

QUESTION 55

The Manifestation of the Resurrection

Next we have to consider the manifestation of the resurrection. And on this topic there are six questions: (1) Should Christ's resurrection have been made manifest to all men, or only to certain specific men? (2) Would it have been fitting for them to see Christ rising? (3) Would it have been fitting for Him to live with His disciples [continuously] after the resurrection? (4) Was it fitting for Him to appear to His disciples with a different visage? (5) Was it fitting for Him to make His resurrection manifest by means of proofs (*argumentis*)? (6) Were those proofs sufficient?

Article 1

Should Christ's resurrection have been made manifest to everyone?

It seems that it Christ's resurrection should have been made manifest to everyone (*resurrectio Christi debuerit omnibus manifestari*):

Objection 1: Just as a public penance is due for a public sin—this according to 1 Timothy 5:20 (“Rebuke [the presbyter] who sins in front of them all”)—so a public reward is due for public merit. But as Augustine says in *Super Ioannem*, “The brightness of the resurrection is the reward for the humility of the passion.” Therefore, since Christ's passion was made manifest to everyone by His suffering in public, it seems that the glory of His resurrection should have been made manifest to everyone.

Objection 2: Just as Christ's passion is ordered toward our salvation, so too is His resurrection—this according to Romans 4:25 (“He rose again for our justification”). But that which involves the common good should be made manifest to all. Therefore, Christ's resurrection should have been made manifest to everyone and not [just] to certain specific individuals.

Objection 3: Those to whom the resurrection was made manifest were witnesses of the resurrection; hence, Acts 3:15 says, “... whom God has raised up from the dead; of this we are witnesses.” But they gave this testimony by preaching in public, something that does not befit women—this according to 1 Corinthians 14:34 (“Let women keep silence in the churches”) and 1 Timothy 2:2 (“I do not allow a woman to teach”). Therefore, it seems unfitting for the resurrection to have been made manifest first to women and then to people more generally.

But contrary to this: Acts 10:40-41 says, “God raised Him on the third day and caused Him to be plainly seen, not by all the people, but by witnesses designated beforehand by God.”

I respond: Among the things that are known, some are known by a common law of nature, whereas others are known by a special gift of grace, such as those things that are divinely revealed. Among the latter, as Dionysius explains in *De Caelestis Hierarchibus*, it is a divinely instituted law that they be revealed without mediation to those who are higher and then delivered through their mediation to those who are lower—this is clear in the case of the ordering of the heavenly spirits.

Now those things that pertain to future glory exceed the common cognition of men—this according to Isaiah 64:4 (“Eye has not seen, O God, without you, what you have prepared for those who love you”). And so things of this sort are not known by man unless they have been divinely revealed; as the Apostle puts it in 1 Corinthians 2:10, “To us God has revealed them through His Spirit.” Therefore, it was because Christ rose by a glorious resurrection that His resurrection was not made manifest to all the people, but [only] to some, by whose testimony it would be brought to the knowledge of the others.

Reply to objection 1: Christ's passion was endured in a body that still had a passible nature, which is something known to everyone by a common law. And this is why Christ's passion could be made manifest to the whole people without mediation. By contrast, Christ's resurrection was effected “by the glory of the Father,” as the Apostle puts it in Romans 6:4. And so it was not made manifest to all the

people without mediation, but [only] to some.

Now the claim that a public punishment is imposed on those whose sin is public should be understood to apply to punishment in the present life. And, similarly, public merits should be rewarded in public, in order that others might be stirred to emulate them. By contrast, the punishments and rewards of the future life will be made manifest in public not to everyone, but specifically to those who have been preordained to this by God.

Reply to objection 2: Just as Christ's resurrection is for the common salvation of everyone, so it comes into the knowledge of everyone—not, to be sure, in such a way that it is made manifest to everyone without mediation, but instead in such a way that it comes to some individuals, through whose testimony it is delivered to everyone.

Reply to objection 3: A woman (*mulier*) is not permitted to teach publicly in a church, but a woman is permitted to give instruction to certain individuals by admonition privately at home (*permittitur autem ei privatim domestica aliquos admonitione instruere*). And so as Ambrose puts it in *Super Lucam*, “A woman (*femina*) is sent to those who are at home,” but it is not the case that a woman is sent to the people to give [public] testimony about the resurrection.

