

**Chapter
Two**

**Lecture
Three**

COMMENTARY ON

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN

St. Thomas Aquinas

Lectio 3

18 ἀπεκρίθησαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῶ, τί σημεῖον δεικνύεις ἡμῖν, ὅτι ταῦτα ποιεῖς; 19 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερω αὐτόν. 20 εἶπαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἕξ ἔτεσιν οἰκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος, καὶ σὺ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερεῖς αὐτόν; 21 ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔλεγεν περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. 22 ὅτε οὖν ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τοῦτο ἔλεγεν, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ὃν εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 23 ὡς δὲ ἦν ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐν τῷ πάσχα ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, θεωροῦντες αὐτοῦ τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει: 24 αὐτὸς δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν αὐτόν αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸ αὐτόν γινώσκειν πάντας, 25 καὶ ὅτι οὐ χρεῖαν εἶχεν ἵνα τις μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου: αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐγίνωσκεν τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ.

Posita occasione signi exhibendi, hic consequenter Evangelista manifestat signum exhibendum: et primo ponit signum quod exhibetur; secundo ponit fructum factorum signorum, qui sequitur, ibi *cum autem esset Ierosolymis* et cetera. Circa primum tria facit.

LECTURE 3

18 At this the Jews responded and said, "What sign can you show us authorizing you to do these things?" 19 Jesus replied, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up again." 20 The Jews then retorted, "This temple took forty-six years to build, and you are going to raise it up again in three days!" 21 He was speaking, however, of the temple of his body. 22 When, therefore, he had risen from the dead, his disciples recalled that he had said this; they then believed the Scriptures and the statement Jesus had made. 23 While he was in Jerusalem during the Passover feast, many people, seeing the signs he was working, believed in his name. 24 But Jesus did not trust himself to them, for he knew all men, 25 and he did not need anyone to give him testimony about men. He was well aware of what was in man's heart.

393 Having set forth the occasion for showing the sign, the Evangelist then states the sign which would be given. First, he gives the sign. Secondly, he mentions the fruit of the signs Christ performed (v 23). As to the first he does three things. First, the request for the sign is given.

Primo ponitur signi postulatio; secundo signi exhibitio, ibi *respondit Iesus, et dixit eis: solvite templum hoc* etc.; tertio signi exhibitio intellectus, seu conceptio, ibi *dixerunt ergo ei: quadraginta et sex annis aedificatum est templum hoc* et cetera.

Signum autem postulatur a Iudaeis; et hoc est quod dixit *responderunt ergo Iudaei, et dixerunt ei: quod signum ostendis nobis, quia haec facis?*

Ubi sciendum est, quod in eiectione negotiatorum de templo per Iesum, duo considerari poterant in Christo: rectitudo et zelus, quae pertinent ad virtutem; et potestas, seu auctoritas. Sed de virtute et zelo Christi, quibus praedicta fecerat, non oportebat peti signum a Christo; cum unicuique liceat operari secundum virtutem. De auctoritate tamen eius, qua eos de templo expellit, signum ab eo quaeri poterat; cum hoc non cuilibet liceret facere, sed auctoritatem habenti.

Praetermisso igitur Iudaei zelo et virtute, signum petunt de eius auctoritate; et ideo dicunt *quod signum ostendis nobis, quia haec facis?* Id est, quare cum tanta potestate et auctoritate nos expellis? Non videtur hoc esse tui officii. Simile dicunt, Matth. XXI, 23: *in qua potestate haec facis?* et cetera.

Signum autem quaerunt: quia familiare erat Iudaeis, signum quaerere, utpote per ea ad legem vocati; Deut. ult., 10. *Non surrexit ultra propheta in Israel sicut Moyses, quem nosset dominus facie ad faciem, in omnibus signis atque portentis.* Et, I Cor. c. I, 22, *Iudaei signa quaerunt.* Ideo David in persona Iudaeorum conqueritur, dicens, Ps. LXXIII, 9: *signa nostra non vidimus.* Quaerebant autem signum, non ut crederent, sed quasi desperantes, quod signum ostendere non posset, et sic eum reprimerent et impedirent. Quia ergo prave quaerebant, non dedit eis signum apertum, sed occultum in figura, scilicet signum de resurrectione.

Secondly, the sign itself (v 19). Thirdly, the way the sign was understood (v 20).

394 The Jews ask for a sign; and this is what he says: **What sign can you show us authorizing you to do these things?**

395 Here we should note that when Jesus drove the merchants Out of the temple, two things could be considered in Christ: his rectitude and zeal, which pertain to virtue; and his power or authority. **It was not appropriate to** require a sign from Christ concerning the virtue and zeal with which he did the above action, since everyone may lawfully act according to virtue. But he could be required to give a sign concerning his authority for driving them out of the temple, since it is not lawful for anyone to do this unless he has the authority.

And so the Jews, not questioning his zeal and virtue, ask for a sign of his authority; and so they say, **What sign can you show us authorizing you to do these things?** i.e., Why do you drive us out with such power and authority, for this does not seem to be your office? They say the same thing in Matthew (21:23): “By what authority are you doing these things?”

