

Quare Christus mori voluit

WHY CHRIST WILLED TO DIE

Manifestum igitur est secundum praedicta, quod Christus aliquos defectus nostros suscepit non ex necessitate, sed propter aliquem finem, scilicet propter salutem nostram. Omnis autem potentia et habitus sive habilitas ordinatur ad actum sicut ad finem: unde passibilitas ad satisfaciendum vel merendum non sufficit sine passione in actu. Non enim aliquis dicitur bonus vel malus ex eo quod potest talia agere, sed ex eo quod agit, nec laus et vituperium debentur potentiae, sed actui. Unde et Christus non solum passibilitatem nostram suscepit ut nos salvaret, sed etiam ut pro peccatis nostris satisfaceret, voluit pati. Passus est autem pro nobis ea quae ut nos pateremur ex peccato primi parentis meruimus, quorum praecipuum est mors, ad quam omnes aliae passiones humanae ordinantur sicut ad ultimum. Stipendia enim peccati mors est, ut apostolus dicit ad Rom. VI, 23.

Evidently, therefore, as we see from this discussion, Christ took some of our defects on Himself, not out of necessity, but for a definite purpose, namely, for our salvation. But every potency and every habit or capacity are ordained toward act as their end. Hence capacity to suffer is not enough for satisfaction or merit apart from actual suffering. A person is called good or evil, not because he is able to perform good or evil actions, but because he performs them; praise and blame are duly rendered not for power to act but for acting. To save us, consequently, Christ was not content merely to make our passibility His portion, but He willed actually to suffer that He might satisfy for our sins. He endured for us those sufferings which we deserved to suffer in consequence of the sin of our first parent. Of these the chief is death, to which all other human sufferings are ordered as to their final term. "For the wages of sin is death," as the Apostle says in Romans 6:23.

Unde et Christus pro peccatis nostris voluit mortem pati, ut dum poenam nobis debitam ipse sine culpa susciperet, nos a reatu mortis liberaret, sicut aliquis debito poenae liberaretur, alio pro eo poenam sustinente. Mori etiam voluit, ut non solum mors eius esset nobis satisfactionis remedium, sed etiam salutis sacramentum ut ad similitudinem mortis eius nos carnali vitae moriamur, in spiritualem vitam translati, secundum illud I Petri III, 18: Christus semel pro peccatis nostris mortuus est, iustus pro iniustis, ut nos offerret Deo, mortificatos quidem carne, vivificatos autem spiritu.

Accordingly Christ willed to submit to death for our sins so that, in taking on Himself without any fault of His own the punishment charged against us, He might free us from the death to which we had been sentenced, in the way that anyone would be freed from a debt of penalty if another person undertook to pay the penalty for him. Another reason why He wished to die was that His death might be for us not only a remedy of satisfaction but also a sacrament of salvation, so that we, transferred to a spiritual life, might die to our carnal life, in the likeness of His death. This is in accord with 1 Peter 3:18: "Christ also died once for our sins, the just for the unjust, that He might offer us to God, being put to death in deed in the flesh, but enlivened in the spirit."

Mori etiam voluit, ut nobis mors eius esset perfectae virtutis exemplum. Quantum ad caritatem quidem, quia maiorem caritatem nemo habet quam ut animam suam ponat quis pro amicis suis, ut dicitur Ioan. XV, 13. Tanto enim quisque magis amare ostenditur, quanto plura et graviora pro amico pati non refugit. Omnium autem humanorum malorum gravius est mors, per quam tollitur vita humana, unde nullum magis signum dilectionis esse potest quam quod homo pro amico vero se morti exponat.

Quantum ad fortitudinem vero, quae propter adversa a iustitia non recedit, quia maxime ad fortitudinem pertinere videtur ut etiam nec timore mortis aliquis a virtute recedat, unde dicit apostolus Hebr. II, 14, de passione Christi loquens: ut per mortem destrueret eum qui habebat mortis imperium, idest Diabolum, et liberaret eos qui timore mortis per totam vitam obnoxii erant servituti. Dum enim pro veritate mori non recusavit, exclusit timorem moriendi, propter quem homines servituti peccati plerumque subduntur.

Quantum ad patientiam vero, quae in adversis tristitiam hominem absorbere non sinit, sed quanto sunt maiora adversa, tanto magis in his relucet patientiae virtus: unde in maximo malorum, quod est mors, perfectae patientiae datur exemplum, si absque mentis turbatione sustineatur, quod de Christo propheta praedixit dicens Isai. LIII, 7: tanquam agnus coram tondente se obmutescet, et non aperiet os suum.

Quantum ad obedientiam vero, quia tanto laudabilior est obedientia, quanto in difficilioribus quis obedit: omnium autem

Christ also wished to die that His death might be an example of perfect virtue for us. He gave an example of charity, for “greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends” (John 15:13). The more numerous and grievous are the sufferings a person does not refuse to bear for his friend, the more strikingly his love is shown forth. But of all human ills the most grievous is death, by which human life is snuffed out. Hence no greater proof of love is possible than that a man should expose himself to death for a friend.

By His death Christ also gave an example of fortitude, which does not abandon justice in the face of adversity; refusal to give up the practice of virtue even under fear of death seems to pertain most emphatically to fortitude. Thus the Apostle says in Hebrews 2:14 ff., with reference to Christ’s passion: “That through death He might destroy him who had the empire of death, that is to say, the devil, and might deliver them who through the fear of death were all their lifetime subject to servitude.” In not refusing to die for truth, Christ overcame the fear of dying, which is the reason men for the most part are subject to the slavery of sin.

Further, He gave an example of patience, a virtue that prevents sorrow from overwhelming man in time of adversity; the greater the trials, the more splendidly does the virtue of patience shine forth in them. Therefore an example of perfect patience is afforded in the greatest of evils, which is death, if it is borne without distress of mind. Such tranquillity the prophet foretold of Christ: He “shall be dumb as a lamb before his shearer, and He shall not open His mouth” (Is. 53:7).

Lastly, our Lord gave an example of obedience; for the more difficult are the precepts one obeys, the more praiseworthy is

difficillimum est mors. Unde ad perfectam obedientiam Christi commendandam, dicit apostolus ad Philip. II, 8, quod factus est obediens patri usque ad mortem.

the obedience. But the most difficult of all the objects of obedience is death. Hence, to commend the perfect obedience of Christ, the Apostle says, in Philippians 2:8, that He was obedient to the Father even unto death.

Caput 228

CHAPTER 228

De morte crucis

THE DEATH OF THE CROSS

Ex eisdem autem causis apparet quare mortem crucis voluit pati. Primo quidem quia hoc convenit quantum ad remedium satisfactionis: convenienter enim homo punitur per ea in quibus peccavit. Per quae enim peccat quis, per haec et torquetur, ut dicitur sapientiae XI, 17. Peccatum autem hominis primum fuit per hoc quod pomum arboris ligni scientiae boni et mali contra praeceptum Dei comedit, loco cuius Christus se ligno affigi permisit, ut exsolveret quae non rapuit, sicut de eo Psalmista dicit in Psal. LXVIII.

The same reasons reveal why Christ willed to suffer the death of the cross. In the first place, such a death was suitable as a salutary means of satisfaction. Man is fittingly punished in the things wherein he has sinned, as is said in Wisdom 1:17: "The things by which a man sins, by the same also he is tormented. But the first sin of man was the fact that he ate the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, contrary to God's command. In his stead Christ permitted Himself to be fastened to a tree, so that He might pay for what He did not carry off, as the Psalmist says of Him in Psalm 58:5.

Convenit etiam quantum ad sacramentum. Voluit enim Christus ostendere sua morte, ut sic moreremur vita carnali quod spiritus noster in superna elevaretur, unde et ipse dicit Ioan. XII, 32: ego si exaltatus fuero a terra, omnia traham ad meipsum.

Death on the cross was also appropriate as a sacrament. Christ wished to make clear by His death that we ought so to die in our carnal life that our spirit might be raised to higher things. Hence He Himself says, in John 12:32: "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to Myself."

Convenit etiam quantum ad exemplum perfectae virtutis. Homines enim quandoque non minus refugiunt vituperabile genus mortis quam mortis acerbiter, unde ad perfectionem virtutis pertinere videtur ut propter bonum virtutis etiam aliquis vituperabilem mortem non refugiat pati. Unde apostolus ad commendandam perfectam obedientiam Christi, cum dixisset de eo quod factus est obediens usque ad mortem, subdidit: mortem autem crucis: quae quidem mors turpissima

This kind of death was likewise fitting as an example of perfect virtue. Sometimes men shrink no less from a disgraceful kind of death than from the painfulness of death. Accordingly, the perfection of virtue seems to require that a person 'should not refuse to suffer even a disgraceful death for the good of virtue. Therefore, to commend the perfect obedience of Christ, the Apostle, after saying of Him that He was "obedient unto death," added: "even to the death of the cross" (Phil.

videbatur, secundum illud sapientiae II, 20: morte turpissima condemnemus eum.