Now the reason why Christ appeared first to women is in order that woman, who first brought the beginning of death to mankind, might likewise be the first to announce the beginnings of Christ's rising again in glory. Hence, Cyril says, “Woman, who was at one time the minister of death, is the first to see and announce the venerable mystery of the resurrection. The female gender has thereby procured absolution from its ignominy and the removal of its curse.”

At the same time, what is likewise shown by this is that, as far as the state of glory is concerned, the feminine sex suffers no disadvantage; instead, if women burn with a greater charity, then they will derive greater glory from seeing God. Thus the women who loved our Lord more intimately, to the extent that “they did not draw back from His sepulcher even as His disciples were drawing back” (Gregory), were the first to see our Lord rising in glory.

Article 2

Would it have been fitting for the disciples to see Christ rising?

It seems that it would have been fitting for the disciples to see Christ rising (*conveniens fuisse quod discipuli viderent Christum resurgere*):

Objection 1: It belonged to the disciples to testify to Christ's resurrection—this according to Acts 4:33 (“With great power the apostles gave testimony to the resurrection of Jesus Christ, our Lord”). But eyewitness testimony is the most certain of all (*certissimum est testimonium de visu*). Therefore, it would have been fitting for them to see the very resurrection of Christ.

Objection 2: In order for them to have the certitude of faith, the disciples witnessed Christ's ascension—this according to Acts 1:9 (“He was lifted up before their eyes” (*videntibus illis*)). But it was similarly necessary for them to have the certitude of faith with respect to Christ's resurrection. Therefore, Christ should likewise have risen while the disciples were watching.

Objection 3: The resurrection of Lazarus was a sign of Christ's future resurrection. But our Lord raised Lazarus before their eyes. Therefore, it seems that Christ should likewise have risen while the disciples were watching.

But contrary to this: Mark 16:9 says, “When our Lord had risen from the dead early on the first day of the week, He appeared first to Mary Magdalene.” But Mary Magdalene had not seen Him rise;

instead, when she looked for Him in the sepulcher, she heard from an angel, “The Lord has risen; He is not here” (Luke 24:6). Therefore, no one saw Him rise.

I respond: As the Apostle says in Romans 13:1, “Those things that are from God are well ordered.” Now as is clear from Dionysius in *De Caelestis Hierarchibus*, chap. 4, the order instituted by God is such that those things that are beyond men are revealed to them by angels. But Christ did not return to a life that is commonly known to men, but instead returned to an immortal life and one conformed to God—this according to Romans 6:10 (“The life that He lives, He lives unto God”). And so it was not fitting for the very resurrection of Christ to be seen without mediation by men; instead, it was fitting for it to be announced to them by angels. Hence, in *Super Matthaëum* Hilary says, “The reason why an angel is the first herald of the resurrection is in order that the resurrection might be announced as a service to the Father’s will.”

Reply to objection 1: The apostles were able to testify to Christ’s resurrection even as eyewitnesses, since, trusting their own eyes, they saw the living Christ, whom they had known to be dead, after His resurrection.

Still, just as the beatific vision is arrived at through the hearing that belongs to faith, so men came to the vision of the risen Christ through what they first heard from angels.

Reply to objection 2: Christ’s ascension transcended the common knowledge of men not with respect to its starting point (*quantum ad terminum a quo*), but only with respect to its ending point (*solum quantum terminum ad quem*). And so the disciples were able to see Christ’s ascension with respect to its starting point, i.e., insofar as He was lifted up from the earth. However, they did not see it with respect to its ending point, since they did not see how He was received into heaven.

By contrast, Christ’s resurrection transcended common knowledge both (a) with respect to its starting point, insofar as His soul returned from hell and His body exited from the closed sepulcher, and (b) with respect to its ending point, insofar as He acquired the life of glory (*est adeptus vitam gloriosam*). And so it was not fitting for the resurrection to be effected in such a way that it might be seen by a human being.

Reply to objection 3: Lazarus was raised from the dead in order to return to a life like the one he had before—something that does not transcend the common knowledge of men. And so the argument is not similar in the two cases.

Article 3

Should Christ have lived continuously with His disciples after the resurrection?

