

CATENA AUREA  
ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN  
St. Thomas Aquinas

## Prologue

Vidi dominum sedentem super solium excelsum et elevatum; et plena erat domus a maiestate eius; et ea quae sub ipso erant, replebant templum.

**Glossa:** Divinae visionis sublimitate illustratus Isaias propheta dixit *vidi dominum sedentem* et cetera.

**Hieronymus, super Isaiam.** Quis sit iste dominus qui videtur, in Evangelista Ioanne plenius discimus, qui ait: haec dixit Isaias, quando vidit gloriam Dei, et locutus est de eo: haud dubium quin Christum significet.

**Glossa:** Unde ex verbis istis materia huius Evangelii, quod secundum Ioannem describitur, designatur.

**Ex Eccles. Hist.** Quia enim nativitatem salvatoris secundum carnem vel Matthaeus, vel Lucas descriperant, reticuit hic Ioannes, et a theologia atque ab ipsa eius divinitate sumit exordium; quae pars sine dubio ipsi velut eximio per spiritum sanctum reservata est.

**Alcuinus:** Unde cum omnibus divinae Scripturae paginis Evangelium excellat, quia quod lex et prophetae futurum praedixerunt, hoc completum dicit Evangelium; inter ipsos autem Evangeliorum scriptores Ioannes eminet in divinorum mysteriorum profunditate: qui a tempore dominicae ascensionis per annos sexaginta quinque verbum Dei absque adminiculo scribendi usque ad ultima Domitiani tempora praedicavit; sed post occisionem Domitiani, cum, Nerva permittente, de exilio rediisset Ephesum, compulsus ab episcopis Asiae, de coaeterna patri divinitate Christi scripsit adversus haereticos, qui Christum ante Mariam fuisse negabant. Unde merito in figura quattuor animalium aquilae volanti comparatur, quae volat altius cunctis avibus, et solis radios irreverberatis aspicit luminibus.

I saw the Lord sitting on a high and exalted throne; and the house was full of his majesty, and his train filled the temple. (Isaiah 6:1)

**Gloss:** Isaiah, enlightened by the sublimity of the divine vision, said: "I saw the Lord sitting" etc.

Who is that Lord who is seen, we learn fully in the Evangelist John, who said, Thus said Isaiah, when he saw the glory of God, and spoke of him; no doubt he meant Christ.

**Gloss:** Thus from those words the matter of this Gospel according to John is designated.

**Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History:** Because Matthew and Luke described the birth of the Savior according to the flesh, John was silent about that, and begins with theology and from his divinity. That aspect no doubt was reserved for this outstanding man by the Holy Spirit.

**Alcuin:** Since the Gospel is the summit of all Scriptur, John excels among the writers of the gospels in treating the depths of the divine mysteries. He preached the word of God without any writing from the time of the Lord's Ascension for 65 years, until the end of the reign of Domitian. But, after Domitian was killed, with the permission of Nerva, he returned from exile to Ephesus, the bishops of Asia compelled him to write against the heretics about the divinity of Christ which is coeternal with the Father, against the heretics who denied that Christ existed before Mary. Therefore, among the four animals, he is deservedly represented by the flying eagle, which flies higher than all birds, and looks at the sun's rays with unshaken vision.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Transcendit enim Ioannes omnia cacumina terrarum, transcendit omnes campos aeris, transcendit omnes altitudines siderum, transcendit omnes choros et legiones Angelorum: nisi enim transcenderet ista omnia quae creata sunt, non perveniret ad eum per quem facta sunt omnia.

Augustinus, de Cons. Evang. *Ex quo intelligi datur, si diligenter advertas, tres Evangelistas temporalia facta domini et dicta quae ad informandos mores vitae praesentis maxime valerent, prosecutos, circa activam virtutem fuisse versatos; Ioannem vero facta domini multo pauciora narrantem, dicta vero eius, praesertim quae Trinitatis unitatem et vitae aeternae felicitatem insinuarent, diligentius et uberius conscribentem, in virtute contemplativa commendanda suam intentionem praedicationemque tenuisse. Unde animalia tria, per quae tres alii Evangelistae designantur, sive leo, sive homo, sive vitulus, in terra gradiuntur: quia tres Evangelistae in his maxime occupati sunt quae Christus in carne operatus est, et quae praecepta mortalis vitae exercendae carnem portantibus tradidit; at vero Ioannes supra nubila infirmitatis humanae velut aquila volat, et lucem incommutabilis veritatis acutissimis atque firmissimis oculis cordis intuetur: ipsam enim maxime divinitatem domini, qua patri est aequalis, intendit, eamque praecipue suo Evangelio, quantum inter homines sufficere credidit, commendare curavit.*

**Glossa:** Potest igitur Evangelista Ioannes cum Isaia propheta dicere vidi dominum sedentem super solium excelsum et elevatum, in quantum acumine visus sui Christum in divinitatis maiestate regnantem inspexit; quae quidem etiam sua natura excelsa est, et super omnia alia elevata. Dicat etiam Evangelista Ioannes et plena erat domus a maiestate eius: quia per ipsum narrat omnia esse facta, et suo lumine omnes homines in hunc mundum venientes illustrari. Dicat etiam quod ea quae sub ipso erant, replebant templum; quia dicit verbum caro factum est; et vidimus gloriam quasi unigeniti a patre, plenum gratiae et veritatis, secundum quod de plenitudine eius nos omnes accepimus. Sic igitur praemissa verba materiam huius Evangelii continent, in quo ipse Ioannes dominum super solium excelsum sedentem insinuat, divinitatem Christi ostendens; et terram ab eius maiestate impleri ostendit, dum omnia per eius virtutem in esse producta ostendit, et propriis perfectionibus repleta; et inferiora eius, idest humanitatis mysteria, templum, idest Ecclesiam, replere

**Augustine, on John:** John transcends all corners of the earth, all fields of air, all heights of the stars, all choirs and legions of angels. For if he did not transcend all those things which are created, he would not reach Him through whom all things were made.

**Augustine, on the Consistency of the Gospels:** If you carefully observe, you can see that the other three Evangelists concentrated on those temporal deeds and sayings of the Lord which are most important for living the present life well; thus they were concerned with the active life. But John narrated many fewer events of the Lord, but put his energy into writing about his words, especially those that teach about the unity of the Trinity and the happiness of eternal life. Thus the three animals symbolizing the other three Evangelists, i.e., the lion, man, and bull, walk on the earth, because these three Evangelists are most concerned with what Christ did in the flesh, and about the commands which he gave mortal men for right living in this life. John, however, flies like an eagle above the clouds of human weakness, and looks at the light of unchangeable truth with the sharpest and firmest eyes of the heart. For he focused mostly on the divinity of the Lord, in which he is equal to the Father, and in his Gospel he preached that as fully as he thought necessary for people to understand.

**Gloss:** The Evangelist John can say with Isaiah: "I saw the Lord sitting on a high and exalted throne," because by his insight he saw Christ reigning in the majesty of divinity, which is by nature most high and elevated above all else. The Evangelist John also could say: "And the house was full of his majesty", because he tells of Him through whom all things were made, and he says that all men coming into this world are enlightened by his light. He could also say: "His train filled the temple," because he says "The Word became flesh, and we saw his glory as of the onlybegotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, from whose fullness we all received." Thus the preceding words contain the matter of this Gospel. In it John himself points out the Lord sitting on a high throne, when he shows the divinity of Christ. He shows that the earth was filled with his majesty, when he shows that all things were made through his power, and are filled with their own perfections. And he teaches that his train, that is the mysteries of his

docet, dum in sacramentis humanitatis Christi et gratiam et gloriam fidelibus repromittit.

**Chrysostomus, in Ioannem.** Quando igitur barbarus hic et indisciplinatus talia loquitur quae nullus eorum qui in terra sunt hominum novit unquam, si hic solus esset, miraculum magnum esset. Nunc autem cum his et aliud isto maius tribuit argumentum, quod a Deo inspirata sunt ei quae dicuntur hic, scilicet quod omnes audiunt, et suadet omnibus per omne tempus. Quis ergo non admirabitur habitantem in eo virtutem?

**Origenes:** Ioannes interpretatur gratia Dei, sive in quo est gratia, vel cui donatum est. Cui autem theologorum donatum est ita abscondita summi boni penetrare mysteria, et sic humanis mentibus intimare?

humanity, fill the temple, that is the Church, when he assures the faithful grace and glory in the sacraments of the humanity of Christ.

**Chrysostom, on John:** If an uneducated barbarian speaks things that no one on earth ever knew, and he alone knows it, that would be a big miracle. But now we have a greater argument than that what is said here is inspired by God, and that is because all hear, and all believe, over all time. Who then would not admire one who has such power.

**Origen:** John means "grace of God", or one who has or has been given grace. Which theologian has ever been given the ability to penetrate the hidden mysteries of the Supreme Good, and teach them to human minds?

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 1

1 ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος,

1a. In the beginning was the Word,

---

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Omnibus aliis Evangelistis ab incarnatione incipientibus, Ioannes transcurrens conceptionem, nativitatem, educationem, augmentationem, mox de aeterna nobis generatione narrat, dicens in principio erat verbum.

**Augustinus Lib. 83 quaest:** Quod Graece logos dicitur, Latine et rationem et verbum significat; sed hoc melius verbum interpretatur, ut significetur non solum ad patrem respectus, sed ad illa etiam quae per verbum facta sunt operativa potentia. Ratio autem, etsi nihil per eam fiat, recte ratio dicitur.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Quotidie autem dicendo verba viluerunt nobis, quia sonando et transeundo viluerunt. Est verbum et in ipso homine quod manet intus: nam sonus procedit ex ore. Est verbum quod vere specialiter dicitur illud quod intelligis de sono, non ipse sonus.

**Augustinus de Trin:** Quisquis autem potest intelligere verbum, non solum antequam sonet, verum etiam antequam sonorum eius imagines cogitatione volvantur, iam potest videre per hoc speculum atque in hoc aenigmate aliquam verbi similitudinem, de quo dictum est in principio erat verbum. Necesse est enim cum id quod scimus loquimur, ut ex ipsa scientia quam memoria tenemus, nascatur verbum, quod eiusmodi sit omnino cuiusmodi est illa scientia de qua nascitur. Formata quippe cogitatio ab ea re quam scimus, verbum est, quod in corde dicimus; quod nec Graecum est, nec Latinum, nec linguae alicuius. Sed cum id opus est in eorum quibus loquimur proferre notitiam, aliquod signum quo significetur assumitur. Proinde verbum quod foris sonat, signum est verbi quod intus latet, cui magis verbi competit nomen:

**CHRYS.** While all the other Evangelists begin with the Incarnation, John, passing over the Conception, Nativity, education, and growth, speaks immediately of the Eternal Generation, saying, In the beginning was the Word.

**AUG.** The Greek word “logos” signifies both Word and Reason. But in this passage it is better to interpret it Word; as referring not only to the Father, but to the creation of things by the operative power of the Word; whereas Reason, though it produce nothing, is still rightly called Reason.

**AUG.** Words by their daily use, sound, and passage out of us, have become common things. But there is a word which remains inward, in the very man himself; distinct from the sound which proceeds out of the mouth. There is a word, which is truly and spiritually that, which you understand by the sound, not being the actual sound.

Now whoever can conceive the notion of word, as existing not only before its sound, but even before the idea of its sound is formed, may see enigmatically, and as it were in a glass, some similitude of that Word of Which it is said, In the beginning was the Word. For when we give expression to something which we know, the word used is necessarily derived from the knowledge thus retained in the memory, and must be of the same quality with that knowledge. For a word is a thought formed from a thing which we know; which word is spoken in the heart, being neither Greek nor Latin, nor of any language, though, when we want to communicate it to others, some sign is assumed by which to express it... Wherefore the word which sounds externally, is a sign of the word which lies hid within, to which the name of word more truly appertains. For that

nam illud quod profertur carnis ore, vox verbi est, verbumque et ipsum dicitur propter illud a quo ut foris appareat sumptum est.

**Basilii:** Hoc autem verbum non est humanum verbum. Quomodo enim erat in principio humanum verbum, ultimo loco accipiente homine generationis principium? Non igitur in principio verbum erat humanum, sed nec Angelorum: omnis enim creatura infra saeculorum terminos est, a creatore essendi sumens principium. Sed audi Evangelium decenter: ipsum enim, unigenitum verbum dixit.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Si autem quis dixerit: cur patrem dimittens, mox nobis de filio loquitur? Quoniam ille quidem manifestus omnibus erat, etsi non ut pater, sed ut Deus, unigenitus autem ignorabatur: ideo decenter eam, quae de isto est, cognitionem confestim initio studuit imponere his qui nesciebant eum; sed neque patrem in his quae de filio sunt sermonibus tacuit. Propter hoc autem et verbum eum vocavit. Quia enim docturus erat quod hoc verbum unigenitus est filius Dei; ut non passibilem aestimet quis generationem, praeveniens verbi nuncupatione, destruit perniciosam suspicionem, esse ex Deo filium impassibiliter ostendens. Secunda vero ratio est, quia ea quae sunt patris nobis annuntiare debebat. Non simpliciter vero eum verbum dixit, sed cum articuli adiectione, a reliquis ipsum separans. Consuetudo enim est Scripturae verba vocare leges Dei et praecepta: hoc autem verbum substantia quaedam est, hypostasis, ens, ex ipso proveniens impassibiliter patre.

**Basilii:** Quare igitur verbum? Quia impassibiliter natum est; quia est generantis imago, totum in seipso generantem demonstrans, nihil inde separans, sed in seipso perfectum existens.

**Augustinus de Trin:** Sicut enim scientia nostra illi scientiae Dei, sic nostrum verbum quod nascitur de nostra scientia, dissimile est illi verbo Dei, quod natum est de patris essentia. Tale est autem, ac si dicerem de patris scientia, de patris sapientia; vel, quod est expressius, de patre scientia, de patre sapientia.

which is uttered by the mouth of our flesh, is the voice of the word; and is in fact called word, with reference to that from which it is taken, when it is developed externally.

**BASIL;** This Word is not a human word. For how was there a human word in the beginning, when man received his being last of all? There was not then any word of man in the beginning, nor yet of Angels; for every creature is within the limits of time, having its beginning of existence from the Creator. But what says the Gospel? It calls the Only-Begotten Himself the Word.

**CHRYS.** But why omitting the Father, does he proceed at once to speak of the Son? Because the Father was known to all; though not as the Father, yet as God; whereas the Only-Begotten was not known. As was meet then, he endeavors first of all to inculcate the knowledge of the Son on those who knew Him not; though neither in discoursing on Him, is he altogether silent on the Father. And inasmuch as he was about to teach that the Word was the Only-Begotten Son of God, that no one might think this a possible generation, he makes mention of the Word in the first place, in order to destroy the dangerous suspicion, and show that the Son was from God impassibly. And a second reason is, that He was to declare to us the things of the Father. But he does not speak of the Word simply, but with the addition of the article, in order to distinguish It from other words. For Scripture calls God's laws and commandments words; but this Word is a certain Substance, or Person, an Essence, coming forth impassibly from the Father Himself.

**BASIL;** Wherefore then Word? Because born impassibly, the Image of Him that begat, manifesting all the Father in Himself; abstracting from Him nothing, but existing perfect in Himself.

**AUG.** As our knowledge differs from God's, so does our word, which arises from our knowledge, differ from that Word of God, which is born of the Father's essence; we might say, from the Father's knowledge, the Father's wisdom, or, more correctly, the Father Who is Knowledge, the Father Who

Verbum ergo Dei patris unigenitus filius, per omnia patri similis et aequalis: hoc enim est omnino quod pater, non tamen pater: quia iste filius, ille pater: ac per hoc novit omnia quae novit pater; sed ei nosse de patre est, sicut esse: nosse enim et esse ibi unum est; et ideo patri, sicut esse non est a filio, ita nec nosse. Proinde, tamquam seipsum dicens, pater genuit verbum sibi aequale per omnia: non enim seipsum integre perfecteque dixisset, si aliquid minus aut amplius esset in eius verbo quam in seipso. Nostrum autem verbum interius, quod invenimus esse utcumque illi simile, quantum sit etiam dissimile, non pigeat intueri. Est enim verbum mentis nostrae quandoque formabile, nondum formatum, quiddam mentis nostrae, quod hac atque hac volubili quadam motione iactamus, cum a nobis nunc id, nunc illud, sicut inventum fuerit vel occurrerit, cogitatur; et tunc fit verum verbum quando illud quod nos diximus volubili motione iactare, ad id quod scimus pervenit, atque inde formatur, eius omnimodam similitudinem capiens; ut quomodo res quaeque scitur, sic etiam cogitetur. Quis non videat quanta sit hic dissimilitudo ab illo Dei verbo, quod in forma Dei sic est ut non ante fuerit formabile, postea formatum, non aliquando possit esse informe, sed sit forma simplex, et simpliciter aequalis ei de quo est? Quapropter ita dicitur illud Dei verbum, ut Dei cogitatio non dicatur; ne aliquid esse quasi volubile dicatur in Deo, quod nunc habeat, nunc accipiat formam ut verbum sit, eamque possit amittere, atque informiter quodammodo volutari.

**Augustinus de Verb. Dom:** Est enim verbum Dei forma quaedam non formata, sed forma omnium formarum, forma incommutabilis, sine lapsu, sine defectu, sine tempore, sine loco, superans omnia, existens in omnibus fundamentum quoddam, in quo sunt, et fastigium sub quo sunt.

**Basilus:** Habet autem et verbum nostrum exterius divini verbi similitudinem quamdam: nam nostrum verbum totam declarat mentis conceptionem: quae namque mente concepimus, ea verbo proferimus. Et quidem cor nostrum quasi fons quidam est: verbum vero prolatum quasi quidam rivulus manans ex ipso.

is Wisdom. The Word of God then, the Only-Begotten Son of the Father, is in all things like and equal to the Father; being altogether what the Father is, yet not the Father; because the one is the Son, the other the Father. And thereby He knows all things which the Father knows; yet His knowledge is from the Father, even as is His being: for knowing and being are the same with Him; and so as the Father's being is not from the Son, so neither is His knowing. Wherefore the Father begat the Word equal to Himself in all things as uttering forth Himself. For had there been more or less in His Word than in Himself, He would not have uttered Himself fully and perfectly. With respect however to our own inner word, which we find, in whatever sense, to be like the Word, let us not object to see how very unlike it is also. A word is a formation of our mind going to take place, but not yet made, and something in our mind which we toss to and fro in a slippery circuitous way, as one thing and another is discovered, or occurs to our thoughts. When this, which we toss to and fro, has reached the subject of our knowledge, and been formed therefrom, when it has assumed the most exact likeness to it, and the conception has quite answered to the thing; then we have a true word. Who may not see how great the difference is here from that Word of God, which exists in the Form of God in such wise, that It could not have been first going to be formed, and afterwards formed, nor can ever have been unformed, being a Form absolute, and absolutely equal to Him from Whom It is. Wherefore; in speaking of the Word of God here nothing is said about thought in God; lest we should think there was any thing revolving in God, which might first receive form in order to be a Word, and afterwards lose it, and be canted round and round again in an unformed state.

**AUG.** Now the Word of God is a Form, not a formation, but the Form of all forms, a Form unchangeable, removed from accident, from failure, from time, from space, surpassing all things, and existing in all things as a kind of foundation underneath, and summit above them.

**BASIL;** Yet has our outward word some similarity to the Divine Word. For our word declares the whole conception of the mind; since what we conceive in the mind we bring out in word. Indeed our heart is as it were the source, and the uttered word the stream which flows therefrom.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Considera etiam in Evangelista prudentiam spiritualem. Noverat homines id quod antiquius est et quod est ante omnia maxime honorantes et ponentes Deum: propter hoc primum dicit principium: in principio, inquit, erat verbum.

**Origenes in Ioannem:** Plura autem sunt signata ab hoc nomine principium. Est enim principium, sicut itineris et longitudinis, secundum illud: initium boni itineris iustorum exercitium. Est autem principium et generationis, iuxta illud: hoc est principium creaturae domini. Sed etiam Deum non enormiter asseret aliquis omnium principium. Illud etiam ex quo sicut ex praeiacente materia alia fiunt, principium est penes eos qui credunt illam ingenitam. Est enim principium secundum speciem; sicut Christus principium eorum est qui secundum imaginem Dei formati sunt. Est etiam principium disciplinae, secundum illud: cum deberetis esse magistri propter tempus, rursus indigetis ut doceamini quae sunt elementa exordii sermonum Dei. Duplex enim est documenti principium: hoc quidem natura, hoc vero quoad nos; ut si dicatur, initium sapientiae fore natura quidem Christum, inquantum sapientia et verbum Dei est; quoad nos vero inquantum verbum caro factum est. Tot igitur significatis ad praesens nobis de principio occurrentibus, potest accipi illud ex quo quid est agens. Conditor enim Christus est velut principium, secundum quod sapientia est; ut verbum in principio, quasi in sapientia sit. Plura enim bona de salvatore dicuntur. Velut igitur vita in verbo est, sic verbum in principio, idest in sapientia erat. Considera vero si possibile est secundum hoc significatum accipere nos principium, prout secundum sapientiam, et exempla quae in ea sunt, fiunt omnia; vel quia principium filii pater est, et principium creaturarum, et omnium entium; per illud in principio erat verbum, verbum filium intelligas in principio, idest in patre, dictum fore.

**Augustinus de Trin:** Aut in principio sic dictum est ac si diceretur: ante omnia.

**Basilus:** Praevidit enim spiritus sanctus futuros quosdam invidentes gloriae unigeniti, qui praeferrent sophismata ad subversionem auditorum: quia si

**CHRYS.** Observe the spiritual wisdom of the Evangelist. He knew that men honored most what was as most ancient, and that honoring what is before every thing else, they conceived of it as God. On this account he mentions first the beginning, saying, In the beginning was the Word.

**ORIGEN;** There are many significations of this word beginning. For there is a beginning of a journey, and beginning of a length, according to Proverbs, The beginning of the right path is to do justice. There is a beginning too of a creation, according to Job, He is the beginning of the ways of God. Nor would it be incorrect to say, that God is the Beginning of all things. The preexistent material again, where supposed to be original, out of which any thing is produced, is considered as the beginning. There is a beginning also in respect of form: as where Christ is the beginning of those who are made according to the image of God. And there is a beginning of doctrine, according to Hebrews; When for the time you ought to be teachers, you have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God. For there are two kinds of beginning of doctrine: one in itself, the other relative to us; as if we should say that Christ, in that He is the Wisdom and Word of God, was in Himself the beginning of wisdom, but to us, in that He was the Word incarnate. There being so many significations then of the word, we may take it as the Beginning through Whom, i.e. the Maker; for Christ is Creator as The Beginning, in that He is Wisdom; so that the Word is in the beginning, i.e. in Wisdom; the Savior being all these excellences at once. As life then is in the Word, so the Word is in the Beginning, that is to say, in Wisdom. Consider then if it be possible according to this signification to understand the Beginning, as meaning that all things are made according to Wisdom, and the patterns contained therein; or, inasmuch as the Beginning of the Son is the Father, the Beginning of all creatures and existences, to understand by the text, In the beginning was the Word, that the Son, the Word, was in the Beginning, that is, in the Father.

**AUG.** Or, In the beginning, as if it were said, before all things.

**BASIL;** The Holy Ghost foresaw that men would arise, who should envy the glory of the Only-Begotten, subverting their hearers by sophistry; as if

genitus est, non erat; et antequam genitus esset, non erat. Ne igitur talia garrere praesumant, spiritus sanctus ait in principio erat verbum.

**Hilarius de Trin:** Transeunt tempora, transeunt saecula, tolluntur aetates: pone aliquid quod voles tuae opinionis principium: non tenes tempore: erat enim unde tractatur.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Sicut autem quis cum stat in navi secus littus, videt civitates et portus, cum vero eum aliquis in medium pelagi duxerit, a prioribus quidem desistere facit, non tamen alicubi defigit ei oculum, ita Evangelista hic super omnem nos ducens creaturam, suspensum dimittit oculum, non dans suspicere aliquem finem ad superiora: hoc enim in principio erat semper et infinite essendi significativum est.

**Augustinus de Verb. Dom:** Sed dicunt: si filius est, natus est; hoc fatemur. Adiungunt deinde: si natus est patri filius, erat pater antequam ei filius nasceretur; hoc respuit fides. Ergo ait: rationem mihi redde quomodo et filius nasci potuit patri, ut coevus esset ei a quo natus est. Post patrem enim nascitur filius, utique patri morituro successurus. Similitudines adhibent de creaturis; et nobis laborandum est ut et nos inveniamus similitudines earum rerum quas astruimus. Sed quomodo possumus in creatura invenire coaeternum, quando in creatura nil invenimus aeternum? Sed si possunt inveniri haec duo coeva, generans et generatum, ibi intelligimus coaeterna. Ipsa quidem sapientia dicta est in Scripturis candor lucis aeternae, dicta est imago patris. Hinc capiamus similitudinem, ut inveniamus coeva, ex quibus intelligamus coaeterna. Nemo autem dubitat, quod splendor de igne exit. Ponamus ergo ignem patrem illius splendoris: mox quidem ut lucernam accendo, simul cum igne et splendor existit. Da mihi hic ignem sine splendore, et credo tibi patrem sine filio fuisse. Imago existit de speculo, hominis intuentis speculum; existit imago mox ut aspector extiterit: sed ille qui inspicit erat antequam accederet ad speculum. Ponamus ergo aliquid natum super aquam, ut virgultum, aut herbam: nonne cum imagine sua nascitur? Si ergo semper esset virgultum, semper esset et imago de virgulto. Quod autem de alio est, utique natum est. Potest ergo semper esse generans, et semper cum illo quod de eo natum est. Sed dicit aliquis: ecce intellexi aeternum patrem, coaeternum filium; tamen sicut

because He were begotten, He was not; and before He was begotten, he was not. That none might presume then to babble such things, the Holy Ghost says, In the beginning was the Word.

**HILARY;** Years, centuries, ages, are passed over, place what beginning you will in your imagining, you grasp it not in time, for He, from Whom it is derived, still was.

**CHRYS.** As then when our ship is near shore, cities and port pass in survey before us, which on the open sea vanish, and leave nothing whereon to fix; the eye; so the Evangelist here, taking us with him in his flight above the created world, leaves the eye to gaze in vacancy on an illimitable expanse. For the words, was in the beginning, are significative of eternal and infinite essence.

**AUG.** They say, however, if He is the Son, He was born. We allow it. They rejoin: if the Son was born to the Father, the Father was, before the Son was born to Him. This the Faith rejects. Then they say, explain to us how the Son could; be born from the Father, and yet be coeval with Him from whom He is born: for sons are born after their fathers, to succeed them on their death. They adduce analogies from nature; and we must endeavor likewise to do the same for our doctrine. But how can we find in nature a coeternal, when we cannot find an eternal? However, if a thing generating and a thing generated can be found any where coeval, it will be a help to forming a notion of coeternals. Now Wisdom herself is called in the Scriptures, the brightness of Everlasting Light, the image of the Father. Hence then let us take our comparison, an from coevals form a notion of coeternals. Now no one doubts that brightness proceeds from fire: fire then we may consider the father of the brightness. Presently, when I light a candle, at the same instant with the fire, brightness arises. Give me the fire without the brightness, and I will with you believe that the Father was without the Son. An image is produced by a mirror. The image exists as soon as the beholder appears; yet the beholder existed before he came to the mirror. Let us suppose then a twig, or a blade of grass which has grown up by the water side. Is it not born with its image? If there had always been the twig, there would always have been the image proceeding from the twig. And whatever is from another

effusum splendorem minus igne lucentem, aut sicut effusam imaginem minus quam virgultum existentem dicimus. Non, sed aequalitas omnimoda est. Non credo, ait, quia non invenisti similitudinem. Fortassis autem invenimus in creatura quomodo intelligamus filium et coaeternum patri, et nequaquam minorem; sed non illud possumus invenire in uno genere similitudinum. Iungamus ergo ambo genera: unum unde ipsi dant similitudines, et alterum unde nos dedimus. Dederunt enim illi similitudinem ex his quae praeceduntur tempore ab his a quibus nascuntur, sicut homo de homine; sed tamen homo et homo sunt eiusdem substantiae. Laudamus ergo in ista nativitate aequalitatem naturae: deest aequalitas temporis. In illo autem genere similitudinum quod nos dedimus de splendore ignis et de imagine virgulti, aequalitatem naturae non invenis, invenis coaevitatem. Totum ergo ibi quod hic ex partibus singulis et rebus singulis invenitur; et non hoc solum quod in creaturis, totum invenio ibi sed tamquam in creatore.

**Ex gestis Conc. Ephes:** Propterea alicubi quidem filium appellat patris, alicubi autem verbum nominat, alicubi autem splendorem vocat Scriptura divina; singula horum nominum de ipso dicens, ut intelligas ea quae de Christo dicuntur, esse contra blasphemiam: quia enim tuus filius eiusdem tibi naturae fit, volens sermo ostendere unam substantiam patris et filii, dicit filium patris, qui ex eo natus est unigenitus. Deinde quoniam nativitas et filius apud nos ostentationem praebent passionis; ideo hunc filium appellat et verbum, impassibilitatem nativitatis eius nomine isto demonstrans. Sed quoniam pater quispiam factus ut homo, indubitanter senior filio suo demonstratur; ne hoc ipsum etiam de divina natura putares, splendorem vocat unigenitum patris: splendor enim nascitur quidem ex sole, non autem intelligitur sole posterior. Coexistere ergo semper patri filium splendor tibi denuntiet; impassibilitatem nativitatis ostendat verbum; consubstantialitatem filii nomen insinuet.

thing, is born. So then that which generates may be coexistent from eternity with that which is generated from it. But some one will say perhaps, Well, I understand now the eternal Father, the coeternal Son: yet the Son is like the emitted brightness, which is less brilliant than the fire, or like the reflected image, which is less real than the twig. Not so: there is complete equality between Father and Son. I do not believe, he says; for you have found nothing whereto to liken it. However, perhaps we can find something in nature by which we may understand that the Son is both coeternal with the Father, and in no respect inferior also: though we cannot find any one material of comparison that will be sufficient singly, and must therefore join together two, one of which has been employed by our adversaries, the other by ourselves. For they have drawn their comparison from things which are preceded in time by the things which they spring from, man, for example, from man. Nevertheless, man is of the same substance with man. We have then in that nativity an equality of nature; an equality of time is wanting. But in the comparison which we have drawn from the brightness of fire, and the reflection of a twig, an equality of nature you cannot find, of time you lost. In the Godhead then there is found as a whole, what here exists in single and separate parts; and that which is in the creation, existing in a manner suitable to the Creator.

**EX GESTIS CONCILII EPHESINI;** Wherefore in one place divine Scripture calls Him the Son, in another the Word, in another the Brightness of the Father; names severally meant to guard against blasphemy. For, forasmuch as your son is of the same nature with yourself, the Scripture wishing to show that the Substance of the Father and the Son is one, sets forth the Son of the Father, born of the Father, the Only-Begotten. Next, since the terms birth and son, convey the idea of passibility, therefore it calls the Son the Word, declaring by that name the impassibility of His Nativity. But inasmuch as a father with us is necessarily older than his son, lest thou should think that this applied to the Divine nature as well, it calls the Only-Begotten the Brightness of the Father; for brightness, though arising from the sun, is not posterior to it. Understand then that Brightness, as revealing the co-eternity of the Son with the Father; Word as proving the impassibility of His birth, and Son as conveying His consubstantiality.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Sed dicunt illi, quoniam hoc, idest in principio, non aeternitatem ostendit simpliciter: etenim et de caelo istud et de terra dictum. In principio, inquit Genesis, fecit Deus caelum et terram. Sed quid commune habet erat ad fecit? Sicut enim quod est, cum de homine quidem dicitur, tempus praesens significat tantum; cum autem de Deo, id quod est semper et aeternaliter; ita et erat de nostra quidem cum dicitur natura, praeteritum significat tempus; cum autem de Deo, aeternitatem ostendit.

**Origenes:** Sum enim verbum duplicem habet significationem: aliquando enim temporales motus secundum analogiam aliorum verborum declarat, aliquando substantiam uniuscuiusque rei, de qua praedicatur, sine temporali motu ullo designat; ideo et substantivum vocatur.

**Hilarius de Trin:** Respice igitur ad mundum, intellige quid de eo scriptum est: in principio fecit Deus caelum et terram. Fit ergo in principio quod creatur, et aetates continet quod in principio continetur ut fieret. Piscator autem illitteratus, indoctus, liber a tempore, solutus a saeculis est, vicit omne principium: erat enim quod est, neque in tempore aliquo concluditur ut coeperit quod erat potius in principio quam fiebat.

**Alcuinus:** Contra eos ergo qui propter temporalem nativitatem dicebant Christum non semper fuisse, incipit Evangelista de aeternitate verbi, dicens in principio erat verbum.

**CHRYC.** But they say that In the beginning does not absolutely express in eternity: for that the same is said of the heaven and the earth: In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth. But are not made and was, altogether different For in like manner as the word is, when spoken of man, signifies the present only, but when applied to God, that which always and eternally is; so too was, predicated of our nature, signifies the past, but predicated of God, eternity.

**ORIGEN;** The verb to be, has a double signification, sometimes expressing the motions which take place in time, as other verbs do; sometimes the substance of that one thing of which it is predicated, without reference to time. Hence it is also called a substantive verb.

**HILARY;** Consider then the world, understand what is written of it. In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth. Whatever therefore is created is made in the beginning, and you would contain in time, what, as being to be made, is contained in the beginning. But, lo, for me, an illiterate unlearned fisherman is independent of time, unconfined by ages, advances beyond all beginnings. For the Word was, what it is, and is not bounded by any time, nor commenced therein, seeing It was not made in the beginning, but was.

**ALCUIN.** To refute those who inferred from Christ's Birth in time, that He had not been from everlasting, the Evangelist begins with the eternity of the Word, saying, In the beginning was the Word.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 2

καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν,

1b. And the Word was with God.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Quia maxime Dei hoc est proprium, aeternum et sine principio esse; hoc primum posuit: deinde ne quis audiens in principio erat verbum, ingenitum verbum dicat, confestim hoc removit dicens et verbum erat apud Deum.

**Hilarius de Trin:** Sine principio enim est apud Deum, et qui abest a tempore, non abest ab auctore.

**Basilus:** Rursus hoc dicit propter blasphemantes quod non erat. Ubi ergo erat verbum? Non in loco incircumscribilia continentur. Sed ubi erat? Apud Deum: neque pater loco, neque filius circumscriptione aliqua continentur.

**Origenes in Ioannem:** Utile est etiam inducere, quod verbum dicitur ad aliquos fieri, puta ad Osee, vel Isaiam, aut Ieremiam: ad Deum autem non fit, quasi prius non ens apud ipsum: ex eo igitur quod iugiter est in eo, dicitur et verbum erat apud Deum: quia nec a principio a patre separatus est.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Non etiam dixit: in Deo erat, sed apud Deum erat, eam quae secundum hypostasim eius est aeternitatem nobis ostendens.

**Theophylactus:** Videtur autem mihi quod Sabellius ex hoc dicto subversus est. Ipse enim dicebat, quod pater et filius et spiritus sanctus una est persona, quae aliquando ut pater apparuit, aliquando ut filius, aliquando ut spiritus sanctus. Manifeste vero confunditur ex hoc verbo: et verbum erat apud Deum. Hic enim Evangelista alium declarat esse filium, alium Deum, scilicet patrem.

**CHRYS.** Because it is an especial attribute of God, to be eternal and without a beginning, he laid this down first: then, lest any one on hearing in the beginning was the Word, should suppose the Word Unbegotten, he instantly guarded against this; saying, And the Word was with God.

**HILARY;** From the beginning He is With God: and though independent of time, is not independent of an Author.

**BASIL;** Again he repeats this, was, because of men blasphemously saying, that there was a time when He was not. Where then was the Word? Illimitable things are not contained in space. Where was He then? With God. For neither is the Father bounded by place, nor the Son by aught circumscribing.

**ORIGEN;** It is worth while noting, that, whereas the Word is said to come [be made] to some, as to Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, with God it is not made, as though it were not with Him before. But, the Word having been always with Him, it is said, and the Word was with God: for from the beginning it was not separate from the Father.

**CHRYS.** He has not said, was in God, but was with God: exhibiting to us that eternity which He had in accordance with His Person.

**THEOPHYL.** Sabellius is overthrown by this text. For he asserts that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one Person, Who sometimes appeared as the Father, sometimes as the Son, sometimes as the Holy Ghost. But he is manifestly confounded by this text, and the Word was with God; for here the Evangelist declares that the Son is one Person, God the Father another.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 3

καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.

1c. And the Word was God.

---

**Hilarius de Trin:** Dices: verbum sonus vocis est, enuntiatio negotiorum, et elocutio cogitationum: hoc verbum in principio apud Deum erat, quia sermo cogitationis aeternus est, cum qui cogitat sit aeternus. Sed quomodo in principio erat quod neque ante tempus, neque post tempus est? Et nescio an ipsum possit esse in tempore. Loquentium enim sermo neque est antequam loquantur, et cum locuti erunt, non erit: in eo enim ipso quod loquuntur, dum finiunt, iam non erit id unde coeperunt. Sed si primam sententiam rudis auditor admiseras, in principio erat verbum, de sequenti quid quaeris: et verbum erat apud Deum? Numquid audieras de Deo, ut sermonem reconditae cogitationis acciperes; aut fefellerat Ioannem quid esset momenti inter inesse et adesse? Id enim quod in principio erat, non in altero esse, sed cum altero praedicatur. Statum igitur verbi et nomen expecta; dicit namque et Deus erat verbum. Cessat sonus vocis et cogitationis eloquium. Verbum hic res est, non sonus; natura, non sermo; Deus, non inanitas est.

