

Marian Library Studies

Volume 13 *Volume 13/14 (1981-1982)*
Combined Volume

Article 5

1-1-1981

Research on the Biblical Approach and the Method of Exegesis Appearing in the Greek Homiletic Texts of the Late Fourth Centuries, Emphasizing the Incarnation Especially the Nativity and Mary's Place Within It

Bertrand Buby
University of Dayton, bbuby1@udayton.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ml_studies



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Buby, Bertrand (1981) "Research on the Biblical Approach and the Method of Exegesis Appearing in the Greek Homiletic Texts of the Late Fourth Centuries, Emphasizing the Incarnation Especially the Nativity and Mary's Place Within It," *Marian Library Studies*: Vol. 13, Article 5, Pages 223-394.

Available at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ml_studies/vol13/iss1/5

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Marian Library Publications at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Marian Library Studies by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

MARIAN LIBRARY STUDIES

A NEW SERIES

VOLUME 13-14 (1981-82) 223-394

Doctoral Dissertation Presented at the International Marian Research Institute
(Pontifical Theological Faculty Marianum)

I

BERTRAND BUBY, S.M.

RESEARCH ON THE BIBLICAL APPROACH
AND THE METHOD OF EXEGESIS
APPEARING IN THE GREEK HOMILETIC TEXTS
OF THE LATE FOURTH
AND EARLY FIFTH CENTURIES,
EMPHASIZING THE INCARNATION
ESPECIALLY THE NATIVITY
AND MARY'S PLACE WITHIN IT

Part of the Doctoral Dissertation in Sacred Theology
with Specialization in Marian Studies



UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
DAYTON OHIO

1981-82

Vidimus et approbamus.

Dayton (Ohio), ex aedibus Instituti
« International Marian Research Institute, »
et Romae, ex aedibus Pontificiae
Facultatis Theologicae Marianum.

Nomina Revisorum

March 1, 1986

Théodore A. Kochler, S.M.

March 8, 1986

Giorgio M. Francini, O.S.M.

MARIAN LIBRARY STUDIES Volume 13-14 December 1981-82

CONTENTS :

- L'omelia sulla generazione di Cristo di Basilio di Cesarea. Il posto della Vergine Maria *Luigi Gambero, S.M.* 1
- Research on the Biblical Approach and the Method of Exegesis Appearing in the Greek Homiletic Texts of the Late Fourth and Early Fifth Centuries, Emphasizing the Incarnation Especially the Nativity and Mary's Place within It (Excerpts) *Bertrand Buby, S.M.* 223
- La dévotion mariale au XVI^e siècle à la lumière des Manuels de Catéchèse en usage en Amérique Latine, en France, en Espagne et en Italie *Jean-Marie Salgado, O.M.I.* 397
- Exégèse, tradition, catéchèse
Conclusions (in English) *Théodore Kochler, S.M.* 633

TABLE OF CONTENTS

** In preparing this dissertation for publication, it was decided to omit Chapters I and II and parts of the introductory materials. The original complete Table of Contents is, however, presented here.*

SITUATING THE RESEARCH: STATUS QUAESTIONIS

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I: THE BEGINNING AND DEVELOPMENT OF EXEGESIS INTO THE LATE FOURTH CENTURY

- Section I: Jewish Exegesis, Midrash
- Section II: The Septuagint
- Section III: Philo
- Section IV: The Epistle of Barnabas—An Early Christian Apologetic
- Section V: Clement of Alexandria
- Section VI: Origen
- Section VII: Ignatius of Antioch: Eastern Beginnings
- Section VIII: Polycarp: Beginnings of Antiochene Exegesis
- Section IX: Clement of Rome
- Section X: Justin
- Section XI: Irenaeus of Lyon
- Section XII: Summary and Conclusion

CHAPTER II: A STUDY OF THE BIBLICAL PRINCIPLES AND METHODS IN TEXTS RELATING TO THE INCARNATION AND MARY'S ROLE WITHIN THE MYSTERY OF CHRIST'S BIRTH FROM 350 A.D. to 430 A.D.

The Cappadocians' Method of Scriptural Exegesis in Their Incarnational Homilies

The Biblical Principles and Methods of John Chrysostom

Theodore of Mopsuestia: His Principles of Exegesis

The Jerusalemites: Cyril of Jerusalem and Hesychius

CHAPTER III: ORCHESTRATION OF BIBLICAL TEXTS USED BY THE
FATHERS IN THEIR NATIVITY HOMILIES: THE ROLE OF
MARY WITHIN THE TEXTS

Part I: 1. Amphilochius

2. Basil the Great

3. Gregory of Nyssa

4. Gregory of Nazianzen

5. John Chrysostom

6. Cyril of Jerusalem

7. Hesychius of Jerusalem

Part II: Hesychius: Study of Texts within Hypapante II

Part III: Origen and Basil: A Comparative / Contrast Study of
Scriptural Texts

Part IV: Amphilochius and Hesychius: Commentary on Ezekiel
44:2

Part V: Amphilochius, Gregory of Nyssa and Hesychius: Com-
mentary on Exodus 3:2: The Burning Bush

Part VI: Excursus on Liturgical Setting of the Homilies

CHAPTER IV: THE USE OF THE SCRIPTURES AND MARIAN IMPLICATIONS
IN THE HOMILIES AND WRITINGS OF THE FATHERS

Part I: On the Virginity of Mary

The Cappadocians

The Antiochenes

The Jerusalemites

Part II: Mary's Role in the Soteriological

Purpose of the Incarnation

The Cappadocians

The Antiochenes

The Jerusalemites

Part III: Typology: Parallelism of: Adam/Christ — Eve/Mary
The Cappadocians
The Antiochenes
The Jerusalemites

CONCLUSIONS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

*** A Table of Contents for the thesis material actually published here is provided at the end of this section, along with the pertinent Indices.*

Rev. Bertrand Buby, S.M. — Born in Braddock, Pennsylvania on June 18, 1934. Ordained to priesthood on March 14, 1964, and received STL (University of Fribourg, Switzerland) in 1964. Studied for Licentiate in Sacred Scripture (Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome) and received SSL in 1966; awarded STD by the International Marian Research Institute (University of Dayton: affiliated branch of Pontifical Theological Faculty Marianum, Rome) in January 1980. Assignments: instructor (University of Dayton, Wright State University, Siena Heights College), 1967-77; assistant professor (University of Dayton), 1977-81; teacher for Archdiocesan Program in Lay Pastoral Ministry, 1977-80. Currently: Provincial Superior, Marianists of Cincinnati Province (1981-); faculty member of the International Marian Research Institute (University of Dayton, 1980-).

ABBREVIATIONS

ALANDGNT	<i>The Greek New Testament</i> , ed. by K. ALAND et al. (2nd ed. Wurttemberg Bible Society, 1968).
ALTANER	B. ALTANER, <i>Patrology</i> , tr. by H. Graef from 5th German ed. (New York, 1961).
AnalBoll	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i> (Brussels, 1882-).
AncChrWr	<i>Ancient Christian Writers</i> , ed. by J. QUASTEN et al. (Westminster, Md.—London, 1946-).
ANCL	<i>The Ante-Nicene Christian Library</i> , ed. by A. ROBERTS and J. DONALDSON, 24 v. (Edinburgh, 1866-72); suppl. v., ed. by A. MENZIES (Edinburgh, 1897).
ANF	<i>The Ante-Nicene Fathers</i> . American reprint of Edinburgh ed., rev. by A. CLEVELAND COXE. 8 v. with suppl. by A. MENZIES (v. 9) and A. CLEVELAND COXE (v. 10). (Buffalo, 1884-86).
ARNDT-GINGRICH	W. F. ARNDT and F. W. GINGRICH (trs. and eds.), <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , tr. and adapt. of W. BAUER's <i>Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch . . .</i> (4th ed., Chicago, 1957).
BAC	Biblioteca de autores cristianos (Madrid, 1945-).
BARDENHEWER	O. BARDENHEWER, <i>Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur</i> , 5 v. (Freiburg, 1913-32).
BEM	<i>Bulletin de la Société Française d'Études Mariales or Études Mariales</i> (Paris, 1935-).
BHG	<i>Bibliotheca hagiographica Graeca</i> , ed. by F. HALKIN, 3 v. (Brussels, 1957).
BHG-Auctarium	<i>Bibliotheca hagiographica Graeca-Auctarium</i> , ed. by F. HALKIN (Brussels, 1969).
<i>Biblica</i>	<i>Biblica</i> (Rome, 1920-).
BiblPatr	<i>Biblia Patristica</i> , ed. by J. ALLENBACH, A. BENOIT, D. A. BERTRAND, A. HAURIOT-FOUSTET, P. MARAVAL, A. PAUTLER, P. PRIGENT. V. 1, <i>Des</i>

- origines à Clément d'Alexandrie et Tertullien* (Paris, 1975). V. 2, *Le troisième siècle (Origène excepté)* (Paris, 1977).
- BiblioPatr *Bibliographia Patristica* (Berlin : DeGruyter, 1956- ; v. 1 appeared in 1959).
- BKV *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter* (Kempten, 1911-).
- CCG *Corpus Christianorum. Series graeca* (Brepols-Turnhout, Belgium, 1978-).
- ChrCent¹ J. DANIELOU and H. I. MARROU, *The First Six Hundred Years*, tr. by V. Cronin, v. 1 of *The Christian Centuries* (New York, 1964).
- CMP *Corpus Marianum Patristicum*, ed. by S. ALVAREZ CAMPOS, v. I- (Burgos, 1970-).
- CPG *Clavis Patrum graecorum*, ed. by M. GEERARD (Turnhout, 1974-): I (1983), II (1974), III (1979), IV (1980).
- CPL *Clavis Patrum latinorum*, ed. by E. DEKKERS (2d ed., Steenbrugge, 1961).
- CSCO *Corpus scriptorum Christianorum orientalium* (Paris-Louvain, 1903-).
- CSEL *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum* (Vienna, 1866-).
- DB *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, ed. by F. VIGOUROUX, 5 v. (Paris, 1895-1912).
- DBSuppl *Dictionnaire de la Bible, suppl.*, ed. by L. PIROT et al. (Paris, 1928-).
- De Primordiis* *De Primordiis Cultus Mariani. Acta Congressus Mariologici-Mariani Internationalis*, 1967. Vols. I-VI. Ed. Pontificiae Academiae Marianae Internationalis (Rome).
- DicBibTh *Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, ed. by X. LÉON-DUFOUR, 2nd ed., rev. and enl. (New York, 1973).
- DHGE *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, ed. by A. BAUDRILLART et al. (Paris, 1912-).
- DSP *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique. Doctrine et histoire*, ed. by M. VILLER et al. (Paris, 1932-).

- DTC *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, ed. by A. VACANT et al., 15 v. (Paris, 1903-50; Tables générales, 3 v., 1951-1972).
- EHRHARD A. EHRHARD, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jh.* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1937-52); vols. 50, 51, 52, of TU.
- EnchMar D. CASAGRANDE, *Enchiridion Marianum Biblicum Patristicum* (Rome, 1974).
- EnchP M. J. ROUET DE JOURNEL, *Enchiridion Patristicum* (Barcelona: Herder, 1959).
- Epektasis *Epektasis. Mélanges Patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*, ed. by J. FONTAINE and Ch. KANNENGIESSER (Paris, 1972).
- EphM *Ephemerides Mariologicae* (Madrid, 1951-).
- ETHL *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* (Bruges, 1924-).
- FathCh *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*, ed. by R. J. DEFERRARI et al. (New York, 1947-60; Washington, 1961-).
- GCS *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* (Berlin, 1897-).
- HATCH-REDPATH E. HATCH and H. REDPATH, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*, 2 v. (Oxford, 1892-97; suppl. 1900-06; repr. Graz, 1954).
- ITQ *The Irish Theological Quarterly* (Dublin, 1906-22, 1951-).
- JB *The Jerusalem Bible*, Eng. ed. by A. JONES (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966).
- JBC *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, ed. by R. E. BROWN, J. A. FITZMYER, and R. E. MURPHY, 2 v. in 1 (Englewood Cliffs, N. J. 1968).
- JewEnc *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, ed. by J. SINGER, 13 v. (New York, 1901-06).
- LAMPE *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, ed. by G. W. H. LAMPE (Oxford-New York, 1976).

- LexChIk *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie*, 8 v. Vols. 1-4 ed. by E. KIRSCHBAUM et al., and vols. 5-8 ed. by W. BRAUNFELS et al.: *Ikonographie der Heiligen* (Rome-Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 1968-1976).
- LexThK² *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. by J. HOFER and K. RAHNER, 10 v. (2d, new ed., Freiburg 1957-65); suppl., *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil: Dokumente und Kommentare*, ed. by H. S. BRECHTER et al., pt. 1 (1966).
- LIDDELL-SCOTT H. G. LIDDELL and R. A. SCOTT, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Rev. and aug. by H. S. JONES and R. MCKENZIE, 9th ed. (Oxford, 1940).
- MANSI J. D. MANSI, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio* (Paris, 1889-1927).
- Maria (DU MANOIR) J. DU MANOIR, *Maria. Études sur la Sainte Vierge*, 8 v. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1949-1971).
- Maria in S. Scr. *Maria in Sacra Scriptura*. Acta Congressus Internationalis Mariologici-Mariani, 1965. Vols. I-VI. Ed. Pontificiae Academiae Marianae Internationalis. (Rome).
- MéISR *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* (Lille, 1944-).
- MLS *Marian Library Studies* (Marian Library, University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio; New Series: 1969-).
- NCEnc *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 15 v., 2 suppl.: v. 16, 17 (New York, 1967).
- NIDictNT *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, ed. C. BROWN, 3 v. (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1975-78). (Original German: *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*, ed. by L. COENEN et al.).
- OChP *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* (Romae, 1935-).
- OxfordDict *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. by F. L. CROSS (London: Oxford University Press, 1966).
- PG *Patrologia Graeca*, ed. by J. P. MIGNE, 217 v., indexes 4 v. (Paris, 1857-66).

- PO *Patrologia Orientalis*, ed. by R. GRAFFIN and F. NAU (Paris, 1903-).
- QUASTEN J. QUASTEN, *Patrology*, 3 v. (Westminster, Md., 1950-).
- RAHLFS A. RAHLFS, *Septuaginta*, 2v. 7th ed. (Stuttgart: Württembergischen Bibelanstalt, 1962).
- RB *Revue biblique* (Paris, 1892-).
- RBén *Revue Bénédictine* (Maredsous, 1884-).
- RechScRel *Recherches de science religieuse* (Paris, 1910-).
- RHE *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* (Louvain, 1900-).
- ROBERT-TRICOT A. ROBERT and A. TRICOT, *Guide to the Bible*, tr. by E. P. ARBEZ and M. P. MCGUIRE, 2 v. (Tournai-New York, 1951-55; v. 1, rev. and enl., 1960).
- RSPT *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* (Paris, 1907-).
- RThAM *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* (Louvain, 1929-).
- SC *Sources chrétiennes*, ed. by H. DE LUBAC and J. DANÉLOU (Paris, 1942-).
- SelectLibNicPNic A *Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. by P. SCHAFF, 14 v. (New York, 1886-1900; reprtd.: Grand Rapids, Mich., 1952ff.); 2d series, ed. by P. SCHAFF and H. WACE, 14 v. (1890-1900; reprtd.: Grand Rapids, Mich., 1979).
- STRACK-BILLERBECK H. L. STRACK and P. BILLERBECK, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, 2 v. (München: C. H. Beck, 1969).
- ThWKittel G. KITTEL, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 10 v. (Stuttgart, 1933-78).
- ThWKittel (Eng) G. KITTEL, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, tr. and ed. by G. W. Bromiley, 10 v. (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1964-76).
- TU *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* (Berlin, 1882-).
- Virgo Immaculata *Virgo Immaculata*. Acta Congressus Internationalis Mariologici-Mariani, 1954. Vols. I-XVIII. Ed. Pontificia Academiae Marianae Internationalis (Rome).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABRAMOWSKI, L. "Zur Theologie Theodors von Mopsuestia." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 72 (1961) 263-293.
- ACKROYD, P. R. and C. F. EVANS, eds. *From the Beginnings to Jerome*. Vol. I of *The Cambridge History of the Bible* (3 vols., 1963-70). Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- ALAND, K. *The Problem of the New Testament Canon*. London, 1962.
- *Saints and Sinners: Men and Ideas in the Early Church*. Philadelphia, 1970.
- *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*. Stuttgart, 1964.
- ALDAMA, J. A. DE. *Maria en la patristica de los siglos I y II*. BAC, 1970.
- "La tragedia Christus patiens y la doctrina Mariana en la Capadocia del siglo IV." *Epektasis*, pp. 417-423.
- *Virgo Mater. Estudios de teologia patristica*. Biblioteca Teologica Granadina, 7. Granada: Facultad de Teologia, 1963.
- ALONSO, J. M. "La espada de Simeon en la exegesis de los Padres." *Maria in S. Scr.* IV: 183-285.
- AMAND, D. "A propos d'une édition 'princeps'." *RBén* 62 (1972) 300-301 (related to S. Y. Rudberg's article: *ibid.*, pp. 184-200).
- "Une homélie grecque inédite antinestorienne du V^e siècle sur l'Incarnation du Seigneur." *RBén* 58 (1948) 223-263.
- AMAND DE MENDIETA, E. "La tradition manuscrite des œuvres de saint Basile." *RHE* 49 (1954) 507-521.
- AMANN, E. "Théodore de Mopsueste." *DTC* XV: 235-279 (1943).
- AMPHILOCHIOS. *Amphilochii Iconiensis Opera*. Edited by C. DATEMA. CCG 3 (1978).
- ARISTEAS. *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate*. Edited by A. PELLETIER, S.J. SC 89 (1962).
- ARNOU, R. "Platonisme des Pères." *DTC* XII: 2258-2392 (1934).
- ASHBY, G. W. *Theodoret of Cyrhus as Exegete of the Old Testament*. Grahamstown: Rhodes University Publications, 1972.
- ATHANASIOS. *Contra Gentes et De Incarnatione*. Edited by R. THOMSON. Oxford Early Christian Texts, XXXVI. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.
- AUBINEAU, M. *Codices Chrysostomici Graeci: I Britanniae et Hiberniae*. Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. Codices Chrysostomici Graeci: Documents, Études et Répertoires publiés par l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes, XIII. CNRS 15. Paris: 1968.
- *Recherches Patristiques. Textes inédits. Études par M. Aubineau. Enquêtes sur des manuscrits*. Edited by Adolf M. HAKKERT. Amsterdam, 1974.

- AUDET, J. P. *La Didachè: Instructions des Apôtres*. Thèse, Paris, 1958.
- ed. *La Didachè: Instructions des Apôtres* (texte et traduction). Paris: Gabalda, 1958.
- BAGATTI, P. Bellarmino, O.F.M. *L'Église de la Gentilité en Palestine*. 1^{er}. XI^e siècle. Jerusalem, 1968.
- BALTHASAR, H. Urs von. *Herrlichkeit. Eine theologische Ästhetik*. 3 vols. Einsiedeln, 1961-69.
- BARDENHEWER, O. *Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Literatur*. Vol. 2. 2nd ed. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1913.
- *Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Literatur*. Vol. 3. Freiburg im Breisgau, Deutschland: Herder, 1923. (Reprint: Darmstadt, 1962.)
- BARDY, G. "Amphiloque." DSp 1: 544 (1957).
- "Basile de Césarée." DHGE 6: 1111 (1932).
- "Basile (Saint) évêque de Césarée de Cappadoce." DSp 1: 1273 (1935).
- "Le Concile d'Antioche (379)." RBén 45 (1933) 196-213.
- "Cyrille de Jérusalem." DSp 2: 2683-2687 (1953); and DHGE 13: 1181-1185 (1956).
- "L'exégèse patristique." In *Initiation Biblique*, edited by ROBERT and TRICOT, Paris, 1939. Translation in ROBERT-TRICOT I: 694-707.
- "Faux et Fraudes littéraires dans l'antiquité chrétienne." RHE 32 (1936) 5-23, 275-302.
- "Interprétation. Exégèse patristique." DBSuppl IV: 569-591.
- "Lucien d'Antioche (Saint)." DTC IX: 1024-1031 (1926).
- "Origène." DTC XI: 1489-1565 (1931).
- *Recherches sur St. Lucien d'Antioche et son école*. Paris, 1936.
- "St. Jean Chrysostome." DTC VIII: 660-690 (1924).
- BAREILLE, G. "Amphilochius d'Iconium." DTC I: 421-423 (1902).
- BARJEAN, K. P. de. *L'École Exégétique d'Antioche*. Paris, 1898.
- BASIL OF CAESAREA, Saint. *Exegetic Homilies of the Fathers of the Church*. Translated by A. C. Way. FathCh 46. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1963.
- *Letters*. Translated by A. C. Way. FathCh 28. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1955.
- *Opera Omnia*: PG 29, 30, 31, 32.
- BATE, H. N. "Some Technical Terms of Greek Exegesis." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 24 (1923) 59-66.
- BAUR, C. "Chrysostomus de Sacerdotio." *Theologie und Glaube* 18 (1926) 569-576.
- *Initia Patrum Graecorum*. 2 vols. Studi e Testi, 180-181. Vatican, 1955.
- *John Chrysostom and His Time*. Translated by Sr. M. Gonzaga. 2 vols. Westminster, Maryland, 1960-1961.
- *S. Jean Chrysostome et ses œuvres dans l'histoire littéraire*. Paris: Louvain, 1907.
- "S. Jérôme et S. Jean Chrysostome." RBén 23 (1906) 430-436.
- BEA, A. "L'Enciclica 'Humani Generis' e gli Studi Biblici." *La Civiltà Cattolica* 101 (1950) 417-430.

- BECKMANN, J. H. "Status doctrinae mariologicae ante Ephesinum conciliūque influxus in pietatem marianam subsequentem." *De primordiis* II: 281-292
- BENNET, M. Chr. "Mary, the Fathers, and the Bible." *Bible Today* 27 (1966) 1900-1905.
- BENOÎT, A. *St. Grégoire de Nazianze. Sa vie, ses œuvres, et son époque.* 2 vols. 2nd ed. Paris, 1885.
- BERNARDI, J. *La Prédication des Pères Cappadociens.* Paris, 1968.
- La Bible et les Pères.* Colloque de Strasbourg, 1-3 octobre, 1969. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1971.
- BICKERSTETH, E. "John Chrysostom and the Early History of the Hypapante." *Studi Bizantini e Neellenici* 8 (1953) 401-404.
- BLACK, M. and H. H. ROWLEY. *Peake's Commentary on the Bible.* London, 1964.
- BLASS, F. and A. DE BRUNNER. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Translated by R. W. Funk. Chicago, 1961.
- BLINZLER, J. *Die Brüder und Schwestern Jesu.* Stuttgart, 1967.
- BLOCH, R. "Midrash." *DBSuppl* V: 1263-1281 (1957).
- BONSDORFF, Max von. *Zur Predigtätigkeit des Johannes Chrysostomus. Biographisch - Chronologische Studien über seine Homilienserien zu neutestamentlichen Büchern.* Helsinki, 1922.
- BONSIRVEN, J. "Interprétation (Histoire de) — 1. Exégèse juive." *DBSuppl* IV: 561-569 (1949).
- "Jewish Exegesis." *ROBERT-TRICOT* I: 684-693 (1960).
- BOTTE, B. *Les Origines de la Noël et de l'Épiphanie.* Études historiques. Textes et études liturgiques. Louvain: Abbaye du Mont César, 1932.
- BOULARAND, E. *La nécessité de la grâce pour arriver à la foi d'après saint Jean Chrysostome.* *Analecta Gregoriana*, 18. 1939.
- BOUYER, L. *The Meaning of Holy Scripture.* Notre Dame, 1958.
- *The Spirituality of the New Testament and the Fathers.* Vol. I of *A History of Christian Spirituality.* New York: Desclée Co., 1963. Translated by Mary P. Ryan from the French *La spiritualité du Nouveau Testament et des Pères.* Paris, 1960.
- BROU, L. "Saint Grégoire de Nazianze et l'antienne 'Mirabile Mysterium' des Laudes de la Circoncision." *ETHL* 58 (1944) 14-22.
- BROWN, R. E. *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke.* New York: Doubleday and Co., 1977.
- *The Sensus Plenior of Sacred Scripture.* Baltimore, 1955.
- *The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus.* New York: Paulist Press, 1971.
- BUBY, B. "A New Testament Passover Haggadah." *Bible Today* 27 (1967) 2010-2016.
- BUCK, F. "Das Marienbild in der Vaterlehre auf Grund von typologischer Schriftauslegung." *Maria in S. Scr.* VI: 185-198.
- BÜCHSEL, H. "Allegoreo." *ThWKITTEL* (Eng) I: 260-263 (1964).
- BULTMANN, R. "Ginosko, Gnosis." *ThWKITTEL* (Eng) I: 689-719 (1964).

- BURGER, D. C. *Bibliotheca Chrysostomica. I. Index initiorum graecorum operum Chrysostomo ad scriptorum*. Portland, 1982.
- *A Complete Bibliography of the Scholarship on the Life and Works of St. John Chrysostom*. Evanston, Illinois, 1964.
- BURGHARDT, W. J. "Mary in Eastern Patristic Thought." In *Mariology*. 3 vols. Edited by J. B. CAROL. Milwaukee, 1957. 2: 88-153.
- "On Early Christian Exegesis." *Theological Studies* 11 (1950) 78-116.
- CABROL, F. *Étude sur la Peregrinatio Silviae: les églises de Jérusalem, la discipline et la liturgie au IV^e siècle*. Paris, 1895.
- CAMELOT, T. "Clément d'Alexandrie et l'Écriture." *RB* 53 (1946) 242-248.
- CAMPENHAUSEN, H. *The Fathers of the Greek Church*. Translated by S. Godman. New York, 1955.
- CANET, L. "Pour l'édition de S. Jean Chrysostome (Sermones contra Judaeos)." *Mélange d'Archéologie et d'Histoire* 34 (1914) 97-200.
- CAPPUYNS, M. "Le 'De imagine' de Grégoire de Nysse traduit par Jean Scot Érigène." *RThAM* 32 (1965) 205-262.
- CARO, R. *La Homiletica Mariana Griega en el Siglo V*. *MLS* 3 (1971), 4 (1972), 5 (1973).
- CARTER, R. E. "The Chronology of John Chrysostom's Early Life." *Traditio* 18 (1962) 357-364.
- CAVALIERI, Franchi de'. "La 'Homilia II in S. Pelagiam' è veramente di S. Giovanni Crisostomo?" *Note agiografiche* 8: 281-303. *Studi e testi*, 65. Vatican, 1935.
- CERFAUX, L. "Simples Réflexions à propos de l'exégèse apostolique." *ETHL* 25 (1949) 565-576.
- J. COPPENS, J. GRIBOMONT. *Problèmes et méthode d'exégèse théologique*. Louvain: Desclée de Brouwer, 1950.
- CHADWICK, H. *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition: Studies in Justin, Clement, and Origen*. New York, 1966.
- CHASE, F. H. *Chrysostom: A Study in the History of Biblical Interpretation*. Cambridge, 1887.
- CHILDS, B. S. "The *Sensus Literalis* of Scripture: An Ancient and Modern Problem." In *Beitrag für Alttestamentlichen Theologie—Festschrift für W. Zimmerli*, pp. 80-93. Göttingen, 1977.
- CHRYSOSTOM, St. John. *Opera Omnia*. Edited by H. SAVILE. 8 vols. Eton, 1612.
- *Sancti Patris Nostri Joannis Chrysostomi Opera Omnia*. . . Edited by B. DE MONTFAUCON. Paris, 1718-38. 13 vols. Revised (GAUME), 1834-40.
- *Opera Omnia*. PG 47-64, in 13 volumes (1858-62).
- *A une jeune veuve sur le mariage unique*. Edited by B. GRILLET and G. H. ETTINGER. SC 138 (1968).
- *Baptismal Instructions*. Translated and annotated by P. W. HARKINS. *AncChrWr* 31 (1911). Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1963.
- *Chrysostom. SelectLibNicPNic* (Series 1), vols. IX-XIV.
- *Les cohabitations suspectes: comment observer la virginité*. Edited by J. DUMORTIER. Paris, 1955.

- *Commentary on St. John, the Apostle and Evangelist: Homilies* [1-88]. Translated by Sr. Th. Aq. Goggin. FathCh 33 and 41. New York, 1957, 1960.
- . . . *Des heiligen Kirchenlehrers Johannes Chrysostomus ausgewählte Schriften, aus dem griechischen übersetzt*. BKV, 8 vols.
- *The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Gospel of St. Matthew*. Translated by G. Prevost. 3 vols. Oxford, 1843-51. Reprinted and revised: Select LibNicPNic 10 (1889), by M. B. RIDDLE.
- *Huit catéchèses baptismales*. Edited by A. WENGER. SC, 50bis (Reprinted with Supplement, 1970).
- *Quatre homélies de saint Jean Chrysostome sur les tentations de Notre Seigneur et l'incarnation* [Syriac] (Edited by F. NAU), in PO 13: 115-157.
- *Sur la Providence de Dieu*. Edited by A. M. MALINGREY. SC 79 (1961).
- *Sur la vaine gloire et l'éducation des enfants*. Edited by A. M. MALINGREY. SC 188 (1972).
- *La virginité*. Edited by H. MUSURILLO and B. GRILLET. SC 125 (1966).
- CHRYSTOSTOMIKA. *Studi e Ricerche intorno a S. Giovanni Crisostomo*. A cura del comitato per il XV centenario della sua morte (407-1907). Rome, 1908.
- CIGNELLI, L. *Maria Nuova Eva nella Patristica Greca*. Assisi, 1966.
- Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum*. Edited by H. KRAFT. München, 1963.
- Clement of Alexandria*. Edited by W. WILSON. ANCL 4 and ANF 2: 171-206.
- CLEMENT OF ROME. *Clément de Rome: Épître aux Corinthiens*. Edited by A. JAUBERT. SC 167 (1971).
- CLOW, W. M. "The Preaching of Chrysostom." *Expositor* VIII, 23 (1922) 359-368.
- Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta*. Revised edition, 1962. New York: Herder. Texts of Councils: 325, Nicea (pp. 1-15); 381, I Constantinople (pp. 17-31); 431, Ephesus (pp. 33-56).
- CONGAR, Y. M. J. "Marie et l'Église dans la pensée patristique." RSPT 38 (1954) 3-38.
- CONYBEARE, F. C. "On the Western Texts of Acts as Evidenced by Chrysostom." *American Journal of Philosophy* 17 (1896) 135-171.
- CRAGHAN, J. *Mary: The Virginal Wife and the Married Virgin: The Problematic of Mary's Vow of Virginity*. Rome, 1967.
- CROUZEL, H. "La Théologie Mariale d'Origène." SC 87: 11-64. Introduction to [Origène] *Homélies sur S. Luc*. Paris: Cerf, 1962.
- CULLMANN, O. *The Early Church*. Edited and translated by A. J. B. HIGGINS. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956.
- CUMMINGS, J. T. "Gregory of Nazianzus, St." NCEnc 6: 791-794 (1967).
- CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, Saint. *Catéchèses baptismales et mystagogiques*. Translated by J. Bouvet. Namur, 1962.
- DANIÉLOU, J. "L'Adversus Arium et Sabellium de Grégoire de Nysse et l'origénisme Cappadocien." RechScRel 54 (1966) 61-66.
- "Compte rendu: Jésus transfiguré, par Harold Riesenfeld, Upsala, 1947." Dieu Vivant 14 (1949) 143-145.

- "Les divers sens de l'Écriture dans la tradition Chrétienne primitive." *EThL* 24 (1948) 119-126.
- "The Fathers and the Scriptures." *The Eastern Churches Quarterly* 10 (1953-1954) 265-273. *Idem. Theology* 57 (1954) 83-89.
- *From Glory to Glory—Texts from Gregory of Nyssa's Mystical Writings.* Translated by H. Musurillo. London, 1962.
- "Moïse, exemple et figure chez Grégoire de Nysse." *Cahiers Sioniens* 8 (1954) 267-282.
- *Origen.* Translated by W. MITCHELL. New York, 1955.
- "Origène." *DBSuppl* VI: 884-908 (1964).
- "Qu'est-ce que la typologie?" In *L'Ancien Testament et les Chrétiens.* Paris, 1951, pp. 199-205.
- A. H. COURATIN and J. KENT. *Historical Theology. The Pelican Guide to Modern Theology*, 2. Penguin Books, 1969.
- DE AMBROGGI, D. P. "I sensi Biblici, Direttive e studi recenti." *La Scuola Cattolica* 78 (1950) 444-456.
- "Il senso letterale pieno nelle Divine Scritture." *La Scuola Cattolica* 60 (1932) 296-312.
- DE FAYE, E. *Clément d'Alexandrie.* Paris, 1906.
- *Origen and His Work.* Translated by F. Rothwell. New York, 1929.
- DEL FABBRO, D. "Le Omelie Mariane nei Padri Greci del V. Secolo." *Marianum* 8 (1946) 201-234.
- DE LUBAC, H. *Exégèse Médiévale. Les quatre sens de l'Écriture.* Parts I, II. Aubier, 1958.
- *Histoire et Esprit, l'Intelligence de l'Écriture d'après Origène.* Paris, 1950.
- *The Sources of Revelation.* Translated by Luke O'Neill. New York: Herder and Herder, 1968.
- DEVRESSE, R. "Chaînes Exégétiques Grecques." *DBSuppl* I: 1084-1233 (1926).
- *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste.* Studi e Testi, 141. Vatican, 1948.
- DEWART, J. M. *The Theology of Grace of Theodore of Mopsuestia.* Washington, 1971.
- DIEKAMP, F. *Doctrina Patrum de Verbi Incarnatione.* Munster, 1907.
- DIEU, L. "La Marialogie de St. Jean Chrysostome." *Mémoires et Rapports du Congrès Marial* (Sect. Fran.) II: 71-83. Brussels, 1921.
- DONDERA, A. *Der Heilige Kirchenlehrer Gregor von Nazianz.* Munster, 1909.
- DORSE, Jean. *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics.* London: Hollis and Carter, 1960.
- DOWNNEY, G. "Antioch." *NCEnc* 1: 623-626.
- *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest.* Princeton, 1961.
- DUBARLE, A. M. "Les fondements bibliques du titre marial de nouvelle Eve." *RechScRel* 39 (1951-1952) 49-64.
- ELLERO, G. M. *Esegesi e Teologia dell'Incarnazione secondo Giovanni Crisostomo.* Vicenza, 1967.
- "Maternita e virtù di Maria in San Giovanni Crisostomo." *Marianum* 25 (1963) 405-446.

- Epttre de Barnabé*. Edited by P. PRIGENT and R. A. KRAFT. SC 179 (1971).
- EUSEBIUS PAMPHILI OF CAESAREA. *The Ecclesiastical History*. PG 20: 45-906; GCS 9: 1-3 (E. SCHWARTZ); SC 31: 41, 55 (G. BARDY). English translation by Ch. F. Cruse. Grand Rapids, Mich., 1966.
- *The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine*. Translated by H. J. Lawler and J. E. L. Oulton. 2 vols. London: S.P.C.K. Press, 1927-28.
- *The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine*. Translated by G. A. Williamson. New York. 1966.
- FERGUSON, J. *Clement of Alexandria*. New York, 1974.
- FERNANDEZ, D. *De Mariologia S. Epiphani*. Rome, 1968.
- "Los origenes de la Mariologia Patristica." EphM 21 (1971) 122-125.
- "La spiritualité Mariale chez les Pères de l'Eglise." In "Marie (Vierge)," DSp 10: 423-440 (1977).
- FESTUGIÈRE, A. J. *Antioche païenne et Chrétienne. Libanius, Chrysostome et les Moines de Syrie*. Paris, 1959.
- FINN, Th. M. "Baptismal Death and Resurrection: A Study in Fourth-Century Eastern Baptismal Terminology." *Worship* 43 (1969) 175-189.
- *The Liturgy of Baptism in the Baptismal Instructions of St. John Chrysostom*. Studies in Christian Antiquity, 15 (Edited by J. QUASTEN). Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1967.
- FITTKAN, G. *Der Begriff des Mysteriums bei Johannes Chrysostomus*. Bonn, 1953.
- FITZMEYER, J. *The Historical Truth of the Gospels* (the 1964 Instruction of the Biblical Commission). Glen Rock, New Jersey, 1964.
- FLANAGAN, M. H. *Chrysostom in the Condescension and Accuracy of the Scriptures*. Wellington, 1958.
- FLEURY, E. *Hellénisme et christianisme: Saint Grégoire de Nazianze et son temps*. Paris, 1930.
- FORRER, G. and W. FOERSTER. "Sôtër." ThWKITTEL (Eng) VII: 1003-1022.
- FRITZ, G. "Pierre d'Alexandrie." DTC XII: 1802-1804 (1935); DTC Tables Générales III: 3706 (1972).
- GALLAY, P. *Langue et style de saint Grégoire de Nazianze*. Paris, 1933.
- GALLUS, T. "De sensu verborum Lc. 2: 35 eorumque momento mariologico," *Biblica* 29 (1948) 220-239.
- GALTIER, P. "Théodore de Mopsueste: Sa vraie pensée sur l'Incarnation." *RechScRel* 45 (1957) 161-186, 338-360.
- GAMBERO, L. "La Madonna negli scritti di San Basilio." *Mater Ecclesiae* XV (Gennaio-Aprile, 1979) 37-45.
- *L'Omelia sulla generazione di Cristo di Basilio di Cesarea. Il posto della Vergine Maria*. Tezi. In MLS 13-14 (1981-82) 1-220.
- GEERLINGS, J. and S. NEW. "Chrysostom's Text of the Gospel of St. Mark." *Harvard Theological Review* 24 (1931) 121-142.
- GELIN, A. "La doctrine paulinienne du Nouvel Adam," BEM 13 (1955) 15-23.
- *The Poor of Yahweh*. Translated by Mother Kathryn Sullivan. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1963.

- GIANNELLI, G. "Témoignages patristiques grecs en faveur d'une apparition du Christ ressuscité à la Vierge Marie." *Mélanges Martin Jugie. Revue des études byzantines* 11 (1953) 106-119.
- GILA, A. "Il culto alla Madre di Dio in Severiano di Gabala." *De Primordiis* 3: 229-242 (1970).
- GILLI, F. *Eusebio di Cesarea e la prima "Quaestio ad Stephanum."* Tezi di licenza. Marianum, 1954.
- GINZBERG, L. "Allegorical Interpretations." *JewEnc* 1: 403-411 (1901).
- GIORGIATIS, B. *Die Lehre des Johannes Chrysostomus über die heiligen Schriften.* Athens, 1947.
- GOODENOUGH, E. R. *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus.* 2nd ed. Oxford, 1962.
- GOODSPEED, E. J. *A History of Early Christian Literature.* Chicago, 1966.
- GORDILLO, M. *Mariologia Orientalis. Series Orientalia Analecta Christiana,* No. 141. Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1954.
- *Theologia Orientalium cum Latinorum comparata; commentatio historica.* Series Orientalia Analecta Christiana, No. 158: vol. I. Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1960.
- GRANT, R. M. *After the New Testament.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- *Augustus to Constantine—The Thrust of the Christian Movement into the Roman World.* New York, 1970.
- GREENLEE, J. H. *The Gospel Text of Cyril of Jerusalem.* Copenhagen, 1955.
- GREER, R. A. *Theodore of Mopsuestia—Exegete and Theologian.* Westminster, 1961.
- GREGORY OF NYSSA, Saint. *The Catechetical Oration of St. Gregory of Nyssa.* Edited by J. H. SRAWLEY. Cambridge Patristic Texts. Cambridge, 1903.
- *Grégoire de Nysse. Discours catéchétique.* Edited by J. H. SRAWLEY. Reprinted by L. Méridier, Paris, 1908.
- GRELOT, F. "Marie (Vierge) I. Écriture Sainte." In *DSp* 10: 409-423 (1977).
- GRIBOMONT, J. "L'Origénisme de S. Basile." In *L'homme devant Dieu. Mélanges Henri De Lubac*, I: 281-294. Paris, 1963-1964.
- GRILLMEIER, A. *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451).* Translated from the German by J. S. Bowden. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965.
- GROBEL, K. "Interpretation." In *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by G. BUTTRICK et al. (5 vols.), II: 718-724 (1962). New York, 1962-76.
- GROOT, A. DE. *Die Schmerzhaftige Mutter und Gefährtin des göttlichen Erlösers in der Weissagung Simeons (Lk. 2: 35).* Kaldenkirchen: Steyler, 1956.
- GROSS, J. "Theodor von Mopsuestia: Ein Gegner der Erbsündenlehre." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 65 (1953-1954) 1-15.
- GUIGNET, M. *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze et la rhétorique.* Thèse. Paris, 1911.
- *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze, orateur et épistolier.* Paris, 1911.
- GUILLET, J. "Les Exégètes d'Alexandrie et d'Antioche." *RechScRel* 34 (1947) 257-302.
- HAGNER, D. A. *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome.* Leiden, 1973.
- HAIDACKER, J. *Die Lehre des heiligen Johannes Chrysostomus über die Schriftinspiration.* Salzburg, 1897.

- HALKIN, F. *Manuscripts Grecs de Paris: Inventaire Hagiographique*. Brussels, 1968.
- HAMELL, P. J. *Handbook of Patrology*. Staten Island, N. Y.: Alba House, 1968.
- HANSON, R. P. C. *Origen's Doctrine of Tradition*. London, 1954.
- HARDY, E. R. *Christology of the Later Fathers*. London and Philadelphia, 1954.
- *Faithful Witnesses: Records of Early Christian Martyrs*. (1908 ed.) New York: World Christian Books, Association Press, 1960.
- HARL, M. "From Glory to Glory" l'interprétation de II Cor. 3, 18b, par Grégoire de Nysse et la liturgie baptismale." In *KYRIAKON*, Festschrift Johannes Quasten, II: 730-735. Munster, 1970.
- ed. *Ecriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse. Actes du Colloque de Chevetogne* (22-26 septembre, 1969). Leiden, 1971.
- HARNACK, A. *History of Dogma*. Translated by J. Millar. 7 vols. London, 1896-1899.
- HARVANEK, R. F. "Gregory of Nyssa, St." *NCEnc* 6: 794-796 (1967).
- HENNECKE, E., ed. *New Testament Apocrypha*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959.
- HERGENROTHER, J. *Die Antiochenische Schule und ihre Bedeutung auf exegetischem Gebiete*. Würzburg, 1866.
- HESYCHIUS OF JERUSALEM, *Les Homélies Festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem*. Edited by M. AUBINEAU. Vols. I and II. *Subsidia Hagiographica*, 59 and 60. Brussels, 1978.
- *Homélies Pascales*. Edited by M. AUBINEAU. SC 187 (1972).
- HOLL, K. *Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem Verhältnis zu den grossen Kappadoziern*. Tübingen, 1904.
- HÖPFL, H. *Introductio Generalis in Sacram Scripturam*. Vol. I. 6th ed. Rome, 1963.
- HUMBERTCLAUDE, P. *La doctrine ascétique de saint Basile de Césarée*. Paris, 1932.
- IGLESIAS, S. M. "Literary Genre of the Infancy Gospel in St. Matthew." In *Contemporary New Testament Studies*, edited by Sr. M. R. Ryan. Minnesota, 1965.
- IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH. *Lettres. Lettres et Martyre de Polycarpe de Smyrne*. Edited by P. Th. CAMELOT. SC 10. 4th ed. (1969).
- IRENÆUS OF LYONS. *Irénée de Lyon. Contre les hérésies. Livre IV*. Edited by A. ROUSSEAU et al. SC 100, 2 vols. (1965).
- *Irénée de Lyon. Démonstration de la Prédication Apostolique*. Edited by L. FROIDEVAUX. SC 62 (1959; reprinted 1971).
- ISAYE, G. "L'Unité de l'opération divine dans les écrits trinitaires de S. Grégoire de Nysse." *RechScRel* 27 (1937) 422-439.
- JAEGER, W. *Two Rediscovered Works of Ancient Christian Literature: Gregory of Nyssa and Macarius*. Leiden, 1954.
- JOUASSARD, G. "L'interprétation par S. Cyrille de la scène de Marie au pied de la croix." *Virgo Immaculata* 4: 28-47 (1955).
- "Marie à travers la patristique." *Maria (Du Manoir)* 1: 69-157 (1949).
- "La nouvelle Ève chez les Pères Anténicéens." *BEM* 12 (1954) 35-54.

- JOURJON, M. "Aux origines de la prière d'intercession de Marie. (Le témoignage des Pères des cinq premiers siècles)." BEM, 23 (1966) 37-49.
- JUGIE, M. "La première fête mariale en Orient et en Occident." *Echos d'Orient* 22 (1923) 129-152.
- JÜSSEN, K. *Die dogmatischen Anschauungen des Hesychius von Jerusalem*. 2 vols.: *Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie*, 17, 20, Münster in Westfalen, 1931-1934.
- "Hesychius v. Jerusalem." *LexThK* 5 (1960).
- "Die Mariologie des Hesychius von Jerusalem." In *Theologie in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Festschrift M. Schmaus*, edited by J. AUER and H. VOLK. Munich, 1957.
- JUZEK, J. H. *Die Christologie des heiligen Johannes Chrysostomus*. Dissertation. Breslau, 1920.
- "Die Lehre des heiligen Johannes Chrysostomus über den Heiligen Geist." *Der Katholik* 93, 1 (1913) 304-320.
- KEANE, H. "The Sacrament of Penance in St. John Chrysostom." *ITQ* 14 (1919) 305-317.
- KELLY, J. N. D. *Early Christian Creeds*. London: Longmans, 2nd. ed. — 1960, 3rd impression — 1963.
- *Early Christian Doctrines*. 2nd ed. London, 1960.
- KIHN, H. *Die ältesten Christlichen Schulen überhaupt und die Schulen zu Antioch, Edessa und Nisibis insbesondere*. 1st part. Weissenburg, 1865.
- *Die Bedeutung der Antiochenischen Schule auf dem Exegetischen Gebiete*. 2nd part. Weissenburg, 1866.
- KLEIST, J. A. *The Epistle of Barnabas*. *AncChrWr* 6 (1948).
- KIRCHMEYER, J. "Hésychius de Jérusalem." *DSP* 7: 399-408 (1968).
- KNACKSTEDT, O. "Die Theologie der Jungfräulichkeit b. hl. Gregor von Nyssa." Dissertation. 1940.
- KRAFT, R. A. "Barnabas' Isaiah Text and the 'Testimony Book' Hypothesis." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79 (1960) 336-350.
- ed. *Barnabas and the Didache*. The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary, 3. New York, 1965.
- LA BONNARDIÈRE, Anne-Marie. *Biblia Augustiniana, V: Ancient Testament. Le livre de la sagesse*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1970.
- LAGRANGE, M.-J. *Histoire ancienne du canon du Nouveau Testament*. Paris, 1933.
- LAMPE, G. W. H. and K. J. WOOLLCOMBE. *Essays in Typology*. Part I: "The Reasonableness of Typology" by G. W. H. LAMPE; Part II: "The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology" by K. J. WOOLLCOMBE. *Studies in Biblical Theology*, 22. Naperville, Illinois: A. R. Allenson, 1957.
- LATKO, E. F. *Origen's Concept of Penance*. Laval: Québec University, 1949.
- LAURENTIN, R. *Court Traité de Théologie Mariale*. Paris, 1954. Table rectificative des pièces mariales inauthentiques ou discutées contenues dans les deux patrologies de Migne (pp. 119-173).
- "L'interprétation de Genèse 3: 15 dans la tradition jusqu'au début du XIII^e siècle." BEM 12 (1954) 77-156.

- LAYTON, B. "The Sources, Date and Transmission of Didache 1.3b-2.1." *Harvard Theological Review* 61 (1968) 343-383.
- LEBRETON, J. "Clément d'Alexandrie." DSp 2: 950-961 (1953).
- LE DÉAUT, R. "Apropos a Definition of Midrash." *Interpretation* 25 (1971) 259-282.
- "A propos d'une définition du midrash." *Biblica* 50 (1969) 395-413.
- *Introduction à la Littérature Targumique*. Première Partie. Rome, 1966.
- *La Nuit Pascale*. Rome, 1963.
- "Les Targums ou versions aramaïques de la Bible." *Service International de Documentation Judéo-Chrétienne* (Rome) IX, 2 (1976) 4-11, 33-35.
- A. JAUBERT, K. HRUBY, *The Spirituality of Judaism*. Translated by P. Barrett. The Religious Experience Series, 11. St. Meinrad, Indiana, 1977. Cf. "Judaïsme." DSp 8: 1487-1564 (1974).
- LEMARIÉ, J. *La manifestation du Seigneur*. Lex orandi, 23. Paris: Cerf, 1957.
- LEROUX, J. M. "Relativité et Transcendance du texte biblique d'après Jean Chrysostome." In *La Bible et les Pères*. Paris, 1971.
- LEYS, R. *L'image de Dieu chez saint Grégoire de Nysse*. Museum Lessianum, 49. Brussels, 1951.
- LIEBAERT, J. *L'Incarnation: I. Des Origines au Concile de Chalcédoine*. Translated from the German. Paris: Cerf, 1966.
- LIGHTFOOT, J. B. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Michigan, 1967.
- LIVIOUS, T. *The Blessed Virgin in the Fathers of the First Six Centuries*. London, 1892.
- LLOPART, E. M. "María y la Iglesia en los Padres Preefesinos." In *Maria-Ecclesia Regina et Mirabilis*, pp. 11-99. Scripta et Documenta, 6. Montserrat, 1956.
- LOEWE, R. "The Jewish Midrashim and Patristic and Scholastic Exegesis of the Bible." TU 63 (1957) 492-514.
- LOOFS, F. *Paulus von Samosata*. TU 44, 5 (1924).
- LYONNET, St. "Témoignages de saint Jean Chrysostome et de saint Jérôme sur Jacques, le Frère du Seigneur." *RechScRel* 29 (1939) 335-351.
- MACRAE, G. W. "The Fourth Gospel and Religionsgeschichte." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32 (1970) 13-24.
- MANZANO, J. "Algunas consideraciones sobre el culto mariano antes del Concilio de Efeso." *De primordiis* 2: 295-326.
- MARCHISANO, F. *L'interpretazione di kecharitomene fino alla metà del secolo XIII. Contributo alla mariologia biblica*. Rome: Universitatis Gregoriana, 1968.
- MARTIMORD, A. G. *L'Église en prière. Introduction à la liturgie*. 3rd ed. Paris, 1965.
- MAYS, J. L. *Micah: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.
- McHUGH, J. *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament*. Garden City, New York, 1975.
- McKENZIE, J. L. "Annotations on the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia." *Theological Studies* 19 (1958) 345-373.