2:8). This sort of death was looked on as the most ignominious of all, in the words of Wisdom 2:20: "Let us condemn him to a most shameful death."

Caput 229

De morte Christi

Cum autem in Christo conveniant in unam personam tres substantiae, scilicet corpus, anima, et divinitas verbi, quarum duae, scilicet anima et corpus, unitae sunt in unam naturam, in morte quidem Christi separata est unio corporis et animae. Aliter enim corpus vere mortuum non fuisset: mors enim corporis nihil est aliud quam separatio animae ab ipso.

Neutrum tamen separatum est a Dei verbo quantum ad unionem personae. Ex unione autem animae et corporis resultat humanitas: unde separata anima a corpore Christi per mortem, in triduo mortis homo dici non potuit. Dictum est autem supra quod propter unionem in persona humanae naturae ad Dei verbum, quidquid dicitur de homine Christo, potest et convenienter de Dei filio praedicari. Unde cum in morte manserit unio personalis filii Dei tam ad animam quam ad corpus Christi, quidquid de utroque eorum dicitur, poterat de Dei filio praedicari. Unde et in symbolo dicitur de filio Dei, quod sepultus est, propter hoc quod corpus sibi unitum in sepulcro iacuit, et quod descendit ad Inferos, anima descendente.

Est etiam considerandum, quod masculinum genus designat personam, neutrum vero naturam: unde in Trinitate dicimus, quod filius est alius a patre, non aliud. Secundum hoc ergo

CHAPTER 229

THE DEATH OF CHRIST

In Christ three substances, the body, the soul, and the divinity of the Word, are joined together in one person. Two of these, the soul and the body, are united to form one nature. Accordingly at the death of Christ the union between body and soul was dissolved. Otherwise the body would not have been truly dead, since death of the body is nothing else than the separation of the soul from it.

But neither soul nor body was separated from the Word of God, as far as union with the person is concerned. Human nature results from the union of soul and body; hence Christ could not be said to be a man during the three days of His death, when His soul remained separated from His body by death. However, as was shown above, on account of the union of the human nature with the Word of God in one person, whatever is said of the man Christ can rightly be predicated also of the Son of God. Consequently, since the personal union of the Son of God both with the soul and with the body of Christ remained in death, whatever is said of either of them could be predicated of the Son of God. Hence the Creed asserts that the Son of God was buried, for the reason that the body united to Him lay in the tomb, and likewise that He descended into hell, because His soul descended.

We should also recall that the masculine gender designates a person, and that the neuter gender designates nature. Thus in speaking of the Trinity we say that the Son is

in triduo mortis Christus fuit totus in sepulcro, totus in Inferno, totus in caelo, propter personam, quae unita erat et carni in sepulcro iacenti, et animae Infernum expolianti, et subsistebat in natura divina in caelo regnante; sed non potest dici quod totum in sepulcro aut in Inferno fuerit, quia non tota humana natura, sed pars in sepulcro aut in Inferno fuit.

another person (*alius*) than the Father, but not that He is another thing (*aliud*). Accordingly, during the three days of His death the whole (*totus*) Christ was in the sepulcher and in hell and in heaven, because of His person which remained united to His flesh reposing in the tomb and to His soul which was emptying hell, and which continued to subsist in the divine nature reigning in heaven. But we cannot say that the whole (*totum*) of Christ was in the sepulcher or in hell, because only a part of the human nature and not the whole of it was in the sepulcher or in hell.

Caput 230

Quod mors Christi fuit voluntaria

Fuit igitur mors Christi nostrae morti conformis quantum ad id quod est de ratione mortis, quod est animam a corpore separari, sed quantum ad aliquid mors Christi a nostra morte differens fuit. Nos enim morimur quasi morti subiecti ex necessitate vel naturae, vel alicuius violentiae nobis illatae; Christus autem mortuus est non necessitate, sed potestate, et propria voluntate. Unde ipse dicebat, Ioan. X, 18: potestatem habeo ponendi animam meam et iterum sumendi eam.

Huius autem differentiae ratio est, quia naturalia voluntati nostrae non subiacent: coniunctio autem animae ad corpus est naturalis, unde voluntati nostrae non subiacet quod anima corpori unita remaneat, vel quod a corpore separetur, sed oportet hoc ex virtute alicuius agentis provenire. Quidquid autem in Christo secundum humanam naturam erat naturale, totum eius voluntati subiacebat propter divinitatis virtutem, cui subiacet tota natura. Erat igitur in potestate Christi ut quandiu vellet, anima

CHAPTER 230

VOLUNTARY CHARACTER OF CHRIST'S DEATH

Christ's death was like our death as regards the essence of death, which consists in the separation of the soul from the body. But in another respect the death of Christ was different from ours. We die for the reason that we are subject to death by a necessary law of nature, or in consequence of some violence done to us. But Christ did not die because of any necessity. He gave up His life by His power and His own will, as He Himself attested: "I have power to lay it [My life] down, and I have power to take it up again" (John 10:18).

The reason for this difference is that physical things are not subject to our will. But the joining of the soul to the body is physical. Hence the fact that the soul remains united to the body or that it is separated from the body, is not subject to our will, but must be brought about by the power of some agent. But whatever was physical in Christ as regards His human nature, was completely subject to His will, because of the power of His divinity, to which all nature is subject. Therefore Christ had it in His power that so long as He willed,

eius corpori unita remaneret, et statim cum vellet, separaretur ab ipso. Huiusmodi autem divinae virtutis indicium centurio cruci Christi assistens sensit, dum eum vidit clamantem expirare, per quod manifeste ostendebatur, quod non sicut ceteri homines ex defectu naturae moriebatur. Non enim possunt homines cum clamore spiritum emittere, cum in illo mortis articulo vix etiam possint palpitando linguam movere: unde quod Christus clamans expiravit, in eo divinam manifestavit virtutem, et propter hoc centurio dixit: vere filius Dei erat iste.

Non tamen dicendum est quod Iudaei non occiderint Christum, vel quod Christus ipse se occiderit. Ille enim dicitur aliquem occidere qui ei causam mortis inducit, non tamen mors sequitur nisi causa mortis naturam vincat, quae vitam conservat. Erat autem in potestate Christi ut natura causae corrumpenti cederet, vel resisteret quantum ipse vellet: ideo et ipse Christus voluntarie mortuus fuit, et tamen Iudaei occiderunt eum.

His soul would remain united to His body, and that the instant He willed, the soul would depart from the body. The centurion standing near the cross of Christ felt the presence of this divine power when he saw Him expire with a loud cry. By this Christ clearly showed that He was not dying like other men, from the breaking down of nature. For men cannot send forth their last breath with a loud cry; in the moment of death they can scarcely move their tongue in a quavering whisper. Hence the fact that Christ died uttering a loud cry gave evidence of the divine power in Him. It was for this reason that the centurion said: "Indeed, this was the Son of God" (Matt. 27:54).

Yet we may not aver that the Jews did not kill Christ, or that Christ took His own life. For the one who brings the cause of death to bear on a person is said to kill him. But death does not ensue unless the cause of death prevails over nature, which conserves life. Christ had it in His power either to submit His nature to the destructive cause or to resist that influence, just as He willed. Thus Christ died voluntarily, and yet the Jews killed Him.

Caput 231

De passione Christi quantum ad corpus

Non solum autem Christus mortem pati voluit, sed et alia quae ex peccato primi parentis in posteros proveniunt, ut dum poenam peccati integraliter susciperet, nos perfecte a peccato satisfaciendo liberaret. Horum autem quaedam praecedunt mortem, quaedam mortem subsequuntur. Praecedunt quidem mortem corporis passiones tam naturales, ut fames, sitis, lassitudo et huiusmodi, quam etiam violentiae, ut vulneratio, flagellatio et similia: quae omnia Christus pati voluit tanquam provenientia ex peccato. Si enim homo non

CHAPTER 231

THE PASSION OF CHRIST AS REGARDS HIS BODY

Christ wished to suffer not only death, but also the other ills that flow from the sin of the first parent to his posterity, so that, bearing in its entirety the penalty of sin, He might perfectly free us from sin by offering satisfaction. Of these ills, some precede death, others follow death. Prior to the death of the body come natural sufferings, such as hunger, thirst, and weariness, and also sufferings inflicted by violence, such as wounding, scourging, and the like. Christ wished to endure all these sufferings, since

peccasset, nec famis aut sitis aut lassitudinis vel frigoris afflictionem sensisset, nec ab exterioribus pertulisset violentam passionem. Has tamen passiones alia ratione Christus pertulit quam alii homines patiantur. In aliis enim hominibus non est aliquid quod iis passionibus repugnare possit. In Christo autem erat unde iis passionibus resisteretur, non solum virtus divina increata, sed etiam animae beatitudo, cuius tanta vis est, ut Augustinus dicit, ut eius beatitudo suo modo redundet in corpus: unde post resurrectionem ex hoc ipso quod anima glorificata erit per visionem Dei, et apertam et plenam fruitionem, corpus gloriosae animae unitum gloriosum reddetur, impassibile et immortale. Cum igitur anima Christi perfecta visione Dei frueretur, quantum est ex virtute huius visionis, consequens erat ut corpus impassibile et immortale redderetur per redundantiam gloriae ab anima in corpus; sed dispensative factum est ut anima Dei visione fruente simul corpus pateretur, nulla redundantia gloriae ab anima in corpus facta. Suberat enim, ut dictum est, quod erat naturale Christo secundum humanam naturam, eius voluntati: unde poterat naturalem redundantiam a superioribus partibus ad inferiores pro suo libito impedire, ut sineret unamquamque partem pati aut agere quod sibi proprium esset absque alterius partis impedimento, quod in aliis hominibus esse non potest.

