The matter of the resurrection of the body was an issue of central concern to medieval Christians, as Carolyn Bynum and others have shown. Most scholars, however, have neglected to consider attitudes around the year 1000. The sermons of Ademar of Chabannes (989–1034) provide insight into early eleventh-century beliefs, and therefore this paper examines his understanding of the resurrected body. Ademar was drawn to the matter of the resurrection for several reasons, including a sense that he was living in the last days and his failure in the debate over the apostolicity of Saint Martial. His understanding of the nature of the resurrected body was also shaped by traditional church teaching, especially the Apostles’ Creed, which he defended in sermons against his perception of the denial of the material world by the “Manichaeans” of Aquitaine. Ademar also used the cult of the saints to demonstrate the reality of the physical resurrection of the body.

The promise of salvation medieval Christians found in scripture exercised great influence on their attitudes towards death and the afterlife. As many recent studies have shown, defining the geography of the afterlife and establishing the rituals of death and dying were of great importance in the Middle Ages. Moreover, as Caroline Walker Bynum has shown, medieval concerns were not limited to the spiritual aspects of salvation but included interest in the fate of the body, specifically with the resurrection of the body itself at the end of
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time. Bynum examines the teachings of patristic and scholastic writers on the reunion of the soul and the body and, in so doing, demonstrates the fundamentally material orientation of medieval eschatology. Indeed, in their meditations on the last things, Bynum notes, medieval writers revealed “not body–soul dualism but rather a sense of psychosomatic unity.” Her work therefore provides keen insights into not only the medieval understanding of the experience of salvation but also of the medieval understanding of the importance of the body.

Bynum rightly observes how important the issue of the resurrection of the body was to Christian thinkers of antiquity and the high Middle Ages. She neglects, however, to consider the attitudes of religious thinkers of the tenth and eleventh centuries, a period many now recognise as the critical moment in the formation of medieval and modern European civilisation. Indeed, many of the concerns raised by thinkers of the patristic and scholastic eras relating to the matter of the resurrected body found voice in the works of ecclesiastics of the early eleventh century. Questions concerning the cult of the saints and their relics, the body and resurrection of Christ, and the corporeality of the sacraments appear in the writings of the early eleventh century. Orthodox writers, like their patristic predecessors and scholastic successors, were faced by the challenge offered by religious dissidents who seemed to reject orthodox teachings on the body, bodily resurrection, and most other accepted doctrines of the established Church. And, in the face of this renewed challenge, ecclesiastical writers offered a vigorous defence of orthodox tradition, including the question of the resurrection of the body at the Last Judgement.

The issues related to the body and bodily resurrection that Bynum identifies as being raised by writers of the patristic and scholastic eras appear in the sermons and other writings of Ademar of Chabannes (ca. 989–1034). A monk of Angoulême and Limoges, Ademar was a master of the many arts of the scriptorium, talents that enabled him to produce an extensive literary corpus. His works include an illustrated Psychomachia, a copy of the lives of the popes, two histories, the most important account of a peace council, and


copies of a number of significant works of the fathers of the church. Moreover, these talents and, perhaps, his own great ambition led him to participate in the promotion of the apostolic cult of Saint Martial of Limoges. Indeed, it required a figure of Ademar's abilities to provide the necessary liturgical and hagiographical materials for the new cult. Although his efforts failed in his own generation as a result of his public defeat and humiliation in 1028, they succeeded in convincing subsequent generations of the apostolicity of Saint Martial, and constitute one of the greatest collections of medieval forgeries.

Ademar's most accomplished and complex forgery can be found in the sermons he wrote in the years after his defeat and prior to his pilgrimage to Jerusalem where he died in 1034. These sermons, now held in Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 2469, fols. 1r–112v) and Berlin (Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, MS Lat. Philipps 1664, fols. 58v–170v), written for the defence of the apostolicity of Saint Martial, contain important insights into the nature of religious belief in the early eleventh century.

In the sermons, Ademar discusses the cult of the saints and relics and their translations and miracles. He offers commentary on a variety of doctrinal issues including baptism and the Eucharist and theological issues concerned with the proper definition of the Trinity. The sermons offer a great treasure trove of information on early eleventh-century belief and reveal contemporary attitudes toward the body and resurrection.

