language. Indeed, as George Lakoff and Mark Johnson put it, “The most fundamental values in a culture will be coherent with the

\(^{172}\) Ibid., 45–54.

\(^{173}\) Ibid., 46.


metaphorical structure of the most fundamental concepts in the culture.\textsuperscript{178} The afterlife is one of such fundamental concepts in the ancient Mediterranean culture to which Luke belonged. Therefore, CMT is a very productive tool for analyzing religious conceptual systems, which are for the most part structured metaphorically. It makes it possible to provide more profound results of the study of Luke’s afterlife language and conceptual system than the traditional critical methods can achieve. Thus, it will be especially helpful while addressing such issues as the following: why does Luke use resurrection language in the contexts of eschatological resurrection and individual resurrection on the one hand, and of the restoration of physical life on the other? Why is the resurrection in Luke 20:35–36 equated with angelic existence but the resurrection of Jesus is expressly corporeal? How can the spatial difference between Luke’s representations of the abode of the dead be accounted for? The essence of this method will be explained below (see p. 206).

The present research consists of three parts. Part 1 is dedicated to two issues: (1) eschatology and the afterlife (chapter 1), and (2) representations of the abode of the dead (chapter 2). In order to build a framework for Luke’s perception of the afterlife, chapter 1 will briefly discuss the basic points of eschatology (immediate, future and present, collective and individual eschatology) and the judgment (the final and postmortem judgment) in Luke’s cultural-religious milieu (both in pagan and Jewish sources) and in Luke-Acts. Chapter 2 will analyze the various representations of the abode of the dead in the ancient Mediterranean world and in Luke-Acts. Part 2 discusses several forms of afterlife existence (chapter 3 and 4). Chapter 3 will deal with several types of resurrection (individual and eschatological resurrection) and the restoration of physical life in Luke’s cultural-religious milieu of the ancient Mediterranean world and then, as they stand in Luke-Acts. Chapter 4 will analyze the immortality of the soul and the celestial (angelomorphic) existence in pagan and Jewish literature and will then explore how the elements of these forms of afterlife existence are present in Luke-Acts. Part 3 of the present research examines interrelations between the representations of the afterlife in Luke-Acts, and consists of one chapter (chapter 5). Thus, Chapter 5 will discuss the interrelations between various forms of afterlife existence, several

\textsuperscript{178} George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, \textit{Metaphors We Live By} (London, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980), 22.
representations of the abode of the dead, and the possible connections between these matters and the eschatological issues in Luke-Acts. It will use the results obtained in the previous chapters and apply the elements of cognitive linguistics. Finally, as a conclusion to the present research, an attempt will be made to answer the question about the possible reasons for the combination of seemingly incompatible views on the afterlife in Luke-Acts.

This investigation argues that Luke as a representative of his cultural-religious milieu inherits its common beliefs and traditions in all their diversity and incoherence and does not consider this variety and even discrepancy as a contradiction. In addition, Luke does not simply borrow or adopt the ideas, but makes new combinations of them for his own purposes and in his own context. The reason for his combinations is rooted in his religious conceptual system, which is predominantly metaphorical. Thus, Luke easily exploits resurrection language for resuscitation, individual resurrection, and eschatological resurrection, because metaphorical representations of resurrection indicate the process and result of revivification either to earthly life or to eternal life in general, which is the opposite of the process and result of dying and going to the underworld. These metaphorical extensions do not emphasize the corporeal character of resurrection. However, it can be recovered from the context or be specially emphasized.

Some elements of the language characteristic of the afterlife, namely the immortality of the soul and angelomorphic existence, which Luke uses in the context of resurrection, are incorporated in order to demonstrate the idea that the risen ones have eternal life and have a glorious and transformed state similar to that of celestial beings. Besides, the elements of the concept of immortality occur in the contexts, which describe more general ideas of the afterlife without direct reference to resurrection.

In addition, the spatial difference between the location of the righteous and that of the wicked in Luke's representation of the abode of the dead metaphorically marks the difference in their afterlife status. He uses the prototypical representations of the otherworld with their structural and orientational metaphorization, and creates a many-sided picture, which does not concentrate on the location of these places more than is needed for their metaphorical extensions.

Finally, Luke's view of repentance and salvation plays the main role in his understanding of the relation between collective and individual as well as
immediate, future, and present aspects of eschatology. For him, repentance brings salvation already in this earthly life and the destiny of the righteous and the wicked is assigned immediately after death with no possibility of change. This means that repentance and proper social behavior affect the afterlife. Therefore, those who do not repent in the face of the coming Kingdom of God, which brings divine salvation, will be punished in the underworld. Those who have repented and have become believers have already received salvation and have already been participating in eternal life. In Luke's view, these people are in some sense already resurrected or live if they were resurrected. This relation between repentance, social behavior, and afterlife in Luke-Acts explains why the issue of the fate of the individual is so important for Luke.
PART 1. ESCHATOLOGY AND THE ABODE OF THE DEAD

Chapter 1. Eschatology and the Afterlife

The proper understanding of Luke's way of presentation of the imagery of the otherworld (the abode of the dead) as well as the forms of afterlife existence is connected with his comprehension of eschatology. Eschatology is usually defined as beliefs about the last things or “beliefs about the fate of humanity beyond death in the final age” as they relate to the collective destiny of nations (national eschatology) and of the world (cosmic eschatology). In addition, the destiny of the individual apart from the end of time can be called individual eschatology.

Therefore the study of the basic points of Luke's eschatology and judgment has to be undertaken first. This chapter is concerned with these matters and will analyze Luke's views on the afterlife in the framework of his perception of the correlation between collective and individual eschatology as

---


181 Hogeterp, Expectations of the End, 3.

182 Some scholars see individual eschatology as a controversial term; e.g., Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba, 1; D. L. Petersen, “Eschatology (Old Testament),” ABD 2:576. Nevertheless, it still can be useful “as long as the individual and the collective dimensions are not artificially contrasted”; Hogeterp, Expectations of the End, 2. Sometimes general beliefs about the afterlife, judgment, and the resurrection are associated with individual eschatology; see David E. Aune, “Eschatology (Early Christian),” ABD 2:594. However, the present research considers individual eschatology as not directly related to the end of time. About the distinction between national, cosmic, and individual eschatology see, e.g., Paul Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1903), 1; U. Fischer, Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978), 3; Lester L. Grabbe, “Eschatology in Philo and Josephus,” in Judaism in Late Antiquity 4 (ed. Alan J. Avery-Peck and Jacob Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 163; Hogeterp, Expectations of the End, 2.
well as between final and postmortem judgment. This analysis will follow the traditio-historical overview of these issues in Luke’s cultural-religious milieu.

1.1 Pagan Eschatological Ideas

As Lehtipuu rightly indicates, the differentiation of fates is “the most obvious feature” in Luke’s parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus,\(^{183}\) and, as one can add, in Luke’s overall view on eschatology. Moreover, it is deeply rooted in his cultural environment.\(^{184}\) This section will analyze the possible impact of pagan eschatology on Luke’s environment.

In studies of Greco-Roman pagan sources the term “eschatology” usually refers only to the issue of the postmortem destiny of the individual regardless of the end of time,\(^ {185}\) i.e., to individual eschatology.\(^ {186}\) P. Bolt emphasizes a three-stage development of belief in the afterlife destiny in Greco-Roman pagan culture.\(^ {187}\) In the most ancient times the idea appeared that the souls of the dead are living as shadows in their tombs (the first stage). These souls would be made happy by the offerings of the living and made unhappy without them. In the Heroic age (the second stage) the dead were considered to dwell

---


\(^{184}\) Ibid., 163.

\(^{185}\) However, the Stoic idea of ἐκπύρωσις can be seen as an exception to this understanding of eschatology in the Greco-Roman pagan world (see p. 175). The roman poet Virgil (70–19 B.C.E.) also thought that after the completion of the circle of the wheel of time the pure souls would become a pure primordial flame of air (*Aen.* 6.744–747). Nevertheless, inattentiveness towards collective eschatology in pagan thought can be connected with the cyclical concept of time peculiar to Greco-Roman cosmology in contrast to the linear understanding of history in Jewish and early Christian beliefs. See Bultmann, *Geschichte und Eschatologie*, 13–23; Aune, “Eschatology (Early Christian),” 598–599; Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End*, 2.


collectively in Hades. At the third stage of development, starting approximately in the time of the philosophers, the more explicit concepts of the afterlife came into being: a greater differentiation of postmortem existence, democratization of a happier afterlife in the mystery cults, and an idea of astral immortality.

The consensus of modern scholarly analysis of views on the afterlife in Hellenistic culture is that pagan beliefs in the hereafter were never uniformly consistent. In the 1st century C.E. some people in Greco-Roman pagan society still adhered to the worldview of the Homeric epics, while others appreciated more philosophical ideas, or were virtually uninterested in the afterlife. Therefore different groups of people had different eschatological expectations. Nevertheless, since Luke takes seriously the idea of the differentiation of postmortem existence and retribution, it seems reasonable to focus on the pagan idea of retribution. In order to illustrate this idea, this section will take as an example Plutarch’s myth of the journey of Aridaeus, which represents an account of postmortem destiny almost contemporary with the time that Luke

---

188 For Homer (ca. 8th century B.C.E.), most of the souls are equal in death; they are barely conscious and live without either reward or punishment. On the other hand, they reflect their positions in their earthly life; Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, “Reading” Greek Death to the End of the Classical Period (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 67.

189 The earliest example of belief in a system of rewards and punishments in the otherworld is found in the Hymn to Demeter (7th century B.C.E.) declaring a better postmortem destiny for the initiates of the Eleusinian mysteries. Not everyone is punished in the realm of Hades; only those who fail to honor and propitiate Persephone will suffer every day forever (367–369). At the same time, those who perform secret rituals will be exempted from the common fate of humans after death. For them special flower-filled meadows are reserved in the afterlife (452–453). In addition, it is worthy of mention that for some thinkers the judgment and its torments were seen as simply allegorized psychological issues. See, e.g., the case of Lucretius in Bernstein, The Formation of Hell, 114.

190 For instance, according to Alan E. Bernstein, they were inconsistent already in the time of Homer; see, Ibid., 23, n.6.

191 In his satirical writings Lucian of Samosata gives a comic view of the realm of Hades, playing with some popular beliefs. For instance, in the Menippus Minos puts everybody to torture after death in proportion to his or her transgressions. The rich are stripped of all their glory, wealth, and power. However, the sufferings of the poor are less than those of the rich: they are allotted only half as much time in their tortures (Men. 12, 14).
was writing. However, as this account is rooted in earlier philosophical tradition, some important references to other texts also will be provided here.

Plutarch (ca. 46–120 C.E.), a Greek historian and thinker, was influenced by the ideas of Plato (428/7–348/7 B.C.E.), which were a clear expression of the belief in retribution after death found in philosophical circles.\textsuperscript{192} In \emph{De sera numinis vindicta} (\emph{Sera.} 563b–568a) Plutarch imitates Plato’s myth of Er,\textsuperscript{193} which is found at the end of the \emph{Republic} (\emph{Rep.} 10.614d–621d) and provides a detailed account of postmortem destiny in the myth of the journey of Aridaeus (also named Thespies) to the otherworld.\textsuperscript{194} To start with Plato first, he reports about a soldier named Er, the son of Armenias, killed in battle, whose body had not decayed ten days after his death. On the twelfth day after death, while lying on his funeral pyre, he revives and tells his friends what he had seen while in Hades. According to his story, after death the soul leaves the body and comes to a meadow (the meeting place), where the judges, who are not mentioned by name, send the souls of the unjust downward and those of the just upward (614 c–d).\textsuperscript{195} The souls return to the meeting place from above and from within the earth after a cycle of ten centuries in the afterlife. During each century the soul receives retribution for its earthly life, whether good or evil (615b). Every thousand years the souls are tested: those who have not been sufficiently purified have their skin flayed, while their flesh is lacerated with thorns. Afterwards they are drawn back to Tartarus. Among them there are the incurable such as Aridaeus and other despots, as well as those who do not have

\textsuperscript{192} As Bernstein puts it, the following important themes concerning afterlife and eschatology are prominent for Plato: “the soul is immortal; it is judged for the character it acquires during its life in the body; it can be rewarded or punished after death. The rewards of the blessed and punishment of the incurably wicked endure forever”; Bernstein, \emph{The Formation of Hell}, 58.


\textsuperscript{194} According to this text, Plutarch obtained this story from Aridaeus who had a near death experience and then recovered.

\textsuperscript{195} In \emph{Gorg.} 523c–d Plato depicts the reversal of the fates of the souls as follows: in earlier times the judges were deceived by the outward appearance of the wicked souls having been “dressed” in their beautiful bodies and wealth. These souls will be judged after death being without these splendid “clothes.”

53
any possibility of rebirth (615e, cf. Gorg. 525c–526c). Other people who are permitted to ascend from the underworld and its punishments rejoin the souls descending from the heavens at the meadow. The blessed souls can choose their new life, being completely free in their choice. For most souls their choice depends on the character of their former life: for instance, Orpheus chose a swan’s life because he was unwilling to have a woman conceiving and giving him birth since he hated women (620a–c). After the soul has made a choice, Lachesis, the daughter of Necessity (Ἀνάγκη) gives it the genius (δαίμων) leading it to drink from the River Lethe in order to obliterate all memory (620e).

Plutarch goes much further than Plato and provides many naturalistic details for the description of the torments of the wicked in the underworld. In some details however, Plutarch regards punishment after death as superior to that on earth. This is a reason for the delay of judgment in the earthly life of the wicked. Thespesius’ soul left his body and was guided by a dead kinsman (συγγενοῦς τινὸς; Sera. 564b) to a certain place in the air (ἀήρ; 564c). According to his vision, the souls of the dead rise to this place like fiery bubbles (πομφόλυγα φλογοειδῆ; 564a). Some of them mount up in a direct line, while others are turned round like spindles (ἄτρακτοι; 564a). Nobody can escape the

---

196 Much later, in his Aeneid Virgil, whose view of the underworld resembles Plato’s, also makes the concept of eternal punishment prominent; see Bernstein, The Formation of Hell, 68. This eternal punishment is not for all the people, but for such as Tityos and Theseus (Aen. 6. 595–618; cf. Od. 11. 576–600). Meanwhile, none can escape punishment for his/her deeds (6.608–614). The wicked go to Tartarus, while the righteous dead reach Elysium to enjoy singing, dancing, wrestling, feasting, and listening to Orpheus’ lyre (6.638–665).


198 In his Phaedo Plato emphasizes four categories of the dead: the pious or holy ones (114b–c), the neutral or average (113d), the curable wicked (113e–114b), and the incurable wicked (113e).


200 However, in his De superstitione Plutarch gives a very contradictory overview of the afterlife, ridiculing beliefs in eternal punishment in Hades (Superst. 167a). See a possible explanation of such a discrepancy in Plutarch’s views in Lehtipuu, The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, 95–96.

201 For the Roman thinker Cicero (106 B.C.E. – 43 B.C.E.), the souls of those who served their country, philosophers, and musicians are enjoying eternal life (Resp. 6.14–16, 18), but the souls of the wicked who gave themselves to earthly pleasures and violated the laws of
judgment presided over by Adrastia, the daughter of Jupiter and Necessity assisted by Poine, Dike, and Erinys. These three helpers rule over three sorts of punishment. The degree of punishment varies according to the severity of the crime and the punishment already received on earth. Poine treats those who receive bodily punishment in their life. This punishment affects the body, possessions, opinion, and senses (564e).

Then Dike punishes those wicked souls which require a greater labor, because they escaped purging or punishment in their earthly life. These souls arrive naked and Dike takes them to their ancestors to show how wicked they are. If their ancestors are wicked as well, their torments are more terrible because both see the sufferings and the shame that has gone before. The ancestors see how their younger generations suffer due to their crimes (565a–b). Thus, the wicked are penalized even in their offspring: both the malefactors and their descendants suffer together. The worst punishment is implied for the elders whose evil deeds have caused suffering for their children. Those who have managed to escape judgment on the earth will be punished after death. The descendants of the wicked are penalized in their descendants (516b). The punishment will be executed according to the severity of the crimes and their consequences.

Each passion is removed from the soul by pain and torment. The souls have different colors corresponding to different passions. The depth of the root of each passion is reflected in the intensity of the color. The souls are purified until they attain their native luster. However, if the image of the passions remains, a new punishment may take place. Those who return to their old passions are punished and are brought into the new bodies of beasts. Other souls, which are also addicted to their earthly desires and pleasures, are not reborn but suffer from their lack of satisfaction (565b–565e). For those who had already been punished on earth, only the irrational and passionate part of the soul is afflicted. Finally, Erinys (Fury) takes the incurable souls from Dike.

gods and humans are unable to ascend to heaven. They wander around the earth for many generations and then return to the stars (Resp. 6.29, cf. Tusc. 1.43–44, 72–73).

202 Plutarch borrows the names of Poine and Dike from Hesiod but changes their roles. Plutarch's Dike operated in a deeper level of Justice; Bernstein, The Formation of Hell, 78.
and puts them into an invisible abyss (τὸ ἄρρητον καὶ ἀόρατον; “Unspeakable and Unseen”) to be imprisoned there (564e–565a). 203

Thus, the refinement of souls between lives is described as a series of tortures. Plutarch gives three techniques resulting in the purification of a person: punishment in the afterlife, demotion of the soul into another body, 204 and denial of reincarnation until passion is spent. 205 In addition, he provides a very vivid picture of these torments in a manner that seems physical (567b–d).

To sum up, Greco-Roman pagan sources deal mostly with the individual type of eschatology. In the 1st century C.E. various groups within Greco-Roman pagan society held different views on eschatology, but such issues as a differentiation in postmortem existence, conjoined with ideas of judgment, the destiny of individuals after death according to their earthly deeds, the punishment of the souls of evildoers and the reward of the souls of the pious as well as the reversal of their fates after death, were very widespread in Greco-Roman pagan society.

1.2 Jewish Eschatological Ideas

Turning to Jewish views on eschatology, this section will explore this part of Luke’s intertextual milieu. It aims to demonstrate the function of the main eschatological scenarios in Jewish traditions of the 1st century C.E.

Already in the beliefs reflected in the Hebrew Bible, judgment is the prerogative of God, 206 but in the ancient period it was thought to take place during life on earth. Those who are committed to God’s covenant are granted a long and prosperous life (cf. Gen 25:8; Deut 28:1–14), while those who are disobedient to the Lord's law will be condemned and put to death (e.g., Deut 27:15–26; 28:15–68). The postmortem fate of individuals was not thought to depend on their earthly deeds. However, over the course of time, Jewish eschatological views, like pagan ones, were developed as beliefs in personal rewards and punishments. Moreover, in some Jewish texts (presumably from

203 However, it is unclear whether they are annihilated or not. See Bernstein, The Formation of Hell, 78.
204 Here the reincarnation is both a punishment and a means of purification.
205 Ibid., 82.
206 E.g., Deut 32:41; 1 Sam 2:10; Ps 1:5–6; 68:6; Isa 2:4; 3:13; Jer 11:20; Ezek 7:9; Dan 7:9–10; Hos 4:9; Mal 3:5.
about the turn of the era onwards) it is not only God who explicitly or implicitly appears as judge of the world but also the Messiah who will judge people at the last judgment. Meanwhile, as in the case of pagan sources, there was no unified Jewish belief in the differentiation of fates, postmortem judgment, and retribution. The sources we have at hand give us a very diverse range of beliefs.

In contrast to pagan eschatological ideas dealing mostly with the destiny of the individual, Jewish eschatology treats both collective and individual destiny. Collective eschatology is a widespread matter in many Jewish texts especially in the apocalyptic literature and is closely connected with the final judgment expected at the end of time. The final judgment represents the act of divine justice applied to the righteous and the wicked of the people of Israel or even to all the nations (4 Ezra 7:37; 2 Bar. 72:2–6; T. Ben. 10:8–9; Wis 3:8). On the other hand, the issue of individual eschatology, which is connected with the

207 In 1 En. 38:2–3 the judgment will start with the coming of the Righteous One, also called the Chosen One (e.g., 39:6; 40:5; 45:3–4), the Son of Man (e.g., 69:26; cf. 46:1–2), and the Messiah (48:10). He was hidden before the creation of the world (48:3, 6) in order to appear at the end of time and to save and vindicate the righteous (48:7). At the day of judgment the Lord of the Spirits will seat him upon the throne of glory to judge the fallen angels (61:8) and the kings along with the mighty (62:2–3). He will operate as a strict judge of the sinners (44:3; 49:4), and drive them from the face of the earth (38:1; 41:2, cf. 44:6). In T. Ben. 10:6–10 the Lord will judge Israel concerning their iniquity against him and disbelief in the Messiah, and then all the nations (10:8–9). However, this feature is probably due to Christian influence on this text; Casey D. Elledge, “The Resurrection Passages in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in Resurrection: the Origin and Future of a Biblical Doctrine (London: T & T Clark, 2006), 87. Then, although the Messiah does not appear as judge in 2 Baruch, his return in glory becomes a catalyst of the collective resurrection. The Messiah’s coming follows the twelve disasters (2 Bar. 27:1–15; 29:3). After his earthly reign marked by wellbeing and peace he will return to heaven in glory (31:1) and this return marks the beginning of the general resurrection. In addition to this judicial role of the Messiah in some Jewish texts, in the Apocalypse of Abraham Abel appears as a preliminary judge of the dead. However, the final judgment belongs to God (T. Ab. 13:2–8).


209 The origins of the belief in the final judgment may be traced to the notion of the Day of the Lord as the gloomy day of judgment and punishment for the wicked in the writings of the prophets of the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Amos 5:18, 20; Obad 1:15; Joel 1:15; 2:11; Zeph 1:7; Zech 14:1).
postmortem (and often preliminary) judgment taking place immediately after death, also appears in some Jewish texts. For instance, in the Book of Watchers both the dead are gathered in the separate places until the end of the time and appear to have already undergone preliminary judgment: the righteous are granted light and water (1 En. 22:9; cf. Ps 36:10), while the wicked suffer from scourges and torments (22:10). Then at the end of time they will receive their final verdict (22:4). At the same time, some other Jewish texts are not interested in the final judgment at all and concentrate only on the individual's postmortem destiny. For instance, 2 Maccabees and 4 Maccabees are concerned with the problem of theodicy and the destiny of the martyrs rather than with the question of judgment.²¹¹

In addition, some Jewish religious groups, such as the Qumran community, adhered to so-called present or realized eschatology that transfers the differentiation of fates and retribution from the immediate (postmortem) or future aspect to the present. For instance, at Qumran the glorification of the righteous and their association with angels was believed to be realized already in the present life. A detailed analysis of this issue will follow below (see p. 192-195).

A good illustration of Jewish eschatological views with clear acceptance of the idea of postmortem judgment and retribution is found in the 4th Book of Ezra. This text was written close to the time of Luke and reflects an interesting combination of both collective and individual eschatology. Together with 2 Baruch it continues the earlier ideas found in the Enochic tradition, speaking about both preliminary and final judgment as well as about an intermediate state between death and resurrection (cf. 1 Enoch 22).²¹² In contrast to 1 Enoch, however, 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch attempt to harmonize the earlier views and incorporate them into a single eschatological scenario.

²¹⁰ The details of the location of the wicked and the righteous in 1 Enoch 22 will be discussed below (see p. 89 below).

²¹¹ The issue of the judgment is also absent in Joseph and Aseneth, which does not treat the question of universal eschatology and the last judgment with its rewards and punishments for the righteous and the wicked. This book deals with the individual afterlife in close connection with the question of conversion to Judaism. The writings of Philo of Alexandria and Flavius Josephus, who discuss the problems of the afterlife without reference to eschatology, are also silent about the final judgment.

Fourth Ezra provides a long account of postmortem destiny in chapter 7, which belongs to Ezra’s third vision (6:35–9:25), in the context of his inquiry to the angel Uriel about the problem of reconciling God’s mercy with the destruction of the wicked.\(^{213}\) According to 7:70, God established judgment from the very beginning of this world. The question of individual eschatology arises in 7:75: Ezra directly addresses to God the question whether an individual will be at rest after death until the end of time or will be tormented. According to God’s answer, the soul is separated from the body after death (7:78) and goes to God the Most High (cf. Eccl 12:7).\(^{214}\) Then the soul is judged and goes either to be wandering in torment or to be in the habitations (*inhabitationes*) or storehouses reserved for the souls of the righteous (7:79–98).\(^{215}\) After this preliminary judgment and separation the souls experience their future punishments and rewards, which are displayed for seven days (7:101). Thus, the wicked are grieving in seven ways, because (1) they scorned the Law; (2) they cannot repent; (3) they see the reward of the righteous; (4) they consider the torment that will be laid up for them in the last days; (5) they see the habitations of the righteous being protected by angels; (6) they see how some of them will go into torments; (7) they will waste away in confusion and be consumed with shame and tremble on seeing the glory of God (7:79–87). Meanwhile, the souls of the righteous receive their reward and can see the glory of God. They are at rest in seven orders (*ordines*) because: (1) they have striven


\(^{214}\) The appearance before God’s glory initiates the process of the preliminary judgment. See Michael Edward Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 240.

\(^{215}\) In the Book of Watchers both categories of the dead gathered in the separate places until the end of the time appear to have already undergone preliminary judgment: the righteous are granted light and water (*1 En. 22:9*; cf. Ps 36:10), while the wicked suffer from scourges and torments (*22:10*). Then at the end of time they will receive their final verdict (*22:4*). In *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* the destinies of the wicked and the righteous are also different already in their intermediate state. The souls of the wicked are in the place of darkness and destruction “in the inextinguishable fire forever” (*63:4*), where they will melt away until the end of time and the renewing of the earth (*16:3*), while the souls of the righteous are put into the storehouses to be in peace until the end of time (*23:13; 32:13*, cf. *4 Ezra* 7:32, 78–101; *2 Bar. 30:2*). They are sleeping there, waiting for the time when they will be freed (cf. 51:5).
to overcome evil thoughts; (2) they see the perplexity of the wandering souls of
the wicked and their future punishment; (3) they see the witness of God that
they obeyed the Law; (4) they understand the rest they enjoy after death, being
gathered into their storehouses and protected by the angels, and the glory
which awaits them in the last days; (5) they rejoice that they have escaped
corruption and will inherit future life and immortality; (6) they are shown how
their faces will shine like the sun and how they will be made like the light of the
stars and become incorruptible;216 (7) they will rejoice to behold the face of God
without any confusion or fear (7:88–98). After seven days the souls return to
their appointed places until the end of time. Thus, the preliminary postmortem
judgment serves as a prelude to the final one.

Further, a Messianic age will immediately precede the end of time (7:28–29).
After it the time of the final judgment will come (7:31). The day of judgment
is perceived as the end of this age and this world and also as the beginning of a
future age of immortality (initium futuri immortalis temporis; 4 Ezra 7:113).217 The
dead will be raised to stand before God at the judgment (7:32–33). Their deeds
will witness for or against people. The righteous will be justified not only
because of their righteous deeds (7:77; 8:33, cf. Pss. Sol. 15:10; Rev 14:13), but also
on account of their faith in God (9:7; 13:23). However, they will not be able to
intercede for the wicked as they could before the day of judgment (7:102–115).218
Those who are found guilty will be put into the fire of Gehenna and the
torments of the pit (cf. 1 En. 22:10),219 while those who are justified will be given
an eternal life of delight and rest (7:36–38).

As is seen from this account, the fates of the righteous and the wicked are
reversed after their judgment, either postmortem or final: while the latter have
prosperity and power in their earthly life, after death they are punished and
destroyed, whereas the suffering and oppressed righteous are rewarded and

216 Cf. 7:125.
217ܬܢܘܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܬܝܕ ܗ (“the beginning of the world to come which is
without death”) in the Syriac version of 7:113.
218 Cf. 2 Bar. 42:7–8; 85:9; L.A.B. 33:5.
219 In some other Jewish texts, the sinners are thought not only to suffer for their
wickedness but even to be destroyed (cf. 1 En. 56:8; 81:8; 2 Bar. 85:13, 15, cf. 51:5–6; T. Zeb. 10:3;
T. Jud. 25:3; Pss. Sol. 15:10).
Such a reversal can be very unexpected and amazing for the oppressors: the wicked in 4 Ezra 9:9–12 complain and regret that it is too late for repentance (cf. 1 En. 63:1–7). Moreover, the reversal of fate is final and there is no way to change it after death (4 Ezra 9:9–12; T. Ab. A 10:14). This issue explicitly or implicitly occurs in many other Jewish texts.

Thus, there are two basic types of judgment in Jewish literature: the eschatological judgment at the end of time and the preliminary judgment after death carried out by God or by a divine agent. In addition, some traditions claim that some eschatological features can be experienced already in the present. Some texts deal with both the preliminary and the final judgments, while others are limited to depict only one, either at death or at some remote future point. Such books as 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch try to present a certain harmonized picture and put together both individual and collective eschatological scenarios. In 4 Ezra the preliminary judgment anticipates the final one and appears as its prelude.

Further, the fates of the different categories of people will be reversed after death. The wicked who were prosperous, powerful, and rich, will be punished and humiliated (sometimes unexpectedly for them); the oppressed righteous will be rewarded and exalted. In spite of some differences in nuance, the common motif in the stories about the reversal of the fates is that the injustice and the inequality of this world will be recompensed after the judgment in the new age. This reversal is final and cannot be changed after death.

---


221 E.g., 1 En. 62:9–16; 96:1–3; 94:8–10; 103:1–8; 104:2–6; 2 Bar. 15:8; T. Jud. 25:4. Sometimes the wicked are depicted as the rich, kings, rulers, or landlords (cf., e.g., 1 En. 62:1; 94:8; 96:4–5; 97:8–10). This motif occurs already in the writings of the prophets, which identify the wicked with the rich oppressing the poor (e.g., Isa 5:14; 10:3; Amos 3:10; 5:11–12), and in other parts of the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Prov 11:28; 22:16, 22–23; Ps 102, 14–15; 37:14; 82:2–4; 94:3–6). Conversely, the righteous oppressed by the wicked rulers are sometimes called the poor or the lowly ones (1 En. 96:5), who will be vindicated, exalted (1 En. 61:14; 104:2–6; cf. Isa 41:17; Amos 4:1; 8:4–6), and even given riches (T. Jud. 25:4).
1.3 The Eschatology of Luke-Acts

After the above overview of the cultural environment of Luke’s eschatological ideas and their relation to the hereafter, the present research moves on to the analysis of Luke’s views. Just as Jewish sources deal with collective and/or individual eschatological beliefs, so Luke-Acts also treats both these types of eschatology. First, this section will examine Lucan passages reflecting collective eschatology and then those that concern the fate of the individual. In addition, it will discuss how Luke deals with temporal aspects of his eschatology, and whether he treats it only as immediate (related to the fate of individual) and future eschatology, or also as present (realized) eschatology.


Lucan views on collective eschatology and the final judgment occur in several passages of his gospel, mostly passages derived from Q. Thus, Luke 3:9 retains the eschatological tradition taken from Q about the imminent end of this world in the message of John the Baptist. In this verse those whose deeds are accounted as evil will be judged at the end of the world and will be committed to the fire. Further, in Luke 10:9–15, the seventy apostles have to go to preach in Palestinian cities with the greeting and warning about the nearness of the Kingdom of God. Those who do not accept this message and not repent in the face of the coming Kingdom will be punished in Hades. The Queen of the South and the people of Nineveh will be justified at the final judgment, while the Jewish people “of this generation” will be condemned because they have not repented at Jesus’ preaching (Luke 11:29–32). All the righteous from Abel to Zechariah will give evidence at the judgment against the impenitent contemporaries of Jesus (11:50–52). The parables of the Thief at Night and the Waiting Servants (Luke 12:39–40, 42–46) tell about the end which may come at any moment. Those who are not ready for it will be punished. The same thought is seen in Luke 17:23–37.

---

The issue of the last judgment is more prominent in Luke 13:22–30, in which Luke uses material taken from his various sources and shapes his own composition according to his purposes. The evildoers (πάντες ἐργάται ἀδικίας) who remain unrepentant will be rejected and excluded from the Kingdom (13:25–27). Luke 13:25–29 represents the scene of the judgment. The figure of the master of the house (οἰκοδεσπότης) appears as the judge pronouncing sentence on those excluded from the Kingdom. Their address, κύριε, ἄνοιξον ἡμῖν resembles Matt 25:11 κύριε κύριε, ἄνοιξον ἡμῖν in the parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins. This passage stands apart from the common scholarly view that Luke does not accentuate the judicial role of Jesus in his writings. Indeed, it seems that in his gospel Luke avoids referring to the enthronement of the Son of Man and his participation in the eschatological judgment as the judge of the world, either in the passages about the Son of Man derived from Q, or in those from his other sources. In Acts 10:42 and 17:31 Jesus appears only as the appointed judge through whom God will judge the world. However, while in Luke 13:25 the identification of the master of the house is uncertain, in 13:26 Luke specifies him as Jesus: the outsiders appeal to him as his contemporaries.

---


224 These words were probably adapted from the LXX version of Ps 6:9: ἀπόστητε ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ, πάντες οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν (“go away from me, all you who do iniquity”).

225 Some manuscripts of Luke have the repetition of the vocative (e.g., A, D, W, Θ, Ψ), but this could be due to assimilation with Matt 25:11. Luke also uses the pair οἰκοδεσπότης-κύριος in contrast to βασιλεὺς in Matthew’s version of this parable (14:15–24) in contrast to βασιλεὺς in Matthew’s version of this parable (Matt 22:1–14).


228 Cf., e.g., Acts 17:31: ἐν ἀνδρὶ δὲ ὄρισεν... ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

The master’s words ἀπόστητε ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ πάντες ἑργάται ἁδικίας (“go away from me, all you evildoers”; 13:27) serve as a sentence upon evildoers. As their punishment they will be thrown into the place of “weeping” (κλαυθμός) and “gnashing of the teeth” (ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων; 13:28a). These people will be angry at seeing Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob along with all the prophets sitting inside or being “in the Kingdom of God” (ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ), while they themselves are thrown out (13:28b). The righteous will be gathered together into this Kingdom like the scattered people of Israel from the entire world (Is 43:5–6; 49:12). Moreover, entry to the banquet is also open to those who have accepted Jesus’ message, repented, and turned from evildoing. This group may include those Jewish people who responded to Jesus’ preaching, the outsiders of Jewish society, and the Gentiles who accepted Jesus. All three groups of the righteous (the patriarchs, prophets, and the followers of Jesus) will be granted their reward: they “will recline in the Kingdom of God” (ἀνακλιθήσονται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ; 13:29).

Further, in Luke 18:1–8, belonging to Lucan material Jesus speaks about the vindication of God’s chosen ones at his second coming. Here, Luke does not give such an extensive account of those who belongs to this group but as is seen from the context of this passage they are the followers of Jesus.

In Luke 22:30b, which appears in the context of the Last Supper as the conclusion of the dispute about precedence among the disciples and the reward of discipleship (22:24–30), Jesus speaks about the disciples’ participation in the eschatological banquet in the Kingdom of God and their role in the last judgment. Luke 22:28–30 is treated as derived from Q, being partly parallel to Matt 19:28 with the closest connection between Luke 22:30b

---


231 This verse can be also seen as a polemic against Jewish understanding of Isa 60:21 as referring to the good lot in the world to come for each Israelite (cf. the prologue to m. Ḥabot). For Luke, a collective reward for Jesus’ contemporaries is ruled out.

232 As Matt 8:11b uses the same form of ἀνακλίνω, it may belong to Q. Nevertheless, Luke uses this verb in the sense of table fellowship in Luke 14:15.

In 22:30b the disciples are promised that they will be sitting on thrones and sharing the judicial functions of the Son of Man (cf. Dan 7:9, 10, 27). The disciples, therefore, in sharing in Jesus' kingly rule, will function as his assistants at his royal court or probably even as the judges of historical Israel who persecuted them.

Luke 21:32–33 (derived from the Marcan Vorlage; cf. Mark 13:30–31) and then 21:34–36 (probably produced by Luke) also depict the sudden end of the world and Jesus' second coming, which will inaugurate the beginning of the last judgment. Moreover, Luke 21:32 (cf. Mark 13:30) retains Jesus' words that the events predicted in this chapter will happen while the generation of the apostles is still alive.

As is seen from the passages discussed above, on the whole, Luke seems to be in line with the main points of the earlier Christian tradition and Jewish beliefs about the last judgment: at the end of time after Jesus' second coming both the righteous and the wicked will stand before God who will judge them according to their earthly deeds. The former will be rewarded with eternal life, while the latter will be punished and will suffer from torment by fire.

---

239Acts 24:15 (cf. 23:8) dealing with the traditional Jewish representations of the general resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked also implies the issue of collective eschatology and the final judgment.
240On the other hand, Lucan collective eschatology is rather different from the previous tradition, first of all, in the matter of the issue of the delay of the parousia. This subject was thoroughly studied by Hans Conzelmann who has stated that Luke attempted to answer the crisis brought about by the delay of the parousia by editing the sources he had...

As Dupont indicates in his article on the afterlife in Luke-Acts, Luke deals not only with collective eschatology but also with the individual's postmortem destiny. It means that in certain passages which speak about the individual's afterlife, Luke continues to hold the traditional eschatological terminology, but interprets it in a new, "individual" way, adopting so-called "individual eschatology" with the judgment explicitly or implicitly taking place immediately after one's death. Dupont regards it as adopted from the Hellenistic pagan beliefs with which Luke was acquainted. Indeed, as has been shown above (see p. 51), this is the main way in which Greco-Roman paganism perceived the individual's postmortem destiny. However, such a representation of the individual's afterlife is not unknown for some strands of Jewish tradition (see p. 57).

This issue occurs in several Lucan passages. The parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19–31), which as Lehtipuu demonstrates, in its written form "must be attributed to Luke himself," speaks about the post-mortem at hand in such a way that the expectation of the imminent end of this world was replaced by a so-called Heilsgeschichte with three periods of the history of the world: the time of the Old Testament (the time of preparation), the time of Jesus, and the time of the Church. This salvation history scheme thus introduced by Luke places the end in an indefinite future. Some indications of the nearness of the parousia still exist in Luke's double work, but they are not much more than traces of certain earlier traditions preserved in his writings, not his own view; see Hans Conzelmann, Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953), 87–127. However, Conzelmann's thesis was not accepted unanimously among scholars. After all, there is anything but a scholarly consensus about eschatology in Luke-Acts. See the discussion in François Bovon, Luc le théologien. Vingt-cinq ans de recherches (1950–1975) (Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1978); François Bovon, Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years of Research (1950–2005) (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University, 2005), 1–87. In addition, as has been shown above, in his study of eschatology and afterlife in Luke-Acts Mattill offers the two epoch scheme for Luke-Acts; Mattill, Luke and the Last Things: a Perspective for the Understanding of Lukan Thought, 13–25 (see n. 35 above).

242 Ibid., 21.
243 For instance, Dupont mentions the parallels with 1 Enoch; ibid., 21.
244 As Lehtipuu shows, the New Testament documents were written in a predominantly oral culture characterized by its variability and creativity; see the discussion
destiny of two individuals, the unnamed rich man and the poor man called Lazarus. According to this parable, they had very different fates in this world: Lazarus was lying at the gates of the rich man's house (16:20), while the latter wallowed in luxury and spent his lifetime in revelry. All these issues symbolize the vast social and economic gulf between them. Lazarus, who during his earthly life had suffered from hunger and thirst, after his death is taken by the angels and carried off to Abraham's bosom, while the rich man after his death is buried and goes to Hades (ᾅδης; 16:22–23).

The location of Lazarus' resting place is far from clear. A detailed discussion of Abraham's bosom will follow (see p. 110, 232), but as Jeremias in Lehtipuu, *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*, 22–29. It is hardly possible to extract the oral source standing behind Luke's text. If it were an oral tradition behind the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, that story was not in a fixed form and Luke did not slavishly repeat it. He could reformulate and reshape it using his own words; ibid., 27. Criticizing the scholars who exaggerate the influence of Egyptian and Jewish motifs on Luke's story (The Demotic Egyptian folktale about Setne Khamwas, the high priest of Ptah at Memphis and his son Si-Osire, and several rabbinical stories, e.g., that telling about two rabbis and a tax-collector Bar-Ma'yan), Lehtipuu agrees and develops R. Bauckham's point about the absence of any direct dependence of Luke 16:19–31 on either Egyptian or Jewish accounts expressed in his "Rich Man and Lazarus;" Lehtipuu, *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*, 34–35. After all, since there were many other stories on a similar theme in the ancient Mediterranean area and the Near East, Luke could have used this popular and well-known theme of the reversal of destiny after death rather than any particular tale.

245 Λάζαρος, the name of the needy man (16:20) is a Greek version of Hebrew לַﬠְזָר, which is a shortened form of אלָﬠזָר ("God helps" or "God has helped"). Some scholars argue that Lazarus' name implies that he put all his trust in God. On the other hand, Luke's Greek-speaking audience could not understand this implied idea without some explicit clarification. Luke, however, does not explain the importance of the etymology of the needy man's name. See the discussion on this subject in Lehtipuu, *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*, 164.

246 Moreover, while the rich man had a funeral (16:22), it is not clear from the text whether Lazarus is buried or not. For instance, Fitzmyer argues that Lazarus is given no burial; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 2:1132. Jeremias supposes that the funeral of the rich man would have been magnificent; Joahim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (2d rev. ed; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972), 184.

247 David B. Gowler, "'At His Gate Lay a Poor Man': A Dialogic reading of Luke 16:19–31," *PRSt* 32, no. 3 (2005), 256.
suggests, Lazarus occupies an exalted and very honorable place at the assembly of the righteous. The rich man representing an unrepentant sinner receives his punishment, being in torment in Hades immediately after death (16:23). Lazarus also receives his good fate immediately after his departure. Thus, in the afterlife their postmortem fates are also dissimilar: they are situated in different parts of the otherworld, divided by a great chasm (χάσμα μέγα, 16:26), which symbolizes a postmortem separation of the righteous from the wicked taking place immediately after death as well as the finality of the reversal of their fates (16:25–26).

---

248 Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, 184. Luke-Acts demonstrates a special interest in and sympathy for the poor and needy. They represent the type of the true righteous ones (cf. Luke 6:20b–21) and will receive the eschatological rewards and relief from their sufferings and troubles (cf., e.g., Luke 1:52–53; 4:18; 6:20–21; 14:13, 21; 18:22; 19:8). It is a common scholarly opinion, reflected in a number of studies, that in Luke 16:19–31 Lazarus is one of these marginal people, who are the subject of God’s special care and protection. See the list of the most important works in Lehtipuu, The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, 165.

249 Abraham refuses the rich man’s request to send a messenger from the otherworld to his family because his brothers do not listen to the law and the prophets (16:30–31). For Luke they are those who remain unrepentant, not obeying the command of the Law to use one’s possessions in a proper way. This parable is addressed not only against the Pharisees as the “lovers of money,” but also against those Jewish people who, while pretending to be faithful to the Law, remained unrepentant after hearing Jesus’ message. They broke the Law, not having shared their wealth with the poor in contrast, for example, to the tax collector in 18:9–14. The parable, therefore, demonstrates that such people remain unrepentant even after Jesus’ resurrection. See Nolland, Luke 9:21–18:34, 831.

250 The motif of the reversal of the fates of the persecutors and of the oppressors, the rich and the poor, the mighty and the lowly is prominent in Luke and often has an eschatological context; Lehtipuu, The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, 171. In addition to Luke 16:19–31, it can be found in the parables of the Two Debtors (7:41–43), of the Good Samaritan (10:30–37), of the Rich Fool (12:16–21), of the Prodigal Son (15:11–32), of the Unjust Steward (16:1–8), and of the Pharisee and the Tax-Collector (18:10–14). In addition, the theme of reversal also occurs in the Magnificat (1:52–53), and in the collection of Beatitudes and Woes (6:20–26). See the discussion of these issues in ibid., 28 n., 86, 87; 171. It can be also traced in 13:22–30 discussed above (the Jews pretending to be pious and the outsiders), 22:28–38 (the apostles sharing in Jesus’ trials and his glory participating in the eschatological banquet), and 23:40–43 (the immediate reversal of the fate of the criminal after his repentance).

251 Greek ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις (“besides all this”; cf. 24:21) in the beginning of this verse probably also indicates the finality of the reversal (Nolland, Luke 9:21–18:34, 828).
Although there is no explicit description of a postmortem judgment after death in this story, both the righteous (in this particular case, the needy) and the wicked (in this parable, the rich who do not want to share their wealth) receive their lot in the otherworld.\(^{252}\) Moreover, there is neither any indication of the final judgment nor any change of their fates or the places they occupy in the otherworld. Therefore, the righteous receive the rewards for their suffering during their earthly life immediately after death, while the wicked receive their punishments in a similar way. Besides, as Lehtipuu argues, the very fact that Lazarus can be sent to this world as a messenger (Luke 16:27–28), indicates that the otherworldly rewards and punishments must take place contemporaneously with life in this world.\(^{253}\) Thus, in this parable the good or bad fate is final and cannot be changed.\(^{254}\) This fate is experienced immediately after death without undergoing any temporary state between death and the final destiny.\(^{255}\) Although Luke 16:19–31 has some parallels with \textit{1 Enoch} 22, it is worth indicating, referring to Lehtipuu's analysis, that while this passage from \textit{1 Enoch} deals with a two-stage judgment (see p. 18), Luke's parable does not.\(^{256}\)

One also encounters the idea of punishment and reward being given to the individual immediately after death in Luke 23:39–43. This passage is unique to Luke, though corresponding to Mark's remark about Jesus reviled by two criminals crucified with him (Mark 15:32b). It may be inspired by this remark.\(^{257}\) After his repentance on the cross the criminal is promised that he will reach the blessed reality of paradise immediately (\(\text{σήμερον} \)[“today”]) and together with Jesus. Luke uses \(\text{σήμερον}\) earlier in the Gospel (cf. 2:11; 4:21; 5:26; 19:9) as a technical term indicating that the messianic salvation is already present in this world.\(^{258}\) Therefore, even during the time of mockery and his own death, Jesus

\(^{252}\) I agree with Lehtipuu that the judgment is implied in this parable. This fact is indicated in the account of the different destinies of Lazarus and the rich man. See Lehtipuu, \textit{The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus}, 210, n. 70.

\(^{253}\) Ibid., 186.

\(^{254}\) Ibid., 211.

\(^{255}\) Ibid., 187.

\(^{256}\) Ibid., 129–137.


brings salvation to the repentant person.  

“Today” is the day of the “messianic salvation inaugurated” by Jesus’ death.  

There is no need for the criminal to wait for the final judgment and the parousia. Besides, Jesus can be implicitly seen in this passage as a judge passing judgment on the criminal and bringing an acquittal for him without mentioning the last judgment at the end of the world. Here postmortem judgment is taken for granted as a step toward the afterlife. Salvation comes to the criminal immediately and he is regarded as righteous immediately after his repentance.

Further, the idea of individual eschatology with a postmortem judgment is also found in the Book of Acts. According to the prayer of the apostles about the replacement of Judas in 1:24–25, the new candidate who will be chosen for the place that had been occupied by Judas, should take “the place of this apostolic ministry” (τὸν τόπον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης καὶ ἀποστολῆς), because Judas “turned aside” (παρέβη) due to his transgression and apostasy. The choice of Judas' successor (1:15–26) takes place in Jerusalem after the ascension of Jesus (1:6–11) in the context of the congregation’s concern about the empty place left in the community of the Twelve after Judas' death. Judas’ fall

---


262 In Luke 12:20 the expression “this very night” can also imply the immediate judgment over the rich fool.


265 While in the tradition used in Matt 27:3–10 Judas repented and returned the money he had been paid for his betrayal, though he still went and hanged himself, Luke gives no information about his repentance. According to the tradition Luke uses in Acts 1:18, Judas invested the money he had received for the betrayal of Jesus in a piece of land. See the survey of the early Christian traditions about Judas, e.g., in Zwiep, *Judas and the Choice of Matthias*, 110–122.
resulted in his going “to his own place” (πορευθῆναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον). Thus, his transgression led him to ruin. “His own place” may serve as a metaphorical representation of death and postmortem fate. For Luke, Judas deserved a bad fate for his apostasy and betrayal of Jesus. Therefore Judas, by remaining unrepentant after his betrayal, apparently had already received his lot in the otherworld that was expected to happen immediately after his death (see p. 97).

There are some other passages in the Lucan writings that are often regarded as pointing to individual eschatology: Luke 12:16–21 (the parable of the Rich Fool), 16:1–8 (the parable of the Unjust Steward), and Acts 14:22 (Paul’s encouragement of the disciples in Antioch about many hardships before entering the Kingdom of God). However, it is unclear whether they speak about the final destiny or just about a certain intermediate state before the final judgment.

An interesting proposal for a seemingly possible explanation of the idea of individual eschatology in Luke-Acts is offered by Lehtipuu. Lucan eschatology might be connected to his view on salvation. Indeed, in contrast to Paul (e.g., Rom 5:9-10), for whom salvation is an eschatological gift, for Luke, it is already available through the preaching of Jesus and the apostles, it exists “now” (σήμερον; cf. Luke 1:71, 77; 19:9; Acts 4:12; 13:26, 47; 16:17). Then, the scheme might be as follows: those who entered the Christian community through repentance anticipate (or have already even received) salvation, the signs of which are

---


already present and will continue in the age to come. However, as the Christians continue to die physically, it is important for Luke to show that life continues after death and those who have died have already undergone judgment and have received their lot in the afterlife. Those who are still alive would be judged in the near future when the parousia comes. For the latter it would be not the individual judgment that has already taken place for the former, but only a collective final judgment. Indeed, the issue of individual eschatology might have served as the answer to the question of the early Christian communities when some members began to die (cf. 1 Thess 4:13–17), and the living wished to know what happens to the dead and to those who are still alive. As Barrett suggests, Luke would have this issue in mind and regard the death of the individual as “an ἔσχατον (though not the ἔσχατον)” and think of it in the eschatological context. If this suggestion were correct, the individual would have his individual eschatology parallel to that which would happen at the last day.

However, as Lehtipuu clearly demonstrates, disproving her own suggestion, this explanation does not cover the whole range of passages about afterlife and judgment found in Luke-Acts. For instance, Luke 10:14; 11:31–32, derived from Q, speak about those who died long ago (the queen of the South, the citizens of Nineveh), but will nevertheless be judged along with the generation of the time of Jesus. Lehtipuu comes to the conclusion that Luke does not aim at constructing a consistent eschatological doctrine, but rather strives for more practical and pastoral aims, such as the message about the relevance of repentance. Indeed, the Galilean cities will be condemned if they do not repent (Luke 11:31–32), and so will be the Pharisees if they do not repent (16:19–31).

---

272 John Drury indicates that the crisis of the individual (death appears as such a crisis in Luke’s parables dealing with individual eschatology) is not a crisis or the end of the world. See John Drury, The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory (Cambridge: SCM Press, 1985), 112–113.
275 Ibid., 264, 303.
276 The theme of repentance occurs in the passages that deal with the afterlife in Luke.
Further, the question of individual eschatology in Luke-Acts is also connected with the postmortem destiny of the martyr who receives a special treatment in the afterlife different from that of ordinary people. Indeed, Jesus enters paradise as a righteous martyr along with the repentant criminal without being in Hades (Luke 23:42–43). The particular features of the destiny of the martyr in Luke-Acts can be explored in the story of the martyrdom of Stephen (Acts 6:8–7:60). This passage narrates the conflict between Stephen and the Jews (mostly foreigners) attending the Synagogue of the Freedmen. This conflict had arisen from Stephen’s preaching with his claim that God does not dwell in a house made with hands (7:48) and his blaming the Jews for their betrayal and murder of Jesus (7:52). It results in his being accused before the Sanhedrin as a denigrator of Moses, God, and the Law, as well as the Temple (6:11–13). The killing of Stephen follows in 7:54–60: he is thrown out of the city and stoned to death.

It is worth noticing that the story of Stephen (Acts 6:8–7:60) has parallels with the description of the trial and crucifixion of Jesus in Luke 22:66–23:46. This connection is clear-cut in the most prominent points of these two accounts: both Jesus and Stephen are brought before the court (Luke 22:66; Acts 6:12), speak about the eschatological Son of Man at the right hand of God (Luke 22:69; Acts 7:56), pray about the forgiveness of their persecutors before death (Luke 23:34; Acts 7:60), and commend their spirits to God (Luke 23:46) or to Jesus (Acts 7:59). This set of motifs reappears in Hegesippus’ version of the

277 See the study of the development of the idea that martyrs ascend directly to heaven at the moment of their death in early Christian literature in Candida R. Moss, The Other Christs: Imitating Jesus in Ancient Christian Ideologies of Martyrdom (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 118–146.

278 As Candida R. Moss shows, the repentant criminal became the prototype of the immediate resurrection of the martyr in Christian martyrological literature (e.g., Cyprian, Ep. 72.22.2; ibid., 123).

