

# Introduction

Saint Thomas Aquinas is a paradox. He was a mystic and a rigorously scientific theologian. His attachment to Judaeo-Christianity was strong enough for him to appreciate and appropriate pagan truths. An Aristotelian, he never ceased utilizing Platonic insights. In him a deep reverence for the Church Fathers was coupled with an astonishing zest for novelty.

All of these cross-currents were to show up in his biblical exegesis. He was neither an Alexandrian nor an Antiochene, perhaps because he was both. No one has successfully categorized his approach to the Bible. Advocates of allegory claim him as their own and defenders of strictly literal interpretation praise him for asserting the sufficiency of the letter. A noted Oxford historian admires the revolutionary quality of his exegetical principles and a prominent Jesuit theologian finds them simply traditional.<sup>1</sup> Is St. Thomas' genius really so elusive? Or was he being eclectic at the expense of consistency?

Aquinas effected a real break-through towards system in the domains of Christian philosophy and theology. But what did he do in the area of exegesis? During the centuries when his disciples were eagerly commenting on his *Summa* and his other systematic works, his commentaries on Scripture gradually became enveloped in thick layers of dust. The dust has been vigorously removed during the past few decades, but not all of it has settled. Nor does the present obscurity on just how systematic theology is related to Scripture clarify the situation. More than an Introduction would be necessary to come anywhere near an adequate treatment of the complex problems involved.

Nevertheless, a basic methodological distinction may go a long way in establishing St. Thomas' position in the history of Christian exegesis. That distinction is between a biblical exegete's presuppositions and his techniques.<sup>2</sup> Both are operative in his exegesis, but in very different ways. Techniques are easy to identify; they pertain to the entire array of hermeneutical methods and sciences aimed at disclosing the human author's intended meaning. Their range embraces everything from ancient history and comparative religion down to philology and lexicography. Exegetical presuppositions are harder to describe since they lie so close to the origins of meaning and expression in man, thus requiring greater self-understanding.<sup>3</sup> In the context of biblical exegesis, presuppositions have to do with what it *means* for the Bible to be both the Word of God and the words of men. This twofold meaning of the Bible corresponds to two fundamental presuppositions. Correlative to the Scriptures as the Word of God there is the faith of the exegete. Because the Word is mediated by men the exegete's philosophical horizon is also a determining factor in his interpretations.

In the following pages I shall attempt to substantiate the thesis that St. Thomas' specific contributions to biblical exegesis were in the realm of the last mentioned presupposition, while on the level of techniques

he adhered closely to the conventions of his day. His lectures on Ephesians can then be read within a general framework of his approach to the Bible.

## ST. THOMAS AND EXEGETICAL PRESUPPOSITIONS

To understand the Bible more is needed than a good dose of hermeneutical techniques. They are an indispensable aid in determining the human author's intended meaning. But this meaning is what no human being could affirm as true on his own power. To understand the Scriptures as its authors meant them to be understood is to accept what they proclaim: the history of salvation culminating in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus as revealing the ultimate meaning of human existence - a meaning only God could give it. A challenge to the religious conversion of faith is issued which no interpreter can explain away. Here St. Thomas is one with the entire Patristic tradition. Like an Irenaeus, an Origen, or an Augustine, Thomas had to respond to God's Word with an unreserved faith before he could even hope to understand something of that Word's meaning, and what it revealed about the meaning of his own existence.

More than faith is presupposed, however, to scriptural exegesis. Just as revelation is mediated by men, so the faith that responds to revelation does not replace the mind of the believer. Because God's Word is mediated by men a tradition is necessary to proclaim the Word and explain it to endlessly varying audiences down the ages. Without this continual re-expression, the original inspired expression would be of little help. What good would come of printing the Greek New Testament on the front page of the *New York Times*? Because faith does not replace the human mind, the operations and drives of human understanding are implicated in both the original expression and the tradition which re-expresses and interprets it.<sup>4</sup>

The exegete's task within the tradition, which he enters through faith, is to question the revealed message, not in doubt but in an effort to better understand it, and so contribute to its authentic transmission. What questions he asks, and how he answers them, will largely be determined by his philosophical horizon. Hence the presence of what contemporary German exegetes speak of as a *Begrifflichkeit*, the set of fundamental concepts employed by an interpreter in his questioning of God's Word.<sup>5</sup>

Here is where St. Thomas marked a notable transition in regard to the Fathers. Before him biblical exegesis in the West had relied mostly on concepts borrowed from Middle or Neoplatonism. In the great Origenist and Augustinian schools the conceptual orientation was to exemplary and final causality. The visible world and human history were symbols of spiritual realities known through illumination.<sup>6</sup>

Aquinas' appropriation of Aristotle introduced a different perspective from which to question God's Word. For Thomas human knowing is impossible without sense and imagination. Efficient and formal causality receive greater recognition. The world and history take on their own value, they are not just symbolic of a higher realm. Reason with its philosophies and sciences is clearly differentiated from faith with its mysteries. Once this differentiation had occurred biblical inspiration became a problem in a way it could not have before. This in turn affected Thomas' treatment of the senses of Scripture.

The contrast between St. Augustine and the newly recovered Aristotle, which aroused his strongest passions, upset or modified his most cherished notions about the universe and its Creator, was bound to have a disturbing effect on his study of the Creator's special book. Aristotle caused him to see Scripture as freshly as he saw all creation.<sup>7</sup>

### *Biblical Inspiration and the Prophetic Mission*

Prior to St. Thomas no theologian had felt the necessity of analyzing the exact relationship between the divine and human authors of the Bible. Man's knowing, and the world he knew, were not thought of as spheres in their own right; hence there was hardly any need to determine how both God and man could author the same book. Following Athenagoras of Athens, the human authors were described as the harp strings played by the Holy Spirit to produce the melody of the Scriptures.<sup>8</sup> For Origen, the Bible was inspired because it contained deep spiritual meanings: to accept only the literal or corporeal sense was tantamount to denying divine inspiration.<sup>9</sup> St. Jerome was fond of portraying the individual personalities of the prophets but did not reflect on how to harmonize this with his claim that they were the pen used by God's hand in composing Scripture.<sup>10</sup> To St. Augustine God's action may have enabled the human author to perceive all the truths which would be drawn from the words he wrote - the Bible was "a letter from our fatherland."<sup>11</sup> St. Gregory felt it superfluous to inquire who had been the human author of the book of Job, the Holy Spirit himself was its author.<sup>12</sup>

From his lectures on Scripture, St. Thomas became increasingly interested in the psychological and theological structures operative in the transmission of revelation. His thorough analysis of ordinary human knowing demanded that the interplay of the divine and the human in mankind's growth in supernatural knowledge receive more attention than the scattered patristic references accorded it. Not that Aquinas ever wrote a separate treatise on biblical inspiration. He lived in an age when the Bible was still considered within the total context of the prophetic mission exercised by the people of God.<sup>13</sup> Scripture was not seen as the end product of this mission but as a means of continuing it.

Prophecy, in Aquinas' thought, is a broad analogous term embracing all the charismatic graces related to supernatural knowledge.<sup>14</sup> It covers everything from the majestic theophanies of Sinai or the high mystical experiences of the prophets strictly so called, through the sacred writers who transmitted and

interpreted God's message, down to the inconspicuous task of a deacon chanting the gospel at a liturgical service.<sup>15</sup> The wide diversity does not render prophecy equivocal. The same general purpose and structure can be found in all of its instances. The purpose of prophecy, dictated by its very nature as a charismatic grace, is to contribute to the good of the ecclesial community, to aid men in their return to God.<sup>16</sup>

The structure of prophecy always contains two relationships or moments. The first is the prophetic gift, the encounter of the prophet with God and his saving truth; a man-to-God relationship which issues in revelation.<sup>17</sup> Revelation, like prophecy, is analogous. It applies to the overpowering experiences in which God reveals a great supernatural mystery, as well as to the more commonplace events of men receiving from God a strong inner conviction of the certainty of their faith so that they can convincingly proclaim it to others.<sup>18</sup> Whatever the depth at which the Divine is confronted, its light never fails to affect the prophet - or sacred author.<sup>19</sup>

The other essential relationship in prophecy has to do with the use of the gift in prophetic communication. This is required by the very nature of the gift which is meant for the benefit of other men and not for the personal sanctification of the prophet. In the first relationship man receives passively from God; the "donum prophetiae" is immediately caused by God. But in the prophet-to-men communication God's causality is not immediate:

The use of any prophecy is within the power of the prophet... Hence, one could prevent himself from using prophecy; the proper disposition is a necessary requirement for the correct use of prophecy since the use of prophecy proceeds from the created power of the prophet. Therefore, a determinate disposition is also preredquired.<sup>20</sup>

This does not destroy the instrumental nature of prophetic or biblical communication; it puts this theory in the perspective Aquinas understood it in.

Inspiration, a direct action of God, belongs to the prophetic encounter; it may reveal to the prophet what he is to communicate (the "acceptio rerum" of Aquinas), yet its essential element is the communication (by means of the "lumen propheticum") of a divine certitude that the prophet's judgment *is true*. But *how* he transmits his message, which literary forms and words he uses, is normally governed by God in an indirect or mediated manner.<sup>21</sup> Under unusual circumstances he could modify an individual's social and literary dispositions in a direct way when conferring the "donum." Regularly, however, these dispositions are provided for by that Providence with which the Divine Artisan plans and effectuates salvation-history. He disposed men and events precisely that they might communicate his word as they did.<sup>22</sup> Thus the emphasis is shifted from isolated individuals to God's control of the whole process in which the Bible was formed. The pre-required dispositions were arranged for within the scope of this special Providence; hence Aquinas clearly indicates that the personal traits of the prophets in no way depreciate the message

they convey, instead, this message “proceeds in harmony with such dispositions.”<sup>23</sup> St. Thomas could never regard the human authors as superfluous.

The exegetical presuppositions of the Angelic Doctor were able to incorporate the vivid awareness of the biblical personalities, distinctive of St. Jerome, within a theological analysis that accentuated their importance while preserving the divine initiative. At the same stroke it utilized the sense of sacred history which St. Augustine had bequeathed the Middle Ages.<sup>24</sup> Revelation was not conceived as occurring within the vacuum of a Platonic heaven. It underwent an organic development, taking fully into account the capacities of those to whom it was imparted. The order of faith presupposes natural knowledge just as grace presupposes the nature it perfects.<sup>25</sup> Instructing mankind through revelation, God respected its power of assimilation:

Progress in knowledge occurs . . . also on the part of the learner; so a master, who has perfect knowledge of an art, does not deliver it all at once to his student from the very outset, for he could not grasp it, instead, he condescends to the student's capacity and instructs him little by little. In such a way did men make progress in the knowledge of faith as time went on.<sup>26</sup>

St. Thomas was aware of a certain growth or development in the revelation of supernatural mysteries<sup>27</sup> even though he could scarcely perceive the historical dimensions of such an evolution.

Any reflections on the Bible's inerrancy must take this development into account. Truth in God undergoes no change, but man's apprehension of the truth does. Scripture presents this growth in faith under the guiding hand of God and the presentation would be false if it did not also display the imperfections inherent in any growth. St. Thomas points out that in prophecy, no matter how profound it is, there is never question of leaving time to enter eternity but somehow of grasping eternity in time - the distinction is important.<sup>28</sup> When discussing the truth of prophecy, St. Thomas reverts to the idea of teaching and its evolutive aspect:

Prophecy is a type of knowledge impressed on the prophet's intellect from a divine revelation, this happens *after the manner of education*. Now the truth of knowledge is the same in both the student and the teacher since the student's knowledge is a likeness of the teacher's knowledge, just as in natural matters the form of what is generated is a certain likeness of the form of the generator.<sup>29</sup>

It is not surprising that for Aquinas Sacred Scripture and Sacred Teaching were equivalent.<sup>30</sup> In this Sacred Teaching which revelation is, and which the Bible presents, there is truth and nothing but it; not a truth numerically identical with that present in God,<sup>31</sup> but truth as it is assimilated by the prophets and

apostles of the Old and New Covenants, and as it was incarnated in the historical situations where it developed. Such a perspective need offer no apologies for the rugged simplicity of the Bible; any apologetic function of allegory ceases. Instead, the exegete is directed to the text so that through it he might reach the mentality of the sacred author, the mind on which revelation impressed its message.

### *The Senses of Scripture*

The second area in which St. Thomas rethought the traditional presuppositions of exegesis was the complex one of the scriptural senses. He could hardly have failed to recognize Platonic undertones in the patristic praise for the spiritual senses. Not that the Fathers dispensed with the literal sense - quite the contrary. Clement of Alexandria and Origen initiated a cycle of liberal and scientific studies to provide the Christian interpreter with an accurate grasp of the text and its historical meaning. Origen himself learnt Hebrew and undertook the first textual criticism of the Old Testament's Greek translations.<sup>32</sup> St. Jerome's labors in producing the Vulgate gave the medieval exegetes their text, while St. Augustine, in the second book of *De Doctrina Christiana*, mapped out an entire program to aid in the understanding of the literal sense; it included Hebrew, Greek, Latin, history, natural science, dialectics and law.<sup>33</sup>

Yet none of the Fathers who were to influence medieval exegesis<sup>34</sup> declared the sufficiency of the literal sense; nor did any of the commentators or theologians prior to St. Thomas. Several reasons account for this attitude. One was the grossly literal approach of those who insisted on taking figurative and metaphorical expressions in the Bible at their face value. Thus, Origen was convinced that an excessively literal interpretation lay at the roots of the Jew's rejection of Christ for not fulfilling the messianic promises to the letter, and the Gnostic rejection of the Old Testament for its anthropomorphic portraits of God. Origen countered both by affirming that nothing in the Holy Books is unworthy of God, provided they are understood spiritually rather than literally.<sup>35</sup> St. Augustine made the same plea for an appreciation of the spiritual message of the Bible.<sup>36</sup> If Cassian paid little attention to the literal meaning, this was no doubt due in large measure to the fanatical adherence of the anthropomorphite monks in Egypt to the literal exposition of biblical metaphor.<sup>37</sup> St. Gregory the Great could find little time amid the dissolution of Roman civilization for the literary and historical inquiry necessary to appreciate the literal sense; spiritual exegesis offered a ready tool to communicate his deep religious insights and to fulfill his pastoral obligations.<sup>38</sup> In this aspect he is the link between the patristic and medieval monastic commentators.<sup>39</sup>

Beyond these apologetic and pastoral motivations, however, there existed a Platonic atmosphere in Christian thinking which disposed commentators to regard the biblical text as merely the necessary shell or veil that had to be pierced in order to get at the inner, nobler, spiritual message. Influenced by Philonic methods, Origen used his axiom, that nothing in the Bible is unworthy of God, to explain away obvious sins, such as Lot's incest, as allegories. "Everything in Scripture is a mystery" since "everything in

Scripture has a spiritual meaning, but not all of it has a literal meaning.”<sup>40</sup> When Origen compares the literal sense to the body and the spiritual senses to the soul and spirit of man, it is not startling to hear one with his Platonic temperament referring to "the base, worthless letter."<sup>41</sup> The meaning of metaphor is placed in the realm of the spiritual since intelligibility must be sought, not in the letter or history, but above them.

St. Augustine furnished the groundwork for the proper relation between the literal and spiritual senses by distinguishing between signs and things. Conventional signs, such as words, refer to things; and in the case of Scripture these things themselves can be used by God to signify some further reality.<sup>42</sup> His opinions on divine illumination, with their dependence on Platonic psychology, are evident in his castigations of those who understand metaphor literally:

For when what is said figuratively is taken as if it were said literally, it is understood in a carnal manner. And nothing is more fittingly called the death of the soul than when that in it which raises it above the brutes, the intelligence namely, is put in subjection to the flesh by adhering to the letter. . . Now it is surely a miserable slavery of the soul to take signs for things and to be unable to lift the eye of the mind above what is corporeal and created, that it may drink in eternal light.<sup>43</sup>

The presuppositions come out clearly in Augustine's definition of metaphor or figurative passages:

Whatever there is in the word of God that cannot, when taken literally, be referred either to purity of life or soundness of doctrine, you may set down as figurative.<sup>44</sup>

Since the end of Scripture is the love and knowledge of God, if an interpretation contributes to this end, while failing to grasp the meaning intended by the sacred author, it is similar to reaching the desired goal by a detour instead of by the route intended. When a Christian is securely in possession of the reality he may even dispense with the Scriptures; the signs have served their purpose for him.<sup>45</sup>

The Augustinian assertion of the superiority of the spiritual senses was hardly questioned by medieval allegorists who seemed more interested in detours than in the intended route. Even Hugh of St. Victor, who chided them for claiming superior spiritual knowledge when they were ignorant of what the letter meant, did not doubt for a moment the superiority of spiritual exegesis.<sup>46</sup> St. Thomas' unqualified adoption of the Aristotelian doctrine concerning the dependence of the human mind on the imagination threw a new light on the importance of the literal sense of Scripture. In this life, Christian contemplation, no matter how fully it attained to the reality, could never dispense with the imagined signs which guided it toward that reality. For St. Augustine, man was a soul and a body, the soul used the body; man's intellectual knowledge is not received from sense objects, even sensation is an act of the soul using the

sense organs.<sup>47</sup> For Aquinas, man is a body animated by an intellectual soul, the soul is the act of the body; he cannot acquire knowledge or think without the assistance of the imagination. Aquinas was fully aware of his divergence from Augustine on this point.<sup>48</sup>

This shift in psychological presuppositions was bound to make itself felt in exegetical principles. Greater stress was placed on the role of the imagination or phantasm in prophecy; even in the highest forms of prophetic encounter the phantasm has its role to play.<sup>49</sup> Another effect was a change in attitude toward the literal sense. Nowhere in St. Thomas does one find any disparaging remarks about it. "The Holy Letters are a way to salvation. . . (God) instructs the human mind immediately through the Holy Letters."<sup>50</sup> Not that the traditional doctrine of the four senses was ever abandoned - far from it. He gave them a precise and transparent definition:

1) The literal or historical sense: That intended by the sacred author, the realities he signified through the words of Scripture. Since God not only can adapt words to convey meaning but also, by his providence, transmit meaning in the very events of life, the realities narrated in the Bible can in turn signify a further spiritual reality. Hence the spiritual senses:

2) The allegorical or typical sense: The realities of the Old Testament signify those of the New, Christ and his Church.

3) The moral or tropological sense: The events of Christ's life, and those who prefigured him, signify what Christians should do, how they should live.

4) The anagogical or eschatological sense: The New Testament realities signify those of the kingdom that is to come.<sup>51</sup>

An Aristotelian *Begrifflichkeit* sets these senses of Scripture in a new perspective. The Origenist and Augustinian view of physical and historical events, along with man's knowledge of them, as symbolic put the stress on the allegorical-anagogical meaning as revealing the Ultimate: God and Christ in glory. Christian interpretation must not remain on the level of literature and history; these are symbols whose transcendent finality must be unfolded.<sup>52</sup> St. Thomas, however, opens the way for a closer analysis of the text and of history as expressing a divinely given meaning. Where the former concentrate on the plus-value of the symbol as pointing beyond itself, Aquinas directs attention to the salvific intelligibility of the sacred text and of history. With the Patristic tradition St. Thomas held that not all four senses could be found in every part of Scripture.<sup>53</sup> Unlike many of the Fathers, for Thomas the one sense which is present in all the verses is the literal one.<sup>54</sup>



This “incarnation” of the spiritual senses was further promoted by recognizing metaphor as a literal sense. Since words, whether spoken or written, refer to things *only by means of the mental conceptions* of the one uttering or writing them, the exegete must interpret the literal meaning of the metaphorical text in accordance with what the author meant it to convey and not at its face value.

When Scripture speaks of the arm of God, the literal sense is not that he has a physical limb, but that he has what it signifies, namely, effective power.<sup>55</sup>

By far, the greatest service which St. Thomas performed in regard to exegetical presuppositions was to assert plainly the sufficiency of the literal meaning. The literal is the only sense on which theological arguments can be based; St. Augustine and others had counseled that arguments must be adduced from "Plain testimonies" but never would they have dreamt of identifying these exclusively with the literal sense.<sup>56</sup> The rise of speculative theology was already dampening enthusiasm for allegorical interpretation at the beginning of the thirteenth century.<sup>57</sup> Aquinas went further still in implanting Christian faith in its literal biblical expression:

Consequently Holy Scripture sets up no confusion, since all meanings are based on one, namely, the literal sense. From this alone can arguments be drawn, and not, as St. Augustine mentions in his letter to Vincent the Donatist, from whatever is said according to allegory. Nor is anything lost from Sacred Scripture on this account, for nothing that is necessary to faith is contained under the spiritual sense which is not openly conveyed by the literal sense elsewhere.<sup>58</sup>

As he points out, this does not lessen the spiritual value of the Bible, it simply locates that value within the ambit of the literal meaning.

The exegetical presuppositions of St. Thomas provided all the elements needed for the theoretical justification of a Christian exegete applying himself wholeheartedly to the interpretation of the literal sense. He could do this without fearing an Origenist censure that he was denying biblical inspiration. For only when the things which the author intended to signify through words were known could the further question be determined of what further realities God was signifying through those things. The distinction between the prophetic encounter and its communication assured the believing exegete that the Bible's origin was both truly divine and really human. The Book was an object of both faith and scientific study. The affirmation of the sufficiency of the literal sense would allow him to appreciate the spiritual riches and salvific power of the inspired text itself. Finally, the identification of the literal meaning of the text and the intention of its authors fully warranted a study of the factors which shaped and influenced their mentality - their languages, cultures and historical contexts.

The elements for a theoretical justification of historical biblical studies, however, must not be confused with the studies themselves. St. Thomas' thirteenth century unawareness of history as we know it today meant that he could not grasp the implications of his own presuppositions. This is evident, for example, in his adoption of the Origenist-Augustinian notion that the Old Testament patriarchs and prophets - the elite whose duty it was to lead the people - had an explicit faith in the mysteries of the Holy Trinity and Christ. Since the mass of the people were not ready for this, their faith was implicit in their acceptance of the Old Law in which these mysteries were prefigured.<sup>59</sup> This did not lead Aquinas to posit mysteries behind every word of the Old Testament but it does explain why the messianic prophecies, such as Isaiah (7:14), can be taken as referring directly to Christ in their literal meaning.<sup>60</sup> Another instance was his acceptance of the Augustinian teaching on the multiplicity of the literal sense. God might have enabled the prophet or sacred author to comprehend many of the diverse meanings which others would draw out of what had been written - even if the human instruments did not in fact know these diverse meanings, surely God did.<sup>61</sup> It was more of a pragmatic norm designed to accommodate the wide diversity in patristic interpretations of particular passages when there could be little hope of reaching an agreement on just what the author had meant.<sup>62</sup>

This demonstrates that St. Thomas' exegetical presuppositions were in continuity with the old as well as open to the new. They were not delivered in the clear-cut, settled once and for all categories which theological manuals associate with Thomist thought. He was grappling with problems the implications of which are not yet fully comprehended today. One wonders whether the crises in Catholic interpretation of the Bible during the sixteenth and seventeenth, or the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, would have been so acute had theologians and exegetes assimilated, let alone advanced, the presuppositional positions of Aquinas.

## ST. THOMAS AND EXEGETICAL TECHNIQUES

Samuel Johnson once defined true genius as "a mind of large general powers, accidentally determined to some particular direction." None doubt that Thomas' laid in theoretical directions. He was not a pioneer forging new literary conventions or discovering unknown hermeneutical techniques. He picked up whatever tools were available and hurried on to his speculation.

Not that his labors in the field of exegetical presuppositions were left at the lecture room door when he began to comment on Scripture. Reading his lectures "against a background of modern exegesis, one naturally finds the medieval element in them startling; approaching them from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, one is more startled by their modernity."<sup>63</sup> His declaration of the sufficiency of the literal sense showed up in the meager contribution he made to allegorism in comparison with St. Bernard, Richard of

St. Victor or Stephen Langton. Yet, he did make a contribution, his exposition on the Psalms is clear proof of it. He should not be dressed up as some sort of Melchisedech in biblical interpretation, appearing mysteriously without antecedents.<sup>64</sup> If his work on presuppositional positions made him a man *for* his times, his exegesis just as clearly indicated that he was a man *of* his times:

One is then justified in considering the commentaries of St. Thomas on St. John, and especially on St. Paul, as the maturest fruit and the most perfect realization of medieval scholastic exegesis.<sup>65</sup>

### *Texts, References and Lectures*

The founding of the Dominican house of studies at Paris in 1231 put new life into the scriptural exegesis of the University. Led by Hugh St. Cher, who was instrumental in having the young Brother Thomas come to Paris for his baccalaureate studies, the friars of St. Jacques became famous for their cooperative efforts in producing biblical concordances, correctories and commentaries.<sup>66</sup>

No matter how fully its deficiencies were recognized, the Vulgate, as edited by Alcuin in 800, remained the quasi-official text for all the lectures at the University. Alcuin had no consistent policy in his divisions of the Text, and wide divergencies existed up to and including the twelfth century in the matter of citations. Stephen Langton seems to have worked out the present system of chapters near the end of his teaching career. They were not long in becoming standard and, with a few precisions possibly due to Hugh St. Cher, remain in use today. Partitioning chapters into verses was not introduced until the sixteenth century. This accounts for St. Thomas' custom of referring to passages by naming the book and chapter and then at least a few words of the text he had in mind.

Since Aquinas distinguished between authenticity and canonicity, he had no qualms on including the deuterocanonical books within the canon. Their authority was not derived from whoever wrote them but "from their acceptance by the Church."<sup>67</sup> The books of the Old and New Testaments are termed canonical because, unlike any others, they constitute the norms for our faith:

Those who wrote the Scriptural canon, such as the Evangelists, Apostles and others like them, so firmly asserted the truth that they left nothing to be doubted. Thus it states: "And we know that his testimony is true," (Jn. 21:24) and "If anyone preach to you a gospel, besides that which you have received, let him be anathema." (Gal. 1:9). The reason for this is that only the canonical Scriptures are normative for faith. Whereas others who write about the truth do so in such a way that they do not want to be believed unless what they affirm is true.<sup>68</sup>

This does not imply that St. Thomas advocated *sola scriptura*; he could not abstract the Book from its living environment within ecclesial tradition. The generations of Christians stretching from Apostolic times down to their own were not viewed by the medieval mind as *separating* them from the integral Christian message but far more as *uniting* them to it. The Church Fathers were the incomparable guides in this positive task of assimilating Christ and his meaning. They never could be rejected in an authentically Christian hermeneutic.

The many glosses facilitated recourse to them; to each passage of a given book the glosses would attach an excerpt from one or more of the Fathers which explained or exemplified the text. Two glosses became standard textbooks in medieval exegesis: the *Glossa Ordinaria* which most probably originated with Anselm of Laon and his school, and the *Magna Glossatura* of Peter Lombard on the Psalms and letters of St. Paul. During the twelfth century the Masters of the Sacred Page not only had to comment on the biblical text but also to read, and interpret, if necessary, many of its patristic glosses. The task was formidable and by Thomas' time it devolved on those contending for their baccalaureate to construe the text and its glosses. This left the master free to undertake the commentary proper.

Aquinas was not content with second-hand patristic sources, he often went back to the original works if they were available. When Urban IV requested him to compose a gloss on the four gospels, with particular attention to the Greek Fathers, St. Thomas included many quotations previously not given in the glosses; he even had translations of some Greek works made into Latin. When the *Expositio Continua* - or the *Catena Aurea* as it was popularly known - had been completed, it represented over twenty-two Latin Fathers and fifty-seven Greek Fathers. Critical scholars of the caliber of Erasmus had nothing but praise for it.<sup>69</sup>

Concordances and dictionaries were essential to thirteenth century reference works. St. Thomas probably had at his disposal some of the better known topical concordances, such as those of Rabanus Maurus or Thomas Gallus with their lists of subjects and the relevant scriptural passages. For verbal concordances he could check Hugh of St. Cher's, or the *Concordantia Sancti Jacobi* and *Concordantie Majores*, both the work of his confreres at St. Jacques. He might also refer to dictionaries, such as Alan of Lille's *Distinctiones Dictionum Theologicalium*, in which the words are illustrated by the literal and spiritual meanings they have in the Bible.

In philology and textual criticism St. Thomas was not the equal of some of his contemporaries. He has been reproached for not learning Greek and Hebrew when he certainly had the opportunity to do so at Paris or Naples. But by his time specialization in these areas had already begun. Besides, his biographies leave the impression that Brother Thomas' schedule was a tight one during his years as a student and professor - a fact corroborated by the enormous volume of his writing. The little Greek he knew, and the less Hebrew, was gleaned almost entirely from patristic references and the *correctoria*. These latter, e.g.,

that of Hugh of St. Cher and the Dominicans of St. Jacques, offered variant readings and emendations to the Alcuin Vulgate text used at Paris. St. Thomas relied on these for his textual criticism, not on a direct study of the manuscripts.<sup>70</sup> The Hebrew or Greek etymologies were obtained from patristic sources, Isidore's *Etymologiae*, or dictionaries like William Brito's *Vocabularium Bibliae*.

References to pagan authors are also found in St. Thomas' lectures on Scripture, though he was more hesitant in this practice than his contemporaries. Cicero, Ovid, Seneca, Plato, Democritus, the Stoics and others are interspersed in the commentaries. The one recurrent figure is, of course, Aristotle; his appearances nearly double all the rest put together. Aquinas was in the best Augustinian tradition when he affirmed that "the doctor of holy Scripture accepts the witness of truth no matter where he finds it."

Hence Augustine remarks in the second book of *De Doctrina Christiana* that if whatever the philosophers have stated is in harmony with our faith, not only should it not be mistrusted, it should be taken from them as though they were not its rightful owners and appropriated for our own use.<sup>71</sup>

St. Thomas wished to demonstrate that Aristotle was as much a witness and an unrightful owner as Plato.

Equipped with his text and reference material, the master was ready for his expositions. Aquinas must have lectured on Scripture anywhere from one to four times a week during the scholastic year.<sup>72</sup> Due to the acclaim given to the *Summa Theologiae*, the *Summa Contra Gentiles* and his commentaries on Aristotle, it is generally not realized that they were never the subject of Aquinas' lectures. The bulk of his lectures were devoted to commenting on the Word of God in a systematic and continuous manner. To this teaching he set aside the freshest time of day, the hour of Prime.<sup>73</sup>

Each book was preceded by a prologue or introduction in which the authorship, subject matter and purpose of the writing was discussed with the aid of a scriptural quotation in which these were all supposed to be at least figuratively contained. From Guerric of St. Quentin Thomas adopted the custom of occasionally doing this within the framework of the four causes, formal and material, final and efficient. At other times he borrowed the introductory procedure of the grammarians and speaks of the matter, intention, and utility of the book. When he alluded to the author as the efficient cause, it is interesting to note that he never bothered to qualify the statement by adding "instrumental."

Next came the commentaries proper with their divisions of the text, explanations, questions and replies. The familiar austerity and no-nonsense quality of Scholastic Latin is heightened in many of the lectures that have been preserved. St. Thomas' commentaries fall into two groups. The first are *expositiones*, they were written by Aquinas himself or dictated outside of classes. In this category belong his commentaries

on Isaias, Job, Jeremias, and Lamentations, the letter to the Romans, the first five chapters of St. John's Gospel and the first seven on 1 Corinthians. The second group are termed *lecturae*, they are transcriptions or *reportationes* of the actual lectures he gave. With the exception of his very first commentary, that on St. Matthew, all the other *lecturae* were taken down by St. Thomas' intimate companion and friend, Reginald of Piperno. Here belong his commentaries on St. John and the Pauline letters, possibly also those on the Psalms. That his *lecturae* on Romans and 1 Corinthians (1-10) are missing suggest that he may have used the *reportationes* in composing his expositions.

The system of transcribing lectures was practiced throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. No pretence at style was made; quotations were usually abruptly recorded without introduction and the references were normally left for the master to fill in later. University statutes required that a master correct the reports personally before they were published. The Official Catalogue of St. Thomas' writings mentions that he corrected and approved of Reginald's transcription of his lectures on St. John, and the catalogues of Tolomeo of Lucca (perhaps the earliest catalogue of his writings) and Bernard Gui state that Thomas also corrected the transcriptions of his lectures on St. Paul's epistles.<sup>74</sup>

#### *Characteristics of St. Thomas' Exegesis*

In the field of spiritual exegesis Thomas Aquinas exhibits a marked restraint when compared to interpreters such as Richard of St. Victor or Stephen Langton, and, to a less extent, in comparison with Hugh of St. Cher or St. Bonaventure. Conformable to custom, he differentiated plainly between the literal and spiritual when he was going to offer more than a literal exegesis of the text. Normally, these two were designated as "literal" and "mystical" respectively - although it may be closer to his mind to translate his *mystice* by "symbolically." He was careful not to skip over the things which the words of Scripture immediately designate, the spiritual can only be constructed on a sound knowledge of the literal sense. Yet he had no guides as to when these things were actually used by God to signify some further reality. A result was that he frequently followed patristic sources and saw spiritual meanings in minor events.

For example, the fig tree under which Nathaniel slept (Jn. 1:48) may be symbolically understood with St. Augustine as sin, or with St. Gregory as the Old Covenant. Our Lord's words in John (11:7) "Let us go into Judea again," symbolically proclaim the final conversion of the Jews. The gold, frankincense and myrrh of the Magi symbolize three different aspects of faith, deeds, and contemplation respectively.<sup>75</sup> With the Fathers, nevertheless, St. Thomas was able to attain deep theological insights, e.g., the feeding of the crowds in John (6) symbolically refers to mankind's spiritual nourishment on wisdom; the bread of life is both God's wisdom incarnate in Christ and the Eucharistic sacrament.<sup>76</sup> This is a case where the sacred author himself intended more than one meaning in what he wrote - the multiplicity of the literal sense has not been entirely rejected by modern scholarship.<sup>77</sup>

When reading St. Thomas' literal exegesis, especially of the Old Testament books, one must keep in mind his acceptance of Origen's and Augustine's teaching on the prophets and elders of Israel having an explicit faith in Christian mysteries. In his commentaries, Aquinas at least twice reproaches Theodore of Mopsuestia for supposedly denying that any Old Testament texts could refer literally to Christ or the Church:

Another [error] was that of Theodore who claimed that nothing brought forward in the Old Testament is literally applicable to Christ but only accommodated to him... Hence, "That it might be fulfilled" would have to be interpreted as though the evangelist had said "That it might be accommodated."<sup>78</sup>

Against this Thomas maintains that some passages have Christ alone as their literal meaning, e.g., Isaiah (7:14) and Psalms (21:2) - to deprive them of this unique reference would be heretical. Most references to Christ, however, relate directly to some Old Testament personage who is a figure of Christ, e.g., Solomon in Psalm (71:8).<sup>79</sup>

Occasions in which the literal sense had only a Christian mystery as its focal point were comparatively rare for the Angelic Doctor. He dismissed the notion, for instance, that the Old Covenant's ceremonial precepts were in large measure unintelligible except as allegories of New Covenant mysteries. On the contrary, they generally have literal, historical reasons which the Jewish people could appreciate.<sup>80</sup>

His insistence on the intention of the human author helped him to resolve, or bypass, discrepancies among the synoptics and St. John. "John himself preserved the historical sequence of events" finds a resonance in contemporary assertions on the fourth gospel's historicity. Following St. Augustine, he recognized that Matthew preferred to recapitulate events.<sup>81</sup> He would discard any interpretation which did not seem to him to represent the mind of the author; he even brands one of John Chrysostom's opinions as "apparently ridiculous" for this reason.<sup>82</sup>

Aquinas was aware of the need for extreme pliability in the exegete; definitive solutions were few and far between. Thus he frequently will give more than one interpretation of a passage - his use of "either . . . or" to introduce them indicates that it is not a question of his opting for a multiplicity of literal senses in these situations. He presented them and would sometimes add that this one or that seemed better to him; at other times he left it up to his students to decide. Father Lagrange, O.P., who knew from experience how inflexible some exegetes could be, remarked on Aquinas' broadmindedness in exegesis.<sup>83</sup> He would not resort to procrustean techniques to "solve" all difficulties. His dominating desire was to uncover the meanings intended by the human and divine authors. And his constant attribution of several possible ones to a passage brought out the avowedly hypothetical nature of his attempts.

The literary context must be accounted for in any interpretation. Both St. Augustine and Richard of St. Victor had counseled this. In his Prologue to the Psalms, Aquinas enumerates some of the literary forms in the Bible: narration, admonition, commands, exhortation, prayer, praise, proverb and parable. Thus Matthew's gospel was intended for the Jews and conforms to their manner of speaking. John does not offer an exact repetition of our Lord's words but strives to bring out their deeper significance.<sup>84</sup> Since "Scripture speaks according to the notions of the people" to whom it is addressed, the historical and cultural context must also be investigated. St. Thomas displays an interest in this aspect of exegesis although his historical horizon was narrow and his sources negligible. He probably consulted Peter Comestor's *Historica Scholastica* which had become a standard reference work.<sup>85</sup>

The dialectical cast of St. Thomas' interpretation of the literal sense runs through every page. Syllogisms are disclosed in St. Paul and the correct sequence of thoughts is commended in St. John.<sup>86</sup> The chief ingredient of this approach to the Bible is the omnipresent divisions and subdivisions. Introduced by Hugh St. Cher, the method was utilized by both St. Albert and St. Bonaventure as well as St. Thomas. In the twelfth century, commentaries were content to take one verse at a time and attempt to exhaust its literal and spiritual significance; the students did not get a feel for the book as a whole. The dialectical procedure enabled Aquinas to define the main theme of a book and then relate each of its parts to this unifying center. The divisions could become as arbitrary as allegorism had been, but modern scholarship renders justice to many of Thomas' precisions.<sup>87</sup>

Finally, the dominant note in his exegesis is its theological import. The schoolmen could not study the Word of God passively. Unequipped with the requisite philological and historical knowledge, they questioned the sacred text with the conceptions available to them. Exposition merges with disputation as theological objections are proposed and answered within the commentary. To interpret the book of Job literally is to engage in a living dialogue with it concerning the problems of evil and predestination, of providence and retribution. The Bible was not an historical curiosity to be approached like an antiquated museum piece. The reported vision Aquinas had of Sts. Peter and Paul coming to aid him in interpreting a particular text demonstrates the vivid reality this Book and its authors had for him and his companions.<sup>88</sup>

A danger existed in St. Thomas' tendency to *develop* the literal sense rather than *explain* it. This was the price he had to pay in his efforts to demonstrate in his day that the speculative and scientific theology he was fathering owed its very existence and vitality to the Bible. As Father Chenu, O.P., has pointed out:

We are confronted with the fact that St. Thomas, a master in theology, took as the matter of his official course the text itself of Scripture, the Old and New Testaments... This is of major significance. Undoubtedly in the history of Thomism the *Summa Theologica* has monopolized all the attention... But it is precisely here that a grave problem arises, and the first condition for understanding and solving it is not to forget that the *Summa* is



planted in the soil of the Scriptures, not merely by some species of devotion which gives its rational systematization a pious aspect, but because of the very law of its genesis. The university education of the thirteenth century will produce disputations and *Summae* only within the framework of Scriptural teaching. This is an apt pedagogical expression of the law of theology: It cannot become a science except in communion with the Word of God, which is listened to first of all for itself alone. A tree cut from its roots dies, even though it remains standing.<sup>89</sup>

Despite the limitations of his time, St. Thomas succeeded more than many a later theologian in revealing the profound unity which fuses sacred doctrine with sacred Scripture.

### THE LECTURES ON EPHESIANS

The Masters of the Sacred Page in thirteenth century Paris inherited from their predecessors a deep devotion to St. Paul. Thomas Aquinas made no secret of it. His commentaries on the Pauline letters practically double those on any other sacred author. He apparently intended to go over the letters a second time, converting the transcribed *lecturae* into expositions - some even hold that his redactions of Romans and 1 Corinthians were the result of an uncompleted second series of public lectures on Paul.<sup>90</sup> If the Psalter and the letters of St. Paul are the two most frequently used writings in the Liturgy, it may well be because "in both nearly the whole of theological teaching is contained." Aquinas praises the Apostle to the Gentiles for the clarity of his wisdom and the strength of his love. Paul was full of the Christ whose mysteries he proclaimed to all men.<sup>91</sup>

Everyone agrees in situating the first series of lectures on St. Paul within Thomas' first teaching assignments in Italy, 1259 to 1268. Mandonnet and most other scholars prefer the earlier part of this period, from 1259 to 1265, as the most likely time of the lectures. This would mean that the majority of them were given while Thomas was teaching at the court of Urban IV in Orvieto, 1261 to 1264.<sup>92</sup> Synave, however, dates them from 1265 to 1267 when St. Thomas was regent of the Dominican's provincial house of studies at Rome.<sup>93</sup> Since we do not know how many lectures a week he was accustomed to give - it could range from one to four and possibly five - no probable dates for lectures on individual letters can be offered. If he followed the sequence of the letters which the Vulgate gives - he knew that it was not the chronological order - the letter to the Ephesians would have fallen in the middle of his course. Thus a *caeteris paribus* guess, which carries little weight in historical matters, would place his Ephesian lectures between 1261 to 1263 if Mandonnet is followed, or 1266 in Synave's scheme.<sup>94</sup>

In attempting to establish the *ordo doctrinae*<sup>95</sup> to be followed in commenting on the Pauline corpus, St. Thomas saw the whole teaching of Paul's fourteen letters centering about the grace of Christ. The letter to the Hebrews, which Aquinas believed was written by Paul in Hebrew and translated by St. Luke into Greek, deals with Christ as the head and source of grace.<sup>96</sup> Grace and its relation to the whole Mystical Body embraces most of the remaining letters. Romans deals with Christ's grace in itself; 1 Corinthians is concerned with the sacraments of grace; 2 Corinthians with the dignity of their ministers; and Galatians with the uselessness of Old Testament sacraments. This grace effects the unity of Christ's Body; Ephesians treats of the institution of ecclesial unity; Philippians with its strengthening and increase, while Colossians seeks to defend it against present persecution; and 1 and 2 Thessalonians against the dangers to come under Anti-Christ. Finally, 1 and 2 Timothy, with Titus, are to the prelates of the Church regarding spiritual matters; Philemon in reference to a temporal issue.<sup>97</sup>

When St. Thomas' more systematic works, such as the *Summa Theologiae*, are studied in isolation from the scriptural matrix they were meant to supplement, misunderstandings are inevitable. He is accused of forgetting the essentially Christian character of salvation, grace, and charity.<sup>98</sup> It was not without reason that Pius XII, during the last year of his pontificate, reminded students of the indispensable role Aquinas' lectures on Scripture play in determining what his true thought is:

In the opinion of men of the finest judgment, the commentaries that St. Thomas wrote on the books of the Old and of the New Testament, and especially on the Epistles of St. Paul the Apostle, reflect such authority, such a keen insight and such diligence that they can be counted among his greatest theological works, and are considered in the nature of a biblical complement to these works, one to be held in the highest esteem. And thus if anyone should neglect them, he cannot be said to enjoy a clear and thoroughgoing acquaintance with the knowledge of the Angelic Doctor.<sup>99</sup>

In developing the main theme of his lectures on Ephesians, the unity of the faithful in Christ, Aquinas continually pointed out the central position of Christ in salvation-history. The whole of Chapter One pivots around the blessings which men have received in Christ. Through him we are chosen, predestined, and adopted as God's children, worthy to partake of eternal beatitude and bodily resurrection (Lect. 1). The Father loves us because he sees his own Son in us; only Christ can justify and save us (Lect. 2). The life-giving mystery revealed through the Apostles is the advent of God in Christ and the recapitulation of everything in Him (Lect. 3). The acceptance of this mystery in faith is dependent on Christ (Lect. 5). As Christ is the model and form of our justice, so his exultation sets the pattern for mankind's resurrection (Lect. 7). In this exultation Christ exercises a supreme fullness of power over the entire universe (Lect. 8).

This sets the stage for Chapter Two in which St. Thomas comments on the effects of Christ's power. The slavery to sin in which Jew and pagan were plunged (Lect. 1) was destroyed by God's unique mercy,

justifying us in Christ (Lect. 2). Only Christ can accomplish this salvation (Lect. 3). The alienation between Jew and pagan (Lect. 4) was completely annihilated by the over-powering unification of mankind effected by the God-man (Lect. 5). Now all the races of men have access by Christ, in the Spirit, to the Father (*ibid.*). A new community of men is formed whose foundation is Christ (Lect. 6).

In the lectures on Chapter Three the special role of the Apostles in disseminating knowledge of this mystery is discussed. The blessings outlined in Chapters One and Two are reiterated in the context of this apostolic mission. Christ is Lord of history (Lect. 3), and the essence of our faith consists in affirming his true divinity and humanity (Lect. 5). The moral exhortations and precepts of Chapters Four to Six are to assist the Ephesians in preserving the ecclesial unity Christ has established and strengthened by his gifts. St. Thomas certainly cannot be accused of failing to impress on his students the profoundly Christological nature of mankind's return to God. If later Thomists are justly reprimanded for this, it is only insofar as they have failed to sink the roots of their theology as deeply into the Word of God as their master did.

The lectures on Ephesians exhibit all the characteristics of Thomas' exegesis. The Prologue considers the four causes of the letter while allegorizing on a verse from Psalm 74. Parallel passages from other parts of Scripture are generously sprinkled throughout the commentary. Since it is a transcription or *reportatio* by Reginald, these quotations are often jotted down without any introductory phrase linking them to the previous thought. Yet the connection is not difficult to perceive in the majority of cases since they merely substantiate or illustrate what preceded.

Aquinas' typically thirteenth century interest in the theological import of the biblical text is evident on every page. Though few in number, similarities to the twelfth century biblical-moral school of exegesis can also be detected.<sup>100</sup> Thus, in Lecture 4 of Chapter One he describes how civil elections were performed at his time. A contemporary maxim is quoted in Lecture 6 of Chapter Five when Thomas assures his students that the caution St. Paul was recommending had nothing in common with that advised in the saying "si non caste, tamen caute." An echo of Stephen Langton's concern for reform can be heard in his categorical statement that bishops, the successors of the Apostles, are to leave temporal administration to deacons since their spiritual duties are a full time job (Ch. 4, Lect. 4). The observation must have met with a rather cool reception at the papal court in Orvieto where it was probably made.

Dialectical procedures are well represented. Objections and answers regarding the Apostle's thought are frequent, and in Chapter Five we are told how Paul demonstrated one of his minor (Lect. 3) and major premises (Lect. 5). The general lines of St. Thomas' divisions of the letter to the Ephesians are excellent; they compare well with those given by modern exegetes.<sup>101</sup> Their only obvious defect is an excessive precision on every minor detail.<sup>102</sup>

The following is an outline of the main sections and their more prominent subdivisions as given by St. Thomas. The reader may find it helpful if he gets lost in the course of a lecture.

	Chapter and Verse	Lecture No.
THE GREETING	1:1-2	1
THE NARRATIVE: meant to fortify the Ephesians in good:		
I. By reason of Christ and his blessings		
a. The blessings offered to all men	1:3-7	1-2
b. The unique gifts given the Apostles	1:8-12	3-4
c. The blessings bestowed on the Ephesians	1:13-14	5
1. Paul's affection for them has grown	1:15-16a	6
2. He prays that they be blessed evermore	1:16b-19a	6
d. Christ, the form and exemplar of all blessings:		
1. Especially in his Resurrection and Exultation	1:19b-21	7
2. In which he has power over the universe and the Church	1:22-23	8
II. By reason of the Ephesians' own past experience		
a. Their sinful state and unmerited justification and salvation in Christ	2:1-10	1-3
b. Their Gentile condition and Christ's goodness	2:11-13	4
1. In making them, with the Jews, on New Man in himself	2:14-18	5
2. Now both share in God's blessings	2:19-22	6
III. By reason of Paul's solicitude for them and the special graces he has received		
a. The dignity of his mission because of		
1. His knowledge of divine mysteries	3:3-6	1
2. His part in carrying these mysteries into effect and their outcome	3:7-12	2-3
b. Paul's trials and his prayer that they remain strong in faith and love	3:13-17	4
c. If they do, a knowledge of divine mysteries will be granted to them also	3:18-20	5
d. A Thanksgiving to God for giving us Christ and the Church	3:21	5
AN EXHORTATION: urging them on to higher goods, especially unity:		
I. An admonition to preserve ecclesial unity		
a. The admonition itself	4:1-4	1
b. The form of this ecclesial unity:		
1. That which is common to every member	4:5-6	2
2. What is particular to each individual:		
a) The source of these different gifts	4:7-11	3-4
b) The fruit of this diversity, Christ's body	4:12-16	4-5
II. How they are to remain in Christian unity		

a.	General norms for everyone:		
1.	Christ's teaching is contrary to pagan sins	4:17-21	6-7
2.	The conditions for knowing Christ's doctrine	4:22-24	7
b.	General precepts applicable to everyone:		
1.	Avoid spiritual sins and follow Christ's example	4:25-5:2	4:8-5:1
2.	Avoid carnal sins; Paul speaks of their punishment and warns against them	5:3-14	2-5
3.	Exhortation to newness of life and thanksgiving	5:15-21	6-7
c.	Particular precepts for different groups		
1.	For husbands and wives, the mystery of Christ and the Church	5:22-23	8-10
2.	For children and parents	6:1-4	1
3.	For slaves and their masters	6:5-9	2
THE CONCLUSION: indicating by whose power these precepts will be fulfilled:			
I.	Trust in God, he will provide spiritual armor for the struggles Christians must undergo	6:10-17	3-4
II.	A final prayer, farewells and doxology	6:18-24	5

St. Thomas once symbolized his attitude before the mysteries of God's Word in an allegory on Jacob and the angel. It reveals the paradox of Aquinas, the theologian's insatiable curiosity before mystery and the mystic's profound reverence before the Infinite. Here we glimpse the restless spirit hidden beneath the unattractive and arid cadences of a schoolman's language and methods:

The whole night they wrestled, muscles straining, neither yielding; but at daybreak the angel disappeared, apparently leaving the field clear to his adversary. But Jacob then felt a violent pain in his thigh. He was left wounded and limping. It is thus that the theologian grapples with the mystery when God brings him face to face with it. He is taut, like a bent bow, grappling with human language; he struggles like a wrestler; he even seems to win the mastery. But then he feels a weakness, a weakness at once painful and consoling, for to be thus defeated is in fact the proof that his combat was divine.<sup>103</sup>

The commentary on Ephesians is one record of such an encounter, with its inevitable shortcomings and its hard-won achievements.

No critical edition of St. Thomas Aquinas' scriptural commentaries has yet been undertaken. The present translation is based on the Parma edition of his complete works.<sup>104</sup> I have also consulted the Piana edition as it has recently been revised by Raphael Cai, O.P., and noted where it varies significantly from the

Parma.<sup>105</sup> Quotations from the Bible and the text of St. Paul's letter to the Ephesians are taken from the Douay-Rheims translation of the Vulgate, except when textual variations or clarity called for a direct translation from Aquinas' version. An asterisk (\*) after the verse number indicates these instances. Unless they are introduced by a word or phrase the biblical references are placed in parentheses: since a passage was cited only by book and chapter number, the verse numbers which have been added later are always enclosed in parentheses.

St. Thomas himself censured word for word translations,<sup>106</sup> and the following makes no pretence at being one. At the beginning of each lecture, where the divisions of the text are given, the lack of any system of verse enumeration obliged Aquinas to quote the first few words of each of the passages pertaining to the subdivisions he was making. To avoid needless repetition I have substituted, in parentheses, the chapter and verse numbers of these quotations. The laconic abruptness of Reginald's transcription has been mitigated only to the extent of adding bracketed words or phrases, not found in the original, in order to form a complete sentence or clarify a hazy reference.

Technical Latin words are given in either notes or brackets whenever it seemed advisable to depart from the accustomed way of rendering them in English. At times, the ponderous and repetitive introductory phrases are shortened, for instance, "Concerning which it must be known that. . .," might read "Note that this. . ." Throughout the work my objective has been to produce as accurate and readable a translation as circumstances and ability permit.

The notes provide the references in the pagan, patristic and medieval authors whom St. Thomas quotes or alludes to in his commentary. In them I have also explained, however briefly and inadequately, some points in Aquinas' teaching which he happens to illustrate or presuppose in the course of a lecture. These range from cosmology and psychology to metaphysics and speculative theology. Further developments of an insight have also been indicated, or how the results of his inquiry compare with those of more recent studies.

In conclusion, I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Fathers Charles English, O.C.S.O., and Emmanuel Rodriguez, O.C.S.O., and Brother John Kohlreiser, O.C.S.O., for assisting me with the reference material. I am especially indebted to Father Pierre Conway, O.P., and Mr. Thomas A. Gallagher for their helpful suggestions and encouragement.

Matthew L. Lamb, O.C.S.O.

# Prologue

*I have strengthened its pillars (Ps. 74:4)*

Wisely has it been remarked that: "No less energy is spent in retaining possessions than in acquiring them."<sup>1</sup> Although St. Paul did not initiate the Ephesians into the faith, the Apostle is justly praised for having strengthened them in it. Of the Church at Ephesus he rightfully can claim: **I have strengthened its pillars** - I who am an Israelite in nationality, a Christian in religion, an Apostle in dignity.

A Jew by birth, for I am an Israelite sprung from Abraham's seed in the tribe of Benjamin (cf. 2 Cor. 11:22; Rom. 11:1). A Christian in religion, "For I, through the law, am dead to the law, that I may live to God; with Christ I am nailed to the cross. And I live, now not I; but Christ liveth in me. And that I live now in the flesh, I live in the faith of the Son of God" (Gal. 2:19-20). An Apostle in dignity since "I am the least of the apostles" (1 Cor. 15:9). These three are found in 2 Corinthians 11 (22-23\*): "They are Israelites: so am I. They are the seed of Abraham: so am I. They are the ministers of Christ, so am I. I speak as one less wise: I am more."<sup>2</sup> Everyone who proclaims saving wisdom, like Paul, must be an Israelite in his contemplation of God, a Christian in his religious faith, an Apostle in his function's authority.

I, therefore, am a Jew by birth, seeking God through faith, and am an Apostle of God through following the example [of the twelve]. **I have strengthened** them lest they falter in their faith, as the workman will buttress a building against a fall. "And thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren" (Lk. 22:32), was spoken to Peter and accomplished by Paul. A verse in Job 4 (4) applies to him: "Thy words have confirmed them that were staggering." The bishop confirms a boy to fortify him against becoming spiritless; similarly, Paul has strengthened the Ephesians not to fear unreasonably. In this connection, Psalm 88 (21-22) says of David: "I have found David my servant: with my holy oil I have anointed him. For my hand shall help him: and my arm shall strengthen him."

"By the word of the Lord," written through Paul, "the heavens," applying to the Ephesians, "were established" (Ps. 32:6) lest they lose their prize of glory, just as a prelate or prince ratifies a gift to protect it against theft. Psalm 40 (13) prays: "But thou hast upheld me by reason of my innocence: and hast established me in thy sight forever." Psalm 67 (29) also asks for strengthening power: "Command thy strength, O God: confirm, O God, what thou hast wrought in us." The Apostle promised these divine aids in 2 Thessalonians 3 (3): "But God is faithful, who will strengthen and keep you from evil."

**I have strengthened its pillars**, namely, the Church's faithful at Ephesus. They are referred to as pillars since they must be straightforward, upright, and strong - straightforward through faith, upright through hope, and strong because of charity. I say straightforward through faith because faith reveals the straight

and true way to arrive at the fatherland; it is symbolized by the pillar of cloud in Exodus 13 (21): "And the Lord went before them to show the way by day in a pillar of a cloud." Faith, similar to clouds, is opaque with its mysteries, dissolves when it gives way to vision, and moistens by arousing devotion. [The faithful are] upright through hope, for hope points heavenwards; it is symbolized by the column of smoke in Judges 20 (40): "And they perceived as it were a pillar of smoke rise up from the city." Hope, like smoke from fire, springs from charity, ascends upward, and finally vanishes in glory. [The faithful must be] strong through charity, "for love is strong as death" (Cant. 8:6); hence, it is symbolized by a pillar of fire capable of consuming everything, as in Wisdom 18 (3): "Therefore, they received a burning pillar of fire for a guide of the way which they knew not." As fire makes the surroundings visible, puts metals to the test, and destroys what can burn, so charity enlightens human actions, examines one's motives, and exterminates all vices.

The efficient cause of this letter is, of course, St. Paul; this cause was ascribed to the **I** of Psalm 74 (4). The final cause is to fortify, designated by the **have strengthened**. The material cause is the Ephesians, as noted under **its pillars**. The formal cause will be understood in the structural divisions of the letter and its method of presentation.<sup>3</sup>

A Glossator<sup>4</sup> prefaces this letter with a prologue or summary expressing two main ideas:

First, he describes them [the recipients].

Secondly, he gives the reason and circumstances of writing, at "The Apostle praises them."

The Ephesians, to whom he wrote, are described in three ways: first, by their locality, "the Ephesians are Asians," coming from Asia Minor; second, by their religion, "they have accepted the word" of Christian "truth"; third is their constancy, "they have remained steadfast in the faith." The first has reference to their home country, the second to grace, and the third to perseverance.

At "The Apostle praises them" he adds the reason and circumstance of writing; he implies four things. First is the reason for writing; secondly, the author is "the Apostle"; thirdly, the place from which he writes is "from a prison in Rome"; fourthly, the messenger through whom he writes is "Tychicus, a deacon" (cf. Eph. 6:21).



# Chapter 1

## LECTURE 1

**1 Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God, to all the saints who are at Ephesus and to the faithful in Christ Jesus: 2\* Grace be to you and peace, from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ. 3 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with spiritual blessings in heavenly places, in Christ; 4 as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and unspotted in his sight in charity. 5 Who hath predestinated us unto the adoption of children through Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the purpose of his will; 6a unto the praise of the glory of his grace.**

The Apostle writes this letter to the Ephesians who were Asians, coming from Asia Minor which is part of Greece.<sup>5</sup> They were not initiated into the faith by the Apostle Paul but he did strengthen them in it. Even before he had met them, they had been converted, as can be gathered from Acts 19 (1): "And it came to pass, while Appollo was at Corinth, that Paul, having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus and found certain disciples." Once they were converted and fortified by the Apostle, they were steadfast in the faith, not succumbing to false doctrine. Thus, they were entitled to encouragement rather than reprimand; and Paul's letter has a tone of reassurance and not of rebuke. He wrote them from the city of Rome through the deacon, Tychicus.<sup>6</sup>

The Apostle's intention is to strengthen them in good habits,<sup>7</sup> and spur them on to greater perfection. The method of presentation can be seen in the division of the letter:

First, the greeting, in which he shows his affection for them.

Secondly, the narrative, in which he strengthens them in good habits (1:3-3:21).

Thirdly, the exhortation, in which he urges them on to greater perfection (4:1-6:9).

Fourthly, the conclusion of the letter, in which he fortifies them for the spiritual combat (6:10-24).

In the salutation, the person greeting comes first, second those greeted, and thirdly the formula of greeting. In reference to the first, he gives the name of the person, **Paul**; second, that person's authority as an **Apostle of Christ**; lastly, the giver of this authority, **by the will of God**. He says **Paul** which is a name of humility,<sup>8</sup> whereas the title of **Apostle** is one of dignity; the reason is that "he that humbleth himself shall be exalted" (Lk. 14:11; 18:14). An Apostle, I mean, **of Jesus** and not one of the pseudo-apostles who are of Satan: "It is no great thing if his [Satan's] ministers be transformed as the ministers of justice" (2 Cor. 11:15). I am an apostle, he says, not by my own merits but **by the will of God**. In many instances it is just the opposite - "They have reigned, but not by me" (Os. 8:4).

He writes **to all the saints who are at Ephesus and to the faithful**. Either [this could mean], I, Paul, write about morals to those who are holy through the exercise of virtues; and about faith to those who believe with true knowledge. Or, [it may mean], **to the saints** who are the elders and perfect [members], and **to the faithful** who are less experienced and imperfect. They are said to believe in Christ Jesus and not in their own deeds.<sup>9</sup>

He adds here the formula of greeting which indicates three qualities which make any gift pleasing: the sufficiency of the gift, in **grace be to you and peace**; the power of the giver, **from God our Father**; and the excellence of the mediator, **and from the Lord Jesus Christ**. For a gift is pleasing when what is given is sufficient and is offered by someone in power, as a king or prince, and is presented by a solemn messenger, for example, by his son.

He mentions **grace** meaning justification from sin, **and peace** which is calmness of mind, or reconciliation to God, in regard to the freedom from punishment due to sin. May this be **to you from God our Father** from whom every good comes: "Every best gift and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of lights" (Jas. 1:17). **And the Lord Jesus Christ** without whom no blessings are given. That is why nearly all the [liturgical] prayers are concluded "through our Lord Jesus Christ." The Holy Spirit is not mentioned in the greeting formula since he is the bond uniting Father and Son and is understood when they are mentioned; or he is understood in the gifts appropriated to him, grace and peace.<sup>10</sup>

Then when he says **Blessed be God . . .** (v. 3) in giving thanks, he strengthens them in good, and he does this in three ways:

First, by giving as a reason Christ, from whom they have received so many gifts (Ch. 1).

Secondly, by reason of they themselves who have been transformed from a former evil condition to their present good one (Ch. 2).

Thirdly, because of the Apostle himself, whose ministry and solicitude has confirmed them in their good state (Ch. 3).

The first is divided into three sections:

First, in giving thanks he touches on blessings in a general way.

