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General Editor’s Introduction

This volume contains the first part of Johann Gerhard’s commonplace On Death, originally published in 1621 in the eighth volume of Gerhard’s Theological Commonplaces. The eighth volume of the original edition also includes the commonplace On the Resurrection of the Dead. This is the first of the author’s six commonplaces on the last things (eschatology).

This commonplace, with the other eschatology commonplaces, can be traced back to Gerhard’s participation in formal disputations. Beginning on February 5, 1607, Gerhard held monthly disputations in Coburg on theological topics, and in advance of each disputation, the list of theses was printed. On December 3, 1610, Gerhard held a disputation on the “four last things of man.” In Gerhard’s Succinct and Select Aphorisms (1611), the “four last things of man” include death, resurrection, judgment, and then either hell or heaven. On August 17, 1616, Gerhard again held a disputation on eschatology. Eleven years passed between Gerhard’s first disputation on these matters to the publication of volume 8 of the Theological Commonplaces. Also, what started as only sixty-two theses grew to fill two entire tomes (out of nine)—an indication of Gerhard’s great interest in eschatology. After the publication of these commonplaces, Gerhard continued dealing with these topics. On October 27, 1621, Gerhard presided at a disputation on death and resurrection. According to the title page, this disputation promised to expound the topics set forth in the recently published eighth volume of the Theological Commonplaces. A disputation on December 7,
1633, dealt with the status of souls after death. Gerhard published again on purgatory (one of the main topics in the present volume) in 1636 in his Catholic Confession. Gerhard had been teaching at Jena since 1616. From 1616 to 1622, he lectured on polemical theology against the Roman Catholics, Reformed, and Socinians. In 1621, his son Johann Ernst Gerhard (d. 1668), who edited so many of his father’s writings, was born.

Modern readers might wonder how it would be possible to fill two whole volumes in our series with just the topic of death. And is it worth reading, especially all the intricate discussions on what happens to our souls after death and before the resurrection? The value of this volume even for the modern reader should be obvious. It deals not just with death, narrowly, but with other important topics for Christian faith and pastoral care of souls, such as

• Whether human beings are both body and soul, both physical and spiritual, and how these two parts of man relate to each other
• What death is
• Whether God causes or determines the death of individuals
• Whether the soul is immortal and can exist as separate from the body between death and resurrection
• Related to this, whether the souls of deceased Christians go immediately to heaven, even before the resurrection; conversely, whether the souls of unbelievers go immediately to hell
• Reincarnation
• Why Roman Catholic churchmen developed the cult of relics, in which body parts of the saints would be displayed in churches for veneration
• What a biblical, Christian attitude toward dead bodies should be
• Whether Christ’s descent into hell was for the purpose of freeing the believers of the Old Testament
• What happens to unbaptized infants who die
• The good things God gives to Christians through death
• Purgatory

9 Regarding events of Gerhard’s life leading up to 1622, see On the End of the World and on Hell, x.
This final topic, purgatory, is the longest section of the volume. In painstaking
detail, Gerhard weighs every possible argument for and against it. From a modern
Lutheran perspective, perhaps not so much needs to be said. One might think, “Of course
purgatory is false.” So why should one read this, considering also the lack of emphasis
on this topic in contemporary Roman Catholicism? The section on purgatory, too, has
many benefits for readers:

- Clear, detailed exposition of many biblical passages relating to life after
death and the last judgment
- Explanation of many statements of the early church fathers concerning the
afterlife and on then-popular practices, such as praying for deceased loved
ones
- Explanation of how Christians, being at the same time saints and sinners,
are actually purged of their sins before entering heaven
- Humor
- Thorough and Bible-focused refutation of the error of purgatory

Editions of the Theological Commonplaces

There are four main editions of Gerhard’s Theological Commonplaces: the Jena edition of
1610 (the edition printed during Gerhard’s lifetime), the Frankfurt/Hamburg edition of
1657 (edited by Johann Ernst Gerhard, the author’s son), the Tübingen edition of 1762
(edited by Johann Friedrich Cotta), and the Berlin/Leipzig edition of 1863 (edited by
Edward Preuss). Dr. Richard Dinda made his translation from the Preuss edition, and
we have edited the text with an eye not only on Preuss but also on the Cotta edition,
which was employed to correct the many typographical errors of Preuss’s edition (some
of which were carried forward from the Frankfurt/Hamburg edition). At the top of each
page of the Concordia edition, references are given to both the Cotta and Preuss editions.
edition, volume 1, page 143.”

In the preface to his edition, Preuss said that he was reprinting the Jena edition
of 1610. However, instead of including the original Commonplaces I–VII of the Jena
edition, Preuss substituted the four commonplaces he found at the beginning of the
Frankfurt/Hamburg edition. These were published in 1625, after Gerhard had finished
his Theological Commonplaces, with the title “Exegesis, or a more copious explanation
of certain articles of the Christian religion.” They were not meant to be a substitute for

10 For example, the Catechism of the Catholic Church speaks of purgatory as a period or state of
purification that “is entirely different from the punishment of the damned,” and it devotes
just one full page to it out of 688: Catechism of the Catholic Church, 2nd ed. (Vatican City:
Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2000), paras. 1030–32, here at 1031. Emphases may have changed,
but contrast this with the Council of Trent (session 6, canon 30, January 13, 1547), which
states that purgatory is the repentant sinner's debt of temporal punishment and anathematizes
all who disagree: Heinrich Denzinger et al., eds., Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and
para. 1580.
the 1610 Commonplaces I–VII but were intended as a supplement. It is these “Exegesis” Commonplaces that Preuss included, and it is the same that we have previously presented to our readers in the volumes covering Exegesis I–IV. These “Exegesis” Commonplaces have been included with printings of Gerhard’s Theological Commonplaces since the Frankfurt/Hamburg edition; therefore they do belong in this series.

The enumeration of the commonplaces has also presented difficulties. Both Preuss and Cotta presented different numbering systems than the seventeenth-century editions of the Theological Commonplaces. We have decided to follow the original enumeration as found in the Jena and Frankfurt/Hamburg editions. A comparison chart is included on p. xiv.

In the Concordia edition, we refer to the commonplaces included both in the original Jena edition and in Preuss’s edition as, for example, “Commonplace XI.” We refer to the “Exegesis” Commonplaces included in Preuss’s edition as “1625 Exegesis, Commonplace II.” And we refer to the original Commonplaces I–VII, which were not included in Preuss’s edition, as “1610 Commonplace V.” In the indices, reference is given first to the commonplace number, then to the section number. For example: “E3.34” means “1625 Exegesis, Commonplace III, § 34.” And “8.55” means “1610 Commonplace VIII, § 55.” This manner of indexing will allow the reader to refer to any edition of the Theological Commonplaces from the seventeenth century to the present.

Preuss’s edition and this Concordia edition occasionally surround sections of text with double asterisks (**). These sections are Gerhard’s marginal notes on his Theological Commonplaces that his son included in the Frankfurt/Hamburg edition.

**This Volume**

Gerhard often gives enumerated lists in the Theological Commonplaces. Often sublists are embedded within these lists, and since Gerhard uses Arabic numerals for all the lists, the enumeration becomes confusing. Gerhard’s eighteenth-century editor, Johann Friedrich Cotta, tried to clarify the nesting of lists by sometimes using Roman numerals or letters. Our edition has generally followed Cotta’s enumeration, but at times even Cotta’s enumeration is confusing. Rather than confusing things further, we have often let Cotta’s numbering stand.

Preuss’s edition lists the six commonplaces on the last things as “treatises.” At the top margin of volumes 8–9 in that edition, a commonplace number is given only for the first commonplace, On Death. After that, the other last things are listed as the “second treatise” through to the “sixth treatise.”

Nevertheless, on the half-title page of the Preuss edition, the commonplace numbers are given. This manner of treating the “last things” content goes back to the original Jena edition, where commonplace numbers were listed on the title page, but within the volume the commonplaces after On Death

11 Ioannis Gerhard Loci Theologici . . . Tomus Octavus (Berolini: Gust. Schlawitz, 1870); Ioannis Gerhard Loci Theologici . . . Tomus Nonus (Lipsiae: J. C. Hinrichs, 1875). These are the last two volumes of the edition begun by Edward Preuss, though Preuss is not listed as editor for these volumes.
were labeled as the second through sixth treatises.\textsuperscript{12} For the sake of clarity, we follow the reference system as listed on the title pages of the original Jena edition.\textsuperscript{13}

The publication of Gerhard’s \textit{Theological Commonplaces} could not happen without the cooperation of a skilled and dedicated team. Joshua J. Hayes took on the main labor of editing, assisted in this volume by Aaron Jensen and me. Richard J. Dinda († 2017), the original translator, and Paul T. McCain († 2020), Concordia Publishing House interim president (2002–2006) and publisher (2006–2020), are remembered with Christian piety for helping to make this project come about in the first place. Dawn Mirly Weinstock has served as production editor for the series from the beginning. Many other colleagues, both within and outside of Concordia Publishing House, have given their advice and support. For all of these people, the Christian readership and I give thanks to God.

May God the Father, who brings the souls of the deceased righteous to “the bosom of Abraham” and heavenly rest, keep the pious reader firm in this faith, through the Son, in the power of the Holy Spirit, unto life everlasting! Amen.

\textit{Benjamin T. G. Mayes}

\textsuperscript{12} For the Jena ed., see above, p. ix n. 1.
\textsuperscript{13} See below, p. xiv.
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* The Jena ed. (1610) has the same enumeration, except that it lacks the Exegesis. Our edition follows this enumeration as well.
COMMONPLACE XXIX

On Death

Part One
Chapter I: On the Nomenclature

First, the etymology. First, of the Latin word.

§ 15. There is no consensus as to the origin of the word “death” [mors].

(1) Augustine (Hypognost. cont. Pelag., bk. 1, toward the middle) derives it from morsus (“bite”). He says: “It is my opinion that death received this designation from the fact that in a sense Adam was destroyed by the bite of a venomous serpent, that is, of the devil in Eden. For the serpent deceived Adam with its bite when it persuaded him through desire to bite—that is, to eat—what was not permitted. Therefore, as if from ‘bite,’ death received its name, which is also why, when the Lord threatens death in the prophet Hosea [13:14], He says, ‘I shall be your death, O death; hell, I shall be your bite.’” In some ancient verses there is expressed a different reason for the name:

Correctly it was named “death” because it is like a bitter bite
For everyone, from which no one can escape.

(2) Some derive “death” from mora (“wait”), because it awaits and desires all people, or because it is not partial to anyone’s circumstances.

(3) Some want “death” to have been so called from a life already served out [emerita] and finished, and the dead [mortui] to have been called, so to speak, “those who have served out their lives” [emeriti].

(4) There are those who seek a Greek derivation either from μείρω (“to divide”), because death is the separation of the soul from the body; or from μόρος, which signifies “lot, portion, and death.” Thus Homer connects both θάνατος (“death”) and μόρος as synonyms, though the latter word may be more poetic. Scaliger (Exerc. 352) says that “death” is so called from “fate,” the Greek word being μόρος or μοιρα.

Second, of the Greek word.

[Scaliger] thinks that θάνατος (“death”) is so called by etymology, as if it were τάνατος, from τείνω (“stretch”), that is, τανῦω (“to extend”), so that death is what stretches the body from the soul or because it is outstretched, as that which extends itself everywhere. However, Henricus Stephanus (Thes. Graecae linguae, on the word θηψω) quite rightly laughs at these and similar etymologies. He says: “Who in the world does not see that it is a very inept matter to investigate the etymology of a noun derived from a verb and, in fact, of a noun which retains even some form of the verb? Who does not see that here it can be said, as in the proverb: That puts the cart before the horse?” Stobaeus (Sermon 119) cites multiple playful etymologies like this from Themistius. They want γένεσις (“begetting”) to be so called from νεσίς επί γῆν (“inclination and leaning to the ground”); γενέθλιον (“birthday”) [to be] from ὡς ἀρχήν γενομένη ἀθλων (“the beginning
of contests and labors’); δέμας (‘body’) as if it were δέσμος (‘bond’), because the soul is kept here, bound or tied against its nature; σώμα (‘body’) as if it were σῆμα (‘sign’); βίος (‘life’), from παρὰ τὴν βίαν (‘by violence’), because the soul, coerced against its will, is detained in this prison. On the other hand, they think that θάνατος (‘death’) is so called as if it were from ἀνὰ εἰς θεὸν φερόμενος (‘bringing us back upon high to God and a divine residence’); θάνω (‘to die’) as if it were ἀνὰ θεέω (‘to return, to go back home’); τελευτή (‘end’) as if it were τελετή (‘initiation’); and τελευτάω (‘to end’) as if it were τελετάω (‘to initiate’) and τελεέω (‘to enter’), because through death the devout are consecrated to and initiated into eternal life. The Greeks call death τελευτή by metonymy, because, as Demosthenes says, it is “the limit of each one’s life.”

Third, of the Hebrew word.

The Hebrew תָּמָשׁ (or תָּמָשָׂה with a paragogic ח, and תָּמָשָׂה with the nominalizing preformative מ) comes from the root מָת (‘he died’). If we read this root as a metathesis, it will become בָּמָה (‘be perfect’), because the death of the godly is the beginning of true perfection and perfect holiness.

Second, homonyms.

§ 16. This word is read in many ways, and thus it is differentiated in various ways.

(1) In general, it is taken either theologically and naturally for the separation of the soul from the body, or politically and civically for the loss of civil rights. Some take Ps. 88:6 in very nearly this sense: “I have become hidden among the dead”; that is, “I have been excluded from the common society of people, and, in terms of civil life, I am like a dead person.” For those who have fallen from a rank of honor and freedom are considered as dead in the civic sense.

(2) In Augustine and other ecclesiastical writers it is divided into the death of the body and the death of the soul. You see, one’s life is twofold—one of nature and one of grace, or one of the body and one of the soul—therefore they claim that there are two deaths: one of the body, which is common to both the good and evil; and one of the soul, which is unique to the ungodly and sinners. Augustine writes (De civ. Dei, bk. 13, at the beginning of ch. 2): “The death of the soul occurs when God deserts it, just as the death of the body occurs when the soul abandons it. The death of both things, then—that is, of the entire man—takes place when the soul, deserted by God, deserts the body. Under such circumstances the soul does not have life from God and the body does not have life from the soul.” And later:

The soul has life from God when it lives well, for it cannot live well without God working in it that which is good. Moreover, the body has life from the soul when the soul lives in the body, whether or not the soul itself has life from God. For in the bodies of the wicked there is a life not of the souls but of the bodies, a life which even dead souls—that is, souls deserted by God—can give them, regardless of how little it is proper life. Because it does not cease, they are also immortal by this. Of the first death, that of the body, it can be said that it is good for the good and bad for the bad; but the second [death] undoubtedly is not good for anyone because it does not happen to the good.
Augustine (De Trinit., bk. 14, ch. 3): “We have died in both soul and body—in the soul because of sin, in the body because of the punishment for sin. Therefore the one death of our Savior was for the salvation from our two deaths.” Ibid. (beginning of ch. 4): “The soul also has its own death when it lacks the blessed life which must be called the true life of the soul. But it is called immortal because whatever kind of life it has, even if it is very wretched, it never ceases to live.” In his exposition of Psalm 48: “The death people fear is the separation of the soul from the body. But the real death, which people do not fear, is the separation of the soul from God. Very often, when people fear the one which separates the soul from the body, they fall into the other which separates the soul from God. For God is the life of the soul, and sin is the death of the soul.”

Fulgentius (Ad Monim., bk. 1, ch. 27): “The first death is that of the soul, and man brings it upon himself. It is the cause of the second death. The second death, which God has given to man, is punishment for the first death. In the first, the soul leaves, and only the flesh dies. In the second, when the soul returns to the flesh, it is tormented in and with the same flesh which has sinned, so that it shares in the death of punishment with the very flesh with which it has shared in the death of sin.”

Ambrose (bk. 5 on Luke) counts three kinds of death. He says: “There are three deaths. That of nature, about which it is said, ‘Men will seek death, but they will not find it’ [Rev. 9:6]. This death should not be feared by the strong, desired by the wise, or sought by the wretched. That of sin, about which it is said, ‘The soul that has sinned will itself die’ [Ezek. 18:20]. That of grace, which produces the destruction of worldly pleasures and in which not the nature but sins die. We undergo this death when we are buried with Christ in Baptism.”

Some explain the three kinds of death a little differently. They say that three deaths are presented in the Scriptures: first, the death of the body, which consists of the separation of the soul; second, the death of the soul, which consists of the loss of grace; third, the death of the whole man, which consists of the loss of eternal life and the tortures of hell for body and soul. The first is bodily death or that of nature; the second is spiritual death or that of grace; the last is the final death or that of glory.

Commonly four kinds of death are counted. The first is the death of the flesh, which separates soul from body. This one is irretrievable, as they say, and is to be meditated on. Second is that of sin, which separates the soul from God. This one is indescribable and is to be fled. Third is that of the spirit, which separates the soul from earthly things. This one is curable and is to be embraced. Fourth is that of hell, which separates body and soul from heavenly things. This one is unending and should terrify. It is according to this division that that riddle is to be understood: “He who dies” (namely, to sins through the death of the spirit) “before he dies” (namely, in the flesh or body) “does not die” (namely, with eternal death or that of hell) “when he dies” (namely, the death of the body).

Augustine (QQ., bk. 65, q. 32): “Holy Scripture shows clearly that there are four deaths. The first is the death of the soul which deserts its Creator, for that which deserts Him sins. The Lord says, ‘Let the dead bury their dead’ [Luke 9:60]. See, here you have those who are dead according to the soul, namely, the ones burying the dead. And whom are they burying? Those who are dead according to the flesh. Therefore this statement
teaches very clearly two deaths: one of the soul, which it incurs by sinning, and the other of the body. The third is that of the soul alone, which it suffers when it leaves this body. The fourth is the death when the soul will receive the body to be sent into everlasting fire.” (See also De civ. Dei, bk. 13, ch. 12.)

(5) Sedulius (on Romans 6) lists five kinds of death. He says: “The first death is the separation of the soul from the body. The second is the separation of the soul from God, which happens through sin. The third is according to the fact that the devil, the author of death, is called ‘death.’ The fourth death is the lake of hell where sinful souls are held. The word is also used to speak of that laudable death whereby each sinner dies by repenting and is buried with Christ.”

(6) This distinction is fuller and more complete: In Holy Scripture and in the ecclesiastical writers the word “death” is taken either properly or figuratively. Properly it is taken for natural death, which is the separation of the soul from the body. (It is called “natural” death not with respect to created nature but with respect to deprived nature.) It is in this sense that it is taken here when man’s death is counted among the last things. Figuratively, it is used either metaphorically or metonymically. Metaphorically it is used for temporal or eternal death. Temporal death, when spoken of metaphorically, again is twofold: either bodily or spiritual. Bodily death, when spoken of metaphorically, includes the calamities of every sort which man must endure in this life because of sin and which are the heralds and messengers of death. Exod. 10:17: “Entreat the Lord to take away this death from me,” that is, the destruction caused by the locusts. Rom. 8:10: “The body is dead,” that is, because of the sin which is still dwelling in it, susceptible to disasters, diseases, and, finally, temporal death itself. 1 Cor. 15:31: “I die every day”; I am beset by the daily and constant peril of death. 2 Cor. 1:10: “God has delivered us from so great a death.” 2 Cor. 4:11: “While we live we are always being given up to death.” Verse 12: “Death is at work in us.” In 2 Cor. 11:23 he writes that he was very often “in death.” For as the poet Statius sings (Theb., bk. 9):1 “The one death wearyes wretched men with a thousand ways of dying.” It is in this sense that some also take the words of Isa. 41:14, “the dead of Israel”; that is, you who have been crushed beneath such great afflictions that you appear to be dead rather than alive. However, in Hebrew it is יָם (“few, a small number”).

There are two spiritual deaths: that of believers and that of unbelievers. The former is praiseworthy and profitable; the latter, detestable and destructive. The spiritual death of believers is that by which they are said to die salutarly:

(1) To sin. [This happens] both through regeneration—since sin has been forgiven them through faith in Christ, it no longer accuses them before God’s judgment; and through renewal—since they put sin to death in their flesh, they repress its vigor, power, drive, and life through the Spirit so that it does not hold dominion and flourish in them. Rom. 6:2, 6, 11–12: “How can we who have died to sin still live in it? Our old man was crucified with Him so that the body of sin might be destroyed. Consider yourselves dead to sin but alive to God in Christ Jesus our Lord. Therefore do not let sin reign in your mortal body to make you obey its desires.” Col. 3:3: “You have died, and

---

1 Statius, Thebaid 9.280 (LCL 498:78–79).
your life is hidden with Christ in God." 1 Pet. 2:24: “That we might die to sin and be alive to righteousness.”

(2) To the Law. [This happens] both through justification, since through faith in Christ they have been freed from the accusation and condemnation of the Law; and through sanctification, since, free of the command and coercion of the Law, they offer willing obedience from their spirit, and since the Law no longer excites the corrupt desire still clinging to their flesh, which is an accidental effect of the Law in those who are not reborn. Rom. 7:1–2, 4: “The Law is binding on a man only during the time he is alive. For a married woman is bound by the Law to her husband so long as he lives. But if her husband dies, she is freed from the Law concerning her husband. Likewise, you also have been put to death to the Law through the body of Christ so that you may belong to another, to Him who rose from the dead, that we may bear fruit to God.” Gal. 2:19[–20]: “I through the Law died to the Law that I might live to God. I have been crucified together with Christ.”