279 Additionally, there is an interesting parallel between Mark 14:58 and Acts 6:14. While Mark speaks about the false witness giving evidence about Jesus’ intention to destroy the Temple, Acts transfers this accusation to the scene of the judgment of Stephen. Moreover, Luke leaves out this episode from the scene of the judgment of Jesus in order to postpone it until that of Stephen. Probably Luke does this in order to emphasize the significance of the martyrdom of Stephen and its connection with Jesus’ passion.

280 See a more extended list of the parallels in these stories and the further bibliography in Horton, Death and Resurrection, 49.
martyrdom of James the Just (Hist. eccl. 2.23.4–18), which probably depends on Luke-Acts.\textsuperscript{281} The early Christian martyrdom typology found in these three passages correlates with that of the Jewish traditions about the Son of Man in Dan 7:13-14 and Ps 110.1.\textsuperscript{282} One can emphasize some common features of these three stories: (1) taking Jesus, Stephen, and James into the court; (2) the testimony concerning the Son of Man; (3) the mock trial; and (4) the prayer about the forgiveness of the persecutors before the martyr's death.\textsuperscript{283}

Thus, the story about Stephen can be seen as a prototypical account of early Christian martyrdom.\textsuperscript{284} His death could be perceived not only as an example of \textit{imitatio Christi}, but also as itself a model for imitation.\textsuperscript{285} Two main

\textsuperscript{281} I agree with Shelly Matthews who indicates that Hegesippus could have used the exegetical approaches composing his account of the martyrdom of James, such as the so-called \textit{gezera shawa}, i.e., scriptural passages containing common words or phrases may be used to interpret each other. On the other hand, there are at least three possibilities how these three accounts can be linked to each other: (1) Hegesippus may have been acquainted with Acts 7; (2) the story about the martyrdom of Stephen may be derived from the more ancient account of the martyrdom of James; Karlmann Beyschlag, “Das Jakobusmartyrium und seine Verwandten in der frühchristlichen Literatur,” Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 56 (1965): 154–175; (3) familiarity with the canonical Gospel passion narrative and independent access to the circulated martyrdom motifs; Shelly Matthews, \textit{Perfect Martyr: the Stoning of Stephen and the Construction of Christian Identity} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 84.


\textsuperscript{283} The accounts of Jesus' and James' deaths (but not the death of Stephen) correlate in one more issue: their deaths cause the destruction of Jerusalem (cf. Luke 19:44 and Hist. eccl. 2.23.18).

\textsuperscript{284} Actually, Stephen is called μάρτυρος in Acts 22:20, which, however, may be translated as “witness” (cf. NRSV). He can be regarded as a protomartyr imitating Jesus Christ. See, e.g., Moss, \textit{The Other Christs: Imitating Jesus in Ancient Christian Ideologies of Martyrdom}, 33–34.

\textsuperscript{285} Ibid., 34.
issues of Stephen’s martyrdom are important for the further study of the afterlife: (a) his vision of the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God and (b) his final prayer and death.

After charging the Jews with persistent opposition to God’s will (7:54) Stephen is given the vision of the glory of God and Jesus standing at the right hand of God (7:55–56). According to Acts 2:32-33, Jesus was raised and exalted “by the right hand of God” or “to the right hand of God” (τῇ δεξιᾷ οὖν τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθείς). Luke mentions Christ entering his glory (εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ) after enduring all things he had to suffer (Luke 24:26; cf. 9:31–32; 24:46). Putting together Luke 24:26 and Acts 2:33, it may be concluded that in Luke’s view Jesus occupies the glorious position at the right hand of God after his resurrection and exaltation to the heights by the right hand of God.


---


288 The expression υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (“the Son of Man”) is used in the New Testament outside the gospels and not being said by Jesus himself only in Acts 7:55–56. It occurs 26 (25) times in Luke (66 times in the Synoptic gospels), the majority of them referring to the figure of the Son of Man from Dan 7:13.

Even more, it seems Luke removes the apocalyptic element found in Mark and changes it to a heavenly vision in Acts 7:55–56. Nevertheless despite that, as Philip B. Munoa III indicates, Luke may have indirectly used Daniel 7 in describing the martyrdom of Stephen. Munoa argues that Jesus’ standing position in Acts 7:55–56 itself alludes to Dan 7:13. However, there is no clear verbal agreement between the images of the Son of Man in these two passages. Moreover, Dan 7:13 represents a dynamic picture, while Acts 7:55–56 deals with a static one. Thus, Munoa’s proposal remains an intuition rather than an argument.

Further, in 1 En. 49:2 the Chosen One is standing before the Lord of Spirits in his eternal glory and might as the Ancient of Days gives power and glory to one who is like a Son of Man (Dan 7:14). The use of (or allusion to) Ps 110:1 and Dan 7:13–14 is a regular indication of the exaltation and resurrection motif in Jewish and early Christian traditions. Therefore, again, Acts 7:55–56 can be labeled as a manifestation of the exalted and resurrected Jesus appearing in his glory in the presence of God. However, as Luke 22:69 along with Acts 2:34 indicate Jesus’ posture as sitting, the question that still remains is why in Acts 7:55–56 Luke changes Jesus’ posture from sitting (which already presupposes Jesus’ exaltation and resurrection according to this tradition) to standing? He

---

293 The posture of the Chosen One is changed in 1 En. 61:8: he is sitting to judge the holy ones. However, doubtless Luke 22:69 and Acts 2:33 accentuate the juridical role of the exalted Jesus.
294 See, e.g., Zwiep, *Christ, the Spirit and the Community of God*, 42–43, 45, 61.
295 Munoa indicates a similar phenomenon in the *Ascension of Isaiah* 9:35 (standing) and 11:32 (sitting), which combine both postures; Munoa, “Jesus, the Merkavah, and Martyrdom in Early Christian Tradition,” 308. However, it has to be noticed that these passages from the *Ascension of Isaiah* deal with the liturgical context. Meanwhile, there is no sign of worship in Acts 7:55–56. Thus, the case of the *Ascension of Isaiah* can hardly be used as a parallel to Luke’s account.
emphasizes the importance of this change by repeating ἑστῶτα twice, in 7:55 and in 7:56.

Barrett argues that Jesus' posture indicates that according to Luke the Son of Man comes to the believer at the moment of his/her death. According to this suggestion, Jesus comes to Stephen not only in the future parousia but also in a personal and individual parousia. This is an assurance for other believers: a Christian can pass into the presence of Christ in heaven immediately after death without waiting for the future resurrection.296 Thus, Barrett discusses Acts 7:55–56 in connection with Lucan individual eschatology: the Son of Man appears at the last moment of the life of a Christian. Barrett argues that among the basic characters of the Book of Acts only Stephen manifestly falls into this category and that is why the title "the Son of Man" comes from his lips.297 This idea is consonant with Lehtipuu's proposal discussed above that the issue of individual eschatology might have served as an answer to the questions of the early Christian communities. However, as we have seen, Luke hardly constructs such an extensive and consistent eschatological doctrine. After all, Barrett's view scarcely explains how it relates to Jesus' posture in Acts 7:55–56. This issue will be discussed at length below (see p. 223). For now, it is important to see that for Luke, Stephen as a martyr certainly goes to heaven immediately after his death.

Moreover, Luke does not mention Jesus as receiving souls after death (at least the souls of martyrs) in Luke (cf., e.g., 12:16–21 [the parable of the Rich Fool], 20:34–38 [Jesus' answer to the Sadducees], and 23:39–43 [the story about the criminal on the cross]) because he had not yet risen. Probably the evangelist is emphasizing this new status of the resurrected one in Acts 7:55–56, 59. Luke, therefore, was able to reinterpret the Son of Man traditions of Dan 7:13–14 and Ps 110:1 in the context of this new status of Jesus. Praying to the risen Jesus about receiving his spirit, Stephen acknowledges his destiny to be with

296 Barrett, "Stephen and the Son of Man," 36–37. However, it is worth indicating that Stephen’s example can be seen as a special case (the destiny of a martyr), and not as the fate of just any Christian.

297 Ibid., 35–36.
him.\textsuperscript{298} However, Luke does not specify the time of the resurrection of Stephen in this passage.\textsuperscript{299}

To sum up, in his double work Luke deals not only with collective eschatology but also with the individual's postmortem destiny. A certain postmortem judgment takes place immediately after one's death. While some Lucan passages accentuate the final destiny of the deceased immediately after death, others are vaguer about the finality of postmortem judgment. In case of a martyr, Luke indicates that Stephen goes directly to heaven after death. However, his judgment is not explicitly mentioned and the finality of his fate is not stressed. In addition, in Acts 7:55–56, 59 Luke emphasizes the new status of the resurrected Jesus as one who receives the souls of believers (at least of martyrs).

1.3.3 Temporal Aspects of Luke's Eschatology

So far the present discussion of Luke's eschatological views seems to imply that he deals with two basic temporal aspects: the immediate and the future. The former appears in the context of individual eschatology, i.e., immediately after one's death. The latter relates to collective eschatology and refers to the distant future. However, the issue is more complicated. Luke 20:27–40, which is a modified version of Mark 12:18–27,\textsuperscript{300} deals with collective destiny of the righteous.\textsuperscript{301} Instead of the Marcan construction ὅταν . . . ἀναστῶσιν ("when they rise from the dead," Mark 12:25) with the verb in the aorist subjunctive form Luke uses the aorist passive participle καταξιωθέντες ("considered worthy," Luke 20:35), i.e., he transfers the future eschatological issues of 20:34–36 to the present, as if those who are worthy of being resurrected have already been raised up. Further, in 20:38b Luke makes a significant addition to Mark 12:25 with the words πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν ("for everybody is alive to him") and puts ζάω in the present tense, since it may indicate the present, not the future, state.


\textsuperscript{299} Therefore, Luke deliberately changes Jesus' stance in Acts 7:55–56 in order to emphasize his resurrection. Further proof of this idea will be given in the extensive discussion in the final chapter of the present research (see p. 223).


\textsuperscript{301} A more detailed textual analysis of Luke 20:27–40 will be provided below (see p. 139).
of the patriarchs and may relate to “the present state” of the resurrection in 20:34–36.\textsuperscript{302}

A similar issue occurs in the parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11–32). The father declares that his son was dead and has come to life again (νεκρὸς ἦν καὶ ἀνέζησεν [ἔζησεν]; Luke 15:24, 32). This passage deals with the destiny of an individual but seems to transfer it from the postmortem state into the present (cf. also Luke 15:4-8).\textsuperscript{303}

Then again, Jesus’ words about the forgiving of the sins of the paralytic man (Luke 5:20–21) and of the woman who anointed his feet (7:48) also may refer to his eschatological juridical function. Indeed, the formula ἀφέωνται σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι/αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου (“your sins have been forgiven”) implies that a certain judgment has already taken place and their sins have been already forgiven. Therefore, it seems that Jesus performs some juridical functions already in the present.\textsuperscript{304} This shift of the traditional understanding of temporal aspects of eschatology in Luke-Acts is connected with Luke’s emphasis on his view of the Kingdom of God as already a present reality and his understanding of salvation as already experienced in this world.\textsuperscript{305} These issues will be discussed in detail below (see p. 106, 236).

Thus, from the time perspective, Luke’s eschatology treats three aspects: the postmortem, the future, and the present. Indeed, he treats some issues that in traditional Jewish eschatology are typically postponed to the distant future (collective eschatology) or assigned to the postmortem state (individual eschatology), as if they were already realized in the present life of believers in Christ.

\textsuperscript{302} Wisdom of Solomon 5:15 also indicates that eternal life is given to the righteous already in their physical life (see p. 182).

\textsuperscript{303} In this passage the issue is even more complicated because, as will be shown below, here Luke uses the language of returning to life or resurrection metaphorically in order to describe the importance of repentance (see p. 236).

\textsuperscript{304} This function of Jesus may be connected with the Son of Man’s authority on earth to forgive sins (Luke 5:24). See Steyn, “Soteriological Perspectives in Luke’s Gospel,”91-92.

1.4 Summary

Luke's manner of presenting the eschatological issues as collective and individual eschatology is, in general, in line with the two basic types of judgment found in Jewish literature (eschatological judgment at the end of time and judgment immediately after one's death) with all their complexity and inconsistency. Thus, his view on the last judgment is as follows: at the end of time after the sudden coming of the Messiah both the righteous and the wicked will stand before God who will judge them according to their earthly deeds. The former will be rewarded with eternal life, while the latter will be punished and suffer from torments by fire.

Further, speaking about the individual's afterlife Luke implies that there is a judgment that takes place immediately after one's death. However, while Luke 16:19–31 and probably 23:39–43; Acts 1:25 speak about the final destiny of the deceased immediately after their death, Luke 12:16-21, 16:1–8, and probably Acts 14:22 do not clarify whether Luke speaks about the final place in the otherworld or about a certain intermediate state before the final judgment. Even dealing with the destiny of a martyr (the martyrdom of Stephen; Acts 7:54–60), while indicating that Stephen goes directly to heaven after his death to be received by the risen Jesus without judgment being explicitly mentioned, Luke emphasizes neither the finality of his fate nor the time of his resurrection.

However, this picture should not be oversimplified. Luke treats not only the postmortem and the future aspects of eschatology, but also the present one. He refers to realized eschatology in the context of collective destiny and concerning the fate of individual. This shift of the traditional understanding of temporal aspects of eschatology is connected with Luke's view of the Kingdom of God and salvation as already experienced in this world.

In addition, Luke supports the idea of a postmortem retribution and differentiation (and reversal, which is sometimes very surprising for the wicked) of the fates with rewards for the righteous and punishment of the wicked, which is well recorded in both pagan and Jewish sources of the Hellenistic and Roman periods. The righteous are enjoying eternal life in a certain blessed reality, while the wicked are put into torment in the underworld.

Jesus as one who receives souls of the dead (at least those of the martyrs). This judicial role of Jesus correlates with those Jewish texts in which the Messiah appears as judge.

To sum up all these variations of Luke’s views, it is still difficult to find an adequate model for describing the eschatological picture of Luke-Acts. It is doubtful whether Luke tries to build a harmonized eschatological model as, for instance, 4 Ezra or 2 Baruch do. As Arie W. Zwiep rightly mentions, “Luke does not offer a systematic treatment of these matters” and one is compelled to deal with scattered utterances and allusions. All this basically confirms Lehtipuu’s thesis that Luke does not develop a systematic eschatological doctrine in Luke-Acts and that eschatological expectations do not form a central theme in his work.

---


The results of the discussion of the eschatological issues with which the previous chapter interacted, demonstrate Luke's concerns about the destiny of the wicked and the righteous from both the individual and the collective eschatological perspectives. Meanwhile, the postmortem destinies of both groups of people are directly linked with the places of their intermediate or final abode. In his double work Luke combines several terms and images of the otherworld. How do they relate to each other and correspond to Luke's eschatological views? It has been demonstrated above that it is hardly possible to find a harmonized eschatological scenario in Luke-Acts (see p. 81). Do these representations of the abode of the dead, then, form any coherent or hierarchical system? In addition, the cognitive analysis of the meaning-making aspects of intertextual relations between Luke-Acts and Jewish and pagan sources, which will be provided below in Chapter 4, requires the investigation of the spatial location of the representations of the abode of the dead in the sources discussed. Thus, the purpose of this chapter is to investigate the interrelation between various representations of the abode of the dead as they occur in Luke-Acts. As Luke's views are rooted in the Hellenistic culture to which he belonged, the major pagan and Jewish representations of the abode of the dead will also be investigated. Therefore, the sources will be examined for two major issues: (1) what are the representations of the abode of the dead? (2) how are these representations spatially oriented?

The imagery of the underworld is basically associated with the abode of the wicked and represented by several terms in Luke-Acts. First, it is the term Hades (ᾅδης), which occurs in Luke 10:15; 16:23, and Acts 2:27, 31. The concept of Gehenna (γέεννα) occurs in Luke 12:5. Further, in the context of the story about the healing of the Gerasene Demoniac (Luke 8:26–39) in 8:31 is found the term “abyss” (ἄβυσσος). The expression “his own place” (ὁ τόπος ὁ ἴδιος) in Acts 1:25b used in the passage about the destiny of Judas, also most probably refers to the abode of the wicked. In addition, the term “perdition” (ἀπώλεια), which Luke uses in Acts 8:20 (cf. Matt 7:13) in the context of the condemnation of Simon the magician, may refer to this subject.

The blessed state of the righteous after their death is described by several terms in the Lucan writings. First, they will be granted the Kingdom of God (ἡ
Another expression representing the abode of the dead in the Lucan writings is paradise (παράδεισος) in Luke 23:43. Additionally, there is the expression “eternal habitations” (αἱ αἰωνίοι σκηναί), which occurs in Luke 16:9 at the conclusion of the parable of the Dishonest Steward (16:1–13), and Abraham's bosom (κέλπος Ἀβραάμ) in 16:22–23, relating to the place where Lazarus is together with Abraham.

For convenience of presentation the terms and the imagery of the abode of the dead will be discussed in two separate sections: as those about the underworld and those about a special blessed reality reserved for the righteous.

2.1 The Underworld

2.1.1 The Underworld in Greco-Roman Pagan Sources

The analysis of the otherworld starts with the overview of pagan sources, and aims at illustrating the major representations of the underworld and their spatial location. Ἅδης or Ἀΐδης (“Hades”) is a traditional word for the Greek underworld.309 It was used for both a person (the god of the underworld), and a place (the place of abode of the souls of the dead). According to the eschatological views of that time, in the archaic period, Hades was seen only as the neutral realm of the dead, neither as a place of reward nor as a place of punishment. However, it underwent a change over the centuries from the neutral realm of the dead to the place of the punishment of the wicked and came to be regarded as the place designed for punishment, especially for the wicked, i.e., hell, “a divinely sanctioned place of eternal torment for the


309 The Greek underworld is also associated with Ἐρέβος (cf. Od. 11.36–37) where the souls of the dead dwell. It was probably used as a synonym for the house of Hades; Bernstein, The Formation of Hell, 25.

310 In Hesiod’s Theogony (Birth of the Gods) most of the principal powers are personified as gods. Even Sleep and Death are children of the god Night (Th. 758–759). Hades, the son of Chronos and Rhea, and Poseidon are brothers of Zeus. After having been swallowed by their father (cf. Theog. 497) the three of them were rescued from Chronos (Hesiod, Theog. 495) and fought against him. Zeus took the heavens; Poseidon obtained the sea, while Hades received the earth and its interior.
wicked.” Why did the concept of Hades undergo such a change? Was it unequivocally perceived negatively in the 1st century C.E., i.e., as the place of torments? Were there any other representations of the underworld which were unambiguously perceived negatively?

In Homer the soul descends beneath the earth to the realm of Hades and Persephone. It is a place without pleasure (Od. 11.94), a kingdom of fluttering shadows (cf. Od. 11.494–495) and bloodless images, which resemble their bodily forms but have none of the strength of real life. Thus, usually the ancient Greeks regarded Hades as situated underneath the earth (cf. Il. 20.61–61; 23.51, 100–101; 7.330; 14.457; 6.19; Od. 10.560; 11.65; 24.10), very far away from human habitation (Od. 10.501–502). However, they did not have “a consistent and clearly mapped-out picture of the landscape of Hades.”

Apart from Hades Homer speaks about Tartarus (Τάρταρος). Like Hades, it is also a place underneath the earth, but rather far below it. Homer locates it in the uttermost depths under the earth, where “there are gates of iron and a brazen doorstep.” It is as far from Hades as the earth is from the sky (Il. 8.13–15). Further, Hesiod personifies Tartarus as father of the monster Typhoeus who was born from Earth. Typhoeus was thrown into the depths of Tartarus by Zeus (Th. 869). While Homer describes only a few individuals punished in the unnamed area of Hades, Hesiod deals with the superhuman Titans and some other criminal demigods, for instance, Atlas, Menoetius, Epimetheus, Prometheus, and Typhoeus (cf. Th. 848–853). The place of their punishment is far below the earth, as far beneath the earth as the sky is above the earth (Th. 721). In Hesiod Tartarus is so deep and dark a place that one would not reach its bottom for a year (740–741). In addition, it is a great chasm (χάσμα μέγα), the place of meeting of the sources and limits of earth, sea, and sky (740). In front of Tartarus (outside of it) are located the houses (δόμοι) of Hades and

311 Bernstein, The Formation of Hell, 3.
312 Robert Garland, The Greek Way of Death (London: Duckworth, 1985), 51. Thus, in the Odyssey it can be reached by sea (Od. 10.501–502) traveling far away to the west and crossing Oceanus (cf. Od. 11.155–159). This seems to be in contradiction to the references to Hades as an underworld.
313 Bernstein, The Formation of Hell, 38. At the beginning of time the Titans opposed Zeus and were confined in Tartarus.
314 The river Styx flows through Tartarus (Th. 775–776).
Persephone guarded by a terrible dog (δεινὸς δὲ κύων; 767–769). Thus, while for Homer Tartarus is situated beneath Hades (Il. 8.16), for Hesiod it is a different place but in the same location.

Further, for Plato, who is concerned with a moral differentiation of postmortem existence, the dead souls inhabit the interior of a spongeliike earth. Tartarus is a chasm in the earth drainage system; it is “the deepest pit below the earth” (Phaed. 112a; cf. Il. 8.14). The morally neutral souls dwell at the Acherusian Lake until they are purified (113d), the incurable are thrown into Tartarus which they can never leave again (113e). The curable sinners are also put into Tartarus, but they are thrown out every year by the current. They are brought into the Acherusian Lake, where they cry out for those whom they killed or offended, to step into the lake. If they persuade their victims, their punishment comes to end, but if not, they are sent back to Tartarus and then into the rivers for another year and the cycle is repeated (114.e–b). Those who are justified as extremely pious are free from this cycle; they do not go to the underworld but rise to live in a pure region on the surface of the earth. Those who have purified themselves by philosophy enjoy the incorporeal life in even more beautiful dwellings (114b–c).

As has been shown above (see p. 53), Plutarch’s account of the otherworld in his De sera numinis vindicta recalls that of Plato’s myth of Er. However, this otherworld is not underground. It is situated in the air: Thespis travels upwards (Sera. 563e–564b), and then is shown a certain gaping chasm (χάσμα

---

315 In Od. 10.491 the underworld is called “the houses of Hades” (Αΐδαο δόμους).
316 It is called Cerberus in 311. In the Hymn to Demeter Hades dwells at or above the gates of Tartarus.
317 As Bernstein argues, Homer saw the difference between Hades and Tartarus as one of level: the latter is far below the former; see Bernstein, The Formation of Hell, 38. Bremmer regards Tartarus as the deepest region of Hades; Bremmer, The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife, 4.
318 In Plato the earth is a “porous, pumicelike sphere” with hollows and channels in every direction; see Bernstein, The Formation of Hell, 54–55. The hollows are connected by subterranean flows full of mud, fire, cold and hot water (Phaed. 111d–e).
319 Plato, referring to Homer (Il. 8.14) called Tartarus “the deepest pit below the earth.”
320 In the myth of Er there are two openings in heaven and in the earth through which the souls are sent to and fro, and a special meadow between these openings where the judges (unnamed) are sitting (Rep. 614d–e).
μέγα) called “the place of Lethe (Λήθη)” (566a). It resembles the dens of Bacchus (565e) and represents the pleasures of the body. In De facie in orbe lunae souls also go up from the earth after death. According to Fac. 943c every soul of the dead wanders to a region between the earth and the moon for a certain period. The good souls go to the gentlest part of the air called “the meadows of Hades” (λειμῶνας Ἅιδου) for a time of purging (943c). Then, the pure souls reach the moon (942f). Meanwhile, some souls suffer their penalties in the hollow Hecate’s Recess (Ἑκάτης μυχός) which is also located on the moon (944c).

This overview of major pagan representations of the underworld indicates that in its late stages of development the perception of Hades as hell was widespread in Hellenistic culture. However, as the following evidences demonstrate, in late Antiquity the moral understanding of Hades coexisted along with older views of the underworld. Pausanias (2nd century C.E.) gives a description of the paintings by the Greek artist Polygnotos (5th century B.C.E.) on the wall of the Lesche (Λέσχη; “Place of talk”) building at Delphi. This wall was painted with the scenes of the realm of Hades based on Homer’s account of the underworld in the Odyssey and the lost epic poems Minyad and the Returns (7th or 6th centuries B.C.E.). The pictures depict Odysseus descending to Hades to inquire of the soul of Teiresias, the river Acheron, the ferryman Charon at the boat, the spirit Eurynomos, the souls of the heroes, and those of the punished in Hades (Tantalus, Tityos, Sisyphus, as well as Ocnus, Theseus, and Perithous; Pausanias, Descr. 10.25.1; 10.28.1–31.12).

Next, the so-called Great Magical Papyrus in Paris contains an account of the love charm (PGM 4.297–408). In this document the formula to be written and recited has a spell for binding the gods of the underworld, including Persephone, Adonis, and Hermes, as well as “mighty Anubis Psirinth” who has the keys of Hades, the gods and daemons of the underworld, and the people who have died. This collection of magic texts compiled from various sources, which could serve as a handbook for a magician, was found in Egypt and was written down in the early 4th century C.E. However, it contains older ideas

321 This chasm was used by Dionysus in his way to heaven and back to fetch his mother Semele (Sera. 566a1–3).
which can be traced even to the early Greek traditions about Hades. All these examples indicate that even at the beginning of the Christian era, the old perception of Hades as a neutral place of abode for the dead was still alive.

To sum up, the most traditional representation of the views on the place of dwelling of the dead in Greco-Roman pagan culture is Hades. While in the archaic period it was associated with a neutral realm of the dead, a place of darkness and without pleasure situated beneath the earth, later it became the place of punishment for the wicked. The geography of Hades is not consistent and clearly mapped out. Usually it was located underneath the earth, far away from human habitation. However, in some texts it can be reached by sea or is situated in the air (e.g., Plutarch, *De sera numinis vindicta, De facie in orbe lunae*).

Another place of abode of the dead is Tartarus. It is similar to Hades as a place underneath the earth but rather far below. Already from the archaic period this dark and deep place was identified with the place of punishment of the wicked. In contrast to Hades as a place neutral to the moral qualities of its inhabitants, Tartarus is always regarded as a dark place of punishment for the wicked. In the Hellenistic and Roman periods the concepts of Hades or Tartarus with their rivers and chasms were still in use as a model of the underworld. However, they came to be regarded as the regular place of abode especially for the wicked. Nevertheless, the older understanding of Hades as a

---


323 However, the perception of Hades in the Roman period was even more complicated and mixed. For instance, as Lehtipuu demonstrates, Lucian of Samosata, although in his *De luctu* (*Luct*. 2–9) criticizing the ordinary people for believing in the ancient myths about the underworld, ascribes the popular idea of postmortem retribution in Hades and Elysion to Homer and Hesiod (*Luct*. 7–8 cf. 2.1–3). However, as has been shown above, in Homer and Hesiod Hades is a neutral place for the dead. See Lehtipuu, *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*, 113–114.
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neutral place of abode of the dead also continued to exist, at least in some popular beliefs.

2.1.2 Jewish Representations of the Underworld

This section will explore Jewish sources and focuses on the development of Jewish beliefs about the dwelling of the dead and the separation of the abode of the wicked from that of the righteous. The most traditional representation of the world of the dead in the Hebrew Bible is Sheol (שְׁאוֹל), to which both the righteous and the wicked go down after death (cf. Ps 89:48). It is a dark and gloomy underworld (Job 10:21–22) from which there is no possibility of returning. The souls of the dead depart from the world of the living and go down to this otherworld (Isa 38:11, 18), where there is no ability to see, feel, or understand, and even the memory of its dwellers is lost (Eccl 9:5,10). They dwell there far away from God and from their relatives. Just as in early pagan views of Hades as a neutral place of the dead, in ancient Israel dwelling in Sheol was seen as a certain deficient and shadowy (צַלְמָוֶת in Job 38:17) existence, the world of spirits, by no means equal to real life (cf. Isa 38:10–20). Due to this view, the afterlife destiny was probably associated with a weak and dream-like state (Isa 14:10–11), which is far away from normal life, and in sharp contrast with the wakeful state. Thus, at death individuals were seen as if they had fallen asleep and dreamed, and could not wake up from such a dream, because there is no return from Sheol (cf. Job 7:9. 16:22; Eccl 12:5b). However, the idea that God’s authority extends even to Sheol occurs in later biblical texts (cf. Ps 139:8). On the other hand, at a certain time Sheol started to be regarded as having different sections. The deepest parts, sometimes called בּוֹר (“pit,” “inferno”) or יַרְכְּתֵי־בוֹר (“the uttermost parts of the underworld” in Isa 14:15; Ezek 32:23), were

---

324 The etymology of the Hebrew word שְׁאוֹל is not clear. Probably it is connected with the infinitive form of the verb שלל (“to ask,” “to inquire”). See John Jarick, “Questioning Sheol,” in Resurrection (ed. Stanley E. Porter, Michael A. Hayes, and David Tombs; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 25.

325 Ps 74:20; 88:7; 143:3; Lam 3:6 use מַחֲשַׁכִּים (“dark regions”) as a synonym of Sheol. Later it occurs in the Qumran literature as the place of torment of the wicked (1QS IV.13).

326 In the LXX version of Job 38:17 it is translated as ᾅδης.
believed to be designed for the wicked. Later the idea of the spatial separation of the righteous and sinners became clearer.

In the LXX ᾅδης becomes a regular representation of the Hebrew concept of שְׁאוֹל. The archaic understanding of Hades in Greek religion as a place indifferent to the earthly behavior of its dwellers (whether virtuous or wicked) is more or less correlated with its Hebrew counterpart used in early Israelite religion. However, as has been shown above, the pagan meaning of Hades in the Hellenistic and Roman periods is often different from its archaic use due to the development of the idea of rewards and punishments for the dead (see p. 86). The later, more developed concept of Sheol may have been correlated with such a new meaning of Hades. Nevertheless, the older conception of Sheol/Hades as a place of abode of the dead may have continued existing in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, at least in some popular beliefs.

In the description of the underworld found in 1 Enoch 22, already after death the souls of the deceased are appointed a place according to their behavior in their earthly life. In 1 En. 22:8–11 the souls of the righteous are separated from those of the wicked and put into various chambers in the underworld. According to 1 En. 22:1–4, the souls of the dead are gathered into four hollow places under a great and high mountain in the west, waiting for the day of the great judgment. Three of these places are dark, while the fourth one is illuminated and has a fountain of water. Each of these pits is designated for specific categories of people according to their ethical behavior (22:8–13). In 22:9, however, there are three hollow places or pits, which serve as a repository for the human beings waiting for judgment. It is difficult to

327 Literally, “the spirits of the souls of the dead” (τὰ πνεύματα τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν νεκρῶν in Greek version of 1 En. 22:3).

328 In Greek manuscripts they are τόποι κοιλώματα (“hollow places”) in 1 En. 22:2a, 3 and κοιλώματα (“hollows”) in 22:2c, 8. As Nickelsburg mentions, τόποι in 22:4 corresponds to Aramaic ירנה (“pit”) of 4QEn I (22:1). See Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 304.

329 Cavallin tries to reconcile these two accounts, arguing that even if it seems to be one place for the righteous being separated from the sinners, and two places for the sinners, one can consider one more pit for those righteous who were slain and accuse their murders (cf. 22:12); Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 41, 49 n.16. However, other scholars argue for other explanations of this inconsistency. For instance, Nickelsburg offers three explanations for this question: (1) there are four places, each of which is introduced with the formula, “thus it has been separated for...” and 22:12
recognize the exact location of these places, but they seem to be in this world, or as Nickelsburg puts it, “this worldly.”

Further, the separation of different categories of people after death mentioned above is found in other texts: for instance, in 4 Ezra the souls of the righteous are in storehouses, while those of the wicked wander about in torments, grieving, and sad (7:79–87; cf. L.A.B. 23:13; 32:13; see p. 59). Fourth Ezra 4:42 also situates the storehouses of the souls of the dead in the world below (in inferno). However, the righteous and the wicked are separated from each other and have to go to their respective sections. Furthermore, it seems that 4 Ezra 7:85, 93, 96 indicate that the places for the righteous and the wicked souls are so close to one another that they even can see each other (cf. 1 En. 108:15). Both categories of souls are stored in the underworld as their temporary repository until the final judgment. As Lehtipuu rightly indicates, such a view of the underworld is typical for the texts that speak about resurrection, and, as may be added, about the final judgment and the system of afterlife rewards and punishments.

describes a separated place for the slain righteous (cf. 22:9b, 10, 12, 13); (2) there are four places and 22:12 describes a separated place for the slain sinners; there are three places and 22:12–13 describes the same place, separated for those sinners who have suffered a violent death; Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in the Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity, 170. He also suggests that there are interpolations in 1 En.22:2 and 22:12 and concedes that originally there would have been only three pits in the text; ibid., 171, n. 26.


It is difficult to define whether 4 Ezra 4:42 refers to the place of the souls of the wicked or to the different places for the righteous and the wicked in the underworld. 2 Bar. 30:1 deals with the souls of the righteous, while 1 En. 51:1 says that the souls of the righteous and those of the wicked are kept in different chambers. See the discussion in Stone, Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra, 99.

In other texts the underworld is reserved exclusively for the wicked. For instance, in 1 Enoch 108 the sinners, blasphemers, and other evildoers will be thrown to darkness to be burnt in the fire (108:2–3).\(^{333}\) This underworld is described as a desolate and unseen place between heaven and earth with something like a cloud, burning flames of fire, and quaking like a mountain (108:3–4).\(^{334}\) The wicked will be gathered into one place to be burnt in the heat of a blazing fire (100:9) and will be swallowed up in the earth (99:2).\(^{335}\)

However, this picture should not be oversimplified. The different views on the underworld can be juxtaposed even in a single text or by the same author. For instance, in Ps.-Phoc. 111–114 the underworld (Ἅιδης) is similar to Sheol as a dark reality designed for all humanity, a common eternal home and fatherland (κοινὰ μέλαθρα δόμων αἰώνια καὶ πατρὶς).\(^{336}\) On the other hand, Ps.-Phoc. 105–108 and 115 speak about the immortality of the soul, and 102–104 about the resurrection.\(^{337}\) It seems that the author of this text tries to combine several views on the afterlife and has no clear and thought out picture of this issue in his mind. In addition, Josephus, on the one hand, indicates that the souls of those who commit suicide will be put into the dark place in Hades (B.J. 3, 375), while the souls of the faint-hearted soldiers will be absorbed into the darkness of the underworld and will be received by the river Lethe to be forgotten (B.J. 6, 46–49). On the other hand, in A.J. 18,14 this author indicates that the Pharisees

---

\(^{333}\) In 1 En. 103:7–8 a flaming fire is burning in Sheol.

\(^{334}\) In 1 En. 91:14 the deeds of the wickedness will descend to the everlasting pit (cf. 22:8–13). Nickelsburg mentions that the materialization of the sins going to Sheol is unusual; see Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 449. Milik offers the variant “the workers [of impiety]” for “the deeds of wickedness”; J.T. Milik, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4, 267.

\(^{335}\) The spirits of the foolish will be cast into the fiery furnace (1 En. 98:3). According to L.A.B. 51:5 the wicked will perish after death, without hope of escape Sheol. In Pss. Sol. 14:9 and 15:10 the inheritance of the wicked is destruction and darkness in Sheol.

\(^{336}\) There are several Hellenistic Jewish epitaphs with the meaning “eternal house” (JIWE ii 577; JIWE ii 164; CIJ ii 820. See Park, Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions, 25–27.

\(^{337}\) Cavallin supposes that the notion of the resurrection is used as an explanation why corpses should be left as they are. Sheol, indifferent to the righteous and wicked, functions as a warning against greed. Besides, the concept of the immortality of the soul is seen as having an independent function in this text; see Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 152.
believed that both the righteous and the wicked are in the underworld after their death waiting for their rewards and punishments (cf. B.J. 2.165).

Further, 1 En. 26:4–27:2 reports that the wicked will be punished after the final judgment at the cursed valley in the west and this will be the place of their final habitation. This barren and cursed valley contrasts with the blessed Jerusalem with its blossoming trees and plenty of water. Nickelsburg, reconstructing the geographical depiction of this valley, argues that the author of this text could have had in mind the valley of Hinnom, which later became the image of Gehenna. The similar picture of a deep valley with burning fire as the place of punishment of the fallen angels and the rulers of the earth occurs in 1 En. 54:1–4. Greek γέεννα corresponds to Hebrew יֵרֵיָה (the valley of Hinnom”; Josh 15:8), the short form of יֵרוֹם (the valley of the son of Hinnom”; cf. Josh 18:16; Jer 7:31) or יֵרוֹם (the valley of the sons of Hinnom”; 2 Kgs 23:10). According to 2 Kgs 23:10; 2 Chr 28:3; 33:6; Jer 7:31; 32:35, this valley with a high place called Topheth in its center was a place of idolatrous cults in late pre-exilic times. Moreover, in Jer 7:31–32; 19:6–9 Jeremiah prophesies that it will be called יָהֵרָה (the Valley of Slaughter”), because God will put the inhabitants of Jerusalem to death by the swords of their enemies and their corpses will be left unburied there. Later these images of fire, corpses, and the wrath of God were assimilated with the fiery place of punishment for the wicked. Indeed, Isa 66:24 probably alludes to it as to a place of the fiery punishment of the sinners after judgment in the sight of the righteous.

At the certain point Gehenna as the valley of the sons of Hinnom located to the west of Jerusalem came to be associated with the place of final destiny and punishment for the wicked like Sheol/Hades in its later development, i.e., with hell. Indeed, for instance, 4 Ezra 7:36–38 (cf. Sib. Or. 4:176–191) indicates that those who are found guilty in the final judgment will be put into the fire of


339 As Chaim Milikowsky indicates, 1 En. 27:1–2 also implicitly speaks about Gehenna; Chaim Milikowski, “Which Gehenna? Retribution and Eschatology in the Synoptic Gospels and in Early Jewish Texts,” NTS 34 (1988), 239.

Gehenna (Gehenna) and the pit of torment (lacus tormenti),\textsuperscript{341} while those who are justified will be given an eternal life of delight and rest (7:36–38).\textsuperscript{342}

Lloyd R. Bailey proposes that such a transformation of the meaning of Gehenna is due to the geography of the holy city. The fused concept of paradise (Gen 2), a sacred mountain with the deity dwelling on it (Ps 48), and an eternal sanctuary in Jerusalem (Ps 132) shape the sacred realm which is opposite to the valley of Hinnom. “Under the influence of curses by the prophets” the latter could represent the underworld.\textsuperscript{343} In addition, Bailey provides another suggestion: whereas the valley of Hinnom was associated with the cults of underworld deities like Moloch, it could have been assumed by its worshipers to be the entrance to the underworld.\textsuperscript{344}

Another place of the torment of the wicked which occurs in Jewish literature, is an abyss (cf. Greek ἄβυσσος). According to 1 En. 18:10, “a terrible place with a narrow cleft to the abyss, full of great pillars of fire” at “the edge of the great earth” is appointed for the imprisonment of the fallen angels. The stars and the hosts of heaven are also imprisoned in the fiery place (19:14–15; 21:1–5). As Nickelsburg argues, this prison is similar to Tartarus as it appears in Hesiod, Theog. 713–748.\textsuperscript{345} There fallen angels are punished (1 En. 10:13). In 1 En. 90:20–27, however, not only the stars along with the fallen angels, but also the seventy shepherds, and the blinded sheep representing the wicked are thrown into the fiery abyss, which is located “to the south of the house” (90:26) and can be identified with Gehenna due to its fiery character.\textsuperscript{346}

\textsuperscript{341} Cf. ܓܗܢܐ (“Gehenna”) and ܥܘܒܐ ܕܬܫܢܝܩܐ (“the bosom of torment”) in the Syriac version of 4 Ezra 7:36.

\textsuperscript{342} Gehenna also occurs as a place for the punishment of the wicked in 2 Bar. 59:10; 85:13; 2 En. 40:12; 42:3, Sib. Or. 1:101-103; 2:288-292; 4:183-186.

\textsuperscript{343} Lloyd R. Bailey, “Gehenna. The Topography of Hell,” BA 49 (1986), 189. After all, geographically, this valley is beneath the walls of the holy city and thus it could represent a lower level world (the underworld).

\textsuperscript{344} Ibid., 190.

\textsuperscript{345} Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 286–287. In the Greek version of 1 En. 20:2 Τάφταρκος is adopted. Moreover, in the 4th Book of Sibylline Oracles Gehenna is equivalent to Tartarus: after the final judgment the wicked will be covered by a mound of earth and put into Tartarus and Gehenna (Sib. Or. 4:185–186).

\textsuperscript{346} Collins, “The Otherworld in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 99. In 1QS IV. 11–13 the term “dark regions” as a synonym of Sheol is associated with eternal damnation, permanent terror, and
As it seen from this analysis, usually the abode of the wicked is located somewhere underground or in certain lower regions. Moreover, some terms used for this abode also refer to such a localization: dark regions, a pit, Gehenna, Tartarus, inferno, an abyss. It is worth mentioning, however, that in 3 Baruch 2–4 the three lowest levels of the heavens are reserved for the wicked. Those who planned to build the tower of Babel are divided into two groups: those who tried to reach the heavens and wage war on God are punished in the first heaven (2:7) and those who forced others to build a tower are located in the second heaven (3:5). A serpent (cf. Genesis 3) and Hades itself are in the third heaven (4:3). A place for the righteous is reserved in the fourth heaven (chapter 10).

The 2nd Book of Enoch goes even further and places both the abode the righteous and that of the wicked on the same (third) level of the heavens. There is a paradise between “corruptibility and incorruptibility” reserved for the righteous as a garden with various sweet-flowering and sweet-smelling trees and a tree of life in its center with its roots at the earth’s end (2 En. 8:1–10). On the northern side of this level of the heavens there is a terrible place of torment and torture for the sinners (9:1–10:6).³⁴⁷

To sum up, Jewish views of the underworld are not expressed by one single term. Probably, the differentiation of Sheol/Hades into several sections brought about such varied descriptions. In some texts both the righteous and the wicked are put into the different sections of the underworld that serve as a repository until the time of the final judgment. On the other hand, in some other texts the world below is reserved only for the wicked. Moreover, the different views on the underworld can be juxtaposed to each other due to the combination of several views on the afterlife within the same text (e.g., Pseudo-Phocylides). Spatially, the abode of the wicked is usually associated with underground or with the lower places (a valley as the opposite of a mountain). However, a few later traditions transfer it to the heavens.

³⁴⁷ Some explanation of such a shift of the location of the abode of the wicked will be given below (see p. 232).
2.1.3 The Underworld in Luke-Acts

This section will analyze the terms and imagery of the underworld in Luke-Acts that have been listed at the beginning of this chapter. Most of them are rooted in Luke's cultural environment and attested in either pagan or Jewish contexts. How does Luke deal with them? Does he reappraise the material he has at hand and make new combinations of ideas?

Starting with Hades, it is seen that Luke 10:15, derived from Q and virtually parallel with Matt 11:23a\(^{348}\) is modeled on Isa 14:13–15, speaking about the king of Babylon pretending to be exalted as high as heaven is, but being brought down to Sheol. This passage from Isaiah metaphorically represents the tremendous fall of this king and does not directly refer to his casting down to Hades. Luke 10:10–15 (as Matt 11:20–24) speaks about the punishment at the eschatological judgment of the citizens of the cities in which Jesus preached. Capernaum seems to be included in their list. It might be suggested as well that not only the pride of the citizens of Capernaum will be humiliated, but they will stand before God at the judgment. However, it is still possible that Hades in 10:15 is used metaphorically rather than as the direct indication of the place of the final punishment of the wicked.\(^{349}\)

Then, in the context of Peter's preaching about the resurrection of Jesus in Acts 2:22–36, the verses 2:27, 31 referring to Ps 16:10 represent an earlier view of Hades as a neutral place where all the dead are located: “For you will not abandon my soul to Hades” (2:27a NRSV).

However, the function of Hades in 16:23 is more complicated. In the context of the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus it serves as a place of punishment for the wicked, which is common in the pagan and Jewish sources dealing with the separation of the righteous and the wicked after death (see p. 86, 89). Indeed, it is a place of punishment with its torments, flames of fire, and thirst (16:24)\(^{350}\) immediately after death, and, moreover, with no reference to the final judgment (16:23) nor any indication that the punishment and the torment of the rich man (as well as the reward of Lazarus) are temporal. On the


\(^{349}\) Lehtipuu also supposes that it is unclear whether Hades is a term for a neutral place of the dead or for the place of punishment of the wicked in Luke 10:15; Lehtipuu, *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*, 270–271.

\(^{350}\) Cf. ὁ τόπος σοῦ τῆς βασάνου («this place of torment”) in 16:28.
other hand, such scholars as Mattill and Osei-Bonsu argue that Hades in 16:23 refers to the intermediate state of the soul before the last judgment. They refer to the preliminary character of the judgment in Hades in 1 Enoch 22 and to the contrast between Hades and Gehenna as a place of the final punishment in the New Testament. Indeed, in Jewish literature and the New Testament writings Gehenna is associated with the place of eschatological punishment of the ungodly, especially due to the unquenchable fire burning there. On the other hand, only Matthew and Luke speak of both Hades and Gehenna and never contrast them. Matthew uses Gehenna as a place of final punishment (5:22, 29, 30; 10:28; 18:9; 23:15, 23), but does not clearly indicate the temporary nature of Hades or its relation to Gehenna. In Luke’s texts the latter term occurs in Luke 12:5. Chaim Milikowski argues that Luke may think that only the souls of the wicked are cast into Gehenna for punishment after their judgment immediately after death. In that case, Luke’s thought would contrast with that of Matthew, who probably believes that both the body and the soul are punished in Gehenna (Matt 10:28). If this were true, there would be no difference for Luke in his understanding of Gehenna in 12:5 and Hades in 16:23. However, as Lehtipuu indicates, due to the fact that there is only a single occurrence of γέεννα in Luke-Acts, both Hades and Gehenna are very ambiguous words there and can be used with different meanings.

So, then, Luke may well understand them as rough equivalents of the place of punishment for the wicked immediately after death. Therefore, Hades in 16:23 can be regarded as the place of the final torment.

---


354 Cf. ibid., 244.


356 See the discussion in ibid., 275.
Further, it can be suggested that Luke has combined several views on Hades in Luke-Acts: an abode of all the dead and the place of the punishment of the wicked. Thus, Luke may use the imagery and lexis of Hades for the representation of the underworld in general regardless of its interim or final character, and may employ this single concept in different ways. 357

Further, the term “abyss” (ἄβυσσος) occurs once in Luke-Acts in Luke 8:31. Luke has adopted it from Jewish traditions about the underworld (see p. 93). The context in which it appears, namely of the sending of the demons into the abyss hardly relates to the issue of the afterlife. Rather it points out its geographical location, probably as the place of the imprisonment of the fallen angels and spirits (cf. 1 En. 10:13; 18:10; 19:14–15; 21:1–5).

In addition, ὁ τόπος ὁ ἴδιος (“his own place”) in Acts 1:25b points out the destiny of Judas (see p. 70). Idioms with such a sense are found in some early Christian (1 Clem. 5:4; Polycarp, Phil 9:2; Ignatius, Magn. 51), Jewish (Jos. Asen. 16:20, 22; Eccl. Rab. 6:6),358 and pagan (e.g., Plato, Apol. 40c) writings.359 Therefore, τόπος may indicate a certain place in the afterworld that one occupies after one’s death. For Judas, “his own place” has a negative connotation in the context of Acts 1:25.360

Finally, the term “perdition” (ἀπώλεια), which Luke uses in Acts 8:20 (cf. Matt 7:13) in the context of the condemnation of Simon the magician, may refer

---

357 Ibid., 270.
358 For instance, in Jos. Asen. 16:17y–22 the heavenly man gives the bees a command to “go off to their place” (εἰς τὸν τόπον ὑμῶν) and they fly back into heaven. This τόπος refers to heaven and probably to paradise (cf. 16:14–15; Marc Philonenko, Joseph et Aséneth: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, 189). However, instead of going into heaven some of these bees try to injure Aseneth but die on the ground (16:22). Then the heavenly man commands them to rise (ἀνάστητε) and go to their place (εἰς τὸν τόπον ὑμῶν) too. At his command these bees are raised and go to the court adjoining Aseneth’s house where they then find their place on the fruit-bearing trees (16:22–23). For the first type of bee the expression εἰς τὸν τόπον ὑμῶν refers to heaven and paradise. For the aggressive bees, however, it indicates another place.
359 This list is provided in Zwiep, Judas and the Choice of Matthias, 167. In addition, the similar expression ὁ αἰώνιος τόπος (“eternal place”) occurs in Tob 3:6.
360 Εἰς τὸν τόπον τούτον τῆς βασάνου (“this place of torment”) in Luke 16:28 refers to Hades as the place of suffering of the rich man after his death. Τόπος is very common word, of course, but it can indicate some similarity of imagery in the description of the destiny of the rich man and Judas.
Thus, Luke combines several views on the concept of Hades. He uses it in relation to the abode of all the dead and to the place of the punishment of the wicked. However, he does not emphasize its interim or final features. Luke also deals with the concept of Gehenna which can be seen as a rough equivalent of the place of punishment for the wicked in his double work, the “abyss” as the place of imprisonment of the fallen angels and spirits, “his own place” as a certain place in the underworld, which one occupies after death, and “perdition” as an indicator of the eternal punishment of the wicked.

2.2 The Abode of the Righteous

2.2.1 Pagan Views on the Abode of the Righteous

While in Greco-Roman pagan sources the underworld is seen as both the neutral abode of the dead and specifically as the place of the punishment of the wicked, a certain place is reserved exclusively for the virtuous. This section will analyze the representations of such a special place and its spatial location.

The idea of escaping Hades appears already in Homeric epics in which a few individuals are granted a blessed life in Elysion (Ἠλύσιον; cf. Ἠλύσιον πεδίον – “Elysian fields”). This place is treated as an abode of the immortal gods where some mortals are allowed to enter and enjoy eternal life together with the gods. In the Iliad Ganymede, whom Zeus appointed to be his cupbearer, is said to be carried off to heaven (20.232–235). Tithonus as the husband of Dawn also comes there (11.1–2). In the Odyssey the Lacedaemonian

---

362 Cf. also ὁ αἰώνιος ὄλεθρος (“the eternal destruction”) in 4 Macc 10:15.
king Menelaus goes to the Elysian Fields to Rhadamanthus instead of Hades *(Od. 4.561–569).*

Homer locates Elysion at the end of the world where there is no snow, storm or rain, but always the cool refreshing breezes of the westerly wind (*Ζέφυρος*) from Oceanus *(Od. 4.563–568).* Hesiod calls the Elysian Fields “the Isles of the Blessed” and locates them far from humans at the shore of Oceanus. Some happy heroes (*ὀλβιοι ἥρως*) from the age of heroes (the soldiers who fought in the Trojan and Theban wars) were sent there by Zeus to enjoy a blessed life. For them the grain-giving field bears honey-sweet fruit thrice a year *(Op. 171–173).* Pindar (ca. 522–443 B.C.E.) describes these islands as being cooled by breezes from Oceanus, while on them flowers of gold blaze *(Ol. 2.71–73).*

Later, the location of the place of the blessed was transferred into the lower world to become the place of the reward of the pious. Thus, in Plato’s *Gorgias* philosophers are sent to the Isles of the Blessed *(Gorg. 526c).* Virgil depicts Elysion as a blessed place with perpetual spring, full of verdure, flowers, and beautiful trees, as well as inexhaustible fountains. The land of the blessed is encircled by a wall made by the Cyclops with a gate *(Aen. 6.630–636)* and has no ruler like Minos or Rhadamanthus. For Virgil, there are two kinds of souls in Elysion: the perfect ones and those who need the further purification of other physical lives *(6.638–751).* The pious souls live in communion with each other,

---

365 So do Castor, Polydeuces *(Od. 11.302–304),* and Cleitus *(Od. 15.250–251).* Even Heracles who also had to die and go to Hades *(Il. 18.115–119)* is with the immortal gods. Odysseus sees in Hades only Heracles’ image *(εἴδωλον; Od. 11.602–603).*

366 Describing the beliefs of the Essenes in *B.J.* 2.154–156, Josephus borrows this image of the abode of the righteous. For him it is located beyond Oceanus in a place free from rain, snow, or heat, but always refreshed by the cool breeze from Oceanus.

367 In Greek literature Elysion and the Isles of the Blessed *(Μακάρων νῆσοι,* cf. e.g., Hesiod, *Op. 171*) usually refer to the same place. Probably these two names originally designated separate places but they had converged in the earliest texts *(Sourvinou-Inwood, “Reading” Greek Death to the End of the Classical Period, 51).*

368 Moreover, Pindar regards it as a life in the presence of the gods *(παρὰ μὲν τιμίως θεῶν ὀτίνες)* for those who have purified their souls through three cycles *(Ol. 2.65–77).*

enjoying the light from their own sun, and singing, dancing, and listening to Orpheus' lyre (6.638–665).

