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CHAPTER 5

DEATH AS THE ULTIMATE SACRIFICE
A proper appreciation of Tertullian's understanding of death is impossible without a recognition of his profound indebtedness to contemporary sacrificial theory. Judaism and classical religion both accorded a prominent position to cultic sacrifice. Christianity has its origin in the expiatory sacrifice wrought by our Lord upon the cross. Within such an intellectual milieu, it was logical for Tertullian to incorporate the sacrificial motif in his general morality.

In this chapter, I will demonstrate the extent to which the sacrificial ethos permeates his theory of death. Furthermore, I will argue that Tertullian's exposition of martyrdom as a sacrifice was coloured by his contact with the stern, all-demanding deities who dominated North African paganism; God, as He was worshipped by Tertullian, had not escaped the stamp of Ba'Al-Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelestis.

5.1 Can ordinary death be regarded as a sacrifice?

Traditionally, cultic sacrifice was regarded as a due which the worshipper owed to his god. However, although Anim. 50:2, 4-6 describes death as a "debt" owed by man to the Almighty, it would be a mistake to envisage death as such a due. Ordinary death is not an expiation for sin; it is a penalty for sin. It forms part of the scheme of divine judgement - not the scheme of worship and sacrifice.
Furthermore, ordinary death diverges from traditional sacrificial theory at another crucial point. Whereas the worshipper makes his offering to his god freely and without constraint, ordinary death is, with the exception of suicide, involuntary. Where would the inherent virtue be in the performing of a deed over which man has neither choice nor control?

There is only one way in which the Tertullianic concept of ordinary death can be termed a sacrifice to the Almighty. Because prayer and patience are spiritual sacrifices, the dying man who does not complain about his fate and his sufferings (continuing throughout to praise his Maker) may with justice be said to offer himself to God. Nonetheless, although Tertullian possessed in his concept of spiritual sacrifice the intellectual foundations for such a theory and indeed probably would have replied in such terms had he been challenged. In his extant works, there is no evidence that he came to such a conclusion.

5.2 Martyrdom: the ultimate sacrifice offered by the faithful - the supreme act of self-abnegation.

"Crudelitas uestra gloria est nostra. Uide tantum ne hoc ipso, quod talia sustinemus, ad hoc solum uideamur erumpere, ut hoc ipsum probemus, nos haec non timere, sed ultro uocare. Arrius Antoninus in Asia cum perseveretur instanter, omnes illius ciuitatis Christiani ante tribunalia eius se manu facta obtulerunt. Tum ille, paucis duci iussis, reliquis ait: ἡ θελεῖτε ἐξανθημοκεῖσθαι, κρατεῖτε ὑδρακονοζως ἵππος ἐκεῖτε. Hoc si placuerit et hic fieri, quid facies de tantis milibus hominum, totuiris ac feminis,
Here, in *Scap.* 5:1, 1-5:2, 10, Tertullian exults in the self-abnegation displayed by the Christian community in the past and prophesies that an identical spirit will not be found wanting in the future. Should it prove necessary, he proclaims in *Scap.* 5:2, 11-5:3, 18, such selflessness will lead to the decimation of Carthaginian society. (The martyr’s self-denial is also to the fore in *Apol.* 30:7, 35-40, where Tertullian by depicting the dying martyr at prayer, highlights his role as the passive, yet willing victim).

Self-abnegation, however, is probably not the only message of *Scap.* 5:1, 1-5:2, 10. The word employed to describe the Christians’ actions, in *Scap.* 5:1, 6 and 5:2, 10, is the verb "offerre". By choosing this verb (rather than verbs such as "dedere" or "tradere") Tertullian did more than simply state that the Carthaginian Christians will, if necessary, voluntarily deliver themselves into the hands of Scapula. He also reminded the faithful that such an action would be a mere prelude to their becoming cultic victims offered to their God. (By recognising that the action of offering themselves to Scapula is simply a prelude to the cultic sacrifice, not the cultic sacrifice itself, it is possible to come to terms with the fact that the verb "offerre" has strong cultic associations in Tertullian’s thought, without losing sight of the fact that the martyr’s sacrifice is offered to God alone).
5.2.1 The martyr - the supreme cultic victim offered by the Christian under the New Dispensation

Tertullian acknowledged that Christ is the cultic victim without peer. He it is who expiated mankind's sins once and for all on the cross. Without prejudice to this, however, he also believed that the martyr is a cultic victim - the supreme cultic victim offered by Christians under the New Dispensation.

Indeed, whilst the strong cultic overtones of Tertullian's theology of martyrdom can be matched by those of Origen's Mart. Prot. 30:293, 6-14 and 35:297, 6-11 (where the martyrs are "blameless priests" who offer themselves upon the altar as "blameless sacrifices" and martyrdom is envisaged as a "burnt offering") one of the most notable features of that theology is its cultic realism. The cultic dimension of the martyr's sacrifice is not nearly as prominent in Mart. Long. 1:55, 29-1:56, 5, 1:51, 8-1:52, 15, Pass. Perp. 21:2, 26-21:3, 1, Pass. Mar et Iac. 12:1, 5-12:3, 15 and Pass. Mont. et Luc. 22:6, 3-6. As for Irenaeus, so disinterested was he in the cultic dimension of the martyr's blood that when making one of his rare allusions to the martyrs' blood, in Ad. Haer. III 18:5, 127-130, he merely observed that those who have cast aspersions upon the martyrs' deaths will be confounded.

The depth of the cultic overtones of Tertullian's martyr theology will become clear in the course of this chapter, as I examine his exploitation of various types of sacrifice and
his indebtedness to the indigenous Romano-Punic cultus. Here, I will examine the contribution made by his predilection for cultic terminology.

The martyr as cultic victim finds one of its finest expressions in *Marc*. IV 39:4, 9-16 and 39:5, 18-25. Expounding Zech. 9:15-16 Tertullian declares that, in the "last days," Christians' blood will be poured out as if on an altar; the key words for a proper understanding of *Marc*. IV 39:4, 9-16 and 39:5, 18-25 are "sanguis", "ouis" and "altare". I quote:

"Ante haec autem persecutiones eis praedicat et passiones euenturas, in martyrium utique et in salutem. Accipe praedicatum in Zacharia: 'dominus', inquit, 'omnipotens proteget eos et consument illos, et lapidabunt lapidibus fundae et bibent sanguinem illorum uelut uinum et replebunt pateras quasi altaris, et saluos eos faciet dominus illo die uelut iones, populum suum, quia lapides sancti uoluntant' ... Nemo in praedicatione bellorum legitimis armis debellantorum lapidationem enumerat popularibus coetibus magis et inermi tumultui familiarem; nemo tanta in bello sanguinis flumina paterarum capacitate metitur aut unius altaris cruentationi adaequat; nemo iones appellat eos, qui in bello armati et ipsi ex eadem feritate certantes cadunt, sed qui in sua proprietate atque patientia dedentes potius semetipsos quam uindicantes trucidantur."

Although *Marc*. IV 39:4, 11-14 with its reference to the faithful being devoured by their enemies and having their blood drunk like wine, would have been ideally suited to an account of the evil powers' rapacious and insatiable appetite for Christian blood, Tertullian never so applied it. Instead, he emphasised that the martyr is God's "sheep" - a "sheep" whose blood, after it has been slain, will be gathered up in a bowl and poured out upon an altar.
The classical "thusia" did not include blood-rites\textsuperscript{16} but describing the Jewish "olah" R.K. Yerkes observes,

"the blood, which was caught in a basin by the priest as it spurted from the severed arteries of the animal, was poured around the base of the altar."\textsuperscript{17}

The blood-rites associated with the cult of Ba'\textsuperscript{al}-Hammon/Saturn, though different, were equally important. Leglay concludes:

"Ensuite, il est probable qu'au cours des sacrifices, après l'immolation et la décollation de la victime, on ne se contentait pas de répandre son sang sur l'autel, comme l'indique une inscription néopunique de Bir-Tlelsa; on devait en asperger aussi les ex-voto dressés dans la zone sacrée du temple, toujours avec la même intention revigorante."\textsuperscript{18}

The cultic dimension of \textit{Marc} IV 39:4, 9-39:5, 25 should not be dismissed on the grounds that it is a direct citation of Zech. 9:15-16. The cultic significance of objects such as blood, sheep, libation bowls and altars must have been well-known to Tertullian's original readers; their own memories of their lives prior to conversion apart, sacrificial ritual played an important role in the lives of their pagan contemporaries. By citing Zech. 9:15-16, Tertullian was consciously exploiting its cultic resonance. Thus, P.A. Gramaglia misses the deeper significance of \textit{Marc}. IV 39:4, 9-39:5, 25, when he concludes that its references to blood simply betoken violence.\textsuperscript{19}

The case for an intimate association between references to the martyr's blood and his cultic sacrifice is reinforced by
such passages as Scorp. 6:11, 19-23 and 15:6, 28-15:6, 4, where Tertullian has no inhibitions about openly stating that God desires the shedding of men's blood. (The decisive words are "concupiscere" and "sitire"). In the words of Scorp. 15:6, 28-15:6, 4:

"Quodsi iam tunc Prodicus aut Valentinus adsisteret sugerens non in terris esse confitendum apud homines, minus uereor ne deus humanum sanguinem sitiat nec Christus uicem passionis quasi et ipse de ea salutem consecetur us exposcat, statim audisset a seruo dei quod audierat diabolus a domino: 'recede satana, scandalum mihi es'.”

(Scorp. 15:6, 28-15:6, 4.).

When these passages are set alongside such passages as Scorp. 6:9, 8-6:11, 18, 12:9, 23-25, Fug. 12:10, 103-110, Apol. 23:19, 93-y/ and Bapt. 16:2, 6-9, (passages which will be discussed in detail later) the contribution of the word "blood" to the theme of the martyr as the supreme cultic victim becomes evident.

The implications of the word "blood" are, I grant, not uniform. Within the works of Tertullian, blood symbolises phenomena as diverse as man’s life-force and the corruptibility of his flesh, his propensity to sin (the "old" man) and his acts of violence. However, it is surely significant that a sizable number of Tertullian’s allusions to the word "blood" appear in a cultic context; excluding those which occur with his soteriology and his martyr theology, there are twenty-one such allusions to the word "sanguis".

Apol. 25:5, 20-26 describes the ceremonial self-laceration of the chief priest of Cybele -
"itaque maiestatis suae in urbem collatae grande documentum nostra etiam aetate proposuit, cum Marco Aurelio apud Sirmium rei publicae exempto die sexto decimo kalendarem aprilium archigallus ille sanctissimus die nono kalendarem earundem, quo sanguinem impurum lacertos quoque castrando libabat, pro salute Marci iam intercepti solita aeque imperia mandauit".

Spect 10:2, 4-8 assumes that the entire sacrificial process within paganism can be summarised under the heading "incense and blood" -

"apparatus etiam ex ea parte consortes, qua ad scenaem a templis et aris et illa infelicitate turis et sanguinis inter tibias et tubas itur duobus inquinatissimis arbitris funerum et sacrorum, dissignatore et haruspice."

Marc. II 22:2, 10-15 though it rejects animal sacrifices, recognises that blood was an integral part of the cultic life of Old Testament Judaism:

"Diximus de sacrificiorum rationali institutione, auocante scilicet ab idolis ad deum officia ea, quae si rursus eiecerat dicens: 'quo mihi multitudinem sacrificiorum uestrorum?' Hoc ipsum uoluit intellegi, quod non sibi ea proprie exegisset. 'Non enim bibam', inquit, 'sanguinem taurorum', quia et alibi ait: 'deus aeternus non esuriet nec sitiet'."

Furthermore, given that Tertullian exhorted the faithful to follow in the footsteps of their Lord, it is surely also significant that some of his allusions to Christ's blood have cultic overtones.23 Marc. V 7:3, 10-12 uses the Passover as a vehicle by which to express the redeeming power of Christ's blood. Fug. 12:3, 24-27 uses the image of the flawless sacrificial victim to express the "cultic" character of the cross. I quote:

"Sic et pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus. Quare pascha Christus, si non pascha figura..."
Christi per similitudinem sanguinis salutaris pecoris et Christi?" (Marc. V 7:3, 10-12)

and

"Quis est nunc, qui aduersus illum reluctatur, immo depretiat mercedem eius tam magno comparatam, pretiosissimo scilicet sanguine agni immaculati?" (Fug. 12:3, 24-27).

Finally, although the majority of his references to the martyrs' blood fail to display overtly sacrificial overtones, some of them employ the word "blood" to symbolise the martyrs' self-denial. Apol. 21:28, 140-142, where Tertullian exults in the bloody wounds inflicted upon the faithful, is deeply imbued with a sense of their selflessness and self-abnegation -

"dicimus et palam dicimus et uobis torquentibus lacerati et cruentati uociferamur: 'deum colimus per Christum'." Apol. 21:25, 128-131, 50:13, 59-50:14, 64 and Scorp. 15:2, 7-9, where the emphasis is upon the 'evangelising' powers of the martyrs' blood, are cast in a similar vein:

"Discipuli uero diffusi per orbem ex praeccepto magistri dei paruerunt, qui et ipsi a Iudaeis persequentibus multa perpessi utique pro fiducia ueritatis libenter Romae postremo per Neronis saeuitiam sanguinem Christianum seminauerunt." (Apol. 21:25, 128-131).

If, as I shall argue later, the Tertullianic concept of blood was intimately bound up with man's life-force, the shedding of the martyr's life-force cannot be other than a quasi-cultic act; the equation of blood with life was integral to many cultic ceremonies in the ancient world.
Thus, allusions to blood which are set in contexts which are not explicitly cultic (notably those where the focus is upon the martyr’s self-denial) may have implicitly cultic connotations.

Turning to the words "sheep" and "altar" (words which are to the forefront in Marc. IV 39:4, 9-39:5, 25) it is important to recognise that they too had profoundly cultic connotations in the ancient world. Under Second Temple Judaism, sheep had been commonly sacrificed to Yahweh and within classical paganism, they continued to be immolated to the gods.26 Tertullian’s familiarity with the cultic use to which sheep were put can be demonstrated by Jud. 13:20, 115-13:21, 124, where he expounds the Aqedah and underlines its importance as a foreshadowing of the Passion:

"Hoc lignum sibi et Isaac, filius Abrahae, ad sacrificium ipse portabat, cum sibi eum deus hostiam fieri praecipisset. Sed quoniam haec fuerant sacramenta, quae temporibus Christi percipienda seruabantur, et Isaac tum ligno solutus est, ariete oblato in uepre cornibus haerente, et Christus suis temporibus lignum humeris suis partauit inhaerens cornibus crucis, corona spinea capiti eius circumdata. Hunc enim oportebat pro omnibus gentibus fieri sacrificium, qui 'tamquam ouis ad uictimam ductus est et, uelut agnus coram tondente se sine uoce, sic non aperuit os suum'."

Altars, too, played a crucial role in contemporary cultic life. Discussing the position of the main altar in sanctuaries dedicated by Ba’al-Hammon/Saturn, Leglay observes -

"l’autel, où s’accomplissent les grands sacrifices, occupe naturellement dans la cour la place d’honneur."27
Drawing on analogy between the ceremonies performed for the gods and the ceremonies performed for the dead, *Spect.*, 13:4, 10-14 recognises that altars are indispensable to both cults:

"Nec minus templa quam monumenta despuimus, neutram aram nouimus, neutram effigiem adoramus, non sacrificamus, non parentamus. Sed neque de sacrificio et parentato edimus, quia non possumus cenam dei edere et cenam daemoniorum."

Indeed, alluding to primitive Roman paganism, *Apol.* 25:13, 59-62 assumes that, in the absence of permanent altars, sacrifices must have taken place rarely -

"frugi religio et pauperes ritus et nulla Capitolia certantia ad caelum, sed temporaria de caespite altaria et uasa adhuc Samia et nidor exillis et deus ipse nusquam."

Thus, *Marc.* IV 39:5, 20-25 where the blood of the Christian "sheep" is gathered up in "bowls" and poured out upon an "altar" unequivocally casts the martyr as a cultic victim.

The cultic connotations of Tertullian's references to the word "altar" within his martyr theology are not confined to *Marc.* IV 39:4, 9-39:5, 25. They are explicit in *Scorp.* 7:7, 7-11 (where he concedes that it would not be unreasonable for the Almighty to demand martyrdoms as a Christianised version of the "altar-pyres" of paganism) and implicit in *Orat.* 5:3, 12-15, *Resurr.* 38:4, 11-15 and *Scorp.* 12:9, 25-12:9, 1 (where he cites Rev. 6:9). To quote *Scorp.* 7:7, 7-11 and *Resurr.* 38:4, 11-15:

"Si noster quoque deus propriae hostiae nomine martyria sibi depotulasset, quis illi
exprobrasset funestam religionem et lugubres ritus et aram rogum et pollinctorem sacerdotem, et non beatum amplius reputasset quem deus comedisset?" (Scorp. 7:7, 7-11)

and

"Male deum norunt qui non putant illum posse quod non putant. Et tamen sciunt potuisse, si instrumentum Iohannis norunt: quem enim animas adhuc solas martyrum sub altari quiescentes conspectui subdidit, posset utique et resurgentes oculis exhibere sine carne!" (Resurr. 38:4, 11-15).

Although Tertullian’s professed concern in Resurr. 38:4, 11-15 (like that of so many other early Church Fathers) was to describe the condition of the souls of the martyrs whilst they await the resurrection, his acceptance of the analogy between Paradise and the divine altar may be imbued with an additional level of meaning. Noting that the "blameless priests" of the supreme High Priest offer themselves as a sacrifice for the sins of the Christian people, in Mart. Prot. 30:293, 1-15, Origen concludes his exposition of Rev. 6:9 by declaring that the martyrs are "seen near the altar as near their own place":

"ὡς γὰρ οἱ τῷ κατὰ τὸν Μαυσωλείον νόμον θυσιαστηρίῳ προσκέμενες διακοινεῖν ἐξόκουν δὲ αἵματος ἰμάχων καὶ τοξών· ἄφετον ἐμφανίζομαι ἕπειτας, οὕτως οὐκ ἴσχυεν πεπελεκισμένων· ἐνέκεν τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ Ἰησοῦ, μὴ μάτην τὸ ἐν οὐρανοῖς θυσιαστηρίῳ παραδείγματος, διεκκινοῦσι τοὺς εὐχομένους ἄφετον ἐμφανίζομαι ἐμέ δὲ καὶ γνώσκομεν δυ, ὅσπερ ὁ ἄρχωρεῖς θυσίαν ἑσυχόν προσήνεγκεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός, οὕτως οἱ ἱερεῖς, ἡν ἔστιν ἄρχωρεῖς, θυσίαν ἑσυχοῦς προσφέροντας· δὲ ἡν ὁ παρὰ οἴκτῳ τόπῳ ὄραντες τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ ἀλλὰ τῶν ἱερέων οἱ μὲν δῖκαιοι καὶ διώκομοι προσφέροντες θυσίας ἑσεράνων τῷ θεόν, οἱ δὲ μεμοιχμένοι μάμοι, οὕς ἀνέγραψε Μωϋσῆς ἐν τῷ Λευιτικῷ, ἐξαρίστων ἀπὸ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου. τὰς δὲ διώκομοι ἱερέως διώκομοι ἱερέων προσφέρων ἢ κροτῶν τῇ ὀμολογίᾳ καὶ πληρῶν πάντας ἀρείμοι, ὃν ἐκποιεῖ ὁ τῶν μαρτυρίου λόγος, περὶ σοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἑνωτέρω προσεκόληκας."
His message in *Hom. Num.* 10:302, 68-77 is identical. The martyrs stand by the altar. Those who assume such a place fulfil sacerdotal functions.

Thus, whilst it is true that the cult of the martyrs was thriving in early third century Carthage and the practice of placing the bones of martyrs beneath the altars of "memoria" would become a common one within the early Church, such a contemporary exegesis of Rev. 6:9 (when read alongside his already illustrated tendency to view altars as the epitome of the entire sacrificial cultus) suggests that Tertullian would have recognised in the motif of the celestial altar a timely reminder of the cultic character of the martyrs' deaths. As P.A. Gramaglia states:

"Per 'altara' Tertulliano intende soprattutto il luogo sacro sul quale venivano compiuti i sacrifici cruenti sia nel mondo pagano sia nel tempio ebraico. Il linguaggio cristiano ricupera tale categoria in riferimento all'altare celeste di cui parla Ap. 6,9 ... Le semantiche sacrificali sono infatti assorbite dall'esperienza del martirio, già in Ap. 6, 9, che richiamava esplicitamente l'immagine del sangue versato dai credenti immolati per la loro fedeltà a Cristo, e dalla spiritualità del culto cristiano espresso nella preghiera comunitaria."  

The Montanist Tertullian may have diverged from Origen when he rejected the idea that the martyrs can expiate the sins of their fellow men but he did acknowledge that they can expiate their own sins. It would be a mistake to be too distracted by this discrepancy between the thought of Tertullian and that of Origen; *Mart. Prot.* 30:293, 1-15 and *Hom. Num.* 10:302, 68-77 demonstrate that, in the
intellectual milieu of the early Church, the cultic implications of Rev. 6:9 were not difficult to discern.

That Tertullian did discern them may be illustrated by Orat. 5:3, 12-15.35 By referring to the calls of the martyrs for their blood to be avenged, he highlighted the fact that it was the shedding of their blood which had won them the right to reside beneath the celestial altar. The shedding of the victims' blood was an essential prerequisite for cultic life in the ancient world.

When read in conjunction with Orat. 28:4, 11-1536 - the passage in which Tertullian envisages the faithful's prayers being conducted to the celestial altar - this means that the martyr's self-sacrifice (the self-sacrifice of which his blood is the symbol) is laid upon the celestial altar and that by that act, his personal sins are expiated. The altar under which he subsequently resides symbolises the act whereby the martyr's death is formally offered to God.

The analogy between martyrs and sacrificial sheep recurs only once outwith Marc. IV 39:5, 23-25. Scorp. 13:4, 5-10 casts the martyr in the role of a "sheep", a "sheep" who is led to the slaughter:

"Et ideo postmodum, 'quis', inquit, 'separabit nos a dilectione Christi? Pressura an angustia an famis an nuditas an periculum an machaera? Secundum quod scriptum est: tua causa mortificamur tota die; deputati sumus ut pecora iugulationis, sed in omnibus istis superuincimus pro eo qui nos dilexit'."

The martyr's Master had been a "sheep"37 too - a "sheep" who had been slaughtered at Calvary.
Fug. 11:1, 1-11:3, 33 employs the metaphor of the Christian "flock", a metaphor which must have helped to provide the intellectual climate for the martyr as cultic victim. Nonetheless, as Fug. 11:2, 19-23 illustrates, Tertullian was concerned primarily with the threat posed to the divine "sheep" by their demoniac predators, not with their passivity in the face of attack -

"in quos et Ezechiel et Hieremias iisdem minis perorant, quod non tantum de pecoribus improbe uescantur pascentes potius semetipsos, uerum et dispersum gregem faciant et in praedam esse omnibus bestiis agri, dum non est pastor illis."

"Sanguis", "ouis" and "altare" - these are not the only words which Tertullian employed when seeking to cast the martyr in the role of cultic victim. Quoting Phil. 2:17 somewhat loosely, Scorp. 13:9, 13-15 reminds the Carthaginian Church that Paul's death was a "libation", a libation poured out over a sacrifice -

"nam etsi libor super sacrificium, gaudeo et congaudeo omnibus uobis, perinde, et uos gaudete et congaudete mihi."

Delineating the role of libations in Greco-Roman cultic life, Yerkes declares:

"Libations were of common occurrence throughout the history of Greek religions. Wine, blood and wine, oil and honey were used for various purposes; if these were lacking, water could be used as a surrogate. They are found in all sacrifices, before the mysteries, at visits to tombs before a journey, before and after meals, before retiring at night, at marriages, for purposes of purification, as accompaniment to simple, private and family devotions. In general it may be observed that the pouring of libations was the natural expression of prayer and of thanksgiving. They occur twice in the thusia:
once at the actual burning of the parts for the god, when a cupful of wine was poured over the burning flesh and into the fire; again after the meal, when a few drops were ceremonially poured into each cup, and then upon the ground, before the cups were filled for drinking.\textsuperscript{38}

Thus, although the word "sacrificium", in Scorp. 13:9, 13, refers to the faith of the church at Philippi and not to the death of Paul, the word "libare" imbues the excerpt with a thoroughly cultic aura. It is an aura which it shares with Scorp. 7:7, 7-11 where the martyr is described as a "hostia" - a "victim" acceptable in the eyes of God.

Furthermore, recording the fact that many of the leading apostles were martyred in horrible circumstances, Scorp. 15:2, 7-9 declares that James (the brother of our Lord) was immolated -

"quod Petrus caeditur, quod Stephanus opprimitur, quod Iacobus immolatur, quod Paulus distrahitur, ipsorum sanguine scripta sunt."

The vocabulary of "immolation" recurs in Apol. 50:12, 51-54:

"Sed hoc agite, boni praesides, meliores multo apud populum, si illis Christianos immolaueritis, cruciatis, torquate, damnate, atterite nos: probatio est enim innocentiae nostrae iniquitas uestra!"

The terms "immolatio" and "immolare" are bound up with the ritual killing and the offering to the gods of the sacrificial victim.\textsuperscript{39} To quote Apol. 40:14, 54-59,

"denique cum ab imbribus aestiua hiberna suspendunt et annus in cura est, uos quidem cottidie pasti statimque pransuri, balneis et cauponis et lupanaribus operantibus, aquilicia Ioui immolatis, nudipedalia populo denuntiatis, caelum apud Capitolium quaeritis, nubila de
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Therefore their transference into the sphere of martyr theology could not have failed to render the martyr’s death a cultic act. (It may even be significant that the verb employed by Tertullian to portray the death of Peter, that is, the verb “caedere” was sometimes used in the ancient world to denote the slaughter of sacrificial victims).

Finally, his theology of martyrdom is invested with a cultic aura by his use of the word "offerre". Gramaglia has noted the importance of "offerre" in Tertullian’s descriptions of worship in ancient Israel:

"Il verbo ‘offerre’ ci interessa evidentemente per la sua presenza nel linguaggio eucaristico cristiano. Tertulliano, tra tanti altri significati che non rientrano nel nostro intento, lo usa tuttavia anche per indicare i riti sacrificali dell’Antico Testamento (De ieiunio, 7, 1; ‘offerebat holocaustum’; Aduersus Marcionem, 3, 13,18: i sacrifici antichi erano compiuti ‘ob honorem dei’), le decime (Aduersus Marcionem, 4, 27, 4), i riti di espiazione e di purificazione (Aduersus Marcionem, 4, 35, 11: ‘offerre munus’; 4, 9, 9-13).”

He has also recognised his use of it with reference to pagan cultic ceremonies.

Read in the light of such passages as Marc. II 22:3, 16-25, Iud. 5:1, 1-5:3, 28 and Ieiun 7:1, 28-7:1, 4, Pat. 16:5, 15-18 is a thoroughly cultic passage; the martyr’s physical and spiritual patience are an oblation made to his God. In Tertullian’s own words:

"Ceterum nos amemus patientiam dei, patientiam Christi: rependamus illi quam pro nobis ipse dependit, offeramus patientiam spiritus,
The idea that the martyr is the supreme cultic sacrifice offered by Christians contributes four valuable insights to Tertullian's theology of martyrdom. Firstly, it highlights the harsh reality of the martyr's death; that death entails intense physical anguish and the spilling of blood. By spotlighting this aspect of martyrdom, Tertullian ensured that laying down one's life for God is not simply a beautiful ideal; it is a concrete, even nauseating reality.

Secondly, by directing attention towards the passivity of the cultic victim and towards the tradition that blood is the ultimate offering, it reminds the faithful that martyrdom demands the total renunciation of self. God requires total loyalty from His people; partial loyalty is not sufficient. Thus, martyrdom is the death of a selfless man.

Thirdly, since the classical world regarded sacrifice as the proper channel of worship between men and the gods, the cultic dimension of Tertullian's theory of martyrdom emphasises that it is the Almighty Himself who is the true recipient of that sacrifice. It is God whom the martyr seeks to repay.44 It is God who covets men's blood.45 With the exception of the death of Christ, martyrdom is the supreme example of the God-orientated death.

The divinely-orientated character of the martyr's death is not contradicted by Apol. 23:19, 93-94 where Tertullian
asserts that the pagans sacrifice Christian blood to their demoniac gods -

"colitis illos, quod sciam, etiam de sanguine Christianorum."

An apologetic device, Apol. 23:19, 93-94 can (as Waltzing appreciates) be partially explained by the fact that the spectacles at which the Christians are destined to die are dedicated to the pagan gods -

"c'est en l'honneur des dieux que sont célébrés les jeux sanglants, où les chrétiens sont livrés aux bêtes."46

However, this excerpt has an additional level of meaning; it views the deaths of the martyrs from the perspective of their pagan persecutors. They slay Christians in order to uphold the authority of the demoniac gods47 in whom they believe. They honour them by offering them the lives of their detractors; this is confirmed by Pass. Perp. 18:4, 6-9, where the pagan authorities attempt to dress Perpetua and her companions in the habiliment of Saturn’s priests and Ceres’ priestesses.48

Scorp. 6:9, 9-6:11, 23, Pat. 16:5, 15-18, Ieiun. 12:2, 13-27 and Fug. 12:10, 103-110, by contrast, view the deaths of the martyrs from the true perspective - the perspective of the believer and his God. Fug. 12:10, 105-107 declares -

"quid autem deo debo, sicut denarium Caesari, nisi sanguinem, quem pro me filius fudit ipsius?"

Whatever the intentions of his pagan persecutors, the true recipient of the martyr’s self-offering is determined by his faith - his faith in the one true God.
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Fourthly, by cloaking the martyr's death in the language of contemporary cultic life, Tertullian pointed to the fact that Christians walk a path of suffering which has already been traversed by their Lord; Christ offered Himself at Calvary as an expiatory sacrifice. Martyrdom is a death which brings the sufferer into "solidarity" with his Saviour.

The contention that the martyr is a cultic victim is not without paradox. Why did Tertullian think in these terms when he regarded the cultic sacrifices of paganism with bitter contempt and withering scorn? Apol. 14:1, 1-7 avers that the flesh of the victims in pagan sacrifices was frequently putrid and that the gods were offered those portions of the animal which normally were deemed fit only for slaves to eat:

"Non dico quales sitis in sacrificando, cum enecta et tabidosa et scabiosa quaeque mactatis, cum de optimis et integris superuacua quaeque truncatis, capitula et ungulas, quae domi quoque pueris uel canibus destinassetis, dum de decima Herculis nec tertiam partem in aram eius imponitis: laudo magis sapientiam, quod de perdito aliquid eripitis."

The recognition that Tertullian was equally contemptuous of the cultic life of ancient Israel merely sharpens the paradox. The holocausts and other rites prescribed by the Torah were not good in themselves; they were necessary to prevent the Jews being seduced by the idolatrous practices of their neighbours. They had been an inescapable concession to the Jews' preoccupation with the things of the flesh. Marked by their oppressive concern with detail,
these sacrifices had been superseded by the worship of the New Dispensation.\textsuperscript{53} Iud. 5:6, 45-54 is typical of Tertullian’s approach:

"Itaque, quomodo carnalia sacrificia reprobata intelleguntur, - de quibus et Esaias loquitur dicens: 'quo mihi multitudinem sacrificiorum uestrorum? dicit dominus,' quoniam et 'si adtuleritis', inquit, 'mihi similaginem, uanum supplicamentum, execramentum mihi est', et adhuc: 'holocausta uestra et sacrificia et adipem hircorum et sanguinem taurorum nolo, nec si ueniatis uideri mihi: quis enim exquisiuit haec de manibus uestris?' - ita sacrificia spiritalia accepta praedicantur, ut prophetae adnuntiant."

There is no simple answer. Tertullian’s understanding of martyrdom was largely governed by cultic metaphors chosen by the Bible. Therefore, since he believed that the Bible could not err,\textsuperscript{54} the contradiction between its description of martyrdom as a cultic sacrifice and its rejection of cultic sacrifices\textsuperscript{55} did not exist as far as he was concerned. However, at the heart of any resolution of the paradox, there must lie a recognition of his fundamental objection to cultic sacrifice.

The killing of an animal, the outpouring of a libation of wine and the scattering of a few grains of incense are empty, meaningless actions; they can be performed without true piety reigning in the heart of the worshipper. Contrasting the prayers offered by Christians for the well-being of the Emperor with the sacrifices offered by pagans, Apol. 30:5, 23-30:6, 34 proclaims:

"Haec ab alio orare non possum, quam a quo me scio consecuturum, quoniam et ipse est, qui solus praestat, et ego sum, cui impetrare debitur, famulus eius, qui eum solus observo, qui pro
disciplina eius occidor, qui ei offero opimam et maiorem hostiam, quam ipse manduit, orationem de carne pudica, de anima innocent, de spiritu sancto profectam, non grana turis unius assis, Arabicae arboris lacrimas, nec duas meri guttas, nec sanguinem reprobisouis mori optantis, et post omnia inquina menta etiam conscientiam spurcam: ut mirer, cum hostiae probantur penes uos a uitiosissimis sacerdotibus, cur praecordia potius uictimarum quam ipsorum sacrificantium examinatur."

The importance of the worshipper's state of mind is also to the fore in Orat. 28:2, 5-28:3, 11; the spiritual character of the worship of the "New Israel" is contrasted with the "Old Israel's" reliance on external ceremonies.

The death of the man who chooses to lay down his life for the sake of his God is not open to that objection. Martyrdom is not an external act - a sham which can be performed without true feeling; it is the outward expression of the love and faith with which the martyr regards his God.56 (Discussing the death of the Catholic Pristinus, Jeiun. 12:3, 27-12:3, 9 asserts that, in the absence of the Christian's intention to "confess" Jesus, death at the hands of the pagan authorities is not true martyrdom. The Montanist Tertullian considered that when Pristinus had been questioned on the rack, he had been too inebriated to deny Christ). Although Apol. 30:7, 35-40 does not cast its message in overtly cultic terms, it indicates the reason why the cultic sacrifice of the martyr is acceptable to God; the martyr is motivated by devotion to God. To quote Tertullian, the martyr dies in the act of prayer:

"Sic itaque nos ad deum expansos ungulae fodiant, cruces suspendant, ignes lambant, gladii guttera detruncent, bestiae insiliant: paratus est ad omne supplicium ipse habitus orantis Christiani. 328
The picture of the martyr dying whilst at prayer is undoubtedly an excellent apologetic device (rendering his murder yet more shameful) but its significance does not end there. It underlines the fact that it is the spiritual victim (that is, the martyr’s faith and devotion to God) which renders the physical victim (that is, his tortured flesh) an acceptable offering to the Almighty.

Before examining the precise character of the martyr’s self-offering, one question demands an answer. Why are so many of Tertullian’s excursions into the cultic genre to be found in a single work?

His enthusiasm in Scorp. for the cultic genre was not the result of his encounter with a new motif. The earliest date which has been suggested for Scorp. is 203. Tertullian’s theology of martyrdom displayed sacrificial traits as early as 197-198.

Thus, in Apol. 50:12, 52, he employed the verb "immolare" to describe the martyrs’ deaths and in Mart. 4:4, 27-4:5, 35, Apol. 50: 5, 21-25 and Nat. I 17:3, 27-29, he chose the deaths of pagans whose self-abnegation is imbued with a quasi-cultic aura as examples with which to persuade the brethren to suffer for their God. Apol. 50:5, 21-25 positively exults in the self-abnegation of Dido and her fellow "victims":
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Instead, Tertullian’s enthusiasm should be explained by his polemical style; he tended to take his cue from the opponents whose case he sought to destroy.\textsuperscript{57} Consequently, in \textit{Scorp.}, his predilection for the martyr as a cultic offering was a direct response to the preoccupations of his Gnostic adversaries. The Gnostics stridently asserted that the Christian God, the God who had already rejected the blood of bulls and goats, had no desire for the blood of men. \textit{Scorp.} 1:8, 23-1:9, 2 purportedly records their reasoning as follows:

"Sic is occidet, qui saluum facere debebit? Semel Christus pro nobis obit, semel occisus est, ne occideremur. Si uicem repetit, num et ille salutem de mea nece expectat? An deus hominum sanguinem flagitat, maxime si taurorum et hircorum recusat? Certe peccatoris paenitentiam manuult quam mortem. Et quomodo non peccatorum desiderat mortem? Haec et si qua alia adinuenta haereticorum uenenorum quem non uel in scrupulum ligant, si non in exitium, uel in bilem, si non in mortem?"

The message of \textit{Scorp.} 15:6, 26-15:6, 4 is identical.

I will return to the further consequences of Tertullian’s interaction with the Gnostic critique of martyrdom later. Meantime, I will confine myself to observing that the connection between that critique and Tertullian’s extensive use of sacrificial terminology, in \textit{Scorp.}, accords well with the underlying purpose of \textit{Marc.} IV 39:4, 9-39:5, 25 and \textit{Fug.} 12:10, 103-110. They also appear in works which were designed to counter too soft a view of God and His demands.
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5.2.2 Martyrdom as thank-offering

"Ceterum nos amemus patientiam dei, patientiam Christi: rependamus illi quam pro nobis ipse dependit, offeramus patientiam spiritus, patientiam carnis, qui in resurrectionem carnis et spiritus credimus!"

Here, in Pat. 16:5, 15-18, Tertullian asserts, in no uncertain terms, that the Christian is duty-bound to repay his Lord for the sufferings which He had undergone on the cross for his sake. The motive inspiring such a repayment is the Christian’s love for and gratitude towards his Lord. Although the ordinary Christian begins to repay his debt to Christ by performing acts of piety and charity, the principal form which repayment takes is his death as a martyr.

The language of debt and repayment undoubtedly left its mark upon Tertullian’s theory of martyrdom. However, a proper understanding of Pat. 16:5, 15-18 also demands that it be set within the context of the thank-offering.

Thank-offerings were an integral part of the cultic life of both ancient paganism and Second-Temple Judaism. One form which these obligations took was first-fruits. Describing the central compartment of many of the stelae dedicated to Ba’al-Hammon/Saturn (the compartment depicting the sacrifice itself) Leglay notes that bunches of grapes, ears of corn, baskets of fruit and honey-combs figured frequently. Even the sacrificial animals themselves (aside from their significance as a reflection of the attributes of the god
himself) were the "first-fruits" of the flocks.62 Similarly, the Old Testament records the fact that offering their God the "first-fruits" of the crops and the flocks was a duty incumbent upon the Hebrews.63

Moreover, since praise and thanksgiving lay at the heart of the holocaust,64 the Hebraic whole burnt-offering was also a thank-offering. (Unlike the first-fruits of the flock in the Romano-Punic tradition, the first fruits of crop and flock were not the raw material of whole burnt-offerings in ancient Israel).

Whilst it is true that Tertullian confined his use of the terms "holocausta" and "holocaustum" to his expositions of Judaic sacrifice,65 the juxtaposition of Marc. II 22:3, 16-22:4, 2 and Pat. 16:5, 15-18 demonstrates that he had incorporated the essential attribute of the true holocaust in his martyr theology - that is, praise and thanksgiving. Explaining why the God who would later condemn the cultic ceremonies of the Jews accepted the holocausts of Abel and Noah, Marc. II 22:3, 16-22:4, 2 distinguishes between a gift which is offered with due homage and a gift which is not so offered:

"Nam etsi ad oblationes Abelin aduertit et holocausta Noe odoratus est libenter, quae iocunditas siue uiscerum herbicinorum siue nidoris ardentium uictimarum? Sed animus simplex et deum metuens offerentium ea, quae a deo habeant et pabuli et suavis olientiae, gratiae apud deum deputabatur, non quae fiebant exigentem, sed illud, propter quod fiebant, ob honorem dei scilicet. Si cliens diuiti aut regi nihil desideranti tamen aliquid uiliissimi munusculi obtulerit, quantitas et qualitas muneris infuscabit diuitem et regem, an delectabit titulus officii? At si cliens ei munera uel ultimo uel
etiam indicta ordine suo offerat et sollemnia regis obseruet, non ex fide tamen nec corde puro nec pleno circa cetera quoque obsequio, nonne consequens, ut rex ille uel diues exclamet: quo mihi multitudinem munerum tuorum?"

By the same token, although Tertullian failed to mention many of the Biblical texts which deal with first-fruits and thank-offerings - texts such as Lev. 2:12, 2:14-16, 23:10-18, 23:20, Num. 8:16-17, 13:20, 15:20-21, 18:12-18, Deut. 18:4, 26:2, 26:10 and Neh. 10:35-3766 - extracts such as Marc. II 22:3, 16-25 and Iud. 5:2, 5-8 prove that he was familiar with the Judaic tradition of the thank-offering. Cain and Abel brought the first-fruits of their crops and flocks.67

Pat. 16:5, 15-18, with its emphasis on the martyr making his response in love and gratitude, has its parallel in Uirg. 13:2, 11-22. There, the virgin offers her flesh and her spirit to the Almighty not in the hope of earthly glory but as an expression of her love for her heavenly Father.

Although written about the thought of Origen, Young’s words apply equally well to Pat. 16:5, 15-18:

The Christian’s holocaust is himself, and he keeps the sacrifice burning on the altar by renouncing his possessions, taking up his cross and following Christ; by giving his body to be burned and following the glory of the martyr, having charity; by loving his brethren, and fighting for justice and truth, even unto death; by dying to all desires of the flesh, as the world is crucified to him and he to the world. The complete self-offering is a spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."68
Incorporated in Tertullian’s martyr theology, the motif of the thank-offering underlines the fact that the martyr’s death is the culmination of a life devoted to loving and praising God. (As Tertullian declared, there was only one proper response of a creature in the face of his Creator – worship). 69 Indeed, it indicates that the essence of the martyr’s death can be summed up in one word. That word is love.

5.2.3 "Baptism in blood" – an expiatory sacrifice?


Scorp. 6:9. 9-6:11, 18 enunciates clearly the idea that during martyrdom, the Christian is baptised in his own blood. It is an idea common to the early Church Fathers. 70

At first sight, this aspect of martyrdom appears to be untouched by sacrificial theory. It receives its impetus from such Biblical texts as Mk. 10:38-39, Lk. 12:50, Jn. 19:34 and I Jn. 5:671 and these texts do not contain any overtly sacrificial material.

What is more, ordinary baptism is never envisaged in terms of an expiatory sacrifice. Baptism washes away sin. Its
efficacy depends not upon any merit which the candidate might possess (not even upon his decision to offer himself to God by entering the font) but upon the promise of the Almighty that the waters of baptism will cleanse men from their sins.\textsuperscript{72} If ordinary baptism is not an expiatory sacrifice, why should the extraordinary baptism of martyrdom have been viewed differently?

Nevertheless, a closer examination of the reasoning which underpinned "baptism in blood" reveals that the fundamental notion upon which it depends lay at the heart of ancient cultic life. "Baptism in blood" does not simply owe its efficacy to the fact that the martyr renounced the temptations of the Devil and the forces of evil;\textsuperscript{73} it owes its efficacy to the fact that candidates willingly shed their very blood (that is, offer up their lives) for the sake of their God. In the words of \textit{Bapt.} 16:2, 6-9,

"proinde nos facere aqua uocatos sanguine electos hos duos baptismos de uulnere percussi lateris emisit, quia qui in sanguinem eius crederent aqua lauarentur, qui aqua lauissent et sanguine oporterent."

Since, as will be demonstrated later, Tertullian believed that blood was the most potent symbol of a man’s life, his assertion, in \textit{Scorp.} 6:11, 14-18, that the martyr’s sins will no longer be imputed to him because he has laid down his life takes on distinctly cultic overtones. Whether it be the Hebraic or the Romano-Punic tradition, it was the offering up of life which gave expiatory sacrifice its power.\textsuperscript{74} The language of sacrifice may have been absent from Tertullian’s exposition of "baptism in blood" but he
never lost sight of the fact that it is by virtue of the offering up of his life that the martyr is cleansed.

Thus, although the mature Tertullian was adamant that the martyr-victim could only expiate his own sins (in contrast to the normal cultic sacrifice where the animal-victim was expiation for the sins of another being or beings), it would seem that subject to the qualifications delineated above, "baptism in blood" may indeed be described as an expiatory sacrifice.

5.2.4 Does blood possess apotropaeic powers? Is martyrdom an aversion sacrifice?

"Translatus est Enoch et Helias nec mors eorum reperta est, dilata scilicet; ceterum morituri reseruantur, ut antichristum sanguine suo extinguant."

Read at its most straightforward, the message of Anim. 50:5, 33-35 is that, in the "last days", the blood of two extraordinary martyrs will be endowed with the power to deal the final blow to the forces of evil. There is a certain irony in the fact that antichrist will be destroyed by blood; his own voracious appetite for blood was notorious.

However, what does it mean to say that the blood of Enoch and Elijah will annihilate antichrist? Sacrifices of aversion were not uncommon in the ancient world. Pagans sought to placate chthonic deities with holocausts. Even
the blood-rites of the Passover originally had an apotropaeic purpose.\textsuperscript{78}

Nevertheless, the motif of the aversion sacrifice does not fit the self-offering of Enoch and Elijah. Their sacrifice will be offered not to antichrist but to the Almighty. Their blood will destroy the forces of evil; it will not seek to placate them.