**Hilarius de Trin:** Simplex autem nuncupatio est, et caret offendiculo adiectionis alienae. Ad Moysen dictum est: dedi te Deum Pharaoni: sed numquid non adiecta nominis causa est, cum dicitur Pharaoni? Moyses enim Pharaoni Deus datus est, dum timetur, dum oratur, dum punit, dum medetur. Et aliud est Deum dari, et aliud Deum esse. Memini quoque et alterius nuncupationis, ubi dicitur: ego dixi: dii estis; sed in eo indulti nominis significatio est; et ubi refertur ego dixi, loquentis potius sermo est, quam rei nomen. Cum autem audio et Deus erat verbum, non dictum solum audio verbum, sed demonstratum esse intelligo quod Deus est.

**Basilus:** Sic igitur excludens accusationem blasphemantium et quaerentium quid est verbum, respondet et Deus erat verbum.

**HILARY;** You will say, that a word is the sound of the voice, the enunciation of a thing, the expression of a thought: this Word was in the beginning with God, because the utterance of thought is eternal, when He who thinks is eternal. But how was that in the beginning, which exists no time either before, or after, I doubt even whether in time at all? For speech is neither in existence before one speaks, nor after; in the very act of speaking it vanishes; for by the time a speech is ended, that from which it began does not exist. But even if the first sentence, in the beginning was the Word, was through your inattention lost upon you, why dispute you about the next; and the Word was with God? Did you hear it said, "In God," so that you should understand this Word to be only the expression of hidden thoughts? Or did John say with by mistake, and was not aware of the distinction between being in, and being with, when he said, that what was in the beginning, was not in God, but with God? Hear then the nature and name of the Word; and the Word was God. No more then of the sound of the voice, of the expression of the thought. The Word here is a Substance, not a sound; a Nature, not an expression; God, not a nonentity.

**HILARY;** But the title is absolute, and free from the offense of an extraneous subject. To Moses it is said, I have given you for a god to Pharaoh: but is not the reason for the name added, when it is said, to Pharaoh? Moses is given for a god to Pharaoh, when he is feared, when he is entreated, when he punishes, when he heals. And it is one thing to be given for a God, another thing to be God. I remember too another application of the name in the Psalms, I have said, you are gods. But there too it is implied that the title was but bestowed; and the introduction of, I said, makes it rather the phrase of the Speaker, than the name of the thing. But when I hear the Word was God, I not only hear the Word said to be, but perceive It proved to be, God.

**BASIL;** Thus cutting off the cavils of blasphemers, and those who ask what the Word is, he replies, and the Word was God.

**Theophylactus:** Vel aliter continua. Postquam verbum erat apud Deum, manifestum est quod duae personae erant, quamvis una natura in duabus existat; unde dicitur et Deus erat verbum; ita ut una natura sit patri et filio, cum sit una deitas.

**Origenes:** Adiciendum etiam, quod verbum in eo quod fit ad prophetas, illustrat prophetas sapientiae lumine: apud Deum vero est verbum obtinens ab eo quod sit Deus; unde praelocavit hoc quod est verbum erat apud Deum, ei quod est Deus erat verbum.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Et non ut Plato, hoc quidem intellectum quemdam, hoc vero animam mundi esse dicens: haec enim procul sunt a divina natura. Sed dicunt: pater cum articuli adiectione dictus est Deus, filius autem sine hac. Quid ergo, cum apostolus dicat: magni Dei et salvatoris nostri Iesu Christi; et rursus: qui est super omnia Deus; sed et Romanis scribens dicit: gratia vobis, et pax a Deo patre nostro sine adiectione articuli. Sed et superfluum erat hic apponere superius continue adiectum. Non igitur etsi non est adiectus filio articulus, propter hoc filius minor est Deus.

**THEOPHYL.** Or combine it thus: From the Word being with God, it follows plainly that there are two Persons. But these two are of one Nature; and therefore it proceeds, In the Word was God: to show that Father and Son are of One Nature, being of One Godhead.

**ORIGEN;** We must add too, that the Word illuminates the Prophets with Divine wisdom, in that He comes to them; but that with God He ever is, because He is God. For which reason he placed and the Word was with God, before and the Word was God.

**CHRYS.** Not asserting, as Plato does, one to be intelligence, the other soul; for the Divine Nature is very different from this... But you say, the Father is called God with the addition of the article, the Son without it. What say you then, when the Apostle writes, The great God and our Savior Jesus Christ; and again, Who is over all, God; and Grace be unto you and peace from God our Father; without the article? Besides, too, it were superfluous here, to affix what had been affixed just before. So that it does not follow, though the article is not affixed to the Son, that He is therefore an inferior God.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 4

2 οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

2. The same was in the beginning with God.

---

**Hilarius de Trin:** Quia dixerat Deus erat verbum, trepido in dicto, et me insolens sermo commovet, cum unum Deum prophetae nuntiaverunt. Sed ne quo ultra trepidatio mea progredi possit, reddit sacramenti tanti piscator dispensationem, et refert ad unum omnia, sine contumelia, sine abolitione, sine tempore, dicens hoc erat in principio apud Deum: apud unum ingenitum Deum, ex quo ipse unius unigenitus Deus est, praedicatur.

**HILARY;** Whereas he had said, the Word was God, the fearfulness, and strangeness of the speech disturbed me; the prophets having declared that God was One. But, to quiet my apprehensions, the fisherman reveals the scheme of this so great mystery, and refers all to one, without dishonor, without obliterating [the Person], without reference to time, saying, The Same was in the beginning with God; with One Unbegotten God, from whom He is, the One Only-begotten God.

**Theophylactus:** Et rursus ne suspicio diabolica aliquos conturbaret, ne forte cum verbum Deus sit, surrexerit contra patrem, ut aliqui fabulantur gentilium, et separatus a patre fuerit ipsi patri contrarius, dicit hoc erat in principio apud Deum; quasi dicat: hoc Dei verbum nunquam a Deo extitit separatum.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Vel ne audiens in principio erat verbum, aeviternum quidem aestimes, seniore vero spatio aliquo patris vitam suscipias, induxit hoc erat in principio apud Deum: non enim fuit unquam solitarius ab illo; sed semper Deus apud Deum erat. Vel quia dixerat Deus erat verbum, ut non aestimet quis minorem esse deitatem filii, confestim cognoscitiva propriae deitatis ponit, et aeternitatem assumens, cum dicit hoc erat in principio apud Deum; et quod factum est adiciens omnia per ipsum facta sunt.

**Origenes:** Vel aliter. Postquam praemisera tres propositiones Evangelista, resumit tria in unum, dicens hoc erat in principio apud Deum. In primo enim trium didicimus in quo erat verbum, quia in principio erat; in secundo apud quem, quia apud Deum; in tertio quid erat verbum, quia Deus. Velut ergo demonstrans verbum praedictum, Deum, per hoc quod dicit hoc, et colligens in propositionem quartam hoc quod est in principio erat verbum, et verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat verbum, ait hoc erat in principio apud Deum. Quaerat autem aliquis, cur non est dictum: in principio erat verbum Dei, et verbum Dei erat apud Deum, et Deus erat verbum Dei. Quisquis autem unicam veritatem fatebitur esse; palam est quoniam et demonstratio eius, quae est sapientia, una est. Sed si veritas una, et sapientia una, verbum quoque quod veritatem enuntiat, et sapientiam expandit in his qui susceptibiles sunt, unum siquidem erit. Nec hoc dicimus inficientes verbum Dei fore, sed ostendentes utilitatem omissionis huius vocabuli Dei. Ipse quoque Ioannes in Apocalypsi dicit: et nomen eius verbum Dei.

**THEOPHYL.** Again, to stop any diabolical suspicion, that the Word, because He was God, might have rebelled against His Father, as certain Gentiles fable, or, being separate, have become the antagonist of the Father Himself, he says, The Same was in the beginning with God; that is to say, this Word of God never existed separate from God.

**CHRYS.** Or, lest hearing that In the beginning was the Word, you should regard It as eternal, but yet understand the Father's Life to have some degree of priority, he has introduced the words, The Same was in the beginning with God. For God was never solitary, apart from Him, but always God with God. Or forasmuch as he said, the Word was God, that no one might think the Divinity of the Son inferior, he immediately subjoins the marks of proper Divinity, in that he both again mentions Eternity, The Same was in the beginning with God; and adds His attribute of Creator, All things were made by Him.

**ORIGEN;** Or thus, the Evangelist having begun with those propositions, reunites them into one, saying, The Same was in the beginning with God. For in the first of the three we learnt in what the Word was, that it was in the beginning; in the second, with whom, with God; in the third who the Word was, God. Having, then, by the term, The Same, set before us in a manner God the Word of Whom he had spoken, he collects all into the fourth proposition, viz. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; into, the Same was in the beginning with God. It may be asked, however, why it is not said, In the beginning was the Word of God, and the Word of God was with God, and the Word of God was God? Now whoever will admit that truth is one, must needs admit also that the demonstration of truth, that is wisdom, is one. But if truth is one, and wisdom is one, the Word which enuntiates truth and develops wisdom in those who ho are capable of receiving it, must be One also. And therefore it would have been out of place here to have said, the Word of God, as if there were other words besides that of God, a word of angels, word of men, and so on. We do not say this, to deny that It is the Word of God, but to show the use of omitting the word God. John himself too in the Apocalypse says, And his Name is called the Word of God.

**Alcuinus:** Qualiter autem ponit substantivum verbum erat? Ut intelligeres omnia tempora praevenisse coaeternum Deo patri verbum.

**ALCUIN;** Wherefore does he use the substantive verb, was? That you might understand that the Word, Which is coeternal with God the Father, was before all time.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 5

3 πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο,

3a. All things were made by him.

---

**Alcuinus:** Postquam dixit de natura filii, de operatione eius subiungit, dicens omnia per ipsum facta sunt; idest, quidquid est, sive in substantia, sive in aliqua proprietate.

**ALCUIN;** After speaking of the nature of the Son, he proceeds to His operations, saying, All things were made by him, i.e. every thing whether substance, or property.

**Hilarius de Trin:** Vel aliter. Erat quidem verbum in principio, sed potuit non esse ante principium. Sed quid ille? Omnia per ipsum facta sunt. Infinitum est per quod fit omne quod factum est; et cum ab eo sint omnia, et tempus ab eo est.

**HILARY;** Or thus: [It is said], the Word indeed was in the beginning, but it may be that He was not before the beginning. But what says he; All things were made by him. He is infinite by Whom every thing, which is, was made: and since all things were made by Him, time is likewise.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Moyses quidem incipiens Scripturam veteris testamenti, de sensibilibus nobis loquitur, et haec enumerat per multa: in principio enim fecit Deus caelum et terram. Deinde inducit, quoniam et lux facta est, et firmamentum et stellarum naturae, et genera animalium. Evangelista vero haec omnia excedens uno verbo comprehendit, ut cognita

**CHRYS.** Moses indeed, in the beginning of the Old Testament, speaks to us in much detail of the natural world, saying, In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth; and then relates how that the light, and the firmament, and the stars, and the various kinds of animals were created. But the Evangelist sums up the whole of this in a word, as familiar to his hearers;

auditoribus, ad altiorem festinans materiam, totum hunc librum instituens non de operibus, sed de conditore.

**Augustinus super Genesim:** Cum enim dicitur omnia per ipsum facta sunt, satis ostenditur et lux per ipsum facta, cum dixit Deus: fiat lux; et similiter de aliis. Quod si ita est, aeternum est, quod ait Deus: fiat lux, quia verbum Dei, Deus apud Deum, patri coaeternus est, quamvis creatura temporalis facta sit. Cum enim verba sint temporis, cum dicimus: quando et aliquando; aeternum tamen est in verbo Dei, quando aliquid fieri debeat; et tunc fit quando fieri debuisset in illo verbo est, in quo non est quando et aliquando: quoniam totum illud verbum aeternum est.

**Augustinus super Ioannem:** Quomodo ergo potest fieri ut verbum Dei factum sit, quando Deus per verbum fecit omnia? Si et verbum ipsum factum est, per quod aliud verbum factum est? Si hoc dicis, quia est verbum verbi, per quod factum est illud; ipsum dico ego unigenitum filium Dei. Si autem non dicis verbum Dei, concede non factum verbum per quod facta sunt omnia.

**Augustinus de Trin:** Et si factum non est, creatura non est; si autem creatura non est, eiusdem cum patre substantiae est, omnis enim substantia quae Deus non est, creatura est: et quae creatura non est, Deus est.

**Theophylactus:** Solent autem Ariani dicere, quod sicut per serram ostium fieri dicimus, quasi per organum, sic et per filium omnia facta fuisse dicuntur, non quod ipse sit factor, sed organum; et sic facturam aiunt filium, tamquam factum ad hoc ut per eum omnia fierent. Nos autem ad huiusmodi fictores mendacii simpliciter respondemus. Si enim, ut dicitis, pater creasset ad hoc filium ut eo tamquam organo uteretur, videretur quod inhonorabilior sit filius quam quae facta sunt; sicut ea quae per serram sunt facta, ipso organo nobiliora existunt; nam serra propter ipsa facta est. Sic et propter ipsa quae facta sunt, ut aiunt, pater creavit filium; tamquam si non deberet Deus cuncta creare, nequaquam filium produxisset. Quid his verbis insanius? Sed aiunt: quare non dixit quod omnia verbum fecit; sed usus est hac praepositione per? Ne filium ingenitum intelligeres, et sine principio, et Dei conditorem.

and hastens to loftier matter, making the whole of his book to bear not on the works, but on the Maker.

**AUG.** Since all things were made by him, it is evident that light was as also, when God said, Let there be light. And in like manner the rest. But if so, that which God said, viz. Let there be light, is eternal. For the Word of God, God with God, is coeternal with the Father, though the world created by Him be temporal. For whereas our when and sometimes are words of time, in the Word of God, on the contrary, when a thing ought to be made, is eternal; and the thing is then made, when in that Word it is that it ought to be made, which Word has in It neither when, or at sometime, since It is all eternal.

**AUG.** How then can the Word of God be made, when God by the Word made all things? For if the Word Itself were made, by what other Word was It made? If you say it was the Word of the Word by Which That was made, that Word I call the Only-Begotten Son of God. But if thou dost not call It the Word of the Word, then grant that that Word was not made, by which all things were made.

**AUG.** And if It is not made, It is not a creature; but if It is not a creature, It is of the same Substance with the Father. For every substance which is not God is a creature; and what is not a creature is God.

**THEOPHYL.** The Arians are wont to say, that all things are spoken of as made by the Son, in the sense in which we say a door is made by a saw, viz. as an instrument; not that He was Himself the Maker. And so they talk of the Son as a thing made, as if He were made for this purpose, that all things might be made by Him. Now we to the inventors of this lie reply simply: If, as you say, the Father had created the Son, in order to make use of Him as an instrument, it would appear that the Son were less honorable than the things made, just as things made by a saw are more noble than the saw itself; the saw having been made for their sake. In like way do they speak of the Father creating the Son for the sake of the things made, as it; had He thought good to create the universe, neither would He have produced the Son. What can be more insane than such language? They argue, however, why was it not said

that the Word made all things, instead of the preposition by being used. For this reason, that you might not understand an Unbegotten and Unoriginate Son, a rival God.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Sed si praepositio per conturbat te, et quaeris in Scriptura quod ipsum verbum omnia faceret, audi David: initio tu, domine, terram fundasti, et opera manuum tuarum sunt caeli. Quod autem hoc de unigenito dixerit, addisces ab apostolo utente hoc verbo in epistola ad Hebraeos de filio.

Si vero de patre hoc prophetam dixisse dicis, Paulum vero filio adaptasse; idem fit rursus. Neque enim id filio convenire dixisset, nisi vehementer consideraret quoniam quae sunt dignitatis, cohonorabilia sunt utrique. Si rursus per praepositio aliquam subiectionem tibi videtur inducere, cur Paulus eam de patre ponit? Fidelis dominus, per quem vocati sumus in societatem filii eius. Et iterum: Paulus apostolus per voluntatem Dei.

**Origenes:** Erravit etiam in hoc Valentinus, dicens verbum esse quod mundanae creationis praestitit causam creatori. Sed si sic se habet veritas rerum, prout ipse intelligit, oportebat scriptum fore per creatorem universa consistere a verbo, non autem e contra per verbum a creatore.

**CHRYS.** If the preposition by perplex you, and you would learn from Scripture that the Word Itself made all thin as, hear David, You, Lord, in the beginning has laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Your hands. That he spoke this of the Only-Begotten, you learn from the Apostle, who in the Epistle to the Hebrews applies these words to the Son.

**CHRYS.** But if you say that the prophet spoke this of the Father, and that Paul applied it to the Son, it comes to the same thing. For he would not have mentioned that as applicable to the Son, unless he fully considered that the Father and the Son were of equal dignity. If again you dream that in the preposition by any subjection is implied, why does Paul use of the Father? as, God is faithful, by Whom you were called into the fellowship of His Son; and again, Paul an Apostle by the will of God.

**ORIGEN;** Here too Valentines errs, saying, that the Word supplied to the Creator the cause of the creation of the world. If this interpretation is true, its should have been written that all things had their existence from the Word through the Creator, not contrariwise, through the Word from the Creator.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 6

καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν.

3b. And without him was not any thing made.

---

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Ut non aestimes, dum dicit omnia per ipsum facta sunt, illa omnia solum dicere eum quae a Moyse dicta sunt, convenienter inducit et sine ipso factum est nihil, sive visibile quid, sive intelligibile. Vel

**CHRYS.** That you may not suppose, when he says, All things were made by Him, that he meant only the things Moses had; spoken of, he seasonably brings in, And without Him was not any thing made, nothing, that is,

aliter. Ne hoc quod dixit omnia per ipsum facta sunt, de signis suspiceris nunc dici, de quibus reliqui Evangelistae locuti sunt, inducit et sine ipso factum est nihil.

**Hilarius de Trin:** Vel aliter. Hoc quod dicitur, omnia per ipsum facta sunt, non habet modum: est ingenitus qui factus a nemine est, est et ipse genitus ab innato. Reddidit auctorem cum socium professus est, dicens sine ipso factum est nihil; cum enim nihil sine eo, intelligo non esse solum: quia alius est per quem, alius sine quo non.

**Origenes:** Vel aliter. Ne existimares ea quae per verbum facta sunt, per se existentia, non contenta a verbo, ait et sine ipso factum est nihil; hoc est, nihil factum est extra ipsum; quia ipse ambit omnia, conservans ea.

**Augustinus de quaest. Nov. et Vet. Testam:** Vel dicens sine ipso factum est nihil, nullo modo ipsum facturam esse suspicari debere edocuit. Quomodo enim potest dici: ipse est factura, cum nihil dicatur Deus sine ipso fecisse?

**Origenes super Ioannem:** Vel aliter. Si omnia per verbum facta sunt: de numero vero omnium est malitia, et totus fluxus peccati; et haec per verbum facta sunt; et hoc est falsum. Quantum igitur ad significata, nihil et non ens, unum sunt. Videtur autem apostolus non entia prava dicere: vocat Deus ea quae non sunt tamquam ea quae sunt. Totaque pravitas nihil dicitur, dum absque verbo facta est.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Peccatum enim non per ipsum factum est: et manifestum est quia peccatum nihil est, et nihil fiunt homines cum peccant.

cognizable either by the senses, or the understanding. Or thus; Lest you should suspect the sentence, All things were made by Him, to refer to the miracles which the other Evangelists had related, he adds, and without Him was not any thing made.

**HILARY;** Or thus; That all things were made by him, is pronouncing too much, it may be said. There is an Unbegotten Who is made of none, and there is the Son Himself begotten from Him Who is Unbegotten. The Evangelist however again implies the Author, when he speaks of Him as Associated; saying, without Him was not any thing made. This, that nothing was made without Him, I understand to mean the Son's not being alone, for 'by whom' is one thing, 'not without whom another.

**ORIGEN:** Or thus, that you might not think that the things made by the Word had a separate existence, and were not contained in the Word, he says, and without Him was not any thing made: that is, not any thing was made externally of Him; for He encircles all things, as the Preserver of all things.

**AUG.** Or, by saying, without Him was not any thing made, he tells us not to suspect Him in any sense to be a thing made. For how can He be a thing made, when God, it is said, made nothing without Him?

**ORIGEN;** If all things were made by the Word, and in the number of all things is wickedness, and the whole influx of sin, these too were made by the Word; which is false. Now 'nothing' and 'a thing which is not,' mean the same. And the Apostle seems to call wicked things, things which are not, God calls those things which be not, as though they were. All wickedness then is called nothing, forasmuch as it is made without the Word. Those who say however ever that the devil is not a creature of God, err. In so far as he is the devil, he is not a creature of God; but he, whose character it is to be the devil, is a creature of God. It is as if we should say a murderer is not a creature of God, when, so far as he is a man, he is a creature of God.

**AUG.** For sin was not made by Him; for it is manifest that sin is nothing, and that men become nothing when they sin. Nor was an idol made by the Word.

Et idolum non per verbum factum est: habet quidem formam quamdam humanam, et ipse homo per verbum factus est; sed forma hominis in idolo non per verbum facta est: scriptum est enim: scimus quod nihil est idolum. Ergo ista non sunt facta per verbum; sed quaecumque facta sunt naturaliter, universa natura rerum, omnis omnino creatura ab Angelo usque ad vermiculum.

**Origenes:** Valentinus autem exclusit ab omnibus per verbum factis quae sunt in saeculis facta, quae credit ante verbum extitisse, praeter evidentiam loquens; siquidem quae putantur ab eo divina, removentur ab omnibus, quae autem, velut ipse putat, penitus destruuntur, vere dicuntur omnia. Quidam enim falso dicunt Diabolum non esse creaturam Dei: inquantum enim Diabolus est, creatura Dei non est: is autem cui accidit esse Diabolum, divina est creatura; ac si diceremus, homicidam creaturam Dei non esse, qui tamen in eo quod homo est, creatura Dei est.

**Augustinus de natura boni:** Non autem sunt audienda deliramenta hominum, qui nihil hoc loco aliquid intelligendum esse putant, quia ipsum nihil in fine sententiae positum est; nec intelligunt nihil interesse utrum dicatur: sine ipso nihil factum est, an sine ipso factum est nihil.

**Origenes:** Si accipiatur verbum pro eo quod in quolibet hominum est, quia et ipsum insitum est cuilibet ab eo quod in principio erat verbum, etiam sine hoc verbo nihil committimus, simpliciter accipiendo quod dicitur nihil. Ait enim apostolus quod sine lege peccatum mortuum erat; adveniente vero mandato peccatum revixit: non enim reputatur peccatum, lege non existente; sed nec peccatum erat, non existente verbo: quia dominus dicit: si non venissem et essem illis locutus, peccatum non haberent. Quaelibet enim excusatio deficit volenti dare responsum de crimine, dum verbo praesente ac iudicante quid est agendum, non obedit quis illi. Nec propter hoc inculpandum est verbum, sicut nec magister, per cuius disciplinam non remanet locus excusationis discipulo delinquenti velut de ignorantia. Omnia ergo per verbum facta sunt, non solum naturalia, sed etiam quae ab irrationabilibus fiunt.

It has indeed a sort of form of man, and man himself was made by the Word; but the form of man in an idol was not made by the Word: for it is written, we know that an idol is nothing. These then were not made by the Word; but whatever things were made naturally, the whole universe, were; every creature from an angel to a worm.

**ORIGEN;** Valentinus excludes from the things made by the Word, all that were made in the ages which he believes to have existed before the Word. This is plainly false; inasmuch as the things which he accounts divine are thus excluded from the “all things,” and what he deems wholly corrupt are properly ‘all things!’

**AUG.** The folly of those men is not to be listened to, who think nothing is to be understood here as something because it is placed at the end of the sentence: as if it made so any difference whether it was said, without Him nothing was made, or, without Him was made nothing.

**ORIGEN;** If ‘the word’ be taken for that which is in each man, inasmuch as it was implanted in each by the Word, which was in the beginning then also, we commit nothing without this ‘word’ [reason] taking this word ‘nothing’ in a popular sense. For the Apostle says that sin was dead without the law, but when the commandment came, sin revived; for sin is not imputed when there is no law. But neither was there sin, when there was no Word, for our Lord says, If I had not come and spoken to them, they had not had sin. For every excuse is without drawn from the sinner, if, with the Word present, and enjoining what is to be done, he refuses to obey Him. Nor is the Word to be blamed on this account; any more than a master, whose discipline leaves no excuse open to a delinquent pupil on the ground of ignorance. All things then were made by the Word, not only the natural world, but also whatever is done by those acting without reason.

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 7

ὁ γέγονεν 4 ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν,

4a. In him was life.

---

**Beda in Ioannem:** Quia Evangelista dixit omnem creaturam factam esse per verbum, ne quis forte crederet mutabilem eius voluntatem, quasi qui subito vellet facere creaturam quam ab aeterno nunquam ante fecisset, ideo docere curavit, factam quidem creaturam in tempore; sed in aeterna creatoris sapientia, quando et quos crearet semper fuisse dispositum; unde dicit quod factum est in ipso, vita erat.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Potest autem sic punctari: quod factum est in ipso; et postea dicatur vita erat. Ergo totum vita est, si sic pronuntiaverimus: quid enim non in illo factum est? Ipse est enim sapientia Dei, et dicitur in Psalmo 103, 24: omnia in sapientia fecisti. Omnia igitur sicut per illum, ita et in illo facta sunt. Si ergo quod in illo factum est, vita est, ergo et terra vita est, et lapis vita est. Inhonestum est sic intelligere, ne nobis subrepat secta Manichaeorum, et dicat quia habet vitam lapis, et habet vitam paries: solent enim ista delirantes dicere; et cum reprehensi fuerint ac repulsi, quasi de Scripturis proferunt dicentes: ut quid dictum est: quod factum est in ipso, vita erat? Pronuntia ergo sic quod factum est: hic subdistingue; et deinde infer in ipso vita erat. Facta est enim terra; sed ipsa terra quae facta est non est vita. Est autem in ipsa Dei sapientia spiritualiter ratio quaedam qua terra facta est; haec vita est. Sicut arca in omni opere non est vita; arca in arte vita est, quia vivit anima artificis. Sic ergo quia sapientia Dei, per quam facta sunt omnia, secundum artem continet omnia quae fiunt per ipsam artem, non haec continuo sunt vita; sed quidquid factum est, vita est in illo.

**BEDE;** The Evangelist having said that every creature was made by the Word, lest perchance any one might think that His will was changeable, as though He willed on a sudden to make a creature, which from eternity he had not made; he took care to show that, though a creature was made in time, in the Wisdom of the Creator it had been from eternity arranged what and when He should create.

**AUG.** ‘The passage can be read thus: What was made in Him was life. Therefore the whole universe is life: for what was there not made in Him? He is the Wisdom of God, as is said, In Wisdom have You made them all. All things therefore are made in Him, even as they are by Him. But, if whatever was made in Him is life, the earth is life, a stone is life. We must not interpret it so unsoundly, lest the sect of the Manicheans creep in upon us, and say, that a stone has life, and that a wall has life; for they do insanely assert so, and when reprehended or refuted, appeal as though to Scripture, and ask, why was it said, That which was made in Him. was life? Read the passage then thus: make the stop after What was made, and then proceed, In Him was life. The earth was made; but, the earth itself which was, as made is not life. In the Wisdom of God however there is spiritually a certain Reason after which the earth is made. This is Life. A chest in workmanship is not life, a chest in art is, inasmuch as the mind of the workman lives wherein that original pattern exists. And in this sense the Wisdom of God, by Which all things are made, contains in art ‘all things which are made, according to that art.’ And therefore whatever is made, is not in itself life, but is life in Him.

**Origenes:** Potest autem et sic distingui sine errore: quod factum est in ipso, et postea dicatur vita erat; ut sit sensus: omnia quae per ipsum et in ipso facta sunt, in ipso vita sunt, et unum sunt. Erant enim, hoc est in ipso subsistunt causaliter, priusquam sint in seipsis effective. Sed si quaeris, quomodo et qua ratione omnia quae per verbum facta sunt, in ipso vitaliter et uniformiter et causaliter subsistunt, accipe exempla ex creaturarum natura. Conspice quomodo omnium rerum quas mundi huius sensibilis globositas comprehendit, causae simul et uniformiter in isto sole, qui est maximum mundi luminare, subsistunt; quomodo numerositas herbarum et fructuum in singulis seminibus simul continetur; quomodo multiplices regulae in arte artificis unum sunt, et in animo disponentis vivunt; quomodo infinitus linearum numerus in uno puncto unum subsistit; et huiusmodi varia perspice exempla, ex quibus velut physicae theoriae pennis poteris arcana verbi mentis acie inspicere, et quantum datur humanis rationibus, videre quomodo omnia quae per verbum sunt facta, in ipso vivunt et facta sunt.

**Hilarius de Trin:** Vel aliter potest legi: in eo quod dixerat sine ipso factum est nihil, posset aliquis perturbatus dicere: est ergo aliquid per alterum factum, quod tamen non sit sine eo factum; et si aliquid per alterum, licet non sine eo, iam non per eum omnia; quia aliud est fecisse, aliud est intervenisse facienti. Enarrat ergo Evangelista quid non sine eo factum sit, dicens quod factum est in eo. Hoc igitur non sine eo quod in eo factum est: nam id quod in eo factum est, etiam per eum factum est: omnia enim per ipsum et in ipso creata sunt. In ipso autem creata, quia nascebatur creator Deus; sed ex hoc sine eo nihil factum est, quod tamen in eo factum est, quia nascens Deus vita erat, et qui vita erat, non posteaquam natus erat, factus est vita. Nihil ergo sine eo fiebat ex his quae in eo fiebant, quia vita est in quo fiebant; et Deus qui ab eo natus est, non posteaquam natus est, sed nascendo quoque exiit.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Vel aliter. Non apponemus finale punctum, ubi dicitur sine ipso factum est nihil, secundum haereticos. Illi enim volentes spiritum sanctum creatum dicere, aiunt quod factum est in ipso, vita erat. Sed

**ORIGEN;** It may also be divided thus: That which was made in him; and then, was life; the sense being, that all things that were made by Him and in Him, are life in Him, and are one in Him. They were, that is, in Him; they exist as the cause, before they exist in themselves as effects. If you ask how and in what manner all things which were made by the Word subsist in Him vitally, immutably, causally, take some examples from the created world. See how that all things within the arch of the world of sense have their causes simultaneously and harmoniously subsisting in that sun which is the greatest luminary of the world: how multitudinous crops of herbs and fruits are contained in single seeds: how the most complex variety of rules, in the art of the artificer, and the mind of the director, are a living unit, how an infinite number of lines coexist in one point. Contemplate these several instances, and you will be able as it were on the wings of physical science, to penetrate with your intellectual eye the secrets of the Word, and as far as is allowed to a human understanding, to see how all things which were made by the Word, live in Him, and were made in Him.

**HILARY;** Or it can be understood thus. In that he had said, without Him was not anything thing made, one might have been perplexed, and have asked, Was then any thing made by another, which yet was not made without Him? if so, then though nothing is made without, all things are not made by Him: it being one thing to make, another to be with the maker. On this account the Evangelist declares what it was which was not made without Him, viz. what was made in Him. This then it was which was not made without Him, viz. what was made in Him. And that which was made in Him, was also made by Him. For all things were created in Him and by Him. Now things were made in Him, because He was born God the Creator. And for this reason also things that were made in Him, were not made without Him, viz. that God, in that He was born, was life, and He who was life, was not made life after being born. Nothing then which was made in Him, was made without Him, because He was life, in Whom they were made; because God Who was born of God was God, not after, but in that He was born.

**CHRYS** Or to give another explanation. We will not put the stop at without Him was not any thing made, as the heretics do. For they wishing to prove the Holy Ghost a creature, read, That which was made in Him, was life. But

ita non potest intelligi. Primum quidem neque tempus erat hic spiritus sancti meminisse; sed si de sancto spiritu hoc dictum est, age, secundum eorum interim legamus modum: ita enim nobis hoc inconueniens erit; cum enim dicitur quod factum est in ipso, vita erat, spiritum sanctum dicunt dictum esse vitam; sed vita haec et lux invenitur esse; inducit enim vita erat lux hominum. Quocirca, secundum eos, lucem omnium hunc spiritum dicit. Quod autem superius verbum dicit, hic consequenter et Deum et vitam et lucem nominat. Verbum autem caro factum est: erit igitur spiritus sanctus incarnatus, non filius. Ideo dimittentes hunc modum legendi, ad decentem veniamus lectionem et expositionem; hoc autem est cum dicitur omnia per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil quod factum est; ibi quiescere fac sermonem; deinde ab ea quae deinceps est dictione incipe, quae dicit in ipso vita erat; ac si dicat sine eo factum est nihil quod factum est, idest factibilium. Vides qualiter hac brevi adiectione omnia correxit supervenientia inconuenientia. Inducens enim sine eo factum est nihil, et adiciens quod factum est, et intelligibilia comprehendit, et spiritum sanctum exceptit: spiritus enim sanctus factibilis non est. Haec igitur quae dicta sunt, de conditione rerum dixit Ioannes. Inducit autem et eum qui est de providentia sermonem, dicens in ipso vita erat. Quemadmodum in fonte qui generat abyssos, et in nullo minoratur fons; ita et in operatione unigeniti quaecumque credas per eum facta esse, non minor ipse factus est. Nomen autem vitae hic non solum conditionis est, sed et providentiae rerum, quae est secundum permanentiam earum. Cum autem audis quoniam in ipso vita erat, ne compositum aestimes: sicut enim pater habet vitam in seipso, ita dedit et filio vitam habere. Ergo sicut patrem non utique dices compositum esse, ita nec filium.

**Origenes in Ioannem:** Vel aliter. Oportet scire, quod salvator quaedam dicit non sibi esse, sed aliis; quaedam vero et sibi et aliis. In hoc ergo quod dicitur quod factum est in verbo, vita erat, scrutandum est an sibi et aliis vita est, vel aliis tantum; et si aliis, quibus aliis. Idem autem est vita et lux; lux autem hominum est: fit itaque hominum vita, quorum est lux; et sic in eo quod dicitur vita, salvator dicitur non sibi, sed aliis. Haec quidem vita verbo praeexistenti aderit, ex eo quod expiata a peccatis anima sit serena, et vita inseratur ei qui verbi Dei se susceptibilem statuit. Unde verbum quidem in principio non dixit factum: non enim erat quando principium verbo careret. Vita autem hominum

this cannot be so understood. For first, this was not the place for making mention of the Holy Ghost. But let us suppose it was; let us take the passage for the present according to their reading, we shall see that it leads to a difficulty. For when it is said, That which was made in Him, was life; they say the life spoken of is the Holy Ghost. But this life is also light; for the Evangelist proceeds, The life was the light of men. Wherefore according to them, he calls the Holy Ghost the light of all men. But the Word mentioned above, is what he here calls consecutively, God, and Life, and Light. Now the Word was made flesh. It follows that the Holy Ghost is incarnate, not the Son. Dismissing then this reading, we adopt a more suitable one, with the following meaning: All things were made by Him, and without Him was not any thing made which was made: there we make a stop, and begin a fresh sentence: In Him was life. Without Him was not any thing made which was as made; i.e. which could be made. You see how by this short addition, he removes any difficulty which might follow. For by introducing without Him was not any thing made, and adding, which was made, he includes all things invisible, and excepts the Holy: Spirit: for the Spirit cannot be made. To the mention of creation, succeeds that of providence. In Him was life. As a fountain which produces vast depths of water, and yet is nothing diminished at the fountain head; so works the Only-Begotten. How great soever His creations be, He Himself is none the less for them. By the word life here is meant not only creation, but that providence by which the things created are preserved. But when you are told that in Him was life, do not suppose Him compounded; for, as the Father has life in Himself, so has He given to the Son to have life in Himself. As then you would not call the Father compounded, so neither should you the Son.

**ORIGEN;** Or thus: Our Savior is said to be some things not for Himself, but for others; others again, both for Himself and others. When it is said then, That which was as made in Him was life; we must inquire whether the life is for Himself and others, or for others only; and if for others, for whom? Now the Life and the Light are both the same Person: He is the light of men: He is therefore their life. The Savior is called Life here, not to Himself, but to others; whose Light He also is. This life is inseparable from the Word, from the time it is added on to it. For Reason or the Word must exist before in the soul, cleansing it from sin, till it is pure enough to receive the life,

non semper erat in verbo; sed haec vita hominum facta est, eo quod vita est lux hominum: cum enim homo non erat, nec lux hominum erat, luce secundum habitudinem ad homines intellecta; et ideo dicit quod factum est in verbo, vita erat; non autem: quod erat in verbo, vita erat. Invenitur autem alia littera non incongrue habens: quod factum est in eo, vita est. Si autem intelligamus vitam hominum quae in verbo fit, eum esse qui dixit: ego sum vita, fatebimur neminem infidelium Christi vivere, sed cunctos esse mortuos qui non vivunt in Deo.

which is thus engrafted or inborn in every one who renders himself fit to receive the Word of God. Hence observe, that though the Word itself in the beginning was not made, the Beginning never having been without the Word; yet the life of men was not always in the Word. This life of men was made, in that It was the light of men; and this light of men could not be before man was; the light of men being understood relatively to men. And therefore he says, That which was made in the Word was life; not That which was in the Word was life. Some copies read, not amiss, "That which was made, in Him is life." If we understand the life in the Word, to be He who says below, 'I am the life,' we shall confess that none who believe not. in Christ live, and that all who live not in God, are dead.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 8

καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων:

4b. And the life was the light of men.