Thus, the idea of a special place reserved for the virtuous is connected with the belief in the possibility of escaping from Hades and enjoying eternal life together with the immortal gods. First, it was located somewhere at the end of the world, far from humans, or at the shore of Oceanus, and appointed only to a few individuals. Then, the concept of the abode of the pious dead underwent development over the centuries. For later authors, Elysion or the Isles of the Blessed came to be the place not only for a few exceptional figures but also for the souls of the pious. Essentially this kind of abode of the dead has become the Greek version of paradise. However, it is not impossible that the old perceptions of Elysion continued to exist in popular beliefs along with the more elaborated views.

2.2.2 The Abode of the Righteous in Jewish Sources

Next, the present research turns to the analysis of the representations of the abode of the righteous in Jewish literature and the views on their spatial location. The fact that in Dan 12:3 the resurrected and glorified righteous will shine like the brightness of heaven seems to indicate their celestial abode. However, 7:27 speaks about an eternal kingdom on the earth succeeding and replacing the four earthly kingdoms (cf. 7:17). Such an ambiguity in the presentation of this imagery may lead to the conclusion that in Dan 12:3 the risen righteous only resemble the stars in some limited sense. What does the evidence from other Jewish sources reveal about this issue? According to the Book of Watchers, the risen righteous will be transferred to Jerusalem after judgment together with the tree of life being transplanted there (1 En. 25:5–6). 1 En. 26:1–3 describes the holy city as the center of the earth (cf. Ezek 5:5; 38:12; Jub. 8:12, 19) with many blossoming trees (cf. 10:18–19), a holy mountain, and a spring of water. The location of this abode of the righteous looks “this worldly” (cf. a naturalistic image of the underworld in 1 Enoch 22; see p. 89), reminiscent of the image of the new creation in Isa 65–66. Indeed, in spite of the spatial (between this world and that to come) and temporal (between this age and the age to come) dualism peculiar to the worldview of the texts

370 Dan 2:31–45 mostly likely also speaks about this issue.
collected in *1 Enoch*, “for several of the Enochic authors, who took their cue from Second and Third Isaiah, future salvation would be realized in a new Jerusalem, situated on a renewed earth (10:16–11:2; 25:3–27:5; 51:4–5).”

One passage from the Epistle of Enoch, which is concerned with the delivery and vindication of the oppressed, also seems to use a “celestial” imagery for the destiny and the abode of the righteous: they will shine like the lights of heaven, the windows of heaven will be opened to them, and they will rejoice like the angels of heaven and be together with the host of heaven (104:2, 4, 6). However, taken in its immediate context, this imagery speaks about the exaltation and vindication of the oppressed righteous rather than about their ascension to heaven. For instance, the opening of the windows of heaven in 104:2 may refer to God’s promise that the cries of the righteous will be heard before God (104:3).

Further, one can see an ambiguous location of the abode of the righteous in the Book of Parables. On the one hand, the righteous will be taken to the Chosen One and dwell beneath the wings of the Lord to be before the Lord like fiery lights with the righteous angels (*1 En*. 39:5–7). On the other hand, heaven will be transformed into an eternal blessing and light, and the earth will be transformed to be a blessing. Then, the righteous will live on it (45:4–5). Meanwhile, Enoch is taken to the highest part of the heavens (the heaven of heavens according to *1 Enoch*), to the heavenly house of fire (71:5–6) to be transformed before the Head of Days (71:11) and the other righteous ones shall follow his way and dwell with him (71:16).

In some other later texts the reference to the heavenly abode of the righteous is more explicit. In the Wisdom of Solomon the righteous are numbered among the sons of God (5:5) having been taken up (μετετέθη) and away (ἡρπάγη) from this world (4:10–11). 2 Baruch speaks about the splendor of

---

371 Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 5. The motif of the eschatological transformation of human life on the renewed earth occurs also in *Jub.* 23:29–31. In addition, the Qumran community’s belief in a real companionship with angels on the earth indicates that the equality with, or likeness of the righteous to angels does not automatically imply their physical transition to the heavenly abode.

372 In *1 En*. 43:1–3 celestial imagery is used for the holy ones on the earth. Moreover, 51:5b also speaks about the righteous living on the renewed earth.
the righteous (51:3b) and their living in the heights of the undying heavenly world (51:10).373

Further, some Jewish texts connect the abode of the righteous with paradise. The idea of eschatological paradise is probably rooted in the prophhecies of the Hebrew Bible about the restoration of Israel patterned on the model of the primeval Eden, the garden of the Lord (cf. Isa 51:3; Ezek 36:33–35).374 Greek παράδεισος is borrowed from Old Persian with the meaning “enclosed space,” as well as “garden,” or “park.”375 In the LXX it corresponds to the Hebrew גַּן-בְּﬠֵדֶן (“the garden of Eden”) in the second story about creation (Gen 2:8–10; et al.) and in Ezekiel’s visions (Ezek 28:13; 31:8).

The Book of Watchers describes the paradise of righteousness eastward from Jerusalem with many large beautiful trees in it and the tree of wisdom in the garden (1 En. 32:3–4).376 The image of a renewed city and eating from the tree of life also allude to paradise (18:10).377 In the Book of Parables Enoch is translated to paradise by the chariot of wind/spirit (cf. 2Kgs 2:11). According to this section of 1 Enoch, paradise is settled on the earth between north and west.378 There Enoch sees the first patriarchs and the righteous from the earliest

---

373 The idea of the heavenly abode of the righteous also occurs in Apoc. Zeph. 8:3–4; 2 En. 22:10; Vis. Isa. 9:6–9. On the other hand, Syb. Or. 4:187 locates the abode of the righteous on earth (ἐπὶ γαῖαν).
375 Bremmer, The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife, 109–118.
376 Aramaic version of 32:3 uses פַּרְדָּס (cf. παράδεισος in Greek version) avoiding גַּן corresponding to the Hebrew גַּן (4QEnª I [26:21]).
377 Cf. T. Sim. 6:7; T. Jud. 25:4; 1 En. 25:4; 2 Bar. 51:11; 4 Ezra 7:123; 8:52; L.A.E. 13:4; 28:4; Pss. Sol. 14:3; cf. Rev 2:7; 22:2, 14,19. Eating from the tree of life is an image of the restoration of immortality. Indeed, for instance, according to the Life of Adam and Eve, Adam did not have access to the tree of life, and therefore did not have immortality because of the war (πόλεμος) that Satan had waged against him (L.A.E. 28:3).
378 In other sections of 1 Enoch the earthly Paradise is located in the east (1 En. 32:3–6) or in the north part of the earth (77:3).
times (70:3–4).\textsuperscript{379} In 1 En. 60:8 and 61:12 the garden of life is a dwelling place of the elect and the righteous who bless and glorify the Chosen One.

*Life of Adam and Eve* regards the risen righteous as being granted “every joy of paradise” (πᾶσα εὐφροσύνη τοῦ παραδείσου)\textsuperscript{380} in which the Lord will dwell among them (*L.A.E.* 13:2–4). The gates of the primeval earthly paradise will be opened again at the end of time according to *T. Lev.* 18:10 and 4 Ezra 8:52 (cf. *T. Dan.* 5:12; *Apoc. Ab.* 21:6; *Pss. Sol.* 14:2–3). As Lehtipuu indicates, the restored earthly paradise related to the original paradise, must be hidden somewhere until the time the Lord will reward the righteous.\textsuperscript{381} Moreover, it is never located in the underworld in Jewish literature.\textsuperscript{382}

Further, it seems that *Life of Adam and Eve* deals with two paradises: the earthly and the heavenly ones. The former is located on the earth opposite the East\textsuperscript{383} in the great dwelling place of God (*dei magnum habitationibus*; *Vita* 45:2),\textsuperscript{384} being surrounded by water (*Vita* 29:2–3) and wall with gates (*L.A.E.* 17:1; 19:1). In the center of this paradise is the tree of life, from which the “first made” were not allowed to eat and the tree with the healing oil, which is distinguished from the tree of life in *Vita* 36:2. After creation of Adam and Eve, this paradise was divided between them (*Vita* 32:2). The bodies of Adam, Abel, and Eve were buried in the regions of this paradise in the place of the creation of Adam (*L.A.E.* 40:6; *Vita* 48:3). On the other hand, the heavenly paradise is the postmortem abode of the soul (*L.A.E.* 37:2–6): when Adam had died, his soul was washed in the Lake of Acheron and then taken into paradise in the third heaven (cf. 40:1; 2 En. 8–9). This place is also called the “paradise of visitation” (*paradisus visitationis*; *Vita* 29:1) and “paradise of righteousness” (*paradisus


\textsuperscript{381} Ibid., 279.

\textsuperscript{382} On this point I agree with Lehtipuu; see ibid., 283.

\textsuperscript{383} There is Latin *hortum* (“garden”) instead of *ortum* (“east”) in some Latin manuscripts.

\textsuperscript{384} Probably, the place of the Jerusalem Temple is implied here (cf. *L.A.E.* 5:3; *Vita* 30:2) See Johnson, “Life of Adam,” 2:254.
iustitiae; Vita 25:3). However, this book does neither explicitly distinguish between these two paradises. Moreover, probably it deals with the same paradise that, on the one hand, is a primeval habitation of the first humans, which has been transported to heaven in order to be an abode of the righteous souls after death, and on the other, a place for the risen ones, which will be transferred back to the earth at the end of time. Meanwhile, paradise is always the place for the righteous.

While the Life of Adam and Eve refers to both earthly and heavenly locations of paradise, some other texts undoubtedly regard it as the abode of the righteous in heaven. Indeed, in 4 Ezra 7:36 the place of rest (locus requietionis) and the paradise (paradisus) of delight (cf. Jos. Asen. 16:14) are the places of abode of the resurrected righteous. The association of this paradise with light can indicate its heavenly location. This idea is even more salient in 2 Baruch. The righteous will be living on the heights of the world which is connected with paradise ( כאן) whose full extent will be spread out for them so that the righteous will see the throne of the Lord’s glory (תְּרוֹמוֹן), the majesty of the living beings under this throne and the hosts of the angels (51:11).

In addition, as Lehtipuu rightly states, the texts that deal with the gathering of the souls of the dead in special chambers and their waiting for resurrection and translation into paradise, identify it as the final abode of the righteous after the judgment at the end of time (1 Enoch, 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch). On the other hand, those accounts in which paradise as a place where the

---

385 de Jonge and Tromp, The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature, 52.
387 According to 2 Bar. 73:1–7, after the judgment the Messiah will sit on the throne of his kingdom and fill everything with eternal peace, rest, and joy.
388 These living beings (בר) can be seen whether as the souls under the divine throne in b. Šabb. 152b or the four living creatures (בר) prostrated before the throne of the Lord (cf. Rev 7:11). One can compare these beings with the four holy creatures with splendid bright crowns and having incredible sizes in 3 En. 21:1b–4 (this text was written in the 5th–6th centuries C.E.). In addition, it is worth mentioning that, according to 3 En. 43:3, the souls of the righteous, who have already been created and returned to God, are flying above the throne of glory.
righteous are put immediately after death (e.g., *Life of Adam and Eve*), do not regard it merely as an interim abode before a final transition to somewhere else.

Thus, in Jewish literature a certain blessed abode is reserved for the righteous. However, its location varies: while in the earlier texts it is “this worldly,” for the later ones it is more celestial. Paradise, which appears as one of the main representations of this abode, is also situated either on the earth or in heaven. In addition, both the earthly and the heavenly paradises appear in the *Life of Adam and Eve*. Moreover, paradise is never located in the underworld and is not seen as an interim location before transition to a final one above.

### 2.2.3 The Abode of the Righteous in Luke-Acts

This section deals with Luke’s terms and imagery for the abode of the righteous mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. It will discuss the representations of this issue in Luke-Acts and examine their spatial location and relation to each other.

The first term connected with the abode of the righteous in Luke-Acts is the Kingdom of God. It is a very complicated concept with many aspects and connotations to its meaning. Moreover, this concept is exceedingly metaphorical and is represented by several parables in the Synoptic tradition. An interesting study of the metaphorical representations of the concept of the Kingdom of God in Jesus’ parables is offered in Jacobus Liebenberg, *The Language of the Kingdom and Jesus: Parable, Aphorism and Metaphor in the Sayings Material Common to the Synoptic Tradition and the Gospel of Thomas* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001).

It designates the ultimate and expected accession of the Lord as ruler and authority over Israel and the whole creation, and a special reality ruled by God. In addition, it is the subject of the preaching of Jesus and the apostles, and, finally, it denotes the eschatological salvation (cf. Luke 18:24–26), whose presence is emphasized in Jesus’ ministry. Therefore it is an

---


393 Lehtipuu, *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*, 289. Moreover, in Mark 9:47 the Kingdom of God is contrasted with Gehenna, while in 9:43, 45 “life” (ζωή) is put instead of the Kingdom (see ibid., 290–291).
anticipation of eschatological reality (cf., Luke 11:2; 19:11; 23:51; Acts 1:6), which, at the same time, is near (Luke 10:9, 11; 17:20; 21:31) or even already present (cf. Luke 9:27; 11:20; 17:21). All these aspects of the Kingdom are common to the synoptic tradition. However, “Luke lets the accent fall more heavily on the presence of the Kingdom.”

Thus, in his double work, Luke accentuates the present aspect of this Kingdom, which can be comprehended among other things in a spatial way (cf. Luke 13:28–29; 18:17, 24–25, 28; Acts 14:22). In addition, the idea of the presence of the Kingdom of God is found in the parable of the Great Banquet (Luke 14:15–24) and in Luke 17:21: ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν (“the Kingdom of God is among you”; Luke 17:21). Moreover, as Maddox argues, the present aspect of the Kingdom is attested in Luke’s description of Jesus’ mission of preaching the Kingdom (cf. Luke 4:43). Such an accent on the presence of the Kingdom is connected with Luke’s vision of realized eschatology and the fulfillment of some eschatological expectations (see p. 79). In turn, this means that for Luke the Kingdom as a representation of the abode of the righteous can be partly transferred from the eschatological future to the eschatological present.

---


399 The context of Jesus’ dispute with the Pharisees in Luke 17:20–21 implies that the Kingdom of God is already here and is present in Jesus (ἐντὸς ὑμῶν as “among you” in 17:21).

On the other hand, another aspect of this spatial use of the term of the Kingdom of God that refers to the eschatological future and the time of the parousia is also significant. Luke 13:28–29, which gives the most detailed account of the Kingdom as the abode of the righteous, is an eschatological banquet with clear future characteristics: the whole context of the parable of the Narrow Door (Luke 13:22–30) implies such a future aspect. It is a feast in which the patriarchs, the prophets, and the followers of Jesus participate. The image of the Kingdom here is, so to speak, a home in which the banquet of the chosen ones takes place. In addition, eating and drinking at this banquet are also parts of this imagery (cf. Luke 6:21; 14:35–24; 22:29–30). Moreover, it is the banquet in which the righteous dead participate. All this can refer here both to the Kingdom and to the realm in the hereafter. However, the exact locality (either heavenly or earthly) of this eschatological banquet is vague (see p. 234).

The Kingdom of God also occurs in the context of the afterlife in Luke 23:42. One of the criminals addresses Jesus appealing for clemency: “Jesus, show favor to me when you come into your Kingdom” (Ἰησοῦ, μνήσθητί μου ὅταν ἔλθῃς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου). On the one hand, the penitent criminal could address himself to the royal status of Jesus: “when you come into your Kingdom,” i.e., “when you come to rule as a king” (ὅταν ἔλθῃς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου). For the


404 The imperative in the aorist passive form with the pronoun (μνήσθητί μου) is often used in the LXX for the appeals of the righteous to the Lord for his steadfast love and faithfulness to his promises (e.g., Deut 9:27; Judg 16:28; 2 Kgs 20:3; 2 Chr 6:42; Neh 5:32; 13:14; Tob 3:3; Ps 24:7; Isa 38:3; Jer 15:35). The form of the penitent criminal’s appeal is similar to that of Joseph in the LXX Gen 40:14: μνήσθητί μου διὰ σεαυτοῦ, ὅταν εὖ σοι γένηται (“show favor to me through you, when it is well with you”). Susan Brayford translates διὰ σεαυτοῦ (“through you”) as “you yourself”; Susan Brayford, Genesis (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 161.

405 Some manuscripts, however, read ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ (“in the power of the kingdom,” or “in the royal power”) in Luke 23:42 (N A C W Δ Θ Ψ 070 f f 28 33 157 180 205 565 597 700 802 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 Byz [E G H Q] Lect it a b q arm geo slav ms OrigensGt Asterius Cyril-Jerusalem Epiphanius; Maximus). Moreover, as Bruce M. Metzger mentions, codex Bezae’s witness, ἐν τῇ ήμέρᾳ τῆς ἐλευσεώς σου (“in the day of your coming”), may point
Lucan Jesus kingly status is probably associated with the glory he received after his sufferings, death, resurrection, and exaltation at the right hand of God (22:69; 24:26; Acts 2:30). Thus, the penitent criminal would naturally call Jesus by one of the Messianic titles.

On the other hand, εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου may also be understood here in a spatial sense and equated with “the Kingdom of God.” Indeed, Luke uses εἰς in a spatial sense very often throughout Luke-Acts and incorporates it into the expression εἰσπορεύονται (εἰσελθεῖν) εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ in a similar meaning (cf. Luke 18:17, 24, 25; Acts 14:22). After all, it matches with παράδεισος (“paradise”) as a blessed reality in the next verse. Therefore, taking into account all these arguments, it is worth suggesting that a spatial reading of “your Kingdom” in the criminal’s request, as a certain blessed reality referring to the fate of the righteous, may be preferable.

The Kingdom of God as an already present reality has a temporary limited location however. Thus, Jesus’ answer to the criminal in 23:43 with the mention of paradise may imply that his Kingdom is still not total until he enters his glory and comes again at the end of time. Luke could combine the Jewish notion of paradise as a blessed dwelling place of the righteous characterized by peace, joy, and eternal life (cf. Isa 51:3) with the belief that the Messiah reigns over it.

to the eschatological kingdom. See Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, 181. Jeremias also indicates that ἔρχομαι in this context can mean “come again” referring to Jesus’ parousia and the last judgment; J. Jeremias, “παράδεισος,” TDNT 5:770.


407 The criminal’s recognition of Jesus as king contrasts with the mockery of the soldiers and Pilate (23:37–38).


410 Ibid., 2:1006.


Indeed, according to 1 En. 61:11–12, the Chosen One (the Messiah) is glorified by the righteous in paradise and can be regarded as their king. The Lucan Jesus enters this paradise as a righteous martyr to be a king and brings the repentant criminal with him (μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ in Luke 23:43). The blessed reality of Jesus’ Kingdom is granted to the latter immediately after death (“today”; see p. 69). If these arguments are correct, there is no need to put the Lucan image of paradise into the context of an intermediate place of the righteous preceding their final destiny, as some scholars try to do. Nevertheless, the location of Lucan paradise remains uncertain. As has been demonstrated above, in Jewish traditions paradise is associated with either the original earthly paradise or with that in heaven (see p. 102). The New Testament documents also have different viewpoints on this account. The idea of the earthly paradise occurs in Rev 2:7 (cf. 22:1–5), while the heavenly one is found in 2 Cor 12:2–4. Indeed, in 2 Cor 12:2 Paul mentions the third heaven that can be identified with the paradise in 12:4.

Another expression representing the abode of the dead in Lucan writings is αἱ αἰωνίοι σκηναί (“eternal habitations”) that occurs in Luke 16:9 at the conclusion of the parable of the Dishonest Steward (16:1–13). This parable has been taken from Luke’s special material. Lehtipuu points out that in the context of this parable the eternal habitations are juxtaposed with the earthly dwellings of the debtors (οἱ οἶκοι αὐτῶν; 16:4) and stand for the good lot of the righteous. In this expression two terms, which seem to be incompatible, are conjoined: αἰώνιος means stability and eternity, while σκηνή (literally “tent”) relates to a collapsible and temporary structure. However, the expression σκηναῖ δικαίων (“the tents of the righteous,” LXX Ps 117:15) indicates the place of salvation and joy brought by the Lord. Later this expression (αἱ σκηναὶ τῶν δικαίων) occurs in T. Ab. a 20:14. Here it is located in paradise as the place of bliss, peace, joy, and eternal life, where Abraham was taken after his death. Indeed, as has been shown above, in Jewish apocalyptic texts the righteous are

---

413 Evans, Saint Luke, 874.
sometimes dwelling in the heavenly places associated with their final reward, together with the angels (e.g., 1 En. 41:2; 39:4,7; 61:2; see p. 101). In the Synoptics this meaning of σκηνή appears in the context of the transfiguration: Peter offers to make tents for Jesus, Moses, and Elijah as appropriate for the heavenly beings and supernatural figures (Luke 9:33; cf. Matt 17:4; Mk 9:5). Even more, in Rev 13:6 σκηνή designates the dwelling place of God and “those who dwell in heaven” (cf. Rev 15:5).

Turning back to Luke 16:9, it is difficult, as Lehtipuu convincingly demonstrates, to define whether those who wisely use their possessions will be received into the blessed eternal habitations immediately after their death or at the end of time. The main point Luke may be making here is that it is right behavior that results in preparedness for the end, no matter when it happens, after one’s death or at the end of this age.

Further, Abraham’s bosom, which appears in Luke 16:22–23, also refers to a certain blessed reality. This expression does not occur elsewhere in Luke-Acts or in the rest of the corpus of the New Testament texts, nor does it appear in most Jewish writings with the exception of a few later ones. It may represent several concepts: (1) a child lying on its parent’s lap (cf. John 1:18); (2) the proximity of a guest to the host at a banquet (reclining next to the host, cf. John 13:23; 2 Clem 4:5); (3) being gathered to one’s ancestors (cf. Gen 15:15). The first and second of these concepts may be combined in Luke 16:22, suggesting Lazarus’ close fellowship with Abraham at a banquet. Thus, Abraham's bosom may represent either an honorable position at a heavenly banquet or close communion with Abraham.

Evans, Saint Luke, 419. In addition, this word is sometimes used for the tabernacle or the tent of meeting as a sanctuary in the wilderness, associated with God’s glory and revelation (e.g., Exod 25:9; 26:1, 6–7, 9, 12; 30:16; cf. Acts 7:44).


Ibid., 288.

T. Ab. A 20, b. Qidd. 72a–b (ביחיו של אברם). T. Ab. a. 20:14 describes Abraham as having been taken into paradise to his own bosom (ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ αὐτοῦ), which means that he was put there before his own death. As many Christian elements were incorporated into the Testament of Abraham, it is possible that this expression was derived from Luke 16:22. See more comments on these texts in Lehtipuu, The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, 276, n. 39.

Marshall, The Gospel of Luke, 636. Lehtipuu also indicates that it could represent either an honorable position at a heavenly banquet or close communion with Abraham.

In Luke 13:28–29 Abraham is participating in the banquet in the transcendent future realm of the Kingdom of God. Referring to this passage, some scholars regard κόλπος Ἀβραάμ as a metaphor representing the messianic banquet,\footnote{E.g., Marshall, \textit{The Gospel of Luke}, 636. The \textit{Testament of Abraham} can be dated about 100 C.E. or even later up to the 3rd century C.E. See Sanders, “Testament of Abraham,” 1:874–875.} where Lazarus enjoys fellowship with Abraham and other righteous people from Israel’s past. In 16:22 however, Luke describes such fellowship not as an event in the distant eschatological future, but as Lazarus' immediate postmortem fate.\footnote{Moreover, the Messiah is not explicitly mentioned at this banquet.} Further, some scholars identify it with paradise,\footnote{E.g., A. Jülicher, \textit{Die Gleichnisreden Jesu} (Band 2; Freiburg: Mohr Siebeck, 1899), 623; Richard Bauckham, “Hades, Hell,” \textit{ABD} 3:315. Marshall, however, rejects this idea, but without giving any clear argumentation; see Marshall, \textit{The Gospel of Luke}, 636.} and as a temporal place for the righteous while waiting for the last judgment,\footnote{As e.g., Mattill, Osei-Bonsu, and Bovon suggest. See Matill, \textit{Luke and Last Things}, 34; Osei-Bonsu, “The Intermediate State in Luke-Acts,” 123; Bovon, \textit{Evangelium nach Lukas}, 3:121.} i.e., a “happy side” of Hades as Mattill calls it. However, as has been shown above (see p. 69), there is no indication of any further change of postmortem destiny in Luke 16:19–31.\footnote{See the analysis of this issue in Lehtipuu, \textit{The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus}, 277–284.} At any rate, Lazarus occupies the exalted and most honorable place at the assembly of the righteous,\footnote{Jeremias, \textit{The Parables of Jesus}, 184.} probably at a certain heavenly banquet.\footnote{Joel B. Green, \textit{The Gospel of Luke} (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997), 607; Lehtipuu, \textit{The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus}, 215.} As well as paradise, the place where Abraham and Lazarus dwell in a close relationship (depicted by the metaphor “Abraham’s bosom”) could also

Moreover, these two connotations do not need to be mutually exclusive. See Lehtipuu, \textit{The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus}, 215.
serve for Luke as a representation of the concept of the honorable blessed reality destined for the righteous.\footnote{Luke 16:22 indicates that Lazarus was taken away to Abraham's bosom (ἀπενεχθῆναι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἰς τὸν κόλπον Ἀβραὰμ). Referring to the use of ἀποφέρω in Greco-Roman pagan literature (e.g., in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Lysias), Pieter W. van der Horst argues that Luke tries not only to show that Lazarus was transferred to a certain place but also “to convey the sense of Abraham’s bosom as the place where the poor Lazarus belonged and that he was entitled to”; Pieter W. van der Horst, “Abraham’s Bosom, the Place Where He Belonged: A Short Note on ἀπενεχθῆναι in Luke 16:22,” in Jews and Christians in Their Graeco-Roman Context: Selected Essays on Early Judaism, Samaritanism, Hellenism, and Christianity (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 164–166. In this connection, one can compare Abraham’s bosom and the Kingdom of God, which belongs to the poor (Luke 6:20); ibid., 166.}

Further, in Luke 16:23 the rich man looks up (ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ) to see Abraham “far away” (μακρόθεν) together with Lazarus in his bosom (16:22–23).\footnote{Although κόλπος is used in the plural in 16:23, its sense is similar to that of 16:22.} It is worth suggesting that the indication of the spatial difference (altitude and distance) between these two people is not accidental.\footnote{A detailed linguistic and exegetical analysis of ἐπῆρεν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ (“he lifted up his eyes”) in Luke 16:23 will be provided below (see p. 232).} It may symbolize the great difference between the postmortem fates of the rich man and Lazarus: the former is below, while the latter is above and there is a vast distance between them. On the other hand, even being separated by altitude and distance, the rich man and Lazarus can see each other. Moreover, this can refer to the above mentioned evidence of 4 Ezra 7:85, 93, 96 that the places for the souls of the righteous and the wicked are close enough to one another that they can still see one another (see p. 90). Although it may be seen as too literalistic a reading of these verses,\footnote{Stone, Fourth Ezra, 241.} Luke 16:23 supports such an interpretation.

To summarize, Luke uses several terms for the representation of the abode of the righteous. The Kingdom of God referring to the eschatological future in Luke 13:28–29, where it appears as an eschatological banquet, may refer to the blessed realm in the hereafter. In 23:42–43 the Kingdom is represented as paradise, which designates its limited character in this age and the gift of eternal life for the righteous. Further, the imagery of “eternal habitations” (16:9)
refers to the place of salvation and joy for the righteous. The expression “Abraham's bosom” (16:22–23) indicates a close relationship between Abraham and Lazarus and the latter's exalted and highly honored position in the blessed reality depicted as a banquet where Abraham and Lazarus enjoy close fellowship. The exact local setting (either heavenly or earthly) of these representations remains vague, but referring to similar Jewish imagery suggests that they certainly are not located underground. Finally, in terms of time, these representations never explicitly denote an intermediate place of the righteous between their death and final destiny.

2.3 Summary

In sum, Luke uses various terms for the representation of the abode of the dead. In doing so, he combines several views on the concept of Hades, both as the abode of all the dead and as the place of the punishment of the wicked, but without specifying its character as either interim or final. In addition, he utilizes some other representations of the underworld: “Gehenna” as a rough equivalent of the place of punishment for the wicked, the “abyss” as the place of imprisonment of the fallen angels and spirits, “his own place” as a certain place in the underworld, which one occupies after death, “perdition” as an indicator of the eternal punishment of the wicked, and “this place of torment,” referring to Hades as the place of suffering of the wicked. These terms are found in either pagan or Jewish contexts dealing with the destiny of the wicked.

Furthermore, in speaking about the abode of the righteous, Luke does not confine himself to one particular term. First of all, he uses one aspect of the concept of the Kingdom of God. In Luke 13:28–29 it appears as an eschatological banquet, while in 23:42–43 it is represented as paradise, which Luke could adopt from Jewish traditions. These two images emphasize the joy of salvation and of a dwelling place of the righteous ruled by the Messiah, as well as the limited character of the Kingdom in this age. In addition, the image of paradise is associated with the gift of eternal life. Indeed, the righteous will be granted eternal life (Luke 10:25; 18:24–25; Acts 13:46, 48) or simply “life” (Acts 11:18) in the Kingdom of God and will have their names written in heaven (Luke 10:20). Luke also uses the expression “eternal habitations,” most probably regarding it as the place of salvation and joy for the righteous. In Luke 16:22–23 the expression “Abraham's bosom” represents the close fellowship Abraham
and Lazarus enjoy at a banquet in the blessed reality where the latter occupies the exalted and most honorable position.

In the light of all this, how do these terms for the abode of the dead relate to each other? Do they represent separate places between which the soul of the deceased wanders until it finds its final destiny, or they can be harmonized into a hierarchical system corresponding to Luke's eschatological views? It seems it is hardly possible to build any coherent system or to harmonize them in spite of the attempts of some early Christian authors and some modern scholars to appoint them their definite locations. Indeed, the representations of the Lucan otherworld do not explicitly refer to specific intermediate states of the soul. Moreover, the exact spatial setting of these places remains vague. Nevertheless, in his representations of the abode of the wicked and that of the righteous, Luke signifies the spatial difference between the locations of these two groups of the dead. What more then does this difference between Luke's various representations of the abode of the dead tell us about the interrelation between them, and how does it affect the inequality between the states of the wicked and the righteous? The further analysis of Luke's combination of different representations of the abode of dead will be one of the subjects of the final chapter of the present research.
PART 2. FORMS OF AFTERLIFE EXISTENCE

Chapter 3. Resurrection

As the analysis of the previous part of this research demonstrates, Luke operates with several categories of eschatological views which exist side by side in his double work. In doing so, he does not create a systematic picture of the future or postmortem destiny of the individual. Consequently, Luke's representations of the abode of the dead are similarly diverse. He combines different representations which can hardly be coherently described. The next question is how this affects his views on the forms of afterlife existence for the individual? Although resurrection seems to dominate, as has been pointed out (see p. 1), Luke-Acts also reflects some other forms: immortality of the soul and angelomorphic existence. This part of the present research discusses several forms of afterlife existence as they appear in Luke-Acts, as well as those found in Luke's cultural milieu of the ancient Mediterranean world, referring first to pagan and then to Jewish sources. This chapter will investigate the issue of the resurrection from the dead to which Luke directly refers as a principal form of afterlife existence. Chapter 4 will explore other forms of the afterlife in Luke's double work.

Linguistically, the issue of resurrection is represented most frequently in Luke-Acts by forms of the verbs ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω. Among other words used the verbs ζάω, ζωοποιέω, and ζωογονέω occur.\textsuperscript{433} The authors of the other early Christian texts also use this vocabulary for this type of afterlife existence. In addition, the word ἀνάστασις ("resurrection") often occurs in Luke-Acts for the designation of both individual and eschatological resurrection.\textsuperscript{434}

In point of fact, Luke uses ἀνίστημι, ἀνάστασις, ἐγείρω, and related words for several ideas: (1) eschatological resurrection; (2) individual resurrection; (3) the resurrection of Jesus; (4) resuscitation or restoration of physical life. This


\textsuperscript{434} Luke 14:14; 20:27, 33, 35–36; Acts 1:22; 2:31; 4:2, 33; 17:18, 32; 23:6, 8; 24:15, 21; 26:23. However, in Luke 2:34 it does not deal with resurrection (see n. 869).
chapter will be dealing with these ideas in sequence, apart from #3 as it goes beyond the scope of the present study. Nevertheless, it will be briefly discussed in its connection with idea #2.

These ideas can be combined here under the general title “resurrection” for convenience of presentation, but how do they relate to each other? In addition, how have these three lexemes come to be associated with resurrection? The origins of resurrection terminology will be examined first.

### 3.1 The Origins of the Resurrection Terminology

As Endsjø argues, many Greeks may have perceived immortality as involving both body and soul. Indeed, many Greco-Roman pagans, especially in popular circles, regarded human nature as a psychosomatic unity. The existence of the soul without the body was seen as insufficient as it does not constitute a complete person.\(^{435}\) For many Greeks therefore,\(^{436}\) to become immortal meant to receive a share in the divine world and to have an eternal union of body and soul.\(^{437}\) Moreover, a few individuals were believed to gain physical immortality after their resuscitation or after their translation to the world of the gods. Nevertheless, linguistically the concept of resurrection was not fully formed and from this point of view, resurrection as receiving eternal life was perceived as something impossible. For instance, this is so for Homer (I. 24,550). Aeschylus (525 B.C.E. – 456 B.C.E.) in his Eumenides also declares the absence of the resurrection: ἅ παξ θανόντος, ο ὔτις ἔστ' ἀνάστασις (“once one has died, there is no resurrection,” Eum. 648).\(^{438}\) However, as will be shown below, forms

---

\(^{435}\) Endsjø, *Greek Resurrection Beliefs and the Success of Christianity*, 24.

\(^{436}\) Obviously excluding such philosophers as Plato.

\(^{437}\) Endsjø, *Greek Resurrection Beliefs and the Success of Christianity*, 39, 57. Indeed, in contrast to the postmortem state of humans and heroes, the gods were often characterized by their corporeality. It can be demonstrated by the example from I. 5.334–340 where Diomedes physically wounds the body of the goddess Aphrodite. "Ἀφθιτος (“incorruptible,” “imperishable”) is used both for the physical objects, such “veil,” “scepter,” “shield,” “vine,” or “gold” (e.g., Od. 5.346–347; 9.133; I. 2.46; II. 2.247; 5.724) and for the gods (e.g., Hymni Homerici, *In Mercurium* 326; Aristophanes, Av. 702; Hesiod, *Theog.* 389, 397, 805), probably in order to emphasize their physical nature (Endsjø, *Greek Resurrection Beliefs and the Success of Christianity*, 40).

\(^{438}\) Bremmer, *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife*, 41.
of the verb ἀνίστημι and the noun ἀνάστασις are used in contexts about the restoration of the physical life (see p. 156, 158).

It is difficult to point out exactly when the idea of resurrection first occurred in Judaism. Moreover, as Lehtipuu notices, “while many Jewish sources bear witness to the fact that belief in resurrection grew stronger before the turn of the era, many of them remain ambivalent concerning the precise nature of resurrection.” Indeed, how could the essential nature of resurrection have been perceived? This issue will be considered in detail in chapter 5, but first, referring to this argument, the terminology which is pertinent to resurrection in the Hebrew Bible and cognate Jewish sources needs to be discussed. This section will deal with this question.

There are several passages from the Hebrew Bible that could serve as a basis for the further development of the idea of resurrection in Judaism, and especially for the shaping of its terminology. However, it is rather problematic to regard these evidences as indications that in a particular text the very idea of resurrection per se is presented unequivocally. It is safer to claim that the later tradition borrowed some language and imagery from these texts, or made several allusions to them.

First of all, an important text is Hos 6:1–2:

Come, let us return to the LORD; for it is he who has torn, and he will heal us; he has struck down, and he will bind us up. After two days he will revive us (יְחַיֵּנוּ); on the third day he will raise us up (יְקִמֵנוּ), that we may live before him (לְפָנָיו וְנִחְיֶה; NRSV).

This prophecy belongs to Hosea’s discourse about the punishment and restoration of Israel, and was delivered in the 8th century B.C.E. in the tumultuous time before the siege and fall of Samaria. As Johnston demonstrates, in its immediate context this passage speaks about the healing and restoration from physical wounds and sickness of Ephraim and Judah,

---

which the Assyrian king could not heal (cf. 5:13–14). Indeed, king Hezekiah was healed on the third day of his disease (2 Kgs 20:6). The three day period can serve here as an image of healing, recovery, and even restoration of life. Thus, Hos 6:1–2 speaks about the healing and restoration of the nation of Israel rather than about personal resurrection. However, the imagery and language Hosea uses was further adopted for the development of the concept of personal resurrection.

The next important passage is found in Isa 26:19, which uses some of the same imagery as Hosea. This verse belongs to the first part of the Book of Isaiah (chapters 1–39). Isaiah 24–27 committed to writing in the 6th–5th centuries B.C.E.

> Your dead shall live (יִחְיוּ), their corpses shall rise (נְבֵלָתִי נְקֻמִּי). O dwellers in the dust (שֹׁכְנֵיﬠָפָר), awake (הָקִיצוּ) and sing for joy! For your dew is a radiant dew, and the earth will give birth to those long dead. (Isa 26:19 NRSV)

---

441 This motif also occurs in Mesopotamian medical texts (Johnston, *Shades of Sheol*, 222).
442 The Syrian god Adonis was believed to be raised on the third day; see James Luther Mays, *Hosea* (OTL; London: SCM, 1969), 95. The revival of Osiris and Inanna was also associated with a period of three days; Hans Walter Wolff, *Hosea* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 117.
444 Cf. 1 Sam 2:6.
445 As John Day claims, the resurrection imagery used in Hos 6:1–2 and then in Isa 26:19 and Dan 12:2–3 has its origin in Canaanite Baal mythology and later was “demythologized” in these biblical writings; see John Day, “Resurrection Imagery from Baal to the Book of Daniel,” in *Congress Volume: Cambridge 1995* (ed. J. A. Emerton; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 125–133.
447 Although the singular form of נבֵלָה in the status constructus is used here, it is translated as a plural form, according to its context. It is used with a similar meaning in Isa 5:25: נְבֵלָתָם (“their corpses”).
Chapters 24–27 of Isaiah are very different from the preceding and following chapters in terms of their subject matter, language, and imagery. They are a type of apocalyptic statement describing a world-wide cataclysm and national annihilation, as well as the vindication and preservation of those committed to the Lord and the defeat of the enemies. Chapter 26 speaks about the present disastrous state of Israel and her future vindication. Therefore, the original context of 26:19 is most probably connected with the subject of national revival and restoration. As Nickelsburg states, the resurrection imagery used in 26:19 occurs in pre-exilic and exilic texts not as a description of the literally dead but as “a picture of the restoration of Israel.” The motif of resurrection appears in Isa 26:19 in the context of the requirement of God’s justice.

However, “your dead” may refer not only to Israel in the context of national restoration but also to those who suffer from their enemies and hope for God’s righteousness (cf. 26:3–4) and mercy, which is able even to raise the righteous dead. Indeed, in contrast to the people of Israel, the foreign oppressors will not be raised (26:11, 14), but turned into dust (אֵין תְנֵפָם; 25:12). Death will be swallowed up forever for the Israelites (25:7). In 26:19 the dead are metaphorically depicted as “dwellers in the dust.” This is connected with the Israelite understanding of human nature as shaped from the dust of the earth, inspired by God’s breath (Gen 2:7), and returning to dust after death. The resurrection of the dead in Isa 26:19 is modeled on this account and appears as a “(newly) creative action of God.” The use of resurrection language may presuppose the existence of this imagery in the worldview of the Israelites. However, such ideas should be argued very carefully, because the specificity of the collective consciousness of Israelite society of that time has to be kept in mind. In their immediate context revival and victory over the enemies could

449 Martin-Achard, From Death to Life, 137.
450 As Martinus C. de Boer notes, Isa 24–27 was written for those who suffered oppression from the enemies of Israel (de Boer, The Defeat of Death, 44–45).
451 Cf. כל יורדין תמר (‘all who go down to the dust;” Ps 22:29 NRSV).
452 de Boer, The Defeat of Death, 46.
453 Johnston, Shades of Sheol, 225.
easily have been understood as a promise of the nation's survival despite the onslaught of the enemies and mortal danger.

The next important passage is Ezek 37:1–14. Most of the dated oracles of the Book of Ezekiel refer to the time around Nebuchadnezzar's siege and destruction of Jerusalem in 587–586 B.C.E. Ezek 11:1; 8:1; 40:1; 29:17–21 indicate that Ezekiel's prophetic activity may have started several years earlier and continued at least sixteen years after the destruction of Jerusalem.\footnote{Margaret S. Odell, \textit{Ezekiel} (Macon, Ga.: Smith & Helwys, 2205), 5. The prophet Ezekiel lived in the Babylonian Exile between 593 and 571 B.C.E. See Joseph Blenkinsopp, \textit{A History of Prophecy in Israel} (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), p.167.} Ezek 37:1–14 belongs to the section dealing with the themes of hope and restoration for Israel (chapters 33–48). These prophecies of the manifestation of the Lord's honor, as well as of the encouragement and hope for Israel follow the threatening part of the book dealing with proclaiming the Lord's judgment, entailing the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile. Ezek 37:1–14 speaks about the vision of a valley of dry bones. At the Lord's command Ezekiel prophesies to those bones and they rearrange themselves into skeletons, grow sinews, muscles, and skin (37:7–8). Then he prophesies again and breath (רָוחָ) comes into these bodies. They come alive and stand (יָעַמְדוּ) on their feet (37:9–10). Afterwards, the explanation of the vision follows: “these bones are the whole house of Israel” (37:11).

The Israelites were like the dry bones that cannot live again but the Lord will open their graves and bring them back from there to life:

> I am going to open your graves, and bring you up from your graves, O my people; and I will bring you back to the land of Israel. And you shall know that I am the LORD, when I open your graves (אֲנִי אֶת־קִבְרוֹתֵיכֶם פֹתֵ), and bring you up from your graves (וְהַﬠֲלֵיתִי אֶתְכֶם מִקִּבְרוֹתֵיכֶם), O my people. I will put my spirit within you, and you shall live (וִחְיִיתֶם), and I will place you on your own soil; then you shall know that I, the LORD, have spoken and will act. (Ezek 37:12–14 NRSV)

In its immediate context, the vision of the revivified bodies in 37:1–14 depicts a reconstituted and restored people of Israel. It is seen as “a dazzling parable of...
return from exile.” Thus, in spite of using the imagery of growing sinews, muscles, and skin, opening graves and bringing up from the graves that could later be perceived as associated with resurrection, it is unlikely that this passage speaks about a personal resurrection from the dead. Moreover, this imagery is too natural and earthly to be referring to eschatological resurrection.

Further, Psalm 1 provides a good example of a text that could be a source of some afterlife imagery for later texts. The main subject of this Psalm, which was probably written in the post-exilic period, is a contrast between the righteous and the wicked in their behavior and destiny.

Therefore the wicked will not stand (literally “arise”; לֹא־יָקוּם) in the judgment, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous. (בַּﬠֲדַת צַדִּיקִים; Ps 1:5 NRSV)

The immediate context of this verse implies the punishment of the wicked in their physical life. Then their judgment can be seen as a certain civil or religious procedure. The congregation of the righteous is related to the worshiping community of Israel committed to the Lord and to the Law.457 However, later this psalm could have been used in an eschatological context: the meaning of לֹא־יָקוּם (from קוּמ „arise”), of the subject of the judgment, and of the congregation of the righteous were reconsidered.458

455 Johnston, Shades of Sheol, 223.
456 As J. Tromp argues, the image of dry bones did not appear as a proof-text of the resurrection of the body until the second century C.E. Although 4 Macc. 18:17 quotes Ezek 37:3 along with other biblical citations, it reflects the notion that the martyrs could regain their lives in heaven rather than the rising of their bodies from their graves; Johannes Tromp, ““Can These Bones Live?’ Ezekiel 37:1–14 and Eschatological Resurrection’,” in The Book of Ezekiel And Its Influence (ed. Henk Jan de Jonge and Johannes Tromp; Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2007), 66. Arguing that Ezekiel 37 was not a proof-text of bodily resurrection until the second century C.E., Tromp fails to mention Rev 11:11 referring to Ezek 37:5, 10. Although it does not relate to the eschatological resurrection, it clearly indicates the bodily resurrection of the two witnesses and their ascension to heaven. Thus, this verse can be considered to be one of the earliest references to Ezek 37 as an evidence of the resurrection of the body.
457 Johnston, Shades of Sheol, 227.
458 Moreover, the topic of Ps 1:3 could have been reread as a reference to paradise (cf. Ezek 47:12).
In addition, there are some significant examples in the Book of Job. First, in Job 14:12-14 the author asks the question whether the dead can be raised:

So mortals lie down and do not rise again; until the heavens are no more, they will not awake or be roused out of their sleep. Oh that you would hide me in Sheol, that you would conceal me until your wrath is past, that you would appoint me a set time, and remember me! If mortals die, will they live again? All the days of my service I would wait until my release should come. (NRSV)

In contrast to this question, Job 19:25–27 speaks about the Redeemer. The Hebrew text of this passage is rather obscure, but it gives some input for the development of the resurrection terminology in the LXX (see p. 125):

For I know that my Redeemer lives and that at last he shall rise upon dust. And after my skin has been thus cut down, then I shall see God from my flesh, whom I shall see for myself . . .

Further, a more obvious motif of resurrection appears in Dan 12:2–3, 13. Verses 2–3 are almost universally accepted as an account of the eschatological resurrection in the Hebrew Bible. The imagery of Hos 6:1–2 that was developed in Isa 26:19 had then been “demythologized” in Dan 12:2–3. These verses

---

459 It is difficult to define the exact date of the Book of Job. It may have been composed in the 3rd century B.C.E. or several centuries earlier. See the discussion on the date of this book, e.g., in Marvin H. Pope, Job (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965), xxx–xxxvii.

460 In Isa 14:9 עֹר and קוּם are also used in similar context: “Sheol beneath is stirred up to meet you when you come; it rouses the shades to greet you, all who were leaders of the earth; it raises (הָאָבֶר) from their thrones all who were kings of the nations.” (Isa 14:9 NRSV)

461 The LXX version of this verse, however, does not necessarily imply the question: “For if a man died, he shall live again (ζήσεται), having accomplished the days of his life. I will wait until I would be made again.”

clearly speak about the resurrection of the dead in their immediate context. Chapters 7–12 of the Book of Daniel were probably compiled during the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus IV Epiphanes (168–164 B.C.E.). Dan 12:1–3 shapes the climax of the angelic discourse of 11:2–12:3 surveying the history of the most prominent powers from the Persian Empire (the time of Cyrus) to Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The end of the latter comes suddenly (11:45b) with the appearance of Michael the prince (דניאל דaniel ד',), bringing great distress and the deliverance of the people of Israel (12:1). Many of those (ברית ברית) who sleep in the dust of the earth (השכין כשכין, אדמת עפר) shall awake (קשת), some (שכין) to everlasting life (חיים עולים), and some (שכין) to shame and everlasting contempt (דרון עולם). Those who are wise (המתים) shall shine like the brightness (כחן) of the sky, and those who lead many to righteousness (מאמין רבים, כוכבים) like the stars (כוכבים) forever and ever. (Dan 12:2–3 NRSV)

The author of this text is probably not concerned with universal resurrection as he mentions that only “many” but not “all” the people will be resurrected. Most likely he is speaking about the faithful and deceitful of the Maccabean time. Some scholars argue that Dan 12:2–3 involves only the resurrection of the righteous. The wicked will be not resurrected but will be eternally held in

464 Collins, Daniel, 390.
465 Daniel 12:1b emphasizes that not all the people of Israel will be delivered from the distress but only those “written in the book.” ספר here is most likely associated with the book of life referring to the community to be restored (Isa 4:3; cf. Exod 32:32–33; Ps 69:28; Mal 3:16–18). “The book” in Dan 12:1 is not simply the book of the renewed community, but the book of eternal life (Collins, Daniel, 389).
466 Ibid., 390.
contempt. However, it is not obvious from the text, as it says . . . (literally, “while those . . .”), which could refer to the resurrection of the wicked. This point is argued, *inter alios*, by Robert Martin-Achard, George W. E. Nickelsburg, and John J. Collins and seems to be correct. Thus, it may be suggested that this passage deals with the general resurrection: both the righteous dead and the wicked will be restored to life to be judged along with the living. In this case, the righteous will be resurrected and rewarded with eternal life, while the wicked will be punished after their resurrection and judgment and will experience their disgrace. Then the righteous will be transformed into a certain glorious state, which is described in terms of light and astronomical imagery (see p. 190). The expression יִחְיֶה עֹלָם (“eternal life”) is a clear-cut indication of the immortality given to them.

In 12:2 the dead are called יְשֵׁנֵי אַדְמַת־ﬠָפָר (“those who sleep in the dust of the earth”), which is connected with the imagery of Isa 26:19:ليلך כְּזֹהַר (the sleeping in the dust”, cf. 25:12; Job 19:25), and, ultimately with Gen 2:7 and 3:19b. The process of the resurrection of the dead, who are sleeping, is described as their waking up (קִיץ). A form of the verb קִיץ is used in Isa 26:19 in a similar sense. Thus Dan 12:2–3 may be alluding to it. It is noteworthy that forms of קִיץ in the context of the afterlife also occur in Jer 51:39, 57; Job 14:12, which also speak about death as sleep.

In Dan 12:13 concluding the angelic instructions, Daniel is promised resurrection at the end of time: “But you go to your end (לַקֵּץ) and rest (וְתָנוּ) You shall rise (וְתַﬠֲמֹד) for your lot (or “reward”; לְגֹרָל) at the end of the days

---

467 B. J. Alfrink, “L’idée de resurrection d’après Dan., XII, 1.2.,” *Bib* 40 (1959): 355–371. This idea has been adopted by de Boer (de Boer, *The Defeat of Death*, 48) and some other scholars; see the list in ibid., 199 and in Collins, *Daniel*, 393, n. 216.


469 Collins, *Daniel*, 393.


(לְקֵץ רֶפֶן).” Here the resurrection is represented by a form of the verb יָמַד (cf. Ezek 37:10).472

As is seen from the analysis of these passages from the Hebrew Bible, which were later interpreted as referring to the resurrection, the process of resurrection is represented by forms of verbs from the roots곀, קָוָא, קִימָא, קִימֹא, and יָמַד. Later, in the LXX forms of the verbs ζάω, ζῆν ποιέω, ζωοποιέω, ζωόω, ζωπυρέω (cf. ἐφεξήγησα), εὐεργετησάμενος (cf. ἐπετεύχθη), and ἐγείρω (cf. ὑρ, קֶימַ, לַקָּמִים) became the basic representations of resurrection. 473 Indeed, יְקִימוּן ("he will revive us") in Hos 6:2 became ἀναστήσομεθα ("we shall arise"); יְקִימוּ ("your corpses shall rise") in Isa 26:19 was translated as ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις; לֹא יָקֻמוּ ("they will not rise") in Ps 1:5 was rendered as οὐκ ἀναστήσονται; יָקִיצוּ ("will awake") in Dan 12:2 as ἀναστήσονται.474

Further, there are some significant changes or additions in the Greek versions of some texts discussed above. Indeed, the LXX rendering of Isa 26:19 is different from the Hebrew original in some significant details:

The dead will rise (ἀναστήσονται) and those who are in the tombs will be raised (ἐγείρθησονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις) and those who are in the earth will rejoice: for the dew from you is healing to them, but the land of the godless will be destroyed.

472 Ezek 37:10: וַיַּﬠַמְדוּ ("and they stood up on their feet"). יָמַד occurs in the context of the resurrection in later texts (cf. b. Sanch. 90b; b. Ketub. 111b). See the use of this verb in the Qumran literature in Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 65. Also its use in an Aramaic inscription from Beth She’arim (BS iii 15) may refer to resurrection: יָמִד יִמְרְעָא ("their resurrection with the righteous," Park, Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions, 169.

473 The translation of the Hebrew Scriptures had been started in the 3rd century B.C.E. (the Pentateuch was translated first), when Jewish views on the afterlife had already been more developed, and continued until the middle of the 2nd century B.C.E. This is seen from the Preface to the Book of Sirach: its author most likely knew the full LXX; see also Lee M McDonald, The Biblical Canon: its Origin, Transmission, and Authority (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007), 115–119.

474 In Theodotion’s translation of Dan 12:2 there is ἐξεγείρθησονται instead of ἀναστήσονται.
In this text the imperatives “awake” and “shout with joy” are replaced with indicative of εὐφραίνω (“rejoice”), while “will live” (יִחְיוּ) became “will rise” (ἀναστήσονται). Then, the “dwellers in the dust” are changed to “those who are in the earth.” This may refer to those who will survive during the punishment of the dead under the earth. “The earth will give birth to those long dead” is translated as “the land of the godless will be destroyed,” while the ἀσεβεῖς (“ungodly”) is used instead of רְפָאִים. The idea of such destruction may indicate a contrast in the destiny of the righteous and the wicked. The destiny of the wicked is not mentioned and it seems “they are simply forgotten.” The resurrection is seen as a reward of the righteous and the bestowal of eternal life on them. This type of the eschatological resurrection is different from that of Dan 12:2–3, which most probably deals with the resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked.

