

## THE THEOLOGY OF THE RESURRECTION

Current spiritual thought, as in all ages of great crises, is strongly eschatological. Today, as in the first age of Christianity, we stand in the shadow of the Victor over sin and death who shall come again to judge the living and the dead. This turning point in the world's history with its startling advances in science, nuclear fission, mastery of space, and its automatization of life is profoundly apocalyptic: the social and moral upheavals are at once splendid and terrifying. The consciousness of the forces at work in history and the powers propelling the race on to its appointed destiny are overwhelming.

In this period of challenge to man and religion there is a special challenge to Catholic theology. And I think the response has been magnificent: enrichment in all fields, in the study of the Mystical Body and a social order with a higher unity, in the loving and tender study of the Immaculate Mother of God assumed into heaven, in an ecclesial-minded liturgy, in a renewed study of the deep sources of revelation. And above all in a deeper and richer insight into the place of Christ as the center and Lord of history the basis of which is a fuller realization of Christ the mediator between God and man. And this implies new insights into the theology of the resurrection and the ultimate end of all things. We may well claim that the abuse of power and nature through the achievements of science and the dread of what is to come, has again turned men's minds and hearts to the divine Omnipotence. Through the Word was the world created. Through the Incarnate Word redeemed! Through Him, the Wisdom of God and the Power of God, will come the final consummation.

The vast assignment for the present paper dictates a procedure of abbreviation and rapid summation. We must assume the fact of Christ's resurrection knowable as historic reality and as part of the preamble of faith, the supernatural acceptance of the mystery of the resurrection as article of divine and Catholic faith, the inerrancy of the inspired accounts. We can do little more than restate in general terms the basic truths of the Incarnation and Redemption.

THE RESURRECTION: A NEW APPROACH

It is becoming increasingly evident that the merely apologetic approach to the resurrection must yield to a far more profound understanding of the truth both as historic reality and as mystery of faith with its true place in the structure of the body of revelation. In fact by the very nature of apologetic and fundamental theology, the apology for the mystery is always profoundly affected by any deeper penetration into the mystery itself and its relation to the body of revealed truth. The order of mystery dictates the order of apologetic, a point particularly true of the reality of the resurrection. Since Christ Himself is the manifestation of the divine revelation and the instrument of the divine salvific action, the apologetic regarding Christ risen from the dead must reflect the profound insights into the mystery of the Victor over sin and death, the Giver of life and glory. It must reflect something of Him who is the resurrection and the life. And the theology of the mystery must shed new light on the whole revealed truth.

"Two world wars have utterly transformed man's appreciation of the dogma of Christ's resurrection," says J. McHugh writing in the *Clergy Review*. "Before 1914 the resurrection was seen mainly, if not wholly, as a weapon in the apologist's arsenal; since 1945 it has been seen rather as an essential and integral part in the work of salvation. Unfortunately this shift of emphasis has not yet found its way into the manuals of theology." (March 1959, p. 186 ff.) The reviewer cites a noted manual: twenty-two pages are devoted to the resurrection as motive of credibility, and but a scant three fourths of a page to resurrection in relation to redemption. And this in a scholion! It must be conceded, however, that since the institution of the Feast of Christ the King the doctrine of Christ in glory has been developed extensively. (Cf. also Durrwell, F.X., *La Résurrection de Jésus Mystère de Salut*, p. 9 ff.)

The apologetic importance, however, will not be diminished by the more fruitful discussion of the mystery. It should rather be heightened. We can never approve of the attitude of those non-Catholic writers who reject the apologetic value of the truth altogether. Such an attitude would mean shipwreck to the faith itself. It is in direct contradiction to the NT and the apostolic preaching

which presents the resurrection as the decisive sign of the mission of Christ.

Our apologetic for the resurrection—and the same is true for other areas which involve controversy—has lost its acerbity. In accordance with what might be called the ecumenical attitude, it is *irenica* in spirit and tone, positive and constructive. Such an approach is fully justified by the venerable tradition in the Church which dates from the days of Clement of Alexandria. This noted writer found the seeds of the truth scattered by the Logos even to the pagan sages. Better acquaintance with historical realities and a more dispassionate agreement on the demands of scientific research, and in the present instance a return to the apostolic kerygma, contribute to the avoidance of harshness and bitterness of debate.

Of a recent work exemplifying such a spirit, "*Jésus ressuscité dans la prédication apostolique*" by Joseph Schmitt, a critical reviewer says, "The Gospel accounts of Easter Day, fragmentary as they are and showing little concordance, do not suffice to give an exact and complete idea of the Resurrection of Christ. In fact, they have too often served as target for rationalistic critics when they attacked this central fact of the Christian faith. To answer the objections effectively, and above all to understand thoroughly the true nature and immense import of the resurrection in the order of salvation, we have to go beyond the Gospels to the most primitive testimonies of the apostolic preaching as they are found in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles" (P. Benoit, O.P., in the *Revue Biblique*, vol. 57, 1950, p. 266).

Father Schmitt himself writing in the *Lexicon fuer Theologie und Kirche* speaks in a similar vein: "The tendency in exegesis today is away from the past rationalistic or exclusively apologetically pointed exegesis and its decadent literature. It is rather toward the study of the bible in the light of historic forms (*formgeschichte*). It attempts to explain and clarify the literary characteristics of the various testimonies of the resurrection, their common origin in the primitive Christian kerygma, and going beyond this, the apostolic interest in the resurrection fact itself" (vol. 1, col. 1028).

From the historico-critical standpoint the oldest and surest

resurrection texts are 1 Cor. 15 and the discourses of the Acts, which bear the clear impress of the primitive preaching in basic features. This is not at all to disregard the Gospel apparition texts, but rather to recognize their fragmentary nature. They are not a simple "Bericht" of the resurrection. We must not simply attempt to "harmonize" them in order to fit them into a consistent context of factual events as they actually occurred. Rather they are historical materials "used" and adapted by the sacred writer for kerygmatic purposes. The basic difference between the Christian who accepts the resurrection and the naturalistic critic is that the latter, no matter how many facts he may accept, seeks only to explain the "belief" of the apostles or the primitive Church. Such is the end and aim of all his historic and psychological effort. Contrariwise the Christian accepts the apparitions themselves with the complex of facts essential to their evaluation. And these are understandable historically only if Jesus actually arose from the dead. The mystery for the rationalist is how the apostles and early Christians arrive at their belief in the resurrection which he rejects altogether. For the Christian the facts show that Christ actually arose from the dead: the apostles were moved by the facts. Realities proved the Reality of the resurrection.

