

rotary movement of Mythology (BC) to the rectilinear, eschatological movement of Revelation (AD). See, for example, *Werke* vol.13, pp 273–4. (See also vol.14, pp 81–86, on how pagan Mythology is a *simulacrum* of the eternal reconciliation which Christ will provide.) For Schelling, ‘natural religion’ (the shattering and scattering of God’s image in polytheism) develops into ‘supernatural religion’ (Petrine and Pauline monotheistic Revelation) and will culminate, in the future, in Johannine freedom; the Schellingian *eschaton* will see mind and will united in *Geist*, Petrine (Catholic) and Pauline (Protestant) churches united in the Johannine (the church of the Holy Spirit, of love), and a completed Christology consummating the epochs of mythology *and* revelation. See *Werke* vol.14, pp 296–327 (esp. pp 303–10 and 326–7). See McCarthy, *Quest for a Philosophical Jesus*, pp 163–213, for an extended discussion of Schelling’s Christology.

- 44 Ibid: “Die Erkenntniß des wahren Gottes bleibt daher immer eine Forderung.” See also vol. 12, p.58.
- 45 For further discussion of Schelling’s influence on Bloch, see Colin Harper, ‘Dialectic in the Philosophy of Ernst Bloch’, unpublished PhD thesis, Queen’s University of Belfast, 1993, esp. pp 81–102.
- 46 Schelling’s conviction that the ‘world-process’ was yet to be completed is made manifest as early as *Die Weltalter*, where he gives a Trinitarian conception of the Past as the Father, the Present as the Son, and the Future as the (yet-to-come) Spirit (*Werke* vol.8, pp 310–14). 80 *Werke* vol.13, p.13.
- 47 See also vol.11, p.139: “God is at every level in the process of becoming, and yet at every level there is a form of this becoming God. There is one God and yet a progressively developing God.”
- 48 Marion, *God Without Being*, p.81.
- 49 Johannes Baptist Metz, *Theology of the World* (trans. Wm. Glen-Doepel; London: Burns & Oates, 1969), p.86.

The Meritorious Human Life of Jesus: Renaissance Humanist Tendencies in the Thomism of Cardinal Cajetan

Michael O’Connor

The Dominican theologian and cardinal, Tommaso de Vio (1469–1534), known as Cajetan after Gaeta, his birthplace, is best remembered for two things. Firstly, he is the expositor of Aquinas, whose monumental commentary on the *Summa* is included in the Leonine edition of Aquinas’ works. As a consequence of this canonisation, Cajetan’s commentary is either treasured or vilified, to the extent that it is judged to represent Aquinas accurately or not; meanwhile, more subtle developments, not to mention overt disagreements, tend to be overlooked. Secondly, and more widely, Cajetan is remembered as the Roman prelate who met with Martin

Luther for three days in October 1518. At those meetings, characterised typically as a dialogue of the deaf, Cajetan sought to persuade Luther to withdraw a number of unorthodox theological opinions. Several years later, Cajetan was involved, albeit peripherally, with the Roman commission that drew up the formal condemnation of Luther's teaching.

It is commonly and plausibly assumed that the rest of Cajetan's work is to be understood in the light of his involvement with Luther, especially his commentaries on biblical texts, which he worked on from 1524 until his death in 1534. The conventional view of the biblical commentaries (found in various forms in Iserloh, Weisheipl, Parker, Janz and others), runs roughly as follows: the Reformers had appealed to scripture alone, and on the basis of scripture were challenging the papacy and Roman traditions; Cajetan, therefore, set out in his biblical commentaries to meet his adversaries on their chosen territory, and to demonstrate, with scholastic patience and rigour, that the Roman use of scripture was sound, that the Bible belonged to the Catholic Church.