Secondly, then the blessings given the Apostles in particular (1:8).

Thirdly, finally the blessings especially granted to the Ephesians themselves (1:13).

He treats of six blessings offered generally to the human race:

First, that of praising [God] in the certainty of future beatitude (1:3).

Secondly, that of being chosen in the foreordained separation from those headed toward destruction (1:4).

Thirdly, that of predestination in the foreordained community of the good, namely, of the adopted sons (1:5).

Fourthly, that of becoming pleasing [to God] through the gift of grace (1:6b).

Fifthly, that of being redeemed, liberated from the punishment of diabolical slavery (1:7a).

Sixthly, that of being pardoned by having sin blotted out (1:7b).

Regarding the benefit of praise (v. 3) two aspects are touched on:

First, the praise itself which should be rendered, at **Blessed be God**.

Secondly, the blessing on account of which it should be rendered, at **who hath blessed us**.

He says that God should be **blessed** or praised by you, me and others with our hearts, tongues and actions. He who is **God** by the divine essence **and Father** because of his property of generating [the Son]. The copula **and** is not placed between **God** and **Father** to designate two separate persons, for there is only one Father, but to denote what he is by his essence and what he is in relation to the Son. **Father**, I say, **of our Lord Jesus Christ**, that is, of the Son who is our Lord because of his divinity, and Jesus Christ according to his humanity.

God **who hath blessed us** with hope in the present while in the future he will bless us with the reality. He puts [the verb] in the past tense, instead of the future, on account of his certainty.<sup>11</sup> Even though by our own merits we were cursed, he blessed us **with every spiritual blessing** both for soul and for body. For then the body will be spiritual: "It is sown a natural body: it shall rise a spiritual body" (1 Cor. 15:44). [This will occur] by a blessing enjoyed **in heavenly places**, that is, in heaven, and **in Christ** since it will be through Christ or by Christ's action: "For he himself will transform our lowly body" (Phil. 3:21).

This blessing is greatly to be desired. And this by reason of its efficient cause since **God** is the one who blesses; and by reason of its material cause since **he hath blessed us**; and because of the formal cause since he blessed us with **every spiritual blessing**; and on account of the end, he blessed us **in heavenly places**. "Behold, thus shall the man be blessed that feareth the Lord" (Ps. 127:4).

Next (v. 4), he treats of the blessing of election; he sets forth the advantages of this election because: it is free, **as he chose us in him**; it is eternal, **before the foundation of the world**; it is fruitful, **that we should be holy**; and it is gratuitous, **in charity**.

Therefore he states: He blessed us in the same way - not through our merits but from the grace of Christ - **as he choose us** and, separating us from those headed to destruction, freely foreordained us **in him**, that is, through Christ. "You have not chosen me; but I have chosen you" (Jn. 15:16). This happened **before the foundation of the world**, from eternity, before we came into being. "For when the children were not yet born, nor had done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election, might stand" (Rom. 9:11). **He chose** us, I say, not because we were holy - we had not yet come into existence - but that **we should be holy** in virtues **and unspotted** by vices. For election performs this twofold action of justice: "Turn away from evil and do good" (Ps. 33:15).

Saints, I assert, **in his sight**; interiorly in the heart where he alone can see: "the Lord beholdeth the heart" (1 Kg. 16:7). Or, **in his sight** may mean that we may gaze on him since the [beatific] vision, according to Augustine, is the whole of our reward. He will accomplish this, not by our merits, but in his charity; or, by our [charity] with which he formally sanctifies us.<sup>12</sup>

Then (v. 5) he adds the third blessing, that of predestination in the foreordained community of those who are good. Six characteristics of predestination are sketched here. First it is an eternal act, he **hath predestinated**; secondly, it has a temporal object, **us**; thirdly, it offers a present privilege, **the adoption of children through Jesus Christ**; fourthly, the result is future, **unto himself**; fifthly, its manner [of being realized] is gratuitous, **according to the purpose of his will**; sixthly, it has a fitting effect, **unto the praise of the glory of his grace**.

Hence he affirms that God, **who hath predestinated us**, has forechosen us by grace alone **unto the adoption of children** that we might share with the other adopted children the goods yet to come - thus he says **unto the adoption of children**. "For you have not received the spirit of bondage again in fear; but you have received the spirit of adoption of sons," and further on, "waiting for the adoption of the sons of God, the redemption of our body" (Rom. 8:15 & 23).

It must be through contact with fire that something starts to burn since nothing obtains a share in some reality except through whatever is that reality by its very nature. Hence the adoption of sons has to occur through the natural son. For this reason the Apostle adds **through Jesus Christ**, which is the third characteristic touched on in this blessing, namely, the mediator who draws all to himself. "God sent his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that he might redeem them who were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons" (Gal. 4:4-5). This is accomplished **unto himself**, that is, inasmuch as we are conformed to him and become servants in the Spirit. "Behold what manner of charity the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called and should be the sons of God," after which comes: "We know that when he shall appear we shall be like to him" (1 Jn. 3:1-2).

Here it should be noted that the likeness of the predestined to the Son of God is twofold. One is imperfect, it is [the likeness] through grace. It is called imperfect, firstly, because it only concerns the reformation of the soul. Regarding this Ephesians 4 (23-24) states: "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man, who according to God is created in justice and holiness of truth." Secondly, even with the soul it retains some imperfection, "for we know in part" (1 Cor. 13:9). However, the second likeness, which will be in glory, will be perfect; both as regards the body - "He will reform the body of our lowliness, made like to the body of his glory." (Phil. 3:21) - and in regard to the soul - "when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away" (1 Cor. 13:10).

What the Apostle says, therefore, about his predestinating us unto the adoption of children can refer to the imperfect assimilation to the Son of God possessed in this life through grace. But it is more probable that it refers to the perfect assimilation to the Son of God which will exist in the fatherland. In reference to this adoption Romans 8 (23) asserts: "Even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption of the sons of God."<sup>13</sup>

Divine predestination is neither necessitated on God's part nor due to those who are predestined; it is rather **according to the purpose of his will**. This is the fourth characteristic which recommends the blessing to us, for it springs from pure love. Predestination, according to [how man] conceives it, presupposes election, and election love. A twofold cause of this immense blessing is designated here. One is the efficient cause which is the simple will of God - **according to the purpose of his will**. "Therefore, he hath mercy on whom he will; and whom he will he hardeneth" (Rom. 9:18). "For of his own will hath he begotten us by the word of truth" (Jas. 1:18). **Unto the praise of the glory of his grace** specifies the final cause which is that we may praise and know the goodness of God. Once again this eminent blessing is recommended inasmuch as the homage [it results in] is in accord with itself. For the [efficient] cause of divine predestination is simply the will of God, while the end is a knowledge of his goodness.

Whence it should be realized that God's will in no way has a cause but is the first cause of everything else. Nevertheless, a certain motive can be assigned to it in two ways. On the part of the one willing, the motive for the divine will is his own goodness which is the object of the divine will, moving it to act. Hence, the reason for everything that God wills is his own goodness: "The Lord hath made all things for himself" (Prov. 16:4). On the side of what is willed, however, some created existent can be a motive for the divine will; for example, when he wills to crown Peter because he has fought well (cf. 2 Tim. 4:7-8). But this latter is not the cause of [God's] willing; rather it is a cause of it happening the way it did.<sup>14</sup>

Nonetheless, it should be acknowledged how, in the realm of what is willed, effects are a motive for the divine will in such a way that a prior effect is the reason for a later one.<sup>15</sup> But when the primary effect [i.e., the perfection of the Universe] is arrived at, no further reason can be given for that effect except the divine will. For instance, God wills that men should have hands that they might be of service to his

mind;<sup>16</sup> and [he wills] man to possess a mind since he wills him to be a man; and he wills man to exist for the sake of the perfection of the Universe. Now since this is what is primarily effected in creation, no further reason for the Universe can be assigned within the domain of creatures themselves; [it lies] rather within the domain of the Creator, which is the Divine Will.

In this perspective, neither can predestination find any reason on the part of the creature but only on the part of God. For there are two effects of predestination, grace and glory. Within the realm of what is willed [by God], grace can be identified as a reason for the effects which are orientated towards glory. For example, God crowned Peter because he fought well, and he did this because he was strengthened in grace. But no reason for the grace, as a primary effect, can be found on the part of man himself which would also be the reason for predestination. This would be to assert that the source of good works was in man by himself and not by grace. Such was the heretical teaching of the Pelagians who held that the source of good works exists within ourselves. Thus it is evident that the reason for predestination is the will of God alone, on account of which the Apostle says **according to the purpose of his will**.<sup>17</sup>

To understand how God creates everything and wills it because of his own goodness, it should be realized that someone can work for an end in two ways. [A person may act] either in order to attain an end, as the sick take medicine to regain their health; or [he may act] out of a love of spreading the end, as a doctor will work to communicate health to others. But God needs absolutely nothing external to himself, according to Psalm 15 (2): "Thou art my God, for thou hast no need of my goods." Therefore, when it is said that God wills and performs everything on account of his own goodness, this should not be understood as though he acted in order to confer goodness on himself but rather to communicate goodness to others.

This divine goodness is properly communicated to rational creatures in order that the rational creature himself might know it. Thus, everything that God performs in reference to rational creatures is for his own praise and glory, according to Isaias 43 (7): "And everyone that calleth upon my name, I have created him for my glory: I have formed him and made him" so that he may know what goodness is, and in this knowledge praise it. The Apostle thus adds **unto the praise of the glory of his grace**, that man might realize how much God must be praised and glorified.

Nor does he say "unto the praise of justice." For justice enters into the picture only where a debt is present or is to be returned. But for man to be predestined to eternal life is not due to him - as was said, it is a grace given in perfect freedom. Nor does he simply say **of the glory**, but annexes **of his grace** as though it were of a glorious grace. And grace is just this; the greatness of grace is revealed in that it consists in the greatness of glory. [Its grandeur is shown] also in the way it is bestowed; for he gives it without any preceding merits when men are unworthy of it. "But God commendeth his charity towards us; because,

when as yet we were sinners according to the time, Christ died for us"; and a little further on, "when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son" (Rom. 5:8 & 10).

By now it must be clear how divine predestination neither has nor can have any cause but the will of God alone. This, in turn, reveals how the only motive for God's predestinating will is to communicate the divine goodness to others.

## LECTURE 2

**6b In which he hath graced us in his beloved Son. 7 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the remission of sins, according to the riches of his grace.**

Now the Apostle writes of the fourth blessing (cf. 1:3), that of becoming pleasing [to God] through the gift of grace. Regarding this he does two things:

First, he touches on the giving of this blessing.

Secondly, he shows the manner and conditions of its bestowal (1:7).

Hence he first asserts: We are predestined unto the adoption of sons, for the praise of the glory of his grace - that grace, I say, **in which he hath graced us in his beloved Son**. In this respect, it should be noted that to be loved by someone is identical to being pleasing to him. For he is pleasing to me whom I love. Now, since God loved us from eternity - he chose us before the foundation of the world in love, as has been said (1:4) - how has he made us pleasing to himself in time? A reply is that those whom he loves eternally in himself, he renders pleasing [to himself] in time according as they exist in their own natures. The former [his love] is from eternity and is not created, the latter happens in time and is said to come into being. Hence the Apostle says that **he hath graced us**, that is, made us pleasing that we should be worthy of his love. "Behold what manner of charity the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called and should be, the sons of God" (1 Jn. 3:1).

Two types of grace are customarily distinguished: charismatic grace freely given without being merited - "And, if by grace, it is now not by works; otherwise grace is no more grace." (Rom. 11:6) - and sanctifying grace which makes us pleasing and acceptable to God.<sup>18</sup> The latter is the grace dealt with here.

Notice how persons can be loved for the sake of others, or for their own sake. For when I love someone very much, I love him and whatever belongs to him. We are loved by God, not for what we are in ourselves, but in him who by himself is beloved of the Father. Thus the Apostle adds **in his beloved Son**

on account of whom he loves us and to the degree that we are like him. For love is based on similarity: "Every beast loveth its like: so also every man him that is nearest himself" (Ecclus. 13:19). By his own nature, the Son is similar to the Father, he is beloved before all else and essentially. Hence he is naturally, and in a most excellent way, loved by the Father. We, on the other hand, are sons through adoption to the degree that we are conformed to his Son; in this way we enjoy a certain participation in the divine love. "The Father loveth the Son; and he hath given all things into his hand. He that believeth in the Son hath life everlasting" (Jn. 3:35-36). "He hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love" (Col. 1:13).

Next (1:7), he sets down the way itself [that grace is given]. Concerning this he does two things:

First, the part of Christ in the way it is given.

Secondly, the part of God in it, at **according to the riches of his grace** (1:7b).

On the part of Christ he writes of two ways through which Christ has made us pleasing [to God]. For within us there exists two antagonisms to the divine good pleasure, the stains of sin and the punishing injuries [sin inflicts]. Justice is as opposed to sin as life is to death, so that through sin, having departed from our likeness to God, we cease being pleasing to God. But through Christ he has made us pleasing. First, indeed, by abolishing the punishment; and in reference to this he says that **in Christ we have redemption** from the slavery of sin. "You know that you were not redeemed with corruptible things, as gold or silver, from the vain manner of life handed down from your fathers: but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb unspotted and undefiled" (1 Pet. 1:18\*-19). "Thou hast redeemed us to God, in thy blood" (Apoc. 5:9).

Secondly, we are said to be redeemed because through Christ we are freed from a slavery in which we were caught as a result of sin without ourselves being capable of fully making satisfaction. By dying for us, Christ has satisfied the Father and thus the penalty of sin was abolished.<sup>19</sup> Whence he says unto **the remission of sins**. "Behold the Lamb of God. Behold him who taketh away the sin of the world" (Jn. 1:29). "Thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise again from the dead, the third day; and that penance and remission of sins should be preached in his name" (Lk. 24:46).

The way [we are blessed with grace] on Gods part is set down in **according to the riches of his grace**. As though he said: In making us pleasing to himself, God not only forgave us our sins, but he gave his own Son to make reparation on our behalf. This was from an overflowing graciousness by which he willed to preserve the human race's honor while, as though in justice, willing men to be freed from the slavery of sin and death through the death of his own Son. Thus, in saying **according to the riches of his grace** he seems to state: That we were redeemed and made pleasing [to God] through the satisfaction of his Son



comes from an overflowing grace and mercy since mercy and compassion are bestowed on those having no claim to it.

In what has been said so far we have followed the interpretation of a Gloss<sup>20</sup> which seems to be a far-fetched exposition since the same idea expressed in one phrase occurs in another. **He chose us** is the same as to say **he predestinated us**. And the same idea is expressed in **that we should be holy and unspotted** as in **unto the adoption of children**.

In this regard it should be known that the customary procedure of the Apostle, when speaking of a difficult subject, is to explain what went before by what immediately follows. This is not verbal proliferation but an exposition; and this is the method the Apostle uses here. Retaining the same import of the words, we may divide it differently from the beginning (v. 3) into three sections:

First, the Apostle gives thanks in **Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ**.

Secondly, he mentions conjointly the bestowal of all blessings in **who hath blessed us with spiritual blessings in heavenly places, in Christ**.

Thirdly, he gives a clear expression of the divine blessings in particular (v. 4ff.).

This latter is divided into two parts:

First, he distinctly formulates the blessings.

Secondly, he interprets them (v. 5).

He formulates the blessings:

First, as regards election, in **as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world**.

Secondly, as regards its consequences, **that we should be holy and unspotted in his sight**.

First, he treats of election, for there are two types of election, one involving a present justification and another an eternal predestination. Concerning the first John 6 (71) states: "Have not I chosen you twelve? And one of you is a devil?" But this is not what the Apostle refers to since it did not occur **before the foundation of the world**. So he immediately clarifies what he means, that it is the second type, eternal predestination. Thus he says **Who hath predestinated us. . .** (v. 5). As he said **in Christ** (v. 3) to signify that we are assimilated and conformed to Christ in proportion as we are [God's] adopted children, so he adds **unto the adoption of children through Jesus Christ**. What he means by **in charity** he explains when he says **In whom we have redemption through his blood**. As though he affirmed: We have, etc.<sup>21</sup> **Unspotted** is expounded by **unto the remission of sins**; while **in his sight** is explained by **unto the praise of the glory of his grace**.

### LECTURE 3

**8 Which hath superabounded in us, in all wisdom and prudence, 9 that he might make known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in him, 10 in the dispensation of the fullness of times, to re-establish all things in Christ, that are in heaven and on earth, in him.**

Having set down the blessings generally given to all, the Apostle now turns to those favors especially granted to the Apostles. This section is divided into two parts:

First, he proposes the special blessings given the Apostles.

Secondly, he indicates their cause (1:11).

In reference to the first he does three things: He sets down the particular blessings of the Apostles:

First, as regards the excellence of their wisdom.

Secondly, as regards a unique revelation of the hidden mystery (1:9a).

Thirdly, he suggests what this mystery is (1:9b-10).

He first states: According to the riches of his grace all the faithful together, both you and we, possess redemption and the remission of sins through the blood of Christ. This grace **hath superabounded in us** who, [as Apostles], have it more fully than others. Whence the rashness - not to say error - of those who dare equate the grace and glory of some saints with that of the Apostles. For this passage openly asserts that the Apostles are more fully graced than the other saints, except for Christ and his Virgin Mother. However, should it be claimed that other saints were able to merit as much as the Apostles merited, and consequently would have as much grace, it must be said that this would be a good argument if grace was given according to merits - but if that were the case, "grace is no more grace" (Rom. 11:6).

Greater dignity was preordained by God to some saints, and hence he infused grace more abundantly into them. For example, he imparted a unique grace to Christ as man when he assumed [the humanity] into the unity of the [Second] Person. He endowed with special graces in both her body and soul, the glorious Virgin Mary whom he chose to be his mother. Similarly, those God called to a unique dignity, the Apostles, were gifted with a corresponding favor of grace. Thus the Apostle states in Romans 8 (23): "ourselves also, who have the first fruits of the Spirit." And a Gloss comments:<sup>22</sup> "their share is first in

time and more copious than others. What rashness, therefore, to put some later saint on the same level with the Apostles.”

God's grace has superabounded in the Apostles, [enriching them] with all wisdom. For the Apostles are set over the Church to be her pastors: "And I will give you pastors according to my own heart: and they shall feed you with knowledge and doctrine" (Jer. 3:15). Two qualities should characterize pastors: a profound knowledge of divine truths and an assiduous fulfillment of religious actions. They must teach those trusted to them the true faith; this requires that wisdom which consists in a knowledge of the divine, concerning which he remarks **in all wisdom**. "For I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to resist and gainsay" (Lk. 21:15). They also need **prudence** to guide their subjects in external and temporal affairs: "Be ye therefore prudent as serpents and simple as doves" (Mt. 10:16\*). Thus the special blessing of wisdom given to the Apostles is clearly expressed.

The reception of an uncommon revelation is their next blessing, **that he might make known unto us the mystery of his will**. As if he had said: Our wisdom does not consist in discovering the natures of material realities, nor the course of the stars, or such like; rather, it concerns Christ alone. "For I judged not myself to know any thing among you, but Jesus Christ; and him crucified" (1 Cor. 2:2). Hence he says **that he might make known the mystery**, that is, the sacred secret, hidden from the beginning, the mystery of the Incarnation. He adds the cause of this hidden mystery when he says **his will**. Future events are known only if their causes are; for example, we can determine a future eclipse only by knowing what causes an eclipse.

Now the mystery of the Incarnation has God's will as its cause since he willed to become incarnate on account of his intense love for men: "For God so loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son" (Jn. 3:16). Yet God's will is more hidden than anything else: "The things also that are of God no man knoweth, but the Spirit of God" (1 Cor. 2:11). So, the cause of the Incarnation was concealed from everyone except those to whom God revealed it through the Holy Spirit, as the Apostle mentions: "But to us, God hath revealed them, by his Spirit. For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God" (1 Cor. 2:10). Hence he affirms **that he might make known the mystery** which is a sacred secret - a secret because it is **of his will**. "I confess to thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them to little ones" (Mt. 11:25). "The mystery which hath been hidden from ages and generations, but now is manifested to his saints, to whom God would make known the riches of the glory of this mystery..." (Col. 1:26-27).

He then explains something about this mystery (vv. 9-10). His thought is involved and should be construed as: **that he might make known unto us the mystery of his will**, which mystery is **to re-establish all things in Christ**, that is, through Christ. All, namely, **that are in heaven and on earth**. This re-establishment in Christ must be **in the dispensation of the fullness of times** which, in turn, is

**according to his good pleasure.** Thus, three aspects of the mystery are touched on; the mystery's cause, the temporal fitness [of its appearance], and its purpose.

**According to his good pleasure** briefly sums up the cause. Although whatever pleases God is good, goodness is preeminently (*antonomastice*) suited to God's pleasure in this [effecting of the Incarnation] because through it we are led to perfectly enjoy goodness. As Psalm 146 (11) declares: "The Lord taketh pleasure in them that fear him: and in them that hope in his mercy"; and Romans 12 (2): "that you may prove what is the good and the acceptable and the perfect will of God."

The suitable time was in that **dispensation of the fullness of times** which Galatians 4 (4-5) speaks of: "But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that he might redeem them who were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." The pointless problem pagans used to raise is thus brushed aside by the Apostle.<sup>23</sup> For as Job 24 (1) remarks: "Times are not hid from the Almighty." He orders and arranges everything, including time; for he manages and accommodates the passage of time to those events which he wills to exist at the right moment. Just as other events effected by him had their specified time, likewise he eternally preordained a time for the mystery of the Incarnation. This time, a Gloss<sup>24</sup> points out, occurred after man was convinced of his own stupidity before the written [Mosaic] Law, when he worshiped creatures instead of the Creator – "For, professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (Rom. 1:22) - and of his own absolute inability to live up to the prescriptions of the written Law. Thus men, no longer trusting in their own wisdom and power, would not consider Christ's advent as unimportant. Weak, and to a certain extent ignorant, they would eagerly desire the Christ.

The mystery's purpose is to **re-establish all things**. Inasmuch as everything is made for mankind, everything would be re-established [when man was redeemed]: "In that day I will raise up the tabernacle of David, that is fallen: and I will close up the breaches of the walls thereof, and repair what was fallen" (Am. 9:11). Everything that is **in heaven**, namely, the angels. Christ did not die for the angels, but in redeeming mankind "he shall fill the ruins" (Ps. 109:6) left by the sin of the angels. Beware of the error Origen fell into, as if the damned angels were to be redeemed through Christ; this was only a figment of his imagination.<sup>25</sup> And **what is on earth** [will be re-established in Christ] insofar as he reconciles heavenly and earthly realities: "Making peace through the blood of his cross, both as to the things that are on earth and the things that are in heaven" (Col. 1:20). This must be understood in reference to the sufficiency [of his redeeming actions], even though, with respect to its efficacy, everything will not be re-established.

**11 In whom we also are called by lot, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things according to the counsel of his will; 12 that we may be unto the praise of his glory; we who before hoped in Christ.**

Previously the Apostle wrote of how he and the other Apostles received an abundance of grace from Christ (1:8). Lest anyone imagine they had it coming to them the Apostle quickly affirms that they were called by God gratuitously, not for their personal merits. This section is divided into three parts:

First, the gratuity of the [Apostolic] call.

Secondly, God's freedom in predestination (1:11b).

Thirdly, what is the end of both [vocation and predestination] (1:12).

I have indicated, he says, that grace has superabounded in us and that everything has been re-established in Christ. The same Christ **In whom we also are called by lot**, not by our own merits but by a divine choice: "Giving thanks to God the Father, who hath made us worthy to be partakers of the lot of the saints in light" (Col. 1:12) because "my lots are in thy hands" (Ps. 30:16).

To understand this it should be realized that many human events which seem to occur by fate and chance, in reality are arranged according to divine providence. Casting lots<sup>26</sup> is no more than a search for divine guidance in contingent and human affairs. Augustine, commenting on Psalm 30 (16), teaches that casting lots is not an evil but a means of discovering God's will in a doubtful issue.

Nonetheless, three sins must be avoided. First, is superstition; for any religion which is shallow and immoral is superstition. The forbidden sin of superstition would be incurred when the casting of lots is performed in league with the devil. For instance, Ezechiel 21 (21) relates how: "the king of Babylon stood in the highway, at the head of two ways, seeking divination, shuffling arrows: he inquired of the idols and consulted entrails." The shuffling of the arrows is related to sortilege, and the questioning of idols belongs to superstition. Sortilege, moreover, is condemned there (Ez. 21) among sins pertaining to superstition.

Secondly, the sin of tempting God must be shunned. As long as a man can discover and accomplish by himself what he ought to do, he tempts God if he resorts to lots, or any other such method, to ascertain what he should do. Only when unavoidably threatened by situations where one is powerless by himself can a man licitly resort to [extraordinary ways of] questioning God concerning what he must do. "But as we know not what to do, we can only turn our eyes to thee" (2 Par. 20:12). Vanity is the third sin. It is committed if we inquire into futile matters not pertaining to us; for example, contingent events in the future. "It is not for you to know the times or moments, which the Father hath put in his own power" (Ac. 1:7).

Relative to this [purpose for which they are cast], there are three types of lots: some are divisory, others are consultatory, while still others are divinatory.

Divisory lots are those which people cast when they are dividing an inheritance and cannot agree. Using a certain ring, slip of paper, or the like, they declare: Whoever it will fall to shall have this part of the inheritance. Such lots can be cast lawfully: "The lot suppresseth contentions: and determineth even between the mighty" (Prov. 18:18) when they wish to divide in this way.

Consultatory lots are used when someone doubts what he should do and consults God by casting lots. Jonas 1 (7) recounts how, when the great storm came upon them at sea, they cast lots to seek information from God that they might know for whose sin the tempest had occurred. This method is licit, especially in necessities and in the elections of secular rulers. Hence, men will make small wax balls called "bussuli," of which some contain slips of paper and others none. Whoever draws a "bussulus" with the paper inside has a voice in the election. This was done also, previous to the Holy Spirit's coming, in spiritual elections, evidenced in the choice of Mathias by lot (Ac. 1:26). Now that the Holy Spirit has come, however, it is no longer lawful in these elections since making use of them would be an insult to the Holy Spirit. It must be believed, after all, that the Holy Spirit will provide his Church with good pastors. After the Holy Spirit's advent, therefore, when the Apostles chose the seven deacons (cf. Ac. 6), they did not cast lots. Thus, this method is not lawful in any ecclesiastical election.

Divinatory lots augur future events reserved to the divine knowledge alone. They always are colored by vainglory, nor can they be resorted to without a sinful curiosity.

Lots, therefore, are nothing other than a questioning concerning realities whose occurrence depends on the divine will. Since grace depends on the divine will alone, the grace of divine election is termed a lot. For God, as though by lot, according to his hidden providence, calls men through an inner grace and not on account of anyone's merits.

Next, when he says **predestined according to his purpose**, he writes of the free predestination of God concerning which Romans 8 (30) deals: "And whom he predestinated, them he also called." The reason for this predestination is not our merits but the will of God alone, on account of which he adds **according to the purpose of him**. "And we know that to them that love God, all things work together unto good; to such as, according to his purpose, are called to be saints" (Rom. 8:28).

He approves of what he has predestined according to his purpose since not only this, but also everything else that God does **he worketh according to the counsel of his will**. "Whatsoever the Lord pleased he hath done, in heaven, in earth, in the sea, and in all the deeps" (Ps. 134:6). "My counsel shall stand, and

all my will shall be done" (Is. 46:10). He did not say "according to his will" lest you would believe it was irrational, but **according to the counsel of his will**. This means, according to his will which arises from reason; not that reason here implies any transition in his thoughts,<sup>27</sup> it rather indicates a certain and deliberate will.

Finally, he briefly mentions the end of one's predestination and vocation, namely, the praise of God. Thus he states **that we may be unto the praise of his glory, we who before hoped in Christ**. Through us, who believe in Christ, the glory of God is extolled. "The mountains and hills shall sing praise before you" (Is. 55:12). The praise of God's glory, as Ambrose remarks,<sup>28</sup> occurs when many persons are won over to the faith, as a doctor's glory is in a large clientele and their cure. "Ye that fear the Lord, hope in him; and mercy shall come to you for your delight" (Ecclus. 2:9).

## LECTURE 5

**13 In whom you also, after you had heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation, in whom also believing, you were signed with the holy Spirit of promise. 14 Who is the pledge of our inheritance, unto the redemption of acquisition, unto the praise of his glory.**

Once the Apostle has enumerated the blessings offered generally to all the faithful, then those especially given the Apostles (1:8), he begins to recount those granted to the Ephesians themselves. This section is divided into two parts:

First, he sets down the favors shown them.

Secondly, he describes his feelings aroused by the favors

The first is divided into three parts according to the three blessings granted to them:

First, the blessing of preaching.

Secondly, the blessing of conversion to the faith (1:13).

Thirdly, the blessing of justification (1:13-14).

In reference to the first point he says: **Christ in whom you also, after you had heard**, that is, by whose favor and power you have heard the proclamation of the **word of truth** since Christ himself has sent those who preach it to you. "How shall they believe him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear, without a preacher? And how shall they preach unless they be sent? . . . Faith, then, cometh by

hearing; and hearing by the word of Christ" (Rom. 10:14-15, 17). They hear through the blessing of him who sends them the preachers: "Blessed are they who hear the word of God and keep it" (Lk. 11:28).

The Apostle mentions the threefold recommendation of this preached word. It is, first of all, true; a **word of truth**. Indeed, it could be nothing else since its source is Christ concerning whom John 17 (17) states: "Thy word is truth." And James 1 (18): "For of his own will hath he begotten us by the word of truth." Secondly, it is a proclamation of good news. Hence he says **the gospel**: it announces the highest good and eternal life. "Word of faith" is preeminently (*antonomastice*) applicable to the Gospel as the communication of the highest good. "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, and that preacheth salvation. . . Get thee up upon a high mountain, thou that bringest good tidings to Sion" (Is. 52:7; 40:9). This refers to future goods. The present goods are what describe and recommend [Christian preaching] in the third place, for it saves. Thus he says **of your salvation**; if believed in, it gives salvation. "I am not ashamed of the gospel. For it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth" (Rom. 1:16). "Now I make known unto you, brethren, the gospel which I preached to you, which also you have received and wherein you stand: by which also you are saved" (1 Cor. 15:1).

Regarding the blessing of conversion to the faith, he states **in whom**, namely, Christ, by whose action you **also believing, were signed**. This blessing is applied to faith since faith is necessary for those who listen. In vain would anyone listen to the word of truth if he did not believe, and the believing itself is through Christ. "By grace you are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, for it is the gift of God" (Eph. 2:8).

Concerning the blessing of justification he mentions that **you were signed with the Holy Spirit** who was given to you. Concerning this [Spirit] three things are said; he is a sign, the spirit of the promise, and the pledge of our inheritance.

He is a sign inasmuch as through him charity is infused into our hearts, thereby distinguishing us from those who are not the children of God. Relating to this he says **you were signed**, set apart from Satan's fold. "Grieve not the holy Spirit of God; whereby you are sealed unto the day of redemption" (Eph. 4:30). Just as men brand a mark on their own herds to differentiate them from others, so the Lord willed to seal his own flock, his people, with a spiritual sign. The Lord had the Jews as his own people in the Old Testament. "And you, my flocks, the flocks of my pastures are men" (Ez. 34:31). "And we are the people of his pasture and the sheep of his hand" (Ps. 94:7). This flock was fed on the earthly pastures of material teachings and temporal goods: "If you be willing and will harken to me, you shall eat the good things of the land" (Is. 1:19). The Lord, therefore, differentiated and set them apart from others by means of the bodily sign of circumcision. "And my covenant shall be in your flesh" (Gen. 17:13); before this it says,



"You shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, that it may be for a sign of the covenant between me and you (Gen. 17:11).

In the New Testament the flock he had is the Christian people: "You are now converted to the shepherd and bishop of your souls" (1 Pet. 2:25). "My sheep hear my voice; and I know them; and they follow me" (Jn. 10:27). This flock is fed on the pastures of spiritual doctrine and spiritual favors; hence the Lord differentiated it from others by a spiritual sign. This is the Holy Spirit through whom those who are of Christ are distinguished from the others who do not belong to him. But since the Holy Spirit is love, he is given to someone when that person is made a lover of God and neighbor. "The charity of God is poured forth in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost who is given to us" (Rom. 5:5). Therefore, the distinctive sign is charity which comes from the Holy Spirit: "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another" (Jn. 13:35). The Holy Spirit is he by whom we are signed.

The Spirit is described as a promise for three reasons. First, he is promised to those who believe: "I will put a new spirit within you. . . And I will give you a new spirit" (Ez. 36:26\*, 37:6\*). Secondly, he is given with a certain promise, by the very fact that he is given to us we become the children of God. For through the Holy Spirit we are made one with Christ: "If any man have not the Spirit of God, he is none of his" (Rom. 8:9\*). As a result of being made adopted children of God, we have the promise of an eternal inheritance since "if sons, heirs also (Rom. 8:17).

Thirdly, he is termed a **pledge** inasmuch as he makes us certain of the promised **inheritance**. Adopting us into the children of God, the Holy Spirit is the **Spirit of promise** who also is the seal of the promise yet to be attained.

However, as is mentioned in a Gloss, a variant reading has **who is the earnest of our inheritance**,<sup>29</sup> and perhaps this is a better rendering. For a pledge differs from the object in place of which it is given, and it must be returned once he who has received the pledge obtains the object due him. An earnest, however, does not differ from the object in place of which it is given, nor is it returned since it is a partial payment of the price itself, which is not to be withdrawn but completed. God communicates charity to us as a pledge, through the Holy Spirit who is the spirit of truth and love. Hence, this is nothing else than an individual and imperfect participation in the divine charity and love; it must not be withdrawn but brought to perfection. More fittingly, therefore, it is referred to as an earnest rather than as a pledge.

Nevertheless, it can also be called a pledge. For through the Holy Spirit God grants us a variety of gifts. Some of these will remain in the fatherland, as charity which "never falleth away" (1 Cor. 13:8); while others will not last on account of their imperfection, such as faith and hope which "Shall be done away" with (*ibid.*, v. 10). Hence, the Spirit is called an earnest in reference to what will remain, and a pledge with respect to what will be done away with.

He adds the purpose for which we are signed as **unto the redemption**. For when a man buys new animals and adds them to his flock, he puts a mark on them to the effect that he has purchased them. Now Christ has purchased a people from the Gentiles. "Other sheep I have that are not of this fold; them also I must bring. And they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd" (Jn. 10:16). And on them he imprints a sign of purchase: "A holy nation, a purchased people" (1 Pet. 2:9) "which he hath purchased with his own blood" (Ac. 20:28).

Christ acquired this people, not because they never were his, but because they previously belonged to him and yet, by sinning, had sold themselves into a diabolical slavery which oppressed them. So it does not simply state that he acquired them but adds **unto redemption**, as though to say: You are not strictly a new acquisition; you are re-purchased from the slavery of the devil through his blood. "You were not redeemed with corruptible things as gold or silver, from the vain manner of life handed down from your fathers: but with the precious blood of Christ" (1 Pet. 1:18\*-19). Christ purchased us, therefore, through a redemption; not that this added anything to God since he needs none of our goods. "And if thou do justly, what shall thou give him [God], or what shall he receive of thy hand?" (Job 35:7). The purpose for which Christ acquired us is **unto the praise of his glory**, that God himself be praised since "everyone that calleth upon my name, I have created him for my glory" (Is. 43:7).

## LECTURE 6

**15 Wherefore, I also, hearing of your faith that is in the Lord Jesus and of your love towards all the saints, 16 cease not to give thanks for you, making commemoration of you in my prayers, 17 that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and of revelation, in the knowledge of him; 18 the eyes of your heart enlightened, that you may know what the hope is of his calling and what are the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, 19a and what is the exceeding greatness of his power towards us, who believe.**

After enumerating the blessings conferred on the Ephesians through Christ (1:13), the Apostle now reveals how his affection for them has grown. This section is divided into three parts:

First, he begins by relating the good reports he has heard concerning them.

Secondly, he gives the thanks due for the blessings they have received (1:16a).

Thirdly, he adds a prayer for future blessings (1:16b-19a).

There were two good things which he heard about them. One was their faith by which they were properly orientated toward God; regarding this he remarked: **Wherefore, I also, hearing of your faith that is in the Lord Jesus.** Indeed, faith makes God dwell in man: "That Christ may dwell by faith in your hearts" (Eph. 3:17). Again, it purifies hearts: "purifying their hearts by faith" (Ac. 15:9). Moreover, it justifies without recourse to the Law: "for we account a man to be justified by faith, without the works of the law" (Rom. 3:28). The second good is love by which they are properly orientated toward their neighbor; in reference to this he says **and of your love** consisting in works of charity. This love is a spiritual sign that a man is a disciple of Christ: "A new commandment I give unto you: That you love one another, as I have loved you, that you also love one another. By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another" (Jn. 13:34-35). This **love**, I say, is **towards all the saints**. For everyone whom we love with charity, we ought to love either because they are holy or in order that they become holy. "Whilst we have time, let us work good to all men, but especially to those who are of the household of the faith" (Gal. 6:10).

Next (1:16a), the Apostle gives thanks for these goods and blessings he has heard about, saying **I cease not to give thanks for you**. On the contrary, however, he could not have continually offered thanks for them. I reply. In saying **I do not cease**, the Apostle means at the required times; or, **I do not cease** because my attitude of thanksgiving for you is without intermission habitually with me. "We cease not to pray for you, and to beg that you may be filled with the knowledge of his will, in all wisdom and spiritual understanding" (Col. 1:9). "Without ceasing I make a commemoration of you; always in my prayers making request" (Rom. 1:9-10).

Consequently, the Apostle prays for the blessings that must be given them in the future. This has three divisions:

First, he sets down certain ones that he asks for them.

Secondly, he explains these (1:17b-19a).

Thirdly, he discloses the exemplar and form of these blessings (1:19bff.).

In regard to the first he says: Not only do I give thanks for past benefits which you have received and for the good reports concerning you, but I also pray that, by all means, these increase in the future, **making commemoration of you in my prayers** in behalf of these to **the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory**.

It must be acknowledged, at this point, that our Lord Jesus Christ is both God and man. Insofar as he is man, he is related to God, since he is composed of body and soul, both of which, being creatures, are necessarily related to God. But according as he is God, he is related to the Father. "I ascend to my Father and to your Father, to my God and to your God" (Jn. 20:17). Likewise, as God he is the glory of the

Father: "who, being the brightness of his glory, and the figure of his substance" (Heb. 1:3). He is also our glory because he himself is life eternal: "That we may be in his true Son: this is the true God and life eternal" (1 Jn. 5:20). Therefore, he states **the God of our Lord Jesus Christ** in relation to him as man, and his **Father** in reference to him as God. I say the **Father of glory**, that is, of Christ who is his glory. "A wise son is the glory of the father" (Prov. 10:1),<sup>30</sup> and of our glory, inasmuch as he communicates glory to all.

Then he writes down the two things he asks for: **the spirit of wisdom and of revelation**. It must be realized here that certain gifts are common to all the saints and are necessary for salvation, such as faith, hope and charity. These they already possessed, as is evident. Then there are other special gifts; he prays that they receive these. First is the gift of wisdom when he says **the spirit of wisdom** whom no one can bestow except God: "And who shall know thy thought, except thou give wisdom, and send thy Holy Spirit from above" (Wis. 9:17). The second gift prayed for is that of understanding which consists in the **revelation** of spiritual mysteries that God alone can give: "There is a God in heaven that revealeth mysteries" (Dan. 2:28).

Next, he explains what he asks for:

First, what pertains to the gift of wisdom.

Secondly, what pertains to the gift of understanding (1:18b).

To the gift of wisdom belongs the knowledge of divine realities. Hence, to ask for the gift of wisdom is to ask that they enjoy a knowledge of God. He begs for this in saying **in the knowledge of him**, as if to say: I ask that, through the spirit of wisdom, you may have **the eyes of your heart enlightened in a clearer knowledge of God**. "Consider, and hear me, O Lord my God. Enlighten my eyes that I never sleep in death" (Ps. 12:4). This is the opposite of those whose eyes are enlightened only with respect to temporal reality when it is more necessary and more glorious to know God. "Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom. . . and let not the rich man glory in his riches: but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me" (Jer. 9:23-24).

Three aspects pertain to the gift of understanding, one of which has reference to the present life, and two to the future. Hope, which is necessary for salvation, belongs to the present condition: "for we are saved by hope" (Rom. 8:24). Concerning this he says **that you may know what**, that is, how great **the hope is of his calling**, meaning the virtue of hope and what an immense reality it is concerned with. This [hope] is of the utmost importance because it concerns the greatest realities: "He hath regenerated us unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" (1 Pet. 1:3). It is also the strongest of the virtues: "we may have the strongest comfort, we who have fled for refuge to hold fast the hope set before us. Which we have

as an anchor of the soul, sure and firm, and which entereth in even within the veil" (Heb. 6:18-19).

Yet, since what we hope for concerns the future life, the other two aspects [of the gift of understanding] pertain to the future. One, the essential reward, is common to all the just; regarding which he says **what are the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints**. Here he writes down four characteristics of those gifts. First, they are most abundant, which he implies in **riches**. "He that shall hear me shall rest without terror, and shall enjoy abundance" (Prov. 1:33); "Glory and wealth shall be in his house" (Ps. 111:3); "With me are riches and glory, glorious riches and justice" (Prov. 8:18). Secondly, they have the greatest clarity, regarding which he says **of glory**, "But glory and honor and peace to every one that worketh good" (Rom. 2:10). Thirdly, they are the most enduring, in reference to which he states **of his inheritance**, for what is hereditary is possessed permanently. "His goods are established in the Lord" (Ecclus. 31:11); "The Lord is the portion of my inheritance and of my cup: it is thou that wilt restore my inheritance to me" (Ps. 15:5). Fourthly, he indicates that they will be most profound, as **in the saints**. "The sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come that shall be revealed in us" (Rom. 8:18); "for that which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation worketh for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory" (2 Cor. 4:17).

The other aspect [of the gift of understanding] which he sets down in reference to the future glory pertains especially to the Apostles. Hence he asks **that you may know. . . what is the exceeding greatness of his power towards us**, the Apostles. He seems to say: Although he bestows the riches of his glory abundantly on all the saints, he grants them in an exceedingly great measure to the Apostles. For the greatness of a power is gauged by what it does. Hence, the more the divine power accomplishes in someone, the more is that divine power revealed there - even though it is one and undivided in itself. Therefore, since a greater effect of the divine power is present in the Apostles, the greatness of this power will reside in them.

He shows what this greater effect present in them is by saying **we who believe**; we who are the first-fruits among those who believe. "We also believe. For which cause we speak also; knowing that he who raised up Jesus will raise us up also with Jesus" (2 Cor. 4:13). "I know whom I have believed and I am certain that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him" (2 Tim. 1:12).

Those among you, therefore, through whom others are taught and called to the faith - such as the doctors [of the sacred sciences] - will be rewarded in a preeminent way. Thus a Gloss<sup>31</sup> states how "the great doctors will enjoy a certain increase in glory above that commonly possessed by all." For the same reason, in Daniel 12 (3), the educated are likened to the brightness of the sky, while the doctors are the stars themselves: "But they that are learned shall shine as the brightness of the firmament: and they that instruct many to justice, as stars for all eternity."

## LECTURE 7

**19b According to the operation of the might of his power, 20 which he wrought in Christ, raising him up from the dead and setting him on his right hand in the heavenly places, 21 above all principality and power and virtue and dominion and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.**

Once he has listed the blessings which he hopes will be granted to the Ephesians in the future (1:16ff.), the Apostle discusses the exemplar and form of those benefits. As the life of Christ is the model and form of our justice, so Christ's glory and exaltation is the form and exemplar of our glory and exaltation. Here the Apostle makes two points:

First, he proposes in a general manner the form of our exaltation with its blessings and gifts.  
Secondly, he discusses it in detail (1:20bff.).

The divine activity in Christ is the form and exemplar of the divine activity in us. In reference to this he states **according to the operation**, that is, in the likeness of the operation, **of the might of his power**, meaning the virtuous power of God, **which he wrought in Christ** exalting him who is the head. Understand that in this way he will mightily act in us. "Whence also we look for the Savior, our Lord Jesus Christ, who will reform the body of our lowness, made like to the body of his glory, according to the operation whereby also he is able to subdue all things unto himself" (Phil. 3:20-21). In Scripture we frequently read that we will be exalted in the likeness of Christ's exaltation. For example, Romans 8 (17): "If we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified with him." Or the Apocalypse 3 (21): "To him that shall overcome, I will give to sit with me in my throne; as I also have overcome and am sat down with my Father in his throne."

As a result, he specifies the form and exemplar in more detail, showing what pertains to the exaltation of Christ while speaking of him inasmuch as he is man (v. 20bff.). He writes of three favors in the exaltation of Christ:

First, the transition from death to life, by **raising him up from the dead**.

Secondly, the exaltation to the utmost heights of glory, **setting him on his right hand**. . .  
(1:20b-21).

Thirdly, an elevation to the greatest of power, **and he hath subjected all things under his feet**. .  
. (1:22-23).

Concerning the first he states that it was **according to the operation which** God the Father **wrought in Christ** by the same power which he shares with Christ. Christ both restored himself to life and was restored to life by the Father.<sup>32</sup> "And, if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you; he that raised up Jesus Christ from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies, because of his Spirit that dwelleth in you" (Rom. 8:11).

**Setting him on his right hand** refers to the second [element in Christ's exaltation]. This height of glory can be viewed in three perspectives: in its relation to God, to material creatures, and to spiritual creatures. Considered in relation to God, he is seated at his right hand; this is not to be thought of as a bodily organ - "God is a Spirit" (Jn. 4:24) - but as a metaphorical way of speaking. The right hand is taken as a nobler and stronger part of man; so when we say that Christ Jesus is seated at the right hand of God, it should be understood that according to his humanity he partakes of the Father's choicest blessings, and according to his divinity it is understood as equality with the Father. "The Lord said to my Lord: sit thou at my right hand" (Ps. 109:1); and the last chapter of Mark (16:19): "And the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken to them, was taken up into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of God."

**In heavenly places** defines Christ's relation to material creatures. For the heavenly bodies occupy the highest place in comparison to the other bodies; yet, "He that descended is the same also that ascended above all the heavens" (Eph. 4:10). In relation to spiritual creatures, he first mentions that Christ is exalted over certain specific ones, and secondly, over all of them generally (1:21b).

To understand this, note that there are nine ranks of angels, of which the Apostle here (1:21a) mentions only the four middle ranks. Above these are the three superior ranks of the Thrones, Cherubim and Seraphim. Below them are the two lower ranks of the Archangels and the Angels. These nine ranks are also differentiated into three hierarchies, or sacred authorities [*principatus*], each of which embraces three ranks.

All the doctors agree in assigning the ranks of the First Hierarchy. The highest rank is the Seraphim, second are the Cherubim, third are the Thrones. In assigning the ranks among the Middle and Lower Hierarchies, however, Dionysius and Gregory disagree.<sup>33</sup> Dionysius, [starting from the highest] and going down, places the Dominions as first in the Middle Hierarchy, the Virtues second, and the Powers third. In the first rank of the Lower Hierarchy he puts the Principalities, second are the Archangels and third are the Angels. This listing of the ranks is in accord with the present text where the Apostle begins, in an ascending order, from the first rank of the Lower Hierarchy, the seventh [down from the Seraphim].

Gregory, on the other hand, arranges them differently. He places the Principalities between the Dominions and the Powers, which is the second rank of the Middle Hierarchy; while he puts the Virtues between the Powers and the Archangels, which is the first rank of the Lower Hierarchy. This arrangement

is supported by the Apostle's words in Colossians 1 (16): "For in him [Christ] were all things created in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers," where he enumerates those ranks in a descending order. Reserving Gregory's classification until we lecture on the letter to the Colossians,<sup>34</sup> for the present we will follow Dionysius' approach since it accords with the text at hand.

To understand this, it should be realized that the structure of reality can be considered in three ways:

First, according as it is present in the First Cause of everything, God.

Secondly, according as it is in the universal causes.

Thirdly, according to the arrangement of individual causes.<sup>35</sup>

Since everything that happens among creatures occurs with the assistance of the angels, the three angelic hierarchies are distinguished according to the threefold way of conceiving the structure of reality. To one it belongs to grasp the intelligible patterns of things in the very summit of reality, God; it pertains to another to grasp the intelligible patterns of reality in the universal causes; while still another [understands these patterns] in the individual causes. For the higher the angelic minds are, the more do they receive divine illumination with greater universality.<sup>36</sup> Therefore, the governance of reality in relation to God pertains to the First Hierarchy. On this account, the ranks of that hierarchy are named with reference to God. The Seraphim are so called because they are burning with love and through it are united to God. The Cherubim are, as it were, radiant inasmuch as they possess a supereminent knowledge of divine mysteries. The Thrones are so termed inasmuch as in them God carries out his judgments. Of these three ranks the Apostle makes no mention here.

To the Middle Hierarchy belongs the governance of things in relation to the universal causes. Hence the ranks of this hierarchy have names associated with power since the universal causes are present in the lower and individual things by their energy and power. Three tasks pertain to these powers which govern universally. First, some must give direction by their commands; secondly, others must dispose of any impediments to the fulfillment [of those commands]; thirdly, some must arrange how others will carry out the commands. Of these, the first belongs to the **Dominions** who, as Dionysius remarks, are free from any subordination; nor are they sent out on external [missions] but they give orders to those who are sent. The second pertains to the **Virtues** who facilitate the execution of the commands. The third belongs to the **Powers** who carry out the commands.

On the Lower Hierarchy devolves the guidance of things in relation to individual causes, and they are named from the [classes of objects] consigned to them. Hence, those called Angels carry out what pertains to the salvation of individual persons. The salvation and utility of greater personages is entrusted to the Archangels. **Principalities** is the name of those who preside over each of the provinces.



Christ is above all of these ranks that have been discussed. The Apostle only makes a special mention of four of them. The reason is that the names of these four ranks are given them for their dignity, and since he is dealing with the dignity of Christ, he names them especially to show that Christ surpasses all created dignity.

Consequently, when he says **and above every name that is named**, he teaches that Christ has been exalted above every spiritual creature in general. He had stated previously that Christ was exalted above all the spiritual creatures whose names were related to power. However, in Sacred Scripture, besides those ranks of angels, other ranks of celestial spirits are mentioned; for instance, the Seraphim (Is. 6), Cherubim (Ez. 10, 11 and 41), and Thrones (Psalms), which he did not speak of. Therefore, he shows that Christ, as man, is exalted above all of these ranks by adding **above every name that is named**. . . [He surpasses] not only those who exercise authority but everything capable of being named.

For it should be recognized that a name is given to understand the object [referred to]; it signifies the object's substance when what the name designates is the precise intelligibility of the object.<sup>37</sup> In asserting **every name that is named** he lets us know that the exaltation is above every substance which can be known and comprehended by a name. I say this to exclude the substance of Divinity which is incomprehensible; so a Gloss remarks that **above every name** means everything that can be named.<sup>38</sup> And lest it be thought that he is above the name of God, he inserts **which is named**. For the divine majesty can be neither embraced nor designated by a name.

**Not only in this world, but also in that which is to come** is added because there are many facts in this life that we grasp through knowledge and which we name, whereas those of the future life cannot be comprehended or named: "We know in part; and we prophesy in part" (1 Cor. 13:9). Nevertheless, the blessed in the future life do name these latter; they are those realities of which the Apostle says in 2 Corinthians 12 (4), that "he heard secret words which it is not granted to man to utter." Yet Christ is even exalted above these. "He hath given him a name which is above all names" (Phil. 2:9).

## LECTURE 8

**22 And he hath subjected all things under his feet and hath made him head over all the church, 23 which is his body and the fullness of him who is filled all in all.**

The Apostle has previously dealt with the exaltation of Christ both from the viewpoint of his passing over from death to life (1:20a), and from that of his exaltation to the highest glory (1:20b-21). Now he treats of the immense power of his exaltation. Concerning this he does two things:

First, he discusses the power of Christ with respect to the whole of creation.

Secondly, then his power in relation to the Church (22b-23).

He affirms that, with respect to the whole of creation, Christ has universal power since God the Father **hath subjected all things under his feet**. The phrase **under his feet** can be taken in two ways. In one it is a figurative and symbolic way of saying that every creature is totally subject to the power of Christ. What we trample under foot is certainly subjected to us. Regarding this power the last chapter of Matthew (28:18) states: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth." "For in that he hath subjected all things to him, he left nothing not subject to him" (Heb. 2:8).

In another acceptation it is a metaphorical way of speaking. By the feet the lowest part of the body is understood, and by the head the highest. Although the humanity and divinity should not be thought of as parts of Christ, nonetheless the divinity is preeminent in Christ and may be understood as his head - "The head of Christ is God" (1 Cor. 11:3). The humanity is lower and may be taken as the feet - "we will adore in the place where his feet stood" (Ps. 131:7). The meaning [of this passage] is then that the Father has not only subjected all of creation to Christ as he is God, to whom everything is subject from eternity, but also to his humanity.

Notice how something may be subjected to Christ in two ways, some are so voluntarily and others involuntarily. Origen overlooked this distinction so that this saying of the Apostle occasioned an error on his part. He claimed that everything subjected to Christ, who is true salvation, must share in salvation. He concluded that the demons and damned will be saved at some time since they are subjected under Christ's feet. But this is contrary to the Lord's pronouncement: "Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire, which was prepared for the devil and his angels"; and he concludes at the end of the chapter, "And these shall go into everlasting punishment" (Mt. 25:41, 46).

It must be held, therefore, that he subjects everything under his feet. Some do so willingly, as to their Savior. For example, the just who fulfill God's will in the present life, and are subjected to him that they may satisfy their desire and will, awaiting for what Proverbs 10 (24) says of the good: "To the just their desire shall be given." Others, however, are subjected to him unwillingly, as to their judge, that Christ may accomplish his own will in their regard. These are the wicked to whom those words in Luke 19 (27) are applicable: "But as for those my enemies, who would not have me reign over them, bring them higher and kill them before me."

Next (v. 22b), he deals with Christ's power with respect to the Church. In reference to this he makes three points:

First, he sets down the relation of Christ to the Church.

Secondly, the relation of the Church to Christ (1:23a).

Thirdly, he explains this relationship (1:23b).

Concerning the first, he says God the Father **hath made him head over all the church**, both of the Church militant, composed of men living in the present, and of the Church triumphant, made up of the men and angels in the fatherland. On account of certain general reasons, Christ is even the head of the angels - "who is the head of all principality and power" (Col. 2:10) - whereas Christ is spiritually the head of mankind for special reasons. For the head has a threefold relationship with the other members. First, it has a preeminent position; secondly, its powers are diffused [throughout the body] since all the senses in the members are derived from it; thirdly, it is of the same nature [as the other members].

Thus, Christ is head of the Angels in regard to preeminence and the diffusion [of his power]. Even in his humanity Christ surpasses the angels: "Being made so much better than the angels as he hath inherited a more excellent name than they" (Heb. 1:4). Moreover, even as man, Christ enlightens and influences them; Dionysius proves this from the words of Isaias 63 (1): "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bosra?," claiming that these words are those of the highest angels. The response which follows: "I, that speak justice and am a defender to save," he says are the words of Christ who immediately answers them. From this it should be understood that Christ not only illumines the lower but also the higher angels.

With respect to a conformity of nature, Christ is not the head of the angels, "for nowhere doth he take hold of the angels; but of the seed of Abraham he taketh hold" (Heb. 2:16). [By this relationship] he is head of men only. "Thou hast wounded my heart, my sister," through nature, "and my spouse," through grace (Cant. 4:9).

He speaks of the relation of the Church to Christ at **which is his body**, inasmuch as she is subject to him, receives his influence, and shares the same nature with Christ. "For as the body is one, and hath many members; and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body, so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. 12:12-13).

He explains **which is his body** by adding **the fullness of him**. To one asking why there are so many members in a natural body - hands, feet, mouth, and the like - it could be replied that they are to serve the soul's variety of activities. [The soul] itself is the cause and principle of these [members], and what they are, the soul is virtually. For the body is made for the soul, and not the other way around. From this

perspective, the natural body is a certain fullness of the soul; unless the members exist with an integral body, the soul cannot exercise fully its activities.

This is similar in the relation of Christ and the Church. Since the Church was instituted on account of Christ, the Church is called the fullness of Christ. Everything which is virtually in Christ is, as it were, filled out in some way in the members of the Church. For all spiritual understanding, gifts, and whatever can be present in the Church - all of which Christ possesses superabundantly - flow from him into the members of the Church, and they are perfected in them.<sup>39</sup> So he adds **who is filled all in all** since Christ makes this member of the Church wise with the perfect wisdom present in himself, and he makes another just with his perfect justice, and so on with the others.

# Chapter 2

## LECTURE 1

**1\* And he hath quickened you, when you were dead in your offences and sins, 2\* wherein in time past you walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of this air, of the spirit that now worketh on the children of despair; 3 in which also we all conversed in time past, in the desires of our flesh, fulfilling the will of the flesh and of our thoughts, and were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest.**

Above, the Apostle enumerated the blessings bestowed on the human race in general through Christ (1:3). Here the Apostle sets them in relief by comparing them to [mankind's] own former condition. Their past state can be considered in two ways: first as a state of sin, and secondly as a state of paganism. Therefore, the Apostle does two things:

First, he recounts the blessings shown them in regard to their first state.  
Secondly, he recalls those related to their second state (2:11).

The first part has two sections:

First, the Apostle describes their state of sin.  
Secondly, the blessing of the grace of justification (2:4).

Again, the first part has two divisions:

First, he calls to mind the state of sin with reference to the pagans.  
Secondly, then with reference to the Jews (2:3).

Once more the first has two parts:

First, he sets down the generality of the blessing.<sup>40</sup>  
Secondly, he adds its necessity (2:1).

God, he says, is wondrously active in the faithful, "according to the operation of the might of his power, which he wrought in Christ," (Eph. 1:19) in raising him from the dead. Hence, according to this activity, and after the example of this operation, he has restored us to the life of grace from the death of sin. "He will revive us after two days: on the third day he will raise us up and we shall live in his sight" (Os. 6:3).

"Therefore, if you be risen with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is sitting at the right hand of God" (Col. 3:1).

He demonstrates the need for such a blessing when he states **when you were dead in your offenses and sins** where he describes so well their sin. First of all, [he depicts] the multitude [of their sins] at **And you, when you were dead** with the worst type of death, spiritual death. "The death of the wicked is very evil" (Ps. 33:22). Sin is termed a death because by it man is separated from God who is life: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life" (Jn. 14:6). **Dead** I say, **in your offenses and sins** - behold the great number! For offenses are the omissions [of what they should have done]"Who can understand offenses?" (Ps. 18:13\*) - while sins are [the evil they] committed. **Wherein in time past you walked** is added to exaggerate the great number of sins. For if some are dead in offenses and sins at one time, they nonetheless cease at another time and leave off sinning; but these keep up their pace in going from bad to worse. Philippians 3 (18) contains a similar idea: "For many walk, of whom I have told you often (and now tell you weeping), that they are enemies of the cross of Christ." They "have walked after vanity and are become vain" (Jer. 2:5).

Secondly, he describes the twofold cause of their sin. One arises from this world insofar as they are attracted by the things of the world.<sup>41</sup> Concerning this he states **according to the course of this world**; you were allured by mundane matters into a worldly life. "If any man love the world, the charity of the Father is not in him." Hence the command: "Love not the world, nor the things which are in the world" (1 Jn. 2:15).

The other cause was the devils whom they served, of which Wisdom 14 (27) warns: "The worship of abominable idols is the cause, and the beginning and end, of all evil."<sup>42</sup> In reference to this he says **according to the prince of the power of this air**, and he portrays three aspects of this cause.

First, as regards their strength he says **the prince of the power**. He exerts a power, not by the fact that he has it naturally, since he is neither the Lord nor creator by nature, but to the degree that he dominates over men who subject themselves to him by sinning. "Now shall the prince of this world be cast out" (Jn. 12:31); "for the prince of this world cometh; and in me he hath not anything" (Jn. 14:30).

Secondly, concerning their dwelling place he says **of this air**, that is, he has power in this darksome atmosphere. Here it should be noted that two opinions exist among the doctors. For some held that the demons who had fallen [from grace] were not from the higher ranks, but from the lower ones in charge of the lower bodies.<sup>43</sup> It is evident that the whole of material creation is governed by God through the ministry of angels. Thus John Damascene<sup>44</sup> was of the opinion that the first of those who had fallen had been in charge of the terrestrial order. He may have derived this from Plato's talk about certain celestial or

world substances. In this perspective **of this air** is interpreted that they were created to preside over this atmosphere.

Others<sup>45</sup> preferred, and with better reason, that those [angels who sinned] were from the highest ranks. **Of this air** then designates that this atmosphere is the place of their punishment. Jude refers to this in his canonical [letter]: "And the angels who kept not their principality but forsook their own habitation, he hath reserved under darkness in everlasting chains, unto the judgment of the great day" (Jude 6). The reason why they were not immediately thrust into hell after their fall, but released in the atmosphere, was because God did not want the creation of those who had sinned to be totally frustrated. Hence, he sent them to try men, by which the good would be prepared for glory and the wicked for eternal death. The time of our warfare and of merit will last until the day of judgment, till then they will remain in the atmosphere; after the day of judgment, however, they will be thrust back into hell.

