The use of some verses in 1 Cor. 15 in Augustine's Theology of Resurrection

INTRODUCTION

The reference of Augustine to 1 Cor. 15 serves to provide an argument from faith for the resurrection. In this article we shall attempt to show this. It is to be noted, however, that not all verses are used by Augustine for the theme of resurrection. This explains why in this article several verses or parts of different verses do not appear. This article is limited to verses 12 to 34. Verses 5-8, where Paul speaks of the order of appearances, will not be treated here, but has been treated rather in a previous article, which deals in part with Augustine's explanation of appearance narratives. It is likewise to be noted that Augustine never, at least as far as we have investigated, refers to verses 1 and 2. He starts with verse 3. A detailed treatment of verse 28: "God will be all in all", which is partly considered here, will follow.

I. The deniers of resurrection in 1 Cor. 15.

This section will be dedicated to discovering the identity of the deniers of resurrection and to investigate whether, according to Augustine, these deniers totally denied life after death or only the bodily resurrection [1]).

[1]) J. Lambrecht divides the deniers into four possible groups:
1) The materialists, e.g. the Sadducees and the Epicurians. They reject every form of life after death. For them existence after death is meaningless. 2) There are some authors, who, by referring to 1 Thes. 4, see that the deniers were those men who suspect that salvation will come only to those who are found living at the time of the Parousia. These deniers fear, therefore, the unknown lot of those who have already died. They accept only a change, a transformation, of the living; they reject the resurrection of the dead. 3) The deniers who were only at Corinth. They rejected the resurrection of the bodies, but not the immortality of the soul (or in a more gnostic term: of the pneuma); they were not materialists but spiritualists. 4) Followers of Hymeneus and Filetus (cf. 2 Tim. 2,18), who, because they have swerved from the truth, have thought that resurrection had taken place already. See *Daar komt toch eens ... opstellen over verrijzenis en eeuwig leven*, Leuven, 1981, p. 24. Augustine gives only two groups: 1) Those who think that there is no other better way of life for them than that which they have in common with the beasts; upon death everything

A. *Their identity: were they from within or from without the community of Corinth? "Some among you"*

Augustine identifies the deniers of resurrection in 1 Cor. 15 as individuals *within* the community of Corinth itself. The proofs he gives for this are the following: (i) the precision of the words of Paul in verse 12: "some among you" *(quidam in vobis)*. He argues that Paul avoided vagueness of expressions, like "some on this earth" *(in hac terra)* or "some in this world" *(in hoc mundo)*. Paul clearly points to them as existing in the community of Corinth.

> There are also among the Corinthians themselves who did not believe in the resurrection, which is the distinguishing faith of the Christians, because the Apostle says to them as follows: "Now if it is preached of Christ that he rose up from the dead, how can some among you say that there is no resurrection of the dead" (1 Cor. 15,12)? He did not say, "on this earth" or "in this world", but "among you"[2]).

(ii) the precision of the words of Paul in verse 12, "some among you", taken together with the warning given in verses 33 and 34: "Do not be deceived: 'Bad company ruins good morals'. Come to your right mind, and sin no more. For some of you have no knowledge of God. I say this to your shame". Verses 33 and 34, apparently at least, imply, if they do not express or confirm, that the community of Corinth was a mixed one, incorporating those who believed in the resurrection and those who did not. Augustine implies this proof, too, in *Epistula* 93,9.32 and in *Contra Partem Donati post Gesta* 21,33-35. In both these works he shows — probably in *Epistula* 93 he had the Donatists in mind — that in the canonical scriptures there are examples of a kind of rebuke which,

will end for man; there will be no hope of another and better life. Therefore they say "Let us eat and drink for tomorrow we shall die" (1 Cor. 15,32). See *Sermo* 361,1, PL 39,1599. Here he puts forward this denial as the motivation for his discussion of the question of resurrection: "Hinc ergo sumatur nostrae disputationis exordium ...". 2) Hymeneus and Philetus, and their followers at Corinth. Augustine pays more attention to the second group. He identifies them as the source of the denial of the resurrection of body by the Manicheans.

[2]) "In ipsis etiam Corinthiis ibi erant, qui non credebant resurrectionem mortuorum, quae singularis fides est christianorum, quod eis ita dicit apostolus: *si* autem *Christus praedicatur quod resurrexit a mortuis, quomodo dicunt quidam in vobis quia resurrectio mortuorum non est* (1 Cor. 15,12)? Non dixit 'in hac terra' vel 'in hoc mundo', sed 'in vobis' inquit". *Contra Partem Donati post Gesta* 21,34, CSEL 53,136. For a similar and related thought, see also *De Unico Baptismo* 11,18, CSEL 53,18-19.

although in fact intended only for some, is expressed as if it applied to all. One example cited by Augustine is in 1 Cor. 15,33 and 34. In *Epistula* 93, written in 408, he explains:

> Hilary, therefore, either was rebuking not the wheat, but the tares, in those ten provinces of Asia, or was addressing himself to the wheat, because it was endangered through some unfaithfulness, and spoke as one who thought that the rebuke would be useful in proportion to the vehemence with which it was given. For the canonical scriptures have also this way of rebuking, that in order that the word may reach some, it is spoken as if to all. For what the apostle says to the Corinthians, "Why is it that some among you say that there is no resurrection of the dead?", clearly shows that not all were like that. Nevertheless, he testifies that those who were such were also not outside but within their communion. Lest those who were of different belief be led astray by them, he warned them a little further on: "Do not be deceived: 'Bad company ruins good morals'. Be cautious, righteous, and sin no more: for some have no knowledge of God. I say this to your shame"[3]).

By way of comparison Hilary's statement shows that for Augustine the deniers were within the community of Corinth. And in *Contra Partem Donati post Gesta* 21,25, he says:

> The apostle, therefore, does not separate physically those who already believed in the resurrection of the dead from those, in the same community, who did not believe it; however, he does not cease to separate them spiritually saying: "Do not be deceived: 'Bad company ruins good morals'" (verse 34). He fears not their assembly, but their consent, lest they adopt the faith (of the others) through bad company, which ruins good morals; therefore, he

[3]) "Hilarius ergo decem provinciarum Asianarum aut zizania non triticum arguebat aut ipsum etiam triticum, quod defectu quodam periclitabatur, quanto vehementius tanto utilius arguendum putabat. Habent enim etiam scripturae canonicae hunc arguendi morem, ut tamquam omnibus dicatur et ad quosdam perveniat. Quod enim dicit apostolus ad Corinthios: *Quo modo dicunt quidam in vobis, quia resurrectio mortuorum non est* (1 Cor. 15,12)? manifestat utique non omnes esse tales, verum tamen non extra sed in eis fuisse testatur. A quibus ne illi seducerentur, qui non ita sentiebant, paulo post monuit dicens: *Nolite seduci; corrumpunt mores bonos conloquia mala. Sobrii estote, iusti et nolite peccare; ignorantiam enim dei quidam habent; ad reverentiam vobis loquor* (1 Cor. 15, 33-34)". *Epistula* 93,9.32, CSEL 34 (2), 477-478. Hilary's words are: "Non peregrina loquor, neque ignorata scribo: audivi ac vidi vitia praesentium; non laicorum, sed episcoporum. Nam absque episcopo Eleusio et paucis cum eo, ex majori partae Asianae decem provinciae, intra quas consisto, vere Deum nesciunt". *De Synodis* 27,63, PL 10,522-523.

admonishes them to separate from their morals, not from the altars[4]).

(iii) The community of Corinth was actually a mixture of good and evil members, and those who believed in the resurrection of the dead. Both formed one community of Corinth. This is proved by the different texts from both the first and the second letters to the Corinthians. In *Contra Partem Donati post Gesta* 6,8, Augustine compares the community of Corinth to a field where both the wheat and the tares grow together, yet do not cross-fertilize each other. The wheat represents the group of the good or the believers; the tares represent the evil or the unbelievers. There is no partnership between the two, although both belong to the same community. According to Augustine, Paul points this out in 2 Cor. 6,14 and 15: "For what partnership have righteousness and iniquity? Or, what fellowship has light with darkness? What accord has Christ with Belial? Or, what has a believer in common with an unbeliever?". And in *Contra Partem Donati post Gesta* 21,34, he specifies the difference in belief between the believers and the nonbelievers regarding the resurrection of the body. He maintains that Paul would not have preached the resurrection of Jesus Christ to the community of Corinth unless he knew that *some* of them were already Christians. Otherwise, Augustine argues, Paul would not have said in 1 Cor. 15,11: "so we preached and so you believed".

> For he could not have preached to them about the resurrection of Christ unless they were already truly Christians. He told them about the resurrection itself of Christ: "so we preached and so you believed"[5]).

In fact, in *Epistula* 93,9.32, Augustine warns against generalizing judgments on the moral standing of the Corinthians. They are not all reprobates as one perhaps could infer from 1 Cor 15,34 and 35 and 1 Cor. 3,3. For in 1 Cor. 3,3 it is said: "For while there is jealousy and

[4]) "Eos ergo, qui iam credebant resurrectionem mortuorum, ab his, qui eam in eodem populo non credebant, non corporaliter apostolus separat, sed tamen spiritaliter separare non cessat dicens: *Nolite seduci; corrumpunt mores bonos conloquia mala* (1 Cor. 15,33). Non eorum congressum, sed consensum timet, ne malis conloquiis adcommodent fidem, quae corrumpunt mores bonos; moribus ergo eos, non altaribus admonet separari". *Contra Partem Donati post Gesta* 21,35, CSEL 53,137.

[5]) "Neque enim posset de Christi resurrectione praescribere nisi iam utique chris tianis, quibus de ipsa resurrectione Christi dicit: *sic praedicamus et sic credidistis* (1 Cor. 15,11)". *Contra Partem Donati post Gesta* 21,35, CSEL 53,136.

strife among you, are you not of the flesh, and walking according to man?". Not all Corinthians are like this. The words of 1 Cor. 1,4-7 testify to this:

> Therefore, unless we have read in the same epistle: "I give thanks to God always for you because of the grace of God which was given you in Christ Jesus, that in every way you were enriched in him with all speech and knowledge — even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you — so that you are not lacking in any spiritual gift" (1 Cor. 1,4-7), we would have thought that all Corinthians were carnal and brutal, not perceiving those things which are of the spirit of God, contentious, envious, walking according to man[6]).

While in *Epistula* 93,9.32 Augustine refers to 1 Cor. 1,4-7, in order to describe the moral goodness of the Corinthians and to counteract the generalizing judgments that they all are evil, as others may be led to think, in *Contra Partem Donati post Gesta* 21,34 he uses the same scriptural text in relation to their belief regarding the resurrection of the dead. In this last mentioned work, therefore, he links 1 Cor. 1,4-7 with 1 Cor. 15,11 and 12. He argues that because of the testimony of Paul in 1 Cor. 1,4-7 there were also those who, because they were enriched in Christ with all speech and with all knowledge, believed in the resurrection of the dead. Moreover, these believers did not allow themselves to be influenced by the nonbelievers. And thus, Augustine opines, they were not led astray.

> Let us now listen to those words with which he so praises the church of Corinth in the beginning of the letter that he says: "I give thanks to God always for you because of the grace of God which was given you in Christ Jesus, that in every way you were enriched in him with all speech and knowledge — even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you — so that you are not lacking in any spiritual gift" (1 Cor. 1,4-7). See, how they were enriched in Christ with all speech and with all knowledge and how they were not wanting in any grace, and how in spite of that there were among those who so far did not believe in the resurrection of the body. I, however, think that these, who are not wanting in grace, did not

[6]) "Proinde nisi in ipsa epistula legeremus: *Gratias ago deo meo semper pro vobis in gratia dei, quae data est vobis in Christo Iesu, quia in omnibus ditati estis in illo, in omni verbo et in omni scientia, sicut testimonium Christi confirmatum est in vobis, ita ut nihil vobis desit in ulla gratia* (1 Cor. 1,4-7), putaremus omnes Corinthios carnales et animales, non percipientes, quae sunt spiritus dei, contentiosos, aemulos, secundum hominem ambulantes". *Epistula* 93,9.32, CSEL 34(2),478.

bear the yoke with those who did not believe that the dead will rise[7]).

The deniers of resurrection, according to Augustine, were within the community of Corinth. But which resurrection did they deny? This leads us to the question, whether they totally denied life after death or only bodily resurrection.

B. *Total denial of life after death or denial only of bodily resurrection?*

In the understanding of Augustine the deniers of resurrection in 1 Cor. 15 denied only bodily resurrection. He shows this by bringing together 1 Cor. 15 and 2 Tim. 2,16-18: "Avoid such godless chatter, for it will lead people into more and more ungodliness, and their talk will eat its way like cancer. Among them are Hymeneus and Philetus, who have swerved from the truth by holding that the resurrection is past already. They are upsetting the faith of some". Augustine is not alone in making this juxtaposition. John Chrysostom (c. 345-407) did the same[8]). Augustine does this by interweaving the different letters of Paul in order to form apart of his whole theology of the resurrection of the dead, and at the same time in order to correct errors. He demonstrates this in a characteristic manner in *Epistula* 55. In this letter he is answering a question raised by a certain Januarius, who asks: "Why does the anniversary on which we celebrate the passion of the Lord not fall on the same day every year, like the day which tradition has handed down as the day of His birth?". Augustine's response is: the observance of Christ's birth is not sacramental but only commemorative, whereas the observance of Christ's passion and resurrection is a sacrament. He explains that "there is a sacrament in a certain celebration when the commemoration of an event is so done that it is understood to signify something, which is to be received in a holy way"[9]). Such is the

[7]) "Nunc adtendamus verba illa, quibus Corinthiorum ecclesiam in epistulae principio sic laudat, ut dicat: *Gratias ago deo meo semper pro vobis in gratia dei quae data est vobis in Christo Iesu, quia in omnibus divites facti estis in illo, in omni verbo et omni scientia, sicut testimonium Christi confirmatum est in vobis, ita ut nihil vobis desit in ulla gratia* (1 Cor. 1,4-7). Ecce sic erant ditati in Christo in omni verbo et in omni scientia, ita eis nihil deerat in ulla gratia, ut in illis essent, qui resurrectionem mortuorum adhuc usque non crederent. Puto autem quod isti, quibus nihil deerat in ulla gratia, non ducebant iugum cum eis, qui resurrecturos mortuos non credebant". *Contra Partem Donati post Gesta* 21,34, CSEL 53,136.

[8]) See *Homilia* 38,1-5, PG 15,321-328. According to John Chrysostom these deniers think that resurrection happens already at the purification of the soul.

[9]) "Sacramentum est autem in aliqua celebratione, cum rei gestae commemoratio ita

celebration of the Passover. It is celebrated not only to recall Christ's death and resurrection but also in order to find a place for all the other things which testify about Him, to the effect that they give evidence of signification of the sacraments. Augustine interprets on the grounds of what Paul meant in Rom. 4,25: "He was delivered for our offences, and was raised for our justification"[10]). The passion and resurrection of Christ were meant to effect and, indeed, they did effect, the remission of our sins and our justification. He reasons that *pascha* originally meant transition. It does not come from the Greek word πάσχειν, which is commonly understood as "to suffer"; it is a Hebrew word which means *transitus*. It has, therefore, an eschatological meaning. For this reason, our transition from death to life has been consecrated, that is, it has already taken place in the passion and in the resurrection of Jesus Christ. It takes place now in faith, as testified by another text besides those of Paul, namely Jo. 5,24: "He who believes in me passes from death to life"[11]).

Augustine reformulates Paul's teaching of double resurrection. He develops it in his system of virtues. The theologal virtues of faith, hope and love, form a triad[12]). In the believers the transition from death to life

fit, ut aliquid etiam significare intellegatur, quod sancte accipiendum est". *Epistula* 55,1.2 CSEL 34(2),170.

[10]) "Eo itaque modo agimus pascha, ut non solum, quod factum est, in memoriam revocemus, id est quod mortuus Christus et resurrexit, sed etiam cetera, quae circa eum adtestantur, ad sacramentorum significationem non omittamus. Quia enim, sicut dicit apostolus, *mortuus est propter delicta nostra et resurrexit propter iustificationem nostram* (Rom. 4, 25), transitus quidam de morte ad vitam in illa passione domini et resurrectione sacratus est". *Epistula* 55.1.2, CSEL 34(2),170.

[11]) "Nam etiam vocabulum ipsum, quod pascha dicitur, non Graecum, sicut vulgo videri solet, sed Hebraeum esse dicunt, qui linguam utramque noverunt. Neque enim a passione, quoniam πάσχειν Graece dicitur pati, sed ab eo, quod transitur, ut dixi, a morte ad vitam, Hebraeo verbo res appellata est. In quo eloquio pascha transitus dicitur, sicut perhibent, qui haec sciunt, quod voluit et ipse dominus tangere, cum ait: *Qui credit in me, transiit a morte ad vitam* (Jo. 5,24)". *Epistula* 55,1.2, CSEL 34(2),171. See also *En. in Ps.* 68, *Sermo* 1,2, CCL 39,902.

[12]) For references on the uses of Augustine of the theologal virtues in a form of a triad, see the following: *In Epistulam Ioannis, Tractatus* 92; *Epistula* 210,1; *En. in Ps.* 148,17; *En in Ps.* 100,3; *Sermo Mai* 98,1; *Sermo* 25,1; *Sermo* 198,3; *De Perfectione Iustitiae Hominis* 8,19; *De Catechizandis Rudibus* 4,8; *De Spiritu et Littera* 36,64; *De Beata Vita* 4,35; *De Libero Arbitrio* 2,54; *Epistulae ad Galatas Expositio* 43; *Soliloquia* 1,13 & 14; *De Ordine* 2,25; *In Epistulam Ioannis, Tractatus* 6,1; *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 83,3; *Epistula* 55,14-26, CSEL 34(2),199; *En. in Ps.* 104,3, CCL 40,1537; *En. in Ps.* 31, En. 2,5, CCL 38,228-229: "Quod credit fidei est, quod operatur caritatis est. Illo ergo loco a fide coepit apostolus: Fides, spes, caritas (1 Cor. 13,13); alio loco ab ipsa caritate coepit: *Caritas de corde, puro et conscientia bona, et fide non ficta* (1 Tim. 1,5). Modo nos a medio

takes place now in faith. However, is not an empty assent. It seeks to work through love and effects the remission of sins. The believers who, having been remitted of their sins, love God and their neighbours, are disposed to hope for eternal life.

> This transition is made by us now through faith, which we have for the remission of sins and by loving God and neighbour in the hope of eternal life; "for faith works through love" (Gal. 5,6) and "the just lives by faith" (Hab. 2,4); and "hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man sees, why does he yet hope for? But if we hope for what we do not see, then we wait for it with patience (Rom. 8,24-45)[13]).

With the theologal virtues the believers are put "under grace" in personal union with Christ. Our union with Christ effects our inclusion in His death, resurrection, and finally our exaltation with Him. In order to prove this through the scriptures, Augustine refers to the following texts: 1 Rom. 6,6: "Our old man is crucified with Him", Eph. 2,6: "He has raised us up together and made us sit with Him in heavenly places". Augustine has always understood that this liberation of man through grace constitutes man's spiritual resurrection only. It is still the resurrection of man's soul and not yet of his body. He proves this by referring to Col. 3,1-2: "If then you are risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sits at the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on earth", and Rom. 8,23-25[14]). The resurrection of the body, for which we now hope, has still to take place. In *Epistula* 55,14.25 Augustine says that our union now with Christ is the beginning of the rest which is not interrupted but glorified by the

coepimus, ab ipsa conscientia et spe. Qui vult, inquam, habere bonam spem, habeat bonam conscientiam, credat, et operetur. A medio imus ad initium et finem; credat et operetur".

[13]) "Hic transitus a nobis modo agitur per fidem, quae nobis est in remissionem peccatorum, in spe vitae aeternae diligentibus deum et proximum, quia *fides per dilectionem operatur et iustus ex fide vivit; spes autem quae videtur, non est spes; quod enim videt quis, quid sperat? Si autem, quod non videmus, speramus, per patientiam expectamus* (Rom. 8,24-25)". *Epistula* 55,2.3, CSEL 34(2),171-172.

[14]) "Idem apostolus eos arguens detestatur, qui tamen dicit nos resurrexisse cum Christo. Unde, nisi quia hoc per fidem et spem et dilectionem factum esse dicit in nobis secundum *primitias spiritus?* Sed quia *spes, quae videtur, non est spes* et ideo, *si, quod non videmus, speramus, per patientiam exspectamus*, restat utique redemptio corporis nostri, quam exspectantes in nobismet ipsis ingemescimus. Unde est illud: *Spe gaudentes, in tribulatione patientes* (Rom. 8,23-25)". *Epistula* 55,2.3, CSEL 34(2), 174.

resurrection; we enjoy this rest now in faith (cf. Hab. 2,4)[15]). And earlier in the same letter he had said:

> But because it follows and he says: "For you are dead and your life is hidden with Christ in God; when Christ your life will appear you shall also appear with Him in glory" (Col. 3,3-4), he sufficiently indicates what he may wish to be understood: our transition from death to life now, which takes place through faith, is accomplished in the hope of the future resurrection and glory at the end, "when this perishable", that is, this flesh, in which we groan now, "puts on imperishability and this mortal (sc. flesh) puts on immortality" (1 Cor. 15,53)[16]).