396 The reason they ask for a sign is that it was the usual thing for Jews to require a sign, seeing that they were called to the law by signs: “There did not arise again in Israel a prophet like Moses, whom, the Lord knew face to face, with all his signs and wonders,” as is said in Deuteronomy (34:10), and “The Jews require signs,” as we find in 1 Corinthians (1:22). Hence David complains for the Jews saying: “We have not seen our signs” (Ps 73:9). However, they asked him for a sign not in order to believe, but in the hope that he would not be able to provide the sign, and then they could obstruct and restrain him. And so, because they

asked in an evil manner, he did not give them an evident sign, but a sign clothed in a symbol, a sign concerning the resurrection.

397 Hence he says, **Jesus replied**, and he gives the sign for which they asked. He gives them the sign of his future resurrection because this shows most strikingly the power of his divinity. For it is not within the power of mere man to raise himself from the dead. Christ alone, who was free among the dead, did this by the power of his divinity. He shows them a similar sign in Matthew (12:30): “An evil and adulterous generation asks for a sign. And a sign will not be given it, except the sign of Jonah the prophet.” And although he gave a hidden and symbolic sign on both occasions, the first was stated more clearly, and the second more obscurely.

398 We should note that before the incarnation, God gave a sign of the incarnation to come: “The Lord himself will give you a sign. A virgin will conceive, and give birth to a son” (Is 7:14). And in like manner, before the resurrection he gave a sign of the resurrection to come. And he did this because it is especially by these two events that the power of the divinity in Christ is evidenced. For nothing more marvelous could be done than that God become man and that Christ’s humanity should become a partaker of divine immortality after his resurrection: “Christ, rising from the dead, will not die again ... his life is life with God” (Rom 6:9), i.e., in a likeness to God.

399 We should note the words Christ used in giving this sign. For Christ calls his body a temple, because a temple is something in which God dwells, according to “The Lord is in his holy temple” (Ps 10:5). And so a holy soul, in which God dwells, is also called a temple of God: “The temple of God is holy, and that is what you are” (1 Cor 3:17). Therefore, because the divinity dwells in the body of Christ, the body of Christ is the temple of God, not only according to the soul but also according to the body: “In him all the fulness of the divinity dwells bodily” (Col 2:9). God dwells in us by grace, i.e., according to an act of the intellect and will, neither of which is an act of the body, but of the soul alone. But he dwells in Christ according to a union in the person; and this union

Unde dicit *respondit Iesus, et dixit eis* etc. in quo ponitur signi postulati exhibitio. Ideo autem dat eis signum resurrectionis futurum, quia in hoc maxime virtus divinitatis eius ostenditur. Non enim puri hominis est ut se excitaret a mortuis; sed solum Christus, qui fuit inter mortuos liber, hoc virtute suae divinitatis fecit. Simile etiam signum ostendit eis. Matth. XII, 39: *generatio prava, et adultera signum quaerit; sed signum non dabitur ei nisi signum Ionae prophetae*. Et licet utrobique dederit signum occultum et figurale; illud tamen manifestius, istud vero obscurius fuit.

Notandum autem, quod ante incarnationem dedit Deus signum futurae incarnationis, Is. VII, 14: *ipse dominus dabit vobis signum: ecce virgo concipiet, et pariet filium* etc.; similiter et ante resurrectionem dedit signum de resurrectione futura: quia istis duobus maxime virtus divinitatis commendatur in Christo. Nihil enim mirabilius fieri potuit quam quod Deus factus est homo, et quod humanitas in Christo, post eius resurrectionem, immortalitatis divinae particeps effecta est; Rom. VI, 9: *Christus resurgens ex mortuis, iam non moritur (...) quod enim vivit, vivit Deo*, id est ad similitudinem Dei.

Sed attendenda sunt verba signi dati. Nam Christus corpus suum templum dicit: cuius ratio est, quia templum dicitur in quo Deus inhabitat etc. secundum illud Ps. X, 5: *dominus in templo sancto suo*. Et inde est quod anima sancta, quam Deus inhabitat, dicitur templum Dei; I Cor. III, 17: *templum Dei sanctum est, quod estis vos*. Quia ergo in corpore Christi divinitas inhabitat, ideo corpus Christi est templum Dei, non solum secundum animam, sed etiam secundum corpus; Col. II, 9: *in quo inhabitat omnis plenitudo divinitatis corporaliter*. Et in nobis quidem habitat Deus secundum gratiam, scilicet secundum actum intellectus et voluntatis, qui non est actus corporis, sed animae tantum; sed in Christo habitat secundum

unionem in persona: quae quidem unio non solum ipsam animam, sed et corpus includit; et ideo ipsum corpus Christi est templum Dei.

Ex hoc autem Nestorius, sui erroris occasionem sumens, dicit verbum Dei unitum humanae naturae secundum inhabitationem tantum; ex quo sequitur quod alia sit persona Dei, alia hominis in Christo. Et ideo dicendum est, quod inhabitatio Dei in Christo refertur ad naturam, quia alia est divina natura, alia humana in Christo; sed non ad personam, quae est eadem in Christo Dei et hominis, scilicet persona verbi, ut dictum est supra.

Hoc igitur supposito, circa hoc signum dominus duo facit. Primo quidem praenuntiat suam mortem futuram; secundo vero resurrectionem.