Inde etiam est quod in passione Christus maximum corporis dolorem sustinuit, quia corporalis dolor in nullo mitigabatur per superius gaudium rationis, sicut nec e converso dolor corporis rationis gaudium impediēbat.

they stem from sin. If man had not sinned, he would not have experienced the affliction of hunger or of thirst or of fatigue or of cold, and he would not have had to undergo the suffering caused by external violence. Christ bore these sufferings for a different reason from that on account of which other men endure them. In other men there is nothing that can resist these sufferings. But Christ had at His disposal means to withstand evils of this sort: not only the uncreated power of His divinity, but also the beatitude of His soul, which is so powerful that, as Augustine says [*Epist. CXVIII, ad Dioscorum, 3*], its happiness in its own way flows over into the body. Thus after the resurrection, by the very fact that the soul will be glorified by the vision of God in unrestricted and full fruition, the body united to the glorified soul will be rendered glorious, impassible, and immortal. Therefore, since the soul of Christ enjoyed the vision of God in the highest degree of perfection, His body should in consequence, so far as the power of this vision is concerned, have been rendered impassible and immortal by an overflowing of glory from the soul to the body. But divine wisdom so disposed matters that Christ's body would suffer at the very time His soul was enjoying the vision of God, with no overflow of glory from the soul to the body. For, as we have said, all that was physical in Christ's human nature was subject to His Will. Hence at His good pleasure He could prevent natural redundance from His higher to His lower parts, and so could allow any part to suffer or do whatever would be proper to it without interference from any other part. This, of course, is impossible in other men.

This also accounts for the fact that during His passion Christ suffered most excruciating pain of body. For His bodily pain was in no way lessened by the higher joy of His rational soul, just as, conversely, pain of body did not obstruct the joy of His rational soul.

Hinc etiam apparet quod solus Christus viator et comprehensor fuit. Sic enim divina visione fruebatur (quod ad comprehensorem pertinet) ut tamen corpus passionibus subiectum remaneret, quod pertinet ad viatorem. Et quia proprium est viatoris ut per bona quae ex caritate agit, mereatur vel sibi vel aliis, inde est quod Christus quamvis comprehensor esset, meruit tamen per ea quae fecit et passus est, et sibi et nobis.

Sibi quidem non gloriam animae, quam a principio suae conceptionis habuerat, sed gloriam corporis, ad quam patiendo pervenit. Nobis etiam suae singulae passiones et operationes fuerunt proficuae ad salutem, non solum per modum exempli, sed etiam per modum meriti, inquantum propter abundantiam caritatis et gratiae nobis potuit gratiam promereri, ut sic de plenitudine capitis membra acciperent.

Erat siquidem quaelibet passio eius, quantumcumque minima, sufficiens ad redimendum humanum genus, si consideretur dignitas patientis. Quanto enim aliqua passio in personam digniorem infertur, tanto videtur maior iniuria: puta si quis percutiat principem quam si percutiat quendam de populo. Cum igitur Christus sit dignitatis infinitae, quaelibet passio eius habet infinitam existimationem, ut sic sufficeret ad infinitorum peccatorum abolitionem. Non tamen fuit per quamlibet consummata humani generis redemptio, sed per mortem, quam propter rationes supra positas ad hoc pati voluit, ut genus humanum redimeret a peccatis. In emptione enim qualibet non solum requiritur quantitas valoris, sed deputatio pretii ad emendum.

This reveals, too, that Christ alone was both a *viator* and a *comprehensor*. He enjoyed the vision of God, which characterizes the *comprehensor*, but in such a way that His body remained subject to sufferings, which characterizes the wayfarer. And since a wayfarer has power to merit, either for himself or for others, by the good works he performs from the motive of charity, Christ too, although He was a *comprehensor*, merited both for Himself and for others by His works and sufferings.

For Himself Christ merited, not indeed glory of soul, which He had from the first instant of His conception, but glory of body, which He won by suffering. For us, too, each of His sufferings and actions was profitable unto salvation, not only by way of example, but also by way of merit; owing to the abundance of His charity and grace, He could merit grace for us, so that thus the members might receive of the fullness of the head.

Any suffering of His, however slight, was enough to redeem the human race, if the dignity of the sufferer is considered. For the more exalted the person on whom suffering is inflicted, the greater is the injury judged to be; for instance, a greater outrage is committed if one strikes a prince than if one strikes a common man of the people. Consequently, since Christ is a person of infinite dignity, any suffering of His has an infinite value, and so suffices for the atonement of infinitely many sins. Yet the redemption of the human race was accomplished, not by this or that slight suffering, but by Christ's death, which, for reasons listed above, He chose to endure to redeem the human race from its sins. For in any purchasing transaction there is required, not only a stipulated amount of appreciable commodity, but also the application of the price to the purchase.

De passibilitate animae Christi

THE PASSIBILITY OF CHRIST'S SOUL

Quia vero anima est forma corporis, consequens est ut patiente corpore, et anima quodammodo patiat: unde pro statu illo quo Christus corpus passibile habuit, etiam anima eius passibilis fuit.

Since the soul is the form of the body, any suffering undergone by the body must in some way affect the soul. Therefore in that state in which the body of Christ was passible, His soul was passible also.

Est autem considerandum, quod duplex est animae passio. Una quidem ex parte corporis, alia vero ex parte obiecti, quod in una aliqua potentiarum considerari potest. Sic enim se habet anima ad corpus sicut pars animae ad partem corporis. Potentia autem visiva patitur quidem ab obiecto, sicut cum ab excellenti fulgido visus obtunditur; ex parte vero organi, sicut cum laesa pupilla hebetatur visus.

We may note that the suffering of the soul is of two kinds. One kind of suffering arises from the body, the other from the object that causes suffering, and this can be observed in any one of the faculties. For the soul is related to the body in the same way that a part of the soul is related to a part of the body. Thus suffering may be caused in the faculty of sight by some object, as when vision is dimmed by an excessively bright light; suffering can also arise from the organ itself, as when vision is dulled because of an injured pupil.

Si igitur consideretur passio animae Christi ex parte corporis, sic tota anima patiebatur corpore patiente. Est enim anima forma corporis secundum suam essentiam, in essentia vero animae omnes potentiae radicanur: unde relinquatur quod corpore patiente quaelibet potentia animae quodammodo pateretur. Si vero consideretur animae passio ex parte obiecti, non omnis potentia animae patiebatur, secundum quod passio proprie sumpta nocumentum importat: non enim ex parte obiecti cuiuslibet potentiae poterat aliquid esse nocivum. Iam enim supra dictum est quod anima Christi perfecta Dei visione fruebatur. Superior igitur ratio animae Christi, quae rebus aeternis contemplandis et consulendis inhaeret, nihil habebat adversum aut repugnans, ex quo aliqua nocumenti passio in ea locum haberet.

Accordingly, if the suffering of Christ's soul is regarded as arising from the body, the whole soul suffered when the body suffered. For the soul in its essence is the form of the body, and the faculties, too, are all rooted in the essence of the soul. Consequently, if the body suffers every power of the soul suffers in some way. But if the suffering of the soul is considered as arising from an object, not every power of Christ's soul suffered, understanding suffering in the proper sense as connoting harm. For nothing that arose from the object of any of these powers could be harmful, since, as we saw above, the soul of Christ enjoyed the perfect vision of God. Thus the higher reason of Christ's soul, which is immersed in the contemplation and meditation of eternal things, embraced nothing adverse or repugnant that could cause it to suffer any harm.

Potentiae vero sensitivae, quarum obiecta sunt

But the sense faculties, whose objects are

res corporeae, habere poterant aliquod nocumentum ex corporis passione: unde sensibilis dolor in Christo fuit corpore patiente. Et quia laesio corporis sicut a sensu sentitur noxia, ita etiam interior imaginatio eam ut nocivam apprehendit, inde sequitur interior tristitia etiam cum dolor in corpore non sentitur: et hanc passionem tristitiae dicimus in anima Christi fuisse. Non solum autem imaginatio, sed etiam ratio inferior nociva corporis apprehendit: et ideo etiam ex apprehensione inferioris rationis, quae circa temporalia versatur, poterat passio tristitiae habere locum in Christo, inquantum scilicet mortem et aliam corporis laesionem inferior ratio apprehendebat ut noxiam, et appetitui naturali contrariam.