Observe also how one reading has "of the spirit" which, as a genitive singular, stands for the plural "of the spirits." Another reading gives "Spirit" in the accusative case; as if to say: "according to the prince spirit," that is, the prince who is a spirit.<sup>46</sup>

Thirdly, [he describes] their activity when he states **that now worketh on the children of despair**. They are the children of despair who reject the fruit of Christ's passion. Or, those who have no faith in eternal realities nor hope in salvation through Christ. In these the prince of the power of this air freely **worketh**, leading them wherever he wishes. Later it is said of them: "Who, despairing, have given themselves up to lasciviousness unto the working of all uncleanness, unto covetousness" (Eph. 4:19). Perhaps, **of despair** means those of whom we should despair because they sin out of malice; the prince of this world doing whatever he pleases in them. For no one should despair of those who sin from ignorance or weakness, nor does that prince do whatever he wants with them.

On the contrary, however, one should never despair of anyone else as long as he lives. I reply. Our hope in someone can be twofold. On the one hand, it can be in the man, and on the other, in divine grace. Thus someone may be despaired of as far as he himself is concerned, but never must confidence in God be lost. For instance, people rightly despaired of Lazarus' power to bring himself back to life once he had been placed in the tomb, but no trust should have been lost in the God who raised him up. Therefore, those who out of malice are sunk in their many sins can be despaired of from the point of view of their own strength: "I stick fast in the mire of the deep: and there is no sure standing" (Ps. 68:3). But no one should despair if it is a question of the divine power. Concerning these children of despair it mentions further on: "Let no man deceive you with vain words. For because of these things cometh the anger of God upon the children of despair" (Eph. 5:6\*).

Next (v. 3), the Apostle recalls the sinful state of the Jews, thereby demonstrating how everyone had sinned, according to that saying of Romans 3 (9): "For we have charged both Jews and Greeks, that they are all under sin." Nevertheless, a difference should be noted. The Apostle had designated two causes when dealing with the sin of the Gentiles, one on the side of the world and the other on that of the demons whom they worshipped. The Jews were like the Gentiles in their sinful condition in regard to the first cause, but not the second; hence, the Apostle only mentions their sin as arising from worldly causes. In reference to this he makes three points:

First, he recounts their guilt regarding sins of the heart.

Secondly, the sins of action.

Thirdly, original sin.

A sin of the heart is implied in carnal desires. About this he asserts: **in which** sins and offenses **also we all** who are Jews **conversed in time past**, leading our life **in the** carnal **desires of our flesh**. "For we ourselves also were some time unwise, incredulous, erring, slaves to diverse desires and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another" (Tit. 3:3). "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ; and make not provision for the flesh in its concupiscences" (Rom. 13:14).

Sin in action is nothing else than a manifestation of inner concupiscence.<sup>47</sup> A certain concupiscence of the flesh exists, it consists of the natural concupiscences; for example, for food through which the individual maintains his own life, and for sexual relations by which the species is preserved. Regarding these he says **fulfilling the will of the flesh**, doing what the flesh delights in. "And they who are in the flesh cannot please God" (Rom. 8:8). Another concupiscence exists, that of thought. These desires do not spring from the flesh but from the appetitive faculty of the soul, such as the ambition for honors, for one's own excellence and the like. Of these he states **and of our thoughts**, that is, inordinate desires are followed once they are caused by the prompting of our reflections.

Original sin is hinted at in **and we were by nature children of wrath**. This sin of the first parent was not only passed on to the Gentiles but to the Jews also: "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death; and so death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned" (Rom. 5:12). Baptism cleanses only the individual person who receives it from original sin; his children must also be baptized. Likewise, circumcision cleansed only the individual from original sin; the children they begot still had to be circumcised. Thus he says **we were by nature**, that is, from the earliest beginning of nature - not of nature as nature since this is good and from God, but of nature as vitiated - **children of** an avenging **wrath**, aimed at punishment and hell, **even as the rest**, that is, the Gentiles.



## LECTURE 2

**4 But God who is rich in mercy, for his exceeding charity wherewith he loved us, 5 even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together in Christ by whose grace you are saved, 6\* and hath raised us up together and hath made us sit together in the heavenly places, in Christ Jesus; 7\* that he might shew in the ages to come the abundant riches of his grace, in his own goodness towards us in Christ Jesus.**

After exaggerating their state of festering sin (2:1), the Apostle recounts here the blessing of the grace of justification. Concerning which he does two things:

First, he sets down the blessing itself.

Secondly, he explains it (2:8).

The blessing is described with reference to its three causes:

First, the efficient cause.

Secondly, the formal or exemplary cause (2:5).

Thirdly, the final cause (2:7).

The efficient cause of the divine blessing of justification is God's charity: **But God, who is rich in mercy, for his exceeding charity wherewith he loved us.** He states **for his exceeding charity** since we can think of a fourfold goodness and efficacy of the divine love. First, it brought us into existence: "For thou lovest all things that are, and hatest none of the things which thou hast made" (Wis. 11:25). Second, he made us according to his own image, capable of enjoying his own beatitude: "And with him [God, were] thousands of saints. In his right hand a fiery law. He hath loved the people; all the saints are in his hand" (Deut. 33:2-3). Third, he renewed men corrupted by sin: "Yea, I have loved them with an everlasting love; therefore have I drawn thee, taking pity on thee" (Jer. 31:3). Fourth, for our salvation he gave over his own Son: "For God so loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son" (Jn. 3:16). Hence Gregory exclaims: "O the incalculable love of your charity! To redeem slaves you delivered up your Son."<sup>48</sup>

He then asserts who is rich in mercy. When a man's love is caused from the goodness of the one he loves, then that man who loves does so out of justice, inasmuch as it is just that he love such a person. When, however, love causes the goodness in the beloved, then it is a love springing from mercy. The love with which God loves us produces goodness in us; hence mercy is presented here as the root of the divine love: "I will remember the tender mercies of the Lord, the praise of the Lord for all the things that the Lord hath

bestowed upon us . . . which he hath given them according to his kindness and according to the multitude of his mercies" (Is. 63:7). And "where are thy yearning pity and thy mercies toward me?" (Is. 63:15\*).

God is said to be **rich in mercy** because he possesses an infinite and unfailing mercy, which man does not. For man has a mercy that is bounded or limited in three ways. Firstly, in bestowing temporal benefits, man's mercy is restricted by the amount of his own possessions. "According to thy ability be merciful" (Tob. 4:8); whereas God is "rich unto all that call upon him" (Rom. 10:12). Secondly, the mercy of man is limited since he can only pardon offenses against himself. Even with these there ought to be a certain qualification; he should not forgive so indiscriminately that whoever is pardoned becomes more bold, prone and ready to offend again. "For, because sentence is not speedily pronounced against the evil, the children of men commit evils without any fear" (Eccl. 8:11). But nothing can harm God and hence he can forgive every offense: "If thou sin, what shalt thou hurt him?" And a little further on, "And if thou do justly, what shalt thou give him?" (Job 35:6 & 7). Thirdly, a man shows mercy in remitting punishment; yet here too a qualification must be observed: he must not contravene the justice of a higher law. God, on the other hand, can remit all punishment since he is not bound by any higher law: "What other hath he appointed over the earth? Or whom hath he set over the world which he made?" (Job 34:13). Thus the mercy of God is infinite because it is not limited by a scarcity of wealth, nor is it restricted through a fear of injury, nor by any higher law.

The exemplary cause of the blessing is that it is granted in Christ. In reference to this he states **even when we were dead in sins, he hath quickened us together in Christ**. He touches upon a triple blessing: justification, resurrection from the dead, and ascension into heaven - through these three we are assimilated to Christ.

He states, that the whole text might be read, concerning the first: **God, who is rich in mercy, for his exceeding charity wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together in Christ**, he has made us live together with Christ. "He will revive us after two days: on the third day he will raise us up and we shall live in his sight" (Os. 6:3). He has quickened us, I say, through a life of justice: "Who hath set my soul to live" (Ps. 65:9). This occurs **in Christ**, that is, through the grace of Christ by whose grace you are saved. "For we are saved by hope" (Rom. 8:24). Regarding the second, he says **and hath raised us up together** with Christ - for the soul [this has happened] in reality, in hope the body [awaits it]. "He that raised up Jesus Christ from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies because of his Spirit that dwelleth in you" (Rom. 8:11). In respect to the third he asserts **and hath made us sit together in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus**, now through hope, and in the future in reality. For, as John 12 (26) puts it: "Where I am, there also shall my minister be. If any man minister to me, him will my Father honor." Also the Apocalypse 3 (21): "To him that shall overcome, I will give to sit with me in my throne; as I also have overcome and am sat down with my Father in his throne."

In these the Apostle uses the past tense in place of the future, proclaiming as already accomplished what has yet to be done on account of the certitude of hope. Thus God has **quickened us** in soul, he **hath raised us up** in body, and **hath made us sit** with Christ in both [body and soul].<sup>49</sup>

Consequently, when he says **that he might shew in the ages to come**, he discloses the final cause of the blessing which has been given. It can be read in two ways, depending on whether **ages to come** pertains to the present or future life. If it applies to this life, then **age** is a certain measure of time and a period of one generation. As though he affirmed: I am saying that we who are the first-fruits of those who sleep (cf. 1 Thess. 4:12ff.), **he hath quickened in Christ that he might shew in the ages to come**, to those who will exist after us, **the abundant riches of his grace**. And this is not on account of our merits, but **in** his own **goodness towards us in Christ Jesus**, that is, through Christ Jesus. "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am the chief. But for this cause have I obtained mercy; that in me first Christ Jesus might shew forth all patience, for the information of them that shall believe in him unto life everlasting" (1 Tim. 1:15-16). Therefore, God has communicated copious gifts of grace to the early saints that later generations would more easily be converted to Christ.

Or, **age** can be taken in reference to the next life, of which Ecclesiasticus 24 (14\*) states: "And into the age to come I shall not cease to be." Although there will then be only one age, since it will be eternity, he nevertheless says **in the ages to come** on account of the numerous saints who will participate in eternity; there are said to be as many **ages** as there are shared-in eternities. Psalm 144 (13) speaks of these ages: "Thy kingdom is a kingdom of all ages." In this sense he affirms: I say that he has vivified us in hope, namely, through Christ or in grace **that he might shew in the ages to come**, that is, that he might bring to perfection in the next life, **the abundant riches of his grace**. Such an abundant grace with which, even in this world, he forgives many sins and confers the greatest of gifts, will superabound even more in the next life, since there it will be enjoyed unfailingly. "I am come that they might have a life," namely, of grace in this world, "and have it more abundantly" in the fatherland of glory (Jn. 10:10\*).

This occurs **in his own goodness**. "How good is God to Israel, to them that are of right heart!" (Ps. 72:1). "The Lord is good to them that hope in him, to the soul that seeketh him" (Lam. 3:25). This is **towards us**; it is beyond our desire, our understanding, and beyond our capacity: "The eye hath not seen, O God, besides thee, what things thou hast prepared for them that wait for thee" (Is. 64:4). And this is **in Christ Jesus**, that is, through Christ Jesus; for as grace is bestowed on us through Christ, so also is glory communicated, which is grace brought to perfection. "The Lord will give grace and glory" (Ps. 83:12). Through the same person we are beatified, through whom we are justified.

He says **that he might shew** because the treasure of grace is hidden within us; we have it "in earthen vessels" as 2 Corinthians 4 (7) expresses it. "Behold what manner of charity the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called and should be the sons of God"; and a little further on, "We are now the

sons of God; and it hath not yet appeared what we shall be" (1 Jn. 3:1-2). But that hidden treasure, although it has not yet been revealed, is shown in the ages to come, since in the fatherland everything relating to the transparent glory of the saints will be unveiled before us. "The sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come that shall be revealed in us" (Rom. 8:18).

### LECTURE 3

**8 For by grace you are saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, for it is the gift of God. 9 Not of works, that no man may glory. 10 For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus in good works, which God hath prepared that we should walk in them.**

When the Apostle was recounting above the blessing of God by which we have been freed from sin, he inserted [the thought] that we had been saved by Christ's grace (2:5). Now he intends to prove that; he makes two points concerning it:

First, he sets down his intention.

Secondly, he clarifies the point in question (2:8b).

I rightly declared, he says of the first, by whose grace you were saved; and indeed, I still confidently say **For**, in place of "because," **by grace you are saved**. "By the grace of God, I am what I am" (1 Cor. 15:10); "being justified freely by his grace" (Rom. 3:24). For to be saved is the same as to be justified. Salvation implies a freedom from dangers; hence, man's perfect salvation will be in eternal life when he will be immune from all dangers, as a ship is said to be safe when it has arrived at port. "Salvation shall possess thy walls, and praise thy gates" (Is. 60:18).

Men receive the hope of this salvation when they are justified from sin in the present, and are thus referred to as saved according to the expression of Romans 8 (24): "For we are saved by hope." But this salvation of grace is by faith in Christ. In the justification of an adult who has sinned, the movement of faith towards God coincides with the infusion of grace. "Thy faith hath made thee whole. Go thy way in peace" (Lk. 8:48). "Being justified, therefore, by faith, let us have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:1).

When he next says **and that not of yourselves**, he clarifies what he had spoken of:

First, regarding faith, which is the foundation of the whole spiritual edifice.

Secondly, regarding grace (2:10).

He eliminates two errors concerning the first point. The first of these is that, since he had said we are saved by faith, any one can hold the opinion that faith itself originates within ourselves and that to believe is determined by our own wishes. Therefore to abolish this he states **and that not of yourselves**. Free will is inadequate for the act of faith since the contents of faith are above human reason. "Many things are shewn to thee above the understanding of men" (Ecclus. 3:25). "The things also that are of God, no man knoweth, but the Spirit of God" (1 Cor. 2:11). That a man should believe, therefore, cannot occur from himself unless God gives it, according to that text of Wisdom 9 (17): "And who shall know thy thought, except thou give wisdom, and send thy Holy Spirit from above."<sup>50</sup> For this reason he adds **for it is the gift of God**, namely, faith itself. "For unto you it is given for Christ, not only to believe in him, but also to suffer for him" (Phil. 1:29). "To another, faith is given in the same Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:9).

The second error he rejects is that anyone can believe that faith is given by God to us on the merit of our preceding actions. To exclude this he adds **Not of preceding works** that we merited at one time to be saved; for this is the grace, as was mentioned above, and according to Romans 11 (6): "If by grace, it is not now by works; otherwise grace is no more grace." He follows with the reason why God saves man by faith without any preceding merits, **that no man may glory** in himself but refer all the glory to God. "Not to us, O Lord, not to us; but to thy name give glory. For thy mercy and thy truth's sake" (Ps. 113:1-2 or 9-10). "That no flesh should glory in his sight. But of him are you in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and justice, and sanctification, and redemption" (1 Cor. 1:29-30).

Next (2:10), he clarifies what he had said regarding grace. Concerning this he does two things:

First, he clarifies the infusion of grace

Secondly, he declares the predestination of grace (2:10b)

There are two essential characteristics of grace, they have already been spoken of. The first of these is that what exists through grace is not present in man through himself or by himself, but from the gift of God. In reference to this he states **For we are his workmanship**, whatever good we possess is not from ourselves but from the action of God. "Know ye that the Lord he is God: he made us, and not we ourselves" (Ps. 99:3). "Is not he thy Father, that hath possessed thee, and made thee, and created thee?" (Deut. 32:6). This is immediately linked with what went before: **that no man may glory for we are his workmanship**. Or, it can be joined with what was said above: **For by grace you are saved**.

The second essential characteristic of grace is that it is not from previous works; this is expressed when he adds **created**. To create anything is to produce it from nothing; hence, when anyone is justified without preceding merits, he can be said to have been created as though made from nothing. This creative action of justification occurs through the power of Christ communicating the Holy Spirit. On this account he

adds **in Christ Jesus**, that is, through Christ Jesus. "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but a new creature" (Gal. 6:15). "Thou shalt send forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created" (Ps. 103:30). Moreover, not only are the habits of virtue<sup>51</sup> and grace given to us, but we are inwardly renewed through the Spirit in order to act uprightly. Whence he goes on **in good works** since the good works themselves are [made possible] to us by God. "For thou hast wrought all our works for us" (Is. 26:12).

Since "whom he predestinated, them he also called" through grace, as Romans 8 (30) expresses it, therefore he adds something concerning predestination, saying, **which** good works **God hath prepared**. For predestination is nothing else than the pre-arrangement of God's blessings, among which blessings our good works themselves are numbered. God is said to prepare something for us insofar as he disposes himself to give it to us. "Thou hast prepared their food, for so is its preparation" (Ps. 64:10).

Lest anyone imagine that good works are prepared for us by God in such a way that we do not cooperate in their realization through our free will, he annexes **that we should walk in them**. As though he said: Thus has he prepared them for us, that we might perform them for ourselves through our free will. "For we are God's coadjutors" (1 Cor. 3:9). For this reason the Apostle said of himself: "But, by the grace of God, I am what I am. And his grace in me hath not been void; but I have labored more abundantly than all they. Yet not I, but the grace of God with me" (1 Cor. 15:10). He expressly said **we should walk** to designate a progress in good works, in line with that saying: "Walk whilst you have the light, that the darkness overtake you not" (Jn. 12:35); "Walk then as children of the light" (Eph. 5:8).

#### LECTURE 4

**11 For which cause be mindful that you, being heretofore Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called circumcision in the flesh, made by hands; 12\* that you were at that time without Christ, being aliens from Israel's way of life and strangers to the testaments, having no hope of the promise and without God in this world. 13 But now in Christ Jesus, you, who some time were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ.**

Once he has outlined God's blessing to the Gentiles in freeing them from sin (2:1), the Apostle recalls the favor shown them in their liberation from the state of paganism. Concerning this he does two things:

First, he recounts the condition of their former state.

Secondly, he describes the blessings granted them in their present state (2:13).

He does two things about the first:

First, he prefaces the recollections of their past state with an exhortation.

Secondly, he discusses the condition of the past state itself (2:11b).

Thus he says **For which cause**, that you might advert to the fact that everything comes to us by God's grace, **be mindful**: "Remember, and forget not how thou provokedst the Lord thy God to wrath in the wilderness" (Deut. 9:7). "That thou mayst remember the day of thy coming out of Egypt, all the days of thy life" (Deut. 16:3).

When he states **that you, being heretofore Gentiles** he recounts, in the second place, the condition of their past state:

First, as regards the evils they endured.

Secondly, as regards the goods of which they were deprived (2:12).

In reference to the first he exposes three evils. First was the crime of paganism, by which they were accustomed to worship idols; this he implies in **that you being heretofore Gentiles**. "You know that, when you were heathens, you went to dumb idols according as you were led" (1 Cor. 12:2). Some books have "You who were Gentiles" and omit everything until "But now in Christ Jesus. . ." (v. 13). Secondly, he discusses their carnal way of life, saying **in the flesh**, that is, living lustfully. "And they who are in the flesh cannot please God" (Rom. 8:8). Thirdly, he speaks of the repugnance and contempt with which the Jews despised them. Hence he mentions **who are called uncircumcision by that type of circumcision which is called circumcision in the flesh** as the circumcised Jews performed this circumcision. He says **made by hands** to distinguish it from the spiritual circumcision spoken of in Colossians 2 (11, 13): "In whom [Christ] also you are circumcised with circumcision not made by hand in despoiling of the body of the flesh; but in the circumcision of Christ, buried with him in baptism. . . And you, when you were dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, he hath quickened together with him, forgiving you all offenses."

Next (v. 12), he recounts the good things of which they were deprived:

First, from a share in the sacraments.<sup>52</sup>

Secondly, from a knowledge of God, at **and without God in this world** (v. 12).

Regarding the first he sets down three sacraments they were deprived of sharing in. They were, first of all, without the fundamental truth of Christ; whence he affirms **that you were at that time without Christ**, without the promise of a Christ as was made to the Jews. "I will raise up to David a just branch; and a

king shall reign, and shall be wise" (Jer. 23:5). "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Sion, shout for joy, O daughter of Jerusalem: Behold thy King will come to thee the just and savior" (Zach. 9:9).

They were deprived, in the second place, from the society of the saints as long as they remained in paganism. He says they were **aliens from Israel's way of life**, since the Jews were not permitted to mix with the Gentiles. "Thou shalt make no league with them, nor shew mercy to them. Neither shalt thou make marriages with them" (Deut. 7:2-3) "Jews do not communicate with Samaritans" (Jn. 4:9). With respect to those who - not without contempt - were accepted into Judaism when they became proselytes he adds **and strangers to the testaments**. As though he asserted: These converts, when they went over to Judaism and became proselytes, were accepted to partake of God's covenants as strangers rather than as citizens. He says **testaments** in the plural<sup>53</sup> since the Old Testament was offered the Jews and the New was promised. "The Lord. . . confirmed his covenant upon the head of Jacob" (Ecclus. 44:25) can be understood of the Old Testament. God promised to give them another covenant: "And I will make with them another covenant that shall be everlasting" (Bar. 2:35). This latter was granted to those "to whom belongeth the adoption as of children, and the glory, and the testament" (Rom. 9:4).

He also sets down another blessing of which they were deprived: the hope of future goods, when he says **having no hope of the promise** since "To Abraham were the promises made and to his seed" (Gal. 3:16).

Finally, he writes of the greatest injury from which they suffered, ignorance of God. **And without God in this world** means without the knowledge of God. "In Judea God is known" (Ps. 75:2), but not among the Gentiles: "Not in the passion of lust, like the Gentiles that know not God" (1 Thess. 4:5). This must be understood of the knowledge obtainable through faith, for Romans 1 (21) speaks of their natural knowledge: "When they knew God, they have not glorified him as God or given thanks."

After this he recalls the blessings offered them through Christ in their [present] condition after conversion. Concerning this he does two things:

First, he shows how they were made partakers of the goods previously denied them.

Secondly, he shows that their participation in those goods is not that of strangers but of citizens (2:19).

The first part again has two sections:

First, he depicts these blessings in a general way.

Secondly, he specifies them (2:14).



With respect to the first: I have mentioned that in former times you were without Christ, alienated from Israel's way of life. **But now**, after you have been converted to Christ, you are **in Christ Jesus**, intimately united to him through faith and love. "He that abideth in charity abideth in God, and God in him" (1 Jn. 4:16). "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but a new creature" (Gal. 6:15).

**You**, I say, **who some time were afar off**, severed from God, not by space but by what you deserved since "salvation is far from sinners" (Ps. 118:155), as well as association with the saints and a share in the covenants, as has already been said. Now you **are made nigh** to God and to his saints and covenants. "Thy sons shall come from afar and thy daughters shall rise up at thy side" (Is. 60:4). "For some of them," namely, the Gentiles, "come from afar off" (Mk. 8:3), from the land of distortion<sup>54</sup> and the state of paganism. Yet now **you are made nigh by the blood of Christ**, that is, through his blood by which Christ draws you: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to myself" (Jn. 12:32). This was on account of his vehement love which most forcefully revealed itself in the death of the cross. "Yea, I have loved thee with an everlasting love: therefore have I drawn thee, taking pity on thee" (Jer. 31:3).

## LECTURE 5

**14\* For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and breaking down the middle barrier of partition, the enmities in his flesh, 15\* making void the law of commandments by the decrees, that he might make the two in himself into one new man, making peace, 16 and might reconcile both to God in one body by the cross, killing the enmities in himself. 17 And, coming, he preached peace to you that were afar off; and peace to them that were nigh. 18 For by him we have access both in one Spirit to the Father.**

Having recounted the blessings imparted to the Ephesians through Christ in a general way (2:13), he now recounts them in greater detail. Concerning this he makes two points:

First, he shows how they have converged with the Jewish people.  
Secondly, how they are drawn closer to God (2:16).

The first has three divisions:

First, he reveals the cause of this convergence.  
Secondly, its manner (2:14b).  
Thirdly, its purpose (2:15b).

Christ is the cause of this drawing together, for which reason he affirms **For he is our peace, who hath made both one**. This is an emphatic way of speaking to better express the reality, as though he said: Rightly do I say that you are drawn near each other, but this occurs through Christ since **he is** the cause of **our peace**. "My peace I give unto you" (Jn. 14:27). It is usual to adopt this way of speaking when the totality of the effect depends on its cause; for instance, we say that God himself is our salvation because whatever salvation is present in us is caused by God. In the same way, whatever peace we possess is caused by Christ and, as a result, whatever convergence [men have with one another]. For when a man is at peace with another he can securely walk towards or approach him. Hence, **he is our peace**. Angels announced peace at his birth: "Glory to God in the highest; and on earth peace to men of good will" (Lk. 2:14). Indeed, while Christ lived in the body the world enjoyed the greatest peace, the like of which it had never before possessed. "In his days shall justice spring up, and abundance of peace" (Ps. 71:7). He himself proclaimed peace when he arose from the dead: "He saith to them: Peace be to you" (Lk. 24:36).

It follows that he **hath made both one**, joining into unity both the Jews who worshipped the true God and the Gentiles who were alienated from God's cult. "And other sheep I have, that are not of this fold; them also I must bring. And they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd" (Jn. 10:16). "One king shall be king over them all. And they shall no more be two nations, neither shall they be divided any more into two kingdoms" (Ez. 37:22).

The manner of convergence is revealed when he states **and breaking down the middle barrier<sup>55</sup> of partition**. The method, then, consists in removing what is divisive. To understand the text we should imagine a large field with many men gathered on it. But a high barrier was thrown across the middle of it, segregating the people so that they did not appear as one people but two. Whoever would remove the barrier would unite the crowds of men into one multitude, one people would be formed.

What is said here should be understood in this way. For the world is likened to a field, "and the field is the world" (Mt. 13:38); this field of the world is crowded with men, "Increase and multiply, and fill the earth" (Gen. 1:28). A barrier, however, runs down the field, some are on one side and the rest on the other. The Old Law can be termed such a barrier, its carnal observances kept the Jews confined: "Before the faith came, we were kept under the law shut up, unto that faith which was to be revealed" (Gal. 3:23). Christ was symbolized through the Old Law: "Behold, he standeth behind our wall" (Cant. 2:9). Christ, however, has put an end to this barrier and, since no division remained, the Jews and the Gentiles became one people. This is what he says: I affirm that he **hath made both one** by the method of **breaking down the middle barrier**.

I say a barrier **of partition** and not a wall. A barrier of partition is one in which the stones are not mortared together with cement; it is not built to last permanently but only for a specified time. The Old

Law was a barrier of partition for two reasons. First, because it was not mortared together with charity which is, as it were, the cement uniting individuals among themselves and everyone together with Christ. "Be careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:3). The Old Law is a law of fear, persuading men to observe its commands by punishments and threats. While that law was in force, those who kept it out of love belonged by anticipation, as Augustine holds, to the New Testament which is the law of love.<sup>56</sup> "For you have not received the spirit of bondage again in fear but you have received the spirit of adoption of sons" (Rom. 8:15). Secondly, the Old Law is a barrier of partition because it was not meant to last permanently but only for a definite time. "As long as the heir is a child, he differeth nothing from a servant, though he be Lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed by the father. So we also, when we were children, were serving under the elements of the world" (Gal. 4:1-3).

A problem arises here since he says **breaking down the barrier of partition** and, on the contrary, Matthew 5 (17) states: "Do not think that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." I reply. The Old Law contained both moral and ceremonial precepts. The moral commandments were not destroyed by Christ but fulfilled in the counsels he added and in his explanations of what the Scribes and Pharisees had wrongly interpreted. So he says in Matthew 5 (20): "Unless your justice abound more than that of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." And further on: "You have heard that it hath been said: Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy. But I say to you: Love your enemies; do good to them that hate you; and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you" (Mt. 5:43-44). He abolished the ceremonial precepts with regard to what they were in themselves, but he fulfilled them with regard to what they prefigured, adding what was symbolized to the symbol.<sup>57</sup>

It should be understood, therefore, that in saying **breaking** he refers to the observance of the carnal law. To break down this barrier of partition is to destroy the hostility between the Jews and Gentiles. The former wanted to observe the law and the latter had little inclination to do so,<sup>58</sup> from which anger and jealousy sprung up between them. But certainly, Christ has abolished this animosity **in his** assumed **flesh**. For at his birth peace was immediately proclaimed to men (cf. Lk. 2:14). Or, **in his** immolated **flesh** since "He hath delivered himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice to God" (Eph. 5:2). In this sacrifice all the former sacrifices were fulfilled and came to an end. "For by one oblation he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. 10:14).

What that barrier was he implies when he says **the law of commandments**, as though he said: **Breaking down the barrier** which is **the law of the commandments**. The Old Law is termed the law of commandments, not because other laws lacked injunctions since the New Law has commandments: "A new commandment I give unto you" (Jn. 13:34). There are two reasons why [this title is applied to the Old

Law]. One is the great number of legal injunctions it contained, so many that men could not possibly keep them all, according to that text of Acts 15 (10): "Now, therefore, why tempt you God to put a yoke upon the necks of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear?" And Job 11 (6): "That he might shew thee . . . that his law is manifold." Or, it is called **of commandments** meaning "of works." "Where is then thy boasting? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? No, but by the law of faith" (Rom. 3:27). Thus the baptism of John was called a baptism of water since it would cleanse only externally and not sanctify interiorly. Likewise, the Old Law was termed of works because it ordained only what must be done, but did not confer the grace through which men would have been assisted in fulfilling the law. The New Law, on the other hand, regulates what must be done by giving commands, and it aids in fulfilling them by bestowing grace.

I affirm [that Christ **in his flesh** was] **making void the law of commandments** as the imperfect is made void by the perfect and the shadow by the truth. "When that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away" (1 Cor. 13:10), that is, the imperfection and shadow of the Old Law of which Hebrews 10 (1) asserts: "The law, having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things. . ." This happened **by the decrees**, referring to the precepts of the New Testament through which the law was annulled.<sup>59</sup> "You shall eat the oldest of the old store; and, the new coming on," that is, the precepts of the Natural Law together with the New Law; and having received these precepts "you shall cast away the old" (Lev. 26:10), meaning the ceremonial precepts of the Old Law as they were in themselves, as was mentioned above.

He reveals the purpose of the convergence when he states **that he might make the two in himself into one new man**. The end is that the aforementioned two peoples would be formed into one people. Whatever unites must come together in some unity, and since the law divided they could not be united in that law. But Christ took the place of the law, and faith in him, as the truth of those symbols, made them one in himself. "That they may be one, as we also are one" (Jn. 17:22); "For, where there are two or three gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Mt. 18:20).

This is **into one new man, making peace**. That is, into Christ himself who is called a new man on account of the new manner of his conception: "For the Lord hath created a new thing upon the earth: a woman shall compass a man" (Jer. 31:22). Another factor is the novelty of the grace he bestows: "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but a new creature" (Gal. 6:15); "and be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man who, according to God, is created" (Eph. 4:23). [Christ is also a new man] on account of the new commands he sets forth: "A new commandment I give unto you: that you love one another as I have loved you" (Jn. 13:34).

This appears to correspond to the Apostle's intention, yet in a Gloss the barrier is duplicated. On the side of the Jews the law is set up as the obstacle, while on the Gentile's side it is idolatry.<sup>60</sup>

When he states **and might reconcile both to God in one body**, he discloses how both draw near to God. Concerning this he does two things:

First, he treats of their reconciliation to God.

Secondly, he writes of the manifestation of this reconciliation (2:17).

It should be realized that love of neighbor is the way to peace with God; for, as is mentioned in 1 John 4 (20): "He that loveth not his brother whom he seeth, how can he love God whom he seeth not?" Let no one pretend he has peace with Christ, Augustine asserts, if he quarrels with another Christian.<sup>61</sup> Hence, he first mentions the peace among themselves Christ brought to men and then the peace of men with God. For this reason he says that **he might reconcile both** the united peoples **in one body** of the Church, namely, in Christ. "We, being many, are one body in Christ" (Rom. 12:5). Then he reconciles us **to God** through faith and charity: "For God indeed was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself" (2 Cor. 5:19).

He achieved this **by the cross, killing the enmities in himself**. In fulfilling the Old Testament symbols, he killed the hostility that had arisen through the law between the Jews and the Gentiles. But the hostility that existed between God and men through sin, he killed in himself when he blotted out sin through the death of the Cross. He "who gave himself for our sins" (Gal. 1:4); "Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many" (Heb. 9:28). Therefore, he says **killing the enmities**, that is, sins, **in himself**, meaning in the immolation of his own body. "Making peace through the blood of his cross, both as to the things that are on earth and the things that are in heaven" (Col. 1:20). "When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son" (Rom. 5:10). "In him [Christ] it hath well pleased the Father that all fullness should dwell; and through him, to reconcile all things unto himself" (Col. 1:19). Since Christ satisfied sufficiently for our sins, reconciliation occurred as a consequence of his having paid the price (cf. 1 Cor. 6:20).

The manifestation of the reconciliation is set down in **And coming, he preached** where he touches on:

First, the proclamation of peace or reconciliation.

Secondly, the cause and reason of this peace (2:18).

The reconciliation of God to man through Christ has been made known because Christ himself not only reconciled us to God and destroyed the hostilities, but also **coming** in the flesh **he preached** and proclaimed **peace**. Or, **coming** after the resurrection when he stood in the midst of the disciples and said: "Peace be to you" (Lk. 24:36). "He hath sent me to preach to the meek, to heal the contrite of heart" (Is. 61:1). "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings and that preacheth peace, of him that sheweth forth good, that preacheth salvation" (Is. 52:7).

**He preached**, I say, not to one people only but **to you** Gentiles **that were afar off**; although not in his own person, nonetheless he proclaimed peace to you through his Apostles. "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations" (Mt. 28:19). "Hear, you that are far off, what I have done: and you that are near, know my strength" (Is. 33:13). Christ in his own person announced the **peace to them that were nigh**. "For I say that Christ Jesus was minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers" (Rom. 15:8). "Behold, an inhabitant shall come, who was not with me: he that was a stranger to thee before shall be joined to thee" (Is. 54:15).

He indicates the cause and form of peace by saying **For by him we have access both**, that is, the two peoples, **in one Spirit**, meaning we are joined by the union of the Holy Spirit. "Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:3). "All these things, one and the same Spirit worketh" (1 Cor. 12:11). The way we enjoy access to the Father is through Christ since Christ works through the Holy Spirit. "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Rom. 8:9). Hence, whatever happens through the Holy Spirit also occurs through Christ.

When he says **to the Father**, [our access] also must be understood as pertaining to the whole Trinity. For, by reason of the unity of the Divine Essence, the Son and the Holy Spirit are in the Father, and the Father and the Son are in the Holy Spirit. In saying **to the Father** he especially shows that whatever the Son possesses he has from the Father, and that he recognizes he has it from the Father.

## LECTURE 6

**19 Now therefore you are no more strangers and foreigners; but you are fellow citizens with the saints and the domestics of God, 20 built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, 21 in whom all the building, being framed together, groweth up into an holy temple in the Lord. 22\* In which you also are built together into an habitation of God in the Spirit.**

Once he has made it clear that the Gentiles have been admitted to spiritual blessings together with the Jews (2:13), he goes on to teach that in these blessings the Gentiles are not of less eminence than the Jews themselves; they enjoy a completely equal access to Christ's blessings. In reference to this he does two things:

First, he presents what he has in mind.

Secondly, he clarifies this presentation by an example (2:20).

Regarding the first he makes two points:

First, he excludes what was [true of] their past state from their present state.

Secondly, he concludes to what is fitting for their present state (2:19b).

In drawing a conclusion, the Apostle says **Now therefore you are no more strangers and foreigners**, and it should be recognized that a similar conclusion follows from the premises. First, indeed, from this, that both [Jews and Gentiles] are united and are reconciled to God. In the second place, they both have access in one Spirit to the Father. Together they are conformed to the whole Trinity; to the Father whom they approach, to the Son through whom, and to the Holy Spirit in whom they have access in unity. Hence, they in no way lack a share in spiritual goods.

To understand the text it must be realized that the community of the faithful are sometimes referred to as a house in the Scriptures: "that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God" (1 Tim. 3:15). At other times it is called a city: "Jerusalem, which is built as a city. . ." (Ps. 121:3). A city possesses a political community whereas a household has a domestic one,<sup>62</sup> these differ in two respects. For those who belong to the domestic community share with one another private activities; but those belonging to the civil community have in common with one another public activities. Secondly, the head of the family governs the domestic community; while those in the civil community are ruled by a king. Hence [the analogy]: what the king is in the realm, this the father is in the home.

The community of the faithful contains within it something of the city and something of the home. If the ruler of the community is thought of, he is a father: "Our Father, who art in heaven" (Mt. 6:9); "thou shalt call me Father and shall not cease to walk after me" (Jer. 3:19). In this perspective, the community is a home. But if you consider the subjects themselves, it is a city since they have in common with one another the particular acts of faith, hope and charity. In this way, if the faithful are considered in themselves, the community is a civil one; if, however, the ruler is thought of, it is a domestic community.

This is why the Apostle writes the two words here: **strangers and foreigners**. For what the stranger is to the home, that the foreigner is to the city. A stranger is an outsider, as it were, of a family: "It is a miserable life to go as a guest from house to house: for where a man is a stranger, he shall not deal confidently" (Ecclus. 29:30). A foreigner is as an alien to the city into which he comes. As though the Apostle said: Formerly you were estranged from the community of believers, as strangers to a home and foreigners to a state - and as the proselytes were to the Old Law - but this is true no longer, for **you are no more strangers and foreigners**. "Behold, an inhabitant shall come, who was not with me: he that was a stranger to thee before shall be joined to thee" (Is. 54:15).

Next (v. 19b), he draws the conclusion of what their present state is, stating **but you are fellow citizens with the saints and the domestics of God**. As if he had said: Since the community of the faithful is termed a city in relation to its subjects, and a home relative to its ruler, the assembly to which you are called is the city of the saints and the house of God. "Glorious things are said of thee, O city of God" (Ps. 86:3). Hence Augustine remarks: "Two loves have formed two cities. For the love of God, even to the contempt of self," namely, of the man loving, "builds the heavenly city of Jerusalem. But the love of self, even to the contempt of God, builds the city of Babylon."<sup>63</sup> Everyone, then, either is a citizen with the saints if he loves God to the contempt of self;<sup>64</sup> or, if he loves himself even to the contempt of God, he is a citizen of Babylon.

Consequently, when he says **built upon the foundation of the Apostles**, he clarifies what has been said. It is customary in the Scriptures that the figure, called metonymy, is used where the container is substituted for what it contains, as a house sometimes refers to those who are in the house. The Apostle employs this figure of speech concerning those who are in the house of God, the faithful; as though they were one house, he compares them to a building. Regarding this he does two things:

First, he sets down what he intended.

Secondly, he shows that the Ephesians themselves have become parts of this building (2:22).

Concerning the first he does two things:

First, he describes the foundation of this building.

Secondly, its construction or completeness (2:21).

He writes of two foundations: one is primary and another secondary.<sup>65</sup> The Apostles and Prophets are the secondary foundation. In this regard he states that they [the Ephesians] are not strangers but fellow citizens who belong already to the spiritual edifice which is **built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets**, that is, upon the teaching of the Apostles and Prophets. Or, **upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets** means upon Christ who is the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets. As though he said: You are built upon the same foundation on which the Apostles and Prophets, who were Jewish, were built.

These two interpretations only differ in words. Yet the first is more suited [to the context]; if the second was the better one there would be no point in adding **Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone** since he would be the principal foundation. Hence this is more in harmony with the first; although Christ would be both the chief stone and the principal foundation. In meaning, however, they are in no way different since it is the same to say that Christ is the foundation, and the teaching of the Apostles and



Prophets is; after all, they proclaimed Christ alone, and not themselves. To accept their doctrine is to accept Christ crucified: "We preach Christ crucified" (1 Cor. 1:23); and "We have the mind of Christ" (1 Cor. 2:16). 1 Peter 1 (12) affirms [of the Prophets]: "To whom it was revealed that, not to themselves but to you, they ministered those things which are now declared to you by them that have preached the gospel to you."

Notice that the Apostles are designated as foundations: "The foundations thereof are in the holy mountains" (Ps. 86:1). "I will lay thy foundations with sapphires" (Is. 54:11), that is, with saintly men. In the Apocalypse 21 (14) they are expressly called foundations: "And the wall of the city had twelve foundations; and in them, the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb." They are referred to as foundations to the degree that their doctrine proclaims Christ. "Upon this rock I will build my Church" (Mt. 16:18).<sup>66</sup>

Both **Apostles and Prophets** are alluded to so that he might indicate that the doctrine of both is necessary for salvation. "Therefore, every scribe instructed in the kingdom of heaven is like to a man that is a householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure new things and old" (Mt. 13:52). Also, that he might show the harmony between the two, of the one with the other, since there is an identical foundation to both. What the Prophets foretold was to come, the Apostles proclaimed as accomplished. "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, which he had promised before, by his prophets, in the holy scriptures, concerning his Son" (Rom. 1:1-3).

Christ Jesus alone is the principal foundation, in reference to this he says **himself being the chief corner-stone**. Here he states three things about him; he is a stone, is placed at the corner, and is the chief one.

He is a stone on account of the strength of the foundation. Whence Matthew 7 (25) speaks of the house founded on a rock and built solidly; neither rains, nor floods, nor winds could destroy it. Such was not the case with the house built on sand. "The stone was cut out of the mountain without hands" (Dan. 2:45). He is called a corner-stone on account of the convergence of both [Jews and Gentiles]. As two walls are joined at the corner, so in Christ the Jewish and Pagan peoples are united. "The stone which the builders rejected; the same is become the head of the corner" (Ps. 117:22): "This is the stone which was rejected by you, the builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other" (Ac. 4:11-12). And Christ applies this text to himself in Matthew 21 (42): "Have you never read in the Scriptures: The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner?" He is referred to as the chief one by reason of his heavenly dignity: "Behold, I will lay a stone in the foundations of Sion, a tried stone, a corner-stone, a precious stone, founded in the foundation" (Is. 28:16).

The foundation of a spiritual edifice contrasts with that of a material building. For a material building rests on a foundation in the earth, the more important the foundation is, the deeper must it be. A spiritual structure, on the other hand, has its foundation in heaven; as a result, the more principal the foundation, the higher it necessarily is. Thus we could imagine a city, as it were, coming down from heaven with its foundation in heaven and the building itself appearing to come downward towards us below, according to that passage of the Apocalypse 21 (2): "I John, saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God."

Next (v. 21), he treats of the building's construction. In erecting any building four stages are requisite. First is the foundation of the edifice, second is the construction, third its increase, and fourth is the completion.<sup>67</sup> He briefly touches on these.

In saying **in whom** he designates the foundation which principally is Christ and secondarily the doctrine of the Apostles and Prophets: "For other foundation no man can lay, but that which is laid; which is Christ Jesus" (1 Cor. 3:11). He discusses the second briefly in all the building being framed together.

Understood allegorically, this signifies the Church herself which is built up when men are converted to the faith. Taken morally<sup>68</sup> it signifies a sanctified soul, and then this building is erected when good works are built upon Christ. "A wise woman buildeth her house" (Prov. 14:1); "let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon" (1 Cor. 3:10). With Christ as foundation, every spiritual edifice - whether of the Jews or of the Gentiles - is constructed by God's power. "Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it" (Ps. 126:1). "For every house is built by some man; but he that created all things is God" (Heb. 3:4). Yet the building is constructed instrumentally either by the man who builds up himself, or by prelates."

He touches on the third when he states **groweth up into an holy temple**; this happens when the number of those saved increases. "And the word of the Lord increased; and the number of the disciples was multiplied in Jerusalem exceedingly" (Ac. 6:7). It also grows when a man makes progress in good works, and he grows in grace to the degree that he becomes a holy temple. A temple is the dwelling place of God and must be holy: "The Most High hath sanctified his own tabernacle" (Ps. 45:5). Since we should be inhabited by God, that he might live in us, we ought to prepare ourselves in order to be holy. "Know you not that you are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (1 Cor. 3:16). "Behold the tabernacle of God with men; and he will dwell with them" (Apoc. 21:3).

But are we not temples of God from the instant we possess charity? I reply that it is so. And the more we progress, so much the more will God dwell within us. Hence, the fourth requisite to this building is its perfection and completion, which he states to be **in the Lord**.

Finally (v. 22), he indicates how the Gentiles have become participants of the building. **In which**<sup>70</sup> building not only are the Jews incorporated, but also you Ephesians **are built together**, that is, you are incorporated like the others. "Unto whom coming, as to a living stone, rejected indeed by men, but chosen and made honorable by God. Be you also as living stones built up, a spiritual house" (1 Pet. 2:4-5). Therefore he adds **into an habitation of God** that God may dwell in you through faith. "That Christ may dwell by faith in your hearts" (Eph. 3:17). Yet this cannot happen without charity since "he that abideth in charity abideth in God, and God in him" (1 Jn. 4:16). And charity is bestowed on us through the Holy Spirit: "The charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost who is given to us" (Rom. 5:5). Thus he adds **in the Spirit**.

# Chapter 3

## LECTURE 1

**1 For this cause, I, Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ, for you Gentiles; 2 if yet you have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me towards you; 3 how that, according to revelation, the mystery has been made known to me, as I have written above in a few words; 4\* as you reading may understand my prudence in the mystery of Christ, 5 which in other generations was not known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit: 6 that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs of the same body, and co-partners of his promise in Christ Jesus, by the gospel.**

The Apostle has previously recounted the many blessings of God granted to the human race and the Apostles themselves,<sup>71</sup> here he turns to God's special blessings bestowed on himself.

First, he sets forth his thought in a general way.

Secondly, he explains each part of it in detail (3:3).

Concerning the first he does two things:

First, he describes his condition in respect to patience and the sufferings he endures.

Secondly, in reference to the gifts of grace God has given him (3:2).

He remarks: I have said that "you also are built together into an habitation of God" (Eph. 2:22); **For this cause**, of your edification and conversion to Christ, **I, Paul**, am a **prisoner** at Rome; my greatness is in being an Apostle of Jesus Christ and a teacher of faith and truth to the nations. He wrote this letter from Rome where he was kept under custody. "I labor even into bands, as an evildoer" (2 Tim. 2:9); "I therefore, a prisoner in the Lord. . ." (Eph. 4:1). Certainly this indicates his suffering and pain amid the prison's squalor.

Since it is not punishment that makes the martyr, but the reason [why he suffers], he inserts the cause of his tribulations. There are two causes in behalf of which someone can pursue martyrdom. One, if he should suffer for faith in Christ, or for any other virtue. "But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or a thief, or a railer, or a coveter of other men's things. But, if as a Christian, let him not be ashamed" (1 Pet. 4:15-16). With respect to this he affirms that he is a prisoner of Jesus Christ. The other is if one suffers for the utility<sup>72</sup> of the Church, in regard to which he says **for you Gentiles**, that is, I long so much for conversion, and thus preach the word of salvation to you, that I have been thrown into prison. "We are in

tribulation for your exhortation and salvation” (2 Cor. 1:6\*). “I now rejoice in my sufferings for you” (Col. 1:24).

Then he makes known the gift of grace given him, as though he said: I assert that I am a prisoner for you Gentiles, **if yet you have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me towards you**. This may be understood in two ways. In one, the dispensation is taken in a passive sense. Here, **if you have heard of the dispensation of the grace** means, if you have understood that this gift of being an apostle among the nations was dispensed to me. For, as is mentioned below: "To everyone of us is given grace, according to the measure of the giving of Christ . . . he gave some apostles, and some prophets. . ." (Eph. 4:7, 11). Whence the Lord Christ has given to me, that I should bear fruit among you, and this has fallen to my lot by God's grace. "I am made a minister of the Gospel" (Col. 1:23). I say **the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me towards you**, that is, I have been entrusted with dispensing those [graces].

In a second way, dispensation is taken actively so that the sense of **if you have heard of the dispensation of the grace** is, if you have understood what has been granted to me: that I might dispense gifts of grace through communicating the sacraments to **you**.<sup>73</sup> "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ and the dispensers of the mysteries of God" (1 Cor. 4:1).

Subsequently, when he says **how that, according to revelation**. . . he makes known the several aspects of his condition in detail. In reference to which he does two things:

First, he treats of what pertains to the dignity<sup>74</sup> of his office, namely, the dispensation of grace. Secondly, what pertains to his experience of patience, namely, tribulations (3:13).

The first part contains two sections:

First, he discusses the dispensation of grace regarding the knowledge of various mysteries. Secondly, regarding how these [mysteries] are carried into effect (3:7).

Once more the first section has two divisions:

First, he sets down the knowledge of the mysteries of Christ that was granted to him. Secondly, he explains what that mystery is (3:6).

He makes three points in regard to his knowledge:

First, it is certain (3:3a).

Secondly, it is full (3:3b-4).

Thirdly, it is eminent (3:5).

Certain it is indeed, for he did not acquire it through human effort or human thought, which can err: "The thoughts of mortal men are timid, and our counsels uncertain" (Wis. 9:14\*). Instead it is through the divine law which is most certain. Hence he says **according to revelation the mystery has been made known to me**. "For neither did I receive it of man; nor did I learn it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. 1:12). "We all, beholding the glory of the Lord with open face, are transformed into the same image" (2 Cor. 3:18).

Moreover, it is a full [knowledge] since it is revealed perfectly to me, and I entrust it to your judgment. I write of it in few words, in which you can recognize that I enjoy a perfect knowledge of the mysteries of faith. And in regard to this he says **as I have written above in a few words** clearly, that **as you are reading, you may understand**. "Thy lips . . . are as a dropping honeycomb" (Cant. 4:11). Lips are small; and those of a doctor are as "a dropping honeycomb" when he conveys many and profound thoughts in a few short words. Nevertheless, note that Augustine remarks<sup>75</sup> how a doctor should aim at being understood. As long as he strives for this his words are not superfluous, but if he remains on a point after he is understood he wastes his words. He adds **my prudence**<sup>76</sup> since "the knowledge of the holy is prudence" (Prov. 9:10). This is not worldly but divine and heavenly, for which reason he states **in the mystery of Christ**.

It is also eminent since it was revealed to the Apostles alone. Hence he adds **which in other generations was not known**. For although the mysteries of Christ were revealed to the prophets and patriarchs, they were more clearly revealed to the Apostles. To the prophets and patriarchs they were revealed in vague generality; but they were shown in their singular and determinate circumstances to the Apostles.<sup>77</sup>

**Other generations** admits of a twofold explanation. In one, by **generations** the times of the generations are understood, as in Psalm 144 (13): "Thy dominion endureth throughout all generations." Then the meaning is **which in other generations**, that is, times, [the mystery] **was not known to the sons of men**, to no rational creature, neither to men nor to angels.<sup>78</sup> "Thou has hid these things from the wise and the prudent, and hast revealed them to little ones" (Mt. 11:25). **As it is now revealed to his holy Apostles and prophets in the Spirit**, to them, namely, who interpret the Scriptures and explain the Law in the spirit of the New Testament. "To you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God; but to the rest in parables" (Lk. 8:10). "And turning to his disciples he said: Blessed are the eyes that see the things which you see. For I say to you that many prophets and kings have desired to see the things that you see and have not seen them" (Lk. 10:23-24).

Another interpretation takes **generations** in the sense of human generations, as in Matthew 23 (36): "All these things shall come upon this generation." Then the meaning is **which in other generations was not known** to those men, that is, who were born in the preceding generations. The rest [is interpreted] as above. "Who hath believed our report? And to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?" (Is. 53:1).

But certainly this sacrament of faith<sup>79</sup> was revealed to some of the Old Testament fathers, as is implied in John 8 (56): "Abraham, your father, rejoiced that he might see my day; he saw it and was glad." And [it was also revealed] to the prophets, according to Joel 2 (28): "And it shall come to pass after this, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy." But it was revealed to them in certain generalities, whereas [it was disclosed] to the Apostles clearly and completely. Three reasons account for this. First, because the Apostles received the revelation immediately from the Son of God: "The only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" (Jn. 1:18). The prophets and fathers of the Old Testament, on the other hand, were taught by angels, or through some similar imagery: "And one of the seraphims flew to me: and in his hand was a live coal which he had taken with the tongs off the altar" (Is. 6:6). Hence, the Apostles received it more clearly. Secondly, they did not see in symbols and riddles as the prophets did, but were given a plain view of the Lord's glory: "Blessed are the eyes that see the things which you see" (Lk. 10:23). Thirdly, since the Apostles were meant to carry into effect and communicate this sacrament, it was necessary for them to be more instructed in it than others. "Others have labored; and you have entered into their labors" (Jn. 4:38).

Consequently, when he states that **the Gentiles should be fellow heirs**, he makes known what the sacrament is. In reference to it, it should be recognized that the Jews enjoyed three prerogatives with respect to the Gentiles. They had the promised inheritance: "For not through the law was the promise to Abraham or to his seed, that he should be heir of the world; but through the justice of faith" (Rom. 4:13); "The Lord is the portion of my inheritance" (Ps. 15:5). Another was their special election, they were set apart from the Gentiles: "The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be his peculiar people of all peoples that are upon the earth" (Deut. 7:6). "We are his people and the sheep of his pasture" (Ps. 99:3); "One is my dove: my perfect one is but one" (Cant. 6:8). Finally, they had the promise of a Christ: "In thee shall all the kindred of the earth be blessed" (Gen. 12:3).

These three the Gentiles did not enjoy: "You were at that time without Christ, being aliens to Israel's way of life" (Eph. 2:12\*). By faith, however, they have received them. First, they share in the inheritance; concerning this he says **fellow heirs** with the Jews in the heavenly inheritance. "And I say to you that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven" (Mt. 8:11). Second, [they are admitted] to the chosen community of believers; thus he states **of the same body**, that is, in one body. "And other sheep I have that are not of this fold," namely, the Gentiles, "them also I must bring. And they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd" (Jn. 10:16). Third, [they are admitted] to a participation in the promised grace; he says

they are **co-partners of his promise**, the promises made to Abraham. "For I say that Christ Jesus was minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers; but that the Gentiles are to glorify God for his mercy" (Rom. 15:8-9).

The Gentiles have acquired all this, not through Moses, but **in Christ**. "For the Law was given by Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" (Jn. 1:17), "by whom he hath given us most great and precious promises" (2 Pet. 1:4). Moreover, these did not come through fulfilling the law, whose burden "neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear" (Ac. 15:10), but **by the gospel** through which all men are saved. "For I am not ashamed of the gospel. For it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first and to the Greek" (Rom. 1:16). "Now I make known unto you, brethren, the gospel which I preached to you, which also you have received and wherein you stand. By which also you are saved" (1 Cor. 15:1-2).

## LECTURE 2

**7\* Of whom I am made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God, which is given to me according to the operation of his power. 8 To me, the least of all the saints, is given this grace, to preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; 9 and to enlighten all men, that they may see what is the dispensation of the mystery which hath been bidden from eternity in God who created all things.**

After the Apostle has discussed the grace given him relative to the knowledge of divine mysteries (3:3), he indicates the same with respect to carrying these mysteries themselves into effect. Concerning this he makes two points:

First, he acknowledges the assistance of grace granted him to put them into practice.

Secondly, he speaks of the ministerial duty confided to him (3:8).

The first has two divisions:

First, he briefly treats of putting divine mysteries into effect.

Secondly, he shows how help has been given him (37b).

The realization of divine realities was committed to him by way of a ministry. He says in relation to this: I assert that this ministry has been entrusted to me, that the Gentiles are co-heirs by the Gospel and through it they share as well in God's promise in Christ Jesus, **of whom I am made a minister**. As though he



stated: I do not fulfill or carry out [this mystery] as if it came from me or was mine, but as a ministry belonging to God. "For this man is to me a vessel of election, to carry my name before the Gentiles" (Ac. 9:15). "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ and the dispensers of the mysteries of God" (1 Cor. 4:1).

When he writes **according to the gift of the grace of God** he touches on the aid granted him to carry out the mysteries. This type of assistance was twofold. One was the capacity to put them into effect, and another was the very actions or activities themselves.<sup>80</sup> God bestows the capability by infusing the virtue and grace through which a man is able and fit for action; while he confers the action itself insofar as he moves us interiorly and spurs us on to good. Receiving both from God, the Apostle acknowledges the first in saying: **I am made a minister**, certainly not on my own merits, nor by my own virtue, but **according to the gift of the grace of God which is given to me**. For I was made worthy to realize the divine mysteries which previously I had persecuted. I have labored more abundantly than all they. Yet not I, but the grace of God with me" (1 Cor. 15:10). In reference to the second he states **according to the operation** which God effects inasmuch as **his power** causes us both to will and to act in accord with good will.

This can be interpreted in another way according to a Gloss.<sup>81</sup> What is said here refers to what immediately preceded (v. 6). For the pagans to have become co-heirs, and of the same body, and co-partners of God the Father's promise - this is a gift God gave the Gentiles in Christ. That is, they come through Christ, **according to the operation of his power** in that he has powerfully acted in raising Christ from the dead.

Next (v. 8), he speaks of the duty entrusted to him; the grace of such a commission has three qualities to recommend it:

First, the condition of the person himself [to whom it is entrusted].

Secondly, the greatness of what is confided to him (38b).

Thirdly, the good that results as its fruit (3:10ff.).

The office confided to him is recommended from this person's condition. For if some king entrusted an important office to a great and high-ranking prince, he would not be doing him a very great favor since he would be placing an important person in an important position. But if he entrusts a great and exceedingly difficult duty to an insignificant person, he would greatly honor him and do him a considerable favor; the more so in proportion as the eminence of the office exceeds him. In this fashion Paul praises the gratuity of the office confided to himself: **To me, the least of all the saints, is given this grace**. He calls himself the **least**, not because of the power granted him, but in recognition of his former state: "For I am the least of the apostles, who am not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God" (1 Cor. 15:9). "The least shall become a thousand, and a little one a most strong nation" (Is. 60:22). This

[duty was to be fulfilled] **among the Gentiles**, that is, throughout the nations. "For he who wrought in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision wrought in me also among the Gentiles. And, when they had known the grace that was given to me, James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision" (Gal. 2:8-9).

In the second place (3:8b), the grace of his mission is commended by reason of the magnitude of his task: to reveal and clarify the great and hidden secrets of God. Think of the greatness of Christ and of the salvation of those who believe which he accomplished. The entire Gospel concerns these two.

Regarding the first he says **to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ**, as if to assert: To proclaim the good is the grace given me. "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (1 Cor. 1:17). "Woe unto me if I preach not the gospel" (1 Cor. 9:16). This good is **the unsearchable riches of Christ** which are true wealth. "God who is rich in mercy . . . hath quickened us together in Christ" (Eph. 2:4); "Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and patience, and longsuffering?" (Rom. 2:4); "The same is Lord over all, rich unto all that call upon him" (Rom. 10:12). These riches are unsearchable indeed, he affirms, since they are as great as his mercy which can be neither understood nor analyzed. "Riches of salvation, wisdom and knowledge: the fear of the Lord is his treasure" (Is. 33:6), referring to Christ since reverence of the Lord found its most plentiful expression in Christ. "And he shall be filled with the spirit of the fear of the Lord" (Is. 11:3).

In Christ "are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col. 2:3). They are unsearchable because Christ's wisdom and knowledge cannot be analyzed. "Peradventure thou wilt comprehend the steps of God, and wilt find out the Almighty perfectly?" (Job 11:7). The implied answer is, No. For creatures, in whom a trace of their Creator is visible,<sup>82</sup> do not provide us with a perfect understanding of Him. Struck by the wonder of these riches, the Apostle exclaimed: "O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways!" (Rom. 11:33). "Who hath searched out the wisdom of God that goeth before all things?" (Ecclus. 1:3).

Concerning the second - to make known the salvation which comes from Christ to those who believe – he says **to enlighten all men**, not only the Jews, but the Gentiles as well, through preaching and miracles. "I will enlighten all that hope in the Lord" (Ecclus. 24:45). "This man is to me a vessel of election, to carry my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel" (Ac. 9:15); "You are the light of the world" (Mt. 5:14). **To enlighten**, I say, insofar as I can, **all** who want to believe. For God "will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. 2:4) in order that they might understand **what is the dispensation of the mystery**. For these [mysteries] would be of no use if they were not imparted [to men]. As if he claimed: I shall enlighten men on how awe-inspiring the mystery of

our redemption is, and from what an immense love it was accomplished. Inexhaustible riches of this sort are imparted to you through Christ.

Yet it might be objected: What you speak of is known to all, even if it is great. The Apostle gives a negative reply, it hath been hidden from eternity. Here it should be noted how everything present in an effect is concealed in the power of its causes. For example, in the power of the sun is contained everything that exists among the realities which come into being and cease to be.<sup>83</sup> Nevertheless, certain [effects] are hidden there, and others are evident. For instance, heat is evidently in fire while the intelligibility of other [effects], which it produces in a more hidden manner, are said to be concealed in it. Now God is the efficient cause of everything; he makes some things whose intelligibility is open [to investigation], namely, those created through the mediation of second causes.<sup>84</sup> Other effects, however, which he immediately produces by himself are hidden in him.

Since God accomplished by himself the mystery of human redemption, this mystery is hidden in him alone. Thus he states that it is **hidden from eternity in God**, known to him only. Yet, to seek out the secrets of the First Cause is the greatest [wisdom]: "We speak wisdom among the perfect; yet not the wisdom of this world, neither of the princes of this world that come to naught. But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, a wisdom which is hidden, which God ordained before the world" (1 Cor. 2:6-7). He, I say, **who created all things**.

