

IN MEMORIAM
JOSEPH QUINT

1898 - 1976

MEISTER[ECKHART]

German Sermons

& Treatises

Translated

With Introduction

And Notes

by M.O'C.Walsh

Vol. I

WATKINS

London & Dulverton

1979

S E R M O N E I G H T

(Pf 8, Q 2, QT 2)

INTRAVIT JESUS IN QUODDAM CASTELLUM ET MULIER QUaedam
EXCEPIT ILLUM ETC.

(Luke 10:38)

I have first quoted this saying in Latin, it is written in the Gospel and in German it means: "Our Lord Jesus Christ went up into a citadel and was received by a virgin¹ who was a wife."²

Now mark this word carefully. It must of necessity be a virgin, the person by whom Jesus was received. 'Virgin' is as much as to say a person who is void of alien images, as empty as he was when he did not exist.³ Now the question may be asked, how a man who has been born and has reached the age of rational understanding can be as empty of all images as he was when he was not; for he knows many things, all of which are images: so how can he be empty of them? Note the explanation which I shall give you. If I were possessed of sufficient understanding so as to comprehend within my own mind all the images ever conceived by all men, as well as those that exist in God Himself — if I had these without attachment, whether in doing or in leaving undone, without before and after but rather standing free in this present Now ready to receive God's most beloved will and to do it continually, then in truth I would be a virgin, untrammelled by any images, just as I was when I was not.

And yet I say that being a virgin by no means deprives a man of works that he has done: he yet remains virgin-free,

offering no hindrance to the highest Truth, even as Jesus is empty and free and virginal in himself. Since according to the masters union comes only by the joining of like to like, therefore that man must be a maiden, a virgin, who would receive the virgin Jesus.

Now attend, and follow me closely. If a man were to be ever virginal, he would bear no fruit. If he is to be fruitful, he must needs be a wife. 'Wife' is the noblest title one can bestow on the soul — far nobler than 'virgin'. For a man to receive God within him is good, and in receiving he is virgin. But for God to be fruitful in him is better, for only the fruitfulness of the gift is the thanks rendered for that gift, and herein the spirit is a wife, whose gratitude is fecundity, bearing Jesus again in God's paternal heart.

Many good gifts, received in virginity, are not reborn back into God in wifely fruitfulness and with praise and thanks. Such gifts perish and all comes to naught, and a man is no more blessed or the better for them. In this case his virginity is useless because to that virginity he does not add the perfect fruitfulness of a wife. Therein lies the mischief. Hence I have said, "Jesus went up into a citadel and was received by a virgin who was a wife." It must be thus, as I have shown you.

Married folk bring forth little more than one fruit in a year. But it is other wedded folk that I have in mind now: all those who are bound with attachment to prayer, fasting, vigils and all kinds of outward discipline and mortification. *All* attachment to any work that involves the loss of freedom to wait on God in the here and now, and to follow Him alone in the light wherein He would

show you what to do and what not to do, every moment freely and anew, as if you had nothing else and neither would nor could do otherwise — *any* such attachment or set practice which repeatedly denies you this freedom, I call a *year*; for your soul will bear no fruit till it has done this work to which you are possessively attached, and you too will have no trust in God or in yourself before you have done the work you embraced with attachment, for otherwise you will have no peace. Thus you will bring forth no fruit till your work is done. That is what I call 'a year', and the fruit of it is paltry because it springs from attachment to the task and not from freedom. These, then, I call 'wedded folk', for they are bound by attachment. They bring forth little fruit, and paltry at that, as I have said.

A virgin who is a wife, is free and unfettered by attachment; she is always as near to God as to herself. She brings forth many and big fruits, for they are neither more nor less than God Himself. *This* fruit and *this* birth that virgin bears who is a wife, bringing forth daily a hundred and a thousandfold! Numberless indeed are her labours begotten of the most noble ground or, to speak more truly, of the very ground where the Father ever begets His eternal Word:— it is thence she becomes fruitful and shares in the procreation. For Jesus, the light and splendour of the eternal heart (as St Paul says (Heb. 1:3), that he is the glory and splendour of the Father's heart and illumines the Father's heart with power), this same Jesus is made one with her and she with him, she is radiant and shining with him in one single unity, as one pure brilliant light in the paternal heart.

MEISTER ECKHART

Elsewhere I have declared that there is a power in the soul⁴ which touches neither time nor flesh, flowing from the spirit, remaining in the spirit, altogether spiritual. In this power, God is ever verdant and flowering in all the joy and all the glory that He is in Himself. *There* is such heartfelt delight, such inconceivably deep joy as none can fully tell of, for in this power the eternal Father is ever begetting His eternal Son without pause, in such wise that this power jointly begets the Father's Son and itself, this self-same Son, in the sole power of the Father. Suppose a man owned a whole kingdom or all the goods of this world; then suppose he gave it up purely for God's sake, and became one of the poorest of the poor who ever lived on earth, and that God then gave him as much suffering as He ever imposed on any man, and that he bore all this to his dying day, and that God then gave him one fleeting glimpse of how He is in this power — that man's joy would be so great that all this suffering and poverty would still be insignificant. Yea, though God were never to vouchsafe him any further taste of heaven than this, he would yet be all too richly rewarded for all that he had ever endured, for God is in this power as in the eternal Now. If a man's spirit were always united with God in this power, he would not age. For the Now in which God made the first man and the Now in which the last man shall cease to be, and the Now I speak in, all are the same in God and there is but one Now. Observe, this man dwells in one light with God, having no suffering and no sequence of time, but one equal eternity. This man is bereft of wonderment and all things are in him in their essence. Therefore nothing new comes to him from future things nor any

SERMON EIGHT

accident, for he dwells in the Now, ever new and without intermission. Such is the divine sovereignty dwelling in this power.

There is another power,⁵ immaterial too, flowing from the spirit, remaining in the spirit, altogether spiritual. In this power God is fiery, aglow with all His riches, with all His sweetness and all His bliss. Truly, in *this* power there is such great joy, such vast unmeasured bliss that none can tell of it or reveal it fully. Yet I declare that if ever there were a single man who in intellectual vision and in truth should glimpse for a moment the bliss and the joy therein, then all his sufferings and all God intended that he should suffer would be a trifle, a mere nothing to him — in fact I declare it would be pure joy and comfort to him.

If you would know for certain whether your suffering is your own or God's then you can know by this: If you suffer for yourself, in whatever way, that suffering hurts and is hard to bear. But if you suffer for God and God alone, your suffering does not hurt and is not hard to bear, for God bears the load. In very truth, if there were a man willing to suffer purely for God's sake and for God alone, then although he were suddenly called upon to bear all the suffering that all men have ever endured, the collective sufferings of all the world, it would not hurt him or bear him down, for God would bear the burden. If they put a hundredweight burden on my neck and another were to bear it on *my* neck, I would as willingly bear a hundred pounds as one, for it would not burden me or cause me pain. In brief, whatever a man suffers for God and God alone, He makes light and pleasant. As I said in

MEISTER ECKHART

the beginning, in the opening words of this sermon: 'Jesus went up into a citadel and was received by a virgin who was a wife.' Why? It had to be so, that she was a virgin *and* a wife. Now I have told you that Jesus was received, but I have not yet told you what the citadel is, as I shall now proceed to do.

I have sometimes said that there is a power in the soul which alone is free. Sometimes I have called it the guardian of the spirit, sometimes I have called it a light of the spirit, sometimes I have said that it is a little spark.⁶ But now I say that it is neither *this* nor *that*; and yet it is a *something* that is more exalted over 'this' and 'that' than are the heavens above the earth. So now I shall name it in nobler fashion than I ever did before, and yet it disowns the nobler name and mode, for it transcends them. It is free of all names and void of all forms, entirely exempt and free, as God is exempt and free in Himself. It is as completely one and simple as God is one and simple, so that no man can in any way glimpse it. This same power of which I have spoken, wherein God ever blooms and is verdant in all His Godhead, and the spirit in God, in this same power God ever bears His only-begotten Son as truly as in Himself, for verily He dwells in this power, and the spirit gives birth with the Father to the same only-begotten Son, and to itself as the self-same Son, and is itself the self-same Son in this light, and is the Truth. If you could know with my heart, you would understand, for it is true, and Truth itself declares it.

Now pay attention! So one and simple is this citadel in the soul, elevated above all modes, of which I speak and which I mean, that that noble power I mentioned is not

SERMON EIGHT

worthy even for an instant to cast a single glance into this citadel; nor is that other power I spoke of, in which God burns and glows with all His riches and all His joy, able to cast a single glance inside; so truly one and simple is this citadel, so mode- and power-transcending is this solitary One, that neither power nor mode can gaze into it, nor even God Himself! In very truth and as God lives! God Himself never looks in there for one instant, in so far as He exists in modes and in the properties of His persons. This should be well noted: this One Alone lacks all mode and property. And therefore, for God to see inside it would cost Him all His divine names and personal properties: all these He must leave outside, should He ever look in there. But only in so far as He is one and indivisible, without mode or properties, (can He do this):⁷ in that sense He is neither Father, Son nor Holy Ghost, and yet is a Something which is neither this nor that.

See, as He is thus one and simple, so He can enter that One that I here call the citadel of the soul, but in no other mode can He get in: only thus does He enter and dwell therein. In *this* part the soul is the same as God and not otherwise. What I tell you is true: I call the Truth as a witness and offer my soul as pledge.

That we may be such a citadel to which Jesus may ascend and be received to abide eternally in us in such wise as I have said, may God help us to this! Amen.