---

**Theophylactus:** Dixerat in ipso vita erat, ne putares quod absque vita sit verbum; nunc ostendit quod vita sit spiritalis, et lux rationalibus cunctis; unde dicitur et vita erat lux hominum; quasi dicat: lux ista non est sensibilis, sed intellectualis, illuminans ipsam animam.

**THEOPHYL.** He had said, In him was life, that you might not suppose that the Word was without life. Now he shows that that life is spiritual, and the light of all reasonable creatures. And the life was the light of men: i.e. not sensible, but intellectual light, illuminating the very soul.

**Augustinus super Ioannem:** Ex ipsa enim vita illuminantur homines, pecora non illuminantur, quia non habent rationales mentes, quae possint videre sapientiam; homo autem factus ad imaginem Dei, habet rationalem mentem, per quam possit percipere sapientiam. Ergo illa vita per quam facta sunt omnia, lux est, et non quorumcumque animalium, sed hominum.

**AUG.** Life of itself gives illumination to men, but to cattle not: for they have not rational souls, by which to discern wisdom: whereas man, being made in the image of God, has a rational soul, by which he can discern wisdom. Hence that life, by which all things are made, is light, not however of all animals whatsoever, but of men.

**Theophylactus:** Non autem dixit: lux est solum Iudaeis, sed omnium hominum; omnes enim homines, in quantum intellectum et rationem recepimus ab eo quod nos condidit verbo, in quantum ab eo illuminari dicimur: nam ratio nobis tradita, per quam rationales dicimur, lux est ad operanda nos dirigens et non operanda.

**Origenes in Ioannem:** Non est autem praetermittendum quod vitam praemittit luci hominum: inconsequens enim erat illuminari non viventem, et advenire illuminationi vitam. Si autem idem est vita erat lux hominum, quod solum hominum, erit Christus lux atque vita solum hominum. Hoc autem opinari haereticum est. Non igitur quidquid dicitur aliquorum, illorum solum est: scriptum est enim de Deo, quod sit Deus Abraham, Isaac et Iacob; non tamen istorum tantum patrum dictus est Deus. Non ergo ex eo quod dicitur lux hominum, excluditur quin sit aliorum. Alius vero contendit ex eo quod scriptum est: faciamus hominem ad imaginem nostram: quod quidquid ad imaginem ac similitudinem Dei factum est, intelligi debet per hominem. Sic igitur lux hominum lux cuiuslibet rationalis creaturae est.

**THEOPHYL.** He said not, the Light of the Jews only, but of all men: for all of us, in so far as we have received intellect and reason, from that Word which created us, are said to be illuminated by Him. For the reason which is given to us, and which constitutes us the reasonable beings we are, is a light directing us what to do, and what not to do.

**ORIGEN;** We must not omit to notice, that he puts the life before the light of men. For it would be a contradiction to suppose a being without life to be illuminated; as if life were an addition to illumination. But to proceed: if the life was the light of men, meaning men only, Christ is the light and the life of men only; an heretical supposition. It does not follow then, when a thing is predicated of any, that it is predicated of those only; for of God it is written, that He is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and yet He is not the God of those fathers only. In the same way, the light of men is not excluded from being the light of others as well. Some moreover contend from , Genesis, Let us make man after our image, that man means whatever is made after the image and similitude of God. If so, the light of men is the light of any rational creature whatever.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 9

5 καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.

5. And the light shines in darkness.

---

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Quia vita illa est lux hominum, sed stulta corda capere istam lucem non possunt, quia peccatis suis aggravantur, ut eam videre non possint; ne ideo cogitent quasi absentem esse lucem, quia eam videre non possunt, sequitur et lux in tenebris lucet, et tenebrae eam non comprehenderunt. Quomodo enim homo positus in sole caecus, praesens est illi sol, sed ipse soli absens est; sic omnis stultus caecus est, et praesens est illi

**AUG.** Whereas that life is the light of men, but foolish hearts cannot receive that light, being so encumbered with sins that they cannot see it; for this cause lest any should think there is no light near them, because they cannot see it, he continues: And the light shines in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not. For suppose a blind man standing in the sun, the sun is present to him, but he is absent from the sun. In like manner every fool is blind, and wisdom is present to him; but, though present, absent from his

sapientia. Sed cum caeco praesens est, oculis eius absens est: non quia illa ipsi absens est, sed quia ipse absens est ab illa.

**Origenes in Ioannem:** Tenebrae autem huiusmodi hominum non natura sunt, secundum illud Pauli: eramus aliquando tenebrae, nunc autem lux in domino.

**Origenes:** Vel aliter. Lux in tenebris fidelium animarum lucet, a fide inchoans, ad spem trahens. Imperitorum vero cordium perfidia et ignorantia lucem verbi Dei in carne fulgentis non comprehenderunt. Sed iste sensus moralis est. Physica vero horum verborum theoria talis est. Humana natura, etsi non peccaret, suis propriis viribus non lucere posset: non enim naturaliter lux est, sed particeps lucis: capax siquidem sapientiae est, non ipsa sapientia. Sicut ergo aer per semetipsum non lucet, sed tenebrarum vocabulo nuncupatur; ita nostra natura dum per seipsam consideratur, quaedam tenebrosa substantia est, capax ac particeps lucis sapientiae: et sicut aer dum solares radios participat, non dicitur per se lucere, sed solis splendor in eo apparere; ita rationabilis nostrae naturae pars, dum praesentiam verbi Dei possidet, non per se res intelligibiles et Deum suum, sed per insitum sibi divinum lumen cognoscit. Lux itaque in tenebris lucet: quia Dei verbum vita et lux hominum in nostra natura, quae per se investigata et considerata, informis quaedam tenebrositas invenitur, lucere non desinit: et quoniam ipsa lux omni creaturae est incomprehensibilis, tenebrae eam non comprehenderunt.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Vel aliter totum ab illo loco et vita erat lux hominum. Primum nos de conditione docuerat; deinde dicit et quae secundum animam bona praebuit nobis veniens verbum; unde dicit et vita erat lux hominum. Non dicit: lux Iudaeorum; sed universaliter hominum: non enim Iudaei solum, sed et gentes ad hanc venerunt cognitionem. Non autem adiecit: et Angelorum; quoniam ei de natura humana sermo est, quibus verbum venit evangelizans bona.

sight, forasmuch as sight is gone: the truth being, not that she is absent from him, but that he is absent from her.

**ORIGEN;** This kind of darkness however is not in men by nature, according to the text in the Ephesians, You were some time darkness, but now are you light in the Lord.

**ORIGEN;** Or thus, The light shines in the darkness of faithful souls, beginning from faith, and drawing onwards to hope; but the deceit and ignorance of undisciplined souls did not comprehend the light of the Word of God shining in the flesh. That however is an ethical meaning. The metaphysical signification of the words is as follows. Human nature, even though it sinned not, could not shine by its own strength simply; for it is not naturally light, but only a recipient of it; it is capable of containing wisdom, but is not wisdom itself. As the air, of itself, shines not, but is called by the name of darkness, even so is our nature, considered in itself; a dark substance, which however admits of and is made partaker of the light of wisdom. And as when the air receives the sun's rays, it is not said to shine of itself, but the sun's radiance to be apparent in it; so the reasonable part of our nature, while possessing the presence of the Word of God, does not of itself understand God, and intellectual things, but by means of the divine light implanted in it. Thus, The light shines in darkness: for the Word of God, the life and the light of men, ceases not to shine in our nature; though regarded in itself, that nature is without form and darkness. And forasmuch as pure light cannot be comprehended by any creature, hence the text: The darkness comprehended it not.

**CHRYS.** Or thus: throughout the whole foregoing passage he, had been speaking of creation; then he mentions the spiritual; benefits which the Word brought w with it: and the life was the light of men. He said not, the light of Jews, but of all men without exception; for not the Jews only, but the Gentiles also have come to this knowledge. The Angels he omits, for he is speaking of human nature, to whom the Word came bringing glad tidings.

**Origenes:** Quaerunt autem quare non verbum lux hominum dictum est, sed vita quae in verbo fit; quibus respondemus: quia vita quae ad praesens, non ea quae communis est rationalium et irrationalium dicitur, sed quae adiungitur verbo quod in nobis fit per participationem verbi primarii, ad discernendum apparentem vitam et non veram, et cupiendam veram vitam. Prius ergo participamus vitam quae apud quosdam quidem est potentia, non actu lux; qui scilicet non sunt avidi perquirere quae ad scientiam pertinent; apud quosdam vero et actu lux efficitur, qui, secundum apostolum, aemulantur dona meliora, scilicet verbum sapientiae. Si tamen et tunc idem est vita et lux hominum, nullus manens in tenebris perfecte vivere comprobatur, nec quisquam viventium consistit in tenebris.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Vita enim adveniente nobis, solutum est mortis imperium; et luce lucente nobis, non ultra sunt tenebrae; sed semper manet vita quam mors superare non potest, nec tenebrae lucem; unde sequitur et lux in tenebris lucet. Tenebras mortem et errorem dicit: nam lux quidem sensibilis non in tenebris lucet, sed sine illis; praedicatio vero Christi in medio erroris regnantis fulsit; et eum disparere fecit, et in vitam mortem fecit mortuus Christus, ita eam superans ut eos qui detinebantur reduceret. Quia igitur neque mors eam superavit, neque error; sed fulgida est eius praedicatio ubique, et lucet cum propria fortitudine; propterea subdit et tenebrae eam non comprehenderunt.

**Origenes:** Est etiam sciendum, quod sicut lux hominum nomen est duarum spiritualium rerum, sic et tenebrae: dicimus enim hominem lucem possidentem, opera lucis perficere, et etiam cognoscere quasi illustratum lumine scientiae; et e contrario tenebras dicimus illicitos actus, et eam quae videtur scientia, non est autem. Sicut autem pater lux est, et in eo tenebrae non sunt ullae, sic et salvator. Sed quia similitudinem carnis peccati subiit, non incongrue de eo dicitur, quod tenebrae in eo sunt aliquae, ipso in se suscipiente nostras tenebras ut eas dissiparet. Haec igitur lux, quae facta est vita hominum, radiat in tenebris animarum nostrarum, et venit ubi princeps tenebrarum harum cum genere bellat humano. Hanc lucem persecutae sunt tenebrae: quod patet ex his quae salvator et eius filii sustinent, pugnantibus tenebris contra filios lucis. Verum quia Deus patrocinator, non invalescunt; unde non

**ORIGEN;** But they ask, why is not the Word Itself called the light of men, instead of the life which is in the Word? We reply, that the life here spoken of is not that which rational and irrational animals have in common, but that which is annexed to the Word which is within us through participation of the primeval Word. For we must distinguish the external and false life, from the desirable and true. We are first made partakers of life: and this life with some is light potentially only, not in act; with those, viz. who are not eager to search out the things which appertain to knowledge: with others it is actual light, those who, as the Apostle said, covet earnestly the best gifts, that is to say, the word of wisdom. (If the life and the light of men are the same, whoso is in darkness is proved not to live, and none who lives abides in darkness.)

**CHRYS.** Life having come to us, the empire of death is dissolved; a light having shone upon us, there is darkness no longer: but there remains ever a life which death, a light which darkness cannot overcome. Whence he continues, And the light shines in darkness: by darkness meaning death and error, for sensible light does not shine in darkness, but darkness must be removed first; whereas the preaching of Christ shone forth amidst the reign of error, and caused it to disappear, and Christ by dying changed death into life, so overcoming it, that, those who were already in its grasp, were brought back again. Forasmuch then as neither death nor error has overcome his light, which is every where conspicuous shilling forth by its own strength; therefore he adds, And the darkness comprehended it not.

**ORIGEN;** As the light of men is a word expressing two spiritual things, so is darkness also. To one who possesses the light, we attribute both the doing the deeds of the light, and also true understanding, inasmuch as he is illuminated by the light of knowledge: and, on the other hand, the term darkness we apply both to unlawful acts, and also to that knowledge, which seems such, but is not. Now as the Father is light, and in Him is no darkness at all, so is the Savior also. Yet, inasmuch as he underwent the similitude of our sinful flesh, it is not incorrectly said of Him, that in Him there was some darkness; for He took our darkness upon Himself, in order that He might dissipate it. This Light therefore, which was made the life of man, shines in the darkness of our hearts, when the prince of this darkness wars with the human race. This Light the darkness persecuted, as is clear from what our

apprehendunt lucem, vel quia celeritatem cursus lucis subsequi non valent propter propriam tarditatem, vel quia si supervenientem expectant, fugantur luce appropinquante. Oportet autem id considerare, quod non semper tenebrae in sinistra parte sumuntur, sed quandoque in bona, posuit tenebras latibulum suum, dum ea quae sunt erga Deum, ignota et imperceptibilia sunt. De hac ergo laudata caligine dicam, quoniam versus lucem pergit, illamque apprehendit: quia quod erat caligo, dum ignorabatur, in lucem cognitam vertitur ei qui didicit.

**Augustinus de Civ. Dei:** Hoc autem initium sancti Evangelii quidam Platonius aureis litteris perscribendum, et per omnes Ecclesias in locis eminentissimis proponendum esse dicebat.

**Beda in Ioannem:** Nam alii Evangelistae Christum in tempore natum describunt, Ioannes vero eundem in principio testatur fuisse, dicens in principio erat verbum. Alii inter homines eum subito apparuisse commemorant; ille ipsum apud Deum semper fuisse testatur, dicens et verbum erat apud Deum. Alii eum verum hominem, ille verum confirmat Deum, dicens et Deus erat verbum. Alii hominem apud homines eum temporaliter conversatum; ille Deum apud Deum in principio manentem ostendit, dicens hoc erat in principio apud Deum. Alii magnalia quae in homine gessit perhibent; ille quod omnem creaturam per ipsum Deus pater fecerit, docet, dicens omnia per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil.

Savior and His children suffer; the darkness fighting against the children of light. But, forasmuch as God takes up the cause, they do not prevail; nor do they apprehend the light, for they are either of too slow a nature to overtake the light's quick course, or, waiting for it to come up to them, they are put to flight at its approach. We should bear in mind, however, that darkness is not always used in a bad sense, but sometimes in a good, as in Psalm xvii. He made darkness His secret place: the things of God being unknown and incomprehensible. This darkness then I will call praiseworthy, since it tends toward light, and lays hold on it: for, though it were darkness before, while it was not known, yet it is turned to light and knowledge in him who has learned.

**AUG.** A certain Platonist once said, that the beginning of this Gospel ought to be copied in letters of gold, and placed in the most conspicuous place in every church.

**BEDE;** The other Evangelists describe Christ as born in time; John witnesses that He was in the beginning, saying, In the beginning was the Word. The others describe His sudden appearance among men; he witnesses that He was ever with God, saying, And the Word was with God. The others prove Him very man; he very God, saying, And the Word was God. The others exhibit Him as man conversing with men for a season; he pronounces Him God abiding with God in the beginning, saying, The Same was in the beginning with God. The others relate the great deeds which He did amongst men; he that God the Father made every creature through Him, saying, All things were made by Him, and without Him was not any shiny made.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 10

6 ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ, ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης; 7 οὗτος ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν, ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ

6. There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. 7. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe. 8. He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light.

φωτός, ἵνα πάντες πιστεύσωσιν δι' αὐτοῦ. 8 οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς, ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός.

---

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Ea quae dicta sunt superius, de divinitate Christi dicta sunt, qui sic venit ad nos secundum quod apparuit homo. Quia igitur sic erat homo ut lateret in illo Deus, missus est ante illum magnus homo, per cuius testimonium inveniretur plusquam homo. Et quis est hic? Fuit homo.

**Theophylactus:** Non Angelus, ut suspicionem multorum destrueret.

**Augustinus:** Et quomodo posset iste verum de Deo dicere, nisi missus a Deo?

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Nihil de reliquo humanum esse aestimo eorum quae dicuntur ab illo: non enim quae eius sunt, sed quae mittentis omnia loquitur: ideo et Angelus nuncupatus est a propheta dicente: ego mitto Angelum meum. Angeli enim virtus est nihil proprium dicere. Hoc autem quod dicit fuit missus, non eius qui ad esse processus ostensivum est. Sicut autem Isaias missus fuit non aliunde quam a mundo, sed a statu quo vidit dominum sedentem super solium excelsum et elevatum, ad plebem; sic et Ioannes a deserto ad baptizandum mittitur; ait enim: qui misit me baptizare, ille mihi dixit: super quem videris spiritum descendentem et manentem super eum, hic est qui baptizat in spiritu sancto.

**Augustinus:** Quid vocabatur? Cui nomen erat Ioannes.

**Alcuinus:** Idest gratia Dei, vel in quo est gratia, qui gratiam novi testamenti, idest Christum, suo testimonio primum mundo innotuit. Vel Ioannes interpretatur cui donatum est, quia per gratiam Dei donatum est illi regem regum non solum praecurrere, sed etiam baptizare.

**AUG.** What is said above, refers to the Divinity of Christ. He came to us in the form of man, but man in such sense, as that the Godhead was concealed within Him. And therefore there was sent before a great man, to declare by his witness that He was more than man. And who was this? He was a man.

**THEOPHYL.** Not an Angel, as many have held. The Evangelist here refutes such a notion.

**AUG.** And how could he declare the truth concerning God, unless he were sent from God.

**CHRYS.** After this esteem nothing that he says as human; for he speaks not his own, but his that sent him. And therefore the Prophet calls him a messenger, I send My messenger, for it is the excellence of a messenger, to say nothing of his own. But the expression, was sent, does not mean his entrance into life, but to his office. As Esaias was sent on his commission, not from any place out of the world, but from where he saw the Lord sitting upon His high and lofty throne; in like manner John was sent from the desert to baptize; for he says, He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said to me, Upon Whom you shall see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizes with the Holy Ghost.

**AUG.** What was he called? whose name was John?

**ALCUIN.** That is, the grace of God, or one in whom is grace, who by his testimony first made known to the world the grace of the New Testament, that is, Christ. Or John may be taken to mean, to whom it is given: because that through the grace of God, to him it was given, not only to herald, but also to baptize the King of kings.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Quare venit? Hic venit in testimonium, ut testimonium perhiberet de lumine.

**Origenes in Ioannem:** Quidam improbare nituntur edita de Christo testimonia prophetarum, dicentes non egere testibus Dei filium habentem credulitatis sufficientiam tum in his quae protulit salubribus verbis, tum in mirabilibus operibus suis. Siquidem et Moyses credi meruit per verbum et virtutes, non egens praevis testibus. Ad hoc dicendum est, quod multis existentibus causis inducentibus ad credendum, plerumque quidam ex hac demonstratione non admirantur, ex alia vero habent causam ut credant. Deus autem est qui pro cunctis hominibus homo factus est. Constat igitur quosdam ex dictis prophetis ad Christi admirationem coactos, mirantes tot prophetarum ante eius adventum voces, constituentes nativitatis eius locum, et alia huiusmodi. Illud quoque advertendum, quod prodigiosae virtutes ad credendum provocare poterant eos qui tempore Christi erant, non autem post longa tempora: nam fabulosa quaedam aestimata fuerunt: plus enim peractis virtutibus facit ad credulitatem quae cum virtutibus quaeritur prophetia. Est autem et tale quid dicere, quod quidam in hoc quod testimonium perhibent Deo, honorati sunt. Privare vult ergo chororum prophetarum ingenti gratia qui dicit, illos non oportere de Christo testimonium exhibere. Accessit autem his Ioannes, ut testimonium de luce perhibeat.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Non ea indigente testimonio, sed propter quid, ipse Ioannes docet, dicens ut omnes crederent per illum. Sicut enim carnem induit, ne omnes perderet; ita et praeconem hominem misit, ut cognatam audientes vocem, facilius advenirent.

**Beda:** Non autem ait: ut omnes crederent in illum: maledictus enim homo qui confidit in homine; sed ut omnes crederent per illum; hoc est, per illius testimonium crederent in lucem.

**AUG.** Wherefore came he? The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light.

**ORIGEN;** Some try to undo the testimonies of the Prophets to Christ, by saying that the Son of God had no need of such witnesses; the wholesome words which He uttered and His miraculous acts being sufficient to produce belief; just as Moses deserved belief for his speech and goodness, and wanted no previous witnesses. To this we may reply, that, where there are a number of reasons to make people believe, persons are often impressed by one kind of proof; and not by another, and God, Who for the sake of all men became man, can give them many reasons for belief in Him. And with respect to the doctrine of the Incarnation, certain it is that some have been forced by the Prophetical writings into an admiration of Christ by the fact of so many prophets having, before His advent, fixed the place of His nativity; and by other proofs of the same kind. It is to be remembered too, that, though the display of miraculous powers might stimulate the faith of those who lived in the same age with Christ, they might, in the lapse of time, fail to do so; as some of them might even get to be regarded as fabulous. Prophecy and miracles together are more convincing than simply past miracles by themselves. We must recollect too that men receive honor themselves from the witness which they bear to God. He deprives the Prophetical choir of immeasurable honor, whoever denies that it was their office to bear witness to Christ. John when he comes to bear witness to the light, follows in the train of those who went before him.

**CHRYS.** Not because the light wanted the testimony, but for the reason which John himself self gives, viz. that all might believe on Him. For as He put on flesh to save all men from death; so He sent before Him a human preacher, that the sound of a voice like their own, might the readier draw men to Him.

**BEDE;** He says not, that all men should believe in him; for, cursed be the man that trusts in man; but, that all men through him might believe; i.e. by his testimony believe in the Light.

**Theophylactus:** Si vero aliqui non crediderint, excusabilis permanet ipse: nam sicut si aliquis includens se in domo caliginis, et ipsum solis radius non illustret, ipse causam tribuit, et non sol; sic Ioannes, ut omnes crederent, missus fuit; sed si minime consecutum est, ipse huius rei causa non extitit.

**Chrysostomus:** Quia vero multum apud nos maior qui testatur, eo cui testimonium perhibet, et dignior fide esse videtur; ne quis et de Ioanne hoc suspicetur, hanc suspicionem destruit, dicens non erat ille lux; sed ut testimonium perhiberet de lumine. Si vero non huic instans opinioni hoc resumpsit ut testimonium perhiberet de lumine, superfluum esset quod dicitur, et magis iteratio sermonis quam explanatio doctrinae.

**Theophylactus:** Sed dicet aliquis: ergo neque Ioannem, neque sanctorum quempiam lucem esse vel fuisse dicemus. Sed si sanctorum aliquem lucem velimus dicere, ponemus lucem absque articulo; ut si interrogatus fueris utrum Ioannes est lux sine articulo, secure concedas; si vero cum articulo, non concedas. Non enim est ipsa lux principalior; sed lux dicitur quia secundum participationem lucem habeat a vero lumine.

**THEOPHYL.** Though some however might not believe, he is not accountable for them. When a man shuts himself up in a dark room, so as to receive no light from the sun's rays, he is the cause of the deprivation, not the sun. In like manner John was sent, that all men might believe; but if no such result followed, he is not the cause of the failure.

**CHRYS.** Forasmuch however as with us, the one who witnesses, is commonly a more important, a more trustworthy person, than the one to whom he bears witness, to do away with any such notion in the present case the Evangelist proceeds; He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light. If this were not his intention, in repeating the words, to bear witness of that Light, the addition would be superfluous, and rather a verbal repetition, than the explanation of a truth.

**THEOPHYL.** But it will be said, that we do not allow John or any of the saints to be or ever to have been light. The difference is this: If we call any of the saints light, we put light without the article. So if asked whether John is light, without the article, you may allow without hesitation that he is: if with the article, you allow it not. For he is not very, original, light, but is only called so, on account of his partaking of the light, which comes from the true Light.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 11

9 ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

9. That was the true Light which lights every man that comes into the world.

---

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** De quo lumine Ioannes testimonium perhibeat, ostendit dicens erat lux vera.

**AUG.** What Light it is to which John bears witness, he shows himself, saying, That was the true Light.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Vel aliter. Quia superius de Ioanne dixerat, quod venit et missus est ut testetur de luce, ne quis hoc audiens propter testantis recentem praesentiam, de eo cui testimonium perhibetur, talem quamdam suspicionem accipiat, reduxit mentem, et ad eam quae supra omne principium est, transmisit existentiam, dicens erat lux vera.

**Augustinus:** Quare additum est vera? Quia et homo illuminatus dicitur lux; sed vera lux illa est quae illuminat; nam et oculi nostri dicuntur lumina, et tamen nisi aut per noctem lucerna accendatur, aut per diem sol exeat, lumina illa sine causa patent; unde subdit quae illuminat omnem hominem. Si omnem hominem, ergo et ipsum Ioannem. Ipse ergo illuminabat, a quo se demonstrari volebat. Quomodo enim plerumque fit ut in aliquo corpore radiato cognoscatur ortus esse sol quem oculis videre non possumus; quia etiam qui saucios habet oculos, idonei sunt videre parietem illuminatum, aut aliquid huiusmodi; sic omnes ad quos venerat Christus, minus erant idonei eum videre. Radiavit Ioannem, et per illum confitentem se illuminatum cognitus est ille qui illuminat. Dicit autem venientem in hunc mundum, nam si illinc non recederet, non esset illuminandus; sed ideo hic illuminandus, quia illinc recessit ubi homo poterat esse illuminatus.

**Theophylactus:** Erubescat Manichaeus, qui conditoris maligni et tenebrosi nos asserit creaturas: non enim illuminaremur, si veri luminis creaturae non essemus.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Ubi sunt etiam qui non dicunt eum verum Deum? Hic enim lux vera dicitur. Sed si illuminat omnem hominem venientem in hunc mundum, qualiter tot sine lumine permanserunt? Non enim omnes cognoverunt Christi culturam. Illuminat igitur omnem hominem quantum ad eum pertinet; si autem quidam mentis oculos claudentes noluerunt recipere lucis huius radios, non a lucis natura obtenebratio est eis, sed a malitia eorum, qui voluntarie privant seipsos gratiae dono: nam gratia quidem ad omnes effusa est; qui vero nolunt dono hoc frui, sibi ipsis hanc imputent caecitatem.

**CHRYS.** Or thus; Having said above that John had come, and was sent, to bear witness of the Light, lest any from the recent coming of the witness, should infer the same of Him who is witnessed to, the Evangelist takes us back to that existence which is beyond all beginning, saying, That was the true Light.

**AUG.** Wherefore is there added, true? Because man enlightened is called light, but the true Light is that which lightens. For our eyes are called lights, and yet, without a lamp at night, or the sun by day, these lights are open to no purpose. Wherefore he adds: which lightens every man: but if every man, then John himself. He Himself then enlightened the person, by whom He wished Himself to be pointed out. And just as we may often, from the reflection of the sun's rays on some object, know the sun to be risen, though we cannot fool; at the sun itself; as even feeble eyes can look at an illuminated wall, or some object of that kind: even so, those to whom Christ came, being too weak to behold Him, He threw His rays upon John; John confessed the illumination, and so the illuminator Himself was discovered. It is said, that comes into the world. Had man not departed from Him, he had not had to be enlightened; but therefore is he to be here enlightened, because he departed thence, when the might have been enlightened.

**THEOPHYL.** Let the Manichean blush, who pronounces us the creatures of a dark and malignant creator: for we should never be enlightened, were we not the children of the true Light.

**CHRYS.** Where are those too, who deny Him to be very God? We see here that He is called very Light. But if He lightens every man that comes into the world, how is it that so many have gone on without light? For all have not known the worship of Christ. The answer is: He only enlightens every man, so far as pertains to Him. If men shut their eyes, and will not receive the rays of this light, their darkness arises not from the fault of the light, but from their own wickedness, inasmuch as they voluntarily deprive themselves of the gift of grace. For grace is poured out upon all; and they, who will not enjoy the gift, may impute it to their own blindness.

**Augustinus Enchir:** Vel quod dicitur illuminat omnem hominem, sic intelligimus: non quia nullus est hominum qui non illuminetur; sed quia nisi ab ipso nullus illuminatur.

**Beda:** Sive naturali ingenio, sive sapientia divina: sicut enim nemo a seipso esse, sic etiam nemo a seipso sapiens esse potest.

**Origenes:** Vel aliter. Non de his qui de occultis seminum causis in species corporales procedunt, debemus intelligere quod illuminat omnem hominem venientem in hunc mundum; sed de his qui spiritualiter per regenerationem gratiae, quae datur in Baptismate, in mundum veniunt invisibilem. Eos itaque vera lux illuminat qui in mundum virtutum veniunt, non eos qui in mundum vitiorum ruunt.

**Theophylactus:** Vel aliter. Intellectus nobis traditus, ac nos dirigens, qui et naturalis ratio nominatur, dicitur lux tradita nobis a Deo. Sed quidam male ratione utentes, seipsos obscuraverunt.

**AUG.** Or the words, lightens every man, may be understood to mean, not that there is no one who is not enlightened, but that no one is enlightened except by Him.

**BEDE;** Including both natural and divine wisdom; for as no one can exist of himself, so no one can be wise of himself.

**ORIGEN;** Or thus: We must not understand the words, lightens every man that comes into the world, of the growth from hidden seeds to organized bodies, but of the entrance into the invisible world, by the spiritual regeneration and grace, which is given in Baptism. Those then the true Light lightens, who come into the world of goodness, not those who rush into the world of sin.

**THEOPHYL.** Or thus: The intellect which is given in us for our direction, and which is called natural reason, is said here to be a light given us by God. But some by the ill use of their reason have darkened themselves.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 12

10 ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω.

10. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.

---

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Lux quae illuminat omnem hominem venientem in hunc mundum, huc venit per carnem: quia dum hic esset per divinitatem, a stultis, caecis et iniquis videri non poterat, de quibus supra dictum est tenebrae eam non comprehenderunt: et ideo dicitur in mundo erat.

**AUG.** The Light which lightens every man that comes into the world, came here in the flesh; because while He was here in His Divinity alone, the foolish, blind, and unrighteous could not discern Him; those of whom it is said above, The darkness comprehended it not. Hence the text; He was in the world.

**Origenes:** Ut enim qui loquitur, dum loqui cessat, vox eius esse desinit, et evanescit, sic caelestis pater, si verbum suum loqui cessaverit, effectus verbi, hoc est universitas verbo condita, non subsisteret.

Non autem putes quia sic erat in mundo quomodo in mundo est terra, pecora, et homines; sed quomodo artifex regens quod fecit; unde sequitur et mundus per ipsum factus est. Non enim sic fecit quomodo facit faber: qui enim fabricat, extrinsecus est ad illud quod fabricat. Deus autem infusus mundo, fabricat ubique positus, et non recedit ab aliquo: praesentia maiestatis facit quod facit, et gubernat quod facit. Sic ergo erat in mundo, quomodo per quem factus est mundus.

**Chrysostomus:** Et iterum, quia in mundo erat, sed non ut mundi contemporaneus, propter hoc induxit et mundus per ipsum factus est; per hoc et rursus te deducens ad aeternam existentiam unigeniti; qui enim audierit quoniam opus eius hoc totum, et si valde insensibilis fuerit, cogetur concedere ante opera esse factorem.

**Theophylactus:** Simul autem hic et Manichaei subvertit rabiem, qui malignum conditorem cuncta produxisse dicebat; necnon et Arii, qui filium Dei dicebat creaturam.

**Augustinus:** Quid est autem mundus per ipsum factus est? Caelum, terra, mare et omnia quae in eis sunt, mundus dicitur. Iterum in alia significatione, dilectores mundi mundus dicuntur; de quo sequitur et mundus eum non cognovit. Num enim caeli, aut Angeli, aut sidera non cognoverunt creatorem, quem confitentur Daemonia, omnia undique testimonium perhibuerunt? Sed qui non cognoverunt eum? Qui amando mundum, dicti sunt mundus: amando enim mundum, habitamus corde in mundo: nam qui non diligunt mundum, carne versantur in mundo, sed corde inhabitant caelum; sicut apostolus dicit: nostra conversatio in caelis est. Amando igitur mundum, hoc appellari meruerunt ubi habitant. Quomodo enim cum dicimus: mala est illa domus aut

**ORIGEN;** For as, when a person leaves off speaking, his voice ceases to be, and vanishes; so if the Heavenly Father should cease to speak His Word, the effect of that Word, i.e. the universe which is created in the Word, shall cease to exist.

**AUG.** You must not suppose however, that He was in the world in tile same sense in w which the earth, cattle, men, are in the world; but in the sense in which an artificer controls his own work; whence the text, And the world was made by Him. Nor again did He make it after the manner of all artificer; for whereas an artificer is external to what he fabricates, God pervades the world, carrying on the work of creation in every part, and never absent from any part: by the presence of His Majesty He both makes and controls what is made. Thus He was in the world, as He by Whom the world w as made.

**CHRYS.** And again, because He was in the world, but not coeval with the world, for this cause he introduced the words, and the world was made by Him: thus taking you back again to the eternal existence of the Only-Begotten. For when we are told that the whole of creation was made by Him, we must be very dull not to acknowledge that the Maker existed before the work.

**THEOPHYL.** Here he overthrows at once the insane notion of the Manichaeian, who says that the world is the work of a malignant creature, and the opinion of the Arian, that the Son of God is a creature.

**AUG.** But what means this, The world was made by Him? The earth, sky, and sea, and all that are therein, are called the world. But in another sense, the lovers of the world are called the world, of whom he says, And the world knew Him not. For did the sky, or Angels, not know their Creator, Whom the very devils confess, Whom the whole universe has borne witness to? Who then did not know Him? Those who, from their love of the world, are called the world; for such live in heart in the world, while those who do not love it, have their body in the world, but their heart in heaven; as said the Apostle, our conversation is in heaven. By their love of the world, such men merit being called by the name of the place where they live. And just as in speaking of a bad house, or good house, we do not mean praise or blame to

bona, non parietes incusamus aut laudamus, sed inhabitantes, sic et mundum dicimus qui inhabitant mundum amando.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Qui autem Dei erant amici, eum cognoverunt, etiam ante corporalem praesentiam: unde et Christus ait quoniam Abraham pater vester exultavit ut videret diem meum. Cum ergo nos interpellant gentiles, dicentes: quid est quod in ultimo tempore venit nostram operaturus salutem, tanto tempore negligens nos? Dicimus, quoniam et ante hoc in mundo erat, et providebat operibus suis, et omnibus dignis cognitus erat: et si eum mundus non cognovit, hi tamen quibus mundus non erat dignus, eum cognoverunt. Dicens autem mundus eum non cognovit, breviter causam ignorantiae praebuit. Mundum enim vocat homines qui soli mundo affixi sunt, et quae mundi sunt sapiunt. Nihil autem ita turbat mentem, ut liqueferi amore praesentium.

the walls, but to the inhabitants; so when we talk of the world, we mean those who live there in the love of it.

**CHRYS.** But they who were the friends of God, knew Him even before His presence in the body; whence Christ said below, Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day. When the Gentiles then interrupt us with the question, Why has He come in these last times to work our salvation, having neglected us so long? we reply, that He was in the world before, superintending what He had made, and was known to all who were worthy of Him; and that, if the world knew Him not, those of whom the world was not worthy knew Him. The reason follows, why the world knew Him not. The Evangelist calls those men the world, who are tied to the world, and savor of worldly things; for there is nothing that disturbs the mind so much, as this melting with the love of present things.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 13

11 εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθεν, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον. 12 ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, 13 οἱ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν.

11. He came to his own, and his own received him not. 12. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: 13. Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the wild of man, but of God.

---

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Dixit quod mundus eum non cognovit, de superioribus loquens temporibus; sed de reliquo sermonem induxit ad praedicationis tempora, et ait in propria venit.

**CHRYS.** When He said that the world knew Him not, he c referred to the times of the old dispensation, but what follows H has reference to the time of his preaching; He came to his own.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Quia scilicet omnia per ipsum facta sunt.

**AUG.** Because all things were made by Him.

**Theophylactus:** Vel per propria mundum intelligas, sive Iudaeam, quam pro hereditate elegerat.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** In propria ergo venit, non gratia suae necessitatis, sed gratia beneficii suorum. Sed unde venit qui omnia implet, et ubique adest? Ea quidem quae ad nos condensatione hoc operatus est: quia enim in mundo existens, non putabatur adesse, eo quod nondum cognoscebatur, dignatus est induere carnem. Manifestationem vero hanc et condensationem adventum vocat. Misericors autem existens Deus omnia facit, ut nos secundum virtutem splendeamus; et propter hoc quidem nullum necessitate, suasionem vero et beneficiis volentes ad se attrahit; et propterea venientem eum hi quidem susceperunt, alii vero non receperunt. Nullum enim vult invitum neque coactum habere famulatum: invitum enim trahi, par est cum eo qui totaliter non servit; unde sequitur et sui eum non receperunt. In Ioannem. Iudaeos nunc suos dicit, ut populum peculiarem; sed et omnes homines ut ab ipso factos: et sicut superius pro communi verecundatus natura dicebat, quoniam mundus per ipsum factus conditorem non cognovit, ita et hic rursus pro Iudaeorum anxius indevotione gravius ponit accusationem, dicens et sui eum non receperunt.

**Augustinus:** Si autem omnino nullus recepit, nullus ergo salvus factus est. Nemo enim salvus fiet, nisi qui Christum receperit venientem; et ideo addit quotquot autem receperunt eum.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Sive sint servi sive liberi, sive Graeci sive barbari, sive insipientes sive sapientes, sive mulieres sive viri, sive pueri, sive senes, omnes eodem digni facti sunt honore, de quo sequitur dedit eis potestatem filios Dei fieri.

**Augustinus:** Magna benevolentia. Unicus natus est, et noluit manere unus; non timuit habere coheredes, quia hereditas eius non fit angusta, si eam multi possederint.