Augustine has always held that while we are still in this state of mortality we continue to groan for the redemption of our bodies, even when in faith we already have risen with Christ with our souls. We have sufficiently demonstrated this in our first article. He repeats this same thought in *Epistula* 55 in connection with Col. 1,18:

> The whole church, therefore, which is found in the pilgrimage of mortality, hopes for this at the end of the world, which has been shown first in the body of Christ, who is "the firstbegotten from the dead" (Col. 1,18), considering that His body, of which He Himself is the Head, is nothing else but the church[17]).

It would not be impossible or groundless to opine that at the same time Augustine was writing his *Epistula* 55, in the year 400, he easily identified the belief of the deniers of resurrection in 1 Cor. 15 with that of Hymenaeus and Philetus in 2 Tim. 2,16-18. At that time he was strongly engaged in battling against the Manicheans. The text in 2 Tim. 2,16-18 furnished him a means of pinning down the Manicheans for their error in denying bodily resurrection. Besides, even before 400, he had already pointed out to them the source of their error, which lay in their belief that

[15]) *Epistula* 55,14.25, CSEL 34(2), 197-198.

[16]) "Sed quia sequitur et dicit: *Mortui enim estis et vita vestra abscondita est cum Christo in deo; cum Christus apparuerit vita vestra, tunc et vos apparebitis cum illo in gloria* (Col. 3,3-4), satis indicat, quid velit intellegi, quia nunc transitus noster de morte ad vitam, qui fit per fidem, spe peragitur futurae in fine resurrectionis et gloriae, cum *corruptibile hoc*, id est caro ista, in qua geminus modo, induet *incorruptionem et mortale hoc* induerit *inmortalitatem* (1 Cor. 15,53)". *Epistula* 55,2.3, CSEL 34(2),172.

[17]) "Hoc igitur universa ecclesia, quae in peregrinatione mortalitatis inventa est, expectat in fine saeculi, quod in domini nostri Jesu Christi corpore praemonstratum est,qui est *primogenitus a mortuis* (Col. 1,18), quia et corpus eius,cui caput est ipse, non nisi ecclesia est". *Epistula* 55,2.3, CSEL 34(2), 173.

there is only one resurrection, namely, that of the souls alone through preaching the truth. He points this out to them in *Contra Faustum Manicheum* 4.2, written in 397 or 398/399. And, according to Augustine, the source is the belief of Hymenaeus and Philetus. J.J. O'Meara, in *The Young Augustine*, is in agreement with W.H.C. Frend[18]), in "The Gnostic-Manichean Tradition in Roman North Africa", when he says that the African-Manichees held St. Paul in high esteem. Thus he is inclined to believe that Augustine, while still a Manichean had "fairly thoroughly" read St. Paul "with Manichean eyes, of course". And when he was converted to Christianity he was curious to read Paul with Christian eyes[19]). Presuming that this is true and that it applies to the question of the belief of the deniers, we could assert all the more that Augustine understood the deniers of the resurrection in 1 Cor. 15 to have denied only the bodily resurrection. The Manicheans considered the body evil, and, because they denied the humanity of Christ, they could not accept His bodily resurrection and our own in the future. Augustine, however, in agreement with the Christian tradition, considers faith in bodily resurrection as the characteristic faith of the Christians. Thus in *Epistula* 55,3.4 he writes:

> For some in studying the words, which Paul frequently says, "Because we also have died with Christ" (Rom. 6,8; Col. 2,20; 2 tim. 2,11), we also rose with Him, did not understand the sense in which they are said, and thought that the resurrection is already past and no other one is to be hoped for in the end of time. "Among whom", he said, "are Hymenaeus and Philetus who swerved from the truth, saying that the resurrection is past already. They are upsetting the faith of some" (2 Tim. 2,17-18)[20]).

[18]) W.H.C. FREND, "The Gnostic-Manichean Tradition in Roman North Africa", in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (April 1953) 13-26, p. 21.

[19]) "Another point which must be strongly emphasized here is the reverence in which St. Paul was held by the African Manichees. Frend goes so far as to say that African Manicheism was a Paulinist heresy and rightly wonders how far Augustine had studied St. Paul's Epistles during his ten years as a Manichee. It is quite impossible to believe that Augustine had not read St. Paul fairly thoroughly — with Manichean eyes, of course. Hence, when his conversion to Christianity does take place, he is naturally very curious to read St. Paul with Christian eyes — which partly accounts for the great prominence of St. Paul in Augustine's conversion": J.J. O'MEARA, *The Young Augustine*, London and New York, 1980, p. 63.

[20]) "Nonnulli enim adtendentes verba,quae assidue dicit apostolus, quia et *mortui sumus cum Christo* (Rom. 6,8; Col. 2,20; 2 Tim. 2,11) et resurreximus cum eo, nec intellegentes, quatenus dicantur, arbitrati sunt iam factam esse resurrectionem nec ullam ulterius in fine temporum esse sperandam, *ex quibus est*, inquit, *Hymenaeus et Philetus, qui circa veritatem aberraverunt dicentes resurrectionem iam factam esse et fidem quorundam subvertunt* (2 Tim. 2,17-18)". *Epistula* 55,3.4, CSEL 34(2),173-174.

Another reason that we may give our position, to wit, that the deniers of resurrection in 1 Cor. 15 denied only the bodily resurrection, could also be that Augustine knew that Paul, in his preaching of the Christian belief on the resurrection of the body, was only addressing those who were already *within* the church. This being the case, Augustine could have always understood that they only denied bodily resurrection but accepted the resurrection of the mind. We see this as a possible solution in his work, *De Baptismo Contra Donatistas*, written either in the year 400 or 401. Here his reference for comparison is 2 Tim 2,17-20. In agreement with St. Cyprian, he maintains that Paul spoke of Hymenaeus and Philetus as members of the church although they maintained a different belief. The case of the Donatists was similar. They were members of the church although they had broken away from the other members. Therefore, if Hymeneaus and Philetus believed that the resurrection is already past, and if according to Augustine the deniers of the resurrection in 1 Cor. 15 were like Hymeneaus and Philetus, then the deniers of resurrection in 1 Cor. 15 denied only bodily resurrection.

> Cyprian, therefore, arguing in such a manner against those, who, under the pretext of avoiding the society of the wicked, have broken away from the united community, shows that he understood by the great house, about which the apostle spoke, in which there were only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and of earth, nothing else but the church, in which there should be good and evil, till at the last day when it should be purged by the winnowing-fan. And if this is so, in the church herself, that is, in the great house itself, there were vessels of dishonor whose preaching spread like a cancer. Because when the apostle spoke about them, he taught this: "And their word", he said, "spreads as a cancer does; among these are Hymenaeus and Philetus, who have swerved from the truth, saying that the resurrection is past already; they are upsetting the faith of some" (2 Tim. 2,17-18)[21]).

[21]) "Sic igitur arguens Cyprianus eos qui tamquam malorum consortium devitantes, se ab unitate disrupant, ostendit magnam domum quam dixit Apostolus, ubi essent non solum vasa aurea et argentea, sed et lignea et fictilia, non se intellexisse nisi Ecclesiam, ubi essent boni et mali, donec in fine sicut area ventilata purgetur. Quod si ita est, in ipsa Ecclesia, id est, in ipsa domo magna erant vasa in contumeliam, quorum sermo ut cancer serpebat. Nam cum de illis Apostolus loqueretur, hoc docuit: *Et sermo*, inquit, *eorum sicut cancer serpit; ex quibus est Hymenaeus et Philetus, qui circa veritatem aberraverunt, dicentes resurrectionem jam factam esse, et fidem quorundam subvertunt. Firmum autem fundamentum Dei stat habens signaculum hoc: Novit Dominus qui sunt ejus; et recedat ab iniquitate omnis qui nominat nomen Domini. In magna autem domo, non solum vasa aurea sunt et argentea, sed et lignea et fictilia* (2 Tim. 2,17-20)". *De Baptismo Contra Donatistas* 4,12.18, PL 43,166. The statement of Cyprian that Augustine is referring to runs as follows: "Tunc deinde

Earlier in the same chapter 12,19 of the fourth book of the same work, Augustine more clearly brings together 2 Tim. 2,17 and 1 Cor. 15, 32-33 and 12. But here, more than proving that the deniers denied only bodily resurrection, he proves that they are within the church of Corinth.

> However, for (Cyprian says) "we find that the apostles in all their epistles execrate and abhor the sacrilegious wickedness of the heretics, such that they say 'their word spreads like a cancer'" (2 Tim. 2,17). How then? Does the apostle not show that they who said, "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we shall die" (1 Cor. 15,32), were also corrupters of good morals through their evil company, adding immediately, "Bad company ruins good morals" (1 Cor. 15,33); and nevertheless he intimated that they were within (the church), when he says, "How is it that some among you say that there is no resurrection of the dead?" (1 Cor. 15,12)[22]).

The last reason we could put forward is this: Augustine does not make a distinction between these three expressions, namely, "resurrection of the dead", "resurrection of the body" and "resurrection of the flesh". These three are used virtually in the same way. This implies that Augustine thinks most of the time, if he does not presume, that Paul's

quantus adrogantiae tumor est, quanta humilitatis et lenitatis oblivio, adrogantiae suae quanta iactatio, ut quis aut audeat aut facere posse se credat quod nec apostolis concessit Dominus, ut zizania a frumento putet se posse discernere aut quasi ipsi palam ferre et aream purgare concessum sit, paleas conetur a tritico separare, cumque apostolus dicat: *in domo autem magna non solum vasa aurea sunt et argentea, sed et lignea et fictilia* (2 Tim. 2,20), aurea et argentea vasa videatur eligere, lignea vero et fictilia contemnere abicere damnare, quando non nisi die Domini vasa lignea divini ardoris incendio concrementur et fictilia ab eo cui data est ferrea virga frangantur". *Epistula* 55,25, CSEL 3, pars 2, 643-644. This text is quoted by Augustine in *De Baptismo Contra Donatistas* 4,12.18, PL 43,165-166. W.H.C. Frend suggests that Augustine was influenced by Cyprian. Cf. *The Donatist Church*, Oxford, 1952, p. 236-237.

[22]) "At enim *invenimus Apostolos in omnibus Epistolis suis exsecrari et detestari haereticorum sacrilegam pravitatem, ita ut dicant sermonem eorum sicut cancer serpere.* Quid enim? et illos qui dicebant, *Manducemus et bibamus, cras enim moriemur*, nonne corruptores morum bonorum per mala colloquia Paulus esse manifestat, continuo subjugens, *Corrumpunt mores bonos colloquia mala*; et tamen eos intus fuisse significavit, cum ait, *Quomodo dicunt quidam in vobis quia resurrectio mortuorum non est?* (1 Cor. 15,32-33,12)". *De Baptismo Contra Donatistas* 4, 12.18, PL 43,165. The statement of Cyprian, as it appears in the CSEL edition, runs as follows: "Si autem quid apostoli de haereticis senserint consideremus, inveniemus eos in omnibus epistulis suis execrari et detestari haereticorum sacrilegam pravitatem. Nam cum dicant sermonem eorum ut cancer serpere, quomodo potest is sermo dare remissam peccatorum qui ut cancer serpit ad aures audientium". *Epistula* 73,15, CSEL 3, pars 2,789. This is quoted by Augustine in *De Baptismo Contra Donatistas* 4,12.18, PL 43,165. The PL edition renders it with a negligible difference: "invenimus" (PL) — "invenïemus" (CSEL), "*ita ut dicant*" (PL) — "*nam cum* dicant" (CSEL).

opponents denied only the resurrection of the flesh and not life after death as such. On this particular point, H.I. Marrou says of Augustine:

> He does not confine himself to a technical vocabulary, using each term in a rigorously univocal sense. For instance, it has sometimes been attempted to establish, if not a distinction, at least shades of difference between the terms "resurrection of the dead", "of the body", "of the flesh"; but Augustine uses the three formulae within a few pages on a few lines of each other with apparently no other concern than to vary the expressions[23]).

C. *Augustine examines the words of Paul concerning the belief of Hymenaeus and Philetus*

In order to follow closely Augustine's analysis of 2 Tim. 2,18 we shall quote the text in Latin: "*Qui circa veritatem erraverunt, dicentes resurrectionem jam factam esse; et fidem quorumdam subverterunt*". In his understanding, Augustine says that Hymenaeus and Philetus denied only bodily resurrection. His main argument is this: Paul said that they erred "*circa veritatem*" and not "*a veritate*". He makes a distinction between the two expressions. However, he does not make any distinction between "*erraverunt circa veritatem*" and "*aberraverunt circa veritatem*", but interchanges them. He opines that Paul had a reason for using "*circa veritatem*" and not "*a veritate*". To say "*erraverunt circa veritatem*" would mean that Hymenaeus and Philetus admitted only a single resurrection; whereas, to say "*aberraverunt a veritate*" would mean that they departed completely from the truth, that is to say, they denied totally life after death. The first statement would signify partial deviation from the truth, whereas the second would signify total deviation or departure from the truth.

> For there were also (men) in the time of the apostles, who had said that the resurrection has already been accomplished and they perverted the faith of some. About them the apostle said: "They have erred concerning the truth, saying that the resurrection has already been accomplished; they are upsetting the faith of some" (2 Tim. 2,18). It is significant that he did not say "they have departed from the truth", but, "concerning the truth"; for they did not possess the truth ... How did they, therefore, err concerning the

[23]) See *The Resurrection and Saint Augustine's Theology of Human Values*, Villanova, 1966, p. 14-15. Marrou gives examples found in *De Catechizandis Rudibus* 7(11): "*corporis resurrectio*"; 27(54) "*resurrectio mortuorum*"; "*resurrectionem ... caro ...*". See also note 47, p. 40.

truth? Because they claimed the one resurrection, but denied the other[24]).

D. *Augustine refutes those who subscribe to the belief of Hymenaeus and Philetus*

Earlier we mentioned that in *Contra Faustum Manicheum* 4,2, Augustine traces the source of the error of the Manicheans to the belief of Hymenaeus and Philetus. As an exponent of the belief in a double resurrection[25]), he refutes their position. Here, however, he presents no more than an *argumentum ad hominem*, which he usually does when he gives free rein to his temper.

> And therefore, while you profess to receive only the new promises of God, you have remained in the old flesh and brought in a novel error; of this novel error the apostle says: "Avoid such godless chatter, for it will lead people into more and more ungodliness, and their talk will eat its way like cancer. Among them are Hymenaeus and Philetus, who have swerved from the truth by holding that the resurrection is past already. They are upsetting the faith of some" (2 Tim. 2,16-18). Know which vein of error you drip from, you, who say that the resurrection which is only of the souls takes place now by preaching the truth; however, you deny the future resurrection of the body, which the apostles preached[26]).

[24]) "Non enim deerant etiam sub Apostolis, qui dicerent resurrectionem iam factam esse, et fidem quorumdam perverterent, de quibus Apostolus, *Qui circa veritatem*, inquit, *erraverunt, dicentes resurrectionem iam factam esse; et fidem quorundam subverterunt* (2 Tim. 2,18). Non autem vacat quod non ait, a veritate aberraverunt ; sed, *circa veritatem*, non tamen veritatem tenuerunt ... Quomodo ergo illi circa veritatem aberraverunt? Quia veram dixerunt resurrectionem unam, sed aliam negaverunt". *Sermo* 262,19.22, PL 39,1626-1627.

[25]) For a study on the teaching of Augustine on the double resurrection, see P. GOÑI, *La resurrección de la carne, según San Agustín*, ch. II, art. I A, Washington D.C., 1961, p. 45-53. His principal references are the following: *Sermo* 362,20,23, PL 39,1627; *De Civitate Dei* 20, 6,1, PL 41,665; *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 19,14, PL 35,1551-1552; *Sermo* 362,22,25, PL 39,1628; *De Civitate Dei* 20,6,2, PL 41,666; *Sermo* 362,21,24, PL 39,1627-1628. In all these references Augustine is interpreting Paul and John.

[26]) "Et ideo dum sola promissa dei nova tenere vos arbitramini, remansistis in vetustate carnis et novitatem induxistis erroris. De qua novitate apostolus dicit: *profanas autem verborum novitates evita; multum enim proficiunt ad inpietatem, et sermo eorum sicut cancer serpit. Ex quibus est Hymenaeus et Philetus, qui circa veritatem aberraverunt dicentes resurrectionem iam factam esse, et fidem quorundam subverterunt* (2 Tim. 2,16f.). Ex qua vena falsitatis vos manare cognoscite, qui dicitis nunc esse resurrectionem tantummodo animarum per praedicationem veritatis, corporum autem, quam praedicaverunt apostoli, futuram negatis". *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 4.2, CSEL 25(1),270.

Later, in the same work, namely, *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 11,3, besides using the same sort of argument, he addes specific points which illustrate that Faustus contradicts himself by claiming that he accepts Paul's teachings. We have already mentioned that Paul was held in high esteem among the Manicheans. Augustine attacks Faustus, accusing him of contradicting himself, since he denies the humanity of Christ and consequently His death and resurrection, which doctrines Paul teaches.

> Take off, therefore, the cloak of fallacy with which Faustus clothed himself when he put a question to himself as if asking and saying, "Do you accept Paul?". And he answered, "Certainly". Why did he not rather answer "Not at all, because as a liar he was not able to answer anything than falsehoods". For what did he accept of the apostle Paul? Not the first man whom he (Paul) says is earth from earth, about whom he likewise says, "The first man Adam became a living being" (1 Cor. 15,45; Gen. 2,7). He (Faustus), however, professes, I do not know what this first man who is neither earth from earth nor has been made into a living being, but that he is of the substance of God, he existing in himself as God does ... Not the second man, whom Paul says is from heaven, whom he also says to be the last Adam who became a life-giving spirit, whom he says was made from the seed of David with respect to the flesh, made from the woman, made under the law in order that he might redeem those who were under the law; about whom he says to Timothy, "Remember that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, rose from the dead according to my gospel" (3 Tim. 2,8); with the example of His resurrection he preaches, too, our own resurrection, saying, "For I delivered to you as of first importance what you also received, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, that He was buried, and that He was raised on the third day according to the scriptures" (1 Cor. 15,3-4). And a little later he infers (the reason) why he had said this: "Now, if it is preached of Christ that he rose from the dead, how can some of you say that there is no resurrection of the dead?" (1 Cor. 15,12)[27]).

[27]) "Exuimini ergo pallio fallaciae, quo Faustus indutus, cum sibi proposuisset tamquam interrogantem et dicentem: *accipis apostolum Paulum?* respondit: *et maxime*. Cur enim non potius respondit: et minime, nisi quia fallax aliud quam id, quod falsum erat, respondere non potuit? Quid enim accepit apostoli Pauli? Non primum hominem, quem ille dicit de terra terrenum, de quo item dicit: *factus est primus homo in animam viventem* (1 Cor. 15,45; Gen. 2,7), ille autem adnuntiat nescio quem primum hominem nec de terra terrenum nec factum in animam viventem, sed de substantia dei id ipsum existentem quod deus est ... Non secundum hominem, quem Paulus dicit de caelo, quem dicit etiam novissimum Adam in spiritum vivificantem, quem dicit factum ex semine David secundum carnem, factum ex muliere, factum sub lege, ut eos, qui sub lege erant, redimeret; de quo ad Timotheum dicit: *memor esto Christum Iesum resurrexisse a mortuis ex semine David secundum evangelium meum;* in cuius exemplo etiam resurrectionem nostram praedicat

In *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 19,14, Augustine analyzes the belief of those who subscribe to only one resurrection through comparing them with the basis for the belief of Hymenaeus and Philetus. Here, however, he does not specify which ones among those who subscribe. We are aware that Augustine knew more of other heresies which denied the resurrection of the body[28]). In his work, *De Haeresibus*, he mentions eighty-eight heresies which arose after the ascension of Christ, twelve of which — he expressly mentions — denied the resurrection of the body. P. Goñi, in *La resurrección de la carne según San Augustín*, specifies them[29]) as follows: *Simoniani*, *Carpocratiani*, *Valentiani*, *Cerdoniani*, *Marcus*, *Caiani*, *Seluciani*, *Hierarchitae*, *Severiani*, *Archontici*, *Manichaei*, and

dicens: *tradidi enim vobis in primis, quod et accepistis, quia Christus mortuus est pro peccatis nostris secundum scripturas; et quia sepultus est et quia resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas* (1 Cor. 15,3f.). Et paulo post infert, quare hoc dixerit: *si autem Christus praedicatur, quia resurrexit a mortuis, quomodo dicunt quidam in vobis, quia resurrectio mortuorum non est* (1 Cor. 15,12)". *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 11,3, CSEL 25(1), 316-317.

