The Basis of Hope in the Resurrection of the Body according to Augustine

INTRODUCTION

The resurrection of the body is the object of man's hope. In this study we attempt to show the basis of this hope, which according to Augustine, as we shall see later, is the fact of Christ's resurrection [1]).

The fact of Christ's resurrection was proved by His appearances in His physical from. He appeared to many not "in spirit but in flesh and bones" (Lk. 24,39). He ate and drank with His disciples (Acts 1,3 and Lk. 24,41-43).

However, as we know, the four narratives concerning the events surrounding the resurrection of Jesus contain many discrepancies. For this reason many modern exegetes strongly discredit the value of the resurrection narratives as accounts of historical facts. To cite one example, R.H. Fuller, in *Formation of the Resurrection Narratives* says :

> The best way to discredit a witness in court is for the cross-examiner to tie him up in knots and make his evidence appear to be such a tissue of inconsistencies that the jury becomes convinced he is untrustworthy. One does not need to be a scientific scholar to do that with the resurrection narratives [2]).

[1]) Cf. *Epistula* 102,1,2 & 3, CSEL 34(2), 545-546: the truth of the promise of resurrection to us is based on the nature of the resurrection of Christ. Being raised from the dead He will never die again; death has no longer dominion over him (Rom. 6,9). It is not based on the resurrection of Lazarus. Lazarus was raised from the dead, but He died again. See also *En in Ps.* 129,9, CCL 40,1895-1896: It is not based on the dead raised by Elijah (3 Kings 17,22), nor on the dead raised by Elisha (4 Kings 4,35), nor on the dead son of the widow of Nain raised by Christ Himself (Lk. 7,15), nor on the raised daughter of Jairus, the ruler of the synagogue (Lk. 8,55), nor on the resurrection of Lazarus (Jo. 11,39-44). All these persons were raised from the dead, but they died again. Our own resurrection at the coming of the Lord will be a resurrection to eternity like that of Jesus Christ.

[2]) See *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives*, New York, 1971, p. 2. This is directly cited by G.E. LADD in *I Believe in the Resurrection of Jesus*, London, 1977, p. 79.

On the other hand Augustine thought[3]), like some others[4]), that the narratives concerning the events of Christ's resurrection had to be harmonized. He attempted through this harmonization to demonstrate the reality of Jesus' resurrection.

But why did Augustine try to establish faith in the resurrection of Jesus? For him faith in the resurrection of Jesus is the specific faith of the Christians that distinguishes them both from the impious, from the Jews, and from the pagans: "The pagans, the impious, and the Jews, believed in the passion of Christ; however, only the Christians believed in His resurrection"[5]). For him, likewise, resurrection of our bodies will also take place. This teaching shocked the Priscillianists and the Manicheans because they denied the goodness of bodies.

I. An attempt to harmonize the resurrection narratives

There are *praenotanda* to the understanding of Augustine's attempt to harmonize the narratives:

[3]) "Omnes enim Evangelistae quattuor, neque de passione, neque de resurrectione ejus tacere potuerunt. Nam quia multa fecit Dominus Jesus, non omnes omnia conscripserunt: sed alius ista, alius illa; summa tamen concordia". *Sermo* 240,1, PL 38,1130.

[4]) Augustine followed the traditional practice of attempting to harmonize scriptural texts. We have the following examples: Tatian († 172), with his *Diatessaron* (153-170); Ammonius of Alexandria, with his Ἁρμονία (c. 220), which was lost; Eusebius of Caesaria († 340), with his *Canons*; Augustine, with his *De Consensu Evangelistarum* (400). This datum is given by M.B. Riddle in an "Introductory Essay" to Augustine's *The Harmony of the Gospels* in The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers VI, Grand Rapids, 1974, p. 68-69. For more information on harmonization see G. Bardy, "La littérature patristique des quaestiones et responsiones sur l'Écriture Sainte", in *Revue Biblique* 41 (1932) 210-236, 341-369, 515-537; 42 (1933) 211-229, 329-352.

[5]) "Passionem Christi et Pagani et impii et Judaei crediderunt: resurrectionem nonnisi Christiani". Sermo 233,1, PL 38,1112. For further references on faith in the resurrection of Christ and of the body, as the specific and the fundamental belief of Christians, see the following works: *Sermo* 216,6, PL 38,1075: "Sola haec fides est, quae christianos ab omnibus hominibus discernit et separat. Nam quia mortuus est et sepultus, et pagani modo credunt, et Judaei tunc viderunt: quia vero tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, nec Paganus nec Judaeus admittit. Discernit ergo a mortuis perfidis vitam fidei nostrae, resurrectio mortuorum. Nam et apostolus Paulus cum Timotheo scriberet: *Memento*, inquit, *Jesum Christum resurrexisse a mortuis* (II Tim. 2,8). Credamus ergo, fratres, et quod in Christo factum credimus, hoc futurum speremus in nobis. Deus enim qui promittit, non fallit". *Contra Faustum* 16,29, CSEL 25(1), 476; *Epistula* 55,2, CSEL 34(2),170; *Sermo* 234,3, PL 38,116; *Sermo Denis* 24,1, MA I,141; *Sermo* 215,6, PL 38,1075; *Sermo* 240,2, PL 38,1131; *Sermo* 241,1, PL 38,1133; *De Trinitate* 2,17,29, CCL 50,119; *En. in Ps.* 101, *Sermo* 2,7, CCL 40,1442; *En. in Ps.* 120,6 CCL 40,1791; *En. in Ps.* 138,8, CCL 40, 1996. See also H.I. Marrou, *The Resurrection and Saint Augustine's Theology of Human Values*, Villanova, 1966, p. 40-41 note 16.

1. Matthew's priority. The chronological order that Augustine gives to the composition of the gospels is as follows: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John.

> Now, those four evangelists whose names have gained the most remarkable circulation over the whole world, and whose number has been fixed as four, — it may be for the simple reason that there are four divisions of that world through the universal length of which they, by their number as by a kind of mystical sign, indicated the advancing extension of the Church of Christ, — are believed to have written in this order: first Matthew, then Mark, thirdly Luke, lastly John[6]).

Augustine gives two reasons for this order. First, as concerns the acquisition of knowledge and the commission to preach, those were first who because of their personal contacts with Jesus heard him speak and saw him act. Second, as concerns the task of composing the record of the Gospel, only Matthew and John obtained places, the former the first and the latter the last. The other two, Mark an Luke, although not among the twelve, were embraced "as sons" and put in between the first two[7]).

2. The principles on which the evangelists wrote. (i) Each evangelist kept an order of narration proper to himself. Augustine holds that, for the work of harmonization, despite the fact that each of the evangelists follows his own order of narration, it does not mean that each is ignorant of what his predecessor had done, or left out as matters about which there was no information things which another nevertheless is discovered to have recorded"; (ii) Avoiding superfluities. Each evangelist received a gift of inspiration. Since this was so, they "abstained from adding to their several labors any superfluous conjoint compositions"[8]).

[6]) "Isti igitur quattuor evangelistae universo terrarum orbe notissimi, et ob hoc fortasse quattuor, quoniam quattuor sunt partes orbis terrae, per cuius universitatem Christi ecclesiam delatari ipso sui numeri sacramento quodammodo declararunt, hoc ordine scripsisse perhibentur: primus Mattheus, deinde Marcus, tertio Lucas, ultimo Johannes". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 1,2.3, CSEL 43,3.

[7]) "Unde alius eis fuit ordo cognoscendi adque praedicandi, alius autem scribendi. Ad cognoscendum quippe adque praedicandum primi utique fuerunt qui secuti dominum in carne praesentem dicentem audierunt facientemque viderunt adque ex eius ore ad evangelizandum missi sunt. Sed in conscribendo evangelio, quod divinitus ordinatum esse credendum est, ex numero eorum, quos ante passionem dominus elegit, primum adque ultimum locum duo tenuerunt, primum Mattheus, ultimum Iohannes, ut reliqui duo, qui ex illo numero non erant, sed tamen Christum in illis loquentem secuti erant, tamquam filii amplectendi ac per hoc in loco medio constituti utroque ab eis latere munirentur". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 1,2.3, CSEL 43,3-4.

[8]) "Horum sane quattuor solus Mattheus Hebraeo scripsisse perhibetur eloquio, ceteri Graeco. Et quamvis singuli suum quendam narrandi ordinem tenuisse videantur, non

3. Augustine's reasons for attempting to harmonize the narratives of the four evangelists[9]). (i) To defend the credibility of the evangelists as narrators of truthful accounts *(veracis narrationis)*; (ii) To defend those who are on the way to faith from being dissuaded by enemies; (iii) To protect the believers from being agitated by enemies; (iv) To equip the believers with answers for their own questions, or for the purpose of refuting the objections coming from their enemies, in matters of faith; (v) To demonstrate to these enemies their errors and the rashness of their charges; (vi) To prove that the evangelists are not antagonistic towards each other.

It is important to take note of the first and the last reasons that Augustine gives. With the first reason he apparently shows that he believes in the historicity of some events in the Gospel. In connection with the resurrection and post-resurrection appearances of Jesus the historical happening is the point of departure of his proofs. With the last reason, it is clear that he is aware that the historical actuality of the events believed by the Christians depends primarily on the possible harmonization of the narratives. In fact all the other preceding reasons

tamen unusquisque eorum velut alterius praecedentis ignarus voluisse scribere repperitur vel ignorata praetermisse, quae scripsisse alius invenitur, sed sicut unicuique inspiratum est non superfluam cooperationem sui laboris adiunxit. Nam Mattheus suscepisse intellegitur incarnationem domini secundum stirpem regiam et pleraque secundum hominum praesentem vitam facta et dicta eius. Marcus eum subsecutus tamquam pedisequus et sequus et breviator eius videtur. Cum solo quippe Iohanne nihil dixit, solus ipse perpauca, cum solo Luca pauciora, cum Mattheo vero plurima et multa paene totidem adque ipsis verbis sive cum solo sive cum ceteris consonante. Lucas autem circa sacerdotalem domini stirpem adque personam magis occupatus apparet. Nam et ad ipsum David non regium stemma secutus ascendit, sed per eos, qui reges non fuerunt, exit ad Nathan filium David, qui nec ipse rex fuit. Non sicut Mattheus, qui per Salomonem regem descendens ceteros etiam reges ex ordine persecutus est servans in eis, de quo postea lonquemur, mysticum numerum". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 1,2.4, CSEL 43,4.

[9]) "Has domini sanctas quadrigas, quibus per orbem vectus subigit populos leni suo iugo et sarcinae levi, quidam impia vanitate vel imperita temeritate calumniis appetunt, ut eis veracis narrationis derogent fidem, per quos christiana religio disseminata per mundum tanta fertilitate provenit, ut homines infideles iam inter se ipsos calumnias suas mussitare vix audeant conpressi fide gentium et omnium devotione populorum. Verum tamen, quia nonnullos adhuc calumniosis disputationibus suis vel retardant a fide, ne credant, vel iam credentes, quantum potuerint, exagitando perturbant, nonnulli autem fratres salva fide nosse desiderant, quid talibus respondeant quaestionibus, vel ad provectum scientiae vel ad illorum vaniloquia refellenda, inspirante adque adiuvante domino deo nostro — quod utinam et ipsorum saluti prosit — hoc opere demonstrare suscepimus errorem, qui contra evangelii quattuor libros, quos evangelistae quattuor singulos conscripserunt, satis argutas criminationes se proferre arbitrantur. Quod ut fiat, quam non sibi adversentur idem scriptores quattuor, ostendendum est. Hoc enim solent quasi palmare suae vanitatis obicere, quod ipsi evangelistae inter se ipsos dissentiant". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 1,7.10, CSEL 43,10-11.

are given to add weight to this last reason. For the main objection of the adversaries, namely, the heathens and the Manicheans, is that the evangelists are not in harmony[10]).

A. *Some salient "apparent" discrepancies in the resurrection narratives harmonized by Augustine*[11])

Matthew	*Mark*	*Luke*	*John*
Evening of the sabbath toward the first day of the week	Very early in the morning at the rising of the sun	Very early in the morning	Early when it was yet dark
An angel sitting outside the tomb on a stone which had been rolled away	A young man sitting on the right side	Two men stood by them	Two angels sitting where the body of Jesus has lain
The women with fear and joy ran to tell the news to the disciples	The women were overcome by trembling and fear and told no one		

B. *Harmony of the narratives on the exact hour at which the women came to the sepulcher*[12])

Matthew narrates that the time was "on the evening of the sabbath towards the dawn of the first day of the week" *(vespere autem sabbati, quae lucescit in primam sabbati)* (Mt. 28,1). Mark says, "very early in the morning, the first day of the week ... at the rising of the sun" *(valde mane una sabbatorum ... oriente iam sole)* (Mk. 16.2). Luke, however, says,

[10]) *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 1,7.10, CSEL 43,11.

[11]) We shall give only some of the themes. The verses in the four Gospels that narrate such themes may be considered "apparent" discrepancies. We use the word "apparent" because, in Augustine's observation, they appear to be in discord. However, for Augustine they could be harmonized. In fact, in connection with the resurrection narratives, Augustine discussed only a few verses which were "apparently" at variance. But he discussed problematic verses either because the expressions used by the evangelists are vague or the words used seem not to tally with facts. We have chosen only three themes which he harmonized, and the rest of the pertinent themes are discussed under the subtitle, "Other problematic aspects of the resurrection narrative".

[12]) The theme discussed by Augustine in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24. 65, CSEL 43,354.

"very early in the morning" *(valde diluculo)* (Lk. 24.1), while John, "early when it was yet dark" *(mane cum adhuc tenebrae essent)* (Jo. 20.1).

According to Augustine there is no discrepancy between the four narrations. Mark is in accord with Luke and John. The description of Luke, that is, "very early in the morning" and that of John, "early when it was yet dark", refer exactly to the same period described by Mark, "very early in the morning, the first day of the week ... at the rising of the sun". This period described by Mark is that when the heavens begin to brighten in the east, and that takes place when sunrise is at hand. The brightness that is diffused by the rising of the sun is commonly called dawn *(aurorae)*. Mark's description, "at the rising of the sun", by which, according to Augustine, he meant the time when the "heavens begin to brighten in the east", is not at variance with the description of John, "when it was yet dark". Augustine explains that at day-breaks, "what remains of the darkness of the night passes away just in proportion as the sun continues to rise"[13]). Nor is Mark's description at variance with that of Luke, "very early in the morning". Augustine points to the distinction between "very early in the morning" and "early in the morning". The former, "very early in the morning" *(valde mane)*, as described by Luke, does not mean that the sun was actually seen blazing over the land, which could have been the case had Luke said "early in the morning". But, as Augustine points out, Luke did not use this description[14]). Luke's description then, "very early in the morning" is in accord with John's, "early, when it was yet dark"[15]). Nor is Matthew's description at variance with that of Luke. However, his expression may pose a difficulty, for he said that the event occurred "on the *evening* of the Sabbath, towards the dawn of the first day of the week" and not "in the *early morning*" nor "in the *morning*". The difficulty arises when we take "evening" in its technical meaning. Augustine explains that what Matthew referred to as the "evening", which is, according to common usage, the first part of the night *(prima pars noctis)*, is actually its close. For the particular part of the night was the period when women were legally allowed to bring spices to the tomb, because it was only since then

[13]) "Die quippe surgente aliquae reliquiae tenebrarum tanto magis extenuantur, quanto magis lux oritur". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.65, CSEL 43,354.

[14]) *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3.65, CSEL 43,354.

[15]) *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3.65, CSEL 43,355.

that the Sabbath was over. It was forbidden to do so during the Sabbath. Therefore, the description "in the evening of the Sabbath" meant the night which followed the day of Sabbath *(nocte sabbati, id est nocte, quae sequitur diem sabbati)*. The evening spoken of could not refer only to the first space of the night *(tantum modo particulam noctis primam)* nor only to the beginning of the night *(solum initium noctis)*. For as it was said by Matthew, it was in the evening when the dawn of the first day of the week was beginning. Accordingly it was not only the beginning of the night, but the night itself *(ipsa nox)*, as it came to a close at the advance of the light. "For the *terminus* of the first part of the night is just the beginning of the second part, but the *terminus* of the whole night is the light". Augustine's explanation is based on the familiar method of expression frequently used in the Holy Scripture: the whole is expressed under the part[16]).

C. *Harmony of the narratives on the number of the angels seen and on their location*[17])

There seems to be a discrepancy between the version of Matthew and that of Mark regarding the location of the angel seen by the women. While Matthew narrates that the angel was sitting upon a stone which already had been rolled away, "For the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door and sat upon it" (Mt. 28.2). Mark, on the other hand, narrates that the angel was seen inside the tomb sitting on the right: "And entering the tomb, they saw a young man[18]) sitting on the right side dressed in a white robe" (Mark 16.5). Augustine tries to harmonize the two versions.

> But the explanation may be that Matthew said nothing about the angel whom they saw when they entered into the graveyard, and that Mark has said nothing about the one whom they saw sitting outside upon the stone. In this way they would have seen two angels and have got two separate angelic reports relating to Jesus, namely, the first one from the angel whom they saw sitting upon the stone

[16]) "Et usitatus loquendi modus est divinae scripturae a parte totum". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.65, CSEL 43,356.

[17]) The theme is discussed in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.67,68, CSEL 43,358-360.

[18]) Augustine identifies "angelus" with "vir" or "angeli" with "viri". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.67,68, CSEL 43,358-360.

outside, and the other from the angel whom they saw sitting on the right when they entered the sepulcher[19]).