Contingit autem ex amore, qui facit duos homines quasi unum, ut aliquis tristitiam patiatur non solum ex iis quae per imaginationem vel per inferiorem rationem apprehendit ut sibi nociva, sed etiam ex iis quae apprehendit ut noxia aliis quos amat: unde ex hoc tristitiam Christus patiebatur, secundum quod aliis, quos ex caritate amabat, periculum imminere cognoscebat culpae vel poenae, unde non solum sibi, sed etiam aliis doluit.

Et quamvis dilectio proximi ad superiorem rationem quodammodo pertineat, inquantum proximus ex caritate diligitur propter Deum, superior tamen ratio in Christo de proximorum defectibus tristitiam habere non potuit, sicut in nobis habere potest. Quia enim ratio superior Christi plena Dei visione fruebatur, hoc modo apprehendebat quidquid ad aliorum defectus pertinet, secundum quod in divina sapientia continetur, secundum quam decenter ordinatum existit et quod aliquis peccare permittatur, et quod pro peccato punietur. Et ideo nec anima Christi, nec aliquis beatus Deum videns, ex defectibus

material things, could receive some injury from the suffering of the body; and so Christ experienced pain of sense when His body suffered. Furthermore, just as laceration of the body is felt by the senses to be injurious, so the inner imagination apprehends it as harmful; hence interior distress follows even when pain is not felt in the body. We assert that suffering of such distress was experienced by the soul of Christ. More than this: not the imagination alone, but also the lower reason apprehends objects harmful to the body; and so, as a result of such apprehension by the lower reason, which is concerned with temporal affairs, the suffering of sorrow could have place in Christ, so far as the lower reason apprehended death and other maltreatment of the body as injurious and as contrary to natural appetite.

Moreover, in consequence of love, which makes two persons, as it were, one, a man may be afflicted with sadness not only on account of objects he apprehends through his imagination or his lower reason as harmful to himself, but also on account of objects he apprehends as harmful to others whom he loves. Thus Christ suffered sadness from His awareness of the perils of sin or of punishment threatening other men whom He loved with the love of charity. And so He grieved for others as well as for Himself.

However, although the love of our fellow men pertains in a certain way to the higher reason, inasmuch as our neighbor is loved out of charity for God's sake, the higher reason in Christ could not experience sorrow on account of the defects of His fellow men, as it can in us. For, since Christ's higher reason enjoyed the full vision of God, it apprehended all that pertains to the defects of others as contained in the divine wisdom, in the light of which the fact that a person is permitted to sin and is punished for his sin, is seen to be in accord with becoming order. And so neither the soul of Christ nor of any of the blessed who behold

proximorum tristitiam pati potest. Secus autem est in viatoribus, qui ad rationem sapientiae videndam non attingunt: hi enim etiam secundum rationem superiorem de defectibus aliorum tristantur, dum ad honorem Dei et exaltationem fidei pertinere existimant quod aliqui salventur, qui tamen damnantur.

Sic igitur de eisdem de quibus dolebat secundum sensum, imaginationem et rationem inferiorem, secundum superiorem gaudebat, inquantum ea ad ordinem divinae sapientiae referebat. Et quia referre aliquid ad alterum est proprium opus rationis, ideo solet dici quod mortem ratio Christi refugiebat quidem si consideretur ut natura, quia scilicet naturaliter est mors odibilis: volebat tamen eam pati, si consideretur ut ratio.

Sicut autem in Christo fuit tristitia, ita etiam et aliae passiones quae ex tristitia oriuntur, ut timor, ira et huiusmodi. Ex iis enim quae tristitiam praesentia ingerunt, timor in nobis causatur, dum futura mala existimantur, et dum aliquo laedente contristati sumus, contra eum irascimur. Hae tamen passiones aliter fuerunt in Christo quam in nobis. In nobis enim plerumque iudicium rationis praeveniunt, interdum modum rationis excedunt. In Christo nunquam praeveniebant iudicium rationis, nec modum a ratione taxatum excedebant, sed tantum movebatur inferior appetitus, qui est subiectus passioni, quantum ratio ordinabat eum debere moveri. Poterat igitur contingere quod secundum inferiorem partem anima Christi refugiebat aliquid, quod secundum superiorem optabat, non tamen erat contrarietas appetituum in ipso, vel rebellio carnis ad spiritum, quae in nobis contingit ex hoc quod appetitus inferior iudicium et modum rationis transcendit. Sed in Christo movebatur secundum iudicium rationis, inquantum permittebat unicuique inferiorum virium moveri proprio motu,

God can be afflicted with sadness by the defects of their neighbors. But the case is otherwise with wayfarers who do not rise high enough to perceive the plan of wisdom. Such persons are saddened by the defects of others even in their higher reason, when they think that it pertains to the honor of God and the exaltation of the faith that some should be saved who nevertheless are damned.

Thus, with regard to the very things for which He was suffering in sense, imagination, and lower reason, Christ was rejoicing in His higher reason, so far as He referred them to the order of divine wisdom. And since the referring of one thing to another is the proper task of reason, we generally say that Christ's reason, if it is considered as nature, shrank from death, meaning that death is naturally abhorrent, but that if it is considered as reason, it was willing to suffer death.

Just as Christ was afflicted with sadness, so He experienced other passions that stem from sadness, such as fear, wrath, and the like. Fear is caused in us by those things whose presence engenders sorrow, when they are thought of as future evils; and when we are grieved by someone who is hurting us, we become angry at him. Such passions existed otherwise in Christ than in us. In us they frequently anticipate the judgment of reason, and sometimes pass the bounds of reason. In Christ they never anticipated the judgment of reason, and never exceeded the moderation imposed by reason; His lower appetite, which was subject to passion, was moved just so far as reason decreed that it should be moved. Therefore Christ's soul could desire something in its higher part that it shrank from in its lower part, and yet there was no conflict of appetites in Him or rebellion of the flesh against the spirit, such as occurs in us owing to the fact that the lower appetite exceeds the judgment and measure of reason. In Christ this appetite was moved in accord with the judgment of reason, to the extent that He

secundum quod ipsum decebat.

Iis igitur consideratis manifestum est quod superior ratio Christi tota quidem fruebatur et gaudebat per comparationem ad suum obiectum (non enim ex hac parte aliquid ei occurrere poterat quod esset tristitiae causa); sed etiam tota patiebatur ex parte subiecti, ut supra dictum est. Nec illa fruitio minuebat passionem, nec passio impediabat fruitionem, cum non fieret redundantia ex una potentia in aliam, sed quaelibet potentiarum permetteretur agere quod sibi proprium erat, sicut iam supra dictum est.

permitted each of His lower powers to be moved by its own impulse, in keeping with propriety.

In the light of all this we see clearly that Christ's higher reason was completely happy and full of joy in respect to its proper object. On the part of this object, nothing that might engender sorrow could arise in Him. But on the part of the subject it was full of suffering, as we indicated in the beginning of this chapter. Yet that enjoyment did not lessen the suffering, nor did the suffering prevent the enjoyment, since no overflowing from one power to another took place; each of the powers was allowed to exercise the function proper to it, as we mentioned above.

Caput 233

De oratione Christi

Quia vero oratio est desiderii expositiva, ex diversitate appetituum ratio sumi potest orationis quam Christus imminente passione proposuit dicens, Matth. XXVI, 39: pater mi, si possibile est, transeat a me calix iste: verumtamen non sicut ego volo, sed sicut tu. In hoc enim quod dixit, transeat a me calix iste, motum inferioris appetitus et naturalis designat, quo naturaliter quilibet mortem refugit, et appetit vitam. In hoc autem quod dicit, verumtamen non sicut ego volo, sed sicut tu vis, exprimit motum superioris rationis omnia considerantis prout sub ordinatione divinae sapientiae continentur. Ad quod etiam pertinet quod dicit, si non potest, hoc solum fieri posse demonstrans quod secundum ordinem divinae voluntatis procedit.

Et quamvis calix passionis non transivit ab eo quin ipsum biberit, non tamen dici debet

CHAPTER 233

THE PRAYER OF CHRIST

Since prayer manifests desire, the nature of the prayer Christ offered when His passion was upon Him may be gathered from the different desires He expressed. In Matthew 26:39 He begs: "My Father, if it be possible, let this chalice pass from Me. Nevertheless, not as I will, but as You wilt." In saying, "Let this chalice pass from Me," He indicates the movement of His lower appetite and natural desire, whereby all naturally shrink from death and desire life. And in saying, "Nevertheless not as I will, but as You wilt," He gives expression to the movement of His higher reason, which looks on all things as comprised under the ordinations of divine wisdom. The same is the bearing of the added words, "If this chalice may not pass away" (Matt. 26:42), whereby He showed that only those events can occur which take place according to the order of the divine will.