Next, the obscure Hebrew text of Job 19:26a becomes clearer in its LXX version: “to raise up my skin (ἀναστήσαι τὸ δέρμα μου) that endures these things.” In LXX Job 42:17, after the words about Job having died old and full of days, a very important addition to the Hebrew text appears: “it is written that he shall arise again (πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι) with those whom the Lord shall raise (ἀνίστησιν).” This addition clearly speaks about the resurrection in which Job will take part of. “With those whom the Lord shall raise” indicates that this is the resurrection of the righteous.

Thus, the most frequent lexical representations of resurrection in the LXX are forms of ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω. While in Greco-Roman pagan culture forms of ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω, as well as ἀνάστασις (“rising up,” “resurrection”) occur, 475 More literally, “the earth will throw out the dead.”

476 This translation is probably connected with the understanding of נָרָץ רַפָאִים תַּפֵּיל in Isa 26:19 as “you shall destroy the land of the dead.” On the other hand, as Brook W. R. Pearson puts it, the Greek translator of Isa 26:19 could have been heavily influenced by Greek cosmological and afterlife ideas. In this case, “the land of the godless” may refer to Tartarus, where the ancient Titans were imprisoned; Brook W. R. Pearson, “Resurrection and the Judgment of the Titans,” in Resurrection (ed. Stanley E. Porter, Michael A. Hayes, and David Tombs; JSNTSup 186; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 33–51.

477 de Boer, The Defeat of Death, 49.

478 The resurrection terminology of 2 Maccabees 7 is also confined to the forms of ἀνίστημι, ἀνάστασις, and ζωὴ αἰωνία (see p. 146).
mostly in the context of the restoration of corpses, in the LXX these lexemes have acquired new meanings in accord with the actively developing Jewish beliefs in the afterlife.⁴⁷⁹ These verbs are also frequent in the context of resurrection in other Jewish texts.⁴⁸⁰

To sum up, while conceptually some Greeks may have had a belief in the possibility of physical immortality, linguistically this concept was not well formed in pagan sources. Nevertheless, some terminology that is similar to that used in Jewish literature and associated with resurrection occurs in contexts speaking about the restoration of physical life.

Further, the analysis of the most relevant passages from the Hebrew Bible, which were later associated with the resurrection, demonstrates that this concept is most frequently represented by forms of verbs from the roots חיָה, קוּם, קִיץ, עוּר, and רֹמַד. Moreover, קוּמ, קִיץ, עוּר, and רֹמַד in many contexts are associated with the idea of rising up, waking up, getting up, or standing. In the LXX and other Jewish literature in Greek various forms of the verbs ζῆν ποιέω, ζωοποιέω, ζωόω, ζωπυρέω, ἀνίστημι, and ἐγείρω became the basic representations of resurrection. The most frequent lexemes are ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω. They also often express the idea of rising, standing up, waking, or getting up from sleep in everyday contexts.

3.2 Eschatological Resurrection

3.2.1 Eschatological Resurrection in Jewish Sources

The issue of eschatological resurrection is linked with Jewish views on collective eschatology and the final judgment at the end of time with its rewards and punishments (see p. 57). Isa 26:19 and Dan 12:2–3 discussed above serve as remarkable representations of two basic aspects of the eschatological resurrection developed in further Jewish texts: the resurrection of the righteous and the general resurrection. This section will analyze in more detail these two aspects of the Jewish views on eschatological resurrection.

⁴⁷⁹ Cf. ἀνάστασις in a Hellenistic Jewish inscription (BS ii 194) found in Beth She’arim: Εὐτυχῶς τῇ ὑμῶν ἀνάστασι ("good luck to your resurrection," translation by Park; Park, Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions, 165.
3.2.1.1 The Resurrection of the Righteous

A certain collective resurrection of the righteous is implied in the Book of Watchers. According to 1 En. 22:1–4, the souls of the dead are gathered into four hollow places in this great and high mountain in the west, waiting for the day of the great judgment. After the judgment the souls of the righteous will be raised (1 En. 22:13). In 25:3–6 they will be given the fruit of the tree of life which it had been forbidden to touch until the last judgment, and its fragrance will be in their bones (αἱ ὀσμαὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ὀστέοις αὐτῶν, 25:6). This fruit will give them life, which means long life on the earth, comparable with that of Enoch’s ancestors (ca. 900 years), without torments, plagues, or suffering (25:6). However, there is no mention of eternal life. The risen righteous will be transferred to Jerusalem together with the tree of life, being transplanted there after the judgment (25:5–6). Meanwhile, the wicked will be punished after the final judgment at the cursed valley to the west, which will be their place of habitation (26:4–27:2). They (the spirits of the sinners) will not be

---

481 The souls of sinners will be neither slain nor raised from their places (μὴ μετεγερθῶσιν ἐντεῦθεν), according to 1 En. 22:13.

482 Although in Semitic use “bones” can refer to substance or self, it is still possible to consider the corporeal resurrection here. Cf. הָנֶשׁ in BDB, 782, אֶפֶך in Jastrow 1:270. See also e.g., the use of the image of תּוֹﬠַצְמ in Ezek 37:5, 7–10; Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 313.

483 Ethiopic ኢቡፋ, Greek εἰς ζωήν. However, Nickelsburg translates it “will be” instead of “unto life,” reconstructing Aramaic לחיין (“to life”) as הלוא (“to be”); see Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 312–313.

484 The Greek text has ζωήν πλείονα ζήσονται ἐπὶ γῆς ἣν ἔζησαν οἱ πατέρες σου (“they will live life exceeding that which your fathers lived on the earth”) suggesting life even longer than that of your ancestors.

485 The description of this blessed life connects with the account of 10:16–17 about the appearing of the plant of righteousness and truth (τὸ φυτὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας in the Greek version of 1 Enoch) after the time of judgment (10:14), when the righteous will be living long lives in peace and blessing.

486 This barren and cursed valley contrasts with the blessed Jerusalem with its many blossoming trees and abundance of water. Nickelsburg, reconstructing the geographical depiction of this valley, argues that the author of the text could have had in mind the valley of Hinnom, which later became the image of Gehenna (Nicksburg, 1 Enoch 1, 319). According to 2 Kgs 23:10; 2 Chr 28:3; 33:6; Jer 7:31; 32:35, this valley was a place of idolatrous cults in late pre-exilic times. Moreover, Isa 66:24 alludes to it as a place of fiery punishment for sinners after their judgment in the sight of the righteous.
“raised from there,” i.e., from their dwellings after their death.\textsuperscript{487} The character of the resurrection of the righteous here is ambiguous. This resurrection is not necessarily bodily, but, as H. C. C. Cavallin puts it, is rather a “resurrection of the soul or spirit,”\textsuperscript{488} i.e., the raising of their souls/spirits from the pit where they have been put after their death.

Further, according to the Epistle of Enoch (\textit{1 Enoch} 91–104), which deals with threats and promises for the righteous and sorrowful predictions for the wicked, the souls of the righteous will come back to life from Sheol (102:4–8; 103:4). After the judgment and punishment of the wicked the righteous dead will arise from their sleep, walk in the paths of the righteousness and be given wisdom.\textsuperscript{489} Moreover, they will walk in everlasting light and will be transformed into moral perfection (92:4; cf. 96:3).\textsuperscript{490} The souls of the righteous who suffered from the wicked during their earthly lives will be vindicated and brought back to life (103:3–4). After the great judgment (104:5), the righteous (probably both those who were dead and those who are still alive) will be transformed into a glorious state: they will shine like the luminaries of heaven and will have access to the portals of heaven (104:2). Moreover, after such a transformation the righteous will probably be in some way like the angels: they will have similar great joy (104:4) and will even be in the company of the host of heaven (104:6).

A similar account of the resurrection of the righteous is depicted in the Additions to the Book of Enoch. In this text the spirits of the righteous who have descended to the darkness of Sheol and whose spirits were tested by the Lord and found pure (108:9) will be summoned from there by God (108:11). They are called “the generation of light” in contrast to those who were born in darkness and deserve the darkness of Sheol (108:11; cf. 108:14). These righteous will shine in the light “for times without number” as appropriate to their nature,\textsuperscript{491} and will sit on thrones of honor (108:12; cf. 104:2; Dan 12:3). In contrast

\textsuperscript{487} Cf. μετεγερθῶσιν ἐντεῦθεν in Greek text of \textit{i En}. 22:13b.

\textsuperscript{488} Cavallin, \textit{Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15}, 42.

\textsuperscript{489} According to the Greek version of \textit{i En}. 102:8, the righteous will be raised from Sheol and saved (ἀναστήτωσαν καὶ σωθήτωσαν). \textit{i En}. 91:10 speaks about the righteous and wise one who will arise from his sleep and will be given to the people.

\textsuperscript{490} Cavallin, \textit{Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15}, 42.

\textsuperscript{491} Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch} 1, 558.
to the righteous, the sinners, blasphemers, and other evildoers will be thrown into the darkness. Their names will be excluded from the book of life (cf. Ps 69:29; Rev 3:5), while their spirits will be slaughtered and will burn in the fire in a desolate and unseen place (108:2–3).

The resurrection of the righteous also occurs in the Psalms of Solomon. Most of these psalms have a didactic character emphasizing not only praise to God but also God’s role as a judge, punishing the wicked and Gentiles, and rewarding the righteous. According to Pss. Sol. 3:10–12, only the righteous will be resurrected to eternal life (ἀναστήσονται εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον; cf. 1 En. 22:10–11, 13). The risen righteous will live “in the light of the Lord” (ἐν φωτὶ κυρίου; 3:12). Their resurrection is a reward for the righteous, while destruction is a punishment for the wicked due to their conduct in this world. Indeed, according to 9:5, one whose conduct is righteous lays up life (ἡσυχαιρίζεις ζωήν) with God, while a wicked person is responsible for his soul being given to destruction (ἀιτίος τῆς ψυχῆς ἐν ἀπωλείᾳ). Thus, the wicked will be destroyed, their inheritance will be destruction and darkness and their iniquities will pursue them to Sheol below (ἕως ᾅδου κάτω; 15:10). In contrast to the wicked going down to Sheol, the righteous will be given the Paradise of the Lord and the trees of life (ὁ παράδεισος τοῦ κυρίου τὰ ξύλα τῆς ζωῆς; 14:3).

In addition to the examples discussed, the Book of Jubilees seems indirectly to indicate the resurrection of the righteous. According to Jub. 23:30–

---

492 Cf. ἀναστήσονται οἱ μὲν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον in Dan 12:2. Cf. also 2 Macc 7:9: εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς ἡμᾶς ἀναστήσει. Stemberger argues that in Pss. Sol. 3:10–12 ἀνίστημι is used for raising again after a sin; Stemberger, Der Leib der Auferstehung, 56–59) but this seems unlikely, because it clearly refers to the resurrection from the dead. I agree with Cavallin on this point (see Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 58).

493 This expression can be seen as an allusion to Isa 60:19–20; Herbert Edward Ryle and Montague Rhodes James, Ψάλμοι Σολομώντος: Psalms of the Pharisees commonly called the Psalms of Solomon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891), 38. In addition, it may refer to the righteous’ heavenly glory; Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity, 164. Stemberger, however, argues that “the light of the Lord” refers to new earthly life of the risen righteous; Stemberger, Der Leib der Auferstehung, 60.

494 Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity, 164.
31, the righteous will be healed and raised up by the Lord. On the other hand, “their bones will rest in the earth and their spirits will increase joy.” 495 R. H. Charles considers the resurrection of the spirit to be described in these verses, 496 while Davenport argues that bones and spirits does not represent a dualism of body and spirit but rather serve as a parallelism referring to man as a unity even in death. 497 However, these two terms are not necessarily parallel in meaning. For instance, 1 Enoch, which the author of Jubilees has used or referred to, does not usually use these terms as parallels. 498

Furthermore, Park gives a very convincing example of belief in the resurrection of the righteous in the Latin epitaph of Regina found in the Monteverde catacomb of Rome (JIWE ii 103):

She will live again, return to the light again.
For she can hope therefore that she may rise into the age promised (surgat in aevom promissum) 499 for both the worthy and the pious, she, a true pledge, who deserved to have an abode in the venerable country. 500

However, the problem with this example is that this epitaph is rather late and is dated from the 2nd to the 4th centuries C.E. 501

495 Quoted from Winternute, "Jubilees," 2:102.
496 APOT 2:49.
498 See, e.g., 1 Enoch 22 where spirit and soul refer to the human substance surviving death. It seems that Cavallin is right in suggesting that there is something not far from the idea of the immortality of the soul or spirit of the righteous in Jub.23:31 (Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 38). On the other hand, as Davenport argues, 23:30–31 may also describe victory over the enemies of Israel. Then, the Lord’s healing of the righteous may refer to the restoration of the nation (cf. Ezek 37:1–14), while their joy is only a celebration of this victory; see Davenport, The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees, 40.
499 As Park argues, this expression (it has some grammatical problems) may allude to the promise of the age to come (עלאם ה הבא; Park, Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions, 168).
500 Translation by Park (ibid., 167).
501 Park supports the view that this epitaph is made by a non-Jewish husband for his Jewish wife. See the discussion of this subject and bibliography in ibid., 167, n. 66. Cavallin
Thus, some Jewish texts deal with a collective resurrection of the righteous. According to this strand of Jewish tradition, the wicked will not be raised, because resurrection is a gift and reward for the righteous only. On the contrary, they will be punished and destroyed. After resurrection the righteous will be transformed into a glorious state which is often depicted in astral imagery: they will shine like stars and enjoy celestial life, in some way resembling angels.

3.2.1.2 General Resurrection

The idea of general resurrection (apart from Dan 12:2-3) usually appears in texts dated later than those dealing with the resurrection of the righteous. A collective eschatological resurrection of the righteous (for their reward) and the wicked (for their punishment) is found in the Book of Parables. According to 51:1, at the end of time, “the earth will restore what has been entrusted to it, and Sheol will restore what it has received, and destruction will restore what it owes.” The Elect One, The Son of Man, the Messiah, who had been hidden for a long time by the Lord, will choose the righteous from among the rest of the risen ones (51:2).

On the other hand, the wicked will be delivered to the angels for punishment (62:11). Those who will repent and abandon their evil deeds will be forgiven by the Lord (50:2b-3), while those who will remain in their sins and will not exalt the name of the Lord, will perish and be brought to the deep valley of punishment (53:1; 54:2) being given no respite (63:1–12).

However, according to 46:6, some sinners will have no hope of rising from their place of torment (46:6). As 51:1 speaks about the universal eschatological resurrection for both the righteous and the rest of the dead, this verse most likely indicates that the sinners (either those raised from the dead or those alive by the time of the judgment) will not escape from their place of punishment after the judgment.

also suggests that it is an example of “later Jewish resurrection faith”; Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 168.

502 Quoted from VanderKam and Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 65.

503 The fallen angels will be punished with burning fire (54:1) in another deep valley in the west (67:4-5). They will be thrown into the abyss of complete judgment (54:5) in the valley (56:4) and into the burning furnace (54:6).
The restoration of those entrusted to the earth (51:1) seems to refer to the bodies of the dead. However, there are some textual problems in this verse and, as Cavallin suggests, all the three expressions with “the earth,” “Sheol,” and “the destruction” could be synonymous parallels. In sum, therefore, the character of the resurrection is obscure in this section of 1 Enoch.

The idea of general resurrection also occurs in the 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. According to 4 Ezra, after the time of the final disasters (5:1–13) the Messiah will be revealed (7:28) establishing a temporary messianic kingdom for a period of 400 years in which all the righteous remaining alive will participate and rejoice. Then, the Messiah and all humanity will die and the world will be turned back to primordial silence for seven days before the re-creation of the world (7:30). After this period the world will be roused and everyone will be raised in order to be judged according to their deeds (7:31–36). While the earth will give back the dead sleeping in it (probably the bodies of the dead), the storehouses will give back their souls (7:32; cf. 4:42–43) and all the nations will be raised from

504 This reading is from the manuscript Kebrān 9/11 (XIX century C.E.). Princeton Ethiopic 3 (18th or 19th century C.E.) and EMML 2080 (14th or 15th century C.E.) have “In those days, Sheol will return all the deposits which she had received and hell will give back all that which it owes”; quoted from Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 1:36. See also, e.g., Siegbert Uhlig, Das äthiopische Henochbuch (hrsg. Werner Georg Kümmel; Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 1984), 594.

505 Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 45. “Destruction” is VanderKam and Nickelsburg’s translation of Ethiopic ስዓል (“destruction”) that may correspond to אֲבַדּוֹן as a synonym of שְׁאוֹל in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Job 26:6; 28:22; Prov 15:11); see VanderKam and Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 65.

506 4 Ezra 7:50 indicates the God has made not one but two worlds.

507 The issue of the resurrection also appears in 4 Ezra 2:10–32. Ezra is called by the Lord to prophesy to the people of Israel about their deliverance from their sorrows, giving them the kingdom of Jerusalem, the everlasting habitations (tabernacula aeterna; 2:10–11). Moreover, the Lord will raise the dead: resuscitabo mortuos de locis suis et de monumentis educam illos (“I will raise the dead from their places and will bring them out from their tombs”; 2:16). However, this prophecy of the resurrection is most likely inspired by the Christian ideas.

508 As Cavallin mentions, the reunion of the body and the soul is probably implied in this description; Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 82. Those in the earth (terra, الأرض) and in the dust (pulvis, الأرض) can be seen as the same category of people. Both most likely refer to the bodies of the dead buried in the
the dead (7:37). The resurrection of both the righteous and sinners is also confirmed by the metaphor of the awakening of the deeds of righteousness and those of iniquity in 7:35 (vigilabunt and non dormibunt). God will be revealed sitting on the throne of judgment to judge all people according to their deeds, which will witness for or against them. Those who are found guilty will be put into the fire of Gehenna and the torments of the pit, while those who are justified will be given an eternal life of delight and rest (7:36–38). The day of the judgment will be not only the end of this age but also the beginning of the future age of immortality (7:113).

In 2 Baruch the eschatological resurrection is depicted as happening in two stages. First, it is the resurrection of the body in its pre-existing form. It is connected with the coming of the Messiah and takes place following His return to heaven in glory after his earthly reign (cf. 4 Ezra 7:28) marked by wellbeing and peace (29:5–8). After the time of the great disasters the

earth. Cf. the expression אַדְמַת־ﬠָפָר in the Hebrew version of Dan 12:2. Cf. alsoܐܕܡܟܝܢ ܒܥܦܪܐ (“and those who sleep in the dust will be raised”) in the Syriac version of this verse from Daniel and ܕܕܡܟܝܢ ܒܥܦܪܐ (“and the dust will give back those who sleep in it”) in 4 Ezra 7:32.

However, as Nickelsburg notices, in contrast to the Book of Daniel the resurrection in 4 Ezra 7:32 is not confined to “some” as in Dan 12:2; Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity, 173.

In 4 Ezra 7:35.

Fourth Ezra 6:20 indicates that the book of the record of the people’ deeds will be opened before the judgment.

The appearance of the Messiah does not affect the resurrection as these are only two events in a series of others; see Joost Holleman, Resurrection and Parousia: A Traditio-Historical Study of Paul’s Eschatology in 1 Cor. 15:20–23 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 129; Puech, La croyance des esséniens en la vie future, 1: 154).


Cavallin mentions, this view of the resurrection “is one of the most extreme expressions of literal faith in the resurrection of the body”; Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 88.

Ibid., 86. In 21:23 Baruch prays to God about reproving the angel of death, revealing his glory, sealing Sheol, and restoring the souls of those who are in the storehouses (ܡܕܢܐ ܠܢܕܐ ܫܝܠ).
Messiah will arise (29:1, cf. Dan 12:1) and those who sleep in hope will be raised (30:1, cf. Dan 12:2). The dust will give back the dead sleeping in it and preserved until the time of the resurrection and they will be raised up (42:8, cf. Isa 26:19). Both the righteous and the wicked seem to survive death in 30:1–5 and will be returned to life to be judged (cf. Dan 12:2).

Then after the resurrection of their earthly bodies (50:2), the dead will be judged according to their deeds (50:3). The forms of those found to be guilty will be changed (51:1) to become more evil than during their earthly life, to startling and horrible forms (51:1–2, 5). Finally, the wicked will be brought into the fire with glowing coals and will be destroyed (51:3, 5, cf. 51:5–6). Meanwhile, the form of those who will be proved to be righteous will also be changed. The righteous will be glorified and transformed: “their face will be changed into the light of their beauty.” They will be exalted and granted immortality in the undying world promised to them in front of the wicked who will then be taken to the place of their torment (51:3b, 5–6). Moreover, the righteous will be transformed into the splendor of angels, i.e., they will be glorified so as to resemble the angels and to be equal to the stars (51:10).

The idea of the general resurrection of both the wicked and of the righteous in their earthly bodies is found in Sib. Or. 4:181–182. God will again shape (μορφώσει) the bones and ashes of the dead and will then raise (στήσει) them in the form they had before (ὡς πάρος ἦσαν; 2 Bar. 50:2). Then the judgment will follow and the wicked will be put into the underworld, while the righteous will live again on the earth (4:183–192).

The idea of the eschatological general universal resurrection appears also in Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum. According to L.A.B. 3:10, when the time appointed for the world is fulfilled, the righteous dead and the wicked sleeping in the earth (cf. 23:13) will be resurrected. God will bring them to life and raise

---

516 There is no explicit mention of the body in this text as it speaks about the form of the righteous and the wicked. However, the notion of the earth giving back the dead may refer to the bodily resurrection (50:2).

517 These are those who despised the Law and God’s wisdom as well as exalting themselves over the righteous (51:4–5).

them up. Sheol will give back what was deposited in it and all will be judged according to their deeds. After this “the world will cease, and death will be abolished, and hell will shut its mouth” (3:10) and another earth and heaven, “an everlasting dwelling place,” will come up.

In addition, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs also speaks about the general and universal (not restricted to Israel) resurrection, which appears to be the threshold of the final judgment of Israel and all the nations. T. Ben. 10:6–10, which is one of the final exhortations of the section ascribed to Benjamin, deals with resurrection in the context of the eschatological prophecies about the glorious Temple and the eschatological prophet through whom salvation from the Most High will be sent (9:2). First, Benjamin describes the resurrection of Enoch, Noah, Seth, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (10:6): they will be raised at the right hand of God in great joy (ἀνισταμένους ἐκ δεξιῶν ἐν ἀγαλλίασε). Then the twelve sons of Jacob will be raised (ἀναστησόμεθα), each over his tribe, to worship the king of the heavens (10:7). After this, other people will rise (ἀναστησόνται), both the righteous, destined for glory, and the wicked, destined for dishonor (10:8). According to Testament of Judah 25, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob will rise to life first (ἀναστήσεται . . . εἰς ζωήν), in order to participate in the restored Israel. Then, the twelve sons of Jacob, beginning with Levi and Judah, will take their positions as rulers over their tribes (T. Jud. 25:1–2).

519 According to 23:13, the dead will be restored at the end of time.
522 Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 54.
523 T. Ben. 9:3 speaking about the prophet’s suffering, crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension, as well as about the spirit of God moving on all the nations is an explicit Christian interpolation; see H. C. Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: a New Translation and Introduction,” OTP 1:827.
524 The references to the resurrection of the righteous also occur in T. Sim. 6:7; T. Jud. 25:1–4, and T. Zeb. 10:2.
525 Elledge, “The Resurrection Passages in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” 84. The selection of the names of the six sons of Jacob probably goes back to Deut 27:12; Hollander and de Jonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 230. It is interesting to
The general universal eschatological resurrection comes up as a basic form of the afterlife in the Life of Adam and Eve. It is explicitly expressed in L.A.E. 13:3b–6: all flesh from Adam until the day of resurrection at the end of time (πᾶσα σάρξ ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης τῆς μεγάλης) will be raised (ἀναστήσεται). 526 “All flesh” most likely refers to “all humanity” (cf. Joel 3:1; Zech 2:17; Isa 40:5). 527 The resurrection language of 13:3b–6 alludes to Dan 12:2, while the use of σάρξ may imply bodily resurrection. 528 All these people will be “holy people” (λαὸς ἅγιος) and will be granted every joy of paradise (πᾶσα εὐφροσύνη τοῦ παραδείσου) and God will be in their midst (L.A.E. 13:3b–4).

To sum up, many Jewish texts evidence a belief in the eschatological general resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked. This resurrection precedes the final judgment. For the righteous it serves for their further reward and for the wicked it is for their punishment.

Further, some more general features of Jewish views on the eschatological resurrection can be emphasized. Most of the texts dealing with the resurrection of the righteous as well as with the general resurrection allude to Dan 12:2–3 in one way or another. It seems that two basic features of the resurrection are patterned after Dan 12:2–3: (1) the raising from sleep in the earth or dust; 529 and (2) the association of the resurrected righteous with light, stars, and heavenly glory. In addition, the strand of tradition reflected in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch clearly brings out a two-stage resurrection process: (1) the bodily resurrection of both

---


527 L.A.E. 41:3; 43:2 speak about the general universal resurrection on the last day.

528 Although L.A.E. 13:3b–5 is omitted in some Greek manuscripts, the same idea appears in L.A.E. 41:2: Adam will be raised on the last day together with all the humans from his seed. A form of the verb ἀνίστημι is used again for the resurrection. The more explicit account of the bodily resurrection (resuscitare corpus Adae) appears in Vita 42:2, but this verse as a part of the passage 42:1b–5 is considered to be a late Christian insertion into the Latin text.

529 As Pheme Perkins indicates in reference to G. Stemberger’s work, there could be a “formula” expression of the resurrection in the texts speaking about the raising of those sleeping in the earth (e.g., 1 En. 51:3; 4 Ezra 7:32; 2 Bar. 21:23–24; 30:2–5; 42:7; L.A.B. 310; Rev 2013) See Perkins, *Resurrection*, 48–48; Stemberger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung*, 88–95.
the righteous and wicked before the judgment, which is only an intermediate phase necessary for distinguishing between the living and the dead; (2) the final transformation of the righteous into a glorious and celestial form and of the wicked into a more evil form.

Thus, only the righteous would be given eternal life (e.g., “the fruit of the tree of life” in 1 En 25:3–4 or “the trees of life” in Pss. Sol. 14:3) in the new age. Even if the wicked were to rise from the dead at the end of time that would be only for their condemnation and punishment. This means that even in the texts that speak about general resurrection the true resurrection to eternal life is that of the righteous only.

### 3.2.2 Eschatological Resurrection in Luke–Acts

This section deals with Luke’s accounts of eschatological resurrection. As Luke–Acts combines two types of eschatological resurrection, the resurrection of the righteous as their reward after the final judgment, and the general resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked before the final judgment, this analysis will treat both these types and their relation to each other in Luke–Acts. The first of these occurs in Luke 14:14 in the expression unique to Luke: ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν δικαίων (“the resurrection of the righteous”). The second component of the eschatological resurrection, which corresponds to the traditional Jewish notion of the general resurrection, is found in Paul’s speech in Acts 24:10–21, the resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked (ἀνάστασιν μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων in Acts 24:15, cf. ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν in 24:21).

Which of these two views of resurrection does Luke prefer as his own? In Luke 14:14 he puts the resurrection motif into the context of the discourse about those who care for the poor. Such people will be blessed (μακάριος) from the eschatological perspective and will therefore have their eschatological reward, i.e., blessed eternal life in resurrection. In the context of Luke, therefore, righteousness is understood as that of the true followers of Jesus (cf. Luke 6:35; 12:8; 21:19, 28). On the other hand, the resurrection of the righteous can be

---

530 Another example of the general resurrection is found in Luke 11:31–32: the Queen of the South and the people of Nineveh will arise (ἐγερθήσεται, ἀναστήσονται) at the judgment with this generation to condemn it. This passage belongs to Q material and was retained by Luke. See Robinson, Hoffman, and Kloppenborg, *The Critical Edition of Q*, 252–255.

531 Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 2:495.
seen as “the positive half of the ‘resurrection both of the righteous and the unrighteous’ contemplated in Acts 24:15.”

Moving forward in this discussion, the issue of the eschatological resurrection is more complicated in 20:27–40. This passage represents Jesus’ discussion with the Sadducees about the resurrection of the dead and is derived from Mark 12:18–27; Luke, however, modifies and enriches Mark’s version. While his account of the Sadducees’ question concerning levirate marriage in the light of the resurrection (Luke 20:27–33) remains generally the same as Mark’s portrayal, Jesus’ answer (20:34–40) contains some alterations, especially in 20:34–36, 38–39. Luke has significantly modified Mark 12:25, changing the expressions and adding many details contrasting the conditions of this age and that to come. He has also elaborated the argument about those who participate in the life of the resurrection (Luke 20:34–36). The Lucan Jesus speaks about “the sons of this age” (οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου) who “marry and are given in marriage” (γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται; 20:34). There are several textual variants of the last expression, the most significant of which are: (1) γεννῶνται καὶ γεννῶσιν (“are begotten and beget”) appearing in D ff i q r (sy hmg) and (2) γεννώνται καὶ γεννώσιν, γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται (“are begotten and beget, marry and are given in marriage”; a Ir Or Cypr Aug.). In either case, 20:34 speaks about the reality of this age where life can be continued only by procreation, of

534 Luke uses similar expressions in Luke 16:8 and 17:27. 16:8 is from Luke’s own material, while 17:27 belongs to Q.
535 Marshall indicates that the first variant may preserve the original text, while most of the manuscripts have been assimilated to Luke 20:35. The second variant looks like a conflation. However, there is no strong evidence of this from Greek texts and the variety of wording in the Latin and Syriac texts also militates against this; see Marshall, The Gospel of Luke, 741.
which marriage serves as the means. Luke, therefore, does not deal with marriage as such, but with procreation. For the Sadducees the Levirate Law serves as a means of the maintenance of the life of the clan corresponding to their ideas of the destiny of the dead: rejecting resurrection, they see human life as continuing only through the life of one’s family – in other words, through descendants, but not through the life of the soul or through the resurrection of the body.

Jesus’ answer to their provocative question contains a direct critique of the Sadducees’ unbelief in resurrection, as well as in the existence of angels, a point the book of Acts also confirms: “there is no resurrection, or angel, or spirit” (23:8 NRSV). Indeed, as appears from Josephus’s reports on the Sadducees, they did not believe even in the immortality of the soul, which, according to their view, perishes along with the body after death, let alone the resurrection (A.J. 18:16). Moreover they dispensed with the idea of punishments and rewards in Hades (B.J. 2:165). Although Josephus may be describing the Sadducees in too Epicurean colors following his purpose to make Jewish views

536 Evans, Saint Luke, 716.

537 Daube argues that the Sadducees probably rejected not only the resurrection from the dead but also the Pharisaic idea that angelic existence served as an intermediate state between death and the resurrection of the righteous (cf. Luke 24:36–43; Acts 12:15; 23:9); Daube, “Critical Note on Acts 23: Sadducees and Angels,” 493–497. He virtually equates angels and spirits in his presentation of the issue. Commenting on Acts 23:9 Henry Cadbury and Kirsopp Lake regard πνεûμα and ἄγγελος as a tautology; see Kirsopp Lake and Henry Cadbury, The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I: The Acts of the Apostles (vol. 4; London: Macmillan, 1933), 290. Crispin Fletcher-Louis supports Daube’s idea in general but he attempts to resolve this problem from his understanding of Lucan Christology, indicating that resurrection can refer to Jesus’ divine state as opposed to the post-resurrection angelomorphism; Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 57–61. See the critique of Fletcher-Louis’ work in Bovon, Luke the Theologian, 538. N. T. Wright also supports Daube and argues that the Sadducees denied resurrection on the one hand, and “the two current accounts of the intermediate state on the other”; see Wright, The Resurrection of the Son of God, 133. Viviano and Taylor go beyond Daube’s idea and argue that the concepts of angels and spirits are connected with various Jewish views on the afterlife: angels represent the angelomorphic type of resurrection reflected in Dan 12:2–3, while spirits stand for the view of Wis 31–3; see Viviano and Taylor, “Sadducees, Angels and Resurrection (Acts 23:8–9),” 497–498. However, these scholars do not provide enough evidence from Jewish sources to support their argument.
more intelligible to his Roman audience.\textsuperscript{538} the New Testament and rabbinical literature are agreed that this group did not believe in resurrection.\textsuperscript{539} Also, ἀνάστασις ("resurrection"); 20:27, 33, 35–36 and the related ἐξανίστημι ("to raise up offspring") used in 20:28 (cf. Gen 38:8) make an additional contrast between Jesus' position and that of the Sadducees.\textsuperscript{540}

Again, Luke makes an argument for the resurrection of the righteous only: only those who are worthy of reaching the age to come (καταξιωθέντες... τυχεῖν) will participate in the future eternal life (20:35),\textsuperscript{541} as they cannot die any more (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται, 20:36). For the resurrection Luke uses the expression ἡ ἀνάστασις ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν ("the resurrection from the dead"; 20:35),\textsuperscript{542} which has been modified from Mark's ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν ("they rise from the dead"; Mark 12:25).\textsuperscript{543}

Luke's expression with the meaning "the resurrection from the dead" (20:35) can be distinguished from "the resurrection of the dead" (ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν) used in Acts 24:21.\textsuperscript{544} François Bovon compares the latter with the first and second resurrection and the first and the second death in Rev 20:5–6 (cf. 20:12–13).\textsuperscript{545} According to his suggestion, Luke may imply the resurrection of the

\textsuperscript{538} Cf. Albrecht Oepke, "ἀνίστηµι, ἐξανίστηµι," \textit{TDNT} 1:370. \\
\textsuperscript{539} In addition to Luke's evidences, cf. Mark 12:18; Matt 22:23; b. Sanch. 90b; 'Abot R. Nat. 5. The Book of Sirach reflects similar views, ignoring afterlife (Sir 14:16–17; 41:11–13). Although these accounts may indicate the polemics between the Sadducees and other religious groups, Luke supports such a critical view of their beliefs. \\
\textsuperscript{541} Both verbs are relatively rare for Luke: καταξιόω appears only here and in 21:30, as well as in Acts 5:41, while τυγχάνω in this sense appears in Acts 24:2; 26:22; 27:3. The idea of being accounted worthy for eternal life also occurs in Lucan writings in Luke 9:56 and Acts 13:46 (cf. 2 Thess 1:15); Evans, \textit{Saint Luke}, 716. \\
\textsuperscript{543} It is interesting, however, that the parallel in Matt 22:30–31 has ἡ ἀνάστασις and ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν. \\
\textsuperscript{545} The second resurrection and the first death do not explicitly appear in this text.
righteous when he uses the first form of the expression and the general resurrection when he deals with the second form, indicating the different character of the resurrection and its effect on the righteous and the wicked.\textsuperscript{546} Indeed, Luke prefers to use the construction ἐκ νεκρῶν for the eschatological resurrection in the gospel and Acts\textsuperscript{547} rather than that of νεκρῶν.\textsuperscript{548} The latter mostly refers to the general resurrection and may be accompanied by the notion of the fulfillment of God’s promises.\textsuperscript{549} It is clear that Acts 24:15 and 26:26 speak about the same type of resurrection. As Conzelmann points out, Paul does not mention the special case of the resurrection of Jesus in his speech until 25:19.\textsuperscript{550} The notion of the last judgment in 24:25 also seems to confirm that the Lucan Paul speaks about the general resurrection. He focuses on the common ground of the Jewish hope of resurrection in order to receive support from the Jewish leaders.\textsuperscript{551} Acts 26:23, while speaking about the resurrection of

\textsuperscript{546} Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, 2:495.


\textsuperscript{548} Acts 17:32; 23:6; 24:21; 26:8, 23.

\textsuperscript{549} As Joost Holleman argues, the earliest Christian concept of Jesus’ resurrection is expressed with the formula ἀνίστημι/ἐγείρω ἐκ (τῶν) νεκρῶν, meaning that he has been taken from the realm of dead. “Other dead do not, or not yet, share in Jesus’ fate, the resurrection to a new life” (Holleman, Resurrection and Parousia, 142). If this argument is correct, the righteous are thought to share in Jesus’ resurrection, which belongs to the individual resurrection of the righteous (see p. 150 below). However, the use ἐκ (τῶν) νεκρῶν in Acts 17:32; 23:6; 24:21; 26:8, 23.

\textsuperscript{550} Conzelmann, A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, 199.

\textsuperscript{551} Pervo, Acts, 599.
Jesus, is connected with 26:8, where Paul again appeals to this traditional Jewish view in order not to lose his audience “at this point.”

On the other hand, in Luke 20:35 Luke may be dealing with the positive half of the general resurrection, which implies that only the righteous would be resurrected to eternal life. Indeed, in Luke 18:30, 31 the eschatological reward of the righteous is defined as “eternal life” (ζωή αἰωνία), which is granted to those who enter the Kingdom of God (Luke 10:25; 18:24–25) and is roughly equivalent to the term “salvation” (cf. 18:26). It also occurs in Acts 13:46, 48 where Paul proclaims that the Gentiles will be worthy of eternal life. The word “life” (ζωή) in Acts 11:18 most likely refers to eternal life as a reward of the righteous as well. The gift of eternal life, which is a regular term for the eschatological reward in both pagan and Jewish texts, may relate to the new age of God’s kingly rule over creation (cf., 1 En. 22:14).

In addition, while in Luke’s account the eschatological issues of Luke 20:34–36 are transferred to the present (see p. 78), Jesus’ positive argument for the resurrection (20:37–39), based on an example from the Law (Exod 3:6), claims that even after the death of the patriarchs the Lord still speaks of himself as their God and therefore always remains their God. It might mean as well that God remains faithful to his promises to them inasmuch as they will be called back from their graves. However, Luke also makes a significant addition to his Marcan Vorlage in Luke 20:38b (“for everybody is alive to him”), asserting that not only the patriarchs are still alive, because the Lord cannot be the God of those who do not exist anymore, but that every dead person is in some sense alive. The idea that everybody is alive for God seems to conflict with that of 20:35 asserting that only those who are worthy reach the life of the new age and resurrection. If every dead person is considered already alive in God’s sight, why is the way to eternal life open only to those who are worthy, that is, to the righteous (including the patriarchs)? This discrepancy may serve as an

---

552 Ibid., 629.
553 Besides, in Luke 10:20 the reward of the righteous is connected with their names being written somewhere in heaven (τὰ ὄνοματα ὑμῶν ἐγγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς). This image is modeled on the Jewish idea of the book of life existing in heaven (cf., Isa 4:3; Dan 12:1; Ps 69:28; Mal 3:16–18; Ps 69:28; 1 En. 108:2, 7–10; Rev 3:5).
554 Ζωή αἰωνία also occurs as a gift to those who have left everything on behalf of Jesus and the Gospel in Mark 10:30.
555 Cf., e.g., Cicero, Resp. 6.14–16, 18; Dan 12:2; Pss. Sol. 3:10–12; 2 Macc 7:9; 4 Macc 10:15.
additional argument for the notion that Luke implies the positive part of the
general resurrection in 20:35.

Thus, Luke-Acts combine two types of eschatological resurrection that are
typical of Jewish sources, the general resurrection and that of the righteous.
Luke is aware of both types of eschatological resurrection, but acknowledges
that “the resurrection from the dead” is the true resurrection of the righteous to
eternal life.

3.3 Individual Resurrection

3.3.1 Ancient Eastern Mediterranean Beliefs in Ghosts

As will be made clear below, some questions concerning Luke’s approach to
individual resurrection are connected with various beliefs in ghosts. Therefore
this issue has to be discussed first. Actually, these ideas cannot be confined to
pagans only, as shown by the story of the witch of Endor, who brought up the
ghost of Samuel (1 Sam 28:7-21). However, in Greco-Roman paganism some
beliefs in the appearance of ghosts, spirits, or visions of dead people visiting the
living of their own accord, rather than being called forth by them, were more
widespread and developed. The dead were thought to be able to return in order
to warn of danger, to prophesy, to comfort the living, or on account of their
own needs.

In cooperation with the shadows of the dead in Hades, ghosts were seen as
“shades on earth.” 556 Indeed, in Od. 11. 205–222 the souls of the dead have
neither flesh nor bones: οὐ γὰρ ἔτι σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα ἰνες ἔχουσιν (11.219), but
exist only as a shadow (σκιά) or a dream (ὄνειρος; 11.207). They can be seen but
not touched (Il. 23.104). 557 It seems ghosts have a similar nature and all these
characteristics are applicable for them as well.

In pagan beliefs there were three main types of ghosts who were thought
to haunt the living: the ἅωροι (the souls of those who had died before their time
and who wander until the completion of their natural lives); the βιαιοθανατοί, or
αὐτόχειρες (the souls of those who had died violently or those of suicides); and

556 Bernstein, The Formation of Hell, 93.
557 Ibid., 27.
the ἄταφοι (the unburied).\textsuperscript{558} The last two categories were considered particularly dangerous and malevolent.\textsuperscript{559} Indeed, proper burial was believed to provide access to the underworld for the dead and to safely isolate them from human habitation. Therefore, they need special attention from the living. Otherwise, disregard for these issues can motivate the soul to return to haunt the living.\textsuperscript{560}

The belief in ghosts haunting the living survived through the centuries and reached down to Roman times. Pliny the Younger (61–112 C.E.) mentions it in his report about the philosopher Athenodorus’ house in Athens (\textit{Ep.} 7.27.5–6).\textsuperscript{561} Some evidence of this belief is also found in Lucian of Samosata’s \textit{Philopseudes}. For instance, in \textit{Philops.} 27 Lucian gives an account of the appearance of the ghost of Eucrates’ wife Demainete, who could not reach the underworld because one of her gold sandals was not burned in her funeral pyre.\textsuperscript{562} Also, Arignotus drove away a fearful phantom from the house of Eubatides in Corinth with an Egyptian spell (\textit{Philops.} 30–31). Although Lucian’s account is a sort of satire and aims at ridiculing these views on ghosts and at demonstrating that they are far-fetched, it confirms the existence of such a belief in that period.

Further, ghosts were believed to appear to punish offenders (cf. Suetonius, \textit{Otho} 7), to seek vengeance for their murders (Plutarch, \textit{Sera}. 555c; Cicero, \textit{Div.} 1.57.1–19), and to return favors when buried out of kindness (Cicero, \textit{Div.} 1.56.11–

\textsuperscript{558} For example, the spirit of Odysseus’ shipmate Elpenor, who had died without burial, appeared to Odysseus outside of Hades complaining that he could not enter there until his body was buried. When Odysseus returned to Circe’s island, he buried him properly (\textit{Od.} 11.52).


\textsuperscript{560} Bernstein, \textit{The Formation of Hell}, 94. On the other hand, Sourvinou-Inwood shows that in \textit{Odyssey} 24, which she sees as a continuation of Homer’s epics, the shadows of the dead can enter Hades without being buried (Sourvinou-Inwood, “\textit{Reading” Greek Death to the End of the Classical Period}, 106).

\textsuperscript{561} Suetonius also provides a story about ghosts telling of Caligula’s appearances (\textit{Cal.} 59).

\textsuperscript{562} In these two stories Lucian also mocks at Plato and the Pythagoreans: Eucrates is reading one of Plato’s works on the immortality of the soul when the ghost of Demainete appears (\textit{Philops.} 27.16–17); Arignotus was a Pythagorean (30.11).
Bernstein also emphasizes a class of stories telling about ghosts announcing the future and returning to the living in groups, for instance, haunting the battlefields where they were killed or died (Damascius, V. Isid. 63).

All these accounts of the diverse beliefs in ghosts, spirits, and messengers demonstrate the widespread idea that contact between the living and the dead is practicable. This idea existed in the ancient eastern Mediterranean milieu and apparently became common for Hellenistic culture. Such contact was thought to be possible because the boundaries between this world and the otherworld were sometimes regarded as porous (cf., e.g. Plato, Phaed. 111d–e; Lucian, Dialogi mortuorum; see n. 318) and religion could not maintain an absolute boundary between the two worlds.

3.3.2 Individual Resurrection in Jewish Sources

Jewish literature differs in its representation of the time of the resurrection. While in the texts discussed above it is seen as an eschatological event, taking place after the last judgment as the reward of the righteous (the resurrection of the righteous), or else at the end of time before the last judgment (the general resurrection), in some other works the issue of the judgment is not so important. This section will provide the most important examples of the accounts dealing with this type of resurrection.

The issue of individual resurrection is directly connected with Jewish views on the destiny of the individual, i.e., individual eschatology which does not relate to the end of time (see p. 57). Indeed, the author of 2 Maccabees is more concerned with the problem of the divine vindication of the martyrs than with the last judgment, and does not emphasize the time of the resurrection. In this text resurrection is connected with the ideas of God’s dominion over the

563 For Plato, there are some souls which are impure because of their excessive care about the body resulting from their close association with it. They are too heavy to go to heaven and wander around graves and monuments as shadowy phantoms (σκιοειδή φαντάσματα). Moreover, they are visible because they share in the visible (κοινεῖται το ὁρατοῦ μετέχουσα; Phaed. 81c–d).


565 Ibid., 105.
creation and a new creation. The clearest account of the resurrection appears in 2 Maccabees 7 in the context of the martyrdom of the seven righteous brothers and their mother, who were put to death because of their refusal to reject the Law. These martyrs are aware that the Lord will give them back their lives because: (1) God will have compassion on the righteous even after their death (cf. Deut 32:36); (2) the Lord will raise up the righteous (ἀναστήσει) to a revived everlasting life (εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς) that follows the present age (ἐκ τοῦ παρόντος ἡμᾶς ζῆν; 7:9); (3) the King of the universe will bring them back to life again because of their obedience to the Law (7:10–11); (4) the resurrection is a new creation (7:22–23), i.e., ex nihilo (οὐκ ἐξ ὄντων; 7:28). Therefore the resurrection in 2 Maccabees has apologetic motifs defending the martyrs’ hope to receive a reward for their obedience to God and to be alive again. It functions as a recompense to the martyrs for losing their bodies in torture for their adherence to the Jewish Law. Moreover, in contrast to this anticipated resurrection of the righteous (ἀναστήσεσθαι ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ), there is no resurrection for the wicked in this text: ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωὴν οὐκ ἔσται (7:14).

In addition, 2 Maccabees comprehends the resurrection of the martyrs as a bodily one. For instance, the third brother confesses his belief that instead of the hands that he loses in his torture he will receive new ones from God (7:10–11).

Further, Pseudo-Phocylides depicts the resurrection from the dead in very general terms: it is not good to dissolve the human frame because of the belief that the remains of the dead will soon (τάχα) go back to the light (φάος) to become gods (Θεοί) afterwards (102–104). Here the very literalistic idea of

---

566 This motif is also prominent for Isa 26:19 and Dan 12:2–3; de Boer, The Defeat of Death, 51.
567 The doctrine of creatio ex nihilo first appears in the Bible in 2 Macc 7:28.
570 The character of Pseudo-Phocylides is not eschatological. However, “soon” (τάχα) in Ps.-Phoc. 103 probably indicates the eschatological resurrection. See the discussion of the meaning of τάχα in Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 152–153 and Puech, La croyance des esséniens en la vie future, 1160.
the resurrection of the same body is combined with that of an angelomorphic (cf. Dan 12:3) or even deifying transformation.\textsuperscript{571}

Thus, some Jewish texts do not emphasize the time of the resurrection. Besides, they deal with the individual's destiny, which is connected with individual eschatology that Jewish sources usually associate with judgment and retribution immediately after the individual's death. Although in 2 Maccabees individual resurrection appears in the context of the reward of the righteous martyrs who suffered for their obedience to God's Law and does not explicitly speak about judgment, it nevertheless asserts that the wicked will not be resurrected. However, Pseudo-Phocylides deals with this type of afterlife existence without any reference to retribution. In any case, these examples demonstrate the finality of the individual's destiny without reference to any further change of destiny at the end of time. After all, this type of resurrection is depicted in bodily form.

\section*{3.3.3 Individual Resurrection in Luke-Acts}

Next, Luke's accounts of individual resurrection will be considered. The individual resurrection of the righteous as a form of afterlife existence occurs in Luke 9:7–9 (repeated in 9:19) and then in the accounts of the resurrection of Jesus. Luke 9:7–9 is inserted between the story about sending the Twelve (9:1–6) and the account of their return (9:10–17). It speaks about Herod's perplexity regarding the people's rumors about Jesus in Galilee.\textsuperscript{572} For this passage Luke uses material derived from Mark 6:14–16 with some modifications. He retains most of the traditional material and extensively edits the words about one of the ancient prophets (9:8; cf. Mark 6:15). Three possible identifications of Jesus, which existed outside the circle of his disciples, come up in this pericope (9:7b–8): he is supposed to be John the Baptist, Elijah, or one of the ancient

\textsuperscript{571} Cavallin supposes that the notion of the resurrection is put into the context of the explanation why corpses should be left as they are; the idea of Sheol, indifferent to the righteous and wicked, functions as a warning against greed; whereas the concept of the immortality of the soul is seen as having an independent function in the text (Cavallin, \textit{Life after Death. Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15}, 152).

\textsuperscript{572} The tetrarch's question anticipates Jesus' question to his disciples in 9:18 and recalls the disciples' question in 8:25. Further, all these opinions from 9:7–9 reappear in the disciples' answer in 9:19.
prophets. According to the first rumor, John had been raised (ἡγέρθη; Luke 9:7b). Here Luke uses a form of the same verb ἐγείρω as Mark 6:14 did (ἐγήγερται). Perhaps the supernatural abilities of the resurrected one in Mk 6:14b (καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ [“and because of this the powers are at work in him”]) may not be excluded from Luke’s view.

The third rumor about Jesus connects him with one of the prophets such as Moses, Isaiah, or Jeremiah (cf. Matt 16:14). Lucan προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη (“one of the ancient prophets had risen”) in Luke 9:8b is different from the Marcan προφήτης ὡς εἷς τῶν προφητῶν (“a prophet like one of the prophets”) in the present form of Mark 6:15. The idea about the coming of such a prophet was popular already in the time of the Maccabees (1 Macc 4:46; 14:41). Moreover, probably this identification of Jesus goes back to the prophecy of Deut 18:15 about a prophet like Moses, whom the Lord would raise up (ἀναστήσει). In its original context it refers to the belief that the Lord would

573 In addition, one can also see in this passage a certain connection with the special case of Jesus’ resurrection: ἐκ νεκρῶν in the expression ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν may be a Lucan insertion linking with the resurrection of Jesus.

574 Probably the omission of this part of the verse is connected with Luke’s tendency to avoid the association of John with Elijah and to depict him only as one who prepares the people for the coming of the Messiah. Moreover, Luke tried to avoid expressions that could allude to any supernatural abilities of the Baptist. Formally, Jesus and John did not even meet in Luke: John has been arrested before the baptism of Jesus and, as a result, it is unclear, by whom it was performed (3:19–22). See Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke, 1:170. However, Luke 3.19–20 could be seen as an example of a flash-forward. Given that Luke knew of Mark’s gospel, he and his readers would have taken it for granted that Jesus was baptized by John (I am grateful to David Clark for this comment).

575 The second rumor about the appearance of Elijah is not connected with individual resurrection.

576 In addition, the prophecies of Jeremiah were popular during the wars of the Maccabees (cf. Dan 9:2, 24; 2 Macc 2:1–8). The prophecy about the sword of the Lord punishing Babylon appears in Jer 50:35–37. The Seleucid Empire could have been considered to be a new Babylon (see Goldstein, II Maccabees, 499). According to the Life of the Prophets Jeremiah was buried (2:2), but 2:19 indicates that Jeremiah and Moses are together “until this day.” In 2 Macc 15:13–16 the prophet Jeremiah appears in a dream to Judas Maccabeus and gives him a golden sword to destroy the enemies of Israel. Fourth Ezra 2:18 also speaks about the sending of Isaiah and Jeremiah before the end of time. However, chapters 1–2 of 4 Ezra is a later Christian addition to this Jewish work and may have been influenced by early Christian ideas.
send a prophet like Moses to Israel. Could Luke have understood this as a hint of resurrection? He indicates that after the resuscitation of the widow’s son at Nain Jesus had been already identified as a great prophet who had arisen in Israel (Προφήτης μέγας ἥγερθη ἐν ἡμῖν; Luke 7:16; cf. Mark 6:4). In Acts 3:22 Peter directly refers to Deut 18:15 and then in 3:26 identifies this prophet with Jesus. However, it is unclear whether he speaks about the resurrection of Jesus or about his sending into the world. Stephen also mentions Deut 18:15 in his speech in Acts 7:37 without referring to the resurrection of Jesus. Finally, it remains ambiguous whether Luke wants to emphasize the possibility of a prophet redivivus and indicate that such a prophet is thought to be raised from the dead (ἀνέστη), or to refer to the belief in the inauguration of the new prophet like Moses. After all, in Luke 9:39 Luke could play with both meanings of ἀνίστημι from LXX Deut 18:15.