- "A Chapter in the History of Spiritual Exegesis: De Lubac's *Histoire et Esprit*." *Theological Studies* 12 (1951) 265-281.
- "A New Study of Theodore of Mopsuestia." *Theological Studies* 10 (1949) 394-408.
- MEDDING, W. "Erscheinung des Auferstandenen vor Maria." *LexChIk* I: 667-671 (1968).
- MEEHAN, D. "Editions of St. Gregory of Nazianzus." *ITQ* 18 (1951) 203-219.
- MEER, F. van der and Christine MOHRMANN. *Atlas of the Early Christian World*. Translated and edited by M. F. HEDLUNG and H. H. ROWLEY. London: Nelson, 1958.
- MEINHOLD, P. "Die drei mariologischen Aussagen in der alten Kirche." *De Primordiis* 2: 195-205.
- MERX, A. "Der Messias oder ta' eb d. Samaritaner." In *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Beih.* 17 (1909).
- METZGER, B. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 3rd ed. London, New York: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- MEYER, L. *Saint Jean Chrysostome, Maître de perfection chrétienne*. Paris, 1933.
- MICHAUD, E. "La Christologie de Jean Chrysostome." *Revue Internationale de Théologie* 17 (1909) 275-291.
- "L'Ecclésiologie de S. Jean Chrysostome." *Revue Internationale de Théologie* 11 (1903) 491-620.
- "La Sotériologie de St. Jean Chrysostome." *Revue Internationale de Théologie* 18 (1910) 35-49.
- MINGANA, A., ed. and trans. *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist*. Woodbrooke Studies, VI. Cambridge, England: W. Heffer and Sons Ltd., 1933.
- ed. and trans. *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Nicene Creed*. Woodbrooke Studies, V. Cambridge, England: W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd., 1932.
- MONTAGNA, D. "La lode alla Theotokos nei testi greci dei secoli IV-VII." *Marianum* 24 (1962) 453-543.
- MONTFAUCON, B. de. "Vita S. J. Chrysostomi nunc primum adornata—Chrysostomi Opera Omnia." PG 47: 83-264.
- MOORE, C. A. *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah—the Additions*. Anchor Bible, 44. New York, 1977.
- MORIN, G. "Quelques aperçus nouveaux sur l'Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum." *RBén* 17 (1925) 239-262.
- MOSSAY, J. *Les fêtes de Noël et d'Epiphanie d'après les sources littéraires cappado-ciennes du IV^e siècle*. Paris: Louvain, 1966.
- *La Noël et l'Epiphanie en Cappadoce au IV^e siècle*. *Lex Orandi*, 40. Paris, 1967.
- "La prédication 'liturgique' de Grégoire de Nazianze." *Studia Patristica*, X/I: 402-406 (TU 107).

- MOULARD, A. *Saint Jean Chrysostome, le défenseur du mariage et l'apôtre de la virginité*. Paris, 1921.
- MOULE, C. F. D. *The Birth of the New Testament*. New York, 1962.
- MOULTON, W. F. and A. S. GEDEN. *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*. 4th ed. Edinburgh, 1974.
- MOUTSOULAS, E. ΓΡΗΓΟΡΙΟΣ Ο ΝΥΣΣΗΣ. *Βίος Συγγράμματα — Διδασκαλία — Βιβλιογραφία*. Athens, 1970. *Νέα Σιών*.
- MUCKLE, J. T. "The Doctrine of St. Gregory of Nyssa on Man as the Image of God." *Medieval Studies* 7 (1945) 55-84.
- MULLER, A. *Ecclesia — Maria. Die Einheit Marias und der Kirche*. 2nd ed. Freiburg: Switzerland, 1955.
- MÜLLER, G. *Lexicon Athanasianum*. Berlin, 1944-1952.
- MURPHY, F. X. "Hesychius of Jerusalem." *NCEnc* 6: 1090 (1967).
- MURRAY, R. *Symbols of Church and Kingdom*. Cambridge, 1973.
- NASH, H. S. "The Exegesis of the School of Antioch: A Criticism of the Hypothesis That Aristotelianism Was a Main Cause in Its Genesis." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 11 (1892) 22-37.
- NEALE, J. M. *The Patriarchate of Antioch* (posthumous continuation of his *Holy Eastern Church*). London, 1873.
- NEWMAN, J. H. *St. Chrysostom*. London: Pickering, 1881. From *Historical Sketches*. 3 vols. Many editions.
- NICOLAS, M.-J. "Introduction théologique à des études sur la Nouvelle Ève," *BEM* 12 (1954) 1-7.
- Noël, *Epiphanie, Retour du Christ*. (Semaine liturgique de l'Institut Saint-Serge.) Paris, 1967.
- NORRIS, R. A., II. *Manhood and Christ—A Study in the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- OHLEYER, L. J. *The Pauline Formula "Induere Christum" with Special Reference to the Works of St. John Chrysostom*. Dissertation. Washington, 1921.
- ORIGEN. *Origène: Commentaire sur Saint Jean*. Edited by C. BLANCE. Tome I (Livres I-V): SC 120 (1966); Tome II (Livres VI-X): SC 157 (1970); Tome III (Livre XIII): SC 222 (1975); Tome IV (Livres XIX-XX): SC 290 (1982).
- *Contra Celsum*. Edited by P. KOETSCHAU. GCS 2-3 (1899).
- *Homélies sur Saint Luc*. Edited by H. CROUZEL, F. FOURNIER, and P. PÉRICHON. SC 87 (1962).
- *In Lucam homiliae XXXIX* (latine, Hieronymo interprete). M. RAUER, ed., *Origenes Werke IX: Die Homilien zu Lukas*. . . . GCS (Berlin, 1959).
- *Traité des principes*. Édité by H. CROUZEL and M. SIMONETTI. SC 252 (1978): Livres I and II (Tome I); SC 253 (1978): Commentaire et fragments (Tome II); SC 268 (1980): Livres III and IV. Texte critique de la Philocalie et de la version latine de Rufin (Tome III); SC 269 (1980): Commentaire et fragments (Tome IV).
- *De principiis*. Origenes Werke, V. GCS 22. Leipzig, 1913.
- *Origen on First Principles*. Koetschau's text of the *De Principiis* translated into English by G. W. Butterworth. Introduction to Torchback edition by H. de Lubac. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

- OSBORN, E. F. *The Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria*. Cambridge, 1957.
- ORTIZ DE URBINA, I. "Lo sviluppo della Mariologia nella Patrologia Orientale." *OChP* 6 (1940) 40-82.
- "Mariologia Amphilochii Iconiensis." *OChP* (1957) 186-191.
- "Primi sermones panegyrici in honorem Mariae a medio saeculo iv ad medium saeculum v." *De primordiis* 3: 119-133.
- OTIS, B. "Cappadocian Thought as a Coherent System." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 12 (1958) 95-124.
- OULTON, J. E. L. and H. CHADWICK, eds. *Alexandrian Christianity: Selected Translations of Clement and Origen*. Philadelphia, 1954.
- OWEN, E. C. E. "St. Gregory at Nazianzus." *Journal of Theological Studies* 26 (1925) 64-71.
- PARGOIRE, J. — "Les homélies de S. Jean Chrysostome en juillet 399." *Echos d'Orient* 3 (1899/1900) 151-162.
- PARKER, H. J. *A Catalogue of Editions of the Fathers of the Church and Ecclesiastical Writers of the First Thirteen Centuries and Collections of Their Fragments, Chronologically Arranged. To Which is Added, a List of Books Recommended to Students in Divinity*. Oxford, 1844.
- PATTERSON, L. *Theodore of Mopsuestia and Modern Thought*. London: S.P.C.K. Press, 1926.
- PELIKAN, J. *The Preaching of Chrysostom—Homilies on the Sermon on the Mount*. Philadelphia, 1967.
- *The Shape of Death: Life, Death, and Immortality*. Abingdon, 1961.
- PERLER, O. and J. L. MAIER. *Les Voyages de Saint Augustin*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1969.
- PERRIN, N. *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom—Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA. *La Migration d'Abraham. Philo d'Alexandrie*. SC 47 (Série annexe, 1957).
- Philo of Alexandria*. 10 vols. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. Loeb Classical Library. Harvard, 1929-1962.
- PIRKE ABOTH. *The Ethics of the Talmud: The Sayings of the Fathers*. Edited by R. T. HERFORD. New York, 1964.
- PIROT, L. *L'œuvre exégétique de Théodore de Mopsueste*. Rome, 1913.
- PITTMAN, R. S. *The Marian Homilies of Hesychius of Jerusalem*. Washington, D. C., 1974.
- PLAGNIEUX, J. *Saint Grégoire de Naziance Théologien*. Paris, 1951.
- PLUMPE, J. C. "Some Little-known Early Witnesses to Mary's Virginitas in Partu." *Theological Studies* 9 (1948) 567-577.
- PONTET, N. *L'Exégèse de S. Augustin—Prédicateur*. Théologie-Études publiées sous la direction de la faculté de théologie de Lyon-Fourvière, 7. Marseille: Aubier, 1944.
- POTTERIE, I. de la. "De interpunctione et interpretatione versuum Joh. I, 3.4." *Verbum Domini* 33 (1955) 193-203.
- PRESTIGE, G. L. *Fathers and Heretics*. London, 1968.
- *God in Patristic Thought*. London: S.P.C.K. Press, 1969.

- *St. Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*. Edited by H. CHADWICK. London: S.P.C.K. Press, 1956.
- PRIGENT, P. *Apocalypse 12. Histoire de l'exégèse*. Tübingen, 1959.
- QUASTEN, J. "Amphilocius von Ikonium." *LexThK*² I: 448-449 (1957).
 "The Liturgical Mysticism of Theodore of Mopsuestia." *Theological Studies* 15 (1954) 431-439.
- RADO, P. "Die Pseudo-Chrysostomische Homilie: εἰς τὴν Χριστοῦ Γέννησιν." *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 61 (1932) 82-83.
- RAHNER, H. *Symbole der Kirche*. Salzburg, 1964.
- RATHAI, O. "Johannes Chrysostomus als Exeget." *Pastor bonus* 30 (1918) 342-351.
- REINE, F. J. *The Eucharistic Doctrine and Liturgy of the Mystagogical Catechesis of Theodore of Mopsuestia*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1942.
- RENOUX, A. *Le Codex arménien Jérusalem 121. I*. PO 35: 1-215 (1969).
 — *Le Codex Arménien Jérusalem 121. II*. Edition comparée du texte et de deux autres manuscrits. PO 36: 139-388 (1971).
- "L'Épiphanie à Jérusalem au IV^e et au V^e siècle d'après le Lectionnaire arménien de Jérusalem." *Revue des Études Arméniennes. Nouvelle Série* 2 (1965) 343-359.
- RICHARD, M. "L'introduction du mot 'hypostase' dans la théologie de l'Incarnation." *MéSR* 2 (1945) 243-252.
- RICHARDSON, C. C. *Early Christian Fathers*. New York, 1975.
- ed. and trans. "Gregory of Nyssa." In *Christology of the Later Fathers*, edited by E. R. HARDY, pp. 233-325. Library of Christian Classics, 3. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954.
- RIDDLE, M. B. "Homilies on the Gospel of Matthew (St. John Chrysostom as Exegete)." *SelectLibNicPNic X* (Series I, 1894).
- RILEY, H. M. *Christian Initiation: A Comparative Study of the Interpretation of the Baptismal Liturgy in the Mystagogical Writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Ambrose of Milan*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1974.
- ROBERTS, A. and J. DONALDSON. "The Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325." In ANF I.
- ROLANDUS, J. *Le Christ et l'homme dans la théologie d'Athanase d'Alexandrie. Étude de la conjonction de sa conception de l'homme avec sa Christologie*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969.
- ROOVER, E. R. de. *L'exégèse patristique de Luc. 1: 35 des origines à Augustin ...* Pont. Universitas Gregoriana. Facultas Theologica. Rome, 1969.
- ROUSSE, J. "Grégoire de Nazianze (saint), évêque." *DSp* 6: 932-971 (1967).
- RUDBERG, S. Y. "Le texte de l'homélie pseudo-basilienne sur l'incarnation du Seigneur." *RBén* 62 (1952) 189-200.
- RUIZ BUENO, D. "La homilía como forma de predicación." *Helmatica* 7 (1956) 79-111.
- SABOURIN, L. *The Psalms: Their Origin and Meaning*. New York: Alba House, 1969.

- SAJDAK, J. *Historia critica scholiastarum et commentatorum Gregorii Nazianzensi*, I. Meletema Patristica, I. Cracow, 1914.
- "Die Scholiasten der Reden des Gregor von Nazianz. Ein kurzgefasster Bericht über den jetzigen Stand der Forschung." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 30 (1930) 268-274.
- SCHAUBLIN, C. *Untersuchungen zur Methode und Herkunft der Antiochenischen Exegese*. Köln-Bonn, 1974.
- SCHLIER, H. "Bathos." *ThWKITTEL* (Eng) I: 516-518 (1964).
- SCHMITZ, P. "Lettres de Dom Claude Martin relatives à l'édition de St. Athanase et de St. Jean Chrysostome." *RBén* 41 (1929) *passim*.
- SCHMOLLER, A. *Handkonkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament*. 13th ed. Stuttgart, 1963.
- SCHOLZ. "Über den Text des Neuen Testaments, welchen der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus in seinen Homilien zum Evangelium des heiligen Matthaeus Folgt." *Katholische Vierteljahrschrift für Wissenschaft und Kunst* 1 (1847) 82-99.
- SCHREINER, J. *Einführung in die Methoden der Biblischen Exegese*. Würzburg, 1971.
- SHAW, P. E. *The Early Tractarians and the Eastern Church*. Milwaukee, 1930.
- SIMONETTI, M. *La Crisi Ariana nel IV Secolo*. *Studia Ephemeridis "Augustinianum"* 11. Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1975.
- *Letteratura Cristiana Antica Greca e Latina*. Milan, 1969.
- SMALLEY, B. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. New York, 1952.
- SMITH, C. "Christmas and Its Cycle." In *NCEnc* 3: 655-660 (1967).
- SMITH, H. *Ante-Nicene Exegesis of the Gospel*. 6 vols. London: S.P.C.K. Press, 1925-1929.
- SMITH, R. "Inspiration and Inerrancy." *JBC* II, n. 66, pp. 499-584.
- SMOTHERS, E. R. "Chrysostom and Symeon (Act. 15, 14)." *Harvard Theological Review* 46 (1953) 203-215.
- "Le texte des Homélies de St. Jean Chrysostome sur les Actes des Apôtres." *RechScRel* 27 (1937) 513-548.
- SOLÁ, F. de Paola. "La Santísima Virgen en las inscripciones, principalmente sepulcrales, en los primeros siglos del cristianismo." *De primordiis* 5: 64-77.
- SÖLL, G. *Mariologie: Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte*. Band III. Faszikal 4. Herder, 1978.
- "Die Mariologie der Kappadozier im Lichte der Dogmengeschichte." *Theologische Quartalschrift* 131 (1951) 163-188, 288-319, 426-457.
- SOWERS, S. G. *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews*. Richmond, 1965.
- SPEDALIERI, F. "La Madre di Dio nella soteriologia di San Giovanni Crisostomo." *EphM* 15 (1965) 385-411.
- SPICQ, C. "L'avènement de la théologie biblique." *RSPT* 35 (1951) 561-574.
- *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse Latine au Moyen Age*. Paris: Vrin, 1944.
- SRAWLEY, J. H. "The Manuscripts and Text of the Oratio Catechetica of St. Gregory of Nyssa." *Journal of Theological Studies* 3 (1902) 421-428.

- "St. Gregory of Nyssa on the Sinlessness of Christ." *Journal of Theological Studies* 7 (1906) 434-441.
- STAAB, K. *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche. Neutestamentliche Abhandlung XV.* Munster, 1933.
- STEPHAN, L. *Die Soteriologie des heiligen Gregor von Nazianz.* Vienna, 1938.
- STEPHENSON, A. A. "Cyril of Jerusalem." *NCEnc* 4: 576-578 (1966).
- "St. Cyril of Jerusalem and the Alexandrian Christian Gnosis." *Studia Patristica*, I: 147-156 (TU 63). Berlin, 1957.
- "St. Cyril of Jerusalem and the Alexandrian Heritage." *Theological Studies* 15 (1954) 573-593.
- STEVENSON, J., ed. *Creeds, Councils and Controversies. Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church, A.D. 337-461.* London: S.P.C.K. Press, 1966.
- STEWARTSON, J. A *Bibliography of Bibliographies on Patristics.* Evanston, Illinois, 1967.
- STRACK, J. L. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash.* New York, 1965.
- STROTMANN, T. "Le Saint-Esprit et la Theotokos dans la tradition orientale." *BEM* 25 (1968) 77-91.
- STRUVE-HAKER, R. "De typologia mariana prae-ephesina intra effervescen-tiam marianam saeculi iv collocata." *De Primordiis* 2: 267-279.
- STRYCKER, E. de. *La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques.* Recherches sur le papyrus Bodmer 5 avec une étude critique du texte grec et une traduction annotée. En appendice: "Les versions arméniennes traduites en latin par H. Quecke. Bruxelles, 1961.
- SULLIVAN, F. A. *The Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia.* *Analecta Grego-riana*, 82. Rome, 1956.
- SWETE, H. B. *Theodori episcopi Mopsuesteni in epistulas minores B. Pauli commentarii.* 2 vols. Cambridge, 1880-1882.
- TANDONNET, R. and J. KIRCHMEYER. "Epiphane (saint) de Constantia (Sala-mine) en Chypre, évêque." *DSP* 4: 854-862 (1961).
- TARCHNISVILI, M. *Le grand lectionnaire de l'Église de Jérusalem (V-VIII siècles).* *CSCO* 188, 189, 204, 205. Louvain, 1959, 1960. (*Scriptores Iberici* 9-10, 13-14)
- TELFER, W. *Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesis of Emesa.* The Library of Christian Classics, IV. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955.
- "The Trustworthiness of Palladius." *Journal of Theological Studies* 38 (1937) 379-383.
- TERNANT, P. "La *Θεωρία* d'Antioche dans le cadre des sens de l'Écriture." *Biblica* 34 (1953) 135-158, 354-383, 456-486.
- TETZ, M. "Zur Edition der dogmatischen Schriften des Athanasius von Alexandrien." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 67 (1955-56) 1-28.
- THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA. *Le Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes (I-LXXX).* Edited by R. DEVREESSE. *Studi e Testi*, 93. Vati-can, 1939.
- *Les Homélie Catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste. Reproduction phototypique du M. Mingana Syr. 561, traduction, introduction, index.* Edited by R. TONNEAU and R. DEVREESSE. (StT 145) Vatican City, 1949.

- *Theodori Mopsuesteni, Commentarius in Evangelium Johannis Apostoli*. Edited by J. VOSTRÉ. CSCO (Series Syr.) 115. Louvain, 1940.
- TIECK, W. A. *Basil of Caesarea and the Bible*. Doctoral dissertation, Microfilm. Columbia University, 1953.
- TOLLINTON, R. B. *Clement of Alexandria*. 2 vols. London, 1910.
- TONIOLO, E. *Antologia Mariana: Scrittori Greci dal III al V secolo*. Rome: Marianum, 1966.
- *Maria nel Mistero di Cristo, Dottrina dei Padri*. Rome, 1969.
- *Omellie Mariane bizantine. Testi scelti e tradotti. Autentiche del IV-V secolo*. Vol. I. Rome, 1968.
- *Omellie Mariane del IV e V secolo*. Rome: Marianum, 1966.
- *S. Giustino Martire, S. Ireneo de Lione*. Corpus Mariologicum. Rome: Marianum, 1966.
- TOUTON, G. "La méthode catéchétique de S. Cyrille de Jérusalem comparée à celles de St. Augustin et de Théodore de Mopsueste." *Proche-Orient Chrétien* 1 (1951) 265-285.
- TURNER, C. H. "On a Paschal Homily Printed in St. Chrysostom's Works, Ascribed by Usher to A.D. 672, but Really Belonging to A.D. 387." *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica* 2 (1890) 130-149.
- USENER, H. *Das Weihnachtenfest*. 2nd ed. Bonn, 1911.
- VACCARI, A. "Esegesi Antica ed Esegesi Nuova." *Biblica* 6 (1925) 249-274.
- "De Messia 'Filio Dei' in V.T.," *Verbum Domini* 15 (1935) 48-55, 77-86.
- "La 'Theoria' nella Scuola Esegetica di Antiochia." *Biblica* 1 (1920) 3-36.
- VAGAGGINI, D. C. *Maria nelle Opere di Origene*. Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 131. Rome, 1942.
- VAILHÉ, S. "Origines de la fête de l'Assomption." *Échos d'Orient* 9 (1906) 138-145.
- VAN ESBROECK, M. "Review of *La Homiletica Mariana Griega en el Siglo V* (See R. CARO, this Bibliography)." *AnalBoll* 94 (1976) 197-199.
- VARDANIAN, P. A. "Ein neu entdecktes Fragment aus Chrysostomus' Kommentar z. Mattheusevangelium." *Handes Amsorya* 35 (1921) 355-364.
- "Inedita aus den Homilien des hl. Chrs. über die Paulusbriefe nach der Handschrift No. 48 von Angora." *Handes Amsorya* 27 (1913) 222-227.
- Vigilius Papa, Constitutum de tribus capitulis*. *Collectio Avellana*. Edited by O. GUNTHER. CSEL XXXV (1895).
- VIGOUROUX, F. "Antioche (École Exégétique d')." *DB I*: 683-687 (1912).
- VISCHER, L. "Mary—Symbol of the Church and Symbol of Humankind." *Midstream: an Ecumenical Journal* XVII (Jan. 1978) 3-12.
- VOISIN, G. *L'Apollinarisme. Étude historique, littéraire et dogmatique sur le début des controverses christologiques au IV^e siècle*. Dissertation. Louvain, 1901.
- VOLKER, W. *Die Wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus*. Berlin, 1952.
- VONA, Costantino. "Il testo cristologico di S. Ignazio di Antiochia: Eph. 19, 1 nella tradizione di alcuni scrittori ecclesiastici." *Euntes Docete* 9 (1956) (Miscellanea in honorem Petri Parente) 64-92.

- VOSTÉ, J. "La chronologie de l'activité de Théodore de Mopsueste." RB 34 (1925) 54-81.
- "Le Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur Saint Jean, d'après la Version Syriaque." RB 32 (1923) 522-551.
- VRIES, W. de. "Der 'Nestorianismus' Theodors von Mopsuestia in seiner Sakramentenlehre." OChP 7 (1941) 91-148.
- WAY, A. C. "Gregorius Nazianzenus." In *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries, Annotated Lists and Guides*, II: 43-192. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1971.
- WEISS, H. *Die Grossen Kappadozier Basilius, Gregor von Nazians und Gregor von Nyssa als Exegeten*. Braunsberg, 1872.
- WENGER, A. A. A. "Hésychius de Jérusalem. Notes sur les sermons inédits et sur le texte grec du commentaire sur le Lévitique." *Revue des études Augustiniennes* (Mémorial G. Bardy) 2 (1956) 457-471.
- "Jean Chrysostome (saint)." DSp 8: 331-335 (1972).
- WIJK, N. Van. "Die älteste Kirchenslav. Übersetzung der Homilie: annuntiationem ss. Deigenetricis." *Byzantinoslavica* 7 (1937-1938) 108-123.
- WILLIS, J. R. *Teachings of Church Fathers*. Herder & Herder, 1966.
- WILMART, A. "La Collection des 38 homélies latines de Saint Jean Chrysostome." *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1917) 305-327.
- WOOLLCOMBE, K. J. "Le sens de 'type' chez les Pères." *Supplément de la Vie Spirituelle* IV, 16 (février 1951) 84-100.
- WRIGHT, A. *Midrash*. New York, 1967.
- ZANELLA, B. *Theodore of Ancyra*. Licenza: Marianum, 1960.

INTRODUCTION

How did the Greek Fathers of the Church in the golden age of Patristic thought use the Bible for their preaching and explaining the mystery of the Incarnation? Were they exclusively interested in the New Testament? Which texts were important for them in their reflections on the Incarnation? What image did Mary of Nazareth have in their sermons, commentaries and panegyrics on the Incarnation or on the feasts celebrated in the liturgy of their churches? Is there a noticeable difference of approach in the different centers of culture where these Church Fathers and Bishops resided? that is, can we see a different school of interpretation in Cappadocia, Antioch, Jerusalem? These are the questions initially posed in researching the homilies and commentaries of these leaders of Church thought. These are also the points of emphasis in this research concerned with discovering the interpretation of texts used, the methods of approach, the principles of exegesis and the structure of their presentation.

Only a thorough study of the entire *opera* of these Fathers would conclusively satisfy such questions and points of emphasis. This work is meant as a beginning, a point of departure for further development and further research. Material from a limited genre, normally the homily or a commentary on specific Scriptural texts, has been chosen to illustrate their method of approaching the Sacred Scriptures in the mystery of the Incarnation.

The selections chosen for this study have been used for research many times by scholars. It is specifically the biblical approach of these preaching writers which is the concern of this limited study. While reading, it was also apparent that each homily or work had to be seen as a precious gem in itself, with the analysis, observation, and inspiration flashing from the various facets of beauty and brilliance found within the isolated priceless jewel.

One very recent study which helped support this method of approach was done by an American scholar who has developed the redaction criticism method. Especially rewarding were the following thoughts:

The interpretation of biblical texts is not governed by theoretical principles different from those applying to any other literature. We can

make the claim in reverse: hermeneutical principles arrived at by a consideration of biblical texts will be applicable also to non-biblical texts, and in particular to the use of the biblical symbol. . . . It is *mutatis mutandis* applicable to any text.¹

The present study was undertaken with such an approach, namely, the principles of New Testament exegesis were the presuppositions and the angle of approach used in studying these Patristic texts. Textual criticism, historical criticism and literary criticism are part and parcel of the process of analysis, interpretation, and comparison of these texts. That is, this study attempts to reach an understanding of written Patristic texts which are considered meaningful by the Church.

The final step in this process of interpretation is the act of interpretation itself.

But if texts are to be so understood, then they can be questioned with regard to the understanding of human life which they express; they can be interrogated by the interpreter with regard to their understanding of the nature of human existence in the world. This is the "pre-understanding" (*Vorverständnis*) with which an interpreter approaches a text; it is the "direction of enquiry" (*das Woraufhin*) which determines the questions to be asked of the text.²

Finally, the same faith that imbued the writers of the texts is a basic ingredient to be found in an act of interpretation which concerns itself with the MYSTERIUM CHRISTI.

This study of homiletic Patristic Greek texts commences with the works circa 350 A.D. (*terminus a quo*) and extends to the year 430 A.D. (*terminus ad quem*), just prior to the Council of Ephesus. It is the intention of the writer to present the exegetical approach of these Fathers of the Church in their sermons or homilies which touch upon the birth of Jesus Christ. Primarily, the study is meant to complement research done on the mystery of the Incarnation. It is not a theological treatise on this event of salvation; rather it is an attempt to present the biblical point of departure for these ecclesiastical pastors. Their method, their favorite texts, and their biblical principles are sorted out, compared, analyzed, presented.

¹ Norman PERRIN, *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom-Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1976), p. 2.

² *Ibid.*, p. 10

The purpose of this research is to demonstrate how these approaches and methods within a living biblical tradition are a part of the broad development of the history of biblical interpretation. The exegetes of this living tradition are humbly aware as they interpret the Bible that their exegesis rests on the shoulders of the giants of their past. In turn, they are seen as part of today's living tradition of biblical interpretation.

The Greek Fathers of the late fourth and early fifth centuries are chosen because they represent several geographical areas of importance in the Church: Alexandria, Antioch, Cappadocia, and Jerusalem. They also contribute to historical enrichment of previously developed biblical exegesis.

Chapter Summaries

CHAPTER ONE

THE BEGINNING AND DEVELOPMENT OF EXEGESIS INTO THE LATE FOURTH CENTURY

The background, in general, for the exegetical approach of the earlier Church Fathers is embedded in a long living tradition within the Christian Church. Before the late fourth century, there already existed a mature approach to biblical interpretation of the Word of God. Moreover, Christian interpretation itself began within the New Testament which also was dependent on the biblical tradition of Judaism. Thus the pre-Christian approach of the Jews—in oral tradition, in the translating of their Bible into the Septuagint, and then the cultural ramifications of a Philo of Alexandria on that same translated text—becomes important in the development of interpretation. Through Philo, the Christian leaders of Alexandria are given a definite approach to the Bible. Clement of Alexandria and Origen move on from that point and begin to fashion a more precise Christian approach to interpreting the Word of God in the living tradition of the Church.

Not only in Alexandria, but elsewhere, additional approaches to the interpretation of the revealed Word of God occurred. Even the Apostolic and Apologetic Fathers of both East and West followed a traditional pattern for their exegesis. This can be traced in the West through Clement of Rome, Justin, and Irenaeus; in the East through Ignatius and Polycarp.

CHAPTER TWO

A STUDY OF THE BIBLICAL PRINCIPLES AND METHODS IN TEXTS RELATING TO
THE INCARNATION AND MARY'S ROLE WITHIN THE MYSTERY OF CHRIST'S BIRTH
FROM 350 A.D. TO 430 A.D.

Building on the biblical approach and outline presented in chapter one, the setting of the late fourth and early fifth centuries is seen as important in the development of exegesis on texts about Christ and, in a subordinate and secondary way, on those which mention Mary insofar as the later Conciliar notion of Theotokos is taking form.

The Fathers chosen are from the areas of Antioch, Cappadocia, and Jerusalem. Alexandria as a school of exegesis was already sketched in chapter one; it now serves as a point for comparison and contrast in the exegesis of the above men who are representatives of key Christian centers.

John Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia represent the best of Antiochene exegesis; Gregory of Nazianzen, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and Amphilochius of Iconium represent Cappadocian homiletic exegesis; Hesychius and Cyril, both of Jerusalem, represent that area. Some pseudonymous writers from the same period of time are also briefly studied through a few nativity homilies.

The texts chosen have been limited both to the mystery of the Nativity and to the fact that some of them mention the Mother of Jesus, Mary. Above all, these texts have been chosen to illustrate that the development of biblical exegesis can be traced through limited genres and perceived as the ongoing presence of the Holy Spirit in the living tradition of revelation.

CHAPTER THREE

ORCHESTRATION OF BIBLICAL TEXTS USED BY THE FATHERS IN THEIR NATIVITY
HOMILIES: THE ROLE OF MARY WITHIN THE TEXTS

This chapter is a study of the principal scriptural texts used by the Fathers in the materials chosen from their homilies and discourses on the Incarnation. The role of Mary is presented through an analysis of these texts. An effort was made to study especially those texts which appeared in several of the Fathers. This is uniquely evident in the study of Luke 2:35, Simeon's prophecy of the sword which pierces the soul of Mary. Origen's commentary is presented and contrasted with Letter 260 of St. Basil.

The key texts of Isaiah 7:14 and Baruch 3:38 are presented in this section of the thesis. They summarize in themselves the content of the thesis, since they were seen by the Fathers as prophetic texts which were fulfilled in the Event of the Incarnation (Baruch 3:38) and the Birth of the Messiah from the Virgin (Isaiah 7:14).

The text of Ezekiel 44:1-2 is carefully analyzed; its importance for Hesychius of Jerusalem becomes evident in his relating it to the integral virginity of Mary. A short excursus on the "burning bush" (Exodus 3:2) is presented through Gregory of Nyssa, Amphilochius, and Hesychius of Jerusalem.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE USE OF THE SCRIPTURES AND MARIAN IMPLICATIONS IN THE HOMILIES AND WRITINGS OF THE FATHERS

The fourth chapter is more of a contextual study of the texts presented in chapter three. Several patterns of thought emerge through this fuller view of the material. Mary is presented as the Virgin from whom Christ is born (*ek parthenou* not *dia parthenou*). Her human flesh is the real medium or instrument for the humanity of Jesus Christ. The soteriological or salvific purpose of the Incarnation is central to the thought of the Fathers. Typology through tradition has a place in these homilies of the Fathers. Finally, the liturgical setting and the festive celebration for these homilies formed the atmosphere in which the biblical tradition of these times was enlivened and deepened. What had begun in the Synagogue with the Targums and the Septuagint was now proclaimed from the Christian pulpit.

CHAPTER III

ORCHESTRATION OF BIBLICAL TEXTS USED BY THE FATHERS IN THEIR NATIVITY HOMILIES: THE ROLE OF MARY WITHIN THE TEXTS

PART I. GENERAL STUDY

Introduction:

The texts chosen by the Fathers in Nativity homilies are not always from the same portions of the Scriptures. What is important is that each of the Fathers used texts either from the Infancy Narratives or from both the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament. A pattern of referring to the same texts appears in the writings of the Fathers, even though they are from diverse geographical areas and have different methods of interpretation. This choice of basic texts or sequence of the same texts is a type of "orchestration" which seems to trigger the memory of the preacher or writer to hearken again and again to these specific texts. Among the most frequently used texts are Baruch 3: 38, Isaiah 7: 14 and Isaiah 9: 5 from the Old Testament, while the Nativity texts and the Prologue of St. John are the ones chosen from the New Testament. A study of the homilies led to a discovery of such favorite texts or to what can be called an "orchestration of texts."

CAPPADOCIANS

1. *Amphilochius* († 394)

A. *New Testament:*

In the New Testament, the initial chapters of Luke (1 & 2) and Matthew are the principal sources for the Fathers in their homilies and commentaries on the Birth of Christ and the role of Mary in the salvific effects of the Incarnation. It is Amphilochius of Iconium († 394) to whom we first turn. He

centers on specific Lucan texts for *Oratio I*, *In Natalitia Domini*, and *Oratio II*, *In Occursum Domini*.¹

1. *Luke 1: 35 (Oratio II: 2, ll. 64-65): A holy spirit will come upon you and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; hence, the holy offspring to be born will be called Son of God.*

This verse is within the context of fulfilling what was prescribed in the Old Testament concerning the first fruits which were to be presented to the Lord. The setting Amphilochius has chosen is taken from Luke himself who uses the text of Leviticus 12: 3, 6 and more explicitly that of Exodus 13: 2, 12, 15 to show the rite of purification Mary was performing in the Temple: "Every male opening the womb shall be declared holy to the Lord" (Luke 2: 23). Amphilochius sees this verified in the dialogue of the Angel Gabriel with Mary: "The holy [offspring] will be called Son of God" (ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ [Luke 1: 35c]).

The text of Luke 2: 23 which has its source in Exodus 13: 2, 12, 15 is summarized by Luke in this fashion: "Every firstborn male opening the womb shall be called holy to the Lord" (Πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοῖγον μήτραν ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ κληθήσεται). Amphilochius uses the text as a confirmation that what was written in the Law and confirmed in the Dispensation of grace was fulfilled in the Lord alone (*Oratio II: 2, ll. 36-37*). Amphilochius does not have the ἐκ σοῦ ("by thee") in Luke 1: 35, a reading which was apparently a later addition, to continue the reading of the two preceding second person singulars in the dialogue text: "upon thee," "overshadow thee." Here, Amphilochius' text of the New Testament is earlier than that of the Peshitta.²

Father Raymond E. Brown in *The Birth of the Messiah* sees the verse having a double role: first, as part of the angel's message and his reassurance to Mary after her objection; secondly and more importantly, he states that "more clearly than Matthew, Luke speaks of Jesus as the 'Son of God' in 35."³ His remarks on verse 35 are close to what Amphilochius understood

¹ AMPHILOCHIUS, *Amphilochii Iconiensis Opera*, ed. by C. DATEMA (CCG 3 [1978]), *Or. I. In Natalitia Domini*: CCG 3: 5-9; PG 39: 36-44 (CPG II: 3231); *Or. II. In Occursum Domini*: CCG 3: 36-73; PG 39: 44-60 (CPG II: 3232).

² B. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the New Testament* (New York, 1971), pp. 129-130. (Cf. for the Peshitta: Tj. BAARDA, "Dionysios bar Salibi and the Text of Luke 1: 35," *Vigiliae Christianae* XVII [1963] 225-229.)

³ R. E. BROWN, *The Birth of the Messiah* (New York, 1977), p. 310.

as the context of the text, that is, "all early Christian christology was vocalized in the reinterpreted terms of Jewish expectations."¹

Brown also sees the text as having a relation to the description of the *Davidic* Messiah. This is, of course, one of the main points in this thesis. Brown further relates the text to Romans 1: 3-4, which also is a text used by the Fathers to show Christ's human origins within the Davidic line; even the holiness or consecratory notion is present in Romans 1: 4 "designated Son of God in power according to the Holy Spirit (Spirit of Holiness) as of the resurrection from the dead."² Brown's conclusion is helpful in establishing an insistence on the Davidic origins which the Fathers give to Jesus and Mary.³ If, as Brown maintains, there is a real begetting of the child as God's Son—and there is no adoption here—then Amphilochius perfectly understood and interpreted the text in this manner.⁴ A final point contained in the thought of Amphilochius is consonant with what Brown has interpreted Luke as saying.

In the Lucan annunciation there is no real contrast between the two parts of Gabriel's message: the Son of the Most High in whom the Davidic royal promise is fulfilled is the child to be called the Son of God, conceived through the Holy Spirit and power. By moving the christological moment from the resurrection to the conception, Luke tells us that there never was a moment on this earth when Jesus was not the Son of God.⁵

Amphilochius attested to this interpretation already in the fourth century.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 311.

² *Ibid.*, p. 312. Yet, O. PROCKSCH, *ἀγιος* (ThWKITTEL [Eng] I: 101), sees it as referring only to the origin of Jesus: "With τὸ γεννώμενον, ἄγιον here belongs to the subject, for the predicate is υἱὸς Θεοῦ; but the expression τὸ γεννώμενον ἄγιον is to be explained by the supranatural origin of the new life, which is called υἱὸς Θεοῦ because of its origin, so that υἱὸς Θεοῦ is here a predicate which is not grounded in the Messianic office of Christ but in his origin." Also note that ἄγιος as an expression for Christ is rare (Mk. 1: 24; Lk. 1: 35, 4: 34; Jn. 6: 69; 1 Jn. 2: 20; Rev. 3: 7; Acts 3: 14; 4: 27, 30). In Amphilochius it is only used here of Christ though it is used almost seventy-five times in his writings.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 313: "The conglomeration of terms . . . in the second half of the Romans formula (designation as Son of God, power, Holy Spirit) is remarkably like the conglomeration of terms in the second half of the angelic message reported in Luke 1: 35 (called Son of God, power, Holy Spirit)."

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 313-314. ". . . Mary is a virgin who has not known man, and therefore the child is totally God's work—a new creation." (p. 314)

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 315-316.

2. Luke 2: 6-7 (*Oratio I: 3, ll. 100-104*): While they were there, the days of her confinement were completed. She gave birth to her firstborn son and wrapped him in swaddling clothes and laid him in a manger, because there was no room for them in the place where travelers lodged.

The only variant presented in this lengthy quotation from Luke is Amphilochius' use of the conjunction γὰρ in place of the δὲ adversative and copulative particle. For homiletic purposes, on the feast of the Birth of Christ Amphilochius has chosen the one text in Luke which directly refers to the birth of Mary's firstborn. The text has to be seen in what has preceded it and what follows it. It is preceded by the important prophetic text of Isaiah 9: 5b: "Upon his shoulders dominion rests; they name him Wonder-Counselor, God-Hero, . . . His dominion is vast and forever peaceful. . . ."¹ The origins of Jesus are seen in the use of Numbers 24: 17: "A star shall arise out of Jacob² and a heavenly man who has appeared from Israel." Amphilochius has truncated and added titles to the text making them refer to Christ. He adds another orchestrated text (Mal. 3: 20) the "sun of justice who overshadows,"³ "the Orient from on high which illumines," and finally the "Lord proceeding from the virginal womb."⁴ This heaping up of titles for the newborn Christ (both from the Old and the New Testaments) ends by stating the purpose of the birth which is always soteriological (ὕπὲρ κόσμον λυτρώσεως, εἰς κόσμον φθαρτὸν ἐλήλυθεν.) "for the redemption of the world he came into the world as a mortal man."⁵ The New Testament text from Luke 2: 11, 32⁶ (See below.) follows, for it is the reality of Christ now completing the titles of the promise with new titles in the dispensation of fulfillment. After a series of contrasts—he who contained the world is held in a woman's arms, he who limited the heavens lies in a manger, and is nursed at the Virgin's breast⁷—Amphilochius turns to our text which expresses the reality of Jesus' being born of Mary.

Fr. Raymond E. Brown maintains Luke is very laconic in describing this event.⁸ There is no hint in Amphilochius or the other Fathers that a

¹ *Or. I. In Natalitia Domini: 3, ll. 78-82.*

² *Ibid.*, ll. 87-88.

³ *Ibid.*, l. 89.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ll. 92-93.

⁵ *Ibid.*, ll. 93-94.

⁶ *Ibid.*, ll. 94-95.

⁷ *Ibid.*, ll. 96-100.

⁸ R. E. BROWN, *op. cit.*, p. 418.

midrash of Genesis 3: 18 was known to them;¹ neither Amphilochius nor any other Father says that the facts are presented from Mary's viewpoint as McHugh infers.² Nor is the term "firstborn" indicative that the Fathers saw Mary as having other children. In fact, none of the Fathers cited uses this text as a controversial one.³ McHugh's remarks about the term are helpful towards understanding the background of the use of the term "firstborn."⁴

What follows the citing of Luke 2: 6-7 is that the redemption brought about by this Child's birth is a strategic victory over the devil. The world is assured of liberty through a virgin (*Ἡλευθέρωται κόσμος διὰ παρθένου*) whereas formerly a virgin had put it under sin (*ὁ διὰ ταύτης τὸ πρὶν ὑπὸ τῇ ἁμαρτίαν πεσὼν* [*Oratio I: 3, ll. 108-109*]).

Thus, Amphilochius uses Luke 2: 6-7 as a fulfillment text for the prophetic promises, and as a verification of the reality of the human birth of a child who effects total redemption.

3. *Luke 2:11 (Oratio I: 3, ll. 94-95): A savior has been born to you, the Messiah and Lord.*

Amphilochius has applied the text to his immediate audience for it reads, "A savior has been born for us today, who is Christ and Lord." Luke reads: *"Ὅτι ἐτέχθη ὑμῖν* (for to you is born) while Amphilochius has *Ἐγεννήθη γὰρ ἡμῖν* (has been born for us). He has not coupled the phrase *ἐν Πόλει Δαβὶδ* (in the city of David).

The immediate context has the citation within the soteriological purpose of the Incarnation: "For the Lord of the heavens and the earth has come from the virginal womb as a mortal man for the redemption of the world."⁵ The context is one of universal salvation. Amphilochius cites the title "light of the nations" which is Luke's exclusive term (except for Isaiah 49: 6) for Christ and his explanation of the apostolic mission of Paul and Barnabas.⁶

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 419.

² J. McHUGH, *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament* (New York, 1975), p. 147.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 201.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 203-204.

⁵ *Or. I. In Natalitia Domini: 3, ll. 93-94.* Cf. W. GRUNDMANN, *χριστός* in ThWKITTEL (Eng) IX: 533-534.

⁶ W. F. MOULTON and A. S. GEDEN. *A Concordance to the Greek New Testament* (Edinburgh, 1974), reprint: pp. 999-1000. Only Luke has *φῶς . . . ἔθνῶν* in Luke 2: 32 and Acts 13: 47. In the Old Testament, the expression is found in Isaiah 49: 6, and implicitly in Isaiah 9: 1.

Brown sees Isaiah 9: 5 as the primary background for this text:

The primary background seems to be Isa. 9: 5 (6): "To us a child is born; to us a son is given." In the Isaian context this child is the heir to the throne of David, and his royal titles follow: Wonderful Counselor, Divine Hero, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. Luke has taken over this Isaian birth announcement of the heir to the throne of David; but for the OT titular he has substituted three titles taken from the Christian kerygma: Savior, Messiah (Christ), Lord.¹

This is precisely what Amphilochius has done, even citing Isaiah 9: 5 (*Oratio I*: 3, ll. 78-82). Isaiah 9: 5 is another example of text orchestration.

The contrast which Amphilochius develops in the same section of his homily can have been intended in Luke as well.²

4. *Luke 2: 21-23 (Oratio II: 2, ll. 39-44): And it came about that when the eight days were accomplished to circumcise the child, they called his name Jesus, which the angel had called him before he was conceived. And when the days of their purification were over, they brought him to the temple and presented him to the Lord, just as it is written in the law of the Lord "Every male opening the womb shall be called holy to the Lord."*

The above text of Amphilochius differs somewhat from the preferred reading today. The notable differences are:

- (1) An addition of *ἐγένετο* before *ὅτε* in line 39. But *ἐγένετο* is characteristic of Luke in the Infancy Narrative. (2) Amphilochius makes the eight days definite by adding *αἱ* to *ἡμέραι* *ὀκτώ*. (3) He also makes the expression more concrete by saying *τὸ παιδίον* in place of the pronoun *αὐτόν*. (4) He omits *ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ* after *συλλημφεθῆναι*. (5) In the light of Datema's critical edition of the text we must retain *αὐτῶν*.³ (6) The expres-

¹ R. E. BROWN, *op. cit.*, pp. 424-425.

² M. HENGEL, *φάνη*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) IX: 54-55: "For Luke the manger expresses the contrast between the world-ruler Augustus and the hidden and lowly birth of the world-redeemer (Luke 2:1, 11, 14). Finally it points forward to the way of humility and suffering which is taken by the Son of God who 'hath not where to lay his head,' Lk. 9: 58." Cf. TERTULLIAN, *De Carne Christi*, 2 (CSEL LXIX: 191 [1939]): "Aufer hinc ... molestos semper Caesaris census et diversoria angusta et sordidos pannos et dura praesepia."

³ B. M. METZGER, *op. cit.*, p. 134: "The reading *αὐτῶν*, which is by far the best attested reading, is difficult, for the Law prescribes no ritual of purification for the husband. The reading *αὐτῆς* (which, in the editions of Theodore Beza, lies behind the AV.) is a late correction made by a punctilious scribe. The Western reading *αὐτοῦ* can be regarded as a transcriptional error for *αὐτῶν* (in cursive Greek script the pronoun was abbreviated

sion κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως is omitted by Amphilochius. (7) And, more in keeping with his intention, the text reads εἰς τὸ ἱερόν (into the temple) instead of Ἱεροσόλυμα. (8) He reads καὶ παρέστησαν (and they presented him to the Lord) instead of the infinitive παραστήσαι, (9) ἐστὶ γεγραμμένον instead of γέγραπται, and (10), curiously, reads ἄρσεν in place of ἄρσεν.¹

The primary context is not the celebration of the Feast of Hypapante, as well noted by C. Datema in his introduction (p. xiii). The primitive title of the homily was "On the Theotokos and on Simeon and Anna"; but it later became a favorite homily for the feast of Hypapante.

The context of Amphilochius' use of the text is in extolling the honor of marriage, virginity, and widowhood.² But the fruit of marriage and virginity for Mary and Joseph, especially the offering of the Child Jesus as the first fruit of the womb, manifests a unique fulfillment of the Jewish ritual; its deepest meaning is that the Lord Jesus alone is holy.³

Brown also helps us to understand why Amphilochius would use the reference to the circumcision with the purification/presentation scene.⁴

5. *Luke 2:32 (Oratio I: 3, l. 95): . . . a revealing light to the Gentiles, the glory of your people Israel.*

In his first homily, Amphilochius is citing the text in part; he is also paraphrasing it. He has retained the "light of the nations" and "Israel." This text is seen in the continued sense of redemption (καὶ σωτηρία οἴκου Ἰσραήλ) (and salvation for the house of Israel).⁵ We have seen above that only Luke uses the expression "light of the nations" in the New Testament and only on two occasions.⁶

αὐτ with the termination expressed by a "shorthand" stroke), or as a deliberate modification, introduced because afterwards (ver. 27) Jesus is the object of the presentation in the Temple."

¹ *Or. II. In Occursum Domini*: 2, ll. 39-44 (CCG 3: 41); also note the critical apparatus quoting the manuscripts for each reading.

² *Ibid.*, 1, ll. 29-34.

³ *Ibid.*, 2, l. 37 and ll. 44-48.

⁴ R. E. BROWN, *op. cit.*, p. 432: "Indeed the circumcision/naming is so intermediary that it can be treated either with the birth scene or with the purification/presentation."

⁵ *Or. I. In Natalitia Domini*: 3, l. 95.

⁶ J. JEREMIAS, *παῖς Θεοῦ*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) V: 706, n. 403: "The phrase in Lk. 2: 32: φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἔθνων, is based on a servant text (לְאֹרֶךְ גִּיּוֹרִים) which is literally the same in Is. 42: 6 and 49: 6, though the combination of Gentiles and Israel (Lk. 2: 32ab) shows that Is. 49: 6 is the closer." Cf. R. E. BROWN (*op. cit.*, p. 440), who sees

6. *Luke 2: 34-35 (Oratio II: 8, ll. 192-259): This child is destined to be the downfall and the rise of many in Israel, a sign that will be opposed and you yourself shall be pierced with a sword so that the thoughts of many hearts may be laid bare.*¹

Amphilochius constantly returns to the main text of his homily (*In Occursum Domini*) Luke 2: 21-38. In section eight, he looks at the text wherein Simeon speaks to Mary of the sword of sorrow which will pierce her heart. His interpretation is that the sign of contradiction is the cross;² the sword of sorrow piercing Mary's heart is the great number of thoughts which inveigh against her mind³—innumerable thoughts which resemble a sword piercing her heart and entering her inmost recesses. All of section eight is a profound biblical meditation on the words of Simeon—possibly the finest ever made.

Amphilochius' text is in perfect agreement with the accepted critical text of today, the only difference is the presence of parentheses for verse 35ab: ("and you yourself shall be pierced with a sword").⁴

De Groot has interpreted Amphilochius in his work on Luke 2: 35.⁵ His fifth point is of interest: Amphilochius gives the reason for her suffering—these afflictions had befallen her for she had not yet experienced the power of the resurrection nor did she know the resurrection was near.⁶

The development of Mary's troubled thoughts is consonant with the image of a human's struggle and offer her as a model of faith acceptable to today's mentality. She is not put beyond the reach of normal human faith struggles. Amphilochius, moreover, in no way passes a moral judgment on these troubled thoughts or doubts of Mary.⁷

Is. 60: 1 as the background for Luke's expression. Also pp. 458-459 for the message of universalism. Cf. A. ΟΕΡΚΕ, ἀποκαλύπτω in ThWKITTEL (Eng) III: 589. Brown did not note that only Luke and Isaiah used the expression "light of the Gentiles."

¹ Amphilochius' text has no parentheses for 2: 35ab: *Or. II. In Occursum Domini*, CCG 3: 63-69; text, *Or. II: 8*, ll. 192-194; branches of text, *Or. II: 8*, ll. 194-195, 196-198, 204-205, 210-214, 221.

² *Or. II. In Occursum Domini: 8*, ll. 214-215.

³ *Ibid.*, ll. 228-229.

⁴ ALAND GNT, p. 210. (Cf. critical apparatus.)

⁵ A. DE GROOT, *Die schmerzhaftē Mutter und Gefährtin des göttlichen Erlösers in der Weissagung Simeons (Lk. 2: 35)* (Kaldenkirchen: Steyler, 1956).

