

JOHN PAUL II

Man and Woman He Created Them



A Theology of the Body

Contents



John Paul II's Instructions for the Theology of the Body	xv
Foreword by Christoph Cardinal Schönborn	xxiii
Preface by Christopher West	xxvii
Introduction by Michael Waldstein	1
1. <i>The Text</i>	4
a. Textual Basis	6
b. Translation	11
c. Literary Genre, Intended Audience, and Authority	14
d. Reading of Scripture	18
2. <i>Wojtyła's Carmelite Personalism</i>	23
a. <i>Gaudium et Spes</i> 24:3, and the Sanjuanist Triangle	23
b. Wojtyła's Encounter with St. John of the Cross	24
c. The Sanjuanist Triangle in Detail.	29
3. <i>Wojtyła and Kant</i>	34
a. Bacon, Descartes, and a New Subjectivity	36
b. Kant's Anti-Trinitarian Personalism	44
c. Kant and John Paul II on Sex and Marriage	55
4. <i>Wojtyła and Scheler</i>	63
a. Scheler's Essentialist Personalism	63
b. Wojtyła's Critique of Scheler	69
5. <i>An Overview of Wojtyła's Concerns</i>	77
a. Wojtyła's Seven Major Works	77
b. Faith, Experience, and Personal Subjectivity	80
c. The Trinitarian Nucleus of the Council.	87

6. <i>The Purpose of the Theology of the Body</i>	94
a. Why Theology “of the Body” in Particular?	94
b. Why <i>Humanae Vitae</i> in Particular?	99
7. <i>Structure and Argument</i>	105
a. The Overall Structure	107
b. Alternate Structures	112
c. The Structure in Detail	114
d. The Main Argument	120
e. A Guiding Star for Reading TOB	124

PART ONE

THE WORDS OF CHRIST

CHAPTER ONE

Christ Appeals to the “Beginning”	131
1. <i>What Is Meant by “Beginning”?</i>	131
Approaching Genesis	131
First Account of the Creation of Man	134
Second Account of the Creation of Man	137
The Perspective of the “Redemption of the Body” (Rom 8:23)	141
2. <i>The Meaning of Original Solitude</i>	146
A Twofold Context	146
Man in Search of His Essence	148
Solitude and Subjectivity	150
Solitude and the Meaning of the Body	152
The Alternative between Death and Immortality	154
3. <i>The Meaning of Original Unity</i>	156
The Unity of the Two	156
Dimensions of Homogeneity	160
“Communion of Persons”	162
“Flesh from My Flesh” (Gen 2:23)	164
The Unity of Becoming “One Flesh”	167
4. <i>The Meaning of Original Nakedness</i>	169
Introductory Observations about Genesis 2:25	169
Shame—A “Boundary” Experience	171

Attempted Reconstruction	173
Participation in the Visibility of the World	175
The Inner Dimension of Vision	175
Intimacy—The Hidden Meaning of Vision	177
5. <i>Man in the Dimension of Gift</i>	178
<i>A. The Spousal Meaning of the Body</i>	178
Creation as Giving	178
Giving and Man	180
Gift—Mystery of a Beatifying Beginning	182
Discovery of the “Spousal” Meaning of the Body	183
“Freedom of the Gift”—Foundation of the Spousal Meaning of the Body	185
The “Spousal Character” of the Body and the Revelation of the Person	187
The Spousal Meaning of the Body as the Fruit of Rootedness in Love	188
<i>B. The Mystery of Original Innocence</i>	191
Gift to the Human Heart	191
Original Innocence and Consciousness of the Spousal Meaning of the Body	192
Innocence at the Foundation of the Exchange of the Gift	194
Exchange of the Gift—Interpretation of Genesis 2:25	196
Theology of Original Innocence	198
The Root of the Ethos of the Human Body	200
The Foundation of the Primordial Sacrament— The Body as Sign	202
6. “Knowledge” and Procreation (Gen 4:1)	204
Between Poverty of Expression and Depth of Meaning	204
“Knowledge” as Personal Archetype	207
Fatherhood and Motherhood as the Human Meaning of “Knowledge”	210
Knowledge and Possession	213
Knowledge Stronger than Death	216
7. [Conclusion: An Integral Vision]	218

