

COMMENTARY ON  
THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN

St. Thomas Aquinas

# 2

## Lectio Lectio 1

1 καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ γάμος ἐγένετο ἐν Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἦν ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐκεῖ: 2 ἐκλήθη δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν γάμον. 3 καὶ ὑστερήσαντος οἴνου λέγει ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν, οἶνον οὐκ ἔχουσιν. 4 [καὶ] λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, γύναι; οὐπω ἦκει ἡ ὥρα μου. 5 λέγει ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ τοῖς διακόνοις, ὅ τι ἂν λέγῃ ὑμῖν ποιήσατε. 6 ἦσαν δὲ ἐκεῖ λίθιναι ὑδρῖαι ἕξ κατὰ τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων κείμεναι, χωροῦσαι ἀνὰ μετροῦσας δύο ἢ τρεῖς. 7 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, γεμίσατε τὰς ὑδρῖας ὕδατος. καὶ ἐγέμισαν αὐτὰς ἕως ἄνω. 8 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, ἀντλήσατε νῦν καὶ φέρετε τῷ ἀρχιτρικλίνῳ: οἱ δὲ ἤνεγκαν. 9 ὡς δὲ ἐγεύσατο ὁ ἀρχιτρικλίνος τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον γεγεννημένον, καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει πόθεν ἐστίν, οἱ δὲ διάκονοι ᾔδεισαν οἱ ἠντληκότες τὸ ὕδωρ, φωνεῖ τὸν νυμφίον ὁ ἀρχιτρικλίνος 10 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, πᾶς ἄνθρωπος πρῶτον τὸν καλὸν οἶνον τίθησιν, καὶ ὅταν μεθυσθῶσιν τὸν ἐλάσσονα: σὺ τετήρηκας τὸν καλὸν οἶνον ἕως ἄρτι. 11 ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἀρχὴν τῶν

## LECTURE 1

1 On the third day there was a wedding at Cana in Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there. 2 Jesus and his disciples were also invited to the feast. 3 When the wine ran out, the mother of Jesus said to him, "They have no more wine." 4 Jesus then said to her, "Woman, what does that have to do with me and you? My time has not yet come." 5 His mother said to the servants, "Do whatever he tells you." 6 Now there were six stone water jars near by for purifications according to Jewish customs, each holding two or three metretes. 7 Jesus said to them, "Fill those jars with water." And they filled them to the top. 8 Then Jesus said to them, "Now pour out a drink and take it to the head waiter." They did as he instructed them. 9 Now when the head waiter tasted the water made wine, and not knowing where it came from (although the servants knew, since they had drawn the water), he called the groom over 10 and said to him, "People usually serve the choice wines first, and when the guests have had their fill, then they bring out inferior wine; but you have saved the best wine until now." 11 This beginning of signs Jesus worked in Cana of Galilee; and Jesus revealed his glory, and his disciples believed in him.

σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἐφάνερωσεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

Supra Evangelista ostendit dignitatem verbi incarnati, et evidentiam eius multipliciter; hic consequenter incipit determinare de effectibus et operibus quibus manifestata est mundo divinitas verbi incarnati, et primo narrat ea quae Christus fecit in mundo vivendo, ad manifestationem suae divinitatis; secundo quomodo Christus suam divinitatem monstravit moriendo; et hoc a XII cap. et ultra.

Circa primum duo facit: primo enim ostendit Christi divinitatem quantum ad dominium quod habuit supra naturam; secundo quantum ad effectus gratiae, et hoc in III cap. ibi *erat homo ex Pharisaeis Nicodemus nomine* et cetera. Dominium autem Christi super naturam proponitur nobis per hoc quod naturam mutavit: quae quidem mutatio facta est a Christo in signum primo discipulis ad confirmandum; secundo vero turbis ad credendum, ibi *post hoc descendit Capharnaum*. Mutatio autem naturae ad confirmandos discipulos in nuptiis facta est, in quibus convertit aquam in vinum; et hoc est quod dicit *nuptiae factae sunt in Cana Galilaeae*: ubi primo describuntur nuptiae; secundo illi qui nuptiis interfuerunt, ibi *erat autem mater Iesu*; tertio describitur ipsum miraculum patratum, ibi *et deficiente vino* et cetera.

Describit autem nuptias primo quidem quantum ad tempus; unde dicit *et die tertia nuptiae factae sunt*, scilicet postquam praedicta de vocatione discipulorum fecerat. Postquam enim manifestatus fuerat testimonio Ioannis, voluit etiam seipsum manifestare. Secundo vero, quantum ad locum; unde dicit *in Cana Galilaeae*. Galilaea namque provincia est, Cana viculus quidam in ipsa provincia.

Quantum autem ad litteram pertinet, sciendum est, quod circa tempus praedicationis Christi est duplex opinio. Quidam namque dicunt, quod a Baptismate Christi usque ad passionem eius, fuerint duo anni et dimidius. Et secundum hos, hoc quod hic legitur de nuptiis, eodem anno factum est quo Christus baptizatus est. Sed his contrariatur sententia et consuetudo Ecclesiae: nam in festo Epiphaniae trium miraculorum commemoratio fit, scilicet

335 Above, the Evangelist showed the dignity of the incarnate Word and gave various evidence for it. Now he begins to relate the effects and actions by which the divinity of the incarnate Word was made known to the world. First, he tells the things Christ did, while living in the world, that show his divinity. Secondly, he tells how Christ showed his divinity while dying; and this from chapter twelve on.

As to the first he does two things. First, he shows the divinity of Christ in relation to the power he had over nature. Secondly, in relation to the effects of grace; and this from chapter three on. Christ's power over nature is pointed out to us by the fact that he changed a nature. And this change was accomplished by Christ as a sign: first, to his disciples, to strengthen them; secondly, to the people, to lead them to believe (2:12). This transformation of a nature, in order to strengthen the disciples, was accomplished at a marriage, when he turned water into wine. First, the marriage is described. Secondly, those present. Thirdly, the miracle performed by Christ.

330 In describing the marriage, the time is first mentioned. Hence he says. On the **third day there was a wedding**, i.e., after the calling of the disciples mentioned earlier. For, after being made known by the testimony of John, Christ also wanted to make himself known. Secondly, the place is mentioned; hence he says, **at Cana in Galilee**. Galilee is a province, and Cana a small village located in that province.

337 As far as the literal meaning is concerned, we should note that there are two opinions about the time of Christ's preaching. Some say that there were two and a half years from Christ's baptism until his death. According to them, the events at this wedding took place in the same year that Christ was baptized. However, both the teaching and practice of the Church are opposed to this. For three miracles are commemorated on the feast of the Epiphany:

adorationis magorum, quae fuit primo anno nativitatis dominicae; et Baptismi Christi, quo baptizatus est eodem die, revolutis triginta annis; et de nuptiis, quae sunt factae eodem die, revolutis triginta annis. Ex quo sequitur quod ad minus unus annus elapsus fuit a Baptismo usque ad nuptias. In quo quidem anno nil aliud legitur dominus fecisse nisi quod dicitur Matth. IV de ieiunio in deserto, et de tentatione a Diabolo, et ea quae hic Ioannes refert de testimonio Baptistae et conversione discipulorum. A nuptiis autem coepit publice praedicare et miracula facere usque ad passionem, ita quod duobus annis cum dimidio publice praedicavit.

Mystice autem per nuptias intelligitur coniunctio Christi et Ecclesiae, quia, ut dicit apostolus Eph. V, 32, *sacramentum hoc magnum est, dico autem in Christo et in Ecclesia*. Et illud quidem matrimonium initiatum fuit in utero virginali, quando Deus pater filio humanam naturam univit in unitate personae, unde huius coniunctionis thalamus fuit uterus virginalis; Ps. XVIII, 6: *in sole posuit tabernaculum suum*. De istis nuptiis dicitur Matth. XXII, 2: *simile est regnum caelorum homini regi, qui fecit nuptias filio suo*, tunc scilicet quando Deus pater humanam naturam verbo suo copulavit in utero virginali. Publicatum autem fuit, quando Ecclesia sibi per fidem coniuncta est; Oseae II, 20: *sponsabo te mihi in fide* et cetera. De istis nuptiis dicitur Apoc. XIX, 9: *beati qui ad caenam nuptiarum agni vocati sunt*. Consummatum autem erit, quando sponsa, idest Ecclesia, introducetur in thalamum sponsi, in caelestem scilicet gloriam.

Nec vacat a mysterio quod die tertio nuptiae factae sunt. Primus namque dies est tempus legis naturae; secundus tempus legis scriptae; tertius vero dies tempus gratiae, in quo dominus incarnatus nuptias celebravit; Oseae VI, 3: *vivificabit nos post duos dies: in die tertia suscitabit nos*.

Locus autem congruit mysterio: Cana enim interpretatur zelus; Galilaea vero transmigratio. In zelo ergo transmigratio hae nuptiae celebrantur, ut denuntiet eos maxime Christi coniunctione dignos existere qui zelo pia devotionis ferventes transmigrant de statu culpae ad gratiam Ecclesiae, Eccli.

the adoration of the Magi, which took place in the first year of the Lord's birth; secondly, the baptism of Christ, which implies that he was baptized on the same day thirty years later; thirdly, this marriage, which took place on the same day one year later. It follows from this that at least one year elapsed between his baptism and this marriage. In that year the only things recorded to have been done by the Lord are found in the sixth chapter of Matthew: the fasting in the desert, and the temptation by the devil; and what John tells us in this Gospel of the testimony by the Baptist and the conversion of the disciples. After this wedding, Christ began to preach publicly and to perform miracles up to the time of his passion, so that he preached publicly for two and one half years.

338 In the mystical sense, marriage signifies the union of Christ with his Church, because as the Apostle says: "This is a great mystery: I am speaking of Christ and his Church" (Eph 5:32). And this marriage was begun in the womb of the Virgin, when God the Father united a human nature to his Son in a unity of person. So, the chamber of this union was the womb of the Virgin: "He established a chamber for the sun" (Ps 18:6). Of this marriage it is said: "The kingdom of heaven is like a king who married his son" (Mt 22:2), that is, when God the Father joined a human nature to his Word in the womb of the Virgin. It was made public when the Church was joined to him by faith: "I will bind you to myself in faith" (Hos 2:20). We read of this marriage: "Blessed are they who are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb" (Rv 19:9). It will be consummated when the bride, i.e., the Church, is led into the resting place of the groom, i.e., into the glory of heaven.

The fact that this marriage took place on the third day is not without its own mystery. For the first day is the time of the law of nature; the second day is the time of the written law. but the third day is the time of grace, when the incarnate Lord celebrated the marriage: "He will revive us after two days: on the third day he will raise us up" (Hos 6:3).

The place too is appropriate. For "Cana" means "zeal" and "Galilee" means "passage." So this marriage was celebrated in the zeal of a passage, to suggest that those persons are most worthy of union with Christ who, burning with the zeal of a conscientious devotion, pass over from the state

XXIV, 26: *transite ad me, omnes qui concupiscitis me* etc., et de morte ad vitam, idest de statu mortalitatis et miseriae, ad statum immortalitatis et gloriae; Apoc. XXI, 5: *ecce nova facio omnia*.

Consequenter cum dicit *erat autem mater Iesu ibi*, describuntur personae invitatae: ubi agitur de tribus, scilicet de matre, de Iesu, et de discipulis.

De matre quidem, cum dicit *et erat mater Iesu ibi*. Quae quidem praemittitur, ut ostendatur quod Iesus adhuc ignotus erat, et non vocatus ad nuptias sicut insignis persona, sed ex quadam familiaritate, tamquam notus, et unus aliorum: sicut enim vocaverunt matrem, ita et filium. Vel forte prius invitatur mater, quia ambigebant de Iesu, an invitatus venturus esset ad nuptias propter summam religiositatem, quam videbant in eo, et quia non viderunt eum se immiscuisse conviviiis. Et ideo puto quod primo consuluerunt matrem, an Iesus esset vocandus. Et ideo signanter dixit Evangelista primo matrem adesse iam in nuptiis, et Iesum postmodum fuisse vocatum.

Et hoc est quod sequitur *vocatus est Iesus*. Voluit autem Christus nuptiis interesse primo quidem ut daret nobis humilitatis exemplum: neque enim ad dignitatem suam respiciebat, sed quomodo dignatus est formam servi accipere, ita non dedignatus est ad nuptias venire servorum, ut dicit Chrysostomus. Et ideo Augustinus: erubescat homo esse superbus, quoniam factus est humilis Deus. Nam inter cetera humilia quae fecit filius virginis, venit ad nuptias, qui eas, cum esset apud patrem, instituit in Paradiso. Et de hoc exemplo dicitur, Matth. XI, v. 29: *discite a me quia mitis sum et humilis corde*.