There is another possible way of harmonizing the two versions, as Augustine shows. The angel seen by the women which the two evangelists were speaking of was one and the same. The angel which, in the version of Mark, was seen sitting on the right, is the very same angel which, in the version of Matthew, was seen sitting on the stone outside. Augustine demonstrated his theory this way, that is, if the first explanation does not appear convincing:

> Or if this explanation is not satisfactory, we ought certainly to accept the theory that, as they entered into the graveyard, they came within a section of the walled ground where, it is reasonable to suppose, a certain space had been by that time securely enclosed, a little distance in front of the rock which had been cut out in order to construct the place of burial; so that, according to this view, what they really saw was the one angel sitting on the right in the space thus referred to, which same angel Matthew also represents as having been sitting on the stone which he had rolled away from the mouth of the tomb when the earthquake took place, that is to say, from the place which had been dug out in the rock for a sepulcher[20]).

Of the two possible explanations, Augustine holds the second to be his definite position. In *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,69 he confirms this position. The stone which had been rolled away from the sepulcher was in the same area as the sepulcher itself. The angel seen by the women was one and the same.

> "For as yet they did not know the Scripture, that He must rise again from the dead. Then the disciples went away again to their own home. But Mary stood outside the sepulcher weeping", (Jo. 20,9-11), that is to say, before the place in the rock in which the

[19]) "Nisi intellegamus aut Mattheum tacuisse de illo angelo, quem intrantes viderunt, Marcum vero de illo tacuisse, quem foris viderunt sedentem super lapidem, ut duos viderint et a duobus singillatim audierint quae dixerunt angeli de Iesu, prius ab illo quem foris viderunt sedentem super lapidem, deinde ab illo quem viderunt in monumentum sedentem a dextris ...". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.63, CSEL 43,352-353.

[20]) "Aut certe intrantes in monumentum in aliqua saepta maceriae debemus accipere, quae communitum locum tunc fuisse credibile est in aliquo spatio ante petram, qua excisa locus factus fuerat sepulturae, ut ipsum viderint in eodem spatio sedentem a dextris, quem dicit Mattheus sedentem super lapidem, quem terrae motu ab ostio monumenti revolverat, id est a loco sepulchri, quod effosum erat in petra". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.63, CSEL 43,353.

> sepulcher was constructed, but at the same time within that space into which they had now entered; for there was a garden there, as the same John mentions. Then they saw the angel sitting on the right on the stone which was rolled away from the sepulcher; of which angel both Matthew and Mark discourse[21]).

What, then, about the versions of Luke and John which mention two angels instead of one? Augustine does not relate the versions of Matthew and Mark which recount the presence of only one angel with those of Luke and John. It may, therefore, be concluded that for Augustine the one angel in the versions of Matthew and Mark is not to be identified with either of the two angels in the versions of Luke and John. That one angel is not clearly identified in the works of Augustine.

However, Augustine identifies the two angels in Luke with the two angels in John. Referring to John, he said, "In the report of two angels who were seen, he is also at one with Luke"[22]). These two angels, which in the narrative of John were seen sitting, one at the head and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain, were the same angels which in the version of Luke were seen standing and which addressed to women, as they were afraid and bowed down their faces to the ground. Augustine, however, explains that the change in the position of the angels may be due to the fact that while John took note of the prior vision by Mary, Luke took note of the later vision.

> At these words, Mary, still weeping, bent down and looked into the sepulcher, "and saw two angels", who are introduced to us in John's narrative, "sitting in white raiment, one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus was laid. And they say to her, 'Woman, why do you weep'? She answers them, 'Because they have taken away my Lord, and I do not know where they have laid him'. Here we are to suppose the angels to have risen up, so that they could be seen standing, as Luke states they were seen, and then according to the narrative of the same Luke, to have addressed the women, as they were afraid and bowed down their faces to the

[21]) "Nondum enim sciebat scripturam, quia oportebat eum a mortuis resurgere. Abierunt ergo iterum ad semet ipsos discipuli. Maria autem stabat foris ad monumentum plorans, id est ante illum saxei sepulchri locum, sed tamen intra illud spatium, quod iam ingressae fuerant; hortus quippe illic erat, sicut idem Iohannes commemorat. Tunc viderunt angelum sedentem a dextris super lapidem revolutum a monumento, de quo angelo narrant Mattheus et Marcus". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.69, CSEL 43,362-363.

[22]) "Illud etiam, quod duo angeli visi sunt, concordat cum Luca". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.68, CSEL 43,361.

> earth: Why do you seek the living among the dead? He is not here, but has risen. Remember how He spoke to you when He was yet in Galilee, saying, the Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise. And they remembered His words" (Lk. 24,5-8)[23]).

It may be proper at this stage to consider the thought behind Augustine's harmonization of Luke's and John's narratives on Mary's vision of the angels. In *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,69, he says that the moment of the address of the angels to Mary, which is narrated in Lk. 24,5-8, is followed immediately by the moment when, according to the narration of John 20,13-18, Mary turned around and saw Jesus standing. At first she did not recognize him, but finally she did. This recognition process was later expounded by Augustine in *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 121,1.2. His starting point is his conception of "angels". He adopted the Greek conception. What are said to be angels by the Greeks are called newsbearers (*nuntii*) in Latin. What, therefore, did those two angels who sat, one at the head and the other at the feet where Jesus was laid, signify? According to Augustine, they were positioned in such a manner because they "signified that the gospel of Christ was to be preached from head to foot, from the beginning even to the end". In the context of the whole particular *Tractatus* 121, the head-through-the-foot of the Gospel stretches through the whole life history of the God-man Jesus, and, therefore, tends toward and climaxes in his resurrection. That the resurrection of Jesus is the news which the angels intended to announce is hinted at, according to the interpretation by Augustine, by John 20,13: "Why do you weep"? For Augustine, insofar as the angels are newsbearers, they were not asking Mary a question. They were instead telling her, "Do not weep"[24]).

[23]) "Ad haec verba Maria dum fleret, inclinavit se et prospexit in monumentum *et vidit duos angelos*, sicut dicit, Iohannes, *in albis sedentes unum ad caput et unum ad pedes, ubi positum fuerat corpus Iesu. dicunt ei illi: mulier, quid ploras? Dicit eis: quia tulerunt dominum meum et nescio, ubi posuerunt eum.* Hic intellegendi sunt surrexisse angeli, ut etiam stantes viderentur, sicut eos Lucas visos fuisse commemorat, et dixisse secundum eundem Lucam timentibus mulieribus et vultum in terram declinantibus: *quid quaeritis viventem cum mortuis? Non est hic, sed surrexit. Recordamini, qualiter locutus est vobis, cum adhuc in Galilaea esset, dicens: quia oportet filium hominis tradi in manus hominum peccatorum et crucifigi et die tertia resurgere, Et recordatae sunt verborum eius". De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.59, CSEL 43,363-364.

[24]) "Angeli lacrymas prohibebant; ubi quid aliud quam futurum quodammodo gaudium nuntiabant? Ita enim dixerunt: *Quid ploras?* ac si dicerent: Noli plorare. At illa eos putans interrogasse nescientes, causas prodit lacrymarum". *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 121,1, CCL 36,665.

With these words the angels were conveying the message of joy, because of the fact that Jesus had risen. In Mary this joy succeeded her sorrow, which overcame her, because at the disappearance of the body of Jesus she did not know where to go to mitigate her grief. It is with this conception that, we believe, Augustine saw the possibility of connecting John 20, 13-18 directly with Luke 5-8, as we pointed out above. In John 20,13-18, Mary finally recognized that the gardener with whom she was talking was Jesus himself. Therefore, it is the thought that the angels conveyed the message of Jesus' resurrection to Mary which was behind Augustine's harmonization of John 20,13-18 and Luke 24,5-8. For Augustine admitted that it could have been "divine impulse" that led Mary to look again into the sepulcher when she saw the two angels.

> What then does it mean, that, as she wept, she stooped down, and looked again into the sepulchre? Was it because her grief was excessive that she hardly thought she could believe either their eyes or her own? Or was it rather by some divine impulse that her mind led her to look within[25])?

D. *The harmony of Mark 16,8 and Matthew 28,8*

Mark 16,8 reads: "And they went out and fled from the tomb; for trembling and astonishment had come upon them; and they said nothing to any one, for they were afraid". Matthew 28,8 reads: "So they departed quickly from the tomb with fear and great joy, and ran to tell his disciples".

Augustine observes that Mark took note of the experience of fear of the women upon receiving the message from the angels; Matthew, however, took note of the experience of joy. Despite the apparent discrepancy between the two evangelists' observations, Augustine thinks that the accounts can be reconciled. He supposes that both feelings were experienced by the women. Their feeling of fear may be explained in that they did "not have enough courage to say something to either of the angels, that is to say, to reply to what they had heard from them, or else they certainly did not dare to speak to the guards whom they saw lying there"[26]). Their feeling of joy, however, is not explained by Augustine.

[25]) "Quid sibi ergo vult quod ista cum fleret, rursum in monumentum inclinata prospexit? Utrum quod nimium dolebat, nec suis nec illorum oculis facile putabat esse credendum? An potius divino instinctu in animo eius effectum est ut prospiceret". *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 121,1, CCL 36,664.

[26]) "Nisi intellegamus ipsorum angelorum nemini ausas fuisse aliquid dicere, id est respondere ad ea quae ab illis audierant aut certe custodibus, quos iacentes viderunt". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.64, CSEL 43,353.

He implies that this was caused by the news that Jesus has risen. Matthew relates that both feelings possessed them.

> Indeed we must suppose that both feelings had possession of their hearts, even though Matthew himself had said nothing about the fear. But now, when this evangelist says, "They departed quickly from the sepulcher with fear and great joy, "he allows nothing to remain which can occasion any question of difficulty on this subject[27]).

We may, however, question Augustine's consistency in his analysis of Matthew 28,8. Why, when referring to one and the same verse, does he say that "both feelings had possession of their minds, *even though Matthew himself had said nothing about the fear"?* In the verse it is clear that both feelings were experienced by women, but it is apparently not true that "Matthew had said nothing about the fear". Augustine does not give any elaborate explanation of this particular verse.

E. *Other problematic aspects of the resurrection narratives*

1. *The problem of the "three days"*[28])

It is narrated that Jesus rose from the dead three days after His death. Jesus Himself foretold this space of time, as Augustine points out: "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Mt. 12,40). The problem arises from interpreting "three days" as three complete days with their corresponding nights. Augustine formulates the problem as follows:

> For the night connected with the coming sabbath follows, and if we compute it along with its day, there will then already be two days and two nights. But, further, after the sabbath there comes the night connected with the first day of the week, that is to say, with the dawning of the Lord's day, which was the time when the Lord arose. Consequently, the result to which this mode of calculation leads us will be just two days and two nights, and one night, even if supposing it possible to take the last as a complete night, and in the

[27]) "Debuimus enim utrumque in illarum animo factum intellegere, etiamsi ipse Mattheus de timore non diceret; cum vero et ipse dicat; *et exierunt cito de monumento cum timore et gaudio magno*, nihil ex hac re quaestionis remanere permittit". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.64, CSEL 43,353.

[28]) The theme is discussed in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.66, CSEL 43,356.

supposition that we were not able to show that the said dawn was in reality the ultimate portion of the same. Thus it would appear that, even though we were to compute these six hours of the day of crucifixion during three of which the sun was darkened, and during the other three of which it shone forth again, the counting of three days and three nights will not hold good[29]).

Augustine resolves the problem by appealing to the principle of computation usually used in the Scripture: the part is counted for the whole. Therefore, counting the day of preparation, during which Jesus was crucified and buried, as one day, plus the day of sabbath as another day, and the dawn at which He rose as another day, we reach the sum of the space of three days[30]).

2. *The problem of the priority of the Lord's appearance to Peter to the other appearances to the male disciples*[31])

There is no problem as regards the priority of Peter in the narratives of the evangelists. The problems, however, may arise, Augustine observes, if we consider the order given by Paul in 1 Cor. 15,5-8: "He

[29]) "Sequitur enim nox futuri sabbati, qua cum suo die conputata erunt iam duae noctes et duo dies; porro autem post sabbatum sequitur nox primae sabbati, id est inlucescentis diei dominici, in qua tunc dominus resurrexit; erunt ergo duae noctes et duo dies et una nox, etiamsi tota posset intellegi, nec ostenderemus, quod illud diluculum pars eius extrema sit; quapropter nec adnumeratis illis sex horis, quarum tribus sol contenebratus est et tribus eluxit, constabit ratio trium dierum et trium noctium". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.66, CSEL 43,357.

[30]) "Restat ergo, ut illo scripturarum usitatissimo loquendi modo, quo a parte totum intellegitur, inveniamus extremum diem tempus parasceves, quo crucifixus et sepultus est dominus, et ex ipsa extrema parte totum diem cum sua nocte, qui iam peractus fuerat, accipiamus, medium vero, id est sabbati diem, non a parte, sed integre totum, tertium rursus a parte sua prima, id est a nocte totum cum suo diurno tempore, ac sic erit triduum". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.66, CSEL 43,357-358.
See also *De Trinitate* 4,6.10, CCL 50,173: "Ipsum autem *triduum* non totum et plenum fuisse scriptura testis est; sed primus dies a parte extrema totus annumeratus est; dies vero tertius a parte prima et ipse totus; medius autem inter eos, id est secundus dies, absolute totus viginti quattuor horis suis, duodecim nocturnis et duodecim diurnis. Crucifixus est enim primo iudaeorum vocibus *hora tertia* cum esset dies sexta sabbati; deinde in ipsa cruce suspensus *hora sexta* et spiritum tradidit *hora nona*; sepultus est autem *cum iam sero factum esset* (Mk. 15,42.46) sicut sese habent verba evangelii, quod intellegitur in fine diei. Undelibet ergo incipias etiam si alia ratio reddi potest quomodo non sit contra evangelium Iohannis ut hora tertia ligno suspensus intellegatur, totum diem primum non comprehendis. Ergo a parte extrema totus computabitur sicut tertius a parte prima. Nox enim usque ad diluculum quo domini resurrectio declarata est ad tertium pertinet diem *quia deus qui dixit de tenebris lumen clarescere* (2 Cor. 4,6) ut per gratiam novi testamenti et participationem resurrectionis Christi audiremus ...".

[31]) The theme is discussed in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.71, CSEL 43,370-371.

appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve. Then he appeared to more than five hundred brethren at one time, most of whom are still alive, though some have fallen asleep. Then he appeared to James, then to all the apostles. Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me". In verse 5, Augustine analyzes, Paul does not say, "He appeared first to Cephas"; but "He appeared to Cephas". Augustine pays attention to the absence of the word "first", in the statement of Paul; thus, he admits the possibility that the priority of the appearance to Peter could neither be held as certain nor be easily denied:

> Now, in the entire number of men, Peter is understood to be the one to whom Christ showed Himself first. At least, this holds good so far as regards all the individuals who are actually mentioned by the four evangelists, and by the apostle Paul. But, at the same time, who would be bold enough either to affirm or to deny that He may have appeared to someone among them before He showed Himself to Peter, although all these writers pass over the matter in silence[32])?

We see here Augustine's position regarding the impossibility of determining whether Christ appeared to Peter first among the apostles. This incertitude caused the impreciseness of Paul, as the bishop of Hippo anticipates in his interpretation of John 21,25: "But there are also many other things which Jesus did; were every one of them to be written, I suppose that the world itself could not contain the books that would be written". Augustine applies this verse to the appearances of Jesus after His resurrection, but, as he says, "all is not recorded, as John plainly declares"[33]). Augustine's position could be said to be ambiguous. In *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,85, he explains that Paul did not say "He appeared *first* to Cephas" because "this would be inconsistent with the fact that it is recorded in the Gospel that He appeared first to the women"[34]). Here we can see that Augustine, besides being unaware of the priority of Paul's composition of the Letter to the Corinthians, as modern exegetes like G.E. Ladd[35]) hold, is also inconsistent in his

[32]) "Omnium ergo virorum primo apparuisse intellegitur Petro, ex his dumtaxat omnibus quos evangelistae quattuor et Paulus apostolus commemoraverunt. Ceterum si apparuit alicui eorum prius quam Petro, quod omnes tacuerunt, quis vel dicere audeat vel negare?". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.71, CSEL 43,370.

[33]) "Sed non omnia scripta sunt, sicut Iohannes fatetur". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.84, CSEL 43,389.

[34]) "Non dixit primo apparuit Cephae, nam esset contrarium quod primo mulieribus apparuisse in evangelio legitur". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.85, CSEL 43,391.

[35]) G.E. Ladd writes: "Paul reserves for us the earliest tradition of the resurrection appearances of Jesus. We have mentioned that the Gospels were written at least a

analysis of 1 Cor. 15,5 with respect to the order of the post-resurrection appearances. Earlier, in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,71, in trying to establish which appearance was first among the appearances made only to the male disciples, he presents 1 Cor. 15,5 in order to pose a possible problem; later in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,85, he no longer considers the same statement of Paul as presenting a possible problem. Moreover, in this later paragraph, he reckons also with the appearances to the women. This inconsistency in Augustine makes us incline to conclude that his position was ambiguous. And this ambiguity is further shown in his attempt to identify the "Twelve" in the order given by Paul.

3. *The problem of the identity of "the Twelve"*[36])

Who were the twelve whom Paul referred to? Augustine gives several possibilities: (i) some unknown twelve belonging to the multitude of the disciples. The reason for this possibility is that at that time the apostles were no longer twelve but eleven; Judas had already disappeared. Some codices, Augustine points out, designated the group as "The Eleven". (ii) Another group of twelve disciples *(sive alios quosdum duodecim discipulos)*. (iii) The consecrated number twelve designating the group of the apostles, even though then their number had already been reduced to eleven. For this latter possibility, Augustine reasons that the number twelve had a mystical importance, so much so that to keep its spiritual symbol only one was elected, Matthias, in order to fill in the place vacated by Judas.