Notes

1. Eckhart's rendering is very free here: the Latin says nothing about a virgin!

2. The play on the two meanings of *empfangen*, 'received' and

MEISTER ECKHART

- 'conceived', cannot be rendered into English.
3. When he was a (Platonic) idea in God.
4. The higher intellect: cf. 1, note 8.
5. The will. The Franciscans gave the will supremacy, the Dominicans (and therefore Eckhart) the intellect.
6. See Introduction: Note A: *Synteresis*.
7. Supplied (after Miss Evans) to complete the sense.

SERMON NINE

(Pf 9, Q 86, QT 28, Evans II, 2)

INTRAVIT JESUS IN QUODDAM CASTELLUM, ET MULIER
QUAEDAM, MARTHA NOMINE, EXCEPIT ILLUM ETC.

(Luke 10: 38).¹

St Luke says in his gospel that our Lord Jesus Christ went into a little town, where he was received by a woman named Martha, and she had a sister named Mary who sat at the feet of our Lord and listened to his words, but Martha moved about, waiting on our Lord. Three things made Mary sit at our Lord's feet. One was that the goodness of God possessed her soul. The second was unspeakable longing: she desired she knew not what, and wanted she knew not what. The third was the sweet solace and joy she gained from the eternal words that flowed from the mouth of Christ.

With Martha too there were three things that made her move about and wait on the beloved Christ. One was her mature age and the ground of her being that was so fully trained that she thought none could do the work as well as she. The second was wise understanding, which knew how to do outward works perfectly as love ordains. The third was the great dignity of her beloved guest.

The masters say that God is ready to give every man full satisfaction of all he desires, both of reason and of the senses. That God gives us satisfaction of mind *and* of the senses can be clearly distinguished in regard to the dearest friends of God.² Satisfaction of the senses means that God gives us comfort, joy and contentment — and

S E R M O N T W E N T Y

(Pf 20, Q 44)

POSTQUAM COMPLETI ERANT DIES. PUER JESUS
PORTABATUR IN TEMPLUM. ET ECCE, HOMO
ERAT IN JERUSALEM, CUI NOMEN SIMON ETC.

(Luke 2:22, 25)

St Luke writes in the gospel: "When the days were accomplished Christ was brought into the temple. And behold, there was a man called Simeon in Jerusalem. He was just and God-fearing, waiting for the consolation of the people of Israel, and the Holy Ghost was in him."

"And behold": this little word *et* in Latin denotes union, binding together and inclusion. Whatever is wholly bound together and included, that implies union. Here I mean that man should be bound together, included and united with God. Our masters say union presupposes likeness. Union cannot be without likeness. Whatever is bound together and included is what makes union. It does not constitute likeness that a thing is near me, as when I sit beside it or am in the same place. Accordingly St Augustine says, 'Lord, when I found myself far from thee, it was not due to remoteness of place, it came from the *unlikeness* in which I found myself.' A master says: 'He whose being and work is altogether in eternity, and he whose being and work is altogether in time, they are never in accord, they never come together.' Our masters say that between those things whose being and work is in eternity and those things whose being and work is in time, there must be a

go-between. If God and the soul are to be united, this must come from likeness. Where there is no unlikeness, there must needs be unity; it is not merely united by inclusion, but it becomes one, not merely likeness but alike. Therefore we say the Son is not *like* the Father, but rather: he is the likeness, he is one with the Father.

Our best masters say, if an image in stone, or painted on a wall, had nothing added to it, then, taken as an image, that image would be one with him of whom it was an image. That is a fitting doctrine for when the soul enters the image, where there is nothing alien but just the image, with which it is one image. If a man is placed in that image where he is like God, then he receives God, then he finds God. Where there is a splitting-up, God cannot be found. When the soul enters her image and finds herself in the image alone, in that image she finds God; and the finding of herself and God is one and the same act, and is timeless — there she finds God. So far as she is therein, so far is she one with God. He means, as far as one is included there where the soul is God's image. As far as he is in there, so far is he divine — so far therein, so far in God, not included, not united, but *one*.

A master says all likeness means birth. He says further that like is not found in nature unless it is born. Our masters say that fire, however powerful it might be, would never burn unless it hoped for birth. However dry the wood placed in it, if it could not conceive (in) its likeness, it would never burn. What the fire wants is to be born in the wood, to become all one fire and to be maintained and last. If it went out and perished, it would no longer be fire, therefore it desires to be maintained. The

nature of the soul would never give birth to her like if she did not desire God to be born in her. The soul would never have entered into her nature, would never have wanted to enter there, but that she expects this birth which God works; and God would not work it but that He wishes the soul to be born in Him. God works and the soul desires. God has the work and the soul has the desire and the power to have God born into her and herself into God. God performs this that the soul may become like Him. She must needs wait for God to be born in her, that her support may be in God, and she must desire union so that she may be supported in God. The divine nature flows into the light of the soul, and in that she is sustained. In this it is God's intention to be born in her, to be united with her and to be sustained in her. How can that be? For surely we say that God is His own support. When He draws the soul in there, she finds that God *is* His own support, and there she stays; otherwise she would not stay. Augustine says: 'As you love, so you are. If you love the earth, you will be earthly; if you love God, you will be divine. Then if I love God, shall I become God? I do not say that, I refer you to holy scripture. In the Prophets God said: "You are gods and the children of the Most High" (Ps. 81:6)'. And therefore I say it is in His *like* that God gives this birth. If the soul had no expectation of this, she would never desire to enter there. She wants to be sustained in Him — her life depends on Him. God has a support, an abiding-place, in His being. Therefore there is nothing for it but to peel off and shed all that belongs to the soul: her life, her powers, her nature — all must go, and she must stand in the pure light where she is one

single image with God: *there* she will find God. It is characteristic of God that nothing alien enters Him, nothing is superimposed on Him or added to Him. Therefore the soul should have no alien impressions, nothing superimposed, nothing added. So much for the first word¹.

“And behold”: *ecce. Ecce*, this little word contains within itself all that belongs to the Word, and nothing can be added to it. The Word, that is God, God is a Word, God’s Son is a Word. He² means that all our life, our whole desire, should be altogether included in, dependent on and directed towards God. Therefore Paul says: “I am what I am by the grace of God” (1 Cor. 15:10), and he says further: “I live, yet not I but God lives in me altogether” (Gal. 2:20). What comes next?

“*Homo erat*”. He says: “Behold, a man”. We use the word *homo* for women as well as for men, but the Latins refuse it to woman because of her weakness.³ *Homo* means as much as ‘what is perfect’, and ‘lacking nothing’. *Homo* ‘a man’ means ‘he who is of earth’, and signifies humility⁴. The earth is the basest element and lies in the middle, and is entirely surrounded by heaven and is fully exposed to the influence of heaven. Whatever heaven performs and pours forth is received in the middle, in the ground of earth. *Homo* in yet another sense means ‘moisture’⁵, and signifies ‘he who is watered with grace’, meaning that the humble man receives at once the influx of grace. In this inflowing of grace the light of intellect climbs up straightway, and there God shines with unquenchable light. Anyone powerfully seized by this light would be as far superior to another man as a living man

is compared to one painted on a wall. This light is so potent that it is not merely in itself free of time and space, but whatever it falls on it robs of time and space and all corporeal images and whatever is alien to it. I have said before, if there were no time or place or anything else, all would be one being. If a man were one like this and would cast himself into the ground of humility, he would there be watered with grace.

Thirdly: this light takes away time and space. “There *was* a man”. Who gave him this light? Purity. The word *erat* belongs most expressly to God⁶. In the Latin tongue there is no word so proper to God as *erat*. That is why John in his gospel comes to say so frequently *erat* ‘there was’, signifying naked essence. All things are additive, but it (*erat*) adds only in thought — a thought not of addition but of subtraction. Goodness and truth add, at least in thought, but naked essence with nothing added is the meaning of *erat*. Secondly, *erat* signifies birth, a perfect becoming. I have now come, today I was coming⁷, and if time were eliminated from my coming and having-come, then the coming and having-come would be drawn into one and would be one. Where the coming and having-come coincide in one, there we are born and remade and re-formed into the primal image. I have also said before, as long as anything remains *of* a thing in its essence, it will not be re-created; it may be repainted or renewed like a seal that is old, which is renewed by re-stamping. A pagan master says what is *there*, no time can stale: there is blessed life in the evermore, where nothing is distorted, nothing is covered over, where there is pure being. Solomon says: “There is nothing new

under the sun" (Eccl. 1:10). This is seldom understood in its proper sense. All that is under the sun grows old and declines, but *there* all is new. Time brings two things: age and decrecence. Whatever the sun shines on, is in time. All creatures are *now* and are from God. But there, where they are *in* God, they are as different from what they are here as the sun is from the moon, and far more so. Therefore he says: *erat in eo*, 'the Holy Ghost was in him', where being is and where coming-to-be is.

"There was a man". Where was he? "In Jerusalem". 'Jerusalem' denotes 'a vision of peace.' In short, it means that man should be at peace and well established. It may mean more. Paul says: "I wish you the peace that passes all understanding. May this guard your hearts and minds" (Phil. 4:7).

Let us pray to our Lord that we may be 'man' in this sense and established in this peace, which is himself. So help us God. Amen.