**Chrysostomus:** Non autem dixit, quoniam fecit eos filios Dei fieri; sed dedit eis potestatem filios Dei fieri; ostendens quoniam multo opus est studio, ut

**THEOPHYL.** By his own, understand either the world, or Judea, which He had chosen for His inheritance.

**CHRYS.** He came then to His own, not for His own good, but for the good of others. But whence did He Who fills all things, and is every where present, come? He came out of condensation to us, though in reality He had been in the world all along. But the world not seeing Him, because it knew Him not, He deigned to put on flesh. And this manifestation and condensation is called His advent. But the merciful God so contrives His dispensations, that we may shine forth in proportion to our goodness, and therefore He will not compel, but invites men, by persuasion and kindness, to come of their own accord: and so, when He came, some received Him, and others received Him not. He desires not an unwilling and forced service; for no one who comes unwillingly devotes himself wholly to Him. Whence what follows, And his own received him not. He here calls the Jews His own, as being his peculiar people; as indeed are all men in some sense, being made by Him. And as above, to the shame of our common nature, he said, that the world which was made by Him, knew not its Maker: so here again, indignant at the ingratitude of the Jews, he brings a heavier charge, viz. that His own received Him not.

**AUG** But if none at all received, none will be saved. For no one will be saved, but he who received Christ at His coming; and therefore he adds, As many as received Him.

**CHRYS.** Whether they be bond or free, Greek or Barbarian, wise or unwise, women or men, the young or the aged, all are made meet for the honor, which the Evangelist now proceeds to mention. To them gave He power to become the sons of God.

**AUG.** O amazing goodness! He was born the Only Son, yet would not remain so; but grudged not to admit joint heirs to His inheritance. Nor was this narrowed by many partaking of it.

**CHRYS.** He said not that He made them the sons of God, but gave them power to become the sons of God: showing that there is need of much care,

eam, quae in Baptismo adoptionis formata est, imaginem incontaminatam semper custodiamus: simul autem ostendens quoniam potestatem hanc nullus nobis auferre poterit, nisi nos ipsi auferamus. Si enim qui ab hominibus dominium aliquarum rerum suscipiunt, tantum habent robur quantum fere hi qui dederunt; multo magis nos qui a Deo potimur hoc honore. Simul autem ostendere vult quoniam haec gratia advenit volentibus et studentibus: etenim in potestate est liberi arbitrii et gratiae operatione filios Dei fieri.

**Theophylactus:** Vel quia in resurrectione filiationem perfectissimam consequemur, secundum quod apostolus dicit: adoptionem filiorum Dei expectantes redemptionem corporis nostri. Dedit ergo potestatem filios Dei fieri, idest hanc gratiam in futura gratia consequendi.

**Chrysostomus:** Et quia in his ipsis ineffabilibus bonis, hoc quidem est Dei, scilicet dare gratiam; illud vero hominis, idest praeberere fidem, subiungit his qui credunt in nomine eius. Quid igitur non dicis nobis, o Ioannes, quod eorum sit supplicium qui eum non receperunt? Quia numquid isto supplicio fiet maius quando praeiacente eis potestate filios Dei fieri, non fiant, sed volentes seipsos tanto privant honore? Sed etiam inextinguibilis eos suscipiet ignis, quod postea manifestius revelabit.

**Augustinus:** Credentes ergo quia filii Dei fiunt et fratres Christi, utique nascuntur; nam si non nascuntur, filii quomodo esse possunt? Sed filii hominum nascuntur ex carne et sanguine, et ex voluntate viri, et complexu coniugii. Illi autem quomodo nascuntur subdit qui non ex sanguinibus, tamquam maris et feminae. Sanguina vel sanguines non est Latinum; sed quia Graece positum est pluraliter, maluit ille qui interpretabatur, sic ponere, et quasi minus Latine loqui secundum grammaticos, et tamen explicare veritatem secundum auditum infirmorum. Ex sanguinibus enim maris et feminae homines nascuntur.

to preserve the image, which is formed by our adoption in Baptism, untarnished: and showing at the same time also that no one can take this power from us, except we rob ourselves of it. Now, if the delegates of worldly governments have often nearly as much power as those governments themselves, much more is this the case with us, who derive our dignity from God. But at the same time the Evangelist wishes to show that this grace comes to us of our own will and endeavor: that, in short, the operation of grace being supposed, it is in the power of our free will to make us the sons of God.

**THEOPHYL.** Or the meaning is, that the most perfect sonship will only be attained at the resurrection, as said the Apostle, Wailing for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body. He therefore gave us the power to become the sons of God, i.e. the power of obtaining this grace at some future time.

**CHRYS.** And because in the matter of these ineffable benefits, the giving of grace belongs to God, but the extending of faith to man, He subjoins, even to those who believe on his name. Why then declare you not, John, the punishment of those who received Him not? Is it because there is no greater punishment than that, when the power of becoming the sons of God is offered to men, they should not become such, but voluntarily deprive themselves of the dignity? But besides this, inextinguishable fire awaits all such, as will appear clearly farther on.

**AUG.** To be made then the sons of God, and brothers of Christ, they must of course be born; for if they are not born, how can they be sons? Now the sons of men are born of flesh and blood, and the will of man, and the embrace of wedlock; but how these are born, the next words declare: Not of bloods; that is, the male's and the female's. Bloods is not correct Latin, but as it is plural in the Greek, the translator preferred to put it so, though it be not strictly grammatical, at the same time explaining the word in order not to offend the weakness of one's hearers.

**Beda:** Sciendum etiam est, quia in Scripturis sanctis sanguis, cum dicitur pluraliter, peccatum significare solet; unde: libera me de sanguinibus.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** In eo autem quod sequitur neque ex voluntate carnis, neque ex voluntate viri, carnem pro femina posuit: quia de costa facta cum esset, Adam dixit: hoc nunc os de ossibus meis, et caro de carne mea. Ponitur ergo caro pro uxore quomodo aliquando spiritus pro marito: quia ille imperare debet, ista servire. Quid enim peius est domo ubi femina habet imperium super virum? Hi ergo neque ex voluntate carnis, neque ex voluntate viri, sed ex Deo nati sunt.

**Beda:** Carnalis enim singulorum generatio a complexu coniugii duxit originem: at vero spiritualis spiritus sancti gratia ministratur.

**Chrysostomus:** Hoc autem narrat Evangelista, ut vilitatem et humilitatem prioris partus, qui est per sanguinem et voluntatem carnis, addiscentes, et altitudinem secundi, qui per gratiam et nobilitatem est, cognoscentes, magnam quamdam hic suscipiamus intelligentiam et dignam dono ipsius qui genuit, et multum post hoc studium demonstramus.

**BEDE;** It should be understood that in holy Scripture, blood in the plural number, has the signification of sin: thus in the Psalms, Deliver me from blood-guiltiness.

**AUG.** In that which follows, Nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, the flesh is put for the female; because, when she was made out of the rib, Adam said, This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh. The flesh therefore is put for the wife, as the spirit sometimes is for the husband; because that the one ought to govern, the other to obey. For what is there worse than a house, where the woman has rule over the man? But these that we speak of are born neither of the will of the flesh, nor the will of man, but of God.

**BEDE;** The carnal birth of men derives its origin from the embrace of wedlock, but the spiritual is dispensed by the grace of the Holy Spirit.

**CHRYS.** The Evangelist makes this declaration, that being taught the vileness and inferiority of our former birth, which is through blood, and the will of the flesh, and understanding the loftiness and nobleness of the second, which is through grace, we might hence receive great knowledge, worthy of being bestowed by him who begat us, and after this show forth much zeal.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 14

14 καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν,

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

---

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Cum dixisset ex Deo nati sunt, quasi ne miraremur et horreremus tantam gratiam, et nobis incredibile videretur, quia homines ex Deo nati sunt; quasi securitatem faciens, ait et verbum caro factum est. Quid

**AUG.** Having said, Born of God; to prevent surprise and trepidation at so great, so apparently incredible a grace, that men should be born of God; to assure us, he says, And the Word was as made flesh. Why marvel you then that men are born of God? Know that God Himself was born of man.

ergo miraris quia homines ex Deo nascuntur? Attende ipsum Deum ex hominibus natum.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Vel aliter. Cum dixisset quoniam ex Deo nati sunt qui susceperunt eum, huius honoris posuit causam, hoc scilicet verbum fieri carnem: factus est enim proprius filius Dei hominis filius, ut filius hominum faciat filios Dei. Cum autem audieris quoniam verbum caro factum est, ne turberis: neque enim substantiam convertit in carnem; hoc enim vere impium est intelligere; sed manens quod est, servi formam assumpsit. Quia enim sunt qui dicunt, quoniam phantasmata quaedam fuerint omnia quae incarnationis sunt; eorum blasphemiam destruens, hanc dictionem factum est posuit, non transmutationem substantiae, sed carnis verae assumptionem repraesentare volens. Si vero dixerint: quoniam Deus omnipotens est, quare et in carnem transmutari non potuit? Dicemus quod transmutari ab illa incommutabili natura omnino procul est.

**Augustinus de Trin:** Sicut autem verbum nostrum vox quodammodo corporis fit assumendo eam in qua manifestatur sensibus hominum, sic verbum Dei caro factum est, assumendo eam in qua et ipsum manifestaretur sensibus hominum. Et sicut verbum nostrum fit vox, nec mutatur in vocem, ita verbum Dei caro quidem factum est; sed absit ut mutaretur in carnem: assumendo quippe illam, non in eam se consumendo, et hoc nostrum vox fit, et illud caro factum est.

**Ex gestis Concilii Ephesini:** Sermo etiam quem proferimus, quo in alterutris locutionibus utimur, sermo est incorporeus, non aspectui subiectus, non tactu tractabilis; sed cum sermo induerit litteras et elementa, visibilis fit, aspectu comprehenditur, tactu tractatur, sic et verbum Dei, quod naturaliter invisibile est, visibile fit; et quod natura incorporeum est, invenitur esse tractabile.

**Alcuinus:** Cum etiam credamus animam incorpoream corpori coniungi, ut ex his duobus fiat unus homo, facilius possumus credere divinam substantiam incorpoream animae in corpore coniungi in unionem personae; ita ut verbum in carnem non sit conversum, nec caro in verbum; cum nec corpus in animam, nec anima convertatur in corpus.

**CHRYS.** Or thus, After saying that they were born of God, who received Him, he sets forth the cause of this honor, viz. the Word being made flesh, God's own Son was made the son of man, that he might make the sons of men the sons of God. Now when you hear that the Word was made flesh, be not disturbed, for He did not change His substance into flesh, which it were indeed impious to suppose; but remaining what He was, took upon Him the form of a servant. But as there are some who say, that the whole of the incarnation was only in appearance, to refute such a blasphemy, he used the expression, was made, meaning to represent not a conversion of substance, but an assumption of real flesh. But if they say, God is omnipotent; why then could He not be changed into flesh? we reply, that a change from an unchangeable nature is a contradiction.

**AUG.** As our word becomes the bodily voice, by its assumption of that voice, as a means of developing itself externally, so the Word of God was made flesh, by assuming flesh, as a means of manifesting Itself to the world. And as our word is made voice, yet is not turned into voice; so the Word of God was made flesh, but never turned into flesh. It is by assuming another nature, not by consuming themselves in it, that our word is made voice, and the Word, flesh.

**EX GESTIS CONC. EPH.** The discourse which we utter, which we use in conversation with each other, is incorporeal, imperceptible, impalpable; but clothed in letters and characters, it becomes material, perceptible, tangible. So too the Word of God, which was naturally invisible, becomes visible, and that comes before us in tangible form, which was by nature incorporeal.

**ALCUIN.** When we think how the incorporeal soul is joined to the body, so as that of two is made one man, we too shall the more easily receive the notion of the incorporeal Divine substance being joined to the soul in the body, in unity of person; so as that the Word is not turned into flesh, nor the flesh into the Word; just as the soul is not turned into body, nor the body into soul.

**Theophylactus:** Apollinarius autem Laodicensis in hoc verbo haeresim statuit: dicebat enim, quod Christus animam rationalem non habuit sed tantum carnem; habens divinitatem pro anima, quae corpus dirigit et gubernat.

**Augustinus contra Serm. Arian:** Si autem moventur in eo quod scriptum est, quod verbum caro factum est, nec ibi anima nominatur; intelligant carnem pro homine positam, a parte totum, figuratae locutionis modo, sicuti est: ad te omnis caro veniet; item quod ex operibus legis non iustificabitur omnis caro; quod apertius alio loco dicitur: non iustificabitur homo ex operibus legis. Sic itaque dictum est verbum caro factum est; ac si diceret: verbum homo factum est.

**Theophylactus:** Evangelista volens ostendere inenarrabilem Dei condescensum, carnem commemorat, ut illius admiremur misericordiam, quoniam propter nostram salutem quod omnino remotum et distans est ab eius natura, assumpsit, scilicet carnem; anima namque habet aliquam propinquitatem ad Deum. Si autem verbum incarnatum est, et humanam animam non assumpsit; sequeretur quod adhuc animae nostrae curatae non essent: quod enim non assumpsit, non sanctificavit. Et qualis derisio, cum anima prius peccaverit, ut carnem assumendo sanctificaverit, id quod est principalis infirmum reliquerit? Subvertitur ex hoc dicto Nestorius, qui dicebat quod non Deus verbum ipse idem factus est homo ex sacro conceptus sanguine virginis; sed virgo peperit hominem qui omnis virtutis dotatus erat specie, et Dei verbum illi erat coniunctum: et ex hoc duos filios asserebat: unum natum de virgine, scilicet hominem; alterum de Deo, scilicet Dei filium, homini illi coniunctum secundum gratiae habitudinem et amorem. Contra quem Evangelista dixit, quod ipsum verbum factum est homo, non quod verbum inveniens hominem virtuosum, se sibi coniunxerit.

**Cyrillus ad Nestorium:** Carnem enim animatam anima rationali uniens verbum sibi secundum subsistentiam, ineffabiliter et inintelligibiliter factus est homo, et appellatus est filius hominis, non secundum voluntatem solam aut beneplacitum, sed neque in assumptione personae solius. Diversae

**THEOPHYL.** Apollinarius of Laodicea raised a heresy upon this text; saying, that Christ had flesh only, not a rational soul; in the place of which His divinity directed and controlled His body.

**AUG.** If men are disturbed however by its being said that the Word was made flesh, without mention of a soul; let them know that the flesh is put for the whole man, the part for the whole, by a figure of speech; as in the Psalms, Unto you shall all flesh come; and again in Romans, By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified. In the same sense it is said here that the Word was made flesh; meaning that the Word was made man.

**THEOPHYL.** The Evangelist intends by making mention of the flesh, to show the unspeakable condescension of God, and lead us to admire His compassion, in assuming for our salvation, what was so opposite and incongenial to His nature, as the flesh: for the soul has some propinquity to God. If the Word, however, was made flesh, and assumed not at the same time a human soul, our souls, it would follow, would not be yet restored: for what He did not assume, He could not sanctify. What a mockery then, when the soul first sinned, to assume and sanctify the flesh only, leaving the weakest part untouched! This text overthrows Nestorius, who asserted that it was not the very Word, even God, Who the Self-same was made man, being conceived of the sacred blood of the Virgin: but that the Virgin brought forth a man endowed with every kind of virtue, and that the Word of God was united to him: thus making out two sons, one born of the Virgin, i.e. man, the other born of God, that is, the Son of God, united to that man by grace, and relation, and love. In opposition to him the Evangelist declares, that the very Word was made Man, not that the Word fixing upon a righteous man united Himself to him.

**CYRIL;** The Word uniting to Himself a body of flesh animated with a rational soul, substantially, was ineffably and incomprehensibly made Man, and called the Son of man, and that not according to the will only, or good-pleasure, nor again by the assumption of the Person alone. The natures are different indeed which are brought into true union, but He Who is of both, Christ the Son, is

quidem quoad unionem collatae naturae; unus autem ex ambabus Christus et filius; non quasi differentia naturarum interempta propter adunationem.

**Theophylactus:** Addiscimus ergo per hoc quod dicitur verbum caro factum est, quia ipsum verbum est homo, et filius Dei existens factus est filius mulieris; quae principaliter Dei genitrix nuncupatur, tamquam Deum in carne genuerit.

**Hilarius de Trin:** Quidam autem volentes unigenitum Deum, qui in principio apud Deum erat Deus verbum, non substantivum Deum esse, sed sermonem vocis emissae, ut quod loquentibus verbum suum, hoc sit patri Deo filius, argute subrepere volunt, ne subsistens verbum Deus, et manens in forma Dei Christus homo natus sit: ut cum hominem illum humanae potius originis causa quam spiritualis conceptionis sacramentum animaverit, non Deus verbum hominem se ex partu virginis efficiens extiterit; sed, ut in prophetis spiritus prophetiae, ita in Iesu verbum Dei fuerit. Et arguere nos solent, quod Christum dicamus esse natum non nostri corporis atque animae hominem, cum nos verbum carnem factum, nostrae similitudinis natum hominem praedicemus, ut vere Dei filius vere filius hominis natus sit; et ut per se sibi assumpsit ex virgine corpus, ita ex se sibi animam assumpsit; quae utique ab homine numquam gignentium originibus praebetur: et cum ipse ille filius hominis sit, quam ridicule praeter Dei filium, qui verbum caro factum est, alium nescio quem tamquam prophetam verbo Dei animatum praedicabimus, cum dominus Iesus Christus et Dei filius et hominis filius sit?

**Chrysostomus:** Ne autem ab eo quod dictum est verbum caro factum est, inconvenienter suspiceris versionem illius incorruptibilis naturae, subdit et habitavit in nobis. Quod enim habitat, non idem est cum habitaculo, sed aliud: aliud autem dico secundum naturam: unione vero et copulatione unum est Deus verbum caro, neque confusione facta, neque destructione substantiarum.

**Alcuinus:** Vel habitavit in nobis, idest inter homines conversatus est.

One; the difference of the natures, on the other hand, not being destroyed in consequence of this coalition.

**THEOPHYL.** From the text, The Word was made flesh, we learn this farther, that the Word Itself is man, and being the Son of God was made the Son of a woman, who is rightly called the Mother of God, as having given birth to God in the flesh.

**HILARY;** Some, however, who think God the Only-Begotten, God the Word, Who was in the beginning with God, not to be God substantially, but a Word sent forth, the Son being to God the Father, what a word is to one who utters it, these men, in order to disprove that the Word, being substantially God, and abiding in the form of God, was born the Man Christ, argue subtilely, that, whereas that Man (they say) derived His life rather from human origin than from the mystery of a spiritual conception, God the Word did not make Himself Man of the womb of the Virgin; but that the Word of God was in Jesus, as the spirit of prophecy in the Prophets. And they are accustomed to charge us with holding, that Christ was born a Man, not of our body and soul; whereas we preach the Word made flesh, and after our likeness born Man, so that He Who is truly Son of God, was truly born Son of man; and that, as by His own act He took upon Him a body of the Virgin, so of Himself He took a soul also, which in no case is derived from man by mere parental origin. And seeing He, The Self-same, is the Son of man, how absurd were it, besides the Son of God, Who is the Word, to make Him another person besides, a sort of prophet, inspired by the Word of God; whereas our Lord Jesus Christ is both the Son of God, and the Son of man.

**CHRYS.** Lest from it being said, however, that the Word was made flesh, you should infer improperly a change of His incorruptible nature, he subjoins, And dwelt among us. For that which inhabits is not the same, but different from the habitation: different, I say, in nature; though as to union and conjunction, God the Word and the flesh are one, without confusion or extinction of substance.

**ALCUIN;** Or, dwelt among us, means, lived amongst men.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 15

καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.

14b. And we saw his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.

---

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Cum dixisset, quod filii Dei facti sumus, et non aliter quam per hoc quod verbum caro factum est; rursus ipsius dicit et aliud lucrum et vidimus gloriam eius: quam utique non vidissemus, nisi per consortium humanitatis visus esset nobis. Si enim Moysi non sustinuerunt faciem glorificatam videre, sed velamine opus fuit; qualiter divinitatem nudam existentem, inaccessibilem etiam ipsis superioribus virtutibus, nos lutei et terrestres sufferre possemus?

**CHRYS.** Having said that we are made the sons of God and in no other way than because the Word was made flesh; he mentions another gift, And we saw His glory. Which glory we should not have seen, had He not, by His alliance with humanity, become visible to us. For if they could not endure to look on the glorified face of Moses, but there was need of a veil, how could soiled and earthly creatures, like ourselves, have borne the sight of undisguised Divinity, which is not vouchsafed even to the higher powers themselves.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Vel aliter. Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis, ista nativitate collyrium fecit, unde tergerentur oculi nostri, ut possimus videre maiestatem eius per eius humanitatem; et ideo dicitur et vidimus gloriam eius. Gloriam eius nemo posset videre, nisi humilitate carnis sanaretur. Irruerat enim homini quasi pulvis in oculum de terra: oculus iste sauciatus erat, et terra illuc mittitur ut sanetur: caro te obcaecaverat, caro te sanat. Carnalis enim anima facta erat, consentiendo carnalibus affectibus; inde fuerat oculus cordis caecatus: medicus fecit tibi collyrium, quoniam sic venit ut de carne vitia carnis extingueret. Verbum enim caro factum est, ut possis dicere vidimus gloriam eius.

**AUG.** Or thus; in that the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, His birth became a kind of ointment to anoint the eyes of our heart, that we might through His humanity discern His majesty; and therefore it follows, And we saw His glory. No one could see His glory, who was not healed by the humility of the flesh. For there had flown upon man's eye as it were dust from the earth: the eye had been diseased, and earth was sent to heal it again; the flesh had blinded you, the flesh restores you. The soul by consenting to carnal affections had become carnal; hence the eye of the mind had been blinded: then the physician made for thee ointment. He came in such wise, as that by the flesh He destroyed the corruption of the flesh. And thus the Word was made flesh, that you might be able to say, We saw His glory.

**Chrysostomus:** Subdit autem, quasi unigeniti a patre: quia multi prophetarum glorificati sunt, puta Moyses, Eliseus et alii multi quicumque miracula ostenderunt; sed et Angeli hominibus apparentes, et eam quae est propriae naturae coruscantem lucem manifestantes, sed et Cherubim et Seraphim cum

**CHRYS.** He subjoins, As of the Only-Begotten of the Father: for many prophets, as Moses, Elijah, and others, workers of miracles, had been glorified, and Angels also who appeared to men, shining with the brightness belonging to their nature; Cherubim and Seraphim too, who were seen in

multa gloria visa sunt a propheta. Ab omnibus his nos abducens Evangelista, et supra omnem naturam et conservorum nostrorum claritatem erigens mentem, ad ipsum nos perducit verticem; quasi dicat: non ut prophetae aut alterius hominis, vel Angeli, aut Archangeli, aut alicuius superiorum virtutum, est gloria quam vidimus; sed quasi ipsius regis, ipsius naturalis filii unigeniti.

**Gregorius Moralium:** In sacro enim eloquio sicut et quasi aliquando non pro similitudine ponitur, sed pro veritate; unde et istud, quasi unigeniti a patre.

**Chrysostomus:** Ac si diceret: vidimus gloriam qualem decebat, et conveniens est habere unigenitum et naturalem filium. Consuetudo enim multorum, regem valde ornatum videntium, est ut cum aliis enarrantes non possunt universalem repraesentare claritatem, hoc inducunt: quid oportet multa dicere? Quasi rex ibat. Sic et Ioannes dicit vidimus gloriam eius, gloriam quasi unigeniti a patre. Angeli enim apparentes ut servi, et dominum habentes, omnia agebant; ipse vero ut dominus cum humili forma apparens. Sed et creaturae dominum cognoverunt, stella magos vocans, Angeli pastores, puer exultans in utero: sed et pater testatus est de caelis, et Paraclytus super ipsum advenit; sed et ipsa rerum natura omni tuba clarius clamavit, quoniam rex caelorum advenerat: etenim Daemones fugiebant, infirmitatis species solvebantur, mortuos dimittebant sepulchra, et animas a malitia ad virtutis verticem agebat. Quid utique quis dicat praeceptorum philosophiam, caelestium legum virtutem, angelicae urbanitatis bonam ordinationem?

**Origenes:** Eius autem quod sequitur, plenum gratiae et veritatis, duplex intellectus est. Potest enim de humanitate ac divinitate incarnati verbi accipi; ita ut plenitudo gratiae referatur ad humanitatem, secundum quam Christus caput est Ecclesiae et primogenitus creaturae universae: quoniam maximum et principale gratiae exemplum, qua nullis praecedentibus meritis homo efficitur Deus, in ipso primordialiter manifestatum est. Potest etiam plenitudo gratiae Christi de spiritu sancto intelligi, cuius septiformis operatio humanitatem Christi implevit. Plenitudo vero veritatis ad divinitatem refertur.

glorious array by the prophets. But the Evangelist withdrawing our minds from these, and raising them above all nature, and every preeminence of fellow servants, leads us up to the summit Himself; as if he said, Not of prophet, or of any other man, or of Angel, or Archangel, or any of the higher powers, is the glory which we beheld; but as that of the very Lord, very King, very and true Only-Begotten Son.

**GREG.** In Scripture language as, and as it were, are sometimes put not for likeness but reality; whence the expression, As of the Only-Begotten of the Father.

**CHRYS.** As if he said: We saw His glory, such as it was becoming and proper for the Only-Begotten and true Son to have. We have a form of speech, like it, derived from our seeing kings always splendidly robed. When the dignity of a man's carriage is beyond description, we say, In short, he went as a king. So too John says, We saw His glory, the glory as of the Only Begotten of the Father. For Angels, when they appeared, did every thing as servants who had a Lord, but He as the Lord appearing in humble form. Yet did all creatures recognize their Lord, the star calling the Magi, the Angels the shepherds, the child leaping in the womb acknowledged Him: yes the Father bore witness to Him from heaven, and the Paraclete descending upon Him: and the very universe itself shouted louder than any trumpet, that the King of heaven had come. For devils fled, diseases were healed, the graves gave up the dead, and souls were brought out of wickedness, to the utmost height of virtue. What shall one say of the wisdom of precepts, of the virtue of heavenly laws, of the excellent institution of the angelical life?

**ORIGEN;** Full of grace and truth. Of this the meaning is twofold. For it may be understood of the Humanity, and the Divinity of the Incarnate Word, so that the fullness of grace has reference to the Humanity, according to which Christ is the Head of the Church, and the first-born of every creature: for the greatest and original example of grace, by which man, with no preceding merits, is made God, is manifested primarily in Him. The fullness of the grace of Christ may also be understood of the Holy Spirit, whose sevenfold operation filled Christ's Humanity. The fullness of truth applies to the Divinity

**Origenes in Ioannem:** Si vero plenitudinem gratiae et veritatis de novo testamento mavis intelligere, non incongrue pronuntiabis plenitudinem gratiae novi testamenti esse per Christum donatam, et legalium symbolorum veritatem in ipso esse impletam.

**Theophylactus:** Vel plenum gratia, prout eius verbum gratiosum erat, dicente David: diffusa est gratia in labiis tuis; et veritate, secundum quod Moyses et prophetae loquebantur aut operabantur in figura, Christus autem cum veritate.

.But if you had rather understand the fullness of grace and truth of the New Testament, you may with propriety pronounce the fullness of the grace of the New Testament to be given by Christ, and the truth of the legal types to have been fulfilled in Him.

**THEOPHYL.** Or, full of grace, inasmuch as His word was gracious, as said David, Full of grace are your lips; and truth, because what Moses and the Prophets spoke or did in figure, Christ did in reality.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 16

15 Ἰωάννης μαρτυρεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ κέκραγεν λέγων, οὗτος ἦν ὃν εἶπον, ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν.

15. John bore witness of him, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I spoke, He that comes after me is preferred before me, for he was before me.

---

**Alcuinus:** Dixerat superius fuisse missum hominem ad perhibendum testimonium; hic determinat testimonium suum, quod manifeste praecursor pronuntiavit; unde dicitur Ioannes perhibet testimonium de ipso.

**ALCUIN;** He had said before that there was a man sent to bear witness; now he gives definitely the forerunner's own testimony, which plainly declared the excellence of His Human Nature and the Eternity of His Godhead. John bore witness of Him.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Vel aliter hoc inducit; ac si dicat: non aestimetis quod nos qui fuimus cum eo multo tempore et mensae ipsius communicavimus, propter gratiam hoc testemur; quia Ioannes, qui antea eum non viderat, nec ei commoratus fuerat, ei testimonium perhibebat. Multoties autem Evangelista revolvit eius testimonium, quia multam admirationem huius viri habebant Iudaei. Et alii quidem Evangelistae antiquorum meminerunt prophetarum, dicentes: hoc factum est ut impleatur quod dictum est per prophetam; hic autem altiore et recentiore testem inducit, non intendens a servo dominatorem facere fide dignum, sed auditorum imbecillitati condescendens.

**CHRYS.** Or he introduces this, as if to say, Do not suppose that we bear witness to this out of gratitude, because we were with Him a long time, and partook of His table; for John who had never seen Him before, nor tarried with Him, bore witness to Him. The Evangelist repeats John's testimony many times here and there, because he was held in such admiration by the Jews. Other Evangelists refer to the old prophets, and say, This was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet. But he introduces a loftier, and later witness, not intending to make the servant vouch for the master, but only condescending to the weakness of his hearers. For as Christ

Quemadmodum enim nisi servi formam assumpsisset, non ita facile susceptibilis factus esset; ita nisi servi voce auditum conservorum praeexcitasset, nequaquam multi Iudaeorum verbum Christi suscepissent. Sequitur et clamat; idest, cum propalatione, cum libertate, sine subtractione omnia praedicat. Non autem a principio dixit, quoniam hic est filius Dei unigenitus naturalis; sed clamat dicens hic erat quem dixi: qui post me venit, ante me factus est, quia prior me erat. Quemadmodum enim matres avium, non confestim pullos suos volationem docent; sed primo quidem extra nidum educunt, postea vero aliam multo velociorem volationem apponunt; sic et Ioannes non confestim Iudaeos ad alta duxit, sed interim paululum a terra eos evolare docuit, dicens, quod Christus melior eo erat; quod non parum interim erat. Et vide qualiter sapienter inducit testimonium: non enim solum apparentem Christum monstrat; sed et antequam apparuisset eum praedicat; quod significatur in hoc quod dicit hic erat de quo dixi. Hoc autem fecit ut facile susceptibilis esset Christus, hominum mente iam praedetenta ab aliis quae de eo dicta erant, et nihil ad hoc humilitas habitus noceret. Ita enim humili et communi omnibus forma Christus utebatur, ut si simul et verba haec audissent de eo, et eum considerassent, Ioannis testimonium derisissent.

**Theophylactus:** Dicit autem qui post me venit, videlicet secundum tempora nativitatis: sex enim mensibus prior Christo Ioannes erat secundum humanitatem.

**Chrysostomus:** Vel hoc non dicit de ea generatione quae est ex Maria: iam enim natus erat Christus quando haec a Ioanne dicebantur; sed de adventu eius ad praedicationem. Dicit autem ante me factus est; idest, clarior est et honorabilior; ac si dicat: non quia prior veni ad praedicandum, ex hoc maiorem me esse illo existimetis.

**Theophylactus:** Ariani vero hanc litteram sic exponunt, volentes ostendere quod Dei filius non est a patre genitus, sed factus, sicut una alia creatura.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Non ergo intelligitur: factus est antequam ego essem factus; sed antepositus est mihi.

would not have been so readily received, had He not taken upon Him the form of a servant; so if he had not excited the attention of servants by the voice of a fellow-servant beforehand, there would not have been many Jews embracing the word of Christ. It follows, And cried; that is, preached with openness, with freedom, without reservation. He did not however begin with asserting that this one was the natural only-begotten Son of God, but cried, saying, This was He of whom I spoke, He that comes after me is preferred before me, for He was before me. For as birds do not teach their young all at once to fly, but first draw them outside the nest, and afterwards try them with a quicker motion; so John did not immediately lead the Jews to high things, but began with lesser flights, saying, that Christ was better than he; which in the mean time was no little advance. And observe how prudently he introduces his testimony; he not only points to Christ when He appears, but preaches Him beforehand; as, This is He of whom I spoke. This would prepare men's minds for Christ's coming: so that when He did come, the humility of His garb would be no impediment to His being received. For Christ adopted so humble and common an appearance, that if men had seen Him without first hearing John's testimony to His greatness, none of the things spoken of Him would have had any effect.

**THEOPHYL.** He said, Who comes after me, that is, as to the time of His birth. John was six months before Christ, according to His humanity.

**CHRYS.** Or this does not refer to the birth from Mary; for Christ was born, when this was said by John; but to His coming for the work of preaching. He then said, is made before me; that is, is more illustrious, more honorable; as if he said, Do not suppose me greater than He, because I came first to preach.

**THEOPHYL.** The Arians infer from this Word, that the Son of God is not begotten of the Father, but made like any other creature.

**AUG.** It does not mean - He was made before I was made, but He is preferred to me.

**Chrysostomus:** Si autem quod dicitur ante me factus est, de productione ad esse intelligeretur, superfluum esset quod additur quia prior me erat. Quis enim est ita insipiens ut ignoret quoniam ex quo ante eum factus est, prior eo erat? Aliter autem e contrario oporteret dicere, scilicet: prior me erat, quia ante me factus est. Ergo quod dicit ante me factus est, de honore intelligitur: hoc enim quod futurum erat, factum dicit, quia consuetudo erat antiquorum prophetarum de futuris quasi de iam praeteritis loqui.

**CHRY.** If the words, made before me, referred to His coming into being, it was superfluous to add, For He was before me. For who would be so foolish as not to know, that if He was made before him, He was before him. It would have been more correct to say, He was before me, because He was made before me. The expression then, He was made before me, must be taken in the sense of honor: only that which was to take place, he speaks of as having taken place already, after the style of the old Prophets, who commonly talk of the future as the past.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 17

16 ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν, καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος: 17 ὅτι ὁ νόμος διὰ μωϋσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο.

16. And of his fullness have all we received, and grace for grace. 17. For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.

---

**Origenes:** Sermo iste in persona Baptistae de Christo testantis prolatus est; quod plurimos fallit, ex hic usque illuc ille enarravit, credentes in persona Ioannis apostoli recitari, inconsequens autem est putare, subito et quasi intempestive interrumpi Baptistae sermonem ex verbo discipuli; et cuique scienti percipere dictionum collationem, in propatulo constat series dicti; dixerat enim ob hoc ante me factus est, qui prior me erat. Ex hoc autem coniecto priorem me fore, quod ex eius plenitudine ego quidem, et ante me prophetae accepimus gratiam secundam pro prima. Pertigerunt enim et illi post figuras per spiritum ad veritatis speculationem. Hinc etiam perpendimus ex plenitudine eius accipientes, legem quidem per Moysen fore datam, gratiam autem et veritatem per Iesum Christum, nedum fore datam, sed factam; patre quidem legem dante per Moysen, gratiam et veritatem faciente per Iesum. Sed si Iesus est qui dicit: ego sum veritas, quomodo veritas fit per Iesum? Sed intelligendum est, quod ipsa veritas substantialis (ex qua prima veritate et eius imagine sculptae sunt multae veritates in his qui veritatem tractant)

**ORIGEN;** This is to be considered a continuation of the Baptist's testimony to Christ, a point which has escaped the attention of many, who think that from this to, He has declared Him, St. John the Apostle is speaking. But the idea that on a sudden, and, as it would seem, unseasonably, the discourse of the Baptist should be interrupted by a speech of the disciple's, is inadmissible. And any one, able to follow the passage, will discern a very obvious connection here. For having said, He is preferred before me, for He was before me, he proceeds, From this I know that He is before me, because I and the Prophets who preceded me have received of His fullness, and grace for grace, (the second grace for the first.) For they too by the Spirit penetrated beyond the figure to the contemplation of the truth. And hence receiving, as we have done, of his fullness, we judge that the law was given by Moses, but that grace and truth were made, by Jesus Christ - made, not given: the Father gave the law by Moses, but made grace and truth by Jesus. But if it is Jesus who says below, I am the Truth, how is truth made by Jesus? We must

nequaquam per Iesum Christum facta est, nec prorsus per aliquem; sed veritas, puta quae consistit in Paulo et apostolis, per Iesum Christum facta est.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Vel aliter. Coniungit hic testimonio Ioannis Baptistae suum testimonium Ioannes Evangelista, dicens et de plenitudine eius nos omnes accepimus. Non praecursoris est verbum, sed discipuli; quasi dicat: etiam nos omnes duodecim, et omnis plenitudo fidelium, et qui nunc sunt, et futurorum, de plenitudine eius accepimus.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Quid autem accepistis? Et gratiam pro gratia: ut nescio quid nos voluerit intelligere de plenitudine eius accepisse, et insuper gratiam pro gratia: accepimus enim de plenitudine eius primo gratiam, et rursus accepimus gratiam pro gratia. Quam gratiam primo accepimus? Fidem. Vocatur enim gratia, quia gratis datur. Hanc ergo accepit gratiam primam peccator, ut eius peccata dimitterentur; et iterum gratiam pro gratia; idest, pro hac gratia in qua ex fide vivimus, recepturi sumus aliam, idest vitam aeternam: vita enim aeterna quasi merces est fidei: sed quia ipsa fides gratia est, vita aeterna gratia est pro gratia. Non erat ista gratia in veteri testamento: quia lex minabatur, non opitulabatur; iubebat, non sanabat: languorem ostendebat, non auferebat, sed praeparabat medico venturo cum gratia et veritate; unde sequitur quia lex per Moysen data est; gratia et veritas per Iesum Christum facta est. Mortem enim temporalem et aeternam occidit mors domini tui: ipsa est gratia quae promissa et non habita erat in lege.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Vel accepimus gratiam pro gratia; idest, pro veteri novam. Sicut enim est iustitia et iustitia, adoptio et adoptio, circumcisio et circumcisio, ita gratia et gratia; sed illa quidem ut typus, haec vero ut veritas. Hoc autem induxit, ostendens quoniam et Iudaei gratia salvabantur, sed et nos omnes gratia salvi sumus: misericordiae autem et gratiae fuit legem suscipere. Propterea cum dixisset gratiam pro gratia, ostendens magnitudinem eorum

understand however that the very substantial Truth, from which First Truth and Its Image many truths are engraver on those who treat of the truth, was not made through Jesus Christ, or through any one; but only the truth which is in individuals, such as in Paul, e.g. or the other Apostles, was made through Jesus Christ.