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 16. (Cf. his entire interpretation, pp. 14-16, which is excellent.)

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 16, c and d.

McHugh has an excellent page¹ on the purpose of "signs" in the New Testament. He cites Luke 2: 34 wherein Jesus is a "sign that will be contradicted." The cross is the most effective of these signs. In a sense, Amphilochius has brought out this meaning in the present pericope.

Modern commentators say the words of Simeon echo Isaiah 8: 14.² We shall return to that text later in Hesychius of Jerusalem.

For a rapid survey of the opinion on inmost thoughts, Brown's notes are helpful.³ However, Amphilochius does not interpret these thoughts as bad! Brown could have used Amphilochius in listing some of his citations on this verse in order to show there were more positive interpretations which were not poor methodologically.⁴

7. Luke 2: 38 (*Oratio II: 5, ll. 120-123*): *The Evangelist has spoken as you have just heard: And this one, Anna, at the same hour, coming in, confessed to the Lord and spoke to all who were looking for redemption in Jerusalem.*

The text of Amphilochius is adapted to the listeners, for he reintroduces Anna by name in these verses; he reads $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\tilde{\omega}$ (to the Lord) in place of $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ $\Theta\epsilon\tilde{\omega}$ (to God) and omits the $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ (concerning him) found in the majority of manuscripts.⁵

The text is chosen for it has the important notion of redemption: $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ Ἱερουσαλήμ (salvation in Jerusalem). This is the soteriological aspect of the mystery of Christ's birth and childhood. As we have seen, it is the predominant interpretation of the Fathers of this epoch when they are speaking of the purpose of Christ's birth.

The term $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in the New Testament (and especially in our present text Luke 2: 38) is the redemption which is awaited for Israel or Jerusalem. It is virtually the same as $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha$. It refers in Luke to a redeemer, that is, to a person (Jesus).⁶

¹ J. McHUGH, *op. cit.*, p. 88. (Cf. n. 19, where he cites the sign of Jonah—AMPHILOCHIUS, likewise, in *Or. II. In Occursum Domini*: 8, ll. 243-247.)

² *Ibid.*, pp. 104-112. (Cf. T. GALLUS, "De sensu verborum Lc. 2:35 eorumque momento mariologico," *Biblica* 29 [1948] 220-239.)

³ R. E. BROWN, *op. cit.*, p. 441.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 462-463.

⁵ ALAND GNT, p. 216. (Cf. critical apparatus.)

⁶ F. BÜCHSEL, $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) IV: 351. References cited for use of $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ are: Luke 1: 68, 2: 38, 1: 71, 24: 21; Ps. 110: 9; 129: 7; less, Hb. 9: 12. Notice Lk. 1: 71 is $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha$ and Luke 24: 21 is δ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$ $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$.

Amphilochius uses *λύτρωσις* three times;¹ *λυτρώω*, once.² It is from these uses that the interpretation of these lines is offered. The verb form need not concern us since it is used simply in a phrase saying "freed or released from groaning or sighing from the sorrows Eve had caused."

In his homily on the birth of Christ, Amphilochius uses the expression *ὕπερ κόσμον λυτρώσεως* (for the world's salvation)³ in the context of the redemptive effect brought about by the Lord who is the sun of justice (Mal. 3: 20),⁴ the shoot of everlasting life (Zech. 6: 12),⁵ the star which has arisen from on high,⁶ the heavenly man,⁷ and the God-Warrior.⁸ Amphilochius has heaped up titles from the Old Testament which have been fulfilled in Christ on the occasion of his birth,⁹ and, likewise, on the occasion of his presentation in the temple.¹⁰ He also has given us another orchestration of favored texts.

In the context of his second homily the term *λύτρωσις* is directly taken from the biblical text of Luke 2: 38 and Amphilochius shows that Anna, the widow who pondered over what the priests and scribes had failed to comprehend, makes known in Jerusalem its salvation (through the person of the Child Jesus).¹¹ The last line of the section confirms this interpretation, for Anna confesses the Child (*τὸ Βρέφος*) to be the healer, the strong redeemer (*λυτρωτὴν ἰσχυρόν*)¹² and the destroyer of sin.

8. Luke 5: 31 (*Oratio I*: 4, ll. 123-124): *The healthy do not need a doctor. . . .*

This text has been chosen by Amphilochius in order to show the salvific purpose of Christ's activity among mankind. The text is used to conclude the fourth section of his *Oratio I* on the birth of Christ, in which Amphilochius shows the purpose of Christ in assuming from the Virgin Mary¹³ his human

¹ *Or. I*: 3, l. 93; *Or. II*: 5, l. 127; *Or. VI*: 2, l. 32.

² *Or. II. In Occursum Domini*: 1, l. 9.

³ *Or. I. In Natalitia Domini*: 3, l. 94.

⁴ *Ibid.*, l. 89.

⁵ *Ibid.*, l. 91 (Zach. 6:12).

⁶ *Ibid.*, ll. 91-92.

⁷ *Ibid.*, l. 88 (Dan. 7: 13 implicit).

⁸ *Ibid.*, l. 89 (Isa. 9: 5).

⁹ *Or. I. In Natalitia Domini*.

¹⁰ *Or. II. In Occursum Domini*.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 5, l. 127.

¹² *Ibid.*, l. 132.

¹³ *Or. I. In Natalitia Domini*: 4, ll. 116-117.

nature which was made bodily substantive for the Word of God (*ἡ τὸν αἰδίδιον τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον σωματικῶς οὐσιώσασα*: O humanity, which was made bodily substantive for the Word of God).¹ The term salvation is also used for the healing of the sickness of sin brought about by Christ as "doctor."²

Datema has chosen Luke 5: 31 as the correct biblical reference over the parallel favored in the Migne edition which used Matthew 9: 12. Only Luke uses the term *ὕγιαίνοντες* (those in good health) for *ἰσχύοντες* (those who are strong) in this proverb used by Jesus.³ What is significant is that Jesus shows himself to be Victor over sin and suffering by his deeds.⁴ In fact, in another homily of Amphilocheus, Jesus heals the paralytic who in turn replies he is healthy because of the action of Jesus.⁵

The word *ιατρός* (physician, doctor) is favored by Amphilocheus in his looking at Jesus as a savior. Perhaps the best parallel is the text from his second homily in which Anna confesses the Child (Jesus) as God, "doctor," and mighty redeemer.⁶

In his *Oratio IV* he extols Christ as the doctor who lays his hands on all kinds of suffering.⁷ Perhaps more than the other Fathers studied, Amphilocheus treats of the ministry of this healing Savior.⁸

B. Old Testament:

1. *Isaiah 7:14: The Virgin shall be with child and give birth to a son, and they shall call him Emmanuel, a name which means "God is with us."*

Amphilocheus uses this most important text once in his homily *In Natalitia Domini*.⁹ It does not appear in the other works which have sur-

¹ *Ibid.*, ll. 117-118.

² *Ibid.*, ll. 125-126.

³ O. LUCK, *ὕγιης*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) VIII: 312.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Or. IX. In Illud: Non Potest Filius a se Facere*: 3, ll. 66-67 (CCG 3: 1177). (Cf. *ὕγεια*, *Or. I*: 4, l. 125; *ὕγιαυ*, *Or. IV*: 5, l. 162; *ὕγιαίνοντες*, *Or. I*: 4, l. 123 and *ὕγιαυα*, *Or. IX*: 2, l. 48; *ὕγιης*, *Or. IX*: 3, l. 65.)

⁶ *Or. II. In Occursum Domini*: 5, ll. 131-132: *Θεὸν ὠμολόγησεν τὸ βρέφος ἡ Ἄννα, ἱατρὸν, λυτρωτὴν ἰσχυρόν, ἀμαρτιῶν ἀναιρέτην.*

⁷ *Or. IV. In Mulierem Peccatricem*: 2, l. 57. (Cf. "Where may I find a doctor who takes away all suffering?" *Or. IV*: 5, l. 150; 9, l. 342bis.)

⁸ He uses *ἰάομαι* seven times, *ἱατρῶν* once, *ἱατρικός* once, *ἱατρός* ten times. (Cf. GCS 3: 352.)

⁹ *Or. I. In Natalitia Domini*: 2, ll. 60-62.

vived under his name. Since this text will be discussed at length under John Chrysostom, only a few remarks are made:

First, Amphilochius is citing it directly from Matthew 1: 23, the only differences being that he does not introduce it with "behold" ('*Idon*'), and the "ν" is lacking in his text for *καλέσουσι(ν)* and *ἐστι(ν)*, which is perfectly acceptable in Greek. Not one of these three differences changes his interpretation.

Secondly, the text is used as a fulfillment of the promise and prophecy God makes through Isaiah. This is the context within Matthew; Amphilochius is simply doing the same. He is in accord with the writers of the New Testament who use Isaiah more often than any other prophet.¹ Already we have seen that Amphilochius is relying heavily on Isaian passages for this part of his homily. The Isaiah 7: 14 text is immediately followed by Isaiah, 9: 5;² methodically in his meditative reflections, he takes up these texts, first, in referring to the Virgin,³ then to the true humanity of the Child who is born and given.⁴ Again an orchestration of desired texts comes into the homily.

Perhaps the Fathers of this epoch were making use of a collection of texts on the Incarnation which were similar to the so-called "TESTIMONIA" used by the writers of the New Testament. If so, they were following a long-standing biblical tradition for using texts, especially texts from Isaiah.⁵

2. *Isaiah 9: 5: A son is born for us, a son is given to us, upon whose shoulder is the government, and his name is called Messenger of Great Counsel, Wonderful in Counsel, God the Mighty, Final Authority, Ruler of Peace, the Everlasting Father.*

Amphilochius uses this important Messianic text in three of his homilies, two of which have been extensively analyzed in this study.⁶ The text Am-

¹ ALAND GNT, pp. 910-913.

² *Or. I. In Natalitia Domini*: 2, ll. 63-65.

³ *Ibid.*, ll. 67-68.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ll. 69-73.

⁵ JBC, p. 550, 68: 79: " 'Testimonia,' a term taken from the title of a work by Cyprian, is the designation for systematic collections of OT passages, usually of Messianic import, which are thought to have been used by the early Christians in their arguments with the Jews. These were proof-texts culled from the OT to show that Jesus was the Messiah."

⁶ *Or. I. In Natalitia Domini*: 2, ll. 63-66; 3, ll. 78-82, l. 89 and *Or. II. In Occursum Domini*: 6, l. 161.

philochius cites is not represented by the Codex Vaticanus.¹ He has the lengthier reading, as given above.

Within the context of his homily, it serves as a confirmation text for the fact that the Child born from the Virgin possesses all of the great titles foretold by Isaiah.² Amphilochius, in the development of his discourse, affirms the Child is named with all these titles.³ He returns especially to the title, *ὁ ἰσχυρὸς Θεός* (Mighty God).⁴ His second homily uses the text to confirm the reality of Christ's birth—"a son is born for us," a fact which is visible to our eyes, and "is given to us," which is known by the mind and thought alone.⁵

This text may be at the basis of the statement from Micah (5: 1-3) that the birth of the Messianic son of David takes place at Bethlehem, thereby stressing the equality of the Messianic son with David himself.⁶ The final Davidic ruler would be God's representative on earth. Isaiah 9: 5f. is the oldest passage to set forth this Messianic expectation; as such, the text refers to an outstanding savior of the house of David who represents the last event in history.⁷

The Septuagint has indicated that formerly the Alexandrian Jews were expecting this coming of a divine messenger.⁸ Amphilochius repeats this title in his ninth homily,⁹ indicating that he understood it as an important Messianic title.

The giving of a name, or, as we have in Isaiah 9: 5f., the conferring of many names, guarantees God's grace and salvation.¹⁰ This is clearly perceived in Amphilochius' second homily.¹¹

¹ RAHLFS, II: 578, critical apparatus. (Cf. H. SASSE, *alwv*, in ThWkittel [Eng] I: 206, n. 33 and, especially, G. BERTRAM, *θαῦμα*, in ThWkittel [Eng] III: 32.)

² *Or. I. In Natalitia Domini*: 2, ll. 60-62 and ll. 68-73.

³ *Ibid.*, 3, l. 80.

⁴ *Ibid.*, l. 89.

⁵ *Or. II. In Occursum Domini*: 6, ll. 161-163.

⁶ F. HESSE, *Χρίστω*, in ThWkittel (Eng) IX: 508.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 506.

⁸ J. SCHNIEWIND, *ἀγγελία*, in ThWkittel (Eng) I: 57 and n. 6 for related material (especially, "Or. c. Cels., II, 70 p. 192, 12 f., Koetschau [Bau J. 2, 206]"). Also, cf. W. ZIMMERLI, *παῖς Θεοῦ*, in ThWkittel (Eng) V: 676 on LXX Messianic understanding.

⁹ *Or. IX. In Illud: Non Potest Filius a Se Facere*: 2, l. 40: *ὁ μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος*.

¹⁰ H. BIETENHARD, *δνομα*, in ThWkittel (Eng) V: 234.

¹¹ *Or. II. In Occursum Domini*: 6, ll. 161-163.

Biblical scholars have associated Isaiah 7: 14 with the text of Isaiah 9: 5,¹ a correlation which was not neglected by Amphilochius or Chrysostom.

Another implicit correlation is found in the Isaian text which reads "for us." This refers to the remnant and the coming of the Messiah as indicated in Isaiah 9: 5 being in the process of enactment. The prophet also says that the Messiah will be given "us" (7: 10 ff. "Immanuel," 9: 5 twice "to us"). The "for us" can only be the remnant whose presence is referred to in Isaiah 8: 16-18.²

The notion of a son in relationship to his father is present in the text. This, of course, opens up parallels with other Messianic texts, especially Psalm 2: 7 and Psalm 110: 3. In the Old Testament, the king is called God's son on three occasions.³ These texts influence the Isaiah 9: 5 ff. Messianic promise.

Finally, the title of Mighty God is important for Amphilochius. He used it three times within the main section of his homily on the birth of Christ. In his understanding, Amphilochius is close to what the Scriptures, especially Isaiah, say of the Messiah.⁴ This can be linked with the effective healing power of Christ which has already been noted as a strong theme within Amphilochius. In summary, however, it is probably correct to infer that all of the titles used in Isaiah 9: 5 and in Amphilochius are of equal value.⁵

3. *Malachai 3: 20* (Sun of Justice): "... the sun of justice will arise. . ."

Amphilochius uses the title of sun of justice for Christ who has come forth from a virginal womb.⁶ He is not alone in using this title in festival homilies. As we have seen, this is one more title which the homilist has heaped up in proclaiming the message of this festival day. It should be noted that Amphilochius uses this text four times in his works.⁷ The texts affirm the title is always understood of Christ in a salvific sense; for example, in his homily on the sinful woman the sun of justice overcomes all aspects of sin;⁸ and in his

¹ G. DELLING, *παρθένος*, in ThWKittel (Eng) V: 832.

² V. HERNTRICH, *λεῖμμα*, in ThWKittel (Eng) IV: 205, 208-209.

³ E. SCHWEIZER, *υἱός*, in ThWKittel (Eng) VIII: 349-351. (Cf. A. VACCARI, "De Messia 'Filio Dei' in V. T.," *Verbum Domini* 15 [1935] 48-55, 77-86.)

⁴ W. GRUNDMANN, *δύναμαι/δύναμις*, in ThWKittel (Eng) II: 299 ff.

⁵ G. VON RAD, *εἰρήνη*, in ThWKittel (Eng) II: 405-406.

⁶ Or. I. In Natalitia Domini: 3, l. 89.

⁷ Ibid. Or. IV. In Mulierem Peccatricem: 2, l. 66; Or. V. In Diem Sabbati Sancti: 3, l. 63; Or. VII. De Recens Baptizatis: 5, l. 159.

⁸ Or. IV: 2, ll. 66-67.

sermon to the recently baptized, it illumines and warms (through the baptismal waters).¹

4. *Baruch 3: 38: Since then he (she) has appeared on earth and moved among men.*

In the tradition of the Fathers studied within this thesis, the text of Baruch 3: 38: "Since then she has appeared upon earth and moved among men" (μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὤφθη καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συναναστρέφη) is among the most favored texts applied to the mystery of the Incarnation. It is frequently orchestrated with Isaiah 7: 14.

Though within its biblical context the phrase is a continuation of the description of Wisdom (feminine), the Fathers have used it for Christ in His Incarnation, thus changing the gender of its antecedent, Wisdom.

The two earliest appearances of the text in reference to the Incarnation are found in Clement of Alexandria² and Hippolytus.³ It is the latter who clearly states that the entire section of the Scripture's Baruch 3: 36-38⁴ was used by Noetus and Theodotus to speak of Christ; unfortunately, the text was used to support their heretical statement: "Christ is the Father, if He is God, therefore the Father suffered."⁵

Hippolytus refutes the textual interpretation of Noetus; the Scriptures are correct. Noetus, however, uses the text otherwise.⁶

¹ *Or. VII*: 5, 1. 159.

² CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Paedag.* I, 10: PG 8: 357-360; *Paedag.* II, 3: PG 8: 433, 436.

³ HIPPOLYTUS, *Contra Noet.*, II: PG 10: 805; *Contra. Noet.*, V: PG 10: 809.

⁴ *Ibid.*, PG 10: 805B. "Such is our God; no other is to be compared to him: He has traced out all the way of understanding, and has given her to Jacob, his servant, to Israel, his beloved son. Since then *she* (he) has appeared on earth, and moved among men" (Bar. 3: 36-38, *New American Bible*).

⁵ *Ibid.*, PG 10: 805B ab initio. (Cf. M. SIMONETTI, *La Crisi Ariana nel IV secolo*, Augustinianum 11 [Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1975], p. 8, n. 18: "Hipp., *Noet.* 7. 15. TERT., *Prax.* 7, 6; 20. Da Ippolito [*Noet.* 2] apprendiamo che in questo modo i monarchiani interpretavano anche Bar. 3, 36-38 'Questo è il nostro Dio e non sarà considerato altro accanto a lui . . . Dopo è apparso in terra e se è intrattenuto con gli uomini.' e. Is. 45: 14 ' . . . perchè in te c'è Dio: a te rivolgeranno le loro preghiere, perchè non c'è Dio fuori di te': si tratta di due passi che troveremo adoperati nel IV secolo in senso antariano, stante l'interpretazione antimonarchiana fornita da Ippolito [*Noet.* 4.5] e Tertulliano [*Prax.* 13, 2; 16, 3], distinguendo Dio Padre dal Dio incarnato.")

⁶ *Ibid.*, PG 10: 808A.

From the third century on, the text is used more often for the Incarnation. By the time of the era of the writers and preachers studied in this thesis, it has become a traditional text for use in Nativity and Incarnational sermons and tracts. Unfortunately, today it is glibly passed over in commentaries as a text which was erroneously applied to the Incarnation or doctrine on the Logos by the Fathers—even being a Christian interpolation.¹

There seem to be two possible reasons for the choice of the text in Incarnational thought and interpretation, the first being the Wisdom-Logos context, and, the second, the servant of God or *παῖς Θεοῦ* context. For the first concept we turn to Athanasius, who speaks of the relationship Wisdom has with the Word of God and the relationship of other Scriptural texts to Baruch 3: 38. Athanasius' thought contains in seed-form what will be developed by the later Greek Fathers of the Church.

Athanasius is commenting on John 17: 3 ("And this is eternal life, that they know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."). Here is the text:

"And we know that the Son of God has come and has given us understanding, to know Him who is true, in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." (I John 5: 20) Therefore, the Son is true God before He becomes man, and after He has become the man Christ Jesus He is the mediator of God and of men. This is indeed what He says, and whom He has sent Jesus Christ, united to the Father according to the Spirit, and to us truly according to the flesh; and so He is mediator of God and of men. Who not only is man, but also is God, just in the manner that Jeremias says: "*THIS IS OUR GOD; NO OTHER CAN COMPARE WITH HIM. HE GRASPED THE WHOLE WAY TO KNOWLEDGE, AND GAVE HER TO HIS SERVANT JACOB AND TO ISRAEL WHOM HE LOVED. AFTER THAT (HE) APPEARED ON EARTH AND LIVED AMONG MEN.*" When then did He live among men unless it be when He was born with them of a woman, became an infant among them, grew with them, and ate with them?"²

¹ C. A. MOORE, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah—the Additions*, Anchor Bible 44 (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1977), pp. 301-302.

² ATHANASIUS, *De Incarnatione et Contra Haereticos*, PG 26: 1024-1025. N. B. SIMONETTI, *op. cit.*, p. 277, n. 79, has to be corrected in the light of Baruch 3: 38 (actually the more important verse of the text): "Va sottolineata, comunque, in Atanasio—come negli altri teologi antiariani— la grande utilizzazione del IV Vangelo. Atanasio si serve solo occasionalmente di Io. 5, 26 (CA 3, 36), che abbiamo visto così importante nella teologia omeousiana. Rileviamo ancora l'assenza di Bar. 3, 36, mentre è utilizzato Is. 45, 14 (CA 2, 23; Serap. 2, 4), che sappiamo di norma affiancato in questo tempo al passo di Baruch."

Athanasius then cites texts to confirm what he is saying (*Jeremiah* 17: 9; *Isaiah* 9: 6; *Isaiah* 7: 14). These latter two texts are the texts which Chrysostom uses. Then in a doctrinal summary these splendid words of Athanasius are given: "Therefore he is God who is born of a Virgin and is made man of the God-bearing Mary."¹

For the second biblical concept of *παῖς Θεοῦ* we turn to the text itself wherein the expression is found, then the obvious correlation the Fathers discovered with *Isaiah* 9: 15 which is so often used with *Baruch* 3: 36-38. Verse 37 reads: "He has traced out all the way of understanding, and has given her to Jacob, *his servant*, to Israel, his beloved son." The expression *child of God* occurs rarely in Jewish literature after 100 B.C., but it is present in *Baruch* 1: 20; 2: 20, 24, 28; 3: 37.² The meaning of "Child of God" is possible for this verse; it is also in *Wisdom* 2: 13.³ The context also leaves room for the second meaning of *παῖς Θεοῦ* namely, servant of God, and the Lukan text 1: 54 compared with *Luke* 1: 69 leads to the same conclusion.⁴ The Fathers are fond of the text of *Isaiah* 9: 5: *ὅτι παιδίον ἐγεννήθη ἡμῖν, υἱὸς καὶ ἐδόθη ἡμῖν* (because a child is born for us, a son is given to us), and use it with the *Baruch* 3: 36-38 text.

Since all of the appearances of *Baruch* 3: 36-38 in the Fathers studied will be discussed, it is now time to turn to Amphilochius' use of the text. It appears only once within his writings, and, as would be expected, in the homily entitled *In Natalitia Domini*.⁵ The text is used within those parts of his homily in which the prophets foretold that God would be seen, that He would be with mankind—Emmanuel, and that, concretely, a child, possessing the titles of God, would be born and given to mankind. The texts referred to are *Baruch* 3: 38,⁶ *Isaiah* 63: 9,⁷ *Isaiah* 7: 14 (*Mt.* 1: 23),⁸ and *Isaiah* 9: 5.⁹ These promises are fulfilled in the birth of Christ. Amphilochius concludes the section with his purpose for using these texts: "From these words you now have knowledge of the mode of [his] presence."¹⁰ The

¹ ATHANASIUS, *op. cit.*, PG 26: 1025A: *Θεὸς οὖν ἔστιν ὁ γεννήθεις ἐκ παρθένου, καὶ γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς θεοτόκου.*

² J. JEREMIAS, *παῖς Θεοῦ*, in ThWNT (Eng) V: 677.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 678. (Cf. n. 149: "We should possibly add *Bar.* 3: 37—lines 34 ff.")

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 679.

⁵ *Or. I. In Natalitia Domini*: 2, ll. 51-52.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, ll. 54-55.

⁸ *Ibid.*, ll. 60-62.

⁹ *Ibid.*, ll. 63-66.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, ll. 66-67.

virginal conception and the condescension of the Word of God are then mentioned in the soteriological purpose of such an Incarnation.¹

Thus Amphilochius has used texts from the common treasury of an already long existing tradition: from Matthew 1: 23 and John 1: 14 through Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Athanasius. Baruch 3: 38 is to be understood as an essential text for the Church of that time.²

5. *Numbers 24: 17: O Day to be celebrated by innumerable hymns, in which a star has risen for us out of Jacob and the heavenly man who has appeared out of Israel.*³

This text is clearly a Messianic one for Amphilochius. He uses the first part of the third stich and three words from the fourth stich within the context of the celebration of the feast of the Nativity and as a source for more messianic titles for Christ which he gathers for this section of the discourse. All of the Old Testament texts which surround this citation are also Messianic: Isaiah 9: 5bis,⁴ and Malachai 3: 20,⁵ and Zechariah 6: 12.⁶ He may intend the text to be linked with that of Baruch 3: 38, for the word ὡφθῆ (appeared) occurs as well as the ἐξ Ἰακωβ and ἐξ Ἰσραήλ found within Baruch 3: 37.

The expression ἀνατολή (ἀνατέλλω) "the rising (from the east)" or "to come forth and arise" is associated with the Messiah. From the close proximity of the text (Numbers 24: 17) to Zechariah 6: 12, we may infer that Amphilochius is dependent on the same tradition as Justin Martyr⁷ and Melito of Sardis.⁸ The former understands the ἀνατολή of Zechariah 6: 12 in terms of the ἀνατέλλειν of the LXX in Numbers 24: 17 so that the advent of Christ is the rising of a star. Melito uses the expression as found in Luke 1: 78 "the morning sun from heaven will rise" in reference to the heavenly light in Christ as Messiah and the sun of the world. The text of Malachai 3: 20 immediately fits this context and is used by Amphilochius. It is not

¹ *Ibid.*, ll. 67-73.

² R. DEVREESE, "Chânes Exégétiques Grecques," DBSuppl I: 1084-1233. (Cf. V. ERMONI, "Baruch," in DTC II: 437-441 and E. PHILIPPE, "Baruch," in DB I: 1475-1484.)

³ My translation. Cf. *Or. I. In Natalitia Domini*: 3, ll. 87-88.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ll. 78-82, l. 89.

⁵ *Ibid.*, l. 89.

⁶ *Ibid.*, l. 91.

⁷ JUSTIN, *Dial.* 100, 4; 106, 4; 121, 2; 126, 1. (Cf. JUSTIN, *Apol.* I, 32, 12 combining Num. 24: 17 and Is. 11: 1, 10.)

⁸ Cf. H. SCHLIER, ἀνατολή, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) I: 353.

a question of directly using Justin or Melito's works; rather a tradition for the use of such orchestrating of texts has already been formed.

Amphilochius definitely is associating all of these texts with the Child who is born of the Virgin. He also calls him the heavenly man, perhaps implicitly referring to another Messianic text, Daniel 7: 13: τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου (like a son of man from the heaven[s]) while Christ as fulfillment is in reality for Amphilochius ὁ ἀνθρώπος ὁ οὐράνιος (the heavenly man).¹

The Qumran texts have a reference to Numbers 24: 17; it is considered Messianic.² Simon's coins after the revolt of 132 carry a star.³ The rabbinic literature witnesses to a Messianic understanding of Numbers 24: 17.⁴ Akiba took Numbers 24: 17 in such a way as to see a fulfillment of the prophecy in Ben Koseba.⁵ Unlike the rabbinic texts adduced, the Christian usage in the Fathers clearly affirms the soteriological role of the Christ.⁶ The Messianic context is thus attested in Judaism, in the Qumran community, in rabbinic literature and especially in the Septuagint itself⁷ — a product of Alexandrian-Diaspora-Judaism, and a translation which became the Church's book.⁸

2. Basil the Great († 379)

Isaiah 7: 14: in the homily on Christ's Birth.⁹

Basil uses the text of Isaiah 7: 14 as it is found in the Septuagint; however, he follows the Vaticanus reading of λήψεται for ἔξει.¹⁰ He uses the

¹ Or. I. In Natalitia Domini: 3, l. 88.

² Cf. JBC, p. 96, 5: 47; IQM 11: 5-7, CD 7: 19-20.

³ W. FOERSTER, ἀστὴρ, in ThWKittel (Eng) I: 505 and n. 19. (Cf. A. S. VAN DER WOUDE, χρῶ, in ThWKittel [Eng] IX: 523, n. 189.)

⁴ Cf. G. KITTEL, ἐρημος, in ThWKittel (Eng) II: 659, citing: Tanchuma תנחומא 7b: "(The Messiah) drives them forth, and brings them into the wilderness. . . ." and Leqach tob Nu. 24: 17 (II, 129b): cf. STRACH-BILLERBECK II: 298.

⁵ R. MEYER, προφήτης, in ThWKittel (Eng) VI: 824, notes 305, 306.

⁶ C. COLPE, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, in ThWKittel (Eng) VIII: 410, n. 67. (I am referring to Christ, not to a second Adam theme.)

⁷ A. S. VAN DER WOUDE, Χρῶ, in ThWKittel (Eng) IX: 510.

⁸ RAHLFS, I: xxiii.

⁹ L. GAMBERO studies the Basilian authenticity and the Marian doctrine of this text in his thesis appearing in this same issue of *Marian Library Studies: L'omelia sulla generazione di Cristo di Basilio di Cesarea. Il posto della Vergine Maria*, MLS 13-14 (1981-1982), see pp. 107-114.

¹⁰ *Homilia in Sanctam Christi Generationem*, PG 31: 1464C; then, as cited from Mat-

text in combination with Baruch 3: 38 (that is, implicitly).¹ He refutes the arguments of those who would read νεανίς (young woman) in place of παρθένος (virgin) by adhering strictly to the Septuagint. It would be absurd that God would promise an extraordinary sign and not fulfill it. He argues that reading "young woman" would not be a special sign. In fact, the sign given by the Lord is unheard of, prodigious, and far removed from the ordinary.² There is a reliance on the tradition of Ignatius of Antioch and possibly of Origen in which Basil stresses the fact that the virginity of Mary was hidden from the prince of this world.³

3. Gregory of Nyssa († 394)

Isaiah 7: 14 and Baruch 3: 38:

Gregory of Nyssa uses the Emmanuel text in his homily on the Birth-day of Christ.⁴ It is within the immediate context of answering *how* "a child is born for us and a son is given to us." (Isaiah 9: 6)⁵ He uses the text, "Behold the virgin shall conceive in her womb and will bring forth a son, and they shall name him Emmanuel, which is interpreted, God-with-us." The citation is through Matthew 1: 23. Just as Basil, he substitutes λήψεται for ἔξει. Then comes his clear statement concerning Mary: "The virgin becomes a mother, and remains a virgin."⁶

4. Gregory of Nazianzus († ca. 390)

Baruch 3: 36-38

This text is used in *Oratio XXX* of Gregory of Nazianzus. Though often used in their Nativity homilies, the Fathers were well aware that the monar-

thew 1: 23, with the same reading λήψεται for ἔξει. (Cf. RAHLFS, II: 575, critical apparatus.)

¹ He states that the name "Emmanuel" means that God is present with men (ὅτι Θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις); PG 31: 1465C.

² *Ibid.*, PG 31: 1465D.

³ *Ibid.*, PG 31: 1464C. (Cf. ORIGEN, *In Lucam. Hom.* VI, 3-4: SC 87: 145; GCS 49, 35. Cf. IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH, *Ephes. XIX.*)

⁴ *In Diem Natalem Christi*, PG 46: 1136A.

⁵ *Ibid.*, PG 46: 1133D.

⁶ Ἡ παρθένος μήτηρ γίνεται, καὶ διαμένει παρθένος (PG 46: 1136A).

chians had used this text in confounding the Father and Son.¹ It is within this same historical context that Gregory makes use of the scriptural reference.²

ANTIOCHENES

5. John Chrysostom († 407)

1. The Orchestration of Texts

John Chrysostom's technique, the "orchestration of texts," is based on using Scripture to prove or interpret Scripture. It basically comprises a choice of texts around a principal text—in the present study this usually is Isaiah 7: 14 or Baruch 3: 38—which helps to confirm, expand, or clarify the interpretation Chrysostom has given. The important texts noticed around Isaiah 7: 14 are the following ones:

Baruch 3: 38:³ "Since then she (He) has appeared on earth, and moved among men."

Micah 5: 2:⁴ "But you, Bethlehem-Ephrathah, too small to be among the clans of Judah, from you shall come forth for me one who is to be ruler in Israel; whose origin is from old, from ancient times."

Romans 6: 9-10:⁵ "We know that Christ, once raised from the dead, will never die again; death has no more power over him. His death was death to sin, once for all; his life is life for God."

Romans 9: 5:⁶ "... theirs were the patriarchs, and from them came the Messiah (I speak of his human origin). Blessed forever be God who is over all! Amen."

Genesis 49: 9-10:⁷ "Judah, like a lion's whelp, you have grown up on prey, my son. He crouches like a lion recumbent, the king of beasts—who would dare rouse him? The scepter shall never depart from Judah,

¹ M. SIMONETTI, *La Crisi Ariana nel IV Secolo*, p. 8, esp. n. 18.

² *Oratio XXX — Theologica IV*, PG 36: 121B.

³ *Contra Iudaeos et Gentiles*, PG 48: 815AB. *Ecloga 34*, PG 63: 823D; *In Matt. Hom.* 5, PG 57: 56; *In Psalm. 47*, PG 55: 216A; *De Incomprehensibili Dei Natura*, PG 48: 739A.

⁴ *In Natalem Christi*, PG 56: 390D. *In Psalm. 44*, PG 55: 195C.

⁵ *In Isaiam 7*, PG 56: 86C; *Ecloga 34*, PG 63: 829C.

⁶ *De Incomprehensibili Dei Natura*, PG 48: 739A.

⁷ *In Illud, Pater*, PG 51: 37B.

or the mace from between his legs, while tribute is brought to him, and he receives the people's homage."

Isaiah 9: 6:¹ "His dominion is vast and forever peaceful, from David's throne and over his kingdom which he confirms and sustains by judgment and justice both now and forever."

A similar constellation of texts is used to demonstrate the reality of the human nature of Jesus Christ: Galatians 4: 4, Philippians 2: 7, John 1: 14 and Romans 9: 5. These have already been cited.

In *De Incomprehensibili Dei Natura*, V,² are found: Isaiah 7: 14 (Matthew 1: 23), Isaiah 9: 6, Romans 9: 5, Ephesians 5: 5, and II Timothy 1: 10. All these texts fit very well the mystery of the Nativity and the Incarnation.

In his homily on the birth of Christ, *Ecloga XXXIV*—the following Incarnational texts are presented: Philippians 2: 5-9, Baruch 3: 38, Isaiah 7: 14, John 1: 1, Matthew 2: 1, Matthew 1: 18-25, Isaiah 7: 10-16 and Romans 6: 9.³

In *Illud, Pater, Si Possibile Est, Transeat*: the value of the text is from its making use of a series of scriptural quotations to bring out a point. Since certain patterns appear, we call it an orchestration of texts or a constellation of favored texts used for the Incarnation.

Here Chrysostom goes to the beginnings of salvation history, starting with a patriarch: "From the prey, my son, you have gone up; you have stooped down as a lion"—thus Jacob blesses *Judah*. Then Isaiah, a prophet, announces that a Virgin shall conceive and bear a son; and, again in Isaiah 53: 2, we see him as an infant and like a root out of dry ground. Isaiah 9: 6 is then cited, followed by Isaiah 11: 1, and finally Baruch 3: 36-38. The Virgin birth and the Incarnation are asserted. David, too, in Psalm 72: 6 says: "May he be like rain that falls on mown grass, like showers that water the earth"; this is seen in reference to Mary as virgin: "so quietly and without noise he entered the virginal womb" (*δτι ἀποφῆτι καὶ ἀταράχως εἰς τὴν μήτραν εἰσελήλυθε τὴν παρθενικήν*) and also stressing the Davidic lineage.⁴

¹ *De Incomprehensibili Dei Natura*, PG 48: 738D; *In Psalm. 44*, PG 55: 195CD.

² *De Incomprehensibili Dei Natura*, PG 48: 738D-739A.

³ *Ecloga 34*, PG 63: 827-829.

⁴ *In Illud, Pater*, PG 51: 37BC.

2. *Mary, the Virgin Mother of Jesus, within the context of fulfillment (Isaiah 7: 14)*

The Virgin Mother of Jesus is primarily seen in texts which are of the prophecy-fulfillment theme. She is the Virgin prophesied in Isaiah 7: 14; she is the human link with the royal lineage of David (Joseph her husband also is seen in this respect.), and she is the Mother who gave Jesus human flesh while remaining a virgin. For Chrysostom Mary is the human instrument by means of which God accomplishes the Incarnation, that is, Jesus takes flesh of her in order to enter into human history and bring about salvation. Thus, her role is also bound up with the purpose of the Incarnation which primarily is soteriological. Mary cannot be compared to Christ. He, as has been pointed out, is the center of the Scriptures for Chrysostom. Mary is always secondary in relationship to Christ; she is present in the Scriptures because of Christ. Chrysostom sees the instrumental role of Mary within the Scriptures as a physical virgin who as a person within history gives the reality of human nature and the Davidic lineage to Jesus her Son.

The text of Isaiah 7: 14 is used sixteen times in an explicit citation. Not only does the text appear in the expected Matthew commentary, where it is used as a direct explicit fulfillment text (Matthew 1: 23),¹ but it is also cited within his commentary on the Prologue of St. John,² and in ten other authentic works of Chrysostom.³ Mary in all these *texts* is seen in relationship to the *event* of the Incarnation, specifically as the virgin (not symbolic) who was to fulfill the role of Mother to the Messiah. That is, for Chrysostom, Mary is a physical virgin born in history who gives birth to a Son for the salvation of mankind.

Why was this text so important for the Fathers and for John Chrysostom? The answer cannot be given categorically. It is evident that Chrysos-

¹ *In Matt. Hom. 5*, PG 57: 56D, 57A.

² *In Joh. Hom. 13*, PG 59: 87B.

³ A. *In Isaiam 7*, PG 56: 78-86 (esp. 82B).
 B. *Ecloga 34*, PG 63: 827-829 (esp. 827A, D).
 C. *In Psalm. 44*, PG 55: 195C.
 D. *In Psalm. 47*, PG 55: 216A.
 E. *In Psalm. 117*, PG 55: 335D.
 F. *De Incomprehensibili Dei Natura*, PG 48: 738C-D.
 G. *Contra Judaeos et Gentiles*, PG 48: 815A.
 H. *In Illud, Pater*, PG 51: 37C.
 I. *In Diem Servatoris*, PG 56: 389B-390C.
 (Cf. *In Matt. Hom. 5*, PG 57: 55A-56D; *In Joh. Hom. 13*, PG 59: 87B.)

tom was interested in showing the reality of Jesus' human nature by demonstrating both that the Virgin and her husband Joseph belonged to the royal lineage of David. This historical fact is important because the Messianic promises are directly related to the Davidic descendants. The text of Isaiah 7: 14 is used often in a context which includes the notion of Davidic line.¹

The starting point for Chrysostom for discussing the Davidic lineage of Jesus is in his commentary on the genealogy of Matthew 1: 1-17. Chrysostom clearly states that Joseph is not the father of Jesus. He is present to offer Jesus the claim to royal Davidic lineage, but, not exclusively, for Chrysostom argues from his own punctuation of the text—citing the parallel from Luke's Gospel—that Mary, too, is of the same House of David (Luke 1: 27).² He is, at first, restricted by the text of Matthew for, definitely, the genealogy of the Virgin is not traced.³ Chrysostom gives the reason why Mary's genealogy is not traced—"It was not the law to do so among the Jews"—and, at the same time, he confirms the purpose and importance of Joseph's lineage from David.⁴ In searching for further support to his understanding of Mary also being from the lineage of David, Chrysostom states that marriage was supposed to be within the same tribe. He thereby returns to the Genesis 49: 10 promise made to the tribe of Judah (a reference which we have seen used by the earlier Fathers).⁵

The mystery of Mary becomes more evident as the prophecy of Isaiah 7: 14 is fulfilled. This key text for Chrysostom helps us to understand Mary's place in the Incarnation. He brings out the fulfillment prophecy in his Matthean commentary which speaks in general about the text of Isaiah 7: 14.⁶

The title of Christ, "Son of David,"⁷ becomes important for both Matthew and Chrysostom's interpretation of Matthew. The title differs from the Fourth Gospel's title of "Word," assuring the reality of Jesus according to the flesh, which means His birth from the Virgin Mary. The thought of Chrysos-

¹ *Ecloga* 34, PG 63: 827D; *In Psalm. 44*, PG 55: 194D-195BCD; *Contra Judaeos et Gentiles*, PG 48: 815C; *In Illud, Pater*, PG 51: 37BC; *In Diem Servatoris*, PG 56: 389B, 390C.

² *In Matt. Hom. 2*, PG 57: 27D.

³ *In Matt. Hom. 1*, PG 57: 21B.

⁴ *In Matt. Hom. 2*, PG 57: 28CD.

⁵ *In Matt. Hom. 2*, PG 57: 28A.

⁶ *In Matt. Hom. 5*, PG 57: 56D.

⁷ *In Matt. Hom. 2*, PG 57: 27B.

tom is definitely biblical when it comes to speaking of the origin of Jesus Christ from the Virgin Mary. He proves for his listeners that Mary is from the lineage of David—so Christ fulfills truly all that springs from biblical prophecy about David's future progeny. It is also another way of claiming for Christ the totality of his human nature from the Virgin Mary—really, according to the flesh; not as from Joseph her spouse, which is according to the Law but not the flesh. There is a pronounced fundamental realism in Chrysostom on this point which issues from the biblical pericope of Matthew 1: 18-25. Insistence on Davidic lineage is an important emphasis in the exegesis of the Fathers and, especially, in Chrysostom. Jesus is a part of the human history of God's People, the Jews, and the linear aspect of the Judaeo-Christian tradition is never forgotten. The Bible of the Church and Synagogue considers the history of mankind as essential to its message. Chrysostom was born into such a heritage.

There are texts in Chrysostom which indicate the lineage of Jesus from the House of David, then, far more remotely, from Jacob through Juda. We have seen examples of this in his commentary on Matthew. The other references are of the fulfillment type, that is, prophecy and promise are carried out by God through the birth of Jesus by Mary.¹ At times, Chrysostom defends the belief in a manner similar to the rabbis who had used their commentaries as a way of protecting the Torah by building a hedge around it;² Chrysostom uses an expression similar to this rabbinic one: "Oppose him from the witness of the Scriptures—as a wall."³ The apophatic approach continues to be used by Chrysostom.⁴

In the homily on the Nativity, *In Diem Natalem*,⁵ Chrysostom affirms Mary to be of the House of David (Cf. Luke 1: 26-27.). We have seen this same argument above in the Matthew commentary. Just as the star led the wise men to Christ, Mary is led to Bethlehem by the law as the prophets had predicted. She, therefore, is from the family of David; for, if she was from Bethlehem she belongs to the family of David (Luke 2: 4). Chrysostom, true to his Antiochene background, proceeds from grammar to defend his

¹ *De Prophetiarum Obscuritate*, PG 56: 166D-167A; *De Melchisedeck*, PG 56: 259D-260A.

² PIRKE ABOTH, *The Ethics of the Talmud: The Sayings of the Fathers*, ed. by R. T. Herford (New York, 1964), p. 21.

³ *De Melchisedeck*, PG 56: 259D.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *In Diem Natalem*, PG 49: 354CD.

interpretation of Luke 1: 26-27. The other parallels to such passages proceed along the same line of prophecy-fulfillment.¹

3. *The Septuagint*

The Septuagint version of Isaiah 7: 14 and its correspondent in Matthew 1: 23 is a basic text for Chrysostom's reflections on the role of the Virgin in the Incarnation. Chrysostom uses *λήφεται* in place of *ἐξει* in the LXX; he also has the third person plural *καλέσσουσιν* in place of *καλέσεις*. He has conflated the texts of Matthew 1: 23 and Isaiah 7: 14.

As we have seen above, there are sixteen different citations of the text (considered in the context of scriptural interpretation) within his works. His commentary on the text of Isaiah is the basis for his other citations, and can be considered to be the matrix.² Chrysostom's later homily on the Nativity³ copies almost verbatim the ideas found in the Isaiah commentary; the same pattern is found in the fifth homily on the Gospel of St. Matthew⁴ wherein the Isaiah text is found.

Virgin is the preferred title of Chrysostom for Mary. (His argumentation differs from that offered by McHugh.)⁵ For Chrysostom, the virginity of Mary is physical, not symbolic. For him, the Septuagint version of Isaiah 7: 14 prophesied her virginity and the fulfillment of it is reached in the birth of Jesus—Matthew 1: 23 being the fulfillment text. Baruch 3: 38 is the prophetic Incarnation text which often accompanies the Isaiah text.

For him, it is not merely a sign but also a prophecy, connected to the sign within these texts.⁶ In his commentary on Isaiah, the Isaiah 7: 14 text is seen within the larger context of the chapter, strengthening Chrysostom's interpretation. In this instance, he uses the prophetic sign as a lesson in how God as a Divine Pedagogue leads us to believe.⁷ By using the plural of Matthew 1: 23 (*καλέσσουσι*) universal salvation is meant, in contrast to its simply being a sign for Ahaz (*καλέσεις*).

¹ *In Matt. Hom. 1*, PG 57: 21A, D, 41CD; *In Matt. Hom. 2*, PG 57: 27D-28A (Gen. 49: 10); *In Illud, Pater*, PG 51: 32C.

² *In Isaiam*, PG 56: 78-86.

³ *Ecloga 34*, PG 63: 827-829.

⁴ *In Matt. Hom. 5*, PG 57: 55-57.

⁵ J. McHUGH, *op. cit.*, pp. 310-311. (Cf. also pp. 281-283.)

⁶ *In Isaiam*, PG 56: 83.

⁷ *Ibid.*, PG 56: 82.

Chrysostom also uses the definite article before the word *παρθένος*. That the woman is a virgin is essential to his interpretation; it cannot be otherwise. Undoubtedly, he is following the fulfillment text of Matthew 1: 23 to render this understanding.

In his citations, the virginity of Mary, the humanity of Jesus, and his Davidic origins are essential for Chrysostom.¹ The texts of Isaiah 7: 14 and Baruch 3: 38 are important to his interpretation of the Incarnation.

4. *Baruch 3: 38: Μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὤφθη καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συναεστράφη. (Since then she has appeared on earth, and moved among men.)*

Chrysostom uses the text of Baruch 3: 38 at least eleven times explicitly.² The prophetic announcement of the Incarnation is his consistent interpretation for this text. Normally, he uses it with a constellation of texts for the Incarnation, especially with Isaiah 7: 14 and Isaiah 9: 6.³ The text is both attributed to Jeremiah⁴ and to Baruch.⁵ It seems that Hippolytus⁶ is the earliest of the writers to use this text. Origen had also used the text.⁷

Frequently the use of the text is doctrinal, having reference to the divine and human natures within Christ. The richest insight into the text

¹ *In Psalm. 49*, PG 55: 21B.

² John Chrysostom:

a. *De Incomprehensibili Dei Natura*, PG 48: 738-739D, 740A.

b. *Contra Judaeos et Gentiles*, PG 48: 815A.

c. *Contra Judaeos et Gentiles*, PG 48: 824A.

d. *De Sancta Pentecoste I*, PG 50: 454B.

e. *In S. Phocam Martyrem*, PG 50: 705B.

f. *In Illud, Pater, Si Possibile Est, Transeat*, PG 51: 37C.

g. *In Psalm. 47*, PG 55: 216A.

h. *In Psalm. 49*, PG 55: 246A.

i. *Ecloga 34*, PG 63: 823D.

j. *In Diem Natalem Christi*, PG 49: 351A.

k. *In Illud. In Qua Potestate*, PG 56: 424D.

³ *De Incomprehensibili Dei Natura*, V (Isa. 7: 14; Matt. 1: 23; Isa. 9: 6; Rom. 9: 5; Ephes. 5: 5; and II Tim. 1: 10), PG 48: 738-739.

⁴ *Contra Judaeos et Gentiles, Quod Christus Sit Deus*, PG 48: 815.

⁵ *Ibid.*, PG 48: 824.

⁶ HIPPOLYTUS, *Contra Noeticum*, PG 10: 805; cf. HIPPOLYTUS, *Noet.* 7: 15; TERTULLIAN, *Prax.* 16, 3: CCL 2, 1181.

⁷ ORIGEN, *In Matt.*, Origenes Werkes X (GCS), 562, 2. *In Joan*, VI, 6: PG 14: 253A; cf. *In Joan.*, Origenes Werkes IV (GCS), XXX: 15, 156. *Comment. in Epist. ad Rom.* IV, 11: PG 14: 1000.

is found in St. Athanasius who seems to bring out both the relationship which Wisdom has with the Word of God, and, likewise, the relationship of other Scriptural texts to Baruch 3: 38. His interpretation contains in its seed-form the notions developed by the later Fathers of the Church. It offers as well an interpretation which springs from the original setting of the text in its Wisdom background. What is most interesting is that he uses the same constellation of texts to be found in Chrysostom (Isaiah 7: 14, Isaiah 9: 6). In a doctrinal summary Athanasius concludes, "The one is God who is born of a virgin and who became man of Mary the mother of God."¹

Athanasius also has commented on Proverbs 8: 25-27² showing that the Son of God is true Wisdom, not created as things in the world, for "before the mountains, before the earth and the waters, before the hills he begot me." The text is parallel in thought to what Athanasius has said about the meaning of Baruch 3: 38, that is, both texts serve to explain the mystery of the Word as Wisdom become flesh among men.

Gregory of Nazianzus³ also used Baruch 3: 36-38 to interpret the meaning of John 17: 3: "And this is eternal life, that they know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." This was the same text Athanasius had used. He understands the text as distinguishing the Father and the Son. In this latter notion, Gregory is close to the use of Hippolytus. It seems that the Fathers of the fourth century were dependent on Athanasius and possibly on Hippolytus for their use of the text in Incarnational thought.

JERUSALEMITES

Their use of Isaiah 7: 14

Since the text of Isaiah 7: 14 is the most important text in those homilies and tracts which treat directly of the birth of Christ, Hesychius and Cyril of Jerusalem have been chosen for the general orientation given to that text. Both preachers are from the geographical area in which the original inspiration of Isaiah 7: 14 came, albeit the translation of the Septuagint, of which they made use, is from Alexandria; therefore, the all-important word *παρθένος* is their preferred title for Mary, the Mother of Jesus.

¹ *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, PG 26: 1024-1025.

² *Oratio II. Contra Arianos*, PG 26: 315-316.

³ *Oratio XXX—Theologica IV*, PG 36: 121B.

The text has been discussed at length throughout the pages of this thesis. The present presentation is meant as an aid to studying the citation as it appears in the context of each of the works of the Jerusalemite Fathers studied.