Secundo vero, ut errorem quorundam excluderet, qui nuptias damnant, quia, ut dicit Beda si thoro immaculato, et nuptiis debita castitate celebratis, culpa inesset, nequaquam dominus ad has venire voluisset. Quia ergo ad nuptias venit, insinuat quod sit damnabilis eorum perfidia qui nuptiis detrahunt. I Cor. VII, 36: *non peccat mulier, si nubat*.

of guilt to the grace of the Church. “Pass over to me, all who desire me” (Sir 24:26). And they pass from death to life, i.e., from the state of mortality and misery to the state of immortality and glory: “I make all things new” (Rv 21:5).

339 Then the persons invited are described. Mention is made of three: the mother of Jesus, Jesus himself, and the disciples.

340 The mother of Jesus is mentioned when he says, **the mother of Jesus was there**. She is mentioned first to indicate that Jesus was still unknown and not invited to the wedding as a famous person, but merely as one acquaintance among others; for as they invited the mother, so also her son. Or, perhaps his mother is invited first because they were uncertain whether Jesus would come to a wedding if invited, because of the unusual piety they noticed in him and because they had not seen him at other social gatherings. So I think that they first asked his mother whether Jesus should be invited. That is why the Evangelist expressly said first that his mother was at the wedding, and that later Jesus was invited.

341 And this is what comes next: **Jesus was invited**. Christ decided to attend this wedding, first of all, to give us an example of humility. For he did not look to his own dignity, but “just as he condescended to accept the form of a servant, so he did not hesitate to come to the marriage of servants,” as Chrysostom says. And as Augustine says: “Let man blush to be proud, for God became humble.” For among his other acts of humility, the Son of the Virgin came to a marriage, which he had already instituted in paradise when he was with his Father. Of this example it is said: “Learn from me, for I am gentle and humble of heart” (Mt 11:29).

He came, secondly, to reject the error of those who condemn marriage, for as Bede says: “If there were sin in a holy marriage bed and in a marriage carried out with due purity, the Lord would not have come to the marriage.” But because he did come, he implies that the baseness of those who denounce marriage deserves to be condemned. “If she marries, it is not a sin” (1 Cor 7:36).

De discipulis vero agitur, cum dicit *et discipuli eius*.

Mystice autem in nuptiis spiritualibus est mater Iesu, virgo scilicet beata, sicut nuptiarum consiliatrix, quia per eius intercessionem coniungitur Christo per gratiam; Eccli. XXIV, 25: *in me omnis spes vitae et virtutis*. Christus autem, sicut verus animae sponsus, ut dicitur infra III, 29: *qui habet sponsam, sponsus est*. Discipuli vero ut paranymphe, quasi coniungentes Ecclesiam Christo, de quo uno dicebatur II Cor. XI, 2: *despondi vos uni viro virginem castam exhibere Christo*.

Et quia in istis nuptiis materialibus aliquid de miraculo pertinet ad matrem, aliquid ad Christum et aliquid ad discipulos, ideo consequenter cum dicit *et deficiente vino* etc. ostendit quid pertineat ad matrem, quid ad Christum et quid ad discipulos. Ad matrem quidem pertinet miraculi procuratio; ad Christum autem miraculi consummatio, et hoc ibi *erant ibi lapideae hydriae sex* etc.; ad discipulos vero miraculi contestatio, ibi *hoc fecit initium signorum Iesus*. Gessit ergo, quantum ad primum, mater Christi, mediatrix personam; et ideo duo facit: primo enim interpellat ad filium; secundo erudit ministros, ibi *et dicit mater eius ministris* et cetera. Circa primum quidem duo ponuntur. Primo matris interpellatio; secundo filii responsio, ibi *dixit ei Iesus: quid mihi et tibi est, mulier?*

In matre autem interpellante, primo quidem nota pietatem et misericordiam. Ad misericordiam enim pertinet ut quis defectum alterius reputet quasi suum: misericors enim dicitur, quasi miserum habens cor super miseria alterius; II Cor. XI, 29: *quis infirmatur, et ego non infirmor?* Quia ergo virgo beata misericordia plena erat, defectus aliorum sublevare volebat; et ideo dicit *deficiente vino, dicit mater Iesu ad eum*.

Secundo reverentiam eius ad Christum: ex reverentia enim quam ad Deum habemus, sufficit nobis ei tantum defectus nostros exponere, secundum illud Ps. XXXVII, 10: *domine, ante te omne desiderium meum*. Qualiter autem nobis Deus subveniat, non est nostrum inquirere; quia, sicut dicitur Rom. VIII,

342 The disciples are mentioned when he says, **and his disciples**.

343 In its mystical meaning, the mother of Jesus, the Blessed Virgin, is present in spiritual marriages as the one who arranges the marriage, because it is through her intercession that one is joined to Christ through grace: “In me is every hope of life and of strength” (Sir 24:25). Christ is present as the true groom of the soul, as is said below (3:29): “It is the groom who has the bride.” The disciples are the groomsmen uniting the Church to Christ, the one of whom it is said: “I betrothed you to one husband, to present you as a chaste virgin to Christ” (2 Cor 11:2).

344 At this physical marriage some role in the miracle belongs to the mother of Christ, some to Christ, and some to the disciples. When he says, **When the wine ran out**, he indicates the part of each. The role of Christ’s mother was to superintend the miracle; the role of Christ to perform it; and the disciples were to bear witness to it. As to the first, Christ’s mother assumed the role of a mediatrix. Hence she does two things. First, she intercedes with her Son. In the second place, she instructs the servants. As to the first, two things are mentioned. First, his mother’s intercession; secondly, the answer of her Son.

345 In Mary’s intercession, note first her kindness and mercy. For it is a quality of mercy to regard another’s distress as one’s own, because to be merciful is to have a heart distressed at the distress of another: “Who is weak, and I am not weak?” (2 Cor 11:29). And so because the Blessed Virgin was full of mercy, she desired to relieve the distress of others. So he says, **When the wine ran out, the mother of Jesus said to him**.

Note, secondly, her reverence for Christ: for because of the reverence we have for God it is sufficient for us merely to express our needs: “Lord, all my desires are known by you” (Ps 37:10). But it is not our business to wonder about the way in which God will help us, for as it is said: “We do

v. 26, *nam quid oremus, sicut oportet, nescimus*. Et ideo mater eius defectum aliorum simpliciter exposuit, dicens *vinum non habent*.

Tertio, virginis sollicitudinem et diligentiam: quia usque ad extremam necessitatem non distulit, sed *deficiente vino*, idest dum esset in deficiendo, iuxta illud quod dicitur in Ps. IX, 10 de Deo: *adiutor in opportunitatibus, in tribulatione*.

Sed quaerit Chrysostomus: quare ante non incitavit Christum ad miracula? Nam de virtute eius erat instructa per Angelum, et confirmata per multa quae viderat circa ipsum fieri, quae omnia conservabat, conferens in corde suo, ut dicitur Lc. II, 51. Cuius ratio est, quia antea ut unus aliorum conversabatur: unde quia non viderat tempus opportunum, hoc facere distulit. Nunc vero post Ioannis contestationem et post discipulorum conversionem, confidenter Christum ad miracula facienda provocat, gerens in hoc figuram synagogae, quae est mater Christi: nam familiare est Iudaeis miracula requirere; I Cor. I, 22: *Iudaei signa petunt*.

Dicit ergo ei *vinum non habent*. Ubi sciendum est, quod ante incarnationem Christi, triplex vinum deficiebat, scilicet iustitiae, sapientiae et caritatis, seu gratiae. Vinum enim mordicat, et quantum ad hoc iustitia dicitur vinum. Lc. X, 34, Samaritanus vinum et oleum apposuit vulneribus sauciati, idest cum dulcedine misericordiae severitatem iustitiae; Ps. LIX, 5: *potasti nos vino compunctionis*. Vinum etiam laetificat cor, iuxta illud Ps. CIII, 15, *vinum laetificat cor hominis*, et quantum ad hoc dicitur vinum sapientia, cuius meditatio maxime laetificat; Sap. VIII, 16: *non habet amaritudinem convictus illius*. Vinum similiter inebriat, Cant. V, v. 1: *bibite, amici, et inebriamini, carissimi*, et secundum hoc caritas dicitur vinum, Cant. c. V, 1, *bibi vinum meum cum lacte meo*. Et dicitur caritas etiam vinum ratione fervoris; Zach. IX, 17: *vinum germinans virgines*.

not know what we should pray for as we ought” (Rom 8:26). And so his mother merely told him of their need, saying, **They have no more wine**.

Thirdly, note the Virgin’s concern and care. For she did not wait until they were in extreme need, but **When the wine ran out**, that is, immediately. This is similar to what is said of God: “A helper in times of trouble” (Ps 9:10).

346 Chrysostom asks: Why did Mary never encourage Christ to perform any miracles before this time? For she had been told of his power by the angel, whose work had been confirmed by the many things she had seen happening in his regard, all of which she remembered, thinking them over in her heart (Lk 2:5 1). The reason is that before this time he lived like any other person. So, because the time was not appropriate, she put off asking him. But now, after John’s witness to him and after the conversion of his disciples, she trustingly prompted Christ to perform miracles. In this she was true to the symbol of the synagogue, which is the mother of Christ: for it was customary for the Jews to require miracles: “The Jews require signs” (1 Cor 1:22).

347 She says to him, **They have no more wine**. Here we should note that before the incarnation of Christ three wines were running out: the wine of justice, of wisdom, and of charity or grace. Wine stings, and in this respect it is a symbol of justice. The Samaritan poured wine and oil into the wounds of the injured man, that is, he mingled the severity of justice with the sweetness of mercy. “You have made us drink the wine of sorrow” (Ps 59:5). But wine also delights the heart, “Wine cheers the heart of man” (Ps 103:15). And in this respect wine is a symbol of wisdom, the meditation of which is enjoyable in the highest degree: “Her companionship has no bitterness” (Wis 8:16). Further, wine intoxicates: “Drink, friends, and be intoxicated, my dearly beloved” (Sg 5:1). And in this respect wine is a symbol of charity: “I have drunk my wine with my milk” (Sg 5:1). It is also a symbol of charity because of charity’s fervor: “Wine makes the virgins flourish” (Zec 9:17).

Et quidem iustitiae vinum deficiebat in veteri lege; in qua iustitia imperfecta erat. Sed Christus eam perfecit; Matth. V, 20: *nisi abundaverit iustitia vestra plusquam Scribarum et Phariseorum, non intrabitis in regnum caelorum*. Deficiebat etiam vinum sapientiae, quae erat occulta et figuralis, quia, ut dicitur I Cor. X, 11, *omnia in figura contingebant illis*. Sed Christus eam manifestavit; Matth. c. VII, 29: *erat enim docens eos, sicut potestatem habens*. Sed et vinum caritatis deficiebat ibi: quia acceperant spiritum servitutis tantum in timore. Sed Christus aquam timoris convertit in vinum caritatis, quando dedit *spiritum adoptionis filiorum, in quo clamamus, abba pater*, ut dicitur Rom. VIII, 15, et quando *caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris*, ut dicitur Rom. V, 5.

Consequenter cum dicit *dixit ei Iesus* etc. ponitur responsio Christi: ex qua quidem responsione triplicis haeresis occasio sumpta est.

Manichaei namque dicunt Christum non habuisse verum corpus, sed phantasticum. Valentinus asserit Christum attulisse corpus caeleste, dicens quod, quantum ad corpus, Christus nihil pertinet ad virginem. Et huius erroris fulcimentum sumit per hoc quod dicit ei Iesus. *Quid mihi et tibi est, mulier?* Quasi dicat: nihil a te suscepti. Sed hoc est contra auctoritatem sacrae Scripturae: dicit enim apostolus, Gal. IV, 4: *misit Deus filium suum, factum ex muliere*: non enim posset dici ex ea factus, nisi ex ea aliquid sumpsisset. Arguit praeterea contra eos Augustinus, dicens: quomodo scis, quod dominus dixit *quid mihi et tibi?* Respondes, quia Ioannes Evangelista hoc narrat. Sed ipse etiam Evangelista dicit de virgine quod erat mater eius. Si ergo credis Evangelistae in eo quod narrat Iesum dixisse matri: *quid mihi et tibi est, mulier?* Credas etiam in hoc ei quod dicit: *et erat mater Iesu ibi*.