Notes

1. All this about the word *et!* In this sermon we see something of Eckhart the scholastic, arguing much as he does (though at even greater length) in his Latin works. But in so doing he never loses sight of the mystical goal.
2. St Luke. Pfeiffer has *et* instead of *er*, but as Quint points out, the discussion of *et* concluded with the previous paragraph.
3. Actually, *mensch* (modern *Mensch*) denotes a human being like Latin *homo*, whereas *man* (modern *Mann*) refers to the male only. French *homme*, like English *man*, can indeed have the wider sense in suitable contexts.
4. Latin *homo* is related by modern etymologists to *humus* 'earth', from which *humilis* 'humble' is derived.
5. Latin *humor* 'liquid' is not related to *humus*, but is by medieval

standards a reasonable guess. In any case, all such derivations are used for their symbolic meaning.

6. In explanation, Quint quotes from Eckhart's commentary on St. John's Gospel (*LW* III,9). According to Latin grammar, *erat* denotes 'substance' (being from the 'substantive verb' *esse!*), 'preterite', and 'imperfect'. The Word (*verbum*), as preterite (or past), is always 'born' (*natum est*); as imperfect, it is always 'being born' (*nascitur*). Grammar is here turned to symbolic account just as etymology above.

7. Eckhart's *was komende* is literally as in English 'was coming': impossible in modern German.

SERMON TWENTY NINE

(Pf/Evans 29 (part), Q 38)¹

IN ILLO TEMPORE MISSUS EST ANGELUS GABRIEL A DEO:

AVE GRATIA PLENA, DOMINUS TECUM

(Luke 1:26, 28)

These words are written by St Luke: "At that time the angel Gabriel was sent by God". At what time? "In the sixth month"² that John the Baptist was in his mother's womb. If anyone were to ask me, Why do we pray, why do we fast, why do we do all our works, why are we baptised, why (most important of all) did God become man? — I would answer, in order that God may be born in the soul and the soul be born in God.³ For that reason all the scriptures were written, for that reason God created the world and all angelic natures: so that God may be born in the soul and the soul be born in God. All cereal nature means wheat, all treasure nature means gold, and all generation means man. Therefore one master says no animal exists but has some likeness to man.

"In time". When the word is first conceived in my intellect, it is so pure and subtle that it is a true word, before taking shape in my thought. In the third place, it is spoken out loud by my mouth, and then it is nothing but a manifestation of the interior word. Thus the eternal Word is spoken inwardly, in the heart of the soul, in the inmost and purest, in the head of the soul of which I just spoke, in the intellect, and *therein* the birth takes place. He who has nothing but a firm conviction and hope of this would be glad to know how this birth occurs and

what conduces to it.

St Paul says: "In the fullness of time God sent His Son" (Gal. 4:4). St Augustine says what this fullness of time is: "Where there is no more time, that is the "fullness of time". The day is full, when there is no more day. That is a necessary truth: all time must be gone when this birth begins, for there is nothing that hinders this birth so much as time and creatures. It is an assured truth that time cannot affect God or the soul by her nature. If the soul could be touched by time, she would not be the soul, and if God could be touched by time, He would not be God. But if it were possible for the soul to be touched by time, then God could never be born in her, and she could never be born in God. For God to be born in the soul, all time must have dropped away from her, or she must have dropped away from time with will or desire.

Another meaning of "fullness of time": if anyone had the skill and the power to gather up time and all that has happened in six thousand years or that will happen till the end of time, into one present Now, *that* would be the "fullness of time". That is the Now of eternity, in which the soul knows all things in God new and fresh and present and as joyous as I have them now present. I was reading recently in a book⁴— who can fully understand it? — that God is now making the world just as on the first day, when He created the world. Here God is rich, and this is the kingdom of God. The soul in which God is to be born must drop away from time and time from her, she must soar aloft and stand gazing into this richness of God's: there there is breadth without breadth, expanseless expanse, and there the soul knows all things, and knows

them perfectly. As for what the masters say of the expanse of heaven, it would be unbelievable to say it. Yet the least of the powers of my soul is wider than the expanse of heaven. I do not speak of the intellect, which is expanseless expanse. In the soul's head, in the intellect, I am as near to a place a thousand miles away across the sea as to the spot where I am standing now. In this expanse and in this richness of God's the soul is aware, there she misses nothing and expects nothing.

"The angel was sent". The masters declare that the multitude of angels is beyond all numbering. They are too numerous for number to contain; their number cannot even be conceived. But for anyone who could grasp distinctions without number and quantity, a hundred would be as one. Even if there were a hundred Persons in the Godhead, a man who could distinguish without number and quantity would perceive them only as one God. Unbelievers and some untutored Christian people wonder at this, and even some priests know as little about it as a stone: they think of three like three cows or three stones. But he who can make distinction in God without number or quantity knows that three Persons are one God.⁵

Also, an angel is so exalted, that the best teachers declare each angel has a complete nature.⁶ It is just the same as if there were a man who had everything that all men have ever had, have now or ever will have of power and wisdom and everything; that would be a miracle, and yet he would be no more than a man: for even though he had all things that all men have, yet he would be far from the angels. Thus every angel has a complete nature and is

distinct from the other angels as one animal is from another that has a different nature.⁷ In this multitude of angels God is rich, and whoever is aware of this is aware of the kingdom of God.⁸ It proclaims God's kingdom just as a lord is proclaimed by the number of his knights. Therefore He is known as the "Lord God of Hosts". All this multitude of angels, however lofty they are, cooperate and help when God is born in the soul. That is to say, they have pleasure and joy and delight in the birth, but they do not act. No work is done there by creatures, for God performs the birth alone, but the angels minister to this. Whatever ministers thereto is a work of service.

The angel was called Gabriel. He did what he was called.⁹ He was no more called Gabriel than Conrad. No one can know an angel's name. No master and no understanding ever got to where an angel received his name: perhaps he is nameless. The soul, too, has no name. Just as no one can find a true name for God, so none can find the soul's true name, although mighty tomes have been written about this. But she is given a name according as she has a regard to her activity. 'Carpenter' is not a man's name, but the name is taken from the work of which he is a master. He took the name 'Gabriel' from the work of which he was a messenger, for *Gabriel* means 'power'. In this birth God works powerfully or exerts power. What is the object of all the power of nature? To effect herself. What does all nature intend in generation? To effect herself. The nature of my father wanted to produce a father in his nature. When that could not be, she wanted to produce one who was in all respects like him. When the strength for this was lacking, she produced one that

was as like as possible — a son. But when the power is still less strong, or some other accident occurs, then she produces a human being still less alike.¹⁰ But in God there is plenitude of power, therefore in *His* birth He produces His like. All that God is in power, truth and wisdom, He bears altogether in the soul.

St Augustine says: 'What the soul loves she grows to be like. If she loves earthly things she becomes earthly. If she loves God (one might ask), does she then become God?' If I said that, it would sound heretical to those whose intelligence is weak and who cannot understand it. But St Augustine says: 'I do not say it, but I refer you to scripture, which says: "I have said that you are gods" (Ps. 82:6)'. Anyone possessing anything of the riches I have spoken of, a glimpse, a hope or an inkling, would quite understand this. Never was there born anything so akin, so like, so one with God as the soul becomes at this birth. If it so happens that there is any hindrance, so that she does not become like in all respects, that is not God's fault: just as far as all her failings drop away from her, just so far does God make her like Himself. That a carpenter is unable to build a fine house out of worm-eaten wood is not his fault; the trouble lies in the wood. And thus it is with God's work in the soul. If the least of the angels were able to take shape or be born in the soul — the whole world would be as nothing to that, for in a single spark of the angel there grows, flourishes and shines forth everything that is in the world. But God performs this birth Himself: the angel can do no work here except ministering.

"Ave": that means 'without woe'.¹¹ Whoever is without

creaturehood is without woe and without hell, and he who is least creature and has least of it, has the least woe. I once declared that he who has the world least, has it most. No one possesses the world so truly as he who has abandoned all the world. Do you know why God is God? He is God because He is without creature. He did not name Himself in time. In time are creatures and sin and death. These are in a certain sense akin, and inasmuch as the soul has dropped away from time, there is there no woe or pain; even distress is turned for her to joy. All that could ever be conceived of delight and joy, of happiness and pleasure, is no joy at all when set against the bliss which is in this birth.

“Full of grace”. The least work of grace is loftier than all angels in their nature. St Augustine says that a work of grace performed by God, such as that He converts a sinner and makes a good man of him, is greater than if God created a new world. It is as easy for God to turn round heaven and earth as it is for me to turn round an apple in my hand. Where grace is in the soul, that is so pure and so like and akin to God, and grace is without works just as in the birth of which I spoke before there is no work. Grace performs no works. St John “performed no sign” (John 10:41). The work that an angel has in God is so lofty that no master and no intelligence ever came to an understanding of it. But from that work there falls a chip, just as a chip might fall from a plank that is being cut — a lightning-flash, which is where the angel touches heaven with his lowest part — and from that there shoots and blossoms and springs into life everything that is in the world.

I sometimes mention two springs. Though this may sound strange, we must speak according to our understanding. One spring, from which grace gushes forth, is where the Father bears forth His only-begotten Son. From that source grace arises, and there grace flows forth from that same spring. Another spring is where creatures flow out of God. This one is as far from the spring whence grace flows as heaven is from earth. Grace does not perform works. Where fire is in its own nature, it does no harm and burns nothing. The heat of the fire burns here below. But where the heat is in the nature of fire, it does not burn and is harmless. Yet when the heat is in the fire it is as far from the fire's true nature as heaven is from earth. Grace performs no works, it is too delicate for this, work is as far from grace as heaven is from earth. An indwelling, an attachment and a union with God, — *that* is grace, and God is ‘with’ that, for there immediately follows:

“God be with you” — and there the birth occurs. Let no one think this is beyond him. What matters the hardship to me, if He does the work? All His commandments are easy for me to keep. Let Him bid me do what He will, I care not at all, it is all a trifle to me, if He gives me His grace with it. Some people say they have not got it. I say, ‘I am sorry. Do you want it?’ — No. — ‘Then I am sorrier still’. If you cannot have it, you should at least have a desire for it. If you can't have a desire for it, you should at least desire to desire it. David says: “I have desired a desire, Lord, for thy justice” (Ps. 119:20).^{1 2}

That we may so desire God that He may be willing to be born in us, so help us God. Amen.