Augustine does not give preference to any of the three possibilities. He is not concerned with which view is to be adopted. But he is engrossed in defending the veracity of the narrators, even when he does not succeed in solving the problem:

> But whichever of these several views may be adopted, nothing necessarily results which can appear to be inconsistent with truth, or at variance with any most truthful narrator of these events[37]).

generation after the events they record, and the tradition of these events was preserved in oral form before it was written down by the evangelists. Paul gives us an earlier tradition. Writing to the Corinthians about A. D. 55 or 56, Paul says ..." : *I Believe in the Resurrection of Jesus*, p. 104.

[36]) The theme is discussed in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.71, CSEL 43,370-371.

[37]) "Quodlibet ergo eorum sit, nihil inde existit quod veritati vel istorum alicui veracissimo narratori repugnare videatur". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.71, CSEL 43,371.

What is Augustine's conception of a most truthful narrator *(veracissimus narrator)?* Does he refer to an inspired narrator as he conceived of the evangelists in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 1,4, or does he refer to a narrator who, as in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 1,3, was in actual personal contact with Jesus and heard him speak and saw him act, and therefore could only narrate "veracious accounts" *(verax narratio)* of historical events which he personally witnessed? Augustine does not give a clear answer to this question.

Although Paul put the appearance to the twelve second in order, Augustine is inclined to put the appearance to the two disciples immediately after that made to Peter.

4. *The appearance to the two*

In the order given by Paul the appearance to the twelve comes immediately after the appearance to Peter. This is at variance with the order given in Luke 24,13-14: "That very day two of them were going to a village named Emmaus, about seven miles from Jerusalem and talking with each other about all these things that had happened" and in Mark 16,12-13: "After this he appeared in another form to two of them, as they were walking into the country. And they went back and told the rest, but they did not believe them". According to these two evangelists, the appearance to the two came before the appearance to the twelve. And Augustine holds that this supposition made by the two evangelists is more probable than that by Paul:

> Still, it remains the probable supposition, that, after He appeared to Peter, He appeared next to those two, one of whom was Cleophas, and regarding that appearance Luke presents us with a complete narrative, while Mark gives us only a brief notice[38]).

5. *The problem posed by Mark 16,14*

Mark 16,14 runs thus: "Lastly[39]), he appeared to the eleven as they sat ay table". The problem arises from taking the implication of the word, "lastly". The use of this word, at least in the judgment of

[38]) "Probabiliter tamen creditur, posteaquam Petro apparuit, deinde apparuisse istis duobus, quorum erat unus Cleopas, de quibus Lucas totum narrat, Marcus autem breviter ita perstringit ...". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.71. CSEL 43,371.

[39]) Augustine used the Latin translation "novissime" which is translated into English as "lastly", The Greek word ὑστερον is translated into English as "afterwards".

Augustine, makes it appear that the appearance to the eleven was the last appearance of Jesus. But this was not the case. There were other appearances after that. Besides, the last time the disciples really saw the Lord was during the time of his ascension. Why then did Mark use the word "lastly"? Augustine answers that "lastly" has been employed "because the incident was the last one that took place on the same day" of the resurrection of Jesus. Besides, as Augustine thinks, it was Mark's style to be concise *(more suo breviter commemorare voluisse)*. It is important to note that Augustine is unaware of the originality of Mark and of his priority to the other evangelists. Augustine considers Mark as the follower and the abbreviator of Matthew *(Marcus eum subsecutus tamquam pedisequus et breviator eius videtur)*[40]).

To resolve the problem on the order of the appearances of Jesus after his resurrection, Augustine gives us his own order, as a result of his harmonization:[41])

1) To the women near the sepulcher (Jn. 20, 14-18; Mk. 16,9-11).

2) To the same women as they were returning from the sepulcher (Mt. 28,9-10; Lk. 24,9-11).

3) To Peter (Lk. 24,34).

4) To the two going to the country (Lk. 24,15).

5) To the many in Jerusalem when Thomas was absent (Jn. 20,19-24; Lk. 24,15-33).

6) On the occasion when Thomas saw Him (Jn. 20,26-29).

7) By the Sea of Tiberias (Jn. 21,1).

8) On the mountain of Galilee according to Matthew (Mt. 28,16-17).

9) At the time to which Mark refers in his statement "lastly" (Mk. 16,14).

10) As Jesus ascended into heaven (Mk. 16,19; Lk. 24,50-51; Acts 1,4).

6. *Unrecorded appearances*

Augustine contends that not all the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus were recorded. His biblical proof is John 21,25 : "But there are also many other things Jesus did; were every one of them written, I suppose that the world itself could not contain the books that would be

[40]) *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 1,2.4, CSEL 43,4.

[41]) The order of the ten distinct appearances given by Augustine as a result of his harmonization of the four evangelists is found in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.83, CSEL 43,388-389.

written". He claims that Jesus had frequent dealings *(crebra conversatio)* with his disciples during the forty days which preceded his ascension[42]). And during those forty days, as Augustine puts it, Jesus appeared "as many times as he wished, to whomever he wished, and in whichever way he wished" *(quotiens voluit, quibus voluit, quemadmodum voluit)*[43]).

7. *The problem of the location of the first appearance to the disciples: Jerusalem or Galilee*[44])

Matthew 28,5-7 and Mark 16,6-7, give the impression that after His resurrection Jesus was not to show Himself to His disciples except in Galilee.

> But the angel said to the woman, "Do not be afraid, for I know that you seek Jesus who was crucified. He is not here, for He has risen, as He said. Come, see the place where He lay. Then go quickly and tell his disciples that he has risen from the dead, and behold He is going before you to Galilee; there you will see Him. See, I have told you" (Mt. 28,5-7).

Mark's version is similar:

> And he said to them, "Do not be amazed; you seek Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified. He has risen, he is not here; see the place where they have laid Him. But, go, tell His disciples and Peter that he is going before you to Galilee; there you will see Him, as He told you" (Mk. 16,6-7).

Seemingly Matthew's version in verses 16 and 17 gives the priority to Galilee, since it mentions the fact that the disciples went to Galilee and actually saw Jesus and worshipped Him:

> Now, the eleven disciples went to Galilee, to the mountain to which Jesus had directed them. And when they saw Him they worshipped Him; but some doubted (Mt. 28,16-17).

John, however, ranks the appearance to the disciples in Jerusalem as the first, without counting the appearance which was made to Mary and the other women, although only Mary's name was mentioned, since she

[42]) "Crebra enim erat eius cum illis conversatio per dies quadraginta, priusquam ascendisset in coelum". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.84, CSEL 43,389-390.

[43]) *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.84, CSEL 43,390.

[44]) The theme is discussed in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.79, CSEL 43,382-384.

was more ardent in love for Jesus[45]). The appearance in Galilee by the Sea of Tiberias was the third in order[46]).

It is with the testimony of John that Augustine agrees. However, he justifies his agreement with him by using proofs given in a disorderly manner. Besides being repetitious Augustine does not marshall his arguments clearly. The task of ordering his arguments falls upon our shoulders. First, Augustine takes up the text of Mark. He notes that Mark did not even record at all the appearance in Galilee, whereas he recorded the other appearances, namely, first, to Mary Magdalene (Mk. 16,9)[47]), then to the two disciples (Mk. 16,12)[48]), and then while the disciples were at table, which occasion Mark called in his own fashion the "last" (Mk. 16,14)[49]), and finally to the disciples when He was ascending to heaven (Mk. 16,19). Luke (24,33) and John (20,19) agree in testifying that the appearance to the two (Mk. 16,12) took place in Jerusalem on the very same day as the Lord's resurrection[50]).

Then Augustine takes up the version of Matthew. He observes that while Mark, on the one hand, did not relate the actual appearance in Galilee as announced beforehand by the angel, Matthew, on the other hand, "confines his statement to a single occurrence, and refers to no other locality whatsoever, whether earlier or later, where the disciples saw the Lord after He has risen, except in Galilee according to the angel's prediction"[51]).

But in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,80, Augustine gives valid reasons for his insistence on the priority of the appearance in Jerusalem. First, he argues that the testimonies of Luke and John are clear enough *(satis dilucide manifestantes)* in showing that the appearance on the very

[45]) "Maria Magdalena sine dubio ceteris mulieribus, quae domino ministraverant, plurimum dilectione ferventior, ut non inmerito Iohannes solam commemoraret tacitis eis quae cum illa fuerunt, sicut alii testantur". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.69. CSEL 43,362.

[46]) "Iam nunc quaerendum est, quando primum visus sit a discipulis in Galilaea, quia et hoc quod tertio narrat Iohannes in Galilaea factum est ad mare Tiberiades". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.79, CSEL 43,382.

[47]) *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.79, CSEL 43,383.

[48]) *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.79, CSEL 43,383.

[49]) *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.79, CSEL 43,383.

[50]) "Sicut Lucas et Iohannes coattestantur, in Hierusalem eodem ipso die resurrectionis iam noctis initio ...". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.79, CSEL 43,383.

[51]) "Mattheus vero nihil aliud dicit nec ullum alium locum omnino commemorat vel ante vel postea, ubi discipuli, posteaquam resurrexit, viderint dominum nisi in Galilaea secundum angeli predictionem". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.79, CSEL 43,383.

same day as the resurrection took place in Jerusalem, which is far enough from Galilee for it to have been impossible for Jesus to be seen by those disciples in these two places in one day[52]). Second, although Mark mentioned the announcement by the angel in the same way that Luke and John did, he nowhere mentioned the actual fulfillment of that appearance in Galilee on the very day of the resurrection[53]). Third, the angel, Augustine observes, did not say, "He goes before you to Galilee, there you will see him *first" (primum)* or "you will see Him only there" *(ibi tantum)*, or "you will see Him nowhere else but there" *(nonnisi ibi)*[54]). Fourth, Matthew did not mention the precise time *(nec expressum est)*:

> When, however, it was said, "See, He will go before you to Galilee, and there you will see Him", it was not made clear when that would take place, whether at an earlier time before he was seen by them elsewhere or after they had seen Him also in some other places besides Galilee[55]).

Fifth, Matthew did not specify the day of their departure when they went to the mountain in Galilee[56]). And sixth, Matthew did not construct his narrative in an order that would force anyone to suppose that the departure to Galilee and the appearance there of the risen Jesus must have been actually the first[57]).

F. *A short discussion with M.B. Riddle on Augustine's statement that Mt. 28,7 and Mk. 16,7: "I will go before you to Galilee; there you will see me" could have been spoken prophetically*

We are struck by the comment of M.B. Riddle given in a note to Augustine's statement that Mt 28,7 and Mk. 16.7: "I will go before you to Galilee; there you will see me", was spoken prophetically. Augustine's statement runs as follows:

> We observe, however, that the words in question are not given as

[52]) *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.80, CSEL 43,384.

[53]) *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.80, CSEL 43,384.

[54]) *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.80, CSEL 43,385.

[55]) "Cum vero dictum est: *ecce praecedit vos in Galilaeam, ibi eum videbitis*, nec expressum est, quando id futurum esset, utrum quam primum, antequam alibi ab eis visus esset, an, posteaquam eum alicubi etiam praeter Galilaeam vidissent ...". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.80, CSEL 43,385.

[56]) "Mattheus dicit Galilaeam in montem, non exprimit diem ...". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.80, CSEL 43,385.

[57]) *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.80, CSEL 43,385.

> the words of the evangelist himself, in the form of a narrative of a past occurrence, but as the words of the angel, who spoke according to the Lord's commission, and subsequently also as the words of the Lord Himself; that is to say, the words are used by the evangelist in his narrative, but they are presented by him as a direct statement of what was spoken by the angel and by the Lord. This, therefore, unquestionably compels us to accept them as having been uttered prophetically[58]).

In a note to this statement M.B. Riddle remarks:

> The discussion of the appearances of the Risen Lord is so clear and candid, that one must regret that it finds the conclusion in the allegorizing exegesis of this section[59]).

M.B. Riddle maintains that Augustine's conclusion is an allegory, instead of a conclusion arrived at through investigation of facts alleged to have actually happened. We flatly disagree with M.B. Riddle. In our own understanding, Augustine gives two possible interpretations of the text in question, namely, the literal and the allegorical. Before giving the allegorical interpretation in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.86, Augustine had already given the literal interpretation in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.80. We would like to draw M. B. Riddle's attention to this reference, namely, *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.80, which Augustine alludes to in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.86, with the words:

> Let us take up now the subject which we had postponed, and inquire what mystical significance underlies the account given by Matthew and Mark, namely, that on rising He made this statement: "I will go before you to Galilee, there you will see me"[60]).

We see that the treatise in paragraph 86 is an attempt to explain the mystical significance of the text to those who may be anxious to know about it. In other words, Augustine is giving an extra explanation. He

[58]) "Procul dubio ergo, quoniam vox est ista non evangelistae narrantis, quod ita factum sit, sed angeli ex mandato domini et ipsius postea domini, evangelistae autem narrantis, sed quod ita ab angelo et a domino dictum sit, prophetice dictum accipiendum est". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.86, CSEL 43,391-392.

[59]) See M.B. RIDDLE, *The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, vol. VI, Grand Rapids, 1974, p. 225 note 1.

[60]) "Nunc iam videamus, quod distuleramus, cuius mysterii gratia secundum Mattheum et Marcum resurgens ita mandaverit: *praecedam vos in Galilaea, ibi me videbitis*". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.86, CSEL 43,391.

considers that the text contains a mystical meaning, besides the literal, since it was uttered by an angel[61]) and the place pointed at was Galilee.

> For all that, as the Lord pointed not to the place where He intended first to manifest Himself, but to the locality of Galilee, where He appeared afterwards for a necessary purpose; and as He conveyed these instructions about being seen, he said through the angel, "See, He goes before you to Galilee; there you shall see me". This makes every believer anxious to inquire with what mystical significance this statement is to be understood[62]).

In this same paragraph, Augustine also says that the appearance in Galilee actually happened, and this is proved by the testimony of Mt. 28,16-17: "Now the eleven disciples went to Galilee, to the mountain to which Jesus had directed them. And when they saw him they worshipped him; but some doubted". With the testimony of Matthew himself, Augustine concludes that there was a literal fulfillment of the prediction, besides the figurative or the allegorical meaning of it:

> For if Matthew himself, too, had not stated that the eleven disciples went to Galilee to a mountain, where Jesus had appointed for them, and that they saw Him there and worshipped Him, we might have supposed that there was no literal fulfillment of the prediction in question, but that the whole announcement was intended to convey a figurative meaning[63]).

It may profit us to illustrate here the allegorical meaning Augustine gives to the verse. He says that Galilee may mean either "transmigration" *(transmigratio)* or "revelation" *(revelatio)*[64]). If the former

[61]) For references in Augustine's works to angels as *nuntii*, see the following works: *De Genesi ad Litteram* 5,19,27, PL 42,334; *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 121,1, CCL 36,665; *En. in Ps.* 8,12, CCL 38,55; *En. in Ps.* 33, Sermo II,11, CCL 38,290; *En. in Ps.* 77,5, CCL 39,1070; *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 24,7, CCL 36,247; *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 53.3. CCL 36,360; *En. in Ps.* 103,16, CCL 40,1488; *En. in Ps.* 135,3, CCL 40,1959.

[62]) "Verum tamen quod dominus non ubi primum se demonstraturus erat, sed in Galilaea, ubi necessario postea visus est, se videndum mandavit et per angelum dicentem: *ecce praecedit vos in Galilaeam, ibi eum videbitis*, et per se ipsum dicens: *ite, nuntiate fratribus meis, ut eant in Galilaeam, ibi me videbunt*, quemvis fidelem facit intentum ad quaerendum, in quo mysterio dictum intellegatur". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.80, CSEL 43,385-386.

[63]) "Nam et ipse Mattheus si omnino non diceret undecim discipulos abisse in montem in Galilaeam, ubi constituerat eis Iesus, et illic eum vidisse adque adorasse, nihil ex hac praedictione conpletum ad litteram putaremus, sed totum figurata significatione praedictum". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.80, CSEL 43,385.

[64]) "Galilaea namque interpretatur vel 'transmigratio' vel 'revelatio'". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.86, CSEL 43,385.

meaning is adopted, namely, "transmigration", the verse would signify that the grace of Christ was to be spread from the people of Israel over towards the gentiles.

> Consequently, if we adopt the idea of "transmigration", what other sense occurs to us to give the sentence, "He goes before you to Galilee; there you shall see Him", but that the grace of Christ was to be spread from the people of Israel over towards the gentiles? In preaching the gospel to these gentiles, the apostles would meet with no acceptance unless the Lord prepared a way for them in the heart of men[65]).

And if the latter meaning, namely, "revelation", is to be adopted, the verse would signify that they would no longer see the Lord in his form as a servant but as equal with the Father (Phil. 2,6-7). This vision, however, will be shown only to the just (Jo. 14,21). Christ will show Himself to them not merely in His glorified body but also as the ineffable light, which enlightens all who come into the world (Jo. 1,9).

Augustine includes the idea of "transmigration" in the idea of "revelation". Christ's revelation of His glorified self means also the revelation of His transmigration from this world to eternity[66]). Yet this transmigration did not involve his detaching Himself from us.

> He went before us to a place which He did not leave although He came to us; and by going ahead of us He has not deserted us[67]).

In this context the conception of the Total Christ is strongly asserted. The Head has preceded. However, He has not broken away from the unity of the body, since He has transmigrated. He seeks the transmigration also of the body to eternity.

> Then we shall have a more happy transmigration from this world to eternity if we embrace His precepts so that we may be worthy to be set apart at His right hand[68]).

[65]) "Prius itaque secundum transmigrationis significationem quid aliud occurrit intellegendum *praecedit vos in Galilaeam, ibi eum videbitis*, nisi quia Christi gratia de populo Israhel transmigratura erat ad gentes? quibus apostoli praedicantes evangelium nullo modo crederentur, nisi eis ipse dominus viam in cordibus hominum praepararet". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.86, CSEL 43, 392.

