

Resurrection

The rising again from the dead, the resumption of life

Resurrection is the rising again from the dead, the resumption of life. The Fourth Lateran Council teaches that all men whether elect or reprobate, "will rise again with their own bodies which they now bear about with them" (cap. "Firmiter"). In the language of the creeds and professions of faith this return to life is called resurrection of the body (*resurrectio carnis*, *resurrectio mortuorum*, Greek: *anastasis ton nekron*) for a double reason: first, since the soul cannot die, it cannot be said to return to life; secondly, the heretical contention of Hymeneus and Philetus that the Scriptures denote by resurrection not the return to life of the body, but the rising of the soul from the death of sin to the life of grace, must be excluded. We shall first treat of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ and then of the General Resurrection of the Body.

Contents

- 1 I. RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST
 - 1.1 A. The Fact of Christ's Resurrection
 - 1.2 B. Opposing Theories
 - 1.2.1 (1) Temporary Swoon
 - 1.2.2 (2) Imposition Theory
 - 1.2.3 (3) Vision Theory
 - 1.2.4 (4) Modernist View
 - 1.3 C. Character of Christ's Resurrection
 - 1.4 D. Importance of the Resurrection
- 2 II. GENERAL RESURRECTION
 - 2.1 A. Dogma of the Resurrection
 - 2.1.1 (1) Old Testament
 - 2.1.2 (2) New Testament
 - 2.1.3 (3) Tradition
 - 2.2 B. Characteristics of the Risen Body

I. RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST

The fact of Christ's resurrection, the theories opposed to this fact, its characteristics, and the reasons for its importance must be considered in distinct paragraphs.

A. The Fact of Christ's Resurrection

The main sources which directly attest the fact of Christ's Resurrection are the Four Gospels and the Epistles of St. Paul. Easter morning is so rich in incident, and so crowded with interested persons, that its complete history presents a rather complicated tableau. It is not surprising; therefore, that the partial accounts contained in each of the Four Gospels appear at first sight hard to harmonize. But whatever exegetic view as to the visit to the sepulchre by the pious women and the appearance of the angels we may defend, we cannot deny the Evangelists' agreement as to the fact that the risen Christ appeared to one or more persons. According to St. Matthew, He appeared to the holy women, and again on a mountain in Galilee; according to St.

Mark, He was seen by Mary Magdalen, by the two disciples at Emmaus, and by the Eleven before His Ascension into heaven; according to St. Luke, He walked with the disciples to Emmaus, appeared to Peter and to the assembled disciples in Jerusalem; according to St. John, Jesus appeared to Mary Magdalen, to the ten Apostles on Easter Sunday, to the Eleven a week later, and to the seven disciples at the Sea of Tiberias. St. Paul (I Cor., xv, 3-8) enumerates another series of apparitions of Jesus after His Resurrection; he was seen by Cephas, by the Eleven, by more than 500 brethren, many of whom were still alive at the time of the Apostle's writing, by James, by all the Apostles, and lastly by Paul himself.