Ebion autem dicens ex virili semine Christum conceptum, et Elvidius, qui dicit quod virgo post partum non permansit virgo, sumpserunt erroris fulcimentum ex hoc quod dicit *mulier*, quod videtur corruptionem importare. Sed hoc est falsum, quia mulier in sacra Scriptura quandoque importat solum sexum feminineum, secundum illud Gal. IV, 4: *factum ex muliere* et cetera. Et hoc patet

The wine of justice was indeed running out in the old law, in which justice was imperfect. But Christ brought it to perfection: “Unless your justice is greater than that of the scribes and of the Pharisees, you will not enter into the kingdom of heaven” (Mt 5:20). The wine of wisdom was also running out, for it was hidden and symbolic, because as it says in 1 Corinthians (10:11): “All these things happened to them in symbol.” But Christ plainly brought wisdom to light: “He was teaching them as one having authority” (Mt 7:29). The wine of charity was also running out, because they had received a spirit of serving only in fear. But Christ converted the water of fear into the wine of charity when he gave “the spirit of adoption as sons, by which we cry: ‘Abba, Father’” (Rom 8:15), and when “the charity of God was poured out into our hearts,” as Romans (5:5) says.

348 Then when he says, Jesus said to her, the answer of Christ is given. This answer has been the occasion for three heresies.

349 The Manicheans claim that Christ had only an imaginary body, not a real one. Valentinus maintained that Christ assumed a celestial body and that, as far as his body was concerned, Christ was not related to the Virgin at all. The source of this error was that he understood, **Woman, what does that have to do with me and you?** as if it meant: “I have received nothing from you.” But this is contrary to the authority of Sacred Scripture. For the Apostle says: “God sent his Son, made from a woman” (Gal 4:4). Now Christ could not be said to have been made from her, unless he had taken something from her. Further, Augustine argues against them: “How do you know that our Lord said, **What does that have to do with me and you?** You reply that it is because John says so. But he also says that the Virgin was the mother of Christ. So, if you believe the Evangelist when he states that Jesus said this to his mother, you should also believe him when he says, **and the mother of Jesus was there.**”

350 Then there was Ebion who said that Christ was conceived from a man’s seed, and Elvidius, who said that the Virgin did not remain a virgin after childbirth. They were deceived by the fact that he said, Woman, which seems to imply the loss of virginity. But this is false, for in Sacred Scripture the word “woman” sometimes refers merely to the female sex, as it does in

etiam per hoc quod Adam ad Deum loquens de Eva, dixit: *mulier quam dedisti mihi sociam, dedit mihi de ligno, et comedi*, Gen. III, 12. Constat enim tunc Evam adhuc virginem fuisse, cum adhuc esset in Paradiso, ubi non cognoverat eam. Unde hoc quod hic dicitur *mulier*, non importat corruptionem, sed determinat sexum.

Sumpserunt etiam Priscillianistae erroris occasionem ex hoc quod dixit *nondum venit hora mea*, dicentes, omnia ex fato accidere, et facta hominum certis horis esse subiecta, et etiam Christi: unde propter hoc dixit *nondum venit hora mea*.

Sed hoc est falsum de quolibet homine. Cum enim homo liberam electionem habeat, libera autem electio competat ei ex hoc quod rationem et voluntatem habet, quae quidem sunt immaterialia: manifestum est quod homo quantum ad electionem nulli corpori subiicitur, sed potius dominatur. Immaterialia enim nobiliora sunt materialibus, et ideo dicit philosophus, quod sapiens dominatur astris. Praeterea, hoc multo minus locum habet in Christo, qui est dominus et conditor siderum. Unde per hoc quod dixit *nondum venit hora mea*, intelligitur hora passionis, sibi, non ex necessitate, sed secundum divinam providentiam determinata. Contra eos etiam est quod dicitur Eccli. XXXIII, 7: *quare dies diem superat?* Respondet: *a domini scientia separati sunt*; idest, divina providentia distincti sunt adinvicem, non a casu.

His ergo exclusis, investigemus huius dominicae responsionis causam. *Quid mihi et tibi est, mulier?* Et quidem, secundum Augustinum, in ipso sunt duae naturae, divina scilicet et humana; et quamvis idem Christus sit in utraque natura, ea tamen quae conveniunt ei secundum humanam naturam, distincta sunt ab his quae conveniunt ei secundum divinam. Miracula autem facere competit ei secundum divinam naturam, quam accepit a patre; pati vero secundum humanam, quam accepit a matre. Et ideo matri exigenti miraculum, respondit dicens *quid mihi et tibi est, mulier?* Ac si dicat: illud quod in me facit miracula, non accepi a te, sed illud unde patior; idest secundum quod competit

“made from a woman” (Gal 4:4). This is obvious also by the fact that Adam, speaking to God about Eve, said: “The woman whom you gave me as a companion, gave me fruit from the tree, and I ate it” (Gn 3:12); for Eve was still a virgin in Paradise, where Adam had not know her. Hence the fact that the mother of Christ is here called “woman” in this Gospel does not imply a loss of virginity, but refers to her sex.

351 The Priscillianists, however, erred by misunderstanding the words of Christ, **My time has not yet come**. They claimed that all things happen by fate, and that the actions of men, including those of Christ, are subject to predetermined times. And that is why, according to them, Christ said, **My time has not yet come**.

But this is false for any man. For since man has free choice, and this is because he has reason and will, both of which are spiritual, then obviously, as far as choice is concerned, man, so far from being subject to bodies, is really their master. For spiritual things are superior to material things, so much so that the Philosopher says that the wise man is master of the stars. Further, their heresy is even less true of Christ, who is the Lord and Creator of the stars. Thus when he says, **My time has not yet come**, he is referring to the time of his passion, which was fixed for him, not by necessity, according to divine providence. What is said in Sirach (33:7) is also contrary to their opinion: “Why is one day better than another?” And the answer is: “They have been differentiated by the knowledge of the Lord,” i.e., they were differentiated from one another not by chance, but by God’s providence.

352 Since we have eliminated the above opinions, let us look for the reason why our Lord answered, **Woman, what does that have to do with me and you?** For Augustine, Christ has two natures, the divine and the human. And although the same Christ exists in each, nevertheless things appropriate to him according to his human nature are distinct from what is appropriate to him according to his divine nature. Now to perform miracles is appropriate to him according to his divine nature, which he received from the Father; while to suffer is according to his human nature, which he received from his mother. So when his mother requests this miracle, he answers, **Woman,**



mihi pati, scilicet humanam naturam, a te accepi; et ideo tunc te cognoscam, cum ipsa infirmitas pendebit in cruce. Et ideo subdit *nondum venit hora mea*; quasi dicat: cum venerit hora passionis, ibi te matrem recognoscam. Unde et in cruce pendens matrem discipulo commendavit.

Secundum Chrysostomum vero, aliter exponitur. Dicitur enim quod beata virgo fervens zelo honoris filii, voluit quod statim antequam opportunum esset, Christus miracula faceret; et ideo Christus, matre haud dubio sapientior, eam repressit. Noluit enim prius facere miraculum, quam sciretur defectus: quia ex hoc fuisset minus notum et minus credibile, et ideo dicit *quid mihi et tibi est, mulier?* Quasi dicat. Quid me molestas? *Nondum venit hora mea*; idest, nondum cognitus sum his qui adsunt. Sed neque defectum vini sentiunt; sine primo hoc sentire, quia cum necessitatem cognoverint, maius reputabunt beneficium quod recipient.

Quamvis autem mater repulsa sit, tamen de filii misericordia non diffidit; ideo consequenter monet ministros, dicens *quodcumque dixerit vobis, facite*, in quo quidem consistit totius iustitiae perfectio. Perfecta namque iustitia est Christo in omnibus obedire; Ex. XXIX, 35: *omnia quae praecepit nobis dominus faciemus*. Hoc autem verbum *omnia quaecumque dixerit vobis facite*, non convenit dici nisi de solo Deo, homo enim aliquando potest errare. Unde in talibus quae sunt contra Deum, hominibus obedire non tenemur; Act. V, 29: *oportet obedire Deo magis quam hominibus*. Deo autem, qui non errat nec falli potest, in omnibus obedire debemus.

Consequenter cum dicit *erant autem ibi lapideae hydriae*, ponitur consummatio miraculi per Christum: circa quod primo describuntur vasa in quibus miraculum patratum est; secundo designatur materia miraculi, ibi *dixit eis Iesus: implete hydrias aqua*; tertio insinuat miraculi demonstratio et approbatio, ibi *dixit eis Iesus: haurite nunc*.

**what does that have to do with me and you?** as if saying: I did not receive from you that in me which enables me to perform miracles, but that which enables me to suffer, i.e., that which makes it appropriate for me to suffer, i.e., I have received a human nature from you. And so I will recognize you when this weakness hangs on the cross. And so he continues with, **My time has not yet come**. As if to say: I will recognize you as my mother when the time of my passion arrives. And so it was that on the cross he entrusted his mother to the disciple.

353 Chrysostom explains this differently. He says that the Blessed Virgin, burning with zeal for the honor of her Son, wanted Christ to perform miracles at once, before it was opportune; but that Christ, being much wiser than his mother, restrained her. For he was unwilling to perform the miracle before the need for it was known; otherwise, it would have been less appreciated and less credible. And so he says, **Woman, what does that have to do with me and you?** As if to say: Why bother me? **My time has not yet come**, i.e., I am not yet known to those present. Nor do they know that the wine ran out; and they must first know this, because when they know their need they will have a greater appreciation of the benefit they will receive.

354 Now although his mother was refused, she did not lose hope in her Son's mercy. So she instructs the servants, Do whatever he tells you, in which, indeed, consists the perfection of all justice. For perfect justice consists in obeying Christ in all things: "We will do all that the Lord commanded us" (Ex 29:35). Do whatever he tells you, is fittingly said of God alone, for man can err now and then. Hence in matters that are against God, we are not held to obey men: "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29). We ought to obey God, who does not err and cannot be deceived, in all things.

355 Now Christ's completion of the miracle is set forth. First, the vessels in which the miracle was performed are described. Secondly, the matter of the miracle is stated (v 7). Thirdly, we have how the miracle was made known and approved (v 8).

Vasa autem in quibus miraculum patratum est, ponuntur sex; et est quod dicit *erant autem ibi lapideae hydriae sex*. Ubi sciendum est, quod sicut Mc. VII, 2 ss., dicitur, Iudaei observabant multas ablutiones corporales, et Baptismata calicum et vasorum: unde quia erant in Palaestina, in qua est defectus aquarum, habebant vasa in quibus servabatur aqua purissima, qua se, et vasa crebro lavarent. Et ideo dicit, quod *erant ibi sex lapideae hydriae*, idest vasa ad conservandum aquam, ab hydros, quod est aqua, *posita secundum purificationem Iudaeorum*, idest ad usum purificationis, *cipientes singulae metretas*, idest mensuras, *binas, vel ternas*: metros enim Graece, mensura Latine dicitur.

Et, ut dicit Chrysostomus, vasa ista deferuntur ad tollendam miraculi suspicionem: tum propter eorum puritatem, ne posset aliquis suspicari quod aqua saporem vini sumpsisset ex faecibus vini prius in eis repositi, nam vasa illa erant *secundum purificationem*, et ideo purissima oportebat ea esse; tum etiam propter vasorum quantitatem, ut evidenter pateat quod aqua tot vasorum in vinum mutari non potuisset, nisi virtute divina.

Mystice vero per sex hydrias significantur sex aetates veteris testamenti, in quibus erant corda hominum receptiva Scripturarum Dei parata, et proposita in exemplum vivendi, ut dicit Glossa.

Hoc vero quod dicit *metretas*, secundum Augustinum, refertur ad Trinitatem personarum. Et dicuntur binae, vel ternae, quia quandoque in sacra Scriptura tres personae distinctim ponuntur, secundum illud Matth. ult., 19: *baptizantes eos in nomine patris, et filii, et spiritus sancti*, quandoque vero duo tantum, scilicet pater et filius, in quibus intelligitur persona spiritus sancti, qui est connexio amborum, secundum illud infra XIV, 23: *si quis sermonem meum servabit, pater meus diliget eum, et ad eum veniemus*. Vel binas propter duas conditiones hominum, Iudaeorum scilicet, et gentilium, ex quibus propagata est Ecclesia. Vel ternas propter tres filios Noe, ex quibus propagatum est humanum genus post diluvium.

356 The miracle was performed in six vessels; **Now there were six stone water jars near by**. Here we should note, that as mentioned in Mark (7:2), the Jews observed many bodily washings and the cleansing of their cups and dishes. So, because they were in Palestine where there was a shortage of water, they had vessels in which they kept the purest water to be used for washing themselves and their utensils. Hence he says, **there were six stone water jars near by**, i.e., vessels for holding water, **for purifications according to Jewish customs**, i.e., to use for **purification, each holding two or three metretes** of liquid, that is, two or three measures; for the Greek “metrete” is the same as the Latin “mensura.”

These jars were standing there, as Chrysostom says, in order to eliminate any suspicion about the miracle: both on account of their cleanliness, lest anyone suspect that the water had acquired the taste of wine from the dregs of wine previously stored in them, for these jars were standing there **for purifications according to Jewish customs**, and so had to be very pure; and also on account of the capacity of the jars, so that it would be abundantly clear that the water in such jars could be changed into wine only by divine power.