The idea of martyrs offering their sacrifice to the powers of darkness would have been abhorrent to Tertullian.\textsuperscript{79} Scorp. 12:11, 8-11 should not be misinterpreted as an aversion sacrifice; it simply describes the insatiable appetite of antichrist.

Whilst not an actual aversion sacrifice, however, the self-offering of Enoch and Elijah would appear to be endowed with apotropaeic qualities. Moreover, they are apotropaeic qualities which the ordinary martyrs share - albeit to a limited degree.

Tertullian acknowledged that it is through shedding his blood that the ordinary martyr prevents the Devil claiming his soul as his peculiar property; the shedding of his blood is the ultimate proof of his determination to adhere to his God. Theirs is indeed the victory whose is the blood.\textsuperscript{80} He also exulted in the fact that the blood of each and every martyr weakens the system of idolatry\textsuperscript{81} which the powers of darkness seek to perpetuate. (Whereas the blood of the extraordinary martyrs will ward off evil from the
whole of mankind, and for all time, the blood of the ordinary martyrs primarily wards evil away from their own souls).

By recognising that the martyrs' blood has apotropaic qualities, Tertullian reminded the faithful that it is in their power to win victory over the forces of evil.

5.2.5 Is martyrdom a communion sacrifice?

Communion sacrifices were well-known throughout the ancient world. For the exponent of Greco-Roman religion, the chief examples of such sacrifices were the "thusia" and the ceremonies of the mystery religions. For the Jew, the standard form which the communion sacrifice took was the "zebach".

The evidence for Tertullian having exploited the motif of the communion sacrifice is slight. Although he was adamant that the martyr's death results in his admission to Paradise (that is, brings him into "communion" with his God) Resurr. 43:4, 11-14 is essentially an eschatological passage, not a sacrificial one:

"Uides quam et hic corporum contemptum ad martyrriorum praestantium referat: nemo enim peregrinatus a corpore statim inmoratur penes dominum, nisi ex martyrli praerogatiua, paradiso scilicet, non inferis, deuersurus."

Prax. 29:7, 45-48 and Mart. 2:9, 2-2:10, 10 are yet more unpromising. In the former, Tertullian asserts that the Holy Spirit accompanies the martyr throughout his anguish in
the arena - upholding and supporting him. In the latter, he assumes that renouncing the world will bring a man into spiritual intimacy with his God. However, once again the language of sacrifice is absent. Moreover, in contrast to Resurr. 43:4, 11-14, the communion which they depict does not depend upon the death of the martyr.

The support offered by the Holy Spirit rests upon the promise of Christ. The spiritual intimacy enjoyed by the confessors is the result of their spiritual maturity; such maturity is not the special prerogative of the confessors.

Therefore, tantalising through the prospect is, it would be wrong to classify Tertullian’s theory of martyrdom in terms of a communion sacrifice. The most that can be said is that Resurr. 43:4, 11-14 would not have been entirely at variance with such a sacrifice.

5.2.6 Blood: the martyr’s life is offered up to God.

5.2.6.1 Tertullian’s equation of blood with life
The assertion that the shedding of the martyr’s blood symbolises the offering up of his life to his God entails an important precondition. That precondition is that blood is intimately bound up with man’s life-force. Therefore, before proceeding to examine the way in which the word “blood" is employed in Tertullian’s theology of martyrdom, it is necessary to examine his understanding of blood. Blood - is it a symbol of life or a symbol of death?
There is, in Tertullian’s works, grounds for controversy regarding this question. Moreover, the issue is complicated by the fact that his use of the word is not uniform. As P.A. Gramaglia, G. Azzali and E. Valgiglio have seen, some of his applications of "sanguis" have connotations of life, others have connotations of violence and death.86

In the days immediately preceding the Parousia, as a sign of the impending judgement, there will be eclipses of the sun and the sky will be red as if with blood — in the words of *Marc.* IV 39:9, 6-10,

"quod et ipsae uires caelorum concuti habeant, accipe Iohelem: 'et dabo prodigia in caelo et in terra sanguinem et ignem et fumi uaporem: sol convuetetur in tenebras et in sanguinem luna, priusquam adueniat dies magnus et inlustris domini'."

*Marc.* IV 40:6, 24-40:6, 1 considered that the pressing of grapes, in Isa. 63:1-2 and Gen. 49:11, denoted the shedding of Christ’s blood and that, in turn, the shedding of Christ’s blood denoted the reality and the severity of His death —

"spiritus enim propheticus, uelut iam contemplabundus dominum ad passionem uenientem, carne scilicet uestitum ut in ea passum, cruentum habitum carnis in uestimentorum rubore designat, conculcatae et expressae ui passionis tamquam in foro torcularis, quia et inde quasi cruentati homines de uini rubore descendunt."

As for *Apol.* 9:10, 44-9:11, 51, it regarded the blood which was shed in the amphitheatre as symptomatic of the violence and the degeneracy of contemporary society:
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"Item illi, qui munere in arena noxiorum iugulatorum sanguinem recentem, de iugulo decurrentem, auida siti comitialí morbo medentes hauserunt, ubi sunt? Item illi, qui de arena ferinis obsoniis cenant, qui de apro, qui de ceruo petunt? Aper ille, quem cruentauit, conluctando detersit; ceruus ille in gladiatoris sanguine se iactauit. Ipsorum ursorum aluei appetuntur cruditantes adhuc de uisceribus humanis; ructuatur ab homine caro pasta de homine."

Through the roasted flesh of wild beasts which have fought in the amphitheatre, the blood which is shed in the arena reaches the bellies of men. Epileptics do not even mask their abnormal longings behind such a disguise; they simply drink the blood itself in an effort to effect a cure for their ailment.

The case for arguing that blood often symbolised violence, degeneracy and death, in the thought of Tertullian, is clearly a good one. To quote Gramaglia:

"La categoria di 'sanguis' ha un ampio ventaglio semantico per descrivere le crudeltà e la degradazione morale della società pagana e di quella romana in particolare. Paradigmatico è da questo punto di vista Apologeticum, 9, 1-15, che elenca i sacrifici di bambini a Saturno in Africa, i sacrifici umani dei Druidi e soprattutto la dimensione religiosa delle stragi gladiatorie che dimostrano la totale mancanza di qualsiasi rispetto per la vita umana (Apologeticum, 9,5: 'Iuppiter quidam, quem ludis suis humano sanguine proluunt'), come nel caso appunto delle Ferie Latine in onore di Giove Laziare, durante le quali veniva offerto alla divinità il sangue di un criminale ucciso nell'arena."®

The case for arguing that blood was bound up intimately with impending cosmic destruction®® is also clearly a good one. Gramaglia declares:

"Tuttavia nei periodi di grande tensione escatologica e di repressione violenta contro i cristiani la semantica del sangue può anche assumere connotazioni di anti-vita e di morte..."
cosmica, come è ben visibile in Ap. 16, 3-4 ('e divenne sangue come di cadavere'); 6, 12 ('tutta la luna si fece come sangue'); 8, 7 ('grandine e fuoco mescolati a sangue'); 16, 5-6. In questi testi, come ha notato U. Vanni, il sangue diventa paradossalmente simbolo di negazione della vita. La visione del sangue come negazione e distruzione cosmica della vita è strutturalmente collegata con la vendetta di Dio che punisce il mondo proprio per aver versato il sangue dei santi e dei profeti; non c'è dubbio che l'Apocalisse è da questo punto di vista la fonte principale della psicologia escatologica di Tertulliano.89

Nevertheless, whilst recognising the importance of violence and death for a proper understanding of Tertullian's concept of blood, I would argue that life was still more important for a proper understanding of the said concept. Viewed thus, the bloody scenes which characterise martyrdom and other murders denote life given over to death; they do not denote simply death and violence per se.

As it is preserved in such texts as Lev. 17:11, Deut. 12:23 and Gen. 9:4, the Biblical tradition assumes that a creature's blood and its life-force are identical:

"For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it for you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood which makes atonement, by reason of the life." (Lev. 17:11).

Scholars have not always agreed about the implications of "blood" ("dam") in the Hebraic tradition. L. Morris believes that in the verses under consideration, the emphasis is always upon the death of the sacrificial victim.90 The balance of the scholarship,91 however, would concur with R.J. Daly when he concludes that blood and "nephes" are inseparable:
"Lev. 17:11 first explains why eating blood is prohibited: the life of the flesh is in the blood (and only the Lord has dominion over life). It then mentions the one use to which blood may be put: to make atonement with it upon the altar. It then explains that the blood does this because of the 'nephes' contained in it. Lev. 17:11 in itself and in its context points to just one meaning: the blood of the sacrificial animal atones by means of and by power of the life (nephes) contained in this sacrificial animal."92

The Hebraic tradition on blood is not, however, relevant to the matter in hand unless it can be proved that Tertullian was familiar with that tradition. Although he cited neither Lev. 17:11 nor Deut. 12:2393 there is evidence to suggest that he accepted the Old Testament teaching on blood. Based upon Gen. 9:4, Ieiun. 4:3, 16-25 and Monog. 5:3, 20-26 declare that it had been the association of blood with the souls of animals which had led the Almighty to prohibit the eating of flesh from which the blood had not been already drained. Ieiun. 4:3, 16-26 declares:

"Nam et hoc ipso, quod eam solam carnem esui eximit, cuius anima non per sanguinem effunditur, omnis reliquae carnis usum concessisse manifestum est. Ad haec respondemus non competisse onerari hominem aliqua adhuc abstinentiae lege, qui cum maxime tam leuem interdictionem unius scilicet pomi tolerare non potuit; remissum itaque illum libertate ipsa corroborandum. Aeque post diluuium in reformatione generis humani suffecisse unam interim legem a sanguine abstinendi permisso usu ceterorum."

According to Gramaglia, in the case of animals, Tertullian believed that the blood and the soul were synonymous:

"Non pochi filosofi identificavano l’anima con il sangue (De Anima, 32, 3); Tertulliano pare accettare tale identificazione almeno per gli animali (De Ieiunio, 4,3: ‘cuius anima non per sanguinem effunditur’) ... Ritiene evidentemente
Even allowing for the fact that he did not identify blood and the human soul in such a simplistic manner, his readiness to identify the souls of animals with their blood could only have encouraged him to imbue blood with overtones of life.

The significance of the Biblical tradition regarding blood is increased by the fact that the Carthaginian Church followed Jewish Kosher practice. This can be illustrated by Apol. 9:13, 57-9:14, 65, where Tertullian asserts that the Christian community in Carthage abstained from eating the meat of animals which had been strangled – for fear of being contaminated by the blood which remains "hidden" in the flesh. I quote:

"Erubescat error uester Christianis, qui ne animalium quidem sanguinem in epulis esculentis habemus, qui propter aequus suffocatis quoque et morticinis abstinemus, ne quo modo sanguine contaminemur uel intra uiscera sepulto. Denique in tormenta Christianorum botulos etiam cruore distantos admouetis, certissimi scilicet, illicitum esse penes illos, per quod exorbitare eos uultis. Porro quale est, ut, quos sanguinem pecudis horrere confiditis, humano inhiare credatis, nisi forte suauiorem eum experti?"

He even goes so far as to maintain that in order to force suspected Christians to declare themselves, the pagan authorities proffered them sausages made from non-Kosher meat. Whilst it is true that Tertullian was prone to exaggeration in his apologetic works and that therefore this story may be an invention, it seems unlikely that he would have included such a detail had the Christian
community in Carthage not been known to adhere to this aspect of Jewish dietary law.

*Apol.* 9:13, 57-9:14, 65 has its parallel in *Mart. Loug.* 1:25, 33-1:25, 4. Expounding the latter passage, Frend observes:

"The authorities tortured a slave girl named Biblis who had previously shown a willingness to recant. In a sudden burst of strength she cried out, 'How could such men eat children, when they are not allowed to consume the blood even of irrational animals (\(\chi λ\gamma w\nu \, \zeta \mu \nu\))?' The statement sounds as though it had been made under the stress of the moment, and is interesting. It suggests that the Christians at Lyons were still observing the strict Apostolic rules concerning food (Acts 15, 20 and 29), and as is well known, these were derived from orthodox Jewish practices."\(^97\)

The reasoning underpinning Jewish Kosher practice is that by virtue of the life-force present within it, blood contaminates those who consume it\(^98\); indeed, it rests firmly upon the Biblical tradition regarding blood. Therefore, the Carthaginian Church’s retention of it is an additional indication that Tertullian associated blood with life.

Barnes is inclined to gloss over any rapport between Jews and Christians in Carthage;\(^99\) he concludes that:

"Tertullian’s knowledge of Jewish customs and ideas is totally superficial: their food taboos and their habit of ritual washing every day could be inferred from the Bible."\(^100\)

This downgrades *Apol.* 9:13, 57-9:14, 65 from a crucial insight into the customs of late second-century Carthage.
into a mechanical reproduction of the conditions of first-century Palestinian Judaism.

In his study of Tertullian’s relationship with contemporary Judaism, Aziza, by contrast, has demonstrated the affinity between his arguments against idolatry and those put forward by Rabbinic Judaism.101 The same can be said for their arguments in favour of moral rigorism.102 Contemplating Apol. 9:13, 57-9:14, 65, he concludes:

"Il est vraisemblable que la communauté chrétienne, tout comme celle, contemporaine, de Lyon, se servait chez le boucher juif."103

Furthermore, since Apol. 9:13, 57-9:14, 65 refers to the contaminating quality of animal blood and therefore strictly only proves that animals’ blood is associated with the life-force, it is significant that Marc. IV 20:11, 3-20:12, 15 indicates that human blood has the power to contaminate those who come into contact with it too. Relating the way in which Jesus healed the woman with a bloody flux, Tertullian states:

"Fides haec fuit primo, qua deum suum confidebat misericordiam malle quam ipsum sacrificium, qua eum deum certa erat operari in Christo, qua si eum tetigit, non ut hominem sanctum nec ut prophetam, quem contaminabilem pro humana substantia sciret, sed ut ipsum deum, quem nulla spurcitia pollui posse praesumpserat. Itaque non temere interpretata est sibi legem, ea contaminari significantem, quae essent contaminabilia, non deum, quem in Christo confidebat. Sed et illud recogituit, ordinarium et sollemnem menstrui uel partualis sanguinis fluxum in lege taxari, qui ueniat ex officio naturae, non ex uitio ualitudinis; ille autem ex uitio ualitudinis redundabat, cui non modum temporis, sed diuinæ misericordiae auxilium necessarium sciebat."
Because the contaminating power of blood arises from its connection with the life-force, the contaminating quality of human blood suggests that although the precise nature of its connection may be different to that prevailing in animals, it, too, is associated with the life-force.

Important though the Biblical evidence and the local custom of the Carthaginian Church were as factors predisposing Tertullian to regard blood as a symbol of life, however, the most important factor was the condition of the embryo in the womb. Discussing the belief that the embryo empathises with his mother, in Anim. 25:3, 33-25:4, 42, Tertullian assumed that the presence of bruises on the unborn child is proof that even within the womb, he possesses a soul. Without blood, there can be no bruises. Without the soul, there can be no blood. Indeed, the soul and the blood are so interdependent that the presence of the former can be deduced from that of the latter. Hypothetically addressing pregnant women, Tertullian declares:

"An et ualetudinibus inuicem communicetis, ille quidem usque et contusionibus uestris, quibus et ipse intus per eadem membra signatur, rapiens sibi iniurias matris. Si liuor ac rubor sanguinis passio est, sine anima non erit sanguis; si ualetudo omnis accessio est, sine anima non erit ualetudo; si alimonia inedia crementa decrementa pauor motus tractatio est animae, his qui fungitur uiuet. Denique desinit uiuere qui desinit fungi. Denique et mortui eduntur; quomodo, nisi et uiui? Qui autem et mortui, nisi qui prius uiui?"

Without the presence of the soul, life is impossible; being alive and possessing a soul are one and the same thing. Therefore, the interdependence of the soul and the
blood means that blood cannot be other than a symbol of life.

Moreover, because they demonstrate the vital role of the blood in the development of the embryo, Apol. 9:8, 31-36 (with its impassioned condemnation of abortion) and Carn. 19:3, 18-19:4, 27 (with its meticulous safeguarding of the nativity of Christ’s flesh) also point to the association of blood with life. I quote:

"Nobis uero homicidio semel interdicto etiam conceptum utero, dum adhuc sanguis in hominem delibatur, dissoluere non licet. Homicidii festinatio est prohibere nasci, nec refert, natam quis eripiat animam an nascentem disturbet. Homo est et qui est futurus; etiam fructus omnis iam in semine est"  
(Apol. 9:8, 31-36)

and

"Negans autem ex carnis quoque uoluntate natum cur non negauit etiam ex substantia carnis. Neque enim, quia ex sanguine negauit, substantiam carnis renuit, sed materiam seminis, quam constat sanguinis esse colorem, ut despumatione, mutatum in coagulum sanguinis feminae. Nam ex coagulo in caseo eius substantiae est, quam medicando constringit, id est lactis. Intellegimus ergo ex concubitu natiuitatem domini negatam, quod sapit et 'non ex uoluntate uiri et carnis', id est non ex uuuluae participatone."  
(Carn. 19:3, 18-19:4, 27).

Apol. 9:8, 31-33 and Carn. 19:3, 20-19:4, 25 consider that blood is one of the fluids from which the flesh of the embryo develops. To understand what Tertullian meant, it is necessary to turn to ancient medicine.
Galen believed that from blood are generated the muscles, the liver and the viscera. He also believed that blood is the "raw material" from which the flesh develops:

"Blood and sperm are the sources of our growth. Blood is like a well developed, compliant, easily usable substrata for development, but the sperm contains the design for the craftsman." 

Discussing Tertullian’s indebtedness to ancient medical theory, Waszink concludes:

"According to Tertullian, the human body comes into existence by the sperm of the father solidifying the 'Καταφύγιον' of the mother. The clearest account of this view of found in c. Chr. 19, 21-3: 'materiam seminis, quam constat sanguinis esse calorem, ut despumatione mutatum in coagulum sanguinis feminae'; ib. 4, 5: 'humoris et sanguinis foeda coagula'; ib. 16, 35 seqq.; adu. Marc. 4, 21 (491, 1-2): 'lege substantiae corporalis ex sanguine et humore'; Apol. 9, 8: 'in utero, dum adhuc sanguis in hominem delibatur'. This view, in Tertullian’s time a very common one, eventually harks back to Aristotle, who asserted that the sperm of the father furnishes the 'moulding force' ('ἦδος'), the 'Καταφύγιον' of the mother the matter ... thus the soul of the embryo comes from the father, its body from the mother." 

(Given that Anim. 25:3, 33-25:4, 42 clearly retains a strong sense of the link between blood and life, it is not significant for the matter in hand that, following Soranus, Anim. 27:5, 27-27:9, 57 propounds a theory of conception according to which "the sperm of the father contains all that is necessary for the creation of man").

Since he believed that in conjunction with sperm, blood is the "source" of human life, blood is, in a very real sense, a symbol of life. Thus, in Apol. 9:8, 31-36, the blood
which coagulates to form the embryo’s flesh epitomises the entire embryo - his soul as well as his body.

Finally, according to Carn. 4:1, 3-6, blood is not simply the substance which coagulates to form the embryo’s flesh; it is one of the fluids which nourishes the embryo. Nourishment is indispensable for human life.

Azzali is well justified when he concludes from the role of blood in reproduction that blood is "animated":

"Che il sangue sia animato si manifesta con evidenza nelle fasi essenziali della vita individuale: nel concepimento, nello sviluppo della sfera emozionale e sensoriale della personalità, infine nella morte."

The intimate association between blood and the soul, in the mind of Tertullian, does not mean that he considered the two substances synonymous in man. Although he cited the theory of Empedicles, in Anim. 5:2, 5-13, in support of his contention that the soul is a corporeal entity, he rejected the idea that the soul is actually composed of blood; instead, he favoured the Stoic vision of spiritual corporeality - on the grounds that it conformed better to Biblical teaching. He observed:

"Nec illos dico solos qui eam de manifestis corporalibus effingunt, ut Hipparchus et Heraclitus ex igni, ut Hippon et Thales ex aqua, ut Empedocles et Critias ex sanguine, ut Epicurus ex atomis (si et atomi corpulentias de coitu suo cogunt), ut Critolaus et Peripatetici eius ex quinta nescio qua substantia (si et illa corpus, quia corpora includit), sed etiam Stoicos allego, qui spiritum praedicantes animam paene nobiscum, qua proxima inter se flatus et spiritus, tamen corpus animam facile persuadebunt."
Likewise, in Anim. 32:3, 13-29, when pouring scorn upon the Pythagorean theory of metensomatosis, Tertullian repudiated the idea that the human soul is composed of blood.

The soul was distilled from the breath of God Himself.\textsuperscript{114} Though not sharing in the divine substance,\textsuperscript{115} the soul is still a spiritual essence. It is not composed of matter.\textsuperscript{116}

Anim. 3:4, 24-31 states:

"Una iam congressione decisa aduersus Hermogenen, ut praefati sumus, quia animam ex dei flatu, non ex materia uindicamus, muniti et illic diuinae determinationis inobscurabili regula: 'et flauit', inquit, 'deus flatum uitae in faciem hominis, et factus est homo in animam uiuam', utique ex dei flatu, de isto nihil amplius reuoluendum."

If the soul was not composed of primordial matter, still less would it have been composed of an earthly material such as blood.

When the Christian casts his mind back to the creation of Adam, it is clear that blood is the "end product" of the water with which God moistened the earth from which He formed Adam - turning it into pliable clay. Intent on proving that Christ’s flesh was terrestrial and not celestial, Tertullian declares, in Carn. 9:2, 6-9:3, 16 that blood is simply red liquid, that is, red water. In his own words:

"Ipsum certe corpus hoc nostrum, quod de limo figulatum etiam ad fabulas nationum ueritas transmisit, utrumque originis elementum confitetur, carne terram, sanguine aquam. Nam licet alia sit facies qualitatis, - hoc est quod ex alio aliuid fit - ceterum quid est sanguis quam rubens humor? Quid caro quam terra conuersa in figuras suas? Considera singulas qualitates, musculos ut glebas, ossa ut saxa, etiam circum papillas calculos quosdam; aspice nenuorum
tenaces conexus ut traduces radicum, et uenarum ramosos discursus ut ambages riuorum, et lanugines ut muscos, et comam ut caespitem, et ipsos medullarum in abdito thesauros ut metalla."

Thus, if Gen. 2:7 determined the Christian understanding of the soul, it also determined the Christian understanding of the flesh.117

The complete identification of blood and the soul is also prevented by the fact that Tertullian did not situate the seat of the soul (the Stoic "hegemonikon") in the blood; he situated it in the heart. In so doing, he gave priority, as Anim. 15:4, 21-33 illustrates, to that strand of Biblical tradition which depicts the heart as the architect of man's good and evil deeds:

"Si enim 'scrutatorem et dispectorem cordis' deum legimus, si etiam prophetes eius occulta cordis traducendo probatur, si deus ipse recogitatus cordis in populo praeuenit: 'quid cogitatis in cordibus uestris neguam?' Si et Davud: 'cor mundum conde in me deus', et Paulus 'corde' ait 'credi in iustitiam', et Iohannes 'corde' ait 'suo unumquemque reprehendi', si postremo 'qui uiderit feminam ad concupiscendum, iam adulterauit in corde', simul utrumque dilucet, et esse principale in anima, quod intentio diuina conueniat, id est uim sapientialem atque uitalem (quod enim sapit, uiuidum est), et in eo thesauro corporis haberii, ad quem deus respicit."

Since the directive faculty of the soul resides in the heart, it would be logical to conclude that that organ is more closely allied to the soul than any other part of the human body.

Tertullian's failure to completely identify the human soul with blood might appear an insurmountable stumbling-block to any theory that blood symbolises life and therefore to any
theory that the blood of the martyr symbolises the offering up of his life to God. This, however, is not the case.

The original formation of Adam indicates that there is an organic connection between blood and the human soul, albeit an extremely tenuous one. Flesh may ultimately be derived from the dust of the ground and blood from the water which moistened that dust but they did not develop solely from those materials. Until the frame of Adam had been infused by the breath of God, it had been composed of clay - not of flesh and blood. Resurr. 7:2, 4-7:4, 18 is unequivocal:

"Sed adhuc uelim discas, quando et quomodo caro floruerit ex limo. Neque enim, ut quidam volunt, illae pelliciae tunicae, quas Adam et Eu paradisum exuti induerunt, ipsae erunt carnis ex limo reformatio, cum aliquanto prius et Adam substantiae suae traducem in feminae iam carne recognouerit - 'hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis et caro ex carne mea' - et ipsa delibatio masculi in feminam carne subpleta sit, limo, opinor, supplenda, si Adam adhuc limus. Obliteratus igitur et deuoratus est limus in carnem. Quando? Cum factus est homo in animam uiuam de dei flatu, uaporeo scilicet et idoneo torrere quodammodo limum in aliam qualitatem, quasi in testam, ita et in carnem. Sic et figulo licet argillam temperato ignis adflatu in materiam robustiorem recorporare et aliam ex alia stringere speciem, aptiorem pristina et sui iam generis ac nominis."

Since flesh and blood came into being at the divine inbreathing, it is reasonable to conclude that they acquired some of their salient characteristics thence.

Discussing the transformation effected by the breath of God, Azzali concludes:

"La sua lettura biblica applica pertanto la scienza alla S. Scrittura. Acqua e terra, i due elementi primordiali dell’insegnamento empedocleo posto a fondamento della fisica dagli Stoici, ricchi di intrinseche potenzialità, le 'radici'
passive, inert e pesanti (Τὸ ὅλον ὑπάρχοντα), costituirono il 'limus' originario dal quale Dio trasse l'uomo. Il sangue non è che l'elemento 'acqua', che in un processo di 'eduizione' si è trasformato e ha espresso e acquisito nuove peculiari qualità. Il soffio divino, 'uapor spiritus', come lo definisce Tertulliano, attivò il processo di cozione che produsse la rielaborazione qualitativa della materia. Pur permanendo sostanzialmente la stessa, da sé essa sviluppa quelle capacità potenziali che realmente la trasformano in una nuova sostanza ('demutatio materiae'), pur senza che essa perda i caratteri e i segni che denotano la sua prima derivazione.\footnote{119}

If blood came into being through the imprint of the divine inbreathing, there is a definite sense in which blood is "animated" - that is, infused with soul:

"Ma certo essi già sono sufficienti ad adombrare un'intima connessione organica di corpo sangue e anima che la derivazione dalla divina creazione e dall'elemento primario colloca in una luce di altissima dignità ed eccellenza."\footnote{120}

Another argument which supports the contention that blood is "animated" also finds its starting point in the original formation of Adam. According to Tertullian, the breath of the almighty was suffused throughout the clay figure and as the breath condensed, it took the contours of that figure;\footnote{121} the "inner man" was furnished with all the members and organs with which the "outer man" was endowed.\footnote{122} This being the case, the divine breath must have condensed in the veins too. Veins contain blood.

Even Tertullian's situation of the "hegemonikon" in the heart\footnote{123} can be reconciled with the "animated" nature of blood. Although ancient physicians considered that blood flows "from the liver, through all the veins to the peripheral organs"\footnote{124} and that the heart is a centre of
Tertullian recognised that there is an intimate relationship between the heart and blood. Thus, in *Anim.* 15:5, 44-45, he quoted with approval an Egyptian saying which assumed that the "hegemonikon" is located in the blood around the heart -

"namque homini sanguis circumcordialis est sensus."

Thus, whilst a combination of Stoic and Biblical teaching inspired him to distinguish the seat of the soul in humans from that in animals, his teaching on the "hegemonikon" retained a sufficiently strong sense of blood's inalienable link with man's life-force for it to be compatible with the idea that blood is "animated". (Moreover, because the directive faculty is a particular function of the soul, its location in any one place does not prejudice the presence of the soul elsewhere in the body).

Thus, the balance of the evidence favours the conclusion that, in the eyes of Tertullian, the fundamental connotations of blood were those of life. Indeed, so convinced was he that blood symbolises life that, in *Apol.* 42:4, 16-19, he sets the possession of "warmth" ("calor") and "blood" ("sanguis") over against being "cold" ("frigere") and "pale" ("pallere") - life over against death:

"Non lauo sub noctem Saturnalibus, ne et noctem et diem perdam; sed lauo et debita hora et salubri, quae mihi et calorem et sanguinem seruet: frigere et pallere post lauacrum mortuus possum!"
Tertullian's equation of the martyr's blood with life

"Aut quomodo reddam quae sunt dei deo? Utique proinde imaginem et monetam ipsius inscriptam nomine eius, id est: hominem Christianum. Quid autem deo debo, sicut denarium Caesari, nisi sanguinem, quem pro me filitus fudit ipsius? Quodsi deo quidem hominem et sanguinem meum debo, nunc uero in eo sum tempore, ut quod deo debo expostuler, utique fraudem deo facio id agens, ne quod debo soluam."

Equating as it does a man and his blood, Fug. 12:10, 103-110 assumes that when the martyr sheds his blood, he offers to the Almighty his very life. His blood is not simply a testimony to the violence which he endures; it is a symbol of the life which he lays down. In his exegesis of Mt. 22:21, Tertullian juxtaposes owing God a Christian "man" and owing God Christian "blood". To offer up a man is to offer up a life - they are one and the same.

His readiness to equate the martyr's blood with his life also comes across in such passages as Scorp. 6:9, 9-6:11, 23, 12:11, 8-11, Fug. 12:9, 93-98 and Ieiun. 12:2, 13-27. Scorp. 6:9, 9-6:11, 18 teaches that it is only by offering the supreme sacrifice of his own life that the martyr earns the remission of his sins through martyrdom. Martyrdom, however, was "baptism in blood". What is more, read in the light of this excerpt, it is evident that the reference to the martyr's blood in the adjacent sentence is a symbol of God's desire for such a self-offering; it is a symbol of His desire for the martyr's life. In the words of Scorp. 6:9, 9-6:11, 23:

According to Scorp. 12:11, 8-11, the "whore of Babylon" is satiated with the blood of the saints -

"magna etiam Babylon cum descriptur ebria sanctorum cruore, sine dubio ebrietas eius martyriorum poculis ministratur, quorum formido quid relatura sit aeque ostenditur."

By referring to the martyr’s blood, Tertullian points not merely to the savagery of antichrist but also to the fact that the diet of antichrist is the lives of the faithful.

Highlighting as it does the voracious appetite of the martyr’s enemies, Scorp. 12:11, 8-11 bears a marked similarity to Scorp. 6:1, 3-9, where Tertullian claims that martyrdom snatches man from the Devil’s throat. When the two passages are set alongside each other, the message is clear - antichrist consumes men, that is, human life.

This is also confirmed by Fug. 12:9, 93-98, where antichrist lusts not for the money of Christians but for the Christians themselves -
"cum igitur nihil nobis Caesar indixerit in hunc modum stipendiariae sectae, sed nec indici umquam tale quid possit, antichristo iam instante et in sanguinem, non in pecunias hiante Christianorum, quomodo mihi proponere potest scripturam esse: 'reddite quae sunt Caesari Caesari'?

If blood had been a symbol of the martyr's death in this excerpt, Tertullian's proposition that the bogus price for a Christian (that is, money) stands in sharp contrast to the real price (that is, the man himself) would have fallen down.128

As for Ieiun. 12:2, 13-27, its conviction that xerophany prepares the soul for martyrdom by disciplining the flesh until it loses much of the moisture which blood usually imparts to it demonstrates that, in the mind of Tertullian, there was an intimate relationship between the martyr's soul and his blood; the "succulence of the blood" is the "baggage" ("impedimenta") of the "miles Christi".

According to Ieiun. 12:2, 19-27 xerophany should be practised -

"ut in carcerem talis introeat Christianus, qualis inde prodisset, non poenam illic passurus, sed disciplinam, nec saeculi tormenta, sed sua officia, eoque fidentior processurus ad certamen e custodia abusus nihil habens carnis, sicut nec habeant tormenta materiam, cum sola et arida sit cute loricatus, et contra ungulas corneus, praemisso iam sanguinis suco tamquam animae impedimentis, properante iam et ipsa, quae iam saepe ieiunans mortem de proximo norit."

If the prospective martyr's blood had not symbolised his life, Tertullian's juxtaposition of man's "love of the flesh" (or to rephrase it, his "love of life") and the "succulence of his blood" would not have held true. Furthermore, if xerophany can be categorised as gaining "an
intimate knowledge of death", the "succulence of the blood" which it is designed to counter must pertain to life. Thus, the key to a proper understanding of *Ieiun.* 12:2, 22-27 is to be found in *Ieiun.* 12:2, 25-26.

In fact, out of the twenty-nine examples of the word "sanguis" which occur within Tertullian’s martyr theology, sixteen clearly indicate that the martyr’s blood betokens his life being given over to death and not simply his violent death as such. They are Anim. 55:5, 50, Apol. 21:25,131, 23:6, 33, 50:13, 60, Cor. 1:3, 18, Fug. 12:9, 96, 12:10, 107, *Ieiun.* 12:2, 25, Orat. 5:3, 14, Praes. 36:3, 10, Scorp. 1:8, 26, 6:9, 10, 6:11, 19 and 12:9, 24.

Tertullian’s use of "cruor" is more ambiguous. While *Scorp.* 12:11, 9 displays connotations of life given over to death, *Scorp.* 8:3, 3 concentrates upon the violence with which Zechariah’s life was taken away.129

Moreover, many of the examples of "sanguis" which do not overtly possess connotations of life, for example, *Bapt.* 16:1, 2, 16:2, 9, *Apol.* 40:1, 3 and 46:1, 2, are in harmony with the theory that the shedding of the martyr’s blood represents the ebbing away of his life. Thus, dealing as they do with "baptism in blood", *Bapt.* 16:1, 2 and 16:2, 9 should probably be read in the light of *Scorp.* 6:9, 9-6:11, 18.

When the life-orientated examples of the martyrs’ "blood" are set within the context of the nineteen examples of
"sanguis" with demonstrable implications of life in Tertullian’s general theology and the eight comparable examples of "sanguis" in his soteriology, their importance is unmistakable.

These intimations that he regarded martyrdom as life given over to death would have been buttressed by the association of blood with life in his general theology. Indeed they were probably the by-product of it. It was also buttressed, however, by the Biblical tradition that blood has "voice"; the tradition enshrined in Gen 4:10 and Rev. 6:9-10.

Discussing the death of Abel, in Marc. II 25:3, 14-20, Tertullian declares in no uncertain terms that Abel’s blood was not silent; it cried out to the Almighty for vengeance. Orat. 5:3, 12-15 is a salutary reminder that this characteristic of the martyr’s blood was not unique to Abel. Under the celestial altar, the martyrs are crying out for God to avenge their blood upon the world. To quote Tertullian:

"Clamant ad dominum inuidia animae martyrum sub altari: ‘quoniam usque non ulcisceris, domine, sanguinem nostrum de incolis terrae?’ Nam utique ultio illorum a saeculi fine dirigitur."

Gramaglia considers that the idea that God avenges the blood of His saints is bound up with the idea that the spirits of the dead need to be placated:

"Indubbiamente queste semantiche sono specificate dal senso molto vivo dell’escatologia imminente e vanno al di là del semplice senso ancestrale"
secondo cui di fronte al sangue si deve fare qualcosa per ‘placarlo’; il desiderio della vendetta finale di Dio non è certo riducibile all’archetipo etnologico secondo cui anticamente al sangue in sé si attribuiva il potere di aiutare e placare lo spirito dei morti."133

There may well be truth in this view.

Nevertheless, the vocalisation of the martyr’s blood has a deeper significance. Although the shedding of the martyrs’ blood (like that of Abel before them) is a poignant reminder that they undergo a violent death, the crucial question has to be - why does God hear the cry raised by their blood? To put it another way, why do their deaths matter to the Almighty?

The answer surely is that, in the eyes of God, all human life is sacrosanct. When condemning abortion, in Apol. 9:8, 31-36, Tertullian declared that all human life is inviolable and that its destruction is always a crime.

Even in Resurr. 28:3, 9-28, 4, 18134 when he expounded Gen. 9:5 so as to prove that, at the resurrection, the beasts will be forced to regurgitate the physical components of those whom they have consumed, there is a definite sense in which it is the destruction of life which God will avenge - not violence per se.

If human life is sacrosanct, in the eyes of the Almighty, He will avenge the taking of that life; it is as a symbol of life that the blood of the saints acquires its voice. Recognising this, Azzali concludes:
"Al sangue del giusto violentemente effuso è poi attribuito il potere di appellarsi direttamente a Dio, come a suo supremo vindice. E' concezione non estranea al mondo classico, ma che a Tertulliano deriva espressamente dalla narrazione biblica dell’uccisione di Abele. Essa manifesta, in ogni caso, la convinzione della assoluta appartenenza del sangue a Dio, della sua sacralità. Questi nostri sondaggi mettono dunque in evidenza innanzitutto che la concezione antropologica del sangue in Tertulliano poggia sul fondamento costituito dalla credenza comune sia all’area culturale classica, sia all’area semitica, che esso è responsabile della vita dell’uomo in quanto è portatore dell’anima e che esso appartiene esclusivamente a Dio e gli è sacro."135

Within Biblical tradition, the vocalisation of blood appertained solely to divine vengeance. In the writings of Tertullian, however, it was not confined to that sphere. Thus, in Anim. 55:5, 40, blood cries out to open the gates of Paradise and in Apol. 50:13, 60-61, it cries out to evangelise those who witness the martyr’s death. On these occasions too, it is the symbolic representation of the martyr’s life which gives blood its power to speak.

Before moving on from the blood/life equation, there is one important objection which must be faced. If the blood of the secular murder victim or the fatally-wounded gladiator is a visible sign of the violence to which he has been subjected, why should the blood of the martyr be interpreted as a symbol of the ebbing away of his life?

Extracts such as, Spect. 19:1, 1-5 and Ieiun. 7:4, 21-7:5, 27 are unequivocal in their association of the blood of
gladiators and secular murder victims with violence. To quote *Ieiun.* 7:4, 21-7:5, 27:


Is not the martyr a victim of judicial murder?

At first sight, this objection to the martyr’s blood having symbolised the offering up of his life to God appears unanswerable. However, by recognising that the shedding of any man’s blood can have more than one level of meaning, it is possible to reconcile these differing strands within Tertullian’s thought.

In *Scorp.* 12:11, 8-11, the blood of the saints points on the one hand to the extreme violence of the "last days" and on the other to the Christian lives which antichrist will destroy. By the same token, the martyr’s blood is both a visible sign of his presentation of his life to God and gruesome evidence that judicial murder has been committed. Thus, whilst the phrase "the blood of the innocent" in *Apol.* 40:1, 1-6, is not at variance with the view that the martyr’s blood denotes his life, there is a definite sense in which it can be set alongside such a phrase as "the blood of Naboth" - a phrase synonymous with a notorious secular murder:

"At e contrario illis nomen factionis accommodandum est, qui in odium bonorum et proborum conspirant, qui aduersus sanguinem..."
innocentium con clamant, praetexentes plane ad odii
defensionem illam quoque uanitatem, quod
existiment omnis publicae cladis, omnis popularis
incommodi a primordio temporum Christianos esse in
causa."

Apol. 40:1, 1-6 focusses primarily upon the martyr’s death from the perspective of his persecutors. The pagans agitate for the execution of Christians, that is, for judicial murder. It is the personal faith of the martyr himself which transfigures that judicial murder into a sacrificial offering to his God. It is the sacrificial motif’s emphasis upon the recipient of the martyr’s self-offering which encourages Christians to look beyond the violence which undoubtedly characterises that oblation, to the presentation of the martyr’s life to God.

Similarly, the blood of the secular murder victim is endowed with several levels of meaning. In the absence of a divine recipient of that blood (a recipient who might transfigure the nauseating incident into a noble sacrifice), the focus of attention remains with the violent deed itself. Nonetheless, because the murder victim’s blood is an "animated" substance, the shedding of his blood is a token of the ebbing away of his life too. Thus, the distinction between the blood of the martyr and that of the ordinary murder victim is, by and large, a false one.

Applied to death, blood as the offering up of life serves to highlight the positive aspect of the often gruesome circumstances of the martyrs’ deaths; martyrdom is not merely a death characterised by selflessness and love of God, it is a death given to God. It also draws attention to
the magnitude of the martyrs' sacrifice; they do, indeed, give their all.

5.2.7 How far did Tertullian's sacrificial theory rest on firm Biblical foundations?

As has been demonstrated in the previous section, Tertullian's equation of blood with life rests upon slender Biblical foundations. He confined his discussions to Gen. 9:4 and Acts 15:29,\textsuperscript{138} omitting such important texts as Lev. 17:11, Deut. 12:23 and Acts 15:20.\textsuperscript{139}

Thus, the question has to be - how far does Tertullian's use of Biblical teaching in other spheres of his sacrificial theory indicate that his sacrificial exposition of martyrdom was Christian inspired?

His recognition that it is spiritual sacrifices which are required from the faithful under the New Covenant was taken straight from the Bible. Texts such as, Ps. 50:14, Isa. 1:11-14, 1:16-17, Jer. 7:21-24, Hos. 6:6, Mal. 1:10-11, Mt. 9:13, Rom. 12:1, I Cor. 3:16-17, Phil. 2:17 and Heb. 10:21-22\textsuperscript{140} were all employed to indicate that the true sacrifice is the worship of a pure heart:

"I appeal to you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present yourselves as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship".

(Rom. 12:1).

Nevertheless, although these verses provided the point of departure for Tertullian's general sacrificial theory, they
do not appear in his theology of martyrdom. There is but one exception; it is Phil. 2:17. Thus, Tertullian confined his use of Rom. 12:1 to authorising the veiling of virgins\textsuperscript{141} and demonstrating the reality of the resurrection of the flesh\textsuperscript{142}.

When this is set alongside the many Biblical texts calling for spiritual sacrifices which he did not quote—notably, Ps. 51:16-17, 116:17, Isa. 66:2, Jer. 6:20, Hos. 9:4, Phil. 4:18, Heb. 12:28, 13:15, I Pet. 2:5, Rev. 5:8, and 8:3-5\textsuperscript{143}—it is clear that, in places, the Biblical foundations of martyrdom as sacrifice are somewhat shaky.

This does not mean that Tertullian’s exposition of this theme was devoid of Biblical material. It included such overtly sacrificial material as Zech. 9:15-16, Rom. 8:36, Eph. 5:2, Phil. 2:17 and 2 Tim. 4:6\textsuperscript{144}.

"As it is written, ‘For thy sake we are being killed all day long; we are regarded as sheep to be slaughtered’"
(Rom. 8:36)

and

"Even if I am to be poured as a libation upon the sacrificial offering of your faith, I am glad and rejoice with you all".
(Phil. 2:17).

It also included such implicitly sacrificial material as 2 Cor. 4:8-11, 4:16-17, 11:23-27, 12:10 and Col. 1:24\textsuperscript{145}.

Teaching on self-denial is an essential prerequisite for any theology of sacrifice.
However, each of these verses appears in Tertullian’s martyr theology once only.\textsuperscript{146} What is more, with the exception of Zech. 9:15-16, Eph. 5:2 and Col. 1:24, they all appear in a single chapter, that is, Scorp. 13.

Indeed, even when he did incorporate acknowledged sacrificial texts into his discussions of martyrdom, he did not necessarily exploit its sacrificial teaching to the full. Thus, in Mart. 2:4, 10-13, although the prospective martyrs are a "fragment offering" (the word "odor" is associated with perfumery and spices) the emphasis in Tertullian’s exegesis of Eph. 5:2 is upon prison conditions - not upon the martyrs’ self-abnegation and imminent deaths. I quote:

\begin{quote}
Quo uos, benedicti, de carcere in custodia, si forte, translatos existimetis. Habet tenebras, sed lumen estis ipsi; habet uincola, sed uos soluti deo estis. Triste illic exspirat, sed uos odor estis suauitatis."
\end{quote}

In truth, some of his most memorable descriptions of the martyr as sacrificial victim are devoid of any Biblical data; they include Pat. 16:5, 15-18, Scorp. 6:11, 19-23, 7:7, 7-11 and Apol. 50:12, 51-54. As for such passages as, Fug. 12:10, 103-110 and Scorp. 6:10, 10-18, they may have included Biblical material but that material was not of a professedly sacrificial character.\textsuperscript{147}

As for verses such as Lev. 16:5-10, Isa. 53:4-8, I Cor. 5:7, Eph. 2:13, Col. 1:20, Heb. 9:14 and I Jn. 1:7-10\textsuperscript{148} verses which figure prominently in his soteriology - the most which can be said is that they probably helped to create a climate
of opinion in which a sacrificially-orientated theory of martyrdom could thrive.