It seems that Christ should have lived continuously with His disciples after the resurrection (*Christus post resurrectionem debuerit continue cum discipulis conversari*):

Objection 1: Christ appeared to His disciples after the resurrection in order (a) to give them assurance of their faith in the resurrection and (b) to bring consolation to those who were troubled—this according to John 20:20 (“The disciples rejoiced at the sight of the Lord”). But they would have been more certain and more consoled if He had shown His presence continuously. Therefore, He should have lived with them continuously.

Objection 2: As Acts 1:3 relates, Christ, after having risen from the dead, did not immediately ascend into heaven, but instead ascended after forty days. But in that intervening time He could not have lived more appropriately in any place other than where His disciples were gathered as well. Therefore, it seems that He should have lived continuously with them.

Objection 3: As Augustine points out in *De Consensu Evangelistarum*, we read that Christ appeared five times on the very Sunday of His resurrection: “first of all, to the women at the tomb; second, to the same women on their way home after leaving the tomb; third, to Peter; fourth, to two individuals who were heading to a village; and, fifth, to a group of the disciples in Jerusalem, when Thomas was not with them.” Therefore, it seems that He should have appeared at least more than once on the other days before His ascension.

Objection 4: Before His passion our Lord had said to His disciples, “After I have risen, I will go before you into Galilee” (Matthew 26:32). Likewise, the angel, and our Lord Himself, said the same thing to the women after the resurrection (Matthew 28:7 and 28:10). And yet before this He was seen by them in Jerusalem—both on the very day of the resurrection, as was noted above (obj. 3), and likewise eight days later, as we read in John 20:26. Therefore, it does not seem that He interacted with His disciples in a fitting manner after the resurrection.

But contrary to this: John 20:26 says, “After eight days Christ appeared to His disciples.” Therefore, He did not live with them continuously.

I respond: With respect to the resurrection, two things had to be made clear to the disciples, viz., (a) the *truth of the resurrection* and (b) the *glory of the risen Christ*.

Now in order for the *truth of the resurrection* to be made manifest, it is sufficient that Christ appeared many times to His disciples, talked with them on familiar terms, ate and drank with them, and presented Himself to them to be touched.

On the other hand, in order to make manifest the *glory of the resurrection*, He willed not to live with them continuously as He had before, lest He seem to have risen again to a life like the one He had before. Hence, in Luke 24:44 He says to them, “These are the words which I spoke to you while I was still with you.” He was, to be sure, at that time with them by His corporeal presence, but before that time He had been with them not only by His corporeal presence, but also by being like them in mortality (*per similitudinem mortalitatis*). Hence, Bede, commenting on the quoted words, says, “‘When I was still with you’—that is to say, ‘when I was still in mortal flesh, as you yourselves are’. At that time He had, to be sure, been raised from the dead in the same flesh, but He was not with them in the same mortality.”

Reply to objection 1: Christ’s frequently appearing was enough to give the disciples assurance of the truth of the resurrection, but continuous life together could have led them into error if they came to believe that He had risen to a life like the one that He previously had.

On the other hand, He promised them the consolation of His continuous presence in another life—this according to John 16:22 (“I will see you again, and your heart will rejoice, and no one will take your joy away from you”).

Reply to objection 2: The reason why Christ did not live continuously with His disciples was not that He thought some other place to be more appropriate, but that He judged that it would be more appropriate for instructing His disciples if He did not live with them continuously—and this for the reason already explained.

Now we do not know which places He occupied corporeally in the intervening time, since (a) Scripture does not hand this down to us and (b) His Lordship extends to every place.

Reply to objection 3: The reason why He appeared more frequently on the first day was that the disciples had to be alerted through many indications in order to gain faith in the resurrection from the beginning. But after they had gained this faith, it was unnecessary for them, already reassured, to be instructed by such frequent appearances.

Hence, we do not read in the Gospels that He appeared to them after the first day except for five times. For as Augustine explains in *De Consensu Evangelistarum*, after the first five appearances, “... sixth, He appeared to them when Thomas saw Him; seventh, at the sea of Tiberias; eighth, on a mountain

in Galilee, according to Matthew; ninth, Mark says that [He appeared] to [the eleven] for the last time while they were at table, since they were no longer going to eat with Him on earth; tenth, on that very day—no longer on earth but lifted up into a cloud—when He ascended into heaven. But not all things were written down, as John points out (John 20:30 and 21:25). For Christ got together with the disciples often before He ascended into heaven.” And this was for their consolation. Hence, 1 Corinthians 15:6-7 says that He appeared to more than five hundred brethren together, and then appeared to James. No mention of these appearances is made in the Gospels.