[66]) "Illa erit revelatio tamquam vera Galilaea, cum similes ei erimus; ibi eum videbimus sicuti est. Ipsa erit etiam beatior transmigratio ex isto saeculo in illam aeternitatem". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.86, CSEL 43,393.

[67]) "Illuc nos praecessit, unde ad nos veniens non recessit et quo nos praecedens non deseruit". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.86, CSEL 43,393. See also *Sermo* 263,2, PL 38,1220.

[68]) "Ipsa erit etiam beatior transmigratio ex isto saeculo in illam aeternitatem, si eius

At present that eternity is the object of hope of the body. God works in the body of Christ so that the servants "as freed people ... may contemplate the form of the Lord"[69]).

This is the allegorical meaning of Matthew 18,7 and of Mark 16,7, according to Augustine. This is not Augustine's sole conclusion to his discussion on the appearances of the risen Lord, as M.B. Riddle contends.

II. The veracity of the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus

Jesus truly rose bodily from the dead. Augustine proves this with the testimony of Lk. 24,39:[70]) "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit has no flesh and bones as you see that I have".

With Lk. 24,39 Augustine proves not only the resurrection of Jesus in His physical form, with which He appeared; he also supports the teaching that we, in the same manner as Jesus, will be raised from the dead and will recover the substance of our flesh in our transformed condition.

In *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 122,2 Augustine calls the teaching on the risen flesh of Jesus the most evident truth *(evidentissimam veritatem)*. H.I. Marrou, in *The Resurrection and Saint Augustine's Theology of Human Values*, points out that Augustine's "principal argument is furnished by the verse Luke 24,39: 'See my hands and my feet ...'"[71]). Augustine uses this scriptural reference as a proof for the rising of the substance of the flesh, against the Manicheans who deny it by invoking 1 Cor. 15,50: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God".

In this section we wish to explain Augustine's use of Lk. 24,39 as a

praecepta sic amplectamur, ut ad eius dexteram segregari mereamur". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.86, CSEL 43,393.

[69]) "Sicut in illa aeternitate cognoscitur, quo servos perducet per formam servi, ut liberi contemplentur formam domini". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.86, CSEL 43,393.

[70]) Augustine knew also of Mt. 28,9, where Jesus is spoken of as touched and seen by the disciples and by the women: "Behold, Jesus met them, saying, all hail! And they came and held Him by the feet and worshipped Him". He used this reference, however, in relation to the mystical significance of Jo. 20,17: "Jesus said to her, 'Do not hold me, for I am not ascended yet to my Father'". The mystical significance is faith in the divinity of Jesus Christ. Cf. *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 121,3, CCL 36,665-666.

[71]) See H.I. Marrou, *The Resurrection and Saint Augustine's Theology of Human Values*, Villanova, 1966, p. 41-42 note 20.

proof for the resurrection of Jesus in His physical form, with which He appeared.

A. *The appearance of Jesus with His physical form was a necessity*

After His resurrection Jesus had necessarily to be in communion with His disciples in His physical form. Augustine gives two principal reasons for this necessity. First, it was in order to strengthen their faith that wavered in the belief that Christ truly rose with His body.

> It was clearly on account of the apostles' weakness. For there were not absent in their number some whom the devil would tempt to unbelief, such that one of the disciples did not believe more in the living members of the body in which he had known Him before than in the recent wounds (Jo. 20,25). Therefore, in order to strengthen them, he judged it good to live with them after resurrection for forty complete days, from the day of His passion until this day, going in and coming out, eating and drinking, just as the Scripture says (Acts 1,3-4); this confirmed that what was taken away through the cross was returned to their eyes after the resurrection[72]).

Second, faith in the Incarnation is always needed by the Church in this age. Why? The Church, as Augustine describes, is like a ship sailing in a flood. The interior eyes of the members of the Church have been blinded "by the dust of sin". We can no longer see Jesus Christ as the Word of God (Jo. 1,1). To see something of this truth we need the service of the exterior eyes. For the exterior eyes to see, the object must have a visible form. It is for this reason that the Incarnation of the Word took place[73]).

Augustine makes a parallel between the purpose of Incarnation and the purpose of the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus in His physical

[72]) "Sane propter infirmitatem discipulorum suorum : non enim deerant etiam in illo numero, quos diabolus infidelitate tentaret, ita ut quidam discipulus ejus in ipsa specie in qua noverat, non tamen magis fidem haberet viventibus membris, quam recentibus cicatricibus (Jo. 20,25): ergo ad eorum confirmationem dignatus est post resurrectionem vivere cum illis quadraginta diebus integris, ab ipso die passionis suae usque in hodiernum diem, intrans et exiens, manducans et bibens, sicut dicit Scriptura (Acts 1,3-4); confirmans hoc redditum esse oculis eorum post resurrectionem, quod ablatum erat per crucem". *Sermo* 264, 2, PL 38,1212.
See also *Sermo* 243,3 PL 38,1144.

[73]) "Excaecatus erat oculus interior pulvere peccatorum, jam non erat unde intelligeretur Verbum : quod dignatus est caro fieri, ut mandaretur quo possit postea videri, quod modo non potest". *Sermo* 264,5, PL 38,1217.

form. He thinks that just as it was necessary for Christ to minister to men in order for them to believe in His physical form after the entrance of sin, so also it was necessary that in the same manner He dealt with His disciples after His death and resurrection. Faith in the Incarnation will always remain necessary in this world. Only after this age, when the just have already attained the vision of the Word as It was in the very beginning, will it no longer be needed.

> If there were already an eye that saw "In the beginning was the Word" (Jo. 1,1), that was, that possessed, that embraced, that enjoyed, it was not necessary for the Word to become flesh and dwell among us. But because the interior eye of man was blinded by the dust of sin and was prevented from possessing and enjoying It, it was no longer in a condition where the Word could be understood; on this account it was necessary for It to become flesh in order that It be sent with something with which it could later be seen, because now It cannot be seen. The economy of salvation through the flesh of Christ is necessary for the faithful in this life, through which they may tend to the Lord; however, when the Word has come in the form of the Word, all the economy of salvation through the form of the flesh will no longer be necessary. Therefore, the dwelling in the flesh after the resurrection during the forty days was necessary, in order to demonstrate that the faith in the incarnation of Christ is necessary as long as the ship in this life is lurching in a flood[74]).

For this reason Augustine exhorts his listeners to believe in the resurrection of Jesus Christ in His physical form: "Behold what I say, brethren! Believe in Jesus Christ. He was born of the Virgin Mary, and crucified. He has risen"[75]).

B. *An apodictical proof for Christ's post-resurrection appearances in His physical form*

Luke 24,39, "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; touch me

[74]) "Si esset jam oculus, qui videret *In principio erat Verbum* (Jo. 1,1), qui videret, qui teneret, qui amplecteretur, qui frueretur, non opus erat ut Verbum caro fieret et habitaret in nobis: sed quia ad illud tenendum et fruendum excaecatus erat oculus interior pulvere peccatorum, jam non erat unde intelligeretur Verbum; quod dignatus est caro fieri, ut mandaretur quo possit postea videri, quod modo non potest. Quia ergo dispensatio carnis Christi huic vitae fidelibus necessaria est, per quam tendant ad Dominum; cum autem ventum fuerit ad speciem illam Verbi, omnis carnalis dispensatio non erit necessaria : ideo conversatio ipsius in carne post resurrectionem per quadraginta dies erat necessaria, ut demonstraret tamdiu esse fidem Incarnationis Christi, quamdiu in ista vita docetur arca in diluvio fluctuare". *Sermo* 264,5, PL 38,1216-1217.

[75]) "Ecce quod dico, fratres: credite in Jesum Christum natum de Maria virgine, crucifixum resurrexisse". *Sermo* 264,5, PL 38,1217.

and see, for a spirit has no flesh and bones as you see that I have" is one of Augustine's apodictical proofs for Christ's resurrection and post-resurrection appearances in His physical form. He refers precisely to this scriptural text, since this clearly demonstrates the veracity of Christ's claim for the reality of His risen body, and because this text directly contradicts the claim of his adversaries and of the enemies of the Christian faith. His adversaries were the Manicheans, the Priscillianists, and the pagans[76]). All of them denied the reality of Christ's body. For them the body is evil. And Christ did not have a true body but simply appeared with a form of a body. The Manicheans and the Priscillianists held the docetist view of the person of Christ[77]). Augustine compares the Manicheans and the Priscillianists[78]) with the disciples. Their mental disposition made them conclude wrongly of their vision.

> He appeared to His disciples, and suddenly He stood in their midst. You heard this when it was read out. The disciples, however, were puzzled; they thought they were seeing His spirit. This is what they think, those who do not believe that Christ had a true flesh. They are the Manicheans, they are the Priscillianists, and not to mention whatever other pests there are. For they do not hold that Christ is nothing; they do not hold this; but they think that He is a spirit, that He had no body[79]).

In *De Agone Christiano* 24.26, written in 396 for the instruction of the ordinary people and partly in order to refute the Manicheans, Augustine for the first time refers to Luke 24,39 as a scriptural text which proves that the risen body of Jesus was the very same one which was laid in the tomb. His argument for the veracity of the appearance of Jesus in

[76]) Cfr. *Sermo* 238,2, PL 38,1125.

[77]) Cf. A.H. NEWMAN, "Introductory Essay on the Manichean Heresy", in *The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, vol. IV, Grand Rapids, 1974, p. 15.

[78]) The Priscillianists adopted the teaching of the Manicheans. Augustine wrote three short works against them, namely, *Ad Orosium Contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas*, *Contra Mendacium Liber ad Consentium*, and *Epistola* 237, *Ad Ceretium Episcopum*. He included this in *De Haeresibus*. Unfortunately, not one of these three gives us an information on their principal arguments against the bodily resurrection of Jesus. For a study on the teaching of Priscillian we refer the readers to H. CHADWICK, *Priscillian of Avila. The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Chruch*, Oxford, 1976.

[79]) "Apparuit discipulis suis, et subito stetit in medio eorum. Cum legeretur audistis. Illi autem turbati sunt; existimabant enim se spiritum videre. Hoc est quod putant, qui eum veram carnem habere non credunt: Manichaei sunt, Priscillianistae sunt, et alia quaecumque nec nominandae pestes. Non enim putant Christum nihil esse, hoc non putant: sed spiritum putant esse, carnem non habuisse". *Sermo* 238,2, PL 38,1125. See also *Sermo Morin* 17,1, M.A. I,659; *Sermo Mai* 95,3, M.A. I,342.

His physical form is built upon the post-resurrection characteristics of the glorified body.

> Let us not listen to those who deny that the body of the Lord which rose from the dead was that one which had been placed in the tomb. For if it were not, he would not have said to His disciples after His resurrection: "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; touch me and see; for a spirit has no flesh and bones as you see that I have". It is sacrilegious to believe that our Lord, when He is Himself the truth, could have lied about something. Let us not be shaken by what is written : *when the doors were closed* He appeared suddenly to the disciples, to the extent that we deny that that body was a human body, because we see that it is contrary to the nature of this body to enter through a closed door. However, everything is possible with God ... For if He could glorify that body like the splendor of the sun before His passion, why after the passion could He not endow it with the power of penetration for a period of time too, as much as He wished, in order that it could enter through the closed doors[80])?

When refuting the Manicheans, for example in *De Continentia*, Augustine sarcastically shows that their doctrine involves self-contradiction; he calls it a doctrine of the "insane". Augustine's own argument, on the other hand, rests upon the authority of Paul and upon the claim of Christ himself. The point he is trying to prove, while refuting the Manicheans, is the reality and the goodness of the body. This teaching is contradictory to that of the Manicheans.

> What does the utterly insane Manichean say of the flesh of Jesus Christ? That it was not real but false. What does the blessed apostle say to this? "Remember that Jesus Christ, who descended from the

[80]) "Nec eos audiamus, qui negant tale corpus domini resurrexisse, quale positum est in monumento. Si enim tale non fuisset, non ipse dixisset post resurrectionem discipulis: *Palpate et videte, quoniam spiritus ossa et nervos non habet, sicut me videtis habere.* Sacrilegum est enim credere dominum nostrum, cum ipse sit veritas, in aliquo fuisse mentitum. Nec nos moveat, quod *clausis ostiis* subito eum apparuisse discipulis scriptum est, ut propterea negemus illud fuisse corpus humanum, quia contra naturam huius corporis videmus esse per clausa ostia intrare. Omnia enim possibilia sunt Deo ... Ita ergo et post resurrectionem de corpore suo fecit, quod voluit. Si enim potuit ante passionem clarificare illud sicut splendorem solis, quare non potuit et post passionem ad quantam vellet subtilitatem in temporis momento redigere, ut per clausa ostia posset intrare?". *De Agone Christiano* 24.26, CSEL 41,126-127. See also *Epistula* 164,5.14, CSEL 44,534: "corpus, quod in cruce reliquerat, in sepulchrum positum recepisse". *Epistula* 102,1.7, CSEL 34(2),550; *Sermo* 362,13, PL 39,1619; *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 11,3, CSEL 25(1),318.

seed of David, has risen from the dead, according to my gospel" (2 Tim. 2,8). And Christ Himself says, "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; touch and see, for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have" (Lk. 24,39). How is there truth in their doctrine which preaches that there was falsity in the flesh of Christ? How was there no evil in Christ, in whom the lie was so grievous? Because apparently to over-clean men true flesh is an evil, and false flesh instead of true flesh is not evil; the true flesh of the one born from the seed of David is evil, and the tongue of the one who says: "Touch and see because the spirit has no bones and flesh, just as you see that I have" is not evil[81]).

Sometime between 405 and 413, while writing *Sermo* 237, Augustine uses the same argument against the Manicheans which he used in *Sermo* 264, namely, the similarity between the state of their minds and that of the temporary state of the minds of the apostles. In this *Sermo*, however, he elaborates his explanations and bolsters his argument by showing the objective value of the testimony of the external senses.

It is important to note why Augustine appeals to the testimony of the senses. His main reason for doing this is to prove the truth of the dogma of Incarnation. This was denied by the Manicheans, since they believe that the human body, just as any other matter, is evil. And for this reason they "destroy the birth of Jesus of a virgin, and they do not want to believe that he was born of a woman"[82]). Accordingly the teaching on the Incarnation of the Word was unacceptable to them[83]).

[81]) "Quid de carne Christi dicit insanissimus Manichaeus? Quod non fuerit vera, sed falsa. Quid ad haec dicit beatus apostolus? *Memor esto Christum Iesum resurrexisse a mortuis ex semine David secundum evangelium meum.* Et ipse Iesus Christus, *palpate*, inquit, *et videte, quia spiritus carnem et ossa non habet, sicut me videtis habere.* Quomodo est in eorum doctrina veritas quae id praedicat, quod in carne Christi erat falsitas? Quomodo in Christo non erat ullum malum, in quo erat tam grande mendacium? Quia videlicet hominibus nimium mundis malum est caro vera et non est malum falsa pro vera; malum est caro vera nascentis ex David semine et non est malum lingua dicentis: *Palpate et videte quia spiritus ossa et carnem non habet, sicut me videtis habere*!". *De Continentia* 10.24, CSEL 41,170-171.

[82]) "Sunt enim hodie qui non credunt carnem habuisse Christum: quia et partum virginis destruunt, et nolunt eum natum ex femina credere". *Sermo* 237,1, PL 38,1122.

[83]) "*Verbum caro factum est* (Jo. 1,14), prorsus alienant a sua fide, vel potius a sua infidelitate. Totam istam dispensationem salutis nostrae, quod factus est homo pro inveniendo homine, qui Deus fecerat hominem; totum hoc, quod Christus in remissionem peccatorum nostrorum verum, non falsum sanguinem fudit, et de vero suo sanguine chirographum peccatorum nostrorum delevit; hoc totum haeritici damnabiles evacuare conantur. Totum hoc, ut Manichaei credunt, quod apparuit oculis hominum, spiritus fuit, caro non fuit". *Sermo* 237,1, PL 38,1122. For other relevant references see the following works: *En. in Ps.* 3,10, CCL 38,13; *En. in Ps.* 34, *Sermo* 2,33, CCL 38,314; *En. in Ps.* 39,5, 6, CCL 38,428; *En. in Ps.* 56,7, CCL 39,699; *En. in Ps.* 109,12, CCL 40, 1611-1612; *In*

In *Sermo* 237 Augustine confronts this denial and disbelief. He argues against the Manicheans with an argument for the truth of the resurrection of Jesus in the body. He bases this on the belief that the Word assumed a human body. As a consequence he rejects the teaching that condemns the body as evil; on the contrary he upholds the goodness of the body and teaches the integration of soul and body. He proves the goodness of the body and the integration of flesh and spirit by pointing to Christ who is Himself both flesh and spirit.

> Sometimes this detestable people, who detest the flesh and live according to the flesh, say this, and they deceive in this manner: Who have the better belief concerning Christ? Is it they who say that He had flesh or we who say that He was God, He was a spirit, and He appeared not as a body to the eyes of men but as God? What shall we answer but that the spirit is better than the body? If, therefore, he says, you confess that the spirit is better than the body, my idea of Christ is better, since I say that He was a spirit and not flesh. O unfortunate mistake! Why? Do I say that Christ was flesh? You say that He was a spirit. I say that He was spirit and flesh. You do not put it better; but you say less[84]).

For Augustine the doctrine of Incarnation is a teaching of the Catholic faith; it is the most well established and the clearest truth: *quod dicit catholica fides, quod dicit fundatissima et serenissima veritas.* It is with this conviction that he exhorts the Manicheans to abandon their error. He compares them with the disciples of Jesus. Like the disciples of Jesus who abandoned their error after having ascertained the truth of Christ's appearances in physical form, the Manicheans should abandon their error. In our observation, however, Augustine's exhortation is not persuasive enough and is fundamentally unacceptable to the Manicheans. He starts with a doctrinal explanation and ends with a conclusion that is derived not from the doctrinal explanation but from the empirical data that are furnished by the senses. The disciples had the

Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus 78,3, CCL 36,524-525; *Sermo* 264,5, PL 38,1216-1217; *Sermo Morin* 17,3, M.A. I,667.