From all this it is evident that if we disregard the exploded hypothesis of apparent death and fraudulent disciples, we must center attention on three points: the situation and attitude of the apostles, the burial and the empty grave, and the apparitions.

Of all the apostles only John possessed the loving courage to stand at the foot of the cross. Peter was nursing the sad remorse of his insistent denial, an act which seems to have placed its stamp on the rest of the disciples. How forlorn the hope of the disciples is evident from the two who met the Master on the way to Emmaus: "we were hoping that it was he who should redeem Israel" (Lk. 24, 21). We cannot fail to note the total change of attitude after the appearance of the Master.

Particularly significant is the burial mentioned already in the ancient formulas (cf. Cor. 15, 3 ff). The constant stress of the "burial" in the formulas from the very beginning must be associated with the "empty grave." There is no trace of "legend" in the

tone and circumstance dealing with the grave. Peter implies burial and grave (Acts 2, 27-32). Paul assumes the empty grave when he speaks of bodily resurrection, even though the point was not calculated to find a favorable reception for his doctrine among the Athenians (1 Cor. 15 and Act 17, 31-32). We must assume that the grave was an object of common knowledge, since the apostles openly preached the resurrection and were accused of stealing the body. All this could scarcely have been possible unless the grave were pointed out, and actually bereft of the body. The empty grave, independent of the apparitions, testifies to them. All hypotheses about it, such as that of a stolen body, a bribing of guards, etc. are utterly pointless. The body was taken from the cross and buried with the full consent of suspicious authorities by men of the greatest probity. Noted men arrange for the burial. The apostles were frightened and did not dare show themselves. Ordinary Jews could not have gotten an audience with Pontius Pilate or have faced the guards (cf. Jo. 19, 38 ff).

It is also a significant fact that Christ did not arise from the dead in a corruptible body and move about through a constant exercise of miraculous powers suspending forces of nature. Far more was involved than a death, separation of soul and body, and reunion of soul and body. This fact must be borne in mind when we speak of the forty days between resurrection and ascension. It seems far more reasonable to hold that resurrection and interior ascension were immediately connected and that the ascension after forty days was the external manifestation of His taking possession of His heavenly throne. With it ended the apparitions, though occasional visions of the Lord did occur. Seen in this light the apparitions were marvelous manifestations of the divine mission. (Cf. Russell, Dom Ralph: "Modern Exegesis and the Fact of the Resurrection, *Downside Review*, Autumn, 1958, p. 341 ff.)

In this light we can understand that only those who were called could see Him. To Paul He appears in light from heaven and those in his company do not see Him (Acts 9, 3 ff.). And it is Paul who uses the term *óphthe* four times (in 1 Cor. 15, 3-8), a form which seems to imply that He was made visible to men through God. Above all we must shun the notion that the resurrection is an iso-

lated miracle, something supererogatory, accidental, added to. "It is the meaningful conclusion of His whole life in which the divine in the uniqueness of His person and the obvious might of His action is manifest. It is the seal placed on His incomparable claim to mission and the divine repudiation of the human verdict of condemnation rendered against Him." (W. Bulst in *Lexicon fuer Theologie und Kirche*, art. Auferstehung Christi, vol. 1, col. 1038.)

#### RESURRECTION: MYSTERY OF FAITH

Practically all the professions of faith from the beginning teach the resurrection of Christ as a basic mystery to be believed by all Christians. It is presented as a fundamental and essential part of the divine plan of salvation (Cf. D. 2 ff, 13, 16, etc., etc.). In the trenchant terms of Karl Rahner, God irrevocably communicates Himself to the world in and through His Son. The triumph of the resurrection is the divine acceptance of the world redeemed and turned toward its eschatological fulfillment at the end of time. All that remains is the unveiling and execution of that which has already been begun and set in motion by the resurrection. Here we have the historic mission of Christ regarding each individual man and all mankind. Since the resurrection in its complete and entire essence is the true fulfillment of the Incarnate Son of God in this mission, it is truly a mystery of faith. Again we say it is not one resurrection among many of the same kind, but the absolutely unique event flowing from the very nature of the Incarnate Logos and His death for our sins. And in turn it is the source and pattern of the resurrection and final glory of the redeemed (*o. c.*, col. 1038 f).

Resurrection is mystery of Christ, the God-man, mediator between God and man. It is the mystery of the Logos made man, our sole bond with God in the entire order of grace. God gives Himself to us through Him, and we turn to God through Christ our Lord. He alone is the perfect manifestation and revelation of the Father and the Holy Spirit, the way of God to man, and man's way to God. All this rests on the simple revealed truth: the Word was made man and lived among us. "And we saw his glory—glory as of the only-begotten of the Father—full of grace and of truth"

(Jo. 1, 14). Grace in Him is the supreme grace of union, the unique foundation of all the graces of Christ and hence of all grace bestowed upon us. A word about this grace of union, which is called the hypostatic union!

#### THE HYPOSTATIC UNION

In the words of the Council of Chalcedon we acknowledge and confess the one Christ, the only-begotten Son and Lord in two natures without any commingling or change or division or separation (D 148 TCT 414). This means that Jesus is not a human but a divine person. The humanity does not subsist in a human personality but in the second person of the Trinity. It is the human nature of the second person of the Trinity. "The hypostatic union is not to be explained without accepting a created reality which interiorly affects the humanity of Christ. It is a determination which is internal, absolutely supernatural, constituting the humanity of Christ substantially as *actu assumpta* by the person of the Word. . . . There can be no doubt that this is the highest conceivable supernatural perfection: created intellectual nature cannot be elevated to a supernaturally loftier height than to be assumed hypostatically by a divine person. The hypostatic order stands at the very summit of the order of grace and the vision of God. Nothing can be more exalted." (Alfaro, J., S.J., Cristo Glorioso, Revelador del Padre, *Gregorianum*, vol. 39, #2, p. 243.)