(3) To the legal ceremonies of the Old Testament. Christ’s death has freed them from these so that they serve God in a newness of spirit, not according to those external observations but according to the inner man. Col. 2:20: “If you have died with Christ to the elements of the world” (that is, if through the power of Christ’s death you have been freed from the legal ceremonies through which God wanted to instruct the former world—that is, the people of the Old Testament—just as children are instructed through the elementary and rudimentary things of letters, Rom. 7:4 and 6; Gal. 2:19), “why do you allow yourselves to be led by the decrees and constitutions of men as if you were still living in the world,” as if you were still subject to the ceremonies of the Law, which consist of worldly, external things, though nevertheless you are in the kingdom of Christ, which is spiritual and internal?

(4) To the world. For they have died and been crucified spiritually with Christ and no longer live a worldly life, do not conform to this world, and do not indulge in its pleasures and desires. Gal. 6:14: “Through Christ the world has been crucified” (and thus is also dead) “to me, and I to the world,” that is, whatever in the world is opposed to the kingdom of Christ: “the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eyes, and the pride of life” (1 John 2:16). Also, the vanities and pleasures of the world no longer have dominion over me, nor do I desire them, but clearly I am dead to [the world]. Rom. 6:6–7: “At the same time our old man was crucified that the body of sin may be destroyed, for the one who has died is justified from sin.” Bernard (vol. 1, serm. 6, De peregrino mortuo et crucifixo, p. 153) says: “Not only am I dead to the world, I have been crucified to it, which is a shameful kind of death. I am crucified to it, and similarly it to me. All the things the world loves are a cross for me: the pleasures of the flesh, high office, wealth, the empty praise of men. On the other hand, the things the world considers a cross, to those I am attached; I cling to them; I embrace them with all my affection.”

The spiritual death of unbelievers is that by which they are said to be dead in their sins and separated from that true life of the soul, which is in God. Matt. 8:22; Luke 9:60: “Let the dead bury their dead.” Luke 15:24: “My son was dead.” John 5:25: “The dead will hear the voice of the Son of Man.” 1 Tim. 5:6: “The widow who lives in luxury is dead even while she lives.” Eph. 2:1[1] and 5; Col. 2:13: “When you were dead in your
sins.” For just as when the soul is separated from the body, the body is made to lack feeling and movement and performs no living actions, so a soulish man who is not a partaker of the spiritual life which depends on the gracious indwelling of God lacks spiritual feeling and cannot do works that are spiritually good and pleasing to God. Just as the dead do not hear, see, or speak, so also those who are spiritually dead in their sins do not hear the voice of God, do not see the works of God, do not preach the mighty works of God. Just as the lifeless body rots and presents an unbearable stench to men, so also men who are dead in their sins are abominable and unbearable to God. The eternal death of the damned is the final and utter loss of fellowship with God, and following this is terrible torment of soul and body and the never-ending wretchedness the condemned must fear in hell. John calls this “the second death” (Rev. 2:11; 20:14). Ps. 34:22: “The worst death of sinners” is taken with respect both to the natural and to the spiritual death which belongs to unbelievers, but in Hebrew it is: “Wickedness will kill the wicked man.” John 6:50: “If anyone will eat of this bread, he will never die.” John 8:51: “If anyone keeps My Word, he will never see death.” John 11:26: “He who lives and believes in Me will never die.”

Those are the chief meanings of the word “death” as they are used in reference to man. In general it should be noted about them that sometimes in one and the same passage various meanings of this word can sometimes occur. Thus when our first parents received this warning (Gen. 2:17): “On the day that you eat of it you will die by death,” then it is understood that the double mention of death designates not only the certainty of the threat but also designates that there are multiple kinds of death men must fear: both death taken properly and metaphorically and, in fact, temporal as well as eternal, corporeal as well as spiritual, the death belonging to unbelievers. Augustine writes (De civit. Dei, bk. 13, ch. 12):

When God told that first man whom He had placed in Paradise about the forbidden fruit: “On the day you eat of it you will die by death” [Gen. 2:17], that threat included not only the first part of the first death, where the soul is deprived of God; nor only the second part, where the body is deprived of the soul; nor only the first entire death, where the soul, separated from God and the body, is punished—but rather it includes whatever belongs to death, even to that final death which is called “the second death” and which nothing comes after.

Same book (ch. 15):

In this death also were threatened other ones which undoubtedly were going to follow. For when the disobedient motion was stirred in the flesh by the motion of the disobedient soul, because of which they covered their private parts, one death was felt in which God has abandoned the soul. This was indicated by His words when He said to the man who was hiding in fear of the one walking around: “Adam, where are you?” [Gen. 3:9]. Surely He was not asking this out of ignorance but was warning him with a rebuke so that he would consider where he was: somewhere without God. But now, when the soul itself deserted the body once it was corrupted and decayed with age, then was experienced the other death about which God had told man while He was still punishing his sin: “You are dust, and to dust you shall return” [Gen. 3:19]. So from these two is supplied that first death, which is of the
entire man, and it is ultimately followed by the second death unless one is set free by the grace of God.

[Augustine again] (De Trinit., bk. 4, ch. 3): “We are dead in both soul and body: in soul, because of sin; in body, because of the punishment for sin.” QQ. (bk. 65, q. 32): “On the day when Adam sinned, he died in his soul, for just as the body has life from the soul, so also the soul, for it to live more blessedly, has life from God. Therefore when God deserted Adam’s soul, it is rightly said to have died the first death, from which three deaths followed later.” (Cf. Ambrose, De paradis., ch. 9.)

However, the word “death” is taken as a reference not only to man, to whom all the meanings listed up to this point should be applied, but also to animals endowed with a sensitive soul2 (Gen. 7:22; 33:13) and to vegetation endowed with a vegetative soul3 (John 12:24; 1 Cor. 15:37). In fact, it is used metaphorically not only with reference to nonliving substances but also to their accidents4 or qualities. Thus in Job 12:12 wisdom which vanishes and passes away is said to die. In Rom. 7:9 the sin that clings to the flesh but is not perceptible enough is said to be dead, and when it does not so much show its powers by stirring up the depraved desire hiding in the flesh it is considered as killed and as if it did not exist. In James 2:17 faith is said to be dead which does not show itself through the effect of works. This is the characteristic of hypocrites, which [characteristic] only bears the name “faith” but is not actually faith. By metonymy the word “death” is taken for something that produces death. 2 Kings 4:40: “Death in the pot,” that is, poisoned food that will bring death. There is a type of metonymy in it when works are said to be dead (Heb. 6:1; 9:14) by reason of cause, because they come from those who are stuck in spiritual death, and by reason of effect, because they produce eternal death. By metonymy and at the same time by metaphor Christ is said to be the death of our death, because with His death He destroyed our death (2 Tim. 1:10). However, these meanings are not part of this commonplace, where the only thing being discussed is the natural death of man.

Third, synonyms.

§ 17. (III) To synonyms belong the periphrases with which death, especially that of the godly, is described in the Holy Scriptures, in the ecclesiastical writers, and in secular authors.

Words for “death.” First, in the Holy Scriptures.

In Holy Scripture there occur the sweetest phrases for speaking in reference to people’s death, especially that of the godly. These contain saving doctrines which provide

2 The sensitive power of the soul, possessed also by animals, was thought to have three functions: perception through internal and external senses, appetite that desires or abhors objects, and motion (Micraelius, s.v. “Anima sentiens”).

3 The vegetative power of the soul, possessed also by animals and plants, was thought to have three functions: nutrition, growth, and generation (Micraelius, s.v. “Vegetans facultas”).

4 An “accident” is an incidental property of a thing, that which affects something but is outside its essence.
useful teaching in many matters and effective consolations which should be used against
the terrors of death. The word most used by the holy men of God, the prophets and apos-
tles, in both the Old and New Testaments is “sleep,” for in death people are said to “fall
asleep” (Deut. 31:16; 2 Sam. 7:12; 1 Kings 2:10; Isa. 26:20; [57:2]; Dan. 12:2; Matt. 9:24;
John 11:11; Acts 13:36; 1 Cor. 11:30; 15:20; 1 Thess. 4:13; etc.). Hilary (on Psalm 126,
p. 552) writes: “God very often calls the death of the saints ‘sleep.’ As sleep is a picture
for death, so the bed is a picture for the tomb.” Such nomenclature can provide us with
useful teaching about many things. For death is compared with sleep:

(I) With respect to its antecedents. Just as sleep rises from vapors of the belly which
are carried to the brain and occupy the muscles and hinder the operations of the senses,
so also the death of the body takes its origin from the fact that our first parents ate of
the fruit of the forbidden tree, and from this it happened that the poisoned odor of sin,
passing throughout the body and all its members, rendered them and all their descend-
ants susceptible to death (Rom. 5:12; 6:23). Because we, their descendants, always carry
around with us that poison of sin in our body in this life, therefore we also always carry
around our death within ourselves. We do not fall into death suddenly but advance into
it little by little. When a poison is taken in, sometimes it lingers in the body for a long
time before it reveals its force. So, too, the poison of sin lingers in our flesh (Rom. 7:18;
Heb. 12:1). In some it works death more quickly; in others, more slowly—and yet it is
fatal to all. Even if we would be freed from all external and violent causes of death, still
death and decay proceeds from an internal cause common to all people. Not everyone
falls asleep peacefully and sweetly, but only those who go to bed with a quiet mind
and a body moderately fed. For to those who wear themselves down with anxieties and
load themselves down with a burdened conscience, sleep is unquiet and restless. Just
so, for the wicked death is not sweet sleep but rather the beginning of eternal death,
for they carry along with them out of this life the worm that gnaws at their conscience
(Isa. 66:24). But the truly godly, on the other hand, who die in the Lord rest peacefully
from their labors (Rev. 14:13), for through true repentance and faith in Christ they put
aside the burden of sin that vexes them, with true trust of the heart they grasp Christ
as their prince of life and victor over death, and they arrange their own life in such a
way that they always await their coming death with a peaceful and joyful mind. Seneca
(Letter 30): “No one receives death happily when it comes except the one who has pre-
pared himself for it for a long time.” Just as we take off our clothes when we are about to
go to sleep, so also the apostle asserts (2 Cor. 5:4) that we are unclothed in death because
death strips us of all the good things of this life, and he carefully notes how we may not
take anything earthly with us from this life. Job 1:21: “Naked I came from my mother’s
womb, and naked shall I return there.” 1 Tim. 6:7: “We brought nothing into this world.
It is clear that we cannot take anything out of it either.” Our body is, so to speak, the
garment and clothing of the soul, and yet in death we are forced to put that very body
aside and be stripped of it (2 Pet. 1:14). Chrysostom (on Hebrews, hom. 5, in morali.):
“We should take off the flesh as easily as we take off our clothes.” Let us also put aside
the coat of our old Adam. Let us take off the cares of this world. That is how we shall be

5  Seneca the Younger, Epistles 30.12 (LCL 75:218–19).
able to fall asleep quietly, etc. Just as sleep sometimes catches one unexpectedly so that he cannot mark exactly that moment of time when he fell asleep, so also men sometimes die at that moment when they are thinking about death least of all, and the soul, more quickly than is believed, departs from the dwelling place of the body so that neither they nor those standing by note the moment of the departure. Gen. 27:2: “I do not know the day of my death.”

Death is certain, but nothing is more uncertain than the hour of death. That you will die is certain; it is uncertain where, how, and when.

Just as infants and children do not understand the advantages of sleep and therefore go to bed unwillingly, so with respect to spiritual wisdom before God, those who do not understand what a great blessing there is in the death of the godly and therefore shudder at death excessively are really children. Just like sleep, so also death is common to all people. Just like sleep, so also death creeps up on people against their will, etc.

§ 18. (II) With respect to the things that accompany it. Just as sleep takes over only the limbs and external senses while the soul carries out its internal operations, as is concluded from dreams, so also in death the body alone perishes while the souls of the godly are carried over into the bosom of Abraham (Luke 16:22), enjoy comfort (v. 25), and become partakers of the true life. Matt. 10:28: “They cannot kill the soul.” Augustine (Confess., bk. 6, ch. 11): “The life of the soul is not destroyed by the death of the body.” Just as sleep is a sweet and useful rest for both sick and healthy men (John 11:12), so also the dead “rest in their chambers” (Isa. 26:20) and “rest from their labors” (Rev. 14:13). Ambrose (De bon. mortis, ch. 3): “Death alone provides rest for a person.” Our days in this life are days as a laborer. Therefore just as the laborer awaits the end of his work, so also in the miseries and hardships of this life we eagerly desire the rest of death (Job 7:1–2). The powers of body and soul are refreshed in sleep so that in the morning one returns to his former work more swiftly and energetically. Hence Tertullian (De anim., ch. 43, p. 287) very beautifully calls sleep “the refresher of bodies, the restorer of powers, the improver of sicknesses, the soother of works, the healer of hardships.” Just so, the death of the godly is something like a renewal, renovation, and repair of all powers, so that when Christ, the Sun of righteousness, rises on the Last Day, they will be swifter and more energetic to do the works for which God created them at the first creation. Just as a sleeping person is immune to all the adverse effects of nature—its cares, distresses, sadness, grief, and fear—so also in death the godly are free from those chastisements, live a tranquil life with God, enjoy sleeping in their tombs as if in their bedrooms and sleeping quarters, and await in peace the joyful day of resurrection. Just as those who sleep do not notice or care what happens out in the streets, whether people are buying or selling, dancing or fighting, and neither do they measure time nor count the hours, so also the dead are not affected by the cares of this world, and they do not consider it important whether those who survive are afflicted by war, hunger, or persecutions. Much less do they feel any remnants of trouble or anxiety as a result of adversities. 2 Kings 22:20: “I shall gather you to your fathers so that your eyes will not see all the evils which I am going to bring upon this place.” Job 14:21: “Whether his sons will be noble or not, he will not know.” Eccl. 9:5: “The living know that they will die, but
the dead no longer know anything” (namely, of those things which are going on on this earth, for in v. 6 it is added: “They have no share in this world and in the work that is done under the sun”). Isa. 63:16: “Abraham does not know us, and Israel does not acknowledge us.” Just as the sleeper sometimes is unaware of the terrors of burning and of great storms which arise while he is asleep but is, so to speak, carried beyond them, so also the godly who die are carried off ahead of the calamities to come. Isa. 57:1–2: “The righteous man is taken away from calamity. Peace comes. The one who walks rightly rests in his bed.”

§ 19. (III) With respect to what follows them. Sleep is not a permanent rest, but we wake back up again at a definite time, and at that time the vigor of the mind, senses, and body will return more keenly. In the same way we shall not remain in death permanently, but “the hour will come in which all who are in their graves will hear the voice of the Son of Man and will come forth: those who have done good to the resurrection of life, but those who have done evil to the resurrection of the judgment” (Dan. 12:2; John 5:28–29). Bede (on Mark): “It is common Christian custom to call the dead ‘sleeping,’ for they will undoubtedly rise again.” Just as Christ denies that the daughter of Jairus was dead but asserts that she is only sleeping (Matt. 9:24)—because soon she was going to be called back to life—so also it should be stated about the dead in general that they are sleeping because they are going to be raised to life by Christ. Isa. 26:19: “Your dead will live; you who dwell in the dust will wake up.” Luke 20:38: “All are alive to God.” Just as sleepers are easily woken up by the voice of another, so also the dead will be easily woken up on the Last Day by the voice of Christ. Augustine (Sermon 44 de verb. Dom.): “None of us wakes up someone sleeping in bed more easily than the Lord wakes up someone lying in the grave.” Just as when we wake from sleep we put on clothes, so also when the godly wake from the dead they will put on their clothes of immortality. 1 Cor. 15:53: “This corruptible thing must put on incorruptibility, and this mortal thing must put on immortality.” Just as we do not know how we shall wake up from sleep, so also we do not understand what the resurrection is going to be like. Just as when we wake up, we seem to have slept for only a few hours, so also on the Last Day, to those who have woken up from death, it will seem that the time which has passed between death and resurrection was very short. Luther (vol. 4, Latin edition, p. 528, commentary on Psalm 90): “The entire time from the beginning of man’s creation will seem to Adam at his resurrection like a one-hour sleep.” The sleep, then, which we need every day for the preservation of our life should be to us a daily reminder and memorial of death because a great part of heavenly wisdom consists in the daily meditation on our death (Ps. 39:5; 90:12). As Plato would say (Phaedo): “True philosophy is attention to one’s death.” When we are about to go to bed and take off our clothes, we should think about how at some time the clothing of our body will be taken off. When we lay ourselves down to sleep, we should think about how someday we will be placed in a grave as our bed. When we close our eyes, we should think about how someday our eyes will close in death. When we get up out of bed, we should think about how someday after our death

we will rise from our graves. If we would daily meditate on our death in this way, we can one day die a godly and peaceful death.

The names for death. First, from the Old Testament.

§ 20. Now, when [death] is compared to sleep by the holy men of God, this is the general and most common description for death. Many special names occur. It was customary for Moses to say that in and through death the godly were collected or “gathered to his people” (Gen. 25:8; 35:29; 49:33); and we find the same expression in Num. 20:26; 31:2; Judg. 2:10; 2 Kings 22:20; 2 Chron. 34:28; Isa. 57:1. נאסף means “to gather something to preserve it, to reduce it to one, to store, to hide.” All these meanings agree with this way of speaking, for in and through death the godly are separated from the confused union of good and evil mixed with each other in this life and are gathered together. “Their souls are gathered up into the bundle of the living” (1 Sam. 25:29) and are thus reduced to one that they may be hidden from the madness of their persecutors and be kept in peace and quiet until the Day of Judgment. Moreover, the godly are said not simply to be collected and gathered but collected and gathered “to their people.” Origen says, “No one is gathered to those who they are not.” It is, then, a populace to which the dying godly are united. Consequently, in death the souls of the godly do not vanish into the breezes, nor are they reduced to nothing. Rather, they are gathered into the assembly of the church triumphant and to that blessed people who went ahead of them from this life in the faith and with whom they constitute one mystical Body. Dust and ashes devoid of the soul is not a populace. Therefore it is not with respect to the grave that they can be said to be gathered to their people. In addition, the patriarch Abraham, about whom the Holy Spirit uses this phrase first of all, as to his body, he was not taken to the tombs of his ancestors and of his people but only to the remains of his wife Sarah in the field of Ephron, as Gesnerus correctly teaches (commentary on Genesis 25). This again is a clear proof that the godly are gathered to their own people with respect not to the body but to the soul. Luther (on Genesis 25, p. 320): “To what place did Abraham cross over? He was gathered to his people. Do people then still exist after this life? That is what the words say, as if he had moved from people to people, from one city to another. Truly this is a memorable and outstanding testimony of the resurrection and of the life to come, and it must be set forth as a comfort for all who believe in God.” Akin to this expression is that other one which God uses to describe the death of Abraham (Gen. 15:15): “You will go in to your fathers in peace.” Therefore Abraham was not totally destroyed in death but rather was transferred to the assembly of his fathers.

§ 21. In 23:14, Joshua calls death “the way of all flesh.” He says, “Behold, I am going in” or through “the way of all flesh.” In 1 Kings 2:2 David uses the same formula of speaking and expresses the necessity of dying common to all men, a necessity introduced into the world because of and through sin, namely, that death has been established for all and that all people are subject to death no less than the rest of living creatures. (See Heb. 9:27; Eccl. 9:3.) The poet says, “Everyone must walk the path of death once.”

8 Lectures on Genesis (1535–45), WA 43:358 (cf. AE 4:309).
9 Horace, Odes 1.28.16 (LCL 33:76–77).
In Ps. 142:7 David calls death the bringing of the soul “out of the lockup or prison” (מִמַּסְגֵּר). Death considered in and of itself he calls “walking through the valley of the shadow of death” (Ps. 23:4). Isaiah speaks about the death of the godly in this way (26:19–20): “Wake up, you who dwell in the dust! Come, My people, enter into your chambers” (ךָבַחֲדָרֶי). (The Septuagint has “into your storeroom.” Therefore the graves of the dead are the houses of the living ones, the sleeping quarters.) “Shut the door over you. Hide yourself for a little while until the wrath is past.” Isa. 57:1–2: “The righteous man perishes.” (בֵּין sometimes means every kind of destruction of something. If taken in this way here, it will have to be explained with respect to the thinking of the ungodly. Before their eyes “they seem to have died” and to be removed with destruction, especially if they are killed by tyrants or are carried off by premature death, Wisdom 3:2–3. Before the eyes of God, however, they are beginning to truly live.) “And there is no one who lays it to heart. Men of mercy are gathered together (נֶאֲסַפִּים), and there is no one who understands. The righteous one is gathered from the face of evil.” (That is, they are gathered together because of the evil that threatens the world, just as the shepherd gathers the sheep into an enclosure when a storm threatens, and just as the head of the household gathers up the valuable furnishings during a fire and puts them in a safe place.) “He will enter into peace. He who walks before Him will rest in beds (מִשְׁכְּבוֹתָם).” (Peace applies to the souls and rest to the bodies in the graves, for because the godly are said to fall asleep in death, it necessarily follows from this that their graves are bedrooms, sleeping quarters.)

