

4

Lectio 1

1 ὥς οὖν ἔγνω ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ φαρισαῖοι ὅτι Ἰησοῦς πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἢ Ἰωάννης 2 —καίτοιγε Ἰησοῦς αὐτὸς οὐκ ἐβάπτισεν ἀλλ' οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ — 3 ἀφῆκεν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. 4 ἔδει δὲ αὐτὸν διέρχεσθαι διὰ τῆς Σαμαρείας. 5 ἔρχεται οὖν εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας λεγομένην Συχάρ πλησίον τοῦ χωρίου ὃ ἔδωκεν Ἰακώβ [τῷ] Ἰωσήφ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ: 6 ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ πηγὴ τοῦ Ἰακώβ. ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς κεκοπιακῶς ἐκ τῆς ὁδοιπορίας ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ: ὥρα ἦν ὥς ἕκτη. 7 ἔρχεται γυνὴ ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας ἀντλήσαι ὕδωρ. λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, δός μοι πεῖν: 8 οἱ γὰρ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπεληλύθεισαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ἵνα τροφὰς ἀγοράσωσιν. 9 λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ Σαμαρίτις, πῶς σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὢν παρ' ἐμοῦ πεῖν αἰτεῖς γυναικὸς Σαμαρίτιδος οὔσης; οὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρίταις.

Posita doctrina Christi de spirituali regeneratione, et quod Christus gratiam spiritualis regenerationis Iudaeis communicaverat, hic consequenter

LECTURE I

1 When, therefore, Jesus learned that the Pharisees had heard that he was making more disciples and baptizing more than John 2 (although Jesus did not himself baptize, but his disciples did), 3 he left Judea, and went again to Galilee. 4 He had, however, to pass through Samaria. 5 He came therefore to a city of Samaria, called Sychar, near the plot of land which Jacob had given to his son Joseph. 6 This was the site of Jacob's well. Jesus, tired from his journey, rested there at the well. It was about the sixth hour. 7 When a Samaritan woman came to draw water, Jesus said to her, "Give me a drink." 8 (His disciples had gone to the town to buy some food.) 9 So the Samaritan woman said to him, "How is it that you, being a Jew, ask me, a woman of Samaria, for a drink?" (Recall that the Jews had nothing to do with the Samaritans.)

549 Having set forth the teaching of Christ on spiritual regeneration, and that Christ had given this grace of spiritual

ostendit quomodo ipsa gratia etiam ad gentes derivata est per Christum. Salutaris autem gratia Christi derivata est dupliciter in gentibus: per doctrinam et per miracula. Marc. ult., 20: *illi autem profecti praedicaverunt ubique*, ecce doctrina, *domino cooperante*, *sequentibus signis*, ecce miracula.

Primo ergo ostendit futuram gentium conversionem per doctrinam; secundo futuram gentium conversionem per miracula, ibi *post duos autem dies exiit inde*. Circa primum duo facit. Primo praemittit quaedam praeambula ad doctrinam; secundo proponit doctrinam, et eius effectum, ibi *respondit Iesus, et dixit ei: si scires donum Dei* et cetera. Quantum ad primum tria praeambula praemittit. Primum ex parte ipsius docentis; secundum ex parte eius de quo doctrina erat, ibi *erat autem ibi fons Iacob*; tertium ex parte personae audientis, ibi *venit mulier de Samaria*, et cetera. Ex parte autem docentis, praeambulum est eius accessus ad locum doctrinae; et ideo dicit *ut ergo cognovit Iesus*, et cetera. Ubi tria facit. Primo innuit terminum a quo recedit, quia a Iudaea; secundo terminum ad quem accedit, in Galilaeam; tertio insinuat medium per quod transit, quia per Samariam. Quantum ad primum ponit primo causam recessus de loco in quo erat; secundo exponit quaedam dicta in causa assignata, ibi *quamquam Iesus non baptizaret* etc.; tertio describit recessum Christi a Iudaea, ibi *reliquit Iudaeam*, et cetera.

Dicit ergo *ut cognovit Iesus quod audierunt Pharisei* etc., volens ostendere Evangelista, quod postquam Baptista repressit discipulorum suorum invidiam, Christus declinavit Pharisaeorum malitiam.

Sed cum dicatur Eccli. XXIII, 29: *domino Deo nostro nota sunt omnia antequam fiant*; et Hebr. IV, 13: *omnia nuda et aperta sunt oculis eius*, quaerendum videtur quomodo Iesus dicitur aliquid de novo cognoscere. Ad quod dicendum est, quod Iesus virtute divinitatis suae ab aeterno cognovit omnia praeterita, praesentia et futura, ut praedictae auctoritates ostendunt; sed inquantum homo aliqua de novo cognovit, scientia experimentalis; et de hac dicitur hic *ut cognovit Iesus*, postquam fuit ei

regenerationem to the Jews, he now shows how Christ gave this grace to the Gentiles. Now the salutary grace of Christ had been dispensed in two ways to the Gentiles: through teaching and through miracles. "Going forth, they preached everywhere": this is the teaching; "the Lord cooperated with them, and confirmed the word with signs". These are the miracles (Mk 16:20).

First, he shows the future conversion of the Gentiles through teaching. Secondly, their future conversion through miracles (v 43). As to the first, he does two things. First, he sets down certain matters preliminary to the teaching. Secondly, he presents the teaching and its effect (v 10). As to the first, he sets down three preliminary facts. First, what relates to the one teaching. Secondly, something about the matter taught. Thirdly, something about who received the instruction (v 7). As to the person teaching, the preliminary remark is about his journey to the place where he taught. Here he does three things. First, he gives the place which he left, that is, from Judea. Secondly, the place where he was going, to Galilee. Thirdly, the place through which he passed, Samaria. As to the first, he does three things. First, he gives the reason for his leaving Judea. Secondly, he explains certain facts included in this reason. Thirdly, he describes Christ's departure from Judea (v 3).

550 The Evangelist says, **When, therefore, Jesus learned that the Pharisees had heard**, because he wished to show that after the Baptist had calmed the envy of his disciples, Jesus avoided the ill will of the Pharisees.

551 Since we read: "All things were known to the Lord God before they were created" (Sir 23:29), and "All things are naked and open to his eyes" (Heb 4:13), it seems that we should ask why Jesus is said to acquire new knowledge. We must answer that Jesus, in virtue of his divinity, knew from eternity all things, past, present and to come, as the scriptural passages cited above indicate. Nevertheless, as man, he did begin to know certain things through

nuntiatum, *quia audierunt Pharisei* et cetera. Et hanc cognitionem Christus de novo accipere voluit dispensative, ad ostendendum veritatem humanae naturae, sicut et multa alia humanae naturae propria voluit facere et pati.

Sed quid est hoc quod dicit *quia audierunt Pharisei, quod Christus plures discipulos facit et baptizat quam Ioannes*, cum ad eos non pertineat? Nam ipsi Ioannem persecuti sunt, nec ei credebant: quia, ut dicitur Matth. XXI, 26, cum dominus quaereret Baptismum Ioannis unde esset, dicebant intra se: *si dixerimus de caelo, dicet nobis: quare ergo non credidistis?* Non ergo crediderant Ioanni.

Sed ad hoc est duplex responsio. Una: quod ipsi discipuli Ioannis, qui supra quaestionem concitaverant contra Christum, erant Pharisei, vel Phariseis confoederati, unde, Matth. IX, 11 et 14 dicitur quod Pharisei simul cum discipulis Ioannis proposuerunt quaestiones contra discipulos Christi. Et secundum hoc concludit Evangelista *ut ergo cognovit Iesus quia audierunt* etc.: idest postquam intellexit quaestionem et commotionem discipulorum Ioannis, qui erant Pharisei, vel Phariseis confoederati, super Baptismo suo et discipulorum eius, *reliquit Iudaeam*.

Vel dicendum, quod Pharisei propter invidiam turbati sunt de praedicatione Ioannis, unde suaserunt Herodi ut caperet eum. Et hoc patet Matth. XVII, 12, ubi cum Christus loqueretur de Ioanne, dicit: *Elias iam venit, et fecerunt in eum quaecumque voluerunt*: et postea subdit: *sic et filius hominis passurus est ab eis*, ubi Glossa dicit quod Pharisei incitaverunt Herodem ad incarcerationem Ioannis et mortem. Videtur ergo probabile quod similiter moverentur contra Christum, ex hoc quod praedicabat. Et hoc est quod dicitur *audierunt*, scilicet ad persequendum *Pharisei* invidi et persecutores Christi *quia Iesus plures discipulos facit et baptizat quam Ioannes*.

experiential knowledge. And it is this experiential knowledge that is indicated when it says here, **When Jesus learned**, after the news was brought to him, **that the Pharisees had heard**. And Christ willed to acquire this knowledge anew as a concession, to show the reality of his human nature, just as he willed to do and endure many other things characteristic of human nature.

552 Why does he say: **the Pharisees had heard that he was making more disciples and baptizing more than John**, when this would seem to be of no concern to them? For they persecuted John and did not believe in him: for as Matthew says (21:25), when the Lord questioned them about the source of John's baptism, they said: "If we say from heaven, he will say to us, 'Why then did you not believe him?'" "Thus they did not believe in John.

There are two answers to this. One is that those disciples of John who had spoken against Christ were either Pharisees or allies of the Pharisees. For we see in Matthew (9:11, 14), that the Pharisees along with the disciples of John raised questions against the disciples of Christ. And so according to this explanation, then, the Evangelist says that **When, therefore, Jesus learned that the Pharisees had heard**, that is, after he learned that John's disciples, who were Pharisees or allied with the Pharisees, had raised questions and had been disturbed about his baptism and that of his disciples, **he left Judea**.

Or, we might say that the Pharisees were disturbed at John's preaching due to their envy, and for this reason they persuaded Herod to arrest him. This is plain from Matthew (17:12), where Christ, speaking of John, says, "Elijah has already come... and they did with him whatever they wanted," and then he adds, "so also will the Son of Man suffer from them." The Gloss comments on this that it was the Pharisees who incited Herod to arrest John and put him to death. Thus it seems probable that they felt the same way toward Christ because of what he was preaching. And this is what it says, that is, the envious Pharisees and persecutors of

De isto auditu dicitur Iob XXVIII, v. 22: *perditio et mors dixerunt: auribus nostris audivimus facta eius*. Sed boni audiunt ad obediendum. Ps. CXXXI, 6: *ecce audivimus eum in Ephrata*: et postea sequitur: *adorabimus in loco ubi steterunt pedes eius*.

Audierunt, inquam, duo: scilicet quod plures discipulos faceret quam Ioannes, quod quidem iustum erat et rationabile, quia, ut dicitur supra III, 30, Christum oportet crescere, et Ioannem minui. Aliud quod baptizabat; et hoc merito, quia ipse mundat. Ps. I, v. 4: *lava me, domine, ab iniustitia mea*. Et alibi, Ps. VII, 7: *exurge, domine* (scilicet baptizando), *in praecepto quod mandasti* (scilicet de Baptismo), *et synagoga populorum* (per Baptismum congregatorum) *circumdabit te*.

Consequenter cum dicit *quamquam Iesus non baptizaret* etc., exponit quod supra dixerat de Baptismo Christi *quod audierunt Pharisei* et cetera. Sed Augustinus dicit, hic apparere inconueniens: nam supra dixerat *et baptizat*, hic vero quasi corrigens id, utpote falsum, dicit *quamquam Iesus non baptizaret*.

Et ad hoc est duplex responsio. Una Chrysostomi: quod hoc quod Evangelista dicit, verum est, quod Christus non baptizavit aliquem; illud autem quod supra dictum est, scilicet baptizat, intelligendum est secundum famam currentem ad Phariseos, quod Christus baptizaret, quod aliqui venientes ad ipsos Phariseos dicerent: vos inuidebatis Iohanni quod discipulos habebat et baptizabat; sed ecce quod hic, scilicet Iesus, plures discipulos facit quam Ioannes, et baptizat. Quare ergo sustinetis eum? Et ideo non dicit Evangelista ex se, quod baptizat, sed quod audierunt Pharisei. Et ideo falsum rumorem populi Evangelista corrigere volens, dicit: verum est quod audierunt Pharisei, quod Christus baptizat, sed est falsum; unde subdit *quamquam Iesus non baptizaret, sed discipuli eius*. Ideo autem, secundum Chrysostomum, Christus non baptizavit, quia in omni Baptismate, quo Ioannes et discipuli baptizaverunt per totum tempus

Christ **had heard**, with the intention of persecuting him, **that he was making more disciples and baptizing more than John**.

553 This kind of hearing is described by Job (28:22): "Death and destruction have said: We have heard of his deeds." The good, on the other hand, hear in order to obey: "We have heard him in Ephrathah" (Ps 131:6), followed by, "We will adore at his footstool."

The Pharisees heard two things. First, that Christ made more disciples than John. This was right and reasonable, for as we read above (3:30), Christ must increase and John must decrease. The second thing was that Christ baptized; and rightly so, because he cleanses: "Wash me from my injustice" (Ps 50:4), and again in Psalm (7:7): "Rise up, O Lord," by baptizing, "in the command you have given," concerning baptism, "and a congregation of people," united through baptism, "will surround you."

554 Then when he says, **although Jesus did not himself baptize**, he explains what he has just said about Christ's baptizing. Augustine says that there is an apparent inconsistency here: for he had stated that Jesus was baptizing, whereas now he says, as though correcting himself, **Jesus did not himself baptize**.

There are two ways to understand this. This first way is that of Chrysostom. What the Evangelist now says is true, i.e., that Christ did not baptize. When he said above that Jesus was baptizing, this was the report received by the Pharisees. For certain people came to the Pharisees and said: You are envious of John because he has disciples and is baptizing. But Jesus is making more disciples than John. and is also baptizing. Why do you put up with him? So the Evangelist is not himself saying that Jesus was baptizing, but only that the Pharisees heard that he was. It is with the intention of correcting this false rumor that the Evangelist says: It is true that the Pharisees heard that Christ was baptizing, but this is not true. So he adds: **although Jesus did not himself baptize, but his disciples did**. And so for Chrysostom, Christ did not baptize,

ante Christi passionem, non dabatur spiritus sanctus; sed ad hoc erat ut assuescerent homines ad Baptismum Christi, et congregarentur ad praedicationem, ut ipse dicit. Inconveniens autem esset quod Christus baptizaret, si non daretur in illo Baptismo spiritus sanctus, quod non dabatur ante Christi passionem: quia, ut dicitur infra VII, 39, *nondum erat spiritus datus, quia nondum Iesus erat glorificatus*.

Sed, secundum Augustinum, dicendum est, et verius, quod discipuli baptizabant Baptismo Christi, aqua scilicet et spiritu, qui in ipso Baptismo dabatur: et etiam ipse Christus baptizabat, et non baptizabat. Baptizabat quidem quia ipse mundabat interius; sed non baptizabat, quia ipse non tingebat aqua exterius; nam discipuli praebebant ministerium per ablutionem corporis, Christus vero praebebat spiritum interius mundantem. Unde ipse proprie baptizabat. Supra I, 33: *supra quem videris spiritum descendentem, et manentem super eum, hic est qui baptizat*.

Ad hoc ergo quod Chrysostomus dicit, quod nondum erat spiritus datus etc., dicendum, quod non erat datus visibilibus signis, sicut post resurrectionem Christi datus est discipulis; sed tamen datus est, et dabatur, per internam sanctificationem, credentibus.

Per hoc autem quod Christus non semper baptizavit, dat nobis exemplum quod maiores Ecclesiarum praelati in his quae per alios fieri possunt, non occupentur, sed ea minoribus facienda relinquant. I Cor. I, 17: *non enim misit me Christus baptizare, sed evangelizare*.

Si autem quaeritur an discipuli Christi baptizati fuerint; dicendum, secundum Augustinum ad Stelentium, quod baptizati fuerunt Baptismo

because the Holy Spirit was not given at any time before the passion of Christ in the baptism of John and his disciples. The purpose of John's baptism was to accustom men to the baptism of Christ and to gather people in order to instruct them, as he says. Moreover, it would not have been fitting for Christ to baptize if the Holy Spirit were not given in his baptism; but the Spirit was not given until after the passion of Christ, as we read below (7:39): "The Spirit had not yet been given, because Jesus had not yet been glorified."

According to Augustine, however, one should say, and this is the preferable way, that the disciples did baptize with the baptism of Christ, that is, in water and the Spirit, and the Spirit was given in this baptism, and also that Christ did and did not baptize. Christ did baptize because he performed the interior cleansing; but he did not baptize because he did not wash them externally with the water. It was the office of the disciples to wash the body, while Christ gave the Spirit which cleansed within. So in the proper sense Christ did baptize, according to: "The man on whom you see the Spirit come down and rest is the one who is to baptize with the Holy Spirit," as was said above (1:33).

With respect to the opinion of Chrysostom that the Holy Spirit was not yet given and so on, we might say that the Spirit was not yet given in visible signs, as he was given to the disciples after the resurrection; nevertheless, the Spirit had been given and was being given to believers through an interior sanctification.

The fact that Christ was not always baptizing gives an example to us that the major prelates of the churches should not occupy themselves with things that can be performed by others, but should allow them to be done by those of lesser rank: "Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the Gospel" (1 Cor 1:17).

555 If someone should ask whether Christ's disciples had been baptized, it could be said, as Augustine answered Stelentius, that

Ioannis, quia aliqui ex discipulis Christi fuerant discipuli Ioannis: sive quod magis credibile est Baptismo Christi; neque enim ministerio baptizandi defuisse creditur, ut haberet baptizatos servos, per quos ceteros baptizaret. Et hoc intelligendum est per hoc quod dicitur Io. XIII, 10: *qui lotus est non indiget nisi ut pedes lavet*. Et postea sequitur: *et ideo vos mundi estis, sed non omnes*.

Consequenter Christi recessum ponit, dicens *reliquit Iudaeam*: et hoc triplici de causa. Una ut subtraheret se invidiae Pharisaeorum, qui ex his quae audierant de Christo, turbabantur, et persecutionem parabant; dans nobis exemplum, ut per mansuetudinem malis cedamus ad tempus. Eccli. VIII, v. 4: *nec strues ligna in ignem illius*. Alia de causa ut ostenderet non esse peccatum persecutores fugere. Matth. X, 23: *si vos persecuti fuerint in una civitate, fugite in aliam*. Tertia causa est, quia nondum venerat tempus suae passionis. Infra II, 4: *tempus meum nondum advenit* et cetera. Est autem et alia causa, propter mysterium: nam per huiusmodi recessum significavit quod discipuli propter persecutionem relicturi erant Iudaeos, et ituri ad gentes.

Consequenter cum dicit *et abiit iterum in Galilaeam*, ostendit locum ad quem accessit. Dicit autem, *iterum*, quia supra II, v. 12 fecerat mentionem de quodam alio descensu Christi in Galilaeam, quo post miraculum nuptiarum descendit Capharnaum. Quia ergo alii tres Evangelistae non faciunt mentionem de illo descensu primo, ideo Evangelista, ut det intelligere quod alii Evangelistae omnia quae dixerunt usque ad istud capitulum, dimiserunt, et ex hoc loco ipse historiam eis contemporaneam texere incepit, dicit *iterum*, per Galilaeam enim, secundum unam interpretationem, intelligitur gentilitas, ad quam Christus a Iudaeis vadit: interpretatur enim Galilaea transmigratio. Secundum aliam interpretationem, per Galilaeam intelligitur caelestis gloria, nam Galilaea revelatio interpretatur.

they had been baptized with the baptism of John, because some of Christ's disciples had been disciples of John. Or, which is more likely, they were baptized with the baptism of Christ, in order that Christ might have baptized servants through whom he would baptize others. This is the meaning of what is said below (13:10): "He who has bathed does not need to wash, except his feet," and then follows, "and you are clean, but not all."

556 He then mentions Christ's going away, **he left Judea**. He left for three reasons. First, to get away from the envy of the Pharisees, who were disturbed because of what they had heard about Christ, and were preparing to harass him. By this he gives us the example that we should, with gentleness, yield ground to evil for a time: "Do not pile wood on his fire" (Sir 8:4). Another reason was to show us that it is not sinful to flee from persecution: "If they persecute you in one town, flee to another" (Mt 10:23). The third reason was that the time of his passion had not yet come: "My time has not yet come" (above 2:4). And there is an additional reason, a mystical one: he indicated by his leaving that because of persecution the disciples were destined to abandon the Jews and go to the Gentiles.

557 Then when he says, **and went again to Galilee**, he shows where he was going. He says, **again**, because above (2:12) he had mentioned another time when Christ went to Galilee: when he went to Capernaum after the miracle at the wedding. Since the other three evangelists did not mention this first trip, the Evangelist says **again** to let us know that the other evangelists had mentioned none of the matters he mentions up to this point, and that he is now beginning to give his account contemporaneous with theirs. According to one interpretation, Galilee is understood to signify the Gentile world, to which Christ passed from the Jews; for Galilee means "passage." According to another interpretation, Galilee signifies the glory of heaven, for Galilee also means "revelation."

Consequenter cum dicit *oportebat autem eum transire per Samariam*, describit medium per quod transit: et primo in generali; secundo in speciali, ibi *venit ergo in civitatem Samariae, quae dicitur Sichar*.

Medium autem quod transit abiens in Galilaeam, est Samaria; et ideo dicit *oportebat eum transire per Samariam*. Dicit autem *oportebat*, ne videatur contrarius suae doctrinae: nam Matth. X, 5, praecepit discipulis, dicens: *in viam gentium ne abieritis*. Quia ergo Samaria terra gentium erat, ideo ostendit quod non ex proposito, sed ex necessitate illuc ivit. Dicit *oportebat*: et ratio huius necessitatis erat, quia Samaria erat sita media inter Iudaeam et Galilaeam.

De ista Samaria sciendum est, quod Amri rex Israel, montem a quodam Somer emit, ut habetur III Reg. XVI, 23 ss., civitatemque quam in montis vertice construxerat, a vendentis nomine Samariam nuncupavit; hac deinde reges Israelitarum pro regia usi sunt, et tota regio ab hac civitate Samaria vocabatur. Unde hoc quod dicitur hic *oportebat eum transire per Samariam*, non est intelligendum per civitatem illam transitum esse facturum, sed per regionem.

Et ideo speciale medium describens, subdit *venit ergo in civitatem Samariae*, idest regionis Samariae, *quae dicitur Sichar*. Sichar enim idem est quod Sichem, secundum aliud nomen: de qua civitate habetur Gen. XXXIII, 16 ss., quod Iacob iuxta eam tetendit tentoria sua, et propter raptum Dinae filiae suae a filio regis Sichem, duo filii Iacob indignati, occiderunt homines civitatis illius; et sic cessit in possessionem Iacob, et habitavit ibi fodiens in ea puteos. Postmodum vero circa mortem suam, dedit eam Ioseph filio suo, secundum quod legitur Gen. XLVIII, 22: *do tibi partem unam extra fratres tuos*. Et hoc est quod dicit *iuxta praedium*, idest agrum, *quod dedit Iacob filio suo*.

Ideo autem haec omnia diligenter Evangelista narrat, ut ostendat quod omnia quae contigerunt circa patriarchas, fuerunt ducentia ad Christum; et quod Christus signatus est per eos, et ab eis secundum carnem descendit.

558 Then he describes the intermediate place through which Christ passed; first in a general way, then specifically.

559 On his way to Galilee, Christ passes through Samaria; hence he says, **He had to pass through Samaria**. He says, **had to pass**, lest he seem to be acting contrary to his own teaching, for Christ says in Matthew (10:5): “Do not go on the roads of the Gentiles.” Now since Samaria was Gentile territory, he shows that he went there of necessity and not by choice. Thus he says, **had to pass**, the reason being that Samaria was between Judea and Galilee.

It was Amri, the king of Israel, who bought the hill of Samaria from a certain Somer (1 Kgs 16:24); and it was there he built the city which he called Samaria, after the name of the person from whom he bought the land. After that, the kings of Israel used it as their royal city, and the entire region surrounding this city was called Samaria. When we read here that Christ **had to pass through Samaria**, we should understand the region rather than the city.

560 Describing it in more detail, he adds, **He came therefore to a city of Samaria**, i.e., of the region of Samaria, **called Sychar**. This Sychar is the same as Shechem. Genesis (33:18) says that Jacob camped near here and that two of his sons, enraged at the rape of Dinah, Jacob’s daughter, by the son of the king of Shechem, killed all the males in that city. And so Jacob took possession of the city, and he lived there and dug many wells. Later, as he lay dying, he gave the land to his son Joseph: “I am giving you a portion more than your brothers” (Gn 48:22). And this is what he says: **near the plot of land which Jacob had given to his son Joseph**.

The Evangelist is so careful to record all these matters in order to show us that all the things which happened to the patriarchs were leading up to Christ, and that they pointed to Christ, and that he descended from them according to the flesh.

Consequenter cum dicit *erat autem ibi fons iacob*, ponit praeambulum doctrinae ex parte rei de qua doctrina tradenda erat. Et hoc congruenter: nam doctrina futura erat de aqua et fonte spirituali, et ideo fit hic mentio de fonte materiali, ex quo sumitur occasio disputandi de fonte spirituali qui est Christus. Ps. XXXV, 10: *apud te est fons vitae*, scilicet spiritus sanctus, qui est spiritus vitae. Item fons est Baptismus, de quo dicitur Zach. XIII, 1: *erit fons patens domui iacob in ablutionem peccatoris et menstruatae*.

Circa hoc tria facit. Primo describit ipsum fontem; secundo sessionem Christi super eum; et tertio sessionis tempus designat.

Fontem quidem describit cum dicit *erat autem ibi fons iacob*. Sed contra. Inferius dicitur *puteus altus est*: non ergo erat fons. Sed dicendum, secundum Augustinum, quod fons erat, et puteus. Omnis enim puteus fons est, sed non convertitur, nam ubi aqua de terra scaturit, fons est: et si quidem aqua in superficie terrae scaturit, fons tantum dicitur; si vero in alto et in profundo scaturit, ita puteus vocatur ut nomen fontis non amittat. Dicitur autem fons iacob, quia ipse puteum illum foderat in terra illa propter defectum aquae, ut dicitur Gen. XXXIV.

Sessio autem Christi innuitur cum subdit *lesus autem fatigatus ex itinere, sedebat sic supra fontem*. Ostendit infirmitatem, quamquam esset virtutis immensae, non propter defectum virtutis, sed ut ostenderet veritatem naturae assumptae. Nam, secundum Augustinum, lesus fortis est, quia (supra I, 1) *in principio erat verbum*, sed infirmus est, quia *verbum caro factum est*. Christus ergo volens ostendere veritatem humanae naturae, permittebat eam agere et pati quae sunt propria homini: volens etiam ostendere in se veritatem divinae naturae, faciebat et operabatur propria Dei. Unde quando retrahebat influxum virtutis divinae a corpore, esuriebat et fatigabatur; quando vero ipsam virtutem divinam corpori exhibebat, sine

561 Then when he says, **This was the site of Jacob's well**, the Evangelist gives the material setting for the spiritual doctrine about to be taught. And this was most fitting: for the doctrine about to be taught was about water and a spiritual font, and so he mentions the material well, thus giving rise to a discussion of the spiritual font, which is Christ: "For with you is the fountain of life" (Ps 35:10), namely, the Holy Spirit, who is the spirit of life. Likewise, the well symbolizes baptism: "On that day a fountain will be open to the house of David, to cleanse the sinner and the unclean" (Zec 13:1).

He does three things here. First, he describes the well. Secondly, Christ's rest at the well. Thirdly, the time.

562 He describes the water source saying, **the site of Jacob's well**. Here one might object that further on (v 11) he says this source is deep; thus it did not gush water like a fountain. I answer, as does Augustine, that it was both a well and gushed water like a fountain. For every well is a fountain, although the converse is not true. For when water gushes from the earth we have a fountain; and if this happens just on the surface, the source is only a fountain. But if the water gushes both on the surface and below, we have a well; although it is also still called a fountain. It is called Jacob's well because he had dug this well there due to a shortage of water, as we read in Genesis (c 34).

563 **Jesus, tired from his journey, rested there at the well**. Jesus reveals his weakness (even though his power was unlimited), not because of a lack of power, but to show us the reality of the [human] nature he assumed. According to Augustine, Jesus is strong, for "In the beginning was the Word" (above 1:1); but he is weak, for "the Word was made flesh" (above 1:14). And so Christ, wishing to show the truth of his human nature, allowed it to do and to endure things proper to men; and to show the truth of his divine nature, he worked and performed things proper to God. Hence when he checked the inflow of divine power to his body, he became hungry and tired; but when he let his divine power

cibo non esuriebat, et in laboribus non fatigabatur. Matth. IV, 2: *ieiunavit quadraginta diebus et quadraginta noctibus, et postea esuriit.*

Ex hoc autem quod Iesus fatigatus est ex itinere, datur nobis exemplum non refugiendi laborem propter salutem aliorum. Ps. LXXXVII, 16: *pauper sum ego, et in laboribus a iuventute mea.* Similiter etiam datur exemplum paupertatis, quia *sedebat sic*, idest super nudam terram.

Mystice autem sessio humilitatem passionis Christi significat. Ps. CXXXVIII, 2: *tu cognovisti sessionem meam* (idest passionem) *et resurrectionem meam.* Item significat auctoritatem docendi, quia loquitur tamquam potestatem habens: unde dicitur Matth. V, 1 s., quod *sedens docebat eos.*

Tempus autem determinatur, cum subdit *hora autem erat quasi sexta.* Et ratio huius determinationis assignatur litteralis et mystica. Litteralis quidem, ut ostendat causam fatigationis: nam in calore, et sexta hora diei, homines magis fatigantur ex labore. Item ut ostendat causam sessionis: libenter enim homines in aestu et calore diei, iuxta aquas quiescunt.