357 In the mystical sense, the six water jars signify the six eras of the Old Testament during which the hearts of men were prepared and made receptive of God’s Scriptures, and put forward as an example for our lives.

The term **metretes**, according to Augustine, refers to the Trinity of persons. And they are described as **two or three** because at times in Scripture three persons in the Trinity are distinctly mentioned: “Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit” (Mt 28:19), and at other times only two, the Father and the Son, in whom the Holy Spirit, who is the union of the two, is implied: “If anyone loves me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him” (below 14:23). Or they are described as two on account of the two states of mankind from which the Church arose, that is, Jews and Gentiles. Or three on account of the three sons of Noe, from whom the human race arose after the deluge.

Consequenter cum dicit *dixit eis Iesus: implete hydrias aqua*, agitur de miraculi materia. Sed circa hoc insurgit quaestio quare non ex nihilo, sed ex materia praeiacente hoc miraculum factum est: ad quod triplex ratio assignatur. Una est secundum Chrysostomum, et litteralis, quia ex nihilo aliquid facere, maius est et mirabilius, quam facere aliquid ex subiecta materia; sed non est ita evidens et credibile multis. Et ideo volens magis credibile esse quod fiebat, ex aqua fecit vinum, capacitati hominum condescendens.

Alia ratio est, ad confutandum perversa dogmata. Quidam namque sunt (ut Marcionistae et Manichaei) qui dixerunt alium esse conditorem mundi, quam Deum, et omnia visibilia ab illo, idest Diabolo, condita esse. Et ideo dominus plura miracula etiam ex substantiis creatis, et visibilibus fecit, ut ostendat ipsas substantias bonas esse, et a Deo creatas.

Tertia ratio est mystica. Ideo enim noluit ex nihilo vinum facere, sed ex aqua vinum fecit, ut ostenderet se non omnino novam doctrinam condere et veterem reprobare, sed adimplere; ut dicitur Matth. V, 17: *non veni solvere legem, sed adimplere*: dum quod figurabat vetus lex, et promittebat, Christus exhibuit, et aperuit; Lc. ult., 45: *aperuit illis sensum ut intelligerent Scripturas*.

Voluit autem per ministros hydrias impleri aqua, ut eos, eius quod fiebat, testes haberet: unde infra dicitur: *ministri autem sciebant* et cetera.

Consequenter cum dicit *et dixit eis Iesus* etc. ponitur miraculi publicatio. Statim enim quod hydriae impletae sunt, aqua in vinum conversa est; et ideo statim dominus miraculum publicat, dicens *haurite nunc, et ferte architriclino*, ubi primo ponitur mandatum Christi examinatorem eligentis; secundo sententiam architriclini degustantis, ibi *ut autem gustavit architriclinus* et cetera.

358 Then when he says that Jesus instructed them, **Fill those jars with water**, he gives the material of the miracle. Here we might ask why this miracle was performed with already existing material, and not from nothing. There are three reasons for this. The first reason is literal, and is given by Chrysostom: to make something from nothing is much greater and more marvelous than to make something from material already existing; but it is not so evident and believable to many. And so, wishing to make what he did more believable, Christ made wine from water, thus condescending to man's capacity.

Another reason was to refute wrong dogmas. For there are some (as the Marcionists and Manicheans) who said that the founder of the world was someone other than God, and that all visible things were established by such a one, that is, the devil. And so the Lord performed many miracles using created and visible substances in order to show that these substances are good and were created by God.

The third reason is mystical. Christ made the wine from water, and not from nothing, in order to show that he was not laying down an entirely new doctrine and rejecting the old, but was fulfilling the old: "I have not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it" (Mt 5:17). In other words, what was prefigured and promised in the old law, was disclosed and revealed by Christ: "Then he opened their minds so they could understand the Scriptures" (Lk 24:45).

Finally, he had the servants fill the jars with water so that he might have witnesses to what he did; so it is said, **the servants knew, since they had drawn the water**.

359 Then, the miracle is made known. For as soon as the jars were filled, the water was turned into wine. So the Lord reveals the miracle at once, saying: **Now pour out a drink and take it to the head waiter**. First, we have the command of Christ selecting who is to test the wine; secondly, the judgment of the head waiter who tasted it.

*Dixit ergo eis, scilicet ministris, haurite nunc, scilicet vinum de hydriis, et ferte architriclino.* Ubi sciendum est, quod triclinium est locus ubi sunt tres ordines mensarum, et dicitur triclinium a triplici ordine lectorum: cline enim in Graeco lectum significat. Nam antiqui in lectis accumbentes consueverant comedere, ut maximus Valerius narrat. Et ideo dicunt in Scripturis accumbere et recumbere. Architriclinus ergo dicitur primus et princeps inter convivas. Vel aliter, secundum Chrysostomum, architriclinus erat qui erat ordinator et dispensator totius convivii. Quia vero sollicitus nondum aliquid gustaverat, voluit dominus quod ipse iudicaret de eo quod factum erat, et non convivae, ne aliquis posset miraculo detrahere, dicens eos ebrios esse, et eorum sensus per comestionem corruptos, ita quod non possent discernere, an vinum esset, vel aqua. Sed, secundum Augustinum, architriclinus erat maior inter discumbentes, ut dictum est; et ideo, ut eius sententia acceptabilior fieret, voluit in eo quod factum erat habere sententiam praesidentis.

Mystice autem, qui hauriunt aquam sunt praedicatores; Is. XII, 3: *haurietis aquas in gaudio de fontibus salvatoris.* Architriclinus autem est aliquis legisperitus, puta Nicodemus, Gamaliel et Paulus. Dum ergo talibus verbum Evangelii committitur, quod latebat in littera legis, quasi vinum de aqua factum architriclino propinatur: qui hoc degustans approbat fidem Christi.

Consequenter cum dicit *ut autem gustavit architriclinus*, ponitur examinantis iudicium: ubi primo inquit veritatem facti; secundo profert sententiam, dicens *omnis homo primum bonum vinum ponit.*

Dicit ergo *ut autem gustavit architriclinus aquam vinum factam, et non sciebat unde esset*, quia ignorabat aquam vinum factam miraculo per Christum, *ministri autem sciebant* cuius ratio est, quia *hauserant aquam; vocat sponsum architriclinus*, ut veritatem inquirat, et de vino sententiam proferat; unde subdit *omnis homo primum bonum vinum ponit* et cetera.

360 **Then Jesus said to them**, i.e., to the servants, **Now pour out a drink**, that is, of wine, from the jars, **and take it to the head waiter** (*architriclinus*). Here we should note that a *triclinium* is a place where there are three rows of tables, and it is called a *trichinium* from its three rows of dining couches: for *cline* in Greek means couch. For the ancients were accustomed to eat reclining on couches, as Maximus Valerius recounts. This is the reason why the Scriptures speak of lying next to and lying down. Thus the *architriclinus* was (the first and chief among those dining. Or, according to Chrysostom, the *architriclinus* was the one in charge of the whole banquet. And because he had been busy and had not tasted anything, the Lord wanted him, and not the guests, to be the judge of what had been done, so some could not detract from the miracle by saying the guests were drunk and, their senses dulled, could not tell wine from water. For Augustine, the *architriclinus* was the chief guest, as was mentioned; and Christ wanted to have the opinion of this person in high position so it would be more acceptable.

361 In the mystical sense, those who pour out the water are preachers: “With joy you will draw water from the springs of the Savior” (Is 12:3). And the *architriclinus* is someone skilled in the law, as Nicodemus, Gamaliel or Paul. So, when the word of the Gospel, which was hidden under the letter of the law, is entrusted to such persons, it is as though wine made from water is poured out for the *architriclinus*, who, when he tastes it, gives his assent to the faith of Christ.

362 Then the judgment of the one examining the wine is given. First, he inquires into the truth of the fact; secondly, he gives his opinion.

He says, **Now when the head waiter tasted the water made wine, and not knowing where it came from**, because he did not know that the water had miraculously been made wine by Christ, **although the servants knew**, the reason being, **since they had drawn the water, he called the groom over**, in order to learn the truth and give his opinion of the wine. Hence he adds: **People usually serve the choice wines first, and when the guests have had their fill, then they bring out inferior wine.**

Ubi, secundum Chrysostomum, hoc considerandum est in miraculis Christi, quod omnia perfectissima fuerunt; unde et socruī Petri perfectissimam sanitatem restituit, ut statim surgens ministraret, ut dicitur Mc. I, 30 et Mt. c. IX, 6. Paralyticum etiam ita perfecte sanitati restituit quod statim surgens, et sublato lecto iret in domum suam, ut dicitur infra V, 9. Hoc etiam in isto miraculo apparet: quia non quaecumque vinum de aqua fecit, sed optimum quod poterat esse. Et ideo dicit architriclinus *omnis homo primum bonum vinum ponit, et cum inebriati fuerint, tunc id quod deterius est*, quia minus bibunt, et quia vinum bonum in quantitate sumptum, cum quantitate cibi magis gravat; quasi dicat: unde est tale vinum, quod tu servasti usque adhuc? Contra consuetudinem scilicet faciens.

Competit autem mysterio. Nam aliquis dicitur mystice primo bonum vinum ponere, qui alios decipere intendens, errorem quem intendit non proponit primo, sed quae alliciant auditores, ut postquam inebriati et allecti fuerint ad consensum suae intentionis, perfidiam manifestet; et de isto vino dicitur Prov. XXIII, 31: *ingreditur blande, et in novissimo mordebit sicut coluber*. Dicitur autem aliquis primo bonum vinum ponere, qui a principio suae conversionis sancte et spiritualiter vivere incipiens, tandem in vitam carnalem degenerat; Gal. III, 3: *sic stulti facti estis, ut cum spiritu coeperitis, nunc carne consummemini?*

Christus vero non primo vinum bonum ponit: quia a principio amara et dura proponit; Mt. VII, 14: *arcta est via quae ducit ad vitam*. Sed quanto plus homo in eius fide et doctrina procedit, tanto plus dulcoratur, et maiorem suavitatem sentit; Prov. IV, 11: *ducam te per semitam aequitatis, quam cum ingressus fueris non arctabuntur gressus tui*. Item in mundo isto amaritudines et tribulationes patiuntur omnes qui pie volunt vivere in Christo; infra XVI, 20: *amen, amen dico vobis, quia plorabitis et flebitis vos et cetera*. Sed in futuro delectationes et gaudia suscipient; unde et sequitur: *tristitia vestra vertetur in gaudium*. Rom. VIII, 18: *existimo quod non sunt condignae passionis huius temporis ad futuram gloriam quae revelabitur in nobis*.

Here we should consider, according to Chrysostom, that everything is most perfect in the miracles of Christ. Thus, he restored most complete health to Peter’s mother-in-law, so that she arose at once and waited on them, as we read in Mark (1:30) and Matthew (7:14). Again, he restored the paralytic to health so perfectly that he also arose immediately, took up his mat, and went home, as we read below (5:9). And this is also evident in this miracle, because Christ did not make mediocre wine from the water, but the very best possible. And so the head waiter says, **People usually serve the choice wines first, and when the guests have had their fill, then they bring out inferior wine**, because they drink less, and because good wine consumed in quantity along with a quantity of food causes greater discomfort. It is as though he were saying: Where did this very good wine come from which, contrary to custom, you saved until now?

363 This is appropriate to a mystery. For in the mystical sense, he serves good wine first who, with an intent to deceive others, does not first mention the error he intends, but other things that entice his hearers, so that he can disclose his evil plans after they have been intoxicated and enticed to consent. We read of such wine: “It goes down pleasantly, but finally it will bite like a serpent” (Prv 23:3 1). Again, he serves good wine first who begins to live in a saintly and spiritual manner at the start of his conversion, but later sinks into a carnal life: “Are you so foolish as, having begun in the Spirit, to end in the flesh?” (Gal 3:3).

Christ, however, does not serve the good wine first, for at the outset he proposes things that are bitter and hard: “Narrow is the way that leads to life” (Mt 7:14). Yet the more progress a person makes in his faith and teaching, the more pleasant it becomes and he becomes aware of a greater sweetness: “I will lead You by the path of justice, and when you walk you will not be hindered” (Prv 4:11). Likewise, all those who desire to live conscientiously in Christ stiffer bitterness and troubles in this world: “You will weep and mourn” (below 16:20). But later they will experience delights and joys. So he goes on: “but your sorrow will be turned into joy.” “I consider that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come, which will be revealed in us,” as is said in Romans (8:18).