6. Cyril of Jerusalem († 387)

1. Isaiah 7: 14 and Baruch 3: 38

In his eleventh Catechetical lecture, Cyril uses the notion of Emmanuel¹ (God with us) as a transition to his use of Baruch 3: 36-38,² thus combining the two favored texts used by the Fathers for the Incarnation. He is using the texts as a testimony to Christ's divinity and humanity.³

His twelfth lecture links the notion of Solomon's building the temple—"Can it indeed be that God dwells among men on earth?"—with the birth of Christ. Since the words from III Kings 8: 27 (Sept.) are remarkably close to Baruch 3: 38, it may be that Cyril understands how a relationship with the transcendent dwelling place of God, by a loving condescension of God, becomes possible through the humanity of Christ. The text concerning the temple reads in the Septuagint: *ὅτι εἰ ἀληθῶς κατοικήσει ὁ Θεὸς μετὰ ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* ("Can it indeed be that God dwells among men on earth?"). It is a question. David's prayer implies that such a presence is possible by God's graciousness. For Cyril, the Baruch 3: 38 text is the answer: *μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὤφθη καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συναεστράφη* ("Since then HE has appeared on earth and moved among men.").

Often the Fathers used Isaiah 7: 14 against unbelievers in a polemic manner. By addressing possible or imagined unbelievers, they enhanced the instructional element in their homilies and lectures. For us today, these passages offer insights into their interpretation. A good example is found in *Catechesis XII, De Christo Incarnato*. This is the same instruction that began with a direct quotation of Isaiah 7:14, which apparently was followed by a hymn to the Virgin-born God (possibly a hymn based on John's Prologue); Cyril's introductory remarks are filled with references to that hymn.⁴ In section two, the Isaiah citation is given an interpreta-

¹ *Catech. Or. XI, De Filio Dei Unigenito*, PG 33: 708C.

² *Ibid.*, PG 33: 709A: *μαρτυρίαν τῆς Χριστοῦ Θεότητος*.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Catechesis XII, De Christo Incarnato*, PG 33: 725A, preliminary inscription.

tion within the context of a polemic questioning of the unbeliever (imagined or real): "Is he who is to come, for whom you are looking, to be born of a Virgin or not?" He has answered the question through a question! "Truly the prophet Isaiah says that Emmanuel would be born from a virgin."¹ The prophetic texts themselves affirm that he is to be born of a virgin, so does the Gospel, so does the Church.²

Cyril gives the clearest expression of his belief in the fourth section of this lecture. It is an expression which is based both on the Isaiah text (7: 14) and on the most important incarnational text in the Prologue, John 1: 14, which he immediately recites after proclaiming: "Believe that He the Only-begotten Son of God—He Himself was again begotten of a Virgin."³

In the latter part of the same instruction, two more uses of the Isaiah prophecy are made by Cyril in explaining the meaning of "'almāh."⁴ Cyril makes a case of the fact that often the context of a young maiden ('almāh) demands she be a virgin. He uses Deuteronomy 22: 27 and I Kings 1: 4 to demonstrate this interpretation. At any rate, no passage shows the word used for a married woman.

Finally, in adhering to the text of Isaiah 7: 14 in its historical setting, Cyril shows that it could only mean the future and not the past. One gets the impression that Cyril was able to argue not only from the Septuagint, but from the Hebrew text.

2. *Davidic/Messianic texts within Cyril of Jerusalem:* Ἐκ τοῦ Δαβὶδ τοῖνυν ἡ ἅγια Παρθένος ("Therefore the holy Virgin was from David.")⁵

Cyril of Jerusalem, more than the other Fathers, underlines the importance of the Davidic lineage of Jesus within the soteriological purpose of the Incarnation. In his three discourses on the Incarnation, there are fifteen references to the Davidic origins of Jesus; these can easily be associated with biblical texts which he considered Messianic.

¹ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 728B, 728C.

² *Ibid.*, PG 33: 728C.

³ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 729A: Πιστεύσον, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ μονογενῆς Υἱὸς, οὗτος ἐκ Παρθένου πάλιν ἐγενήθη.

⁴ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 753A, 753C. Cf. JUSTIN MARTYR, *Tryph.* 43, 67, 71; EUSEBIUS, *Demonstr. Evang.* VII, 1, 315. For other texts using 'almāh, see: Exod. 2: 8, Cant. 1: 3, Ps. 68: 25.

⁵ *Catechesis XII, De Christo Incarnato*, PG 33: 757A.

First, there are texts which speak of Jesus being born according to the flesh (hence, from David) and, yet, in his divinity he is not subjected to time and is eternal with the Father. Citing Matthew 1: 1, "The book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham"—He is the Son of David at the end of the ages (*Υἱὸς μὲν γὰρ Δαβὶδ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων . . .*) and, according to that same human source, from David he is subjected to time, to being handled and to genealogical descent (*Ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν κατὰ τὸν Δαβὶδ, καὶ χρόνῳ . . . καὶ γενεαλογεῖται*).¹

Cyril uses two messianic psalms more to speak of the twofold generation of Christ than simply of his human origins from David. In Psalms 110: 2 (109) he shows the eternal sonship of the Lord and his dominion over all things.²

Psalm 2: 7 and Psalm 109: 3³ are used in the eleventh instruction to indicate Christ's eternal generation. He also cleverly uses a phrase from Isaiah 53: 8—"Who shall tell of his generation?" Cyril says: "The Son Himself says of the Father, 'The Lord said to me. Thou art my Son, today I have begotten Thee'" (Psalm 2: 7). Cyril understands today (*σήμερον*) to be a timeless, before all ages, designation. To confirm his statement, he adds Psalm 109: 3 ("From the womb, before the morning star, have I begotten Thee."); this is the locus for the strongest juxtaposition of the two psalms considered messianic in any of the works presented.⁴ The two Septuagintal verb forms *γενένηκά* and *ἐγέννησά* unite the two psalms in a grammatic manner as well as in an hermeneutical one, as Cyril has shown.

Cyril uses Micah 5: 2 as a text for showing the twofold generation of Christ. He cites the entire text: "But you, Bethlehem, house of Ephratha, are not the least among Judah's clans; from you shall come forth for me a Ruler who shall shepherd my people Israel. His origin lies in former times, in ancient days."⁵

¹ *Catechesis XI, De Filio Dei Unigenito*, PG 33: 696C-697A. He explains: *Τὸ δὲ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, οὔτε χρόνῳ ὑποβάλλεται οὔτε τόπῳ, οὔτε γενεαλογεῖται.*

² *Catechesis X, De Uno Domino*, PG 33: 672B.

³ *Catechesis XI, 5*, PG 33: 697A.

⁴ *Ibid.* Cf. PG 33: 749A where Psalm 2: 7 is applied to Christ's universal rule. Davidic origins are not mentioned.

⁵ PG 33: 716AB. The note in Migne is worthwhile for a study of the variants and their source; cf. PG 33: 715CD, 716C.

Cyril has used a text with variants coming from St. Matthew's use of the same verse, from the Alexandrine codex of the LXX and from codex Barberinus. Cf. J. L. Mays, *Micah: A Commentary*, Old Testament Library (Philadelphia, Pa.: Westminster Press,

Secondly, since the above text also refers to the geographical origins of David and the Messiah, we will consider the texts which refer to "a city of David." The above paragraph and its notes serve as a transition to this second point.

In his twelfth catechetical instruction, Cyril returns to the verse of Micah 5: 2. This time his text is remarkably closer to the Septuagint.¹ His interpretation commences with an exact understanding, namely, the *place* of the promise is what is emphasized.² Since Cyril and his congregation are in Jerusalem, the references are quite descriptive, colorful, and alive. He refers to the woody area that had been there but a few years ago!³ Thus, Cyril is merely confirming the prophetic promise of Micah and its fulfillment, just as Matthew's Gospel had affirmed.⁴

In section six of his tenth discourse, the New Testament text of Luke 2: 11 is given to show the fulfillment in salvation history of what Micah had promised. Cyril says, "Christ the Lord is he who is born in a city of David." He immediately affirms that before the Incarnation Christ is already Lord (*πρὸ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεώς ἐστι Χριστὸς Κύριος*).⁵

The final reference to the city of David takes us to the same text of Luke 2: 10-11 with the great proclamation of the good news coming to the

1976), pp. 115-116: "The purpose of the double name, Bethlehem Ephratha, seems clear. Both are associated with the origin of David before he became king in Hebron and Jerusalem. David's father, Jesse, was a Bethlehemite (I Sam. 16.1, 18) and an Ephrathite from Bethlehem of Judah (I Sam. 17.12) . . . 'Origen' . . . echoes the verb 'come forth' (*ὑψ*) and thinks of children originating in the loins of their father." " . . . The motif emphasizes the marvel of God's intervention, who brings forth a man to save his people from the most unlikely and unexpected quarter. From such an unlikely source shall emerge one who will specifically belong to YHWH . . . He will serve as ruler (*mōšēl*) over Israel."

¹ The Septuagint does not have the negative conjunction *μή* before *ὀλιγοστός*; Cyril also has *γὰρ* before *μοι* just as his other citation. He also adds the word *ἡγούμενος* (which is found in Matthew 2: 6). Remarkably, he has dropped the extended phrase "who shall shepherd my people Israel" which he had used in the other reference to Micah 5: 2.

² *Catechesis XII*, 20, PG 33: 740B: *Ἐπαγγελίας δὲ τὸν τόπον* . . . (Cf. J. L. MAYS, *op. cit.*, p. 115: "The opening is similar to 4.8 in pointing out a person who is to hear a promise.")

³ Cyril refers to Psalm 131: 6 (132): "Lo, we hear of it at Ephratha: we found it in the fields of the wood."

⁴ Matt. 2: 6.

⁵ *Catechesis X*, 6, PG 33: 668A *fine*. Luke 2: 11 reads: *ὅτι ἐτέχθη ὑμῖν σήμερον σωτὴρ ὃς ἐστὶν Χριστὸς κύριος ἐν πόλει Δαβὶδ*.

Cyril reads: *Χριστὸς ὁ κυριὸς ἐστὶν ὁ τεχθεὶς ἐν πόλει Δαβὶδ*.

shepherds from an angel. The difference is that in this text Christ the Lord is identified as the Son of God.¹

Thirdly, Cyril shows the origins of Jesus back to Judah. He emphasizes the human origins of Jesus (ἐκ παρθένου) through Mary who is unqualifiedly affirmed to be of the family of David. Let us proceed from the references in Genesis 49: 9-10: Jesus Christ is called "Lion" indicating his kingly and steadfast, confident nature. He is the strong lion of the tribe of Judah. This assertion finds its source in Genesis 49: 9, but it is not cited directly. Interestingly, the word *ηγούμενος* is within the text of the Septuagint. Could Matthew in 2: 6 and Cyril himself have consciously merged the text of Micah 5: 2 with Genesis 49: 10b?²

The last citation of Genesis 49: 8, 10 is found in the *Catechesis XII*. Cyril tells us that he is shortening the quotation from Genesis; he proceeds: "Judah, your brothers will praise you. . . . For there will not lack a ruler from Judah, nor a leader from his thigh bones, until he comes who is to be reserved—and he will not be the expectation (of the Jews) but of the Gentiles." Cyril has extended the salvific effect to all nations, hence, the universal effect of Christ's coming into history is borne out.³ A comparison of the two texts in Cyril may result in discovering the versions he was using. This is beyond my scope.

The final part of this excursus consists of the references Cyril has to the Davidic lineage of Mary. In his twelfth catechesis on the Incarnate Christ, Cyril states Christ is born of a virgin. The context of the entire section 23 is within the descent from David. He uses texts from the Old Testament and applies them to Christ; he explicitly denies they are said of Solomon. The gathering of such Davidic references is excellent, and the overall Christian

¹ *Catechesis X*, 10, PG 33: 673A: κύριος τοίνυν ἐστὶν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ.

² *Catechesis X*, 3, PG 33: 664B. New Testament texts having the notion of Genesis 49: 9-10 are Revelations 5: 5 (ὁ λέων ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα, ἡ εἶψα Δαυὶδ . . .) and Hebrews 7:14 (γὰρ οὗτις ἐξ Ἰούδα ἀνατέταλκεν ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, εἰς ἣν φυλὴν περὶ ἱερῶν οὐδὲν Μωϋσῆς ἐλάλησεν).

However, neither of these two works are found in the list of books which Cyril gives us in *Catechesis IV*: 33-36. Lagrange says that the Apocalypse is probably excluded because of the influence of Eusebius, the metropolitan of Caesarea during this time. (Cf. M.-J. LAGRANGE, *Histoire Ancienne du Canon du Nouveau Testament* [Paris, 1933], p. 111.)

³ *Catechesis XII*, 17A. See the excellent notes in Migne on a comparison of Cyril's text with the LXX. I agree that the expression (οὐκ Ἰουδαίων) is a parenthetical remark of Cyril rather than a citation from a Greek version. Such expressions are part of his polemic against the Jews.

fulfillment context seems to affirm the Davidic line through Mary, albeit implicitly.¹

Cyril uses texts from the Old Testament in order to prove that Mary is of the family of David. He emphatically asserts that the Scriptures (Psalm 132: 11, Psalm 89: 29, 36-38) are not said of Solomon but of Christ. Then he proceeds to apply all of the texts cited which directly apply to David as being confirmed by the words of Luke in the New Testament: "And the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David" (Luke 1: 32). Thus Mary is of the family of David. Moreover, his polemic against the Jews influences his interpretation of the texts of Isaiah; he goes so far as to say Isaiah foreknew that the Jews would be troubled by what he said: "And they shall wish they had been burnt with fire: for unto us a child is born (not unto them), unto us a Son is given" (Isaiah 9: 5).²

Psalm 132: 17 is attributed by Cyril to the Patriarch David who says of the Messiah: "I have prepared a lamp for my Anointed." Some, Cyril tells us, interpret this as a lamp of prophecy; others say it of the flesh He assumed from the Virgin (ἐκ Παρθένου).³ Cyril applies the words of St. Paul ("We are earthen vessels that hold this treasure.") to the flesh Jesus assumed from the Virgin Mary, leading up to his conclusion that she, too, is from the line of David.⁴

Cyril uses then both the Old Testament and the New Testament to show that Mary springs from Davidic origins. In the same thoroughly Davidic section (XXIII), Gabriel testifies clearly to Mary: "The Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David" (Luke 1: 32). Paul says, "He who was made from the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom. 1: 3), and "Remember Jesus Christ raised from the dead, from the seed of David, according to my gospel" (II Tim. 2: 8). He ends the orchestration of such

¹ *Catechesis XII*, 23, PG 33: 756A, C.

² *Ibid.*, PG 33: 756C.

³ *Catechesis X, De Uno Domino Jesu Christo*, PG 33: 681A. (Cf. PG 33: 681-682D: "... Eusebius, lib. IV *Demonstr. evang.*, cap. 16, pag. 187. Hilar., in *psalm. CXXXI*, n. 28 ... Joan. V, 36. ... Athanasius. ... Greg. Nyssenus ... de Joanne Baptista. ... Alia vero interpretatio de carne Christi communis est apud interpretes. Habetur apud Euseb., lib. IV *Dem.*, cap. 16, pag. 188, et lib. VII, cap. 2, p. 348. Greg. Naz., orat. 42 n. 62, p. 694; auctorem *Paraphrasis in Psalmos* a Corderio editae; Theodoretum in hujus psalmi commentario; Chromatium Aquileiensem, concione 1, *De octo beatitud.*, *Bib. PP. Lugd.*, tom. V, pag. 980: quo loco multa de ea re dissertat. Revera propheticus hujus loci sensus est de Davidis semine, ac potissimum de Christo, qui Davidis filius, ejus sedis ac regni sublimiori sensu restaurator a Deo datus est.")

⁴ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 681A (II Cor. 4: 7).

texts with Isaiah 11: 10. "And there will be in that day, the Root of Jesse, who will rise up to rule the nations, and in him shall the nations hope."¹ He also uses Psalm 22: 9 ("Thou art the One who took me out of the womb.") in reference to Mary, which shows the manner of Jesus' birth from the Virgin while other births are bound by natural law of marriage.²

His most unique interpretation is that of Paul's dictum in Galatians 4: 4: "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman . . ."—which means made *only* of a woman, that is, from a virgin (ἐκ Παρθένου). Reversing the arguments of the opposers, Cyril adds: "for we have already demonstrated that a virgin is also called woman."³ The use of Galatians 4: 4 in this manner may have also been implicit within Theodore of Mopsuestia.⁴ If this assumption is valid, then there must have been a tradition upon which both exegetes were depending.

Cyril also used the oft-cited Messianic text of Isaiah 9: 5: ". . . for unto us a child is born [not unto them], unto us a Son is given."⁵ There are several things to be said about his use of the text; he, like the Cappadocian Amphilochius, uses it for the eternal generation of the Son of God as well as for his birth in time—for "Mark thou that at first He was the Son of God, then was given to us." Secondly, in showing that the ἡμῖν refers to the Christians and not, as he explicitly says, "οὐ γὰρ ἀντοῖς," he may be applying the theme of remnant to the Christian Church, setting it as the New Israel. The Jews had taken the יְהוָה as referring to themselves as the "remnant."⁶ The argumentation has the familiar ring of Justin Martyr who claimed the Old Testament for the Christians as their Scriptures!

After such a statement, Cyril shows that the peace of the Son of God is endless since his Kingdom has no bounds. He quotes again from Isaiah

¹ *Catechesis XII*, PG 33: 756BC.

² *Ibid.*, PG 33: 757A.

³ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 765A.

⁴ A. MINGANA, ed. and trans., *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Nicene Creed*, Woodbrooke Studies (Cambridge, England: W. Heffer and Sons Lmt., 1932), V: 67.

⁵ *Catechesis XII*, PG 33: 756C.

⁶ V. HERTRICH, *λεῖμμα*, in ThWKittel (Eng) IV: 205: "In Is. 1: 8, 9 Zion is the remnant which God has left. The prophet and his disciples are the remnant in Israel (8: 16-18). The distinctive interrelation of historical and eschatological events is particularly to be seen in Is. in Messianic passages in which the coming of the Messiah is directly imminent (7: 10 ff.), and indeed in process of enactment (9: 5). The prophet also says that the Messiah will be given 'us' (7: 10 ff., 'Immanuel'; 9: 5 twice יְהוָה). The יְהוָה can only be the remnant whose presence is referred to in 8: 16-18."

("... upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order it"), and he concludes: "*The Holy Virgin, therefore, is from David.*"¹

7. Hesychius of Jerusalem († after 450)

Twice within his homily on Mary, the Mother of God, Hesychius makes use of the text of Isaiah 7: 14.² In the first instance, the text is indirectly or implicitly inferred. In fact, it is seen conflated with the first text Hesychius makes use of (Luke 1: 28, 31), and, felicitously so, for it gives us an insight into his understanding and interpretation of the text. Here is a comparison of the two texts:

1: ἰδοὺ γὰρ συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἑμμανουήλ. ("Behold, she shall conceive in her womb and bring forth a son and you will call his name Emmanuel.")

(Hesychius, *Homélie VI*: 1: 9-11, p. 194)

2: ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσουσι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἑμμανουήλ. ("Behold the Virgin will conceive in her womb and bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel.")

(Hesychius, *Homélie VI*: 7: 6-8, p. 202)

The only difference in the Septuagint for the verse is καλέσεις³ for καλέσουσι in Hesychius' second text.

The difference in the first text is significant. Hesychius has introduced this verse by means of the angelic salutation (Luke 1: 28bc); he is using the text of Luke rather closely,⁴ but changes the name of Jesus to Emmanuel (!) thereby indicating his understanding of Isaiah 7: 14 behind what he has to say about this verse, as well as giving us the primary notion he is attaching to this festal celebration of Mary.⁵

¹ *Catechesis XII*, PG 33: 756C, 757A: Ἐκ τοῦ Δαβὶδ τοίνυν ἦν ἡ ἁγία παρθένος.

² HESYCHIUS OF JERUSALEM, *Les Homélie Festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem*. 2 vols. Ed. by M. AUBINEAU. Vol. I: *Les Homélie I-XV* (Brussels, 1978): *Homélie VI*: 1: 9-11, p. 194, and *VI*: 7: 6-8, p. 202.

³ RAHLFS, II: 579.

⁴ HESYCHIUS, *Homélie VI*: 1: 9-11, except he omits in Luke 1: 31 καὶ and reads συλλήψῃ in place of συλλήμψῃ; and, of course, substitutes or conflates from Isaiah 7: 14 (Cf. Mt. 1: 23.) Ἑμμανουήλ.

⁵ *Ibid.*, *VI*: 1: 5-6: παρθένον γὰρ περιέχει πανήγυριν (p. 194). "Ce n'est pas encore une fête de l'Annonciation, mais on en devine l'amorce. Ce n'est pour lors qu'une fête de l'Incarna-

Such a use is a felicitously free one which enables us to speculate that both Matthew and Luke themselves had to be thinking of the same Emmanuel text (Luke 1: 31, Matthew 1: 23). Their mode of transmitting the text to the faithful was respectively, through the dialogue of the messenger Gabriel with Mary, hence the second person singular; and, in Matthew the word of the Lord was accomplished through his prophet Isaiah, hence the third person singular. Interestingly enough, both evangelists have retained this pattern in the Sermon on the Plain (Luke 6: 20ff.) and the sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5: 3 ff.).

The immediate context of the use of the Isaiah text is the celebration that the Virgin has been received by God's Word (hence John 1: 14),¹ and has through the message of Gabriel overcome the sadness and misery caused by the first virgin (Eve).² Hesychius shows both the eternal generation of the Word as well as the birth of Jesus Christ in the history of mankind. Through his birth it has become a salvation history.

The second time Hesychius uses the text is within a context of challenging the unbeliever to look at an array of prophetic texts which are now fulfilled in the Incarnation. Isaiah 7: 14 forms a part of the *orchestrated* texts so often used by the preachers of this time. Its present location is just prior to the Baruch 3: 38 text which Hesychius attributes to Jeremiah.³ Then other Messianic title texts are added in the most dense use of texts within this homily.⁴

The Emmanuel title is only found in Matthew 1: 23 where it is interpreted as God with us. In the Old Testament, Isaiah 7: 14 is the primary source for the title. There may be an implicit reflection on the title in Acts 10: 38 where we find the expression (ὁ Θεὸς ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ [Jesus]) "God was with Him."⁵ Again the importance of naming is evident in the text. The idea

tion, dont la première démarche est évoquée dans le sillage de l'Épiphanie, mais où la place faite à Marie, déjà considérable, ira vite grandissant" (pp. 188-189).

¹ *Ibid.*, VI: 1: 7.

² *Ibid.*, VI: 1: 13-21.

³ *Ibid.*, VI: 7: 8-9 (Cf. HESYCHIUS [AUBINEAU, ed.], *op. cit.*, I: 192.).

⁴ *Ibid.*, VI: 7: 11-21: "orient" (Zech. 6: 12); "sun of justice" (Mal. 3: 20); "man of desires" (Dan. 9: 23, 10: 11—Theodotion); the closed door (Ezek. 44: 2-3); and the "son of man" (Dan. 7: 13).

⁵ E. STAUFFER, *Θεός*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) III: 116, n. 163. (Cf. Emmanuel in Isa. 8: 10, Am. 5: 14, Isa. 8: 8. Cf. G. QUELL, *ἐκλέγομαι* [O.T.], in ThWKITTEL [Eng] IV: 161, n. 86.)

of naming is particularly clear when the accusative of object is linked with a predicative accusative as in the verses we are considering—Matthew 1: 21, 23 (Is. 7: 14), Matthew 1: 25, Luke 1: 13, 31.¹ We have already noted how certain names bring salvific effect: Emmanuel is among them.

In speaking of the term *παρθένος* for 'almāh in the Hebrew, the Fathers usually enter into a polemic against the unbelievers. Chrysostom uses examples from the Bible where the term can mean, in his opinion, an unmarried woman who is a virgin. The term 'almāh appears nine times within the Bible, and in Genesis 24: 43, Exodus 2: 8, Psalm 68: 25, and I Chronicles 15: 20 it can mean an unmarried woman. The emphasis in the texts may be on the physical maturity and marriageable age of the woman rather than on her virginity. Even so, the term 'almāh is not normally used for the mother of a son who has long since been able to walk—that is, if one interprets the son of Isaiah to be the promised "Emmanuel." Some scholars state that the notion of parthogenesis would require the term *bethulāh* rather than 'almāh.²

The Fathers, however, coming from the tradition of an Ignatius of Antioch and Justin Martyr are not wont to succumb to lexical arguments against the virginity of the mother of the Messiah. In fact, they have their own lexical proof texts for this verse, as we have seen in Chrysostom.³ Here the living tradition of the texts is what is important; for those who are considered orthodox, the text does mean virginity which is physical and not only symbolic.

There are also scholars who have spoken clearly of interpreting the text as the Fathers have done, that is, as implying the virginal conception of Mary in Matthew 1: 23.⁴

¹ K. L. SCHMIDT, *καλέω*, in ThWKittel (Eng) III: 487.

² G. DELLING, *παρθένος*, in ThWKittel (Eng) V: 832.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 833: "This review . . . makes it plain that on purely lexical grounds it is impossible to say whether the translator is expressing true virginity when he uses *παρθένος* at Is. 7: 14. The total picture of LXX usage demands no more than the sense of a "woman untouched by a man up to the moment of the conception (of Immanuel)."

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 836, esp. n. 66: "Lagrange, 70. Mt and Lk. obviously derived their account of the virgin conception of Jesus from Palestinian Christianity. It has been noted again and again that the infancy story in Lk. goes back to Jewish Christian tradition in style and structure, . . ." (Lagrange 70 refers to M.-J. LAGRANGE, "La conception surnaturelle du Christ d'après saint Luc," RB 11 [1914] 60-71, p. 70.)

Cf. E. SCHWEIZER, *πνεῦμα* (D-F), in ThWKittel (Eng) VI: 402.

PART II. HESYCHIUS: STUDY OF TEXTS WITHIN *Hypapante II**Introduction:*

This second part of the study centers on Hesychius and texts from the infancy narrative of St. Luke which are used to explain the role of Mary within the Incarnation. These same texts give us a resource for studying the methodology of Hesychius.

Thanks to the critical edition of the festal homilies of Hesychius by Father M. Aubineau, we can analyze two of the four Marian discourses to know the use of the Sacred Scriptures by Hesychius in his preaching about the mysteries of Mary and of the Incarnation. Father Aubineau in his introduction to the first homily of Hesychius on the feast of "Hypapante" stresses the fact that:

Hesychius draws his knowledge from the Bible: he commented on Leviticus and the Psalter, and has glossed Isaiah. True, the rules for the homiletic genre differ from those of a learned commentary destined only to be read. Nevertheless, we find again, in Hesychius the preacher the same scrupulous fidelity to Scripture, and "mutatis mutandis" some of his procedures as commentator.¹

Aubineau briefly indicates some characteristics of this use of the Bible in the example of the first homily for the feast of Hypapante.² In particular, Aubineau points to Hesychius' faithfulness to follow the progression of the biblical text itself, the commenting upon the Bible through the Bible (both Old and New Testaments), and the use of frequent rhetorical questions inspired by the biblical text itself. We have also drawn our own conclusions about this method and its characteristics, as shown in the second homily on the Hypapante³ and the important VIth discourse praising Mary, the Mother of God⁴—both dated before the Council at Ephesus (431).

*A. Introductory Remarks on Homily II, De Hypapante**Luke 2: 22-38: The Presentation of the Lord*

Hesychius is among the earliest witnesses to the fact that homilies were delivered on the feast of Hypapante. The recent critical edition by Aubineau

¹ HESYCHIUS OF JERUSALEM, *Les Homélies Festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem*, ed. by M. AUBINEAU. 2 vols. (Brussels, 1978), Vol. I: *Les Homélies I-XV*, p. 6.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 7-11.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 61-75.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 194-205.

helps to determine this through the documentation. Father Aubineau indicates that the feast was considered very important and was celebrated in Jerusalem on February 14 (forty days after the Epiphany, January 6).¹

The second homily of Hesychius is a good example of the evolution between the composition of Luke, who stressed the importance of Jerusalem and the event of Jesus' Presentation in the Temple, and the explanation of this text and this event as a mystery of salvation by Hesychius in Jerusalem, around 400-420 A.D.

Hesychius, right from the beginning, quotes the texts indicating the action of the Holy Spirit in this pericope (Luke 2: 25-38). This second homily—starting at verse 25, the episode of Simeon—begins with a comment about the Holy Spirit, and stresses this Spirit throughout the entire homily by means of a rhetorical question: "Do you not know that the Holy Spirit . . . ?" The argumentation then follows with the given biblical facts, that: (1) The Spirit has established Simeon as a prophet. (2) Simeon is addressed with divine advice (*Χρηματισμός*), corresponding to the verb in Luke 2: 26 (*κεχρηματισμένον*), that he should not see death until he had seen the Christ (Cf. Luke 2: 26.); at once, Hesychius adds the text of the promise fulfilled: "Now, Master, you can dismiss your servant according to your word in peace" (Luke 2: 29). (3) The Spirit guides Simeon in the blessing of Joseph and Mary (Luke 2: 34). (4) It is the Spirit who orders Simeon to announce to Mary: "Behold this one [the child] is established for the fall and rise of many in Israel." (5) It is he who inspires Anna and she, too, becomes a "prophetess" (Luke 2: 36): "Is it not because she was filled by this [Spirit] that she announced the redemption (Luke 2: 38) through the baby [Jesus]?"

B. The Holy Spirit and the Mystery of Salvation

In Simeon, Hesychius shows the action of the Spirit in our salvation. The Spirit expresses great praise of Simeon (*οὐ μικρὸν ἐγκώμιον*).² Luke's text reads: "There was a man in Jerusalem" (Luke 2: 25); Hesychius amplified the text saying: "A man was *found* in Jerusalem. The grace [of God] found him, a man whom the Prophets and the Law [the Ancient Covenant] awaited and desired; the prophets sought him, the law desired him, the higher grace (*Χάρις*) found him and 'crowned him'; . . . he was

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-6.

² *Ibid.*, *Hom. II*: 3: 2, p. 62.

just, pious, and he waited for the consolation for Israel." (Cf. Luke 2: 25—dative: τῷ Ἰσραήλ, instead of Luke's genitive.)¹ We should compete with Simeon in his dispositions; we could declare him "blessed."

The Holy Spirit was upon him (Luke 2: 25). Hesychius explains the text, using I Corinthians 3: 16 (Simeon is a temple, the temple of God.) and the biblical themes of the temple of Yahweh and of the people as the bride of God: "Simeon kept pure the bridal chamber of his flesh, it was revealed to him that he would not die before seeing the Christ 'the one who abolishes death . . . the one who changes tombs into bridal chambers.'"² Simeon attracted the indwelling of the Spirit.

Simeon came to the Temple, moving in the Spirit. For Hesychius it is evident that Simeon acted always according to the command of the Spirit (κατὰ πρόσταξιν τοῦ πνεύματος)³ indwelling in him. The Spirit enabled him to recognize the Child. Hesychius explains the content of this inspiration and this command with the Spirit saying: "Run, old man, run; hurry now, grasp the blessing rapidly before the star appears, before the Magi come, so that we may not be mocked."⁴ Hesychius is delineating one of his principles, namely, the plan of God. The light of the Spirit [Jesus] has to precede the star in Bethlehem: "It must be acknowledged that through me [the Spirit] its course was guided and received its beam. But do not be deprived . . .⁵ by the uncircumcised taking the first fruits of the benediction."⁶

Luke 2: 28-32 reads: "And [Simeon] blessed God. . . ." For Hesychius this blessing is already a Trinitarian doxology: Simeon blessed God the Father with the Son, and the Son with the Holy Spirit. Indeed the Spirit was active; the Son was there as a baby; the Father "worked in numerous and great mysteries."⁷

"My eyes have seen your salvation (Luke 2: 30) . . . the light of the nations, and the glory of your people Israel" (Luke 2: 32). Hesychius' comment sees a direct revelation of the divinity of the Child Jesus. Simeon speaks to the Child: "Now, through your own experience you made the Most High present to the human race who humbled himself for us by becoming a

¹ *Ibid.*, *Hom. II*: 3:3-10, p. 62.

² *Ibid.*, *Hom. II*: 4, p. 64.

³ *Ibid.*, *Hom. II*: 5: 2-3, p. 64.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Hom. II*: 5: 10-11, p. 64.

⁵ Since it is the Jews who must first receive the Messiah.

⁶ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, *Hom. II*: 5: 13-16, pp. 64, 66.

⁷ *Ibid.*, *Hom. II*: 6: 7, p. 66.

baby."¹ Making use of the biblical theme of God the Father as potter, Hesychius in this same text notes beautifully that the potter did not save the clay without first being incorporated with it.

"My eyes have seen your salvation prepared for all the nations" (Luke 2: 30-31). This salvation is for all the nations because it is offered by the maker of all who exists from the beginning (*ἀπαρχῶν*); the mystery of this salvation is universal. Hesychius explains Luke's word order (first: light for the nations; second: the glory of Israel) as the Plan of Salvation in which the last (the Gentiles) become first and the first (the Jews) last,² as St. Paul also put it.

C. Prophecy of Simeon

The texts beginning with Simeon's blessing and ending with the sword of sorrow (Luke 2: 35) are of special interest since they touch upon Mary's role in the mystery of Christ's Presentation in the Temple.

Since there is a similar treatment of Luke 2: 34-35 in *Homily I, De Hypapante*, the following structural analysis showing likenesses and differences will help in our commenting upon each one separately. The differences are shown in parentheses.

<i>Homily II, De Hypapante</i> ³	<i>Homily I, De Hypapante</i> ⁴
8: 1-2 (His father and mother) are <i>astonished</i>	7: 1 (Joseph) and his mother are <i>astonished</i>
8: 4-8 A reflection of Mary	7: 3-5 (developed) reflections of Mary
8: 12-13 (the blessing of Simeon; the parents become a bene- diction)	
9: 1-2 (Child will cause) fall and rise of many	7: 5-6 Fall and rise of many

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 67, n. 1: Jesus could present the Most High to mankind through his "personal experience."

² *Ibid.*, p. 66 (Cf. Mt. 19: 30, etc.): a prediction of Jesus (through the Evangelists) indicating the mystery of salvation which Hesychius summarizes (according to Rom. 9: 1-5, 11: 1-26): "Those who had preceded were deprived of their privileges because of their apathy."

³ *Ibid.*, *Hom. II*: 8-12, pp. 68-73.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Hom. I*: 7-8, pp. 38-43.

		7: 8	(Christ as [key-] stone)
9: 4-15	unbelievers— (Law-believers sin, but rise) (direct) use of I Peter 2: 6-8	7: 9-15	unbelieving; believing
10: 1-2	sign of contradiction = Cross	7: 9	(allusion) to I Peter 2: 6-8
10: 9-10	lists unbelievers (only Pharisees)	8:	sign of contradiction = Cross
10: 11	lists believers — centurion, MARY key text: (was already presented through I Peter 2: 6-8)	8: 1-6	listing of unbelievers: (Jews, Synagogue, "people," priests, scribes, Pagans)
11: 1-3	<i>Sword</i> = (διάκρισις)	8: 7	lists believers: centurion, MARY
11: 4	(Θαυμάσεις = paradox revealed by Spirit to Mary) her pondered prodigies (contrasted with Christ hung upon Cross)	8: 8-10	key text: (I Cor. 1: 23-24)
12: 2	διαλογισμοί — Luke 2: 35	8: 11-13	<i>Sword</i> = (διχόνοια)
12: 5	(ὑπομειναντῶν)	8: 14-15	her prodigies pondered
12: 8	Cleopas — (μικρὰ περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ)	8: 17	(Ποῖοι) διαλογισμοί;
12: 12	(Mary Magdalene) — (ὁ λογισμὸς ἀσθενήσας) (No outward failing for Mary)	8: 18	(Varying, troubled thoughts about Christ during Passion)
		8: 21	(ὑπομένοντες)
		8: 21	Cleopas
		8: 22	(disciples)
			(Not only simple disciples, but the elect [Cleopas] and his Mother have passed through this shock.)

Hesychius cites Luke accurately (Luke 2:35). Through his technique of rhetorical questioning, he calms his audience into understanding Joseph is not the human father in the conception of Jesus. He has the evangelist

(Luke) not forgetting what had been said through Gabriel (Cf. Luke 1: 35.), and, in giving a further reason why Joseph is called father, Hesychius returns to the tradition begun by Ignatius of Antioch and continued by Origen, namely, that the devil would be kept uninformed about the mystery of salvation, in which Mary's virginity plays a role.¹

Immediately returning, as is his wont, to the text of Luke 2: 33, he states "they were still in amazement at what things were being said of him" (Notice that Hesychius has changed the participle *θαυμάζοντες* to *Ἐθαύμαζον*—imperfect tense).² Simeon then blesses them (Luke 2: 34a). Hesychius interprets this to mean that Joseph and Mary in being blessed by Simeon become a benediction for those who had been under the blow of a malediction.³ This interpretation of Hesychius is consonant with the Lukan text.⁴

Sections 9 and 10 of Hesychius' *Homily II, De Hypapante*, are treated under the excursus for I Peter 2: 6-8.

D. Luke 2:35: "A sword shall pierce your heart . . ."

Hesychius introduces the passage on the sword with a remark leading us to conclude that the interpretation he will proffer is bound up with the believers (those who rise) and unbelievers (those who will fall).⁵ Thus, the remarks made in the excursus on Luke 2: 34 are important for understanding what follows.

Hesychius' text is again an accurate citation of Luke 2: 35. He reads the particle *δε* as do the majority of the Greek manuscripts with the exception of Vaticanus. Aland's critical edition has noted this and retained the particle in the main body by means of a bracket.⁶

We will compare (pp. 310 ff.) Basil's text with Origen's on this verse. Our task here is simply to note the different approach of Hesychius in his

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 69, n. 1.

² *Ibid.*, *Hom. II*: 8: 11, p. 68.

³ *Ibid.*, *Hom. II*: 8: 12-14, p. 68.

⁴ J. SCHNEIDER, *εὐλογέω*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) II: 761-762: "When Simeon takes the child Jesus into his arms, he can only praise God for the grace which has been given him to see the Savior (Lk. 2: 28). He himself has entered the kingdom of blessing which flows from Christ. Thus the old man can also bless the parents of the child (2: 34)."

⁵ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, *Hom. II*: 11: 1, p. 71 (*Τούτοις ἐστὶ τὰ ἐπόμενα σύμφωνα*).

⁶ ALANDGNT, p. 210.

commentary on the sword which pierces Mary's soul. Hesychius calls the sword "ἡ διάκρισις," which Aubineau translates as a doubt.¹

The word *διάκρισις* has the following principal meanings: a) separation, distinction, b) division, c) discernment, d) hesitation, doubt.² (The word, however, is not found in the New Testament.)

Mary will experience the "*διάκρισις*" at the time of the Crucifixion. We must remember that Hesychius is understanding Simeon as prophesying about the future: "You will be astonished³ upon seeing him suspended on the cross." The word *Θαυμάζω* may indicate a marvellous element of revelation;⁴ the fact that several of the prodigies accomplished in Mary immediately follow strengthens this interpretation.

There is a revelation of the inner trouble Mary experienced because of Simeon's prediction, but, strictly speaking, there is not a negative judgment passed on her. Struggles leading her to perfection are evident, but, it seems, to a less "culpable" degree than those of Cleopas (*μικρὰ περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*),⁵ and Mary Magdalene (*ὁ λογισμὸς ἀσθενῆς αὐτῆς*).⁶ Moreover, we have the example of the centurion who has no negative pronouncement made about him in relationship to the death of Christ. At most, Mary's failing would be slighter than that of Cleopas and Magdalene; and who would put the centurion above her?

In Luke 2: 35b the term *διαλογισμοί* is important. The word is found thirteen times in the New Testament and all uses are pejorative. In Luke the

¹ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 71.

² LAMPE, pp. 375-376. Lampe's entry has the definition "a division of opinion, discord." The examples given treat of discord at Nicaea and other Council-like settings. From the exegetes studied, Gregory of Nazianzen uses the word in *Or.* 32.2 (PG 36: 176B) and Basil has it in *Epist.* 260 (PG 32: 965C) and in *Epist.* 51.2 (PG 32: 392). Apparently, Thomas Aquinas was aware of the problem with this word. A. DE GROOT, *op. cit.*, has the following important statement: "Zwar wollte S. Thomas Basilium freisprechen, indem er unsere Stelle nicht als, *dubium infidelitatis* sondern als, *dubium admirationis et discussionis* interpretiert" (p. 14, n. 23: "*Summa Theol.* III, q. 27, a. 4, ad 2 . . .").

³ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, *Hom.* II: 11: 4-5, p. 70: *Θαυμάσεις γὰρ ὁρῶσα ἐπὶ σταυροῦ κρεμαμένον . . .*

⁴ G. BERTRAM, *Θαῦμα*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) III: 39: "The marvellous element in this story corresponds to OT prophecy. Jesus Himself applied the saying in Ps. 118: 22f. to Himself in the parable of the wicked husbandmen, Mk. 12: 11, Mt. 21: 42, in keeping with its Messianic exposition in Judaism."

⁵ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, *Hom.* II: 12: 8, p. 72.

⁶ *Ibid.*, *Hom.* II: 12: 13, p. 72.

other five uses refer to hostile thoughts against Jesus or, at least, questioning him. The *διαλογισμοί* of 35b would be a continuation of the sign to be contradicted in 2: 34d.¹

Hesychius' interpretation of such thoughts is crucial to understanding his concept of Mary's holiness. It is not at all certain that he passes negative judgment upon her. The conclusions are not drawn up with regard to her person. Certainly, he is far from the negative decision of Origen, which we will see in our study of Basil's letter 260. All of the words used by Hesychius touch the notion of severance within the mind or heart, doubting, wavering, or struggling within. Hesychius presents the human psychological condition in Mary's heart. In a sense, the Holy Spirit through Simeon has opened the innermost heart of Mary's thought and revealed it to future generations. If there is scandal to be taken, it would be absurd to blame Mary and the Holy Spirit!

In reviewing the patristic literature on these passages, R. E. Brown is critical of the interpretation because most of the Fathers interpreted Luke with non-Lucan material.² He does not cite either Amphilochius or Hesychius. Hesychius has remained with Lucan texts throughout his homily. We have seen how he carefully moves along from verse to verse from a given pericope throughout his entire homily.³ He has also used texts to which Brown himself alludes (Cf. I Peter 2: 8, Isaiah 8: 14, Psalm 118: 22, Romans 9: 30).⁴ What is expressed ambiguously in Luke is also ambiguous in Hesychius—our later doctrinal concerns about the holiness of Mary did not influence either the evangelist or Hesychius, the preacher who commented on Luke.

The Fathers and modern exegetes have carefully looked at the symbol of the sword in attempting to interpret the passage. The text reads *ῥομφαία* in Luke 2: 35a.⁵ We may note the commentary included under *ῥομφαία*

¹ R. E. BROWN, *op. cit.*, p. 441.

² *Ibid.*, p. 462. BROWN cites Origen, Epiphanius, and Ambrose.

³ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 6-7: "Hésychius va régler ses développements sur la progression même du récit, du verset 22 au verset 35, gratifiant chaque membre de phrase, chaque expression notable, de brèves considérations comme dans ses commentaires, à cette différence près que les gloses seront ici un peu plus copieuses, et insérées avec habileté dans une période oratoire."

⁴ R. E. BROWN, *op. cit.*, p. 461.

⁵ W. MICHAELIS, *ῥομφαία*, in Th WKITTEL (Eng) VI: 994: "The statistics [LXX] overwhelmingly support the equation *ῥομφαία* = *חֶדֶב* [herev] = 'sword,' and this is the sense even where there is no Mas. [massorah]."

in the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*.¹ For Brown, the most recent exegete to comment on this verse, the sword is one of discrimination. He uses Ezekiel 14: 17 as the closest Old Testament vocabulary parallel: "Let a sword pass through the land so that I may cut off man and beast."² Brown uses this text to develop his exegesis, yet dismisses Ambrose's use of the sword as representing the word of God. Naturally, he would reject Basil's use of Hebrews 4: 12. It is here that Hesychius has identified the sword with the *διάκρισις*,³ for doubts cut through every human heart at the moment of the Crucifixion. Mary is astonished at the sight and questions how it is possible that one born in such a special manner could undergo the Crucifixion. The contrasting of calamities with prodigies is one of the characteristics of Hesychius' description of those who believe the Word and those who stumble by not believing the Word. Those who believe see the prodigies and overcome the calamities; the reverse is true for the unbelievers. Though the notion of stumbling because they do not believe the Word is based more on I Peter 2: 6-8,⁴ the notion of the Word cutting through may be implicit (Cf. Heb. 4: 12.); the immediate context does not permit the latter notion, but the overall section of the homily may allow for this implicit reference to Hebrews 4: 12.⁵

We may conclude our observations on Hesychius' understanding of Luke 2: 35 with the assurance that he did understand Mary as participating in the prophetic announcement of Simeon as a believer in Christ. Certainly, as Basil had noticed, the Apostles and Mary were rapidly brought to salva-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 995: "The saying of the aged Simeon to the mother of Jesus in Lk. 2: 34f. contains in v. 35a the parenthetical statement: *καὶ σοῦ δὲ αὐτῆς τὴν ψυχὴν διελεύσεται ῥομφαία*. This intimation, influenced by OT diction, . . . looks ahead to the later fate of Jesus and to the maternal sorrow which Mary will not be spared but which will not lead her astray from God's gracious guidance." (Cf. n. 19: "Rightly, most modern commentators are against the idea that there is any reference to Mary's future doubts concerning Jesus' mission.")

² R. E. BROWN, *op. cit.*, p. 463. (The LXX reads: *Ῥομφαία διελθάτω διὰ τῆς γῆς*.)

³ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, *Hom. II*: 11: 3-4, p. 70: *Ῥομφαία σοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν*", *ἢ διάκρισις*, . . .

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Hom. II*: 9: 10, p. 68: *ὅσοι προσκόπτουσιν, τῷ λόγῳ* which AUBINEAU translates so well: ". . . ils choppent parce qu'ils ne croient pas à la Parole (p. 69)."

⁵ J. McHUGH, *op. cit.*, p. 109: "The meaning of Simeon's prophecy, therefore, is that the word of revelation brought by Jesus will pass through Israel like a sword, and will compel men to reveal their secret thoughts." (Cf. p. 108: ". . . In the New Testament, then, the sword can be a metaphor for divine revelation as an instrument of judgment, whereby God compels men to reveal their true characters.")

tion through the Resurrection. The clouds of doubt are over. She who had no explicit failing is enumerated with Cleopas and Magdalene. Mary's innermost thoughts are revealed only through the Holy Spirit prophesying through Simeon. Her mystery is known only to the Spirit. Can we not assume that she who pondered so many of the prodigies accomplished in her and her Son was always under the power of the Spirit? Hesychius leaves us with our own conclusions.

In *I, De Hypapante*, Hesychius concludes his homily with his reflections on Luke 2: 33-35.¹ We have seen the comparison of its structure (that is, the section covering Luke 2: 33-35) with *II, De Hypapante*. In outline it is similar, but our concern was to indicate the differences (by means of parentheses). Our present task is simply to draw up the significant remarks which may help our conclusion.

Hesychius paraphrases Luke 2: 33a to read "Joseph and his Mother," but does not comment on the statement as he does in homily II. He expands the prodigies centered in the mystery of the Incarnation: How could the Christ permit Himself to be the Son of Man, how could a woman contain God in her womb, how could Mary give birth to the liberator of the world? This more extensive description fits well the *Θεοτόκος* title which appears two times within this first homily.²

He cites Luke 2: 34b, alluding to I Peter 2: 6 and Isaiah 28: 16, applying the text simply to those who fall because of unbelief and those who rise because of their belief in Christ the stone.³ He gives examples of those who fall (Judas) and rise after having fallen (Peter). Peter sins through the words of his mouth, but rises; whereas, Judas sins in the depths of his heart.⁴

The homily rapidly draws to its conclusion, beginning with the "sign of contradiction" (Luke 2: 34c) which is the Cross. The long list of unbelievers is drawn up: Jews, the Synagogue, the people, priests, scribes and pagans.⁵ The centurion, however, openly professes his belief.

Hesychius uses a reference to I Corinthians 1: 23-24 to summarize or, better, to find a biblical parallel to what he has just said: "A scandal for the Jews and foolishness for the pagans, but for those who are called, it is Christ, the power and wisdom of God."⁶

¹ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 38, 40, 42.

² *Ibid.*, *Hom. I: 2: 21, 8: 15* (Cf. p. 11.).

³ *Ibid.*, *Hom. I: 7: 5-11*, p. 38.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ll. 15-17.

⁵ *Ibid.*, *Hom. I: 8: 1-7*, p. 40.

⁶ *Ibid.*, ll. 8-10.

Hesychius continues to cite the text of Luke 2: 35a. The sword is a metaphor for a doubt because just as it divides and cuts a body, so, too, a doubt divides and makes the soul hesitate.¹ He clearly states that though Mary was a virgin she also was a woman; though she was Θεοτόκος she also was of our frail human substance (ἐκ τοῦ ἡμετέρου φυχράματος).² The word used by Hesychius for Mary's doubt is διχόνοια. The word means a discord or division of opinion.³

In concluding, Hesychius touches upon the final part of Luke 2: 35—"so that the thoughts of many might be revealed." He, as is his custom, asks, "What thoughts? The different ones about Christ at the moment of His Passion."⁴ Hesychius, then, is bringing back the theme of his homily about the believers and unbelievers. The disciples with Cleopas (an elect?) bring to the audience concrete examples of doubt as they raise questions about Christ as prophet and liberator. Mary, who is greater than they, likewise undergoes the inner turmoil of disturbing thoughts about her Son at the moment of His Crucifixion. Hesychius closes his homily with the sentence: "By the Passion of the Cross indeed all have been subjected to the crucible and all were shaken, not only the ordinary disciples but even the elect and His Mother."⁵

E. An Excursus on I Peter 2: 6-8

In his homily II, *De Hypapante*, Hesychius makes use of Scripture to fulfill Scripture.⁶ He has remarkably combined the interpretation of Luke 2: 34 with the text of I Peter 2: 6-8. He has recognized the fulfillment of Isaiah 28: 16 within the words of Peter who is consciously citing Isaiah the prophet. The texts are so inextricably bound together that we have one of the finest biblical interpretations possible, and, as we will see, Hesychius has seen a connection with Simeon and Mary noticed also by modern exegetes. It is one of the finest pieces of exegesis studied within these homilies. More-

¹ *Ibid.*, II. 12-14.

² *Ibid.*, I. 15.

³ LAMPE, p. 375 (διχόνοια).

⁴ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, *Hom. I*: 8: 17-19, p. 40.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II. 31-32. Cf. R. CARO, *La Homiletica Mariana Griega en el Siglo V*, MLS 3 (1971), pp. 53-58, esp. pp. 57-58.

⁶ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, *Hom. II*: 9: 1-15, pp. 68, 70.

over, within this paragraph Hesychius gives the key to his analysis of the sword of sorrows within Luke 2: 35.

The text in Hesychius reads: "Behold I am laying a cornerstone (key-stone) in Zion, chosen, honorable, and he who puts his faith in it *shall not be ashamed*."¹ The latter part of the citation follows the text of Romans 9: 33 reading *οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται* (shall not be ashamed) rather than the LXX Isaian 28: 16 *οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ* (lest he not be shamed).