[28]) There is a parallel between the challenges with regard to the faith of the Christians in the time of Paul and in the time of Augustine. Paul was confronted by the Stoics and by the Epicureans. Augustine was confronted in a similar way by many others. Cf. H.-I. MARROU, *The Resurrection and Saint Augustine's Theology of Human Values*, Villanova, 1966, p. 6. The author refers also to P. COURCELLE, "Propos antichrétiens rapportés par saint Augustin", in *Recherches Augustiniennes I*, Paris, 1958, p. 149-186. Here P. Courcelle gives a catalogue of objections raised against the ressurection.

[29]) The *Simoniani* were followers of Simon Magus; their beliefs and practices are described in Acts 8,9-19. Cf. *De Haeresibus*, PL 42,25. The *Carpocratiani* were the followers of Carpocrates, who was born in Alexandria; he was considered a gnostic and he was greatly influenced by Plato. Cf. P. GONI, *op. cit.*, p. 30 note 113. See also *De Haeresibus* 7, PL 42,27. The *Valentiniani* were followers of Valentin, who was born in Egypt and was educated in Alexandria. His heresy spread to Cyprus. Cf. P. GOÑI, *op. cit.*, p. 30 note 114; see also *De Haeresibus* 11, PL 42,28. The *Cerdoniani* were followers of Cerdon, who was a Syrian by birth. He was the teacher of Marcion. Cf. P. GOÑI, *op. cit.*, p. 30 note 115, *De Haeresibus* 21, PL 42,29. Marcus was a contemporary of Ireneus. His heresy spread through Asia Minor and probably reached the East as well. Cf. P. GOÑI, *op. cit.*, p. 31 note 116. The *Caiani* honored Cain; they were anti-Semitic. Cf. *De Haeresibus* 18, PL 42, 29. The *Seluciani*, known also as Hermiani, believed that there would be no future resurrection. Resurrection takes place now in the generation of children. *Ibid.* 59, PL 42,41. The *Hierachitae* were followers of Hieracha. He was a native of Leontopolis in Egypt. His practice of austerity gained him many followers. Cf. P. GOÑI, *op. cit.*, p. 31 note 119; *De Haeresibus* 47,38-39. The *Severiani* were followers of the way of Pythagoras and of the Essenes. They spread through Asia Minor and the Roman province and Antioch in Syria. Cf. P. GOÑI, *op. cit.*, p. 31 note 120; see *De Haeresibus* 24, PL 42,30. The *Archontici* received their names from their belief that the universe is ruled by the princes or *archontes*. Cf. P. GOÑI, *op. cit.*, p. 31 note 121; *De Haeresibus* 20, PL 42,29. For an extensive study on these heretics, see L. MÜLLER, *The De Haeresibus of Saint Augustine, A translation with an Introduction and Commentary*, Washington D.C., 1956.

Origeniani. Augustine gives two opinions regarding the heresy of the *Origeniani*[30]): (i) Only according to Epiphanius that "there are Origenists followers of the writer Adimantius, who reject the resurrection of the dead"; (ii)There were defenders of Origen who said that he did not reject the resurrection of the body. To these twelve mentioned by P. Goñi, we would like to add another three which we presume Augustine knew denied the bodily resurrection, although in *De Haeresibus* he did not say this expressly. They are the *Gnostici* and the *Priscillianistae* and the *Marcionitae*. Our reason is simple. If these twelve heresies or the adherents were gnostic, and on that account denied bodily resurrection, or, if, at least, they were influenced by Gnosticism, then with even more likelihood, we can say that the Gnostics themselves denied the resurrection of the body. In fact the Gnostics had contempt for the body and matter in general. For them salvation consisted in the possession of knowledge. The Priscillianists thought similarly. As we have pointed out already in a previous article, this group adopted the position of the Manicheans. They were docetistic and taught that matter was evil. Tertullian, in *Adversus Marcionem* 5,10, says that Marcion denies the resurrection of the body. For him resurrection takes place in the soul: "*Marcion enim in totum carnis resurrectionem non admittens et soli animae salutem repromittens, non qualitatis, sed substantiae facit quaestionem*"[31]). Augustine certainly knew Marcion's position on this subject[32]). In *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 19,14, Augustine was preoccupied with heresy during his time. He invoked divine assistance: "Behold we see the resurrection of the mind; let us not, therefore, lose faith on the resurrection of the body. And unless you, Lord Jesus, declare this to us, whom shall we put in opposition to those who assert the contrary"[33]). We suspect that he was referring particularly to the Manicheans. The Manicheans, who were the representatives of Gnosticism during that time, not only taught the resurrection of the

[30]) "Origeniani, inquit, *alii, qui et Adamantii tractatoris, qui et mortuorum resurrectionem repellunt* ... Haec quidem de Origene Epiphanius: sed qui eum defendunt ... dicunt ... neque resurrectionem repulisse mortuorum". *De Haeresibus* 42, PL 42,33.

[31]) TERTULLIAN, *Adversus Marcionem* 5,10.3, CCL pars I, 692.

[32]) Cf. L. MÜLLER, *The De Haeresibus of Saint Augustine. A Translation with an Introduction and Commentary*, Washington D.C., 1956, p. 146: "There was to be no resurrection of the flesh, for it will be destroyed as the seat of sin".

[33]) "Ecce videmus resurrectionem mentis; non ergo amittamus fidem de resurrectione carnis. Et nisi tu, Domine Iesu, dixeris eam, quem opponemus contradictoribus?": *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 19,14, CCL 36,197.

minds but also found fault in those who believed in the resurrection of the body. Augustine confronted them square by using their own proofs against them. They claimed proofs from the Gospel according to John. It is understandable why they did this. It was because of the apparent traces of Gnosticism in the narration of John. In their understanding, John can be said to claim that the resurrection takes place now, "and now is" (Jo. 5,25), in the act of believing. This means that according to them the eschatological conditions are fully accomplished now in faith. Augustine, however, compares them with Hymenaeus and Philetus.

> All, therefore, who have founded a sect of a false religion, while they wished to be believed, could not deny resurrection of the mind which you talk about; They all agree about this point, but many deny the resurrection of the flesh; they say that the resurrection has taken place already in faith. The apostle opposes such people, saying: "Among whom are Hymenaeus and Philetus, who erred concerning the truth, saying that the resurrection has taken place already. They are upsetting the faith of some" (2 Tim. 2,18). They said that the resurrection has taken place already in such a manner that another one is not to be hoped for; they reprimanded men who hoped for the resurrection of the flesh, just as if the resurrection which has been promised has been accomplished in the mind by the act of believing. The apostle reprimands them. Why does he reprimand them? Did they not say what the Lord said now, "The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the son of God, and those who hear will live" (Jo. 5,25)[34])?

Augustine argues that they did not really understand John. Although here he claims that John, truly, speaks of the resurrection, the evangelist, however, does not teach a single resurrection, namely, of the mind alone. Moreover, Augustine points out, it is the Lord Himself who makes the claim that there is a double resurrection, that is, of the soul, which takes place now in faith, and consequently, the resurrection of the body, which will follow in the future.

[34]) "Volentes ergo sibi credi omnes qui instituerunt alicuius etiam falsae religionis sectam, negare istam mentium resurrectionem non potuerunt; omnes de illa consenserunt, sed multi carnis resurrectionem negaverunt, dixerunt in fide iam factam esse resurrectionem. Talibus resistit apostolus, dicens: *Ex quibus est Hymenaeus et Philetus, qui circa veritatem aberraverunt, dicentes resurrectionem iam factam esse, et fidem quorumdam subvertunt* (2 Tim. 2,17-18). Iam factam esse resurrectionem dicebant, sed eo modo ut alia non speraretur; et reprehendebant homines qui sperabant resurrectionem carnis, velut iam resurrectio quae promissa erat, credendo impleretur in mente. Reprehendit eos apostolus. Cur eos reprehendit? Nonne hoc dicebant quod modo Dominus loquebatur: *Venit hora, et nunc est, quando mortui audient vocem Filii Dei, et qui audierint, vivent* (Jo. 5,25)?". *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 19,14, CCL 36,197-198.

> Did they not say what the Lord now said, "The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and they who hear will live" (Jo. 5,25)? But I am still speaking of the life of the mind, Jesus tells you; I do not speak yet about the life of the body; but I am speaking about the life of the life of the body, that is, about (the life) of the soul, in which is the life of the body, since I know that bodies are lying in the tombs and I also know that your bodies will likewise be in the tombs. I don't speak yet of that resurrection. I speak of this. Arise in this, lest you arise in that into punishment[35]).

II. The consequences of the denial of the resurrection of the dead. Verses 12-19

1 Cor. 15,12-19 may be taken as a separate unit. However, of all Augustine's various references to the chapter no single one treats of it as a whole. Augustine refers to it as if it consists of several sets of verses. In *Contra Litteras Petiliani* 3,46.55-56, he juxtaposes verses 13-15; in *De Doctrina Christiana* 2,31,119f., verses 13-14; in *Epistula* 28,3.4, verses 14-15; in *De Mendacio*, he uses only verse 15; in *De Virginitate* 22 and in *En. in Ps.* 127,16, he uses only verse 19; and in *Contra secundam Iuliani responsionem opus Imperfectum* 6,34-35, verses 14-17.

In his explanation of the varied sets of verses Augustine has two kinds of argumentation for the consequences of the denial of the resurrection of the dead, namely, an argument from the logic of the propositions and an argument from his interpretation of the meaning of the various Pauline texts. In this section we shall show Augustine's understanding of the different sets of verses based on these two kinds of argumentation.

A. *An argument from the logic of verses 13-15: its form*

In *Contra Litteras Petiliani* 3,46.55-56 Augustine condemns as absurd the view which denies the resurrection of the dead. He argues

[35]) "Nonne hoc dicebant quod modo Dominus loquebatur: *Venit hora, et nunc est, quando mortui audient vocem Filii Dei; et qui audierint, vivent* (Jo. 5,25)? Sed de vita mentium loquor adhuc, ait tibi Iesus; nondum loquor de vita corporum; sed loquor de vita vitae corporum, id est, de animarum, in quibus est vita corporum; nam scio esse corpora in monumentis iacentia, scio et corpora vestra in monumentis futura; nondum de illa resurrectione loquor; de ista loquor, in ista resurgite, neque ad poenam in illa resurgatis". *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 19,14, CCL 36,198.

from the testimony of Paul in 1 Cor. 15,13-15: "But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised; and if Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is vain, and your faith is also vain. And we are found false witnesses of God because we have testified of God that He raised up Christ, whom He did not raise up, if it is so that the dead do not rise up".

The content of Augustine's argument was not directed against Petilian, who was a Donatist. The Donatists did, in fact, believe in the resurrection of the dead[36]). Augustine was simply making a comparison between the way Petilian attributed something to him, as though it was his opinion, and the way Paul's opponents had wished to accuse the apostle of having meant to say by "Then Christ has not been raised" that there is no resurrection of the dead.

> It is just as if those, whom the apostle confutes because they said that there is no resurrection of the dead, would have wished to accuse the same apostle since he has said: "Then Christ was not raised" (verse 13), and the preaching of the apostles is vain, the faith of the believers is also vain, and they are found to be false witnesses against God, who had said that He had raised up Christ. This is what Petilianus wished to do with me, since he was desperate at not being able to read that I have written, which he could not answer, and he wanted to think that he had answered them well[37]).

Although, Augustine does not appeal here to verses 13-15 in order to make a counterattack against Petilian on the issue of the resurrection of the body, his reference to the case of Paul and his opponents leads us to his understanding of the verses. This is his analysis. These verses, in the way Augustine used them, were said by Paul in order to point out to his opponents the drastic consequences that result from the denial of the

[36]) Cf. W.H.C. FREND, "The Gnostic-Manichean Tradition in Roman North Africa", in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 4 (1953) 13-26, p. 14. See also "Manichaeism in the Struggle Between Saint Augustine and Petilian of Constantine" in *Augustinus Magister II*, Paris, 1954, p. 860: "The Donatists buried their dead in great cemetries where care was taken to preserve the shape of the body in plaster for recognition at the last day; offerings were made to the dead".

[37]) "Quemadmodum si illi quos apostolus arguit, quia dicebant non esse resurrectionem mortuorum, eundem apostolum accusare vellent, quoniam dixit: *neque Christus ressurrexit*, et inanem esse praedicationem apostolorum, inanem etiam fidem credentium falsosque inveniri testes adversus deum, qui dixissent quod suscitaverit Christum, hoc mihi Petilianus facere voluit desperans legi posse quae scripsi, quibus respondere non potuit, et putari se respondisse magnopere concupivit". *Contra Litteras Petiliani* 3,46.55, CSEL 52,207.

resurrection of the body. These can be deduced even from the logical sequences of the propositions alone. Thus, for example, if one removes the proposition: "If there is no resurrection of the dead" (verse 13a), the rest of the propositions would have been badly expressed; yet the misstatement must be ascribed to Paul himself. It would leave just the statement, "Christ has not been raised" (verse 13b). Or, if one removes the condition "if" and restate the main clause in this manner, "There is no resurrection of the dead", then the consequences would be the following: (i) Christ was not raised, (ii) Paul's preaching and that of the evangelists were vain, (iii) the faith of the Corinthians and all that it involves is vain.

However, Augustine contends that verses 13-15 have been well worded and exactly stated, so much so that if mistaken inferences are ever made from them, they must have derived from the errors of the deniers themselves.

> If, therefore, you remove what has been placed at the head of this argument: "If there is no resurrection of the dead" (verse 13a), the rest must have been wrongly said, and yet must be ascribed to the apostle. But if you restore (the proposition) on which they depend and put this at the beginning: "There is no resurrection of the dead", then these will rightly follow: "And Christ was not raised", and "our preaching is vain" and "your faith" and all that it involves "is also vain". And all of these have been well and carefully said by the apostle, and whatever mistakes they may contain are to be attributed to those who denied the resurrection of the dead[38]).

In *De Mendacio* 21 and in *Epistula* 28,3.4, the other consequence is mentioned by Augustine, that is, the evangelists were found to be false witnesses.

B. *An argument from the logic of verses 13-14: its validity*

While in *Contra Litteras Petiliani* 3,46.56 and in *De Doctrina Christiana* 2,31.49,119-120 Augustine is concerned simply with the form

[38]) "Si ergo tollas quod in capite ratiocinationis huius (est) positum: *si resurrectio mortuorum non est*, male cetera dicta sunt et apostolo tribuenda sunt; si autem reddas unde pendent et in exordio constituas: (si) *resurrectio mortuorum non est*, recte consequentur: *neque Christus resurrexit* et: *inanis est praedicatio nostra, inanis est fides vestra* et cetera quae conexa sunt, et haec omnia ab apostolo bene ac prudenter dicta sunt, quoniam quidquid mali habent illis imputandum est, qui negabant resurrectionem mortuorum". *Contra Litteras Petiliani* 3,46.56, CSEL 52,208. See also *Contra Litteras Petiliani* 3,47.57, CSEL 52,209; *De Doctrina Christiana* 2,31.49,119-120, CSEL 80,67-68.

of the logic of verses 13-15, by his analysis of which he was able to deduce the veracity of the resurrection of the dead from the logical sequences of the propositions, in *De Doctrina Christiana* 2,32.50,121-123 he deduces his conclusion from the validity of the proposition.

The validity of propositions depends on the degree of objectivity they express. For Augustine objectivity, in this particular case, is that which "exists in the reasons of things, and has its origin with God"[39]). The propositions made by men of this order are a result of their observations of things, of which they can learn and teach. Men do not create this order; they simply describe it.

> Nevertheless, the truth itself of the logical sequences has not to be instituted, but observed and noted by men, in order that they may either learn or teach it; since it exists perpetually and have been divinely instituted in the reason of things. For someone who narrates the order of history does not himself create that order; and as he who describes the position of places, or the natures of animals, or of plants, or of stones, does not describe that these things have been instituted by men, and he who points at te stars and describes their movements does not describe that the thing has been instituted by him or by any other man[40]).

The order of propositions is a reflection of the order of things of nature. What, as a rule, applies to the description of the order of things of nature, that is to say, that the arrangement of things does not depend on man's making, also applies to the logical sequences of propositions. Thus when someone says, "When the consequent proposition is false, it is necessary that the antecedent be also false", he simply shows how this holds true; he does not create its order. It is the same with the propositions on the resurrection of the dead, which, in this particular case, are expressed by Paul in verses 13-14. They are a reflection of the truth of the resurrection of the dead. They are not mere projections of the mind, much less the products of wishful thinking. Augustine de-

[39]) "Ipsa tamen veritas conexionum non instituta, sed animadversa est ab hominibus et notata, ut eam possint vel discere vel docere. Nam est in rerum ratione perpetua et divinitus instituta". *De Doctrina Christiana* 2,31.121, CSEL 80,68.

[40]) "Ipsa tamen veritas conexionum non instituta, sed animadversa est ab hominibus et notata, ut eam possint vel discere vel docere. Nam est in rerum ratione perpetua et divinitus instituta. Sicut enim qui narrat ordinem temporum, non eum ipse componit, et locorum situs aut naturas animalium vel stirpium vel lapidum qui ostendit non res ostendit ab hominibus institutas, et ille qui demonstrat sidera eorumque motus, non a se vel ab homine aliquo rem institutam demonstrat". *De Doctrina Christiana* 2,31.121, CSEL 80,68.

monstrates this as follows: If, as the deniers would formulate it, this proposition occurs first, namely, "there is no resurrection of the dead", it would necessarily follow that Christ did not rise from the dead either. However, since the consequent proposition, "Christ did not rise" is false, then it is necessary that the precedent, "there is no resurrection of the dead" is also false. Why? Because Christ rose from the dead. The only logical conclusion from verses 13-14, therefore, is that there is a resurrection of the dead.

In *De Doctrina Christiana* 2,32.50,123, Augustine formulates his syllogism as follows[41]):

> If there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ did not rise from the dead (verse 13).
> Christ, however, rose from the dead.
> Therefore, there is a resurrection of the dead.

In this particular case, concerning the resurrection of the dead, both the law of the logical sequences and the sentence itself in the conclusion are true[42]).

C. *An argument from his interpretation of the meaning of Pauline texts. A discussion with Julian: verse 16*

In *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,34 written in 429/430, both Julian and Augustine consider verse 13 and 16 as parallel texts. Verse 13 reads: "If there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised". Verse 16 reads: "If the dead are not raised, then Christ was not raised". Although both Julian and Augustine agree on the identity of meaning of the two verses, they disagree, however, in their interpretation. Let us show this in a scheme[43]).

[41]) "Quod totum breviter ita dicitur: Si non est resurrectio mortuorum, neque Christus resurrexit; Christus autem resurrexit, est igitur resurrectio mortuorum". *De Doctrina Christiana* 2,32.123, CSEL 80,69. As shown by the minor premise and conclusion, Augustine applies his theology of the Total Christ to his analysis of verse 13.

[42]) "Sed in hoc loco de resurrectione cum ageretur, et regula conexionis vera est et ipsa in conclusione sententia". *De Doctrina Christiana* 2,33.124, CSEL 80,69.

[43]) A similar discussion is found in *Contra Julianum* 5,15.52-54, PL 44,813-814.

Julian	Augustine
There is no sin by nature.	There is an original sin.
Nature is not bad (the opposite is Manicheism).	There is something bad in nature.
Christ has our nature and flesh.	Christ has only the similitude of sinful flesh.
An example must be on the same level.	An example does not have to be on the same level.

Julian uses 1 Cor. 15,16 as a proof for his position: if Christ was raised from the dead, then we too shall be raised.

> Never he (Paul) would have said: "If the dead are not raised, then Christ was not raised" (verse 16); if it could be referred to this (sentence): "But since Christ was born of a virgin, he has risen in a special way; men, however, since they are born by a diabolical mixture (intercourse), do not rise"[44]).

Again for Julian there is no difference in nature between Jesus as a man and us.

> But he (Paul) would immediately declare: what was the idle brag about resurrection, if it was not fitted to our hope nor to our teaching? For what reason would there be to teach; what reason would there be to show an example, if the nature of Jesus and ours is not similar, and if there would be no hope of reigning with Him, and no strength to follow Him[45])?

Augustine's specific point with regard to 1 Cor. 15,13 is this: some of the Corinthians believed that Christ was risen; but they did *not believe* that there will be a resurrection of the rest of mankind: "*Resurrectionem mortuorum non esse putantibus, et tamen Christum resurrexisse credentibus, propterea dicitur, 'Si resurrectio mortuorum non est, neque Christus resurrexit'*".

[44]) "Nunquam quippe diceret, *Si mortui non resurgunt, nec Christus resurrexit:* cui poterat referri, Sed Christus, quoniam de virgine natus est, peculiariter resurrexit; homines autem, quia nati sunt de commixtione diabolica, non resurgunt". *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,34, PL 45,1587.

[45]) "Verum ille protinus referret, Et quae fuit resurgendi vanitas, si nec spei nostrae nec magisterio parabatur? Quae enim esset ratio docendi, quae gravitas exempli, si natura in nobis dissimilis, et spe conregnandi, et vi careret imitandi?": *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,34, PL 45,1587.

