

COMMENTARY ON
THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN

St. Thomas Aquinas

Lectio 7

14 καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν,

Posita necessitate adventus verbi in carnem et etiam utilitate, consequenter Evangelista modum veniendi manifestat dicens *et verbum caro factum est*. Et secundum hoc continuatur ad hoc quod dixerat: *in propria venit*; quasi dicat: verbum Dei *in propria venit*. Sed ne credas ipsum venisse, locum mutando, ostendit modum quo venit, scilicet per incarnationem: eo enim modo venit, quo missus est a patre, a quo missus est, in quantum factus est caro. Gal. IV, 4: *misit Deus filium suum, factum ex muliere* etc., ubi dicit Augustinus: eo missum, quo factum.

Secundum Chrysostomum autem continuatur ad illud *dedit eis potestatem* etc.; quasi dicat: si quaeris unde potuit dare hanc potestatem hominibus, ut filii Dei fierent, respondet Evangelista *quia verbum caro factum est*, dedit nobis quod possemus filii Dei fieri. Gal. IV, 5: *misit Deus filium suum, ut adoptionem filiorum Dei reciperemus*.

Secundum vero Augustinum continuatur sic ad hoc quod dixerat *sed ex Deo nati sunt*: quasi enim dure videbatur, ut homines ex Deo nascerentur, ideo quasi in argumentum huius dicti, ut scilicet verbum esse credatur, subdit Evangelista illud de quo minus videtur, scilicet quod *verbum caro factum est*.

LECTURE 7

14a And the Word was made flesh, and made his dwelling among us.

165 Having explained the necessity for the Word's coming in the flesh as well as the benefits this conferred, the Evangelist now shows the way he came (v 14a). He thus resumes the thread with his earlier statement, **he came unto his own**. As if to say: The Word of God came unto his own. But lest anyone suppose that he came by changing his location, he shows the manner in which he came, that is, by an incarnation. For he came in the manner in which he was sent by the Father, by whom he was sent, i.e., he was made flesh. "God sent his Son made from a woman" (Gal 4:4). And Augustine says about this that "He was sent in the manner in which he was made."

According to Chrysostom, however, he is here continuing the earlier statement, **he gave them power to become the sons of God**. As if to say: If you wonder how he was able to give this power to men, i.e., that they become sons of God, the Evangelist answers: because **the Word was made flesh**, he made it possible for us to be made sons of God. "God sent his Son ... so that we might receive our adoption as sons" (Gal 4:5).

But according to Augustine, he is continuing the earlier statement, **who are born from God**. For since it seemed a hard saying that men be born from God, then, as though arguing in support of this and to produce belief in the existence of the Word, the Evangelist adds something which seems less seemly, namely, that **the Word was made flesh**. As if to say: Do not wonder

Quasi dicat: ne mireris si homines ex Deo sunt nati, quia *verbum caro factum est*, idest Deus factus est homo.

Notandum quod hoc quod dicitur *verbum caro factum est*, quidam male intelligentes, sumpserunt occasionem erroris. Quidam namque posuerunt verbum ita carnem factum esse ac si ipsum vel aliquid eius sit in carnem conversum, sicut cum farina fit panis, et aer ignis. Et hic fuit Eutiches, qui posuit commixtionem naturarum in Christo, dicens in eo eandem fuisse Dei et hominis naturam. Sed huius opinionis falsitas manifeste apparet, quia, sicut est dictum supra, *verbum erat Deus*. Deus autem immutabilis est, ut dicitur Mal. III, 6: *ego Deus, et non mutor*, unde nullo modo potest esse quod in aliam naturam convertatur. Est ergo dicendum contra Eutichem *verbum caro factum est*: verbum carnem assumpsit, non quod ipsum verbum sit ipsa caro; sicut si dicamus: homo factus est albus, non quod ipse sit ipsa albedo, sed quod albedinem assumpsit.

Fuerunt etiam alii qui, licet crederent verbum non in carnem mutatum sed quod eam assumpsit, tamen dixerunt ipsum assumpsisse carnem sine anima; nam si carnem animatam assumpsisset, dixisset Evangelista: *verbum caro cum anima factum est*. Et sic fuit error Arii, qui dixit quod in Christo non erat anima, sed verbum Dei erat ibi loco animae.