Reply to objection 4: In commenting on Matthew 26:32 (“After I have risen, I will go before you into Galilee”), Chrysostom says, “He is not going to some far off region in order to appear to them, but to His own people and in those very places”—where for the most part they had lived with Him—“in order that they might thereby believe that He who had been crucified was the very one who rose.” Again, the reason why “He says that He is going to Galilee is in order to free them from fear of the Judeans.”

So, then, as Ambrose says in *Super Lucam*, “Our Lord told the disciples that they would see Him in Galilee, but He first presented Himself to them when they were hunkered down in the locked room out of fear. Nor was this the breaking of a promise, but it was instead the premature fulfillment of the promise out of kindness. But afterwards, when their minds had been strengthened, they went to Galilee.

Alternatively, nothing prevents us from supposing that there were fewer individuals in the locked room and many more on the mountain.” For, as Eusebius says, “Two evangelists, viz., Luke and John, write that He appeared in Jerusalem only to the eleven, whereas the other two evangelists said that the angel, along with our Savior, told not only the eleven, but all the disciples and brethren, to hurry to Galilee.” (These are the ones whom Paul mentions when he says, “Then He appeared to more than five hundred brethren at once” (1 Corinthians 15:6).) “The more accurate solution, however, is that He first appeared once or twice to those who were hiding in Jerusalem, in order to comfort them. By contrast, in Galilee it was not in secret, or just once or twice, that He showed Himself to them with great power, ‘presenting Himself to them alive after His passion by many proofs’, as Luke testifies in Acts 1:3.”

An alternative reply is that, as Augustine explains in *De Consensu Evangelistarum*, “what was said by the angel and by our Lord, viz., that He would ‘go before them into Galilee’, has to be understood as a prophecy.

“For it has to be understood to occur in Galilee, taken under the signification of a *transmigration*, because they were going to transmigrate from the people of Israel to the gentiles, who would not accept the preaching of the apostles unless our Lord prepared their way in the hearts of men. And this is signified by the words ‘He will go before you into Galilee’.

“On the other hand, insofar as Galilee is taken as a *revelation*, we are to understand that our Lord is no longer in the form of a servant, but is instead in that form in which He is equal to the Father and which He promised to those who love Him. Although He has gone before us in this sense, He has not abandoned us.”

Article 4

Was it fitting for Christ to appear to the disciples with a different visage?

It seems that it was not fitting for Christ to appear to the disciples with a different visage (*Christus non debuerit discipulis in alia effigie apparere*):

Objection 1: Only what is can appear in accord with the truth. But in Christ there was only one visage. Therefore, if Christ appeared with another visage (*in alia effigie*), then this was not a veridical apparition, but a deceptive one (*non fuit apparitio vera sed ficta*). But that is absurd, since, as Augustine

says in *83 Quaestiones*, “If He deceives, He is not the truth, but Christ is the truth.” Therefore, it seems that it was not fitting for Christ to appear to the disciples with a different visage.

Objection 2: Nothing can appear with a different visage than it has unless the eyes of those seeing it are held under the spell of illusions (*nisi oculi intuentium aliquibus praestigiis detineantur*). But since illusions of this sort are effected by the magical arts, they are inappropriate for Christ—this according to 2 Corinthians 6:15 (“What harmony is there between Christ and Belial?”). Therefore, it seems that it was not fitting for Christ to appear with a different visage.

Objection 3: Just as our faith is made certain by Sacred Scripture, so the disciples were made certain in their faith in the resurrection by Christ’s appearances. But as Augustine argues in *Epistola ad Hieronymum*, if even one lie is received into Sacred Scripture, the entire authority of Sacred Scripture will be disproved (*infirmabitur tota Sacrae Scripturae auctoritas*). Therefore, if in even one apparition Christ appeared to the disciples in a way different from the way He was, than whatever they saw in Christ after the resurrection will be disproved. But this is absurd. Therefore, it was not fitting for Him to appear with a different visage.

But contrary to this: Mark 16:12 says, “After this, He was manifested with a different visage (*in alia effigie*) to two of them as they were walking into the country.”