1. *Verses 13 and 12 in connection with verse 20*

How does Julian understand verses 13 and 12 in connection with verse 20: "But Christ was raised from the dead"? He claims that verse 20 is a completion of the hypothetical sentences of verses 13 and 12: "If ... if ...". This means that since we have the same human nature as Jesus, we too can claim for ourselves the resurrection of our bodies, because He rose in a body.

> Paul says, "If there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ was not raised. If, however, Christ was raised from the dead, how is it that some of you say that there is no resurrection of the dead" (verses 13 and 12)? That is, if you confess that Christ as man was of the same nature as we are, on what grounds do you think either that the resurrection was accomplished in Him or that it will not be accomplished in the rest in the future? After the conditions have been granted, Paul completed the sentence: "Now, however", he says, "Christ was raised from the dead (verse 20); therefore, there will be a resurrection of the dead[46]).

Augustine, however, maintains that there are differences between Jesus and us. He makes the following points[47]): (i) Jesus was not only a man, but also God. Other men are not God. (ii) Jesus was born of a virgin and of the Holy Spirit. Other men are not. (iii) Jesus has the power "to lay down His life and to take it back again" (Jo. 10,18). Other men do not have such power. Augustine, nevertheless, argues that it is not on the basis of dissimilarity but of similarity with us that Jesus was raised from the dead. His flesh, not conceived in sin, was made like sinful flesh *(similitudo carnis peccati)*. Our flesh is sinful. The priviledge of origin may not be the same in Him as in us. Yet His flesh and ours are similar concerning their origin from earth; and, therefore, both are mortal substances. Christ Himself willed this similarity. Being similar with us, He died in the same manner as we do. On the basis of this similarity He rose from the dead in order to set the *exemplum* in order to demonstrate that we, too, should rise.

[46]) "*Si*, inquit, *resurrectio non est mortuorum, neque Christus resurrexit, Si autem Christus ex mortuis resurrexit, quomodo dicunt quidam in vobis quia resurrectio mortuorum non est?* Id est, si confitemini ejusdem illum secundum hominem, cujus nos, fuisse naturae, qua ratione vel in illo factam resurrectionem, vel in reliquis non futuram putatis? Praemissis conditionibus, implet ex omni parte sententiam: *Nunc autem*, inquit, *Christus resurrexit ex mortuis*; erit ergo resurrectio mortuorum". *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,34, PL 45,1587-1588.

[47]) *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,34, PL 45,1588.

> If therefore they mention these things because they admit that Christ alone rose from the dead, they would not like to believe that others (will rise). Shall we thus have to deny the great differences between Christ and others in order to be able to persuade people to believe in the resurrection of the dead on the basis of the equality of Christ with them? Just, therefore, as we do not deny this difference, because of which we confess that the flesh of Christ alone was not a flesh of sin like that of others but a similitude of the flesh of sin, nevertheless, we allege that not only had his flesh risen but also that the flesh of others will rise; and so we allege and say what the Apostle has said: "If the dead are not raised, then Christ was not raised" (verse 16). Christ,however, was raised; therefore, the dead rise. For the fact that the privileges of origin are not the same in both flesh does not mean that the flesh of Christ is not of the same mortal substance taken from the earth. The likeness of a sinful flesh has certainly a difference, with which it is distinguished from the flesh of sin. But let it not be that Christ had made Himself dissimilar from them by rising, with whom He chose to be equal by dying[48]).

In a related controversy, in connection with the consequence of a denial of the resurrection of the body, Julian claims that there is a similarity in nature between Jesus and us, in order to make it seem that Augustine maintains that He suffered of inborn deformity in the same manner that we do.

> Let us elaborate on these forces in the transmission (of sin) and say, "if Christ, who was made man, did not have natural sin, how is it that some of you say that an inborn deformity dominates the image of God?". If, however, there is evil in nature, Christ also, who possesses the same nature, is put under the reign of the devil. If, however, He is believed to be guilty, then our preaching is vain, your faith is also empty; the apostles are false witnesses, since they gave a

[48]) "Si ergo ista dicant, quia Christum solum resurrexisse concedunt, caeteros nolunt; numquid ideo illas Christi tam magnas a caeteris differentias negaturi sumus, ut aliorum quoque mortuorum resurrectionem de Christi cum eis aequalitate persuadere possimus? Sic ergo nec istam differentiam denegantes, qua fatemur solam carnem Christi, non ut aliorum fuisse carnem peccati, sed carnis peccati similitudinem; non ideo tamen solam resurrexisse, sed aliorum quoque resurrecturam esse defendimus, et sic defendimus, ut dicamus quod apostolus dixit, *Si mortui non resurgunt, neque Christus resurrexit:* resurrexit autem Christus; resurgunt igitur mortui. Neque enim quia non eadem sunt in utraque carne originis merita, ideo non est eadem terrena mortalisque substantia. Habet quidem differentiam suam similitudo carnis peccati, qua discernitur a carne peccati: sed absit ut Christus eis se disparem faciat resurgendo, quibus se voluit aequare moriendo". *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,34, PL 45, 1588. See also *De Genesi ad Litteram* 10,18, CSEL 28(1),320: Christ has a "*similitudo carnis peccati*".

testimony against God, because He had made His Son without deformity and holy from the seed of David according to the flesh, if the crime of the cursed seed has infected Him. Moreover, if we hope in such a Christ, then we are the most pitiable of all men[49]).

Augustine, however, answers insistently that even when Christ did not have original sin, still His flesh was similar to ours. He, nevertheless, makes this distinction: Christ's flesh being similar to ours does not mean that there was sin in Him[50]). Christ was not guilty of any sin. Because He was not guilty of any sin He was able to blot out our sins. On account of this, the preaching of Paul was not in vain; our faith is not empty; the apostles were not false witnesses; and we are not to be the most pitiable of all men[51]).

2. *The consequence of hoping in Christ only for this life: verse 19*

In *En. in Ps.* 127.16 Augustine related verse 19 to 2 Tim. 3,12. 1 Cor. 15,19 runs as follows: "If for this life only we have hope in Christ, we are the most pitiable of all people". And 2 Tim. 3,12: "All who desire to live with Christ will be persecuted". One can immediately see the outcome of

[49]) "Has vires exseramus in traducem, dicamusque: Si Christus, qui homo factus est, non habuit naturale peccatum; quomodo dicunt quidam in vobis quia imagini Dei pravitas dominetur ingenita? Si autem in natura malum est; et Christus, qui in eadem natura deprehenditur, sub regno diaboli est constitutus. Si autem ille creditur reus, inanis est praedicatio nostra, et vacua est fides vestra: inveniuntur autem falsi testes Apostoli, quia testimonium dixerunt adversus Deum, quo Filium suum, ex semine David secundum carnem, innocuum sanctumque formaverit, si eum malidicti seminis crimen infecit. Prorsus si in tali Christo speramus, miserabiliores sumus omnibus hominibus". *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,35, PL 45,1589.

[50]) "Non enim sequitur ut si Christus, qui homo factus est, non habuit naturale, hoc est, originale peccatum, nulla imagini Dei pravitas dominetur ingenita: quoniam non sequitur ut si nihil habuit pravitatis similitudo carnis peccati, nihil habeat pravitatis cui est ista similis, id est, caro ipsa peccati; imo vero id sequitur, ut si est similitudo carnis peccati, sit etiam caro peccati. Quia omne simile, alicui simile sit necesse est: et si solus habuit Christus veram quidem carnem, sicut caeteri homines, sed tamen carnis peccati non proprietatem, sed similitudinem; non solum necesse est ut sit alia cui haec similis sit caro peccati, sed omnium caeterorum hominum non sit nisi caro peccati". *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,35, PL 45,1589.

[51]) "Quapropter etsi malum est in carne peccati, non est tamen in Christo, qui venit in carne vera, non tamen in carne peccati, sed in similitudine carnis peccati, carnem sanare peccati. Non ergo ille creditur reus, sed ab illo noster solvitur reatus, et originalis, et additus. Unde nec inanis est Apostoli praedicatio, qui non praedicaret in Christo similitudinem carnis peccati, nisi aliorum carnem sciret esse peccati. Nec vacua est fides nostra, qua vacuatur haeresis vestra. Nec falsi testes inveniuntur Apostoli, qui similitudinem carnis peccati discernunt a carne peccati". *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,35, PL 45, 1589-1590.

this juxtaposition. Hoping in Christ only for this life leads to a state where suffering is meaningless. Suffering persecutions inflicted by external forces and/or coming from the proclivity of concupiscence, as described in Wis. 9,15: "For a perishable body weighs down the soul", is of no value. Without the reality of the resurrection we are to be the most pitiable of all men.

> For what, therefore, do we suffer such persecutions? "If for this life only we have hoped in Christ", the apostle says, "we are the most pitiable of all men" (1 Cor. 15,19). For what were the martyrs condemned to the beasts? What was the good of that? Can it be described? By what means? Which tongue can tell it? Or which ear can hear it? That, indeed, "neither the ear heard it, nor has it entered into man's heart" (1 Cor. 2,9). Let us love much; let us grow much in love. For you see that battles are not wanting; we fight against our concupiscence. We fight outside with the unbelievers and disobedient men; we fight inside ourselves against suggestions and carnal perturbations. Everywhere we are still fighting, because the body, which corrupts, weighs down the soul (Wis. 9,15). Let us still fight, since even if "the spirit is alive, nevertheless the body is dead because of sin" (Rom. 8,10)[52]).

III. Corporate personality and the resurrection of the body

Our purpose in this section is to investigate and expose Augustine's interpretation of 1 Cor. 15,20-22. With the use of these verses he expounds on the idea of causality in connection with the theme of resurrection. As we shall see, his theology of corporate personality functions as the guiding idea of his exegesis. The idea of causality is gradually delineated, first in verse 20 and second and more clearly in verses 21 and 22.

[52]) "Propter quid ergo patimur tantas persecutiones? *Si enim in hac vita in Christo sperantes sumus tantum*, ait apostolus, *miserabiliores sumus omnibus hominibus*. Propter quid damnati sunt ad bestias martyres? Quod est illud bonum, dici potest? unde, aut quae lingua dicat? aut quae aures audiant? Et quidem illud *nec auris audivit, nec in cor hominis adscendit*. Amemus tantum, proficiamus tantum; videtis enim quia pugnae non desunt, et pugnamus cum concupiscentiis nostris. Pugnamus foris cum infidelibus et inoboedientibus hominibus, pugnamus intus cum suggestionibus, cum perturbationibus carnalibus: ubique pugnamus adhuc, quia corpus quod corrumpitur, aggravat animam; pugnamus adhuc, quoniam si *spiritus vita est*, tamen *corpus mortuum est propter peccatum*". *En. in Ps.* 127,16, CCL 40,1879-1880.

A. *Verse 20: "But in fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of those who have fallen asleep"*

At the very outset we would like to point out that we have seen Augustine making references to verse 20 only four times, and only in four works, namely, *Confessiones*, *Adnotationes in Job*, *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum*, and in *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69. In *Confessions* 9,4 he alludes indirectly to the first part of the verse: "He ... rising from the dead". Here he speaks of himself before his conversion as unaffected by the merits of Christ's glorification, since then he still loved vanities and searched for lies (cf. Ps. 4,3). In *Adnotationes in Job* 38, he makes mention of the second part of the verse:

> He knew His place, that He was to be the "first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep" (verse 20b), the first-born from the dead, the head of the church, whom the body will also follow in the future resurrection of the saints[53]).

In *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,36 he brings verse 20 together with verse 21. But here the verses appear to have been said by Julian. Augustine puts them in his mouth.

In both *Adnotationes in Job* 38 and in *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,36, the aspect of "*primitiae*" is Augustine's point of concentration. We have already dealt with this extensively in a previous article. Nevertheless, here we would like to add something more.

Let us turn to *Adnotationes in Job* 38, written in 399. If we follow the sentence closely, which we cited above, the sentence structure makes it appear that Augustine does not distinguish between the two conceptions, namely, "*primitiae dormientium*" and "*primogenitus a mortuis*". He puts the latter in apposition to the former. What does this mean? Does this mean that these conceptions are equivalent in meaning? This could have been the case at the time when he wrote this book in 399. However, it is impossible to substantiate this on the basis of another work written around that time, including a mention of verse 20, since no such work exists. In his later writings, on the other hand, this can be proved without difficulty. In our previous article we have already explained how in *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum 3*, *Quaestiones Numerorum 32*, dating from 419, Augustine makes a distinction between "*primitiae*" and "*primo-*

[53]) "Ipse agnovit ordinem suum, ut esset *primitiae dormientium*, primogenitus a mortuis, caput ecclesiae, secuturo etiam corpore in futura resurrectione sanctorum". *Adnotationes in Job* 38, CSEL 28(2), 603.

genitus". "*Primogenita*" or προτογενήματα are the first fruits taken from the earth, or a tree or a vine (προτογενήματα *vero primi fructus de terra sumpti vel de arbore vel de vite*). It is the first harvest. "*Primitiae*" or ἀπαρχαί are those taken firstly from the fruits already harvested and put into containers *(primitiae autem de fructibus quidem, sed iam redactis ab agro, sicut de massa, de lacu, de dolio, de cupa, quae primitus sumebantur)*. It is what has been taken from what has been selected. This connotes that the "*primitiae*" and the rest of the harvest from which they have been selected stand very close to each other. This further implies that the relation or union between the "*primitiae*" and the rest, which are left behind in the containers, is much closer than the relation or union between the "*primogenita*" and the subsequent fruits. For both the "*primitiae*" and the remainder belong to the same selected group.

Even with this subtle distinction between the "*primitiae*" and the "*primogenita*", we could safely say that Augustine has made the idea of causality already decipherable in *Adnotationes in Job* 38. For even there, although he put "*primogenitus a mortuis*" as an appositive to "*primitiae dormientium*", he added the conception of "*caput ecclesiae*"[54]). This latter expresses clearly the union between the influence upon one another of Christ and the church. For Christ, who is the Head, and the church, which is His body, form one single organism. on the basis of incarnation[55]) and on the basis of theologal virtues[56]), the unity of the head

[54]) See also *Sermo* 264,6, PL 38,1218.

[55]) Concerning this point see the following: *Sermo* 92,3,3, PL 38,573; *En. in Ps.* 56,5, CCL 39,697-698; *In Epistulam Ioannis Tractatus* 1,2, PL 35,1979; *En. in Ps.* 90, *Sermo* 2,5, CCL 39,1270-1271; *In Epistulam Ioannis Tractatus* 2,2, PL 35,1000; *Sermo Mai* 86,2, MA 1,325; *En. in Ps.* 101, *Sermo* 1,2, CCL 40,1427; *Sermo Morin* 3,4, MA 1,598-599; *Sermo* 361, 13,14, PL 39,1606; *En. in Ps.* 122,1, CCL 40,1814; *En. in Ps.* 95,2, CCL 40,1343.

[56]) Cf. *En. in Ps.* 100,3, CCL 39,1408. The text runs as follows: "Quia ergo misericordia et iudicium cantatur nobis, et nos facientes misericordiam securi exspectemus iudicium; et simus in corpore ipsius, et nos cantemus ea. Cantat enim hoc Christus; si solum caput cantat, a Domino est canticum hoc, ad nos non pertinet; si autem totus Christus, id est caput et corpus eius, esto in membris eius, adhaerere illi per fidem, et per spem, et per caritatem; et il illo cantas, in illo exsultas; quia et ipse in te laborat, in te sitit, in te esurit et tribulatur. Ille in te adhuc moritur, et tu in illo iam resurrexisti. Nam si non in te moreretur, nollet in te sibi parci persecutore, cum diceret: *Saule, Saule, quid me persequeris?* Ergo, fratres mei, Christus cantat; sed quomodo, nostis; Christum assidue commendavimus vobis, et scio quia rudia vobis non sunt. Dominus Christus Verbum Dei est, per quod facta sunt omnia. Hoc Verbum ut redimeret nos, caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis: factus est homo Deus super omnia, Filius Dei aequalis Patri; ad hoc homo factus est, ut Deus homo mediator esset inter homines et Deum, et reconciliaret longe positos, et coniungeret separatos, et revocaret alienatos, et reduceret peregrinos; ad hoc factus est homo. Factus est ergo caput ecclesiae, habet et corpus et membra".

and the body continuously seeks to keep itself indivisible, in a certain way, and works for its completion. In the context of the Total Christ, it is unthinkable to have a Head without a Body. The union between the Head and Body has not been severed at the ascension of the Head. The union remains, and the Head seeks to have a complete union later with the Body. This will be accomplished at the resurrection of the body. This explains why in *Adnotationes in Job* 38 Augustine says that in the resurrection which is to come the body will also follow the head who has already risen and ascended.

In *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 6,36 Augustine asserts this idea of causality, when he agrees with Julian that the resurrection of Christ causes the resurrection of the just; however, only insofar as this resurrection of the just is taken as a reward, that is, in opposition to death which is a punishment consequent upon sin. This point will not be discussed again here, since we have already treated it sufficiently. The idea of causality becomes clearer in his explanation of verses 21 and 22. In *De diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69[57]) Augustine points out that verse 20 clearly demonstrates that it is by assuming a human body that Christ died and rose from the dead. He discusses this in the context of the distinction between the Father and the Son.

B. *Verses 21 and 22: "For as by a man came death, by a man also has come the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive"*

1. *We are descendants of the stock of Adam*

In *Contra Fortunatum Disputatio* 21-22, written in 392, Fortunatus, a Manichean, was contending against Augustine that the soul of man, even in its pristine state, was already compelled by nature to transgress the precepts of God. Apparently the soul sins involuntarily, that is, through the force of nature, which is not subject to the law of God[58]). He

[57]) "Invenimus itaque ita ventum esse ad hunc locum, ut supra diceret, *Nunc autem Christus surrexit a mortuis, primitiae dormientium* (1 Cor. 15,20). Agebat enim de resurrectione mortuorum, quod in Domino secundum susceptionem hominis factum est; quanquam apertissime sequatur et dicat: *Quoniam quidem per hominem mors ... ut sit Deus omnia in omnibus* (1 Cor. 15,21-18). Manifestum est ergo hoc secundum susceptionem hominis dictum". *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69, PL 40,79.

[58]) "Haec nos dicimus, quod a contraria natura anima cogatur delinquere ... Nam dictum est ab apostolo, quod *prudentia carnis inimica sit deo; legi enim dei non est subiecta, nec enim potest* (Rom. 8.7). Paret ergo his rebus, quod anima bona factione illius, quae legi dei non est subiecta, peccare videtur, non sua sponte". *Contra Fortunatum Disputatio* 21, CSEL 25(1),102 and 103.

gives several reasons for this, namely, (i) covetousness, which is the root of all evil, dwells in us. Faustus ascribes this reason to Augustine[59]). (ii) There are several testimonies in Paul such as Gal. 5,17: "The flesh lusts against the spirit; and the spirit lusts agains the soul" and Rom. 7,23: "I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin which dwells in my members". Faustus, however, admits that only the grace of God through Christ will deliver us from the body of death (Rom. 7,25).

Augustine responds that Adam was not compelled by nature. He could exercise his will freely when he was first formed[60]). He was created in such a way that had he willed to obey the precepts of God, absolutely nothing could have resisted his will[61]).

However, after this voluntary act of sin, Adam was plunged into the necessity of doing what he did not wish to do. We, too, have been plunged into this necessity. Augustine's proofs for this are the following: (i) The testimony of Paul in 1 Cor. 15,21-22, which has its parallel in Rom. 5,19: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by one man's obedience many will be made righteous". (ii) The testimony of our internal experience. Before we acquire a habit of doing something, we experience that we have the free will of doing or not doing it[62]).

Concerning the two reasons, Augustine traces them to our descent from Adam. We are descended from his stock *(ab eius stirpe descendimus)*. The use of "*stirps*" here as a symbol signifies that there is an ontological union between us and Adam. And because of this union, like Adam who was made subject to the law of sin, we, too, were made subject to the same law. The law of sin is: "Whoever has sinned shall die". And similarly, just as Adam was made subject to the law of death

[59]) "Nam dixit dignatio tua, quod haec sit radix malorum, cupiditas, quae in nostris corporibus versatur, cum quando non est cupiditas mali ex nostris corporibus, ex principali illa contraria natura versatur in mundo". *Contra Fortunatum Disputatio* 21, CSEL 25(1),102.

[60]) "Liberum voluntatis arbitrium in illo homine dico, qui primus formatus est". *Contra Fortunatum Disputatio* 21, CSEL 25(1),103.

[61]) "Ille sic factus est, ut nihil omnino voluntati eius resisteret, si vellet dei praecepta servare". *Contra Fortunatum Disputatio* 21, CSEL 25(1),104.