### LECTURE 3

**10 That the manifold wisdom of God may be made known to the principalities and powers in heavenly places through the church, 11\* according to a pre-determining of the ages which he made in Christ Jesus our Lord; 12\* in whom we have assurance and access with confidence by the faith of him.**

Once he has set forth the dignity of his office that arises from the magnitude of what it entrusts to him (3:8), the Apostle here gives evidence of his office's worth from the utility of its effect. This consists in the revelation of great realities to eminent persons. Three points are to be considered regarding this:

First, to whom the revelation is directed (3:10a).

Secondly, through whom it is made known, at **through the church** (3:10b).

Thirdly, what is revealed, namely, **the manifold wisdom of God** (3:10a).

The Apostle touches on four points in his description of this wisdom:

First, its many facets (3:10).

Secondly, how it is so manifold (3:11a).

Thirdly, the source of this multiplicity (3:11b).

Fourthly, the effect of its coming from that source (3:12).

The wisdom which is revealed is **manifold**. Job 11 (5) briefly speaks of this diversity: "And I wish that God would speak with thee, and would open his lips to thee, that he might shew thee the secrets of wisdom, and that his law is manifold." "For in her," namely, divine wisdom, "is the spirit of understanding: holy, one, manifold" (Wis. 7:22). Manifold that is, in her effects, yet one in her essence.

The way this revealed knowledge is many-sided is **according to a pre-determining of the ages**,<sup>85</sup> meaning the differentiation and limitation of the various times. For God plans something to exist at one time, and others at another time. In this fashion such wisdom is referred to as **manifold according to a pre-determining of the ages** since he provides different times with different events.

The source of this multiplicity is Christ; hence he says **which God made in Christ Jesus our Lord**, that is, through Christ. For he himself alters times and their states: "God, who, at sundry times and in diverse manners, spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all in these days hath spoken to us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the ages" (Heb. 1:1-2\*).

**Which he made in Christ Jesus** may refer to eternal predestination since the Father accomplishes this in his Son: "He chose us in him [Christ] before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy" (Eph. 1:4). For the Son himself is the wisdom of the Father, and nothing is determined or foreordained except through wisdom. Or **which he made in Christ Jesus** may refer to the fulfillment of eternal predestination which God the Father brings to completion through the Son. We are those "upon whom the ends of the ages have come" (1 Cor. 10:11\*).

The effect of this source [*auctoris*] consists in a great fruit which comes to us from Christ. This is expressed at **in whom we have assurance**. . . Concerning this he does two things:

First, he puts down the blessings we receive.

Secondly, he designates through what we receive them (3:12b).

There are two goods which we obtain. One pertains to the hope of attaining [to our reward]; and in reference to this he says **in whom**, namely Christ, **we have assurance** of arriving at heaven and our eternal inheritance. "Have confidence, I have overcome the world" (Jn. 16:33). "Such assurance we have, through Christ, towards God" (2 Cor. 3:4\*). The second good pertains to the power of attaining to [our reward]; in respect to which he states that we have **access with confidence**. "Let us go, therefore, with

confidence to the throne of his glory" (Heb. 4:16\*).<sup>86</sup> "Thou shalt call me father and shall not cease to walk after me" (Jer. 3:19). "By whom [Christ] also we have access through faith into this grace wherein we stand; and glory in the hope of the glory of the sons of God" (Rom. 5:2).

The means by which these are given us is **by the faith of him**, namely, of Christ. "Being justified, therefore, by faith, let us have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:1).

That we might summarize [what has been said above] briefly, I assert that God's many-faceted wisdom is revealed in the differentiation and pre-determining of the ages, which gives us assurance and access to the Father by faith in him.

He discusses those to whom the manifold wisdom of God is revealed in that text (3:10) previously not mentioned: that it **may be made known to the principalities and powers**, from which its greatness is evident. And, since there are also princes and potentates on earth, he adds **in heavenly places** meaning in heaven, where we shall be. Note here that Principalities and Powers are two ranks which, by their very names, designate a preeminence in action. The rank of Powers is ordered to check any hindrances to salvation, while the rank of Principalities takes the lead and gives commands that [salvation] might be carried into effect properly. The regulative function of the Principality rank is evident from that text of Psalm 67 (26-28): "Princes went before joined with singers. . . The princes of Juda are their leaders." The repressive function of the Powers is clear in Romans 13 (3-4): "Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good; and thou shalt have praise from the same. For he is God's minister to thee, for good. But, if thou do that which is evil, fear; for he beareth not the sword in vain. For he is God's minister; an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil."<sup>87</sup> Hence, those to whom [the mystery] is made known are eminent; the holy angels by whom the saints are directed and protected.

The means through which the manifold wisdom of God is made known to them is designated by his saying **through the church**. This presents no small problem. For a Gloss has "That is, through the Apostles preaching in the Church."<sup>88</sup> This is one way it could be understood, the angels are taught by the Apostles, and this seems to have some grounds to it. For we notice that in heaven the higher angels, who are enlightened immediately by God, illumine and teach the lower angels who are not enlightened immediately by God. Therefore, it does not seem unreasonable that the Apostles should teach the angels since they were taught immediately by God according to John 1 (18): "The only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

However, another factor upsets the sufficiency of this [interpretation]. For there are two natures in Christ, the divine and the human. The Apostles were taught immediately by Christ in his human nature; but the angels immediately intuit the divine nature - even the lower angels, otherwise they would not be happy, since the beatitude of a rational creature can consist in the vision of the Divine Essence alone.<sup>89</sup> It

certainly would be unseemly and absurd for us to maintain that the saints in the fatherland could be taught by even the most perfect of those still on their way [to heaven]. Although among men born of women none greater than John the Baptist has arisen, yet "he that is the lesser in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he" (Lk. 7:28\*). To hold that the demons could be instructed by men is, at first glance, credible. But that the blessed could be educated by pilgrims when they immediately behold the Word, the spotless mirror reflecting all being, this should not be held and does not appear proper.

Therefore, it must be asserted that the angels are instructed **through the church**, that is, through the apostolic preaching, as the Gloss maintains, in such a way that they are not taught by the Apostles, but in them. Augustine remarks, in his *Super Genesim ad Litteram*,<sup>90</sup> that before God created [material] beings, he impressed on the angelic minds the intelligible patterns of natural realities. The "before" designating the order of nature and not of time, since from the standpoint of time everything was created together. As a result, angels know natural things in two ways. They know them in the Word, and this is termed their morning knowledge; and they know them in their own proper natures, this is referred to as their evening knowledge.

Further, there exist certain intelligible patterns [operative in] the mysteries of grace which transcend the whole of creation. These intelligible patterns are not impressed on the angelic minds but are hidden in God alone. Thus the angels do not grasp them in themselves, nor even in God, but only as they unfold in the events [which the mysteries] effect. Now, the intelligible patterns relative to God's manifold wisdom belong to this category. They are hidden in God and gradually unfold in external effects. Clearly, therefore, the angels will understand them neither in themselves, nor in the Word, nor by the Apostles or any other wayfarer. Rather, they know [the mysteries of grace] hidden in the Divine Mind as they unfold in the Apostles themselves. This is like the case of a house, or the concept of a house to be built, in the mind of an architect. As long as it remains in his mind it can be known to no one - except God who alone penetrates into human souls. However, once the concepts are realized externally in the construction, in the house after it is built, anyone can learn from the building what previously was concealed in the architect's mind. Yet, they are not taught by the house but in the house.<sup>91</sup>

There is still another interpretation of **that it may be made known to the principalities and powers** in which the conjunction **that** is not taken causally, but in a certain way, consecutively. Thus it would read: To make known what is the dispensation of the mystery hidden for ages in God who has created all reality; hidden, nonetheless, in such a way that it was made known to Principalities and Powers. The sacrament was concealed in God in such a manner that he later revealed it to the Principalities and Powers, not from eternity but from the time they began to exist, for every creature has a beginning.<sup>92</sup> This was not through the earthly Church but through the heavenly one - the true Church who is our mother and to whom we tend; on her is our militant Church patterned. Thus the **through** signifies only a natural sequence, [the mysteries] are made known "through the heavenly Church" in the sense that it is passed on

from one to another. As when it is said: That fact is known throughout [*per*] a whole realm or city because the news traveled from one person to another in their conversations. Acts 9 (42) uses this figure of speaking in reference to St. Peter's raising of Tabitha: "And it was made known throughout all Joppe; and many believed in the Lord."

On the other hand, the Teacher<sup>93</sup> comments on the text of Augustine in such a way that "to enlighten all men, that they may see what is the dispensation of the mystery which hath been hidden from eternity in God" (Eph. 3:9) occurs **through the Church**, that is, to all men who are in the earthly Church. But this is not in accord with Augustine's thought.

Here it could be asked whether the angels knew of the mystery of the Incarnation from the beginning of the world. The Teacher replies that it was known to the higher angels but not the lower ones. So the lower angels ask: "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bosra?" (Is. 63:1). This opinion contradicts that of Blessed Dionysius who sees in the Holy Scriptures two questions asked by the angels about Christ.<sup>94</sup> The first is from Psalm 23 (8): "Who is this King of Glory?" and the other is from Isaias 63 (1): "Who is this that cometh from Edom?" According to Dionysius, the first is asked by the lower angels and the second by the higher. He bases this on the fact that God does not reply to the first, but someone else says: "The Lord of hosts, he is the King of Glory" (Ps. 23:10). Whereas the second is answered by God immediately: "I, that speak justice and am a defender to save" (Is. 63:1). Hence, Dionysius prefers to say that both were ignorant of some [aspects of the mystery] and knew others. From the beginning all knew the mystery of the Incarnation in a general fashion, but as time passed - or in the temporal process - they learned its detailed intelligible patterns when they were explicated in external events.

#### LECTURE 4

**13 Wherefore I pray you not to faint at my tribulations for you, which is your glory. 14 For this cause I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, 15 of whom all paternity in heaven and earth is named; 16 that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened by his Spirit with might unto the inward man; 17 that Christ may dwell by faith in your hearts; that, being rooted and founded in charity.**

After the Apostle has dealt with the dignity of the office belonging to his position (3:3), he goes on to speak of his tribulations and sufferings. In reference to this he does two things:

First, he exhorts them lest they be troubled by his sufferings; they should have patience.

Secondly, since divine assistance is necessary if man is not to become agitated, he prays that they might accomplish this through divine grace (3:14).

About the first he says: Due to the importance and security of my office, which I have through faith in Christ, it happens that I suffer tribulations; but they neither daunt me nor can they tear me away from Christ. "Who then shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation? Or distress? Or famine? Or nakedness? Or danger? Or persecution? Or the sword?" (Rom. 8:35). As though he affirmed that nothing can. **Wherefore I urge and pray you not to faint at my tribulations.** My sufferings should not be an occasion for you to fail in faith or in good works at all. "Think diligently upon him [Jesus] that endureth such opposition from sinners against himself; that you be not wearied, fainting in your minds" (Heb. 12:3).

I declare that you must not be disheartened, they are **for you**, for your own utility. "Whether we be in tribulation, it is for your exhortation and salvation; or whether we be comforted, it is for your consolation; or whether we be exhorted, it is for your exhortation and salvation, which worketh the enduring of the same sufferings which we also suffer, that our hope for you may be steadfast, knowing that as you are partakers of the sufferings, so shall you be also of the consolation" (2 Cor. 1:6-7). Or, he says **for you** meaning, for your testing: "As gold in the furnace he hath proved them, and as a victim of a holocaust he hath received them" (Wis. 3:6).

**Which is your glory** if you do not fall but remain steadfast in sufferings, for "He that shall persevere unto the end, he shall be saved" (Mt. 10:22). In a different way, **which is your glory**, that is, the endurance of our trials is to your own glory in that God exposes his Apostles and prophets to sorrows and pains on account of your salvation. "For this reason have I hewed them in the prophets, I have slain them by the words of my mouth" (Os. 6:5\*). "We are your glory, as you also are ours, in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. 1:14).

As a consequence he goes on (v. 14) to implore assistance for them through a prayer that they might derive advantage from his exhortation.

First, he sets down the prayer.

Secondly, confident of its being heard, he adds a thanksgiving (3:20).

The first part has three sections:

First, he mentions to whom the prayer is addressed.

Secondly, the intention of the prayer (3:16).

Thirdly, the prayer's fruit (3:18).



Humility makes a prayer worthy of being heard: "He hath had regard to the prayer of the humble: and he hath not despised their petition" (Ps. 101:18). And, "The prayer of him that humbleth himself shall pierce the clouds: and till it come nigh he will not be comforted." (Ecclus. 35:21). Therefore, he immediately starts his prayer in humility, saying **For this cause** that you fail not in the faith **I bow my knees to the Father**. This is a symbol of humility for two reasons. First, a man belittles himself, in a certain way, when he genuflects, and he subjects himself to the one he genuflects before. In such a way he recognizes his own weakness and insignificance. Secondly, physical strength is present in the knees; in bending them a man confesses openly to his lack of strength. Thus external, physical symbols are shown to God for the purpose of renewing and spiritually training the inner soul. [This is expressed] in the prayer of Manasse: "I bend the knee of by heart. . ." <sup>95</sup> "For every knee shall be bowed to me: and every tongue shall swear" (Is. 45:24).

He describes next the person to whom the prayer is directed, God, whom he portrays in his nearness and in his authority. For from his relationship to us we are encouraged to pray with confidence. In this regard he states **to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ** and whose children we are also. "Every best gift and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of lights" (Jas. 1:17). "Thou, O Lord, are our Father, our Redeemer: from everlasting is thy name" (Is. 63:16). We are confirmed in the hope of obtaining what we ask for with confidence by his authority since from him **all paternity in heaven and earth is named**.

At this point the question arises if there is any paternity in heaven. A quick answer would be that **in heaven** means that paternity is present in God and in Divinity, and that this is the source of all fatherhood. But this is not questioned here, it is known to all the faithful. It is asked whether **in heaven**, that is, in the angels, there is any paternity.

To this I reply that paternity exists only among beings who live and who know. But life is twofold: it is either actual or potential. To possess the vital activities in potency is to be potentially alive; for example, a person who is sleeping is said to be potentially alive in regard to the external actions [he performs when awake]. But when someone actually performs the vital activities, he is alive in act. <sup>96</sup> Thus, not only he who transmits the potency to life is the father of him to whom he gives it, but also he who communicates an act of life can be called a father. Therefore, whoever stimulates another to some vital act, whether it be to good activity, to understanding, to willing or loving, can be given the name of father. "For if you have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet not many fathers" (1 Cor. 4:15). Likewise, in the hierarchical acts by which one angel illumines, perfects, and purifies another, it is evident that that angel is the father of the other - just as a teacher is the father of his disciples.

Some doubt that the fatherhood in heaven and on earth is derived from the paternity which exists in the Divinity. It seems not to be, for we give names in accordance with our knowledge of the reality named. And whatever we do know is through creatures; hence, the names we give to the things themselves are applicable primarily, and to a greater degree, to creatures rather than God.

I reply and state that the name of anything we name can be taken in two ways. In one it is expressive or symbolic of an intellectual concept, since words are the marks or signs of the impressions or concepts that are in the soul. In this perspective a name refers to creatures more than to God. However, in the second [the name] discloses the quiddity of the external object which is named; thus it will refer more to God. Therefore, the word **paternity**, when it signifies a concept formed by our intellect as it is naming a thing, will primarily be applicable to creatures instead of God since creatures are more known to us than God. But when it signifies the reality itself which has been named, then [this reality] is primarily in God rather than in us. For certainly all the power to procreate present in us is from God. So he says **of whom all paternity in heaven and earth is named** as though to affirm: The fatherhood present in creatures is, as it were, nominal or vocal; but the divine fatherhood by which the Father communicates his whole nature to the Son without any imperfection, this is true paternity.

Next (v. 16), he discloses what he prays for:

First, he does this.

Secondly, he shows through whom he can ask for what he desires (3:16b).

Thus he says: I ask that you do not give up, but be steadfast like men. Yet I know that by yourselves you cannot achieve this without God's gift, so I beg **that he would grant** it to **you** since "every best gift and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of lights" (Jas. 1:17). He will do this **according to the riches of his glory**, that is, in accord with his overflowing majesty and grandeur. "Glory and riches are in his house" (Ps. 111:3), and "with me are riches and glory" (Prov. 8:18). Riches, I say, which will cause you **to be strengthened with might**. "It is he that giveth strength to the weary, and increaseth force and might to them that are not" (Is. 40:29). This is for **the inward man** because a man is overcome easily by his enemy if he is not inwardly fortified. [God must] "establish him and strengthen him with judgment and with justice, from henceforth and forever" (Is. 9:7\*).

Inserted in the above is the phrase **by his Spirit** indicating through whom petitions are granted. The Spirit himself fortifies, he is the Spirit of fortitude, and is the source of our not yielding under sufferings. We receive him through a faith which is most strong because it is the substance of the realities we hope for - that is, it makes these desired realities exist within us. Whence 1 Peter 5 (9) [concerning the devil]: "Whom resist ye, strong in faith." And Paul adds **that Christ may dwell by faith in your hearts**. "Sanctify the Lord Christ in your hearts" (1 Pet. 3:15).

With what? I claim that it should not only be through faith, which as a gift is the strongest, but also through the charity that is in the saints. **That** you may be **rooted and founded in a charity** which "beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Charity never falleth away" (1 Cor. 13:7-8). "For love is strong as death. . ." (Cant. 8:6). A tree without roots, or a house lacking a foundation are destroyed easily. In a similar manner, a spiritual edifice not rooted and founded in charity cannot last.

## LECTURE 5

**18 You may be able to comprehend, with all the saints, what is the breadth and length and height and depth; 19 to know also the charity of Christ, which surpasseth all knowledge; that you may be filled into all the fullness of God. 20 Now to him who is able to do all things more abundantly than we desire or understand, according to the power that worketh in us; 21\* to him be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus, unto all the generations of the age of ages, Amen.**

Previously the Apostle revealed the object of his petition or prayer in behalf of the Ephesians, a strengthening of spirit in faith and charity (3:14). Consequently, he here shows the fruit of this strengthening through faith and charity; it is a certain type of knowledge. He sets forth:

First, the knowledge itself.

Secondly, the effective power of this awareness or knowledge (3:19b).

He says: You ought to be so rooted and founded in charity, dearly beloved, that **you may be able to comprehend, with all the saints, what is the breadth and length and height and depth**. This can be read in two ways.<sup>97</sup> In the first way we are more in accord with the Apostle's thought.

The knowledge of God is necessary for us both in the future life and in the present. For in the future we shall rejoice in our knowledge of God and in our perception of the humanity [the Son] assumed. "Now this is eternal life: that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent" (Jn. 17:3). [Our Lord compared himself to a door; men will] "go in" to contemplate the divinity, and will "go out" in the contemplation of the humanity, "and shall find pastures" (Jn. 10:9). Faith inaugurates that future knowledge; it is "the substance of things hoped for" (Heb. 11:1), already making the realities we desire exist within us in an inchoate manner. For this reason our faith consists in the divinity and humanity of Christ. "For I judged not myself to know anything among you, but Jesus Christ; and him crucified" (1 Cor. 2:2). In accord with this he discusses:

First, the knowledge of divinity.

Secondly, the knowledge of the mysteries of the humanity (3:19).

He reveals the knowledge of the divinity to them with the words: **that you may be able to comprehend, with all the saints.** . . . As though he said: Be strong in faith and charity for if you are, you will gain life eternal where you will enjoy God's presence and perfectly know him. It is evident from John 14 (21) that God reveals himself to one who loves: "He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father; and I will love him and will manifest myself to him." It is also clear that he shows himself to one who believes, as a variant reading of Isaias 7 (9) puts it: "Unless you believe, you will not understand."<sup>98</sup> You must be fortified by faith and charity in order that you might be able to comprehend.

It should be noted that sometimes **to comprehend** means "to enclose," and then it is necessary that the comprehending totally contains within itself what is comprehended. At other times it means "to apprehend," and then it affirms a remoteness or distance and yet implies proximity. No created intellect can comprehend God in the first manner. "Peradventure thou wilt comprehend the steps of God, and wilt find out the Almighty perfectly?" (Job 11:7). The answer implied is, No. For one could know him perfectly to the extent that [one knew all] that could be known about him. And this type of knowledge is not referred to in **that you may comprehend**, but rather the second kind. This latter is one of the three dowries,<sup>99</sup> and it is of it that the Apostle speaks here when he says **that you may comprehend**, meaning, that you may enjoy the presence of God and know him intimately. "Not as though I had already attained, or were already perfect; but I follow after, if I may by any means apprehend [*comprehendam*], wherein I am also apprehended by Christ Jesus" (Phil. 3:12). Such comprehension is common to all his saints; so he adds **with all the saints**. "This glory is to all his saints" (Ps. 149:9). "So run that you may apprehend [*comprehendatis*]" (1 Cor. 9:24\*).

Note that the words **what is the breadth and length and height and depth** seem to owe their origin to the passage in Job 11 (7-9). "Peradventure," he says, "thou wilt comprehend the steps of God?" As if he stated that God is incomprehensible. Then he gives the reason for this incomprehensibility by saying: "He is higher than the heaven, and what wilt thou do? He is deeper than hell, and how wilt thou know? The measure of him is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea." Yet from this it appears that Job, in attributing the four different dimensions to him, shows that he is comprehensible. Alluding to these words the Apostle asserts that **you may be able to comprehend what is the breadth and length and height and depth**; as though he said: May you possess sufficient faith and charity that you might comprehend him to the extent that he is able to be comprehended. Dionysius explains the text in this way.<sup>100</sup>

Under no pretext should these dimensions be conceived as physically applicable to God, "God is spirit" (Jn. 4:24). They are in God metaphorically. **Breadth** designates the dimension or extension of his power

and divine wisdom over all being. "And he poured her out," namely wisdom, "upon all his works" (Ecclus. 1:10). By **length** his eternal duration is signified: "But thou, O Lord, endurest forever" (Ps. 101:13), and "holiness becometh thy house, O Lord, unto length of days" (Ps. 92:5). **Height** or loftiness denotes the perfection and nobility of his nature which infinitely exceeds all creation: "The Lord is high above all nations: and his glory above the heavens" (Ps. 112:4). In **depth** the incomprehensibility of his wisdom is intimated: "It is a great depth," this divine wisdom, "who shall find it out?" (Eccl. 7:25). Clearly, therefore, the fulfillment of our faith and charity is to arrive at a perfect knowledge of the faith, by it we shall know, to the degree we can attain to it, the infinite extent of his power, the unbounded eternity of his duration, the loftiness of his most perfect nature, and the incomprehensibility and depth of his wisdom.

Next, since further knowledge is also necessary - a knowledge of the mysteries of the humanity - he goes on **to know also the charity of Christ**. For whatever occurred in the mystery of human redemption and Christ's incarnation was the work of love. He was born out of charity: "For his exceeding charity wherewith he loved us even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together in Christ" (Eph. 2:4-5). That he died also sprang from charity: "Greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (Jn. 15:13). And "Christ also hath loved us and hath delivered himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice to God" (Eph. 5:2). On this account St. Gregory exclaimed: "O the incalculable love of your charity! To redeem slaves you delivered up your Son."<sup>101</sup> It follows that to know Christ's love is to know all the mysteries of Christ's Incarnation and our Redemption. These have poured out from the immense charity of God; a charity exceeding every created intelligence and the [combined] knowledge of all of them because it cannot be grasped in thought. Thus he says **which surpasseth all natural knowledge** and every created intellect: "The peace of God, which surpasseth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 4:7). For **the charity of Christ** is [the manifestation of] what God the Father has accomplished through Christ: "God indeed was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself" (2 Cor. 5:19).

The other manner in which this passage (vv. 18-19) can be read is in reference to the perfection of our charity. As though he stated: Be strong, rooted and founded in charity, that **you may comprehend** - and not merely know - **with all the saints**; since this gift of charity is common to all, no one can be holy without charity, as the third chapter of Ephesians indicates.<sup>102</sup> **May you**, I say, **comprehend what is the breadth** of charity, extending, as it does, even to one's enemies: "Thy commandment is exceeding broad" (Ps. 118:96). For charity is broad in its diffusion: "And the Lord brought me forth into a broad place" (Ps. 17:20\*). Its **length** is seen in its durability, never stopping, it begins in this life and is perfected in glory: "Charity never falleth away" (1 Cor. 13:8), and "Many waters cannot quench charity" (Cant. 8:7). Its **height** is perceived in its motivation which is heavenly; God is not loved to obtain temporal advantages - which love would be sickly - but he is loved for his own sake alone. "Set thyself up on high and be glorious" (Job 40:5). **Depth** signifies the source of charity itself. For our love of God does not spring

from ourselves, but from the Holy Spirit, as Romans 5 (5) mentions: "The charity of God is poured forth in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost who is given to us." Hence, for one person to possess a love which is lasting, extensive, sublime and deep, while another person does not, arises out of the depth of divine predestination. And "who has measured the depth of the abyss?" (Ecclus. 1:2).

Thus **you may be able to comprehend**, in the sense of perfectly attaining to, **with all the saints, what is the breadth** with which your charity should extend even to enemies, and what is the **length** during which it never ceases, and its **height** in loving God for his own sake, and the **depth** of the divine predestination [from which it springs].

At this point it should be realized that it was within Christ's power to choose what type of death he wanted. And since he underwent death out of charity, he chose the death of the cross in which the aforesaid four dimensions are present. The cross-beam has **breadth** and to it his hands were nailed because through charity our good works ought to stretch out even to adversaries: "The Lord brought me forth into a broad place" (Ps. 17:20\*). The trunk of the cross has **length** against which the whole body leans since charity ought to be enduring, thus sustaining and saving man: "He that shall persevere unto the end, he shall be saved" (Mt. 10:22). The projection of wood [above the cross-beam], against which the head is thrown back, has **height** since our hope must rise toward the eternal and the divine: "The head of every man is Christ" (1 Cor. 11:3). The cross is braced by its **depth** which lies concealed beneath the ground; it is not seen because the depth of the divine love which sustains us is not visible insofar as the plans of predestination, as was said above, are beyond our intelligence.

In this manner we should comprehend the power of our love, and of Christ's, realizing that his surpasses human understanding. For no one could know how much Christ has loved us; nor can one know the charity of the knowledge of Christ, [that love] which is possessed with knowledge of Christ. I hold that such charity surpasses a love which is without knowledge.

Is it not correct that a charity with knowledge is more eminent than a charity without knowledge? It seems that it is not, for then a wicked theologian would have a charity of greater dignity than a holy old woman. I reply that what is discussed here is a knowledge which exerts its influence [on one's life and conduct]. For the force of the knowledge stimulates one to love more since the more God is known, so much the more is he loved. For this reason Augustine used to ask: "That I may know You and know myself."<sup>103</sup> Or, this is stated here on account of some who possess zeal for God "but not according to knowledge" (Rom. 10:2). A charity coupled with the above mentioned knowledge of Christ surpasses the love of such people.

Next he speaks of the efficacy of a knowledge of the divine. **That you may be filled unto all the fullness of God**, that is, that you might enjoy a perfect participation in all God's gifts. In other words, that you

might possess the fullness of the virtues here, and beatitude in the next life - charity accomplishes just that. "Come over to me, all ye that desire me, and be filled with my fruits" (Ecclus. 24-26).

After this, the Apostle gives thanks to God for hearing his prayer (v. 20). In reference to this he does three things:

First, he mentions the power of God with which he grants petitions.

Secondly, he gives an example of that power (3:20)

Thirdly, he mentions what prompts his thanksgiving (3:21).

He describes the infinite power of God, saying **Now to him**, meaning to Christ as God and God the Father, **who is able to do all things**: "Almighty is his name" (Ex. 15:3). "Now, to him that is able to establish you, according to my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ" (Rom. 16:25). He effects this within us **more abundantly than we** either would know how to ask for through **desire** or **understand** with our intelligence.

He gives an example of this profusion within us [of the divine power], saying **according to the power that worketh in us**. As if he had stated: It becomes apparent once we consider what he has wrought in us men. For the human mind and will could never imagine, understand or ask that God become man, and that man become God and a sharer in the divine nature. But he has done this in us by his power, and it was accomplished in the Incarnation of his Son. "That through this you may be made partakers of the divine nature" (2 Pet. 1:4\*). Concerning these matters Ecclesiasticus 18 (2-4) says: "Who is able to declare his works? For who shall search out his glorious acts? And who shall shew forth the power of his majesty? Or, who shall be able to declare his mercy?"

Or, **that worketh in us** Apostles, to whom he gave the grace of proclaiming the good news of "the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to enlighten all men, that they may see what is the dispensation of the mystery which hath been hidden from eternity in God" (Eph. 3:8).

The subject matter of the thanksgiving is the twofold blessing God has bestowed upon us. The first is the institution of the Church, and the second the Incarnation of his Son. Hence he says **to him**, God the Father, **be glory in the Church** for all he has done in the Church he established, **and in Christ**, that is, through Christ; or for Christ whom he gave to us. **To him**, I repeat, **be glory** that his glory might shine forth, not only now, but **unto all the generations of the age of ages**, meaning in the age which embraces all things.<sup>104</sup> "Now, to the King of ages, immortal, invisible, the only God, be honor and glory forever and ever. Amen" (1 Tim. 1:17).

# Chapter 4

## LECTURE 1

**1 I, therefore, a prisoner in the Lord, beseech you that you walk worthy of the vocation in which you are called; 2 with all humility and mildness, with patience, supporting one another in charity; 3 careful to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace; 4 one body and one spirit; as you are called in one hope of your calling.**

The Apostle recalled above the divine blessings through which the Church's unity has originated and been preserved (Ch. 1-3). Now he admonishes the Ephesians to remain within this ecclesial unity. Regarding this he does two things:

First, he exhorts them to persevere in unity.

Secondly, he instructs them how to remain in it (4:17).

The first section is again divided into two parts:

First, he cautions them to keep ecclesial unity.

Secondly, he sets forth the pattern of this Church unity (4:5ff.).

The first part has three divisions:

First, he offers certain incentives to maintain ecclesial unity.

Secondly, he sets down an admonition (4:2).

Thirdly, he shows the purpose of his admonition (4:3).

Three incentives are given for them to maintain the Church's unity. First is the devotedness of Paul's love, second is the remembrance of his chains, and third is the consideration of the divine favors.

The affection of his love is intimated by his entreaty **Therefore** because you have obtained so many blessings from the Lord, **I beseech you**. I do not command you even though I could; on account of my lowliness I do not command but plead with you. Proverbs 18 (23) remarks: "The poor will speak with supplications." Charity is another reason [for such a procedure], it prompts men to action more than fear: "Wherefore, though I have much confidence in Christ Jesus to command thee that which is to the purpose, for charity's sake I rather beseech" (Phm. 1:8). He stirs them by recalling his chains: **I, a prisoner in the Lord**. With these words he urges them to remain united, giving them three motives. First, a friend sympathizes with a suffering friend and more readily tries to fulfill his wishes so that he might thereby



console him. "A friend shall not be known in prosperity, and an enemy shall not be hidden in adversity. In the prosperity of a man, his enemies are grieved; and a friend is known in his adversity" (Ecclus. 12:8-9).

Secondly, the Apostle himself suffers imprisonment for their own utility. Hence he urges them to remember this, as though he wanted to put them under certain obligations. "Now, whether we be in tribulation, it is for your exhortation and salvation; or whether we be comforted, it is for your consolation; or whether we be exhorted, it is for your exhortation and salvation, which worketh the enduring of the same sufferings which we also suffer" (2 Cor. 1:6).

Thirdly, as was mentioned previously in Chapter Three (v. 13) where he writes "my tribulations for you, which is your glory," these sufferings were for the Ephesians' own immense glory. For God exposed his own chosen friends to adversities in behalf of their salvation. Therefore he adds **in the Lord** which means, on account of the Lord. Or, he annexes **in the Lord** since it was the Apostle's glory to be imprisoned, not as a thief or murderer, but as a Christian and for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ, in accordance with Ezechiel 3 (25): "And thou, O son of man, behold, they shall put bands upon thee, and they shall bind thee with them: and thou shalt not go forth from the midst of them."

He also stimulates them by a consideration of the divine blessings: **that you walk worthy of the vocation in which you are called**. You should be attentive to the dignity to which you are summoned, you ought to behave in a way conformable to it. If someone had been chosen to a rank of nobility in a kingdom, it would be an indignity for him to perform peasant work. Hence the Apostle warns the Ephesians, as though he said: You are called to be fellow citizens with the saints of God's household (cf. Eph. 2:19), henceforth it is unworthy of you to engage in earthly affairs or worry about worldly matters.<sup>105</sup> "You should walk worthy of God, in all things pleasing" (Col. 1:10\*); "let your conversation be worthy of the gospel of Christ" (Phil. 1:27). And why? Because "he hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light" (1 Pet. 2:9).

Subsequently, when he says **with all humility and mildness, with patience, supporting one another in charity**, he expresses the way [to fulfill] his admonition, teaching them how they can behave in a worthy manner. Four virtues must be cultivated, and their four opposite vices shunned.

The first vice which he rejects is pride. When one arrogant person decides to rule others, while the other proud individuals do not want to submit, dissension arises in the society and peace disappears. Whence Proverbs 13 (10): "Among the proud there are always contentions." To eliminate this he says **with all** interior and exterior **humility**. "The greater thou art, the more humble thyself in all things: and thou shalt find grace before God" (Ecclus. 3:20); "let nothing be done through contention, neither by vain glory; but in humility, let each esteem others better than themselves" (Phil. 2:3). "God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble" (Jas. 4:6).

Anger is the second vice. For an angry person is inclined to inflict injury, whether verbal or physical, from which disturbances occur. "A passionate man stirreth up strifes: he that is patient appeaseth those who are stirred up" (Prov. 15:18). To discard it he says **with all mildness**; this softens arguments and preserves peace. "To the meek he will give grace" (Prov. 3:34); "The meek shall inherit the land" (Ps. 36:11). "My son, do thy works in meekness: and thou shalt be beloved above the glory of men" (Ecclus. 3:19).

The third is impatience. Occasionally, someone who himself is humble and meek, refraining from causing trouble, nevertheless will not endure patiently the real or attempted wrongs done to himself. Therefore, he adds **with patience** in adversities. "Patience hath a perfect work" (Jas. 1:4), "in thy humiliation keep patience" (Ecclus. 2:4). "For patience is necessary for you; that, doing the will of God, you may receive the promise" (Heb. 10:36).

An inordinate zeal is the fourth vice. Inordinately zealous about everything, men will pass judgment on whatever they see. Not waiting for the proper time and place [to voice their criticisms], a turmoil arises in society. "If you bite and devour one another, take heed that you be not consumed one of another" (Gal. 5:15). Hence he says **supporting one another in charity**; mutually bearing with the defects of others out of charity. When someone falls he should not be immediately corrected - unless it is the time and the place for it. With mercy these should be waited for since "charity beareth all things" (1 Cor. 13:7). Not that these failings are tolerated out of negligence or consent, nor from familiarity or carnal friendship, but from charity. "Bear ye one another's burdens; and so you shall fulfill the law of Christ" (Gal. 6:2). "Now, we that are stronger ought to bear the infirmities of the weak" (Rom. 15:1).

After this he shows the purpose of his admonition which is to maintain unity among the faithful. Three points are made:

First, he sets forth the unity itself which is the goal (4:3a).

Secondly, he describes how the unity is kept (4:3b-4a).

Thirdly, he expresses the reason for preserving this unity (4:4b).

First of all he remarks: You ought to walk worthy of your calling and be **careful to keep the unity of the spirit**. Two types of unity exist. One whose purpose is to commit evil; it is wicked and might be called a unity of the flesh. "Of one spark cometh a great fire, and of one deceitful man much blood" (Ecclus. 11:34). The other is a unity of the spirit; it is good and its purpose is to do good. "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!" (Ps. 132:1). "That they may be one, as we also are" (Jn. 17:11).

The way to continue in this unity is through **the bond of peace**. For charity is a union of souls. Now the fusion of material objects cannot last unless it is held by some bond. Similarly, the union of souls through love will not endure unless it is bound. Peace proves to be a true bond; that peace which is, according to Augustine, the balanced harmony between the measure, form, and order of a thing.<sup>106</sup> This is achieved when each possesses what is proper to himself. For this reason he says **in the bond of peace**. "God hath placed peace in thy borders" (Ps. 147:14). Peace in its turn is maintained by justice: "And the work of justice shall be peace" (Is. 32:17). "Be not grieved with her bands" (Ecclus. 6:26). Why? Because "in her is the beauty of life: and her bands are a healthful binding" (*ibid.* v. 31).

Now in man there is a twofold unity. The first is the ordered structure of the organs among themselves, the second is the union of the body and the soul constituting what neither are separately.<sup>107</sup> Because the Apostle speaks of the Church's unity after the fashion of the unity found in man, he adds **one body** as if to say: Be united in the bond of peace that you may be one body - this regards the first type of unity - all the faithful should be ordered among themselves as members making up a single body. "We, being many, are one body in Christ; and every one members one of another" (Rom. 12:5). **And one spirit** - referring to the second [type of unity in man] - that you might possess a spiritual consensus through the unity of your faith and charity.

Or: **one body** designates a unity with other men, and **one spirit** union with God; because "he who is joined to the Lord is one spirit" (1 Cor. 6:17).

Next, when he says **as you are called in one hope of your calling** he points out the reason for this unity. We notice that when persons are called together to possess something in common and mutually enjoy it, they usually live and travel together. Thus, in a spiritual way he says: Because you are called to one and the same reality, namely, the final reward, you ought to walk together with a unity of spirit **in the one hope of your calling**, tending toward the one reality you hope for as a result of your vocation.<sup>108</sup>

"Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly vocation" (Heb. 3:1), "consider your vocation" (1 Cor. 1:26\*). If anyone asks: Who will call us? And to what? 1 Peter 5 (10) replies: "The God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory in Christ Jesus" where your true happiness is. "Blessed are they that are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb" (Apoc. 19:9).

## LECTURE 2

**5 One Lord, one faith, one baptism; 6 one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all and in us all.**

After he has exhorted them to secure ecclesial unity (4:1), the Apostle offers the Ephesians, in this section, a glimpse of this unity's pattern. Since the Church is likened to a city, it is one and distinct, although this unity is not uncomposed but composed of different parts. Thus the Apostle does two things:

First, he shows what is common in the Church.

Secondly, he shows what is distinctive [to each member] in her (4:7).

The solidarity of any city demands the presence of four common elements: one governor, one law, the same symbols, and a common goal. The Apostle affirms that these are present in the Church also.

Hence, he says: You ought to have one body and one spirit since you belong to the one unified Church. First, she has one leader, Christ. Obeying **one Lord**, not many, conflicts do not arise from trying to comply with divergent commands. For Hebrews 3 (6) states: "Christ [is] as the Son in his own house." "Therefore let all the house of Israel know most certainly that God hath made both Lord and Christ, this same Jesus, whom you have crucified" (Ac. 2:36). "There be lords many; yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things . . . and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things" (1 Cor. 8:5-6). "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth. In that day there shall be one Lord, and his name shall be one" (Zach. 14:9).

Secondly, her law is one. For the law of the Church is the law of faith: "Where then is thy boasting? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? No, but by the law of faith" (Rom. 3:27). **Faith** is sometimes applied to the reality believed in, as with "This is the Catholic faith . . ." <sup>109</sup> meaning this is what must be believed. At other times, **faith** refers to the habit of faith by which a man believes what he must in his very heart. **Faith** in both these senses can be called one.

In the former, **one faith** would mean that you are bidden to believe in the same truths and live in the same moral way. For what is believed by all the faithful is one and the same reality, hence [their faith] is termed Catholic or Universal. "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak," that is, think, "the same thing and that there be no schisms among you; but that you be perfect in the same mind and in the same judgment" (1 Cor. 1:10). In the second way, **one faith** designates the unity of the habit of faith by which all believe. I mean that it is specifically one - not numerically one - since the same faith is present in each one's heart; just as when many persons want the same thing, they are said to be of one will.

Thirdly, the Church shares the same symbols. They are Christ's sacraments, of which baptism is the first and the entrance to the rest. Hence he says **one baptism**. Three reasons account for this unity. First, baptisms do not differ by reason of who administers them. No matter who performs the rites they possess an unvaried power because he who baptizes interiorly is one, namely, Christ. "He upon whom thou shalt

see the Spirit descending and remaining upon him, he it is that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost" (Jn. 1:33). Second, baptism is one since it is conferred in the name of the one Triune God: "baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" (Mt. 28:19). The third reason is that it cannot be repeated. The sacraments of penance, matrimony, the eucharist and last anointing may be repeated, but not baptism. "For it is impossible for those who were once illuminated," by baptism, "have tasted also the heavenly gift and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, have moreover tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, and are fallen away," through sins, "to be renewed again to penance" (Heb. 6:4-6). It is not repeated, either by reason of the sacramental character [it imparts], or because its cause is not repeated: "For we are buried together with him by baptism into death; that, as Christ is risen from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also may walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6:4). And Christ died but once as 1 Peter 3 (18) affirms.

Fourthly, the Church has the same goal, God. The Son leads us to the Father: "when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God and the Father; when he shall have brought to naught all principality and power and virtue" (1 Cor. 15:24). In reference to this the Apostle adds **one God and Father of all**:

First, he mentions his unity.

Secondly, his dignity (4:6b).

Regarding the first he has two remarks. One pertains to the Divine Nature, he says there is **one God**: "Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord" (Deut. 6:4). The other has to do with his kindness to us and our piety; whence he says **Father of all**: "Thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer: from everlasting is thy name" (Is. 63:16); "Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created us?" (Mal. 2:10).

He extols God's dignity on three scores. The Divine Majesty **who is above all**: "The Lord is high above all nations; and his glory above the heavens" (Ps. 112:4). His power which extends **through all** [that exists]: "Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord?" (Jer. 23:24). "Thou hast subjected all things under his feet" (Ps. 8:8). "All things are delivered to me" (Lk. 10:22) since "all things were made by him" (Jn. 1:3). Wisdom 11 (21) indicates how this is accomplished: "Thou hast ordered all things in measure, and number, and weight. For great power always belonged to thee alone: and who shall resist the strength of thy arm?" Finally, there is the abundance of his grace **in us all**: "Thou, O Lord, art among us, and thy name is called upon by us" (Jer. 14:9).

Majesty is appropriated to the Father who is the source and principle in the Divinity, exceeding the whole of creation. Power is appropriated to the Son who is that wisdom which "reacheth from end to end mightily" (Wis. 8:1). Grace is appropriated to the Holy Spirit who "hath filled the whole world" (Wis. 1:7).<sup>110</sup>

### LECTURE 3

**7 But to every one of us is given grace, according to the measure of the giving of Christ. 8 Wherefore he saith: Ascending on high, he led captivity captive; he gave gifts to men. 9 Now, that he ascended, what is it, but because he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? 10 He that descended is the same also that ascended above all the heavens, that he might fill all things.**

Previously the Apostle dealt with ecclesial unity in the perspective of what is common within the Church (4:5), now he manifests this same [unity] from the viewpoint of what is personal and specific to each of the faithful members of the Church. Concerning this he makes three points:

First, he points out the fact of distinctions.

Secondly, he introduces a [Scriptural] authority for them (4:8).<sup>111</sup>

Thirdly, he explains this authoritative quotation (4:9).

He states: We have in the Church one God, one faith, one baptism. Nonetheless, each of us has the diverse graces especially granted to him - **to every one of us is given grace**. As though he said: None of us lack a share in divine grace and communion, "of his fullness we all have received; and grace for grace" (Jn. 1:16). This grace, however, is certainly not bestowed on everyone uniformly and equally but **according to the measure of the giving of Christ**. Christ is the donor who metes out the grace to each, who have "different gifts according to the grace that is given us" (Rom. 12:6).

The variation does not spring from fate or chance, nor from a difference of merit, but from the giving of Christ; that is, according as Christ allots it to us. Only he has received the Spirit without measure (cf. Jn. 3:34); the rest of the saints obtain it in a limited degree, "according as God hath divided to every one the measure of faith" (Rom. 12:3). "And every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labor" (1 Cor. 3:8). Again, "to one he gave five talents, and to another two, and to another one, to every one according to his proper ability" (Mt. 25:15). Just as it is in Christ's power to give or not, so he can grant more or less.

**Wherefore he saith** (v. 8) introduces an authoritative text from Psalm 67 (19) supporting **according to the measure of the giving of Christ**. Three points are made. First, it speaks of Christ's ascension; secondly, of mankind's liberation; thirdly, of the bestowal of spiritual gifts. Each of these will follow in order.

He refers to the ascension saying: **Wherefore** to signify this the prophet David **saith** in Psalm 67: **ascending on high . . .** "For he shall go up that shall open the way before them. They shall divide and pass through the gate and shall come in by it: and their king shall pass before them, and the Lord at the head of them" (Mic. 2:13). Christ "setteth up his wings on high" (Job 39:18). He ascends, I say, but not alone. **He led captivity captive**, that is, those whom the devil had captured. For the human race was imprisoned;

the saints who had died in love, and so merited eternal glory, were held like prisoners by the devil in limbo. "My people led away captive because they had not knowledge" (Is. 5:13). Christ liberated these prisoners and brought them with himself to heaven. "Shall the prey be taken from the strong? Or can that which was taken by the mighty be delivered? For thus saith the Lord: Yea verily. Even the captivity shall be taken

away from the strong: and that which was taken by the mighty shall be delivered" (Is. 49:24-25).

Indeed, this is not only true of those already dead; it also applies to the living. Held under sin's bondage, Christ made men the slaves of justice in delivering them from sin, as Romans 6 (18) phrases it. Thus in some way he led men captive not unto destruction but salvation. "From henceforth thou shalt catch men" (Lk. 5:10).

Besides grasping men from a diabolical slavery and placing them in his own service, he has enriched them spiritually. Hence he adds **he gave gifts** of grace and glory **to men**. "For God loveth mercy and truth; the Lord will give grace and glory" (Ps. 83:12). "By whom he hath given us most great and precious promises, that by these you may be made partakers of the divine nature" (2 Pet. 1:4). This version [of Ps. 67:19] does not contradict the reading which has "Thou hast received gifts in men."<sup>112</sup> Clearly, he as God bestows the gifts which he as man receives in the faithful who are his members. In heaven he gives, since he is God, while on earth he accepts what is given in the manner Matthew 25 (40) describes: "As long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me."

Next he comments on the authority:

First, in reference to the ascension.

Secondly, regarding what is given men (4:11).

He does two things concerning the first:

First, he shows how he descended.

Secondly, how he ascended (4:10).

In reflecting upon the first point, it appears improper for Christ, who is true God, to lower himself, since nothing is more eminent than God. To remove any doubts on this score the Apostle asserts, **Now, that he ascended, what is it, but because he also descended first**. As if he would say: For this reason do I first mention that he ascended and only afterward that he descended; he descended in order that he might ascend. For otherwise he could not have ascended.

How he descended is shown in **into the lower parts of the earth**, which can be interpreted in two ways. In one, the lower regions are understood as those parts of the earth we inhabit. It is lower than the heavens and the atmosphere. The Son of God came down to these sections of the earth, not by any local movement, but by assuming a lowly, terrestrial nature; according to that text of Philippians 2 (7): "He emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men, and in habit found as a man." In the second way it can be understood as referring to hell, which is even below us. He descended thither in his soul that he might free the saints from it. This seems to agree with the **he led captivity captive** above. "Thou also, by the blood of thy testament, hast sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water" (Zach. 9:11). "I saw another mighty angel come down from heaven" (Apoc. 10:1) "I have seen the affliction of my people in Egypt, and I have heard their cry . . . And knowing their sorrow, I am come down to deliver them" (Ex. 3:7-8).

Next (v. 10), three aspects of the ascension are discussed. First, **He that descended is the same also that ascended** indicates the person who ascends. It affirms the unity of person [in the two natures of Christ], the divine and the human.<sup>113</sup> For he who descended, as was said, is the Son of God taking on human nature. He who ascends is the Son of man, raising human nature to the preeminence of immortal life. Thus the Son of God who descended and the Son of man who ascended are identical: "And no man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended from heaven, the Son of man who is in heaven" (Jn. 3:13). Notice too how the humble who voluntarily lower themselves, spiritually ascend to the grandeur of God: "he that humbleth himself shall be exalted" (Lk. 14:11).

Secondly, **above all the heavens** denotes the destination of the ascension. "He mounteth above the heaven of heavens, to the east" (Ps. 67:34). This should not be understood simply in reference to an ascension above the physical heavens, it also refers to every spiritual creature. God has set Christ "on his right hand in the heavenly places. Above all principality and power and virtue and dominion and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come" (Eph 1:20-21).

Thirdly, the fruitful outcome of the ascension is **that he might fill all things**, bestowing on every race of men the fullness of spiritual gifts. "We shall be filled with the good things of thy house" (Ps. 64:5); "Come over to me, all ye that desire me, and be filled with my fruits" (Ecclus. 24:26). Or, **that he might fulfill**, that is, put into effect **all things** written concerning himself: "all things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses and in the prophets and in the psalms, concerning me" (Lk. 24:44).



## LECTURE 4

**11 And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors; 12 for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; 13 until we all meet into the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ.**

Here the Apostle expounds what was mentioned earlier (4:9) about the bestowal of gifts. Concerning this he makes two points:

First, he shows that the Lord has imparted a variety of gifts on each of the faithful.

Secondly, he indicates the utility and fruitfulness of these gifts (4:13).

The many different states and functions in the Church are designated as the gifts of Christ. Consider how, among the gifts of Christ, the Apostles are conceded the first place: **And he gave some Apostles**. "And he chose twelve of them whom also he named apostles" (Lk. 6:13). "God indeed hath set some in the church; first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly doctors; after that miracles . . ." (1 Cor. 12:28).

Apostles are put first because they had a privileged share in all of Christ's gifts. They possessed a plenitude of grace and wisdom regarding the revelation of divine mysteries. Christ "opened their understanding that they might understand the scriptures" (Lk. 24:45). "To you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God" (Mk. 4:11). "Because all things, whatsoever I have heard of my Father, I have made known to you" (Jn. 15:15). They also possessed an ample ability to speak convincingly in order to proclaim the gospel. "I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to resist and gainsay" (Lk. 21:15). "Go ye unto the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature" (Mk. 16:15). Moreover, they also had an exceptional authority and power for looking after the Lord's flock. "Feed my sheep" (Jn. 21:17). "For if also I should boast somewhat more of our power, which the Lord hath given us unto edification and not for your destruction, I should not be ashamed" (2 Cor. 10:8).

Therefore, the Apostle adds three ecclesiastical categories according as they share in each of the foregoing. Related to the revelation of divine mysteries he annexes **and some prophets** who foretold the incarnation of Christ. Of them 1 Peter 1 (10\*) declares: "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and diligently searched, who prophesied of the glory to come in you." "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John" (Mt. 11:13). But after Christ came, the apostles became the prophets of the joy of

the life to come. "Blessed is he that readeth and heareth the words of this prophecy, and keepeth those things which are written in it; for the time is at hand" (Apoc. 1:3). They also became the interpreters of what the ancient prophets had foretold. "Be zealous for spiritual gifts; but rather that you may prophesy" (1 Cor. 14:1). "Behold I send to you prophets and wise men and scribes; and some of them you will put to death" (Mt. 23:34).

Relative to the proclamation of the gospel he adds **some evangelists**. They had the duty of preaching the good news, and even of writing it down although they were not among the principal apostles. "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, of them that bring glad tidings of good things!" (Rom. 10:15). "To Jerusalem I will give an evangelist" (Is. 41:27).

In reference to the care of the Church he says **some pastors** who are responsible for the Lord's flock. Under the same heading he adds **and doctors** to bring out how the pastor's specific task in the Church is to instruct the people in what pertains to faith and good conduct. The administration of temporalities does not belong to bishops, who are the successors of the Apostles, but rather to deacons. "It is not reasonable that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables" (Ac. 6:2). "Embracing that faithful word which is according to doctrine, that he may be able to exhort in sound doctrine" (Tit. 1:9). The words of Jeremias 3 (15) apply to bishops: "I will give you pastors according to my own heart, and they shall feed you with knowledge and doctrine."

Next (v. 12), he discloses the fruitful results of these gifts or functions. Concerning this he does two things:

First, he speaks of their fruit.

Secondly, he explains how the faithful may attain to this fruit (4:14).

The first section has two divisions also:

First, he sets down their immediate result.

Secondly, their ultimate fruit (4:13).

The proximate effects of the above mentioned gifts or functions are threefold. First, consider those who are placed in these functions; spiritual gifts are communicated to them that they might be at the service of God and their fellow man. Thus he states **for the work of the ministry** which offers honor to God and salvation to one's fellow men. "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ and the dispensers of the mysteries of God" (1 Cor. 4:1). "You shall be called the priests of the Lord; to you it shall be said: Ye ministers of our God" (Is. 61:6).

Secondly, consider the perfection of those who already believe; so he says **for the perfecting of the saints**, that is, of those already sanctified through faith in Christ. Prelates must be especially anxious to lead those entrusted to them toward the state of perfection. This is why Dionysius claims, in his *Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*,<sup>114</sup> that they are to be all the more perfect. "Wherefore, leaving the word of the beginning of Christ, let us go on to things more perfect; not laying again the foundation of penance from dead works and of faith towards God" (Heb. 6:1). "The consumption abridged shall overflow with justice. For the Lord God of hosts shall make a consumption, and an abridgment in the midst of all the land" (Is. 10:22).<sup>115</sup>

A third [immediate effect] is the conversion of the unbelievers. About this he states **for the edifying of the body of Christ**. When the infidels are converted, Christ's Church - which is his body - is built up. Whoever preaches "speaketh to men unto edification and exhortation and comfort" (1 Cor. 14:3). "For greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues; unless perhaps he interpret, that the church may receive edification . . . So you also, forasmuch as you are zealous of spirits, seek to abound unto the edifying of the church" (1 Cor. 14:5, 12).<sup>116</sup>

He goes on (v. 13) to discuss the ultimate fruit [of the Church's preaching] which can be understood in two ways. One sees it as touching on the absolutely ultimate effect: the resurrection of the saints. In this perspective two facts are asserted. First is the spiritual and corporeal convergence [*congregatio*] of all who have risen. The physical convergence will consist in this, that all the saints will be drawn together toward Christ: "Whosoever the body shall be, there shall the eagles also be gathered together" (Mt. 24:28).<sup>117</sup> Concerning this he says **until we all meet**, as if to say: The above ministry, the perfecting of the saints, and the edifying of the Church will continue until we all meet Christ in the resurrection. "Behold, the bridegroom cometh. Go ye forth to meet him" (Mt. 25:6). "Be prepared to meet thy God, O Israel" (Am. 4:12). We shall meet one another also: "We who are alive, who are left, shall be taken up together with them [those who have died] in the clouds to meet Christ" (1 Thess. 4:16). "If by any means I may attain to the resurrection which is from the dead" (Phil. 3:11).

The spiritual convergence, however, is seen in relation to our merits, which is according to the same faith; regarding this he says **into the unity of faith**. There is only "one Lord, one faith" (Eph. 4:5). Again he said earlier: "Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:3). **The knowledge of the Son of God** is the reward, it consists in the perfect vision and knowledge of God of which 1 Corinthians 13 (12) speaks: "Then shall I know even as I am known." "And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying: Know the Lord; for all shall know me from the least of them even to the greatest" (Jer. 31:34).

Secondly, he discusses the aforementioned fruit in respect to the perfection of those who rise. He relates first of all the perfection itself when he says **unto a perfect man**. This should not be understood as

though women will be changed into men at the resurrection - some have misread it in such a fashion. Both sexes will remain, though sexual intercourse will no longer occur, as our Lord indicates in Matthew 22 (30): "For in the resurrection they shall neither marry nor be married, but shall be as the angels of God in heaven." [They will remain as a witness] to the perfection of nature, and for the glory of God who created such a nature. The **perfect man** designates the complete and total perfection of that state. "When that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away" (1 Cor. 13:10). Thus **man** is used here rather in contradistinction to boy than as the opposite of woman.

He describes, in the second place, the exemplar of this perfection when he says **unto the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ**. Consider how the true physical body of Christ is the exemplar of his mystical body. Both are made up of many members joined into a unified whole. Now the physical body of Christ grew to the mature and robust age of thirty-three years before he died. Therefore, the age of the risen saints, who will experience neither imperfection nor the failings of old age, will correspond to that mature age. "He will reform the body of our lowliness, made like to the body of his glory" (Phil. 3:21).

In another way [this passage, v. 13] can be understood as referring to the ultimate fruit [of the Church's ministry] in the present life. This will happen when all the faithful come to her in **the unity of faith** and the **knowledge** of the truth. "And other sheep I have that are not of this fold; them also I must bring. And they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd" (Jn. 10:16). In this the mystical body is perfected spiritually in a manner similar to [the physical perfection of] Christ's natural body. In this perspective, the whole body of the Church is termed a manly body, following the metaphor used by the Apostle in Galatians 4 (1): "Now, I say: As long as the heir is a child, he differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all."<sup>118</sup>

## LECTURE 5

**14 That henceforth we be no more children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive; 15 but, doing the truth in charity, we may in all things grow up in him who is the head, even Christ; 16 from whom the whole body, being compacted and fitly joined together, by what every joint supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in charity.**

Having spoken of the diversity of spiritual gifts and their fruit (4:12), now the Apostle describes how we attain to that fruit. Concerning this he does two things:

First, he removes two obstacles.

Secondly, he teaches the way of gaining access to them (4:15).

It was stated well, he says, that the ultimate fruit of these gifts is for us to meet the Lord as a "Perfect man unto the measure of the age of Christ." We are obliged **henceforth** to cease being **children** and become mature men; for as long as a person is a boy he is not a perfect man. Whoever is to meet the Lord must leave his childhood behind. The Apostle did just that: "When I became a man, I put away the things of a child" (1 Cor. 13:11). It is a quality of the child never to be fixed or determinate in anything, he rather believes whatever is told him. To act like grown men we have to abandon a fickle oscillation and instability in our judgments. "Do not become children mentally; in malice be children but in your mind be mature" (1 Cor. 14:20\*). Those who waver are called such from the word "wave"; like a wave **tossed to and fro** they are not firm in the faith. "He that wavereth is like a wave of the sea, which is moved and carried about by the wind" (Jas. 1:6). But now it is imperative for us to stand firm and not fluctuate.

Evil teachings are like the wind Proverbs 25 (23\*) speaks of with merit: "The north wind brings forth rain." "And the rain fell, and the floods came and the winds blew; and they beat upon that house. And it fell; and great was the fall thereof" (Mt. 7:27). Hence he warns against being carried about with every wind of doctrine. As though he said: We must not be shaken by these wicked doctrines that buff about seeking to agitate hearts and ruin spiritual accomplishments. Three qualities demonstrate that it is not good doctrine.

First, its source is **from the wickedness of men**. Not being sound doctrine, but false and wicked, someone will concoct dogmas out of it in order to wield dominion over others, even though souls are lost. Such were the teachings of that most wicked Arius whose abdomen burst asunder [at his death].<sup>119</sup> He could be made the subject of a discourse on Ecclesiasticus 31 (29\*) "The testimony of his wickedness is true." Second, its methods are **by cunning craftiness** to mean one thing and pretend to hold some other opinion. On this account the Apostle wrote the Corinthians: "I fear lest, as the serpent seduced Eve by his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted and fall from the simplicity that is in Christ" (2 Cor. 11:3). Third, this is also evident from its effects, for such doctrine **lies in wait to deceive**. Its teachers seduce and lie in wait, not to rob money or temporal goods, but to spread errors. "Evil men and seducers shall grow worse and worse; erring, and driving into error" (2 Tim. 3:13).

Having pointed out the impediments [of immaturity and erroneous doctrine] which prevent one from acquiring the fruit of spiritual gifts, he discloses here how that fruit can be attained. He argues this way: It was said just now that to obtain the fruit of these spiritual gifts we must stop being children and grow up into mature adults. As long as we are childish we have not reached a mature state, neither do we grow. Hence, it is necessary for us to grow up. This is what he says about **doing the truth in charity** where he makes two points:

First, in what areas we ought to grow up.

Secondly, through whom [we are to grow] (4:15b).

With respect to the first he states **doing the truth in charity we may grow up** in good works and the form of good works, which two are truth and charity.<sup>120</sup> Any good work is at times referred to as truth, for instance, Tobias 1 (2): "Even in his captivity he forsook not the way of truth." Let us, therefore, do the truth, namely, every good work. Or, put true doctrine into practice since it is not enough simply to bear or teach the truth, it must be acted on as well. Thus the Apostle counsels Timothy: "Take heed to thyself and to doctrine; be earnest in them. For in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee" (1 Tim. 4:16). "Be ye doers of the word and not hearers only" (Jas. 1:22) since "doers shall be justified" (Rom. 2:13). That is, if they act out of charity, the form of good works. "Do manfully and be strengthened. Let all your actions be done in charity" (1 Cor. 16:13-14); otherwise they will be useless: "If I should distribute all my goods to feed the poor, and if I should deliver my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing" (1 Cor. 13:3).

Because not to make progress in the approach to God is itself a retrogression, the Apostle adds that **we may grow up in him**, (v. 15b) where he states three points by explaining:

First, the author of our development.

Secondly, the truth about him (4:16a).

