

Durham E-Theses

*To examine the episodes in the Forth Gospel as
symbolic of various types of spiritual characters and
attitude.*

James Atkinson

How to cite:

Atkinson, James (1949) To examine the episodes in the Forth Gospel as symbolic of various types of spiritual characters and attitude. Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/9717/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Name of Candidate :- Rev. James Atkinson M.A.

Title of thesis :-

To examine the episodes in the Fourth Gospel as symbolic of various types of spiritual characters and attitude, studying

(a) to what extent ancient commentators thus understood and used the Fourth Gospel,

and

(b) whether, in the light of modern knowledge of the Book and its purpose, the Fourth Gospel can be so interpreted.

Name of degree for which the thesis is submitted :- M. Litt

Date of Submission :- September 1949.

Abstract of Thesis

The thesis is an examination of the problem of interpreting the Fourth Gospel and finding the Author's intent, and includes in its survey a detailed examination of the ancient commentators down to the fifth century.

The writer believes that much modern work fails to do justice to the Fourth Gospel, for it begins with one or other of the assumptions that interpretation will yield ultimately either to the historical or psychological technique. These lines of interpretation (allegorical, mystical, mythical, devotional, even the purely historical), yield an impasse. The writer suggests that the episodes of the Fourth Gospel were deliberately selected by John as types of the human soul confronted in an historical experience by God in Christ. That the Johannine presentation was

a deliberative and purposive design forced upon John by the sheer pressure of the intellectual and spiritual climate of the day needing an explanation of the synoptic *εὐαγγέλιον* which had stated everything but explained nothing, leaving unexplained problems of eternity and time, history and the Incarnation. That he attempted this by a selection of events from which the reader may transmute the historical experience of another into eternal truth for himself. That ancient commentators tried to unfathom John on these lines. That some modern interpreters corroborate this view.

Following an introduction on the Sitz im Leben of the Fourth Gospel, there is a detailed examination of the commentaries of :-

Heracleon (the Gnostic) - forty considerable fragments extant.

Origen (640 pages extant).

Cyril of Alexandria

Chrysostom

Augustine

concluded by a discussion on how far modern interpreters corroborate the thesis.

Whatever value the conclusions of the ancient commentators may now have, their technique of interpretation may prove to be the key which, if properly filed, will open the Fourth Gospel. In this way the Fourth Gospel may regain its central position in our theology, and there without sacrifice of scholarship or intellect.

Name of Candidate :-

Rev. J. Atkinson M.A.

Title of thesis :-

To examine the episodes in the Fourth Gospel as symbolic of various types of spiritual characters and attitude, studying

(a) to what extent ancient commentators thus understood and used the Fourth Gospel,

and

(b) whether, in the light of modern knowledge of the Book and its purpose, the Fourth Gospel can be so interpreted.

(Definition of terms:-

"symbolic of various types of spiritual character and attitude"

By this phrase is meant the representation of Truth by a natural incident, personality or figure, where the truth depends not only on the accuracy of the symbolising appearances as facts, but on the truth of the ideas and experiences thus symbolised : it is a combination of naturalism with abstraction. It is the approach of the personality seeing the world of experience as temporal types of the invisible, imperishable archetypal world of eternity. It connotes something more than allegorical but rather rational; more than mystical but rather intellectual.)

Name of the degree for which the thesis is submitted :- M. Litt.

Date of submission :- September 1949.

PLAN OF THE THESIS.

The Thesis falls into three parts, A, B and C.

Part A is a matter of fact text book introduction. It indicates the present writer's position as to the purpose and plan of the Fourth Gospel, together with its authorship and date. It is not an estimation of the varying positions taken by modern scholars. It is a statement rather than an argument or discussion. It is given not as a contribution to learning but as an introduction to Part B, and serves to justify the type of interpretation to which the study of the ancient commentators has led. It contains, too, a consideration of the use made of the Fourth Gospel by Justin, Ignatius and Irenaeus, as being introductory to the work of the great commentators.

Part B is the main part. This is an examination in detail of the commentaries on the Fourth Gospel by:-

Heracleon.
Origen
Cyril of Alexandria
Chrysostom
Augustine

Heracleon exists in considerable fragments, Origen in 640 pages of Greek text, while the others are virtually intact.