Mortem quidem praenuntiat cum dicit *solvite templum hoc*. Christus enim mortuus fuit, et ab aliis occisus, Matth. XVII, v. 22: *et occident eum*, eo tamen volente: quia, ut dicitur Is. LIII, 7, *oblatus est quia ipse voluit*. Et ideo dicit *solvite templum hoc*, idest corpus meum. Et non dicit, solvetur, ne intelligas eum seipsum occidisse; sed dicit *solvite*, quod non est imperantis, sed praenuntiantis, et permittentis. Praenuntiantis quidem, ut sit sensus *solvite templum hoc*, idest, solvetis; permittentis vero, ut sit sensus *solvite templum hoc*, idest, facite de corpore meo quod vultis, illud vobis expono, sicut dicit Iudae, infra XIII, 27: *quod facis, fac citius*: non quidem imperans ei, sed eum eius arbitrio derelinquens.

Dicit autem *solvite*, quia mors Christi est solutio corporis eius, aliter tamen quam aliorum hominum. Nam corpora aliorum hominum solvuntur per mortem usque ad incinerationem carnis, et pulverationem: qualis quidem solutio non fuit in Christo; quia, ut dicitur in Ps. XV, 10, *non dabis sanctum tuum videre corruptionem*. Fuit ibi tamen solutio per mortem, quia anima separata est a corpore,

includes not only the soul, but the body as well. And so the very body of Christ is God's temple.

400 But Nestorius, using this text in support of his error, claims that the Word of God was joined to human nature only by an indwelling, from which it follows that the person of God is distinct from that of man in Christ. Therefore it is important to insist that God's indwelling in Christ refers to the nature, since in Christ human nature is distinct from the divine, and not to the person, which in the case of Christ is the same for both God and man, that is, the person of the Word, as was said above.

401 Therefore, granting this, the Lord does two things with respect to this sign. First, he foretells his future death. Secondly, his resurrection.

402 Christ foretells his own death when he says, **Destroy this temple**. For Christ died and was killed by others: "And they will kill him" (Mt 17:22), yet with him willing it: because as is said: "He was offered because it was his own will" (Is 53:7). And so he says, Destroy this temple, i.e., my body. He does not say, "it will be destroyed," lest you suppose he killed himself. He says, Destroy, which is not a command but a prediction and a permission. A prediction, so that the sense is, **Destroy this temple**, i.e., you will destroy. And a permission, so that the sense is, **Destroy this temple**, i.e., do with my body what you will, I submit it to you. As he said to Judas: "What you are going to do, do quickly" (below 13:27), not as commanding him, but as abandoning himself to his decision.

He says **Destroy**, because the death of Christ is the dissolution of his body, but in a way different from that of other men. For the bodies of other men are destroyed by death even to the point of the body's returning to dust and ashes. But Such a dissolution did not take place in Christ, for as it is said: "You will not allow your Holy One to see corruption" (Ps 15:10). Nevertheless, death did bring a dissolution to

ut forma a materia, et quia sanguis separatus est a corpore, et quia corpus eius perforatum est clavis et lancea.

Resurrectionem autem praenuntiat cum dicit *et in tribus diebus excitabo illud*, scilicet corpus; idest a mortuis suscitabo. Non autem dicit excitabitur, nec excitabit illud pater, sed ego *excitabo*: ut ostendat se propria virtute a mortuis resurgere. Nec tamen negamus quin pater eum a mortuis suscitaverit, quia, ut dicitur Rom. c. VIII, 11, *qui suscitavit Iesum a mortuis*. Et in Ps. XL, 11: *tu autem, domine, miserere mei, et resuscita me*. Sic ergo Deus pater Christum suscitavit a mortuis, et Christus propria virtute resurrexit; Ps. III, 6: *ego dormivi, et soporatus sum, et exurrexi, quia dominus suscepit me*. Nec est in hoc contrarietas, quia eadem est virtus utriusque: unde *quaecumque pater facit, haec similiter, et filius facit*: infra V, 19. Nam si pater eum suscitavit, et filius; II Cor. ult., 4: *nam si crucifixus est ex infirmitate, sed vivit ex virtute Dei*.

Dicit autem *et in tribus diebus* et non post tres dies, quia non diebus tribus completis in monumento permansit; sed, sicut Augustinus dicit, est synecdochica locutio, in qua ponitur pars pro toto.

Origenes autem huius locutionis mysticam rationem assignat, dicens: corpus Christi verum est templum Dei, quod quidem corpus figurat corpus mysticum, idest Ecclesiam; I Cor. XII, 27: *vos estis corpus Christi, et membra de membro*. Et sicut in corpore Christi habitat divinitas per gratiam unionis, ita et in Ecclesia per gratiam adoptionis. Et quamvis corpus istud mystice dissolvi videatur adversitatibus tribulationum, quibus affligitur, tamen suscitatur in tribus diebus, scilicet in die legis naturae, et in die legis scriptae, et in die legis gratiae; quia, etsi in his diebus, quantum ad aliquos corpus dissolvatur, quantum ad aliquos tamen vivit. Et ideo dicit *in tribus diebus*, quia huius resurrectio spiritualis in tribus diebus perficitur. Sed post tres dies perfecte resuscitabimur, non solum quantum ad primam resurrectionem, sed etiam quantum ad

Christ, because his soul was separated from his body as a form from matter, and because his blood was separated from his body, and because his body was pierced with nails and a lance.