I respond: As has been explained (aa. 1-2), Christ’s resurrection had to be made manifest to men in the manner in which divine things are revealed to them. But divine things are made known to men insofar as men are affected in diverse ways. For those who have a well-disposed mind perceive divine things according to their truth, whereas those who have minds that are not well-disposed perceive divine things with a sort of confusion that belongs to doubt or error. For as 1 Corinthians 2:14 says, “The sensual man (*animalis homo*) does not perceive the things that are of the Spirit of God.”

And this is why, after his resurrection, Christ appeared to some, who were well-disposed, with His own visage, whereas He appeared with a different visage to those who already seemed to be growing tepid in their faith, even to the point of their saying, “We were hoping that He was going to redeem Israel” (Luke 24:21). Hence, in a certain homily Gregory says, “He showed Himself to them in His body in the way in which He existed in their minds. For instance, because in their hearts He was still a stranger to the Faith, He made a pretense of going on farther”—that is, as if He were a stranger.

Reply to objection 1: As Augustine says in *De Quaestionibus Evangeliorum*, “Not everything of which we make a pretense is a lie. On the one hand, when we make a pretense of something that does not signify anything, then it is a lie. But, on the other hand, when our pretense has some signification, then it is not a lie, but some figure of the truth. Otherwise, all the things that have been said figuratively by wise and holy men, or even by our Lord Himself, will be counted as lies, since according to our usual understanding, truth does find a place in such sayings. And as with words, deeds are also feigned without lying, in order to signify something.” And so it happened in the case just mentioned above, as has been explained.

Reply to objection 2: As Augustine says in *De Consensu Evangelistarum*, “Our Lord was able to transform His flesh in such a way that there really was a true visage other than the one that they were used to seeing. For before His passion He had been transfigured on the mountain in such a way that His face shone like the sun.

“But this is not what happened [after the resurrection] (*sed non ita nunc factum est*). For it is not unreasonable to hold that the impediment in their eyes came from Satan, lest they recognize Jesus.” Hence Luke 24:16 says, “But their eyes were kept from recognizing Him.”

Reply to objection 3: This argument would go through if they had not been led from the look of the unfamiliar visage back to truly seeing Christ’s visage. For as Augustine says in the same place, “The permission”—namely, that their eyes should be held fast in the way noted above—“was granted by

Christ only until the Sacrament of the Bread, so that when they had shared in the unity of His body, the enemy's impediment may be understood to have been removed, with the result that Christ could be recognized." From there he goes on to add in the same place, "'Their eyes were opened, and they recognized Him' (Luke 24:31)—not that before this they had been walking with their eyes closed, but that there was something in them because of which they were not permitted to recognize what they saw, i.e., something that fog or some humor would normally cause."

Article 5

Was it fitting for Christ to make the reality of the resurrection clear by means of proofs?

It seems that it was not fitting for Christ to make the reality of the resurrection clear by means of proofs (*Christus veritatem resurrectionis non debuerit argumentis declarare*):

Objection 1: Ambrose says, "Get rid of the proofs when it is faith that is inquiring (*tolle argumenta ubi fides quaeritur*).” But what is inquiring about Christ's resurrection is faith (*circa resurrectionem Christi quaeritur fides*). Therefore, proofs have no place.

Objection 2: Gregory says, "Faith has no merit if human reason provides the test for it (*fides non habet meritum cui human ratio praebet experimentum*).” But it was not Christ's role to empty faith of its merit. Therefore, it was not His role to confirm the resurrection by proofs.

Objection 3: Christ came into the world so that men might acquire beatitude through Him—this according to John 10:10 ("I have come so that they might have life, and have it more abundantly"). But by showing proofs of the sort in question He seems to be posing an impediment to human beatitude; for John 20:29 says from the mouth of our Lord, "Blessed are they who have not seen and have believed." Therefore, it seems that it was not fitting for Christ to make His resurrection manifest through proofs.

But contrary to this: Acts 1:3 says, "Christ appeared to His disciples during forty days by many proofs, speaking of the kingdom of God."

I respond: 'Proof' (*argumentum*) is said in two ways: (a) sometimes 'proof' means a line of reasoning that effects faith with respect to a matter of doubt (*quaecumque ratio rei dubiae faciens fidem*), whereas (b) sometimes 'proof' means a sensible sign that leads to the manifestation of some truth, in the way that Aristotle sometimes uses the name 'proof' (*argumentum*) in his books.