In conclusion, a review of Tertullian’s Biblical data suggests that whilst Biblical teaching played a part in inspiring his reflections on the martyr’s sacrifice, it cannot explain all its salient characteristics. His theory of martyrdom was profoundly cultic in character\textsuperscript{149}, yet for all their cultic aura, Zech. 9:15-16, Rom. 8:36 and Phil. 2:17 cannot account for passages such as Scorp. 6:11, 19-23, 7:1, 24-7:2, 7 and 7:7, 7-11. Even his familiarity with the cultic practice of the Old Testament cannot do so,\textsuperscript{150} since he almost invariably referred to it in a derogatory manner. Was the Tertullianic vision of the martyr’s sacrifice inspired by forces outwith the Judeo-Christian tradition? The hypothesis has to be examined.

5.2.8 The martyr’s God: the heir to Ba’al-Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelestis

"Sanguinem hominis deus concupiscit? Et tamen ausim dicere, si et homo regnum dei, si et homo certam salutem, si et homo secundam regenerationem. Nulla compensatio inuidiosa est in qua aut gratiae aut iniuriae communis est ratio."

Here, in Scorp. 6:11, 19-23, Tertullian states bluntly and without equivocation that the Christian God hungers for the blood of His followers. His decision to couch this terrible demand in such a way as to render it subject to conditions should not be allowed to deceive. The faithful did long for a secure salvation and the advent of the Kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{151}
They did long for second birth, a second birth which they believed was to be found in the waters of baptism. Therefore, Tertullian clearly did believe that God covets the blood of His followers. He did more. He considered that God exacts a fair exchange.

God covets the blood of the faithful - the claim is astounding and appalling. It is, moreover, a claim which has no precedent in the Bible. The God of the Old Testament may have sometimes been a bloodthirsty God, a God of vengeance - as Num. 23:22-24, Jer. 46:10, 48:10 and Ezek. 14:19 demonstrate - but this aspect of His character was primarily directed against His foes, not His followers. Deut. 32:42-43 is characteristic:

"'I will make my arrows drunk with blood, and my sword shall devour flesh - with the blood of the slain and the captives, from the long-haired heads of the enemy. Praise his people, 0 you nations; for he avenges the blood of his servants, and takes vengeance on his adversaries, and makes expiation for the land of his people'."

Where the Bible does concentrate on the blood of the saints, it depicts it as something precious in the eyes of the Almighty - something whose shedding must be avenged. Rev. 16:6 declares:

"For men have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink. It is their due!"

If Scorp. 6:11, 19-23 has no obvious Biblical antecedent, it also had no counterpart outwith the confines of Christian North Africa, in contemporary Christian literature. Mart.
Pol. I 16:1, 12-16 draws attention to Polycarp’s blood but it does so less to highlight the gruesome nature of God’s demands, than to emphasise the miraculous properties of his blood; it doused the faggots and put out the flames which threatened to engulf him. I quote:

"Πέρας γονιν ἱέστες οἱ δεήσεωι μὴ δυνάμενοι αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς διαπυρηθῆναι, ἐκέλευσαν προσελθόντα αὐτῷ κομψέτορα παραδίδουσιν ἡμῖν. καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσαντος, ἐξήλθεν πλήθος αἵματος ὅσα κατακαθέσατο τὸ πῦρ καὶ θαυμάσσει πάντα τὸν ὄχλον, εἰ τοσοῦτοι τοι δειαφορὰ μετολῇ τῶν τε ὑπότατων καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν."

Mart. Louq. employed sacrificial language in moderation only and did not highlight the shedding of the martyrs’ blood.154 Irenaeus was similarly reticent regarding the shedding of blood.155 As for Ignatius of Antioch, although his reflections upon his imminent death are imbued with a thoroughly sacrificial aura,156 he was far more interested in the blood of Christ as it is encountered in the eucharist,157 than in the imminent spilling of his own blood.

Recognising as he did the redemptive power of the martyr’s blood (both in terms of personal redemption158 and the redemption of others)159 Origen implies that the martyr’s blood is precious in the eyes of God. Mart. Prot. 50:309, 25-50:309, 3 declares:

"τάχα δὲ καὶ δωσαίς "τιμῶ αἵματι" τῷ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἡγορᾶσθεμεν. Ἰησοῦ λαβόντος κτὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὄνομας οὕτως τῷ "τιμῶ αἵματι" τῶν μακρύρων ἁγορασθησθήσονται τίνες, καὶ αὐτῶν πλέον ψυχομένων παρ’ ὅ ὑψώθησαν αὐν δίκαιοι μὲν γενόμενοι μὴ μακρυτιρθήσαντες δὲ λόγον γὰρ ἔχει τὸ ἱέρας τῶν ἐν μαστοώρθθαντον ψυχοι κολετθοῦν, ὡς δὴλον ἐκ τοῦ "ἐκεῖν ψυκῆ ἐκ τῆς τῆς πάντως ἔλεγχος πρὸς ἐμαυτοῦ."
So precious is that blood that its plea for vengeance catches the ear of the Almighty. Mart. Prot. 50:309, 19-24 declares:

"Καὶ τούτῳ δὲ γινώσκωμεν, διὰ τὸ ἔρθησαν περὶ τοῦ Ἀβελ ἀνικαρποθενίου ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄνθρωποκτόνου καὶ ἄδικον Καίν εὐφορία τὰ πέπαι, ἐὰν ἄδικος ἤξυνη τὸ αἷμα τοῦ γαρ φωνὴ αἵματος τοῦ ἀδικοῦ σοὶ βοᾷ πρὸς με ἐκ τῆς γῆς;" νοοῦμεν λέγεσθαι καὶ περὶ ἐκάστου τῶν μορτύρων, ἐὰν ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ αἵματος βοᾷ πρὸς τὸν θεόν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.

However, the recognition that blood is precious, in the eyes of God, cannot be equated with the stark assertion that God wants human blood.

Finally, there is Eusebius' Pal. Mart. It is true that Eusebius' account of the deaths of the Palestinian martyrs under the Diocletian persecution dwells on, nay revels in, the physical torments inflicted upon the martyrs. His account of the Governor Urbanus' treatment of the martyr Epiphanius, in Pal. Mart. 4:11-12, is representative:

"ὑπερήμερον δὲ ἐνταῦθα παρατάθησα επὶ τοῦ κολαστρίου ἐξίλου τοὺς πᾶδας τῇ υστεραίᾳ παρίσταται τοῖς δικαστήριοις. ἔνθα δὲ γενναίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγκυομένου Οὐρβανοῦ ἐπιδείξεως ὀστέρ τινος ἁγαθοῦ τῆς οἰκείας ομόθητος ποιομένου, παν εἶδος κολαστρίων ἐπηγαγενε κατὰ τοῦ μαρτύρου, ταῖς πλευραῖς ἁριές οὐσίων καὶ σπλαγχνῶν αὐτῶν (καταξαίειν παρακελεύομεν) δὲ πληγαὶ τε κατὰ προσώπου καὶ αὐξένου αὐτῷ τασάντας ἐπιθείναι, ὡς μηκβῇ, ὡστὶς εἰς, τὸ πρόσωπον αφαιρεθέντα, γινώσκεθαι. ὁ μὲν δὴ τοῦθεν μάρτυς, οὐκ τὰς ἁδαίμονας, καὶ τὴν πυθήν καὶ τὸ σῶμα ροσθεῖς ἐτὶ μᾶλλον θείας δυναμεως εμπειροῦσας, πολλα τοῦ δικαστοῦ πυρανομουμένοι οὐδὲν λείπειν ἢ Χριστιανῶν ἐκατόν ομολογεῖ εἰναι, εἰτα ερωταμένος ὡστὶς εἰς καὶ πόθεν, ποὶ τε εἰς μενων, οὐδὲν ἔτερον ἢ Χριστοῦ δοῦλον ἐκατόν ομολογεῖ. ὁ δὲ εἰς μανίαν ἡδη χαρών καὶ κινημένος επι τῆς τοῦ μαρτύρου αἰκήταρ φωνῆ, λίνως ἐλαῖοι δεσθεῖσαι τοὺς πᾶδας περιπλέξαντας αὐτοῦ πῦρ ψάφαις προστάτει. ὡς δὲ οἱ βασανισταῖ τὸ προσταχθὲν ἐτέλους, αὐτρήσει δὲ ψυχῆς ὁ μάρτυς, φόβερον δὲ θέαμα τοὺς ὀρόσων ἢν, οὐτω μὲν τὰς πλευράς διερρογώς, οὕτω δὲ διωγκηκώς καὶ τοῦ προσώπου τὴν μορφὴν ἠλλωσμένος, πολλοὶ τε τῷ πυρὶ τοὺς πᾶδας ἐπὶ μακρὸν καταβεβαῖς χρόνου, ὡς διαρρέειν μὲν τηκομένας κτροῦ δικτὴν τὰς σάρκας, τὸν δὲ ὅστεν καθαπερ ἔτηρων καλαίμων εἰςω δικυνεῖσθαι τὸ πῦρ."
Nevertheless, there is a distinction between expatiating upon the physical torments endured by the martyrs (that is, extolling their extraordinary powers of endurance) and actually recording the shedding of their blood (that is, demonstrating a preoccupation with the substance blood itself). The reader of Pal. Mart. undoubtedly knows that a man who had had his flesh lacerated, indeed mangled with claws ("ungulae") would have been spurting blood but Pal. Mart. very rarely alludes to the substance blood itself in extremely graphic terms, this despite the fact that Eusebius normally describes the martyrs sufferings in extremely graphic terms.

One of the most memorable exceptions is to be found in Pal. Mart. 9:9-12, where Eusebius declares that the pagans’ contempt for the dead (contempt expressed by their failure to permit them proper burial) led to the pillars of the city dripping blood. I quote:

"νόκτωρ δ’ οὐν επιμελώς καὶ μεθ’ ἡμερῶν ύπαίθρους θηράν εἰς βορᾶν τοὺς νεκροὺς φυλάττεσθαι προστάτευτε, καὶ παρὴν ἄραν ἐπὶ πλεῖσθοι ἡμέραις οὐκ ὀλίγον ανθρώπων αριθμὸν τῇ θηριώδει ταύτῃ καὶ κακράρῳ βουλή διακοσμούμενον· ἀλλ’ οἱ μὲν εἰς ἀπόστοτο, οἱ δ’ τὴν σπονδήν ἀξίων, ὡς μηδὲ νεκροὶ κλαπείειν, ἐπεσκόπουν, ἔτηρες δὲ ἁγροὶ καὶ κυνές οἰονέν τις σαρκοφάγον, τὰ δέ λεία μέλη όδε κατείστησε ἐπιστάμενον, καὶ η ὁ πάϊς γε μὴν ἐν κύκλῳ πολίς σπαλαγχνῶν καὶ ὀστέων ἀνθρωπεῖον διεστάραι, ὡς μὴν τὰ πῶστε δεινότερον μὴν αὐτοῖς ὡσι πρῶτον ἀπεχθαύει εἰς ὧν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, φαντάζεσθαι, φαντάζεσθαι, οὐκ οὖν τὴν συμφόραν εἰς συστάτη καταστάθη, τάς ἄριστος αὐτῶν καὶ τῇ κοινῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀφέρει φύσεως ἀπολοφορεῖν, προκειόμενο γάρ ἄρχοστα πυλῶν θέαμα πως ἐκέντρο καὶ πραγματικῆς ἀκοής μείζον, οὐκ ἔφ’ ἐνι χαροὶ κατεσθείμενοι τῶν ἀνθρωπεῖον σαρκῶν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πάντα τόπου διαρρυπατοῦμενον· μελή γοῦν ὅλα καὶ σάρκας μέρη τέ τινα σπαλαγχνῶν καὶ πυλῶν εἰς τοὺς τινας κατειδίεν εἰρηκασία έπ’ οὐς πλείοντες ἡμέραις επιτελοῦμενοι τούτων τοῖς παραδόξοις συμβαίνειν, αἰθία τὰ παῦει καὶ λαμπροῖς ᾧς καὶ τοὺς περίχωσας καταστάσας εὐδίνωτοι· εἰτα ἁδρῶν τῶν ἄνα τὴν πολὺν κύρους τας δημοσίας ὡπρεῖον στοιχεία, δακρύον τινὰ τρόπον τινας τίνας σπαλαγχνῶν αὐτοσκόπουν, ἀγορᾶς τε καὶ πλατείας, μηδεμίας νεκραῖος εἰς ἀφρός γεγενημένης, οὐκ οἷδ’ ὅποθεν ὤδῃ παντείστηκαν καθοριαντοί, ὡς αὐτίκα διανέμηται εἰς πάντας δακρύοις στὴν γῆν ἁρρητὰ λόγῳ, τὴν τῶν τοῦτο πραγμάτων άνσωσιογίαν ἡμὶ δέρωσαν, εἰς ἑλεγχόν τε φύσεως αἰτίων ἀτεχνοῦ καὶ συνομπάθους ἀνθρώποις λίθοις καὶ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ὅλην ἐπικλάεσαι τοῖς γεγενημένοις."
However, even in *Mart. Pal.* 9:9-12, the blood is being "shed" by stones; it is not being offered up by men.

The accounts of martyrdom which date from third century North Africa, by contrast, may not have made such a stark claim as *Scorp.* 6:11, 19-23 but they do share Tertullian’s preoccupation with blood. *Pass. Mont. et Luc.* 22:3, 19-21 exults in the fact that rain fell during the death of Flavian, ensuring that as at his Lord’s Passion, water was mixed with blood -

"et, quod Flauianus ipse ore suo dixit, ad hoc pluebat ut dominicae passionis exemplo aqua sanguini iungeretur."

*Pass. Perp.* 18:3, 3-6 glories in the fact that going from childbirth to martyrdom, Felicitas went from one blood bath to another -

"item Felicitas, saluam se peperisse gaudens ut ad bestias pugnaret, a sanguine ad sanguinem, ab obstetrice ad retiarium, lotura post partum baptismo secundo."

As for *Pass. Perp.* 21:2, 26-21:3, 1, it savours the gory details of Saturus’ death, depicting his "second baptism" in an extremely graphic manner:

"Et statim in fine spectaculi leopardo obiectus de uno morsu tanto perfusus est sanguine, ut populus reuertenti illi secundi baptismatis testimonium reclamauerit: 'Saluum lotum! Saluum lotum!' Plane utique saluus erat qui hoc modo lauerat."

It is true that, in each of the foregoing excerpts the immediate context would have encouraged the redactor to make great play on the martyr’s blood. The "baptism in blood"
motif was an integral part of popular martyr theology; its link with Christ’s spear wound was also part of popular tradition. The parallel between childbirth and martyrdom was highly apposite; both were frequently "blood-wrung" affairs.

It is also true that the North African Christians’ preoccupation with the blood of the martyr was bound up with the value which they placed upon relics. Thus, Pass. Perp. 21:4, 1-21:5, 5 records the fact that Saturus gave a blood-drenched ring to a watching soldier:

"Tunc Pudenti militi, ‘uale’, inquit, ‘et memento fidei et mei; et haec te non conturbent, sed confirment.’ Simulque ansulum de digito eius petiit, et uulneri suo mersam reddidit ei hereditatem, pignus relinquentis illi et memoriam sanguinis".

Nevertheless, when set alongside the limited interest in that aspect of the martyr’s death which writers outwith the region displayed, the propensity of North African writers for dwelling upon the actual shedding of the martyr’s blood suggests that there was an influence at work in North Africa which was not operating elsewhere.

I believe that the memory of the stringent demands imposed upon their followers by the Romano-Punic deities, Ba’al-Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelestis, played a vital role in determining the distinctive theology of martyrdom of Christian North Africa. Even a partially retained folk memory can exert a strong sway - albeit often operating
unconsciously. In the case of the North African Christians of Tertullian's era, however, that tradition would have been reinforced still further by the fact that the deities in question were still part of a living tradition - a tradition practised in a modified form by their pagan neighbours.161

Blood played a crucial role in the worship of both Ba’al-Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelestis.162 In his study of the Saturn cult, Leglay has observed that blood was the proper means of communication between the human and the divine:

"Nous avons vu plus haut que le meilleur moyen, et le plus sûr, d'entrer en communication avec le sacré et de garantir l'efficacité de l'intervention divine était le don absolu par le sacrifice sanglant, parce qu'il détient une puissance contraignante exceptionnelle."163

Not merely was blood the means by which Ba’al-Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelestis were honoured, it was the means by which they were revivified.164

Furthermore, the Punic tradition was that Ba’al-Hammon and Tanit exact human blood from their followers. "Mlk b’l" ("mulk ba’al") or "mlk’dm" ("mulk’adam"). "Molk" (human sacrifice) was the perfect gift.165 Those animal sacrifices which did occur were sacrifices of substitution - "mlk’mr ("mulk’immor").166 Discussing the "bottle" motif, a motif which was not uncommon on Punic stelae, S. Brown concludes:

"The addition of feet and of recognisable features to the supposed ‘neck’ of some bottles does seem to support an interpretation of them as symbolic human beings. That they represent swaddled infants is a reasonable suggestion, although it must be noticed that the bottle takes many forms, which need not all represent the same object or
concept, Etruscan terra cotta votive figurines or swaddled babies do resemble the bottle motif ... and a woman depicted on a stela from Monte Sirai appears to be carrying a swaddled child."\textsuperscript{167}

This conclusion is confirmed by C. Picard, who went so far as to declare that the gender of the child can be determined from the "bottles".\textsuperscript{168}

Brown believes that Punic Carthage’s predominantly sacrificially orientated vision of its gods can also be demonstrated by the iconography of its stelae. He observes:

"The Tanit motif represents the divinity (possibly Tanit), present at the Tophet lifting both arms in ritual greeting. The Hand motif indicates the worshipper engaged in sacrificial ritual, raising only his right hand. The Caduceus is the heraldic symbol of the transportation of the victim from earthly to sacrificial state. Combinations of Tanit and Caduceus motifs would thereby represent the divinity beside a symbol associated with death and sacrifice. Tanit/Hand/Caduceus groups would symbolise the entire sacrificial process from the parent’s or priest’s ritual greeting to the sacrifice of the child and the divinity’s acceptance of the offering. Tanit/Pitcher/Incense burner groups would indicate not the act of child sacrifice but proceeding or accompanying libations and offerings of incense. The sheep motif, when introduced onto the stela alone in conjunction with any of the Tanit/Hand/Caduceus or Tanit/Pitcher/Incense burner combinations, may have specified the substitution of a sheep for an infant or the sacrifice of a sheep and an infant, or it may have served as a more general reference to sacrifices.\textsuperscript{169}

Attempting to reconstruct the grim ceremonies which were enacted at the Tophet at Salammbo, J.G. Février concludes:

"C'est la nuit. Nuit qui sans doute n'est pas trop obscure, car nous sommes à Carthage, mais qui ajoute au mystère. La scène semble être éclairée seulement par le brasier allumé dans la fosse sacrée, le tophet: on en voit les reflets plutôt que la lueur. Mais la grande statue de bronze de Ba' al-Hammon, dressée tout au bord de la fosse sacrée, vers laquelle elle tend les mains, rougeoie sous la flamme. Devant la statue, nous
dit Plutarque, c’est-à-dire, si l’on donne à la préposition son sens exact, de l’autre côté du tophet, se tiennent les joueurs de flûtes et de tambourins, qui font un vacarme assourdissant. Le père et la mère sont présents. Celle-ci ne doit, nous dit encore Plutarque, ni pleurir, ni gémir. Ils remettent le bébé à un prêtre, qui s’avance le long de la fosse, égorge l’enfant de façon mystérieuse, c’est-à-dire probablement selon un rite spécial, dont les spectateurs, derrière les officiants et les musiciens, discernent mal les détails. Puis il place la petite victime sur les mains étendues de la statue divine, d’où elle roule dans le brasier. Cependant la foule, affolée par le bruit et par l’odeur de la chair brûlée, oscille en cadence, sur un rythme dément, qui se précipite sous les coups des tambourins. L’offrande de chaque nouvelle victime accroîtra cette frénésie collective.\textsuperscript{170}

Although such a statue has not been found at the Salammo Tophet, the archaeological evidence would seem to support the view that the children were laid upon the pyre one at a time.\textsuperscript{171} Thus, whilst it is not possible to be sure whether the child victims were, at the time of their immolation, conscious or unconscious, alive or dead,\textsuperscript{172} the broad lines of Février’s delineation of the Tophet "ceremony" were probably correct.

Some modern scholars have questioned whether child sacrifice was actually practised at the Salammo Tophet.\textsuperscript{173} M. Gras, P. Roulliard and J. Texidor declare:

"Le tophet en somme fut très probablement un cimetière d’enfants (mort-nés, prématurés, difformes) mais aussi un lieu sacré où des animaux étaient sacrifiés pour demander à Baal Hamon un autre enfant à la place de celui qu’on incinérait, les prières incinérait sont toujours adressées au même dieu, et même si les formules sont obscures, voire difficilement compréhensibles, on sait que Baal Hamon, au Proche-Orient ancien, ne fut jamais connu comme aimant les sacrifices d’enfants; pourquoi serait-il devenu parmi les Phéniciens de la Méditerranée, à partir du huitième ou du septième siècle, le Cronos friand d’enfants dont parle la mythologie?"\textsuperscript{174}
The interpretation of H. Benichou-Safar though less radical, still downplays the role of child sacrifice at the Tophet:

"La réalité du sacrifice humain carthaginois dicté par l’intérêt national ou l’intérêt privé et constituant une offrande de prémices ou une offrande expiatoire est établie par trop d’éléments convergents pour que, austère actuel de nos connaissances, on songe à la nier. Mais on ne doit pas pour autant méconnaître la propagande diffamatoire des ennemis de Carthage qui peut avoir amplifié ou déformé des actes réels, mais seulement épisodiques, de barbarie. Il n’est donc pas déraisonnable de croire qu’à côté de quelques dizaines - peut-être davantage - d’enfants effectivement offerts vivants au tophet, celui-ci abrite pour l’essentiel des petits êtres nés avant terme, morts-nés ou fauchés prématurément.\textsuperscript{175}

Nevertheless, the weight of contemporary scholarship would tend to contradict this view.\textsuperscript{176} Discussing the contents of one hundred and thirty urns which were excavated from the strata at Salammbo and which have been examined by the project’s osteologist, J. Schwartz, L.E. Stager asserts that, as late as the fourth century B.C., the vast majority of the urns contained human bones.

Fifty urns dating from the fourth century B.C. have been examined; forty-four contained human bones, five contained animal bones and one a mixture of human and animal bones. Thus, if the sample were to prove representative, eighty-eight per cent of the Tophet sacrifices at that period would have been those of children and a mere ten per cent those of animals, the remaining two per cent comprising of mixed urns. By contrast, of the eighty urns analysed from the seventh and the sixth centuries B.C., a mere fifty urns contain human bones; the remainder are divided between
twenty-four which contained animal bones and six which contained a mixture of the two. The percentage figures for the earlier period, therefore, are appreciably lower - sixty-two and a half per cent, thirty per cent and seven and a half per cent, respectively. (At the Tophet at Tharros, by contrast - a Tophet used from the seventh to the third centuries B.C. - thirty-five to forty per cent of the urns contained both human and animal bones and, as yet, no urns have been found to contain animal substitutes.)

Another distinctive feature of the Salammbo Tophet urns is the growth of multiple burials. Whereas in the sample dating from the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. the urns almost invariably contained the bones of a single newborn infant, as many as thirty-two per cent of those from the fourth and third centuries consisted of multiple burials. Probing the reason behind such multiple burials, Stager declares:

"It is in terms of the vow (Phoenician/Punic 'ndr', which frequently occurs on inscribed stelae) made by the parents of the sacrificed children that we should attempt to interpret the double interments. We can imagine a scenario somewhat as follows. In fulfilment of a vow for a favour granted (or to be granted) by the deity, the parent pledges his unborn child. But this child is either born dead or dies before the time of sacrifice ... To fulfil the vow the parent is obliged to sacrifice the youngest living offspring (the two to four year old) as an acceptable response to the favour granted (or to be granted) by the god."
thriving in the "golden age" of Punic Carthage - that is, at a relatively modern date. Stager asserts:

"From this (Schwartz') analysis, which of course remained tentative until all of the urn contents have been thoroughly studied, I have difficulty accepting the evolutionary scheme proposed by many historians of religion who maintain that the 'barbaric' practice of human sacrifice was gradually replaced by the more 'civilised' practice of animal substitution. Abraham substituting the 'ram-in-the-thicket' for his son Isaac is usually considered paradigmatic. Such was not the case in Carthage: for it was precisely in the 4th - 3rd centuries B.C., when Carthage had attained the heights of urbanity, that child sacrifice flourished as never before."180

The claims that the incinerated bones at the Salammbo Tophet were either the cremated remains of children who had died before they had been initiated into society (that is, children under four years of age)181 or those of aborted foetuses and infants who had died a natural death182 are subject to three major flaws. In an age when cremation was a widely accepted practice, they do not explain the conviction (well attested throughout the ancient world)183 that the Carthaginians sacrificed their children; that conviction cannot be dismissed simply as a slur manufactured by their enemies.184

Moreover, as Brown has seen, they build too much upon the fact that child burials were notoriously poorly marked in the ancient world and that therefore they appear to be rare outwith the confines of the Tophet. They also build too much upon the modern reader's revulsion towards deeds which, from a twentieth century perspective, appear "uncivilised":
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"It is certainly possible, perhaps even probable, that all children buried in the Tophet were not sacrificed. Yet the absence of large numbers of 'normal' children's burials in Carthaginian cemeteries cannot automatically be assumed to account for the presence of so many Tophet burials. Children's graves are very poorly preserved throughout the Greek and Roman Mediterranean - at sites where no alternative burial ground exists to explain their absence - simply because children were buried less carefully (as at Carthage until the Byzantine period). The desire of modern authors to minimise the institutionalised violence of the Phoenicians is understandable, given our own values, but might have been incomprehensible to a Carthaginian. We might feel less need to explain away or excuse the acts of non-Mediterranean, more 'primitive' peoples." 185

The Punic tradition of human sacrifice should not be dismissed as irrelevant on the grounds that, by Tertullian's generation, it had been completely superseded by "molchomor" and other sacrifices of substitution.186 Because such animal sacrifices rested on the assumption that the animal-victim dies in place of either the child "victim" or the dedicant (an assumption enshrined in the ritual requirement that the relevant individual lay his hand upon the head of the sacrificial victim) they retained the memory of the Punic tradition.

According to G.C. Picard, molchomor

"consistait à remplacer l'enfant destiné au sacrifice par un animal, assimilé à lui par des rites magiques." 187

Leglay concurs:

"Celui qui offre la victime, et que le Tarif dit de Marseille nomme le 'maître du sacrifice', s'approche de l'animal et, face à l'autel, le purifie par l'encens, puis lui impose sa main droite sur la tête. S'il s'agit d'un sacrifice 'molchomor', c'est l'enfant, et non plus l'offrant, qui vient toucher la victime. Ce rite
Ba‘al-Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelestis may have been propitiated in later years by the blood of animals and birds but they retained the right to demand human life and human blood.

When set against the background of the Punic tradition of child sacrifice, Tertullian’s assertion, in Scorp. 6:11, 19-23 that God requires men’s blood becomes readily intelligible; he had been unable to shake himself free of the idea that human blood is the means by which deities can be appeased and even apparently rendered propitious. Thus, by offering the Father his blood, the martyr caused Him to set aside the wrath which his sins had engendered, and to look with favour upon him. Frend correctly observes:

"The connection between the old national cult and Christianity may perhaps also be sought in the attitude of the more rigorous Christians towards martyrdom. This was regarded both as the crowning achievement in the Christian’s life and a personal sacrifice to God, which automatically released the sinner from all guilt. The background may have been the reminiscence of human sacrifice, and in some passages of Tertullian this seems to have remained strong. ‘Does God desire man’s blood?’ he asks, and his reply is in the affirmative ... In another passage he explains, ‘Happy is the man whom God has devoured’, and so as to indicate that he means this in a literal sense he appeals for justification to the pagan rites of human sacrifice practised in Gaul, Sythia and also in Africa."

This does not mean that every aspect of Tertullian’s thought which strikes the modern reader as bizarre or bloodthirsty should be attributed to the influence of the cults of Ba‘al-
Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelestis. In Mart. Prot. 23 288, 8-23:289, 18, Origen positively exults in the torments inflicted by Antiochus Epiphanes upon the eldest of the seven martyred brothers - whilst still alive, he was roasted in a pan over a fire:

Yet, bizarre though this account may sound to the modern ear, Origen was merely reproducing the details given by 2 Macc. 7:5.

By the same token, Ignatius' desire that the wild beasts might grind his body between their teeth (grind it until not a trace remained) sounds grotesque but it drew its inspiration from I Cor. 5:7. Plainly, each passage must be judged on its merits and its inspiration assessed accordingly.

Scorp. 6:11, 19-23 is not the only passage which points to Tertullian's indebtedness to the indigenous North African deities. At the heart of the sacrificial life of the cult of Ba'âl-Hammon/Saturn, in Tertullian's own day, there lay one liturgical formula - "uita pro uitâ, anima pro animâ, sanguine pro sanguine."191 By means of this formula, in the
sacrifice of "molchomor", the child and the substitute animal-victim were not merely dedicated to the god, they were identified. Brown declares:

"The animal is a substitute ('pro uikario') for the health ('pro salute') of the child, Concessa on stela III and Donatus on stela IV, breath for breath ('anima pro anima'), blood for blood ('sanguine pro sanguine'), and life for life ('uita pro uita')."

In Fug. 12:10, 105-110, Tertullian sought to prove that the martyr owes God his own blood because he is indebted to Him for Christ's blood:

"Quid autem deo debeo, sicut denarium Caesari, nisi sanguinem, quem pro me filius fudit ipsius? Quodsi deo quidem hominem et sanguinem meum debeo, nunc uero in eo sum tempore, ut quod deo debeo expostuler, utique fraudem deo facio id agens, ne quod debeo soluam."

There is, of course, an important difference between the pagan formula and the Christian dictum. The pagan formula had symbolised the fact that the animal victim is a substitute for the child "victim"; the animal died in place of the man. The Christian dictum enunciated by Tertullian is not that the martyr must shed his blood in Christ's place; rather, it is that he must repay Him the blood which He has already shed.

Nonetheless, there are certain analogies. Like the liturgical formula before him, Tertullian affirms that God demands human life; He demands human souls (for "man" is nothing less than body and soul) and human blood. Moreover, just as the liturgical formula enunciated a deliberate parallelism when it set the blood of the animal-
victim over against that of the child - "victim", Tertullian enunciated an implicit parallelism when he set the blood of the martyr over against that of his Master. Finally, just as the requirement that the animal be sacrificed depends upon Ba'al-Hammon/Saturn’s right to demand the worshipper’s life, the requirement that the martyr sacrifice himself depends upon God’s right to demand Christian blood and Christian lives; the obligation of man rests upon the legitimate demands of the Deity. Thus, whilst it is true that Fug. 12:10 103-110 was inspired by Mt. 22:21, there are signs that its author had not entirely forgotten the pagan formula - the formula according to which the worshipper owed his god human blood.

The second sign of Tertullian’s indebtedness to Romano-Punic religion is to be found in Scorp. 7:1, 24-7:2, 7; his God is a "murderer". Wisdom murdered Her first-born Son on the cross at Calvary. She continues Her career as a murderess by slaying Her younger sons in the arena:


At first sight, Tertullian appears to have drawn his inspiration from the Bible. Prov. 9:1-2 states:
"Wisdom has built her house, she has set up her seven pillars. She has slaughtered her beasts, she has mixed her wine, she has also set her table."

The Hebrew Bible speaks of Wisdom slaughtering "her slaughterings" - תַּנְדָּגָה רְאוֹתָה. The Septuagint employs the word "Οὐμακτάς", a word commonly employed of sacrificial victims - "Έψαλεν τα ἐκ βρατηρία τοῦ ἐκ νῦν". The Vetus Latina also employs the motif of the cultic victim:

"Sapientia aedificauit sibi domum exsidit columnas septem immolauit victimas suas miscuit uinum et proposuit mensam suam."

However, according to Tertullian, Wisdom murders her sons - "sophia ... iugulauit filies suas" (Scoip. 7:1, 28-7:1, 1).

Whilst it is true that within a sacrificial vision of martyrdom, the substitution of the word "sons" for words denoting cultic victims is a small step, the question has to be - why was he inspired to take that step? Two centuries later, Augustine would not feel the need so to distort Prov. 9:2, when in Civit. Dei. XVII 20:259, 59-20:260, 76, he applied it to the martyrs' deaths.

Furthermore, whilst it is true that the Almighty has the power "to kill" and "to make alive", Tertullian's assertion that God "murders" His followers cannot be dismissed in terms of his adherence to Deut. 32:39; it is one thing to acknowledge that God "kills", it is another to brand Him a "murderer". Instead, therefore, the question has to be - why was he attracted to Deut. 32:39?
It could be argued that the substitution of the word "filii" for the word "uictimae" is the logical corollary of the fact that the Biblical Sophia is feminine. Motherhood is a feminine characteristic. However, taken by itself, this is an inadequate explanation - failing as it does to explain why Tertullian was inspired to play on this aspect of Sophia. (The feminine connotations of Sophia were there for all theologians to exploit but they did not do so).

Tertullian's preference for the word "filii" can be explained by a combination of two factors. Firstly, Ba'el-Hammon/Saturn was notorious as the god of human sacrifice - the god of infanticide. Apol. 9:4, 11-15 asserts:

"Cum propriis filiis Saturnus non pepercit, extraneis utique non parendo perseuerabat, quos guidem ipsi parentes sui offerebant, et libentes respondebant et infantibus blandieabantur, ne lacrimantes immolarentur."

Such was his notoriety that Tertullian believed that, even in late second century Carthage where human sacrifice was officially prohibited, he still exacted his terrible price amid deepest secrecy.198

Abhorrent though he found the practice of human sacrifice and repulsive though he found the god who demanded such sacrifices,199 the lingering tradition of such a practice in Punic North Africa had unconsciously conditioned the third century theologian into accepting the idea that God has the right to demand the lives of His followers. It is surely significant that when picking examples with which to justify the actions of Sophia, Tertullian chose examples of human sacrifice. In the words of Scorp. 7:6, 2-7:
"Sed enim Scythurum Dianam aut Gallorum Mercurium aut Afrorum Saturnum hominum uictima placari apud saeculum licuit, et Latio ad hodiernum Ioui media in urbe humanus sanguis ingustatur, nec quisquam retractat aut non rationem praesumit aliquam aut inaestimabilem dei sui uoluntatem."

P. Stockmeier saw the significance of Tertullian’s rendering of Prov. 9:2:


Secondly, Kronos/Saturn (the name by which Ba’al-Hammon was Romanised) was notorious for two actions - the castration of his father and the devouring of his children.201 That Tertullian was familiar with Saturn the murderer - Saturn the devourer of his children - can be demonstrated by Nat. II 12:13, 18-12:15, 26:

The analogy between the murderous impulses of Saturn and those of Sophia is striking. There are, of course, major differences. Sophia does not indulge in "cannibalistic" tendencies and her actions have the constructive purpose of earning her victims' life eternal; they do not bear the marks of wanton destruction. Nevertheless, there is definitely a good case for arguing that the memory of the Saturn myth had predisposed Tertullian to favour the replacement of the word "victims" with the word "sons" in his rendition of Prov. 9:2.

The third indication that his martyr theology was influenced by the Romano-Punic sacrificial tradition is to be found in Scorp. 7:7, 7-11. There Tertullian toys with the idea that the Almighty instituted martyrdom in order to provide a Christianised version of the dreary altar-pyre - the altar-pyre characteristic of pagan cultic life:

"Si noster quoque deus propriae hostiae nomine martyria sibi depostulasset, quis illi exprobrasset funestam religionem et lugubres ritus et aram rogum et pollinctorem sacerdotem, et non beatum amplius reputasset quem deus comedisset?"

Although he wrote in the pluperfect tense and the conditional mood (with the result that he did not categorically state that God had established martyrdom as a counterpart to the gloomy sacrifices of contemporary paganism), this passage makes it clear that he did not find such a picture of martyrdom abhorrent and that he could reconcile it with his fundamental concept of deity. It is
surely no coincidence that according to Scorp. 8:1, 12-20, the death of His Saints is ordained by God and is precious in His sight:

"Unum igitur gradum insistimus et in hoc solum prouocamus, an praecepta sint a deo martyria, ut credas ratione praecepta, si praecepta cognoveris, quia nihil deus non ratione praeceperit. Siquidem honorata est apud illum mors religiosorum ipsius, ut canit Dauid, non, opinor, ista communis et omnium debitum - atquìn ista etiam ignominiosa est ex elogio transgressionis et merito damnationis - sed illa quae in ipso aditum ex testimonio religionis et proelio confessionis pro iustitia et sacramento."

Indeed, I would go so far as to suggest that Tertullian's "coyness" in Scorp. 7:7, 7-11 was due more to the fear of outraging some of his Christian readers, than to a genuine failure to adhere to the sombre vision of martyrdom there delineated.

Whilst it is true that he was fond of drawing parallels between the ceremonies directed towards the gods and those directed towards the dead (for example, the altars, the sacrifices and the functionaries) the question has to be, why was he so convinced that the cultic life of contemporary paganism was gloomy? Moreover, given that Scorp. 7:7, 7-11 adjoins a catalogue of human sacrifices which Tertullian believed were practised in the classical world (Scorp. 7:6, 2-7) what more appropriate when hinting at a Christianised version of those sacrifices than a reference to "an altar-pyre" and an "undertaken-priest"?

Pyres had figured prominently in the cultic life of Ba‘al-Hammon and Tanit; indeed, they had been infamous as the god
and goddess of the "burning altars" (the title "Baʿal-Hammon" may even have had its origin therein). Even after they had been Romanised, burning altars frequently figured in the central compartment of stelae dedicated to Baʿal-Hammon/Saturn. Leglay observes:

On sait d’autre part l’importance considérable des sacrifices dans le culte phénicien. Et l’examen des stèles à Saturne a montré que la foi des fidèles dans l’efficacité des sacrifices n’avait pas faibli à l’époque romaine: l’autel embrasé figure presque toujours au centre des monuments. Nous aurions là un nouvel héritage indirect, mais fidèlement transmis par les Puniques, de la conception phénicienne du dieu. Le Baʿal de Carthage, successeur du El ougaritien, n’est donc en définitive qu’une autre forme de ce El en tant que ‘maître des hammanim’.

Furthermore, it is not insignificant that, in Scorp. 7:7, 11, Tertullian chose to employ the verb "comedesse" - a verb meaning "to eat up" or "to devour". The "devouring" of his children had been one of the salient characteristics of Kronos/Saturn; the word employed by Nat. II 12:14, 21 was "deuorare". The message is clear. Baʿal-Hammon/Saturn had devoured the children of the Carthaginians; the Father will devour His "sons" born by faith.

The fourth parallel between Tertullian’s theory of martyrdom and the local religious tradition was that both envisaged blood as a symbol of life. According to the local tradition, it was just because the blood of the sacrificial victim encapsulates the life-force that it possesses the power to propitiate and to revivify the gods. To quote Leglay:
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"Si le sang, en qui réside l'anima et qui, à ce titre, est principe de vie, a été retenu comme l'offrande la plus agréable aux dieux et la plus efficace, c'est que par sa vertu propre, il a pour effet principal de les revigoré. Par la vie qu'il anime, il est capable de revivifier la divinité. Or c'est une conception très ancienne, communément admise chez les peuples sémitiques en particulier, que les dieux sont par essence éternels, mais que leur éternité doit être périodiquement relancée par un rapport extérieur, si l'on veut qu'elle soit agissante. Rien mieux que le sang ne pouvait rénover les 'puissances' de la divinité ... Par le sacrifice du sang, la divinité se trouve irrémissiblement 'liée' à l'offrant; elle est rendu 'propice'; elle doit répondre à la prière exprimée".207

Tertullian did not believe that the blood of the martyrs revivifies the Father. He is omnipotent and eternal;208 He requires nothing from His creation to maintain that state.209 He also did not believe that blood and the human soul can be identified completely.

However, as Scorp. 6:9, 9-6:11, 18 makes clear, he did regard the blood of the martyr as a symbol of his life being raised up to the Almighty. Indeed, he did more, he exulted in the shedding of blood210 and considered that it was a due owed by men to the Deity211 - a means of propitiating God's anger.212

When Tertullian's exultation in the shedding of the martyrs' blood and his recognition that blood is a due are placed alongside his failure to exploit many of the Biblical texts where the equation of blood with life is taught, it seems reasonable to conclude that the Biblical teaching merely built upon the bedrock of his pre-conversion understanding of blood. This is rendered still more likely by the fact that Scorp. 6:9, 9-6:11, 23 - the passage which includes his
astounding claim that God "covets" man's blood - does not feel the need to provide Biblical confirmation for its assumption that the shedding of the martyrs' blood and the offering up of their lives are one and the same.

The fifth significant feature is to be found in *Leiun*. 12:3, 27-12:3, 9. Discussing the death of the Catholic Pristinus, Tertullian maintains that he was not a true martyr, because being too drunk to deny Christ when questioned on the rack, he had gone to his death under constraint - not willingly.213 The key phrase occurs in *Leiun*. 12:3, 4 - "ne mori uellet".

Within the sacrificial ceremonies of Ba' al-Hammon/Saturn, great emphasis was laid on the need for the animal to go to its death voluntarily.214 If the animal struggled, this was taken as a sign that the god had rejected it. Likewise, it had been mandatory that the immolation of infants to Ba' al-Hammon and Tanit should be unmarred by expressions of grief on the part of the parents.215

Since the Biblical tradition of witnessing could have led him to the same conclusion,216 it is impossible to prove categorically that Tertullian was consciously indebted to paganism for his distinction between true martyrs who go to their deaths willingly and true apostates who go to their deaths under constraint. Nevertheless, given that this distinction was an unusual one (it being more usual to think simply in terms of "martyrs" and "apostates") it is a fascinating possibility.
Sixthly, there is Tertullian’s fondness for alluding to the self-immolation of Dido. Employed to reinforce his teaching on monogamy (in Cast. 13:3, 24-28 and Monog. 17:2, 5-10) it was also employed, in Mart. 4:5, 31-32, Apol. 50:5, 23-24 and Nat. I 18:3, 25-28 as a tool with which to exhort the faithful to display self-denial in the face of persecution. To quote Apol. 50:5, 23-24:

"Aliqua Carthaginis conditrix rogo secundum matrimonium euadit: o praecominum castitatis et pudicitiae!"

Tertullian’s immediate source for this story was Virgil’s Aen.IV 504-553 and IV 584-705. However, it could be significant that he named Dido, the "founder" of Carthage. Discussing the accounts of Dido’s self-immolation, G.C. Picard suggests that although many legends came to surround her death, Dido probably sacrificed herself in order that by the shedding of her royal blood, she might ensure the prosperity of her foundation. He declared:

"La légende dépouillée de l’élément sentimental qu’y ont introduit les Grecs se présente donc comme un ‘récit sacré’, qui racontait que la fondatrice de Carthage s’était sacrifiée par le feu pour assurer la prospérité de sa ville. D’autre part, le sacrifice de la reine a été précédé d’un projet de mariage. Dans la forme rationalisée de la légende, ce mariage est commandé par des raisons politiques. Mais ce qui est essentiel, c’est qu’il doit assurer la prospérité de la communauté. Nous verrons dans un instant que nombre de sociétés primitives connaissent un rituel comportant d’abord mariage sacré, puis mise à mort du roi. Le but de l’opération est de renouveler les énergies de la communauté, et d’une façon générale, celles de la nature."
If Dido was, in truth, a human sacrifice and the remnants of such a tradition still circulated in the Carthage of Tertullian’s era, his fondness for recounting her death may be significant. It is, of course, impossible to prove what folk traditions circulated in Carthage regarding the city’s founder. Nonetheless, by emphasising that flames were the means whereby Dido effected her suicide, Tertullian appears to diverge from the story given by Virgil. Though she climbed upon a pyre, according to Aen. IV 663-665, Dido met her death by the sword - not by fire,

"dixerat, atque illam media inter talia ferro conlapsam aspicient comites, enseaque cruore spumantem sparsasque manus."

Moreover, according to Aen. IV 685-687, her sister Anna climbed upon the pyre and clasped the dying Dido in her arms (a detail which accords poorly with the concept of a blazing pyre) -

"sic fata gradus euaserat altos, semianimemque sinu germanam amplexa fouebat cum gemitu atque atros siccabat ueste cruores."

Did Tertullian simply assume that pyres and flames are synonymous or was there something in the local tradition which encouraged him to favour those elements within the Virgilian account of Dido which could mistakenly suggest that the pyre was already burning? I am inclined to favour the latter interpretation.

Even if such a tradition had no currency, however, Tertullian’s fondness for recounting the death of Dido demonstrates that he regarded her as an important emblem of
Carthage's Punic past (just as he did the mantle)\textsuperscript{222} and that in itself is a sign that he retained a certain nostalgic attachment for that past.

Finally, \textit{Anim.} 55:5, 36-40 where Tertullian asserts that the "key" to Paradise is the martyr's own "blood", may also be a legacy from Carthage's Punic past:

"Agnosce itaque differentiam ethnici et fidelis in morte, si pro deo occumbas, ut paracletus monet, non in mollibus febribus et in lectulis, sed in martyriis, si crucem tuam tolas et sequaris dominum, ut ipse praecipit. Tota paradisi clauis tuus sanguis est."