403 He foretells his resurrection when he says, **and in three days I will raise it up again**, that is, his body; i.e., I will raise it from the dead. He does not say, "I will be raised up," or "The Father will raise it up," but **I will raise it up**, to show that he would rise from the dead by his own power. Yet we do not deny that the Father raised him from the dead, because as it is said: "Who raised Jesus from the dead" (Rom 8:11); and "O Lord, have pity on me, and raise me up" (Ps 40:10). And so God the Father raised Christ from the dead, and Christ arose by his own power: "I have slept and have taken my rest, and I have risen, because the Lord has taken me" (Ps 3:6). There is no contradiction in this, because the power of both is the same; hence "whatever the Father does, the Son does likewise" (below 5:19). For if the Father raised him up, so too did the Son: "Although he was crucified through weakness, he lives through the power of God" (2 Cor 13:4).

404 He says, **and in three days**, and not "after three days," because he did not remain in the tomb for three complete days; but, as Augustine says, he is employing synecdoche, in which a part is taken for the whole.

Origen, however, assigns a mystical reason for this expression, and says: The true body of Christ is the temple of God, and this body symbolizes the mystical body, i.e., the Church: "You are the body of Christ" (1 Cor 12:27). And as the divinity dwells in the body of Christ through the grace of union, so too he dwells in the Church through the grace of adoption. Although that body may seem to be destroyed mystically by the adversities of persecutions with which it is afflicted, nevertheless it is raised up in "three days," namely, in the "day" of the law of nature, the "day" of the written law, and the "day" of the law of grace; because in those days a part of that body was destroyed, while another still lived. And so he says, in three days, because the spiritual resurrection of this body is accomplished in three days. But after those three days we will be perfectly risen, not only as to the first resurrection,

secundam; Apoc. XX, v. 6: *beatus qui habet partem in resurrectione secunda*.

Consequenter cum dicit *dixerunt ergo Iudaei* etc. ponitur signi exhibitus intellectus, et primo quidem ponitur intellectus falsus, conceptus a Iudaeis; secundo vero intellectus verus, conceptus ab apostolis, ibi *ille autem dicebat de templo corporis sui*.

Falsus autem intellectus Iudaeorum erat quia credebant quod Christus diceret hoc de templo materiali, in quo tunc erat; et ideo secundum hunc intellectum, respondent de templo materiali, et dicunt *quadraginta et sex annis aedificatum est templum hoc*, scilicet materiale, in quo sumus, *et in tribus diebus excitabis illud?*

Sed contra hoc est obiectio litteralis. Nam templum in Ierusalem per Salomonem fuit aedificatum, et ut habetur III Reg. c. VI, 1 s. a Salomone fuit consummatum septem annis, quid est ergo quod hic dicit *quadraginta et sex annis aedificatum est templum hoc?* Respondeo. Dicendum, secundum quosdam, quod hoc non est intelligendum de prima aedificatione templi, quae completa est a Salomone septem annis: nam templum quod Salomon aedificaverat, destructum fuit a Nabuchodonosor, sed intelligendum est de reaedificatione facta sub Zorobabel, postquam reversi fuerunt a captivitate, sicut legitur in libro Esdrae quae quidem multis impugnantibus undique inimicis, intantum impedita et dilata fuit, quod non potuit consummari templum usque ad quadragesimum sextum annum.

Vel dicendum, secundum Origenem, quod intelligitur de templo Salomonis: quod quidem dicitur aedificatum quadraginta et sex annorum tempore, ut numeretur tempus ab eo die quo David mentionem fecit de aedificatione templi, consulens super hoc Nathan prophetam, ut habetur II Reg. VII, 2 s., usque ad consummationem perfectam per Salomonem: nam ex illo die David incepit praeparare

but also as to the second: "Happy are they who share in the second [sic] resurrection" (Rv 20:6).

405 Then when he says, **The Jews then retorted**, we have the interpretation of the sign he gave. First, the false interpretation of the Jews. Secondly, its true understanding by the apostles (v 21).

406 The interpretation of the Jews was false, because they believed that Christ was saying this of the material temple in which he then was; consequently, they answer according to this interpretation and say: **This temple took forty-six years to build**, i.e., this material temple in which we are standing, **and you are going to raise it up again in three days!**

407 There is a literal objection against this. For the temple in Jerusalem was built by Solomon, and it is recorded in 2 Chronicles (6:1) that it was completed by Solomon in seven years. How then can it be said that this temple took forty-six years to build? I answer that according to some this is not to be understood of the very first temple, which was completed by Solomon in seven years: for that temple built by Solomon was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar. But it is to be understood of the temple rebuilt under Zerubbabel, after they returned from captivity, as recorded in the book of Ezra (5:2). However, this rebuilding was so hindered and delayed by the frequent attacks of their enemies on all sides, that the temple was not finished until forty-six years had passed.