CHAPTER TWO

Christ Appeals to the Human Heart 225

1. In the Light of the Sermon on the Mount 225

 Matthew 5:27–28—“Whoever Looks to Desire...” 225

 Matthew 5:27–28—Ethical Meaning 227

 Matthew 5:27–28—Anthropological Meaning 229

 Matthew 5:27–28 Indicates a Further Dimension 232

2. The Man of Concupiscence 234

A. The Meaning of Original Shame 236

 Casting Doubt on the Gift 236

 Man Alienated from Original Love 238

 Change in the Meaning of Original Nakedness 241

 “Immanent” Shame 242

 Sexual Shame 244

B. Insatiability of the Union 246

 Corruption of the Consciousness of the Unitive Meaning
 of the Body 246

 A Deeper Dimension of Shame 249

 The Meaning of “Insatiability of the Union” 251

 Where Does the Insatiability of the Union Come From? 253

C. The Corruption of the Spousal Meaning of the Body 255

 Meaning—“Measure of the Heart” 255

 Threat Against the Expression of the Spirit in the Body 257

 Loss of the Freedom of the Gift 258

 The Inner Measure of Belonging 261

3. Commandment and Ethos 264

A. It Was Said, “Do Not Commit Adultery” (Mt 5:27) 267

 The History of a People 267

 Legislation 270

 The Prophets 273

 Covenant 275

B. “Whoever Looks to Desire...” 278

 Shift in the Center of Gravity 278

 The Wisdom Tradition 280

The Inner State of the Man of Concupiscence (Sir 23:16–24)	282
Christ’s Call to Halt at the Threshold of the Look	284
Concupiscence—Reduction of a Perennial Call	286
Concupiscence—“Communion” of Persons Versus “Urge” of Nature	290
C. <i>“Has Committed Adultery in the Heart...”</i>	293
The “Key” Phrase.	293
A First Reading	295
A Second Reading.	297
Purity of Heart as the Fulfillment of the Commandment	299
4. <i>The “Heart”—Accused or Called?</i>	301
A. <i>Condemnation of the Body?</i>	303
Manichaeism	303
The Correct Understanding	306
Anti-Value or Value not Sufficiently Appreciated?	308
B. <i>The “Heart” Under Suspicion?</i>	309
“Masters of Suspicion”	309
Essential Divergence	312
C. <i>Eros and Ethos</i>	314
Eros as the Source of the “Erotic”	314
Ethos as an Inner Power of Eros	317
The Problem of Erotic Spontaneity.	318
5. <i>The Ethos of the Redemption of the Body</i>	321
6. <i>Purity as “Life according to the Spirit”</i>	326
“Purity” and “Heart”	326
“Body” and “Spirit” according to St. Paul	329
“Works of the Flesh” and “Fruit of the Spirit”	333
“Flesh” and “The Freedom for Which Christ Set Us Free”	337
Purity—“Keeping the Passions Away” or “Keeping the Body with Holiness and Reverence”?	340
Analysis of the Pauline “Description of the Body” (1 Cor 12:18–27).	344
Purity as a Virtue and a Gift	349
Purity and Wisdom	354

<i>7. The Gospel of Purity of Heart—Yesterday and Today</i>	355
Theology of the Body	355
Theology and Pedagogy	360
<i>Appendix: The Ethos of the Body in Art and Media</i>	364
CHAPTER THREE	
Christ Appeals to the Resurrection	379
1. <i>The Resurrection of the Body as a Reality of the “Future World”</i>	379
A. <i>The Synoptics: “He Is Not God of the Dead but of the Living”</i>	379
The Third Part of the Triptych	379
Witness to the Power of the Living God	383
The New Meaning of the Body	387
Spiritualization	389
Divinization	392
B. <i>Pauline Interpretation of the Resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15:42–49</i>	401
Final Victory over Death	401
The First Adam and the Last Adam	403
2. <i>Contenance for the Kingdom of Heaven</i>	412
A. <i>The Words of Christ in Matthew 19:11–12</i>	412
Christ’s Word and the Rule for Understanding	412
Three Kinds of “Eunuchs”—Why?	415
Contenance for the Kingdom of Heaven and “Fruitfulness from the Spirit”	419
The Expression “For the Kingdom of Heaven” Indicates Motivation	422
Contenance and Marriage—Vocation of “Historical” Man	426
Right Understanding of the “Superiority” of Contenance for the Kingdom of Heaven	428
Contenance for the Kingdom—Between Renunciation and Love.	432
The Spousal Meaning of the Body as the Foundation of Christ’s Call to Contenance	437
Renunciation in the Service of Affirmation	441