Here is an outline of a possible harmony of the Evangelists' account concerning the principal events of Easter Sunday: (1) The holy women carrying the spices previously prepared start out for the sepulchre before dawn, and reach it after sunrise; they are anxious about the heavy stone, but know nothing of the official guard of the sepulchre (Matt., xxvii, 1-3; Mark, xvi, 1-3; Luke, xxiv, 1; John, xx, 1). (2) The angel frightened the guards by his brightness put them to flight, rolled away the stone, and seated himself (not upon Greek: *ep autou*, but) above (Greek: *epano autou*) the stone (Matt., xxviii, 2-4). (3) Mary Magdalen, Mary the Mother of James, and Salome approach the sepulchre, and see the stone rolled back, whereupon Mary Magdalen immediately returns to inform the Apostles (Mark, xvi, 4; Luke, xxiv, 2; John, xx, 1-2). (4) The other two holy women enter the sepulchre, find an angel seated in the vestibule, who shows them the empty sepulchre, announces the Resurrection, and commissions them to tell the disciples and Peter that they shall see Jesus in Galilee (Matt., xxviii, 5-7; Mark, xvi, 5-7). (5) A second group of holy women, consisting of Joanna and her companions, arrive at the sepulchre, where they have probably agreed to meet the first group, enter the empty interior, and are admonished by two angels that Jesus has risen according to His prediction (Luke, xxiv, 10). (6) Not long after, Peter and John, who were notified by Mary Magdalen, arrive at the sepulchre and find the linen cloth in such a position as to exclude the supposition that the body was stolen; for they lay simply flat on the ground, showing that the sacred body had vanished out of them without touching them. When John notices this he believes (John, xv, 3-10). (7) Mary Magdalen returns to the sepulchre, sees first two angels within, and then Jesus Himself (John, xx, 11-16; Mark, xvi, 9). (8) The two groups of pious women, who probably met on their return to the city, are favored with the sight of Christ arisen, who commissions them to tell His brethren that they will see Him in Galilee (Matt., xxviii, 8-10; Mark, xvi, 8). (9) The holy women relate their experiences to the Apostles, but find no belief (Mark, xvi, 10-11; Luke, xxiv, 9-11). (10) Jesus appears to the disciples at Emmaus, and they return to Jerusalem; the Apostles appear to waver between doubt and belief (Mark, xvi, 12-13; Luke, xxiv, 13-35). (11) Christ appears to Peter, and therefore Peter and John firmly believe in the Resurrection (Luke, xxiv, 34; John, xx, 8). (12) After the return of the disciples from Emmaus, Jesus appears to all the Apostles excepting Thomas (Mark, xvi, 14; Luke, x) dv, 36-43; John, xx, 19-25). The harmony of the other apparitions of Christ after His Resurrection presents no special difficulties.

Briefly, therefore, the fact of Christ's Resurrection is attested by more than 500 eyewitnesses whose experience, simplicity, and uprightness of life rendered them incapable of inventing such a fable, who lived at a time when any attempt to deceive could have been easily discovered, who had nothing in this life to gain, but everything to lose by their testimony, whose moral courage

exhibited in their apostolic life can be explained only by their intimate conviction of the objective truth of their message. Again the fact of Christ's Resurrection is attested by the eloquent silence of the Synagogue which had done everything to prevent deception, which could have easily discovered deception, if there had been any, which opposed only sleeping witnesses to the testimony of the Apostles, which did not punish the alleged carelessness of the official guard, and which could not answer the testimony of the Apostles except by threatening them "that they speak no more in this name to any man" (Acts, iv, 17). Finally, the thousands and millions, both Jews and Gentiles, who believed the testimony of the Apostles in spite of all the disadvantages following from such a belief, in short the origin of the Church, requires for its explanation the reality of Christ's Resurrection, for the rise of the Church without the Resurrection would be a greater miracle than the Resurrection itself.

B. Opposing Theories

By what means can the evidence for Christ's Resurrection be overthrown? Three theories of explanation have been advanced, though the first two have hardly any adherents in our day.

(1) Temporary Swoon

There is the theory of those who assert that Christ did not really die upon the cross, that His supposed death was only a temporary swoon, and that His Resurrection was simply a return to consciousness. This was advocated by Paulus ("Exegetisches Handbuch", 1842, II, p. 929) and in a modified form by Hase ("Gesch. Jesu", §112), but it does not agree with the data furnished by the Gospels. The scourging and the crown of thorns, the carrying of the cross and the crucifixion, the three hours on the cross and the piercing of the Sufferer's side cannot have brought on a mere swoon. His real death is attested by the centurion and the soldiers, by the friends of Jesus and by his bitterest enemies. His stay in a sealed sepulchre for thirty-six hours, in an atmosphere poisoned by the exhalations of a hundred pounds of spices, would have of itself sufficed to cause death. Moreover, if Jesus had merely returned from a swoon, the feelings of Easter morning would have been those of sympathy rather than those of joy and triumph, the Apostles would have been roused to the duties of a sick chamber rather than to apostolic work, the life of the powerful wonderworker would have ended in ignoble solitude and inglorious obscurity, and His vaunted sinlessness would have changed into His silent approval of a lie as the foundation stone of His Church. No wonder that later critics of the Resurrection, like Strauss, have heaped contempt on the old theory of a swoon.