408 Or it could be said, according to Origen, that they were speaking of Solomon's temple: and it did take forty-six years to build if the time be reckoned from the day when David first spoke of building a temple and discussed it with Nathan the prophet, as we find in 2 Samuel (7:2), until its final completion under Solomon. For from that first day onward David began preparing the material and the things necessary for building the

materiam et necessaria ad aedificationem templi. Et si diligenter dictum tempus consideretur, ascendit ad numerum quadraginta sex annorum.

Quamvis autem Iudaei intentionem suam referrent ad templum materiale, tamen, secundum Augustinum, potest referri ad templum corporis Christi: quia, sicut ipse dicit in Lib. LXXXIII quaest., conceptio et formatio humani corporis perficitur quadraginta quinque diebus hoc modo. Primis enim sex diebus corporis humani conceptio, quasi lactis habet similitudinem; novem vero diebus sequentibus convertitur in sanguinem; duodecim inde diebus solidatur in carnem; sed decem et octo reliquis diebus formatur usque ad perfecta lineamenta omnium membrorum. Isto ergo numero sex, novem, duodecim et octodecim in unum coacto, exurgit numerus quadraginta et quinque, cui addito uno propter sacramentum unitatis, sunt quadraginta sex.

Sed ex hoc insurgit quaestio: quia huius processus formationis non videtur habere locum in corpore Christi, quia in ipso instanti conceptionis formatum fuit et animatum. Sed dicendum, quod licet in corporis Christi formatione sit aliquid singulare, quia in ipso instanti corpus Christi fuit perfectum quantum ad omnia lineamenta membrorum, non tamen quantum ad debitam corporis quantitatem; et ideo in utero virginis tamdiu permansit quousque ad quantitatem debitam perveniret.

Accipiamus autem dictum numerum suprapositum, scilicet senarium, qui primus erat et quadraginta sex, qui erat ultimus; et ducamus unum in alterum: ex eis surgunt ducenta septuaginta sex. Dividendo ergo tot dies in menses, dando cuilibet mensi triginta dies sunt novem menses et sex dies. Recte ergo quadraginta et sex annis templum dicitur aedificatum esse, quod significabat corpus Christi, ut insinuet, quod tot anni fuerunt in fabricatione templi quot fuerunt dies in perfectione corporis Christi: nam ab octavo Kal. Aprilis in quo Christus fuit conceptus, et (ut creditur) passus, usque ad octavum

templi. Accordingly, if the time in question is carefully calculated, it will come to forty-six years.

409 But although the Jews referred their interpretation to the material temple, nevertheless, according to Augustine, it can be referred to the temple of Christ's body. As he says in *The Book of Eighty-three Questions*, the conception and formation of the human body is completed in forty-five days in the following manner. During the first six days, the conception of a human body has a likeness to milk; during the next nine days it is converted into blood; then in the next twelve days, it is hardened into flesh; then the remaining eighteen days, it is formed into a perfect outlining of all the members. But if we add six, nine, twelve and eighteen, we get forty-five; and if we add "one" for the sacrament of unity, we get forty-six.

410 However a question arises about this: because this process of formation does not seem to have taken place in Christ, who was formed and animated at the very instant of conception. But one may answer that although in the formation of Christ's body there was something unique, in that Christ's body was perfect at that instant as to the outlining of its members, it was not perfect as to the quantity due the body; and so he remained in the Virgin's womb until he attained the due quantity.

However, let us take the above numbers and select six, which was the first, and forty-six, which was the last, and let us multiply one by the other. The result is two hundred seventy-six. Now if we assemble these days into months, allotting thirty days to a month, we get nine months and six days. Thus it was correct to say that it took forty-six years to build the temple, which signifies the body of Christ; the suggestion being that there were as many years in building the temple as there were days in perfecting the body of Christ. For from March twenty-five, when Christ was conceived, and (as is believed) when he suffered, to December

Kal. Ianuarii sunt tot dies, scilicet ducenti septuaginta sex, quod numerus surgit ex senario ducto in quadraginta et sex.

Ex hoc etiam numero Augustinus (ut patet per Glossam) aliud intelligit mystice. Dicit enim, quod ex litteris nominis Adam multiplicatis, secundum numerum quem more Graecorum ipsae litterae important, surgit numerus quadraginta et sex. Nam a in Graeco secundum numerum importat unum, cum sit prima littera in alphabeto; d vero secundum ordinem importat quatuor. Addito ergo uno quod importat a, et quadraginta quod importat m, habemus quadraginta et sex. In quo significatur quod corpus Christi assumptum est de corpore Adam.

Item secundum Graecos ex primis litteris acceptis ex nominibus quatuor partium mundi componitur hoc nomen Adam: scilicet anathole, quod est oriens; disis quod est occidens; Arctos, quod est Septemtrio; mesembria, quod est meridies: in quo significatur quod Christus ex Adam carnem assumpsit, ut congreget electos suos a quatuor partibus mundi; Matth. XXIV, 31: *congregabit electos suos a quatuor ventis*.

Consequenter cum dicit *ille autem dicebat de templo corporis sui*, ponitur intellectus signi verus, conceptus a discipulis, et primo ponitur ipsorum intellectus; secundo vero unde apostoli hoc conceperunt, ibi *cum ergo surrexit* et cetera.