Not merely does his emphasis on the shedding of the martyr's blood underline the fact that salvation depends upon blood, his exultation therein is characteristic of the distinctive North African tradition - the tradition which produced \textit{Pass. Perp.} 18:3, 3-6.

It could, of course, be argued that, in \textit{Scorp.} 6:11, 19-23, Tertullian was simply employing irony as a weapon with which to lambast his Gnostic opponents - irony was an art at which he was a past master. He was the man who when observing, in \textit{Apol.} 40:2, 6-9, that whenever the Tiber overflows its banks and the Nile fails to rise, the pagans exclaim "the Christians to the lion", made the rejoinder "what so many to one lion?" I quote:

"Si Tiberis ascendit in moenia, si Nilus non ascendit in rura, si caelum stetit, si terra mouit, si fames, si lues, statim 'Christianos ad leonem!' Tantos ad unum?"
Tertullian would then be ridiculing his opponents, in *Scorp.* 6:11, 19-23, by ascribing to them a belief which he was confident that his readers would find absurd and indeed repulsive - the belief that God "covets" man's blood. Were this proved to be the case, Tertullian would be employing the same tactic as he adopted in *Praes.* 44:1, 1-44:12, 31. There he demonstrated that heresy is a blatant falsehood by sarcastically describing the version of the final judgement which the heretics would require, were their beliefs to be proved true - a judgement at which Christ would recant such beliefs as the resurrection of the flesh and the Incarnation.

Such an irony-based interpretation might find support in the fact that *Scorp.* is a direct response to the Gnostic claim that the God who does not desire the blood of bulls and goats cannot desire the blood of men (*Scorp.* 1:8, 23-1:9, 2 and 15:6, 28-15:6, 4). The key verbs employed in *Scorp.* 1:8, 26 and 15:6, 1 are "flagare" and "sitire", respectively.

Similarly, it could be argued that, in such passages as *Scorp.* 6:11, 19-23, 7:1, 28-7:2, 7, 7:7, 7-11 and *Fug.* 12:10, 105-110, Tertullian was simply employing sacrificial language symbolically or to put it another way, metaphorically. If this is the case, his sacrificially-orientated allusions to the martyr's death should be placed in the same category as Origen's allusions to the Christian's spiritual sacrifices in *Kels.* VIII. 17:755, 15-17:755, 10. Origen declares:
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"Mēta tā tauta dē ὦ Κέλσος φησιν ημᾶς βαμοῦς καὶ αγάλματα καὶ νεῶς ἱδρύεσθαι φευγεῖν. ἔτει τὸ πιστῶν ἡμῖν ἀφανός καὶ ἀποφήτου κοινωνίας οἴεται εἶναι συνήθεια; σοὶ ὁρῶν ὅτι βωμοὶ μὲν εἰσιν ἡμῖν τὸ ἐκαστὸν τῶν δικαίων ἡγεμονικόν, αὕτος ὁ ἀναπέμπεται ἀληθῶς καὶ νοητῶς εὐωδία "θυμίαματα," ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως καθαρᾶς.

διὸ λέγεται παρὰ τῷ Ἡσαίῳ ἐν τῇ Ἀποκάλυψις "τά δὲ θυμίαματα εἰσίν αἱ προσευχῆς τῶν ἁγίων" καὶ παρὰ τῷ υμωθῷ γὰρ εὐνηθής ἡ προσευχή μου ὡς θυμίαμα ἐνώπιόν σου." αγάλματα δὲ καὶ πρέποντα θεϊ ανάθημα, οὐχ ὑπὸ βαναυσίν τεχνών κατεσκευασμένα ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ λόγου θεοῦ πραγμάτων καὶ μορφούσει ἐν ἡμῖν, αἱ ἁρεταί, μιμήματα τυγχάνουσαν τοῦ πρωτοτόκου „πάσης κτίσεως,“ ἐν ὃ ἐστὶ δικαίωσιν καὶ σωφρόσυνης καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ σοφίας καὶ ευσεβείας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἁρετῶν παραδείγματα. ἐν πάσιν ἐνόν ἐστι, τοῖς κατὰ τὸν θείον λόγον σωφρόσυνην ἑαυτῶς κατασκευασάς καὶ δικαίωσιν καὶ ἀνδρείαν καὶ σοφίαν καὶ ευσεβείαν καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἁρετῶν τὰ κατασκευασμένα, αγάλματα· ὅς πρέπον εἶναι πεπείσμαθα τιμᾶται τὰ πρωτότυπον παντὸς ἁγαλμάτων, την εἰκόνα „τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀφάτου,“ τὸν μονογενὴ θεόν. ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἐκδόθηκεν „τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρωπόν σὺν τοῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ εὐδοκίμων τῶν νέων, τὸν ἀνακαινισθείν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν καὶ εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτῶν,“ τὸ κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος· εἶναι αναλαμβάνοντες. αγάλματα ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ποιοῦσιν, ὅποια βουλεῖται ὁ ἐπὶ πάσι θεὸς. εἰκονοῦν."

Such a symbolic or metaphoric interpretation might look for support to Orat. 28:4, 11-15, where Tertullian states that the prayers of the faithful will be ushered to the altar of God to the accompaniment of hymns, psalms and general thanksgiving.

"Hanc de toto corde deuotam, fide pastam, ueritate curatam, innocentia integram, castitate mundam, agape coronatam cum pompa operum bonorum inter psalmos et hymnos deducere ad dei altare debemus omnia nobis a deo impetraturam".

It might also look for support to Scorp. 7:7, 7-11, where Tertullian states that were God to have instituted martyrdom as an imitation of the "dreary altar-pyres" of paganism, the men whom He so "devoured" would be deemed "happy". Whilst not actually presenting his proposition in the form of a metaphor, Tertullian does employ the verb "comedesse" in a metaphorical manner; the Tertullianic God does not
"masticate", He requires the "sustenance" of neither meals nor martyrs.

Tertullian would then simply be declaring, in Scorp. 6:11, 19-23, 7:1, 28-7:2, 7, Fug. 12:10, 105-110 and Anim. 55:5, 36-40 that martyrdom is the presentation of the Christian's faith and love to his God. A comparable construction could also be placed upon extracts such as Marc. IV. 39:4, 9-39:5, 25, Scorp. 13:4, 5-10, 13:4, 13-15 and Apol. 50:12, 51-54 - extracts which, as is demonstrated earlier in this chapter, I am inclined to interpret in terms of an actual quasi-cultic sacrifice.

For reasons which I have enumerated above, I do not personally adhere to either the ironic or the symbolic/metaphoric interpretation. It is too easy to dismiss ideas which are problematic or repulsive. It would be fatal to patronise Tertullian by assuming that he could not possibly really have meant it when he stated that God "covets" man's blood and that the martyr is a cultic victim immolated to his God. Moreover, irony is a phenomenon which is notoriously difficult to prove (especially after the passage of several centuries). As for the symbolic/metaphoric interpretation, it is important to recognise that metaphors are not necessarily incompatible with sincere belief in that which the metaphors purport to depict. The metaphorical use of the verb "devour" (in Scorp. 7:7, 7-11) does not detract from the sincerity of Tertullian's conclusions; rather, by being evocative of the activities of Kronos/Saturn, it lends power and impact to
those conclusions. Nevertheless, both the ironic and the symbolic/metaphoric are perfectly valid interpretations.

The argument that the Tertullianic God bore the unmistakable stamp of Ba'al-Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelestis is open to several further objections. Firstly, it seems to rest upon a premise - the premise that before his conversion to Christianity, Tertullian had been a devotee of one or both of the gods in question. He was, however, extremely reticent about his life as a pagan and there is no direct evidence regarding his previous religious affiliation. A variety of cults were in vogue in Roman Carthage.

Secondly, as He is portrayed in the Old Testament, Yahweh is also (when the occasion demands it) an angry, cruel and bloodthirsty God. He is the God who slew the first-born of the Egyptians and who authorised the Israelites to drive the original inhabitants out of the promised land. He is the God who hardened the heart of Pharaoh and who will, without pity, annihilate all who do not bear the mark of election. He is the God who will destroy the sites where rival gods are worshipped and who will kill the devotees of such gods:

"'Non ibitis post deos alienos ex deis nationum, quae circum uos, quia aemulatur deus deus tuus in te, et ne iratus indignetur et exterminet te facie terrae' ... De quibus omni fariam extippandis: perditione perdetis, inquit, omnis loca, in quibus servierunt nationes deis suis, quas uos possidebitis hereditate, super montes et colles et sub arbores densas, quasque effodietis aras eorum, eueretis et comminuetis staticula eorum et excidetis lucos eorum et sculptilla ipsorum deorum concremabitis igni et disperdetis nomen eorum de loco illo'."
Therefore, when Tertullian depicted an angry, cruel and bloodthirsty Deity, he was not automatically indebted to Ba'al-Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelesis. Moreover, since Ba'al-Hammon and Tanit were, like Yahweh, Semitic gods - masters of both men and the created order - some of the analogies between Tertullian’s God and the Punic gods was the result of their common Semitic inheritance.

Thirdly, the Tertullianic God was not simply a God of anger and of judgement; He was also a God of love and a God of mercy.\(^{228}\) If it were to be proved that Tertullian placed more emphasis upon the loving, merciful side of God’s character - on God in His role as Redeemer\(^ {229}\) - the argument that the angry, all-demanding, bloodthirsty side of his God had been reinforced by the local religious tradition would be severely weakened.

Fourthly, given his vehement rejection of idolatry - the "gods" were deified men\(^ {230}\), their statues the "abodes" of demons - is it conceivable that he would consciously have endowed his God with any of the attributes of one of their number?

Last and by no means least, human sacrifice was no longer being practised in Tertullian’s generation. Was the memory of it too distant to have coloured his perception of Deity?

The claim that the Tertullianic God had inherited the bloodthirsty propensities of Ba'al-Hammon/Saturn and
Tanit/Caelestis does not demand that human sacrifice was still being observed in Carthage at the time of Tertullian’s writing. It does not even demand that such sacrifices had taken place within living memory.

Many scholars have accorded prominence to the Codex Fuldensis version of Apol. 9:2, 4-8 and have assumed that human sacrifice took place publicly in Carthage as late as the middle of the second century A.D. Such an interpretation presumes that the Tiberius mentioned, in Apol. 9:2, 5, was an unknown governor of Proconsular Africa (not the Emperor Tiberius) and that the textual variant "my father" ("teste militia patris nostri") is preferred to that of "my country" ("teste militia partriae nostrae"). To quote Waltzing:

"On ne connaît aucun proconsul d'Afrique du nom de Tiberius. L'empereur Tibère ne fut jamais proconsul d'Afrique. Jos. Scaliger ... explique: jusqu'à un proconsul (du règne) de Tibère et il lit: 'usque ad proconsulem Tiberii'. La correction serait inutile, car 'usque ad proconsulatum Tiberii', 'jusqu'à un proconsulat du règne de Tibère', aurait le même sens. Mais Tertullien ajoute que la milice, les soldats que commandait son père attestent le fait. Il s'agit donc d'un proconsul du deuxième siècle, dont le nom n'est pas autrement connu ou a été altéré dans tous les mss ... S. Jérôme, de uiris ill., 53, dit de Tertullien: 'patre centurione proconsulari.' S. Jérôme a probablement puisé son renseignement dans ce passage de l'Apologétique. S'il en est ainsi, il faut admettre qu'il lisait dans son exemplaire de Tertullien: 'patris nostri', et non: 'patriae nostrae'.

Nonetheless, since classical authors manifested their revulsion at the Carthaginian practice on every possible occasion, it is difficult to believe the Roman authorities tolerated the public continuance of human
sacrifice as late as the mid-second century A.D. The Druidic sacrifices in Gaul were suppressed by either Augustus or Tiberius.\textsuperscript{235} Archaeological evidence to support such a continuance is also extremely dubious.\textsuperscript{236} Brown declares:

"Fragments of inscriptions to Saturn and a bust identified by Lapeyre as Saturn found within the cemetery indicate possible religious activity in the old area of the Tophet in Roman times. This is logical since though Romans identified Ba‘al-Hammon with Saturn, but the remains do not confirm that child sacrifice continued to be practised here after 146 B.C. In North Africa the archaeological evidence indicates that the practice of child sacrifice continued at Cirta until at least the late second century B.C. and at Hadrumetum until at least the first century B.C. There is as yet no evidence that it continued openly or in secret until the third century A.D., as Tertullian says. This question will not be answered without the help of further archaeological discoveries."\textsuperscript{237}

Therefore, since the Codex Fuldensis is the only manuscript to prefer "patris nostri",\textsuperscript{238} I believe that Tertullian intended to date the suppression of a child sacrifice to the reign of the Emperor Tiberius:\textsuperscript{239}

"Infantes penes Africam Saturno immolabantur palam usque ad proconsulatum Tiberii, qui ipsos sacerdotes in eisdem arboribus templi sui obumbratricibus sceleris uotio ol crucibus uiuos exposuit, teste militia patriae nostrae, quae id ipsum munus illi proconsuli functa est."\textsuperscript{240} (Apol. 9:2, 4-8).

One possibility is that Tertullian intended to refer to an unspecified proconsul, who held office in the reign of Tiberius.\textsuperscript{240} (This line of argument should not be prejudiced by the fact that Barnes took it to extremes when he proposed that the present text of Apol. 9:2, 4-8 is a
Another possibility is that Tertullian was referring to Tiberius himself; Emperors enjoyed "proconsular imperium". Taking into account Braun's arguments against the "proconsular imperium" approach, I am inclined to favour the former view.

Child sacrifice was an extremely gruesome and harrowing practice. Consequently, it must have made a great impression on the folk memory of the people of Roman North Africa; the reputation of Ba' al-Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelestis as gods of human sacrifice must have lived on, long after the sacrifices themselves had ceased.

That this was indeed the case can be demonstrated by Apol. 9:3, 8-9:4, 15. There, Tertullian not merely paints a vivid picture of the scene at the Tophet (a picture which includes such details as the parents fondling their babes in order that they might prevent them crying) he also employs the common apologetic device of causing the charges which are laid against Christians to rebound upon those who made the accusations. If the oral tradition regarding human sacrifice had not made a profound impact upon the consciousness of Tertullian and his contemporaries, his depiction of the scene would not have been so realistic and his exploitation of this apologetic device so effective. (The allusion to human sacrifice, in Justin Martyr's Apol. II 12:4, 9-12:7, 30, does not have anything like the same realism).
Moreover, because the impact of human sacrifice upon the collective consciousness of Roman North Africa was immense, men and women of Tertullian’s generation could have been influenced by the concept of deity epitomised by Ba’al-Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelestis, without ever having personally adhered to their cults. Thus, although Tertullian’s indebtedness to the local religious tradition may point to where his pre-conversion loyalties had lain, evidence that his loyalties had lain elsewhere would not necessarily weaken the case for his having been influenced by the Romano-Punic concept of deity.

The objection that he had unequivocally rejected the gods of the nations is, however, far more significant. The objection is all the more pertinent when it is recalled that he dismissed Saturn as no more than a common murderer and cruel mutilator.244

Nonetheless, a distinction has to be made between the conscious act of endowing the Christian God with the attributes of His rivals (that is, a deliberate act of idolatry) and the unconscious, subtle influence of the cultural environment in which a man finds himself (that is, indirect idolatry). Tertullian’s tendency to favour a stern, imperious vision of the Godhead falls into the latter category.

With regard to the question of whether or not Tertullian did indeed incline away from the idea of a God of love towards that of a God of wrath, Marc. I 27:2, 12-27:3, 26 makes it
clear that a god who does not chastise the rebellious and 
who is not feared by his followers is worthy of nothing but 
contempt. Genuine love for God stems from a healthy fear of 
the consequences for man if he does not love Him. A god who 
is simply kind, without also being stern, cannot be the true 
God; his tame acceptance of the violation of his commands is 
not in agreement with true divinity.245 In Tertullian’s own 
words:

"Audite, peccatores, quique nondum hoc estis, ut esse possitis: deus melior inuentus est, qui nec offenditur nec irascitur nec ulciscitur, cui nullus ignis coquitur in gehenna, cui nullus dentium frendor horret in exterioribus tenebris: bonus tantum est. Denique prohibit delinquere, sed litteris solis. In uobis est, si uelitis illi obsequium subsignare, ut honorem deo habuisse uideamini; timorem enim non uult. Atque adeo praese ferunt Marcionitae, quod deum suum omnino non timeant. ‘Malus enim’, inquit, ‘timebitur, bonus autem diligetur’. Stulte, quem dominum appellas negas timendum cum hoc nomen potestatis sit, etiam timendum? At quomodo diliges, nisi timas non diligere? Plane nec pater tuus est, in quem competat et amor propter pietatem et timor propter potestatem, nec legitimus dominus, ut diligas propter humanitatem et timeas propter disciplinam."

For all that he couched his argument in terms of a sarcastic 
repudiation of Marcion’s "good god", Tertullian’s message is 
clear; the true God is a God who can become angry and even 
vengeful - a God who can be offended.

The message of Resurr. 14:6, 20-14:8, 30, Marc. I 26:5, 22- 
26:5, 4 and I 27:6, 16-18 is identical. Lordship and 
judgement are essential characteristics of the Christian 
God. Thus, in Resurr. 14:6, 20-14:8, 30, because the 
Almighty is man’s Maker, He is his Lord and because He is 
his Lord, He is his Judge. The purpose of resurrection can
be summed up in one word - the word "judgement". Likewise, in *Marc.* I 26:5, 22-26:5, 4, Tertullian declares that it would be unworthy of God to omit to chastise sinners; unless He subdues evil, He is not truly a good God. He asserts:

"Si indignum est deum iudicare, aut si eatenus dignum est deum iudicare, qua tantummodo nolit et prohibeat, non etiam defendat admissum, atquin nihil deo tam indignum quam non exequi quod noluit et prohibuit admissi: primo, quod qualicunque sententiae suae et legi debeat uindictam in auctoritatem et obsequii necessitatem, secundo, quia boni aemulum sit necesse est quod noluit admissi et nolendo prohibuit, malo autem parcere deum indignius sit quam animaduertere, et quidem deo optimo, qui non alias plane bonus sit, nisi mali aemulus, uti boni amorem odio mali exerceat et boni tutelam expugnatione mali impleat."

*Marc.* I 27:6, 16-18 even goes so far as to categorise the Christian God as a Being who is "angry" and "offended" - referring to man being cast away into the outer darkness, Tertullian concludes:

"Ergo salutis in detrimentum abicietur, et hoc decerni non poterit nisi abirato et ofenso et executore delicti, id est iudice."

The essentially wrathful nature of the Tertullianic God also comes across in his fondness for the language of "satisfaction"; in his penitential theory, the word "satisfactio" appears four times and "satisfacere" appears twelve times.246 The Father is a God who requires to be propitiated. A God who requires to be propitiated is an angry God, an offended God. *Paen.* 7:12, 44-7:14, 52 is unequivocal:
"Uerum non statim succidendus est ac subruendus est animus desperatione, si secundae quis paenitentiae debitor fuerit. Pigeat sane peccare rursus, sed rursus paenitere non pigeat; pudeat iterum periclitari, sed non iterum liberari neminem pudeat: iterandae ualitudinis iteranda medicina est. Gratus in dominum extiteris, si quod tibi denuo offert, non recusaueris. Offendisti sed reconciliari adhuc potes: habes cui satisfacias et quidem ulentem!"

As Pud. 2:7, 25-31 recognises, the Christian God is a God whose mercy must never be taken for granted; His enemies will be summarily dispatched to the fires of Gehenna. Tertullian declares:

"Deus enim zelotes, et qui naso non deridetur, adulantium scilicet bonitati eius, et qui licet patiens, tamen per Esaiam comminatur patientiae finem: 'tacui, numquid et semper tacebo et sustinebo? Quiuei uelut parturiens, exsurgam et arescere faciam. Ignis enim procedet ante faciem ipsius, et exuret inimicos eius', non solum corpus, uerum et animas occidens in gehennam."

The vision of an angry, vengeful God (a God who needs to be propitiated) also lies behind such passages as Scorp. 6:9, 9-6:11, 18, 6:11, 19-23, 7:1, 24-7:2, 7, 7:7, 7-11, Fug. 12:10, 103-110 and Pud. 22:9, 41-22:15, 72. It would be a mistake to be misled by the merciful facade which pervades Scorp. 6:9, 9-6:11, 18. It is because he has offered Him the supreme sacrifice, that is, his own life,247 that the martyr is shown mercy by the Father. Without that sacrifice, He would exact retribution. The other passages carry a similar message; it is the martyr’s death which causes God to look on him with favour.248

As depicted by Marc. I 26:3, 8-11, I 27:2, 12-27:3, 26, Scorp. 2:3, 23-2:6, 15 and Pud. 2:7, 25-31, the Father is a
jealous God, an angry God. As depicted by Scorp. 6:11, 19-23, 7:1, 24-7:2, 7 and 7:7, 7-11, the Father is a tyrannical God, one might even say a gruesome God. As depicted by Marc. I 27:3, 18-27:5, 10, Paen. 5:3, 9-5:8, 29 and 6:14, 53-6:17, 65 the Father is a God who is to be feared. Tertullian was well-advised to observe, in Cult. II 2:2, 9-15, that fear is one of the most secure foundations of salvation:

Debemus quidem ita sancte et tota fidei substantia incedere, ut confisae et securae simus de conscientia nostra, optantes perseverare id in nobis, non tamen praesumentes. Nam qui praesumit, minus iam ueretur, qui minus ueretur, minus praecauet, qui minus praecauet, plus periclitatur. Timor fundamentum salutis est, praesumptio impedimentum timoris."

The Tertullianic God is not devoid of love and mercy. He sheds the blessings of the natural order upon both the just and the unjust\(^\text{249}\) and prefers the repentance of sinners to their death.\(^\text{250}\) In the person of the Father, He is the God who loved mankind so much that He was prepared to sacrifice His Son for its sake;\(^\text{251}\) in the person of the Son, He is the God who was prepared to suffer anguish and death on a cross in order to redeem fallen humanity.\(^\text{252}\) Thus, Tertullian's concept of deity did have a softer, profoundly Christian side.

Nevertheless, in the writings of Tertullian, the God of love and mercy was often a veneer overlaying a harsher vision of deity. Whilst He is not confined to that sphere, the God of love is upper-most in his soteriology; indeed it finds its apogee there.\(^\text{253}\) Even in his early moralistic works, the
God of judgement is never far below the surface\textsuperscript{254} - love and mercy are, by and large, the prerogative of those who seek to do His will\textsuperscript{255}.

The latter moralistic works tend to place still more emphasis on the judgemental aspect of God. Their references to His mercy are often a platform from which Tertullian went on to argue that men had abused God’s clemency\textsuperscript{256}.

As for Tertullian’s martyr theology, it paints a picture of a stern, all-demanding, judgemental God\textsuperscript{257}. Even in Fug. 12:2, 11-12:3, 36 where he spotlighted the Father’s love and the altruism in sacrificing His Son for mankind, Tertullian had an ulterior motive. By emphasising the love and altruism displayed by the Father and the love and self-denial displayed by the Son, he sought to prove that God has an absolute right to demand the Christians’ blood\textsuperscript{258}.

Thus, important though divine love and divine mercy were in the eyes of Tertullian, they did not occupy a sufficiently prominent position in his theology to prevent the Tertullianic God being categorised as a severe God.

Based as they are on Biblical citations, Scorp. 2:2, 8-2:14, 21 and Fud. 2:4, 13-2:8, 34 are poignant reminders that the severity of the Tertullianic God cannot entirely be ascribed to the local pagan vision of deity.

Divine judgement, like the divine sovereignty of which it is an expression, has a firm basis in Holy Writ\textsuperscript{259}. Therefore,
Braun is correct when he concludes that the essential characteristics of the Tertullianic God can be found in the Judeo-Christian tradition. Discussing Tertullian's use of the word "dominus", he observes:

"Équivalent spontané de κύριος, 'dominus', conformément à son sens étymologique de 'maître de la maison' (par opposition à l'esclave), s'est imprégné sans difficulté de la notion de puissance souveraine, d'autorité absolue de Dieu sur l'homme, sa créature; ce mot latin, par l'intermédiaire du terme de la LXX, et du Nouveau Testament grec, a recueilli tout un héritage hébraïque."  

However, the recognition that certain passages in the Old Testament portray a severe, judgemental God does not explain why Tertullian was attracted to that aspect of the Bible's teachings nor does it explain the peculiar harshness which his vision of God sometimes displayed.

Irenaeus' Ad Haer. III 25:3, 28-40 is also a poignant reminder that all the severity which characterised Tertullian's descriptions of the divine Sovereign and Judge cannot entirely be ascribed to the indirect influence of the cults of Ba'al-Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelestis. The analogies between this excerpt and Resurr. 14:6, 20-14:8, 30 are marked, yet Irenaeus had no experience of Romano-Punic paganism:

"Hic enim qui iudicialis, si non et bonus sit, non est deus, quia deus non est cui bonitas desit; et ille rursus qui bonus, si non et iudicialis, idem quod hic patietur, ut auferatur ei ne sit deus. Quemadmodum autem et sapientem dicunt patrem omnium, si non et iudiciale ei adsignent? Si enim sapiens, et probator est; probatori autem subest iudiciale, iudiciale autem adsequitur iustitia ut iuste probet; iustitia prouocat iudicium; iudicium autem, cum fit cum iustitia, transmittet
ad sapientiam. Sapientia igitur praecellet pater super omnem humanam et angelicam sapientiam, quoniam dominus et iudex iustus et dominator super omnes."

Leaving aside the question of Tertullian’s indebtedness to Irenaeus, it is clear that both theologians were indebted to the Judeo-Christian tradition for many of the salient features of their vision of God.

Nevertheless, Marc. I 27:2, 12-27:3, 26 and I 26:5, 22-26:5, 4 were distinguished by a peculiar harshness of spirit. For the author of Marc. I 26:5, 22-26:5, 4, it would be unworthy of God to display mercy in the face of evil - evil men must be absolutely destroyed ("expugnare"). For the author of Marc. I 27:2, 12-27:3, 26, God is primarily a being who is to be feared. He saw no insensitivity in referring, in jest, to the fires of Gehenna and to the outer darkness; he did not appreciate that given the frailty of men, eternal chastisement is a subject upon which it ill-behoves any man to jest - not even if he does so as a rhetorical device.

When Spect. 30:3, 8-30:5, 26 is set alongside these passages, the peculiar harshness of spirit which pervades Tertullian’s vision of God is yet more apparent. He assumes that one of the joys which God will bestow upon the elect will be the pleasure of watching the damned writhing in Gehenna.

Although the difference is one of nuance, there is a clear distinction between Tertullian’s descriptions of God the Judge and those given by Irenaeus. According to Ad. Haer. IV 40:2, 18-28, Christ’s separation of the sheep from the
goats is simply the logical outworking of the fact that His Father inflicts both good and evil upon mankind:

"Sed quoniam unus et idem dominus separari demonstrauit in iudicio omne genus humanum, 'quemadmodum pastor segregat oues ab haedis', et alis quidem dicet: 'uenite, benedicti patris mei, percipite quod paratum est uobis regnum', alis uero: 'discedite a me, maledicti, in ignem aeternum quem praeparauit pater meus diabolo et angelis eius', unus et idem pater manifestissime ostenditur, 'faciens pacem et condens mala', praeparans utrisque quae sunt apta, quemadmodum et unus iudex utrosque in aptum mittens locum."

Ad Haer. V 27:1, 4-31 and V 27:2, 32-56 describe the judgement exacted by the Almighty in a similar vein, that is, in terms of the joint exercising of wrath and mercy.

It is not that Irenaeus was more inclined to cite Biblical verses than Tertullian. In the course of his works, Tertullian cited many Biblical verses which are orientated towards judgement and chastisement - such as Deut. 32:39, Mt. 10:28, 13:30, 25:30, 25:32, 25:41, Lk. 12:4-5, Rev. 20:10 and 21:8.263 It is not even that Irenaeus adhered to a different estatological vision to Tertullian; he too saw in the Almighty an implacable enemy of evil.

The fundamental difference between Tertullian’s vision of the Almighty as Judge and that of Irenaeus is twofold. Firstly, Tertullian positively exulted in the retribution which God will exact upon sinners.264 Irenaeus, by contrast, simply recorded the fact that the Almighty will chastise those who fail to heed His call.265 Secondly, Tertullian often failed to counterbalance his descriptions of divine judgement and chastisement with references to the eternal rewards which the Almighty will grant to the
elect.266 Irenaeus’ concern to remind his readers that the Almighty is a God of salvation was commensurate with his concern to remind them that He is a God of retribution.267

As for Scorp. 6:11, 19-23, 7:1, 24-7:2, 7 and 7:7, 7-11 (with their picture of a tyrannical, murderous God) and Spect. 30:3, 8-30:5, 26 (with its exultation in the torments of the damned) they have no parallel in the works of Irenaeus. Irenaeus’ God may have been the God of the Old Testament and the God of the martyrs268 but He was never depicted in such brutal terms.

It is true that the need to counter the Gnostic concept of a purely good god was a factor encouraging Tertullian to favour a severe, judgemental vision of the Father. However, Gnosticism can only partially explain the severity which marks some of his descriptions of the Almighty; Irenaeus whose Ad Haer. was also written to counter the Gnostic threat, sets forth a vision of deity which is appreciably less sombre.269

Moreover, contrary to what might have been expected had the severity of the Tertullianic God been inspired exclusively by the need to counter the Gnostic threat, Tertullian’s descriptions of an authoritarian, forbidding Deity are not confined to his anti-Gnostic works.270 Thus, Pud. 2:3, 9-2:5, 20, a Montanist work designed to counter the Catholic Church’s "loving" response to repentant fornicators, depicts God as a Being who hardens His heart to sinners.
It is also true that Tertullian’s conversion to Montanism encouraged him to favour a stern view of God and His demands upon men. Discussing the fact that the Paraclete’s teachings appear burdensome, Monog. 2:4, 21-31 asserts that it is entirely appropriate for God to impose such burdens:

"Paracletus autem multa habens edocere quae in illum distulit dominus, secundum praefinitionem, ipsum primo Christum contestabitur qualem credimus, cum toto ordine dei creatoris, et ipsum glorificabit, et de ipso commemorabit, et sic de principali regula agnitus illa multa quae sunt disciplinarum reuelabit, fidem dicente pro eis integrate praedicationis, licet nouis, quia nunc reuelantur, licet onerosis, quia nec nunc sustinentur, non alterius tamen Christi quam qui habere se dixit et alia multa quae a paracleto edocerentur, non minus istis onerosa quam illis a quibus noncum tunc sustinebantur."

However, as was the case with the Gnostic threat, his conversion to Montanism only provides a partial explanation for Tertullian’s rigorous concept of God. Although Fug. (with its stark assertion that the Christian owes God his blood) dates from his Montanist period, Scorp. which contains some of his most formidable descriptions of the Almighty and His demands was written before his adhesion to Montanism. Even the menacing vision of the God delineated by Marc. may not necessarily have been Montanist inspired; contrary to Marc. I 29:1, 19-29:9, 30, there is nothing in these descriptions to prove that Tertullian had made major alterations to the said chapters under the influence of Montanism.

Furthermore, the recognition that Tertullian’s concept of God was influenced by his conversion to Montanism does not
explain why he was attracted to Montanism in the first place.275

The answer would seem to be clear. The distinctively formidable, sombre and even menacing character of the Tertullianic God had its origin in a factor which did not operate outwith the North African environment. That factor was the tradition regarding the sombre, inclement deities Ba’al-Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelestis.

In this conclusion I am supported by both Frend and Stockmeier. Frend asserts that North African theology of the patristic period was fundamentally a religion of fear:

"Their religion seems to have been concentrated on the prospect of Judgement hereafter, and on the consequent necessity of propitiating the wrath of God. It was a religion of fear and dread, not of love."276

What is more, he unhesitatingly locates the source of that fear in the indirect influence of the Saturn cult:

"One does not have to look far in the works of the African Fathers for descriptions of the hereafter which would justify an attitude of mind hardly different from that produced by the worship of Saturn ... The God of the North African Church writers was conceived as a Being capable of the worst human passions, of implacable jealousy, rage and desire for revenge. Milder views were branded as heresy."277

Stockmeier goes still further:

"Tertullian argumentiert so in der Begründung des Martyriums mit einer Vorstellung von Gott, die mehr von den lokalen Traditionen des Saturnkultes geprägt ist als vom biblischen Richtmass."278
Ba‘al-Hammon/Saturn was, by repute, a stern, even a harsh god - a god who was noted for his violent rage and his cruel tyranny over humanity. According to G.C. Picard:

"Le terme de ‘Dominus’ désigna parfois à lui seul le dieu qu’on appelait aussi ‘Senex’, le vieillard, comme le font volontiers les auteurs chrétiens. Ces titres insistent sur le caractère sombre et tyrannique du terrible seigneur de l’Afrique. Sa dureté, non moins que sa richesse, qui lui permettait de régir la fécondité de la terre, le rapprochaient également du dieu des morts et du monde souterrain, Pluton, avec qui il avait en commun l’épithète de ‘Frugifer’."

Frend is well-justified in designating him a "terrible being":

"It can be no accident that Saturn is always depicted as aged and morose. He was in fact a jealous, implacable and terrible being."

Tanit/Caelestis had the reputation for being a forbidding goddess too. Above all, a goddess of fertility - a "mother" goddess - the price which she exacted for that fertility (in the centuries before the Roman conquest) had been the blood of infants. Discussing the motifs associated with the sign of Tanit on Punic stelae, Brown observes:

"The anthropomorphized figure holds objects such as a Caduceus which I interpret as a divine attribute copied from Hermes’ staff, on stelae from Cirta (figure 52:d; Berthier and Charlier 1952-1955: plates IVA, VIA). It also carries vegetation: a branch or a stalk of wheat (figure 53:b) and a leaf (Berthier and Charlier 1952-1955: XXXVB). Tanit is also associated with wheat on a few Carthaginian stelae (figure 18:227), suggesting a possible connection between the motif and the fourth-century importation of the cult of Demeter and Kore into Carthage. Kore was represented in Magna Graecian iconography holding stalks of wheat (pinax from Iocri: Moscati 1973: 57, left). It is not difficult to imagine a conceptual link between Demeter’s loss of her
child and a Carthaginian parent’s loss of his child through child sacrifice, although literary or archaeological substantiation does not exist.”284

Indeed,

"at Carthage in the fourth century B.C. Tanit is mentioned alone or in the first place (before Ba‘al-Hammon) in the sacrificial dedications."285

The fact that Tertullian did not incorporate many of the distinctive titles and symbols of either Ba‘al-Hammon/Saturn or Tanit/Caelestis in his descriptions of God should not be allowed to mislead. Titles, such as "genitor" and "frugifer286 and symbols, such as, sun, moon, stars, bulls, rams, doves, ears of corn, pomegranates, pine cones and honey-combs,287 were too closely associated with paganism. Indeed, symbols are irrelevant when describing a God who prohibits any representation of Himself.288 The Tertullianic God may have been Lord of the Heavens and Lord of the harvest but unlike his pagan predecessors, Tertullian never confused the Creator and His creation.289

Thus, when taken alongside his vision of a formidable, even menacing God, his unequivocal assertion that his God "covets" men’s blood and his analogies between martyrdom and human sacrifice indicate that the martyr’s God was indeed the heir of Ba‘al-Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelestis.

Incorporated in his theology of martyrdom, Tertullian’s inability to divest himself of the memory of the demands of Ba‘al-Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelestis had several consequences. It underlined the fact that God has the right
to demand the martyr’s death; martyrdom is not simply a meritorious deed, it is an obligation. It also underlined the fact that the martyr’s death is not simply a nauseating spectacle, it is an oblation to God - an oblation whereby his very life is given to his Maker. In short, martyrdom is a highly cultic act. It is an act which not merely replaces the cultic ceremonies of the old aeon; it surpasses them.

To sum up, Tertullian’s exposition of martyrdom as the ultimate sacrifice offered by the ordinary human being to his God is both fascinating and complex. An overtly cultic phenomenon, his exposition of martyrdom bore the stamp not merely of the Biblical teaching on sacrifice but also of the Romano-Punic religious tradition, with the weight, at crucial moments, upon the latter. A thank-offering, an expiatory sacrifice and an offering to ward off evil, the death of the martyr possesses many different shades of meaning. There was, however, one feature which characterised all Tertullian’s accounts of martyrdom as sacrifice. By offering his blood to the Almighty, the martyr offers Him his very being - his very life. The commitment of the true martyr is never half-hearted; martyrdom demands total self-denial.

Tertullian’s sacrificial understanding of martyrdom is an extremely harsh ethic. So harsh is it, indeed, that there are moments when it appears to lose sight of the God of love - the God revealed in the Person of Christ - and to become little more than a Christianised paganism.
As was the case with martyrdom as combat with the forces of evil, it is an ethic which must have been disheartening, even terrifying to the spiritually weak. None but the spiritually strong could have hoped to meet its demands without quailing. If martyrdom as the ultimate offering to the Almighty represented the ideal, apostatisation in the wake of pressure by the pagan authorities must, in a not insignificant number of cases, have constituted the reality.
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CHAPTER 6

DEATH AS THE GATEWAY TO THE HEREAFTER
It is highly appropriate that this study of Tertullian’s understanding of death should culminate in an examination of his eschatology. He believed that each member of the human race is ultimately destined to experience either everlasting bliss or never-ending woe; the "last things" are the end to which human life is tending.

When faced with the apparently wanton destruction which death entails, our Lord’s promise of a new life after death offers the ordinary believer hope. When faced with the trials and temptations of earthly existence, the threat of punishment in the next world and the hope of reward encourages him to remain faithful to his calling.

Discussing Tertullian’s thought, J. Pelikan declares:

"Almost without exception, he applies the concept ‘hope’ to the eschatological realm ... In keeping with this approach, one of Tertullian’s favourite expressions seems to have been ‘spes resurrectionis’, for he uses it often. Similar phrases are ‘spes aeterna’, ‘spes aduentus domini’, ‘spes nostra’, ‘spes per exspectationem’, ‘spes in regno’. From these, as well as from the lack of statements about a hope this side of the ‘parousia’, it would appear that Tertullian looked to the ‘parousia’, and perhaps only to it, as the source of his hope for the future."

The motivation of the martyr is similar. The temporary delights of Paradise and the everlasting joys of the celestial Kingdom are the goal towards which he consciously strives.

Three themes lie at the heart of Tertullian’s eschatology. They are the resurrection of the flesh, the final judgement
of mankind and the eternal chastisement of the damned in Gehenna. Therefore, justice demands that I address them first.

6.1 Death: the prelude to corporeal resurrection.

According to Tertullian, the resurrection of the flesh is an indispensable element in Christian belief. It is not simply that the Lord of the Gospel rose from the dead—thereby inaugurating the Gospel. The Christian’s salvation revolves around his own resurrection; indeed, it is his faith in his ultimate resurrection which distinguishes him from his pagan neighbours:

"Fiducia Christianorum resurrectio mortuorum. Illam credentes sumus; hoc credere veritas cogit; veritatem deus aperit. Sed vulgus inridet, existimans nihil superesse post mortem." (Resurr. 1:1, 2-5).

The crucial role accorded to the resurrection of the flesh, in the theology of Tertullian, is confirmed by P.P. Santidrian:

"Es preciso observar que el tema de la resurrección de la carne es una cuestión altamente preocupante para Tertuliano. Junto con la Encarnación del Verbo frente al docetismo y con la identidad del Dios creador y el Dios del Nuevo Testamento contra Marción, la resurrección de la carne ocupa el centro de su temario dogmático ... La idea de la resurrección recorre toda la obra de Tertuliano. En toda ella hay una visión de carácter escatológico. La mente de nuestro autor se halla proyectada hacia el fin del mundo. Su obra toda expresa esta tendencia hacia el evento final ... Ese día será espectacular, dice él mismo. Y se queda extasiado en la contemplación de tal espectáculo. Y en medio de la contemplación de este último día pone la certeza de la resurrección de la carne."
6.1.1 Resurrection and final judgement

The resurrection of the flesh is the work of Almighty God.\textsuperscript{10} There is no power within the flesh which itself renders resurrection possible. Interpreting God's restoration of the leprous hand of Moses, Resurr. 28:1, 3-28:2, 9 observes:

"Cum Moyses manum in sinum condit et emortuam profert et rursus insinuat et uiuidam explicat, nonne hoc de toto homine portendit? Síquidem trina uirtus dei per illa trina signa denotabatur cum suo ordine, prímo diabolum serpentem quamquam formidabilem subactura homini, dehinc carnem de sinu mortis retractura, atque ita omnem sanguinem executura iudicio."

Indeed, as Braun confirms, Tertullian went so far as to coin neologisms such as, "resurrector", "resuscitator", "restitutor" and "suscitator"\textsuperscript{11}, in his bid to describe God's critical role in the resurrection of the flesh:

"Son goût pour le suffixe '-tor', son désir de développer cette terminologie en exprimant par un nom une fonction divine intimement liée au plan du salut, l'ont amené enfin à divers essais néologiques: 'resurrector' en est un, que notre écrivain a abandonné aussitôt pour une formation plus rationnellement construite et qui devait prendre racine après lui, 'resuscitator'."\textsuperscript{12}

Thus, according to Resurr. 12:8, 29-34, God's role as "resuscitator" and "restitutor" is proclaimed both by prophecy and by nature -

"praemisit tibi naturam magistrum, summissurus et prophetiam, quo facilius credas prophetiae discipulus ante naturae, quo statim admittas, cum audieris quod ubique iam uideris, nec dubites deum carnis etiam resuscitatorem, quem omnium noueris restitutorem."
The metaphor of the "seed" - a metaphor for which Tertullian displayed a marked predilection, in his description of the resurrection body\textsuperscript{13} could imply that the resurrection will be a joint venture between God and man. (By remaining intact in the grave, bones and teeth provide the "seed" for the resurrection body.)\textsuperscript{14} His concern, however, was to emphasise the continuity between the buried flesh and the resurrected flesh - not to imbue the flesh with an intrinsic power. The "seed" of the flesh may remain but without the decision and the power of God, it will never flower.

The ways of God, though mysterious, are not without purpose. The resurrection of the flesh facilitates the execution of a just judgement. "Man" is not simply a soul in isolation; he is soul and flesh conjoined.\textsuperscript{15} His actions cannot be ascribed to his soul alone; they are also the responsibility of his flesh.\textsuperscript{16} To use imagery beloved by Resurr. 16:6, 21-16:8, 34,\textsuperscript{17} if a "cup" which is associated with evil deeds is smashed and the "sword" which is similarly tarnished is cast aside, is it not just that the flesh (whose relationship to the soul is that of "servant" not that of "tool")\textsuperscript{18} should be punished when it "allies" itself with the soul in the commission of evil?\textsuperscript{19}

Resurr. 14:8, 25-30 and 14:10, 34-14:11, 45 saw the issue clearly. It is appropriate that man should be challenged regarding whether or not he has respected the commandments of his Creator. Such a judgement must be plenary, with both parties (the soul and the flesh) being produced in court.
If the flesh does not re-emerge from the grave, this will not be possible. To quote Tertullian:

"Igitur si deo et domino et auctori congruentissimum est iudicum in hominem destinare de hoc ipso, an dominum et auctorem suum agnos cere et obseruare curari an non, idque iudicum resurrectio expunget, haec erit tota causa, imo necessitas resurrectionis, congruentissima scilicet deo: destinatio iudicii ... Dicimus plenum primo perfectumque credendum iudicum dei, ut ultimum iam atque exinde perpetuum, ut sic quoque iustum, dum non in aliquo minus, ut sic quoque deo dignum, dum pro tanta eius patientia plenum atque perfectum. Itaque plenitudinem perfectionemque iudicii nonnisi de totius hominis praesentatione constare. Totum porro hominem ex utriusque substantiae congregatione parere, idcircoque in utraque exhibendum quem totum oporteat judicari, qui nisi totus utique non uixerit. Qualis ergo uixerit, talem judicatumiri, quia de eo, quod uixerit, habeat judicari. Uita est enim causa iudicii, per tot substantias dispungenda per quot et functa est." (Resurr. 14:8, 25-30 and 14:10, 34-14:11, 45).

Discussing Tertullian’s use of such words, as "repraesentatio", "exhibitio", "repraesentare” and "exhibere", in his theology of resurrection, Santidrian confirms the extent to which that theology is orientated towards the final judgement:

"Desde este punto de vista la idea de presentación de la carne ante el tribunal de Dios la indican los términos ‘repraesentare’ y ‘repraesentatio’. La resurrección significa la presentación, ante el tribunal de Dios, de todo lo que compone al hombre, es decir: alma y carne. Igualmente sirven a Tertuliano para expresar esta idea los términos ‘exhibere’ y ‘exhibito’, que ya tenían en el latín anterior un especial valor jurídico como ‘presentar ante el juez, ante el tribunal, para ser juzgado o testimoniar’."20

At first sight, Anim. 40:2, 4-40:4, 30 might seem to be at variance with the conclusion that Tertullian’s theory of the resurrection was essentially judgement-orientated. It
teaches that the flesh ministers to the soul as an "instrument" (not as a "friend"), and that consequently, in the eyes of God, it is less culpable than the soul. Nevertheless, closer examination of the extract in question reveals that he was concerned less to excuse the flesh than to prove the soul's responsibility for inaugurating sin. Anim. 40:2, 4-40:4, 30 should be read in the light of those passages where he taught that the soul will be punished in the interval between death and resurrection.

