14 Love (*Amor*)

It is read that natural love is double:[[1]](#endnote-1) spontaneous and unnatural. Natural love is that of a father for his son, of a man for a woman, and the contrary.

Concerning the first, it is evident in Gen. 37[:35], because Jacob loved his son Joseph for whose loss “he would not receive comfort.” The same is evident concerning David for Absalom whom he continually commanded to serve when however, he became an enemy to himself, 2 Kings 18[:5]. The same is evident of the father for his prodigal son, Luke 15[:20]. Concerning the love of a man for a woman and the contrary it is evident in Gen. 2[:24]: “They shall be two in one flesh,” that is, by a certain natural affection it is permitted some material alteration to be distinguished in the sex.

Spontaneous love is that of a man for a man and of a man for God. The love of a man for a man arises out of the agreement of customs or out of the benefits of deeds. Wherefore the Philosopher says, 2, *Rhetorica*,[[2]](#endnote-2) that to love is to wish for someone what one thinks is good, for his sake, not one’s own.

Again, a friend is one who loves and who is loved by these suppositions. It is necessary that a friend rejoices with one in good things, and sorrows with one in sad things, just as it was with David and Jonathan. But here it is to be noted that Jonathan in one thing was lacking in the law of friendship, because he lied to his father because of David, 1 Kings 20[:1-3], when he excused his absence.

Wherefore, Valerius, *De gestis memorabilium*, book six,[[3]](#endnote-3) swears about the magistrate Rutilius who, when he denied the unjust petition of a friend, he heard from that one, What profits me your friendship, if what I ask, you do not do? To whom the other one replied, What profits me your friendship, if because of you I do something temporary and as a benefaction? Therefore Aristotle, first book, *Ethics,[[4]](#endnote-4)* spoke well, Socrates is my friend, but truth is a better friend. Wherefore also Abraham after his contracted friendship with Abimelech blamed him, Gen. 21[:22-25]. And Ambrose,[[5]](#endnote-5) those whom love joins either it makes similar or shapes them so. Again, Zeno the Philosopher,[[6]](#endnote-6) truth is to be cultivated which alone makes men next to God. Therefore, the Lord, Exod. 4[:12], among the first things which he commanded, he said to his people, “Beware you never join in friendship with the inhabitants of that land, which may be your ruin.” Because of this the Lord seized the king of Juda, Josephat, through the prophet because he contracted friendships with Achab, the reprobate king of Israel, as is evident in 2 Paral. 19[:2]. Wherefore Augustine,[[7]](#endnote-7) He is not a friend to you who wants to make you an enemy to God.

Again, in *Epistola ad Macedonio*,[[8]](#endnote-8) no one can be a truer friend of man, unless first he was a friend of the truth. Wherefore Augustine, *On the City of God*, book 12, chapter 18,[[9]](#endnote-9) for the body is borne by its gravity, as the spirit by love. Wherefore, Quintilian, in the book *De causis*, chapter 8,[[10]](#endnote-10) No one is found in human affairs who has thought of a more distinguished nature than love. For what would be happier to humankind if all could be friends. For then wars, seditions, thefts and quarrels would cease. And Boethius, *On the Consolation of Philosophy*, prose 5,[[11]](#endnote-11) friendship which is not acquired by virtue but by fortune, through misfortune will be converted to an enemy. Again, the true friend is tested more in adverse times than in prosperous, Eccli. 37[:1], in all friendships “there is only a friend in name.”

Wherefore Boethius, *On the Consolation of Philosophy*, prose 8,[[12]](#endnote-12) adverse fortune is more beneficial to men than prosperous fortune. Because adversity distinguishes the true friends from the flatterers. This is evident in Lam. 1[:2]: “All her friends have despised her,” in straitened times. Wherefore, Gregory, in the book *Moralia*,[[13]](#endnote-13) for when a man in a prosperous condition is beloved, it is very doubtful whether his good fortune or the individual be the object of love. But the loss of prosperity puts to the test the force of the affection.” Where, one who deserts his neighbor is attacked, because he has not loved his neighbor, Eccli. 6[:10]: “There is a friend a companion at the table.” Wherefore it is to be noted here that there is a triple kind of friends. For there is the friend of the table, the superficial, and the real.