§ 22. The author of the Book of Wisdom describes the death of the godly in this way (3:1–3): “The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God” (namely, after death, which he had discussed at the end of the preceding chapter), “and no torment will ever touch them. In the eyes of the foolish they seem to have died, and their departure (ἔξοδος) was thought to be an affliction.” (The death of Christ is indicated with the same expression in Luke 9:31; and likewise Peter in 2 Pet. 1:15 calls his own death an “exodus,” because in death the soul exits from the body and men exit from this state of life into another life. The deliverance of the Israelites from their bondage in Egypt is called a “departure” [ἔξοδος], as the inscription of the second book of Moses and Heb. 11:22 shows. In the same way, as long as our soul stays in our body, it is vexed by wretched captivity and slavery, Rom. 7:14 and 23–24; but when it exits the body, then it is freed from those bonds, Ps. 142:7.) “And their going” and journey “from us,” namely, to the region of the living, “was thought to be grief, but they are at peace.” Wisdom 4:7: “The righteous man, if an early death overtakes him, will be at rest.” (In this life there is no cessation of hardship, grief, and tribulation, Ps. 90:10, but in death will follow rest.) [Wisdom 4:10: “The one pleasing to God was loved, and he was transferred away from sinners alive.” The apostle uses the same description for Enoch in Heb. 11:5. Those who change dwelling places and carry their things from one dwelling to another are properly said to be transferred (μετατίθεμαι). So also in death there occurs a change in dwelling places because “the tent of this earthly dwelling place is destroyed that we may receive a building from God, a dwelling not made with hands, but an eternal one in heaven” (2 Cor. 5:1; 2 Pet. 1:14). Moving out of a house is generally a bother, but if someone moves out of a ruined building into a royal palace, out of the worst neighborhood into the community of
his best friends—a move of this kind should please him. This very thing can be applied to the death of the godly, etc.

Second, from the New Testament.

§ 23. In the New Testament, in the evangelists, there occur these descriptions. In Matt. 10:22; 24:13; Mark 13:13; 1 Cor. 1:8; Heb. 3:6, etc., death is called the “end” [τέλος], not because all things are finished in and with death—for this word is used in John 13:1 even in reference to Christ’s death—but because it puts an end to this earthly and mortal life and worldly way of living. Hence it is also counted among the last things of man. Eccl. 9:10: “There is no work or thought or knowledge or wisdom in the grave into which you are going.”

In Luke 2:29 Simeon describes death with the most beautiful expression: “Lord, You now dismiss (ἀπόλέσθαι) Your servant in peace.” This appears to have been taken from Num. 20:29, where the Septuagint translators use the word ἀπολύσθαι to describe the death of Aaron, and about Abraham they say (Gen. 15:2): “I shall depart (ἀπολύσαμαι)” or die “without children.” The verb ἀπολέσθαι is taken:

(1) In reference to a release from prison and chains (Matt. 18:27; 27:15; Mark 15:11; Luke 23:16; Acts 3:13). In Xenophon (Hellen., bk. 4),10 χρημάτων πολλῶν ἀπολέσθαι is to receive a great sum of [ransom] money and release someone from prison, etc. This sense fits beautifully with this commonplace, because our life on earth is nothing else but a dark and dirty prison from which we are freed through a blessed release. Josephus (De bello Judaic., bk. 2, ch. 12) and Eusebius (Praeparat. evang., bk. 9, ch. 2) report that the Essenes taught: “The souls, as immortal, always remain, and when they are loosed from their fleshy chains, they rejoice as if freed from a very long bondage and are carried up on high.”

(2) In reference to a dismissal to one’s homeland. In this way Christ is said to dismiss (ἀπολέσαι) the crowds when He dismissed from Himself those He had detained in the wilderness, each to his hometown. (See Matt. 14:15; 15:32; Mark 8:9.) Polybius writes:11 “They went away [ἀπέλυσαν] to their house.” This meaning, too, can be applied to this commonplace. This life of ours is a sort of constant pilgrimage through the wilderness of the world. When we reach its end, which is death, we are dismissed into our heavenly homeland.

(3) In reference to a dismissal or departure after a task has been completed, as in Exod. 33:11; Acts 13:3; 15:30. In this way, when in this life we have completed our journey and all that the Lord wanted us to complete, then our Lord who placed us in this station kindly dismisses us, nor are we permitted to depart from this life before the dismissal from our Lord.

(4) In reference to a freeing from an infirmity. Luke 13:12: “Woman, you are dismissed (ἀπολέσαται) from your infirmity.” In this way death is the last physician for all diseases and distresses, and after death our soul is restored to perfect health.

---

10 Xenophon, Hellenica 4.22 (LCL 88:368–69).
Luke 9:31 Christ’s death is called a “departure,” the reason for which name we discussed in the preceding section [§ 22].

In Luke 9:51 [death] is called “a receiving back (ἀνάληψις).” But even though this designation is used elsewhere in particular in reference to the death of Christ, which was followed by His glorious assumption into heaven and return to His Father, which is described by the word ἀνάληψις (Mark 16:19; Acts 1:2; 1 Tim. 3:16), nevertheless it can be applied in general to the death of the godly. For it is properly said to be a “receiving back” when children who have been gone from home for a long time are restored to their parents and their fathers again acknowledge them as theirs. Budaeus says, “To receive back is to take back into the home a disinherited son, something fathers would do in Athens after correction and satisfaction.” Demosthenes (Contra Neaeram):12 “He received him back as his own.” In this way we poor exiles wander away from our heavenly Father in this world; but with His “receiving back,” Christ earned it for us that we are received back into our fatherland and that the heavenly Father acknowledges us as His children. For this reason Tobit prays (Tobit 3:6): “Now, O Lord, command them to receive back my spirit.” It says about Elijah as he was carried off into heaven by an angelic chariot (2 Kings 2:9): “Before I am received back from Him.” Sirach 48:9: “The one who was received back in a whirlwind.” The same expression is used in reference to Enoch (Sirach 49:14): “He was received back from the earth,” because “the spirit returns to Him” in death and is received by Him who gave it (Eccl. 12:7). In secular writers this “receiving back” is the recovery of strength after an illness, the recuperation, for which reason Suidas explains it with the word “strengthening (ἀναρρωσις).” This meaning can be applied to this commonplace because after death our soul recuperates from the feeble condition of sin and is infused with perfect health.

In John 5:24 death is called a “crossing (μετάβασις)” because through death we make a passage across from this earthly life into a heavenly one, and we leap over that wall which separates us from the glory of Christ and of all the elect in heaven. (See Luke 16:26.)

§ 24. The sweetest names for death occur in Paul. 1 Cor. 15:43–[44]: “It is sown in corruption; it rises in incorruption. It is sown in shame; it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness; it is raised in power. It is sown a soulish body; it is raised a spiritual body.” Note here that by a sort of emphatic metaphor the apostle has alternated the words, because earlier in v. 36 he attributed to the seed those things that belong to our body, but here he attributes to our bodies the things that belong to the seed. Moreover, there is hidden in the verb “to sow,” repeated several times in reference to dead bodies, an elegant metaphor. John 12:24: “Unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, that is all it remains; but if it dies, it bears much fruit.” To the eyes of the foolish, to whom nothing about the harvest is known, it would seem absurd to throw a grain of wheat onto the ground. So also the ungodly, to whom the article of the resurrection is either unknown or absurd, claim that death is a complete and total destruction. Grains of wheat thrown upon the earth sprout forth again in their own time. So also in the resurrection “our bones shall grow again like grass” (Isa. 66:14). A very happy and rich

harvest follows a sad sowing. So also we die in pain and sadness, but we rise again in joy. Ps. 126:5–6: “Those who sow in tears will reap with rejoicing. Those who go forth weeping as they carry the precious seed will come back with shouts of joy as they carry their sheaves.”

2 Cor. 5:1: “We know that, if the earthly tent of our dwelling” (that is, the earthly dwelling place in which we live as in a house) “is destroyed, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands and eternal in the heavens.” This is an elegant description of death. In this life we live in “houses made of clay” (Job 4:19). We carry around an earthly body which thus is fragile and tottering like a tent, providing only a temporary dwelling place in which only soldiers stay in wartime and which they can move quickly. That tent, the apostle says, is dissolved in death, but in its place we receive a home not made by hands, not transitory, but eternal in the heavens.

In [2 Cor. 5:]4 dying is called unclothing (ἐκδύσασθαι). The reason for this metaphor we explained earlier in §17.

In v. 8 it is said that in death the godly “are away from the body and at home with the Lord.” While they continue on in this life, they wander around and are away from the Lord, that is, they are not yet in their true homeland, in heaven. But when through death they pass from this life into the heavenly one, then “they wander away from the body and are present with the Lord,” something at which the apostle hints with his elegant antanaclasis\(^\text{13}\) in vv. 6 and 8: “While at home in the body we are away from the Lord. While away from the body, we are at home with the Lord.”

Phil. 1:23: “I desire to untie (ἀναλύσαι) and to be with Christ.” 2 Tim. 4:6: “The time of my untying (ἀναλύσις) is now near.” The word ἀναλύσις indicates not only a separation of soul from body, not just the dissolving of the mass of the human body composed and shaped from the four elements—both of which clearly happen in death, for the Lord dissolves the structure of man that He may rebuild it much more gloriously and elegantly—but it also has other metaphorical meanings which can be correctly applied to the death of the godly. For it means:

1. To gather up the baggage, to prepare for a trip, and to start on it, just as sailors are said to “untie.” When about to depart, they untie the ropes and commit themselves to the sea (Odyss., o.), just as those who are about to ride prepare horses which they later, after arriving, will untie. In the same way the death of the godly is a sort of setting out and emigration from the condition of mortal life into the region of the living.

2. To leave an inn or temporary lodging and to return home. In Luke 12:36 it is used for a master returning home from the marriage feast. In the same way, in death the soul leaves the inn of its body and returns to its true homeland, which is why Chrysostom renders it as “change of location, being transferred, moving from a rented house.”

3. To be loosed from bonds. In this way cows who have been bound to the yoke all day are said to be untied (ἀναλύσεθαι) in the evening, and those who have been bound with chains in prison and now have had their bonds loosed and are restored to freedom are said to have been untied (ἀναλύσεθαι). This can be fittingly applied to the death of the godly. The time of this life is a time of labor and of hardship (Job 7:2; Ps. 90:10);

\(^\text{13}\) When a word is repeated but with an opposite meaning.
in death we are loosed from those bonds and are freed from the yoke of the cross. Tertullian explains it as "be received." In this translation he was considering the related word ἀπολύεσθαι.

(4) To go to bed. Judith 13:1: “When evening came, his slaves hurried to untie (ἀναλύειν).” In the same way the godly go to bed when they are called out of this life through death.

In his letter to the Philippians, namely, at 1:21, the apostle calls dying “gain.” Cyprian comments on those words (De mortalit., serm. 4, p. 209): The Christian “counts it as the greatest gain to be no longer held by the ropes of this world, to be no longer subject to the sins and faults of the flesh, to be exempt from oppressing tribulations, to be freed from the poisoned jaws of the devil, and to advance at Christ’s call to the joy of eternal salvation.” Another of the fathers explains the apostle’s words in this way: “It is gain to have escaped the increases of sin; it is gain to have fled the baser things; it is gain to pass on to better things.” Who in the world would deny that it is the greatest gain that in death the godly trade in sin for righteousness (Rom. 6:7), labor for rest (Job 3:13), war for peace (Job 7:1; Wisdom 3:3), weeping for comfort (Luke 16:25), corruptibility for incorruptibility and mortality for immortality (1 Cor. 15:53–54), misery for happiness (Rev. 14:13), a living death for an undying life (John 5:24), captivity for freedom, and a mound of evils for a mountain of all goods?

In Heb. 11:5 death is called “a transfer (μετάθεσις),” a word which was discussed earlier in § 22.

In Heb. 13:7 it is called “the leaving of our way of life (ἐκβασις τῆς ἀναστροφῆς)” in these lands, for [death] is at the same time the leaving of all our evils and miseries (1 Cor. 10:13).

In 2 Pet. 1:14 Peter calls his own death “the putting off of the tent (ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματος),” imitating the Pauline expression in 2 Cor. 5:1.

In Rev. 14:13 John calls dying in the Lord “resting from labors.” In this life we labor under the weight of the cross and sin, but after death we arrive at a peaceful rest, and at that time Christ will give us full and complete “rest” (Matt. 11:28). From the tumultuous sea of this world He will draw us to the very quiet and tranquil harbor of eternal life.

In Fragmenta apostolorum (published by Praetorius), Peter is mentioned as having said to the wife of Albinus and to the other brothers: “You think that we must flee to escape a death which we have sought with many sighs as an advancement of life.” Irenaeus (bk. 3, ch. 37, f. 224): “God forbade man’s transgression by inserting death and making sin cease, bringing an end to it through the dissolving of the flesh which was to occur on earth. This was so that at some time man, in ceasing to live to sin and die to it, would begin to live to God.”

Second, from the fathers.

§ 25. (2) In the ecclesiastical writers especially the following descriptions [of death] occur. Tertullian writes (De patient., ch. 9, p. 132): “What you consider death is a departure. He who goes on ahead should not be mourned but, of course, missed.” De anima (ch. 27, p. 278): “Death is determined to be nothing other than the separation of body and soul.” Chapter 51 (p. 291): “The operation of death in our midst is the separation of
body and soul.” A little earlier, in ch. 50: “According to the general thinking of the whole human race we declare death to be the debt of nature.” The virgin Caecilia, when led to her punishment, said, “It is not the person but the wretchedness of the Christian person that is dying.”

Cyprian (De mortalit., serm. 4, p. 208): “Simeon bears witness that there is peace, that there is a free and serene quiet for the servants of God when we have been removed from those tempests of the world and aim for the harbor of eternal security and rest, when this death has lost its sting and we come to immortality. For that is our peace; that is the tranquility of faith; that is stable, firm, and permanent freedom from worry.” Page 212: “Just as that mortality is a plague to Jews, the heathen, and the foes of Christ, so it is a salvific departure for servants of God.” Page 213: “How backward and how perverse it is that, even though we ask that God's will be done, we do not immediately obey the command of His will when He calls and summons us out of this world!” And later: “We know that our brothers who have been freed from the world by the summons of the Lord are not lost but sent ahead. In receding, they advance. Like ones who travel and sail off, they should be missed, not mourned.” Page 214: “When we die, we pass by death to immortality. Eternal life cannot happen unless a departure from here takes place. This is not an exit but a crossing from a temporal journey traveled to eternal ones. Who would not hurry on to better things? Who would not want to be changed and reshaped more quickly to the likeness of Christ and come to be worthy of heavenly grace?” And later: “He who intends to come to the throne of Christ, to the brightness of the heavenly kingdoms, should not mourn or weep but instead, according to the Lord's promise, according to true faith, should rejoice in his progressing translation.” Page 215: “When the day of our own summons comes, let us come to the Lord freely and without hesitation as He calls us.” And later:

We must reflect on and consider the fact that we have renounced the world and yet live here as strangers and pilgrims. We should embrace the day that assigns each to his own dwelling place, which restores us to paradise and the heavenly kingdom, taking us from here and pulling us out of the snares of this world. Who, when located abroad, would not hurry to go back to his homeland? Who, when hurrying to sail to his family, would not more eagerly wish for a favorable wind that he may embrace his loved ones more quickly? We consider our homeland to be paradise. We have already begun to have the patriarchs as our fathers. Why do we not hurry and run that we may be able to see our homeland and to greet our parents?

Methodius calls the death of the godly “a medicinal cleansing of soul and body.” He is the one who calls it “the burial of all sins and evils, the end of evils, and the door to life.”

Hilary (commentary on Psalm 62, toward the middle): “‘Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints’ [Ps. 116:15], because through it those who have been released from the Law of sin are repaid with eternity by advancing to a glorious change, with an eternity for soul and body already without the body of sin.” On Psalm 63: “Death is not the destruction of the soul but its departure from the body.” On Psalm 119 (p. 527): “The blessed Paul groans over the dwelling place of his body, lamenting that he is sojournig apart from God by residing in the flesh. From this, on the other hand, he knows that he must sojourn in the flesh so that he may reside in it with God. Yet it
would be better for him to die and to be with Christ, namely, with his soul free through its separation from the body and divested of the burden and connection of this weak and dangerous flesh."

Lactantius (Inst., bk. 3, ch. 18): "Just as life itself is a good thing if it is lived with virtue and an evil thing if it is lived with wickedness, so also death must be evaluated on the basis of the past acts of life. So it happens that, if life was spent in the worship of God, death is not a bad thing because it is the translation to immortality. However, if it was spent otherwise, it must be a bad thing because it sends one over to eternal punishments."

Ambrose (De bono mortis, ch. 2): "If life is filled with burdens, surely its end is an easing of them. But that good easing is death. Dying is an end. Therefore death is a good thing." Chapter 3: "Death is the loosing of soul and body and a sort of dividing of a man, for when we die, we are loosed from this connection of soul and body." Chapter 10: "The soul is taken back, not destroyed." On Luke 8: "Where there is faith in the resurrection, there is no likeness of death but of rest." De fid. resurrect. (ch. 9): "There had to be an end to ills so that death might restore what life had lost. For immortality is more burdensome than it is useful if it does not breathe of grace. If you should examine it well, that is the death not of nature but of wickedness. For the nature remains, wickedness dies, and what was rises again." Ambrose again (De excess. frat.): "Those who will not be taken away by death but received by eternity appear not lost but sent ahead."

Basil (Serm. in matyr. Julittam): "He did not die; rather, he returned."

Athanasius (Orat. contra idola, p. 23): "It is not the soul that dies; instead, the body dies because of the departure of the soul."

Ephraem (De judicio, ch. 3): "As if in bonds or in prisons, so all the saints stay in their bodies until the time of their release, hurrying to the very tranquil harbor to gain a life without storms."

Nazianzen (Orat. 38, εἰς τὰ γενέθλια): "Man gains death as the cutting off of sin so that evil will not be immortal." Definit. rerum (v. 25): "Life is the union of the soul and body, just as death is their separation."

Gregory of Nyssa (Orat. de morte): "Death is like a midwife to bring us over to a better life." Thus though the godly must taste the bitterness of death in the putting aside of this tent, [this is] just as an infant must endure the perils and pains of birth in being born from the narrow womb of their mother into this spacious world. Nevertheless that convulsion lasts only a short time, and that day becomes the birthday of eternal life, just as days of martyrdom are called the birthdays of the saints, as Chytraeus teaches (De mort. et vit. aet., p. 49). The same Nyssa (toward the end of his Orat. habita in funere Pulcheriae): "Death is nothing else but the washing away of sinfulness."

Chrysostom (on Genesis, hom. 45, col. 375): "Death is the transmigration from baser to better things." On Matthew (hom. 35): "Just as when the bronze from which a statue is made is poured, we say then that there is no loss of bronze because it is being given over to a better use, similarly it will happen with your body that death itself and mortality are destroyed by the corruption of the flesh," etc. On 2 Corinthians (hom. 2): "You have not been lost but have been set in a safer place."
Augustine (Letter 6): “We have not lost but sent ahead.” De spiritu et anim. (ch. 43): “The death of a person is nothing else but the destruction of the flesh. When the force of its life-giving power has left the flesh, it returns to the ground from which it was taken, but without its senses, which it did not have of itself. Not unlike how the sun provides light for the day, the soul gives life to the flesh when it comes and causes death when it leaves. However, death does not consume things which were joined together but separates them when it returns both to their origin.” Hypognost. contra Pelag. (bk. 1, toward the middle): “Death is nothing else but the name for when life departs, just as hunger is a lack of food; thirst, a need for drink; darkness, an absence of light; barrenness, a lack of fruit; silence, an absence of voice; poverty, a lack of resources; and any other such things which are nothing else but a name for of a lack of things.”

Idiota (De contempti. mortis, § 8): “Death is the harbor toward which all we wretches are sailing in these calamities of the world. The more quickly we reach it, the more swiftly shall we be freed,” etc.

In Nicephorus (bk. 11, ch. 43), when someone had announced to a hermit that his son had died, he is said to have replied: “Why would he blaspheme so? For his son is not dead but is sleeping.” For Death retains its names, but the rest is an easy sleep.

Bernard (in a letter): “The death of the righteous is good because of its rest, is better because of its newness, and is the best because of its security. On the other hand, the death of sinners is very bad, namely, bad in the loss of the world, worse in the separation from the flesh, worst in the twofold grief of the worm and the fire.” Bernard again (De transit. Malach.): “Precious is the death of the saints” [Ps. 116:15], precious clearly as the end of their labors, as the completion of their victory, as the door to life and the entrance into perfect safety.”

Damascenus (De orth. fid., bk. 2, ch. 1), after mentioning the end of the world, adds: “For the death of each person is an individual culmination.”

Conradus Teutonicus is written to have said when he was about to die: “That point of death at which you see me is only a transition from weeping to laughter, from labor to rest.”

Johannes Baptista Mantuanus (Syl., bk. 6):

Death is the harvest
Of the spirits. Death is their reaping. The heavens are the storehouses of heaven.
The vinedresser and harvester are God and His ministers.

Lindebergius:

Death, which is the destruction of this bodily mass,
Is that door to life and the beginning of a new one,
The passage from the living, the origin of the heavenly life.

Third, names for death from the heathen.