MEISTER ECKHART

Notes

1. Pfeiffer's No.29 is from a fragmentary text. Miss Evans translates this in vol.I as No.29, but gives the full text as No.27 in vol.II, following Sievers.
2. This is what the gospel actually says, but Eckhart has quoted it differently because he wants to talk about time.
3. See No.2, note 8.
4. Probably St Augustine's *Confessions* XI, ch.13 (Q).
5. The Trinity.
6. According to St Thomas, each angel is a species in himself (Q).
7. Or belongs to a different species.
8. A play on *riche* 'rich' and *riche* 'kingdom' (modern *reich* and *Reich*).
9. *Gabriel* 'the power of God'.
10. A daughter (Q).
11. Eckhart explains this pseudo-etymology in *LW* II, 267: '*Ave*,' *sine vae* (Q).
12. A literal rendering of the Vulgate *Concupivit anima mea desiderare justificationes tuas*.

SERMON THIRTY

(Pf 30, Q 45)

BEATUS ES, SIMON BAR JONA, QUIA CARO ET SANGUIS ETC.

(Matt. 16:17)

Our Lord says: "Simon Peter, thou art blessed; flesh and blood have not revealed that to thee, but my Father who is in heaven". St Peter has four names: he is called Peter, and is called Bar-Jona, and is called Simon, and is called Cephas.

Now our Lord says: "Thou art blessed". All people desire blessedness. And a master¹ says all people desire to be praised. But St Augustine says a good man desires no praise, he desires to be worthy of praise. Now our masters say virtue is so pure, so wholly abstract and detached from all corporeal things in its ground and true nature that nothing whatever can enter into it without defiling the virtue and making it a vice. A single thought or any seeking of one's own advantage, and it is not a true virtue, it is turned to vice. Such is virtue by nature.

Now a pagan master² says if a man practises virtue for the sake of anything else but virtue, then it never was a virtue. If he seeks praise or anything else, he is selling virtue. One should never give up a virtue by nature for anything in the world. Therefore a good man desires no praise, but he desires to be worthy of praise. A man should not be sorry if people are angry with him, he should be sorry to deserve the anger.

Now our Lord says: "Blessed art thou". Blessedness lies in four things: in having everything that has essence, that

MEISTER ECKHART

truly: he who is not fully below obtains and receives nothing, however small. If you have an eye to yourself or to any thing or person, you are not right under and will get nothing, but if you are right under, you will receive fully and perfectly. It is God's nature to give, and His being depends on His giving to us when we are under. If we are not, and receive nothing, we do Him violence and kill Him. If we cannot do this to Him, then we do it to ourselves, as far as in us lies. If you would truly give Him all, see to it that you put yourself in true humility under God, raising up God in your heart and your understanding. "Our Lord God sent His Son into the world" (Gal. 4:4). I once said here, God sent His Son into the world in the soul's fullness of time, when she had finished with time.³ When the soul is free from time and place, then the Father sends His Son into the soul. This is the meaning of the words: "The best gift and perfection come from above, from the Father of lights".

That we may be made ready to receive this best gift, may God help us, the Father of lights. Amen.

Notes

1. This sentence was condemned in art. 26 of the Bull of 1329: *Omnes creature sunt unum purum nichil: non dico quod sint modicum vel aliquid, sed quod sint unum purum nichil.*

2. Cf. No.8.

3. Cf. No.29.

SERMON FORTY ONE

(Pf 41, Q 70, QT 53)¹

MODICUM ET NON VI DEBITIS ME, ETC.

(John 16:16)

Our Lord said to his disciples: "A little, a tiny bit, a wee while, and you will not see me; again a little, and you shall see me". The disciples said: "We do not know what he is saying". This is written by St John, who was there. When our Lord saw their hearts, he said: "A little while, and you shall see me, and your hearts will rejoice, and that joy shall never be taken from you." Now our Lord says: "A little, and you will not see me". The finest masters say that the kernel of salvation lies in understanding. A prominent theologian² recently came to Paris and opposed this with loud fulminations. Then another master³ spoke up better than all those of Paris who held to the better doctrine: 'Master, you cry out and fulminate very positively. If it were not God's word in the holy gospel, you would be making a great fuss'. Knowledge seizes on that barely which it knows. Our Lord says: "That is the eternal life, that we know thee alone as true God" (John 17:3). The perfection of blessedness lies in both, knowledge and love.

Now he says: "A little, and you will not see me". This has four meanings which sound much alike, but are very different. "A little, and you will not see me". All things must be little in you, and as nothing. I have said before that St Augustine says, 'When St Paul saw nothing, he saw God'.⁴ Now I will turn the phrase round (which is better), and say, 'when he saw naught,⁵ he saw God'. That is the

first meaning.

The second meaning is: Unless all the world and all time become little in you, you will not see God. St John says in the Apocalypse: "The angel swore by the eternal life that time should be no more" (Rev. 10:5). St John says openly:⁶ "The world was made by Him, and it did not know Him" (John 1:10). Also a pagan master says that world and time are small things. Unless you transcend world and time, you will not see God. "A little, and you will not see me".

The third meaning is: As long as anything adheres to the soul, however little, of sin or akin to sin, you will not see God. The masters declare that heaven receives no alien impressions.⁷ There are many heavens: each one has its spirit and its angel who is allotted to it.⁸ If he were to operate in another heaven to which he was not allotted, he could do nothing with it. One priest said, 'I wish your soul were in my body'. Then I said, 'Truly, she would be foolish in there, for she could do nothing with it, nor could your soul in my body'. No soul can do anything except in the body to which she is allotted. The eye does not tolerate anything alien in itself. A master says, 'If there were no means, we could see nothing'. If I am to see the colour on the wall, it must be made small in the light and and in the air and its image must be conveyed to my eye. St Bernard says the eye is like heaven, it receives heaven in itself. The ear does not do that: it does not hear it, nor does the tongue taste it. Secondly, the eye is shaped round like heaven. Thirdly, it stands high like heaven. Therefore the eye receives the impression of light, because it has the property of heaven.⁹ Heaven receives no alien impressions.

The body does receive alien impressions, and the soul also receives alien impressions, as long as she works in the body. If the soul is to know anything outside of herself, such as an angel, or anything, however pure, she must do this with a subtle glimpse without any image.¹⁰ So too an angel, if he is to recognise another angel or anything that is under God, must do it with a subtle glimpse without any image such as the images here. But he knows himself without this subtle glimpse, without image and without likeness. So too the soul knows herself without glimpse, without image and without likeness, immediately. If I am to know God, that must occur without images and immediately. The greatest masters say that one knows God without means. That is how the angels know God, just as He knows Himself without image and without 'a little'.¹¹ If I am to know God without 'means' and without image or likeness, then God must become practically 'I', and I practically God, so wholly one that when I work with Him it is not that I work and He incites me, but that I work wholly with what is mine. I work as truly with Him as my soul works with my body. That is a great comfort for us, and if we had nothing else, that should be spur enough for us to love God.

The fourth sense is entirely opposite to these three. We must be great and lofty if we are to see God. The light of the sun is little compared to the light of the intellect, and the intellect is little compared to the light of grace. Grace is a light that transcends and soars above everything that God ever created or could create. Yet the light of grace, great as it is, is little indeed compared with the divine light. Our Lord rebuked his disciples and said: "In you is

yet but a little light" (John 12:35). They were not without light, but it was small. We must ascend and grow great in grace. As long as we are growing in grace, it is grace and it is little, and in it we see God from afar. But when grace is perfected in the highest, it is not grace: it is a divine light in which one sees God. St Paul says: "God lives and dwells in a light to which there is no access" (1 Tim. 6:15). There is no access, there is only an attainment. Moses says: "No man has seen God" (cf. Exodus 33:20). As long as we are men and as long as anything human attaches to us and we are approaching, we cannot see God; we must be raised up and set in pure rest, and thus see God. St John says: "We shall know God as God knows Himself" (cf. 1 John 3:2). God's nature is that He knows Himself without 'a little' and without this or that. That is how the angels know God, as He knows Himself. St Paul says: "We shall know God as we are known" (cf. 1 Cor. 13:12). And I say we shall know Him just as He knows Himself, in the reflection which is solely the image of God and the Godhead, but the Godhead only in as far as it is the Father.¹² In so far as we are like *this* image, from which all images have flowed out and fled, and as we are reflected in this image and equally entered into the image of the Father — as far as He knows that in us, so far do we know Him as He knows Himself.

Now he says: "A little, and you will not see me; a little again, and you shall see me". Our Lord said: "That is the eternal life, that we know thee alone as true God".