[62]) "Potest autem unusquisque nostrum mediocri consideratione invenire verum esse, quod dico. Hodie namque in actionibus nostris antequam consuetudine aliqua implicemur, liberum habemus arbitrium faciendi aliquid vel non faciendi". *Contra Fortunatum Disputatio* 21, CSEL 25(1), 104.

because of sin, we, too, were made subject to the law of death. The law of death is expressed in Gen. 3,19: "You are dust, and into dust you shall return"[63]). Augustine further says that we share the same fate with Adam since we share with him the same origin, that is, from dust. This means that our state of being mortal, because of which, even before the first sin, we were already ontologically destined to die potentially, became a confirmed reality as a consequence of the first sin.

> For we were born in such a way that, because we are dust, we shall also return to dust on account of the consequence of the first sin of man[64]).

2. *Death in "Per hominem mors" refers only to the death of the body*

In *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione* 1,8,8, written in 411, Augustine claims that the death spoken of in verse 21a, "by a man came death", refers only to the death of the body. The reasons he gives for this are the following: (i) Paul intends to speak of the resurrection of the body only in verse 21. According to Augustine, the rest of the verses after verse 21 and the way they are said, that is, with persuasion, earnestness and sharpness concerning the resurrection of the body, show this.

> Moreover, his statement "Through one man came death, through one man also the resurrection of the dead" (verse 21) — in what other sense can it be understood than as concerning the death of the body; since in order to say this, he spoke about the resurrection of the body persuasively in a most earnest and sharp discourse[65])?

(ii) Together, verses 21 and 22 convey the same message as Rom. 5,12: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin". In Rom. 5,12, Augustine recalls, the deniers of the resurrection of the body

[63]) "Lex autem peccati est, ut quicumque peccat, moriatur - ab ista lege liberamur, cum iusti esse coeperimus. Lex mortis est, qua dictum est homini: *terra es et in terram ibis* (Gen. 3,19)". *Contra Fortunatum Disputatio* 21, CSEL 25(1),106.

[64]) "Ex ipso enim omnes sic nascimur, quia terra sumus, et in terram ibimus propter meritum peccati primihominis". *Contra Fortunatum Disputatione* 21, CSEL 25(1),106. See also the following: *De Civitate Dei* 14,12, CSEL 40(2),30; *Sermo* 9,2, CCL 41,108. In connection with Ecclesiastes 12,7: "*Tunc convertetur in terram pulvis, sicut fuit, et spiritus revertetur ad dominum, qui dedit illum*", see the following: *Epistula* 166,26, CSEL 44,581; *Epistula* 143,8, CSEL 44,258-259; *Epistula* 190,17, CSEL 57,152.

[65]) "Item quod ait: *Per hominem mors et per hominem resurrectio mortuorum*, quid aliud quam de morte corporis intellegi potest, quando ut hoc diceret de resurrectione corporis loquebatur eamque instantissima et acerrima intentione suadebat?": *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione* 1,8.8, CSEL 60,9.

wish to understand this text to refer to the death of the soul. Against them Augustine contends that on the basis of the related and similar meaning of Rom. 5,12 with 1 Cor. 15,21-22, no death other than that of the body is intended by Paul, since here it is the resurrection of the body which is treated, the opposite of the death of the body.

> What is, then, his statement here to the Corinthians: "Through man death and through man the resurrection of the dead; for just as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all will be made alive", except what he also says to the Romans: "Through one man sin entered into the world and through sin death"? They want to understand by this not the death of the body, but of the soul; it is as if another thing has been said to the Corinthians by "through man death", where they are not allowed to understand this of the death of the soul, since the context deals with the resurrection of the body, which is the opposite of the death of the body. Therefore, even there only death through man is thought of and not also of sin, since the text does not deal with righteousness, which is contrary to sin; but it treats of the resurrection of the body, which is contrary to the death of the body[66]).

3. *The comprehension of "all" in "all die in Adam" and of "all" in "All are brought to life in Christ"*

The first "all" differs in comprehension from the second "all". Augustine shows this difference in the various but coherent uses he makes of the verse in several contexts.

In *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione* 1,28.55, written in 411 and directed to the Pelagians, Augustine says that no one who has come to Christ by baptism is excepted from the grace of forgiveness of sins, nor is eternal life regarded possible apart from in His kingdom. Eternal life is to be revealed to the righteous at the resurrection of the dead. These righteous who shall partake of the eternal life shall be made alive only in Christ. Augustine deduces the reason for the vivification of the righteous

[66]) "Quid est ergo quod hic ait ad Corinthios: *per hominem mors et per hominem resurrectio mortuorum; sicut enim in Adam omnes moriuntur, sic et in Christo omnes vivificabuntur*, nisi quod ait etiam ad Romanos: *per unum hominem peccatum intravit in mundum et per peccatum mors?* Hanc illi mortem non corporis, sed animae intellegi volunt; quasi aliud dictum sit ad Corinthios 'per hominem mors', ubi omnino animae mortem accipere non sinuntur, quia de resurrectione corporis agebatur, quae morti corporis est contraria. Ideo etiam sola mors ibi per hominem facta commemorata est, non etiam peccatum, quia non agebatur de iustitia, quae contraria est peccato, sed de corporis resurrectione, quae est corporis morti". *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione* 1,8.8, CSEL 60,9.

in Christ from the salutary dispensation of Christ in them all, as opposed to the penal consequence of the sin of Adam in all.

> Since this is the case, no one of those who have come to Christ through baptism has ever been regarded according to sound faith and sound doctrine to have been excluded from the grace of the remission of sins, nor is eternal life possible to somebody apart from His kingdom. For this (eternal life) is ready to be revealed at the end of time (cf. 1 Pet. 1,5), this is, at the resurrection of the dead who pertain not to eternal death wich is called "the second death", but to eternal life, which God, who does not lie, promised to His saints and His faithful people. All those who shall be partakers of this life shall not be made alive except in Christ, even as all die in Adam[67]).

What is the extent of "all" in "all die in Adam" and "all" in "all are made alive in Christ"? In the former "all" encompasses everybody[68]). In the latter "all" encompasses only a group among the former[69]). However, in the former "all" may also apply to a particular group, encompassing only everybody belonging to that group who have willed to die eternal death. Yet this "all" is within the compass of the "all" who die in Adam, since nobody, either good or evil, is exempted from the fate of death brought about by the sin of Adam. The latter "all" is a group encompassing everybody who has been chosen and willed to be in union with Christ. Augustine saw the scriptural explanation of this in Rom. 5,18.

> For just as all who belong wholly to the generation according to the will of the flesh do not die except in Adam, in whom all have sinned, so, from these, all who belong wholly to the regeneration

[67]) "Quae cum ita sint, neminem umquam eorum, qui ad Christum accesserunt per baptismum, sana fides et sana doctrina putavit exceptum a gratia remissionis peccatorum nec esse posse alicui praeter regnum eius aeternam salutem. Haec enim parata est revelari in tempore novissimo, hoc est in resurrectione mortuorum pertinentium non ad mortem aeternam, quae secunda mors appellatur, sed ad vitam aeternam, quam promisit non mendax deus sanctis et fidelibus suis, cuius vitae particeps omnes non vivificabuntur nisi in Christo, sicut in Adam omnes moriuntur". *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione* 1,28.55, CSEL 60,53-54. See also *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 2,134, PL 45,1197: "infants are included"; *Opus Imperfectum contra Julianum* 2,68, PL 45,1171.

[68]) "Quemadmodum enim omnes omnino pertinentes ad generationem voluntatis carnis non moriuntur nisi in Adam, in quo omnes peccaverunt ...". *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione* 1,28.55, CSEL 60,54. See also *De Diversis Quaestionibus ad Simplicianum* 1,16, PL 40,121.

[69]) "... sic ex his omnes omnino pertinentes ad regenerationem voluntatis spiritus non vivificantur nisi in Christo, in quo omnes iustificantur ...". *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione* 1,28.55, CSEL 60,54.

according to the will of the Spirit are not made alive except in Christ, in whom all are made righteous, because just as through one all are led to condemnation, so through one all are led to justification (cf. Rom. 5,18)[70]).

Later Augustine makes a further distinction between both uses of "all" by pointing out the distinction between the sinful flesh *(caro peccati)* and the flesh made after the likeness of the sinful flesh *(caro in similitudine carnis peccati)*, and the relation of each with the generations concerning condemnation and justification. From the sinful flesh all are born unto condemnation. Through the One made after the likeness of the sinful flesh all are freed from condemnation. Not all, however, are freed from condemnation. Why not all? For Augustine gives faith as the requirement for justification. His scriptural proof for this is 2 Thes. 3,2: "For not all men have faith". He, therefore, limits the application of "all" in "all are made alive in Christ" only to believers.

> Certainly the sinful flesh is one thing, in which all are born to condemnation, and the flesh made after the likeness of the sinful flesh, through which all are freed from condemnation is another. The word "all" has not been said so that all (without any exception) who are born of the sinful flesh are themselves understood to be cleansed by the flesh made after the likeness of the sinful flesh, "for not all have faith" (2 Thes. 3,2); but all who belong to the generation born through carnal union are not born except through the sinful flesh, and all who belong to the generation born through spiritual union are not cleansed except through the flesh made after the likeness of the sinful flesh; this is to say, the former to condemnation through Adam, the latter to justification through Christ[71]).

[70]) "Quemadmodum enim omnes omnino pertinentes ad generationem voluntatis carnis non moriuntur nisi in Adam, in quo omnes peccaverunt, sic ex his omnes omnino pertinentes ad regenerationem voluntatis spiritus non vivificantur nisi in Christo, in quo omnes iustificantur, quia sicut per unum omnes ad condemnationem sic per unum omnes ad iustificationem". *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione* 1,2.55, CSEL 60,54. See also the following: *Contra Duas Epistulas Pelagianorum* 4,4.8, CSEL 60,529; *De Spiritu et Littera* 1,1, CSEL 60,155; *Epistula* 166,24, CSEL 44,579-580; *Sermo* 165,7, PL 38,906.

[71]) "Una est quippe caro peccati, in qua omnes ad damnationem nascuntur, et una est caro in similitudine carnis peccati, per quam omnes a damnatione liberantur. Nec ita dictum est omnes, velut quicumque nascuntur in carne peccati, idem ipsi omnes mundari intellegantur per carnem similem carni peccati — *non enim omnium est fides* — sed omnes pertinentes ad generationem conubii carnalis non nascuntur nisi in carne peccati et omnes pertinentes ad generationem conubii spiritualis non mundantur nisi per carnem similem carni peccati; hoc est: illi per Adam ad condemnationem, isti per Christum ad iustificationem". *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione* 1,28,55, CSEL 60,54-55.

In an analogy Augustine compares Adam to the only obstetrician in a certain village who delivers all, and Christ to the only teacher of letters who teaches all in that same village. By "all" in the former is meant all who are born. By "all" in the latter is meant only those who learn.

> It is as if we should say, for example: there is one obstetrician in a certain village who delivers all; and in this very same village there is one teacher of letters who teaches all. In the first sentence, the "all" can only mean those who are born; and in the latter, the "all" can only mean those who learn. However, not all who are born learn the letters. But it is clear that in both, in the former, it has been rightly said, "she delivers all, since without her help nobody is born", and in the latter, it has been rightly said, "he teaches all, since ouside his teaching, nobody learns"[72]).

In order to be justified, besides the openness to Christ's aid one needs the disposition and capacity of accepting and assimilating His teaching in faith[73]). Augustine speaks of this in *Epistula* 187,9.30, written in 417, in connection with birth and rebirth. Here, he compares verses 21-22 with verses 46-49. He contends that both sets of verses express a similar meaning: two events of birth and rebirth which take place in one man pertain to the two men in him. Birth in sin, on account

[72]) "Tamquam si dicamus verbi gratia: 'una est obstetrix in hac civitate, quae omnes excipit, et unus est hic litterarum magister, qui omnes docet', neque ibi possunt intellegi omnes, nisi qui nascuntur, neque hic omnes, nisi qui discunt; non tamen omnes qui nascuntur litteras discunt, sed cuius claret, quod et illic recte dictum est: 'omnes excipit, praeter cuius manus nemo nascitur, et hic recte dictum est: 'omnes docet, praeter cuius magisterium nemo discit'". *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione* 1,28,55, CSEL 60,54-55. The same analogy is used in *De Nuptiis et Concupiscentia* 2,22.46, CSEL 42,302.

[73]) In order to demonstrate this, Augustine, in *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 26,3 &4, gives two examples: (i) in connection with the story of the woman suffering of hemorrhage in Lk. 8,44-46, he says: "Si trahitur, ait aliquis, invitus venit. Si invitus venit, nec credit; si non credit, nec venit. Non enim ad Christum ambulando currimus, sed credendo; nec motu corporis, sed voluntate cordis accedimus. Ideo illa mulier quae fimbriam tetigit, magis tetigit quam turba quae pressit". (ii) In connection with Jo.6,44, he explains: "Inde et hic si advertis: *Nemo venit ad me, nisi quem Pater attraxerit* (Jo. 6,44). Noli te cogitare invitum trahi; trahitur animus et amore. Nec timere debemus ne ab hominibus qui verba perpendunt, et a rebus maxime divinis intellegendis longe remoti sunt, in hoc scripturarum sanctarum evangelico verbo forsitan reprehendamur, et dicatur nobis: Quomodo voluntate credo, si trahor? Ego dico: parum est voluntate, etiam voluptate traheris. Quid est trahi voluptate? *Delectare in Domino, et dabit tibi petitiones cordis tui* (Ps. 36,4). Est quaedam voluptas cordis, cui panis dulcis est ille caelestis. Porro si poetae dicere licuit: Trahit sua quemque voluptas, non necessitas, sed voluptas; non obligatio, sed delectatio, quanto fortius nos dicere debemus trahi hominem ad Christum, qui delectatur veritate, delectatur beatitudine, delectatur iustitia, delectatur sempiterna vita, quod totum Christus est?". *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 26,3,4, CCL 36,261.

of which we die, pertains to the Adam in us. Rebirth in grace, on account of which we are justified and merit the resurrection of the body, pertains to the Christ in us. Thus, the expression "all" and "all" in verse 22 means that nobody is led to death except through the first man Adam, and nobody is made alive except in Christ. As existing in Adam, man suffers what the will of man has effectively led him to — death. As existing in Christ, man enjoys what the grace of God has brought him to - life. We suffer death since we came from and are members of Adam through propagation by carnal union. But we live, if we are members of Christ through spiritual union. Here, Augustine places emphasis on the wills of Adam and of Christ, which, respectively, led us to our fate, which is death, and our destiny, which is complete union with Christ.

> He thus said "all" and "all" because nobody suffers death except through the former (Adam), and nobody (is made alive) except through the latter (Christ). In the former it appeared what the will of man was able with regard to death. In the latter it appeared what the help of God was able to do with regard to life. Briefly, the first man was nothing more than man; the second, however, was God and man. For sin is committed by abandoning God; justification does not happen without God. And therefore we would not die if we had not come from the members of the former through carnal propagation; and we would not be made alive unless we were members of the latter through spiritual union. Therefore, there was a need for us to be born and reborn[74]).

A similar explanation is given by Augustine in *De Civitate Dei* 13,23. Here he juxtaposes verses 21-22 with verses 47-49. He uses the symbolism of "imago". We all have put on the image of Adam through the physical inheritance of sin and death; but, through rebirth we, the believers, have put on the image of the heavenly man by the grace of pardon and eternal life. Seen in this context, the "all" in the first proposition means that no one dies in his physical body except in Adam. In this case, the "all" encompasses everybody without exception. However, of the "all" who

[74]) "'Omnes' et 'omnes' ideo dixit, quia in mortem nemo nisi per illum, in vitam nisi per istum; in primo patuit, quid hominis arbitrium valeret ad mortem, in secundo autem, quid dei adiutorium valeret ad vitam, denique primus homo nonnisi homo, secundus vero deus et homo; peccatum enim factum est relicto deo, iustitia non fit sine deo. Ac per hoc nec moreremur, nisi per carnalem propagationem de membris illius veniremus, viveremus, nisi per spiritalem conexionem membra huius essemus. Ideo nobis fuit nasci et renasci". *Epistula* 187,9.30, CSEL 57,108.

die in Adam, only a number will be made alive in Christ. But, "all" in this number will be made alive only in Christ.

> The apostle puts this in the same letter more plainly: "Through man death and through man the resurrection of the dead. For just as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all are made alive" (1 Cor. 15,21-22) — undoubtedly (brought to life) in a spiritual body which will exist in relation to the life-giving spirit. This does not mean that because all who die in Adam are members of Christ (for a great number of them will be punished with the second death in eternity). However, "all" and "all" has been said thus, because no one dies in his animal body except in Adam, so no one is made alive in a spiritual body except in Christ[75]).

In *De Gratia Christi et Peccato Originali* 2,26.31, Augustine extends the compass of the "all" in "all will be made alive in Christ" to include the saints before Christ came. He asserts this against the position of the Pelagians who attempted to exclude the righteous of ancient times, as if Jesus Christ was not the Mediator between them and God, since, as they contend, incarnation has still not taken place. Augustine gives a chain of reasons for his contention: (i) the righteous of ancient times were destined to rise and will be made alive in Christ; (ii) they will be made alive in Christ because they are members of His body; (iii) they are members of His body because Christ is also their Head (cf. 1 Cor. 11,3); (iv) He is their Head because there is only one Mediator between God and them, Jesus Christ. Augustine's reasons, however, do not rest on the simple enumeration of scriptural citations. He places emphasis on the necessity of their faith in the resurrection and the second coming of Jesus, and on the necessity of having ordained their lives righteously and in a manner godly *(iuste pieque vixissent)* in accordance with their faith.

> If, however, since truth speaks through His apostles, "just as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive, because through that man death and through this man the resurrection of the dead", which Christian may dare to doubt that even those righteous men who pleased God in the earliest times of the human

[75]) "Hoc in eadem epistula evidentius ita ponit: *Per hominem mors, et per hominem resurrectio mortuorum. Sicut enim in Adam omnes moriuntur, sic et in Christo omnes vivificabuntur;* iam utique in corpore spiritali quod erit in spiritum vivificantem; non quia omnes, qui in Adam moriuntur, membra erunt Christi (ex illis enim multo plures secunda in aeternum morte plectentur); sed ideo dictum est *omnes* adque *omnes*, quia sicut nemo corpore animali nisi in Adam moritur, ita nemo corpore spiritali nisi in Christo vivificatur". *De Civitate Dei* 13,23 CSEL 40(1),651-652.

> race will come to the resurrection of eternal life, and not to eternal death, because in Christ they will be made alive. They are, however, made alive in Christ because they belong to the body of Christ, and they belong to the body of Christ because Christ is their head (1 Cor. 11,3); and Christ is also their Head because there is one Mediator between God and men, the man Jesus Christ (1 Tim. 2,5). But He could not have been (their Mediator) unless they had believed by His grace in His resurrection. But how would they have done this if they had not known that He will come in His flesh and if they had not lived righteously and in a godly manner according to this faith[76])?

Abraham was an example of the ancient saints who believed in the Incarnation of Jesus. For a scriptural proof for this, Augustine points to Jo. 8,56, where the Lord Jesus Himself says: "Abraham desired to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad". "My day", that is, Jesus' day refers to "His time". It is with respect to His incarnation that the Word, before It was made flesh, had a time (= living in time), for His divinity transcends all time. Those righteous men profited not only by Christ's divinity but also by His humanity.

> For it is not to be thought of that those righteous men of ancient times profited only by His everlasting divinity and not also by His humanity, which was not yet revealed. For that statement of the Lord Jesus: "Abraham desired to see my day and he saw it and was glad" (Jo. 8,56) — if He willed His day to be understood by His time — affords, indeed, Abraham a testimony that he was imbued with the faith in His incarnation. For it is with respect to this that He is living in time, since His divinity transcends all time, because through It all periods of time have been made[77]).

[76]) "Si autem, quemadmodum per apostolos suos veritas loquitur, *sicut in Adam omnes moriuntur, sic et in Christo omnes vivificabuntur, quia per illum hominem mors et per istum hominem resurrectio mortuorum,* quis audeat dubitare christianus etiam illos iustos, qui recentioribus generis humani temporibus deo placuerunt, ideo in resurrectionem vitae aeternae, non mortis aeternae esse venturos, quia in Christo vivificabuntur: ideo autem vivificari in Christo, quoniam ad corpus pertinent Christi; et ideo pertinere ad corpus Christi, quia et ipsis *caput est Christus;* ideo et ipsis caput esse Christum, quia *unus mediator est dei et hominum homo Christus Iesus?* quod eis non fuisset, nisi in eius resurrectionem per eius gratiam credidissent. Et hoc quomodo fieret, si eum in carne venturum esse nescissent neque ex hac fide iuste pieque vixissent?". *De Gratia Christi et De Peccato Originali* 2,26.31, CSEL 42,191.