Thirdly, the manner of the development (4:16b)

He asks that **we may grow up in him**, namely, in Christ, of whom 1 Peter 2 (2\*) declares: "In him may you grow unto salvation." **In him**, I repeat, **who is the head**, Christ, and in the Church which is his body (cf. Col. 1:24). Let us increase, not in wealth as was said of Job that "his possession hath increased on the earth" (Job 1:10), but in spiritual goods. Nor in one area only, but **in all things**, that is, being fruitful and increasing in every good. "Whatsoever else you do, do all to the glory of God . . . As I also in all things please all men" (1 Cor. 10:31, 33). The Apostle commends the Corinthians on this score: "Now, I praise you, brethren, that in all things you are mindful of me and keep my ordinances as I have delivered them to you" (1 Cor. 11:2).

Next (v. 16b), he speaks about the truth of Christ through whom we ought to grow. Three points concerning an organic body are to be kept in mind: its organs are interrelated, they are bound together by tendons, each member serves the rest. "If the foot should say: because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear should say: because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were the eye, where would be the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where would be the smelling?" (1 Cor. 12:15-17). Therefore, one body is composed

of many members in these three ways: through its structured whole or unity, through its connective bindings, and through its reciprocal actions and assistance just as all these actions of interrelating organs, the connecting of tendons, and movements take their initiative from the body's head, so the spiritual counterparts of these flow from Christ, our head, into his body, the Church.

First, there is a structured unity through faith. Whence he says **from** Christ who is our head, as was already mentioned, **the whole body, being compacted** is joined together in a unity. "He will gather together the dispersed of Israel" (Ps. 146:2). "He will gather together unto him all nations, and heap together unto him all people" (Hab. 2:5). Christ is "the head, from which the whole body, by joints and bands, being supplied with nourishment and compacted, groweth unto the increase of God" (Col. 2:19).

Second, a connecting and binding force emanates from Christ, the head, into his body, the Church, since whatever is united must be held together or bound by some nexus or bond. On this account he says **fifty joined together, by what every joint supplieth**, that is, through the faith and charity which unite and knit the members of the mystical body to one another for their mutual support. "All the works of the Lord are good: and he will furnish every work in due time" (Ecclus. 39:39). Thus the Apostle himself, confident of this mutual being-of-service which reigns among the members of the Church due to the divine unifying action, had said: "I know that this shall happen to me unto salvation, through your prayer and the assistance of the Spirit of Jesus Christ" (Phil. 1:19\*).

Third, from Christ the head there is infused into his members the power to act in order that they may grow spiritually. For this reason he states **according to the operation in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body**. As if he said: Not only is the structured unity of the members of the Church through faith, and their connection or being joined together through the mutual service of charity, from Christ the head. Indeed, from him comes the actual operation or movements of the members needed for action, and this according to the measure and competency of each member. Thus he asserts that Christ accomplishes **the increase of the body according to the operation and in the due measure of every part**. Therefore, the body not only grows through the faith which compacts it into a structured whole and through charity's mutual assistance, but also through the actual binding force which flows out from each member according to the degree of grace given him; and also through the actual impulse to act which God effects in us.<sup>121</sup> "Thou hast wrought all our works for us" (Is. 26:12). He is the "same God who worketh all in all" (1 Cor. 12:6). This interpretation accords with that of the Glossator.<sup>122</sup>

But why does God make each member grow? To build up the body. "In whom all the building, being framed together, groweth up into an holy temple in the Lord. In whom you also are built together into an habitation of God in the Spirit" (Eph. 2:21-22). So 1 Corinthians 3 (9) affirms that "you are God's building." All this occurs **in the charity** of which it is said that "charity edifieth" (1 Cor. 8:1). Or, **in**

**charity** refers to the purely gratuitous love with which God accomplishes all this. "Yea, I have loved thee with an everlasting love: therefore have I drawn thee, taking pity on thee. And I will build thee again, and thou shalt be built" (Jer. 31:3-4). This is what he states in **unto the edifying of itself in charity**.

## LECTURE 6

**17 This then I say and testify in the Lord: that henceforward you walk not as also the Gentiles walk in the vanity of their mind, 18 having their understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them because of the blindness of their hearts, 19 who, despairing, have given themselves up to lasciviousness unto the working of all uncleanness, unto covetousness.**

The Apostle previously admonished the Ephesians to persevere in ecclesial unity by describing to them its quality and pattern (4:1). In the part that follows he teaches them the way to remain within the Church's unity. Regarding this he does two things:

First, he gives them precepts by which they can remain in ecclesial unity.<sup>123</sup>

Secondly, near the end of the Letter (6:10) he shows them where they can find the strength to fulfill these commands.

The first section has two parts:

First, he sets down precepts for everyone.

Secondly, he adds certain ones pertaining to particular classes within the Church (5:22).

The first contains two divisions:

First, he expresses certain general precepts to which all the others can be reduced.

Secondly, he treats of particular ones (4:25).

Again, the first section has two parts. Since the Apostles' intention is to draw them away from their old customs to embrace Christ's new teaching:

First, he demonstrates how the doctrine of Christ is just the opposite of the old pagan perversity.

Secondly, he offers them incentives to leave it behind and adopt the way of Christ (4:22).



The first of these has two sections:

First, he describes the pagans' way of life.

Secondly, he shows that Christ's teaching is contrary to it (4:20).

The first part has three divisions:

First, he exhorts them to reject the pagan way of life.

Secondly, he describes it in reference to the pagan's inner mind (4:18).

Thirdly, he does so in reference to his external way of acting (4:19).

That you will be able to carry out, he says, what I have spoken of above, **I say**, not beseeching you as previously, rather **I say and testify** to what I have asserted. I testify again to every man circumcising himself that he is a debtor to the whole law" (Gal. 5:3). "I charge thee, before God and Jesus Christ, who shall judge the living and the dead . . ." (2 Tim. 4:1). And what [does he bear witness to here]? **That henceforward**, from the moment you believed and were converted to Christ, since you "are [now] clean" (Jn. 13:10), **you walk not as also the Gentiles walk. To walk** here means to live: "If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit" (Gal. 5:25). This should not be **as the Gentiles walk**: "You know that, when you were heathens, you went to dumb idols according as you were led" (1 Cor. 12:2). You must not walk in such a manner: "My son, walk not with them: restrain thy foot from their paths" (Prov. 1:15).

Then, in saying **in the vanity of their mind**, he gives the reason for his prohibition. Note that to walk spiritually is to make progress. "The path of the just is right to walk in" (Is. 26:27), and to Abraham it was said: "Walk before me, and be perfect" (Gen. 17:1). There are three norms immanent in man by which he must be guided and regulated if he is to walk justly and make spiritual progress. In man, one of these is the reason which judges about what is to be done in concrete circumstances.<sup>124</sup> Another is the understanding of universal principles, called synderesis; and thirdly, there is the divine law or God. Actions are good and meritorious when the person is guided by these three in their proper interrelations; namely, when the action is in accord with the judgment of reason, and this reason judges according to true understanding, or synderesis; and this synderesis is, in turn, directed by the divine law.

The life of the Gentiles did not resemble this, it was lacking these three. First of all, rational judgment was missing since they **walked in the vanity of their mind**. **Mind** here is the power to apprehend [*vis apprehensiva*] through which we judge about individual objects. Hence, a man is called upright when he judges correctly about what should be done. But this **mind** is sometimes upright, and at other times vain. It is termed upright when, guided by appropriate norms, it attains to the proper end; it is vain when, led by the wrong norms, it does not achieve the proper end. "All men are vain, in whom there is not the

knowledge of God" (Wis. 13:1), "because they became vain in their thoughts" (Rom. 1:21) "and walked after vanity and are become vain" (Jer. 2:5).

Why? Obviously because in performing such acts their reason is not guided by an enlightened understanding, but an erroneous one. This is what he says about them **having their understanding darkened**. "Their foolish heart was darkened" (Rom. 1:21), and "they have not known nor understood: they walk on in darkness" (Ps. 81:5). This is traceable to their not sharing in the divine light, or not being enlightened and directed by the divine law. Thus he adds **alienated from the life of God**, from God who is the life of the soul. "I am the way, and the truth, and the life" (Jn. 14:6).

Or, **from the life of God** may mean from charity and spiritual grace by which the soul lives formally [a supernatural life]. "The grace of God is life everlasting" (Rom. 6:23). Existing without an expectation of eternal life, they held for a mortality of the soul contrary to faith and hope. "And they knew not the secrets of God, nor hoped for the wages of justice, nor esteemed the honor of holy souls" (Wis. 2:22). Or again, **from the life of God** might indicate an existence estranged from that holy living which comes through faith: "I live, now not I; but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. 2:20). "The just man liveth by faith" (Rom. 1:17). Or, the life which comes through charity: "We know that we have passed from death to life, because we love the brethren" (1 Jn. 3:14). [The pagans] were not like this; instead, they were alienated.

He briefly discusses the quality of this alienation, it is **through the ignorance that is in them**, not of stars or the movement of the constellations, but of the Divine Nature. "Some have not the knowledge of God" (1 Cor. 15:34), since in former times God was known only among the Jews. But "God, indeed having winked at the times of this ignorance, now declareth unto men that all should everywhere do penance" (Ac. 17:30). God, insofar as he himself was concerned, was not the cause of this ignorance since "That which is known of God is manifest in them. For God hath manifested it unto them" (Rom. 1:19). Certainly the cause was themselves due to the **blindness of their hearts**. He describes it well as **blindness** since from created reality they could not attain to a knowledge of the Creator. "For their own malice blinded them. And they knew not the secrets of God, nor hoped for the wages of justice" (Wis. 2:21-22).

Then the Apostle goes on (v. 19) to portray how their exterior manner of life was once they lost hope, a loss due to their alienation from life. "I have done with hope. I shall now live no longer" (Job 7:16). "And they said: We have no hopes; for we will go after our own thoughts and we will do everyone according to the perverseness of his evil heart" (Jer. 18:12). This is what follows in that they **have given themselves up to lasciviousness unto the working of all uncleanness, unto covetousness**. The text can be read in two ways. **Unto covetousness** may be taken as a separate vice meaning they were avaricious: "Being filled with all iniquity, malice, fornication, avarice . . ." (Rom. 1:29). "Let your manners be without covetousness, contented with such things as you have" (Heb. 13:5). For "nothing is more wicked than the

covetous man" (Ecclus. 10:9). Thus Habacuc 2 (9): "Woe to him that gathereth together an evil covetousness to his house that his nest may be on high, and thinketh he may be delivered out of the hand of evil."

**Unto covetousness** might also be joined with what goes before, meaning "Covetously" and modify the preceding. In that case their life was weighted down with a triple burden. First, they did not sin from passion but by choice, thus he says they **have given themselves up to lasciviousness**. As though he had said: Instead of sinning through passion or weakness they just sold themselves over to it: "Assemble ye all that are in the city, that we may of our own accord yield ourselves all up to the people of Holofernes" (Jdt. 7:15). "They have not done penance for the uncleanness, and fornication, and lasciviousness, that they have committed" (2 Cor. 12:21).

Secondly, [their sins were aggravated] from the complete lack of restraint; they "walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness and despise government" (2 Pet. 2:10). Therefore, he adds **unto the working of all uncleanness**; "these men have placed their uncleannesses in their hearts, and have set up before their face the stumbling-block of their iniquity" (Ez. 14:3). Thirdly, their sin was greater from its continuance, for they sinned incessantly. "They have committed fornication and have not ceased: because they have forsaken the Lord in not observing his law" (Os. 4:10). Whence he states **unto covetousness**, that is, [they sinned] ardently, with a constant and insatiable appetite for more. "Having eyes full of adultery and of sin that ceaseth not; alluring unstable souls; having their heart exercised with covetousness; children of malediction. Leaving the right way they have gone astray" (2 Pet. 2:14-15).

## LECTURE 7

**20 But you have not so learned Christ; 21 if so be that you have heard him and have been taught in him, as the truth is in Jesus. 22\* To put off, according to the former way of life, the old man, who is corrupted according to the desire of error, 23 and be renewed in the spirit of your mind, 24 and put on the new man, who according to God is created in justice and holiness of truth.**

Having shown the depravity of the Gentile's conduct (4:17), the Apostle points out now that Christ's teaching is completely contrary to such a way of life and condition. Because some men who distorted Christian doctrine held there is no life after the present one, but that man's soul, like the rest of the animals, dies with his body, the Apostle makes clear:

First, that Christ's teaching is contrary to their former life and condition.

Secondly, the requisites of Christ's teaching (4:22).

Thus he affirms: It was said that they, despairing, gave themselves up to lust, **But you have not learned** that **Christ** is to be so imitated. How should he be? "You yourselves have been taught by God that you must love one another" (1 Thess. 4-9). "Therefore, brethren, stand fast; and hold the traditions which you have learned" (2 Thess. 2:14\*). And how shall we retain them? "When you had received of us the word of the hearing of God, you received it not as the word of men, but, as it is indeed, the word of God, who worketh in you that have believed" (1 Thess. 2:13). Therefore, "Rooted and built up in him and confirmed in the faith, as also you have learned; abounding in him in thanksgiving" (Col. 2:7).

This certainly will happen **if you have heard him**, for hearing is the servant of instruction. **If** here is the equivalent of "because." "And this is the declaration which" you have heard, as 1 John 1 (5) expresses it in reference to the proclamation of the faith. "He that harkeneth to me shall not be confounded" (Ecclus. 24:30). And "the ear that heareth the reproofs of life shall abide in the midst of the wise. He that rejecteth instruction despiseth his own soul: but he that yieldeth to reproof possesseth understanding" (Prov. 15:31-32). **If also you have been taught in him** how what pertains to faith must be kept and fulfilled. "They did as they were taught" (Mt. 28:15), **as the truth is in Jesus**. As though he said: If you have heard the faith of Christ preached and how this faith must be put into practice, you have been taught what Jesus is like, he is himself the truth which is imparted to you. You must not, therefore, behave as those who despair.

How should they live? He adds **to put off, according to the former way of life, the old man**. The passage has two variant readings.<sup>125</sup> One is the infinitive, **to put off**; then it would be construed with what preceded to read: The truth about which you were instructed in Jesus was to put off the old man. The more common reading has an imperative, **put ye off**; in this case the signification is: Since the life and teachings of the Gentiles are contrary to those of Jesus, in which you have been taught, the only alternative is that you discard the old man.

Hence he makes two points here since vices must first be eradicated before virtues can be cultivated:

First, he instructs them to put aside their former condition, their old way of living.

Secondly, how they must take on a new way of life [characteristic] of Jesus (4:23).

Three considerations follow. First, what does **the old man** mean? Some hold that the old man is external and the new man interior. But it must be said that the old man is both interior and exterior; he is a person who is enslaved by a senility in his soul, due to sin, and in his body whose members provide the tools for sin. Thus a man enslaved to sin in soul and body is an old man. He is already on the way to corruption, or is actually beginning to decay since "that which decayeth and groweth old is near its end" (Heb. 8:13). And so a man subjected to sin is termed an old man because he is on the way to corruption. On this

account he goes on, **corrupted according to the desire of error**. Anything will corrupt when it deviates from the order of its inner being. Man's nature longs for what accords with reason; and truth is reason's perfection and good. Hence, when someone's reason sways toward error, and his desire is corrupted from this error, he is referred to as an old man.

This, he says, is **according to** evil **desire**. "Make not provision for the flesh in its concupiscences" (Rom. 13:14). "Many [are the] unprofitable and hurtful desires which drown men into destruction and perdition" (1 Tim. 6:9). Some people are lured into these cravings through their own weakness. Malice will draw others to them, as it does those who say that God does not have a providential care [of the universe].<sup>126</sup> Therefore he adds **of error** because the mind and affections of those who maliciously err become corrupted. Possibly the **desire of error** refers to whatever makes men err, according to Wisdom 2 (21): "These things they thought, and were deceived: for their own malice blinded them," and in Proverbs 14 (8): "The imprudence of fools erreth."

In Colossians 3 (9) the Apostle indicates how to leave the old man behind: "Stripping yourselves of the old man with his deeds." The substance of human nature is not to be rejected or despoiled, but only wicked actions and conduct. "Have your manner of life good among the Gentiles" (1 Pet. 2:12\*); "Be thou an example of the faithful, in word, in conduct, in charity, in faith, in chastity" (1 Tim. 4:12\*).

Next (v. 23), he indicates the new condition they are to take on. In doing three things concerning this, he shows:

First, through what means we can obtain this newness.

Secondly, in whom this newness resides (4:24a).

Thirdly, what the newness is (4:24b).

Regarding the first he says **be renewed in the spirit of your mind**. Notice that although **spirit** is frequently said to be in man, nevertheless three spirits are discernible in him. One is the Holy Spirit: "Know you not that you are the temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (1 Cor. 3:16). Another is his spiritual reason: "For the flesh lusteth against the spirit; and the spirit against the flesh" (Gal. 5:17). Finally, there is man's imaginative spirit: "Know ye, O Israel, that the prophet was foolish, the man was mad, and spiritual" (Os. 9:7\*), that is, his imagination went wild.<sup>127</sup>

Therefore, **the spirit of your mind** may point to the Holy Spirit. He then states that the cause of renewal is the Holy Spirit who dwells in our rational spirit: "God hath sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts" (Gal. 4:6). "Send forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created: and thou shalt renew the face of the earth" (Ps. 103:30). Or **spirit** could refer to the rational spirit and would be identical with our mind, similar to the expression in Colossians 2 (11): "In despoiling of the body of the flesh," that is, the body which the

flesh is. Likewise here, **in the spirit of your mind** would refer to the spirit which the mind is. He would qualify it in this way since there is another spirit within us, differing from the mind, and which is common to both us and the beasts.

However, he states **be renewed in the spirit of your mind**; what is not spoiled keeps its freshness and does not require a renewal. If Adam had not become tainted neither he nor ourselves would need a renovation. Yet, once he was corrupted, both he and his offspring are in need of a renovation. In the present life we must be renewed in soul; our body will be in the future when "this corruptible must put on incorruption; and this mortal must put on immortality" (1 Cor. 15:52). Hence he says **be renewed in the spirit** since, unless the spirit is renewed in this life, the body will never be renewed. Or, **in the spirit of your mind** can be interpreted as in your mind which was made spiritual and will return to the same.

**And put on the new man** discloses in whom this renewal takes place. Adam introduced sin into all men, and thus became for everything the primary source of oldness. Likewise, the primary source of newness and renovation is Christ. In Adam all die and in Christ all will be brought back to life. "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but a new creature" (Gal. 6:15). Therefore, "put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 13:14).

**Who, according to God, is created in justice and holiness of truth** makes known what the renovation is. It admits of a triple explanation. If the **who** refers to [man's] spirit, it would mean: The spirit, which our mind is, was created by God in the freshness of original justice; or, by a second creative act was renewed to be just again: "Created in Christ Jesus in good works" (Eph. 2:10). Or, the **who** might have reference to the new man, Christ. Then the text could be construed as: **who is created**, that is, formed in the Virgin's womb **according to God** by the Holy Spirit and not human seed. Or, he was created according to an existence of grace, as well as a fullness **in justice** toward men **and a holiness** before God that was not fictitious but **of truth**: "In holiness and justice before him" (Lk. 1:75). It could rather mean that **holiness** is in his heart, **truth** on his tongue, and **justice** in his actions.

## LECTURE 8

**25 Wherefore, putting away lying, speak ye the truth, every man with his neighbor; for we are members one of another. 26 Be angry, and sin not. Let not the sun go down upon your anger. 27 Give not place to the devil.**

Having set down above the general admonition to put on a newness of life (4:17), now the Apostle determines on the particular precepts. Concerning this he does two things:

First, he restrains them from committing interior sins which corrupt the spirit.  
Secondly, he prohibits exterior sins which corrupt the flesh (5:3).

The first has two divisions:

First, he forbids sins which consist in one's personal deordination.  
Secondly, then sins which consist in the deordination of others (4:29).

The first section again is divided into three parts since he forbids:

First, sin corrupting man's rational powers.  
Secondly, sin deordinating his irascible emotions (4:26).  
Thirdly, sin pertaining to the concupiscible emotions (4:28).<sup>128</sup>

Regarding the first of these he does three things. First, he forbids one of them; then he urges its opposite [virtue]; thirdly, he gives his reason. Hence, he first prohibits what is characteristic of the old man, thereby expounding what he said above (v. 24): "Put on the new man." To accomplish this he first bans lying because through this sin of the tongue the truth of reason is corrupted. **Wherefore** to put on the new man you should be **putting away lying**, for "Thou [O Lord] wilt destroy all that speak a lie" (Ps. 5:7) maliciously.

Then he urges them on to newness of life, saying with Zacharias (8:16) **speak ye the truth, every man with his neighbor**. And why? Because **we are members of one another**. For members are to love and mutually assist one another in truth. "We, being many, are one body in Christ; and every one members one of another" (Rom. 12:5).

When forbidding sins destructive of the order in the irascible emotions, he makes three points:

First, he gives a warning.  
Secondly, he explains what he means (4:26b).  
Thirdly, he gives the reason for his concern (4:27).

He gives his warning when he says **Be angry, and sin not**. This is susceptible of two interpretations; for there are two types of anger, a good one and an evil one. Anger is evil when, contrary to justice, it strives inordinately for revenge. It is good when it seeks a just vindication, namely, when the person is vexed at the time, with whom, and to the degree that, he should be. The [above warning] is applicable to both. If it concerns evil anger, the sense is that he does not command it but permits it. As though he said: Should it

happen that anger wells up within you - which is human enough - do not sin. You must not be led on to perform [what the inordinate passion craves] through consenting to it. "Let no temptation take hold on you, but such as is human" (1 Cor. 10:13). For, without doubt, whoever is angered against his brother in any other way "shall be in danger of the judgment" (Mt. 5:22). Joseph counseled his brothers against such anger: "Be not angry in the way" (Gen. 45:24).

If it is interpreted concerning righteous anger it is not simply permitted, like the first, but imperative. **Be angry** against your sins, for man desires a twofold vindication. One regarding himself when he sins, so that penance becomes a certain type of vindication which man inflicts and receives in himself. Such a wrath is good, and with respect to it the imperative is used: **be angry** against your sins, **and sin not** any more, nor commit those types of sin with which you must again be exasperated.

Now, some are doubtless of the opinion that a man can be mad at himself for his own sins safely, but that this does not hold true concerning his neighbors and their sins. This is false; a man can be mad at himself for his own sins, and at his fellow man because of his sins. Therefore, zealously **be angry** at other people's offenses. "Phinees hath turned away my wrath from the children of Israel because he was moved with my zeal against them" (Num. 25:11). And Elias said: "With zeal have I been zealous for the Lord God of Hosts: for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant" (3 Kg. 19:10). By following the dictates of reason, rather than acting before [reason has had time to reflect], you **sin not**. "Let every man be swift to hear, but slow to speak, and slow to anger" (Jas. 1:19).

In **Let not the sun go down upon your anger** he explains what he had said, and the explanation can be interpreted according to the three above expositions. If it concerns evil anger, then he would be saying: Do not nurture seeds of wrath, cast them off before sunset; for although the first impulses of temper are excusable, due to human frailty, it is illicit to dwell on them.

In reference to good anger, as it is directed against one's personal sins, the **sun** is Christ. "Unto you that fear my name the sun of justice shall arise" (Mal. 4:2) **Let not it go down upon your anger**, that is, on your sins, on account of which you must be angered again and punish yourselves. When the sins of others are in question the **sun** refers to reason. "Remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth, before the time of affliction comes, and the years draw nigh of which thou shalt say: They please me not; before the sun . . . is darkened" (Eccl. 12:1). The **sun** should not set on your anger, that is, the dictates of reason must not be clouded over. "Anger indeed killeth the foolish" (Job 5:2).

The reason for the warning is indicated in **Give not place to the devil**. The devil gains entrance to us either through sin or consent to it. "The devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, to betray him" (Jn. 13:2), after which it says: "After the morsel, Satan entered into him" (*ibid.* 27). Passions of this kind easily pull one's consent [toward their desires], especially when they have biased the



judgment of reason. Anger particularly does this since it involves the rapid raising of blood, the speed of whose movement precedes any rational judgment. Excited like this, the devil wins a foothold within us; thus he says **give not place to the devil**. You ought not to persist, he seems to say, in your ill temper, for you will only invite the demon who is himself continually angered. God is "my deliverer from my infuriated enemies" (Ps. 17:48\*). "The devil is come down unto you, having great wrath" (Apoc. 12:12). He cannot accomplish this, at least in the soul of a just man. But this justice is forfeited through anger: "For the anger of man worketh not the justice of God" (Jas. 1:20). If you do not want to give Satan a place, at least in your soul, do not let the sun set on your wrath. "Remove anger from thy heart" (Eccl. 11:10).

## LECTURE 9

**28 He that stole, let him now steal no more; but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have something to give to him that suffereth need. 29 Let no evil speech proceed from your mouth; but that which is good, to the edification of faith, that it may administer grace to the hearers.**

Having banned the age-old corruption in man's rational and irascible powers (4:25), here he proscribes it in regard to the concupiscible emotions when they desire temporal goods inordinately. Concerning this he does two things:

First, he prohibits the old ways of these emotions.

Secondly, he exhorts the Ephesians to renew them (4:28b).

Stealing pertains to the concupiscible appetite's old ways; it arises from a corrupted and inordinate desire for a temporal object. Therefore he says **He that stole, let him now steal no more**, as if to say: Whoever has old and corrupted concupiscible emotions due to a contaminating desire for transitory goods, let him not steal any more if he wants to renew them. For "confusion is upon a thief" (Ecclus. 5:17), so that Exodus 20 (15) asserts: "Thou shalt not steal."

Since someone might excuse himself by reason of his poverty,<sup>129</sup> he says **rather let him labor, working with his hands**. The Apostle himself practiced this: "For such things as were needful for me and them that are with me, these hands have furnished" (Ac. 20:34). "For you yourselves know how you ought to imitate us: for we were not disorderly among you; neither did we eat any man's bread for nothing, but in labor and in toil we worked night and day, lest we should be chargeable to any of you" (2 Thess. 3:7-8).

Notice that three motives for manual labor are given. Primarily, it is to obtain necessary food: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread" (Gen. 3:19). Therefore, anyone who does not lawfully have the where-with-all to live is bound to work with his hands. "If any man will not work, neither let him eat," (2 Thess. 3:10) seems to affirm: just as he who does not eat when necessity demands it sins, so likewise he who does not work when necessary. This is put here to exclude stealing. Sometimes, however, work is urged in order to dispel idleness since "idleness hath taught much evil" (Ecclus. 33:29). Hence, those who lead an idle life are bound to work with their hands: "For we have heard there are some among you who walk disorderly; working not at all, but curiously meddling. Now we charge them that are such and beseech them by the Lord Jesus Christ that, working with silence, they would eat their own bread" (2 Thess. 3:11-12). At other times work is recommended to discipline and control the flesh. In this sense it is included among the acts of continence, as in 2 Corinthians 6 (5): "In labors, in watchings, in fastings."

Three reasons exist, therefore, for engaging in physical labor. The first is necessary for everyone, and is so by a necessity of precept,<sup>130</sup> while idleness can be avoided in other ways and the immoral tendencies of the flesh can be controlled and checked by other means. It is sufficient if these latter are accomplished in some way.

**Which is good** follows and can be understood in two ways. If it has the accusative force it could be rendered: Rather let him labor by the work of his hands, not at what is unlawful, but at whatever is honest. "And in doing good, let us not fail. For in due time we shall reap, not failing" (Gal. 6:9). "Cease to do perversely. Learn to do well" (Is. 1:16-17). Or it can be taken with a nominative force: Rather let him labor by the work of his hands which is good. This is the reason why they should work, as though he said: Not only is it necessary to work, it is even good to work that he who does can live and **that he may have something to give to him that suffereth need**. "Lend to thy neighbor in the time of his need" (Ecclus. 29:2).

When he states **Let no evil speech proceed from your mouth** (v. 29) he begins to discuss what the old man does in relation to other men. He makes two points:

First, he prohibits the old and encourages the new.

Secondly, he provides an example for imitation at the beginning of Chapter Five (5:1).

A person may be wrongly disposed toward his neighbor in two ways. In one way, he may hurt him through evil words; in another, he may harm him through bad example. First he forbids the former, secondly the latter (4:30). The first of these also has two sections:

First, he bans the old.

Secondly, he urges them toward the new (4:29b).

Thus he says **Let no evil speech proceed from your mouth**. A word from the mouth exteriorizes or expresses whatever is on the mind since spoken words are signs of what occurs in the soul. A good word is one which indicates good interior dispositions, while an evil word externalizes evil dispositions.

Man should possess a threefold inner relationship; namely, to himself, that all his powers are subject to reason; to God, so that his reason submits to him; and to his fellow man when he loves him as himself. Hence a word is evil when it shows that a man is not properly related within himself. This is the false word by which he means one thing and says another; futile and vain talk also belong to this category. Again, there are wicked words which indicate that a man is not related properly to God, such as perjury, blasphemy and the like. Finally, there is also evil talk which is against one's neighbor, such as injurious, deceitful, and fraudulent words. Therefore does he say **Let no evil speech proceed from your mouth**. "No" is equivalent to "none." "Keep yourselves therefore from murmuring which profiteth nothing, and refrain your tongue from detraction: for an obscure speech shall not go for naught" (Wis. 1:11). For God will certainly not forget any thought, "and no word can hide itself from him" as Ecclesiasticus 42 (20) remarks. "But now put away also any anger, indignation, malice, blasphemy, or filthy speech out of your mouth" (Col. 3:8\*).

With **that which is good** he encourages them on toward newness because a good word, spoken at the right time and place, is blessed. "A word in due time is best" (Prov. 15:23). "If any man speak, let him speak as the words of God" (1 Pet. 4:11). And what for? He adds **to the edification of faith** in order, that is, for faith to be strengthened in the hearts of the weak: "Let all things be done to edification" (1 Cor. 14:26).

If it **may administer grace to the hearers** such a word is proven good and it is profitable. For frequently a man repents and is disposed for grace from hearing a good sermon and through the power it conveys. "While Peter was yet speaking these words, the Holy Spirit fell on all them that heard the word" (Ac. 10:44). Our Lord spoke in this fashion; Luke 4 (22) recounts: "They wondered at the words of grace that proceeded from his mouth." "The words of the mouth of a wise man are grace" (Eccl. 10:12).

## LECTURE 10

**30 And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God; whereby you are sealed unto the day of redemption. 31 Let all bitterness and anger and indignation and clamor and blasphemy be put away from you, with all malice. 32 And be ye kind one to another; merciful, forgiving one another, even as God hath forgiven you in Christ.**

Previously the Apostle warned the Ephesians to abstain from wicked and injurious words (4:29). Here he advises them against words or actions which would upset or sadden other men. Regarding this he does two things:

First, he prohibits what is old.

Secondly, he encourages what pertains to the new (4:32).

Again the first part has two subdivisions:

First, he forbids what is old in general.

Secondly, he gets down to specific vices (4:31).

There might be an objection to his saying **grieve not the Holy Spirit of God**. The Holy Spirit is God in whom there can be no emotion or sorrow. I reply that the Holy Spirit is said to be grieved when that person is saddened in whom the Spirit dwells. "He that despiseth you, despiseth me" (Lk. 10:16). "But they provoked to wrath and afflicted the spirit of his Holy One: and he was turned to be their enemy" (Is. 63:10).

Or, it could be called a metaphorical expression.<sup>131</sup> Just as God is said to be angry on account of the similarity of what he does [to the results of human anger], so he could also be said to be grieved. When some person is saddened he withdraws from whoever is depressing him, likewise does the Holy Spirit withdraw from one who is sinning. Thus the meaning of **grieve not the Holy Spirit** is: do not chase him away or reject him through sin. "For the Holy Spirit of discipline will flee from the deceitful, and will withdraw himself from thoughts that are without understanding: and he shall not abide when iniquity cometh in" (Wis. 1:5).

Therefore, the Holy Spirit must not be saddened, and this on account of the blessing of his saving seal. Thus he adds **whereby you are sealed**, that is, you are reformed and set apart from others. Whoever possesses this seal shall enjoy eternal life. For this reason he must be held on to and in no way grieved since without him there is no life everlasting. "God also hath sealed us and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts" (2 Cor. 1:22). When did this happen? In **the day of redemption**, that is, of baptism. "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (Jn. 3:5). "You shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence" (Ac. 1:5). He says **redemption** since in baptism a man becomes a sharer in the redemption accomplished by Christ.

In what follows (v. 31) he discloses what specifically belongs to the old man. For at times a man will sadden his friend out of anger, at other times on set purpose. Anger, however, has three degrees.

Sometimes it is constrained and remains within the heart, as when someone is only inwardly mad. On other occasions it is expressed verbally, although not in a contemptuous way, as when someone says "Raca" (cf. Mt. 5:22). At still another time contempt may be present in the verbal expression as in "You cursed fool!" Hence he first writes down what pertains to anger of the heart; second what is proper to its inordinate expression; and third what has reference to contempt.

In anger of the heart the following succeed one another. Firstly, anger is the result of sorrow,<sup>132</sup> which Sacred Scripture refers to as bitterness: "As Anna had her heart full of bitterness, she prayed to the Lord, shedding many tears" (1 Kg. 1:10\*). Thus he says **all bitterness** which arises from the memory of past injuries. For "there is no understanding where there is bitterness" (Ecclus. 21:15). Secondly, it immediately desires revenge; hence he says **and anger** which is a craving for revenge. "For the anger of man worketh not the justice of God" (Jas. 1:20). Thirdly, an angered person imagines whatever offends him is an insult, and he is indignant if it passes without punishment. Therefore, **and indignation** follows.

Noise has to do with the inordinate expression of anger. "And I looked that he should do judgment, and behold, iniquity: and do justice, and behold, a cry" (Is. 5:7). Hence he says **and clamor**. In a similar way, blasphemy is either against God or against his saints. Yet "he that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, dying let him die" (Lev. 24:16). Thus he says **and blasphemy**. And he adds that these **be put away from you, with all malice** of action. Reject "all malice and all guile and dissimulations" (1 Pet. 2:1).

Next, when he says **be ye kind one to another** he determines what pertains to the new man which is contrary to the above mentioned passions. Opposed to bitterness is kindness; so he says **be ye kind one to another** since "the spirit of wisdom is benevolent" (Wis. 1:6). Mercy is contrary to anger, thus he mentions **merciful**: "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful" (Lk. 6:36). Opposed to indignation is a pardoning attitude; whence he says **forgiving one another even as God hath forgiven you in Christ**. "Forgiving one another, if any have a complaint against another. Even as the Lord hath forgiven you, so do you also" (Col. 3:13). "He that spared not even his own Son," and shortly afterwards, "how hath he not also, with him, given us all things?" (Rom. 8:32).

# Chapter 5

## LECTURE 1

**1 Be ye therefore followers of God, as most dear children; 2 and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us and hath delivered himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice to God for an odor of sweetness.**

Once he has exhorted them to kindness and mercy, which are the effects of charity (4:32), he gives them a model [to imitate]. In reference to this he does two things:

First, he urges them to imitate the exemplar, namely, God.

Secondly, he lets them know in what they should imitate him (5:2).

I have affirmed, he says, that you ought to forgive one another as God has forgiven you in Christ. **Be ye therefore followers of God** because this is indispensable even if it is difficult. "What is man, said I, that he can follow the King his maker?" (Eccl. 2:12). Nonetheless, human nature would never achieve its end except in union with God. "My foot hath followed his steps: I have kept his way, and have not declined from it" (Job 23:11). He must be imitated insofar as it is possible for us to do so - a son must imitate his father. Thus he adds **as children** since he is our father through creation: "Is not he thy father, that hath possessed thee, and made thee, and created thee?" (Deut. 32:6). He puts in **most dear** because God chose us to share in what is his very own.

**And walk in love** (v. 2) comes next, here;

First, he maintains that the way to imitate God is in charity.

Secondly, he speaks of the tremendous sign of charity (5:2b).

The charity of God has made us his most dear children: "For you have not received the spirit of bondage again in fear; but you have received the spirit of adoption of sons, whereby we cry: Abba, Father. For the Spirit himself giveth testimony to our spirit that we are the sons of God" (Rom. 8:15-16). Certainly we ought to follow him in love. He says **walk** to signify "you must always advance" as in Genesis 17 (1): "Walk before me and be perfect." This should be **in love** since love is so good that man ought always to make further progress in it, and is that kind of a debt which man always has to pay. "Owe no man any thing, but to love one another" (Rom. 13:8). Or **in love** may mean the way in which God is followed more closely: "And I shew unto you yet a more excellent way. If I speak with the tongues of men, and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling symbol" (1 Cor. 12:31-13:1). "Above all these things have charity, which is the bond of perfection" (Col. 3:14). This must be done

according to Christ's example, whence he adds **as Christ also hath loved us**. Jesus "having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them unto the end" (Jn. 13:1).

According to Gregory, "love is verified when it is expressed in action."<sup>133</sup> Therefore he adds **and hath delivered himself for us**. "He hath loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood" (Apoc. 1:5). "I live in the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and delivered himself for me" (Gal. 2:20). "He hath delivered his soul unto death and was reputed with the wicked" (Is. 53:12).

This death was both advantageous and necessary for us, thus he says **an oblation and a sacrifice**. Here the Apostle is speaking in the way the Old Law does. In it, as Leviticus 4 indicates, when someone sinned he was obliged to offer, because of it, the sacrifice and oblation which was designated for the sin. Then too, when someone gave thanks to God, or wished to obtain some favor, he had to offer a victim of peace, as prescribed in Leviticus 3 (9), which was of a most sweet savor to the Lord (v. 16). These, however, are all accomplished through Christ who in order that we might be cleansed from sin and attain to glory, **hath delivered himself for us, an oblation** through the actions he performed during his life: "He was offered because it was his own will, and he opened not his mouth" (Is. 53:7); **and** [he died as] **a sacrifice to God** for sin.

This was **for an odor of sweetness**, hinting at what is said in Leviticus 3 (5ff.). But certainly the odor described there was not pleasing to God in itself but according to its signification, inasmuch as it symbolized the sweet-smelling oblation of the body of Christ, the Son of God. "Behold, the smell of my son is as the smell of a plentiful field" (Gen. 27:27). "Draw me, we will run after thee to the odor of thy ointments" (Cant. 1:3). In this way also we ought to offer spiritual sacrifices to God: "A sacrifice to God is an afflicted spirit" (Ps. 50:19).

## LECTURE 2

**3 But fornication and all uncleanness or covetousness, let it not so much as be named among you, as becometh saints; 4 or obscenity or foolish talking or scurrility, which is to no purpose; but rather giving of thanks.**

Having previously cautioned them, the Apostle taught the Ephesians to put off the old man and put on the new by forbidding spiritual vices (4:25). Now he also bans carnal sins. It is divided into two parts:

First, he prohibits the old way of carnal sins.

Secondly, he stimulates them on to the new life (5:15).

The first part has three subdivisions:

First, he rejects the old sins.

Secondly, he sets forth their punishment (5:5).

Thirdly, he precludes a fallacy (5:6).

The first section has two parts:

First, he bars certain principal vices.

Secondly, he rejects some vices associated with them (5:4).

He eliminates three vices. There is a natural voluptuousness committed with another outside of wedlock; whence he says **fornication**. "For the spirit of fornication hath deceived them" (Os. 4:12); "flee from fornication" (1 Cor. 6:18). Job did this: "I made a covenant with my eyes, that I would not so much as think upon a virgin" (31:1). This is called "fornication" from the word "fornix," that is, the triumphal arch near which brothels were situated. "Fornication came in upon them."<sup>134</sup>

**And all uncleanness** designates every impurity against nature, namely, when the act is not ordered toward the generation of offspring. "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are: fornication, uncleanness, immodesty, luxury" (Gal. 5:19).

Thirdly, he bans avarice in mentioning **covetousness**. But why this? Is it to be classed with carnal sins? I reply that it is neither identified with, nor completely separate from, carnal sin but midway between the spiritual and carnal sins. It can be explained this way. Sin contains two elements, the object of the sin and the gratification the object affords. Thus with certain sins both the object and the gratification are spiritual, such as anger. Both revenge, which is the objective of anger, and its gratification, are spiritual; the same holds true for vainglory.<sup>135</sup> Other sins, however, are completely carnal both in their objects and their gratification; such as gluttony and voluptuousness. But covetousness is between each of these because its object is carnal, namely money, whereas its gratification is spiritual inasmuch as the mind finds rest in the possession of money. Therefore, covetousness is enumerated among the carnal sins by reason of its object, and among the spiritual ones by reason of the gratification it affords. "Let your manners be without covetousness" (Heb. 13:5).

Or it might be answered that covetousness is opposed to justice and thus is classed with the kind of sensuality known as adultery. The latter is the unjust use of another man's woman and covetousness is the unjust use of money.



Above he said "He that stole, let him now steal no more" (Eph. 4:28). But here he says **let it not so much as be named among you** because in the spiritual battle carnal sins must first be conquered. In vain would anyone struggle against internal sins unless he had first overcome external, carnal ones - against which there will always be a struggle. Therefore he says **let it not so much as be named among you, as becometh saints** who refrain from such actions, thoughts and words. "I will destroy the name of Babylon, and the remains, and the bud, and the offspring" (Is. 14:22). "Take care of a good name" (Ecclus. 41:15) since this is fitting for saints. "In all things let us exhibit ourselves as the ministers of God" (2 Cor. 6:4).

Next he sets down some vices associated with the aforementioned. Regarding them he makes two points:

First, he rejects these vices.

Secondly, he encourages them to practice the contrary virtue.

Hence he bans three vices, namely, **obscenity** which consists in impure touches, embraces and lustful kisses. "But he that is an adulterer, for the folly of his heart shall destroy his own soul. He gathereth to himself shame and dishonor" (Prov. 6:32-33). Then there is **foolish talking** which is words provocative of evil. "For her conversation," that is, of an evil woman, "burneth as fire" (Ecclus. 9:11). Finally there is **scurrility** consisting in jocose words with which some attempt to please others. "But I say unto you that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall render an account for it in the day of judgment" (Mt. 12:36). All of these are grave insofar as they are said or done in connection with mortal sins; for anything, even if it is generally good, becomes mortal to the degree that it is ordered toward mortal sins.

Then he introduces them to the opposite, namely, thanksgiving. Whence he says **but rather giving of thanks**. "Joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving and the voice of praise" (Is. 51:3).

### LECTURE 3

**5 For know you this and understand: that no fornicator or unclean or covetous person, which is a serving of idols, hath inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God. 6\* Let no man deceive you with vain words. For because of these things cometh the anger of God upon the children of despair. 7 Be ye not therefore partakers with them.**

The Apostle above forbade carnal sins (5:3), here he threatens them with the penalty of damnation that is inflicted on sinners. In reference to this he does two things:

First, he assures them of it.

Secondly, he mentions the sins one by one (5:5b).

He states **For know you this and understand**, that is, be actually certain of it and not just habitually.

"These things I write to you that you may know that you have eternal life; you who believe in the name of the Son of God" (1 Jn. 5:13). And what does he write? **That no fornicator or unclean or covetous person, which is a serving of idols, hath inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God.**

Notice that he calls covetousness idolatry, for idolatry happens when the honor due God alone is given to creatures. Now there is a twofold honor due God; we must establish him as the goal of our life and we must put our trust of reaching the goal in him. Hence, whoever places these in creatures is guilty of idolatry. A covetous person commits this when he fixes his end in a created reality as well as putting all his trust in it. "Of their silver and their gold they have made idols to themselves, that they might perish" (Os. 8:4). This happens since, as Proverbs 11 (28) affirms: "He that trusteth in his riches shall fall."

However, since in the other sins a man also puts his goal in a creature, clinging to it by love, why are not they termed idolatry too? I reply that idolatry consists in giving an illegitimate worship to some external object. Whereas in the other sins one's end is deorientated interiorly, as though it consisted in one's own exaltation. Whoever places his end in riches, on the other hand, fixes it in an external object as an idol.

Does that mean that covetous persons, giving the honor due God to creatures, are really and essentially idolators? I hold that they are not, because in moral issues acts or deeds are judged by their end.

Therefore, only those are essentially idolators who intend to really offer worship to a creature. A covetous person does not really (*per se*) intend to do this, he only happens (*per accidens*) to do it in his excessive and inordinate love [for riches].

What happens to such people? They do not possess the **inheritance** since heirs are sons, as Romans 8 (17) states. But these persons are not sons because they are carnal, therefore they do not enjoy the inheritance as 1 Corinthians 15 (50) affirms: "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot possess the kingdom of God," that is, God himself who said: "I am their inheritance" (Ez. 44:28).

It might be asked: If the inheritance is God himself who is indivisible and inseparable, why does he say **in the kingdom of Christ and of God**, dividing the two as if the inheritance could be severed? I reply. Our inheritance consists in the enjoyment of God. But God enjoys himself in a way different from that in which we shall enjoy him. God perfectly delights in himself since he perfectly knows and totally loves himself inasmuch as he is knowable and lovable. Not so with us, even though we shall perfectly know him in heaven and, as a consequence, love him. For someone may indeed grasp a simple reality and know the whole of it, while still not [knowing it] totally. For example, if the light of the sun were as small as a point, the human eye could perceive the whole of it, although not fully, whereas the eagle's eye would grasp it totally.<sup>136</sup> Similarly, even if we know God perfectly in heaven and love him perfectly,

nevertheless we do not totally comprehend him. Hence it seems that there is a certain imperfection and individuality there. Therefore he says **of Christ and of God** conjointly, as though setting one part with another part, since it is through Christ and none other that the inheritance is had.

Next he says **Let no man deceive you**, thereby rejecting a fallacy of those who would mislead them. Regarding this he makes two points:

First, he sets down a warning.

Secondly, he adds the reason for it (5:8).

The first has two more parts:

First, he warns them not to be deceived into believing what is told them.

Secondly, that they should not associate with those liars by doing evil (5:7).

The first section still has two parts:

First, he puts an end to the deception.

Secondly, he shows them a sign of the deceit (5:6b).

Notice that only in reference to carnal vices does he teach them to avoid being deceived. For from the beginning men have rationalized to find reasons why fornication and other venereal sins were not really sins so that they might indulge their cupidity without restraint. Hence he states **vain words** since words that claim these are not sins and do not exclude one from the kingdom of God and of Christ are irrational. "Beware lest any man cheat you by prophecy and vain deceit" (Col. 2:8).<sup>137</sup>

He demonstrates that such men are deceivers and their words fallacious since, if carnal sins were not sins, they would not be punished by God; God is just and does not impose a penalty where there is no offense. But such acts are punished by God and therefore are sins. He proves the minor when he says **For because of these things cometh the anger of God**, namely, on account of carnal sins, **upon the children of despair**.<sup>138</sup> This is evident in the flood (Gen. 7), in what happened to the Sodomites (Gen. 19); and again, almost the whole tribe of Benjamin was destroyed on account of this (Jg. 19 & 20).

He says **the children of despair** because those who sin in this way despair of eternal life. If they acted this way and still hoped for eternal life, it would rather be presumption than hope, which is the certain expectation of obtaining future beatitude meritoriously. So he mentioned previously (Eph. 4:19): "Who, despairing, have given themselves up to lasciviousness unto the working of all uncleanness, unto covetousness." "Let no meadow escape our riot. Let none of us go without his part in luxury," and near

the end of the same chapter "For they hoped not for the wages of justice, nor esteemed the honor of holy souls" (Wis. 2:8 & 22). Hence he states that **upon the children of despair** who do not hope for eternal joys, **cometh the anger of God** on account of their sins. Or, **of despair** signifies those of whom we cannot be confident of as far as their merits are concerned.

He concludes, **Be ye not therefore partakers with them** by associating with them in such actions. "For what participation hath justice with injustice? Or what fellowship hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever?" (2 Cor. 6:14-15).

#### LECTURE 4

**8 For you were heretofore darkness, but now light in the Lord. Walk then as children of the light. 9 For the fruit of the light is in all goodness and justice and truth; 10 proving what is well pleasing to God. 11 And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness; but rather reprove them.**

Previously the Apostle had banned carnal sins by threatening punishment and rejecting a fallacy (5:6). Here he gives the reason; it is taken from their situation. He does two things:

First, he describes their situation.

Secondly, he deduces two conclusions from it (5:8b).

Their situation, however, is described as twofold:

First, their past.

Secondly, their present situation (5:8a).

Thus he remarks **you were heretofore darkness** blinded by ignorance and error. "Having their understanding darkened" (Eph. 4:18). "They have not known nor have they understood; they walk on in darkness" (Ps. 81:5). The darkness also comes from sin: "The way of the wicked is darksome; they know not where they fall" (Prov. 4:19). But observe that he does not vaguely call them "darksome" but **darkness**. For anyone appears to be whatever is predominant in him; thus the whole state appears to be the king and whatever the king does is said to be done by the state, likewise when sin dominates a man the entire person is referred to as sin and darkness.

Next he describes their present condition, as though he said: But now you enjoy the light of faith: "among whom you shine as lights in the world" (Phil. 2:15), for "you are the light of the world" (Mt. 5:14). But

this contradicts what was said of John the Baptist: "He was not the light" (Jn. 1:8). How then can other believers be called the light? I reply. They are not referred to as the light in essence but through participation.

Afterwards, he derives two conclusions. He had said that they had been darkness but now are light. Therefore:

First, he concludes that they should conform themselves to what they now are.

Secondly, that they avoid what they previously were (5:11).

The first has two sections:

First, he writes down an admonition.

Secondly, he explains it (5:9).

He affirms: Since you are now light, perform the deeds of light - **Walk as children of the light**. "Walk whilst you have the light, that the darkness overtake you not" (Jn. 12:35). He interprets this when he says **For the fruit of the light is in all goodness**. However, a person behaves as a child of the light in two ways; first in reference to the substance or kind of actions he performs, then in reference to the manner or intention he does them with. Thus:

First, he determines the actions which should be performed.

Secondly, with what intention they should be done (5:10).

Therefore he remarks: I have said that you should walk as children of the light, but **the fruit of the light** is actions which are fruitful and resplendent. "And my flowers are the fruit of honor and riches" (Ecclus. 24:23). This is **in all goodness**. Whence it must be recalled that every act of virtue is reduced to three relationships. For it is necessary that the agent be ordered within himself, to his neighbor, and to God. Within himself, that he be good in himself; and on this account he says **in all goodness**. "Teach me goodness and discipline and knowledge" (Ps. 118:66). He must be ordered to his fellow man by justice; whence he says **and justice**. "I have done judgment and justice" (Ps. 118:121). While he is ordered to God through knowledge and a confession of the truth; so he adds **and truth**. "Only love ye truth and peace" (Zach. 8:19).

Another interpretation is that goodness refers to the heart, justice to one's actions, and truth to the tongue. This was mentioned above in Chapter 4 (25); it is also in Zacharias 8 (16): "Speak ye truth every one with his neighbor."

Then he discloses with what intention the actions should be performed. For they should not be done abruptly but with **proving**, that is, discerning with one's mind - "Let everyone prove his own work," as Galatians 6 (4) expresses it - **what is well pleasing to God**, that is, you ought to have the intention of doing whatever pleases God. "Be reformed in the newness of your mind, that you may prove what is the good and the acceptable and the perfect will of God" (Rom. 12:2).

After this he exhorts them not to return to the state they have left behind because, as Galatians 2 (18) remarks: "If I build up again the things which I have destroyed, I make myself a prevaricator." Lest "the dog is returned to his vomit; and, the sow that was washed, to her wallowing in the mire" (2 Pet. 2:22). This section is divided into two parts:

First, he gives the caution.

Secondly, he tells them his reason (5:12).

The first is again divided into two sections:

First, he warns them not to do evil.

Secondly, he tells them to reprehend wickedness (5:11b).

He stated **proving what is well pleasing to God. And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness** which are sensuous actions leading to an everlasting darkness. They are unfruitful since they only possess a momentary delight which disappears very quickly. "What fruit therefore had you then in those things of which you are now ashamed?" (Rom. 6:21). "Trees of the autumn, unfruitful, twice dead, plucked up by the roots, raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own confusion; wandering stars, to whom the storm of darkness is reserved for ever" (Jude 1:12). Moreover, they seek out places of darkness for their depravity where they have the companionship of beasts. "The eye of the adulterer observeth darkness, saying: No eye shall see me. And he will cover his face. He diggeth through houses in the dark, as in the day they had appointed for themselves; and they have not known the light" (Job 24:15-16). With these, therefore, have no fellowship, neither by imitating, nor assisting, nor consenting to them. "What fellowship hath a holy man with a dog?" (Ecclus. 13:22).

But clearly this is not enough; you must also reprehend them since, as Augustine remarks,<sup>139</sup> God sometimes punishes innocent companions because those who are good do not reprimand the evil ones. "And he gave every one of them commandment concerning his neighbor" (Ecclus. 17:12). Hence he says **but rather reprove them**. "Reprove, entreat, rebuke in all patience and doctrine" (2 Tim. 4:2). But do we always sin if we do not reprove those who sin? Augustine replies:<sup>140</sup> Should you refrain from reprimanding out of a fear of charity, namely, lest the sinner fall into greater evil and begin to afflict those

who are good, you shall not sin. But if you do this from a fear that has its source in greed, lest the sinner grow indignant and you lose your benefices, then you do sin.

## LECTURE 5

**12 For the things that are done by them in secret, it is a shame even to speak of. 13 But all things that are reprov'd are made manifest by the light; for all that is made manifest is light. 14\* Wherefore it saith: Rise, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead; and Christ shall enlighten thee.**

The Apostle explained his warnings above (5:9), and now he gives the reasons for them. He had given two warnings: the first was that they should not associate in the works of darkness, the second that they should reprove sinners. Hence he does two things:

First, he gives the reason for the first warning.

Secondly, the reason for the second (5:13).

Thus he asserts: I said well that you ought not to have fellowship but rather reprimand and reprove such as these. Why? Because **the things that are done by them in secret, it is a shame even to speak of**. This is characteristic of carnal vices which possess a great depravity; they have the least amount of rational good since actions of this type are common to us and the beasts.

After this the Apostle gives the reason for the second warning, and he makes two points:

First, he sets down the reason.

Secondly, he produces a confirmation of it (5:14).

Regarding the first, he wants to prove that it is fitting for them to reprimand delinquents. He proves it this way: Whatever is shown to be evil is to be reprov'd, for every reproof is a certain manifestation; but every manifestation occurs through the light, and you are the light; hence it is fitting for you to reprove and reveal those who are evil. He expresses the major of this reasoning at **But all things that are reprov'd are made manifest by the light**. And the minor is expressed in **for all that is made manifest is light**. As though he said: For this reason it is fitting for you to reprimand them because, as 1 Corinthians 2 (15) puts it, "the spiritual man judgeth all things; and he himself is judged of no man." Thus a Gloss<sup>141</sup> offers the following interpretation: **All sins that are reprov'd by the light**, that is, by the good and holy men who are the children of the light, **are made manifest** through a confession. "But he that

shall confess and forsake them [his sins], shall obtain mercy" (Prov. 28:13). **For all evil that is made manifest**, through confession, **is light**, that is, is turned into light.

Next, he verifies this by an authority (v. 14) which a Gloss interprets: In order that light might prevail he - the Holy Spirit - says: Rise thou that sleepest and arise from the dead and Christ shall enlighten thee.<sup>142</sup> But this is not customary for Paul. Hence it must be said that the Apostle is introducing the image found in Isaias 60 (1): "Arise, be enlightened, O Jerusalem; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee." Thus **wherefore it saith** refers to Scripture. **Rise** from a neglect of good works, **thou that sleepest**. "How long wilt thou sleep, O sluggard?" (Prov. 6:9). "Shall he that sleepeth rise again no more?" (Ps. 40:9). **And arise from the dead**, that is, from dead or destructive actions. Christ "will cleanse our conscience from dead works" (Heb. 9:14). "Thy dead men shall live, my slain shall rise again" (Is. 26:19). Rise therefore **and Christ shall enlighten thee**. "The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear?" (Ps. 26:1). "Enlighten my eyes that I never sleep in death" (Ps. 12:4).

Yet are not we capable of rising from sin ourselves since it says: **Rise . . . and Christ shall enlight thee?** I reply. Two things are requisite for the justification of a sinner, namely, a free decision cooperating in the act of rising [from sin] and grace itself. And certainly the free decision itself is had from prevenient grace, while the meritorious actions that follow are from subsequent grace.<sup>143</sup> Hence the last chapter of Lamentations (v. 21) says: "Convert us, O Lord, to thee, and we shall be converted."

## LECTURE 6

**15 See therefore, brethren, how you walk circumspectly; not as unwise, 16 but as wise; redeeming the time, because the days are evil. 17\* Wherefore, become not imprudent; but understanding what is the will of God.**

Above he forbade the old ways of carnal illusions (5:3), now he exhorts them to the contrary newness. He encourages them:

First, toward a newness opposed to the former illusions.

Secondly, toward a newness opposed to voluptuousness (5:18).

The first section contains three parts:

First, he gives them a caution against the fallacy.

Secondly, he shows them the newness of this precaution (5:16b).



Thirdly, he teaches them how to act according to it (5:17).

Whence he states **therefore** from the preceding **see how you walk circumspectly**. Caution is one of the conditions of prudence by which a person avoids hindrances in accomplishing what he has to do. Everyone ought to possess this caution. "Let thy eyes look straight on and let thy eyelids go before thy steps" (Prov. 4:25). This is a characteristic of wise men, thus he adds **not as unwise** who do not know how to avoid the obstacles. "All the foolish of heart were troubled" (Ps. 75:6). **But as wise**: "The eyes of a wise man are in his head: the fool walketh in darkness" (Eccl. 2:14). Some say: "If you do not act chastely, nonetheless act cautiously." The Apostle does not take it in such a sense; when he says **circumspectly** it is as though he said: Beware of men who thwart chastity.

He explains the necessity of this precaution when he says **redeeming the time**, which can be interpreted in two ways. On certain occasions a man redeems his property by offering a gift or something else for it; for instance, someone is said to compensate for a grievance he caused by offering a gift or money, or by renouncing something which is rightfully his. In this sense he would be saying: The whole of time is now a time of deception, hence you should be **redeeming the time, because the days are evil**. At the time Adam sinned, and from then on, snares have always been set to thrust men into sin. It was not that way in the state of innocence when it was unnecessary for a man to abstain from anything which was licit, since there was nothing in his will driving him to sin. But now we have to redeem the time, **because the days are evil**; we must avoid the depravity of the days, and "beware beforehand of the evil day," as Ecclesiastes 7 (15) expresses it. To do this we must renounce even certain things which are lawful: "All things are lawful for me; but all things do not edify" (1 Cor. 10:23). In this way a person is said to redeem a grievance he caused since he permits something that is rightfully his to be forfeited.

There is another interpretation of **redeeming the time**. For it sometimes happens that a person lives a great part of his life in sin, and this is time lost. But how is he to redeem it when man is incapable of paying his debts? I reply that he ought to devote himself to good works to an even greater degree than he had previously pursued sinful ones. "For the time past is sufficient to have fulfilled the will of the Gentiles, for them who have walked in riotousness, lusts, excesses of wine, revellings, banquetings, and unlawful worshipping of idols" (1 Pet. 4:3). The first interpretation, however, is better.

Then he goes on to teach them how to abide by the precaution, saying: **Wherefore** that you may be able to redeem the time **become not imprudent**. Notice that there is a difference between wisdom and prudence. For prudence is a certain type of wisdom, but not the whole of wisdom. "Wisdom is prudence to a man" (Prov. 10:23). That man is called wise in an absolute sense who puts everything into perspective; but a man is wise only in a certain respect when he puts in order only those things about which he is well informed. "As a wise architect I have laid the foundation" (1 Cor. 3:10). For the role of the wise man is to put things in order, as the *First Book of the Metaphysics* states.<sup>144</sup>

Everyone who sets things in perspective considers their end; hence he is wise in an absolute sense who knows and acts for the universal end, God. "For this is your wisdom, and understanding in the sight of nations" (Deut. 4:6). For wisdom, as Augustine mentions in the *Fourth Book on the Trinity*, is the knowledge of divine realities.<sup>145</sup> Prudence, on the other hand, is the directive care of particular things, as when a person regulates his actions. Thus, wisdom is prudence to man. For this reason he says **become not imprudent, but understanding what is the will of God**. For just as speculative reason puts whatever is to be done in perspective and judges it - it is necessary to have conclusions and to judge them by principles - so likewise in the field of performance.<sup>146</sup> Now the first principle through which we ought to judge and regulate everything is the will of God. Hence the intellect, in moral matters and those which lead to God, must have the will of God for its principle. If it does, then the intellect becomes prudent. "O that they would be wise and would understand, and would provide for their last end" (Deut. 32:29). Our Lord taught this: "Thy will be done" (Mt. 26:42).

## LECTURE 7

**18 And be not drunk with wine, wherein is luxury; but be ye filled with the Holy Spirit, 19 speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual canticles, singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord; 20 giving thanks always for all things, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to God and the Father; 21 being subject one to another, in the fear of Christ.**

He urged them before to that newness which is in opposition to the old illusion (5:15), now he does the same in reference to the old ways of carnal sins. Or, we might say that he previously reprimanded carnal sins in regard to voluptuousness and here does it concerning gluttony. He makes two points:

First, he forbids the old way.

Secondly, he introduces them to the new condition (5:18b).