However, his vision of the resurrection of the flesh is not simply bound up with judgement; it is bound up with a particular vision of judgement. In the mind of Tertullian, judgement was frequently associated less with vindication than with chastisement.

According to Apol. 48:4, 33-39, God causes the flesh to be reintegrated because otherwise man will be incapable of receiving chastisement:

"Sed quia ratio restitutionis destinatio iudicii est, necessario idem ipse, qui fuerat, exhibebitur, ut boni seu contrarii meriti iudicium a deo referat. Ideoque repraesentabuntur et corpora, quia neque pati quicquam potest anima sola sine materia stabili, id est carne, et quod omnino de iudicio dei pati debent animae, non sine carne meruerunt, intra quam omnia egerunt."

Well might Resurr. 25:2, 8-9 speak of the "censorial" roll of the universal resurrection.

Whilst it is true that, for the elect, the day of reckoning will bring vindication - not condemnation - the juxtaposition of resurrection and judgement, in the theology
of Tertullian, ensures that the resurrection is a solemn, even awe-inspiring, event. The faithful must have looked to it with a mixture of yearning and dread.

6.1.2 Resurrection – a Biblical message

Tertullian found in nature many phenomena which appear to foreshadow the resurrection, as did so many theologians in the early Church. Each evening the setting sun "dies" seemingly shrouding the world in darkness, yet as it rises again each morning, it is "reborn", suffusing the earth with light. Likewise, the fruitfulness of summer gives way, in its turn, to the barrenness of winter – only to have its promise "reborn" with the buds of spring. Apol. 48:8, 55-48:9, 62 exploits such cycles of "death" and "rebirth" to the full:

"Lux cottidie interfecta resplendet et tenebrae pari uice decedendo succedunt, sidera defuncta uiuescunt, tempora ubi finiuntur, incipiunt, fructus consuommauntur et redeunt, certe semina non nisi corrupta et dissoluta fecundius surgunt: omnia pereundo seruantur, omnia de interitu reformantur. Tu, homo, tantum nomen, si intellegas te uel detitulo Pythiae discens, dominus omnium morientium et resurgentium, ad hoc morieris, ut pereas?"

In the words of Resurr. 12:7, 27-12:8, 34, God "wrote" the resurrection into His "works" before He set it down in "words"; prior to giving mankind "prophecy" as its teacher, He gave it "nature".

Nonetheless, in spite of their polemical value, such analogies never occupied anything other than a secondary
place in Tertullian’s theory of resurrection. They are confined to three chapters (Resurr. 12:1, 1-12:9, 36, 13:1, 1-13:4, 16 and Apol. 48:8, 55-48:9, 62) and do little to contribute to his understanding of either the purpose of the resurrection or the character of the resurrection body. Moreover, as an argument in favour of the resurrection, the analogies with nature may have confirmed the belief of waverers but they would have been unlikely to have brought belief to those who were sceptics.

Tertullian’s theory of the resurrection rests firmly upon Biblical foundations. Those foundations are twofold. As a result of texts such as, Gen. 9:5, Isa. 26:19-20, 66:14, Ezek. 37:1-14, Jon. 2:10 and Mal. 4:2, Tertullian was confident that the God of the Old Dispensation had foretold the reintegration of the flesh. (Indeed, he laid so much importance on Ezek. 37:1-14, with its account of the reanimation of the "dry bones" that he quoted it in its entirety in Resurr. 29:2, 5-29:15, 34).

That he took the words of such Old Testament texts literally can be demonstrated by Resurr. 31:5, 17-31:7, 26. There, he sought to prove that the reanimation of the "dry bones" which Ezekiel describes, points to the resurrection of the dead (not to the restoration of Israel):

"In summa: si proprie in Israelis statum resurgentium ossuum imago contenditur, cur etiam non Israeli tantummodo uerum et omnibus gentibus eadem spes adnuntiatur et recorporandarum et redanimandarum reliquiarum et de sepulchris exsuscitandorum mortuorum? De omnibus enim dictum est: 'uiuent mortui et exurgent de sepulchris: ros enim, qui a te, medella est ossibus eorum'. Item alibi: 'ueniet adorare omnis caro in conspectu
Valuable though Tertullian found the intimations of resurrection which appear in the Old Testament, however, he drew his principal inspiration from the New Testament.

Mt. 22:23-33, Mk. 12:18-27, Lk. 14:12-14, 20:27-38, Jn. 5:28-29, 11:38-44 and Rev. 20:4-6 — these texts are all quoted in his works. From Mt. 22:30, Mk. 12:25 and Lk. 20:35-36, he took the idea that the glorified dead, the "sons of the resurrection", will be "like angels" and from Rev. 20:4-6, he took the distinction between the general resurrection and the resurrection of the just.

I would go further. Tertullian did not simply draw the bulk of his teaching on the resurrection from the New Testament; he drew the vast majority of it from the Pauline Epistles. From I Cor. 15:12-23, he learnt that the resurrection of the Christian cannot be divorced from that of his Saviour — to deny the one is to deny the other. I Cor. 15:50-56 taught him that "flesh" and "blood" must take on "immortality" and "incorr uptibility" if it is to enter the Kingdom; by such a glorification of the resurrected flesh, "Death" will indeed be "swallowed up in victory". Finally, I Cor. 15:35-46 provided him with the metaphor of the "seed" and 2 Cor. 5:1-5 with those of the "overgarment" and the "dwelling-place".

Marc. V. 10:14, 11-10:15, 24 demonstrates clearly the depth of his dependence on Pauline teaching:
"Ceterum aliud resurrectio aliud regnum. Primo enim resurrectio, dehinc regnum. Resurgere itaque dicimus carmem, sed mutatam consequi regnum. 'Resurgent enim mortui incorrupti' - illi scilicet, qui fuerant corrupti dilapsis corporibus in interitum - 'et nos mutabimur in atomo, in oculi momentaneo motu; oportet enim corruptium hoc' - tenens utique carmem suam dicebat apostolus - 'induere incorruptelam et mortale hoc inmortalitatem' - ut scilicet habilis substantia efficieretur regno dei; erimus enim sicut angeli: haec erit demutatio carnis, sed resuscitatae. Aut si nulla erit, quomodo induet incorruptelam et inmortalitatem? Aliud igitur facta per demutationem tunc consequetur dei regnum, iam non caro nec sanguis, sed quod illi corpus deus dederit".

Indeed, so deeply indebted was he that, to all intents and purposes, Resurr. 49:1, 1-55:12, 50 is a commentary on I Cor. 15:12-56.

Of course, there were occasions when Tertullian failed to capitalise on New Testament. A notable example was his failure to cite Jn. 11:25. Thus, although he recognised that the resurrection of man depends upon that of his Lord, he did not exploit the fact that Christ promised that He is "the resurrection and the life". (Given the nature of Jn. 11:25, this omission is striking).

Nevertheless, given the profusion of his Biblical citations, such omissions do not seriously detract from the profoundly Biblical character of his resurrection theology.

Tertullian read the Old Testament texts which he quoted in favour of the resurrection of the dead in the light of the New Testament - inspired by its promises, he also went on from there to "read" nature in a similar light. For
Tertullian, resurrection was beyond doubt a Biblical message.

6.1.3 The characteristics of the resurrection body

When he is resurrected, each man will arise with the very same flesh in which he lived. His flesh will not simply be human flesh, it will, in truth, be the identical substance.

In an endeavour to establish that the resurrected flesh is identical with the buried flesh, Tertullian displayed a predilection for the language of "restoration". "Restitutio", "redintegratio", "restituere" and "reficere" are words which occupy an important place in his thought.

Even those words which describe resurrection in terms of "standing up" (such as, "surgere", "exsurgere" and "resurgere") and of being "raised up" (such as, "excitare", "suscitare" and "resuscitare") assume that the flesh which rises is the same flesh which was laid in the grave. The same is true of the vocabulary of "reanimation" and "revival", notably, "reanimatio", "redanimare", "reuiuiscere" and "reuiuificare".

If the assumption underlying the "restoration" of the flesh is that the flesh which is restored, is the same flesh which previously existed, the assumption underlying the use of such terms as "arising" and being "raised up" is that the flesh in question is the same flesh as that which "fell
Similarly, the flesh which receives the soul again must be the flesh which received it originally.

The key to Tertullian’s thinking lies in the prefix "re". 

Marc. V 9:4, 2-6 states:

"Surgere enim potest dici et quod omnino non cecidit, quod semper retro iacuit. Resurgere autem non est nisi eius, quod cecidit; iterum enim surgendo, quia cecidit, resurgere dicitur. 'Re' enim syllaba iterationi semper adhibetur."

Although the Greek equivalent found favour with the Biblical writers, Braun has discerned, in Tertullian’s works, a certain wariness regarding the verb "uiuificare". Employed thirty-two times in all, it was employed only once outwith direct Biblical citations. Braun concludes:

"Mais 'uiuificare’ et ses dérivés, étroitement liés aux expressions scripturaires, sont restés chez Tertullien porteurs d’une idée plus générale que celle de résurrection."

Tertullian’s disquiet at the lack of precision bedevilling the verb "uiuificare" is surely significant. Had he believed that the flesh which rises will not be identical to that which is laid in the grave, such disquiet would have been unnecessary.

Thus, as Braun recognises the need to preserve the inalienable link between buried flesh and the resurrected flesh was the principle which guided Tertullian’s choice of vocabulary:

"On peut dire que, par souci de précision et de netteté, il s’est attaché au couple ‘resurgere’ -
'resuscitare' dont le préfixe impliquait clairement l'idée d'un rappel à l'existence."49

Indeed, so concerned was he to uphold the aforesaid link that he sometimes employed vocabulary which had little precedent in the Bible:50

"On trouve aussi chez Tertullien, à propos de la Résurrection, des termes qui ne sont pas liés aussi nettement que les précédents au vocabulaire et aux énoncés bibliques: ce sont ‘restituere’ et ‘restitutio’. Nous avons vu plus haut que ces vocables pouvaient s’appliquer à l’œuvre de réparation et de rétablissement de l’ordre surnaturel accomplie par le Christ. La résurrection eschatologique, qui parachève ce salut en rétablissant l’être humain dans son intégrité, en reconstituant le composé personnel dissocié par la mort, conséquence du péché, méritera aussi d’être appelée ‘restitutio’."51

An examination of specific passages dealing with the resurrection confirms that Tertullian identified the resurrected flesh and the buried flesh. Discussing the reentry of the soul into the flesh, Apol. 48:2, 11-16 asserts that when something is "restored", "the thing becomes what it was formerly:"

"Si quaecumque ratio praeest animarum humanarum reciprocandarum in corpora, cur non in eandem substantiam redeant, cum hoc si restitui, id esse, quod fuerat?"

The message of Apol. 48:2, 11-16 should not be dismissed on the grounds that it contrasts the humanity of the resurrection body with Empedocles’ doctrine of metensomatosis. By emphasising that "Gaius himself will return from Gaius", Apol. 48:1, 7-1052 makes it clear that the restoration to which it alludes also includes the retention of individuality.
Resurr. 11:9, 30-11:10, 36 assumes that for the God who created the universe from nothing, it will be a simple task to reassimilate man from his scattered components; the "restoration" of the flesh will be a far more straightforward task than its "institution" was. Tertullian goes further. He assumes that the flesh which is reconstructed by God will be the flesh whose components "drained away" into the soil. In his own words:

"Siue enim ex nihilo deus molitus est cuncta, poterit et carnem in nihilum proiectam exprimere de nihilo; siue de materia modulatus est alia, poterit et carnem quocumque dehaustam euocare de alio. Et utique idoneus est reficere qui fecit, quanto plus est fecisse quam refecisset, initium dedisse quam reddidisse: ita restitutionem carnis faciilorem credas institutionem."

The link between the resurrected flesh and the buried flesh reappears in such extracts as Resurr. 18:5, 21-18:9, 43 and Marc. V. 9:3, 19-9:4, 10. Discussing the phrase "the resurrection of the dead", Tertullian comments that only that which has "fallen" can "rise again". It is the flesh which "falls" as a result of death; the soul remains intact. Indeed, the soul is incapable of "falling" - even in sleep, it remains active. Resurr. 18:5, 21-18:8, 39 is adamant:

"Cum audio resurrectionem homini inminere, quaeram necesse est, quid eius cadere sortitum sit, siquidem nihil resurgere expectabit nisi quod ante succiderit. Qui ignorat carnem cadere per mortem, potest eam nec stantem nosse per uitam. Sententiam dei natura pronuntiat: 'terra es et in terram ibis', et qui non audit, uidet: nulla mors non ruina membrorum est. Hanc corporis sortem dominus quoque expressit, cum ipse substantia
indutus, "diruite", inquit, 'templum istud, et ego illud triduo resuscitabo.' Ostendit enim, cuius sit dirui, cuius elidi, cuius iacere, cuius et releuari et resuscitari, - quamquam et animam circumferet trepidantem usque ad mortem, sed non cadentem per mortem, - quia et scriptura, 'de corpore', inquit, 'suo dixerat'. Atque adeo caro est, quae morte subruitur, ut exinde a cadendo cadauer enuntietur; anima porro nec vocabulo cadit, quia nec habitu ruit, atquin ipsa est, quae ruinam corpori infert, cum efflata est, sicut ipsa est, quae illud de terra suscitautit, cum inflata est. Non potest cadere quae suscitautit ingressa; non potest ruere quae elidit egressa."

Examining Tertullian's application of the verbs "surgere", "exsurgere" and "resurgere", Santidrian confirms that the equation of dying with "falling" played a crucial role in Tertullian's resurrection theology.53

The message of Resurr. 27:4, 12-27:5, 23 is not dissimilar. Tertullian compares the resurrected flesh with salted meat which has been preserved in a larder. Salt is used to keep meat fresh, so that it may be reproduced at the appropriate moment; burial spices are used to conserve the flesh so that it may be reproduced at the resurrection. He declares:

"Adeo nobis quoque suppetit allegorice defensio corporalis resurrectionis. Nam et cum legimus: 'populus meus, introite in cellas promas quantulum, donec ira mea praetereat', sepulchra erant cellae promae, in quibus paulisper requiescere habebunt qui in finibus saeculi sub ultima ira per antichristi uim excesserint. Aut cur cellarum promarum potius vocabulo usus est, et non aliquis loci receptorii, nisi quia in cellis promis caro salita et usui reposita seruat, depromenda illinc suo tempore? Proinde enim et corpora medicata condimentis sepulturae mausoleis et monumentis sequestrantur, processura inde cum iussit dominus."

The metaphor of salted meat suffers from a logical flaw. Whereas salted meat which is brought forth from a larder has
been successfully conserved, the resurrected flesh (despite the application of burial spices) has not been so conserved; it requires to be reintegrated. Nonetheless, if Tertullian had not considered that the flesh which rises from the grave will be identical to the flesh which is laid there, his allusions to the preservative properties of salt and to contemporary burial practices would have been inappropriate.

Indeed, so literal was his understanding of the resurrection that, in Resurr. 32:1, 1-32:3, 16, he asserts that those who are unfortunate enough to have their corpses consumed by vultures, fish or wild beasts will have their corporeal constituents recovered from these creatures by God Himself. This is far more than an unthinking repetition of I Enoch 61:5. It is proof positive that, in the eyes of Tertullian, the newly resurrected body will be a reintegration of the very components which made up the original body. (The question of how such components can retain their individuality after they enter the food chain is not one which Tertullian considered - nor could he have been expected to do so).

The unity of the resurrected flesh and the buried flesh can also be inferred from Resurr. 42:8, 35-41, where he notes that whilst the vast majority of the flesh disintegrates in the grave, bones and teeth survive - "seeds" of that body which will re-emerge at the resurrection. I quote:

"Sed et proxime in ista ciuitate cum odei fundamenta tot ueterum sepulturarum sacrilega conlocarentur, quingentorum fere annorum ossa
adhuc succida et capillos olentes populus exhorruit. Constat non tantum ossa durare uerum et dentes incorruptos perennare, quae ut semina retinentur fruticaturi corporis in resurrectione."

In theory, the metaphor of the "seed" simply points to the continuity of species which prevails between the seed which is planted and the plant which grows.\(^5\)\(^6\) In practice, however, Resurr. 42:6, 27-42:13, 59 makes it clear that the resurrected flesh is the reintegration of the earthly flesh from which it "grows."

Finally, Tertullian’s contention that the resurrection body will retain all its members in the hereafter\(^5\)\(^7\) (even those members which will be quiescent in eternity)\(^5\)\(^8\) indicates that he believed that the resurrection body and that in which man lived out his earthly life will be one and the same. If the risen flesh will be a new creation, why should the Almighty endow it with reproductive organs and digestive tract? If, on the contrary, man’s own flesh will have been reintegrated, his members will symbolise the retention of his individuality.

The resurrection is, in short, an integral part of the divine plan to overcome sin and to restore man to God - not an idealised new "man" but man as God intended him to be. Santidrian declares:

"Dios crea al hombre con alma y cuerpo que forman una unidad. La muerte, que es un efecto del pecado, arruina la obra de Dios. A consecuencia de esto perece la carne, sobre la cual Dios ejercitará su poder en la resurrección, volviéndola a colocar en su condición terrena con la diferencia de que no estará sometida a las humillaciones, dolores y debilidades que ahora padece. Pero esta resurrección no es sino el
culmen de la restauración ya comenzada en Cristo y por Cristo. El hombre creado por Dios se realiza en la gracia divina y el conjunto de los dones también divinos. Pecando, este hombre se aleja de su creador. Cristo viene a redimirlo y lo devuelve, lo restituye a Dios. De esta suerte se hace realidad una primera parte del plan divino que sólo será completado en los acontecimientos escatológicos, entre los cuales destaca, como remate, la salvación del cuerpo, es decir, la resurrección de la carne. En ella será restituida al hombre, y por él a Dios, la carne que se había perdido por el pecado, que había sido arrebatada por la muerte.  

Tertullian’s emphasis on the Almighty’s power to call forth each man’s corporeal components from wheresoever they had "drained away" is not without its difficulties. How can such a theory stand alongside his condemnation of cremation? How can such a theory be acceptable when one considers those who die diseased and disabled? Finally, if resurrection means the reintegration of the "old" creation, how can it be reconciled with the promise of a new creation – a new Heaven and a new earth?

In common with so many Christians of his era, Tertullian vehemently condemned cremation. Highlighting the extent to which the life of the Roman soldier was incompatible with a sincere profession of Christianity, Cor. 11:3, 23-24 pours scorn on the suggestion that the Christian could be cremated. Since the true Christian will not have to endure the eternal fire, it is inappropriate for his flesh to endure an earthly one -

"et cremabitur ex disciplina castrensi Christianus, cui cremare non licuit, cui Christus merita ignis indulsit?"
Its intimate association with contemporary paganism may have exacerbated the repugnance which Tertullian felt for cremation. Nonetheless, although he never stated so openly, it seems likely that his repugnance (like that of the early Church in general) was the result of his belief in the resurrection of the dead. (One of his most resounding condemnations of cremation appears in Resurr. 1:3, 8-11—that is, in a work about resurrection). If man’s flesh will arise from the grave, is it not an insult to the God upon whom his resurrection depends for that gift to destroy that flesh by cremating it?

The claim that cremation is incompatible with belief in the resurrection seems, however, to involve a dangerous, even heretical, implication. That is the implication that the Almighty cannot restore bodies which have been cremated.

Such an implication is ridiculous, for it is tantamount to saying that God’s powers are limited. What is more, its acceptance would mean that the Almighty will be compelled to exclude some of the most worthy Christians from participation in the resurrection; many martyrs were either burnt to death or had their corpses cremated by the pagan authorities.

In truth, the difficulty is probably more apparent than real. Tertullian never wavered in his conviction that God is omnipotent; indeed, his very concept of Deity required that God be omnipotent. Therefore, had he been challenged, it seems likely that he would have replied as
follows. Although the Almighty possesses the power to reintegrate human flesh which had been destroyed by flames, the Christian should not take his God for granted by assuming that He will perform such an extraordinary act of reintegration, unless it is absolutely necessary. Is the Tertullianic God not the God who will recover men’s corporeal constituents from the gullets of beasts?

As for the question of whether or not the identification of the buried flesh with the risen flesh means that the latter will retain the defects with which the individual died, Tertullian’s answer was a resounding negative. The flesh will arise as God intended it to be - not as misfortune (whether in life or in the womb) made it.

If "general death" is rescinded by resurrection, how much more should resurrection rescind the "partial death" of disability? The flesh’s restoration will be a gift to "nature", not to "injury". To quote Resurr. 57;2, 9-57:5, 19:

"Si enim caro de dissolutione reparabitur, multo magis de uexatione reuocabitur. Minoribus maiora praescribunt. Cuiuscumque membra detruncatio vel obtunso nonne mors membra est? Si uniuersalis mors resurrectione rescinditur, quid portionalis? Si demutamur in gloriam, quanto magis in incolomitate? Uitiatio corporum accidens res est, integritas propria est. In hac nasciur: etiam si in utero uitiemur, iam hominis est passio; prius est genus quam casus. Quomodo uita confertur a deo, ita et refertur; quales eam accipimus, tales et recipimus. Naturae, non iniuriae reddimur; quod nascimur, non quod laedimur, reuuiuescimus."
His equation of resurrection with restoration to health is confirmed by Resurr. 57:6, 19-27. Since nothing is more "pallid", "weak" and "stiff" than a corpse, it is one and the same things for a dead man to be "raised" and for him to be "made entire".68

There is a flaw in Tertullian's logic. If the resurrected flesh is indeed composed of the identical constituents to those of which it was composed in this life, the act whereby God rescinds disability ought to take place not at the moment of resurrection but at the moment of glorification. (Resurr. 57:3, 13-14 with its parallel between being "changed into glory" and "being changed into health" would fit in well with such timing). Nonetheless, perhaps because such a delay would have been incompatible with his belief in millennial bliss,69 Tertullian adhered to the position that each man rises from the grave physically perfect.

The issue of how such a reintegration of the "old" creation accords with belief in a new Heaven and a new earth is one which Tertullian made no effort to address. Had he done so, he may well have focussed upon the underlying reason for God's institution of such a new creation.

The present creation has been sullied by the sins of mankind - sin has even abrogated the harmony which was supposed to prevail within nature.70 God's creation of a new Heaven and a new earth is an act whereby primeval purity is restored. The restitution of man's original corporeal components is an act restoring primeval purity too.

459
The statement that the resurrection body will be composed of the individual’s own earthly flesh is only one aspect of a twofold truth. At some point after the resurrection, the risen dead and those who were still alive at the Parousia will be "changed". The words used by Tertullian to describe this transformation include "inmortalitas", "incorruptibilitas", "incorruptela", "mutatio", "demutatio", "indumentum", "superindumentum", "angelificatus", "mutare", "demutare", "induere" and "superinduere". Clothed with "immortality" and "incorruptibility", the elect will become "like angels". Indeed, without such a transformation, flesh and blood will be incapable of inheriting the Kingdom of God.

Discussing this transformation, Santidrian correctly observes that according to Tertullian, the flesh will cease to be subject to death and decay:

"Lo que se expresa a través de todos estos términos es que el hombre, en la resurrección, sufre una transformación que lo convierte en inmortal en cuanto a la carne. En cuanto al alma ya lo era. Y lo convierte también de corruptible en incorruptible. En esta mutación o transformación la carne no deja de ser carne, sino que es la misma pero salvada; permanece la misma pero atravesada por la gracia, empapada de vida. Es decir, la carne sigue siendo la misma, pero recibe algo que no tenía. En esa transformación se dará a la carne la ‘inmortalitas’, que la penetrará y la hará inmortal. Igualmente recibirá la carne la ‘incorruptela’ o ‘incorruptibilitas’, que no será algo idéntico a la ‘inmortalitas’. Si ésta, la ‘inmortalitas’, convierte la carne en inmortal, no expuesta al ‘mori’, la ‘incorruptela’ o ‘incorruptibilitas’ la hace incorruptible, no expuesta al ‘pati’. Este hacerse la carne ‘impassibilis’, no expuesta al ‘pati’ no quiere decir que en adelante no sea capaz de ‘sentir’ el
The exact timing of this "change" is difficult to determine. Basing himself upon I Cor. 15:52, Tertullian sometimes implies that it will follow hard upon the resurrection. Thus, Marc. V. 10:14, 13-21 declares:

"'Resurgent enim mortui incorrupti' - illi scilicet, qui fuerant corrupti dilapsis corporibus in interitum - 'et nos mutabimur in atomo, in oculi momentaneo motu; oportet enim corruptium hoc' - tenens utique carnem suam dicebat apostolus - 'induere incorruptelam et mortale hoc inmortalitatem' - ut scilicet habilis substantia efficiatur regno dei; erimus enim sicut angeli -: haec erit demutatio carnis, sed resuscitatae."

Nevertheless, there are good reasons for supposing that the said "change" does not supervene until after the final judgement - that is, until just before the elect’s accession to the Kingdom. If it took place before the final judgement, the "change" would constitute a pre-judgement. Because it is one of the privileges of the elect (from which the damned are excluded), those to whom it is granted will be vindicated. Indeed, in Marc. III 24:6, 7-12, Tertullian explicitly asserts that "angelic substance", the "overgarment of incorruptibility", will not be granted until after the millennium:

"Post cuius mille annos, intra quam aetatem concluditur sanctorum resurrectio pro meritis maturius uel tardius resurgentium, tunc, et mundi destructione et iudicii conflagratione commissa, demutati in atomo in angelicam substantiam, scilicet per illud incorruptelae superindumentum, transferemur in caeleste regnum."

(G.W. Martin is wrong to distinguish between the conferring of immortality and the conferring of incorruptibility -
placing the former at the onset of the millennium and the latter at the close of the final judgement. Tertullian almost always refers to them in the same breath. Moreover, the divinely granted power to remain alive beyond the normal span should not be confused with immortality).

In an effort to describe the glorification of the risen flesh, Tertullian employs three distinct metaphors.

His favourite metaphor is that of the heavenly "garment" or "overgarment"; the elect will have their flesh "clothed" with immortality and incorruptibility. To be found in such extracts as Resurr. 41:5, 19-23, 56:3, 8-56:4, 14 and 62:2, 6-62:3, 15, a particularly fine expression of this theme is to be found in Marc. V. 12:1, 3-12:3, 22. I quote:

"'Etenim qui sumus in isto tabernaculo corporis ingemimus, quod grauemur nolentes exui, sed superindui'. Hic enim expressit (Paul) quod in prima epistola strinxit: 'et mortui resurgent incorrupti', qui iam obierunt, 'et nos mutabimur', qui in carne fuerint reprehensi a deo hic. Et illi enim resurgent incorrupti, recepto scilicet corpore et quidem integro, ut ex hoc sint incorrupti, et hi propter temporis ultimum iam momentum et propter merita uexationum antichristi compendium mortis, sed mutati, consequentur, superinduti magis quod de caelo est quam exuti corpus. Ita si hi super corpus induent caeleste illud, utique et mortui recipient corpus, super quod et ipsi induant incorruptelam de caelo, quia et de illis ait: 'necesse est corruptuim istud induere incorruptelam et mortale istud inmortalitatem.' Illi induunt, cum receperint corpus, isti superinduunt, quia non amiserint corpus, et ideo non temere dixit: 'nolentes exui corpore, sed superindui,' id est nolentes mortem experiri, sed uita praeveni, uti 'deuoretur mortale hoc a uita', dum eripitur morti per superindumentum demutationis."
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The metaphor of the heavenly "garment" has the virtue of emphasising the continuity between the resurrected flesh and the glorified flesh. When someone is enveloped in an article of clothing, his body remains unaltered beneath it. By donning different apparel, a man superficially alters the outward appearance of his body; he does not alter its essential characteristics. When applied to the glorified body, the metaphor of the heavenly "garment" implies that glorification does not detract from the essential humanity and individuality of the resurrected flesh.

The implications of the metaphor of the heavenly "overgarment" are analogous. An outer-garment is worn over another article of clothing; it is worn without prejudice to any clothing which lies beneath. Thus, as J. E. McWilliam-Dewart has seen, the metaphor of the heavenly "overgarment" implies that the humanity of the resurrected flesh is not impaired by glorification:

"The image is one of a glorious and all-enveloping outer robe, but one which precisely is an outer robe and requires an inner garment: 'to be clothed upon can evidently only apply to one who is already dressed'."81

The metaphor of the heavenly "overgarment" also has the virtue of reconciling the glorification of the risen flesh with those passages where Tertullian styled the earthly flesh a "garment".82 The angelic "mantle" will be placed over the "undergarment" of earthly flesh.

The weakness of both the metaphor of the heavenly "garment" and that of the heavenly "overgarment" is that they fail to
emphasise that immortality and incorruptibility are fundamental characteristics of the glorified body — not merely appendages. Whilst Tertullian never suggested that immortality and incorruptibility would ever be withdrawn from the glorified body, the clothing metaphor does not, in theory, exclude the possibility. An article of clothing may be removed at any time.

The second metaphor employed by Tertullian is that of the "seed". The flesh is "sown" in the grave but like the grain of wheat which is sown in the soil and emerges complete with stalk, ear, beard and husk, it will rise again in a more developed form. An "additional body" will be "built up" over the earthly body — an additional body given by God. Resurr. 52:5, 14-52:10, 40 asserts:

"Non enim et suggerit, quomodo 'non quod futurum est corpus' seminetur, dicens: 'sed nudum granum, si forte, frumenti uel alicuius eiusmodi: deus autem dat illi corpus prout uult', certe ei grano, quod nudum seminari ait? Certe, inquis. Ergo saluum est cui dare habet deus corpus. Quomodo autem saluum est, si nusquam est, si non resurgit, si non id ipsum resurget? Si non resurget, saluum non est; si non est et saluum, accipere corpus a deo non potest. Sed enim saluum omni modo constat. Ad quid ergo dabit illi deus prout uult corpus, habenti utique proprium corpus illud nudum, nisi ut iam non nudum resurget? Ergo additicium erit corpus quod corpori superstruitur, nec exterminatur illud, cui superstruitur, sed augetur. Saluum est autem quod augetur. Seritur enim solummodo granum sine folliculi ueste, sine fundamento spicae, sine munimento aristae, sine superbia culmi. Exurgit autem copia feneratum, compagine aedificatum, ordine structum, cultu munitum et usquequaque uestitum. Haec sunt ei corpus a deo aliiud, in quod non abolitione sed ampliatione mutatur, et unicuique seminum suum corpus deputaudit non suum, id est non pristinum, ut tunc et illud suum sit, quod extrinsecus a deo adquirunt. Serui igitur exemplo et conserua speculum eius carni eandem credens fruticaturam, quae sit seminata, ipsam, etsi pleniorem, non aliam, etsi aliter reuertentem: accipiet enim et
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Indeed, in Resurr. 52:11, 40-52:15, 59 and Marc. V. 10:4, 10-17, he goes on to assert that because the merits of men differ, some of the elect will enjoy positions of particular "honour" and "privilege" in the Kingdom. (The key words are "gloria", "honor" and "praerogitiua"). I would go further. When set alongside his claim that the Almighty will give the risen flesh the "adornment" which its merits warrant, Tertullian's exposition of the themes of the flesh of "man", "birds", "fish" and "cattle" and the glory of "sun", "moon" and "stars" suggests that he believed that the comeliness of the resurrection body will depend upon the spiritual beauty of the individual concerned.

One of the most important metaphors in Tertullian's entire theology the metaphor of the "seed" when applied to resurrection theology has manifold and, at times, contradictory implications. A seed produces a plant of the same genus - as Resurr. 52:4, 10-12 acknowledges, if wheat has been planted, it is never barley which emerges from the soil. Thus, when applied to the resurrection, the metaphor of the "seed" underlines the continuity which prevails between the buried flesh and the resurrected flesh, the risen flesh and the glorified flesh. T.P. O'Malley declares:

"In the tradition of the apologists, and following Paul, Tertullian uses the seed figure to express the resurrection. Here again, the emphasis is on identity, continuity, development; but his inspiration is almost wholly biblical ... This biblically inspired axis of imagery is used in exactly the same line that the classically
inspired imagery of seed takes: identity in development.\textsuperscript{89}

The glorified flesh stands in a direct line from the earthly flesh and indeed inescapably depends on it. Just as there would be no plant without the appropriate seed, the glorified flesh would be deprived of its peculiar character if, as a result of glorification, the individuality of the earthly flesh were to be subsumed.

However, there is running alongside these connotations of continuity an entirely contrary series of implications - implications arising from Tertullian's theory of propagation. \textit{Resurr.} 12:4, 14-12:5, 22 teaches that as the young seedling develops and is nourished, the seed itself shrivels up and is destroyed - that is, for the seedling to grow, the seed itself must "perish" ("perire").\textsuperscript{90} \textit{Marc. V.} 10:5, 19-25 applies the same reasoning to the resurrection:


Tertullian was quite uncompromising in his use of the language of "destruction".\textsuperscript{91}

It is true that he confined his exploitation of the analogy between the destruction of the seed and the resurrection to the decomposition of the flesh in the grave.\textsuperscript{92} (\textit{Resurr.} 52:17, 66-68 goes so far as to cite the divine edict which is recorded in Gen. 3:19). It is also true that because of
its emphasis on the perishable nature of the flesh, I Cor. 15:42 implicitly calls for such a theory of propagation if its parallel between the seed and the buried flesh is to stand.

Nevertheless, this should not be allowed to obscure the fact that the Tertullianic metaphor of the "seed" has unambiguous connotations of discontinuity. Thus, whatever Tertullian's avowed intentions, the metaphor of the "seed" leaves open the possibility that glorification might subsume certain fundamental characteristics of human flesh.

Finally, the metaphor of the "seed" blurs the distinction between resurrection and glorification - the fully developed plant being the end product of a single process which began with the sowing of a seed. Marc. V. 10:5, 25-10:5, 6 is characteristic of Tertullian's approach:

"Proinde et si seritur corpus animale, resurget spiritale, etsi habet aliquod proprium corpus animale uel spiritus, ut possit uideri corpus animale animam significare et corpus spiritale spiritum non ideo animam dici in resurrectione spiritum futuram, sed corpus, quod cum anima nascendo et per animam uiuendo animale dici caput, futurum spiritale, dum per spiritum surgit in aeternitatem."

The third metaphor is that of the heavenly "dwelling-place" or "superstructure". Immortality and incorruptibility are a celestial "dwelling-place" which will be built upon the resurrected flesh. Resurr. 42:2, 6-14 states:

"Nam cum adicit (Paul): 'oportet et enim corruptiunm istud induere incorruptelam et mortale istud induere inmortalitatem', hoc erit illud domicilium de caelo, quod gementes in hac carne
superinduere desideramus, utique super carnem in qua deprehendemur, quia 'grauari nos' ait, 'qui simus in tabernaculo, quod nolimus exui sed potius superindui, uti deuoretur mortale a uita', scilicet dum demutatur superinduendo quod est de caelis."

As with the metaphor of the heavenly "mantle" (with which it was closely associated in his works), the metaphor of the celestial "dwelling-place" or "superstructure" is complicated by the fact that Tertullian also employed the image of the "dwelling-place" with reference to the earthly flesh. Taken literally, 2 Cor. 5:2-4 requires him to construct one building over another.

Nevertheless, the implications of the building metaphor are clear. There is continuity between the resurrected flesh and the glorified flesh. Since the superstructure would collapse without them, the most important part of any building is the foundations. Even if the superstructure is altered, the foundations remain intact. Applied to the glorified flesh, this means that it is the same flesh which lived, died and rose again; glorification rests upon the "foundations" of a retained humanity and a retained individuality.

Although the predominant connotations of the foregoing metaphors are those of continuity (rather than those of discontinuity) it is still necessary to ask the following question - does glorification leave the basic attributes of the resurrected flesh intact or does it entail their annihilation?
Tertullian frequently states that the mortal must be "swallowed up" by "life", that is, by the "heavenly overgarment" of immortality and incorruptibility. Thus, for a proper understanding of this transformation, a key word is "deuorare".

In Resurr. 54:1, 2-54:2, 11, Tertullian went to great lengths to prove that an object which is "swallowed up" is not necessarily destroyed. He reminded his readers that when applied to the act of overcoming anger or sorrow, the word "deuorare" means "to hide" or "to cover"; it does not mean "to annihilate". His argument proceeds as follows:

"Nam quia et illud apud apostolum positum est: 'uti deuoretur mortale a uita', caro scilicet, deuorationem quoque ad perditionem scilicet carnis adripiunt, quasi non et bilem et dolorum deuorare dicamur, id est abscondere et tegere et intra nosmetipsos continere. Denique cum et illud scriptum sit: 'oportet mortale hoc induere immortalitatem,' ostenditur, quomodo mortale deuoretur a uita, dum indutum immortalitate absconditur et tegitur et intus continetur, non dum absumitur et amittitur."

However, he did not apply the word "deuorare" consistently throughout his resurrection theology. Resurr. 54:4, 18-54:5, 23 states unequivocally that Death will be "swallowed up" so as to be annihilated:

"Ceterum mors merito in interitum deuoratur, quia et ipsa in hoc deuorat. 'Deuorauit', inquit, 'mors inualescendo', et ideo 'deuorata est in contentionem. Ubi est, mors, aculeus tuus? Ubi est, mors, contentio tua?""

Tertullian’s explanation of why mortal flesh and Death are "swallowed up" differently is that the former is capable of
assuming immortality, whilst the latter (by its very nature) is not capable of so doing. The weakness of this explanation is that, because it focusses upon the nature of Death and not upon the inherent implications of the word "deorare" there is a danger that the word itself will continue to be evocative of destruction.

In his use of "deorare", Tertullian was careful to avoid the suggestion that the glorification will destroy the earthly flesh. Nevertheless, there are many stages between an object retaining all its salient characteristics and its annihilation. The ambiguity surrounding Tertullian's use of the verb "deorare" (an ambiguity which has its origin in the Biblical text itself) suggests that even in his own eyes, the transformation effected by the acquisition of immortality and incorruptibility was a major one.

A similar ambiguity apparently marks his concept of "change". Nonetheless, it is with his concept of "change" that the key to his understanding of glorification lies.

In his resurrection theology, Tertullian emphasises that "change" does not involve the cessation of the state which existed previously. Alluding to the additional body which will be "built up" over the risen flesh, Resurr. 52:7, 24-27 argues that whatever is "increased" is not "abolished"; rather, it is "conserved". Resurr. 55:3, 8-55:6, 23 also distinguishes "change" from "destruction" ("perditio"). If something is "destroyed",

470
the object in question ceases to exist. If it is "changed", it continues to exist, albeit in a different form. Where the glorified flesh is not to remain the same flesh which arose from the graves, it would not simply have been "changed" - it would have been "destroyed". In Tertullian's own words:

"Discernenda est autem demutatio ab omni argumento perditionis: aliud enim demutatio, aliud perditio. Porro non aliud, si ita demutabitur caro, ut pereat; peribit autem demutata, si non ipsa permanserit in demutatione, quae exhibita fuerit in resurrectione. Quemadmodum enim perit, si non resurgit, ita et si resurgit quidem, uerum in demutatione subducitur, aequque perit: aequque enim non erit, acsi non resurrexerit. Et quam ineptum, si in hoc resurgit, ut non sit, quae potuit non resurrexisse, ne esset, quia non esse iam coeperat. Non miscebuntur omnino diversa, mutatio atque perditio, operibus utique diversa: perdit haec, illa mutat. Quomodo ergo quod perditum est mutatum non est, ita quod mutatum est perditum non est. Perisse enim est in totum non esse quod fuerit; mutatum esse aliter esse est. Porro dum aliter est, id ipsum potest esse. Habet enim esse quod non omnino perit; mutationem enim passum est, non perditionem."

The outward appearance of men alters in the course of their life-time. The hand of Moses was temporarily afflicted with leprosy.101 Yet, throughout these "changes", the individuality of the flesh concerned remains constant.

However, when discussing the Incarnation and God's creation of a new Heaven and the new earth, Tertullian appears to advocate an entirely different theory of "change". Prax. 27:7, 35-37 equates "transformation" with "destruction", since whatever is transformed "ceases to be what it was and begins to be what it was not".102 If the Word became flesh by "transformation of substance", Jesus must have been
neither flesh nor Spirit but a "third substance", an amalgam of the two.103

Herm. 34:1, 13-34:2, 18 defines "change" as the "destruction" of an object's "primitive condition". For the Almighty to "change" the Heavens and for the present Heavens to "perish" is one and the same thing:

"'Caelum primum et terra prima abierunt, et locus non est inuentus illis', quia scilicet quod finit et locum amittit. Sic et David: 'opera manuum tuarum caeli; et ipsi peribunt. Sed et si mutabit illosuelut opertorium, et mutabuntur', et mutari perire est pristino statui, quem, dum mutantur, amittunt."

Contrary to first impressions, the discrepancy is not the result of an opportunistic lack of consistency on the part of Tertullian. The passages in question can be reconciled with the position advocated in his resurrection theology by the recognition that his understanding of "change" was governed by the philosophical distinction between "substance" and "accidents". (It is surely significant that Prax. 27:8, 44 includes the phrase "demutatone substantiae" and Herm. 34:2, 18 the phrase "perire est pristino statui").

J. Daniélou defines in "substantia" in the following terms:

"It points to the concrete ground which permanently underlies individual realities and persists throughout the variety of qualities, actions, and changing elements. 'Substantia', in other words, is what determines the fundamental characteristics of things and their level in the scale of realities. It corresponds, therefore, to that aspect of the 'res', which is concerned with its constitutive element, not with its individual properties."104
The definition of "status" is not dissimilar.105

Thus, as Daniélou has correctly observed, when in Resurr. 55:3, 8-55:6, 23, Tertullian denies that "change" is equivalent to "destruction", he is working on the principle that the alteration of an object's "accidents" do not affect its "substance":

"It should also be noted that Tertullian rejects in this context all change which is in effect a deterioration of substances, although he accepts a type of change which is a development from the seed of the substance itself."106

In Prax. 27:7, 35-27:8, 48 and Herm. 34:1, 13-34:2, 18, by contrast, the "change" which is being proposed would entail the creation of an entirely new "substance". It is only where the "substance" of an object is threatened that "change" becomes "destruction".

The message for Tertullian's theory of glorification is clear. If immortality and incorruptibility are merely "accidents", the earthly flesh will not be fundamentally altered by their addition. However, were mortality and corruptibility to be proved to be part of the "substance" of the human condition, glorification would indeed have caused the resurrected flesh to cease to be what it was before.107

Immortality, incorruptibility and impassibility - these will be the distinguishing features of the glorified flesh.108

The distinguishing features of the earthly flesh, by contrast, (the flesh which is reintegrated at the
resurrection) are mortality, corruptibility and passibility.\textsuperscript{109} Although death is the appointed penalty for sin\textsuperscript{110} and man became subject to it because he was disobedient,\textsuperscript{111} he could not have been liable to such a penalty unless he had been created mortal. The Devil and his minions also fell,\textsuperscript{112} yet because they were created immortal spirits,\textsuperscript{113} they did not die.

By the same token, although the fatigue of toiling on the land and the agony of childbirth did not become part of human existence until after the Fall,\textsuperscript{114} they could not have constituted a punishment for sin, if Adam and Eve had been created incapable of suffering.

Finally, if man’s flesh had been created incorruptible, he would have been subject to neither sin nor death.\textsuperscript{115} Whatsoever has a beginning is subject to corruption\textsuperscript{116} the Eternal God alone is incorruptible.\textsuperscript{117}

Vicastillo confirms that, in the eyes of Tertullian, human flesh per se is mortal, corruptible and passible:\textsuperscript{118}

"Si la ‘mortalitas’ es un débito de la ‘natiuitas’, la ‘condicio passibilis’ viene a ser el otro débito (‘lex’ lo llama Tertuliano) de la ‘caro nata’, un medio para llegar al débito final; no por nada se presenta a Cristo revistiendo inseparables las dos condiciones carnales: ‘sordidis indutus, id est carnis passibilis et mortalis indignitate’ (Jud. 14, 7, Marc. 3, 7, 6). Todo esto evidencia que la ‘condicio passibilis’ es algo que corresponde a la naturaleza propia de la carne humana."\textsuperscript{119}

Tertullian’s doctrine of the Incarnation corroborates the fact that mortality, corruptibility and passibility are the
distinguishing features of human flesh. It was Christ’s possession of these characteristics which lay at the heart of the Incarnation.120

Carn. 9:6, 29-9:8, 45 declares that the hunger and the thirst, the fear and the sorrow endured by Christ prove that He was truly the Son of Man. Carn. 6:5, 30-6:7, 45 declares that Christ’s mortality was a necessary adjunct to His mission and a sign of His true humanity.