Humanism and scholasticism in Cajetan's pastoral theology

Out of context, individual passages appear to support the conventional view: a substantial proportion of the commentary on John 6, for example, defends Roman practices against demands for infant communion and communion from the chalice for the laity. A close reading of the commentaries, however, shows the conventional view to be unsustainable. There are a number of reasons: (1) Cajetan's commentaries, in approximately half a million words, mention 'Lutherans' on only four occasions, and only one of those touches directly on a doctrinal matter (the form of words to be used in the celebration of the eucharist). (2) In numerous instances, where a defence of traditional practice or doctrine might have been expected (for example, concerning the sacerdotal interpretation of *presbyteros*), Cajetan fails to provide it, or refers his reader elsewhere. (3) On significant issues (for example, the canon of the Old Testament), far from defending the status quo, Cajetan resolutely held to positions that drew criticism from within his own Dominican order and from the Sorbonne. (4) The most frequent spontaneous asides are those which offer encouragement to pastors and preachers or are critical of poor ecclesiastical leadership.

Cajetan never states explicitly his motive in writing these commentaries; on the few occasions where he hints at his purpose, the reader is assumed to be a pastor or preacher, often in religious vows,

286

and his main concern is to put sound biblical theology at the service of the Church. The renaissance humanists had called for a return 'to the sources' (*ad fontes*), in order to renew Church and society. The most plausible characterisation of these commentaries is that they are Cajetan's humanist-inspired, yet typically Dominican, return 'to the sources' of the Christian faith. These works have more in common with the biblical annotations of the humanists (especially Erasmus, whose New Testament scholarship Cajetan exploited extensively) than with the polemical treatises of the controversialists. They are pastoral in intent, for the reform of the Church through the education of preachers and pastors.¹

At the same time, and unlike many another 'Thomist', Cajetan shows himself a faithful disciple of Aquinas by turning his theologian's mind to scriptural exegesis. Though barely acknowledged, Aquinas is ever present: on questions of structure (the commentary on Job is modelled on that of Aquinas), on the interpretation of proof texts, even the choice of examples to illustrate a line of thought. The conventional view of Cajetan's biblical commentaries would encourage us to find Aquinas used as a weapon against the Protestants. The view proposed here, that Cajetan's commentaries are a project of humanist inspiration, should prepare us for something different.

Early on in his commentary on Genesis, Cajetan gives an indication of the combination of humanist and scholastic doctrine that can be expected from him. He asks how it is that man, being in the image and likeness of God (that is, having an intellectual soul) nevertheless has an earthly body. His answer turns on the meaning he gives to 'dust of the earth' (Gen 2.7): unlike vapour or smoke, which rise, dust testifies to the earthly nature of human beings, heavy and mortal. Reversing the conventional connotations, however, Cajetan remarks that dust is the finest, most subtle element in material creation. The human body is therefore the most refined in all creation, and the dusty materiality of the human body becomes, as it were, the ground for human spirituality. Indeed, Cajetan has assimilated into his discussion of the *body* much that Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (the 'Prince of the humanists') says of the *spirit*, that intermediate between earthly body and heavenly soul. Cajetan is not the first to exult in being made from dust—there are echoes throughout humanist literature and preaching—but there is no obvious precedent for his particular exegesis of Gen 2.7.²

Cajetan goes on to demonstrate the refinement of the human body by importing two ideas from Aquinas: the sophistication of the human sense of touch, and upright posture.³ These two factors demonstrate the

harmony and integrity in which the body is constituted, a most perfectly balanced and composed organ of sense. Cajetan here again echoes Pico, who viewed human nature as a microcosm, containing all creation.⁴ It is thoroughly fitting, and the sacred author intends it to be understood, that this is the sort of body which has a rational soul.⁵

Throughout his biblical commentaries Cajetan demonstrates his willingness to employ humanist methodological principles (the use of philology and grammar in theology). These comments on Genesis exemplify his openness also to the doctrinal emphases of humanism (the dignity of the body and the nobility of human being—Michelangelo began work on the Sistine Chapel Ceiling at about the time Cajetan became Dominican Master General). Humanist theological rhetoric was not without difficulties: with their confidence in human potential, the humanists risked appearing to sympathise with Pelagius. But that risk was completely absent in their discussion of the humanity of the sinless one, Jesus—a subject of joyous and grateful preaching at the papal court. Cajetan was aware of, and contributed to, the optimistic theological style of high renaissance Rome;⁶ at the same time, he knew that Aquinas characterised redemption as a work of the merit of Christ. In the Christology that emerges within his biblical commentaries, these strands come together: in Christ, the grace of God becomes a work of human merit.⁷