Thus he says: I have stated that fornication and all uncleanness should not be even named among you. Yet you ought also be careful to abstain from superfluous wine since excessive food and drink is a cause of sensuality; and especially wine which warms and excites a man. "Wine is a luxurious thing, and drunkenness riotous" (Prov. 20:1). "When the king was merry, and after very much drinking was well warmed with wine, he commanded . . . to bring in queen Vashti before the king" (Est. 1:10-11). "Fornication and wine and drunkenness take away the understanding" (Os. 4:11). Whence Jerome remarks: "A man over whom Sodom could not prevail was conquered by wine - Lot."<sup>147</sup> Therefore **be not drunk with wine, wherein is luxury**.

**But be ye filled with the Holy Spirit.** Among all those things which breed a variety of moods is wine; thus it begets animosity and makes men "talk in thousands" as 3 Esdras 3 (21) affirms. Appropriately therefore does he teach them the opposite, to be filled with the Holy Spirit who engenders an intensity of devotion: "In spirit fervent" (Rom. 12:11). Who also spreads joy and spiritual happiness: "justice, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Rom. 14:17). Who, moreover, makes men speak out boldly: "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost; and they began to speak with diverse tongues, according as the Holy Ghost gave them to speak" (Ac. 2:4), so that those who heard them thought they were drunk (Ac. 2:13).

But do we possess the Holy Spirit by our own power? I reply and say that the Holy Spirit is possessed in two ways. Either he is had receptively, and it is not in our power to receive him, rather we accept him as a gift from God: "the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost, who is given to us" (Rom. 5:5). Or he is possessed dispositively, and even here we are not capable of receiving him since we cannot dispose ourselves without the grace of God: "Not that we are sufficient to think any thing of ourselves, as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is from God" (2 Cor. 3:5).

Or, someone may be said to receive the Holy Spirit, and nonetheless not be full of the Holy Spirit. He has the grace of the Holy Spirit in reference to certain aspects of his life, but not in reference to every one of his actions. Then is he said to be full of the Holy Spirit when he avails himself of the Spirit in all he does.

The way to be filled is found in the love of God and one's fellow men. Thus when he says **speaking to yourselves in psalms** (v. 19):

First, he touches on the way of being filled in relation to God.

Secondly, in relation to one's fellow man (5:21).

Concerning the first of these he does three things:

First, he prescribes spiritual meditation.

Secondly, he speaks of spiritual exultation (5:19b).

Thirdly, comes the thanksgiving (5:20).

The first has two parts:

First, he writes of the manner of the meditation.

Secondly, the subject matter of it (5:19a).

There are two ways of **speaking to yourselves**. One is external, of a man talking to other men; another is interior, of a man speaking to himself. This latter ought to be repentant: "I will speak in the bitterness of my soul" (Job 10:1). And it ought to be done in secret: "when thou shalt pray, enter into thy chamber and, having shut the door, pray to thy Father in secret" (Mt. 6:6). "When I go into my house, I shall repose myself with her [wisdom]" (Wis. 8:16).

He then touches on the subject-matter of meditative prayer when he says **in psalms and hymns and spiritual canticles**. To sing is to make use of the psalter; and thus **in psalms**, that is, in good works. "Take a psalm, and bring hither the timbrel: the pleasant psalter with the harp" (Ps. 80:3). **And hymns**, that is, by the divine praises: "A hymn to all his saints" (Ps. 148:14); **and spiritual canticles** concerning the hope of eternal realities: "Rejoicing in hope" (Rom. 12:12); "Upon the ten stringed psalter, with a canticle upon the harp" (Ps. 91:4), "Sing ye to the Lord a new canticle, because he hath done wonderful things" (Ps. 97:1). Hence we meditate on honest actions and what we should do; on the divine praise and what we should imitate; and on the joy of heaven and what we should render homage to, and how.

The first effect of the Holy Spirit is a holy meditation, and the second is a spiritual exultation; from frequent meditation the fire of charity is enkindled in the heart. "My heart grew hot within me: and in my meditation a fire shall flame out" (Ps. 38:4). And from this a spiritual joy is born within the heart; thus he mentions **singing and making melody** so that our will would be stirred by spiritual joys to undertake good works. "I will sing with the spirit, I will sing also with the understanding" (1 Cor. 14:15). "In all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual canticles, singing in grace in your hearts to God" (Col. 3:16).

This refutes the error of those heretics who claim that it is useless to sing vocal canticles to the Lord; that only spiritual ones matter. In the praises of the Church there is an essential element to consider, what the Apostle refers to as **in your hearts**. Yet there is another element [the external expression in song] which has a twofold purpose. One is that it is for us, to stimulate our minds to an interior devotion. If someone is rather moved to frivolity or vain glory by it, this is contrary to the Church's intention. Its second purpose is for others, since by it the illiterate become more devout: "And when the minstrel played, the hand of the Lord came upon him" (4 Kgs. 3:15).<sup>148</sup>

The third effect is thanksgiving because, when someone is influenced in these ways toward God, he recognizes that everything he has is from God. For the more a person is affected by his relation to God, and knows him, the more does he see God as greater while he himself becomes smaller, indeed almost nothing, in comparison with God. "Now my eye seeth thee. Therefore do I reprehend myself, and do penance in dust and ashes" (Job 42:5-6). So he declares **giving thanks always for all things**, for all his gifts, whether of prosperity or adversity. "I will bless the Lord at all times; his praise shall be always in my mouth" (Ps. 33:1). For adversities are also gifts to us on the way: "Count it all joy when you shall fall

into diverse temptations" (Jas. 1:2). And the Apostles "indeed went from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were accounted worthy to suffer reproach for the name of Jesus" (Ac. 5:41). "In all things give thanks" (1 Thess. 5:18).

This is **in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ** since all blessings come through him. "Let us have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom also we have access through faith into this grace" (Rom. 5:1-2). Yet he adds **to God** inasmuch as he is our maker through creation, **and the Father** since he sent Christ to us through whom he regenerated us. Thus we give thanks to him as God regarding the goods of nature, and to him as Father in reference to the goods of grace.

He sets down the way of being filled [by the Spirit] in relation to one's fellow men by saying **being subject one to another, in the fear of Christ**, that is, not out of a human fear but from a reverence for Christ.

## LECTURE 8

**22\* Let women be subject to their husbands as to a lord; 23 because the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the church. He is the savior of his body. 24 Therefore, as the church is subject to Christ, so also let the wives be to their husbands in all things. 25 Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the church and delivered himself up for it; 26 that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life; 27 that he might present it to himself, a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish. 28a So also ought men to love their wives as their own bodies.**

Up until now the Apostle has set down general precepts applicable to everyone (4:17), at this point he expresses those which pertain to particular persons or classes. According to the Philosopher in his *Politics*,<sup>149</sup> a home must possess three relationships if it is to be complete, namely, that of the husband and wife, of the father and the children, and that between the master and his servants. Hence these three are dealt with when the Apostle instructs:

First, the husband and wife.

Secondly, the father and child (6:1).

Thirdly, the servants and masters (6:5).

The first has two divisions:

First, he cautions the women to be subject.  
Secondly, he admonishes the men to love (5:25).

The first is again twofold:

First, he gives an admonition.  
Secondly, he explains the reason for it (5:23).

Hence he states: **Let women be subject to their husbands** because "a woman, if she have superiority, is contrary to her husband" as Ecclesiasticus 25 (30) affirms. So he especially warns them about subjection. This is **as to a lord** since the relation of a husband to his wife is, in a certain way, like that of a master to his servant, insofar as the latter ought to be governed by the commands of his master. The difference between these two relationships is that the master employs his servants in whatever is profitable to himself; but a husband treats his wife and children in reference to the common good. Thus he mentions **as to a lord**; the husband is not really a lord, but is *as* a lord. "Let wives be subject to their husbands" (1 Pet. 3:1).

Next, he adds his reason; regarding it he makes three points:

First, he offers it for consideration.  
Secondly, he introduces an example (v. 23b).<sup>150</sup>  
Thirdly, from the example he draws his conclusion (v. 24).

The reason for this subjection is that the husband is the head of the wife, and the sense of sight is localized in the head - "The eyes of a wise man are in his head" (Eccl. 2:14) - and hence a husband ought to govern his wife as her head. "The head of the woman is the man" (1 Cor. 11:3). Then he brings in his example when he says: **as Christ is the head of the church**. God "hath made him head over all the church, which is his body" (Eph. 1:22-23). This is not for his own utility, but for that of the Church since **he is the savior of his body**. "For there is no other name under heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved" (Ac. 4:12). "Behold, God is my savior; I will deal confidently and will not fear" (Is 12:2).

From this he draws the conclusion he intended, saying **Therefore, as the church is subject to Christ**. As though he said: It is not proper for an organ to rebel against its head in any situation; but as Christ is head of the church in his own way, so a husband is the head of his wife; therefore the wife must be obedient to her husband **as the church is subject to Christ**. "Shall not my soul be subject to God?" (Ps. 61:2), **so also let the wives be to their husbands**. "And thou shalt be under thy husbands power" (Gen. 3:16), in all things which are not contrary to God, for Acts 5 (29) affirms: "We ought to obey God rather than men."

After this he admonishes the husbands that they are to love their wives.

First, he does this.

Secondly, he gives his reason (5:25b).

He states: **Husbands, love your wives**. For certainly it is from the love he has for his wife that he will live more chastely and both of them will enjoy a peaceful relationship. If he should love another more than his own wife, he exposes both himself and his wife to the possibility of sin. "Husbands, love your wives and be not bitter towards them" (Col. 3:19).

He then treats of the threefold reason for this.

First, one springs from the example of Christ (v. 25b).

Secondly, another comes from the husband himself (5:28b).

Thirdly, another from a divine commandment (5:31).

Concerning the first he does three things:

First, he offers the example of Christ's love.

Secondly, then the sign of that love (5:25b-27).

Thirdly, finally he deduces his intended conclusion (5:28a).

Thus he says: **as Christ also loved the church**; "Be ye therefore followers of God, as most dear children; and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us and hath delivered himself for us" (Eph. 5:1-2). The sign of Christ's love for the church is that **he delivered himself up for it**. "The Son of God who loved me and delivered himself for me" (Gal. 2:20). "He hath delivered his soul unto death" (Is. 53:12). And for what? **That he might sanctify it**: "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people by his own blood, suffered without the gate" (Heb. 13:12). "Sanctify them in truth" (Jn. 17:17); that is the effect of Christ's death.

As a result of this sanctification he cleanses it from the stains of sin. Hence he adds **cleansing it by the laver of water**. This washing has a power from the passion of Christ. "All we who are baptized in Christ Jesus are baptized in his death; for we are buried together with him by baptism into death" (Rom. 6:3-4). "And I will pour upon you clean water and you shall be cleansed from all your filthiness" (Ez. 36:25). "There shall be a fountain open to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem; for the washing of the sinner and of the unclean woman" (Zach. 13:1). This occurs **in the word of life** which, coming

upon the water, gives it the power to cleanse: "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (Mt. 28:19).

The goal of this sanctifying action is the Church's purity. Thus he states **that he might present it to himself, a glorious church**; as if the Apostle said: It would be highly improper for the immaculate bridegroom to wed a soiled bride. This is why he presents her to himself in an immaculate state, now through grace and in the future through glory.

Regarding the latter, he says **glorious** by the clarity of both body and soul. For "he will reform the body of our lowliness, made like to the body of his glory" (Phil. 3:21). Hence he adds **not having spot**: "the man that walked in the perfect way, he served me" (Ps. 100:6); "blessed are the undefiled in the way: who walk in the law of the Lord" (Ps. 118:1). **Or wrinkle** refers to the lack of suffering since, as the Apocalypse 7 (16) remarks: "they shall no more hunger nor thirst," **or any such thing, but that it should be holy** through its confirmation in grace, **and without the blemish** of any defilement. Thus all of these characteristics can be understood of the appearance of the Church in the future through glory.

But if they are taken to refer to her appearance through faith, then he would be saying: **that he might present to himself**, through faith, **a glorious church**, since "it is a great glory to follow the Lord" (Ecclus. 23:38), **not having a spot** of mortal sin. "Thou are stained in thy iniquity" (Jer. 2:22). Nor does it have a **wrinkle**, that is, a duplicity of purpose which those who are rightly united with Christ and the Church do not have. "My wrinkles bear witness against me" (Job 16:9). **But** rather **that it should be holy** through its aspiration **and without blemish** through every kind of purity.

From the above he, in the third place, draws the conclusion he intended by affirming: **So also ought men to love their wives as their own bodies.**

## LECTURE 9

**28b He that loveth his wife loveth himself. 29 For no man ever hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, as also Christ doth the church; 30 because we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones.**

Above he urged husbands to love their wives, he appealed to Christ and to the example of Christ's love for the church (5:25). Here he demonstrates the same thing from the point of view of the husband himself. He makes two points:



First, he gives the reason.

Secondly, he verifies it through an example (5:29b).

The reason is as follows. A husband and wife are somehow one; hence, as the flesh is subject to the soul, so is the wife to the husband; but no one ever held his own flesh in contempt, therefore neither should anyone his wife. Whence he states **He that loveth his wife loveth himself**. "Therefore, now they are not two, but one flesh" (Mt. 19:6). Just as a man sins against nature in hating himself,<sup>151</sup> so does he who hates his wife. "With three things my spirit is pleased, which are approved before God and men: the concord of brethren, and the love of neighbors, and man and wife that agree well together" (Ecclus. 25:1-2).

He proves that they ought to love one another in saying **For no man ever hated his own flesh**. This love is evident in what happens since "love is verified when it is expressed in action."<sup>152</sup> For we love anything whose powers we sustain. **But everyone nourisheth and cherisheth his own flesh** in order to sustain it. "But, having food and wherewith to be covered, with these we are content" (1 Tim. 6:8).

But is not this contrary to Luke 14 (26): "If any man come to me, and hate not his father and mother and wife and children and brethren and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple?" I reply. The Apostle affirms that a man ought to love his wife as he does himself; but he must love himself less than God; hence he should also love his wife less than God. In stating "he who does not hate his wife," he is not commanding that she be hated - which would be to command a mortal sin - but that she be loved as the man loves himself. Now love in a lesser degree is like a certain hatred in comparison with whatever is loved most or to a greater degree, in this case, God.

Likewise, **no man ever hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it**. But there are objections to this. When anyone loves something he never wants nor desires to be separated from it. Yet the saints wanted to be separated from the flesh. "Unhappy man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Rom. 7:24), "having a desire to be dissolved and to be with Christ" (Phil. 1:23). Besides, nobody afflicts what he loves, but the saints punished their flesh while they were in this world. "I chastise my body and bring it into subjection" (1 Cor. 9:27). Moreover, some people even kill themselves, as is frequently heard of. Judas did it.

I reply. The flesh, when considered in itself, is not held in contempt, but everyone naturally wants it to exist and nourishes it for this end. On the other hand, the flesh can be considered as an obstacle to what we will, and thus, through circumstance (*per accidens*), it can be detested in a certain way. For everything that we will is either good or evil. If good, it may be the ultimate end, eternal life, from which we are held back by the flesh. "While we are in the body we are absent from the Lord" (2 Cor. 5:6). And since we naturally desire our fulfillment and well-being - nor can we enjoy these while we are in the flesh - we will

to discard it, not as an evil held in contempt, but as a good we love less than the greater good it impedes. The authoritative texts quoted above, and others like them, are to be explained in this way.

Or, we may will a good that is not the end, but disposes for the end; for example, virtuous habits. But this type of good is opposed by the immoral tendencies of the flesh. On this account do the saints discipline and punish their flesh in order that it might submit to the spirit for the curbing of sensual desires. For, in desiring such, the flesh blocks our acquisition of the virtues which dispose us for the ultimate good. Therefore, whoever punishes his flesh that it might submit to his spirit does not hate it, but rather obtains its own good which is that it be subject to the spirit - just as the good of man is to be subject to God: "it is good for me to adhere to my God" (Ps. 72:28). "I chastise my body. . ." and similar passages are to be understood in this way. This would not have been necessary in the state of innocence as long as man was subject to God, and the flesh totally submissive to the spirit; the gift of original justice consisted precisely in this mutual submission.

On the other hand, we sometimes will what is evil. Hence, just as holy persons discipline, or wish to discard, their flesh inasmuch as it is an obstacle to the good they desire, so also the wicked, insofar as the flesh blocks the evil they desire, will kill it and commit suicide, as Judas did.

Then he indicates that a man must love his wife through an example. Thus he says, **Christ also loved the Church** as something of his very self **because we are members of his body**. "For we are members one of another" (Eph. 4:25). He mentions **of his flesh** on account of his sharing the same nature with us. "For a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me to have" (Lk. 24:39). Or, he says this mystically so that **of his flesh** refers to the weak who are of the flesh, and **of his bones** would refer to the strong who are hard as bone.

## LECTURE 10

**31 "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother; and shall cleave to his wife; and they shall be two in one flesh." 32 This is a great sacrament; but I speak in Christ and in the church. 33 Nevertheless, let every one of you in particular love his wife as himself; and let the wife fear her husband.**

The Apostle exhorted the Ephesians above to love their wives. He did this in two ways: both by offering the example of Christ's love for the Church, and by the love a man has for himself (5:25), now he gives a third encouragement drawn from the authority of Scripture. Regarding this he does three things:

First, he brings in the authoritative text.

Secondly, he explains it mystically (5:32).

Thirdly, he adapts it according to its literal meaning to the case in question (5:33).

The authoritative text is Genesis 2 (24); words spoken by Adam when he saw his wife who had been formed from his rib. Yet does not this contradict Matthew 19 (4-5) which states that God himself spoke these words? I reply that Adam spoke them as inspired by God, and God spoke them insofar as he was inspiring and teaching Adam. We use the same expressions; there are many words which the Lord spoke by those whom the spirit of God instructed; so Matthew 10 (20) affirms: "For it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you."

It should be noted that in the above mentioned authority a threefold union of a man and wife is designated. The first union is through the devotion of their love, for it is strong enough in each that they both left their fathers behind. "So a man loves his wife better than his father or mother. Many have lost their heads completely for their wives" (3 Esd. 4:25-26), and much more concerning this is stated there [in 3 Esd. 4]. But this is natural, for natural desires fit in harmoniously with actions that must be performed. It is evident that a desire exists in all higher agents that they administer to, and communicate with, lower agents. Thus a natural love for the lower is present in them. Now a man is an inferior in relation to his father and mother, he is not higher than they; hence he is naturally more drawn towards his wife and children, to whom he is superior, than to his parents. And also because his wife is intimately united to him in the act of procreation.

The second union is through living together. Thus he says **and he shall cleave to his wife**. "With three things my spirit is pleased, which are approved before God and men: the concord of brethren, and the love of neighbors, and man and wife that agree well together" (Ecclus. 25:1-2).

The third is their carnal union - **and they shall be two in one flesh**, that is, in their carnal intercourse. For in any act of generation there is an active and a passive power. In plants both powers are in the same [plant], but in the perfect animals they are distinguished. And hence in the act of generation among animals the male and female become, as in plants, only one and the same body.<sup>153</sup>

He goes on to interpret this mystically, and he says **This is a great sacrament**, it is the symbol of a sacred reality, namely, the union of Christ and the Church. "I will not hide from you the mysteries of God" (Wis. 6:24).

Notice here that four Sacraments are termed great. Baptism by reason of its effect, since it blots out sin and opens the gate of paradise; Confirmation by reason of its minister, it is conferred only by bishops and not by others; the Eucharist because of what it contains, the Whole Christ; and Matrimony by reason of

its signification, for it symbolizes the union of Christ and the Church. If, therefore, the text is mystically interpreted, the preceding passage should be explained as follows: **For this cause shall a man**, namely, Christ, **leave his father and mother**. I say **leave his father**, because he was sent into the world and became incarnate - "I came forth from the Father and am come into the world" (Jn. 16:28) - **and his mother** who was the synagogue - "I have forsaken my house, I have left my inheritance, I have given my dear soul into the hand of her enemies" (Jer. 12:7). **And he shall cleave to his wife**, the Church. "Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (Mt. 28:20).

Next, the point is argued by interpreting the above example according to its literal meaning. For there are certain passages in the Old Testament which can be said only of Christ. For instance, Psalm 21 (17): "They have dug my hands and feet: they have numbered all my bones"; or Isaias 7 (14): "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son; and his name shall be called Emmanuel." Other passages, however, can be explained as referring to Christ and others; to Christ principally, and to others as they were types of Christ. The above example (Gen. 2:24) is of this category.

Thus it must first be interpreted in reference to Christ, and afterwards concerning others. Hence he says **Nevertheless, let every one of you in particular love his wife**, as though he asserted: The above example is principally related of Christ, but not only about him since it must be interpreted and fulfilled in other persons as types of Christ.<sup>154</sup> He states **as himself** because, just as everyone loves himself in relation to God, so he ought to love his wife in this way, and not inasmuch as she draws him into sin. "If any man come to me, and hate not his father and mother and wife . . . he cannot be my disciple" (Lk. 14:26). But what about the wife? **And let the wife fear her husband**, with the fear of reverence and submission since she must be subject to him.

# Chapter 6

## LECTURE 1

**1 Children, obey your parents in the Lord; for this is just. 2 Honor thy father and thy mother, which is the first commandment with a promise; 3 that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest be long lived upon earth. 4 And you, fathers, provoke not your children to anger; but bring them up in the discipline and correction of the Lord.**

He had previously given advice to husband and wife which is one relationship in the family (5:22). Now he cautions the fathers and children, which is the home's second relationship:

First, he mentions how the children should behave toward their parents.

Secondly, how, conversely, fathers should be related to their children (6:4).

The first has two sections:

First, he sets down the warning.

Secondly, he gives the reason (6:1b).

He begins, **Children, obey your parents**. Note here that fathers have a natural duty to instruct their children in moral conduct. The children, on the other hand, have a natural duty, while their parents are instructing them, to be obedient to them - as the sick are to obey doctors. Hence the proper characteristic of children is obedience. "Children, obey your parents in all things; for this is well pleasing to the Lord" (Col. 3:20). He says **in the Lord** because neither parents, nor anyone else, ought to be obeyed when they command something contrary to God. "It is necessary to obey God rather than men" (Ac. 5:29). The authoritative text previously brought forward (5:29) is to be explained in this way also. "If any man come to me, and hate not his father and mother . . . he cannot be my disciple" (Lk. 14:26) is to be understood insofar as they are against God.

The reason he gives for this arises from two sources: from justice and from a utility. That it is just is evident and proved from the fact that the divine law commands only what is just. "The justices of the Lord are right" (Ps. 18:9). And the divine law commands: "Honor thy father and mother, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee" (Ex. 20:12 & Deut. 5:16). "He that feareth the Lord honoureth his parents and will serve them as his masters that brought him into the world" (Ecclus. 3:8).

Honor implies a manifestation of reverence to those who are over us; and since we have parents over us, the word "honor" is used. Hence he affirms: **for this is just, honor thy father and thy mother**. "He that

honoureth his father shall enjoy a long life; and he that obeyeth the father shall be a comfort to his mother" (Ecclus. 3:7). That children ought to honor their parents is to be understood in three ways. They must venerate them as elders; show obedience to them as teachers; and give them sustenance as the ones who had nourished them when they were strong.

He goes on to indicate the dignity of this precept, saying **which is the first commandment**. On the contrary, the first commandment is that the One God must be worshipped. I reply. The commandments were contained on two tablets. The first contained those whose reference was to God; the second those which referred to one's neighbors. On this second tablet the first commandment is to honor one's parents. And this is for two reasons. First, it is the only affirmative precept on the second tablet since it is natural for us to serve our parents, which is not true of our other fellow men, and hence there is no other affirmative command. Rather, nature dictates that a man should not harm his neighbors, and hence this is forbidden. Therefore, the first possesses a prior and greater obligation and so is **the first**. The second reason is that God must be honored as the source of our existence, and our parents also as the source of our existence. *The Sixth Book of the Ethics*<sup>155</sup> points out that we have three things from our parents: existence, life and education. Thus it is fitting that after the commandments related to God, the first would be in reference to our parents.

Or, **first** may refer to the promise which is annexed to this one only. There are two reasons for this. One is that men, in doing things for others, seek their own good; and they can expect no advantage from parents who have already grown old, unless a reward come from God. The second reason is lest anyone imagine that honoring one's parents was not meritorious because it is natural; on this account he adds that **thou mayest be long lived upon the earth**. In the Old Testament temporal promises were pledged because the people then were immature and hence were graciously taught as children under a tutor. Nevertheless, in those little gifts which were suited to a young people, great spiritual favors were symbolized. Therefore this text can refer, according to its literal meaning, to temporal goods; which is why he says **with a promise, that it may be well with thee**, that is, that you may abound in the promised benefits.

For he who is grateful in receiving lesser favors deserves to receive greater ones. Now we have the greatest of benefits from our parents: existence, nourishment, and education. Therefore, when anyone is grateful for these, he becomes worthy to receive greater - thus he remarks **that it may be well with thee**. For, as 1 Timothy 4 (8) affirms, "godliness is profitable to all things, having promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come." He joins that **thou mayest be long lived upon earth** as though [to add it over and] above the grace and favor of life which you enjoy from your parents. "Length of days is in her [wisdom's] right hand: and in her left hand riches and glory" (Prov. 3:16).

Yet it is objected: Many who are devoted to their parents die quickly. Therefore it must be realized that these temporal goods are not absolute except insofar as they are related to spiritual benefits. They are

good for a man to the degree that he is aided by them towards spiritual realities. If it is an obstacle to virtue, fortune must not be termed good. Hence, a long life is good in the measure that it is related to the service of God. It is sometimes not given lest it thwart [this service]. "He was taken away lest wickedness should alter his understanding, or deceit beguile his soul" (Wis. 4:11). Or, he could be referring to a spiritual meaning, that **thou mayest be long lived** in the land of the living. "Thy good spirit shall lead me into the right land; for thy name's sake, O Lord, thou wilt quicken me" (Ps. 142:10-11).

After he has instructed the children, he counsels the parents. Regarding which he makes two points:

First, he places one restriction.

Secondly, he gives an incentive, at **but bring them up. . .**

When he says **And you, fathers, provoke not your children to anger**, it is not that the fathers must give in to their will in all matters. Here it must be noted that the authority of a father with respect to his child is different from that of a master with respect to his servant. For the master employs his servant to his own advantage, but the father manages his child for the child's advantage. It is necessary that fathers educate their children for the children's own good; not, however, by excessively restricting or subjecting them.<sup>156</sup> Thus Colossians 3 (21) states: "Fathers, provoke not your children to indignation, lest they be discouraged." Because such provocation does not inspire them to good.

How then should they? He adds **but bring them up in the discipline** of spankings **and the correction of words**. That is, correct and educate them that they might be of service to **the Lord**. Or, **in the discipline** may designate that they should encourage them to do good, **and correction** to restrain them from evils.

## LECTURE 2

**5 Servants, be obedient to them that are your lords according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in the simplicity of your heart, as to Christ; 6 not serving to the eye, as it were pleasing men, but, as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; 7 with a good will serving, as to the Lord, and not to men; 8 knowing that whatsoever good thing any man shall do, the same shall he receive from the Lord, whether he be bond or free. 9 And you, masters, do the same things to them, forbearing threatenings; knowing that the Lord both of them and you is in heaven. And there is no respect of persons with him.**

Once he has given advice concerning the two relationships of husband to wife, and father to children (5:22), he now instructs them regarding the relation of servant to master. In reference to this he does two things:

First, he instructs the servant.

Secondly, the master (6:9).

The first has three parts:

First, he sets down the admonition.

Secondly, he explains it (6:6).

Thirdly, he indicates the reward (6:8).

Again, the first part has three subdivisions; he admonishes them:

First, to obedience.

Secondly, to reverence.

Thirdly, to simplicity of heart.

For he instructs them to obey as by a command of the Lord. Hence he states **Servants, be obedient to them that are your lords according to the flesh**. He cautions them regarding reverence, saying **with interior fear**: "if I be a master, where is my fear?" (Mal. 1:6). **And exterior trembling**: "serve ye the Lord with fear; and rejoice unto him with trembling" (Ps. 2:11). And this must be **in the simplicity of your heart**: "Seek him in simplicity of heart" (Wis. 1:1); "Hast thou considered my servant Job . . . a simple and upright man, and fearing God, and avoiding evil?" (Job 1:8).

In this way is Christ to be served; thus he says **as to Christ**. "Seek him in simplicity of heart" (Wis. 1:1); "O Lord God, I also in the simplicity of my heart have joyfully offered all these things" (1 Par. 29:17). He also mentions **as to Christ** since whatever power a master has comes from Christ the Lord. "Therefore, he that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God" (Rom. 13:2). They must be served as Christ is in whatever is not contrary to faith nor contrary to Christ himself.

He explains **in simplicity of heart**:

First, he repudiates what is against simplicity.

Secondly, he teaches the appropriate way of acting (6:6b).



It is against simplicity that a servant be concerned with what the eye sees instead of what pleases the Lord.<sup>157</sup> For such a servant does not possess simplicity and rectitude of intention. Hence he forbids this saying **not serving to the eye**, namely, the master, on account of a temporal advantage only, as it were pleasing men. "If I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ" (Gal. 1:10). **But, as the servants of Christ**, "Serve ye the Lord Christ" (Col. 3:24). And how? **Doing the will of God**, by carrying his commands into action. "Carry out his word" (Ps. 102:20\*), just as Christ did: "I came down from heaven, not to do my own will but the will of him that sent me. Now this is the will of the Father who sent me" (Jn. 6:38-39), that I obey men for the sake of God. And thus he states **as servants of Christ**, being of service to the Lord and not to men; that is, not for their own sakes but for that of the Lord.

How should this be done? **From the heart**. "Whatsoever you do, do it from the heart, as to the Lord, and not to men" (Col. 3:23).<sup>158</sup> You should act **with a good will**, that is, with the right intention; "that you may stand perfect and full in all the will of God" (Col. 4:12).

Next, he mentions the reward, saying **knowing** - "These things I write to you that you may know" (1 Jn. 5:13) - **that any man . . . whether he be bond or free** is not favored because of his status. For there is no respect of persons with God. "There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male or female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28). "In very deed I perceive that God is not a respecter of persons. But, in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh justice is acceptable to him" (Ac. 10:34-35).

**Whatsoever good thing any man shall do** it must be accomplished for the universe.<sup>159</sup> "Whatsoever thy hand is able to do, do it earnestly: for neither work, nor reason, nor wisdom, nor knowledge, shall be in hell, whither thou art hastening" (Eccl. 9:10). What he does **the same shall he receive from the Lord**, as a recompense. "Knowing that you shall receive of the Lord the reward of inheritance" (Col. 3:24).

Then he goes on to give advice to masters, and he makes two points:

First, he sets down a warning.

Secondly, he adds the reason (6:9b).

He states, therefore, **And you, masters, do the same**, namely, with a proportional identity: as servants act from the heart and with a good will, so also should you act. "If thou have a faithful servant, let him be to thee as thy own soul" (Ecclus. 33:31) - **forbearing threatenings** and not only [refraining from] blows and whippings.

Why? He gives the reason when he says **knowing that the Lord both of them and you is in heaven**. "For the same is Lord over all" (Rom. 10:12). It is as though he were saying: You are fellow servants, and

hence you ought to behave well towards them. "Shouldst not thou then have had compassion also on thy fellow servant?" (Mt. 18:33). **And there is no respect of persons with him.** Romans 2 (11) makes the same statement, as also Acts 10 (34). "Thou dost not respect any person" (Lk. 20:21).

### LECTURE 3

**10\* Finally, brethren, be strengthened in the Lord and in the power of his virtue. 11 Put you on the armor of God, that you may be able to stand against the deceits of the devil. 12 For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness in the high places.**

The Apostle has previously written down many general and particular instructions aimed at destroying the old man of sin and encouraging the newness of grace (1:1 & 4:17). Now he speaks of the power by which we must carry out these precepts, for we must trust in divine assistance. Concerning this he does two things:

First, he sets down the advice.

Secondly, he explains it in detail (6:12).

The first has two sections:

First, he shows what interior reality we ought to trust in.

Secondly, then he shows what exterior reality we must trust in (6:11).

The inner reality we should have confidence in is the divine help, thus he states **Finally, brethren, be strengthened.** "Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and the Lord shall be his confidence" (Jer. 17:7). There are two reasons why anyone would trust in another person. One is that this person is charged with protecting him; and the other reason is that he is strong and prepared to defend him. These two are realized in God with respect to his creatures; for God is concerned with you: "Casting all your care upon him, for he hath care of you" (1 Pet. 5:7). Moreover, he is powerful and prompt to grant assistance.

Therefore he asserts **finally brethren**, as if to say: Now that I have advised you above concerning the fulfillment of the precepts, **be strengthened**, not in yourselves, but **in the Lord** who has care of you. "It is good for me to adhere to my God, to put my hope in the Lord God" (Ps. 72:28). "Say to the fainthearted: Take courage, and fear not . . . God himself will come and will save you" (Is. 35:4). "The

Lord is with me as a strong warrior: therefore they that persecute me shall fall and shall be weak" (Jer. 20:11). **And in his**

**power** "for he is mighty" (Lk. 1:49). Although in God virtue and power are identical, nonetheless, since virtue is the ultimate of power, and as it were the perfection of power, on this account he says **in the power of his virtue**, that is, in his virtuous power.<sup>160</sup> "I can do all things in him who strengtheneth me" (Phil. 4:13). "O Lord, set me beside thee; and let any man's hand fight against me" (Job 17:3).

Someone might say: If God is powerful and wills [to protect us], we ought to be unconcerned. He replies that this is not so; indeed, everyone must do what he can since, if an unarmed man went into battle, no matter how much the king protected him he would still be in danger. Hence he says **Put you on the armor of God**, that is, the gifts [of the Holy Spirit] and virtues. "Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light" (Rom. 13:12). "Put ye on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, the bowels of mercy, benignity, humility, modesty, patience" (Col. 3:12). For the virtues protect man from vices.

An objection: the Lord is so powerful a king that no one can attack him. I reply. This is true concerning violence; yet the devil does attack him, not in himself, but in his members through deceit and illusions. "For many are the snares of the deceitful" (Ecclus. 11:31). Thus he adds **that you may be able to stand against the deceits of the devil**. "Be sober and watch; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, goeth about seeking whom he may devour" (1 Pet. 5:8). "He lieth in wait in secret like a lion in his den" (Ps. 9:30).

He then goes on to explain this warning in detail:

First, concerning the snares of the enemies.

Secondly, what arms should be taken up (6:13).

Thirdly, the confidence which must be had in Christ (6:18).

He describes the snares because, when an enemy is near at hand, there is not much reason to be on one's guard or fear him if he is weak, stupid and the like. But when he is strong, evil and shrewd, then he ought to be dreaded. These latter are found in the devil. Firstly, he is not weak. For this reason he states that **our wrestling is not against flesh and blood**. By flesh and blood sins of the flesh are to be understood: "flesh and blood cannot possess the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. 15:50), nor can carnal men. "Immediately I condescended not to flesh and blood" (Gal. 1:16), that is, to carnal men. But, his saying **our wrestling is not against flesh and blood** seems to be false no matter how it is understood since, as Galatians 5 (17) holds, "For the flesh lusteth against the spirit; and the spirit against the flesh." "Many [sinners] are they that persecute me and afflict me" (Ps. 118:157).

I reply in two ways. First, supply "only" so that we could say **our wrestling is not only against flesh and blood** without it also being against the devil. A second answer is that an action which is attributed to an instrument is principally of the agent. As Romans 9 (16) holds: "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy." He seems to say: When you will or do anything, it is not from yourself, but from God. Thus here, **our wrestling is not against flesh and blood** would be interpreted: When flesh and blood attack us, it is not of themselves principally but from a higher moving force, namely, from the devil.

Next, the devil's power is described, for we fight **against principalities and powers . . . of this darkness**. "The prince of this world cometh, and in me he hath not any thing" (Jn. 14:30). He is called the prince of the world, not by reason of creation, but because worldly minded people imitate him. "And the world knew him [Christ] not" (Jn. 1:10), that is, the worldly princes. Or, he is called the prince as though he had captured the primacy. Hence princes are, as it were, the first leaders in something. "Princes went before joined with singers" (Ps. 67:26). "Thou art a prince of God among us" (Gen. 23:6).

The exercise of justice pertains to power. Hence, insofar as some demons incite others to rebel against God, they are called Principalities; insofar as they have the power to punish those who are subjected to them, they are called Powers. "But this is your hour and the power of darkness" (Lk. 22:53).

But since some angels fell from every one of the ranks, why does the Apostle only mention those two ranks, calling them demons? I reply. There are three characteristics in the names of the ranks. For in some is implied a relation to God, in others power, in still others the service of God. In the names Cherubim, Seraphim and Thrones, a turning toward God is connoted. The devils, on the other hand, are turned away from God, and hence these names do not apply to them. Again, certain names imply an ordination to the service of God, as the Angels and Archangels; these also are not applicable to the demons, unless one joins "of Satan" to the names. Thirdly, since Virtues and Dominations also imply an ordering toward God's worship these names cannot be applicable to the demons. Only those two, **Principalities and Powers**, are common to the good and bad angels.

Hence, they are powerful and great, possessing an immense army against which we must fight as **against the rulers of the world of this darkness** of sin. "For you were heretofore darkness, but now light in the Lord" (Eph. 5:8). Whatever is darksome is wholly of their rank and subject to them. As a Gloss comments: "Evil men are horses, and the demons the riders; hence, if we kill the riders, the horses will be ours."<sup>161</sup> "And the darkness did not comprehend it" (Jn. 1:5).

They are also cunning, [we must fight] **against the spirits of wickedness**; this is an emphatic way of saying "spiritual wickedness," by which is understood the fullness of evil. He affirms **the spirits of wickedness** because, the higher one's nature is, the more terrible and pernicious it is when one turns to

evil. Whence the Philosopher states<sup>162</sup> that an evil man is worse than all the animals. Thus he says **the spirits of wickedness** since they are spiritual and most wicked.

He mentions **in the high places** for two possible reasons. Either to show the strength and advantage they possess to overcome us; we are on the earth, but they are on high in the dusky atmosphere so that they have the better position. "And the fowls of the air devoured it" (Lk. 8:5). Or, he says **in the high places** because this struggle is for heaven, and this should urge us on to fight.

#### LECTURE 4

**13 Therefore, take unto you the armor of God, that you may be able to resist in the evil day and to stand in all things perfect. 14 Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth and having on the breastplate of justice; 15 and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; 16 in all things taking the shield of faith, wherewith you may be able to extinguish all the fiery darts of the most wicked one. 17 And take unto you the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.**

The Apostle explained the devil's snares previously (6:12), and here he advises us to take up arms. In reference to this he does two things:

First, he concludes from the foregoing that arms are necessary.

Secondly, he describes the variety of weapons (6:14).

Thus he says: You have evil enemies who are powerful and most wicked, and the struggle is for an exacting object since it is for heaven. **Therefore, take unto you the armor of God**, that is, be armed with spiritual weapons. "For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty to God unto the pulling down of fortifications, destroying counsels" (2 Cor. 10:4). And this **that you may be able to resist**. "Whom resist ye, strong in faith" (1 Pet. 5:9). "Resist the devil; and he will fly from you" (Jas. 4:7). For the more is conceded to him, the more will he press in upon you. **In the evil day** indicates that a day is evil from what occurs in it. "Redeeming the time, because the days are evil" (Eph. 5:16). "Beware beforehand of the evil day" (Eccl. 7:15).

Take up these [weapons] not only for defense, but also to make progress: **and to stand in all things perfect**, that is, stand firm in both adversity and prosperity. "That you may be perfect and entire, failing in nothing" (Jas. 1:4). Concerning this 1 Peter 1 (13) affirms: "Trust perfectly in the grace which is offered you in the revelation of Jesus Christ."

However, must everyone be perfect? I reply that there are three types of perfection. There is one of sufficiency when a man has what is necessary for his salvation; for instance, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart," as if to say: Let there be nothing in your heart which is contrary to God. This much is necessary for salvation. "That you may be perfect and entire, failing in nothing" (Jas. 1:4). Another is the total and overflowing perfection proper to the fatherland; there glory is consummated in this, that the perfect totally inhere in God. "For in the resurrection they shall neither marry nor be married; but shall be as the angels of God in heaven" (Mt. 22:30). The Apostle speaks of this in Philippians 3 (12:13): "Not as though I had already attained, or were already perfect. . . Brethren, I do not count myself to have apprehended." The third perfection is between the above two, it is that of the counsels in which a man strives to withdraw himself from these [passing realities] and make progress towards those [which remain forever].

Then he goes on to describe the variety of weapons. There are three kinds of spiritual armor, paralleling bodily arms. Some are like clothes and are meant to cover one; others are to protect him (6:16); and still others are for fighting (6:17).

Three things are necessary for clothing. Firstly, it must be bound with a belt; regarding this he says **Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about.** However, a man clothes himself before he puts his belt on. Here the Apostle follows the order of spiritual armor. In spiritual warfare it is first necessary to check carnal desires, just as the nearest enemy must be conquered first. This is done by bridling the loins in which sensuality thrives; such girding is done through temperance which is opposed to gluttony and sensuality. "Let your loins be girt" (Lk. 12:35); "gird up thy loins like a man" (Job 38:3). But this must be done **with truth**, that is, with the right intention and not with pretence. A variant reading gives "with charity"; as 1 Corinthians 16 (14) states: "Let all that you do be done in charity."

Secondly, he warns them to overcome greed for created things. Two weapons can be found against it: justice and the renunciation of temporalities. First, he commands us not to unjustly usurp property; justice will look after this. Thus he says **and having on the breastplate of justice**, on account of which a man keeps out of other people's property. Justice is referred to as a breastplate because it covers all the virtues just as a breastplate does the members [of the body]. "He will put on justice as a breastplate, and will take true judgment instead of a helmet" (Wis. 5:19). Second, he commands us to get rid of an excessive care about temporal realities. When we are too caught up in these, our feet are not ready to carry out divine pursuits and proclaim its mysteries. For this reason he says **and your feet shod** - understand by this that one's inclinations should be determined - **with the preparation of the gospel of peace.** As a symbol of this the Lord sent the Apostles (cf. Mk. 6:9) shod with sandals. These have soles underneath, by which the raising of the mind from earthly matters is signified; and they are open above, in which an eagerness

for divine wisdom is signified. He adds **of peace** since through the gospel peace is proclaimed to us. "When you come into the house, salute it, saying: Peace be to this house" (Mt. 10:12).

The second function of weapons is to protect. Two areas which contain the mainsprings of our life must be guarded: the chest in which the heart is situated, and the head which contains the brain. The chest is protected by a shield; thus he states **in all things taking the shield of faith** because faith is presupposed to all the other virtues just as a shield is basic to all weapons.

For there is a difference between the armor of the moral virtues, such as temperance which is to gird one's loins and justice which is to put on a breastplate, and this type of armament - the shield - which consists of the theological virtue of faith. Just as a shield wards off the arrows, so faith repels what is aimed against it and gains the victory. The saints "by faith conquered kingdoms" (Heb. 11:33), whereas we conquer the powers of darkness by the moral virtues. Thus he says **wherewith you may be able to extinguish all the fiery darts of the most wicked one**, the devil, whose arrows are certain interferences from evil angels (cf. Ps. 77:49). They are fiery since evil desires burn: "Fire hath fallen on them, and they shall not see the sun" (Ps. 57:9). These are extinguished through faith; it quenches present and transitory temptations with the eternal and spiritual blessings promised in Holy Scripture. Thus the Lord brought forward authoritative texts of Holy Scripture to oppose the devil's temptations. We ought to do the same; if tempted to gluttony, [counter it with] "Not in bread alone doth man live" (Deut. 8:3), or "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink" (Rom. 14:17). If tempted to sensuality, "Thou shalt not commit adultery" (Ex. 20:14); if to theft, "Thou shalt not steal" (Ex. 20:15) - and so on with any others.

Faith is called a shield since, as a shield protects the entire chest, so faith must be in our heart. Hope, on the other hand, is referred to as a helmet because, as a helmet is on the head, so the head of the moral virtues is the end, and hope is concerned with this end. Hence he states **And take unto you the helmet of salvation**.

Finally, the third function of weapons is for attack. It is not enough to simply defend one's self, it is also necessary to assault the enemy. Physically, this is done with a material sword; it is done spiritually through the word of God which is the sword of the Holy Spirit. On this account he affirms **and take up the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God**. "For the word of God is living and effectual and more piercing than any two-edged sword and reaching unto the division of the soul and the spirit" (Heb. 4:12). Preaching is called the sword of the Spirit because it will not penetrate to the spirit unless it is disposed by the Holy Spirit. "For it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you" (Mt. 10:20).

Therefore, we possess weapons to defend ourselves against carnal adversaries, namely, gluttony and sensuality, through temperance: **Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth**. By the arms

of justice, which make us refrain from what is unlawful, we can conquer also earthly greed: **and having on the breastplate of justice**. This is aided by purity of heart or poverty which withdraw us even from things which are lawful: **and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace**. Moreover, we have weapons by which we are guarded from error, the armor of faith: **in all things taking the shield of faith**; and also protected from the enemies of the human race: **wherewith**, meaning the shield of faith, **you may be able to extinguish all the fiery darts of the most wicked one**. We likewise possess armor by which we are strengthened in spiritual blessings, the armor of hope: **and take unto you the helmet of salvation**. A helmet rests on the head, and so does hope in its end. Now the head of the moral virtues is the very end with which hope is concerned. Thus, to take up the helmet of salvation is nothing less than to have hope in the ultimate end. Finally, we have weapons to assault the demons themselves: **the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God**. This happens frequently during sermons when the word of God, penetrating into the hearts of sinners, thrusts out the chaos of sins and demons.

## LECTURE 5

**18 By all prayer and supplication, praying at all times in the spirit; and in the same watching with all instance and supplication for all the saints; 19 and for me, that speech may be given me, that I may open my mouth with confidence, to make known the mystery of the gospel, 20 for which I am an ambassador in a chain; so that therein I may be bold to speak according as I ought. 21 But, that you also may know the things that concern me and what I am doing, Tychicus, my dearest brother and faithful minister in the Lord, will make known to you all things; 22 whom I have sent to you for this same purpose, that you may know the things concerning us, and that he may comfort your hearts. 23 Peace be to the brethren and charity with faith, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. 24 Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in incorruption. Amen.**

Previously the Apostle set down what he had to say about snares and weapons (6:12), now he explains what he had also said concerning a confirmation and strengthening in the power of God. He does this through a prayer to God for divine assistance. He does three things:

First, he cautions them to pray for themselves.

Secondly, for others.

Thirdly, for the Apostle himself.

In reference to the first he determines seven conditions for prayer. First, it must be complete. Whence he says **By all prayer**; this occurs when someone has recourse to prayer in everything, or prays for every good. Secondly, it must be humble and not presumptuous. "He hath had regard to the prayer of the



humble: and he hath not despised their petition" (Ps. 101:18). This happens when a man does not imagine that he is going to be heard on account of his own merits, but on account of the divine mercy. And so he adds **and supplication**, that is, through an accepting of a sacred reality.<sup>163</sup> "In every thing, by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your petitions be made known to God" (Phil. 4:6).

Thirdly, prayer must be continual, **at all times**. "Pray without ceasing, in all things give thanks" (1 Thess. 5:17-18). "I will bless the Lord at all times" (Ps. 33:2), that is, the established times. Fourthly, it should be devout since it is **in the spirit**. "I will sing with the spirit, I will sing also with the understanding" (1 Cor. 14:15), that is, not in a distracted manner. Fifthly, it should be vigilant: **and in the same watching**. "Be prudent therefore and watch in prayers" (1 Pet. 4:7). Sixthly, it must be in earnest: **with all instance**. "Instant in prayer" (Rom. 12:12). Seventhly, it should be charitable, done for all the other saints: **and supplication for all the saints**. "I desire, therefore, first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgivings be made for all men" (1 Tim. 2:1).

Lastly, he asks prayers for himself: **and for me**. He asks three things for himself which are necessary for any preacher: That his mouth would be opened, that he might prepare himself as much as he can for preaching, and that grace be given him.

In order for these to be granted to him he begs them to pray for him, saying **that speech may be given me that I may open my mouth**. I cannot speak anything else but what the Lord gives me, as Balaam expressed it (Num. 22:38). Hence our Lord affirmed: "For it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you" (Mt. 10:20). He also states there (v. 19): "For it shall be given you in that hour what to speak." The Apostle places this petition first, **that speech may be given me that I may open my mouth**. "Praying withal for us also, that God may open unto us a door of speech" (Col. 4:3).

And for what, Paul? He answers, that I may **with confidence make known the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in a chain**. This is his second petition. For it is not only necessary for a preacher that the word or knowledge be given him when he talks, but also that he preach the word given him boldly and with assurance. This is what he means by **with confidence**. This is how the Apostles preached, "they spoke the word of God with confidence" (Ac. 4:31).

The Apostle praises the duty of preaching for its prominence and grandeur. Thus he says **the mystery of the gospel**. Then he discloses how he willingly undergoes suffering and ignominy for it, **for which I am an ambassador in a chain**. These two are linked together in Colossians 4 (3): "That God may open unto us a door of speech to speak the mystery of Christ, for which also I am bound." And because "a parable coming out of a fool's mouth shall be rejected; for he doth not speak it in due season" (Ecclus. 20:22). The Apostle does not merely ask that the word or knowledge of preaching be given him. He also prays for the grace of speaking with confidence so that he would not stop what he began on account of the chains by

which he was bound; that he might fulfill confidently and faithfully the duty entrusted to him and begun by him.

In the third place, he asks that the appropriate time and manner be granted him because there is "a time to keep silence, and a time to speak" (Eccl. 3:7). Therefore he asks **that therein I may be bold to speak according as I ought**. Certainly among all people it is one's manner and quality [of speaking] which makes it acceptable. The Apostle also asked for this in Colossians 4 (4): "That I may make it manifest as I ought to speak." As Proverbs 15 (23) expresses it: "A word in due time is best."

At the end of this letter the Apostle reveals his condition to the Ephesians (v. 21) when he:

First, does this; and

Secondly, greets them in the customary way (6:23).

In the first part he makes three points:

First, he makes known his condition (6:21a).

Secondly, he recommends, on several accounts, the disciple who brings the news (6:21b).

Thirdly, he gives the purpose why he makes his condition known to them, namely, for their consolation - **that he may comfort your hearts**.

**But, that you also may know the things that concern me and what I am doing.** As though the Apostle said: For the sake of the mystery of the Gospel, on account of which I am imprisoned, I want you to know that chains and all tribulations and all torments, inflicted while discharging the duty entrusted to me, do not cause me anxiety. Neither do they change my heart or ruin me interiorly, nor do they even touch me; but, of course, I am disturbed by what goes on around me, not about what is within me.

Since I am not able to leave, chained as I am, to tell you, **Tychicus, my dearest brother and faithful minister in the Lord, will make known to you all things**. Thus you can safely believe him about all these matters. "Who thinkest thou is the faithful and wise steward?" (Lk. 12:42). He surely is such **whom I have sent to you for this same purpose, that you may know the things concerning us**. This is the disciple's recommendation. And what for? **That he may comfort your hearts**.

Next, when he says **Peace be to the brethren** the Apostle writes his usual greeting. And notice that although the bestowal of grace precedes peace and the mutual love of men among themselves and with God since "there is no peace to the wicked, saith the Lord" (Is. 57:21), nevertheless, in its own way peace does precede the putting of grace into practice and the preservation of truth and charity. Hence, he first

wishes that they have peace with one another and charity toward God - **peace be to the brethren and charity with faith.**

Peace and charity contribute greatly toward the preservation of grace; yet, since they always presuppose grace - they could not be had without it - on this account he prays that they receive grace. **Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in incorruption. Amen.**

# Abbreviations

A.C.W.	Ancient Christian Writers, edit. J. Quasten and J. Plumpe. Westminster, Md.
A.E.R.	<i>American Ecclesiastical Review</i> . Washington, D.C.
A.N.F.	Ante-Nicene Fathers. Buffalo and New York.
C.B.Q.	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i> . Washington, D. C.
De Ver.	<i>Quaestiones Disputatae de Veritate</i> , by Thomas Aquinas. Translated by J. V. Mc Glynn, S.J. Chicago, 1953.
D.T.C.	<i>Dictionnaire de théologie catholique</i> . Paris.
F.C.	The Fathers of the Church. New York.
Meta.	<i>In Duodecim Libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis Expositio</i> , by Thomas Aquinas. Translated by J. P. Rowan, Chicago, 1961.
N.P.N.F.	The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, ed. by P. Schaff. Buffalo and New York.
P.G.	Patrologia Graeca. Paris.
P.L.	Patrologia Latina. Paris.
R.S.R.	<i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i> . Strasbourg and Paris.
R.T.A.M.	<i>Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale</i> . Louvain.
S.C.	Sources chrétiennes, ed. by H. de Lubac and J. Daniélou. Paris.
S.C.G.	<i>Summa Contra Gentiles seu de Veritate Catholicae Fidei</i> , by Thomas Aquinas. New York.
S.D.B.	<i>Supplément au dictionnaire de la Bible</i> , ed. L. Pirot. Paris
S.T.	<i>Summa Theologiae</i> , by Thomas Aquinas. New York.
Suppl.	<i>Supplementum Tertiae Partis Summae Theologiae</i> , by Thomas Aquinas; extracts from his earlier <i>Scriptum in IV Libros Sententiarum</i> .
T.D.N.T.	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , ed. By G. Kittel and G. W. Bromiley. Michigan and London.
T.S.	<i>Theological Studies</i> . Baltimore.

# Introduction

1. Cf. Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 2nd revised edition (New York: Philosophical Library, 1952), pp. xv, 41, 263, 292-94, 300 ff., where she stresses the novelty of Aquinas' position. Against her analysis, Henry de Lubac, S.J., endeavors to demonstrate St. Thomas' traditionalism, cf. *Exégèse médiévale, les quatre sens de l'Écriture*, 2e partie, t. 11 (Paris: Aubier, 1964), pp. 272-302.

2. A similar distinction between exegetical presuppositions and techniques has been made on the philosophical level by Bernard Lonergan, S.J., in *Insight, A Study of Human Understanding*, 2nd edition (New York: Philosophical Library, 1958), pp. 577-79.
3. For an accurate and profound methodological explanation of meaning and expression, cf. Lonergan's *Insight*, pp. 357-59, 549-94. Alonso Schökel's *The Inspired Word* (N.Y.: Herder, 1965), pp. 134-72, 255-79 shows how modern literary and linguistic studies can deepen our appreciation of the Bible.
4. For a fuller treatment of these processes in theological and dogmatic development, cf. B. Lonergan, *De Deo Trino* (Rome: Gregorian, 1964), vol. 1, pp. 5-112, vol. II, pp. 7-61.
5. For the technical significance of *Begrifflichkeit* in R. Bultmann, cf. A. Malet, *La Pensée de Rudolf Bultmann* (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1963), pp. 277 ff. Also S. Ogden, *Christ without Myth* (London: Collins, 1962), pp. 65-66. For its use here, cf. F. Crowe, "Method in Theology," T.S. 23 (1962), pp. 637-42.
6. On Origen, cf. H. de Lubac, *Histoire et Esprit* (Paris: Aubier, 1950), pp. 92-194, 278-94; J. Daniélou, *Origen* (N.Y.: Sheed and Ward, 1955), pp. 73-98; H. Crouzel, *Origène et la "connaissance mystique"* (Paris: Desclee, 1961), pp. 47-84. On St. Augustine, cf. H.-I. Marrou, *S. Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (Paris: Boccard, 1958--4th ed.), pp. 302-27, 357-85. Concerning the vast influence of Origen on western exegesis, cf. Smalley, *op. cit.* pp. 14-20. Y. Congar has described briefly the main differences between the Augustinian and Thomist positions, cf. his "Théologie," *D.T.C.* 15a, col. 386-88; and *La foi et la théologie* (Tournai: Desclee, 1962), pp. 230-33, 246-48.
7. Smalley, *op. cit.*, p. xv; she is referring to the thirteenth century biblical scholar. The platonism of the Origenist-Augustinian approach can be traced through the early Middle Ages up to the time of the twelfth century Paris masters, cf. R. McNally, S.J., *The Bible in the Early Middle Ages* (Md.: Newman, 1959), pp. 53-61, and Smalley, *op. cit.*, p. 262; also C. Spicq, O.P., "Histoire de l'interprétation au moyen âge en occident," *S.D.B.* IV, pp. 609-615.
8. Cf. Athenagoras' *Presbeia peri ton christianon*, 7 and 9 (P.G. 6, 904 and 908); he is followed by Pseudo-Justin's *Cohort. ad Graecos*, 8 (P.G. 6, 257) and Hippolytus of Rome, *Peri tou Antichristou*, 2, (P.G. 10, 728). St. Thomas was to utilize the concept of instrumentality in his analysis, giving it greater precision.
9. Cf. de Lubac, *Histoire et esprit*, pp. 296 ff.

10. Cf. Smalley, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-22, and St. Jerome's *Epist.* 70, 7 (P.L. 22, 627). St. Augustine also uses this expression, *De Cow. Evang.*, I, 25-54 (P.L. 34, 1070).
  
11. *In Psalm.* 90, 2; 149, 5 (P.L. 37, 1159, 1952). In his *Confess.*, 12, 31 Augustine sees God's action as allowing the author to perceive all the truths which can be drawn from his words. But in the *De Doct. Christ.*, 3, 27 it is the Holy Spirit who makes provision for these meanings even if the human author may not know them—"forsitan vidit et certe Dei Spiritus." De Lubac's statement in his *Exégèse médiévale*, 2-2, p. 285 note 1 needs modification.
  
12. *Moralia in Job, praef.* I, 2 (P.L. 75, 517).
  
13. This is evident from the fact that all the currents which were to make up the Bible are discussed under prophecy. The Legal stream is represented in Moses who was the greatest of prophets since, among other reasons, he proclaimed the Law to the people in the name of God, cf. *De Ver.* 12, 14; *S.T.* II-II, 174, 4. The prophetic stream is obviously mentioned; following St. Jerome, St. Thomas includes judges, Ruth and Kings in the prophetic books, cf. *De Com. et Part. S. Scrip.* The Sapiential stream, termed the "hagiographa," makes up the rest of the Old Testament and is clearly included within his analogically conceived notion of the prophetic mission; those who wrote these books were aided by the "lumen divinum" which is the formally unifying factor in all prophecy, cf. *De Ver.* 12, 12 ad 10; *S.T.* II-II, 174, 2 ad 3; 171, 3 ad 3. The writings of the New Testament trace their origin to the truly prophetic experience of the Apostles, cf. *De Ver.* 12, 14 ad 5; *S.T.* II-II, 173, 2c; *In Matt.* 10, n.2, v.20; *In Joan.* 18, Lect. 4, n.2; *In Rom.* 12, Lect. 2. Thus the canonical Scriptures are sometimes attributed to "the Apostles and Prophets," cf. *In I Tim.* 6, Lect. 1; *S.T.* I, 1, 8 ad 2.
  
14. Charismatic graces are the *gratiae gratis datae* discussed in *S.T.* I-II, 111, 4-5. St. Thomas' final position is to include all of these related to knowledge within his analogical conception of prophecy, cf. Prologue to II-II, 171. The unifying factor in the analogous reality is the "lumen divinum" or "lumen propheticum," *S.T.* II-II, 171, 3 ad 3, which can vary in degree, *De Ver.* 12, 13; *S.T.* 174, 3; it can also penetrate to almost every level of reality, *S.T.* II-II, 171, 3. The expression "lumen" must be understood within the context of Aquinas' use of it in his analysis of man's natural intellectual consciousness, cf. B. Lonergan, S.J., "The Concept of *Verbum* in the Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas," T.S., Vol. 8 (1947), pp. 64-73. By it the prophet is enabled to judge events and issues in a supernatural manner. (*S.T.* II-II, 173, 2). The "lumen fidei," in its turn, enables men to assent voluntarily to the truths enunciated by the prophets (*ibid.*, 171, 3 ad 2; 5c; *D.V.* 12, 2 *sed con.*; *In Boet. de Trin.* 3, 1 ad 4). These two "lumina" are forms of the "lumen gratiae" (*S.T.* I-II, 109, 1c) but they differ in that the prophetic light is directed toward a

supernatural judgment itself while the light of faith prepares the mind to assent to what God reveals through the prophets (*D.V.* 12, 1 ad 4 *bis*). On the importance of correctly understanding Aquinas' concept of *lumen* cf. Frederick Crowe, S.J., *De Verbo Dei cum Hominibus Communicato* (Toronto: Regis College, mimeographed, 1963), pp. 83-99.

