

**Chapter
Three**

**Lecture
Six**

COMMENTARY ON

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN

St. Thomas Aquinas

Lectio 6

32b καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῦ οὐδεὶς λαμβάνει. 33 ὁ λαβὼν αὐτοῦ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐσφράγισεν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀληθὴς ἐστίν. 34 ὃν γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ, οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν τὸ πνεῦμα. 35 ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν υἱόν, καὶ πάντα δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ. 36 ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον: ὁ δὲ ἀπειθῶν τῷ υἱῷ οὐκ ὄψεται ζωὴν, ἀλλ' ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μένει ἐπ' αὐτόν.

Supra Ioannes Baptista commendavit Christi doctrinam; hic vero agit de diversitate recipientium: unde tractat de fide adhibenda ipsi doctrinae, et circa hoc tria facit. Primo ostendit raritatem credentium; secundo credendi debitum, ibi *qui autem acceperit eius testimonium* etc.; tertio fidei praemium, ibi *qui credit in filium, habet vitam aeternam*.

Dicit ergo: dico quod Christus certam scientiam habet, et vera loquitur. Tamen licet pauci testimonium eius accipiant, non propter hoc doctrinae ipsius derogatur, quia hoc non est ex parte eius, sed ex parte eorum qui non recipiunt, scilicet discipulorum Ioannis, qui nondum credebant, et

LECTURE 6

32b “And his testimony no one accepts. 33 But whoever accepts his testimony has given a sign [or certifies] that God is true. 34 For the One whom God sends speaks the words of God, for God does not bestow the Spirit in fractions. 35 The Father loves the Son, and has put everything into his hands. 36 Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life. But whoever is unbelieving in the Son will not see life; rather, the anger of God rests on him.”

535 Above, John the Baptist commended the teaching of Christ; here, however, he considers the difference in those who receive it. Thus, he treats of the faith that must be given to this teaching. And he does three things. First, he shows the scarcity of those who believe. Secondly, the obligation to believe (v 33). Lastly, the reward for belief (v 36).

536 He says therefore: I say that Christ has certain knowledge and that he speaks the truth. Yet although few accept his testimony, that is no reflection on his teaching, because it is not the fault of the teaching but of those who do not accept it: namely, the disciples of

Pharisaeorum, qui ipsius doctrinae detrahebant. Et ideo dicit *et testimonium eius nemo accipit*.

Hoc autem quod dicit *nemo*, potest dupliciter exponi. Uno modo, *nemo*, idest pauci, et si aliqui accipiant. Et quod aliqui accipiant, ostendit subdens: *qui autem accepit eius testimonium* et cetera. Hoc modo loquendi usus est Evangelista cum dixit, supra I, 11: *in propria venit, et sui eum non receperunt*. quia pauci eum receperunt.

Alio modo, quia accipere eius testimonium est credere in Deum; sed nullus potest credere ex seipso, sed ex Deo; Eph. II, 8: *gratia salvatis estis*. Et ideo dicit *nemo accipit*, scilicet ex se, nisi donetur sibi a Deo.

Vel aliter. Consuetum est in Scriptura divina populo loqui de duobus. Quia quamdiu sumus in hoc mundo, mali sunt permixti bonis; et ideo Scriptura aliquando loquitur de populo, referendo intentionem suam ad malos, aliquando ad bonos. Et hic modus loquendi habetur Ier. XXVI: nam primo dicit: omnis populus et sacerdotes quaerebant occidere Ieremiam: referens intentionem suam ad malos: et postea statim dicit, quod omnis populus quaerebat eum liberare, loquens de bonis. Eodem modo et Ioannes Baptista habens oculos suos ad sinistram, idest ad malos, dicit *et testimonium eius nemo accipit*: et ex alia referens ad dexteram, idest ad bonos, dicit *qui autem acceperit eius testimonium* et cetera.

Qui autem acceperit eius testimonium, ubi ostendit debitum fidei, quod est supponere se veritati divinae. Et circa hoc quatuor facit. Primo proponit divinam veritatem; secundo subdit divinae veritatis denuntiationem, ibi *quem enim misit Deus, verba Dei loquitur*; tertio insinuat denuntiandi facultatem, ibi *non enim ad mensuram dat Deus spiritum*; quarto assignat facultatis rationem, ibi *pater diligit filium* et cetera.