The way of merit

Cajetan follows the approach of Aquinas in seeing the saving work of Christ in terms of merit.⁸ God chose to save the world, and to perfect the work of creation, not in a single moment, but through the mediation of his incarnate Son, through the intermediate stage of his merit.⁹ There are three stages to the process.

Firstly, the Son of God has power and glory as God, equally with the Father. This he has because he is consubstantial with the Father, of one nature with him and therefore his equal in all things (except being the person of the Father). The Son could have become our redeemer through a simple divine '*fiat*', but did not.

Secondly, from the first moment of the incarnation, Jesus was filled with grace. On account of the hypostatic union, his human nature is made divine, becoming the human nature of God the Son.¹⁰ For Cajetan, as for Aquinas, Jesus enjoyed the beatific vision in his humanity from the first moment of his conception. This he had not by nature, but by the grace of personal union, by the gift of God uniting his humanity to the person of the Son. He is filled with grace in his humanity because the Father loves him.¹¹ The glory of Christ is

described in similar terms: he has glory by nature (as God), and glory in his human soul (by grace, through the love of God). This glory he has (his enjoyment of the beatific vision), is unmerited, given him on account of the unity of his humanity with the person of the Son.¹² Thus he shares, in his humanity, in his inheritance as Son, being constituted 'heir of all things' (Heb 1.2). By the grace of union, Jesus enjoys all that pertains to the Son of God as a result of natural filiation. The first two stages may be summed up as follows: as the Son of God, he has power and glory by nature; in his humanity, he has power and glory by grace.¹³ Christ could have become our redeemer simply by sharing with us the blessedness of his humanity, but did not.

Cajetan, like Aquinas, still has to account for the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, for the salvation of the world, to give eternal life. Thus thirdly, he says that God chose to save us through the merit of his Son; Christ became the meritorious cause and the ministerial cause of our salvation.¹⁴

So far, Cajetan has followed closely the contours of Aquinas' line of thought. However, an indication that Cajetan's agreement with Aquinas was not unqualified can be seen in the *Summa* commentary (the commentary on the *Tertia pars* was published in 1522). Aquinas sets a limit to what Christ can gain by his merit: bodily glory, the ascension, and the veneration paid to him. The other benefits he enjoys cannot be merited. Aquinas states it as a rule that what is possessed already cannot be merited.¹⁵

Commenting on this text, Cajetan appears to accept the explanation given. However, he goes on to suggest that Aquinas could have put it rather more simply: suppose for argument's sake that Christ possessed none of those benefits that were, in fact, his; now suppose that he acquired all of those benefits by his merit. This befits his dignity, since to acquire by merit is more noble than to receive from another. (Cajetan defends the more complex explanation of Aquinas on the grounds that it makes a higher distinction, but there is more politeness than honesty in this.)¹⁶

A comparison of exegesis confirms Cajetan's preference for a more extensive presentation of the merit of Christ. When Jesus says that he has always done what is pleasing to the Father, 'He has not left me alone for I always do what is pleasing to him' (Jn 8.29), Aquinas chooses to stress the prevenient love of the Father which renders Christ pleasing to him. Indeed, he says explicitly that Christ's obedience is not a meritorious cause of his being pleasing to the Father, but rather a sign of it, bearing witness to the Father's love of him.¹⁷ Cajetan, on the other hand, makes precisely the opposite point, the point about merit. The

Son of man, as man, merited God's help, care and guidance in every aspect of his human life, in all that he did and all that he suffered. For the chosen way of salvation, Jesus does not claim this protection from God '*iure divinae personae*', but earns it *iure meriti*.¹⁸ Without hesitation, he always did what was pleasing to the Father. As a man, he never ceased from keeping his Father's commandments, and in this he merited the Father's care.¹⁹