Et huius positionis falsitas apparet, tum quia repugnat sacrae Scripturae, quae in pluribus locis mentionem facit de anima Christi, sicut illud Matth. XXVI, 38: *tristis est anima mea usque ad mortem*; tum etiam quia quaedam passiones animae recitantur de Christo, quae in verbo Dei nullo modo esse possunt, nec etiam in carne sola, sicut illud Matth. XXVI, 37: *coepit Iesus taedere, et maestus esse*; tum etiam quia Deus non potest esse forma alicuius corporis; nec etiam Angelus corpori uniri potest per modum formae, cum secundum naturam a corpore sit separatus; anima autem unitur corpori sicut forma. Non igitur verbum Dei corporis forma esse potest.

if men are born from God, because **the Word was made flesh**, i.e., God became man.

166 It should be noted that this statement, **the Word was made flesh**, has been misinterpreted by some and made the occasion of error. For certain ones have presumed that the Word became flesh in the sense that he or something of him was turned into flesh, as when flour is made into bread, and air becomes fire. One of these was Eutyches, who postulated a mixture of natures in Christ, saying that in him the nature of God and of man was the same. We can clearly see that this is false because, as was said above, “the Word was God.” Now God is immutable, as is said, “I am the Lord, and I do not change” (Mal 3:6). Hence in no way can it be said that he was turned into another nature. Therefore, one must say in opposition to **Eutyches, the Word was made flesh**, i.e., the Word assumed flesh, but not in the sense that the Word himself is that flesh. It is as if we were to say: “The man became white,” not that he is that whiteness, but that he assumed whiteness.

167 There were others who, although they believed that the Word was not changed into flesh but assumed it, nevertheless said that he assumed flesh without a soul; for if he had assumed flesh with a soul, the Evangelist would have said, “the Word was made flesh with a soul.” This was the error of Arius, who said that there was no soul in Christ, but that the Word of God was there in place of a soul.

The falsity of this opinion is obvious, both because it is in conflict with Sacred Scripture, which often mentions the soul of Christ, as: “My soul is sad, even to the point of death” (Mt 26:38), and because certain affections of the soul are observed in Christ which can not possibly exist in the Word of God or in flesh alone: “He began to be sorrowful and troubled” (Mt 26:37). Also, God cannot be the form of a body. Nor can an angel be united to a body as its form, since an angel, according to its very nature, is separated from body, whereas a soul is united to a body as its form. Consequently, the Word of God cannot be the form of a body.

Praeterea, constat quod caro non sortitur speciem carnis, nisi per animam: quod patet, quia recedente anima a corpore hominis, seu bovis, caro hominis vel bovis, non dicitur caro nisi aequivoce. Si ergo verbum non assumpsit carnem animatam, manifestum est quod non assumpsit carnem. Sed *verbum caro factum est*; ergo carnem animatam assumpsit.

Fuerunt autem alii, qui, ex hoc moti, dixerunt verbum carnem quidem animatam assumpsisse, sed anima sensitiva tantum, non intellectiva, loco cuius in corpore Christi dixerunt verbum esse. Et hic fuit error Apollinaris, qui quandoque Arium secutus est, tandem propter auctoritates praedictas coactus fuit ponere aliquam animam in Christo, quae posset harum passionum esse subiectum, ita tamen quod ratione et intellectu careret sed loco horum verbum esset in homine Christo.

Sed hoc manifeste apparet esse falsum, quia repugnat auctoritati sacrae Scripturae, in qua quaedam dicuntur de Christo, quae nec in divinitate, nec in anima sensitiva, nec in carne inveniri possunt: sicut illud quod admiratus est, ut dicitur Matth. VIII, 10; admiratio autem est passio animae rationalis et intellectivae, cum sit desiderium cognoscendi causam occultam effectus visi. Sic igitur, sicut tristitia cogit in Christo ponere partem animae sensitivam, contra Arium, ita admiratio cogit ponere in ipso partem animae intellectivam, contra Apollinarem.

Idem etiam apparet per rationem. Sicut enim non est caro sine anima, ita non est vera caro humana sine anima humana, quae est anima intellectiva. Si ergo verbum assumpsit carnem animatam anima sensitiva tantum, et non rationali, non assumpsit carnem humanam: et ita non poterit dici: Deus factus est homo.