Consequenter cum dicit *hoc fecit initium signorum Iesus*, ponitur miraculi contestatio per discipulos facta. Ex quo habetur quod falsa est historia de infantia salvatoris, in qua recitantur multa miracula facta a Christo adhuc puero existente; si enim hoc verum esset, non utique Evangelista diceret *hoc fecit initium signorum Iesus*. Et ratio quare non in pueritia miracula fecit, assignata est supra, ne ea scilicet homines phantastica reputarent: ergo hac de causa hoc miraculum, scilicet de aqua vinum, fecit in Cana Galilaeae Iesus, quod est initium signorum, quae fecit Iesus postea. *Et manifestavit gloriam suam*, idest potentiam qua gloriosus est; Ps. c. XXIII, 10: *dominus virtutum ipse est rex gloriae*.

*Et crediderunt in eum discipuli eius*. Sed quomodo crediderunt? Iam enim discipuli erant, et ante crediderant. Sed dicendum est, quod aliquid dicitur esse aliquando non secundum quod nunc est, sed secundum quod futurum est; sicut dicitur quod Paulus apostolus natus est Tharso Ciliciae: non quod ibi sit natus apostolus, sed quod futurus apostolus, ibi natus fuit; ita dicitur hic *et crediderunt in eum discipuli eius*, scilicet qui erant discipuli eius. Vel dicendum, quod ante crediderunt ei sicut bono viro, iusta et recta praedicanti; sed modo crediderunt in eum tamquam in Deum et cetera.

364 Then when he says, **This beginning of signs Jesus worked in Cana of Galilee**, he gives the disciples' acknowledgment of the miracle. We can see from this the falsity of the *History of the Infancy of the Savior*, which recounts many miracles worked by Christ as a boy. For if these accounts were true, the Evangelist would not have said, **This beginning of signs Jesus worked**. We have already given the reason why Christ worked no miracles during his childhood, that is, lest men regard them as illusions. *It was for the reason given above, then, that Jesus performed this miracle of turning water into wine at Cana of Galilee; and this was the first of the signs he did. And Jesus revealed his glory, i.e., the power by which he is glorious: "The Lord of hosts, he is the King of glory" (Ps 23:10).*

365 **And his disciples believed in him**. But how did they believe? For they already were his disciples and had believed before this. I answer that sometimes a thing is described not according to what it is at the time, but according to what it will be. For example, we say that the apostle Paul was born at Tarsus, in Cilicia; not that an actual apostle was born there, but a future one was. Similarly, it says here that **his disciples believed in him**, i.e., those who would be his disciples. Or, one might answer that previously they had believed in him as a good man, preaching what was right and just; but now they believed in him as God.

**Lectio 2**

12 μετὰ τοῦτο κατέβη εἰς καφαρναοῦμ αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ [αὐτοῦ] καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκεῖ ἔμειναν οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας. 13 καὶ ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 14 καὶ εὔρεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοὺς πωλοῦντας βόας καὶ πρόβατα καὶ περιστερὰς καὶ τοὺς κερματιστὰς καθημένους, 15 καὶ ποιήσας φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχοινίων πάντας ἐξέβαλεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, τὰ τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας, καὶ τῶν κολλυβιστῶν ἐξέχεεν τὸ κέρμα καὶ τὰς τραπέζας ἀνέτρεψεν, 16 καὶ τοῖς τὰς περιστερὰς πωλοῦσιν εἶπεν, ἄρατε ταῦτα ἐντεῦθεν, μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου. 17 ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι γεγραμμένον ἐστίν, ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου καταφάγεται με.

Supra Evangelista posuit signum quod fecit Christus pertinens ad virtutem immutativam naturae, ad discipulorum confirmationem; hic consequenter agit de signo resurrectionis ad eandem virtutem pertinente, quod proposuit Christus ad turbarum conversionem.

Circa hoc ergo miraculum duo facit Evangelista. Primo ponit miraculi proponendi occasionem; secundo ipsius miraculi praenuntiationem, ibi *responderunt ergo Iudaei* et cetera. Circa

**LECTURE 2**

12 After this he went down to Capernaum together with his mother, his brethren and his disciples; but they did not remain there many days. 13 The Jewish Passover was near at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. 14 In the temple precincts he came upon merchants selling oxen, sheep and doves, and moneychangers seated at tables. 15 And when he had made a kind of whip from cords, he drove everyone, including sheep and oxen, out of the temple, swept away the gold of the money changers, and knocked over their tables. 16 To those selling doves he said, "Get Out of here! And stop making my Father's house into a marketplace." 17 His disciples then remembered that it is written: "Zeal for your house consumes me."

366 Above, the Evangelist presented the sign Christ worked in order to confirm his disciples; and this sign pertained to his power to change nature. Now he deals with the sign of his resurrection; a sign pertaining to the same power, but proposed by Christ to convert the people.

The Evangelist does two things as to this miracle. First, he mentions its occasion. Secondly, the prediction of the miracle (v 18). As to the first he does two things. First, he describes the place. Secondly, he tells of the

primum duo facit. Primo describit locum; secundo narrat factum, quod fuit occasio miraculi proponendi, ibi *et invenit in templo vendentes oves et boves*. Locus autem in quo hoc fuit, est Ierosolyma: et ideo Evangelista gradatim ostendit quo ordine Ierosolymam dominus venerit. Primo ergo ostendit quomodo in Capharnaum descendit; secundo vero quomodo Ierosolymam ascendit, ibi *et prope erat Pascha*. Circa primum tria facit. Primo assignat locum quo descendit; secundo, describit societatem quam habuit; tertio innuit moram quam protraxit.

Locus quidem quo descendit est Capharnaum; et ideo dicit *post hoc*, scilicet miraculum de vino, *descendit Capharnaum*. Videtur, quantum ad historiam pertinet, huic dicto contrariari quod dicitur Matth. IV, v. 12 s., scilicet quod dominus descenderit Capharnaum post incarcerationem Iohannis. Hoc autem quod hic refert Evangelista, totum factum est ante incarcerationem Iohannis.

Respondeo dicendum, quod ad huius quaestionis intelligentiam sciendum est, quod sicut ex ecclesiastica historia habetur, reliqui Evangelistae, scilicet Matthaeus, Marcus et Lucas narrationem evangelicam inceptorunt ab eo tempore quo Iohannes fuit inclusus in carcere. Unde statim Matth. IV, 12, post Baptismum, et ieiunium, et tentationem eius, texere incepit suam narrationem ante incarcerationem Iohannis, dicens: *cum audivisset Iesus quod traditus esset Iohannes* etc., et similiter Marcus; unde dicit: *postquam autem traditus est Iohannes, venit Iesus in Galilaeam* et cetera. Iohannes vero Evangelista qui supervixit aliis, cum trium Evangelistarum ad ipsum notitia pervenisset, ditorum fidem et veritatem probavit; tamen, quia vidit aliqua deesse, illa scilicet quae primo praedicationis suae tempore, ante Iohannis incarcerationem, dominus gesserat, ideo ad preces fidelium ipse Evangelium suum altius inchoans, ea quae praeterierant, priora, ante traditionem Iohannis, domini gesta conscripsit, scilicet a primo anno quo baptizatus est; ut in eius Evangelii serie apparet. Secundum hoc ergo Evangelistae non dissonant; sed quia

incident which was the occasion for proposing this miracle (v 14). Now the place where this happened was Jerusalem. And so the Evangelist recounts step by step how the Lord had come to Jerusalem. First, then, he shows how he went down to Capernaum. Secondly, how he then went up to Jerusalem. As to the first he does three things. First, he mentions the place to which he went down. Secondly, he describes his company. Thirdly, he mentions the length of his stay.

367 The place to which Christ went down was Capernaum; and so he says, **After this**, i.e., the miracle of the wine, **he went down to Capernaum**. Now as far as the historical truth is concerned, this seems to conflict with Matthew's account that the Lord went down to Capernaum after John had been thrown into prison (Mt 4:12), while the entire series of events the Evangelist refers to here took place before John's imprisonment.

I answer that in order to settle this question we should bear in mind what is learned from the *Ecclesiastical History*, that is, that the other Evangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke, began their account of the public life of Christ from the time that John was thrown into prison. Thus Matthew (4:12), after describing the baptism, fast and temptation of Christ, began at once to weave his story after John's imprisonment, saying: "When Jesus heard that John had been arrested." And Mark (1:14) says the same: "After John had been arrested, Jesus came into Galilee." John, who outlived the other three Evangelists, approved the accuracy and truth of their accounts when they came to his notice. Yet he saw that certain things had been left unsaid, namely, things which the Lord had done in the very first days of his preaching before John's imprisonment. And so, at the request of the faithful, John, after he began his own Gospel in a loftier manner, recorded events that took place during the first year in which Christ was baptized before John's imprisonment, as is plain from the order of the events in his Gospel. According to this, then, the Evangelists are not in disagreement. Rather, the Lord went down to Capernaum twice: once before John's imprisonment (which is the one



dominus bis Capharnaum descendit, semel ante incarcerationem Ioannis, de quo agitur hic, et semel post incarcerationem eius, de quo agitur Matth. IV, 13 et Lc. IV, 31.

Capharnaum autem interpretatur villa pulcherrima, et significat mundum istum, qui habet decorem ex ordine et dispositione divinae sapientiae; Ps. XLIX, 11: *pulchritudo agri mecum est*. Descendit ergo dominus in Capharnaum, idest mundum istum, cum matre, et fratribus, et discipulis. Nam in caelis dominus patrem habet sine matre, in terris matrem sine patre; et ideo signanter matrem solum nominat. In caelis etiam fratres non habet; sed est ipse *unigenitus, qui est in sinu patris*: supra I, 18. In terris vero est *primogenitus in multis fratribus*, ut dicitur Rom. VIII, v. 29. In terris habet discipulos quos doceat mysteria divinitatis, quae ante hominibus ignota fuerant, quia, ut dicitur Hebr. I, 2, *novissime diebus istis locutus est nobis in filio* et cetera.

Vel Capharnaum interpretatur ager consolationis: per quod signatur omnis homo qui fructum bonum facit; Gen. XXVII, 27: *ecce odor filii mei sicut odor agri pleni*. Et talis homo dicitur ager consolationis, quia dominus consolatur, et gaudet de profectu eius; Is. LXII, 5: *gaudebit dominus super te* etc., quia de eius bono Angeli gaudent; Lc. XV, v. 10: *gaudium est Angelis Dei super uno peccatore poenitentiam agente*. Dicit ipse, et mater.

Societas eius fuit primo matris; unde dicit *et mater eius*, quia enim ad nuptias venerat, et fuerat miraculi procuratrix, reducebat eam dominus Nazareth, quae erat villa in Galilaea, in qua Capharnaum metropolis erat.

Secundo fuit fratrum; unde dicit *et fratres eius* et cetera. Ubi cavendi sunt duo errores, scilicet Elvidii dicentis, quod beata virgo post Christum alios filios habuit, et hos dicit fratres domini, quod est haereticum: quia fides nostra tenet, quod mater Christi sicut fuit virgo ante partum, ita et in partu, et post partum virgo permansit.

dealt with here), and once after his imprisonment, which is dealt with in Matthew (4:13) and Luke (4:31).

368 Now “Capernaum” means “very pretty village,” and signifies this world, which has its beauty from the order and disposition of divine wisdom: “The beauty of the land is mine” (Ps 49:2). So the Lord went down to Capernaum, i.e., this world, with his mother and brethren and disciples. For in heaven the Lord has a Father without a mother; and on earth a mother without a father. Thus, he significantly mentions only his mother. In heaven he does not have brothers either, but is “the Only Begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father” (above 1:18). But on earth he is “the Firstborn of many brothers” (Rom 8:29). And on earth he has disciples, to whom he can teach the mysteries of the divinity, which were not known to men before: “In these days he has spoken to us in his Son” as we read in Hebrews (1:1).

Or, “Capernaum” means “the field of consolation”; and this signifies every man who bears good fruit: “The odor of my son is like the odor of a fruitful field” (Gn 27:27). Such a person is called a field of consolation because the Lord is consoled and rejoices in his achievement: “God will rejoice over you” (Is 62:5), and because the angels rejoice over his good: “There is joy in the angels of God over one repentant sinner” (Lk 15:10).

369 His companions were, first of all, his mother. So he says, **with his mother**, for because she had come to the wedding and had brought about the miracle, the Lord accompanied her back to the village of Nazareth. Nazareth was a village in Galilee, whose chief town was Capernaum.

370 Secondly, his companions were his brethren; and so he says, **his brethren** (*fratres*, brothers, brethren). We must avoid two errors here. First, that of Elvidius, who said that the Blessed Virgin had other sons after Christ; and he called these the brothers of the Lord. This is heretical, because our faith maintains that just as the mother of Christ was a virgin

Item error quorundam dicentium, Ioseph ex alia coniuge filios genuisse, et hos vocari fratres domini, quod Ecclesia non tenet.