Mystica autem causa assignatur triplex. Una, quia Christus in sexta aetate saeculi in mundum venit, carnem assumens. Alia, quia sexto die homo factus est, et in sexto mense conceptus est Christus. Tertia, quia in sexta hora sol in alto existit, et non restat nisi ut declinet. Sol autem, quantum ad hoc pertinet, temporalem prosperitatem significat, secundum illud Iob XXXI, 26: *si vidi solem cum fulgeret* et cetera. Tunc ergo Christus venit quando prosperitas mundi in alto erat, idest, in cordibus hominum per amorem florebat; sed per eum amor a cordibus hominum declinare debebat.

influence his body, he did not become hungry in spite of a lack of food, and he did not become tired in his labors. "He had fasted forty days and forty nights, and was hungry" (Mt 4:2).

564 Seeing Jesus becoming tired from his journey is an example to us not to shrink from our work for the salvation of others: "I am poor, and have labored since my youth" (Ps 87:16). We also have an example of poverty, as Jesus **rested there**, upon the bare earth.

In its mystical meaning, this resting [literally, a sitting] of Christ indicates the abasement of his passion: "You know when I sit down (i.e., the passion), and when I rise" (Ps 138:2). Also, it indicates the authority of his teaching, for he speaks as one having power; thus we read in Matthew (5:1) that Christ, "sitting down, taught them."

565 He indicates the time, saying, **It was about the sixth hour.** There are both literal and mystical reasons for fixing the time. The literal reason was to show the cause of his tiredness: for men are more weary from work in the heat and at the sixth hour [at noon]. Again, it shows why Christ was resting: for men gladly rest near the water in the heat of the day.

There are three mystical reasons for mentioning the time. First, because Christ assumed flesh and came into the world in the sixth age of the world. Another is that man was made on the sixth day, and Christ was conceived in the sixth month. Third, at the sixth hour the sun is at its highest, and there is nothing left for it but to decline. In this context, the "sun" signifies temporal prosperity, as suggested by Job (31:26): "If I had looked at the sun when it shone, etc." Therefore Christ came when the prosperity of the world was at its highest, that is, it flourished through love in the hearts of men; but because of him natural love was bound to decline.

Consequenter cum dicit *venit mulier de Samaria*, ponitur praeambulum ex parte audientis: et circa hoc duo facit. Primo ponitur persona cui exhibetur doctrina; secundo innuitur praeparatio eius ad doctrinam, ibi *dixit ergo ei mulier illa Samaritana*.

Persona autem, cui exhibetur doctrina, est mulier Samaritana; unde dicit *venit mulier de Samaria haurire aquam*. Mulier ista significat Ecclesiam gentium nondum iustificatam, quae idolatria detinebatur, sed tamen per Christum iustificandam. Venit autem ab alienigenis, scilicet a Samaritanis, qui alienigenae fuerant, licet vicinas terras incolerent: quia Ecclesia de gentibus, aliena a genere Iudaeorum, ventura erat ad Christum; Matth. VIII, 11: *multi venient ab oriente et occidente, et recumbent cum Abraham Isaac et Iacob in regno caelorum*.

Haec autem mulier praeparatur ad doctrinam per Christum, cum dicit *da mihi bibere*. Et primo dat ei occasionem quaerendi; secundo Evangelista interponit quaerendi opportunitatem, ibi *discipuli autem eius abierant*.

Occasio autem et praeparatio mulieris fuit petitio Christi; unde dicit *da mihi bibere*. Petit namque potum, et quia sitiebat aquam propter aestum diei, et quia sitiebat salutem hominis propter amorem eius; unde in cruce pendens dixit: sitio.

Opportunitatem autem quaerendi a muliere habuit Christus, quia non erant ibi discipuli eius, a quibus quaereret aquam; et ideo dicit Evangelista *discipuli enim eius abierant in civitatem*.

Ubi tria de Christo nota: scilicet eius humilitatem, in eo quod solus relinquebatur; dabat enim in hoc exemplum discipulis suis omnem superbiam conculcare. Sed quaereret fortasse aliquis, quae necessitas

566 Next, we have a preliminary remark concerning the one who listens to Christ. First, we are introduced to the person who is taught. Secondly, we are given her preparation for his teaching.

567 The teaching is given to a Samaritan woman; so he says, a **Samaritan woman came to draw water**. This woman signifies the Church, not yet justified, of the Gentiles. It was then involved in idolatry, but was destined to be justified by Christ. She **came** from foreigners, i.e., from the Samaritans, who were foreigners, even though they lived in the neighboring territory: because the Church of the Gentiles, foreign to the Jewish race, would come to Christ: "Many will come from the East and the West, and will sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven," as we find in Matthew (8:11).

568 Christ prepares this woman for his teaching when he says, **Give me a drink**. First, we have the occasion for his asking her. Secondly, the Evangelist suggests why it was opportune to make this request (v 8).

569 The occasion and the preparation of the woman was the request of Christ; thus he says, **Give me a drink**. He asks for a drink both because he was thirsty for water on account of the heat of the day, and because he thirsted for the salvation of man on account of his love. Accordingly, while hanging on the cross he cried out: "I thirst."

570 Christ had the opportunity to ask this of the woman because his disciples, whom he would have asked for the water, were not there, thus the Evangelist says, **His disciples had gone to the town**.

Here we might notice three things about Christ. First, his humility, because **he was left alone**. **This** is an example to his disciples that they should suppress all pride. Someone might ask what need

fuerat assuescere discipulos ad humilitatem, quia piscatores et humiles extiterant, et tabernaculorum factores. Sed advertere debent, qui talia dicunt, quod repente piscatores huiusmodi facti sunt reverentiores omnibus regibus, facundiores philosophis et rhetoribus, et familiares domini orbis terrarum: et tales sic repente promoti consueverunt superbire, utpote inexpertes ad tantum honorem.

Secundo nota Christi parsimoniam: nam ita parum curabat de cibis quod nihil comestibile secum ferebat. Tertio etiam nota, quod dimiserunt eum solum in cruce; Is. LXIII, 3: *torcular calcavi solus, et de gentibus non est vir mecum.*

Praeparavit dominus mulierem ad recipiendum spiritualem doctrinam, dando ei occasionem quaerendi; hic consequenter ponitur quaestio; secundo assignatur ratio quaestionis, ibi *non enim coutuntur Iudaei Samaritanis.*

Sciendum est autem, quod dominus petierat a muliere potum, intendens magis de spirituali quam de corporali potu; mulier vero, potum spiritualem nondum capiens, intendebat solum de corporali; et ideo respondet *quomodo tu, Iudaeus cum sis, bibere a me poscis, quae sum mulier Samaritana?* Christus Iudaeus erat; quia et de Iuda promissus, Gen. XLIX, 10: *non auferetur sceptrum de Iuda, et dux de femore eius, donec veniat qui mittendus est*, et de Iuda natus; Hebr. VII, 14: *manifestum est quod ex Iuda ortus sit dominus noster.* Cognoscebat autem mulier Christum esse Iudaeum ex habitu: nam, sicut dicitur Num. XV, 37 ss., dominus praecepit quod Iudaei portarent fimbrias hyacinthinas in quatuor angulis vestium suarum, ut per eas discernerentur ab aliis populis.

there was to train the disciples in humility, seeing that they had been but lowly fishermen and tentmakers. Those who say such things should remember that these very fishermen were suddenly made more deserving of respect than any king, more eloquent than philosophers and orators, and were the intimate companions of the Lord of creation. Persons of this kind, when they are suddenly promoted, ordinarily become proud, not being accustomed to such great honor.

Secondly, note Christ's temperance: for he was so little concerned about food that he did not bring anything to eat. Thirdly, note that he was also left alone on the cross: "I have trodden the wine press alone, and no one of the people was with me" (Is 63:3).

571 Our Lord prepared the woman to receive his spiritual teaching by giving her an occasion to question him. First, her question is given. Secondly, her reason for asking it (v 9).

572 Here we should point out that our Lord, when asking the woman for a drink, had in mind more a spiritual drink than a merely physical one. But the woman, not yet understanding about such a spiritual drink, though only of a physical drink. So she responds: **How is it that you, being a Jew, ask me, a woman of Samaria, for a drink?** For Christ was a Jew, because it was promised that he would be from Judah: "The scepter will not be taken away from Judah... until he who is to be sent comes" (Gn 49:10); and he was born from Judah: "It is evident that our Lord came from Judah" (Heb 7:14). The woman knew that Christ was Jewish from the way he dressed: for as Numbers (15:37) says, the Lord commanded the Jews to wear tassels on the comers of their garments, and put a violet cord on each tassel, so that they could be distinguished from other people.

Consequenter assignatur ratio quaestionis, sive ab Evangelista, secundum Glossam, sive a muliere, secundum Chrysostomum, cum dicit *non enim coutuntur Iudaei Samaritanis*.

Sciendum est autem circa hoc quod sicut dicitur IV Reg. XVIII, propter peccata populi Israel, scilicet decem tribuum, qui colebant idola, ducti sunt in captivitatem a rege Assyriorum in Babylonem, et ne Samaria absque habitatoribus remaneret, fecit ibi gentes ex diversis locis ductas habitare. Et cum ibi essent, volens dominus ostendere quod non propter imbecillitatem suae virtutis, sed propter Iudaeorum malitiam tradidit eos, immisit ipsis gentibus leones, et saevas bestias, quae eos laedebant. Quae ubi nuntiata sunt regi Assyriorum, habito ex consilio, quod hoc ideo eis contingeret quia non servabant legitima Dei terrae, misit ad eos sacerdotem quemdam ex Iudaeis, traditurum eis Dei legem, secundum legem Moysi. Unde et isti licet non essent ex populo Iudaeorum, servabant tamen legem Moysi; sed cum Deo vero colebant idola, nec prophetis attendebant, et vocabant se Samaritanos a civitate Samariae quae erat sita in monte Somer: III Reg. c. XVI, 24. Revertentibus ergo Iudaeis ex captivitate in Ierusalem, semper infesti fuerunt et contrarii; et, sicut dicitur in Esdra, impediabant eos aedificare templum et civitatem. Et licet Iudaei vitarent omnes alias nationes, specialiter tamen vitabant istos, nec in aliquo coutebantur eis; et hoc est quod dicit *non enim coutuntur Iudaei Samaritanis*. Non dicit quod Samaritani non coutantur Iudaeis, quia libenter voluissent adiungi et couti Iudaeis; sed Iudaei eos repellebant, secundum illud Deut. VII, 2: *non inibis cum eis foedus* et cetera.

573 Then the reason for this question is given: either by the Evangelist, as the Gloss says, or by the woman herself, as Chrysostom says; the reason being, **the Jews had nothing to do with Samaritans.**

Apropos of this, we should note that, as mentioned in 2 Kings, it was on account of their sins that the people of Israel, i.e., of the ten tribes, who were worshipping idols, were captured by the king of the Assyrians, and led as captives into Babylonia. Then, so that Samaria would not remain unpopulated, the king gathered people from various nations and forced them to live there. While they were there, the Lord sent lions and other wild beasts to trouble them; he did this to show that he let the Jews be captured because of their sins, and not because of any lack in his own power. When news of their trouble reached the Assyrian king and he was informed that this was happening because these people were not observing the rites of the God of that territory, he sent them a priest of the Jews who would teach them God's law as found in the law of Moses. This is why, although these people were not Jewish, they came to observe the Mosaic law. However, along with their worship of the true God, they also worshipped idols, paid no attention to the prophets, and referred to themselves as Samaritans, from the city of Samaria which was built on a hill called Somer (1 Kgs 16:24). After the Jews returned to Jerusalem from their captivity, the Samaritans were a constant source of trouble, and as we read in Ezra, interfered with their building of the temple and the city. Although the Jews did not mix with other people, they especially avoided these Samaritans and would have nothing to do with them. And this is what we read: **Jews had nothing to do with the Samaritans.** He does not say that the Samaritans do not associate with Jews, for they would have gladly done so and have cooperated with them. But the Jews rebuffed them in keeping with what is said in Deuteronomy (7:2): "Do not make agreements with them."

Sed si non erat fas Iudaeis cōtū Samaritanis, quare Deus petebat a Samaritana potum? Ad quod, secundum quod dicit Chrysostomus, posset aliquis respondere, quod dominus sciebat eam non sibi tradituram potum, ideo petivit. Sed hoc non sufficit: quia petens quod non licet, a peccato non est immunis, quantum in se est, quin scandalizet, etsi non detur ei quod ipse petit. Et ideo dicendum est, quod, sicut dicitur Matth. XII, v. 8, *filius hominis est dominus etiam sabbati*. Unde tamquam dominus legis poterat uti et non uti lege et observantiis et legalibus, secundum quod sibi expediens videbatur. Et quia imminebat tempus quo gentes vocarentur ad fidem, ipsis gentibus cōtebatur.

574 If it was not lawful for the Jews to associate with Samaritans, why did God ask a Samaritan woman for a drink? One might answer, as Chrysostom does, that the Lord asked her because he knew that she would not give him the drink. But this is not an adequate answer, because one who asks what is not lawful is not free from sin—not to mention the scandal—even though what he asks for is not given to him. So we should say, as we find in Matthew (12:8): “The Son of Man is Lord even of the sabbath.” Thus, as Lord of the law, he was able to use or not use the law and its observances and legalities as it seemed suitable to him. And because the time was near when the nations would be called to the faith, he associated with those nations.

COMMENTARY ON
THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN

St. Thomas Aquinas

Lectio 2

10 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ,

εἰ ᾔδεις τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ

καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ λέγων σοι,

δός μοι πεῖν,

σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας αὐτὸν

καὶ ἔδωκεν ἂν σοι ὕδωρ ζωῶν. 11 λέγει αὐτῷ [ἡ γυνή], κύριε, οὐτε
ἀντλημα ἔχεις καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶν βαθύ: πόθεν οὖν ἔχεις τὸ ὕδωρ
τὸ ζωῶν; 12 μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰακώβ, ὃς ἔδωκεν
ἡμῖν τὸ φρέαρ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔπιεν καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ
θρόεμα αὐτοῦ; 13 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ,

πᾶς ὁ πίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου

διψήσει πάλιν:

14 ὃς δ' ἂν πίῃ ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος οὗ ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ,

οὐ μὴ διψήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,

ἀλλὰ τὸ ὕδωρ ὃ δώσω αὐτῷ

γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος

ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

LECTURE 2

10 Jesus replied and said:

“If you knew the gift of God,
and realized who it is who says to you,
‘Give me a drink,’
You perhaps would have asked him
that he give you living water.”

11 The woman challenged him: “You, sir, have no bucket, and the well
is deep. How then could you have living water? 12 Are you greater
than our father Jacob, who gave us this well and drank from it with his
sons and his flocks?” 13 Jesus replied and said:

“Whoever drinks this water
will be thirsty again,
but whoever drinks the water that I give,
will never be thirsty again.
14 The water that I give
will become a fountain within him,
leaping up to provide eternal life.”

15 “Lord,” the woman said, “Give me this water so that I shall not grow
thirsty and have to keep coming here to draw water.” 16 Jesus said to
her: “Go, call your husband, and then come back here.” 17 “I have no

15 λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ γυνή, κύριε, δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ, ἵνα μὴ διψῶ μηδὲ διέρχωμαι ἐνθάδε ἀντλεῖν. 16 λέγει αὐτῇ, ὕπαγε φώνησον τὸν ἄνδρα σου καὶ ἐλθὲ ἐνθάδε. 17 ἀπεκρίθη ἡ γυνή καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα. λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καλῶς εἶπας ὅτι ἄνδρα οὐκ ἔχω. 18 πέντε γὰρ ἄνδρας ἔσχες, καὶ νῦν ὃν ἔχεις οὐκ ἔστιν σου ἀνὴρ· τοῦτο ἀληθὲς εἶρηκας. 19 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή, κύριε, θεωρῶ ὅτι προφήτης εἶ σύ. 20 οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ προσεκύνησαν· καὶ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐστὶν ὁ τόπος ὅπου προσκυνεῖν δεῖ. 21 λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,

πίστευέ μοι, γύναι,
ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα
ὅτε οὔτε ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ
οὔτε ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις
προσκυνήσετε τῷ πατρὶ.
22 ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ οἶδατε·
ἡμεῖς προσκυνοῦμεν ὃ οἶδαμεν,
ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν.
23 ἀλλὰ ἔρχεται ὥρα, καὶ νῦν ἐστίν,
ὅτε οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταὶ
προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ πατρὶ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ·
καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ τοιούτους ζητεῖ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν.
24 πνεῦμα ὁ θεός,
καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτὸν
ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν.

25 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή, οἶδα ὅτι μεσσίας ἔρχεται, ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός· ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν ἅπαντα. 26 λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,

ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι.

husband,” replied the woman. Jesus said, “You are right in saying you have no husband, 18 for you have had five, and the man you are living with now is not your husband. What you said is true.” 19 “Sir,” said the woman, “I see that you are a prophet. 20 Our ancestors worshiped on this mountain, but you people claim that Jerusalem is the place where men must worship God.” 21 Jesus said to her:

“Believe me, woman,
the hour is coming
when you will worship the Father
neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem.
22 You people worship what
you do not understand,
while we understand what we worship,
since salvation is from the Jews.
23 But the hour is coming, and is now here,
when true worshipers will worship the Father
in spirit and in truth.
Indeed, it is just such worshipers the Father seeks.
24 God is spirit,
and those who worship him
ought to worship in spirit and truth.”

25 The woman said to him: “I know that the Messiah is coming, the one called Christ; when he comes he will tell us everything.” 26 Jesus replied:

“I who speak to you am he.”

Consequenter cum dicit *respondit Iesus et dixit ei* etc., narrat Evangelista ipsam doctrinam spiritualem. Et primo ponitur ipsa doctrina; secundo effectus doctrinae, ibi *et continuo venerunt discipuli eius*. Circa primum duo facit. Primo ponit summarie totam doctrinam; secundo explicat eam per partes, ibi *dixit ei mulier: domine, neque in quo haurias habes, et puteus altus est*.

Dixit ergo: tu miraris quod ego Iudaeus potum petii a te Samaritana; sed non debes mirari, quia ad hoc veni ut etiam gentibus potum darem. Et ideo dixit *si scires donum Dei, et quis est qui dicit tibi, da mihi bibere, tu forsitan petisses ab eo*.

Et, ut incipiamus ab ultimo, requirendum est quid intelligatur per aquam. Et dicendum, quod per aquam intelligitur gratia spiritus sancti: quae quidem quandoque dicitur ignis, quandoque aqua, ut ostendatur quod nec hoc, nec illud dicitur secundum substantiae proprietatem, sed secundum similitudinem actionis. Nam ignis dicitur, quia elevat cor per fervorem et calorem, Rom. XII, 11: *spiritu ferventes* etc. et quia consumit peccata; Cant. VIII: *lampades eius, lampades ignis atque flammarum*. Aqua vero dicitur propter purificationem; Ez. XXXVI, 25: *effundam super vos aquam mundam, et mundabimini ab omnibus inquinamentis vestris*. Et propter refrigerationem ab aestibus tentationum; Eccli. c. III, 33: *ignem ardentem extinguit aqua*. Et propter satietatem contra sitim terrenorum, et quorumcumque temporalium; Is. LV, 1: *omnes sitientes, venite ad aquas*.

Est autem duplex aqua: scilicet viva et non viva. Non viva quidem est quae non continuatur suo principio unde scaturit; sed collecta de pluvia, seu aliunde, in lacunas et cisternas a suo principio separata servatur. Viva autem aqua est quae suo principio continuatur, et effluit. Secundum hoc ergo gratia spiritus sancti recte dicitur aqua viva, quia ita ipsa gratia spiritus sancti datur homini quod tamen ipse fons gratiae datur, scilicet spiritus sanctus. Immo per ipsum datur gratia; Rom. V, 5: *caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per*

575 Now (v 10), the Evangelist gives us Christ's spiritual teaching. First, he gives the teaching itself. Secondly, the effect it had (v 27). As to the first, he does two things. First, a summary of the entire instruction is given. Secondly, he unfolds it part by part (v 11).

576 He said therefore: You are amazed that I, a Jew, should ask you, a Samaritan woman, for water; but you should not be amazed, because I have come to give drink, even to the Gentiles. Thus he says: **If you knew the gift of God, and realized who it is who says to you, Give me a drink, you perhaps would have asked him.**

577 We may begin with what is last, and we should know first what is to be understood by water. And we should say that water signifies the grace of the Holy Spirit. Sometimes this grace is called fire, and at other times water, to show that it is neither one of these in its nature, but like them in the way it acts. It is called fire because it lifts up our hearts by its ardor and heat: "ardent in Spirit" (Rom 12:11), and because it burns up sins: "Its light is fire and flame" (Sg 8:6). Grace is called water because it cleanses: "I will pour clean water upon you, and you will be cleansed from all your uncleanness" (Ez 36:25), and because it brings a refreshing relief from the heat of temptations: "Water quenches a flaming fire" (Sir 3:33), and also because it satisfies our desires, in contrast to our thirst for earthly things and all temporal things whatever: "Come to the waters, all you who thirst" (Is 55:1).

Now water is of two kinds: living and non-living. Non-living water is water which is not connected or united with the source from which it springs, but is collected from the rain or in other ways into ponds and cisterns, and there it stands, separated from its source. But living water is connected with its source and flows from it. So according to this understanding, the grace of the Holy Spirit is correctly called living water, because the grace of the Holy Spirit is given to man in such a way that the source itself of the grace is also given, that is, the Holy Spirit. Indeed,

spiritum sanctum, qui datus est nobis. Nam ipse spiritus sanctus est fons indeficiens, a quo omnia dona gratiarum effluunt; I Cor. XIII, 11: *haec omnia operatur unus atque idem spiritus* et cetera. Et inde est quod si aliquis donum spiritus sancti habeat, et non spiritum, aqua non continuatur suo principio, et ideo est mortua, et non viva; Iac. II, v. 20: *fides sine operibus mortua est.* Sic ergo patet quid per aquam intelligatur.

Sed consequenter ostenditur, quod ad habendum aquam vivam, idest gratiam, in adultis per desiderium pervenitur, idest per petitionem; Ps. IX, 17: *desiderium pauperum exaudivit dominus*, quia absque petitione et desiderio non datur alicui gratia. Unde dicimus quod in iustificatione impii requiritur liberum arbitrium ad detestandum peccata et ad desiderandum gratiam, secundum illud Matth. VII, 7: *petite, et accipietis.* Intantum enim requiritur desiderium, quod etiam ipse filius ad petendum inducitur; Ps. II, 8: *postula a me, et dabo tibi.* Unde nec aliquis contradicens gratiae eam recipit, nisi prius reducatur ad desiderium gratiae, sicut patet in Paulo, qui antequam gratiam reciperet, reductus est ad desiderium gratiae, dicens, Act. IX, 6, *domine, quid me vis facere?* Et inde est quod signanter dicitur *tu forsitan petisses ab eo.* Et dicit *forsitan*, propter liberum arbitrium, quo homo aliquando desiderat et petit gratiam, aliquando non.

Sed ad petendum gratiam incitatur desiderium hominis ex duobus, scilicet ex cognitione desiderandi boni, et ex cognitione datoris: et ideo duo cognoscenda proponit. Primo scilicet ipsum donum; unde dicit *si scires donum Dei*, quod est omne bonum desiderabile, quod est a spiritu sancto; Sap. c. VIII, 21: *scio quod non possum esse continens, nisi Deus det.* Et hoc donum Dei est et cetera. Secundo proponit ipsum datorem; unde dicit *et quis est qui dicit tibi* etc., scilicet, si scires eum qui dare potest, qui sum ego; infra XV, 26: *cum venerit Paraclitus, quem ego mittam vobis a patre (...) ille testimonium perhibebit de me;* Ps. LXVII, 19: *dedit dona hominibus.*

grace is given by the Holy Spirit: "The love of God is poured out into our hearts by the Holy Spirit, who has been given to us" (Rom 5:5). For the Holy Spirit is the unfailing fountain from whom all gifts of grace flow" One and the same Spirit does all these things" (1 Cor 12:5,1.). And so, if anyone has a gift of the Holy Spirit without having the Spirit, the water is not united with its source, and so is not living but dead: "Faith without works is dead" (Jas 2:20).

578 Then we are shown that in the case of adults, living water, i.e., grace, is obtained by desiring it, i.e., by asking. "The Lord has heard the desire of the poor" (Ps. 9:17), for grace is not given to anyone without their asking and desiring it. Thus we say that in the justification of a sinner an act of free will is necessary to detest sin and to desire grace, according to Matthew (7:7): "Ask and you will receive." In fact, desire is so important that even the Son himself is told to ask: "Ask me, and I will give to you" (Ps 2:8). Therefore, no one who resists grace receives it, unless he first desires it; this is clear in the case of Paul who, before he received grace, desired it, saying: "Lord, what do you want me to do?" (Acts 9:6). Thus it is significant that he says, you perhaps would have asked him. He says perhaps on account of free will, with which a person sometimes desires and asks for grace, and sometimes does not.

579 There are two things which lead a person to desire and ask for grace: a knowledge of the good to be desired and a knowledge of the giver. So, Christ offers these two to her. First of all, a knowledge of the gift itself; hence he says, If you knew the gift of God, which is every desirable good which comes from the Holy Spirit: "I know that I cannot control myself unless God grants it to me" (Wis 8:2 1). And this is a gift of God, and so forth. Secondly, he mentions the giver; and he says, and realized who it is who says to you, i.e., if you knew the one who can give it, namely, that it is I: "When the Paraclete comes, whom I will send you from the Father, the Spirit of truth... he will bear witness to me" (below 15:26); "You have given gifts to men" (Ps 67:19).

Sic ergo haec doctrina est de tribus: scilicet de dono aquae vivae, de petitione ipsius doni et de datore eius.

Et ideo cum dicit *dixit ei mulier* etc., de ipsa doctrina tractat explicite quantum ad haec tria: et primo quantum ad donum; secundo quantum ad petitionem, ibi *dicit ei mulier: domine, ut video, propheta es tu*; tertio quantum ad datorem, ibi *dicit ei mulier: scio quia Messias venit* et cetera. Circa primum duo facit. Primo explicat donum, ostendendo eius virtutem; secundo agit de perfectione ipsius doni, ibi *dicit ei mulier: domine, da mihi hanc aquam* et cetera. Circa primum duo facit. Primo ponitur inquisitio mulieris; secundo responsio Christi, ibi *respondit Iesus, et dixit ei: omnis qui biberit ex aqua hac, sitiet iterum*.

Circa primum sciendum est, quod mulier ista Samaritana, verba quae dominus spiritualiter intelligebat, carnaliter accipiebat, quia erat animalis. I Cor. II, 14: *animalis homo non percipit ea quae sunt spiritus Dei*. Et ideo verba quae dominus dicebat, quasi inconvenientia et impossibilia, argumento quodam utens, infringere conabatur, hoc modo: tu promittis mihi aquam vivam, aut ergo de isto puteo, aut de alio; sed non de isto, quia *nec in quo haurias habes, et puteus altus est*; de alio autem non videtur credibile quod dare possis, quia *non maior es patre nostro Iacob, qui dedit nobis puteum*.

Primo ergo prosequens primum, videamus hoc quod dicit *domine, neque in quo haurias habes*, idest hauritorio cares, quo aquam de puteo extrahere possis, et *puteus altus est*, scilicet ut absque hauritorio manu non possis attingere.

Per altitudinem, seu profunditatem putei, intelligitur sacrae Scripturae profunditas, et sapientiae divinae; Eccle. VII, 25: *alta profunditas et quis*, etc.; hauritorium autem quo aqua sapientiae salutaris hauritur, est oratio; Iac. I, 5: *si quis indiget sapientia, postulet a Deo*.

Accordingly, this teaching concerns three things: the gift of living water, asking for this gift, and the giver himself.

580 When he says, The woman challenged him, he treats these three things explicitly. First, the gift; secondly, asking for the gift (v 19); and thirdly, the giver (v 25). He does two things about the first. First, he explains the gift by showing its power. Secondly, he considers the perfection of the gift (v 15). About the first he does two things. First, he gives the woman's request. Secondly, Christ's answer (v 13).

581 We should note, with respect to the first, that this Samaritan woman, because she was sensual, understood in a worldly sense what the Lord understood in a spiritual sense: "The sensual man does not perceive those things that pertain to the Spirit of God" (1 Cor 2:14). Consequently, she tried to reject what our Lord said as unreasonable and impossible with the following argument: You promise me living water; and it must come either from this well or from another one. But it cannot come from this well because **You, sir, have no bucket, and the well is deep**; and it does not seem probable that you can get it from some other well, because you are not **greater than our father Jacob, who gave us this well**.

582 Let us first examine what she says, **You, sir, have no bucket**, i.e., no pail to use to draw water from the well, **and the well is deep**, so you cannot reach the water by hand without a bucket.

The depth of the well signifies the depth of Sacred Scripture and of divine wisdom: "It has great depth. Who can find it out?" (Ecc 7:25). The bucket with which the water of wisdom is drawn out is prayer: "If any of you lack wisdom, ask God" (Jas 1:5).

Secundum ostendit, cum dicit *numquid tu es maior patre nostro iacob, qui dedit nobis puteum?* etc.; quasi dicat: numquid meliorem aquam habes ad dandum nobis quam iacob? Dicit autem patrem suum iacob, non quod Samaritani de generatione sint iacob, ut ex supradictis apparet, sed quia legem Moysi habebant, et quia intraverunt terram semini iacob repromissam.

Commendat autem mulier ista puteum istum ex tribus. Primo ex auctoritate dantis; unde dicit *patre nostro iacob, qui dedit nobis puteum*. Secundo ex suavitate aquae, et dicit, quod *ipse iacob ex eo bibit, et filii eius*: nisi enim fuisset suavis, non ipsi bibissent, sed pecoribus eam tradidissent. Tertio ex ubertate, cum dicit *et pecora eius*: quia enim erat suavis, nisi fuisset uberrima, non dedissent eam pecoribus.

Sic et sacra Scriptura magna est auctoritate, quia a spiritu sancto est data; delectabilis est suavitate, Ps. c. CXVIII, 103: *quam dulcia sunt faucibus meis eloquia tua*. Iterum fecunda est ubertate, quia non solum sapientibus, sed etiam insipientibus communicatur.