Contrasting "integritas" with "corruptela"121, Tertullian teaches that illness and deformity are simply "accidents" of the human condition;122 they do not detract from the "substance". It seems likely, therefore, that when he argues that the risen flesh is "changed", in Resurr. 55:3, 8-55:6, 23, he was also numbering mortality and corruptibility amongst the "accidents" of the human condition. Consequently, immortality and incorruptibility can be substituted without the creation of an entirely new "substance". Thus, in the eyes of Tertullian, the "substance" of the human condition was not mortal, corruptible flesh, it was simply flesh. Discussing the teaching of Resurr., B.E. Daley concludes:

"In short, the risen will be 'like the angels' (Luke 20.36), and so will experience, in this same substance of flesh, the characteristics of the spiritual beings ('spiritalem subeant dispositionem', 62; cf. De An. 56, where Tertullian asserts that the state of the risen body will be determined by the 'standard of the angels').123
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However, Tertullian probably underestimated the tremendous transformation which immortality and incorruptibility will make to the human condition. In his overriding concern to protect the reality of the resurrection against its Gnostic detractors, he failed to appreciate fully the consequences of the glorified flesh’s transference onto a higher plane.

I believe that there is a case for arguing that mortality, corruptibility and passibility are so bound up with the human condition that they pertain to the "substance" of humanity, as it was created by God. If this is true, the acquisition of immortality and incorruptibility may indeed cause the glorified flesh, whilst retaining its individuality, to "cease" to be what it was before. Tertullian’s argument may be flawed.

The consequences of Tertullian’s concept of the resurrection body for his understanding of death are threefold. Firstly, whilst he sometimes categorises resurrection as the resurrection of the "dead" and the resurrection of the "body", his favourite term was the resurrection of the "flesh". Examples include Resurr. 2:10, 49, 27:1, 2, 56:1, 2, Marc. V. 10:3, 4 and V. 11:16, 15. The result is that the new life is inextricably tied to the old life - the life which was laid in the grave. As Daley notes:

"His treatise De Carnis Resurrectione is directed against Christian 'heretics' - Gnostics or Marcionites - who deny the materiality of the risen body".
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Secondly, because of its emphasis on the glorification of the risen flesh, Tertullian’s concept of the resurrection body reminds the faithful that death is ephemeral - a transition to renewed life on a higher plane. Whilst seeds are destroyed in the soil, they are destroyed in order that there might be new life. Likewise, the fleshy "seed" is destroyed by death in order that it might flower again in eternity. Thus, his teaching on the resurrection body appends an important rider to his vision of death as the ultimate symbol of man’s mortality. Death is not the end of life; it is simply the end of the beginning.

Thirdly, since death attacks the flesh (not the soul) resurrection is the direct reversal of death. Moreover, since man is not simply a soul but a soul and flesh united, Tertullian’s teaching on the resurrection is further confirmation of the fact that the new life if not a return to pre-death existence was inextricably linked to the life which was laid in the grave.

6.2 Death: the summons to the final judgement

"Enimuero nos, qui sub deo, omnium speculatorum, dispungimus quique aeternam ab eo poenam prouidentem, mertito soli innocentiae occurrimus et pro scientiae plenitudine et pro latebrarum difficultate et pro magnitudine cruciatus, non diuturni, uerumtamen sempiterni, eum timentes, quem timere debebit ipse, qui iudicat, deum, non proconsulem."

Apol. 45:7, 26-32 conveys effectively the awe-inspiring, even appalling, character of the final judgement. In His
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role as Judge, the Almighty is a God who is to be feared. Indeed, so impressed was Tertullian by the terrifying character of the day of judgement that he used men's fear of it as a sanction for both his stern moral teaching and his resolute stand against heresy.\textsuperscript{132} (The words "iudex", "iudicium" and "iudicare" appear at key moments in his theology).\textsuperscript{133}

\textit{Cast.} 9:5, 40-45 threatens those who indulge in remarriage with a judgement analogous to that which befell the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah.\textsuperscript{134} \textit{Praes.} 44:1, 1-44:12, 31 mockingly contrasts the final judgement "envisaged" by heretics with the genuine "day of the Lord". Christ will "acknowledge" that He never warned against the machinations of the heretics. He will "repent" of having taught that He was born of a Virgin and of promising resurrection to all flesh.\textsuperscript{135}

Against the background of such a judgement-orientated theology, it is hardly surprising that in \textit{Paen.} 5:3, 7-5:4, 12 and \textit{Cult.} 2:2, 9-2:3, 23 Tertullian concluded that fear is an indispensable foundation of the Christian life.

6.2.1 The "mechanics" of judgement

In the reflections of Tertullian, the "mechanics" of judgement are fourfold. The principal "mechanism" of judgement is the divine standards enshrined in the teachings of the Bible. The other "mechanisms" are the accusation, the ordeal and the books of life and death.
The judgement to which men and women will come as a result of death is a stringent one. They will be examined to determine how far they have obeyed the commandments enshrined in the decalogue and how far they have truly loved their neighbour. They will be judged not merely upon their actions but also upon their thoughts - the very whispers of their hearts. Since looking at a woman lustfully is one manifestation of adultery and succumbing to anger is one manifestation of murder, nobody will be able to stand before the bar of God without a profound sense of guilt.

They will even be responsible for the sins which they inspire in their fellow men. Cult. II. 2:4, 23-30 warns women who adorn themselves that they are responsible for the lust which they inspire:

"Quid autem alteri periculo sumus? Quid alteri concupiscentiam importamus? Quam si dominus ampliando legem a facto stupri non discernit in poena, nescio an impune habeat qui alicui causa fuerit perditionis. Perit enim ille, simul in tuam formam concupierit, et admisit iam in animo quod concupiuit, et facta es tu gladius illi, ut, etsi a culpa uaces, ab inuidia non libereris."

They will also be judged as to whether or not they have misused God's creation - be it by misusing the body (through the artful application of cosmetics or the excessive indulgence of any appetite) or by misusing the created order through acts of idolatry. Spect. 2:11, 53-59 is unequivocal -
Most important of all, however, they will be assessed on whether or not they have made Christ Jesus the "foundation" of their lives\textsuperscript{142} - the conscious inspiration of their thoughts and actions. He who willingly has ministered to Christ in the form of the needy will be vindicated;\textsuperscript{143} he who has ignored Christ in his "brother" will be condemned. He who has resolutely "confessed" Jesus before men will be acquitted;\textsuperscript{144} he who has either equivocated or openly apostatised will be convicted.\textsuperscript{145}

Finally, since as Carn. 16:3, 16-16:4, 29 recognised, Christ is the embodiment of true humanity (His flesh being sinless and His soul pure)\textsuperscript{146} men and women standing before the bar of God will be judged by that standard of true humanity. How far have they succeeded in conforming their behaviour to the pattern of humanity found in the Incarnate One?

Formal accusation appears to have taken several forms. The first is the accusation of angelic witnesses. According to Idol. 23:7, 9-14, those who affix their names to bonds which contain oaths to false gods will have those bonds laid before the court by angels. The signatures of the human witnesses will have been replaced by the "signatures" of angels:

"Dominum oremus, ne qua nos eiusmodi contractus necessitas circumsistat et, si ita euenerit, det
Thus, as Waszink and Van Winden recognise, if the defendant has committed idolatry, he will be formally charged by the angels - "at the final judgement this document becomes, in Tertullian's imagination, a charge of idolatry, this time signed by the angels of God."147

The second is the accusation made by the Devil. At his baptism, the Christian enters into a compact to renounce "the Devil, his pomp and his angels".148 As a result of that compact, the neophyte participates in the redemption won by Christ149 and the Devil loses all150 rights over him. Should the Christian renegue, however, on that compact and delight in the "things" of the Devil, he will fall prey to Satan and become once again his absolute "property".151

When the Devil accuses the defendant before the divine Judge he is attempting to enforce what he sees as his proprietary rights. Anim. 35:3, 24-36 sets the scene vividly:

"Tum si in diabolum transfertur adversarii mentio ex observatione comitante, cum illo quoque moneris eam inire concordiam quae deputetur ex fidei conventione; pactus es enim renuntiasse ipsi et pompaet angelis eius. Conuenit inter uos de isto. Haec erit amicitia observatione sponsionis, ne quid eius postea resumas ex his quae eierasti, quae illi reddidisti, ne te ut fraudatorem, ut pacti transgressorem iudici deo obiciat, sicut eum legimus abili sanctorum criminatorum et de ipso etiam nomine diaboli delatorem, et iudex te tradat angelo executionis, et ille te in carcerem mandet infernum, unde non dimittaris nisi modico quoque delicto mora resurrectionis expense. Quid his sensibus aptius? Quid his interpretationibus uerius?"

481
These formal accusations are reminiscent of the classical "libellus" procedure - the procedure whereby criminal proceedings were initiated by a formal accusation made by a private individual. Discussing that procedure, Sherwin-White has noted:

"There is evidence enough from Trajan onwards that the emperors insisted that all charges against Christians must be made in proper form by a private 'accusator' or 'delator' who is not an informer, 'index', but a private prosecutor. No charge, then no case".152

It may well be that Tertullian had this procedure in mind when he visualised the workings of the divine court. If a defamation in an earthly court could not stand without an honest "delator", would it not be reasonable to assume that a defamation in the divine court also required a "delator"?

However, the exegesis of Anim. 35:3, 24-36 in terms of a Satanic "counsel for the prosecution", is not without its difficulties. How can Satan assume such a role when he himself is condemned? (Cast down from the celestial realm in ignomy,153 God's proscription of Satan was reaffirmed when for the duration of the millennium, He bound him in the abyss).154 The difficulty is exacerbated still further if Resurr. 25:2, 6-9 is taken at its face value, for there Tertullian implies that the Devil and his angels will have been sent to the fires of Gehenna before the general resurrection commences -

"atque ita diabolo in abyssum interim relegato primae resurrectionis praerogatiua de solis ordinetur, dehinc et igni dato universalis resurrectionis censura de libris iudicetur."
The second difficulty is still more pressing. Since Anim. 35:3, 33-35 concludes that those who are successfully prosecuted by the diabolic "delator" will be imprisoned until the "slightest farthing" of their sins have been expiated, how can those delations take place at the last judgement? The sentences of that court are everlasting; there will be no release from the punishments of Gehenna.155

A comparison of the passage in question with Anim. 58:8, 45-52 and Marc. III. 24:6, 7-9 indicates that the "prison" referred to there is situated in the upper echelons of the underworld ("inferi"), that is, in the interim abode of the dead. Therefore, would it not be more appropriate to situate the Devil’s accusations at a series of particular judgements?

Furthermore, since the emphasis in Anim. 35:3, 33-35 is upon the defendant’s ultimate release from "prison", is it not the case that the Devil’s accusations will be made not against all men but against the elect alone?

I will deal with the difficulties relating to the timing of the Devil’s accusations first, because they are the most serious. Tertullian normally described judgement as an act of collective eschatology:156

"In aduentum, opinor, Christi ut a nostra suspirant, in saeculi huius occasum, in transitum mundi quoque, ad diem domini magnum, diem irae et retributionis, diem ultimum et occultum nec uelli praeter patri notum, et tamen signis atque portentis et concussionibus elementorum et conflictationibus nationum praenotatum."
It seems unlikely, therefore, that in Anim. 35:3, 24-36, he deviated from this view and taught that there will also be a particular judgement.

The notion of individual judgement is not simply at variance with Tertullian's collective vision of judgement. It is also at variance with elements within his wider eschatology. According to Resurr. 43:4, 11-14 and Pat. 13:7, 25-28, the martyrs alone enjoy the privilege of directly entering the divine presence:

"Nemo enim peregrinatus a corpore statim inmoratur penes dominum, nisi ex martyrii praerogatiua, paradiso scilicet, non inferis, deuersurus." (Resurr. 43:4, 12-14).

Even if, as seems probable, the phrase "penes dominum" refers to the "house of God" and therefore not necessarily to the immediate presence of the Almighty, the peculiar privilege of the martyrs contradicts the idea of particular judgement. The logical corollary of being called before a judge is that one is in the presence of that judge. If even the highly privileged martyrs cannot enter the immediate presence of the Almighty until after the Parousia, should the unworthy be accorded a higher privilege?

Idol. 23:7, 9-14 explicitly situates the angelic accusation on the "day of judgement." Moreover, within an eschatological context, the phrase "before the judge" (Anim. 35:3, 31) is bound to be evocative of the final judgement. Indeed, it is practically a synonym for it.
Finally, since the Parousia has not yet taken place,\textsuperscript{160} Satan would have to be readmitted to the celestial regions (temporarily at least) if he were to make his accusations at a series of individual judgements. In the eyes of Tertullian, such a readmittance would have been anathema.

The only justification for readmitting Satan to the presence of God (God in the form of Glorified Christ of the Parousia)\textsuperscript{161} is that as a result of that readmittance, he will be judged and condemned to the everlasting torments of Gehenna.\textsuperscript{162} Therefore, the most appropriate moment for the Devil to make his accusations against man is the final judgement, when he will be present in court as a defendant. (The argument that because God is omniscient\textsuperscript{163}, individual judgement does not have to take place in the immediate presence of God does not do justice to the intense realism which pervades \textit{Anim.} 35:3, 24-36).

Tertullian was more concerned with exploiting Mt. 5:25-26 for his immediate purpose than with fitting it logically into his wider eschatological scheme. (His immediate concern was to prove that retribution can be exacted upon the human soul without indulging in such a falsehood as metensomatosis).\textsuperscript{164} Thus, in his exegesis of Mt. 5:25-26, his principal interest was in the contribution which it made to the idea of retribution in the interval between death and resurrection.\textsuperscript{165}

The fact that \textit{Anim.} 35:3, 33-35 focusses upon those who will be released from "prison" (that is, those who have sinned
and yet still held onto Christ) is also not an insurmountable difficulty. Although the constraints of Mt. 5:25-26 obliged Tertullian to highlight that group of defendants, they do not logically demand that he confined the attacks of the diabolic "delator" to that group.

Had Tertullian been asked to explain how the human soul can be chastised in the interval between death and resurrection, on the strength of an accusation which will not be made until the final judgement, he would probably have replied in terms of the omniscience of the Almighty. In His foreknowledge of the accusation which Satan will make and His knowledge of the extent to which it is justified, God sends the defendant’s soul to the appropriate intermediate abode.

The problems associated with the person of the "counsel for the prosecution" are still less serious. Interpreted with reference to the last judgement, Anim. 35:3, 24-36 undoubtedly does contradict Resurr. 25:2, 6-9. However, since the latter’s assertion that the Devil and his minions will be consigned to Gehenna before the general resurrection also contradicts Paen. 7:8, 28-29 and Uxor. II. 6:1, 6-9 (where it is claimed that the faithful are destined to judge the Devil and his angels), Resurr. 25:2, 6-9 should probably be dismissed as an unthinking "telescoping" of the events of the end times.

As for Satan’s being, at one and the same time, "counsel for the prosecution" in the case against mankind and a defendant
in the same court, it has its parallel in the dual role of the elect. They too are there both as defendants and judges.\textsuperscript{168}

Accusation, however, may not end with the machinations of Lucifer. \textit{Cult.} I.2:5, 39-47 declares that those men who do not eschew the arts introduced by the Watchers will be "judged" by those same angels. \textit{Monog.} 17:1, 1-17:5, 23 declares that those who refuse to submit to the rigours of chastity will be "judged" by virtuous pagans who themselves willingly submitted to those rigours.

Braun interprets passages such as \textit{Monog.} 17:1, 1-17:5, 23 and \textit{Uirg.} 17:2, 9-18 in terms of pagan judges in the court of the Almighty\textsuperscript{169} - a paradox indeed. I am more inclined to conclude that, in the eyes of Tertullian, the Watchers and virtuous pagans will assume the role of accusers and that it is by virtue of their accusations, that sinners will be judged and condemned.

Tertullian never explained the purpose underlying the Devil's role as "counsel for the prosecution" at the final judgement. However, he would probably have replied in similar terms to those which he employed when explaining the Devil's role in inspiring persecution. God employs the Devil's spite for His own purpose.

The third "mechanism" by which judgement will be achieved is the "fire of judgement" - in effect trial by "ordeal". Inspired by \textit{I Cor.} 3:10-15, Tertullian regarded the said
fire as an "intelligent", probing substance - a substance which whilst destroying evil works and convicting wicked men, leaves good works and their practitioners intact. Thus, if a man builds his life upon the true "foundation", that is, Christ Jesus, the fire of judgement will vindicate him but if he fails to do so, he will be condemned. To quote Marc. V. 6:10, 8-6:11, 18:

"Positurus (Paul) unicum fundamentum, quod est Christus. Quia et de hoc per eundem prophetam creator: 'ecce ego', inquit, 'inicio in fundamenta Sionis lapidem pretiosum, honorabilem, et qui in eum crediderit non confundetur'. Nisi si structorem se terreni operis Deus profitebatur, ut non de Christo suo significaret, qui futurus esset fundamentum credentium in eum. Super quod prout quisque superstruxerit, dignam scilicet uel indignam doctrinam, si opus eius per ignem probabitur, si merces illi per ignem rependetur, creatoris est, quia per ignem uidicatur nostra superaedificatio, utique sui fundamenti, id est sui Christi".

The fire of judgement should not be dismissed simply as a metaphor for the bitter pangs of guilt and inadequacy which will overwhelm man when he stands before God in all His purity. It is a real fire.

The idea of a real fire, which is endowed with peculiar properties, has its parallels in the fire of Gehenna and the fire which will totally consume the earth. The reality of those fires is confirmed by Tertullian's readiness to draw the analogy with the fire which struck Sodom and Gomorrah. Apol. 40:7, 24-28 characterises that fire as follows:

"Nondum Iudaeorum ab Aegypto examen Palaestina susceperat, nec iam illic Christianae sectae origo consederat, cum regiones affines eius Sodoma et
If Tertullian envisaged the fire of Gehenna as a genuine fire whose attributes include the ability to scorch flesh without consuming it and the fire on the last day as a genuine fire whose attributes include the power to consume substances which are not normally combustible, might he not have regarded the fire of judgement as a real fire, which by divine dispensation will be "intelligent" and "sin-directed"?

Indeed, there is a case for arguing that the fire of judgement and the fire which will ultimately consume the earth are the same fire - endowed with the qualities appropriate to the task in hand. Thus, in Spect. 30:2, 5-8, Cast. 9:5, 40-45 and Monog. 16:4, 24-27, the judgement and chastisement of mankind is set alongside the consumation of the world:

"At enim supersunt alia spectacula, ille ultimus et perpetuus iudicii dies, ille nationibus insperatus, ille derisus, cum tanta saeculi uetustas et tot eius natiuitates uno igni haurientur." (Spect. 30:2, 5-8).

However, although the Tertullianic concept of the fire of judgement was undoubtedly inspired by the Pauline concept, it displays certain discrepancies. In contrast to I Cor. 3:13, it lays particular emphasis upon the need for the Christian to build sound "doctrine" ("doctrina"). I Cor. 3:13 alludes merely to good "works" ("opus"). (Tertullian's
emphasis was probably born of his desire to counter Marcionism).

The other discrepancy between *Marc*. V. 6:11, 14-18 and I Cor. 3:14-15 is that the former restricts the work of the fire of judgement to vindicating or condemning men and women. I Cor. 3:15, by contrast, states that in some cases an individual will be saved, even though his works have been consumed by the fire - that is, the Pauline fire has cleansing properties.

This does not mean that Tertullian did not recognise that the life of even the most devout Christian is a mixture of good and bad deeds. What it does mean is that he was afraid lest too great an emphasis on the cleansing aspect of the fire of judgement should decrease man's fear of that fire.

Finally, the fourth "mechanism" of judgement is the books of life and death - the books in which each man's conformity to or deviation from divine standards is recorded. Indeed, the aforesaid books are symbols of vindication and condemnation. Thus, in *Scorp*. 12:8, 19, the presence of the martyrs' names in the book of life symbolises their salvation, whereas in *Resurr*. 25:2, 8-9, the presence of men's names in the book of death symbolises their damnation. (In the term "book of death", the word "death" refers to the "second death" - the death inflicted by Gehenna).
Given that it leads inexorably to such a stringent, even formidable investigation, death must have been a terrifying experience. For all that Tertullian urged the faithful to grasp the blessings promised to the martyrs with confidence and delight,¹⁸⁰ he recognised that fear of judgement is the natural instinct of the soul.¹⁸¹ Test. 2:4, 31-2:5, 37 declares:

"Si enim anima aut diuina aut a deo data est, sine dubio datorem suum nouit, et si nouit, utique et timet et tantum postremo ad auctorem. An non timet quem magis propitium uelit quam iratum? Unde igitur naturalis timor animae in deum, si deus non nouit irasci? Quomodo timebitur, qui nescit offendi? Quid timeatur nisi ira? Unde ira nisi ex animaduersione? Unde animaduersio nisi de iudicio?"

Daley correctly observes that:

"Christian eschatological faith, as he formulates it, is caught in a tension between fear of judgement and dread of the suffering that the end of the present order will involve, and a longing to be free of the injustices and limitations of this age."¹⁸²

The prospect of judgement after death also reminds the faithful that because it is the last moment for him to repent, death crystallises man’s eternal fate. The yardstick by which he will be judged is the spirit in which he lived and died. Death determines the bounds beyond which man’s search for true piety and true virtue cannot extend. Thus, death is an extremely solemn moment - a moment for soul searching - a moment of truth.

Finally, although the martyr engaged in the ultimate combat with the forces of evil in the arena,¹⁸³ the Devil’s role as "counsel for the prosecution" is a salutary reminder that
death does not bring an end to his machinations. By so doing, it indicates that even beyond the grave man will have cause to fear the forces of evil.

6.2.2 The characteristics of judgement

Many of the salient characteristics of Tertullianic judgement confirm that death is a terrifying "watershed". Firstly, God's judgement is absolute and definitive. The justice of a truly just God cannot be flawed and against the sentences of the divine court, there can be no appeal.184 (Tertullian's choice of adjectives to describe the final judgement is illuminating, including as they do words such as "aeternus", "perfectus", "perpetus", "plenus" and "sempiternus").185 Resurr. 14:10, 34-14:11, 42 demonstrates clearly that divine justice is both perfect and everlasting:

"Dicimus plenum primo perfectumque credendum iudicium dei, ut ultimum iam atque exinde perpetuum, ut sic quoque iustum, dum non in aliquo minus, ut sic quoque deo dignum, dum pro tanta eius patientia plenum atque perfectum. Itaque plenitudinem perfectionemque iudicii nonnisi de totius hominis repraesentatione constare. Totum porro hominem ex utriusque substantiae congregatione parere, idcircoque in utraque exhibendum quem totum oporteat iudicari, qui nisi totus utique non uixerit". (Resurr. 14:10, 34-14:11, 42).

Secondly, preoccupied as it was with man's standing in the eyes of God, Tertullian's concept of judgement was a thoroughly legalistic one. Men will be assessed on the basis of their adherence to divine law and their acquisition of "merit".186 Moreover, as Cult. II. 10:5, 29-10:6, 40 saw clearly, supererogatory merit will win far more praise from
God than those actions which merely fulfil the minimal requirements of His teaching:

"Quanto enim utilius et cautius egerimus, si praesumamus omnia quidem a deo prouisa tunc et in saeculo posita, at uti nunc essent in quibus disciplina seruorum eius probaretur, ut per licentiam utendi continentiae experimenta procederunt? Nonne sapientes patresfamiliae de industria quaedam seruis suis offerunt atque permittunt, ut experiantur, an et qualiter permissis utantur, si probe, si moderate? Quanto autem laudabilior qui abstinuerit in totum, qui timuerit etiam indulgentiam domini? Sic igitur et apostolus, 'omnia', inquit, 'licent, sed non omnia expediunt.' Quanto facilius inlicita timebit qui licta uerebitur?"

Marriage is permitted by God\textsuperscript{187} but by anticipating the chastity which will characterise the Kingdom,\textsuperscript{188} the Christian earns supererogatory merit to set in the balance against his sins. Similarly, the sincere observance of the Christian life is meritorious but the steadfast endurance of martyrdom will win such an abundance of supererogatory merit that the subject’s sins will all be washed away.\textsuperscript{189}

The eschatological dimension of Tertullian’s doctrine of penance is related to the concepts of merit and the individual’s standing in the eyes of God too. Exhomologesis is performed in this life as a means of averting divine chastisement in the life to come.\textsuperscript{190}

The legalistic character of Tertullian’s theory of judgement is confirmed by Martin who contrasts his preoccupation with man and his standing before God with the Greek Fathers’ preoccupation with the granting of incorruptibility.\textsuperscript{191}
Thirdly, his theory of judgement was firmly orientated towards chastisement. Indeed, so deeply ingrained was his assumption that for the vast majority of mankind, judgement leads to chastisement that, in extracts such as Resurr. 17:9, 34-38, Cast. 9:5, 40-45, Monog. 16:4, 24-27, Apol. 48:4, 33-39 and Test. 2:4, 31-2:6, 44 he practically equated judgement and chastisement. Resurr. 17:9, 34-38 is representative:

"Denique haec erit ratio in ultimum finem destinati iudicii, ut exhibitione carnis omnis diuina censura perfici possit. Alioquin non sustineretur in finem, quod et nunc animae decerpunt apud inferos, si solis animabus destinaretur."

Finally, because the Tertullianic understanding of judgement is firmly grounded in the teachings of the Bible, it must have had authority in the eyes of its original readers. Tertullian employed texts such as Mt. 25:1-13, Lk. 12:35-40 and I Thess. 5:1-3192 to confirm that judgement will fall unexpectedly - like a "thief" in the night. Mt. 25:31, Lk. 12:40, 12:46 and 21:25-28193 establish that judgement is a collective act - an act which must await the Parousia. As for Rev. 20:1-15,194 it too indicates the place of the final judgement in the wider eschatological scheme.

The divine standards upon which humanity will be judged are enshrined in such texts as Deut. 5:1-21, Mt. 5:21-22, 5:27-28, 10:32-33, 22:37-39, Mk. 12:30-31 and Lk. 12:8-9.195 The "fire of judgement" is attested by I Cor. 3:10-15, the diabolic accuser by Mt. 5:25-26 and the books of life and death by Rev. 20:12 and 15.196 As for the notion that God
will vindicate those who serve the oppressed and avenge those who have been slain for His sake, it is corroborated by Gen. 9:5, Mt. 25:34-40 and Rev. 6:9-10.197

The metaphors employed by Tertullian to describe the act of judgement are Biblical too - that is, the harvesting and threshing of the human "grain" and the ascending and descending of the celestial "ladder".198

Even the closing act of the final judgement, the dismissal of the damned to the fires of Gehenna, amid the accompaniment of their lamentations, is derived from the Bible - that is, from Mt. 25:41, 25:46, Mk. 9:43-48, Lk. 12:4, 12:27-28 and Rev. 20:13-15.199

6.3 Death: the gateway to eternal chastisement

The fate of the damned is a terrible one. After they have been sentenced, they will be cast into the fires of Gehenna,200 where they will be "roasted" for eternity. The
chastisement inflicted upon the damned in Gehenna is known as the "second death".201

Tertullian longed to enter the Kingdom.202 He spoke enthusiastically about the acquisition of immortality and incorruptibility203 (the necessary preconditions for entry into that Kingdom) and about the martyrs' privileges in the celestial Paradise204 (privileges which partially anticipate its joys). Nevertheless, he reserved his greatest enthusiasm not for describing Heaven but for describing Gehenna. Pelikan affirms:

"It is symptomatic of Tertullian's general disposition and outlook that his most vivid discussions of eschatology are those that deal with eternal punishment, with hell-fire and with the ultimate fate of the wicked."205

Thus, in Spect. 30:3, 8-14 and 30:5, 19-26, Tertullian gloats over the torments which will be inflicted upon those symbols of contemporary paganism - kings, governors, philosophers, actors and athletes. In fact, he goes so far as to assure the faithful that viewing the torments of the damned will be one of the joys savoured by the elect. Visualising, as it does, governors "melting" in the flames, athletes performing feats of agility as they are "tossed" by the fire and tragic actors giving a "vocal" performance, this passage is marked by a delight in the sufferings of others which is repulsive:

"Quae tunc spectaculi latitudo! Quid admirer? Quid rideam? Ubi gaudeam, ubi exultem, spectans tot ac tantos reges, qui in caelum recepti nuntiabantur, cum ipso Ioue et ipsis suis testibus in imis tenebris congemescentes? Item praesides persecutores dominici nominis saeioribus quam
ipsi flammis saeuierunt insultantibus contra Christianis, liquescentes? ... Tunc magis tragoedi audiendi, magis scilicet vocales in sua propria calamitate; tunc histriones cognoscendi, solutiores multo per ignem; tunc spectandus auriga in flammae rota totus ruber; tunc xystici contemplandi, non in gymnasiis, sed igne iaculati, nisi quod ne tunc quidem illos uelim iaculati, ut qui malim ad eos potius conspectum insatiabilem conferre, qui in dominum desaeuierunt."

It may be true that exulting in the sufferings of those who have been responsible for inflicting agony and anguish upon the group to which one belongs (in the case of Tertullian, that group being the Church) is not infrequently a characteristic of fallen human nature. Nevertheless, whilst this may have contributed to Tertullian's "unholy" delight at the prospect of the torments of kings and governors within the fires of Gehenna, it is less helpful in explaining his analogous reaction to the torments of athletes and actors within that same fire. Moreover, it is a mistake to "explain away" too swiftly everything within Tertullian's thought which strikes the modern reader as repulsive.

6.3.1 The salient features of Gehenna

Gehenna is first and foremost a "torture chamber". "Poena", "supplicium", "cruciatas" and "tormentum"206 - these words recur throughout Tertullian's descriptions of Gehenna. Whilst it is true that taken in isolation, these words do not necessarily indicate that the torture inflicted will be physical (as Marc. IV. 30:4, 18-30:5, 5 recognised) he normally employed them with reference to physical torments.207
Granted that the principal torments inflicted by the Tertullianic Gehenna were physical ones, what did they include? Spect. 30:3, 8-30:5, 26 indicates that the main implement of torture is fire. A broader examination of Tertullian’s allusions to Gehenna confirms this conclusion.

Scorp. 12:11, 12-13 and Fug. 7:2, 32-34 declare that the damned will be cast into the lake of "fire" and "brimstone".208 Cast. 3:6, 39-3:7, 50 and Monog. 3:4, 26-32 remind their readers that although chastity is the highest good, it is better to marry than to "burn".209 Marc. IV. 30:3, 14-16 brands Gehenna as "oven" -

"itaque et ego uanitatem uanitate depellam, fermentationem quoque congruere dicens regno creatoris, quia post illam clibanus uel furnus gehennae sequatur."

Indeed, when seeking an earthly analogy for Gehenna, Tertullian settled on volcanoes.210 The chief characteristic of a volcano is molten lava. In Tertullian’s eyes, such molten lava was nothing less than liquid fire. Paen. 12:2, 4-12:4, 13 observes:

"Quid illum thesaurum ignis aeterni existimamus, cum fumariola quaedam eius tales flamarum ictus suscitent ut proximae urbes aut iam nullae extent aut idem sibi de die sperent? Dissiliunt superbissimi montes ignis intrinsecus feti et - quod nobis iudicii perpetuitatem probat - cum dissiliant, cum deuorentur, numquam tamen finiuntur! Quis haec supplicia interim montium non iudicii minantis exemplaria deputabit? Quis scintillas tales non magni alicuius et inaestimabilis foci missilia quaedam et exercitatoria iacula consentiet?"
What is more, the anguish of those condemned to Gehenna is exacerbated by the extraordinary character of its fires. Despite their corporeality, the flames of Gehenna are endowed with a peculiar property - the property of conferring "incorruptibility" upon their victims. Thus, because they never consume their victims, there is no hope of annihilation and hence an end to torment. Apol. 48:13, 86-48:15, 97 is unequivocal:

"Profani uero et qui non integre ad deum, in poena aeque iugis ignis, habentes ex ipsa natura eius, diuina scilicet, subministrationem incorruptibilitatis. Noverunt et philosophi diuiersitatem arcani et publici ignis. Ita longe alius est, qui usui humano, alius qui iudicio dei apparat, siue de caelo fulmina stringens, siue de terra per uertices montium eructuans; non enim absunit quod exurit, sed dum erogat, reparat. Adeo manent montes sempes ardentes, et qui de caelo tangitur, saluus est, ut nullo iam igni decinerescat: hoc erit testimonium ignis aeterni, hoc exemplum iugis iudicii poenam nutrientis. Montes uruntur et durant: quid nocentes et dei hostes?"

Can a fire which promotes incorruptibility rather than destruction be regarded as a genuine fire? Tertullian never attempted to deal with this question. Had he done so, however, he would surely have replied in terms of "substance" and "accidents". Although in common experience, the consequence of setting an object alight is that it will be consumed, destruction is simply one of the "accidents" of fire. Therefore, the substitution of imperishability for destruction does not detract from the "substance".

The relationship between the fires of Gehenna and the fire which will judge mankind and then consume the earth is a
complex one. This is hardly surprising given that judgement and chastisement are intimately related in Tertullian's thought.213

As was demonstrated earlier, Cast. 9:5, 40-45 and Monog. 16:4, 24-27 teach that the earth will be consumed by fire, a fire such as that which decimated Sodom and Gomorrah. The same excerpts, however, also carry strong overtones of the chastisement of erring mankind. The inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah were overtaken by fire and brimstone214 - the very substances which will lie at the heart of the penalties of Gehenna - and they (like the damned) were so overtaken as a punishment for their sins.215

Marc. IV. 30:1, 25-30:3, 18 also highlights the difficulty of distinguishing between the fire which chastises and the fire which judges. Discussing the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven, Tertullian uses the phrase "the heat of judgement" ("feruor iudicii") whilst contrasting the delights of the Kingdom and the miseries of Gehenna. To quote Marc. IV. 30:3, 16-18:

"Quale est enim, ut sit lenissimi dei regnum quod etiam iudicii ferus lacrimosa austeritate subsequitur?"

Marc. IV. 30:3, 14-16 with its reference to the "oven of Gehenna" confirms that he was alluding neither to the probative "heat" of the fire of judgement nor to the destructive "heat" of the fire which will consume the world but to the punitive "heat" of Gehenna.
The intimate link between judgement and chastisement is underlined by Fug. 12:3, 28-31. There, Tertullian set "eternal judgement" and "everlasting death" alongside one another, in a manner which suggests that he regarded them as practically identical.

I believe that Tertullian’s tendency to employ the language of "judgement" with reference to chastisement is significant. The fire which will approve or repudiate each man, the fire which will consume the present creation and the fire which will punish the wicked - they are all expressions of the divine decree that good should flourish and evil should be eradicated.

I determined earlier that according to Tertullian, the fire of judgement and the fire which will consume the present creation probably are a single fire - a fire which will be endowed at different stages with the qualities appropriate to the task in hand. I will now proceed further. Might it not be the case that that fire and the fire of Gehenna are ultimately derived from a single mass of fire - one fire which depending on requirements, can torture or annihilate its victims? Tertullian did not provide an answer but the extracts quoted above indicate that had he done so, his answer could well have been in the affirmative.

If the principal instrument of torture is fire, another such instrument is darkness. For Tertullian, being thrust into the "outer darkness" and being sent to Gehenna are one and the same -
"audite, peccatores, quique nondum hoc estis, ut esse possitis: deus melior inuentus est, qui nec offenditur nec irascitur nec ulciscitur, cui nullus ignis coquitur in gehenna, cui nullus dentium frendor horret in exterioribus tenebris: bonus tantum est". (Marc. I. 27:2, 12-16).

Given that he identified "light"217 with God, there is surely a case for arguing that the darkness of Gehenna is a sign that God has utterly abandoned the damned and that consequently not even diffuse beams of His presence reach them. (It may be significant that Marc. IV. 30:4, 18-30:5, 5 declares that it is because they have been excluded from the Kingdom that the damned "wail" and "gnash" their teeth. It may also be significant that Marc. IV. 29:10, 19-29:11, 25 defines "damnation" as the "loss of salvation"). Pass Perp. 12:1, 15-12:3, 21 by claiming that the walls of the celestial city were "constructed" of "light", also assumes that light symbolises the presence of God.218

However, Marc. I. 27:2, 12-16 should not be dismissed simply as a metaphor for God's abandonment of the damned. The man who viewed the fires of Gehenna realistically219 would have been unlikely to have entirely allegorised away the accompanying darkness. Thus, if the darkness of Gehenna is a symbol of God's abandonment of the damned, it is also a reality. When juxtaposed alongside the fires of Gehenna, such darkness should probably be interpreted as a general, smoke-filled murkiness - a murkiness alleviated only by the diffuse, smoke-diffracted glow from the fires.
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Moreover, although Tertullian never stated it explicitly, the damned would also seem to have been subject to noxious smells. The "lake" into which they are thrown was not simply one of fire, it was a lake of burning sulphur. Burning sulphur gives off sulphur dioxide, an extremely pungent gas. Tertullian would not have recognised the modern terminology but he would have recognised the reality which it seeks to describe, that is, that the smell of burning sulphur is nauseating.

However, in contrast to the Gk. Apoc. Pet. and the Gk. Apoc. Paul (which probably date from the middle of the second century and the early third century, respectively) the Tertullianic Gehenna did not inflict measure for measure punishments upon its denizens. There are no examples of sinners being impaled by the offending limb or of fornicators being submerged up to their navels in a fiery river. The graphic descriptions of Gk. Apoc. Pet. 24 and Gk. Apoc. Paul. 31 find no parallel in Tertullian's works:

"And there were also others, women, hanging by their hair above that mire which boiled up; and these were they that adorned themselves for adultery. And the men that were joined with them in the defilement of adultery were hanging by their feet, and had their heads hidden in the mire, and said: 'We believed not that we should come unto this place'" (Gk. Apoc. Pet. 24).

and

"And I saw there a river of fire burning with heat, and in it was a multitude of men and women sunk up to the knees, and other men up to the navel; others also up to the lips and others up to the hair ... And I asked and said: 'Who are these, Lord, that are sunk up to their knees in
the fire? He answered and said unto me: 'These are they which when they are come out of the church occupy themselves in disputing with idle talk. But these that are sunk up to the navel are they who, when they had received the body and blood of Christ, go and commit fornication, and did not cease from their sins until they died; and they that are sunk up to their lips are they that slandered one another when they gathered in the church of God; but they that are sunk up to the eyebrows are they that beckon one to another, and privily devise evil against their neighbours'." (Gk. Apoc. Paul. 31).

Furthermore, in contrast to the aforementioned apocalypses, the Tertullianic Gehenna did not confront the exploiter with those whom he had exploited. There is therein no scene comparable to that delineated by Gk. Apoc. Pet. 26:

"And hard by that place I saw another strait place wherein the discharge and the stench of them that were in torment ran down, and there was as it were a lake there. And there sat women up to their necks in that liquor, and over against them many children which were born out of due time sat crying: and from them went forth rays of fire and smote the women in the eyes: and these were they that conceived out of wedlock and caused abortion".

In view of his abhorrence of both abortion and sexual offences, Tertullian's restraint in his expositions of Gehenna is, at first sight, surprising. Set against the context of his profound Biblicism, however, that restraint was to be anticipated. The Bible attests to the fiery character of Gehenna. It also attests to the existence of the "outer darkness". It does not bear witness to the infliction of punishments in the hereafter, based upon the law of "talion".
The one point at which his reflections upon the hereafter seem to approach those of the aforementioned apocalypses is *Resurr.* 31:9, 28-33. Quoting Isa. 66:24, he visualises the time when the elect will leave their sepulchres and will look upon the torments of the damned. Amongst those torments, he numbers a "worm" which gnaws at their flesh without ceasing:

"Tunc ergo et quod subiecit inplebitur: ‘et exibunt’, utique de sepulchris, ‘et uidebunt artus eorum, quiimple egerunt, quoniam uermis eorum non decidet et ignis eorum non extinguetur, et erit satis conspectui omni carnī’, scilicet quae resuscitata et egressa de sepulchris dominum pro hac gratia adorabit."

This worm which never ceases to devour its victims bears a striking similarity to the infernalised creature of torture described by Gk. Apoc. Pet. 27 and Gk. Apoc. Paul. 42:

"And other men and women were being burned up to their middle and cast down in a dark place and scourged by evil spirits, and having their entrails devoured by worms that rested not. And these were they that had persecuted the righteous and delivered them up." (Gk. Apoc. Pet. 27).

It is difficult to determine whether or not Tertullian's allusion to a "worm", in *Resurr.* 31:9, 28-33, is to be understood in terms of an infernalised creature of torment. One point in favour of such an interpretation is that the fire referred to in conjunction with it was understood as the fire of Gehenna.

It may also be significant that Isa. 66:24 (the text quoted by Tertullian) is the very text which provided the Biblical
warrant for infernalised worms,\textsuperscript{226} in the eyes of the authors of apocalyptic "tours" of Hell.

However, since Tertullian regarded the chastisements of Gehenna as the "second death"\textsuperscript{227} and worms are proverbially the symbol of the ravages wrought by the grave (that is by physical death), it may well be that he intended his allusion to the ever ravenous worm simply as a symbol of the ravages inflicted upon the damned by the "second death". Moreover, there is no evidence that he knew either of the apocalypses under consideration.

Thus, it is probable (though not certain) that Tertullian included infernalised worms in his vision of Gehenna. What is certain, is that he did not include therein such infernalised creatures of torment as snakes and other beasts.\textsuperscript{228}

Tertullian designated the punishments of Gehenna "mors secunda".\textsuperscript{229} Therefore, an accurate understanding of eternal chastisement would not be complete without an examination of the implications of the term "second death". To quote \textit{Fug}. 7:2, 32-34 -

\begin{quote}
"\textit{postremo in Apocalypsi non fugam timidis offert, sed inter ceteros reprobos particulam in stagnum sulphuris et ignis, quod est mors secunda.}"
\end{quote}

The "first" death merely afflicts the flesh; the "second" death afflicts the soul and the flesh. Describing the "second death", in \textit{Ciuit. Dei.} XIII. 2:615, 7-2:616, 26, Augustine declares that abandoned by God, the soul continues
to imbue the flesh with life so enabling it to suffer torment. *Ciuit. Dei.* XIII. 2:616, 19-26 concludes:

"Nam in illa ultima poena ac sempiterna, de qua suo loco diligentius disserendum est, recte mors animae dicitur, quia non uiuit ex deo; mors autem corporis quonam modo, cum uiuat ex anima? Non enim aliter potest ipsa corporalia, quae post resurrectionem futura sunt, sentire tormenta. An quia uita qualiscumque aliquod bonum est, dolor autem malum, ideo nec uiuere corpus dicendum est, in quo anima non uiuendi causa est, sed dolendi?"

Tertullian's ideas on this aspect of the "second death" are thought out far less clearly.

In passages such as *Scorp.* 9:6, 27-9:6, 2, 10:8, 28-10:8, 5 and *Resurr.* 35:5, 16-35:7, 28, where he warns the faithful not to fear men who can only kill the flesh but God who can also "kill" the soul, his concern is to demonstrate that the soul will be chastised in the hereafter. It is not to demonstrate the manner of that chastisement. *Resurr.* 35:5, 16-35:6, 28 declares:

"Item si animae corpus opponitur, uacabit astutia: cum enim utrumque proponitur, corpus atque animam, occidi in gehennam, distinguitis corpus ab anima, et relinquitur intellegi corpus id, quod in promptu est, caro scilicet, quae sicut occidetur in gehennam, si non magis a deo timuerit occidi, ita et uiuificabitur in uitam aeternam, si maluerit ab hominibus potius interfici. Proinde si quis occasionem carnis atque animae in gehennam ad interitum et finem utriusque substantiae adripiet et non ad supplicium, quasi consumendarum, non quasi puniendarum, recordetur ignem gehennae aeternum praedicari in poenam aeternam, et inde aeternitatem occasionis agnoscat, propterea humanae ut temporali praetimendam."

However, given that Tertullian envisaged the soul as a corporeal entity (an entity which is capable of suffering alone in the interval between death and resurrection) it...
is probable that he visualised it suffering physical penalties as well as spiritual ones. His reflections on the term "mors secunda" are far more literalistic than those of Augustine. There is, in the writings of Tertullian, nothing to match Augustine's assertion that the soul is said to "die" because life which is orientated towards the perpetuation of suffering cannot be viewed as true life.

Marc. IV. 29:10, 19-29:11, 25 states that the essence of damnation is the "loss of salvation". Marc. IV. 30:4, 18-30:5, 5 states that, at the close of the final judgement, the damned's exclusion from the Kingdom will cause them intense grief. When these passages are juxtaposed alongside Resurr. 43:4, 11-14 and Pat. 13:7, 25-28 (where the Beatific Vision is one of the foremost blessings of the elect) and Marc. I. 27:2, 12-16 (where Gehenna is depicted as a place of darkness) they probably point to the fact that for the soul, being "killed" eternally and being abandoned by God are one and the same.

The implications of the term "mors secunda", however, are not confined to the chastisement of the soul. They also have a message for the chastisements of Gehenna in their wider sense. Whenever physical death attacks the flesh, it annihilates it.232 The putrefaction which follows naturally upon physical death is a nauseating phenomenon233 - a phenomenon which evokes revulsion in all who behold it. What is more, death is a phenomenon which can never be partial in its operation; man is either alive or dead.234
The designation "mors secunda" does not imbue eternal chastisement with overtones of annihilation. Such overtones would have demanded the unthinkable, that is, that the wicked should eventually obtain a release from their anguish - the release of oblivion. Likewise, the motif of the "separation" of body and soul has nothing to contribute to this theme. Indeed, far from being separated, the soul and the flesh are united in suffering.