That we may come to this knowledge, may God help us. Amen.¹³

Notes

1. This, according to Quint, is a better version of Pfeiffer's No. 41, which he reprints as an appendix to his No.70, with variants from the Basle Tauler edition of 1521.
2. Probably the Franciscan Gonsalvus, with whom Eckhart debated in Paris in 1302 or 1303 (see Introduction).
3. The master who thus opposed Gonsalvus can scarcely be Eckhart himself. Quint thinks it may have been the distinguished Dominican Jean Quidort.
4. See No.19.
5. The inversion is hard to bring out in English. At the first place Eckhart has *Dô Sant Paulus niht ensach*, and at the second place *dô er sach niht*, which is more emphatic and in which *niht* clearly means 'nothing'. For the meanings of *niht*, see No.6, n.5, and No.13b, n.2.
6. 'Openly' in the gospel, not in the 'secret' revelation of the Apocalypse.
7. This is Aristotelian doctrine, as taught by Albertus Magnus (Q).
8. Cf. John 14:2, "In my Father's house are many mansions". As regards the spirits, Quint refers to the *substantiae separatae* of Neoplatonism, who are often identified with the angels.
9. Cf. St Bernard of Clairvaux, *In Cant. sermo 31 no. 2* (Q). As in modern German, *himel* means both 'heaven' and 'sky'.
10. *Mit einem kleinen bildelîn âne bilde*, lit. 'with a little (or subtle) imagelet without an image', i.e. abstractly.
11. '*Kleine*' (in quotes) in Quint's edition. This is the same word as is used in the scriptural text for the sermon, where it renders *modicum*. It means not only 'little' as in modern German, but 'fine, subtle', &c. (etymologically cognate with English *clean*). Here it means without the least, or subtlest thing intervening, without 'means'. Another example of the difficulty of translating this sermon.
12. The Son as image of the Father (Q).
13. I have not thought it necessary to translate the second version of this sermon which Quint appends (see n. 1), as it is on the whole inferior and adds little of interest or importance. But attention may be drawn to an example of Eckhart's free use of scripture to express his meaning. In the last paragraph he says (Miss Evan's translation): 'As our Lord said to St Mary Magdalene, "Touch me not, I am not yet ascended *in thee* to my Father" (John 20:17), rendering the Vulgate

MEISTER ECKHART

Noli me tangere, nondum enim ascendi ad Patrem meum. The words 'in thee' have no equivalent in the Latin, being inserted to give Eckhart's mystical interpretation of the passage. We may compare his treatment of the text to No.8. Medieval exegesis was often pretty free, but Eckhart seems to go further than most. None of his inquisitors objected to these additions, and Quint too, more surprisingly, does not comment on them.

SERMON FORTY TWO

(Pf 42, Q 69)

MODICUM ET IAM NON VIDEBITIS ME

(John 16:16)

I have quoted a text in Latin which is written in St John's Gospel which we read on Sunday. It is what our Lord said to his disciples: "A little, a short while, and suddenly you will not see me".

Anything, however small, adhering to the soul, prevents us from seeing God. St Augustine asked what eternal life was, and said by way of answer: 'If you ask what eternal life is, ask and listen to eternal life itself'. No one knows better what heat is than he who is hot; no one knows better what wisdom is than he who is wise; no one knows better what eternal life is than eternal life itself. Now the Eternal Life, our Lord Jesus Christ, says: "That is eternal life, that we know thee alone as true God" (John 17:3). If a man espied God from afar as by some medium or in a cloud, he would not depart from God for an instant for all the world. What do you think, then, how tremendous that is if one sees God without medium? Now our Lord says: "A little, a short while, and suddenly you will not see me". All creatures God ever created or might yet create, if He wished, are little or nothing compared with God. Heaven is so vast and so wide that if I told you, you would not believe it. If you were to take a needle and prick the heavens with it, then that part of heaven that the needle-point pricked would be greater in comparison to heaven and the whole world, than heaven and the world are compared

IN MEMORIAM
JOSEF QUINT
1898-1976

MEISTER ECKHART

Sermons & Treatises

VOLUME II

Translated and Edited by
M.O'C. WALSHE



ELEMENT BOOKS

1979

MEISTER ECKHART

III, 227), where he ascribes it to Avicenna. Miss Evans, mysteriously, has 'arrow' for 'hedgehog'.

9. See No. 50, and No. 27. Elsewhere Eckhart, who is not always wholly consistent, describes these three as *lower* powers. But here he is obviously equating them with faith, hope and love (Q).

10. Cf., e.g., No. 8.

11. Cf. *Conf.* II, c. 4. n. 9 (Q).

12. Eckhart here returns to his text.

13. St Elisabeth. After her husband's death she had to endure persecution. She tended the poor and the sick.

SERMON FIFTY THREE

(Pf 88, Q22, QT 23)

AVE, GRATIA PLENA, DOMINUS TECUM!

(Luke 1:28)

This text which I have said in Latin is found in the holy gospel, and means in German: 'Hail to thee, full of grace, the Lord is with thee!' The Holy Ghost shall descend from above, from the lofty throne and shall come into thee from the light of the eternal Father. Here, there are three things to be understood. The first is the humility of the angelic nature, the second is that he knew himself unworthy to name God's mother, and the third that he addressed not her alone, but a great multitude: every good soul that desires God.

I say that if Mary had not first borne God spiritually, he would never have been born of her physically.

A woman said to our Lord: "Blessed is the womb that bore you" (Luke 11:27). And our Lord replied: "Not only is the womb blessed that bore me: blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it". It is more worth to God to be born spiritually of the individual virgin or good soul, than that he was physically born of Mary.¹

By this is to be understood that we are an only son, whom the Father has eternally borne. When the Father begot all creatures, he begot me, and I flowed forth with all creatures while remaining within the Father.² It is like what I am now saying: it springs up within me, then secondly, I pause in the idea, and thirdly, I speak it out, and all of you receive it, yet really it is in me all the time.

Likewise I remain in the Father. In the Father are the primal images of all creatures. This bit of wood has a rational image in God. It is not only rational, it is pure reason.

The greatest good God ever did for man was that he became man himself. Here I shall tell you a story that is relevant to this. There was once a rich man and a rich lady. The lady had an accident and lost one eye, at which she grieved exceedingly. Then the lord came to her and said, 'Wife, why are you so distressed?' You should not be so distressed at losing your eye'. She said, 'Sir, I do not mourn because I have lost my eye, I mourn for fear you might love me the less'. Then he said, 'Lady, I love you'. Not long afterwards he put out one of his own eyes, and going to his wife, he said, 'Lady, so you may know I love you I have made myself like you: now I too have only one eye'.³ This is like man, who could scarcely believe that God loved him so much, until God put out one of His own eyes and assumed human nature. This was "made flesh". Our lady asked: "How can this be?", and the angel replied: "The Holy Ghost will come down into you from on high", from the highest throne from the Father of eternal light.

In principio. "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given" (Is. 9:6): a child by the frailty of human nature, a son by the eternal Godhead. The masters say all creatures are striving to bring forth and to emulate the Father. Another master says every active cause works solely for the sake of its end, so as to find rest and peace in its end. One master⁴ says all creatures work towards their primal purity and their highest perfection. Fire as fire does not burn:

it is so pure and so fine that it does not ignite; rather, the nature of fire ignites and infuses into the dry wood its nature and its clarity according to its highest perfection. God has done the same. He has created the soul according to His own perfect nature, pouring into her all His own light in its pristine purity, while Himself remaining uncontaminated.

I said recently in one place that when God created all creatures, if God had not previously begotten something that was uncreated that bore within itself the images of all creatures — that is the spark, as I said at St. Maccabees if you were listening⁵ — this spark is so akin to God that it is a single impartible one, and it contains in itself the images of all creatures, imageless images and images above images.⁶

Yesterday a question was debated in the schools⁷ among the great theologians. I said I was astonished that scripture is so pregnant with meaning that no one can fully understand the least word of it. And so,⁸ if you ask me, since I am an only son whom the heavenly Father has eternally begotten, whether I have eternally been that son in God, my answer is: Yes and no. Yes, a son in that the Father has eternally begotten me, not a son by way of being unborn.

In principio. Here we are given to understand that we are an only son whom the Father has been eternally begetting out of the hidden darkness of eternal concealment, indwelling in the first beginning of the primal purity which is the plenitude of all purity. There I have been eternally at rest and asleep in the hidden understanding of the eternal Father, immanent and unspoken. Out of

that purity He has been ever begetting me, his only-begotten son, in the very image of His eternal Fatherhood that I may be a father and beget him of whom I am begotten. Just as if one were to stand before a lofty mountain and call out, 'Are you there?', it would echo and resound, 'Are you there?' And if he said, 'Come out!', echo would reply, 'Come out!' In fact, seen in that light, any bit of wood would become an angel and would become rational, and not only rational – it would become pure intelligence in that primal purity which is the plenitude of all purity. And that is what God does: He begets His only-begotten Son in the highest part of the soul.⁹ In the same moment that He bears His only-begotten Son into me, I bear him back into the Father. It is no different from God's bearing the angel,¹⁰ and being born again by the Virgin. I used to wonder (it is many years ago) whether I should be asked why one blade of grass is so unlike another; and as it happened, I *was* asked why they are so different. Then I said it is more marvellous that all blades of grass are so much alike. One master says that the blades of grass are all different owing to the superfluity of the goodness of God, which He pours out superabundantly into all creatures to reveal His majesty the more. So I said, it is more wonderful how much the grass-blades are alike, explaining that just as all angels are one in their original pure nature, so all blades of grass are one in their original pure nature, and there all things are one.

I used to think sometimes, when I came here, that man could come in time to compel God.¹¹ If I were up here, and said to someone, 'Come up here', that would be hard for him, but if I said, 'Sit down here', that would be easy.