John, who did not yet believe, and the Pharisees, who slandered his teaching. Thus he says, **And his testimony no one accepts**.

537 **No one** can be explained in two ways. First, so that it implies a few; and so some did accept his testimony. He shows that some did accept it when he adds, "But whoever accepts his testimony." The Evangelist used this way of speaking before when he said: "He came unto his own, and his own did not receive him" (above 1:11): because a few did receive him.

In another way, to accept his testimony is understood as to believe in God. But no one can believe of himself, but only due to God: "You are saved by grace" (Eph 2:8). And so he says, his testimony no one accepts, i.e., of himself, but it is given to him by God.

This can be explained in another way by realizing that Scripture refers to people in two ways. As long as we are in this world the wicked are mingled with the good; and so Scripture sometimes speaks of "the people," or "they," meaning those who are good; while at other times, the same words can refer to the wicked. We can see this in Jeremiah (26): for first it says that all the people and the priests sought to kill Jeremiah, and this referred to those who were evil; then at once it says that all the people sought to free him, and this referred to those who were good. In the same way, John the Baptist says, looking to the left, i.e., toward those who are evil, **And his testimony no one accepts**; and later, referring to those on the right, i.e., to the good, he says, **But whoever accepts his testimony**.

538 **But whoever accepts his testimony**. Here he speaks of the obligation to believe, i.e., to submit oneself to divine truth. As to this he does four things. First, he presents the divine truth. Secondly, he speaks of the proclamation of the divine truth (v 34). Thirdly, of the ability to proclaim it (v 34b). Fourthly, he gives the reason for this ability (v 35).

Debitum autem fidei est ut homo veritati divinae se supponat; et ideo dicit quod si pauci testimonium eius accipiunt, tamen aliqui accipiunt; unde dicit *qui autem acceperit eius testimonium*; idest quicumque sit ille, *signavit*, idest signum quoddam in corde suo ponere debet seu posuit, quod ipse Christus est Deus. Et *est verax*, quia ipse dicebat se esse Deum: quod si non esset, non esset verax, cum tamen scriptum sit, Rom. III, 4: *est autem Deus verax* et cetera. De isto signaculo dicitur Cant. VIII, 6: *pone me ut signaculum super cor tuum*. Et II Tim. II, 19: *firmum fundamentum Dei stat, habens signaculum* et cetera.

Vel, secundum Chrysostomum, *signavit*, idest monstravit, *quia Deus*, scilicet pater, *verax est*, quia scilicet misit filium suum, quem promisit mittendum. Quod ideo dicit Evangelista ut ostendat eos qui non credunt Christo, veritatem patris negare.

Et ideo statim subdit divinae veritatis commendationem, dicens *quem enim misit Deus, verba Dei loquitur*; quasi dicat: hoc signavit, quod Christus, cuius testimonium accipit, *quem Deus misit, verba Dei loquitur*. et ideo qui credit ei, credit patri, infra VIII, 26: *ego quae audivi a patre loquor in mundo*. Unde non loquebatur nisi patrem, et verba patris; quia missus erat a patre, et quia ipse est verbum patris: unde etiam se loqui patrem dicit.

Vel si hoc quod dicit, *quod Deus verax est*, referatur ad Christum, datur intelligi distinctio personarum: cum enim pater sit Deus verax, et Christus est verax Deus; sequitur, quod verus Deus misit Deum verum, distinctum ab eo in persona, non in natura.

539 Man's obligation to the faith is to submit himself to divine truth, and so he says that if few accept his testimony that means that some do. Hence he says, **whoever accepts his testimony**, i.e., whoever he may be, **has given a sign**, i.e., he ought to affix a certain sign or has in fact placed a seal in his own heart, that Christ is God. And he [Christ] is true, because he said that he is God. If he were not, he would not be true, but it is written: "God is true" (Rom 3:4). Concerning this seal it is said: "Set me as a seal on your heart" (Sg 8:6), and "The foundation of God stands firm, bearing a seal, etc." as we read in 2 Timothy (2:19).