Consequenter cum dicit *respondit iesus* etc. ponitur responsio domini, ubi explicat virtutem suae doctrinae: et primo quantum ad hoc quod dixerat eam esse aquam; secundo quantum ad hoc quod dixerat eam esse aquam vivam, ibi *sed aqua quam ego dabo ei, fiet in eo fons aquae salientis in vitam aeternam*.

Ostendit autem, quod doctrina sua sit optima aqua, ex hoc quod habet aquae effectum, scilicet quod auferat sitim multo amplius quam aqua ista corporalis; ostendens se in hoc esse maiorem quam iacob. Et ideo dicit *respondit iesus, et dixit ei*, quasi dicat: tu dicis, quod iacob dedit vobis puteum, sed ego dabo aquam meliorem, quia *omnis qui biberit ex hac aqua*, scilicet corporali vel carnalis cupiditatis et concupiscentiae, licet ad horam sedetur appetitus, tamen *sitiet iterum*, quia insatiabilis est delectationis appetitus; Prov. XXIII, 35: *quando evigilabo, et rursus vina reperiam?* Sed *qui biberit*

583 The second point is given at, **Are you greater than our father Jacob, who gave us this well?** As if to say: Have you better water to give us than Jacob? She calls Jacob her father not because the Samaritans were descendants of the Jews, as is clear from what was said before, but because the Samaritans had the Mosaic law, and because they occupied the land promised to the descendants of Jacob.

The woman praised this well on three counts. First, on the authority of the one who gave it; so she says: our father Jacob, who gave us this well. Secondly, on account of the freshness of its water, saying: Jacob drank from it with his sons: for they would not drink it if it were not fresh, but only give it to their cattle. Thirdly, she praises its abundance, saying, and his flocks: for since the water was fresh, they would not have given it to their flocks unless it were also abundant.

So, too, Sacred Scripture has great authority: for it was given by the Holy Spirit. It is delightfully fresh: “How sweet are your words to my palate” (Ps 118:103). Finally, it is exceedingly abundant, for it is given not only to the wise, but also to the unwise.

584 Then when he says, Jesus replied and said, he sets down the Lord’s response, in which he explains the power of his doctrine. First, with respect to the fact that he had called it water. Secondly, with respect to the fact that he called it living water (v 14).

585 He shows that his doctrine is the best water because it has the effect of water, that is, it takes away thirst much more than does that natural water. He shows by this that he is greater than Jacob. So he says, **Jesus replied and said**, as if to say: You say that Jacob gave you a well; but I will give you better water, because **whoever drinks this water**, that is, natural water, or the water of sensual desire and concupiscence, although it may satisfy his appetite for a while, **will be thirsty again**, because the desire for pleasure is insatiable: “When will I wake up and find wine again?” (Prv 23:35). **But whoever drinks the water**, that is, spiritual water, **that I give, will never be thirsty**

ex hac aqua, scilicet spirituali, quam ego dabo ei, non sitiet in aeternum; Is. penult., 13: servi mei bibent, et vos sitietis.

Sed contra. Eccli. XXIV, 29, dicitur: *qui bibunt me, adhuc sitient*. Quomodo ergo non sitiet in aeternum qui biberit ex hac aqua, scilicet divina sapientia, cum ipsa sapientia dicat: *qui bibunt me, adhuc sitient*? Sed dicendum, quod utrumque verum est: quia qui bibit ex aqua quam Christus dat et sitit adhuc et non sitit; sed qui bibit ex aqua corporali, sitiet iterum: et hoc propter duo. Primo, quia aqua materialis et carnalis non est perpetua, nec causam perpetuam habet, sed deficientem: unde et effectus oportet quod cesset; Sap. V, 9: *transierunt haec omnia quasi umbra* et cetera. Aqua vero spiritualis causam perpetuam habet, scilicet spiritum sanctum, qui est fons vitae, numquam deficiens: et ideo qui ex ea bibit, non sitiet in aeternum; sicut qui haberet in ventre fontem aquae vivae, non sitiret unquam.

Alia ratio est, quia differentia est inter rem spiritualem et temporalem. Licet enim utraque generet sitim, tamen aliter et aliter: quia res temporalis habita, causat quidem sitim non sui ipsius, sed alterius rei; spiritualis vero tollit sitim alterius rei, et causat sui ipsius sitim. Cuius ratio est, quia res temporalis antequam habeatur, aestimatur magni pretii et sufficiens; sed postquam habetur, quia nec tanta, nec sufficiens ad quietandum desiderium invenitur, ideo non satiat desiderium, quin ad aliud habendum moveatur. Res vero spiritualis non cognoscitur, nisi cum habetur Apoc. II, 17: *nemo novit nisi qui accipit*. Et ideo non habita, non movet desiderium; sed cum habetur et cognoscitur, tunc delectat affectum et movet desiderium, non quidem ad aliud habendum, sed quia imperfecte percipitur propter recipientis imperfectionem, movet ut ipsa perfecte habeatur. Et de hac siti dicitur in Ps. XLI, 2: *sitivit anima mea ad Deum fontem vivum*. Sed haec sitis in mundo isto usquequaque non tollitur, quia bona spiritualia in vita ista percipere non possumus; et ideo qui biberit ex hac aqua, adhuc quidem sitiet eius perfectionem; sed non sitiet in aeternum, quasi ipsa aqua deficiat; quia, ut dicitur in Ps. XXXV, 9: *inebriabuntur ab ubertate domus tuae*. In vita autem gloriae, ubi

again. “My servants will drink, and you will be thirsty,” as said in Isaiah (65:13).

586 Since we read in Sirach (24:29): “Those who drink me will still thirst,” how is it possible that we will never be thirsty if we drink this water of divine wisdom, since this Wisdom itself says we will still thirst? I answer that both are true: because he who drinks the water that Christ gives still thirsts and does not thirst. But whoever drinks natural water will become thirsty again for two reasons. First, because material and natural water is not eternal, and it does not have an eternal cause, but an impermanent one; therefore its effects must also cease: “All these things have passed away like a shadow” (Wis 5:9). But spiritual water has an eternal cause, that is, the Holy Spirit, who is the unfailing fountain of life. Accordingly, he who drinks of this will never thirst; just as someone who had within himself a fountain of living water would never thirst.

The other reason is that there is a difference between a spiritual and a temporal thing. For although each produces a thirst, they do so in different ways. When a temporal thing is possessed it causes us to be thirsty, not for the thing itself, but for something else; while a spiritual thing when possessed takes away the thirst for other things, and causes us to thirst for it. The reason for this is that before temporal things are possessed, they are highly regarded and thought satisfying; but after they are possessed, they are found to be neither so great as thought nor sufficient to satisfy our desires, and so our desires are not satisfied but move on to something else. On the other hand, a spiritual thing is not known unless it is possessed: “No one knows but he who receives it” (Rv 2:17). So, when it is not possessed, it does not produce a desire; but once it is possessed and known, then it brings pleasure and produces desire, but not to possess something else. Yet, because it is imperfectly known on account of the deficiency of the one receiving it, it produces a desire in us to possess it perfectly. We read of this thirst: “My soul thirsted for God, the living fountain” (Ps 41:2). This thirst is not completely taken away in this world because in this life we cannot understand spiritual things; consequently, one who drinks this water will

beati perfecte bibunt aquam divinae gratiae, non sitient in aeternum; Matth. c. V, 6: *beati qui esuriunt et sitiunt iustitiam*, scilicet in mundo isto, *quia saturabuntur* in vita gloriae.

Consequenter cum dicit *sed aqua quam ego dabo ei, fiet in eo fons aquae salientis in vitam aeternam*, ostendit doctrinam suam esse aquam vivam ex motu ipsius aquae; unde dicit, quod est fons decurrens, Ps. XIV, 5: *fluminis impetus laetificat civitatem Dei*.

Sed alius est cursus aquae materialis, scilicet deorsum, alius istius spiritualis, quia ducit sursum; et ideo dicit: dico, quod talis est aqua materialis quod non tollit sitim, sed aqua quam ego do, non solum sitim aufert, sed est viva quia est coniuncta fonti; unde dicit quod *fiet in eo fons*: fons, inquam perducens per bona opera ad vitam aeternam. Ideo dicit *aquae salientis*, idest salire facientis, *in vitam aeternam*, ubi non est sitis, infra c. VII, 38: *qui credit in me, flumina*, scilicet bonorum desideriorum, *de ventre eius fluent aquae vivae*; Ps. XXXV, 10: *apud te est fons vitae*.

Consequenter cum dicit *dixit ad eum mulier*, agitur de petitione doni: et primo ponitur modus percipiendi ipsum donum; secundo convincitur mulier, ibi *dixit ei Iesus: bene dixisti* et cetera. Modus percipiendi, ut dictum est, est per orationem et petitionem: et ideo primo ponitur petitio mulieris; secundo responsio Christi, ibi *dixit ei Iesus, vade* et cetera.

Quantum ad primum notandum, quod mulier ista in exordio collationis mutuae, Christum non vocavit dominum, sed simpliciter Iudaeum, dicens: *quomodo tu, Iudaeus cum sis, bibere a me poscis?* Hic vero statim cum audit eum fore sibi utilem, et aquam dare posse, dominum eum vocat; unde *dixit ad eum mulier: domine, da mihi hanc aquam*.

still thirst for its completion. But he will not always be thirsty, as though the water will run out, for we read (Ps 35:9): “They will be intoxicated from the richness of your house.” In the life of glory, where the blessed drink perfectly the water of divine grace, they will never be thirsty again: “Blessed are they who hunger and thirst for what is right,” that is, in this world, “for they will be satisfied,” in the life of glory” (Mt 5:6).

587 Then when he says, **The water that I give will become a fountain within him, leaping up to provide eternal life**, he shows from the movement of the water that his doctrine is living water; thus he says that it is a leaping fountain: “The streams of the river bring joy to the city of God” (Ps 45:4).

The course of material water is downward, and this is different from the course of spiritual water, which is upward. Thus he says: I say that material water is such that it does not slake your thirst; but the water that I give not only quenches your thirst, but it is a living water because it is united with its source. Hence he says that this water **will become a fountain within** one: a fountain leading, through good works, to eternal life. So he says, **leaping up**, that is, making us leap up, **to eternal life**, where there is no thirst: “He who believes in me, out of his heart there will flow rivers “ that is, of good desires, “of living water” (below 7:38); “With you is the fountain of life” (Ps 3 5:10).

588 Then when he says, **The woman said**, he states her request for the gift. First, her understanding of the gift is noted. Secondly, the woman is found guilty (v 17). As was said, the way to obtain this gift is by prayer and request. And so first, we have the woman’s request. Secondly, Christ’s answer (v 16).

589 We should note with respect to the first that at the beginning of this conversation the woman did not refer to Christ as “Lord,” but simply as a Jew, for she said: “How is it that you, being a Jew, ask me, a woman of Samaria, for a drink?” But now as soon as she hears that he can be of use to her and give her water, she calls him “Lord”: Lord, give me this

Quia enim hoc carnaliter intelligebat, et duplici corporali necessitate tenebatur, scilicet sitis et laboris, veniendo ad puteum et portando, ideo aquam petens, haec duo allegat, dicens quo ad primum, *ut non sitiam*; et quo ad secundum, *neque veniam huc haurire*. Naturaliter enim homo laborem refugit; Ps. LXXII, 5: *in labore hominum non sunt*.

Dixit ei Iesus: vade, et cetera. Hic ponitur responsio domini. Sed sciendum est, quod dominus respondebat spiritualiter, sed mulier intellexit carnaliter: et ideo potest hoc dupliciter exponi. Uno modo secundum Chrysostomum, qui dicit, quod dominus volebat dare aquam spiritualis doctrinae non sibi soli, sed specialiter viro suo; quia, ut dicitur I Cor. c. XI, 3, *caput mulieris vir*, et ideo voluit ut praecepta Dei ad mulierem per virum devenirent, I Cor. XIV, 35, dicitur quod *si mulier aliquid addiscere vult, domi virum interroget*. Et ideo dicit *vade, voca virum tuum, et veni huc*; et tunc cum eo et per eum dabo tibi.

Alio modo, secundum Augustinum, exponitur mystice. Nam sicut de aqua dominus figurative loquebatur, ita de viro. Vir autem iste, secundum Augustinum, est intellectus: nam voluntas parit et concipit a vi apprehensiva movente eam: unde voluntas est sicut mulier; ratio vero movens voluntatem est vir eius. Quia ergo mulier, idest voluntas, prompta erat ad recipiendum, sed non movebatur ab intellectu et ratione, ut specialiter hoc intelligeret sed adhuc sub sensu detinebatur, ideo dominus dixit ei *vade*, tu sensualis, *voca virum tuum*, idest, rationabilem intellectum advoca, quo spiritualiter et intelligibiliter intelligas quod modo carnaliter sapis; *et veni huc*, intelligendo ducta ratione. *Respondit mulier*, et cetera.

Hic convincitur a Christo mulier. Et primo ponitur eius responsio; secundo contestatio qua convincitur a Christo, ibi *bene dixisti*.

water. For she was thinking of natural water, and was subject to the two natural necessities of thirst and labor, that is, of going to the well and of carrying the water. So she mentions these two things when asking for the water: saying in reference to the first, **so that I shall not grow thirsty**; and in reference to the second, **and have to keep coming here to draw water**, for man naturally shrinks from labor: “They do not labor as other men” (Ps 72:5).

590 Then (v 16), the answer of Jesus is given. Here we should note that our Lord answered her in a spiritual way, but she understood in a sensual way. Accordingly, this can be explained in two ways. One way is that of Chrysostom, who says that our Lord intended to give the water of spiritual instruction not only to her, but especially to her husband, for as is said, “Man is the head of woman” (1 Cor 11:3), so that Christ wanted God’s precepts to reach women through men, and “If the wife wishes to learn anything, let her ask her husband at home” (1 Cor 14:35). So he says, **Go, call your husband, and then come back here**; and then I will give it to you with him and through him.

Augustine explains it another way, mystically. For as Christ spoke symbolically of water, he did the same of her husband. Her husband, according to Augustine, is the intellect: for the will brings forth and conceives because of the cognitive power that moves it; thus the will is like a woman, while the reason, which moves the will, is like her husband. Here the woman, i.e., the will, was ready to receive, but was not moved by the intellect and reason to a correct understanding, but was still detained on the level of sense. For this reason the Lord said to her, Go, you who are still sensual, **call your husband**, call in the reasoning intellect so you can understand in a spiritual and intellectual way what you now perceive in a sensual way; **and then come back here**, by understanding under the guidance of reason.

591 Here (v 17), the woman is found guilty by Christ. First, her answer is set down. Secondly, the encounter in which she is found guilty by Christ.

Circa primum sciendum est, quod mulier turpitudinem suam occultare volens, et Christum sicut purum hominem credens, licet verum responderit Christo, tamen fecte et occulte dedecus suum tacebat; quia, secundum quod dicitur Eccli. IX, 10: *mulier fornicaria quasi stercus in via conculcabitur*. Et ideo *respondit et dixit: virum non habeo*. Et verum erat: quia licet ante plures habuerit, scilicet quinque, nunc vero non legitimum habebat virum, sed cuidam adhaeserat; et ideo convincitur a domino.

Unde dicit *dixit ei Iesus: bene dixisti, quia non habeo virum*, scilicet legitimum; *quinque enim viros habuisti*, ante ipsum, *et nunc quem habes*, idest hoc modo uteris ut viro, *non est tuus vir; hoc vere dixisti*: quia virum non habes. Ideo autem dixit ei dominus ea quae ab ea non didicerat, et occulta sibi videbantur, ut mulierem ad spiritualem intelligentiam reducat et credat, in Christo aliquid divinum esse.

Mystice autem quinque viri sunt quinque libri Moysi, quia Samaritani, ut dictum est, eos recipiebant; et ideo dicit *quinque enim viros habuisti; et nunc quem habes*, idest quem audis, scilicet Christum, non est tuus vir, quia non credis.

Sed, ut dicit Augustinus, haec expositio non est bona, quia mulier ista dimissis quinque viris, venit ad hunc quem habebat, sed isti qui veniunt ad Christum, non dimiserunt quinque libros Moysi. Et ideo aliter dicendum, quod *quinque viros habuisti*, idest quinque sensus, quibus usque modo utebaris; sed hunc quem habes, scilicet rationem errantem, qua spiritualiter dicta adhuc carnaliter intelligis, *non est tuus vir*, legitimus, sed adulter; et ideo tolle istum adulterum errorem, qui te corrumpit et *voca virum tuum*, idest intellectum, ut intelligas me.

592 As to the first, we should note that the woman, desiring to hide her wrongdoing, and regarding Christ as only a mere man, did answer Christ truthfully, although she keep silent about her sin, for as we read, “A fornicating woman will be walked on like dung in the road” (Sir 9:10). She said, **I have no husband**. This was true; for although she previously had a number of husbands, five of them, she did not now have a lawful husband, but was just living with a man; and it is for this that the Lord judges her.

593 Then the Evangelist reports that Jesus said to her: **You are right in saying you have no husband**, a legitimate husband; **for you have had five**, before this one, **and the man you are living with now**, using as a husband, **is not your husband**. **What you said is true**, because you do not have a husband. The reason our Lord spoke to her about these things he had not learned from her and which were her secrets, was to bring her to a spiritual understanding so that she might believe there was something divine about Christ.

594 In the mystical sense, her five husbands are the five books of Moses: for, as was said, the Samaritans accepted these. And so Christ says, **you have had five**, and then follows [understanding Christ’s words in a slightly different sense, as meaning:] **and he whom you now have**, i.e., he to whom you are now listening, i.e., Christ, **is not your husband**, because you do not believe.

This explanation, as Augustine says, is not very good. For this woman came to her present “husband” after having left the other five, whereas those who come to Christ do not put aside the five books of Moses. We should rather say, **you have had five**, i.e., the five senses, which you have used up to this time; but **the man you are living with now**, i.e., an erring reason, with which you still understand spiritual things in a sensual way, **is not your lawful husband**, but an adulterer who is corrupting you. **Call your husband**, i.e., your intellect, so that you may really understand me.

Hic agitur de petitione qua donum acquiritur, quae est oratio. Et primo ponitur quaestio mulieris de oratione; secundo responsio Christi, ibi *dixit ei Iesus: mulier, crede mihi*. Circa primum duo facit mulier. Primo confitetur idoneitatem Christi ad respondendum quaestioni; secundo quaestionem proponit, ibi *patres nostri in monte hoc adoraverunt*, et cetera.

Mulier autem ista auditis quae Christus de occultis ei manifestaverat, quem usque modo purum hominem credidit, nunc prophetam confitetur, idoneum ad satisfaciendum de dubiis. Hoc est proprium prophetarum, ut absentia et incognita annuntient; I Reg. IX, 9: *qui olim dicebatur videns, nunc dicitur propheta*. Et ideo dicit *domine, ut video, propheta es tu*; quasi dicat: in hoc quod occulta mihi dicis, ostenderis propheta. In quo, secundum Augustinum, patet quod coepit ad eam venire vir, sed non plene venit: quia dominum prophetam putabat: licet enim propheta esset, Matth. XIII, 57: *non est propheta sine honore nisi in patria sua*: tamen erat plusquam propheta, quia prophetas ipse constituit; Sap. VII, 27: *in animas sanctas per nationes se transfert, amicos Dei et prophetas constituit*.

Consequenter ponit quaestionem de oratione, dicens *patres nostri in monte hoc adoraverunt; et vos dicitis quia Ierosolymis est locus ubi adorare oportet*. In quo admiranda est mulieris diligentia, quia mulieres, utpote curiosae et infructuosae, et non solum infructuosae, sed et otiosae, I Tim. V, non de mundanis, non de futuris eum interrogabat, sed de his quae Dei sunt; secundum illud Matth. VI, 33: *primum quaerite regnum Dei*.

Et movet primo quaestionem de his quae in terra illa homines movere consueverant, scilicet de loco orationis, de quo quaestio vertebatur inter Iudaeos et Samaritanos; et hoc est quod dicit *patres nostri in monte hoc adoraverunt, et vos dicitis* et cetera. Circa quod sciendum est, quod Samaritani (secundum legis mandata) Deum colentes, fecerunt templum, in quo eum adorarent, non euntes in Ierusalem

595 Now the Evangelist treats of the request by which the gift is obtained, which is prayer. First there is the woman's inquiry about prayer. Secondly, Christ's answer (v 21). Concerning the first the woman does two things. First, she admits that Christ is qualified to answer her question. Secondly, she asks the question (v 20).

596 And so this woman, hearing what Christ had told her about things that were secret, admits that the one who up to now she believed was a mere man, is a prophet, and capable of settling her doubts. For it is characteristic of prophets to reveal what is not present, and hidden: "He who is now called a prophet was formerly called a seer" (I Sin 9:9). And so she says, **Sir, I see that you are a prophet**. As if to say: You show that you are a prophet by revealing hidden things to me. It is clear from this, as Augustine says, that her husband was beginning to return to her. But he did not return completely because she regarded Christ as a prophet: for although he was a prophet—"A prophet is not without honor except in his own country" (Mt 13:57)—he was more than a prophet, because he produces prophets: "Wisdom produces friends of God and prophets" (Wis 7:27)

597 Then she asks her question about prayer, saying: **Our ancestors worshiped on this mountain, but you people claim that Jerusalem is the place where men must worship God**. Here we should admire the woman's diligence and attention: for women are considered curious and unproductive, and not only unproductive, but also lovers of ease (1 Tim 5), whereas she did not ask Christ about worldly affairs, or about the future, but about the things of God, in keeping with the advice, "Seek first the kingdom of God" (Mt 6:33)

She first asks a question about a matter frequently discussed in her country, that is, about the place to pray; this was the subject of argument between Jews and Samaritans. She says, **Our ancestors worshiped on this mountain, but you people say**. We should mention that the Samaritans, worshiping God according to the precepts of the law, built a temple in which to adore him; and they did not go to Jerusalem where

propter Iudaeos eis infestos: quod quidem templum fecerunt in monte Garizim, Iudaei vero in monte Sion. Unde quaestio vertebatur inter eos quis istorum montium esset convenientior locus orationi; et utrique adducebant rationes pro parte sua: Samaritani quidem dicebant magis in monte Garizim esse adorandum, quia antiqui patres adoraverunt ibi dominum; et ideo dicit *patres nostri in monte hoc adoraverunt*.

Sed quomodo dicit mulier *patres nostri*, cum Samaritani non essent ex semine Israel? Ad hoc est responsio, secundum Chrysostomum, quod aliqui dicunt Abraham in monte illo filium obtulisse; alii autem in monte Sion, ut habetur Gen. XXII. Vel potest dici, quod *patres nostri* intelligantur Iacob et filii eius, qui, ut habetur Gen. XXXIII, et dictum est supra, habitavit in Sichem, quae est sita iuxta montem Garizim, et forte ibi adoraverunt in monte dominum. Vel potest dici quod filii Israel adoraverunt in monte hoc, quando Moyses praecepit ut ascenderent in montem Garizim ad benedicendum servantibus mandata domini, ut dicitur Deut. VI. Et vocat istos patres suos, vel propter legem datam filiis Israel, quam servabant Samaritani, vel propter terram eorum quam inhabitabant, ut dictum est supra.

Iudaei autem dicunt orandum esse in Ierusalem auctoritate domini qui praecepit Deut. XII, 13: *cave ne offeras holocausta tua in omni loco quem videris, sed in loco quem elegerit dominus Deus tuus*: qui quidem orationis locus primo fuit in Silo, postea vero auctoritate Salomonis et Nathan prophetae, arca Dei portata est de Silo in Ierusalem, et ibi factum est templum, secundum illud Ps. LXXVII, 60: *repulit tabernaculum Silo*. Et postea sequitur: *sed elegit tribum Iuda, montem Sion, quem dilexit*. Sic ergo Samaritani adducebant pro se auctoritatem patrum; Iudaei vero auctoritatem prophetarum, quos Samaritani non recipiebant. Hanc ergo quaestionem mulier proponit: nec est mirandum a quo docta fuerit, quia communiter contingit ut in terris in quibus diversa sunt dogmata, etiam simplices in eis sint instructi. Unde, quia Samaritani fuerant in continuo iurgio cum Iudaeis, ideo mulieres et simplices in materia ista edocti erant.

the Jews interfered with them. They built their temple on Mount Gerizim, while the Jews built their temple on Mount Sion. The question they debated was which of these places was the more fitting place of prayer; and each presented reasons for its own side. The Samaritans said that Mount Gerizim was more fitting, because their ancestors worshiped the Lord there. So she says, **Our ancestors worshiped on this mountain**.

598 How can this woman say, **our ancestors**, since the Samaritans were not descended from Israel? The answer, according to Chrysostom, is that some claim that Abraham offered his son on that mountain; but others claim that it was on Mount Zion. Or, we could say that **our ancestors** means Jacob and his sons, who as stated in Genesis (33) and as mentioned before, lived in Shechem, which is near Mount Gerizim, and who probably worshiped the Lord there on that mountain. Or it could be said that the children of Israel worshiped on this mountain when Moses ordered them to ascend Mount Gerizim that he might bless those who observed God's precepts, as recorded in Deuteronomy (6). And she calls them her ancestors either because the Samaritans observed the law given to the children of Israel, or because the Samaritans were now living in the land of Israel, as said before.

The Jews said that the place to worship was in Jerusalem, by command of the Lord, who, had said: "Take care not to offer your holocausts in every place, but offer them in the place the Lord will choose" (Dt 12:13). At first, this place of prayer was in Shiloh, and then after, on the authority of Solomon and the prophet Nathan, the ark was taken from Shiloh to Jerusalem, and it was there the temple was built: so we read: "He left the tabernacle in Shiloh," and a few verses later, "But he chose the tribe of Judah, Mount Zion, which he loved" (Ps 77:60). Thus the Samaritans appealed to the authority of the patriarchs, and the Jews appealed to the authority of the prophets, whom the Samaritans did not accept. This is the issue the woman raises. It is not surprising that she was taught about this, for it often happens in places where there are differences in beliefs that even the simple people are instructed about them. Because the

Samaritans were continually arguing with the Jews over this, it came to the knowledge of the women and ordinary people.

Consequenter cum dicit *dixit ei Iesus* etc., ponitur responsio Christi. Et primo distinguit trinam orationem; secundo comparat eas adinvicem, ibi *vos adoratis quod nescitis*.

599 Christ's answer is now set down (v 21). First he distinguishes three types of prayer. Secondly, he compares them to each other (v 22).

Circa primum reddit primo mulierem attentam, utpote grandia locuturus, dicens *crede mihi*, et fidem adhibe, quia ubique opus est fide. Hebr. XI, 6: *accedentem ad Deum oportet credere*; Is. VII, 9: *nisi credideritis, non intelligetis*.

600 As to the first, he first of all gains the woman's attention, to indicate that he was about to say something important, saying, **Believe me**, and have faith, for faith is always necessary: "To come to God, one must believe" (Heb 11:6); "If you do not believe, you will not understand" (Is 7:9).

Secundo proponit trinam adorationem, quarum duae iam erant, alia vero expectabatur futura. Duarum autem quae erant, una erat Samaritanorum, qua orabant in monte Garizim; et hanc exprimit dicens *venit hora quando neque in monte hoc*, scilicet Garizim, *adorabitis*. Alia est Iudaeorum qua orabant in monte Sion, scilicet in Ierusalem; et hanc exprimit dicens *neque in Ierusalem*.

Secondly, he mentions the three kinds of worship: two of these were already being practiced, and the third was to come. Of the two that were current, one was practiced by the Samaritans, who worshiped on Mount Gerizim; he refers to this when he says, **the hour is coming when you will worship the Father neither on this mountain**, of Gerizim. The other way was that of the Jews, who prayed on Mount Zion; and he refers to this when he says, **nor in Jerusalem**.

Tertia est futura, quae expectatur, quae est alia ab istis; et hanc insinuat excipiendo utramque adorationem: nam si veniat hora quando adorabunt, non tamen in monte Garizim neque in Ierusalem, manifestum est quod erit tertia adoratio Christi, evacuans utrorumque adorationem. Nam si aliquis vellet duos populos in unum coniungere, oporteret in utroque removeri illud in quo abinvicem dissident, et aliquid eis commune in quo conveniant, concedere. Christus ergo, volens coniungere Iudaeos et gentiles, removet a Iudaeis caeremonias, et a gentibus idolatriam, quae duo erant sicut paries unus in quo uterque abinvicem dissidebant, et fecit ex utroque populo unum populum secundum illud Eph. c. II, 14: *ipse est pax nostra, qui fecit utraque unum*. Sic ergo cessavit caeremonialis cultus et idololatria gentium, et sic introductus est verus Dei cultus a Christo.

The third type of worship was to come, and it was different from the other two. Christ alludes to this by excluding the other two: for if the hour is coming when they will no longer worship on Mount Gerizim or in Jerusalem, then clearly the third type to which Christ refers will be a worship that does away with the other two. For if someone wishes to unite two people, it is necessary to eliminate that over which they disagree, and give them something in common on which they will agree. And so Christ, wishing to unite the Jews and Gentiles, eliminated the observances of the Jews and the idolatry of the Gentiles; for these two were like a wall separating the peoples. And he made the two people one: "He is our peace, he who has made the two of us one" (Eph 2:14). Thus the ritual observances [of the Jews] and the idolatry of the Gentiles were abolished, and the true worship of God established by Christ.

Mystice autem, secundum Origenem, per tres adorationes intelliguntur divinae sapientiae tres participationes. Quidam namque participant eam obnubilantes tenebris erroris, et isti adorant in monte: quia omnis error ex superbia causatur; Ier. LI, 25: *ecce ego ad te mons pestifer*. Quidam vero participant ipsam divinam sapientiam sine errore, sed imperfecte, quia in speculo et aenigmate; et isti adorant in Ierusalem, quae significat praesentem Ecclesiam; Ps. CXLVI, 2: *aedificans Ierusalem dominus* et cetera. Beati vero et sancti participant illam sine errore perfecte, quia vident Deum sicuti est, ut dicitur I Io. III. Et ideo dicit *venit hora*, idest expectabitur, quando neque in erroribus, neque per speculum et in aenigmate participabitis divinam sapientiam, sed sicuti est.