Written primarily to demonstrate the orthodoxy of the apostolicity of Saint Martial, the sermons were intended also to demonstrate Ademar's own orthodoxy. It must be remembered that his own orthodoxy had been brought into question after his defeat in the apostolicity debate. A serious problem under
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any circumstances, the matter of right belief was even more critical in Ademar’s own “millennial generation.”

For Ademar and others of his era, apocalyptic concerns were of great importance. Although we need not revive the old notion of “the terrors of the year 1000,” it is evident from Ademar’s writings that he was aware that he lived in an apocalyptic age. Indeed, the very organisation of his sermons suggests Ademar’s essentially eschatological orientation in the late 1020s and early 1030s. The Paris manuscript addresses the alpha of history, the apostolic age, and the vita of Saint Martial. The sermons in this collection describe the life and activities of Saint Martial and his posthumous miracles. The sermons in MS 2469 focus on the life of Martial, but they also address events closer to Ademar’s own age and culminate with the great peace council of Limoges in 1031. The second collection, MS 1664, is concerned with the omega of history, with events in Ademar’s own day especially matters of orthodoxy and heresy. Although the apostolicity of Martial remains an important theme in this collection, the sermons of MS 1664 are concerned with the defence of the faith against heretics and antichrists. The eschatological orientation of the manuscript is reinforced by the works that precede the sermons in the collection, especially copies of Bede’s commentary on the Apocalypse of John and Jerome’s commentary on Daniel.

The heightened apocalyptic expectations Ademar reveals in the sermons he wrote at the approach of the millennium of the Passion were most likely the result of the numerous signs and prodigies he witnessed that foretold the coming of the Last Days. He had learned of the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre by al-Hakim, whom Ademar clearly saw as an antichrist or the Anti-christ, and had witnessed a number of miraculous occurrences in his native
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Aquitaine, including the discovery of the relics of John the Baptist, the *praecursoris Domini*. Of even greater importance for Ademar was the stunning vision he experienced of the crucified Christ weeping in the night sky. The meaning of this vision is revealed in one of Ademar’s sermons from the Berlin manuscript where he notes that, “on the day when the Lord will judge the world the sign of the cross will appear in heaven.” Indeed, as Daniel Callahan demonstrates, the theme of final judgement and its close proximity is one of the fundamental themes of Ademar’s sermons. References to the Last Judgement and lamentations concerning the lack of love and the growth of wickedness in his own age can be found throughout the sermons in the Berlin collection. Moreover, evidence of an apocalyptic mentality can be found elsewhere in Ademar’s literary corpus. This mindset affected his interpretation of the peace council of Limoges of 1031 and his attitude towards heretics and Jews. For Ademar, the heretics were the forerunners of the antichrist who signalled the coming of the final struggle of good and evil. Finally, it should be noted that Ademar himself participated in the great pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1033, which was noted for its apocalyptic nature. Ademar’s pronounced eschatological anxieties and concerns about his own orthodoxy therefore led him, throughout his sermons, to consider questions of the Last Judgement and with it questions of the resurrection of the body. This connection between apocalypticism and concerns with the resurrected body reflects, in some ways, a unique or at least novel approach. Although millenarian concerns influenced thinking on the body and resurrection until the patristic age, they had been largely replaced or suppressed in favour of an eschatology that put the Last Days into the distant future. And, according to Caroline Bynum, by the fifth century, “few any longer expected the millennial age to come soon, and eschatological yearning was increasingly focused on heaven, to which the soul might go while the bones still reposed underground.” Although his thinking was not millenarian, it was apocalyptic and focused on the signs of the Last Days. His concerns with resurrection signalled a break with the thinking of the previous half millennium, because he...
Ademar’s awareness of the imminence of the Last Judgement and misgivings about his own faith led him to defend orthodoxy and explore the issue of the resurrection in his sermons. Indeed, defence of the faith and resurrection of the body overlap because one of the great tenets of Christian belief is the resurrection of both Christ and the individual believer. Consequently, Ademar discusses the orthodox teaching of this question in his sermons, especially in his sermon *De Eucharistia*. In this sermon, Ademar offers commentary on the Creed and notes that it teaches that Christ suffered his Passion, died and was buried under Pontius Pilate. Ademar stresses too that Christ suffered in the flesh and that, although the humanity of Christ perished on the cross, the divinity survived. He continues the sermon by noting that Christ entered hell in his divinity to release the good and grant their resurrection. In fact, for Ademar, this is clear evidence that all souls will rise at judgement day. Even clearer evidence for Ademar is provided by the sixth section of the Creed, which states that Christ ascended into heaven. In his commentary on this passage, Ademar explains that Christ rose from the dead and was seen by all his apostles and disciples and then ascended into heaven “in the very same flesh in which he was born and in which he suffered.” Clearly, there is no better demonstration for the hope of resurrection than the example of Christ. As the monk of Saint Martial himself notes, Christ’s resurrection in the flesh offers us hope that at the end of time “we all will rise good and evil, young boys and old men and women each in that flesh in which we now live.” For Ademar, then, the Creed provides clear support for bodily resurrection in its emphasis on the death and resurrection of Christ.