Or, following Chrysostom, he has given a sign, i.e., he has shown **that God**, that is, the Father, **is true**, because he sent his Son whom he promised to send. The Fvangelist says this to show that those who do not believe Christ deny the truthfulness of the Father.

540 Then immediately he adds a commendation of divine truth, saying, **For the One whom God sends speaks the words of God**. As if to say: He has given this as a sign, namely, that Christ, whose testimony he accepts, **the One whom God sends speaks the words of God**. Consequently, one who believes Christ believes the Father: "I speak to the world what I have heard from the Father" (below 8:26). So he expressed verbally nothing but the Father and the words of the Father, because he has been sent by the Father, and because he is the Word of the Father. Hence, he says that he even bespeaks the Father.

Or, if the statement **God is true** refers to Christ, we understand the distinction of persons; for since the Father is true God, and Christ is true God, it follows that the true God sent the true God, who is distinct from him in person, but not in nature.

Denuntiandi autem facultas subest Christo maxima, quia non ad mensuram recipit spiritum; et ideo dicit *non enim ad mensuram dat Deus spiritum*.

Posses enim dicere, quod licet miserit eum Deus, tamen non omnia a Deo loquitur, sed aliqua: nam et prophetae aliquando quidem locuti sunt ex spiritu suo, aliquando vero ex spiritu Dei. Sicut II Reg. VII, 3 legitur de Nathan propheta, quod ex spiritu suo loquens, consuluit David, quod aedificaret templum; quod quidem postmodum ex spiritu et nutu divino retractavit. Sed hoc ostendit Baptista locum non habere in Christo; quia prophetae quidem accipiunt spiritum Dei mensurate, scilicet quantum ad aliquid non quantum ad omnia, et ideo non quantum ad omnia verba Dei loquuntur; Christus autem, qui absque mensura et quantum ad omnia spiritum recepit, ideo quantum ad omnia verba Dei loquitur.

Sed quomodo spiritus sanctus datur ad mensuram, cum sit immensus, secundum Athanasium in suo symbolo: *immensus pater, immensus filius, immensus spiritus sanctus*? Responsio. Dicendum, quod spiritus sanctus datur ad mensuram, non quantum ad essentiam suam et virtutem eius, secundum quod est infinitus; sed quantum ad dona, quae dantur mensurate. Ephes. IV, 7: *unicuique nostrum data est gratia secundum mensuram*.

Notandum autem, quod hoc quod dicitur hic de Christo, quod non ad mensuram dedit ei Deus pater spiritum, potest dupliciter intelligi. Uno modo intelligitur de Christo secundum quod Deus; alio modo secundum quod homo. Ad hoc enim datur alicui aliquid ut habeat illud: habere autem spiritum sanctum, convenit Christo et in quantum Deus et in quantum homo; et sic secundum utrumque habet spiritum sanctum. Sed in quantum homo, habet spiritum sanctum ut sanctificantem; Is. LXI, 1: *spiritus domini super me, eo quod unxerit me*, scilicet hominem; in quantum vero Deus habet spiritum sanctum ut manifestantem tantum,

541 The ability to proclaim divine truth is present in Christ in the highest degree, because he does not receive the Spirit in a partial way; and so he says, **for God does not bestow the Spirit in fractions.**

You might say that although God sent Christ, yet not all that Christ says is from God, but only some of the things; for even the prophets spoke at times from their own spirit, and at other times from the Spirit of God. For example, we read that the prophet Nathan (2 Sm 7:3), speaking out of his own spirit, advised David to build a temple, but that later, under the influence of the Spirit of God, he retracted this. However, the Baptist shows that such is not the case with Christ. For the prophets receive the Spirit of God only fractionally, i.e., in reference to some things, but not as to all things. Consequently, not all they say are the words of God. But Christ, who received the Spirit fully and in regards to all things, speaks the words of God as to all things.

542 But how can the Holy Spirit be given in fractions, since he is immense or infinite, according to the Creed of Athanasius: "Immense is the Father, immense the Son, immense the Holy Spirit"? I answer that the Holy Spirit is given in fractions, not in respect to his essence or power, according to which he is infinite, but as to his gifts, which are given fractionally: "Grace has been given to each of us according to degree" (Eph 4:7).