Consequenter cum dicit *vos adoratis quod nescitis*, comparat praedictas adorationes ad invicem: et primo comparat secundam ad primam; secundo tertiam ad primam et secundam, ibi *sed venit hora*. Circa primum tria facit. Primo ostendit defectum primae adorationis; secundo veritatem secundae; tertio rationem utriusque assignat.

Quantum ad primum dicit *vos adoratis quod nescitis*.

Sed videtur alicui quod dominus explicare debuisset veritatem quaestionis, et rationem mulieris exsolvere. Sed dominus de hoc non curat, quia utraque adoratio cessare debebat.

Quantum autem ad hoc quod dicit *vos adoratis*, sciendum est, quod philosophus dicit, aliter est cognitio in rebus compositis, et aliter in simplicibus. Nam composita quidem possunt quantum ad aliquid cognosci, ita ut quantum ad aliquid in eis remaneant incognita: unde potest de his haberi falsa cognitio. Sicut si aliquis habens veram cognitionem de animali quantum ad eius substantiam, tamen potest errare circa cognitionem accidentis, utrum scilicet sit album vel nigrum; et differentiae, utrum scilicet sit alatum vel quadrupes. In simplicibus autem nullo modo potest esse falsa cognitio: quia aut

601 As for the mystical sense, and according to Origen, the three types of worship are three kinds of participation in divine wisdom. Some participate in it under a dark cloud of error, and these adore on the mountain: for every error springs from pride: "I am against you, destroying mountain" (Jer 51:25). Others participate in divine wisdom without error, but in an imperfect way, because they see in a mirror and in an obscure way; and these worship in Jerusalem, which signifies the present Church: "The Lord is building Jerusalem" (Ps 146:2). But the blessed and the saints participate in divine wisdom without error in a perfect way, for they see God as he is, as said in 1 John (3:2). And so Christ says, **the hour is coming**, i.e., is waited for, when you will participate in divine wisdom neither in error nor in a mirror in an obscure way, but as it is.

602 Then (v 22), he compares the different kinds of worship to each other. First, he compares the second to the first, Secondly, the third to the first and second (v 23). As to the first he does three things. First, he shows the shortcomings of the first type of worship. Secondly, the truth of the second (v 22b). Thirdly, the reason for each statement.

603 As to the first he says, **You people worship what you do not understand**.

Some might think that the Lord should have explained the truth of the matter and solve the woman's problem. But the Lord does not bother to do so because each of these kinds of worship was due to end.

As to his saying, **You people worship**, and so on, it should be pointed out that, as the Philosopher says, knowledge of complex things is different than knowledge of simple things. For something can be known about complex things in such a way that something else about them remains unknown; thus there can be false knowledge about them. For example, if someone has true knowledge of an animal as to its substance, he might be in error touching the knowledge of one of its accidents, such as whether it is black or white; or of a difference, such as whether it has wings or is four-footed. But there cannot be false

perfecte cognoscuntur, inquantum scitur eorum quidditas; aut nullo modo cognoscuntur, si non possit ad eam attingi. Cum ergo Deus sit omnino simplex, non potest de eo haberi falsa cognitio per hoc quod aliquid de eo sciatur et aliquid nesciatur, sed per hoc quod non attingitur. Unde quicumque credit Deum esse aliquid quod non est, puta corpus, vel aliquid huiusmodi, non adorat Deum, quia nescit eum, sed aliquid aliud.

Samaritani autem falsam opinionem habebant de Deo dupliciter. Primo, quia aestimabant eum esse corporeum, unde et credebant ipsum in uno loco corporeo tantum determinate ibidem adorari oportere. Deinde, quia non credebant eum esse super omnia, sed aequalem aliquibus creaturis: unde simul cum eo et idola adorabant, quasi sibi aequalia. Et ideo nesciebant eum, quia non attingebat ad veram cognitionem eius. Et ideo dicit dominus *vos adoratis quod nescitis*; idest, non adoratis Deum, quia nescitis ipsum, sed phantasiam vestram, qua aliquid apprehenditis ut Deum; Eph. IV, 17: *sicut et gentes ambulant in vanitate sensus sui* et cetera.

Quantum vero ad secundum, scilicet quantum ad diversitatem adorationis Iudaeorum, dicit *nos adoramus quod scimus*. Et connumerat se Iudaeis, quia et Iudaeus erat secundum gentem, et etiam mulier opinabatur eum et prophetam et Iudaeum esse. *Nos adoramus quod scimus*: quia Iudaei per legem et prophetas veram cognitionem seu aestimationem de Deo habebant, in hoc quod non credebant ipsum esse corporeum, nec in uno loco determinato esse, quasi eius maiestas a loco capi possit; III Reg. VIII, 27: *si enim caeli caelorum te capere non possunt, quanto magis domus haec quam aedificavi?* Nec etiam idola colebant; et ideo in Ps. LXXV, v. 2 dicitur: *notus in Iudaea Deus*.

Rationem autem huius assignat cum dicit *quia salus ex Iudaeis est*; quasi dicat: ideo vera notitia de Deo habebatur solum a Iudaeis, quia futurum erat quod salus ex Iudaeis proveniret; et sicut principium

knowledge of simple things: because they are either perfectly known inasmuch as their quiddity is known; or they are not known at all, if one cannot attain to a knowledge of them. Therefore, since God is absolutely simple, there cannot be false knowledge of him in the sense that something might be known about him and something remain unknown, but only in the sense that knowledge of him is not attained. Accordingly, anyone who believes that God is something that he is not, for example, a body, or something like that, does not adore God but something else, because he does not know him, but something else.

Now the Samaritans had a false idea of God in two ways. First of all, because they thought he was corporeal, so that they believed that he should be adored in only one definite corporeal place. Further, because they did not believe that he transcended all things, but was equal to certain creatures, they adored along with him certain idols, as if they were equal to him. Consequently, they did not know him, because they did not attain to a true knowledge of him. So the Lord says, **You people worship what you do not understand**, i.e., you do not adore God because you do not know him, but only some imaginary being you think is God, “as the Gentiles do, with their foolish ideas” (Eph 4:17).

604 As to the second, i.e., the truth of the worship of the Jews, he says, **we understand what we worship**. He includes himself among the Jews, because he was a Jew by race, and because the woman thought he was a prophet and a Jew. **We understand what we worship**, because through the law and the prophets the Jews acquired a true knowledge or opinion of God, in that they did not believe that he was corporeal nor in one definite place, as though his greatness could be enclosed in a place: “If the heavens, and the heavens of the heavens cannot contain you, how much less this house that I have built” (1 Kgs 8:27). And neither did they worship idols: “God is known in Judah” (Ps 75:2).

605 He gives the reason for this when he says, **since salvation is from the Jews**. As if to say: The true knowledge of God was possessed exclusively by the Jews, for it had been determined that salvation would

sanitatis debet esse sanum, ita principium salutis, quae habetur per Dei veram cognitionem et verum cultum, oportet veram cognitionem de Deo habere: et ideo, quia ex eis principium salutis et causa, scilicet Christus, provenire debebat, secundum illud Gen. c. XXII, 18: *in semine tuo benedicentur omnes gentes*, oportet Deum notum esse in Iudaea.

Provenit autem ex Iudaeis salus tripliciter. Primo quantum ad doctrinam veritatis, quia omnes gentes erant in erroribus; Iudaei autem in veritate permanebant; Rom. c. III, 2: *quid amplius est Iudaeo? Quia tradita sunt eis eloquia Dei*. Secundo quantum ad spiritualia dicta: nam prophetia, et alia dona spiritus sancti, prius eis data fuerunt, et ex eis devenerunt ad alios; Rom. XI, 17: *tu, scilicet gentiles, cum esses oleaster, insertus es in illis*, scilicet Iudaei; Rom. XV, 27: *nam si spiritualium eorum, scilicet Iudaeorum, participes facti sunt gentiles, debent et in carnalibus ministrare illis*. Tertio quantum ad ipsum salutis auctorem, quia ex eis processit secundum carnem; Rom. c. IX, 5: *ex quibus Christus est secundum carnem*.

Consequenter cum dicit *sed venit hora* etc. comparat aliam adorationem duabus primis: et primo ponit eminentiam eius ad alias; secundo praeeminentiae convenientiam, ibi *nam et pater tales quaerit*.

Sed attendendum est circa primum, secundum Origenem, quod supra loquens de tertia adoratione, cum dixit *venit hora quando non in monte hoc neque in Ierosolymis adorabitis patrem*, non addidit dominus, *et nunc est*; hic vero de ipsa loquens, dicit *venit hora, et nunc est*: quia tunc locutus est de adoratione in patria, secundum quam perfectam Dei cognitionem participabimus, quae nondum viventibus in hac carne mortali venit; hic vero loquitur de ea quae est in vita ista, quae iam venit per Christum.

come from them. And as the source of health should itself be healthy, so the source of salvation, which is acquired by the true knowledge and the true worship of God, should possess the true knowledge of God. Thus, since the source of salvation and its cause, i.e., Christ, was to come from them, according to the promise in Genesis (22:18): "All the nations will be blessed in your descendents," it was fitting that God be known in Judah.

606 Salvation comes from the Jews in three ways. First in their teaching of the truth, for all other peoples were in error, while the Jews held fast to the truth, according to Romans (3:2): "What advantage do Jews have? First, they were entrusted with the words of God." Secondly, in their spiritual gifts: for prophecy and the other gifts of the Spirit were given to them first, and from them they reached others: "You," i.e., the Gentiles, "a wild olive branch, are ingrafted on them," i.e., on the Jews (Rom 11:17); "If the Gentiles have become sharers in their (i.e., the Jews') spiritual goods, they ought to help the Jews as to earthly goods" (Rom 15:27). Thirdly, since the very author of salvation is from the Jews, since "Christ came from then in the flesh" (Rom 9:5).

607 Now (v 23), he compares the third kind of worship to the first two. First, he mentions its superiority to the others. Secondly, how appropriate this kind of worship is (v 23b).

608 As to the first point, we should note, as Origen says, that when speaking above of the third kind of worship, the Lord said, **the hour is coming when you will worship the Father neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem**; but he did not then add, **and is now here**. But now, in speaking of it, he does say, **the hour is coming, and is now here**. The reason is because the first time he was speaking of the worship found in heaven, when we will participate in the perfect knowledge of God, which is not possessed by those still living in this mortal life. But now he is speaking of the worship of this life, and which has now come through Christ.

Et ideo dicit *venit hora, et nunc est, quando veri adoratores adorabunt patrem in spiritu et veritate.*

Quod potest legi primo quidem, secundum Chrysostomum, ut per hoc totum ostendatur eminentia istius adorationis ad adorationem Iudaeorum, ut sit sensus: sicut adoratio Iudaeorum praeeminet adorationi Samaritanorum, ita adoratio Christianorum praeeminet ei quae est Iudaeorum; et hoc in duobus. Primo, quia illa est secundum carnales caeremonias, Hebr. IX, 10: *in iustitiis carnis usque ad tempus correctionis impositis*, haec vero est secundum spiritum. Secundo vero, quia illa est secundum figuras: nam Deo illae victimae, secundum quod sunt res quaedam, non placebant; unde in Ps. XLIX, 13, dicitur: *numquid manducabo carnes taurorum, aut sanguinem hircorum potabo?* Et alibi, Ps. I, 18: *sacrificium dedissem utique: holocaustis non delectaberis*, inquantum scilicet sunt res quaedam; sed delectabatur in eis inquantum erant figura verae victimae, et veri sacrificii; Hebr. X, 1: *umbram habet lex futurorum bonorum, non rerum ipsam imaginem* et cetera. Haec autem adoratio est in veritate, quia ipsa secundum se Deo placet. Supra I, 17: *gratia et veritas per Iesum Christum facta est*. Et ideo quantum ad primum dicit, quod *veri adoratores adorabunt in spiritu*, non in caeremoniis carnalibus; quantum ad secundum dicit *in veritate*, non in figura.

Secundo potest legi quod dominus per haec duo quae dicit, scilicet *in spiritu et veritate*, vult ostendere differentiam adorationis, non tantum ad illam Iudaeorum, verum etiam ad eam quae erat Samaritanorum. Ad illam quidem Iudaeorum, per hoc quod dicitur *et veritate*: nam illa, ut dictum est, cum errore erat, quia adorabant quod nesciebant, ista vero est cum vera Dei cognitione.

Tertio modo legitur ut per hoc quod dicit *in spiritu et veritate*, ostendatur conditio verae adorationis. Ad hoc enim quod adoratio vera sit, duo requiruntur. Unum quod sit spiritualis: unde dicit *in spiritu*, id est in fervore spiritus; I Cor. XIV, 15: *orabo spiritu, orabo et mente*; Eph. V, 19: *psallentes in cordibus vestris Deo*. Aliud, quod sit

609 So he says, **But the hour is coming, and is now here, when true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and in truth.**

We can understand this, as Chrysostom does, as showing the superiority of this worship to that of the Jews. So that the sense is: Just as the worship of the Jews is superior to that of the Samaritans, so the worship of the Christians is superior to that of the Jews. It is superior in two respects. First, because the worship of the Jews is in bodily rites: "Rites for the body, imposed only until the time they are reformed" (Heb 9:10); while the worship of the Christians is in spirit. Secondly, because the worship of the Jews is in symbols: for the Lord was not pleased with their sacrificial victims insofar as they were things; so we read, "Shall I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats?" (Ps 49:13), and again, "You would not be pleased with a holocaust" (Ps 50:18), that is, as a particular thing; but such a sacrificial victim would be pleasing to the Lord as a symbol of the true victim and of the true sacrifice: "The law has only a shadow of the good things to come" (Heb 10:1). But the worship of the Christians is in truth, because it is pleasing to God in itself: "grace and truth have come through Jesus Christ," as we saw above (1:17). So he is saying here that **true worshipers will worship in spirit**, not in bodily rites, **and in truth**, not in symbols.

610 This passage can be interpreted in a second way, by saying that when our Lord says, **in spirit and in truth**, he wants to show the difference between the third kind of worship and not just that of the Jews, but also that of the Samaritans. In this case, **in truth**, refers to the Jews: for the Samaritans, as was said, were in error, because they worshiped what they did not understand. But the Jews worshiped with a true knowledge of God.

611 **In spirit and in truth** can be understood in a third way, as indicating the characteristics of true worship. For two things are necessary for a true worship: one is that the worship be spiritual; so he says, **in spirit**, i.e., with fervor of spirit: "I will pray with spirit, and I will pray with my mind" (1 Cor 14:15); "Singing to the Lord in your hearts" (Eph 5:19).

in veritate. Primo quidem fidei, quia nullus fervor spiritualis desiderii est ad merendum idoneus, nisi adsit veritas fidei; Iac. I, 6: *postulet autem in fide nihil haesitans*. Secundo vero *in veritate*, idest sine fictione et simulatione: contra quod dicitur Matth. VI, 5: *amant in angulis orare, ut videantur ab hominibus*.

Sic ergo ad ipsam orationem requiritur fervor caritatis quantum ad primum, et veritas fidei quantum ad secundum, et rectitudo intentionis quantum ad tertium.

Sed dicit *patrem*, quia adoratio legis non erat patris, sed domini. Nos adoramus ut filii per amorem, illi vero adorabant ut servi per timorem.

Sic ergo hoc quod dicit *veri*, opponitur contra tria, secundum dictas expositiones. Primo contra falsum adorationis ritum Samaritanorum; Eph. IV, 25: *deponentes mendacium, loquimini veritatem*. Secundo contra vanum et transitorium quod erat in caeremoniis carnalibus; Ps. IV, 3: *ut quid diligitis vanitatem, et quaeritis mendacium?* Tertio contra figurale; supra I, 17: *gratia et veritas per Iesum Christum facta est*.

Consequenter, cum dicit *nam et pater tales quaerit*, ostendit convenientiam tertiae adorationis ex duobus. Primo ex voluntate et acceptione eius qui adoratur; secundo ex ipsius natura, ibi *spiritus est Deus*.

Circa primum sciendum est quod ad hoc quod homo mereatur quod petit accipere, ea debet petere quae non sint contra voluntatem dantis, et eo modo quo acceptum est danti; et ideo cum oramus Deum, esse debemus quales Deus quaerit: Deus autem tales quaerit qui scilicet eum adorent in spiritu et veritate, et in fervore caritatis, et veritate fidei; Deut. X, 12: *et nunc, Israel, quid dominus Deus tuus petit a te, nisi ut timeas dominum Deum tuum, et ambules in viis eius*,

Secondly, the worship should be **in truth**. First, in the truth of faith, because no fervent spiritual desire is meritorious unless united to the truth of faith, "Ask with faith, without any doubting" (Jas 1:6). Secondly, **in truth**, i.e., without pretense or hypocrisy; against such attitudes we read: "They like to pray at street corners, so people can see them" (Mt 6:5).

This prayer, then, requires three things: first, the fervor of love; secondly, the truth of faith; and thirdly, a correct intention.

He says, the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and in truth, because under the law, worship was not given to the Father, but to the Lord. We worship in love, as sons; whereas they worshiped in fear, as slaves.

612 He says **true** worshipers, in opposition to three things mentioned in the above interpretations. First, in opposition to the false worship of the Samaritans: "Put aside what is not true, and speak the truth" (Eph 4:25). Secondly, in opposition to the fruitless and transitory character of bodily rites: "Why do you love what is without profit, and seek after lies" (Ps 4:3). Thirdly, it is opposed to what is symbolic: "Grace and truth have come through Jesus Christ" (above 1:17).

613 Then when he says, **Indeed, it is just such worshipers the Father seeks**, he shows that this third kind of worship is appropriate for two reasons. First, because the One worshiped wills and accepts this worship. Secondly, because of the nature of the One worshiped (v 24).

614 Concerning the first, we should note that for a man to merit receiving what he asks, he should ask for things which are not in opposition to the will of the giver, and also ask for them in a way which is acceptable to the giver. And so when we pray to God, we ought to be such as God seeks. But God seeks those who will worship him in spirit and in truth, in the fervor of love and in the truth of faith; "And now, Israel, what does the Lord your God want from you, but that you fear the Lord your God,

et diligas eum, ac servias domino Deo tuo in toto corde tuo, ut bene sit tibi? Mich. c. VI, 8: indicabo tibi, o homo, quid sit bonum, et quid Deus requirat a te: utique facere iudicium, et diligere misericordiam, et sollicitum ambulare cum Deo tuo.

Hoc autem ostendit ex natura ipsius, dicens *spiritus est Deus*: nam, sicut dicitur Eccli. XIII, 19: *omne animal diligit sibi simile*, ergo Deus intantum diligit nos, inquantum ei assimilamur; sed non assimilamur ei secundum carnalia, quia est incorporeus, sed secundum spiritualia, quia *Deus spiritus est*; Eph. IV, 23: *renovamini spiritu mentis vestrae*.

Hoc autem quod dicit *spiritus est Deus*, denotat in Deo incorporeitatem; Lc. ult., 39: *spiritus carnem et ossa non habet*. Item vivificationem, quia tota vita nostra est a Deo, ut a principio effectivo. Est etiam Deus veritas; infra XIV, 6: *ego sum via, veritas et vita*: et ideo in spiritu et veritate oportet adorare eum.

Consequenter cum dicit *dixit ei mulier* etc. agitur hic de datore doni: quod respondet ei quod dominus dixerat *si scires donum Dei, et quis est qui dicit tibi, da mihi bibere, petisses utique*. Et primo ponitur confessio mulieris; secundo doctrina Christi, ibi *ego sum qui loquor tecum*. Circa primum duo facit: primo enim profitetur mulier fidem Christi venturi; secundo perfectionem doctrinae eius, ibi *cum ergo venerit, ille annuntiabit nobis omnia*.

Sciendum est ergo, quod mulier eorum quae dicta sunt altitudine fatigata, obstupuit, ea capere non valens. Dicit *scio quia Messias venit, qui dicitur Christus*; quasi dicat: ista verba non capio; sed veniet tempus quando veniet Messias, et tunc sciemus omnia ista: Messias enim Hebraice, unctus Latine, Graece Christus est. Sciebat autem mulier ista Messiam venturum, edocta per libros Moysi, ubi Christi adventus praenuntiatus est; Gen. penult., 10: *non auferetur sceptrum de Iuda, et dux de femore eius, donec veniat qui mittendus est*. Sicut autem Augustinus dicit, haec est prima locutio mulieris in qua

and walk in his ways, and love him, and serve the Lord your God with all your heart" (Dt 10:12); and in Micah (6:8): "I will show you, man, what is good, and what the Lord requires of you: to do what is right, and to love mercy, and to walk attentively with your God."

615 Then he shows that the third type of worship is appropriate from the very nature of God, saying, **God is spirit**. As is said in Sirach (13:19), "Every animal loves its like"; and so God loves us insofar as we are like him. But we are not like him by our body, because he is incorporeal, but in what is spiritual in us, for **God is spirit**: "Be renewed in the spirit," of your mind (Eph 4:23).

In saying, **God is spirit**, he means that God is incorporeal: "A spirit does not have flesh and bones" (Lk 24:39); and also that he is a life-giver, because our entire life is from God, as its creative source. God is also truth: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life" (below 14:6). Therefore, we should worship him in spirit and in truth.

616 When he says, **The woman said to him**, he mentions the one who gives the gift; and this corresponds to what our Lord said before, **If you knew the gift of God, and realized who it is who says to you, Give me a drink, you perhaps would have asked him**. First, we have the woman's profession. Secondly, the teaching of Christ (v 26). As to the first, he does two things. First, the woman professes her faith in the Christ to come. Secondly, in the fulness of his teaching, **he will tell us everything**.

617 The woman, wearied by the profound nature of what Christ was saying, was confused and unable to understand all this. She says: **I know that the Messiah is coming, the one called Christ**. As if to say: I do not understand what you are saying, but a time will come when the Messiah will arrive, and then we will understand all these things. For "Messiah" in Hebrew means the same as "Anointed One" in Latin, and "Christ" in Greek. She knew that the Messiah was coming because she had been taught by the books of Moses, which foretell the coming of Christ: "The scepter will not be taken away from Judah... until he who is

nominat Christum: ut det intelligere, quod post quinque sensus corporeos, iam inciperet redire ad virum legitimum.

Hic autem Messias cum venerit, perfectam doctrinam proponet, cum dicit *cum ergo venerit, ille annuntiabit nobis*. Et hoc praedixerat Moyses; Deut. XVIII, 18: *prophetam suscitabo eis de medio fratrum suorum, similem eis; et ponam verba mea in ore eius, loqueturque ad eos omnia quae praecepero illi*. Et quia iam advocaverat mulier ista virum suum, intellectum scilicet et rationem, ideo dominus aquam doctrinae spiritualis ei propinat, optime manifestando se ei.

Et ideo dicitur *dixit ei Iesus: ego sum qui loquor tecum*, scilicet Christus; Sap. VI, 14: *praeoccupat eos qui se concupiscunt, ut illis se prior ostendat*; infra XIV, v. 21: *ego diligam eum, et manifestabo ei meipsum*.

Non autem Deus manifestavit se mulieri a principio: quia forte credidisset, et visum fuisset sibi ex vanitate loqui. Nunc autem paulatim in cognitione Christi eam reducens, opportune revelavit se ipsum; Prov. XXV, 11: *mala aurea in lectis argenteis, qui loquitur verbum in tempore suo*. Et quidem interrogatur a Phariseis, utrum esset Christus, infra X, 24: *si tu es Christus, dic nobis palam*, et tamen eis non se manifeste revelavit, quia non ad discendum quaerebant, sed ad tentandum. Haec vero simplici mente loquebatur.

to be sent comes" (Gn 49:10). As Augustine says, this is the first time the woman mentions the name "Christ": and we see by this that she is now beginning to return to her lawful husband.

618 When this Messiah comes, he will give us a complete teaching. Hence she says, **when he comes he will tell us everything**. This was foretold by Moses: "I will raise up a prophet for them, from among their own brothers, like them; and I will put my words in his mouth, and he will tell them all I command him" (Dt 18:18). Because this woman had now called her husband, i.e., intellect and reason, the Lord now offers her the water of spiritual teaching by revealing himself to her in a most excellent way.

619 And so Jesus says: **I who speak to you am he**, i.e., I am the Christ: "Wisdom goes to meet those who desire her, so she may first reveal herself to them" (Wis 6:14), and below (14:21): "I will love him, and reveal myself to him."

Our Lord did not reveal himself to this woman at once because it might have seemed to her that he was speaking out of vainglory. But now, having brought her step by step to a knowledge of himself, Christ revealed himself at the appropriate time: "Words appropriately spoken are like apples of gold on beds of silver" (Prv 25:11). In contrast, when he was asked by the Pharisees whether he was the Christ, "If you are the Christ, tell us clearly" (below 10:24), he did not reveal himself to them clearly, because they did not ask to learn but to test him. But this woman is speaking in all simplicity.

COMMENTARY ON
THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN

St. Thomas Aquinas

Lectio 3

27 καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἦλθαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ὅτι μετὰ γυναικὸς ἐλάλει: οὐδεὶς μέντοι εἶπεν, τί ζητεῖς; ἢ, τί λαλεῖς μετ' αὐτῆς; 28 ἀφῆκεν οὖν τὴν ὑδρίαν αὐτῆς ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ λέγει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, 29 δεῦτε ἴδετε ἄνθρωπον ὃς εἶπέν μοι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα: μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός; 30 ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτόν. 31 ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ ἡρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγοντες, ῥαββί, φάγε. 32 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,

ἐγὼ βρωσιν ἔχω φαγεῖν ἣν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε.

33 ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους, μή τις ἤνεγκεν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν;

Posita doctrina de aqua spirituali, hic agit de effectu ipsius doctrinae, et primo proponit ipsum effectum; secundo ipsum effectum manifestat, ibi *interea rogabant eum discipuli eius*. Effectus autem huius doctrinae est fructus proveniens ex parte fidelium, et ideo primo ponitur fructus proveniens ex parte discipulorum admirantium; secundo fructus proveniens ex parte mulieris virtutem Christi annuntiantis ibi *reliquit ergo hydriam suam mulier*.

LECTURE 3

27 His disciples, returning at this point, were amazed that Jesus was speaking with a woman. But no one said, "What do you want?" or "Why are you talking to her?" 28 The woman then left her water jar and went off to the town. And she said to the people: 29 "Come, and see the man who told me everything that I have done. Could he not be the Christ?" 30 At that they set out from the town to meet him. 31 Meanwhile, his disciples asked him saying, "Rabbi, eat something." 32 But he said to them,

"I have food to eat of which you do not know."

33 At this the disciples said to one another, "Do you suppose that someone has brought him something to eat?"

620 After presenting the teaching on spiritual water, the Evangelist now deals with the effect of this teaching. First, he sets down the effect itself. Secondly, he elaborates on it (v 3 1). The effect of this teaching is its fruit for those who believe. And first we have its fruit which relates to the disciples, who were surprised at Christ's conduct. Secondly, its fruit in relation to the woman, who proclaimed Christ's power (v 28).

Tria autem ponuntur quantum ad discipulos: scilicet eorum reditus ad Christum; unde dicit *et continuo venerunt discipuli eius*. Et, ut dicit Chrysostomus, satis opportune, postquam se Christus mulieri manifestavit, discipuli occurrerunt, ut ostendatur, omnia tempora, divina providentia dispensari; Sap. VI, 8: *unumquodque fecit Deus, quia pusillum et magnum; et aequaliter est ei cura de omnibus (...) et in omni providentia occurret illis*; Eccle. VIII, 6: *omni negotio tempus est et opportunitas*.

Secundo ponitur eorum admiratio de Christo; unde dicit *et mirabantur, quia cum muliere loquebatur*. Mirabantur quidem bonum; sed non suspicabantur malum, ut Augustinus dicit. Mirabantur autem duo. Primo quidem superabundantem Christi mansuetudinem et humilitatem: quia dominus orbis terrarum dignatus est cum inope muliere loqui, et diu, dans in hoc nobis exemplum humilitatis; Eccli. IV, 7: *congregationi pauperum affabilem te facito*. Secundo quia cum Samaritana et alienigena loquebatur, nescientes mysterium, quod mulier typum Ecclesiae gentium gereret, quam quaerebat qui venit *quaerere et salvum facere quod perierat*: Lc. XIX, 10.

Tertio ponitur eorum reverentia ad Christum, quae ostenditur ex taciturnitate eorum. In hoc enim ostendimus reverentiam ad Deum quando facta eius discutere non audemus; Prov. XXV, 2: *gloria Dei est celare verbum, et gloria regum investigare sermonem*. Et ideo dicit, quod licet mirarentur, *nemo tamen dixit: quid quaeris, aut quid loqueris cum ea?* Eccli. XXXII, 9: *audi tacens, et pro reverentia accedet tibi bona gratia*. Sed tamen sic eruditi erant discipuli ordinem servare, ex reverentia et timore filiali ad Christum, ut aliquando quidem confidenter eum interrogent de his quae ad eos pertinebant, scilicet quando Christus aliqua proponebat ad eos pertinentia, quae eorum capacitatem transcendebant; Eccli. XXXII, 10: *adolescens, vix loquere in causa tua*. Aliquando vero eum non interrogent, in his scilicet quae ad eos non pertinebant, sicut hic.

621 We are told three things about the disciples. First, their return to Christ: he says, **His disciples, returning at this point**. As Chrysostom reminds us, it was very convenient that the disciples returned after Christ had revealed himself to the woman, since this shows us that all events are regulated by divine providence: “He made the small and the great, and takes care for all alike” (Wis 6:8); “There is a time and fitness for everything” (Ecc 8:6).