Commenting on the words of Jesus, 'All authority [Vulgate: *potestas*] in heaven and on earth has been given to me' (Mt 28.18), Aquinas asks why Christ speaks of being given power after his resurrection; he gives two options: firstly, 'giving' can be a figure of speech for 'disclosing' or 'publicising'. Secondly, Christ (as the Son of God), who had the kingdom of the world already, in his resurrection took possession of it and began to exercise governance of it.²⁰ For Cajetan, this second choice of Aquinas' is the only choice,²¹ in a modified form, it will dominate his theology of sacred history. Cajetan notes the progressive stages through which the Kingdom will come, in terms reminiscent of the progress of a newly elected pope's grand procession from the Vatican to the Lateran (his *possessio*), the taking possession of authority and jurisdiction. Christ merits dominion over heaven and earth which he first of all acquires in his resurrection; he then takes possession of heaven at his ascension, and will take possession of earth when he comes again as judge.²² For Cajetan, Christ accomplishes all things by the way of merit.

The way of merit: a way of obedience and suffering

For Cajetan, God chose to bring about salvation by means of a redemptive incarnation²³ —and he chides the Scotists for speculating otherwise.²⁴ God chose to save creation by means of the incarnation of his Son. In the *Summa*, Aquinas asked why this was more fitting than any other way. Reflecting on the reply Aquinas gives, Cajetan adds an answer of his own: it is more appropriate to human dignity that we should be saved by one like us. Listing all that Christ has achieved and will achieve, he relishes the opportunity to attribute that achievement to a human being.²⁵ The gift of salvation is thoroughly 'humanised' in Christ. Cajetan attends to the course of the narrative: the Son came forth from the Father not only to assume flesh, but to assume passible, mortal flesh, and to enter into the common intercourse of the world;²⁶ he suffered and died; by this he merited power and glory—for others, certainly—but for himself too. The first beneficiary of the redeeming work of Christ, is Christ himself, in his humanity. Aquinas speaks in passing of Christ meriting salvation for himself;²⁷ Cajetan makes this idea a central feature of his Christology.

The key text for Cajetan is the saying of the risen Jesus to the disciples on the road to Emmaus (Lk 24.26):

Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory?

Christ chose to enter into glory by the road of merit and therefore of suffering.²⁸ It is a journey he embarks on willingly and lovingly, subjecting himself to, and learning within, the conditions of human life.²⁹ He became a man of hope; with regard to the vicissitudes of his earthly mission, he hoped for deliverance, for the resurrection, for future exaltation, for the kingdom, and for the salvation of the faithful.³⁰ And this hope was, of course, fulfilled by his own merits, on account of which he acquired, or will acquire in due course, those things he hoped for.³¹ During his lifetime he knew, speculatively, that God was well pleased in him; but with the resurrection, he knew this experientially.³²

Jesus dies in order that, by his death, he might merit possession of the kingdom which was already his.³³ His death at the appointed time both consumes him and brings to completion his work on earth, fulfilling all that is written of him.³⁴ Before, as man, he had power over all things by the simple gift of God; now, by the merit of his passion and death, he has received all power over heavenly and earthly things.³⁵ Cajetan insists that Jesus chose to become immortal and impassible by the way of the cross.³⁶ This is the will of God, who wanted Christ first to merit salvation for himself before salvation would then be given to us.

Thus there is a threefold coronation of Christ: as God he is given (or rather, already has) the kingdom of heaven; as man, he receives the kingdom as a gift of grace on account of the grace of personal union; but as the one who suffered and died for the salvation of the world, he receives the kingdom as the reward owed to him in justice on account of his meritorious obedience: to God, to his parents too—even to Pilate.³⁷

The way of merit: a way of prayer

Cajetan repeatedly draws together and identifies the merit of Christ, the death of Christ and the prayer of Christ.