543 We should note that we can understand in two ways what is said here, namely, that God the Father did not give the Spirit to Christ in a partial way. We can understand it as applying to Christ as God, and, in another way, as applying to Christ as man. Something is given to someone in order that he may have it: and it is appropriate to Christ to have the Spirit, both as God and as man. And so he has the Holy Spirit with respect to both. As man, Christ has the Holy Spirit as Sanctifier: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me" (Is 6 1:1), namely, as man. But as God, he has the Holy Spirit only as manifesting himself, inasmuch as the Spirit

secundum quod ab eo procedit. Io. XVI, 14: *ille clarificabit*, idest manifestabit, *quia de meo accipiet*.

Sic ergo utroque modo, scilicet in quantum Deus et in quantum homo, Christus habet spiritum sanctum non ad mensuram. Nam Christo, in quantum Deus, dicitur Deus pater dare spiritum sanctum, non ad mensuram, quia dat ei virtutem et potestatem spirandi spiritum sanctum, qui, cum sit infinitus, in infinitum dat ei pater: quem quidem pater dat ei sicut ipse habet, ut scilicet sicut ab eo procedit, ita et filio. Et hoc dedit ei per aeternam generationem. Similiter et Christus, in quantum homo, non ad mensuram habuit spiritum; nam hominibus datur spiritus sanctus ad mensuram, quia gratia eius ad mensuram eis datur; sed Christus in quantum homo non ad mensuram recepit gratiam: et ideo non ad mensuram recepit spiritum sanctum.

Sed notandum, quod in Christo est triplex gratia, scilicet unionis, singularis personae, quae est habitualis, et capitis, quae est influentiae; et quamlibet istarum recepit Christus non ad mensuram.

Nam gratia unionis, quae non est habitualis, sed quoddam gratuitum donum, datur Christo, ut scilicet in humana natura sit verus filius Dei non per participationem, sed per naturam, in quantum scilicet humana natura Christi unita filio Dei in persona sit: quae quidem unio gratia dicitur, quia nullis praecedentibus meritis hoc habuit. Natura autem divina infinita est: unde ex ipsa unione accepit donum infinitum. Sic ergo non ad mensuram recepit spiritum sanctum, idest donum et gratiam unionis, quae spiritui sancto attribuitur in quantum gratuita.

Gratia autem habitualis dicitur, secundum quod anima Christi plena fuit gratia et sapientia, secundum quod dicitur supra I, 14: *vidimus eum quasi unigenitum a patre, plenum gratiae* et cetera. De qua quidem

proceeds from him: “He will give glory to me,” that is, make known, “because he will have received from me,” as is said below (16:14).

Therefore, both as God and as man, Christ has the Holy Spirit beyond measure. For God the Father is said to give the Holy Spirit without measure to Christ as God, because he gives to Christ the power and might to bring forth (*spirandi*) the Holy Spirit, who, since he is infinite, was infinitely given to him by the Father: for the Father gives it just as he himself has it, so that the Holy Spirit proceeds from him as much as from the Son. And he gave him this by an everlasting generation. Similarly, Christ as man has the Holy Spirit without measure, for the Holy Spirit is given to different men in differing degrees, because grace is given to each “by measure” [cf., e.g., Mk 4:24; Mt 7:2]. But Christ as man did not receive a certain amount of grace; and so he did not receive the Holy Spirit in any limited degree.

544 It should be noted, however, that there are three kinds of grace in Christ: the grace of [the hypostatic] union, the grace of a singular person, which is habitual, and the grace of headship, which animates all the members. And Christ received each of these graces without measure.

The grace of union, which is not habitual grace, but a certain gratuitous gift, is given to Christ in order that in his human nature he be the true Son of God, not by participation, but by nature, insofar as the human nature of Christ is united to the Son of God in person. This union is called a grace because he had it without any preceding merits. Now the divine nature is infinite; hence from that union he received an infinite gift. Thus it was not by degree or measure that he received the Holy Spirit, i.e., the gift and grace of union which, as gratuitous, is attributed to the Holy Spirit.