Praeterea ad hoc verbum humanam naturam assumpsit, ut eam repararet. Ergo id reparavit quod assumpsit. Si ergo non assumpsit animam rationalem, non reparasset eam: et sic nullus fructus proveniret nobis ex verbi incarnatione,

Furthermore, it is plain that flesh does not acquire the specific nature of flesh except through its soul. This is shown by the fact that when the soul has withdrawn from the body of a man or a cow, the flesh of the man or the cow is called flesh only in an equivocal sense. So if the Word did not assume flesh with a soul, it is obvious that he did not assume flesh. **But the Word was made flesh**; therefore, he assumed flesh with a soul.

168 And there were others who, influenced by this, said that the Word did indeed assume flesh with a soul, but this soul was only a sensitive soul, not an intellectual one; the Word took the place of the intellectual soul in Christ's body. This was the error of Apollinaris. He followed Arius for a time, but later in the face of the [scriptural] authorities cited above, was forced to admit a soul in Christ which could be the subject of these emotions. But he said this soul lacked reason and intellect, and that in the man Christ their place was taken by the Word.

This too is obviously false, because it conflicts with the authority of Sacred Scripture in which certain things are said of Christ that cannot be found in his divinity, nor in a sensitive soul, nor in flesh alone; for example, that Christ marvelled, as in Matthew (8:10). For to marvel or wonder is a state which arises in a rational and intellectual soul when a desire arises to know the hidden cause of an observed effect. Therefore, just as sadness compels one to place a sensitive element in the soul of Christ, against Arius, so marvelling or amazement forces one to admit, against Apollinaris, an intellectual element in Christ.

The same conclusion can be reached by reason. For as there is no flesh without a soul, so there is no human flesh without a human soul, which is an intellectual soul. So if the Word assumed flesh which was animated with a merely sensitive soul to the exclusion of a rational soul, he did not assume human flesh; consequently, one could not say: "God became man."

Besides, the Word assumed human nature in order to repair it. Therefore, he repaired what he assumed. But if he did not assume a rational soul, he would not have repaired it. Consequently, no fruit would have accrued to us from

quod falsum est. *Verbum ergo caro factum est*, idest carnem animatam anima rationali assumpsit.

Sed forte dicis: si verbum carnem sic animatam assumpsit, quare Evangelista de anima rationali mentionem non fecit, sed de carne solum dicens *verbum caro factum est*? Respondeo dicendum quod propter quatuor rationes Evangelista hoc fecit.

Primo ad ostendendum veritatem incarnationis contra Manichaeos, qui dicebant verbum non assumpsisse veram carnem, sed phantasticam tantum, cum non esset conveniens ut boni Dei verbum assumeret carnem, quam ipsi dicebant Diaboli creaturam. Et ideo Evangelista, ut hoc excluderet, fecit de carne specialiter mentionem; sicut et Christus, Lc. XXIV, 39, existimantibus discipulis eum esse phantasma, veritatem resurrectionis ostendit, dicens: *spiritus carnem et ossa non habet, sicut me videtis habere*.

Secundo ad demonstrandam Dei erga nos magnitudinem benignitatis. Constat enim quod anima rationalis magis conformis est Deo quam caro, et quidem magnum pietatis sacramentum fuisset si verbum assumpsisset animam humanam, utpote sibi conformem, sed assumere etiam carnem elongatam a simplicitate suae naturae, fuit multo amplioris, immo inaestimabilis pietatis indicium; secundum quod apostolus dicit I ad Tim. III, 16: *et manifeste magnum est pietatis sacramentum, quod manifestatum est in carne*. Et ideo ut hoc ostenderet Evangelista, solum de carne mentionem fecit.

Tertio ad demonstrandam veritatem et singularitatem unionis in Christo. Aliis enim hominibus sanctis unitur quidem Deus, quantum ad animam solum; unde dicitur Sap. VII, v. 27: *per nationes in animas sanctas se transfert, amicos Dei et prophetas constituens*. Sed quod verbum Dei uniretur carni, hoc est singulare in Christo, secundum illud in Ps. CXL, 10: *singulariter sum ego donec transeam*; Iob XXVIII, 17: *non adaequabitur ei aurum*. Hanc ergo singularitatem unionis in Christo ostendere volens Evangelista, de carne solum mentionem fecit, dicens *verbum caro factum est*.

the incarnation of the Word; and this is false. **Therefore, the Word was made flesh**, i.e., assumed flesh which was animated by a rational soul.