¶ Concerning the first it is said in Eccli. 6[:10]: “There is a friend a companion at the table, and he will not abide in the day of distress.” Wherefore Chrysostom, *Super Epistolam ad Hebreos*,[[14]](#endnote-14) to eat and drink together does not make a true friendship. In fact, thieves and homicides have such a friendship, but if we truly take care in consoling or correcting, we are truly friends. Such a friend of the table can well be called dear which is while he eats well. He promises he will be a friend to the spirit and that he will labor well in the divine office, but when he is carried to the divine office, but when he is carried to penitence, he is recalcitrant and murmuring. Wherefore this is the voice of the soul, I have the miserable flesh of my companions, namely, my flesh with me, for, it wants to reign, but it does not want to labor with me. Such ones today are carnal neighbors who while it is well for them, they predict all things to hold up the same, according to that of the Psal. [48:19]: “He will praise you when you shall do well to him,” but when the benefactor dies or suffers adversities, he is handed over to oblivion and another is loved in his place.

¶ The second friend is nominal or superficial, who promises a thousand things, but does nothing. Such a one is the world, who in life gives him anything, but in death takes away everything, Eccli. 31[:1]: “That is only a friend in name.”

¶ The third friend is real, that is, true. But that one is proven better in adversity than in prosperity, because in prosperity it is not known whether it is fortune or the person who is loved, Eccli. 12[:8]: “A friend shall not be known in prosperity.” Thence said Seneca,[[15]](#endnote-15) when he saw the great crowd follow Dionysius the tyrant, the crows followed the cadavers, the wolves followed the bodies, the ants followed the grains, the flies followed the honey, but this crowd did not follow him as a man, but as prey, Prov. 14[:20], They are friends while we are in abundance, but in adversity only the true friend puts himself and all his goods at our disposal. For example, when there is a great hunger, a man will strip himself down to his shirt, thus where there is great hunger for love in a lover, he will ruin himself in all things by which he can help his beloved, Eccli. 6[:15]: “Nothing can be compared to a faithful friend.” The figure is in Jonathan who stripped himself and gave everything to David, even down to his girdle at the time of his persecution, 1 Kings 20[:40-43]. When therefore Christ has done so many and so great things for us freely, it is just that we return our love freely. And thus, that member is introduced, as a tactile sign that love of man is pleasing to God. Wherefore Augustine, book 8, *The Confessions*, c. 6,[[16]](#endnote-16) friendship of an earthly commander is something fragile in which through many dangers it leads forth to a greater danger. But if I wish to be the friend of God, behold now I am become so.

Again, Bernard,[[17]](#endnote-17) I am a miser as far as I owe love to my God, who made me when I was nothing, who redeemed me when I would have perished. He descended to be subject to death, he assumed our mortality, he sustained death, and thus he redeemed himself from death. Therefore, I will restore to him what I do not have, what will I repay unless that I love him. “Who has loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood,” Apoc. 1[:5]. And therefore “not as though we had loved God, but because he has first loved us,” 1 John 4[:19]. For just as the heat of the fire among all qualities is greatest of first acts and more inclines a thing for acting, thus love which in Sacred Scripture is compared to fire.

Wherefore Chrysostom *Super Mattheum*, homily 24,[[18]](#endnote-18) that just as there is a humor in grass and trees, this is love in men. According to Aristotle, 6, *De animalibus*, first chapter,[[19]](#endnote-19) eggs do not produce pullets without the color of the parent residing in them. Thus spiritually no person in the nest of the church is without the heat of charity sent into them by God the parent, [1] John 3[:15]: “He that loves not, abides in death,” on account of which Mary died through sin, and through love she came back to life, Luke 7[:47]: “Many sins are forgiven her, because she has loved much.” Hugh, *De archa Noe*,[[20]](#endnote-20) asks, How can a man arrive to the honor of God since man cannot know me here? And he responds, Man who wants to know the customs and secrets of another, makes himself familiar to him, and converses in his house. The house in which God is freely conversant is our soul.