His grace is termed habitual insofar as the soul of Christ was full of grace and wisdom: “the Only Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth” (above 1:14). We might wonder if Christ did receive this

gratia dubium esse potest, an recepit eam non ad mensuram. Cum enim huiusmodi gratia sit donum creatum, confiteri oportet quod habeat essentiam finitam: quod quidem quantum ad essentiam, secundum quod quid creatum est, ipsa gratia habitualis finita fuit.

Sed tamen Christus dicitur eam recepisse non ad mensuram, triplici ratione. Primo quidem ex parte recipientis. Manifestum est enim uniuscuiusque naturae capacitatem esse finitam: quia, etsi infinitum bonum recipere possit cognoscendo, et amando, et fruendo, tamen ipsum recipit fruendo finite. Est autem cuiuslibet creaturae, secundum suam speciem et naturam, determinata capacitatis mensura; quae tamen divinae potestati non praeiudicat quin posset aliam creaturam facere maioris capacitatis; sed iam non esset eiusdem naturae secundum speciem; sicut si ternario addatur unitas, erit alia species numeri. Quando igitur alicui naturae non datur de bonitate divina, quanta est capacitas naturalis speciei suae, videtur ei secundum aliquam mensuram donatum; quando vero tota naturalis capacitas impletur, non videtur ei secundum mensuram donatum; quia etsi sit mensura ex parte recipientis, non est tamen mensura ex parte dantis, qui totum paratus est dare: sicut aliquis vas ad fluvium deferens, absque mensura invenit ibi aquam paratam, quamvis ipse cum mensura accipiat, propter vasis determinatam quantitatem. Sic igitur gratia Christi habitualis, finita quidem est secundum essentiam, sed infinite, et non secundum mensuram dicitur dari, quia tantum ei datur quantum natura creata capere potest.

Secundo vero ex parte doni recepti. Nam omnis forma, seu actus secundum rationem suam consideratus, non est finitus eo modo quo, finitur per subiectum in quo recipitur; sed nihil prohibet illum secundum suam essentiam finitum esse, in quantum esse suum est in aliquo receptum. Illud enim secundum essentiam suam infinitum est, quod habet totam plenitudinem essendi: quod quidem soli Deo convenit, qui est summum esse. Si autem ponatur aliqua forma spiritualis esse non

grace without measure. For since such grace is a created gift, we must admit that it has a finite essence. Therefore, as far as its essence is concerned, since it is something created, this habitual grace was finite. Yet Christ is not said to have received this in a limited degree for three reasons.

First, because of the one who is receiving the grace. For it is plain that each thing's nature has a finite capacity, because even though one might receive an infinite good by knowing, loving and enjoying it, nevertheless one receives it by enjoying it in a finite way. Further, each creature has, according to its species and nature, a finite amount of capacity. But this does not make it impossible for the divine power to make another creature possessing a greater capacity; but then such a creature would not be of a nature which is specifically the same, just as when one is added to three, there is another species of number. Therefore, when some nature is not given as much of the divine goodness as its natural capacity is able to contain, then it is seen to be given to it by measure; but when its total natural capacity is filled, it is not given to it by measure, because even though there is a measure on the part of the one receiving, there is none on the part of the one giving, who is prepared to give all. Thus, if someone takes a pail to a river, he sees water present without measure, although he takes the water by measure on account of the limited dimensions of the pail. Thus, the habitual grace of Christ is indeed finite according to its essence, but it is said to be given in an infinite way and not by measure or partially, because as much was given to him as created nature was able to hold.

Secondly, Christ did not receive habitual grace in a limited way by considering the gift which is received. For every form or act, considered in its very nature, is not finite in the way in which it is made finite by the subject in which it is received. Nevertheless, there is nothing to prevent it from being finite in its essence, insofar as its existence (*esse*) is received in some subject. For that is infinite according to its essence which has the entire fulness of being

in subiecto existens, puta albedo, vel color, non quidem haberet essentiam infinitam, quia essentia eius esset determinata ad genus, vel speciem; nihilominus tamen totam plenitudinem illius speciei possideret: unde secundum rationem speciei, absque termino, vel mensura esset, habens quicquid ad illam speciem pertinere potest. Si autem in aliquo subiecto recipiatur albedo, vel color, non habet semper totum quicquid pertinet ad rationem formae huius de necessitate et semper, sed solum quando sic habetur sicut perfecte haberi potest; ita scilicet quod modus habendi adaequet rei habitae potestatem. Sic igitur gratia Christi habitualis, finita quidem fuit secundum essentiam; sed tamen dicitur absque termino et mensuram fuisse, quia quicquid ad rationem gratiae poterat pertinere, totum Christus accepit. Alii autem non totum accipiunt; sed unus sic, et alius sic. *Divisiones enim gratiarum sunt.* I Cor. XII, 4.