Although the chalice of the passion did not pass from Him, but He had to drink it, we may not

quod eius oratio exaudita non fuerit. Nam secundum apostolum ad Hebr. V, 7, in omnibus exauditus est pro sua reverentia. Cum enim oratio, ut dictum est, sit desiderii expositiva, illud simpliciter oramus quod simpliciter volumus: unde et desiderium iustorum, orationis vim obtinet apud Deum, secundum illud Psal. IX, 17: desiderium pauperum exaudivit dominus. Illud autem simpliciter volumus quod secundum rationem superiorem appetimus ad quam solam pertinet consentire in opus. Illud autem simpliciter oravit Christus ut patris voluntas fieret, quia hoc simpliciter voluit, non autem quod calix ab eo transiret, quia nec hoc simpliciter voluit, sed secundum inferiorem rationem, ut dictum est.

say that His prayer went unheard. For, as the Apostle assures us in Hebrews 5:7, in all things Christ “was heard for His reverence.” Since prayer, as we have remarked, is expressive of desire, we pray unconditionally for what we wish unconditionally; and so the very desires of the just have the force of prayer with God, according to Psalm 9:17: “The Lord hath heard the desire of the poor.” But we wish unconditionally only what we desire with our higher reason, which alone has the power of assenting to an undertaking. Christ prayed absolutely that the Father’s will might be done, for this was what He wished absolutely. But He did not thus pray that the chalice might pass from Him, because He wished this, not absolutely, but according to His lower reason, as we have stated.

Caput 234

CHAPTER 234

De sepultura Christi

THE BURIAL OF CHRIST

Consequuntur autem hominem ex peccato post mortem alii defectus et ex parte corporis, et ex parte animae. Ex parte corporis quidem, quod corpus redditur terrae, ex qua sumptum est. Hic autem defectus corporis in nobis quidem secundum duo attenditur, scilicet secundum positionem, et secundum resolutionem. Secundum positionem quidem, in quantum corpus mortuum sub terra ponitur sepultum; secundum resolutionem vero, in quantum corpus in elementa solvitur, ex quibus est compactum.

In consequence of sin, other defects, both on the part of the body and on the part of the soul, overtake man after death. With regard to defects on the part of the body, the body returns to the earth from which it was taken. This defect on the part of the body has two phases in the case of ourselves: it is laid away and it corrupts. It is laid away, inasmuch as the dead body is placed beneath the earth in burial; and it corrupts, inasmuch as the body is resolved into the elements of which it was composed.

Horum autem defectuum primum quidem Christus pati voluit, ut scilicet corpus eius sub terra poneretur. Alium autem defectum passus non fuit, ut scilicet corpus eius in terram resolveretur: unde de ipso Psal. XV, 10, dicit: non dabis sanctum tuum videre corruptionem, idest corporis putrefactionem. Huius autem ratio est, quia corpus Christi materiam sumpsit de natura humana, sed formatio eius non fuit

Christ wished to be subject to the first of these defects, namely, the placing of His body beneath the earth. But He did not submit to the other defect, the dissolving of His body into dust. Thus Psalm 15:10 says of Him: “Nor will you let your holy one to see corruption,” that is, decay of the body. The reason for this is plain: although Christ’s body received matter from human nature, its

virtute humana, sed virtute spiritus sancti. Et ideo propter substantiam materiae subterraneum locum, qui corporibus mortuis deputari consuevit, voluit pati: locus enim corporibus debetur secundum materiam praedominantis elementi. Sed dissolutionem corporis per spiritum sanctum fabricati pati non voluit, quia quantum ad hoc ab aliis hominibus differebat.

formation was accomplished not by any human power but by the power of the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, the substance of His matter being what it was, He wished to be subject to the place beneath the earth usually given over to dead bodies; for that place which is in keeping with the matter of the predominant element in bodies is rightly assigned to them. But He did not wish the body that had been formed by the Holy Spirit to undergo dissolution, since in this respect He was different from other men.

Caput 235

De descensu Christi ad Inferos

Ex parte vero animae sequitur in hominibus ex peccato post mortem, ut ad Infernum descendant non solum quantum ad locum, sed etiam quantum ad poenam. Sicut autem corpus Christi fuit quidem sub terra secundum locum, non autem secundum communem resolutionis defectum, ita et anima Christi descendit quidem ad Inferos secundum locum, non autem ut ibi poenam subiret, sed magis ut alios a poena absolveret, qui propter peccatum primi parentis illic detinebantur, pro quo plene iam satisfecerat mortem patiendo: unde post mortem nihil patiendum restabat, sed absque omni poenae passione localiter ad Infernum descendit, ut se vivorum et mortuorum liberatorem ostenderet. Ex hoc etiam dicitur quod solus inter mortuos fuit liber, quia anima eius in Inferno non subiucuit poenae, nec corpus eius corruptioni in sepulcro.

Quamvis autem Christus descendens ad Inferos, eos liberavit qui pro peccato primi parentis ibi tenebantur, illos tamen reliquit qui pro peccatis propriis ibidem poenis erant addicti: et ideo dicitur momordisse Infernum, non absorbuisset, quia scilicet partem liberavit,

CHAPTER 235

DESCENT OF CHRIST INTO HELL

On the part of the soul, death among men is followed, in consequence of sin, by descent into hell, not only as a place, but as a state of punishment. However, just as Christ's body was buried beneath the earth regarded as a place but not with respect to the common defect of dissolution, so His soul went down to hell as a place, not to undergo punishment there, but rather to release from punishment others who were detained there because of the sin of the first parent for which He had already made full satisfaction by suffering death. Hence nothing remained to be suffered after death, and so without undergoing any punishment He descended locally into hell that He might manifest Himself as the Savior of the living and the dead. For this reason He alone among the dead is said to have been free, since His soul was not subject to punishment in hell and His body was not subject to corruption in the grave.

When Christ descended into hell He freed those who were detained there for the sin of our first parent, but left behind those who were being punished for their own sins. And so He is said to have bitten into hell but not to have swallowed it, for He freed a part and left

et partem dimisit.

Hos igitur Christi defectus symbolum fidei tangit, cum dicit: passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus, descendit ad Inferos.

a part.

The Creed of our faith touches on the various defects of Christ when it states: "He suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died and was buried; He descended into hell."

Caput 236

De resurrectione et tempore resurrectionis Christi

Quia ergo per Christum humanum genus liberatum est a malis quae ex peccato primi parentis derivata erant, oportuit quod sicut ipse mala nostra sustinuit ut ab eis nos liberaret, ita etiam reparationis humanae per ipsum factae in eo primitiae apparerent, ut utroque modo Christus proponeretur nobis in signum salutis, dum ex eius passione consideramus quid pro peccato incurrimus, et quod nobis patiendum est ut a peccato liberemur, et per eius exaltationem consideramus quid nobis per ipsum sperandum proponitur.

Superata igitur morte, quae ex peccato primi parentis provenerat, primus ad immortalem vitam resurrexit: ut sicut Adam peccante primo mortalis vita apparuit, ita Christo pro peccato satisfaciente, primo immortalis vita in Christo appareret. Redierant quidem ad vitam alii ante Christum vel ab eo vel a prophetis suscitati, tamen iterum morituri, sed Christus resurgens ex mortuis, iam non moritur: unde quia primus necessitatem moriendi evasit, dicitur princeps mortuorum et primitiae dormientium, scilicet quia primus a somno mortis surrexit, iugo mortis excusso.

Eius autem resurrectio non tardari debuit,

CHAPTER 236

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST

Since the human race was freed by Christ from the evils flowing from the sin of our first parent, it was fitting that, as He bore our ills to free us from them, the first fruits of man's restoration effected by Him should make their appearance in Him. This was done that Christ might be held up to us as a sign of salvation in two ways. First, we learn from His passion what we brought down on ourselves by sin and what suffering had to be undergone for us to free us from sin. Secondly, we see in His exaltation what is proposed to us to hope for through Him.

In triumph over death, which resulted from our first parent's sin, Christ was the first of all men to rise to immortal life. Thus, as life first became mortal through Adam's sin, immortal life made its first appearance in Christ through the atonement for sin He offered. Others, it is true, raised up either by Christ or by the prophets, had returned to life before Him; yet they had to die a second time. But "Christ rising again from the dead, dies now no more" (Rom. 6:9). As He was the first to escape the necessity of dying, He is called "the first begotten of the dead" (Apoc. 1:5) and "the first fruits of those who sleep" (1 Cor. 15:20). Having thrown off the yoke of death, He was the first to rise from the sleep of death.