§ 26. In secular writers one finds the following periphrases for death. Plato defines it as the parting or the separating and departure of the soul and the body (in the Phaedo and Gorgias); also, that it is the migration of the soul from this place to another, because
it is a sort of ἀποδήμια or “pilgrimage” (Phaedo). 14 In Sallust (In Catilina), Julius Caesar says, “Death is the respite from tribulations in grief and wretchedness. It dissolves all the ills of mortals.” 15 Plutarch writes: “Death is a change of place for the soul, not its destruction.” 16 Euripides: “Dying is the greatest cure for ills.” When Socrates was about to die, he was asked what was happening. He replied: “Now sleep begins to commend me to its brother.” Likewise Socrates called death “a wonderful gain,” according to Plato (Apolog. Socratis). 17 Homer makes death and sleep “twins.” 18 Seneca: “It is foolish to take pleasure in sleep and yet shudder at death, because sleep is a close imitation of death.” (However, the heathen did not know the real reasons why the death of the godly is compared with sleep.) Artabanus (in Herodotus): 19 “Death is the highly desired refuge from a life of tribulation, a harbor for the wretched, and a means of escape from the things which make us wretched.” Cicero (Tusc.) 20 defines death as “the departure of the soul from the body, a dissolving, a change of life, a moving to those shores where those who have departed from this life dwell, a harbor from evil, the end of wretched life.” With these agree the statement of Servius (Comment. Virg.): “This thing which is called death is not death, since it causes nothing to perish. Rather, it is an untying. For this reason many call it quite well a dissolution, as if it gets in the middle and unites the connection between compound things.” In Valerius (bk. 3), Epaminondas says as he is about to die: “This is not the end of my life. Rather, a better and loftier beginning is approaching. For now your Epaminondas is being born because he is dying.” The orator Gorgias, already an old man, when asked if he was willing to die, said, “Very much so, because I am not unwilling to depart from what is like a stinking, rotting dwelling.” In regard to the followers of Pythagoras, Iamblichus mentions (De vita Pythag., ch. 36) that it was customary for them “to leave the body as if leaving prison or chains,” etc.

16 Euripides, Children of Heracles 595–96 (LCL 484:64–65).
17 Plato, Apology 40 (LCL 36:188–89).
18 Homer, Iliad 16.672 (LCL 171:212–13).
20 Cicero, Tuscalan Disputations 1.98 (LCL 141:116–17).
Chapter VIII: The Consequences of Death with Respect to the Soul

Section I: On the Immortality of the Soul

§ 140. Up to this point we have been discussing the consequences of death with respect to the body. It remains for us to speak from here on about the consequences of death with respect to the soul, that is, about the condition and state of the soul after death. The wise king says (Eccl. 12:7): “The dust will return to the earth just as it was,” or just as it had been earlier, “and the spirit will return to God who gave it.” By this he teaches us that there is a great difference between the state of the body and that of the soul after their separation, which occurs in death. In life they are connected by the most intimate bond, which is why the emotions and passions of the body spill into the soul, and, in turn, the emotions and the passions of the soul spill into the body, for the soul does nothing outside the body, nor does the body do anything outside the soul. However, in death the soul is separated from the body and returns to God. It stands before His judgment, and He, or the holy angels, will carry it into heaven, or the evil spirits will thrust it down into hell. The body returns to the dust of the ground, from which its first and ancient origin came, and through rotting away and turning into ashes it is reduced to its original elements. After that dissolution and separation the emotions and passions of the soul no longer spill into the body, and, in turn, the emotions and passions of the body no longer spill into the soul. The soul does not act through the instrument of the body but lives and exists separately. It also is not dissolved or broken into pieces the way the body returns to its original elements. Rather, it exists outside the body, leads an immortal life, and, separated as it is from every activity of the body, it is kept in a certain where until, on the appointed day of the universal resurrection of the body, it is raised by God’s power and is again connected with it. After this, man receives the just sentence of the Judge.

The immortality of the soul is affirmed.

§ 141. Therefore the soul, the noblest part of man, does not perish in death but continues immortal, something we give as proven on the following bases:

(I) From the clear assertion of our Savior (Matt. 10:28): “They cannot kill the soul.” That which lives in such a way that it cannot be killed is immortal. A denial of killing is an assertion of immortality and indestructibility. But now, the soul lives in such a way that it cannot be killed. Therefore it is immortal. Augustine (on John, tr. 47): “How am I sure that the soul does not die? Listen to the Lord Himself giving that assurance to His servant: ‘Do not fear those who kill the body and afterward have nothing else that they can do’ [Matt. 10:28]. Surely, then, the soul is immortal.” If someone objects with Schmaltzius (Cont. Frantz., p. 413) that it is immediately added in what follows: “Fear Him who can destroy soul and body in hell,” this objection is invalid, for what is being discussed there is the second death which occurs not by butchery and annihilation but by torturing with the
punishments of hell. Tertullian writes (De resurr. carnis, ch. 34, p. 330): “We accept the immortality of the soul such that it is believed to perish not by destruction but by punishment, that is, in hell.” Augustine (De civit. Dei, bk. 13, ch. 12): “The death of the whole man is followed by that which the authority of the Word of God calls ‘the second death.’ The Savior indicated this when He said, ‘Fear Him,’ etc. That last eternal death is rightly called the death of the soul because it does not have life from God, nor should it be said that the body is alive in which the soul is not there for living but for grieving,” etc.

In addition, the soul is not immortal in the same way as God is immortal, namely, essentially and independently, for in this sense only God is said to have immortality (1 Tim. 6:16). Rather, it is immortal through the gift of its creation, because God made it in such a way that it does not have within itself an inner cause of corruption but is by nature incorporeal, invisible, and immortal. Yet if He wanted, God could reduce the soul to nothing and wipe it out completely. However, because He wanted it to be immortal, it continues to be immortal through and because of that will of the Creator. Something is immortal either absolutely and simply because no power, even that of God, can destroy it—only God is immortal in this way—or because God has created it in such a way that it does not perish, though it can be destroyed by the absolute power of God; the souls of men and angels are immortal in this way.

§ 142. (II) From the contrast between soul and body. Something in which soul and body are contrasted with each other antithetically cannot be predicated of both equally. However, soul and body are contrasted with each other in mortality such that mortality is affirmed about the body but denied about the soul. Therefore mortality cannot be predicated of both equally. The minor proposition is proven from that very statement of the Savior: “Do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul” [Matt. 10:28], where it is clear that killing is predicated of the body affirmatively and of the soul negatively. We add the passage Eccl. 12:7: “The dust returns to the earth just as it was before, but the spirit returns to God who gave it.” If the spirit—that is, the soul—were subject to death in the same way as the body, surely a contrast could not be made between the states of body and of soul which follow after death.

(III) From the original creation of the soul. The souls of beasts were produced of the same raw material as their bodies, and, for this reason, when their bodies perish, their souls themselves perish. Gen. 1:20 and 24: “God said, ‘Let the waters bring forth swarms of living souls, and let flying animals fly above the earth. Let the earth bring forth living souls according to their kind, livestock and crawling animals and beasts of the earth according to their kinds.’ For man, however, God breathed a soul into him. Gen. 2:7: “The Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his face the breath of life; and the man became a living soul.” From this we infer the following. If his origin is different from the souls of animals, his death, too, is not the same as that of the souls of animals. But now, the original creation of the human soul is different from that of the souls of animals because it was not made of elementary raw material, as are animals' souls, but was breathed by God into a body formed of earth. To the body, then, is attributed a molding from the dust of the earth, but to the soul is attributed the immediate inbreathing of God. The Hebrews note that the word ייצר [“formed”] has two yodhs, though regularly it should have one yodh and two tseres, to hint at the twofold creation of man, an earthly
one of his body and a heavenly one of his soul. Bernard (De nativ. Dom., serm. 2): “The spirit has not a common but a unique creation. It is not created in a mass but is inspired by a certain individual excellence.” Augustine (De Genes. ad literam, bk. 2, ch. 9) applies to this the words of Isa. 57:16: “I have made the souls.” More fittingly related to this is the passage Eccl. 12:7: “The spirit returns to God who gave it.” That is, God formed the body of man from the dust of the earth, but He breathed the soul into it. Therefore the dust, or the body formed from the dust, returns to the earth, but the spirit returns to God who gave it. Moreover, it should be added to this argument that man was created in the image and likeness of God (Gen. 1:27), and thus also for immortality (Wisdom 2:23), which God breathed into the soul of man. He illuminated it with the light of divine wisdom, righteousness, and joy and created it for eternal life.

§ 143. (IV) From its very name. Moses calls the soul breathed into the first man “the breath of lives” [יִּתְנֶפֶשׁ רֹבָמָה] [Gen. 2:7], where they note the plural number which suggests the twofold life of man, temporal and eternal, which man was supposed to obtain by the benefit of an immortal soul. However, because that word “lives” [רֹבָמָה] occurs only in the plural, that argument is not very strong. Some look for an argument from the word “spirit,” for just as the angels are rightly believed to be immortal because they are immaterial spirits, so also is the human soul because it is called “spirit” (Eccl. 3:21; Acts 7:59; Heb. 12:23; etc.). But because the souls of animals are called “spirits” (Gen. 6:17; Eccl. 3:21), a conclusive argument cannot be sought from that bare designation alone, but it must be connected and added to the rest that the soul is the sort of spirit which returns to God, which can and should be committed into God’s hand, etc.

(V) From its continuation of life after one’s death. Whoever is still living though their body has been reduced to ashes, their soul lives. The reason is that there are not more than two parts to a man: body and soul. Surely, then, life is attributed to him either with respect to the body or with respect to the soul. In regard to the body after death and before its resurrection and union with the soul, it cannot be said that it is alive. Therefore this must be understood with respect to the soul. I add: Although their bodies have been reduced to ashes, the holy patriarchs are still alive (Matt. 22:32; Mark 12:26[–27]; Luke 20:37[–38]). There Christ uses this argument: Those whom God regards in such a way that He calls Himself their God, they are alive, because God is not the God of the dead but of the living. Yet God regards the holy patriarchs in such a way that He calls Himself their God even after death (Exod. 3:6). Therefore those holy patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are still alive even after their death. However, they are not still alive with respect to their bodies; therefore it is with respect to their souls. Moreover, what is said about the holy patriarchs must also be stated about the rest of the godly, because God asserts that He is also their God. Note here that Christ seems to have taken His argument from Hab. 1:12: “Because You are our God from the beginning, we shall not die,” namely, forever.

§ 144. The Photinians object: (1) “It was the Savior’s intent there to talk about the resurrection of bodies.”

We respond. From this it cannot be inferred that the same work does not also establish the immortality of souls. For it is from the immortality of the soul that He deduces against the Sadducees its union with the body. It is very emphatic when He speaks not
in the future but in the present in Luke 20:38: “All are alive to Him.” The Sadducees
denied not only the resurrection of bodies but also the immortality of souls (Acts 23:8).
Therefore Christ is proving both against them on the basis of Moses, whose books alone
they would accept. Jerome (commentary on Matthew 22): “He sets an example from
Moses to prove the eternal nature of souls, as when he proved that souls continue to exist
after death. For it could not happen that He would be the God of those who did not exist.
Consequently, He also introduces the resurrection of bodies, which did good or evil along
with their souls.”

(2) “Christ ought to have said not that the fathers themselves but their souls are
alive.”

We respond. Opposites must not be made out of subordinates.1 The fathers are said
to be alive for the very reason that their souls are alive. Synecdoche, where what belongs
to the part is attributed to the whole, is commonly used in the Scriptures. Thus the
apostle says (Phil. 1:23): “I prefer to be with Christ,” that is, by way of and with respect
to the soul. The converted thief was going to be with Christ that very day (Luke 23:43).

(3) “God is called the God of the patriarchs because He had favor on them in time
past.”

We respond. In that case Christ would have had to have said not “I am,” but “I was
their God.” Although Moses does not add the verb explicitly in the Hebrew, nevertheless
when Christ quotes the words of Moses, He is correct in expressing it because it is con-
tained in it implicitly.

(4) “He is said to be their God because His favor is on their descendants.”

We respond. Scripture unites the two: that He is the God of the fathers and of their
seed or posterity (Gen. 17:7). Therefore He favors both not only in life but also after
death, that is, if they persevere in the true faith until the end of life.

(5) “In Rom. 14:9 Christ is called the Lord also of the dead.”

We respond. Some people make a distinction between the phrases “the God of the
dead” [Matt. 22:32] and “the Lord of the dead.” A simpler answer is that Christ is adapt-
ing His response [in Matthew] to the opinion of the Sadducees, who thought that man
died in body and soul and never again rose to life. In this sense Christ is correct in saying
that God is not God of the dead, that is, of those who are not alive with respect either
to soul or body and who have been entirely reduced to nothing. On the other hand, the
apostle [in Romans] is asserting that Christ is Lord of the living and of the dead, that is,
of those who no longer live on this earth but yet at the same time are leading a blessed
life in heaven. Briefly, God is God only of the living; that is, those of whom the heavenly
Lord says that He is their God are alive, but they are alive in two different ways. Some live
in the body and with the body, but others live outside of and loosed from the body; nev-
ernless they all are alive. From those divine words, then, our Savior completely proved
against the Sadducees both the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body.
The pious ancients acknowledge the same thing:

---

1 In logical arguments, “opposites” are propositions that exclude each other. On “subordinates,”
see above, p. 186 n. 66.
Origen (on Matthew, tr. 22, toward the end): “The God who is says, ‘I am who I am’ [Exod. 3:14], etc. Although He could have cited a thousand examples proving the coming resurrection, He did not do this from the prophets but only from the Law, because the Sadducees would read only the Law of Moses. Wanting to appease them from that, He produced from it an example. If it is impossible to be called the God of those who do not exist, if this is impossible, therefore He is the God of those who do exist and who are alive and sense His kindness.”

Hilary (on Psalm 51): “Everyone who is faithful in the Lord, though he be dead, is alive to God, as it is said, ‘I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob.’ He is not the God of the dead but of the living.” And later: “God has not taken away from Himself the right to make alive by decreeing the law that we must die” (etc.). “Therefore all the faithful saints are alive to God. For when He calls Himself the God of those who have died, that is, of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and then immediately testifies that God is the God not of the dead but of the living, He is teaching through this that those who are thought of as dead by the judgment of human opinion are not dead to Him, the one who decrees the Law.” Hilary again (on Matthew, can. 23, toward the middle): “These words, ‘I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,’ had come to Moses when those holy patriarchs were already at rest. Thus those whose God He was had God. But they could not have had anything if they did not exist, because it is in the nature of a thing that it must exist for something else to belong to it. Thus having God is for the living, because God is eternity, and it is not for those who are dead to have that which is eternal. How shall those who are and will be, be denied existence when Eternity declares that they exist?”

Damascenus (Orth. fid., bk. 4, ch. 28): “God is not the God of the dead, of those who have died and who will not exist anymore, but of the living. Their souls are alive in His hand, and their bodies will live again through the resurrection.”

Luther (commentary on Genesis, vol. 2, p. 295): “In the First Commandment is the doctrine of faith and of the resurrection of the dead: ‘I, the almighty Creator of heaven and earth, am your God. That is, you must live that life that I do.’ If He were saying this to cattle, they would live forever, but it is to us, to us, I say, that these things are said. Not this: ‘You should eat straw, grain, grass,’ but ‘I am your God!’” etc.

The following can be observed in passing, as Bellarmine teaches (De purg., bk. 1, ch. 3, response to arg. 2):

Among the Jews it once was very common to consider the question of the resurrection and that of the immortality of the soul as the same question, though they actually are different. For among the Jews, those who denied the one would deny the other, like the Sadducees, and those who would confess the one would also confess the other, like the Pharisees, as is clear from Acts 23. This is not without good reason, for since the rational soul is the true form of the body and thus a true part of man, it is implausible that God wanted the soul to live forever without the body. Hence, in Matthew 22, in order to prove the resurrection to the Sadducees, the Lord uses the testimony of Scripture: “I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God

---

of Jacob” [v. 32]. He also adds that He is not the God of the dead but of the living. From these points He intends to imply that the dead do therefore rise again. However, this argument draws no conclusion unless it is presupposed that the question of the immortality of souls and that of the resurrection of bodies are taken as one and the same question. Otherwise the consequence could be denied, for God will be the God of the living even if the dead did not rise again because their souls themselves are alive. In the same way, it proves nothing when the apostle says (1 Corinthians 15): “What benefit does it bring me if the dead do not arise? Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die” [v. 32], unless he presupposes that the souls are mortal if the bodies do not rise again. For if the soul is immortal, even if bodies did not rise again, it will be very beneficial to fast and live well because it will benefit by acquiring glory for the soul.

Aben Ezra writes (commentary on Lev. 18:13) that God says, “I will be the Lord your God,” in order to show that they are going to live in both ages. (Cf. Flacius, Clav. Script., part 1, s.v. resurrectio.)

In Matthew 22 and 1 Corinthians 15 the question of the immortality of the soul is connected with the resurrection of bodies, and the one is proved from the other. What connects these two questions—namely, of the immortality of the soul and of the resurrection of the body, or, on the other hand, of the mortality of the soul and of the permanent passing or eternal destruction of the body—is the greatest connection of these two parts of man. For God did not create the soul in such a way that it should live by itself eternally without the body as the angels do. Rather, because it is only one part of a man, it necessarily requires the restoration of the other part for the man to become whole. He who sins as a whole man must be punished as a whole man; or, in turn, he who is grafted onto Christ, has been justified through Him, and has become a child of God as a whole man, he will live forever as a whole man. If, then, the body is never supposed to be restored through resurrection, the other part of the man—namely, the soul—will necessarily be maimed and as nothing. But if it lives and is supposed to live forever and fare either well or badly, then by necessity it must at some point also receive the other part which entirely belongs to it so that the man may be whole forever. So, then, from the immortality of the soul is also firmly deduced the immortality of the body made through the renewal of the resurrection. In turn, from the full and permanent destruction of the body follows the nothingness and destruction of the soul as a maimed and mutilated part, so to speak.

§ 145. (VI) From the description of death. The Holy Spirit describes the death of the patriarchs in this way, that “they were gathered to their people” (Gen. 25:8; 35:29; 49:[33]). Earlier we showed that the immortality of the soul can be clearly deduced from this expression [§ 20]. This expression was used first of all about Abraham, about whom it cannot be said that his body was laid in the tombs of his ancestors. Therefore that gathering to his people which took place cannot be understood to be in reference to his body. When Daniel is about to die, he is told (Dan. 12:13): “Go to your end, and you will rest and stand” (you will rise at the divinely appointed time, and meanwhile you will be established with respect for your soul) “in your allotment,” that is, in the place assigned you, namely, “in the allotment of the saints in light” (Acts 26:18; Col. 1:12). Theodotion translates this “in your rank.” Therefore Daniel’s soul did not perish in death but has continued to survive in the allotment of the saints. On the other hand, about the betrayer
Judas, Peter says (Acts 1:25) that after death “he went to his place,” that is, to the place of torments, namely, the place prepared for him and all unbelievers by the just judgment of God (Matt. 25:41). For just as Solomon teaches by illustration (Eccl. 11:3): “If a tree falls” (that is, if the soul of a man, separated from the body, departs in death) “to the east or to the west” (in the place of joys or torments, in light or in darkness, in bliss or condemnation), “whatever place it falls, there it will be and remain.” In 2 Cor. 5:1 and 2 Pet. 1:14 death is called “the taking down of the tent.” But now, when a tent is taken down, the one who has been living in it does not immediately perish but sets the place of his fortunes elsewhere. In 2 Cor. 5:4 we are said in death to be taking off our clothes, namely, that of the body. But the one who takes off his clothes does not immediately cease to exist. In v. 8 we are said to be making a pilgrimage away from the body to the Lord. But now, the one who makes a pilgrimage only changes his location but does not lose his life. The same thing is to be stated about a man’s soul in death.

(VII) From the state and condition of souls after death. In Eccl. 12:5 it is said about the souls of all people in general that “they go to their eternal home,” that is, to the place where they will remain forever. This cannot be understood in reference to their bodies, which of course will be raised from the grave. In Luke 12:20 it is said that in death God will “recall” them. It is said about the souls of the godly in particular that they are committed into the hand of God as a special deposit or treasure (Ps. 31:5; Luke 23:46; Acts 7:59). For this reason Christ is called their “shepherd” and “bishop” not only in life but also in death (1 Pet. 2:25). In Luke 16:22 it is said that the angels carry them off into the bosom of Abraham; in Wisdom 3:1, that they are in the hand of God and that torment does not touch them; in Phil. 1:23, that they are with Christ; in 2 Cor. 5:8, that they are present with the Lord; in Luke 23:43, that they are with Christ in paradise as soon as they have been freed from their bodies. (Schmaltzius, Post. cont. Frantz., disp. 7, p. 410, divides this passage in such a way that he claims it must be read: “I say to you today: You will be with Me in paradise.” However, we shall refute later on this wicked separation of things which must be kept together [§ 190].) In Eccl. 12:7 it is said that they must return to God (into heavenly bliss, for some take this passage to refer to the souls of the godly in particular, though it can also be taken generally in the sense explained earlier). In Rev. 7:15 it is said that they are before the throne of God and serve Him day and night; in Rev. 6:10, that they ask God to avenge their blood, something we should take as referring specifically to the souls of the martyrs slain because of the Word of God (v. 9). But, on the other hand, it is said about the souls of the damned that they will be thrust immediately from death into hell, into the place of torments, and there they will be tormented (Luke 16:23–25, 28). Abigail, in her conversation with David (1 Sam. 25:29), describes this different and, in fact, opposing and completely contrary condition of the souls of the godly and of the ungodly after death: “The soul of my lord will be bound or wrapped up in the bundle of the living, but the soul of your enemies will be thrown with a sling.” For from other passages of Scripture it can be gathered that this must be taken as a reference not only to the preservation of life against the violence of enemies but also to the reward for godliness and kindness after this life.
From all these passages we draw the following conclusion: Whatever receives rewards or punishments immediately after death continues to survive after death. However, the soul of a man receives rewards or punishments immediately after death. Therefore.