We must conclude from this truth that there is a real relation in the human nature of the Word, a relation both unique and intimate, no less intimate than the relation between our own human person and our human nature. But we may not overlook the fact that the relation cannot be real in the person assuming, the Logos, for God is utterly unchangeable. Because of this bond of person between Logos and the human nature of Christ, all the human actions of Christ are divine-human and of infinite personal moral worth. Moreover, through this bond of union there exists also a singular relation of the humanity of Christ to the Father and the Holy Spirit.

As to the human nature itself, since it is true, perfect, integral, it must possess rational soul, true body, intellect, will, emotions,

senses. The documents of faith stress equally the true humanity and the true divinity. In a perfect human nature there is a kind of recapitulation of all mankind, for human nature and all men are truly redeemed. Just as man must have the power of conscious realization of self, of his nature and person, so Jesus Christ must possess a truly human consciousness of His own "I," which does not refer to a human subsistence since the human nature subsists in the person of the Logos. There must be a true human consciousness of the divine person to which the human nature belongs.

Clearly this human consciousness must include the most absolute certainty of its own subsistent "I," which is the Eternal Word. This is possible only through intuitive vision of the Word. "Human consciousness of Christ must include a psychological exigence for the vision of the Logos. The vision of God is connaturally due to Christ, the Incarnate Word, and only to Him. Christ is the only man (only created intellectual being) who cannot have a created self-consciousness without seeing the Word and in it the person of the Father. The Incarnation of the Word placed in the world a created mind for which the vision of God is connatural and due" (*ibid.*, p. 247).

What we have said thus far is little more than a scholastic exposition of the clear teaching of the *Mystici Corporis* (TCT 495, D 2289, Cf. also D 2184) and the common doctrine of theologians that Christ as man possessed the vision of God from the first moment of the existence of His created intellect. Actuated by the light of glory the human mind of Christ sees the "Divine Word as subsistent in the very same humanity which intuites it." It "experiences itself as non-subsistent in itself; and as hypostatically assumed by the Word, it perceives the Word as subsistent in it. It experiences the presence of pure being as personally subsistent in it" (*ibid.*, p. 248). There must be in Christ one psychological unity, an ineffable unity which "constitutes the authentically proper experience of Christ-the-man, an experience no other created intellect can possess." Here in human consciousness is direct experience of the immediate presence of the Subsistent Word (*ibid.*, p. 248).

"This human experience of Christ is the ineffable experience of God as His Father eternally generating Him. This is the nucleus



of the religious experience of Jesus: Christ lives from God as from His Father. . . . This religious experience is the supreme revelation of God, the divine revealability and communicability in supreme degree" (*ibid.*, p. 250). Thus the "humanity of Christ reveals and makes credible the divinity, ultimately God as Father of Christ. Appearing on earth with admirable sanctity, doctrine, miracles, above all with His intimate experience of God His Father, He is the sovereign divine sign inviting men to faith. In self-manifestation He reveals the Father, and to believe in Christ is to believe in the Father" (*ibid.*). "Christ is the supreme divine sign, the fundamental manifestation of His own mystery and the mystery of the Father. Visible image of the invisible Father, since He is incarnate, just as the Logos in the Trinity is the invisible image of the Father!" But only "after the resurrection will there be the full revelation of the Father. He reveals Himself fully and thereby the Father. On earth the revelation is through faith not through vision" (*ibid.*, p. 254). Center and source of supernatural truth, Christ is also the center and source of all grace. Both grace and glory are "capital" in Christ. He possesses both in fullness to communicate to mankind. But this leads to our discussion of the mediation of Christ.

#### THE MEDIATION

Incarnation is intrinsically directed to mediation, which is intelligible only in the light of the hypostatic union. Because of the union of the humanity with the Logos, Christ the man is our mediator. The Church has defined the doctrine found in St. Paul: "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, bearing witness in his own time" (1 Tim. 2, 5-6; cf. Hebr. 9, 15; 12, 24). Following is the decision of the Council of Trent: "If any one says that this sin of Adam . . . is removed by any other remedy than by the merit of the one mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ, who reconciled us with God in His Blood, A.S." (D. 243). "By force of the hypostatic union itself," says Father Parente, "Christ is constituted the mystical head of all men, so that between Christ and the human

race there exists a solidarity by which redemption and its fruits flow unto us" (*De Verbo Incarnato*, p. 243).

"God, all merciful," says the *Mystici Corporis*, "'so loved the world as to give His only-begotten Son'; and the Word of the Eternal Father through this same love assumed human nature from the race of Adam—but an innocent and spotless nature it was—so that he, as a new Adam, might be the source whence the grace of the Holy Spirit should flow into all the children of the first parent. Through the sin of the first man they had been excluded from adoption into the children of God: through the Word Incarnate made brothers according to the flesh of the only-begotten Son of God, they would receive the power to become the sons of God" (*Mystici Corporis*, #12, Paulist Press). (For the notion of solidarity of the human race in Christ as found in the draft prepared for definition by the Council of the Vatican, cf. Parente, *o. c.*, p. 267.)

The manuals of dogmatic theology usually sum up the teaching of the Church as found in conciliar and other decisions (cf. D 86, 122, 371, 429, 550) regarding Christ our Mediator as follows: Christ reconciled us with God through His merits, His satisfaction, His sacrifice. Particularly it was the passion and death on the cross which wrought our redemption from sin, though Christ merited and satisfied for us throughout His whole life. Viewed in the strict sense, merit, satisfaction, sacrifice cease with the death of Christ. We must likewise note that the redemption wrought by Christ is real, objective, and superabundant. It is effected by Christ not by mere external acts, but by these acts in manifestation of the interior dispositions of the love and obedience of the God-man (Phil. 2, 8; Eph. 5, 2).