Wherefore he says, in the same place,[[21]](#endnote-21) between the love of God and the love of the world there is a difference because in the beginning the love of the world is sweet, but it seems to have a bitter end. But the love of God begins from bitterness, such as through penitential works, but it ends in sweetness which is shown in parable, John 2[:10]: “Every man at first sets forth good wine, and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse.” Because concerning the love of the world it is asked, “But you have kept the good wine until now,” [John 2:10]. Because concerning the love of God one asks, according to Gregory in a *Homilia*,[[22]](#endnote-22) love if it is not idle, but it is great, and works great things according to the effect. Wherefore it is to be known that the love of God and of the world is similar. In man they cannot remain since they are contrary to each other, [1] John 2[:15]: “If any man loves the world, the charity of the Father is not in him.” However, many say they love God, but the deed denies it, Psal. [77:36]: “They loved him with their mouth.” But if we wished to know the truth, note that that in which man is more joyful and delighted, that he loves more.

Wherefore Macrobius relates in the *Saturnalia*,[[23]](#endnote-23) that a certain knight having a suspected wife consulted a certain experienced cleric. He however sitting down with the wife at the table touched her pulse, which while there was talk about her lover it was much moved. When in truth it was about her own husband it was quiet.

¶ Morally the knight is Christ; the wife is the soul, which sometimes loves the world more than Christ. The sign of which is if there is talk of Christ the hearers grow tepid, if it is of the world they awake and applaud.

Wherefore, it is read in the *Vitae Patrum*,[[24]](#endnote-24) when a certain abbot spoke about heavenly things, the fellow brothers slept, when in truth he spoke about temporal things they were awake and laughing. And then pigs were seen to run about among them.

Wherefore also lovers of the world are like a fish which is called *carnicus* whose nature is that in saltwater it is happy and well. In sweet water in truth it turns up its belly as if dead until it goes back to saltwater. Thus, do many while they are turned in solicitude for earthly matter, which, according to Boethius, *De consolatione*,[[25]](#endnote-25) “the joy of human happiness is shot through with bitterness.” However, in the divine words they taste no flavor, and this is to turn up the belly, that is, through the belly they excuse themselves that they did not hear the discourse but had to hurry off to breakfast. He has gone through many days for speaking, it is time for breakfasting, against which, Philip. 3[:19]: “Whose God is their belly.”

¶ Concerning these temporal matters thus it is that the eye existing in one and gazing at heavenly things that indicate how small they would be; the cause is on account of the great distance from them, thus one who would be in the highest, the earthly things indicate that they would be small. Thus, it is concerning the lovers of the world and the lovers of heaven. Concerning the first, it is said in [1] Cor. 2[:14]: “But the sensual man perceives not these things that are of the Spirit of God.” Concerning the others, it is said in Philip. 3[:8]: “I count all things to be but as dung.”

¶ The third love, just as it was touched on above, is said to be unnatural or insane when a creature is loved more than the creator. Concerning which Wisdom 15[:6]: “The lovers of evil things deserve to have” death. This happens to many in many ways. For some love temporal riches too much, just as the dropsical loves drink, the firewood, Eccle. 5[:9]: “He that loves riches shall reap no fruit from them.” And Eccli. 10[:10]: “There is not a more wicked thing than to love money.” Others love carnal delights, just as the old, rubbing, those having a fever, for wine, [Prov. 21:17]: “He that loves good cheer, shall be in want: he that loves wine,” etc. [2] Tim. 3[:4]: “Lovers of pleasures more than of God.” Thus, Amnon evilly loved his sister Tamar, 2 Kings 13[:20]. And concerning the blind carnal love, it is treated in the verse:[[26]](#endnote-26) Every love is blind; love is not an equal judge; for misshapen cattle it judges to be beautiful.