This is what God does. Whenever a man humbles himself, God is unable to withhold His own goodness; He is obliged to sink Himself, to pour Himself out into that humble man, and to the meanest of all He gives Himself most, and gives Himself wholly. What God gives is His being, and His being is His goodness, and His goodness is His love. All sorrow and all joy comes from love. I was thinking on the way, when I was supposed to come here, that I did not want to come here because I should become wet with love.¹² Perhaps you too have been wet with love, but we shall not discuss that. Joy and sorrow both come from love. A man should not fear God, for he who fears Him, flees Him. Such a fear is harmful fear. The right sort of fear is the fear of *losing* God. Man should not fear Him, he should love Him, for God loves man to the highest perfection. The masters say that all things strive to give birth, and to become like the Father. And they declare that the earth flees from the heavens: but if she flees downwards, she comes downwards to heaven, and if she flees upwards, then she comes to the lowest of the heavens. The earth can never flee so low but heaven flows into her and impresses his power on her and fructifies her, whether she wishes it or not.¹³ It is just the same with a man: he thinks he can get away from God, but he cannot escape Him, for every nook and cranny reveals Him. He thinks he is fleeing from God, and runs into His arms. God gives birth to His only-begotten Son in you whether you like it or not; whether you are asleep or awake, God does His work. I was speaking recently about whose fault it was if a man could not taste that, and I said it was because his tongue was coated with

extraneous filth, that is to say, with creatures, just like a man to whom all food seems bitter and not to his taste. Why don't we like this food? The reason is for lack of salt. The salt is divine love. If we had divine love we should savour God, and all the works God ever performed, we should receive all things from God, and do all the works that He does. In this sameness we are all His only Son.

When God created the soul, He created her according to His own most perfect nature, so that she might be the bride¹⁴ of His only-begotten Son, who, knowing this full well, decided to go forth out of the private chamber of his eternal Fatherhood in which he eternally slept, remaining unspoken within.¹⁵ *In principio*. In the first beginning of the primal purity the Son set up the tent of his eternal glory and came forth from the Most High, so as to elevate his beloved, to whom the Father had eternally wedded him, and to bring her back into the Highest whence she had come.¹⁶ And in another place it says: "Lo, your king is coming to you!" (Zach. 9:9). For this reason he went forth and came leaping like a young stag, and suffered the pangs of love: and he did not come out except with the wish to return to the chamber with his bride. This chamber is the silent darkness of the mysterious Fatherhood. When he went forth from the Most High, he wanted to show her the hidden mystery of his secret Godhead, where he is at rest with himself and all creatures.

In principio:¹⁷ this means when translated a beginning of all being, as I said in the schools, but I said further: it is an end of all being, for the first beginning is for the sake of the final end. Indeed, God Himself does not rest there, where He is the first beginning: He is at rest where

He is an end and a repose of all being, not that this being is then brought to naught, rather it is there brought to completion in its final end, as total perfection. What is the final end? It is the hidden darkness of the eternal Godhead, which is unknown and never has been known and never shall be known. God abides there unknown in Himself, and the light of the eternal Father has ever shone in there, and the darkness does not comprehend the light.¹⁸

That we may come to this truth, may that Truth help us whereof I have spoken. Amen.

Notes

1. Cf. No. 8.
2. Cf. No. 17.
3. Eckhart also tells this story in his commentary on St. John. There is a medieval German version, *Diu getriuwe kone* ('The Faithful Wife'), by Herrand von Wildonje (ca. 1250), in which the ugly husband loses an eye in the wars, and his beautiful wife puts out one of hers.
4. These masters have not been identified.
5. See No. 50, n.9.
6. Eckhart does not complete the sentence, or at least the MSS do not.
7. Presumably the Dominican *Studium Generale* in Cologne. Cf. No. 83, n. 4.
8. Eckhart means that just as all the learned theologians cannot fully interpret a single word of scripture, so too he cannot give a simple 'yes or no' answer to *this* question.
9. The intellect: cf. No. 54, n. 7.
10. Of the Annunciation.
11. Cf. No. 24a.
12. Probably = 'wet with tears of love' (Q). Quint rejects an earlier explanation (which Miss Evans appears to follow) that Eckhart is making a little joke about having had to come in the rain.

MEISTER ECKHART

13. See No. 50.

14. Quint reads *brût* ('bride') for the meaningless *geburt* ('birth') of the MSS and Pfeiffer's text. Miss Evans has independently adopted 'bride' in her translation. This is obviously correct in view of what follows.

15. Christ as the Word (*Logos*) as yet unspoken. For the theme of God 'speaking the Word', cf. No. 1.

16. Quint refers to Psalm 18:6 and Cant. 2:8. This whole passage has been thought to smack more of Suso than of Eckhart, but Quint points out parallels in Eckhart's other works; and Suso was, after all, Eckhart's pupil. In earlier tradition the bride of the Song of Songs has been interpreted as the Church, but long before Eckhart's time she was taken as the individual soul, as here.

17. These opening words of Genesis and St. John's gospel run like a *Leitmotiv* all through this sermon. See the remarks by Clark and Skinner. *Meister Eckhart, Selected Treatises and Sermons*, 1958, p. 48, on the difficulty of adequately translating these words, which, as they say, are 'fraught with profound philosophical overtones'. Cf. Kelley, p. 250, n. 4.

18. Cf. John 1:5.

SERMON FIFTY FOUR

(Q 23)

COMPULIT JESUS DISCIPULOS ASCENDERE IN NAVICULAM ET
PRAECEDERE EUM TRANS FRETUM

(Matt. 14:22)

"Jesus bade his disciples go up into a little boat and cross the turbulent sea".¹ Why does he call the sea turbulent? Because it rages and is restless. "He bade his disciples go up". Whoever would hear the Word and be a disciple of Christ, must rise up and raise his mind above all corporeal things, and must cross over the turbulence of the mutability of all transitory things. As long as there is anything of mutability, whether it is cunning or anger or sadness, that beclouds the reason, so that it cannot hear the Word.

A master² says whoever would understand natural things and even material things must strip his understanding bare of all extraneous matters. I have also said before, when the sun pours forth its radiance on corporeal things, whatever it can take hold of it turns to vapour and draws up to itself: if the sunshine were able, it would draw it into the ground from which it radiates. But when the sunshine draws this matter up into the air, so that it expands of itself and becomes warm from the sun, then, rising up into the region of cold, it suffers a setback from the cold, and is cast down to earth again as rain or snow.³ Thus it is with the Holy Ghost: he lifts the soul and supports her and draws her up with him, and if she were ready, he would draw her into the ground from which he emanated. And so it comes that, when the Holy Ghost is

MEISTER ECKHART

are distinguished by working and not-working. When I return to God, if I do not remain there,⁹ my breakthrough will be far nobler than my outflowing. I alone bring all creatures out of their reason into my reason, so that they are one with me.¹⁰ When I enter the ground, the bottom, the river and fount of the Godhead, none will ask me whence I came or where I have been. No one missed me, for there God *unbecomes*.¹¹

Whoever has understood this sermon, good luck to him. If no one had been here I should have had to preach it to this collecting-box. There are some poor people who will go back home and say, 'I shall settle down and eat my bread and serve God'. By the eternal truth I declare that these people will remain in error, and will never be able to strive for and win what those others achieve who follow God in poverty and exile. Amen.

Notes

1. Quoted out of context by the Nazi apologist Walter Lehmann (see J. Clark, *The Great German Mystics*, 1949, pp. 34f.).
2. Quint quotes from Plato's *Timaeus* in explanation of this theory.
3. The text is that for St John the Baptist (29 August).
4. *Got wirt und entwirt*. This refers, as Clark notes, to the difference between God and Godhead. See n. 8 and n. 11.
5. They are illumined by the active intellect (Clark).
6. i.e. a mirror.
7. As Clark notes, Eckhart here clearly shows he is no pantheist.
8. The explanation of the phrase 'God becomes and unbecomes' (n. 4).
9. If I penetrate beyond 'God' to the 'Godhead'.
10. Cf. n. 5.
11. The further explanation of 'God becomes and unbecomes' (n. and n. 8).

SERMON FIFTY SEVEN

(Pf 96, Q 12, QT 13)

QUI AUDIT ME NON CONFUNDETUR

(Eecl. 24:30)

The text that I have quoted in Latin is declared by the eternal wisdom of the Father and it says: "Whoever hears me is not ashamed" — if he is ashamed of anything, he is ashamed of being ashamed —. "He that works in me does not sin. He that reveals me and shines me forth shall have eternal life". Of these three sayings which I have quoted, each would be sufficient for a sermon. I will speak first of the words of the Eternal Wisdom: "Whoever hears me is not ashamed". Whoever would hear the eternal wisdom of the Father, he must be within, and at home, and must be one: then he can hear the eternal wisdom of the Father.

There are three things that prevent us from hearing the eternal Word. The first is corporeality, the second is multiplicity, the third is temporality. If a man had transcended these three things, he would dwell in eternity, he would dwell in the spirit, he would dwell in unity and in the desert — and there he would hear the eternal Word. Now our Lord says: "No one hears my word or my teaching unless he has abandoned self".¹ For to hear the Word of God demands absolute self-surrender. The hearer is the same as the heard in the eternal Word. All that the eternal Father teaches, is His being and His nature and His entire Godhead, which He divulges to us altogether in His Son and teaches us that we are that same Son. A man

who had gone out of self so far that he was the only-begotten Son would own all that the only-begotten Son owns. Whatever God performs and whatever He teaches, all that He performs and teaches in His only-begotten Son. God performs all His works that we may become the only-begotten Son. When God sees that we *are* the only-begotten Son, He is in such haste to get to us and hurries so much as if His divine being would be shattered and destroyed in itself, that He may reveal to us the abyss of His Godhead and the plenitude of His being and His nature: God then hastens to make it our own just as it is His own. Here God has delight and joy in abundance. That man stands in God's ken and in God's love, and becomes none other than what God is Himself.²

If you love yourself, you love all men as yourself. As long as you love a single man less than yourself,³ you have never truly learnt to love yourself —unless you love all men as yourself, all men in one man, that man being God and man. It is well with that man who loves himself and all men as himself, with him it is very well. Now some people say, 'I love my friend, who is good to me, better than any other man'. It is not right so, it is imperfect. But it must be tolerated, just as some people sail across the sea with half a wind, and still get there. So it is with people who love one person better than another: it is natural. If I truly loved him as myself, then, whatever happened to him for good or ill, whether it were life or death, I would be as glad for it to happen to me as to him, and that would be *real* friendship.