As to the resurrection itself in relation to the salvation, all agree that it does complete and fulfill the redemptive acts, that sacrifice, merit, satisfaction were pointed to the resurrection. Without the resurrection, of course, Christ surely could not be considered the *Victor* over sin and death. Without the resurrection all proof of the truth of our faith and the work of Christ would collapse. This much, I think, no theologian has ever denied. But is there no more to be said? I think much more is to be said, much more!

If we analyze the salvific acts of Christ in their relative causal-

ity we should discern the true place of the resurrection in the divine plan. Christ, the God-man has redeemed us: through His divinity as the principal cause. This work He shares with the Father and the Holy Spirit, for all the works of God *ad extra* are common to all three persons. Though God could effect the complete work of man's salvation directly and without any choice of instruments, the divine decree chose the humanity of Christ as the instrument of the whole work of salvation. It is the instrumental cause united to the divinity through the hypostatic union (*instrumentum conjunctum divinitatis*), but it is not to be viewed as a mere passive tool. We must look upon this instrument in the light of all that we have already said about the perfect humanity of Christ in its relation to the Logos. The humanity in all its perfection of being and action freely participates in the whole work of salvation. Instrumentality is effective in the highest freedom. And its human acts are under the impulse of actual grace and are undergirded by the sanctifying grace which is the *gratia capitis*.

In all the meritorious acts of Christ the formal element is love for God and man. In acts of satisfaction for the penalty due to our sins and redemption from the guilt of sin and sacrifice for reconciliation with God, the human flesh and blood freely contributed anguish and pain. Just as merit formally required love, so redemption, satisfaction, and sacrifice required justice, a loving and all perfect justice. Thus many elements enter into the work. In the words of Parente, "the Catholic doctrine is not exclusive. Various elements combine in the mystery of redemption. There are various aspects of a harmonious whole, a certain vital organism whose members (the divine attributes, the work of Christ, the co-operation of man) are intimately connected" (*ibid.*, p. 279). To ascertain the part played by the resurrection we must turn first to the inspired writers, and only then to the Fathers and scholastic theologians. A bold return to the primitive kerygmatic teaching is indicated. We begin with Saint Paul.

#### THE PAULINE DOCTRINE

St. Paul enunciates the message of salvation through Christ. His Christology, in the words of Cerfaux, "begins as a soteriology.

Here we have a great intervention of God in the world of men, a drama of which God is the author and in which Christ is the central figure. The action begins with Christ's death, and continues through His resurrection, the preaching of his Gospel, the concerted resistance of powers inimical to Christ, and the persecution of the gospel preachers. It comes to a climax in Christ's final victory and second coming. It would be wrong to suppose that the whole drama was played out on the cross, once and for all, and thereafter reproduced as a mystery, or shared in by the faith of believers participating in the fruits of Christ's victory. The power of God is the same throughout the whole action of Christ's death and resurrection, and in the preaching of the gospel and the salvation of believers (Rom. 1, 16). At the parousia, this same power will receive its full manifestation. God is always at work, saving men through Christ, from Good Friday until the last day." (Cerfaux, L., *Christ in the Theology of St. Paul*, p. 11.)

The Pauline texts on the resurrection abound, but we must limit our consideration to four, and serious discussion to one, which we consider the crucial and classical text on the causality of the resurrection. In his letter to the Philippians, the Apostle says: "so that I may know him and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings: become like to him in death, in the hope that somehow I may attain to the resurrection from the dead" (3, 10 f). To the Colossians he writes: "For you were buried together with him in Baptism, and in him also rose again through faith in the working of God who raised him from the dead" (2, 12). A very striking passage is in the sixth chapter to Romans: "For we were buried with him by means of Baptism into death, in order that, just as Christ has risen from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also may walk in newness of life. For if we have been united with him in the likeness of his death, we shall be so in the likeness of his resurrection also" (Rom. 6, 4-5).

The classical text is in the fourth chapter to Romans: "Now not for his sake only was it written that 'It was credited to him,' but for the sake of us also, to whom it will be credited if we believe in him who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, *who was delivered up for our sins, and rose again for our justification*" (4,

23-25). We might say that this text is the sum and center of the Pauline doctrine which views the resurrection of the Lord as the very focus of the whole apostolic kerygma.

#### EXEGETICAL BACKGROUND FOR ROM. 4, 25

Recent studies on the resurrection deal specifically with the historic background of the exegesis of this passage. David Stanley, S.J., in the *Verbum Domini* (vol. 29, 1951, pp. 257-274) traces the history of the exegesis in an article entitled "Ad historiam Exegeseos Rom. 4, 25." In the *Gregorianum* already referred to Stanislas Lyonnet, S.J., takes up all phases of the problem in an article with the significant title, "La valeur sotériologique de la résurrection du Christ selon saint Paul." We have space only for these two.

According to Father Lyonnet the text offers no difficulty to the Greek Fathers. For Origen the bond of causality between the resurrection of Christ and the justification of the Christian is obvious. The same is true of John Chrysostom and the other Greek Fathers (*loc. cit.*, p. 297). In his brief summary of the teaching in the East, Father Stanley has the following conclusion for this portion of his study: death and resurrection of Christ are always associated and placed on equal footing in the work of redemption. Some causal efficacy is maintained for both. Generally speaking (with a slight difference in the function of death and resurrection maintained by Theodoret) the Greeks make no distinction between the influence of the two. The very lack of precision accounts for the ease with which they explain the function of the resurrection of Christ as given by St. Paul, a difficulty which disturbed the Latins later on. The Greeks make no mention of the "merit" of Christ. But for them the role of resurrection is not limited to the part played in the faith which justifies: for them resurrection is not a mere motive of credibility or confidence (*ibid.*, p. 261).