The Creed offers one further passage confirming bodily resurrection. Indeed, it makes belief in the resurrection of the body one of the central articles of the faith. The eleventh distinction of the Creed is the belief in the resurrection of the flesh, which, Ademar notes, is proved by Job’s assertion, “I know that my redeemer lives, and that I will rise from the earth on the last day, and I will see my God in my flesh.” At the resurrection, all will rise in
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25. D.S., MS Lat. Phillipps, 1664, fol. 73v. “in ipsa carne in qua natus est et in qua passus est et in qua resurrexit in ipsa victor ad caelos ascendit.”
26. D.S., MS Lat. Phillipps, 1664, fol. 78v. “Credant quia filius Dei mortuus postquam fuit in vera carne resurrexit per veram resurrectionem carnis et in resurrectione sua contulit nobis spem resurrectionis futurae. Quia sicut ille tercia die resurrexit vivus a mortuis in sua propria carne in qua mortuus fuit, ut et nos in die iudicii, hoc est in fine saeculorum, resurgamus omnus et boni et mali, pueri iuvenes, et senes viri et mulieres in cadem qua nunc vivimus carne.” Similar sentiments are expressed in his sermon on the Catholic faith (fols. 83v–96r, especially fols. 95v–96r).
27. Bynum, *Resurrection of the Body*, 26, notes that the resurrection of Jesus was one of the central factors in the development of the notion of bodily resurrections for those who compiled the various Christian creeds in the second century.
28. Bynum, *Resurrection of the Body*, 26, notes that the authors of the creed specifically emphasised resurrection of the physical body, and therefore Ademar’s arguments seem firmly built upon the tradition first established in the second century.
the very bodies they possessed while living and neither sex nor nature will change, according to Ademar, except that the infirmities of this world will not survive into the next. Moreover, like many twelfth-century scholastic writers, Ademar explains that not only those bodies resting in their tombs but all those bodies devoured by animals or burned will rise at the judgement and will assume the same flesh they had while they lived. These bodies, he explains in his discussion of the twelfth and final article of the faith, will enjoy eternal joy or sorrow after their resurrection at the Last Judgement. Thus, motivated by both his personal religious crisis and millennial anxieties, Ademar focused on the Last Judgement and the resurrection and defended resurrection of the body as one of the central teachings of the faith sanctioned by the Creed itself.