Each commentary is worked through and summarised, and in the particular context comments are made and sometimes conclusions indicated. Each commentator is given an explanatory essay or essays, and support for the contention of the thesis summarised at the end of the examination of each commentator.

This part is in every sense the main body of the work, and it is here that all the research has been conducted.

Part C is a discussion as to how far the conclusions suggested in Part B are valid, and how far they find corroboration in the work of modern interpreters of the Fourth Gospel.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Introductory Page 3

Part A.

A discussion of the date, place,
authorship and intent of the Fourth
Gospel.

A consideration of the use made of
the Fourth Gospel by the Apostolic
Fathers and the Apologists.

Page 7

Part B.

An examination of the commentaries
of:-

Heracleon (as extant)
Origen (as extant)
Cyril of Alexandria
Chrysostom
Augustine

with comments.

Page 33

Part C.

Corroboration for the thesis in the
work of some modern interpreters.

Page 482

The treatment of the historical and critical problems involved in the interpretations of the Fourth Gospel is very difficult - perhaps we may never have the data necessary for their complete solution. But these questions are subsidiary to the exposition of the text. It is vastly more important to learn what the Evangelist meant to teach, and what was the picture of Christ present to his mind, than to know if he was an apostle. This thesis is written as an effort to see the Fourth Gospel as those would who first read it, by examining the way those writers nearest the Fourth Evangelist in time and thought first understood and interpreted it. Its appeal to the twentieth century cannot be unfolded until this lesser task of setting out its original appeal has been comprehended : what did his nearer contemporaries make of his presentation of the apostolic *κηρυγμα* ?

The Fourth Gospel bears obvious traces of its author's intention to give certain if not all of its episodes a secondary spiritual meaning, and even to emphasise certain facts almost entirely for the sake of their symbolic value e.g. ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ, (John 13³⁰). The disciples, too, who appear by name, have been selectively chosen and often, if not always, bear the reality of a spiritual type as well as being historical personages, e.g. Thomas. The whole Gospel is built upon a carefully constructed plan which must be called theological or spiritual rather than historical - we may instance how, after each of the great acts of Jesus there follow discourses which draw out the significance of the actions. A good case can be shown for the transposition

of historical incidents, (The Temple Cleansing?), and possibly the alteration of dates, (Crucifixion?), to subserve the writer's spiritual task, though here one cannot be too definite, for there is only the Marcan chronology with which to compare, and Mark may only have a logical order rather than a strictly chronological sequence.

It is worth noting, too, the treatment given by ancient commentators to the very details of chronology and geography which conservative critics have seen as vivid touches of an eye-witness, for instance, the readings of $\beta\eta\theta\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$ and $\beta\eta\theta\alpha\beta\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$ on John 1²⁸. In his commentary, (Vl. 40), Origen gives geographical reasons for his rejection of $\beta\eta\theta\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$ and his acceptance of $\beta\eta\theta\alpha\beta\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$, having been to ^{the} spot himself to enquire of the inhabitants, but, and this is most significant, he goes on to "justify" his choice on "mystical" or "Spiritual" grounds, which grounds are to him, and presumably to his readers, decisive and telling. (This will be dealt with ad. nec.) That it is very difficult to extract a coherent chronology from the notes of time, or even to identify the majority of place names peculiar to the Fourth Gospel, certainly gives some support to the 'spiritual' interpretation given to these details by the ancient commentators.

On searching out the intention of the writer of the Fourth Gospel, it is difficult to deny that he deliberately brings into the ancient Jewish Feasts a new Christian significance, (as New Testament writers did generally), and the relevant teaching of the Master is presented in this historical context. For instance, in John 8² ff. the significance of the Feast of

Tabernacles is shown to be Jesus' tabernacling of Christ in the flesh, and the Passover is obviously written as the Passover of the Lamb of God and not as the Jewish Passover in the closing chapters of the Gospel.

Numbers appear to bear an esoteric meaning. Modern commentators and critics are very sceptical of the many conclusions drawn from the author's use of numbers, and quite rightly so, e.g. Bernard, lxxxviii, and Hatch, Hibbert Lectures (1888), p 84. But the ancients did give symbolic meaning to these data, and our task is to elicit that meaning, even if it is considered erroneous. Examples : the "forty and six years" of the temple building, the 153 fishes, and numerous others.