<i>B. Paul's Understanding of the Relation between Virginity and Marriage (1 Cor 7)</i>	443
Christ's Statement and the Teaching of the Apostles.	443
Paul's Argumentation	446
"Concupiscence" and "Gift from God"	453
 CONCLUSION OF PART ONE	
The Redemption of the Body	459

**PART TWO
THE SACRAMENT**

CHAPTER ONE

The Dimension of Covenant and of Grace	465
 <i>1. Ephesians 5:21–33</i>	465
<i>A. Introduction and Connection</i>	465
The Text of Ephesians 5:21–33	465
Ephesians 5:21–33 and Christ's Words	466
Ephesians 5:21–33—Two Meanings of "Body"	466
Does Ephesians 5:21–33 Speak about the Sacramentality of Marriage?	467
Sacrament and Body	468
Direction of the Following Analyses	468
<i>B. Detailed Analysis</i>	469
Ephesians 5:21–33 in the Context of Ephesians as a Whole.	469
The Mystery of Christ and the Vocation of the Christian	470
The Atmosphere of the Christian Community's Life	470
Indications for the Community of the Family	471
The Spouses: "Reciprocally Subject in the Fear of Christ"	472
Analogy and Mystery (At the Foundation of the Sacramentality of Marriage).	474
An Additional Aspect of the Analogy—Head and Body.	477
Two Subjects or One?	481
"...As Their Own Body" (Eph 5:28)	484
"This Mystery Is Great"	487

2. <i>Sacrament and Mystery</i>	491
The Mystery Hidden from Ages Revealed and Active in Christ	491
The Analogy of Spousal Love	493
Isaiah and Ephesians	497
The Reality of the Gift, The Meaning of Grace	500
Marriage as the Primordial Sacrament	503
“The Sacrament of Redemption”	507
Marriage as Figure and as Sacrament of the New Covenant	510
The Sacraments of the Church	512
3. <i>Sacrament and “Redemption of the Body”</i>	515
A. <i>The Gospel</i>	515
The Words of Christ and the Mystery of Redemption	515
The Sacrament of Redemption and the Indissolubility of Marriage	516
Sacrament—Given as Grace and Assigned as an Ethos	519
Sacrament—Call to “Life according to the Spirit”	522
Sacrament and the Eschatological Hope of the “Redemption of the Body”	523
B. <i>Ephesians</i>	525
The Spousal and Redemptive Meaning of Love	525
Redemption of the Body and “The Sacrament of Man”	527
 CHAPTER TWO	
The Dimension of Sign	531
1. “<i>Language of the Body</i>” and the Reality of the Sign	531
The Marital Promise	531
“Prophetism of the Body”	534
“Language of the Body” Reread in the Truth	538
“Language of the Body” and the Concupiscence of the Flesh	542
“Language of the Body” and “Hermeneutics of the Sacrament”	546
2. <i>The Song of Songs</i>	548
Resuming Genesis: Wonder	548
“My Sister, My Bride”	560
“A Garden Closed, A Fountain Sealed”	568
Eros or Agape?	582

3. <i>When the “Language of the Body” Becomes the Language of the Liturgy (Reflections on Tobit)</i>	592
The Marriage of Tobias and Sarah	592
Love as a Test	598
The Prayer of the New Spouses	604
When the Language of the Liturgy Becomes the “Language of the Body”	610
The Sacramental Sign—“ <i>Mysterium</i> ” and “Ethos”	613
 CHAPTER THREE	
He Gave Them the Law of Life as Their Inheritance	617
1. <i>The Ethical Problem</i>	617
The Moral Norm and the Truth of the “Language of the Body”	617
The Rightness of the Norm and Its “Practicability”	621
Responsible Parenthood	625
The Truth of the “Language of the Body” and the Evil of Contraception	630
Ethical Regulation of Fertility (The Primacy of Virtue)	633
Ethical Regulation of Fertility: Person, Nature, and Method	636
2. <i>Outline of Conjugal Spirituality</i>	639
The Power that Flows from Sacramental “Consecration”	639
Analysis of the Virtue of Continence	643
Continence between “Arousal” and “Emotion”	648
The Gift of Reverence	653
 Conclusion	659
 Bibliography	665
 Index of Words and Phrases	677
 Scripture Index	725
 Systems of Reference to TOB	731