[77]) "Neque enim putandum est, quod antiquis iustis sola quae semper erat divinitas Christi, non etiam quae nondum erat eius humanitas revelata profuerit. Illud enim, quod ait dominus Iesus: *Abraham concupivit diem meum videre et vidit et gavisus est,* si diem suum voluit suum tempus intellegi, testimonium profecto perhibuit Abrahae, quod fide fuerit incarnationis eius inbutus. Secundum hanc enim habet tempus; divinitas vero eius omne

The righteous, therefore, of ancient times are included in the "all" who will be made alive in Christ. The "extension of the origin" and the "extension of the dimensions of the Church" reaches back to them. In this connection, T. van Bavel, in his article, "What kind of Church Do You Want? The Breadth of Augustine's Ecclesiology", has an elaborate discussion of the extent of the church and salvation. He says that, according to Augustine's ecclesiology, the Church goes back even to Abel, that is, by tracing back the foundations of the church to men who with their deeds, lived, suffered, and struggled for God.

> With the Maccabean martyrs we have another set of texts, in which the foundations of the church appear more clearly. For what made them Christians? Only their deeds, i.e. their struggle and suffering for God, who has revealed Himself both in the Law of Moses and in Jesus Christ. "Yet, Jews will reproach us: 'how can you consider our martyrs as belonging to you? Is it through stupidity or insolence that you are celebrating their memory? Read their confession of faith. Did they confess Christ?'. But my answer to these Jews would be: Certainly, they did not confess Christ explicitly, for the mystery of Christ was still veiled" (*Sermo* 300,3,3). At the beginning of the same sermon Augustine had already warned against thinking that before the Christians became His people, Christ had no people at all. From this text we can conclude that the idea of a Christ-centered community *(populus)* depends clearly upon concrete faith lived in deeds.

He continues:

> Pursuing the same line of thought, Augustine becomes aware of the fact that there is no reason for stopping at Abraham and the Old Testament saints. One cannot maintain that there was no authentic justice or holiness before Abraham. Therefore, Augustine feels himself obliged to extend the idea of the church, asserting now that the church did not only exist from the time of Abraham, but even from Abel[78]).

tempus excedit, quia per illam universa facta sunt tempora". *De Gratia Christi et De Peccato Originali* 2,26.31, CSEL 43,191-192.

[78]) T. VAN BAVEL, "What Kind of Church Do You Want? The Breadth of Augustine's Ecclesiology", in *Louvain Studies* 7,3 (1979) 147-171, p. 151-152. See also *En. in Ps.* 118, sermo 29,9, CCL 40,1767: "Unde hoc ergo iste initio cognovit, nisi quia ecclesia loquitur, quae terris non defuit ab initio generis humani, cuius primitiae Abel sanctus est, immolatus et ipse in testimonium futuri sanguinis Mediatoris ab impio fratre fundendi? Nam et illud ab initio dictum est: *Erunt duo in carne una* (Gen. 2,24). Quod magnum sacramentum apostolus Paulus exponens: *Ego*, inquit, *dico in Christo et in Ecclesia* (Eph. 5,32)".

4. *Adam is an opposite figure of Christ*

In the *De Nuptiis et Concupiscentia* 2,27.46 Augustine links verse 22 with Rom. 5,14: "Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam, who was the figure of the one who has to come". Adam was the figure *(forma)* of Christ, who was still to come. However, he was His opposite figure. According to Augustine, verse 22 expresses this opposition: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive".

> Of which future (was he the figure) except of Christ? And which figure except the contrary? Because elsewhere he also says briefly: "Just as in Adam all die, so also in Christ will all be made alive in Christ" (1 Cor. 15,22). Just as in the former that event (sc. will take place), so in the latter this event (sc. will take place)[79]).

How was Adam an opposite figure of Christ? For two reasons: (i) The grace of God through Christ abounded much more unto the many who were led to death by the sin of Adam. For all who are delivered through Christ suffer only temporal death; they have everlasting life in store for them.

> But this figure is not conformable in every respect. Accordingly, the apostle, following the same idea, added, "But the free gift is not like the trespass. For if many died through one man's trespass, much more have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of that one man Jesus Christ abounded for many" (Rom. 5,15). But what does it mean, "much more it abounded", except that because all, who are freed through Christ, suffer death temporarily on account of Adam; however, on account of Christ himself they will live without end[80]).

(ii) One offence by Adam delivered all to condemnation. However, the free gift of God through Christ delivers from all offences, both original and the personal sins.

[79]) "Cuius futuri nisi Christi? Et qualis forma nisi a contrario? Quod alibi etiam breviter dicit: *Sicut in Adam omnes moriuntur, ita et in Christo omnes vivificabuntur:* sicut in illo illud, ita in isto istud". *De Nuptiis et Concupiscentia* 2,27.46, CSEL 42,300.

[80]) "Ipsa est forma, sed haec forma non omni ex parte conformis est. Unde hic apostolus secutus adiunxit: *sed non sicut delictum ita et donatio; si* enim *ob unius delictum multi mortui sunt, multo magis gratia dei et donum in gratia unius hominis Iesu Christi in multos abundavit.* Quid est 'multo magis abundavit', nisi quia omnes, qui per Christum liberantur, temporaliter propter Adam moriuntur, propter ipsum autem Christum sine fine victuri sunt?". *De Nuptiis et Concupiscentia* 2,27.46, CSEL 42,300.

> Let these (objectors) say how one can come from one offence unto condemnation, except it be that even one original sin, which has passed to all, is sufficient for condemnation. But grace (can bring one) out of many offences into justification, because it dissolves not only that one (original sin), which is contracted from the first sin, but also the others, which are added in each man by the action of his own will[81]).

IV. Conceptions of some words of phrases: verses 23-28

In this section we wish to give Augustine's conceptions or explanations of some words or phrases in verses 23-28. It is to be noted that not all phrases or words, as far as we have seen, have been explained. In *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69[82]) Augustine gives the whole pericope, from verse 20 to verse 28. Let us show here the differences and similarities between the version used by Augustine for verses 23-28 and of the *Vetus Latina*.

Vetus Latina (Sabatier)	Version used by Augustine
v. 23: Unusquisque autem in suo ordine, initium Christus: deinde hi, qui sunt Christi in adventu ejus.	Unusquisque autem in suo ordine: initium Christus; deinde ii qui sunt Christi, in praesentia (παρουσία) ejus.
v. 24: Deinde finis; cum tradiderit regnum Deo et Patri, cum evacuaverit omnem principatum, et omnem potestatem, et virtutem.	Deinde finis, cum tradiderit regnum Deo et Patri: cum evacuaverit omnem principatum et omnem potestatem et virtutem.
v. 25: Oportet enim illum regnare, donec ponat omnes inimicos sub pedibus ejus.	Oportet enim illum regnare, donec ponat omnes inimicos suos sub pedibus suis.
v. 26: Omnia enim subjecit sub pedibus ejus: Novissimus inimicus destruitur mors. Cum autem dicat:	Novissima inimica destruetur mors. Omnia enim subjecit sub pedibus eius.
v. 27: Omnia subjecta sunt: praeter eum, qui subjecit ei omnia.	Cum autem dixerit quod omnia subjecta sunt, manifestum est quia praeter eum qui sujecit illi omnia.
v. 28: Nam cum subjecta illi fuerint omnia: tunc ipse Filius subditus erit ei, qui sibi omnia, ut Deus sit omnia in omnibus.	Cum autem ei omnia subjecta fuerint, tunc et ipse Filius subjectus erit ei qui illi subjecit omnia, ut sit Deus omnia in omnibus.

[81]) "Dicant isti, quomodo ex uno delicto in condemnationem, nisi quia sufficit ad condemnationem etiam unum originale peccatum, quod in omnes homines pertransiit. Gratia vero ideo ex multis delictis in iustificationem, quia non solum illud unum solvit, quod originaliter trahitur, sed etiam cetera, quae in unoquoque homine motu propriae voluntatis adduntur". *De Nuptiis et Concupiscentia* 2,27.46, CSEL 42,300-301.

[82]) *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69, PL 40,75.

A. *Verse 23: "Christ the beginning, then they who belong to Christ"*

Augustine gives three coherent interpretations of verse 23. First, in *En. in Ps.* 67,24, in connection with Ps. 67,18[83]): "The chariot of God is of ten thousands manifold", or "of ten of thousands manifold", or "ten times thousand times manifold", (μυριοπλάσιον). Augustine interprets verse 23 as meaning that Christ is our leader who brings us, who belong to Him, to the reality of what we have been hoping for in patience. He compares Christ to a charioteer who drives a chariot to a certain destination. The chariot signifies the multitude of saints. Christ as the charioteer abides in and guides *(immanendo et regendo)* them.

> The following sentence is also composed thus: "The chariot of God is of ten thousands manifold", or "of ten of thousands manifold", or "ten times thousand times manifold" (Ps. 67,18). For every Latin interpreter has translated as best as he could that one Greek word that has been said there μυριοπλάσιον. In Latin, however, this could not be adequately expressed, since the Greek call a thousand χίλια; μυριάδες, however, is a digit of tens of thousands, one μυριὰς is ten thousand. Therefore, by this word the psalmist signified a vast multitude of saints and believers, who by carrying God become in a certain manner the chariot of God. By abiding in and by guiding this (multitude) He brings it to its end as if He leads His chariot to a certain destined place[84]).

With this interpretation Augustine compares Christ, the *initium*, to a charioteer and us, who belong to Christ, to the chariot. He also brings out the idea of *union* between us and Christ, and the idea of Christ as our principle; thus the idea of order, Christ as the beginning *(initium)*, then we, who follow and belong to Him, is made clear. This union and direction to our end happens now, as is also expressed in the text *(immanendo et regendo)*. In the following sentence, in connection with the words *Milia laetantium*, Augustine says that this multitude of saints

[83]) The *Vetus Latina* version is: *Currus Dei decem milium multiplex, milia laetantium. Dominus in eis in Sina in sancto.*

[84]) "Ita fit etiam quod sequitur: *Currus Dei decem milium multiplex*, vel *denum milium multiplex*, vel *decies milies multiplex*. Unum verbum enim graecum sicut quisque potuit latinorum interpretum transtulit, quod ibi dictum est, μυριοπλάσιον. Latine autem satis non exprimi non potuit, quoniam mille apud Graecos χίλια dicuntur, μυριάδες autem plura dena milia; μυριὰς quippe una, decem milia sunt. Ingentem itaque multitudinem sanctorum atque fidelium, qui portando Deum fiunt quodammodo currus Dei, significavit hoc nomine. Hanc immanendo et regendo perducit in finem tamquam currum suum velut in locum aliquem destinatum". *En. in Ps.* 67,24, CCL 39,887.

or faithful is the church, which now rejoices in hope (Rom. 12,12) and will continue to rejoice, even more fully, through the attainment of its end: "*Haec est sancta ecclesia, quae sunt quod sequitur: Milia laetantium. 'Spe enim sunt gaudentes'* (Rom. 12,12), *donec perducantur in finem quem nunc exspectant per patientiam*". Second, in *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 68,2, he speaks of John 14,2: "In the house of my Father there are many mansions", Augustine interprets verse 23 to signify the union, in terms of presence, between Christ and us. This presence of Christ in us is symbolized by our being the temple of God (1 Cor. 3,17), and by our being His kingdom; Christ is present in the temple and in the kingdom of God which He will hand over to His Father at the end of time. Christ himself prepares us to dwell now in these mansions, and to dwell to a fuller extent later in them while contemplating His father *(contemplando etiam Patri suo)*.

> However. He prepares mansions by preparing lodgers for the mansions. Now, when He said: "In the house of my Father there are many mansions" (Jo. 14,2), what do we think the house of God is but the temple of God? Ask the apostle what it could be and let him answer: "For the temple of God is holy, which you are" (1 Cor. 3,17). This is also the kingdom of God, which the Son will hand over to the Father. In connection with the Apostle himself says: "First Christ, then those who belong to Christ in His presence; then the end, when He will hand over the kingdom to God and Father" (verse 23)[85]).

Third, in *De Trinitate* 4,3.6 Augustine explains Paul's reason for saying the sentence in verse 23. In the context of resurrection verse 23 is said to point out the chronological order in resurrection. Christ was first. Then we shall follow Him. Augustine says this in accordance with his conception of Christ's resurrection as *the exemplum.*

> It is on account of this *exemplum* of our future resurrection in body, which went before in the Lord, that the Apostle says: "First Christ, then they who belong to Christ" (verse 23)[86]).

[85]) "Parat autem quodammodo mansiones, mansionibus parando mansores. Quippe cum dixerit: *In domo Patris mei mansiones multae sunt*, quid putamus esse domum Dei, nisi templum Dei ? Quod autem sit, interrogetur apostolus, et respondeat: *Templum enim Dei sanctum est, quod estis vos.* Hoc est etiam regnum Dei, quod Filius traditurus est Patri; unde dicit idem apostolus: *Initium Christus, deinde qui sunt Christi in praesentia eius; deinde finis, cum tradiderit regnum Deo et Patri". In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus* 68,2, CCL 36,498.

[86]) "Propter hoc exemplum futurae nostrae resurrectionis in corpore quod praecessit

We are not going to repeat here our explanation of *exemplum resurrectionis*. However, we would like to show that beside an explanation from his *exemplum* theory, in the statement itself there are words that indicate that Augustine meant to show this order. The first word is *praecessit* (went before). Christ's resurrection in body has come first. The word *praecedere* denotes that others follow. Accordingly it is on the basis of this precedence that our own bodies will be raised. They will follow *the* example which has been demonstrated to be a precedence. The second word is *initium*. It is clear that in Augustine's reference to this verse, in the version with the word *initium* and not *primitiae*, he means the order in time of resurrection: *Initium Christus, deinde ii qui sunt Christi*[87]).

B. *Verse 24: "Then comes the end, when He delivers the Kingdom ..."*

1. *Finis*

The word *finis* refers to the time at the completion of history when all the good actions, which now on account of human weakness have to be demanded of everybody in their relationship with one another, will cease.

> Our Lord Jesus Christ will, therefore, hand over the kingdom to God and Father (verse 24), without excluding Himself nor the Holy Spirit from it, since He will lead the believers to the contemplation of God, where there is the end of all good actions and where there is eternal rest and "joy" which "will not be taken away" (Jo. 16,22) from us[88]).

Specifically these good actions are the works of mercy; for after the transformation of our bodies no work of mercy will still be needed. There will no longer be anyone needy among us.

> But perhaps you work hard when you sow, and you feel pain in your compassion because you see people in misery. One day it will be better when we do not have those to whom we give alms. When all have been transformed into incorruption (1 Cor. 15,54), there

in domino dicit apostolus: *Initium Christus, deinde qui sunt Christi". De Trinitate* 4,3.6, CCL 50,169.

[87]) We have not come across any reference to the verse with *primitiae* instead of *initium*.

[88]) "Tradet itaque *regnum deo et patri* dominus noster Iesus Christus, non se inde separato nec spiritu sancto, quoniam perducet credentes ad contemplationem dei ubi est *finis* omnium bonarum actionum et requies sempiterna et *gaudium* quod non *auferetur* a nobis". *De Trinitate* 1,10.20, CCL 50,56.

will be no hungry person for you to give bread to, no thirsty one for you to give drink to, no naked one for you to clothe, no stranger for you to receive ...[89]).

Finis also refers to Christ Himself. He is our end. In *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.7 Augustine makes a distinction between *finis qui pertinet ad consummationem* and *finis qui pertinet ad consumptionem*. The former refers to the end that perfects; the latter refers to the end that corrupts. Christ is the end that perfects. He perfects our union with God through Him: *Ipse scilicet finis est, ut sit Deus omnia in omnibus* (verse 28). This conception of Christ as *finis* seems to show that Augustine makes Christ both the principle[90]) and the end of human beings, for, in Augustine's interpretation of Paul, Christ is both the *initium* and the *finis* of humanity's union with God now, and later to perfection. This is apparently in accordance with the whole of verse 23, where the version with *in praesentia* (παρουσία) *ejus* is used instead of *in adventu ejus*. With this version, i.e. with *in praesentia ejus*, the idea of God's presence in us through and with Christ is presented as continuing towards a more evident and fuller presence. This presentation becomes clearer in Augustine's explanation of the following verses.

2. *Cum (Christus) tradiderit regnum Deo et Patri*

This phrase does not mean that now the Father does not possess the kingdom: "*Sed alia in hoc capitulo, cujus totum textum commemoravi, solent habere questionem: primo quod dictum est, 'Cum tradiderit regnum Deo et Patri'; quasi nunc non teneat regnum Pater*"[91]). Augustine understands the phrase as referring to the event when Christ will bring the believers to the contemplation of God. In *De Trinitate* 1,8.16 he identifies this contemplation of God with what Paul in 1 Cor. 13,12 calls the "face to face" vision of God. At the same time it is clear that Augustine identifies "the kingdom" with the "righteous believers".

What is meant, therefore, by "When He will hand over the kingdom to God and Father"? Is it as though now God and Father

[89]) "Sed laboras forte cum seminas, et doles cum misereris, quia miseros vides. Melius enim aliquando non habebimus quibus ista demus. Cum omnes in incorruptionem commutabuntur, nullus esuriet cui porrigas panem, nullus sitiet cui des potum, nullus nudus erit quem vestias, nullus peregrinus quem suscipias". *En. in Ps.* 36, sermo 3,7, CC 38,373. See also *In Ioannis Epistolam Tractatus* 8,5, PL 35,2038.

[90]) See *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.6, PL 40,77: in connection with 1 Cor. 15,27-28.

[91]) *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.3, PL 40,75.

> does not possess the kingdom? But because "the Mediator between God and men, the man Jesus Christ" (1 Tim. 2,5) will lead all the righteous — those who live now according to their faith, over whom He reigns — to the sight which the same Apostle calls the "face to face" (1 Cor. 13,12) vision; so it is said "when He has handed over the kingdom to God and Father", as if it were to mean "When He shall have led the believers to the contemplation of God and Father"[92]).

Later in *De Trinitate* 1,10.20 he describes this contemplation as the state where we shall have no need of anything apart from God. Here he adds an interpretation of verse 28: "God will be all in all".

> Therefore, in that contemplation "God" will be "all in all", since apart from Him nothing else will be needed; but it will be sufficient to be illumined by and to enjoy Himself alone[93]).

In that contemplation Christ Himself will reign in and will manifest Himself together with the Father to the righteous believers. This means that Christ's reign will continue and will become more full through eternity. Thus the phrase *cum (Christus) tradiderit regnum Deo et Patri* does not mean the transfer of the kingdom from Christ's reign to the Father's reign. Rather, it is the bringing of the righteous believers to the full understanding and vision of Christ's reign together with the Father's reign in them.

> However, through His nature, which is equal to that of the Father, Christ reigns with the Father in those contemplating the truth. Christ, who leads those who believe in Him now from a faith in His incarnation to the nature of the divinity, will not isolate Himself when He hands over the kingdom to God and Father; but He will show Himself one (with the Father) to be enjoyed by those who contemplate[94]).

[92]) "Quid ergo est: *Cum tradiderit regnum deo et patri*, quasi modo non habeat regnum deus et pater? Sed quia omnes iustos quibus nunc regnat *ex fide* viventibus *mediator dei et hominum homo Christus Iesus* perducturus est ad *speciem* quam visionem dicit idem apostolus *facie ad faciem*, ita dictum est: *Cum tradiderit regnum deo et patri*, ac si diceretur: 'Cum perduxerit credentes ad contemplationem dei et patris'". *De Trinitate* 1,8.16, CCL 50,49.

[93]) "In illa igitur contemplatione *deus* erit *omnia in omnibus* quia nihil ab illo aliud requiretur, sed solo ipso inlustrari perfruique sufficiet". *De Trinitate* 1,10.20, CCL 50,57.

[94]) "Per speciem autem, quae aequalis est Patri, cum Patre regnat in contemplantibus vertitatem. Quod autem tradet regnum Deo et Patri, a fide incarnationis suae ad speciem deitatis perducens eos qui sibi nunc credunt, non ipse amittit, sed uterque se unum ad fruendum contemplantibus praebet". *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.9, PL 40,79.

C. *Verses 24 and 25: The reign and the kingdom*

Regnare (verse 25) refers to the reigning over the kingdom *(regnum)* that is spoken of in verse 24: "when He delivers *the kingdom* to God and Father. This kingdom comprises both all creation and the church"[95]).

In *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.8 Augustine thinks it possible that some will consider *regnare* in verse 25 to have no connection with *regnum* in verse 24. They may think that *regnum* (verse 24) refers to the universal creation over which God reigns, while *regnare* (verse 25) refers to overcoming the evil forces because of the following phrase: *donec ponat omnes inimicos sub pedibus suis.*

> Similarly there are those who may understand this verse: "It is necessary that he reigns until He subjugates all his enemies" (verse 25) in a manner that "to reign" has been placed without connection with that "kingdom" about which the Apostle says "When He will hand over the kingdom to God and Father" (verse 24), such that there, in verse 24, he called the kingdom the whole creation over which God reigns, here, however, in verse 25, he used the word "*regnare*" with the meaning to lead an army or to defend a city as though against the enemy, such that he said as follows: "It is necessary that He reigns until He subjugates all His enemies" (verse 25), since there will be no reason to have such a kingdom with armed leaders, if the enemy has been so dominated that it cannot rebel. For indeed it has been said in the Gospel "And His Kingdom will have no end" (Lk. 1,33); and according to this He will reign through eternity. However, in accordance with the battle waged under him against the devil there will always be this guard until He subjugates all His enemies. But later there will be no guard since we shall enjoy everlasting peace[96]).