Further, like the other evangelists, Luke uses the verbs ἐγείρω and ἀνίστημι in the Easter narrative. The resurrection of Jesus is dated to the third day after his death on the cross and his burial (Luke 24:1; cf. Hos 6:1–2; Mark 16:1-2; 24:1; Matt 28:1; John 20:1). Luke 24:36–43 emphasizes its corporeal character much more than is done elsewhere in the Lucan writings. There are

---

577 It is worth mentioning that in rabbinic Judaism יָרֵחַ in Deut 31:16 in the context of the death of Moses came to be interpreted as referring to his resurrection (b. Sanh. 90b). See Sawyer, “Hebrew Words for the Resurrection of the Dead,” 218.
579 Cf. καὶ ἀνέστη Ηλιας προφήτης (“then Elijah arose”) in Sir 48:1.
582 It appears that there is no significant difference between the uses of these two verbs in the New Testament. However, it is obvious that the authors of Matthew and John as well as Paul prefer using ἐγείρω for the resurrection of Jesus. In the Gospel of Peter, which is basically dedicated to the depiction of the death and resurrection of Jesus, the verb ἀνίστημι is also used: “He has been raised (ἀνέστη) and gone ... for he has been raised (ἀνέστη) and gone from where he had been sent” (13:56).
583 The corporeality of Jesus’ resurrection is also emphasized in Acts 2:27:31; 13:34–37 referring to Ps 16:10: the risen Jesus will never turn to corruption (διαφθορά).
several traditions behind this episode: it closely relates to the tradition of John 20:19–23; it also has some connections with Mark 16:14–15; Mat 28:16–20; 1 Cor 15:5 (cf. Luke 24:34), and even contrasts with some Jewish patterns about the appearance of angelic figures. However, Luke reformulates all the material he has at hand according to his own views. In this episode the risen Jesus appears in the midst of his disciples to show himself to them alive. The disciples, however, are in a panic (πτοηθέντες δὲ καὶ ἔμφοβοι γενόμενοι; 24:37; cf. 21:9; 24:5), imagining they are seeing a ghost (πνεῦμα). This fact indicates two issues: Luke is aware of beliefs that the dead appear from time to time in such a bodiless image; the image of the risen One is depicted as so unusual that he could be taken as a ghost. In 24:39 Luke demonstrates that the risen Jesus is not such a bodiless entity but a real human being, though with a resurrected body: ὅτι πνεῦμα σάρξ καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει (“because a ghost has no flesh and bones”). The expression σάρξ καὶ ὀστέον is a synecdoche used in the Bible for the whole body. Moreover, flesh and bones were regarded as features of the resurrected body (cf. Ezekiel 37). If Luke is referring to this tradition, he may be trying to provide evidence for the solidity and rigidity of the human body. Thus, Luke deliberately emphasizes the corporeal character of the resurrection of Jesus. Moreover, here he is in line with Jewish traditions about individual

584 There are also some similarities between Luke 24:36–43 and Mark 6:45–51 omitted by Luke earlier, such as unexpected appearance, the disciples’ fear, the disciples’ imagining that they were seeing a ghost, and the use of the expression ἐγώ εἰμι, but it is hardly possible to consider that this episode was reproduced by Luke. The idea of a ghost and the use of ἐγώ εἰμι are the only striking similarities between these accounts, all other features are common to the description of supernatural appearances (Nolland, Luke 18:35–24:53, 1211–1212). However, the language and style of Luke 24:36–43 and Mark 16:14–15 are too different for them to be dependent on each other. It is hardly possible to state that the composer of the conclusion of Mark’s Gospel was familiar with the Lucan account; see Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, 4:580.

585 John Nolland indicates that ἔστη in Luke 24:36 may be connected with the appearances of angels in the LXX (Gen 18:2; Dan 8:15; 12:5; 1 Chr 21:15–16; Tob 5:4); Nolland, Luke 18:35–24:53, 1212.

586 It is worth mentioning that in Acts 12:15 ἄγγελος is used in similar sense.

587 This sentence can be seen as Luke’s explanatory remark.


resurrection (see p. 147). In order to demonstrate that the risen Jesus is not a ghost, the author uses the same lexis that is found in some Greek pagan texts dealing with ghosts. Indeed, according to a view going as far back as Homeric times, the soul of the dead, whose nature is similar to that of a ghost, has neither flesh (σάρξ) nor bones (ὀστέα; Od.11.219), but exists only as a shadow or a dream (11.207). The disciples could not have known about the details of the burial of Jesus as they did not participate in it (cf. Luke 23:53–55). Improper burial or its lack was regarded as one of the main reasons for the appearance of ghosts. Luke may also be referring to the belief that the souls of innocent victims appear in order to punish offenders (cf. Suetonius, Otho 7) and to seek vengeance for their murders (Plutarch, Sera. 555c; Cicero, Div. 1.27.57).

Jesus offers to let his disciples examine his bodily marks of identification and shows them the affected parts of his body, namely his hands and feet (24:39). He offers his disciples to look at him for two reasons: first, to identify him as Jesus (ὁτι ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτός [“see that it is I myself,” 24:39 NRSV])\(^{590}\) and then to make sure he is not a ghost but a real human. For the latter reason he asks them not only to look at him but even touch him: ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε (“touch me and see,” 24:39 NRSV). Jesus’ hands and feet have been pierced in the crucifixion and are the obvious features of his body. Moreover, hands and feet are visible parts of the human body.

Further, in order to convince his disciples, the Lucan Jesus demonstrates his ability to eat ordinary food as a proof that he is not a ghost (24:41–43).\(^{591}\) Eating itself was not a convincing proof of “materiality” in Jewish tradition, as is seen, for instance, in Gen 18:8; 19:1–3; Tob 12:19; these passages tell of angels who seem to share a meal with people. However, it is only a semblance: ἀλλὰ ὅρασιν ὑμεῖς ἐθεωρεῖτε (“but you saw a vision,” Tob 12:19): angels do not need to eat, even if they appear in human form. When the Lucan Jesus eats, then he

---


\(^{591}\) According to the best manuscripts Jesus was offered a piece of cooked fish, though later manuscripts add the more symbolic ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου ("from a honeycomb"; E.g., ΔΨƒ’ 28 33 180 205 565 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1292 1342 1424 1505 Byz [E H N]). This may be influenced by the later liturgical practice of use of honey at the Eucharist and Baptism; Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, 187.
demonstrates that he is neither an angel nor a spirit. For Luke's audience this would have been adequate to provide a bodily manifestation (cf. Acts 10:41).  

But in trying to emphasize the bodily character of the resurrection of Jesus, Luke does not forget about the supernatural abilities of the resurrected one: he appears and disappears, he may be unrecognizable, or even invisible, and he finally ascends to heaven (Luke 24:13–51; Acts 1:9). Here, Luke may combine Jewish views on the individual and eschatological aspects of resurrection: in some Jewish texts the state which the righteous will obtain at the end of time points to their glorification and transformation: they will be given the garments of glory (1 En. 62:13–16), their bodies will be transformed into the radiance of glory (2 Bar. 51:10, 4 Ezra 7:36–38) or will obtain it (e.g., T. Benj. 10:6–10). This glory makes possible miracles, healings, and other supernatural abilities of the risen righteous. This fact is indicated in Luke 9:7–9 and again in 9:19, reflecting popular Jewish beliefs ascribing such abilities to the resurrected.

Thus, individual resurrection, which does not have a direct connection with the end of time, functions in Luke-Acts in two ways. On the one hand, as Jesus’ case indicates, Luke deliberately demonstrates its corporeality more explicitly than he does with eschatological resurrection. On the other hand, he points out that Jesus’ resurrected body has supernatural abilities similar to the glorified and transformed state of the righteous at their eschatological resurrection. In this way, Luke combines some features of both individual and eschatological resurrection. In addition, while his views on eschatological resurrection are connected with his collective eschatology, this type of resurrection may also be associated with individual eschatology: it deals with the postmortem destiny of the individual.

3.4 The Restoration of Physical Life

3.4.1 The Restoration of Physical Life in Greco-Roman Paganism

This section will analyze pagan accounts of resuscitation. There are some Greek stories recounting attempts to return dead people to physical life. The belief in

593 Cf. Acts 9:3–7 where Paul cannot perceive any image of the resurrected Jesus apart from a light and a voice.
the possibility of such a restoration was known from the archaic period and survived through the centuries. For this reason, this research will pay attention to some important stories from several different periods of Greco-Roman history. In addition, it will analyze some important terminology that is used for the description of resuscitation.

As far back as the archaic period, Homer gives an account of the warrior Protesilaus killed at Troy, who returns from Hades for a day on account of his distracted wife (Il. 2.698–702). Much later, in Heroicus Philostratus (ca. 170–247 C.E.) develops a story about Protesilaus, who had become a symbol of return from Hades.\textsuperscript{594}

Plato deals with the restoration of life in the myth of Er (Rep. 10.614d–621d): this soldier was resuscitated on the twelfth day after his death in battle. Although he uses this motif in the context of his idea of reincarnation, it somehow reflects the belief that souls can leave the underworld. This belief continued existing through the centuries. Even in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century C.E. Proclus reported about Polycritus of Aetolia, Eurynous of Nicopolis, and Rufus of Philippi who returned from death in a way similar to that of Er (In rem. pub. 2.115).\textsuperscript{595}

Another important example is the myth reflected in the Alcestis, a play by Euripides (438 B.C.E.). This play tells a story about Alcestis, the wife of Admetus, the king of Pherae (Thessaly). With Apollo’s help Admetus was able to trick the Fates into granting him the opportunity to escape death provided somebody else would die instead of him. Only Alcestis agreed to die in his place. After her death and burial, however, she is turned back by Heracles fighting with Death (Θάνατος) and defeating him with his brute strength (Alc. 840.1139–1142). Alcestis completely recovers her life on the third day after her return. This story was popular in Greek culture. For instance, Aeschylus refers to the story of Alcestis as to an example of being rescued from death and

\textsuperscript{594} In Chariton’s De Chaerea et Callirhoae Dionysius considers Chaereas to be Protesilaus, returned from the world of the dead (Chaer. 5.10.1).

\textsuperscript{595} In addition, Phlegon (2\textsuperscript{nd} century C.E.) recounts the story about a dead cavalry commander Bouplagus from the army of Antiochus, who rose up and went to the Roman camp to ask the commanders to grant proper conduct towards the soldiers who had been killed (Mir. 3.4–5).
returning to the physical body (Eum. 723–724), while Plato uses it in order to demonstrate the power of love and to illustrate how the soul is sent back from the dead by the gods (Symp. 179b–d).

Further, a belief in the possibility of resuscitation is found in the traditions about Asclepius. Pindar reports that this doctor was punished by Zeus for trying to break the limits of death and to bring back to life a dead patient (Pyth. 3.54–58). Various poets of the classical period claimed that Asclepius resuscitated several people including Tyndareus before being killed by Zeus. Later this story was embellished with more fantastic details. For instance, Diodorus of Sicily, who was active from 60 to 30 B.C.E., reports about a number of dead healed by this doctor (Diod. Sic. 4.71.2–3). Pseudo-Apollodorus thinks that Asclepius used blood from Medusa’s right side (3.10.3), while Virgil (Aen. 7.761–782) and Ovid (Met. 15.533–535) regard him as using a medicinal herb.

Furthermore, in the popular mystery cult of Isis, this goddess was venerated for her healing power giving immortality, by which, as Diodorus of Sicily reports, she not only raised from the dead (ἀναστῆσαι) her son Horus, but also made him immortal (τῆς ἀθανασίας ποιῆσαι μεταλαβεῖν; Diod. Sic. 1.25.6.1–1.25.7.1). This power was reckoned also to be held by her brother Osiris, and could have been to a certain extent transmitted to the initiates of this cult. Indeed, Lucius, the main character in Apuleius’ Metamorphoses (2nd century C.E.), after his transformation into an ass was regarded as dead by his family and friends. However, he was restored to human life as a sort of symbolic rebirth through the worship of Isis.

Pagan literature also indicates an interest in the idea of restoration of life as a waking up from sleep or unconsciousness (swoon) of those who were

597 Plato speaks about the fate of Alcestis without mentioning Heracles.
598 Endsjø, Greek Resurrection Beliefs and the Success of Christianity, 48.
599 Ibid., 48.
600 As Diodorus Siculus mentions, Isis was also identified with Demeter (Diod. Sic. 1.25.1.1).
601 Apuleius’ Metamorphoses also incorporates the ancient myth of Cupid and Psyche, which included a story about descent to and return from the underworld (Metam. 4.28–6.24).
considered to be dead. Sleep itself was seen to have an affinity with death (cf. Cicero, *Div. 1.63.3–5*).\(^{602}\) For instance, Chariton (1st century C.E.) uses this motif many times in his *De Chaerea et Callirhoe*, while Apuleius in his *Metamorphoses* (*Metam. 10.11–12*) includes a story about the raising of a boy who was considered to be dead through poisoning, but in fact was only drugged.

An interesting link between death, sleep, and rising up in pagan culture is found in Claudius Aelianus’ *De Natura Animalium* (ca. 175–235 C.E.): he refers to the evidence of the historian Hippys (5th or 3rd century B.C.E.) who reports about a certain woman with a tapeworm. She came to the temple of Asclepius and lay down in the place that was accustomed for healing. She rested quietly as was prescribed (ἡσύχαζε προσταχθείσα; this can be seen as a dream or even some sort of anaesthesia). The attendants remove her head from her neck and the worm is pulled forth. However, they cannot attach her head back to her body and Asclepius appears in order to do this and raises up (ἀνέστησε) the woman (*De Natura Animalium* 9.33).

It is worth indicating that the form of the verb ἀνίστημι, which occurs in this passage, and the noun ἀνάστασις connected with it are sometimes used for the restoration of the physical life of the dead in pagan literature, not only in the context of the resuscitation of corpses by Asclepius (cf. ἀνίστησι τεθνεῶτας – Pausanias, *Descr. 2.26.6.1*), but also in Euripides’ *Hercules furens* for Heracles’ returning from Hades (*Herc. fur. 719*).\(^{603}\) Moreover, the verb ἐγέιρω occurs in the magical papyri in a similar context (PGM 4. 195).\(^{604}\)

In addition, the possibility of the restoration of physical life is connected with the belief that the process of death is gradual. The soul of the deceased reaches its final destination not immediately after death but following a certain period of being between the world of the living and that of the dead. The interval between death and descending to the underworld was regarded as crucial for the safety of the soul, whose diminished powers of resistance leave it exposed to an attack from malignant spirits. The passing of such a critical stage of the soul was marked by the completion of the funeral rites. In ancient

---


\(^{603}\) Cf. Lucian, *Alex. 24; Philops. 26.*

\(^{604}\) Νεκρός in one of its meanings relates to a “corpse” (see, e.g., BDAG, 667) and is used for bodies raised by magicians in Lucian’s *Philopseudes* (*Philops. 13.19*; see Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 122).
Athens the intermediate period of transition of the soul could be at least until
the performing of the thirtieth-day rites, called τριακοστία. This word was also used for the ritual performed monthly, either on the thirtieth day or the death-day of the deceased (Garland, The Greek Way of Death, 40).

605 In other cities this period was different. It seems many of these rituals survived through the centuries until the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Thus, Lucian reports about a period of fasting covering three days from the time of passing away (Luc. 24), and followed by a special banquet shared by the living and the deceased person. A meal called καθέδρα marked the conclusion of the mourning and the resumption of normal life in the community. As Ramsay MacMullen shows, family funeral picnics were still alive in early Christian times. Moreover, as D. Kraemer supposes, the Jewish tradition of visiting the tomb on the third day after death as well as the practice of the ossilegium may also have been connected with the widespread view of death as an extended process. The relatives may have visited the tomb in order to make sure the deceased was really dead and not in a swoon or merely sleeping. This practice offers evidence that the belief that the soul reaches the otherworld within a certain period was not peculiar to Greco-Roman paganism. It was rather a common feature of ancient Eastern Mediterranean culture. After all, during this interval between death and descent to the underworld the soul of the deceased could be called back to physical life.

To sum up, many Greco-Roman pagan traditions assume the possibility of restoration to physical life and refer to such heroes as Alcestis, Asclepius, and others. Moreover, in some stories about the resuscitation the return of life is associated with waking up from sleep or unconsciousness. In some such accounts the process of the restoration of life is depicted with use of forms of ἀνίστημι, ἐγέιρω, and the noun ἀνάστασις. Finally, the process of death was

606 This word was also used for the ritual performed monthly, either on the thirtieth day or the death-day of the deceased (Garland, The Greek Way of Death, 40).

606 Ibid., 38–40. The rites on the third day after death or burial was called τρίτα. The banquet on this day was distinguished from those prepared at the tomb. The living were not allowed to eat from them to prevent any influence of the spirits.

607 Ibid., 40.

608 Ramsay MacMullen, Second Church: Popular Christianity AD 200–400 (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 46.

believed to be gradual and this made resuscitation possible. This belief was common in the ancient Eastern Mediterranean culture.

### 3.4.2 The Restoration of Physical Life in Jewish Sources

How does Jewish literature represent restoration to life? What kind of language does it use for this phenomenon? The question of the restoration of physical life is not central in Jewish beliefs. However, the Hebrew Bible registers some examples of occasional miraculous resuscitation, mentioned in 1 Kgs 17:17–24; 2 Kgs 4:31–37; 13:21, based on the traditions about Elijah and Elisha. Thus, Elijah raises the widow’s son in 1 Kgs 17:22 and his soul returns:

> וַתָּשָׁב נֶפֶשׁ הַיֶּלֶד ("the life of the child came into him again," NRSV). The LXX version of this verse omits the notion of the human component surviving death but retains it in 1 Kgs 17:21: ἐπιστραφήτω δὴ ἡ ψυχή τοῦ παιδάριου τούτου εἰς αὐτόν ("let this child’s soul come back into him").

In the LXX Greek ψυχή regularly translates the Hebrew נפש ("a life force”, “person”, “soul”). The mention of the return of the human component surviving death in the act of resuscitation serves as a proof of the reality of the recovery from death to physical life in these stories.

Further, although the restoration of life is not resurrection to eternal life, the terminology peculiar to the concept of the resurrection from the dead is used in the account of Elisha resuscitating the child of the Shunammite woman in 2 Kgs 4:31–37:

> having been sent by Elisha to lay his staff on the boy’s face, Gehazi cannot raise him and reports to Elisha that the boy has not awakened (גָּרְרָה הֵקִיץ; "the child has not awakened"; 4:31 NRSV). The LXX version also uses resurrection terminology in this verse: Οὐκ ἠγέρθη τὸ παιδάριον ("the child has not woken up"). The same tendency is found in 2 Kgs 13:21 narrating the burial of a certain man who was thrown into the tomb of Elisha:

> והָאֵלִישָׁע וַיָּקָם וַיְחִי אֱלִישָׁע בְּﬠַצְמוֹת הָאִישׁ וַיִּגַּע ("the man touched the bones of Elisha and came to life and stood on his feet").

Again, the LXX uses ζάω and ἀνίστημι in this verse.

---

600 Cf. 1 Kgs 17:21 in the Hebrew Bible: וַתָּשֶׁב נֶפֶשׁ הַיֶּלֶד ("let this child’s life come into him again” NRSV).

601 Cf. וַיָּקָם וַיְחִי אֱלִישָׁע בְּﬠַצְמוֹת הָאִישׁ וַיִּגַּע ("and they stood on their feet”) in Ezek 37:10.
Thus some stories about the miraculous restoration of physical life occur in the Hebrew Bible and the LXX, and are based on the traditions about Elijah and Elisha. Similarly to resurrection, resuscitation in these accounts may be described in terms of waking up from sleep.


Next this research moves to the discussion of restoration to physical life in Luke's double work. What is the function of such restoration in Luke-Acts? How does Luke share the beliefs and language of resuscitation common to his cultural environment?

Several times in the Gospels Jesus practices resuscitation in the sense of returning to physical life. Like Matthew, Luke also understands it as a sign of the coming of the Messiah (νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, Luke 7:22, cf. Matt 11:5). It should be noted, however, that none of those who had been raised was believed to have gained physical immortality. Quite the contrary, all of them were allegedly resuscitated only to a temporary physical life and eventually died again.

Similarly to the pagan and Jewish accounts of the restoration of life, Luke in his stories about resuscitation often deliberately plays with ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω in their meaning of resurrection, on the one hand, and awakening and standing up, on the other, in contrast to the affinity of sleep with death. This is well seen in Luke 8:41–42, 49–56. This passage belongs to the twofold episode about Jairus' daughter and the woman with a hemorrhage (8:40–56), which concludes the group of Jesus' mighty works that demonstrate his power over the elements, demons, disease, and death (8:22–56) and lead up to the confession of 9:20. In this episode the main source for Luke is material derived from Mark 5:21–43. Luke has made some changes, improving Mark's style, reformulating his expressions, abridging some details, and adding some new points according to his own view on this episode. In this passage Jesus enters Jairus' house after the report about the death of Jairus' daughter (8:49–51) and

---

612 Jesus – the Master of the Storm (8:22–25); the story about the Gerasene Demonic (8:26–39); the story about Jairus' daughter and the woman with a hemorrhage (8:40–56).

613 For instance, Luke abridged some details of Mark's account about Jesus' entering Jairus' house, especially those about the mourners (8:52, cf. Mark 5:38). Meanwhile, he retained the report about people crying inside or outside the house, showing the mournful atmosphere there and the reality of the girl's death.
makes a significant remark practically identical in both Marcan and Lucan versions: οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει (“she is not dead but sleeping,” Luke 8:52, cf. Mark 5:39). Greek καθεύδω (literally “sleep”) sometimes stands for death in the New Testament (e.g., 1 Thess 5:10), although κοιμάομαι is more usual in this meaning (cf. e.g., Matt 27:52; Acts 7:60; 15:26; 2 Pet 3:4; 1 Thess 4:13–15). Besides, καθεύδω in Luke 8:52 may allude to 2 Kings 4:31 (σὺν ῥήγερθη) referring to the stories about the resuscitations performed by Elijah and Elisha (see p. 158). However, it seems that here καθεύδω does not refer to death, since Jesus contrasts it to ἀποθνῄσκω. In 8:53 Luke, including the remark about the people ridiculing Jesus, underlines the reality of the girl's death. On the other hand, Luke exactly follows his source in using καθεύδω in 8:52. Moreover, all three Synoptics put this verb in the same form in their accounts of this episode (cf. Mark 5:39; Mat 9:24). One may suggest that the use of this verb may indicate the idea that the girl's death is not fatal and will be overcome by Jesus' mighty power and Jairus' faith (see p. 220).

Further, Jesus takes the girl by the hand (κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς) and calls her, ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε (“child, get up,” Luke 8:54; cf. Mark 5:41), as if she were sleeping. Luke deliberately replaces Mark's λέγει in Jesus' address to the girl with ἐφώνησεν emphasizing the role of the loud voice in the act of awaking the person and summoning her spirit to return to her body. The girl rises immediately (ἀνέστη παραχρῆμα) as her spirit (πνεῦμα) returns (8:55).


---

614 BDAG, 551.
616 On the other hand, F. Bovon states that this word is used by Luke in order to underline the role of the voice in Jesus' miracle-working. The voice foreshadows the active power of the word (Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, 1:452). Luke also uses φωνέω in 8:8 (as a call to listen), 22:60 (for the cock's crowing), and Acts 16:28 (Paul's shout to the jailer). However, in the meaning of “calling” this verb occurs in John 11:28, 18:33, and 12:17, where it used for calling Lazarus out of the tomb. Thus the choice of φωνέω to describe the calling to the girl's spirit departed from her body can be quite a plausible reason for using this word in such a context.
resuscitation of Tabitha, a pious woman from the Christian community in Joppa, who had fallen sick and died (9:37). After death she had been washed by widows (cf. 9:39), a customary ritual in preparing a corpse for burial, and had been laid in an upper room. As Joppa was not far from Lydda, where Peter was staying at that time, he was asked to come (9:38). After being told about Tabitha (9:39), Peter puts everyone out of the upper room and kneels to pray about her resuscitation. Then Peter addresses Tabitha: Ταβιθά, ἀνάστηθι ("Tabitha, rise!" 9:40). These words recall those of Jesus addressed to Jairus’ daughter, not in the form given in Luke 8:54, but rather that given in Aramaic in Mk 5:41, Ταλιθα κουμ. While using ἐγείρω for resurrection in Luke 7:14; 8:54, here Luke prefers the verb ἀνίστημι. In contrast to Luke 8:54 (cf. Mark 5:41), where Jesus takes Jairus’ daughter by hand, Peter does not take her hand while resuscitating her, but simply turns to her body. Then, Tabitha opens her eyes.

---

617 Tabitha is Aramaic טָבִיתָא that corresponds Hebrew צִבְיָה. She is described as μαθήτρια ("a woman disciple") with the Greek name Δορκάς ("Gazelle"; 9:36). Although the word μαθήτρια is unique for the New Testament, Luke probably wants to underline that this woman was one of the disciples (e.g., 6:1, 17; 7:18; 9:10, 19, 26, 40; 11:29; 14:20, 22; 15:30; 16:1; 21:16).


619 Ὑπερῷον ("an upper room") used here recalls the story of the resuscitation of the child in 1 Kgs 17:17–24.

620 The account of the resuscitation of Tabitha recalls that of Jairus’ daughter, especially Luke 8:51–55. It is noteworthy however, that in contrast with the former the parents of the girl stay in the room. Moreover, Luke uses ἐκβαλὼν δὲ ἔξω πάντας in Acts 9:40 which rather correspond to ἐκβαλὼν πάντας from Mark 5:40 than to the account from Luke’s gospel, which omits these words.


622 Conzelmann indicates that “Tabitha, rise!” (_TABĪTĀ, ἀνάστηθι, Aramaic Ταβιθά κουμ) recalls Ταλιθα κουμ (Aramaic טָלִיתָא מוּק) from Mark 5:41 (Conzelmann, A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, 77). Indeed, these expressions are similar phonetically and semantically.

623 Some WT manuscripts add “in the name of Jesus Christ,” which may have been a pious addition. On the other hand, the shorter expression might simply recall Jesus’ address to Jairus’ daughter. In any case, it is implied here that Peter uses a prayer for resuscitation that could be a prayer to Jesus as the resurrected one, but not to any other power.
looks at him, and sits up (ἀνεκάθισεν, 9:40). Peter raises her (ἀνέστησεν αὐτήν) giving her his hand (9:41). It is noteworthy that ἀνεκάθισεν precisely matches Luke 7:15, where it appears in the context of the resuscitation of the widow’s son at Nain. Moreover, just as Jesus gave the risen widow’s son to his mother, so also Peter presents Tabitha to the congregation and the widows (9:41).

Luke emphasizes the reality of the restoration to normal physical life in the stories about resuscitation which mention the return of the human component that survives death. In the story of Jairus’ daughter it is a πνεῦμα (Luke 8:55). However, in the story of Eutychus (Acts 20:7-12), which also recalls Luke 8:49–56 in some detail, this substance is represented by a ψυχή. On the first day of the week Paul and his companions were gathered in Troas together with a local community of believers for the common meal that could be a night celebration of the Eucharist (20:7). While Paul was delivering a lengthy sermon, the youth named Eutychus became drowsy, fell out of the window on which he was sitting and was found dead (ἤρθη νεκρός). Then, Paul restored him to life bending over and embracing him (20:9–10, 12). Afterwards, the apostle declared that Eutychus’ ψυχή (“soul”) had come back to him (20:10).

In addition, since he belonged to the eastern Mediterranean culture Luke could easily have shared the widespread belief in the gradual process of death. It is not unlikely, therefore, that he supports a view that the human component that is thought to live on after death is considered as still being at the time of resuscitation in proximity to the dead body of which it had been part. Luke

624 As Tabitha was already alive, Luke is playing with several meanings of ἀνίστημι in this episode.

625 Like Acts 9:36–42, the episode of the raising of Eutychus (20:7–12) also has some parallels with other accounts about resurrection from the dead, mainly Mark 5:36–43; Luke 7:11–17; 8:49–56; as well as 1 Kgs 17:17–24; 2 Kgs 4:18–37. However, there is not so much afterlife terminology in this passage. Nevertheless, the resuscitation of Eutychus could serve as a reminder of the power of Jesus’ resurrection which is celebrated in the Eucharist; Fitzmyer, The Acts of the Apostles, 668. Probably, Luke, having received this account from tradition, did not add such a terminology in editing this traditional story about Paul.


627 Conzelmann emphasizes that Acts 20:10 speaks about the a real raising from the dead (Conzelmann, A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, 169).
believes that this component has not yet reached the otherworld. The mention of the spirit (πνεῦμα) in the act of the girl’s revivification in Luke 8:55 may be influenced by the story of Elijah’s restoration to life of the widow’s son in 1 Kgs 17:21–22 in the LXX, but reading πνεῦμα instead of ψυχή. It seems that Luke alludes to 1 Kgs 17:21–22 and replaces ψυχή with πνεῦμα deliberately. Some of the occurrences of πνεῦμα in the Lucan double work depend on the Greek text of Ps 31:5 (Luke 1:47; 23:46, and Acts 7:59 alluding to it). Luke may therefore have replaced ψυχή with πνεῦμα in Luke 8:55 in order to adjust it in accordance with Ps 31:5. The use of πνεῦμα in Luke 24:37, 39 can be explained as Luke’s aim to emphasize the fact that the disciples were afraid of the appearance of the ghost as a spiritual being. The account of Acts 20:10, where Luke calls the component surviving death ψυχή, which is closer to LXX 1 Kgs 17:21, is more complicated. It is most likely, however, that he regards the Greek ψυχή and πνεῦμα as synonyms and as a kind of parallelism for the human component surviving death. The same inconsistency is found in Jewish terminology used for the human component surviving death: while a few books prefer a single term for it, others easily deal with several terms used as synonyms.

628 Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, 1:452.
629 Cf. ἐπιστραφὴν δὴ ἡ ψυχή τοῦ παιδαρίου τούτου εἰς αὐτόν (“let this child’s soul come back into him”) in 1 Kgs 17:21 and ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς καὶ ἀνέστη παραχρῆμα (“her spirit turned back and she immediately got up”) in Luke 8:55. This Lucan addition is absent in Mark 5:42 (cf. Mat 9:25).
630 However, there is a possible parallel between Luke 1:47 and 1 Sam 2:1. But it is noteworthy that Luke or his source changes καρδία to πνεῦμα in this verse.
631 For instance, the Book of Watchers uses “the souls of the people” (αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων in the Greek version of 1 En. 9:3), “the spirits of the souls of the dead” (τὰ πνεῦματα τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν νεκρῶν in the Greek version of 1 En. 22:3a), “all the souls of human beings” (πάσας τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων in the Greek version of 1 En. 22:3b), “the spirit” (τὸ πνεῦμα; 22:6–8), “the spirits of the dead” (τὰ πνεῦματα τῶν νεκρῶν; 22:9), and “the spirits” (πνεῦματα, 22:8–13). The expression “the spirits of the souls of the dead” of 22:3a probably combines the term “souls” from the early stage of tradition behind this text with the term “spirits” from the later stage. In the Epistle of Enoch the anthropological terminology includes souls (ψυχαὶ), spirits (πνεῦματα), and the body of flesh (τὸ σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς). “Souls” and “spirits” are most likely used synonymously: “The souls of the pious who have died will come to life... their spirits will not perish” (103:4). In 4 Ezra 6:37 “spirit” (spiritus) and “soul” (anima) are used virtually as synonyms even denoting the human inner being.
To summarize, for Luke the stories about the restoration of physical life function as a sign of the coming of the Messiah. They do not refer to the gaining of physical immortality but to the temporary return to physical life. In these stories Luke often uses forms of ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω and plays with their meanings of resurrection, awakening, and standing up. In Luke 8:49–56 he also exploits several meanings of καθεύδω, which sometimes represents death in the New Testament. However, in this episode Luke may intend to demonstrate that physical death is not fatal and can be defeated by Jesus’ power and a believer’s faith. Besides, he emphasizes the role of the loud voice in the act of waking the person and underlines the reality of the resuscitation by mentioning the component of the human being that survives death. He represents this component with the terms ψυχή and πνεῦμα which he probably uses as synonyms. Finally, he shares the widespread eastern Mediterranean belief that death is a gradual process and believes that the soul of the departed does not reach the otherworld immediately after death and can be called back to the body.

3.5 Summary

The resurrection seems to be a dominant form of afterlife existence in Luke-Acts. However, using resurrection language Luke has in mind several issues: (1) the eschatological resurrection of the dead, both that of the righteous only, and the general resurrection; (2) individual resurrection (including the resurrection of Jesus); (3) restoration to earthly life, which itself does not directly relate to the afterlife, but is nevertheless expressed via forms of ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω. Luke sometimes deliberately plays with the different meanings of these verbs (most markedly in the scenes of the resuscitations discussed), emphasizing their meaning as awakening and standing up. Here, Luke is at one with typical Jewish representations of the resurrection and restoration to physical life (cf. 2 Kgs 4:31; 13:21) via ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω as equivalents of the Hebrew קום, קיץ,_unsigned, and רופ. The use of the lexemes associated with awakening, getting up, and standing up for the resurrection is combined with that of sleep standing for death (καθεύδει in Luke 8:52; cf. καθεύδοντες in Dan 12:2). The same pattern is found in some pagan accounts about the resuscitation of corpses as their waking up from sleep or unconsciousness (sometimes with the use of forms of ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω).
Further, if Bovon is right in his suggestion that Luke distinguishes between “the resurrection from the dead” and “the resurrection of the dead,” then it means that the evangelist, being aware of both types of eschatological resurrection which are found in Jewish beliefs, speaks about “the resurrection from the dead” as about the true resurrection of the righteous to eternal life. He could also comprehend it as the positive half of the general resurrection, after which only the righteous would be resurrected to eternal life, while the wicked would be punished and condemned. This type of resurrection is found in Luke's collective eschatology.

Luke deliberately marks out the corporeality of individual resurrection, which is connected with his individual eschatology and is best seen in the case of Jesus’ resurrection. Luke wants to protect this notion of resurrection from any association with angelomorphism or with the appearance of a ghost (Luke 24:37–39). On the other hand, Jesus' resurrected body does have some supernatural abilities peculiar to the glorious state of the righteous at the eschatological resurrection.

Moreover, from the perspective of time, Luke's eschatological resurrection operates not only in the future but also in the present. The same is true of individual resurrection, since Luke speaks about Jesus as already resurrected. Nevertheless, it seems that Luke does not regard this overlap of several temporal aspects of eschatology as a contradiction.

In addition, dealing with the restoration of life, Luke mentions the return of the human component surviving death, which is represented by the terms ψυχή and πνεῦμα. These terms are most likely used as synonyms as is often attested in Jewish sources. Moreover, Luke may have shared the widespread eastern Mediterranean belief that death is a gradual process. Consequently, he regards the human component that is thought to survive after death as not immediately being in the otherworld, but still being in the proximity of the dead body at the time of resuscitation.

Next, how does Luke operate with the elements of other forms of afterlife existence in his double work? This question will be investigated in the next chapter of the present research.
Chapter 4. The Immortality of the Soul and Angelomorphism

The “afterlife language,” i.e., the terminology and imagery Luke employs in Luke 20:35–38 for the eschatological resurrection are more reminiscent of the idea of the immortality of the soul with some angelomorphic features, than of the concept of the bodily resurrection. Indeed, the resurrected righteous become immortal like angels; they are among the children of God (a title often associated with angels), and they live “spiritually” in heaven or somewhere else, being alive to God along with the patriarchs.

In more detail, the very idea of the resurrection in Luke 20:36 is represented by means of language with some elements of the concept of immortality: the righteous cannot die anymore. Moreover, the Lucan addition πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν (“for everybody is alive to him”) in Luke 20:38b also seems to reflect this concept. Furthermore, Luke 20:35–36 does not present the concept of the resurrection by any specific corporeal characteristics. It is rather similar to angelomorphic transformation as is seen from the use of the terms ἰσάγγελοι and υἱοὶ θεοῦ in 20:36.

Further, a certain spiritual survival of the patriarchs along with the prophets is depicted in Luke 13:28–29, which speaks about the Kingdom of God as an eschatological banquet in which the patriarchs and the prophets have been participating. Moreover, some of the participants are those who have already died. However, Luke does not mention their resurrection or any intermediate state between their death and resurrection.

In Luke 16:22–23 Lazarus’ honorable position at a certain banquet (see p. 111) does not refer to Lazarus’ resurrection. Moreover, Luke 16:19–31 describes Abraham receiving Lazarus in his bosom, referring to this patriarch as being alive.632 Similarly, in Luke 23:42–43 the penitent criminal receives his blessed state immediately after death. Again, there is no explicit indication of either eschatological or individual resurrection in this pericope.

These issues move us on to a discussion of the influence of some other forms of the afterlife, which may affect certain passages in Luke-Acts, first, immortality and second, angelomorphic (celestial) transformed existence. How do they function in Luke’s double work and how do they relate to resurrection?

---

This chapter is devoted to the analysis of two ideas, the immortality of the soul and angelomorphic existence. It should be noted that the present research follows Fletcher-Louis’ definition of angelomorphic as applicable “wherever there are signs that an individual or community possesses specifically angelic characteristics or status, though for whom identity cannot be reduced to that of an angel.”

The ideas of the immortality of the soul and of angelomorphism have a long history and are quite complicated. For instance, there were several views about what it means to be immortal or how angelomorphic transformation correlates with resurrection or other forms of afterlife. This is a case where an overview of pagan and Jewish sources may require much more space than the analysis of Luke-Acts. Therefore this chapter will deal mostly with the analysis of Luke’s environment. However, it will also examine Luke-Acts on the following issues: what kind of immortality and angelomorphism does Luke imply for the resurrected? How does the idea of immortality function in Lucan passages that do not mention resurrection? Thus this chapter will first investigate the issues of the immortality of the soul and of astral immortality (blessed celestial life) in Greco-Roman pagan sources, and then the idea of the immortality of the soul and that of angelomorphic existence in Jewish literature. Then follows an inquiry into how the elements of these forms of afterlife function in Luke-Acts.

4.1 The Immortality of the Soul and Celestial (Angelomorphic) Afterlife in Pagan and Jewish Sources

4.1.1 The Immortality of the Soul in Greco-Roman Paganism

This section discusses the idea of the immortality of the soul in pagan sources. It will analyze how this culture perceives it and will demonstrate that it was a diverse idea in itself. Indeed, already in Homeric times, the souls of the dead in general were believed to go to the underworld (cf. Homer, Il. 1.1–5). An existence of this kind, in fact, did not mean immortality for many Greco-Roman pagans, especially in popular circles which regarded human nature as a...
psychosomatic unity.\textsuperscript{634} In essence, for them this is not immortality as such but only a shadowy existence for the disembodied soul.\textsuperscript{635} Humans are mortal by definition and cannot escape their mortal nature.\textsuperscript{636} In contrast, the gods are immortal (ἀθάνατοι θεοί; Homer, \textit{Il.} 18.116)\textsuperscript{637} and are therefore separate from the human reality. So the existence of the soul without the body is insufficient as it does not constitute a complete person.\textsuperscript{638} This view does not imply a real and full existence of the shadow.

The idea of the “full” immortality of the soul, which considers it to be a real and truly desirable form of afterlife, had probably been introduced into Greek culture from outside.\textsuperscript{639} In the 5\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.E. Herodotus still saw it as absurd and essentially un-Greek. He claimed that it could have come from Pythagorean or Egyptian beliefs (\textit{Hist.} 2.81, 123).\textsuperscript{640} This immortality of the soul is closely related to the idea of reincarnation or metempsychosis (μετεμψύχωσις), a belief that the human soul enters another corporeal entity after death. Thus earthly existence is just a stage in a longer span of life; the soul had not only existed before entering the physical body but would go through a


\textsuperscript{635} In Homer the human substance surviving death is a shadow (εἴδωλον) that has some emotional components (\textit{Od.} 11.602–603; \textit{Il.} 23.104–107).

\textsuperscript{636} Θνητοί (\textit{Il.} 1.339; 1.574; 10.403; 12.242; \textit{Theog.} 224) or βρωτοί (\textit{Il.} 2.248; 3.223; 5.361; \textit{Od.} 8.239; 12.77; Hymni Homerici, \textit{In Mercurium} 354; \textit{Theog.} 369; \textit{Op.} 15).

\textsuperscript{637} Cf. μάκαρες θεοί (Hesiod, \textit{Theog.} 101, 128, 881).

\textsuperscript{638} Endsjø, \textit{Greek Resurrection Beliefs and the Success of Christianity}, 24.

\textsuperscript{639} Bremmer, \textit{The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife}, 1. See also Endsjø, \textit{Greek Resurrection Beliefs and the Success of Christianity}, 105–106.

\textsuperscript{640} Plato also admits that the idea of the immortal soul is unfamiliar to his contemporaries (\textit{Resp.} 608d). As Bremmer puts it, the reason for its popularity was probably due to the development of the idea of personal survival after death replacing during the course of the archaic period the more ancient concept of collective survival (Bremmer, \textit{The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife}, 25). Indeed, in Homer the dead are often mentioned in the plural as an enormous, undifferentiated group (Homer, \textit{Od.} 10.521, 11.29). The idea of immortality could also have come from Orphic circles that appeared at approximately the same time or slightly later (Endsjø, \textit{Greek Resurrection Beliefs and the Success of Christianity}, 107).
series of reincarnations in successive lives. This form of the afterlife became popular among Greek philosophers and poets since the latter part of the 6th century B.C.E. and was related to Pythagorean teaching.

Plato extensively developed the ideas of immortality and reincarnation, which affected many later authors. Therefore, his views deserve all the more careful attention here. In the *Phaedrus* he speaks about several incarnations of the soul (*Phaedr. 247–249*). He builds an analogy in which the soul is like the union between a charioteer and his team of horses with wings riding through the heavens. One of these horses is good; another is not (*246a–b*). The bad horse has to be appropriately disciplined by reason (*νοῦς*), which is “the soul’s pilot” (*ψυχῆς κυβερνήτης; 247c*). If this horse brings the soul down, it will be incarnated in the body. Only the soul that can see the truth (*ἀλήθεια*) may enter the human form (*249b*). Those who are unable to pursue the truth are destined for a series of deprivations. The shortness of the time of the soul’s riding through the heavens is a consequence of the previous failure to discipline the rowdy horse. The demotion would be continued even under the earth (*249a*), while the incarnation itself is seen as an imprisonment, literally, “bind in it like an oyster (*ὀστρέον*)” (*250c*). Reincarnations are graded in nine levels from

---


642 Its origin goes back to the ancient myth about the legendary singer Orpheus and his follower Musaeus, adopted in the context of the idea of the divine origin of the soul and the possibility of its return to the divine state (Richardson, “Early Greek Views about Life after Death,” 61). This return is to be free from rebirth through an ascending series of earthly cycles and various forms of purgatory in the underworld. The myth about Orpheus’ trip to Hades and back and his receiving special knowledge about death and the afterlife were developed in the so-called Orphic literature. Some texts of the Orphic circle declare that human nature encloses a conflict between the body and the soul and by means of the euphony of σῶμα (“body”) and σῆμα (“tomb”) consider the body to be a tomb or prison of the soul (Bernstein, *The Formation of Hell*, 43). Bremmer considers the origin of Orphism to postdate the first decade of the 5th century B.C.E. but to predate the time of Empedocles (ca. 490–430 B.C.E.), who had already been influenced by it. The oldest Orphic theogony is probably reflected in Parmenides (ca. 5th century B.C.E.; Bremmer, *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife*, 15). Orphism continued to be popular in the Hellenistic and Roman periods as some frescoes at Pompeii (1 century C.E.) demonstrate (Porter, "Resurrection, the Greeks and the New Testament," 76).

643 Cf. the ideas of Philolaus and the Orphics (see n. 642).
philosopher to tyrant according to the amount of truth absorbed during the ride of the soul through the heavens (248c).\textsuperscript{644}

Plato provides several arguments in favor of the immortality of the soul. The soul must exist after death as well as before life because life moves to death and death to life, and so on (\textit{Phaed. 70c–72e}). Then, since ideas are the causes of all things, the idea essential to the soul is that of life (105d–e). In addition, the soul exists always (\textit{αὐτὸ ἀεὶ ἄνω εἶναι}) and it is immortal (\textit{ἀθάνατον}) because it cannot be destroyed either by its own faults or by anything external (\textit{Rep. 610e–611a}).\textsuperscript{645} Moreover, the soul is immortal because whatever is always in motion is immortal. A source of motion (\textit{ἀρχὴ κινήσεως}) is a self-mover (\textit{τὸ αὐτὸ κινοῦν}) and has no beginning (\textit{Phaedr. 245c, d}).

Further, in the \textit{Timaeus} Plato speaks about the irrational and mortal kind of soul which apparently does not survive death (\textit{Tim. 69, cf. Rep. 439d–e}). The rational, intellectual part of the soul is most important (cf. \textit{Soph. 249; Tim. 30b}) as it shares the nature of divinity. Thus the soul shares with the immortal gods (\textit{ἀθάνατοι}) their \textit{ἀθανασία}. Its character, therefore, is intellectual, immortal, and

\textsuperscript{644} In the myth of Er Plato distinguishes between two types of metempsychosis: human beings are turned into animals, and animals are turned into humans (\textit{Rep. 62oa–d}; cf., Diog. Laert. 8.36; Apuleius, \textit{Metamorphoses}). In addition, in the \textit{Phaedo} he indicates that while the body after death should be dissolved, the soul, if it is the pure soul of the philosopher, departs to the divine (\textit{Phaed. 81a}; cf. \textit{Gorg. 526c}). If however it is polluted, impure, and bound to the body by pleasures and pains, it will wander among tombs, waiting for its reincarnation in either animal or human form (\textit{Phaed. 80a–82a}).

\textsuperscript{645} The immortal soul should be studied not in its present state of communion with the mortal body but as a purified soul (\textit{Rep. 611c}). Then one may see its attraction to the divine, immortal, and eternal being (\textit{ὡς συγγενής οὖσα τῷ τε θείῳ καὶ ἀθανάτῳ καὶ τῷ ἀεί ὄντι – 611e}). As Bernstein points out, Plato pairs the term “immortal” (\textit{ἀθάνατος}) with the expression “existing always” (\textit{ἀεὶ ἄνω εἶναι}), which has expressiveness and force due to the connection of the simple adverb \textit{ἀεὶ} with the more technical \textit{εἶναι}. On the other hand, Socrates’ opponent Glaucon, who doubts the immortality of the soul, uses \textit{ἄθιδιον} (\textit{ἀτιδιον εἶναι}; \textit{Rep. 611b5}) instead of \textit{ἀθάνατον} to describe immortality. \textit{Ἀθιδιον is a shortened form of ἀείδιον (“always-like”), which combines ἀεί with the adjective suffix –διον). See Bernstein, \textit{The Formation of Hell}, 60–61. However, it is not clear whether Plato really implies this difference. For instance, \textit{ἄθιδιον} may be seen as derived from Άθης, which etymology goes back to “unseen” or “invisible”; see Robert Beekes, \textit{Etymological Dictionary of Greek} (vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 34.
divine. The soul has an imperishable nature and belongs to the realm of the invisible world and is mixed with the world-soul (*Tim. 41d*). Νοῦς as a part of the human soul is a δαίμων (“a guiding spirit,” “god”) given us by the god as a gift (90a). The body and two lower, mortal parts of the soul including pleasure, pain, boldness, fear, and anger, were made by the so-called “young gods,” i.e., the stars and heavenly bodies (42d5–e1; 69c3–72d8). Δαίμων as the immortal and divine part of the soul resides in the top part of the body and raises humans up (ἀνεφείν) away from the earth to heaven (the place of the origin of the soul), suspends the human head, keeps the whole body upright (ὀρθοῖ, 90a), and makes it possible to contemplate the orderly heavenly movement (90c7–d7). Moreover, in 74c Plato speaks about a certain correctness or, literally, “uprightness” of the soul (διόρθωσις) that becomes apparent through correct reasoning (47c2). Human nature can partake of immortality (ἀθανασία), if a person seriously exercises all the aspects or parts of his/her soul. Then, keeping his/her guiding spirit well-ordered (εὖ κεκοσμημένον τὸν δαίμονα) the person can obtain bliss (εὐδαίμονα εἶναι; 90c5–6). Thus, it may be suggested that for Plato the soul has to be upright and its uprightness makes the whole personality (including the body) upright. Even more, the upright standing posture of human beings marks their participation in immortality. In addition, in the *Phaedrus* Plato speaks about the souls of the immortals (ἀθαναστατοι), which arrive at the top of heaven and are standing on its ridge (ἐστησαν ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ νότῳ; 247b7–c1) to observe what is outside heaven. Here, Plato also emphasizes

---

646 The divine character of the soul is also supported by Pindar, who speaks about the soul as an “eternal image” surviving death. The soul is alone of divine origin (fr. 131; cf. Plutarch, *Cons. Apoll.* 120D) and occurs in one of the so-called Orphic Golden Leaves (the 4th century B.C.E.): “I am the son of Earth and of starry Heaven, but I am of Heavenly origin (γένος οὐρανιόν)” (2 Petelia 6–7); see Fritz Graf and Sarah Iles Johnston, *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife: Orpheus and the Bacchic Gold Tablets*, 6; Bolt, “Life, Death, and the Afterlife in the Greco-Roman World,” 69; Bremmer, *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife*, 22.

647 Erwin Rohde, *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co, 1925), 465, 479, n. 13. In *Tim. 30c* Plato argues that the world is a living thing with its soul (ξύμψωκες) and intelligence (ἐννοικες). The world has a visible part as its body, and an invisible part, which is its soul (*Tim. 36e*). The world-soul consists of the mixture of the Same, the Different, and Being (37a).
the standing posture of the soul as a mark of its immortality and its ability to contemplate, and as a feature which indicates a stability like that of the gods.\textsuperscript{648}

Such a view of the importance of the uprightness of the body and the soul for Plato is in line with the perception of the human standing posture in ancient society. Indeed, the ability to stand upright was sometimes regarded as distinctly human.\textsuperscript{649} The most ancient notice of this belief is found in Xenophon’s \textit{Memorabilia}: of all the animals only the human being has been made upright (literally, “of all living beings, they [the gods] raised only the human to stand upright,” μόνον τῶν ζῴων ἀνθρώπων ὀρθὸν ἀνέστησαν).\textsuperscript{650} This uprightness (ὀρθότης) helps humans to look forward a great distance, and, what is more important, to contemplate better what is above (ὕπερθεᾶσθαι, \textit{Memor}. 1.4.11.4). Moreover, humans are given a soul as the most excellent part of their personality (1.4.13.2). These features distinguish them from animals and make them to live like the gods (ὡς περὶ θεοὶ ἀνθρώποι βιοτεύουσι, 1.4.14.2). This topic had been picked up and further elaborated by Plato.

In addition, in \textit{De partibus animalium} Aristotle (384 – 322 B.C.E.) develops the idea of the upright state, declaring that humans share the highest category of being because among animals only they stand upright (Ὁρθὸν μὲν γάρ ἐστι μόνον τῶν ζῴων). The reason for this is because their nature and essence are divine (τὴν φύσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν εἶναι θείαν; \textit{Part. an.} 686a 27–28). Next, he argues that ψυχή is the substance (οὐσία) of the living being, its first actuality and the form of the body’s matter (\textit{De an.} 412b27–413a1) and therefore cannot exist independently from the body.\textsuperscript{651} Only the mind (νοῦς) is the immortal part of the personality, which can neither be contaminated by the material world

\textsuperscript{648} As Michael Allen Williams argues, in this Platonic tradition describing the ascent of the individual to a transcendent realm, the verb ἵστημι “has the technical philosophical connotation of "absence of motion"”; Michael Allen Williams, \textit{The Immovable Race} (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 81. However, the present research tries to keep in mind both the “upright posture” and “standing” meanings of this verb in the contexts dealing with the afterlife.


\textsuperscript{650} Xenophon lived ca. 430–354 B.C.E.

\textsuperscript{651} It cannot even be separated from the body (\textit{De an.} 413a4)
Aristotle regards the mind as a different kind of soul (ψυχῆς γένος ἕτερον; De an. 413b) or even a part of the soul (τοῦ μορίου τοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς; De an. 429a). The mind survives death (Metaph. 1070a), as it is imperishable (Cael. 279b) and has immaterial divine substance (Metaph. 1072b, 1073a). Thus, in Aristotle's philosophy ψυχή may denote the personality and totality of mind and soul but does not represent a pure spirituality which is occupied by νοῦς.

Later, the Middle Platonists and the Neo-Platonists also supported Plato's idea of the survival of the immortal soul after death. Also, some of them shared and developed Plato's view on the importance of the standing posture of the soul. Thus, Plutarch also speaks about reincarnation, noting in his De esu carnium that it is a reason to abstain from eating animals (ταῖς ψυχαῖς εἰς σώματα πάλιν μεταβολῆς; De esu. 998 d1–11). In his Consolatio ad uxorém he indicates that the immortal soul (ἀφθαρτον οὖσαν τὴν ψυχήν) is like a caged bird (ταῖς ἁλισκομέναις ὄρνισι) released after death. If it spends a long time in the body and is too attached to this world, it will immediately take another body and may even tend to retain the form it had in the body. However, the soul which was in the body for a short time will quickly recover its fire and go to its

---

652 However, Aristotle showed little interest in the further development of the doctrine of the survival of the mind, and his views on mind and soul had very little influence on later popular thought (Richardson, “Early Greek Views about Life after Death,” 62–64).