[84]) "Aliquando ipsi detestabiles, carnem detestantes, et secundum carnem viventes, aliquando hoc dicunt, et sic decipiunt: Qui melius credunt de Christo, illi qui dicunt quia carnem habuit, an nos qui dicimus, Deus erat, spiritus erat, et oculis hominum non corpus, sed Deus apparebat? Quid est melius, caro, an spiritus? Quid responsuri sumus, nisi spiritum carne esse meliorem? Si ergo, dicit, confiteris quia spiritus melior sit quam caro; melius ego de Christo sentio, qui eum spiritum fuisse dico, non carnem. O infelix error! Quare? Ego carnem dico fuisse Christum? Tu dicis spiritum: ego spiritum et carnem. Non tu melius dicis, sed minus dicis". *Sermo* 237,2, PL 38,1122-1123.

priviledge of having these data. The Manicheans, however, did not. The disciples, according to him, really "touched and saw" Jesus (Lk. 24,39). The Manicheans did not. Thus, how could Augustine place the Manicheans and Jesus' disciples in the same situation?

C. *The post-resurrection appearances in the light of Augustine's theory of sensation*

It will be of help to us to show, in a form of a summary, Augustine's theory of sensation[85]). We shall limit ourselves to the aspect that is relevant to our objective, that is, a clarification of Augustine's appeal to the testimony of the senses, as provided by Like 24,39.

Perception by the external senses has an objective value. The senses do not deceive, because their only function is to inform the mind *(animus)* how they are affected by their contacts with external bodies. When the mind attends to these contacts, sensation takes place. This attention is the act of the mind alone[86]). This attention of the mind, which Augustine calls opinion *(opinio)*, may sometimes be mistaken. It may take, for example, for similitude what is real or vice versa. In this case, Augustine explains, the defect does not come from the external senses nor from the objects perceived, but from the deficiency of understanding *(ab intelligentia deficiens)*. This frequently happens with the information furnished by the sense of sight to the mind[87]). To make

[85]) For studies on Augustine's theory of sensation and knowledge, see the following works: M.R. MILES, *Augustine on the Body*, Ch. II, p. 9-39; M.A.I. GANNON, "The Active Theory of Sensation in St. Augustine", in *The New Scholasticism* 30, 1956; R.H. NASH, *The Light of the Mind: St. Augustine's Theory of Knowledge*, Lexington, 1969; R.J. O'CONNELL, *St. Augustine's Early Theory of Man*, Cambridge, 1968. For a study on the difference between St. Augustine's and St. Thomas' theory of knowledge, see M.C. D'ARCY, "The Philosophy of St. Augustine", in *A Monument to Saint Augustine*, London, 1945, p. 175-194. For Augustine's explanation of the interrelation between the body and the soul in the process of sensation, see the following works: *De Genesi ad Litteram* 12,14 and 16, CSEL 28(1),398-399 and 401-402; *De Musica* 6,1-5, PL 32,1161-1171. For a study on Plotinus' influence on Augustine's theory of sensation, see M.R. MILES, *Augustine on the Body*, Ch. II.

[86]) "Solius animi est haec intentio". *De Trinitate* 11,2.2, CCL 50,335.

[87]) "Inluditur autem anima similitudinibus rerum non earum vitio, sed opinionis suae, cum adprobat quae similia sunt pro his, quibus similia sunt, ad intellegentia deficiens. Fallitur ergo in visione corporali, cum in ipsis corporibus fieri putat, quod fit in corporis sensibus — sicut navigantibus videntur moveri quae stant et intuentibus caelum stare sidera, quae moventur ... aut cum repentinis inopinatisque corporalibus visis anima turbata vel in somnis videre se putat vel aliquo eius modi spiritali viso adfici". *De Genesi ad Litteram* 12,25, CSEL 28(1), 417-418.

up for this deficiency and to ensure right judgment, Augustine recommends that the sense of sight be complemented by the testimony of the other senses:

> Therefore, all the corporeal visions should appeal for help from the testimonies of the other corporeal senses, especially of the mind and of reason, in order that what is held real in these visions may be found as true as it is found[88]).

In connection with the possibility for the mind to commit a mistake, Augustine, moreover, teaches that a confused mental state and fixed thoughts *(cogitationes)* could contribute to a wrong judgment. This was what happened with the disciples, in Augustine's interpretation.

> The Lord said to them: "Why are you troubled"? The mental disturbance had believed what you believe. How is this? They thought that they saw a spirit. For this reason, the Lord addressed them: "Why are you troubled, and why do thoughts rise in your heart"? (Lk. 24,38) These thoughts are earthly. For if they were heavenly, they would descend into your heart, not ascend[89]).

We do not have other clearer references to consult in order to elucidate this point. However, we are convinced that this could be safely interpreted within the context of the appearances-narratives. Within this context, the statement, in our opinion, may mean that the disciples like Mary Magdalene were as yet not in a mental state to accept the fact of the resurrection of Jesus; for even at that time, they still did not believe in His divine origin and destiny. This is clear in Augustine's interpretation of John 20,17: "Do not hold me, for I am not yet ascended to my Father". Augustine thinks it possible to interprete this phrase as a prohibition to believe in Jesus after the resurrection, simply as a man, just as He was thought of before it. He explains this in *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 121,3:

> However, it could be that Mary believed that He was unequal with the Father; this certainly was forbidden when it was said to

[88]) "Unde in omnibus corporalibus visis et aliorum sensuum contestatio et maxime ipsius mentis atque rationis adhibetur, ut, quod in hoc rerum genere verum est, inveniatur quantum inveniri potest". *De Genesi ad Litteram* 12,15, CSEL 28(1), 417-418.

[89]) "Ait illis Dominus, *Quid turbati estis?* Perturbatio credidit quod credis. Quid? Putabant se spiritum videre. Et Dominus ad haec: *Quid turbati estis, et cogitationes ascendunt in cor vestrum?* Cogitationes istae terrenae sunt. Si enim coelestes essent, descenderent in cor, non ascenderent". *Sermo* 237,3, PL 38,1123. See also *Sermo* 242,1, PL 38,1139.

> her: "Do not touch me"; that is to say: Do not believe in me in the way you known me up to now; do not let your thought stretch outward to what I have been made for you, nor pass into that (*Verbum*) through which it (my flesh, "*caro*") was made. For how could it not be that she still believed in him carnally, when she wept over him as a man[90])?

This text clearly applies to Mary. But could it also apply to the disciples as regards their state of mind? Without saying it expressly, Augustine thinks that the disciples are in the same psychological state as Mary. He implies a similarity in his interpretation of the statement, "for I have not yet ascended to my Father". Augustine interprets this as touching in faith Jesus as God and as equal with the Father.

> "For I have not yet ascended", he says, "to my Father. There you will touch me, when you have believed that as God, I am in no wise unequal with the Father[91]).

As shown by Jo. 20,17, "But go to my brethren, and say to them, I ascend to my Father, and your Father", Mary was commanded to relay the content of this faith in Jesus' divinity to the disciples. Since it was a command, therefore, it implied that the disciples did not yet believe then in His divinity. Besides, it may be for this same reason that Augustine further explains why in the verse Jesus did not say, "Our Father", but, "My Father and your Father". For He is the Father of Christ by nature; He is our Father by grace. Nor did He say "Our God", but, "My God and your God". This means that in one sense He is Jesus' God; Jesus as a man is also under Him. He is likewise our God, in another sense; that is, between us and God, Jesus is the mediator. Augustine kept to the word *vestrum* in *Patrem vestrum* and *Deum vestrum*. This means that the content of the message did not apply, for their instruction, only to Mary, but also to the disciples. If it had been *tuum*, then it would have applied only to Mary.

[90]) "Poterat autem sic credere Maria, ut eum putaret imparem Patri, quod utique prohibetur cum ei dicitur : *Noli me tangere*; Noli in me sic credere, quemadmodum adhuc sapis; noli tuum sensum huc usque pertendere quod pro te factus sum nec transire ad illud per quod facta est. Quomodo enim non carnaliter adhuc in eum credebat, quem sicut hominem flebat?". *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 121,3, CCL 36,666. See also *De Trinitate* 4,3.6, CCL 50,168; *Sermo* 245,2.3, PL 38,1151-1152; *Sermo* 243,2, PL 38,1144.

[91]) "*Nondum enim adscendi*, inquit, *ad Patrem meum*; ibi me tanges quando me credideris Patri non imparem Deum". *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 121,3, CCL 36,666.

> "But go to my brethren, and tell them, 'I ascend to my Father and your Father'". He does not say "Our Father"; in one sense, therefore, mine, in another sense, yours; by nature mine, by grace yours. "And my God, and your God". Nor here did He say, "Our God"; therefore, also here in one sense, mine, in another sense, yours; my God, under whom I also am a man, your God, between whom and you I am a mediator[92]).

Earlier, in the same passage, Augustine says that the "touch" in Jo. 20,17 can only be interpreted as the touching in faith Jesus Christ's divinity, because, as it is narrated in Mt. 28,9, the disciples and Mary literally "got hold" of Jesus Christ's feet.

> Christ wished to be believed in this way; that is, He Himself is to be touched spiritually in the sense that He and the Father are one. Indeed, to the most inward thoughts of one, who has made progress in this (knowledge of Christ) such that he acknowledges Him to be equal with the Father, He has in a manner ascended to the Father; in any other way He is not rightly touched, that is, in any other way He is not rightly believed in[93]).

D. *An argument from delay in instruction*

Another argument that we could present for our contention, namely, that the disciples still could not believe that Jesus has truly risen bodily, is that they had still not been instructed about the resurrection of one man, although they already believed in general resurrection of the body in the future. The Judaic religion taught the doctrine of the general resurrection of the body. In the interpretation of Augustine the Jews claimed hope in the resurrection only for themselves. The rest were excluded from this hope. Augustine reacts to this. In order to contradict the Judaic teaching he asserts the resurrection of Jesus Christ and, by extension, our own future resurrection. In *En. in Ps.* 65,1 he says:

> For we Christians knew that resurrection already took place in the Head, and future resurrection will take place in the members.

[92]) "*Vade autem ad fratres meos, et dic eis: Adscendo ad Patrem meum et Patrem vestrum.* Non ait: Patrem nostrum; aliter ergo meum, aliter vestrum; natura meum, gratia vestrum. *Et Deum Meum, et Deum vestrum.* Neque hic dixit: Deum nostrum; ergo et hic aliter meum, aliter vestrum; Deum meum sub quo et ego homo sum, Deum vestrum inter quos et ipsum mediator sum". *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 121,3, CCL 36,666-667.

[93]) "Aut sic in se credit voluit Jesus, hoc est, sic se spiritaliter tangi, quod ipse et Pater unum sint. Eius quippe intimis sensibus quodammodo adscendit ad Patrem, qui sic in eo profecerit ut Patri agnoscat aequalem; aliter non recte tangitur, id est, aliter non recte in eum creditur". *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 121,3, CCL 36,666.

> Christ is the Head of the Church; the Church is His members. What has preceded in the Head will follow in the body. This is our hope. We believe in this. We remain firm in this. We persevere amidst much evil in this world, while hope consoles us before hope becomes a reality. For it will be a reality when we too have risen, and having been transformed into beings with heavenly condition we have been made equal with the angels[94]).

Farther in the same context he refers directly to the Jews:

> The Jews, indeed, had hoped for the resurrection of the dead; and they hoped that they alone would rise to the blessed life because of the work of the law, and because of the justification by the Scriptures, which the Jews alone had but the gentiles had not. Christ was crucified; "blindness from the part of Israel happened in order that the fullness of the gentiles might enter in" (Rom. 11,25), as the apostle said. The resurrection of the dead began to be promised to the gentiles, who believed is Jesus Christ because He had risen. Thus, this psalm is against the presumption and pride of the Jews, in favor of the faith of the gentiles who are called to the same hope of resurrection[95]).

In *In Johannis Evangelium Tractatus* 120 Augustine includes in his treatise the unawareness of the disciples and of the women concerning the resurrection of Jesus. First, he points out that the women and the disciples never at first believed that the empty tomb suggested that Jesus had risen from the dead. He shows this on the basis of Jo. 20,9: "For as yet they did not know that He must rise from the dead". All that they believed then, was that the body of Jesus was simply removed from the sepulcher[96]). Augustine explains clearly this thought in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.69:

[94]) "Resurrectionem enim christiani novimus in capite nostro iam factam, et in membris futuram. Caput ecclesiae Christus est, membra Christi ecclesia. Quod praecessit in capite, sequetur in corpore. Haec est spes nostra; ad hoc credimus, ad hoc duramus, et perseveramus in tanta malignitate huius saeculi, consolante nos spe, antequam spes fiat res". *En. in Ps.* 65,1, CCL 39,838.

[95]) "Tenebant ergo Iudaei spem resurrectionis mortuorum; et solos se ad beatam vitam resurrecturos sperabant propter opus legis, et propter iustificationes scripturarum, quas habebant soli Iudaei, et gentes non habebant. Crucifixus est Christus; *caecitas ex parte Israel facta est, ut plenitudo gentium intraret* (Rom. 11,25): hoc apostolo dicente. Coepit etiam gentibus promitti resurrectio mortuorum, credentibus in Iesum Christum quod resurrexit. Inde psalmus iste est adversus praesumtionem et superbiam Iudaeorum, pro fide gentium ad eamdem spem resurrectionis vocatarum". *En. in Ps.* 65,1, CCL 39,839.

[96]) "Sublatum esse Dominum de monumento, discipulis eius Petro et Iohanni nuntiaverat Maria Magdalene; quo illi venientes, invenerunt sola linteamina, quibus corpus fuerat involutum; et quid aliud credere potuerunt, nisi quod dixerat, quod etiam

> Then John also entered and saw likewise and believed what Mary said, that the Lord had been taken away from the sepulcher, for he did not know yet that it was necessary for him to rise from the dead[97]).

In *In Johannis Evangelium Tractatus* 120,9 Augustine definitely denies the possibility that John during the first discovery of the empty tomb immediately believed that Jesus had risen. Therefore, he clarifies Jo. 20,8: "And he saw and he believed":

> "And he saw", he says, "and he believed". Here, some, paying too little attention, think that John believed that Jesus had risen; but what follows does not indicate this. For what does he mean with that he added immediately, "For they did not know yet the scripture that He must rise from the dead"? The man who he did not know had to rise; he therefore did not believe to have risen. What, then, did he see? What did he believe? He clearly saw the empty tomb, and believed the statement of the woman, that He had been removed from the tomb[98]).

And, second, in Augustine's description of the grave-yard drama, where he displays very good insights into the psychology of the participants, especially of the women, he argued that what kept Mary at the sepulcher, while the men had already gone away, was that she wanted always to be physically near the Lord, even when He was buried.

> "But Mary stood outside the sepulcher weeping" (Jo. 20,11). The weaker sex was fastened to the place by a stronger affection. And the eyes which had sought the Lord and had not found Him had nothing else to do but cry, more deeply sorrowful that He had been taken away from the tomb than when He was killed on the cross; for no remembrance of such a master remained, whose life had been withdrawn from them. This grief, therefore, now kept the woman at the tomb[99]).

ipsa crediderat?". *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 121,1, CCL 36,664. See also *Sermo* 245,1, PL 38,1151; *Epistula* 129,2, CSEL 44,35.

[97]) "Deinde et Iohannes intravit et vidit similiter et credidit quod Maria dixerat sublatum esse dominum de monumento. Nondum enim sciebat scripturam, quia oportebat eum a mortuis resurgere". *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.69, CSEL 43,362.

[98]) "*Et vidit*, inquit, *et credidit*, Hic nonnulli parum adtendentes, putant hoc Iohannem credidisse, quod Iesus resurrexit; sed quod sequitur, hoc non indicat. Quod sibi enim vult quod statim adiunxit: *Nondum enim sciebant scripturam, quia oportet eum a mortuis resurgere?* Non ergo eum credidit resurrexisse, quem nesciebat oportere resurgere. Quid ergo vidit? quid credidit? Vidit scilicet inane monumentum, et credidit quod dixerat mulier, eum de monumento esse sublatum". *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 120,9, CCL 36,664.

[99]) "*Maria autem stabat ad monumentum foris plorans.* Viris enim redeuntibus,

Let us briefly recapitulate. The Manicheans, the Priscillianists, and the pagans denied the bodily resurrection of Jesus, since they held that the flesh is evil. The Jews, whose teaching influenced the women and the disciples, did not believe in the resurrection of one man before the general resurrection of the body. Against this background Augustine is forced to demonstrate in the most simple and evident way, by the testimony of the external senses, the veracity of the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus. He thinks that it is possible to explain this by referring to Luke 24,39.

> Therefore, "why are you troubled, and questionings arise in your heart? See my hands and my feet, touch and see'. If the attention of the mind is not enough for you, put your hands out! If this attention is not enough, or if touching is not sufficient, feel! He did not only say, touch! but also, feel! and examine closely! Let your hands prove it to you if your eyes are deceived: Feel and see! Have eyes in your hands. Feel what, and see what? "Because the spirit has no flesh and no bones, just as you see that I have" (Lk. 24,39)[100]).

Augustine's marshalling of the different testimonies of the senses according to their degree of sensibility, to wit, first, "put your hand out" *(manus mittite)*, second, "have contact" *(tangere)*, third, "feel" *(palpate)* and, finally, "feel and examine thorougly" *(palpate et contrectate)*, clearly demonstrates his intention of establishing the certitude of the bodily appearance of Jesus. In fact, it is for this reason that, as he points out, the disciples began to believe in His bodily resurrection rather than that He had appeared in His spirit. Therefore, Augustine exhorts the Manicheans to believe with the disciples.

infirmiorem sexum in eodem loco fortior figebat affectus. Et oculi qui Dominum quaesierant et non invenerant, lacrymis iam vacabant, amplius dolentes quod fuerat de monumento ablatus, quam quod fuerat in ligno occisus; quoniam magistri tanti, cuius eis vita subtracta fuerat, nec memoria remanebat. Tenebat itaque ad monumentum iam dolor iste mulierem". *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 121,1, CCL 36,664.

