

<Text6>

(*Cat*, 44)

<On the Resurrection of the Flesh and the Last Judgment>

Do you believe that there is a resurrection? I do. How? After I die I will rise again on the day of judgment as a thirty-year-old. I will come to Mount Olivet for the judgment, which is the center of the world, from where the Son of God ascended to the Father, where he will come to judge the living and the dead and *to reward each one according to his works* (Mt. 16, 27).¹

¹ cfr *Pont. Rom.-Germ.* 2, cxi, 26 (p. 175, 32-p. 176, 3). Although the manuscripts used by the editors of the *Pont. Rom.-Germ.* are all post s. IX, at least some parts of the tenth-century pontifical date to the ninth century; see, for example, KEEFE, *Water and the Word*, 2, Text 11, p. 250–52.

Commentary on Text 6

This brief text offers a mental picture of the last judgment. The interrogated person believes that after he dies he will rise again on the day of judgment in the prime of his life. He will come for judgment to Mount Olivet, where Christ will come to judge the living and the dead, and reward each person according to his works.

This text raises the question of the popular understanding of the last judgment. That Christ will come to judge the living and the dead is in the Apostles', Nicene, N.-C., and Athanasian creeds. Was it always understood literally, or was it sometimes explained figuratively? We saw in Text 5 that its composer, contrary to Gennadius, thought "the living and the dead" should be understood as "the just and sinners." This could be, however, not a denial of a real day and a real place and a real weighing of deeds, but a particular view about whether everyone has to die in order to resurrect and then be judged. Perhaps it was thought that to be judged before death would not allow you to repent on your deathbed. One passage in Scripture seems to indicate that not everyone will die before Christ's second coming, but it is ambiguous: Jn. 21, 23 states: "The saying spread abroad among the brethren that this disciple was not to die; yet Jesus did not say to him that he was not to die, but, 'If it is my will that he remain until I come, what is that to you?'"

The idea that we will rise as thirty-year-olds is well known in patristic literature and repeated by the Carolingians: cfr Ps.-Alcuinus, *De diuinis officiis*, 51 - PL 101, 1280C-D: *Nam Dominus triginta annorum aetate baptizatus est, et David triginta annorum regni suscepit gubernaculum. Primum etiam hominem in triginta annorum aetate creatum doctores asserunt, et*

nostra corpora in mensuram aetatis plenitudinis Christi credimus et speramus resurrectura; cfr also Ps.-Hilarius, *Expositio de fide catholica* (Cat, 9) - ed. Künstle, *Eine Bibliothek*, p. 174, et Ignotus, *Expositio fidei* (Cat, 206) - PLS IV, 2166): *Sed tamen resurgent homines iuuenes quasi triginta annos, licet senes aut infantes transierunt*; cfr also Ps.-Ambrosius, *De Trinitate seu tractatus in symbolum apostolorum* (Cat, 143a) - PL 17, 566A: *In illa autem Ierusalem caelesti, ubi sol iste ac luna septuplum lucebunt, diuersitates non erunt aetatum; ibi enim nec infans, nec senex, nec paruus erit, qui non impleat dies suos, utpote filius resurrectionis, et in mensuram perueniat aetatis plenitudinis Christi, ut nec desint alicui annorum spatia, nec supersint*; cfr etiam Augustinus, *De ciuitate Dei*, XXII, 15 - ed. Dombart et Kalb, CC SL 48, where Augustine says that all the resurrected bodies will be given the stature they had in their prime, or the stature they would have attained. He takes the words of St. Paul in Eph. 4, 13 (“stature of the full maturity of Christ”) to be meant either physically, as Christ’s age, or spiritually, as the full body of the church.

A very similar text to Text 6 is found embedded in a baptismal examination in the *Pontificale Roman-Germanicum* of the tenth-century (employing earlier texts, but I have not yet found what follows in a s. IX ms). There it states: “26. Again, do you believe that there is a resurrection? I do. How? I believe that after I die I will rise again in that perfect age in which Christ himself resurrected and ascended to the Father and from where he will come to judge the living and the dead and *to reward each one according to his works* (Mt. 16, 27).² The PRG-X

² “26. Item credis resurrectionem? Credo. Item quomodo? Credo postquam morior quod resurgam in perfecta aetate, in qua ipse Christus resurrexit et ascendit ad patrem et inde uenturus est iudicare uiuos et mortuos et reddere unicuique secundum opera sua”. *Pont. Rom.-Germ.* 2, cxi, 26 (p. 175, 32-p. 176, 3. Although the manuscripts used by the editors of the *Pont.*

does not have the part about the judgment taking place on Mount Olivet, where we must go after we resurrect. Text 6 makes the event of the last judgment less vague. It almost paints a scene, even a narrative scene: reading it we are forced to imagine Christ ascending to the Father from Mount Olivet as it is described in Acts 1, 9–11, with the Apostles gazing open-mouthed as he disappeared in a cloud, and then returning in glory to that same spot, with risen bodies countless in number streaming toward the Mount, the center of the world. If Text 6 was composed at the time of Carolingian discouragement of art, it did very well at painting a mental image with words (as we saw done in Text 1). Whether the composer intentionally altered a version of Text 6 such as that in the PRG-X to make it even more descriptive, as if painting an icon with words, we are at least allowed to question why the difference between Text 6 and the PRG-X.