**CHRYS.** Or thus; John the Evangelist here adds this testimony to that of John the Baptist, saying, And of his fullness have we all received. These are not the words of the forerunner, but of the disciple; as if he meant to say, We also the twelve, and the whole body of the faithful, both present and to come, have received of His fullness.

**AUG.** But whet have you received? Grace for grace. So that we are to understand that we have received a certain something from His fullness, and over and above this, grace for grace; that we have first received of His fullness, first grace; and again, we have received grace for grace. What grace did we first receive; Faith: which is called grace, because it is given freely. This is the first grace then which the sinner receives, the remission of his sins. Again, we have grace for grace; i.e. instead of that grace in which we live by faith, we are to receive another, viz. life eternal: for life eternal is as it were the wages of faith. And thus as faith itself is a good grace, so life eternal is grace for grace. There was not grace in the Old Testament; for the law threatened, but assisted not, commanded, but healed not, showed our weakness, but relieved it not. It prepared the way however for a Physician who was about to come, with the gifts of grace and truth: whence the sentence which follows: For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth were made by Jesus Christ. The death of your Lord has destroyed death, both temporal and eternal; that is the grace which was promised, but not contained, in the law.

**CHRYS.** Or we have received grace for grace; that is, the new in the place of the old. For as there is a justice and a justice besides, an adoption and another adoption, a circumcision and another circumcision; so is there a grace and another grace; only the one being a type, the other a reality. He brings in the words to show that the Jews as well as ourselves are saved by grace: it being of mercy and grace that they received the law. Next, after he

quae data sunt, subdit quia lex per Moysen data est, gratia et veritas per Iesum Christum facta est. Et supra quidem Ioannes ad seipsum comparans Christum, ait ante me factus est: hic autem Evangelista ad eum qui illo tempore magis in admiratione apud Iudaeos erat quam Ioannes, Christi comparationem facit, scilicet ad Moysen. Et considera prudentiam. Non personarum, sed rerum comparationem facit, gratiam et veritatem legi opponens; et huic addit data est, quod ministrantis erat; huic autem facta est, quod est regis cum potestate omnia operantis: cum gratia quidem, quia cum potestate omnia dimittebat peccata. Et gratiam quidem eius Baptismatis donum, et adoptio quae per spiritum nobis datur, et alia multa ostendunt: veritatem autem plenius sciemus si figuras veteris legis didicerimus: ea enim quae in novo testamento perficienda erant, in veteri testamento figurae praescripserunt, quas Christus veniens adimplevit. Unde figura data est per Moysen, veritas per Christum facta est.

**Augustinus de Trin:** Vel gratiam referamus ad scientiam, veritatem ad sapientiam: in rebus enim per tempus ortis illa summa gratia est, quod homo in unitate personae coniunctus est Deo: in rebus vero aeternis summa veritas recte tribuitur Dei verbo.

has said, Grace for grace, he adds something to show the magnitude of the gift; For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth were made by Jesus Christ. John when comparing himself with Christ above had said, He is preferred before me: but the Evangelist draws a comparison between Christ, and one much more in admiration with the Jews than John, viz. Moses. And observe his wisdom. He does not draw the comparison. between the persons, but the things, contrasting grace and truth to the law: the latter of which he says was given, a word only applying to an administrator; the former made, as we should speak of a king, who does every thing by his power: though in this King it would be with grace also, because that with power He remitted all sins. Now His grace is shown in His gift of Baptism, and our adoption by the Holy Spirit, and many other things; but to have a better insight into what the truth is, we should study the figures of the old law: for what was to be accomplished in the New Testament, is prefigured in the Old, Christ at His Coming filling up the figure. Thus was the figure given by Moses, but the truth made by Christ.

**AUG.** Or, we may refer grace to knowledge, truth to wisdom. Amongst the events of time the highest grace is the uniting of man to God in One Person; in the eternal world the highest truth pertains to God the Word.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 18

18 θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε: μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.

18. No man has seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he has declared him.

---

**Origenes in Ioannem:** Incongrue Heracleon asserit hoc promulgatum fuisse non a Baptista, sed a discipulo: nam si illud de plenitudine eius nos omnes accepimus, a Baptista prolaturum est, quomodo non est sequens, ipsum de gratia

**ORIGEN;** Heracleon asserts, that this is a declaration of the disciple, not of the Baptist: an unreasonable supposition; for if the words, Of His fullness have we all received, are the Baptist's, does not the connection run naturally,

Christi suscipientem, et secundam pro prima gratia, confitentemque, legem per Moysen fore traditam, gratiam vero et veritatem per Iesum Christum prodiisse; intellexisse qualiter Deum nemo vidit unquam, quodque unigenitus, cum in patris gremio requiescat, interpretationem ipsi Ioanni, nec non omnibus his qui de perfectione gustaverint, concesserit? Non enim nunc primitus annuntiavit: nam priusquam Abraham fieret, docet nos Abraham exultasse, ut videret eius gloriam.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Vel aliter. Evangelista ostendens multam eminentiam donorum Christi ad ea quae per Moysen dispensata sunt, vult de reliquo causam rationalem differentiae dicere: nam ille quidem famulus existens, minorum rerum factus est minister; hic vero dominator et regis filius existens, multo maiora nobis attulit coexistens semper patri, et videns eum: propter hoc ita intulit, dicens Deum nemo vidit unquam.

**Augustinus ad Paulinam:** Quid ergo est quod Iacob dicit: vidi dominum facie ad faciem; et quod de Moyse scriptum: quia loquebatur cum Deo facie ad faciem; et illud quod propheta Isaias loquens de seipso ait: vidi dominum Sabaoth sedentem in throno?

**Gregorius Moralium:** Sed patenter datur intelligi quod quamdiu hic mortaliter vivitur, videri per quasdam imagines potest Deus; sed per ipsam naturae suae speciem non potest; ut anima gratia spiritus afflata, per figuras quasdam Deum videat; sed ad ipsam vim eius essentiae non pertingat. Hinc est enim quod Iacob, qui Deum se vidisse testatur, non nisi Angelum vidit: hinc est quod Moyses, qui cum Deo facie ad faciem loquitur, dicit: ostende mihi te ipsum manifeste, ut videam te. Ex qua eius petitione colligitur, quia eum sitiebat per incircumscriptae naturae suae claritatem cernere, quem iam coeperat per quasdam imagines videre.

**Chrysostomus:** Si autem antiqui patres ipsam viderunt naturam, nequaquam differenter considerassent: simplex enim quaedam est et infigurabilis; non sedet, neque stat, neque ambulat; haec enim corporum sunt: unde et per

that he receiving of the grace of Christ, the second in the place of the first grace, and confessing that the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ; understood here that no man had seen God at any time, and that the Only Begotten, who was in the bosom of the Father, had committed this declaration of Himself to John, and all who with him had received of His fullness? For John was not the first who declared Him; for He Himself who was before Abraham, tells us, that Abraham rejoiced to see His glory.

**CHRYS.** Or thus; the Evangelist after showing the great superiority of Christ's gifts, compared with those dispensed by Moses, wishes in the next place to supply an adequate reason for the difference. The one being a servant was made a minister of a lesser dispensation: but the other Who was Lord, and Son of the King, brought us far higher things, being ever coexistent with the Father, and beholding Him. Then follows, No man has seen God at any time, &c.

**AUG.** What is that then which Jacob said, I have seen God face to face; and that which is written of Moses, he talked with God face to face; and that which the prophet Isaiah said of himself, I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne?

**GREG.** It is plainly given us to understand here, that while we are in this mortal state, we see God only through the medium of certain images, not, in the reality of His own nature. A soul influenced by the grace of the Spirit may see God through certain figures, but cannot penetrate into his absolute essence. And hence it is that Jacob, who testifies that he saw God, saw nothing but an Angel: and that Moses, who talked with God face to face, says, Show me Your way, that I may know You: meaning that he ardently desired to see in the brightness of His own infinite Nature, Him Whom he had only as yet seen reflected in images.

**CHRYS.** If the old fathers had seen That very Nature, they would not have contemplated It so variously, for It is in Itself simple and without shape; It sits not, It walks not; these are the qualities of bodies. Whence he said

prophetam dicit: ego visionem multiplicavi eis, et in manibus prophetarum assimilatus sum; hoc est, condescendi eis, non quod eram apparui: quia enim filius Dei per veram carnem appariturus erat nobis, primo excitavit eos videre Deum, sicut possibile erat eis videre.

**Augustinus ad Paulinam:** Sed cum scriptum sit: beati mundo corde, quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt, et iterum: cum apparuerit, similes ei erimus, quoniam videbimus eum sicuti est, quid est quod hic dicitur Deum nemo vidit unquam? An fortasse respondetur, quod illa testimonia de videndo Deo sunt, non de viso? Ipsi enim Deum videbunt, dictum est, non viderunt; et non vidimus, sed: videbimus eum sicuti est: Deum enim nemo vidit unquam: vel in hac vita sicuti ipse est, vel etiam in Angelorum vita, sicut visibilia ista quae corporali visione cernuntur.

**Gregorius Moraliu:** Si vero a quibusdam potest in hac corruptibili carne viventibus, sed tamen inaestimabili virtute crescentibus, quodam contemplationis acumine aeterna claritas Dei videri; hoc ab hac sententia non abhorret, quoniam quisquis sapientiam, quae Deus est, videt, huic vitae funditus moritur, ne iam eius amore teneatur.

**Augustinus super Genesim:** Nisi enim ab hac vita quisque quodammodo moriatur, sive omnino exiens de corpore, sive ita aversus et alienatus a carnalibus sensibus, ut merito nesciat, sicut apostolus ait utrum in corpore, an extra corpus sit, non in illam rapitur et subvertitur visionem.

**Gregorius:** Sciendum vero est, quod fuere nonnulli qui Deum dicerent in illa regione beatitudinis in claritate sua conspici, sed in natura minime videri. Quos nimirum minor inquisitionis subtilitas fefellit: neque enim illi simplici et incommutabili essentiae aliud est claritas, aliud natura.

**Augustinus ad Paulinam:** Si autem dicitur, in hoc quod scriptum est Deum nemo vidit unquam, homines tantummodo intelligendos: nam hoc apostolus

through the Prophet, I have multiplied visions, and used similitudes, by the ministry of the Prophets: i.e. I have condescended to them, I appeared that which I was not. For inasmuch as the Son of God was about to manifest Himself to us in actual flesh, men were at first raised to the sight of God, in such ways as allowed of their seeing Him.

**AUG.** Now it is said, Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God; and again, When He shall appear, we shall be like to Him, for we shall see Him as He is. What is the meaning then of the words here: No man has seen God at any time? The reply is easy: those passages speak of God, as to be seen, not as already seen. They shall see God, it is said, not, they have seen Him: nor is it, we have seen Him, but, we shall see Him as He is. For, No man has seen God at any time, neither in this life, nor yet in the Angelic, as He is; in the same way in which sensible things are perceived by the bodily vision.

**GREG.** If however any, while inhabiting this corruptible flesh, can advance to such an immeasurable height of virtue, as to be able to discern by the contemplative vision, the eternal brightness of God, their case affects not what we say. For whoever sees wisdom, that is, God, is dead wholly to this life, being no longer occupied by the love of it.

**AUG.** For unless any in some sense die to this life, either by leaving the body altogether, or by being so withdrawn and alienated from carnal perceptions, that he may well not know, as the Apostle says, whether he be in the body or out of the body, he cannot be carried away, and borne aloft to that vision.

**GREG.** Some hold that in the place of bliss, God is visible in His brightness, but not in His nature. This is to indulge in over much subtlety. For in that simple and unchangeable essence, no division can be made between the nature and the brightness.

**AUG.** If we say, that the text, No one has seen God, at any time, applies only to men; so that, as the Apostle more plainly interprets it, Whom no man

planius explicans: quem nemo, inquit, hominum vidit, sed nec videre potest, ut ita dictum sit Deum nemo vidit unquam, ac si diceretur: nullus hominum, quaestio illa solvi videbitur, ut non sit huic sententiae contrarium quod dominus ait: Angeli eorum semper vident faciem patris mei; ut scilicet Angelos Deum videre credamus, quem nemo vidit unquam, scilicet hominum.

**Gregorius:** Sunt tamen nonnulli qui nequaquam Deum videre nec Angelos suspicantur.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Dicentes, quod ipsum quod Deus est, non solum prophetae, sed nec Angeli viderunt, neque Archangeli. Sed si interrogaveris eos, audies de substantia nihil respondentem. Gloria vero in excelsis Deo non solum cantantes, sed et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis. Et si a Cherubim et Seraphim concupiveris aliquid discere, mysticam sanctimonii melodiam audies, et quoniam plenum est caelum et terra gloria eius.

**Augustinus ad Paulinam:** Quod quidem intantum verum est, quia Dei plenitudinem nullus non solum oculis corporis, sed vel ipsa mente aliquando comprehendit. Aliud est enim videre, aliud totum videndo comprehendere: quandoquidem id videtur quod praesens utcumque sentitur; totum autem comprehenditur videndo quod ita videtur ut nihil eius lateat videntem, aut cuius fines circumspici possunt.

**Chrysostomus:** Sic igitur solus patrem videt filius et spiritus sanctus. Quod enim creabilis est naturae, qualiter poterit videre quod increabile est? Ita igitur nullus novit Deum, ut filius; unde sequitur unigenitus filius, qui est in sinu patris, ipse enarravit. Ne propter nominis communionem unum quemdam eorum qui gratia facti sunt filiorum esse existimes eum, primo quidem adiectus est articulus. Si vero hoc non sufficit tibi, audi aliud nomen unigenitus.

**Hilarius de Trin:** Naturae quidem fides non satis explicata videbatur ex nomine filii, nisi proprietatis virtus per exceptionis significantiam adderetur; praeter filium enim et unigenitum nihil cognominans, suspicionem penitus adoptionis exclusit, cum veritatem nominis unigeniti natura praestaret.

has seen nor can see, no one is to be understood here to mean, no one of men: the question may be solved in a way not to contradict what our Lord says, Their Angels do always behold the face of My Father; so that we must believe that Angels see, what no one, i.e. of men, has ever seen.

**GREG.** Some however there are who conceive that not even the Angels see God.

**CHRYS.** That very existence which is God, neither Prophets, nor even Angels, nor yet Archangels, have seen. For inquire of the Angels; they say nothing concerning His Substance; but sing, Glory to God in the highest, and Peace on earth to men of good will. Nay, ask even Cherubim and Seraphim; you will hear only in reply the mystic melody of devotion, and that heaven and earth are full of His glory.

**AUG.** Which indeed is true so far, that no bodily or even mental vision of man has ever embraced the fullness of God; for it is one thing to see, another to embrace the whole of what you see. A thing is seen, if only the sight of it be caught; but we only see a thing fully, when we have no part of it unseen, when we see round its extreme limits.

**CHRYS.** In this complete sense only the Son and the Holy Ghost see the Father. For how can created nature see that which is uncreated? So then no man knows the Father as the Son knows Him: and hence what follows, The Only-Begotten Son, Who is in the bosom of the Father, He has declared, Him. That we might not be led by the identity of the name, to confound Him with the sons made so by grace, the article is annexed in the first place; and then, to put an end to all doubt, the name Only-Begotten is introduced.

**HILARY;** The Truth of His Nature did not seem sufficiently explained by the name of Son, unless, in addition, its peculiar force as proper to Him were expressed, so signifying its distinctness from all beside. For in that, besides Son, he calls Him also the Only-Begotten, he cut off altogether all suspicion

**Chrysostomus:** Sed et aliud posuit, dicens qui est in sinu patris. Etenim in sinu conversari multo plus est quam simpliciter videre: nam qui simpliciter videt, non omnino eius quod videt cognitionem habet: qui vero in sinu conversatur, nihil ignorabit. Cum igitur audieris quod nullus cognoscit patrem nisi filius, nequaquam dicas, quoniam etsi plus omnibus novit patrem, sed non quantus est novit eum: propterea Evangelista in sinu patris eum morari dicit, ut non aestimemus per id aliud significatum quam familiaritatem unigeniti, et coaeternitatem ad patrem.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** In sinu enim patris, idest in secreto patris: non enim Deus habet sinum, quemadmodum nos habemus in vestibus; aut cogitandus est sic sedere quomodo nos; aut forte cinctus est, ut sinum haberet: sed quia sinus noster intus est, secretum patris sinus patris vocatur. Qui ergo in secreto patris novit patrem, ipse enarravit quod vidit.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Sed quid enarravit? Quoniam unus est Deus. Sed et hoc reliqui prophetae et Moyses clamant: quid ergo plus didicimus a filio in sinibus paternalibus existente? Primum quidem ipsa haec quae alii narraverunt, sunt enarrata ex operatione unigeniti; deinde quoniam multo maiorem suscepimus doctrinam per unigenitum, et cognovimus quoniam spiritus est Deus, et quod eos qui adorant eum, in spiritu et veritate adorare oportet, et quoniam Deus pater est unigeniti.

**Beda:** Praeterea sciendum, quia si ad praeteritum referatur quod ait enarravit, homo factus enarravit quid de Trinitatis unitate sentiendum, qualiter ad eius contemplationem properandum, quibus actibus sit perveniendum. Si vero referatur ad futurum, tunc enarrabit cum electos suos ad visionem claritatis suae inducet.

of adoption, the Nature of the Only-Begotten guaranteeing the truth of the name.

**CHRYS.** He adds, Which is in the bosom of the Father. To dwell in the bosom is much more than simply to see. For he who sees simply, has not the knowledge thoroughly of that which he sees; but he who dwells in the bosom, knows every thing. When you hear then that no one knows the Father save the Son, do not by any means suppose that he only knows the Father more than any other, and does not know Him fully. For the Evangelist sets forth His residing in the bosom of the Father on this very account: viz. to show us the intimate converse of the Only-Begotten, and His co-eternity with the Father.

**AUG.** In the bosom of the Father, i.e. in the secret Presence of the Father: for God has not the fold on the bosom, as we have; nor must be imagined to sit, as we do; nor is He bound with a girdle, so as to have a fold: but from the fact of our bosom being placed innermost, the secret Presence of the Father is called the bosom of the Father. He then who, in the secret Presence of the Father, knew the Father, the same has declared what He saw.

**CHRYS.** But what has He declared? That God is one. But this the rest of the Prophets and Moses proclaim: what else have we learnt from the Son Who was in the bosom of the Father? In the first place, that those very truths, which the others declared, were declared through the operation of the Only Begotten: in the next place, we have received a far greater doctrine from the Only Begotten; viz. that God is a Spirit, and those who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth; and that God is the Father of the Only Begotten.

**BEDE;** Farther, if the word declared have reference to the past, it must be considered that He, being made man, declared the doctrine of the Trinity in unity, and how, and by what acts we should prepare ourselves for the contemplation of it. If it have reference to the future, then it means that He will declare Him, when He shall introduce His elect to the vision of His brightness.

**Augustinus:** Fuerunt autem homines qui dicerent, vanitate cordis sui decepti: pater invisibilis est, filius autem visibilis est. Si ergo propter carnem filius visibilis dicitur, et nos concedimus, et est Catholica fides; si autem, ut ipsi dicunt, antequam incarnaretur, multum delirant, si Christus sapientia Dei et virtus Dei est: sapientia enim Dei videri oculis non potest. Si verbum hominis oculis non videtur, verbum Dei sic videri potest?

**Chrysostomus:** Non igitur soli ipsi proprium est Deum nemo vidit unquam, sed et filio: quia, ut Paulus dicit, est imago Dei invisibilis; qui vero invisibilis imago est, et ipse invisibilis est.

**AUG.** Yet have there been men, who, deceived by the vanity of their hearts, maintained that the Father is invisible, the Son visible. Now if they call the Son visible, with respect to His connection with the flesh, we object not; it is the Catholic doctrine. But it is madness in them to say He was so before His incarnation; i.e. if it be true that Christ is the Wisdom of God, and the Power of God. The Wisdom of God cannot be seen by the eye. If the human word cannot be seen by the eye, how can the Word of God?

**CHRYS.** The text then, No man has seen God at any time, applies not to the Father only, but also to the Son: for He, as Paul said, is the Image of the invisible God; but He who is the Image of the Invisible, must Himself also be invisible.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 19

19 καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωάννου, ὅτε ἀπέστειλαν [πρὸς αὐτόν] οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων ἱερεῖς καὶ λευίτας ἵνα ἐρωτήσωσιν αὐτόν, σὺ τίς εἶ; 20 καὶ ὠμολόγησεν καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο, καὶ ὠμολόγησεν ὅτι ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός. 21 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν, τί οὖν; σὺ ἡλίας εἶ; καὶ λέγει, οὐκ εἰμί. ὁ προφήτης εἶ σὺ; καὶ ἀπεκρίθη, οὐ. 22 εἶπαν οὖν αὐτῷ, τίς εἶ; ἵνα ἀπόκρισιν δώμεν τοῖς πέμψασιν ἡμᾶς: τί λέγεις περὶ σεαυτοῦ; 23 ἔφη, ἐγὼ φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, εὐθύνατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, καθὼς εἶπεν ἠσαΐας ὁ προφήτης.

19. And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who are you? 20. And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ. 21. And they asked him, What then? Are you Elias? And he said, I am not. Are you that prophet? And he answered, No. 22. Then said they to him, Who are you? that we may give an answer to them that sent us. What say you of yourself? 23. He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias.

---

**Origenes:** Secundum legitur hoc testimonium a Ioanne Baptista de Christo prolatum, incipiente primo illic: hic est de quo dixi, et desinente ibi: ipse enarravit.

**ORIGEN;** This is the second testimony of John the Baptist to Christ, the first began with, This is He of Whom I spoke; and ended with, He has declared Him.

**Theophylactus:** Vel aliter. Postquam superius dixit Evangelista, quod Ioannes testabatur de Christo: ante me factus est, nunc subiungit quando praemissum testimonium reddiderit Christo Ioannes; unde dicit et hoc est testimonium Ioannis, quando miserunt Iudaei ab Hierosolymis sacerdotes et Levitas ad Ioannem.

**Origenes:** Iudaei quidem ab Hierosolymis, ut cognati existentes Baptistae de stirpe sacerdotali existentis, sacerdotes et Levitas destinant, sciscitatuos quis esset Ioannes; eos scilicet qui reputati sunt secundum electionem ab aliis differre; et ab electo Hierosolymorum loco. Ioannem itaque quaerunt cum tanta veneratione; erga Christum autem nihil huiusmodi factum legitur a Iudaeis. Sed quod erga Ioannem Iudaei, hoc Ioannes erga Christum prosequitur, per proprios discipulos interrogans: tu es qui venturus es, an alium expectamus?

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Sic autem fide dignum aestimaverunt esse Ioannem, ut ei de seipso dicenti crederent; unde dicitur ut interrogarent eum: tu quis es?

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Non autem mitterent nisi moverentur excellentia auctoritatis eius, quia ausus est baptizare.

**Origenes:** Ioannes autem, ut videtur, discernebat ex quaestione, sacerdotum et Levitarum dubitationem, ne forte Christus esset baptizans; apertius tamen illud profiteri cavebant, ne temerarii putarentur. Quapropter merito, ut eorum opinio fallax de eo primitus aboleretur, ac subinde veritas propalaretur, quod non sit Christus ante omnia manifestat; unde sequitur et confessus est, et non negavit: et confessus est: quia non sum ego Christus. Hic etiam adiciamus, quia tempus adventus Christi populum recreabat quodammodo iam praesens existens, legisperitis ex sacris Scripturis illius tempus speratum colligentibus: propter quod Theodas non modicam multitudinem quasi Christus congregavit, et post illum Iudas Galilaeus in diebus professionis. Cum ergo ferventius Christi expectaretur adventus, Iudaei transmittunt ad Ioannem, per hoc quod est tu quis es? Conicere volentes si ipse se Christum fateretur. Non autem ex

**THEOPHYL.** Or, after the introduction above of John's testimony to Christ, is preferred before me, the Evangelist now adds when the above testimony was given, And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem.

**ORIGEN;** The Jews of Jerusalem, as being of kin to the Baptist, who was of the priestly stock, send Priests and Levites to ask him who he is; that is, men considered to hold a superior rank to the rest of their order, by God's election, and coming from that favored above all cities, Jerusalem. Such is the reverential way in which they interrogate John. We read of no such proceeding towards Christ: but what the Jews did to John, John in turn does to Christ, when he asks Him, through His disciples, Are you He that should come, or look we for another?

**CHRYS.** Such confidence had they in John, that they were ready to believe him on his own words: witness how it is said, To ask him, Who are you?

**AUG.** They would not have sent, unless they had been impressed by his lofty exercise of authority, in daring to baptize.

**ORIGEN;** John, as it appears, saw from the question, that the Priests and Levites had doubts whether it might not be the Christ, who was baptizing; which doubts however they were afraid to profess openly, for fear of incurring the charge of credulity. He wisely determines therefore first to correct their mistake, and then to proclaim the truth. Accordingly, he first of all shows that he is not the Christ: And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ. We may add here, that at this time the people had already begun to be impressed with the idea that Christ's advent was at hand, in consequence of the interpretations which the lawyers had collected out of the sacred writings to that effect. Thus Theudas had been enabled to collect together a considerable body, on the strength of his pretending to be the Christ; and after him Judas, in the days of the taxation, had done the same. Such being the strong expectation of Christ's advent then prevalent, the Jews

eo quod dicit non sum ego Christus, negavit: ex hoc enim ipso confessus est veritatem.

**Gregorius in Evang:** Negavit plane quod non erat, sed non negavit quod erat, ut veritatem loquens, eius membrum fieret cuius sibi nomen fallaciter non usurparet.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Vel aliter. Passi erant Iudaei quamdam humanam passionem ad Ioannem. Indignum enim aestimabant, subici eum Christo propter multa quae Ioannis claritatem demonstrabant: quorum primum erat genus illustre, principis enim sacerdotum filius erat; deinde dura educatio, humanorum despectio. In Christo autem contrarium videbatur: genus humile, quod ei exprobrabant dicentes: nonne hic est fabri filius? Dieta communis, et vestimenta nihil plus multis habentia. Quia igitur Ioannes continue ad Christum mittebat, volentes magis Ioannem habere magistrum, mittunt ad eum, opinantes per blanditias eum allicere ad confitendum se Christum esse. Non ergo quosdam contemptibiles mittunt, ut ad Christum, ministros et Herodianos, sed sacerdotes et Levitas; et non quoscumque, sed eos qui erant ex Hierosolymis, hoc est honorabiliores; et ad hoc mittunt ut interrogarent tu quis es? Non quasi ignorantes, sed volentes eum inducere ad hoc quod dixi: unde Ioannes ad mentem et non ad interrogationem eis respondit et confessus est, et non negavit; et confessus est: quia non sum ego Christus. Et vide sapientiam Evangelistae. Tertio quasi idem dicit, et virtutem Baptistae indicans, et malitiam et amentiam Iudaeorum. Devoti enim famuli est, non solum non rapere gloriam domini, sed oblatam a multis respuere. Turbae quidem ex ignorantia ad hanc venerunt suspicionem ut Ioannem Christum aestimaret; hi vero a maligna mente, ex qua interrogabant eum, aestimantes per blanditias attrahere ad hoc quod volebant: nisi enim excogitassent hoc, respondentem non sum ego Christus, dixissent: non hoc suspicati sumus, non hoc venimus interrogaturi. Sed capti et manifesti effecti ad aliud veniunt; unde sequitur et interrogaverunt eum: quid ergo? Elias es tu?

send to John, intending by the question, Who are you? to extract from him whether he were the Christ.

**GREG.** He denied directly being what he was not, but he did not deny what he was: thus, by his speaking truth, becoming a true member of Him Whose name he had not dishonestly usurped.

**CHRYS.** Or take this explanation: The Jews were influenced by a kind of human sympathy for John, whom they were reluctant to see made subordinate to Christ, on account of the many marks of greatness about him; his illustrious descent in the first place, he being the son of a chief priest; in the next, his hard training, and his contempt of the world. Whereas in Christ the contrary were apparent; a humble birth, for which they reproach Him; Is not this the carpenter's son? an ordinary way of living; a dress such as every one else wore. As John then was constantly sending to Christ, they send to him, with the view of having him for their master, and thinking to induce him, by blandishments, to confess himself Christ. They do not therefore send inferior persons to him, ministers and Herodians, as they did to Christ, but Priests and Levites; and not of these an indiscriminate party, but those of Jerusalem, i.e. the more honorable ones; but they send them with this question, to ask, Who are you? not from a wish to be informed, but in order to induce him to do what I have said. John replies then to their intention, not to their interrogation: And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ. And observe the wisdom of the Evangelist: he repeats the same thing three times, to show John's virtue, and the malice and madness of the Jews. For it is the character of a devoted servant, not only to forbear taking to himself his lord's glory, but even, when numbers offer it to him, to reject it. The multitude indeed believed from ignorance that John was the Christ, but in these it was malice; and in this spirit they put the question to him, thinking, by their blandishments to bring him over to their wishes. For unless this had been their design, when he replied, I am not the Christ, they would have said, We did not suspect this; we did not come to ask this. When caught, however, and discovered in their purpose, they proceed to another question: And they asked him, What then? Are you Elias?

**Augustinus:** Noverant enim quod praecessurus erat Elias Christum: non enim alicui ignotum erat nomen Christi apud Hebraeos; sed non putabant illum esse Christum; nec tamen omnino putaverunt Christum non esse venturum; et cum sperarent futurum, offenderunt in praesentem. Sequitur et dixit: non sum.

**Gregorius in Evang:** Ex his verbis nobis quaestio valde implexa generatur. Alio quippe in loco inquisitus a discipulis dominus de Eliae adventu, respondit: si vultis scire, Ioannes ipse est Elias. Requisitus autem Ioannes dicit non sum Elias. Quomodo ergo propheta veritatis est si eiusdem veritatis sermonibus concors non est?

**Origenes:** Dicit aliquis quod se ignorabat Ioannes esse Eliam; et hoc nimirum utentur documento qui assistunt iteratae incorporationis rationi, tamquam anima denuo induente corpora. Quaerunt enim Iudaei per Levitas ac sacerdotes, an esset Elias, cum iteratae corporis assumptionis documentum verax arbitrantur, quasi paternum existens, nec alienum ab arcanorum suorum doctrina. Ob hoc itaque dicit Ioannes: Elias non sum; nam nescit primaevam vitam propriam. Qualiter autem videtur rationabile, si tamquam propheta spiritu illuminatus est, et de Deo et unigenito tanta narravit, ignorasse de seipso an unquam eius anima fuerit in Elia?

**Gregorius in Evang:** Sed si subtiliter veritas ipsa requiratur, hoc quidem quod inter se contrarium sonat, quomodo contrarium non sit invenitur. Ad Zachariam namque de Ioanne Angelus dixit: ipse praecedet ante illum in spiritu et virtute Eliae, quia scilicet sicut Elias secundum domini adventum praeveniet, ita Ioannes praevenit primum; sicut ille praecursor venturus est iudicis, ita iste praecursor factus est redemptoris. Ioannes igitur in spiritu Elias erat, in persona Elias non erat. Quod autem dominus fatetur de spiritu, hoc Ioannes denegat de persona: quia et iustum sic erat ut discipulis dominus spiritalem de Ioanne sententiam diceret, et Ioannes turbis carnalibus non de suo spiritu, sed de corpore responderet.

**AUG.** For they knew that Elias was to preach Christ; the name of Christ not being unknown to any among the Jews; but they did not think that our Lord was the Christ: and yet did not altogether imagine that there was no Christ about to come. In this way, while looking forward to the future, they mistook at the present. And he said, I am not.

**GREG.** These words gave rise to a very different question. In another place, our Lord, when asked by His disciples concerning the coming of Elias, replied, If you will receive it, this is Elias. But John says, I am not Elias. How is he then a preacher of the truth, if he agrees not with what that very Truth declares?

**ORIGEN;** Some one will say that John was ignorant that he was Elias; as those say, who maintain, from this passage the doctrine of a second incorporation, as though the soul took up a new body, after leaving its old one. For the Jews, it is said, asking John by the Levites and priests, whether he is Elias, suppose the doctrine of a second body to be already certain; as though it rested upon tradition, and were part of their secret system. To which question, however, John replies, I am not Elias: not being acquainted with his own prior existence. But how is it reasonable to imagine, if John were a prophet enlightened by the Spirit, and had revealed so much concerning the Father, and the Only-Begotten, that he could be so in the dark as to himself, as not to know that his own soul had once belonged to Elias?

**GREG.** But if we examine the truth accurately, that which sounds inconsistent, will be found not really so. The Angel told Zacharias concerning John, He shall go before Him in the spirit and power of Elias. As Elias then will preach the second advent of our Lord, so John preached His first; as the former will come as the precursor of the Judge, so the latter was made the precursor of the Redeemer. John was Elias in spirit, not in person: and what our Lord affirms of the spirit, John denies of the Person: there being a kind of propriety in this; viz. that our Lord to His disciples should speak spiritually of John, and that John, in answering the carnal multitude, should speak of his body, not of his spirit.

**Origenes:** Respondit ergo Levitis et sacerdotibus: non sum, coniectans propositum quaestionis eorum: non enim sapiebat praemissa examinatio, si idem spiritus esset in utroque; sed si Ioannes esset ipse Elias qui assumptus est, nunc apparens, secundum quod a Iudaeis expectabatur, absque nativitate. Primus autem arbitrans resumptionem corporum, dicet, quod inconsequens est filium Zachariae tanti sacerdotis in senio natum, super omnem humanam expectationem, ignorari a sacerdotibus et Levitis ipsum natum fuisse; maxime Luca testante quod factus est timor in omnibus habitantibus circa eos. Sed forsitan quoniam prope finem Eliam expectabant ante Christum, quasi tropice sciscitari videntur: an es tu qui praenuntias Christum venturum? Et caute respondit: non sum. Sed nihil mirabile. Sicut in salvatore, pluribus scientibus ex Maria nativatem eius, quidam fallebantur putantes eum Ioannem Baptistam vel Eliam, aut aliquem prophetarum; sic et in Ioanne quosdam ortus eius ex Zacharia non latebat; et quidam dubitabant, si forsitan qui expectabatur Elias apparuit in Ioanne. Quoniam vero cum plures in Israel editi fuerint prophetae, unus de quo Moyses prophetaverat, praesertim expectabatur, iuxta illud: prophetam vobis suscitabit Deus ex fratribus vestris: sicut mihi, illi parebitis; tertio sciscitantur, non si foret propheta simpliciter, sed cum articulo, ut in Graeco ponitur; unde sequitur propheta es tu? Per singulos enim prophetas noverat populus Israel neminem eorum fore hunc quem Moyses prophetaverat, qui sicut Moyses medius staret inter Deum et homines, et accepto testamento a Deo traderet discipulis. Hoc autem illis nomen non Christo attribuentibus, sed arbitrantibus alium a Christo ipsum fore, Ioannes scivit quoniam et Christus ille propheta esset; unde subditur et respondit: non.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Vel quia Ioannes maior erat quam propheta: quia prophetae longe praenuntiaverunt, Ioannes praesentem demonstrabat. Sequitur dixerunt ergo ei: quis es, ut responsum demus his qui miserunt nos? Quid dicis de teipso?

**ORIGEN;** He answers then the Levites and Priests, I am not, conjecturing what their question meant: for the purport of their examination was to discover, not whether the spirit in both was the same, but whether John was that very Elias, who was taken up, now appearing again, as the Jews expected, without another birth. But he whom we mentioned above as holding this doctrine of a reincorporation, will say that it is not consistent that the Priests and Levites should be ignorant of the birth of the son of so dignified a priest as Zacharias, who was born too in his father's old age, and contrary to all human probabilities: especially when Luke declares, that fear came on all that dwelt round about them. But perhaps, since Elias was expected to appear before the coming of Christ near the end, they may seem to put the question figuratively, Are you he who announces the coming of Christ at the end of the world? to which he answers, I am not. But there is in fact nothing strange in supposing that John's birth might not have been known to all. For as in the case of our Savior many knew Him to be born of Mary, and yet some wrongly imagined that He was John the Baptist, or Elias, or one of the Prophets; so in the case of John, some were not unacquainted with the fact of his being son of Zacharias, and yet some may have been in doubt whether he were not the Elias who was expected. Again, inasmuch as many prophets had arisen in Israel, but one was especially looked forward to, of whom Moses had prophesied The Lord your God will raise up unto you a Prophet from the midst of you, of your brethren, like to me; to Him shall you hearken: they ask him in the third place, not simply whether he is a prophet, but with the article prefixed, Are you that Prophet? For every one of the prophets in succession had signified to the people of Israel that he was not the one whom Moses had prophesied of; who, like Moses, was to stand in the midst between God and man, and deliver a testament, sent from God to His disciples. They did not however apply this name to Christ, but thought that He was to be a different person; whereas John knew that Christ was that Prophet, and therefore to this question, he answered, No.

**AUG.** Or because John was more than a prophet: for that the prophets announced Him afar off, but John pointed Him out actually present. Then said they to him, Who are you? that we may give an answer to them that sent us. What say you of yourself?