Cajetan, like Aquinas, defines prayer as a human activity; God does not pray. The prayer of Christ is a consequence of the incarnation. He prays as man, in a human way.³⁸ For Aquinas, the human prayer of Jesus is an example for all to imitate.³⁹ Cajetan, whilst not overlooking that element,⁴⁰ concentrates on the fact that

prayer is a properly human activity carried out by the fully human Christ. He notes the 'we' sayings in the priestly prayer of Jesus: 'May they be one as we are one' (Jn 17.21). For Aquinas, the 'we' is spoken in the name of the divine Son and Father. For Cajetan, however, the 'we' stands for Jesus and the Father. The humanity of the one praying is implicated, and also helps define the kind of union that is at issue: not the Trinitarian union of the divine persons, but the union of human and divine brought about through the incarnation. Jesus prays for us to share in the indissoluble bond of love which he, as a man, enjoys with the Father.⁴¹ Although Cajetan actually says less than Aquinas about the Christ's example of prayer, he has highlighted both Jesus' thoroughly human relationship with the Father, and the prototypical character of his prayer.⁴²

Prayer is not an isolated activity, but the underlying category of all that Jesus does. Cajetan draws attention to the spirituality of Jesus, his fasting and prayer. All that he did and suffered was on account of the Father; the whole life of Christ was of God.⁴³ His whole life, day and night, as it were, comes before God. He calls out to God with every good work.⁴⁴ He calls out to God with great feeling and trust.⁴⁵ Indeed, in a remarkable piece of exegesis, it can be said that prayer is not so much what he *does*, but what he *is*: 'I myself am my prayer to you, since all that I am is a prayer.'⁴⁶ He, for whom existence means to be a Word spoken by the Father, is also a prayer returned to the Father.

If the whole of his life is a prayer, then his death will crown that prayer. The key text this time is Ps 2.8:

Ask of me, and I will make the nations your heritage, and the ends of the earth your possession.

The Father wants to give dominion over the nations to his Son, but he wants to do this in answer to prayer. For Aquinas, Christ's prayer exemplifies a general rule about prayer: God wants us to pray for his gifts so that we will not simply receive them, but receive them precisely in answer to prayer.⁴⁷ Cajetan, on the other hand, considers why this general rule is applied in the particular case of Jesus. He stresses that this pattern has something to do with the intrinsic ordering of divine providence. According to Cajetan, God chose to bring about his purpose (to give Christ dominion over the nations) through an appropriate intermediate means, namely, the prayer which was the obedient life and death of the messiah.⁴⁸

For Cajetan, the acceptance of Christ's prayer is signalled in two moments, the resurrection and Pentecost.⁴⁹ Firstly, the resurrection is the inheritance of the Son, but also the reward for the one who shed

his blood.⁵⁰ Appearing to his disciples on Easter evening, Jesus demonstrates to them that in the humility of his passion, he was heard by God and that God showed his face to him. God answered his prayer and rendered him justice.⁵¹

Secondly, Jesus had promised to pray to the Father for the gift of the Holy Spirit; this he did by his death.⁵² The Holy Spirit descends on the apostles at Pentecost in tongues of fire in answer to his Passion. The fire of the Holy Spirit calls to mind the burnt offerings of the old covenant and is a sign that the sacrifice of Christ was most pleasing to God.⁵³

Cajetan sees no contradiction between praying for dominion over the nations and meriting eternal life for the world. The Lordship of Christ is not domineering; it is liberating and redemptive. For this reason, Christ's prayer to be given the nations is also a prayer that the world be glorified. His whole life, culminating in his passion, was a meritorious praying and interceding for the human race, an intercession which is prolonged in heaven.⁵⁴ His reign and their glory are both God's predestined gift to the messiah, his rightful inheritance and the reward of his merit.⁵⁵