In the West there is no such agreement. (In the light of studies already made we may suggest that further study in the area is indicated.) We do have some clear statements such as the following by St. Hilary, found in his comment on Ps. 135: "Redemit nos cum se pro peccatis nostris dedit: redemit nos per sanguinem suum, per passionem suam, per resurrectionem suam. Haec magna vitae nostrae

pretia sunt." *PL* 9, 776 A. According to Father Lyonnet, Augustine has many texts which in distinguishing causality of death and resurrection, attribute precisely to the latter the communication of new life to mankind (*ibid.*, p. 298). Though the great Doctor of Hippo did not compose an explicit exegesis on the passage, he seems to give a double explanation of it. His thought is not foreign to the Greek concept, in fact he goes further than the Greeks. Not only does he attribute redemptive influence to both death and resurrection, but he makes a clear distinction of the causality. But he also makes an effort to explain the function of resurrection in the nature of justifying faith. Surely the two are not contradictory (Stanley, *loc. cit.*, pp. 271-272).

By way of contrast the exegesis of Ambrosiaster and Pelagius seems rather superficial. The thought of Ambrosiaster is wholly juridical: resurrection has no more than an extrinsic causality in relation to our justification. Through His resurrection Christ imparted an authority to the precepts which they would otherwise have lacked: "resurgens praeceptis suis auctoritatem praebuit" (*PL* 17, 92). The thought of Pelagius differs little from this: "necessario resurgens apparuit, ut iustitiam credentium confirmaret" (ed. A. Souter: *Texts and Studies* IX, 2, p. 41. Lyonnet, *ibid.*, p. 298).

Ambrosiaster, for obvious reasons, exercised a great influence on subsequent thought in the West. Though the influence of Augustine was very great, it also proved to be the source of perplexity and confusion. Some followed him in one phase of his thought, others in the other. It is the unique merit of Aquinas that he came to realize the inadequacy of the Western tradition after Augustine and turned to the tradition in the East. His clear perception of the inadequacy of the concept of merit in explaining the whole truth of redemption prompted him to enlarge the categories and include, beyond the notion of merit, the important concept of efficacy. Here too we see the stamp of the great mind of the Angelic Doctor: the new concept is in complete harmony with the whole Thomistic system.

Thomas states his position very clearly in many passages, of which we can cite but a few: In his commentary on Romans in the fourth chapter, *lectura* 3, he says: "Et resurrexit propter justifica-

tionem nostram, i.e., ut nos *resurgendo iustificaret*. . . . Et quod propter delicta nostra sit traditus in mortem, manifestum videtur ex hoc quod sua morte meruit nobis deletionem peccatorum, sed resurgendo non meruit, quia in statu resurrectionis non fuit viator, sed comprehensor."

"Et ideo dicendum est quod mors Christi fuit nobis salutaris non solum per modum meriti sed etiam per modum cuiusdam efficientiae. Cum enim humanitas Christi esset quodammodo instrumentum divinitatis eius, ut Damascenus dicit, omnes passiones et actiones humanitatis Christi fuerunt nobis salutiferae, utpote ex virtute divinitatis provenientes. Sed quia effectus habet aliquam similitudinem causae, mortem Christi, qua extincta est in eo mortalis vita, dicit esse causam extinctionis peccatorum nostrorum: resurrectionem autem eius qua redit ad novam vitam gloriae, dicit esse causam iustificationis nostrae, per quam redimus ad novitatem iustitiae."

It is quite evident that Thomas is speaking of a true causality. Not only does he expressly say "cause," but he places resurrection on a par with passion, which is surely a true cause. Particularly significant is the use of the gerundive form "*resurgendo iustificaret*," by rising from the dead he would justify us. The form clearly implies that the act of rising from the dead and not merely the risen Christ is the cause of our justification. In fact it would be difficult to see how the risen Christ could be the cause of the new life except through the instrumentality of His divine-human acts.

It has been pointed out that in this instance also Thomas bases his doctrine on the sacred word, the revealed truth, and then fits it into his system and not the other way around. Far from denying the meritorious cause, he accepts it and places it in proper perspective, and adds the new category of efficiency which embraces both the passion and the resurrection. The humanity in its acts is instrument of divinity in effecting our salvation. "Death and resurrection as two aspects of one reality were efficient causes of remission of sin and of the new life of justification." But Thomas clearly distinguishes these two aspects, the remission of sin and the justification or infusion of new life (Lyonnet, *ibid.*, p. 302).

"Dicendum, quod in iustificatione animarum duo concurrunt,

scilicet remissio culpae et novitas vitae per gratiam. Quantum ergo ad efficientiam quae est per virtutem divinam, tam passio Christi quam resurrectio est causa iustificationis quoad utrumque. Sed quantum ad exemplaritatem, proprie passio et mors Christi est causa remissionis culpae per quam morimur peccato; resurrectio autem est causa novitatis vitae, quae est per gratiam sive iustitiam. Et ideo apostolus dicit quod traditus est, scilicet in mortem propter delicta nostra, scilicet tollenda, et resurrexit propter iustificationem nostram" (III, q. 56 a 2 ad 4).

In the very same article Thomas says that the resurrection of Christ works through the power of divinity; it has an *effective* power instrumentally, not merely in respect to the resurrection of bodies but also in respect to the resurrection of souls. It also has the nature of exemplary cause (*exemplaritatis*) in respect to the resurrection of souls, because we must be made to conform also in our souls to the risen Christ. In the response to the second objection in the same article Aquinas says that the "efficacy of the resurrection of Christ contacts souls not through the proper power of the risen body itself, but through the power of divinity to which it is personally united" (Cf. Lyonnet, *ibid.*, p. 303).

Though resurrection completes and perfects the merit, the satisfaction, and sacrifice of Christ which would be utterly futile if Christ had not risen, though resurrection begins the heavenly priesthood and is the Father's seal of approval of the mission of Christ, it is also a true cause of grace through instrumental-efficient causality. The sacred humanity is the instrument of the meriting of all graces through the passion and death. It is likewise the supreme sacrament through which all graces are wrought and dispensed to mankind. The act of the resurrection and all the acts of the risen Christ are the cause of grace in us. All graces are given through the *Sacramentum Humanitatis Christi*.