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Vides hic vehementius insistentes et interrogantes; hunc autem cum mansuetudine eas quae non erant verae suspiciones destruentem, et eam quae est vera ponentem: unde sequitur ait: ego vox clamantis in deserto.

**Augustinus:** Isaias illud dixit; in Ioanne prophetia ista completa est.

**Gregorius in Evang:** Scitis autem quod unigenitus filius verbum patris vocatur. Ex ipsa autem nostra locutione cognoscimus, quia prius vox sonat, ut verbum possit audiri. Ioannes ergo vocem se asserit esse, quia verbum praecedit, et per eius ministerium, patris verbum ab hominibus auditur.

**Origenes:** Ineleganter autem Heracleon de Ioanne et prophetis considerans, ait, quoniam verbum quidem salvator est, vox autem per Ioannem intelligitur; solus enim sonus est omnis gradus propheticus. Cui dicendum, quod si non significativam vocem dederit tuba, nemo se accinget ad praelium. Si ergo nil aliud quam sonus est vox prophetica, quomodo transmittit nos ad illam salvator? Scrutamini Scripturas. Dicit autem Ioannes se esse vocem non clamantem in deserto, sed clamantis in deserto, eius scilicet qui stabat et clamabat: si quis sitit, veniat ad me, et bibat. Clamat enim ut distantes auditu percipiant, et gravem habentes auditum sentiant immensitatem eorum quae dicuntur.

**Theophylactus:** Vel quia veritatem manifeste annuntiat: omnes enim qui in lege erant, obscure loquebantur.

**Gregorius:** Vel in deserto Ioannes clamat, quia quasi derelictae ac destitutae Iudaeae solatium redemptoris annuntiat.

**Origenes:** Opus autem vocis in deserto clamantis est ut anima a Deo destituta, ad rectam faciendam viam domini revocetur, nequaquam pravitatem serpentini gressus proseguendo: secundum contemplationem quidem sublimatam in veritate absque permixtione mendacii, et secundum actionem

**CHRYS.** You see them here pressing him still more strongly with their questions, while he on the other hand quietly puts down their suspicions, where they are untrue, and establishes the truth in their place: saying, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness.

**AUG.** So spoke Esaias: the prophecy was fulfilled in John the Baptist.

**GREG.** You know that the only-begotten Son is called the Word of the Father. Now we know, in the case of our own utterance, the voice first sounds, and then the word is heard. Thus John declares himself to be the voice, i.e. because he precedes the Word, and, through his ministry, the Word of the Father is heard by man.

**ORIGEN;** Heracleon, in his discussion on John and the Prophets, infers that because the Savior was the Word, and John the voice, therefore the whole of the prophetic order was only sound. To which we reply, that, if the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle? If the voice of prophecy is nothing but sound, why does the Savior send us to it, saying, Search the Scriptures? But John calls himself the voice, not that cries, but of one that cries in the wilderness; viz. of Him Who stood and cried, If any man thirst, let him come to Me and drink. He cries, in order that those at a distance may hear him, and understand from the loudness of the sound, the vastness of the thing spoken of.

**THEOPHYL.** Or because he declared the truth plainly, while all who were under the law spoke obscurely.

**GREG.** John cries in the wilderness, because it is to forsaken and destitute Judea that he bears the consolatory tidings of a Redeemer.

**ORIGEN;** There is need of the voice crying in the wilderness, that the soul, forsaken by God, may be recalled to making straight the way of the Lord, following no more the crooked paths of the serpent. This has reference both to the contemplative life, as enlightened by truth, without mixture of falsehood, and to the practical, as following up the correct perception by the

post congruam speculationem licitum opus referentem; unde sequitur dirigite viam domini, sicut dixit Isaias propheta.

**Gregorius:** Via domini ad cor dirigitur, cum veritatis sermo humiliter auditur; via domini ad cor dirigitur, cum ad praeceptum vita praeparatur.

suitable action. Wherefore he adds, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias.

**GREG.** The way of the Lord is made straight to the heart, when the word of truth is heard with humility; the way of the Lord is made straight to the heart, when the life is formed upon the precept.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 20

24 καὶ ἀπεσταλμένοι ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν φαρισαίων. 25 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, τί οὖν βαπτίζεις εἰ σὺ οὐκ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐδὲ ἠλίας οὐδὲ ὁ προφήτης; 26 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγων, ἐγὼ βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι: μέσος ὑμῶν ἕστηκεν ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε, 27 ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, οὗ οὐκ εἰμι [ἐγὼ] ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος. 28 ταῦτα ἐν βηθανίᾳ ἐγένετο πέραν τοῦ ἰορδάνου, ὅπου ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων.

24. And they which were sent were of the Pharisees. 25. And they asked him, and said to him, Why baptize you then, if you be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet? 26. John answered them, saying, I baptize with water: but there stands one among you, whom you know not; 27. He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose. 28. These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing.

---

**Origenes:** Facta responsione versus sacerdotes et Levitas, denuo missum est a Pharisaeis; unde dicitur et qui missi fuerant erant ex Pharisaeis. Quantum enim ex ipso sermone coniecturari contingit, dico tertium hoc esse testimonium. Vide tamen quomodo iuxta sacerdotalem et leviticam personam est cum mansuetudine prolatum illud tu quis es? Nihil enim arrogans vel protervorum in eorum quaestione continetur, sed cuncta decencia veros Dei ministros. Sed Pharisaei secundum suum nomen divisi et importuni ex discordia contumeliosas voces praetendunt Baptistae; unde sequitur et dixerunt ei: quid ergo baptizas, si tu non es Christus, neque Elias, neque propheta? Non quasi scire volentes, sed prohibere eum a Baptismo. Deinde vero nescio quo pacto proni ad Baptismum iverunt ad Ioannem. Huius autem solutio est, quia

**ORIGEN;** The questions of the priests and Levites being answered, another mission comes from the Pharisees: And they that were sent were of the Pharisees. So far as it is allowable to form a conjecture from the discourse itself here, I should say that it was the third occasion of John's giving his witness. Observe the mildness of the former question, so befitting the priestly and levitical character, Who are you? There is nothing arrogant or disrespectful, but only what becomes true ministers of God. The Pharisees however, being a sectarian body, as their name implies, address the Baptist in an importunate and contumelious way. And they said, Why baptize you then, if you be not that Christ, neither Elias, neither that Prophet? not caring about information, but only wishing to prevent him baptizing. Yet the very next thing they did, was to come to John's baptism. The solution of this is,

Pharisaei non credentes accedunt ad Baptisma, sed ex hypocrisi, cum timerent populum.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Vel ipsi idem sacerdotes et Levitae ex Pharisaeis erant. Et quia blanditiis eum non valuerunt supplantare, accusationem ei immittere tentant, cogentes eum dicere quod non erat; unde sequitur et interrogaverunt eum, et dixerunt: quid ergo baptizas, si tu non es Christus, neque Elias, neque propheta? Quasi audaciae videbatur esse baptizare, si Christus non erat, nec praecursor illius, nec praeco, idest propheta.

**Gregorius in Evang:** Sed sanctus quisque etiam cum perversa mente requiritur, a bonitatis suae studio non mutatur. Unde Ioannes quoque ad verba invidiae praedicamenta respondit vitae; unde sequitur respondit eis dicens: ego baptizo in aqua.

**Origenes:** Ad illud enim quid ergo baptizas? Quid aliud afferri decebat, nisi proprium Baptismum carnale praetendere?

**Gregorius:** Ioannes enim non spiritu, sed aqua baptizat: quia peccata solvere non valebat: baptizatorum corpora per aquam lavat, sed tamen animas per veniam non lavat. Cur ergo baptizat qui peccata per Baptismum non relaxat? Nisi ut praecursionis suae ordinem servans, scilicet qui nasciturum nascendo praevenerat, baptizaturum quoque dominum baptizando praeveniret; et qui praedicando factus est praecursor Christi, baptizando etiam praecursor eius fieret imitatione sacramenti; qui inter haec mysterium redemptionis nostrae annuntians, hanc in medio hominum et stetit asserit et nesciri; sequitur enim medius autem vestrum stetit quem vos nescitis: quia per carnem dominus apparens, et visibilis extitit corpore, et invisibilis maiestate.

**Chrysostomus:** Hoc autem dixit, quoniam decens erat Christum commixtum esse populo, ut unum multorum, se ubique humilem esse docentem. Cum autem dixit quem vos nescitis, scientiam hic cognitionem certissimam dicit; puta quis est, et unde.

that they came not in faith, but hypocritically, because they feared the people.

**CHRYS.** Or, those very same priests and Levies were of the Pharisees, and, because they could not undermine him by blandishments, began accusing, after they had compelled him to say what he was not. And they asked him, saying, Why baptize you then, if you are not the Christ, neither Elias, neither that Prophet? As if it were an act of audacity in him to baptize, when he was neither the Christ, nor His precursor, nor His proclaimer, i.e. that Prophet.

**GREG.** A saint, even when perversely questioned, is never diverted from the pursuit of goodness. Thus John to the words of envy opposes the words of life: John answered them, saying, I indeed baptize with water.

**ORIGEN;** For how would the question, Why then baptize you, be replied to in any other way, than by setting forth the carnal nature of his own baptism?

**GREG.** John baptizes not with the Spirit, but with water; not being able to remit sins, he washes the bodies of the baptized with water, but not their souls with pardon. Why then cloth he baptize, when he cloth not remit sins by' baptism? To maintain his character of forerunner. As his birth preceded our Lord's, so cloth his baptism precede our Lord's baptism. And he who was the forerunner of Christ in His preaching, is forerunner also in His baptism, which was the imitation of that Sacrament. And withal he announces the mystery of our redemption, saying that He, the Redeemer, is standing in the midst of men, and they know it not: There stands one among you, whom you know not: for our Lord, when He appeared in the flesh, was visible in body, but in majesty invisible.

**CHRYS.** One among you. It was fitting that Christ should mix with the people, and be one of the many, showing every where His humility. Whom you know not; i.e. not, in the most absolute and certain sense; not, who He is, and whence He is.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Humilis enim non videbatur, et propterea lucerna accensa est.

**Theophylactus:** Vel medius erat Pharisaeorum dominus; sed ignorabant eum, quia ipsi Scripturas se scire putabant: et in quantum in illis praenuntiabatur dominus, medius eorum erat, scilicet in cordibus eorum; sed nesciebant eum, eo quod Scripturas non intelligebant. Vel aliter. Medius quidem erat, in quantum mediator Dei existens et hominum Christus Iesus medius Pharisaeorum extitit, volens illos Deo iungere; sed ipsi nesciebant eum.

**Origenes:** Vel aliter. Hoc edito ego baptizo in aqua, ad illud quid ergo baptizas? Ad secundum si tu non es Christus? Praeconium de praecedenti Christi substantia proponit, quod tanta sit ei virtus quod invisibilis sit sua deitate, cum sit praesens cuilibet et totum per orbem diffusus: quod notatur ex illo medius vestrum stetit. Hic enim per totam orbis machinam effluxit, sic ut quae creantur, per ipsum creentur; omnia enim per ipsum facta sunt: unde palam est quod inquirentibus a Ioanne quid ergo baptizas? Ipse medius erat. Vel quod dicitur in medio vestrum stetit, intelligendum est de nobis hominibus. Cum enim simus rationales, in medio nostrum existit; ex eo quod principale, scilicet cor, in medio totius corporis insitum est. Qui ergo verbum in medio gerunt, non autem cognoscunt de illius natura, nec de quo fonte manavit, nec quomodo consistit in eis; hi verbum in medio sui obtinentes ignorant, quod tamen Ioannes agnovit: unde exprobrando dicit ad Pharisaeos quem vos nescitis. Quia expectantes Pharisaei Christi adventum, nihil tam arduum de eo contemplabantur, solum hominem sanctum existimantes eum esse. Dicit autem stetit: nam stat pater invariabilis existens et impermutabilis: stat quoque verbum eius ad salvandum continuo, quamvis carnem suscipiat, quamvis medium hominum stet invisibile. Ne vero putet aliquis alium esse invisibilem ad omnes homines venientem, vel ad universum orbem, ab eo qui humanatus est et in terra comparuit, subdit qui post me venit, hoc est qui post me appariturus est. Non autem idem denotatur hic per hoc quod dicit post, et cum Iesus nos post se invitat; illic enim sequi post ipsum praecipitur nobis, ut eius indagando vestigia, perveniamus ad patrem: hic autem ut pateat quid sequatur ex Ioannis dogmatibus: venit enim ut cuncti credant per eum, praeparati ad perfectum verbum per minora. Dicit ergo ipse est qui post me venit.

**AUG.** In His low estate He was not seen; and therefore the candle was; lighted.

**THEOPHYL.** Or it was, that our Lord was in the midst of the Pharisees; and they not knowing Him. For they thought that they knew the Scriptures, and therefore, inasmuch as our Lord was pointed out there, He was in the midst of them, i.e. in their hearts. But they knew Him not, inasmuch as they understood not the Scriptures. Or take another interpretation. He was in the midst of them, as mediator between God and man, wishing to bring them, the Pharisees, to God. But they knew Him not.

**ORIGEN;** Or thus; Having said, I indeed baptize with water, in answer to the question, Why baptize you then? - to the next, If you be not Christ? he replies by declaring the preexistent substance of Christ; that it was of such virtue, that though His Godhead was invisible, He was present to every one, and pervaded the whole world; as is conveyed in the words; There stands one among you. For He it is, Who has diffused Himself through the whole system of nature, insomuch that every thing which is created, is created by Him; All things were made by Him. Whence it is evident that even those who inquired of John, Why baptize you then? had Him among them. Or, the words, There stands one among you, are to be understood of mankind generally. For, from our character as rational beings, it follows that the word g exists in the center of us, because the heart, which is the spring of motion within us, is situated in the center of the body. Those then who carry the word within them, but are ignorant of its nature, and the source and beginning and the way in which it resides in them; these, hearing the word within them, know it not. But John recognized Him, and reproached the Pharisees, saying, Whom you know now not. For, though expecting Christ's coming, the Pharisees had formed no lofty conception of Him, but supposed that He would only be a holy man: wherefore he briefly refutes their ignorance, and the false ideas that they had of His excellence. He said, stand; for as the Father stands, i.e. exists without variation or change, so stands the Word ever in the work of salvation, though It assume flesh, though It be in the midst of men, though It stand invisible. Lest any one however should think that the invisible One Who comes to all men, and to the universal world, is different from Him Who was made man, and

appeared on the earth, he adds, He that comes after me, i.e. Who will appear after me. The after however here has not the same meaning that it has, when Christ calls us after Him; for there we are told to follow after Him, that by treading in His steps, we may attain to the Father; but here the word is used to intimate what should follow upon John's teaching; for he came that all may believe, having by his ministry been fitted gradually by lesser things, for the reception of the perfect Word. Therefore he said, He it is Who comes after me.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Ac si diceret: ne aestimetis totum in meo consistere Baptismate; si enim meum Baptisma perfectum esset, alius non veniret post me, aliud Baptisma daturus. Sed haec praeparatio est illius, et transibit in proximo, ut umbra et imago; sed oportet eum qui veritatem imponet, venire post me: si enim hoc esset perfectum, nequaquam secundi locus quaereretur; et ideo subdit qui ante me factus est, hic est honorabilior et clarior.

**Gregorius:** Sic namque dicitur ante me factus est, ac si dicatur: antepositus est mihi. Post me ergo venit, quia postmodum natus; ante me autem factus est, quia mihi praelatus.

**Chrysostomus:** Ne autem existimes comparabilem esse excellentiam hanc, incomparabilitatem ostendere volens, subiungit cuius ego non sum dignus ut solvam corrigiam calceamenti; quasi dicat: intantum est ante me ut ego neque in ultimis ministrorum vocari dignus sim: calceamentum enim solvere ultimi ministerii res est.

**Augustinus:** Unde et si dignum se diceret tantummodo corrigiam calceamenti solvere, multum se habuisset.

**Gregorius in Evang:** Vel aliter. Mos apud veteres fuit ut si quis eam quae sibi competeret, accipere uxorem nollet, ille ei calceamentum solveret qui ad hanc sponsus iure propinquitatis veniret. Quid igitur inter homines Christus, nisi sanctae Ecclesiae sponsus apparuit? Recte ergo Ioannes se indignum esse ad solvendam corrigiam eius calceamenti denuntiat; ac si aperte dicat: redemptoris

**CHRYS.** As if he said, Do not think that every thing is contained in my baptism; for if my baptism were perfect, another would not come after me with another baptism. This baptism of mine is but an introduction to the other, and will soon pass away, like a shadow, or an image. There is One coming after me to establish the truth: and therefore this is not a perfect baptism; for, if it were, there would be no room for a second: and therefore he adds, Who is made before me: i.e. is more honorable, more lofty.

**GREG.** Made before me, i.e. preferred before me. He comes after me, that is, He is born after me; He is made before me, that is, He is preferred to me.

**CHRYS.** But lest you should think this to be the result of comparison, he immediately shows it to be a superiority beyond all comparison; Whose shoe latchet I am not worthy to unloose: as if He said, He is so much before me, that I am unworthy to be numbered among the lowest of His attendants: the unloosing of the sandal being the very lowest kind of service.

**AUG.** To have pronounced himself worthy even of unloosing His shoe's latchet, he would have been thinking too much of himself.

**GREG.** Or thus: It was a law of the old dispensation, that, if a man refused to take the woman, who of right came to him, to wife, he who by right of relationship came next to be the husband, should unloose his shoe. Now in what character did Christ appear in the world, but as Spouse of the Holy Church? John then very properly pronounced himself unworthy to unloose

vestigia non denudare valeo; quia sponsi nomen mihi immeritus non usurpo. Quod tamen intelligi et aliter potest. Quis enim nesciat quod calceamenta ex mortuis animalibus fiant? Incarnatus vero dominus veniens, quasi calceatus apparuit, qui in divinitate sua morticina nostrae corruptionis assumpsit. Corrigit ergo calceamenti est ligatura mysterii. Ioannes ergo solvere corrigiam calceamenti eius non valet: quia incarnationis mysterium nec ipse investigare sufficit; ac si patenter dicat: quid mirum si mihi ille praelatus est quem post me quidem natum considero, sed nativitatis eius mysterium non comprehendo?

**Origenes in Ioannem:** Quidam vero non inepte dixit, hoc sic intelligendum. Non sum ego tanti ut causa mei descendat a magnalibus, ac carnem quasi calceamentum suscipiat.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Et quia Ioannes cum decenti libertate ea quae de Christo sunt, omnibus praedicabat, propterea Evangelista et locum designat, dicens haec in Bethania facta sunt trans Iordanem, ubi erat Ioannes baptizans. Non enim in domo, neque in angulo Christum praedicabat, sed Iordanem transiens in media multitudine, praesentibus omnibus qui ab eo baptizabantur. Quaedam vero exemplariorum certius habent in Bethabara: Bethania enim non ultra Iordanem, neque in deserto erat, sed prope Hierosolymam.

**Glossa:** Vel duae sunt Bethaniae: una trans Iordanem, altera citra non longe a Ierusalem, ubi Lazarus fuit suscitatus.

**Chrysostomus:** Hoc autem et propter aliam causam designat: quia enim res non antiquas narrabat, sed ante parvum tempus contingentes, praesentes et videntes testes facit eorum quae dicuntur, demonstrationem a locis tribuens.

**Alcuinus:** Bethania vero domus obedientiae interpretatur; per quam innuitur quia per obedientiam fidei omnes ad Baptisma debent pervenire.

this shoe's latchet: as if he said, I cannot uncover the feet of the Redeemer, for I claim not the title of spouse, which I have no right to. Or the passage may be explained in another way. We know that shoes are made out of dead animals. Our Lord then, when He came in the flesh, put on, as it were, shoes; because in His Divinity He took the flesh of our corruption, wherein we had of ourselves perished. And the latchet of the shoe, is the seal upon the mystery. John is not able to unloose the shoe's latchet; i.e. even he cannot penetrate into the mystery of the Incarnation. So he seems to say: What wonder that He is preferred before me, Whom, being born after me, I contemplate, yet the mystery of Whose birth I comprehend not.

**ORIG.** The place has been understood not amiss thus by a certain person; I am not of such importance, as that for my sake He should descend from this high abode, and take flesh upon Him, as it were a shoe.

**CHRYS.** John having preached the thing concerning Christ publicly and With becoming liberty, the Evangelist mentions the place of His preaching: These things were done in Bethany beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing. For it was in no house or corner that John preached Christ, but beyond Jordan, in the midst of a multitude, and in the presence of all whom He had baptized. Some copies read more correctly Bethabara: for Bethany was not beyond Jordan, or in the desert, but near Jerusalem.

**GLOSS;** Or we must suppose two Bethanias; one over Jordan, the other on this side, not far from Jerusalem, the Bethany where Lazarus was raised from the dead.

**CHRYS.** He mentions this too for another reason, viz. that as He was relating events which had only recently happened, He might, by a reference to the place, appeal to the testimony of those who were present and saw them.

**ALCUIN.** The meaning of Bethany is, house of obedience; by which it is intimated to us, that all must approach to baptism, through the obedience of faith.

**Origenes:** Bethabara vero interpretatur domus praeparationis, et convenit cum Baptismo praeparantis domino plebem perfectam. Iordanis autem interpretatur descensus eorum. Quis autem erit hic fluvius nisi salvator noster, per quem ingredientem in hunc mundum mundari convenit, non suum descendente descensum, sed humani generis? Hic segregat donatas a Moyse, ab his quae per Iesum donantur, sortes; huius rivuli laetificant civitatem Dei. Sicut autem draco latitat in Aegyptiaco fluvio, ita Deus in isto. Pater enim est in filio; et qui proficiscuntur illuc ubi se lavent, opprobrium Aegypti deponunt, ac apti ad perceptionem hereditatis parantur, necnon a lepra mundantur, et duplicis capaces sunt gratiae, ac prompti fiunt ad susceptionem spiritus almi, in aliud flumen nequaquam descendente spiritali columba. Trans Iordanem vero Ioannes baptizat, ut praecursor venientis non innocentes sed peccatores vocaret.

**ORIG.** Bethabara means house of preparation; which agrees with the baptism of Him, who was making ready a people prepared for the Lord. Jordan, again, means, “their crescent.” Now what is this river but our Savior, through Whom coming into this earth all must be cleansed, in that He came down not for His own sake, but for theirs. This river it is which separates the lots given by Moses, from those given by Jesus; its streams make glad the city of God. As the serpent lies hid in the Egyptian river, so does God in this; for the Father is in the Son. Wherefore whosoever go thither to wash themselves, lay aside the reproach of Egypt, are made meet to receive the inheritance, are cleansed from leprosy, are made capable of a double portion of grace, and ready to receive the Holy Spirit; nor does the spiritual dove light upon any other river. John again baptizes beyond Jordan, as the precursor of Him Who came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 21

29 τῇ ἐπαύριον βλέπει τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ λέγει, ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου. 30 οὗτός ἐστιν ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον, ὅπισω μου ἔρχεται ἀνὴρ ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν. 31 καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον ἐγὼ ἐν ὕδατι βαπτίζων.

29. The next day John sees Jesus coming to him, and said, Behold the Lamb of God, which takes away the sin of the world. 30. This is he of whom I said, After me comes a man which is preferred before me: for he was before me. 31. And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water.

---

**Origenes:** Post testimonium Ioannis, iam videtur Iesus veniens ad eum, non solum adhuc perseverantem, sed et potiolem effectum: quod per diem secundariam designatur; unde dicitur altera die vidit Ioannes Iesum venientem ad se. Pridem autem Iesu mater protinus ut illum concepit, ad matrem Ioannis praegnantem proficiscitur, et per vocem pervenientem ad aures Elisabeth ex Mariae salutatione exultat Ioannes conceptus in utero; hic autem post Ioannis

**ORIGEN;** After this testimony, Jesus is seen coming to John, not only persevering in his confession, but also advanced in goodness: as is intimated by the second day. Wherefore it is said, The next day John sees Jesus coming to him. Long before this, the Mother of Jesus, as soon as she had conceived Him, went to see the mother of John then pregnant; and as soon as the sound of Mary's salutation reached the ears of Elisabeth, John leaped

testimonium, ipse videtur a Baptista, accedens ad eum. Prius autem auditu aliorum instruitur aliquis, ac deinde oculate inspicit illa. Per hoc autem quod Maria ad Elisabeth venit minorem, et filius Dei ad Baptistam, ad fervorem opitulandi minoribus, et ad modestiam admonemur. Verum unde ad Baptistam venit salvator, non hic dicitur; sed ex dictis Matthaei colligimus dicentis: tunc venit Iesus a Galilaea ad Iordanem ad Ioannem, ut baptizaretur ab eo.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Vel aliter. Matthaeus adventum Christi ad Baptismum praesentialiter dicit; Ioannes autem, et rursus eum ivisse ad Ioannem ostendit post Baptisma; et hoc manifestat quod postea dicit quia vidi spiritum descendentem et cetera. Partiti enim sunt sibi Evangelistae tempora narrationis: Matthaeus enim ea quae antequam ligaretur Ioannes Baptista praeteriens, festinat ad ea quae deinceps sunt tempora; sed Ioannes his maxime immoratur, quae scilicet ante incarcerationem Ioannis fuerunt; unde hic dicitur altera die vidit Ioannes Iesum venientem ad se. Cuius igitur gratia secundo post Baptismum ad eum veniebat? Quia ipsum baptizaverat cum multis; ut nullus suspicetur quoniam ex eadem causa ex qua et alii, ad Ioannem veniret; puta peccata confessurus, aut in poenitentiam abluendus in flumine. Propterea ergo accedit, dans Ioanni occasionem corrigendi hanc suspicionem, quam Ioannes per verba correxit; unde sequitur et ait: ecce agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccatum mundi. Qui igitur ita purus erat ut aliorum peccata absolvere posset, manifestum est quoniam non ut confiteretur peccata accedit, sed ut occasionem det Ioanni loquendi de ipso. Venit etiam secundo, ut hi qui priora audierant, certius recipiant quae praedicta sunt, et alia rursus audiant. Dicit autem ecce agnus Dei, innuens quod hic est qui olim quaerebatur, rememorans prophetiae Isaiae, et umbrae quae secundum Moysen erat, ut a figura facilius eos ducat ad veritatem.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Si autem agnus Dei est innocens, et Ioannes agnus; an non et ipse est innocens? Sed omnes ex illa propagine veniunt de qua cantat gemens David: ego in iniquitatibus conceptus sum. Solus ergo ille agnus qui non sic venit: non enim in iniquitate conceptus est, nec in peccatis mater eius eum in utero aluit, quem virgo concepit, virgo peperit, quia fide concepit, et fide suscepit.

in the womb: but now the Baptist himself after his testimony sees Jesus coming. Men are first prepared by hearing from others, and then see with their own eyes. The example of Mary going to see Elisabeth her interior, and the Son of God going to see the Baptist, should teach us modesty and fervent charity to our inferiors. What place the Savior came from when He came to the Baptist we are not told here; but we find it in Matthew, Then comes Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John to be baptized of him.

**CHRYS.** Or; Matthew relates directly Christ's coming to His baptism, John His coming a second time subsequent to His baptism, as appears from what follows: I saw the Spirit descending, &c. The Evangelists have divided the periods of the history between them; Matthew passing over the part before John's imprisonment, and hastening to that event; John chiefly dwelling on what took place before the imprisonment. Thus he says, The next day John sees Jesus coming to him. But why did He come to him the next day after His baptism? Having been baptized with the multitude, He wished to prevent any from thinking that He came to John for the same reason that others did, viz. to confess His sins, and be washed in the river to repentance. He comes therefore to give John an opportunity of correcting this mistake; which John accordingly did correct; viz. by those words, Behold the Lamb of God, which takes away the sin of the world. For He Who was so pure, as to be able to absolve other men's sins, evidently could not have come thither for the sake of confessing His own; but only to give John an opportunity of speaking of Him. He came too the next day, that those who had heard the former testimonies of John, might hear them again more plainly; and other besides. For he said, Behold the Lamb of God, signifying that He was the one of old sought after, and reminding them of the prophecy of Isaiah, and of the shadows of the Mosaic law, in order that through the figure he might the easier lead them to the substance.

**AUG.** If the Lamb of God is innocent, and John is the lamb, must he not be innocent? But all men come of that stock of which David sings sorrowing, Behold, I was conceived in wickedness. He then alone was the Lamb, who was not thus conceived; for He was not conceived in wickedness, nor in sin did His mother bear Him in her womb, Whom a virgin conceived, a virgin brought forth, because that in faith she conceived, and in faith received.

**Origenes in Ioannem:** Sed cum quinque offerantur animalia in templo: tria terrestria: vitulus, ovis et capra; volatilia vero duo: turtur et columba; et de ovibus tria adducantur: aries, ovis, agnus; de genere ovium agnum memoravit: agnum enim in oblationibus quotidianis offerri videmus, unum quidem mane, alterum vero vespere. Quenam autem oblatio alia potest esse quotidiana a rationali natura comprehendenda, nisi verbum vigen, agnus typice nuncupatum? Hoc nempe censebitur oblatio matutina ad frequentiam intellectus in divinis relatum: neque enim anima pati potest ut summis iugiter insistat, eo quod corporis terrestris et gravis coniugium est sortita. Ex hoc etiam verbo quod Christus est agnus, coniectare de pluribus poterimus: et quodammodo vespere pertingemus ad corporalia procedentes. Qui autem hunc obtulit agnum ad immolandum, Deus fuit in homine reconditus, magnus sacerdos, qui dixit: nemo tollit animam meam a me, sed ego pono eam; unde dicitur agnus Dei: ipse enim nostros languores accipiens, totius mundi tollens peccata, mortem quasi Baptismum suscepit. Apud Deum enim non pertransit incorrectum quidquid agimus quod disciplina indigeat, quae per difficilia exercetur.

**Theophylactus:** Vel dicitur Christus agnus Dei, in quantum Deus pater mortem Christi acceptavit pro nostra salute, vel in quantum eum pro nobis tradidit morti: sicut enim dicere consuevimus: haec oblatio est talis hominis, id est quam talis homo obtulit; sic et Christus dicitur agnus Dei, dantis scilicet filium suum pro nostra salute in mortem. Et ille quidem agnus typicus nullius omnino peccatum sustulit; hic vero peccatum universi orbis terrarum: periclitantem enim mundum eruit ab ira Dei; unde subdit ecce qui tollit peccatum mundi. Non autem dixit: qui tollet, sed qui tollit peccatum mundi, quasi semper hoc faciente ipso: non enim tunc solum tulit cum passus est, sed ex illo tempore usque ad praesens tollit, non semper crucifixus; unam enim pro peccatis obtulit oblationem, sed semper purgans per illam.

**ORIGEN;** But whereas five kinds of animals are offered in the temple, three beasts of the field, a calf, a sheep, and a goat; and two fowls of the air, a turtle dove and a pigeon; and of the sheep kind three are introduced, the ram, the ewe, the lamb; of these three he mentions only the lamb; the lamb, as we know, being offered in the daily sacrifice, one in the morning, and one in the evening. But what other daily offering can there be, that can be meant to be offered by a reasonable nature, except the perfect Word, typically called the Lamb? This sacrifice, which is offered up as soon as the soul begins to be enlightened, shall be accounted as a morning sacrifice, referring to the frequent exercise of the mind in divine things; for the soul cannot continually apply to the highest objects because of its union with an earthly and gross body. By this Word too, Which is Christ the Lamb, we shall be able to reason on many things, and shall in a manner attain to Him in the evening, while engaged with things of the body. But He Who offered the lamb for a sacrifice, was God hid in human form, the great Priest, He who said below, No man takes it (My life) from Me, but I lay it down of Myself: whence this name, the Lamb of God: for He carrying our sorrows, and taking away the sins of the whole world, has undergone death, as it were baptism. For God suffers no fault to pass uncorrected; but punishes it by the sharpest discipline.

**THEOPHYL.** He is called the Lamb of God, because God the Father accepted His death for our salvation, or, in other words, because He delivered Him up to death for our sakes. For just as we say, This is the offering of such a man, meaning the offering made by him; in the same sense Christ is called the Lamb of God Who gave His Son to die for our salvation. And whereas that typical lamb did not take away any man's sin, this one has taken away the sin of the whole world, rescuing it from the danger it was in from the wrath of God. Behold Him Who takes away the sin of the world: he said not, who will take, but, Who takes away the sin of the world; as if He were always doing this. For He did not then only take it away when He suffered, but from that time to the present, He takes it away; not by being always crucified, for He made one sacrifice for sins, but by ever washing it by means of that sacrifice.

**Gregorius Moraliū:** Tunc autem ab humano genere plene peccatum tolletur, cum per incorruptionis gloriam nostra corruptio permutabitur: esse namque a culpa liberi non possumus, quousque in corporis morte tenemur.

**Theophylactus:** Sed quare non dixit: peccata mundi, sed peccatum? Ut videlicet per hoc quod dixit peccatum, universaliter peccatum videretur innuere; sicut consuevimus dicere, quod homo eiectus est de Paradiso, idest omne genus humanum.

**Beda:** Vel peccatum mundi dicitur originale peccatum, quod est commune totius mundi; quod quidem peccatum originale et singulorum superaddita Christus per gratiam relaxat.

**Augustinus:** Qui enim de nostra natura peccatum non assumpsit, ipse est qui tollit nostrum peccatum. Nostis, quia quidam homines dicunt: nos tollimus peccata ab hominibus quia sancti sumus: si enim non fuerit sanctus qui baptizat, quomodo tollit peccatum alterius, cum sit ipse homo plenus peccato? Contra istas disputationes hic legamus ecce qui tollit peccatum mundi, ut non sit praesumptio hominibus in homines.

**Origenes:** Sicut tamen iugi oblationi agni cognatae sunt reliquae oblationes legales, sic huius agni oblationi cognatae oblationes videntur mihi effusiones sanguinis martyrum, quorum patientia et confessione et promptitudine ad bonum, obtunduntur machinationes impiorum.

**Theophylactus:** Quia vero superius illis qui ex Pharisaeis venerant Ioannes dixerat quod medius vestrum stat quem vos nescitis, hic ignorantibus demonstrat, dicens hic est de quo dixi: post me venit vir qui ante me factus est. Vir dominus dicitur propter aetatis perfectionem: nam triginta annorum baptizatus est; vel quia spiritualis animae vir est, et Ecclesiae sponsus; unde Paulus: despondi vos uni viro virginem castam exhibere Christo.

**GREG.** But then only will sin be entirely taken away from the human race, when our corruption has been turned to a glorious incorruption. We cannot be free from sin, so long as we are held in the death of the body.

**THEOPHYL.** Why does he say the sin of the world, not sins? Because he wished to express sin universally: just as we say commonly, that man was cast out of paradise; meaning the whole human race.

**GLOSS;** Or by the sin of the world is meant original sin, which is common to the whole world: which original sin, as well as the sins of every one individually, Christ by His grace remits.

**AUG.** For He Who took not sin from our nature, He it is Who takes away our sin. Some say, We take away the sins of men, because we are holy; for if he, who baptizes, is not holy, how can he take away the other's sin, seeing he himself is full of sin? Against these reasoners let us point to the text; Behold Him Who takes away the sin of the world; in order to do away with such presumption in man towards man.

**ORIGEN;** As there was a connection between the other sacrifices of the law, and the daily sacrifice of the lamb, in the same way the sacrifice of this Lamb has its reflection in the pouring out of the blood of the Martyrs, by whose patience, confession, and zeal for goodness, the machinations of the ungodly are frustrated.

**THEOPHYL.** John having said above to those who came from the Pharisees, that there stood one among them whom they knew not, he here points Him out to the persons thus ignorant: This is He of whom I said, After me comes a man which is preferred before me. Our Lord is called a man, in reference to His mature age, being thirty years old when He was baptized: or in a spiritual sense, as the Spouse of the Church; in which sense St. Paul speaks, I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Post me autem venit, quia posterior natus est; ante me factus est, quia praelatus est mihi.

**Gregorius in Evang:** Praelationis autem eius causas aperit, cum subiungit quia prior me erat; ac si aperte dicat: inde me etiam post natus superat quo eum nativitatis suae tempora non angustant: nam qui per matrem in tempore nascitur, sine tempore est a patre generatus.

**Theophylactus:** Ausculta, o Ari. Non dixit: quia prior me creatus est, sed quia prior me erat. Audiatur hoc Pauli Samosatani abusus, quod non ex Maria sumpsit primordium; quia si essendi principium sumpsit ex virgine, qualiter prior extitit praecursore? Nam manifestum est quod praecursor Christum in sex mensibus superabat secundum humanam generationem.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Ut autem non videatur ex amicitia propter cognationem ei testimonium perhibere, quia cognatus eius erat secundum carnem, propterea dicit ego nesciebam eum. Et secundum rationem hoc contingit: etenim in deserto conversatus est Ioannes. Miracula vero quaecumque Christo puero existente facta sunt, puta quae circa magos, et quaecumque talia, ante multum contigerant tempus, Ioanne et ipso valde puero existente. In medio vero tempore ignotus omnibus existebat; propter quod subdit sed ut manifestetur in Israel, propterea veni ego in aqua baptizans. Hinc enim manifestum est quoniam et illa signa quae quidam dicunt a Christo in pueritia facta, mendacia et fictiones sunt. Si enim a prima aetate miracula fecisset Iesus, nequaquam neque Ioannes eum ignorasset, nec reliqua multitudo indignisset magistro ad manifestandum eum. Non igitur ipse Christus Baptismate indigebat, neque aliquam aliam causam habebat illud lavacrum quam praemonstrationem facere eius fidei quae est in Christum. Non enim dixit: ut mundem eos qui baptizantur, neque: ut liberem a peccatis, veni baptizans; sed ut manifestetur in Israel. Sed numquid sine Baptismate non licebat praedicare et inducere turbas? Sed facilius ita factum est: nequaquam enim cucurrissent omnes, si sine Baptismate praedicatio facta esset.