Et ideo Hieronymus eos improbat: nam dominus in cruce pendens virginem matrem virgini discipulo custodiendam dimisit. Cum ergo Ioseph fuerit specialis custos virginis et etiam salvatoris in pueritia, credibile est eum virginem fuisse. Et ideo sane intelligentes, fratres domini dicimus consanguineos virginis matris, in quocumque gradu, vel etiam Ioseph, qui putabatur pater; et hoc quidem secundum consuetudinem Scripturae, quae communiter consanguineos fratres appellat. Unde Gen. XIII, v. 8: *ne quaeso sit iurgium inter me et te: fratres enim sumus*, dicit Abraham ad Lot; cum tamen esset nepos eius. Et attende, quod separatim nominat fratres et discipulos: quia non omnes consanguinei Christi, eius discipuli erant. Unde infra VII, 5 dicitur: *nondum credebant in eum fratres eius*.

Tertio socii eius fuerunt discipuli sui: unde dicit *et discipuli eius*. Sed ex hoc insurgit quaestio, qui fuerint eius discipuli. Videtur enim, secundum Matthaeum, quod primi qui conversi sunt ad Christum, fuerint Petrus et Andreas, Ioannes et Iacobus; sed hi vocati sunt a Christo post incarcerationem Ioannis, ut patet Matth. IV, v. 18 ss. non videtur ergo quod descenderint cum Christo in Capharnaum, ut hic habetur, cum hoc fuerit ante Ioannis incarcerationem.

Sed ad hoc duplex est responsio. Una, secundum Augustinum, de consensu Evangelistarum, quod Matthaeus non servat ordinem historiae, sed illud quod praetermiserat recapitulans, ea narrat post Ioannis incarcerationem quae ante facta fuerant. Unde sine ulla temporis consequentis differentia dixit: *ambulans Iesus iuxta mare Galilaeae, vidit duos fratres* etc., non addens post hoc vel in diebus illis. Alia est, secundum eundem, quod discipuli domini, in Evangelio dicuntur non solum illi duodecim quos elegit dominus, et apostolos nominavit, ut habetur Lc. VI, 13, sed etiam omnes qui in

before giving birth, so in giving birth and after giving birth, she remained a virgin. We must also avoid the error of those who say that Joseph fathered sons with another wife, and that these are called the brothers of the Lord; for the Church does not admit this.

Jerome refutes this opinion: for on the cross the Lord entrusted his virgin mother to the care of his virgin disciple. Therefore, since Joseph was the special guardian of the Virgin, and of the Savior too, in his childhood, one may believe that he was a virgin. Consequently, it is a reasonable interpretation to say that the brothers of the Lord were those related to his virgin mother in some degree of consanguinity, or even to Joseph, who was the reputed father. And this conforms to the custom of Scripture which generally refers to relatives as brothers. Thus we read: "Let us not quarrel, for we are brothers" (Gn 13:8), as Abram said to Lot, who was his nephew. And note that he distinguishes between relatives and disciples, because not all of Christ's relatives were his disciples; hence we read: "Even his brethren did not believe in him" (below 7:5) .

371 Thirdly, his disciples were his companions; hence he says, **and his disciples**. But who were his disciples? For it seems, according to Matthew, that the first ones to be converted to Christ were Peter and Andrew, John and James; but they were called after John's imprisonment, as is clear from Matthew (4:18). Thus it does not seem that they went down to Capernaum with Christ, as it says here, since this was before John's imprisonment.

There are two answers to this. One is from Augustine, in his *De Consensu Evangelistarum*, namely, that Matthew does not follow the historical order, but in summarizing what he omitted, relates events that occurred before John's imprisonment as though they happened after. So, without any suggestion of a time lapse he says, "As Jesus was walking by the Sea of Galilee, he saw two brothers" (Mt 4:18), without adding "after this" or "at that time." The other answer, also by Augustine, is that in the Gospel not only the twelve whom the Lord chose and named apostles are called disciples of the Lord (Lk 6:13), but also all who believed in him and were

eum credentes, eius magisterio ad regnum caelorum erudiebantur. Potuit ergo esse quod quamvis illi duodecim nondum eum secuti fuissent, nihilominus tamen aliqui alii qui sibi adhaeserunt, hic eius discipuli nominentur. Sed prima responsio melior est.

Moram autem contraxit ibi parvam; unde dicit *et ibi manserunt non multis diebus*. Huius ratio est, quia cives Capharnaum non se exhibuerunt devotos ad suscipiendum doctrinam Christi, quia erant valde corrupti; unde et Matth. XI, 23 dominus eos obiurgat, quod nec ad virtutes in eis factas, nec ad doctrinam Christi poenitentiam egerunt, dicens: *et tu, Capharnaum, numquid ad caelum exaltaberis? Usque in Infernum descendes: quia si in Sodomis factae fuissent virtutes quae factae sunt in te, forte mansissent usque in hanc diem*. Et tamen quamquam mali essent, descendit illuc, ut deduceret matrem ad cuius consolationem et honorem ibidem aliquamdiu moratur.

Mystice autem signatur per hoc quod aliqui multis sermonibus Christi immorari non possunt, sed pauca ad eorum illuminationem de multis sufficiunt, propter intellectus eorum imbecillitatem. Unde apud tales Christus paucis documentis immoratur ut Origenes dixit; secundum illud infra XVI, v. 12: *multa habeo vobis dicere; sed non potestis portare modo*.

Consequenter cum dicit *et prope erat Pascha*, manifestat locum quo ascendit. Et circa hoc duo facit. Primo innuit occasionem ascensus; secundo ponit ascensum, ibi *et ascendit Iesus*.

Occasio autem ascensus fuit Pascha Iudaeorum. Ex. XXIII, 17 praecipitur quod ter in anno omne masculinum praesentetur coram domino, et inter illos terminos unus erat Pascha Iudaeorum. Quia ergo dominus venit ut doceret omnes humilitatis et perfectionis exemplum, voluit legem, quamdiu statum habuit, observare: non enim venit legem solvere, sed adimplere, ut ipse dicit Matth. V, v. 17. Ex quo, quia Pascha Iudaeorum imminebat, Ierusalem

instructus for the kingdom of heaven by his teaching. Therefore, it is possible that although those twelve did not yet follow him, others who adhered to him are called disciples here. But the first answer is better.

372 His stay there was short; hence he says, **but they did not remain there many days**. The reason for this was that the citizens of Capernaum were not eager to accept the teachings of Christ, being very corrupt, so that in Matthew (11:23) the Lord rebukes them for not doing penance in spite of the miracles done there and of Christ's teaching: "And you Capernaum, will you be lifted up to heaven? You will go down to hell. For if the mighty works that were done in you had been performed in Sodom, it would have stood until this day." But although they were evil, he went there to accompany his mother, and to stay there for a few days for her consolation and honor.

373 As for its mystical sense, this signifies that some cannot remain long with the many words spoken by Christ; a few of these words are enough for them, to enlighten them, because of the weakness of their understanding. Hence as Origen said, Christ reveals few things to such persons, according to "I have many things to tell you, but you cannot bear them now" (Jn 16:12).

374 Then when he says, **The Jewish Passover was near at hand**, he mentions the place to which he went up. And concerning this he does two things. First, the occasion is given. Secondly, the going up.

375 Now the occasion for his going up was the Jewish Passover. For in Exodus (13:17) it is commanded that every male be presented to the Lord three times a year; and one of these times was the Jewish Passover. So, since the Lord came to teach everyone by his example of humility and perfection, he wished to observe the law as long as it was in force. For he did not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it (Mt 5:17). And so, because the Passover of the Jews was at hand, he went up to Jerusalem. So we,

ascendit. Nos ergo ad eius exemplum deberemus sollicite divina praecepta servare. Si enim ipse Dei filius decreta legis a se datae implebat, celebrans solemnitates; quanto studio bonorum operum deberemus nos eas et praevenire, et celebrare?

Notandum est, quod in Evangelio Ioannis in tribus locis fit mentio de Pascha, scilicet hic, et infra VI, 4, ubi fecit miraculum de panibus, ubi dicitur: *erat autem proximum Pascha, dies festus Iudaeorum*; et infra c. XIII, 1, ubi dicitur: *ante diem festum Paschae*. Unde secundum hoc Evangelium, habemus quod post miraculum de vino Christus praedicavit duobus annis, et quantum est a diebus Baptismi usque ad Pascha; nam hoc quod fecit hic, fuit prope Pascha, ut hic dicitur, et postea, revoluto anno, prope aliud Pascha fecit miraculum de panibus, et tunc Ioannes fuit decollatus. Unde Ioannes circa Pascha decollatus fuit; quia, ut dicitur Matth. c. XIV, 13, statim post decollationem Ioannis, Christus secessit in desertum, et ibi fecit miraculum de panibus: quod quidem miraculum fuit factum prope Pascha, ut dicitur infra VI. Sed tamen festum huius decollationis celebratur eo die quo caput eius inventum est. Postea, in alio Paschate, passus est Christus.

Secundum opinionem ergo illorum qui dicunt, quod miraculum factum in nuptiis, et ea quae hic dicuntur, eodem anno gesta sunt quo baptizatus est Christus, a Baptismo Christi usque ad eius passionem fuerunt duo anni et dimidius: et ideo, secundum eos, Evangelista dicit *prope erat Pascha Iudaeorum*, ut ostendat quod ante paucos dies fuerat baptizatus.

Sed Ecclesia tenet contrarium. Credimus enim quod eodem die quo dominus baptizatus est, revoluto anno, factum fuerit miraculum de vino; et postea revoluto anno, prope Pascha, Ioannes fuerit decollatus; et quod ab isto Paschate circa quod Ioannes fuit decollatus, fuerit unus annus usque ad Pascha in quo Christus passus est. Unde oportet aliud Pascha a Baptismo Christi usque ad miraculum de vino intermedium esse, de quo nullus Evangelista

after his example, should carefully observe the divine precepts. For if the Son of God fulfilled the decrees of a law he himself had given, and celebrated the great feasts, with what zeal for good works ought we both to prepare for them and observe them?

376 It should be noted that in John's Gospel mention is made of the Passover in three passages: here, and in (6:4), when he worked the miracle of the loaves, where it is said: "Now the Jewish Passover was near at hand", and again in (13:1), where it says: "Before the feast day of the Passover." So, according to this Gospel, we understand that after the miracle of the wine Christ preached for two years plus the interval between his baptism and this Passover. For what he did here occurred near the Passover, as it says here, and then a year later, near the time of another Passover, he performed the miracle of the loaves, and in the same year John was beheaded. Thus John was beheaded near the time of the Passover, because we read in Matthew (14:13) that immediately after John was beheaded Christ withdrew to the desert, where he worked the miracle of the loaves; and this miracle took place near Passover time, as stated below (6:4). Nevertheless, the feast of this beheading of John is celebrated on the day his head was found. It was later, during another Passover, that Christ suffered.

So, according to the opinion of those who say that the miracle worked at the wedding and the events being discussed here occurred in the same year in which Christ was baptized, there was an interval of two and one half years between Christ's baptism and his passion. So, according to them, the Evangelist says, **The Jewish Passover was near at hand**, in order to show that Christ had been baptized just a few days before.

But the Church holds the opposite. For we believe that Christ worked the miracle of the wine on the first anniversary of the day of his baptism; then a year later, near Passover time, John was beheaded; and then there was another year between the Passover near which John was beheaded and the Passover during which Christ suffered. So between the baptism of Christ and the miracle of the wine there had to be another Passover which

facit mentionem: et sic, secundum quod Ecclesia tenet, Christus tribus annis et dimidio praedicavit.

Ait autem *Iudaeorum*, non quod alterius nationis homines Pascha celebrarent, sed duplici de causa. Una quia quando aliqui festum aliquod sancte et pure celebrant, dicitur illud domino celebrare; cum vero nec pure, nec sancte celebrant, non domino, sed sibi solemnizant; Is. I, 14: *Kalendas vestras, et festivitates vestras odivit anima mea*; quasi dicat: quia vobis, et non mihi celebratis, non placent mihi; Zach. VII, 5: *cum ieiunaretis, numquid ieiunium ieiunastis mihi?* Quasi dicat, non, sed vobis. Quia ergo isti Iudaei depravati erant, et eorum Pascha indebite celebrabant, ideo Evangelista non dicit: prope erat Pascha domini, sed *Iudaeorum*.

Vel hoc dicit ad differentiam nostri Paschae: nam Pascha Iudaeorum erat figurale, utpote immolatione agni figuralis celebratum; sed nostrum Pascha verum est, in quo recolimus veram passionem agni immaculati; I Corint. V, 7: *Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus*.