Tertio autem ex parte causae. In causa enim quodammodo habetur effectus. Cuicumque ergo adest causa infinitae virtutis ad influendum, dicitur habere illud quod influitur, absque mensura, et aliquo modo infinite. Puta, si quis haberet fontem, qui aquam infinitam posset effluere, infinite diceretur et absque mensura aquam habere. Sic anima Christi, infinitam et absque mensuram gratiam habet, ex hoc ipso quod habet verbum sibi unitum, quod est totius emanationis creaturarum infinitum et indeficiens principium.

Patet autem ex his quae dicta sunt, quod gratia ipsius Christi, quae dicitur capitis, secundum quod Christus est caput Ecclesiae, est infinita quantum ad influentiam. Ex hoc enim quod habuit unde effunderet absque mensura spiritus dona, accepit virtutem effundendi ipsa absque mensura, ut scilicet gratia Christi non solum sufficiat ad salutem

(*essendi*): and this is true of God alone, who is the supreme esse. But if we consider some “spiritual” form as not existing in a subject, for example, whiteness or color, it would not be infinite in essence, because its essence would be confined to some genus or species; nevertheless it would still possess the entire fulness of that species. Thus, considering the nature of the species, it would be without limit or measure, since it would have everything that can pertain to that species. But if whiteness or color should be received into some subject, it does not always have everything that pertains necessarily and always to the nature of this form, but only when the subject has it as perfectly as it is capable of being possessed, i.e., when the way the subject possesses it is equivalent to the power of the thing possessed. Thus, Christ’s habitual grace was finite according to its essence; yet it is said to have been in him without a limit or measure because he received everything that could pertain to the nature of grace. Others, however, do not receive all this, but one receives in one way, and another in another way: “There are different graces”

The third reason for saying that the habitual grace of Christ was not received in a limited way is based on its cause. For an effect is in some way present in its cause. Therefore, if someone has an infinite power to produce something, he is said to have what can be produced without measure and, in a way, infinitely. For example, if someone has a fountain which could produce an infinite amount of water, he would be said to have water in an infinite way and without measure. Thus, the soul of Christ has infinite grace and grace without measure from the fact that he has united to himself the Word, which is the infinite and unfailing source of the entire emanation of all created things.

From what has been said, it is clear that the grace of Christ which is called capital grace, insofar as he is head of the Church, is infinite in its influence. For from the fact that he possessed that from which the gifts of the Spirit could flow out without measure, he received the power to pour them out without measure, so that the grace of Christ

hominum aliquorum, sed hominum totius mundi, secundum illud I Io. II, 2: *ipse est propitiatio pro peccatis nostris, et non pro nostris tantum, sed etiam totius mundi, ac etiam plurium mundorum, si essent.*

Habet etiam Christus denuntiandi veritatem divinam opportunam facultatem, quia omnia sunt in potestate eius; unde dicit *pater diligit filium, et omnia dedit in manu eius*: quod quidem potest referri ad Christum secundum quod homo, et secundum quod Deus; sed aliter et aliter. Si enim referatur ad Christum, secundum naturam divinam, tunc *diligit* non designat principium, sed signum: non enim possumus dicere quod pater omnia filio dat, quia diligit eum, propter duo. Primo, diligere est actus voluntatis; dare autem naturam filio, est generare ipsum. Si ergo pater daret voluntate naturam filio, voluntas patris esset principium generationis filii; et sic sequeretur quod pater generaret filium voluntate, et non natura: quod est haeresis Ariana.