As is the method of Hesychius, especially in thematic homilies, the preacher continues by citing consecutive verses of the same chosen Scriptures. Thus he continues citing the text of I Peter 2: 7-8. His second homily *De Hypapante* started with Luke 2: 26 and consecutively and systematically works up to Luke 2: 38. The possibly prior or earlier homily, *I, De Hypapante*,² starts with Luke 2: 22 and progresses to 2: 35. A comparison of the two texts was made earlier in this study; both homilies have I Peter 2: 6-8 and the "sword of sorrows" (Luke 2: 35).

The text of I Peter 2: 6-8 reads in Hesychius: "For you, then, who believe, [the stone] is precious; but for the unbelieving the stone which the builders rejected, this [stone], has become a "capstone" [keystone] and an obstacle stone and a stumbling block—for such who are stumbling are those disbelieving the Word." He follows the text of I Peter even more closely for these two verses than for verse six; the only difference consists in his use of *ἄσσοι* in place of *οἱ* before *προσκόπτουσιν*.³

In his first homily, which contains an interpretation which identifies the stone as Christ,⁴ Hesychius alludes to I Peter 2: 6, then I Peter 2: 8.⁵ The texts are definitely related, for they are applied to the same section of Luke 2: 33-34 and are substantially the same in understanding. This text is an

¹ *Ibid.*, ll. 4-6, p. 68.

² *Ibid.*, *Hom. I*: 1: 16, 8: 18, pp. 26 and 40. AUBINEAU, who is the expert on HESYCHIUS, has presented convincing information that Homily I is probably a festival sermon for February 14: *The Meeting of the Savior*, and indicates it may be the earliest of such homilies—though Amphilochius of Iconium has one that can be argued as pre-dating this of Hesychius. Aubineau states: "Voilà donc une homélie sur l'*Hypapante*, peut-être la plus ancienne qui ait été conservée, prononcée par le prêtre Hésychius, à Jérusalem, un 14 février, dans la première moitié du v^e siècle: cette homélie s'insère parfaitement dans l'ordo liturgique de la ville sainte; elle convient à une fête du Christ, manifesté tout ensemble dans son humanité et sa divinité" (*ibid.*, p. 6).

³ *Ibid.*, *Hom. II*: 9: 10, p. 68.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Hom. I*: 7: 8, p. 38.

⁵ *Ibid.*, ll. 8 and 9.

important one for Hesychius, for, as Aubineau has pointed out, there are other allusions to I Peter 2: 6 and Isaiah 28: 16 in his works—all touching upon the mystery of Hypapante.¹ The text of Peter also alludes to Psalm 118: 22. The use of such a text with its parallels and sources makes it a perfect choice for Hesychius' theme of promise-fulfillment through Isaiah to Peter and then in the reality of Simeon's words to the Virgin. It is another example of passing from text to event (a reality or historical occasion in the eyes of an evangelist, in this case, Luke 2: 33-35).

Hesychius has definitely placed Simeon's words to Mary as the starting point for his masterful interpretation.² The same phrase from Luke 2: 34 is taken up again as the sign of contradiction is explained to Mary.³ She and then Cleopas and Mary Magdalene become the persons involved in his explanation of the doubts and intimate thoughts to be revealed. He had used Peter and Judas in his first homily, then Mary, the Mother of Jesus, and Cleopas. Peter and Judas are left aside in the second homily.⁴

Let us return to the biblical text of I Peter 2: 6-8 and survey the background of that text and the parallels suggested by it and by Hesychius in his homilies on the Hypapante.

Hesychius is identifying Jesus with all of the texts, but especially with that of I Peter 2: 6. He tells us explicitly in his first homily, "*Λίθος ἦν ὁ Χριστὸς εἰς οἰκοδομὴν κείμενος.*"⁵ The stone referred to in I Peter 2: 6 is the "final stone" in a building, probably the one set over a gate, normally called the "keystone." This word *ἀκρογωνιαίος* is found only in I Peter 2: 6 and Ephesians 2: 20; in both cases it refers to Christ. ("You form a building which rises on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the *capstone*." Eph. 2: 20) The background for the

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 39, n. 1 (referring to *Hom. I: 7: 8-9*): "Allusion à *I Pierre* 2, 6 et *Is.* 28, 16: 'Si lapis anguli nobis non faber factus esset, dissoluta domus non potuisset exaedificari,' dans *Hom. georg. in Hyp.*, 7 (Garrite, p. 369)."

He alludes to the dating of the homily in n. 2: "La chute est imputable à l'homme mais le relèvement est l'œuvre du Christ. Si ces propos très 'antipélagiens' avaient été tenus du vivant de Jérôme († 419) et que d'aventure ils eussent été rapportés à Bethléem, le vieux polémiste aurait exulté."

² *Ibid.*, *Hom. II: 9: 1-2*, p. 68.

³ *Ibid.*, *Hom. II: 10: 1-2*, p. 70.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 39, n. 3: "... Hesychius in *Hom. georg. in Hyp.*, 8: 'Cecidit Iudas et surrexit Paulus'—another example of how he has applied the "rise and fall" of Luke 2: 34 now to Judas and Paul!

⁵ *Ibid.*, *Hom. I: 7: 9-10*, p. 38.

term is fascinating. Joachim Jeremias has clearly demonstrated that the term "final stone" or capstone is a better rendition than Isaiah 28: 16 (LXX) which identifies ἀκρογωνιαίος with the foundation stone.¹

Perhaps the clinching argument is that the second parallel used in I Peter 2: 7, εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας, is read *l' rōsh pinnah* in Psalm 118: 22—which literally means the cap of a corner or the head of a corner. In fact, Jeremias points out that Peshitta Psalm 118: 22 reads "head of the building." In the New Testament, Psalm 118: 22 is found in Mark 12: 10 and its parallels, Acts 4: 11, and, of course, I Peter 2: 7. All texts refer to Christ chosen by God as the chief capstone in the heavenly sanctuary.²

The Christian Scriptures are using the Hebrew Scriptures as a source for these Messianic statements about Christ as rock. The rabbinic literature, likewise, attests to the Judaic tradition of these same texts used for the Messiah.³

In Christian usage, the Psalm 118: 22 translated in the Syriac has been attested to by Symmachus, Testimony of Solomon, Hippolytus, Tertullian, Aphroates, Prudentius and in Synagogue poetry: the κεφαλὴ γωνίας is the stone which crowns the building, or, more precisely, the keystone of the structure.⁴ This tradition is also attested in the Epistle of Barnabas where this falling or rising is on Christ as salvation.⁵

¹ J. JEREMIAS, *γωνία, ἀκρογωνιαίος (κεφαλὴ γωνίας)*, in ThWkittel (Eng) I: 792.

² *Ibid.*, p. 793: "I Peter 2: 7 interprets Ps. 118: 22 in terms of the σκάνδαλον which Jesus is for unbelievers. In other words, the κεφαλὴ γωνίας is not so much the final stone but a sharp stone at the corner of the building against which men stumble and fall." J. JEREMIAS has also seen a relationship of this concept to Luke 2: 34. Treating λίθος, † λίθινος, in ThWkittel (Eng) IV: 268-280, he writes (pp. 271-272): "Perhaps the concept of the rock is also present in Luke 2: 34 (οὗτος κεῖται εἰς πτώσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ) with its suggestion of either stumbling or being established. Certainly the two-fold effect which is ascribed to Christ as the stone bringing salvation or destruction in R. 9: 33 and 1 Pt. 2: 4-8 strongly suggests an allusion to Is. 8: 14 in Luke 2: 34."

³ *Idem*, ThWkittel (Eng) IV: 272: "The christological rock (or stone) passages of the NT mentioned under 1. [p. 271] rest almost entirely on OT verses: Ps. 118: 22; Is. 28: 16; Da. 2: 34 f., 44 f.; Ex. 17: 6 and Nu. 20: 7 ff. (Zech. 4: 10). How these verses came to be referred to Christ is obvious when we see that many of them were already associated with the Messiah in later Judaism."

⁴ *Ibid.*, esp. p. 274, notes 50-60.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 279: "Thus Barn. 6, 2-4 combines the following sayings: Is. 28: 16a, 16b; 50: 7; Ψ 117: 22, and Barn. seems to be answering possible objections to this kind of proof when he himself asks: 'Do we set our hope only on a stone?' and he bases his negative answer on Is. 50: 7 (καὶ ἐθνή μὲ ὡς στερεὰν πέτραν): . . ."

The association of all three texts from the Old Testament—Isaiah 28: 16, Isaiah 8: 14, and Psalm 118: 22—are evident in Paul's letter to the Romans 9: 33, and the author of I Peter 2: 7 f. follows this example of Paul. The texts have been conflated both by Paul and by the writer of I Peter.¹

The next step in the exegesis of both Hesychius and I Peter 2: 7-8 is to relate the notion of salvation in Christ as a decision; for those who refuse to believe in him, destruction awaits and the stone becomes a stumbling block; whereas, for those who believe, it is a rising through faith in the word which results in salvation. These notions are present in both homilies of Hesychius;² and these notions are present in Romans 9: 32 ff. and I Peter 2: 8.³

Hesychius rarely develops the Davidic descent of Jesus, but he does pay attention to the geographical references which relate to the city of David, whether that be Sion or Bethlehem. For this reason, the choice of Scriptural citations mentioning Sion is not accidental. It is this Jerusalemite's mode of identifying the origins of Jesus, and may even relate to Mary as "daughter of Sion."⁴ We have already referred to Caro and Aubineau on this point.

¹ O. CULLMANN, *πέτρα*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) VI: 98.

² HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, *Hom. I*: 7: 6-8, 9-15, p. 38; *Hom. II*: 10-15, pp. 68 and 70.

³ G. STÄHLIN, *προσκόπτω*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) VI: 754: "The starting-points and methods of the two combinations are, of course, quite different. P[au]l. is dealing with the destiny of Israel which stumbled on Christ, whereas 1 Pt. is dealing with the spiritual building in which Christ is the corner-stone." (Cf. *ibid.*, p. 753, n. 49; cf. also *idem*, *σκάνδαλον*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) VII: 353.)

⁴ E. LOHSE, *Σιών*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) VII: 327: "Σιών is mentioned only 7 times in the NT. It occurs 5 times in OT quotations: Mt. 21: 5 (= Is. 62: 11; Zech. 9: 9) and Jn. 12: 15 (= Is. 40: 9; Zech. 9: 9) have the population in view when they speak of the daughter of Zion. In R. 9: 33 a quotation from Is. 28: 16 and 8: 14 is adduced in which the accent is on *λίθον προσκόμματος*. *λίθος* is also emphasized in 1 Pt. 2: 6 (Is. 28: 16). To prove the eschatological salvation of Israel from Scripture Paul in R. 11: 26 appeals to Is. 59: 20; Ps. 14: 7; *ἤξει ἐκ Σιών ὁ ῥυόμενος*. Only in Hb. 12: 22; Rev. 14: 1 is there no quotation."

PART III. ORIGEN AND BASIL:
A COMPARATIVE/CONTRAST STUDY OF SCRIPTURAL TEXTS

A. *Initial Considerations*

Basil has a reflection on the verses of Luke 2: 34-35 in his letter to Optimus.¹ Since the text of Origen probably was a source for Basil's thinking on this passage, the study of Origen's homily and Basil's letter is important. Origen's is the earliest of commentaries on this scene of Simeon and Mary; his commentary may have influenced the writers and preachers who followed; the closest in parallel to Origen's thought is that of Basil.

The comparison/contrast chart which follows presents the sequence of Origen and Basil's reflections with an emphasis on the Scriptures cited by them. Origen's complete homily is highlighted so that the context is presented in a better perspective when compared and contrasted with Basil's letter. The fact that the genre of Origen's homily differs from that of Basil's letter is important. If Basil is using Origen, it could well have been from memory rather than from a written source; after all, the context of a letter written to a bishop and relative seems to offer a more *ad hoc* presentation than a serious study from a former text. This statement is made in order to emphasize the difference between a homily and a letter. The best available source for Origen's homilies on Luke is that of Crouzel.² Other studies are incomplete, for they lack the full context of the homilies.

What are the differences, especially from the comparison of Scriptural texts?

(A) Origen has an entire introduction to the text which Basil does not employ. The exact citation of Luke 1: 35 is first given and interpreted by Origen.³

(B) In the same section 1, Origen also cites Luke 2: 33; I retain the defective Latin *erat*, even though in the introductory citation and in his XVI

¹ BASIL THE GREAT, *Letter 260*, PG 32: 964C-968A. (Cf. Saint BASIL OF CAESAREA, *Letters*, FathCh 28: 228-232 [1955].)

² ORIGEN, *Origène: Homélies sur S. Luc*, ed. by H. CROUZEL et al., SC 87: 250-263 (1962).

³ *Ibid.*, p. 250, section 1. It is important that the reader follow either the homily itself or the chart prepared for the comparison/contrast in the points presented.

homily Origen had used "erant" for the same verse. It probably is a mistake either in the manuscript or translation of Jerome.¹

(C) Section 2 of Origen is where the parallel begins, but Basil immediately proceeds to outline his entire response in three points:

- 1) 2: 34B - fall and rise
- 2) 2: 34C - sign of contradiction
- 3) 2: 35 - the sword.

Apparently Optimus was only interested in the sword and did not see the difficulties involved in 1) and 2); Basil brings this to his attention and offers his commentary on them.²

Origen's method of commentary is twofold in this homily. He presents a simple, literal interpretation as in sections one and two, and immediately follows with a more profound insight or reflection on the texts in the same sections. Origen is often working at two levels in his exegesis. Basil's method is on one level. This is apparent in the comparative outline which follows.

(D) Origen's application of the texts about Simeon's prophecy is always made universally. Even when Mary is directly involved in his interpretation, the universal application is made to her; there are no exceptions to this in the present homily. His use of Matthew 26: 31 is universal. He strengthens his choice of the text by using Romans 3: 23, as we will see. His emphasis is on the "omnes scandalizabimini" and "omnes peccaverunt."³

Basil in his first reflection on Luke 2: 34 is speaking more of the ascetical condition of each individual who must experience the fall and rise through faith in Christ. He is not as harsh or absolute about the sword of doubt for Mary, the apostles, and Peter. The key to understanding his interpretation of the "fall and rise of many" is through his use of Paul's statement "When I am weak, then am I strong" (II Cor. 12: 10),⁴ a theme to which he returns in the last sentence of his letter.⁵ Basil indirectly refers to Genesis 3: 14: unbelievers are like the serpent who cannot fall for they are already at the level of the earth.⁶ It is interesting that Basil uses the same word for serpent both for the ascetical metaphor applied to the un-

¹ A. DE GROOT, *op. cit.*, p. 8, n. 4: wherein he justifies Jerome's translation and fidelity to Origen on Scriptural matter in Luke 2: 35.

² BASIL THE GREAT, *Letter 260*, PG 32: 964C.

³ ORIGEN (CROUZEL et al., eds.), *op. cit.*, SC 87: 250, 252.

⁴ BASIL THE GREAT, *Letter 260*, PG 32: 964D, 965A.

⁵ *Ibid.*, PG 32: 968A fine.

⁶ *Ibid.*, PG 32: 965A.

believer (μετὰ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ) and for the sign which Moses used in the desert (Numbers 21: 8 τὸν ὄφιν ἐπὶ σημειοῦ).¹

(E) Origen uses several texts which are not presented by Basil; for example, John 9: 39 which contains the paradox of Jesus, "I came into this world to divide it, to make the sightless see and the seeing blind."² Perhaps he intends to lead his listeners to an understanding of the phrase "the downfall and the rise of many in *Israel*." For him *Israel* would mean "to see God." He says: "in *Israhel*, hoc est in his, qui plena possunt acie et ratione conspiciere."³ He also had referred to Adam and Eve whose eyes were opened (Genesis 3: 7).⁴

(F) Origen's use of II Timothy 2: 11 and Romans 6: 5 completes his arguments more fully than Basil who does not make use of these texts. They are an excellent choice for showing the "fall and rise" in Christ.⁵

(G) The triple example of falling and rising is similar. Origen's examples are more rudimentary and not as nuanced ascetically as the contrasts of Basil.⁶

(H) Origen extends his universal application of the sign of contradiction even to the Virgin Mother; the Resurrection, the prophetic announcements, and the words of Scripture are also each seen as a sign of contradiction.⁷

B. Luke 2: 35 in Origen and Basil⁸

The comparative/contrast outline clearly indicates the fact that both Origen and Basil have the same Scripture texts at certain points of their development. It is here that Basil gives evidence of knowing and remembering the interpretation of Origen on the sword which pierces Mary's heart. We must also remember that Optimus had expressly asked Basil to explain the text of Luke 2: 35.⁹ This text is the high point in both Origen's homily and Basil's letter.

¹ *Ibid.*, PG 32: 965B.

² ORIGEN (CROUZEL et al., eds.), *op. cit.*, SC 87: 252.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 254: 4.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 252.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 254.

⁶ *Ibid.*, (Cf. BASIL THE GREAT, *Letter 260*, PG 32: 965AB.)

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 254, 256.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 256: 6 and PG 32: 965C.

⁹ BASIL THE GREAT, *Letter 260*, PG 32: 964C.

Two texts are important for seeing the similarity of their interpretation. In introducing his exegesis about the sword (Luke 2: 35a), Basil uses the text of Hebrews 4: 12, thereby giving to the sword a revelatory meaning. Though today's exegetes may disagree about such a use,¹ the biblical understanding of both Origen and Basil enabled them to use the Scriptures from cover to cover without restricting themselves to the narrower use of texts, especially parallel texts. For the Fathers, revealed ideas are parallel; the words do not have to match perfectly; the thought contained within the passage which helps them to understand another passage is more important to them. Thus, Origen may have used this text of Hebrews 4: 12. If so, then Basil is especially dependent on Origen at this point of his interpretation. In Crouzel's edition there is a Greek fragment which has been attributed to Origen which is almost identical to Basil's text.²

Origen cites the text of Matthew 26: 31 (Crouzel gives Mark 14: 27 as the text cited, but Matthew 26: 31 is the better choice.).³

"Omnes vos scandalizabimini in nocte hac": Basil: Πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοί.⁴ Both Origen and Basil apply the text to everyone, though the immediate Scriptural context applies it to all in the sense of all of the apostles present at the supper and following Jesus to Mount Olivet (cf. Matt. 26: 30). There is another difference, however. Basil emphasizes the (ἐν ἐμοί) "in me," while Origen emphasizes the time of the Passion "in nocte hac." Matthew 26: 31 is the better choice of reference for it contains both expressions of emphasis, whereas Mark 14: 27 reads: ὅτι πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε.

Basil implicitly refers to John 19: 25-27, for he says Mary is standing at the cross (παρεστῶσα τῷ σταυρῷ).⁵ Origen is concerned, once again, about universal salvation which means all have to be redeemed by Christ, including Mary. If Mary was not "scandalized," then Jesus did not die for

¹ R. E. BROWN, *op. cit.*, p. 462: "Much of this reflection is poor methodologically, for it seeks to interpret Luke through non-Lucan material—material of which Luke and his community may have been totally ignorant."

² BASIL THE GREAT, *Letter 260*, PG 32: 964C. An almost exact parallel to the Greek fragment given in ORIGEN (CROUZEL et al., eds.), *op. cit.*, SC 87: 494 (Frag. 43; in RAUER, GCS, Origenes Werke IX = Frag. 69), n. 2: "Ce passage est identique à Basile, PG 32, 965C. Cependant le glaive, symbole de la Parole de Dieu, selon la citation de Hebr. 4, 12, se retrouve dans Ambroise, II, S.C. 45, p. 99. Nous avons donc conservé ce passage."

³ ORIGEN (CROUZEL et al., eds.), *op. cit.*, SC 87: 256.

⁴ BASIL THE GREAT, *Letter 260*, PG 32: 965C.

⁵ *Ibid.*

her sins. He uses the citation from Romans 3: 23 as a tour de force to strengthen his position: "Omnes peccaverunt et indigent gloria Dei, iustificati gratia ejus et redempti." He also attends to the mention of the time of the Passion as he had done in Matthew 26: 31 (*in nocte hac*); after Romans 3: 23 he says, "*utique et Maria illo tempore scandalizata est.*"¹

Basil does not use Romans 3: 23. He returns to the scene of the Annunciation which Mary recalls (Luke 1: 32, 33, 35)²—a point which Origen also takes up, but not as completely—"You brought him forth as a virgin recalling Gabriel's words" (Luke 1: 35).³ Basil does, however, refer to John 11: 50 which has a similar connotation to Romans 3: 23. Basil says, "For the Lord must taste of death for the sake of all, and being made a propitiation for the world, He must justify all men in His blood."⁴

Origen definitely imputes the guilt of sin to Mary: "*pertransibit infidelitatis gladius et ambiguitatis mucrone ferieris.*"⁵ Basil does not definitely say she sinned. He says, "Even you will feel a certain perplexity about your soul. . . . Therefore, some doubt will touch even you yourself who have been taught from above concerning the Lord."⁶ For Basil, this is the sword which pierces Mary's heart.

Origen returns to the Mount of Olives in having Christ say, "*Pater, si possibile est, pertranseat calix iste a me*" (Mt. 26: 39). Basil does not cite this text. The letter of Basil ends with a short comment on Luke 2: 35b: "that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed." His words are consoling: "Swift healing will come from the Lord (*ταχεῖά τις ἰασις*)" for the disciples, for Mary and for Peter. He returns to a thought he had begun in point one, what was human proved unsound in order that the power of the Lord might be manifested (II Cor. 12: 10; I Cor. 1: 18, 21, 25).⁷

Origen's homily continues on, but he, too, addresses the meaning of Luke 2: 35b saying, these thoughts are the evil thoughts of men which must be made known so that they may be healed. He breaks into a penitential response from Psalm 32: 5 and shows through Isaiah 44: 22 that sins will be

¹ ORIGEN (CROUZEL et al., eds.), *op. cit.*, SC 87: 258.

² BASIL THE GREAT, *Letter 260*, PG 32: 965C fine.

³ ORIGEN (CROUZEL et al., eds.), *op. cit.*, SC 87: 258: 7.

⁴ BASIL THE GREAT, *Letter 260*, PG 32: 968A.

⁵ ORIGEN (CROUZEL et al., eds.), *op. cit.*, SC 87: 258.

⁶ BASIL THE GREAT, *Letter 260*, PG 32: 968A: *Τίς καὶ περὶ τὴν ψυχὴν σάλος.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, fine.

blotted out.¹ The rest of his homily is concerned with Anna and widowhood.

Basil, then, does not impute any sin to Mary. His words are sensitive and filled with hope.² He has used Origen's material without being constrained to maintain the same opinion.

C. Outline — *COMPARISON AND CONTRAST:*

of Origen's and Basil's Comments on Luke 2: 34-35

(with Emphasis on Scriptural Texts Used or Alluded to by Them)

ORIGEN

HOMILIA XVII: SC 87: 250-263

BASIL

EPISTOLA 260: PG 32: 964C, 965, 968A

Legend: * texts used directly
() implicit texts
- difference (in italics)

Legend: * texts used directly
() implicit texts
- difference (in italics)

1. Exact citation of * Luke 1: 35 which means Jesus was born of Virgin.

* Luke 2: 33: Et erat pater illius et mater admirantes super his, quae dicebantur de eo.
pater illius = Joseph because

simple interpretation:

- 1) he cared for the Savior; more profoundly:
- 2) Luke is concerned about naming Joseph for the order of genealogy.

¹ ORIGEN (CROUZEL et al., eds.), *op. cit.*, SC 87: 260.

² L. GAMBERO, "La Madonna negli scritti di San Basilio," *Mater Ecclesiae* XV (1979) 44: "La Madonna ha dunque sofferto il dubbio ai piedi della croce del Figlio; ma questi riconfermò i suoi discepoli e la sua stessa Madre nella fede, di cui Maria è divenuta altissimo modello." We must remember that Mary stood as a believer at the Cross; Basil had informed us that those who are unbelieving never have stood, but remain earth-bound like the serpent (Gen. 3: 14).

ORIGEN

Admirabantur:

- 1) at Angel's words
- 2) at heavenly multitude
- 3) at shepherds

which means they marvelled exceedingly

"vehementissime mirabantur."

2. * Luke 2: 34-35 cited in toto.

Savior came for fall and rise

- 1) simply means: for unbelievers and believers
- 2) more profoundly means: the same would fall and rise
 - use of * John 9: 39 to explain meaning: "In iudicium ego veni, ut, qui non videbant, videant et, qui videbant, caeci fiant."

Adam et Evae oculi sunt aperti (Gen. 3: 7).

3. * Luke 2: 34c: Savior will make of my fall a rising

just as prophets fall on their faces before a revelation to be purified of their sins

* II Tim. 2: 11: si commortui sumus, et convivemus

* Rom. 6: 5: si conformes facti sumus mortis, conformes et resurrectionis erimus.

BASIL

- * Luke 2: 34-35 cited in toto.

Basil informs Optimus of three points:

- 1) the Lord is for the fall and rise
 - applied to each individual in interior conflict of higher and lower nature
 - use of * II Cor. 12: 10 ("When I am weak, then am I strong.").

Allusion to serpent = those already on ground cannot fall; they are unbelievers (Gen. 3: 14 implicit).

Fall in order to rise in Christ through faith:

ORIGEN

pagan/ in you must fall
love of prostitution / fall
sinner / must fall.

4. * Luke 2: 34c: "et in signum cui
contradicetur"

"In Israhel = qui plena possunt
acie et ratione conspiciere."

All things touching upon the
mystery of salvation are bound
up with this sign of contradic-
tion :

- 1) The Virgin Mother is a sign
of contradiction
 - a) Marcionites
 - b) Ebionites
- 2) *Even* Resurrection is a sign
which divides opinions.

5. Arguing over meaning of Resur-
rection

* John 20: 26

Even words of heretics against
prophets saying He did not ful-
fill them

Even Scripture is contradictory
sign for unbelievers.

6. * Luke 2: 35 "et tuam ipsius
animam pertransibit gladius."
Fragment in Greek—*In Luc.*
Hom. XVII, 6, SC 87: 494, frag.
43; RAUER (GCS, Origenes Werke
IX) 256, frag. 69.
The sword means the word

BASIL

lower nature / higher
fornication / chastity
irrational / rational

* returns to text: "for the fall
and rise of many."

- 2) A sign which is contradicted

A. The Cross as a sign of con-
tradiction cites * Num. 21: 3
(cf. John 3: 14-15) (serpent).

B. Sign is indicator of something
uncertain or obscure—
Various opinions on Incar-
nation: anti-Arian.

- 3) The sword = the word which
has the power of trying and of
discerning thoughts, and which
extends "even to the division of
soul and mind, of joints and
marrow, judging the inmost
thoughts."

ORIGEN

which tries and penetrates "even to dividing the soul and mind, the joints and the marrow, judging even the inmost thoughts."

* Heb. 4: 12

Even Mary's soul will be pierced and that of all the apostles, Peter especially; for as the Lord says:
"Omnes vos scandalizabimini in nocte hac."

* Matt. 26: 31

If Mary was not "scandalized" then "*Non est mortuus Jesus pro peccata ejus.*"

Yet, * Rom. 3: 23: "Omnes peccaverunt et indigent gloria Dei, justificati gratia ejus et redempti."

"...utique et Maria illo tempore scandalizata est."

7. This is what the prophecy of Simeon means, that even though you know you brought him forth as a virgin recalling Gabriel's words (Luke 1: 35):

Pertransibit infidelitatis gladius et ambiguitatis mucrone ferieris.

BASIL

* Heb. 4: 12

Every soul is tested at the time of the Passion because the Lord has said:

"All will be scandalized in me."

* Matt. 26: 31

Mary stands at Cross (implicit John 19: 25-27).

She recalls testimony and words of Gabriel:

- *secret of her conception*

- *miracles of her Son*

(- Luke 1: 32, 33, 35).

"Even you will feel a certain perplexity about your soul."

"For the Lord must taste of death for the sake of all, and, being made a propitiation for the world, He must justify all men in His blood." (— John 11: 50)

Therefore, "Some doubt will touch even you yourself who have been taught from above concerning the Lord." = the sword.

ORIGEN

when you see Him crucified,
 dead, subjected to ignominy,
 and when he has said, "Pater,
 si possibile est, pertranseat
 calix iste a me."

* Matt. 26: 39

8. * Luke 2: 35b: These thoughts are the evil thoughts of men, these must be made known so that they are healed.

Use of * Psalm 32 (31): 5: for confession of sin: Peccatum meum notum feci tibi, et iniquitatem meam non abscondi.

Dixi: annuntiabo iniustitiam meam contra me Domino.

Result: * Is. 44: 22: Ecce, delebo ut nubem iniquitates tuas et sicut caliginem peccata tua.

9. Anna now mentioned by * Luke 2: 36a: fasted, was chaste: received gift.
10. Widows addressed.
11. Recalls * I Cor. 1: 2 Virgins, widows in Church.
 * I Pt. 4: 11.

BASIL

"That the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed": Luke 2: 35b.

After the scandal of the Cross
Swift healing will come from the Lord

- *for disciples,*
for Mary,
for Peter.

"What was human, therefore, was proved unsound in order that the power of the Lord might be manifested." (II Cor. 12:10; I Cor. 1:18, 21,25)

PART IV. AMPHILOCHIUS AND HESYCHIUS:
COMMENTARY ON EZEKIEL 44: 2

A. Introduction

The birth of Jesus Christ from the Virgin Mary is the mystery of the Incarnation. The Fathers have seen this mystery as a paradox which can be understood only through Christian faith. Nevertheless, they wrestled with Scripture texts from both Testaments in order to understand this mystery of salvation. The feast of Hypapante presented an occasion for their use of texts which were the source of Luke's Infancy Narrative, especially in the prescriptions for presentation and purification. The presentation of Jesus in the Temple led several of the Fathers to see a relationship between the texts of the Old Testament behind Luke's account (Luke 2: 22-24) and Ezekiel 44: 1-2.¹ The latter text enables them to proceed further and deeper into the paradox of the mystery of Christ's birth from the womb of Mary which was closed to man, open to the Lord alone, and which, because of His special power, remained intact (closed and unharmed) after the birth of Christ. The Old Testament background of Luke's account of the prescription: "Every male opening the womb shall be consecrated to the Lord," is taken from Exodus 13: 2, 12, 15.

Amphilochius has seen and developed the relationship of Ezekiel 44: 1-2 with Luke 2: 23 (Exodus 13: 15): *πάν ἄρσεν διανοίγον μήτραν ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ κληθήσεται*. He explains the versicle in this manner:

For every virgin the law of nature is such that only by intercourse with a man can her womb be opened and then can she conceive and bring about a birth. But in the case of our Savior it is not in this manner, for without intercourse the womb of the Virgin was opened and he proceeded immaculate so that what is said, "every male opening the womb will be called holy," refers only to the Lord.²

Amphilochius contrasts Christ's birth to the defiled births of Cain, Esau, and Reuben—all who were firstborn, but not holy to the Lord. Jesus, how-

¹ J. A. DE ALDAMA, *Virgo Mater*, Biblioteca Teologica Granadina, 7 (Granada: Facultad de Teología, 1963), esp. ch. 6: "La virginidad in Partu en la exegesis patristica de Ex. 13, 12 y Ez. 44, 2," pp. 129-182.

² AMPHILOCHIUS (DATEMA, ed.), *Or, II. In Occursum Domini*, CCG 3: 43 (*Or. II: 2*, ll. 49-53).

ever, is announced by Gabriel who says "the holy one to be born of you will be called a son of God."¹

Amphilochius then explains the apparent contradiction of the prescription "every male opening the womb" by having recourse to the text of Ezekiel 44: 2: "This gate belongs to the Lord and he shall enter and he shall go out yet the gate will be closed." By the power of the Lord nothing remains closed and all is opened to him.² It is here that true virginity occurs where the Lord enters and opens the womb, yet does not harm the virginal womb.

Aldama has studied Ezekiel 44: 2 and its relationship to Exodus 13: 12. He explains that this latter text was ordinarily interpreted in the manner of Origen, but the Fathers of the fourth century in relating the text to Ezekiel 44: 2 have progressed and, at the same time, maintained the tradition of Origen.³ Both texts are seen as the word of God; the text of Ezekiel complements and resolves the difficulties of the phrase "opening the womb."⁴

Aldama has also found a similar pattern of thought and the use of both texts in a work attributed to Gregory of Nyssa.⁵ Even if unauthentic, the work belongs to the same epoch. Since it is not specifically within the texts studied in this thesis it is left aside; moreover, Aldama has given us the history of the use of this text.

Caro mentions the text in his study of Proclus of Constantinople. The text depicts for Proclus the mystery of the divinity and humanity which is manifested in the normal birth and at the same time virginal birth of Christ.⁶

¹ *Ibid.*, II. 54-60.

² *Ibid.*, 3, II. 73-74, 77.

³ J. A. DE ALDAMA, *op. cit.*, p. 144: "Es muy característica en este sentido la homilía *In Hypapanten* de San Anfiloquio de Iconio a fines del siglo IV. Anfiloquio desarrolla ante todo el tema tradicional *vulvam aperiens*, en el sentido de Orígenes. Se dijo de un modo general en la Escritura; pero se cumple sólo en el Señor."

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 145-146.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 147: "Sólo que el autor se ha contentado con yuxtaponer Ez. 44, 2 y Ex. 13, 12, sin detenerse a compararlos. Al fin, la obra es un mero repertorio de testimonios bíblicos." (Cf. *Delecta testimonia adversus Judaeos*, 3 [PG 46: 209A, C].)

⁶ R. CARO, *op. cit.*, MLS 3 (1971) 90: "Parto y concepción, dos momentos virginales de este misterio inefable: *ἐκείνος ἀφράστως ἐγεννήθη, ὁ καὶ τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων εἰσελθὼν ἀκολύτως . . .* el Emmanuel abre las puertas de la naturaleza como hombre, pero como Dios no rasga los sellos de la virginidad, sino que sale del seno materno como entró por el oído, nace como fue concebido. . . ." (Cf. *Laudatio in sanctissimam Dei genitricem Mariam*, PG 65: 692A.)—This homily dates from during or after Ephesus. The text can be added to those studied by ALDAMA, *op. cit.*, p. 147 and n. 51.

Hesychius of Jerusalem has cited the text of Ezekiel 44: 2 in his works.¹ Our procedure will consist in citing the text from *Homily I, De Hypapante*, then *Homily VI, De Sancta Maria Deipara*, and, finally, *Homily V, De Sancta Maria Deipara*. Aubineau's work answers Aldama's question about the existence of a second homily, *De Hypapante*. There is no citation of Ezekiel 44: 2 in this recently published homily.²

B. *Homily I, De Hypapante* (Hesychius)

Fr. M. Aubineau demonstrates the first homily on the Hypapante as a work which is essentially biblical. He gives among many texts cited, that of Ezekiel 44: 1-2 which Hesychius uses to honor the virginity of Mary. The same text is seen in relationship to Exodus 13: 2, 12, 15 as implicit in Luke 2: 23b.³ The entire context is the presentation in the temple; Hesychius comments on the entire pericope Luke 2: 22-35.

He shows us his biblical acumen while noting that this prescription of the law ("Every male opening the maternal womb will be sacred to the Lord.") is surpassed by the Legislator of the law, Christ himself, for "in fact he has not opened but has kept closed the gate of the Virgin; he has not violated the seal of nature, he has not caused any shame to her who has borne him: indeed he has left intact the sign of her virginity."⁴ Hesychius leads the listener to the text to which he has already hinted—"If you do not believe this, learn from what Ezekiel says (citing all of Ezekiel 44: 1-2)."⁵

We are a long distance from the commentary of Origen which influenced many of the Fathers.⁶ The emphasis is no longer on the *text* of Exodus 13: 12 but on the fulfillment of Ezekiel 44: 2 in the *event* of Jesus Christ being born of the Virgin without in any way destroying her integral virginity. The power of Christ as legislator enables him to accomplish the prescription indicated by Luke, for he goes beyond the law while accomplishing the

¹ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, Vol. I. *Les homélies I-XV*:

a) *Hom. I, De Hypapante*, 3: 12-15, with Ex. 13: 2 (ll. 15-16), p. 30;

b) *Hom. V, De S. Maria Deipara*, 2: 19-29, pp. 160, 162 (Cf. pp. 122-123);

c) *Hom. VI, De S. Maria Deipara*, 7: 18-20, pp. 202, 204 (Cf. p. 180).

² ALDAMA, *op. cit.*, p. 148, notes 55 and 56.

³ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 7.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Hom. I*: 3: 4-9, p. 28.

⁵ *Ibid.*, ll. 9-15, pp. 28 and 30.

⁶ ORIGEN (CROUZEL et al., eds.), *op. cit.*, *Hom XIV*: 7-8, SC 87: 224, 226. (Cf. ALDAMA, *op. cit.*, pp. 132-133.)

prescription, for only *He is holy to the Lord*. Amphilochius referred this only to Jesus; Hesychius, through explaining how Christ fulfilled the prescription as legislator, showed how Jesus accomplished the magnificent event foretold by Ezekiel 44: 1-2. Hesychius has gone from the biblical text to another, but, even better, he has moved from *text* to *event*: the Incarnation and its effect on the Virgin. Hesychius has advanced the understanding of the mystery and has clearly affirmed the integral virginity of Mary after the birth of Christ.

There is evidence from his use of the Septuagint text that Hesychius has actually rephrased the words of the text to show precisely what he understands of Mary's virginity. He definitely believes her to be virgin after the birth of Christ. He has taken verse three of Ezekiel and incorporated the "going in" (only v.2) with the "going out" of verse 3.¹ This totally corrects the exegesis of Origen which saw no man entering Mary's virginal womb, but when Christ was born he opened her womb, thereby changing the integral state of Mary's virginity. Hesychius, by rephrasing the citation, has a perfect comparison for what he received from the Christian tradition about the nature of Mary's virginity. We are a long way from Origen.

Hesychius now has established his understanding of the mystery. He returns to the first text, Luke 2: 23 (Exodus 12: 2, 12, 15): "Every male opening the womb shall be called holy to the Lord," and makes clear "this One is not only holy: for he excels in holiness; the more he distinguishes himself by his birth, the more he transcends the precept of the Law."²

C. Homily V, *De S. Maria Deipara* (Hesychius)

Fr. Aubineau shows that the use of Ezekiel 44: 1-2 in this homily is the third of biblical comparisons used by Hesychius.³ Bound up with the comparison is another Scriptural text, John 20: 19, in which Hesychius sees Jesus rejoining his disciples on Easter evening though the doors were closed (τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων in *Hom. V, 2: 20,26*).⁴

¹ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, *Hom. I: 3: 14* reads: εἰσελεύσεται καὶ ἐξελεύσεται. The LXX = εἰσελεύσεται δι' αὐτῆς. Fr. Aubineau points out the variant ἀπέστρεψε adopted by Hesychius in place of ἐπέστρεψεν in Ezek. 44: 1 (*ibid.*, p. 31, n. 1).

² *Ibid.*, ll. 16-18, p. 30.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 122 (Aubineau's introduction to *Hom. V, De S. Maria Deipara*).

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 122-123: Il ne reste plus à l'orateur qu'à transposer en jouant des mêmes verbes au sujet du sein (πύλη, Θύρα) de Marie, pour exploiter les versets d'Ézéchiël en

The homily has an advanced nuance of honor for the Virgin. She is addressed personally by the preacher. The titles taken from Scripture are directly addressed to her ("Another [Ezekiel] has named you Eastern Gate.")¹ Aubineau has shown that the "theophores" are the prophets who have given these titles² to Mary.

Hesychius is consistent. He speaks again in this homily of the gate which leads outside. Here the birth of Christ, not his conception, is meant. Mary has become the gate of life presented for God's only Son, facing the East, for the "true light illuminating every man was coming into the world," leaving her womb, as from a nuptial couch. He addresses Mary personally: "You have brought the king within although the gates were closed, and yet again you have led him outside: He the King of glory, in fact, neither in his conception nor in any manner in his birth, has opened the gates of your womb, nor unloosened the bonds of your virginity."³ What is evident is that Hesychius' thought is the same as in the first homily; here, however, his theological reflection comes more to the fore than does his biblical exegesis. The passage is not dependent on the biblical text as in *I, De Hypapante*; moreover, it is more personal and spontaneous; one could say it is almost presented in a devotional manner. We are closer to Ephesus.

D. Homily VI, *De Sancta Maria Deipara* (Hesychius)

Fr. Aubineau uses the common elements of *Homily V* and *Homily VI* to establish the authenticity of Hesychius' authorship for both. He states that Ezekiel 44: 2-3 is cited accurately in *Homily VI*: 7: 18-20, while in *Homily V*: 2: 19-29, Hesychius lengthily exploits the same verses to affirm the virginity of Mary after the birth of Christ.⁴

Even more crucial to the question of establishing the authenticity is to discover whether Hesychius has cited the text in a manner similar to *Homily*

faveur de la maternité virginal: . . . Tu as introduit (εἰσήγαγες) le roi au-dedans, bien que les portes fussent fermées, mais de nouveau tu l'as produit au-dehors (ἐξήγαγες). . . "

¹ *Ibid.*, *Hom V*: 2: 19, p. 160.

² *Ibid.*, p. 161, n. 2 and p. 156, showing the correct use of τῶν θεοφόρων and rejecting Caro's defense of the title θεοφόρος for Mary.

³ *Ibid.*, *Hom. V*: 2: 19-29, pp. 160, 162.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 181: ". . . l'homélie VI se montre discrète sur ce point, insistant plutôt sur la conception virginal. Offrirait-elle un stade de pensée moins élaborée?"

I, De Hypapante. Then the result would be that there are definite biblical facts or data which corroborate the arguments of authorship. Hesychius, again, does rephrase the text of the Septuagint just as he had done in *Homily I, De Hypapante*; thus the authorship of Homilies I, V, and VI are rendered more probable—not that they are called into question, but this internal evidence makes the comparative study of these texts a key to better interpretation.

Conclusions

Hesychius uses the text of Ezekiel 44: 1-2 in three of his homilies (*Homily I, 3*; *Homily V, 2*; and *Homily VI, 7*). By means of a transposition of the words *καὶ ἐξελεύσεται* from Ezekiel 44: 3 into Ezekiel 44: 2 the virginity of Mary is affirmed before and during the birth of Christ. This transposition helps us to identify Hesychius as author of all three homilies. The text as cited is neither consonant with the Septuagint nor the Hebrew for Ezekiel 44: 2. Hesychius applies the *entering* and *leaving* (*καὶ εἰσελεύσεται καὶ ἐξελεύσεται*) to the person of God of Israel in *Homily I, De Hypapante* 3, 14. Both in the original Hebrew and in the Septuagint, the subject who goes out is the king or prince of Ezekiel 44: 3. In *Homily V, De Sancta Maria Deipara*, Hesychius is directly addressing the Virgin Mary as the Eastern Gate. She is the one who introduces the king within and leads him outside while the doors remain shut. He is, of course, applying this to Mary's virginity. Finally, in *Homily VI, De Sancta Maria Deipara*, it is the Lord who enters and leaves while the door remains closed. In all three citations the proximity of the two verbs *εἰσελεύσεται* and *ἐξελεύσεται* indicates the intention of Hesychius as author and preacher. If we look at his use of the texts, then compare them with the Septuagint and Hebrew of Ezekiel 44: 1-3, we will observe that Hesychius has changed the text for his homiletical purpose which is to affirm the virginity of Mary at the conception and birth of Christ. In fact, in *Homily V* the virginity of Mary is affirmed after the birth of Christ.

PART V. AMPHILOCHIUS, GREGORY OF NYSSA AND HESYCHIUS:
COMMENTARY ON EXODUS 3: 2: THE BURNING BUSH

A. *ὁ βάτος καλεῖται πυρὶ, ὁ δὲ βάτος οὐ κατεκαίετο* (LXX)

Amphilochius makes use implicitly of Exodus 3: 2 in *Oratio I, In Natalitia Domini*.¹ The text is found within his introduction to the theme of the homily. The feast of the Nativity has been prepared both by the prophetic types of the past and the more recent proclamation of the salvific event.² The invisible mystery has become visible through the Incarnation. One of the signs from the past was the fire Moses saw in the bush. It is one among many such signs, for Abraham saw a visible manifestation of God through the angels, Isaiah through the seraphim, and Ezekiel through the cherubim (Gen. 17, 1; Isa. 3: 2; Ezek. 1: 4-28). Amphilochius, by means of these four names—Abraham, Moses, Isaiah, and Ezekiel, has spanned the beginnings of salvation history from the first believer, Abraham, to Moses, the great prophet and recipient of the Torah, down to the classical prophets, Isaiah and Ezekiel. All of these believers experienced the invisible mystery of God in signs which were visible.

The burning bush was the sign Moses experienced on Horeb while tending sheep for Jethro, the priest of Midian (Exodus 3: 1). This is the simple and yet profound setting Amphilochius gives to the sign of the burning bush: *πάλιν ὡς ὤφθη τῷ Μωϋσῇ διὰ πυρὸς ἐν τῇ βάτῳ*. It is an example, one among several, chosen by the preacher to emphasize that the manifestation of God was prepared for in the stages of salvation history. Amphilochius does not return to this theme of the burning bush in his homily nor in any other of his discourses.

B. *Gregory of Nyssa's Use of the Text Exodus 3: 2 in ORATIO IN
DIEM NATALEM CHRISTI*

Lampe's entry under *βάτος*³ (a bramble bush) indicates the wide range of meanings the word has had for the Fathers. It is his sixth meaning which concerns us in this study, namely, the burning bramble bush as typifying Mary in her Incarnational role. It is precisely this interpretation that we find

¹ AMPHILOCHIUS (DATEMA, ed.), *op. cit.*, CCG 3 (1978), *Or. I. In Natalitia Domini*: 1, ll. 44-45, p. 6.

² *Ibid.*, ll. 13-15, p. 5.

³ LAMPE, p. 294, col. 1.

in the Nativity homily of Gregory of Nyssa. The development (which is the most complete) of the type is found in section five of the homily. The author of the homily is using the example of the burning bush to help his listeners understand the integrity of Mary's virginity. He has just made the statement that the "Virgin has become Mother and yet remains (*διαμένει*) virgin."¹

Giving his personal interpretation (*τοῦτό μοι δοκεῖ*),² the author describes the phenomenon not as a local experience for Moses, but as a temporal one which causes him to look toward the future.³ We have, once again, a setting within salvation history and a fulfillment of the prophetic sign through the event of the Incarnation, especially in the virginity of Mary. The last text used by Gregory was Isaiah 7: 14 in which the Virgin and Emmanuel were emphasized both in the biblical text and his interpretation of the text. The transition to the burning bush image is a continuing development of the same thought concerning the virginity of Mary within the Incarnation. He clearly says, "What in fact was then signified in the flame and bush, with the passing of time which intervenes, especially becomes apparent in the mystery of the virgin. Just as then the bush was alighted by flame and yet did not burn itself out, so this Virgin who brings forth light is not corrupted."⁴

Gregory of Nyssa has brought the framework of the text into a comparison of Mary's virginity with the burning bush. He is beyond Amphilochius who has seen the text simply as a theophany which helps us to understand the plan of God in preparing mankind for the Incarnation. Gregory sees the details of the Incarnation by relating the mystery to the virginity of Mary. The section on the burning bush is pastorally concluded in this manner: "Do not [listener] be embarrassed by the similitude in understanding that the bush signifies the body of the Virgin bearing [our] God."⁵

*C. Hesychius: Exodus 3: 2 as Presented in HOMILY V,
DE SANCTA MARIA DEIPARA*

Fr. Aubineau has an excellent introduction to the text of Exodus 3: 2 which is the second comparison Hesychius used to teach about the virginal

¹ *In Diem Natalem Christi*, PG 46: 1136A.

² *Ibid.*, PG 46: 1136B.

³ *Ibid.*: οὐ τοιαύτην, οἶμαι. . . ἀλλὰ τὴν παροδικὴν τοῦ χρόνου διὰ βασιλ.

⁴ *Ibid.*, PG 46: 1136B, C.

⁵ *Ibid.*, PG 46: 1136C: Εἰ δὲ βάθος προδιατυποῖ τὸ θεοτόκον σῶμα τῆς παρθένου μὴ αἰσχυρῆς τῷ αἰνίγματι.

maternity of Mary.¹ The thought, as interpreted by Hesychius, parallels his other example which we have already seen, the eastern gate of Ezekiel 44: 1-2, in the sense that Mary brings forth her son without losing the seal of her virginity. As the seal was not broken by man, nor does Jesus in coming forth from her womb break the virgin's seal. The list of verbs drawn up by Hesychius serves to develop the stages of her maternity, while the antitheses serve to explain further the mystery of Christ's birth from the Virgin.²

Hesychius uses the text within the second section of his homily, wherein he develops mysteries which were confided to the prophets and the "God-carriers" among whom is Moses. Like Gregory of Nyssa, he exposes the lines of prophecy-fulfillment within salvation history, but we are at a later epoch; Hesychius personally addresses the Virgin with her own titles (*Σοὶ μὲν οὖν ὧ παρθένε*).³ Fr. Aubineau has remarked on the breadth of development of Hesychius' thoughts. Briefly summarized they are:⁴

- 1) the only begotten son has flesh and the virgin is *Θεοτόκος*.
- 2) Mary is illumined (as by fire) but is not consumed, because she brings forth her son without the opening of her womb.
- 3) she has conceived him without tarnishing her virginity.
- 4) she has brought him into the world as a newborn while retaining as sealed her womb.
- 5) she fed him with her milk without anyone else touching her breasts.
- 6) she brought forth a little infant without experiencing a man as his father.
- 7) she became a mother without becoming a spouse.
- 8) a son was raised and one does not discover his father.

In the sixth homily, Hesychius does not mention the theme of the burning bush and is more reserved in his appeal to the prophets. *Homily VI* does seem more distant from Ephesus than *Homily V*, as Aubineau has astutely remarked.⁵

¹ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, I: 121.

² *Ibid.*, p. 122: "On lira la quinzaine de lignes consacrées à l'exégèse du 'Buisson ardent', en prêtant une particulière attention au vocabulaire: aux verbes exprimant les étapes d'une maternité (*συλλαμβάνειν, κνοφορεῖσθαι, τίπτειν, ἐξάγειν*), aux mots qui désignent le 'sein maternel' (*γαστήρ, κοιλία, μήτρα*), à ces images qui suggèrent la parturition virginale non sans braver les pudeurs modernes (*οὐκ ἀνοίγειν, οὐ φθείρειν, κλειῖσθαι, σφραγίζειν*)." (Cf. R. CARO, *op. cit.*, MLS 3 [1971] 51.)

³ *Ibid.*, *Hom. V, De S. Maria Deipara*: 2, l. 1, p. 160.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ll. 5-12, p. 160.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 179, 189. M. Aubineau dates *Homily V* before 428 (p. 183).