CHAPTER THREE

Christ Appeals to the Resurrection



1. The Resurrection of the Body as a Reality of the “Future World”

A. THE SYNOPTICS: “HE IS NOT GOD OF THE DEAD BUT OF THE LIVING”

The Third Part of the Triptych

64 *General Audience of November 11, 1981* (*Insegnamenti*, 4, no. 2 [1981]: 600–603)

1. TODAY WE TAKE UP AGAIN, after a rather long pause, the meditations we have been presenting for quite a while, which we have defined as reflections on the theology of the body.

As we continue, we should go back to the words of the Gospel in which Christ appeals to the resurrection, words that have a fundamental importance for understanding marriage in the Christian sense and also “the renunciation” of conjugal life “for the kingdom of heaven.”

The complex casuistry of the Old Testament in the field of marriage moved not only the Pharisees to go to Jesus, to set before him the problem of the indissolubility of marriage (see Mt 19:3–9; Mk 10:2–12), but on another occasion the Sadducees, to ask him about

the law of so-called levirate marriage.⁶⁶ This dialogue is reported in similar ways by the Synoptics (see Mt 22:24–30; Mk 12:18–27; Lk 20:27–40). Although the three redactions are nearly identical, one nevertheless notices some differences between them that are slight but at the same time significant. A deeper analysis is required since the dialogue is reported in three versions, those of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and inasmuch as its contents have an essential meaning for the theology of the body.

Next to the two other important dialogues, namely, the one in which Christ appeals to the “beginning” (see Mt 19:3–9; Mk 10:2–12) and the other in which he appeals to man’s innermost [being] (to the “heart”) while indicating the [reductive] desire and concupiscence of the flesh as a source of sin (see Mt 5:27–32), the dialogue that we propose to analyze now is, I would say, *the third component of the triptych* of Christ’s own statements, the triptych of words that are essential and constitutive for the theology of the body. In this dialogue, Jesus appeals to the resurrection, thereby revealing a completely new dimension of the mystery of man.

2. The revelation of this dimension of the body, stupendous in its content—and yet connected with the Gospel reread as a whole and in depth—emerges in the dialogue with the Sadducees, “who say there is no resurrection” (Mt 22:23);⁶⁷ they came to Jesus to present to him an argument that—in their judgment—showed the reasonableness of

66. This law, contained in Deuteronomy 25:7–10, concerned brothers who lived under the same roof. If one of them died without leaving children, the brother of the deceased had to take the widow of his dead brother as his wife. The child born from this marriage was recognized as the son of the deceased, so that his bloodline would not become extinct and that his heredity would be preserved in the family (see Gen 38:8).

67. In the time of Christ, the Sadducees formed a distinct group within Judaism tied to the circle of the priestly aristocracy. In opposition to the oral tradition and the theology elaborated by the Pharisees, they held to the literal interpretation of the Pentateuch, which they considered the main source of Yahwist religion. Since there is no mention of life after death in the oldest biblical books, the Sadducees rejected the eschatology proclaimed by the Pharisees and affirmed that “souls die together with the body” (see Flavius Josephus, *Antiquitates Iudaicae*, 17.4.16).

The views of the Sadducees, however, are not directly known to us since all of their writings were lost after the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, when the group disappeared. The information about the Sadducees is meager: we gather it from the writings of their ideological adversaries.

their position. This argument was supposed to contradict “the hypothesis of the resurrection.” The reasoning of the Sadducees is the following: “Teacher, Moses wrote for us that if a man’s brother dies, leaving a wife but no child, the man shall marry the widow and raise up children for his brother” (Mk 12:19). Here the Sadducees appeal to the so-called levirate law (see Deut 25:5–10), and by attaching themselves to the prescription of this ancient law *they present the following case*: “There were seven brothers; the first married and, when he died, left no children; and the second married her and died, leaving no children; and the third likewise; none of the seven left children. Last of all the woman herself died. In the resurrection, when they will rise, whose wife will she be? For the seven had married her” (Mk 12:20–23).⁶⁸