169 But you may say: If the Word did assume flesh with such a soul, why did the Evangelist not mention “rational soul,” instead of only “flesh,” saying, **the Word was made flesh**? I answer that the Evangelist had four reasons for doing this.

First, to show the truth of the incarnation against the Manichaeans, who said that the Word did not assume true flesh, but only imaginary flesh, since it would not have been becoming for the Word of the good God to assume flesh, which they regarded as a creature of the devil. And so to exclude this the Evangelist made special mention of the flesh, just as Christ showed the truth of the resurrection to the disciples when they took him for a spirit, saying: “A spirit does not have flesh and bones, as you see that I have” (Lk 24:39).

Secondly, to show the greatness of God’s kindness to us. For it is evident that the rational soul has a greater conformity to God than does flesh, and that it would have been a great sign of compassion if the Word had assumed a human soul, as being conformed to himself. But to assume flesh too, which is something far removed from the simplicity of his nature, was a sign of a much greater, indeed, of an incomprehensible compassion. As the Apostle says (1 Tim 3:16): “Obviously great is the mystery of godliness which appeared in the flesh.” And so to indicate this, the Evangelist mentioned only flesh.

Thirdly, to demonstrate the truth and uniqueness of the union in Christ. For God is indeed united to other holy men, but only with respect to their soul; so it is said: “She [wisdom] passes into holy souls, making them friends of God and prophets” (Wis 7:27). But that the Word of God is united to flesh is unique to Christ, according to the Psalmist: “I am alone until I pass” (Ps 140:10). “Gold cannot equal it” (Jb 28:17). So the Evangelist, wishing to show the uniqueness of the union in Christ, mentioned only the flesh, saying, **the Word was made flesh**.

Quarto ad insinuandam congruitatem humanae reparationis. Homo enim per carnem infirmabatur, et ideo Evangelista volens insinuare adventum verbi congruum esse nostrae reparationi, mentionem de carne specialiter fecit, ut ostenderet quod caro infirma per carnem verbi reparata fuit; et hoc est quod apostolus dicit, Rom. VIII, 3: *nam quod impossibile erat legi, in quo infirmabatur per carnem, Deus filium suum mittens in similitudinem carnis peccati, et de peccato damnavit peccatum in carne.*

Sed quaeritur, quare Evangelista non dixit verbum carnem assumpsit, sed potius *verbum caro factum est*. Respondeo dicendum, quod hoc ideo fecit, ut excluderet errorem Nestorii, qui dixit in Christo fuisse duas personas, et duos filios, et alium esse filium virginis: unde non concedebat quod beata virgo esset mater Dei.

Sed secundum hoc Deus non esset factus homo; quia impossibile est quod duorum singularium, quae diversa sunt secundum suppositum, unum praedicetur de alio. Unde si alia est persona verbi, seu suppositum, et alia persona hominis, seu suppositum in Christo, tunc non erit verum quod dicit Evangelista *verbum caro factum est*. Ad hoc enim fit aliquid, ut sit; si ergo verbum non esset homo, non posset dici quod verbum sit factum homo. Et ideo signanter Evangelista dixit *factum est*, et non dixit assumpsit, ut ostendat quod unio verbi ad carnem non est talis qualis est assumptio prophetarum, qui non assumebantur in unitatem suppositi, sed ad actum propheticum: sed est talis quod Deum vere faceret hominem, et hominem Deum, idest quod Deus esset homo.

Fuerunt et alii, qui non intelligentes modum incarnationis, posuerunt quidem assumptionem praedictam esse terminatam ad veritatem personae, confitentes in Deo unam personam Dei et hominis; sed tamen dicunt in ipso fuisse duas hypostases, sive duo supposita, unum naturae humanae creatum, et temporale, aliud divinae increatum, et aeternum. Et talis est prima opinio quae ponitur III Sent. dist. VI.

Fourthly, to suggest its relevance to man's restoration For man was weak because of the flesh. And thus the Evangelist, wishing to suggest that the coming of the Word was suited to the task of our restoration, made special mention of the flesh in order to show that the weak flesh was repaired by the flesh of the Word. And this is what the Apostle says: "The law was powerless because it was weakened by the flesh. God, sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and in reparation for sin, condemned sin in his flesh" (Rom 83).

