

COMMENTARY ON  
THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN

St. Thomas Aquinas

# 2

## 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 ὑδρίαὶ ἕξ κατὰ τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων κείμεναι, χωροῦσαι ἀνὰ μετρητὰς δύο ἢ τρεῖς. 7 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, γεμίσατε τὰς ὑδρίας 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 τετάρτηκα 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 metretres. 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, *capietes 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 examinatore 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 inquirat 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 passiones 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.