654 On the other hand, it seems that Aristotle treats the mind as external to the individual, as it comes to the individual from outside at creation (νοῦν μόνον θύραθεν ἐπεισίεναι; Gen. an. 736b) and lives its own separate life, probably as a divine component in the human being (De an. 408b29; Gen. an. 736b28). See Rohde, Psyche, 494.

655 Later, Plutarch also distinguished between ψυχή and νοῦς. The former is a source of pleasure and pain, and the latter of virtue and wisdom (Fac. 943 a1–e5).

656 Many of Plato's ideas on immortality are also reflected in Pseudo-Plato's Axiochus (ca. 1st century B.C.E.).

657 Williams provides some important examples from Plotinus and Proclus and argues that later Greco-Roman philosophy may have been influenced by Plato's ideas about the "standing" of the soul in Phaedr. 247b–c. See Williams, The Immovable Race, 74–82.

658 However, he says that there is a little doubt about belief in metempsychosis: εἰ μὴ πίστεως ἄξιον τὸ ἀποδεικνύμενον (“if not to be demonstrated to the point of belief”; De esu. 998 d1).
natural state (*Cons. ux. 611 e1–f7*). Furthermore, in *Apophthegmata laconica* Plutarch gives an interesting account related to the human upright posture as a mark of immortality: when someone set himself to make a corpse stand upright (νεκρὸν στῆσαι ὀρθόν), and, for all his efforts, was unable to do so, he said, “Egad, there is need of something inside” (*Apoph. lac. 234f 7–8, translation by F.C. Babbitt*).

Cicero, though not a Middle Platonist in the strict sense, also maintained Plato’s view on immortality. For instance, at the end of his *De republica* this author places the dream of the Roman general Scipio Aemilianus, (*Somnium Scipionis; Resp. 6*). This dream is a fiction that, like Plutarch’s myth of Aridaeus, also resembles Plato’s myth of Er. In *Resp. 6.11* Scipio declares that at death the soul is alive and it returns to heaven (*Resp. 6.13–14*). Then, in 6.26 his dead grandfather by adoption Scipio Africanus, whom Scipio meets in his dream, argues that as the eternal god (*deus aeternus*) moves the universe, which is partly mortal (*parte mortalem*), so the eternal soul (*animus sempiternus*) moves the fragile body (*fragile corpus*). Thus, he virtually translates Plato’s argument for immortality (*Resp. 6.27–28; cf. Phaedr. 245c–246a*). In his *Tusculanae disputationes* Cicero puts forward the idea that the origin of the soul is heavenly, divine, and eternal (*Tusc. 1.27*). He also emphasized the upright posture of humans. In *De natura deorum* he declares that human beings are raised from the ground (*humo excitatos*) to stand tall and upright (*celsos et erectos constituit*), so that they can contemplate heaven (*caelum intuentes*) and so receive knowledge of the gods. This upright posture is their distinctive feature and the gift of the gods (*Nat. d. 2.140.4–9*).

Ideas of immortality and of reincarnation continued to be popular in the Roman period (cf. Diog. Laert. 8.36). For instance, Virgil reflects the idea of the immortality of the soul, describing the journey of his hero through the underworld in his *Aeneid 6*, which recalls Homeric myths. However, as E.

---

659 Also Apuleius, familiar with Platonism, several mystery cults, and the cult of Isis, uses this motif in his *Metamorphoses*.

660 *Plutarch’s Moralia with English Translation by Frank Cole Babbitt* (vol.3; Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press and Wiliam Heinemann, 1931), 411.

661 In his writings Cicero reflected the ideas of several philosophical schools, *inter alia*, Epicureans, Stoics, and Middle-Platonists.

662 The high position of the eyes in the human body also serves to aid this contemplation (*Nat. d. 2.140.11–141.1*).
Rohde points out, the idea of the “full” immortality of the soul did not have a deep impact on the Greek populace and remained confined to some isolated sects and philosophical schools.\textsuperscript{663} This does not mean that for those who did not accept this idea death brings about the end of everything, but it indicates the belief that integral immortality involving body and soul is inaccessible for most people.\textsuperscript{664}

Further, many philosophers from pre-Socratic to Roman times spoke about the soul as if it consisted of some substance or “stuff,” for example of fire or air (\(\alpha\iota\nu\gamma\rho\); e.g., Euripides, \textit{Suppl.} 531–536, 1140; \textit{Hel.} 1014–1016).\textsuperscript{665} However, such stuff was not to be confused with \(\varepsilon\lambda\eta\), which was associated with heavy matter and sometimes with the body.\textsuperscript{666} Others treated the soul as a harmony of constituents, which ceased to exist after the death of the body.\textsuperscript{667} For instance, the Stoics held that the soul is of a physical nature.\textsuperscript{668} Moreover, they argued that the soul is constituted by \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\omega\mu\alpha\), which they saw as the active, generative principle organizing the cosmos. It was also associated with the initial fire identified with divinity.\textsuperscript{669} The Stoics considered individual souls to be parts of the divine soul and surviving only until the next cosmological cycle of recreation initiated by a conflagration (\(\varepsilon\kappa\pi\varphi\rho\omega\varsigma\)). Souls are reabsorbed into the divine soul and then redistributed in a new creation. Some Stoics claimed that every soul survives until the conflagration (Cleantes; ca. 330 – 230 B.C.E.), while others considered only the wise souls to continue existing after death.

\textsuperscript{663} Rohde, \textit{Psyche}, 254, 544. On the other hand, some Hellenistic philosophers and writers also did not believe in the existence of the soul after death. For example, the Epicureans regarded death as the end of all sensation, the destruction of both body and soul (Diog. Laert. 10.124–27).

\textsuperscript{664} Endsjø, \textit{Greek Resurrection Beliefs and the Success of Christianity}, 109.

\textsuperscript{665} Aristotle mentioned the view reflected in the Orphic hymns that the soul is borne by winds and enters the body while breathing from the universe (\(\delta\lambda\zeta\); \textit{De an.} 410b28).

\textsuperscript{666} Epictetus, for instance, equated flesh (\(\sigma\varphi\chi\delta\iota\alpha\)) with heavy matter (\(\varepsilon\lambda\eta\); \textit{Diatr.} 3.7.25.1–26.1).

\textsuperscript{667} Richardson, “Early Greek Views about Life after Death,” 62.

\textsuperscript{668} Marcus Aurelius considered the soul to go to the sky at death to be diffused, turned to fire, and absorbed into the intelligence of the universe (\textit{Med.} 4.21.59–61).

\textsuperscript{669} John Sellars, \textit{Stoicism} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 98.
They also distinguished between the soul (ψυχή) as the power of conscious life found in animals and the rational soul (λογικὴ ψυχή) generating the quality of rationality in human beings. All levels of human nature contain πνεῦμα. This is what gives its animal characteristics to the soul and the rational power of judgment to the rational soul. As Martin argues, the notion that πνεῦμα is a higher part of the self, probably identical with νοῦς, could have been existed in the Greco-Roman pagan milieu due to the common view that πνεῦμα is “the stuff that enabled perception, cognition, and contemplation.”

The Epicureans argued that the soul consists of fine particles of matter that are dissolved at physical death like other parts of a human being (Lucretius De. Rer. Nat. 3.31–42, 521–547, 1045–1052). Cicero, although rejecting the Stoic doctrine of the soul, treated it as being of fire or air (or a mixture of fire and air; Nat. d. 3.36.9) that makes it swift, hot, and light in order to ascend the heavens (Cicero, Tusc. 1.17.41; 1.19.43). In addition, while the human rational soul (animus), intellect (mens), reason (ratio), wisdom (consilium), and foresight (prudential) are made by divine providence (Nat. d. 2.147.1–3), every living being consisting of the natural elements (e.g., fire, air, and water) perishes and cannot live forever (nullum est animal sempiternum; Nat. d. 3.31.1–3.32.1).

670 Some later Stoics, such as Epictetus (55 – 135 C.E.), thought that the soul is destroyed along with the body immediately after death (Diatr. 2.1.17–19; 4.7.15–16). In the texts of Seneca (4 B.C.E. – 65 C.E.) and Marcus Aurelius (121–180 C.E.) diverging ideas are presented: the soul ceases consciousness at death, it survives until the ἐκπύρωσις, or it exists in a celestial abode (e.g., Seneca, Ep. 79.12; 102.22–23). See the discussion in Lehtipuu, The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, 86.

671 The innate πνεῦμα is an important subject for Aristotle who argued that it is already present in semen and is responsible for fertility and life-generating power (De an. 2.3.736b–737a). Moreover, De spiritu, which was ascribed to Aristotle, connects πνεῦμα with the soul (De spir. 1.481a; cf. 9.485b). The author of this text sees πνεῦμα as an instrumental body of the soul, which forms a unity with it. See Aristotle, Aristotle, On the Life-Bearing Spirit: a Discussion with Plato and his Predecessors on Pneuma as the Instrumental Body of the Soul (trans. A. P. Bos and Rein Ferwerda; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 1–2, 63–64.

672 Sellars, Stoicism, 105.

673 Martin, The Corinthian Body, 275, n. 64.

674 Epictetus probably saw it as that of divine origins (Diatr. 1.14.5–10; 3.13.15).

In spite of the diversity in Greco-Roman pagan theories regarding soul and body, all of them supported a dualism of these entities, deprecating the body in the sense of the flesh-and-blood body of current human existence. While the philosophers spoke about the embodiment of the soul, talking about death, they regarded the body as occupying a lower place in the hierarchy than that of the soul. The body is too heavy \(^ {676}\) to come up from the earth and become immortal. \(^ {677}\) For Plato the soul itself could have stayed in a different position in such a hierarchy, depending on how polluted by earthly pleasures it was. Epictetus (55 – 135 C.E.) then, sharing both Platonic and Stoic doctrines, spoke about the body opposed to πνεῦμα and linked to the earth as “wretched flesh (σάρξ)” (Diatr. 1.1.9), and to the “corpse” (νεκρόν; Diatr. 3.10.15) as a location of desires (Diatr. 2.22.17–19). Thus he considered the soul not to be completely immaterial. \(^ {678}\)

To sum up, the understanding of immortality in the Greco-Roman pagan cultural-religious milieu of the 1st century C.E. includes several issues: (1) the Homeric notion of the shadow of the dead in the underworld, which in fact, does not mean immortality; (2) the “full” immortality of the soul, developed by Plato, a single truly desirable type of existence of the soul, which is not only immortal but even divine; (3) a partial immortality of individual souls, which are part of the divine soul and survive only until the next conflagration (Stoics).

In several philosophical doctrines the body occupies a lower place in the hierarchy than the soul, and is too heavy to come up from the earth after death and become immortal like the soul. Even more, according to Plato’s view, the soul has to be upright and its uprightness makes the whole personality upright. The human ability to stand upright was regarded as distinctive for humanity and for several Greco-Roman authors served as a mark of immortality and divinity in human nature. Such a feature of the human soul associated with its immortality and divinity is also connected in Greco-Roman pagan literature with the perception of the restoration of life as a process of waking up from the sleep of death attested (see p. 155). Indeed, in order to be alive, a person has to stay upright. This posture is opposite to that of lying in bed as associated with sleep and death. Besides, standing also indicates immovability and stability,

\(^ {676}\) Cf. βαρύς, γεώδης, ὁρατός in Phaed. 81c9.
\(^ {678}\) Ibid., 117.
which are features of divinity. As will be shown in Chapter 5, this belief is quite
important for the understanding of the constitutive cognitive mechanisms
behind the concept of resurrection.

4.1.2 Astral (Celestial) Immortality in Greco-Roman Paganism

This section aims to demonstrate how the pagan sources connect the
immortality of the soul with celestial afterlife. Xenophon (ca. 430–354 B.C.E.),
referring to Socrates’ views, reports that this philosopher (ca. 469–399 B.C.E.)
argued that stars have soul and intellect (Mem. 1.4.8).679 The belief that the soul
is returning to the stars in the sky after death had been explicitly expressed
since the 5th century B.C.E. Alcmaeon of Croton (5th century B.C.E.), while
speaking about the divinity of the stars suggests that the basic characteristic
that souls and heavenly bodies have in common is their continuous motion,
“reflecting the fundamental relationship which existed between human life and
the life of the heavens.”680 Aristophanes (ca. 421 B.C.E.) states: “when we die, we
become stars” (ὡς ἀστέρες γιγνόμεθ’, ὅταν τις ἀποθάνῃ; Pax. 832–833). Such a
destiny may refer to the ascension of the souls to the sky as the dwelling place
of the gods. Indeed, some Greek epitaphs from the 5th–4th centuries B.C.E. speak
about the soul being received by the air (αἰθήρ) after death, hence, about the
soul going to the sky.681

Plato was also concerned with this idea. In the Timaeus he states that each
soul was assigned to a star (ἄστρον) at creation. The stars and heavenly bodies
are the “young gods” (41a), who shape human bodies and make the lower,
mortal parts of the soul (42d–e; see p. 171). Then, the souls allegedly begin
migrating into physical bodies (41e). Those who live a virtuous life would return

679 In the Apologia Plato also indicates that Socrates believed in the divinity of the stars
(Apol. 26d). For Pindar the destiny of the pious souls is in the presence of the gods (παρὰ μὲν
τιμίοις θεῶν οἵτινες; Ol. 2.65–66). See Scott, Origen and the Life of the Stars, 3.
680 Alan Scott, Origen and the Life of the Stars, 4.
681 The earliest example is from an epitaph of the Athenian dead at Potidæa in 432
B.C.E. stating that the air receives their souls while the earth takes over their bodies;
Garland, The Greek Way of Death, 75. Αἰθήρ was seen as the upper region of the air and the
dwelling place of the gods; ibid., 128. This idea could have been not unfamiliar already to
Pythagoreans maintaining the notion that the soul originates in heaven. As Martin argues,
they also could easily believe that after death the soul would return to the realm of the stars
(Martin, The Corinthian Body, 118. See also Scott, Origen and the Life of the Stars, 4).
Plato is also sympathetic to Greek (especially Ionian) astronomical ideas and regards the heavenly bodies as eternal, visible, and begotten gods (Tim. 40b–d). He speaks about σῶμα ὁρατὸν οὐρανοῦ (“the visible body of heaven,” Tim. 36e) and τοῦ κόσμου σῶμα (“the body of the universe,” Tim. 32c) and considers it to be composed of such primary elements as earth, water, air, and fire (Tim. 32b–c). Moreover, the immortal soul is ruling over the world (ἀρχεῖ τε δὴ σωμάτων πάντων) of matter, and the reason (νοῦς) for all that exists (τῶν ὄντων) is in the heavenly bodies (ἐν τοῖς ἄστροις; Leg. 967e). Later, the gods of the myths were often allegorically identified with the visible gods of the heavenly bodies: Zeus as heaven, Apollo as the sun, Artemis as the moon, and Demeter as the earth.

In Cicero’s Somnium Scipionis Africanus declares that a specific place is reserved in the sky for righteous statesmen to enjoy blessed eternal life (Resp. 6:13). The souls of these people are gathered in heaven (in the Milky Way) among the stars (6.16). A similar idea occurs in Tusculanae disputationes: after death the soul goes to its permanent home in heaven (Tusc. 1.11), which is a place among the stars (1.43–44).

Thus, the pagan idea of astral immortality as a form of afterlife existence is connected with the belief that the soul is of divine origin, and therefore belongs

---

682 This idea was maintained by the Neo-Platonists of the Roman period; see Sebastian Ramon Philipp Gertz, Death and Immortality in Late Platonism: Studies on the Ancient Commentaries on Plato’s Phaedo (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

683 Scott, Origen and the Life of the Stars, 7.

684 In this cosmic system the Earth is foremost among the heavenly gods, the one with the greatest seniority (Tim. 40d). The heavenly bodies were thought to consist either of fire (cf. Plato, Tim. 40a), ether (Plato. Epin. 981c; Aristotle, Peri philos. Fr. 27; cf. Clement of Rome, Recogn. 8.15), πνεῦμα, or the primary elements.

685 The Epinomis ascribed to Philip of Opus who lived in Plato’s time also claims that the stars are gods (982ε1–4; 986ε6).

686 Burkert, Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche, 488.

Xenocrates (ca. 396–314 B.C.E.) saw the heavens and the stars as the Olympic gods (fr. 15).
to the world of the immortal gods. Eventually the view that the nature of the soul is of celestial substance became a “part of Hellenistic folklore” and is found among the ideas of several philosophical schools and popular beliefs.

4.1.3 Immortality in Jewish Sources

Apart from explicit or implicit references to the resurrection, there are several Jewish texts which imply other forms of afterlife or prefer more general ideas and terminology instead of expressing its particular forms. This section will analyze the basic texts of this type in order to describe Jewish views on the immortality of the soul and some other similar ideas. First, this set of ideas is seen in the motif of the departure of the righteous from the world and their entry into the heavenly place of rest. This motif can be traced back to the account of the destiny of the suffering servant in the Book of Isaiah (especially Isa 53) as his return and restoration to life, and to the idea of the premature departure of the righteous ones from this world and their gathering in the

687 Indeed, the stars were often regarded as gods or divine beings in the Greco-Roman world (Scott, *Origen and the Life of the Stars*, 3–75).
688 See the notion that the stars are alive, e.g. in Cicero, *Nat. de.* 2.15.42.
689 Scott, *Origen and the Life of the Stars*, 24–38. There are some examples of epitaphs expressing this idea. For instance, an inscription from the 1st century B.C.E. says: μήτηρ μή με δάκρυε· τίς ἡ χάρις; ἀλλὰ σεβάζοι· ἀστὴρ γὰρ γενόμην θεῖος ἀκρεσπέριος (“Do not weep for me, mother. What is pleasure? But be reverent, for I have become an evening star among the gods”); IG XII.7.123.5–6); See Endsjø, *Greek Resurrection Beliefs and the Success of Christianity*, 116; cf. ἐις δὲ θεοὺς ἀνέλισα καὶ ἀθανάτοισι μέτειμι (“I have gone up to the gods and I am among the immortals,” EG 340) cited by Park, *Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions*, 155. However, some Greek circles such as the Epicureans denied the divine nature or origin of the stars and heavenly bodies, regarding them as consisting of a porous earthly material filled with fire; see Scott, *Origen and the Life of the Stars*, 6.
690 The suffering servant of the Lord was wounded (ךֵּחֲלָל) for the transgressions of the people of Israel and crushed (םִנְזָךְ) for their iniquities (53:5). Finally, he “was cut off from the land of the living” (נָצְרֹת בֵּית לִבְנֵי), stricken, and buried (53:8–9). His death is a sacrifice for the wicked and “the justification for many” (יַצְדִּיק צַדִּיק עבְדִי לָרַבִּים). However, afterwards, “his soul will see his offspring” and “prolong his days” (יַאֲרִי יָמִים; 53:10). The servant will prosper, be exalted and lifted up (52:13).
heavenly place of rest in Isa 57:1–2. Then, this motif had been developed in the Astronomical Book and the Book of the Wisdom of Solomon.

To start with the Astronomical Book, some of the Ethiopic versions of 1 En. 81:9 give the following reading: “those who do right shall not die on account of the (evil) deeds of the people, they will gather on account of the deeds of the evil ones,” while others read “those who do right shall die on account of the deeds of the people, they will assemble on account of the deeds of the evil ones.” Thus, either the righteous will escape the judgment and perdition (which connects with the thought of 81:4: in spite of the mass of sinful humanity there are some exceptions – the righteous who will have no record of evil deeds at the day of the judgment) or else some righteous will die unjustly at the hands of the wicked. These righteous will be “assembled” or “gathered up” on account of the wicked.

The Book of the Wisdom of Solomon combines the wisdom and apocalyptic traditions of Israel with some philosophical concepts, and uses some Greek rhetorical devices and expressions. The main topic of this book is wisdom rooted in the religious tradition of Israel and the author exhorts his readers to pursue wisdom and follow its way. For doing so, one should live the righteous life that results in immortality: δικαίων δὲ ψυχαὶ ἐν χειρὶ θεοῦ (“the souls of the righteous are in God’s hand”; 3:1). This book probably describes two postmortem states of the righteous one: (1) they are in God’s hand, being in peace (ἐν εἰρήνῃ; 3:2) immediately after their death; (2) they will shine out (ἀναλάμψουσιν) like sparks running through the stubble in the day of their visitation (ἐπισκοπή; 3:7, cf. 3:13). Thus, after death (even premature) the

---

691 In Isa 57:1 נאספים (“are gathering,” “are being taken away”) may indicate the righteous’ departure from the world and entering the heavenly place of rest.
693 The reading in the Manuscript Princeton Ethiopian 3 (Garrett collection – Isaac 3) and EMML 2080. Quoted from ibid., 1:59.
694 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 112. Charles translates it as “be taken away”; APOT 2:246.
695 As Collins demonstrates, the influence of Platonic/Pythagorean tradition is most notably seen in Wis 9:15, while that of Jewish apocalyptic is in 5:1–5; John J. Collins, “The Root of Immortality: Death in the Context of Jewish Wisdom,” HTR 71, no. 3–4 (1978), 187–188.
696 Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah, 205.
righteous are at rest (ἐν ἀναπαύσει; 4:7), being loved by God. They are taken up (μετετέθη; 4:10; cf. μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός [“he [Enoch] was taken by God”] in the LXX of Gen 5:24), and are caught up to God (ἡρπάγη; 4:11). In contrast to Gen 5:24 the righteous one is taken up after his death without his body. Moreover, his death is probably depicted as his martyrdom.

The visitation can be regarded as the day of the Lord with its judgment at the end of time (3:7–8, cf., e.g., Mal 3:1; Dan 7:9). Meanwhile, 3:7 speaks about the eschatological glorification of the righteous and probably their transformation without reference to their resurrection. The righteous will be counted among the sons of God (κατελογίσθη ἐν υἱοῖς θεοῦ) and have a lot among God’s saints (ἐν ἁγίοις ὁ κλῆρος αὐτοῦ; 5:5). The righteous will live forever (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα), receive a glorious kingly crown and a beautiful diadem from the Lord and will be protected by God’s hand (5:15–16). The present tense of ζάω in 5:15 may presuppose that immortality is granted to the righteous already in this life and continues after their physical death without ceasing.

Thus, the Wisdom of Solomon speaks about the immortality of the soul as a form of afterlife existence. Moreover, it seems that the immortality of the righteous is not an intermediate state between their death and the end of time

---

697 Cf. 2 Cor 12:4 where Paul uses ἡρπάζω in the context of his heavenly journey: ἡρπάγη εἰς τὸν παράδεισον (“was caught up into Paradise,” NRSV).

698 Nickelsburg sees in the story of the righteous from Wisdom of Solomon 2, 4–5 an account of persecution and exaltation with material from Isa 52–53 adapted to conform to the form of the wisdom tale. The story is divided into two parts: persecution from the unnamed rich (5:8) in 2:12–20 and a postmortem confrontation between the righteous one and his persecutors (4:20–5:14); Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity, 78–83.

699 I agree with Cavallin on this point; see Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 127. In addition, in the Qumran texts the end of the world and the time of the final judgment are sometimes expressed as a time of “visitation” (παράδεισον; e.g., 1 QS IV.19; cf. Wis 3:7).

700 Cf., e.g., Dan 12:3; 1 En. 62:15; 2 Bar. 51:3; 4 Ezra 7:97, 125; Vita 29:13.

701 “Sons of God” and “saints” here may represent angels or celestial beings. Cf. υἱοὶ θεοῦ in connection with angels and the issue of immortality in Luke 20:36.

702 An echo of this idea can be found in Luke 20:37–38 speaking about Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as well as others (πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν) as being alive to God.
(the day of visitation) but their final postmortem existence. This text uses the afterlife terminology peculiar to Greco-Roman pagan immortality language and incorporates it into the Jewish theological conceptions. Therefore, in contrast to Plato’s views on immortality as an inalienable feature of the human soul, according to the Wisdom of Solomon, immortality is granted only to the souls of the righteous as a result of their right behavior during their earthly life.

Further, the issue of the immortality of the soul is found in several other Jewish texts. The 4th Book of Maccabees discusses the questions of death and afterlife in the context of the suffering and martyrdom of the pious Jews from 2 Macc 6–7. According to 4 Maccabees, the martyrs, having walked their way through their sufferings receive the reward of eternal life. Nevertheless, this book replaces the belief in a corporeal resurrection with that of a spiritual incorporeal existence (e.g., 9:22; 14:5, cf. 2 Macc 7:4–9).

The belief in immortality is confirmed by use of immortality language: ἀθανασία, ψυχή ἀθάνατος (14:5; 16:13; 18:23; cf. 7:3), and ἀφθαρσία (“incorruption,” “immortality”; 9:22; 17:12). The elder Eleazar will not die to God (θεῷ οὐκ ἀποθνῄσκουσιν) just as the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob did not die but live to God (ζῶσιν τῷ θεῷ; 7:18–19). Similarly, the seven brothers in their suffering and martyrdom on account of God will obtain the prize of virtue (τὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀθλα) and will be with God (ἐσόμεθα παρὰ θεῷ; 9:8). Moreover, they “knew that those who die for the sake of God (οἱ διὰ τὸν θεὸν ἀποθνῄσκοντες) live

703 As in 2 Maccabees, belief in the afterlife is a result of faith in God’s power, mercy, justice, and ability to save the martyrs and give them eternal life. This belief is expressed in several references to Scripture at the conclusion of the book in 18:11–19 (Cain and Abel; Isaac as a sacrifice; Joseph in prison; Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah; Daniel among the lions; cf. Isa 43:2; Ps 34:19a; Prov 3:18; Ezek 37:3; Deut 32:39b).

704 Although in 9:7 the seven brothers told the tyrant that he puts their souls to death (ἡμῶν ψυχὰς εἰ θανατώσεις), here ψυχή means “life” rather than “soul.” Moreover, the reference to Ezek 37:3 in the context of this book is symbolical rather than a literal belief in the physical resurrection (Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 122–123).

705 The latter word occurs in the LXX only in the Wisdom of Solomon and in 4 Maccabees. Cavallin indicates that it appears in 1 Cor 15:50–54 as the transcendental form of life attained by the resurrection or transformation; see ibid., 120. Ἀφθαρσία ἐν ζωῇ πολυχρονίῳ in 17:12 (“immortality in a life of long duration”) can also mean “everlasting life” (cf. APOT 2:683) or “endless life.”
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to God (ζῶσιν τῷ θεῷ) as do Abraham and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the patriarchs” (16:25). 706 The pious will be granted eternal life (ὁ ἀΐδιος τῶν εὐσεβῶν βίος, 10:15; αἰώνιος ζωή, 15:3), which is promised by God. They will be received by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and will be praised by all the patriarchs, playing the role of heavenly hosts (13:17). On the other hand, the wicked, represented by the tyrant king, will experience eternal torments (ἀκαταλύτους βασάνους; 10:11; cf. 12:12; 13:15) and destruction (τὸν αἰώνιον ὀλέθρον; 10:15). 707

The righteous martyrs called οἱ Αβραμιαῖοι παῖδες (“the children of Abraham”) 708 are gathered together into the chorus of the fathers (εἰς πατέρων χορὸν; 18:23; cf. Isa 57:1). After death they stand before God’s throne and live “the life of eternal blessedness” (τὸν μακάριον βιοῦσιν αἰῶνα; 17:18), obtaining a divine portion (θεία μερίς; 18:3). In 9:22 the death of the martyr is depicted as his transformation into immortality: the first brother is transformed into incorruption by the fire in his torture (ἐν πυρὶ μετασχηματιζόμενος εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν; 9:22). 709 Thus, the righteous are given immortality virtually immediately after their death. 710 It is worth indicating here that although 4 Maccabees holds with the idea of the incorporeal immortality of the soul in contrast to the resurrection in 2 Maccabees, nevertheless it also refers to the idea of retribution immediately after an individual’s death.

An interesting combination of different views (at least three) on the forms of the afterlife occurs in Pseudo-Phocylides. 711 While Ps.-Phoc. 102–104 speaks

---

707 Cavallin indicates that 4 Maccabees should be compared with 2 Macc 7:14 regarding the absence of resurrection for the king. In the former the negative statement was changed to the positive about his eternal destruction. Moreover, he demonstrates that the terminology “eternal life – “eternal destruction” is comparable with so-called “two-way theology”; see Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 117–118). Such a theology is discussed by Nickelsburg as one of the three basic forms within the framework of Jewish conceptions of the afterlife (Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity, 214–215).
708 Αβραμιαῖος can refer not only to their genealogical relations but also to the way of life. Indeed, in 4 Maccabees Abraham is an example of the righteous walking the way of faith and trust in God, in spite of all sufferings and troubles.
709 Cf. with the account of the martyrdom of Eleazar in 7:10–15.
710 Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 119.
711 Ibid., 152.
about the bodily resurrection of the same body and an angelomorphic transformation, 111–114 deals with the shadowy existence in Ἅιδης, a common eternal home and fatherland for all humanity (κοινὰ μέλαθρα δόμων αἰώνια καὶ πατρὶς), indifferent to the righteous or wicked, rich or poor. Then 105–108 and 115 speak about the immortality of the soul. Souls (ψυχαί) remain unharmed after death, while the body goes back to the earth (105–107). The immortality of the soul is declared to be an inherited quality of human beings: “the soul is immortal” (ψυχὴ δ’ ἀθάνατος; 115).

Further, the idea of the immortality of the soul as an intermediate state of the dead between their death and their final destiny (either resurrection or another existence) is attested in several Jewish texts. The salient example of such views is found in 1 Enoch 22 representing a very complicated picture of postmortem destiny, and combines several traditions. In this account the souls of the righteous and the wicked are divided in separate chambers in the underworld waiting for the last judgment and their final destiny (22:4), whether destruction or resurrection to eternal life (22:13; cf. 25:5–6).

Certain pagan ideas about death and immortality were used by Philo of Alexandria and Flavius Josephus, including those of the corruptible matter of the body and its function as a prison for the soul as well as of death as the liberation of the immortal soul from the perishable body.

The immortality of the soul is a central issue in Philo’s works. Philo does not explicitly connect personal immortality with any form of collective

---

712 Ibid., 152.
713 E.g., in 1 Enoch; 4 Ezra; 2 Baruch; L.A.E./Vita; L.A.B.; Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. However, in T. Lev. 18:9–14 immortality is a form of afterlife for the righteous as their final destiny.
715 Cavallin indicates the opinion of some scholars that the passage from Exsecr. 158 is a possible reference to the resurrection. It speaks about the reestablishment of Israel after all the curses. However, as Cavallin demonstrates, even if the idea of the resurrection could have been implied in the Jewish traditions used by Philo, it is not salient in his own writings (see Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 137–138).
Mostly he is concerned with the issue of the afterlife in the context of his view of anthropology and the incorruptibility of the soul (ἀφθαρσία ψυχῆς; cf. QG 3.11).

According to Philo, those who do not believe in God are dead in their souls even in this life, while those who serve the Lord have everlasting life (Spec. 1.345). Referring to Deut 4:4, Philo provides the idea that obedience to and worship of God is the condition of such everlasting life, probably even in this physical life. Only wise and good souls will obtain the heavenly reality (Somn. 1.151; Ios. 2.29; Praem. 152; QG 3.11), while the wicked will go to hell (Ἅιδος or τάρταρος; Somn. 1.151; Praem. 152; cf. Spec. 3.152–154; Praem. 69–70, 152; Legat. 49, 103). The wise and virtuous are translated to another place of abode after their death. Moreover, immortality can be obtained through a voluntary death for the sake of commitment to the Law, that is, through martyrdom (Legat. 117, 192, 369; cf. 2 Maccabees 7 and 4 Maccabees).

After death a person will hasten to regeneration to combine with incorporeal beings and be without mixture and without body (Cher. 114). Erwin R. Goodenough sees this rebirth as reabsorption without personality into the transcendent God. Probably Philo regards it as an ideal form of afterlife. However, it seems that for him the patriarchs and Moses from Israel’s past in some sense preserve their personalities, serving God as intercessors for people (Pream. 166; cf. QG 1.70). In Sacr. 1:5–7 Philo names Abel, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob among these righteous ones and equates them with the angels (ἴσος ἄγγέλοις γεγονός) as “incorporeal and happy souls” (ἀσώματοι καὶ εὐδαίμονες ψυχαί). They have passed over to the immortal and perfect genus (ἄφθαρτον καὶ τελεωτάτον γένος). Moses, however, has taken a position even higher than this group. At his death he departed to another abode (Sacr. 1:8). Moreover, before his death he was transformed from a double being of soul and body into the nature of a single body (εἰς μονάδος) and into a most sun-like mind (εἰς νοῦν ἴλιοειδέστατον; Mos. 2,288). At his death he shed his body like the shell to ascend to God. However, he was stopped on his way in order to intercede for

---

716 See the list of the passages that may implicitly refer to immortality in the context of collective eschatology in ibid., 140, n.28.
717 Ibid., 135.
Further, like Plato and some other philosophers, Philo also indicates the importance of the standing posture of the human soul as a mark of its immortality and immovability. He describes Abraham and Moses as standing, considering them to be a paradigm of stability comparable with the eternal stability and immovability of God. Thus, according to Post. 27.2–6 Abraham stands (ἔστηκε) near to the standing God (τῷ ἑστῶτι θεῷ; cf. Gen 18:22–23), because his soul is immutable (ἄτρεπτος) and stands (ἧσταται) near the divine power. Similarly, Moses also stands before God who stands eternally (ἑστῶτα ἀεὶ θεόν; Gig. 49; cf. Deut 5:31).

For Josephus, who supported the idea of the liberation of the soul, death means the beginning of immortality. In A.J. 17,354 (cf. A.J. 17,349–350) he clearly expresses the belief in the immortality of the soul as his own:

Now I did not think these histories improper for the present discourse, both because my discourse now is concerning kings, and otherwise also on account of the advantage hence to be drawn, as well for the confirmation of the immortality of the soul (ἁμὴρ τὰς ψυχὰς ἀθανασίας ἐμφεροῦς), as of the providence of God over human affairs, I thought them fit to be set down. As Goodenough shows, in Philo’s works Moses’ position is unique among humans because he was sent to this physical world as a loan and was the ruler of his passions. He was a sort of a god and at his death nothing was taken from him or added to him due to his perfection. Moses, according to Philo’s thought, was not a mixture of qualities and bodies as other people are. While other righteous people obtain eternal life by flight to God (cf. Fug. 78), Moses was elevated by the Logos to a certain unique position of standing with God (Sacr. 8). See Goodenough, An Introduction to Philo Judaeus, 105.

A similar belief is expressed in Eleazar’s speech in B.J. 7,344–348, in Josephus’ speech against suicide (B.J. 3,372–374), in Titus’ speech to his soldiers (B.J. 6,46–49), in the account of the sacrifice of Isaac (A.J. 1,228–331), and in the accounts of the beliefs of the Essenes (B.J. 2, 154–157; A.J. 18:18) and of the Pharisees (B.J. 2,163; A.J. 18,14).

719 As Goodenough shows, in Philo’s works Moses’ position is unique among humans because he was sent to this physical world as a loan and was the ruler of his passions. He was a sort of a god and at his death nothing was taken from him or added to him due to his perfection. Moses, according to Philo’s thought, was not a mixture of qualities and bodies as other people are. While other righteous people obtain eternal life by flight to God (cf. Fug. 78), Moses was elevated by the Logos to a certain unique position of standing with God (Sacr. 8). See Goodenough, An Introduction to Philo Judaeus, 105.

720 Williams, The Immovable Race, 27.


722 In contrast to some other texts mentioning this episode (e.g., Heb 11:17–19; Pirqe R. El. 31,3), Josephus did not refer to the resurrection.
Referring to the latter, he indicates that the Pharisees believed that only the souls of the righteous pass to another body after death. He virtually “translates” the Pharisaic belief in the resurrection into the language of Josephus’ pagan readership. Indeed, he avoids referring to the resurrection as unaccustomed to the Greeks and rather uses language similar to that of the metempsychosis of the Pythagorean and Platonic traditions (B.J. 2,163; A.J. 18,14; cf. B.J. 3,374).723

Thus the idea of the “full” or Platonic type of immortality influenced some Jewish views on the afterlife existence. However, while for some Greek philosophers the human soul is ultimately immortal, Jewish traditions reserve the idea of immortality only for the righteous as their reward for their pious earthly life. Moreover, for such Jewish beliefs (e.g., in the Wisdom of Solomon and 4 Maccabees) the immortality of the righteous is their final postmortem existence. Other Jewish texts go even further (e.g., Pseudo-Phocylides, Philo, and Josephus) and use the pagan view on the liberation of the immortal soul from the perishable body at death, and that of metempsychosis. In addition, sometimes immortality represents an intermediate state before the eschatological resurrection at the end of time, reminiscent of the shadowy existence of the soul in Sheol in early Israelite views or in Hades in Homeric epics.

4.1.4 Angelomorphic Existence in Jewish Sources

As has been indicated above, belief in a blessed celestial life was very widespread in Hellenistic culture. How do Jewish views contribute in this issue? There is a tendency in many Jewish texts to connect the glorious existence of the righteous after death with shining. It is probably based on the association of divine epiphanies with light in the Hebrew Bible (Exod 3:2; Deut

723 Elledge, *Life after Death in Early Judaism*, 61, in contrast to Cavallin who sees consistent allusions to the idea of resurrection in Josephus’s thought; Cavallin, *Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15*, 146. Josephus’ Pharisees believed that every soul is incorruptible (ἀφθαρτος; B.J. 2,163). See also Ag. Ap. 2,218 where the belief in coming into being again and receiving a better life appears without reference to the Pharisees. As Josephus’ views had probably been shaped by his Pharisaic background, he might have shared their belief in the resurrection, which is known from such accounts of the Pharisees as the New Testament and Hippolytus, *Haer.* 9:26–27. However, he prefers speaking about metempsychosis.
which was later combined with astronomy.\footnote{Alan Scott, Origen and the Life of the Stars, 91.} Thus, this section will explore Jewish views on celestial postmortem existence and angelomorphic transformation. There are several trends in these views. This discussion starts with those texts that deal with eschatological resurrection but use certain astral and angelic imagery for the glorified state of the righteous. Then it moves on to the analysis of some Qumran ideas of angelic transformation, and after this to the overview of some other traditions such as the transformation of the righteous in Joseph and Aseneth, 4 Maccabees, and in the writings of Philo and Josephus who exploit pagan ideas of astral immortality.

The character of resurrection in the Jewish texts discussed above often remains ambiguous. Indeed, although the language of Dan 12:2 echoes that of Isa 26:19, it does not include הֵנְבֵלָ ("the corpse", cf. Isa 26:19), probably in order to avoid any explicit corporeal description. The author of Daniel is rather more concerned with the final stage of the resurrection process which seems to be "astronomical" or angelomorphic transformation. The same tendency occurs in many other texts.\footnote{Cavallin argues that traces of angelification are seen in Ps 2:7; 110:3; Num 24:17; Isa 4:12–14; T. Levi 18:3; T. Jud 24:1; Rev 1:16; 22:16; Matt 2:2, 9–11; 17:2 (Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 203).} For instance, the character of resurrection in the Book of Watchers (especially 1 Enoch 22–25) is very obscure and seems to be rather that of the spirit or the soul than that of the body.\footnote{A similar ambiguity appears in the Epistle of Enoch and Additions to 1 Enoch (1 En. 91:10; 92:3–4; 103:4; 104:2; 108:11–12), which most likely implies a spiritual type of resurrection rather than a bodily one, as well as in the Psalms of Solomon (e.g., Pss. Sol. 3:10–12), Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (T. Ben. 10:6–10; T. Sim. 6:7; T. Jud. 25:1–4; T. Zeb. 10:2), and the Testament of Job (T. Job 4:9; 40:4).} On the other hand, several other Jewish texts treat resurrection as corporeal. Indeed, 2 Maccabees explicitly indicates the bodily character of the afterlife. However, here the resurrection is closely connected with martyrdom and is associated with individual resurrection (see p. 146–147). Likewise, 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch are also very explicit about the bodily character of the resurrection. Nevertheless, in these texts it is an intermediate state of the
righteous and the wicked before their final transformation rather than a compensation or reward for their righteousness.\(^{727}\)

Thus, in Dan 12:3 the postmortem reward of the righteous is described by means of astronomical imagery. Indeed, the righteous will shine as the brightness of the firmament and as the stars (כַּכּוֹכָבִים; Dan 12:3). Their shining may serve as a metaphor of the celestial glory given them after their resurrection. In the context of Dan 8:10 כּוֹכָבִים is connected with הַשָּׁמָיִם צָבָא (“the host of heaven”). As has been shown above, due to the very brief and general description of the fate of the righteous wise, it is uncertain whether they are thought to be literally exalted to the heavens in the original context of Dan 12:3 (cf. Isa 52:13), or to be associated with angels, being transformed into a celestial form or the like (see p. 100).

The association or equality of the transformed righteous with angels seems to occur in 1 En. 103:3–4; 104:4–6; As. Mos. 10:8–10. However, in 1 En. 43:1–3 the names of the holy ones dwelling on the earth are metaphorically depicted as the lightings and the stars. On the other hand, the angelomorphic character of the final transformation of the body of the righteous is firmly emphasized in the Book of Parables. When Enoch’s spirit ascends to heaven and is given all the secrets of mercy, righteousness, the ends of heaven, and the treasures of the stars (71:1–4), he is taken to the highest part of the heavens to the heavenly house of fire (71:5–6), where his flesh is melted or dissolved and his spirit is transformed before the Head of Days (71:11) so that righteousness can dwell in him (71:14). Thus, Enoch’s flesh virtually disappears after this transformation and his new state is spiritual rather than corporeal. Moreover, the other righteous ones will be transformed as well and dwell with Enoch (71:16).\(^{728}\) They will be vindicated and glorified; the light will dwell upon them (50:1). They will have arisen from the earth (62:15) and put on the garment of glory, which is the garment of life from the Lord of Spirits (62:15b–16).

---


\(^{728}\) Cavallin states that Enoch’s assumption may be regarded as the pattern for the afterlife destiny of the righteous in the Book of Parables (Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 47).
This motif was further developed in later tradition: for instance, in 2 Baruch the righteous will be transformed into the splendor of angels, i.e., they will be glorified to an angelic state.\textsuperscript{729} The shape of their face will be changed into the light of their beauty (51:3b) and they will resemble the celestial beings, while their bodies will be transformed into the radiance of glory (2 Bar. 51:10).\textsuperscript{730}

Turning back to the Book of Parables, it is worth indicating that in this section of 1 Enoch transformation to heavenly glory is connected with the idea of the restoration of the original state of humanity. A new transformed existence of the chosen ones corresponds to the description of the exalted human state at creation:

For indeed human beings were not created but to be like angels, permanently to maintain pure and righteous lives. Death, which destroys everything, would not have touched them, had it not been through their knowledge by which they shall perish; death is (now) eating us by means of this power. (1 En. 69:11)\textsuperscript{731}

Thus, human beings will be given immortality like that of angels, which they had in Paradise even before they received the prohibited knowledge from the fallen Watchers.\textsuperscript{732}

\footnotesize{
\textsuperscript{729} Cavallin, \textit{Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15}, 88. It also occurs in many other Jewish texts, e.g., in 1 En. 39:7; 50:1; 92:4; 108:11–12; 2 En. 42:5; 65:0; 4 Ezra 7:97; 3; Pss. Sol. 3:12; Vita 29:13; 4 Macc 17:5; cf. Odes Sol. 21:3.

\textsuperscript{730} Cavallin calls this transformation “the most explicit expression concerning a spiritually resurrected body which can be found in the Jewish literature investigated” (Cavallin, \textit{Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15}, 88). Cf. 4 Ezra 7:36–38, 97; T. Benj. 10:6–10. The association of the glorious existence of the righteous after death with shining occurs in many other Jewish texts, e.g., in 1 En. 39:7; 50:1; 92:4; 108:11–12; 2 En. 42:5; 65:0; Pss. Sol. 3:12; Vita 29:13; 4 Macc 17:5; cf. Odes Sol. 21:3.

\textsuperscript{731} Quoted from Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 1:48. 1 En. 69:4–11 connects death with the fall of the evil angels and death appears as a personified cosmic power (e.g., Isa 25:8; 1 En. 69:11; Wis 1:16; 2:24). Originally, human beings were created immortal like angels, but through the prohibited destructive knowledge obtained from the evil angelic forces and subjection to them death destroyed humans.

\textsuperscript{732} It is worthy of attention that, according to the Book of Watchers, the angels are not only immortal but also have no need to reproduce:

Surely you, you [used to be] holy, spiritual, the living ones, [possessing] eternal life; but (now) you have defiled yourselves with women, and with
In addition, the *Life of Adam and Eve* also links the loss of the primordial glory after Adam’s fall (*L.A.E.* 20:1; 21:6)\(^{733}\) to the radiance of the resurrected ones (*Vita* 29:7–10). The transformation of human nature and its glorification will be another result of the resurrection: the former glory of Adam and the state he had before the fall will be restored to him and he will be seated on the throne of the fallen angel (*L.A.E.* 39:2; *Vita* 47:3).\(^{734}\) Moreover, this ethical transformation will take place together with the resurrection: there will be neither sinners nor evil hearts, but all the people will be given a heart understanding the good and worshiping God alone (*L.A.E.* 13:5).

Further, an interesting strand of the belief in the glorious transformation of human nature is found in the views of the Qumran community. As Collins demonstrates, the Qumran wisdom text *4QSapiential Work A*, in paraphrasing Gen 1:27, understands the creation of a human in the likeness of God to be a

> the blood of the flesh begotten children, you have lusted with the blood of the people, like them producing blood and flesh, (which) die and perish. On that account, I have given you wives in order that (seeds) might be sown upon them and children born by them, so that the deeds that are done upon the earth will not be withheld from you. Indeed you, formerly you were spiritual, (having) eternal life, and immortal in all the generations of the world. That is why (formerly) I did not make wives for you, for the dwelling of the spiritual beings of heaven is heaven (1 *En.* 15:4–7; Quoted from Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 1:21).

This idea probably influenced CD 7:5–6 declaring that the purified righteous will live a thousand generations. Also it may have been the basis for the celibacy of the Qumran community (Collins, “The Angelic Life,” 301).

\(^{733}\) According to *L.A.E.* 11:2, human nature was changed due to Adam’s fall. Indeed, death is a result of the fall, the destruction caused by God’s wrath (*L.A.E.* 14:2). All humans are mortal due to the disobedience of Adam and Eve (cf. 2 *Bar* 23:4). Human nature (φύσις) has been changed (μετηλλάγη) after Adam and Eve ate from the tree in Paradise from which God had prohibited them from eating (*L.A.E.* 11:2). This text interprets Gen 3:7a to say that before the fall humans had glorious clothes (*L.A.E.* 20:2; 21:5–6), also called δικαιοσύνη in *L.A.E.* 20:1. Because of the battle (πόλεμος) which Satan had placed in him, Adam did not have access to the tree of life any more, and therefore lost his immortality (*L.A.E.* 28:3).

\(^{734}\) In addition, *Vita* 29:13, alluding to Dan 12:3, describes the resurrection in more astral imagery: the righteous will shine like the sun before God. However, section 29:4–15 is omitted in some Latin manuscripts and is regarded as a Christian interpolation (Johnson, “Life of Adam and Eve,” 2:268–270).
creation in the likeness of קדושׁים, i.e., the angels’ (4Q417 2 I. 15–18).735 Thus, קדושׁים is used here instead of אלהים in its angelic sense.736 According to this text, not all humanity has this likeness, but only one type of human beings, which is associated with עָמִּי רֹחַ (“people of spirit”), in contrast to רוח בּּוֹר (“the spirit of flesh”) that acts in another part of humanity. This exalted human was created by God to rule over the world (1QS III. 17) and to bear God’s glory. Obviously, the Qumran community identified themselves with this “people of spirit.”737

Again, 4Q491 11 I. 11–18 speaks about someone claiming to sit on the throne of glory in heaven, having been reckoned among the gods. This text can be seen as an example of the Qumran belief in actual transformation and heavenly enthronement in the liturgical act of joining together heaven and earth.738 Another example of this belief is the 4Q Songs of the Sage (4Q511 35 2b–4) that elevates the priests as “the eternal sanctuary,” “the people of his righteousness, his army and his ministers, the angels of his glory.” In 1QSb IV. 23–28 this elevation is expressed in a more surprising way: the priest is not only superior

---


736 אלהים is often used to refer to angels in the Qumran literature. See Carol Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: a Critical Edition (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1985), 24. Collins also indicates that the idea of the creation of Adam in the likeness of the angels is also found in rabbinic literature (Collins, “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones,” 615). For the Qumran community, this shared likeness may have been not just metaphorical, but also perceived as an actual partnership in reality. The feeling of a union with angels was so clear for the Qumran community that they called them by the same terms that they used for themselves: רוח (4Q400 1 II. 9; 4Q403 1 I. 34), קדושׁים (4Q400 1 I. 4; 4Q403 1 II. 24), וֹאֵד (e.g., 4Q400 1 I. 17; 4Q403 1 I. 24, 31;), and כוהנים (e.g., 4Q400 1 I. 20; 4Q400 1 I. 8,17,19–20; 4Q403 1 II. 19). This list is from Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, 25–26. She also indicates that the term הוהי is not explicitly used for angels in other Qumran texts, nor in the apocryphal and rabbinic literature.

737 In addition, 1QH XIX. 10b–14 also speaks about the return to exalted humanity.

738 Bjorn Frennesson, In a Common Rejoicing: Liturgical Communion with Angels in Qumran (Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1999), 116. Brooke supports this idea (Brooke, “Men and Women as Angels in Joseph and Aseneth,” 162).
to other members of the community but even comparable to the angel of God’s presence when the priest blesses the people with the blessing from Num 6:22–26. 739 While pronouncing the words from Num 6:26, he becomes the light to the world, which illuminates the members of the community, as a representative of the Lord — the angel of God’s presence (מַלָּאך פְּנֵי), 740 not in an eschatological sense but already in this life. 741 This motif of the shining of divine light is connected to the shining of Moses’ face after the Sinai revelation in Exod 34:30. It occurs in 1QH a XV. 6–8, 742 where the author thanks God, inter alia, for his salvation and the sevenfold light of God’s glory in which he shines (XV. 22–24). This text clearly demonstrates the exaltation of the righteous and his illumination by the light of God’s glory. 743

It is worth noticing, however, that while many Jewish texts deal only with the figures of the righteous ones from Israel’s past as glorified, transformed, or associated with the angels, 744 the Qumran representations of the righteous’


740 Crispin H.T. Fletcher-Louis, “4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christology,” DSD 3, no. 3 (1996), 309. The connection between a human’s face and God’s also appears in 2 En. 44:1: “the Lord created mankind by his hands and in the likeness of his own face, both small and great the Lord created [them]. One, who reproaches a person’s face, reproaches the Lord’s face”.

741 Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke, 2:1305. As Segal indicates, the priest’s resemblance to an angel is as ambiguous as that in Dan 12:3 regarding the use of the preposition כְּ (cf. 1QSb IV. 25) denoting either likeness or identity (Segal, Life after death, 304–305).

742 Moreover, the expression “from the refuge of the flesh” in 1QH a XV. 17 may indicate the transformation of the nature of the righteous one.

744 James H. Charlesworth demonstrates this tendency in 1 Enoch, 2 Enoch, Conflict of Adam and Eve with Satan, Apocalypse of Sethel, Prayer of Joseph, Prayer of Jacob, History of Rechabites, Testament of Solomon, 2 Baruch, Odes of Solomon, Joseph and Aseneth, and
transformation and glorification have to be interpreted in the context of the
realized eschatology of this community. Its main eschatological concern is on
life with the angels experienced already in this physical life, and continuing in
the future.\textsuperscript{745} Therefore reflection on the problem of death is not explicit in the
Dead Sea Scrolls. While some scholars argue that the idea of the resurrection
somehow appears in the Qumran texts,\textsuperscript{746} others hold a different opinion.\textsuperscript{747} It is
safe to conclude, however, that for the Qumran community belief in the
resurrection is not central and is not discussed explicitly.\textsuperscript{748} The resurrection

\textit{Testament of Job;} See James H. Charlesworth, “The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel,” in
\textit{Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms} (ed. John J. Collins and George W. E.
Nicksburg; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980), 135–151.


E.g., Friedrich Nötscher, \textit{Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumransekte} (Bonn: P.
Hanstein, 1956), 151–158; Menahem Mansoor, “Studies in the Hodajot IV,” JBL 76 (1957), 139,
146; C. Rabin, \textit{Qumran Studies} (Scripta Judaica 2; London: Oxford University Press, 1957), 73–
74; K. Schubert, “Das Problem der Auferstehungshoffnung in den Qumrantexten und in der
frührabbinischen Literatur,” WZKM 56 (1960): 154–167; Puech, \textit{La croyance des esséniens en
la vie future : immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle}?