(VIII) From the appearance of Moses. In Christ’s transfiguration (Matt. 17:3; Mark 9:4; Luke 9:30) it is not only Elijah, who was carried into heaven in a chariot of fire, who appears and speaks with Christ (Tertullian, De resurr. carnis, ch. 8, calls him “a candidate for eternity”), but it is also Moses, who had died several centuries earlier and whose body had been placed in the ground (Deut. 34:5–6). Therefore his soul did not perish along with his body but was carried up to heavenly bliss and experiences eternal joy. The same thing is to be stated about the souls of all the other godly.

(IX) From the resurrection of the flesh. In the Creed we confess faith in the resurrection of the flesh. But how will the body rise again without the soul, or how will there be a soul if it will not exist?

Whether the immortality of the soul can be learned from the light of nature.

§ 146. These are the stronger arguments which are cited from Scripture in favor of the immortality and imperishability of the soul. Some claim that the same thing can be effectively proven from the light of nature, and for this purpose they offer especially these reasons:

(1) The rational soul is a substance existing of itself and is spiritual, as is clear from its operation, because some spiritual acts of knowing are within us, that is, not consisting of matter nor depending on matter or subject but using no instrument in knowing universal and eternal nonmaterial things. Therefore it, too, is immortal. The scholars of Coimbra draw out this argument in detail in their treatise De anim. separat. (disp. 1, art. 3, col. 568).

(2) The human soul is a simple, invisible, immaterial essence, very much like God, independent of material.

(3) It is an essence moving itself first.

(4) It desires with the eternal appetite of nature, and it is not likely that such a desire is engendered within it in vain.

(5) It contemplates eternal essences, though nothing nevertheless can rise up to the contemplation of Him from whose entire class of being it differs.

(6) It is perfected more and more in its removal from sensory things; therefore when it will be separated from the body, it will come out as entirely perfect.

(7) It did not arise from the elements because it has naturally inherent knowledge which no elementary matter can imbibe.

(8) It makes an inherent distinction between the honorable and the shameful. From this it concludes the rule of justice that it should go well for the good and badly for the bad. But now, in this life the good rather often do not receive their rewards nor the wicked their deserved punishments. Therefore there remains another life to which the immortal soul aspires; otherwise that distinction inherent in the mind would be in vain.

(9) It puts fear into people whose conscience bothers them because of their sins. Therefore it has a natural concern about the state that will follow after death and is rightly conscious of its own immortality. For if the soul were not to survive after death,
people would have no reason to have a bad conscience as to why they should fear future punishment.

(10) At times it experiences naturally a sort of ecstasy, that is, an intended application of the rational part to things above without any use of the senses. Therefore it can also exist naturally of itself, for anything which does not in and of itself depend on something else to work also does not depend on something else to exist. (See Zabarella, *De accret. et nutrit.*, ch. 15, p. 811.)

(11) And, finally, they stress the consensus of the more sensible philosophers, who argue that the immortality of the soul is among the number of those things which are preconceptions, first premises, granted by all. Tertullian (*De resurr. carn.*, ch. 3): “Some things are known by nature, such that the immortality of the soul is known to many.” The verse of Phocylides, written from the Sibylline oracles, speaks about the immortality of the soul in this way:

Soul remain unharmed in the process of decay.

Also:

The soul lives immortal and unaging always.

Lactantius (*Instit.*, bk. 7, ch. 13) also cites these Sibylline lines:

Being always ageless, it remains impervious to everything.

It remains immortal and is the mistress of life

Because the foreknowledge of God arranged it as His firstborn.

Ovid sings:3 “Souls have no death.” (Cf. Plato, *Gorgias, Phaedo, Epinomides*, and *De republica*, bk. 10; Cicero, *Disp. Tusculan.*, bk. 1; *Cato Maior*, or *De senectute*; Thomas, *Contra gentes*, bk. 2, ch. 79; Antoninus of Florence, *Summ.*, part 1, tit. 1, ch. 5, § 2; Pererius, *Physic.*, bk. 6, ch. 20; Valerius, *Physic.*, ch. 50; Andreas Cesalpinus, *Quaest. peripatat.*, bk. 2, q. 8; Lemnius, *De occult. nat. mirac.*, bk. 1, ch. 14; Camerarius, *Subcisiv. oper.*, bk. 1, ch. 97; and many others.)

Ludovicus Vives writes (*De anima*, bk. 2, ch. *de imm. anim.*): “Wherever we turn—up, down, around—all things teach, testify, and cry out that the soul is immortal: nature and the necessity of causes, the proportionality and analogy, life and harmony, the dignity of man, the goodness of God, our usefulness from His kindness.”

§ 147. On the other hand, Scotus (*Sent.*, bk. 4, dist. 43, q. 2), Cajetan (on Romans 9 and Ecclesiastes 3), and those whom Scaliger (*Exerc.*, no. 307, sec. 33) follows in this question claim that the immortality of the soul cannot be proven firmly and conclusively by natural light. For this reason the scholars of Coimbra (op. cit.) are angry with them, but more than is deserved. For we distinguish: (1) Between preceding and following reasons. Thomas ([ST,] part 1, q. 32, art. 1): “A reason for something is introduced in two ways: first, to prove sufficiently some root; second, that which shows that the consequent effects are in harmony with the posited root.” In this latter way the immortality of the soul can be proven from natural light after the same consequence will first have been proven as immovable from the Holy Scriptures. (2) Between compelling and probable reasons. Arguments produced from the light of nature can introduce some persuasion

---

of probability about the immortality of the soul, but by no means do they show a firm, immovable, and unchangeable foundation for faith. The wise king says (Eccl. 3:21): “For who knows” (namely, from natural principles and reasons) “whether the spirit of man goes upward and the spirit of the animal goes downward?” Philipp Melanchthon (Explicat. evang. hom. de die pascat., f. 519 of the Hanover edition of 1549) says, “Philosophy makes some conjecture and has some guess about immortality, however little that might be and whatever it might be like.” Peter Martyr (Loci, class. 3, ch. 15, no. 16): “That the soul is immortal is rather unclear to the light of nature, because no few noble philosophers have had a much different opinion. In fact, Tertullian and Nazianzen ascribe even to Aristotle himself that he believed that man’s soul was mortal. Also Alexander, the Peripatetic of Aphrodisia, quite clearly believed this,” etc. This is also clear from a passage of Cicero (Disp. Tuscul., bk. 1, in a question not far from the beginning), for there Atticus is introduced saying this:4 “I am pleased with the idea that, when men’s spirits depart from their bodies, they can arrive at heaven as if at their dwelling place. First, I would want this to be true. Second, even if it is not, I would want to convince myself that it is.” Marcus responds: “Why, then, do you need our help? Can we surpass Plato in eloquence? Unroll his book on the soul carefully! You will have no more to desire.” Atticus retorts: “By Hercules, I have done it and, in fact, quite often. But somehow, when I read it, I agree; but when I put down his book and begin to reflect on the immortality of souls, all that agreement slips away.” The same doubt is put in the mouth of Cato in Cicero (Dial. de senectute). The opinions of philosophers about the immortality of the soul are susceptible to many doubts, not unlike the storms of winds and waves by which a storm-tossed ship at sea is beaten about and driven this way and that.

**Statements of the fathers concerning the immortality of the soul.**

§ 148. Many things can be cited from the fathers to defend the immortality of the soul because the unanimous consensus of godly and learned antiquity supports this teaching.

Clement (Recognitiones, bk. 3) testifies that Peter used this line of reasoning: “If God is just, the soul is immortal.”

Irenaeus (bk. 2, ch. 62, p. 163): “In the story written about the rich man and Lazarus, the Lord taught quite clearly that souls not only continue to endure without passing from one body into another but also observe the character of the body in which they are also adapted and remember the works they did here and from which they have ceased.” Book 5 (ch. 10, p. 324): “Souls are incorruptible in comparison with mortal bodies. For God breathed the breath of life into the face of man, and he became a living soul [Gen. 2:7]. Moreover, the state of life is nonbodily. It is flesh which dies and is dissolved, not soul nor spirit. To die is to lose the ability to live, to become breathless, soulless, and motionless from now on, and to perish in those things from which it had the beginning of its substance. This, however, does not happen to the soul, for it is the breath of life; nor to the spirit, for it is not a composite being but a simple spirit which cannot be dissolved, and it is life itself for those who obtain it.”

---

4 Cicero, Tusculan Disputations 1 (LCL 141:30–31).
ON DEATH

The author of *Quaest. ad Antiochum*, which is attributed to Athanasius, writes (q. 17):

“The word of Christ teaches us very clearly that our body is mortal and that our soul is immortal. For Christ says, ‘Do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul’ [Matt. 10:28].”

Chrysostom (*De provid.*, hom. 4) says, “Those who can doubt the immortality of the soul can also doubt whether it is day at noon.”

Ambrose (*De bono mortis*, ch. 9, part 4, p. 239):

It is obvious that the soul does not die along with the body because it is not of the body. Moreover, that the soul is not of the body is taught by Scripture in many ways. For Adam received the spirit of life from the Lord our God, and man became a living soul. And David says, “Soul, turn to rest because the Lord has blessed you. Listen to how He has blessed you, because,” he says, “He has freed my feet from slipping” [Ps. 116:7–8]. You see that he rejoices at the remedy of this death because an end has been made to error, because sin and not nature is lacking. Then, as if unclothed and freed, he says, “I shall please the Lord in the land of the living” [v. 9], for that is the region of those who are alive. Then he calls that rest of souls the land of the living, where sins do not enter, where the glory of virtues is alive.

And later:

The soul that sins dies, but surely not with some destruction of itself. Rather, it dies deservedly to God because it lives in sin. For how can its substance perish, because it certainly is the soul which pours in life? That which has a soul poured into it has life poured into it. That which has the soul depart from it has life depart from it. Therefore the soul is life. For how can it accept death when it is the opposite of death? Just as snow cannot accept heat because it immediately melts, and just as light does not accept darkness because it immediately breaks it up, because when light is brought in, the horror of darkness is removed, as when fire is brought close, the cold of snow ceases—so also the soul that creates life does not accept death or die.

Chapter 10:

Therefore you have an explanation; but the former is human, the latter divine, when the Lord says, “I have the power to put aside My soul and the power to take it up again” [John 10:18]. You see, then, that it does not die with the body. It is put aside, and then taken back again, and it is commended into the hands of God the Father. But that you might not say, “That which belongs to Christ is special,” listen to Him say, “How do you know if your soul is to be demanded tonight?” [Luke 12:20]. Did He actually say that your soul dies within you? No, but that it is “demanded of you.” That which has been given is demanded, or they take it back from you. For the soul is taken back, not destroyed. What is taken back continues to exist, but what is destroyed no longer exists (etc.).

Lactantius (*Instit.*, bk. 7, chs. 9–11) proves the immortality of souls with many arguments. He says:

If God is without body, invisible, and eternal, therefore it is not believable that the soul should perish just because it is not seen after it leaves the body. For clearly there is something sentient and flourishing which does not come into view. From this is also recognized the immortality of the soul because there is no other living creature which has some knowledge of God. It is almost only religion that separates man from
the animals. Because this comes to people alone, it surely bears witness that we affect, that we desire, that we worship that which is familiar to us, that which is going to be near (etc.). Virtue, too, is given to people alone, and that is a great argument that the soul is immortal, because it will not happen according to nature if the soul is wiped out, for that endangers this present life.

In ch. 13 he says, “Those who denied the immortality of souls had good eyes but a blind heart.”

Gregory of Nyssa (De resurr. et anim.) also confirms the immortality of the soul with many arguments.

Augustine writes (commentary on Psalm 88): “In regard to the immortality of the soul, even many philosophers of the heathen have argued many points, and they have left it written for memory in very many books that the human soul is immortal.” In De orig. anim. ad Hieron. (bk. 1, ch. 2), among those things which he asserts that he holds very firmly about the soul, he lists its immortality. He says: “A man’s soul is immortal according to some measure of its own, for it is not exactly like God. For Holy Scripture recounts many things about the deaths of souls, but because it dies alienated from the life of God in such a way that it nevertheless does not altogether cease living according to its own nature. Thus it is found to be mortal for one reason, as also it is said to be immortal not without reason.” Letter 3 ad Volus.: “Now what extreme idiot or what lowly little girl does not believe that the soul is immortal?”

Sidonius (in his Epitaph. Claud. Mamert.): “Mind and glory cannot be buried.”

Gregory (Dialog.): “The almighty God created three living spirits: one which has rule over the flesh; the second which is covered by the flesh but does not die with the flesh; the third which is covered by the flesh and does die with the flesh. The first belongs to the angels; the second, to men; the third, to animals.”

However, in something so obvious there is no need to say more.

The antithesis of those who deny the immortality of the soul.

§ 149. The immortality of the soul is denied by: (1) The Epicureans. Scripture expresses their wicked thoughts and voices by way of imitation (Isa. 22:13; 1 Cor. 15:32): “Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we shall die.” Wisdom 2:2–3, 21–23: “We were born by chance, and afterward we shall be as if we never existed. For our body will be spent ashes, and the spirit will dissolve like tender air.” They thought these things and were in error, for their wickedness blinded them, and they did not recognize the secrets of God or hope for the reward of righteousness nor discern the prize for blameless souls. For God created man for incorruption.” Augustine (Confess., bk. 6, last chapter): “If the soul is mortal, Epicurus wins first place in my mind.” (Cf. Plutarch, De placit. philos., bk. 4, ch. 7; and Galen, De phil. hist., ch. 17—where they attribute this opinion to Epicurus.)

If only that opinion had died along with Epicurus, but things show that Brenz’s complaint (Homily 35 on Luke 2) is not for nothing: “Although there is no public confession among us that the soul perishes together with the body or that there is no resurrection from the dead, nevertheless the impure and profane life led by the vast majority of people clearly indicates that they do not think that there is a life after this one,” etc.
(II) The Sadducees. Acts 23:8 says about them: “They say that there is no resurrection or angel or spirit.” Some understand “spirit” here to mean an angel. Therefore they think that those words “or angel” have crept into the text as a gloss, or at any rate the latter is an explanation of the former, as in v. 9: “What if a spirit or an angel spoke to him?” They think this explanation is favorable because of what is added: “The Pharisees believe in them both,” namely, both that there is a resurrection of the flesh and that there are angels. However, it is better to stick with the literal sense because the Sadducees denied not only the angels but also souls; that is, they claimed that a man’s soul is nothing other than the natural temperament of the elements which passes away along with the body, rather than a spiritual essence which is separated from the body and continues to exist after death. Josephus (Antiquit. Judaic., bk. 18, ch. 2): “The opinion of the Sadducees extinguishes souls, too, along with the body.” De bell. Judaic. (bk. 2, ch. 7): “In general the Sadducees deny both the punishment and the honors of souls.” (See Tertullian, De resurr. carnis.)

(III) Some Arabs. Eusebius writes about them (Hist. eccles., bk. 6, ch. 37): “At the same time” (the third century after Christ) “some others arose in Arabia who introduced a doctrine foreign to the truth. They said that in this present time souls die and perish along with the body, but in the resurrection to come they will be restored to life together with them afresh. So Origen was invited back to a synod of significant size gathered for this purpose, and he publicly debated this question such that the minds of those who earlier had been misled were turned away from error,” Augustine quotes this passage from Eusebius in the same words (De haeres. ad Quodvultd., ch. 83), and the same thing is found in Ius canonicum (c. Quidam, 24, q. 3).

(IV) Akin to this error is when Jerome mentions about Origen (Letter ad Avitum) that he had thought “that souls, after they had received salvation, no longer would be souls. For just as, he says, the Lord and Savior came to seek and save that which had perished so that it no longer would be perished, so also the soul that had perished and for whose salvation the Lord has come will cease to be a soul when it has been saved.”

(V) Damascenus (De haeres., p. 585) mentions some heretics whom he calls “Thnetopsychites,” who said that the souls of men are like the souls of animals and that they pass away along with their bodies.

(VI) Many of the heathen philosophers have denied the immortality of the soul. Augustine writes (De spir. et anim., ch. 48): “The soul does not die along with the body, as Aratus declares, nor does it pass away later, as Zeno said, because it lives substantially.” Pliny (Nat. hist., bk. 7, ch. 55)5 deserves the best in regard to the souls of animals, about which he wrote so much; but he deserves the worst in regard to the human soul, whose mortality he attacks with biting bitterness. In his book Quod animi mores temperamentum corporis sequantur, Galen scolds Plato for defending the immortality of the soul. Justin (Paraenes. ad gent.), Gregory of Nyssa (De anim.), Nazianzen (Cont. Eunom.), Plutarch (De placit. philos., ch. 1), Cajetan (De anim., bk. 3, ch. 2), Pomponatius (De immortal. anim.), and many others attribute to Aristotle that he claimed that the human soul was mortal. On the other hand, Eugubinus (De perenn. philos., bk. 3, ch. 21) and the scholars of Coimbra (De anim. separat., disp. 1, art. 2) try to free him from this stain.

---

In *De anim.* (bk. 3, ch. 5), he says, “There is only one thing separable, the mind, and this alone is immortal and eternal.” Scotus (*Sent.*, bk. 4, dist. 43, q. 2, art. 2) and Nifo (*De immort. anim.*, ch. 1) think: “Aristotle certainly had doubts about this question and inclined sometimes to this opinion and sometimes to that one.” Lucretius (bk. 3) tries to prove the mortality of the soul with thirty more arguments.

(VII) Concerning John XXIII, the Council of Basel (sess. 11, toward the end of part 4 of the *Concil.*, Venetian edition, p. 294) speaks in this way: “Often and more often, before high churchmen and other respectable and honest men, at the urging of the devil he stubbornly has said, asserted, dogmatized that there is no eternal or other life after this one. In fact, he said and stubbornly believed that the soul of a man is extinguished with the body and dies like those of brute animals,” etc. When the pontiff Paul III was about to die, he is reported to have said that he was now going to learn the truth about three questions on which he had entertained doubts throughout his life: “First, whether souls are immortal; second, whether there is a hell; third, whether there is a God.” Petrus Pomponatus of Mantua taught publicly at Bologna about the mortality of the soul and the destruction of it. Giorgio Sabino, furnished with Philipp's letter of recommendation, was admitted to the conversation and table of Cardinal Bembo. Among other things Bembo asked him specifically about three subjects: “First, what was Philipp's annual stipend? Second, how many hearers did he have? Third, what did Philipp believe about the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the dead, and eternal life?” When Sabino had responded to the third question: “There are many pages of his, and especially a book of commonplaces, in which are to be seen the complete assurance of his faith about these articles,” Bembo responded: “I would consider Philipp a prudent man if he did not believe these things.”

(Cf. Oswald Gottwald, *Meditat. practic. praesent. in coena.*) In the Lateran Council of 1512 the immortality of the soul had to be asserted with a special decree. From this it is understood that many within the papal kingdom had had doubts about it. M. Antonius Zimara (*Problemata*, prob. 50) asks: “Why do clerics and monks in the papacy feel disturbed and shudder at death more than other things?” And he answers: “Either because by nature they are cold of heart and melancholy, or because they have decided that they will pass away completely and utterly, since they exist neither in their own nature nor in that of descendants when they depart from this life.” With this he wanted to hint that many of them called into doubt the resurrection of the flesh and the immortality of the soul.

(VIII) As for the Anabaptists, Feuardentius (*Adnotat. ad Irenaeum,* ch. 63) writes:

In 1568 the Anabaptists published throughout Poland their theses printed at Krakow, the tenth of which is: “We deny that any soul continues to exist after death. On the contrary, we say that the Antichrist thought that up to set up his own kitchen through a fictitious purgatory and the invocation of the saints.” One of their ministers, Domonowski, also held a debate with the fathers of the Polish Society in October 1589, and there he publicly asserted that the soul perishes along with the body. Another, named Budnaeus, was asked what he thought about this subject, and he answered that it was a dubious matter and that the decision was still pending under

---

the judge. Andreas Jurgiewicius, a both careful and learned man, reports these things about his Poland in his pamphlet which he calls *Bellum quinti evangelii* (ch. 10).

(IX) About the Libertines, Calvin (*Contra Libertinos*) writes that, according to a certain author Quentin Piccard, they teach that souls of men are not immortal.

(X) Servetus introduced the mortality of the soul along with other monstrous errors, according to Beza (*Letter ad Dudithium*, p. 190).

(XI) The Photinians speak about the immortality of the soul unclearly and deceitfully. They explain the reason for this plan of theirs in the handwritten *Acta* of the Colloquy of Racovia. They say: “This matter must be dealt with cautiously, just as both Christ Himself and the apostles accommodated themselves to the capacity of the people, as the parable of the rich man and Lazarus teaches. That was not a time for upsetting the Jews, as now also is not such a time. So also sometimes some things can be said which assert this opinion to people, until finally the time becomes ripe and people become accustomed to these manners of speaking.” Moreover, they seem to believe that the soul of man is extinguished along with the body, but it is called “immortal” because the souls of the godly are going to be raised up again to life along with their bodies. In regard to the ungodly they claim that either they are not going to be raised up again or that after their resurrection and judgment they are going to be reduced to nothing. That they actually believe this is readily apparent from their hypotheses, for they claim: “The death of a man is the annihilation of him” or reduction to nothing, and that resurrection and rising up again is nothing else but to “exist again out of nonexistence,” as we have seen above [§ 54]. They deny that the souls of men receive rewards or punishments after death. The [Colloquy] of Racovia speaks as follows about this:

It should be noted that to a certain extent Christ and the apostles were forced to adapt themselves to the opinions of men which were predominant at that time and often, as the parable of the rich man and Lazarus teaches clearly enough. For that someone was in hell and was being tormented there and that someone rests in the bosom of Abraham are clearly fiction and are similar to the things the poets write about Ixion, Sisyphus, and Tantalus. Those who wish to consider the glory of God must also use this prudence today in this matter among the common crowd of Christians. It does not escape me that you, too, deny the immortality of souls except of Christians at the resurrection.