(2) Imposition Theory

The disciples, it is said, stole the body of Jesus from the grave, and then proclaimed to men that their Lord had risen. This theory was anticipated by the Jews who "gave a great sum of money to the soldiers, saying: Say you, His disciples came by night, and stole him away when we were asleep" (Matt., xxviii, 12 sq.). The same was urged by Celsus (Orig., "Contra Cels.", II, 56) with some difference of detail. But to assume that the Apostles with a burden of this kind upon their consciences could have preached a kingdom of truth and righteousness as the one great effort of their lives, and that for the sake of that kingdom they could have suffered even unto death, is to

assume one of those moral impossibilities which may pass for a moment in the heat of controversy, but must be dismissed without delay in the hour of cool reflection.

(3) Vision Theory

This theory as generally understood by its advocates does not allow visions caused by a Divine intervention, but only such as are the product of human agencies. For if a Divine intervention be admitted, we may as well believe, as far as principles are concerned, that God raised Jesus from the dead. But where in the present instance are the human agencies which might cause these visions? The idea of a resurrection from the grave was familiar to the disciples from their Jewish faith; they had also vague intimations in the prophecies of the Old Testament; finally, Jesus Himself had always associated His Resurrection with the predictions of His death. On the other hand, the disciples' state of mind was one of great excitement; they treasured the memory of Christ with a fondness which made it almost impossible for them to believe that He was gone. In short, their whole mental condition was such as needed only the application of a spark to kindle the flame. The spark was applied by Mary Magdalen, and the flame at once spread with the rapidity and force of a conflagration. What she believed that she had seen, others immediately believed that they must see. Their expectations were fulfilled, and the conviction seized the members of the early Church that the Lord had really risen from the dead.

Such is the vision theory commonly defended by recent critics of the Resurrection. But however ingeniously it may be devised, it is quite impossible from an historical point of view. (a) It is incompatible with the state of mind of the Apostles; the theory presupposes faith and expectancy on the part of the Apostles, while in point of fact the disciples' faith and expectancy followed their vision of the risen Christ. (b) It is inconsistent with the nature of Christ's manifestations; they ought to have been connected with heavenly glory, or they should have continued the former intimate relations of Jesus with His disciples, while actually and consistently they presented quite a new phase that could not have been expected. (c) It does not agree with the conditions of the early Christian community: after the first excitement of Easter Sunday, the disciples as a body are noted for their cool deliberation rather than the exalted enthusiasm of a community of visionaries. (d) It is incompatible with the length of time during which the apparitions lasted; visions such as the critics suppose have never been known to last long, while some of Christ's manifestations lasted a considerable period. (e) It is not consistent with the fact that the manifestations were made to numbers at the same instant. (f) It does not agree with the place where most of the manifestations were made; visionary appearances would have been expected in Galilee, while most apparitions of Jesus occurred in Judea. (g) It is inconsistent with the fact that the visions came to a sudden end on the day of the Ascension.

Keim admits that enthusiasm, nervousness, and mental excitement on the part of the disciples do not supply a rational explanation of the facts as related in the Gospels. According to him, the visions were directly granted by God and the glorified Christ; they may even include a "corporeal appearance" for those who fear that without this they would lose all. But Keim's theory satisfies neither the Church, since it abandons all the proofs of a bodily resurrection of Jesus, nor the enemies of the Church, since it admits many of the Church's dogmas; nor again is it consistent with itself, since it grants God's special intervention in proof of the Church's faith,

though it starts with the denial of the bodily Resurrection of Jesus, which is one of the principal objects of that faith.