Ascensus fuit in Ierusalem; et ideo dicit *et ascendit Iesus Ierosolymam*. Ubi nota, secundum ordinem historiae, Iesum bis circa festum Paschae Ierosolymam ascendisse, et expulisse de templo ementes et vendentes. Semel quidem ante incarcerationem Ioannis, quod hic Evangelista commemorat, alia vice, imminente Paschate, et tempore passionis, quod narrat Matthaeus. Nam frequenter dominus similia facta operatus est, sicut patet de duplici illuminatione caecorum: una Matth. IX, 28, et alia Mc. c. X, 46 ss. Et similiter bis eiecit ementes et vendentes de templo.

Mystice autem ascendit Ierosolymam, quae interpretatur visio pacis, et significat aeternam beatitudinem: in quam ascendit, et

the Evangelist does not mention. And so, according to what the Church holds, Christ preached for three and one half years.

377 He says, **the Jewish Passover**, not as though the people of other nations celebrated a Passover, but for two reasons. One, because when people celebrate a feast in a holy and pure way, it is said that they celebrate it for the Lord; but when they celebrate it in neither of those ways, they do not celebrate it for the Lord, but for themselves: “My soul hates your new moons and your feasts” (Is 1:14). It is as though he said: Those who celebrate for themselves and not for me, do not please me: “When you fasted, did you fast for me?” (Zec 7:5), as if to say: You did not do it for me, but for yourselves. And so because these Jews were corrupt and celebrated their Passover in an unbecoming manner, the Evangelist does not say, “the Passover of the Lord,” but the Jewish Passover was at hand.

Or, he says this to differentiate it from our Passover. For the Passover of the Jews was symbolic, being celebrated by the immolation of a lamb which was a symbol. But our Passover is true, in which we recall the true passing [passion] of the Immaculate Lamb: “Christ, our Passover, has been sacrificed” (1 Cor 5:7).

378 The journey was to Jerusalem, and so he says, **and Jesus went up to Jerusalem**. Note here that according to the historical order, Jesus went up to Jerusalem near the time of the Passover and expelled the merchants from the temple on two occasions. The first, before John’s imprisonment, is the one the Evangelist mentions here; the other is mentioned by Matthew (21:13) as occurring when the Passover and the hour of his passion were at hand. For the Lord frequently repeated works that were similar. For example, the two cases of giving sight to the blind: one in Matthew (9:28) and another in Mark (10:46). In like manner he twice cast merchants from the temple.

379 In the mystical sense, Jesus went up to Jerusalem, which is translated as the “vision of peace,” and signifies eternal happiness. It is to

suos transduxit. Sed non vacat a mysterio, quod in Capharnaum descendit, et postmodum Ierosolymam ascendit. Nisi enim descendisset primum, non competisset ei ascendere: quia, ut dicitur Eph. IV, 10, *qui descendit, ipse est et qui ascendit*. Non facit autem mentionem de discipulis in ascensu ad Ierosolymam: quia discipulorum ascensus est ex ascensu Christi; infra III, 13: *nemo ascendit in caelum nisi qui descendit de caelo, filius hominis*.

Consequenter cum dicit *et invenit in templo vendentes oves et boves* etc. narrat Evangelista factum quod movit Christum ad signum resurrectionis proponendum. Et circa hoc tria facit. Primo manifestat Iudaeorum vitium; secundo innuit Christi remedium, ibi *et cum fecisset quasi flagellum* etc.; tertio subdit prophetiae oraculum, ibi *recordati vero sunt discipuli* et cetera.

Circa primum sciendum, quod Diabolus insidiatur his quae Dei sunt, et ea nititur corrumpere. Inter cetera autem quibus sancta corrumpit, praecipuum est vitium avaritiae; unde dicitur Is. LVI, 11: *pastores eius nescierunt intelligentiam, omnes in viam suam declinaverunt: unusquisque ad avaritiam suam a summo usque ad novissimum*. Quod quidem ab antiquis temporibus Diabolus fecit. Nam sacerdotes veteris testamenti, qui instituti erant ut divinis vacarent, avaritiae studebant. Praeceptum autem erat a Deo in lege, quod in certis solemnitatibus domino immolarent aliqua animalia; ad quod quidem praeeptum implendum de prope venientes ad templum, secum animalia ducebant, illi autem qui a remotis veniebant, non valebant animalia ducere de domibus suis. Quia ergo oblationes huiusmodi cedebant in utilitatem sacerdotum, ne deessent animalia de remotis venientibus ad offerendum, providerunt ipsi sacerdotes ut animalia in templo venderentur; et ideo faciebant ea in templo, idest in atrio templi, exponi ad vendendum. Et hoc est quod dicit *et invenit dominus in templo vendentes oves, et boves, et columbas* et cetera.

here that Jesus ascended, and he took his own with him. There is no lack of mystery in the fact that he went down to Capernaum and later went up to Jerusalem. For if he did not first go down, he would not have been suited to go up, because, as it is said: "He who descended is the same as he who ascended" (Eph 4:10). Further, no mention is made of the disciples in the ascent to Jerusalem because the ascent of the disciples comes from the ascent of Christ: "No one has gone up to heaven except the one who came down from heaven, the Son of Man, who lives in heaven" (below 3:13).

380 Then when he says, **In the temple precincts he came upon merchants selling oxen, sheep and doves**, the Evangelist sets down what moved Christ to propose the sign of the resurrection. He does three things with this. First, he exposes the faulty behavior of the Jews. Secondly, he discloses Christ's remedy (v 15). Thirdly, he gives the announcement of the prophecy (v 22).

381 With respect to the first, we should note that the devil plots against the things of God and strives to destroy them. Now among the means by which he destroys holy things, the chief is avarice; hence it is said: "The shepherds have no understanding. All have turned aside to their own way; everyone after his own gain, from the first one to the last" (Is 56:11). And the devil has done this from the earliest times. For the priests of the Old Testament, who had been established to care for divine matters, gave free rein to avarice. God commanded, in the law, that animals should be sacrificed to the Lord on certain feasts. And in order to fulfill this command, those who lived nearby brought the animals with them. But those who came a long distance were unable to bring animals from their own homes. And so because offerings of this kind resulted in profit for the priests, and so animals to offer would not be lacking to those who came from a distance, the priests themselves saw to it that animals were sold in the temple. And so they had them shown for sale in the temple, i.e., in the atrium of the temple. And this is what he says: **In the temple precincts he came upon merchants selling oxen, sheep and doves**.

Ubi primo facit mentionem de duobus animalibus terrestribus, quae secundum legem domino offerri poterant, scilicet de bove et ove. Tertium vero animal terrestre, quod offerebatur capra scilicet, annumeratur cum ove: similiter etiam turtur annumeratur cum columba.

Et quia contingebat aliquando aliquos ad templum venire, qui nec animalia secum ducebant, nec pecuniam, unde emere non valebant; ideo sacerdotes aliam avaritiae artem adinvenerant, ut scilicet in templo constituerent nummularios et campsores, qui praedictis non habentibus pecuniam mutuarent. Et licet usuram inde non reciperent, quia hoc erat in lege prohibitum, loco tamen eius quaedam collibia, idest parva munuscula et vilia recipiebant. Et haec ipsa in utilitatem sacerdotum cedebant; et hoc est quod dicit *et nummularios sedentes* scilicet in templo, paratos ad pecuniam mutuandam.

Sed hoc quidem mystice tripliciter intelligi potest. Primo enim per vendentes et ementes significantur illi qui ecclesiasticas res vendunt, vel emunt: nam bona ecclesiastica spiritualia, et eis annexa, significantur per oves, et boves, et columbas. Ipsa consecrata quidem, et confirmata sunt ex doctrinis apostolorum et doctorum, qui significantur per boves; Prov. XIV, 4: *ubi plurimae sunt segetes, ibi manifesta fortitudo bovis*. Item ex sanguine martyrum, qui significantur per oves. Unde in persona eorum dicitur in Ps. XLIII, et Rom. VIII, 36: *aestimati sumus ut oves occisionis*. Item dona spiritus sancti, quae significantur per columbas: quia, ut dicitur supra I, 32, spiritus sanctus in specie columbae apparuit. Omnia ergo haec vendunt, scilicet doctrinam apostolorum, sanguinem martyrum et dona spiritus sancti, quicumque bona ecclesiastica spiritualia, et eis annexa vendere praesumunt.

Secundo, contingit aliquos praelatos, seu Ecclesiarum praepositos, etsi non manifeste per simoniam, occulte tamen per negligentiam boves, et oves, et columbas vendere, tunc scilicet quando tantum inhiant temporalibus lucris, et occupantur in eis, et

Mention is first made of two land animals, which according to the law could be offered to the Lord: the ox and the sheep. The third land animal offered, the goat, is implied when he says “sheep”, similarly, the turtle-dove is included when he says “doves.”

382 It sometimes happened that some came to the temple not only without animals, but also without money to buy them. And so the priests found another avenue for their avarice; they set up moneychangers who would lend money to those who came without it. And although they would not accept a usurious gain, because this was forbidden in the law, nevertheless in place of this they accepted certain “*collibia*”, i.e., trifles and small gifts. So this also was turned to the profit of the priests. And this is what he says, **moneychangers seated at tables**, i.e., in the temple, ready to lend money.

383 This can be understood mystically in three ways. First of all, the merchants signify those who sell or buy the things of the Church: for the oxen, sheep and doves signify the spiritual goods of the Church and the things connected with them. These goods have been consecrated and authenticated by the teachings of the apostles and doctors, signified by the oxen: “When there is an abundant harvest the strength of the ox is evident” (Prv 14:4); and by the blood of the martyrs, who are signified by the sheep: so it is said for them: “We are regarded as sheep for the slaughter” (Rom 8:36): and by the gifts of the Holy Spirit, signified by the doves, for as stated above, the Holy Spirit appeared in the form of a dove. Therefore, those who presume to sell the spiritual goods of the Church and the goods connected with them are selling the teachings of the apostles, the blood of the martyrs, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

Secondly, it happens that certain prelates or heads of churches sell these oxen, sheep and doves, not overtly by simony, but covertly by negligence; that is, when they are so eager for and occupied with temporal gain that they neglect the spiritual welfare of their subjects. And this is the way they

negligunt spiritualem salutem subditorum: nam per hoc vendunt oves, et boves, et columbas, idest tria genera hominum eis subditorum. Scilicet praedicatores et operatores, qui significantur per boves; Is. XXXII, 20: *beati qui seminatis super omnes aquas, immittentes pedem bovis et asini*. Quia praelati debent ordinare boves, idest doctores et sapientes cum asinis, idest rudibus et simplicibus. Vendunt etiam activos, et ministeriis vacantes, qui significantur per oves, infra X, 27: *oves meae vocem meam audiunt* etc.; II Reg. ult., 17: *isti, qui oves sunt, quid fecerunt?* Vendunt et contemplantes, qui significantur per columbas; Ps. LIV, 7: *quis dabit mihi pennas sicut columbae et volabo?*

Tertio per templum Dei potest intelligi spiritualis anima, ut dicitur I Cor. III, 17: *templum Dei sanctum est, quod estis vos*. Tunc ergo homo vendit in templo oves, et boves, et columbas, quando in anima bestiales motus retinet, pro quibus homo vendit se Diabolo. Nam per boves, qui agriculturae deserviunt, significantur terrena desideria; per ovem, quae est animal stultum, significatur hominis stoliditas; per columbas vero hominis instabilitas: quae quidem Deus de cordibus hominum expellit.

Et ideo statim ponitur domini remedium, cum dicit *et cum fecisset quasi flagellum de funiculis, omnes eiecit de templo*: ubi dominus apposuit remedium et operis, et verbi, ut doceret eos qui curam habent Ecclesiae, subditos facto et verbo debere corrigere. Et ideo circa hoc duo facit. Primo ponitur remedium quod adhibuit facto; secundo remedium quod adhibuit verbo, ibi *et his qui vendebant columbas dixit* et cetera.

Circa primum tria facit. Primo eiecit homines; secundo oves et boves; tertio effudit pecuniam.

Eiecit quidem homines flagello, et hoc est quod dicit *et cum fecisset quasi flagellum de funiculis*, quod quidem non potuit fieri nisi virtute

sell the oxen, sheep and doves, i.e., the three classes of people subject to them. First of all, they sell the preachers and laborers, who are signified by the oxen: "Happy are you who sow beside all the streams, letting the ox and the donkey range free" (Is 32:20); because prelates ought to arrange the oxen, i.e., teachers and wise men, with the donkeys, i.e., the simple and uneducated. They also sell those in the active life, and those occupied with ministering, signified by the sheep: "My sheep hear my voice" (below 10:27); and as is said in 2 Samuel (24:17): "But these, who are the sheep, what have they done?" They also sell the contemplatives, signified by the doves: "Who will give me wings like a dove, and I will fly?" (Ps 54:7).

Thirdly, by the temple of God we can understand the spiritual soul, as it says: "The temple of God is holy, and that is what you are" (1 Cor 3:17). Thus a man sells oxen, sheep and doves in the temple when he harbors bestial movements in his soul, for which he sells himself to the devil. For oxen, which are used for cultivating the earth, signify earthly desires; sheep, which are stupid animals, signify man's obstinacy; and the doves signify man's instability. It is God who drives these things out of men's hearts.