Although [the *Acta*] deny this (pp. 56, 77), it is effectively inferred from the hypothesis that dying means being completely extinguished and that rising again means existing again after nonexistence. This is why on p. 79 it also wretchedly weakens the passage in Eccl. [12:7]: “The spirit returns to God who gave it,” which Puccius had cited in support of the immortality of the soul. Schmaltzius (*Contra Frantz.*, disp. 7, p. 409) complains that he and his followers are falsely charged with claiming that “man dies as far as his soul is concerned.” However, in the same place he adds: “We have grave doubts as to whether that spirit which has been separated from the body and which returns to God has been endowed with any feeling. In fact, we believe that the situation is quite different.” Page 140: “We believe that the soul, or spirit, returns after death to God, who gave it, and so it survives” (note!) “in its own way.” In the same work he refutes the arguments which Frantz had cited in support of the immortality of the soul from Luke 23:43; Phil. 1:23;
Rev. 6:9; etc. On p. 413 he adds: “The passage of Eccl. 12:7 is nearly the only one which confirms openly that man’s soul survives after death.” However, Socinus tries to twist that into a strange sense, so what protection or foundation for this opinion will be left then to remain in Scripture?

(XII) The Jesuits accuse our Luther of denying the immortality of souls because he writes (vol. 7, Wittenberg edition, Adsert. articulorum per bullam papalem damnatorum, p. 127): “Recently in Rome in a truly masterful way they decreed the holy article that the soul of man is immortal. For it had been forgotten in the common Creed, when we all say, ‘I believe in an eternal life.’ Likewise, with the help of Aristotle they also decreed that the soul is an essential form of the body, and many more of these fine articles, which are most especially fitting for the Papist Church, that they may retain men’s dreams and the devil’s teaching, while they trample underfoot the teachings of Christ and the Creed.”

Martin Borrich, a Calvinist, throws the same passage before us. Pistorius (Hodeg., ch. 12, p. 536) writes: “Luther says that man’s soul perishes along with the body and is mortal.”

We respond. (1) In six hundred places Luther sets out his own teaching of the immortality of the soul, which he did not wish to deny with those words. (2) Greiser and other Jesuits attribute to Luther a sleeping of the soul, as will become clear below [On Death, Part Two (Commonplace XXIX/2), § 305]. Therefore he did not deny the immortality of the soul, for sleeping is one thing, nonexisting another. (3) The context shows clearly that Luther is not denying the immortality of the soul but is making fun of the pope, who in his councils promises new articles of faith and, when coming to the matter, produces either those which were sufficiently established already before in Scripture and in the creeds of our faith (such as immortality, which shortly before had been defined by the Lateran Council under Leo X, sess. 8); or those which were taken from the schools of the philosophers and have nothing to do with the doctrine of salvation (such as the essential form of the body); or even false, anti-Christian, and wicked ones (such as purgatory, transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the Mass, the power of the pope, the choice of foods, etc.), which Luther, from the apostle, calls “doctrines of demons” [1 Tim. 4:1]. That this is Luther’s genuine intent is obvious from the fact that he adds ironically to the article which the pope established about the immortality of the soul: “Namely, in the Creed the Holy Spirit forgot this article in which we all confess life everlasting.” In the same sense must be taken the words of Luther (Adsert. omnium articul., art. 27, vol. 2, Latin edition of Jena, f. 307): “Nevertheless I allow the pope to make articles of faith for himself and his faithful, such as that bread and wine are transubstantiated in the Sacrament; that the essence of God neither begets nor is begotten; that the soul is the substantial form of the human body; that he is the emperor of the world, the king of heaven and god of earth; that the soul is immortal.”

8 Assertio omnium articulorum M. Lutheri per bullam Leonis X. novissimam damnatorum (1520), WA 7:426 (AE 71).
9 Assertio omnium articulorum M. Lutheri per bullam Leonis X. novissimam damnatorum (1520), WA 7:131–32 (AE 71).
With clearly similar impudence Pistorius (Mille viginti falsa) smears onto all Lutherans this heresy that “with the Sadducees they do not believe in the immortality of the soul” because they call the saints who live with Christ in heaven “the dead.”

And yet: (1) In this area we are following the lead of Scripture (Rom. 14:8; 1 Thess. 4:16; Rev. 14:13) and of the Apostles’ Creed, in which Christ is said to be the judge of “the living and the dead.” (2) We call those saints “the dead” not in the Photinian sense, that they no longer exist and live, but in the orthodox sense, namely, both distinctively, that they may be distinguished from the saints who are still living on the earth, and relatively, with respect to the soulish life from which they have been translated to heavenly and spiritual life.

The arguments against the immortality of the soul.

§ 150. Against the immortality of the soul and in support of the destruction of the soul, the following are cited: (1) certain passages of Scripture; (2) rational arguments.

From Scripture. Job 14:10: “When a man dies, where is he?”

The stronger statements of Scripture are these: (1) Job 14:7, 10–12, 14: “A tree has hope, if it is cut down, that it will sprout again and that its shoots will not cease. But when man dies and is seized in weakness, where, I ask, is he? Just as the waters recede from the sea and the river empties and runs dry, so, too, when man sleeps, he does not rise. Do you think a dead man will live again?”

We respond. (1) If all these things were understood simply and absolutely, not only the immortality of the soul but also the resurrection of the dead will be denied. (2) It is clear from Job 19:25 that Job made an outstanding confession about the resurrection of the dead.

(3) Therefore some respond that Job, vexed by the greatness of his grief, is considering only the present evil condition. He is not thinking now of the resurrection of the dead, nor is he lifting his spirits there as the force of calamity presses in on him. He does not, however, deny [the resurrection], as seen from his hope in the Lord which he confesses everywhere (Job 13:15–16): “Even if the Lord kills me, I shall hope in Him. He will be my salvation.” However, this hope could not be certain unless he was considering the resurrection.

(4) Rufinus (Expos. symb., p. 387), Lyranus (in his commentary), and others think that the meaning of these words is that man is not going to be in a worse condition than a tree which has been cut down and is nearly dead, and then rises again and sends out sprouts. Therefore what is added to the apodosis of the comparison they read as a question: “Will a man die?” And “Where, I ask, is he?” they explain as “Where is he eventually?” or “Will he really never be?” (with admiration) and “Will he never appear again?” On the contrary, in fact, he will be renewed by the scent of the divine spirit as a tree is regenerated by the scent and breath of the waters. Rufinus says:

Is it not evident that with these words he is, so to speak, shaming people, saying, “Is the human race so foolish that when they see the trunk of a felled tree putting forth
shoots from the ground and the dead wood taking life again, they\(^\text{10}\) think that their own case has no comparison, not even to wood or even the trees? But that you may know that it should be read as a question when he said, “But when a mortal has fallen, will he not rise again?” he proves from what follows. For he immediately adds: “For if a man dies, will he live?” And a little later he says, “I shall wait until I am made again” [Job 14:14]. And again he says, “He will raise again above the earth my skin which now draws these things” [cf. Job 19:25–26 LXX].

(5) Some answer that Job is speaking about man’s condition after death according to nature, namely, that he cannot be brought back to life naturally. However, the resurrection is not a work of nature but of God through Christ.

(6) Some claim that Job is speaking these things not from his own opinion but from that of his friends, and that he is refuting the opinion of those who are looking only to the good and evil things of this life and are not thinking at all of the future. Job refutes them under this charge: that under such circumstances man would be the most wretched of all because life is disastrous for him and his death is everlasting and irreversible.

(7) The response which is simplest and best fits the text is that Job is discussing here man’s recall and return to this life. This is shown by theprotasisofthecomparison, because a felled tree still puts forth shoots and greens again for this life; but man, once dead, is not brought back to this life except by an extraordinary and special miracle of God. This is shown, too, by a comparison with a similar passage. [Job] 7:7: “Remember that my life is like a breath; my eye will never again see good”; that is, I am not going to return to this life to enjoy any happiness or good in it again. Verses 9–10: “As the cloud fades and vanishes, so he who goes down to the tomb does not come up; he returns no more to his house, nor does the place know him anymore,” namely, where he had been before while he was still living. It is shown by the expressed limitation added in vv. 14–15: “I wait all the days I am now serving until my change comes. You will call me” (namely, on the Last Day when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of Man, John 5:28–29), “and I will answer You” (I shall hear Your voice and shall come forth alive from the grave). “You will favor the work of Your hands.”

(8) Job, however, is so far from denying the resurrection of the dead with these words that rather he is establishing it. For he does not simply and absolutely say, “Once man falls asleep, he will not rise up again,” but he adds “until they pass away,” or do not exist, “why will he not keep watch?” [Job 14:12 Vg]. Mercerus takes this as a simple negation so that the sense is: “as long as the heavens will be” or “until the heavens will no longer exist,” which will never occur. That is, man is never going to be put back together according to nature. However, the very confession of Job and other passages of Scripture (Isa. 65:18; 66:24; Luke 21:33; etc.) show that these words are more accurately taken as a sort of limitation and determination of time when, after the destruction of heaven and earth has begun, God’s power is going to raise up man again from the sleep of death. Epiphanius (Ancor.): “Job says, ‘When a man sleeps, he will no longer rise again or know his place,’ because, in fact, the resurrection does not occur every day, but it has been decreed for one day. But as Job shows that he knows he is looking into some

\(^{10}\) Read opinentur with PL 21:383 instead of opinetur.
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predetermined time, he immediately answers the question. 'Until heaven and earth are 
removed, our bodies are in the earth; but when the One who rolls up heaven like a book 
and shakes the earth comes, then those who are in the earth will rise again.'

(9) The same dissimilarity of the tree which Job cites to disprove the recall of man 
to this life is applied by the Holy Spirit elsewhere to prove the resurrection of the dead 
(John 12:24; 1 Cor. 15:36). Just as trees and grasses and seeds, nearly dead in winter and 
which appear to us to have clearly died in the cold of winter, put up shoots again, and 
just as seeds, rotting in the earth, turn green again after some time, so also “our bones 
will flourish like grass” in the resurrection (Isa. 66:14). Why could not He who does this 
every year for trees, shrubs, and seeds according to the ordinary course of nature do the 
same thing for the human body beyond nature?

Psalm 115:17: “The dead will not praise You.”

§ 151. (II) Ps. 115:17: “The dead will not praise You, nor any of those who go down 
into silence.” In harmony with this are Ps. 6:5: “In death there is no one who remembers 
You”; and Ps. 30:9: “Will the dust confess You or tell of Your faithfulness?”

We respond. (1) The psalmist is speaking about those proclamations of divine praise 
which the devout offer to God with a bodily voice in this life in the fellowship of the 
church militant. He is speaking about the preaching and spreading of true doctrine and the 
celebration of God’s benefits and of His praises, all of which serves others in this life. He is 
drawing them to imitation by an example, for he immediately adds (Ps. 115:18): “But we 
who live bless the Lord from this time forth and forevermore,” that is, to all eternity. For 
though the souls of the godly, loosed from their bodies, live with God in heavenly bliss and 
glory and praise God in their own way along with the heavenly spirits, yet that celebration 
of God’s name is no longer heard by people still living in the flesh such that they might 
be roused by it to conceive faith in the mercy of God and to give thanks to God. This is 
fruit that the praises and thanksgivings in the church of people still living on earth obtain. 
(Cf. Sirach 17:28: “From the dead, as from one who does not exist, thanksgiving ceases. 
The one who is alive and healthy of heart praises the Lord.”) Augustine (explanation of 
Psalm 29 [30]) writes: “If I do not quickly rise up again, and if my body is destroyed, ‘will 
my dust really praise You?’ that is, the crowd of the wicked whom I shall justify with my 
resurrection. ‘Or will it announce Your truth to the salvation of others?’ [Ps. 30:9].”

(2) Some take these words as a reference to those who perish with the second or 
eternal death and explain “Sheol” as hell so that the meaning is: Unless You lift me up 
with the Spirit of comfort and are present with Your help, I can easily slip into the pit 
of despair and, consequently, of damnation. Basil writes on Psalm 113: “He is not here 
calling ‘dead’ those who simply have finished their life but those who died in wickedness, 
for they go down into hell.” However, the first explanation fits the text better.

(3) That the psalmist by no means absolutely and simply denies that the dead praise 
the Lord is clear both from this passage, because he adds “We who are alive bless the 
Lord from this time forth and forevermore” [Ps. 115:18], and from other passages in the 
Psalms: Ps. 116:7: “Return to rest, my soul, for the Lord has blessed you”; Ps. 116:9: “I 
will walk in the presence of the Lord in the land of the living”; Ps. 118:17: “I shall not die, 
but I shall live and recount the deeds of the Lord.”
Ecclesiastes 3:19: “The fate of the sons of men and the fate of beasts are the same.”

§ 152. (III) Eccl. 3:19–21: “The fate of the sons of men and the fate of beasts are the same. As the latter dies, so, too, does the former. They all have the same breath, and man has no advantage over the animals; for all is vanity. All go to one place; all are from the dust, and all turn to dust again. Who knows whether the spirit of man goes upward and the spirit of the beast goes down to the earth?”

We respond. (1) Gregory (Dialog., bk. 4, ch. 41) thinks these words are cited in imitation, in the persona of the ungodly, just like those found in Wisdom 2:1[–20]. In this regard he is following Gregory of Neocaesarea, who applies these words to Solomon while he was still secretly indulging in his pleasures, in this sense: “When I was giving myself to my pleasures, I sensed my mind somehow becoming irrational and agitated by the thoughts that there was one fate for men and beasts and that nothing else survives after this life.”

(2) The simpler response is that Solomon is comparing men with beasts with respect to the necessity of death but not with respect to their state and condition after death.

(3) When he adds by way of prolepsis: “Who knows whether the spirit of man goes upward and the spirit of the beast goes down to the earth?” [Eccl. 3:21], this should not be stretched wider than the point of the comparison allows. Solomon is speaking about natural and experiential knowledge which man acquires from a consideration of the fates which occur equally to men and beasts. For as far as those external fates which meet the eyes are concerned, man does not seem to be different from the beasts with respect to those fates. For just as a beast falls, is hurt, becomes sick, feels cold, thirsts, dies, etc., so also the same things happen to men.

(4) However, from the revelation of the Word we learn through spiritual knowledge that there is a very great difference between the death of man and that of beasts because man’s soul is immortal, and his body is going to be raised from the dust of the ground in its own time, but neither of these applies to beasts. That Solomon is not denying nor taking away from man this spiritual knowledge of the immortality of the soul is clear from Eccl. 12:7: “The spirit returns to God who gave it.”

(5) In his commentary on this passage Jerome seeks a solution in the words “who knows.” He says:

He contends that there is no difference between the beasts and man according to the worth of the soul, but by adding “who,” he wanted to demonstrate the difficulty of this matter. For the pronoun “who” in Scripture is always taken in reference not to what is impossible but to what is difficult. Therefore between men and beasts there is only this difference: that the spirit of man goes up into heaven and the spirit of a beast goes down into the ground and is dissolved with its flesh, at least if a churchman who is learned in the heavenly disciplines and is a declarer of doubtful doctrines may be certain of this matter.

Later he adds a mystical explanation:

Who knows whether a saint, who is worthy of the name “man,” goes up into heaven and whether a sinner, who is called “a beast,” goes down into the earth? For it can happen either way because of the uncertain and slippery state of this life, such that
the righteous man may fall and the sinner may rise up again. Sometimes it happens that the one who is more rational and learned in the Scriptures, that is “the man,” does not live circumspectly and as one worthy of his knowledge, and he is brought down into hell, and someone more simple and common, who is called “a beast” in comparison with man, lives a better life and is crowned with martyrdom and becomes a resident of heaven.

However, this goes way too far from the simplicity of the literal reading.

(6) Jerome later resorts to limbo. He says: “Solomon is not saying these things as if he thinks that man’s soul is dissolved just like the soul of a beast nor as if they are going to the same place, but because before the coming of Christ all were carried down into the lower regions” (etc.). “And though being dissolved and being preserved are not the same thing, yet there is very little difference between being dissolved like the soul of a beast and being left in darkness.” But we shall show a little later [§§ 173–179] that the hypothesis about limbo is opposed to the Scriptures.

From rational arguments.

§ 153. (2) Lactantius refutes the rational arguments formed against the immortality of the soul (Instit., bk. 7, ch. 12). The more potent ones are the following.

From the production of the soul.

(1) “The soul is drawn forth from the power of material things and is propagated through generation. Therefore it also perishes in death.”

We respond. Properly speaking, the soul is not generated but propagated, for procreation is a matter of the entire composite. This, however, does not follow: the soul is propagated; therefore it is also corrupted. For the nature of the soul must not be considered on the basis of its propagation but on the basis of its own essence, which is this: that it is an incorporeal, invisible, and immortal spirit. For any given thing is the way God wanted it to be in creation and has the quality He gave it. If the idea of bringing out of the power of material things is understood to mean that the soul springs from the bodily seed as such, we deny that the soul is brought forth from the power of material things. However, if those words are explained in this way: that a man by the power of God’s blessing [Gen. 1:28] generates something similar to himself according to species and thus propagates a soul—then we grant that the soul is produced from the power of material things. That is, we concede that it is not created by God apart from means but that it is propagated by parents into their offspring through the kindness and arrangement of God. However, it cannot be inferred from this that the soul cannot exist outside the body, because both—namely, both the propagation of the soul and its existence outside the body—depend completely and uniquely on God’s arrangement and will. Irenaeus (Adv. haeres., bk. 2, ch. 64, p. 164):

If some people should say here that those souls which began to exist a little earlier cannot continue to exist for a long time, but that they must either be without birth so that they are immortal or, if they receive the beginning of generation (in man’s generation),
they must die along with the body, then they should learn that being without begin-
ning and truly without end and always being the same in the same way is true of God
alone, who is the Lord of all. But all the things which exist and are made are from
Him. They receive a beginning in their generation, and because of this they are lower
than He who made them, because they are not without birth. However, they perse-
vere and are extended in duration according to the will of God who made them. So He
grants that in the beginning they come to be and afterward that they are.

Lactantius (op. cit.):

Just because the soul is born with the body, that does not mean it also has to perish
with the body, for the nature of the two is not the same. The body is solid and tangible;
it is seen and touched by eyes and hand. However, the soul is subtle and evades touch
and sight. The body is formed from the ground and is solid. The soul has nothing
concrete in it. It does not have the weight of dust (etc.). So though they are born con-
nected and associated with each other, and the one formed from earthly solidification
acts as a vessel for the other which has been drawn from heavenly subtlety, because a
certain force separates the two, a separation called “death,” both return to their own
nature. That which was of the dust dissolves into dust. That which is of heavenly
spirit continues to exist and remains alive because a divine spirit is eternal.

From the operation of the soul.

(II) “The rational soul cannot have an operation completely independent of the
body, for when one engages in contemplation, he must contemplate alongside a mental
image,” Aristotle (De anim., bk. 3, text. 39). Therefore it must also be unable to have an
existence outside the body.”

We respond. We deny the antecedent if it is taken generally to include also the state
of the soul separate from the body. For Scripture testifies that souls which have been sep-
parated from their bodies are not deprived of their operations, as will become clear a little
later. Furthermore, some of the philosophers themselves claim that the intellect oper-
ates without means [inorganicus] and does not need bodily images for its own operation.
Intelligible representations, which are required for the intellect, can exist in the separated
soul in the same way as they exist in the angels, who clearly are nonbodily spirits.

From the suffering of the soul.

(III) “That which can naturally suffer can also be destroyed because suffering is a
sort of initial destruction. But the soul, while a man is alive, suffers sadness and pain.
Therefore.”

We respond. Sadness in the soul does not arise from a violent assault on primary
qualities, which is the cause of natural destruction, but from a consideration of things
that oppose man’s nature. The act of grieving asserts the very intimate union of the soul
with the body, a union which initiates material operations in the body itself. However,
this by no means implies that the soul is material and destructible in itself and in its own
nature. Lactantius responds (op. cit.): “Furthermore, virtue and wisdom are necessary
that grief be overcome by fortitude, that pleasure be vanquished by abstinence. For if it lacks virtue, if it is given over to pleasures and becomes defiled, it will become subject to death because virtue makes for immortality and pleasure makes for death. However, death does not completely destroy or obliterate but affects it with eternal torments, for the soul cannot utterly perish.”

From the change of the soul.

(IV) “Because sensation increases in children, flourishes in youths, and diminishes in the old, from this it is apparent that the soul is mortal.”