(a) Therefore, taking 'proof' in the first way, Christ did not prove (*non probavit*) the resurrection to His disciples through proofs (*per argumenta*). For this sort of argumentative proof (*talis probatio argumentativa*) proceeds from principles that are such that if they were not known to His disciples, then nothing would be made manifest to them by means of those principles, since nothing can come to be known from what is not known. On the other hand, if the principles were known to them, those principles would not transcend human reason, and so they would not be effective for building up faith in the resurrection, which exceeds human reason. For as *Posterior Analytics* 1 explains, the principles have to be taken from the same genus [as the conclusions].

He did, however, make His resurrection credible to them by appeal to the authority of Sacred Scripture (*probavit autem eis resurrectionem suam per auctoritatem Sacrae Scripturae*), which is a foundation of the Faith, when He said, "All things must be fulfilled that are written about me in the Law and the Psalms and the Prophets," as is reported in Luke 24:44.

(b) On the other hand, if 'proof' is taken in the second way, then in this sense Christ is said to have made His resurrection clear by means of proofs, insofar as He showed through some very evident signs that He had truly risen. Hence, where we have "*in multis argumentis*" [by many proofs] (Luke 1:3), the

Greek text has ‘*tekmerium*’, which means ‘an evident sign for proving’, in the place of ‘*argumentum*’.

There were two reasons why Christ showed these signs of His resurrection to the disciples:

First of all, because their hearts were not disposed toward accepting faith in the resurrection easily. Hence, in Luke 24:25 He says to them, “O foolish ones and slow of heart to believe [all that the prophets have spoken]! And Mark 16:14 says, “He upbraided them for their lack of faith and hardness of heart.”

Second, in order that, given that signs of this sort were shown to them, their testimony might be rendered more efficacious—this according to 1 John 1:2 (“What we have seen and have heard, and what our hands have handled, this we testify to.”

Reply to objection 1: Ambrose is speaking here of proofs that proceed according to human reason, and, as has been shown, such proofs are invalid with respect to making known those things that belong to the Faith.

Reply to objection 2: The merit of faith comes from the fact that a man believes by God’s mandate what he does not see. Hence, the only sort of argument (*sola ratio*) that excludes merit is an argument which makes one see by scientific knowledge (*per scientiam*) what is being proposed as something to be accepted on faith (*id quod credendum propositum*). And this sort of argument is a demonstrative argument (*ratio demonstrativa*). But Christ did not put forth arguments of this sort (*huiusmodi rationes*) in order to make the resurrection evident.

Reply to objection 3: As has been explained, the merit of beatitude that faith causes is not totally excluded unless a man refuses to believe anything that he does not see. But a man’s believing what he does not see because of visible signs does not totally empty either his faith or his merit. For instance, Thomas, to whom it was said, “Because you have seen me, you have believed,” saw one thing and believed another: he saw the wounds and believed God.

On the other hand, an individual who does not need aids of this sort in order to believe has a more perfect faith. Hence, to show the lack of faith in particular individuals, our Lord says in John 4:48, “Unless you see signs and wonders, you do not believe.” Accordingly, one can understand that those who have such a prompt mind that they believe God even without seeing signs are blessed in comparison with those who do not believe unless they see such signs.

Article 6

Were the proofs put forth by Christ sufficient to make manifest the reality of His resurrection?

It seems that the proofs put forth by Christ were not sufficient to make manifest the reality of His resurrection (*argumenta quae Christus induxit non sufficienter manifestaverunt veritatem resurrectionis eius*):

Objection 1: After the resurrection Christ showed nothing to men that angels, appearing to men, would not also show or also be able to show. For angels have often shown themselves to men in human form, and they have spoken with them and lived with them and eaten with them as if they themselves were real men. This is clear from Genesis 18 in the case of the angels whom Abraham received with hospitality, and it is clear from Tobit 5:5 in the case of the angel who “took Tobias away and brought him back.” And yet angels do not have real bodies that are naturally united to them, which is what is required for a resurrection. Therefore, the signs that Christ showed to His disciples were not sufficient to make His resurrection manifest to them.