[95]) "Tradet ergo regnum Deo et Patri, cum per illum per speciem cognoscetur Pater. Regnum enim ejus sunt in quibus nunc regnat per fidem. Aliter enim dicitur regnum Christi secundum potestatem divinitatis, secundum quod ei cuncta creatura subjecta est; et aliter regnum ejus dicitur Ecclesia, secundum proprietatem fidei quae in illo est, secundum quod orat qui dicit, *Posside nos* (Is. 26,13,LXX). Neque enim non ipse possidet omnia". *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.4, PL 40,76.

[96]) "Sunt item qui sic intelligant hunc locum, *Oportet eum regnare, donec ponat omnes inimicos suos sub pedibus suis*, ut sub alia significatione positum hic dicant *regnare;* non sub ea qua positum est, *regnum* de quo ait, *Cum tradiderit regnum Deo et Patri:* ut illud sic appellaverit, *regnum*, quo universam creaturam Deus regit; hoc autem sic appellaverit, *regnare*, ut intelligatur tanquam adversum hostem exercitum ducere, vel defendere civitatem: ut ideo dixerit, Oportet eum regnare, donec ponat omnes inimicos suos sub pedibus suis; quia talis regni, quale habent principes armatorum, nulla erit causa, hoste ita subjecto ut rebellare non possit. Nam utique dictum est in Evangelio, *Et regni ejus non erit finis*, secundum quod regnat in aeternum: secundum autem id quod adversus diabolum sub eo militatur; tandiu erit utique ista militia, donec ponat omnes inimicos suos sub pedibus

D. *Verse 25: "For it is necessary that He reigns until He subjugates all his enemies". The duration of Christ's reign*

This phrase seems to suggest that Christ will no longer reign later. Will this really be the case? No. Why? First, because the preceding phrase *deinde finis* does not mean the termination of Christ's reign. Second, because Christ's kingdom will have no end (Lk. 1,33)[97]). The phrase indicates that Christ's reign has to be made more evident until all His enemies acknowledge Him to be the ruler. After He has subjugated His enemies, He will be acknowledged all the more as ruler. This shows the continuity of Christ's reign.

> "For it is necessary that He reigns until He subjugates His enemies" (verse 25). This means that it is necessary for His reign to become evident to such a degree until all His enemies confess that He reigns. For the words are understood to mean that His enemies will be subjugated in the future. But if we had taken it to refer to the just, then these are subjected by believing in Him. Therefore they can be called "enemies" because they became just from having been unjust, and are subjected to Him by believing. However, it has to be taken for the unjust who do not belong to the future happiness of the just, for even the unjust themselves, being made ashamed by the manifestation of Christ's reign, will confess that He reigns. Therefore, "It is necessary that He reigns until He subjugates all His enemies" (verse 25). This has not been said as if after He has subjugated all His enemies He will not reign. Rather, "It is necessary that He reigns until He subjugates His enemies". He is saying that it is necessary for Him to bring His kingdom to a degree of recognition until all His enemies in no way dare to deny that He reigns[98]).

suis; postea vero non erit, cum pace perpetua prefruemur". *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.8, PL 40, 77-78.

[97]) "Deinde quod dictum est, *Oportet enim illum regnare, donec ponat omnes inimicos suos sub pedibus suis*; quasi postea non sit regnaturus, et ad hoc valeat quod supra dictum est, *Deinde finis*. Quod sacrilega opinione sic accipiunt, quasi finem dixerit consummationem regni ejus; cum scriptum sit in Evangelio, *Et regni ejus non erit finis* (Lk. 1,33)". *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.3, PL 40,75.

[98]) "*Oportet enim eum regnare, donec ponat omnes inimicos suos sub pedibus suis:* id est, oportet regnum ejus in tantum manifestari, donec omnes inimici ejus ipsum regnare fateantur. Hoc enim intelligitur, sub pedibus ejus futuros inimicos. Quod si de justis acceperimus, ideo dictum est, *inimicos*, quia ex injustis justificantur, et ei credendo subduntur. De injustis autem qui ad justorum beatitudinem futuram non pertinent, sic accipiendum est, quoniam et ipsi eum regnare ipsa regni ejus manifestatione confusi fatebuntur. Ergo, *Oportet eum regnare donec ponat omnes inimicos sub pedibus suis*, non ita dictum est, quasi cum posuerit inimicos sub pedibus suis, non sit postea regnaturus: sed, *Oportet eum regnare, donec omnes inimicos suos sub pedibus suis*, oportet eum, inquit, ad tantam evidentiam regnum suum perducere, donec inimici ejus nullo modo audeant negare quod regnet". *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.5, PL 40,76.

Christ as the Word of God reigns from and through eternity: *Nam secundum id quod Verbum Dei est, tam sine fine quam sine initio et sine intermissione est regnum ejus*[99]). In this respect Augustine refers to Christ as the second Person of the Trinitarian unity. As the incarnate Word, Christ *began* to reign in the faithful at the beginning of faith in His incarnation, and He continues to reign through His life, sufferings and death: *Secundum autem quod Verbum caro factum est* (Jo. 1,14), *coepit regnare in credentibus per fidem incarnationis suae. Unde est etiam illud: "Dominus regnavit a ligno" (Ps. 95,10). Hinc autem evacuavit omnem principatum et omnem potestatem et virtutem, dum non per claritatem ejus, sed per humilitatem salvi fiunt credentes in eum*[100]). In this respect Augustine refers to Christ as both God and man, i.e. as the Mediator. What remains to be seen is whether Christ reigns as the Head, in the Total or Universal Christ respect. We have not seen any clear reference to this idea. It seems implied, however, in Augustine's explanation of 1 Cor. 15,28: "*tunc et ipse Filius subjectus erit ei qui illi subjecit omnia*" in *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.10[101]). We shall show this later.

Christ's reign through sufferings continues until and beyond the point when "He will deliver it at the end to God and Father" (verse 24). Why? Because by His humility in becoming man He did not separate from the Father. He remained one with Him.

> He who was laughed at, crucified, and abandoned, acquires this kingdom and "will deliver it at the end to God and Father" (verse 24), not in order that He may lose it, but in order that what He has sown in faith, when He came less than the Father, He may bring to that essence, through which He, being equal with the Father, did not separate from Him[102]).

The handing over of the kingdom by Christ to the Father will reveal Christ's reign together with the other Persons of the Trinity.

> Let us not think that Christ will so give the *kingdom to God and Father* (verse 24) that He may take it away from Him. For some vain talkers have believed even this. For when it is said "He will deliver

[99]) *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.8, PL 40,78.

[100]) *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.8, PL 40,78.

[101]) *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.8, PL 40,79.

[102]) "Ille inrisus, ille crucifixus, ille derelictus hoc regnum adquirit et tradet in fine deo et patri, non ut ipse amittat, sed, quod in fide seminavit, cum venit minor patre, hoc perducat ad speciem, in qua aequalis non recessit a patre". *Epistula* 140,27.66, CSEL 44,212.

> the kingdom to God and Father", He Himself is not separated, because He is one God together with the Father[103]).

During Augustine's time, some considered the word "until" *(donec)* in verse 25, "It is necessary that he reigns until he subjugates all his enemies", to mean that Christ's reign will end when he subjugates all his enemies". Augustine opines that they have been deceived by the word, and more precisely because they are careless readers and are looking for controversies. For Augustine the word "until" is used in order to signify continuity and not a break or the end of Christ's reign. He cites Psalm 111,8 as another sample text in which "until" is used with the same function.

> But the word "until" which has been used deceives those who are careless readers of the sacred scriptures and are eager for controversies. The text continues as follows: "It is necessary that he reigns until he subjugates all his enemies" (verse 25), as though, when he had subjugated them, he would not reign. Nor do they understand that this has been said as in the other text: "His heart is steadfast, He will not be shaken until He triumphs over His enemies" (Ps. 111,8). For He will not then be shaken when He has triumphed[104]).

In *De Sermone Domini in Monte* 1,11.30 Augustine explains even more clearly that the word "until" signifies the continuous reign of Christ through eternity. Here he sees the similarity in meaning and function of "until" in 1 Cor. 15,25 with that in Psalm 109,1 and in Mt. 5,26.

> For perhaps "until you pay" has been so expressed here in the way that it has been expressed there where it is said. "Sit at my right hand, until I subjugate all your enemies" (Ps. 109,1); for it does not mean that when the enemies are subjugated, he ceases to sit at the right hand; or (take) that statement of the apostle: "for it is

[103]) "Nec sic arbitremur Christum traditurum *regnum deo et patri* ut adimat sibi. Nam et hoc quidam vaniloqui crediderunt. Cum enim dicitur: *Tradiderit regnum deo et patri*, non separatur ipse quia simul cum patre *unus deus est". De Trinitate* 1,8.16, CCL 50,49.

[104]) "Sed divinarum scripturarum incuriosos et contentionum studiosos fallit verbum quod positum est, *donec*. Ita namque sequitur: *Oportet enim illum regnare donec ponat omnes inimicos sub pedibus suis*, tamquam cum posuerit non sit regnaturus. Nec intellegunt ita dictum sicut est illud: *Confirmatum est cor eius; non commovebitur donec videat super inimicos suos*. Non enim cum viderit, iam *commovebitur". De Trinitate* 1,8.16, CCL 50,49.

necessary that he reigns until he subjugates all his enemies" (1 Cor. 15,25); for it is not that he ceases to reign after they have been subjugated. Therefore, just as there it is understood, concerning whom it has been said: "It is necessary that he reigns, until he subjugates his enemies", that he will always reign, because they will always be subjugated, so here, it can also be accepted concerning whom it has been said: "You will never get out until you have paid the last penny" (Mt. 5,26), that he will never depart[105]).

In *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.5, in comparison with Ps. 122,2: "Our eyes look to the Lord our God till He shows mercy to us", Augustine interprets the word "*donec*" of 1 Cor. 15,25 to mean the limit of the degree of evidence of His reign, so that His enemies will not be able to deny it. By no means does it signify the end of Christ's reign.

For it has been written "So our eyes look to the Lord our God till He shows mercy to us" (Ps. 122,2). This does not mean that we should look away from Him after He has showed mercy to us. Our happiness is commensurate with our delight in contemplating Him. This is the meaning (of the words). The purpose of our gaze is not to strive for the Lord — unless it is to strive to obtain His mercy — so that we should later look away from Him, but so that we should not have any farther desire than Him. *Donec* therefore has been said in this sense; you must understand by it "no more". For how could the reign of Christ be more evident or be made more manifest than when all enemies confess that He reigns? It is one thing, therefore, not to be further manifested; it is another not to stay further. Not to be manifested further is not to become more evident; not to stay further is not to become more persevering. When, however, will the reign of Christ be more evident than when He is glorified in the sight of all His enemies[106])?

[105]) "Ita enim fortasse hic positum est donec solvas, quomodo in illo ubi dictum est: *Sede ad dexteram meam, donec ponam omnes inimicos tuos sub pedibus tuis;* non enim, cum fuerint inimici sub pedibus positi, desinet ille sedere ad dexteram; aut illud apostoli: *Oportet enim illum regnare, donec ponat omnes inimicos suos sub pedibus suis;* non enim, cum positi fuerint, desinet regnare. Quemadmodum ergo ibi intellegitur, de quo dictum est: *Oportet eum regnare, donec ponat inimicos sub pedibus*, semper regnaturum, quoniam semper illi erunt sub pedibus, ita hic accipi potest, de quo dictum est: *Non exies inde, donec solvas novissimum quadrantem*, semper non esse exiturum". *De Sermone Domini in Monte* 1,11.30, CCL 35,31-32.

[106]) "Nam scriptum est, *Ita oculi nostri ad Dominum Deum nostrum, donec misereatur nostri* (Ps. 122,2): nec ideo tamen, cum misertus nostri fuerit, oculos ab eo debemus avertere. In tantum enim est beatitudo nostra, in quantum ejus contemplatione perfruimur. Sic ergo et hoc dictum est. Oculorum nostrorum intentio ad Dominum non porrigitur, nisi usque ad impetrationem misericordiae ipsius, non ut postea inde avertatur, sed ut nihil inde amplius requirat. *Donec* ergo pro eo positum est, ut *non amplius* intelligas. Quo enim amplius, id est, usque ad quam majorem manifestationem manifestabitur regnum Christi,

The manifestation of Christ's reign together with the Father connotes the "subjugation of all principality and all power and authority" (verse 24). Augustine interprets this phrase as the termination of Christ's use of symbols in the economy of salvation.

> For just as he says: "For everything has been delivered to me by my Father, and no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal Him; then the Father will be revealed by the Son "after He has put down all the principality and all power and authority" (verse 24), i.e. in such a manner that there is no need of the distribution of symbols through angelic principality and powers and authority[107]).

In *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.9 this phrase means the destruction of all earthly principality, power and authority. Augustine contrasts this with how Christ reigns in His incarnate flesh. While He ruled in a hidden way (Mt. 18,25) by emptying Himself and taking a form of a servant (Phil. 2,7), He will rule manifestly after destroying all principality, power and authority.

> For He will hand over the kingdom to the Father, when He reigns through that by which He is equal also to the Father in those contemplating the truth, and when He makes the Father visible through Himself only begotten through His essence. For now He reigns in the believers through a power with which He emptied Himself, accepting the form of a servant (Phil. 2,7). Then, however, He will hand over the kingdom to God and Father after He has destroyed every principality, power and authority. How did He destroy them except by humility, patience, and weakness? For what principality will not be destroyed, when the Son of God reigns consequently in the believers, the earthly rulers submitted Him to judgment? What power will not be destroyed when He Himself through whom everything was created reigns in the believers, for the

nisi quousque omnes inimici eum regnare fateantur? Aliud est ergo non amplius manifestari, aliud non amplius permanere. Non amplius manifestari, est non fieri manifestius: non amplius permanere, non fieri perseverantius. Quando autem manifestius erit regnum Christi, quam cum omnibus claruerit inimicis?". *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.5, PL 40,76-77.

[107]) "Sicut enim dicit: *Omnia mihi tradita sunt a patre meo; et nemo novit filium nisi pater, neque patrem quis novit nisi filius et cui voluerit filius revelare;* tunc revelabitur a filio pater *cum evacuaverit omnem principatum et omnem potestatem et virtutem*, id est ut necessaria non sit dispensatio similitudinum per angelicos principatus et potestates et virtutes". *De Trinitate* 1,8.16, CCL 50,49.

very reason that He was subjected to powers such that He said to a man (Pilate), "You would not have power over me unless it has been given to you from above" (Jo. 19,11)? What force will not be destroyed, when He Himself, through whom the heavens have been strengthened, thus reigns in the believers, because he became weak till the cross and death? Properly speaking it is the Son who reigns in this manner in the faith of the believers. For the Father cannot be said or believed either to be incarnated, or judged, or crucified. By His essence, however, which is equal to the Father, He reigns with the Father, in those contemplating the truth[108]).

Earlier, in *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.4 he says that when Christ's reign with the Father has been made manifest, no hope in earthly powers will remain: *In illa enim manifestatione nulli spes aliqua remanebit in quoquam principe, aut in quoquam homine. Quod etiam nunc prophetice canitur: "Bonum est sperare in Domino, quam sperare in homine; bonum est sperare in Domino quam sperare in principibus"* (Ps. 117,8-9)[109]).

E. *Verse 26: "When death, the last enemy, will be destroyed"*

The destruction of death, the last enemy, brings about the realization of the object of our hope: eternal life. Augustine shows this by bringing together 1 Cor. 15,26 with Gal. 6,8: "For he who has sown in his own flesh will from the flesh reap corruption; but he who sows in the spirit will from the spirit reap eternal life". The sowers in the flesh are those who love fleshly desires more than God. The sowers in the spirit are those, who, in accordance with their faith together with love, work for justice. Given this distinction between the two kinds of sowers, one can easily see the implications. Whereas the dynamics of the actions of those

[108]) "Regnum enim tradet Patri, cum per id regnabit in contemplantibus veritatem, quo aequalis et Patri, et per se unigenitum per speciem faciet videri Patrem. Nunc enim per hoc regnat in credentibus, quo se ipsum exinanivit, forman servi accipiens (Phil. 2,7). Tunc autem tradet regnum Deo et Patri, cum evacuaverit omnem principatum, et potestatem, et virtutem. Unde evacuabit (evacuavit), nisi humilitate, et patientia, et infirmitate? Quis enim principatus non evacuetur, cum Filius Dei propterea regnat in credentibus, quia eum principes saeculi judicaverunt? Quae potestas non evacuetur, cum ipse per quem facta sunt omnia, propterea regnat in credentibus, quia ita subjectus est potestatibus, ut diceret homini, *Non haberes in me potestatem nisi data tibi esset desuper* (Jo. 19,11)? Quae virtus non evacuetur, cum ipse per quem coeli solidati sunt, ideo regnat in credentibus, quia usque ad crucem mortemque infirmatus est? Hoc autem modo Filius proprie regnat in fide credentium. Non enim Pater dici aut credi potest vel incarnatus, vel judicatus, vel crucifixus. Per speciem autem, quae aequalis est Patri, cum Patre regnat in contemplantibus veritatem". *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.9, PL 40,78-79.

[109]) *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.4, PL 40,76.

who sow in the flesh are vicious and fatal because from the corruptible flesh they reap corruption, the dynamics of those who sow in the spirit are eschatological. In other words, although the activities of those who sow in the spirit derive from their desires, which in turn arise from their mortal existence, and occur only with struggling and suffering, and despite their enemies, those who sow in the spirit will nevertheless reap eternal life.

> He says: "For he who has sown in his own flesh will from the flesh reap corruption". He says this of those who love desires more than God. He sows in his own flesh, who does everything in order that it will be of benefit to him in the flesh, even if it appears to be good. "However, he, who sows in the spirit, will from the spirit reap eternal life" (Gal. 6,8). The sowing in the spirit consists in serving justice arising from faith and love, and in not obeying the desires of sin although they come from the mortal flesh. However, the reaping of eternal life will come when the last enemy, death, is destroyed (1 Cor. 15,26), when this mortal (sc. flesh) is absorbed by life, and the corruptible (sc. flesh) puts on incorruption[110]).

Death is the last manifestation of mortality[111]). When seen in the context of the church, Augustine refers to it as the final removal of all the changeableness incidental to her mortal condition. On account of her liability to change, the church is comparable to the moon that wanes and waxes. Before the Parousia, the church in her pilgrimage wanes amidst many iniquities. But even amidst and despite of them the church waxes by bringing forth many faithful witnesses to the side of truth. It is not idle speculation to say that Augustine was thinking of the condition of the church during his time, when several heresies and violent schisms, especially Donatism, arose. Indeed, bearing witness to the truth in such circumstances, while it often, if not always, involves a painful struggle for survival, still inevitably leads to the gradual establishment of righteous-

[110]) "*Quia qui seminaverit*, inquit, *in carne sua ex carne metet corruptionem*. Hoc dicit de amatoribus voluptatum magis quam dei. In carne enim sua seminat, qui omnia, quae facit, etiamsi bona videantur, propterea tamen facit, ut carnaliter ei bene sit. *Qui autem seminaverit in spiritu, de spiritu metet vitam aeternam*. Seminatio in spiritu est ex fide cum caritate servire iustitiae et non obaudire desideriis peccati, quamvis de mortali carne existentibus. Messis autem vitae aeternae, cum inimica novissima destruetur mors et absorbebitur mortale a vita et corruptibile hoc induet incorruptionem". *Epistulae ad Galatas expositio* 61,4-7, CSEL 84,136.

[111]) See *Contra Secundinum Manichaeum* 10, CSEL 25(2),922; *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69,6, PL 40,77: death will be destroyed at the transformation of the body (1 Cor. 15,53). Death is included in the phrase: "*Omnia enim subjecit sub pedibus ejus*".

ness and the enjoyment of peace. One can only hope for the definitive attainment of these when death, the last enemy, has been destroyed. This will take place when all the manifestations of mortality incidental to the changeable condition of the church are removed.

> The church, truly, while it remains under the conditions of this mortality of the flesh, on account of this mutability, is called moon. Hence in the scriptures is said: "They have made ready their arrows in the quiver, that they may, while the moon is obscured, wound those who are upright in heart" (Ps. 10,3). For before what the apostle says happens: "When Christ, who is your life, shall appear, then shall you also appear with Him in glory" (Col. 3,4), the church appears to be obscure in the time of her pilgrimage, groaning amidst many iniquities; and at such a time the snares of the seducers to falsehood are to be feared. These he intended to designate by the word "arrows". Hence in another passage concerning the faithful witnesses to the truth which the church brings forth everywhere, it is said: "The moon, a faithful witness in heaven" (Ps. 88,38). And when the psalmist sang of the kingdom of the Lord, he said: "In His days shall rise righteousness and abundance of peace, until the moon be destroyed" (Ps. 71,7), that is, the abundance of peace shall grow so greatly, until He finally takes away all the changeability of this mortal condition. Then "death, the last enemy, is destroyed" (1 Cor. 15,26) ...[112]).