Secundo autem, quia dilectio patris ad filium est spiritus sanctus. Si ergo dilectio patris ad filium esset ratio quare dedit omnia pater in manu filii, sequeretur quod spiritus sanctus esset principium generationis filii; quod est inconveniens. Dicendum est ergo, quod *ly diligit* importat signum tantum, ut dicatur, quod dilectio perfecta, qua *pater diligit filium*, est signum quod pater *dedit omnia in manu eius*, quae scilicet pater habet. Matth. XI, 27: *omnia mihi tradita sunt a patre meo*. Infra XIII, 3: *sciens quia omnia dedit ei pater in manus*.

Si referatur autem ad Christum, secundum quod homo, sic *ly diligit* dicit rationem principii, ut dicatur pater omnia in manu filii tradidisse, scilicet quae in caelis et quae in terris sunt, secundum illud Matth. ult., 18: *data est mihi omnis potestas in caelo et in terra*. Hebr. I, 2: *quem constituit heredem universorum*. Et huius traditionis ratio est, quia diligit eum; unde dicit *pater diligit filium*: dilectio enim patris ratio est creandi

is sufficient not merely for the salvation of some men, but for all the people of the entire world: “He is the offering for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for those of the entire world” (1 Jn 2:2), and even for many worlds, if they existed.

545 Christ also had the ability appropriate for declaring divine truth, because all things are in his power; hence he says, **The Father loves the Son, and has put everything into his hands**. This can refer to Christ both as man and as God, but in different ways. If it refers to Christ according to his divine nature, then **loves** does not indicate a principle but a sign: for we cannot say that the Father gives all things to the Son because he loves him. There are two reasons for this. First, because to love is an act of the will; but to give a nature to the Son is to generate him. Therefore, if the Father gave a nature to the Son by his will, the will of the Father would be the principle of the generation of the Son; and then it would follow that the Father generated the Son by will, and not by nature; and this is the Arian heresy.

Secondly, because the love of the Father for the Son is the Holy Spirit. So, if the love of the Father for the Son were the reason why the Father put everything into his hands, it would follow that the Holy Spirit would be the principle of the generation of the Son; and this is not acceptable. Therefore, we should say that **loves** implies only a sign. As if to say: The perfect love with which **the Father loves the Son**, is a sign that the Father **has put everything into his hands**, i.e., everything which the Father has: “All things have been given to me by my Father (Mt 11:27); “Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands” (below 13:3).

But if **loves** refers to Christ as man, then it implies the notion of a principle, so that the Father is said to have put everything into the hands of the Son, everything, that is, that is in heaven and on earth: “All authority has been given to me, in heaven and on earth,” as he says in Matthew (28:18); “He has appointed him [the Son] the heir of all things” (Heb 1:2). And the reason why the Father gives to the Son

quamlibet creaturam. Sap. XI, 25: *diligis omnia quae sunt, et nihil odisti eorum quae fecisti*. De dilectione autem filii habetur Lc. c. III, et Matth. III, 17: *hic est filius meus dilectus, in quo complacui mihi*. Et Coloss. I, v. 13: *transtulit nos in regnum filii dilectionis suae*, idest filii sui dilecti.

Consequenter cum dicit *qui credit in filium, habet vitam aeternam*, ostendit fructum fidei: et primo ponit fidei praemium; secundo infidelitatis supplicium, ibi *qui autem incredulus est et cetera*.

Sed praemium fidei est inaestimabile, quia vita aeterna; et ideo dicit *qui credit in filium habet vitam aeternam*. Et hoc ex praemissis ostenditur. Si pater omnia dedit filio, scilicet quae habet, et ipse habet vitam aeternam: ergo et filio dedit ut sit vita aeterna. Infra V, 26: *sicut pater habet vitam in semetipso, sic dedit et filio habere vitam in semetipso*: quod quidem competit Christo in quantum est verus et naturalis Dei filius. I Io. ult., v. 20: *ut sitis in vero filio eius Christo: hic est verus Deus, et vita aeterna*. Qui credit in eum habet illud in quod tendit, scilicet ipsum filium in quem credit; sed ipse est vita aeterna: ergo qui credit in eum, habet vitam aeternam. Infra X, 17: *oves meae vocem meam audiunt (...) et ego vitam aeternam do eis*.