Dicit ergo: Iudaei hoc dixerunt ignorantes, sed Christus non sic intelligebat, immo intelligebat de templo corporis sui; et hoc est quod dicit *ille autem dicebat de templo corporis sui*. Qua autem ratione corpus Christi dicatur templum, dictum est supra.

Et ex hoc Apollinaris occasionem erroris sumens, dixit, quod caro Christi esset materia inanimata, quia templum est res inanimata. Sed in hoc decipitur: quia cum dicitur quod corpus Christi est templum,

twenty-five, there are this number of days, namely, two hundred seventy-six, a number that is the result of multiplying forty-six by six.

411 Augustine (as is plain from the Gloss) has another mystical interpretation of this number. For he says that if one adds the letters in the name "Adam," using for each the number it represented for the Greeks, the result is forty-six. For in Greek, A represents the number one, since it is the first letter of the alphabet. And according to this order, D is four. Adding to the sum of these another one for the second A and forty for the letter M, we have forty-six. This signifies that the body of Christ was derived from the body of Adam.

Again, according to the Greeks, the name "Adam" is composed of the first letters of the names of the four directions of the world: namely, Anathole, which is the east; Disis, which is the west; Arctos, which is the north; and Mensembria, the south. This signifies that Christ derived his flesh from Adam in order to gather his elect from the four parts of the world: "He will gather his elect from the four winds" (Mt 24:31).

412 Then, the true interpretation of this sign as understood by the apostles is given (v 2 1). First, the way they understood it is given. Secondly, the time when they understood it (v 22).

413 He says therefore: The Jews said this out of ignorance. But Christ did not understand it in their way; in fact, he meant the temple of his body, and this is what he says: **He was speaking, however, of the temple of his body.** We have already explained why the body of Christ could be called a temple.

Apollinaris misunderstood this and said that the body of Christ was inanimate matter because the temple was inanimate. He was mistaken in this for when it is said that the body of Christ is a temple, one is

est metaphorica locutio, in qua quidem locutione non attenditur similitudo quantum ad omnia, sed quantum ad aliquid, scilicet quantum ad inhabitationem, quod quidem refertur ad naturam, ut dictum est supra. Praeterea hoc manifeste apparet per auctoritatem sacrae Scripturae, cum dicit ipse Christus: *potestatem habeo ponendi animam meam*.

Unde autem apostoli hunc verum intellectum conceperunt, ostendit consequenter Evangelista, cum subdit *cum ergo surrexisset a mortuis, recordati sunt discipuli eius* et cetera. Nam ante resurrectionem difficile erat hoc intelligere: primo quia per hoc ostendebatur quod in corpore Christi erat vera divinitas, alias non potuisset dici templum; et hoc tunc temporis intelligere, humanam capacitatem excedebat. Secundo quia in hoc facit mentionem de passione et resurrectione, cum dicit *excitabo illud*, quod nullus discipulorum adhuc audierat. Unde quando Christus resurrectionem et passionem suam expressit apostolis, Petrus hoc audiens, scandalizatus est, dicens: *absit a te, domine* (Matth. XVI, 22). Sed post resurrectionem, quando iam plene cognoverant Christum esse Deum, per ea quae circa passionem et resurrectionem ostenderat, et quando sacramentum resurrectionis ipsius didicerant *tunc recordati sunt discipuli eius quia hoc dicebat de corpore suo, et tunc crediderunt Scripturae*, scilicet prophetarum; Oseae VI, 3: *vivificabit nos post duos dies, et tertia die suscitabit nos*; Ionae II, 1: *erat Ionas in ventre ceti tribus diebus et tribus noctibus*. Et inde est quod in ipsa die resurrectionis aperuit illis sensum ut intelligerent Scripturas. *Et sermoni eius, quem dixit Iesus, huic scilicet, solvite templum hoc, et in tribus diebus excitabo illud*.

Analogice autem per hoc datur nobis intelligi, secundum Origenem, quod in ultima resurrectione naturae, erimus Christi discipuli, quando in magna resurrectione totum corpus Iesu, id est Ecclesia eius, certificabitur de his quae nunc per fidem aenigmatice cognoscimus;

speaking metaphorically. And in this way of speaking a likeness does not exist in all respects, but only in some respect, namely, as to indwelling, which is referred to the nature, as was explained. Further, this is evident from the authority of Sacred Scripture. when Christ himself said: "I have the power to lay down my life," as we read below (10:18).

414 The time when the apostles acquired this true understanding is then shown by the Evangelist when he says, **When, therefore, he had risen from the dead, his disciples recalled that he had said this**. Prior to the resurrection it was difficult to understand this. First, because this statement asserted that the true divinity was in the body of Christ; otherwise it could not be called a temple. And to understand this at that time was above human ability. Secondly, because in this statement mention is made of the passion and resurrection, when he says, **I will raise it up again**; and this is something none of the disciples had heard mentioned before. Consequently, when Christ spoke of his resurrection and passion to the apostles, Peter was scandalized when he heard it, saying, "God forbid, Lord" (Mt 16:22). But after the resurrection, when they now clearly understood that Christ was God, through what he had shown in regard to his passion and resurrection, and when they had learned of the mystery of his resurrection, **his disciples recalled that he had said this** of his body, and **they then believed the Scriptures**, i.e., the prophets: "He will revive us after two days; on the third day he will raise us up" (Hos 6:3), and "Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights" (Jon 2:1). So it is that on the very day of the resurrection he opened their understanding so that they might understand the **Scriptures and the statement Jesus had made**, namely, **Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up again**.