Augustine uses the phrase, "when death, the last enemy, is destroyed" for awakening hope in some existential situations. For example, in *Epistula* 55,14.26, addressed to Januarius, he appeals to this phrase together with verse 54: "When death is swallowed up in victory", in order to exhort believers in time of seemingly unbearable burdens not to lose sight of the reality on which their hope is anchored. In such conditions some can easily lapse into murmuring against God and even into despair of the possibility of attaining freedom from suffering, thus considering suffering meaningless or futile. There were several believers

[112]) "Ecclesia vero adhuc in ista mortalitate carnis constituta propter ipsam mutabilitatem lunae nomine in scripturis significatur. Unde est illud: *Paraverunt sagittas suas in pharetra, ut sagittent in obscura luna rectos corde.* Prius enim fiat illud, quod dicit apostolus: *Cum Christus apparuerit vita vestra, tunc et vos cum illo apparebitis in gloria,* obscura videtur ecclesia in tempore peregrinationis suae inter multas iniquitates gemens et tunc sunt timendae insidiae fallacium seductorum, quas nomine sagittarum intellegi voluit. Unde alio loco propter nuntios fidelissimos veritatis, quos ubique parit ecclesia, dicitur: *Luna testis in caelo fidelis,* et cum de regno domini psalmus caneret: *Orietur,* inquit, *in diebus eius iustitia et abundantia pacis, quoad usque interficiatur luna,* id est abundantia pacis in tantum crescet, donec omnem mutabilitatem mortalitatis absumat, *tunc novissima inimica destruetur mors ...". Epistula* 55,6.10, CSEL 34(2), 198.

of this kind especially among the poor, during Augustine's time[113]). He therefore urges them to continue to hope and struggle, till death the last enemy has been destroyed. For only then will the new life which now begins in faith and is maintained in hope be made perfect.

> Remember how often I repeated this. Let us not think that we ought to be made happy and freed from all difficulties already now in this life, and, that therefore, we may murmur sacrilegiously against God when we are in trouble in temporal things, as if He were not giving us what He has promised. He has indeed promised those things necessary for this life. But the consolations of those in misery and the joys of the happy are different. He says: "Lord, according to the many troubles in my heart, your exhortations have rejoiced my soul" (Ps. 93,19). Let us therefore not murmur in our difficulties, lest we lose the breadth of our cheerfulness, of which it is written, "Rejoicing in hope", because there follows, "patient in tribulation" (Rom. 12,12). The new life, therefore, is meanwhile begun in faith and maintained in hope; for then it will be (perfect) "when death is swallowed up in victory" (1 Cor. 15,54) and when that "last enemy, death, is destroyed" (1 Cor. 15,56)[114]).

F. *Verse 27: "But when he said all things are made subject to Him it is clear that He who made all things subject to him is excepted"*

Who puts all things under whom? For Augustine, both the Father and the Son together bring everything into subjection to themselves. Augustine was aware of the possibility that others, on reading verse 27b, could think that it is the Father alone, without the Son, who brings everything into subjection to Himself. He warns against this misconception. For him, the operation of the Father and the Son are indivisible, so much so that while the Father subjects everything to Himself and to the Son, simultaneously and together the Son brings this same operation into subjection to the Father and to Himself. Augustine's scriptural proofs

[113]) See *En. in Ps.* 93,1, CCL 39,1300-1301.

[114]) "Quod memento quam saepe commemorem. Neque iam nunc in ista vita nos beatos fieri debere arbitremur et ab omnibus difficultatibus liberos ac sic in angustiis rerum temporalium adversus deum ore sacrilego murmuremus, quasi non exhibeat, quod promisit. Promisit quidem etiam huic vitae necessaria; sed alia sunt solatia miserorum, alia gaudia beatorum: *Domine*, inquit, *secundum multitudinem dolorum meorum in corde meo exhortationes tuae iucundaverunt animam meam.* Non ergo murmuremus in difficultatibus, ne perdamus latitudinem hilaritatis, de qua dicitur: *Spe gaudentes*, quia sequitur: *In tribulatione patientes.* Nova ergo vita in fide nunc inchoatur in spe geritur; nam tunc erit, cum *absorbebitur* mors in victoriam, cum illa *novissima inimica destruetur mors ...". Epistula* 55,14.26, CSEL 34(2), 198-199.

for the operation of the Son are Phil. 3.20,21, for the Son's subjecting everything to Himself; and 1 Cor, 15,24, for the Son's subjecting everything to the Father. However, let us not lose sight of the fact that Augustine explains this within his theology of the Trinity, and, therefore, both the Father and the Son include each other in their operations.

> Let not anyone, when he has heard what the apostle says: "But when he has said all things are made subject to him, it is clear that He who made all things subject to Him is excepted" (verse 27), think the words, that He has made subject all things under the Son, to be so understood of the Father that he may not think that the Son Himself subjects everything to Himself. What the apostle was saying to the Philippians shows this: "Our commonwealth is in heaven; from it we wait for a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who has charged our lowly body to be like His glorious body, by the power which enables Him to subject all things to Himself" (Phil. 3.20,21). For the operation of the Father and the Son is indivisible. Otherwise, the Father Himself has not subjected everything under Himself, but the Son has made subject all things to Him, who delivers the kingdom and destroys "all principality and all the power and all the authority" (verse 24). These words of Paul are indeed spoken of the Son: "when He has delivered up the kingdom to God and Father; when He has destroyed all the principality and all the authority and all the power" (verse 24). For He who destroys is the one who subjects[115]).

Therefore, in this particular eschatological operation, while the Father subject everything to Himself and to the Son, in the same manner and at the same time the Son subjects everything to the Father and to Himself *(Nec quisquam ... existimet de patre intellegendum quod subiecerit omnia filio ut ipsum filium sibi omnia subiecisse non putet)*. For a clear understanding of the text it is important to take note that in describing the operation of the Father in relation to the Son, Augustine does not use the reflexive pronoun, "*ipsum ...sibi*"; whereas in describing

[115]) "Nec quisquam cum audierit quod ait apostolus: *Cum autem dixerit quia omnia subiecta sunt, manifestum quia praeter eum qui subiecit illi omnia*, ita existimet de patre intellegendum quod subiecerit omnia filio ut ipsum filium sibi omnia subiecisse non putet. Quod apostolus ad philippenses ostendit dicens: *Nostra autem conversatio in caelis est; unde et salvatorem exspectamus dominum Iesum Christum, qui transfiguravit corpus humilitatis nostrae conforme ut fiat corpori gloriae suae, secundum operationem suam qua possit etiam sibi subiecere omnia*. Inseparabilis enim est operatio patris et filii. Alioquin nec ipse pater sibi subiecit omnia, sed filius ei subiecit qui ei regnum tradidit et evacuat *omnem principatum et omnem potestatem et virtutem*. De filio quippe ista dicta sunt: *Cum tradiderit*, inquit, *regnum deo et patri, cum evacuaverit omnem principatum et omnem potestatem et virtutem*. Ipse enim subiecit qui evacuat". *De Trinitate* 1,8.15, CC 50,48-49.

the operation of the Son, he does: "*ipsum filium sibi omnia subiecisse*". Later, however, in the same text referring again to the operation of the Father, he uses the reflexive pronoun: "the Father Himself subjects everything to Himself" *(ipse pater sibi subiecit omnia)*.

In *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.6[116]) Augustine points out that it is Paul's intention in this verse to show that the Father had subjected everything to the Son both in the form of a servant and as the principle, because of which He is equal with the Father.

G. *Verse 28: "Then the Son will be also subjected to Him ... God will be all in all"*

1. *Tunc et ipse Filius subjectus erit ei qui illi subjecit omnia*

In *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.10 Augustine considers the question whether the word *Filius* refers to Christ alone as the Head of the church (Ephes. 5,23) or to the Total Christ *(universum Christum)*, that is, Christ in union with His Body and members. Although he says that, properly speaking, this verse, within the context of verses 20-28, refers to the resurrection of Christ by reason of His having a human body he nevertheless considers it valid to ask whether this same verse also refers to the Total Christ.

> What has been said is right: "Then the Son Himself will also be subjected to Him who put all things under Him" (verse 28). Although this is said on account of His assuming humanity, since it is from here that the question dealing with the resurrection of the body has arisen, nevertheless it is rightly asked whether this was said concerning Himself alone as the Head of the church (Eph. 5,23) or concerning the Total Christ, including His Body and members[117]).

Augustine is inclined to interpret the verse according to the conception of Christ as the Total Christ. His reasons are the following: (i) the testimonies of many scriptural texts which speak of Jesus Christ not only as an individual but as a corporate person; (ii) in the life after resurrection and transformation Christ and His Body will remain in union such that "God will be all in all".

[116]) *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.6, PL 40,77.

[117]) "Sane quod dictum est, *Tunc et ipse Filius subjectus erit ei qui illi subjecit omnia;* quamvis secundum susceptionem hominis dicatur, quia inde est quaestio nata, cum ageret de resurrectione mortuorum: tamen recte quaeritur utrum secundum ipsum tantum dictum sit, quod est caput Ecclesiae (Eph. 5,23); an secundum universum Christum, annumerato corpore et membris ejus". *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.10, PL 43,79.

> For when He says to the Galatians, "Holy Scripture does not say, 'And to offspring', as to many, but as to one, 'And to your offspring', that is Christ"; lest we understand in this sentence Christ Himself alone, who was born of the virgin Mary, he later said, "For you are all one in Christ Jesus. If however you are of Christ, therefore you are an offspring of Abraham" (Gal. 3,16,28,29). And when he spoke to the Corinthians about charity, drawing a parallel from the members of a body he said: "For just as a body is one and has many members, however all the members of a body, although they are many, are one body, so also is Christ". He did not say, "so also (the body) of Christ"; but "so also is Christ", showing that Christ is rightly called also the Universal Christ, that is, the Head with His Body, that is the Church. We find in many scriptural texts that Christ is spoken of also in this way, such that He is thought of in union with all His members; with respect to them it has been said, "You are the body of Christ and His members" (1 Cor. 12,12,27). Thus it is not absurd for us to understand it as follows: "Then the Son Himself will also be subjected to Him who subjects all the things to Him" (verse 28), so that we understand that the Son not as the Head of the Church alone but all the saints in union with Him, who are one in Christ, are one offspring of Abraham. They are, however, subjected with respect to the contemplation of the eternal truth, in order to obtain happiness, where no motion of the soul and no part of the body create an obstacle, "such that" in that life, since no one loves his individual power, "God will be all in all"[118]).

With this conception of Christ as the Total Christ Augustine perhaps has also in mind the reign of Christ as the Total Christ from His incarnation until and through eternity. This completes the theme of the reign of Christ which we partly showed earlier according to three ways of

[118]) "Cum enim ait ad Galatas, *Non dicit: Et seminibus, tanquam in multis; sed tanquam in uno, Et semini tuo, quod est Christus;* ne ipsum hoc loco solum intelligeremus Christum, qui de Maria virgine est natus, postea dicit, *Omnes enim vos unum estis in Christo Jesu. Si autem vos Christi, ergo Abrahae semen estis* (Gal. 3,16,28,29). Et ad Corinthios cum de charitate diceret, de membris corporis similitudinem ducens: *Sicut enim corpus unum est*, inquit, *et membra habet multa, omnia autem membra corporis cum sint multa, unum est corpus; ita et Christus.* Non dixit, ita et Christi; sed, ita et *Christus*, ostendens Christum recte appellari etiam universum, hoc est, caput cum corpore suo, quod est Ecclesia. Et multis Scripturarum locis invenimus Christum etiam hoc modo appellari, ut cum omnibus suis membris intelligatur, quibus dictum est, *Vos estis corpus Christi et membra* (1 Cor. 12,12,27). Non ergo absurde sic intelligimus. *Tunc et ipse Filius subjectus erit ei qui illi subjecit omnia;* ut Filium non solum caput Ecclesiae, sed et omnes cum eo sanctos intelligamus, qui sunt unum in Christo, unum semen Abrahae: subjectum autem secundum contemplationem sempiternae veritatis, ad obtinendam beatitudinem, nullo motu animi, nulla parte corporis resistente; *ut* in illa vita nemine amante propriam potestatem, sit *Deus omnia in omnibus". De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83,69.10, PL 40,79.

naming Him, which Augustine gives in *Sermo* 341,1.1[119]): (i) "God" and according to the divinity, that is, coequal and coeternal with the Father before the incarnation of the body; (ii) "Christ", after the incarnation of a body, when the same person who is man is God, and the same person who is God is at the same time man, the Mediator and the Head of the Church; and (iii) "the Total Christ", i.e. Head and Body, according to the fullness of a perfect man (Eph. 4,13) in whom each of us is a member.

2. *Deus omnia in omnibus*

Augustine gives several coherent meanings to the phrase "God will be all in all", as follows: the righteous will be made whole; God will be the only source of all their satisfaction and the only object of their desire; and they will attain perfect peace; and they will reach unity with one another not only in nature but also in will, judgment, thoughts and ways. We shall elaborate this theme in the last article of this series.

In *Sermo* 255,8 where Augustine refers to verse 28c and juxtaposes it with verse 53, he speaks of salvation in terms of being healthy *(sanitas)*. Healthiness also means immortality. One is not healthy when one still has many desires, for many desires cause disorder; or else, he who has many desires is sick[120]). At the donning on of immortality (cf. verse 53), these many desires will be removed away and replaced by only one desire, the desire for God alone.

> What is this healthiness by which we say we are healthy? Take the following illustration. Because since the sick have many desires, which healthiness takes away, in whatever way this healthiness takes them away, so, in the same way does immortality take them all away, because our healthiness is our immortality[121]).

[119]) *Sermo* 341,1.1, PL 39,1493. For references on the theme of the Total Christ, see the following: E. FRANZ, *Totus Christus, Studien über Christus und die Kirche bei Augustin*, Bonn, 1956; T. VAN BAVEL, *Christians in the World*, New York, 1980, p. 80-95; R. BERNARD, "La prédestination du Christ total selon saint Augustin", in *Recherches Augustiniennes III*, Paris, 1965, p. 1-58.

[120]) "Sunt quaedam aegrotantium desideria: ardent desiderio aut alicujus fontis, aut alicujus pomi; et sic ardent, ut existiment quia si sani fuerint, frui debeant ipsis desideriis suis. Venit sanitas, et perit cupiditas. Quod desiderabat, fastidit: quia hoc in illo febris quaerebat. Et qualis est ista sanitas, in qua convalescit aegrotus?". *Sermo* 255,7, PL 38,1189-1190.

[121]) "Sanitas ista qua dicimur sani, quid est? Sed tamen hinc capite exemplum. Quia cum multa sint aegrotantium desideria, quae ista sanitas tollit; quomodo illa tollit ista sanitas, sic omnia tollit immortalitas: quia sanitas nostra immortalitas est". *Sermo* 255,7, PL 38,1190.

The substitution of the many desires now for many things by only one desire later occurs when we possess God, who is Himself the creator of everything, in the next life, when God will be all in all.

> Here you seek for riches. How will you lack anything when you have Him who made everything? In order that I may assure you also with the words of the apostle, he says this about that life: "that God may be all in all"[122]).

What Augustine is saying here is that at that time when God is all in all, our desires here and now which seek to be satisfied with created things will be transformed into only one desire, which will be satisfied by the Creator.

That God will be the only object of man's desire is even more clearly expressed by Augustine in *De Civitate Dei* 22,30:

> The reward of virtue will be God Himself, who gave the virtue, together with the promise of Himself, the best and the greatest of all possible promises. For what did He mean when he said, in the words of the prophet, "I shall be their God and they will be my people" (Lev. 26,12)? Did He not mean I shal be the source of their satisfaction; I shall be everything that men can honorably desire: life, health, food, riches, glory, honor, peace, and every blessing? For that is also the correct interpretation of the apostle's words, "so that God may be all in all" (verse 28). He will be the goal of all our longings; and we shall see Him forever; we shall love Him without satiety; we shall praise Him without wearying. This will be the duty, the delight, the activity of all, shared by all who share the life of eternity[123]).

Concomitant with the attainment of a single desire is the attainment of perfect peace. What kind of peace is this? How does it differ from the peace we attain now? It is the peace purged of all forces of mortality,

[122]) "Divitias hic quaeris: quomodo tibi deerunt omnia, quando illum habebis qui fecit omnia? Et ut verbis Apostoli te faciam securum, de illa vita hoc dixit: *Ut sit Deus omnia in omnibus* (1 Cor. 15,28)". *Sermo* 255,7, PL 38,1190.

[123]) "Praemium virtutis erit ipse, qui virtutem dedit eique se ipsum, quo melius et maius nihil possit esse, promisit. Quid est enim aliud quod per prophetam dixit: *Ero illorum Deus, et ipsi erunt mihi plebs*, nisi: 'Ego ero unde satientur, ego ero quaecumque ab hominibus honeste desiderantur, et vita et salus et victus et copia et gloria et honor et pax et omnia bona? Sic enim et illud recte intellegitur, quod ait apostolus: *Ut sit Deus omnia in omnibus*. Ipse finis erit desiderium nostrorum, qui sine fine videbitur, sine fastidio amabitur, sine fatigatione laudabitur. Hoc munus, hic adfectus, hic actus profecto erit omnibus, sicut ipsa vita aeterna, communis". *De Civitate Dei* 22,30, CSEL, 40(2),665-666. See also *Sermo* 148,9, PL 38,867.

namely, troubles, covetousness, needs and weariness. These characterize the present peace that we can attain here and now. The peace that we may now enjoy, according to Augustine, is neither true nor perfect.

> Therefore, what kind of peace is this which men now have with the resisting presence of all troubles, covetousness, needs and weariness? This is not a true, not a perfect peace ... For wherever there is still mortality, how can peace be full[124])?

In order to speak of where and when perfect peace can be attained, Augustine introduces the idea of two cities, namely, the present city and the city hereafter. As we shall show later, these two cities are not numerically distinct; the present city will be transformed into the city of the hereafter. In that city, the peace we now enjoy will be purified. God alone will be our common peace. And He alone will be our common sight and possession. When will this take place? This will happen after the transformation of the bodies, when God's reign in that other city will be unchallenged.

> We shall be in a certain city ... Peace, therefore, will be purged in all the sons of God, all loving one another seeing themselves filled with God, since God will be all in all (verse 28). We shall have God as our common sight; we shall have God as our common possession; we shall have God as our common peace. For whatever that which He gives now to us, He Himself will be ours for everything that He gives; He himself will be our perfect and full peace[125]).

While still in the city of the present time peace can never be fully attained. In *Epistula* 238,2.13, in connection with verse 28, Augustine speaks of the impossibility of attaining unity among men in any society, even when they belong to the same nature and share the properties of that nature. This cannot be had either in a religious community[126]) nor in any sort of society. People cannot be fully united because of their diversity in will, judgment, opinion and customs. Diversity is a threat to peace, or a sign that true peace does not exist.

[124]) "Qualis ergo est ista pax, quam hic habent homines tantis resistentibus molestiis, cupiditatibus, indigentiis, lassitudinibus? Non est ista vera, non est perfecta pax ... Ubi enim adhuc mortalitas, quomodo est plena pax?". *En. in Ps.* 84,10, CCL 39,1170.

[125]) "Erimus in quadam civitate ... Erit ergo pax purgata in filiis Dei, omnibus amantibus se, videntibus se plenos Deo, cum erit Deus in omnibus. Commune spectaculum habebimus Deum; communem possessionem habebimus Deum; communem pacem habebimus Deum. Quidquid enim est quod nobis modo dat, ipse nobis erit pro omnibus quae dat; ipse erit perfecta et plena pax". *En. in Ps.* 84,10, CCL 39,1170.

[126]) See *Epistula* 210,1, CSEL 57,354. Addressed to Felicitas.

> For those men through fellowship in a society and by sharing one and the same nature, by which they were men, were one, although sometimes because of diversity in will, and judgment and opinions, and dissimilarity in customs they were not one; however, they will be fully and perfectly one, when they have arrived at that end, "that God may be all in all" (verse 28)[127]).

Let us take note of the contrast between "they were one" *(unum erant)* and "they will be fully and perfectly one" *(erunt autem plene perfecteque unum)*. This shows how unity cannot be fully achieved on earth in any society.

M. Alfeche O.S.A.

[127]) "Illi enim homines per consortium et communionem unius eiusdemque naturae, qua omnes homines erant, unum erant, etsi aliquando secundum diversitates voluntatum et sententiarum et opinionum morumque dissimilitudines non erant unum; erunt autem plene perfecteque unum, cum perventurum fuerit ad eum finem, *ut sit deus omnia in omnibus*". *Epistula* 238,2,13, CSEL 57,542-543.