Christ's resurrection was not to be long delayed,

nec statim post mortem esse. Si enim statim post mortem rediisset ad vitam, mortis veritas comprobata non fuisset. Si vero diu resurrectio tardaretur, signum superatae mortis in eo non appareret, nec hominibus daretur spes ut per ipsum liberarentur a morte. Unde resurrectionem usque ad tertium diem distulit, quia hoc tempus sufficiens videbatur ad mortis veritatem comprobendam, nec erat nimis prolixum ad spem liberationis tollendam. Nam si amplius dilata fuisset, iam fidelium spes dubitationem pateretur, unde et quasi deficiente iam spe quidam dicebant tertia die, Lucae ult., 21: nos sperabamus quod ipse redempturus esset Israel.

Non tamen per tres integros dies Christus mortuus remansit. Dicitur tamen tribus diebus et tribus noctibus in corde terrae fuisse illo modo locutionis quo pars pro toto poni solet. Cum enim ex die et nocte unus dies naturalis constituatur, quacumque parte diei vel noctis computata Christus fuit in morte, tota illa dicitur in morte fuisse.

Secundum autem Scripturae consuetudinem nox cum sequenti die computatur, eo quod Hebraei tempora secundum cursum lunae observant, quae de sero incipit apparere. Fuit autem Christus in sepulcro ultima parte sextae feriae quae si cum nocte praecedenti computetur, erit quasi dies unus naturalis. Nocte vero sequente sextam feriam cum integra die sabbati fuit in sepulcro, et sic sunt duo dies. Iacuit etiam mortuus in sequenti nocte, quae praecedit diem dominicum, in qua resurrexit, vel media nocte secundum Gregorium, vel diluculo secundum alios: unde si computetur vel tota nox, vel pars eius cum sequenti die dominico, erit tertius dies naturalis.

nor, on the other hand, was it to take place immediately after death. If He had returned to life immediately after death, the fact of His death would not have been well established; and if the resurrection had been long delayed, the sign of vanquished death would not have appeared in Him, and men would not have been given the hope that they would be rescued from death by Him. Therefore He put off the resurrection until the third day, for this interval was judged sufficient to establish the truth of His death, and was not too long to wither away the hope of liberation. If it had been delayed for a longer time, the hope of the faithful might have begun to suffer doubt. Indeed, on the third day, as though hope were already running out, some were saying: "We hoped that it was He that should have redeemed Israel" (Luke 24:21).

However, Christ did not remain dead for three full days. He is said to have been in the heart of the earth for three days and three nights, according to that figure of speech whereby a part is often taken for the whole. For, since one natural day is made up of a day and a night, Christ is said to have been dead during the whole of any part of a day or a night that is counted while He was lying in death.

Moreover, in the usual practice of Scripture, night is figured in with the following day, because the Hebrews reckon time by the course of the moon, which begins to shine in the evening. Christ was in the sepulcher during the latter part of the sixth day, and if this is counted along with the preceding night, it will be more or less one natural day. He reposed in the tomb during the night following the sixth day, together with the whole of the Sabbath day, and so we have two days. He lay dead also during the next night, which preceded the Lord's Day, on which He rose, and this occurred either at midnight, according to Gregory [*In Evangelia*, II, hom. 21], or at dawn, as others think [Augustine, *De Trinitate*, IV, 6]. Therefore, if either the whole night, or a part of it together with the Lord's Day following, is taken into our

calculation, we shall have the third natural day.

Nec vacat a mysterio quod tertia die resurgere voluit, ut per hoc manifestetur quod ex virtute totius Trinitatis resurrexit: unde et quandoque dicitur pater eum resuscitasse, quandoque autem quod ipse propria virtute resurrexit, quod non est contrarium, cum eadem sit divina virtus patris et filii et spiritus sancti; et etiam ut ostenderetur quod reparatio vitae non fuit facta prima die saeculi, idest sub lege naturali, nec secunda die, idest sub lege Mosaica, sed tertia die, idest tempore gratiae.

The fact that Christ wished to rise on the third day is not without mysterious significance; for so He was able to show that He rose by the power of the whole Trinity. Sometimes the Father is said to have raised Him up, and sometimes Christ Himself is said to have risen by His own power. These two statements do not contradict each other, for the divine power of the Father is identical with that of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Another purpose was to show that the restoration of life was accomplished, not on the first day of the world, that is, under the natural law, nor on the second day, that is, under the Mosaic law, but on the third day, that is, in the era of grace.

Habet etiam rationem quod Christus una die integra et duabus noctibus integris iacuit in sepulcro: quia Christus una vetustate quam suscepit, scilicet poenae, duas nostras vetustates consumpsit, scilicet culpae et poenae, quae per duas noctes significantur.

The fact that Christ lay in the sepulcher for one whole day and two whole nights also has its meaning: by the one ancient debt Christ took on Himself, that of punishment, He blotted out our two ancient debts, sin and punishment, which are represented by the two nights.

Caput 237

CHAPTER 237

De qualitate Christi resurgentis

QUALITIES OF THE RISEN CHRIST

Non solum autem Christus recuperavit humano generi quod Adam peccando amiserat, sed etiam hoc ad quod Adam merendo pervenire potuisset. Multo enim maior fuit Christi efficacia ad merendum quam hominis ante peccatum. Incurrit siquidem Adam peccando necessitatem moriendi, amissa facultate qua mori non poterat, si non peccaret. Christus autem non solum necessitatem moriendi exclusit, sed etiam necessitatem non moriendi acquisivit: unde corpus Christi post resurrectionem factum est impassibile et immortale, non quidem sicut primi hominis, potens non mori, sed omnino non potens mori, quod in futurum de nobis ipsi expectamus.

Christ recovered for the human race not merely what Adam had lost through sin, but all that Adam could have attained through merit. For Christ's power to merit was far greater than that of man prior to sin. By sin Adam incurred the necessity of dying, because he lost the power which would have enabled him to avoid death if he had not sinned. Christ not only did away with the necessity of dying, but even gained the power of not being able to die. Therefore His body after the resurrection was rendered impassible and immortal. Thus Christ's body was not like that of the first man, which had the power not to die, but was absolutely unable to die. And this is what we await in the future life for

ourselves.

Et quia anima Christi ante mortem passibilis erat secundum passionem corporis, consequens est ut corpore impassibili facto, etiam anima impassibilis redderetur.

Another consideration: Christ's soul before His death was capable of suffering in company with the suffering of His body. Consequently, when His body became incapable of suffering, His soul also became incapable of suffering.

Et quia iam impletum erat humanae redemptionis mysterium, propter quod dispensative continebatur fruitionis gloria in superiori animae parte, ne fieret redundantia ad inferiores partes et ad ipsum corpus, sed permetteretur unumquodque aut agere aut pati quod sibi proprium erat, consequens fuit ut iam per redundantiam gloriae a superiori animae parte totaliter corpus glorificaretur, et inferiores vires: et inde est quod cum ante passionem Christus esset comprehensor propter fruitionem animae, et viator propter corporis passibilitatem, iam post resurrectionem, viator ultra non fuit, sed solum comprehensor.

Furthermore, the mystery of man's redemption was now accomplished. To enable Christ to achieve that end, the glory of fruition had, in God's dispensation, been restricted to the higher regions of His soul, so that no overflowing to the lower parts and to the body itself would occur, but each faculty would be allowed to do or suffer what was proper to it. But now the body and the lower powers were wholly glorified by an overflow of glory from the higher regions of the soul. Accordingly Christ, who before the passion had been a *comprehensor* because of the fruition enjoyed by His soul and a wayfarer because of the passibility of His body, was now, after the resurrection, no longer a wayfarer, but exclusively a *comprehensor*.

Caput 238

CHAPTER 238

Quomodo convenientibus argumentis Christi resurrectio demonstratur

ARGUMENTS DEMONSTRATING CHRIST'S RESURRECTION

Et quia, ut dictum est, Christus resurrectionem anticipavit, ut eius resurrectio argumentum nobis spei existeret, ut nos etiam resurgere speraremus, oportuit ad spem resurrectionis suadendam, ut eius resurrectio, nec non et resurgens qualitas, congruentibus indiciis manifestaretur. Non autem omnibus indifferenter suam resurrectionem manifestavit, sicut humanitatem et passionem, sed solum testibus praeordinatis a Deo, scilicet discipulis, quos elegerat ad procurandum humanam salutem. Nam

As we stated above, Christ anticipated the general resurrection in order that His resurrection might bolster up our hope of our own resurrection. To foster our hope of resurrection, Christ's resurrection and the qualities of His risen nature had to be made known by suitable proofs. He manifested His resurrection, not to all alike, in the way that He manifested His human nature and His passion, but only "to witnesses preordained by God" (Acts 10:41), namely, the disciples whom He had selected to bring about man's salvation. For the state of resurrection, as was mentioned above, belongs to the glory of the

status resurrectionis, ut dictum est, pertinet ad gloriam comprehensoris, cuius cognitio non debetur omnibus, sed iis tantum qui se dignos efficiunt. Manifestavit autem eis Christus et veritatem resurrectionis, et gloriam resurgentis.