622 Secondly, we see their surprise at what Christ was doing; he says, they **were amazed that Jesus was speaking with a woman**. They were amazed at what was good; and as Augustine says, they did not suspect any evil. They were amazed at two things. First, at the extraordinary gentleness and humility of Christ: for the Lord of the world stooped to speak with a poor woman, and for a long time, giving us an example of humility: “Be friendly to the poor” (Sir 4:7). Secondly, they were amazed that he was speaking with a Samaritan and a foreigner, for they did not know the mystery by which this woman was a symbol of the Church of the Gentiles; and Christ sought the Gentiles, for he came “to seek and to save what was lost” (Lk 19:10).

623 Thirdly, we see the disciples’ reverence for Christ, shown by their silence. For we show our reverence for God when we do not presume to discuss his affairs: “It is to the glory of God to conceal things; and to the glory of kings to search things out” (Prv 25:2). So the Evangelist says that although his disciples were surprised, none of them said, **What do you want?** or asked him, **Why are you talking to her?** “Listen in silence” (Sir 32:9). Yet the disciples had been so trained to observe order, because of their reverence and filial fear toward Christ, that now and then they would question him about matters that concerned themselves, i.e., when Christ said things relating to them, but which were beyond their understanding: “Young men, speak if you have to” (Sir 3 2:10). At other times they did not question him; in those matters that were not their business, as here.

Consequenter cum dicit *reliquit ergo hydriam suam mulier, et abiit in civitatem*, ponitur fructus proveniens ex parte mulieris, officium apostolorum annuntiando assumentis: et ponuntur tria, quae colligi possunt ex dictis et factis eius: scilicet devotionis affectus; secundo praedicationis modus, ibi *dicit illis hominibus: venite, et videte hominem, qui dixit mihi omnia quaecumque feci*; tertio praedicationis effectus, ibi *et exierunt de civitate, et veniebant ad eum*.

Affectus autem mulieris apparet ex duobus. Primo ex hoc quod prae magnitudine devotionis, illud pro quo specialiter venerat ad fontem, quasi oblita, dereliquit aquam et hydriam: unde dicit, quod *reliquit mulier hydriam suam, et abiit in civitatem*, annuntiare scilicet magnalia de Christo, non curans de corporeo commodo propter utilitatem aliorum. In quo sequitur apostolorum exemplum, qui, ut dicitur Matth. IV, 20: *relictis retibus, secuti sunt dominum*. Per hydriam autem intelligitur cupiditas saeculi, per quam de profundo tenebrarum, cuius imaginem puteus gerit, idest de terrena conversatione, homines hauriunt voluptates. Qui ergo cupiditates saeculi propter Deum derelinquunt, hydriam derelinquunt; II Tim. II, 4: *nemo militans Deo, implicat se negotiis saecularibus*. Secundo vero apparet ex multitudine eorum quibus annuntiat: quia non uni tantum, nec duobus vel tribus, sed toti civitati, unde *abiit in civitatem*: in quo significatur apostolorum officium, quibus committit dominus, Matth. ult., 19: *euntes docete omnes gentes*, infra c. XV, 16: *posui vos ut eatis, et fructum afferatis*.

Praedicationis autem modus innuitur cum dicit *et dicit illis hominibus* etc., ubi primo invitat ad Christi visionem cum dicit *venite, et videte hominem*. Audierat enim mulier ista a Christo, quod ego sum Christus; sed non statim dixit quod venirent ad Christum, seu crederent, ne daret occasionem blasphemandi; et ideo a principio dixit ea de Christo quae credibilia erant et in propatulo, scilicet quod esset homo; Phil. II, 7: *in similitudinem hominum factus*. Nec dixit credite, sed *venite, et videte*; quia manifeste noverat, quod si gustarent de illo fonte, eum videndo, eadem paterentur quae et ipsa; Ps. c. LXV, 16: *venite, et narrabo quanta fecit animae meae*. Nihilominus tamen in hoc veri

624 Then (v 28), we have the fruit which relates to the woman; by what she said to her people, she was taking on the role of an apostle. From what she says and does, we can learn three things. First, her affective devotion; secondly, her way of preaching; thirdly the effect her preaching had (v 30).

625 Her affection is revealed in two ways. First, because her devotion was so great that she forgot why she had come to the well, and left without the water and her water jar. So he says, **the woman then left her water jar and went off to the town**, to tell of the wonderful things Christ had done; and she was not now concerned for her own bodily comfort but for the welfare of others. In this respect she was like the apostles, who “leaving their nets, followed the Lord” (Mt 4:20). The water jar is a symbol of worldly desires, by which men draw out pleasures from the depths of darkness—symbolized by the well—i.e., from a worldly manner of life. Accordingly, those who abandon worldly desires for the sake of God leave their water jars: “No soldier of God becomes entangled in the business of this world” (2 Tim 2:4). Secondly, we see her affection from the great number of those to whom she brings the news: not to just one or two, but to the entire town; we read that she **went off to the town**. This signifies the duty Christ gave to the apostles: “Go, teach all nations” (Mt 28:19); and “I have chosen you to go and bring forth fruit” (below 15:16).

626 Next we see her manner of preaching (v 29). She first invites them to see Christ, saying, **Come and see the man**. Although she had heard Christ say that he was the Christ, she did not at once tell the people that they should come to the Christ, or believe, so as not to give them a reason for scoffing. So at first she mentions things that were believable and evident about Christ, as that he was a man: “made in the likeness of men” (Phil 2:7). Neither did she say, “believe,” but **Come, and see**; for she was convinced that if they were to taste from that well by seeing him, they would be affected in the same way she was: “Come, and I will tell you the great things he has

praedicatoris imitatur exemplum, non ad se homines, sed ad Christum vocando; II Cor. IV, v. 5: *non enim praedicamus nosmetipsos, sed Christum*.

Secundo ponit divinitatis Christi indicium, cum dicit *qui dixit mihi omnia quaecumque feci*, scilicet quot viros habuerat. Hoc enim est divinitatis officium et indicium quod occulta et secreta cordium manifestet. Et licet illa quae fecerat, ad confusionem suam pertinerent, nihilominus tamen non est verecundata referre: nam, ut Chrysostomus dicit, anima cum ignita fuerit igne divino, ad nihil eorum quae sunt in terra de reliquo respicit, neque ad gloriam, nec ad verecundiam; sed ad illam solam, quae detinet eam, flammam.

Tertio autem concludit Christi maiestatem, dicens *numquid ipse est Christus?* Non est ausa asserendo ostendere quod esset Christus, ne videretur alios velle docere; et ipsi ex hoc irati exire ad eum nollent. Neque tamen totaliter hoc siluit; sed sub quaestione, quasi hoc eorum iudicio committens, proposuit dicens *numquid non ipse est Christus?* Hic enim facilius modus est suadendi.

Per hanc autem mulierem, quae infimae conditionis est, signatur apostolorum praedicatorum modus: quia, ut dicitur I Cor. c. I, 26: *non multi sapientes, non multi potentes secundum carnem (...), sed quae stulta sunt mundi elegit Deus, ut confundat sapientes*. Unde Prov. IX, 3, ipsi apostoli ancillae dicuntur: *misit*, inquit sapientia divina, scilicet apostolos, filius Dei, *ancillas suas*, scilicet apostolos, *vocare ad arcem*.

Fructus autem praedicationis ponitur ibi *et exierunt de civitate* ad quam iverat mulier, et veniebant ad ipsum, scilicet Christum: in quo datur intelligi, quod si ad Christum ire volumus, oportet nos exire de civitate; idest, amorem carnalis cupiditatis deponere; Hebr. XIII, 13: *exeamus ad eum extra castra, improperium eius portantes*.

done for me” (Ps 65:16). In this she is imitating the example of a true preacher, not calling men to himself, but to Christ: “What we preach is not ourselves, but Jesus Christ” (2 Cor 4:5).

627 Secondly, she mentions a clue to Christ’s divinity, saying, **who told me everything that I have done**, that is, how many husbands she had had. For it is the function and sign of the divinity to disclose hidden things and the secrets of hearts. Although the things she had done would cause her shame, she is still not ashamed to mention them; for as Chrysostom says: “When the soul is on fire with the divine fire, it no longer pays attention to earthly things, neither to glory nor to shame, but only to that flame that holds it fast.”

628 Thirdly, she infers the greatness of Christ, saying, **Could he not be the Christ?** She did not dare to say that he was the Christ, lest she seem to be trying to teach them; they could have become angry at this and refuse to go with her. Yet she was not entirely silent on this point, but submitting it to their judgment, set it forth in the form of a question, saying, **Could he not be the Christ?** For this is an easier way to persuade someone.

629 This insignificant woman signifies the condition of the apostles, who were sent out to preach: “Not many of you are learned in the worldly sense, not many powerful... But God chose the simple ones of the world to embarrass the wise” (1 Cor 1:26). Thus in Proverbs (9:3) the apostles are called handmaids: “She,” divine wisdom, i.e., the Son of God, “sent out her handmaids,” the apostles, “to summon to the tower.”

630 The fruit of her preaching is given when he says, **At that** they set **out from the town**, to where she had returned, to meet him, Christ. We see by this that if we desire to come to Christ, we must set out from the town, i.e., leave behind our carnal desires: “Let us go out to him outside the camp, bearing the abuse he took,” as we read in Hebrews (13:13).

Consequenter cum dicit *interea rogabant eum discipuli* etc., manifestatur effectus spiritualis doctrinae: et primo per doctrinam Christi ad discipulos; secundo per effectum operis in alios, ibi *ex civitate autem illa multi crediderunt*. Circa primum duo facit. Primo ponitur occasio manifestationis huius fructus; secundo ponitur ipsa manifestatio *ille autem dixit eis: ego cibum habeo manducare quem vos nescitis*.

Occasio autem manifestationis sumitur ex instantia discipulorum ad hoc ut Christus manducaret; et ideo dicit *interea*, idest, inter mulieris verba et locutionem Christi cum ea, et inter tempus adventus Samaritanorum, *rogabant eum*, scilicet Christum, *discipuli eius, dicentes: Rabbi, manduca*; arbitantes hoc tempus fore aptum ad prandium, antequam multitudo eorum concurreret. Non enim coram aliquo advena sibi escas propinabant: unde dicitur Mc. VI, 31, quod tanta multitudo confluebat ad eum, quod non habebat tempus manducandi.

Hunc autem fructum manifestat, data sibi occasione dicens *ille autem dixit eis* etc.: ubi primo ponit fructum figurata locutione; secundo innuitur tarditas discipulorum ad intelligendum, ibi *dicebant ergo discipuli eius*; tertio exponit dominus quae dixerat, ibi *dixit eis Iesus: meus cibus est ut faciam voluntatem eius qui misit me*.

Fructus autem spiritualis doctrinae proponitur sub figura cibi et refectionis; et ideo dicit *ego cibum habeo manducare*. Et sciendum quod sicut refectio corporalis non est perfecta nisi cibo iungatur potus, et e converso; ita etiam ad spiritualem refectionem utrumque haberi debet; Eccli. XV, 3: *cibavit illum dominus pane vitae et intellectus*, ecce cibus, *et aqua sapientiae salutaris*, ecce potus, *potavit illum*. Ideo congrue post poculi negotium, quo Samaritana potata fuerat, conveniens erat et de cibo disceptare: et sicut per aquam intelligitur sapientia salutaris, ita per cibum intelligitur operatio bona.

Cibus autem iste quem Christus manducare habebat, est salus hominum, quam quaerebat: ostendens per hoc quod dicit se cibum habere manducare, quantum desiderium habet salutis nostrae. Sicut

631 Now the effect of this spiritual teaching is elaborated. First, by what Christ said to his disciples; secondly, by the effect of all this on the Samaritans (v 39). Concerning the first he does two things. First, we have the situation in which Christ speaks to his disciples; secondly, what he said (v 32).

632 The situation is the insistence of the apostles that Christ eat. He says, **Meanwhile**, i.e., between the time that Christ and the woman spoke and the Samaritans came, **his disciples asked him**, that is, Christ, **Rabbi, eat something**: for they thought that then was a good time to eat, before the crowds came from the town. For the disciples did not usually offer Christ food in the presence of strangers: so we read in Mark (6:3 1), that so many people came to him that he did not even have time to eat.

633 After presenting the situation, he gives its fruit. First, it is given in figurative language. Secondly, we see the disciples are slow in understanding this. Thirdly, the Lord explains what he meant (v 34).

634 The fruit of his spiritual teaching is proposed under the symbols of food and nourishment, so the Lord says, **I have food to eat**. We Should note that just as bodily nourishment is incomplete unless there is both food and drink, so also both Should be found in spiritual nourishment: "The Lord fed him with the bread of life and understanding," this is the food, "and gave him a drink of the water of saving wisdom," and this is the drink (Sir 15:3). So it was appropriate for Christ to speak of food after having given drink to the Samaritan woman. And just as water is a symbol for saving wisdom, so food is a symbol of good works.

The food that Christ had to eat is the salvation of men; this was what he desired. When he says that he has food to eat, he shows how great a desire he has for our salvation. For just as we desire to eat

enim nobis cum esurimus, concupiscibile est manducare, ita et ei salvare nos; Prov. VIII, 31: *deliciae meae sunt esse cum filiis hominum*. Et ideo dicit *cibum*, idest conversionem gentium, *habeo manducare quem vos nescitis*: quia non poterant adhuc praecognoscere conversionem gentium.

Vel aliter, secundum Origenem, contingit sicut de cibo corporali, ita et de spirituali; non enim eadem quantitas omnibus sufficit, sed uni quidem maior quantitas necessaria est, alteri minor; et uni quidem sanum est quod alteri nocet. Eodem modo in spirituali refectio: non enim eadem qualitas, seu quantitas doctrinae spiritualis adhibenda est singulis, sed secundum dispositionis congruitatem et capacitatem hominum. Nam, secundum apostolum: *nuper geniti infantes rationabile lac appetunt*. Perfectorum autem est solidus cibus: unde Origenes dicit, quod ille qui est altioris doctrinae, et aliis in spiritualibus praeest, potest hoc verbum dicere infirmis et debilius intellectus existentibus. Et sic apostolus loquitur, I Cor. III, 1: *tamquam parvulis in Christo, lac vobis potum dedi, non escam*. Et hoc multo amplius veridicus Iesus dicere potest *cibum habeo manducare*; infra XVI, 12: *multa habeo vobis dicere quae non potestis portare modo*.

Tarditas autem intellectus discipulorum innuitur ex hoc quod ea quae dixit dominus de cibo spirituali, intelligebant de corporali: adhuc enim et ipsi sine intellectu erant, secundum illud Matth. XV, 16. *Et ideo dicebant discipuli ad invicem* et cetera. Non est ergo mirum, si mulier illa Samaritana spiritualem aquam non intelligebat; ecce enim quod discipuli Iudaei spiritualem non intelligunt escam.

In hoc autem quod dicunt adinvicem *numquid aliquis attulit ei?* Consuetudinem Christi debemus attendere, quia cibos ab aliis oblatos solebat accipere: non quod bonis nostris indigeret, quia *bonorum nostrorum non indiget*, ut dicitur in Ps. XV, 2, nec esca hominum, quia dat escam omni carni.

when we are hungry, so he desires to save us: “My delight is to be with the children of men” (Prv 8:3 1). So he says, **I have food to eat**, i.e., the conversion of the nations, **of which you do not know**; for they had no way of knowing beforehand about this conversion of the nations.

635 Origen explains this in a different way, as follows. Spiritual food is like bodily food. The same amount of bodily food is not enough for everyone; some need more, others less. Again, what is good for one is harmful to another. The same thing happens in spiritual nourishment: for the same kind and amount should not be given to everyone, but adjusted to what is appropriate to the disposition and capacity of each. “Like newborn babes, desire spiritual milk” (1 Pt 2:2). Solid food is for the perfect; thus Origen says that the man who understands the loftier doctrine, and who has charge of others in spiritual matters, can teach this doctrine to those who are weaker and have less understanding. Accordingly, the Apostle says in 1 Corinthians (3:2): “Being little ones in Christ, I gave you milk, not solid food.” And Jesus could say this with much more truth: **I have food to eat**; and “I have many things to tell you, but you cannot bear them now” (below 16:12).

636 The slowness of the disciples to understand these matters is implied by the fact that what our Lord said about spiritual food, they understood as referring to bodily food. For even they were still without understanding, as we see from Matthew (15:16). It is not surprising that this Samaritan woman did not understand about spiritual water, for even the Jewish disciples did not understand about spiritual food.

In their saying to each other, **Do you suppose that someone has brought him something to eat?** we should note that it was customary for Christ to accept food from others; but not because he needs our goods: “He does not need our goods” (Ps 15:2), nor our food, because it is he who gives food to every living thing.

Sed quare quaerebat, et ab aliis accipiebat? Propter duo. Primo ut dantes et afferentes, meritum consequerentur; secundo, ut daret Christus exemplum, quod vacantes spiritualibus non erubescant paupertatem, nec grave putent ab aliis nutriri. Proprium est enim doctoribus alios habere procuratores ciborum, ut ipsi de nullo curantes, verbi ministrationem sollicite procurent, ut dicit Chrysostomus. Et hoc idem habetur in Glossa. I Tim. c. V, 17: *qui bene praesunt presbyteri, duplici honore digni habeantur, maxime qui laborant in verbo et doctrina.*

637 Then why did he desire and accept goods from others? For two reasons. First, so that those who give him these things might acquire merit. Secondly, in order to give us an example. that those engrossed in spiritual matters should not be ashamed of their poverty, nor regard it burdensome to be supported by others. For it is fitting that teachers have others provide their food so that, being free from such concerns, they may carefully pay attention to the ministry of the word, as Chrysostom says, and as we find in the Gloss. “Let the elders who rule well be regarded as worthy of a double compensation; especially those concerned with preaching and teaching (1 Tim 5:17).”

Lectio 4

34 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς,

ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν
ἵνα ποιήσω τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με
καὶ τελειώσω αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον.
35 οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι
ἔτι τετράμηνός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται;
ἰδοὺ λέγω ὑμῖν,
ἐπάρατε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν
καὶ θεάσασθε τὰς χώρας
ὅτι λευκαί εἰσιν πρὸς θερισμόν.
ἤδη 36 ὁ θερίζων μισθὸν λαμβάνει
καὶ συνάγει καρπὸν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον,
ἵνα ὁ σπείρων ὁμοῦ χαίρῃ καὶ ὁ θερίζων.
37 ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ἀληθινός
ὅτι ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ σπείρων
καὶ ἄλλος ὁ θερίζων.
38 ἐγὼ ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς θερίζειν
ὃ οὐχ ὑμεῖς κεκοπιάκατε:
ἄλλοι κεκοπιάκασιν,
καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν κόπον αὐτῶν εἰσεληλύθατε.

LECTURE 4

34 Jesus explained to them,

“My food is to do the will of him
who sent me, to accomplish his work.
35 Do you not have a saying:
‘There are still four months, and it will be harvest time’?
So I say to you: Lift up your eyes,
look at the fields, because they are
already white for the harvest!
36 He who reaps receives his wages
and gathers fruit for eternal life,
so that the sower can rejoice
at the same time as the reaper.
37 For here the saying is verified:
‘One man sows, another reaps.’
38 I have sent you to reap
what you have not worked for.
Others have done the work,
and you have entered into their labors.”

Posita tarditate intellectus discipulorum circa figuratam locutionem, hic consequenter dominus explanat eam, et primo ponit explanationem figuratae locutionis; secundo adhibet similitudinem, ibi *nonne vos dicitis, quia adhuc quatuor menses sunt, et messis venit?*

Circa primum sciendum est, quod sicut Christus supra explanavit mulieri, quod figuraliter ei proposuit de aqua, sic et apostolis explanat quod figuraliter eis de cibo proposuit, sed aliter et aliter: nam apostolis tamquam capacioribus absque verborum involutione expositionem statim proponit; mulierem autem, utpote minus capacem, per multa verba ad veritatis cognitionem perducit.

Hoc autem quod dicit *meus cibus est ut faciam voluntatem eius qui misit me, ut perficiam eius opus*, satis rationabilem habet causam. Cum enim cibus corporalis sustentet hominem, et perficiat ipsum, ille est spiritualis cibus animae, et creaturae rationalis, quo sustentatur et perficitur. Hoc autem est ut coniungatur suo fini et ut sequatur regulam superiorem; quod David intelligens dicebat, Ps. LXXII, 27: *mihi autem adhaerere Deo bonum est*. Et ideo Christus secundum quod homo, convenienter suum cibum esse dicit, ut Dei faciat voluntatem, et ut perficiat opus eius.

Et haec quidem duo possunt intelligi ut unum: ita tamen quod secundum sit expositio primi. Vel possunt intelligi ut aliud et aliud.

Si autem intelligantur ut unum, tunc est sensus: *meus cibus est*, idest, in hoc est firmitas et sustentatio mea, *ut faciam voluntatem eius qui misit me*, secundum illud Ps. XXXIX, 9: *facere voluntatem tuam, Deus meus, volui, et legem tuam in medio cordis mei*; infra VI, 38: *descendi de caelo, non ut faciam voluntatem meam, sed voluntatem eius qui misit me*. Sed quia facere voluntatem alicuius intelligitur dupliciter: uno modo ut faciat eum velle, alio modo ut opere

638 Since the disciples were slow to understand the Lord's figure of speech, the Lord now explains it. First, we have its explanation; secondly, its application (v 35).

639 As to the first, we should note that just as Christ explained to the Samaritan woman what he had told her in figurative language about water, so he explains to his apostles what he told them in figurative language about food. But he does not do so in the same way in both cases. Since the apostles were able to understand these matters more easily, he explains to them at once and in few words; but to the Samaritan woman, since she Could not understand as well, our Lord leads her to the truth with a longer explanation.

640 It is perfectly reasonable for Christ to say, **My food is to do the will of him who sent me, to accomplish his work**. For as bodily food sustains a man and brings him to perfection, the spiritual food of the soul and of the rational creature is that by which he is sustained and perfected; and this consists in being joined to his end and following a higher rule. David, understanding this, said: "For me, to adhere to God is good" (Ps 72:28). Accordingly, Christ, as man, fittingly says that his food is to do the will of God, to accomplish his work.

641 These two expressions can be understood as meaning the same thing, in the sense that the second is explaining the first. Or, they can be understood in different ways.

If we understand them as meaning the same, the sense is this: My food is, i.e., in this is my strength and nourishment, **to do the will of him who sent me**; according to, "My God, I desired to do your will, and your law is in my heart" (Ps 39:9), and, "I came down from heaven not to do my own will, but the will of him who sent me" (below 6:38). But because "to do the will" (*facere voluntatem*) of another can be understood in two ways—one, by making him will it, and second, by fulfilling what I know he

compleat illud quod scit eum velle; ideo dominus exponens quid sit facere voluntatem eius qui misit eum, dicit hoc scilicet esse *ut perficiam opus eius*, idest, ut compleam opera quae scio eum velle; infra IX, 4: *me oportet operari opera eius qui misit me donec dies est*.

Si autem intelligatur ut aliud et aliud; sic sciendum est, quod Christus duo fecit in mundo isto. Primo docuit veritatem, invitando, et vocando ad fidem: et in hoc complevit voluntatem patris; infra VI, 40: *haec est voluntas patris qui misit me, ut omnis qui videt filium et credit in eum, habeat vitam aeternam*. Secundo consummavit ipsam veritatem, aperiendo per passionem suam in nobis ianuam vitae, dando potestatem perveniendi ad consummatam veritatem; infra XVII, 4: *opus consummavi quod dedisti ut faciam*. Sic ergo dicit *meus cibus est ut faciam voluntatem eius qui misit me*, vocando homines ad fidem, *ut perficiam opus eius*, perducendo eos ad perfectum.

Vel, secundum Origenem, omnis homo qui bene operatur, ad duo debet dirigere suam intentionem, scilicet ad honorem Dei, et ad utilitatem proximi: quia, sicut dicitur I Tim. I, 5: *finis praecepti est caritas*: quae continet amorem Dei et proximi. Et sic quando aliquid facimus propter Deum, finis praecepti est Deus; quando vero propter utilitatem proximi, finis praecepti est proximus. Secundum hoc ergo dicit Christus *meus cibus est ut faciam voluntatem Dei*, idest ut intentionem meam dirigam et regulem in his quae sunt ad honorem Dei, *ut perficiam opus eius*, idest, ea faciam quae sunt ad utilitatem et perfectionem hominis.

Sed contra, Dei perfecta sunt opera: non ergo convenienter dicitur opera perfici Dei. Respondeo dicendum, quod inter ceteras creaturas inferiores homo est speciale opus Dei, quia ad imaginem et similitudinem suam fecit illum Gen. I, 26. Et hoc opus in principio quidem perfectum fuit, quia Deus fecit hominem rectum, ut dicitur Eccle. VII, 30. Postmodum vero per peccatum hanc perfectionem amisit, et a rectitudine recessit. Et ideo ut hoc opus domini perfectum

wills—therefore, explaining what it means to do the will of him who sent him, the Lord says, **to accomplish his work**, that is, that I might complete the work I know he wants: “I must do the works of him who sent me while it is day” (below 9:4).

If these two expressions are understood as different, then we should point out that Christ did two things in this world. First, he taught the truth, in inviting and calling us to the faith; and by this he fulfilled the will of the Father: “This is the will of my Father, who sent me: that everyone who sees the Son and believes in him should have eternal life” (below 6:40). Secondly, he accomplished the truth by opening in us, by his passion, the gate of life, and by giving us the power to arrive at complete truth: “I have accomplished the work which you gave me to do” (below 17:4). Thus he is saying: **My food is to do the will of him who sent me**, by calling men to the faith, **to accomplish his work**, by leading them to what is perfect.

642 Another interpretation, given by Origen, is that every man who does good works should direct his intention to two things: the honor of God and the good of his neighbor: for as it is said: “The end of the commandment is love” (1 Tim 1:5), and this love embraces both God and our neighbor. And so, when we do something for God’s sake, the end of the commandment is God; but when it is for our neighbor’s good, the end of the commandment is our neighbor. With this in mind, Christ is saying, **My food is to do the will of him who sent me**, God, i.e., to direct and regulate my intention to those matters that concern the honor of God, **to accomplish his work**, i.e., to do things for the benefit and perfection of man.

643 On the other hand, since the works of God are perfect, it does not seem proper to speak of accomplishing or completing them. I answer that among lower creatures, man is the special work of God, who made him to his own image and likeness (Gn 1:26). And in the beginning God made this a perfect work, because as we read in Ecclesiastes (7:30): “God made man upright.” But later, man lost this perfection by sin, and abandoned what was right. And so, this work of the Lord needed to be

esset, reparari indigebat: quod quidem perfectum est per Christum, quia dicitur Rom. V, 19: *sicut enim per unius hominis inobedientiam peccatores constituti sunt multi, ita per unius obedientiam iusti constituentur multi*. Sic Christus dicit *ut perficiam opus eius*, idest ut hominem ad perfectum deducam.

Consequenter cum dicit *nonne vos dicitis quod adhuc quatuor menses sunt, et messis venit?* etc. ponit similitudinem. Sed attende, quod Christus a muliere potum petivit, dicens: *da mihi bibere*, et ideo occasione huius petitionis introduxit similitudinem de aqua. Hic vero discipuli inducunt dominum ad manducandum: unde et occasione huius introducit dominus similitudinem de cibo spirituali, quia idem intelligitur per cibum et potum.

Sic ergo sunt quidam a quibus Deus petit potum sicut a muliere; quidam vero Deo offerunt potum. Sed cibum nullus Deo offert nisi prius petierit ab eo Deus: tunc enim Deo cibum spirituale offerimus quando ab eo poscimus salutem nostram, cum scilicet petimus: *fiat voluntas tua sicut in caelo et in terra*. Salutem ex nobis ipsis consequi non possumus nisi praeveniti a gratia praeveniente, secundum illud Thren. ult., 21: *converte nos, domine, ad te, et convertemur*.

Ipse ergo prius petit qui per praevenientem gratiam nos petere facit. In hac autem similitudine primo agit de messe; secundo de messoribus, ibi *et qui metit, mercedem accipit*. Circa primum duo facit. Primo ponit similitudinem de messe corporali; secundo de messe spirituali, ibi *ecce dico vobis: levate oculos vestros*, et cetera.

Per hoc autem quod dicit *nonne vos dicitis, quod adhuc quatuor menses sunt, et messis venit?* Datur intelligi quod Christus statim post captionem Ioannis de Iudaea recessit, sicut dicitur Matth. IV, 12, et transivit per Samariam; et quod hoc fuit in hieme: et Ioannes similiter captus. Unde quia ibi tempestivius messes perficiuntur, quatuor menses erant ab illo tempore usque ad messem. Dicit

repaired in order to become right again; and this was accomplished by Christ, for “Just as by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one man, many will be made just” (Rom 5:19). Thus Christ says, to **accomplish his work**, i.e., to bring man back to what is perfect.

644 Then when he says, **Do you not have a saying: There are still four months, and it will be harvest time?** he makes use of a simile. Note that when Christ asked the Samaritan woman for a drink, “Give me a drink,” he made use of a simile concerning water. But here, the the disciples are urging the Lord to eat, and now he makes use of a simile concerning spiritual food.

There are some persons whom God asks for a drink, as this Samaritan woman; and there are some who offer a drink to God. But no one offers food to God unless God first asks him for it: for we offer spiritual food to God when we ask him for our salvation, that is, when we ask, “Your will be done on earth as it is in heaven” (Mt 6:10). We cannot obtain salvation of ourselves, unless we are pre-moved by “prevenient grace,” according to the statement in Lamentations (5:21): “Make us come back to you, O Lord, and we will come back” (Lam 5:21). The Lord himself, therefore, first asks for that which makes us ask through “prevenient grace.”

In this simile, we have first, the harvest. Secondly, those who reap the harvest (v 36). He does two things concerning the first. First, he states the simile concerning the natural harvest; secondly, concerning the spiritual harvest (v 35b).