Nevertheless, like its physical counterpart, the "second death" is a nauseating phenomenon, entailing the most excruciating torments. The description of Gehenna given by Spect. 30:3, 8-30:5, 26 is positively repellant. Man has an instinctive revulsion in the face of the ravages of the grave:

"Quotiens etiam praeteritis uobis suo iure nos inimicum uulgus inuadit lapidibus et incendiis? Ipsis Bacchanalium furiis nec mortuis parcunt Christianis, quin illos de requie sepulturae, de asylo quodam mortis, iamalios, iam nec totos auellant, dissipent, distrahant." (Apol. 37:2, 6-10).

Therefore, the metaphor "mors secunda" could only have increased Christians' appreciation of the horrific nature of Gehenna's torments.

By the same token, it reminded the faithful that just as there can be no such thing as partial death, there can be no such thing as partial punishment. Designating it "everlasting" death, Fug. 12:3, 28-31 underlines the absolute character of the "second death":

"Et dominus quidem illum redemit ab angelis munditenentibus, a potestatibus, a spiritalibus"
nequitiae, a tenebris huius aeui, a iudicio aeterno, a morte perpetua".
(Fug. 12:3, 28-31).

The phrase "mors secunda" also highlights the fact that chastisement is "natural" - "natural" in so far as it is ordained by God.237 (Physical death, too, is a "natural" phenomenon; the inescapable biological fate of all men238 - the divinely imposed penalty239 for sin. However, in contrast to physical death, eternal death is also unambiguously "unnatural". Provided he eschews sin, man was created for salvation; man may have been created "mortal"240, he was not created the inevitable denizen of Gehenna.

Finally, the phrase "second death" encourages the "personification" of Gehenna, since in the writings of Tertullian, physical death itself sometimes assumed a personified form.241 To quote Resurr. 54:4, 18-54:5, 22:

"Ceterum mors merito in interitum deuoratur, quia et ipsa in hoc deuorat. 'Deuoravit', inquit, 'mors inualescendo', et ideo 'deuorata est in contentionem. Ubi est, mors, aculeus tuus? Ubi est, mors, contentiaio tua?'".

However, in contrast to physical death which when personified almost seems to have been "demonised", the personified "second death" remains unambiguously an agent of God. The result of such a personification must have been that the punishments inflicted by that place became still more tangible and immediate.
Given the horrendous nature of the Tertullianic Gehenna, it is hardly surprising that Tertullian described it as a place which echoes with the shrieks and groans of the damned.

The consequences of his vision of Gehenna for the attitude to death of those with whom it came into contact must have been threefold. As was the case with the prospect of divine judgement, the prospect of eternal chastisement after death must have rendered death an extremely terrifying experience - both for the person dying and for the person who had been bereaved.

In the eyes of Tertullian, the Christian life was motivated by the fear of the eternal fire. Pelikan observes:

"Like the Christian hope and the prospect of judgement, the threats of eternal fire provided Tertullian with a compelling motivation for ethics. Since Christ had removed the fire which the Christians had justly deserved and since baptism extinguished that fire for the believer, true repentance consisted in a contemplation of the ‘gehenna in corde’ and the eternal fire which it presaged. Indeed, Tertullian went so far as to say that Christian modesty was ‘constantly motivated by the fear of eternal fire and the desire for the eternal kingdom’.

It is extremely unlikely that Christians whose lives had been governed by the fear of Gehenna would have been able to divest themselves of that fear when Gehenna loomed largest, that is, in the face of death.

Secondly, it must have imbued the hours preceding death with intense soul-searching and imbued the moment of death itself with profound solemnity. If the fate of those who do not, in this life, make their peace with God is a horrendous one,
the need to achieve such peace before death supervenes is a pressing one.

Thirdly, it puts the sufferings which often accompany physical death into perspective. The sufferings of this present hour are indeed naught compared with those which may be to come. Thus, there is a sense in which painful physical death is a "pale imitation" of its eternal counterpart.

6.3.2 The denizens of Gehenna

The awe and the terror inspired by such a chastisement-orientated vision of death could have been exacerbated only by the ease with which its author condemned men to Gehenna. According to Tertullian, Gehenna will not simply be populated by such "major" criminals as apostates, heretics and pagan idolators.\textsuperscript{242} It will also be populated by more "minor" criminals. Elaborate dress, remarriage and attendance at spectacles - there are all sins which will result in a Christian being sent to Gehenna.\textsuperscript{243}

Those Christians who fail to perform due penance for their sins will also be consigned to Gehenna. Exhomologesis duly performed allows the faithful to escape the eternal fire:\textsuperscript{244}

\[\text{"Si de exomologesi retractas, gehennam in corde considera, quam tibi exomologesis extinguet, et poenae prius magnitudinem imaginare, ut de remedii adoptione non dubites."} \]
\textit{(Paen. 12:1, 1-4).}
Most frightening of all, however, for those Christians whose faith was fragile or whose conviction of salvation was weak must have been the fact that Tertullian included unbaptised infants and young children amongst the denizens of Gehenna. If young children who are relatively unspotted by life are to be numbered amongst the damned, will not the sins of their more "experienced" brethren weigh heavily upon the consciences of those Christians?

Tertullian condemned infant baptism. Indeed, he condemned any precipitate acceptance of that sacrament. \textit{Bapt.} 18:4, 22-25 and 18:5, 28-34 declare that it is unnecessary for the "age of innocence" to rush to the "forgiveness of sins".

\textit{Anim.} 38:1, 1-38:2, 20 appears to confirm the view that infants and young children are innocent; it is only at puberty that the soul acquires the "knowledge" of good and evil and with it "shame". The acquisition of the knowledge of good and evil had lain at the heart of the Fall.\textsuperscript{245}

However, against such passages, there have to be set those which teach that all souls are derived from Adam’s soul\textsuperscript{246} and that unless a man is "born" of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom.\textsuperscript{247} \textit{Bapt.} 13:2, 5-13:3, 17 regards baptism as an indispensable precondition for salvation:

"Fuerat salus retro per fidem nudam ante domini passionem et resurrectionem: at ubi fides aucta est credentibus in natiuitatem passionem resurrectionemque eius, addita est ampliato sacramento obsignatio baptismi, uestimentum quodammodo fidei quae retro erat nuda, nec potest iam sine sua lege. Lex enim tingendi imposita est et forma praescripta: ‘ite’ inquit ‘docete nationes tinguentes eas in nomine patris et filii
et spiritus sancti’. Huic legi conlata definitio illa: ‘Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et spiritu sancto non introbit in regno caelorum’ obstringit fidem ad baptismi necessitatem”.

There is no place in Tertullian’s eschatological geography for a "limbo" of the unbaptised.

6.4 Death - entrance into the realm of anticipatory awaiting

6.4.1 The underworld - the fate of the ordinary soul in the interval between death and resurrection

"Cur enim non putes animam et puniri et foueri in inferis interim sub expectatione utriusque iudicii in quadam usurpatione et candida eius? Quia saluum debet esse, inquis, in iudicio diuino negotium suum sine ulia praelibatione sententiae; tum quia et carnis opperienda est restitutio ut consortis operarum atque mercedum. Quid ergo fiet in tempore isto? Dormiemus? At enim animae nec in uiuentibus dormiunt; corporum enim est somnis, quorum et ipsa mors cum speculo suo somno. Aut nihil uis agi illic, quo uniuersa humanitas trahitur, quo spes omnis sequestratur? Delibari putas iudicium an incipi? Praecipitari an praeminstriari? Iam uero quam iniquissimum otium apud inferos, si et nocentibus adhuc illic bene est et innocentibus nondum! Quid amplius uis esse post, mortem confusa spe et incerta expectatione ludentem an uitae recensum iam et ordinationem iudicii inhorrentem?" (Anim. 58:2, 4-58:3, 19).

Within a collective vision of eschatology, the condition of the soul in the period between death and resurrection becomes a pressing issue. This is particularly true in the case of Tertullian. Daley correctly observes:

"Tertullian elaborates more clearly than any Christian writer before him a theory of an 'interim state', in which the souls of the dead await and even anticipate their final punishment or reward. He hints, in fact, that this picturesque conception of the beginnings of the afterlife before the resurrection is one of the
charismatically inspired doctrines of the Montanist sect. So, at the end of his De Anima (cc. 55-58) he sketches out in some detail a picture of Hades, 'an enormous subterranean space, hidden deep in the bowels of the earth', which serves as a 'reception room' ('hospitium') for all the dead, villains and heroes alike (55).”248

In Anim. 58:2, 4-58:3, 19, Tertullian asserts that within the confines of the underworld, the souls of the elect will enjoy a foretaste of their future bliss, while the souls of the wicked will suffer a foretaste of their future woe. He reminds his readers that even during this present life the soul never sleeps. Finally, he declares that it would be most unjust if, in the interval between death and resurrection, the souls of true believers were still in suspense regarding their ultimate salvation and if the souls of the impious were enjoying peace.

Such a theory of "anticipatory awaiting" rests upon two inter-related foundations. Those foundations are the corporeality of the soul and the soul’s capacity to feel emotions without fleshly stimuli. Thus, Anim. 7:3, 11-7:4, 23 is adamant that the soul can only undergo torment or refreshment because it is corporeal; indeed, it is its corporeality which makes it possible for the soul to be held in custody. I quote:

"Quid est autem illud quod ad inferna transfertur post diuortium corporis, quod detinetur illic, quod in diem iudicii reseruat, ad quod et Christus moriendo descendit (puto, ad animas patriarcharum), si nihil anima sub terris? Nihil enim, si non corpus; incorporalitas enim ab omni genere custodiae libera est, immunis et a poena et a fouella. Per quod enim punitur aut fouetur, hoc erit corpus; reddam de isto plenius et oportunius. Igitur si quid tormenti siue solacii anima praecerpit in carcere seu deuersorio inferum, in igni uel in sinu Abrahae, probata
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erit corporalitas animae. Incorporalitas enim nihil patitur, non habens per quod pati possit; aut si habet, hoc erit corpus. In quantum enim omne corporale passibile est, in tantum quod passibile est corporale est".

Similarly, Anim. 58:4, 19-58:5, 32 is adamant that because the soul is capable, in its earthly life, of feeling emotions which are entirely at variance with the flesh’s immediate experience, it is well qualified to experience joy or sorrow whilst the flesh is mouldering in the grave. To quote Tertullian:


What are the salient features of the condition of the dead in the interval between death and resurrection?

Although Anim. 58:4, 19-58:5, 32 indicates that their own inner peace or remorse will play a part in determining their joy or sorrow, Tertullian concentrated primarily upon the physical comfort or pain which will be conferred upon them. The condition of the pious is characterised by such words as, "refrigerium", "solacium" and "requiescere", that of the impious by such words as "ignis", "supplicium", "tormentum" and "cruciare". 249

Moreover, like the eternal fate which awaits them, the short term fate of the impious is intimately bound up with fire. Indeed, it is possible that the compartment of the "inferi" where they are held has its own punitive fire.
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What seems more reasonable, however, is that, situated directly above Gehenna, its fires made the said compartment blisteringly hot. C.E. Hill observes that:

"Gehenna is a fiery reservoir at the lowest reaches of Hades preserved for the punishment of the last day but on whose banks, close enough to feel a scorching foretaste of their ultimate ruin, the ungodly are already deposited."^250

As for the short-term fate of the pious, it is intimately bound up with the concept of "refrigerium". In secular usage, "refrigerium" is frequently associated with "refreshment by means of water".^251 To quote Daniélou, it was applied not simply -

"to the idea of a cool drink, but also to everything covered by rest and refreshment, including bathing, meals and relaxation in games."^252

When applied to the hereafter, the word retained overtones of "terrestrial", that is, physical refreshment. Thus, according to Pass. Perp. 8:1, 6-8:4, 14, when Perpetua had a vision of her brother Dinocrates' translation from a place of torment to a place of comfort, a golden bowl full of water lay at the heart of the vision:

"Die quo in neruo mansimus, ostensum est mihi hoc. Uideo locum illum quem retro uideram et Dinocraten mundo corpore bene uestitum refrigerantem; et ubi erat uulnus uideo cicatricem, et piscinam illum, quam retro uideram, summissa margine usque ad umbilicum pueri; et aquam de ea trahebat sine cessatione. Et super marginem fiala aurea plena aqua. Et accessit Dinocrates et de ea bibere coept; quae fiala non deficiebat. Et satiatus accessit de aqua ludere more infantium gaudens. Et experrecta sum. Tunc intellexi translatum eum esse de poena."
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Pass. Mar. et Iac. 6:13, 17–6:15, 24 also associated "refreshment" with water. Cyprian filled a cup from one of Paradise's pools and gave it to the martyred Marian.

Indeed, C. Mohrmann correctly concludes:

"Il faut mettre en principe que plusieurs faits sont en faveur d'une interprétation qui considère 'refrigerium', 'rafraîchissement', comme point de départ direct de l'évolution sémasiologique qui nous occupe ici. En premier lieu: le sens de rafraîchissement était bien vivant dans le latin des chrétiens et il n'a jamais été complètement refoulé par un sens plus large et moins nettement défini. En second lieu l'art figuratif paléo-chrétien suggère une interprétation qui prend comme point de départ certaines conceptions humaines de rafraîchissement, d'ombre, de breuvage. D'une part les représentations des repas célestes sont iconographiquement très proches des anciennes représentations de repas funéraires, tout en faisant allusion à l'Eucharistie par les symboles traditionnels du poisson, du vin et du panier à pain; d'autre part les paysages paradisiaques, images bucoliques, avec leurs sources et tant d'autres emblèmes rustiques à l'ombre des arbres feuillus, nous avertissent de ne pas exclure du 'refrigerium' paléo-chrétien l'image du rafraîchissement terrestre."253

Just as the essence of the physical torment inflicted upon the souls of the wicked will be heat and thirst,254 the essence of the bliss enjoyed by the souls of the elect will be pleasant coolness and preservation from the pangs of thirst.

The words "solacium" and "requies" also imply that, in the interval between death and resurrection, the condition of the souls of the just will be one of physical comfort and repose. To quote Daniélou,

"in the Septuagint, the New Testament and the earliest Christian literature, the theme of God's
rest on the seventh day and that of the rest of the dead are combined."255

In the eyes of the early Church, the celestial Paradise was an attractive place.256 Therefore, it seems likely that Abraham’s Bosom, though not so beautiful or splendid, was also characterised by pleasing surroundings.

Anim. 7:4, 18-23, 55:2, 7-16, 57:7, 45-47 and 58:1, 1-58:3, 19 are adamant that Abraham’s Bosom (the receptacle of the unmartyred just) is situated in the underworld. Thus, Anim. 55:2, 7-16 mocks those Christians who setting themselves above their Lord, are too proud to "enter" an Abraham’s Bosom which is set within the confines of the "inferi":

"Quodsi Christus deus, quia et homo, mortuus secundum scripturas et sepultus secundum easdem, huic quoque legi satisfecit forma humanae mortis apud inferos functus, nec ante ascendit in sublimiora caelorum quam descendit in inferiora terrarum, ut illic patriarchas et prophetas compottes sui faceret, habes et regionem inferum subterraneam credere et illos cubito pellere qui satis superbe non putent animas fidelium inferis dignas, serui super dominum et discipuli super magistrum, aspernati, si forte, in Abrahæ sinu expectandæ resurrectionis solacium capere."

However, in Tertullian’s works, there are two passages which might support an alternative "geographical" vision. Marc. IV. 34:11, 18-34:12, 4 declares that Abraham’s Bosom is distinct from the "inferi", and indeed, that "a great abyss" divides the two regions. Marc. IV. 34:13, 10-15 asserts that Abraham’s Bosom though "not in Heaven", is "higher" than the "inferi". I quote:

"Sed Marcion aliormus cogit: scilicet utramque mercedem creatoris siue tormenti siue refrigerii apud inferos determinat, eis positam, qui legi et
prophetis oboedierint, Christi uero et dei sui caelestem definit sinum et portum. Respondebimus et ad haec, ipsa scriptura reuincente oculos eius, qui ad inferos discernit Abrahae sinum pauperi. Aliud enim inferi, ut puto, aliud quoque Abrahae sinus. Nam et magnum ait intercidere regiones istas profundum et transitum utrimque prohibere. Sed nec adleuasset diues oculos et quidem de longinquo, nisi in superiora et de altitudinis longinquo per immensam illam distantiam sublimitatis et profunditatis" (Marc. IV. 34:11, 18-34:12, 4)

and

"Eam itaque regionem, sinum dice Abrahae, etsi non caelestem, sublimiorem tamen inferis, interim refrigerium praebere animabus iustorum, donec consummatio rerum resurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis expungat, tunc apparitura caelesti promissione, - quam Marcion suo deo uindicat". (Marc. IV. 34:13, 10-15).

Discussing the apparent contradiction between these passages and such excerpts as Anim. 7:4, 18-23, 55:2, 7-16 and 58:1, 1-58:3, 19, Martin assumes the Abraham’s Bosom and Paradise were synonymous and that, in the interval between writing Marc. and Anim. (that is, in the years between 208 and 210) Tertullian came to restrict the membership of Abraham’s Bosom to the martyrs and to consign the unmartyred just to Hades. He observes:

"It looks very much as if he advanced in those two years to the position where he still held that 'Abraham’s Bosom' or 'Paradise' was for 'the righteous', but had become more exacting in his definition of 'the righteous'. On this understanding, the ordinary Christians would still anticipate the joys of Heaven in their own compartment of Hades ('apud inferos'), but would not be admitted to the 'refrigeria' of 'Abraham’s Bosom' or 'Paradise'." 257

Pelikan supports this distinction between Abraham’s Bosom and the underworld. 258
Martin concedes that the phrase "sublimiorem inferis" (in 
Marc. IV 34:13, 11) may simply refer to "an area 'in the 
lower areas' which is yet higher than those inhabited by 
sinners". However, he considers that -

"the stress on 'magnum profundum' taken from 
Jesus' language at Lk. 16:26 (Χριστου του μεγαλου 
θεου) does not make it easy to think that Tertullian 
thus understood the situation."  

I believe that several factors militate against such an 
equation of Abraham's Bosom and Paradise. Firstly, at the 
time of writing Anim. Tertullian manifestly did distinguish 
between the areas in question. Anim. 55:2, 7-16 assumes 
that Abraham's Bosom is the abode of the righteous dead, 
Anim. 55:4, 27-55:5, 40, that Paradise is the abode of the 
martyrs alone. 

Moreover, it is surely significant that Anim. 7:4, 18-23 
does not mention the martyrs. According to Tertullian, 
martyrdom is the peculiar criterion of entry into 
Paradise. Had Paradise and Abraham's Bosom been one and 
the same, he might reasonably have been expected to mention 
the martyrs at that juncture. It is surely also significant 
that Marc. IV. 34:10, 10-34:13, 14 fails to employ the 
metaphor of the "divine altar". That altar was Tertullian's 
favourite metaphor for Paradise; indeed, he hardly ever 
referred to Paradise without employing it.

Secondly, Martin's line of argument assumes that the 
compartment of the underworld where the just are lodged (the
compartment alluded to in Anim. 58:2, 4-58:5, 32) has no name. Yet, Anim. 7:4, 18-23 explicitly calls it Abraham’s Bosom, whilst Anim. 58:1, 1-3 by alluding to the fates of Dives and Lazarus, does so implicitly:

"Omnis ergo anima penes inferos? Inquis. Uelis ac nolis, et supplicia iam illic et refrigeria: habes pauperem et diuitem."

Thirdly, Anim. 35:3, 24-36 and 58:8, 45-50 warn the faithful that those who fail to adhere to their baptismal vows will be thrown into "prison" - not to be released until they have paid off the "last farthing". They also state that that "gaol" is situated in "inferi".

Since, in the eyes of Tertullian, the souls of the elect are aware of their ultimate salvation and enjoy some of its fruits, even as they await the resurrection, those who are released from their incarceration in the underworld must have been incarcerated in the receptable of the just. (Daniélou’s suggestion that some of the elect will be temporarily imprisoned in the receptable of the damned is erroneous,\textsuperscript{263} depending as it does on a fully developed doctrine of Purgatory). Given that Tertullian named the receptable of the just Abraham’s Bosom, it is clear that he could not have equated Abraham’s Bosom and Paradise. The idea of men being incarcerated in Paradise is ridiculous.

Fourthly, his emphasis on the "great gulf" which separates Abraham’s Bosom from the region of torment is not a serious obstacle to a subterranean understanding of Abraham’s Bosom. The said gulf merely denotes the fact that man’s fate is
sealed in this life – there can be no repentance after death. Even within a subterranean understanding of Abraham’s Bosom, it is necessary for there to be a chasm which cannot be spanned – a chasm preventing movement upwards from the region of temporary torment.

Finally, the short period between the composition of Marc. and Anim. mitigates against Martin’s interpretation. He asserts that between 208 and 210, Tertullian redrew the demarcations of Abraham’s Bosom/Paradise, so as to exclude the unmartyred just. However, since Tertullian declares, in Anim. 55:5, 41-43, that he also teaches in the now lost De Paradiso that all souls must await the day of the Lord in the "inferi", he would have to have redrawn those demarcations very soon after he finally revised Marc.

I am personally inclined to believe that Tertullian’s apparent ambiguity in Marc. IV 34:10, 10-34:13, 15 was due to a dual, though closely related, agenda, that is, an anxiety to distinguish Abraham’s Bosom from the Marcionite vision of Sheol and an anxiety to distinguish it from the subterranean areas of punishment.

Marc. III. 24:1, 4-8 makes explicit one of the issues facing Tertullian – the issue which is implicit in Marc. IV. 34:11, 18-22. An imaginary retort by Marcion, Marc. III 24:1, 4-8 contrasts the heavenly Kingdom promised by the good god with Creator’s promise of the refreshment in Sheol:

"'Immo’, inquis, 'spero ab illo, quod et ipsum faciat ad testimonium diversitatis, regnum dei aeternae et caelestis possessionis. Ceterum
uester Christus pristinum statum Iudaeis pollicetur ex restitutione terrae et post decursum uitae apud inferos in sinu Abrahae refrigerium'."

In his eagerness to protect the Creator's promises from their Marcionite detractors, Tertullian may have over-emphasised the superior nature of the blessings of Abraham's Bosom to the shadows of Old Testament Sheol, thereby giving the false impression that Abraham's Bosom is not a compartment of "Sheol"/"inferi".

The other issue facing Tertullian comes across in Marc. IV. 34:13, 10-15, where he sets the words "inferi" and "caelum" in opposition. If the contrast between Heaven and the "inferi" is to hold good - Heaven being characterised by rewards - the "inferi" must stand for either Gehenna or an area where interim punishment is inflicted. (Although Tertullian normally employed the word "gehenna" when referring to eternal chastisement, Fug. 12:2, 21-22 proves that he did occasionally use the word "inferi"). Thus, his message would be that Abraham's Bosom though not a heavenly abode, is situated higher than Gehenna and the area of interim punishment.

Indeed, the contrast between Abraham's Bosom and the areas of punishment would also have been encouraged by the Marcionite vision of Sheol which he sought to counter. According to Marcionite eschatology, all men who neglect to worship the good god are destined permanently for the Creator's underworld. Within such a scheme, the distinction between "inferi" and "gehenna" becomes somewhat blurred; Marcion regarded the Creator's "rewards" with such
contempt that he considered them as little better than punishments. The result must have been that when employed by Marcion, the word "underworld" carried strong overtones of punishment.

By situating Abraham’s Bosom in the underworld, Tertullian created a tripartite division of "inferi" - Abraham’s Bosom, the temporary abode of the damned and Gehenna. To employ a thoroughly modern simile, the Tertullianic underworld is like a multi-storey block of flats, with Gehenna on the ground floor and Abraham’s Bosom as the "penthouse". Whether Tertullian did or did not consciously appropriate those traditions, his thinking on the underworld stands in a direct line with Old Testament teaching on Sheol and that of I Enoch 22:1-14 regarding the four "caverns".

6.4.2 Did Tertullian believe in Purgatory?

Certain members of the scholarly community (reading later Catholic doctrine back into the reflections of the early Church) consider that Tertullian adhered to a doctrine of Purgatory. A d’Ales declares:

"Les élus devront expier jusqu’aux moindres fautes, avant d’être admis à la première résurrection, et leur millénaire s’en trouvera plus ou moins écourté, si même il n’est pas, pour quelques-uns, totalement supprimé. Qu’est-ce que cette attente douloureuse, sinon un purgatoire?"

However, a minute examination of Tertullian’s works reveals that this view is unfounded. In its developed form, the theory of Purgatory assumes that there is a fixed place,
where those souls who are neither absolutely pure nor totally corrupt will be purified.\textsuperscript{270} The purpose of Purgatory is to render those who pass through it fit for the celestial realms.\textsuperscript{271} Thus, since purification is the preliminary to eternal bliss, Purgatory stands closer to Heaven than to Hell. To quote J. Le Goff:

"Purgatory was not ultimately a true intermediary. Reserved for the purification of the future elect, it stood closer to Heaven than to Hell. No longer in the centre, Purgatory was situated above rather than below the true middle ... It is therefore illusory to think of Purgatory as lying midway between the Hell escaped and the Heaven desired by the soul, all the more so because the soul's stay in Purgatory is merely temporary, ephemeral, not everlasting like its term in Heaven or Hell."\textsuperscript{272}

Purgation will be achieved by a combination of real fire and metaphorical fire (that is, remorse).\textsuperscript{273} Intimately bound up with medieval penitential practice, Purgatory made it possible to extend penance beyond the grave.\textsuperscript{274} The medieval Church assumed that the vast majority of mankind would serve time in Purgatory.\textsuperscript{275}

The ideas broached by Tertullian are quite different. \textit{Anim.} 7:1, 3-7:2, 7 and 7:4, 18-24 acknowledge that, in the interval between death and resurrection, some souls will be scorched by fire. \textit{Anim.} 7:1, 3-7:2, 7 observes:

"Dolet apud inferos anima cuiusdam et punitur in flamma et cruciatur in lingua et de digito animae felicioris implorat solacium roris. Imaginem existimas exitum illum pauperis laetantis et diuitis maerentis? Et quid illic Eleazari nomen, si non in ueritate res est?"
Nonetheless, in these excerpts, the key words are "tormentum", "punire" and "cruciare"; the words "purgatio" and "purgare" are absent. Clearly, the aim of the Tertullianic fire is to chastise its victims - not to purify them.

This conclusion is confirmed by Anim. 58:2, 4-58:3, 19. There, Tertullian asserts that whilst awaiting the resurrection, the soul will be given a foretaste of its eternal fate. To quote Anim. 58:2, 4-7:

"Cur enim non putes animam et puniri et foueri in inferis interim sub expectatione utriusque iudicii in quadam usurpatione et candida eius?"

It is surely significant that just as in Anim. 7:1, 3-7:2, 7 and 7:4, 18-23, Anim. 58:2, 4-58:3, 19 employs the terminology of chastisement to describe the experiences of the wicked in "inferi" and not that of purification. When read in the light of this passage, the fire which tortures Dives and his fellow sinners is simply the harbinger of the fires of Gehenna.

Then there are Anim. 35:3, 24-36 and 58:8, 45-52, passages where Tertullian affirms that the souls of the faithful will be held in "prison" until they have served the sentence which their sins merit. Anim. 58:8, 45-52 declares:

"In summa, cum carcerem illum, quem euangelium demonstrat, inferos intellegimus et nouissimum quadrantem modicum quoque delictum mora resurrectionis illic luendum interpretamur, nemo dubitatit animam aliquid pensare penes inferos salua resurrectionis plenitudine per carnem quoque. Hoc etiam paracletus frequentissime
commendauit, si qui sermones eius ex agnitione promissorum charismatum admiserit."

Yet, in these passages too, the emphasis is upon the terminology of "payment", not upon that of "purification". "Expendere", "luere" and "pensare" - these are the words which Tertullian chose.278

The dividing line between expiating one's sins and being purged of sin is a fine one. Nevertheless, in Anim. 35:3, 24-36 and 58:8, 45-52, it is clear that the souls of the faithful will be punished for their sins - not purged of them. Daley justly observes:

"In two passages of De Anima (35; 58) Tertullian applies to this pre-resurrection period of suffering in Hades the reference in Matt. 5:26 to the 'prison' from which the unforgiving believer will not be released until he has 'paid the last farthing'. This does not imply, for him, a limited suffering of purgation, but rather a temporary anticipation, in the sinner's soul, of the eternal fate of his whole person (so De An. 58)."279

The key to a proper understanding of the "incarceration" of the faithful is to be found in Marc. III. 24:6, 7-9. There, Tertullian states that the first resurrection will be a gradual process. The saints will not arise together. The precise moment of their resurrection will be determined by the weight of their sins:

"Post cuius mille annos, intra quam aetatem concluditur sanctorum resurrectio pro meritis maturius uel tardius resurgentium."

Within such a theory of "graded" resurrection, the saints will indeed be imprisoned until they have paid off the "last farthing".
The importance of *Marc.* III. 24:6, 7-9 is confirmed by Waszink:

"Nobody is admitted to the millennium before he has expiated his sins 'up to the last farthing'; the more sins one has to expiate, the later he will take part in the 'first resurrection'. Pagans (by 'sancti' Tertullian means the Christians ...) are altogether excluded from this resurrection; they remain in hell till the last judgement." 280

For this postponement of the individual's resurrection to the millennium to truly constitute Purgatory "in embryo", the soul concerned will have to be "improved" as a direct result of the experience. There is no hint of such an improvement in *Marc.* III. 24:6, 7-9. Deferral of the individual's participation in the millennium is a penalty for sin; it is not an act of catharsis. Waszink supports this conclusion:

"Tertullian regards the circumstance that the 'sancti' (adv. *Marc.* 3, 24: ... 'mille annos, intra quam aetatem concluditur sanctorum resurrectio pro meritis maturius uel tardius resurgentium') must expiate even the slightest sins ('modicum quoque delictum') by a residence in hell as an 'argumentum a fortiori' in favour of his conviction 'animam aliquid pensare penes inferos'. Nevertheless, he does not believe in the purification of the soul after death ... he assumes that the only punishment undergone by those who, without being perfect, are not excluded from the millennium, consists in a postponement of their first resurrection (which, however, does not last until the last judgement, as A.J. Mason supposes, but till the moment at which they have 'paid the uttermost farthing'; it stands to reason that this moment differs for everybody)." 281
Anim. 35:3, 33 was accurate when it gave the angel who will escort the soul to its temporary "prison" the designation "the avenging angel".

The incarceration of the elect until they merited resurrection to the millennium may have shared with the full-blown doctrine of Purgatory the task of completing the expiation which exhomologesis had begun282 and like the inhabitants of Purgatory, those who underwent it may have stood closer to Heaven than to Gehenna but in all other respects, it diverged sharply from that institution. In the eyes of Tertullian, the elect are, in total, a small number;283 indeed, since the martyrs automatically expiate all their sins,284 these of the elect who die with sins unaccounted for must have been a still smaller number. Moreover, unlike the inhabitants of Purgatory, the elect are subjected to neither torment by fire nor any other retributive penalty.

Finally, although the Tertullianic "prison" appears to have been a fixed place (whose cells included both the intermediate abode of the pious and that of the impious - Anim. 58:8, 48-50 pointing to the latter when it notes that the flesh will subsequently be obliged to pay its dues too, "nemo dubitabit animam aliquid pensare penes inferos salua resurrectionis plenitudine per carnem quoque") Tertullian's choice of cell for the imprisonment of the faithful mitigates against a genuine theory of Purgatory. The need for the faithful to anticipate a measure of their future joy means that that cell must be none other than Abraham's
However, an area which is specifically given over to joy can hardly be said to fulfil the basic criterion of Purgatory, that is, that it be a site whose specific purpose is purification.

There is only one passage which might appear to stand against the equation of Abraham’s Bosom and a prison cell. It is Anim. 7:4, 18-20, where Tertullian juxtaposes "torment" and "comfort", "the prison" and "the lodging-place", "the fire" and "Abraham’s Bosom":

"Igitur si quid tormenti siue solacii anima praecerpit in carcere seu deuersorio inferum, in igni uel in sinu Abrahae, probata erit corporalitas animae".

Nevertheless, such an impression is a false one. The Tertullianic "prison" covered not merely Abraham’s Bosom but also the "condemned cell" where the damned are held. Tertullian’s intention, in Anim. 7:4, 18-20, is to contrast the privileged treatment accorded to the pious with the hardship inflicted upon the impious. The metaphor of prison, with its connotations of want and deprivation, fits this overall design well, particularly when it is set over against "a lodging-place", the implications of a lodging-place being those of ease and comfort - ease and comfort in a period of transition to a permanent home.
In Anim. 58:1, 1-3, Tertullian states categorically that each member of humanity must await the onset of the resurrection in the underworld. Elsewhere, however, he recognises one exception to this rule - the martyrs. They await the resurrection in Paradise. Scorp. 12:9, 25-12:10, 7 and Anim. 55:4, 29-55:5, 40 were in no doubt regarding the temporary "dwelling" of the martyrs. To quote Scorp. 12:9, 25-12:10, 7:

"Sed et interim sub altari martyrum animae placidum quiescunt et fiducia ultionis patientiam pascent et indutae stolis candidam claritatis usurpant, donec et ali lorum consortivm impleant. Nam et rursus inmultudo albati et palmis uictoriae insignes reuelantur, scilicet de antichristo triumphantes, sicut unus ex presbyteris, 'hi sunt', ait, 'qui ueniunt ex illa pressura magna et lauerunt uestimentum suum et candidauerunt ipsum in sanguine agni'. Uestitus enim animae caro. Sordes quidem bapismate abluuntur, maculae uero martyrio candidantur".

Although Tertullian never specifically stated so, the souls of the martyrs (like their compatriots in Abraham’s Bosom) must enjoy "refrigerium"; it is inconceivable that he would have accorded the unmartyred just a privilege from which he excluded the martyrs.

Where the treatment of the souls of the martyrs differs from that accorded to those of unmartyred just is that the martyrs are granted additional honours and delights. Palms are placed in their "hands". Crowns encircle their "brows".
White robes envelope their "bodies". (The key to a proper understanding of the delights of the Tertullianic Paradise is the corporeality of the soul).

Based as it is upon Rev. 7:13-16, it is possible that Scorp. 12:10, 1-7 has ceased to contemplate the condition of the martyrs' souls in the interval between death and resurrection, moving on to contemplate instead the condition of the martyrs in the Kingdom. In that case, their "white robes" will be nothing less than their purified resurrected flesh. Nevertheless, it is more likely that the extract in question simply amplifies the preceding vision, with the result that the souls of the martyrs are robed in white as visible testimony to the purity of their martyred flesh.

Robed in white, with crowns and palms, the martyrs also enjoy the privilege of the Beatific Vision. Resurr. 43:4, 12-14 declares:

"Nemo enim peregrinatus a corpore statim inmoratur penes dominum, nisi ex martyrii praerogatiua, paradiso scilicet, non inferis, deuersurus".

The joy of the martyrs in Paradise is, however, not absolute. How can it be other than incomplete when their deaths have not yet been avenged and they have still to enter the portals of the heavenly Jerusalem?288 How can their joy be perfect when the flesh, the soul's partner in life, is excluded from it and when entrance into the Kingdom is still prohibited?289
The incomplete character of paradisiacal bliss is confirmed by Orat. 5:3, 12-15. There, citing Rev. 6:9-10, Tertullian acknowledges that the martyrs continue to be subject to impatience:

"Clamant ad dominum inuidia animae martyrum sub altari: "quonam usque non ulcisceris, domine, sanguinem nostrum de incolis terrae?" Nam utique ultio illorum a saeculi fine dirigitur."

(Scorp. 12:9, 25-12:9, 1, with its reference to the "patience" of the martyrs as they await the Parousia, was probably an overly idealised picture - a picture which was born of his desire to prove that the martyrs accept God’s will).

What is noteworthy about Tertullian’s vision of the celestial Paradise is the subordinate role which that vision accords to the metaphor of the garden. This is in marked contrast to Pass. Perp. 4:8, 26-30 and 11:5, 2-11:6, 5, where Paradise is envisaged as a beautiful garden, a garden furnished with trees, roses and all manner of flowers. In the writings of Tertullian, there is no passage to match the poetic imagination of Pass. Perp. 11:5, 2-11:6, 5:

"Et dum gestamur ab ipsis quattuor angelis, factum est nobis spatium grande, quod tale fuit quasi uiridarium arbores habens rosae et omne genus flores. Altitudo arborum erat in modum cypessi, quorum folia cadebant sine cessatione."

His failure to employ the metaphor of the garden does not necessarily mean that he rejected it. Apol. 47:13, 56-60 describes the celestial Paradise as a place of exceptional loveliness ("amoenitas"). Scorp. 12:8, 15-12:9, 23 includes the "tree of life" within the inheritance of the martyrs;
the tree which had grown in the Garden of Eden. Finally, Anim. 55:4, 29-35 alludes to Saturus' vision of Paradise; the metaphor of the garden held pride of place in that vision.

What it does highlight is that Tertullian was wary of indulging in speculation for which there is no Biblical warrant. Thus, by and large, he based his descriptions of the celestial Paradise on 2 Cor 12:2-3 and Rev. 6:9-10.

It may also illustrate his distaste for importing physical luxuriance into the hereafter (his account of the millennium is marked by a similar distaste).290 Even his descriptions of the earthly Paradise are characterised by restraint.291

It is one thing to describe the joys conferred by the Tertullianic Paradise. It is another to determine its geographical position. Paen. 12:9, 37-41 teaches that the temporary home of the martyrs is distinct from the earthly Paradise to which Adam sought readmission; instead, it is to be identified with the celestial altar.292

Such an identification, however, is not without its difficulties. Anim. 55:3, 19-25 and Resurr. 50:4, 13-50:6, 28 both teach that until the Parousia has occurred, no man will enter the Kingdom. Anim. 55:3, 19-25 observes:

"Quo ergo animam exhalabis in caelum Christo illic adhuc sedente ad dexteram patris, nondum dei iussu per tubam archangeli audito, nondum illis quos domini aduentus in saeculo inuenerit, obuiam ei ereptis in aerem, cum his qui mortui in Christo primi resurgent? Nulli patet caelum terra adhuc
The problem is compounded by the fact that, in Resurr. 43:4, 11-14, Scorp. 12:10, 1-7 and Pat. 13:7, 25-28, Tertullian declares that the martyrs will be admitted to the divine "presence" immediately upon death. To quote Pat. 13:7, 25-28 -

"cum uero producitur ad experimentum felicitatis, ad occasionem secundae intinctionis, ad ipsum divinae sedis ascensum, nulla plus illic quam patientia corporis".

It would be a mistake to dismiss the problem posed by Anim. 55:3, 19-25 and Resurr. 50:4, 13-50:6, 28 on the grounds that the latter teaches the unworthiness of the flesh to enter the Kingdom -not the unworthiness of the soul. Such a distinction is very fine. It is, moreover, a distinction which plainly does not apply to Anim. 55:3, 19-25.

It would also be a mistake to dismiss the problem in terms of the new Heaven and the new earth293 which will eventually replace the present Creation. Tertullian may occasionally have substituted the word "paradisus"294 for the words "Heaven" or "Kingdom" but the "Kingdom" does not correspond to the new Heaven and "Paradise" to the old Heaven. The Kingdom from which the martyrs are excluded is the very place that Christ has already entered.295

be removed simply by the recognition that God cannot be confined with one place, since if He could be limited, He would not be God. Nonetheless, in the case of Tertullian, such a reluctance to place limitations upon God was undoubtedly reinforced by the Judaic concept of the "seven Heavens".

Within such a concept, it is the seventh Heaven which contains the divine throne. 2 Enoch 9:1-6 describes the loftiest of the Heavens, where God is enthroned and worshipped by the angelic host day and night, in the following terms:

"They showed me from afar the Lord sitting on his throne; and all the heavenly armies, grouped according to their rank, came forward and worshipped the Lord, and then they returned again and went to their places in joy and gladness and in measureless light."
(2 Enoch 9:4)

In an anthropomorphic age, the seventh Heaven is regarded as the "dwelling-place" of God.

Paradise is situated in the third Heaven. 2 Enoch 5:1-8 asserts:

"And the men took me from there and led me up to the third heaven and set me in the midst of Paradise. And that place is more beautiful than anything there is to see - all trees in full bloom, all fruit ripe, every kind of food always in abundance, every breeze fragrant."
(2 Enoch 5:1-2).

Thus, although the inhabitants of Paradise do not enjoy God's presence in the absolute sense that the inhabitants of the seventh Heaven do, they will delight in its reflective beams.
Tertullian’s indebtedness to the theory of the seven Heavens is confirmed by Praes. 24:5, 12-16, where recounting the experience of Paul in 2 Cor. 12:2-3, he equated Paradise with the third Heaven:

"Sed etsi in tertium usque caelum ereptus Paulus et in paradisum delatus audiit quaedam illic, non possunt uideri fuisse quae illum in aliam doctrinam instructorem praestarent, cum ita fuerit condicio eorum ut nulli hominum proderentur."

Furthermore, the words "penes" and "sedes" which are to the fore, in Resurr. 43:4, 13 and Pat. 13:7, 27 respectively, do not simply mean "the presence of" God or "the throne of" God. They can also mean "the house of" God. Thus, the phrases "penes dominum" and "divine sedes" refer to the celestial realms in general, not simply to the immediate presence of God.

Within such an eschatological geography, Tertullian could remain true to those Biblical texts which closed the gates of the Kingdom (that is, the seventh Heaven) to men until after the Parousia, notably, Jn. 3:13 and I Cor. 15:50297, whilst permitting the souls of the martyrs to enjoy the delights of the divine presence, or to put it another way the Beatific Vision, in an attenuated form.

There is a certain logic in situating the celestial altar within the celestial realms and yet outwith the seventh Heaven. Sacrifices and sacraments are indispensable modes of communication between man and God in this life but when
the faithful have entered the immediate presence of the Divine, that is, the Kingdom, they will become obsolete. As the channel of these sacrifices and sacraments, the celestial altar is also necessary only until the elect enter into their full inheritance. Afterwards, it will become obsolete too.

As for the problems posed by Christ’s High Priesthood and the laying of the faithful’s prayers and good works upon the celestial altar (problems to the fore in such excerpts as Iud. 14:8, 52-57 and Orat. 28:3, 8-28:4, 15) they can probably be best explained in terms of the omniscience of God. Christ can advocate the merits of the faithful and the Father can accept their gifts without those merits or gifts entering the immediate presence of the omniscient Triune God.

Applied to death, Tertullian’s theory of anticipatory awaiting has several consequences. Firstly, it detracts from the absolute character of both death and resurrection. Because the souls of the dead retain sensibility after death, there is a sense in which death is not the annihilation of man; the flesh alone is annihilated.

As a result, resurrection does not restore life to a totally annihilated being; it restores life to that part of man’s constitution which has been annihilated, that is, the flesh. Though the being to whom that restoration is made had lost an integral part of his person, he had retained his identity.
and his individuality, even before his flesh is restored to him. Life in the sphere of anticipatory awaiting may be a grey "half-life" but it is still life.

Secondly, like the fears of judgement and chastisement, the fear of interim punishment after death must have rendered death frightening in the eyes of the spiritually weak. However, for their spiritually stronger brethren or for men assured of their own salvation, the prospect of rewards in the interval between death and resurrection must have imbued death with hope.

Thirdly, the prospect of such rewards must have been an excellent pastoral device for assuaging the grief of the bereaved. The idea that the souls of one's loved ones are enjoying "peace" and "refreshment" is a comfort. The idea that their flesh is simply mouldering in the grave would be a torment. Thus, the concept of anticipatory awaiting distracts attention away from the putrefaction which inescapably follows hard upon death towards the life which continues after death.

6.5 Death: entry into eternal bliss

Eternal bliss is the goal to which Christians aspire. The essence of that bliss is life everlasting and citizenship of the Kingdom. That these were indeed the fundamental characteristics of eternal bliss, in the eyes of Tertullian, comes across clearly in Scorp. 12:8, 15-22. The diet of angels, the inscription of one's name in the book of life,
the right to eat from the forbidden tree and the privilege of being a "column" in the temple of God, a "column" upon which the names of the Father, the Son and the New Jerusalem have been etched - these are numbered amongst the inheritance of the elect. Tertullian declares:

"Exinde uictoribus quibusque promittit nunc arborem uitate et mortis ueniam secundae, nunc latens manna cum calculo candido et nomine ignoto, nunc ferreae uirgae potestatem et stellae matutinae claritatem, nunc albam uestiri nec deleri de libro uitate et columnam fieri in dei templo in nomine dei et domini et Hierusalem caelestis inscriptam, nunc residere cum domino in throno eius, quod aliquando Zebedaei filiis negabatur."