**AUG.** He comes after me, because he was born after me: He is made before me, because He is preferred to me.

**GREG.** He explains the reason of this superiority, in what follows: For He was before me; as if his meaning was; And this is the reason of His being superior to me, though born after me, viz. that He is not circumscribed by the time of His nativity. He Who was born of His mother in time, was begotten of His Father out of time.

**THEOPHYL.** Attend, O Arius. He said not, He was created before me, but He was before me. Let the false sect of Paul of Samosata attend. They will see that He did not derive His original existence from Mary; for if He derived the beginning of His being from the Virgin, how could He have been before His precursor? it being evident that the precursor preceded Christ by six months, according to the human birth.

**CHRYS.** That He might not seem however to give His testimony from any motive of friendship or kindred, in consequence of his being related to our Lord according to the flesh, he says, I knew Him not. John could not of course know Him, having lived in the desert. And the miraculous events of Christ's childhood, the journey of the Magi, and such like, were now a long time past; John having been quite an infant, when they happened. And throughout the whole of the interval, He had been absolutely unknown: insomuch that John proceeds, But that He should, be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water. (And hence it is clear that the miracles said to have been performed by Christ in His childhood, are false and fictitious. For if Jesus had performed miracles at this early age, he would not have been unknown to John, nor would the multitude have wanted a teacher to point Him out.) Christ Himself then did not want baptism; nor was that washing for any other reason, than to give a sign beforehand of faith in Christ. For John said not, in order to change men, and deliver from sin, but, that he should be made manifest in Israel, have I come baptizing. But would it not have been lawful for him to preach, and bring crowds together, without baptizing? Yes: but this was the easier way, for he would not have collected such numbers, had he preached without baptizing.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Ubi ergo cognitus est dominus, superfluo ei via parabatur, quia cognoscentibus se, ipse factus est via. Itaque non duravit diu Baptisma Ioannis, sed quoadusque demonstratus est dominus humilis. Ergo ut daretur nobis a domino humilitatis exemplum ad percipiendam salutem Baptismi, suscepit Baptismum servi; et ne praeponeretur Baptismus servi Baptismo domini, baptizati sunt alii Baptismo conservi. Sed qui baptizati sunt Baptismo conservi, oportebat ut baptizarentur Baptismo domini; qui autem baptizantur Baptismo domini, non opus habent Baptismo conservi.

**AUG.** Now when our Lord became known, it was unnecessary to prepare a way for Him; for to those who knew Him, He became His own way. And therefore John's baptism did not last long, but only so long as to show our Lord's humility. Our Lord received baptism from a servant, in order to give us such a lesson of humility as might prepare us for receiving the grace of baptism, And that the servant's baptism might not be set before the Lord's, others were baptized with it; who after receiving it, had to receive our Lord's baptism: whereas those who first received our Lord's baptism, did not receive the servant's after.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 22

32 καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν Ἰωάννης λέγων ὅτι τεθέαμαι τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον ὡς περιστερὰν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν: 33 καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι ἐκεῖνός μοι εἶπεν, ἐφ' ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. 34 καὶ γὰρ ἑώρακα, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

32. And John bore record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. 33. And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom you shall see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptize with the Holy Ghost. 34. And I saw, and bore record that this is the Son of God.

---

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Quia Ioannes testatus est ita magnum quid quod sufficiens erat auditores omnes stupefacere, puta quod totius orbis terrarum solus ipse peccata tolleret, volens credibilis id facere, reduxit hoc ad Deum et spiritum sanctum. Posset enim aliquis dicere Ioanni: qualiter igitur tu cognovisti eum? Respondet quod per descensum spiritus sancti; unde sequitur et testimonium perhibuit Ioannes, dicens: quia vidi spiritum descendentem quasi columbam de caelo, et mansit super eum.

**CHRYS.** John having made a declaration, so astonishing to all his hearers, viz. that He, whom he pointed out, did of Himself take away the sins of the world, confirms it by a reference to the Father and the Holy Spirit. For John might be asked, how did you know Him? Wherefore he replies beforehand, by the descent of the Holy Spirit: And John bore record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him.

**Augustinus de Trin:** Non autem tunc unctus est Christus spiritu sancto quando super eum baptizatum velut columba descendit: tunc enim corpus

**AUG.** This was not however the first occasion of Christ's receiving the unction of the Holy Spirit: viz. Its descent upon Him at His baptism; herein

suam, scilicet Ecclesiam suam, praefigurare dignatus est, in qua praecipue baptizati accipiunt spiritum sanctum. Absurdissimum enim est ut credamus eum cum iam triginta esset annorum (eius enim aetatis a Ioanne baptizatus est) accepisse spiritum sanctum; sed venisse ad illud Baptisma, sicut sine ullo omnino peccato, ita non sine spiritu sancto. Si enim de famulo eius et praecursore ipso Ioanne scriptum est: spiritu sancto replebitur ab utero matris suae; qui quamvis seminatus a patre, tamen spiritum sanctum in utero formatum accepit: quid de homine Christo intelligendum est vel credendum, cuius carnis ipsa conceptio non carnalis, sed spiritualis fuit?

**Augustinus de agone Christiano:** Non autem dicimus solum Christum verum corpus habuisse, spiritum autem sanctum fallaciter apparuisse oculis hominum: sicut enim non oportebat ut homines falleret filius Dei, sic nec spiritus sanctus. Sed omnipotenti Deo, qui universam creaturam ex nihilo fabricavit, non erat difficile verum corpus columbae sine aliarum columbarum ministerio figurare; sicut ei non fuit difficile verum corpus in utero virginis sine virili semine fabricare.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Duobus autem modis ostendit visibiliter dominus spiritum sanctum; per columbam super dominum baptizatum; per ignem vero super discipulos congregatos: ibi simplicitas, hic fervor ostenditur. Ergo ne spiritu sanctificati dolum habeant, in columba demonstratum est; et ne simplicitas frigida remaneat, in igne demonstratum est. Nec movet, quia linguae divisae sunt: noli dissipationem timere, unitatem in columba cognosce. Sic ergo oportebat demonstrari spiritum sanctum venientem super dominum, ut cognoscat unusquisque, si habeat spiritum sanctum, simplicem se esse debere sicut columbam, et habere cum fratribus veram pacem, quam significant oscula columbarum. Osculantur et corvi, sed laniant; a laniatu innocens est natura columbarum: nam corvi de morte pascuntur, columba non nisi de frugibus terrae vivit. Si etiam gemunt columbae in amore, nolite mirari, quia in columbae specie voluit demonstrari spiritus sanctus; ipse enim interpellat pro nobis gemitibus inenarrabilibus. Non autem spiritus sanctus in semetipso, sed in nobis gemit, quia gemere nos facit. Qui enim novit in pressura se esse mortalitatis huius, peregrinari se a domino, quamdiu propter hoc gemit, bene gemit: spiritus illum docuit gemere. Multi autem gemunt,

He condescended to prefigure His body, the Church, wherein those who are baptized receive preeminently the Holy Spirit. For it would be absurd to suppose that at thirty years old, (which was His age, when He was baptized by John,) He received for the first time the Holy Spirit: and that, when He came to that baptism, as He was without sin, so was He without the Holy Spirit. For if even of His servant and forerunner John it is written, He shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from His mother's womb; if He, though sprung from His father's seed, yet received the Holy Ghost, when as yet He was only formed in the womb; what ought we to think and believe of Christ, whose very flesh had not a carnal but spiritual conception?

**AUG.** We do not attribute to Christ only the possession of a real body, and say that the Holy Spirit assumed a false appearance to men's eyes: for the Holy Spirit could no more, in consistency with His nature, deceive men, than could the Son of God. The Almighty God, Who made every creature out of nothing, could as easily form a real body of a dove, without the instrumentality of other doves, as He made a real body in the womb of the Virgin, without the seed of the male.

**AUG.** The Holy Ghost was made to appear visibly in two ways: as a dove, upon our Lord at His baptism; and as a flame upon His disciples, when they were met together: the former shape denoting simplicity, the latter fervency. The dove intimates that souls sanctified by the Spirit should have no guile; the fire, that in that simplicity there should not be coldness. Nor let it disturb you, that the tongues are cloven; fear no division; unity is assured to us in the dove. It was meet then that the Holy Spirit should be thus manifested descending upon our Lord; in order that every one who had the Spirit might know, that he ought to be simple as a dove, and be in sincere peace with the brethren. The kisses of doves represent this peace. Ravens kiss, but they tear also; but the nature of the dove is most alien to tearing. Ravens feed on the dead, but the dove eats nothing but the fruits of the earth. If doves moan in their love, marvel not that He Who appeared in the likeness of a dove, the Holy Spirit, makes intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered. The Holy Spirit however groans not in Himself, but in us: He makes us to groan. And he who groans, as knowing that, so long as He is under the burden of this mortality, he is absent from the Lord, groans well: it is the Spirit that

infelicitate terrena, vel quassati damnis, vel aegritudine corporis praegravati; sed non columbae gemitu gemunt. Unde ergo debuit demonstrari spiritus sanctus unitatem quamdam designans, nisi per columbam, ut pacatae Ecclesiae diceretur: una est columba mea? Unde debuit humilitas figurari nisi per avem simplicem et gementem? Apparuit ibi sancta et vera Trinitas: pater in voce dicente: tu es filius meus dilectus; spiritus sanctus in columba. In ista Trinitate missi sunt apostoli baptizare in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti.

**Gregorius Moralium:** Dicit autem manentem super eum: in cunctis namque fidelibus spiritus sanctus venit, sed in solo mediatore semper singulariter permanet: quia eius humanitatem nunquam deseruit, ex cuius divinitate procedit. Sed cum de eodem spiritu discipulis dicatur: apud vos manebit, quomodo singulare signum erit quod in Christo permanet? Quod citius cognoscemus, si dona spiritus discernamus. In his enim donis, sine quibus ad vitam perveniri non potest, spiritus sanctus in electis omnibus semper permanet; ut sunt mansuetudo, humilitas, fides, spes, caritas; in illis autem quibus per ostensionem spiritus non nostra servatur vita, sed aliorum quaeritur, non semper manet, sed aliquando se a signorum ostensionibus subtrahit, ut humiliter eius virtutes habeantur. Christus autem in cunctis eum semper et continue habuit praesentem.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Ne autem aliquis aestimet spiritus Christum indignasse sicut et nos, hanc etiam destruit suspicionem, ostendens quod spiritus sancti descensio solum pro manifestando Christo facta est; unde sequitur et ego nesciebam eum; sed qui misit me baptizare in aqua, mihi dixit: super quem videris spiritum descendentem et manentem super eum, hic est qui baptizat in spiritu sancto.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Quis autem misit Ioannem? Si dicamus: pater, verum dicimus; si dicamus: filius, verum dicimus. Manifestius autem est ut dicamus: pater et filius. Quomodo ergo nesciebat eum a quo missus est? Si enim non noverat eum a quo voluit baptizari, temere dicebat ego a te debeo baptizari. Noverat ergo eum: quid ergo est quod dicit et ego nesciebam eum?

has taught him to groan. But many groan because of earthly calamities; because of losses which disquiet them, or bodily sickness which weigh heavily on them: they groan not, as does the dove. What then could more fitly represent the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of unity, than the dove? as He said Himself to His reconciled Church, My dove is one. What could better express humility, than the simplicity and moaning of a dove? Wherefore on this occasion it was that there appeared the very most Holy Trinity, the Father in the voice which said, You are My beloved Son; the Holy Spirit in the likeness of the dove. In that Trinity the Apostles were sent to baptize, i.e. in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

**GREG.** He said, Abode upon Him: for the Holy Spirit visits all the faithful; but on the Mediator alone does He abide for ever in a peculiar manner; never leaving the Son's Humanity, even as He proceeds Himself from the Son's Divinity. But when the disciples are told of the same Spirit, He shall dwell with you, how is the abiding of the Spirit a peculiar sign of Christ? This will appear if we distinguish between the different gifts of the Spirit. As regards those gifts which are necessary for attaining to life, the Holy Spirit ever abides in all the elect; such are gentleness, humility, faith, hope, charity: but with respect to those, which have for their object, not our own salvation, but that of others, he does not always abide, but sometimes withdraws, and ceases to exhibit them; that men may be more humble in the possession of His gifts. But Christ had all the gifts of the Spirit, uninterruptedly always.

**CHRYS.** Should any however think that Christ really wanted the Holy Spirit, in the way that we do, he corrects this notion also, by informing us that the descent of the Holy Ghost took place only for the purpose of manifesting Christ: And I knew Him not: but He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said to me, Upon whom you shall see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizes with the Holy Ghost.

**AUG.** But who sent John? If we say the Father, we say true; if we say the Son, we say true. But it would be truer to say, the Father and the Son. How then knew he not Him, by Whom he was sent? For if he knew not Him, by Whom he wished to be baptized, it was rash in him to say, I have need to be baptized by You. So then he knew Him; and why said he, I knew Him not?

**Chrysostomus:** Sed cum dicit nesciebam eum, antequam tempus dicit, non tempus quod est prope Baptismum, cum prohibebat eum, dicens ego a te debeo baptizari.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Sed legantur alii Evangelistae, qui planius illud dixerunt; et inveniemus apertissime tunc descendisse columbam cum dominus ab aqua ascendit. Si ergo post Baptisma descendit columba, et antequam baptizaretur dixit illi Ioannes ego a te debeo baptizari; ante Baptismum illum noverat: quomodo ergo dixit ego nesciebam eum; sed qui misit me baptizare? et cetera. Hoc audivit Ioannes, ut nosceret eum quem non noverat, an forte ut plenius nosset quem iam noverat? Noverat quidem dominum, noverat filium Dei, noverat quia ipse baptizaret in spiritu sancto. Ante enim quam veniret ad fluvium Christus, cum multi ad Ioannem concurrerent, ait illis qui post me venit, maior me est: ipse vos baptizabit in spiritu sancto et igne. Sed quid? Non noverat, potestatem Baptismi ipsum dominum habiturum et sibi retenturum (ne Paulus aut Petrus diceret: Baptismus meus, sicut invenis dixisse: Evangelium meum), sed ministerium plane transiturum in bonos et malos? Quid tibi faciat malus minister, ubi bonus est dominus? Ecce post Ioannem baptizatum est, post homicidam non est baptizatum: quia Ioannes dedit Baptismum suum, homicida dedit Baptismum Christi; quod sacramentum tam sanctum est ut nec homicida ministrante polluat. Potuit autem dominus, si vellet, potestatem dare alicui servo suo ut daret Baptismum suum tamquam vice sua, et constituere tantam vim in Baptismate translato in servum, quantam vim haberet Baptisma datum a domino. Hoc noluit ut in illo esset spes baptizatorum a quo baptizatos se agnoscerent; et noluit servum ponere spem in servo. Si autem daret hanc potestatem servis, tot essent Baptismata quot essent servi; et quomodo dictum est Baptisma Ioannis, sic diceretur Baptisma Petri vel Pauli. Per hanc ergo potestatem, quam solum sibi Christus retinuit, stat unitas Ecclesiae, de qua dictum est: una est columba mea. Potest autem fieri ut aliquis habeat Baptismum praeter columbam; ut prosit ei Baptismus praeter columbam, non potest.

**CHRYS.** When he said, I knew Him not, he is speaking of time past, not of the time of his baptism, when he forbade Him, saying, I have need to be baptized of You.

**AUG.** Let us turn to the other Evangelists, who relate the matter more clearly, and we shall find most satisfactorily, that the dove descended when our Lord ascended from the water. If then the dove descended after baptism, but John said before the baptism, I have need to be baptized of You, he knew Him before His baptism also. How then said he, I knew him not, but He which sent me to baptize? Was this the first revelation made to John of Christ's person, or was it not rather a fuller disclosure of what had been already revealed? John knew the Lord to be the Son of God, knew that He would baptize with the Holy Ghost: for before Christ came to the river, many having come together to hear John, he said unto them, He that comes after me is mightier than I: He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire. What then? He did not know that our Lord (lest Paul or Peter might say, my baptism, as we find Paul did say, my Gospel,) would have and retain to Himself the power of baptism, the ministering of it however passing to good and bad indiscriminately. What hindrance is the badness of the minister, when the Lord is good? So then we baptize again after John's baptism; after a homicide's we baptize not: because John gave his own baptism, the homicide gives Christ's; which is so holy a sacrament, that not even a homicide's ministration can pollute it. Our Lord could, had He so willed, have given power to any servant of His to give baptism as it were in His own stead; and to the baptism, thus transferred to the servant, have imparted the same power, that it would have had, when given by Himself. But this He did not choose to do; that the hope of the baptized might be directed to Him, Who had baptized them; He wished not the servant to place hope in the servant. And again, had He given this power to servants, there would have been as many baptisms as servants; as there had been the baptism of John, so should we have had the baptism of Paul and of Peter. It is by this power then, which Christ retains in His own possession exclusively, that the unity of the Church is established; of which it is said, My dove is one. A man may have a baptism besides the dove; but that any besides the dove should profit, is impossible.

**Chrysostomus:** Et quia pater vocem emisit praedicans filium, superveniet spiritus sanctus vocem trahens super caput Christi, ne quis praesentium existimaret dici de Ioanne quod dictum est de Christo. Sed dicet aliquis: qualiter non crediderunt Iudaei, si viderunt spiritum? Sed talia non solum indigent oculis corporis, sed magis visione mentis. Si namque miracula facientem videntes, intantum ebrii erant a livore ut contraria his quae videbantur, enuntiarent; qualiter solo adventu spiritus sancti in specie columbae expulissent incredulitatem? Quidam vero dicunt, non omnes vidisse spiritum, sed solum Ioannem, et eos qui devotius dispositi erant. Etsi enim sensibilibus oculis possibile erat videre in specie columbae spiritum descendentem; non tamen propter hoc necesse est omnibus hoc fuisse manifestum. Etenim Zacharias in specie sensibili multa consideravit, et Daniel, et Ezechiel; sed et Moyses multa vidit, qualia aliorum nullus: unde subdit Ioannes et ego vidi, et testimonium perhibui, quia hic est filius Dei. Agnum quidem eum vocaverat; et quoniam in spiritu baptizare debebat, dixit, filium autem ante hoc nusquam.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Oportebat enim ut ille baptizaret qui est filius Dei unicus, non adoptatus. Adoptati filii ministri sunt unici; unicus autem habet potestatem, adoptati ministerium.

**CHRYS.** The Father having sent forth a voice proclaiming the Son, the Holy Spirit came besides, bringing the voice upon the head of Christ, in order that no one present might think that what was said of Christ, was said of John. But it will be asked: How was it that the Jews believed not, if they saw the Spirit? Such sights however require the mental vision, rather than the bodily. If those who saw Christ working miracles were so drunken with malice, that they denied what their own eyes had seen, how could the appearance of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove overcome their incredulity? Some say however that the sight was not visible to all, but only to John, and the more devotional part. But even if the descent of the Spirit, as a dove, was visible to the outward eye, it does not follow that because all saw it, all understood it. Zacharias himself, Daniel, Ezechiel, and Moses saw many things, appealing to their senses, which no one else saw: and therefore John adds, And I saw and bore record that this is the Son of God. He had called Him the Lamb before, and said that He would baptize with the Spirit; but he had no where called Him the Son before.

**AUG.** It was necessary that the Only Son of God should baptize, not an adopted son. Adopted sons are ministers of the Only Son: but though they have the ministration, the Only one alone has the power.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 23

35 τῆ ἐπαύριον πάλιν εἰστήκει ὁ Ἰωάννης καὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο, 36 καὶ ἐμβλέψας τῷ Ἰησοῦ περιπατοῦντι λέγει, ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

35. Again the next day after John stood, and two of his disciples; 36. And looking upon Jesus as he walked, he said, Behold the Lamb of God!

---

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Quia multi his quae a principio Ioannes dicebat non attendebant, secunda rursus eos excitat voce; unde dicitur altera die iterum stabat Ioannes, et ex discipulis eius duo.

**CHRYS.** Many not having attended to John's words at first, he rouses them a second time: Again the next day after John stood, and two of his disciples.

**Beda:** Stabat quidem Ioannes, quia illam virtutum arcem conscenderat, a qua nullis tentationum posset improbitatibus deici: stabant cum illo discipuli, quia magisterium illius corde sequebantur immobili.

**Chrysostomus:** Sed quare non totum mundum circuevit, in omni loco Iudaeae praedicans eum; sed stabat circa flumen, expectans eum venire, ut ostenderet venientem? Quia scilicet per opera Christi hoc fieri volebat. Vide etiam qualiter hoc maioris aedificationis fuit: quia enim parvam immisit scintillam, repente flamma in altum elevata est. Alter autem etsi circumiens hoc dixisset, videretur ex studio quodam humano fieri quae fiebant, et suspicione plenum esset eius praeconium. Igitur prophetae quidem et apostoli omnes absentem Christum praedicaverunt; hi quidem ante praesentiam secundum carnem, illi vero post assumptionem: unde ut ostendatur quod non voce solum, sed et oculis eum ostendebat, subditur et respiciens Iesum ambulans, dixit: ecce agnus Dei.

**Theophylactus:** Respiciens, inquit, quasi oculis innuens gratiam et admirationem quam habebat in Christo.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Ioannes quidem amicus sponsi erat; non quaerebat gloriam suam, sed testimonium perhibebat veritati: non enim voluit apud se remanere discipulos suos, ut non sequerentur dominum; sed magis ostendit quem sequerentur, dicens ecce agnus Dei.

**Chrysostomus:** Non longum facit sermonem: quoniam unum solum in studio habebat, adducere eos, et coniungere Christo: sciebat enim quoniam de reliquo non indigerent eo testante. Non autem singulariter discipulis loquitur de his Ioannes, sed eis publice cum omnibus: quia ex communi doctrina suscipientes sequelam Christi, firmi de reliquo permanserunt, non propter gratiam Christi sequentes eum, sed propter suum lucrum: et non facit sermonem suum deprecativum, sed admiratur solum praesentem, et demonstrat eis praeparationem propter quam venit, et modum praeparationis: agnus enim utrumque insinuat: et dicit agnus, cum articuli adiectione, excellentiam eius ostendens.

**BEDE;** John stood, because he had ascended that citadel of all excellences, from which no temptations could cast him down: his disciples stood with him, as stout-hearted followers of their master.

**CHRYS.** But wherefore went he not all about, preaching in every place of Judea; instead of standing near the river, waiting for His coming, that he might point Him out? Because he wished this to be done by the works of Christ Himself. And observe how much greater an effort was produced; He struck a small spark, and suddenly it rose into a flame. Again, if John had gone about and preached, it would have seemed like human partiality, and great suspicion would have been excited. Now the Prophets and Apostles all preached Christ absent; the former before His appearance in the flesh, the latter after His assumption. But He was to be pointed out by the eye, not by the voice only; and therefore it follows: And looking upon Jesus as He walked, he said, Behold the Lamb of God!

**THEOPHYL.** Looking he said, as if signifying by his looks his love and admiration for Christ.

**AUG.** John was the friend of the Bridegroom; he sought not his own glory, but bore witness to the truth. And therefore he wished not his disciples to remain with him, to the hindrance of their duty to follow the Lord; but rather showed them whom they should follow, saying, Behold the Lamb of God.

**CHRYS.** He makes not a long discourse, having only one object before him, to bring them and join them to Christ; knowing that they would not any further need his witness. John does not however speak to his disciples alone, but publicly in the presence of all. And so, undertaking to follow Christ, through this instruction common to all, they remained thenceforth firm, following Christ for their own advantage, not as an act of favor to their master. John does not exhort: he simply gazes in admiration on Christ, pointing out the gift He came to bestow, the cleansing from sin: and the mode in which this would be accomplished: both of which the word Lamb testifies to. Lamb has the article affixed to it, as a sign of preeminence.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Iste enim singulariter dicitur agnus solus sine macula, sine peccato; non cuius maculae abstersae sunt, sed cuius macula nulla fuerit: singulariter hic est agnus Dei, quia singulariter huius agni sanguine solo homines redimi potuerunt. Hic est agnus quem lupi timent, qui leonem occisus occidit.

**Beda:** Ideo etiam agnum vocat, quia dona sui velleris sponte largiturum, ex quo vestem nobis nuptialem facere possumus, idest exempla vivendi nobis relicturum, praevitit, quibus in dilectione calefieri deberemus.

**Alcuinus:** Mystice autem stat Ioannes, cessat lex, et venit Iesus, idest gratia Evangelii, cui ipsa lex perhibet testimonium. Ambulat Iesus discipulos collecturus.

**Beda:** Ambulatio etiam Iesu dispensationem incarnationis, qua ad nos venire ac nobis exempla vivendi praebere dignatus est, insinuat.

**AUG.** For He alone and singly is the Lamb without spot, without sin; not because His spots are wiped off; but because He never had a spot. He alone is the Lamb of God, for by His blood alone can men be redeemed. This is the Lamb whom the wolves fear; even the slain Lamb, by whom the lion was slain.

**BEDE.** The Lamb therefore he calls Him; for that He was about to give us freely His fleece, that we might make of it a wedding garment; i.e. would leave us an example of life, by which we should be warmed into love.

**ALCUIN.** John stands in a mystical sense, the Law having ceased, and Jesus comes, bringing the grace of the Gospel, to which that same Law bears testimony. Jesus walks, to collect disciples.

**BEDE.** The walking of Jesus has a reference to the economy of the Incarnation, by means of which He has condescended to come to us, and give us a pattern of life.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 24

37 καὶ ἤκουσαν οἱ δύο μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος καὶ ἠκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ. 38 στραφεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ θεασάμενος αὐτοὺς ἀκολουθοῦντας λέγει αὐτοῖς, τί ζητεῖτε; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, ῥαββὶ ὃ λέγεται μεθερμηνευόμενον διδάσκαλε, ποῦ μένεις; 39 λέγει αὐτοῖς, ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε. ἦλθαν οὖν καὶ εἶδαν ποῦ μένει, καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ ἔμειναν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην: ὥρα ἦν ὡς δεκάτη. 40 ἦν Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς Σίμωνος Πέτρου εἷς ἐκ τῶν δύο τῶν ἀκουσάντων παρὰ Ἰωάννου καὶ ἀκολουθησάντων αὐτῷ:

37. And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus. 38. Then Jesus turned, and saw them following, and said to them, What seek you? They said unto Him, Rabbi, (which is to say, being interpreted, Master,) where dwell you? 39. He said to them, Come and see. They came and saw where he dwelt, and abode with him that day: for it was about the tenth hour. 40. One of the two which heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother.

**Alcuinus:** Ioanne perhibente testimonium quia Iesus esset agnus Dei, discipuli qui prius erant cum Ioanne, magistri imperium implentes, secuti sunt Iesum; unde dicitur et audierunt eum duo discipuli loquentem, et secuti sunt Iesum.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Considera autem, quia quando dixit: post me veniens ante me factus est, et quoniam non sum dignus solvere corrigiam calceamenti eius, nullum cepit; sed quando de dispensatione locutus est, et ad humiliora sermonem duxit dicens ecce agnus Dei, tunc secuti sunt eum discipuli. Multi enim non ita adducuntur cum aliquid magnum et excelsum de Deo dicatur, sicut cum benignum et amicum hominum audiunt, et aliquid ad salutem hominum pertinens. Considerandum autem, quod Ioannes dicit ecce agnus Dei, et Christus nihil loquitur: nam et sponsus cum silentio adest: alii eum inducunt, et sponsam in manu eius ponunt; quam cum acceperit, de ea disponit. Ita Christus venit copulaturus sibi Ecclesiam, nihil ipse dixit; sed accessit solum amicus eius Ioannes, dexteram ei sponsae imposuit, per sermones suos animas hominum in manus ei ponens; quos accipiens ita disposuit ut ultra ad Ioannem non redirent. Sed aliud hic observandum est: sicut enim in nuptiis non puella ad sponsum vadit, sed ipse ad eam festinat, ita hic contingit: non enim in caelum ascendit hominum natura; sed ad eam filius Dei accessit, et ad domum duxit paternam. Et quidem alii discipuli Ioannis erant qui non solum secuti non sunt, sed et zelotype ad Christum dispositi erant; qui autem meliores erant, simul audierunt et secuti sunt, non quasi magistrum priorem contemnentes, sed ab eo persuasi, promittente quod baptizaret in spiritu sancto Christus. Et vide discipulorum studium cum verecundia fieri: neque enim mox ascendentes interrogaverunt Iesum de necessariis et maximis rebus; neque publice, sed singulariter ei loqui studuerunt; unde sequitur conversus autem Iesus, et videns eos sequentes se, dicit eis: quid quaeritis? Hinc erudimur quia cum nos bene velle inceperimus, tunc Deus dat nobis multas salutis occasiones. Interrogat autem, non ut discat, sed ut per interrogationem magis eos familiares faciat, et ampliorem fiduciam det, et ostendat eos auditione dignos.

**ALCUIN.** John having borne witness that Jesus was the Lamb of God, the disciples who had been hitherto with him, in obedience to his command, followed Jesus: And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus.

**CHRYS.** Observe; when he said, He that comes after me is made before me, and, Whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose, he gained over none; but when he made mention of the economy, and gave his discourse a humbler turn, saying, Behold the Lamb of God, then his disciples followed Christ. For many persons are less influenced by the thoughts of God's greatness and majesty, than when they hear of His being man's Helper and Friend; or any thing pertaining to the salvation of men. Observe too, when John says, Behold the Lamb of God, Christ says nothing. The Bridegroom stands by in silence; others introduce Him, and deliver the Bride into His hands; He receives her, and so treats her that she no longer remembers those who gave her in marriage. Thus Christ came to unite to Himself the Church; He said nothing Himself; but John, the friend of the Bridegroom, came forth, and put the Bride's right hand in His; i.e. by his preaching delivered into His hands men's souls, whom receiving He so disposed of, that they returned no more to John. And observe farther; As at a marriage the maiden goes not to meet the bridegroom, (even though it be a king's son who weds a humble handmaid,) but he hastens to her; so is it here. For human nature ascended not into heaven, but the Son of God came down to human nature, and took her to His Father's house. Again; There were disciples of John who not only did not follow Christ, but were even enviously disposed toward Him; but the better part heard, and followed; not from contempt of their former master, but by his persuasion; because he promised them that Christ would baptize with the Holy Ghost. And see with what modesty their zeal was accompanied. They did not straightway go and interrogate Jesus on great and necessary doctrines, nor in public, but sought private converse with Him; for we are told that Jesus turned, and saw them following, and said to them, What seek you? Hence we learn, that when we once begin to form good resolutions, God gives us opportunities enough of improvement. Christ asks the question, not because He needed to be told, but in order to encourage familiarity and confidence, and show that He thought them worthy of His instructions.

**Theophylactus:** Vide autem quod sequentibus se dominus convertit faciem, et respexit: quia nisi per bonam operationem ipsum secutus fueris, ad visionem faciei eius numquam pertinges, neque ad domum eius poteris pervenire.

**Alcuinus:** Ergo illi discipuli tergum ipsius sequebantur ut viderent, et faciem domini videre non poterant; ideo convertit se, et quodammodo de sua maiestate descendit, ut possint discipuli faciem illius contemplari.

**Origenes:** Forte autem non frustra post sextum testimonium desinit Ioannes eos contestari, et Iesus secundum septimum dicit quid quaeritis?

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Sed illi non solum sequendo, sed interrogando amorem suum ad Christum manifestaverunt; unde sequitur qui dixerunt ei: Rabbi (quod dicitur interpretatum magister), ubi habitas? Nondum ab eo aliquid discentes, magistrum eum vocant, ad discipulatum se impellentes, et causam ostendentes propter quod sequebantur.

**Origenes:** Congrua vero pro vectis ex Ioannis testimonio prolatio depromens Christum doctorem, ac exprimens desiderare habitaculum filii Dei contueri.

**Alcuinus:** Nolunt enim transitorie uti eius magisterio, sed inquirunt ubi maneat, ut et tunc in secreto verbis illius imbui, et exinde saepius possent eum visitare et plenius instrui. Mystice autem volunt sibi ostendi in quibus Christus habitet, ut eorum exemplo se tales exhibeant in quibus velit habitare. Vel quod Iesum ambulantes vident, et statim ubi maneat quaerunt, nos monet, ut cum incarnationem eius ad mentem reducimus, sollicito corde eum rogemus ut mansionem aeterni habitaculi nobis ostendat: unde quia videt bene petentes, libere eis sua reserat arcana; unde sequitur dicit eis: venite et videte; quasi dicat: habitaculum meum explicari non potest sermone, sed opere demonstratur. Venite ergo credendo et operando, et videte intelligendo.

**THEOPHYL.** Observe then, that it was upon those who followed Him, that our Lord turned His face and looked upon them. Unless you by your good works follow Him, you shall never be permitted to see His face, or enter into His dwelling.

**ALCUIN.** The disciples followed behind His back, in order to see Him, and did not see His face. So He turns round, and, as it were, lowers His majesty, that they might be enabled to behold His face.

**ORIGEN.** Perhaps it is not without a reason, that after six testimonies John ceases to bear witness, and Jesus asks seventhly, What seek you?

**CHRYS.** And besides following Him, their questions showed their love for Christ; They said to Him, Rabbi, (which is, being interpreted, Master,) where dwell You? They call Him, Master, before they have learnt any thing from Him; thus encouraging themselves in their resolution to become disciples, and to show the reason why they followed.

**ORIGEN.** An avowal, befitting persons who came from hearing John's testimony. They put themselves under Christ's teaching, and express their desire to see the dwelling of the Son of God.

**ALCUIN.** They do not wish to be under His teaching for a time only, but inquire where He abides; wishing an immediate initiation in the secrets of His word, and afterwards meaning often to visit Him, and obtain fuller instruction. And, in a mystical sense too, they wish to know in whom Christ dwells, that profiting by their example they may themselves become fit to be His dwelling. Or, their seeing Jesus walking, and straightway inquiring where He resides, is an intimation to us, that we should, remembering His Incarnation, earnestly entreat Him to show us our eternal habitation. The request being so good a one, Christ promises a free and full disclosure. He said to them, Come and see: that is to say, My dwelling is not to be understood by words, but by works; come, therefore, by believing and working, and then see by understanding.

**Origenes:** Vel per hoc quod dicit venite, ad actionem invitat; per hoc autem quod dicit videte, ad contemplationem.

**Chrysostomus:** Christus autem non dicit eis signa domus neque locum, sed attrahit eos ad sequendum. Non dixit: non est tempus nunc, audietis cras, si quid vultis discere; sed ut ad amicos et familiares loquitur. Qualiter ergo alibi ait: filius hominis non habet ubi caput reclinet, hic autem dicit venite et videte ubi habito? Sed per hoc quod dicit: non habet ubi caput suum reclinet demonstravit quod habitaculum proprium non habebat, non quod in domo non maneret; sequitur enim venerunt, et viderunt ubi maneret, et manserunt ibi die illo. Cuius autem gratia manserunt non adiungit Evangelista, quia manifestum erat quod propter doctrinam.

**Augustinus:** Quam beatum autem diem duxerunt, quam beatam noctem. Aedificemus ergo et nosmetipsi in corde nostro, et faciamus domum, quo veniat ille et doceat nos.

**Theophylactus:** Non frustra autem et tempus notavit Evangelista, cum subdit hora autem erat quasi decima; ut tam doctores quam discipulos erudiret, quod doctrina propter tempus non est praetermittenda.

**Chrysostomus:** Multum enim studium demonstrabant ad audiendum, in eo quia neque ab hora aversi sunt, cum sol esset ad occasum. Et multis quidem carni servientibus tempus quod est post escas, non est aptum ad quippiam necessariorum, eo quod corpus escis gravatur. Ioannes vero, cuius isti erant discipuli, non erat talis: sed cum multo maiori sobrietate vespere degens quam nos mane.

**Augustinus:** Numerus etiam iste legem significat, quia in decem praeceptis data est lex. Venerat autem tempus ut impleretur lex per dilectionem, quae a Iudaeis impleri non poterat per timorem; unde et decima hora dominus audivit Rabbi: magister enim legis non est nisi dator legis. Sequitur erat autem Andreas frater Simonis Petri unus ex duobus qui audierant a Ioanne, et secuti fuerant eum.

**ORIGEN.** Or perhaps come, is an invitation to action; see, to contemplation.

**CHRYS.** Christ does not describe His house and situation, but brings them after Him, showing that he had already accepted them as His own. He says not, It is not the time now, tomorrow you shall hear if you wish to learn; but addresses them familiarly, as friends who had lived with him a long time. But how is it that He said in another place, The Son of man has no where to lay His head? when here He says, Come and see where I live? His not having where to lay His head, could only have meant that He had no dwelling of His own, not that He did not live in a house at all: for the next words are, They came and saw where He dwelt, and abode with Him that day. Why they stayed the Evangelist does not say: it being obviously for the sake of His teaching.

**AUG.** What a blessed day and night was that! Let us too build up in our hearts within, and make Him an house, whither He may come and teach us.

**THEOPHYL.** And it was about the tenth hour. The Evangelist mentions the time of day purposely, as a hint both to teachers and learners, not to let time interfere with their work.

**CHRYS.** It showed a strong desire to hear Him, since even at sunset they did not turn from Him. To sensual persons the time after meals is unsuitable for any grave employment, their bodies being overloaded with food. But John, whose disciples these were, was not such a one. His evening was a more abstemious one than our mornings.