15. The analogical concept of prophecy is differentiated according to *content* into four general categories. One class, termed most properly prophetic in *S.T.* II-II, 171, 3, deals with future events which the prophet knows with divine assistance, cf. *De Ver.* 12, 2c, ad 1, ad 4; 3c; 10c; 11; *S.C.G.* III, 154; *In Hebr.* 6, Lect. 4; *In Rom.* 3, Lect. 1; 12, Lect. 2; *S.T.* II-II, 171, 3, 6 ad 2; 172, 1c; 174, 1c ad 1. A second category of prophecy occurs when the existence of supernatural mysteries is made known to a prophet; in *S.C.G.* III, 154, this was designated as "Sapientia" but by the time of his writing the prologue to *S.T.* II-II, 171, St. Thomas had reverted to his position in *De Ver.* 12, 2c and *In Rom.* 12, Lect. 2 where he incorporates this within an analogical notion of prophecy, cf. also *S.T.* 171, 3c and 174, 3c; *In I Cor.* 14, Lect. 1; for this prophecy in action cf. *S.T.* II-II, 174, 6; *De Ver.* 12, 14 ad 1. The third class has to do with a supernaturally acquired knowledge of the existence of what is otherwise knowable by natural means. It is prophetic because these natural objects are seen "in lumine divino," i.e., in reference to God and his plans, cf. *De Ver.* 12, 13; *S.T.* II-II, 174, 3c. Finally, a scarcely recognized fourth category, not yet noticed when he was composing *De Ver.* 12, deals with the interpretation and propagation of the truths revealed in the other forms of prophecy. In *S.C.G.* III, 154 and *In I Cor.* 12, Lect. 2, St. Thomas saw the need of men supernaturally equipped to interpret what others had written; it was termed "interpretatio sermonis." In commenting on I Cor. 14 he deepened his understanding of this grace, regarding it as a real type of prophecy, cf. *In I Cor.* 14, Lects. 1, 2, 3, 5; also *In Rom.* 12, Lect. 2. He grasped the broad dimensions prophecy had for St. Paul: "Someone is also termed a prophet solely by the fact that he proclaims the prophetic words in the Church, or expounds or chants them there." *In I Cor.* 14, Lect. 1; also *ibid.*, 11, Lect. 2; 14, Lect. 6; *In Tit.* 1, Lect. 3. Cf. note 18 below for further remarks.
  
16. The difference between charismatic graces and sanctifying grace is that the latter concerns man's personal relations or union with God, whereas the former enable him to cooperate with other men in bringing them to God, cf. *S.T.* I-II, 111, 1. Thus the "Utilitas Ecclesiae" is the motive force in prophecy, cf. *De Ver.* 12, 2, 3 ad 11 & 15; 5c; 13c; *In I Cor.* 14, *passim*; *In Rom.* 12, Lect. 2; *S.T.* II-II, 171, 1c. P. Benoit, O.P., in his *Prophecy and Inspiration* (New York: Desclee, 1961) pp. 103-111 tries to distinguish between the prophet and the sacred authors by saying that in the former the speculative judgment predominates and in the latter the practical judgment. This can find no support in St. Thomas who conceived of Prophecy--taken analogously--as directed toward assisting men in their total response to God in faith and morality, cf. *S.T.* II-II, 173, 2c; 174, 6c (note how he says "prophetica revelatio" is concerned with both faith and morals). It is possible to

trace this dual aspect of supernatural knowledge, its speculative and practical qualities, from its origin in God's knowledge through prophecy and Scripture to theology, cf. *S.T.* I, 14, 16; 1, 4c; 1, 3c. For the practical judgments involved in writing a book, cf. notes 17 to 23 below.

17. This is one of the key distinctions in Aquinas' analysis; he terms the first aspect or moment the prophetic "donum" and the second its "usus." It runs throughout all of his analysis, cf. *De Ver.* 12, 2c; 3 ad 15; 4c, ad 1 & 3; 5c, ad 3; 9c; 12 ad 4; 13c; *In I Cor.* 14, 1 ff.; *S.C.G.* III, 154; *S.T.* II-II, 171, 1c; 172, 3 ad 1; 4 ad 4; 173, 3c, ad 4; 4c; 174, 2 ad 3; 3 ad 3; 4c. A revelation is always involved in the encounter in which the "donum" consists, *ibid.*, 171, 1 ad 4. Benoit, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-11 departs from Aquinas by seeking to distinguish sharply between revelation and inspiration. For the Angelic Doctor revelation, like prophecy, was analogous. Benoit, on the other hand, is influenced by today's tendency to think of passive revelation in the cut and dried terms of the manuals; we tend to regard a truth as either clearly and explicitly revealed or not revealed at all. But for St. Thomas man's knowledge of the faith grows, truths are revealed slowly over a period of time (cf. notes 26 and 27 below). The Bible communicates this organic development of salvation-history to men up to its definitive apex in the revelation of the Word Incarnate himself. The whole of the Bible must be approached with faith; this does not mean that every sentence is a definable dogma.

Much of the Scriptures deal with otherwise naturally knowable subjects, such as Israel's history, but as Aquinas points out (*S.T.* I, 1, 7) these are related *in the light* of God's plans for salvation-history. To initially perceive and judge this to be true required some type of revelation, and to assent to it requires faith. If biblical inspiration did not terminate in this analogous revelation why is it necessary to even posit a supernatural action in the formation of the Bible? Why must we approach all of Scripture with faith if only portions of it contain passive revelation and most of it does not? Benoit seems to overlook the fact that between the natural and the supernatural no medium area exists in which to fit a knowledge whether speculative or practical which is neither one nor the other. Nor is there a truly supernatural knowledge which is not also to some degree a revelation, at least in that it views and expresses some fact—otherwise knowable to reason perhaps—within the light of salvation-history.

18. At first, St. Thomas did not connect the "interpretatio sermonis" (mentioned as the fourth class of prophecy in note 15 above) with the prophetic mission. But in *In I Cor.* 14, Lect. 6 he began to understand this as an "usus prophetiae" and in *S.T.* II-II, 173, 2c and 176, 2 ad 4 he speaks of the corresponding "donum prophetiae." The prologue to II-II, 171 indicates in what this "donum" consists. It is the charismatic gift of faith which "grants a certain supereminent certitude of faith by which a man is fit to instruct others in what pertains to the faith." *S.T.* I-II, 111, 4 ad 2. Benoit chose to develop Aquinas' concept of instrumentality in applying his analysis of prophecy to the



sacred writers. I think St. Thomas' more frequently repeated insight into the difference between "donum" and "usus," with their analogous nature, might prove more fruitful.

For example, today the complex origin of the biblical books is well known; they were not, for the most part, composed by single authors, as was formerly held, but by various traditions. Cf. J. McKenzie, S.J., "The Social Character of Inspiration," *C.B.Q.* Vol. 24 (1962) pp. 115-24. Utilizing St. Thomas' fourth category of prophecy we can claim that the men who perpetuated the Old and early New Testament traditions had a deeper bond uniting them to the messages than the ordinary people. The latter accepted it as coming from God through the *virtue* of faith. This may also have been the personal response of the men who perpetuated the traditions, but their social responsibility required more. Those who originated the various prophetic, legal, sapiential, and New Testament traditions usually experienced the deep prophetic encounter and consequent active revelation needed to grasp and affirm supernatural mysteries. But these were perpetuated, and applied to changing times, by disciples in whom the prophetic "donum" was normally the charismatic grace of faith. Since this "gratia gratis data" clearly consists in a "prophetica revelatio" (cf. II-II, 171, prol.) there can be no doubt that the communication, whether oral or written (cf. II-II, 174, 6 obj. 2), flowing from it is really inspired in the sense in which "biblical inspiration" is used today.

19. For the differentiation of prophecy according to the *manner* of its experience, cf. *De Ver.* 12, 7, 12, 13; *In I Cor.* 14, 1; *S.T.* II-II, 173, 2, 3; 174, 2-4. Also Benoit, *op. cit.*, p. 37. As Benoit himself admits, his distinction between prophecy and inspiration on the basis of "lumen et species" and "lumen solum" cannot be supported by St. Thomas who expressly states concerning this "lumen": "from the reception of which someone is constituted a prophet." (*De Ver.* 12, 1c; also *S.T.* 171, 3 ad 3; 173, 2c). The "lumen propheticum" is a passing impression on the prophet's mind (II-II, 171, 2); yet St. Thomas does speak of an "habilitas" resulting from its reception (*ibid.*, ad 2), indicating that there is a variation in degree. This "habilitas" must especially be remembered when discussing the prophetic "donum" operative in the charismatic gift of faith mentioned in note 18 above.
20. *De Ver.* 12, 4c; *S.T.* II-II, 174, 3 ad 3; 173, 3 ad 4. For further references, cf. those given in note 17 above. This contrasts with the "donum": "The gift of prophecy, which exists beyond the capacity of man, is given by God and not through the power of some created cause," *ibid.* It seems to me that Benoit's theory of inspiration, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-132, would profit from this distinction between "donum" and "usus." Fixing attention on the communication or "usus," and this precisely under the form of writing, he conceives of inspiration as some sort of created "supernatural impulse" flowing from God to the sacred author, taking "the form of an immediate physical motion." (*op. cit.*, p. 120). This manner of explaining the divine action has already been shown as not that of St. Thomas, cf. B. Lonergan, "St. Thomas' Theory of Operation," *T.S.* Vol. 3

(1942), pp. 375-401, and his "St. Thomas' thought on *Gratia Operans*," *ibid.*, pp. 533-78. As a result, Benoit's idea of the author's instrumentality is much stricter than that of Aquinas. Cf. notes 21 to 23 below.

21. That inspiration, for St. Thomas, pertains to the "donum" is evident from *S.T.* II-II, 171, 1 ad 4; also cf. Benoit, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-69. So in *De Comm. et Part. S. Scrip.* he can distinguish the prophets, who often spoke in God's name, and the hagiographers who: "inspired by the Holy Spirit [the *donum*] spoke, not on the part of the Lord, but as it were from themselves [*usus*]." Note that I say God's "governance" was not immediate. His providence immediately extends to every detail in salvation-history ordering each to its end, but the carrying into effect—the "gubernatio"—of these plans is mediated by secondary causes, cf. *S.C.G.* III, 76, 77, 83, 94; *S.T.* I, 22, 3; 103, 6. Of course the "what" which the *donum* imparts shares in the latter's analogical character as briefly sketched in note 15 above. Even the most "natural" books of the Old Testament deal with their material in the light of Yahweh and his plans for his people; e.g. Numbers treating of the communal organization of the people centered about God's abode, the ark and tabernacle, and the need to submit to their God-given leaders; or Proverbs seeking to implement "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom" with down-to-earth practical advice. Note also that the deficiency mentioned in *S.T.* II-II, 173, 4 deals with the *quid*, the "what" imparted by the *donum*. Inspiration will effect the *usus* by means of the *donum* which can modify, profoundly or slightly, the recipient's mental and imaginative "species"—cf. references given in note 19 above. Should any dispositions be positively contrary to the communication of the message, God, as Universal Cause, can alter them when imparting the *donum*, cf. *De Ver.* 12, 4 ad 1, ad 2 and 6; *S.T.* I, 105, 1, 3-4; II-II, 172, 3 ad 1. But normally these dispositions are impartial from the viewpoint of *what* is to be communicated, cf. *ibid.*, and the following note.
22. This was Thomas' insight expressed in *S.T.* II-II, 172, 3c. To appreciate its implications one must read the writings of Lonergan referred to in note 20 above; for a contemporary statement of the same basic idea, cf. his *Insight*, p. 664. It discloses the major weakness in Benoit's theory of inspiration (which he is trying to remedy) and those of others. They are worked out within the framework of either a Bañez or a Molina who both agreed in the presupposition that God controls all events because he controls each. For Benoit the whole Bible is inspired because the Almighty controlled every single writer and literary piece. St. Thomas' concept of instrumentality, as Lonergan has demonstrated, affirms that God controls each event because he controls all. Applied to Scripture this means that each and every part of it is authored by God because he originated (cf. "Deus origo eius est" of *De Comm. et Part. S. Scrip.*) the whole process of the Bible's formation. Thus he could state: "Furthermore, God also at the moment of his creation can create a subject that he might dispose the soul *in its very creation* for prophecy, and would grant it the prophetic grace." *S.T.* II-II, 172, 3c. The difference between the instrumentality operative in the

composing of the Scriptures and the Universal Instrumentality discussed by Lonergan, *T.S.* 1942, pp. 391-95, is that the Providence guiding the genesis of the Bible is an essential element in the special Providence concerned with salvation-history; cf. *S.C.G.* III, 111-113. Note the affinity this has with K. Ralmer's thesis: God's willing of the Scriptures as a constitutive element in his willing of the Church, cf. his *Inspiration in the Bible* (N.Y.: Herder & Herder, 1961). For valid criticisms and modifications of Ralmer's Theory, cf. Y. Congar, O.P., *Sainte Eglise* (Paris: Ed. du Cerf, 1963), pp. 187-200; and especially F. Crowe, *op. cit.*, pp. 85 and 90. B. Benoit is also broadening his conception of inspiration, cf. "les Analogies de l'inspiration," *Sacra Pagina*, Vol. I (Paris: Lecoffre, 1959) pp. 86-99. This is even more pronounced in his most recent article "Réviffition et inspiration," in the *Revue biblique*, Vol 72 (1963), pp. 321-370, where he knits revelation and inspiration more closely together than in his previous works. Failing to grasp the importance of Aquinas' distinction between *donum* and *usus* (pp. 325-336), he ends by defining revelation and inspiration in terms which approach those two aspects of the prophetic mission (pp. 367-368).

23. *De Ver.* 12, 4 ad 1; also *S.T.* II-II, 172, 3 ad 1. This is emphasized in 171, 6c where divine veracity is predicated of both prophetic knowledge and communication.
24. *De Doct. Christ.* 3, 6-9; McNally, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-46; Smalley, *op. cit.*, p. 24.
25. ". . . for faith supposes natural knowledge in the same way grace does nature, and as perfection presupposes what can be perfected." *S.T.* I, 2, 2 ad 1. Growth is indispensable to human knowledge, *ibid.*, 85, 1c; for some passages where Aquinas speaks of the development of supernatural knowledge, cf. I-II 98, 3 ad 2; 99, 6c; 101, 2 ad 1; II-II, 1, 7c, ad 2; *In Matt.* 3, n.1.
26. *S.T.* II-II, 1, 7 ad 2. In *De Ver.* 14, 11c. St. Thomas quotes St Gregory in support of this view; "With the passing of time the growth in divine knowledge has increased." *Hom. 16 in Ezech.* The Old Testament leaders have a more explicit knowledge of the mysteries of faith since they are to instruct the people, *S.T.* II-II, 2, 6. Father de Lubac is not quite correct in saying that Aquinas' analysis of the relationship between the Old and New Testaments is linked with the passing from literal meanings to spiritual ones, cf. *Exégèse médiévale*, 2-2, p. 287 *In II Cor.* 3, Lect. 2 is not at all concerned with the senses of Scripture; what St. Thomas is affirming is that the Old Law was primarily a written law whereas the New Law is primarily a law of the Spirit; the fact that it is written down in the New Testament scriptures is only a secondary aspect of it, cf. *S.T.* I-II, 106, 1; nor do the senses of Scripture enter into the lengthy comparison of the Old and New Laws in *ibid.*, 107, 1-4.
27. Cf. *S.T.* II-II, 174, 6; *De Ver.* 12, 14 ad 1; *In I Cor.* 14, Lect. 2.

28. *De Ver.* 12, 6; *S.T.* II-II, 173, 1. On the imperfection inherent in man's growth in faith, cf. *ibid.*, 1, 7 ad 3.
29. *S.T.* II-II, 171, 6c; also 172, 6 ad 2; *De Ver.* 12, 10 ad 7 & 11. It is interesting to compare scriptural revelation and the theories on teaching proposed in *De Ver.* 11, 1. Some maintain that in education everything depends on the teacher; in biblical perspectives these would be the fundamentalists who consider the human authors as no more than the puppets of God. Others maintain that education consists in the student recalling what he already knew, the teacher only appears to cause the knowledge; these would be the rationalists for whom revelation is dependent entirely on human genius—if there is a God he is not needed. Finally, Aquinas holds that education is a process in which the teacher actualizes the potentialities of the students as regards knowledge and virtue, both God and man are essential to the Bible.
30. Cf. *S.T.* I, 1, where "sacra doctrina" and "sacra scriptura" are often interchangeable, cf. G. Van Ackeren, *Sacra Doctrina, The Subject of the First Question of the Summa of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Rome: 1952).
31. *De Ver.* 11, 1 ad 6.
32. Cf. Daniélou, *Origen*, pp. 14 ff., 133-38; also H. de Lubac's introduction to *Origène: homélies sur la Genèse*, S.C. VII, pp. 5-55.
33. Smalley, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-46, points out how St. Augustine's program was realized only over a period of centuries. Yves Congar, O.P., makes the same point when he discusses the three stages theology went through up until the thirteenth century; it was successively under the regime of grammar, then dialectics, and finally metaphysics. *D.T.C.* 15-A, 359-74.
34. The Antiochene School of exegesis had practically no influence on medieval exegesis. Its only well known representative was St. John Chrysostom whose homilies were more pastoral than exegetical in tone, cf. Smalley, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-20.
35. Cf. Daniélou, *op. cit.*, pp. 141-43.
36. Cf. *De Doct. Christ.* 3, 5; also his famous plea in *De Gen. ad Litt.* I, 18 ff., for not making rash assertions on what the first chapters of Genesis are supposed to literally mean.
37. Cf. *Collatio* 14, 8-11; also O. Chadwick, *John Cassian: A Study in Primitive Monasticism* (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1950), pp. 151-53; on the Origenist controversy, pp. 33-36.

38. Smalley, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-35. Referring to St. Gregory's prophetic gifts Aquinas feels that one can discern "almost all the movements of ones own heart" in the writings of Gregory, *In I Cor.* 14, Lect. 5.
39. Cf. J. Leclercq, O.S.B., *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture* (New York: Fordham, 1961), pp. 31-44.
40. *Hom. in Gen.* 10,1 and *De Prin.* 4,3,5. Origen scholars have not yet reached agreement on the extent of Philonic influence on Origen's exegesis, cf. *T.S.* 24 (1963), pp. 250-63.
41. *De Prin.* 4,1,7. According to J. McKenzie Origen did not clarify the inner connection between the historical and allegorical senses, cf. "A Chapter in the History of Spiritual Exegesis," *T.S.* 12 (1951), pp. 276-80.
42. *De Doct. Christ.* Book 1, 2, 3, 31 and 32. Augustine does not here explicitly relate the use by God of the things Scripture refers to as a means of further signification, but he does in *Epist.* 102, n.33.
43. *De Doct. Christ.* 3, 5. In book 1, 23 and 26, he states how we are to love our bodies for man is both soul and body, but the body is "beneath" us. For a succinct account of his theory of knowledge, cf. Copleston, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 51-67.
44. *De Doct. Christ.* 3, 10; also cf. *ibid.*, 15.
45. *Ibid.*, 1, 39: "And thus a man who is founded on faith, hope and love, keeping a firm grasp on these, does not need the Scriptures except for the purpose of instructing others."
46. Hugh increased the dignity of the historical or literal sense by joining it with the allegorical as pertaining to knowledge, but the literal was still considered as the necessary but lowly foundation of the allegorical, cf. *Didascalion*, VI, 4, 4.
47. Cf. Portalié, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-14; Copleston, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-67 where he holds that Augustine's illumination cannot be equated with Thomas' affirmation of the dependence of the human mind on the Divine Consciousness or "lumen," cf. *S.T.* I, 84, 5c; 88, 3 ad 1.
48. Cf. *ibid.*, 84, 6c; grace does not dispense with this dependence, 12, 13c. For Aquinas the soul is the act of the body, *ibid.*, 76, 1, together body and soul form one unique being, III, 62, 1 ad 2.

The only instance when the phantasm is not operative in contemplation is during an ecstatic vision of the Divinity itself, cf. *S.T.* I, 12, 11; II-II, 175, 4 & 5; 180, 5.

49. *De Ver.* 12, 12 ad 2; *S.T.* II-II, 174, 2 ad 4.
  
50. *In II Tim.* 3, Lect. 3. St. Thomas does not insert Peter Lombard's qualifying phrase that the holy letters instruct one if they are "spiritually understood," *Collectanea in Epist. Pauli*, P.L. 192, col. 378.
  
51. *S.T.* I, 1, 10; also *Quodlibet* VII, 6, 2; *In Gal.* 4, Lect. 7. St. Thomas was principally dependent on St. Augustine and Venerable Bede for his definition. For the organic relationship between these four senses cf. W. J. Burghardt, S.J., "On Early Christian Exegesis," *T.S.* 11 (1950), p. 105. P. Crelot, *La Bible, Parole de Dieu* (Paris: Desclee, 1965), pp. 232-38 overlooks the clear references to "Sensus litteralis" as that whereby men signify things by words, cf. *Quodlibet* VII, 6, 3c. The texts quoted in note 1, p. 233, refer to a different problem, cf. our note 62 below. Nor is Grelot's opinion supported by Aquinas' biblical commentaries where the literal sense is what the writer intended.
  
52. Cf. note 6 above; also H. de Lubac's introduction to Origen's *Homélies sur l'Exode*, *S.C.* 1947, pp. 47-52. ". . . if history truly mediates, it must not retain us, its entire function on the contrary is *to pass away*. Entirely, down to its final event, it prepares for something else. The Truth to which it introduces us is no longer of the historical order." *ibid.* p. 50. The perspective is different in Aquinas for whom the only sense present in all of Scripture is the literal, cf. *Quodlibet* VII, 6, 2 ad 5. Since this was the meaning intended by the author, if he intended to signify Christ in metaphorical language then this signification is its literal meaning, *ibid.* ad 1. He insists that in general the Old Law ceremonial precepts have a "causa litteralis" as well as a figurative reason, *S.T.* I-II, 102, 2; *In Rom.* 4, Lect. 2. For a comparison of Aquinas' exegesis of these precepts with that of his predecessors, cf. Smalley, *op. cit.* pp. 303-06. Where Thomas does not hesitate to identify a spiritual meaning with the literal sense if intended by the author, the Augustinians and Origen usually affirm the same truth very differently by denying the passage a literal or historical meaning; the human mind can, after all, grasp spiritual realities without corporeal assistance.
  
53. *Quodlibet* VII, 6, 2 ad 5. Both de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale*, 2-2, p. 274, and D. Chenu, O.P., *Introduction à l'étude de s. Thomas d'Aquin*, (Montreal: Etudes médiévales, 1954) p. 218, are of the opinion that the Angelic Doctor made his own what is said in the fifth objection of *Quodlibet* VII, 6, 2 concerning the "de necessitate sacrae Scripturae" of the four senses. Yet the answer to the objection is in full agreement with its conclusion, when interpreting the Bible one does not have to of *necessity* find four senses because they are often not there to begin with.

54. The fact that particular instances in the ceremonial precepts may only have a "figuralis causa" (*S.T.* I-II, 102, 2 ad 3) does not mean that they only have a spiritual sense; as intended by the author, the figurative value is the literal meaning—"causa" cannot be interchanged with "sensus."
55. *S.T.* I, 1, 10 ad 3; also I-II, 102, 2 ad 1; *Quodlibet.* VII, 6, 2 ad 1. Hugh of St. Victor in his *De Scripturis*, P.L. 175, 14, and Alexander of Hales in his *Summa Theologica*, tract. intro., I, 4 ad 2 had already put metaphor and figure in the literal or historical sense. On spoken or written words as immediately related to mental conceptions, cf. Lonergan, "The Concept of *Verbum* in the Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas," *T.S.* Vol. 7 (1946) pp. 350 ff., and the references there given to the Angelic Doctor.
56. None of the patristic quotations Father de Lubac brings forward to contest the novelty of this position, in *Exégèse médiévale.* 2-2, p. 277 do so. They provide the rudiments but lack the stark clarity of Aquinas' assertion. The *De Doct. Christ.* 3, 2 deals with punctuation, and the "planissime dictum" of *ibid.*, 22 6 reveals its ambiguity in the application made of it in Book 3, 26. No matter how "plain" a statement might be it could still be classed as figurative and obscure in virtue of Book 3, 10 and 15.
57. Cf. Smalley, *op. cit.*, pp. 243-45, 281-92; also de Lubac, *Histoire et esprit*, pp. 422 ff.
58. *S.T.* I, 1, 10 ad 1. The writings of the Gospel themselves are to dispose the reader for grace, *ibid.*, I-II, 106, 1 ad 1. Note that I, 1, 10 is in the context of theoretical argumentation in theology as a science. This must be differentiated from other approaches to Scripture, cf. *In I Sent.* prol., q. 1, art. 5.
59. Cf. *De Doct. Christ.* 3, 9; on Origen cf. J. Guillet, "Les exégèses d'Alexandrie et d'Antioch: conflict ou malentendu?" *R.S.R.* Vol. 34 (1947) pp. 288-89. For St. Thomas, cf. *De Ver.* 14, 11; *S.T.* II-II, 2, 6-8. He qualifies it by saying that the Old Testament prophets and patriarchs only knew of the Christian mysteries in vague generalities, I, 57, 5 ad 3; *In Eph.* 3, Lect. 1.
60. Cf. *In Isaias*, 7, v.14; also *In Eph.* 5, Lect. 10; *In Psalmis*, prol.
61. *De Pot.* 4, 1 where Aquinas puts the brakes on any excesses by his reference to the context—"salva circumstantia litterae." *S.T.* I, 1, 10c; II-II, 173, 4.
62. Cf. de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale*, 2-2, pp. 279-85 for a brief account of the debates on whether or not St. Thomas really held the multiplicity of the literal sense. Smalley, *op. cit.*, pp. 300-01

observes: "The discussion shows either that St. Thomas followed St. Augustine, or that he did not make his meaning clear. In his exegesis he generally avoids long lists of alternative explanations, such as his predecessors were accustomed to give; and this suggests that he preferred only one literal meaning."

63. Smalley, *ibid.*, p. 301; yet she does admit on p. 329 that "The very concentration on Aristotle, which enabled the Dominicans to effect a change in exegetical principles, tended to prevent their new principles bearing fruit."
64. Cf. Y. Congar, "Le sens de l'économie salutaire dans la théol. de s. Thomas," in *Festgabe Lortz* (1957) pp. 91-96.
65. C. Spicq, "Saint Thomas exégète," *D.T.C.*, 15-A, col. 695.
66. Cf. Smalley, *op. cit.*, pp. 270-72; Hugh of St. Cher's *Postilla* or commentaries on the whole Bible were most likely a cooperative undertaking.
67. *De Comm. et Part. S. Scrip.* in *Opuscula Theologica*, Vol. 1 (Rome: Marietti, 1954), pp. 435-39.
68. *In Joan.* 21, Lect. 6; also *In I Tim.* 6, Lect. 1; *S.T.* I, 1, 8 ad 2; yet these norms needed interpretation, *ibid.*, II-II, 1, 9 ad 1; 10 ad 1.
69. Cf. de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale*, 2-2, p. 453; the Vander edition of 1703 gives the letter to J. Jonas as *Epist.* 435, Tom. III-B, p. 458 E. On Erasmus' respect for Thomas Aquinas cf. de Lubac, *ibid.*, pp. 432-33.
70. Spicq, *D.T.C.*, 15-A, col. 710 and his *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine*, pp. 165-172.
71. *In I Cor.* 1, Lect. 3; also *In Tit.* 1, Lect. 3. This enthusiasm for the Philosopher did not prevent him from remarking: "For no philosopher possessed such great wisdom that by it men could be withdrawn from error" *In Joan.* 6, Lect. 5.
72. Cf. P. Glorieux, "Essai sur les commentaires scripturaires de s. Thomas et leur chronologie," *R.T.A.M.* Vol. 17 (1950) pp. 261-64.
73. Cf. Congar, *la Foi et la théologie* (Paris: 1962) pp. 242-43; J. R. Sheets, S.J., "The Scriptural Dimension of St. Thomas," *A.E.R.*, Vol. 144 (1961) pp. 172-73.



74. P. Mandonnet, O.P., *des Ecrits authentiques de s. Thomas d'Aquin*, 2nd ed. (Fribourg: 1910) pp. 63 and 69 for Tolomeo and Gui's catalogues. The Official Catalogue (*ibid.*, p. 31), as well as that of Harley (p. 46) and Gui (p. 69), list the commentary on the Psalms as *reportationes* of Reginald, but Glorieux, *op. cit.*, p. 250 believes they were composed by St. Thomas himself. The fact of these transcriptions should not militate against their acceptance as genuine works of Aquinas since A. Dondaine, O.P., has demonstrated that a group of secretaries was responsible for copying down St. Thomas' dictation on "his own writings" and publishing them, cf. *Secrétaires de Saint Thomas* (Rome: S. Sabina, 1956).
75. Cf. *In Joan.* 1, Lect. 16, n. 4; 11, Lect. 2, n. 2; *In Matt.* 2, n. 3.
76. *In Joan.* 6, Lect. 1, n. 5; Lect. 4, ns. 5-7.
77. Cf. X. Leon-Dufour, S.J., "le Mystère du pain de vie," *R.S.R.* Vol. 46 (1958) pp. 481-523. For a brief description of John's "twofold meaning" cf. R. Brown, S.S., *The Gospel of St. John* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1960) pp. 12-13.
78. *In Matt.* 1, n. 5; also *In Psalmis*, prol. Theodore of Mopsuestia did claim that a few passages of the Old Testament were literally applicable to Christ; scholars are now in doubt as to whether the propositions condemned at the Second Council of Constantinople truly embody Theodore's Christology. This disparaging reference to Theodore must not be taken as an implicit approval of Origen. In *S.T.* I, 51, 1 ad 1 he is mentioned by Thomas as "deceived on many issues since he followed the opinions of the ancient philosophers."
79. Prologue to his *Comm. on the Psalms*; this comes from St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei* 17, 8.
80. *S.T.* I-II, 102, 2; cf. note 52 above.
81. John's historicity, *In Joan.* 12, Lect. 1, n. 3; 19, Lect. 3, n. 4; on insignificance of minor divergencies, *In Joan.* 18, Lect. 4, n. 5. On Matthew's tendency to recapitulate events, *In Joan.* 2, Lect. 2, n. 1.
82. Cf. *In Rom.* 3, Lect. 1 and 2; 5, Lect. 4; *In Gal.* 4, Lect. 4; *In Eph.* 1, Lect. 2; *In I Tim.* 2, Lect. 1; on John Chrysostom, *In Joan.* 6, Lect. 3, n. 8.
83. *Saint Paul, Epître aux Romains* (Paris, 1916) p. ix.

84. St. Augustine, *De Gen. ad Litt.* P.L. 34, col. 262; Richard of St. Victor, P.L. 196, col. 265; on St. Matthew, *In Matt.* 1, n. 2; on St. John's use of our Lord's words, *In Joan.* 3, Lect. 1, n. 2 and Spicq's comment, *D.T.C.*, 15-A, col. 731.
85. Cf. Smalley, *op. cit.*, pp. 197-200. On God's condescension to man in his revelation, cf. *S.T.* I-II, 98, 3 ad 2; I, 68, 3; 67, 4.
86. E.g., *In Rom.* 8, Lect. 1; *In Eph.* 5, Lect. 3 and 5; *In Joan.* 1, Lect. 1, n. 3; Lect. 3, n. 1.
87. Cf. Spicq, *D.T.C.*, 15-A, col. 716.
88. Bernard Gui's *Legenda S. Thomae*, c. 16. Translated by K. Foster, O.P., in his *The Life of Saint Thomas Aquinas* (Baltimore: Helicon, 1959) pp. 38-39; also p. 57 and notes.
89. Chenu, *Introduction*, p. 199; also Sheets, *op. cit.*, pp. 154-57.
90. Mandonnet, "Chronologie des écrits scripturaires de s. Thomas d'Aquin," *Rev. Thomiste*, Vol. 33 (1928) pp. 222-45; M. Grabmann, *Die Werke des Hl. Thomas von Aquin* (Munster: 1949) pp. 269-71; Glorieux, *op. cit.*, pp. 254-258.
91. *Prologus* to his lectures on St. Paul.
92. Glorieux, *op. cit.*, p. 257; Grabmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 269-70.
93. P. Synave, O.P., "les Commentaires scripturaires de s. Thomas d'Aquin," *Vie Spirituelle*, Vol. 43 (1923) pp. 464-66.
94. On the difficulties involved in establishing how many lectures Aquinas gave during a week, cf. Glorieux, *op. cit.*, pp. 262-64. Most probably the order followed was that of the Vulgate; the prologue to the Pauline corpus suggests this order except that Hebrews is placed first. Yet in the prologue to his lectures on Hebrews he places it last.
95. The "ordo doctrinae vel disciplinae" is the synthetic movement in teaching which begins with the fundamental concepts of the subject to be taught and proceeds to show how they are interrelated with all of the subject's elements. This presupposes the analytic movement of the "via inventionis" which gradually discovers the various elements in the subject. Cf. Chenu, *Introduction*, pp. 258 ff.; Lonergan, *Divinarum Personarum Conceptio Analogica*, (Rome: Gregorianum. 1957) pp. 20-28.

96. St. Thomas took the opinion on the origin of Hebrews from the *Glossa Ordinaria*, P.L. 114, col. 643, or more likely from the Lombard's *Magna Glossatura*, P.L. 192, col. 399. It was Dionysius the pseudo-Areopagite and Jerome whom he invokes as his authorities in this matter.
97. *Prologus* to the Pauline Corpus just before his commentary on Romans.
98. Cf. Chenu, *Introduction*, p. 269; also Sheets, *op. cit.*, pp. 158-70 where he develops the scriptural dimension in St. Thomas' thought on grace.
99. From an address to the Faculty and Students of the Roman Athenaeum Angelicum on January 14, 1958; an English translation in *The Pope Speaks*, Vol. 5, no. 1 (Summer 1958) pp. 91-95—quotation from p. 93. Not least among the benefits is a keener appreciation of the historical context of St. Thomas' work.
100. Peter Comestor, Peter Cantor and Stephen Langton, all Masters of the Sacred Page in Paris during the twelfth century, are usually referred to as constituting the biblical-moral school of exegesis. In their commentaries they would frequently refer to local customs, etc. They would also stress the moral or tropological sense of Scripture; especially Langton who was interested in ecclesiastical reform. Cf. Smalley, *op. cit.*, pp. 240-45.
101. Compare with A. Wikenhauser, *New Testament Introduction* (N.Y.: Herder & Herder, 1958), pp. 422-23; and P. Benoît, *l'Épître aux Ephésians* (Paris: Ed. du Cerf, 1949) pp. 79-80.
102. Each verse is fitted, willy-nilly, into the overall scheme of the letter; thus a complete diagram of the divisions given by R. Cai, O.P., in his edition of St. Thomas' commentaries on Paul (Rome: Marietti, 1953) runs from page 507 to 514.
103. Quoted by D. Chenu in his *Is Theology a Science?* (New York: Hawthorn, 1959), p. 47. Neither the French original nor the English translation gives the reference and I have not been able to locate it.
104. *Parmae Editio*, t. XIII, A.D. 1862, Typis P. Fisscadori. The editor of this edition was Father Giovanni M. Allodi who, except for the *Summa Theologica*, simply reprinted the Piana text, modifying its spelling and expanding its frequent abbreviations. The Parma could thus be termed a "corrected reprint" of the Fiana.

105. *S. Thomae Aquinatis Super Epistolas S. Pauli Lectura*, 8th ed. (Rome: Marietti, 1953) 2 vols. Father Cai offers a corrected reprint of the *Editio Piana* of 1570, taking into account the *Editio Antuerpiense* of 1592. In the notes this will be referred to as the Piana-Cai edition.
106. *Contra Errores Graecorum*, proem, no. 1030 in *Opuscula Theologica*, Vol. 1 (Rome: Marietti, 1954) pp. 315-16.

## Prologue

1. Ovid, *De Arte Amatoria*, II, v.13. On St. Thomas' use of profane authors, cf. Spicq, *D.T.C.* 15-A, 723-24.
2. Often, St. Thomas' citations of Scripture contain minor variations from the Clementine edition of the Vulgate. For instance, he inserts here "so am I" after "They are ministers of Christ." At other times his understanding of a Latin word or phrase is different from the meaning which the Douay-Rheims translation of the Vulgate conveys. In both these cases an asterisk (\*) is placed immediately after the number of the verse; only significant variations will be mentioned in the notes. The "seed of Abraham" in 2 Cor. 11:22 is taken by Aquinas as a reference to St. Paul's faith since "the men of faith are the real sons of Abraham." (Gal. 3:7; also Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:3,16). This provides the three correlations:  
     Israelites—Paul's Jewish origin  
     Seed of Abraham—Paul's religious faith  
     Ministers of Christ—Paul's Apostleship
3. St. Thomas did not hesitate to apply several, or all, of the four metaphysical causes in his Scripture commentaries. In the Prologues to these commentaries he usually discusses the author (efficient cause), while the final cause is more often designated as the "subject matter," the "intention of the author," or the "utility" of the book or letter; cf. Prologues to the Psalms (Vivès Ed., t. 18, p. 228), to the Lamentations and Jeremiah (*ibid.*, t. 19, pp. 66-67, 199); they also appear in his introduction to the Pauline Corpus and many of Paul's individual letters (Romans, Colossians, Philippians, etc.). He also applies them in a commentary proper; for example, cf. his comments on Ephesians 1, Lect. 1; 2, Lects. 2 & 5. On the development of this method, cf. Smalley, *op. cit.*, pp. 99, 116-17, 296-917; Spicq, *op. cit.*, col. 717.
4. The Glossator in question is Peter Lombard (c. 1100-1160 A.D.), whose glosses on the Psalms and Pauline letters superseded those of the *Glossa Ordinaria*. A gloss would offer some ancient

text, in the present instance an Old or New Testament book, accompanied by marginal and interlinear explanatory notes—usually quotations from the Fathers of the Church. On the mysteries surrounding the *Glossa Ordinaria*, falsely attributed to Walafrid Strabo, cf. Smalley, *op. cit.*, pp. 55-66.

When Aquinas refers to "the Gloss" he normally means Lombard's *Collectanea in Epistolis S. Pauli*, P.L. 191-92; thus of the thirteen references in his lectures on Ephesians to the Gloss all can be located in Lombard and only five in the *Glossa Ordinaria*, from which Lombard probably lifted them. The statement cited here is one of the five, it reads: "The Ephesians are Asians; having received the word of truth, they remained steadfast in faith. The Apostle praises them, writing from a prison in Rome through Tychius, a deacon." P.L. 114, col. 587; 192, col. 169.

## Chapter One

5. Ephesus, as a Greek city, owed its origin to the colonizing Ionians. It was an important port of Ancient Greece and under Roman rule became part of the province of Asia. Although oriental influences were increasing, Asia Minor was still predominantly Greek in language and culture when St. Paul travelled its roads. St. Thomas' use of "pars Graeciae" need not, then, connote political ties. Latin classical authors often referred to Lower Italy, inhabited by Greeks, as "Major Graecia," and it may be in this more cultural sense that Aquinas thought of Asia Minor as "Part of Greece."
6. It is commonly held today that St. Paul is the author of this Letter, but this authorship need not imply that he wrote every word of it. In his day dictation left more initiative to the scribes than that method does today. He probably wrote or dictated it during his Roman imprisonment, sometime between 61 and 63 A.D. Few modern scholars, however, maintain that it was addressed only to the Ephesian community. The "at Ephesus" of v.1 is missing from the best Greek manuscripts. It seems that this was a circular letter—hence its more impersonal tone as compared with other Pauline letters—intended for the Christian communities in Asia. Or, as P. Benoit, O.P., conjectures in his "les Epîtres de la captivité" *Bible de Jerusalem* (Paris: Ed. du Cerf, 1949), p. 73, it may have been intended for all the communities made up of recent converts from paganism. The "at Ephesus" was added later either because of the connection between Eph. 6:21-22 and 2 Tim. 4:12, or because it was found among the papers of the Ephesian Church.
7. "In good habits" is equivalent to "in the practice of virtue." St. Thomas' "habitus" cannot adequately be translated by the English "habit." For him virtue, or "bonus habitus," is a spiritually

creative power which is the exact opposite of the mechanical repetition of acts associated with the word "habit." Cf. S. Pinchaera, O.P., "Virtue is not a Habit," *Cross Currents*, Winter 1962, pp. 65-81.

8. He is referring to the Latin "paulus" which means "little, small, trifling." St. Thomas has more to say on the name Paul in his first lecture on Ch. 1 of the Letter to the Romans.
9. The Piana-Cai has either a variant or a misprint when it reads "and about the end to those who believe..." (*finem* instead of *fidem*). The Parma differs again when it reads "They are said to believe **in Christ Jesus** and not in their own sects." However, it notes the "in their own deeds" of the Piana, which I have followed as fitting more into the context of the gratuitous favors he speaks of in this lecture.
10. Appropriation occurs when an attribute which really belongs to the Divine Nature, and so is common to all Three Persons, is attributed to one of the Persons. We do this because the divine activities by which God creates and redeems us—his "ad extra" actions—are more easily grasped by us than the activity of his own inner life. Thus we take events which the whole Trinity accomplished and attribute them to one or another Person in order to better understand his personal properties, cf. *S.T.* I, 39, 7 and 8. For example, creation is attributed to the Father, truth to the Son, and love as it effects our sanctification (grace and peace) to the Holy Spirit.
11. St. Thomas was dimly aware of the Hebrew usage regarding verb tenses and its influence on New Testament constructions, cf. Spicq, *op. cit.*, col. 706-07. His observation on the certainty of human salvation in Christ is characteristic of Paul's thought. In the final stages of his thought, represented in the Captivity Letters, the Apostle views the temporal dimensions of our Christian existence in the light of the mystery of Christ *already* unifying the world of men and the cosmic forces in his glorified existence. Cf. L. Cerfaux, *Christ in the Theology of St. Paul* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1959), pp. 419-38, 532-534; and D. M. Stanley, S.J., *Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology* (Rome: Institutum Biblicum, 1961), pp. 210-17.
12. The Augustine referred to is, of course, St. Augustine, the Bishop of Hippo and Doctor of the Church (354-430 A.D.). The work St. Thomas had in mind is most likely *De Trinitate* I, 8, n. 17 (P.L. 42, 831). When we see God "face to face" (1 Cor. 13:12), "this contemplation is promised to us as the end of all our labors and the eternal fullness of our joys . . . Contemplation is indeed the reward of faith, and our hearts are purified by faith in preparation for this reward." Translation of S. McKenna, C.S.S.R. *Saint Augustine, The Trinity* (F.C. 1963), pp. 23-25. This idea is expanded in the final two chapters of Book 22 of *The City of God*. The supernatural virtue of charity is the "effective form" (*S.T.* II-II, 23, 8 ad 1) of all the other virtuous acts, and thus formally sanctifies

us because it directs us to God as he is in himself (*ibid.*, 23, 6c). The acts of any other virtue are holy only insofar as they share in this Godward impulse of charity (*ibid.*, 23, 7 & 8).

13. Note that the six blessings developed in this lecture are offered to all mankind; this does not mean that they are accepted by everyone. At the beginning of Lecture 5 Aquinas refers back to them as "the blessings offered generally to all the faithful." In the Second Lecture he opts for a less involved exegesis of vv. 3-7; however, his theological reflections on these blessings remain valid. Many contemporary exegetes maintain that vv. 3-14 enumerate six blessings given men by God, cf. K. Sullivan, R.S.C.J., *The Captivity Epistles* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1960), pp. 54-56.
14. Peter's actions are not the cause of God's willing him glory but they are *a* cause of his attaining glory. They are a cause only because God has willed them to be such; as St. Thomas expresses it: "There can be no merit on the part of man before God except on the presupposition that God has ordained it" (*S.T.* I-II, 114, 1c). No one insists more strongly than Aquinas on the sinner's absolute dependence on God to justify him (*ibid.*, 113); but he equally insists that God's justifying word effects what it says. God's love—unlike created love—presupposes no goodness but rather creates that goodness (*ibid.*, 110, 1c). For a similar presentation in a scriptural perspective, cf. H. Kung, "Justification and Sanctification in the New Testament," in *Christianity Divided* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1962), pp. 309-35. Cf. also note 80 below.
15. One created effect, i.e., a creature, existing prior to another may be the cause of this other existing also. If so, the priority may be either of nature or of time depending on whether one views the succession of causes from the evolutive perspective of the imperfect beings preceding the more perfect—which is temporal priority—or, from the teleological perspective of nature intending the more perfect beings which the imperfect then strive to attain—priority of nature; cf. *S.T.* I, 77, 4c; 85, 3 ad 1. For an enlightening presentation of these priorities, cf. B. Lonergan, S.J., *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1958); on a temporal priority cf. the schemes of recurrence in emergent probability, pp. 115-28; on natural priority cf. the upward directed dynamism of proportionate being, pp. 444-58, 665. Temporal succession does not affect God's creative will-act which is eternal and comprehends all times "tota simul"; cf. *S.T.* I, 10, 1-4. For a further discussion of the freedom in the divine creative and predestining will-acts cf. *ibid.*, 1, 19, 5; 23, 5.
16. This views the relation of hands to the human mind in a teleological perspective. It is interesting to note that St. Thomas saw in the coordination of the human mind and human hands the radical power for a limitless technology, cf. *S.T.* I, 76, 5 ad 4; 91, 3 ad 2. If the cause of the entire created universe was itself created it would perforce be simply a part of this *created* universe and so push

the investigation back a step further. Note that Aquinas conceived the spiritual creation as included in this created universe, cf. *S.T.* I, 50, 1c; 61, 3 & 4.

17. Pelagianism, one of the important heresies of the fifth and sixth centuries, owed its origin chiefly to Pelagius (c. 360-420 A.D.), who spread the teaching—some of which he learned from Rufinus—that human nature had not been corrupted by original sin, and that man was not dependent on divine grace for his meritorious actions. In the present context "ratio" is sometimes translated as "motive." When St. Thomas asserts that "the reason for predestination is the will of God alone" he is speaking in terms of the divine causality in itself ("ex parte volentis"). When seen in the perspective of man ("ex parte voliti") grace, as St. Thomas mentioned several lines above, is the reason of predestination.
18. "Charismatic grace" and "sanctifying grace" are translations of "gratia gratis data" and "gratia gratum faciens" respectively. The former is given to individuals for the utility of the whole Christian community, e.g., the grace of prophecy; the latter effects the individual's own personal sanctification, cf. *S.T.* I-II, 111, 1c; *S.C.G.* III, 154; *Comm. on Romans*, Ch. I, Lect. 3.
19. The satisfaction of Christ should not be approached in a purely vindictive or juridic fashion, as though an angered God could be appeased only by terrible suffering on man's part. The truly Christian notion of satisfaction was spelled out by St. Thomas: "He properly satisfies for an offense who presents the offended party with something this party loves just as much, or more, than he hates the offense." *S.T.*, III, 48, 2c. Thus it is the *love* with which Christ offered *himself* that made the passion a truly redeeming sacrifice (*ibid.*, 48, 3 & 4).
20. The Gloss in question is that of Peter Lombard, cf. his *Collectanea*, P.L. 192, col. 171.
21. Both the Parma and Piana-Cai editions seem to have defective texts here. The sentence is not completed. Perhaps Aquinas referred to the passion as revealing to us the extent of God's charity; or, it may refer to the central role of love in Christ's satisfaction (cf. note 19 above); or to charity as formally sanctifying (redeeming) us.
22. Lombard's *Collectanea*, P.L. 191, col. 1444.
23. This is a reference to the objection that pagans used to bring against Christians. The Gentile Christians had to assert, against Judaizing pressures, God's universal will to save all men. But then, if God willed all men to be saved, why did the Redeemer come so late in mankind's history? For the answers Christians gave cf. Tertullian, *Adv. Gnosticos Scorpiace*, 6 (P.L. 2, col. 133); Eusebius' *Demonstratio Evangelica* 8, (P.G. 22, col. 569) and Gregory of Nyssa's *Adv.*



*Apollinarem* (P.G. 45, col. 1273). St. Thomas is probably referring to St. Augustine's reply to the objections in Porphyry's writings, cf. his letter "On the Six Questions Answered for Pagans," (P.L. 33, col. 375-76), translated by W. Parsons, S.N.D., *St. Augustine's Letters*, Vol. 2, (F.C. 1953), pp. 148-77. St. Thomas qualifies one of the positions Augustine takes in this letter by excerpts from the doctor's later writings, cf. *S.T.* III, 1, 5 ad 2.

24. Lombard's *Collectanea*, P.L. 192, col. 173.
  
25. Origen (c. 185-253 A.D.) propounded his Eschatology with a special emphasis of what St. Paul here called the *anakephalaiôsasthai* (Eph. 1:10) which in Origen became the *apokatastasis* or universal re-establishment of all things in Christ. But he took it to mean the restoration of all things into their original, purely spiritual state. This involved the purification or redemption of the damned, including the demons, cf. his *Peri Archon* I, 6 and III, 6. (P.G. 11, 169 ff.). Translated by F. Crombie, *De Principiis*, (A.N.F. 1926) pp. 260-62 and 344-48. St. Thomas will mention Origen again in this connection in Lecture 8 of this chapter. He saw the crux of Origen's position in his misunderstanding of the volitional powers of the damned, cf. *De Malo*, 16, 5; *De Ver.*, 24, 10; and *S.T.* I, 64, 2.
  
26. In the next few paragraphs St. Thomas is leading up to why St. Paul can refer to the Apostles' vocation as a "call by lot." His roundabout way may have been prompted by a pastoral solicitude for the students; one of his opusculum even deals with the subject, *De Sortibus, ad Dominum Jacobum, de Tolongo*. The reference to St. Augustine is his *Ennarrationes in Psalmos*, Ps. 30, sermo 2, 16 (P.L. 36, 246 ff.). Translated by S. Hebgin and F. Corrigan, O.S.B., *Saint Augustine on the Psalms*, Vol. 2 (A.C.W., 1961) pp. 41-42.
  
27. "Any transition in his thoughts" translates "discursum." God's absolutely infinite comprehension of Himself rules out any succession in his awareness, cf. *S.T.* I, 14, 7. The will is "certain" when it follows on rational judgments of value.
  
28. St. Ambrose (c. 340-397 A.D.), Bishop of Milan and Doctor of the Church. St. Thomas is most likely quoting from Peter Lombard's *Collectanea in Paulum*, In Epis. ad Eph. (P.L. 192, col. 174). This in turn comes from a *Commentarium in Epist. ad Ephesios* (P.L. 17, col. 375) falsely ascribed to Ambrose; some hold it was composed by Hilary, a deacon and member of the pontifical delegation to the Council of Ephesus (449 A.D.).
  
29. "Pledge" translates "pignus" and "earnest" renders "arrha." The Gloss Aquinas refers to is Peter Lombard's *Collectanea* (P.L. 192, col. 175). His option for "arrha" could have been prompted by

textual as well as theological motives since it is the Latin transliteration of the Greek word used by Paul, *arrabon*. Its modern counterpart would be down-payments or securities.

30. St. Thomas' citation of Prov. 10:1 differs from the Clementine edition of the Vulgate which reads: "A wise son maketh the father glad." as translated by the Douay-Rheims.
31. The quotation is from Lombard's *Collectanea*, P.L. 192, col. 177. It is also found in the *Glossa Ordinaria*, P.L. 114, col. 590.
32. The Resurrection was caused by the Divine Power which is common to all Three Persons and is identical with the Divine Essence itself (*S.T.* I, 25, 1e and ad 3). And the divinity of the Son was united to both Christ's soul and his dead body (*ibid.*, III, 50, 2-3). Hence the Resurrection can be attributed to the Father and to Christ himself, *ibid.*, 53, 4. Cf. also his commentaries on Ps. 40; on John, Ch. 2, Lect. 3; on Romans, Ch. 4, Lect. 3; on 1 Corinthians, Ch. 15, Lect. 2.
33. The following is the descending order of the angelic ranks as St. Thomas presents them here:

First Hierarchy:	Seraphim	
	Cherubim	
	Thrones	
Middle Hierarchy:	<i>Dionysius</i>	<i>Gregory</i>
	Dominions	Dominions
	Virtues	Principalities
	Powers	Powers
Lower Hierarchy:	Principalities	Virtues
	Archangels	Archangels
	Angels	Angels

Not all the doctors agreed, however, on the listing of the First Hierarchy. St. John Chrysostom (c. 344-407 A.D.), Patriarch of Constantinople and Doctor of the Church, put Powers in the place of Thrones, cf. C.V. Heris, O.P., *le Gouvernement divin*, Vol. 1 (Paris: Ed. de Cerf, 1959) pp. 277-83. The Gregory here referred to is Pope St. Gregory the Great (540-604 A.D.). He treats of the heavenly hierarchies in his *Homilia 34 in Evangelia*, P.L. 76, 1250-51. During the Middle Ages, Dionysius was thought to be the Areopagite mentioned in Acts 17:34; this accounts for the great authority his writings enjoyed. It is now established that he probably lived in Syria during the first half of the fifth century. A Christian platonist and disciple of Proclus, his writings were

translated into Latin by Scotus Erigena around 858 A.D. St. Thomas took him as a primary witness to the immediate post-apostolic Church. He commented on his *De Divinis Nominibus* and some have counted over 1,700 explicit references to Dionysius in Aquinas' writings. Fortunately, this thorough acquaintance with Greek-Oriental theology influenced Thomas' own thought profoundly. Dionysius lists the angelic ranks in his *De Coelestia Hierarchia*, Ch. 77. (P.G. 3, 205 ff.).

34. Cf. his commentary on Colossians, Ch. 1, Lect. 4. This reference to his coming lectures on Colossians leads Raphael Cai, O.P., to conclude that these lectures were given later on in the same scholastic year; cf. Cai's Preface to his edition of the Piana edition of Aquinas' lectures on the Pauline corpus (Rome: Marietti, 1953) Vol. 1, p. viii.
35. These three types of causes are summed up in St. Thomas' *Commentary on the Metaphysics of Aristotle* (translated by J. P. Rowan, Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1961, Vol. 2, p. 476, n. 1207): "Now we find three grades of causes in the world. First, there is a cause which is incorruptible and immutable, namely, the divine cause; second, beneath this there are causes which are incorruptible but mutable, namely, the celestial bodies; and third, beneath this there are those causes which are corruptible and mutable. Therefore causes in this third grade are particular causes and are determined to proper effects of the same kind; for example, fire generates fire, man generates man, and plants generate plants." In the present lecture St. Thomas refers to the third category as "determinatio ad speciales effectus" which I have translated as "individual causes." The celestial bodies are universal causes insofar as their causality extends to all terrestrial alteration, generation and corruption (cf. Appendix on Thomas' cosmology). God's causality is most universal since its proper effect is existence itself: "Whatever exists, and in whatever way it exists, comes properly under the causality and direction of that (first) cause." (Rowan's translation of the *Meta.*, *ibid.*, n. 1209). I have translated "rationes rerum" by "intelligible patterns of things" or "of reality" since this would embrace formal, efficient and final causality, as well as mirror closely the fluidity of Aquinas' usage of "rationes rerum."
36. Angelic knowledge is not gained in a learning process like human knowledge; rather, God infuses the knowledge so that it is connatural to the spirits from the first instant of their existence, cf. *S.T.* I, 55, 2e; 106, 1-4. (This, of course, applies only to knowledge connatural to angelic intelligences; regarding certain types of supernatural knowledge, cf. Ch. 3, Lect. 3 below). St. Thomas often refers to the whole of spiritual creation as angelic or as composed of angels; this must not be confused with the rank of Angels in the Lower Hierarchy.
37. "Precise intelligibility" translates the "definitiva ratio" of a thing. This is known when the *form* of the object is grasped, cf. *In Meta.* V, Lect. 2, n. 764 (Rowan's translation, Vol. 1, p. 305). For

example, H<sub>2</sub>O is the proper chemical name, revealing its chemical form or intelligible proportion, for what common experience designates as water. For an analysis of the cognitive processes involved, and Aquinas' terminology, cf. B. Lonergan, "The Concept of *Verbum* in the Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas," *T.S.*, September 1946, pp. 349-92, especially pp. 349-72.

38. Lombard's *Collectanea*, P.L. 192, col. 178: "super omne nominabile."
39. The concept of the Church as the "fullness" or *pleroma* of Christ is an important one for Paul. The sanctifying power of Divinity is "concentrated" in the risen body of Christ (cf. Cerfaux, *op. cit.*, pp. 426-29). But the Church is also the body of Christ: "This 'fullness' which is present in Christ is less static than dynamic; it is directed towards the sanctification of Christians through him . . . And so we can say that Christ is the sanctifying fullness of Christians. In keeping with this formula, but taking *pleroma* in the passive and concrete sense to mean the entirety of those who receive life and sanctification from Christ, Paul writes that the Church is the body of Christ, his *pleroma*, that is to say, the sphere in which is exercised the power of life and sanctification of him who 'fulfills' holiness completely in all (Eph. 1:23)." L. Cerfaux, *The Church in the Theology of St. Paul* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1959), pp. 322-23. The intimate union between the risen body of Christ and the Church (cf. *S.T.*, III, 8, 2) is certainly stressed by St. Thomas when he uses the relationship of soul and body to enunciate analogously the relation between Christ and the Church, his *pleroma*.

## Chapter Two

40. St. Thomas' text had "convivificavit" inserted in verse 1 after "vos" so that it read, similar to verse 5, "And he has restored you to life when you were dead. . ." This reading corresponds to a few Vulgate codices and was adopted in the edition of Pope Sixtus V, although it is now recognized as an interpolation.
41. St. Thomas notes in his *Commentary on St. John's Gospel*. Ch 1, Lect. 5, that "world" has at least three different meanings in Scripture. Positively, it may refer to the world as created and ruled by God; or, as it is loved by God and brought to perfection through Christ's redemption. Negatively, it refers to the world as perverted by sin and hostile to God, which is the meaning St. Paul gives it here. For the way in which these three are interrelated, and how the positive triumphs over the negative, cf. "Christian Humanism and St. John's Theology of Life," *Review for Religious*, March, 1964.

42. Following a common Biblical approach, Aquinas equates idol worship with slavery to the devil, cf. Ps. 95:5; 105:33; Deut. 32:17; Bar. 4:3; 1 Cor. 10:20.
43. The "lower bodies" are identical with the "corruptible and mutable causes" mentioned in note 35 above. Aquinas never went into a detailed speculation about which ranks of angels governed which parts of the universe. In a general way, it could be said that the Middle Hierarchy would govern the celestial bodies—the nine celestial spheres (cf. Appendix)—and the Lower Hierarchy the terrestrial sphere made up of the four elements of fire, water, earth and air; cf. *S.T.* I, 63, 7c. Yet St. Thomas only mentions this as an opinion of others and does not seem attracted to it; he reminds us that the lowest possible angel transcends the whole of material creation by reason of its pure spirituality, *ibid.*, 110, 1 ad 3.
44. St. John Damascene (c. 677-750), a priest and Doctor of the Church. The work referred to here is his celebrated *De Fide Orthodoxa*, 11, 4 (P.G. 94, 873-76).
45. This is the opinion of St. Gregory the Great in his *Homilia 34 in Evangelia*, P.L. 76, 1250. For a further discussion of this cf. *S.T.* I, 63, 7.
46. St. Thomas is borrowing this observation from Peter Lombard's *Collectanea*, P.L. 192, col. 179. The Greek has the genitive *tou pneumatos*, "of the spirit."
47. In these few sentences St. Thomas hints at his thought on concupiscence and original sin. It is not that these desires are sinful, for if the delight resulting from obtaining what we desire is not evil (*S.T.* I, 1-4), neither is the desire evil (*ibid.*, 30, 2c). If man had not sinned his enjoyment of sensible goods would be even more intense than now; to be ruled by reason is not to become "angelized," cf. I, 98, 2 ad 3. Yet, due to the lack of original justice (I-II, 82, 3), these desires can become causes of sin (I-II, 77). This is taking "concupiscentia" in the strictly theological sense, cf. K. Ralmer, "The Theological Concept of Concupiscentia," *Theological Investigations* (Baltimore: Helicon, 1960), pp. 360-69. By "natural concupiscences" St. Thomas means that men share them with all animals, whereas the "Concupiscence of knowledge," or of reason, is proper to man only, cf. *S.T.* I-II, 30, 3c.
48. This same quotation is ascribed to St. Gregory in Lecture 5 of Ch. 3. I have not been able to locate it in his writings. It occurs word for word in the *Exultet* of the Easter Vigil Liturgy – "O inaestimabilis dilectio caritatis: ut servum redimeres, filiurn tradidisti." Liturgists seem to agree that the *Exultet*, or "Benedictio Cerei Gallicana," owes its main inspiration to the fourth or fifth century; and it has been attributed both to St. Ambrose and Augustine. The earliest records we have of it are in the Gelasian Sacramentaries of the eighth century, cf. Schmidt, S.J., *Hebdomada*

*Sancta*, Vol. 2 (Rome: Herder, 1957) pp. 639-45. Possibly St. Thomas was under the impression that St. Gregory had composed the *Exultet*. St. Thomas' attribution of the quotation to St. Gregory more than likely springs from the common medieval custom of accepting Gregory as the author of the texts in the missal.

49. Cf. note 11 above. For St. Thomas "salus" is a divine action directed at the whole of man's being. V. White, O.P., has pointed out how "holiness (*sanctitas*), health (*sanitas*), completeness (*perfectio*), and wholeness (*integritas*) are, in principle, virtually synonymous for Aquinas; cf. his *Soul and Psyche* (London: Collins & Harvill, 1960), pp. 184-86. Notice how St. Thomas regularly speaks of "human salvation" or the "salvation of man" rather than the "salvation of souls."
  
50. The act of faith is essentially an assent to God revealing himself to man (*S.T.* II-II, 1, 1c). The individual articles of faith are only the material determinations of this essential acceptance of Divinity revealing himself. St. Thomas brings out this interpersonal character of faith: "Everyone who believes assents to someone's words; and thus, in any form of belief, it seems that it is the person to whose words the assent is given, who is of principal importance and, as it were, the end; while the individual truths through which one assents to that person are secondary" (*ibid.*, 11, 1c). Cf. J. Mouroux, *I Believe, The Personal Structure of Faith* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1959).
  