Ademar's concerns with orthodoxy and questions of the body and bodily resurrection were inspired also by the recent and dramatic appearance of heretics or, as some have suggested, alleged heretics in Aquitaine and elsewhere in Europe, which he clearly saw as evidence of the imminent apocalypse. Ademar himself was well aware of the appearance of religious dissidents whose rigid asceticism denied the worth of the body. In his chronicle, Ademar identified the heretics appearing in Aquitaine in 1018 as Manichaeans and messengers of Antichrist who denied baptism, the cross, and all sane doctrine. They also abstained from food, he tells us, and lived as
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31. D.S., MS Lat. Phillipps, 1664 fol. 77v: “Nec tantum illi quorum ossa in sepulchris tunc requiescent sed etiam ipsi qui a bestis, avibus, et piscibus et ab aliis animalibus devorati sunt vel quorum ossa incensa sunt omnes in momento ad vocem Domini resurgent in ipsa carne in qua prius fuerunt.” On twelfth-century attitudes toward reassemblage of the body, see Bynum, Resurrection of the Body, 121–37.
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33. Frassetto, “Heretics, Antichrists, and the Year 1000” and Callahan, “The Manichaeans and the Antichrist in the Writings of Ademar of Chabannes” examine the relationship between heresy and apocalypticism in Ademar's sermons. The debate concerning the origins of heresy in the eleventh century is a long-standing one, and most recently this debate has focused on the existence of heresy after the turn of the millennium. Indeed, it has been suggested that accusations of heresy were rhetorical devices designed to denigrate clerical opponents rather than statements of unorthodox belief. Among those who have suggested that accusations of heresy involved royal or ecclesiastical politics are R.-H. Bautier, “L’hérésie d’Orléans et le Mouvement Intellectuel au Début du Xle siècle. Documents et Hypothèses,” in Enseignement et Vie Intellectuelle (Xe-XVe siècle) (Paris, 1975), 63–88; Guy Lobrichon, “Le Chiaroscuro de l’Heresie: Early Eleventh Century Aquitaine as Seen from Auxerre,” in The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000, ed. Richard Landes and Thomas Head (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992), 80–104; Guy Lobrichon, “Arras, 1025, ou le vrai procès d’une fausse accusation,” in Inventer L’hérésie? Discours Polémiques avant L’inquisition, ed. Monique Zerner (Nice: University of Nice, 1998), 67–85; Moore, “The Birth of Popular Heresy,” 8–25. For a direct response to some of these arguments see Richard Landes, “The Birth of Heresy: A Millennial Phenomenon,” Journal of Religious History 24 (2000): 26–43. Despite the sophistication of the arguments against the reality of the existence of heresy, I remain unconvinced for at least two reasons. It seems unlikely that accusations of heresy would serve the rhetorical ends intended if heresy did not exist in some form, especially after centuries of non-existence. Moreover, it is likely that some form of popular protest would have emerged against the church as it reformed itself and introduced a variety of new claims (e.g. jurisdiction over marriage) in the early eleventh century. Indeed, both the promise and the failure of reform, as both Landes and Moore have argued, provided the necessary stimulus for heresy.
The heretics of Orléans, he observes, were especially praised for their religious life and were, most likely, adherents of a simple, ascetic lifestyle like the heretics of Aquitaine. The religious dissidents appearing throughout the West rejected the sacraments of the church and offered a challenge to the lax morals of the ecclesiastical establishment. These heretics thus combined an ethical and doctrinal programme that rejected traditional orthodox teaching in favour of what appears to have been a radically antimaterialistic teaching.

Although he describes the heretics in his work of history, Ademar provides more detailed discussion of heretics and heresies in his sermons. Throughout the sermons, and especially in the Berlin manuscript, Ademar describes the beliefs of heretics around him, associating them with the great historical heresies. He warns frequently of the appearance of heretics and antichrists in the sermons and concludes one sermon by announcing that he has things to say concerning “certain heretics who secretly rise among us denying baptism, the mass, the cross and the Church and who are messengers of Antichrist.” In a section recalling his chronicle, Ademar says that in order to seduce the simple folk the heretics fast and reject marriage but in fact secretly practise unspeakable acts. Of course, it is most unlikely that they indulged in sexual excess but instead practised sexual abstinence. Indeed, most accounts of the heretics of the early eleventh century note their renunciation of physical, especially sexual, pleasure. They lived purely, rejecting material temptations for spiritual reward and thus offered an alternative to the increasingly wealthy and materialistic church militant. Moreover, their simple and ascetic lifestyle, which denied earthly pleasures, suggests a denial of the body and a rejection of the idea of the goodness of the body. Although there remain questions about what the heretics did believe, it is likely that Ademar believed that the heretics advocated a complete denial of the body and bodily resurrection and thus, ecclesiastics like Ademar defended orthodox teachings of the body and resurrection.
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36. D.S., MS Lat. Philipps, 1664, fol. 114v. “Dicere habemus vobis de aliis rebus quae pertinent ad sindodum et de haereticis qui modo latenter inter nos surgunt qui negant baptismum, missam, crucem, ecclesiam, qui praecursores Antichristi sunt.” See also folios 69r, 69v, 71r, 72v, 73r, 74r, 75c, 78v, 83v–87v, 89v, 90v, 92v, 93r, 96v, 102v, 104r, 106v, and 107v.
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38. See Bynum, Resurrection of the Body, 214–20 for attitudes of ecclesiastics toward twelfth-century heretics. It should be noted at this point that Ademar’s emphasis on the body in reaction to the heretics is in some ways unique. The sermon of Gerard of Arras-Cambrai, the account of the council of Orléans of Paul of Saint Pére de Chartres, and even the passages in the history of...
In his sermons, Ademar’s attention is not limited to contemporary heretics and heresy. Indeed, because he believed that the heresy of his age was merely the resurgence of ancient errors, he indulged in numerous lengthy discussions of the great heresies of the past. In one of these passages, Ademar denounces the teachings of Apollinaris of Laodicea who denied the humanity of Christ incarnate because human depravity prohibited the full conjoining of God and man. In the sermon, *Sermo ad Sinodum de Catholica Fide*, Ademar denounces the errors of the Arians. In this passage he asserts the importance of recognising that Christ was fully human and fully divine and explains that Christ suffered on the cross according to his human nature. Indeed, the Arians come under attack by Ademar because they erred on Christological matters in such a way as to diminish the physical body of Christ. Other ancient sects, including the Sabellians and Thimotiani, also come under attack for their Christological errors that undermine the orthodox teaching of physical resurrection by denying that Jesus was fully divine and fully human in one body.