E.g., Robert B. Laurin, “The Question of Immortality in the Qumran ’Hodayot’,” JSS 3

Bremmer, \textit{The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife}, 46. There are two sets of texts found in
the Qumran library that are most explicit about the resurrection: 4Q385–388 (4QPseudo-
Ezekiel) and 4Q521. The first work (4Q385, 386, 388) represents different copies of this
writing dated from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 1\textsuperscript{st} centuries B.C.E. This set of fragments contains, among
other materials, an interpretation of the vision of Ezekiel 37, and consists of a dialogue
between God and the prophet. The issue of restoration/resurrection is moved to the
eschatological reality and, as is argued by some scholars, refers to the eschatological
resurrection. However, as Tromp demonstrates, like Ezek 37:1–14, 4Pseudo-Ezekiel also
interprets the future restoration of Israel as a political event rather than as the
eschatological resurrection. The only difference between these two texts is the reorientation
of the latter towards the eschatological time, in which its author believed he was living
(Tromp, ”Can These Bones Live?” Ezekiel 37:1–14 and Eschatological Resurrection,” 72–75).

4Q521 explicitly mentions the resurrection from the dead: יֵשׁ הַלָּלוֹת הַמָּתִים חָיוֹת עָנוֹיִם בֵּשֵׁר
(“he will heal the wounded and will make the dead live”; 4Q521 fr.2 II,12) and
הַמָּתִים עָנוֹיִם ("he gives life to the dead of his people," 4Q521 fr.7, 6, cf. 1 Sam 2:6). However, neither 4Q385–388 nor 4Q521 contain any specifically sectarian ideology and
probably do not reflect the specific view of the Qumran community. See, e.g., Lichtenberger,
language may serve as a metaphorical representation of the transformed state of the purified members of the Qumran community in their fellowship with the celestial host.  

Next, the motif of angelomorphic transformation and glorification is found in Joseph and Aseneth, which presents a story about Aseneth’s conversion from idolatry to Judaism and her subsequent marriage to the righteous and pious Joseph. In the account of her conversion, after eating the bread of life and drinking a cup of immortality, she is anointed with the ointment of incorruptibility. As a result, her flesh flourishes like living flowers and her bones grow strong like the cedars of God’s paradise of delight (ὁ παράδεισος τῆς ἀφθαρσίας τῆς ἐπικαιροτείμνησις τῶν αὐτοκεφαλῶν ἀνάστησις τῆς ἀφθαρσίας τῆς ἐπικαιροτείμνησις τῶν αὐτοκεφαλῶν ἀνάστησις τῆς ἀφθαρσίας τῆς ἐπικαιροτείμνησις τῶν αὐτοκεφαλῶν ἀνάστησις τῆς ἀφθαρσίας τῆς ἐπικαιροτείμνησις τῶν αὐτοκεφαλῶν ἀνάστησις τῆς ἀφθαρσίας τῆς ἐπικαιροτείμνησις τῶν αὐτοκεφαλῶν ἀνάστησις τῆς ἀφθαρσίας τῆς ἐπικαιροτείμνησις τῶν αὐτοκεφαλῶν ἀνάστησις τῆς ἀφθαρσίας τῆς ἐπικαιροτείμνησις τῶν αὐτοκεφαλῶν ἀνάστησις τῆς ἀφθαρσίας τῆς ἐπικαιροτείμνησις τῶν αὐτοκεφαλῶν ἀνάστησις τῆς ἀφθαρσίας τῆς ἐπικαιροτείμνησις τῶν αὐτοκεφαλῶν ἀνάστησις τῆς ἀφθαρσίας τῆς ἐπικαιροτείμνησις τῶν αὐτοκεφαλῶν ἀνάστησις τῆς ἀφθαρσίας τῆς ἐπικαιροτείμ

“Auferstehung in den Qumranfunden,” 83–85; Bremmer, The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife, 43–45.

749 George Brooke, “The Structure of 1QH” XII 5–XIII 4 and the Meaning of Resurrection,” in Resurrection. Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech (ed. Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert Tigchelaar; Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 15–22. For instance, phrases about resurrection such as “to raise the worms of the dead from the dust (הهةים מוטר חולות מתים) to the everlasting community ([] לכוות טל\

750 Joseph and Aseneth declares that the renewal of life begins with conversion to a true religion (Judiasm) and uses resurrection language in this very context. According to 15:5, from the day of her conversion onward Aseneth will be renewed (ἀνακαινισθήσεται), formed anew (ἀναπλασθήσεται), made alive again (ἀναζωοποιηθήσεται), will eat the blessed bread of life and drink the blessed cup of immortality (ἀθανασίας), and will be anointed with the blessed ointment of incorruptibility (χρίσματι εὐλογημένῳ τῆς ἀφθαρσίας). As Cavallin mentions, the use of these three verbs with the prefix ἀνά in 15:5 may imply an idea of the resurrection (Cavallin, Life after Death. Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, 156). However, they may also express the idea of angelomorphic transformation rather than resurrection.
τρυφῆς τοῦ θεοῦ). She is embraced by untiring power; her youth would never end and her beauty would never fail (16:16). After washing her face she becomes like the sun, her eyes are like a rising morning star, her cheeks like the fields of the Most High, her lips like a rose of life (ὡς βόδιν ζωῆς), her teeth like fighting people, and her hair is like wine in the paradise of God (18:9). In 20:6, Aseneth’s parents and whole her family see her like the appearance of light and heavenly beauty (κάλλος οὐράνιον).

In addition, it is worth pointing out that 4 Maccabees also refers to a certain celestial immortality of the soul, but without any reference to resurrection (in contrast to 2 Maccabees 7). Indeed, in their afterlife the martyrs are likened to the stars and are granted a celestial postmortem existence:

The moon in heaven, with the stars, does not stand so august as you, who, after lighting the way of your star-like (ἰσαστέρους) seven sons to piety, stand in honor before God and are firmly set in heaven with them. (4 Macc 17:5 NRSV)

Thus, the seven brothers with their mother became star-like in heaven, which points to their transformed and glorified postmortem existence.

Some pagan ideas about the astronomical afterlife imagery are reflected in the works of Philo of Alexandria and Flavius Josephus. In Mos. 2,108 Philo speaks about the soul receiving immortality as being “inscribed in the records of God, sharing the eternal life of the sun and moon and the whole universe.”

Here the soul is associated with the heavenly bodies. Indeed, Philo proposes the stars to be living creatures composed from mind (Somn. 1.135–137; Gig. 7; Plant. 12). Sometimes he speaks about the sun and stars being made from ether (Deus. 78; Plant. 3; Mos. 1.217; QG 4.8) or fire (Conf. 156; Mos. 2.184; QG 3.3), that is some sort of corporeal soul. On the other hand, the stars are even divine souls (Gig. 8) or divine natures (Op. 144; Prov. 2.50; QG 4.188), and a host of visible gods (αἰσθητὰ θεῖα; Aet. 46.3). Philo does not contrast the divine stars with the Lord, but for him they are mighty and superhuman entities, belonging to the

751 The reference to the sun and the morning star are also used for Joseph and the heavenly man. A similar motif is found in 4Q541 IX. 2–5 and is linked to angelic status (Brooke, “Men and Women as Angels in Joseph and Aseneth,” 168, n. 28).

heavenly court. Moreover, the angels for him are beings inhabiting the region below the moon. They are incorruptible and incorporeal ideas (ἀφθαρτοὶ καὶ ἄσώματοι ἰδέαι in Gig. 1:61; cf. QG 3.11).

Further, in Josephus’ writings, according to Titus’ speech to his solders, those heroes who die in battle will be given immortality and their souls will be received by ether, the purest element and will be set among the stars to become good spirits (δαίμονες δ᾽ ἀγαθοί; B.J. 6,46–49). Here, in contrast to Josephus’ views as a Pharisee (B.J. 2,163; A.J. 18,14), Titus does not speak about the soul’s future return to another body. However, as Elledge indicates, the statement that the ether will receive the soul of a hero as a stranger (ξενοδοχῶν; B.J. 6, 47) may point to a temporary sojourning of the soul among the stars.

To summarize, many Jewish sources in one way or another refer to a celestial afterlife. First, some texts dealing with eschatological resurrection use astral and angelic imagery for the glorified state of the righteous. Further, while such accounts as Dan 12:3 and 1 En. 43:1–3 seem to indicate a resemblance of the righteous to the celestial beings, other sources clearly refer to their angelic transformation in heaven (cf. the Book of Parables; 4 Ezra; 2 Baruch).

Thus, shining and light may refer to the glorification of the resurrected. This fact demonstrates the ambiguity of the nature of the eschatological resurrection in Jewish views. Those texts that deal with this type of resurrection but explicitly speak about its bodily character (4 Ezra; 2 Baruch) treat it as an intermediate state of both the righteous and the wicked before their final transformation.

Further, the transformation of the righteous to heavenly glory is associated with the idea of the restoration of the original state of humanity. This idea occurs in the Book of Parables, the Life of Adam and Eve, and some Qumran documents (e.g., 4QSapiential Work A). In fact, the Qumran ideas of the transformation of the righteous and their association with the angels as a present reality are connected with the views of this community on realized eschatology.

---

753 Scott, Origen and the Life of the Stars, 71–72.
754 However, Philo also calls them “forms” after Plato; Erwin R. Goodenough, “Philo on Immortality,” Harvard Theological Review 39, no. 2 (1946): 103.
755 Elledge, Life after Death in Early Judaism, 74, n. 97. The connection between the soul and the ether appears also in B.J. 2, 154–157 describing Essene beliefs.
In addition, some other Jewish traditions do not combine angelomorphic existence with eschatological resurrection. For instance, *Joseph and Aseneth* puts it into the context of conversion to Judaism and a renewal of life; 4 Maccabees, Philo, and Josephus connect it with pagan ideas of astral immortality.

### 4.2 Immortality and Angelomorphism in Luke’s Views of the Afterlife

How do the elements of pagan and Jewish views of the immortality of the soul and the angelomorphic afterlife function in Luke-Acts? This section will analyze these issues in the Lucan passages mentioned at the beginning of this chapter and in some others.

As has been indicated above, Luke 16:19–31 deals with the individual’s postmortem destiny and depicts Lazarus’ destiny as the final one (see p. 69). Some details of this parable seem to refer to the corporeality of the postmortem states of the rich man and Lazarus. Indeed, the former is in torments and flame in Hades and wants Lazarus to cool his tongue with water from the tip of his finger (16:24). Moreover, Lazarus is feasting at the banquet along with Abraham. However, as Lehtipuu demonstrates, the mention of their bodily parts (finger and tongue) does not refer to real corporeality but it “makes the story alive and more immediate.”

Moreover, she also indicates that in pagan and Jewish sources the souls of the deceased had some corporeal and physical characteristics. Indeed, many Greek philosophers considered the soul in some way material (e.g., fire or air; see p. 175). This feature of the soul may have affected the descriptions of postmortem existence in a corporeal manner. Thus, in Luke 16:22–23 the existence of Abraham and Lazarus is not associated with resurrection. The expression ἐάν τις ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ (“if someone rises from the dead”; NRSV) in 16:31 rather alludes to Jesus’ resurrection than to Lazarus’

---

757 Ibid., 223–228.
Moreover, in this story Abraham serves as a heavenly host, just as in 4 Macc 13:17.

What form of afterlife existence then does Luke imply in this passage as well as in Luke 13:22–30 and 23:42–43? Is this a shadowy existence or immortality of the soul in a Platonic mode? It is safe to argue that just as many Jewish texts, Luke prefers to speak about the afterlife existence of an individual in these pericopes in more general terms instead of using resurrection terminology, and without special reference to their intermediate or final destiny. In these passages he does not concentrate on any specific form of afterlife existence.

Further, as has been indicated above, Luke's afterlife language in Luke 20:36–38 seems to be more appropriate for the concept of immortality. Moreover, the Lucan representation of the resurrection in Luke 20:35–36 is connected with the transformation of the righteous to an angelomorphic type of existence or glorification, the view so widespread in the Jewish sources discussed. Indeed, Luke speaks about the immortality of the risen ones: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται (“they cannot die). In addition, the Lucan πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν (“for everybody is alive to him”) is another element of the language of immortality in Luke’s argument about resurrection. It is similar to 4 Macc 7:19 and 16:25: ζῶσιν τῷ θεῷ.

---

759 In the Apocalypse of Zephaniah Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are in the heavens together with Enoch, Elijah, and David (Apoc. Zeph. 9:4). As Lehtipuu indicates, the motif of the reception of the souls of the righteous by the patriarchs (cf. Luke 16:22) may be traced to the Hebrew Bible metaphor of death as going to one’s fathers and sleeping with one’s ancestors (cf. Gen 15:15; 25:8; 35:29; 47:30; 49:33; Deut 31:16; Judg 210; 1 Kgs 1:21; 2:10; 11:21, 43; Lehtipuu, The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, 207–208. Cf. also “Levi ... was gathered (προσετέθη) to his fathers” in T. Lev. 19:4. In addition, T. Jud. 26:3; T. Dan. 7:1 indicate that the patriarchs were buried in Hebron near Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Originally, this imagery referred to the shadowy existence in Sheol, but later became the indication of the high position of the patriarchs in the otherworld as the righteous from Israel’s past. Such a notion is attested in some Jewish epitaphs. See Lehtipuu, The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, 208; Pieter W. van der Horst, Ancient Jewish Epitaphs (ed. Tj. Baarda and A. S. van der Woude; Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 2; Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1991), 117.
Next, while Mark 12:25 has ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ("like angels in the heavens") and Matt 22:30 retains Mark's ὡς ἄγγελοι, Luke deliberately changes Mark's ὡς ἄγγελοι to ἰσάγγελοι (ἰσ- from ἶσος – "equal to," “like,” “the same as")- ἄγγελος), in 20:36 a word unique in the New Testament. The particular reasons of this replacement of ὡς with ἰσο- in Luke 20:36 will be discussed in the next chapter in more detail.

In 20:36b Luke exploits the term υἱοί θεοῦ (cf. Hebrew בנים, בנות),760 which is often associated with angels761 or celestial beings762 in Jewish sources.763 Even more, Lucan ἰσάγγελοι resembles ἰσος ἄγγελοις in Philo’s Sacr. 1:5 and ἰσαστέροι in 4 Macc 17:5. As has been indicated above, in this account of Philo’s the immortal and incorporeal souls of Abel, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are equated with the angels (ἱσος ἄγγελοις γεγονώς; Sacr. 1:5–7; see p. 186). Thus, in this passage the patriarchs and the righteous are equated with the angels in their immortality. Besides, 4 Macc 17:5 directly connects the destiny of the righteous with a celestial postmortem existence.

It can be suggested, therefore, that Luke uses the widespread view that human immortality in heaven is associated with the immortality of the angels. In Jesus’ argument of 20:35–36a those who are worthy of reaching the life of the new age and resurrection need no procreation, and furthermore cannot die (20:35–36a).764

In his important study of Luke-Acts Fletcher-Louis argues that the angelomorphic traditions can be traced in several Lucan passages.765 Apart

---

760 The expression per se is Semitic. Υἱός with the genitive case of something often denotes one who shares in something (e.g., Mat 8:12; 9:15; Mark 3:17; Luke 16:8; John 17:12; Acts 4:36; Eph 2:2; 2 Thess 2:3). The expression υἱοί τῆς άναστάσεως is unique in the New Testament, though this type of expression occurs in Luke 10:6; 16:8.

761 See LXX Dan 3:25; Job 1:6; Deut 32:8; Wis 5:5; some readings of Gen 6:2, 4; cf. 1 En. 1–36.


763 Sometimes the righteous are also numbered among the sons of God, especially those who suffered martyrdom (Wis 5:5).

764 Several manuscripts soften δύνανται, putting μέλλουσιν instead (D W Θ it a, c, f, A, i, l, q syr hmg Marcion acc. to Tertullian, Tertullian Cyprian Macrobius Augustine Julian-Eclanum). See also Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, 146.

from Luke 20:29–40 he refers to the possible angelophany in Luke 5:1–11; some important features of the transfiguration (9:28–36); rejoicing in angelic community in Luke 15:7, 10; the resurrection of the prodigal son (15:11–32); the likeness of Stephen’s face to the face of an angel (Acts 6:15); angels in Acts 7:53; and some accounts about the Son of Man. It is not a purpose of this research, however, to go into detail in discussing Fletcher-Louis’ views. Moreover, it seems that not all these passages directly deal with the afterlife. Nevertheless, his work demonstrates that Luke has a particular interest in presenting issues with the use of angelomorphic language. Probably the most important passages for the subject of the present research are Luke 15:7, 10 and 15:11–32. The former account may relate to Lucan realized eschatology and indicate the importance of repentance: “there will be more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents than over ninety-nine righteous persons who need no repentance” (Luke 15:7 NRSV). Moreover, as Fletcher-Louis argues, Luke 15:10 would refer to the community of Jesus’ disciples as angelomorphic: “there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner who repents” (NRSV).766 However, it should be stated here, that this suggestion would imply too direct an association of the believers with angels in this verse. Indeed, to be equal to an angel is not the same as to be an angel.

Further, Luke 15:11–32 has been already discussed above (see p. 79). Yet, it does have some important parallels with the account of 20:27–40. In 15:19 the prodigal son humbly declares: “I am no longer worthy (ἄξιος) to be called your son (υἱός σου)”(Luke 15:19 NRSV; cf. 15:21). As Fletcher-Louis rightly indicates, the language of this verse, which is peculiar to Luke, resembles that of 20:35–36: those who are worthy (καταξιωθέντες) of reaching the age to come and of resurrection are children of God (υἱοί εἰσιν τοῦ θεοῦ).767 Moreover, both these pericopes in some way deal with realized eschatology.

To sum up, Luke exploits elements of immortality in the context of resurrection in order to demonstrate that the risen ones obtain eternal life. In addition, Luke uses the widespread idea of the equality of humans with angels or celestial beings. In some passages that deal with the postmortem existence of an individual and do not explicitly mention resurrection he speaks about the

766 Ibid., 218. Cf. 1 En. 104:4, which speaks about the glorified righteous, who like the angels will have great joy (see p. 129 above).
afterlife in more general terms and does not concentrate on specific forms of afterlife existence.

### 4.3 Summary

Apart from resurrection, traces of the idea of the immortality of the soul and that of angelomorphic existence are also found in Luke's double work. Immortality occurs either in connection with resurrection or as a separate topic. In the first case, in contrast to pagan and Jewish accounts dealing with the immortality of the soul as a real and desirable form of afterlife existence, Luke makes use of the notion of immortality in order to demonstrate that risen people have eternal life. In the second case, as for instance, in Luke 16:19–31, it is unclear whether Luke has in mind a shadowy existence of the disembodied soul, or some other type of immortality. Probably in these passages he prefers to deal with more general ideas of the afterlife without emphasizing any particular form of it. However, it remains unclear whether he refers to the final destiny of Lazarus, the rich man, and the repentant criminal, or their intermediate state.

Perhaps Luke 20:27–40 is the most prominent case where these ideas coexist side by side and are inseparable from each other. In this passage Luke uses the language of angelomorphic existence in the context of the eschatological resurrection, most likely in order to demonstrate the glorious and transformed state of the risen ones, and their immortality as a gift of eternal life. Moreover, Luke does not explicitly emphasize the corporeal character of this type of resurrection. Many Jewish texts also have a tendency to avoid an overt manifestation of the corporeality of the resurrection.

Thus, the fact that Luke applies some elements of immortality and angelomorphism in his discourse on the afterlife moves this research to the suggestion that he adopts the afterlife language he has at hand and uses it for his own purposes in a manner different from its function in its pagan and Jewish counterparts.

In addition, one aspect of pagan views on the immortality of the soul must be especially emphasized in this summary because it is important for further analysis in the next chapter. This is the idea of the “uprightness” of the soul as a mark of its immortality and divine origin, which is attested in some philosophical works. It refers to immovability and stability as features of
divinity. It is also connected with the ancient Mediterranean idea of the distinctively human ability to stand upright, and indicates that the process of waking up and standing up was associated with the return of life. This posture is the opposite of lying in bed as associated with sleep and death.

The material discussed in Parts 1 and 2 of this study calls for further consideration and explanation. How does one account for the fact that Luke-Acts combines traditions and beliefs in the afterlife that are so varied or even seem to be mutually exclusive? This needs further discussion, which will deal with such issues as the relation of Luke's representations of resurrection to the essential nature of this form of afterlife; the corporeality of resurrection; the spatial differences between the representations of the abode of the dead; the relation between Luke's realized eschatology and resurrection; and the Lucan emphasis on individual eschatology. These questions are to be dealt with in the final part of this research.
PART 3. INTERRELATIONS BETWEEN THE VARIOUS VIEWS OF THE AFTERLIFE IN LUKE-ACTS


The analysis of the various traditions of the afterlife, both pagan and Jewish, made in the previous chapters demonstrates the diversity of views coexisting side by side. Basically, Luke shares the diversity of his cultural-religious milieu and reflects it in his texts. Luke may be regarded as a good representative of his cultural-religious milieu, inheriting its common beliefs and traditions in all their diversity and complexity. Thus, he is not unique in his multi-faceted representation of the afterlife and this is how his variety of views should be explained.

Further, such diversity is found not only in Luke's pagan and Jewish environment but also in early Christian tradition. For instance, the combination of two types of eschatological resurrection is typical not only of Jewish beliefs but also of some New Testament writers who mingle these two types of resurrection. On the other hand, some New Testament documents are more univocal about the features of the resurrection: for instance, Mark speaks only about the resurrection of the righteous (Mark 12:25, cf. 13:27) and so does Paul (cf., Rom 2:7–8; 6:20–23; 9:22–23; 1 Cor 1:18; 2 Cor 2:15; Phil 1:28; 3:19), while Q mentions general resurrection (Luke 11:31–32). Luke's manner of presenting eschatological perspectives as both collective and individual is also found in pre-Lucan Christian tradition, for instance in Paul's writings: although Paul argues about the eschatological resurrection in 1 Cor 15:51–52 and 1 Thess 4:14–17, in Phil 1:23–24 he speaks about his desire to be with Christ immediately after his death. Meanwhile, Luke goes even further and speaks about the eschatological destiny of the righteous as if it were already accomplished (Luke 20:27–40).

However, this is not the complete picture. Luke does not simply borrow or adopt the views he has inherited but makes new combinations of ideas for his own purposes and in his own context, using material he has at hand. Just to
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give a brief example from the material examined above, in Luke 24:37, 39 he emphasizes the corporeality of the resurrection of Jesus, opposing it to the Hellenistic belief in the appearance of a ghost (πνεῦμα) who has neither flesh (σάρξ) nor bones (ὀστέα; cf. Homer, Od. 11. 205–222). In the Hellenistic culture the pair “flesh and bones” serves as a representation of the whole human body.

Next, the most salient and ambiguous issues from the previous chapters of the present study still have to be taken into consideration. What is the reason behind the combination of various traditions and beliefs in the afterlife in Luke-Acts? This question presupposes a discussion of the subjects: why does Luke exploit the similar language for resuscitation, individual resurrection, and eschatological resurrection? How does this language relate to the essential nature of resurrection as a form of afterlife existence? How does Luke perceive the corporeality of resurrection? How should the spatial differences between Luke’s representations of the abode of the dead be accounted for? How does resurrection relate to Luke's realized eschatology? Finally, why does Luke emphasize individual eschatology in his double work? These issues will be under review in the rest of this chapter.

**5.1 The Metaphorical Character of Luke’s Representations of the Afterlife**

The main keys for understanding the reasons behind the combination of different ideas in Luke-Acts can be found in Luke's religious-cultural views. His cultural intertextual milieu is connected with the general ideas and views that formed the worldview of the traditional eastern Mediterranean society of his time. It points the student of Luke-Acts to the need for an analysis of the interaction between Lucan social and cultural issues and his afterlife language.

**5.1.1 The Cognitive Linguistic Approach to Luke’s Afterlife Language**

As has been suggested above (see p. 46), it is productive to make the analysis of the meaning-making aspects of the relations in Luke’s cultural intertextual milieu by means of the elements of cognitive linguistics. This section will explain the essence of this method focusing on the analysis of cognitive metaphors.

Cognitive linguistics deals with conceptual systems distinguishable for different cultures and languages. A conceptual system can be defined as the
repository of concepts available to human beings. In turn, from the perspective of cognitive linguistics, a concept is a fundamental unit of knowledge necessary for the perception and categorization of the world. In principle, each concept can be encoded and externalized via a language system (lexical concept). Moreover, a language is assumed to reflect a particular conceptual system and can be used for investigation of the conceptual organization.

A religious conceptual system is predominantly metaphorical. As Jan G. van der Watt puts it, “if a person wants to speak about the D/divine it should be done by means of metaphors. Although human concepts are used, reference is made to a divine reality (which differs from the ordinary referents of the concepts).” In cognitive linguistics metaphor is a phenomenon in which one conceptual domain is systematically structured in terms of another. Thus, religious language can be regarded as a certain metaphorical system that allows

---


775 Vyvyan Evans and Melanie Green, *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 38. In other words, metaphor is the comprehension of one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain. A conceptual domain can be defined as any coherent organization of experience; Zoltán Kövecses, *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 4. Also it can be seen as “a coherent area of conceptualization relative to which semantic units may be characterized”; Ronald W. Langacker, *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar* (vol. 1; Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1987), 488.
the articulation of an abstract, transcendent, and divine reality “by using finite expressions derived from the experiences of human existence.”\textsuperscript{776} After all, religion works with language that describes divine issues. Therefore the religious experience of a certain culture is conveyed via the production of a set of central metaphors.\textsuperscript{777} Moreover, due to the centrality and importance of the sacred texts in Judaism and Christianity they “codify root metaphors through various linguistic and generic strategies.”\textsuperscript{778}

Thus, the cognitive linguistic approach to metaphor, which regards it as a matter of cognition, can be productively used for the interpretation of religious texts. The essence of the method applied in the present research is based on the works of the American linguists George Lakoff, Mark Johnson, and Mark Turner, who argue that metaphor is not only a rhetorical device or characteristic of language, but more an integral part of the process of human thinking and acting. \textsuperscript{779} This theory is called Cognitive Metaphor Theory


\textsuperscript{777} A good example of religious metaphor attested in the New Testament is \textit{Jesus is the son of God}. It should not be understood literally as it describes the unique relations between Jesus and God. See also the investigation of the metaphors of kingship in Beth M. Stovell, \textit{Mapping Metaphorical Discourse in the Fourth Gospel: John’s Eternal King} (Linguistic Biblical Studies 5; Leiden: Brill, 2012).


According to CMT, our conceptual system in terms of which we think and act is fundamentally metaphorical in nature. This conceptual system plays a central role in defining human everyday realities. As the human cognitative (thinking) process is largely metaphorical, it allows us to comprehend an aspect of the more abstract concept in terms of another, “lower level” concept from everyday human experience (e.g., an aspect of arguing in terms of battle). In other words, it is a process of metaphorical extension consisting of mapping features from the concept that serves as a basis for the metaphor (the source conceptual domain) to the target concept (the target conceptual domain). Metaphorical extension can be seen as the extension of meaning of a certain word in a new direction through the adaptation of its original meaning, so that the word conveys a new meaning (e.g., “illuminate” originally means “light up” but it has been broadened to “clarify”). Mapping, in turn, is an operation that associates some elements of the source domain with one or more elements of the target domain or vice versa. Some aspects of the source domain could be highlighted in the metaphor, while others are hidden in order to focus on

---

780 It is also called Conceptual Metaphor Theory.

certain specific aspects of the target domain (e.g., the battling aspect of arguing). Therefore, “a metaphorical concept can keep us from focusing on other aspects of the concept that are inconsistent with that metaphor.”\textsuperscript{782} Such metaphors are called basic or conventional as they are used in our everyday communication mostly automatically and unconsciously.\textsuperscript{783} They shape a large part of the common conceptual apparatus of the culture peculiar to a certain nation or group. The understanding of the conceptual mechanism of these metaphors and the mental concepts they represent can help us in the interpretation of texts from another time and culture. Indeed, while some primary metaphor-patterns may be found in any languages and cultures (being universal or at least widely distributed), others are unique to specific societies and groups (culture-specific).\textsuperscript{784}

Further, while, according to Lakoff and Johnson, in some conceptual metaphors one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of the other (structural metaphors),\textsuperscript{785} in others the source domain is centered in embodied experience. Indeed, the features of the human body and its orientation to the physical world provide many basic dimensions for metaphorical extensions.\textsuperscript{786} This kind of conceptual metaphor is called orientational metaphor. It does not structure one concept in terms of the other, but “organizes a whole system of

\textsuperscript{782} Lakoff and Johnson, \textit{Metaphors we live by}, 10.


\textsuperscript{784} Grady, "Metaphor," 204. Lakoff and Johnson also emphasize this fact in their studies. See, e.g., Lakoff and Johnson, \textit{Metaphors we live by}, 8–9. Moreover, even universal metaphors may be perceived by a certain culture in a specific way.

\textsuperscript{785} Ibid., 14.

concepts with respect to one another.” 787 The orientational metaphors give a concept a spatial orientation, because they are based in human physical and cultural experience. The common physical experience is represented by several polar oppositions like *up-down, in-out, near-far*, and so on, but the orientational metaphors based on such experience vary from culture to culture. 788

Usually the conceptual system is not static. This is true for the biblical texts, which contain older concepts coexisting side by side with newer ones. The same has to be said about Greco-Roman pagan and Jewish views. Moreover, as the Judaism of the 1st century C.E. was affected by the dominant Hellenistic culture, many concepts overlapped or were mingled. Therefore these concepts need to be discussed as found in their dynamic development. 789 Moreover, the lexical conceptual system of Hebrew is not congruent with that of ancient Greek. However, the Greek of the LXX was heavily influenced by Jewish culture with its conceptual system and worldview. As Emanuel Tov indicates, the translators often used Greek lexemes in unusual contexts: “at the level of lexicography, Hebraisms do not function as ordinary Greek words possessing Greek meanings, but they are used as mere symbols representing Hebrew words.” 790 Besides, the meanings of some lexemes, especially polysemantic ones, may have been changed in later periods, and may have come to express meanings not intended by the translators of the LXX.

Thus, the analysis of the meaning-making aspects of the relations between Luke’s social and cultural issues and his afterlife language in his cultural intertextual milieu can be done by means of some insights drawn from

788 Ibid., 14. Here Lakoff and Johnson indicate that in some cultures the future is represented by the orientational metaphor *the future is in front of us*, while in the others as *the future is behind us*.
790 Emanuel Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 88. As Tov indicates, a good example of such a use is εἰρήνη as an equivalent of מַשָּׁל in the LXX.
cognitive linguistics, which deals with conceptual systems peculiar to certain cultures and languages. The human conceptual system is fundamentally metaphorical in nature. CMT, which is particularly used in the present research, argues that metaphor is an integral part of the process of human thinking and acting. As the human cogitative process is largely metaphorical, it allows us to comprehend an aspect of a more abstract concept in terms of another, “lower level” concept from everyday human experience. In the process of such metaphorical extension some features of the concept in the source domain are mapped onto the concept of the target domain, while some other aspects of the source domain remain hidden in the metaphor. Such metaphors shape a large part of the common conceptual apparatus of a culture and can be called basic or conventional for their automatic and unconscious use in human everyday communication. The analysis of the conceptual mechanism of these metaphors can help us in the interpretation of Luke-Acts and its intertextual milieu. In addition, as many concepts of Hellenistic culture overlap or mingle, they will be discussed in their dynamic development.

5.1.2 Metaphorical Representations of Death and Resurrection

As has been demonstrated above, such different issues as resuscitation, individual resurrection, and eschatological resurrection are often represented by similar or even identical terminology (see p. 164). The reason behind the use of resurrection language in these various contexts can be found in the cognitive analysis of some parts of Luke’s conceptual system. This section will undertake such a cognitive analysis in which death and resurrection will be regarded as concepts (parts of the conceptual system). Their basic representations will be explored in terms of semantics and context, focusing on their metaphorical aspects (conceptual metaphors).

This analysis starts with the concept of resurrection. In the New Testament texts it is most frequently represented by forms of the verbs ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω, which in everyday contexts often express the idea of rising, standing up, waking, or getting up from sleep. Among the other lexemes signifying this concept the verbs ζάω, ζωοποιέω, ζωογονέω, and ἵστημι are found. The percentage ratio of these lexemes in the New Testament is shown in diagram 1. This diagram demonstrates that the representation of the concept of resurrection by means of ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω (81%) predominates over other
more general terms (19%). Like the other New Testament authors, Luke also uses these lexemes.\(^7\)

![Diagram 1]

The next issue that arises from this observation is how lexemes with the meaning of rising, waking, or standing up relate to the essential nature of resurrection as a form of afterlife. The analysis of the most relevant passages from the Hebrew Bible, which were later interpreted as referring to the resurrection, even if their original context sometimes hardly allows such an interpretation, demonstrates that the core of this concept is represented by forms of verbs from the roots הָיָה, קֻם, קִיץ, עוּר, and עָמַד. The percentage ratio of these lexemes in the Hebrew Bible is shown in diagram 2.

Four of these verbs, קוּם, קִיץ, עוּר, and ﻖَامَ, are related to the ideas of rising up, waking up, or standing. As is seen from diagram 2, in total (69%), forms of these verbs predominate over the more general חָיָה (31%). In the LXX the forms of the verbs ζάω, ζήν ποιέω, ζωοποιέω, ζωόω, ζωπυρέω (cf. חָיָה), ἀνίστημι (cf. ﻖَامَ), and ἐγείρω (cf. עוּר, קִיץ) as the equivalents of their Hebrew counterparts became the basic representations of resurrection. As has been found, in Greco-Roman pagan culture these words were sometimes associated with the restoration of the dead to physical life (see p. 156). However, in the LXX these lexemes acquired new meanings according to the actively developing Jewish beliefs in the afterlife. Later they were used in Jewish and early Christian literature and, as is seen in diagram 1, with the predominance of forms of ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω.
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792 The result for this diagram is obtained by calculating the occurrences of these verbs in the relevant contexts, which were later interpreted as referring to the resurrection. The passages from the Hebrew Bible chosen for this calculation are 1 Kgs 17:22; 2 Kgs 4:31; 13:21 (these three accounts deal with the restoration of physical life discussed above; see p. 158); Isa 14:9; 26:14, 19; Jer 51:39, 57; Ezek 37:1–14; Dan 12:2, 13; Hos 6:2; Ps 1:5; Job 14:12, 14; 19:25. This analysis indicates that in Ezek 37:1–14 forms from the root חָיָה heavily predominate over others (cf. ﻖَامَ) and are used with a single meaning: the dry bones will come to life. For this reason in this passage חָיָה has been reckoned as one occurrence.

793 Cf. συνεγείρω and ἐξυπνίζω as the translation of ﻖَامَ in Isa 14:9 and Job 14:12.

794 The verb ἵστημι serves as an equivalent of ﻖَامَ in Ezek 37:10.
Further, the concept of death in the corpus of literature discussed (including pagan texts) is often represented via the metaphor *death is sleep*. As Thomas H. McAlpine’s analysis indicates, sleep and death are related and “death could be spoken of in terms of sleep, a sleep from which one did not awake. And here the edge of the metaphor depended on the painful difference between the sleeping and the dead.” For instance, Job 14:12 speaks about death as a sleep from which one cannot awake “until the heavens are no more” (עַד־בִּלְתִּי שָׁמַיִם). In Jer 51:39, 57 this concept is metaphorically described as “eternal sleep” (שְׁנַת־עוֹלָם). Such a view of sleep as a metaphor of death occurs already in ancient Egyptian culture (e.g., Pyr. 1006; 1011b) as well as in Ugaritic culture where šnt (“sleep”) is found along with qbr (“tomb”; KTU 1.19 iii:150–151). In the Accadian epic of Gilgamesh sleepiness is evidence of human mortality. The immortal gods have no need for sleep (Tabl. XI. 200–221).

In the LXX this feature of the concept of death is represented by Greek ὕπνος (“sleep”), ὕπνος αἰώνιος (“eternal sleep”), as well as κοιμάω, κοιμάσθαι (“sleep,” “fall asleep”), and καθεύδω (“lie down to sleep”). The same tendency can be traced in later texts: for instance, in The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs the patriarchs fall asleep with the fathers: “he slept with the fathers” (ἐκοιμήθη μετὰ τῶν πατέρων; T. Sim. 8:1). Death is also represented as “eternal sleep” (ὕπνος αἰώνιος; T. Iss. 7:9; cf. T. Zeb. 10:6; T. Dan. 7:1), which is sleep in
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795 In the Hebrew Bible this aspect of the concept of death is represented by the lexeme שָׁנָה and related forms of the verb שָׁכַב (“sleep,” “lie down to sleep”).
797 See the further analysis of the lexical relationship between sleep, waking, death, and resurrection in the Hebrew Bible in McAlpine, *Sleep, Divine & Human, in the Old Testament*, 144–149.
799 See more examples of the association of death with sleep in Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and Ugaritic cultures in McAlpine, *Sleep, Divine & Human, in the Old Testament*, 136–141.
peace (ἐν εἰρήνῃ; T. Gad. 8:4) or rest (T. Zeb. 10:4). In addition sleep referring to death occurs in several sections of 1 Enoch (e.g., 92:3; 100:5).800

Apart from biblical and cognate literature sleep as an aspect of death occurs in the formulas from the Jewish epitaphs of the Hellenistic period found in Rome: ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἡ κοίμησις αὐτοῦ/αὐτῆς/αὐτῶν/σου (“In peace is his/her/their/your sleep”)801 or simply as ε.ε.η.κ.α.802 In Greco-Roman paganism sleep was also associated with death, inter alia, due to the lack of feeling and consciousness (cf. Plato, Apol. 40 d1–e1; Cicero, Div. 1.63.3–5; Lucretius De Rer. Nat. 3.912–930; see p. 155).803

In addition, as has been indicated above, the Jewish tradition of visiting the tomb on the third day after death and the practice of the ossilegium also could be associated with the link between sleep and death (see p. 157). Thus, the metaphorical extension of sleep as death can be regarded as common for the Mediterranean milieu.

800 See the summary of the use of sleep in the context of death in Jewish literature in Robert E. Bailey, “Is ‘Sleep’ the Proper Biblical Term for the Intermediate State?,” ZNW 55, no. 2 (1964), 162.


802 Park gives five possible points of comparison between death and sleep in this formula: (1) inactivity; (2) temporariness; (3) both previous points; (4) a permanent blessed afterlife or unending existence in the underworld; (5) absence of intention to emphasize any particular postmortem condition. He admits that this formula can deal with a combination of some of these points; Park, Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions, 100–101. In addition, the motif of peace occurs in some Jewish epitaphs mentioning the “house of peace” (οἶκος εἰρήνης, e.g., JIWE ii 588). See ibid., 27–29.

803 As sleep was considered to be related to death, contact with the dead was believed to be possible in dreams. This idea had been known from the archaic period and survived until Hellenistic and Roman times. For example, in Homer the dead Patroclus appears to Achilles while sleeping (Il. 23.65–101); Cicero reports that Scipio was in contact with his grandfather in a dream (Cicero, De rep. 6.9–26); Tiberius, the brother of Gaius Gracchus, appeared to his brother in a dream to announce that the manner of Gaius Gracchus’ death must be the same as his own; Simonides is forewarned by the man whose corpse he buried that he should not go on a sea voyage (Div. 1.56.1–16; 2.134.15). See more examples in Marbury B. Ogle, “The Sleep of Death,” MAAR 11 (1933), 81–87; McAlpine, Sleep, Divine & Human, in the Old Testament, 141–144.
One of the reasons for this metaphorical mapping relates to the perception of the underworld as the place of abode of the dead. In the Hebrew Bible Sheol (cf. Hades in the pagan texts) is a deficient, shadowy, sleepy, and weak existence (e.g., Isa 14:10–11), which is far removed from normal life, in contrast to a wakeful state (see p. 88). At death the individual is thought of as if he/she has fallen asleep and cannot wake up from such a sleep because there is no return from Sheol (cf. Job 7:9, 16:22; Eccl 12:5b).

Thus, sleep is a metaphorical representation of death; however, as McAlpine argues, it is not a sort of death, although some texts seem to be interpreted in this way.804

The following analysis will focus on the most frequently occurring representation of resurrection as waking and getting up from sleep. It is worth suggesting that the use of lexemes connected with this idea denotes a special way of conceptualizing resurrection, which is typical of Jewish culture as well as of some others.805

The core of the metaphorical extension of the concept of resurrection can be seen as waking up and getting up from sleep. Indeed, for instance in the Hebrew Bible, the dead will be raised from sleeping in “the dust” (יְשֵׁנֵי אדְמַת-ﬠָפָר, Isa 26:19, cf. 19:25) or in “the dust of earth” (יְשֵׁנֵי אדְמַת-ﬠָפָר, Dan 12:2). Such an extension is possible due to the metaphorical representation of death as sleep and to the use of the forms of the verb קִיץ, which in the contexts of everyday human experience often means awakening (cf., e.g., Gen 28:16; 1 Sam 26:12; 1 Kgs 217


805 For instance, in ancient Egyptian views of the afterlife resurrection is described as a process of rising, awakening, and standing up from the dead. In the Egyptian Texts of Pyramids often occur forms of  “stand up”; Pyr. 837b, 1007a, 1047a, 1068b), (w)ťs, (ťs) (“rise”; Pyr. 260a, 735b, 792c, 793b, 837a, 895a, 1012a, 1259b, 1357a, 1360a, 1363a, 2116a), ns (“wake up”; 383 a, 597a, 612a, 651a, 735b, 793a, 837a, 894c, 1006, 1011b, 1068a, 1180d, 1259a, 1478a–d, 1479a, 1502a). In addition, Josephus refers to the report of Menander who provides information about the festival of the resurrection (εγερσις) of the Tyrian god Hercules as a part of the cult of his awakening from sleep (A.J. 8.146). See Day, “Resurrection Imagery from Baal to the Book of Daniel,” 133.
The verb עָרָה is used similarly (cf. Job 14:12). The forms of קִיץ also occur in the context of awakening and getting up from sleep, sometimes as part of a parallelism with עָרָה and קִיץ (e.g., Job 14:12; Ps 7:7; Isa 14:9).

The same tendency is found in the LXX (ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω) and other Jewish texts. In 2 Baruch the souls of the dead are sleeping (רומס) in Sheol (шаяל; 30:1). At the time of the eschatological resurrection the dust of the earth (מפר) will give them back and raise them up (שקפ; 42:8, cf. Isa 26:19). “Those who sleep in his hope (with hope in him) will be awakened” (רומס נמשך ונשקפ). A similar image appears in 4 Ezra: the dead who are in the earth (terra, בקשת) and in the dust (pulvis, בקשת) will be raised (7:32, cf. Dan 12:2).

Further, in the Hebrew Bible the verb קָפָר, which is also used in the context of resurrection (see p. 125), often occurs in the meaning “stand up,” i.e., it serves as a marker of the vertical position of the body after lying (in bed; cf. 1 Chr 28:2; Ezek 2:1, 2; 37:10). This fact moves the discussion on to another way of metaphorization of resurrection: it is also represented by the orientational metaphor resurrection is rising up (upward moving). In orientational metaphors the physical basis for personal well-being such as happiness, health, and life is often expressed as up in many cultures and this is
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806 Cf. also Isa 14:9: שַׁעֲרָל... עָרָה... רָפָאִים ("Sheol... rouses for you the spirits of the dead").
807 E.g., Gen 19:33, 35; Exod 21:19; 1 Sam 3:6, 8; Ruth 3:14; Eccl 12:4; Ps 17:15; 44:24.
808 It is worth noticing how this metaphor works in the early Christian hymn included in Eph 5:14. One can see the first two parts of this hymn as a poetic parallelism. It can be translated as follows: “sleeper (of the sleep of death), awake (“Ἐγείρε, ὁ καθεύδων), rise (or get up) from the dead (ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν) and Christ will shine (ἐπιφαύσει) on you.” Several modern translations follow this interpretation (e.g., NRSV, NJB, CEV). Some ancient translations, such as the Syriac Peshitta understood it in a similar way: “wake up, sleeper!” (迪拜ەکە یەکەیژەتنۆری
809 Cf. Dan 12:2a: (ربس میشیر اکاردیترپەر کیش) (“many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth will awake”). The idea of the dead sleeping in the earth also appears in 2 Bar. 21:24: (بەکەیژەتنۆری (those, who sleep in the earth)).
810 Cf. also (مانی نەکەیژەتنۆری (many of those, who sleep in the dust will be awakened”) in the Syriac version of Daniel and (بەکەیژەتنۆری (the dust will give back those who sleep in it”) in 4 Ezra 7:32.
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true in the culture discussed.\textsuperscript{811} Indeed, in the Bible life is \textit{up}, while death is \textit{down}: “For the wise the path of life (אֹרַח חַיִּים) leads upward (לְמַﬠְלָה), in order to avoid Sheol below (מָטָּה)” (Prov 15:24 NRSV).\textsuperscript{812} In addition, as the examples above from Xenophon’s \textit{Memorabilia}, Plato’s \textit{Timaeus}, Aristotle’s \textit{De partibus animalium}, Cicero’s \textit{De natura deorum}, and Plutarch’s \textit{Apopthegmata laconica} indicate, in ancient society the ability to stand upright was sometimes regarded as distinctly human and emphasizing the special relations of human beings with divinity and with the celestial world above (see p. 171). Moreover, in Plato’s \textit{Timaeus} the uprightness of the soul makes the person (including the body) upright. Such a perception of the human standing posture also demonstrates the significance of embodied experience in structuring meaning and the special role of \textit{up} in relation to life, immortality, and divinity as a common feature of eastern Mediterranean culture. The upright standing posture of human beings marks their participation in immortality.

Therefore, reviving (cf. forms from the root הָיָה as a representation of resurrection in the Hebrew Bible) is metaphorically expressed through the metaphor \textit{life is moving up} and connected with the other metaphors of resurrection (awaking, getting up from sleep, rising up, standing up, and lifting up from the underworld).\textsuperscript{813}

\textsuperscript{811} Already in 1967 M. Osborn spoke about so-called archetypical metaphors grounded in the prominent features of experience, objects, actions, conditions, and, even more, motivations which are salient in human consciousness. He indicated that vertical scale images refer to desirable objects above and undesirable objects below. In his opinion, this feature may express the human quest for power; M. Osborn, “Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: The Light-Dark Family,” \textit{Quarterly Journal of Speech} 53, no. 2 (1967): 116. Also, Lakoff and Johnson base their description of up-down spatialization metaphors (Lakoff and Johnson, \textit{Metaphors We Live By}, 14–21) on the important research made by William Elmer Nagy, who worked with such lexical items as “high,” “low,” “rise,” “fall,” and “raise”; William Elmer Nagy, “Figurative Patterns and Redundancy in the Lexicon” (Ph.D. diss., University of California, 1974).

\textsuperscript{812} The allusion to this verse is seen in \textit{Pss. Sol.} 15:10: ἕως ᾅδου κάτω (“Sheol below”). In addition, the so-called epitaph of Jesus (JIGRE 34) found in Leontopolis (2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C.E. to 2\textsuperscript{nd} century C.E.) declares that the deceased goes to μυχὸν αἰώνων ἐν σκοτίᾳ διάγειν (“the innermost place of the ages to be in darkness”). See Park, \textit{Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions}, 31.

\textsuperscript{813} Cf. “you brought up (וַתַּﬠַל) my life from the Pit (מִשַּׁחַת)” (Jonah 2:6 NRSV).
Further, as Lehtipuu rightly indicates, the character of the resurrection (corporeal or incorporeal) and its meaning remain ambiguous even in the texts which clearly speak about personal resurrection (such as Dan 12:2–3). She also raises a very important question: “if the key terminology is partly the same, how would people have understood a difference between the “resurrection” of Jesus and, say, the ‘reviving’ of Lazarus?” Thus, the next question is what kind of afterlife reality and existence is described by resurrection? One may suggest that the metaphorical representation of the concept of resurrection in terms of waking up and standing up does not emphasize the corporeal character of resurrection. It speaks about the process and result of revivification either to earthly life or to eternal life in general, which is opposite to the process and result of dying and going to the underworld. This is why Luke readily uses resurrection language for resuscitation, individual resurrection, and eschatological resurrection. However, it does not mean that the very term “resurrection” (ἀνάστασις) has a single meaning for Luke and is used only in the context of the afterlife or resuscitation. Indeed, although it occurs mostly in such a framework, in Luke 2:34 it is exploited in the context of the exaltation of the humble and oppressed (see n. 869).

Further, indeed, resurrection as a restoration of physical life is often perceived in Luke-Acts through the metaphors of sleeping and awakening: in raising Jairus’ daughter Jesus declares that she is sleeping (καθεύδει; Luke 8:52, cf. Mark 5:39; Matt 9:24) and wakes her up (ἐγείρε; Luke 8:54, cf. Mark 5:41). It can also be assumed that for Luke as well as for other Synoptics death is not fatal, because to God everybody is alive (cf. Luke 2:38b). Moreover, the choice of καθεύδω may reveal the very possibility of the resurrection: the dead can arise, because for God they are in a certain sense not dead but sleeping (e.g., being in an intermediate state between their physical death and their final destiny). God is able to awaken them from such a sleep. Thus, here in Luke

---

815 Ibid., 153.  
817 Michel (Michel, “Zur Lehre vom Todesschlaf”) and Cullmann (Oscar Cullmann, “Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?,” 84) argue that “sleep” is the biblical term for the intermediate state of the soul between death and resurrection. Moreover, for Michel the metaphor (though he does not use this term) death is sleep relates only to the righteous who receive the promise that they will be raised; Michel, “Zur Lehre vom
8:54 and parallel verses death can be seen only as an intermediate state limited in time between physical demise and final resurrection, but not as a permanent state. The girl's spirit returns and she gets up (ἀνέστη, Luke 8:55; Mark 5:42). The resuscitation of the son of the widow from Nain (Luke 7:14) and that of Tabitha (9:36–41; cf. 20:7–12) are described alike and with use of resurrection language (see p. 160).

Horton argues that Luke's stories about actual death and the restoration of physical life follow the messianic pattern, i.e., are parallel with Jesus' suffering, death, and resurrection. Indeed, Luke may have a literary intention to connect the preaching about the crucified-and-risen Messiah with these examples of resuscitation as its physical analogue. This may be especially essential for the Book of Acts. After all, the language used for the description of Jesus' resurrection may have affected other accounts of the afterlife and restoration of physical life. Moreover, the resuscitation of Jairus' daughter can

---

Todesschlaf,” 286. However, as has been demonstrated above, (1) death is associated with sleep not only for the righteous or pious; it is a rather more common metaphor (cf. the LXX Ps 87:6); (2) this metaphor occurs in pagan and Jewish sources (including epitaphs) that do not imply resurrection; see Park, Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions, 99, 185; (3) in Jewish tradition and early Christian writings the resurrection of the dead is often attributed to both the righteous and the wicked. Nevertheless, in some Jewish epitaphs there occurs the formula that may emphasize the wish of a blessed afterlife for the deceased: μετὰ τῶν δικέων ἡ κοίμησις αὐτοῦ (“with the righteous is his sleep”). See the examination of the use of this formula in ibid., 112–121. Also, see Bailey’s analysis of the arguments of Michel and Cullmann that demonstrates the doubtfulness of their hypothesis that sleep is an overall biblical term for the intermediate state; Bailey, “Is ‘Sleep’ the Proper Biblical Term for the Intermediate State?”. On the other hand, in Luke 8:52 (cf., Mark 5:39; Matt 9:24) as in some other passages the intermediate state as a sleep may be implied (Bailey admits that 1 Thess 4:13 may also indicate the interim state of the dead; ibid., 164).


Cf. ἡγέρθη in Matt 9:25.

In the story of the resuscitation of Lazarus in John 11:1–44 Jesus first tells his disciples that Lazarus had fallen asleep (κεκοίμηται) and he wants to wake “our friend” up (ἵνα ἐξυπνίσω αὐτόν; John 11:11, note ἐξυπνίζω instead of ἐγείρω for awakening). However, as the disciples have not recognized the metaphorical meaning of sleep representing death, and regard the death of Lazarus as a normal sleep (ἡ κοίμησις τοῦ ὑπνοῦ), Jesus directly declares that he is dead (ἀπέθανεν; John 11:11–14). When they come to his tomb, Jesus calls the dead: “Lazarus, come out!” (Λάζαρε, δεῦρο ἔξω; John 11:43).

Horton, Death and Resurrection, 63–68.
be seen as a sign of the eschatological resurrection and, which is also significant, as a sign of the presence of the Kingdom of God. However, it is not a full picture: as has been shown above, the origin of the representation of the restoration of life through the metaphors of sleeping and awakening has a longer history. It even goes far back beyond pre-Lucan early Christian views (Mark 5:21–43), to the accounts of the resuscitation of the dead in the narratives about Elijah and Elisha (1 Kgs 17:17–24 and 2 Kgs 4:31–37; 13:21), and the pagan stories about Asclepius and Heracles (also, some magic papyri, see p. 156) as well as to the idea of the restoration of Israel in the Hebrew Bible (Hos 6:1–2; Isa 26:19; Ezek 37:1–14).