Therefore St Paul said: "I would be willing to be eternally separated from God for the sake of my friend and for

God's sake".⁴ To be separated from God for an instant is to be separated from God for ever, and to be separated from God is hellish pain.⁵ Now what does St Paul mean by these words, when he says he would be separated from God?⁶ The masters question whether St Paul was on the way to perfection, or whether he was completely perfect. I say he stood in the fullness of perfection, otherwise he could not have said this.

I will put into plain words what St Paul meant when he said that he would be separated from God. Man's highest and dearest leave-taking is if he takes leave of God for God. St Paul left God for God: he left everything that he could get from God, he left everything that God could give him and everything he might receive from God. In leaving these he left God for God, and *then* God was left with him, as God is essentially in Himself, not by way of a reception or a gaining of Himself, but rather in an essentiality which is where God is. He never gave God anything, nor did he receive anything from God: it is a single oneness and a pure union. *Here* man is true man, and suffering no more befalls that man than it befalls the divine essence: as I have said before, there is something in the soul that is so near akin to God that it is one and not united. It is one, it has nothing in common with anything, and nothing created has anything in common with it. All created things are nothing. But this is remote and alien from all creation. If man were wholly thus he would be wholly uncreated and uncreatable.⁷ If everything that is corporeal and defective were to be comprehended in this unity, it would be no different from that which this unity is. If I were to find myself for a single instant in this

essence, I would have as little regard for myself as for a dung-worm.

God gives to all things equally, and as they flow forth from God they are equal: angels, men and all creatures proceed alike from God in their first emanation. To take things in their primal emanation would be to take them all alike. If they are alike in time, in God in eternity they are much more like. If you could take a fly in God, it is in God far nobler than the highest angel in himself. Now all things are equal in God and are God Himself. Here God delights so in this likeness that He pours out His whole nature and being in this equality in Himself. He rejoices in it, just as if one were to turn a horse loose in a green meadow that was entirely smooth and level, and it would be the horse's nature to let himself go with all his strength in galloping about the meadow — he would enjoy it for it is his nature. In just the same way God finds joy and satisfaction when He finds likeness:⁸ He rejoices, pouring out all His nature and His being into His likeness, for He is Himself this likeness.

A question arises about the angels: Do those angels who dwell here with us to serve and guard us suffer a diminution of their joys in comparison with those that abide in eternity:⁹ is it in any sense a drawback to them to be engaged in serving and protecting us? I reply, No, not at all. Their joy is no less, and so too their equality: for the angel's work is God's will and God's will is the angel's work, and accordingly such an angel is not hindered in his joy, his likeness or his work. If God should tell an angel to fly to a tree and pick off the caterpillars, the angel would be ready to pick them off: being God's will

it would be his happiness.

A man who is established thus in God's will wants nothing but what is God's will and what is God. If he were sick he would not want to be well. To him all pain is pleasure, all multiplicity is bare simplicity, if he is truly established in the will of God. Even though it meant the pains of hell it would be joy and happiness to him. He is free and has left self behind, and must be free of whatever is to come in to him: if my eye is to perceive colour, it must be free of all colour. If I see a blue or white colour, the sight of my eye which sees the colour, the very thing that sees, is the same as that which is seen by the eye. The eye with which I see God is the same eye with which God sees me: my eye and God's eye are one eye, one seeing, one knowing and one love.¹⁰

That man who is established thus in God's love must be dead to self and all created things, paying as little regard to himself as to one who is a thousand miles away. That man abides in likeness and abides in unity in full equality, and no unlikeness enters into him. This man must have abandoned self and all this world. If there were a man who possessed all the world, and if he gave it up barely, just as he received it, for God's sake, then our Lord would give him back all this world and eternal life as well.¹¹ And if there were another man possessing nothing but good will, who thought: Lord, were this whole world mine, and if I had another world and yet another, making three; if he were to wish: Lord, I will abandon these and myself as barely as I received them from you — then God would give that man just as much as if he had (really) given it away with his own hand.¹² Another man

again, who had nothing physical or spiritual to resign or give, he would give up the most. A man who wholly resigned self for a single instant, to him all would be given. But if a man abandoned self for twenty years, if he took back self for a single instant, he would never have been self-abandoned. That man who both has and is resigned, and never again glances at what he has abandoned but remains firm, unmoved in himself and unchangeable, that man alone has left self.

That we may thus remain firm and unchangeable as the eternal Father, so help us God and eternal Wisdom. Amen.

Notes

1. Cf. Luke 14:26.
2. Practically all of this paragraph was objected to by the Cologne censors, but was not condemned by the Pope.
3. Clark says of these words, 'I omit a meaningless sentence missing in three old manuscripts' (!). True, the grammar is awkward, but the phrase is far from meaningless.
4. Cf. Rom. 9:3.
5. This whole passage was also objected to by the censors. It is tempting to suppose that this is Eckhart's interpretation of the eternity of hell.
6. Eckhart apparently treated this question at length in a lost Latin work (Q).
7. This passage was condemned in the bull of 1329, but Eckhart had explained in his declaration in the Dominican church at Cologne in February 1327 that he meant it is 'concreated'. Cf. No. 84, n. 9.
8. *Glîcheit* (*Gleichheit* in Modern German) means both 'equality' and 'likeness', as Clark notes.
9. Lit. 'do they have less equality of their joys'.
10. This was objected to by the Cologne censors. Eckhart replied by quoting St Augustine, *De Trinitate* ix, 2 (Q). Cf. also No. 7.
11. Clark compares Luke 18:28-30.
12. Like the first man mentioned, who *really* owned the world.

SERMON FIFTY EIGHT

(Pf 58, Q 66, Qt 27, Evans II, 13)

FUGE SERVE BONE ET FIDELIS ETC.

(Matt. 25:23)

We read in the gospel the saying of our Lord: "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter into the joy of your Lord: because you have been faithful over small things, I will set you over all my possessions".

Well then, let us carefully examine the words used by our Lord when he said: "good and faithful servant, enter into the joy of your Lord: because you have been faithful over small things, I will set you over all my possessions". Now in another gospel our Lord said to a young man who addressed him and called him 'good': "Why do you call me good? None is good but God alone" (Mark 10:17), and that indeed is true. Whatever is a creature, in so far as it depends on itself, is not good. Nothing whatever is good except God alone. Did God then contradict his own words? Not in the least! Now mark my words.

So far as man denies himself for God and is atoned with God, to that extent he is more God than creature. A man who makes himself wholly free of self for God's sake, who belongs to none but God and lives for none save God alone, is in truth by grace the same as God is by nature, and God for his part knows no difference between Himself and that man. However, I say 'by grace'. For God is and this man is, and just as God is good by nature, so this man is good by grace, for God's life and being is entire in this man. That is why he called this man 'good', for the

SERMON SIXTY SEVEN

(Pf 84, Q 9, QT 10)

QUASI STELLA MATUTINA IN MEDIO NEBULAE ET QUASI LUNA
PLENA IN DIEBUS SUIS LUCET ET QUASI SOL REFULGENS, SIC
ISTE REFULSIT IN TEMPLO DEI

(Eccl. 50:6-7)

“Like a morning star in the midst of the mist, and like a full moon in his days, and like a bright sun, so did he shine in the Temple of God”. Now I will take the last words: “the temple of God”. What is God, and what is the temple of God?

Twenty-four masters came together¹ to decide what God was. They came at the appointed time and each one brought his answer: I will pick out two or three. One said: ‘God is something compared with which all transitory and temporal things are nothing, and all that has being is trifling before Him’. The second said: ‘God is something that is necessarily above being, that in itself needs none and that all things need’. The third said: ‘God is an intellect that lives solely by understanding itself’.

Passing over the first and the third, I will speak of the second, that God is something that necessarily transcends being. Whatever has being, time or place, cannot reach God: He is above it. God is in all creatures, in so far as they have being, and yet He is above them. By being in all creatures, He is above them: what is one in many things must needs be above those things. Some masters would hold that the soul is only in the heart. That is not so, and some great masters have erred in this. The soul is whole

and undivided, at once in the foot, in the eyes and in every member. If I take a moment of time, it is neither today nor yesterday. But if I take Now², it includes all time. The now in which God made the world is as close to this time as the now in which I am just speaking, and the last day is as close to this now as the day that was yesterday.