3. Christ’s answer is one of the key answers of the Gospel, in which—taking purely human arguments as a point of departure and in contrast to them—he reveals another dimension of the question, one that corresponds to the wisdom and power of God himself. In a similar way, the Gospel presents the case of the tax coin with Caesar’s image and the correct relation between what is divine and what is human in the realm of power (“belonging to Caesar”) (see Mt 22:15–22). This time *Jesus answers as follows*: “Is not this the reason you are wrong, that you know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God? For when they rise from the dead, they take neither wife nor husband, but are like angels in heaven” (Mk 12:24–25). This is the fundamental reply to the “case,” that is, to the problem contained in it. Since he knew the ideas of the Sadducees and saw their real intentions, Christ immediately afterward takes up again *the problem of the possibility of the resurrection* denied by the Sadducees. “And as for the dead being raised, have you not read in the book of Moses, in the story about the bush, how God said to him, ‘I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?’ He is not God of the dead, but of the living” (Mk 12:26–27). As one can see, Christ quotes the same Moses to whom the Sadducees appealed, and he ends by saying, “You are quite wrong” (Mk 12:27).

68. By turning to Jesus with a purely theoretical “case,” the Sadducees simultaneously attack the primitive view of the Pharisees about life after the resurrection of the body; they insinuate, indeed, that faith in the resurrection of the body leads to allowing polyandry, contrary to the law of God.

4. Christ makes this concluding statement a second time. In fact, the first time he makes it at the beginning of his explanation. He says at that point, “You are wrong, because you know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God.” This is the version in Matthew (22:29). In Mark we read, “Is not this the reason you are wrong, that you know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God?” (Mk 12:24). In Luke 20:27, 36, by contrast, Christ’s corresponding answer lacks the polemical tone of “You are quite wrong.” On the other hand, he proclaims the same thing inasmuch as he introduces into the answer some elements found neither in Matthew nor in Mark: “Jesus said to them, ‘The sons of this age take wife and take husband; but those who are considered worthy of the other world and the resurrection from the dead take neither wife nor husband. Indeed they cannot die anymore, because they are equal to the angels and, being sons of the resurrection, they are sons of God’” (Lk 20:34–36). With respect to the very possibility of the resurrection, Luke—like the other two Synoptics—*appeals to Moses, that is, to the passage in Exodus 3:2–6*, which tells the story that the great legislator of the Old Covenant had heard the following words from the bush that “burned with fire, but was not consumed”: “I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob” (Ex 3:6). In the same place, when Moses asked the name of God, he heard the reply, “I am who am” (Ex 3:14).

In this way, when he speaks about the future resurrection of the body, Christ appeals to the very power of the living God. In our next meetings we will have to consider this point in more detail.

65 *General Audience of November 18, 1981* (*Insegnamenti*, 4, no. 2 [1981]: 656–61)

1. “YOU ARE WRONG, because you know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God” (Mt 22:9), Christ said to the Sadducees, who—rejecting faith in the future resurrection of the body—had presented the following case to him: “There were seven brothers among us; the first married, and died childless, leaving the widow to his brother” (according to the Mosaic Law of the “levirate”). “The second did the same, so also the third, down to the seventh. Last of all, the woman herself died. In the resurrection, then, of the seven whose wife will she be?” (Mt 22:25–28).

Christ answers the Sadducees by stating at the beginning and at the end of his answer that they are quite wrong, because they know

neither the Scriptures nor the power of God (see Mk 12:24; Mt 22:29). Since the dialogue with the Sadducees is reported in all three Synoptic Gospels, we should briefly compare the parallel texts.

Witness to the Power of the Living God

2. Although it does not refer to the bush, Matthew's version (Mt 22:24–30) agrees almost entirely with Mark's (Mk 12:18–25). Both versions contain two essential elements: (1) the statement about the future resurrection of the body; (2) the statement about the state of the bodies of risen human beings.⁶⁹ These two elements are also found in Luke 20:27–36.⁷⁰ The first element, concerning the future resurrection of the body, is joined, especially in Matthew and Mark, with the words addressed to the Sadducees that they “know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God.” This statement deserves special attention, because in it Christ points to the very basis of faith in the resurrection, to which he had appealed in answering the question posed by the Sadducees with the concrete example of the Mosaic Law of the levirate.