384 The Lord's remedy is at once set forth (v 15). Here the Lord's remedy consisted in action and in words, in order to instruct those who have charge of the Church that they must correct their subjects in deed and in word. And he does two things with respect to this. First, he gives the remedy Christ applied by his action. Secondly, the remedy he applied by word (v 16).

385 As to the first he does three things. First, he drives the men out. Secondly, the oxen and sheep. Thirdly, he sweeps away the money.

He drives the men out with a whip; and this is what he **says, when he had made a kind of whip from cords**. This is something that could be



divina; nam, et Origenes dicit, quod divina potestas Iesu poterat cum volebat accensam iracundiam hominum suffocare, sicut sedare mentium turbines; Ps. XXXII, v. 10: *dominus dissipat cogitationes hominum*. Facit autem flagellum de funiculis, quia, ut dicit Augustinus, de peccatis nostris sumit materiam, unde nos puniat: ipsa enim protelatio peccatorum, secundum quod peccata peccatis adduntur, funiculi dicuntur; Prov. V, v. 22: *funibus peccatorum suorum constringitur*; Is. V, 18: *vae qui trahitis iniquitatem in funiculis* et cetera. Sicut ergo eiecit de templo negotiatores, ita nummulariorum aes effudit, et mensas subvertit.

Attende, quod si ista, quae videbantur aliquo modo licita, quasi ad cultum Dei ordinata, de templo eiecit, quanto magis si invenisset aliqua illicita? Ideo autem eos eiecit, quia sacerdotes in hoc non intendebant honorem Dei, sed utilitatem propriam. Unde dicitur Ez. XLIV, 8: *posuistis custodes observationum mearum in sanctuario meo vobismetipsis*.

Ostendit autem dominus zelum ad ea quae sunt legis, ut ex hoc ipso confutaret pontifices et sacerdotes, qui erant ei de lege calumniam illaturi. Per hoc etiam quod huiusmodi eiecit de templo, dedit intelligere quod appropinquabat tempus quo sacrificia legis cessare debebant, et verus Dei cultus ad gentes transferri; Matth. c. XXI, 43: *auferetur a vobis regnum* et cetera. Similiter etiam ut ostenderet eorum damnationem qui spiritualia vendunt; Act. VIII, 20: *pecunia tua tecum sit in perditione*.

Consequenter cum dicit *et his qui columbas vendebant, dixit etc.*, ponit remedium quod adhibuit verbo. Ubi notandum est, quod simoniaci primo quidem fugandi sunt de Ecclesia. Sed quia adhuc dum vivunt, per liberum arbitrium possunt se convertere, et adiuti a Deo ad statum gratiae redire, non sunt desperandi. Si vero non convertuntur, tunc quidem non fugantur, sed ligantur ab illis, quibus dicitur, Matth. XXII, 13: *ligatis manibus et pedibus eius, mittite eum in tenebras exteriores*. Et ideo dominus hoc attendens, primo

done only by divine power. For as Origen says, the divine power of Jesus was as able, when he willed, to quench the swelling anger of men as to still the storms of minds: "The Lord brings to naught the thoughts of men" (Ps 32:10). He makes the whip from cords because, as Augustine says, it is from our own sins that he forms the matter with which he punishes us: for a series of sins, in which sins are added to sins, is called a cord: "He is bound fast by the cords of his own sins" (Prv 5:22); "Woe to you who haul wickedness with cords" (Is 5:18). Then, just as he drove the merchants from the temple, so he swept away the gold of the moneychangers and knocked over their tables.

386 And mark well that if he expelled from the temple things that seemed somehow licit, in the sense that they were ordained to the worship of God, how much more if he comes upon unlawful things? The reason he cast them out was because in this matter the priests did not intend God's glory, but their own profit. Hence it is said: "It is for yourselves that you placed guardians of my service in my sanctuary" (Ez 44:8)

Further, our Lord showed zeal for the things of the law so that he might by this answer the chief priests and the priests who were later to bring a charge against him on this very point. Again, by casting things of this kind out of the temple he let it be understood that the time was coming in which the sacrifices of the law were due to cease, and the true worship of God transferred to the Gentiles: "The kingdom of God will be taken away from you" (Mt 21:43). Also, this shows us the condemnation of those who sell spiritual things: "May your money perish together with you" (Acts 8:20).

387 Then when he says, **To those selling doves he said**, he records the treatment which the Lord applied by word. Here it should be noted that those who engage in simony should, of course, first be expelled from the Church. But because as long as they are alive, they can change themselves by free will and by the help of God return to the state of grace, they should not be given up as hopeless. If, however, they are not converted, then they are not merely to be expelled, but handed over to those to whom it is said: "Bind him hand and foot, and cast him into outer darkness" (Mt 22:13). And so the Lord, attending to this, first warns them,

quidem admonet; secundo rationem admonitionis inducit, ibi et *nolite facere* et cetera.

Monet quidem venditores columbarum eos increpando, quia per eos signantur illi qui vendunt dona spiritus sancti, scilicet simoniaci.

Rationem huius inducit, cum dicit: *et nolite facere domum patris mei, domum negotiationis*. Is. I, 16: *auferte malum cogitationum vestrarum ab oculis meis*. Attende autem, quod Matth. XXI, 13 dicit: *nolite facere domum meam speluncam latronum*, hic vero dicit: *domum negotiationis*, quod dominus ideo fecit ut, sicut bonus medicus, primo a levioribus incipiens, postea dura proponeret. Hoc enim quod hic factum dicitur, primo factum fuit: unde in ipso principio, non latrones, sed negotiatores eos vocat. Sed quia ex eorum duritia adhuc a tali negotiatione non cessabant, ideo dominus alia vice eos expellens de quo agitur in Mc. c. IX, 15 ss. durius eos increpat, vocans latrocinium quod primo vocaverat negotiationem.

Dicit autem *domum patris mei*, ad excludendum errorem Manichaei, qui dicebat, quod Deus veteris testamenti non fuerat pater Christi, sed Deus novi. Sed si hoc verum esset, cum templum fuisset domus veteris testamenti, non utique Christus dixisset templum domum patris sui.

Sed quare non sunt turbati Iudaei de hoc quod hic vocat Deum patrem suum, sicut dicitur infra V, 18, quod propter hoc eum persequerentur? Ad quod dicendum est, quod Deus est pater aliquorum per adoptionem, puta iustorum, et hoc non erat novum apud Iudaeos; Ier. III, 19: *patrem vocabis me, et post me ingredi non cessabis*. Sed per naturam solius Christi est, Ps. II, 7: *dominus dixit ad me: filius meus es tu*, scilicet verus et naturalis; et hoc inauditum erat apud eos. Et ideo quia Christus se verum Dei filium dicebat, Iudaei persequerentur ipsum; infra V, 18: *propter hoc*

and then gives the reason for his warning, saying, **stop making my Father's house into a marketplace**.

388 He warns those selling the doves by reproaching them, for they signify those who sell the gifts of the Holy Spirit, i.e., those who engage in simony.

389 He gives his reason for this when he says, **stop making my Father's house into a marketplace**. "Take away your evil from my sight" (Is 1:10). Note that Matthew (2 1:13) says: "Do not make my house a den of thieves," while here he says, **a marketplace**. Now the Lord does this because, as a good physician, he begins first with the gentler things; later on, he would propose harsher things. Now the action recorded here was the first of the two; hence in the beginning he does not call them thieves but merchants. But because they did not stop such business out of obstinacy, the Lord, when driving them out the second time (as mentioned in Mark 11:15), rebukes them more severely, calling robbery what he had first called business.

He says, **my Father's house**, to exclude the error of Manicheus, who said that while the God of the New Testament was the Father of Christ, the God of the Old Testament was not. But if this were true, then since the temple was the house of the Old Testament, Christ would not have referred to the temple as **my Father's house**.

390 Why were the Jews not disturbed here when he called God his Father, for as is said below (5:18), this is why they persecuted him? I answer that God is the Father of certain men through adoption; for example, he is the Father of the just in this way. This was not a new idea for the Jews: "You will call me Father, and you will not cease to walk after me" (Jer 3:19). However, by nature he is the Father of Christ alone: "The Lord said to me: 'You are my Son' " (Ps 2:7), i.e., the true and natural Son. It is this that was unheard of among the Jews. And so the Jews persecuted him because he called himself the true Son of God: "the Jews tried all the

*persequerentur Iudaei Christum, quia non solum solvebat sabbatum; sed et patrem suum dicebat Deum, aequalem se Deo faciens. Cum autem hic Deum vocat patrem, dicebant de eo quod esset per adoptionem.*

Quod autem domus Dei non debeat fieri domus negotiationis, habetur Zach. c. ult., 21: *non erit ultra mercator in domo domini exercituum in die illo.* Et in Ps. LXX, v. 16 secundum aliam litteram: *quoniam non cognovi negotiationem, introibo in potentias domini.*

Consequenter cum dicit *recordati sunt vero discipuli eius* etc. ponit prophetiae oraculum, quod quidem scriptum est in Ps. LXVIII, 10: *zelus domus tuae comedit me.* Ubi sciendum, quod zelus proprie dicit quamdam intensionem amoris, qua intense diligens, nihil sustinet quod amori suo repugnet. Et inde est quod viri diligentes intense uxores, nec in eis sustinentes aliorum consortium, utpote amori eorum contrarium, zelotypi dicuntur. Ille igitur proprie zelum Dei habet qui nihil patienter sustinere potest contra honorem Dei, quem maxime diligit; III Reg. c. XIX, 10: *zelo zelatus sum pro domino exercituum* et cetera. Nos autem debemus diligere domum domini, secundum illud Ps. XXV, 8: *domine, dilexi decorem domus tuae.* Et intantum debemus diligere quod zelus eius nos comedit: dum si quid contrarium fieri videbimus, studeamus etiam quantumcumque cari nostri sint qui hoc facient, removere, nec timeamus propter hoc aliqua mala perpeti. Unde dicitur in Glossa: bonus zelus est fervor animi, quo quis mortis abiecto timore, pro defensione veritatis accenditur. Eo comeditur, qui quaelibet prava quae viderit, corrigere satagit; et si nequit, tolerat, et gemit.

harder to kill him, because he not only broke the Sabbath rest, but even called God his own Father, making himself equal to God” (below 5:18). But when he called God his Father on this occasion, they said it was by adoption.

391 That the house of God shall not be made a marketplace is taken from Zechariah (14:21): “On that day there will no longer be any merchants in the house of the Lord of hosts”; and from the Psalm (70:16), where one version has the reading: “Because I was not part of the marketplace, I will enter into the strength of the Lord.”

392 Then when he says, **His disciples then remembered**, he sets down a prophecy which was written in Psalm 69 (v 9): “Zeal for your house consumes me.” Here we should remark that zeal, properly speaking, signifies an intensity of love, whereby the one who loves intensely does not tolerate anything which is repugnant to his love. So it is that men who love their wives intensely and cannot endure their being in the company of other men, as this conflicts with their own love, are called “zelotypes.” Thus, properly speaking, one is said to have zeal for God who cannot patiently endure anything contrary to the honor of God, **whom** he loves above all else: “I have been very zealous for the Lord God of hosts” (1 Kgs 19:10). Now we should love the house of the Lord, according to the Psalm (25:8): “O Lord, I have loved the beauty of your house.” Indeed, we should love it so much that our zeal consumes us, so that if we notice anything amiss being done, we should try to eliminate it, no matter how dear to us are those who are doing it; nor should we fear any evils that we might have to endure as a result. So the Gloss says: “Good zeal is a fervor of spirit, by which, scorning the fear of death, one is on fire for the defense of the truth. He is consumed by it who takes steps to correct any perversity he sees; and if he cannot, he tolerates it with sadness.”

**Lectio 3**

18 ἀπεκρίθησαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, τί σημεῖον δεικνύεις ἡμῖν, ὅτι ταῦτα ποιεῖς; 19 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τούτον καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν. 20 εἶπαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, τεσσεράκοντα 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 αὐτὸν 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. Primo ponitur signi postulatio; secundo signi exhibitio, ibi *respondit Iesus, et dixit eis: solvite templum hoc* etc.; tertio signi exhibiti

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

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.

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.

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 Ioniae 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*, idest 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.

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

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

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 is it is said: "You will not allow your Holy One to see corruption" (Ps 15:10). Nevertheless, death did bring a dissolution to 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.

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

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



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

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

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 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

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 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

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, 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

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 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

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, idest Ecclesia eius, certificabitur de his quae nunc per fidem aenigmatice cognoscimus; 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:

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 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

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 quoniam 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 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.

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 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.

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 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.

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 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.

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*.

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).