51. Cf. note 7 above. The "habitus" are creative powers by which men can perform different types of actions. For instance, the ability to solve complex mathematical problems is only acquired through training and practice; we cannot perform the requisite mental acts until we are conditioned by a learning process. The creative power which results from this conditioning is obviously distinct from the individual acts of solving mathematical problems, yet it is nonetheless real since if it did not exist we should have to go through the whole learning process before each act. Unlike such acquired powers, the supernatural virtues are infused by God, cf. *S.T.* I-II, 51, 4; 63, 4.
  
52. St. Thomas is using "sacramenta" here in the Patristic sense which does not limit it to the seven sacraments. All sanctifying mysteries are "Sacraments." Christ, as the incarnation of God, is thus *the* sacrament of the Divine redemptive presence in the world of man; the Church—or as St. Thomas refers to it in discussing the second sacrament of which the pagans were deprived, the "society of the saints"—is the continuation of this sacramental presence. Aquinas probably owed this terminology to Hugh of St. Victor's *De Sacramentis*, P.L. 176, 181 ff. Like Hugh, he discussed the "sacraments of nature" (*In IV Sent.*, d. 1, q. 2, a. 6, sol. 3) which were even capable of symbolizing Christ (*S.T.* I-II, 103, 1; cf. note 154 below). The Old Law also had its sacraments (*S.C.G.* IV, 57; *S.T.* I-II, 101, 4; 102, 5; 103; III, 61, 3 ad 2). On "sacramentum" as a holy secret

or sanctifying mystery, cf. *S.T.* III, 60, 1 ad 2; and A. M. Roguet, O.P., *les Sacrements* (Paris: Desclée et Cie, 1945) pp. 257-60. A broader usage of the term "sacrament" is being restored to contemporary theology, cf. E. Schillebeeckx, O.P., Christ: *The Sacrament of the Encounter with God* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1963).

53. The Douay-Rheims translation of the singular "testament" corresponds to neither the Vulgate nor the original Greek.
  
54. "Land of distortion" translates "regio dissimilitudinis." This expression originated in Plato (cf. *Politicus*, 273 d), designating the region of becoming between pure being and absolute non-being. St. Augustine used it in his *Confessions* VII, 10 and it enjoyed wide vogue in the Middle Ages where it was associated with the "terra longinqua" of the prodigal son in Lk. 15:13. In similar fashion St. Thomas here links it with the "de longe venerunt" of Mk. 8:3. The Christian concept of sin distorting man's likeness to God is what it mainly implies. Cf. E. Gilson, *The Mystical Theology of St. Bernard* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1940) pp. 33-59; and note 43 on pp. 224-25. Also P. Courcelle, "Tradition neo-platonicienne et traditions chrétiennes de 'la région de dissemblance'," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, Vol. XXII (1957) pp. 5-53; and "Témoins nouveau de 'la région de dissemblance'," *Bibliothèque de l'école des Chartes*, Vol. CXVIII (1960) pp. 20-36.
  
55. The Douay-Rheims translates "paries" as "wall," but St. Thomas distinguishes between "paries" and "murus." The former is a temporary partition—I have translated it as "barrier"—whereas the latter is permanent and used often in reference to city walls.
  
56. St Augustine's *De Gratia Christi et Peccato Originali*, 2, 24-25 (P.L. 44, col. 398-400); also *Contra Adamantum Manich. Discip.* 17, (P.L. 42, col. 157-62). In St. Thomas' view of salvation-history the Old Law had an embryonic relationship to the New: "As the effect is in its cause, or the perfect is in its less perfect beginnings—just as the whole tree is contained in the seed—so is the New Law contained in the Old Law." *S.T.* I-II, 107, 3. This is a corollary of the general pattern of God's salvific revelation to man, it is gradual in order for man to better assimilate it (*ibid.*, 99, 6). Thus the New Covenant fulfills the Old by realizing its deepest potentialities (*ibid.*, 107, 2); they both have the same goal while they differ as less perfect and more perfect in their methods of attaining that goal (*ibid.*, 107, 1). This is why Aquinas characterized the Old Law as one of Fear and the New as one of Love. For a genuine supernatural love could only be offered to God by God himself become man and communicating his love, the Holy Spirit, to other men (*S.T.* II-II, 24, 2c; III, 8, 6c). Hence Christ is the head of all mankind (*ibid.*, III, 8, 3) and those who observed God's commands out of supernatural love in the Old Testament really belonged to the New, while those in the New Covenant who still practice virtue

out of fear of punishment are acting as though they were under the Old Law (*ibid.*, I-II, 107, 1 ad 2). For a comparison of the Old and New Covenants in an eschatological perspective, cf. *ibid.*, 103, 3.

57. The ceremonial precepts, in Aquinas' view, served two purposes. One was to provide Israel with a suitable religious cult of Yahweh, the other was to symbolize the mystery of Christ. Thomas (in *S.T.* I-II, 102, 2) refers to St. Jerome's comment on Old Testament prophecy to show how this symbolic character must be present in the actual rites themselves and not fanciful speculations arbitrarily tacked on to them later. Jerome's observation was: "During the course of the Old Testament period the prophets promised much about the coming of Christ and the salvation of the Gentiles; yet they did this precisely by not neglecting the age in which they lived. As though they would not instruct the assembled people about the matters then confronting them, but would rather seem to wildly speculate about uncertain and future happenings." (*Comm. super Osee*, 1, P.L. 25, 824). In the remaining articles of question 102 St. Thomas applies the principles discussed here, and in note 56 above, with too much attention to minor details—closer to Latin patristic methods than those of modern scholars. Nevertheless, the latter base their theories on principles similar to those St. Thomas adopted, cf. C. Charlier, *The Christian Approach to the Bible*, (Maryland: Newman, 1959) pp. 159-84, 255-73.
58. The text is somewhat ambiguous here: "... inter Judaeos et Gentiles: quia isti volebant legem servare, illi vero minime..." According to literal usage, "isti" and "illi" would make the passage read: "between the Jews and Gentiles, the latter wanting to observe the law and the former least (wanting it)." If Thomas was asserting that the Gentiles were eager to observe the law, then either the Jews were not at all eager to observe it themselves or they were not eager to let the Gentiles do so. Old Testament history, however, offers so few instances of these phenomena—not to mention St. Paul's struggles with the judaizing Christians in the New—that I have taken "isti" to refer to the Jews and "illi" to the Gentiles.
59. The Douay-Rheims, closer to the meaning of the Greek translates the "decretis" of the Vulgate as "in the decrees," referring to the Old Testament. St. Thomas saw it instead as an ablative of means, "by the decrees," referring to the commands of the New Law abrogating the Old. The following text from Leviticus is used to designate the three divinely originating laws operative in human history and society, cf. *S.T.* I-II, 91; 93, 98; 106. The temporal adjectives of the scriptural text have the following correlatives:
- oldest—natural law
  - old—Old Law, especially ceremonial precepts
  - new—New Law of the Gospel.



The basic principles of the natural law were changed by neither the Old nor the New Laws (*ibid.*, I-II, 94, 5). Since the moral precepts, e.g., the ten commandments, are closely related to the natural law they too are still in force (*ibid.*, 100, 1). The New Law of the Gospel is primarily a spiritual law, existing by the grace of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the faithful; the written expression of this law is only a secondary characteristic (*ibid.*, 106, 1-2).

60. The Gloss is the Lombard's *Collectanea*, P.L. 192, col. 184. St. Thomas took his interpretation of "decretis" as an ablative of means from this source.
61. Cf. Augustine's commentary on Ps. 124, n. 10 (P.L. 37, col. 1655-56). In discussing the peace which results from true Christian love, St. Thomas is careful to point out that it consists in a harmony of wills in matters pertaining to salvation, and not necessarily in a harmony of intellectual opinions, cf. *S.T.* II-II, 29, 1; 3 ad 2; 37, 1; 38, 1. St. Augustine's sharp difference of opinion with St. Jerome indicates that he understood the distinction clearly, cf. *St. Augustine's Letters* (translated by W. Parsons, S.N.D., F.C., 1951) Vol. 1, pp. 93 ff., 172 ff., 390 ff. A short history of the dispute is given in *The Letters of St. Jerome* (translated by C. Mierow, A.C.W. 1963) Vol. 1, pp. 13-16; and one of Jeromes sharper responses is in *The Satirical Letters of St. Jerome* (translated by P. Carroll, Chicago: Gateway, 1956), pp. 123-26.
62. I have translated "collegium fidelium" as "the community of the faithful": although the collegiality of the faithful certainly carries different connotations than the community of the faithful. Throughout these paragraphs community translates *collegium*. The political community and the domestic community are two distinct domains in human intersubjective experience. Each has its own type of authority, cf. *In Libros Politicorum Aristotelis Expositio* (Turin: Marietti, 1951) p. 27, n. 90; and each requires its own specialization of the virtue of prudence, cf. *S.T.* II-II, 50, 2 ad 3.
63. In both the Piana-Cai and the Parma editions this is given as a direct quotation. It seems to come from *The City of God*, XIV, 28 (P.L. 41, 436). But there it reads: "Two cities have been formed by two loves: the earthly by the love of self, even to the contempt of God; the heavenly by the love of God, even to the contempt of self." (translated by M. Dodds, New York: Modern Library, 1950), p. 477. It is most likely that St. Thomas picked up his "Jerusalem-Babylon" designations from a sentence in Peter Lombard's commentary on this same verse in Ephesians (P.L. 192, col. 186): "Two loves have made the whole world into two cities, the love of God has formed Jerusalem, and earthly love Babylon."
64. The Parma edition notes that a quotation from Proverbs 31:21 has been inserted at this point: "For all her domestics are clothed with double garments." The Piana-Cai includes it in the text without

comment. If St. Thomas actually mentioned the quote in his lecture it may have been within a context which pointed out how love of God to contempt of self paradoxically leads to the highest realization of self; the city of God's love takes good care of its domestics. This is the analysis St. Bernard made of the growth in man's love for God. He begins by loving God for man's sake and, in the fourth and highest stage, ends by loving himself for God's sake, cf. *Saint Bernard on the Love of God*, a translation of *De Diligendo Deo* (P.L. 182, 973 ff.), by T. Connolly, S.J. (Maryland: Newman, 1951) pp. 43-46. Man discovers his true identity in God, cf. Gilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 128 ff. and notes 102 and 151 below.

65. Primary and secondary should be understood here in the light of primary and secondary causality. The secondary causes are totally dependent on God, the primary and universal cause, cf. *S.T.* I, 19, 6; 21, 4; 65, 3; 105, 6. But this in no way dispenses from the necessity and real causal influence of the secondary causes, *ibid.*, 22, 3; 103, 6; 116, 2. St. Thomas hints, in this way, at the intimate relationship between Christ and the scriptures.
66. Aquinas interprets Mt. 16:18 as primarily referring to Peter's confession of Christ's divinity: "'Upon this rock,' namely, your confession, 'I will build my Church.'" (*S.T.* II-II, 174, 6c). And this is the meaning he gives the text here. For the New Testament affirmation of the Petrine teaching office he more realistically turns to Lk. 22:32, "But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren." (*ibid.*, II-II, 1, 10c). Yet St. Thomas was aware of other possibilities, cf. his *Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel*, Ch. 16, Lect. 2.
67. In contemporary terms, these four stages would be: laying the foundation, erecting the supporting superstructure, filling in the rest of the building's shell, and finally doing the interior.
68. Allegorical and moral meanings are two of the spiritual senses of Scripture. Here is an instance in which St. Thomas uses allegory, not simply of Old Testament events signifying those of the New, but in the broader meaning of mysteries pertaining to faith, cf. de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale*, 1-1, pp. 489 ff.
69. Men are only the instruments of God both in their own sanctification, and—as with the ecclesiastical ministers or prelates—in the sanctification of other men. Sanctity is not man-made independently of God.
70. St. Thomas sees the "in quo" of the Vulgate as referring to the Holy Temple, while the Douay-Rheims, and most modern translators, view it in reference to our Lord, translating it "in whom" instead of "in which."

## Chapter Three

71. The favors granted to the whole human race are treated in Chapter One, Lectures 1 and 2, those to the apostles in Chapter One, Lectures 3 and 4.
72. Y. Congar, O.P., has pointed out in *l'Episcopat et l'Eglise universelle* (Paris: ed. du Cerf, 1962) pp. 106-23, how "utilitas" in these contexts does not connote a self-centered or pragmatically successful utility. The Fathers and early theologians used it to designate the supernatural care Christian authority must take regarding the good of persons, especially their spiritual well-being. In listing "utilitas" as an essential motive for martyrdom, St. Thomas reveals its spiritual and salvific character, its opposition to any short-sighted pragmatism, and the difficult duties with which it can confront Christians.
73. "Sacraments" here is probably to be taken in the broad sense of "sanctifying mysteries," cf. note 52 above. On the central role the mystery of God's call to the Gentiles played in the vocation and theology of St. Paul, cf. Cerfaux, *The Church in the Theology of St. Paul*, pp. 176-86, 311-12.
74. Notice how the apostolic "dignitas" involves being of service to the people of God. In his commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel, Ch. 20, he outlines the difference between the Christian dignity of the Apostles, and those who are their successors, and the prestige enjoyed by political authority. The dignity of truly Christian authority consists in its ministering to the faithful, cf. Y. Congar, "Authority as Service," *Perspectives*, Nov.-Dec. 1963, pp. 167-70. This same concept of dignity is mentioned in Lectures 2 and 3 of this chapter.
75. *De Cathechizandis Rudibus* I, 11, 16. Translated by J. Christopher, *First Catechetical Instruction*, A.C.W. 1946, pp. 38-39. And *De Doctrina Christiana* IV, 4; translated by J. Gavigan, O.S.A., *Christian Instruction*, F. C. 1947, pp. 172-73.
76. St. Paul referred to his special religious insights as *ten sunesin mou*; the Vulgate rendered this as "prudential mean"—hence St. Thomas' allusion to prudence—which the Douay-Rheims translated as "knowledge."
77. According to Aquinas the Old Testament leaders enjoyed an explicit, though vague, faith in Christ and the Trinity, cf. note 59 of Introduction. This gave the faith even in its material determinations (cf. note 50 above) a strong continuity. In line with the references in notes 56 and

57 above, the faith remains substantially the same but undergoing a dynamic growth which brings out its inner potentialities, cf. *S.T.* II-II, 1, 7. Regarding the two central mysteries of our faith, St. Thomas distinguished three main stages of their development:

- a. Before the Mosaic Law: Abraham and his clan instructed in what pertains to faith in the Godhead. Only vague promises of a Messiah (cf. Gen. 3:15).
- b. Mosaic Law: The pre-Mosaic faith in God is further refined and extended to the whole Israelite nation. Messianic expectations increase.
- c. Law of Grace: Divinity revealed as Trinity in Unity. The Word becomes incarnate. (cf. *S.T.* II-II, 174, 6).

Moral doctrine is also present in this development, but it is more conditioned by the needs of particular times (*ibid.*). In each stage the first revelations are the more excellent, they give the stage its overall direction. Other revelations, or inspired religious insights, follow until the next stage gives salvation-history a new direction. This brings out the primary importance of the Apostles and the early Church with its witness to Christ for all the succeeding generations of Christians, cf. Chapter 1, Lect. 3 and Ch. 4, Lect. 4 of this commentary. For a perceptive application of these ideas to the problems of Scriptural inspiration, cf. K. Ralmer, S.J., *Inspiration in the Bible* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1961).

78. In interpreting "generations" as temporal succession, Aquinas extends it to cover the angels. They are beyond the space-time categories men experience (*S.T.* I, 52, 1c). Yet they do experience a certain succession in intellectual and volitional acts (*ibid.*, 57, 3 ad 2; 61, 2 ad 2; 63, 6 ad 4), and their influence on material creatures also involves them in temporal continuity (*ibid.*, 53).
79. From the following paragraph we see that the "sacrament of faith"—cf. note 52 above—was the call of the Gentiles to become God's own people, cf. note 73 above. Yet, this mystery was so intimately connected with the coming of Christ, that St. Thomas also seems to be referring to the Incarnation as the "sacrament of faith." Cf. note 59 of the Introduction for references to the explicit faith of Old Testament leaders.
80. God has assisted Paul by granting him both the capability ("facultas") of realizing supernatural mysteries in human history, and by assisting him to actualize these very capacities he has given. On the distinction between capacity to act and the action itself, cf. note 51 above. This divine action does not impinge on human freedom, it is the cause of that freedom. St. Thomas set the divine action in the perspective of eternity-time relations; God comprehends the total extension of time in one ever-present act of understanding. From this it follows that he wills events without detracting from their contingency (*S.T.* I, 19, 8), just as he knows contingent events infallibly (*ibid.*, 14, 13). For our free actions, like all other contingent occurrences, are contingent only as long as they have not happened; e.g., you do not have to read this note, but as long as you are

reading it, even though it is a contingent act, you necessarily are reading it. Freedom of action does not imply that man can do something and not do it at exactly the same instant. And once we are in this sphere of actual existence we are in the domain of God's proper causality, cf. note 35 above. Thus God is a transcendent cause of human actions, especially those which are supernatural, because of the radical relation temporal and created existence has to his Eternal and Perfect Being, cf. B. Lonergan, "St. Thomas' Theory of Operation," *T.S.*, Vol. 3, pp. 387-95; and "St. Thomas' Thought on *Gratia Operans*," *ibid.*, pp. 533-47; a summary is given in his *Insight*, pp. 661 ff.

81. The Gloss is from Peter Lombard's *Collectanea*, P.L. 192, col. 188. Notice the salvific or redemptive value of Christ's resurrection, cf. *S.T.* III, 56, 1-2; 57, 6.
82. Traces, or the "vestigia," of the Triune God are present in the whole of creation. The substantial principle of each being is a vestige of God the Father; the intelligible patterns or structure of its being are evidences of the Word; and the interrelations it has with other creatures are a faint trace of the Holy Spirit, cf. *S.T.* I, 45, 7. These traces are distinguished from the "image" of God which is applicable only to rational creatures, *ibid.*, 93, 2 & 6.
83. In the cosmic view of Aristotle, the sun was responsible for the coming-to-be and ceasing-to-be ("generatio et corruptio") of material objects in the sublunary spheres. While causing organic life to appear on earth (*In II De Coelo*, 14, 426), it was only a partial cause—St. Thomas maintains—of human life (*S.T.* I, 91, 2 ad 2).
84. All created causes are second causes, as distinguished from God who is the First Cause, cf. note 65 above. Material causes are subject to scientific investigations which can uncover their intelligible patterns, and their correlations with other material objects.
85. St. Thomas often uses "saeculum" to refer to a limit of existence or a duration of time, rather than in the sense of the "world" or "earth," cf. *In I De Coelo*, 21, 9; *S.T.* I, 10, 2 ad 2; 6 ad 1. So Aquinas took the "praefinitionem saeculorum" of Eph. 3:11 to refer to God's "eternal purpose" (as the Douay-Rheims translates it, correctly giving the meaning of the Greek *kata prothesin ton aionon*) precisely as it predetermines, or prelimits, temporal durations. Cf. note 104 below.
86. The text which Aquinas quoted had "gloriae" instead of "gratiae." Although some Vulgate codices have "gloriae," most follow the *tes charitos* ("of the grace") found in the Greek.
87. Both the Scriptural references St. Thomas offers literally mean earthly princes and magistrates. Following Patristic usage, which only echoes biblical traditions, Aquinas gives these terrestrial

functions a celestial archetypal counterpart, to use M. Eliade's terminology, cf. *Cosmos and History* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1959), pp. 6-11. This does not mean that they are empty metaphors; faith assents to the realities these symbols point to, in this case the existence of created spirits. On the difference and relation between symbol as a "modus significandi" and the supra-human realities they signify, cf. *S.T. I*, 13, 1-6. Thus, in this lecture, St. Thomas will refer to the heavenly Church as the "pattern" or "exemplar" of the earthly Church. Ultimately all created beings are patterned after the divine "ideas," cf. *ibid.*, 1, 15.

88. From the Lombard's *Collectanea*, P.L. 192, col. 189, B.
89. Cf. *S.T. I*, 62, 1-4; I-II, 1-3. Man, as a rational animal, cannot escape acting for some ultimate end (q. 1); created goods such as money, pleasure, health, fame or power are insufficient to satisfy him (q. 2); since it must be a good which really fulfills his intellectual and moral capacities (q. 3). *A fortiori* does this apply to a purely spiritual being.
90. *Super Genesim ad Litteram*, V. 19 (P.L. 34, 335). St. Thomas opted for the opinion—which he expresses here—that the angels were created at the same time as the material universe, cf. *S.T. I*, 61, 3. There was no time "before" creation since time only began when creatures subject to change existed, cf. note 92 below. There are two sources of angelic knowledge. Their natural mode of knowledge is to receive the ideas from God (cf. note 36 above) and from the mediation of higher angels (*S.T. I*, 106, 1 & 4). Now that they are beatified, they also immediately intuit the Trinity, *ibid.*, I, 62, 1. Thus, St. Augustine in *Super Genesim ad Litteram* IV, 22, 26 (P.L. 34, 311-14) coined the distinction between "cognitio matutina" referring to the knowledge they receive in the beatific vision from the Primordial Cause of all reality, the Word; and the "cognitio vespertina" which designated the knowledge they acquire naturally from themselves and other creatures, cf. *S.T. I*, 58, 6 & 7; 117, 2 ad 1.
91. Since a building lacks human intellectual powers it cannot actively teach men, but men can learn from it or, as Thomas puts it, in it. Likewise, man cannot actively instruct angelic minds (*S.T. I*, 117, 2), but the latter can learn of God's plans for salvation as they actually unfold in human history.
92. That creation began in time might seem paradoxical, time never existed prior to creation. In this sense it could be held that creatures "always" existed since there was never a time when they did not, cf. A. Sertillanges, O.P., "Creation," in *God and His Creation*, (Chicago: Fides, 1955) pp. 189-190. By creatures having a beginning, St. Thomas means that time, or the duration of creatures, does not stretch back into a past that never ends (*S.T. I*, 46).

93. The Teacher is Peter Lombard who refers to *Super Genesim ad Litteram* (cf. note 90 above) in his *Collectanea*, P.L. 192, col. 189. He received the title of "Magister" due to the widespread use of his *Sentences* as a theological text in Medieval European universities. This acclaim was increased by the Fourth Lateran Council openly adopting his Trinitarian doctrine, cf. J. De Ghellinek, "Pierre Lombard," in *D.T.C.* 12, col. 2012-15.
94. The reference is to the *Collectanea* as given in the preceding note. For Dionysius cf. note 33 and 36 above; the reference is to the *De Coelestia Hierarchia*, Ch. 7 ff.
95. The Prayer of Manasse is a short apocryphal work written in Greek at the beginning of the Christian era. Taking a cue from 2 Par. 33:18-19, an anonymous Jew wrote a prayer expressive of the sentiments which the scriptural text gives us to understand were those of Manasse.
96. Potentialities are the ground of habits. To follow up on the illustration given in note 51 above, it would be impossible for men to acquire mathematical habits if they did not possess intellectual potentialities. It is these radical potentialities that are conditioned by the learning process so that habits are acquired. Cf. *In V. Meta.*, Lect. 14, n. 960 and Lect. 20, n. 1064; Rowan's translation Vol. 1, pp. 369 and 401; also *S.T.* I, 77.
97. The second interpretation of this passage is given on page 145 below.
98. The Septuagint gives the reading St. Thomas quotes; also the Itala Latin translation, which predated St. Jerome's Vulgate and was used by St. Augustine. However, the Hebrew Massoretic text has *lo' teh' amenu*: "If you do not believe you will not be established."
99. Medieval theologians distinguished various qualities and gifts of the blessed in heaven. Insofar as beatitude was likened to a marriage with Christ, or a marriage feast, certain gifts were discussed under the imagery of dowries. One of these was the "comprehension" or "enjoyment" the saints possess in the beatific vision, cf. *Suppl.* 95, 5.
100. In his *De Divinis Nominibus*, Ch. 9 (P.G. 3, 913). For St. Thomas' comments on this chapter cf. Lecture 2.
101. Cf. note 48 above.
102. Some manuscripts note that "Ut dicitur Ephes. III" is a superfluous addition to the text. It probably refers to v. 17-18. The quotation from Ps. 118:96 most likely refers to Christ's commandment in Mt. 5:44: "But I tell you, love your enemies and pray for your persecutors." St.

Thomas connects "height" with the love of heaven since there God will be perfectly loved for his own sake, cf. *S.T.* II-II, 26, 13. Yet this love in heaven is not without its paradox, we shall love God perfectly then because we will see him as the unbounded fulfillment of man's striving for goodness. To love God perfectly is, in this sense, the greatest love of self, *ibid.*, 26, 13 ad 3; also note 64 above. Perhaps this is what Aquinas meant in his quote from Job 40:5. His ascribing these four dimensions to charity is similar to St. Gregory's in his *Homiliarum. in Ezechielem Prophetam*, VI, 19, and St. Augustine's in *De Doct. Christ.* 2, 41.

103. *Soliloquies*, II, 1, 1. Translated by T. Gilligan, O.S.A., F.C. 1948, p. 381. For St. Paul's concept of perfection through knowledge, cf. J. Forestell, "Christian Perfection and Gnosis in Phil. 3:7-16," *C.B.Q.* April, 1956, pp. 126-36. The "scientia afficiente" St. Thomas here speaks of is the same as the "sapida scientia," the knowledge that spirates love, which he discusses in *S.T.* I, 43, 5 ad 2. For him the wisdom that is joined with love is both speculative and practical, *ibid.*, II-II, 45, 3.
104. St. Thomas interprets "saeculi saeculorum" as referring to the "age" which embraces all other times, the span of duration during which creatures have existed—cf. note 85 above. This age is termed "aevum" in *S.T.* I, 10, 5-6; it is the duration proper to the unchangeable existence of the heavenly bodies which, nevertheless, undergo local motion (cf. note 35 above). It is also the duration proper to the angels insofar as their existence is immutable, yet they do experience change in their understanding and will. Hence, this age of "aevum" lies between eternity, which knows no before and after but is "tota simul," and the time which we experience, essentially consisting in succession.

## Chapter Four

105. "World" is here taken in a negative sense, as an enemy of God, cf. note 41 above.
106. *De Natura Boni*, Ch. 3 (P.L. 42, 553). Translated by A. Newman in N.P.N.F. Vol. 4, 1887, p. 352. As St. Thomas interprets these in *S.T.* I, 5, 5, measure ("modus") refers to the prerequisites of a being, for instance, sub-atomic particles are prerequisites for the chemical elements. Form ("species") is what the being is, its immanent intelligibility, cf. note 37 above. Order ("ordo") refers to an inclination in a being to achieve a goal, produce an act, or the like, e.g., the unstable chemical elements possess an "ordo" toward forming compounds. The balanced harmony ("tranquillitas") which results from the proper interplay of these three is by no means equivalent to static immobility; it often is very dynamic. These three aspects of a being admit of a wide variety of applications on many levels. On the plane of human existence and its relation to God,



sin destroys the proper unfolding of man's "ordo" toward God and so disrupts the harmony in the measure, form and order of grace (*S.T.* I-II, 85, 4). Contrariwise, God's redeeming love for man and man's response in love effects a true harmony or peace (*ibid.*, II-II, 29, 1-4). St. Thomas remarks that this balanced harmony "is achieved when each possesses what is proper to himself" because diversity is an essential element in the building up of the Body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:1 ff.; and Ch. 4, Lect. 4 below). St. Augustine's immediate application of measure, form, and order, are to the good, but Aquinas uses them in a definition of peace in view of Augustine's reflections in *The City of God*, XIX, 13 (cf. *S.T.* II-II, 29, 1 ad 1).

107. "Constituting what neither are separately" translates "tertium constituentium." The body and soul constitute what neither of them are in isolation, a man, cf. *S.T.* I, 75. The human soul is the central intelligibility unifying man's physical, chemical, biological, psychological and intellectual multiplicity. For St. Thomas' teaching in summary form, cf. Longergan, "The Concept of *Verbum* in the Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas," *T.S.* Sept. 1946, pp. 366-68. For a contemporary formulation, cf. his *Insight*, pp. 431-37, 514-20.
108. The Piana-Cai has either a variant or a misprint: reading as "*spem speratam*" instead of the Parma's "*rem speratam*."
109. "This is the Catholic faith . . ." are among the opening and closing words of the Athanasian Creed. It was composed in the fourth or fifth century and ascribed to St. Athanasius because of its forthright and exact Trinitarian and Christological doctrine. On "habit of faith" cf. notes 7, 50 and 51 above.
110. Cf. note 10 above.
111. Among the "auctoritates" which theology appeals to in support of its positions, Holy Scripture naturally holds the primary place. Other authorities are Conciliar or Papal decisions and the Church Fathers, cf. *S.T.* I, 1, 8; *S.C.G.* I, 9; on Patristic authority in St. Thomas, cf. G. Greenen, "Saint Thomas et les pères," *D.T.C.* 15-A, col. 738-61. For a brief treatment of the use of authorities in the Middle Ages, cf. Chenu, *Introduction à l'études de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, pp. 109-25.
112. In Eph. 4:8 St. Paul quotes from the Septuagint version of Ps. 67:19. The Hebrew Massoretic text and the Vulgate read, "thou hast received gifts among men."
113. The doctrine of the Hypostatic Union, as formulated in the Councils of Chalcedon (451 A.D.) and II Constantinople (553), teaches that the Divine Nature and Human Nature of Christ are united in

the unity of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity. "Nature" signifies *what* something is, whereas "person" signifies *he who* has such and such a nature. Thus the union of two natures could not occur in one or the other of the natures themselves since they are mutually exclusive, humanity is not divinity and vice versa. But the two natures can be united in the *Person who* thereby possesses two natures, cf. *S.T.* III, 2, 2-3. In the next two sentences some editions of the Parma omit the words, "He who ascends is the Son of Man, raising human nature" and simply have "For he who descended, as was said, is the Son of God taking on human nature to the preeminence of immortal life."

114. Cf. note 33 above. The reference here is to Chapters 5 and 6 of the *Ecclesiastica Hierarchia* (P.G. 3, 505 ff.). By "state of perfection" St. Thomas is not referring to the technically theological sense of "status perfectionis," by which the Episcopacy and religious institutes are designated. He is rather referring to the more general sense in which all Christians who strive to perfect their love of God and men are in a state or condition of perfection, cf. *S.T.* II-II, 184, 1-3. The role of religious institutes and the Episcopacy is to give certain types of external expression to this inner search for, and attainment of, the perfection of love, *ibid.*, 184, 4 ff. For men need to express their love and worship externally, *ibid.*, 27, 6 ad 3; 30, 4 ad 1; 81, 7; 84, 2.
115. The Vulgate text St. Thomas is quoting reads: "Consummatio abbreviata inundabit iustitiam. Consummationem enim, et abbreviationem Dominus Deus exercituum faciet." In his commentary on Isaias 10:22-23 St. Thomas takes the literal meaning of "consummatio abbreviata" as referring to the destruction of Jerusalem and Judaea by Sennacherib. Modern biblical scholars tend to agree; the new Confraternity Edition translates the difficult Hebrew passage: "Their destruction is decreed, as overwhelming justice demands. Yes, the destruction he has decreed, the Lord, the God of hosts, will carry out within the whole land." Aquinas also notes there (*Comm. on Is.* 10:22) that in Rom. 9:27-29 this same passage is used in reference to those who will be saved, the remnant; it could be in this sense that he is quoting it here. Aquinas also notes that in the Septuagint it reads "an abbreviated word" (*logon suntelon*) instead of "a consumption abridged." Following Patristic exegesis, he sees this as either a reference to the Gospel as a summation of perfection (cf. Mt. 22:40), or to the Word Incarnate who, in himself, sums up all that had been revealed through many prophets, cf. H. de Lubac, S.J., *Exégèse médiévale*, (Paris: Aubier, 1961) 2-18, pp. 181-97. Thus, here he could be saying that the evangelical character of the Church's ministry will share in the Gospel's perfecting power. Most likely, in quoting this passage of Isaias, Aquinas had all of these nuances in mind, for the "Perfecting of the saints" translates "ad consummationem sanctorum" so that the occurrence of "consummatio" in Is. 10:22 suggested itself. On this use of parallel texts and verbal association in Aquinas' exegesis, cf. Spicq, *op. cit.*, 703, 721.

116. The "speaking with tongues" St. Paul is here referring to should not be confused with the Pentecostal "gift of tongues" (Ac. 2:1-13) which possibly meant that the first disciples spoke, or were understood in, other languages, cf. *S.T.* II-II, 176, 1. (This has been called into question by no less an authority than S. Lyonnet, S.J., who holds that the Pentecostal "gift of tongues" was also a question of prayer and not of preaching, cf. *Verbum Domini*, Vol. 24 (1944), pp. 65-75). The phenomenon of "glossolalia" mentioned here and in 1 Cor. 14 was the utterance of unintelligible sounds or incoherent words during an ecstatic state. Hence Paul's insistence that this charisma should not dominate the liturgical assembly unless someone was present who had the gift of interpreting the sounds so that those present could receive some instruction.
117. In Scripture the eagle is a symbol of the saints or heavenly beings (cf. Ez. 1:10; 10:14; Apoc. 4:7) whose life has been renewed (cf. Is. 40:31; Ps. 103:5).
118. In Gal. 4:1 St. Paul says that all men under the Old Covenant were like a young boy who is an heir (and they were heirs to the New Covenant) and yet is under tutors (the Old Law) until Christ came. Since the "body of the Church is made up of men who existed from the beginning of the world until its end" (*S.T.* III, 8, 3c) it also underwent this gradual development. And it grows now as new members are brought into it.
119. St. Thomas is here referring to a supposed incident in the death of Arius as related by St. Athanasius in his *De Morte Aarii*, (P.G. 25 col. 688). Like the death of Judas recorded in Acts 1:18, Arius was suddenly stricken down, either from a fall or a swelling (the Greek Athanasius uses is exactly that of Acts 1:18), and his abdomen burst asunder—"crepuit medius." Historians see no reason to deny that Arius died suddenly, cf. G. Bardy in *Histoire de l'Eglise*, t. 3 (Bloud et Gay, 1947) p. 113; but the details are certainly tendentious. Aquinas' harshness with Arius is probably due to the storm of controversy and political intrigue involved in the spread of his heretical teaching. He was condemned at Alexandria in 321 and at Nicea in 325 for denying the Divinity of the Word. Without a distinction between Nature and Person, he could not grasp how the Son is as fully God as the Father. Hence he held that the Word is God's first and most perfect creature (*ktisma, poiema*), created from nothing. Nicea countered this with its belief that the Word is consubstantial (*homoousion*) with the Father. Despite the condemnation, Arius' doctrine and influence spread widely due mostly to the active support of the emperors Constantius II and Valens, as well as his subtle use of the Greek terminology involved to bypass the orthodox formulations.
120. On charity as the form of all the supernatural virtues, cf. note 12 above. For the "truth" of virtue in which a man acts in conformity with his natural and supernatural existence, cf. *S.T.* I, 16, 4 ad 3.

121. The words "binding force which flows out from each member according to the degree of grace given him, and also through the actual" are an interpolation made by Remigius Nannini, O.P., in his edition of 1562. He claimed that "compositionem ab unoquoque membro egredientem, secundum mensuram gratiae sibi datae, et actualem" were to be found in the margins of one of the oldest manuscripts. He put the words in the margin of his own edition but, by the time of the Veneta edition of 1593, they were included in the text itself. No trace of the manuscript he referred to has been located and the authenticity of the interpolation is questioned, cf. the preface of R. Cai, O.P., in his re-edition of the *Piana Super Epistolas S. Pauli Lectura* (Rome: Marietti, 1953) pp. x-xiv.
122. The Glossator is Peter Lombard in his *Collectanea*, P.L. 192, col. 203.
123. The words "Regarding this he does two things: First, he gives them precepts by which they can remain in ecclesial unity" are another interpolation by Remigius Nannini; they merely repeat what was said in the previous sentence.
124. The Vulgate translated the Greek *noos* of Eph. 4:17 as "sensus," which in the Douay-Rheims is rendered "mind." The commentary is not clear as to whether the "reason" St. Thomas is here referring to is the practical reason which is the *subjectum* of prudence (cf. *S.T.* II-II, 47, 1-3) or the "ratio particularis," or internal sense of appraisal, which is also called the "vis cogitativa" or "vis apprehensiva" in its more directly cognitive aspects. That he does mean by "reason" this "ratio particularis" is favored by his later identification of "sensus" with "vis apprehensiva." This power is generically of the same type as that found in lower animals (*S.T.* I, 78, 4 ad 5), but in man it is brought to greater perfection because of the influence his intellectual reason exerts over its activities (*ibid.*, I, 78, 4c). Whereas lower animals must rely on instinct in their appraisal of what is good (liked) or bad (disliked), man's "particular reason"—which might be rendered as "the faculty of direct appraisal"—is able to be checked by his intellect (*ibid.*, I, 81, 3c), and so enjoy a greater freedom (*ibid.*, I, 83, 1c). For example, man can freely choose to undergo medicinal treatment that is painful. The terms "reason" and "judgment" in reference to this faculty of direct appraisal must not be taken in a strictly intellectual sense. As Aquinas points out here, it can be upright or perverted depending on whether or not man's intellectual powers guide it according to the proper moral standards. These latter are termed "synderesis" which is the habit of primary or general moral principles applicable to the sphere of human activity (*ibid.*, I, 79, 12) as the immanent standards in men which give their consciences a normative force (*ibid.*, 79, 13); e.g., the most basic one of doing good and avoiding evil. By "the divine law or God" Aquinas is referring to the Eternal Law which God himself is (*ibid.*, I-II, 91, 1 ad 3; 93, 1-2) and from whom all other norms of action are derived (*ibid.*, 93, 3). For a further discussion of the "ratio

particularis" cf. R. E. Brennan, O.P., *Thomistic Psychology* (New York: Macmillan, 1949), pp. 133-35, 144-46, 201-02; compare with the contemporary treatment of these psychological phenomena by M. B. Arnold, *Emotion and Personality* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1960), Vol. 1, pp. 61-66, 171-77, 189-91, 231-33, and Vol. 2, pp. 193-202.

125. The Greek has the infinitive *apothesthai*, to put off; this is followed by most of the Vulgate codices with "deponere." But a sixth or seventh century Vulgate codex, and several Patristic citations, have the imperative form "deponite." This latter was also adopted by the Vulgate edition of Sixtus V. St. Thomas' parenthetical remark above about "if" sometimes meaning "because" is correct. However, it is not the correct interpretation here since the Greek has *ei ge*, "if indeed."
126. To deny Providence is also to deny predestination and reprobation (cf. *S.T.* I, 23, 1) along with the moral guilt which sin produces (*ibid.*, I-II, 87, 1c).
127. "Imaginative spirit" translates "spiritus phantasticus" referring to the phantasm or imagination (cf. *S.T.* I, 78, 4) which embraces the "ratio particularis" mentioned in note 124 above. The word "spirit" is used in connection with these interior psychological functions, even when they are also possessed by animals lower than man, cf. *S.C.G.* IV, 23. *Mind* here is definitely a rationally spiritual faculty and not that discussed in lecture 6 above (cf. note 124) since here it translates *mens* whereas there the word was *sensus*—even though the same Greek word is used by St. Paul, *noos*.
128. "Passiones" is here translated by "emotions" (cf. Brennan, *op. cit.*, pp. 151 ff.). The concupiscible emotions might be represented as comparatively mild reactions to either favorable stimuli—so love, desire, joy—or unfavorable stimuli—hatred, aversion, sorrow. In these terms, the irascible emotions would be emergency reactions either to favorable stimuli—such as hope when the object can be attained, and despair when it cannot—or unfavorable stimuli—such as courage, fear or rage. Cf. *S.T.* I, 81, 2; I-II, 23, 1-2; 25, 1-4; also R. E. Brennan, O.P., *General Psychology* (New York: Macmillan, 1948), pp. 266-71; and M. B. Arnold, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 193-99.
129. This does not mean that the poor who cannot find jobs are not permitted to relieve their own real necessities by taking what is superfluous to others. As St. Thomas explains in *S.T.* II-II, 66, 7c, this is not theft since by the divine and natural laws temporal goods are meant to supply men with what is necessary for their human existence.
130. The "necessity of precept" refers to Gen. 3:19 and the admonitions of St. Paul quoted previously.

131. God cannot receive or "suffer" anything ("pati" in the sense of reception, from which the "passiones" or emotions get their name) since he is the fullness of all Being, cf. *S.T.* I, 2, 3; 3, 1. Anger is metaphorically attributed to God because of an analogy with the results of human anger. When men are mad they punish, so when God punishes he is said to be angered, *ibid.*, I, 3, 2 ad 2; 59, 4 ad 1; I-II, 47, 1 ad 1. Yet, even in the punishment of hell God's mercy is evident, *ibid.*, I, 21, 4 ad 1; *Suppl.* 99, 3 ad 4.
132. Men are angered because of some imaginary or real wrong done to themselves (*S.T.* I-II, 47, 1); St. Thomas believes that these injuries can be reduced to a feeling, on the part of the angered man, that those who injure him are taking his importance too lightly—"parvipensio" (*ibid.*, 47, 2).

## Chapter Five

133. St. Gregory the Great, *Homilia 30 in Evangelia*, (P.L. 76,1220).
134. The etymology of Aquinas is correct, although the Romans transferred the use of "fornix" from designating arches or vaults to brothels which were situated in underground vaults. The quotation from Prov. 20:26 is as given in the Piana-Cai edition; although far from the true reading of v. 26 it seems to fit the context. The Parma gives the correct Vulgate reading: "incurvat super eos fornicem." If St. Thomas actually quoted it in this way, he may have taken it to mean that the king built an arch near a place of fornication. It seems more probable, however, that he quoted the verse as the Piana-Cai gives it since "fornicam" here means "wheel." The Confraternity translates the verse as: "A wise king winnows the wicked, and threshes them under the cartwheel."
135. "Spiritual sins" are those whose gratification is achieved in the mere apprehension of what is desired, without any tactile experiences, cf. *S.T.* I-II, 72, 2.
136. Each of the blessed will know God as perfectly as his capabilities allow; but he will never exhaust the infinite clarity or "knowability" of God, cf. *S.T.* I, 12, 7; 26, 3; I-II, 3, 8. As an illustration, St. Thomas mentions that if all the brilliance of the sun were concentrated so that the human eye could see the whole of it, the eye still could only glimpse at it momentarily, whereas the eagle—as was then thought—could gaze at it continually.
137. The text of Col. 2:8 has "philosophy" and not "prophecy": St. Thomas' commentary on Colossians, Ch. 2, Lect. 2, has the correct reading. Perhaps the syllogism he was about to give distracted him or a copyist! It could be schematized as follows:

major: God punishes whoever sins gravely,  
 minor: But those who commit carnal vices are punished by God,  
 conclusion: Therefore carnal vices are gravely sinful.

138. St. Thomas takes "diffidentiae" in the sense of "despair" rather than "unbelief." The Greek term *apeitheia* means "disobedience," especially (in the N.T.) against God. Hence the connotation of "disbelief" in the proclamation of his gospel, or "distrust" in the salvation he gives.
139. *The City of God* I, 9 (P.L. 41, col. 21-23). A similar theme is treated in *Sermo 82 de Verbis Domini*, n. 7 (P.L. 38, 508). Translated by R. G. MacMullen in N.P.N.F., Vol. 6, p. 359. Referring to Mt. 18:15, "If thy brother shall sin against thee, go and rebuke him between thee and him alone," St. Augustine remarks, "If you will neglect this, you are worse than he . . . You are worse in keeping silence, than he in his reviling." St. Thomas discusses the serious obligation of fraternal correction in *S.T.* II-II, 33, 2.
140. *The City of God*, I, 9 (P.L. 41, 22) and note 42. "If anyone forbears to reprove and find fault with those who are doing wrong, because he seeks a more seasonable opportunity, or because he fears they may be made worse by his rebuke, or that other weak persons may be disheartened from endeavouring to lead a good and pious life, and may be driven from the faith; this man's omission seems to be occasioned not by covetousness, but by a charitable consideration. But what is blameworthy is, that they who themselves revolt from the conduct of the wicked . . . spare those faults . . . because they fear to give offense, lest they should injure their interests . . . that is to say, their non-intervention is the result of selfishness, and not of love. Accordingly, this seems to me to be one principal reason why the good are chastised along with the wicked, when God is pleased to visit with temporal punishments the profligate manners of a community." St. Thomas' reference to losing "your benefices" (*beneficia tua*) may indicate that he had clergy in mind. A benefice was an ecclesiastical position or function to which a stipend or salary was attached. This naturally put the clerical recipient in an embarrassing position if he had to disagree or reprimand the "benefactors" supporting him.
141. The Gloss is Peter Lombard's *Collectanea*, P.L. 192, col. 211.
142. On scriptural texts as "authorities" cf. note 111 above. The Gloss is the Lombard's as given in note 141 above. Notice Aquinas' appeal to St. Paul's customary way of using Old Testament authorities, rather than side-stepping the problem of where Paul's quotation comes from by simply saying, as the Gloss does, that it was uttered by the Holy Spirit through Paul himself. St. Thomas thought Eph. 5:14 was a compilation of several O.T. passages. Today it is almost unanimously regarded as a fragment from an early Christian hymn used in the baptismal liturgy.

It is held that 1 Tim. 3:16 is a fragment from the same hymn which celebrates Christ's divinity and enthronement in heaven. Cf. D. M. Stanley, SJ., "Carmenque Christo Quasi Deo Dicere..." *C.B.Q.* Vol. 20 (1958) pp. 183-185.

143. Justification is entirely dependent on the gratuity of God's action, the will cooperates only after God's grace has enabled it to. "There are five effects of grace in us. The first is that the soul is healed [justified]; the second that it wills the good; a third is that the good it has willed is effectively accomplished; a fourth is that it perseveres in good; the fifth is that the soul attains to glory. Hence, insofar as grace causes the first effect in us it is termed prevenient with regard to the second effect; and inasmuch as it causes the second effect, it is termed subsequent with regard to the first. As one effect follows another and is prior to a third, so grace may be termed both prevenient and subsequent with respect to different effects." (*S.T.* I-II, 111, 3c). For the development and context of these distinctions, cf. Lonergan, "Habitual Grace as *Operans* and *Cooperans*," *T.S.* Vol. 3 (1942), pp. 82-87; and "St. Thomas on *Gratia operans*," *ibid.*, pp. 554-561. Since metaphors are often used in reference to grace it is important to keep in mind that it is not some sort of supernatural "thing" poured into a man in order to justify or sanctify him. Grace is simply the result of man himself being justified by God; as St. Thomas expresses it: "Grace is said to be created because of the fact that man is created according to it—that is, he is constituted in a new existence—from nothing, that is, from no merits of his own." (I-II, 110, 2 ad 3).
144. Ch. 2, 982a, 17-19. For St. Thomas' comments cf. Lect. 2 n. 42. "Sapientis est ordinare" includes both the speculative task of knowing the causes of reality, and the practical task of directing action in accord with that knowledge. Hence Aquinas sums up the general description of a wise man "as one who knows all, even difficult matters, with certitude and through their causes; who seeks this knowledge for its own sake; and who directs others and induces them to act." (Rowan's translation, *ibid.*, n. 43).
145. Both the Parma and the Piana-Cai have the *Fourth Book*, but it seems to be rather the *Fourteenth Book*, Ch. 1, n. 3 (P.L. 42, 1037). As translated by S. McKenna, in his *St. Augustine, The Trinity*, p. 413: "Knowledge of divine things is properly called wisdom, but the name science properly belongs to the knowledge of human things." Since man can only find his complete fulfillment in God (*S.T.*, I-II, 3, 8), what prudence is to a man's individual actions in life, that wisdom is to his whole span of existence, aiming his existence to the fulfillment of wisdom in the beatific vision.
146. Cf. *S.T.*, I, 79, 11-13; and note 124 above on "synderesis." just as speculative thought has certain basic principles which underpin all its efforts, e.g., the principle of non-contradiction or sufficient reason, so also does practical thought aimed at action, e.g., to do good and avoid evil.



147. St. Jerome, *Epistula* 22, (P.L. 23, 423). The following reference is to 3 Esdras, i.e., the apocryphal third book.
148. St. Thomas' reflections on choral chant in *S.T.* II-II, 91 follow from his general analysis of external expressions in man's religious worship (cf. references in note 114 above). "We use language with God, not to manifest our thoughts to him, for he is the searcher of hearts, but to induce reverence in ourselves and others who hear. Hence vocal praise is not necessary on God's account, but for the one who praises him." (*ibid.*, 1c). A possible consequence of this is that "Doctrinal instruction and preaching are nobler than chant as methods of rousing men to devotion" (*ibid.*, 2 ad 3). The reference to the "illiterates" must be taken within this context; Aquinas' own experience probably led him to conclude that good theological teaching and preaching did the educated more spiritual good than listening to Gregorian chant.
149. Aristotle, Book 1, Ch. 11 and 24. For St. Thomas' comments cf. Lect. 1, n. 25 and Lect. 2, n. 44. Note that in the following paragraphs St. Thomas takes the Vulgate's "sicut domino" as a reference to any lord or master, whereas the Greek *to Kyrio* means "to the Lord" Christ.
150. St. Thomas' use of "exemplum" here should not be taken simply in the sense of an "illustration." It also has the meaning of "exemplar" as in Lecture 1 of this chapter. The union of persons which is the very essence or formal cause of matrimony (*S.T.* III, 29, 2c; *Suppl.* 44, 1c) was raised to the dignity of a sacrament by Christ so that it conforms to the union of love he has for his spouse, the Church (*Suppl.* 42, 1 ad 3). Cf. St. Thomas' comments on Eph. 5:32 below.
151. St. Thomas' analysis of charity is in terms of an interpersonal friendship between God and Man (*S.T.* II-II, 23, 1). Any interpersonal union is necessarily based on the recognition by each of the parties that he himself is a person, a unity, who can—or must—enter into a union with the other. Where God is "the Other" this means that we recognize our own nothingness and absolute need for him. Now, a correct self-love, springing from a true self-knowledge (*ibid.*, 25, 7), is an acceptance of this self-unity that I am; hence it is "the form and root of all friendship" and as such is obligatory (*ibid.*, 25, 4). Cf. notes 64 and 102 above. The total primacy of love for God is also a consequence (*ibid.*, 26, 1).
152. This is from St. Gregory, cf. note 133 above.
153. At this point Remigius Nannini O.P., (cf. note 121 above) noted in the margins of his 1562 edition that "Many manuscript codices agree in adding here: 'as occurs all the time in plants'."

154. Some passages of the Old Testament refer directly to Christ in their literal meaning, others literally refer to some Old Testament personage who, in turn, symbolizes Christ. This is the allegorical sense, cf. note 79 of the Introduction. Human marriage has an archetypal significance. M. Eliade points out in his *Cosmos and History*, pp. 23-27 how it reproduces the union of heaven and earth. From a theological viewpoint, does not this "union of heaven and earth," with the cosmic regeneration which results from it, somehow typify the hypostatic union? St. Thomas thought so (*Suppl.* 61, 2 ad 1) even to the point of calling the marriage of infidels a "quasi-sacrament" (*ibid.*, 59, 2 ad 1).

## Chapter Six

155. Both the Parma and the Piana-Cai editions give the *Sixth Book* of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*. It is *Book Eight*, 12, 1162-a, 4-8 where he says: "The friendship of children to parents, and of men to gods, is a relation to them as to something good and superior; for they have conferred the greatest benefits, since they are the causes of their being and of their nourishment, and of their education from their births." Here St. Thomas lists "esse, vivere et disciplinam" so that "vivere" is evidently intended to convey the idea of sustaining our physical life.
156. The Piana-Cai edition has "non tamen minis arcendo aut subiiciendo" rather than the Parma's "non tamen nimis arcendo aut subiiciendo." I have translated the latter; the former might be rendered as "not, however, by keeping them at a distance with threats, or subjugating them."
157. "Domini" here could refer either to the servant's master or to the Lord, Christ. I have adopted the latter since it is in better agreement with what follows.
158. The Piana-Cai edition interpolates "He adds the same when he says **as to the Lord and not to men.**" The Parma notes that this is not in the 1498 edition but in the 1570 Piana and Remigius' 1562 edition. Again it is due to Remigius Nannini and probably had manuscript witnesses to it preceding the 1498 edition.
159. The Parma simply omits the sentence "**Quodcumque fecerit bonum**, est omni faciendum." The lack of unity between Ac. 10:34-35 and Eccl. 9:10 seems to indicate that it is not the correct reading. This advice might seem somewhat materialistic, but only if "the universe" is taken in a materialistic sense. (For *omne*, -is, n. in the sense of "the all, the universe" cf. R. J. Deferrari's *A Lexicon of St. Thomas Aquinas*.) For St. Thomas it definitely was not. The whole universe, in its totality, is ordered towards God (*S.T.* I, 65, 2c). In *S.T.* II-II, 180, 4c he speaks of creatures as

“divinorum effectuum”—a phrase which reminds one of Teilhard de Chardin’s reference to the universe as “the divine milieu.” Indeed, we are parts of this universe and in us the universe will reach its undreamt of fulfillment in the beatific vision (*ibid.*, I, 73, 1; I-II, 2, 8 ad 2). This attitude to the universe is merely a consequence of his doctrine on creation, the “exodus” of creation from God (I, 23, 7; 44) and its return to him (*S.C.G.* I, 1) through rational creatures (*S.C.G.* I, 1; II, 23; also *S.T.* 103, 2 ad 3) and in Christ (I, Intro. to question 2). In willing and working for the good of the universe we are acknowledging the goodness of the Persons who created it, cf. *S.C.G.* I, 71; II, 45. Also Lonergan, *Insight*, pp. 698-99; and J. H. Wright, *The Order of the Universe in the Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas*, (Rome: Greg. Univ. Press, 1957), especially pp. 153-55.

160. St. Thomas takes “in potentia virtutis ejus” in the technical sense of “power” and “virtue” rather than the Douay-Rheims “the might of his power.” Here it is not a question of the passive powers or potencies referred to above (cf. note 96 above), but of an infinitely active power (*S.T.* I, 25, 1). God never changes, not because he is “static,” but because his infinite dynamism can neither decrease nor increase.
161. This is from the Lombard’s *Collectanea*, P.L. 192, col. 219. In quoting Jn. 1:5 St. Thomas may have been mentioning how the powers of evil will not be able to conquer those who hold fast to Christ since they did not capture [*comprehendere*] him.
162. Aristotle, *Politics*, I, 2, 1253a, 30 ff. “For man, when perfected, is the best of animals, but, when separated from law and justice he is the worst of all; since armed injustice is the more dangerous, and he is equipped at birth with arms, meant to be used by intelligence and virtue, which he may use for the worst ends. Wherefore, if he have not virtue, he is the most unholy and the most savage of animals, and the most full of lust and gluttony.”
163. “Supplication” translates “obsecratio” which St. Thomas understands in the light of its root “ob sacrum.” We will be heard, not on our own merits, but “on account of a sacred reality,” i.e., the divine mercy or God’s own holiness, cf. *S.T.* II-II, 83, 17c.

## A Note On St. Thomas' Cosmology

In his commentaries on such letters as Colossians and Ephesians, both of which assert the cosmic supremacy of Christ, St. Thomas would naturally have alluded to the cosmic picture of his day. It was by no means a primitive picture, as even a cursory reading of his commentary on Aristotle’s *De Coelo et Mundo* will prove. Although Aquinas never doubted expressly the essentials of his cosmology,

nonetheless on many issues it was an avowedly *hypothetical* system--an attempt to explain what data was available concerning the celestial motions. Cf. *S.T.* 1, 32, 1 ad 2; *In II de Coelo*, 17, n. 451; and T. Litt, *Les corps célestes dans l'univers des s. Thomas d'Aquin* (Louvain, 1963), pp. 262-67.

Aristotle's universe was made up of between 47 and 55 concentric spheres. He had taken this idea from two fourth century B.C. mathematician-astronomers, Eudoxus and Callipus, who had resorted to the geometry of the sphere to attempt an explanation of planetary motions. Aristotle transformed their geometric symbols into a celestial mechanics in which the spheres were seen as transparent orbs (*In II de Coelo*, n. 413) of force or motion. They were not composed of any of the four elements (earth, air, fire, or water) but of a fifth simple, corporeal element; one not subject to the alterations of the mixed bodies (cf. *In I de Coelo*, Lect. 4-8). This fifth element was sometimes termed "ether" and was thought to adopt a perfectly circular movement (cf. *In XII Meta.*, Lect. 10). The earth was at rest in the center of these concentrically moving spheres.

St. Thomas' conceptions differed from Aristotle's on three major points. He followed Ptolemy in placing the Mercury and Venus spheres between those of the Moon and Sun, whereas Aristotle had put the Sun sphere after that of the Moon (*In II de Coelo*, Lect. 17). Another area in which Aquinas seems to have opted for Ptolemy's hypothesis was in the latter's rejection of the large number of Aristotle's spheres intended to account for planetary motions. Each planet had only one sphere moving it in an eccentric path—the earth was not the exact center of their movement (*ibid.*). All the planets, excepting the Sun, were not directly moved by the cyclic movement of the spheres, they rather moved in small epicycles which, in turn, were moved by the spheres.

The outermost sphere was the *Primum Mobile* whose absolutely perfect East-West motion imparted the 24 hour motion to the stars and planets. For Aristotle this was the Star sphere, but by Ptolemy's time it was perceived that the fixed stars had a motion of their own besides the 24 hour one, what is now known as the precession of the equinoxes (*ibid.*, n. 456). Hence Aquinas concluded that the *Primum Mobile*, with its perfect diurnal motion, had no stars (*ibid.*, Nos. 199, 374, 456). In proportion to their proximity to the *Primum Mobile* the other planetary spheres shared in its regularity, the Star sphere being the most regular after it (*ibid.*, nos. 451, 473).

The perfection of these motions, in which intelligible forms had fully actualized their matter (*ibid.*, n. 63), seemed to indicate that they were moved or animated by incorporeal intelligences (*In XII Meta.*, Lect. 9; *In de Coelo*, nos. 373, 418, 473). Aquinas hesitated on just how this causal influence was exercised, cf. Litt, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-109. In any event "it does not pertain to faith whether they are so (animated) or in some other way" (*Quodlibet* 12, 6, 2).

There were no voids between the spheres since they were contiguous at all points (*In II de Coelo*, nos. 352, 401, 476). It should be kept in mind that St. Thomas' references to "heavenly bodies" are to these transparent, corporeal spheres of force or motion just as much as to the stars or planets the spheres moved. The following diagram gives a rough approximation of this cosmic picture. The *Primum Mobile* is concentric to the earth moving all the heavens in the diurnal East-West movement (*In de Coelo*, nos. 28, 341, 368, etc.). The other spheres were eccentric and had motions beside the diurnal one. Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, and Venus had three other motions; one by which the planet moved around its epicycle, a second by which the epicycle's center moved around the sphere, and a third which we now term the precession of the equinoxes. Mercury had a fourth motion by which the sphere itself moved in a small cycle about the earth, while the Moon possessed a fifth motion (cf. *ibid.*, n. 454). The Sun alone had no epicycle movement and was directly moved by its eccentric sphere.

Beyond the sphere of the *Primum Mobile* was no "beyond" for there was no space or time as we know it. Referred to as the Empyrean, it was often included in Medieval cosmography with the result that many thought the Middle Ages believed in a localized heaven. That this was not the opinion of St. Thomas can be deduced from several facts. The Empyrean is a fit "place" for the angels (*S.T.* 1, 102, 2 ad 1, 4 ad 1; 112, 1 ad 2; etc.); yet an angel can be said to be a "body" or to be "localized" only in a completely *equivocal* sense (1, 52, 1c). Again, the Empyrean is fit for human beatitude (1, 102, 2 ad 1; 1-11, 4, 7 ad 3; 111, 57, 1, 3); yet, it is "ridiculous to say that souls, which are spiritual substances, are in any natural locality" (1, 102, 2 ad 2). Hence, there is always an incommensurability between natural bodies with their space-time and what lies "beyond" them. This accounts for the fact that Aquinas never discussed the Empyrean in his strictly Cosmological works. Whereas he does categorically state in Lecture 21 of *In I de Coelo* that God and spirits are totally incommensurate with the universe.

Dante stresses such a total incommensurability in his *II Paradiso*. In Canto 22 he refers to the Empyrean, "For it is not in space and has no pole" (line 67). In Canto 27 (106 ff.) Beatrice tells Dante:

This heaven it is which has no other 'where'  
Than the Divine Mind; 'tis but in that Mind  
That love, its spur, and the power it rains inhere.

B. Reynolds translation (Md.: Penguin, 1962) pp. 251, 294.

Among her comments on Dante's *Divine Comedy*, Dorothy L. Sayers pointed out how false the notion is that ascribes a localized heaven to Medieval piety:

Beyond all nine spheres lies the Tenth Heaven, or Empyrean, the true abode of God and of His saints. It has neither position nor velocity nor movement nor duration: it is eternal and infinite, and to it all space-time measurements are wholly irrelevant and meaningless. The idea that 'the Middle Ages' believed in a localized, temporal, and material Heaven is entirely false; intelligent

Christians no more believed such a thing then than they do now. *The Divine Comedy, Hell* (Md.: Penguin, 1959) p. 294.

St. Thomas held that when the final coming of Christ would bring this universe to its complete fulfillment, the celestial spheres would cease their motion. The Divine Glory will burst forth on the universe and transfuse it with visible manifestations of the Divine Presence, making it a worthy object for the glorified vision of a risen mankind (cf. *Suppl.* 91; and Litt, *op. cit.*, pp. 242-54).