170 A question arises as to why the Evangelist did not say that the Word assumed flesh, but rather that **the Word was made flesh**. I answer that he did this to exclude the error of Nestorius. He said that in Christ there were two persons and two sons, [one being the Son of God] the other being the son of the Virgin. Thus he did not admit that the Blessed Virgin was the mother of God.

But if this were so, it would mean that God did not become man, for one particular *suppositum* cannot be predicated of another. Accordingly, if the person or *suppositum* of the Word is different than the person or *suppositum* of the man, in Christ, then what the Evangelist says is not true, namely, **the Word was made flesh**. For a thing is made or becomes something in order to be it; if, then, the Word is not man, it could not be said that the Word became man. And so the Evangelist expressly said was made, and not "assumed," to show that the union of the Word to flesh is not such as was the "lifting up" of the prophets, who were not "taken up" into a unity of person, but for the prophetic act. This union is such as would truly make God man and man God, i.e., that God would be man.

171 There were some, too, who, misunderstanding the manner of the incarnation, did indeed admit that the aforesaid assumption was terminated at a oneness of person, acknowledging in God one person of God and man. But they said that in him there were two hypostases, i.e., two *supposita*; one of a human nature, created and non-eternal, 'and the other of the divine nature, non-created and eternal. This is the first opinion presented in the *Sentences* (III, d6).

Sed secundum hanc opinionem non habet veritatem ista propositio: Deus factus est homo, et homo factus est Deus. Et ideo haec opinio damnata est tamquam haeretica in quinto Concilio, ubi dicitur: si quis in domino Iesu Christo unam personam, et duas hypostases dixerit, anathema sit. Et ideo Evangelista, ut omnem assumptionem excluderet, quae non terminatur ad unitatem personae, utitur hoc verbo *factum est*.

Si vero quaeris quomodo verbum est homo, dicendum quod eo modo est homo quo quicumque alius est homo, scilicet habens humanam naturam. Non quod verbum sit ipsa humana natura, sed est divinum suppositum unitum humanae naturae. Hoc autem quod dicitur *verbum caro factum est*, non aliquam mutationem in verbo, sed solum in natura assumpta de novo in unitatem personae divinae dicit. *Et verbum caro factum est*, per unionem ad carnem. Unio autem relatio quaedam est. Relationes autem de novo dictae de Deo in respectu ad creaturas, non important mutationem ex parte Dei, sed ex parte creaturae novo modo se habentis ad Deum.

Sequitur *et habitavit in nobis*; quod quidem dupliciter distinguitur a praemissis. Primo ut dicatur quod supra Evangelista egit de verbi incarnatione, dicens *verbum caro factum est*; hic vero modum incarnationis insinuat, dicens *et habitavit in nobis*. Secundum enim Chrysostomum et Hilarium, per hoc quod Evangelista dicit *verbum caro factum est*, posset aliquis intelligere quod sit conversum in carnem, et non sint in Christo duae naturae distinctae, sed una tantum natura ex humana et divina commixta; ideo Evangelista hoc excludens, subiunxit *et habitavit in nobis*, idest in nostra natura, ut tamen in sua maneret distinctum. Illud enim quod in aliquid convertitur, non manet ab eo in quod convertitur secundum naturam distinctum;

quod autem ab aliquo non distinguitur, non inhabitat illud; quia habitare distinctionem inhabitantis et in quo habitat importat. Sed verbum habitavit in nostra natura ergo naturaliter est ab ipsa distinctum. Et ideo in quantum humana natura a natura verbi fuit in Christo distincta, dicitur habitaculum divinitatis et templum, iuxta illud infra II, 21: *hoc autem dicebat de templo corporis sui*.

According to this opinion the proposition, “God was made man and man was made God,” is not true. Consequently, this opinion was condemned as heretical by the Fifth Council, where it is said: “If anyone shall assert one person and two hypostases in the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema.” And so the Evangelist, to exclude any assumption not terminated at a oneness of person, says, was made.

172 If you ask how the Word is man, it must be said that he is man in the way that anyone is, man, namely, as having human nature. Not that the Word is human nature itself, but he is a divine *suppositum* united to a human nature. The statement, **the Word was made flesh**, does not indicate any change in the Word, but only in the nature newly assumed into the oneness of a divine person. **And the Word was made flesh** through a union to flesh. Now a union is a relation. And relations newly said of God with respect to creatures do not imply a change on the side of God, but on the side of the creature relating in a new way to God.