3. Without any doubt, the Sadducees treat the question of the resurrection as a type of theory or hypothesis that can be refuted.⁷¹

69. Although the New Testament does not know the expression “resurrection of the body” (which appears for the first time in St. Clement, 2 Clem 9:1, and in Justin, *Dial.* 80:5), but uses the expression “resurrection of the dead,” intending by it man in his integrity, it is nevertheless possible to find in many texts of the New Testament faith in the immortality of the soul and its existence also apart from the body (see, e.g., Lk 23:43; Phil 1:23–24; 2 Cor 5:6–8).

70. The text of Luke contains some new elements around which a discussion among exegetes is taking place.

71. We know that in the Judaism of that period there was no clearly formulated doctrine about the resurrection; there were only the different theories launched by the individual schools.

The Pharisees, who cultivated theological speculation, strongly developed the doctrine of the resurrection, seeing allusions to it in all the books of the Old Testament. Yet, they understood the future resurrection in an earthly and primitive way, predicting, for example, an enormous increase of crops and of fertility after the resurrection.

The Sadducees, by contrast, polemicized against this view, starting with the premise that the Pentateuch does not speak about eschatology. One must also keep in mind that in the first century, the canon of the books of the Old Testament had not yet been determined.

The case presented by the Sadducees directly attacks the Pharisaic view of the resurrection. In fact, the Sadducees held that Christ was a follower of the Pharisaic view.

Christ's answer equally corrects the views of the Pharisees and those of the Sadducees.

Jesus first shows them a mistake in their method: *they do not know the Scriptures*; and then an error of substance: they do not accept what is revealed by the Scriptures—*since they do not know the power of God*—they do not believe in the one who revealed himself to Moses in the burning bush.

It is a very significant and very precise answer. Here Christ meets men who consider themselves experts and competent interpreters of the Scriptures. Jesus responds to these men—the Sadducees—that mere literal knowledge of Scripture is not enough. Scripture is in fact and above all a means for knowing the power of the living God, who reveals himself in it, just as he revealed himself to Moses in the bush. In this revelation, he called himself “the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and of Jacob”⁷²—of those, therefore, who were the ancestors of Moses in the faith that springs from the revelation of the living God. All of them have been dead for a long time; nevertheless, Christ completes the reference to them with the statement that God “is not God of the dead, but of the living.” One can only understand this key statement, in which Christ interprets the words addressed to Moses from the burning bush, if *one admits the reality of a life that does not end with death*. Moses’ fathers in the faith, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are living persons for God (“for all live for him,” Lk 20:38) although according to human criteria they should be numbered among the dead. Correctly rereading Scripture, and particularly God’s words just quoted, means knowing and welcoming with faith the power of the Giver of life, who is not bound by the law of death, which rules over man’s earthly history.

72. This expression does *not* mean, “God *who was honored* by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,” but, “God who *took care* of the patriarchs and freed them.”

This formula returns in Exodus 3:6, 15–16, and 4:5, always in the context of the promise of the liberation of Israel: the name of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is a pledge and guarantee of this liberation.

“God of X is synonymous with help, support, and shelter for Israel.” A similar sense is found in Genesis 49:24: “God of Jacob—Shepherd and Rock of Israel, the God of your father, who will help you” (see Gen 49:24–25; see also Gen 24:27; 26:24; 28:13; 32:10; 46:3). F. Dreyfus, O.P., “L’argument scripturaire de Jésus en faveur de la résurrection des morts (Mc 12:26–27),” *Revue Biblique* 66 (1959): 218.

In Jewish exegesis at the time of Jesus, the formula, “God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,” in which all three of the names of the patriarchs are quoted, indicated *God’s relationship with the people of the covenant as a community*. See E. Ellis, “Jesus, the Sadducees and Qumran,” *New Testament Studies* 10 (1963–1964): 275.