[100]) "Ergo, *Quid turbati estis, et cogitationes ascendunt in cor vestrum? Videte manus meas et pedes meos, palpate et videte*. Si parum est vobis attendere; manus mittite. Si parum est attendere, nec sufficiat tangere; palpate. Nec, Tangite, solum dixit; sed palpate et contrectate. Probent sibi manus vestrae, si mentiuntur oculi vestri: *Palpate et videte*, oculos in manibus habete. Quid palpate, et quid videte? *Quia spiritus carnem et ossa non habet, sicut me videtis habere"*. *Sermo* 237,3, PL 38,1123. See also *Sermo* 246,4, PL 38,1155: "Numquid jam ascenderat ad Patrem, quando dicebat, *Palpate et videte?* Praebet se tangendum discipulis suis, non tangendum, sed palpandum, ut fides fiat verae carnis, veri corporis, ut exhibeatur etiam tactibus humanis soliditas veritatis: praebet ergo se palpandum manibus discipulorum". In connection with the "touch" by Thomas and on the general application of the sense of sight to the other external senses, see *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 121,5, CCL 36,668.

> You erred with the disciples, be corrected with the disciples. It is human, I concede. You think that Christ was a spirit. So did Peter. So did the others, who thought that they saw His spirit. But they did not linger in this error, so that you may know exactly that this had been in their hearts[101]).

But, since it is Augustine's theory that no rightful knowledge takes place in believers without the aid of divine illumination, he adds that it was Jesus the Physician who finally converted the disciples from their error.

> The Physician did not send them away as they were. He approached them and gave them the medicine. He saw the wounds in their hearts; and by bearing the wounds in His body, He cured the wounds of their hearts[102]).

E. *Does the testimony of 'touch and see' in Lk. 24,39 give Augustine a definitive stand for the veracity of the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus?*

In *Sermo* 237, by appealing to the testimony of Lk. 24,39: "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; touch me and see; for the spirit has no flesh and bones as you see that I have", Augustine appears to confirm the veracity of the bodily resurrection and of the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus. A question, however, may be posed concerning how definite this confirmation is. How could Augustine be sure that the disciples really believed in Jesus' bodily resurrection immediately after they had touched and seen Him, when he also appeals to the other

[101]) "Errabas cum discipulis, corrigere cum discipulis. Humanum est, concedo. Putatis spiritum Christum: hoc et Petrus, hoc et caeteri qui spiritum putaverunt se videre; sed in isto errore non remanserunt, ut scias prorsus hoc fuisse in cordibus eorum". *Sermo* 237,3, PL 38,1123-1124.

[102]) "Medicus eos non dimisit sic: accessit, medicamentum adhibuit; vulnera in cordibus videbat; et unde vulnera cordium curaret, in corpore cicatrices". *Sermo* 237,3, PL 38,1124. Note that here Augustine appears to show that Christ Himself initiated the imparting of knowledge to the apostles. This thinking is in accordance with his conception of Christ as the wisdom of God whose role is teaching (cf. *De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae* 16,27). God himself does the illuminating (cf. *Soliloquia* 1,6.12). It is also interesting to note that here Augustine speaks of Christ correcting the error of the Apostles by curing the wounds of their hearts. For him faith involves the mind and the heart. And so often we come across texts where he uses *animus* or *mens* when he means *cor*, or vice versa. For example, he says, "Debuimus enim utrumque in illarum animo factum intellegere, etiamsi ipse Mattheus de timore non diceret ...", referring to the feeling of "fear and joy". Cf. *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,24.64, CSEL 43,353.

activities of Jesus, like eating and drinking before the disciples, in order to demonstrate that He had truly risen in His physical form?

We observe that in *Sermo* 237 augustine omits Lk. 24,41: "While they were still unbelieving and wondering for joy, He said to them, 'Do you have something to eat'?". In *De Consensu Evangelistarum* 3,25.74, however, he thinks it possible to harmonize Lk. 24,36-40: "However, as they were saying this, Jesus stood in their midst and said to them, 'Peace be with you'; it is I, do not be afraid. But they were startled and frightened, and they thought that they were seeing a spirit. And He said to them, 'Why are you disturbed and why do questionings *(cogitationes)* arise in your hearts'? See my hands and my feet, because it is I myself. Touch and see, because a spirit has no flesh and bones, just as you see that I have. And after He had said this, He showed to them His hands and feet". With Jo. 20,19-20: "Therefore, on the evening of that day, the first day of the week, and the doors were closed, where the disciples were for fear of the Jews, Jesus came, stood in their midst and said to them, 'Peace be with you'. And after He had said this, He showed them His hands and side". After Jo. 20,19-20 Augustine thinks it fit to add Lk. 24,41-43: "However, while they were still unbelieving and wondering for joy *(prae gaudio)* He said: 'Do you have here something to eat? And they gave Him a piece of broiled fish and a honey-comb containing honey. And after He had eaten, He took the left-over and gave it to them". With these three groups of verses, namely, Lk. 24,36-40, Jo. 20,19-20, and Lk. 24,41-43, Augustine weaves complementary groups of verses from the two evangelists, Luke and John, into one part of the appearance-narrative. This shows that Augustine does not find it sufficient to appeal only to Lk. 24,39 in order to prove that the disciples, after they had seen and touched Jesus, at once believed in His bodily resurrection. We think, therefore, that in *Sermo* 237 it would have been more proper for Augustine to include a further testimony given in Lk. 24,41. This reference narrates Jesus' plan of demonstrating further the veracity of His bodily resurrection by eating with or before His disciples. Augustine, however, does not include this.

If our argument here is insufficient, we refer to another *Sermo* namely *Sermo* 265,1. There Augustine shows that even after the several appearances during the first day, the disciples remained indeed uncertain. They needed, therefore, to be constantly reassured through the dealings of Jesus with them until the day of His ascension. However, in the homily, Augustine's scriptural reference is Acts 1,3: "To them He

presented Himself alive after his passion by many proofs, appearing to them during forty days, and speaking of the kingdom of God".

> For the Lord our Savior, after His body had been laid down and recovered, rose from the dead; after this He showed Himself alive to the disciples, He whom they despaired of when He was dying. Afterwards He returned to them for their eyes to see and for their hands to examine thoroughly, building up their faith by exhibiting the truth; since to show the wonderful miracle in one day and to withdraw it at once was not sufficient for human frailty and weak anxiety. He had dealings with them on earth, just as we heard when the *Acts of the Apostles* was read, He had dealings with them on earth for forty days, going in and coming out, eating and drinking, in order to show them the truth and not because He Himself needed something[103]).

In *Sermo* 242,2, written between 400 and 410, Augustine asserts that Christ Himself knew that to be merely seen and touched by the disciples was not sufficient to demonstrate the veracity of His post-resurrection appearance that is narrated in Lk. 24,39.

> We heard when the Gospel was read now that when He showed Himself alive to the eyes and hands of His disciples, He perceived that it was not enough to demonstrate the corporeal evidence; but He added, "Do you have here anything to eat? And they offered Him a piece of broiled fish and a honey-comb containing honey. He ate it and what remained He gave to them"[104]).

Another reason given much earlier by Augustine for the need of the disciples to be strengthened in their belief is given in *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 4,2.

> Jesus showed Himself to the disciples after His resurrection in

[103]) "Dominus enim Salvator noster, posito corpore, et recepto corpore, posteaquam resurrexit a mortuis, exhibuit se discipulis viventem, quem desperaverant morientem. Posteaquam se reddidit oculis intuendum, manibus contrectandum, aedificans fidem, exhibendo veritatem; quoniam parum fuit humanae fragilitati et infirmae trepidationi tam magnum miraculum uno die exhibere, et inde subtrahere; conversatus est cum eis in terra, sicut audivimus, cum liber Actuum Apostolorum legeretur, conversatus est cum eis in terra quadraginta diebus, intrans et exiens, manducans et bibens: ut exhiberet veritatem, non quod haberet necessitatem". *Sermo* 265,1, PL 38,1219. See also *Sermo* 264,2, PL 38,1212.

[104]) "Modo Evangelium cum legeretur, audivimus, quia cum exhiberet se vivum oculis manibusque discipulorum suorum, parum illi visum est ad demonstrandam evidentiam corporalem: sed addidit, *Habetis hic aliquid quod manducetur? Et obtulerunt ei partem piscis assi, et favum mellis: et manducavit, et reliquias dedit illis* (Lk. 24,37-43)". *Sermo* 242,2, PL 38,1139. See also *Sermo* 243,3 PL 38,1144.

> order not only to be seen and be touched by them, lest they should think that their mortal and carnal senses were in any way playing tricks on them, and he rather strengthened them by means of the testimony of ancient books, with the words: "It was necessary that all things should be fulfilled that were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets and in the Psalms concerning me" (Lk. 24,44)[105]).

We, therefore, conclude that Augustine refers to the other activities of Jesus Christ after His resurrection, namely, eating and drinking, entering in and going out, as narrated in Acts 1,3 and Lk. 24,41-43. These activities of Christ as further demonstrations for His resurrection in body support the testimony given in Lk. 24,41-43.

III. The bond between Christ's glorification and our own future glorification

The resurrection of Christ inaugurated His glorification[106]). To a certain extent, His resurrection included already our own resurrection. His is the *exemplum* of our own resurrection[107]).

There have been several works written that partly include the theme of the bond between Christ's glorification and our own in the future. F. Da Cagliari, in *Cristo Glorificato di Spirito Santo nel Pensiero di S. Agostino e di S. Cirillo Alessandrino*, centers his discussion on the antithesis of humility and glorification, signified by Christ's incarnation, passion, resurrection and ascension[108]). W. Geerlings, in *Christus*

[105]) "Unde Dominus posteaquam resurrexit a mortuis seque non solum intuendum discipulorum oculis sed etiam contrectandum manibus obtulit, ne quid tamen cum suis mortalibus et carnalibus sensibus fallaciter agi arbitrarentur, magis eos de veterum librorum testificatione firmavit dicens: *oportebat inpleri omnia, quae scripta sunt in lege Moysi et prophetis et psalmis de me". Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 4,2 CSEL 25(1),269.

[106]) "Haec est clarificatio Domini nostri Jesu Christi, quae ab eius resurrectione sumsit exordium". *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 104,3, CCL 36,603; see also *Sermo* 265,8, PL 38,1222; *Sermo* 263,1, PL 38,1209.

[107]) *Sermo* 263,1, PL 38,1209; *Sermo* 361,3, PL 39,1600; *Sermo* 362,10, PL 39,1617; *Sermo* 240,2, PL 38,1131; *Sermo* 241,1, PL 38,1132; *Sermo* 242,1, PL 38,1139; *De Trinitate* 7,3-5, CCL 50,253f.; *En. in Ps.* 34, *Sermo* 2,3, CCL 38,314; *En. in PS.* 39,5, CCL 38,428; *En. in Ps.* 55,3, CCL 39,679; *En. in Ps.* 61,22, CCL 39,791; *En. in Ps.* 70, *Sermo* 2,10, CCL 40,968-970; *En. in Ps.* 101, *Sermo* 2,14, CCL 40,1448; *En. in Ps.* 101, *Sermo* 2,14, CCL 40,1449; *En. in Ps.* 102,6, CCL 40,1456; *Sermo* 216,6, PL 38,1075.

[108]) F. Da Cagliari, *Cristo glorificato Datore di Spirito Santo nel Pensiero di S. Agostino E di S. Cirillo Alessandrino*, Roma, 1961, p. 70f.

Exemplum. Studien zur Christologie und Christusverkündigung Augustins, gives the different meanings of *exemplum* in Augustine. In the context of resurrection he speaks of Augustine's conception of resurrection as a way by which man enjoys God, the Highest Good[109]). In this respect Geerling's treatment is limited because he deals with the theme only in the perspective of Augustine's concept of *uti* and *frui*. A.J. Vermeulen, in *The Semantic Development of Gloria in Early Christian Latin*, includes Augustine's conception of *Gloria* in the context of the meaning Augustine gives to the humility of Christ's death on the cross[110]). According to him, Augustine makes the humility of Christ's death on the cross as the basis of His later glory.

In this section we attempt to trace back in Augustine the origin of the bond of Christ's glorification and ours in the future. We also attempt to show how Augustine came to think that Christ's resurrection is the *exemplum* of our future resurrection. The theme of Christ's ascension is excluded. Augustine considers it no more than an extension of Christ's glory in His resurrection[111]).

A. *The bond between Christ's resurrection and ours*

In *De Quantitate Animae* 33,76, written in 388, Augustine clearly mentions for the first time the certainty of the resurrection of the body[112]). Here also for the first time he speaks of the bond that exists between the resurrection of Christ and our own that will happen in the future.

> We shall also see that this corporeal nature, in obedience to the divine laws, undergoes so many changes and vicissitudes that we may maintain even the resurrection of the body, which some believe with hesitation and others not at all, to be so certain that the rising of the sun after it has gone down is not more certain to us. With this certainty let us therefore look down on those who laugh at the fact that the form of a man has been assumed by the most powerful, eternal, and immutable Son of God at the other miracles pertaining to this history, in order to set for us the prototype and the firstfruits

[109]) W. GEERLINGS, *Christus Exemplum. Studien zur Christologie und Christusverkündigung Augustins*, Mainz, 1978, p. 195-199.

[110]) A.J. VERMEULEN, *The Semantic development of Gloria in Early Christian Latin*, Nijmegen, 1956, p. 191f.

[111]) *Sermo* 263,1, PL 38,1209; *Sermo* 265,7 & 12, PL 38,1222 & 1224.

[112]) Cf. M.R. MILES, *Augustine on the Body*, Missoula, 1979, p. 106.

> of our salvation, as those boys, who, when they see a painter painting by looking at tablets (= models) set before him, think that he cannot paint a man unless he looks at another picture[113]).

In this text Augustine is speaking of the vision of a man in contemplation. In the thinking of Augustine this vision is a glimpse of the reality which brings one to believe that if body, by being subject to the divine laws, can change much, then it is not absurd to admit also that after the resurrection our body can be transformed.

In the same text, Augustine establishes as certain the ability of the bodies to be transformed after the resurrection: *ita certam teneamus*. He traces this certainty to the purpose of Christ's incarnation, life, sufferings and death: the whole history of Christ's earthly existence was aimed at the salvation of mankind. This means that in the thinking of Augustine the role of Christ's mediation is absolutely necessary for our salvation, and for that matter for our resurrection. Christ's own bodily resurrection took place in order to set for us the *exemplum* and the *primitiae* of our salvation. This means that the meaning of Christ's resurrection cannot be separated from His own life, sufferings and death. Nor, therefore, can it be separated from our own future resurrection. It is in this sense that it is the *exemplum* of our future resurrection.

Christ's resurrection, seen within the context of his life on earth exercises a certain degree of causality in our own future resurrection. In the text quoted above Augustine speaks of this. In an analogy of the ability of a painter to paint even without a model but with his capacity to put under his command the instruments for painting, Augustine is able to demonstrate the causality that Christ's resurrection, in connection with the causality of His incarnation and deeds has upon our own resurrection. He demonstrates this causality further in *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,67,2, where he uses a similar analogy. However, there he speaks more properly of the causality of God in comparison with the causality of a painter upon a painting. In our understanding the reference to the

[113]) "Videbimus etiam naturae hujus corporeae tantas commutationes et vicissitudines, dum divinis legibus servit, ut etiam ipsam resurrectionem carnis, quae partim tardius, partim omnino non creditur, ita certam teneamus, ut certius nobis non sit, solem, cum occiderit, oriturum. Jamvero eos qui ad exemplum salutis nostrae ac primitias, a Filio Dei potentissimo, aeterno, incommutabili susceptum hominem, eumdemque natum esse de virgine, caeteraque hujus historae miracula irrident, sic contemnemus, tanquam eos pueros, qui cum pictorem propositis tabulis, quas intueatur, pingentem viderint; non putent posse hominem pingi, nisi aliam picturam, qui pingit, aspexerit". *De Quantitate Animae* 33,76, PL 32,1077.

causality of God does not rule out the causality of Christ, considering that in the thinking of Augustine Christ as the Son of God and the second Person in the Trinitarian unity shared the causality of the Father and vice versa[114]). In the transformation of the risen body, the same body will acquire another dignity.

> For "we are God's children now; it does not appear yet what we shall be. But we know that when he appears, we shall be like Him since we shall be like Him, since we shall see Him as He is" (1 Jo. 3,2). This is itself the revelation of the sons of God, which the desire of creation hopes for now; this does not mean that creation hopes for a revelation of another nature, which may not be a creation; but itself in its actual state now hopes for what it will itself be in the future. It is as if it were said, when a painter paints with the colors put under his control and prepared for his work, the expected result of the colors is the manifestation of the image, not because then they are one thing and later they will be another; but only because they will acquire another dignity[115]).

In this analogy we see clearly that God, as compared to the painter, who exercises causality in the transformation of the colors into a certain image, exercises causality efficaciously in the process of transforming our body. The colors undergo transformation through the power and control *(subjectis sibi)* of the painter. Our body will rise and undergo transformation through the power and control of God.