In a final, crucial passage, Ademar again decries the errors of the Manichaeans and clearly associates them with the heretics’ rejection of the orthodox belief in bodily resurrection. In a sermon in which Ademar discusses the various tenets of the Creed, he accuses the Manichaeans of Aquitaine of rejecting the cross, the most important symbol of bodily resurrection. Ademar explains that Christ suffered on the cross in his human form, and it is the death and resurrection of Christ that offers testimony of the victory over death and hope for the resurrection of the body. The Manichaeans, he explains, deny the cross and thus deny resurrection of the flesh. It is at this point that Ademar’s denunciation of the Christological errors of the ancient heretics merges with his perception of the heretics of his day. The denial of the humanity, and the implicit denial of the bodily resurrection of Christ found among the earlier heretics suggests a Docetism perhaps reflected in the rejection of the cross Ademar attributed to the heretics of his day. Although it is most unlikely that the heretics of Ademar’s day were well versed in the teachings of the ancient heresiarchs, it is likely that they practised a rigid asceticism that was intended to sublimate the material to the spiritual. Whatever the actual beliefs of the heretics were, though, Ademar’s image of the teachings of the heretics, like the image found in the later commentators on heresy, is one in which the worth of the human body is rejected.

Rodolphus Glaber do not address the resurrected body as Ademar does. Although these other sources provide defences of orthodox teaching and support the fundamental materialism of orthodox sacramental teachings, they are less concerned with matters of resurrection or the body. Even the sources concerning heresy at Orleans, where the heretics taught a Docetist Christology, pay scant attention to the issue of the body and bodily resurrection. It is likely that Ademar's response was conditioned, in part, by his own apocalyptic sentiments and concerns over his own orthodoxy in the wake of the debate over the apostolicity of Saint Martial.

39. D.S., MS Lat. Philippus, 1664, fol. 94r.
40. D.S., MS Lat. Philippus, 1664, fols. 84r−86v.
41. D.S., MS Lat. Philippus, 1664, fols. 84r and 96r.
42. D.S., MS Lat. Philippus, 1664, fol. 72v.
In his sermons, Ademar provides a clear picture of the antimaterialist teachings of the heretics of Aquitaine and, like his contemporary chroniclers of heresy, offers a refutation of these errors. The sudden appearance of religious dissent around the millennium forced many ecclesiastics like Ademar to defend orthodox teaching. For Ademar, this need was reinforced by his eschatological understanding of the heretics whom he labelled messengers of anti-Christ. Indeed, in the face of anticrisths and Manichaeans who denied the sacramental teachings of the church and emphasised the spiritual over the material, Ademar reasserted the truth of orthodox teaching. In long discussions of baptism and the Eucharist, Ademar emphasised the material elements of these sacraments. He acknowledges the symbolic value of the substances of the sacraments and also the operation of the Holy Spirit in the water of baptism and the physical transformation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. And, as we have seen, his discussion of the Creed stressed the importance of the body in the resurrection. Ademar’s focus on the body and on bodily resurrection in his sermons was, in part, his response to the heretics of Aquitaine who rejected the material world and denied bodily resurrection.