**AUG.** The number here signifies the law, which was composed of ten commandments. The time had come when the law was to be fulfilled by love, the Jews, who acted from fear, having been unable to fulfill it, and therefore was it at the tenth hour that our Lord heard Himself called, Rabbi; none but the giver of the law is the teacher of the law.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Cuius autem gratia alterius nomen non ponitur? Quidam dicunt, propterea quia hic qui scribit est qui secutus est eum. Quidam vero dicunt, quod ille alius non insignis erat: quae igitur utilitas si didicerimus nomen illius? Neque enim septuaginta duorum discipulorum nomina Evangelista posuit.

**Alcuinus:** Vel duo discipuli qui secuti sunt Iesum, sunt Andreas et Philippus.

**CHRYS.** One of the two which heard John speak and followed Him was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. Why is the other name left out? Some say, because this Evangelist himself was that other. Others, that it was a disciple of no eminence, and that there was no use in telling his name any more than those of the seventy-two, which are omitted.

**ALCUIN.** Or it would seem that the two disciples who followed Jesus were Andrew and Philip.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 25

41 εὕρισκει οὗτος πρῶτον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον Σίμωνα καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, εὕρηκαμεν τὸν μεσσίαν ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνευόμενον Χριστός: 42 ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν. ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, σὺ εἶ Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωάννου: σὺ κληθήσῃ κηφᾶς ὃ ἐρμηνεύεται Πέτρος.

41. He first finds his own brother Simon, and said to him, We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ. 42. And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said, You are Simon the son of Jonas: you shall be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, A stone.

---

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Andreas quae a Iesu didicit non detinuit apud seipsum; sed festinat, et currit cito ad fratrem, traditurus ei bona quae suscepit; unde dicitur invenit hic primum fratrem suum Simonem, et dixit ei: invenimus Messiam (quod est interpretatum Christus).

**Beda:** Hoc est enim vere dominum invenire, vera illius dilectione fervere, fraternae quoque salutis curam gerere.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Et quidem non dixerat Evangelista quae Christus fuerat sequentibus se locutus; sed ex his quae hic dicuntur licet addiscere. Quaecumque enim Andreas didicit, in brevi ostendit, magistri virtutem, qui persuaserat eis, et eorum desiderium quod prius habuerant, repraesentans: hoc

**CHRYS.** Andrew kept not our Lord's words to himself; but ran in haste to his brother, to report the good tidings: He first finds his own brother Simon, and said to him, We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ.

**BEDE.** This is truly to find the Lord; viz. to have fervent love for Him, together with a care for our brother's salvation.

**CHRYS.** The Evangelist does not mention what Christ said to those who followed Him; but we may infer it from what follows. Andrew declares in few words what he had learnt, discloses the power of that Master Who had persuaded them, and his own previous longings after Him. For this

enim verbum invenimus, est patientis pressuram propter absentiam et exultantis postquam apparuit quod expectabatur.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Messias autem Hebraice, Graece Christus, Latine unctus dicitur: chrisma enim unctio est: ille autem singulariter unctus est: unde omnes Christiani ununtur, secundum quod in Psal. 44 dicitur: unxit te Deus Deus tuus oleo exultationis prae participibus tuis: participes enim eius sunt omnes sancti; sed ille est singulariter sanctus, et singulariter unctus.

**Chrysostomus:** Et ideo non dixit Messiam simpliciter, sed cum adiectione articuli. Considera vero ex ipso principio obedientem Petri mentem: confestim enim cucurrit nihil tardans; unde sequitur et adduxit eum ad Iesum. Sed nullus facilitatem ei imponat, si non prius multa perquirens ita sermonem suscepit; conveniens enim est, et fratrem diligentius ei dixisse hoc, et per longa verba; sed Evangelistae ubique multa intermittunt, brevilocutioni curam habentes. Aliter autem neque dictum est quoniam credidit simpliciter, sed quoniam duxit eum ad Iesum, illum ei de quo dixerat traditurus, ut omnia ab illo discat. Ipse autem dominus incipit revelare ea quae deitatis sunt, et paulatim ea aperire praedicationibus. Non enim minus quam signa, prophetiae adducunt: hoc enim est maxime opus Dei, quod neque imitari Daemones possunt: nam in miraculis quidem et phantasia fit utique; futura autem praedicere cum certitudine, illius solius incorruptibilis est naturae; unde sequitur intuitus autem eum Iesus dixit: tu es Simon filius Ioanna; tu vocaberis Cephas (quod interpretatur Petrus).

**Beda:** Intuitus autem est eum non exterioribus oculis solum, sed et aeterno divinitatis intuitu vidit cordis eius simplicitatem, animi sublimitatem, cuius merito cunctae esset praeferendus Ecclesiae. Neque autem in Petri vocabulo, quasi Hebraeo vel Syro, aliam interpretationem quaerere oportet: quia idem est Graece et Latine Petrus, quod Syriace Cephas; et in utraque lingua nomen a petra derivatur. Vocatur autem Petrus ob firmitatem fidei, qua illi petrae adhaesit de qua apostolus ait: petra autem erat Christus; qui sperantes in se ab hostis insidiis reddit tutos, et spiritualium charismatum fluentia ministrat.

exclamation, We have found, expresses a longing for His coming, turned to exultation, now that He was really come.

**AUG.** Messias in Hebrew, Christus in Greek, Unctus in Latin. Chrism is unction, and He had a special unction, which from Him extended to all Christians, as appears in the Psalm, God, even Your God, has anointed You with the oil of gladness above Your fellows. All holy persons are partakers with Him; but He is specially the Holy of Holies, specially anointed.

**CHRYS.** And therefore he said not Messias, but the Messias. Mark the obedience of Peter from the very first; he went immediately without delay, as appears from the next words: And he brought him to Jesus. Nor let us blame him as too yielding, because he did not ask many questions, before he received the word. It is reasonable to suppose that his brother had told him all, and sufficiently fully; but the Evangelists often make omissions for the sake of brevity. But, besides this, it is not absolutely said that he did believe, but only, He took him to Jesus; i.e. to learn from the mouth of Jesus Himself, what Andrew had reported. Our Lord begins now Himself to reveal the things of His Divinity, and to exhibit them gradually by prophecy. For prophecies are no less persuasive than miracles; inasmuch as they are preeminently God's work, and are beyond the power of devils to imitate, while miracles may be fantasy or appearance: the foretelling future events with certainty is an attribute of the incorruptible nature alone: And when Jesus beheld him, He said, You are Simon the son of Jonas; you shall be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, A stone.

**BEDE.** He beheld him not with His natural eye only, but by the insight of His Godhead discerned from eternity the simplicity and greatness of his soul, for which he was to be elevated above the whole Church. In the word Peter, we must not look for any additional meaning, as though it were of Hebrew or Syriac derivation; for the Greek and Latin word Peter, has the same meaning as Cephas; being in both languages derived from petra. He is called Peter on account of the firmness of his faith, in cleaving to that Rock, of which the Apostle speaks, And that Rock was Christ; which

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Non est autem magnum quia dominus dixit cuius filius esset iste: omnia enim nomina sanctorum suorum sciebat, quos ante constitutionem mundi praedestinavit. Illud autem magnum quia mutavit ei nomen, et fecit de Simone Petrum. Petrus autem a petra; petra vero Ecclesia: ergo in Petri nomine figurata est Ecclesia. Et quis securus est, nisi qui aedificat supra petram? Intentum autem te fecit dominus: nam si antea Petrus vocaretur, non ita videres mysterium petrae, et putares casu eum sic vocari, non providentia Dei. Ideo eum voluit aliud prius vocari, ut ex ipsa commutatione nominis, sacramenti vivacitas commendaretur.

**Chrysostomus:** Ideo etiam nomen mutavit, ut ostendat quia ipse est qui vetus testamentum dedit et nomina transmavit, qui Abram Abraham vocavit, et Sarai Saram, et Iacob Israel. Igitur multis quidem et a nativitate nomina imposuit, ut Isaac et Samson; aliis autem post eam quae a progenitoribus est nuncupationem, ut Petro et filiis Zebedaei: nam quibus quidem a prima aetate debebat virtus clarescere, ex tunc nomina susceperunt; quibus autem postea debebat augeri, postea nuncupatio posita est.

**Augustinus de Cons. Evang:** Non autem parva repugnantia potest putari si iuxta Iordanem, antequam Iesus isset in Galilaeam, ad testimonium Ioannis Baptistae secuti sunt eum duo, quorum unus erat Andreas, qui fratrem suum Simonem adduxit ad Iesum; quando et nomen ut Petrus nominaretur accepit; cum ab aliis Evangelistis dicatur, quod eos in Galilaea piscantes invenerit, atque ad discipulatum vocaverit: nisi quia intelligendum est, non sic eos vidisse dominum iuxta Iordanem ut ei iam inseparabiliter inhaerent; sed tantum cognovisse qui esset, eumque miratos ad propria remeasse. Non autem quis arbitretur quod tunc Petrus nomen accepit, ubi ait illi dominus: tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam; sed ubi commemoratur ei dictum esse tu vocaberis Cephias (quod interpretatur Petrus).

secures those who trust in it from the snares of the enemy, and dispenses streams of spiritual gifts.

**AUG.** There was nothing very great in our Lord saying whose son he was, for our Lord knew the names of all His saints, having predestinated them before the foundation of the world. But it was a great thing for our Lord to change his name from Simon to Peter. Peter is from petra, rock, which rock is the Church: so that the name of Peter represents the Church. And who is safe, unless he build upon a rock? Our Lord here rouses our attention: for had he been called Peter before, we should not have seen the mystery of the Rock, and should have thought that he was called so by chance, and not providentially. God therefore made him to be called by another name before, that the change of that name might give vividness to the mystery.

**CHRYS.** He changed the name too to show that He was the same who done so before in the Old Testament; who had called Abram Abraham, Sarai Sarah, Jacob Israel. Many He had named from their birth, as Isaac and Samson; others again after being named by their parents, as were Peter, and the sons of Zebedee. Those whose virtue was to be eminent from the first, have names given them from the first; those who were to be exalted afterwards, are named afterwards.

**AUG.** The account A here of the two disciples on the Jordan, who follow Christ (before he had gone into Galilee) in obedience to John's testimony; viz. of Andrew bringing his brother Simon to Jesus, who gave him, on this occasion, the name of Peter; disagrees considerably with the account of the other Evangelists, viz. that our Lord found these two, Simon and Andrew, fishing in Galilee, and then bid them follow Him: unless we understand that they did not regularly join our Lord when they saw Him on the Jordan; but only discovered who He was, and full of wonder, then returned to their occupations. Nor must we think that Peter first received his name on the occasion mentioned in Matthew, when our Lord says, You are Peter, and upon this rock will I build My Church; but rather when our Lord says, You shall be called Cephias, which is by interpretation, A stone.

**Alcuinus:** Vel aliter. Nondum imponit ei nomen, sed praesignat quod postea fuit ei impositum, quando dixit ei Iesus: tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam. Mutaturus autem nomen Christus, voluit ostendere etiam nomen illud quod a parentibus datum erat, non carere virtutis significatione. Simon enim obediens interpretatur, Ioanna gratia, Iona columba; quasi dicat: tu es obediens, filius gratiae, vel filius columbae, idest spiritus sancti: quia humilitatem de spiritu sancto accepisti, ut vocante Andrea, videre me desiderares. Non enim dedignatus est maior minorem sequi: quia non est ordo aetatis ubi est meritum fidei.

**ALCUIN.** Or perhaps He does not actually give him the name now, but only fixes beforehand what He afterwards gave him when He said, You are Peter, and upon this rock will I build My Church. And while about to change his name, Christ wishes to show that even that which his parents had given him, was not without a meaning. For Simon signifies obedience, Joanna grace, Jona a dove: as if the meaning was; You are an obedient son of grace, or of the dove, i.e. the Holy Spirit; for you have received of the Holy Spirit the humility, to desire, at Andrew's call, to see Me. The elder disdained not to follow the younger; for where there is meritorious faith, there is no order of seniority.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 26

43 τῇ ἐπαύριον ἠθέλησεν ἐξελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γαλιλαίαν, καὶ εὗρίσκει Φίλιππον. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἀκολούθει μοι. 44 ἦν δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος ἀπὸ βηθσαϊδά, ἐκ τῆς πόλεως Ἀνδρέου καὶ Πέτρου. 45 εὗρίσκει Φίλιππος τὸν Ναθαναὴλ καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, ὃν ἔγραψεν μωϋσῆς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ καὶ οἱ προφῆται εὐρήκαμεν, Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν τοῦ Ἰωσήφ τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ. 46 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ναθαναὴλ, ἐκ Ναζαρέτ δύναται τι ἀγαθὸν εἶναι; λέγει αὐτῷ [ὁ] Φίλιππος, ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε.

43. The day following Jesus would go forth into Galilee, and finds Philip, and said to him, Follow me. 44. Now Philip was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter. 45. Philip finds Nathaniel, and said to him, We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph. 46. And Nathaniel said to him, Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth? Philip said to him, Come and see.

---

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Postquam accepit Christus hos discipulos, venit de reliquo ad alios convertendum, scilicet Philippum et Nathanaelem; unde dicitur in crastinum autem voluit exire in Galilaeam.

**CHRYS.** After gaining these disciples, Christ proceeded to convert others, viz. Philip and Nathanael: The day following Jesus would go forth into Galilee.

**Alcuinus:** A Iudaea scilicet, ubi erat Ioannes baptizans, deferens honorem Baptistae, ne videatur magisterium eius minuere, dum adhuc statum habet. Vocaturus etiam discipulum ad sequendum, voluit exire in Galilaeam, idest in transmigrationem factam vel revelationem; ut sicut ipse proficiebat sapientia

**ALCUIN.** Leaving, that is, Judea, where John was baptizing, out of respect to the Baptist, and not to appear to lower his office, so long as it continued. He was going too to call a disciple, and wished to go forth into Galilee, i.e. to a place of "transition" or "revelation," that is to say, that as He Himself

et aetate et gratia apud Deum et homines, et sicut passus est et resurrexit, et ita intravit in gloriam suam; sic etiam suos sequaces ostenderet et exire et proficere in virtutibus, et per passiones ad gaudia transmigrare debere; unde sequitur et invenit Philippum, et dicit ei Iesus: sequere me. Sequitur qui imitatur humilitatem et passionem eius, ut sit socius resurrectionis et ascensionis.

**Chrysostomus:** Et vide quod antequam aliquis ei adhaereret, nullum vocavit: nam si quidem nullo iam sponte adveniente attraxisset, fortassis resiliissent: nunc autem a seipsis eligentes sequi dominum, firmi de reliquo permanserunt. Philippum autem vocat, magis notum ei existentem, quia in Galilaea nutritus erat. Sed unde Philippus secutus est Christum? Nam Andreas quidem audiens a Ioanne Baptista, Petrus autem ab Andrea; hic autem a nullo aliquid discens, solum dicente Christo ad eum sequere me, confestim persuasus est. Conveniens est autem Philippum a Ioanne audientem sequi Christum, vel etiam vocem Christi hoc operatam esse.

**Theophylactus:** Non enim simpliciter omnibus vox Christi dicebatur, sed fidelium interiora ad eius inflammabat amorem: deinde quia in corde Philippi de Christo cogitatio inerat, et in libris Moysi assidua lectio, ut expectaret Christum, statim cum vidit, credidit. Forte autem ab Andrea et Petro de Christo aliquid didicit, quia ex eadem patria erant; quod Evangelista videtur innuere per hoc quod subdit erat autem Philippus a Bethsaida civitate Andreae et Petri.

**Chrysostomus:** Christus etiam hinc suam virtutem ostendit, quod a terra nullum ferente fructum, nam a Galilaea propheta non surgit, inlytos discipulos elegit.

**Alcuinus:** Bethsaida etiam domus venatorum interpretatur; quo nomine civitatis curavit Evangelista ostendere quales tunc iam animo erant Philippus, Petrus et Andreas, et quales officio erant futuri, idest capiendis ad vitam animabus intenti.

increased in wisdom or stature, and in favor with God and man, and as He suffered and rose again, and entered into His glory: so He would teach His followers to go forth, and increase in virtue, and pass through suffering to joy. He finds Philip, and said to him, Follow Me. Everyone follows Jesus who imitates His humility and suffering, in order to be partaker of His resurrection and ascension.

**CHRYS.** Observe, He did not call them, before some had of their own accord joined Him: for had He invited them, before any had joined Him, perhaps they would have started back: but now having determined to follow of their own free choice, they remain firm ever after. He calls Philip, however, because he would be known to him, from living in Galilee. But what made Philip follow Christ? Andrew heard from John the Baptist, and Peter from Andrew; he had heard from no one, and yet on Christ saying, Follow Me, was persuaded instantly. It is not improbable that Philip may have heard John: and yet it may have been the mere voice of Christ which produced this effect.

**THEOPHYL.** For the voice of Christ sounded not like a common voice to some, that is, the faithful, but kindled in their inmost soul the love of Him. Philip having been continually meditating on Christ, and reading the books of Moses, so confidently expected Him, that the instant he saw, he believed. Perhaps too he had heard of Him from Andrew and Peter, coming from the same district; an explanation which the Evangelist seems to hint at, when he adds, Now Philip was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter.

**CHRYS.** The power of Christ appears by His gathering fruit out of a barren country. For from that Galilee, out of which there arises no prophet, He takes His most distinguished disciples.

**ALCUIN.** Bethsaida means house of hunters. The Evangelist introduces the name of this place by way of allusion to the characters of Philip, Peter, and Andrew, and their future office, i.e. catching and saving souls.

**Chrysostomus:** Non solum autem Philippus a Christo persuasus est, sed praeco aliis fit; unde sequitur invenit Philippus Nathanael, et dicit ei: quem scripsit Moyses in lege et prophetae, invenimus Iesum filium Ioseph a Nazareth. Vide qualiter sollicitam mentem habebat, et continue meditabatur quae sunt Moysi, et expectabat adventum Christi. Et quidem quod Christus debebat venire, noverat prius; quoniam autem hic Christus erat, ignorabat. Dicit autem quem scripsit Moyses et prophetae, credibilem faciens suam praedicationem, et ex hinc persuadens auditorem quod circa legem et prophetas sollicitus erat, et omnia perscrutans cum veritate ut et Christus testatus est. Si vero dicit filium Ioseph, ne turberis: eius enim filius aestimabatur esse.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Cui scilicet desponsata erat mater eius: nam quod ea intacta conceptus et natus sit, bene noverunt ex Evangelio omnes Christiani. Addit autem et locum: a Nazareth.

**Theophylactus:** Non quia in ea natus erat, sed nutritus. Generatio enim eius multis erat incognita; sed quod in Nazareth esset nutritus, cognitum erat. Et dixit ei Nathanael: a Nazareth potest aliquid boni esse?

**Augustinus:** Ambas pronuntiationes potest consequens vox Philippi sequi: sive sic pronunties, tamquam confirmans: a Nazareth potest aliquid boni esse: et ille dicat veni et vide; sive sicut dubitans, et totum interrogans: a Nazareth potest aliquid boni esse? Veni et vide. Cum ergo sive illo modo, sive isto pronuntietur, non repugnent verba sequentia, nostrum est quaerere quid potius intelligamus in his verbis. Nathanael enim doctissimus legis, cum audisset Philippum dicentem invenimus Iesum, audito a Nazareth, erectus est in spem, et dixit a Nazareth potest aliquid boni esse. Scrutatus enim erat Scripturas, et sciebat, quod non facile alii Scribae et Pharisei noverant, quia inde erat expectandus salvator.

**Alcuinus:** Qui singulariter sanctus est, innocens, impollutus; de quo propheta: exiet virga de radice Iesse, et Nazaraeus (idest flos) de radice eius ascendet. Vel potest hic versiculus sub dubitatione interrogative proferri.

**CHRYS.** Philip is not persuaded himself, but begins preaching to others: Philip finds Nathanael, and said to him, We have found Him of whom Moses in the Law, and the Prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph. See how zealous he is, and how constantly he is meditating on the books of Moses, and looking for Christ's coming. That Christ was coming he had known before; but he did not know that this was the Christ, of whom Moses and the Prophets did write: He says this to give credibility to his preaching, and to show his zeal for the Law and the Prophets, and how that he had examined them attentively. Be not disturbed at his calling our Lord the Son of Joseph; this was what He was supposed to be.

**AUG.** The person to whom our Lord's mother had been betrothed. The Christians know from the Gospel, that He was conceived and born of an undefiled mother. He adds the place too, of Nazareth.

**THEOPHYL.** He was bred up there: the place of His birth could not have been known generally, but all knew that He was bred up in Nazareth. And Nathanael said to him, Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth.

**AUG.** However you may understand these words, Philip's answer will suit. You may read it either as affirmatory, Something good can come out of Nazareth; to which the other says, Come and see: or you may read it as a question, implying doubt on Nathanael's part, Can any good thing come out of Nazareth? Come and see. Since either way of reading agrees equally with what follows, we must inquire the meaning of the passage. Nathanael was well read in the Law, and therefore the word Nazareth (Philip having said that he had found Jesus of Nazareth) immediately raises his hopes, and he exclaims, Something good can come out of Nazareth. He had searched the Scriptures, and knew, what the Scribes and Pharisees could not, that the Savior was to be expected thence.

**ALCUIN.** He who alone is absolutely holy, harmless, undefiled; of whom the prophet said, There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and

a branch (Nazaraus) shall grow out of his roots. Or the words may be taken as expressing doubt, and asking the question.

**Chrysostomus:** Audiverat enim Nathanael a Scripturis quod a Bethlehem oporteret Christum venire, secundum illud: et tu, Bethlehem terra Iuda, ex te exiet dux qui regat populum meum Israel. Cum igitur audivit a Nazareth, dubitavit, non inveniens convenire enuntiationem Philippi cum prophetica praedicatione. Nazaraeum autem vocant prophetae ab educatione et conversatione. Considera vero eius in inquirendo prudentiam et mansuetudinem: non enim dixit: decipis me, Philippe; sed interrogat dicens a Nazareth potest aliquid boni esse? Valde autem et Philippus prudens erat; non enim interrogatus frangitur, sed immoratur, virum volens ducere ad Christum; unde sequitur dicit ei Philippus: veni et vide. Trahit quidem eum ad Christum, sciens de reliquo eum non contradicturum, si verba et doctrinam illius gustaverit.

**CHRYS.** Nathanael knew from the Scriptures, that Christ was to come from Bethlehem, according to the prophecy of Micah, And you, Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, - out of you shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel. On hearing of Nazareth, then, he doubted, and was not able to reconcile Philip's tidings with prophecy. For the Prophets call Him a Nazarene, only in reference to His education and mode of life. Observe, however, the discretion and gentleness with which he communicates his doubts. He does not say, You deceive me, Philip; but simply asks the question, Can any good thing come out of Nazareth? Philip too in turn is equally discrete. He is not confounded by the question, but dwells upon it, and lingers in the hope of bringing him to Christ: Philip said to him, Come and see. He takes him to Christ, knowing that when he had once tasted of His words and doctrine, he will make no more resistance.

---

## CHAPTER I

### Lectio 27

47 εἶδεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Ναθαναήλ ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ λέγει περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἴδε ἀληθῶς Ἰσραηλίτης ἐν ᾧ δόλος οὐκ ἔστιν. 48 λέγει αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ, πόθεν με γινώσκεις; ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, πρὸ τοῦ σε Φίλιππον φωνῆσαι ὄντα ὑπὸ τὴν συκῆν εἰδόν σε. 49 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ, ῥαββί, σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, σὺ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. 50 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, ὅτι εἰπόν σοι ὅτι εἰδόν σε ὑποκάτω τῆς συκῆς πιστεύεις; μείζω τούτων ὄψη. 51 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεωγῆτα καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

47. Jesus saw Nathanael coming to him, and said of him, Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile! 48. Nathanael said to him, Whence know you me? Jesus answered and said to him, Before that Philip called you, when you were under the fig tree, I saw you. 49. Nathanael answered and said to him, Rabbi, you are the Son of God; you are the King of Israel. 50. Jesus answered and said to him, Because I said to you, I saw you under the fig tree, believe you? you shall see greater things than these. 51. And he said to him, Verily, verily, I say to you, Hereafter you shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Nathanael non suscipiendo ex Nazareth Christum esse, eam quae illi erat circa Scripturas diligentiam ostendit; in non respuendo vero eum qui annuntiaverat, multum desiderium quod habebat circa Christi praesentiam monstravit. Sciebat enim quod poterat Philippus circa locum falli; unde sequitur vidit Iesus Nathanael venientem ad se, et dicit de eo: ecce vere Israelita, in quo dolus non est: quia nihil ad gratiam vel odium loquebatur.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Vel aliter. Quid est in quo dolus non est? Forte non habebat peccatum? Forte illi medicus non erat necessarius? Absit. Nemo sic natus est ut medico illo non egeret. Dolus enim est cum aliud agitur, et aliud fingitur: quo modo ergo in illo dolus non erat, si peccator est? Fatetur se peccatorem; si enim peccator est et iustum se dicit, dolus est in ore ipsius. Ergo in Nathanaele confessionem peccati laudavit, non indicavit non esse peccatorem.

**Theophylactus:** Sed Nathanael laudatus non acquievit extemplo, sed expectavit, adhuc volens aliquid manifestius discere; et interrogat; sequitur enim dicit ei Nathanael: unde me nosti?

**Chrysostomus:** Ipse quidem igitur ut homo investigabat, Iesus autem ut Deus respondebat: sequitur enim respondit Iesus et dixit ei: priusquam te Philippus vocaret, cum esses sub ficu, vidi te: non ut homo eum intuens, sed ut Deus desuper cognoscens. Vidi, inquit, te, idest morum tuorum mansuetudinem. Dicit autem cum esses sub ficu: quoniam nullus ibi erat, sed soli Philippus et Nathanael singulariter loquebantur: propter hoc dictum est quod videns eum a longe dixit ecce vere Israelita; ut scires quoniam antequam appropinquaret Philippus, haec loquebatur Christus, et insuspicabile fiat Christi testimonium. Noluit autem Christus dicere: non sum ex Nazareth, ut annuntiavit tibi Philippus; sed ex Bethlehem, ut non faceret altercabilem sermonem; neque etiam per hoc dedisset argumentum sufficiens quod ipse esset Christus; sed ostendit se Christum per hoc quod praesens erat loquentibus illis.

**CHRYS.** Nathanael, in difficulty as to Christ coming out of Nazareth, showed the care with which he had read the Scriptures: his not rejecting the tidings when brought him, showed his strong desire for Christ's coming. He thought that Philip might be mistaken as to the place. It follows, Jesus saw Nathanael coming to Him, and said of him, Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile! There was no fault to be found with him, though he had spoken like one who did not believe, because he was more deeply read in the Prophets than Philip. He calls him guileless, because he had said nothing to gain favor, or gratify malice.

**AUG.** What means this, In whom is no guile? Had he no sin? Was no physician necessary for him? Far from it. No one was ever born, of a temper not to need the Physician. It is guile, when we say one thing, and think another. How then was there no guile in him? Because, if he was as a sinner, he confessed his sin; whereas if a man, being a sinner, pretends to be righteous, there is guile in his mouth. Our Lord then commended the confession of sin in Nathanael; He did not pronounce him not a sinner.

**THEOPHYL.** Nathanael however, notwithstanding this praise, does not acquiesce immediately, but waits for further evidence, and asks, Whence know You me?

**CHRYS.** He asks as man, Jesus answers as God: Jesus answered and said to him, Before that Philip called you, when you were under the fig tree, I saw you: not having, beheld him as man, but as God discerning him from above. I saw you, He says, that is, the character of the life, when you were under the fig tree: where the two, Philip and Nathanael, had been talking together alone, nobody, seeing them; and on this account it is said, that on seeing him a long way off, He said, Behold an Israelite indeed; whence it appears that this speech was before Philip came near, so that no suspicion could attach to Christ's testimony. Christ would not say, I am not of Nazareth, as Philip told you, but of Bethlehem; in order to avoid an argument: and because it would not have been sufficient proof, had He mentioned it, of His being the Christ. He preferred rather proving this by His having been present at their conversation.

**Augustinus:** Quaerendum est enim an aliquid significet arbor ficus. Invenimus arborem ficus maledictam, quia sola folia habuit, et fructu caruit. In origine humani generis Adam et Eva, cum peccavissent, de foliis ficus subcinctoria sibi fecerunt. Folia ergo ficulneae intelliguntur peccata. Erat autem Nathanael sub arbore ficus, tamquam sub umbra mortis; ac si dominus ei dicat: o Israel, sine dolo quisquis es, o popule Iudaeus ex fide, antequam te per apostolos meos vocarem, et cum esses sub umbra mortis, et tu me non videres, ego te vidi.

**Gregorius Moralium:** Vel cum esses sub ficu, vidi te; idest, positum te sub umbra legis elegi.

**Augustinus de Verb. Dom:** Recordatus est autem Nathanael se fuisse sub ficu ubi non erat Christus praesentia corporali, sed scientia spirituali; et quia sciebat se solum fuisse sub ficu, agnovit in illo divinitatem.

**Chrysostomus in Ioannem:** Sic ergo ab hac praedicatione, et ab eo quod mentem scrutatus est eius, et quia cum adversus eum dicere videretur, non culpavit, sed laudavit, cognovit quoniam vere est Christus; unde sequitur respondit ei Nathanael, et ait: Rabbi, tu es filius Dei, tu es rex Israel; quasi dicat: tu es qui expectabaris, tu es qui quaerebaris. Quia enim argumentum inaltercabile suscepit, venit ad confessionem, et in mora priori diligentiam ostendens, et in posteriori confessione devotionem. Multi autem legentium sermonem hunc anxiantur: Petrus enim qui post miracula et doctrinam confessus est, quoniam filius est Dei, beatificatur, ut a patre revelationem iam suscipiens; Nathanael autem ante signa et doctrinam hoc dicens, nihil tale audivit. Est igitur huius causa, quoniam verba quidem eadem locutus est Petrus et Nathanael, non autem eadem mente; sed Petrus quidem confessus est filium Dei ut Deum verum; hic autem ut hominem nudum; dicens enim ei tu es filius Dei, induxit tu es rex Israel; Dei autem filius non Israelis est rex solum, sed et orbis terrarum universi. Hoc etiam manifestum est ex his quae consequuntur. Nam Petro nihil postea addidit Christus: sed quasi perfecta eius existente fide, Ecclesiam se dixit in confessione illius fabricaturum esse. Nathanael autem, quasi multa parte et maiori confessionis deficiente, ad maiora educitur; nam sequitur et dixit ei: quia dixi tibi: vidi te sub ficu, credis: maius his videbis; quasi dicat: magnum tibi visum est hoc esse quod dixi, et

**AUG.** Has this fig tree any meaning? We read of one fig tree which was cursed, because it had only leaves, and no fruit. Again, at the creation, Adam and Eve, after sinning, made themselves aprons of fig leaves. Fig leaves then signify sins; and Nathanael, when he was under the fig tree, was under the shadow of death: so that our Lord seems to say, O Israel, whoever of you is without guile, O people of the Jewish faith, before that I called you by My Apostles, when you were as yet under the shadow of death, and saw Me not, I saw you.

**GREG.** When you were under the fig tree, I saw you; i.e. when you were yet under the shade of the law, I chose you.

**AUG.** Nathanael remembered that he had been under the fig tree, where Christ was not present corporeally, but only by His spiritual knowledge. Hence, knowing that he had been alone, he recognized our Lord's Divinity.

**CHRYS.** That our Lord then had this knowledge, had penetrated into his mind, had not blamed but praised his hesitation, proved to Nathanael that He was the true Christ: Nathanael answered and said to Him, Rabbi, You are the Son of God, You are the King of Israel: as if he said, You are He who was expected, you are He who was sought for. Sure proof being obtained, he proceeds to make confession; herein showing his devotion, as his former hesitation had shown his diligence. **ID.** Many when they read this passage, are perplexed at finding that, whereas Peter was pronounced blessed for having, after our Lord's miracles and teaching, confessed Him to be the Son of God, Nathanael, who makes the same confession before, has no such benediction. The reason is this. Peter and Nathanael both used the same words, I but not in the same meaning. Peter confessed our Lord to be the Son of God, in the sense of very God; the latter in the sense of mere man; for after saying, You are the Son of God, he adds, You are the King of Israel; whereas the Son of God was not the King of Israel only, but of the whole world. This is manifest from what follows. For in the case of Peter Christ added nothing, but, as if his faith were perfect, said, that he would build the Church upon his confession; whereas Nathanael, as if his confession were very deficient, is led up to higher things: Jesus answered and said to him, Because I said to you, I saw you under the fig tree, believe you? You shall see greater things

propterea me regem Israelis confessus es: quid igitur dices cum maius videbis? Et quid sit istud maius, ostendit subdicens et dicit eis: amen, amen dico vobis, videbitis caelum apertum, et Angelos Dei ascendentes et descendentes super filium hominis. Vide qualiter paulatim eum a terra abducit, et facit quod non ultra aestimet Christum esse hominem solum: cui enim Angeli ministrant, qualiter hic homo purus esset? Per hoc igitur suadet Angelorum se esse dominatorem: sicut enim in proprium regis filium descenderunt et ascenderunt in eum ministri regales; hoc quidem in tempore crucis, hoc vero in tempore resurrectionis et ascensionis; sed et ante hoc, quando accesserunt et ministrabant ei, et quando evangelizabant eius nativitatem. Futurum vero a praeterito probavit; qui enim in praeteritis virtutem eius agnoverat, et de futuris audiens facilius suscepit.

**Augustinus de Verb. Dom:** Recolamus autem veterem historiam, quando Iacob in somniis vidit scalam a terra pertingentem usque in caelum, et dominus incumbens super eam, et Angeli ascendebant et descendebant per eam. Denique ipse Iacob quia intellexit quid viderit, posuit lapidem et fudit oleum: dum unxit lapidem Iacob, numquid idolum fecit? Significavit, non adoravit. Agnoscitis chrisma, agnoscite et Christum. Ipse est lapis quem reprobaverunt aedificantes. Si ergo Iacob vidit scalam, qui est Israel appellatus, et Nathanael iste vere Israelita erat; convenienter somnium Iacob dominus dixit ei; quasi dicat: cuius nomine te appellavi, ipsius somnium in te apparuit: videbis enim caelum apertum, et Angelos Dei ascendentes et descendentes super filium hominis. Si autem ad illum descendunt, et ad illum ascendunt, et sursum est, et hic est: sursum in se, deorsum in suis.

**Augustinus in Ioannem:** Sunt autem Angeli Dei boni praedicatores praedicantes Christum; hoc est super filium hominis ascendunt et descendunt, sicut Paulus, qui ascenderat usque ad tertium caelum, descendit usque ad lac potum parvulis dandum. Dixit autem maius his videbis; quia plus est quod nos dominus vocatos iustificavit, quam quod vidit iacentes sub umbra mortis. Quid enim nobis proderat, si ibi mansissemus ubi nos vidit? Quaeritur autem quare Nathanael, cui tantum testimonium perhibuit filius Dei, inter duodecim

than these. As if He said, What I have just said has appeared a great matter to you, and you have confessed Me to be King of Israel; what will you say when you see greater things than these? What that greater thing is He proceeds to show: And He said to him, Verily, verily, I say to you, Hereafter you shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man. See how He raises him from earth for a while, and forces him to think that Christ is not a mere man: for how could He be a mere man, whom angels ministered to? It was, as, as it were, saying, that He was Lord of the Angels; for He must be the King's own Son, on whom the servants of the King descended and ascended; descended at His crucifixion, ascended at His resurrection and ascension. Angels too before this came and ministered to Him, and angels brought the glad tidings of His birth. Our Lord made the present a proof of the future. After the powers He had already shown, Nathanael would readily believe that much more would follow.

**AUG.** Let us recollect the Old Testament account. Jacob saw in a dream a ladder reaching from earth to heaven; the Lord resting upon it, and the angels ascending and descending upon it. Lastly, Jacob himself understanding what the vision meant, set up a stone, and poured oil upon it. When he anointed the stone, did he make an idol? No: he only set up a symbol, not an object of worship. You see here the anointing; see the Anointed also. He is the stone which the builders refused. If Jacob, who was named Israel, saw the ladder, and Nathanael was an Israelite indeed, there was a fitness in our Lord telling him Jacob's dream; as if he said, Whose name you are called by, his dream has appeared to you: for you shall see the heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man. If they descend upon Him, and ascend to Him, then He is both up above and here below at the same time; above in Himself, below in His members.

**AUG.** Good preachers, however, who preach Christ, are as angels of God; i.e. they ascend and descend upon the Son of man; as Paul, who ascended to the third heaven, and descended so far even as to give milk to babes. He said, We shall see greater things than these: because it is a greater thing that our Lord has justified us, whom He has called, than that He saw us lying under the shadow of death. For had we remained where He saw us, what profit would it have been? It is asked why Nathanael, to whom our Lord bears such

apostolos non invenitur? Intelligere autem debemus, ipsum eruditum fuisse et peritum legis: propterea noluit illum dominus inter discipulos ponere, quia idiotas elegit, unde confunderet mundum. Volens enim superbiorum frangere cervices, non quaesivit per oratorem piscatorem; sed de piscatore lucratus est imperatorem. Magnus Cyprianus orator; sed prius Petrus piscator; per quem postea crederet non tantum orator, sed etiam imperator.

testimony, is not found among the twelve Apostles. We may believe, however, that it was because he was so learned, and versed in the law, that our Lord had not put him among the disciples. He chose the foolish, to confound the world. Intending to break the neck of the proud, He sought not to gain the fisherman through the orator, but by the fisherman the emperor. The great Cyprian was an orator; but Peter was a fisherman before him; and through him not only the orator, but the emperor, believed.

Translated by John Henry Newman  
except Prooemium and bracketed portions by Joseph Kenny, O.P.  
<http://dhs priory.org/thomas/CAJohn.htm#2>