PART VI. EXCURSUS ON LITURGICAL SETTING OF THE HOMILIES

Included in several of the homilies treated here are indications about the liturgical celebration of the feast. Within such contexts, the interpretation offered by the Fathers was primarily a call of faith to respond to the Word of God in the special event of the Incarnation. To summarize, an example from each of the Fathers is given.

A. THE CAPPADOCIANS

Amphilochius

In his first sentences of the *Oratio I, In Natalitia Domini*, Amphilochius tells us of the feast being celebrated: "Today is the festive day of the birth of Christ our true God."¹ The entire homily is constructed on the traditional model of an encomium.²

In the opinion of K. Holl, the second homily, *De Occursum Domini*, may be the most ancient witness to the feast of Hypapante.³ But C. Datema in his recent critical edition finds this impossible so early after the introduction of the feast of Christmas.⁴

Basil

In *Homilia in Sanctam Christi Generationem* (PG 31: 1457), Basil begins with an exhortation to the faithful to honor the birth of Christ in silence. He tells us that the feast is also called Theophania.⁵

¹ AMPHILOCHIUS (DATEMA, ed.), *op. cit.*, CCG 3, *Or. I*: 1, ll. 12-13: καὶ κορυφὴ πανσεβάσμιος ἡ σήμερον τῶν ἀγίων χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν γενεθλίων ἐστὶν ἑορτή. (Cf. LAMPE, p. 1003: πανσεβάσμιος: "wholly august" of festivals.) Almost all of section 1 of this homily is set within the context of a festive celebration. See esp. *Or. I*: 1, ll. 21-22, 25-26.

² *Ibid.*, pp. XII-XIII: "Le plan de l'homélie suit le modèle traditionnel pour un *encomium*: dans la première partie l'orateur met en valeur la signification de la fête; ensuite, pour la partie centrale, il fait un exposé sur le mystère, et il termine en incitant les fidèles à vivre selon leurs convictions."

³ K. HOLL, *Amphilochius von Ikonium* . . . (Tubingen, 1904), pp. 61 ff., 104 ff. (Cf. A. DE GROOT, *op. cit.*, p. 15.)

⁴ AMPHILOCHIUS (DATEMA, ed.), *op. cit.*, CCG 3, p. XIII.

⁵ BASIL THE GREAT, *Homilia in Sanctam Christi Generationem*, PG 31: 1473A: ὄνομα Θώμεθα τῇ ἑορτῇ ἡμῶν θεοφάνια.

Gregory of Nazianzus

Gregory of Nazianzus' *In Theophania, sive Natalitia Salvatoris*¹ confirms Basil's statement about the two names for the feast, since, in the liturgical context of the celebration, Christ's birth is also his manifestation (*Τὰ δὲ νῦν θεοφάνια, ἡ πανήγυρις, εἰπουν Γενέθλια*).² God indeed has appeared to men—preexistent as Word, yet incarnate *for the sake of our salvation*. The restoration of ourselves is completed through his becoming flesh (*ῥεῦσαντας ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ εἶναι διὰ κακίαν, πρὸς αὐτὸ πάλιν ἐπαναγάγη διὰ σαρκώσεως*).³

Gregory of Nyssa

In his *Oratio in Diem Natalem Christi*,⁴ Gregory of Nyssa uses two psalms to sound the note of celebration of the feast of the birth of Christ: "Blow the trumpet at the new moon as a sign of your solemnity" (*ἐν εὐσήμεν ἡμέρα ἑορτῆς ὑμῶν*).⁵ He takes up the theme of light for this feast, since it is the Lord who enlightens mankind. There is a thematic inclusion; for Gregory both begins and ends with light, concluding with John 1: 4. The Prologue was, perhaps, one of the texts for the feast.⁶

The theme continues with Psalm 118: 24: "This is the day the Lord has made, come, let us exult and rejoice in it." He adds words from St. Paul which corroborate the theme: "Because at the coming of the Lord, day increases and night is done away with' . . . the brilliant rays of the Gospel enlighten the whole world."⁷

B. THE ANTIOCHENES

John Chrysostom

John Chrysostom's homily on the birth of Christ⁸ mentions that it is not quite ten years that they have celebrated this specific feast.⁹ He develops

¹ GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, *Oratio XXXVIII, In Theophania, sive Natalitia Salvatoris*, PG 36: 311-344.

² PG 36: 313C.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ GREGORY OF NYSSA, *Oratio in Diem Natalem Christi*, PG 46: 1127-1150.

⁵ *Ibid.*, PG 46: 1128A.

⁶ *Ibid.*, PG 46: 1149B fine.

⁷ *Ibid.*, PG 46: 1128B, 1129D.

⁸ St. John Chrysostom, *Homilia in Diem Natalem*, PG 49: 351-362.

⁹ *Ibid.*, PG 49: 351.

three reasons for the celebration of the feast.¹ He has the same excitement and joy in announcing the feast in his other Nativity homily; the introduction is in fact an eclogue announcing the feast and its benefits to mankind.²

Theodore of Mopsuestia

Theodore of Mopsuestia gives us no indications of liturgical celebration for the context of his commentary on the Gospel of John. But in the parallels chosen from his works on the Nicene Creed³ and the Lord's Prayer,⁴ we have evidence from the content of both treatises that each was a *Liber ad baptizandos*, that is, a handbook for the preparation of the catechumens during the Lenten season. The second booklet contains a commentary on the Lord's Prayer, on the sacrament of baptism in general, and on the Greek liturgy.⁵

C. THE JERUSALEMITES

St. Cyril of Jerusalem

Cyril's *Catecheses* (X-XII) were studied since they treat of Christ's Incarnation. These lectures were not delivered at liturgical celebrations. They were given during Lent to those who were preparing for baptism. Cyril delivered an introductory lecture followed by eighteen more lectures which were to form a complete course of instruction for those preparing for

¹ *Ibid.*, PG 49: 351-354: 1) the feast of Christ's birth was accepted quickly and objections against it were removed by a clear explanation of the event; 2) the historical context of Luke's second chapter leads us to accept the basis for this tradition about the birth of Christ; 3) the determination of the date is based on the knowledge of the time of the Feast of Tabernacles, when Zachary would have offered incense in the temple. John the Baptist's conception took place during this time, and from Luke's statement regarding Elizabeth's pregnancy of six months at the time of the Annunciation to Mary, the feast of Christ's birth could be determined.

² *Ecloga in Sanctam Diem Natalem Christi* (Hom. XXXIV), PG 63: 821-834, esp. PG 63: 821D (CPG 4684).

³ A. MINGANA, ed. and trans., *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Nicene Creed*, Woodbrooke Studies, V (Cambridge, 1932).

⁴ *Idem*, ed. and trans., *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist*, Woodbrooke Studies, VI (Cambridge, 1933).

⁵ *Idem*, *Commentary . . . on the Nicene Creed*, p. 7.

the fullness of the Christian faith through baptism.¹ Dom Cabrol has listed lectures VI-XI during the sixth week of Lent; lecture XII belonged, according to Cabrol, to the seventh week.² It is to the Mystagogic Lectures that we must turn for precise information from Cyril on the liturgy.³

Hesychius of Jerusalem

M. Aubineau has pointed out the liturgical context of the homilies of Hesychius in his critical edition. In *Homily VI*, the account of the Annunciation is developed, not, however, for the Feast of the Annunciation, but rather for a feast of Mary celebrated on the fourth day of the octave of Epiphany.⁴ Hesychius introduces his homily on this occasion, saying "... it is indeed an assembly in honor of the Virgin who surpasses all women, since she received voluntarily the Word of God Himself."⁵

Aubineau has noted the significance of Hesychius in that he shows the development that takes place prior to Ephesus. His *Homily VI* seems to predate the Nestorian crisis (before 428); it insists more on the virginal conception than on the divine maternity. *Homily V* is an amplification of *Homily VI* and emphasizes more the title Theotokos; for it, Aubineau proposes the date 432 or 433: that is, after Ephesus.⁶

¹ W. TELFER, *Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa*, The Library of Christian Classics, IV (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965).

² F. CABROL, *Étude sur la Peregrinatio Silviae: les églises de Jérusalem, la discipline et la liturgie au I^{er} siècle* (Paris, 1895), ch. 7. (Cf. W. TELFER, *op. cit.*, p. 36, n. 47.)

³ SelectLibNicPNic VII: xli-xlvi (1894).

⁴ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, I: 185: "J. Grosdidier de Matons a édité un hymne de Romanos le Mélode, pour l'Annonciation, dans laquelle il salue 'un des premiers kontakia, voire le tout premier, composé à l'occasion de la première célébration de la fête, au 25 mars'. L'homélie VI d'Hésychius, qui traite assez longuement du mystère de l'Annonciation, en une occasion qui n'était pas encore une fête de l'Annonciation, se situe un bon siècle plus tôt." (Reference is to ROMANOS, *Hymn IX*, in SC 110, p. 16.)

⁵ *Ibid.*, *Hom. VI*: 1, ll. 4-7, p. 194.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. LXVI and pp. 192-193: "Ce sixième document [l'homélie VI] en raison de son ancienneté, éclaire d'un jour nouveau les origines de la liturgie des fêtes de la Vierge à Jérusalem; il permet de mesurer des progrès dans la formulation des doctrines mariales, avant et après le concile d'Éphèse; il révèle, dans la Ville sainte, en ce premier quart du v^e siècle, des antagonismes profonds, qui ne désarment pas, entre les deux communautés juive et chrétienne."

CHAPTER IV

THE USE OF THE SCRIPTURES AND MARIAN IMPLICATIONS IN THE HOMILIES AND WRITINGS OF THE FATHERS

Introduction

This final chapter proposes the theme of the virginity of Mary from the texts presented in Chapter Three. Mary emerges as the Virgin from whom Christ is born (*ἐκ παρθένου*). The Scriptures and Mary is another title that can be applied to this chapter, since the statements of the Fathers spring from the texts which speak of the virginity of Mary. Her virginity is seen as a historical fact presented to the people; it is never expressed in a symbolic fashion. Her human flesh is the real medium or instrument for the humanity of Jesus Christ.

PART I. ON THE VIRGINITY OF MARY

THE CAPPADOCIANS

1. *Amphilochius of Iconium*

The principal works of Amphilochius are *Oratio I, In Natalitia Domini*, and *Oratio II, In Occursum Domini*. Parallels are taken from *Fragmenta II*, 19-21; *Homilia IX*: 5, 150-155; *Contra Haereticos*, 876-880; *De Abrahamo*; and *De Recta Fide*.¹

Amphilochius understands the virginity of Mary within the context of the Incarnation. Her virginity is always seen in relationship to Christ; never is it spoken of in isolation from his birth and its revealed meaning within the salvific purpose of that birth.

¹ For all these works, see: AMPHILOCHIUS (DATEMA, ed.), *op. cit.*, CCG 3.

The setting of Amphilochius' first homily is in a panegyric celebrated in honor of the birth of Christ from the perfectly pure and undefiled Virgin.¹ The mystery of the unblemished Virgin is not known by reason, but by the revelation of God's word descending among us, effecting salvation through freeing us from sin.² That salvation is accomplished for the whole world, for the Lord has proceeded from a virginal womb to redeem what has been corrupted.³

Amphilochius understands the Lukan statement, "Every male opening the womb shall be sacred to the Lord" (Luke 2: 23), to mean that the virginity of Mary could only remain if the Lord himself opened the womb without intercourse. All of the texts are seen in relationship to God, not to the work of man.⁴ Thus Mary's virginity persists.

In *Oratio II*, Amphilochius uses the texts of Ezekiel 44: 2 and Psalm 23: 7, applying their words to the virginity of Mary—only the Lord could open and not harm the "virginal gates."⁵ Amphilochius develops his interpretation of the texts in an apophatic and mystical sense.

Within the same homily, Amphilochius sees the text of Isaiah 9: 5 ("A son is born for us, a son is given to us") as fulfilled in Christ "being born" from a virgin (*διὰ τὴν ἐκ παρθένου γέννησιν*) and in his "being given" from God. ("What is born is seen with the eyes; what is given is known by the mind and the thought alone.")⁶

Amphilochius, along with the other Fathers of this era, speaks of the reality of the human nature taken from the Virgin or taken from Mary *ἐκ Μαρίας ἀνθρώπων*.⁷ The use of the preposition *ἐκ* emphasizes the material cause of her virginity within the flesh of Christ. Irenaeus had used the same expression *ἐκ Μαρίας* to combat the Gnostics (e.g., *Adversus Haereses III*: 21, 9-10). The origin of Jesus is almost always expressed by this preposition within the New Testament: *ἐξ ἧς* (Mt. 1: 16); *ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου* (Mt. 1: 20; cf. Luke 1: 35); *ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβίδ* (Rom. 9: 5); *ἐκ Θεοῦ* (John 1: 13).⁸

¹ *Ibid.*, Or. I. In *Natalitia Domini*: 1, ll. 30-31, p. 5.

² *Ibid.*, 2, l. 67, p. 6.

³ *Ibid.*, 3, ll. 92-96, p. 7.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Or. II, In *Occursum Domini*: 2, ll. 50-54, p. 43.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 3, ll. 74-75, p. 45.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 6, l. 159, p. 57.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Or. IX. In *Illud: Non Potest Filius a Se Facere*: 6, ll. 150-155, p. 179.

⁸ R. M. GRANT, *After the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), pp. 113, 116-118.

The stress is definitely on the reality of the human flesh taken from the Virgin Mary. In *De Abrahamo*, Amphilochius says, "The just man understood that the One who came forth *from Mary* would suffer in [his] body."¹

Mary's accompanying Joseph to the temple for Jesus' circumcision shows that Amphilochius understood her virginity to be permanent (τεχθεις . . . ὑπὸ τῆς ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας . . . ἀνατραρεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ καὶ τῆς ἀγίας παρθένου Μαρίας . . .)² "Having been born of the ever-virgin Mary . . . and reared by Joseph and the holy Virgin Mary . . ."

The entire mystery of Mary within the Incarnation is summed up by Amphilochius in the treatise *De Recta Fide*.³ The biblical reflection of Amphilochius leads him to a profession of faith in the birth of Christ within time and from the Virgin Mary. His existence with the Father surpasses that from the Virgin. The divinity of Jesus wherein he is God is an ineffable mystery.⁴

2. St. Basil

In Basil's reflection on the birth of Jesus, the virginity of Mary is interpreted primarily from the Septuagintal reading of Isaiah 7: 14. He turns to the text three times within his homily and elucidates the meaning of Mary's virginity.⁵

His biblical reflections center upon the person of Christ in this birth; Mary is seen in relationship to Christ.⁶ The reality of Christ's birth of a virgin mother⁷ is drawn out from the texts used: Isaiah 7: 14, John 1: 14. These parallel texts emphasize the twofold generation of Christ, one in time and one in eternity, and, indirectly, on two occasions the text of Baruch 3: 38 is suggested.⁸

¹ AMPHILOCHIUS (DATEMA, ed.), *op. cit.*, *De Abraham*, ll. 420-421, p. 302.

² *Ibid.*, *Contra Haereticos*, ll. 876-880, p. 208.

³ *Ibid.*, *De Recta Fide*, ll. 50-57, pp. 316, 318.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Or. II. In Occursum Domini*: 6, ll. 156-157, p. 57, ("Esteem not lightly this child; because he is a child. He who is a child is coeternal with the Father.")

⁵ *Homilia in Sanctam Christi Generationem*, PG 31: 1464D, 1465B, 1465D.

⁶ PG 31: 1460C: *συνκαταβαλόντα σοι καὶ διὰ σαρκός*; PG 31: 1461C: *Θεὸς ἐν σαρκί*; cf. PG 31: 1464A.

⁷ PG 31: 1468A: *παρθένος καὶ μήτηρ*

⁸ Isaiah 7: 14: PG 31: 1464D, 1465B, 1465D. John 1: 14: PG 31: 1460C. Baruch

He affirms the holiness of this woman's virginity,¹ and manifests his own devotion to the tradition that she always remained a virgin. For Mary's virginity, Basil uses both the reputable source of Ignatius and also an apocryphal tradition (*Protoevangelium Jacobi*).² Finally, he sees Mary's call to virginity within the mystery of salvation history; for him, her virginity is an election.³

In summary, Basil has both demonstrated a biblical context for the virginity of Mary within the history of salvation and showed the understanding of her virginity for his day in the Christian tradition.

3. Gregory of Nazianzus

Gregory of Nazianzus, the theologian, interprets the virginity of Mary in the same manner as his fellow Cappadocians; however, he uses parallels which are bolder and more paradoxical. "Christ is born in the flesh" (*Χριστός ἐν σαρκί*), is associated with "His birth from the Virgin" (*Χριστός ἐκ Παρθένου*). The fear which sin had brought about is now, through Christ's birth, overcome, and hope is present.⁴

The reality of the human nature of Jesus is stressed by his being born in the flesh of the Virgin while yet being God the Word; thus the celebration is of the birth of Christ. It also can be called a manifestation of the Word (*Γενέθλια . . . Θεοφάνια*).⁵

Jesus Christ is presented as a striking fulfillment-type of Melchisedech: nature's laws being reversed. First, he is without a mother, being eternally one with the Father; then, at his birth in time, he has a mother but no

3: 38: PG 31: 1460B (implicit): *Θεός ἐκ γῆς, Θεός ἐν ἀνθρώποις*; PG 31: 1465C: *ὅτι Θεός ἐν ἀνθρώποις, ἐπειδὴ ἐρμηνεύεται, φησὶ, τὸ Ἐμμανουήλ (Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός)*.

¹ PG 31: 1464A: *Παρθένου ἀγίας σώμα*; PG 31: 1468A: *καὶ ἐν τῷ ἁγιασμῷ τῆς παρθενίας μένουσα*.

² PG 31: 1464A-C; PG 31: 1468C-D: *Δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ ἡ κατὰ τὸν Ζαχαρίαν ἱστορία, ὅτι μέχρι παντός παρθένος ἡ Μαρία*. Basil is referring to the *Protoevangelium of James*, sec. 10, 1-2. Cf. E. HENNECKE, *New Testament Apocrypha*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), I: 379-380. E. DE STRYCKER, *La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques*, *Subsidia Hagiographica*, 33 (Brussels, 1961), pp. 110, 112.

³ PG 31: 1464C: *ἐξελέγη ἡ μακαρία Παρθένος, οὐδὲν τῆς παρθενίας ἐκ τῆς μνηστείας παραβλαβείσης*.

⁴ *Oratio XXXVIII, In Theophania*, PG 36: 313A.

⁵ *Ibid.*, PG 36: 313C.

father, so to speak.¹ The same thought is clearly expressed by St. Augustine.²

The paradox continues under a new image, towards the end of the same homily on the Nativity or Manifestation, only there it is the contrast of flesh with spirit. Mary the Virgin is prepared by the Holy Spirit so that Jesus' birth from a virgin is fitting in that the contraries of flesh and spirit become united. God deifies through the spirit; human nature is deified. Gregory proclaims it as a wonderful union and an admirable paradox.³

4. Gregory of Nyssa

Gregory of Nyssa's *Oratio in Diem Natalem Christi*⁴ has an abundance of references to the virginity of Mary. Once again he agrees with the other writers and preachers of his time in delineating the reality of the humanity of Jesus Christ which comes through the undefiled virgin's flesh.⁵ He nuances his understanding of her virginity by setting it within the imagery of the temple, and sees Mary as a consecrated offering to the Lord.⁶ In the note of consecration he has added something new to the general thought of the Cappadocians on the virginity of Mary. In fact, the shadow of temple imagery is persistent in his homily on the birth of Christ, and using such a notion of a consecrated offering enhances the unity of the homily. His use of an apocryphal writing (*Protoevangelium Jacobi*) adds to the temple scenery, for it refers both to the legend of Mary being within the temple precincts as a child and to her name being called Mary because of the unexpected grace of her birth to her parents.⁷

¹ *Ibid.*, PG 36: 313B.

² AUGUSTINE, *Tract. 8 in Joannem*: "Christus singulariter natus de patre sine matre, de matre sine patre; sine matre, Deus, sine patre, homo."

³ *Oratio XXXVIII, In Theophania*, PG 36: 325B.

⁴ *Oratio in Diem Natalem Christi*, PG 46: 1127-1150.

⁵ PG 46: 1128B (διὰ δὲ τῆς παρθενικῆς ἀφθορίας ἐπὶ τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βίον διαπεράσας). It is also apparent that he is strongly rooted in the tradition of using ἐκ παρθένου to bear out the meaning of the reality of the human flesh taken from the Virgin. (Cf. PG 46: 1136D; cf. PG 45: 1256B.)

⁶ PG 46: 1140D: Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὴν ἀφιερωθείσαν τῷ θεῷ σάρκα, οὐδὲν τι τῶν ἁγίων ἀναθημάτων . . .).

⁷ PG 46: 1137D, 1140A. E. HENNECKE, *op. cit.*, I: 374, 376, 380; STRYCKER, *op. cit.*, pp. 110, 112.

The biblical text of Isaiah 7: 14 as found in Matthew's Gospel is the text which Gregory of Nyssa uses to explain the how of Mary's virginity. Unlike other women, Mary is "both mother and virgin" (*Ἡ γὰρ αὐτὴ καὶ μήτηρ καὶ Παρθένος ἐστὶ*).¹ His reference to the burning bush of Moses as an image of her virginity links the prophetic sacredness of the apparition of Yahweh to Moses with what has been said by Isaiah 7: 14.² Then he mentions the meeting of Jesus and John the Baptist while they were within their mothers' wombs, indicating the superiority of Jesus over the Baptist.³ Though the texts are very loosely used in an accommodative sense, there is, nevertheless, a sense of the history of salvation and Mary's role within it. The burning bush image keeps the sacredness of the temple image and God's presence in mind and unifies the homily once again.

In Gregory's understanding of Mary we find that she is presented as a virgin at the time of conception, at the birth of Jesus, and always remains a virgin. He does not raise the question of other children nor does he express any other thoughts beyond this simple expression: "The virgin becomes a mother and remains a virgin" (*Ἡ Παρθένος μήτηρ γίνεται, καὶ διαμένει Παρθένος*),⁴ but this implies ever-virgin.

After the birth at Bethlehem, the Virgin remains untouched by man and embraces her son.⁵ Gregory emphasizes the reality of the human nature of the baby, while the Virgin Mother rejoices.⁶

Gregory has Mary formulate questions to the Angel Gabriel which help the listener to understand more deeply the meaning of the mystery being announced. Through the power of the Most High and the coming of the Spirit, Christ is formed in the Virgin.⁷ This development of thought on the Incarnation is the result of Gregory meditating upon Luke 1: 35 and I Corinthians 1: 24 of Paul.

¹ PG 46: 1136A.

² PG 46: 1136B.

³ PG 46: 1136D (*Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν προλαμβάνει τὸν ἐκ παρθενίας ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς στειρίας*).

⁴ PG 46: 1136A.

⁵ PG 46: 1141B: *καὶ ἡ μετὰ τόκον παρθένος, ἡ ἄφθορος μήτηρ περιέπει τὸ ἔγγονον*.

⁶ PG 56: 1137C: *ἐπαγάλλεται ἡ παρθένος τῷ τόκῳ*.

⁷ PG 46: 1141B: *Τοῦ οὖν ὑψίστου Θεοῦ ἡ δύναμις, ἥτις ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός, διὰ τῆς ἐπελεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐμμορφοῦται τῇ παρθενίᾳ*.

THE ANTIOCHENES

5. St. John Chrysostom

The favored text of John Chrysostom for speaking of the Virgin is Isaiah 7: 14 with its fulfillment counterpart, Matthew 1: 23. In his fifth homily on Matthew's Gospel, Chrysostom takes up the Emmanuel saying of Isaiah 7: 14 as it is used in Matthew 1: 23.¹ Joseph is told to take Mary as his wife. Having meditated on the prophet's word, Joseph the just one believes and is opened to the mystery of Mary's virginity. The angel uses the text which Joseph was familiar with to help him understand Mary's virginity. In fact, it is not merely a prophet who said this, but "what was said by the Lord" through a prophet. It is at this point that Chrysostom explains how the Septuagint, which, he says, was written a hundred years before Christ, is more worthy of belief than those who argue that the text means a young girl;² Chrysostom is referring to the later translations of Aquila and Symmachus and Theodotion who translate 'almāh by *νεάνις*. Of course, this brings out the fact that Chrysostom considers the Septuagint inspired, while he was not familiar with the Hebrew text itself. He was more a man of Church tradition than an inquiring exegete on this point.

In his commentary on John, the same Scriptural references are used to affirm Mary's virginity. Only here the texts of Isaiah 7: 14 and Matthew 1: 22-23 are seen in the context of prophetic fulfillment at the birth of Christ

¹ In *Matt.*, *Hom.* 5, PG 57: 56C. The complete list of references to Isaiah 7: 14 is comprised of:

- a. In *Isaiam* 7, PG 56: 82B.
- b. *Ecloga* 34, PG 63: 827A, D.
- c. In *Matt.*, *Hom.* 5, PG 57: 56-57D, 58A.
- d. In *Psalm*. 44, PG 55: 195C.
- e. In *Psalm*. 47, PG 55: 216A.
- f. In *Psalm*. 117, PG 55: 335D.
- g. In *Joh.*, *Hom.* 13, PG 59: 87B.
- h. *De Incomprehensibilia Dei*, PG 48: 738C.
- i. *De Consubstantiali contra Anomoeos*, PG 48: 765C.
- j. *Contra Judaeos et Gentiles*, PG 48: 815B.
- k. In *Illud, Pater*, . . . , PG 51: 37B.
- l. In *Natalem Christi*, PG 56: 389AB.

² *Ibid.*, PG 57: 56C.

so that by "mentioning the facts of the venerable prophets, the evangelists lead the listener to singular events."¹

Chrysostom sees Mary as virgin physically and not merely symbolically in her relationship to her Son Jesus Christ. He speculates what her action would have been had the Annunciation been different—even a possibility of her suicide, but in returning to the text of Luke we see that Chrysostom considers her admirable. His other thoughts on Mary are simply part of his enthusiastic oratory to catch the audience's attention. The context is the historical reality of the setting—at least, as he understood it.²

His listings and interpretation of Isaiah 7: 14 lead to a confirmation of the title VIRGIN as his preferred title for Mary, the Mother of Jesus. For Chrysostom, the context of a prophetic announcement in Isaiah—clearly stated in the Septuagint and understood by this master of the Greek tongue as her physical virginity, not a symbolic one—was primarily that which was prophesied in Isaiah 7: 14 and fulfilled in the birth of Jesus, Matthew 1: 23 being the terminal fulfillment text. In his homilies, Chrysostom does *not* use the New Adam theme in order to arrive at the virginity of Mary in the mystery of the Incarnation. Though this theme may be in homilies attributed to Chrysostom,³ the virginity of Mary and the Davidic origin of Jesus are emphasized. The prophetic Incarnation text for Chrysostom is Baruch 3: 38 seen in relationship to Isaiah 7: 14.

Within his fifth homily on the Gospel of St. Matthew, Chrysostom uses the Emmanuel prophecy four times.⁴ Chrysostom discusses the objections of those who say the text reads "a young woman" and not "virgin." The text is invaluable:

"Behold a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel." How was it then that His name was not called Emmanuel but Jesus Christ? Because he did not say "you (sing.) shall call," but "they shall call," that is, the multitude, and the issue of events. For here he puts the *event as a name: and this is customary in Scripture, to substitute the events that take place for names.* Therefore, to say, "they shall call Him Emmanuel" means nothing else than they shall see God among men. And He has indeed always been among men, but never so manifestly.⁵

¹ In Joh., Hom. 13, PG 59: 87.

² In Matt., Hom. 4, PG 57: 45A.

³ Cf. PG 56: 385-394.

⁴ In Matt., Hom. 5, PG 57: 56D.

⁵ Ibid., PG 57: 56D-57A.

Chrysostom reads "they shall call him Emmanuel"—contrary to the original Septuagint and more consonant with Matthew 1: 23. He interprets the article or pronoun as definitive, that is, he explains it to specify *THIS VIRGIN*. That the woman is a virgin is essential to Chrysostom's interpretation. For him it cannot be otherwise. Undoubtedly, he is following through on his belief taken from Matthew 1: 23 and from the orthodox doctrine of the Church, so strongly attested in the fourth-century Fathers. He uses parallel passages from the New Testament to corroborate his meaning of the definite article, e.g., John 1: 19, John 1: 25, John 1: 1.¹

Chrysostom does not use the text of John 1: 13 (the variant reading) to support his affirmation of the virginity of Mary. There is only a remote possibility of his having been aware of the singular number: "[He] who was born, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God." The Peshitta Syriac upon which his text was based reads in the plural: "those who." The text² in which the remote possibility is present fits better under the topic of typology which will be presented in part four of this chapter.

To help mankind reach an understanding of the mystery of the Virgin, Chrysostom makes use of comparisons with Sarah, Rebecca, Rachel, and Elizabeth; the miracle of the birth from a Virgin is more acceptable when seen in the light of God's divine pedagogy for mankind.³ We have seen the same approach used by other Fathers of the Church referred to in this study.

Chrysostom in his homily on the birth of Christ defends the virginity of Mary by means of grammatical parallels to the use of the word "until" in Matthew 1: 25. Apparently, then as now, the literal and rigid understanding of the text could imply that Mary had other children after the birth of Christ. Chrysostom demonstrates that "until" is a biblical word which has a wider nuance.⁴ It is interesting that Chrysostom nowhere in his consideration of the texts about the brothers and sisters of Jesus infers these were children of Mary. In fact, he is not even bothered by such a consideration!

¹ In *Isaiam* 7, PG 56: 83D-84A; *Ecloga* 34, PG 63: 828B.

² In *Joh.*, *Hom.* 26, PG 59: 155D. For an excellent presentation of the manuscript evidence, consult: B. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 3rd ed. (New York, 1971), pp. 196-197.

³ *Hom. in Genesim* 25, PG 54: 445D, 446A-D, 447; *Peccata Fratrum Non Evulganda*, PG 51: 359A-D, 360A-D.

⁴ *Ecloga* 34, PG 63: 830D.

Finally, in his homily on the birthday of Christ, Chrysostom, as a true Antiochene, emphasizes the reality of the human nature which is assumed as immaculate flesh from a virginal womb. The emphasis is clearly on Christ being fully human through his birth of the Virgin.¹

6. Theodore of Mopsuestia

Theodore of Mopsuestia accepts the virginity of Mary, seeing in her the source for the true humanity of Jesus. He also indicates that Jesus was of the seed of David and Abraham. His statement, made to those preparing for baptism, seems to have been drawn from Luke 1: 35 and Romans 1: 3 for he mentions Jesus was of Mary "by the power of the Holy Spirit" and is "of the seed of David and Abraham."² He insists that the reality of Jesus' human nature born from a woman is formed by the Holy Spirit in the maternal womb without the agency of a human father.³

Theodore, in explaining the statement from the Creed: "And was born of the Virgin Mary and crucified in the days of Pontius Pilate," interprets it in such a way that Jesus is born of the Virgin as a man and according to the law of human nature. Though he uses the thought of St. Paul in Galatians 4: 4 to emphasize further the reality of Jesus' human nature born from a woman, he is not, as Cyril of Jerusalem, using the text to refer explicitly to the virginity of Mary.⁴

In another statement about the Creed, he shows the human instrumentality of Mary and its importance in the economy of salvation.

They [our fathers] wrote and arranged the Creed in short terms, and this is the reason why they said: "Who was born of the Virgin Mary and was crucified in the days of Pontius Pilate." They only said the beginning and the end of the economy that took place on our behalf, as the beginning of all grace is His birth of Mary, and its end is crucifixion.⁵

¹ *In Diem Natalem*, PG 49: 359CD.

² A. MINGANA, ed. and trans., *Commentary . . . on the Nicene Creed*, p. 67.

³ *Vigilius Papa, Constitutum de tribus capitulis. Collectio Avellana*. Ed. by O. GUNTHER, CSEL XXXV (1895), p. 238, ll. 29-36 (PG 86: 1059A).

⁴ A. MINGANA, *Commentary . . . on the Nicene Creed*, p. 67.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

THE JERUSALEMITES

7. Cyril of Jerusalem

Cyril, more than the other Fathers studied in this thesis, adheres to a plain and almost literal paraphrasing of the texts of Scripture in his interpretation. This trait enables us to discover a basic understanding of the virginity of Mary for him as a Jerusalemite. There is only one way of speaking of Jesus' birth and that is ἐκ παρθένου. He gives us his own preference for that expression when he has almost slipped into saying διὰ παρθένου.¹ The text can serve as an interpretative norm for all other references to the birth from the Virgin. This interpretation essentially separates Cyril from any Gnostic tendency to remove oneself from the reality of the human flesh assumed by Christ from the Virgin. The role of the Virgin is to be seen in the physical giving to Christ from her real human flesh.

Since the basic texts studied were from Cyril's *Catecheses X-XII*, the more important references will follow the sequence of the chapters:

(1) Christ is the Lord and Son of God. He is born in Bethlehem of Judea (cf. Luke 2: 10) in the city of David. Gabriel is the servant of God used for the announcement that the Lord would be born of a Virgin (γεννησθαι ἐκ Παρθένου).²

(2) The same archangel Gabriel bears witness to Mary, the Virgin, the Θεοτόκος.³ Here Cyril uses a faith expression for the Virgin which is not found in Sacred Scripture but is part of his understanding of her role within the Incarnation. As a Jerusalemite, this term Θεοτόκος enables us to see how universally acceptable was that expression, that even a strong literalist like Cyril would employ it freely.

(3) It is within his *Catechesis XII, Illuminandorum*, that the title of Virgin predominates, more precisely because Cyril is basing his instruction

¹ *Catechesis XII, De Christo Incarnato*, PG 33: 741B: Διὰ παρθένου τῆς Εὔας ἦλθεν ὁ Θάνατος, ἔδει διὰ παρθένου, μάλλον δὲ ἐκ παρθένου, φανῆναι τὴν ζωὴν.

An important contribution to this notion is found in R. M. GRANT, *op. cit.*, pp. 116-121; more in keeping with the Patristic understanding, cf. pp. 117-118.

² *Catechesis X, De Uno Domino Jesu Christo*, PG 33: 673AB (cf. *Catechesis XVII*, n. 6).

³ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 685A: μαρτυρεῖ Γαβριὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος τὴν Μαριὰμ εὐαγγελιζόμενος μαρτυρεῖ Παρθένος ἡ Θεοτόκος.

on the Emmanuel text, Isaiah 7: 14.¹ His first sentence exhorts the ones to be baptized to raise their hymn to the God born of a Virgin.² It may be suggested that the Prologue of John was used as a hymn in the communities. This seems plausible, for Cyril immediately cites verses 1 and 14 of the Prologue.

(4) The true prophet Isaiah also says that Emmanuel would be born from a Virgin (*ἐκ παρθένου γεννηθήσεται*).³ The same truth is expressed by the Church, namely, that the Word becomes flesh from the Virgin and the Holy Spirit (*ἐκ παρθένου καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου*).⁴ The reality of the Incarnation is thereby assured, it is not merely in appearance but in truth (*ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, οὐ φαντασίᾳ, ἀλλὰ ἀληθείᾳ*).

(5) The most direct expression of Cyril's belief about Christ and his birth from the Virgin is given in paragraph four: "Believe that He the Only-begotten Son of God—He himself was again begotten of a Virgin."⁵

(6) All of his teachings about the birth of Christ from a Virgin are based on the Sacred Scriptures—this means both the Old Testament or, better, Hebrew Scriptures and the Gospels. From the latter, the manner, the place and the time are learned.⁶

(7) The tour de force text of Isaiah 7: 14 is now defended by Cyril. Even though he understands the text can mean a "young woman," for him the ecclesial tradition has understood Isaiah 7: 14 from the Septuagint. Cyril justifies his usage from Scripture, I Kings 1: 4.⁷ In fact, there is no passage in which the word "'Almāh" can mean a married woman, but it could imply a maiden (virgin).

(8) The next development in his thought on the Virgin is to show that she is of the Davidic line. The standard texts of Luke 1: 32, II Timothy 2: 8, and Romans 1: 3 are used. All is framed within the structure of the *ἐκ*

¹ *Superscription of Catechesis XII, Illuminandorum*, PG 33: 725A.

² *Ibid.*, PG 33: 725A: τὸν ἐκ Παρθένου γεννηθέντα Θεόν.

³ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 728C bis.

⁴ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 728 (3)C.

⁵ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 729A. See also *Catechesis XII*, PG 33: 765B.

⁶ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 729C. (Cf. PG 33: 744C.)

⁷ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 753AB, 753C fine. (Cyril diligently searches the Scriptures to refute those who say νεᾶνις, that is, "young woman." He has cited the Scriptures to prove his meaning: *ὅτι καὶ ἡ παρθένος ἐν τῇ Θείᾳ Γραφῇ*. He comes back to Isaiah 7: 14 to show that the text reads more than *ὅτι ἔλαβεν*; rather, *ἀλλ' ὅτι λήπεται ἡ παρθένος*.)

παρθένου.¹ The straightforward conclusion of Cyril is that the holy Virgin is therefore of David.²

(9) He situates her virginity within the context of the creative goodness of God in forming human nature. The nuptials of the Virgin are with God. Mary is proclaimed (macarism) a woman of faith by Elizabeth.³

(10) He refutes the pagan Greeks for their denying that it was impossible for the Christ to be born of a virgin.⁴

(11) As Chrysostom does, Cyril develops the reasonableness of God being able to be born of a virgin. Had not barren women, like Sarah, given birth to a son?⁵

(12) He also argues from the more evident miracles to the birth from a virgin.⁶

(13) He returns to the creation narrative of Eve, the first woman, who was born motherless. Mary by the power of God and the Holy Spirit begets Christ.⁷

(14) It is only Cyril who explicitly uses the one reference in St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians which refers to the birth of Christ from a woman (Gal. 4:4) as affirming that woman to be a virgin.

Cyril reasons: Paul says, "God sent his Son not made of man and woman, but made only from a woman, that is, from a virgin. For that the virgin is also called a woman we showed above. For He who makes souls virgin, was born of a virgin."⁸ The interpretation springs from Cyril's belief more than from the text itself. There is no scholar in the twentieth century who has seen in Paul's words the virginity of Mary being affirmed.

(15) The final references to the Virgin are all within the context of a parenesis meant for the listeners who are preparing for baptism. This pastoral concern of Cyril leads him to present Mary the Virgin as a model of faith.⁹

Even though Mary is mentioned and her virginity affirmed, Cyril centers his thought on Christ Himself and always emphasizes that He is

¹ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 756ABC.

² *Ibid.*, PG 33: 757A: ἐκ τοῦ Δαβὶδ τοίνυν ἦν ἡ ἁγία Παρθένος.

³ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 760A. (Cf. Hosea 2: 20, Luke 1: 45.)

⁴ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 760B.

⁵ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 760C.

⁶ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 761AB.

⁷ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 761BC.

⁸ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 765A.

⁹ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 768AB, 769A.

the object of his Scriptural concerns for the listening believers. Cyril of Jerusalem brings one back to Christ no matter what the context is—"One is the Lord Jesus Christ, an admirable name indirectly foretold by the prophets; Isaiah the prophet had said: 'Behold your Savior comes having his reward with him' (Isaiah 62: 11) . . . Jesus as he is manifestly called not by all, but by the angel."¹

8. Hesychius of Jerusalem

Two homilies from among those recently published in M. Aubineau's edition of Hesychius² were chosen in order to discover Hesychius' concepts concerning Mary's virginity and her role in the Incarnation. In the opinion of Aubineau, *Homily II, De Hypapante*,³ and *Homily VI, De Sancta Maria Deipara*,⁴ were written prior to the Council of Ephesus in 431 A.D. It is from these works that the following remarks are made:

First, Hesychius clearly states the physical virginity of Mary. Just as the other preachers and theologians of his epoch had used Isaiah 7: 14 and Baruch 3: 38 so, too, does this Jerusalemite. Within the setting of those two texts he states: "Indeed the Mother is a virgin even after the birth and she preserves unshakeable the seal of virginity which nature had granted."⁵ These thoughts are seen in the context of a series of texts from the prophets down to the birth of Jesus—a salvation history, so to speak, in which Hesychius includes the fact of the Mother remaining a virgin.⁶ The text also shows that Jesus Christ is the person on whom the Scriptures focus—through the prophets and then through Mary's virginal motherhood.

Secondly, Hesychius states in the opening verses of his panegyric that the Virgin surpasses all women.⁷

Thirdly, Hesychius uses extended series of questions as a fascinating way of developing the nature of Mary's virginity. Mary herself asks these

¹ *Catechesis X, De Uno Domino Jesu Christo*, PG 33: 677A.

² HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, Vol. I: *Les Homélies I-XV*.

³ *Ibid.*, *Hom. II, De Hypapante*, pp. 44-75 (text: pp. 61-75).

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Hom. VI, De Sancta Maria Deipara*, pp. 170-205 (text: pp. 194-205).

⁵ *Ibid.*, *Hom. VI: 8: 7-9*, p. 204: Παρθένος γὰρ ἡ μήτηρ, καὶ μετὰ τόκον διέμεινε τῆς παρθενίας σφραγίδας ἃς ἡ φύσις ἐπέθηκεν ἀπαρασαλεύτους φυλάττουσα.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 175. M. Aubineau lists the twelve citations from the Hebrew Scriptures, particularly Isaiah 7: 14, Baruch 3: 38, Ezekiel 44: 2-3, and Psalm 86: 5.

⁷ *Ibid.*, *Hom. VI: 1: 6*, p. 194.

questions of Gabriel in the dialogue,¹ and then the Magi discreetly avoid sixteen questions which Hesychius, for purposes of instruction, poses for them!²

Fourthly, in *Homily II, De Hypapante*, Hesychius asks why the evangelist and writer of the divine genealogy mentions Joseph as father of the Child ("As the child's father and mother stood there wondering at the things which were said about him . . ." [Luke 2: 33]). It is Luke who had also explained how the Virgin would conceive and bear a son (Luke 1: 35). Luke has not forgotten, he simply mentions Joseph in order to protect the mystery of our salvation.³ This helps us identify Hesychius with those who followed the earlier tradition about this secret of Mary's virginity.⁴

Fifthly, Hesychius uses the expression *ἐκ παρθένου* to express the reality of the human nature of Jesus. In his homily on St. Stephen this expression is found within a text that has two of Christ's important titles in the New Testament: "the Son of God" and the "Word-God." Hesychius thus shows the eternal generation of the Son from the Father and the reality of his human birth from the Virgin.⁵

Sixthly, as Aubineau has observed, the use of the prophecy of Ezekiel 44: 2-3⁶ ("This gate will be kept shut. No one will open it or go through it, since Yahweh, the God of Israel, has been through it and so it must be kept shut.") is cited exactly, whereas in his later homily, Hesychius develops more at length the virginity of Mary "in partu." In *Homily VI* (from prior to 431 A.D., as already noted), the insistence is more on the virginal conception.⁷

¹ *Ibid.*, *Hom. VI*: 2: 1-15, pp. 194-197.

² *Ibid.*, p. 171: "La discrétion des Mages, prosternés devant leur 'roi' et leur 'Dieu' (4, 17), est longuement citée en exemple: on énumère seize questions, seize 'comment' (πῶς), qu'ils ont eu la sagesse de ne point poser! Ainsi 'comment la conception est-elle divine, le sein sans semence, l'enfantement sans flétrissure' (4, 3-4). A la différence de ce qu'on a constaté dans l'homélie V, on remarquera qu'Hésychius insiste ici sur la conception virginale, ne faisant qu'une brève allusion à la virginité 'in partu,' sans le luxe de détails, quelque peu indiscrets, auquel donnaient lieu les images de 'porte fermée' et de 'fontaine scellée.'"

³ *Ibid.*, *Hom. II, De Hypapante*, 8: 1-11, p. 68.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 69, n. 1 (Aubineau's remark): "Il est possible qu'Hésychius remonte ici directement à Origène (qui cite d'ailleurs Ignace d'Antioche): cf. *In Lucam, Hom. VI*, 3-4 (SC 87, p. 145 Crouzel; GCS 49, p. 35 Rauer)."

⁵ *Ibid.*, *Hom. IX, In S. Stephanum*: 24: 3-6, p. 346: *ὁ ἐκ Πατρὸς αὐτὸς ἐκ παρθένου ἐγένετο*.

⁶ *Ibid.*, *Hom. VI, De Sancta Maria Deipara*: 7: 18-20, pp. 202, 204.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 181: "... l'homélie VI se montre discrète sur ce point, insistant plutôt sur la conception virginale. Offrirait-elle un stade de pensée moins élaborée?"

PART II. MARY'S ROLE IN THE SOTERIOLOGICAL PURPOSE OF THE INCARNATION

In this second part, the place of Mary within the soteriological purpose of the Incarnation is brought out through a presentation of the texts studied. She will be seen:

- (a) in the salvation history of God's plan for his people;
- (b) in the important fact of providing—either through Joseph, her husband, or her own lineage—a real connection with the Davidic line. This is an important historical fact for the Fathers; the Messiahship of Jesus is entirely based upon his descentance from David;
- (c) in the biblical fulfillment of promises made to his people. All three of these points will be presented synthetically through the various statements made by the Fathers: the Cappadocians, the Antiochenes, and the Jerusalemites.

THE CAPPADOCIANS

1. *Amphilochius of Iconium*

The soteriological purpose of the Incarnation is the predominant theme of the homilies of Amphilochius. Mary's role is best expressed in *Oratio I* wherein the Lord has come from virginal bowels into a contaminated world for the salvation of the world (ἐπὲρ κόσμον λυτρώσεως).¹ The need for a healer (ἰατρός) of sickness is the image used for bringing about this salvation.² This image springs from Jesus saying, "It is not those who are well who need the doctor, but the sick. . . ."³ In turn, the faithful themselves are encouraged in the pärenesis of Amphilochius to become the seeds of salvation for all whom they meet.⁴ In the *Oratio II (In Occursum Domini)*, Anna is a model for the faithful through her open belief that the Child

¹ AMPHILOCHIUS (DATEMA, ed.), *op. cit.*, *Or. I. In Natalitia Domini*: 3, ll. 92-93, p. 7.

² *Ibid.*, 4, ll. 123-128, p. 8.

³ Luke 5: 31.

⁴ AMPHILOCHIUS (DATEMA, ed.), *op. cit.*, *Or. I*: 5, l. 150, p. 9: σπέρμα σωτηρίας.

Jesus is the doctor-healer, the strong redeemer and the remover of sin.¹ The same homily concludes with the prophetic image of the sign of the cross (Ezekiel 9: 5-6) being realized in the saving Cross through which Jesus the Christ and Lord redeems the world.²

This redemptive purpose of the Incarnation is understood as the fulfillment of God's promises which are expressed in the text so often used within these homilies. The pattern of promise and fulfillment emerges from the concatenation of fixed biblical passages which serve as witness texts ("testimonia") to the Incarnation event. Amphilochius gathers texts which are now familiar to us through all of the Fathers of his era.³ The same promise-fulfillment pattern is present in his homily on Abraham:

... From the beginning the (things) that have happened were destined to happen, and none of the elders has failed to share the (things) that we (now) meditate upon. For God is the beginning and also the end, He whom Mary has borne as a man, the young man who is eternal.⁴

The context of universal salvation history is present in the background of Amphilochius' homilies. He sets the birth of Christ in the overall pattern of the history of mankind. In *Oratio II* this history is poetically sketched from creation, through Noah, through Abraham, and through Moses.⁵

¹ *Ibid.*, *Or. II. In Occursum Domini*: 6, ll. 131-132, p. 53.

² *Ibid.*, 8, ll. 253-256, pp. 71 and 73.

³ *Ibid.*, *Or. I*: 2, ll. 51-66, p. 6: in which Baruch 3: 38, Isaiah 63: 9, Isaiah 7: 14 (Matthew 1: 23), and Isaiah 9: 5 appear; and *Or. I*: 3, ll. 78-95, p. 7: in which the testimonia are Isaiah 9: 5, Numbers 24: 17, Malachi 3: 20, and Zechariah 6: 12 which are all fulfilled in: "Today is born for us a Savior, who is Christ the Lord (Luke 2: 11)." By means of these texts, Amphilochius joins the soteriological purpose of the Incarnation with the birth of the Lord from a virginal womb. For example, the image of the Sun of righteousness (Mal. 4: 2) rising from on high is used as a poetic description of the salvific plan of God through the Incarnation. His immediate Scriptural source is Luke 2: 11 and 2: 32 ("For to you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, who is Christ the Lord." . . . "a light of revelation to the Gentiles, and for glory to thy people Israel"). The context of the notion of sun of righteousness is used to support his concept of the Incarnation, namely, that it is salvific. The prophecy of promise from the prophet Malachi fits his context. Amphilochius has used the image as a Scriptural parallel in his contemplation of the mystery of the Incarnation ("But for you who fear my name, the Sun of Righteousness shall rise.").

⁴ *Ibid.*, *De Abraham*: ll. 372-377, pp. 279, 299 (translation cited from p. 298).

⁵ *Ibid.*, *Or. II*: 6, ll. 141-163. (Cf. *De Abraham*, p. 300, where the same historical perspective is presented through the persons of Adam, Noah, Abraham, Sarah, and Isaac, up to the Virgin and Christ Himself.)

The Davidic lineage of Jesus is presented but once in the Opera of Amphilochius' works.¹ This is a striking difference in Amphilochius among the other Fathers studied.

2. St. Basil

Basil the Great in his homily on the holy birth of Christ states that God became flesh (*Θεός ἐν σαρκί*) in order that he might sanctify cursed human nature. He asks where is the effecting of this disposition *καὶ τί τὸ ἐργαστήριον τῆς οἰκονομίας ταύτης*) and responds that it is from the body of the holy virgin (*Παρθένον ἁγίας σῶμα*).² His statements are based on a direct contemplative reflection of the text of Matthew 1: 18: "When his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found to be with child of the Holy Spirit." Thus he combines both the soteriological importance of the Incarnation with the effective human instrument of the flesh taken from the body of the Virgin.

The election of a Virgin is most fitting for this mystery; her betrothal to Joseph adds a blessing to the married state as well. We have seen the election of Mary in Basil's reflections on virginity; here, the election is in the history of the salvation of mankind in God's plan. Basil sees Joseph as the protector of the chosen virgin so that she would not be calumniated nor mocked; virginity would have the protection of the married state.³

Basil then develops the thought for the listener. Mary is seen within the history of salvation as the fitting bearer of the Lord. His words are exact: *ὅτι ὁ ἐπιτήδειος πρὸς τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν τοῦ κυρίου καιρὸς, πάλαι προωρισμένος καὶ προδιατεταγμένος πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, τότε ἐνειστήκει καθ' ὃν ἔδει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Ὑψίστου τὴν Θεοφύρον ἐκείνην συστήσασθαι σάρκα*.⁴ (It was therefore a fitting time [event] for the Incarnation of the Lord, as formerly determined and predestined before the foundation of the world and thence brought about, that the

¹ *Ibid.*, *Fragmenta II*: 4, ll. 68-69 p. 230: *ἡ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ Δαβὶδ ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς τεχθεὶς Ἰησοῦς*. (Cf. the name David which appears also in *Or. VIII*: 1, ll. 4 and 13, but without any Messianic context.)