This connection, by which the Lordship of Christ is his ministry of eternal life, carries over into discussions of grace and salvation. The nature of eternal life is understood by reflecting on the means by which eternal life has been merited and ministered. God has chosen that Christ should reign in his humanity. Therefore he had to rise from the dead as the first-fruits, in his humanity, to reach perfection in a human way.⁵⁶ Others will reach perfection through sharing in his perfection.⁵⁷ The merit of Christ becomes the justice of the world, justifying the world, so that the world's justice is nothing other than the communicated and transforming justice of God in the merit of Christ.⁵⁸ The world receives not just grace in Christ but a share in his justice. Hence prayer is in and through the life, death and resurrection of Christ. The prayer of Christ is transferred to believers: they pray with his prayer, namely, his life, death and resurrection.⁵

Conclusion

Methodological and ideological debts to humanism have been discerned in the optimistic and world-affirming Christology of Cajetan's biblical commentaries: the passion and cross are the culmination of the meritorious life of Christ, by which he became the first-fruits of grace and glory for the whole of creation; the world has been divinised from within, by one of its own. Cajetan steers a confident path between Pelagius and Luther: grace is prevenient and

salvation is gratuitous; and yet, human co-operation is called forth, having been enabled and pioneered by the merit of Christ. The merit of Christ becomes the merit of those who are his through faith and baptism, enabling them to live lives that are, like his, genuinely pleasing to God.

Thomism—even that of Aquinas—is not culturally insulated; and Cajetan’s Thomism reveals much about the culture he inhabited. This study began with the assumption of discovering a polemical, anti-Lutheran, counter-reformation Thomism in Cajetan’s biblical commentaries. It ends with the conclusion that Cajetan’s reforming, pastoral aims are inadequately represented by such categories: theology in the early sixteenth century is not a monochrome print of reformation versus counter-reformation, but a polychrome canvas of reform, humanism, scholasticism, devotion, polemic (not to mention astrology, syncretism, white magic). Cajetan consistently emphasises those elements in Aquinas’ thought that are most compatible with the humanism of the renaissance papal court; and in virtually every instance where his theology departs from that of Aquinas, it does so in the direction of humanist thought. Most of his adult life was spent in the Rome of Michelangelo, Josquin des Prez, Bramante and Raffaello; that this environment is reflected in his theological output—no less than, say, three days of theological disputation in Germany with an Augustinian friar—should not really come as a surprise.

- 1 See my unpublished D. Phil. thesis, ‘Exegesis, doctrine and reform in the biblical commentaries of Cardinal Cajetan, 1469–1534’, Oxford, 1997. This characteristic of Cajetan’s thought, as instanced in his preaching before the papal court in the first decade of the 1500s, has been examined by Jared Wicks, ‘Thomism between Renaissance and Reformation: the Case of Cajetan’, *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 68 (1977), pp. 9–32; and John O’Malley, *Praise and Blame in Renaissance Rome: Rhetoric, Doctrine and Reform in the Sacred Orators of the Papal Court, c. 1450–1521* (Durham NC: Duke, 1979), pp. 108–110.
- 2 On Gen 2.7, 1. 16b–17a. Cajetan’s commentaries are cited according to the 5 volume edition, *Opera omnia quotquot in sacrae scripturae expositionem reperiuntur* (Lyons, 1639), giving biblical verse, volume, page number and column. On Pico, see Charles Trinkaus, *In Our Image and Likeness: Humanity and Divinity in Italian Renaissance Thought* (London: Constable, 1970), pp. 513–514. See also John O’Malley, ‘An Ash Wednesday Sermon on the Dignity of Man for Pope Julius II, 1513.’ In Sergio Bertelli and Gloria Ramakus, eds., *Essays Presented to Myron P. Gilmore* (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1978) Vol.1, pp. 193–207.
- 3 On Gen 2.7, 1, 17a. For Aquinas on touch and upright posture, ST 1, 91, 3 ad I and ad 3.
- 4 On Gen 2.7, 1, 17a. On Pico, see Trinkaus, *In Our Image and Likeness*, pp. 518–520.
- 5 On Gen 2.7,1, 17a.
- 6 See works by O’Malley and Wicks cited above in n.1.
- 7 Marcel Nieden’s recent study of Cajetan’s Christology, *Organum Deitatis. Die Christologie des Thomas de Vio Cajetan* (New York: Brill, 1997), treats this matter inadequately.