Objection 2: Christ rose by a glorious resurrection—that is, as someone having a human nature

together with glory. But some of the things that Christ showed to His disciples seemed to be contrary to *human nature*, e.g., the fact that He vanished from their sight, and the fact that He came in to them through the closed doors, whereas other things that He showed to them seemed to be contrary to *glory*, e.g., the fact that he ate and drank, and the fact that He had scars from His wounds. Therefore, it seems that those proofs were not sufficient, or even appropriate, for making the resurrection manifest.

Objection 3: After the resurrection Christ's body was not such that it was fit to be touched by a mortal human; hence, in John 2:17 He Himself said to Mary Magdalene, "Do not touch me, for I have not yet ascended to my Father." Therefore, it was not appropriate for Him, in order to make the resurrection manifest, to show Himself to His disciples as touchable.

Objection 4: Among the gifts of a glorified body, the principal one seems to be brightness (*claritas*). But in the case of Christ's resurrection, this gift is not shown by any proof. Therefore, the proofs for making manifest the characteristics of Christ's resurrection were insufficient.

Objection 5: The angels introduced as witnesses to the resurrection seem insufficient because of the disagreements among the evangelists. For in Matthew an angel is described as sitting on the rolled back stone, whereas in Mark the angel is described as seen within by the women who have entered the tomb. Again, a single angel is described by these evangelists, whereas in John there are two angels described as sitting and in Luke two angels described as standing. Therefore, these testimonies to the resurrection seem incompatible with one another.

But contrary to this: Christ, who is "God's wisdom" (1 Corinthians 1:24), "delightfully and appropriately disposes all things," as Wisdom 1:8 says.

I respond: Christ made His resurrection manifest in two ways, viz., (a) by testimony and (b) by proofs, i.e., signs. And each sort of manifestation was sufficient in its own genus.

For He made use of two sorts of *testimony* in order to make His resurrection manifest to the disciples, and neither of them can be refuted. As is clear from all the evangelists, the first of these is the testimony of the angels who announced the resurrection to the women. The second is the testimony of the Scriptures, which, as Luke 24:25-27 and Luke 24:44-47 report, He Himself proposed in order to exhibit the resurrection.

The *proofs* were likewise sufficient to show the resurrection to be *real* and also *glorious*:

He showed that it was a *real* resurrection in one way *on the part of His body*. On this score He showed three things. First of all, that it was a real and solid body, not an imaginary body or a rarified body, such as air. And this He showed by presenting His body as touchable. Hence, in Luke 24:39 He says, "Touch and see; for a ghost does not have flesh and bones, as you see that I have." Second, He showed that it was a human body by presenting to them His true visage, which they saw with their eyes. Third, by showing them the scars of the wounds, He proved that it was numerically the same body that He previously had. Hence, we read in Luke 24:38-39, "He said to them, 'See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself'."

In a second way He showed them the reality of His resurrection *on the part of the soul that was united once again to His body*. And this He showed through the works of the three kinds of life. First of all, through the work of *nutritive* life, by eating and drinking with His disciples, as we read in Luke 24:42-43. Second, through the works of *sentient* life, by replying to the disciples' questions and by greeting those who were present, thereby showing that He could both see and hear. Third, through the works of the *intellective* life, by speaking with them and discoursing on the Scriptures.

And lest anything be lacking in the completeness of the manifestation, He likewise showed that He had a *divine nature* by working the miracle of the catch of fish, and, further, by ascending into heaven while they were watching. For as John 3:13 says, "No one has ascended into heaven except He who has descended from heaven: the Son of Man, who is in heaven."

He also showed the *glory* of His resurrection to the disciples, by coming in to them through the closed doors. This accords with what Gregory says in a homily, “Our Lord presented His flesh to be touched—that flesh which He had brought in through the closed doors—to show that His body was of the same nature and of a different glory.” Similarly, the fact that “He vanished from the sight of the disciples” (Luke 24:31) also involved a property of glory, since it was thereby shown that it was within His power to be seen and not to be seen—which, as was explained above (q. 54, aa. 1-2), belongs to the condition of a glorified body.

Reply to objection 1: Each separate proof would be insufficient to make Christ’s resurrection manifest, but all of them taken together make Christ’s resurrection completely manifest—especially because of the testimony of Scripture, because of what the angels said, and because of the affirmations of Christ Himself confirmed by miracles. Moreover, the angels who appeared did not assert that they were human in the way that Christ asserted that He was truly a man.