² ST. BASIL THE GREAT, *Homilia in Sanctam Christi Generationem*, PG 31: 1464A. For the healing effect on mankind, cf. PG 31: 1461AB.

³ *Ibid.*, PG 31: 146B. (Cf. J. McHUGH, *op. cit.*, pp. 168, 170, 300.)

⁴ *Ibid.*, PG 31: 1464B ad finem.

Holy Spirit and power of the Most High made that flesh conform to the bearer of God.) His reflection returns to the text of Matthew 1: 18: "Before they came together she was found to be with child of the Holy Spirit."¹

Basil uses the text of Balaam, "A star rises out of Jacob and a man shall arise out of Israel" (Numbers 15: 17) as referring to the Davidic dynasty from which the Messiah would come.² The fulfillment of the prophecy and promise of God to Balaam is seen in the spiritual reflection of Basil upon Matthew 1: 18-25 and Matthew 2: 9: "And there in front of them was the star they had seen rising; it went forward and halted over the place where the child was."³

Finally, the depth of God's love is shown in such a loving plan of salvation for mankind. Basil uses Titus 2: 11, Malachi 4: 2 and I Corinthians 15: 54 to express the loving kindness of God: "Ὁ βάθος ἀγαθότητος καὶ φιλάνθρωπίας θεοῦ!"⁴

3. Gregory of Nazianzus

One of the soteriological principles of Gregory of Nazianzus is that only through the assumption of real human nature by Christ are we saved.⁵ Christ is in the flesh because he is from the Virgin.⁶ With his birth, once again the light is created, the Egyptians are vexed by darkness, and a people who were in darkness experience a great light. The old has passed away and all things are made new. The letter yields to the spirit; shadows are removed and truth makes its entrance. Natural laws are reversed; the figure of Melchisedech is brought to mind: he who was without a mother, afterwards (in Christ) is without a father (human). Gregory casts the above scriptural reminiscences into a history of salvation with the Incarnation being the apex of that saving action and it is applauded by all nations: "For a child is born

¹ *Ibid.*, PG 31: 1464D.

² *Ibid.*, PG 41: 1469B. Cf. JB, p. 205, n. 24g.

³ *Ibid.*, PG 31: 1472A: *τάχα που τῇ προφητείᾳ τοῦ βαλαάμ* referring to Numb. 24: 9.

⁴ *Ibid.*, PG 31: 1461B ad finem. Titus 2: 11: "... God's grace has been revealed, and it has made salvation possible for the whole human race." Mal. 4: 2 (= 3: 20): "... the sun of righteousness will shine out with healing in its wings." I Cor. 15: 54: "Death is swallowed up in victory."

⁵ GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, *Epistola 101*, PG 37: 181C. (Cf. DSp 6, col. 940.) ;

⁶ *Idem*, *Oratio XXXIV*, In *Theophania*, PG 36: 313A.

for us, a son is given to us."¹ This birth in time is contrasted with the eternal generation of the Word; it is the former which is the cause of our salvation, and is that which restores us to what we had formerly lost.²

The spiritual image of God is restored in mankind because of the Incarnation. The word who was the perfect image of the Father (ἡ ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκὼν, ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ὄρος καὶ λόγος)³ was conceived of the Virgin (κνηθεὶς μὲν ἐκ τῆς Παρθένου) thereby deifying human nature.⁴

One can see that in his understanding of the soteriological principle of the Incarnation, Gregory of Nazianzus likewise develops one of his favorite themes, that of the divinization of the Christian.⁵

THE ANTIOCHENES

4. St. John Chrysostom

Chrysostom frequently alludes to the soteriological purpose of the Incarnation and indicates the role of the Virgin within it. He has several modes of so doing, for example, using a collection of sacred texts which describe the fulfillment of God's saving action among mankind; at other times, his use of Scripture is rapid—just in passing, as it were—as he develops salvation history with broad strokes. There are examples which are filled with profound theological statements which result from biblical reflections; and, finally, there are poetic descriptions of the salvific effect of Jesus.

In his sermon entitled *Pater, Si Possibile Est, Transeat*,⁶ we are fortunate to have a passage which gathers the most favored texts used for the Incarnation by the Fathers of the late fourth century. After catching the ear of his listener, Chrysostom starts with Christ's conception in the womb of the Virgin, practically referring to the creation of human flesh from the clay of earth; he then shows the promises God has made through the prophets,

¹ *Ibid.*, PG 36: 313AB.

² *Ibid.*, PG 36: 313C: Ἐφάνη γὰρ Θεὸς ἀνθρώποις διὰ γεννήσεως . . . τὸ δὲ, δι' ἡμᾶς γενόμενος ὕστερον . . . ῥεύσαντας ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ εἶναι διὰ κακίαν.

³ *Ibid.*, PG 36: 321D, 324A ad finem.

⁴ *Ibid.*, PG 36: 325B.

⁵ DSp 6, col. 948 aB imo.

⁶ *In Illud, Pater, Si Possibile Est, Transeat*, PG 51: 37BC.

using the texts we have presented throughout this thesis. It is a veritable florilegium of scriptural texts. The texts are:

- (1) *Genesis 49: 9*: "From the prey, my son, thou art gone up; stooping down he couched as a lion." Chrysostom is accurately citing the Septuagint. The verse is used to locate the human origins of Jesus in Judah. His power is affirmed because of His love for God, just as certain as the lion rises up certain of its prey.¹ The Septuagint uses the term "lion" some 150 times. The passage of *Genesis 49: 9* (upon which *Revelations 5: 5* is based) is a passage which later Judaism interpreted in terms of the Messiah.² The Messiah is compared to a lion in the Messianology of IV Esdras. Judah is that Lion (*Gen. 49: 9*) which is set up against the Eagle (Rome). He is of the seed of David.³
- (2) *Isaiah 7: 14*: Chrysostom's text is again closest to the Septuagint with the variation of *καλέσουσι*.⁴ The text has sufficiently been commented on in the study of Chrysostom's use of it and that of *Baruch 3: 38*.⁵
- (3) *Isaiah 53: 2*: Chrysostom has taken liberties with the Septuagintal text: he prefaces "and we saw him" before the phrase "like a child, like a shoot from the parched earth." In the Septuagint, the expression *καὶ εἶδομεν αὐτόν* more correctly refers to the second phrase of *53: 2*. Chrysostom could have used the opening words *ἀνηγγέλαμεν ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ*, which the later Fathers used for divinely ordained proclamation.⁶ The text fits well with the notion of salvation, where in the Bible *διψάω* is used for yearning for salvation.⁷ Perhaps the Septuagint has intentionally substituted the thought of thirst for dryness as the presupposition of the publication of salvation.⁸ The passage is an important link towards understanding related passages which are considered Messianic.⁹ Moreover, the Peshitta, a source which Chrysostom knew, in-

¹ G. QUELL, *ἐκλέγομαι*, in ThWKittel (Eng) IV: 160.

² W. MICHAELIS, *λέων*, in ThWKittel (Eng) IV: 252.

³ C. COLPE, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in ThWKittel (Eng) VIII: 427, n. 211: "... (cf. Mi. 5; Jer. 23: 5-8; Ez. 34: 23-31; Am. 9: 8-15; Is. 9: 11) ... 'He is not pre-existent like the Son of Man (13: 26), though He is kept for the end of days, ...'"

⁴ RAHLFS, p. 575; critical apparatus.

⁵ Cf. Chap. III, pp. 277-284.

⁶ J. SCHNIEWIND, *ἀπαγγέλλω* in ThWKittel (Eng) I: 64 (notes 31 and 32: cf. I Cl. 16, 3; 18, 15 and Herm. v. 2, 1, 3; 3, 3, 1; M. Pol., 15, 1; 1 Cl., 17, 7).

⁷ G. BERTRAM, *διψάω* in ThWKittel (Eng) II: 227.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 228, n. 11.

⁹ W. ZIMMERLI, *παῖς Θεοῦ*, in ThWKittel (Eng) V: 676: "The יִנְיָק [Yonëk] of 53: 2 is surprisingly transl. by *παιδίον*, which is familiar from the Messianic statement in 9: 5

terpreted the statements of Isaiah 53 in a Messianic manner.¹ There is evidence of a rabbi of the fourth century who used the same text Messianically.² Unfortunately, the rapid rift between Judaism and Christianity led to removal of unwanted Messianic texts.³ The notion of *ῥίζα* (shoot or root) definitely has a Messianic sense which relates our verse to Isaiah 11: 10.⁴

- (4) *Isaiah 9: 5*: Chrysostom cites the Septuagint accurately. We have already commented on the background of this text⁵: "For a child is born to us, a son is given to us; upon his shoulder dominion rests. They name him Wonder-Counselor, God-Hero, Father-Forever, Prince of peace."
- (5) *Isaiah 11: 1*: Again, Chrysostom has accurately given the Septuagint's reading for the verse. It may be that Chrysostom has, together with the other Fathers, related the text to Christ's birth by taking it from Justin who has combined this text with another favored one for the Incarnation, Numbers 24: 17 ("A star shall rise out of Jacob").⁶ The root of Jesse then is taken in a Messianic sense, that is, a new root which will establish a kingdom of peace and righteousness.⁷ Naturally, the title must be linked with David through whom the Messianic promise is founded. It is interesting that even excavations have given us a reminder of Isaiah 11: 1.⁸

and par. to the correctly rendered *ῥίζα*, also reminiscent of the Messianic 11: 1. This raises the question whether there may not be discerned in the LXX transl. a Messianic understanding. The reconstruction *ἀνέτειλε* in 53: 2 might well pt. in a similar direction."

¹ J. JEREMIAS, *παῖς Θεοῦ*, in ThWKittel (Eng) V: 688-689.

² R. BERECHIAH (c. 340), cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK I: 50f.

³ J. JEREMIAS, *παῖς Θεοῦ*, in ThWKittel (Eng) V: 698, n. 328a: "At all events the rapid replacement of the LXX by Aquila . . . shows that in the 2nd cent. the removal of unwanted texts was in fact a weapon in Judaism's conflict with Christianity."

⁴ C. MAURER, *ῥίζα*, in ThWKittel (Eng) VI: 987: "Isaiah 53: 2 perhaps carries with it the Messianic sense of Is. 11: 10. . . . According to the traditional LXX text (*ἀνγγελάμεν*) the comparison with the shoot and the root does not relate to the figure of the Servant of the Lord but to proclamation concerning Him: 'We proclaim in his presence as a child (proclaims), as a root pines in the dry ground.' But there has probably been corruption in the Gk. and one may conjecture *ἀνέτειλεν* and construe like the Mas.: 'He(sc. the Servant of the Lord) grew up before him (sc. Yahweh) like a child, like a shoot in the dry ground.'"

⁵ See Chap. III, pp. 268-270.

⁶ JUSTIN, *Apol. I*, 32, 12. (Cf. H. SCHLIER, *βραχίων*, in ThWKittel [Eng] I: 640.)

⁷ C. MAURER, *ῥίζα*, in ThWKittel (Eng) VI: 986-987, for an excellent exegesis of the text and its relationship to Isaiah 53: 2.

⁸ E. LOHSE, *υἱὸς Δαβὶδ*, in ThWKittel (Eng) VIII: 479, n. 2: "'For the members of the Jewish community at Dura-Europos to see before them at the very right of the central

- (6) *Baruch* 3: 36-38 has been treated already within the textual study of Chrysostom.
- (7) *Psalms* 71: 6: "He shall come down like rain upon the grass and like showers watering the earth." Chrysostom's text differs from the Septuagint in reading for 71: 6b *σταγὼν ἢ στάζουσα* in place of *σταγόνες στάζουσαι*. This psalm may possibly be the one used for the liturgy on the day in which his homily was preached.¹

An example of Chrysostom's rapid use of Scripture in presenting the soteriological purpose of the Incarnation is found in his introductory remarks to his homily on the birth of Christ. He uses the texts of Matthew 13: 17 ("Many a prophet longed to see what you see . . . to hear what you hear") and *Baruch* 3: 38 (God "was seen upon the earth through human flesh, and moved among men"), and then encourages the Christians to rejoice in their Savior (*τὸν Σωτῆρα*).²

An excellent example of Chrysostom's theological reflection on the purpose of the Incarnation is brought out in his second homily on Matthew.³ What is significant is that he repeats the same phrase in his homily for the birthday of Christ;⁴ thus we have a perfect parallel to his thought. In his second homily on St. Matthew, he states that the Son of God was the Son of Abraham and the Son of David so that the sons of Adam might become future sons of God. He was born according to the flesh (*Ἐγεννήθη γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα*) that you might be born according to the spirit (*ἵνα σὺ γεννηθῇς κατὰ πνεῦμα*); born of a woman so that you might cease being born of a woman (*ἔγεννήθη ἐκ γυναικὸς*). In being born of a woman he was similar to us; however, to be born neither of the blood, nor of the will of man and the flesh but of the Spirit—this announces our future birth of the Holy Spirit.

Torah Shrine of the House of Assembly a scene depicting the anointing of David, was inevitably a reminder of the divine promises concerning the Messianic king who was to come, the Lord's Anointed himself, a "shoot out of the stock of Jesse" (Is. 11: 1) and a son of David. In all probability the scene received its prominent position in order to perform precisely this function." (C. H. KRAELING, "The Synagogue," *The Excavations at Dura-Europos*, VIII, 1 [1956] 168.)

¹ L. SABOURIN, *The Psalms: Their Origin and Meaning* (New York: Alba House, 1969), pp. 351-352.

² *In Diem Natalem*, PG 49: 351A.

³ *In Matt., Hom. II*, PG 57: 26A

⁴ *Ecloga* 34, PG 63: 822D: *Ἐγεννήθη τὸν κατὰ σάρκα, ἵνα γεννηθῇς κατὰ πνεῦμα · ἐγεννήθη ἐκ γυναικὸς, ἵνα παύσῃ γυναικὸς ὡν υἱός.* (Underlining indicates the parallel to *In Matt., Hom. II*, i.e., PG 57: 26A.)

Chrysostom's biblical thought springs from the texts of Matthew and is explained by a parallel thought taken from the Prologue of John.¹ What is new is his emphasis on the Holy Spirit within the soteriology of the Incarnation and, indirectly, a reflection on the virginity of Mary—the component of being born not according to flesh and blood or the will of man.

The homily on the birthday of Christ leads up to the completion of the Incarnation seen by Chrysostom's return to his favorite text, Baruch 3: 38.² There are other modes also of expressing the soteriology of the Incarnation. At times, Chrysostom has more poetic descriptions which seem to wander away from the biblical texts.³

Davidic Lineage of Jesus—and Mary

In the Fathers' choice of texts on the Incarnation, historical foundations are emphasized.⁴ This is evident in the important fact that Jesus was of the Davidic line. For the Greek Fathers the insistence on the Davidic line is an important part of the Messianic promise. Often in their homilies, the same Fathers try to illustrate that Mary, too, is from the lineage of David. John Chrysostom, as we will see, is no exception.

In his consecutive commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, Chrysostom at once refers to the descent of Jesus from David and Abraham, his ancestors. In doing this, Chrysostom is simply relying on Matthew's text, 1: 1. Matthew associates the name David with the confession of Jesus as the

¹ Chrysostom does not use the text of John 1: 13 explicitly as an argument for the birth of Jesus from a Virgin. However, this text is quite close to such an interpretation, albeit in a transferred and implicit sense. We have seen that ancient witnesses (Irenaeus, Tertullian, Ambrose, Augustine and Pseudo-Athanasius) read John 1: 13 in the singular: "[He] who was born, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God." All Greek manuscripts, as well as other versional and patristic witnesses, attest the plural. (Cf. B. METZGER, *op. cit.*, pp. 196-197 for the substance of these remarks.)

² *Ecloga* 34, PG 63: 823D.

³ Cf. *Ecloga* 34, PG 63: 825A (more poetic) and *In Matt., Hom. III*, PG 57: 34BC (a wandering description).

⁴ E. LOHSE, *υἱὸς Δαβὶδ*, in ThWKRTEL (Eng) VIII: 486, n. 52: "In stressing the title Son of David the Evangelist is not so much pursuing a historical concern (Strecker, *op. cit.*, 118-120); he rather 'emphasizes Jesus as the Son of David, in whom are fulfilled all legitimate Jewish Messianic hopes' (Gibbs, *op. cit.*, 463), and he is thus 'contending for the Messiahship of Jesus predominantly under the royal title of Son of David' . . ." The Fathers are already speaking from a living tradition which emphasized the Davidic origins of Jesus. Thus the statement just made is not contradicted or dismissed by the above remark; rather it is complemented.

Messiah of God's people. In him the promises are fulfilled in his earthly life. But it is the Christian community that will associate the name *Kurios* and Son of God (Mt. 22: 41-46) with Jesus, in whom all power is given both in the heavens and on the earth.¹

John Chrysostom states that among the Jews it is not the custom to give a genealogy through women—though in Matthew four women are mentioned in the genealogy; they are not totally exemplary, and serve another purpose.² His next step is to show that the title Son of David rather than Son of Abraham is what is being emphasized by the Evangelist Matthew.³ He uses John 7: 42 as a confirmatory text, and he cites the text accurately: "Does not the Messiah come from the seed of David and from Bethlehem from the village where David was?"

He continues to give his interpretation in this second homily on Matthew. "Why," he asks, "if Jesus was not truly born of Joseph's seed can he be said to be of David? How do we know the Virgin was of the line of David?" By means of a grammatical interpretation, Chrysostom clearly affirms Mary to be of the House of David (Luke 1: 27): "to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house and family of David." Joseph, according to law, was to choose a wife from the same tribe.⁴ Being a just man, he not only chose a virgin, but also one from his own tribe: οὐκ ἄνωμεν τὴν Μαρίαν . . . καὶ ἔδειξεν ὄντα ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας Δαυὶδ.⁵

His reasoning about the origins of Jesus takes him back to a text which is also considered Messianic, namely, Genesis 49: 10. Chrysostom states, "The Patriarch Jacob also foretold that He should arise out of the tribe of Judah, saying in this manner: 'There shall not fail a ruler out of Judah, nor a governor out of his loins, until He would come for whom it is appointed, and He is the expectation of the Gentiles.'"⁶ This citation, Chrysostom says, "makes it clear that He was of the tribe of Judah." Chrysostom goes on to say that the Evangelist Matthew makes it evident that Jesus was also of the house and lineage of David, since it could not happen that one could be of the tribe of Judah, but not of the family of David.⁷

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 486. Chrysostom, *In Matt.*, *Hom. II*, PG 57: 25A.

² *In Matt.*, *Hom. I*, PG 57: 21B (Cf. PG 57: 28B).

³ *Ibid.* *In Matt.*, *Hom. II*, PG 57: 27B. (Cf. E. LOHSE, *υἱὸς Δαυὶδ*, in ThWKRITTEL [Eng] VIII: 486d.)

⁴ *Ibid.*, PG 57: 27D.

⁵ *Ibid.*, PG 57: 28D.

⁶ *Ibid.*, PG 57: 28A.

⁷ *Ibid.*, PG 57: 28B.

Chrysostom also alludes to a "mystical reason" why Mary's genealogy is not traced, namely, that this fact was not to be made known to the Jews! Chrysostom avows he has taken this reason from the early Fathers—specifically he is referring to Ignatius of Antioch's reference in his *Epistle to the Ephesians XIX*.¹ Even the Virgin herself conceals this mystery.

After having confirmed Jesus' genealogy to be Davidic through Joseph and Mary as well, Chrysostom cites Luke 2: 48: "Behold, thy father and I have sought thee."² This is done to protect the title Son of David; for that reason, only Joseph and Mary have been granted the revelation—even the apostles carefully refrain from saying too much about the origins of Jesus and his birth from a Virgin. It seems that Chrysostom is heavily indebted to the tradition started by Ignatius of Antioch; this notion has influenced his exegesis on this passage.

In his fourth homily, Chrysostom does a fine piece of exegesis in separating Matthew 1: 18 from the genealogy. In this respect, he is consonant with modern exegesis. He has his own intuitions about the reason for the transition in Matthew: "For as though he were about to speak of something unusual, he promises to tell the *manner* thereof."³ The text cited in Chrysostom reads (Mt. 1: 18): τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ γέννησις οὕτως ἦν. The variants of significance read γένεσις which can also mean "creation," "generation," and "genealogy" (Mt. 1: 1); whereas the term used and cited by Chrysostom is more suited to his exegesis, for it emphasizes "engendering" and not the other meanings. It became the customary word used in Patristic literature to refer to the Nativity.⁴

¹ *Ibid.*, PG 57: 31D. We have seen several other Fathers using the same tradition whose source is ultimately in Ignatius of Antioch, *Ad Ephes. XIX* (init.); Origen, *Homilia VI in Lucam*. Cf. ANF I: 57; SelectLibNicPNic X: 14, n. 1; C. VONA, "Il testo cristologico di S. Ignazio di Antiochia: Eph. 19, 1 nella tradizione di alcuni scrittori ecclesiastici," *Euntes Docete* 9 (1956) 64-92.

² Chrysostom's text differs from the accepted critical text of today. His text reads: Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ σου ἐξηγουμέν σε. Contrast with Ἰδοὺ ὁ πατὴρ σου καὶ ἐγὼ δδυνώμενοι ἐξηγουμέν σε. He has omitted the element of Joseph and Mary's anxiety and sorrow in searching for the Child Jesus.

³ *In Matt., Hom. IV*, PG 57: 41C.

⁴ B. METZGER, *op. cit.*, p. 8: "In the present passage not only do the earlier representatives of several text-types support γένεσις, but the tendency of copyists would have been to substitute a word of more specialized meaning for one that had been used in a different sense in ver. 1, particularly since γέννησις corresponds more nearly with the verb γεννᾶν used so frequently in the previous genealogy." Cf. LAMPE, p. 311 under γεννάω (to beget, engender). There are eight entries under Chrysostom: (1) Against Arians for whom this

Chrysostom's keen eye has detected the purpose and technique of Matthew's genealogy. He mentions that Matthew resumes what he began in speaking of the arrangement of the generations into three portions. What interests us in this technique (an inclusion) is that Chrysostom ends the passage with the indication that it was to David and Abraham that the promises were made.¹ Salvation history is thus shown as factual through Davidic lineage and as soteriological through the overall purpose of Matthew's genealogy.

In his homily on the birth of Christ, Chrysostom sets the stage for his interpretation of how Mary likewise is of the House of David by using texts referring to Bethlehem—Matthew 2: 1-2 and Luke 2: 4. He then uses the text of Luke 1: 26, 27 to affirm Mary, too, was of the house and lineage of David. The similarity of argument used in his commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel helps confirm that this Nativity homily belongs to Chrysostom.²

Chrysostom has also abbreviated the text of Luke 2: 4.³ He then leads us to the same argument presented in his commentary on Matthew that Mary was of the family of David. Chrysostom's text differs slightly from the critical New Testament text. He omits the *δὲ* before *τῷ μνηνῇ*; he reads *ὑπὸ* rather than *ἀπὸ*—due to a more refined Greek, using the preposition *ὑπὸ* instead of the *ἀπὸ* and its more archaic cognate relationship to *ἀπεστέλλη*. He also reads a perfect passive participle *μεμνηστευμένην* in place of the

became a byword: *anom.* 7.2 (I. 502E) (2) baptismal (being engendered or born): Chrys., *hom.* 7.2 in *Col.* (11.374B); p. 312, under *γέννησις*, *ἡ* (generation, engendering, also birth): — (1) an ineffable mystery; Chrys., *nativ.* 2 (6.394B), — (2) said of the Nativity—parallel with eternal generation, Chrys., *nativ.* 2 (6.394A) and foretold by prophets, Chrys., *nativ.* 1 (2.355D), — (3) feast of Nativity—as source for all other feasts, Chrys., *Philogon.* 6 (1.497C), — (4) spiritual birth, regeneration, Chrys., *hom.* 25.1 in *Jo.* (8.143D) and through baptism, Chrys., *hom.* 25.2 in *Jo.* (8.145E). Whereas the only entries under *γένεσις* (p. 310) for Chrysostom are under (1) baptismal *rebirth*: Chrys., *hom.* 7.3 in *Col.* (11.374C) and (2) his refutation of the idea of birth, fate, destiny in an astrological sense; cf. Chrys., *hom.* 1.3 in I Tim. (11.553B).

¹ In *Matt.*, *Hom.* IV, PG 57: 41C: "Wherefore, that he was not acting without an object or by chance, when he distributed Christ's forefathers into three portions, is plain from what has been said. And notice, too, whence he begins and where he ends. From Abraham to David; from David to the Babylonian Captivity; from this unto Christ Himself. For both at the beginning he put the two in close succession, David and Abraham, and also in summing up he mentions both (an inclusion) in the same way and this, because as I have already said, it was to them that the promises were made."

² In *Diem Natalem*, PG 49: 354CD.

³ Chrysostom has left out an entire phrase: *ἐκ πόλεως Ναζαρεθ εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν εἰς πόλιν Δαυὶδ ἥτις καλεῖται βηθλέεμ.*

aorist ἐμνηστευμένην. Then he explicitly gives his grammatical interpretation, saying that the expression ἐξ οἴκου Δαυὶδ is said in reference to the Virgin as it is obviously clear.¹ In the parallel to his second homily on Matthew's Gospel, Chrysostom amplifies his text to say ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατριᾶς Δαυὶδ ("of the house and lineage of David"). He questions his audience: "What do you wish to be more clearly put than when you hear that the Virgin was of the house and lineage of David?"²

5. Theodore of Mopsuestia

Theodore has emphasized the soteriological purpose of the Incarnation by focusing exclusively on Christ. There are no texts which explicitly refer to Mary's role in this mystery. He does, however, clearly demonstrate from the Scriptures that her Son has lineage from David according to the flesh and the humble form of a slave.³ He likewise states that Jesus was born of the Virgin Mary as a man, according to the law of human nature, and was made of a woman.⁴ In another passage, he implies the importance of Jesus' coming from the Davidic line; undoubtedly, because Mary then is the instrument for his human flesh and nature.⁵ A parallel to this thought is found in his instruction on the Nicene Creed which states that Jesus is fashioned from a

¹ PG 49: 354D: περὶ τῆς παρθένου ὑποληπτέον εἰρησθαι. The key word is ὑποληπτέον, which allows for Chrysostom's making it his assumption or opinion that the antecedent refers to the Virgin and not Joseph.

² His argument is put more forcefully for he uses Τί τοῖνυν βούλει τούτου σαφέστερον (more clearly).

³ Vigilius Papa, *Constitutum* . . . (GUNTHER, ed.), PG 86: 1059A: *natum autem est ex Maria, qui ex semine est David.*

⁴ A. MINGANA, *Commentary . . . on the Nicene Creed*, p. 67: "He was born of the Virgin Mary as a man, according to the law of human nature, and was made of woman. Indeed the Apostle said thus: 'God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.'" (Galatians 4: 4)

⁵ THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA, *Les Homélies Catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste* . . . , ed. by R. TONNEAU and R. DEVREESE (Vatican City, 1949), *Cat. Hom. VIII*, pp. 209-211: "Quand en effet il est dit: *Au sujet de son Fils qui fut de la descendance de David, en la chair, il est certain qu'ici le nom de Fils est donné à celui qui fut de la lignée de David par la chair, et non pas à Dieu le Verbe, mais à la forme d'esclave qui fut assumé. Ce n'est pas en effet que Dieu devint chair, ni non plus que Dieu devint de la lignée de David, mais cet homme qui fut assumé pour nous, c'est lui évidemment que le bienheureux Paul appelle Fils. Or nous le considérons comme Fils et lui en donnons le nom; non pas à lui simplement, mais pour la conjonction qu'il eut avec le Fils véritable.*" (Italics for emphasis.)

woman without marital intercourse; He is from the nature of Mary and for this reason is said to be of the seed of David (Joseph is not mentioned).¹

Thus, Theodore's contribution to this section is in the verification of Scriptural evidence pointing to the Davidic origin of Jesus. He implicitly says that the Davidic line comes through Mary.

THE JERUSALEMITES

6. St. Cyril of Jerusalem

From a study of Cyril's three *Catechetical Instructions on the Incarnation*, we have seen the Davidic lineage of the Messiah is greatly emphasized. There are but a few texts which concern the soteriological purpose of the Incarnation, aside from the Davidic texts seen in this context.

The names Jesus and Christ are explained as having a two-fold significance: Jesus, because he grants salvation; Christ, because he is anointed as priest.² Cyril traces the name Jesus "through Auses" and then through the type, Jesus son of Nave (or Nun).³ For "Christ," he sees a type in Aaron who is anointed priest by Moses, his brother.

For the title "Savior," Cyril uses both the Old Testament—Isaiah 62: 11: "Behold, a Savior comes to you, his reward is with him"—and the New Testament—Matthew 1: 21: "She shall bear a son and you shall call his name Jesus for he shall save his people from their sins." He has prefaced this by saying that Jesus is interpreted among the Hebrews as Savior;⁴ among the Greeks, Savior means he who heals.⁵

¹ A. MINGANA, *Commentary . . . on the Nicene Creed*, p. 67: "In this way we should also think about Christ our Lord. It was a novel thing to have been fashioned from a woman without marital intercourse, by the power of the Holy Spirit, but He is associated with the human nature by the fact that He is from the nature of Mary, and it is for this that He is said also to be the seed of David and Abraham, as in His nature He is related to them."

² *Catechesis X, De Uno Domino Jesu Christo*, PG 33: 676A.

³ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 675D-676D. The notes are remarkable for identifying the names both in Codices of the LXX and in a clear parallel with EUSEBIUS, *lib. IV, Demonstr. evangel.*, p. 196. Cf. Numbers 13: 16, Exodus 29: 4-9.

⁴ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 677A.

⁵ *Ibid.*, PG 33: 677C. (Cf. the remarks made on healing in AMPHILOCHIOS OF ICONIUM.)

Though not directly based on a Scriptural text, the following words of Cyril are a biblical reflection on the life of Jesus as Savior and his birth of the Virgin:

The Savior passed nine months in the womb of the Virgin; but the Lord was a man for thirty-three years, so that if a Virgin rejoices because of the nine months, how much more so we because of the many years.¹

7. Hesychius of Jerusalem

In the two homilies chosen to represent Hesychius, care was taken to select those which were delivered before the Council of Ephesus.² Hesychius, thus, represents the latter part of the exegesis prior to that Council. The two works presented are closely related to the first two chapters of Luke's Gospel. It is within his fidelity to that Evangelist's context that Hesychius is speaking both in his *II, De Hypapante* and *VI, De Sancta Maria Deipara*.

First, Hesychius presents the two mysteries which center on the Incarnation in a soteriological framework. The first instance of this is his treatment of Anna as prophetess who, filled with the Spirit, announces salvation through the newborn (λύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ βρέφους κατήγγειλεν).³ He has carefully set his thought within the principal text for his homily, Luke 2: 26-38, the center pericope of the Presentation of Jesus in the Temple. All of his interpretation recognizes the impelling initiative of the Holy Spirit within Simeon, Joseph and Mary, and Anna. The setting is perfect for the liturgical celebration of God's proclaimed word on the occasion of the Hypapante.

The homily entitled *VI, De Sancta Maria Deipara*, closely follows the Gospel of Luke. In fact, Hesychius is attentive to Lukan soteriology in using a phrase from the same Gospel to have Gabriel explain his message to

¹ *Catechesis XII*, PG 33: 768A.

² HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, I: 428, 179-183.

³ *Ibid.*, *II, De Hypapante*: 1: 1-2, p. 62. (For an excellent excursus by Fr. AUBINEAU on the mystery of salvation, see *ibid.*, pp. 50-52; references are to *II, De Hypapante*: II: 7: 8 and 8: 10; II: 6: 5 and 7: 3; II: 15: 11; II: 7: 1, 6; II: 7: 8; II: 7: 10; II: 7: 11-13; II: 9: 11; II: 9: 12-13; II: 10: 8; II: 9: 11; II: 9: 13-15; II: 10: 9; II: 10: 9-11.) The term βρέφος is used eight times within the N.T., six times by Luke-Acts, and four times within the first two chapters of Luke's Gospel.

Mary; Jesus is announced as "a savior of those who were lost."¹ Hesychius, as a Jerusalemite, remains close to the Scripture, almost paraphrasing it in order to interpret it.

The Lukan characteristics of Hesychius' homily on the Presentation are clearly presented in his reflections on Luke 2: 30 where Simeon exclaims: "My eyes have seen thy salvation."² The theme of salvation (*σωτήριον*³ twice; *σῶσαι*⁴ once; *σωτηρίας*⁵ once) becomes universal. Hesychius remains faithful to Luke's text by announcing the theme of salvation through the image of a "Light to the Nations"—a phrase only found in Luke-Acts in the New Testament.⁶

He calls the Incarnation a "mystery of salvation"⁷ which is hidden from the one who lies in wait for his prey.⁸

Secondly, the soteriological purpose is seen through the promises within prophecy and their fulfillment in the mystery of the Incarnation. This is magnificently presented in the last two sections of his sixth homily, *De Sancta Maria Deipara*. He presents an orchestration of the favored texts for the Incarnation and challenges the unbeliever to pay attention to what is being fulfilled in the history of salvation. Twelve citations from the Old Testament are presented as promises from the Lord through his prophets, ten of which are given in this section; they are fulfilled in Christ.⁹ All of the texts are used as promise-fulfillment texts:

- 1) Deuteronomy 18: 15: *The Lord God will raise up a prophet for you from among your brethren like unto me; listen to him* (προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει χύριος ὁ Θεός, ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ· αὐτοῦ ἀκούσετε).

Hesychius has taken the text and used the plural ὑμῖν for σοι, omitted the σου after ὁ Θεός, reversed the phrases, changed σου το ὑμῶν after

¹ *Ibid.*, Hom. VI: 3: 8-9, p. 196. Hesychius has Gabriel saying of Jesus: ὡς τῶν ἀπολυμένων σωτήρ. Compare with Luke 19: 10: ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.

² *Ibid.*, Hom. II: 7: 1, p. 66.

³ *Ibid.*, 7: 1, 6, p. 66.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 7: 4, p. 66.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 7: 8, p. 66.

⁶ Luke 2: 32 and Acts 13: 47 (cf. Isaiah 49: 6).

⁷ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, Hom. II: 7: 8-9, p. 66 and 8: 10, p. 68.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 69, n. 1; cf. Chap. III, p. 300, n. 1.

⁹ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 175-176, where the twelve texts are presented: Deut. 18: 15; Is. 7: 14; Bar. 3: 36; Bar. 3: 38; Zach. 6: 12; Mal. 3: 20; Ezek. 44: 2-3; Dan. 7: 13; Gen. 49: 10; Ps. 86: 5; Ps. 71: 7; Ps. 71: 8.

ἀδελφῶν; and used the future active ἀκούσετε in place of the future middle ἀκουσέσθε.¹ The plural emphasizes the members of the community (which now Hesychius regards as the Christian community), while the original text envisioned only Israel as a corporate unity.

The text is Messianic and may have been from a Palestinian tradition that the Messiah will be the prophet of Deuteronomy 18: 15, 18.² In fact, the paucity of rabbinic examples may have been due to its being expunged because of the welcome the text received in Christianity.³ Hesychius, as a Jerusalemite, naturally would be interested in this text. In the homilies studied, he alone uses it. It also fits the Christian tradition behind the Transfiguration wherein Elijah appears as the harbinger and Moses as the immediate forerunner of the Messiah.⁴ Both as a Jerusalemite who knew the Hebrew tradition and as a Greek-speaking preacher and exegete, Hesychius may well be aware that the phrase in Deuteronomy can mean "to cause [someone] to be born" or to cause him to appear in history,⁵ thereby giving even more force to the promise-fulfillment theme expressed in this text.

Just as Matthew's Gospel has presented Jesus as a new Moses, so, too, Hesychius may see Jesus as an anti-type of Moses, a suffering mediator who fasts for forty days, wrestles with God, and dies outside the promised land just as Jesus dies outside the walls of the city.⁶

Despite the importance of this text for the Samaritans—they added it to the tenth commandment and considered it Messianic—Hesychius is depending on the tradition as he found it in Christianity and not upon anyone in particular. One would have expected it to have been used Messianically by Justin Martyr, who rather allegorizes Moses as a moral example.⁷

¹ *Ibid.*, *Hom.* VI: 7: 4-6, p. 202. Cf. ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ (Mk. 9: 7) which contains an allusion to Dt. 18: 15. See J. JEREMIAS, *Μωυσῆς*, in ThWKittel (Eng) IV: 869, also C. COLPE, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, in ThWKittel (Eng) VIII: 445, n. 318.

² J. SCHNIEWIND, *ἀπαγγέλλω*, in ThWKittel (Eng) I: 67.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 67, n. 26, citing a reference to STRACK-BILLERBECK II: 479f., 626; IV: 452ff. on Ps. 110; IV: 1223, Index s.v. Elias, etc.

⁴ J. JEREMIAS, *Ἡλ(ε)ίας*, in ThWKittel (Eng) II: 938, esp. n. 81.

⁵ *Idem*, *λῆθος*, in ThWKittel (Eng) IV: 270, esp. n. 19.

⁶ A. OEPKE, *μεσίτης*, in ThWKittel (Eng) IV: 612; (Cf. J. JEREMIAS, *Μωυσῆς*, in ThWKittel [Eng] IV: 860-862, for examples from rabbinic literature and from Josephus referring to Messiah in likeness of Moses as prototype. For a quick survey of the question of whether Deut. 18: 15, 18 is Messianic during the time of Christ, cf. *ibid.*, p. 858, n. 125. Also, cf. G. FRIEDRICH, *προφήτης*, in ThWKittel [Eng] VI: 846-847.)

⁷ J. JEREMIAS, *Μωυσῆς*, in ThWKittel (Eng) IV: 858, n. 126 and 873, n. 257 (JUSTIN, *Dial.* 90). However, see Barnabas 6: 8 (*ibid.*, p. 865, n. 199); Deuteronomy 18: 15-19 was

Hesychius, who has relied so closely on Luke's Gospel within this homily, may also associate the redemptive power of Jesus' birth with Deuteronomy 18: 15; even though Moses is never called *λυτρωτής* in the Septuagint, he is in Acts 7: 25, with an apparent parallel to Jesus. The word has a Messianic ring in Luke 24: 21 and *λύτρωσις* in 1: 68 and 2: 38.¹ We have seen Hesychius' fondness for this word.

Unfortunately, Hesychius does not come back to this text in his *Homily on Stephen*² wherein the crucial text of Acts 7: 37 is omitted. In this text, a promise of a prophet like Moses was fulfilled in Jesus, and Moses is a prototype of Jesus in his sufferings.³

2) Isaiah 7: 14⁴: *Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a son and his name shall be called Emmanuel.* (We have already seen this text in combination with use of Baruch 3: 36, 38.)

3) Baruch 3: 36, 38⁵: *This is our God, and there shall be no other like unto him . . . afterwards HE was seen upon earth, and conversed with men.*

4) Zechariah 6: 12⁶: *Behold a man whose name is Orient.*

Hesychius' text is the same as the Septuagint reading. The Hebrew text suggests the reading of Shoot or Branch *שֶׁמַח* (*šemah*) for *ἀνατολή* in the Septuagint. The term *ἀνατέλλειν* is a translation of the substantive *šemah* ("to sprout") and *zrah* ("to arise"). In connection with Jeremiah 23: 5, Zechariah 3: 8 and our present text, a form of *ἀνα τέλλειν* is used to translate the former (*šemah*), whereas in the Messianic text of Numbers 24: 17, it is *zrah* or *darah*. The latter refers to the Messiah. The two meanings merge and it is difficult to make precise what the meaning is.⁷

the locus classicus for the Messianic expectation of the Samaritans. (Cf. A. MERX, "Der Messias oder ta'eb d. Samaritaner," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft Beih.* 17 (1909) 43.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 868, n. 226.

² HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 328-350.

³ K. H. RENGSTORF, *σημείον*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) VII: 242.

⁴ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, *Hom.* VI: 7: 6-8, p. 202.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II. 9, 10-11, p. 202.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I. 12, p. 202.

⁷ H. SCHLIER, *ἀνατέλλω, ἀνατολή*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) I: 352: "Elsewhere, however, it is more in keeping with Christian usage to render 'arise' or 'shine forth' in relation to Christ: 2 Pt. 1: 19; Ign. Mg., 9, 1: *ἐν ᾗ* (sc. *ἡμέρᾳ*) *καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν* (Christ = our life) *ἀνέτειλεν δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ Θανάτου αὐτοῦ*. Like Christ and the sun, the martyr, too, rises up to God. (Ign. R., 2, 2)."

It is a name for the Messiah in the Synagogue and may mean a "star shining from heaven"; thus the relationship to the text from Numbers 24: 17 is seen—"a star shall rise out of Jacob."¹

5) Malachi 3: 20: *He will arise . . . a sun of justice, and healing is in his wings.*

Since the biblical background of the text has already been commented upon under Amphilochius,² I shall refer only to the text as found in Hesychius. The text is in perfect agreement with the Septuagint.³ The context within the homily follows the overall pattern of promise and fulfillment as is characteristic for all twelve biblical citations used in the conclusion of his homily. Aubineau has been able to restore the text through noticing the twin citations of Zechariah 6: 12 and Malachi 3: 20.⁴ This is a very helpful contribution for biblical scholars.

¹ *Ibid.* p. 353: "We might also refer to the exposition of Zech. 6: 12 in Justin and Melito. Justin always understands the ἀνατολή of Zech. 6: 12 (Dial. 100, 4; 106, 4; 121, 2; 126, 1) in terms of ἀνατέλλειν of LXX Nu. 24: 17, so that for him the advent of Christ is the rising of a star. And Melito construes Lk. 1: 78 as follows: καὶ μόνος οὗτος ἀνέτειλεν ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ. The visitation of the mercy of God has come with the dawn of heavenly light in the Messiah Christ as the sun of the world."

Also, for the name of the Messiah (cf. C. MAURER, ῥίζα, in ThWKittel [Eng] VI: 988: "The idea that the Messiah is the root of Jesse is common in the Synagogue. In this connection שִׁרְיָ [šōreš] is always related to the descendant of Jesse in the sense of shoot, Tg. Pro. Is. on 11: 1, . . . This is supported by the general replacement of שִׁרְיָ [šōres] by the unequivocal שִׁמְחָ [šemah] "shoot," Tg. Pro. Jer. on 23: 5; 33: 15; Zech. 3: 8, 6: 12."

² See Chap. III, pp. 259-260, 265-266, 270, 273-275.

³ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, *Hom.* VI: 7: 12-14, p. 202.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 178-179: "Les citations jumelées de Zach. 6, 12 et Mal. 3, 20, dont nous avons pu restituer le texte intégral (VI, 7, 12-13), se lisent ensemble dans l'homélie. In Psalmum 67, 5 (PG 93: 1288C), pour plus de sécurité, nous avons vérifié, en recourant au cod. Vat. gr. 525, fol. 247r, la teneur du fragment imprimé par Migne."

From n. 6, p. 178: "On trouvera une citation isolée . . . de Mal. 3, 20 dans l'Hom. in Psalmum 96, 11 (PG 55: 777, lin. 8 ab imo)."

From p. 192: "On verra comment, en 7, 12-13, reprenant une suggestion de Picot, mais l'exploitant plus complètement, nous avons restitué dans le texte un verset entier de Mal. 3, 20, qui avait disparu par une sorte de 'saut du même au même' (ἀνατολή/ἀνατέλει): ce qui disculpe Hésychius d'avoir cité, sous le nom de Zacharie, un fragment de Malachie."

Hesychius, in using the citation further than Amphilochius, that is, including the phrase "and healing is in his wings (rays)," is able to have the fulfillment of the text seen in the healing power of Jesus as he cures the woman "who had suffered from hemorrhages many years."¹

6) Ezekiel 44: 2-3: *The Lord will enter and leave by her, and the door shall remain closed.*

We have seen that Amphilochius in his *Oration II, De Hypapante*, has used this same citation of Ezekiel.² Hesychius is abbreviating the text in passing—giving only a few words from the two verses in Ezekiel.³

7) Daniel 7: 13: *I was looking and behold there came upon the clouds of the heaven, one like to a son of man.*⁴

His text closely parallels the Septuagint except for his leaving aside—*ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτός* and his changing into the participle *ἐρχόμενος* what was *ἦρχετο* in the Septuagint. It is striking that this text which was so prominent in Mark's Gospel (especially Chapter 14) is used rarely in the homiletics of the fourth and fifth centuries. Amphilochius, as we have seen, may have implicitly referred to it. This is the only explicit citation of it in the works expressly studied. It is definitely a Messianic reference.⁵ Sometimes Daniel 7: 13 was contrasted with Zechariah 9: 9.⁶ On the basis of

¹ *Ibid.*, *Hom. VI*: 7: 14-16, p. 202.

² AMPHILOCHIOS (DATEMA, ed.), *op. cit.*, *Or. II. In Occursum Domini*: 3, ll. 74-75, p. 45, applies the text to the virginal womb of Mary. (Cf. R. CARO, *op. cit.*, *MLS* 3 [1971] 81, 90, has cited Proclus [PG 75: 692A] for using the text of Ezekiel 44: 1-2: "Ilustra finalmente su creencia, con el conocido testo de Ezequiel 44, 2 en que se identifica a María con la puerta cerrada a través de la cual solamente pasará el Señor Dios de Israel quien la cerrará a su salida" [p. 99].)

³ Hesychius has only the following from the Septuagint: *Ἡ πόλη αὐτῆς κεκλεισμένη ἔσται, οὐκ ἀνοίχεται καὶ οὐδεὶς μὴ διέλθῃ δι' αὐτῆς, ὅτι κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ εἰσελεύσεται δι' αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔσται κεκλεισμένη. . . ἐξελεύσεται* (v. 4). He has reversed the word order, picking and choosing from Ezek. 44: 2-4.

⁴ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, *Hom. VI*: 7: 20-21, p. 204.

⁵ J. SCHNEIDER, *ἐρχομαι*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) II: 667. (Cf. E. STAUFFER, *Θεός*, in ThWKITTEL [Eng] III: 99, n. 211.)

⁶ O. MICHEL, *ἵππος*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) III: 337, n. 8: "Cf. bSanh., 98a: R. Alexandrei (c. 270) has said: R. Jehoshua b. Levi (c. 250) brought into contrast Da. 7: 13: 'Lo, there came with the clouds of heaven one like a son of man,' and Zech. 9: 9: 'Poor and riding on an ass.' If they (Israel) have merits (are worthy), he comes with the clouds of heaven;

Daniel 7: 13. it is often maintained that the Messiah will come with the clouds of the heavens.¹ The text fits in well with salvation history for it indicates that the goal and end of history is the establishment of God's rule.²

A parallel to such Messianic thought can be seen in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*. Hesychius could have been aware of Justin's ideas.³ An excellent summary of the Son of Man and its relationship to the human nature of Christ as found in Ignatius, Barnabas, Justin, Irenaeus and Tertullian is found in Colpe's development of the biblical notion of the son of man.⁴

8) Genesis 49: 10: *The sceptre shall not be taken away from Juda, nor a ruler from his thigh, till he come that is to be sent, and he shall be the expectation of nations.*

We have seen the general biblical background for this verse already. Hesychius has but one change in his text from that of the Septuagint; his text reads: ϕ ἀπόκειται⁵ in place of τὰ ἀποκείμενά αὐτῷ. We have seen that his reading corresponds with that of John Chrysostom, hence, a text which was slightly different from our reading of the critical edition of the Septuagint text. (See table for biblical references.) The context of Hesychius' use is once again a familiar orchestration of promise-fulfillment texts or testimonia.

if they have no merits, he comes poor and riding on an ass." (Cf. C. SCHNEIDER, κἀθήμεναι, in ThWKittel [Eng] III: 442.)

¹ A. OEPKE, νεφέλη, in ThWKittel (Eng) IV: 909. Cf. where Matthew follows the Septuagint more closely than Mark 14: 62. Mt. 26: 64: ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is not in Luke. Hesychius would be closer to Matthew than Mark who is rarely used in the Fathers of this period of time, incl. 350-430 A.D.

² J. BEHM, προνοέω, in ThWKittel (Eng) IV: 1015. (Also, cf. A. OEPKE, παρουσία, in ThWKittel [Eng] V: 862.)

³ C. COLPE, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, in ThWKittel (Eng) VIII: 430: "On the other hand Judaism, which apart from Da. 7: 27 always interpreted the כִּרְ אֱנֹשׁ [bar enosh] of Da. 7: 13 f. messianically, retained all the characteristics of the Son of Man, though His name was changed, usually to כִּרְ נֶפֶלִי [ben nephli] or Son of the clouds, or else it was quoted in the original context and implicitly related to the Messiah. Trypho in Just. Dial., 32, 1 recognised that a glorious and powerful Messiah will come acc. to Da. 7: 13, though he denies that He was come in Christ crucified or that Christ will come again. He thus bears witness to a messianic interpretation of Da. 7: 13 f. independent of the Chr. one" (Cf. JUSTIN, Dial. 14: 8; 31: 1, 3; 120: 4.)

⁴ Ibid., pp. 476-477.

⁵ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), op. cit., Hom. VI: 8: 2-4, p. 204.

- 9) Psalm 86: 5 (Heb: 87: 5): *Sion is a mother, a man will say; and a man has been engendered in her, and the Most High himself has established her.*¹

Hesychius' text has but one difference from that of the Septuagint. He reads *ἐγεννήθη* in place of *ἐγενήθη*. This may indicate that he directs his attention to the birth of Jesus from Mary rather than a more general notion of being engendered. It would follow; for his immediate application is to the Mother/Virgin: "Indeed the Mother has remained a Virgin even after giving birth, preserving unharmed the seal of virginity which nature had bestowed."² It also could show a theme of Mary as prefigured in Sion; if so, this would take the place of a theme of Davidic lineage which is developed more fully and explicitly in Cyril of Jerusalem, but rarely in Hesychius.³

The theme Mary-Sion is only present in Hesychius among the Fathers studied. The present Psalm and its application to her is the principal text for helping us to see his understanding of Mary in relationship to Sion. Aubineau has seen the relationship of Sion to Mary and possibly to the place where the liturgy and word of God is preached.⁴

The Psalm has the word mother only in the Greek version. The Hebrew text only mentions Sion. Interestingly, the *Jerusalem Bible* maintains the Septuagint reading: "But all call Zion 'mother,' since all were born in her."⁵ Caro sees the relationship between Mary and Jerusalem (Sion) and probes with a question whether the typology between Mary and Church is also indicated.⁶

¹ *Ibid.*, II. 5:7, p. 204.

² *Ibid.*, II. 7-9, p. 204.