173 Now follows, **and made his dwelling among us**. This is distinguished in two ways from what went before. The first consists in stating that above the Evangelist dealt with the incarnation of the Word when he said, **the Word was made flesh**; but now he touches on the manner of the incarnation, saying, **and made his dwelling among us**. For according to Chrysostom and Hilary, by the Evangelist saying **the Word was made flesh**, someone might think that he was converted into flesh and that there are not two distinct natures in Christ, but only one nature compounded from the human and divine natures. And so the Evangelist, excluding this, added, **and made his dwelling among us**, i.e., in our nature, yet so as to remain distinct in his own. For what is converted into something does not remain distinct in its nature from that into which it is converted.

Furthermore, something which is not distinct from another does not dwell in it, because to dwell implies a distinction between the dweller and that in which it dwells. But the Word dwelt in our nature; therefore, he is distinct in nature from it. And so, inasmuch as human nature was distinct from the nature of the Word in Christ, the former is called the dwelling place and

Et quidem, quamvis a praedictis sanctis hoc sane dicatur, cavenda est tamen calumnia quam aliqui ex hoc incurrunt. Nam antiqui doctores et sancti, emergentes errores circa fidem ita persequabantur, ut interdum viderentur in errores labi contrarios; sicut Augustinus contra Manichaeos, qui destruebant libertatem arbitrii, taliter disputat, quod videtur in haeresim Pelagii incidisse. Hoc igitur modo Evangelista Ioannes, ne per hoc quod dixerat *verbum caro factum est*, intelligeretur in Christo confusio vel transmutatio naturarum, subiunxit *et habitavit in nobis*:

ex quo verbo Nestorius occasionem sumens erroris, dixit, filium Dei sic esse unitum homini ut tamen Dei et hominis non esset una persona: voluit enim quod verbum per solam inhabitationem per gratiam fuerit humanae naturae unitum. Ex hoc autem sequitur quod filius Dei non sit homo.

Ad quorum evidentiam sciendum est quod in Christo duo considerare possumus, scilicet naturam et personam. Secundum naturam autem attenditur in Christo distinctio, non secundum personam, quae una et eadem est in duabus naturis; quia humana natura in Christo fuit assumpta in unitatem personae. Inhabitatio ergo, quam ponunt sancti, referenda est ad naturam, ut dicatur quod *habitavit in nobis*, idest natura verbi inhabitavit naturam nostram, non secundum hypostasim seu personam, quae est eadem utriusque naturae in Christo.

Quod autem blasphematur Nestorius, auctoritate sacrae Scripturae evidenter refellitur. Apostolus enim Phil. II, 6 unionem Dei et hominis exinanitionem vocat, dicens de filio Dei: *qui cum in forma Dei esset, non rapinam arbitratus est se esse aequalem Deo; sed semetipsum exinanivit, formam servi accipiens*. Non autem dicitur Deus exinaniri Deus ex eo quod creaturam rationalem per gratiam inhabitet, quia sic pater et spiritus sanctus exinanirentur, cum et ipsi

temple of the divinity, according to John (2:21): “But he spoke of the temple of his body.”

174 Now although what is said here by these holy men is orthodox, care must be taken to avoid the reproach which some receive for this. For the early doctors and saints were so intent upon refuting the emerging errors concerning the faith that they seemed meanwhile to fall into the opposite ones. For example, Augustine, speaking against the Manichaeans, who destroyed the freedom of the will, disputed in such terms that he seemed to have fallen into the heresy of Pelagius. Along these lines, John the Evangelist added, **and made his dwelling among us**, so that we would not think there was a mingling or transformation of natures in Christ because he had said, **the Word was made flesh**.

Nestorius misunderstood this phrase, **and made his dwelling among us**, and said that the Son of God was united to man in such a way that there was not one person of God and of man. For he held that the Word was united to human nature only by an indwelling through grace. From this, however, it follows that the Son of God is not man.

175 To clarify this we should know that we can consider two things in Christ: his nature and person. In Christ there is a distinction in nature, but not in person, which is one and the same in the two natures, since the human nature in Christ was assumed into a oneness of person. Therefore, the indwelling which the saints speak of must be referred to the nature, so as to say, he **made his dwelling among us**, i.e., the nature of the Word inhabited our nature; not according to the hypostasis or person, which is the same for both natures in Christ.