(4) Modernist View

The Holy Office describes and condemns, in the thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh propositions of the Decree "Lamentabili", the views advocated by a fourth class of opponents of the Resurrection. The former of these propositions reads: "The Resurrection of our Savior is not properly a fact of the historical order, but a fact of the purely supernatural order neither proved nor provable, which Christian consciousness has little by little inferred from other facts." This statement agrees with, and is further explained by the words of Loisy ("Autour d'un petit livre", p. viii, 120-121, 169; "L'Evangile et l'Eglise", pp. 74-78; 120-121; 171). According to Loisy, firstly, the entrance into life immortal of one risen from the dead is not subject to observation; it is a supernatural, hyper-historical fact, not capable of historical proof. The proofs alleged for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ are inadequate; the empty sepulchre is only an indirect argument, while the apparitions of the risen Christ are open to suspicion on a priori grounds, being sensible impressions of a supernatural reality; and they are doubtful evidence from a critical point of view, on account of the discrepancies in the various Scriptural narratives, and the mixed character of the detail connected with the apparitions. Secondly, if one prescind from the faith of the Apostles, the testimony of the New Testament does not furnish a certain argument for the fact of the Resurrection. This faith of the Apostles is concerned not so much with the Resurrection of Jesus Christ as with His immortal life; being based on the apparitions, which are unsatisfactory evidence from an historical point of view, its force is appreciated only by faith itself; being a development of the idea of an immortal Messias, it is an evolution of Christian consciousness, though it is at the same time a corrective of the scandal of the Cross. The Holy Office rejects this view of the Resurrection when it condemns the thirty-seventh proposition in the Decree "Lamentabili": "The faith in the Resurrection of Christ pointed at the beginning not so much to the fact of the Resurrection, as to the immortal life of Christ with God."

Besides the authoritative rejection of the foregoing view, we may submit the following three considerations which render it untenable: First, the contention that the Resurrection of Christ cannot be proved historically is not in accord with science. Science does not know enough about the limitations and the properties of a body raised from the dead to immortal life to warrant the assertion that such a body cannot be perceived by the senses; again, in the case of Christ, the empty sepulchre with all its concrete circumstances cannot be explained except by a miraculous Divine intervention as supernatural in its character as the Resurrection of Jesus. Secondly, history does not allow us to regard the belief in the Resurrection as the result of a gradual evolution in Christian consciousness. The apparitions were not a mere projection of the disciples' Messianic hope and expectation; their Messianic hope and expectations had to be revived by the apparitions. Again, the Apostles did not begin with preaching the immortal life of Christ with God, but they preached Christ's Resurrection from the very beginning, they insisted on it as a fundamental fact, and they described even some of the details connected with this fact: Acts, ii, 24, 31; iii, 15, 26; iv, 10; v, 30; x, 39-40; xiii, 30, 37; xvii, 31-32; Rom., i, 4; iv, 25; vi, 4, 9; viii, 11, 34; x, 7; xiv, 9; I Cor., xv, 4, 13 sqq.; etc. Thirdly, the denial of the historical certainty of

Christ's Resurrection involves several historical blunders: it questions the objective reality of the apparitions without any historical grounds for such a doubt; it denies the fact of the empty sepulchre in spite of solid historical evidence to the contrary; it questions even the fact of Christ's burial in Joseph's sepulchre, though this fact is based on the clear and simply unimpeachable testimony of history (cf. Lepin, "Christologie. Commentaire des Propositions XXVII-XXXVIII du Deeret du Saint Office `Lamentabili", Paris, 1908).