Veritatem quidem resurrectionis, ostendendo quod idem ipse qui mortuus fuerat, resurrexit et quantum ad naturam, et quantum ad suppositum. Quantum ad naturam quidem, quia se verum corpus humanum habere demonstravit, dum ipsum palpandum et videndum discipulis praebuit, quibus dixit Luc. ult., 39: *palpate et videte, quia spiritus carnem et ossa non habet, sicut me videtis habere. Manifestavit etiam exercendo actus qui naturae humanae conveniunt, cum discipulis suis manducans et bibens, et cum eis multoties loquens et ambulans, qui sunt actus hominis viventis, quamvis illa comestio necessitatis non fuerit: non enim incorruptibilia resurgentium corpora ulterius cibo indigebunt, cum in eis nulla fiat deperditio, quam oportet per cibum restaurari. Unde et cibus a Christo assumptus non cessit in corporis eius nutrimentum, sed fuit resolutum in praeiacentem materiam. Verumtamen ex hoc ipso quod comedit et bibit, se verum hominem demonstravit.*

Quantum vero ad suppositum, ostendit se esse eundem qui mortuus fuerat, per hoc quod indicia suae mortis eis in suo corpore demonstravit, scilicet vulnerum cicatrices; unde dicit Thomae, Ioan. XX, 27: *infer digitum tuum huc et vide manus meas, et affer manum tuam, et mitte in latus meum, et Luc. ult., 39, dixit: videte manus meas et pedes meos, quia ego ipse sum. Quamvis hoc etiam dispensationis fuerit quod cicatrices vulnerum in suo corpore reservavit, ut per eas resurrectionis veritas probaretur: corpori enim incorruptibili resurgenti debetur omnis integritas. Licet etiam dici possit, quod in martyribus*

comprehensor, and knowledge of this is not due to all, but only to such as make themselves worthy. To the witnesses He had chosen Christ revealed both the fact of His resurrection and the glory of His risen nature.

He made known the fact of His resurrection by showing that He, the very one who had died, rose again both in His nature and in His suppositum. As regards nature, He showed that He had a true human body when He offered Himself to be touched and seen by the disciples, to whom He said: “Handle and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see Me to have” (Luke 24:39). He gave further evidence of the same by performing actions that belong to human nature, eating and drinking with His disciples, and often conversing with them and walking about. These are the actions of a living man. Of course such eating was not dictated by necessity. The incorruptible bodies of the risen will have no further need of food, for there occurs in them no deterioration that has to be repaired by nourishment. Hence the food consumed by Christ did not become nourishment for His body but was dissolved into pre-existing matter. Yet He proved that He was a true man by the very fact that He ate and drank.

As regards His suppositum, Christ showed that He was the same person who had died, by displaying to His disciples the marks of His death on His body, namely, the scars of His wounds. In John 20:27 He says to Thomas: “Put your finger here and see My hands; and bring your hand here and put it into My side.” And in Luke 24:39 He says: “See My hands and feet, that it is I Myself.” It was by divine dispensation that He kept the scars of His wounds in His body, so that the truth of the resurrection might be demonstrated by them; for complete integrity is the proper condition of the incorruptible risen body, although we may say that in the case of the martyrs some indications of the wounds they

quaedam indicia praecedentium vulnerum apparebunt cum quodam decore in testimonium virtutis. Ostendit etiam se esse idem suppositum, et ex modo loquendi, et ex aliis consuetis operibus, ex quibus homines recognoscuntur: unde et discipuli recognoverunt eum in fractione panis, Luc. ult., et ipse in Galilaea aperte se eis demonstravit ubi cum eis erat solitus conversari.

Gloriam vero resurgentis manifestavit dum ianuis clausis ad eos intravit, Ioan. XX, et dum ab oculis eorum evanuit, Luc. ult. Hoc enim pertinet ad gloriam resurgentis, ut in potestate habeat apparere oculo glorioso quando vult, vel non apparere quando voluerit. Quia tamen resurrectionis fides difficultatem habebat, propterea per plura indicia tam veritatem resurrectionis quam gloriam resurgentis corporis demonstravit. Nam si inusitatam conditionem glorificati corporis totaliter demonstrasset, fidei resurrectionis praeiudicium attulisset, quia immensitas gloriae opinionem excussisset eiusdem naturae. Hoc etiam non solum visibilibus signis, sed etiam intelligibilibus documentis manifestavit, dum aperuit eorum sensum, ut Scripturas intelligerent, et per Scripturas prophetarum se resurrecturum ostendit.

bore will appear with a certain splendor, in testimony of their virtue. Christ further showed that He was the same suppositum by His manner of speech and by other familiar actions whereby men are recognized. Thus the disciples knew Him “in the breaking of bread” (Luke 24:35). Also, He openly showed Himself to them in Galilee, where He was accustomed to converse with them.

Christ manifested the glory of His risen nature when He came among them, “the doors being shut” (John 20:26), and when “He vanished out of their sight” (Luke 24:31). For the glory of risen man gives him the power to be seen in glorious vision when he wishes, or not to be seen when he so wishes. The reason why Christ demonstrated the truth of His resurrection and the glory of His risen body by so many proofs, was the difficulty that faith in the resurrection presents. If He had displayed the extraordinary condition of His glorified body in its full splendor, He would have engendered prejudice against faith in the resurrection: the very immensity of its glory would have excluded belief that it was the same nature. Further, He manifested the truth not only by visible signs, but also by proofs appealing to the intellect, as when “He opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures” (Luke 24:45), and showed that according to the writings of the prophets He was to rise again.

Caput 239

De duplici vita reparata in homine per Christum

Sicut autem Christus sua morte mortem nostram destruxit, ita sua resurrectione vitam nostram reparavit. Est autem hominis duplex mors et duplex vita. Una quidem mors est corporis per separationem ab anima; alia per separationem a Deo. Christus autem, in quo

CHAPTER 239

THE TWOFOLD LIFE RESTORED IN MAN BY CHRIST

As Christ destroyed our death by His death, so He restored our life by His resurrection. Man has a twofold death and a twofold life. The first death is the death of the body, brought about by separation from the soul; the second death is brought about by

secunda mors locum non habuit, per primam mortem quam subiit, scilicet corporalem, utramque in nobis mortem destruxit, scilicet corporalem et spiritualem.

Similiter etiam per oppositum intelligitur duplex vita: una quidem corporis ab anima, quae dicitur vita naturae; alia a Deo, quae dicitur vita iustitiae, vel vita gratiae: et haec est per fidem, per quam Deus inhabitat in nobis, secundum illud Habacuc II, 4: iustus autem meus in fide sua vivet,

et secundum hoc duplex est resurrectio: una corporalis, qua anima iterato coniungitur corpori; alia spiritualis, qua iterum coniungitur Deo. Et haec quidem secunda resurrectio locum in Christo non habuit, quia nunquam eius anima fuit per peccatum separata a Deo. Per resurrectionem igitur suam corporalem utriusque resurrectionis, scilicet corporalis et spiritualis, nobis est causa.

Considerandum tamen est, quod, ut dicit Augustinus super Ioannem, verbum Dei resuscitat animas, sed verbum caro factum resuscitat corpora. Animam enim vivificare solius Dei est. Quia tamen caro est divinitatis eius instrumentum, instrumentum autem agit in virtute causae principalis, utraque resurrectio nostra, et corporalis et spiritualis, in corporalem Christi resurrectionem refertur ut in causam. Omnia enim quae in Christi carne facta sunt, nobis salutaria fuerunt virtute divinitatis unitae, unde et apostolus resurrectionem Christi causam nostrae spiritualis resurrectionis ostendens, dicit ad Rom. IV, 25, quod traditus est propter delicta nostra, et resurrexit propter iustificationem nostram. Quod autem Christi resurrectio nostrae corporalis resurrectionis sit causa, ostendit I ad Cor. XV, 12: si autem Christus

separationem a Deo. Christus, in whom the second death had no place, destroyed both of these deaths in us, that is, the bodily and the spiritual, by the first death He underwent, namely, that of the body.

Similarly, opposed to this twofold death, we are to understand that there is a twofold life. One is a life of the body, imparted by the soul, and this is called the life of nature. The other comes from God, and is called the life of justice or the life of grace. This life is given to us through faith, by which God dwells in us, according to Habakkuk 2:4: "The just shall live in his faith."

Accordingly, resurrection is also twofold: one is a bodily resurrection, in which the soul is united to the body for the second time; the other is a spiritual resurrection, in which the soul is again united to God. This second resurrection had no place in Christ, because His soul was never separated from God by sin. By His bodily resurrection, therefore, Christ is the cause of both the bodily and the spiritual resurrection in us.