One master says: 'God is something that works in eternity, undivided in itself, needing no one's help or instrument and remaining in itself, that needs nothing but that all things need, to which all things strive as to their final goal.' This goal has no modes, it outgrows all modes and spreads far and wide. St Bernard says: 'To love God is a mode without a mode'.³ A physician who wants to cure a sick man has no 'mode' of health, of just *how* healthy he wants to make the sick man. He has modes of making him well, but as to how well he wants to make him, that is without 'mode' — as well as ever he can! And there is no 'mode' of how much we should love God — as much as ever we can, that is, without 'mode'. Everything works in (its) being, nothing can work except in its being. Fire cannot work except in wood. God works beyond being, in breadth, where He can move, and He works in non-being: before there was being, God was working: He wrought being where no being was. Masters of little subtlety say God is pure being. He is as high above being as the highest angel is above a midge. I would be as wrong to call God a being as if I were to call the sun pale or black. God is neither this nor that. And one master says: 'Whoever thinks he has known God, if he has known *anything*, it was not God he knew'. But when I have said God

is not a being and is above being, I have not thereby denied Him being: rather I have exalted it in Him. If I get copper in gold, it is there and it is there in a nobler mode than it is in itself. St Augustine says: 'God is wise without wisdom, good without goodness, powerful without power'.⁴

Junior masters teach in the schools that all beings are divided into ten modes,⁵ all of which they deny to God. None of these modes affects God, but He lacks none of them. The first, which has most being, in which all things take their being, is *substance*, and the last, which has least being, is called *relation*, and in God this is equal to the greatest, which has most being: they have a like image in God. In God the images of all things are alike, but they are images of unlike things. The highest angel, the soul and the midge have an equal image in God. God is not being or goodness. Goodness adheres to being and does not go beyond it: for if there were no being there would be no goodness, and being is even purer than goodness. God is not 'good', or 'better' or 'best'. Whoever should say God is good would do Him as much injustice as if he called the sun black.⁶

Yet God says: "None is good but God alone" (Matt. 19:17). What is good? That is good which shares itself. We call him a good man who shares himself and is helpful. Hence a pagan master says a hermit is neither good nor bad in this sense, for he neither shares himself nor is helpful. God shares Himself most of all. No thing shares of its own, for all creatures are nothing in themselves. Whatever they share, they have from another. Nor do they give themselves: the sun gives its radiance but remains where

it is, the fire gives its heat but remains fire; but God shares His own, for He is of Himself what He is, and in all the gifts He gives, He first of all gives Himself. He gives Himself, God, as He is, in all His gifts, to the extent that one is able to receive Him. St James says: "All good gifts descend from above, from the Father of lights" (James 1:17).

When we receive God in being, we receive Him in His forecourt, for being is the forecourt of His dwelling. Where is He then in His temple, where He shines in holiness? Intellect is the temple of God. God dwells nowhere more truly than in His temple, in intellect, just as the second⁷ master said, that 'God is an intellect that lives solely by understanding itself' — remaining alone in Himself where nothing ever touched Him, for He is there alone in His stillness. God in His own knowing knows Himself in Himself.

Now let us consider the soul, which has a tiny drop of intellect, a little spark, a twig. She has powers which work in the body. One is the power of digestion, which works more by night than by day, whereby man waxes and grows. The soul also has a power in the eye, on account of which the eye is so delicate and sensitive that it does not take in things in their crudity as they are in themselves: they must first be sifted and made fine in the air and in the light — that is because it has the soul within it. There is another power in the soul, with which she remembers. This power is able to picture in itself things which are not present, so that I can recognise things as well as if I saw them with my own eyes, and even better — I can easily think of a rose in winter — and with *this*

power the soul works in non-being and follows God, who works in non-being.

A pagan master says the soul that loves God takes hold of Him under the garment of goodness — all the sayings I have quoted so far are from pagan masters, who knew only by the light of nature: I have not yet come to the words of the saintly masters, who knew by a much higher light — he says the soul that loves God takes hold of Him under the garment of goodness. Intellect draws this garment of goodness off God and takes Him bare, where He is stripped of goodness and being and of all names.

I stated in the school that intellect was higher than will, but they both belong to this light.⁸ Then a master in another school⁹ said will was nobler than intellect, for will takes things as they are in themselves, whereas intellect takes things as they are in it. That is true. An eye is nobler in itself than an eye which is painted on a wall. But I say that intellect is nobler than will. Will takes God under the cloak of goodness. Intellect takes God bare, when He is stripped of goodness and being. Goodness is a cloak under which God is hidden, and will takes God from under the cloak of goodness. If there were no goodness in God, my will would not want Him. If anyone wanted to clothe a king on the day of his coronation, and were to clothe him in grey, he would not have clothed him well. I do not become blessed because God is good. I will never entreat God to make me blessed with His goodness, for He could not do so. I am blessed only because God is intellectual and I know it. A master says God's intellect is that on which an angel's essence chiefly depends. The question is, where the essence of an image is most

truly to be found: in the mirror or in the object it proceeds from. It is more truly in that which it proceeds from. The image is in me, of me, mine. As long as the mirror is on a level with my face, my image is in it. If the mirror were to fall, the image would be destroyed. An angel's being depends on God's intellect being present to him, in which he knows himself.

"Like the morning star in the midst of the mist". I refer to the little word *quasi*, which means 'as', and is what the children at school call a 'by-word'.¹⁰ This is what I mean in all my sermons. The truest thing that one can say of God is 'Word' and 'Truth'. God called Himself a Word. St John said: "In the beginning was the Word" (John 1:1), meaning that beside the Word, man was a 'by-word'. It is like the 'free star', after which Friday is named, Venus,¹¹ which has many names. When it precedes the sun and rises before the sun, it is called a morning star; when it follows the sun, so that the sun sets first, it is called the evening star. Sometimes it is above the sun, sometimes below the sun. More than all (other) stars, it is always equally close to the sun, never going further from it or nearer to it. It signifies the man who aims always to be near God and present to Him, in such a way that nothing can alienate him from God, whether fortune, misfortune or any creature.

He says also: "Like a full moon in his days". The moon is the ruler of moist nature. The moon is never nearer to the sun than when it is full, and when it first gets its light from the sun. And because it is nearer to the earth than any star, it has two disadvantages: that it is pale and mottled, and that it loses its light. It is never so

powerful as when it is furthest from the earth: then it draws the sea out furthest. The more it wanes, the less it can draw the sea out.¹² The more the soul is raised above earthly things, the stronger she is. A man who knew nothing but creatures would never need to attend to any sermons, for every creature is full of God and is a book. But the man who would come to that of which I have been speaking — and this is the whole burden of my discourse — he should be like the morning star: for ever present to God and by Him, at an equal distance, and raised above all earthly things, a 'by-word' beside the Word.

There is one uttered word: that is the angel, man and all creatures. There is another word, thought but unuttered,¹³ through which it can come that I imagine something. There is yet another word, unuttered and unthought, which never comes forth but is rather eternally in Him who speaks it: it is evermore in conception in the Father who speaks it, remaining within. Intellect always works inwards. The subtler and more spiritual a thing is, the more strongly it works inwardly; and the stronger and finer the intellect is, the more is that which it knows united with it, the more it becomes one with it. It is not thus with physical things: the stronger *they* are, the more they work outwards. God's blessedness lies in the inward-working of the intellect in which the Word is immanent. *There* the soul should be a 'by-word' and perform one work with God, to gain her happiness in that self-contained knowledge, there where God is blessed.

That we may ever be a 'by-word' to this Word, may the Father and this same Word and the Holy Ghost help us. Amen.

MEISTER ECKHART

Notes

1. Cf. *Liber XXIV Philosophorum*, ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus, ed. Denifle (1886) (Q).
2. The eternal now.
3. *De diligendo Deo* 1,1 (Q).
4. Cf. *De Trinitate* V, 1, n.2.
5. Aristotle's ten categories, which were taught by the *baccalaurei*.
6. Condemned in the Bull, art. 28.
7. Actually the third (see above). Cf. No. 94, n. 8.
8. The higher light mentioned above, of revealed truth (available, of course, only to Christians).
9. The Franciscan general Gonsalvus. This is the usual debate between Dominicans and Franciscans.
10. Adverb: *bf-wort* = *ad-verbium*.
11. Cf. French *vendredi* (*Veneris dies*). This etymology of 'Friday' is wrong: Friday is the day of Fria or Frigg, the goddess of love who was equated with Venus.
12. The opposite is in fact true: the moon's attraction is strongest when it is nearest to the earth.
13. I read *unvürbrâht* with Clark, as against Quint's *vürbrâht* 'uttered'. Miss Evans has silently corrected Pfeiffer's reading, which agrees here with Quint, in the same sense. Both readings have manuscript support, and both make sense, but the one chosen shows a logical progression. The three 'words' are, according to Quint:
 1. The word objectified outside of God in creatures,
 2. The word by which man thinks and imagines,
 3. The Word (Christ, *Logos*) in God.

SERMON SIXTY EIGHT

(Pf 90, Q11, QT 12)

IMPLETUM EST TEMPUS ELIZABETH

(Luke 1:57)

"Elizabeth's time was fulfilled and she bore a son. John is his name. Then the people said, What wonders shall come of this child, for God's hand is with him?" One scripture says: "The greatest gift is that we are God's children",¹ and that He bears His Son in us. The soul should give birth to nothing inside herself, if she wishes to be the child of God in whom God's Son shall be born — in her nothing else should be born. God's chief aim is giving birth. He is never content till He begets His Son in us. And the soul, too, is in no way content until the Son of God is born in her. And from that there springs forth grace. Grace is thereby infused. Grace does not work: its work is its becoming. It flows out of God's essence and flows into the essence of the soul and not into her powers.

When the time was fulfilled, grace was born.² When is the fullness of time? When time is no more. If anyone has, in time,³ set his heart on eternity so that in him all temporal things are dead, *that* is "the fullness of time". I once said, 'He will not always rejoice who rejoices in time'.⁴ St Paul says: "Rejoice in God all the time" (Phil. 4:4). He rejoices all the time who rejoices above time and apart from time. One writer says there are three things that so hinder a man that he cannot know God at all: the first is time, the second corporality, the third multiplicity.⁵ As long as these three things are in me, God is not