The classic distinction between objective and subjective redemption, the former embracing all which Christ earned or did for all mankind, the latter the "application" to the souls of individual men can be retained. But a restudy of the use of these terms and concepts in the light of the categories just explained is suggested. We prefer to speak of the objective aspect and the subjective aspect



of redemption. The former should include all the work of Christ, all that He is and all that He wrought, all that He now does. The subjective would comprise the total effect in individual souls (Cf. Lyonnet, *ibid.*, p. 307 f).

In concluding this part of our paper we stress again the unity of the work of redemption, the exterior acts with interior disposition, the passion and death directed essentially to resurrection, resurrection completing the death. "Christ's act of love would have to be efficacious, vivifying, communicating divine life to the concrete human nature of Christ, body and soul." Though the lapse of time between death and resurrection made the death obvious and verifiable, a truly human death, nevertheless "such a death is necessarily bound up with the resurrection. . . . In reality they are two aspects of the one sole unique mystery" (*ibid.*, p. 316).

#### THE PASCHAL FEAST

Christ the risen Savior, source of our whole supernatural life, continues the work begun in His earthly life through His Mystical Body, the Church, with her Eucharistic Sacrifice and her sacraments of salvation. Through baptism we are incorporated into Him and we live in union with Him through the divine liturgy. "The Church prolongs the priestly mission of Jesus Christ mainly by means of the sacred liturgy," says Pius XII. "She does this in the first place at the altar, where constantly the Sacrifice of the Cross is re-presented and, with a single difference in the manner of its offering, renewed. She does it next by means of the sacraments, those special channels through which men are made partakers in the supernatural life. She does it finally by offering to God, all Good and Great, the daily tribute of her prayer of praise" (*Mediator Dei*, NCWC edition, #5).

In this cult the central feast is that of Redemption, for we approach God the Father as redeemed through the Blood of His Son. As the resurrection sums up and completes the whole work of redemption, so the celebration of the feast of the resurrection is focus and center of the whole liturgy. The feast of the resurrection is the central feast of the calendar. Such is the clear lesson of the primitive preaching reflecting as it does the primitive liturgy, such is the

primitive liturgy reflecting as it does the primitive kerygma. Even the hastiest survey in the history of the liturgy shows how the worship of the year centers in the paschal feast.

In the Roman liturgy the paschal cycle from Septuagesima to the octave of Pentecost was integrally formed already in the tenth century. It was already in existence in the sixth and little was added after the tenth. "It was faithfully preserved," says Father Schmidt, "by the Church and just recently in the last few years was freed from the squalid neglect of many centuries and reintegrated into its pristine splendor" (Schmidt, Herman, S.J., *Gregorianum*, vol. 39, #2, p. 463). The point is stressed in the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites establishing the present Holy Week liturgy: "Maxima redemptionis nostrae mysteria, passionis nempe, mortis et resurrectionis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ab apostolica inde aetate singulari prorsus recordatione celebrare quotannis studuit sancta Mater Ecclesia" (Nov. 16, 1955). Similar is the thought of Father Joseph Loew, C.S.S.R.: "Si verum est, summam operis Redemptionis generis humani in mysteriis praesertim passionis, mortis et resurrectionis Domini nostri Jesu Christi contineri, aequae verum est instaurationem liturgicam, auspice Summo Pontifice Pio PP. XII, ex intimo centro ipsius sacrae liturgiae exordium sumpsisse." (For the preface to *Hebdomada Sancta* by Schmidt, S.J.; cf. *Gregorianum*, *loc. cit.*, p. 463.)

In the words of Father Durrwell (*loc. cit.*) "in the history of the spirituality of the Church the new awareness of the paschal mystery is undoubtedly one of the major developments of our time." In the return to the original stress of the vigil and the Eucharistic sacrifice we focus attention on the commemoration of the paschal mysteries. We say "mysteries" advisedly, for there are many facets and phases. This is brought out most strikingly in the profession of faith by the faithful during the vigil. Intimately bound up with this profession of faith, with all its historic background, is the preparation for baptism which effects in the soul what the lips enunciate in the formulas of faith. The most ancient formula of this profession is already found in St. Paul. We note 1 Cor. 15, 3-4.

The profession is repeated in lapidary fashion in the early Fathers. Ignatius of Antioch says: "qui (Jesus Christus) vere

natus est, edit et bibit, vere persecutionem passus est sub Pontio Pilato, vere crucifixus et mortuus est . . . qui et vere resurrexit a mortuis . . ." (Trall 9). In the second century we find these words in the Roman liturgy: "Credis in Christum Jesum filium Dei qui natus est de spiritu sancto ex Maria virgine et crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato et mortuus est et sepultus et resurrexit die tertia vivus a mortuis et ascendit in caelis et sedit ad dexteram patris, venturus iudicare vivos et mortuos?" (Trad. Apost. Hipp.)

The symbol of faith was explained in the catechetical instruction before baptism in the early Church. At baptism it is solemnly professed in words. In the sacrament the virtue of faith is infused and the baptized is incorporated in Christ as a member of the Church. In this central unity of the liturgy all the mysteries of faith are focused in the mystery of redemption. No mystery is celebrated in isolation even though there be many feasts. The paschal feast commemorates the resurrection as completing the whole work of the Savior: passion, death, burial, resurrection form one harmonious whole. Passion is not for itself, it is the way to the joy of resurrection. The passion without resurrection would pave the way to pessimism and sadism. The death of Christ is the way to life: the mystery of resurrection is life in abundance, but it is life through death. Remove passion and death and the result is an illusory quietism and unreal mysticism, futile, imaginary. The liturgy always combines the two: Christ suffering is never without the joy of resurrection. The resurrection is the triumph after suffering and death. Note the words of the Good Friday liturgical hymn:

"Pange, lingua, gloriosi lauream certaminis,  
Et super Crucis trophaeo die triumphum nobilem:  
Qualiter Redemptor orbis immolatus vicerit."