645 **Do you not have a saying: There are still four months, and it will be harvest time?** We can see from this that, as stated in Matthew (4:12), Christ left Judea and traveled through Samaria right after John was arrested, and that all this happened during the winter. So, because the harvests ripen there more according to the season, there were four months from that time till the harvest. Thus he says, **Do you not have a**

ergo *nonne vos dicitis*, loquendo de messe corporali, *quod adhuc quatuor menses sunt*, qui extant futuri, *et messis venit?* Idest, tempus collectionis messium. *Sed ecce dico vobis*, de spirituali messe loquens, *levate oculos vestros, et videte regiones, quae albae sunt iam ad messem*.

Ubi sciendum est, quod tempus messium dicitur tempus collectionis fructuum: et ideo omnis collectio fructuum comparatur tempori messium. Tempus autem collectionis fructuum duplex est. Nihil enim prohibet in temporalibus et in spiritualibus, quin illud quod est fructus respectu praecedentium, sit etiam semen respectu sequentium: nam bona opera sunt fructus spiritualis doctrinae, sicut fides, et huiusmodi; quae tamen sunt semina vitae aeternae, quia per ea ad vitam aeternam pervenitur. Eccli. XXIV, 23 dicit sapientia: *flores mei*, respectu fructus sequentis, *sunt fructus honoris et honestatis*, respectu praecedentium.

Secundum hoc ergo una est collectio messis spiritualis respectu fructuum aeternorum, scilicet congregatio fidelium in vitam aeternam: de qua dicitur Matth. XIII, 39: *messis est consummatio saeculi*. Et de ista non agitur hic. Alia est in praesenti. Et hoc potest intelligi dupliciter. Uno modo collectio fructuum, scilicet fidelium in Ecclesia congregandorum conversio; alio modo ipsa cognitio veritatis, qua aliquis fructum veritatis in anima sua congregat: et de utraque secundum diversas expositiones hic agitur.

De prima, secundum Augustinum et Chrysostomum, hoc modo: *vos dicitis*, quoniam adhuc non est tempus corporalis messis; sed non sic est de messe spirituali, *immo ecce dico vobis: levate oculos vestros*, scilicet mentis per considerationem, vel oculos etiam corporis, *et videte regiones, quoniam albae sunt iam ad messem*: quia scilicet tota regio plena erat Samaritanis ad Christum exeuntibus.

saying, about the natural harvest, **There are still four months** that must pass, **and it will be harvest time?** i.e., the time for gathering up the harvest. So I say to you, speaking of the spiritual harvest, Lift up your eyes, **look at the fields, because they are already white for the harvest.**

646 Here we should point out that harvest time is the time when the fruit is gathered; and so whenever fruit is gathered can be regarded as a harvest time. Now fruit is gathered at two times: for both in temporal and in spiritual matters there is nothing to prevent what is fruit in relation to an earlier state from being seed in relation to something later. For example, good works are the fruit of spiritual instruction, as is faith and other such things; but these in turn are seeds of eternal life, because eternal life is acquired through them. So Sirach (24:23) says: "My blossoms," in relation to the fruit to follow, "bear the fruit of of honor and riches," in relation to what preceded.

With this in mind, there is a certain gathering of a spiritual harvest; and this concerns an eternal fruit, i.e., the gathering of the faithful into eternal life, of which we read: "The harvest is the end of the world" (Mt 13:39). We are not here concerned with this harvest. Another spiritual harvest is gathered in the present; and this is understood in two ways. In the first, the gathering of the fruit is the converting of the faithful to be assembled in the Church; in the second, the gathering is the very knowing of the truth, by which a person gathers the fruit of truth into his soul. And we are concerned with these two gatherings of the harvest, depending on the different expositions.

647 Augustine and Chrysostom understand the gathering of the harvest in the first way, as follows. You say that it is not yet the time for the natural harvest; but this is not true of the spiritual harvest. Indeed, **I say to you: Lift up your eyes**, i.e., the eyes of your mind, by thinking, or even your physical eyes, **look at the fields, because they are already white for the harvest**: because the entire countryside was full of Samaritans coming to Christ.

Hoc autem quod dicit *albae sunt*, metaphoricum est: cum enim segetes dealbatae sunt, signum est quod sunt praeparatae ad messem. Nihil aliud per hoc significare voluit quam quod homines ad salutem et susceptionem verbi parati erant ei. Unde dicit *videte regiones*, quia non solum Iudaei, sed etiam gentiles parati sunt ad fidem. Matth. c. IX, 37: *messis quidem multa, operarii autem pauci*. Et sicut messes dealbantur propter praesentiam solis aestivo tempore magis ferventis, ita et homines per adventum solis iustitiae, scilicet Christi, et praedicationem atque virtutem suam, praeparabantur ad salutem. Et de isto sole dicitur Mal. IV, 2: *vobis timentibus nomen meum oriatur sol iustitiae*. Et inde est quod tempus adventus eius dicitur tempus plenitudinis; Gal. IV, 4: *cum ergo venit plenitudo temporis, misit Deus filium suum*.

De secunda autem collectione messis, idest veritatis in anima, exponit Origenes, qui dicit, quod tot fructus veritatis colligit in messe, quot quis veritates cognoscit. Et vult, quod totum hoc quod dicitur *nonne vos dicitis quoniam adhuc quatuor menses sunt et messis venit? Et ecce dico vobis: levate oculos vestros, et videte regiones, quia albae sunt iam ad messem*, intelligatur parabolice dictum. Et secundum hoc duo facit dominus in verbis istis. Primo ponit falsam opinionem quorundam; secundo excludit eam, ibi ego dico vobis.

Opinio namque quorundam erat quod nulla veritas alicuius rei haberi possit ab homine et ex hoc derivata est haeresis Academicorum dicentium nihil pro certo sciri posse in vita ista; iuxta quod dicitur Eccle. VII, v. 24: *cuncta tentavi in sapientia. Dixi: sapiens efficiar. Illa autem recessit a me multo magis quam fuerat*. Hanc ergo opinionem tangit dominus, dicens *nonne vos dicitis, quoniam adhuc quatuor menses sunt, et messis venit?* Id est, tota vita praesens, in qua homo quatuor elementis deservit, finiri oportet ut post eam collectio veritatis habeatur in alia vita.

Sed hanc opinionem consequenter excludit cum dicit: non est ita; sed ecce dico vobis: *levate oculos vestros*. Hoc enim in sacra

The statement that the fields are already white is metaphorical: for when sown fields are white, it is a sign that they are ready for harvest. And so he only means to say by this that the people were ready for salvation and to hear the word. He says, **look at the fields**, because not only the Jews, but the Gentiles as well, were ready for the faith: "The harvest is great, but the workers are few" (Mt 9:37). And just as harvests are made white by the presence of the burning heat of the summer sun, so by the coming of the Sun of justice, i.e., Christ, and his preaching and power, men are made ready for salvation. Malachi (4:2) says: "The sun of justice will rise on you who fear my name." Thus it is that the time of Christ's coming is called the time of plenitude or fulness: "When the fulness of time had come, God sent his Son" (Gal 4:4).

648 Origen deals with the second gathering of the harvest, i.e., the gathering of truth in the soul. He says that one gathers as much of the fruit of truth in the harvest as the truths he knows. And he says that everything said here (v 35) was presented as a parable. In this interpretation, the Lord does two things. First, he mentions a false doctrine held by some. Secondly, he rejects it, I say to you.

Some thought that man could not acquire any truth about anything. This opinion gave rise to the heresy of the Academicians, who maintained that nothing can be known as certain in this life; about which we read: "I tested all things by wisdom. I said: 'I will acquire wisdom,' and it became further from me" (Ecc 7:24). Our Lord mentions this opinion when he says, Do you not have a saying: There are **still four months and it will be harvest time?** i.e., this whole present life, in which man serves under the four elements, must end, so that after it truth may be gathered in another life.

Our Lord rejects this opinion when he says: This is not true, I say to you: Lift up your eyes. Sacred Scripture usually uses this expression when

Scriptura dici consuevit quodcumque aliquod subtile et altum considerandum praecipitur, Is. XL, 26: *levate in excelsum oculos vestros, et videte quis creavit haec*. Nam oculi quando non sunt elevati a terrenis, vel a concupiscentia carnali, non sunt idonei ad cognitionem spiritualis fructus: nam quandoque deprimuntur ad terrena, retracti a consideratione divinorum, secundum illud Ps. XVI, 11: *oculos suos statuerunt declinare in terram*, quandoque excaecantur per concupiscentiam, Dan. XIII, 9: *et declinaverunt oculos suos, ut non viderent caelum, neque recordarentur iudiciorum Dei*.

Dicit ergo *levate oculos vestros, et videte regiones, quoniam albae sunt iam ad messem*, idest, ita dispositae, quod ex eis veritas sciri potest: nam per regiones specialiter intelliguntur omnia ex quibus veritas accipi potest. Et hae specialiter sunt Scripturae. Infra V, 39: *scrutamini Scripturas (...) quia ipsae testimonium perhibent de me*. Et hae regiones erant quidem in veteri testamento; sed non erant albae ad messem, quia homines non poterant ex eis spiritualemente fructum accipere quousque Christus venit, qui eas dealbavit, aperiendo eorum intellectum; Lc. ult., 45: *aperuit illis sensum, ut intelligerent Scripturas*. Item creaturae sunt messes, ex quibus colligitur fructus veritatis; ad Rom. I, 20: *invisibilia Dei per ea quae facta sunt, intellecta conspiciuntur*. Sed tamen gentiles qui earum cognitioni insistebant, erroris potius quam veritatis fructus ex eis colligebant: quia, ut ibidem dicitur, *servierunt creaturae potius quam creatori*. Et ideo nondum albae erant; sed Christo veniente, albae factae sunt ad messem.

Consequenter cum dicit *et qui metit, mercedem accipit*, agit de messoribus: et circa hoc primo ponit messorum praemium; secundo inducit proverbium, ibi *in hoc enim est verbum verum*; tertio exponit, idest adaptat ipsum, ibi *ego misi vos metere*.

Quantum ad primum notandum est quod dominus exponens supra quod de aqua dixerat spirituali, proposuit conditionem, per quam aqua spiritualis differt a corporali: quia scilicet qui biberit ex aqua

something subtle and profound is being presented; as, “Lift up your eyes on high, and see who has created these things” (Is 40:26). For when our eyes are not lifted away from earthly things or from the desires of the flesh, they are not fit to know spiritual fruit. For sometimes they are prevented from considering divine things because they have stooped to earthly things: “They have fixed their eyes on the earth” (Ps 16:11); sometimes they are blinded by concupiscence: “They have averted their eyes so as not to look at heaven or remember the judgments of God” (Dn 13:9).

649 So he says, **Lift up your eyes, look at the fields, because they are already white for the harvest**, i.e., they are such that the truth can be learned from them: for by the “fields” we specifically understand all those things from which truth can be acquired, especially the Scriptures: “Search the Scriptures... they bear witness to me” (below 5:39). Indeed, these fields existed in the Old Testament, but they were not white for the harvest because men were not able to pick spiritual fruit from them until Christ came, who made them white by opening their understanding: “He opened their minds so they could understand the Scriptures” (Lk 24.45). Again, creatures are harvests from which the fruit of truth is gathered: “The invisible things of God are clearly known by the things that have been made” (Rom 1:20). None the less, the Gentiles who pursued a knowledge of these things gathered the fruits of error rather than of truth from them, because as we read, “they served the creature rather than the Creator” (Rom 1:25). So the harvests were not yet white; but they were made white for the harvest when Christ came.

650 Next (v 36), he deals with the reapers. First, he gives their reward. Secondly, he mentions a proverb. And thirdly, he explains it, i.e., applies it (v 38).

651 Concerning the first, we should note that when the Lord was explaining earlier about spiritual water, he mentioned the way in which spiritual water differs from natural water: a person who drinks natural

corporali sitiet iterum qui vero biberit ex aqua spirituali non sitiet in aeternum. Eodem modo etiam hic exponens quod dicit de messe, proponit quod dissimile est inter messem corporalem et spiritualem; unde tria proponit.

Unum quidem secundum quod attenditur similitudo utriusque messis, scilicet quod qui metit tam in corporali messe quam in spirituali, mercedem accipit. Ille autem metit spiritualiter, qui congregat fideles in Ecclesia, vel qui colligit fructus veritatis in anima sua. Et uterque mercedem accipit, secundum illud I Cor. III, 8: *unusquisque propriam mercedem accipiet secundum suum laborem*.

Duo alia proponit, secundum quae attenditur dissimilitudo. Primo quidem, quia fructus messoris, qui metit messem corporalem, pertinet ad vitam corporalem; sed fructus eius qui metit messem spiritualem, pertinet ad vitam aeternam. Et ideo dicit *et congregat*, ille scilicet qui metit spiritualiter, *fructum in vitam aeternam*, scilicet fideles qui ad vitam aeternam pervenerint; Rom. VI, 22: *habetis fructum vestrum in sanctificationem, finem vero vitam aeternam*. Vel ipsam cognitionem et expositionem veritatis per quam homo acquirit vitam aeternam. Eccli. XXIV, v. 31: *qui elucidant me, vitam aeternam habebunt*. Secundo vero attenditur dissimilitudo: quia in messe corporali ad miseriam reputatur quod unus seminet et alius metat, unde qui seminat tristatur de hoc quod alius metit; sed in semine spirituali aliter est, quia *qui seminat simul gaudet, et qui metit*.

Et quidem, secundum Chrysostomum et Augustinum, seminantes semen spirituale sunt patres veteris testamenti et prophetae: nam, ut dicitur Lc. VIII, 11, *semen est verbum Dei* quod Moyses et prophetae seminauerunt in Iudaea; sed apostoli messuerunt, quia ipsi quod intendebant, scilicet homines adducere ad Christum, efficere non potuerunt, quod tamen apostoli fecerunt. Et ideo utrique simul gaudent, scilicet apostoli et prophetae, in una mansione gloriae, de conversione fidelium; Is. LI, 3: *gaudium et laetitia inuenietur in ea, gratiarum actio et vox laudis*. Et per hoc confutatur

water will become thirsty again, but one who drinks spiritual water will never be thirsty again. Here, too, in explaining about the harvest, he points out the difference between a natural and a spiritual harvest. Three things are mentioned.

First, the way in which the two harvests are similar: namely, in that the person who reaps either harvest receives a wage. But the one who reaps spiritually is the one who gathers the faithful into the Church, or who gathers the fruit of truth into his soul. Each of these will receive a wage, according to: "Each one will receive his own wage according to his work" (1 Cor 3:8).

The two other points he mentions concern the ways the two harvests are unlike each other. First, the fruit gathered from a natural harvest concerns the life of the body; but the fruit gathered by one who reaps a spiritual harvest concerns eternal life. So he says, he who reaps, i.e., he who reaps spiritually, **gathers fruit for eternal life**, that is, the faithful, who will obtain eternal life: "Your fruit is sanctification, your end is eternal life" (Rom 6:22). Or, this fruit is the very knowing and explaining of the truth by which man acquires eternal life: "Those who explain me will have eternal life," as we read in Sirach (24:3 1). Secondly, the two harvests are unlike because in a natural harvest it is considered a misfortune that one should sow and another reap; hence he who sows is saddened when another reaps. But it is not this way when the seed is spiritual, for **the sower can rejoice at the same time as the reaper**.

According to Chrysostom and Augustine, the ones who sow spiritual seed are the fathers and prophets of the Old Testament, for "The seed is the word of God" (Lk 8:11), which Moses and the prophets sowed in the land of Judah. But the apostles were the reapers, because the former were not able to accomplish what they wanted to do, i.e., to bring men to Christ; this was done by the apostles. And so both the apostles and the prophets rejoice together, in one mansion of glory, over the conversion of the faithful: "Joy and gladness will be found there, thanksgiving and the voice of praise" (Is 51:3). This refutes the heresy of the Manicheans

haeresis Manichaeorum damnantium patres veteris testamenti; cum tamen, ut hic dominus dicit, simul gaudebunt cum apostolis.

Secundum Origenem vero, seminantes in qualibet facultate dicuntur illi qui quaelibet illius facultatis principia tradunt; metentes vero qui ex illis procedunt ulterius: et hoc multo magis in ista, quae est omnium scientiarum scientia. Prophetæ seminantes sunt, quia multa de divinis tradiderunt; messorum vero sunt apostoli, qui ea quae non manifestaverunt prophetæ hominibus, praedicando et docendo revelaverunt. Eph. III, 5: *quod aliis generationibus non est agnitum (...) sicut nunc revelatum est sanctis apostolis eius.*

Consequenter cum dicit *in hoc enim est verbum verum* etc., inducitur proverbium; quasi dicat, quod *in hoc*, idest in isto facto, *verum est verbum*, idest impletur vulgare proverbium, quod erat apud Iudaeos, scilicet unus seminat et alius metit. Quod proverbium derivari videtur ex eo quod dicitur Lev. XXVI, 16: *seretis frustra segetem, quae ab hostibus devorabitur*. Ex quo consueverunt Iudaei, quando aliquis in re aliqua laborabat, et alius inde gaudebat, huiusmodi proverbium proferre. Hoc est ergo quod dominus dicit: in hoc quod prophetæ seminaverunt et laboraverunt, et vos metitis et gaudetis, impletur proverbium.

Vel aliter. *In hoc verbum verum est*, scilicet quod ego dico, *quod alius est qui seminat, et alius qui metit*; quia vos metetis fructus ex laboribus prophetarum. Sed prophetæ quidem et apostoli alii sunt, non in fide: quia et illi et isti fidem habuerunt, Rom. c. III, 21: *nunc autem sine lege iustitia Dei manifestata est, testificata a lege et prophetis*, sunt tamen alii in conversatione: quia prophetæ vivebant sub caeremoniis legalibus, a quibus Christiani et apostoli liberi sunt. Gal. c. IV, 3: *et cum essemus parvuli, sub elementis huius mundi eramus servientes. At ubi venit plenitudo temporis, misit Deus filium suum factum ex muliere, factum sub lege, ut eos qui sub lege erant redimeret, ut adoptionem filiorum reciperemus*. Et licet disparis

who condemn the fathers of the Old Testament; for as the Lord says here, they will rejoice with the apostles.

According to Origen, however, the “sowers” in any faculty [of the soul] are those who confer the very first principles of that faculty; but the reapers are those who proceed from these principles to further truths. And this is all the more true of the science of all the sciences. The prophets are sowers, because they handed down many things concerning divine matters; but the apostles are the reapers, because in preaching and teaching they revealed many things which the prophets did not make known: “which was not made known to the sons of men in other generations as it has now been revealed to his holy apostles” (Eph 3:5).

652 Then when he says, **For here the saying is verified**, we are given a proverb. As if to say: **For here**, i.e., in this fact, **the saying is verified**, i.e., the proverb in current use among the Jews is fulfilled: **One man sows, another reaps**. This proverb seems to have grown out of a statement in Leviticus (26:16): “You will sow your seed in vain for it will be devoured by your enemies.” As a result, the Jews used this proverb when one person labored on something, but another received the pleasure from it. This then is what our Lord says: The proverb is verified here because it was the prophets who sowed and labored, while you are the ones to reap and rejoice.

Another interpretation would be this. **For here the saying is verified**, i.e. what I am saying to you, **One man sows, another reaps**, because you will reap the fruits of the labor of the prophets. Now the prophets and the apostles are different, but not in faith, for they both had faith: “But now the justice of God has been manifested outside the law; the law and the prophets bore witness to it” (Rom 3:21). They are different in their manner of life, for the prophets lived under the ceremonies of the law, from which the apostles and Christians have been freed: “When we were children, we were slaves under the elements of this world. But when the fulness of time came, God sent his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, so that we could receive

temporis labores habuerint apostoli et prophetae, tamen gaudio pariter perfruentur, et mercedem accipient *in vitam aeternam: ut simul gaudeat qui seminat et qui metit*. Et hoc praefiguratum fuit in transfiguratione Christi, ubi omnes gloriam suam habuerunt, et patres veteris testamenti, scilicet Moyses et Elias, et patres novi testamenti, scilicet Petrus, Ioannes et Iacobus: dans per hoc intelligere, quod in illa futura gloria simul gaudent novi et veteris testamenti iusti.

Consequenter cum dicit *ego misi vos metere quod non laborastis*, adaptat proverbium ad propositum, et primo dicit apostolos esse messoros; secundo ostendit esse laboratores, ibi *alii laboraverunt, et vos in labores eorum introistis*.

Quantum ad primum dicit: dico quod *alius est qui metit*, quia vos estis messoros, *alius est qui seminat*, quia *ego misi vos metere quod non laborastis*. Non autem dicit mittam sed *misi*, quia bis misit eos: semel ante passionem suam ad Iudaeos, cum dixit eis: *in viam gentium ne abieritis (...) sed ite potius ad oves quae perierunt domus Israel*, ut dicitur Matth. X, 5. Et quantum ad hanc missionem, missi fuerunt metere quod non laboraverunt, scilicet ipsos Iudaeos convertere, in quibus prophetae laboraverunt. Misit autem eos post resurrectionem ad gentes, dicens eis, Mc. ult., 15: *euntes in mundum universum, praedicare Evangelium omni creaturae*. In hac missione missi sunt de novo seminare; unde apostolus, Rom. XV, v. 20 et 21: *sic autem praedicavi Evangelium, ubi non nominatus est Christus, ne super alienum fundamentum aedificarem; sed sicut scriptum est: quibus non est annuntiatum de eo, videbunt, et qui non audierunt, intelligent*. Et ideo dicit *misi*, habens respectum ad primam missionem. Sic ergo apostoli sunt messoros, sed alii, scilicet prophetae, sunt seminatores.

Unde dicit *alii laboraverunt*, seminando primordia doctrinae Christi, *et vos in labores eorum introitis*, ad colligendum fructus. Sap. III, 15: *bonorum laborum gloriosus est fructus*. Laboraverunt, inquam, prophetae, ut adducerent homines ad Christum. Infra V,

adoption as sons" (Gal 4:3). And although the apostles and prophets labor at different times, nevertheless they will rejoice equally and receive wages **for eternal life, so that the sower can rejoice at the same time as the reaper**. This was prefigured in the transfiguration of Christ, where all had their own glory, both the fathers of the Old Testament, that is, Moses and Elijah, and the fathers of the New Testament, that is, Peter, John and James. We see from this that the just of the New and of the Old Testaments will rejoice together in the glory to come.

653 Then (v 38), he applies the proverb. First, he calls the apostles reapers. Secondly, he says they are laborers (v 38b).

654 he says concerning the first: I say that it is one who reaps, because you are reapers, and another who sows, for **I have sent you to reap what you have not worked for**. He does not say, "I will send you," but I have sent you. He says this because he sent them twice. One time was before his passion, when he sent them to the Jews, saying: "Do not go on the roads of the Gentiles... but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt 10:5). In this case, they were sent to reap that on which they did not work, that is, to convert the Jews, among whom the prophets worked. After the resurrection, Christ sent them to the Gentiles, saying: "Go to the whole world, and preach the good news to every creature," as we find in Mark (16:15). This time they were sent to sow for the first time; for as the Apostle says: "I have preached the good news, but not where Christ was already known, so as not to build on another's foundation. But as it is written: 'They to whom he was not proclaimed will see, and they who have not heard will understand.'" (Rom 15:20). And so Christ says, I have sent you, referring to the first time they were sent. This is the way, then, the apostles are reapers, and others, the prophets, are the sowers.

655 Accordingly, he says, Others have done the work, by sowing the beginnings of the doctrine of Christ, **and you have entered into their labors**, to collect the fruit: "The fruit of good labors is glorious" (Wis 3:15). The prophets labored, I say, to bring men to Christ: "If you believed

46: *si crederetis Moysi, crederetis forsitan et mihi: de me enim ille scripsit. Si autem illius litteris non creditis, quomodo verbis meis credetis?* Sed non ipsi fructum messuerunt. Unde secundum hoc dicebat Is. c. XLIX, 4: *in vacuum laboravi, et sine causa: vane fortitudinem meam consumpsi.*

Moses, you would perhaps believe me, for he wrote of me” (below 5:46). If you do not believe his written words, how will you believe my spoken words? But the prophets did not reap the fruit; so Isaiah said with this in mind: “I have labored for nothing and without reason; in vain I have exhausted my strength” (Is 49:4).

Lectio 5

39 ἐκ δὲ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν τῶν Σαμαριτῶν διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικὸς μαρτυρούσης ὅτι εἶπέν μοι πάντα ἃ ἐποίησα. 40 ὥς οὖν ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Σαμαριῖται, ἠρώτων αὐτὸν μέναι παρ' αὐτοῖς; καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ δύο ἡμέρας. 41 καὶ πολλῶ πλείους ἐπίστευσαν διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ, 42 τῇ τε γυναικὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι οὐκέτι διὰ τὴν σὴν λαλιὰν πιστεύομεν: αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀκηκόαμεν, καὶ οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου.

Supra dominus praenuntiavit apostolis fructum qui Samaritanis provenerat ex praedicatione mulieris; hic autem Evangelista agit de isto fructu, et primo ponitur fructus proveniens ex praedicatione mulieris; secundo insinuat augmentatio ipsius fructus facta per Christum, ibi *et multo plures crediderunt in eum propter sermonem eius*. Fructus autem ex praedicatione mulieris proveniens ostenditur quantum ad tria.

Primo quantum ad fidem, quia, in Christum crediderunt; unde dicit *ex civitate autem illa, ad quam scilicet abierat mulier, multi homines crediderunt in eum Samaritanorum*, et hoc *propter verbum mulieris*, a qua Christus aquam petierat, *testimonium perhibentis*, hoc scilicet *quia dixit mihi omnia quaecumque feci*: quod quidem testimonium satis inducens erat ad credendum Christo. Cum enim quae Christus dixerat pertinerent ad defectuum suorum manifestationem, nisi ipsa commota fuisset ad credendum, talia non referret: et ideo statim ad

LECTURE 5

39 Many Samaritans of that town believed in him on the testimony of the woman who said, "He told me everything I ever did." 40 So when the Samaritans came to him, they begged him to stay with them awhile. So he stayed there two days. 41 And many more believed in him because of his own words. 42 And they said to the woman, "Now we believe not just because of your story, but because we have heard him ourselves, and we know that here is truly the Savior of the world."

656 Above, the Lord foretold to the apostles the fruit to be produced among the Samaritans by the woman's witness. Now the Evangelist deals with this fruit. First, the fruit of the woman's witness is given. Secondly, the growth of this fruit produced by Christ (v 41). The fruit of the woman's witness is shown in three ways.

657 First, by the faith of the Samaritans, for they believed in Christ. Thus he says, **Many Samaritans of that town**, to which the woman had returned, believed in him, and this, **on the testimony of the woman**, from whom Christ asked for a drink of water, who said, **He told me everything I ever did**: for this testimony was sufficient inducement to believe Christ. For since Christ had disclosed her failures, she would not have mentioned them if she had not been

auditum verborum suorum crediderunt. In quo significatur quod fides est ex auditu.

Secundo ostenditur fructus quantum ad eorum accessum ad Christum: nam ex fide sequitur desiderium rei creditae. Et ideo postquam crediderunt, accedunt ad Christum, ut perficiantur per eum; unde dicit *cum venissent ad illum Samaritani*. Ps. XXXIII, 6: *accedite ad eum, et illuminamini*. Matth. XI, v. 28: *venite ad me, omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego reficiam vos*.

Tertio quantum ad desiderium: nam credenti non solum est necessarium venire ad Christum, sed quod habeat eum secum; unde dicit quod *rogaverunt eum ut ibi maneret*. *Et mansit ibi duos dies*.

Manet autem dominus nobiscum per caritatem. Infra XIV, 23: *si quis diligit me, sermonem meum servabit*; et paulo post: *et mansionem apud eum faciemus*. Sed manet duos dies, quia duo sunt praecepta caritatis, scilicet dilectionis Dei et proximi, in quibus *lex pendet et prophetae*, ut dicitur Matth. c. XXII, 40. Tertia autem dies est dies gloriae: Oseae, VI, 3: *vivificabit nos post duos dies, in die tertia suscitabit nos*. Et in hac die non mansit ibi, quia Samaritani non erant adhuc capaces gloriae.

Consequenter cum dicit *et multo plures crediderunt in eum propter sermonem eius*, ponit Evangelista quod fructus proveniens ex praedicatione mulieris, augmentatus est ex praesentia Christi; et hoc tripliciter. Primo ex multitudine credentium; secundo ex modo credendi; tertio ex veritate fidei.

Ex multitudine credentium augmentatus est, quia propter mulierem multi crediderunt in eum; sed *multo plures crediderunt propter sermonem eius*, scilicet Christi. In quo signatur, quod licet multi crediderint per prophetas, tamen multo plures conversi sunt ad fidem veniente Christo, secundum

brought to believe. And so the Samaritans believed as soon as they heard her. This indicates that faith comes by hearing.

658 Secondly, the fruit of her witness is shown in their coming to Christ: for faith gives rise to a desire for the thing believed. Accordingly, after they believed, they came to Christ, to be perfected by him. So he says, **So when the Samaritans came to him**. “Come to him, and be enlightened” (Ps 33:6); “Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you” (Mt 11:28).

659 Thirdly, the fruit of her witness is shown in their desire: for a believer must not only come to Christ, but desire that Christ remain with him. So he says, **they begged him to stay with them awhile. So he stayed there two days**.

The Lord remains with us through charity: “If anyone loves me, he will keep my word” (below 14:23), and further on he adds, “and we will make our abode with him.” The Lord remains for two days because there are two precepts of charity: the love of God and the love of our neighbor, “On these two commandments all the law and the prophets depend” (Mt 22:40). But the third day is the day of glory: “He will revive us after two days; on the third day he will raise us up” (Hos 6:3). Christ did not remain there for that day because the Samaritans were not yet capable of glory.

660 Then (v 41), the Evangelist says that the fruit resulting from the witness of the woman was increased by the presence of Christ; and this in three ways. First, in the number of those who believed. Secondly, in their reason for believing. Thirdly, in the truth they believed.