We respond. Such increase and decrease does not concern the very essence of the soul but only its operation, which varies in accord with the variety of its instruments, namely, of its spirits and humors. Lactantius (op. cit.): “The mind and soul are not the same, for the one is that by which we live; the other, that by which we think. It is the mind and not the soul of sleepers that falls asleep. In the insane the mind is suppressed, but the soul remains. Therefore they are not called soulless but mindless. Thus the mind, that is, the intelligence, increases or decreases in proportion to age. The soul always exists in its own state; and from the time it receives the ability to breathe, it endures to the last until it sends away the enclosure of a body and returns home.” And later: “It is not a failure of the soul but of the body if sight grows dim, if the tongue becomes slow, if hearing is lost.”

From a comparison.

(V) “Just as an eye which has been plucked from the body and is separated from it can see nothing, so also the soul, when separated, can sense nothing because it is itself a part of the body.”

We respond. The soul is not part of the body but its actuality [ἐντελέχεια]. Seeing, or the faculty of seeing, does not belong to the eye in and of itself but because of something else, namely, because of the soul. But the power to understand and to sense belongs to the soul itself in and of itself. A distinction must also be made between integral and essential parts. An eye is an integral part of the body; the soul is an essential part of man. Lactantius (op. cit.): “That comparison is false and dissimilar, for the soul is not part of the body but is in the body, just as that which is contained within a vessel is not a part of the vessel, nor are the things that are within a house called parts of the house. So also the soul is not part of the body, because the body is either the vessel or the dwelling place of the soul.”

13 On bodily “humors,” see above, p. 111 n. 23
SECTION II: ON METEMPSYCHOSIS, OR THE TRANSMISSION OF THE SOUL

§ 154. Therefore, once it has been shown that man’s soul is not extinguished in death but departs from the dwelling place of the body, it remains for us to discuss the state and condition of the separated souls. This entire treatment, however, can be reduced to two main headings. The first concerns the where, regarding that dwelling place into which the soul is taken after man’s death. This we can call “the soul’s holding” [ψυχοδοχεῖον]. The latter concerns its activity and experience, what those separated souls do or do not do, whether, overcome by some Epimenidean sleep, they are totally unconscious, inactive, inert, and idle until the day of the last judgment; or, on the other hand, they do and experience various things in keeping with the state and condition of their distinct dwellings.

On the migration of souls from body to body.

Before we deal with the where or the soul’s holding, above all must be removed that absurd and brutish belief which claims that “souls migrate from bodies worn out by age and death and slip themselves into new and recently born bodies, and that souls are always being reborn, sometimes in a man, sometimes in a domestic animal, sometimes in a wild beast, sometimes in a bird, and in this way they are immortal because they often exchange the dwelling places of various dissimilar bodies.”

The defenders of metempsychosis.

The above words are from Lactantius (Div. inst., bk. 7, toward the end of ch. 12) as he describes the transmigration or transanimation of souls, which in Greek is called μετεμψυχώσις or μετενσωμάτωσις.

(1) This opinion originated, according to Herodotus, in Egypt, the mother of all idolatry.

(2) Pythagoras and other heathen philosophers approved it and dressed it up with certain rational arguments. This is said of Pythagoras by Lactantius (op. cit.) and Laertius (Vit. Pythag.). Plato held the same opinion (Irenaeus, bk. 2, ch. 59, attributes to him that he was the first to introduce it) and wrote (Polit., bk. 10):2 “Orpheus, because of his hatred for women, passed into a swan; Thamyra, into a nightingale; a swan, back into a man; Ajax, into a lion; Agamemnon, into an eagle; Atalanta, into a boxer; Epeus, into a beautiful woman; Thersites, into a monkey; Ulysses, into a common person.” In his Timaeus3 he asserts that unjust men pass into women; those who speculate and are stuck in contemplation change into birds; despisers of philosophy change into farm animals; and that men given to worldly things change into fish. In his Phaedo4 he argues that

1 So called after Epimenides of Crete (quoted in Acts 17:28 and Titus 1:12), who supposedly fell asleep for seventy-five years.
tainted souls fall out of heaven and subsequently after death return from body into body; that after ten thousand years they will have run their course; that then the good souls go back to heaven, and the wicked ones pass down to infernal punishments. Nevertheless the disciples of Plato try to soften all this with a concocted interpretation and contend that these things should be taken allegorically.

Ovid writes (Metamorph., bk. 5):^3

Souls are without death but always leave their original place.
They take up new homes where they live and reside.
For I myself remember that at the time of the Trojan War
I was Pantoides Euphorbus, whose breast the young son
Of Atreus once pierced with his heavy spear in an attack (etc.).

Julian the Apostate ridiculously used to claim that the soul of Alexander had moved into him. Lactantius (Instit., bk. 3, at the beginning of ch. 18) attributes this belief to the Stoics no less than to Pythagoreans. Ambrose writes about the heathen in general (De bono mortis, middle of ch. 10): “They believed it the highest reward if the souls of the great philosophers migrated into bees or nightingales so that those who earlier had terrified mankind with their words later soothed it with the sweetness of honey and of song.”

(3) As for the Pharisees, Josephus (De bello Judaic., bk. 2, ch. 7) relates: “They have said that the souls of the good pass into other bodies but that the souls of the wicked are tortured with endless punishment.” Herod, too, seems to be given to this belief (Matt. 14:2; Mark 6:14). Elias Levi mentions (Thesbite) that the Jewish leaders at the time of Christ held this Pythagorean dream of גִלְגוּל נְפַשׁוֹת, that is, of metempsychosis.

** Drusius (Annotat. in N. T., part 2, Matt. 16:14) writes: “The Jews think that the soul of Adam rolled through the body of David and from there returned into the body of the Messiah. They think that this is hinted at through the three letters אדם [ADM, “Adam”], so that as an acronym the initial א signifies Adam; the ד, David; and the מ, the Messiah.” **

(4) This was introduced into the Christian church by the Carpocratians, the Gnostics, the Marcionites, and the Manichaean. In regard to the Carpocratians, see Epiphanius (Haeres., vol. 2, bk. 1, no. 27). Concerning the Gnostics, Marcionites, and Manichaean, Epiphanius writes (Haeres., vol. 3, bk. 2, no. 42):

That wretched Marcion thinks, along with others who think the same, that the same soul is in men and animals. Many erroneous heresies hold this belief in vain. For Valentinus, Colorbasius, and all the Gnostics and Manichaean declare, as they themselves fabricate out of some figment of the imagination, that there are passings of souls from bodies to bodies among men who do not have knowledge. For they say that these souls wander about and pass through the bodies of living things until they have gained that knowledge and, purged and set loose in this way, have migrated back to the heavenly places.

He mentions about the Manichaean (Haeres., vol. 2, bk. 2, no. 66) that “they introduced the migrations of souls from bodies into bodies. This idea they perhaps gathered” (he says) “from Plato, Zeno the Stoic, or from some other fanatic.” (Cf. Theodoret,
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Philastrius (Philastrius Brixiensis, Philaster of Brescia)

• Haeres. • Diversarum haereseon liber (CSEL 38)

Philo of Alexandria

• Collected works • Operum... Tomvs Prior [–Alter]. Lyon, 1561
• De vita Moysis • Περὶ Τοῦ Βαυ Μωυσῆς. De vita Mosis (LCL 289) • On Moses (LCL 289)

Philosopher, the. See Aristotle

Phocylides


Photius Constantinopolitanus

• Biblioth. • ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ ΤΟΥ ΦΩΤΙΟΥ. Librorum quos legit Photius patriarcha excerpta et censurae. Augsburg: Ad insigne Pinus, 1601

Picos Mirandulanos, Franciscus (Giovanni Francesco Pico della Mirandola)

• Collected works • Ioannis Pici Mirandulae Omnia Opera. Venetiis: Fontaneto, 1504
• Contra astrol. • Disputationes contra astrologos. Benedictus Hectoris Bononensis, 1498

Pintus, Hector (Hector Pinto)

• Isaiah • IN ESAIAM PROPHETAM Commentaria. Cologne: Johann Crith, 1615
Piscator Johannes (Herbornensis, Piscator of Herborn)


Ecclesiastes • In Ecclesiasten Salomonis Commentarius. In Quo, Praeter Novam Versionem Versioni Tremellio-Junianae • regione adjectam, ordine & distinctè proponuntur I. Analysis Logica singulorum capitum. II. Scholia in singula capita. III. Observationes locorum doctrinae e singulis capitibus depromatae. Herborn: [Christoph Corvinus], 1612

Daniel • In Prophetam Danielem Commentarius. In Quo Praeter Novam Versionem, Ordine Et distinctè proponuntur I. Analysis Logica singulorum capitum. II. Scholia in singula capita. III. Observationes locorum doctrinae e singulis capitibus depromatae. Herborn: [Christoph Corvinus], 1614

Romans • Analysis Logica Epistola Pauli ad Romanos. Herborn: Christoph Corvinus, 1608

Pistorius, Johann

Apostasia • See Causae mutatae religionis a Marchione Badensi

appendix to Fascic. temp. • See Causae mutatae religionis a Marchione Badensi

Causae mutatae religionis a Marchione Badensi • Unser/ Von Gottes Genaden/ Jacobs/ Marggrafen zu Baden und Hachberg/ . . . Christliche erhebliche und wofordierte Motifen/ warum wir . . . die Lutherische Lehr verlassen/ und zu dem Catholischen immerwehrenden und allein seligmachenden Christlichen Glauben Uns notwendig begeben. Munich: Hertsroy, Henricus, 1615

Hodeg. • Wegweisser vor alle verführte Christen. Vienna: Franz Kolb, 1600

Mille viginti falsa • Primae [Ex Quatuordecim] Disputationis Quam Magnifcellus Doctor Marpurgensis Contra Libri D. Pistorii Caput primum de Scripturae autoritate ridicule inepteque lusit. Mille Et Viginti Falsa Ex Septendecim Parvis Folisis Pro Exemplo Lutheranae miseriae fideliter exscripta & ad agnoscedam Lutheranismi vanitatatem sub totius mundi aspectum subiecta. Friburgi Brisgoiae: Böcklerus, 1601

Motiv apostasiae Badensis • See Causae mutatae religionis a Marchione Badensi

Platina, Bartholomeus


Plato


Apolog. Socratis • Apology (LCL 36)
De legibus • Laws (LCL 187, 192)
De republica (LCL 237, 276) • The Republic (LCL 237, 276)
Epinomides • Epinomis (LCL 201)
Gorgias (LCL 531)
Phaedo • Φαῖδρος (LCL 36) • Phaedo (LCL 36)
Polit. • See De republica
Timaeus (LCL 234)

Platonicus, Lamblichus. See lamblichus Platonicus

Pliny the Elder (Gaius Plinius Secundus)


Plutarch

Cimon • See Parallel Lives

De placit. philos. • De philosophorum placitis libellus elegantissimus. Argentorati: Schurerius, 1516
O N DEATH

Plutarch, cont’d.


Theseus • See Parallel Lives

Polanus (Amandus Polanus von Polansdorff)

Syntagma Theologiae Christianae . . . Justa leges ordinis Methodici conformatum, atque In libros decem digestum. Hanau: Johann Aubry I. Erben, 1615

Polybius

Historiarvm Libri . . . Aeneae . . . Tactici commentarius De tolerantâ obsidione. [Frankfurt am Main]: Aubry, 1610 • The Histories (LCL 128, 137–38, 159–61)

Polydorus. See Vergilius, Polydorus

Pomponatius, Petrus

De immortal. anim. • Tractus de immortalitate animae. 1516
De incantationibus. 1520

Porta, Conrad

Pastorale Lutheri: das ist nitlicher Unterricht von den fürnembsten Stücken zum heil. Ministerio gehörig. Eisleben, 1582

Posidonius of Colama


Praepositivus of Liège

Comp. theol. • Cf. Praepositini Cancellarii De sacramentis et de novissimis: Summae theologicae pars quarta. Edited by Daniel Edward Pilarczyk. Romae: Ed. Urbanianae, 1964 (Gerhard quotes from Sixtus Senensis, Bibliotheca Sancta, bk. 6, annotation 47)

Praetorius, Stephan

Fragmenta apostolorum • Pavli Apostoli Ad Laodicenses Epistola, Latinè & Germanè edita, studio & opera Stephani Praetorii. Adjecum sunt Fragmenta Apostolorum & Patriarcharum Testamenta, pio lectori non injucunda futura. Hamburg: Binder, 1595

Pratum spirituale


Proclus of Constantinople

Serm. de fde ad Armen: • Tomus ad Armenios (PG 65; ACO 4/2)

Procopius Gaziæus

1 Samuel • See Deuteronomy
Deuteronomy • Commentarii in Exodum, in Leviticum, in Numeros, in Deuteronomium, in librum Josue, in Judices, in libros Regum, in Paralipomena (PG 87)

Isaiah • Episteth aevum Prophetarum in prophetÆa et viis, et de moribus et religiis, etpersonis quae Spiritus sanctus dixit. In prophetiam Isaiaem, in prophetiam Jesu Christum, in prophetae et prophetiae divinam secretum et recitationem (ACW 15)

Propertius

Elegies (LCL 18)

Prosper of Aquitaine

De vocat. gent. • De vocazione omnium gentium (PL 51) • On the Calling of All Nations (ACW 15)
Sentent. • Liber sententiæarum ex operibus S. Augustini delibatarum (PL 45; CCSL 68A)
Prudentius, Aurelius

- Collected works • *Opera*. Edited by Weitz. Hanau, 1613
- Hymns • *Cathemerinon liber* (PL 49) • *Daily Round* (LCL 398)

Quintus Smyrnaeus (Quintus Calaber)

- *Posthomerica* (LCL 19)

Rabanus Maurus

- *Genesis* • *Hraban Mauri, Abhatis primum Fuldensis, Ordinis S. Benedicti, postea Archiepiscopi Moguntini Operum quotquot reperiri potuerunt; Tomus 2: Continens Commentaria in Pentateuchum, sive Quinque Libros Moysis. Coloniae Agrippiniae: Hieratus, 1626
- *Instit. cleric.* • *De clericorum institutione et ceremonijs Ecclesiae, ex Vетeri et Novo Testamento, ad Heislulphum Archiepiscopum libri III. Coloniae*: Ioannes Prael, 1532

Ranulphus. See Higden, Ranulphus

Rashi (Jarchi, Shlomo Yitzhaki)

- *Ezekiel* • *R[abbi] Salomonis Jarchi, Rashi dicti, Commentarius Hebraicus in prophetas maiores et minores ut et in Hiobum et Psalmos: Latine versus, cum duobus vetustissimis codicibus MStis membranaceis collatus, multis in locis auctus et emendatus atque notis criticis & philologicis illustratus. Gotha: Reyher, 1713

Regius [Regiae Bibliae]


Remensis. See also Hincmar of Reims

- *Adnot.*

Remigius, Nicholas

- *Daemonolatreiae Libri tres*. Lyon, 1595

Rhenanus, Beatus

- *In Tertulliani contra Marcion.* • *See Tertullian, Collected works*
  - *on Tertullian’s De corona* • *See Tertullian, Collected works*
  - *on Tertullian’s De martyrib.* • *See Tertullian, Collected works*

Rhodiginus, Coelius. See Coelius Rhodigianus

Ribera, Franciscus de

- *Hebrews* • *In Epistolam B. Pavli Apostoli ad Hebracos Commentarij. Cologne: Arnold Mylius, 1600*
- *Hosea* • *See Minor Prophets*
- *Joel* • *See Minor Prophets*
- *Malachi* • *See Minor Prophets*
- *Micah* • *See Minor Prophets*
- *Minor Prophets* • *IN LIBRVM DVODECIM PROphetarum commentarij, SENSVM EORVNDEM PROPHETARium Historicum, & Moralem, persaepe etiam Allegoricum complectentes. Cologne: Hermann Mylius I.*, 1610
- *Zechariah* • *See Minor Prophets*
Richard of Middleton (Richardus de Mediavilla)

Sent. • In primum sententiæ questiones. Venetiis: Lazarus Soardus, 1509

Richard of St. Victor (Richardus a Sancto Victore, Richardus Victorinus)

Except. • Liber exceptionum

Rivet, Andreas (André Rivet)

Critici sacri • CRITICI SACRI SPECIMEN. HOC EST, CENSVRAE DOCTORVM TAM EX ORTHODOXIS QVAM EX PONTIFICIS, IN SCRIPTA QVAE PATRIBVS plerisque proscorum & puriorum seculorum, vel affixit incogitantia, vel supposuit impostuta . . . & Prolegomena . . . De Patrum autotitate, errorum causis, & nothorum notis. [Heidelberg]: Gotthard Vögelin, s.d.

Roffensis, Fisher (Ioannes Roffensis, John Fisher, bishop of Rochester)

art. 37 • See Contra Luther

Confatat. Lutheri • See Contra Luther.

Contra art. 32 Lutheri • See Contra Luther

Contra Luther • Assertionis Lutheranæ Confutatio. Juxta verum ac originalem archetypum, nunc ad unguem diligentissime recogn., per . . . Ioannem Roffensem Episcopum. Coloniae: Birckmann, 1558

Rosh Hashanah


Rufinus of Aquileia (Tyrannius Rufinus)

Expositio symboli contra Jovianum haereticum. Cologne: U. Zell, ca. 1470 (CCSL 20) • A Commentary on the Apostles’ Creed (ACW 20)

Psalms • In Psalmos LXXV commentarius (PL 21)

Symbol. • See Expositio symboli

Ruizius, Franciscus (Francisco Ruiz de Montoya)

Regular intell. Scripturas • REGVLAE INTELLIGENDI SACRAS SCRIPVRAS EX MENTE SS. Patrum, & Orthodoxorum Theologorum, hac tempestate vtiles cumprimis & necessariae. Constance: Nikolaus Kalt, 1599

Rupert of Deutz (Rupertus Tuitiensis)

Collected works • R. Domini, D. Ruperti, Abbatis Monasterii Tuitiensis, Ordinis D. Benedicti . . . quotquot hactenus haberi potuerunt, Opera Omnia. Coloniae Agrippinae: Mylius, 1602

De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius (PL 167; CCCM 21–24)

Exodus • See De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius

Genesis • See De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius

Zechariah • Commentariorum in Duodecim Prophetas Minores Libri XXXI (PL 168)

Sabellius, Marcus Antonius Coccius

De Omnivm gentium . . . factis & dictis. Basel: Heinrich Petri, 1563

Sabinus

Interp. • Commentarius in Metamorphosis • See Ovid, Collected works

Sacrarium Coloniense

Sallust


Salmeron, Alfonsus (Alfonso Salmerón)

1 Corinthians • See Pauline Epistles

1 Thessalonians • See Pauline Epistles
Salmeron, Alfonso (Alfonso Salmerón), cont'd.

disp. 25 • See tom. 14

Opera, tom. 6 • Commentarii In Evangelicam Historiam, & in Acta Apostolorum. Tomvs Sexxtvs, De Miraculis Domini Nostri Iesu Christi. Cologne: Anton Hierat and Johann Gymnich IV, 1602

Pauline Epistles • Commentarii in omnes epistolas B. Pauli, & Canonicas; in quatuor tomos distributi . . . quorum hic est primus, in ordine autem Tomus decimus tertius. Cologne: Anton Hierat & Johann Gymnich IV, 1604
tom. 6 • Commentarii In Evangelicam Historiam, & in Acta Apostolorum. Tomvs Sexxtvs, De Miraculis Domini Nostri Iesu Christi. Cologne: Anton Hierat and Johann Gymnich IV, 1602
tom. 7 • Commentarii In Evangelicam Historiam, & in Acta Apostolorum. Tomvs Septimvs. Cologne: Anton Hierat and Johann Gymnich IV, 1602
tom. 14 • Commentario In Epistolam B. Pauli Tomus II. in ordine autem, Tomus Decimus Quartus, Continens Expositionem in vtramque B. Pauli Apostoli Epistolam ad Corinthis. Coloniae Agrippinae: Hierat; Gymnicus, 1604

tom. 16 • Disputationvm In Epistolam Canonicas, & Apocalypsin Tomus Qvartvs, ac omnium operum postremus, in ordine autem Tomvs XVI. Cologne: Hierat & Gymnich, 1604

tract. 14 • See tom. 14
tract. 16 • See tom. 16

Salomon (rabbi). See Rashi

Samuel ben Nahman

In Exposit. Geneseos maiore

Sandaeus, Maximilianus (Sandaes of Würzburg)


Saribusiensis, Johannes. See John of Salisbury

Scaliger, Julius Caesar

Exerc. • Exotericarum exercitationum liber XV. De subtilitate. Frankfurt am Main: Claude de Marne & Johann Aubry, 1592

Schemoth Rabba

Midrash Rabbah. Translated into English with notes, glossary, and indices under the editorship of H. Freedman and Maurice Simon. London: Soncino, 1983

Schindlerus, Valentinus (Valentin Schindler)

Lexicon pentaglotton, Hebraicum, Chaldaeicum, Syriacum, Talmudico-Rabbinicum, & Arabicum. Hannover: Henneus, 1612

Schmaltzius, Valentinus (Valentin Schmalz)

Contra Frantz. • See Refut. Frantz.

De div. Christi • De divinitate Jesu Christi, liber. Rakov.: Sternacki, 1608

Examinatio centum errorum, quos Martinus Smiglecius Jesuita . . . Collegit. Rakov: Sebastian Sternacki, 1615

Post. cont. Frantz. • See Refut. Frantz.