Supplicium autem infidelitatis est intolerabile et quantum ad poenam damni, et quantum ad poenam sensus. Quantum quidem ad poenam damni, quia privatur vita; unde dicit *qui autem incredulus est filio, non videbit vitam*. Non autem dicit non habebit sed *non videbit*: quia vita aeterna in visione verae vitae consistit. Infra XVII, 3: *haec est vita aeterna, ut cognoscant te solum Deum verum, et quem misisti Iesum Christum*: quam quidem visionem et cognitionem increduli non habebunt; Iob XX, v. 17: *non videat rivulos lactis etc.*, idest dulcedinem

is because he loves the Son; hence he says, **The Father loves the Son**, for the Father's love is the reason for creating each creature: "You love everything which exists, and hate nothing which you have made" (Wis 11:25). Concerning his love for the Son we read in Matthew (3:17): "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased"; "He has brought us into the kingdom of the Son of his love," that is, i.e., of his beloved Son (Col 1:13).

546 Then when he says, **Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life**, he shows the fruit of faith. First, he sets forth the reward for faith. Secondly, the penalty for unbelief (v 36b).

547 The reward for faith is beyond our comprehension, because it is eternal life. Hence he says, **Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life**. And this is shown from what has already been said. For if the Father has given everything he has to the Son, and the Father has eternal life, then he has given to the Son to be eternal life: "Just as the Father possesses life in himself, so he has given it to the Son to have life in himself" (below 5:26): and this belongs to Christ insofar as he is the true and natural Son of God. "That you may be in his true Son, Christ. This is the true God and eternal life" (1 Jn 5:20). **Whoever believes in the Son** has that toward which he tends, that is, the Son, in whom he believes. But the Son is eternal life; therefore, whoever believes in him has eternal life. As it says below (10:27): "My sheep hear my voice ... and I give them eternal life."

548 The penalty for unbelief is unendurable, both as to the punishment of loss and as to the punishment of sense. As to the punishment of loss, because it deprives one of life; hence he says, **whoever is unbelieving in the Son will not see life**. He does not say, "will not have," but will not see, because eternal life consists in the vision of the true life: "This is eternal life: that they may know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom you have sent" (below 17:3): and unbelievers will not have this vision and this knowledge: "Let him not see the brooks of honey" (Jb 4:19), that is,

vitae aeternae. Dicit autem *non videbit*, quia videre vitam ipsam, est proprium praemium fidei formatae.

Quantum vero ad poenam sensus, quia graviter punitur; unde dicit *sed ira Dei manet super eum*. Ira enim in Scripturis pro afflictione qua Deus malos punit, accipitur; unde cum dicit *ira Dei patris manet super eum*, idem est ac si dicat: sentient poenam a Deo patre.

Et licet pater *omne iudicium dederit filio*, ut dicitur infra V, 22 tamen Baptista refert hoc ad patrem, intendens per hoc Iudaeos reducere ad credendum filio. Et de isto iudicio dicitur Hebr. X, 31: *horrendum est incidere in manus Dei viventis*. Dicit autem *manet super eum*, quia ista poena numquam ab incredulis desistet; et quia omnes qui nascuntur in ista vita mortali, habent secum iram Dei, quam accepit primus Adam. Eph. II, 3: *eramus natura*, idest per nativitatem, *filii irae*. Ab hac autem ira non liberamur nisi per fidem Christi; et ideo qui non credunt in Christum filium Dei, manet in eis ira Dei.

the sweetness of eternal life. And he says, **will not see**, because to see life itself is the proper reward for faith united with love.

The punishment of sense is unendurable because one is severely punished; so he says: **the anger of God rests on him**. For in the Scriptures anger indicates the pain with which God punishes those who are evil. So when he says, the anger of God, the Father, rests on him, it is the same as saying: They will feel punishment from God the Father.

Although the Father “has given all judgment to the Son,” as we read below (5:22), the Baptist refers this to the Father in order to lead the Jews to believe in the Son. It is written about this judgment: “It is a terrible thing to fall into the hands of the living God” (Heb 10:31). He says, **rests on him**, because this punishment will never be absent from the unbelieving, and because all who are born into this mortal life are the objects of God’s anger, which was first felt by Adam: “We were by nature,” that is, through birth, “children of anger” (Eph 2:3). And we are freed from this anger only by faith in Christ; and so the anger of God rests on those who do not believe in Christ, the Son of God.