176 The blasphemy of Nestorius is further refuted by the authority of Sacred Scripture. For the Apostle calls the union of God and man an emptying, saying of the Son of God: “He, being in the form of God ... emptied himself, taking the form of a servant” (Phil 2:6). Clearly, God is not said to empty himself insofar as he dwells in the rational creature by grace, because then the Father and the Holy Spirit would be emptying themselves, since they too

inhabitare hominem dicantur per gratiam; dicit enim Christus de se et de patre loquens, infra XIV, 23: *ad eum veniemus et mansionem apud eum faciemus*. De spiritu autem sancto dicit apostolus, I Cor. III, 16: *spiritus Dei habitat in nobis*.

Praeterea, si Christus personaliter Deus non esset, praesumptuosissime dixisset: *ego et pater unum sumus*; et *antequam Abraham fieret, ego sum*. Ego autem personam loquentis demonstrat; homo autem erat, qui loquebatur; unum cum patre praeexistebat Abrahae.

Potest etiam aliter continuari, ut dicatur quod supra egit de verbi incarnatione, nunc autem agit de verbi incarnati conversatione, dicens *et habitavit in nobis*, idest inter nos apostolos conversatus est familiariter, secundum quod dicit Petrus, Act. I, 21: *in omni tempore quo intravit et exivit inter nos dominus Iesus*. Baruch IV, 38: *post haec in terris visus est*.

Hoc autem Evangelista addidit propter duo. Primo ut ostendat mirabilem conformitatem verbi ad homines, inter quos sic conversatus est, ut videretur quasi unus ex eis. Non solum enim in natura voluit assimilari hominibus, sed etiam in convictu et familiari conversatione absque peccato, cum eis voluit esse simul, ut sic homines suae conversationis dulcedine allectos traheret ad seipsum.

Secundo ut ostendat sui testimonii veritatem. Evangelista enim supra de verbo magna quaedam dixerat et adhuc multa de eo mirabilia dicturus erat, et ideo ut eius testimonium credibilius fieret, accepit quasi in veritatis argumentum, se cum Christo conversatum fuisse, dicens *et habitavit in nobis*. Quasi dicat: bene possum testimonium perhibere de ipso quia cum ipso conversatus sum; I Io. c. I, 1: *quod fuit ab initio, quod audivimus, quod vidimus oculis nostris, quod perspeximus, et manus nostrae contrectaverunt de verbo vitae etc.*, et Act. X, 40: *dedit eum manifestum fieri, non omni populo, sed testibus praeordinatis a Deo idest nobis qui manducavimus et bibimus cum illo*.

are said to dwell in man through grace: for Christ, speaking of himself and of the Father says, “We will come to him and make our home with him” (below 14:23); and of the Holy Spirit the Apostle says: “The Spirit of God dwells in us” (1 Cor 3:16).

Furthermore, if Christ was not God as to his person, he would have been most presumptuous to say: “I and the Father are one” (below 10:30), and “Before Abraham came to be, I am,” as is said below (8:58). Now “I” refers to the person of the speaker. And the one who was speaking was a man, who, as one with the Father, existed before Abraham.

177 However, another connection [besides that given in 173] with what went before is possible, by saying that above he dealt with the incarnation of the Word, but that now he is treating the manner of life of the incarnate Word, saying, he **made his dwelling among us**, i.e., he lived on familiar terms with us apostles. Peter alludes to this when he says, “During all the time that the Lord Jesus came and went among us” (Acts 1:21). “Afterwards, he was seen on earth” (Bar 3:38).

178 The Evangelist added this for two reasons. First, to show the marvelous likeness of the Word to men, among whom he lived in such a way as to seem one of them. For he not only willed to be like men in nature, but also in living with them on close terms without sin, in order to draw to himself men won over by the charm of his way of life.

Secondly, to show the truthfulness of his [the Evangelist’s] statements. For the Evangelist had already said many great things about the Word, and was yet to mention more wonderful things about him; and so that his testimony would be more credible he took as a proof of his truthfulness the fact that he had lived with Christ, saying, he **made his dwelling among us**. As if to say: I can well bear witness to him, because I lived on close terms with him. “We tell you ... what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes” (1 Jn 1:1); “God raised him up on the third day, and granted that he be seen, not by all

the people, but by witnesses preordained by God,” that is, “to us who ate and drank with him” (Acts 10:40).