Refut. Frantz. • Refutatio Theesium D. Wolfgangi Frantzii . . . De Praecipuis Christianae Religionis Capitibus. Racovia: Sebastian Sternacki, 1614

Schopperus, Jacobus (Caspar Scippius, Gaspar Schoppius, Kaspar Schoppe)

Apolog. cont. Humm. • Apologiticus Adversus Aegidium Huniam: Pro Gemino de Indulgentiis libro III. 1602

Schweigerus (Salomon Schweigger)

Koran • Alcoranus mahometicus, das ist: Der Türcken Alcoran, Religion und Aberglauben. Nürnberg, 1624

Scotus. See Duns Scotus, Johannes
Scotus Hyberniensis, Sedulius

1 Corinthians • See Pauline Epistles
Hebrews • See Pauline Epistles
Pauline Epistles • In Omnes D. Pauli epistolas annotationes. Basel: Heinrich Petri, 1538
Romans • See Pauline Epistles

Scribonius. See Largus, Scribonius

Sedulius. See Scotus Hyberniensis, Sedulius

Seneca, Lucius Annaeus (Seneca the Younger)

Collected works • Opera, quae extant, omnia. Basel: Eusebius Episcopius, 1590
Herc. Jurens • Hercules (LCL 62)
Letters • [Liber epistolae]. Rome: Arnold Pannartz, 1475 (LCL 75–77) • Ad Lucillum epistolae morales (LCL 75–77)

Seneca the Elder

De remediis fortun. • Suasoriae (LCL 464)

Senensis, Sixtus (Sisto da Siena)

Annot. • See Bibliotheca Sancta
Bibl. annot. • See Bibliotheca Sancta


Septuagint translators


Servius Honoratus, Marcus


Sibylline oracles or prophecies (Oracula Sibyllina)


Siculus, Lucius Marineus (Lucio Marineo)

De reb. Hispan. • [L. Marini Siculi regii historiographi opus de rebus Hispaniae memorabilibus modo castigatum atque Casareae Maiestatis iussu in lucem editum. Compluti: M. de Eguia, 1533

Sidonius Apollinaris


Epitaph. Claud. Mamert. • Epistolae (PL 58)

Sigebertus Gemblacensis (Sigebert of Gembloux)

Chronicon Sigeberti Gemblacensis monachi. Antverpiae, 1608

Sigonius, Carolus (Carlo Sigonio)

Comm. in Sulpic. Sever. • B. SVLPICII SEVERI, BITVRICENSIS EPISCOPI, SACRÆ HISTORIÆ LIBRI II. In eosdem CAROLI SIGONII Commentarios. Eiusdem de TEMPORIBVS Hebraeorum Catalogus. Hanoviae: Antonius; Egenolphus, 1602

Sixtus Senensis. See Senensis, Sixtus
Socinus, Faustus (Fausto Sozzini)

1610 debate • See Contra Puccium

Anti-Pucc. • See Contra Puccium

Contra Puccium • De Statu prius hominis ante lapsum DISPUTATIO. Quam FAUSTUS SOCINUS . . . per scripta habuit cum FRANCISCO PUCCIO . . . anno 1578. In qua habetur Responsio, ad Defensionem Francisci Pucci suorum argumentorum, De immortalitate hominis & omnium rerum ante lapsum. Rakow: Sebastian Sternacki, 1610


Explicitat. quorundam Scripturae locor. • See Explicit: aliquot locor. Script.

Praelectiones theologicae. Rakow: Sebastian Sternacki, 1609

Socrates

Hist. • Triperitae historie ex Socrate Sozomeno et Theodorico in unum collecte et . . . de greco in latinum translate libri numero duodecim. Augsburg: Johann Schüßler, 1472 • The Ecclesiastical History of Socrates Scholasticus (NPNF² 2)

Sommer, Johannes

Collected works • Opera omnia theologica quaee supersunt. Vienna, 1999

Conjunct. senior. • De Jusificatione hominis coram Deo. Item propositiones de eadem, una cum responsione Seniorum. Et confessione responsionis autore Ioanne Sommero. 1572

Tractatus aliquot christianae religionis. Aleksey Rodecki, 1583

Sonnius, Franciscus

Demonstrationum christianae religionis ex verbo Dei libri tres. Antverpiae: Apud Ph. Nutium, 1570

Sophronius of Constantinople

De monarchia Dei

Soto, Dominicus de (Domingo de Soto)

Sent. • In quartum sententiarum Commentarij. Lovanii: Johannes Masius, 1573

Soto, Petrus a

Assertio catholicae fidei circius articulos confessionis . . . Ducis Wirtenbergensis oblatae per legatos eius concilio Tridentino 24. Januarii Anni 1552. Francoforti, 1561

Speculum peccatoris (PL 40)

Speculum exemplorum. See Jacobus de Voragine, Speculum exemplorum

Stapleton, Thomas

Antidota apostolica contra nostri temporis haereses, in Acta Apostolorum et in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos. Antwerp, 1595

Promptuarium Catholicae, Ad instructionem Concionatorum contra nostri temporis haereses; Super Evangellia Ferialia Per Totam Quadragesimam. In Hac Parte Quadragesimali vnus Caluini varia impietas in multis, eisdemque grauiissimis fidei dogmatibus aperitur, & accurate refutatur. Cologne: Arnold, 1594

Statius, Publius Papinius

Thebaid (LCL 207, 498)

Stella, Didacus (Diego Estella)

Adnotat. • See Luke

ON DEATH

Stephanus, Henricus

Steuchus Eugubinus, Augustinus (Agostino Steuco)
Annot. on Genesis 2 • Cosmopoeia vel, de mundano opificio, expositio trium captium Genesis. Lugduni: Sebast. Gryphius, 1535

De perenni Philosophia libri X. Basel: Nikolaus Brylinger & Sebastian Franch, 1542

Genesis • See Old Testament

Old Testament • Recogntio Veters Testamenti Ad Hebrarum Veritatem, collata etiam editione Septuaginta interprete cum ipsa aevitate Hebrewa, Nostraque translatione. Cum expositione Hebreworum, ac Graecorum, qui passim toto opere citabantur. Venetiis: Aldus & Socerus, 1529

Psalms • See Old Testament

Recogntio Pentateuchi • See Old Testament

Stevartius, Petrus
Censura

Stobaeus, Johannes
Ioannis Stobaei Sententiae ex thesauris Graecorum delectae, quarum authores circiter ducentos et quinquaginta citat et in sermones siue locos communes digestae à Conrado Gesnero. Lugduni: Frellon, 1608

Serm. 117 • See Ioannis Stobaei Sententiae

Serm. 119 • See Ioannis Stobaei Sententiae

Serm. 122 • See Ioannis Stobaei Sententiae

Strabo

Suarez, Franciscus (Francisco Suárez)
In Thom. • Commentaria ac disputationes in primam partem divi Thomae. Moguntiae: Mylius, Lippius, 1607

part 3. Thom. • See vol. 1

Thom. • See In Thom.

vol. 1 • Commentariorum et disputationum in tertiarm partem divi Thomae tomus primus. 1590

Suetonius
Lives of the Caesars (LCL 31, 38)

Suidas
Lexicon • Suidae lexicon: Graece et Lat. Osnabrück: Biblio-Verl., 1986

Sulpicius Severus
Sacra historia • Chronica (CSEL 1)

Vita Martini episcopi • De vita beati Martini (PL 20)

Surius, Laurentius
Commentarius Brevis Rerum In Orbis Gestarum, Ab Anno Salutis M. D. Usque In Annum M.D.LXXIII. Cologne: Quentel, 1602

Die 3 de Augusti • See Commentarius Brevis Rerum

Hist. • See Commentarius Brevis Rerum

Sutlivius, Matthaeaus (Matthew Sutcliffe)
De purg. • Adversus Roberti Bellarmini de purgatorio dispositionem liber vnus. Londini: Georgius Bishop, Radulphus Newberie, & Robertus Barker, 1599
Sylvius, Aeneas
    Historia Bohemica. 1463

Symmachus
    Greek translation of Old Testament • in fragments of Origen, Hexapla (PG 15–16)

Synod, Fifth. See Concil.

Synod, Seventh. See Council, Seventh

Synod of Trebur. See Concil.

Syriac paraphrase

Talmud
    Jerusalem • Edited by Heinrich W. Guggenheimer. 2000–2015

Tanhumah

Tapperus, Ruardus (Ruard Tapper)
    art. 6 • See Explicatio Articulorum
    art. 8 • See Explicatio Articulorum

Explicatio Articulorum Venerandae Facultatis Sacrae Theologiae Generalis Studii Lovaniensis circa dogmata ecclesiastica ab annis triginta quattuor controversa, una cum responsione ad argumenta adversariorum. Lovani: Apud Martinum Verhasselt in pingui Gallina, 1555–57

Targum. See also Munsterus, Sebastianus, Bible


Thargvm, hoc est, Paraphrasis Onkeli Chaldaica in sacra Biblia, ex Chaldaeo in Latinvm fidelissime versa. Strassburg: Georg Messerschmidt, 1546

Targum Chaldaicum. See Targum

Targum Onkelos. See Targum

Tatian
    Oratio ad Graecos (PG 6) • The Discourse to the Greeks (ANF 2)
    Protrept. ad gentes • See Oratio ad Graecos

Terence
    The Brothers (LCL 23)

Tertullian (Quintus Septimus Florens Tertullianus)

Collected works • In Q. Septimii Florentis Tertulliani Opera, Quae Ad Manvs Ipsivs Pervenerant, Et Cvra Ipsivs Evrant In Lxvmen Edita, Annotationes . . . His Svbiectae Svt Censvrae Inqvisiitionis Hispanicae In B. Rhenui Annotationes Ad Tertullianvm, Prov editae sunt in Indice librorum expargarorum. [Heidelberg: Hieronymus Commelinus,] 1597. Opera omnia. [Heidelberg]: Commelinus, 1608

Adversus Marcionem (CCSL 1) • Against Marcion (ANF 3)
Apologeticum (CCSL 1) • Apology (ANF 3; FC 10)
Contra Marcion. • See Adversus Marcionem
De anima (CCSL 2) • On the Soul (ANF 3)
Tertullian (Quintus Septimus Florens Tertullianus), cont’d.

De baptismo (CCSL 1) • On Baptism (ANF 3)
De coron. milit. • De corona (CSEL 70) • The Chaplet (ANF 3)
De exhortatione castitatis (CCSL 2) • Exhortation to Chastity (ACW 13)
De fug. in praeuent. • De fuga in persecutione (PL 2)
De Monogamia (PL 2) • Monogamy (ANF 4)
De patientia (CSEL 47) • On Patience (ANF 3)
De resurrect. carnis • De resurrectione mortuorum (CCSL 2) • The Resurrection of the Flesh (ANF 3)

Theodoret of Cyrus (Theodoretus Cyrrhensis)

Collected works • Operum . . . . tomus secundus. Paris: Michel Sonnius II., 1608
1 Corinthians • See Pauline Epistles
Deuteronomy • See Quaestiones in Octateucham
1 Corinthians • See Pauline Epistles
Deuteronomy • See Quaestiones in Octateucham
Dialogues, The “Eranistes” or “Polymorphus” (NPNF2 3)
Genesis • See Quaestiones in Octateucham
Hebrews • See Pauline Epistles
Historia ecclesiastica (GCS 19; PG 82) • Ecclesiastical History (NPNF2 3)
Jeremiah • Explanatio in Jeremiam (PG 81)
Leviticus • See Quaestiones in Octateucham (PG 80)
Malachi • See Minor Prophets
Micah • See Minor Prophets
Minor Prophets • Explanatio in XII prophetas minores (PG 81)
Psalms • Interpretatio in Psalmos (PG 80, 84) • Commentary on the Psalms (FC 101–2)
q. 38 on Genesis • See Quaestiones in Octateucham
Quaestiones in Octateucham (PG 80) • The Questions on the Octateuch. Translated by Robert C. Hill. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007–
Zechariah • See Minor Prophets

Theodorus Lector


Theodotion

Greek translation of Old Testament • in fragments of Origen, Hexapla (PG 15–16)

Theophylact (Theophylactus de Achrida)

1 Corinthians • See Pauline Epistles
Theophylact (Theophylactus de Achrida), cont’d.

Hebrews • See Pauline Epistles

Luke • See Gospels


Philippians • See Pauline Epistles

Thomas Aquinas

Collected works • Opera omnia. Rome: Antonio Blado hiers, Giovanni Gigliotti, & Giulio Accolti, 1569–71

1 Corinthians • Expositio in 2 episolas d. Pauli ad Corinthios

Contra gentes • Summa contra gentiles • The summa contra gentiles. Literally translated by the English Dominican fathers from the latest Leonine edition. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1924–29

De malo • Quaestiones . . . De potentia Dei. De unione verbi De spiritualibus creaturis De anima De virtutibus De malo. Strasbourg: Martin Flach II., 1507

Opusc. • See Collected works

Opusc. contra Graecos


Sent. • In . . . Sententiarum libro interpretatio

ST • Summa theologia • The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas. Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. London: Oates & Washbourne, 1924

Supplem. • See ST

Thomas of Strasbourg (Thomas de Argentina)

Sent. • Commentaria in IIII. libros Sententiarum. Geneva: Orerius, 1585

Tilenus, Daniel

disp. 65 • Syntagmatis disputationum theologiarum . . . pars prima. Sedan: Jean Jannon, 1613

Nota ad Bellarm. de Christo • Disputatio Roberti Bellarmini . . . de controversia seconda fidei Christianae, quae est de Christo capite totius ecclesiae quinque libris comprehensa, cum notis . . . Danielis Tileni. Sedani: Ex typographia Ioannis Iannoni, 1619

Timplerus, Clemens

Anthop. • Physicae seu Philosophiae Naturalis Systema Methodicum. Hanau: Wilhelm Antonius, 1607

Toletus, Franciscus (Francisco de Toledo)

Inst. • Summæ, De instructione Sacerdotum libri septem: De peccatis liber vnum: cum Bullaæ Coænae Domini dilucidatione, Quibus omnis Christiani officij ratio explicatur. Lyon: Horace Cardon, 1599

Luke • Commentarii In Sacrosanctum Iesv Christi D. N. Evangelium secundum Lucam. Cologne: Arnold Mylius, 1611

Topiarius, Dominicus Aegidius

De noviss. • De Qualiuar Hominis Novissimis. Antwerp 1588

Tossanus, Paul


Ecclesiastes • See Biblia

Romans • See Biblia
Tostatus Abulensis, Alphonsus (Alfonso Tostado Ribera)

Collected works • Opera omnia, quoutquot in Scripturae sacrae Expositionem & alia, adhuc extare inventa sunt. Venice: Sessa, 1596


Tremellius, Immanuel

Bible • See Junius and Tremellius, Bible

Daniel • See Junius and Tremellius, Bible

Ecclesiastes • See Junius and Tremellius, Bible

Trithemius, Johannes

Chronicon Hirsauense • Chronicon Insigne Monasterij Hirsauensis, Ordinis S. Benedicti, Per Ioannem Trithemivm Abbatem Spanheimensem, Virvm Sva atque doctiss. conscriptum, ac diu hactenus à multis desideratum, nunc uerò primùm in lucem editum. Basileae: Oporinus, 1559

Tubingen, theologians of

Apologia contr. Sotum

Turrecremata, Joannes de

In Gratianii decretorum primam commentarii. London: Blasius Guido, 1555

Twelve Tables, Laws of the

Lex XII Tabularum (LCL 329) • The Law of the Twelve Tables (LCL 329)

Tympius, Matthaeus (Matthaeus Tympe)

Ritual. Germ. • Der Ceremonien Wurumb! Das ist! Lautere und klare ursachen und auflegungen der farnemmenst Ceremonyn/ welche auf einspruchn def H. Geists bey dem H. Gottesdienst inn der gantzen H. Christenheit von alters her gleichförmig und einhellig gebrauchet werden. Münster in Westph.: Raßfeldt, 1609

Ulpian. See Leo, emperor, Const.

[Demosthenis et Aeschinis Principum Graeciae Oratorum Opera / Cum utriusque autoris Vita et Ulpiani Commentaris, novisq(ue) Scholiis. Francofurti: Marnius, 1604]

Valentia, Gregorius de

Apolog. contra Heerbrand. • Conflatio calumniarum, quas Heerbrandus spongia quadam sua, ut appellat, complexas est & in Apologeticum de idololatria, super Ingolstadii aeditum, leviter ac petulanter effudit. Ingolstadii: David Sartorius, 1579

Commentariaorium theologorum tomi quatuor, in quibus omnes quaestiones, quae continentur in Summa theologica D. Thomae Aquinatis ordine explicantur. Venetis: apud Ioannem Antonium & Iacobum de Franciscis, 1608

Contra. Heebr. • See Apolog. contra Heerbrand.

De purg. • See Commentariaorium theologorum (?)

In Thom. • See Commentariaorium theologorum

Libr. de indissol. matrim. vinc. vol. 4 • See Commentariaorium theologorum

Valerius, Cornelius


Valerius Maximus

bk. 3 • De factis ac dictis memorabilibus Exemplorum Libri novem. Leipzig: Melchior Lotter I., 1512
Vallesius, Franciscus (Francisco Valles)

*De Sacra Philosophia, sive de iis quae physice scripta sunt in Libris Sacris.* Frankfurt am Main: Nikolaus Basse, 1600

Vasquez, Gabriel (Vasquius)

*De adorat.* • *De cultu Adorationis libri tres.* Moguntiae: Albinus, 1601

*Hebrews.* • *Paraphrasis et compendiaria Explicatio ad nonnullas Pauli Epistolae.* Ingolstadt, 1613

*In Thonam.* • *Commentarii, ac disputaciones in primam partem S. Thomae.* Ingolstadii: Nutius & Hettsroy, 1609

Vatablus, Franciscus


*Daniel.* • See Bible

*Ecclesiastes.* • See Bible

*Genesis.* • See Bible

Vergerius, Petrus Paulus (Pietro Paulo Vergerio)

*Annot. ad catalog. haeretic.* • *Catalogus Haereticorum.* Regio Monte Borussiae, 1556

*Opera.* • *Primum tomos operum Vergerii: Adversus papatum.* Tubingae: apud viduam Ulrici Morhardi, 1563

Vergil (Publius Vergilius Maro, Virgil)

*Collected works.* • *Opera omnia, Clarissimorum Virorum Notationibus Illustrata.* Frankfurt am Main: Johann Theobald Schönwetter, 1608. *Opera Omnia: Bucolica, Georgica, Aeneis; Ciris Et Culex; Cum Commentario Frid. Taubmann. curante et edente Christiano Taubmann.* Wittenberg: Zacharias Schürer, 1618

*Aeneid* (LCL 63–64)

Vergilius, Polydorus

*De rerum inventoris libri octo.* Basel: Thomas Guarin, 1575

*Interpret. orat. Domin.* • *Commentariolum in Dominican Precem.* Basel, 1525

Vermigli, Peter Martyr (Pietro Martire Vermigli)

*Loci communes.* Heidelberg: Andreas Cambier, 1603

Victor de Vita


Victorinus of Poitiers

*Revelation.* • *Scola in Apocalypsin Beati Joannis* (CSEL 49) • *Commentary on the Apocalypse of the Blessed John* (ANF 7)

Viega, Blasius de (Brás Viegas)

*Revelation.* • *In Apocalypsim Joannis Apostoli Commentarii exegetici. Coloniae Agrrippinae: Crithius,* 1617

Vincentius Belvacensis

*Sermon de assumpt. Beat. Virgin.*

Vita Antonii Eremitae. See Athanasius, Vita

Vita Bernhardi. See Guilelmus, Vita Bernhardi

Vita Hilarionis. See Jerome, Vita Hilarionis

Vita Macarri. See Palladius of Galatia, *Historia ad Lausum*
ON DEATH

Vitae Patrum sive Historiae Eremiticae libri decem (PL 73–74)

Vives, Joannes Ludovicus (Juan Luis Vives)

- Collected works • Opera, in duos distincta tomos. Basel: Nikolaus Episcopius, 1555

Volaterranus, Raphael

- Commentarium urbanorum libri octo et triginta, accuratius quam antehac excusi. [Frankfurt:] Apud Claudium Marnium, & hæredes Ioannis Aubrij, 1603

William of Auxerre (Altisiodorensis)

- Summa Aurea in IV libros Sententiarum. Paris: Francois Regnault, 1500

William of Occam

- Dialogus magistri Guillermi de ocham doctoris famosissimi. [Lyon: Trechsel, ca. 1494]

Witzel, Georg

- Homiliae orthodoxae: Postil oder Außlegung echter Catholischer lehr uber alle Episteln und Evangelien aller Sontage. Behem, 1546

Wolf, Johann

- Cent. 16 • See Lectiones memorabiles

- Lectiones memorabiles • Lexicon memorabilium et reconditarum centenarii XVI. [Tomus I–II]. Lausingen: Leonhard Reinmichel, 1600

- Memorab. • See Lectiones memorabiles

Xenophon

- Cyropaedia (LCL 51–52)

- De paedia • See Cyropaedia

- Hellenica (LCL 88–89) • Historia Rerum Gestarum in Graecia... Addita est Narratio Praceptarum Rerum temporis secuti praemium ad Mantinum, usque ad Alexandrum Magnum. Leipzig: Valentin Bapst, 1546. Opera... omnia... in Latinam linguam couersa. Basel: Nikolaus Brylinger, 1553

Zabarella, Giacomo

- De accret. et nutrit. • De rebus naturalibus libri XXX. Francofurti, 1617

Zepper, Wilhelm


Zimara, Marcus Antonius

- Problemata • Marci Antonii Zimara Sanctipetrinatis problema his addita, una cum trecentis Aristotelis & Averrois propositionibus, suis in locis insertis