Text 6 is known to me in three mss (although more mss have come to my attention, which probably contain Text 6, or some variation of it; see below). In all three it is part of a larger clerical interrogation. Also, in all three it is immediately followed by Text 15 (*Cat*, 95), and in two of them Text 6 and Text 15 are immediately followed by Text 1 (*Cat*, 2).

Its earliest ms is Paris, BnF, lat. 1603, s. VIII-IX, northeastern France. D. Bullough dates it “after 789, apparently ‘Hofnahe’” (Bullough, *Alcuin: Achievement*, p. 350, note 64). Y. Hen says its provenance is St.-Amand, and the ms may have been written in or around St.-Amand (‘Knowledge of Canon Law’, p. 131). He further comments that the royal court at Aachen and the monastery of St.-Amand were closely linked to each other, and that St.-Amand enjoyed royal patronage (p. 131). Their close relations were significant for the implementation of the Carolingian reforms regarding

Rom.-Germ. are all post s. IX, at least some parts of the tenth-century pontifical date to the ninth century; see, for example, KEEFE, *Water and the Word*, 2, Text 11, p. 250-252.

the clergy. (Somebody using the ms in the early ninth century added an excerpt from the *Admonitio generalis*—see p. 132.) This is intriguing in light of the court’s hiatus in the use of images in the 790s due to its understanding and reaction to the Council of 787 on the veneration of images, and my suggestion that Text 6 is “illustrative” (Bullough, *Alcuin: Achievement*, p. 350, note 64). The only illustrations in Paris 1603 are some of the large initials formed by elongated bodies of birds or dogs in the two penitentials on f. 102r-v, 106r, 159v, 162^{bis}r (Hen, p. 125). We may not have explored enough the impact of the court’s temporary halt in the use of images. It may have impacted the kind of texts chosen to teach the faith. Let us look at the Paris ms in more detail.

The Paris ms might have been intended as a bishop's book for reference and instructing, although Hen, ‘Knowledge of Canon Law,’ p. 128–29, believes it served as a *uade mecum* of a rural parish priest. It is 203 f.; 220-225 x 130-135 mm. (8” x 5 ¼”); 25 lines, almost entirely in two columns. Following excerpts from a sacramentary with votive masses, and excerpts from Charlemagne’s *Admonitio generalis* (an. 789), c. 81, on servile work on Sundays (added slightly later), the bulk of the ms is taken up with the *Collectio uetus Gallica* and additions and appendices to the *Collectio uetus Gallica*, including a clerical interrogation, f. 152v-159v (tit. and inc.: "Incipiunt sententias de floratibus diuersis. homo pro quid dicitur?"), in which are Texts 6, 15, 1 (*Cat*, **44, 95, 2**; f. 154r-156v), and Ps.-Pirminius, *De singulis libris canonicis scarapsus*. Hen says that the catechetical questionnaire on f. 152v-159v, containing our Text 6, “had quite a circulation in the eighth century” (p. 126, my emphasis) and on it to see A. Wilmart, ‘Les Messes de la collection de Saint-Amand,’ *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 3, 1923, p. 69, n. 15. I have now seen Wilmart’s article, and on p. 69, in the course of describing the contents of Paris 1603, he says:

“un questionnaire catéchétique qui paraît avoir joui de quelque faveur dans les milieux barbares du VIII^e siècle: *Incipiunt sententias defloratibus diuersis. Homo pro quid dicitur...nullatenus sunt recipienda* (fol. 152v-159v).” Then he footnotes this statement with a reference to W. Schmitz, *Miscellanea Tironiana* (Leipzig, 1896), 28–34, who knows a redaction of the text in Tironian notes in Vaticano, BAV, Vat. Reg. lat. 846, s. IX, perhaps from Micy. But, says Wilmart, many other exemplars have been found of this catechetical questionnaire, which would make possible a good edition, and lists: Einsiedeln, SB 281 (s. VIII^{ex}), p. 60–77; St. Gallen, SB 230 (s. IXⁱⁿ), p. 316–25; St. Gallen, SB 225 (s. IX), p. 461-473, text incomplete; and Zurich, ZB, Rh. 104 (s. IX), f. 94-99, text incomplete. I have not yet seen these mss to check if they have the same version of Text 6 as in Paris, BnF, lat. 1603. But Wilmart also says (p. 68-69) that the copyist (Martin) of f. 70-192 of Paris 1603 “a vraisemblablement reproduit, peut-être en l’exagérant, la disposition d’un modèle exécuté un demi-siècle environ auparavant.” Wilmart’s article is really on the masses which appear in it. He concludes (p. 76) that the masses copied from older liturgical books were copied to keep them in memory at a time when their missals were condemned to disappear, that is, with the liturgical reforms associated with Pope Hadrian, Charlemagne, and Alcuin. These masses, then, are “l’effet d’un conflit considérable, qui dut troubler la vie intime du monastère vers les années 785-790.” The monks at St.-Amand, where Wilmart believes Paris 1603 was written, were under extreme pressure to follow the liturgical reforms, because of their intimate association with the court. But they were attached to certain texts in sacramentaries that should now be replaced. If they did not agree with the court on this liturgical reform, could they also not have agreed with the court on its position against images? If this ms was intended as a preservation volume reflecting a “considerable conflict” with the court, could its compiler have included the clerical questionnaire

containing Texts 6, 15, and 1 because he found that at least two of them (Texts 1 and 6) were mental images, substituting for the ban against physical images?

The second ms is Albi, BM 40, which Mordek dates s. IX^{1/2}, southern France, but Bischoff dates s. IX, southern France. It is now 88 f. (incompl.); 249 x 162 mm. (10" x 6 1/2"); 23 lines. There are some decorated initial letters (f. 13v, 18v, 23r, 42v). It was perhaps a monastic schoolbook for instructing clergy. Following explanation of the words *carmentes* and *uocales*; on letters, inc.: "Incipit de littera. lector scisti litteras, quid me interrogas de littera"; sentences attributed to Augustine on the Old and New Testament, inc.: "Incipiunt sententias sancti augustini tam de uetus quam de nouo testamento. interrogas. quid interes inter uetus et nouum testamento," is the same clerical interrogation (f. 13v-18v) as in Paris, BnF, 1603, in which are Texts 6, 15, 1 (f. 15r-17r), and also Ps.-Pirminius, *De singulis libris canonicis scarapsus*. Following that are homilies and excerpts from the fathers.

The third ms is El Escorial, RBSL, L. III. 8, ca. 860-870, Senlis (Kottje, 'Zur Herkunft,' p. 623–24); 189 f.; 230 x 172 mm. (9 1/4" x 6 3/4"), 24 lines. Kottje calls it "a collection volume for the work of pastoral care" (p. 623). I have termed it a bishop's pastoral manual. Amid a variety of kinds of texts useful to a bishop for himself or instructing his clergy (such as excerpted canons; episcopal capitularies; a horologium; expositions on the Lord's prayer, the creed, the mass, baptism; a penitential; a computus, a letter of Bishop Herpuin of Senlis to Archbishop Hincmar of Reims and three canons on paying the tithe and offering the first fruits, on degraded priests, on priests wearing their stoles; a letter *dimissoria* of Bishop Herpuin of Senlis for a deacon, addressed to Archbishop Wenilo of Rouen (sat 858-870), is a clerical interrogation (f. 77r-78r) containing Texts 6 and 15 (f. 77v-78r). The clerical interrogation is the same as the one in Paris 1603 and Albi 40,

except that it is incomplete at the beginning and Text 15 is incomplete. (It ends in the middle of a line, $\frac{3}{4}$ of the way down f. 78r, and immediately on the same line, without a break or title, in the same hand, begins a sermon, which goes to the end of f. 79v.) We can compare the three clerical interrogations of Paris 1603, Albi 40 and Escorial L. III. 8:

Paris 1603, f. 152v-159v: INCIPIVNT SENTENTIAS DE FLORATIBVS DIVERSIS. Homo pro quid dicitur? Resp. homo dicitur ab humo, quia de limo terrae formatus est. Inter. quibus substantiis constat homo?... (f. 153v:) Inter. es baptizatus? Resp. sic sum. Inter. Pro quid? Resp. propter illa sex peccata quod admisit adam... (f. 154r:) et ecce ego uobiscum sum omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem saeculi. Inter. Credis resurrectionem?... (f. 154v) secundum opera sua (= Text 6). Inter. quatenus dicis homo es christianus, baptizatus es, resurrectionem credis. expone mihi fidem tuam quomodo credis?... (f. 156r) non amisit diuinitatem (= Text 15). Inter. edissere mihi de caeleste generatione... (f. 156v) sed de uxore generatum (= Text 1). Inter. pro quid christus filius dei in iordane ab iohanne baptizatus est? Respondit. prima causa fuit ut... (f. 157) Inter. quid est fides?... (f. 158r) deinde per propheta deinde agiographa pro qua causa id ad fidem nostrum roborandam (at this point Albi 40, f. 18v, ends agreement with Paris 1603 and begins Ps.-Pirminius' Scarapsus, with a large decorated initial letter. Paris 1603 continues:} quia moyses sentencias... the interrogations continue to f. 159v)... nullatenus sunt recipiendos". Then follow more "additions to the *Collectio uetus Gallica*, before Ps.-Pirminius' Scarapsus begins on f. 163r.