C. Character of Christ's Resurrection

The Resurrection of Christ has much in common with the general resurrection; even the transformation of His body and of His bodily life is of the same kind as that which awaits the blessed in their resurrection. But the following peculiarities must be noted: (1) Christ's Resurrection is necessarily a glorious one; it implies not merely the reunion of body and soul, but also the glorification of the body. (2) Christ's body was to know no corruption, but rose again soon after death, when sufficient time had elapsed to leave no doubt as to the reality of His death. (3) Christ was the first to rise unto life immortal; those raised before Him died again (Col., i, 18; I Cor., xv, 20). (4) As the Divine power which raised Christ from the grave was His own power, He rose from the dead by His own power (John, ii, 19; x, 17-18). (5) Since the Resurrection had been promised as the main proof of Christ's Divine mission, it has a greater dogmatic importance than any other fact. "If Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain" (I Cor., xv, 14).

D. Importance of the Resurrection

Besides being the fundamental argument for our Christian belief, the Resurrection is important for the following reasons: (1) It shows the justice of God who exalted Christ to a life of glory, as Christ had humbled Himself unto death (Phil., ii, 8-9). (2) The Resurrection completed the mystery of our salvation and redemption; by His death Christ freed us from sin, and by His Resurrection He restored to us the most important privileges lost by sin (Rom., iv, 25). (3) By His Resurrection we acknowledge Christ as the immortal God, the efficient and exemplary cause of our own resurrection (I Cor., xv, 21; Phil., iii, 20-21), and as the model and the support of our new life of grace (Rom., vi, 4-6; 9-11).

II. GENERAL RESURRECTION

"No doctrine of the Christian Faith", says St. Augustine, "is so vehemently and so obstinately opposed as the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh" (In Ps. lxxxviii, sermo ii, n. 5). This opposition had begun long before the days of St. Augustine: "And certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics", the inspired writer tells us (Acts, xvii, 18, 32), "disputed with him [Paul]... and when they had heard of the resurrection of the dead, some indeed mocked, but others said: We will hear thee again concerning this matter." Among the opponents of the Resurrection we naturally find first all those who denied the immortality of the soul; secondly, all those who, like Plato, regarded the body as the prison of the soul and death as an escape from the bondage of matter; thirdly, the sects of the Gnostics and Manichaans who looked upon all matter as evil; fourthly, the followers of these latter sects, the Priscillianists, the Cathari, and the Albigenses; fifthly, the Rationalists, Materialists, and Pantheists of later times. Against all these

we shall first establish the dogma of the resurrection, and secondly consider the characteristics of the risen body.

A. Dogma of the Resurrection

The creeds and professions of faith and conciliar definitions do not leave it doubtful that the resurrection of the body is a dogma or an article of faith. We may appeal, for instance, to the Apostles' Creed, the so-called Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, the Creed of the Eleventh Council of Toledo the Creed of Leo IX, subscribed by Bishop Peter and still in use at the consecration of bishops, the profession of faith subscribed by Michael Paleologus in the Second Council of Lyons, the Creed of Pius IV, and the Decree of the Fourth Lateran Council (c. "Firmiter") against the Albigenses. This article of faith is based on the belief of the Old Testament, on the teaching of the New Testament, and on Christian tradition.

(1) Old Testament

The words of Martha and the history of the Machabees show the Jewish belief towards the end of the Jewish economy. "I know", says Martha, "that He shall rise again, in the resurrection at the last day" (John, xi, 24). And the third of the Machabee martyrs put forth his tongue and stretched out his hands, saying: "These I have from heaven, but for the laws of God I now despise them: because I hope to receive them again from him" (II Mach., xii, 11; cf. ix, 14). The Book of Daniel (xii, 2; cf. 12) inculcates the same belief: "Many of those that sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake: some unto life everlasting, and others unto reproach, to see it always." The word many must be understood in the light of its meaning in other passages, e.g. Is., liii, 11-12; Matt., xxvi, 28; Rom., v, 18-19. Though Ezechiel's vision of the resurrection of the dry bones refers directly to the restoration of Israel, such a figure would be hardly intelligible except by readers familiar with the belief in a literal resurrection (Ez, xxxvii). The Prophet Isaias foretells that the Lord of hosts "shall cast down death headlong for ever" (xxv, 8), and a little later he adds: "Thy dead men shall live, my slain shall rise again... the earth shall disclose her blood, and shall cover her slain no more" (xxvi, 19-21). Finally, Job, bereft of all human comfort and reduced to the greatest desolation, is strengthened by the thought of the resurrection of his body: "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and in the last day I shall rise out of the earth. And I shall be clothed again with my skin, and in my flesh I shall see God. Whom I myself shall see, and my eyes shall behold, and not another; this hope is laid up in my bosom" (Job, xix, 25-27). The literal translation of the Hebrew text differs somewhat from the foregoing quotation, but the hope of resurrection remains.