The transformation of the body of Christ after His resurrection from the dead was not patterned after any model. His resurrection is itself the *exemplum* of our own future resurrection. In the context of

[114]) See *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 19,15, CCL 36,198: "Animas ergo suscitat Deus, per Christum filium Dei; corpora suscitat Deus, per eumdem Christum filium hominis".
In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus 19,5, CCL 36,190: "Et filius quos vult vivificat, et Pater quos vult vivificat, et ipsos Filius quos et Pater; ac per hoc eadem Patris et Filii et potestas est et voluntas".
In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus 21,10, CCL 36,217: "Ergo et Lazarus qui resurrexit, et a Patre et a Filio suscitatus est in dono et gratia Spiritus sancti; et illud mirabile opus Trinitas fecit".

[115]) "*Filii* enim *Dei sumus, et nondum apparuit quid erimus. Scimus autem quoniam cum apparuerit, similes ei erimus, quoniam videbimus eum sicuti est* (1 Jo. 3,2). Ipsa est revelatio filiorum Dei, quam nunc exspectat exspectatio creaturae: non quod creatura exspectet alterius naturae, quae non sit creatura; sed ipsa qualis futura est: tamquam si diceretur, operante pictore subjectis sibi coloribus et ad opus ejus paratis, exspectatio colorum manifestationem imaginis exspectat: non quia tunc sunt alii erunt; sed tantum quod aliam dignitatam habebunt". *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,67,2, PL 40,67.

salvation it is by way of Christ's resurrection, similarly in connection with our life history in union with Christ, that will bring us to a state where we shall enjoy the vision of Christ as God.

In "'Primitiae Spiritus'. Remarques sur une citation paulinienne des 'Confessions' de saint Augustin", J. Pépin acknowledges also the same difficulty as we are struggling with in *De Quantitate Animae*. He wrestles with the complexity that Augustine presents by associating *exemplum* with *primitiae*. J. Pépin unravels this difficulty in the light of Augustine's statement in *En. in Ps.* 64,5. There Augustine associates *primitiae* with incarnation. He apparently identifies the human body of Jesus Christ as the *primitiae*.

> Why will all flesh come to Him? Because He assumed flesh. For what purpose will all flesh come? He took up therefore the firstfruits from the womb of a virgin; after the firstfruits have been assumed, the rest will follow in order that the holocaust be completed. Why then does He say: All flesh? Because all flesh means: All men [116]).

In *En. in Ps.* 64,6 Augustine clearly says that this *primitiae* is the *primitiae carnis* that Christ took from the womb of a virgin. The virgin was one of us. This shows that Christ assumed from us a body that He would offer on the cross to God.

> Someone, therefore, stood out, our priest, sent by the Lord God; He assumed from us what He would offer to the Lord; we called them the holy firstfruits of the flesh taken from the womb of a virgin. He offered this holocaust to God; He extended His hands on the cross ... [117]).

B. *The meaning of "primitiae" in the perspective of resurrection*

Augustine distinguishes in a precise manner the nuanced conception of *primitiae* from the conception of *primitiva* and *primogenita*. *Primitiae* are the selected things among those harvested. *Primitiva* are the first

[116]) "Quare ad illum omnis caro veniet? Quia carnem assumsit. Quo veniet omnis caro? Tulit inde primitias ex utero virginali, assumtis primitiis cetera consequentur, ut holocaustum compleatur. Unde ergo *omnis caro?* Omnis homo". *En. in Ps.* 64,5, CCL 39,827.

[117]) "Exstitit ergo a Deo Domino missus quidam sacerdos noster; assumsit a nobis quod offeret Domino, ipsas diximus sanctas primitias carnis ex utero virginis. Hoc holocaustum obtulit Deo: extendit manus in cruce ...". *En. in Ps.* 64,6, CCL 39,828.
See also *En. in Ps.* 129,7, CCL 40,1895: Christ's resurrected body is our *primitiae* offered to God.

offspring of beasts and human beings: *primitivi animalium fetus, etiam hominum. Primogenita* are the first fruits *harvested.* For Augustine the *primitiae* are therefore the selected articles among the *primogenita.* This would mean that for him there is a very close unity between the *primitiae* and those who belong to this group. When applied to Christ and His Body, *primitiae* would signify the close union between Christ and His Body. It is understandable that Augustine sees the relationship between Christ's resurrection and ours in the future in the perspective of unity and not in the perspective of series of harvests because it seems that he looks at the relationship in the light of his teaching concerning the Total Christ. This teaching becomes often the underlying idea of his arguments for the resurrection of our bodies[118]). The Head, who has risen and ascended, longs for the resurrection of the body in view of the unity of these two parts. Augustine presents this unity in the image of the unity of the harvest that has already been put in a container or its like.

> "The first-born (*primogenita*) that are in their land, which they bring to the Lord, will be yours" (Num. 18,13). Here he does not call *primogenita* the first offspring of beasts, because in Greek they are called πρωτότοκα; here, however, the word used is πρωτογενήματα. But in Latin the two names are not found for these things. And therefore some understood those πρωτογενήματα to be *primitias*; but *primitiae* are called ἀπαρχαί and they are something else. These three, therefore, should be distinguished in this manner because πρωτότοκα are the first offspring of beasts and also human beings, πρωτογενήματα, however, are the first fruits harvested from the earth, or from a tree, or from a vine; the *primitiae*, on the other hand, are those things which have been firstly selected from the fruits, but have been already harvested from the field and are taken first as from a lump, from a container, from a jar, from a cask[119]).

[118]) See *En. in Ps.* 65,1 CCL 39,839.

[119]) "*Primogenita omnia quaecumque fuerint in terra eorum, quantacumque adtulerint domino, tibi erunt* (Num. 18,13). Hic primogenita, non fetus primitivos pecorum dicit; nam ipsa graece πρωτότοκα nominantur, haec autem πρωτογενήματα, sed latine duabus his rebus duo nomina reperta non sunt. Et ideo ista πρωτογενήματα quidam 'primitias' interpretati sunt; sed primitiae ἀπαρχαί dicuntur et aliud sunt. Haec igitur tria ita discernuntur, quia πρωτότοκα sunt primitivi animalium fetus, etiam hominum, πρωτογενήματα vero primi fructus de terra sumti vel de arbore vel de vite; primitiae autem de fructibus quidem, sed iam redactis ab agro, sicut de massa, de lacu, de dolio, de cupa, quae primitus sumebantur". *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum (Quaestiones de Numeris)* 32, CSEL 28(2),340 J. Pépin, "'Primitiae Spiritus'. Remarques sur une citation paulinienne des 'Confessions' de saint Augustin", p. 176: "*primitiae* enfin s'applique aux premiers prélèvements effectués sur récolte déjà rentrée".

It would be in accordance with the idea in this text to say that for Augustine the flesh of Christ which He himself offered to God as an holocaust is the flesh which is ontologically one with our own. This explains the idea that Christ's resurrection in flesh included already, in a certain measure, the resurrection of our flesh: *Sed resurrexit in eo quod pro te accepit ex te. Ergo natura in illo praecessit te; et quod sumptum est ex te, adscendit ante te; ibi ergo et tu adscendisti. Adscendit ergo ille prior, quia caro illa de genere humano.* This text, which is found in *En. in Ps.* 70, *Sermo* 2,10 — a similar thought is also found in *En. in Ps.* 65,1 — shows that for Augustine the bond between Christ and us, which was established through His incarnation, was not broken by His death and ascension. His flesh rose from the dead and ascended. Yet it retains its ontological union with our flesh[120]). Accordingly His resurrection showed the resurrection of the firstfruits.

> "For as by a man", therefore, "came death, by a man also came the resurrection of the dead" (1 Cor. 15,21), manifested, not created; for both have been instituted by God; but the condition of death is in Adam; however, in the person of Christ the firstfruits of the resurrection shone[121]).

This statement is actually Julian's. Augustine, however, assimilates it; thus showing agreement with Julian. J. Pépin points this out also: *mis par A. sur les lèvres de Julien*[122]). In the context of the theme of resurrection Julian and Augustine are discussing the meaning of *primitiae* in 1 Cor. 15,20 and 21: "But in fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the firstfruits *(primitiae)* of those who have fallen asleep. For as by one man came death, by one man has come also the resurrection of the dead". J. Pépin contends that here Augustine is amplifying the meaning of *primitiae* as *initium*[123]). According to his interpretation of Augustine, the bishop of Hippo teaches that Christ's resurrection was the beginning of the resurrection of the dead. We agree with this interpretation. This conception of *primitiae resurrectionis* as *initium resurrectionis* connotes the idea of bond in resurrection. The signification of Christ's resurrec-

[120]) See *En. in Ps.* 39,5 and 6, CCL 38,428.

[121]) "*Per hominem ergo mors, et per hominem resurrectio mortuorum* (1 Cor. 15,21), manifestata, non creata: caeterum utrumque institutum per Deum est; sed in Adam mortis conditio, in persona vero Christi primitiae resurrectionis claruerunt". *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,36, PL 45,1591-1592.

[122]) J. PÉPIN, "'Primitiae Spiritus'. Remarques sur une citation paulinienne des 'Confessions' de saint Augustin", p. 176 note 3.

[123]) Ibid. See also *In Epistulam Ioannis Tractatus* 2,2, PL 35,1990.

tion, which should not be isolated from the signification of His life, sufferings and death, continues to exercise causality in us towards the time of our own resurrection. This idea is explained more clearly in the conception of Augustine of the resurrection of the body in terms of reward for the just. Christ is the author of the resurrection of the bodies of the just: *et duo ista contraria singulos auctores habent, Adam mors, Christum resurrectio mortuorum.*

> Now therefore, because he speaks of the resurrection of the body, which will be in the future, with which on the contrary he contrasts the death of the body, which happens now, and these two opposites have their own authors, death has Adam, the resurrection of the body has Christ, it is understood that just as that resurrection was a reward, so death is to be understood as a punishment. For on the contrary nature is not contrasted with a reward whereas a punishment is. And therefore in this passage, where the resurrection of the body is contrasted with the death of the body, yhe Apostle does not speak of the general resurrection, which pertain both to the just and the unjust; but rather, of that resurrection, in which those who are vivified in Christ will be present and not those who are condemned by Christ, although He will raise up both, since all who are in the sepulcher will hear His voice; and will go to the resurrection of life those who lived well; however, those who lived unjustly will go to the resurrection unto judgment (cf. Jo. 5,28-29). For this reason, as I have said, I therefore recommend this, which pertains to the favor of Christ, and not that also which pertains only to judgment, in order to show that since the resurrection is a reward, so also the death of the body, which on the contrary is contrasted with this, is shown to be a penalty[124]).

It is understandable that Augustine holds that the resurrection of the body of the just is a reward because His main concern is to show that the resurrection of body is a work of God's justice. For this reason, while

[124]) "Nunc proinde quia de resurrectione corporis loquitur, quae futura est, cui opponit e contrario mortem corporis, quae nunc fit; et duo ista contraria singulos auctores habent, Adam mors, Christum resurrectio mortuorum: sicut intelligitur resurrectio illa praemialis, ita esse intelligenda est mors ista poenalis. Praemio quippe a contrario non opponitur natura, sed poena. Et ideo isto loco, ubi resurrectio corporis opponitur morti corporis, non de communi resurrectione agit Apostolus, quae ad justos et injustos pertinet; sed de illa potius, in qua erunt qui vivificabuntur in Christo, non qui damnabuntur a Christo: quamvis utrosque ipse resurgere faciat, cujus vocem audient omnes qui in monumentis sunt; et procedent qui bene fecerunt, in resurrectionem vitae; qui autem mala egerunt, in resurrectionem judicii (Jo. 5,28-29). Ideo ergo, ut dixi, eam volui commendare, quae ad beneficium Christi pertinet, non etiam illam, quae tantum ad judicium; ut quoniam ista praemialis est, mors quoque corporis, quae a contrario huic opponitur, ostendatur esse poenalis". *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,36, PL 45,1593.

on the one hand he maintains that both the just and the unjust will rise, on the other hand he always makes a distinction between the destiny of the risen body of the just and the destiny of the risen body of the unjust. The former will rise to a better condition, the latter to a worse condition. He has a great esteem for those who for a just cause courageously face sufferings even till death. It is not because he praises death in itself, which he never does because death for him is a penalty for sin, but because he believes that death on account of a just cause guarantees the dead the reward of a resurrection to a better condition.

> For just as death is contrary to life, so also punishment is contrary to reward; through this punishment, that is, death of the body, since the holy martyrs fought and conquered, their death in which they sleep in the Lord is precious, not in itself, but because of its rewarding function (cf. Ps. 115,15). And the tortures that the saints receive are, indeed, without doubt precious; but it is not so, that because they are precious, they are not tortures; just it is not so, that because they are tortures, they are precious; but because they have been received for the cause of truth, or because they have been borne with holiness. If you held this sound and Catholic thought, you would refrain from sending to the paradise of God, that is to say, to the place of holy delights, not only the punishments of death but also of the infirmities which carry death[125]).

Later Augustine says that the causality of Christ's resurrection upon our own is made possible through the justice and aid of Christ: *per justitiam ejus et gratiam.* He does not, however, explain how this justice and aid of the risen Christ works in us.

> And you understand thus, that all who die with the death of the body die in Adam, because through this man came death, that is, through his guilt and punishment; and all who are not condemned but are made alive with the resurrection of the body of Christ live in Christ, because through this man came the resurrection of the dead,

[125]) "Sicut enim vitae mors, ita praemio poena contraria est; per quam poenam, id est, corporis mortem, quoniam sancti martyres certaverunt atque vicerunt, mors eorum in qua nunc dormiunt in conspectu Domini, non suo genere, sed illius munere pretiosa est (Ps. 115,15). Etiam poenae quippe sanctorum, sine dubitatione pretiosae sunt: sed non quia pretiosae sunt, ideo poenae non sunt; sicut non quia poenae sunt, ideo pretiosae sunt; sed quia pro veritate susceptae, vel cum pietate toleratae sunt. Hunc sensum sanum et catholicum si teneres, non in paradisum Dei, hoc est, in locum sanctarum deliciarum, non solum mortuum poenas, verum etiam mortiferarum valetudinum mitteres". *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,36, PL 45,1593-1594.

> that is, through his justice and grace. For since the death of the body is penal, therefore, we see from its contrary that the resurrection of the body is opposite to it, since it is a reward, when the other (= the resurrection of the unjust) is also penal[126]).

For both Augustine and Julian therefore, the conception of Christ's resurrection as the firstfruits of those who have died applies only to the resurrection of the just.

> He says, "But in fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of those who have fallen asleep, since through a man came death, and through a man came the resurrection of the dead" (1 Cor. 15,20-21). Here the Apostle does not speak about the general resurrection, which even wicked and worldly men will undergo, but only the resurrection of those who will be lifted up into glory[127]).

C. *The double effect of Christ's resurrection*

In *Sermo* 231,2 Augustine says that the resurrection of Christ is the new life of the believers: *Resurrectio autem Domini nostri Jesu Christi nova vita est credentium in Jesum, et hoc est sacramentum passionis et resurrectionis ejus, quod valde nosse et agere debetis.* Farther, in the same context, he says that there is a parallel between circumcision in the Old Testament and the resurrection of Christ. Both took place on the eighth day. Augustine interprets circumcision by the use of a stone to mean allegorically the destruction of carnal life through the resurrection of Jesus, in view of His resurrection that would take place on the eighth day[128]). For in his understanding Christ is the stone (cf. 1 Cor. 10,4).

[126]) "Et sic intelligas, omnes qui morte corporis moriuntur, in Adam mori, quia per ipsum hominem mors, id est, per culpam eius et poenam; et omnes qui resurrectione corporis non damnantur, sed vivificantur, in Christo vivificari, quia per ipsum hominem resurrectio mortuorum, id est, per justitiam ejus et gratiam. Quia enim est poenalis corporis mors, ideo illi resurrectionem corporis tantummodo praemialem (cum sit alia quoque poenalis), e contrario videmus oppositam". *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,36, PL 45,1594-1595.

[127]) "*Nunc autem*, inquit, *Christus resurrexit a mortuis primitiae dormientium; quoniam quidem per hominem mors, et per hominem resurrectio mortuorum* (1 Cor. 15,20-21). De resurrectione hic Apostolus non generali loquitur, quam experturi sunt etiam scelesti, etiam profani homines; sed de eorum tantummodo, qui transferentur in gloriam". *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,36, PL 34,1590.

[128]) "Ergo crucifixus est, ut in cruce ostenderet veteris hominis nostri occasum: et resurrexit, ut in sua vita ostenderet nostrae vitae novitatem. Sic enim doctrina docet apostolica: *Traditus est*, inquit, *propter peccata nostra, et resurrexit propter justificationem nostram* (Rom. 4,25). Huius rei signum circumcisio data erat Patribus, ut octavo die circumcideretur omnis masculus (Gen. 17,12). Circumcisio fiebat in cultellis petrinis (Jos. 5,2): quia petra erat Christus (1 Cor. 10,4). In ista circumcisione significabatur exspoliatio

With respect to us in the New Testament, Christ's resurrection that took place on the eighth day destroyed our old life. We now live in hope for our own resurrection: *Resurrectio ipsius innovat nos. Ergo octavo die resurgendo circumcidit nos. In ipsa spe vivimus.* This shows the effect of Christ's resurrection in us.

In *De Trinitate* 4,3.6 Augustine explains how this effect takes place in us.

> Therefore, for this double death of ours the Savior payed out His own single death; and to effect our resurrection too, He set before and offered His own one resurrection both as a sacrament and as an example[129]).