Meanwhile, another of Horton’s findings deserves further attention. He argues that the episodes about the healing of some lame individuals also relate to the motif of resurrection in the Book of Acts, and are connected with Jesus’ resurrection (Acts 3:1–4:31; 9:32–35; 14:8–11). Indeed, the name of the resurrected Jesus has made the beggar strong (ἐστερέωσεν; 3:15–16). In addition, death and illness may be metaphorically connected: both signify the inactivity of the body and are associated with lying down (cf. the metaphor death is sleep above). The healing itself refers only to the change from immovable passivity to purposeful activity, but Luke’s language and imagery allude to a death-resurrection experience. Luke again uses forms of the verbs ἀνίστημι (3:22, 26; 9:34; 14:10) and ἐγείρω (3:7). Moreover, he refers to the imagery of the uprightness of the human body/soul as a distinctively human feature and a sign of immortality: after their healing both the lame beggar (3:7–8) and the lame man of Lystra stand upright (14:10). In the latter account Luke uses terminology close to that of Xenophon (Memor. 1.4.11.4), Plato (Tim. 47c2; 90a), Aristotle (Part. an. 686a), and Cicero (Nat. d. 2.140.4–9): ἀνάστησι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου ὀρθός (“stand upright on your feet”).

In addition, it is noteworthy that in 14:10, while healing a lame man, Paul calls him with a loud voice (μεγάλῃ φωνῇ). The fact is that the metaphor resurrection is awakening and getting up from sleep occasionally includes an important element of calling the dead “sleeping” person, namely a loud voice addressed to this person to wake him/her up. This is well shown in Luke 7:14;

823 Horton, Death and Resurrection, 68–74.
824 Ibid., 68.
This element of the metaphor occurs in John 5:25 in the context of the eschatological resurrection: “the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live (ζήσουσιν)” (NRSV). In 1 Thess 4:16 the archangel’s call and God’s trumpet at the end of time serve as such a sound. Thus, in this metaphorical representation a loud voice appears as the means of resurrection.

Further, the fact that Luke uses the metaphor of waking up and standing up to represent resurrection can help with resolving the difficult interpretation issue this research has faced in discussing Acts 7:55–56: why does Luke deliberately change the traditional representation of the glorified Jesus’ posture from sitting (cf. Mark 14:62; Matt 26:64; Luke 22:69; Acts 2:34) to standing (ἑστῶτα)?825 Many explanations have been offered but they are far from being in consensus.826 Nevertheless, in his above mentioned article Munoa offers his own important suggestion and indicates the connection between Acts 7:55–56 and the exaltation and resurrection imagery (see p. 76).827 Moreover, he argues that in the context of Luke-Acts Jesus’ standing posture suggests his resurrection and vindication. By changing his position Jesus reassures Stephen that he has been resurrected.828 Indeed, it has to be added to this that whereas Stephen’s speech ends with the words blaming the stiff-necked people who killed Jesus (7:51–52), his testimony about Jesus standing at the right hand of God in 7:55–56 can be seen as evidence for Jesus’ resurrection. In spite of the many explanations of Jesus’ position offered, this point has not been under discussion. In other words, the immediate context of Stephen’s speech in Acts 7:1–53 has not been extensively taken into account so far. Unfortunately, Munoa does not give a strong support for his argument in his article. Moreover, it seems that the traditional critical methods cannot go further in the interpretation of this issue. The application of CMT to the cognitive analysis of

---

825 Luke emphasizes the importance of this change by using ἑστῶτα twice, in 7:55 and in 7:56.
826 There is no space here to mention all these interpretations. In his article Barrett lists some of the most important scholarly suggestions about Jesus’ posture; Barrett, “Stephen and the Son of Man,”32–34. Barrett’s own position was discussed above (see p. 77). Cf. also Owen, “Stephen’s Vision in Acts VII.55–6,”224–226.
828 Ibid., 314.
the conceptual metaphors of death and resurrection in this scene gives some additional support to and elaboration of this argument.

In Luke 23:46 Jesus prays with the words from Ps 31:5 and dies (ἐξέπνευσεν; “he breathed his last” NRSV). Stephen’s dying prayer in Acts 7:59 resembles it: “Lord Jesus, receive my spirit (τὸ πνεῦμά μου)”. At this rate, Stephen’s death in 7:60 is metaphorically depicted as his falling asleep: he passed away, literally “fell asleep (ἐκοιμήθη).” In the Rabbinical tradition Ps 31:5 (31:6 in the Hebrew Bible) could have been used as a part of the traditional Jewish evening prayer, a prayer before going to sleep (b. Ber. 5a): “Into your hand I commit my spirit ( والاستي).” If Ps 31:5 had indeed been used as a part of the evening prayer already in Luke’s time, it could be seen here as a reference to his falling asleep, a metaphorical extension of his death.\(^{829}\) If so, then in the typological representation of Jesus’ passion and Stephen’s martyrdom, their falling asleep may serve as a metaphor of death. At least, Stephen’s death is represented with such a metaphor.

Further, it can be suggested that Jesus’ standing position in Acts 7:55–56 is a metaphor of his resurrection.\(^{830}\) Indeed, the verb ἵστημι (sometimes though not often) represents the concept of resurrection in Rev 11:11 (referring to Ezek 37:10: ἔστησαν ἐπὶ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτῶν), as well as in Rev 20:12 (καὶ εἶδον τοὺς νεκροὺς, τοὺς μεγάλους καὶ τοὺς μικροὺς, ἑστῶτας ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου). While the former passage deals with the resurrection of the martyrs, the latter speaks about the eschatological resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked before the last judgment. According to Sib. Or. 4:181–182, God will raise (cause to stand) humans (literally, “mortals”) again (στήσει δὲ βροτοὺς πάλιν). Furthermore, ἵστημι occurs in the scene of the appearance of the risen Jesus in the midst of his disciples in Luke 24:36 (Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτῶν λαλούντων αὐτὸς ἔστη ἐν

\(^{829}\) Unfortunately, one cannot go too far with this argument, because it seems b. Ber. 5a is the earliest account of the possible use of this verse in the evening prayer.

\(^{830}\) In Acts 2:32–33 Luke had already included the theme of his resurrection (ἀνέστησεν) by God and his exaltation to the right hand of God (τῇ δεξιᾷ οὖν τοῦ θεοῦ υψωθείς). It is also worthy of notice that Fletcher-Louis, who interprets Jesus’ standing as “a posture appropriate to an angelomorphic being,” regards it as referring to immortality and immutability; Fletcher-Louis, “Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology,” 247. Jesus therefore is encouraging Stephen about the future resurrection of the latter.
μέσῳ αὐτῶν καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν), John 20:19b (ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν), and to Mary Magdalene in John 20:14 (τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἑστῶτα). Thus the result of the application of CMT to this passage demonstrates that Luke connects Acts 7:55–56 with the exaltation and resurrection imagery of the glorified Jesus. In 7:52 Stephen speaks about Jesus’ humiliation and death and then, using ἑστῶτα, confirms the reality of his resurrection by a vision of the resurrected and glorified Son of God in 7:55–56, which serves as evidence of Jesus’ resurrection. Besides, this vision indicates how Stephen identifies the Son of Man as Jesus. Therefore, Luke may have deliberately changed Jesus’ stance in 7:55–56, deviating from the standard picture of Jesus as the glorified Son of Man in order to emphasize his resurrection.

To sum up, Luke shares basic points of the conceptual system of the Hebrew Bible, cognate Jewish texts, and early Christian literature and uses such metaphorical representations of the concept of death as death is sleep and that of resurrection as waking up, getting up from sleep, rising up, and standing up. The metaphors of resurrection can include an important element of calling to the dead person and are directly connected with the metaphorical representation of reviving as life is moving up. These metaphors do not emphasize the corporeal character of resurrection automatically but speak about the process and result of revivification either to earthly life or to eternal life in general, which is opposite to the process and result of dying and going to the underworld. This is therefore the reason why Luke readily uses similar metaphorical imagery and language for resuscitation, individual resurrection, and eschatological resurrection.

5.1.3 The Corporeality of Resurrection in Luke–Acts

The metaphorical extensions of resurrection, structuring it in terms of the concepts of waking up and standing up, or derived from the source domain centered in human bodily experience, do not automatically imply the corporeal character of resurrection. This ambiguity about the nature of resurrection reveals why Luke emphasizes the corporeality of the resurrection of Jesus in a special way: like him his audience shared the eastern Mediterranean ideas and views on the afterlife, so resurrection did not automatically mean the

831 In addition, it is significant that Luke uses ἵστημι (Acts 3:8) and παρίστημι connected with it (4:10) in the account of the healing of the lame beggar discussed above.
resurrection of the body (cf., e.g., Dan 12:2–3; 1 Enoch 22–25; 91:10; 104:2). This section will investigate how Luke concretizes the corporeality of resurrection on the one hand, and, on the other hand, operates with the ambiguous character of the eschatological resurrection, using the language of immortality and angelomorphism.

Lehtipuu argues that Luke's emphasis on the corporeality of the resurrection of Jesus “has to do with Luke's overall understanding of Jesus’ death as a martyr's death." 832 Indeed, the story of the martyrdom of the seven brothers and their mother in 2 Maccabees 7, which is a clear example of the connection between Jewish martyrdom and resurrection, describes the individual resurrection of martyrs as a bodily one. In the pre-Lucan Christian tradition Jesus' resurrection, as an example of the individual resurrection, came to be connected with the eschatological resurrection. Probably, this idea was developed by Paul. 833 In 1 Corinthians 15, Paul's central text on the eschatological resurrection, he links together Jesus' resurrection and the eschatological one (15:12–19). Then he describes the eschatological resurrection as a two-stage process (15:20–23). These two stages correspond “to two categories of people to be raised.” 834 As the first-fruits (ἀπαρχή) of those who have fallen asleep, Jesus belongs to the first category, while Christians belong to the second one. However, although Luke supports the tradition that the risen Jesus is the first among many who will be resurrected at the end of time (Acts 26:23), 835 he acknowledges “a tension between the belief that Jesus had already risen from the dead on the one hand, and the future resurrection of the believers on the other hand.” 836 As Lehtipuu argues, for Luke the bodily resurrection of Jesus is only an intermediate phase in his final vindication in heaven. 837 Would this explain why the eschatological resurrection is not envisaged in bodily terms? This important argument would suggest that Luke used another idea of the eschatological resurrection as a two-stage process,

---

833 Holleman, Resurrection and Parousia, 137.
834 Ibid., 52.
835 Holleman argues that Acts 26:23 is dependent on 1 Cor 15:20. See ibid., 138.
837 Ibid., 158, 162.
which is attested in 2 Baruch (see p. 134), but, as will be shown below, he did not.

These two stages are different from those found in 1 Cor 15:20–23. According to 2 Bar. 50:2, the first stage of the resurrection implies the resurrection of the physical body. The resurrection of Jesus as an intermediate state before his ascension might refer to this stage. However, Jesus’ body would be physical too. In addition, as 2 Bar. 51:3b, 5–6, 9 say, the second stage of resurrection reveals the transformation and glorification of the righteous, and so does Jesus. Indeed, as Turid Karlsen Seim indicates, Jesus’ post-resurrection appearances are in some sense different from his post-ascension ones. 838

Certainly, in the story about Paul’s conversion (Acts 9:3–9; 22:6–11; 26:12–18) it is rather a heavenly vision (26:19) of a bright light accompanying Jesus’ voice, but not an appearance in flesh and bones. 839 Stephen also sees a figure of the glorified Son of Man in a vision from above (7:55–56). In Paul’s case Jesus’ physical features are virtually unrecognizable. 840 Stephen recognizes Jesus, but the features of this identification are not clear apart from referring to his glory and resurrection (see p. 225). Moreover, in the stories about Jesus’ post-resurrection appearances Luke does not explicitly mention his glory (δόξα), while Jesus’ post-ascension visions are rather similar to Luke’s account of Jesus’ transfiguration. 841

In spite of the seeming plausibility of these suggestions, there are some problems with this argument. First, as Luke puts it, the supernatural abilities of Jesus’ resurrected body may indicate that his body is already transformed after his resurrection (Luke 24; Acts 1:9; 9:3–7; cf. Luke 9:7–9, 19). What need is there for a transfiguration before resurrection? Moreover, in the transfiguration scene Moses and Elijah also have such a glory (Luke 9:30–31).

839 See Zwiep, Christ, the Spirit and the Community of God, 168–170.
841 Ibid., 37. The expression δόξα θεοῦ (cf. Acts 7:55) has a Semitic background and represents the Lord’s majestic presence; Fitzmyer, The Acts of the Apostles, 392. It is regarded as the glory belonging to God. Cf. דּוֹּ֥֝֗זֶּ֤א אֵֽתּוֹ in the LXX version of Ezek 9:3; 10:19 and בַּּ֝֗נָּ֥֗וּר אֵֽלֶּ֤֚יְֶשׁוּ֥֥֗אָ֤ה in the Hebrew Bible. More often it occurs as δόξα κυρίου (Exod 40:34–35; Lev 9:23; 1 Kgs 8:11; 2 Chr 5:14; Isa 58:8; 1 Bar 4:37; 5:7). Luke puts the form δόξα κυρίου in Luke 2:9, while in Luke 9:32 he uses τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ referring to the glory of Jesus in his transfiguration. During Jesus’ earthly life, this glory is visible for his closest disciples: Peter, John, and James. Moreover, in the transfiguration scene Moses and Elijah also have such a glory (Luke 9:30–31).
then for any further transformation of Jesus’ body? Moreover, although Luke may have perceived the character of the resurrection of Jesus in a way similar to the account of 2 Maccabees 7, there is no indication of a two-stage resurrection scheme in this account: the martyrs are raised to revived everlasting life (2 Macc 7:9), though their resurrection is depicted in more physical terms. Finally, as Zwiep demonstrates, despite inserting the ascension story, Luke does not separate exaltation from resurrection (see n. 287). Thus, in Jesus’ case there is no need for such a two-stage scheme, which is per se virtually an exception to the presentation of the process of resurrection in Jewish sources. At least, although Jesus’ resurrection would be an intermediate stage of his final transformation, any other stages of this transformation into a certain glorified existence after his ascension are obscure in Luke-Acts.

Next, turning back to the point that Jesus’ death and resurrection are connected with the story in 2 Maccabees 7, it may be suggested that Luke deliberately marks the corporeality of the resurrection of Jesus, indeed perceiving it as the individual corporeal resurrection of a martyr. This suggestion helps to answer the question why Luke is so uncertain about the character of the eschatological resurrection in his double work. It can be argued that for Luke the final state of the resurrected body is coupled with its transformation into a certain glorified existence similar to the angelic state. Here again the cognitive analysis of Luke’s metaphorical representation of resurrection in Luke 20:35–36 serves as a valuable tool of interpretation.

Thus, as has been demonstrated above, ἀνάστασις refers to revivification to eternal life but does not indicate whether the type of post-mortem existence is corporeal or incorporeal. So, on the one hand, 20:35 speaks about resurrection, but on the other, 20:36 uses the widespread idea of the equality of humans with angels or celestial beings. The Greek prefix ἰσ- (from ἶσος – “equal,” “like,” “the

---

842 Zwiep argues that Luke’s ascension story is “a description of the last post-resurrection appearance of Jesus”; Zwiep, Christ, the Spirit and the Community of God, 63. See also Zwiep, The Ascension of the Messiah in Luke Christology, 164-165.

843 It is not the subject of this research to go into detail about the case of the resurrection of Jesus. His resurrection is of a special character for Luke. As Fletcher-Louis argues, in spite of some angelomorphic features, which, as it was believed, are peculiar to the resurrected righteous, Jesus’ post-mortem existence can be seen as “a unique incidence of a full bodily resurrection” and continuation of his earthly life and ministry; Fletcher-Louis, Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology, 70.
same”) may serve as an auxiliary means for building a simile, i.e., the comparison or resemblance between two concepts marked by “like” or “as”.

Simile is often distinguished from metaphor but in some cases it functions in a similar way. Janet Martin Soskice makes a contrast between illustrative and modeling types of simile as distinctive in terms of epistemic distance. An illustrative simile, which “compares, point by point, two known entities,” has a restricted implication and is different from metaphor. However, in a modeling simile a well-known concept is used for the explanation of what is “beyond our full grasp.” As Soskice argues, this sort of simile can be virtually equated with metaphor because it shares its cognitive function, in spite of their grammatical difference. Therefore, one can regard the simile *the resurrected are like angels* (ἰσάγγελοι) in Luke 20:36 as a modeling one. Thus, the transformed state of the resurrected is metaphorically represented by the angel-like state. The points of equation between the source domain (angel) and the target domain (the resurrected righteous) that are used in this simile are immortality, celestial life, which implied celibacy in Jewish literature (*1 En.* 15:6–7; cf. Luke 20:35), and a splendid and glorious shape of both the resurrected and the angels. In this case, in turn, the term υἱοί θεοῦ in Luke 20:36b, although often associated with angels in Judaism, serves as an equivalent of the Marcan ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (Mark 12:25).

In addition, Luke might have regarded the ὡς ἄγγελοι of his Marcan Vorlage (Mark 12:25) as ambiguous and changed it in order to avoid any allusion to a direct association of the resurrected with angels. Indeed, in some Jewish texts heroes from Israel’s past were directly identified with celestial beings (cf. *2 En.* 30:11–12; *Pr. Jos.* fr. a, 1:1). However, Luke may also have replaced ὡς ἄγγελοι with ἰσάγγελοι simply in order to be close to Philo’s description of the postmortem destiny of Abel, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in *Sacr.* 1:5–7. In *Saint Luke*, 718.

---


845 Ibid., 60.

846 Ibid., 60. Cf. “God is (like) our father.”

847 Ibid., 59–60.


Thus, in any case, in Luke's view the resurrected righteous share in the angels' immortality and their heavenly existence. These righteous participate in the resurrection because they are "the sons of the resurrection" and, moreover, become the children of God as a result of their resurrection.

Further, in the corpus of the New Testament texts Luke is not unique in how he operates with elements of angelomorphism in the context of resurrection. The incorporation of the elements of angelomorphic or astral immortality into the discourse about the eschatological resurrection is also found in the pre-Lucan Christian tradition. For instance, in 1 Corinthians 15 Paul explains this future event and the necessity of the resurrection of the body through the eschatological interpretation of Gen 1–2 (1 Cor 15:35–49), and through an anthropogenic metaphor of sowing (15:36–38, 42–44). He clarifies the nature of the resurrected body by making an analogy with heavenly bodies (15:39–41), i.e., refers to the pagan idea of astral immortality (see p. 179). Moreover, for him the resurrected body is different from earthly flesh: σαρκὶ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομῆσαι οὐ δύναται οὐδὲ ἡ φθορὰ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν κληρονομεῖ ("flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does the perishable inherit the immortal"; 1 Cor 15:50). In 15:42–44, the resurrection is a transformation of the physical body (σῶμα ψυχικόν), which is subject to decay, into a new incorruptible, glorified, and "spiritual" (πνευματικόν) body.

Raised up, taking part in angelomorphic life as in a present spiritual resurrection from a dead society. See, e.g., ibid., 81–82, 88. The present research does not support such a view.

As Frederick William Danker argues, Luke could intend to show that in the life of the new age divine Fatherhood will replace the human one and as angels are God's children, the resurrected righteous will be as well. See Frederick William Danker, Jesus and the New Age (St. Louis: Clayton, 1972), 205.

An interesting connection between likeness to angels and immortality is found in Clement of Alexandria's Stromateis: the true Gnostic is, on the one hand, equal to angels (ἰσάγγελοι), and, on the other hand, is eternal standing light (φῶς ἑστός; Strom. 7.10.57.5.1–6). See further the discussion of this passage in Williams, The Immovable Race, 77.


Cf. σῶματα ἐπουράνια ("the heavenly bodies") in 1 Cor 15:40 and σώμα ὄρατον οὐρανοῦ ("visible body of heaven") in Plato, Timaeus 36e5.

A similar idea is found in some of the Jewish sources discussed: for instance, L.A.E. 39:2 and Vita 47:3 present the result of resurrection in the transformation of human nature and the return of the original glory Adam had before the Fall (cf. 2 En. 22:8; Apoc. Ab. 13:14; see p. 192 above).
However, even in this discussion of the “spiritual” resurrection and transformation (1 Cor 15:42–44, 51–52), Paul speaks about the resurrected body, i.e., expresses it in bodily terms.

Thus, Luke deliberately emphasizes the corporeality of the individual resurrection in the case of Jesus (Luke 24:37–43). He aims at linking his resurrection to the individual corporeal resurrection of martyrs attested in some Jewish texts. Nevertheless, the final state of the resurrected body (either that of Jesus’ or that of the righteous at the eschatological resurrection) is tied to its transformation into a certain glorified existence. In the case of Jesus Luke is more uncertain about his final transformation, simply mentioning the marks of his glory (e.g., the light) in the post-ascension visions of Jesus. However, in his description of the eschatological resurrection of the righteous, Luke refers to its likeness to the angelic state. The reason why Luke incorporates some features of immortality and angelomorphism into his discourse about the eschatological resurrection is that he strives to demonstrate the immortality and eternal life of the righteous. As there is no reference to their martyrdom, there is no need for additional emphasis on the corporeality of this resurrection.


As has been shown above (see p. 114), it is hardly possible to build any coherent or harmonized system of the images of the otherworld in Luke-Acts. As Lehtipuu demonstrates, in the case of Abraham’s bosom, “there can be no definite answer as to whether Abraham and Lazarus are on ‘the happy side’ of Hades or not.” Nevertheless, a step forward in this discussion can be made if one moves on to analyze the spatial difference between Luke’s representations of the abode of the dead from the point of view of CMT. That is the main focus of this section.

In the pagan and Jewish texts discussed above the location of the abode of the wicked is usually somewhere below, in lower or underground regions. On the other hand, the place reserved for the virtuous and righteous and those associated with a blessed and eternal “real” life is always above or in higher

855 Lehtipuu, The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, 276. Bauckham argues that at least it is not necessarily the case that both the rich man and Lazarus are in the underworld; Bauckham, ABD 3:15.
regions, and never in the underworld. Most sources support such regularity in the representation of these places, no matter which terms are used for them. As has been shown, even in 3 Baruch 2–4, which appoint the three lowest levels of the heavens for those who are not righteous, this abode is lower than that of the righteous (see p. 94). A certain exception is the 2nd Book of Enoch that locates both places for the righteous and for the wicked on the same (third) level of the heavens. This atypical transition of the place of punishment to the heavenly level may be connected with the marginality or possible syncretism of the ideas of 2 Enoch. On the other hand, such a set of abodes of the different groups of people at the same level resembles the picture in 1 Enoch 22, though there it is not the heavens but Sheol.856 The transition of the place of the wicked to the air is also found in Plutarch’s De sera numinis vindicta (Sera. 563e–564b) or on the moon as in his De facie in orbe lunae (Fac. 944 c). Moreover, the heavenly paradise is located in the third heaven in L.A.E. 37:2–6 (cf. 33:2–3). However, the places of the wicked and of the righteous are at a distance from each other even in 2 Enoch. After all, the goal of Enoch’s heavenly journey in this book is not the third heaven but the place before the throne of the Lord on the seventh level of the heavens (20:1–5) as the place of the highest blessedness.

Luke also emphasizes the spatial difference between the postmortem dwellings of the righteous and the wicked. Indeed, his representation of the abode of the righteous is associated with its exalted position. Thus it refers to heaven (Luke 6:23; 10:20; 12:33; 16:9; 18:22; Acts 7:56) as well as to their higher (Luke 16:23) or blessed location (Luke 13:29–30; 23:43). Luke 16:23 can be regarded as the key Lucan passage relating to this issue (see p. 112). The Greek expression ἐπῆρεν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ (“he lifted up his eyes”) occurs in the LXX (cf. 2 Sam 18:24) and corresponds to the stereotypical Hebrew נושא (or נשי in the Hebrew Bible. It can be translated either as simply “look at”857 or with reference to spatial dimensions.858 In Luke 6:20, which can

---

856 In b. Tamid 32b Gehenna is located above the earth in the firmament (cf. Gen 1:6). In b. Hag. 12b the firmament is the second level of the heavens. However, even according to this text, the souls of the righteous are above, on the seventh heaven.

857 See, e.g., the LXX 2 Sam 18:24; cf., e.g., Gen 49:29; Judg 19:17; Job 21:12; Ezek 8:5; Dan 8:3; 10:5; Zech 11:8

858 Cf. 2 Kgs 19:22; 1 Chr 21:16; Isa 37:23; Zech 5:1.
be regarded as derived from Q, it appears with no implication of “lower to higher” position. Fitzmyer argues that this Septuagintalism would have been preserved in Luke 16:23 from certain material Luke uses in this parable. However, as Lehtipuu demonstrates, Luke himself is responsible for this story in its written form. Therefore, it is unlikely that Luke retains this Septuagintalism without any specific reason but just because it belongs to the earlier tradition he uses. In the context of this parable the difference between the rich man and Lazarus in their social position and honor as well as in their postmortem state is often marked by the spatial distinction between them. Indeed, in 16:19–21 Lazarus lies at the rich man’s gate (the lower position), while the latter feasts in his house (the upper position). The poor man longs to eat what falls (the lower position) from the rich man’s table (the higher position). Then, in 16:22–23, after their death their fates are suddenly changed: the angels carry Lazarus away to Abraham’s bosom (presumably the higher position, which is far away from the rich man’s place); the rich man is buried (the lower position). Hence, it can be suggested that the differentiation of the fates of these two people is illustrated by the spatial change between them. Now, the rich man’s position is not above that of Lazarus. On the contrary, in the hereafter he has to look up to see the poor man (16:23).

In addition, in Luke 16:23 the wicked and the righteous are separated not only by altitude but also by distance. Greek ἀπὸ μακρῶθεν in Luke 16:23 points out a vast distance between two types of people in the otherworld. This distance metaphorically emphasizes the difference between the state of the righteous and that of the wicked. The rich man looks up to see Abraham who is far away, together with Lazarus in his bosom.

Furthermore, Luke 13:24–25 may serve as an additional indication that the emphasis on the spatial difference between the righteous and the wicked is important for Luke: the former enter the house (they are in), while the latter stay outside (ἔξω). In this parable the Kingdom of God, which is metaphorically represented as a house of salvation, plays the role of a container, in CMT

---

terminology. Luke uses similar imagery in Luke 18:24–25 (cf. 24:26), perceiving the Kingdom in a spatial sense. Thus, there is a distance between those who are in the Kingdom and those who are outside. Luke’s emphasis on this distance may refer to the important cognitive relation between center and periphery in the ancient world. As Mario Liverani argues in his study of the ideological issues of the Assyrian empire, the diversity of space played an important role in this culture. An inner space (center), which is perceived as a positive one, is in opposition to an outer one (periphery), which is characterized negatively. Indeed, “the inner zone is reassuring because it is normal . . . ; the outer zone or periphery is worrying because it is abnormal.” Then, the inner space is luminous, structured, and productive, while the outer one is dark, chaotic, and sterile. Hence in the cognitive sense, center (in) serves as a metaphor for the Kingdom in Luke, while periphery (out) stands for the dark place of torment of the wicked.

All in all, what does the indication of the spatial difference (altitude and distance) between these two categories of people refer to? It demonstrates that the spatial difference of the postmortem positions of the rich man and Lazarus marks the difference in their afterlife status: the lower position the rich man occupies in Hades corresponds to his worse fate and humiliated state, while the higher position of Lazarus (as well as Abraham), who is in a certain blessed reality, designates his honorable and exalted state. These divergent states stand for the condemned or blessed realities reserved for the wicked or the righteous. On the other hand, it is doubtful that Luke tries to accentuate the exact geographical mapping of these realities or their real spatial location underground, on earth or in heaven. Indeed, for instance, the location (heaven or earth) of the dwelling of the righteous is ambiguous even in Jewish texts (cf., e.g., LAB 3:10). The literal localities of the eschatological banquet in the

863 Cf. also Mark 9:43–47 there entering life is equated with entering the kingdom of God.

864 See Mario Liverani, “The Ideology of the Assyrian Empire,” in Power and Propaganda. A Symposium on Ancient Empires (ed. Mogens Trolle Larsen; Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1979), 306. I am grateful to Arie Leder for pointing out to me this important feature of the cognitive opposition between center and periphery.

865 Ibid., 306.

866 Luke 10:15 dealing with heaven and Hades, also can be regarded as an example of the indication of the difference between the humiliated and the exalted states.
Kingdom of God in Luke 13:29 and paradise in 23:43 also remain vague. Taking all this into account, how, after all, does one account for the significance of the spatial difference between abode of the wicked and the righteous in Luke-Acts?

According to cognitive linguistics, a schematic representation of the most salient or central characteristics associated with members of a given category is called a prototype. The most salient and central representations of the abode of the dead are connected with the spatial difference between the location of the righteous and that of the wicked. Therefore it seems most likely that in using these prototypical representations of the otherworld, Luke is relying on his audience’s cultural acquaintance with these representations and their “orientational metaphorization,” in the terminology of Lakoff and Johnson. He utilizes a complex imagery that metaphorically represents various aspects of his complex picture of the otherworld. This probably suggests that Luke uses the spatial mapping of the abode of the dead in terms of the orientational metaphor of up, which he applies to the concepts of life, immortality, and honor, and that of down for death and humiliation. After all, the spatial representations of the abode of the dead correlate with the view of “a three-storey universe” common in ancient cosmology: the dead (especially the wicked) are in the underworld (cf. down), the living are on the earth (middle), while the gods (and the blessed righteous) are in the heavens (cf. up).

Next, the pictures of the banquet in Luke 13:28–29 and paradise in 23:43 also serve as metaphorical extensions of the concept of the Kingdom of God: they accentuate such aspects as the joy of salvation, the kingly rule of the Messiah over it, its limited character in this age, and the gift of eternal life.

---

867 1 Thess 4:17 makes a hint that the final abode of the believers is in heaven with the Lord. On the other hand, in Rev 21:2, 10 the New Jerusalem, which is a dwelling place of the righteous, comes down out from heaven to the new earth.

868 In Prototype Theory humans rely upon the most representative (the most frequently perceived) part of a category (the principle of perceived world structure). These prototypes build the structure and organize the category; Evans, A Glossary of Cognitive Linguistics, 175–176.

869 It is worth mentioning that the use of the word ἀνάστασις (here, “raising up”) in Luke 2:34 implies the exaltation of the humble and oppressed as the opposite of the πτώσις (“fall”) of the wicked.

870 Park, Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions, 204.
Thus, Luke uses all these images for creating a many-sided picture of the reality of humiliation and condemnation for the wicked on the one hand, and the reality of honor, blessing, and eternal life destined for the righteous on the other. Spatially the wicked are located below, in the underground or in the lower regions, while the righteous are always above or in the higher regions. Jewish and Greco-Roman pagan literature of the period has the same tendency in the representation of the abode of the dead, no matter which terms are used. In Luke's conceptual system the spatial dimensions metaphorically refer to the difference in postmortem fate and status: the lower position indicates the worse fate and humiliated state, while the higher position designates the honorable and exalted state. This is why he does not concentrate on the location of these places more than is needed for these metaphorical extensions.


The issue which is at stake in this final section of the present study covers two further questions that puzzle the student of Luke's views on the afterlife: (1) how do we account for the fact that Luke ascribes a number of afterlife realities to the present, instead of the future to which they are traditionally ascribed?; and (2) what is most significant for Luke in his emphasis on the importance of individual eschatology?

Indeed, as the above analysis of Luke 20:35 has indicated, Luke deliberately changed Mark 12:25 as if he were transferring the eschatological resurrection issues of 20:34–36 to the present. The present tense of ζάω in Luke 20:38b also may indicate that for Luke the righteous in some sense have already been raised up.

Another passage already noticed above (see p. 79, 202), the parable of the Prodigal Son, also uses afterlife language (ἀναζάω in Luke 15:24, ζάω in 15:32) and in a certain way transfers the issues from the postmortem existence into the present. On the other hand, the issue is rather more complicated, since from the CMT perspective, in this account the resurrection of the prodigal son serves as a metaphorical extension of the concept of repentance (repentance is resurrection). A similar example of resurrection representing another concept is found in Jos. Asen. 15:5; 27:10 where resurrection appears as a metaphorical
extension of the concept of conversion to Judaism after Aseneth’s repentance (see p. 196). \(^{871}\)

Luke’s comprehension of repentance and its theological importance for his double work can serve as a key for the interpretation of the reason for the transfer of these eschatological issues to the present. Luke 9:60 (cf. Matt 8:22), derived from Q, may also refer to this issue: those who have repented and are following Jesus are, in some sense, already resurrected \(^{872}\) or live as if they were resurrected \(^{873}\). This idea is connected with Luke’s awareness of the nearness of the Kingdom of God or even its presence already in this age (see p. 105). Those who have repented already participate in the Kingdom of God which represents the blessed reality of the righteous being ruled by God. Moreover, the Kingdom of God relates to salvation (Luke 13:23–30; 18:18–27). \(^{874}\) In Luke salvation is not only an eschatological future but is already in this world (cf., Luke 19:9). In turn, the Kingdom of God is present in Jesus himself bringing divine salvation to repentant sinners (Luke 17:21). Salvation from sin and death is possible through repentance (μετάνοια) and following Jesus. \(^{875}\) In other words, repentance brings salvation, which is already in action in Luke-Acts and will continue in the age to come. \(^{876}\) Those who entered the Christian community

\(^{871}\) In some Qumran texts the resurrection imagery stands for the transformed state of the Qumran community in their fellowship with the angels (see p. 194 above).


\(^{873}\) “Let the dead bury their own dead; but as for you, go and proclaim the kingdom of God” (Luke 9:60 NRSV).


\(^{876}\) The present participle σῳζόμενοι (“being saved”) used for those who are accepted into the Kingdom of God in Luke 13:23 may indicate that eschatological salvation, equivalent in this passage to entry into the Kingdom, has already begun (cf. Acts 2:47). However, some scholars prefer to see the future aspect of salvation in this passage. See, e.g., Steyn, “Soteriological Perspectives in Luke’s Gospel,” 83.
through repentance have already received salvation. Another conclusion to which Luke brings his audience relates to how their repentance and the proper social behavior, including charity and concern for their neighbors, affect their afterlife. 877 Those who do not accept the gospel Jesus proclaims and do not repent in the face of the coming Kingdom will be punished in Hades (Luke 10:9–15). 878 As the passage about the two criminals on the cross (Luke 23:39–43) demonstrates, even at the last moment of earthly life repentance and, in turn, sharing the eternal life prepared for the righteous is possible. According to the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, the destiny of the righteous and the wicked is different immediately after death and cannot subsequently be changed. Hence, Luke points out that repentance and proper social behavior by an individual directly affect his or her afterlife, not only at the future eschatological end of time, but also immediately after death. This is probably a principal reason why Luke emphasizes the importance of individual eschatology in his double work.

Thus, those who have repented already share in eternal life. This idea is realized not only in anticipation of the future resurrection but also in a preliminary participation in it already in this earthly life. Although the temporal and spatial dichotomy seems to be not unimportant for Luke, 879 due to the presence of salvation and the Kingdom of God already in the present, two different sorts of reality (this age and that to come) coexist together. Luke was able to make a distinction between those who belong to this age and those who are worthy of attaining the age of the resurrection. As Seim argues, in Luke the spatial dichotomy of two ages is converted to social dichotomies, while respecting the temporal one. “The heavenly life is proleptically realized on earth in ways that do not transgress the taxonomic order. One is invited to live ‘as if.’” 880

877 Cf., Carroll, Response to the End of History, 67, 71.
878 Here it is a place of punishment. The theme of the significance of repentance in Lucan thought is also emphasized in Luke 13:1–5, the main conclusion of which is “unless you repent, you all will perish likewise” (like those Galileans and the eighteen citizens of Jerusalem).
879 Cf., e.g., Luke 18:29–30 where the term ὁ αἰών ὁ ἐρχόμενος (“the age to come”) indicates a future reality.
To sum up, the marked shift of the temporal aspect of resurrection from the hereafter to the present in Luke-Acts is due to Luke's understanding of salvation. For him salvation is partly a present reality. In turn, proper social behavior and repentance open the entrance to salvation and define the individual's destiny immediately after death. Therefore, those who have repented receive salvation and are even somehow already granted eternal life while still living in this world.

5.3 Summary

Luke shares the diversity and incoherence of the common beliefs and traditions that he inherited from his cultural-religious milieu. This is the reason why he has a variety of views on the afterlife in his double work. Dealing with the ideas he had at hand, Luke makes new combinations of them for his own purposes and in his own context. The reason for his combination of the different ideas can be found in his religious conceptual system, which is predominantly metaphorical from the cognitive linguistics point of view. Applying CMT and perceiving metaphor as a matter of cognition, it has been found that the metaphorical extension of the concept of death is seen as death is sleep, while resurrection is waking up, getting up from sleep, rising up, and standing up in the Hebrew Bible and cognate Jewish literature as well as in the early Christian texts. In addition, in the eastern Mediterranean culture the upright standing posture of human beings marks their participation in immortality and the orientational metaphor of up relates to life, immortality, and sometimes even to divinity. In that case, reviving is metaphorically expressed through the metaphor life is moving up and connected with the other metaphors of resurrection. In addition, the metaphor resurrection – awakening and getting up from sleep can include an important element of calling to the dead “sleeping” person: a loud voice is addressed to the person to wake him or her up.

Next, these metaphorical representations of the concept of resurrection do not automatically emphasize its corporeal character but speak about the process and result of revivification either to earthly life or to eternal life in general, which is opposite to the process and result of dying and going to the underworld. In turn, this is the reason why Luke readily uses the same language and imagery for resuscitation, individual resurrection, and eschatological
resurrection. Thus, for Luke and for his audience resurrection does not automatically mean the resurrection of the body.

The corporeality of the resurrection can be recovered from the context or be specially emphasized as has been done in Luke 24:37–43. Luke marks the corporeality of the resurrection of Jesus in order to conform it to the Jewish idea of the individual corporeal resurrection of martyrs.

Furthermore, Luke incorporates some features of immortality and angelomorphism into the discourse about the eschatological resurrection in order to demonstrate that immortality and eternal life are intrinsic characteristics of the risen righteous. Luke couples the final state of the resurrected body with its transformation into a certain glorified existence similar to the angelic state. However, the angel-like state is a metaphorical extension of such a transformation and glorification but not a reference to real angelification: they are equated in immortality, celestial life, and the splendid and glorious form of both the resurrected and the angels.

Further, while it is hardly possible to perceive a coherent or harmonized system in the representation of the abode of the dead in Luke-Acts, it is still possible to connect the various images of the otherworld that Luke uses with the spatial difference between the location of the righteous and the wicked: the former are higher up than the latter. Luke could use their prototypical representations relying upon his audience’s cultural acquaintance with their structural and orientational metaphorization, and could create a many-sided picture of the otherworld without concentrating on the location of these places any more than was needed for their metaphorical extensions.

Finally, Luke’s understanding of repentance and salvation can serve as a key for the interpretation of the reason for the seeming transfer of eschatological resurrection issues to the present, and for the importance of individual eschatology in Luke-Acts. For Luke repentance and proper social behavior affect the afterlife. On the other hand, for him salvation is not only an eschatological future but also a present reality. Those who do not repent in the face of the coming Kingdom, which represents the blessed reality of the righteous ruled by God, and brings divine salvation to the repentant, will be punished in Hades, while those who have repented and entered the Christian community have already received salvation and participate in eternal life, i.e., in some sense, are already resurrected or live if they were resurrected. The destiny of the righteous and the wicked is defined immediately after death without any possibility of subsequent change. This is probably a principal reason why Luke emphasizes the importance of individual eschatology and afterlife existence in his double work.
Although Luke probably did not aim at forming an integrated eschatological model in his double work, and different eschatological aspects coexist side by side, the frame of his perception of the afterlife is nevertheless built on his views of eschatology and judgment. First, Luke deals with collective eschatology and the final judgment at the end of time. This idea occurs in many of the texts discussed and indicates that at the end of time both the righteous and the wicked will stand before God, who will judge them according to their earthly deeds. This postmortem differentiation implies the reversal of the fates of the individuals concerned (a surprise for the wicked). The righteous will obtain their rewards, while the wicked will be punished. Second, Luke refers to individual eschatology and the judgment after death. According to this idea, a certain postmortem judgment takes place immediately after the individual’s death. Luke clearly speaks about the final destiny of the individual after death in Luke 16:19–31 (and probably 23:39–43) and Acts 1:25. However, in Luke 12:16–21, 16:1–8 (and probably Acts 14:22) he is less explicit about the character of the postmortem judgment, whether preliminary or final. The same uncertainty appears in Luke’s presentation of the destiny of a martyr: he gives no explicit description of the finality of the fate of Stephen (Acts 7:54–60). These presentations of the eschatological issues correlate with the complicated and sometimes inconsistent eschatological ideas found in his cultural milieu. Moreover, while pagan sources are mostly confined to individual eschatology and postmortem judgment, the Jewish literature of the period deals with both types of eschatology and judgment. In addition, in Jewish sources the postmortem judgment appears either as a preliminary or as a final verdict.

Further, in some passages of Luke-Acts (Luke 5:20–21; 7:48; 15:11–32; 20:34–36) the traditional Jewish presentation of collective eschatology and of resurrection postponed until the end of time is somehow potentially transferred into the present. Such a comprehension of eschatology is also attested in some Jewish circles, such as the Qumran community. In their views the fate of the individual was in its temporal aspect transferred from a postmortem or a future occurrence to the present.

Next, in Luke’s double work the judgment is presided over by a judge, who is most often associated with God, but sometimes, more implicitly, with Jesus (e.g., Luke 13:22–30; 22:24–30 23:39–43). This judicial role of Jesus is connected with the corresponding characteristic of the Messiah in some later Jewish texts.
Moreover, in Acts 7:55–59 it is the risen Jesus who receives the souls of the dead (at least of the martyrs).

Further, after the judgment (either the final or preliminary one) and the differentiation between the righteous and the wicked, the latter are put into torment in the underworld, while the former are enjoying eternal life in a specific blessed reality. For the representation of the abode of these two groups of the dead, Luke uses various terms. His general image of the underworld is expressed as Hades (ᾅδης), which was a traditional word among the Greeks, and then used by the translators of the LXX as the regular representation of the Hebrew concept of Sheol (שְׁאוֹל). The archaic understanding of Hades in Greco-Roman pagan religion as a place indifferent to the earthly behavior of the dead more or less correlates with its Hebrew counterpart in early Israelite religion. However, in the Hellenistic and Roman periods Hades acquires the characteristics of the place of punishment for the wicked. Moreover, in Judaism the concept of Sheol was also revised and correlated with the new meaning of the Greek ᾅδης. Nevertheless, the older understanding of Sheol/Hades as a neutral place of abode of the dead continued to exist, at least in some popular beliefs. Luke combines these two meanings of Hades as (1) the abode of all the dead (Acts 2:27, 31); and (2) the place of punishment of the wicked (Luke 16:23, and less probably 10:15). Moreover, speaking about #2 Luke does not specify the interim or final character of Hades.

In addition, Luke uses other representations of the underworld relating to the destiny of the wicked that are attested in either pagan or Jewish sources: “Gehenna” as the rough equivalent of the place of punishment for the wicked, “abyss” as the place of the imprisonment of the fallen angels and spirits, “perdition” as indicating the eternal punishment of the wicked, “his own place” as a certain place in the underworld for the wicked (Judas), and “this place of torment” as the place of the suffering of the wicked in Hades.

The abode of the righteous as the place they receive their rewards is also represented by several terms. For this, Luke uses the concept of the Kingdom of God, which appears as an eschatological banquet (Luke 13:28–29) and as paradise (23:42–43). This imagery emphasizes the joy of salvation and a dwelling place of the righteous ruled by the Messiah, as well as the limited character of the Kingdom in this age. In addition, the image of paradise adopted from Jewish traditions emphasizes the gift of eternal life for the believers.
Furthermore, Luke uses the expression “eternal habitations” (16:9), which combines the image of eternity and that of the tabernacle, but most probably means the place of salvation and joy for the righteous. He also introduces the expression “Abraham’s bosom” (Luke 16:22–23), which indicates the close fellowship of Abraham and Lazarus. This expression refers to the exalted and most honorable position of the righteous in the blessed state, which is also depicted as a banquet, but not in the eschatological future.

All in all, because of the complexity of Luke’s eschatological views and their unsystematic treatment, it is hardly possible to build any coherent system or harmonize these diverse representations of the abode of the dead or to define whether they refer to the separate places between which the soul of the deceased wanders and finds its final destiny.

Further, the rewards of the righteous and the punishments of the wicked as well as the places of their postmortem dwellings are interrelated with the forms of their afterlife existence. The main form of such an existence in Luke-Acts is resurrection, linguistically most frequently expressed via forms of the verbs ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω. On the one hand, resurrection indicates an eschatological reward for the believers related to the gift to them of eternal life (Luke 14:14; 20:27–40). On the other hand, the eschatological general resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked preceding the final judgment appears in Acts 24:10–21. Both these types of eschatological resurrection are typical of Jewish texts. It is then not improbable that Luke perceives the resurrection of believers in Christ as a positive part of the general resurrection, i.e., as the resurrection to eternal life.

Moreover, in Luke’s view the term “resurrection” also relates to the individual resurrection of the righteous (Luke 9:7–9; 9:19) without any direct connection with the end of time. This type of resurrection occurs in certain Jewish texts, especially in 2 Maccabees 7 and in Ps.-Phoc. 102–104. The resurrection of Jesus (24:36–43) also belongs to this type of resurrection, but it probably inaugurates the eschatological resurrection (cf. Acts 26:23).

All in all, in Luke-Acts the forms of ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω stand for the restoration of physical life to certain individuals, which in itself does not directly relate to the afterlife, apart from the fact that for a certain period the soul of the deceased was believed to be in a form of postmortem existence, probably not far from the dead body. Indeed, Luke emphasizes the reality of the restoration of normal physical life in the stories about resuscitation which
mention the return of the human component surviving death, which is represented by the terms ψυχή and πνεῦμα. Most probably, he regards these terms as synonyms. The same inconsistency is attested in Jewish sources that prefer either a single term or several terms used as synonyms. Besides, since he shared the eastern Mediterranean culture, Luke may have understood death as a gradual process and may have supported the view that the human component that is thought to live on after death is not yet in the otherworld, but still in the proximity of the dead body in the time of resuscitation.

Further, as in pagan and Jewish stories about resuscitation, Luke deliberately plays with the meaning of ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω in their meaning of resurrection, on the one hand, and awakening and standing up, on the other, in contrast to the affinity of sleep with death (cf. Pausanias, Descr. 2.26.6.1; Euripides, Herc. fur. 719; 2 Kgs 4:31; 13:21). Thus, using resurrection language, Luke may have in mind several issues: the eschatological resurrection of the dead, individual resurrection, and the restoration of earthly life.

Next, speaking about resurrection, Luke uses the language characteristic of the other forms of afterlife in pagan and Jewish sources, namely the immortality of the soul and angelomorphic existence. The former, which can be compared with the pagan “full” or Platonic type of immortality, occurs in the “resurrection” contexts of Luke-Acts, demonstrating the idea that the risen ones have eternal life (e.g., Luke 20:38b). The latter occurs in the context of the eschatological resurrection, in order to depict the glorious and transformed state of the risen ones and to emphasize their immortality, which they come to share with celestial beings as their intrinsic characteristic.


To sum up, the analysis of various pagan and Jewish traditions about the afterlife demonstrates their diversity and sometimes the coexistence of divergent views side by side. Luke inherits in good measure the common beliefs and traditions of his cultural-religious milieu with all their diversity and inconsistency. Apparently, he does not consider the variety and even discrepancy of his views as a contradiction. That is how this diversity should be accounted for. However, this is not the entire picture. Luke does not simply borrow or adopt the ideas he has at hand, but rather makes new combinations of them for his own purposes and in his own context. Luke's views on the
The afterlife, which are the focus of the present research, can be brought together into four primary combinations of afterlife ideas: (1) the issue of resurrection, which combines the eschatological and individual types, including a certain realized eschatological resurrection, as well as the restoration of physical life; (2) the relationship between the corporeality and incorporeality of the resurrection; (3) the several representations of the abode of the dead; (4) Luke's special interest in individual eschatology, while retaining the view of the importance of collective eschatology.

The reason for Luke's combination of these different ideas is rooted in his religious conceptual system, which is predominantly metaphorical. Thus, the combination of different types of resurrection is possible due to the metaphorical extension of the concept of resurrection as waking up and getting up from sleep, as well as rising up and standing up in the Hebrew Bible and cognate Jewish literature, as well as in early Christian texts. It may include an important element of calling the dead “sleeping” person via a loud voice addressed to this person to wake him/her up. In addition, some pagan texts also connect sleep or unconsciousness, death, and the resuscitation of corpses, sometimes with the use of the same lexis.

Further, reviving is metaphorically expressed via the orientational metaphor life is moving up, and is connected with other metaphors of resurrection. Moreover, in the eastern Mediterranean culture this orientational metaphor of up relating to life, prosperity, and divinity is linked to the idea that the upright standing posture of human beings marks their participation in immortality and divinity.

These metaphorical representations of the concept of resurrection indicate the process and result of revivification either to earthly life or to eternal life in general, which is the opposite of the process and result of dying and going to the underworld. That is why Luke can readily use the same resurrection language for the issues of resuscitation, individual resurrection, and eschatological resurrection. Although he perceives them as different issues operating in different contexts, the conceptual mechanisms and the corresponding metaphorical extensions working through them are similar for him.

However, these metaphorical extensions do not emphasize the corporeal character of resurrection. Indeed, although Luke uses similar terminology in speaking about several types of resurrection, he never explicitly emphasizes the
corporeal character of the eschatological resurrection. Many Jewish texts dealing with resurrection have the same tendency. Therefore, for Luke and for his audience, resurrection does not automatically mean the resurrection of the body. The corporeal character of the resurrection can be recovered from the context or may be specially emphasized as it is in Luke 24:37–43. Luke marks the corporeality of the resurrection of Jesus in order to conform it to the Jewish idea of the individual corporeal resurrection of martyrs, and to protect it from any association with angelomorphism or with the appearance of a ghost. Nevertheless, Jesus’ resurrected body is transformed and glorified, and also has supernatural powers similar to those occurring in the Jewish descriptions of the glorious state of the righteous at the eschatological resurrection.

Thus, Luke couples the final state of the resurrected body with its transformation into a certain glorified substance. In the case of Jesus Luke provides almost no explicit details (apart from the marks of his glory) about his final transformation. Nonetheless, in Luke 20:34–36 he likens the state of the resurrected righteous to the angelic state. However, this angel-like state is only a metaphorical extension of the eschatological transformation and glorification, and not a reference to angelification: the resurrected and the angels are equated in terms of their immortality, celestial life, and splendid glorious form.

Next, the spatial difference between the location of the righteous and that of the wicked in Luke’s representation of the abode of the dead metaphorically marks the difference in their afterlife status. In this cognitive mapping of the abode of the dead in terms of the orientational metaphor of up applied to the concepts of life, immortality, and honor, and that of down for death and humiliation, the higher position designates the honorable and exalted status, while the lower position corresponds to the worse fate and condition of humiliation. In addition, the metaphorical opposition up-down relates to the ancient cosmological view of “a three-storey universe.”

These upper and lower positions refer to the blessed reality reserved for the righteous and the reality of condemnation for the wicked. Luke, therefore, uses the prototypical representations of the otherworld with their structural and orientational metaphorization, and creates a many-sided picture without any more concentration on the location of these places than is needed for their metaphorical extensions.

Luke’s understanding of repentance and salvation can be seen as the main key for the interpretation of the problem of the apparent transformation of
eschatological resurrection issues to the present, and that of the importance of individual eschatology. Meanwhile, for Luke salvation is not only an eschatological future but also a present reality. Those who do not repent in the face of the coming Kingdom of God, which represents the blessed reality of the righteous being ruled by God and brings divine salvation, will be punished in Hades. Those who have repented and have become believers have already received salvation and, accordingly, already participate in eternal life. On the understanding that for Luke both sorts of reality (this age and the age to come) coexist, these people are, in some sense, already resurrected or live if they were resurrected.

Finally, since repentance brings salvation already in this earthly life, the destiny of the righteous and the wicked is assigned immediately after death with no possibility of change. Therefore, according to Luke, repentance and proper social behavior affect the afterlife. This is why individual eschatology and the afterlife destiny of the individual are so important for him.

Thus, as an answer to the central question of this research about an explanation for the apparent variety of ideas of the afterlife in Luke-Acts, it can be stated that Luke uses various sources and oral traditions that reflect the diverse and incoherent views on the afterlife which coexisted in his cultural-religious milieu with its predominantly metaphorical religious conceptual system. Using CMT to analyze the variety of ideas dealing with the afterlife in Luke-Acts demonstrates that Luke shares this conceptual system and does not consider this variety (or even discrepancy) to be a contradiction. Moreover, the application of CMT indicates that in his presentation of the afterlife Luke regards these ideas as consistent; they are apparently coherent in the conceptual system he shares. Luke deals with religious metaphors that work in this conceptual system even if they seem to us to be inconsistent and incoherent. He therefore easily combines them according to his own purposes and in his own context.
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