Ademar’s response to the Manichaeans of Aquitaine is paralleled, in some ways, by André of Fleury’s account of the heretics of Orléans of 1022. Indeed, Admer’s description of heretics in Aquitaine recalls André’s description of the heretical canons at Orléans whose teachings included denial of the incarnation and resurrection, and baptism and marriage. The heretics of Orléans thus seem to have held Docetist and antimaterialist doctrines similar to those of the heretics of Aquitaine, which inspired, in part, Ademar’s defence of the resurrection of the body. Although Andre does not explicitly defend resurrection of the body in his account of the episode, as Ademar does in his sermons, he does include the confession of faith delivered by Gauzlin in the following year. In his confession, Gauzlin states, “I affirm that he [Jesus] suffered his passion in his own real flesh, that he died the real death of his body, that he was resurrected in the true resurrection of the flesh and the resurrection of his soul in which he will come to judge the living and the dead.” He proclaims shortly after, “I believe in the resurrection of this flesh that we wear and not in the resurrection of an other flesh.”

44. Callahan, “The Manichaeans and the Antichrist.”
45. Ademar’s defence of the church’s teachings of the fundamental materialism of the sacraments against the heretics is similar to that of Gerard of Arras-Cambrai. For further discussion of the similarities of Ademar and Gerard’s sermons, see Michael Frassetto, “Reaction and Reform: Reception of Heresy in Arras and Aquitaine.”
47. André of Fleury, Vita Gauzlini, 56. “Que hujus modi erant: Trinitatem in unitate mentiebatur se credere, filiumque Dei carnem sumpsisse; baptizatos autem negabant, nuptias cum benedictione non deberi fieri.”
48. André of Fleury, Vita Gauzlini, 56. “Passum esse vera carnis passione, mortuum vera corporis sui morte, resurrexisse vera carnis sue resurrectione et vera anime resurrectione in qua veniet judicare vivos ac mortuos assero.”
49. André of Fleury, Vita Gauzlini, 56. “Credo, hujus, quam gestamus, et non alterius carnis resurrectionem.”
similar to one proclaimed shortly before by Gerbert of Aurillac and by Valdes of Lyons in the twelfth century, suggests concerns over the proper materialist understanding of the body at resurrection that were inspired by the errors of the heretics. Indeed, the appearance, or perceived appearance, of heretics around the turn of the millennium who apparently denied church teaching forced orthodox ecclesiastics to defend traditional doctrines, including the doctrine of the bodily resurrection of Jesus and all people.

Ademar’s perception of the heretics’ denial of the body and bodily resurrection provides a negative image of the importance of the body and resurrection of the flesh to the orthodox at the turn of the millennium. A more positive image is to be found in his treatment of the cult of the saints and their relics. Indeed, promotion of the cult of the saints may have been a further response to the heretics’ rejection of bodily resurrection and church teaching in general.

One example of his promotion of the cult of the saints and relics can be found in his chronicle. In his history, Ademar offers a version of the tale of Otto III’s discovery of the body of Charlemagne that further demonstrates his own apocalypticism and incorporates Charlemagne and the discovery of his relics in the context of the Last Emperor. At the discovery of the tomb, Ademar explains, the great king’s body was found to be without corruption, demonstrating that his body already revealed its glorification in heaven. Clearly, this saintly king’s body remained uncorrupted because it foreshadowed the ultimate resurrection and reunification with its soul at the end of time, which Ademar clearly identified with his own time. As revealing as this passage from the history is, it is in the sermons celebrating saints Valerie and Martial, whose numerous miracles reveal the promise of bodily resurrection, that Ademar most clearly associates the cult of the saints and relics and the resurrection of the body.

Evidence of the unity of the resurrected soul and body is offered in Ademar’s sermons on the vita of St Valerie. The martyrdom of Valerie reveals the triumph of the body over fragmentation and its unity at the resurrection.