In this statement we can easily see that the significance of Christ's resurrection is inseparable from the significance of His death. Likewise we can see the double effect of His death and resurrection in us. And finally we can see Augustine's intention of showing that this double effect takes place in us. For this intention we point to the words used by Augustine: *ad faciendam.* This denotes the efficacious causality of Christ's resurrection. *Facere*, as distinguished from *agere*, signifies a certain specific real result. One may question our position here on the basis of Augustine's own statement that the effect of Christ's death and resurrection upon us happens in a sacramental way (this can mean as a mystery and a sign of grace): *in sacramento.* One may be led to think that this effect takes place only in our souls. This is not, however, the case in my own opinion. First, because in the text cited above Augustine is speaking clearly of the double effect of Christ's single death and resurrection. Second, Augustine is speaking of one man but considers him doubly : the exterior man and the interior man. By exterior man, he refers to his body. By interior man, he refers to his soul. The resurrection of Christ exercises causality upon both the interior and the exterior man. It effects justification upon the interior man. But this justification is extended to the resurrection of the exterior man: *Eius autem resurrectio differtur in finem cum et ipsa iustificatio nostra perficietur ineffabiliter*[130]).

carnalis vitae octavo die per Christi resurrectionem. Septimus enim dies hebdomadis sabbato completur. Sabbato Dominus jacuit in sepulcro, septima sabbati: resurrexit octava. Resurrectio ipsius innovat nos. Ergo octavo die resurgendo circumcidit nos. In ipsa spe vivimus". *Sermo* 231,2, PL 38,1105.

[129]) "Huic ergo duplae morti nostrae salvator impendit simplam suam, et ad faciendam utramque resuscitationem nostram in sacramento et exemplo praeposuit et proposuit unam suam". *De Trinitate* 4,3.6, CCL 50, 166-167.

[130]) "Corpus vero tamquam *homo exterior* quanto est haec vita diuturnior magis

In "Le sacrifice selon saint Augustin", J. Lécuyer looks at the causality of the resurrection of Jesus Christ in us in the perspective of Augustine's conception of sacrifice. Referring to the same statement of Augustine in *De Trinitate* 4,3.6, quoted above, he says that by virtue of the two words, namely, *sacramentum-exemplum*, Augustine is expressing the real causality of Christ's resurrection taken in union with the meaning of His sacrifice[131]).

However, farther statements of Augustine in *De Trinitate* 4,3.6 may present us with a problem. He seems to split up the effect of Christ's resurrection in us as a *sacramentum* and its effect as an *exemplum*. He apparently says that as *sacramentum* it effects in us a spiritual transfiguration.

> But the resurrection of the body of the Lord is shown to pertain to the mystery of our own interior resurrection, where, after He had risen, He said to the woman, "Do not touch me, for I have not yet ascended to my Father". With this mystery the Apostle agreed when he said: "If then you have risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sits at the right hand of God; set your thoughts on things above" (Col. 3,1-2). For not to touch Christ, except when He had ascended to the Father, means not to know Christ in his body[132]).

As an *exemplum*, Augustine seems to say, it effects in us faith in the truth of His resurrection in body; it is an *exemplum docens*.

magisque *corrumpitur* vel aetate vel morbo vel variis afflictationibus donec veniat ad ultimam quae ab omnibus mors vocatur. Eius autem resurrectio differtur in finem cum et ipsa iustificatio nostra perficietur ineffabiliter". *De Trinitate* 4,3.5, CCL 50,165.

[131]) "Mais comment échapper à la conclusion que le Sacrifice du Christ, tout en étant le plus vrai des sacrifices, est cependant aussi un *sacrement*, c'est-à-dire un 'signe sacré'? Tel est bien, en effet, l'enseignement de saint Augustin, clairement exprimé dans le *De Trinitate:* la mort du Christ est à la fois *sacramentum* et *exemplum* de notre double mort spirituelle et corporelle; la Résurrection est le sacrement de notre résurrection spirituelle; c'est-à-dire que le sacrifice du Christ n'est pas seulement un modèle à suivre, un exemplaire de nos sacrifices personnels, mais qu'il les signifie et les cause tout ensemble; la juxtaposition des deux mots: sacramentum-exemplum montre assez qu'il n'y s'agit pas seulement d'une signification vide et inefficace, mais bien d'une réelle causalité". J. LÉCUYER, "Le sacrifice selon saint Augustin", in *Augustinus Magister II*, Paris, 1954, p. 909.

[132]) "Resurrectio vero corporis domini ad sacramentum interioris resurrectionis nostrae pertinere ostenditur ubi postquam resurrexit ait mulieri: *Noli me tangere; nondum enim ascendi ad patrem meum.* Cui mysterio congruit apostolus dicens: *Si autem resurrexistis cum Christo, quae sursum sunt quaerite ubi Christus est in dextera dei sedens; quae sursum sunt sapite* (Col. 3,1-2). Hoc est enim Christum non tangere nisi cum ascenderit ad patrem, non de Christo carnaliter sapere". *De Trinitate* 4,3.6, CCL 50,168.

> He assumed from you that in which He would die for you. With this example He would teach you. What would He teach you? That you will rise[133]).

These two statements seem to show that for Augustine Christ's resurrection in the body does not have any real effect in ourselves with respect to our future resurrection in body. In our opinion this does not seem to reflect Augustine's thinking. Our reasons are the following. First, an earlier statement of Augustine in *De Trinitate* 4,3.6 shows that Christ's resurrection causes a simultaneous effect in our souls and bodies: *sed indutus carne mortali et sola moriens, sola resurgens, ea sola nobis ad utrumque concinuit cum in ea fieret interioris hominis sacramentum, exterioris exemplum*[134]). Augustine uses here the word *concinuit*, which is a musical term to express tunes sounded together in harmony or in concert. This means that in the mind of Augustine the resurrection of Christ taken in relation with His death causes simultaneous effect in us, that is to say, in our soul and in our body. It effects a spiritual transformation of our souls; it effects an elevation in dignity in our bodies. This interpretation would be in accordance with Augustine's thinking that with the resurrection, seen in the context of the Total Christ, our human nature also rose with Him. We have shown this already. The second reason is this: farther in *De Trinitate* 4,3.6, in the same context, Augustine associates the idea of Christ's resurrection with the idea of the transfiguration of our bodies to the glorious body of the risen Christ. He does this by associating 1 Cor. 15,23: "Christ the beginning, then they who belong to Christ", with Phil. 3,21: "He transformed our lowly body to be like His glorious body".

> It is on account of this *exemplum* of our future bodily resurrection, which went before in the Lord, that the Apostle says, "Christ the beginning, then they who are of Christ" (1 Cor. 15,23). For in that text he was speaking about the resurrection of the body, about which he also says, "He transformed our lowly body to be like His glorious body" (Phil. 3,21).[135])

[133]) "Suscepit a te in quo moreretur pro te, quo exemplo doceret te. Quid doceret te? Quia resurrecturus es". *En. in Ps.* 70, *Sermo* 2,10, CCL 39,168.

[134]) "Neque enim fuit peccator aut impius ut ei tamquam spiritu mortuo in interiore homine renovari opus esset et tamquam resipiscendo ad vitam iustitiae revocari, sed indutus carne mortali et sola moriens, sola resurgens, ea sola nobis ad utrumque concinuit cum in ea fieret interioris hominis sacramentum, exterioris exemplum". *De Trinitate* 4,3.6, CCL 50,167.

[135]) "Propter hoc exemplum futurae nostrae resurrectionis in corpore quod praecessit in domino dicit apostolus: *Initium Christus, deinde qui sunt Christi* (1 Cor. 15,23).

This text shows that for Augustine the risen Christ continues the work of transforming our bodies until they acquire the same dignity after their resurrection as the glorious body of Christ. Augustine expresses this idea further:

> Therefore, the one death of our Savior brought salvation to our double death; and His one resurrection wrought for us two resurrections when His body was offered in each case, that is in death and in resurrection, with a certain healing suitableness both in the sacrament of the interior man and in the *exemplum* of the exterior man[136]).

Third, Augustine considers the resurrection of Christ as a sacrifice. It is a partial offering to God of the Total Christ[137]). It will become a total offering — Augustine calls it a holocaust — when after the resurrection of our bodies, at the transformation of our corruptible bodies to incorruptible, the Total Christ in His resurrected body has been offered to God as a complete sacrifice. This clearly shows the unity between Christ's resurrection as the resurrection of the Head and our

De corporis enim resurrectione illo loco agebatur propter quam etiam dicit: *Transfiguravit corpus humilitatis nostrae conforme corpori gloriae suae* (Phil. 3,21)". *De Trinitate* 4,3.6, CCL 50,169. In connection with Phil. 3,21, in *En. in Ps.* 144,19, CCL 40,2102, Augustine referred to it in order to show how Christ is for us an *exemplum patientiae*, without alluding to the causality of His resurrection upon ours in the future: "Et tamen ut tibi ostenderet exemplum patientiae, transfiguravit corpus humilitatis nostrae conforme gloriae suae".

[136]) "Una ergo mors nostri salvatoris duabus mortibus nostris saluti fuit, et una eius resurrectio duas nobis resurrectiones praestitit cum corpus eius in utraque re, id est et in morte et in resurrectione, et in sacramento interioris hominis nostri et exemplo exterioris medicinali quadam convenientia ministratum est". *De Trinitate* 4,3.6, CCL 50,169. See E. FRANZ, *Totus Christus. Studien über Christus und die Kirche bei Augustin*, Bonn, 1956, p. 153: with respect to the causality of Christ's suffering, he says, "Der 'compassio' hier entspricht die 'glorificatio'".

[137]) See the following works: *En. in Ps.* 65,18, CCL 39,852: "Quid est holocaustum? Totum incensum, sed igne divino. Holocaustum enim dicitur sacrificium, cum totum accenditur. Aliae sunt partes sacrificiorum; aliud holocaustum; quando totum ardet, et totum consumitur igne divino, holocaustum dicitur; quando pars, sacrificium. Omne quidem holocaustum sacrificium, sed non omne sacrificium holocaustum. Holocausta promittit; corpus Christi loquitur, unitas Christi loquitur: *Introibo in domum tuam in holocaustis* (Ps. 65,13). Totum meum consumat ignis tuus; nihil mei remaneat mihi, totum sit tibi, Hoc autem erit in resurrectione iustorum, *quando et corruptibile hoc induetur incorruptione, et mortale hoc induetur immortalitate; tunc fiet quod scriptum absorpta est in victoriam* (1 Cor. 15,54). Victoria quasi ignis divinus est; cum absorbet mortem nostram, holocaustum est. Non remanet aliquid in carne, non remanet aliquid culpabile in spiritu; totum ex mortali vita consumetur, ut in aeterna vita consummetur: erunt ergo illo holocausta". *En. in Ps.* 64,4 and 5, CCL 39,826 and 827; *En. in Ps.* 129,7, CCL 40,1895; *En. in Ps.* 130,4, CCL 40,1900; *En. in Ps.* 140, 5, CCL 40,2029; *En. in Ps.* 1,4, CCL 38,113; *En. in Ps.* 49,15, CCL 38,588; *En. in Ps.* 50,23, CCL 38,618.

resurrection in the future, which will be the resurrection of the Body of the Total Christ[138]).

Our position here would not be in complete agreement with any conception of *exemplum* in the interpretation of W. Geerlings, in *Christum Exemplum. Studien zur Christologie und Christusverkündigung Augustins*. We refer to his interpretations of Augustine's conception of Christ as the *exemplum*, conceived more as an external model than Christ as the *exemplum* exercising efficacious internal causality in us. W. Geerlings gives Augustine's three uses of the word *exemplum* as follows:[139])

1. pedagogical dimension of the *exemplum* that calls for imitation.
2. the moralizing exemplary interpretation of history.
3. the speculative interpretation of ideas as *exempla* (= neo-Platonic).

Given this presentation of Augustine's general conceptions of *exemplum*, it is not surprising that when Geerlings applies a conception of *exemplum* to Christ, he is inclined to show our means of relating with Christ more through following Him as *the* model: *Christus, exemplum sine exemplo*[140]). This would attribute the causality of Christ in us more to an external influence. This is apparently explained by Geerlings' idea of God's action through Christ in history. Geerling says that the early writings of Augustine show a total identification between the inner enlightenment through the light of the mind, on the one hand, and, the teacher Christ *(Christus magister et praedicator)*, on the other. But the main point in this magister-presentation shifts to the presentation of

[138]) "Caro factus: unde caro? Ex Maria virgine. Unde Maria virgo? Ex Adam. Ergo ex illo primo captivo; et caro in Christo de massa captivitatis. Utquid hoc? Ad exemplum. Suscepit a te in quo moreretur pro te, quo exemplo doceret te. Quod doceret te? Quia resurrecturus es. Unde enim crederes, nisi exemplum carnis praecederet assumtae de massa mortis tuae? Ergo in illo primo resurreximus; quia et Christus cum resurrexit, nos resurreximus. Non enim Verbum mortuum est; et resurrexit; sed in Verbo caro mortua est, et resurrexit. Ibi mortuus est Christus, ubi es tu moriturus; et ibi resurrexit Christus, ubi es tu resurrecturus. Exemplo suo docuit quid non timeres, quid sperares". *En. in Ps.* 70, *Sermo* 2,10, CCL 39,968-969. See also the following works: *En. in Ps.* 101, *Sermo* 2,14, CCL 40,1449; *En. in Ps.* 102,6, CCL 40,1456; *En. in Ps.* 129,6, CCL 40,1894; *Sermo* 361,1, PL 39,1599; *Sermo* 362,10-12, PL 39,1617-1618; *Sermo* 233,1, PL 38,1112; *Sermo* 241, 1, PL 38,1133; *Sermo* 261,1, PL 38,1202; *Sermo* 265,2, PL 38,1219.

[139]) "Diesen unterschiedlichen, breit gefächerten Interessen und Aufgaben Augustins entspricht der vielfältige Gebrauch des Wortes exemplum. Sowohl die pädagogische Dimension des zur Nachahmung einladenden exemplums, die moralisierden exemplarische Geschichtsdeutung, wie die spekulative Deutung der Ideen als exempla begegnen uns im augustinischen Werk". W. GEERLINGS, *Christus Exemplum*, p. 170.

[140]) W. GEERLINGS, *Christus Exemplum*, p. 169.

Christ as the teacher of morality *(Sittlichkeit)*. Christ as *magister* and *praedicator* is a teacher of morality; and as the true teacher Christ is the *exemplum* for his pupil to follow. Christ's teaching, as a consequence of His incarnation, includes the demonstration of human weakness and the way in which it can be overcome[141]). The other dimension of Christ as *exemplum* is His life. Christ's life is the *exemplum vitae*[142]). By His total adoption of human nature, He experienced all human feelings and temptations. For this reason His life is a powerful *exemplum* for the life of individual Christian. This is the *exemplum incarnationis* which functions as an outstanding stimulus, because His incarnation has taken place *in nobis, pro nobis, de nobis*. This means that God's way to man turns Christ to man's way to God[143]). Christ's resurrection is another dimension of the *Christus exemplum*. The *exemplum resurrectionis* announces to us in the *signum* or *exemplum resurrectionis* the definitive experience or enjoyment (from *frui*) of beatitudo in the *jenseitige* world in the highest good, namely, in God: *Die Welt der Sachen aber kann ein frui nicht ermöglichen, die beatitudo bleibt ein jenseits geschenktes Gut. Es wird uns im signum oder exemplum resurrectionis angekündigt*[144]). With this statement Geerlings places more emphasis on the external causality of Christ's resurrection in us.

This emphasis on the exterior causality is somehow moderated later by Geerlings when he speaks of the imagery used by Augustine in *Sermo* 340,1. He points at Augustine's use of the imagery of the field, where the planter is an extrinsic agent in the care for the field, but the growth is given by an interior agent: *Extrinsecus accipite plantatorem atque rigatorem, intrinsecus vero incrementi datorem*[145]). This would show the

[141]) *Ibid.*. p. 189-190.

[142]) *Ibid.*, p. 191.

[143]) *Ibid.*, p. 191: "Dieses exemplum incarnationis entfaltet seine Wirkung als vorbildlich wirkender Stimulus deshalb, weil die Menschwerdung in nobis, pro nobis, de nobis (*Contra Felicem Manichaeum* 2,9, CSEL 25(2), 838) geschehen ist. Der Weg Gottes zum Menschen macht darum Christus selbst zum Weg der menschen zu Gott. Quomodo in illo ambulandum sit, discite non solum eius verbo, sed etiam eius exemplo (*Sermo* 157,2, PL 38,860)". E. FRANZ, *Totus Christus. Studien über Christus und die Kirche bei Augustin*, p. 117, sees more than Geerlings with respect to the words "in nobis, pro nobis, de nobis". Franz sees both the external and internal conception of *exemplum*. "Pro nobis" refers to the external; "de nobis" refers to the internal.

[144]) W. GEERLINGS, *Christus Exemplum*, p. 195-199.

[145]) *Ibid.*, p. 220: "Den uns schon bekannten Gegensatz von exemplum exterioris hominis und sacramentum interioris hominis verknüpft Augustin mit dem biblischen Bild von den Christen als dem Ackerfeld Gottes, auf dem verschiedene Mitarbeiter arbeiten. Diese haben unterschiedliche Aufgaben der Pflege, das Wachstum aber können sie nicht

closer union between the effect of Christ's sufferings in our souls and in our bodies. Here, however, Geerlings speaks apparently only of Christ's death and nothing about His resurrection in connection with His death. He seems to have overlooked Augustine's statement in *De Trinitate* 4,3-6 — we refer to this as our main reference — where Augustine speaks of the inseparability of the significance of Christ's resurrection from the significance of His death for our life until death and resurrection.

In a certain disagreement with Geerlings we contend that in Augustine there is more about an inner unity of Christ's resurrection in body, taken in connection with His sacrifice and death, with us concerning our interior and exterior life. Its causality extends to us until the resurrection of our bodies. This is the deeper meaning of Christ's resurrection as the *exemplum resurrectionis*.

M. Alfeche O.S.A.

hervorbringen. Extrinsecus accipite plantatorem atque rigatorem, intrinsecus vero incrementi datorem (*Sermo* 340,1, PL 38,1484). Dieses innerliche Wachstum wird zunächst grundgelegt in der Taufe, die für Augustin, nicht zuletzt aus der antipelagianischen Frontstellung, zu dem entscheidenden Sakrament wird".