4. It seems to be in this way that one must interpret Christ's answer given to the Sadducees about the possibility of the resurrection,⁷³ according to the version of all three Synoptics. The moment was to come when Christ would give an answer to this question by his own resurrection; meanwhile, however, he appeals to the testimony of the Old Testament by showing how to find in it the truth about immortality and resurrection. In order to find it, one must not stop at the mere sound of the words, but go up also to the power of God revealed by these words. The reference to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in that theophany granted to Moses, about which we read in Exodus 3:2–6, constitutes a testimony that the living God gives to those who live “for him,” to those who, thanks to his power, have life, even if according to the dimensions of history one would have to number them among those long dead.

5. The full meaning of this testimony, to which Jesus appeals in his dialogue with the Sadducees, could be gathered (still in the light of the Old Testament alone) in the following way. He who is—he who lives and is Life—constitutes the inexhaustible fountain of existence and of life, just as he revealed himself at the “beginning” in Genesis (see Gen 1–3). Although, due to sin, bodily death has become man's lot⁷⁴ and access to the tree of Life (this great symbol of Genesis) was denied to him (see Gen 3:22), nevertheless, *when the living God enters his covenant with man* (Abraham, the patriarchs, Moses, Israel), *he continually renews in this covenant the very reality of Life*, reveals again its prospects, and in some way opens up again the access to the tree of Life. Together with the covenant, a share in this life, whose fountain is God himself, is given to the same human beings who, as a consequence of breaking the first covenant, had lost

73. In our contemporary way of understanding this Gospel text, Jesus' reasoning concerns only immortality; if, in fact, the patriarchs are alive after their death already now, before the eschatological resurrection of the body, then Jesus' statement regards the immortality of the soul and does not speak about the resurrection of the body.

Jesus' reasoning, however, was directed toward the Sadducees who did not know the dualism of body and soul and accepted only the biblical psycho-physical unity of man, who is “body and breath of life.” And so, according to them, the soul dies together with the body. To the Sadducees, Jesus' statement that the patriarchs are alive could only signify the resurrection with the body.

74. We are not pausing here to examine the purely Old Testament understanding of death, but take into account theological anthropology as a whole.

access to the tree of Life and, in the dimensions of their earthly history, were subjected to death.

6. Christ is God's final word on this subject; in fact, the covenant established with him and through him between God and humanity opens an infinite prospect of Life: and access to the tree of Life—according to the original plan of the God of the covenant—is revealed to every man in its definitive fullness. This will be the meaning of Christ's death and resurrection; this will be the testimony of the paschal mystery. The dialogue with the Sadducees, however, takes place *in the pre-paschal phase of Christ's messianic mission*. The course of the conversation according to Matthew 22:24–30, Mark 12:19–25, and Luke 20:28–36 shows that Christ—who, particularly in the dialogues with his disciples, had spoken a number of times about the future resurrection of the Son of Man (see Mt 17:9, 23; 20:19)—does not refer to this topic in the dialogue with the Sadducees. The reasons are obvious and clear. The discussion takes place with the Sadducees, “who say there is no resurrection” (as the evangelist stresses), that is, who cast doubt on its very possibility, and at the same time consider themselves experts on the Scripture of the Old Testament and its qualified interpreters. For this reason Jesus appeals to the Old Testament and shows on its basis that “they do not know the power of God.”⁷⁵

75. This is the decisive argument, which confirms the authenticity of the discussion with the Sadducees.

If the pericope were “a *post-paschal addition by the Christian community*” (as Bultmann, for example, held), faith in the resurrection would be supported by the resurrection of Christ, which imposed itself as an irresistible force, as St. Paul, for example, makes us understand (see 1 Cor 15:12).

See J. Jeremias, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, pt. 1 (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1971); see also I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1978), 738.

The reference to the Pentateuch—while in the Old Testament there were texts that dealt directly with the resurrection (e.g., Isa 26:19 or Dan 12:2)—attests that the dialogue was truly with the Sadducees, who considered the Pentateuch the only decisive authority.

The structure of the controversy shows that this was a rabbinic discussion according to the classical models in use in the academies at that time.

Cf. J. Le Moyne, O.S.B., *Les Sadducéens* (Paris: Gabalda, 1972), 124f.; E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), 257; D. Daube, *New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: Athlone Press, 1956), 158–63; J. Rademakers, S.J., *La bonne nouvelle de Jésus selon St Marc* (Brussels: Institut d'Etudes Théologiques, 1974), 313.