51. The connection between the cult of relics and bodily resurrection was not new in the eleventh century. Indeed, as Bynum notes, *Resurrection of the Body*, 92–114, the association was made by the church fathers, especially Augustine. Ademar’s own arguments surely owed a debt to the fathers, even though they were uniquely his own and inspired by the events of his day. On the cult of the saints and control of popular piety, see Bernard Töpfer, “The Cult of Relics and Pilgrimage in Burgundy and Aquitaine at the Time of the Monastic Reform,” in *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, ed. Thomas Head and Richard Landes (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992), 41–57, and Richard Landes, “Between Aristocracy and Heresy: Popular Participation in the Limousin Peace of God, 994–1033,” in *The Peace of God*, 184–218.
55. B.N., MS Lat. 2469, fol. 14v–25v contain the sermons for Valerie.
Like many other female saints, Valerie faced the choice between suffering martyrdom and preserving her chastity. She had been betrothed to Stephen, duke of Aquitaine, but upon hearing the preaching of Martial, she converted to Christianity and took a vow of perpetual chastity. As a consequence of her vow, her fiancé ordered her execution and she was beheaded. Signs of Valerie’s glorification occurred at her beheading when, as Ademar observes in one of his sermons, she was visited by angels who comforted her as she praised Christ and prepared her for delivery into heaven. In another sermon honouring Valerie, Ademar notes that she was rewarded for her physical suffering when he proclaims, “At the moment she felt the sword she possessed joy without end.” Indeed, in that same sermon he explains that although she was beheaded she preserved her bodily integrity because she chose martyrdom to preserve her maidenhood. Thus, Valerie preserved the purity of her body for its ultimate reunion with her soul in heaven.

The miracles at Valerie’s death and at her tomb provide further evidence of Ademar’s notion of the unity of body and soul in life and at the resurrection. At her execution, Valerie left the impression of her footprints in the solid rock beneath her. This miracle caused by Valerie’s body was followed in Ademar’s day by many more associated with her relics, including both heavenly signs and bodily cures. As dramatic as these events were, an even more spectacular miracle occurred immediately following Valerie’s martyrdom. After her decapitation, Valerie picked up her head and carried it to Martial who then buried her in a tomb he had prepared for himself. This episode reveals the unity of the body and the triumph over the decay and dismemberment of the flesh. Valerie’s miracle, moreover, demonstrates the glorification of the body and, as Ademar notes, provides evidence for the general resurrection of the body at the end of time. These miracles demonstrate that saints’ bodies were, in Bynum’s words, “pregnant already with the glory they would receive fully only at the resurrection,” and thus offered Ademar and his audience with hope for the resurrection of their own flesh.

Ademar’s hopes for the resurrection of the flesh received even greater support from the life of his patron Saint Martial. In the sermons, Ademar provides the strongest evidence for the resurrection of the body in discussions of the numerous resurrections from the dead performed by Martial. In the commentary on the Creed from De Eucharistia, he observes that the twelfth distinction is belief in eternal life and that all the apostles raised the dead to prove to those who denied the existence of life after this that the body would
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be rejoined with the soul. Martial too, as an apostle, performed these miracles to symbolise the future resurrection of the flesh. Among those the saint revived are the executioner of Valerie, two pagan priests, the sons of two powerful nobles, and his own disciple, Austriclinian. In one particular episode from the life of the saint recorded in the sermons, Ademar asserts that Martial raised two pagan priests from the dead in order to convince the other pagans of the truth of eternal life and the resurrection of the flesh. Indeed, this passage from De Eucharistia serves as a gloss on Ademar’s discussion of the twelfth distinction of the Creed and is intended to reinforce the truth of the teaching of the resurrection. And, in his sermon on the Catholic faith, Ademar offers further support from the life of Martial for belief in the final resurrection. In this sermon, Ademar explicitly connects Martial’s raising of the dead with the resurrection of Christ. He repeats the tales of Martial’s many resurrections and compares them with the resurrections of the dead performed by Jesus Christ and by Peter and the other apostles. Moreover, Ademar connects the resurrection of Christ, and also the general resurrection of the flesh, with the miraculous resurrections of the dead when he notes that Saint Martial ordered the dead. “In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, whom the Jews crucified and who rose from the dead on the third day, rise and stand on your own feet.” It is the memory of the resurrection of Christ and the hope for the resurrection of the flesh that is offered in Ademar’s discussion of Martial’s resurrections of the dead. Thus, the lives of the saints and the miracles they perform provide further hope that the body itself will rise to rejoin the soul.