"Vexilla Regis prodeunt—Fulget crucis mysterium  
Quo carne carnis Conditor—Suspensus est patibulo—  
Impleta sunt quae concinit—David fideli carmine  
Dicens: In nationibus—Regnavit a ligno Deus.  
Arbor decora et fulgida,—Ornata Regis purpura."

And the oration: "Crucem tuam adoramus, Domine, et sanctam

resurrectionem tuam laudamus, et glorificamus: ecce enim propter lignum venit gaudium in universo mundo."

The feast of Easter is considered the greatest feast of the year. In the mysteries of passion, death, resurrection, it is the resurrection which is supreme. This is implied by the words of St. Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians: "If Christ has not risen, vain then is our preaching, vain too is your faith . . . for you are still in your sins" (15, 14-16). The Roman martyrology calls Easter the solemnity of solemnities, which means it is the greatest feast of the year. Attention is called to the meaning of the term *pascha*, *passio*, *transitus*. It is the passing from death to life, from suffering to glory. Most strikingly is this expressed in the *Christus factus est pro nobis obediens usque ad mortem . . . mortem autem crucis . . . propter quod et deus exaltavit illum . . . etc. . . .* (*ibid.*, pp. 471-472).

In this great feast there is the commemoration of the passing of Christ from death to life. There is action, vital action through the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist. There is community participation and the manifestation of great joy. There is the initiation into the cult of the Church with the most perfect worship of God. There is sacramental efficacy in the sign and symbol of the mysteries of faith, all of which is directed to a truly sacramental and cultural life in the Christian order. On this Paschal night there is the highest realization of commemorative feast, personal initiation, effective sacramental symbolism. "Christ risen from the dead is really present. He is proclaimed in sacred and beautiful words and also in the symbol of the paschal fire and the candle. He acts through baptism to bring to sinners a true resurrection from sin and initiation into the Church. Words and actions are directed to a vital moral life, a truly sacramental life. Christ is priest and victim in union with the initiated in the sacrifice offered to the Father in the sublimest act of worship. In this highest act of cult, each of the initiated is given a share in the Banquet of the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world, who frees the faithful from their daily faults and gives them peace" (*ibid.*, pp. 474-475); the writer is particularly indebted to this splendid article of Father Schmidt's).

## ESCHATOLOGY OF THE RESURRECTION

The resurrection of Christ, we stated above, is cause both of our newness of life which is called grace and of the resurrection of our bodies in the day of final judgment. Resurrection of Christ is cause of the resurrection of both soul and body. This causality is indicated in many texts, some of which we have already cited. Particularly striking are the following: in the first chapter of his letter to Colossians St. Paul refers to Christ as "the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature." "In him were created all things. . . . All things have been created through and unto him, and he is before all creatures." Christ is "the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, that in all things he may have the first place" (15-18). In the fifteenth chapter of the first letter to Corinthians, he says, "Christ has risen from the dead, the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep" (20).

This doctrine of the causality of the resurrection in relation to our resurrection might be stated as follows: "the resurrection of Christ, both as an event in history, and in its permanent effects in the glorious humanity of the risen Christ, is an instrumental cause of our justification and of our future glory" (*Gregorianum*, 1958, vol. 39, #2, p. 274, Van Roo, W. A., S.J.). The doctrine of St. Thomas, already indicated in the previous pages, may be found stated very clearly in the third part of the *Summa Theologiae*, in question 56, art. 1: "I answer that 'what is first in each category is the cause of all that is subsequent.' . . . First however in the category of true resurrection was the resurrection of Christ. . . . Hence it must be that the resurrection of Christ is the cause of our resurrection. . . . And this is indeed reasonable, for the principle of human vivification is the Word of God. Indeed this is the natural order of things divinely instituted that every cause should first have its effects in that which is closest to it, and through this work upon the other things which are more remote. . . . And therefore the Word of God first confers immortal life on the body naturally united to it, and then through it effects the resurrection in all others."

The Thomistic teaching is further clarified in the same article by an explanation of the hierarchy of causes operative in the work

of our resurrection. "The justice of God is the first cause of our resurrection: the resurrection of Christ, however, is the secondary cause, and is effective as it were instrumentally (quasi instrumentalis)" (*loc. cit.* ad 2). "The resurrection of Christ is not strictly speaking the meritorious cause of our resurrection, but it is the efficient and exemplary cause" (*loc. cit.* ad 3).

This efficient causality of the resurrection of Christ is clearly distinguished from the exemplary causality in the mind of Thomas, for the resurrection is effective in the resurrection of both good and bad. But the resurrection of Christ is exemplar or pattern only of the resurrection of the good (*loc. cit.* ad 3). That St. Thomas refers to the resurrection as act or event and not merely to the risen Christ is evident from the parallel between the death of Christ as cause and the resurrection as cause: "As to efficiency, which depends on the divine power, it is common to both the death of Christ and the resurrection to be cause of the destruction of death and the renewal of life. But as far as exemplarity is concerned, the death of Christ, through which He departed from mortal life, is the cause of the destruction of death in us. But His resurrection by which He began His immortal life is the cause of the renewal (reparationis) of our life. Of course the passion of Christ is also the meritorious cause" (*loc. cit.* ad 4).

Great perplexity arises in any explanation of the humanity of Christ as instrumental cause. Though the concept of instrumental causality is simple enough in the natural order of things in which instruments enter into every phase of human activity, the instrumental cause in the supernatural order involves many great difficulties. The sacred writer is the free instrumental cause of the inspired writings under the divine influence. The sacraments are instrumental causes of the imparting of grace. The sacred humanity of Christ is the instrumental cause of all supernatural good in the present order. In addition to the obvious difficulties there is the problem of what we might call presence and contact of the instrument. How can events long past, such as the event of the resurrection, be an instrument in the present conferring of grace? Here we are concerned not with moral value or merit of an act, but with

its "efficacy" as cause of our resurrection even though the resurrection is long past historically.