415 In the anagogical sense, according to Origen, we understand by this that in the final resurrection of nature we will be disciples of Christ, when in the great resurrection the entire body of Jesus, that is, his Church, will be made certain of the things we now hold through faith in

et tunc recipiemus fidei complementum, videndo per speciem quod nunc per speculum intuemur.

Consequenter cum dicit *cum autem esset Ierosolymis*, ponit fructum consecutum ex signis, scilicet conversionem aliquorum credentium: et circa hoc tria facit. Primo proponit ipsos credentes, propter miracula; secundo ostendit quomodo Christus se habuit ad eos, ibi *ipse autem Iesus non credebat semetipsum eis*; tertio rationem assignat ad hoc, ibi *eo quod ipse nosset omnes*.

Fructus autem qui provenit ex signis Iesu magnus est, quia multi crediderunt, et conversi sunt ad eum; et hoc est quod dicit *cum autem esset Ierosolymis in Pascha, in die festo, multi crediderunt in nomine eius*, id est in eum, *videntes signa quae faciebat*.

Nota autem, quod dupliciter aliqui crediderunt. Quidam namque propter miracula visa, quidam vero propter occultorum revelationem et prophetiam. Sed commendabiliores sunt qui propter doctrinam credunt, quia sunt magis spirituales, quam qui propter signa, qui sunt grossiores et magis sensibiles. Isti autem qui conversi sunt, sensibiles ostenduntur per hoc quod non propter doctrinam, sicut discipuli, sed *videntes signa quae faciebat, crediderunt in nomine eius*. I Cor. XIV, v. 22: *prophetiae datae sunt fidelibus et cetera*.

Sed quaeritur hic quaenam signa viderunt facta a Iesu, cum nullum legamus eum tunc signum fecisse in Ierusalem. Ad hoc potest dupliciter responderi, secundum Origenem. Uno modo quod multa signa facta sint a Iesu ibi tunc temporis, quae hic non habentur; nam Evangelistae scienter multa praetermiserunt de miraculis Christi, cum tot fecerit quod non possent de facili scribi; infra ult., 25: *multa quidem alia signa fecit Iesus: quae si scribantur per singula, nec ipsum arbitror mundum capere posse eos qui scribendi sunt libros*. Et hoc signanter Evangelista ostendit cum dicit *videntes signa quae*

a dark manner. Then we shall receive the fulfillment of faith, seeing in actual fact what we now observe through a mirror.

416 Then (v 23) he sets forth the fruit which resulted from the signs, namely, the conversion of certain believers. Concerning this he does three things. First, he mentions those who believed on account of the miracles. Secondly, he shows the attitude of Christ to them (v 24). Thirdly, he gives the reason for this (v 25).

417 The fruit which developed from the signs of Jesus was abundant, because many believed and were converted to him; and this is what he says, **While he was in Jerusalem during the Passover feast, many people, seeing the signs he was working, believed in his name**, i.e., in him.

418 Note that they believed in two ways: some on account of the miracles they saw, and some on account of the revelation and prophecy of hidden things. Now those who believe on account of doctrine are more commendable, because they are more spiritual than those who believe on account of signs, which are grosser and on the level of sense. Those who were converted are shown to be more on the level of sense by the fact that they did not believe on account of the doctrine, as the disciples did, but **seeing the signs he was working**: "Prophecies are for those who believe" (1 Cor 14:22).

419 One might ask which signs worked by Jesus they saw, for we do not read of any sign worked by him in Jerusalem at that time. According to Origen, there are two answers to this. First, Jesus did work many miracles there at that time, which are not recorded here; for the Evangelist purposely omitted many of Christ's miracles, since he worked so many that they could not easily be recorded: "Jesus did many other signs, and if every one was written, the world itself, I think, would not be able to contain the books that would be written" (below 21:25). And the Evangelist expressly shows this when he says, **seeing the**

faciebat, quae iam praetermissa sunt, quia non fuit intentio Evangelistarum omnia signa Iesu conscribere, sed tot quot necessaria erant ad Ecclesiam fidelium instruendam. Alio modo, quia inter miracula potest maximum signum reputari, quod cum flagello facto ex funibus, hominum multitudinem Iesus de templo solus eiecerit.