(2) New Testament

The resurrection of the dead was expressly taught by Christ (John v, 28-29; vi, 39-40; xi, 25; Luke, xiv, 14) and defended against the unbelief of the Sadducees, whom He charged with ignorance of the power of God and of the Scriptures (Matt., xxii, 29; Luke, xx, 37). St. Paul places the general resurrection on the same level of certainty with that of Christ's Resurrection: "If Christ be preached, that he rose again from the dead, how do some among you say that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then Christ is not risen again. And if Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain" (I

Cor., xv, 12 sqq.). The Apostle preached the resurrection of the dead as one of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, at Athens, for instance (Acts, xvii, 18, 31, 32), at Jerusalem (xxiii, 6), before Felix (xxiv, 15), before Agrippa (xxvi, 8). He insists on the same doctrine in his Epistles (Rom., viii, 11; I Cor., vi, 14; xv, 12 sqq.; II Cor., iv, 14; v, 1 sqq.; Phil., iii, 21; I Thess., iv, 12-16; II Tim., ii, 11; Hebr., v1, 2), and in this he agrees with the Apocalypse (xx, 12 sqq.).

(3) Tradition

It is not surprising that the Tradition of the early Church agrees with the clear teaching of both the Old and New Testaments. We have already referred to a number of creeds and professions of faith which may be considered as part of the Church's official expression of her faith. Here we have only to point out a number of patristic passages, in which the Fathers teach the doctrine of the general resurrection in more or less explicit terms. St. Clement of Rome, I Cor., xxv; St. Justin Martyr, "De resurrect.", vii sqq.; Idem, "Dial. c. Tryph.", lxxx; Athenagoras, "De resur. tarn.", iii; Tatian, "Adv. Grabs.", vi; St. Irenaeus, "Contra hoer.", I, x; V, vi, 2; Tertullian, "Contra Marcion.", V, ix; Idem, "De praescript.", xiii; Idem, "De resurrect. earn.", I, xii, xv, lxiii; Minucius Felix, "Octay.", xxxiv; Origen, torn. XVII, in Matt., xxix; Idem, "De princip.", praef., v; Idem, "In Lev.", v, 10; Hippolytus, "Adv. Graec." in P.G., X, 799; St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "Cat.", XVIII, xv; St. Ephraem "De resurrect. mort." St. Basil, "Ep: cclxxi", 3; St. Epiphanius, "In ancor.", lxxxiii sq., xcix; St. Ambrose, "De excessu frat. sui Satyri", II, lxxvii, cii; Idem, "In Ps. cxviii", serm. x n. 18; Ps. Ambr., "De Trinit.", xxiii, in P.L., XVII, 534; St. Jerome, "Ep. ad Paul" in LIII, 8; Rufinus, "In symbol.", xlv sq.; St. Chrysostom (Pa. Chrysostom), "Fragm. in libr. Job" in P.G., LXIV, 619; St. Peter Chrysologus, serm. 103, 118; "Apost. Constit." VII, xli; St. Augustine "Enchirid.", 84; Idem, "De civit. Dei", XX, xx; Theodoret, "De provident.", or. ix; "Hist. eccl.", I, iii.