Albi, BM 40, f. 13v-18v: INTERROGACIONES DE DIVERSIS. homo pro quid dicitur... (= the same material as in Paris 1603, with myriad minor variations, until f. 18v, as noted above.

El Escorial, RBSL, L. III. 8, f. 77r-78r = clerical interrogation: INCIPIUNT INTERROGATIONES. INT. Es baptizatus? Resp. Sic sum. Int. pro quid? Resp. propter illa sex peccata...(f. 77v) ad consummationem saeculi. Int. Credis reurrectionem?...secundum opera sua (=Text 6). Int. quatenus dicis homo es christianus, baptizatus es, resurrectionem credis. expone mihi fidem tuam quomodo credis...(f. 78r) procedens spiritus sanctus (= Text 15, incomplete). Omnes homines masculi uel femine debetis intellegere quod dominus fecit caelum et terram et in caelo misit solem et lunam...(f. 79v) altera die dicebimus pius deus nos liberare et saluare dignetur qui uiuit et regnat in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

Thus, these three mss show that their compilers did not copy blocks of material without careful regard of the contents. If a traditional block of material was Texts 6, 15, 1 in a clerical interrogation that began with a question on the origin of the word "man," the compiler of the Escorial ms read this material and made a decision over it, about what to eliminate (whether he was simply trying to abbreviate, or did not like what he read, or thought it was unnecessary or inappropriate for his audience). I have suggested above that Text 1 may have been composed in relation to the Adoptionist controversy. This had long blown over at the time the Escorial ms was written, and its compiler could have eliminated Text 1 for that reason.

Text 6 is specifically on the resurrection of the dead; Text 15 is on the faith more generally. It begins: "Set out for me your faith, how you believe. (Response.) I believe in one God the Father almighty, and the rest, which follows in the Nicene Creed. (Expone mihi fidem tuam, quomodo credis. (Responsio:) Credo in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem, et reliqua, quae secuntur de

symbolo Nicaeno.) Text 15 continues with interrogations on the Trinity and how the Son is both less than and equal to the Father. One would think that Text 15 would precede Text 6, that is, that the priest would be questioned on his knowledge of the creed before his belief in the resurrection of the dead. But the connection between the resurrection of the dead and the creed is not simply that the resurrection of the dead is one of the articles in the [Nicene-Constantinopolitan] creed. Rather, without belief in the resurrection of the dead, *your faith is in vain*. It is worth repeating Paul's words to the Corinthians: "Brothers and sisters: If Christ is preached as raised from the dead, how can some among you say there is no resurrection of the dead? If there is no resurrection of the dead, then neither has Christ been raised. And if Christ has not been raised, then empty too is our preaching; empty, too, your faith. Then we are also false witnesses to God, because we testified against God that he raised Christ, whom he did not raise if the dead are not raised. For if the dead are not raised, neither has Christ been raised, and if Christ has not been raised, your faith is vain; you are still in your sins" (1 Cor. 15, 12-17).

This passage might explain why Text 6 is placed directly before Text 15: if you do not, first of all, believe in the resurrection of the dead, then Christ did not resurrect, and anything else you believe is pointless. Paul's entire argument is based on the assumption that Christ was fully human and truly died, like all humans must. ("If there is no resurrection of the dead, then neither has Christ been raised.") Although Text 6 does not say 'I believe in the resurrection of the dead because Christ resurrected and he is fully human like us,' Text 6 does bring Christ's resurrection to mind in saying that we will rise as 30-year-olds. In fact, the PRG-X version of Text 6 quoted above says: "I believe that after I die I will rise again in that perfect age in which Christ himself resurrected."

Was there a specific heresy that Text 6 was addressing? One thinks of Docetism when one thinks of not truly human; or perhaps monophysitism, in which the doctrine that Christ really had only one divine nature could lead to denying a bodily resurrection.

In sum, this commentary has focused on the idea of a text being a mental image, the continuation of an idea I proposed with Text 1. As for the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh itself, I hardly speak about it, except for mentioning its possible connection to Docetism or Monophysitism. Under Text 13 I list what all of our Texts say about the condition of our resurrected bodies, and under Text 14 I talk about the resurrection of the flesh (carnis) vs. resurrection of the dead (mortuorum). Perhaps I should consolidate.