Qualiter autem ad credentes se habuit, ostendit dicens *ipse autem Iesus non credebat semetipsum eis*, scilicet qui crediderant in eum. Sed quid est hoc quod homines credunt Deo, et ipse Iesus non credebat se eis? Numquid potuissent eum occidere, ipso nolente? Sed dicet aliquis, quod ideo non credebat se eis, quia sciebat eos fecte credere. Sed si hoc verum esset, non utique diceret Evangelista, quod multi crediderant in nomine eius, et tamen non credebat se eis. Et ratio est, secundum Chrysostomum, quia isti crediderunt in eum, sed imperfecte, quia nondum poterant attingere ad perfecta mysteria Christi, *et ideo non credebat se eis*, idest, secreta sua mysteria eis nondum revelabat: nam et ipsis apostolis multa non revelavit; infra XVI, 12: *multa habeo vobis dicere; sed non potestis portare modo*; I Cor. III, 1: *non potui vobis loqui quasi spiritualibus, sed quasi carnalibus*. Et ideo notanter Evangelista, ut ostendat eos imperfecte credere, non dicit, quod credebant in eum, quia nondum credebant eius divinitatem; sed dicit *in nomine eius*: illud quod de eo, nomine tenus dicebatur, scilicet quod iustus, vel huiusmodi.

Vel, secundum Augustinum, isti gerunt in Ecclesia typum catechumenorum, qui etsi credant in nomine Christi, Iesus tamen non credit se illis, quia Ecclesia non dat eis corpus Christi: quod quidem corpus, sicut nullus sacerdos conficere potest nisi in sacerdotem consecratus, ita nullus sumere debet nisi baptizatus.

Ratio autem huius quod non credebat se eis, ostenditur ex perfecta Christi cognitione; unde dicit *eo quod ipse nosset omnes*. Licet

signs he was working, without mentioning them, because it was not the intention of the Evangelist to record all the signs of Jesus, but as many as were needed to instruct the Church of the faithful. The second answer is that among the miracles the greatest could be the sign in which Jesus by himself drove from the temple a crowd of men with a whip of small cords.

420 The attitude of Jesus to those who believed in him is shown when he says, **But Jesus did not trust himself to them**, i.e., those who had believed in him. What is this, men entrust themselves to God, and Jesus himself does not entrust himself to them? Could they kill him against his will? Some will say that he did not trust himself to them because he knew that their belief was not genuine. But if this were true, the Evangelist would surely not have said that many believed in his name, and yet he did not trust himself to them. According to Chrysostom, the reason is that they did believe in him, but imperfectly, because they were not yet able to attain to the profound mysteries of Christ, and so **Jesus did not trust himself to them**, i.e., he did not yet reveal his secret mysteries to them; for there were many things he would not reveal even to the apostles: "I still have many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now" (below 16:12), and "I could not speak to you as spiritual persons, but as sensual" (1 Cor 3:1). And so it is significant that in order to show that they believed imperfectly, the Evangelist does not say that they believed "in him," because they did not yet believe in his divinity, but he says, **in his name**, i.e., they believed what was said about him, nominally, i.e., that he was just, or something of that sort.

Or, according to Augustine, these people represent the catechumens in the Church, who, although they believe in the name of Christ, Jesus does not trust himself to them, because the Church does not give them the body of Christ. For just as no priest except one ordained in the priesthood can consecrate that body, so no one but a baptized person may receive it.

421 The reason Jesus did not trust himself to them arises from his perfect knowledge; hence he says, **for he knew all men**. For although

autem homo ignorans debeat de quolibet praesumere bonum; tamen postquam veritas innotescit de aliquibus, debet se homo habere ad eos secundum eorum conditionem. Et quia Christum nihil latebat eorum quae sunt in homine, cum sciret eos imperfecte credere, non credebat se eis.

Describitur autem cognitio Christi universalis, quia non solum familiares, sed etiam alios extraneos cognoscebat, et ideo dicit eo *quod ipse nosset omnes*, et hoc per potentiam divinitatis; Eccli. XXIII, 28: *oculi domini multo plus lucidiores sunt super solem*. Nam homo, etsi cognoscat alios, non tamen certam cognitionem de eis potest habere, quia non videt nisi ea quae apparent; et ideo opus est ei testimonio aliorum. Christus autem certissime cognoscit, quia intuetur cor: et ideo *non erat ei opus ut quis testimonium perhiberet de homine*; immo ipse testis est, Job XVI, 20: *ecce in caelo est testis meus*.

Perfecta, quia non solum quantum ad exteriora, sed etiam quantum ad interiora sua cognitio se extendit; et ideo dicit *ipse enim sciebat quid esset in homine*, idest occulta cordis. Prov. XV, 11: *Infernus, et perditio coram domino*.

one must ordinarily presume good of everyone, yet after the truth about certain people is known, one should act according to their condition. Now because nothing in man was unknown to Christ and since he knew that they believed imperfectly, he did not trust himself to them.

422 The universal knowledge of Christ is then described: for he knew not only those who were on close terms with him, but strangers too. And therefore he says, **for he knew all men**; and this by the power of his divinity: "The eyes of the Lord are far brighter than the sun" (Sir 23:28). Now a man, although he may know other people, cannot have a sure knowledge of them, because he sees only what appears; consequently, he must rely on the testimony of others. But Christ knows with the greatest certainty, because he beholds the heart; and so **he did not need anyone to give testimony about men**. In fact, he is the one who gives testimony: "Look, my witness is in heaven" (Jb 16:20)

His knowledge was perfect, because it extended not only to what was exterior, but even to the interior; thus he says, **He was well aware of what was in man's heart**, i.e., the secrets of the heart: "Hell and destruction are open to the Lord: how much more the hearts of the children of men" (Prv 15:11).