The doctrine of St. Thomas is stated in an answer to the objection he himself raises: the resurrection cannot be the cause of our resurrection because there is no contact (*non habet contactum corporalem ad mortuos qui resurgent, propter distantiam temporis et loci*): "And therefore as other things which Christ did or endured in His humanity are salutary through the power of divinity . . . so the resurrection of Christ is the efficient cause of our resurrection through the power of divinity, which properly is able to vivify the dead. This power indeed is present to and contacts all places and times and such contact in power (*contactus virtualis*) is sufficient for this category of efficiency" (*loc. cit.* ad 3).

Though we realize that much remains to be discussed in this difficult area, the explanation of Father Van Roo (*loc. cit.*) seems very helpful. "The resurrection is the historic act by which God crowned the redemptive work of Christ. It is the glorification of Christ Himself, effected by the Divine power alone as principal cause. The glorious risen humanity of Christ is first and foremost in Christ Himself the full consequence of the hypostatic union, of the redemptive incarnation. In Christ the Head the full victory over sin and death has been achieved. Further, in our regard, the resurrection itself as an event in history, and the glorious risen humanity now in heaven, are instruments of our grace and future glory. They pertain to the whole mystery of the Incarnation, in which the humanity of Christ and all its mysteries are somehow one with the unity of order: directed by God as the principal cause, and by the human reason and will of Christ as unique hypostatically united instrumental cause, to all the effects of grace. All these mysteries together constitute the great efficacious sign by which God has shown and shows, has effected and continues to effect, our salvation" (*loc. cit.*, p. 283).

#### THE FINAL CONSUMMATION IN CHRIST

The resurrection of Christ is the cause of the glorification of our souls and bodies. It is the teaching of faith that the risen Christ will come to judge the living and the dead and that just and unjust

will rise in their own bodies unto eternal glory or eternal damnation. Though theologians differ in explaining the identity (Cf. Diekamp, Franz, *Theologiae Dogmaticae Manuale*, vol. IV, p. 493 ff), it is a truth of faith that the bodies after the resurrection will be identical with the terrestrial bodies (D. 347, 429). The risen Christ is the pattern and exemplar of the glorified bodies of the just. We already noted that the resurrection both of the just and unjust is effected through the risen Christ. With Father and Holy Spirit He is the principal efficient cause of the resurrection and the glorified humanity and the fact of His resurrection are the instrumental cause.

Though many points regarding the final consummation in Christ might be properly discussed we have space for only two. These we place as questions for discussion and further study: Shall we view the mediation of the God-man as truly eternal, continuing in heaven, so that even in the light of glory the way to the Father is through the Incarnate Son? Does the immediacy of the beatific vision conflict with such eternal mediation? The suggestion is made by the noted theologian Karl Rahner and taken up and explained by Father Alfaro in the article already referred to (*Cristo Glorioso, Revelador del Padre, Gregorianum*, vol. 39, #2).

According to this theologian the mediation continues eternally and Christ the Mediator continues eternally to reveal the Father and the Holy Spirit. The Father gives Himself to us through the Son, and man through perfect knowledge of Christ even as man must know the hypostatic union. This is known perfectly only if the Second Person is known in Himself. The "glorified humanity eternally exercises an instrumental-dispositive-manifestative causality regarding the immediate vision of the Word, which vision includes necessarily the vision of the Father and the Holy Spirit. The Father reveals Himself in the glory of Christ eternally and Christ in glory revealing himself reveals the Father eternally to us" (*loc. cit.* p. 264). "Far from impeding the immediate vision of God, the perfect knowledge of the glorified humanity disposes for it and psychologically demands it as necessary complement: Christ cannot be perfectly known in His glorified humanity without immediate vision of



the person of the Word subsisting in the humanity" (*loc. cit.* p. 262).

Alfaro protests that the glorified humanity is not an objective medium. It is not an object through which we have the vision of God. But in accordance with the doctrine of the instrumental causality, it is an "instrument disposing man for vision." . . . It is the divinely created supreme, incomparable communication, the most perfect subjective disposition for the vision of God. "We can have no more perfect disposition for the vision of God than that caused by the immediate and perfect knowledge of the glorified humanity in which the Word subsists, no more perfect disposition for the vision of the trinity than that caused by the perfect knowledge of the glorious humanity hypostatically united to the Word" (*loc. cit.* p. 262-263). Such is our first "quaestio."

The second question is concerned with the glorified body of risen man. Our manuals of theology usually teach that there is an "accidental" increase in glory after the resurrection because of the union of the soul with the body, as though there is a kind of "redundancy" of the glory of the soul. (cf. Diekamp, *op. cit.* p. 559). Quite different is the attitude of Alfaro. Boldly he says: "This union, fully human, authentically human, of glorified man with Christ shall be according to the structure, integral and unitarian, of the activity of man risen, who continues to be truly man: the immediate encounter of glorified man is with the glorious humanity of Christ and in Christ Himself (without objective mediation) shall take place the very vision of the divinity: Christ in glory reveals God perfectly."

#### THE THEOLOGY OF THE RESURRECTION

Risen man is truly man, integral man, truly a human person. What a difference between the separated soul in its glory and integral man in glory? What is the difference in the beatified activity of the two? Is it merely accidental? Says Alfaro: Theology "has discussed the problem of the increase of happiness. Is it merely extensive or also intensive? This is really a secondary problem, but it conceals a really difficult and profound problem, which arises from the dogma of resurrection. According to this dogma man as integral man now exists and acts as integral man with a different

activity from that of the separated soul. Integral man must be fully beatified as man. How can this be limited to mere passive reception in the body of that which overflows from the soul?" The conclusion is evident that risen man can be entirely and perfectly happy only as total and integral man with authentically integral human activity in the full and unified exercise of his cognitive and appetitive faculties (cf. *ibid.* p. 267).

The eternal fulfillment of the incarnation is found in Christ in glory. Forever He exercises His heavenly priesthood. Forever He dispenses to the blessed the life in glory: "the life that he lives, he lives unto God." We too once "dead to sin" shall be forever "alive to God in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 6, 10-11).

EDWIN G. KAISER, C.P.P.S.,  
St. Joseph's College  
Rensselaer, Indiana