An even more dramatic demonstration of the power of Saint Martial and the relationship of the body and soul can be seen in Ademar’s account of the saint’s healing of the plague of the firesickness in Aquitaine in 994. In his chronicle, Ademar provides a brief outline of the events associated with the plague. He notes that a great pestilence struck Limoges in that year and that the “bodies of men and women beyond number were consumed by an invisible fire.” This plague, probably an attack of ergotism, elicited a decisive response from the duke and bishops of Aquitaine who ordered a three-day fast and the translation of many relics, especially those of Saint Martial. The intervention of Martial and the other saints brought an end to the plague and in the presence of the relics, oaths of peace were sworn by the duke and other princes. Once again, the body becomes the locus of saintly intervention and this reinforces the underlying assumption of the unity of the body and soul.
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69. Chronique, 3:35, 158; See also the remarks of Landes, “Between Aristocracy and Heresy,” 186–90 for further remarks about the event and for bibliography concerning ergotism.
That Ademar understood this miracle in terms of body–soul unity is demonstrated clearly in his sermons. In four sermons from the Paris manuscript, Ademar provides more extensive commentary on the events of 994 that further demonstrates the importance of apocalypticism for understanding Ademar’s attention to the resurrection of the body.70 Both the way he structured the events of 994 in the sermons and the language he used, mainly from Isaiah’s description of the return of the Jews to God’s holy mountain in Jerusalem, reveal Ademar’s eschatological understanding of the plague and its cure.71 He stresses the role of Martial in the cure by describing the appearance of a light over the saint’s tomb in the middle of the night and, at the same moment that this prodigy occurred, the bishop dreamt that the saint appeared before him with a pitcher of water to put out the fire.72 Moreover, in these sermons he clearly identifies the penitential and eschatological nature of the plague. In the first sermon, he notes that the Lord decided to send a temporal punishment to Aquitaine rather than reserve his vengeance for some eternal penalty.73 At several points in the other sermons he repeats the idea that the fire was sent to chastise the people of Aquitaine for their sins.74 This punishment took the form of a fire that turned the bodies of the wretched to smoke and transformed parts of many bodies to flaming coals.75 Only when the people of Aquitaine appealed to Martial, offering prayers and translating his relics, did the plague come to an end.76 After the translation, a council proclaimed the peace in Aquitaine, thus further restoring the proper religious life. The translation brought about the restoration of spiritual and physical health after the sinfulness of the people brought forth bodily punishment. Ademar’s account of the events of 994 clearly associate the moral turpitude of the people of Aquitaine as the cause of the plague. As a consequence of spiritual failings, Ademar explains, divine authority imposed physical punishment. For Ademar, therefore, there was a clear connection between the body and soul. Indeed, the belief in the unity of body and soul is revealed in this account because the body endured a penitential fire as a result of the moral failings of the soul. The cure of the firesickness, like the other great miracles of the saints, provides one last example of the centrality of the body in the thought of an eleventh-century ecclesiastic.

The sermons of Ademar demonstrate the importance of bodily resurrection and the notion of psycho–somatic unity for ecclesiastics at the time of the millennium. Recalling the commentary of the church fathers and anticipating the commentary of the schoolmen, Ademar’s sermons provide an important link between the two. In his sermons, Ademar stressed the orthodox belief in
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the integrity of the body rather than its denial. And in his commentary on the Creed and the cult of the saints, Ademar confirms the importance of the body in Christian eschatology. In fact, these are the very same issues that ecclesiastical writers throughout the Middle Ages explored in their concern with the body and the promise of salvation. His attention to the issue of the resurrection of the body, however, reveals his unique reaction to the various concerns of the early eleventh century. Although indebted to the church fathers, Ademar was equally inspired by apocalyptic concerns. His attention to the resurrection, unlike that of the fathers, was conditioned by his own sense of the imminence of the end of time. Throughout his writings, Ademar demonstrates his apocalypticism, a sentiment that surely drew his attention to the state of the body and soul at the general resurrection. Moreover, both questions of his own orthodoxy and the appearance of what he termed Manichaeans further focused his attention to the ultimate fate of the body. Indeed, the heretics’ (or the perception of the alleged heretics’) essential challenge to the materialist doctrines of the church led Ademar to the defence of church doctrines on the resurrection of the body, the reality of the Incarnation, and the physical nature of the sacraments. Although addressing an issue that was as old as the faith itself, Ademar was driven by his own apocalypticism, concerns over his own orthodoxy, and the errors of the heretics he saw around him. Ademar’s sermons, therefore, show us that interest in the demonstration of the Christian doctrine of bodily resurrection can be found in the eleventh century and remind us of the importance of this period in the formation of medieval civilisation.