661 The fruit was increased as to the number of those who believed because while many believed in Christ on account of the woman, **many more believed in him because of his own words**, i.e., Christ’s own words. This signifies that although many believed because of the prophets, many more were converted to the

illud Ps. VII, 8: *exurge, domine, in praecepto quod mandasti, et synagoga populorum circumdabit te.*

Secundo augmentatus est fructus ex modo credendi; unde dicunt mulieri *quia iam non propter tuam loquelam credimus.*

Sed notandum, quod tria sunt necessaria ad perfectionem fidei, quae hic per ordinem ponuntur. Primo ut sit recta; secundo ut sit prompta; tertio ut sit certa.

Recta quidem est fides, cum veritati non propter aliquod aliud, sed ei propter seipsam obeditur; et quantum ad hoc dicit, quod *mulieri dicebant*, quod iam *credimus* veritati, *non propter tuam loquelam*, sed propter ipsam veritatem. Inducunt autem nos ad fidem Christi tria. Primo quidem ratio naturalis. Ad Rom. I, 20: *invisibilia Dei a creatura mundi per ea quae facta sunt, intellecta conspiciuntur.* Secundo testimonia legis et prophetarum. Rom. III, v. 21: *nunc autem iustitia Dei sine lege manifestata est, testificata a lege et prophetis.* Tertio praedicatio apostolorum et aliorum. Rom. X, 14: *quomodo credent sine praedicante?* Sed quando per hoc homo manuductus credit, tunc potest dicere, quod propter nullum istorum credit: nec propter rationem naturalem, nec propter testimonia legis, nec propter praedicationem aliorum, sed propter ipsam veritatem tantum; Gen. XV, 6: *credidit Abraham Deo, et reputatum est ei ad iustitiam.*

Prompta quidem est fides, si cito credit: et hoc erat in istis, quia ad solum auditum conversi erant ad Deum; unde dicunt *ipsi enim audivimus, et tamen credimus ei, et scimus quia hic est vere salvator mundi*, absque hoc quod miracula videremus, sicut Iudaei viderunt. Et licet credere cito hominibus pertineat ad levitatem, secundum illud Eccli. c. XIX, 4: *qui facile*

faith after Christ came, according to the Psalm (7:7): “Rise up, O Lord, in the command you have given, and a congregation of people will surround you.”

662 Secondly, this fruit was increased because of the way in which they believed: for they say to the woman: **Now we believe not just because of your story.**

Here we should note that three things are necessary for the perfection of faith; and they are given here in order. First, faith should be right; secondly, it should be prompt; and thirdly, it should be certain.

Now faith is right when it obeys the truth not for some alien reason, but for the truth itself; and as to this he says that they said to the woman, Now we believe, the truth, **not just because of your story**, but because of the truth itself. Three things lead us to believe in Christ. First of all, natural reason: “Since the creation of the world the invisible things of God are clearly known by the things that have been made” (Rom 1:20). Secondly, the testimony of the law and the prophets: “But now justification from God has been manifested outside the law; the law and the prophets bore witness to it” (Rom 3:21). Thirdly, the preaching of the apostles and others: “How will they believe without someone to preach to them?” as Romans (10:14) says. Yet when a person, having been thus instructed, believes, he can then say that it is not for any of these reasons that he believes: i.e., neither on account of natural reason, nor the testimony of the law, nor the preaching of others, but solely on account of the truth itself: “Abram believed God, who regarded this as his justification” (Gn 15:6).

Faith is prompt if it believes quickly; and this was verified in these Samaritans because they were converted to God by merely hearing him; so they say: **we have heard him ourselves**, and believe in him, **and we know that here is truly the Savior of the world**, without seeing miracles, as the Jews saw. And although to

credit, levis est corde, tamen credere cito Deo, magis laus est, secundum illud Ps. XVII, 45: *in auditu auris obedivit mihi*.

Debet fides esse certa, quia qui dubitat in fide, infidelis est; Iac. I, 6: *postulet autem in fide nihil haesitans*. Et ideo istorum fides certa erat, unde dicunt *et scimus*. Aliquando enim ipsum credere dicitur scire, sicut hic patet: quia scientia et fides conveniunt in certitudine. Nam sicut scientia est certa, ita et fides: immo multo magis, quia certitudo scientiae innititur rationi humanae, quae falli potest, certitudo vero fidei innititur rationi divinae, cui contrariari non potest. Differunt tamen in modo: quia fides habet certitudinem ex lumine infuso divinitus, scientia vero ex lumine naturali. Nam sicut certitudo scientiae habetur per prima principia naturaliter cognita, ita et principia fidei cognoscuntur ex lumine infuso divinitus; Eph. II, 8: *gratia salvati estis per fidem; et hoc non ex vobis, Dei enim donum est*.

Tertio augmentatus est fructus ex veritate credendi; et ideo dicit *quia hic est vere salvator mundi*: ubi confitentur Christum salvatorem singularem, verum et universalem.

Singularem quidem, cum discretum eum ab aliis dicunt *hic est*, qui scilicet singulariter salvare venit. Is. XLV, 15: *vere tu es Deus absconditus, Deus Israel salvator*. Actor. IV, v. 12: *non est aliud nomen sub caelo datum hominibus, in quo oporteat salvos fieri*.

Verum autem, cum dicit *vere*: nam cum, secundum Dionysium, salus sit liberatio a malis et conservatio in bonis, est duplex salus: quaedam vera, quaedam non vera. Vera quidem salus, cum liberamur a veris malis, et conservamur in veris bonis. In veteri autem testamento licet missi fuerint

believe men quickly is an indication of thoughtlessness, according to Sirach (19:4): “He who believes easily is frivolous,” yet to believe God quickly is more praiseworthy: “When they heard me, they obeyed me” (Ps 17:45).

Faith should be certain, because one who doubts in the faith is an unbeliever: “Ask with faith, without any doubting” (Jas 1:6). And so their faith was certain; thus they say, **and we know**. Sometimes, one who believes is said to know (*scire*), as here, because *scientia* [science, knowledge in a more perfect state] and faith agree in that both are certain. For just as *scientia* is certain, so is faith; indeed, the latter is much more so, because the certainty of scientia rests on human reason, which can be deceived, while the certainty of faith rests on divine reason, which cannot be contradicted. However they differ in mode: because faith possesses its certainty due to a divinely infused light, while *scientia* possesses its certainty due to a natural light. For as the certitude of *scientia* rests on first principles naturally known, so the principles of faith are known from a light divinely infused: “You are saved by grace, through faith; and this is not due to yourselves, for it is the gift of God” (Eph 2:8).

663 Thirdly, the fruit was increased in the truth believed; so they say, **here is truly the Savior of the world**. Here they are affirming that Christ is the unique, true and universal Savior.

He is the unique Savior for they assert that he is different from others when they say, here is, i.e., here he alone is who has come to save: “Truly, you are a hidden God, the God of Israel, the Savior” (Is 45:15); “There is no other name under heaven given to men, by which we are saved” (Acts 4:12).

They affirm that Christ is the true Savior when they say, **truly**. For since salvation, as Dionysius says, is deliverance from evil and preservation in good, there are two kinds of salvation: one is true, and the other is not true. Salvation is true when we are freed from

aliqui salvatores, non tamen vere salvabant: quia liberabant a malis temporalibus, quae non sunt vera mala, nec vera bona, quia sunt transitoria.

Sed Christus est vere salvator, qui liberat a veris malis, scilicet peccatis; Matth. I, 21: *ipse enim salvum faciet populum suum a peccatis eorum*. Et praeservat in veris bonis, idest spiritualibus. Universalem vero, quia non particularem, scilicet Iudaeorum tantum, sed *mundi*. Supra c. III, 17: *non enim misit Deus filium suum ut iudicet mundum, sed ut salvetur mundus per ipsum*.

true evils and preserved in true goods. In the Old Testament, however, although certain saviors had been sent, they did not truly bring salvation, for they set men free from temporal evils, which are not truly evils, nor true goods, because they do not last. But Christ is truly the Savior, because he frees men from true evils, that is, sins: "He will save his people from their sins" (Mt 1:21), and he preserves them in true goods, that is, spiritual goods.

They affirm that he is the universal Savior because he is not just for some, i.e., for the Jews alone, but is the Savior **of the world**. "God did not send his Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world might be saved through him" (above 3:17).

Lectio 6

43 μετὰ δὲ τὰς δύο ἡμέρας ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν: 44 αὐτὸς γὰρ Ἰησοῦς ἐμαρτύρησεν ὅτι προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει. 45 ὅτε οὖν ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, ἐδέξαντο αὐτὸν οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι, πάντα ἑωρακότες ὅσα ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, καὶ αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν. 46 ἦλθεν οὖν πάλιν εἰς τὴν Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ὅπου ἐποίησεν τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον.

Posita conversione gentium per viam doctrinae hic ponitur ipsorum conversio per viam miraculi: unde et quoddam miraculum a Christo perpetratum Evangelista inducit, circa quod primo ponitur locus; secundo describitur miraculum, ibi *et erat quidam regulus* etc.; tertio ponitur miraculi effectus, ibi *cognovit ergo pater et cetera*. Circa primum duo facit. Primo designat generalem locum miraculi, scilicet patriam; secundo specialem, ibi *venit ergo iterum in Cana Galilaeae*. Circa primum duo facit. Primo designat generalem locum miraculi; secundo insinuat quomodo Christus fuit ibi receptus, ibi *cum ergo venisset in Galilaeam*. Circa primum duo facit. Primo designat locum generalem; secundo rationem assignat, ibi *ipse enim Iesus testimonium perhibuit*, et cetera.

Dicit ergo primo: dico quod mansit Iesus apud Samaritanos per duos dies, *et post duos dies exiit inde*, id est de Samaria, *et abiit in Galilaeam*, ubi nutritus fuerat: per quod significatur quod in fine

LECTURE 6

43 After two days he left that place and went to Galilee. 44 Jesus himself had testified that a prophet has no honor in his own country. 45 When however he arrived in Galilee, the Galileans welcomed him, because they had seen all the things he had done in Jerusalem on the festive day, where they too had gone. 46a He therefore went to Cana in Galilee once more, where he had made the water wine.

664 Having described the conversion of the Gentiles due to teaching, their conversion due to miracles is now given. The Evangelist mentions a miracle performed by Christ: first, giving the place; secondly, describing the miracle; and thirdly, its effect (v 53). He does two things about the first. First, he gives the general location of the miracle, that is, Christ's own homeland. Secondly, the specific place (v 46). With respect to the first he does two things. First, he mentions the general place. Secondly, he tells how Christ was received there (v 45). Concerning the first he does two things. First, he indicates the general place. Secondly, he gives a certain reason, at (v 44).

665 He says first of all: I say that Jesus remained with these Samaritans for two days, and **after two days he left that place**, i.e., **Samaria, and went to Galilee**, where he had been raised. This signifies that at the

saeculi, confirmatis gentibus in fide et veritate, revertetur ad Iudaeos convertendos, secundum illud Rom. XI, 25: *donec omnis plenitudo gentium intraret, et sic omnis Israel salvus fieret.*

Et rationem assignat, dicens *ipse enim Iesus testimonium perhibuit, quia propheta in sua patria honorem non habet.* Hic oritur dubitatio: una quidem de sententia litterae; alia vero de eius continuatione.

De sententia quidem litterae dubitatur, quia non videtur verum esse quod hic dicitur, scilicet quod propheta in patria sua honorem non habet: nam aliqui prophetae honorati leguntur in terra sua. Sed, secundum Chrysostomum, respondetur ad hoc, quia dominus hic loquitur prout in pluribus accidit. Unde licet in aliquo singulari habeat instantiam, non tamen propter hoc debet reputari falsum, nam in naturalibus et in moralibus, regula eorum quae ut in pluribus verificatur, est vera; et si in aliquo particulari aliter sit, non reputatur falsa.

Istud autem quod dominus dicit, in pluribus prophetarum verum erat, quia in veteri testamento vix invenitur aliquis prophetarum, qui a suis contribulibus persecutionem passus non fuerit, secundum illud Actor. VII, 52: *quem prophetarum non sunt persecuti patres vestri?* Et Matth. XXIII, 37: *Ierusalem, Ierusalem quae occidis prophetas, et lapidas eos qui ad te missi sunt.* Hoc etiam verbum domini verificatur non solum in prophetis apud Iudaeos, sed etiam, ut Origenes dicit, in pluribus apud gentiles, quia a suis civibus sunt habiti contemptui, et ad mortem deducti: nam consueta conversatio cum hominibus, et nimia familiaritas, reverentiam minuit, et contemptum parit. Et ideo quos familiares magis habemus, minus revereri consuevimus, et quos familiares habere non possumus, magis reputamus.

Cuius contrarium contingit de Deo: nam quanto aliquis Deo per amorem et contemplationem familiarior efficitur, tanto eum excellentiorem reputans, magis reveretur, et seipsum minorem

end of the world, when the Gentiles have been confirmed in the faith and in the truth, a return will be made to convert the Jews, according to: “until the full number of the Gentiles enters, and so all Israel will be saved” (Rom 11:2 5).

666 Then he gives a certain reason, saying: **Jesus himself had testified that a prophet has no honor in his own country.** There are two questions here: one is about the literal meaning; and the other about the continuity of this passage with the first.

The problem about the literal meaning is that it does not seem to be true, as stated here, that a prophet has no honor in his own country: for we read that other prophets were honored in their own land. Chrysostom answers this by saying that the Lord is speaking here about the majority of cases. So, although there might be an exception in some individual cases, what is said here should not be considered false: for in matters concerning nature and morals, that rule is true which is verified in most cases; and if a few cases are otherwise, the rule is not considered to be false.

Now what the Lord says was true with respect to most of the prophets, because in the Old Testament it is hard to find any prophet who did not suffer persecution, as stated in Acts (7:52): “Which of the prophets did your fathers not persecute?”; and in Matthew (23:37): “Jerusalem, Jerusalem, you kill the prophets and stone those who are sent to you.” Further, this statement of our Lord holds true not only in the case of the prophets among the Jews, but also, as Origen says, with many among the Gentiles, because they were held in contempt by their fellow citizens and put to death: for living with men in the usual way, and too much familiarity, lessen respect and breed contempt. So it is that those with whom we are more familiar we come to reverence less, and those with whom we cannot become acquainted we regard more highly.

However, the opposite happens with God: for the more intimate we become with God through love and contemplation, realizing how superior he is, the more we respect him and the less do we esteem

reputat: Iob XLII, 5: *auditu auris audivi te, nunc autem oculus meus videt te: idcirco ipse me reprehendo, et ago poenitentiam in favilla et cinere*. Et huius ratio est, quia in homine, cum sit infirmæ et fragilis naturæ, quando cum alio diu conversatur, cognoscit in eo aliqua infirma, et ex hoc diminuitur reverentia eius ad eum. Sed cum Deus sit immense perfectus, quanto plus homo in cognitione eius proficit, tanto magis perfectionis eius excellentiam admiratur, et ex hoc eum magis reveretur.

Sed numquid Christus propheta fuit? Videtur quod non, quia prophetia importat ænigmaticam cognitionem. Num. XII, 6: *si quis fuerit inter vos propheta domini, in visione apparebo ei*. Christus autem non habuit ænigmaticam cognitionem. Quod autem propheta fuerit, patet per illud quod dicitur Deut. XVIII, 15: *prophetam suscitabit dominus de fratribus tuis et de gente tua sicut me; ipsum audies*: quod exponitur de Christo.

Respondeo dicendum, quod propheta duplex habet officium: scilicet visionis, I Reg. IX, 9: *qui nunc vocatur propheta, olim dicebatur videns*, item Annuntiationis, et quantum ad hoc Christus propheta fuit, quia veritatem de Deo annuntiavit; infra XVIII, 37: *ad hoc natus sum, et ad hoc veni in mundum, ut testimonium perhibeam veritati*. Sed quantum ad primum, sciendum est, quod Christus fuit simul viator et comprehensor. Viator quidem, quantum ad humanæ naturæ passibilitatem, et ad omnia quæ ad eam pertinent; comprehensor vero quantum ad unionem divinitatis, secundum quam Deo perfectissime fruebatur. Sed in visione prophetiæ duo sunt. Scilicet lumen intellectuale mentis; et quantum ad hoc non habuit rationem prophetiæ: quia non habuit lumen defectivum, sed comprehensoris. Item est ibi visio imaginaria; et quantum ad hoc habuit similitudinem cum prophetis, secundum quod viator fuit, et poterat diversa formare in imaginatione sua.

De continuatione dubitatur: non enim videtur Evangelista recte continuare hoc quod dicit *post duos autem dies abiit Iesus in*

ourselves. "I have heard you, but now I see you, and so I reprove myself, and do penance in dust and ashes" (Jb 42:5). The reason for this is that man's nature is weak and fragile; and when one lives with another for a long time, he notices certain weaknesses in him, and this results in a loss of respect for him. But since God is infinitely perfect, the more a person knows him the more he admires his superior perfection, and as a result the more he respects him.

667 But was Christ a prophet? At first glance it seems not, because prophecy involves an obscure knowledge: "If there is a prophet of the Lord among you, I will appear to him in a vision" (Nm 12:6). Christ's knowledge, however, was not obscure. Yet he was a prophet, as is clear from, "The Lord your God will raise up a prophet for you, from your nation and your brothers; he will be like me. You will listen to him" (Dt 18:15). This text is referred to Christ.

I answer that a prophet has a twofold function. First, that of seeing: "He who is now called a prophet was formerly called a seer" (I Sm 9:9). Secondly, he makes known, announces; Christ was a prophet in this sense for he made known the truth about God: "For this was I born, and for this I came into the world: to testify to the truth" (below 18:37). As for the seeing function of a prophet, we should note that Christ was at once both a "wayfarer" and a "comprehensor," or blessed. He was a wayfarer in the sufferings of his human nature and in all the things that relate to this. He was a blessed in his union with the divinity, by which he enjoyed God in the most perfect way. There are two things in the vision or seeing of a prophet. First, the intellectual light of his mind; and as regards this Christ was not a prophet, because his light was not at all deficient; his light was that of the blessed. Secondly, an imaginary vision is also involved; and with respect to this Christ did have a likeness to the prophets insofar as he was a wayfarer and was able to form various images with his imagination.

668 Secondly, there is the problem about continuity. For the Evangelist does not seem to be right in connecting the fact that **After two days he**

Galilaeam, cum hoc quod dicitur: *ipse enim testimonium perhibuit* et cetera. Videtur enim quod non abiit in Galilaeam, quia *ipse Iesus testimonium perhibuit*. Si enim sine honore erat ibi, videtur ratio esse quod non iret illuc.

Ad hoc, uno modo respondet Augustinus dicens, hoc Evangelistam dixisse respondendo quaestioni quae posset fieri: quare ibat illuc, cum in Galilaea diu moratus fuisset, et non fuerunt ad eum conversi Galilaei; et Samaritani in duobus diebus conversi sunt? Quasi dicat: licet conversi non fuerint nihilominus tamen ipse illuc abiit *quia ipse testimonium perhibuit, quod propheta in sua patria honorem non habet*.

Alio modo respondet Chrysostomus sic: *post duos dies exiit inde, et abiit*, non in Capharnaum, quae erat patria sua propter continuam commorationem, Bethlehem autem propter originem, Nazareth vero propter educationem. Non ergo abiit in Capharnaum; unde Matth. XI, 23, hoc exprobrat eis, dicens: *et tu, Capharnaum, numquid usque in caelum exaltaberis? Usque in Infernum descendes*. Sed in Cana Galilaeae. Et rationem assignat hic, quia male se habebant ad eum. Et hoc est, quod dicit *ipse enim Iesus testimonium perhibuit, quod propheta in sua patria honorem non habet*.

Sed numquid Christus quaerebat gloriam ab hominibus? Videtur quod non, quia infra VIII, 50, dicit: *ego non quaero gloriam meam*. Respondeo dicendum, quod solus Deus est qui sine vitio gloriam suam quaerit. Homo autem ab hominibus quaerere non debet gloriam suam, sed gloriam Dei. Christus autem quaerebat in quantum Deus convenienter gloriam suam, et in quantum homo gloriam Dei in seipso.

Consequenter cum dicit *cum ergo venisset in Galilaeam* etc., ostendit quod honorifice fuerit Christus a Galilaeis receptus magis quam ante, cum dicit *cum ergo venisset in Galilaeam Iesus, exceperunt eum Galilaei* honorifice. Et huius ratio est, quia *viderunt omnia quae*

left that place and went to Galilee, with the statement of Jesus that **a prophet has no honor in his own country**. It would seem that the Evangelist should have said that Christ did not go into Galilee, for if he was not honored there, that would be a reason for not going there.

Augustine answers this by suggesting that the Evangelist said this to answer a question that could have been raised, namely: Why did Christ return to Galilee since he had lived there for a long time, and the Galileans were still not converted to him; while the Samaritans were converted in two days? It is the same as saying: Even though the Galileans had not been converted, still Jesus went there, for **Jesus himself had testified that a prophet has no honor in his own country**.

Chrysostom explains this in a different way: After two days he left, not for Capernaum, which was his homeland because of his continuous residence there, nor for Bethlehem, where he was born, nor for Nazareth, where he was educated. Thus he did not go to Capernaum; hence in Matthew (11:23) he upbraids them, saying: "And you, Capernaum, will you be exalted to heaven? You will descend even to hell." He went rather to Cana in Galilee. And he gives the reason here [for not going to Capernaum]: because they were ill-disposed toward him. This is what he says: **Jesus himself had testified that a prophet has no honor in his own country**.

669 Was Christ seeking glory from men? It seems not, for he says: "I do not seek my own glory" (below 8:50). 1 answer that it is only God who seeks his own glory without sin. A man should not seek his own glory from men, but rather the glory of God. Christ, however, as God, fittingly sought his own glory, and as man, he sought the glory of God in himself.

670 Then he shows that Christ was received by the Galileans more respectfully than before, saying, **When however he arrived in Galilee, the Galileans welcomed him**, respectfully. The reason behind this

fecerat Ierosolymis in die festo: et ipsi enim venerant ad diem festum, secundum quod mandabatur in lege.

Sed contra hoc est quia supra non legimus Christum aliquod miraculum Ierosolymis fecisse. Respondeo dicendum, secundum Origenem, quod Iudaei maximum miraculum reputaverunt hoc quod Christus cum tanta auctoritate expulit ementes et vendentes de templo. Vel dicendum, quod forte fecit ibi plura miracula quae non scripta sunt, secundum illud infra ult., 25: *multa quidem et alia signa fecit Iesus (...) quae non sunt scripta in libro hoc.*

Mystice autem per hoc datur nobis exemplum, quod si volumus in nobis recipere Christum Iesum, oportet nos ascendere in Ierusalem in die festo; idest, captare quietem mentis, et videre singula quae peragit ibi Iesus. Is. XXXIII, 20: *respice Sion civitatem solemnitatis nostrae*; Ps. CXLII, 5: *meditatus sum in omnibus operibus tuis.*

Attende autem, quod secundum quod homines inferiores erant in ordine dignitatis, meliores erant quo ad Deum. Iudaei autem digniores erant quam Galilaei; infra c. VII, 52: *scrutamini Scripturas, quia propheta a Galilaea non surrexit.* Galilaei vero digniores erant quam Samaritani; supra eodem: *non contumetur Iudaei Samaritanis.* Sed e converso Samaritani meliores erant quam Galilaei, quia plures ex eis crediderunt in Christum in duobus diebus et sine miraculo, quam de Galilaeis in multis diebus, et etiam cum miraculo vini: non enim crediderunt in eum nisi eius discipuli. Iudaei vero peiores erant ipsis Galilaeis; quia nullus ex eis crediderat, nisi forte Nicodemus.

Consequenter dicit *venit ergo iterum in Cana Galilaeae*: quod, secundum Chrysostomum, ponitur ut conclusio praemissorum; quasi dicat: quia non honorabatur in Capharnaum, ideo noluit ire illuc, ubi dehonorabatur. Sed in Cana Galilaeae ire debebat: nam primo erat invitatus ad nuptias, modo autem venit iterum non invitatus. Ideo autem de duplici adventu in Cana mentionem facit, ut ostendat eorum

was **because they had seen all the things he had done in Jerusalem on the festive day, where they too had gone**, as the law commanded.

This seems to conflict with the fact that we did not read above of any miracles being performed by Christ at Jerusalem. I answer, with the opinion of Origen, that the Jews thought it a great miracle that Christ drove the traders from the temple with such authority (above 2:14). Or, we could say that Christ performed many miracles which were not written down, according to, "Jesus did many other signs... which are not written down in this book" (below 20:30).

671 In its mystical sense, this gives us an example that if we wish to receive Jesus Christ within ourselves, we should go up to Jerusalem on a festive day, that is, we should seek tranquility of mind, and examine everything which Jesus does there: "Look upon Zion, the city of our festive days" (Is 33:20); "I have meditated on all Your works" (Ps 142:5).

672 Note that as men were lesser in dignity, they were better with respect to God. The Judeans were superior in dignity to the Galileans: "Look at the Scriptures and see that the Prophet will not come from Galilee" (below 7:52); and the Galileans were superior in dignity to the Samaritans: "The Jews had nothing to do with the Samaritans" (above 4:9). On the other hand, the Samaritans were better than the Galileans because more of them believed in Christ in two days without any miracles than the Galileans did in a long period of time and even with the miracle of the wine: for none of them believed in him except his disciples. Finally, the Judeans were worse than the Galileans, because none of them believed in Jesus, except perhaps Nicodemus.

673 Then he says, **He therefore went to Cana in Galilee**. According to Chrysostom, this is given as a conclusion from what went before; it is as though he were saying: Christ did not go to Capernaum because he was not held in honor there. But he was under an obligation to go to Cana in Galilee: for on the first occasion he had been invited to the wedding, and now he goes again without being invited. The two trips to

duritiam: nam in primo miraculo, scilicet de vino, soli discipuli eius crediderunt in eum; in secundo vero solus regulus, et domus eius tota. Sed Samaritani ad solum verbum crediderunt.

Mystice autem per duplicem adventum in Cana, signatur duplex effectus verbi Dei in mentem. Primo enim laetificat: quia, ut dicitur Matth. XIII, 20: *cum gaudio suscipiunt verbum*. Et hoc signatur in miraculo vini, quod *laetificat cor hominis*, ut dicitur in Ps. CIII. Secundo sanat; Sap. XVI, 12: *neque herba, neque malagma sanavit eos, sed sermo tuus, domine, qui sanat omnia*. Et hoc significatur in cura infirmi.

Item per hoc significatur duplex adventus filii Dei. Scilicet primus, qui fuit mansuetudinis ad laetificandum; Is. XII, 6: *exulta et lauda, habitatio Sion, quia magnus in medio tui sanctus Israel*. Unde et Angelus ad pastores ait, Lc. II, 10: *annuntio vobis gaudium magnum, quia natus est vobis hodie salvator*. Et hoc signatur per vinum. Secundus adventus eius in mundum erit maiestatis, quando veniet tollere infirmitates et poenalitates nostras, et configurare nos corpori claritatis suae; et hoc signatur in cura infirmi.

Cana are mentioned by the Evangelist to show their hardness of heart: for at the first miracle of the wine, only his disciples believed in Christ; and at the second miracle, only the official and his household believed. On the other hand, the Samaritans believed on Christ's words alone.

674 In the mystical sense, the two visits to Cana signify the effect of God's words on our minds. First of all they cause delight, because they who hear the word "receive the word with joy" (Mt 13:20). This is signified in the miracle of the wine, which as the Psalm (103:15) says, "gladdens the heart of man." Secondly, the word of God heals: "It was neither a herb nor a poultice that healed them, but your word, O Lord, which heals all things" (Wis 16:12). And this is signified by the curing of the sick son.

Further, these two visits to Cana indicate the two comings of the Son of God. The first coming was in all gentleness to bring joy: "Rejoice and give praise, people of Zion, for he is great who is in your midst, the Holy One of Israel" (Is 12:6). So the angel said to the shepherds: "I bring you good news of great joy... this day a Savior has been born to you" (Lk 2:10). This is signified by the wine. His second coming into the world will be in majesty, when he will come to take away our weaknesses and our punishments, and to make us like his radiant body. And this is signified in the cure of the sick son.

Lectio 7

46b καὶ ἦν τις βασιλικὸς οὗ ὁ υἱὸς ἠσθενεῖ ἐν Καφαρναούμ: 47 οὗτος ἀκούσας ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἦκει ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἠρώτα ἵνα καταβῇ καὶ ἰάσῃται αὐτοῦ τὸν υἱόν, ἤμελλεν γὰρ ἀποθνήσκειν. 48 εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτόν, ἐὰν μὴ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἴδῃτε, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε. 49 λέγει πρὸς αὐτόν ὁ βασιλικός, κύριε, κατάβηθι πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν τὸ παιδίον μου. 50 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, πορεύου: ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ. ἐπίστευσεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῷ λόγῳ ὃν εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐπορεύετο. 51 ἥδη δὲ αὐτοῦ καταβαίνοντος οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ ὑπῆντησαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ὅτι ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ ζῇ. 52 ἐπύθετο οὖν τὴν ὥραν παρ' αὐτῶν ἐν ᾗ κομψότερον ἔσχεν: εἶπαν οὖν αὐτῷ ὅτι ἐχθὲς ὥραν ἐβδόμην ἀφῆκεν αὐτόν ὁ πυρετός. 53 ἔγνω οὖν ὁ πατήρ ὅτι [ἐν] ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐν ᾗ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ, καὶ ἐπίστευσεν αὐτός καὶ ἡ οἰκία αὐτοῦ ὅλη. 54 τοῦτο [δὲ] πάλιν δεύτερον σημεῖον ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλθὼν ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

Posito loco miraculi, consequenter agitur de ipso miraculo; et ponuntur tria, scilicet persona infirmans, persona interpellans et persona sanans. Persona infirmans est filius reguli, persona interpellans est pater eius, sed persona sanans est Christus.