- 8 On the soteriology of Aquinas, see Bernard Catão, *Salut et rédemption chez S. Thomas d' Aquin* (Paris: Cerf, 1965); Romanus Cessario, *The Godly Image: Christ and Salvation in Catholic Thought from Anselm to Aquinas* (Petersham, Mass.: St. Bede's, 1990); Brian Davies, *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), pp. 332–334.
- 9 On Jn 4.34, IV, 3 13b.
- 10 On Jn 10.36, IV, 364a–b.
- 11 On Col 1.19, V, 262a.
- 12 On Jn 17.24, IV, 411b; parallels in Aquinas, *Super Evangelium Sancti Joannis Lectura* (Fifth edition, ed., R. Cai, Turin/Rome: Marietti, 1952), p. 425b.
- 13 On Heb 1.2, V, 330b; on Heb 1.4, V, 331 b; parallels in Aquinas on Heb 1.2 and 1.4, *Super Epistola Sancti Pauli Lectura* (Eighth edition, ed., R. Cai, Turin/Rome: Marietti, 1953), 11, 340b, 345b–346a.
- 14 On Jn 17.21, IV, 410b.
- 15 'Cum meritum non sit nisi cuius quod nondum habetur.' ST III, 19, 3.
- 16 'Adverte hic quod Auctor potuisset unico verbo expedire hanc quaestionem, dicendo quod supposit absentia quorundam bonorum, quae de facto fuit in Christo, ut patet, ad dignitatem ipsius spectat quod habuerit illa per meritum, quia quod est per se nobilius est quam quod per aliud; altius tamen Auctor orsus, monstrare voluit quare quaedam potuit mereri Christus et quaedam non.' On ST III, 19, 3, [II]. Cajetan's commentary on Aquinas is cited according to the text included the Leonine edition of Aquinas' *Opera omnia*, vols. IV–XII.
- 17 *Super Evangelium Sancti Joannis Lectura*, p. 223a.
- 18 On Jn 8.29, IV, 349a. See also on Ps 20.3, III, 73a.
- 19 On Jn 8.29, IV, 349a. Compare also Aquinas on Mt 12.18, *Super Evangelium Sancti Matthaei Lectura* (Fifth edition, ed. R. Cai, Turin/Rome: Marietti, 1951), p. 157a and Cajetan, on Mt 12.18, IV, 60a.
- 20 *Super Evangelium Sancti Matthaei Lectura*, p. 377a.
- 21 On Mt 28.18, IV, 130a.
- 22 On Lk, 19.15, IV, 254b; on Mt 8.12, IV, 44a.
- 23 On Jn 10.15, IV, 361a.
- 24 On ST III, 1, 3, [IX].
- 25 '[...] quod autem homo seipsum salvet, redimat, pro se pugnet, mereatur, vincat, satisfaciat, triumphet, regnet, judicet, et huiusmodi, ad nostram spectat dignitatem; ut facile patet dilatando.' On ST 111, 46, 3, [III].
- 26 On in 16.28, IV, 405a.
- 27 'Christus non solum per suam passionem sibi, sed etiam omnibus suis membris meruit salutem.' ST III, 48, 1.
- 28 'Dupliciter potest aliquis salvari, vel quod immediate transferatur in rem termini, vel quod mediante statu spei transferendus sit in rem termini. Christus non salvavit nos primo modo (quia nec ipse seipsum salvavit primo modo, sed voluit per merita pervenire ad gloriam suam) sed secundo modo.' On Rom 8.24, V, 48a.
- 29 On 2 Cor 5.19, V, 171b; on 2 Cor 5.21, V, 172a–b.
- 30 On Ps 16.1, III, 54a.
- 31 On Ps 16.1, III, 54a.
- 32 'Cognoverat Christus homo ante resurgeret ab initio conceptionis suae quod Deus [...] complacuit sibi in Christo; sed cognoveret speculative. In resurrectione autem cognovit experientia, experimentaliter; prius enim non fuerit expertus.' On Ps 41 11, III, 150b.
- 33 On Lk 19.12, IV, 254b; on Lk 24.26, IV, 274a–b.
- 34 Cajetan offers these three readings as three possible renderings in Latin of the original Greek: 'consummo', 'consummor', 'consumor'. On Lk 13.32, IV, 235b.
- 35 On Mt 28.18, IV, 130a.
- 36 On Gen 49.11.1, 150a.