However, as Augustine says in his commentary on St. John [*In Joannis Evangelium*, XIX, 15], we are to understand that the Word of God raises up souls, but that the Word as incarnate raises up bodies. To give life to the soul belongs to God alone. Yet, since the flesh is the instrument of His divinity, and since an instrument operates in virtue of the principal cause, our double resurrection, bodily and spiritual, is referred to Christ's bodily resurrection as cause. For everything done in Christ's flesh was salutary for us by reason of the divinity united to that flesh. Hence the Apostle, indicating the resurrection of Christ as the cause of our spiritual resurrection, says, in Romans 4:25, that Christ "was delivered up for our sins and rose again for our justification." And in 1 Corinthians 15:12 he shows that Christ's

praedicatur quod resurrexit, quomodo quidam dicunt in vobis quoniam resurrectio mortuorum non est?

Pulchre autem apostolus peccatorum remissionem Christi attribuit morti, iustificationem vero nostram resurrectioni, ut designetur conformitas et similitudo effectus ad causam. Nam sicut peccatum deponitur cum remittitur, ita Christus moriendo deposuit passibilem vitam, in qua erat similitudo peccati. Cum autem aliquis iustificatur, novam vitam adipiscitur: ita Christus resurgendo novitatem gloriae consecutus est. Sic igitur mors Christi est causa remissionis peccati nostri et effectiva instrumentaliter, et exemplaris sacramentaliter et meritoria. Resurrectio autem Christi fuit causa resurrectionis nostrae effectiva quidem instrumentaliter et exemplaris sacramentaliter, non autem meritoria: tum quia Christus iam non erat viator, ut sibi mereri competeret, tum quia claritas resurrectionis fuit praemium passionis, ut per apostolum patet Philipp. II.

Sic igitur manifestum est quod Christus potest dici primogenitus resurgentium ex mortuis, non solum ordine temporis, quia primus resurrexit secundum praedicta, sed etiam ordine causae, quia resurrectio eius est causa resurrectionis aliorum, et in ordine dignitatis, quia prae cunctis gloriosior resurrexit.

Hanc igitur fidem resurrectionis Christi symbolum fidei continet dicens: tertia die resurrexit a mortuis.

resurrection is the cause of our bodily resurrection: “Now 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?”

Most aptly does the Apostle attribute remission of sins to Christ’s death and our justification to His resurrection, thus tracing out conformity and likeness of effect to cause. As sin is discarded when it is remitted, so Christ by dying laid aside His passible life, in which the likeness of sin was discernible. But when a person is justified, he receives new life; in like manner Christ, by rising, obtained newness of glory. Therefore Christ’s death is the cause of the remission of our sin: the efficient cause instrumentally, the exemplary cause sacramentally, and the meritorious cause. In like manner Christ’s resurrection was the cause of our resurrection: the efficient cause instrumentally and the exemplary cause sacramentally. But it was not a meritorious cause, for Christ was no longer a wayfarer, and so was not in a position to merit; and also because the glory of the resurrection was the reward of His passion, as the Apostle declares in Philippians 2:9 ff.

Thus we see clearly that Christ can be called the first-born of those who rise from the dead. This is true not only in the order of time, inasmuch as Christ was the first to rise, as was said above, 85 but also in the order of causality, because His resurrection is the cause of the resurrection of other men, and in the order of dignity, because He rose more gloriously than all others.

This belief in Christ’s resurrection is expressed in the words of the Creed: “The third day He arose again from the dead.”

De duplici praemio humiliationis, scilicet
resurrectione et ascensione

**THE TWOFOLD REWARD OF CHRIST'S
HUMILIATION: RESURRECTION AND
ASCENSION**

Quia vero secundum apostolum exaltatio Christi praemium fuit humiliationis ipsius, consequens fuit ut duplici eius humiliationi duplex exaltatio responderet.

According to the Apostle, the exaltation of Christ was the reward of His humiliation. Therefore a twofold exaltation had to correspond to His twofold humiliation.

Humiliaverat namque se primo secundum mortis passionem in carne passibili quam assumpserat; secundo quantum ad locum, corpore posito in sepulcro, et anima ad Inferos descendente. Primae igitur humiliationi respondet exaltatio resurrectionis, in qua a morte ad vitam rediit immortalem; secundae humiliationi respondet exaltatio ascensionis: unde apostolus dicit Ephes. IV, 10: qui descendit, ipse est et qui ascendit super omnes caelos.

Christ had humbled Himself, first, by suffering death in the passible flesh He had assumed; secondly, He had undergone humiliation with reference to place, when His body was laid in the sepulcher and His soul descended into hell. The exaltation of the resurrection, in which He returned from death to immortal life, corresponds to the first humiliation. And the exaltation of the ascension corresponds to the second humiliation. Hence the Apostle says, in Ephesians 4:10: "He who descended is the same also that ascended above all the heavens."

Sicut autem de filio Dei dicitur quod est natus, passus et sepultus, et quia resurrexit, non tamen secundum naturam divinam, sed secundum humanam: ita et de Dei filio dicitur quod ascendit in caelum, non quidem secundum divinam naturam, sed secundum humanam. Nam secundum divinam naturam nunquam a caelo discessit, semper ubique existens. Unde ipse dicit, Ioan. III, 13: nemo ascendit in caelum, nisi qui descendit de caelo, filius hominis qui est in caelo. Per quod datur intelligi, quod sic de caelo descendisse dicitur naturam assumendo terrenam, quod tamen in caelo semper permansit. Ex quo etiam considerandum est, quod solus Christus propria virtute caelos ascendit. Locus enim ille debebatur ei qui de caelo descenderat ratione suae originis. Alii vero per se ipsos ascendere non possunt, sed per Christi virtutem, eius membra effecti.

However, as it is narrated of the Son of God that He was born, suffered and was buried, and rose again, not in His divine nature but in His human nature, so also, we are told, He ascended into heaven, not in His divine nature but in His human nature. In His divine nature He had never left heaven, as He is always present everywhere. He indicates this Himself when He says: "No man has ascended into heaven but He who descended from heaven, the Son of man who is in heaven" (John 3:13). By this we are given to understand that He came down from heaven by assuming an earthly nature, yet in such a way that He continued to remain in heaven. The same consideration leads us to conclude that Christ alone has gone up to heaven by His own power. By reason of His origin, that abode belonged by right to Him who had come down from heaven. Other men cannot ascend of themselves, but are taken up by the power of Christ, whose members they have been made.

Et sicut ascendere in caelum convenit filio Dei secundum humanam naturam, ita additur alterum quod convenit ei secundum naturam divinam, scilicet quod sedeat ad dexteram patris. Non enim ibi cogitanda est dextera, vel sessio corporalis, sed quia dextera est potior pars animalis, datur per hoc intelligi quod filius considet patri non in aliquo minoratus ab ipso secundum divinam naturam, sed omnino in eius aequalitate existens. Potest tamen et hoc ipsum attribui filio Dei secundum humanam naturam, ut secundum divinam naturam intelligamus filium in ipso patre esse secundum essentiae unitatem, cum quo habet unam sedem regni, idest potestatem eandem. Sed quia solent regibus aliqui assidere, quibus scilicet aliquid de regia potestate communicant, ille autem potissimus in regno esse videtur quem rex ad dexteram suam ponit, merito filius Dei etiam secundum humanam naturam dicitur ad dexteram patris sedere, quasi super omnem creaturam in dignitate caelestis regni exaltatus.

Utroque igitur modo sedere ad dexteram est proprium Christi: unde apostolus ad Heb. I, 13, dicit: ad quem autem Angelorum dixit aliquando: sede a dextris meis?

Hanc igitur Christi ascensionem confitemur in symbolo, dicentes ascendit in caelum, sedet ad dexteram Dei patris.

As ascent into heaven befits the Son of God according to His human nature, so something else is added that becomes Him according to His divine nature, namely, that He should sit at the right hand of His Father. In this connection we are not to think of a literal right hand or a bodily sitting. Since the right side of an animal is the stronger, this expression gives us to understand that the Son is seated with the Father as being in no way inferior to Him according to the divine nature, but on a par with Him in all things. Yet this same prerogative may be ascribed to the Son of God in His human nature, thus enabling us to perceive that in His divine nature the Son is in the Father Himself according to unity of essence, and that together with the Father He possesses a single kingly throne, that is, an identical power. Since other persons ordinarily sit near kings, namely, ministers to whom kings assign a share in governing power, and since the one whom the king places at his right hand is judged to be the most powerful man in the kingdom, the Son of God is rightly said to sit at the Father's right hand even according to His human nature, as being exalted in rank above every creature of the heavenly kingdom.

In both senses, therefore, Christ properly sits at the right hand of God. And so the Apostle asks, in Hebrew 1: 13: "To which of the angels said He at any time: Sit on My right hand?"

We profess our faith in this ascension of Christ when we say in the Creed: "He ascended into heaven and sits at the right hand of God the Father."