Even so, Christ ate in one way and the angels [referred to in the objection] ate in a different way. For since the bodies assumed by the angels were not living or animate bodies, there was no genuine eating, even though there was real chewing of the food and its transfer to the interior part of the assumed body. Hence, in Tobit 12:18-19 the angel himself said, “When I was with you, I seemed to be eating and drinking with you, but I use an invisible food. By contrast, since Christ’s body was truly alive, His eating was genuine. For as Augustine says in *De Civitate Dei* 13, “It is not the *power* to eat, but the *need for* eating, that is removed from risen bodies.” Hence, as Bede puts it, “Christ ate by His power and not out of need.”

Reply to objection 2: As has been explained, some proofs were put forth by Christ to show the reality of His *human nature*, whereas some were put forth to show the *glory* of one who rises from the dead. Now the condition of human nature, insofar as it is thought of in itself, i.e., with respect to the present life, is contrary to the condition of glory—this according to 1 Corinthians 15:43 (“What is sown in weakness will rise in power”). And so the things that were adduced in order to show the condition of glory seem to conflict with the nature, not absolutely speaking, but in its present state, and vice versa. Hence, Gregory says in a homily, “The Lord manifested two wonders, which are mutually contrary according to human reason, when after the resurrection He showed His body to be both incorruptible and yet touchable.”

Reply to objection 3: As Augustine says in *Super Ioannem*, “What our Lord says, ‘Do not touch me, for I have not yet ascended to my Father’ (John 20:17), is in order that the Church of the gentiles, which did not believe in Christ until He had ascended to the Father, might be prefigured in this woman.

“An alternative is that Jesus wanted to be believed in for Himself, i.e., He wanted to be touched *spiritually*, because He and the Father are one. Indeed, an individual who has advanced to the point of recognizing Him as equal to the Father ascends in a certain way to the Father in his innermost thoughts. By contrast, this woman still believed in Him *carnally* and wept over Him as over a [mere] man.”

Now the fact that we read elsewhere that Mary had touched Christ when, along with the other women, she came up to Him and embraced His feet (Matthew 28:9) “does not raise an issue,” as Severianus says. “For the one act has to do with a prefigurement, the other with her sex; the one is a matter of divine grace, the other is a matter of human nature.”

An alternative reply is, as Chrysostom puts it, “This woman wanted to converse with Christ just as before the passion. Out of joy she was thinking of nothing great, even though Christ’s flesh had been made much better by rising again. And this is why He said, ‘I have not yet ascended to my Father’, as if to say, ‘Do not suppose that I am now leading an earthly life. For the fact that you see me on earth is due to the fact that I have not yet ascended to My Father. But I am going to ascend shortly’. Hence He adds, ‘I am ascending to my Father and to your Father’.”

Reply to objection 4: As Augustine says in *Ad Orosium*, “Our Lord rose with brightened flesh,

but He did not want to appear to the disciples with that brightness, since their eyes were incapable of seeing through such brightness. For if before He died for us and rose again, the disciples were incapable of seeing Him when He was transfigured, how much more incapable they were of seeing Him with the brilliant flesh of the Lord.”

One must also take into account that after the resurrection our Lord wanted mainly to prove that He was the same one who had died. This purpose could have greatly impeded if He were to show them the brightness of His body. For a change that is made in how something looks shows to the highest degree how different it is, since it is sight especially that judges the common sensibles, among which are (a) *one* and *many* and (b) *same* and *different*. On the other hand, before the passion, lest His disciples should come to despise the weakness displayed in the passion, Christ especially wanted to show them the glory of His majesty, which the brightness of His body demonstrates most of all.

And that is why, before the passion, He showed His glory to the disciples ahead of time through the brightness of His body, whereas after the resurrection He showed His glory through other indications.

Reply to objection 5: In *De Consensu Evangelistarum*, Augustine says, “We can grasp that one angel was seen by the women, both according to Matthew and according to Mark, as long as we understand that they entered the tomb, that is, a space that was some sort of walled enclosure, and that there they saw an angel sitting upon the stone which had been rolled back from the tomb, as Matthew says, and that he was sitting on the right side, which is what Mark says. Later on, when they looked around the place in which our Lord’s body had lain, they saw two angels, who were at first seated, as John says, and who afterwards rose so as to be seen standing, as Luke says.”