The general resurrection can hardly be proved from reason, though we may show its congruity. (a) As the soul has a natural propensity to the body, its perpetual separation' from the body would seem unnatural. (b) As the body is the partner of the soul's crimes, and the companion of her virtues, the justice of God seems to demand that the body be the sharer in the soul's punishment and reward. (c) As the soul separated from the body is naturally imperfect, the consummation of its happiness, replete with every good, seems to demand the resurrection of the body. The first of these reasons appears to be urged by Christ Himself in Matt., xxii, 23; the second reminds one of the words of St. Paul, I Cor., xv, 19, and II Thess., i 4. Besides urging the foregoing arguments, the Fathers appeal also to certain analogies found in revelation and in nature itself, e.g. Jonas in the whale's belly, the three children in the fiery furnace, Daniel in the lions' den, the carrying away of Henoah and Elias, the raising of the dead, the blossoming of Aaron's rod, the preservation of the garments of the Israelites in the desert, the grain of seed dying and springing up again, the egg, the season of the year, the succession of day and night. Many pictures of early Christian art express these analogies (Kraus, "Encyci. Archaol." s.v. Auferstehung; Northcote and Brownlow, "Roma Sotterranea"). But in spite of the foregoing congruities, theologians more generally incline to the opinion that in the state of pure nature there would have been no resurrection of the body.

B. Characteristics of the Risen Body

All shall rise from the dead in their own, in their entire, and in immortal bodies; but the good shall rise to the resurrection of life, the wicked to the resurrection of judgment. It would destroy the very idea of resurrection, if the dead were to rise in bodies not their own. Again, the resurrection, like the creation, is to be numbered amongst the principal works of God; hence, as at the creation all things came perfect from the hand of God, so at the resurrection all things must be perfectly restored by the same omnipotent hand. But there is a difference between the earthly and the risen body; for the risen bodies of both saints and sinners shall be invested with immortality. This admirable restoration of nature is the result of the glorious triumph of Christ over death as described in several texts of Sacred Scripture: Is., xxv, 8; Osee, xiii, 14; I Cor., xv, 26; Apoc., ii, 4. But while the just shall enjoy an endless felicity in the entirety of their restored members, the wicked "shall seek death, and shall not find it, shall desire to die, and death shall fly from them" (Apoc., ix, 6).

These three characteristics, identity, entirety, and immortality, will be common to the risen bodies of the just and the wicked. But the bodies of the saints shall be distinguished by four transcendent endowments, often called qualities. The first is "impassibility", which shall place them beyond the reach of pain and inconvenience. "It is sown", says the Apostle, "in corruption, it shall rise in incorruption" (I Cor., xv, 42). The Schoolmen call this quality impassibility, not incorruption, so as to mark it as a peculiarity of the glorified body; the bodies of the damned will be incorruptible indeed, but not impassible; they shall be subject to heat and cold, and all manner of pain. The next quality is "brightness", or "glory", by which the bodies of the saints shall shine like the sun. "It is sown in dishonor," says the Apostle, "it shall rise in glory" (I Cor., xv, 43; cf. Matt., xiii, 43; xvii, 2; Phil., iii, 21). All the bodies of the saints shall be equally impassible, but they shall be endowed with different degrees of glory. According to St. Paul: "One is the glory of the sun, another the glory of the moon, another the glory of the stars. For star differeth from star in glory" (I Cor., xv, 41-42). The third quality is that of "agility", by which the body shall be freed from its slowness of motion, and endowed with the capability of moving with the utmost facility and quickness wherever the soul pleases. The Apostle says: "It is sown in weakness, it shall rise in power" (I Cor., xv, 43). The fourth quality is "subtility", by which the body becomes subject to the absolute dominion of the soul. This is inferred from the words of the Apostle: "It is sown a natural body, it shall rise a spiritual body" (I Cor., xv, 44). The body participates in the soul's more perfect and spiritual life to such an extent that it becomes itself like a spirit. We see this quality exemplified in the fact that Christ passed through material objects.

A. J. MAAS