³ I have found but one direct reference to Davidic lineage in Hesychius, and, even here, Hesychius applies the text to Mary's virginity. Cf. *ibid.*, *Hom. V, De Sancta Maria Deipara*: 2: 3, p. 160: *Καὶ ὁ μὲν σε 'Ράβδον' Ἰεσοῦ καλεῖ, ἵνα τὸ ἄρρωτον καὶ ἀκαμπὲς τῆς παρθενίας ἀνέλξηται* (Cf. Isaiah 11: 1.). This is more consonant with Hesychius' pattern to view David as a psalmist and prophetic voice rather than the ancestor of Jesus.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 187: "Par Sion, on doit entendre ici un des lieux vénérées de Jérusalem où le peuple de Dieu a pris naissance lors de la Pentecôte, mais aussi Marie, mère du Christ, célébrée en ce jour. L' 'homme', ici invoqué, est son fils. Le Très-Haut, qui a fondé Sion et Marie, a déjà été cité en VI, 3, 3, précisément dans le verset de *Luc* 1, 35: 'La puissance du Très-Haut te prendra sous son ombre.'" Cf. p. 187, n. 1: "*Lectonnaire arménien*, no. 5 (PO 16, p. 219)" ("On s'assemble à la Sainte-Sion"); also, Aubineau's reference to another use of that verse (p. 187, n. 2), "*In Psalmum 86, 5* (PG 55, 743, lin. 32)."

⁵ JB, p. 871, Psalm 87: 5.

⁶ R. CARO, *op. cit.*, MLS 3 (1971) 45.

There are problems with both the Hebrew¹ and Septuagintal texts² which may account for the varied interpretations. However, within a tradition even these "mistakes" often lead to remarkable and creative intuitions. Yet, modern interpreters would concede Hesychius' insight is accurate.³ Rabbinic interpretation permits our seeing redemption by the Messiah within this Psalm.⁴ In later writings *Σιών* or Jerusalem is applied to the Church.⁵

10) Psalm 71: 7-8: *Justice will arise in his days. He will rule from sea to sea and from the rivers to the ends of the inhabited earth.*⁶

Hesychius cites these verses of the psalm directly from the Septuagint; there is but one difference, the use of the plural *ἀπὸ ποταμῶν* instead of the Septuagint *ἀπὸ ποταμοῦ*. The Psalm is considered Messianic by commentators and in the Targum.⁷ Both the Hebrew text and the Septuagint read "River" (singular).⁸

¹ L. SABOURIN, *op. cit.*, pp. 212-213.

² W. MICHAELIS, *μήτηρ*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) IV: 642, n. 7: "ψ 86: 5: *μήτηρ Σιών* is a scribal error (Rahlfs *μη τη*, Schleusner, III, 557μητι). Cf. also Jer. 15: 8. For non-biblical examples of this use cf. Liddell-Scott s.v. Cf. also Str.-B., III, 574."

³ G. FOHRER, *Σιών*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) VII: 316: "Thus everyone finds his spiritual home in Jerusalem no matter where he was born, Ps. 87: 5. By acknowledgment of Yahweh the other peoples become members of the people of God."

⁴ A. S. VAN DER WOUDE, *Χρῶ*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) IX: 526 (Midr. Ps., 87,6 on 87: 5).

⁵ E. LOHSE, *Σιών*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) VII: 338: "Jerusalem 'is the Church, for the city of God is the Church, the vision of peace (*δρασις ειρήνης*),' Orig. Hom. in Jer., 9 on Jer. 11: 2." Also: "The Ophites contrasted Jerusalem in the height, which is the mother of all living creatures, with Egypt as *τῇ κάτω μῆτρ*."

⁶ HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, Hom. VI: 8: 9-11, p. 204.

⁷ L. SABOURIN, *op. cit.*, pp. 351-352.

⁸ R. RENGSTORF, *Ἰορδάνης*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) VI: 610: "Alongside the purely geographical and political evaluation of the Jordan there is another which is controlled by the concept of the land of Israel as depicted in the divine promise to the patriarch Abraham. Here in the framework of a theological eschatological view the Jordan is part of the land and not its frontier. The eastern frontier is the Euphrates and the river of Egypt borders it to the South. As one would expect, this way of looking at things is esp. in scribal circles and comes to expression in religio-legal judgments, esp. those which group the territory on the far side of Jordan with Judaea and Galilee." Also, n. 28: "Cf. esp. Gn. 15: 18, but also Ex. 23: 31; Dt. 1: 7; 11: 24; Jos. 1: 4; Is. 27: 12; Mi. 7: 12; Zech. 9: 10; Ps. 72: 8." (Italics added).

PART III. TYPOLOGY:

PARALLELISM OF: ADAM/CHRIST—EVE/MARY

The beginnings of a comparison of Christ with Adam are found within St. Paul, the earliest New Testament writer. Luke, too, in his genealogy, states that Jesus is the "son of Adam, the son of God" (Luke 3: 38). Both Paul and Luke had the Genesis account of Adam in mind when referring to Jesus and Adam; the two chapters of Genesis 2 and 3 belong to the Yahwist tradition.¹ It is from this general biblical context that the antithesis between the first Adam and the second Adam emerges in the writings of Justin and Irenaeus; both are ultimately dependent on the sources of Genesis, Luke, and the letters of Paul for the materials which led them to a parallel of Adam/Christ and a contrast of Mary/Eve or Church/Eve.² In the fourth and fifth centuries, the Fathers were dependent for their development of these themes and types on both the biblical sources and the tradition Justin and Irenaeus had begun.³

The parallel of Adam/Christ, Eve/Mary has been described as fitting into the overall plan of God, that is, into salvation history by both Söll

¹ See DicBibIth, pp. 6-7, under Adam; Michel JOIN-LAMBERT and Xavier LÉON-DUFOUR have presented the biblical data in a clear succinct fashion.

² G. SÖLL, *Mariologie. Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, Band III, Fas. 4 (Herder: 1978), p. 34: "Ohne Vorgriff auf spätere Erweiterungen und Reflexionen ergibt sich aus dieser Eva-Maria-Parallele, die Paulus für Adam-Christus vorgebildet (Röm 5, 14; I Kor 15, 22 45) und Ignatius gedanklich vorbereitet hatte, dass Justin Maria bewusst in der Heilsgeschichte verankerte und damit zugleich die von der Ostkirche besonders entfaltete inkarnatorische Soteriologie bestätigte, die besagt: Die Erlösung begann mit der Menschwerdung, und Maria hat hier einen unverdrängbaren Platz.

Gleichzeitig setzte hier die weitere Entfaltung des von Lk skizzierten ethischen Marienbildes ein. Es war der Anfang einer Bildtheologie, in der die Details der Einzelschilderung dazu dienten, die Gesamtgestalt Mariens vor dem Hintergrund der Kontraperson Eva immer mehr zum Leuchten zu bringen und sie in die Nähe ihres Sohnes zu rücken." (Cf. G. JOUASSARD, "La Nouvelle Ève chez les Pères Anténicéens," BEM 12 [1954] 51.)

³ *Ibid.*, p. 41, and p. 47: "Das von Lukas gezeichnete Marienbild war durch die Eva-Maria-Parallele eines Justin und Irenäus bereichert worden."

p. 35: "... versuchte Irenäus die beiden Testamente auch dadurch innerlich zu verbinden, dass er die Schöpfungsordnung mit der Erlösungsordnung als Einheit der göttlichen Heilsveranstaltung herausstellte und Christus schon im Alten Bund vorgezeichnet sah."

and Congar.¹ M.-J. Nicolas² has also seen this plan in his identifying the parallel typology with the theme of recapitulation already found in Irenaeus.

Since the biblical principles of Justin and Irenaeus have been presented in the survey of chapter one, some of the same Scriptural texts used by the Fathers are now the object of study. Only those texts from Genesis 2 and 3 and the Pauline texts used by the Fathers are presented.

THE CAPPADOCIANS

1. Amphilochius of Iconium

Genesis 3: 16: I will multiply thy sorrows and thy conception: in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children and thou shalt be under thy husband's power and he shall have dominion over thee.

The text is exactly cited from the Septuagint without any variants.³ Amphilochius has used the text to praise virginity which he sees as beginning with the angels.⁴ He lauds virginity as victory and freedom from the curse which had been brought upon Eve. The text of Genesis 3: 16 corroborates the fate of Eve, while Amphilochius has a progression of ideas for virginity from a cosmic victory (τὸν κόσμον νικῶσα)⁵ to the spiritual victory (τὰ πάθη πατοῦσα),⁶ breaking with Eve (the fallen virgin) (τῇ Εἰδᾷ μὴ κοινωνοῦσα),⁷ as a state free from sadness (λύπης ἀπελλαγμένη),⁸ redeemed from

¹ Y. M. J. CONGAR, "Marie et l'Église dans la pensée patristique," RSPT 38 (1954) 3-38.

² M.-J. NICOLAS, "Introduction théologique à des études sur la Nouvelle Ève," BEM 12 (1954) 7: "La théorie de la 'Récapitulation' dans saint Irénée devra donc être analysée dans sa profondeur, pour que nous nous rendions compte si elle implique aussi fortement une Nouvelle Ève, réparatrice de la première, qu'un Nouvel Adam. . . La Nouvelle Ève met forcément en cause le Décret de l'Incarnation, ses rapports avec le Décret de la Création."

³ AMPHILOCHIUS (DATEMA, ed.), *op. cit.*, Or. II. In Occursum Domini: 1, ll. 10-12, p. 37: Πληθύνων πληθυνῶ τὰς λύπας σου καὶ τὸν στεναγμόν σου ἐν λύπαις τέξῃ τέκνα καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα σου ἡ ἀποστρέφῃ σου, καὶ αὐτός σου κυριεύσει.

⁴ *Ibid.*, l. 2: ὥς τῶν ἀγγέλων σύμφυτος.

⁵ *Ibid.*, ll. 6-7.

⁶ *Ibid.*, l. 7.

⁷ *Ibid.*, ll. 7-8.

⁸ *Ibid.*, l. 8.

groans (στεναγμῶν λελυτρωμένη—perfect participle indicating those completely redeemed).¹ The latter statements are seen as indications of a positive nature contrasted with the original maledictions made upon Eve; through virginity a perfectly achieved purity is brought about (ἀγνείας ἐπειλημμένη),² and the state of virginity does not take up the sentence of condemnation (μὴ προσδεχομένη τὴν φάσκουσιν).³ Therefore, virginity is “unenslaved property” (ὡς ἀδούλωτον κτῆμα)⁴ and is a free dwelling place (ὡς ἐλεύθερον ἐνδιαίτημα).⁵ Amphilochius then uses words which analyze this freedom from the curse; it is a new, more spiritual condition, a laborious ascetic ornament (ὡς τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἔξεως ἀνωτέρα)⁶ freeing one from sufferings in time of necessity (ὡς τῶν ἐπ’ ἀνάγκαις παθῶν ἀπολυθεῖσα).⁷ He then addresses his audience of virgins with an eschatological praise showing virginity as bridal union with Christ in the heavenly nuptial bed of the kingdom.⁸ Amphilochius has sandwiched the text of Genesis 3: 16 between the heavenly, cosmic and spiritual aspects of virginity and, after the citation of the text, with freedom, spiritual liberty and heavenly union.

He then addresses the married with praises, showing (in Cappadocian style) the wedded state as the source for virgins. Marriage thus is complementary to the state of virginity; there is no negative innuendo.

This is his introduction to the mystery of Jesus (Luke 2: 21-23) and more specifically Genesis 4: 8:

When the eighth day arrived for his circumcision, the name Jesus was given the Child, the name the angel had given him before he was conceived. When the day came to purify them according to the law of Moses, the couple brought him up to the temple so that he could be presented to the Lord as it is written in the law of the Lord, every first born male shall be called holy to the Lord.⁹

¹ *Ibid.*, I. 9.

² *Ibid.*, II. 9-10.

³ *Ibid.*, I. 10.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I. 13.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I. 14.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I. 15.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II. 15-16, pp. 38, 40.

⁸ *Ibid.*, I. 16: ὡς συνεισελθοῦσα τῷ νυμφίῳ Χριστῷ εἰς τὸν Θάλαμον τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 2, II. 39-44, p. 40.

Conclusion:

Genesis 3: 16 as used by Amphilochius does not directly set up a parallel with Eve/Mary. It is more a parallel of Eve/a virgin (who brings about malediction, sorrow, and constraint) and virginity as a choice which leads to joy, freedom, and blessing. The first mention of Mary is some several paragraphs later when the text of Luke 1: 35 mentions Gabriel speaking to the Virgin. Jouassard has pointed out that the Eve/Mary cycle in Justin is based on the virginity theme, while the contrasts between Mary/Eve are the interests of Irenaeus.¹ In Amphilochius, the parallel is not explicit; Mary is not even mentioned. Therefore, the Christian state of virginity is what is contrasted with Eve. If we push for the entire context and allow for the later mention of the Virgin Mary, then Amphilochius would be closer to the cycle of Justin.

In *Oratio I, In Natalitia Domini*, Amphilochius uses the theme of freedom achieved through a virgin while subjugation to sin comes from the first virgin, but there is no direct citation of a biblical text from Genesis 3. The allusion is implicitly Genesis 3: 15, but both Datema in his critical edition² and Laurentin³ do not affirm the text was used. Amphilochius' context is that of salvation history alluding to the fact that the Incarnation took place because the Master is being born of a virgin and is thus becoming similar to the servants in order that they might become more similar to God. The allusion is close to the Christ hymn of Philippians 2: 6.⁴

¹ G. JOUASSARD, "La nouvelle Ève . . .," p. 51: "Nous sommes loin apparemment de savoir tout ce qui s'est écrit à son sujet; dans ce que nous atteignons il se manifeste deux tendances principales: l'une qui pousse à montrer ce qui rapproche Marie d'Ève, la virginité; l'autre, ce qui les oppose toutes deux. La première tendance est représentée par le *Dialogue avec Tryphon* et Tertullien; la seconde par saint Irénée et à peu près uniquement par lui, en définitive, bien qu'il y ait des amorces dans le *Dialogue* et qu'il reste un organe-témoin chez Tertullien."

² AMPHILOCHIUS (DATEMA, ed.), *op. cit.*, cf. critical apparatus for biblical references.

³ R. LAURENTIN, "L'interprétation de la Genèse 3: 15 dans la tradition jusqu'au début du XIII^e siècle," BEM 12 (1954) 140.

⁴ AMPHILOCHIUS (DATEMA, ed.), *op. cit.*, *Or. I: 4*, ll. 108-112, p. 8: (my translation) "The world is freed through a Virgin, which, formerly through a virgin, fell under the power of sin. Through a virginal birth so great and so many an invisible horde of demons was destroyed. The Master became conformed to [His] servants, in order that the servants would again be conformed to God."

Genesis 3: 18: Thorns and thistles shall the earth bring forth.

Amphilochius uses this text in the overall context of salvation history effected through Christ and through Mary's overcoming the blunder of Eve.¹ His *Oratio VII* is an address to those recently baptized. The biblical allusions are well chosen. It is the text of Genesis 3: 18, "Thorns and thistles shall the earth bring forth for you," which is read in the pattern of Mary/Eve, Adam/Christ contrasts. This curse is removed because of Christ. Here Amphilochius is closer to the cycle of Mary/Eve in Irenaeus. Here is the translation of the significant lines:

No longer does Eve fear the reproach of Adam, for indeed in Mary the blunder of the former is revoked; no longer does Adam fear the serpent, for Christ has crushed the head of the dragon. "For you," he says, "smashed the head of the dragon upon the water," that is upon the one baptized.²

The allusion is not to Genesis 3: 15 but to Psalm 73: 13.

Virgin Earth: Adam/Christ

A final parallel is found in *De Abraham* in which Adam is a symbol for Christ: "For Adam is a symbol of him, [Adam] who has come forth out of a virginal earth, in the same way as God, the Christ."³ The same idea has an exact parallel in Amphilochius' *Homily VI, In Illud: Pater si possibile est*.⁴

The notion is a commonplace one among the Fathers; E. M. Llopart, in his study of Mary and the Church in the pre-Ephesus thought of the Fathers, cites all of its uses.⁵

2. St. Basil

Genesis 3: 19: For dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.

The verse cited is found in his homily on the birth of Christ.⁶ The theophany or revelation of Christ becoming flesh reverses this malediction. To-

¹ *Ibid.*, Or. VII, *De Recens Baptizatis*: 4, ll. 100-109, pp. 158-159.

² *Ibid.*, ll. 100-104.

³ *Ibid.*, *De Abraham*, ll. 378-379, p. 300.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Or. VI: 7, ll. 138-139, ll. 141-145 (p. 144).

⁵ E. M. LLOPART, "María y la Iglesia en los Padres Preefesinos," in *Maria-Ecclesia Regina et Mirabilis*, p. 36, n. 62.

⁶ *Homilia in Sanctam Christi Generationem*, PG 31: 1473A.

day, Christ's Birthday, is the liberation of Adam's multitude (Σήμερον ἐλύθη ἡ καταδίκη τοῦ Ἀδάμ.). The verse is parallel to what follows.

Genesis 3: 16: In pain thou shalt bring forth children.

"This phrase will no longer be heard because blessed is she who has borne Emmanuel, and blessed her breasts which nourished him."¹ Mary is seen as a benediction reversing the malediction of Eve to whom those lines were first addressed.

3. Gregory of Nyssa

Genesis 3: 15: He shall crush thy head.

In Gregory's Christmas homily, the text of Genesis 3: 15 is implicit. The author says, "Then, having put on human flesh, he crushed with his foot the many heads of the serpent who, falling to the ground, he tread upon it."² What is of interest is that the gender is correctly attributed to the masculine pronoun—"He shall crush thy head"—as the Hebrew indicates.³ This homily would fit Laurentin's schema of a Christological interpretation of Genesis 3: 15, that is, it is Christ who crushes the head of the serpent.⁴ Since the text is not explicit, Laurentin has not cited the homily.

*Genesis 3: 16: In pain shalt thou bear children.*⁵

In the same homily, the author contrasts the malediction of Genesis 3: 16 with the joy and gladness which the words "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee" bring to the Virgin. Though neither Mary nor Eve is explicitly referred to, the context indicates they are understood. Such a contrast fits more the pattern of Irenaeus than Justin, if we would reflect on the possible tradition-source.⁶

There is a final section of the same homily which has the pattern of a first woman contrasted with another woman; the first man contrasted with

¹ *Ibid.*, II. 8-10.

² *In Diem Natalem Christi*, PG 46: 1132C.

³ R. LAURENTIN, "L'interprétation de la Genèse 3, 15 . . .," p. 109.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

⁵ *In Diem Natalem Christi*, PG 46: 1140C.

⁶ G. JOUASSARD, "La nouvelle Ève . . .," p. 51.

the second. Since the thoughts are conflated from Romans 5: 12 and Genesis 3: 15, we mention their appearance. Death occurs because of the first man; the second brings salvation. The first has fallen through sin; the second has risen. The first woman, by listening to the advice of the serpent, surrendered herself to sin; the second opened the way to righteousness. The fidelity of the author to the masculine agent in Genesis 3: 15 is brought out in the sense that the woman gives the author of light an entrance, and that author is the killer of the serpent.¹

THE ANTIOCHENES

4. St. John Chrysostom

Chrysostom is dependent on the tradition for his use of types in his discourses, homilies and treatises.² One of the richest and most developed contrasts he uses is that of the virgin-earth from which Adam was formed and the Virgin from whom the Christ took flesh.³ Unfortunately, the setting for such comparisons is often his polemic against the Jews. What concerns us is his use of Genesis 2: 8, Genesis 3: 5, and I Corinthians 15: 47 (the second Adam-Christ) in his treatise, *De Mutatione Nominum II*.

Chrysostom starts with the meaning of the word *Adam* as coming from the Hebrew which translated into Greek means "earthly," "of the earth." He uses the term Eden—the place where Adam was formed—as meaning virgin-earth (τὸ γὰρ Ἐδεμ τὴν παρθένον σημαίνει γῆν). "God, indeed, planted a garden in Eden facing the East" (Genesis 2: 8). He then makes the parallel to the Virgin: "Therefore, He has called that paradise Eden because it signifies virgin-earth. This virgin is a type of the latter Virgin. For just as that earth brought forth produce without anything being sown, so, too, this (Virgin) brought forth Christ for us without the seed of man."⁴ Chrysostom further explains the significance: "Since, therefore, man was formed

¹ PG 46: 1148AB.

² *Homilia in Genesim 25*, PG 54: 445D-446AD; Sarah, Rachel, Elizabeth, and Rebecca are used as contrasts to the Virgin. *Peccata Fratrum Non Evulganda*, PG 51: 359AD, 360AD.

³ *De Mutatione Nominum II*, PG 51: 129AB, 130CD.

⁴ *Ibid.*, PG 51: 129A.

from the virgin earth, Adam is named after his mother. And so men are accustomed often to name their children after their mother: so God, likewise, formed man from the earth and declared him Adam after his mother (earth). She was called Eden, he Adam."¹

The text that Chrysostom has used is the Septuagint which reads: *Εδεμ κατὰ ἀνατολάς*; in it he sees a relationship between *Αδαμ/Εδεμ*. This is only possible in the Greek; for the Hebrew of Genesis 2: 8 reads: *בְּעֵדֶן* (be eden) for in Eden and *אָדָם* (Ādām) for Adam. Both words are etymologically distinct; even the sound in the Hebrew tongue would not create a similarity. The illustration serves to show that the Septuagint was Chrysostom's bible, and that several of his ideas are either from an earlier tradition or from such a premise. The notion, however, of God forming Adam from the earth is correct in its biblical context, and in Genesis 2: 8 the term *יָצַר* (*yašar*) denotes the activity of a potter as he shapes the vessels of clay with his hands. It is a word used in creation terminology. There is an interesting parallel in Jeremiah 1: 5 (formation in his mother's womb) where the image of God's invisible and omnipotent action is already present.² Chrysostom is, therefore, drawing up a good parallel for the virginal conception of Jesus; but his etymological argument is false.

The term *τρυνφή* is a rendering of Eden. It is only in our texts (Genesis 2: 8, 2: 10, and 4: 16) where Eden is the Septuagint transcription that only a place-name is meant.³

Chrysostom, in the same treatise, returns to the concept again in his reflection on Genesis 3: 5: "You will be like gods." In order to instruct Christians in the attitude of humility, he refers to the text on the second Adam (I Cor. 15: 47): "The first man was of earth, formed from dust, the second is the Lord from heaven."⁴ His argument leads the listener to give the heavenly origin and name to Christ become flesh through the Incarnation, just as Adam derived his name from the earth. Chrysostom's text differs from the established critical text of I Corinthians 15: 47 which reads simply *ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*. Chrysostom's text reads *ἄνθρωπος ὁ κύριος*; it is well attested in the manuscripts.⁵ It seems that the insertion of *ὁ κύριος*

¹ *Ibid.*, PG: 129B.

² W. FOERSTER, *κτίζω*, in ThWKittel (Eng) III: 1007.

³ J. JEREMIAS, *παράδεισος*, in ThWKittel (Eng) V: 766.

⁴ A. GELIN, "La doctrine paulinienne du Nouvel Adam," BEM 13 (1955) 18-19.

⁵ ALAND GNT, p. 616, critical apparatus.

in place of *ἄνθρωπος* began with Marcion, thereby explaining the nature of the "man from heaven."¹

Chrysostom's use of the text is a good one exegetically. In Paul's preaching of the resurrection the first man, who is of the earthly ground, is contrasted with the second man, who is from heaven. Christ is, for Paul, this heavenly man—the last Adam—the life-giving spirit—the second man.²

THE JERUSALEMITES

5. Cyril of Jerusalem

In his twelfth lecture, Cyril of Jerusalem introduces the contrast of Mary/Eve: "Through Eve yet virgin came death; through a virgin, or rather from a virgin, must the Life appear; that as the serpent beguiled the one, so to the other Gabriel might bring good tidings."³ Genesis 3: 6, 13 are implied and contrasted with an allusion to Gabriel's salutation in Luke 1: 35. The Scriptural pattern established by Irenaeus in the contrast is maintained. We have seen how Gregory of Nyssa used the same implicit references to Genesis and Luke. Here the emphasis is not on crushing the serpent's head (It is not mentioned.), but on the good news of Gabriel contrasted with the beguiling and bad news of the serpent. We must also see a close parallel to Justin's thought since both the virgin/Eve is mentioned and the Virgin/ (Mary) who brings Life. Justin's words are similar:

Eve, when she was a virgin and undefiled, having conceived the word of the serpent, brought forth disobedience and death: but the Virgin Mary received faith and joy, when the Angel Gabriel announced the good tidings to her.⁴

¹ B. METZGER, *op. cit.*, p. 568: "The insertion of *ὁ κύριος* (Marcion preferred *κύριος* as a substitute for *ἄνθρωπος*) is an obvious gloss added to explain the nature of 'the man from heaven' . . . if this were original there is no reason why it should have been omitted. The singular reading of P⁴⁶ (*ἄνθρωπος πνευματικός*) shows the influence of ver. 46, while the omission of *ἄνθρωπος* (cop^{aa} Cyril) is merely a transcriptional accident."

² H. TRAUB, *οὐρανός*, in ThWKITTEL (Eng) V: 528.

³ *Catechesis XII, De Christo Incarnation*, PG 33: 741B.

⁴ JUSTIN, *Trypho*, 100.

The next reference to the person of Eve/Mary is set in a polemical context. Cyril is using the birth of Eve from Adam's side as a parallel to the birth of Christ from the Virgin. His own words are quite clear:

Of whom in the beginning was Eve begotten? What mother conceived her the motherless? But the Scripture says that she was born out of Adam's side. Is Eve then born out of a man's side without a mother, and is a child not to be born without a father, of a virgin's womb? This debt of gratitude was due to men from womanhood: for Eve was begotten of Adam, and not conceived of a mother, but as it were brought forth of man alone. Mary, therefore, paid the debt of gratitude, when not by man but of herself alone in an immaculate way she conceived of the Holy Spirit by the power of God.¹

The fact of the unique virgin nature of both women places this reflection of Cyril more in line with Justin. The context, incidentally, is polemical in both.

6. Hesychius of Jerusalem

Fr. M. Aubineau has indicated the bibliography for the theme of the New Eve,² particularly as it applies to the work of Hesychius. Our task is to present simply the reference to the theme as it appears only in the homilies chosen for this study.³

Hesychius shows how the first virgin (Eve) brought sorrow and the pains of childbirth; the second virgin (Mary) dissipates the clouds of sorrow and brings the light of joy.⁴ Aubineau has seen in the text of Hesychius an allusion to Genesis 3: 16-17 identifying the malediction that has come upon all through Eve; Mary through the intervention of the Angel has brought back joy and enveloped her sisters (all women) with the light. The use of Genesis and Luke has, once again, been the biblical source for this Eve/Mary contrast. The thoughts of both Justin (who emphasizes the parallel of the two virgins) and Irenaeus (who sets up the contrasts) are present in Hesychius.

¹ *Catechesis XII*, 29, PG 33: 761BC.

² HESYCHIUS (AUBINEAU, ed.), *op. cit.*, Vol. I: *Les Homélies I-XV*, p. 27, n. 4.

³ *Ibid.*, see *Hom. I*: 2: 11-16, p. 26 and *Hom. V*: 4: 6, p. 164, for the significant parallels of Eve/Mary.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Hom. VI*: 1: 12-21, p. 194.

CONCLUSIONS

The Fathers studied in this thesis delivered their homilies and interpretations during the period of 350 A.D. to 430 A.D. Before them, there already was a solid and mature approach to the interpretation of the Word of God. These earlier interpreters, such as Justin and Origen, were a part of the living tradition often referred to in the works of the Cappadocians, the Jerusalemites, and the Antiochenes who were presented here. These latter writers and preachers contributed to the historical enrichment of previously developed biblical exegesis. This is apparent through the sampling of similar texts which were used constantly in reflections upon the Incarnation. The texts chosen were limited to the mystery of the Nativity, the Presentation in the Temple, and to the fact that Mary, the Mother of Jesus, was mentioned within these texts. These texts also illustrate that the development of biblical exegesis from one epoch to another can be traced through a study of limited genres (for example, the homily) and perceived as the presence of the Holy Spirit within the living tradition of interpreting revelation. A primary conclusion, then, is that there is a continuity and a development of interpretation with the tradition of the Christian Churches and areas represented by the eight Fathers who were studied. All of them were faithful to that tradition, and, at the same time, added new insights to their study of the same biblical texts and themes.

The second chapter demonstrates and concludes that the following biblical principles were used by the Fathers:

1. The text of the Bible is the starting point for their exegesis. For the Old Testament they used the Septuagint. The literal sense of the Bible was understood by them as the principal sense.
2. Within the living tradition of Christianity, faith is necessary to understand the Bible and to interpret it faithfully. For the Fathers the text was always related to the living faith they possessed.
3. God is understood by them as Author of the Old Testament and the New Testament. Both Testaments are divinely inspired. The Spirit keeps alive the meaning of the texts within the community of belief.
4. The Incarnation is understood as a mystery of salvation. Christ is always central in their reflections on this mystery. Texts chosen from both the Old and New Testaments are used to bring out the salvific effect of Christ within human history. The purpose of the Incarnation is soteriological.

5. Scripture is best explained by Scripture. The Fathers make abundant use of parallel passages to illustrate the meaning of texts they use.
6. There is an over-arching Divine Plan within God's written revelation. His condescending love has made this Plan known through the Scriptures. He is a Divine Pedagogue.
7. The New Testament is often seen as the fulfillment of the Old Testament—especially of the prophetic sections. This principle is seen also through the continued use of typology which was found in the Apologists. Basically, the relationship of the Old Testament and the New Testament is one of prophecy and its fulfillment.
8. The Fathers continually use certain clusters of texts (orchestrations) in order to develop their interpretation of the mystery of the Incarnation.
9. For this period of time (350-430 A.D.), the Fathers emphasize the distinction of the human and divine natures of Christ in their exegesis.
10. The role of the Virgin Mary in the Incarnation is seen principally in their use of Isaiah 7: 14 which they see fulfilled in her giving birth to Emmanuel-Christ. The New Testament texts confirm this prophecy. Mary is also seen as the perfection of former types and parallels.

In order to enter more concretely into the exegetical methods of the Fathers and to show how they were using the text of the Septuagint, occasionally making slight changes, an orchestration of biblical texts is presented. The comparative study of the sword piercing the soul of Mary (Luke 2: 35) is presented as an example to show the continuing tradition, and, at the same time, the individual insights of the Fathers who commented upon the text. The text also gives evidence of a growth in understanding the role of Mary within the tradition. The later writers removed most of the negative connotations concerning Mary's doubt.

Finally, a contextual study of the texts is presented. Developments are easily noticed and pointed out. Several definite conclusions emerge from this fuller view of the material. First, every Father affirms the physical virginity of Mary. They are fond of the expression "*ek parthenou*" in order to express this virginity. Often they refer to the notion of the enduring state of her virginity (*diamenēi*). Secondly, the human virginal flesh of Mary is the real medium or instrument for the reality of Jesus' human nature. All of the Fathers studied are convinced that Jesus takes the fullness of His human flesh solely from Mary, the Virgin. Thirdly, the mystery of salvation is emphasized by each of the Fathers in his reflections on the Incarnation. It is a salvific mystery, not merely a revelational one. This mystery is presented

as the Plan of God. It is a fulfillment of what was promised in the Prophets and carried out in the Event of the Birth of Christ. Therefore, the mystery of salvation is seen in the over-arching theme of salvation history—a history which unites both the Old Testament texts and those of the New Testament. In the fourth place, these later Fathers continue to make use of the typology developed by Justin and Irenaeus. This going back and forth from the New Testament to the Old Testament for the discovery of types and their fulfillment in Christ and Mary was part of the living tradition continued by these interpreters of the fourth and fifth centuries. A fifth conclusion is that certain texts were basic to the interpretation of the mystery of the Incarnation in a homiletical context. The two texts which parallel the statement of this thesis are Baruch 3: 38: "He appeared on earth and moved among men" and Isaiah 7: 14: "Behold a Virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son and they shall call him Emmanuel." The former text illustrates the Incarnation as a mystery embedded within the reality of human history; the latter shows the manner of Christ's becoming flesh from the Virgin and being "God with us." These two texts summarize better than any other texts the purpose of this thesis: to show the biblical understanding of the Fathers in their reflections on the mystery of the Incarnation and Mary's role within it. It is no accident that these texts were the ones most consistently used by the Fathers in their homilies.

Lastly, as a contextual conclusion, we might say that the homiletic interpretation began in the Synagogue and continued in the Christian pulpit. The following article of Vatican II's "Constitution on the Liturgy" is important for understanding how the Word of God continues and is kept alive:

Sacred Scripture is of the greatest importance in the celebration of the liturgy. For it is from it that lessons are read and explained in the homily, and psalms are sung. . . . it is essential to promote that sweet and living love for sacred scripture to which the venerable tradition of Eastern and Western rites gives testimony. (Art. 24, Vatican II, "The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy," *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 4 December, 1963).

This study began with the reading of the Torah within the Synagogue as it was presented in Nehemiah 8: 8: "Ezra read plainly from the book of the law of God, interpreting it so that all could understand what was read," and ended with the plain proclamation and interpretation of the Word of God by the Christian preachers in the Eastern Churches in the late fourth and early fifth centuries. Such preaching was done with a warm and living love and with great attention to the written word of God and the context of the liturgical assembly of God's people.

Both the Synagogue and the Christian assembly handed on to us a living tradition which has its source in the written revelation of God's words. All of the preachers and interpreters of that Word depended humbly on that Word and on those generations who had preceded them in the proclamation and the interpretation of divine revelation.

The genre selected for this study was intentionally the homily, or, where that was not possible, a catechesis on the Word of God or a true simple interpretation of it. The evidence of an orderly and faithful presentation of that divine message was overwhelming. Certain principles of interpretation formed into a definite pattern, and cherished texts were seen again and again in the geographical areas represented: Jerusalem, Antioch, and Capadocia.

This is a living testimony to their fidelity to a tradition of Christian faith in which all shared and in their turn faithfully passed on "by word of mouth" to their listeners and to us.

The liturgical setting and occasion of these homilies and scriptural developments was the atmosphere in which the tradition was enlivened and deepened, as insight grew upon insight, and as inspired preachers moved their listeners to understand and to respond, not to their words but to the Word of God.

BIBLICAL INDEX

OLD TESTAMENT

Genesis

2	371, 372
2:8	377, 378
2:10	378
3	371, 372, 374
3:5	377, 378
3:6	379
3:7	312, 316
3:13	379
3:14	311, 315, 316
3:15	374, 376, 377
3:16	372, 373, 374, 376
3:16-17	380
3:18	375
3:19	375, 376
4:8	373
4:16	378
15:18	370
17:1	326
24:43	294
49:8	289
49:9	289, 353
49:9-10	277, 289
49:10	289, 357, 363, 368

Exodus

2:8	286, 294
3:1	326
3:2	326, 327, 328
13:2	258, 320, 322, 323
13:12	258, 320, 322, 323
13:15	320, 322, 323
17:6	308
23:31	370
29:4-9	361

Leviticus

12:3	258
12:6	258

Numbers

13:16	361
15:17	351
20:7	308
21:8	312
24:17	260, 274, 275, 349, 354
	365, 366

Deuteronomy

1:7	370
11:24	370
18:15	363, 364, 365
18:18	364
22:27	286

Joshua

1:4	370
-----	-----

I Samuel

16:1	288
16:18	288

I Kings

1:4	286, 344
-----	----------

I Chronicles

15:20	294
-------	-----

Psalms [LXX = ()]

2:7	270, 287
14:7	309
22:9	291
(23):7	334
32(31):5	314, 319
(47)	283
(49)	283
(67):5	366
68:25	286, 294
(71):6	355
(71):7	363
(71):7-8	370
(71):8	363

72:6	278	8:16-18	270, 291
72:8	370	9:1	261
(73):13	375	9:5	260, 262, 266, 268, 269, 270, 273, 274, 290, 291, 334, 349, 353, 354
(86):5	363, 369, 370	9:6	262, 273, 276, 278, 283, 284
87:5	363, 370	9:11	353
87:5, 6	370	11:1	274, 278, 354, 355, 366
89: 29	290	11:10	277, 354
(96):11	366	27:12	370
(109):3	287	28:16	304, 306, 307, 308, 309
110	364	40:9	309
110:2	287	44:22	314, 319
110:3	270	45:14	271, 272
110:9	265	49:6	261, 363
(117):22	308	50:7	308
118:22	301, 302, 307, 308, 309	53:2	278, 353, 354
118:24	330	53:8	287
129:7	265	59:20	309
(131)	290	62:11	309, 346, 361
(131):6	288	63:9	273, 349
132:11	290		
132:17	290		
<i>Proverbs</i>		<i>Jeremiah</i>	
8:25-27	284	1:5	378
<i>Canticles</i>		11:2	370
1:3	286	15:8	370
<i>Wisdom</i>		17:9	273
2:13	273	23:5	365, 366
<i>Isaiah</i>		23:5-8	353
1:8, 9	291	33:15	366
3:2	326		
7	339	<i>Baruch</i>	
7:10	270, 291	1:20	273
7:10-16	278	2:20	273
7:14	256, 267, 268, 270, 271, 273, 275, 276, 278, 279, 280, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 292, 293, 294, 327, 335, 338, 339, 340, 344, 346, 349, 353, 363, 365, 383	2:24	273
8:8	293	2:28	273
8:10	293	3:36	272, 284, 363, 365
8:14	265, 302, 308	3:36-38	271, 273, 274, 276, 278, 285, 355
		3:37	273
		3:38	256, 272, 273, 274, 276, 277, 282, 283, 284, 285, 335, 336, 340, 346, 349, 353, 355, 356, 363, 365, 383

Ezekiel

9:5-6	349
10	326
14:17	303
34:23-31	353
44:1	256, 320, 322, 323, 325, 328, 367
44:2	256, 293, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 328, 334, 346, 347, 363, 366, 367
44:2-4	367
44:3	293, 324, 325, 346, 363

Daniel

2:34ff.	308
2:44	308
7:13	266, 275, 293, 363, 367, 368
7:27	368
9:23	293
10:11 (Theodotion)	293

Hosea

2:20	345
------	-----

Amos

5:14	293
9:8-15	353

Micah

5	353
5:1-3	269
5:2	277, 287, 288
5:7-12	370

Zechariah

3:8	365, 366
4:10	308
6:12	266, 274, 349, 363, 365, 366
9:9	309, 367
9:10	370

Malachi

3:20	260, 266, 270, 274, 293, 349, 363, 366
4:2	349, 351

NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew

1:1	287, 356, 358
1:1-17	280

1:16	334
1:18	350, 351, 358
1:18-25	278, 281, 351
1:20	334
1:21	294, 361
1:22-23	339, 340
1:23	268, 274, 275, 276, 278, 279, 282, 283, 293, 294, 339, 340, 341, 349
1:25	341
2:1	278
2:1-2	359
2:6	288, 289
2:9	351
5:3	293
9:12	267
13:7	355
21:5	309
21:42	301
22:41-46	357
26:30	313
26:31	311, 313, 314, 318
26:39	314, 319
26:64	368
<i>Mark</i>	
1:24	259
12:10	308
12:11	301
14:27	313
14:62	368
<i>Luke</i>	
1 and 2	257
1:13	294
1:26-27	281, 359
1:27	280, 357
1:28	292
1:31	292, 293, 294
1:32	290, 314, 318, 344
1:33	314
1:35	258, 259, 300, 310, 314, 315, 318, 334, 338, 342, 347, 369, 379
1:45	345
1:54	273
1:68	265, 365
1:69	273

1:71	265
1:78	274, 366
2:1	262
2:4	281, 359
2:6-7	260, 261
2:10-11	288, 289
2:11	260, 261, 262, 288, 349
2:14	262
2:21-23	262, 373
2:21-38	264
2:22	306
2:22-24	320
2:22-35	322
2:22-38	295, 296
2:23	258, 320, 323, 334
2:25	297
2:25-38	296
2:26	296, 306
2:26-38	362
2:28	300
2:28-32	297
2:29	296
2:30	297, 363
2:30-31	298
2:32	260, 261, 263, 297, 349, 363
2:33	300, 304, 310, 315, 347
2:33-34	306, 307
2:33-35	304, 307
2:34	265, 296, 300, 302, 303, 304, 305, 307, 308, 311, 317
2:34-35	264, 298, 310, 316
2:35	264, 265, 299, 300, 302, 303, 305, 306, 311, 312, 313, 314, 317, 319, 382
2:36	296
2:38	265, 296, 306, 365
2:48	358
3:38	371
4:34	259
5:31	266, 348
9:58	262
19:10	363
24:21	265, 365

John

1:1	278, 341, 344
1:13	334, 341, 356
1:14	274, 278, 286, 293, 335, 344
1:19	341
1:25	341
3:14-15	317
5:36	290
6:69	259
7:42	357
9:39	312, 316
11:50	314, 318
12:15	309
17:3	272, 284
19:25-27	313, 318
20:19	323
20:26	317

Acts

3:14	259
4:11	308
4:27	259
4:30	259
7:25	365
7:37	365
13:47	261, 363

Romans

1:3	290, 342, 344
1:3-4	259
1:4	259
3:23	311, 314, 318
5:12	377
5:14	371
6:5	312, 316
6:9	278
6:9-10	277
9:1-5	298
9:5	277, 278, 283
9:30	302
9:32	309
9:33	306, 308, 309
11:1-26	298, 309

I Corinthians

1:2	319
1:18	314, 319
1:21	314, 319

1:23-24 299, 304
 1:24 338
 1:25 314, 319
 3:16 297
 15:22 371
 15:45 371
 15:47 377, 378
 15:54 351

II Corinthians

4:7 290
 12:10 311, 316, 319

Galatians

4:4 278, 291, 342, 345, 360

Ephesians

2:20 307
 5:5 278, 283

Philippians

2:5-9 278
 2:6 374
 2:7 278

II Timothy

2:8 290, 344
 2:11 312, 316

Hebrews

4:12 303, 313, 318
 7:14 289
 9:12 265
 12:22 309

Titus

2:11 351

I Peter

2:4-8 308
 2:6 304, 306, 307, 309
 2:6-8 299, 300, 303, 305, 306,
 307
 2:7 306, 308, 309
 2:8 302, 306, 309
 4:11 319

II Peter

1:19 365

I John

2:20 259

Revelation

3:7 259
 5:5 353
 14:1 309

INDEX OF NAMES

**This index does not include the names of biblical authors or other biblical persons (See BIBLICAL INDEX.) and does not refer to the pages of the Bibliography (Names presented there are in alphabetical order and readily consulted.).*

- AKIBA 275
 ALANDGNT 264, 265, 268, 300, 378
 ALDAMA, J. A. DE 320, 321, 322
 AMBROSE 302, 313, 356
 AMPHILOCHIUS OF ICONIUM 255-256,
 257-275, 291, 320-324, 326-328,
 329, 333-335, 348-350, 361, 367,
 372-375
 APHROATES 308
 AQUILA 339
 ATHANASIOUS 272, 273, 274, 284, 290
 AUBINEAU, M. 292, 293, 295, 296,
 297, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305,
 306, 307, 309, 322, 323, 324, 327,
 328, 332, 346-348, 362-370, 380
 AUGUSTINE 337, 356
 BARNABUS [Epistle of] 308, 364, 368
 BASIL THE GREAT 255, 275-276,
 300, 301, 303, 310-319, 329, 330,
 335-336, 350-351, 375-376
 BEHM, J. 368
 BERECHIAH, R. 354
 BERTRAM, G. 269, 301, 353
 BIETENHARD, H. 269
 BROWN, R. E. 258, 259, 260, 262,
 263, 265, 302, 303, 313
 BÜCHSEL, F. 265
 CABROL, F. 332
 CARO, R. 305, 309, 321, 328, 367,
 369
 CHROMATIUS AQUILENSIS 290
 CHRYSOSTOM *See* JOHN CHRYSOS-
 TOM
 CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA 254, 271,
 274
 CLEMENT OF ROME 254
 COLPE, C. 275, 353, 368
 CONGAR, Y. M. J. 372
 CROUZEL, H. 310-319, 322, 347
 CULLMANN, O. 309
 CYRIL OF JERUSALEM 255, 284, 285-
 292, 331-332, 342, 343-346, 361-
 362, 379-380
 DATEMA, C. 258, 262, 263, 267, 320,
 326-328, 329, 333, 335, 348-350,
 367, 372-375
 DELLING, G. 270, 294
 DEVREESE, R. 274, 360
 EPHIPHANIUS 302
 ERMONI, V. 274
 EUSEBIUS 289, 290, 361
 FOERSTER, W. 275, 378
 FOHRER, G. 370
 FRIEDRICH, G. 364
 GALLUS, T. 265
 GAMBERO, L. 275, 315
 GARRITE 307
 GEDEN, A. S. 261
 GELIN, A. 378
 GIBBS 356
 GRANT, R. M. 334, 343
 GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS 255, 276-
 277, 284, 290, 301, 330, 336-337,
 351-352
 GREGORY OF NYSSA 255, 256, 276,
 290, 321, 326-328, 330, 337-338,
 376-377, 379
 GROOT, A. DE 264, 301, 311
 GROSIDIER DE MATONS, J. 332
 GRUNDMANN, W. 261, 270

- GUNTHER, O. 342, 360
 HENGEL, M. 262
 HENNECKE, E. 336, 337
 HERNTRICH, V. 270, 291
 HESSE, F. 269
 HESYCHIUS OF JERUSALEM 255, 256,
 265, 284, 292-309, 320-324, 326-
 328, 332, 346-348, 362-370, 380
 HIPPOLYTUS 271, 274, 283, 284, 308
 HOLL, K. 329
 IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH 254, 276, 294,
 300, 347, 358, 368, 371
 IRENAEUS 254, 334, 356, 368, 371,
 372, 374, 375, 376, 379, 380, 383
 JEREMIAS, J. 263, 273, 308, 354,
 364, 378
 JEROME 311
 JOHN CHRYSOSTOM 255, 268, 270,
 273, 277-284, 294, 301, 330, 339-
 342, 352-360, 377-379
 JOIN-LAMBERT, M. 371
 JOSEPHUS 364
 JOUASSARD, G. 371, 374, 376
 JUSTIN 254, 274, 275, 286, 291, 294,
 354, 364, 366, 368, 371, 372, 374,
 379, 380, 381, 383
 KITTEL, G. 275
 KOETSCHAU 269
 KRAELING, C. H. 355
 LAGRANGE, M.-J. 289, 294
 LAMPE 301, 305, 326, 329, 358
 LAURENTIN, R. 374, 376
 LÉON-DUFOUR, X. 371
 LIDDELL-SCOTT 370
 LLOPART, E. M. 375
 LOHSE, E. 309, 354, 356, 357, 370
 LUCK, O. 267
 MCHUGH, J. 261, 265, 282, 303, 350
 MARCION 379
 MAURER, C. 354, 366
 MAYS, J. L. 287, 288
 MELITO (OF SARDIS) 274, 275, 366
 MERX, A. 365
 METZGER, B. M. 258, 262, 341, 356,
 358, 379
 MEYER, R. 275
 MICHAELIS, W. 302, 353, 370
 MICHEL, O. 367
 MINGANA, A. 291, 331, 342, 360, 361
 MOORE, C. A. 272
 MOULTON, W. F. 261
 NICOLAS, M.-J. 372
 NOETUS 271
 OEPKE, A. 264, 364, 368
 OPTIMUS 310, 311, 312
 ORIGEN 254, 255, 256, 274, 276, 283,
 288, 300, 301, 302, 310-319, 321,
 322, 323, 347, 358, 370, 381
 PERRIN, N. 253
 PHILIPPE, E. 274
 PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA 254
 PICOT 366
 PIRKE ABOTH 281
 POLYCARP 254
 PROCKSCH, O. 259
 PROCLUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE 321,
 367
 PRUDENTIUS 308
 PSEUDO-ATHANASIUS 356
 QUELL, G. 293, 353
 RAHLFS 269, 275, 276, 292, 353
 RAUER (GCS) 313, 317, 347
 RENGSTORF, K. H. 365, 370
 ROMANOS THE MÉLODE 332
 SABOURIN, L. 355, 370
 SASSE, H. 269
 SCHLEIER, H. 274, 354, 365
 SCHMIDT, K. L. 294
 SCHNEIDER, C. 368
 SCHNEIDER, J. 300, 367
 SCHNIEWIND, J. 269, 353, 364
 SCHWEIZER, E. 270, 294
 SIMON 275
 SIMONETTI, M. 271, 272, 277
 SÖLL, G. 371
 SOLOMON ["TESTIMONY OF . . ."]
 308
 STÄHLIN, G. 371
 STAUFFER, E. 293, 367
 STRACH-BILLERBECK, 275, 354, 364
 STRECKER 356
 STRYCKER, E. DE 336
 SYMMACHUS 308, 339
 TANCHUMA 275

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| TELFER, W. 332 | TJ. BAARDA 258 |
| TERTULLIAN 262, 271, 283, 308, 356,
368, 374 | TONNEAU, R. 360 |
| THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA 255, 291,
331, 342, 360-361 | TRYPHO 368 |
| THEODORETUS 290 | TRAUB, H. 379 |
| THEODOTION 293, 339 | VACCARI, A. 270 |
| THEODOTUS 271 | VAN DER WOUDE, A. S. 275, 370 |
| THOMAS AQUINAS 301 | VON RAD, G. 270 |
| | VONA, C. 358 |
| | ZIMMERLI, W. 269, 353 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Material published here)

COMPLETE TABLE OF CONTENTS FROM THESIS	225
ABBREVIATIONS	228
BIBLIOGRAPHY	233
INTRODUCTION	252
CHAPTER III: ORCHESTRATION OF BIBLICAL TEXTS USED BY THE FATHERS IN THEIR NATIVITY HOMILIES: THE ROLE OF MARY WITHIN THE TEXTS	257
Part I: General Study	257
1. Amphilochius	257
2. Basil the Great	275
3. Gregory of Nyssa	276
4. Gregory of Nazianzus	276
5. John Chrysostom	277
6. Cyril of Jerusalem	285
7. Hesychius of Jerusalem	292
Part II: Hesychius: Study of Texts within <i>Hypapante II</i>	295
Part III: Origen and Basil: A Comparative/Contrast Study of Scriptural Texts	310
Part IV: Amphilochius and Hesychius: Commentary on Ezekiel 44: 2	320
Part V: Amphilochius, Gregory of Nyssa and Hesychius: Commentary on Exodus 3: 2: The Burning Bush	326
Part VI: Excursus on Liturgical Setting of the Homilies	329
CHAPTER IV: THE USE OF THE SCRIPTURES AND MARIAN IMPLICATIONS IN THE HOMILIES AND WRITINGS OF THE FATHERS	333
Part I: On the Virginity of Mary	333
The Cappadocians	333
The Antiochenes	339
The Jerusalemites	343
	393

Table of Contents

Part II: Mary's Role in the Soteriological Purpose of the	
Incarnation	348
The Cappadocians	348
The Antiochenes	352
The Jerusalemites	361
Part III: Typology: Parallelism of: Adam/Christ—Eve/Mary	371
The Cappadocians	372
The Antiochenes	377
The Jerusalemites	379
CONCLUSIONS	381
BIBLICAL INDEX	385
INDEX OF NAMES	390