The importance of everlasting life and citizenship of the Kingdom in Tertullian's understanding of eternal bliss is confirmed by Mart. 3:3, 23-26 and Iud. 9:22, 150-154. The former promises the faithful the crown of immortality, angelic essence and citizenship of Heaven. The latter promises them the right to drink deep in the land of milk and honey -

"nam quia Iesus Christus secundum populum, quod sumus nos nationes in saeculi deserto commorantes antea, introducturus esset in terram repromissionis melle et lacte manantem, id est in uitate aeternae possessionem, qua nihil dulcius".

Mart. 3:3, 23-26 also focusses upon yet another aspect of his understanding of eternal bliss, that is, honour ("gloria"). The saints will be accorded a position of distinction in the celestial realms. What is more, the honour which they enjoy will not be uniform. Thus, Resurr. 52:11, 40-52:15, 59 observes that just as the brightness of the sun, of the moon and of the stars differ, the honour
conferred upon the saints will bear a direct relation to their personal worth.

It is difficult to determine exactly what Tertullian included under the heading "gloria". Resurr. 52:11, 40-52:15, 59 with its distinction between the flesh of ordinary Christians and that of martyrs, suggests that the individual's spiritual depth and the radiance and beauty of his resurrected flesh will go hand in hand. Mart. 4:9, 18-24 with its contrast between the false "bead" of earthly praise and the true "pearl" of heavenly glory, points to the fact that the saints will be received with acclaim by God and the angelic host. "Gloria" probably included a variety of blessings.

The faithful will also experience the delight of contemplating God and singing His praises. Tertullian never employed I Cor. 13:12 directly in his meditations upon the hereafter. (He confined his exegesis of the phrase "to see through a glass darkly" to God's revelation of Himself to men in dreams and visions). Nevertheless, given that he knew I Cor 13:12, it is likely that he was familiar with the other half of its parallel, that is, the prospect of seeing God "face to face".

Even if he were not so familiar, Resurr. 58:5, 12-15 indicates that he looked with expectation to the time when the faithful will stand in the immediate presence of the Lord:
"Ubi casus aduersi apud deum, aut ubi incursus infesti apud Christum? Ubi daemonici impetus apud spiritum sanctum, iam et ipso diabolo cum angelis suis ignibus merso?"

Since contemplating an object follows naturally from being in its presence, contemplation of the Godhead is the logical consequence of standing in the immediate presence of the Trinity.

If contemplating the Divine is the logical corollary of being in God's presence, praising God is the logical corollary of truly knowing Him. Indeed, Resurr. 61:1, 1-6 considers that man has been endowed with a mouth not simply that he might take sustenance but also that he might glorify God:

"Sed accepisti, homo, os ad uorandum atque potandum: cur non potius ad eloquendum, ut a ceteris animalibus distes? Cur non potius ad praedicandum deum, ut etiam hominibus antistes? Denique Adam ante nomina animalibus enuntiauit quam de arbore decerpsit, ante etiam prophetauit quam uorauit".

The delights of the elect, however, are not confined to contemplating the Deity and offering Him praise. Eternal bliss will also be characterised by an intimate, loving relationship with God - a relationship in which the Christian has been "accepted" by his Father. This is expressed vividly in Cult. II. 13:7, 43-45, Marc. III. 24:10, 16-24:11, 20 and Resurr. 63:1, 1-63:3, 12, where Tertullian adopted the metaphors of having a lover and being a bride to express the saints' relationship with their God, in the hereafter. To quote Cult. II. 13:7, 43-45, the woman who "attires" herself in the "fine linen" of holiness and the "purple" of chastity will have God as her "Lover":
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"Uestite uos serico probitatis, byssino sanctitatis, purpura pudicitiae. Taliter pigmentatae deum habebunt amatorem."

A proper understanding of life in the Kingdom, however, requires a recognition not merely of the pleasures in which the faithful will indulge but also of the pleasures which they will eschew. Life in the Tertullianic Kingdom will be entirely celibate. Sexual relations will cease. The reason is simple. With the abolition of death, procreation will have become redundant. 300

The watchword of the Tertullianic Kingdom is taken from the Synoptic Gospels, that is, from Mt. 22:30, Mk. 12:25 and Lk. 20:35-36. 301 The "sons of the resurrection" will "neither marry" nor be "given in marriage".

Cast. 13:4, 35-41 epitomises Tertullian’s attitude to sexual relations, both in this life and in the hereafter. Sexual relations will play no part in eternity. Therefore, whosoever aspires to the joys of eternity should renounce them in this life:

"Quanti igitur et quantae in ecclesiasticis ordinals de continentia censentur, qui deo nubere maluerunt, qui carnis suae honorem restituerunt, - quique se iam illius aequi filios dicauerunt, occidentes in se concupiscientiam libidinis et totum illud, quod intra paradisum non potuit admiiti. Unde praesumendum est hos, qui intra paradisum recipi volent, tandem debere cessare ab ea re, a qua paradisus intactus est."

The celibate character of life eternal does not mean that the resurrected flesh will have lost its gender. Such a
loss would have deprived it of its humanity and its individuality. It means rather that men and women (whilst retaining their sexuality) will cease to feel its demands or to respond to them.

The celibacy which characterises life in the Kingdom, together with the fundamental nature of the blessings delineated above, underlines the fact that the joys of the Tertullianic Kingdom are primarily spiritual joys—not physical ones. Thus, Marc. III. 24:11, 20-23 was well justified in likening those who attain to the celestial Kingdom to doves—

"ita per illum ascensum ad cælestia regna tendentes miratur spiritus dicens: uolant uelut qui sunt milui, ut nubes uolant et uelut pulli columbarum ad me, scilicet simpliciter, ut columbae".

Doves are symbols of purity and outward manifestations of the Spirit.302

There is, however, evidence to suggest that the joys awarded to the faithful in the Tertullianic Kingdom will not be simply spiritual ones. Contrasting the eternal torment which will be inflicted upon the damned with the endless bliss which will be bestowed upon the faithful, Apol. 49:2, 5-8 and Test. 4:1, 1-9 characterise that bliss by the word "refrigerium". In the words of Test. 4:1, 1-9:

"Iam nunc quod ad necessariorem sententiam tuam spectet, quantum et ad ipsum statum tuum tendit, adfirmamus te manere post uitae disputationem et expectare diem iudicii proque meritis aut cruciatui destinari aut refrigerio, utroque sempiterno; quibus sustinendis necessario tibi substantiam pristinam eiusdemque hominis materiam et memoriam reuersuram, quod et nihil mali ac boni
sentire possis sine carnis passionalis facultate et nulla ratio sit iudicii sine ipsius exhibitione qui meruit iudicii passionem".

When transposed into eschatology, the word "refrigerium" retained profoundly physical overtones - overtones derived from "refreshment by water". 303

Thus, when applied to the celestial sphere, the word "refrigerium" indicates that the resurrected dead will enjoy ease and repose. Furthermore, since the enjoyment of beautiful surroundings is a physical delight, celestial "refrigerium" also indicates that the elect will enjoy the peerless beauty of Heaven.

The physical overtones of celestial "refrigerium" are corroborated by Test. 4:1, 5-9, where Tertullian states that the faithful will only become capable of experiencing it after their souls have been reunited with their bodies. An experience which requires that the object which undergoes it be corporeal must be a physical one.

The physical overtones of celestial "refrigerium" are also corroborated by the fact that neither illness nor physical disability will find a place within the Kingdom of God. Resurrection and the restoration of physical integrity are one and the same thing - to quote Resurr. 57:4, 14-57:5, 19:

"Uitiatio corporum accidens res est, integritas propria est. In hac nascimur: etiam si in utero uitiemur, iam hominis est passio; prius est genus quam casus. Quomodo uita conflertur a deo, ita et refertur; quales eam accipimus, tales et recipimus. Naturae, non iniuriae reddimur; quod nascimur, non quod laedimur, reuiescimus".
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Furthermore, as Resurr. 57:12, 50-57:13, 60 saw clearly, although the resurrected flesh will retain the capacity for suffering as part of its humanity, it will be given no further occasions for suffering.

The extent to which the banishment of illness and physical disability from the Kingdom of God will contribute to the absence of sorrow and weeping within its boundaries can be seen in Resurr. 58:4, 10-12 -

"si dolor et maeror et gemitus ipsaque mors ex laesuris et animae et carnis obueniunt, quomodo auferentur, nisi cessauerint causae, scilicet laesurae carnis atque animae?"

There is even, in the works of Tertullian, testimony to suggest that the resurrected saints literally may receive physical sustenance. In line with Rev. 2:17, Scorp. 12:8, 17 asserts that they will be granted the "hidden manna". Since manna was (according to Ps. 78:25) the "bread" of angels, this allusion may simply symbolise the fact that the resurrected saints will acquire angelic essence. Nevertheless, it is more likely that it is also an actual allusion to the food of man in the celestial Kingdom. This interpretation need not be prejudicial by the fact that bodily functions, such as, digestion, will cease after the resurrection. After glorification, the saints will be subject to the same conditions as the angels. If manna can be consumed by the angels, why may it not also be consumed by the glorified saints?
It is true, of course, that Tertullian (like Jewish apocalyptic thought before him) may have confined the saints' enjoyment of "hidden manna" to the period of the millennium. 2 Baruch. 29:8 concludes:

"And at that time the storehouse of manna shall descend from on high again; and they shall eat of it in those years, because it is they who have come to the final consummation".

However, since manna is the "bread" of the angels, it hardly seems reasonable that at the very moment when they acquire "angelic essence", the glorified saints should cease to share the diet of the angels. The celestial character of the New Jerusalem\(^307\) does indeed make it reasonable for Tertullian to have also numbered the consumption of manner amongst the physical delights of the millennium (the story of the Exodus warning against any suggestion that ordinary human flesh cannot eat manna).\(^308\) Nonetheless, I am extremely reluctant to exclude the consumption of manna from his understanding of celestial "refrigerium".

Resurr. 35:12, 46-35:13, 54 with its allusion to the faithful "reclining at meat in the Kingdom of God" probably referred to the millennium - the "fruit of the vine" (to which Mt. 26:29 alludes) being an earthly phenomenon. Nonetheless, Tertullian does contrast the joys of the "wedding feast" with the torments of Gehenna. For the dichotomy to hold true, the banquet should be held within the boundaries of the Kingdom.
He would probably have justified the dichotomy between the millennium and Gehenna on the grounds that the New Jerusalem is celestial in character. However, if he did envisage the banquet taking place in the Kingdom itself, this would provide yet more confirmation of the physical character of celestial "refrigerium".

Thus, even life eternal, which brings the saints permanently into the presence of God and hence into the sphere of spiritual joy, has its physical dimension. This is hardly surprising. Life eternal is intimately associated with the resurrection of the flesh; the flesh is the ground of all physical experience.

Death as entry into eternal bliss has two major consequences. Firstly, for all that the prospect of judgement and chastisement imbues death with terror and the prospect of putrefaction imbues it with horror, the prospect of celestial blessings imbues death with a certain hope and even a certain beauty. If a man truly believes that death will bring him into the immediate presence of a loving, benign God, it is an event which is to be embraced calmly; it may even be embraced with joy.

There is, however, an important caveat. Hope and joy untinged with fear will be possible only for those who are moderately confident of their personal salvation. For the remainder, terror and horror will be tinged with hope and longing.
Secondly, death as entry into eternal bliss (like Tertullian’s teaching on resurrection and on anticipatory awaiting) is a salutary reminder that physical death is not the end of human existence; it is simply the end of the beginning.

6.6 Death: the doorway to the millennium

Tertullian (like so many of his Montanist brethren) was a convinced Chiliast. After Christ appears on the clouds at the Parousia, He will inaugurate on earth a heavenly kingdom - a kingdom which will endure for a thousand years. The site of that kingdom will be none other than the celestial Jerusalem - the city described in Rev. 21:2-4 and 21:10-27.

There will, of course, be some Christians who will not be obliged to pass through the gateway of death in order to enter the millennium - alive at the time of the Parousia, they will be "caught up" to be with Christ "in the clouds". However, for the vast majority of the elect, death will indeed be one of the preliminaries to millennial bliss. Hence, the title adopted here.

Marc. III 24:3, 18-24 has no doubts about the essentially celestial character of the millennial kingdom:

"Nam et confitemur in terra nobis regnum promissum, sed ante caelum, sed alio statu, utpote post resurrectionem in mille annos in ciuitate diuini operis Hierusalem caelo delatum, quam et apostolus matrem nostram sursum designat. Et politeuma nostrum, id est municipatum, in caelis
esse pronuntians, alicui utique caelesti ciuitati eum deputat."

So literally did Tertullian interpret the descent of the celestial Jerusalem that, in *Marc.* III. 24:4, 27-31, he affirmed that the image of a city has been discerned in the sky over Judea. That image was a portent of the Second Coming.

The celestial character of the New Jerusalem is confirmed by the nature of the joys conferred upon the elect - spiritual joys. *Marc.* III. 24:5, 2-7 observes:

"Hanc dicimus excipiendis de resurrectione sanctis et refouendis omnium bonorum, utique spiritualium, copia in compensationem eorum, quae in saeculo uel despeximus uel amisimus, a deo prospectam, siguidem et iustum et deo dignum illic quoque exultare famulos eius, ubi sunt et adflictii in nomine ipsius".

(Although Tertullian is not specific, they probably included singing the praises of the Father and ever increasing companionship with the Son.)

The Tertullianic vision of the millennium differs markedly from that favoured by apocalyptic Judaism. The abundance of nature described so vividly by 2 Baruch 29:5 has no parallel in his writings:

"The earth shall also yield its fruit ten thousand-fold; and on each vine there shall be a thousand branches, and each branch shall produce a thousand clusters, and each cluster produce a thousand grapes, and each grape produce a cor of wine".

Moreover, given Tertullian’s familiarity with the writings of Irenaeus, his rejection of such physical luxuriance would seem to have been the result of conscious decision, not of

The idea that the elect will be granted an extensive progeny also has no place in the Tertullianic vision. Tertullian urged the faithful to anticipate the conditions of the Kingdom by being chaste during their earthly life; the reintroduction of marriage into the New Jerusalem would have been a retrograde step.

However, even during the Tertullianic millennium, the saints will not entirely be deprived of physical blessings. *Marc.* III. 24:5, 2 states that the elect will be "refreshed" (the actual verb used is "refouere"). Within the eschatology of the early Church, "refreshment" is a distinctly physical experience.

Indeed, *Pud.* 19:9, 39-42 equates permission to enter "the Holy City" with permission to eat the fruit from "the tree of life", whilst *Marc.* III 24:8, 23-29 likens the inheritance of the faithful to the inheritance promised to Jacob. Heavenly blessings ("the dew of Heaven") will be followed by earthly ones ("the fatness of the earth"). I quote:

"Sic et rursus: 'beati qui ex praecptis agunt, ut in lignum uitae habeant potestatem et in portas ad introeundum in sanctam ciuitatem. Canes uenefici, fornicator, homicida foras', utique qui non ex praecptis agant" (*Pud.* 19:9, 39-42)
"Nam circa Iacob, qui quidem posterioris et praelatioris populi figura est, id est nostri, prima promissio caelestis est roris, secunda terrenae opimitatis. Nos enim primo ad caelestia inuitamur, cum a saeculo auellimur, et ita postea inuenimur etiam terrena consecuturi. Et euangelium uestrum quoque habet: 'quaerite primum regnum dei, et haec adicientur uobis'." (Marc. III. 24:8, 23-29).

Even Resurr. 35:12, 47-35:13, 54 with its allusion to the "marriage feast" probably points to the physical character of millennial "refrigerium" - involving as it does such physical delights as eating and drinking.

Tertullian's assertion that the unworthy will be seized and bound hand and foot, cast out of the "marriage feast" owed more to the exigencies of the Biblical text than to the timing of that feast in his wider eschatology. Whether that feast occurs in the celestial Jerusalem or in the Kingdom of God, the diners will be those whose virtue has been proven.

Thus, whilst he rejected the physical luxuriance of Judaic millennial thought, he appears to have envisaged the saints experiencing physical comfort and sustenance, albeit in moderation. The comestibles directly associated with the millennium (that is, manna and the fruit of the tree of life) may have all possessed spiritual, even eucharistic, connotations but the consumption of them must have contributed to the physical pleasure of the elect. (Tertullian never came to grips with the question of how such sustenance accorded with the suspension of all
digestive functions after the resurrection and the fact that the resurrected flesh had not yet been glorified).

Finally, the physical dimension of millennial "refrigerium" is demonstrated by the beauty of the celestial city - Rev. 21:10-21 describes the New Jerusalem as a city built of gold, with walls of bejewelled jasper - and by the fact that it is a place of perfect peace. Not only will the saints live together in mutual concord, the Devil and his minions will cease their assaults.\textsuperscript{320} In so far as it makes it possible for man to concentrate fully upon God, freedom from demoniac assault is a spiritual blessing. Similarly, since true concord stems from a right relationship with God, it too is a spiritual blessing. However, because freedom from demoniac assault contributes to man's physical well-being (banishing as it does, disease from the celestial city) it also plays a part in millennial "refreshment".

Death as the gateway to millennial bliss shares with death as entry into eternal bliss the fact that it imbues death with hope and that it is a salutary reminder that that event is simply the end of the beginning. However, these are not its only consequences.

It points to the fact that death does not draw the final curtain upon the fundamental characteristics of life as it has been known in this earthly sphere. Because the saints will be compensated for the hardships which they have endured in this life by physical comforts and delights in the hereafter\textsuperscript{321} (comforts and delights which were denied to
them previously) there is a sense in which the Tertullianic millennium is an act of Recapitulation. Death may not be the "Rubicon" which it appears; beyond death, there will be a period in which life has similarities to earthly existence.

It also underlines the fact that death is an extremely solemn moment. Because of Tertullian's theory of gradual resurrection, each man will inhabit the celestial city for the exact period which his merits warrant. A man's state of mind at the moment of his death could have a bearing on those merits.

To sum up, reverting, as it frequently does, to thoughts of the judgement and the chastisement which God will execute upon mankind, death as the gateway to the hereafter is, above all, distinguished by its severity. The dichotomy between saints and sinners is an absolute one. Therefore, although Tertullian never actually quoted Mt. 25:32-33, his reflections on the hereafter may probably best be described as a "sheep" and "goats" eschatology.

Such a dichotomy between saints and sinners whilst offering hope to the persecuted and encouragement to the spiritually strong, must have been disheartening and even terrifying on the spiritually weak and to those who lacked confidence in their personal election. Indeed, since the faithful were to be constrained to the path of virtue by their fear of the penalties for straying from that path, it would not be
unfair to describe Tertullian's eschatology as an eschatology which governed through fear.

Faith, hope and love - these are distinguishing features of the Christian life. Tertullian's eschatology was imbued with profound faith - faith in the promises of the Almighty. To the spiritually strong, it offered hope - hope of a beautiful future - but because it rejoiced in the exclusion of the vast majority of mankind from that future, it was deficient in love.

"So faith, hope and love abide, these three; but the greatest of these is love" (I Cor. 13:13). In Tertullianic eschatology, there was faith, hope and fear. The "greatest" of these was fear.
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CONCLUSION
CONCLUSION

In writing this thesis, I set out to demonstrate two propositions - that Tertullian's reflections on death are extremely complex and that a proper understanding of those reflections demands that due attention be given to his peculiar vision of eschatology, demonology and sacrificial theory. This I hope I have done.

In chapter one, I established that although death is "natural" (man having been created "mortal"\(^1\)) it entails the violent disjunction of two conjugal substances\(^2\) - the substances in question being flesh and soul. Indeed, death is the very antithesis of the Tertullianic (that is, traducianist)\(^3\) theory of conception. I also established that, in the eyes of Tertullian, death is associated inescapably with putrefaction\(^4\) - a putrefaction which has its origin in the flesh's own moisture.\(^5\) Lastly, I established that despite his amateurish excursions into scientific theory, for Tertullian, death was essentially a theological event, an event which was grounded in the divine ordinance recorded in Gen. 3:19.\(^6\)

In chapter two, I indicated that whilst Tertullian did adhere to a legitimate version of the "imitatio Christi" theory, that adhesion was not as firm as might have been expected. Not merely did he refrain from alluding to the said motif in Mart., he evidenced throughout his works a preoccupation with the Christian's enslavement to God the Father, at the expense of a preoccupation with his enslavement to God the Son.\(^7\) I also indicated that the
Tertullianic version of the "imitatio Christi" motif was characterised by its severity - focussing as it did upon the compulsory obedience of the divine "slave" (as opposed to the unconstrained response of the divine "disciple") and the statutory repayment of the indebted Christian (as opposed to the love-inspired offering of the baptised Christian). Finally, I indicated the importance of reading motifs such as Christian "servitude" in the light of the probable expectations of Tertullian's original readers - a theme to which I returned later in the thesis.

Chapter three set out to perform a similar function to that of chapter two; it "cleared the ground" or to put it another way, it demonstrated why the concept of "teaching" was not to the forefront of Tertullian's understanding of death. Martyrdom as an act of witness to God, martyrdom as an act of witness against man and martyrdom as an act of witness against Satan - these ideas all accord ill with the notion of a "teaching medium". The same holds true of Tertullian's failure to exploit to the full the martyr in his role as the heir to the prophets, the heir to the divine Witness and the man who sets the seal upon Church doctrines. Then there is Tertullian's failure to capitalise upon the idea that the "blood" of the Christians is the "seed" of the Church. For all its vivid pictorial appeal, he employed the metaphor of "sowing" the "seed" of faith twice only. As for ordinary death, there is no conclusive evidence that Tertullian employed the motif of the teaching medium at all. If the depth of Tertullian's adhesion to the idea of death as a teaching medium is in question, however, the essential character of his version of
that idea was not in doubt. Despite his famous axiom regarding the "blood" of the Christians, the Tertullianic version of the teaching medium was fundamentally a Matthean-inspired "confession" motif.

Chapter four began to penetrate those matters which lay at the heart of Tertullian's understanding of death. The subject under consideration was death as the culmination of man's conflict with the powers of evil - a subject which was not least amongst those matters. The chapter demonstrated that, for Tertullian, the Christian was a divine "soldier", a man who (when challenged by his spiritual and human foes) must not waiver in his support for the cause of justice - the cause of God. It also demonstrated that the Christian is a divine "athlete". However, unlike the theme of the divine "soldier" which despite receiving superficial colour from contemporary human soldiering was essentially an Ephesians-inspired theme, that of the divine "athlete" cannot be understood properly divorced from its classical background. Sports such as wrestling, boxing and the pankration all left their distinctive mark upon the Tertullianic martyr. (Whilst the interpretation which is placed upon all oblique texts must be ultimately subjective, the final test surely has to be - how might Tertullian's original readers reasonably have understood them?) Last and by no means least, the chapter demonstrated Tertullian's ability vividly to conceptualise evil; the Devil and his minions were not simply dangerous and subtle opponents, they were, in the mind of Tertullian, not infrequently anthropomorphised.
Chapter five continued to probe into the heart of Tertullian's understanding of death. In Tertullian's writings, death was depicted regularly as a quasi-cultic sacrifice; the martyr was a victim "immolated" to his God, a "libation" poured out to the one true Deity. I would go further. There is evidence to suggest that the Tertullianic martyr was immolated to a God who bore striking similarities to the indigenous deities of Romano-Punic North Africa (Ba'el-Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelestis) and that consequently his death was a Christianised version of the blood-rung offerings which used to take place at the Salammbo tophet.

Chapter six completed the intellectual voyage to the heart of Tertullian's understanding of death, an understanding of death which was bound up intimately with his hopes and fears regarding the afterlife. Events such as resurrection, the final judgement and the millennium, places such as Gehenna, Abraham's Bosom, Paradise and the Kingdom, these all receive close scrutiny. The broad conclusions were as follows. By virtue of his stern, even bloodthirsty vision of Deity and his recognition of the arduous, even brutal nature of the struggle with the Satanic host, Tertullian's vision of death was already imbued with a profound severity. Orientated as his eschatology was towards the final judgement and the chastisements which will follow that judgement, his vision of the afterlife simply compounded that severity. A severe vision, it was also, however, a vision which responded unhesitatingly to the theological challenge of his own generation - the theological challenge thrown down by the Gnostics. The resurrection of the
flesh occupied the foremost place within Tertullian's eschatology. Indeed, even at the risk of detracting from the alteration to the flesh which the acquisition of immortality and incorruptibility will make, Tertullian strenuously defended the right of earthly flesh to enter the eternal Kingdom. Finally, I indicated the danger of projecting later concepts back into a earlier age. Tertullian's theory of anticipatory awaiting (in the interval between death and resurrection) must not be confused with the medieval doctrine of Purgatory.

Had the limitations engendered by both time and space not precluded the endeavour, I would have examined, in depth, Tertullian's metaphorical use of death. By refusing to obey the command of his God, the sinner is "dead" to true life - life as God would have it lived. By entering the waters of the font, the neophyte "dies" with Christ (that is, renders himself "dead" as regards sin) and "rises again" to new life. By being cast out of the Church, the excommunicant pre-empts his "eternal death". Even nature's pattern constitutes a continuous cycle of "death" and "rebirth". Such an examination would, I believe, be fascinating and would amply repay the effort.

This study of Tertullian's understanding of death and the afterlife would not be complete, however, without a brief attempt to determine his contribution to the Church and his place in Christian history. To appreciate that contribution, it is necessary to examine the intellectual climate within which Tertullian wrote.
The Gnostics assured the faithful that traditional martyrdom was superfluous. Heracleon (one of the foremost Valentinians) declared (according to Clement of Alexandria) that "confession by mouth" is required from some believers only; what is required from all believers is confession "in works and action", "works" and "action" which "correspond to faith in Him". To quote Strom. IV. 9:71, 10-9:72, 2:

"Τούτον ἐξηγούμενος τοῦ τόπου Ἡρακλέων ὁ τῆς Ὀυαλεντίνου σχολῆς δοκιμῶτας κατὰ λέξιν φησιν ὁμολογιαί εἶναι τὴν μὲν ἐν πίστει καὶ πολιτείᾳ, τὴν δὲ ἐν φωνῇ. ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐν φωνῇ ὁμολογία καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγιωτῶν γίνεται, ἢ μόνην, φησιν, ὁμολογίαν ἑργάζεται εἰ μίαν πολλαῖς ὑπὸ ὑποκρίσεως ὁμολογεῖν. ἀλλ’ οὔδ᾿ εὐρεθησαίτος οὖσαν ὁ λόγος καθολικὸς εἰρημένος· οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ σφηκούσιν ὁμολογησίᾳ τὴν διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ὁμολογίαν καὶ ἐξήλθον, εἷς ὁ Ἐνῖατος, Φίλιππος, Θωμᾶς, Λέοντς καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ. καὶ ἔστιν ἡ διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ὁμολογία ὡς καθολικὴ, ἀλλὰ μερικὴ, καθολικὴ δὲ ἡ νῦν λέγει, ἢ ἐν ἑργαῖς καὶ πράξεις καταλληλοῖς τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν πίστεως. ἐπεται δὲ ταυτίζει τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ καὶ ἡ μερικὴ ἡ ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγιωτῶν, εἰς δὲ καὶ ὁ λόγος ἀιρή. ὁμολογήσεις γὰρ οὕτως καὶ τῇ φωνῇ ὅθεν προομολογήσεις προτέρου τῇ διαθέσει καὶ καλὸς ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν ὁμολογούσιν ἐν ἑμοὶ ἐπεν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἀρνούμενόν τοῖς ἑμὲν προσέθηκεν. οὕτω γὰρ, καὶ τῇ φωνῇ ὁμολογήσασσιν αὐτὸν, ἀρνοῦσάν φησιν τῇ πράξει μὴ ὁμολογόντες, μόνοι δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ ὁμολογόσιν οἱ ἐν τῇ καὶ φησιν αὐτὸν πολιτείᾳ καὶ πράξει βιοῦντες, ἐν οἷς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁμολογεῖ ἐνειλημμένος αὐτοῦς καὶ ἐκχώμενος ὑπὸ τούτων. διότερ αἰρήσασθαι αὐτὸν ὑπέδοτο δύνανται· ἀρνοῦσάν δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μὴ ὑπέστην ἐν αὐτῷ, ὅ γαρ εἴπεν· ὃς ἀρνηθησάτο ἐν ἑμοί, ἀλλ’ ἐμέ· οὔδείς γὰρ ποτε ἂν ἐν αὐτῷ ἀρνηθῇ αὐτὸν, τὸ δὲ ἐμπροσθεν τῶν αὐθαυσίων, καὶ τῶν σφηκούσιν καὶ τῶν ἔθνων δέ όμοιος παρ’ οἷς μὲν καὶ τῇ πολιτείᾳ, παρ’ οἷς δὲ καὶ τῇ φωνῇ. διότερ αἰρήσασθαι αὐτὸν ὑπέδοτο δύνανται· ἀρνοῦσάν δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μὴ ὑπέστην ἐν αὐτῷ."

The Gnostics' hostility to martyrdom is recorded yet more openly in Tertullian's own works. The "innocent" are suffering. Men are dying "without reason". The God who rejects the "blood" of "bulls" and "goats" cannot desire the "blood" of "men". Rather, He is the God who prefers the "repentance" of sinners to their "deaths", the God who in the Person of the Son died to expiate sin once and for all. In the words of Scorp. 1:6, 14-1:8, 29:
"Itaque primo trahentes adhuc caudam de affectibus applicant aut quasi in vacuum flagellant: haecceine pati homines innocentes? Ut putes fratrem aut de melioribus ethnicum. Siccine tractari sectam nemini molestam? Dehinc adigunt: perire homines sine causa. Perire enim, et sine causa, prima fixura. Exinde iam caedunt: sed nesciunt simplices animae, quid quomodo scriptum sit, ubi et quando et coram quibus confitendum, nisi quod nec simplicitas ista, sed uanitas, immodemia pro deo mori, ut qui me saluum faciat. Sic is occidet, qui saluum facere debebit? Semel Christus pro nobis obiit, semel occisus est, ne occideremur. Si uicem repetit, num et ille salutem de mea nece expectat? An deus hominum sanguinem flagitat, maxime si taurorum et hircorum recusat? Certe peccatoris paenitentiam manuult quam mortem. Et quomodo non peccatorum desiderat mortem?"

Moreover, doubts regarding the mandatory character of martyrdom were not confined to the ranks of the heretics. They also emerged from within the bounds of the Church; indeed, they were voiced memorably by a man in a position of authority - Clement of Alexandria, head of the famous Alexandrian Catechetical School.

I acknowledge that although Christian Gnosticism shared with Gnosticism a preoccupation with "knowledge" as a "key" to salvation, it should not be confused with Gnosticism as it manifested itself outwith the Church. The two were distinct phenomena. However, for the matter in hand, it is surely significant that Christian Gnosticism assured the faithful that "whatever way it is released from the body", each soul who lives "purely" in the knowledge of God is a "witness", a "witness" both in "life" and in "word". *Strom.* IV. 4:15, 13-29 declares:
Christian Gnosticism (as evidenced by Clement of Alexandria) went further. It asserted that both the martyr who deliberately provokes the pagan authorities and the martyr who goads his pagan neighbours are guilty of their own deaths; they are "accomplices" in the "crimes" of their persecutors. Strom. IV. 10:76, 15-10:77, 33 asserts:

"Επει δ' ἐμπαινει εἰπη δὴν διώκσων υμᾶς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτη, ἠφεῖστε εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν, οὐχ ὡς κακόν τὸ διώκεσθαι παραίτετε ἤφεῖσιν ὡδ' ὡς θανατίον φοβομένοις διὰ φοβεῖς ἐκκλίνειν προστάται τοῦτον—βουλεῖται δὲ ἡμᾶς μὴ δειν αἰτίους μὴ δεῖνα διατίπτονς κακόν τινος γινεσθαι, ὑπότην ταῖς αὐτός πρὸς δὲ καὶ τῷ διώκεναι καὶ τῷ αἰσχροῦ ὕπνου γαρ τῶν παραγγέλλει αὐτοῦ περιτίςσαθαι, ὃ δὲ παρακοουσι καὶ ρυθμισθῶν, εἰ δὲ ὁ ἁνελθὼν ἄρθρων θεοῦ εἰς θεὸν ἀμαρταίοις καὶ τῷ απεκπεινοῦντας αὐτοῦ ἐνακοασθαί τῷ ἐκτός τῶν προσαγόν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ σύντος δ' αὖ εἰς τῷ περιστερόμενον τῶν διώκων, ἀλώσιμον δαίμονα παρεῖποιν ἑαυτόν. εὐτυχος εἰς τὸ ὅπως ἔσ' ἐευτυχος ὁ συνεργὸς γυμνῶνς τῇ τῶν διώκων πονηρία, εἰ δὲ καὶ προσερεθίζῃ, τέλεοι αἰτίοις, ἐκκαλοῦμενοι τῷ θείῳ. ὡδ' δὲ αὐτῶς καὶ αἰτίως μάχης παράχαρες τίναι ἡ ζημίας ἡ ἔχθρας ἡ δικησθεὶς, ἀφορμὴν ἐγένεσθαι διαμηνυόμενος. διὰ τῶν' σὺν μηδενῶς ἀνέχεσθαι τῶν εἰς τῷ βίῳ προστίθηται ἡμῖν, ἀλλα καὶ τῷ ἀσχοῖς τῷ μακρίκτην καὶ τοῦ χιτῶνος προσδίοδοι, σύν τα ἀπορροφήθης διαμεμερίσθης μόνον, ἀλλ' ῥημών ἀντιποιοῦμενοι τῶν ἐπιπλοκομένων ἐσ' ἐαυτοὺς ἐγκαταστήσαμεν καὶ δι' ἡμῶν εἰπὶ τὴν τοῦ ὅμοιος διακινήσαμεν βλασφημίαν."

I appreciate that Tertullian was not consciously writing against the views propounded by Clement of Alexandria; indeed, as far as I am aware, there is no evidence, in his works, to suggest that he was cognisant of Clement’s views.
I also appreciate that any dichotomy between the views of Tertullian regarding martyrdom and those of Clement of Alexandria should not be overstressed. Clement, too, set a high value upon the martyr’s death and the martyr’s crown. However, in the eyes of the Alexandrian theologian, martyrdom should not be sought, it should seek out those men and women whom it would honour.

Nevertheless, the recognition of the divergent opinions regarding the nature of Christian "witness" and the conditions upon which the Christian should seek to offer that "witness" through the martyr’s death, is surely a prerequisite for appreciating the proper place of Tertullian’s theology of death within the Church of his generation. Moreover, it is surely a warning to the modern reader that even ideas which may sound harsh, even repugnant to the modern ear had their role to play in the intellectual "maelstrom" of the early Church.

Then there was the syncretistic climate which characterised Greco-Roman society in Tertullian’s generation - a climate which obscured the distinctions between individual deities or systems of belief and which rendered it inconceivable that there was any one belief or deity for which it was worth dying. The pagans who appear in Mart. Pol. 8:2, 3-9 plainly found Polycarp’s obdurate insistence upon honouring one God and one God alone incomprehensible:

"καὶ ὑπήντα αὐτῷ ὁ εἰρήναρχος Ἡρώδης καὶ ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ Νικήτης, οἱ καὶ μεταθέντες αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν καρούχαν ἐπείθον παρακαθεζόμενοι καὶ λέγοντες: Τι γὰρ κακῶν ἐστιν εἰπεῖν Κύριος Καίσαρ, καὶ ἐπιθυμοῦσι καὶ τὰ τούτως ἀκόλουθα καὶ διασωζόμεθα; ὦ δὲ τὰ μὲν πρώτα οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτοῖς, ἐπιμενόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἔστιν· Οὐ μέλλω ποιεῖν ὅ συμβουλευεῖτε μοι."
Finally, there was the Catholic Church’s teaching on flight - teaching which grounded upon Mt. 10:23 rendered flight permissible. If Jesus explicitly permits Christians to "flee" from city to city when faced by persecution, why should they perform the supreme act of self-abnegation, that is, martyrdom? Thus, whilst (in principle) the desire to eschew unnecessary violence should not be confused with cowardice in the face of death (the latter not being the inevitable consequence of the former) the Church’s interpretation of Mt. 10:23 unwittingly provided its weaker brethren with an intellectual justification for their fear, thereby "legitimating" it.

In the case of the Gnostics and the pagans, there was active hostility towards martyrdom. In the case of Clement of Alexandria, there was merely doubt regarding whether or not martyrdom was the sole form which Christian "witness" might appropriately take, together with doubt regarding the absolute necessity of actively seeking martyrdom. Those who advocated flight when facing persecution though they did not share all the premises of Clement of Alexandria, reached practically the same conclusion - that is, that martyrdom whilst good in itself, should not be sought rashly. Against such an intellectual "maelstrom", Tertullian’s insistence that the Christian must eagerly offer his own life as a "witness" to his Lord and Saviour before his fellow men - his insistence that martyrdom was not simply a good way to die but the good way to die - was a valuable and indeed a vital stand.
Had the Church Universal adopted the view of martyrdom propounded by either the Gnostics or the Christian Gnostics, it would have proved yet more difficult for it to have resisted the coercion used against the Faith by the pagan authorities, coercion which culminated in the horrors of the Diocletian persecution. What is more, had teachings on martyrdom such as those of Tertullian (teachings which made martyrdom mandatory) not played their part in rendering the Church a nuisance and indeed a threat to the pagan authorities (a nuisance and a threat, furthermore, which showed no signs of going away) the Church might not have been granted toleration in 313. The so-called "conversion" of Constantine probably owed more to political expediency than to religious fervour. A Church which had not been prepared to die for the sake of its beliefs would have been an easy prey to the syncretistic tendencies of Greco-Roman religious life, it would also have been an ever dwindling body - a body with a limited power to attract new recruits.

Furthermore, within the context of the pre-Constantinian Church (where martyrdom was an ever present danger facing the faithful and the natural mortality rate was already high)\(^\text{41}\) Tertullian performed the valuable function of thinking through, in detail, the meaning of death. He did more. He provided clear and intellectually coherent reflections on death. The modern reader may find Tertullian's reflections on death repugnant. However, if Tertullian's premises are accepted, his conclusions are normally logical. Whether his premises should always be accepted is an entirely separate issue, an issue which falls outwith the scope of this study.
What of Tertullian's end? Ironically, in view of the eagerness with which he urged his fellow Christians to "follow" in the way of the cross (the way of eternal blessing) there is no evidence that Tertullian was martyred. Whether this was a failure of opportunity or a failure of will, it is impossible to judge. (Personally, I am inclined to favour the former conclusion, though it is important to recognise that the fault could lie in yet another direction - that is, with the historical sources themselves).

Tertullian disappears from the face of history neither in a blaze of glory nor to the blast of celestial trumpets but softly and quietly. The "rest" is indeed "silence".
References: Conclusion

5. Anim. 51:3, 10-14, Resurr. 51:8, 41-44 and Ieiun. 12:2, 23-27.
7. Spect. 1:1, 4-5, Uxor. I. 5:1, 7-8, Resurr. 52:12, 44-45 and Cast. 12:3, 17. See also Chapter 1, notes 77 and 78.
10. Resurr. 8:5, 19-8:6, 30, Pat. 16:5, 15-18 and Cor. 14:3, 14-41:4, 32.
12. See Chapter 2, section 3.3.
13. Scorp. 9:7, 4-9:8, 17 and Marc. II. 25:3, 14-24; Orat. 5:3, 12-15; and Paen. 7:7, 23-7:9, 34, respectively.
14. See Chapter 3, sections 2.5, 2.6 and 3, respectively.
18. See Chapter 3, notes 62 and 63, together with Chapter 3, section 2.1.
19. Fug. 9:2, 17-22, 10:1, 4-8, Scorp. 4:5, 14-18, Cor. 1:3, 14-22, Mart. 3:1, 13-3:3, 23 and Apol. 50:2, 7-50:3, 17.
20. Fug. 10:1, 4-8, 9:2, 17-22, Scorp. 4:5, 14-18 and Cor. 1:3, 14-22.
22. Apol. 50:2, 7-50:3, 17, Mart. 3:1, 13-3:3, 23 and Scorp. 4:5, 14-18.
23. Cor. 1:3, 14-22 and Fug. 9:2, 17-22. See also Chapter 4, section 1.2.
24. Scorp. 6:1, 3-9, Ieiun. 17:8, 20-25, and Fug. 1:5, 37-40. See also Chapter 4, section 1.4.2.
29. See Chapter 5, notes 170 and 176. For evidence of the opposing view of events at the Salammbô tophet see Chapter 5, note 173.


33. Resurr. 52:7, 24-27, 54:1, 2-54:2, 11 and 55:3, 8-55:6, 23. See also Chapter 6, section 1.3.


35. Anim. 35:3, 24-36, 58:2, 4-58:5, 32 and 58:8, 45-50.

36. Resurr. 46:3, 7-46:15, 60.


41. See Chapter 1, note.1.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. PRIMARY MATERIAL

Acta Martyrum:

Apocalypse of Paul:

Apocalypse of Peter:

Augustine of Hippo:
De Ciuitate Dei XX - XXII.

Enarrationes in Psalms LXXVIII.

Barnaba Epistle:

2 Baruch:

Bible (English):
Revised Standard Version.

Cicero:
Tusculanae Disputationes.

Pro Cluentio.

Pro Roscio Amerino.

Pro Archia Poeta


Clement of Alexandria:

Τὸν κατὰ τὴν Ἁλεθὴ Φιλοσόφιαν Γνωστικὸν Ηπομνήματὸν Στρῶματος Ἄρτος.


Diodorus Siculus:

Bibliothēkēs Historikēs XIII and XX.


I Enoch:


2 Enoch:


Eusebius of Caeserias:

Ekklēsiastikēs Historias.


Peri tôn en Palaistinēi Marturesantōn.


Hermae Pastor:

Hesiod:-
Theogonia.


Ignatius of Antioch:-
Tou Hagiou Ignatiou Epistolai.


Irenaeus of Lyons:-
Aduersus Haereses I - V.


Julian of Norwich:-
Shewinges.


Justin Martyr:-
Apologia I-II.


Origen:-
Eis Marturion Protreptikos.


Peri Archon I-IV.


Plato:— Apologia.


Ps. Plato:— Minōs.


Seneca:—

Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales.


De Consolatione ad Marciam.


De Consolatione Polybium.


De Consolatione Polybium.
De Consolatione ad Heluiam.


De Consolatione Polybium.

Septuaqinta:–


Silius Italicus:–

Punica.


Tertullian of Carthage:–

Collective Works –

Tertulliani Opera I (Opera Catholica, Aduersus Marcionem) and II (Opera Montanistica), Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina, Turnholt, 1954.

Individual Works –

Ad Uxorem.


Aduersus Hermogenem.


Aduersus Marcionem.


Aduersus Praxean.


Aduersus Valentinianos.


Apologeticum.

De Anima.

De Baptismo.

De Carne Christi.


De Cultu Feminarum.

De Exhortatione Castitatis.

De Idololatria.

De Monogamia.

De Oratione.

De Paenitentia.

De Patientia.

De Praescriptione Haereticorum.

De Resurrectione Mortuorum.


De Spectaculis.


Vetus Latina:


Virgil:

Aeneid IV.

Achard, M. De la Mort à la Résurrection d’après l’Ancien Testament, Neuchatel, 1956.

Alès, A.d' La Théologie de Tertullien, Paris, 1905.


Boer, P. de The Imitation of Paul, Kamen, 1962.


Braun, R. "Nouvelles Observations Linguistiques sur le Rédacteur de la 'Passio Perpetuæ’", Vig. Christ., 33, 1979, pp.105-117.

Brock, A.J. Greek Medicine, London, 1929.


Brown, S. Late Carthaginian Child Sacrifice and Sacrificial Monuments in their Mediterranean Context, Sheffield, 1991.


Burnier, E. La Notion de Témoignage dans le Nouveau Testament, Lausanne, 1939.


Cintas, P. "Deux Campagnes de Fouilles à Utique", Karth., 2, 1951, pp. 5-84.


Dölger, F.J. "Das Martyrium als Kampf mit dem Teufel", Ant. Christ., 3, 1933, pp.177-188.
Edelstein, L. Ancient Medicine, Baltimore, 1967.
Hanson, R.C.P. "Notes on Tertullian's Interpretation of Scripture", J.T.S., N.S., 12, 1961, pp.273-279.


MacMullen, R. Paganism in the Roman Empire, New Haven, 1981.

MacMullen, R. Christianising the Roman Empire (AD.100 - 400), New Haven, 1984.


Pelikan, J. The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600), Chicago, 1971.
Pétré, H. L'Exemplum chez Tertullien, Dijon, 1940.
Pietrelli, E. "'Caro et Sanguis Regnum Dei possidere non possunt' (I Cor. 15, 50)", Aev., 49, 1975, pp.36-76.


Siegel, R.E. Galen's System of Physiology and Medicine, New York, 1957.
Singer, C. Anatomy and Physiology from the Greeks to Harvey, New York, 1957.
Valgiglio, E. Confessio nella Bibbia e nella Letteratura Cristiana Antica, Torino, 1980.


Vicastillo, S. "La ‘Caro Infirmia’ en la Antropología de Tertuliano", Esp., 26, 1977, pp.113-120.


Wright, E.A. *Greek Athletics*, London, 1925.


Young, F.M. *Can these Dry Bones live?* London, 1982.