- 37 On Phil 2.8, V, 250a.
- 38 On Jn 17.1, IV, 406b; on Ps 88.2, III, 299b.
- 39 *Super Evangelium Sancti Joannis Lectura*, p. 411 b.
- 40 On Jn 17.1, IV, 406b.
- 41 '[...] constat autem quod filii hominis est orare et propterea in tota hac oratione demonstratur quod homo.' On Jn17. 11, IV, 409a. Aquinas discusses the unity of Father and Son at *Super Evangelium Sancti Joannis Lectura*, p. 417b.
- 42 It is hard to imagine how Craig S. Farmer's assessment could be further off-target: 'Cajetan's John commentary is so literal in its interpretation that it would be of little value even if we were to include it in this study. His comments rarely go beyond a terse rephrasing of the Evangelist's words. He does not raise theological questions, and he rarely offers learned speculation even concerning the literal level of meaning; spiritual meanings are non-existent.' *The Gospel of John in the Sixteenth Century. The Johannine Exegesis of Wolfgang Musculus* (Oxford: OUP, 1997), p. 110.
- 43 On Ps 16.8, III, 55a; on Ps 16.4, III, 54b; on Ps 109.20, III, 373a. See also on Ps 109.24, III, 373b; on Ps 69.7, III, 240a.
- 44 On Ps 22.2, III, 79a.
- 45 On Mk 14.36, IV, 164a.
- 46 'Ego ipse sum oratio mea tibi, quia totum quod sum, sum oratio.' On Ps 69.13, III, 240b. Saint Antoninus made a similar statement about Saint Dominic with reference to the nine ways of prayer, 'Licet autem quasi tota vita beati Dominici posset dici oratio', cited in William Hood, *Fra Angelico at San Marco* (New Haven: Yale, 1993), p. 318, n. 33.
- 47 *Expositio in Job et in Primam Davidis Quinquagena* (Naples: Virgiliana, 1857), pp. 152b–153a.
- 48 On Ps 2.8, III, 11b.
- 49 On Phil 2.9, V, 250a–b; on Ps 20.6, III, 73b.
- 50 On Mt 21.42, IV, 96b; on Heb 13.20, V, 361b.
- 51 On Ps 22.23–24, III, 81 b; on Ps 41.12, III, 150b.
- 52 'Convenit autem Iesu secundum humanam naturam rogare Patrem. Et dicit rogabo quia futurum erat meritum mortis eius, intercedens apud Patrem.' On Jn 14.16, IV, 390a.
- 53 '[...] ita ignis Spiritus sancti totam Christi passionem gratissimam acceptavit.' On Ps 20.3, III, 73a.
- 54 'Officium [...] orandi autem tota vita testatur: tota siquidem Christi vita fuit meritum orans et intercedens ad Deum pro humano genere.' On Ps 109.4, III, 372a. Postulat autem pro membris suis Iesus in coelo existens tum facto, monstrando signa passionis, tum merito, offerendo pietatem qua passus est pro illis.' On Heb 7.25, V, 344b. "On Ps 16.5, III, 54b–55a.
- 56 On I Cor 15.25, V, 143a.
- 57 On Heb 2.10, V, 334b. See also on Heb 5.8–9, V, 339a.
- 58 On Jn 12.31, IV, 376a–b. 'Nihil alius simus, in intellectu, in affectu, in operatione, et in perpeffione, nisi quod ex iustitia Dei qui est meritum Christi, sumus.' On 2 Cor 5.21, V, 172b.
- 59 On Eph 6.18, V, 244b.