LECTURE 7

46b There happened to be a certain official, whose son lay sick at Capernaum. 47 When he heard that Jesus had come to Galilee from Judea, he went to him, and begged him to come down and heal his son, who was at the point of death. 48 But Jesus said to him, "Unless you see signs and wonders, you do not believe." 49 The official said to him, "Lord, come down before my child dies." 50 Jesus told him, "Go, your son lives." The man took Jesus at his word, and started for home. 51 While he was on his way down, his servants ran up to meet him with word' that his son was going to live. 52 He asked them at what time his boy got better. And they told him that yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him. 53 The father then realized that it was at that very hour when Jesus told him, "Your son lives." He and his whole household became believers. 54 This was the second sign Jesus had performed on returning from Judea to Galilee.

675 Having told us the place of this miracle, the Evangelist now describes the miracle itself: telling us of the person who was ill; the one who interceded for him; and the one who healed him. The one who was ill was the son of the official; his father interceded for him; and it was Christ who was to heal him.

Circa personam infirmam primo ponitur eius conditio, quia *filius reguli*; secundo locus infirmitatis, quia *Capharnaum*; tertio conditio morbi, quia *febris*.

Quantum ad primum dicit *erat quidam regulus, cuius filius infirmabatur*. Dicitur autem regulus multipliciter. Uno modo qui praeest parvo regno; et hoc modo non accipitur hic: quia tunc temporis nullus erat rex in Iudaea; infra XIX, 15: *non habemus regem nisi Caesarem*. Alio modo, secundum Chrysostomum, aliquis de stirpe regia: nec hoc modo accipitur. Sed tertio modo regulus dicitur aliquis officialis regis; et isto modo accipitur hic regulus.

Unde, secundum quod Chrysostomus dicit, quidam eundem ipsum aestimant centurionem, de quo habetur Matth. VIII, 5. Sed hoc non est verum: nam quantum ad quatuor differunt. Primo quidem quantum ad genus infirmitatis: nam ille centurionis erat paralyticus, unde dicebat *puer meus iacet paralyticus in domo*. Filius autem reguli erat febricitans; unde dicit: *heri hora septima reliquit eum febris*. Secundo quantum ad personam infirmam, quia ille erat servus: unde dicit *puer meus*, iste vero erat filius: unde dicit *cuius filius*. Tertio quantum ad petitionem: nam centurio Christum volentem ad domum suam ire, rogabat remanere, dicens: *domine, non sum dignus ut intres sub tectum meum, sed tantum dic verbo, et sanabitur puer meus*. Regulus vero eum rogabat descendere in domum suam, dicens: *domine, descende prius quam moriatur*. Quarto quantum ad locum: quia illud fuit in Capharnaum; istud vero in Cana Galilaeae. Ergo iste regulus non est idem quod centurio; sed erat quidam de familia Herodis tetrarchae, sive nuntius, sive officialis imperatoris.

Allegorice autem regulus iste, Abraham, vel aliquis ex patribus veteris testamenti dicitur, ex eo quod adhaeret magno regi per fidem, scilicet Christo; de quo dicitur in Ps. II, 6: *ego autem constitutus sum rex ab eo*. Huic autem Abraham adhaesit, secundum illud infra VIII, 56: *Abraham pater vester exultavit ut videret diem meum*. Filius eius

676 About the person who was ill, he first tells us of his status, a **son** of an official; secondly, where he was, at **Capernaum**; thirdly, his illness, a **fever**.

He says about the first, **There happened to be a certain official, whose son lay sick**. Now one can be called an official for a variety of reasons. For example, if one is in charge of a small territory. This is not its meaning here for at this time there was no king in Judea: "We have no king but Caesar" (below 19:15). One is also called an official, as Chrysostom says, because he is from a royal family; and this is also not its meaning here. In a third way, an official is some officer of a king or ruler; and this is its meaning here.

Some think, as Chrysostom reports, that this official is the same as the centurion mentioned by Matthew (8:5). This is not so, for they differ in four ways. First, because the illness was not the same in each. The centurion was concerned with a paralytic, "My servant is lying paralyzed at home" (Mt 8:6); while this official's son is suffering from a fever, **yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him**. Secondly, those who are sick are not the same. In the first case, it was a servant, "my servant"; but now we have a son, as it says, **whose son**. Thirdly, what is requested is different. For when Christ wanted to go to the home of the centurion, the centurion discouraged him, and said: "Lord, I am not worthy to have you come under my roof; but only say the word and my servant will be healed" (Mt 8:8). But this official asked Christ to come to his house, **Lord, come down before my child dies**. Fourthly, the places are different. For the first healing took place at Capernaum, while this one is at Cana in Galilee. So this official is not the same as the centurion, but was from the household of Herod the Tetrarch, or some kind of a herald, or an official of the Emperor.

677 In its allegorical sense, this official is Abraham or one of the fathers of the Old Testament, in so far as he adheres by faith to the king, that is, to Christ, about which we read, "I was made king by him over Zion" (Ps 2:6). Abraham adhered to him, for as is said below (8:56): "Abraham, your father, rejoiced that he might see my day." The son of this official is

est populus Iudaeorum, infra VIII, 33: *semen Abrahae sumus, et nemini servivimus unquam*, qui infirmatur pravis voluptatibus et dogmatibus, sed in Capharnaum, idest in abundantia, quae fuit Iudaeis causa recedendi a Deo; secundum illud Deut. XXXII, 15: *incrassatus est dilectus, et recalcitravit*; et sequitur: *dereliquit Deum factorem suum, et recessit a Deo salutari suo*.

Moraliter vero in regno animae rex est ipsa ratio, secundum illud Prov. XX, 8: *rex qui sedet in solio suo*. Quare dicitur rex? Quia totum corpus hominis per eam regitur, et affectus hominis ab ea dirigitur et informatur, nec non et aliae vires animae eam sequuntur. Sed quandoque dicitur regulus, quando scilicet diminuitur in cognitione, qua obscurata, sequitur inordinatas passiones, et non resistit eis, secundum illud Eph. IV, 17: *ambulant in vanitate sensus sui, tenebris obscuratum habentes intellectum*. Et ideo filius eius, idest affectus, infirmatur, idest deviat a bono, et declinat ad malum. Si enim ratio fuisset rex, idest fortis, filius eius non infirmaretur; sed quia regulus est, ideo filius eius infirmatur. Et hoc Capharnaum; quia abundantia temporalium est causa spiritualis infirmitatis; Ez. XVI, 49: *haec fuit iniquitas sororis tuae Sodomae, abundantia, saturitas panis, et otium ipsius et filiarum eius*.

Consequenter cum dicit *hic cum audisset* etc., ponitur persona interpellans, et primo ponitur motivum ad interpellandum; secundo ipsa interpellatio; et tertio necessitas interpellandi.

Motivum ad interpellandum fuit adventus Christi; unde dicit *hic*, scilicet regulus, *cum audisset quod Iesus adveniret a Iudaea in Galilaeam, abiit ad eum*. Nam quamdiu adventus Christi differebatur, spes hominum invalidior erat de sanatione a peccatis; sed cum auditur adventus Christi appropinquare, spes sanitatis confortatur in nobis; et tunc imus ad eum: nam ad hoc ipse venit in mundum, ut peccatores salvos faceret; Lc. XIX, 10: *venit filius hominis quaerere et salvum facere quod perierat*. Sed, sicut dicit Eccli. XVIII, 23, ante orationem animam parare debemus, quod fit occurrendo Deo per

the Jewish people: “We are the descendants of Abraham, and we have never been slaves to any one” (below 8:33). But they are sick from evil pleasures and incorrect doctrines. They are sick at Capernaum, i.e., in the abundance of goods which caused them to leave their God, according to, “The beloved grew fat and rebellious... he deserted the God who made him, and left God his Savior” (Dt 32:15).

678 In the moral sense, in the kingdom of the soul, the king is reason itself: “The king, who sits on his throne of judgment” (Prv 20:8). But why is reason called the king? Because man’s entire body is ruled by it: his affections are directed and informed by it, and the other powers of the soul follow it. But sometimes it is called an official [not the king], that is, when its knowledge is obscured, with the result that it follows inordinate passions and does not resist them: “They live with their foolish ideas, their understanding obscured by darkness” (Eph 4:17). Consequently, the son of this official, i.e., the affections, are sick, that is, they deviate from good and decline to what is evil. If reason were the king, that is, strong, its son would not be sick; but being only an official, its son is sick. This happens at Capernaum because a great many temporal goods are the cause of spiritual sickness: “This was the crime of your sister Sodom: richness, satiety in food, and idleness” (Ez 16:49).

679 Now we see the person making his request (v 47). First, we have the incentive for making his request. Secondly, the request itself. Thirdly, the need for the request.

680 The incentive for making the request was the arrival of Christ. So he says, **When he, the official, heard that Jesus had come to Galilee from Judea, he went to him.** For as long as the coming of Christ was delayed, men’s hope of being healed from their sins was that much fainter; but when it is reported that his coming is near, our hope of being healed rises, and then we go to him. For he came into this world to save sinners: “The Son of Man came to seek and to save what was lost” (Lk 19:22). Further, as Sirach says (18:23), we should prepare our soul by prayer, and we do this by going to God through our desires. And this is

desiderium: et hoc fecit iste; unde dicitur quod *abiit ad eum*. Amos c. IV, 12: *praeparare in occursum Dei tui Israel*.

Petitio autem fit de sanatione filii sui; unde dicit *rogabat eum ut descenderet*, scilicet per misericordiam; Is. LXIV, 1: *utinam dirumperes caelos, et descenderes; et sanaret filium eius*. Sic et nos debemus rogare ut sanemur a peccatis, secundum illud Ps. XL, v. 5: *sana animam meam, quia peccavi tibi*. Nam nullus per se potest ad statum iustitiae redire, nisi a Deo sanetur, secundum illud Iob VI, 13: *non est auxilium mihi ex me*. Sic et patres veteris testamenti rogabant pro populo Israel. Unde de uno eorum dicitur II Mac. ult. 14: *hic est fratrum amator, quia multum orat pro sancta civitate et pro populo Israel, Ieremias propheta Dei*.

Sed necessitas interpellandi est urgens, *incipiebat enim mori*. Quando enim homo tentatur, incipit infirmari; sed quando tentatio praevalet ita ut inclinet ad consensum, est prope mortem, sed quando iam consentit, incipit mori. Cum ergo consummat peccatum, moritur, quia, ut dicitur Iac. I, 15: *peccatum cum consummatum fuerit, generat mortem*. De qua dicitur in Ps. c. XXXIII, 22: *mors peccatorum pessima*, quia hic incipit, et in futuro absque fine terminatur.

Consequenter cum dicit: *dixit ergo Iesus ad eum*, agitur de petitione sanitatis, quae fit per Christum, et primo ponitur reprehensio domini; secundo petitio reguli; tertio impetratio petitionis.

Reprehendit autem eum dominus de infidelitate; unde dicit ad eum *nisi signa et prodigia videritis, non creditis*. Sed hoc habet quaestionem. Primo quidem videtur inconvenienter dictum de regulo *nisi signa et prodigia videritis, non creditis*: nisi enim eum salvatorem credidisset, non petivisset ab eo sanitatem.

Ad quod dicendum est, quod regulus iste adhuc non credebat perfecte: erat enim in eo duplex defectus fidei. Unus, quia licet

what the official did, as we read, he went to him. Amos (4:12) says, “Be prepared to meet your God, O Israel.”

681 The request of the official was that Christ heal his son. So the Evangelist says that he begged him to come down, out of compassion: “O that you would rend the heavens, and come down” (Is 64:1), **and heal his son**. We, too, ought to ask to be healed from our sins: “Heal my soul, for I have sinned against you” (Ps 40:5). For no one of himself can return to the state of justice; rather, he has to be healed by God: “I cannot help myself” (Jb 6:13). The fathers of the Old Testament interceded for the people of Israel in the same way; for as we read of one: “He loves his brothers, because he prays much for the holy city and for the people of Israel, Jeremiah, the prophet of God” (2 Me 15:14).

682 The need for this request was urgent, for the son **was at the point of death**. When a person is tempted, he is beginning to become sick; and as the temptation grows stronger and takes the upper hand, inclining him to consent, he is near death. But when he has consented, he is at the point of death and beginning to die. Finally, when he completes his sin, he dies; for as we read: “Sin, when it is completed, brings forth death” (Jas 1:15). The Psalm (33:22) says about this: “The death of sinners is the worst,” because it begins here and continues into the future without end.

683 Now he deals with the request for Christ to heal the son of the official. First, our Lord’s criticism is given. Secondly, the official’s request. Thirdly, the granting of the request.

684 Our Lord criticizes him for his lack of faith, saying, **Unless you see signs and wonders, you do not believe**. This raises a question, for it does not seem right to say this to this official, for unless he had believed that Christ was the Savior, he would not have asked him to heal his son.

The answer to this is that this official did not yet believe perfectly; indeed, there were two defects in his faith. The first was that although he believed

crederet Christum esse verum hominem, non tamen credebat eum habere virtutem divinam; alias credidisset eum absentem posse sanare, cum Deus ubique sit praesens, secundum illud Ier. XXIII, 24: *caelum et terram ego impleo*. Et sic non rogasset eum quod descenderet in domum suam, sed quod mandaret tantum. Secundus defectus fuit, quia, secundum Chrysostomum, dubitabat utrum Christus sanare posset filium suum: nam si pro certo hoc credidisset, non expectasset adventum Christi ad terram suam, sed ipse potius ivisset in Iudaeam. Sed modo quasi desperatus de salute filii, nolens negligere quidquid circa hoc facere posset, abiit ad eum more parentum, qui desperantes de salute filiorum, etiam imperitos medicos consulunt.

Secundo vero, quia non videtur reprehendendus de hoc quod signa quaerebat: nam fides per signa probatur. Et ad hoc dicendum est quod aliter trahuntur ad fidem Christi infideles; et aliter fideles. Infideles non possunt trahi nec adduci auctoritate sacrae Scripturae, quia ei non credunt; nec per rationem naturalem quia fides est supra rationem; et ideo ducendi sunt per miracula; I Cor. XIV, 22: *signa data sunt infidelibus, non fidelibus*. Fideles autem ducendi sunt et dirigendi in fidem auctoritate Scripturae, cui acquiescere tenentur. In hoc ergo regulus redarguitur: quia cum esset nutritus inter Iudaeos, et de lege instructus, non per Scripturae auctoritatem, sed per signa credere volebat. Et ideo dominus eum reprehendens dicit *nisi signa et prodigia*, idest miracula quae sunt aliquando signa, inquantum sunt demonstrativa dominicae veritatis: prodigia vero, vel quia certissime indicent, ut sic dicatur prodigium, quasi porrodictum; vel quia aliquid futurum protendit, ut sic dicatur prodigium, quasi procul ostendens aliquem effectum futurum.

Consequenter ponitur instantia reguli: non enim ad reprehensionem domini desistit, sed cum instantia dicit ad eum *domine, descende priusquam moriatur filius meus*; Lc. XVIII, 1: *oportet semper orare, et*

that Christ was a true man, he did not believe that he had divine power; otherwise he would have believed that Christ could heal one even while absent, since God is everywhere, as Jeremiah (23:24) says: "I fill heaven and earth." And so he would not have asked Christ to come down to his house, but simply give his command. The second defect in his faith, according to Chrysostom, was that he was not sure that Christ could heal his son: for had he been sure, he would not have waited for Christ to return to his homeland, but would have gone to Judea himself. But now, despairing of his son's health, and not wishing to overlook any possibility, he went to Christ like those parents who in their despair for the health of their children consult even unskilled doctors.

685 In the second place, it does not seem that he should have been criticized for looking for signs, for faith is proved by signs. The answer to this is that unbelievers are drawn to Christ in one way, and believers in another way. For unbelievers cannot be drawn to Christ or convinced by the authority of Sacred Scripture, because they do not believe it; neither can they be drawn by natural reason, because faith is above reason. Consequently, they must be led by miracles: "Signs are given to unbelievers, not to believers" (1 Cor 14:22). Believers, on the other hand, should be led and directed to faith by the authority of Scripture, to which they are bound to assent. This is why the official is criticized: although he had been brought up among the Jews and instructed in the law, he wanted to believe through signs, and not by the authority of the Scripture. So the Lord reproaches him, saying, **Unless you see signs and wonders**, i.e., miracles, which sometimes are signs insofar as they bear witness to divine truth. Or **wonders** (prodigia), either because they indicate with utmost certitude, so that a prodigy is taken to be a "portent" or some "sure indication"; or because they portend something in the future, as if something were called a **wonder** as if showing at a great distance some future effect.

686 Now we see the official's persistence, for he does not give up after the Lord's criticism, but insists, saying. **Lord, come down before my child dies**: "We should pray always, and not lose heart" (Lk 18:1). This

non deficere. Ostenditur in hoc profectus fidei eius quantum ad aliquid, quia scilicet vocat eum dominum: licet non totaliter in fide profecerit, adhuc enim corporalem praesentiam Christi ad salutem filii sui necessariam credens, rogabat eum ut descenderet.

Sed quia oratio perseverans impetrat, ideo quod petit, conceditur ei a domino; unde *dicit ei Iesus: vade, filius tuus vivit.* Ubi primo ponitur Annuntiatio sanitatis per Christum, qui eam fecit; secundo ponuntur personae, quae eam factam viderunt, ibi *iam autem eo descendente* et cetera. Circa primum duo ponuntur: mandatum domini et obedientia reguli, ibi *credidit homo sermoni quem dixit ei Iesus.*

Circa primum dominus duo facit. Primo quidem praecipit; secundo vero annuntiat. Praecipit autem ut vadat: unde dicit *vade*; idest dispone te praeparando ad gratiam per motum liberi arbitrii in Deum; Is. XLV, 22: *convertimini ad me, et salvi eritis.* Et per motum liberi arbitrii in peccatum. Nam in iustificatione impii quatuor exiguntur, specialiter in adultis; scilicet infusio gratiae et remissio culpa, motus liberi arbitrii in Deum, qui est fides, et in peccatum, qui est contritio.

Annuntiat autem salutem filii, quam petierat, dicens *filius tuus vivit.*

Sed quaeritur cur Christus rogatus a regulo ut descenderet in domum suam, corporaliter ire recusat, ad servum vero centurionis corporaliter ire pollicetur? Huius autem duplex ratio assignatur. Una secundum Gregorium, ut in hoc superbiam nostram retundat, qui magnis hominibus nos ad serviendum offerimus, parvis autem servire recusamus: cum ipse, qui est dominus omnium, ad servum centurionis se iturum obtulit, ire vero ad filium reguli recusavit; Eccli. c. IV, 7: *congregationi pauperum affabilem te facito.* Alia ratio, secundum Chrysostomum, quia centurio iam confirmatus erat in fide Christi, credens quod etiam absens salvare posset; et ideo ad fidem et devotionem eius ostendendam dominus ire promisit. Iste vero

shows an improvement in his faith in one respect, that is, in that he calls him “Lord.” But there is not a total improvement, for he still thought that Christ had to be physically present to heal his son; so he asked Christ to come.

687 His request is granted by the Lord, for persevering prayer is answered. Jesus said to him: **Go, your son lives.** Here we have first, the statement by Christ, who cured the boy, that the boy was cured. Secondly, we are told of the persons who witnessed the cure (v 51). Two things are mentioned concerning the first: the command of the Lord and the obedience of the official (v 50b).

688 As to the first, the Lord does two things. First, he orders; secondly, he affirms. He orders the official to go: hence he says, Go, i.e., prepare to receive grace by a movement of your free will toward God: “Turn to me, and you will be saved” (Is 45:22); and by a movement of your free will against sin. For four things are required for the justification of an adult sinner: the infusion of grace, the remission of guilt, a movement of the free will toward God, which is faith, and a movement of the free will against sin, which is contrition.

Then the Lord says that his son is healed, which was the request of the official: **Your son lives.**

689 One may ask why Christ refused to go down to the home of this official as asked, while he promised to go see the servant of the centurion. There are two reasons for this. One, according to Gregory, is to blunt our pride; the pride of us who offer our services to great men, but refuse to help the insignificant: since the Lord of all offered to go to the servant of the centurion, but refused to go to the son of an official: “Be well-disposed to the poor” (Sir 4:7). The other reason, as Chrysostom says, was that the centurion was already confirmed in the faith of Christ, and believed that he could heal even while not present; and so our Lord promised to go to show approval of his faith and devotion. But this official was still imperfect, and did not yet clearly know that Christ could heal

adhuc imperfectus erat, nondum noverat manifeste quod absens curare poterat: et ideo non accedit, ut eum imperfectionem suam cognoscere faciat.

Obedientia reguli ponitur quantum ad duo. Primo quia annuntianti credidit; unde dicit *credidit homo sermoni quem dixit Iesus*, scilicet, *filius tuus vivit*. Secundo vero, quia mandato obedivit; unde dicit *et ibat*, proficiendo in fide, licet adhuc neque integre neque sane, ut Origenes dicit. In quo signatur, quod ex fide iustificari oportet; Rom. V, 1: *iustificati ex fide, pacem habeamus ad Deum nostrum Iesum Christum*. Oportet nos proficiendo ire: quia qui stat, exponit se periculo ut vitam gratiae conservare non possit; in via enim Dei non proficere, deficere est.

Annuntiatio autem sanitatis facta per servos ponitur consequenter, cum dicit *iam autem eo descendente, servi occurrerunt ei* et cetera. Et primo ponitur denuntiatio salutis; secundo fit inquisitio de tempore sanationis, ibi *interrogabat autem horam ab eis*.

Dicit ergo *iam autem eo descendente*, a Cana Galilaeae in domum suam, *servi occurrerunt ei*: ex quo patet quod regulus iste dives erat, habens multos servos; *et annuntiaverunt, dicentes, quia filius tuus vivit*: et hoc ideo quia credebant Christum personaliter accedere, cuius praesentia iam curato filio superflua videbatur.

Mystice autem servi reguli, scilicet rationis, sunt opera hominis, quia homo est dominus suorum actuum, et affectus sensitivae partis, quia obediunt rationi imperanti et dirigenti. Isti autem servi annuntiant quidem quod filius reguli, scilicet rationis, vivit, quando relucent in homine bona opera, et vires inferiores magis obediunt rationi, secundum illud Eccli. XIX, 27: *amictus corporis, et risus dentium, et ingressus hominis annuntiant de illo*.

even while absent. And so our Lord does not go, in order that he may realize his imperfection.

690 The obedience of this official is pointed out in two ways. First, because he believed what Christ said; so he says, **The man took Jesus at his word**, that is, **Your son lives**. Secondly, because he did obey the order of Christ; so he says, he **started for home**, progressing in faith, although not yet fully or soundly, as Origen says. This signifies that we must be justified by faith: “Justified by faith, let us have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ” (Rom 5:1). We also must go and start out by making progress: because he who stands still runs the risk of being unable to preserve the life of grace. For, along the road to God, if we do not go forward we fall back.

691 Next we see the servants bringing news of the healing. First, the news of the healing is given. Secondly, there is an inquiry about the time of the healing (v 52).

692 He says, **While he was on his way down**, from Cana of Galilee to his own home, **his servants ran up to meet him**—which shows that this official was wealthy and had many servants— **with word that his son was going to live**: and they did this because they thought that Christ was coming, and his presence was no longer necessary as the boy was already cured.

693 In the mystical sense, the servants of the official, i.e., of reason, are a man’s works, because man is master of his own acts and of the affections of his sense powers, for they obey the command and direction of reason. Now these servants announce that the son of the official, that is, of reason, lives, when a man’s good works shine out, and his lower powers obey reason, according to: “A man’s dress, and laughter, and his walk, show what he is” (Sir 19:27).

Sed quia regulus neque integre neque sane adhuc credebat, adhuc volebat scire utrum casu an praecepto Christi filius curatus esset: et ideo tempus curationis inquirat. Et hoc est quod dicitur *interrogabat ergo horam ab eis*, scilicet servis, *in qua melius habuerat*, scilicet filius suus; et invenit quod illa hora curatus fuit statim quando dominus dixit ei *vade, filius tuus vivit*. Nec mirum, quia ipse Christus est verbum, quo factum est caelum et terra, secundum Ps. CXLVIII, 5: *ipse dixit, et facta sunt; ipse mandavit, et creata sunt*; Eccli. X, 5: *facile est in conspectu domini et cetera*.

Et ideo *dixerunt ei*, scilicet servi, *quod heri hora septima reliquit eum febris*. Mystice autem per horam septimam, in qua puer a febre dimittitur, significantur septem dona spiritus sancti, per quem fit remissio peccatorum, secundum illud Io. XX, c. 22: *accipite spiritum sanctum; quorum remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis*. Per quem etiam vita spiritualis causatur in anima; infra VI, 64: *spiritus est qui vivificat*. Etiam per horam septimam signatur tempus quieti conveniens, nam dominus septimo die requievit ab omni opere quod patrarat: in quo significatur quod vita spiritualis hominis in quiete spirituali consistit, secundum illud Is. c. XXX, 15: *si quieveritis, salvii eritis*. De malis dicit Is. LVII, 20: *cor impii quasi mare fervens, quod quiescere non potest*.

Consequenter cum dicit *cognovit ergo pater* etc., ponitur effectus miraculi: et primo ponitur miraculi fructus; secundo ipsum miraculum altero miraculo continuatur, ibi *hoc iterum secundum signum fecit Iesus*.

Dixit ergo *cognovit ergo pater*, comparans horam nuntiantium servorum, horae Christi praenuntiantis quia *illa hora erat in qua dixit ei Iesus: vade: filius tuus vivit*. Ex hoc conversus est ad Christum, cognoscens miraculum eius virtute factum: *credidit ipse, et domus eius tota*, scilicet servi et ministri, quia secundum conditionem dominorum, sive bonam sive malam, servi disponuntur, secundum illud Eccli. X, 2: *secundum iudicem populi, sic et ministri eius*; Gen. XVIII, v. 19: *scio enim quod praecepturus sit filiis suis*.

694 Because this official did not yet believe either fully or soundly, he still wanted to know whether his son had been cured by chance or by the command of Christ. Accordingly, he asks about the time of the cure. **He asked them**, the servants, **at what time his boy got better**. And he found that his son was cured at exactly the same hour that our Lord said, **Go, your son lives**. And no wonder, because Christ is the Word, through whom heaven and earth were made: “He spoke and they were made; he commanded and they were. created” (Ps. 148:5).

695 **And they**, his servants, **told him that yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him**. In the mystical sense, the seventh hour, when the boy is cured of his fever, signifies the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, through whom sins are forgiven, according to: “Receive the Holy Spirit; whose sins you forgive, are forgiven” (below 20:22), and through whom spiritual life is produced in the soul: “It is the Spirit that gives life” (below 6:64). Again, the seventh hour signifies the appropriate time for rest, for the Lord rested from all his work on the seventh day. This indicates that the spiritual life of man consists in spiritual rest or quiet, according to: “If you remain at rest, you will be saved” (Is 30:15). But of the evil we read: “The heart of the wicked is like the raging sea, which cannot rest” (Is 57:20).

696 Next, we are given the effect of this miracle (v 53). First, its fruit is mentioned. Secondly, this miracle is linked with another one (v 54).

697 He says, **The father then realized**, by comparing the hour mentioned by the servants with the hour of Christ’s affirmation, **that it was at that very hour when Jesus told him, Your son lives**. Because of this he was converted to Christ, realizing that it was by his power that the miracle was accomplished. **He and his whole household became believers**, that is, his servants and his aides, because the attitude of servants depends on the condition, whether good or wicked, of their masters: “As the judge of the people is himself, so also are his ministers”

(Sir 10:2); and in Genesis (18:19) we read: “I know that he will direct his sons.”

Patet autem ex hoc quod fides istius semper profecit: nam a principio quando interpellavit pro filio infirmo, debilis erat; postea plus firmitatis habere coepit, quando vocavit eum dominum; deinde quando credidit homo sermoni, et ibat, magis perfecta erat; tamen non integre, quia adhuc dubitavit. Hic, cognita manifeste Dei virtute in Christo, perficitur in eius fide, quia, ut dicitur Prov. IV, v. 18: *iustorum semita quasi lux splendens procedit, et crescit usque ad perfectum diem.*

Continuatur autem miraculum istud praecedenti miraculo, cum dicitur *hoc iterum secundum signum fecit Iesus*: quod potest dupliciter intelligi. Uno modo quod in isto eodem adventu de Iudaea in Galilaeam fecerit dominus duo miracula, quorum primo non scripto, istud ponitur secundum. Alio modo quod Iesus duo signa fecit in Galilaea diversis temporibus. Unum scilicet de vino, et istud secundum quod fecit circa filium reguli, veniens iterum a Iudaea in Galilaeam.

Ostenditur autem per hoc quod Galilaei peiores erant Samaritanis, qui nullum signum a domino expectantes, verbo tantum eius crediderunt multi ex eis; sed ad istud miraculum non credidit Christo nisi regulus et domus eius tota: nam Iudaei propter eorum duritiam paulatim convertebantur ad fidem, secundum illud Mich. VII, 1: *factus sum sicut qui colligit in autumno racemos vindemiae; non est botrus ad comedendum; praecoquas ficus desideravit anima mea.*

This also shows that the faith of the official was constantly growing: for at the beginning, when he pleaded for his sick son, it was weak; then it began to grow more firm, when he called Jesus “Lord” then when he believed what the Lord said and started for home, it was more perfect, but not completely so, because he still doubted. But here, clearly realizing God’s power in Christ, his faith is made perfect, for as Proverbs (4:18) says: “The way of the just goes forward like a shining light, increasing to the full light of day.”

698 Finally, this miracle is linked with the previous one, **This was the second sign Jesus had performed on returning from Judea to Galilee.** We can understand this in two ways. In one way, that our Lord performed two miracles during this one trip from Judea to Galilee; but the first of these was not recorded, only the second. In the other way, we could say that Jesus worked two signs in Galilee at different times: the one of the wine, and this second one about the son of this official after he returned again to Galilee from Judea.

We also see from this that the Galileans were worse than the Samaritans. For the Samaritans expected no sign from the Lord, and many believed in his word alone; but as a result of this miracle, only this official and his whole household believed: for the Jews were converted to the faith little by little on account of their hardness, according to: “I have become as one who harvests in the summer time, like a gleaner at the vintage: not one cluster to eat, not one of the early figs I desire” (Mi 7:1).