¶ Others love temporal honors just as smoke seeks ascent, Matt. 23[:6]: “They love the first places in the synagogues.” This worldly love contracts rather than pours out because, according to Dionisius, *De Dei nominibus*,[[27]](#endnote-27) “it is not a true love, but an idol of love or a fall from true love.” For it does not broaden itself, but rather whatsoever it loves it turns back to its own utility, to have a companion, a fellow lover, or a fellow love. It does not care lest it seem to lose anything of utility. Against which Richard of Saint Victor, book three, *De Trinitate*, chapter 11,[[28]](#endnote-28) “in mutual love there is nothing rarer or clearer than by that one whom you love the best, and by that one whom you are loved the best, you wish the other to be loved equally. To this deed that Valerius narrates in *De gestis memorialibus,* book four,[[29]](#endnote-29) concerning the two friends Damon and Pythias, of whom one, when Dionysius the tyrant wanted to put him to death, they petitioned from him a truce, so that he could first put in order his affairs at home, which he could not obtain, unless one of the companions would give himself as bail for the return of his companion. In truth the day was set and there was no doubt he would do it. However, with the preset day approaching, nor was he returning, all judged the rash sponsor worthy of death. He, in truth, not distrusting the place taken for his friend, the hour set down that he would be drawn to his death came around. However, the tyrant marveling over the fidelity of the friendship, in any case remitted the death penalty, and asked if he might receive a third degree of their sodality.
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24. *Vitae Patrum, Verba Seniorum* 3.36 (PL 73.762): Fuit quidam vir magnus de sanctis senioribus, cui talem gratiam donaverat Christus, revelante ei Spiritu sancto, ut videret quod alii non videbant (Joan., libell. I, n. 3). Referebant ergo sancti seniores quia aliquando quamplurimi sedebant fratres, et simul loquebantur inter se, et conferebant de sanctis Scripturis quae ad salutem pertinent animarum. Stabant autem circa eos sancti angeli laetantes in hilari vultu, considerantes, delectabantur enim de eloquiis Domini. Cum autem aliud quodcunque inter se loquerentur, statim sancti angeli recedebant longius, indignantes contra eos; veniebant autem porci sordidissimi et morbo pleni, et volutabant se inter eos; daemones enim in specie porcorum delectabantur [Col.0762D] per superflua et vaniloquia eorum. [↑](#endnote-ref-24)
25. Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiae* 2 prosa 4 (PL 63.684): Quam multis amaritudinibus humanae felicitatis dulcedo respersa est! quae si etiam fruenti jucunda esse videatur, tamen, quo minus, cum velit, abeat, retineri non possit. [↑](#endnote-ref-25)
26. Samuel Singer, *Thesaurus proverbiorum medii aevi* # 390, 391 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998), 7:425: Omnis amor cecus; non est amor arbiter equus; nam deforme pecus iudicat esse decus. [↑](#endnote-ref-26)
27. Dionysius, *De divinis nominibus* 4.12 (PG 3:710): ...qui non est verus amore, sed imago, vel potius lapsus a vero amore

    Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Commentary on Dionysius, De Divinis Nominibus*, c ap. 4. lec. 9 (§ 12, 166): qui non est verus amor, sed idolum aut magis, casus a vero amore. [↑](#endnote-ref-27)
28. Richard of St. Victor, *De Trinitate* 3.11 (PL 196.922): in mutuo siquidem amore, multumque fervente nihil rarius, nihil praeclarius quam ut ab eo quem summe diligis, et a quo summe diligeris, alium aeque diligi velis. [↑](#endnote-ref-28)
29. Valerius Maximus, *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* 4.7.ext.1, (LCL 492:420-424): Haeret animus in domesticis, sed aliena quoque bene facta referre Romanae urbis candor hortatur. Damon et Phintias Pythagoricae prudentiae sacris initiati tam fidelem inter se amicitiam iunxerant, ut, cum alterum ex his Dionysius Syracusanus interficere vellet, atque is tempus ab eo, quo prius quam periret domum profectus res suas ordinaret, impetravisset, alter vadem se pro reditu eius tyranno dare non dubitaret. solutus erat periculo mortis qui modo gladio cervices subiectas habuerat: eidem caput suum subiecerat cui securo vivere licebat. igitur omnes et in primis Dionysius novae atque ancipitis rei exitum speculabantur. adpropinquante deinde finita die nec illo redeunte unus quisque stultitiae tam temerarium sponsorem damnabat. at is nihil se de amici constantia metuere praedicabat. eodem autem momento et hora a Dionysio constituta et eam qui acceperat supervenit. admiratus amborum animum tyrannus supplicium fidei remisit insuperque eos rogavit ut se in societatem amicitiae tertium sodalicii gradum mutua culturum benivolentia reciperent. hascine vires amicitiae? mortis contemptum ingenerare, vitae dulcedinem extinguere, crudelitatem mansuefacere, odium in amorem convertere, poenam beneficio pensare potuerunt. quibus paene tantum venerationis quantum deorum inmortalium caerimoniis debetur: illis enim publica salus, his privata continetur, atque ut illarum aedes sacra domicilia, harum fida hominum pectora quasi quaedam sancto spiritu referta templa sunt. [↑](#endnote-ref-29)