The episodes, as spiritual experiences, are carefully selected, and presented as types of spirituality, e.g. the account of the man born blind is undeniably written to expound spiritual blindness. Not that it might merely have been a beautiful spiritual poem, but that this has happened in time, was and is ingredient in the world of events, and here is its true and abiding significance. The Jesus of time is the Christ of eternity : the historical is the omni-present.

This was not really a new technique but is common to New Testament writers, e.g. Ep. to Hebrews, Galatians, Stephen's speech in Acts where Christ is not mentioned by name, Paul in Galatians..... It is fair to say that the early commentators expounded the Scriptures typologically : their main error was that the idea of scientific and objective accuracy was wholly

lacking, not appearing for centuries later; consequently the exegesis and allusions are often wrong, fanciful and grotesque.

But the technique is an historical fact and we are to examine its results and interpretations. Whether we are studying the extremes of Alexandria, or the caution of Antioch, we see that the difference between orthodox and heterodox comment is one not of technique but of preconceptions.

PART A.

To set the Fourth Gospel in its historical context. Page 8

The Fourth Gospel and other writings ascribed to John. Page 14

The Fourth Gospel and the Apostolic Fathers. Page 18

The Fourth Gospel and the Apologists. Page 21

The Author, and the date and place of composition of the Fourth Gospel. Page 26

TO SET THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN ITS HISTORICAL CONTEXT.

Every age has given its own interpretation and restatement of the teaching of the New Testament. In the course of years, Christian doctrine has undergone continual change and development, but yet Christian theologians have generally considered their task to be the preservation and propagation of a faith once delivered, which faith is to be found in Holy Scripture. Scripture has always been a regulative principle, but it had to be understood and interpreted in and for very different ages.

There are three main views about the interpretation of the New Testament, though there is much shading off between one view and another. The first is that Christianity has suffered a continuous degeneration, and has lost the primitive purity of the Gospel of the Master. Extreme critics say that the process began with St. Paul. This view is fairly widespread among otherwise educated laity, and was seen at its clearest and strongest in Harnack.

The other view is that the New Testament, and also Christianity itself, have grown up from one premise after another like deductions in mathematics, and is capable of indefinite and valid elaborations. This position is seen at its best in Roman Catholicism.

The third view allows for both revelation and development, and was the view of all commentators examined in this thesis, as it was of the writer of the Fourth Gospel before them. The Christian religion must always remain the same, for it is the human response to God's saving work. But the formulation of it

will be ever changing, and one could only wish that the man in the street was as alive to this as is the man in the study. Without this development, theology becomes irrelevant and unintelligible, but the development applies to the form or expression only, the truth the form expresses remains constant. Further, every form is half-revealing and half-concealing, couched in the terminology of a particular epoch, or even personality.

Another motive producing change has been the necessity of combating novel doctrines of heretics. It is important to realise that most heretics went wrong in their zeal to win the outsider by stretching the Revelation given too far, in an effort to embrace an alien thought form. This is seen so clearly in the Gnostics who believed themselves orthodox and actually used the Fourth Gospel to substantiate their position, but yet when you read their works you can see so clearly that what they were presenting was something wholly alien to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The true answer to heresy was the one the author of the Fourth Gospel gave - a clearer insight into the Gospel of Christ than had been given and one which answered the needs of its day by embracing its errors and giving a truer synthesis than had already been given. To give an example (outside the New Testament) of a true coping with error :- An objection to the Nicene Creed was that it introduced the novel and unscriptural word *ὁμοούσιος*, but the answer was that this word really safeguarded the eternal truth found in scripture, the truth of which both sides alike were anxious to preserve. It is also a matter of interest that St. Thomas Aquinas makes the same

justification of the unscriptural word "person" in the doctrine of the Trinity :- 10

Summa Theol 1, q. XXIX, a, 111 ad primum : ad inveniendum autem nova nomina antiquam fidem de Deo significantia, coegit necessitas disputandi cum haereticis. nec haec novitas vitanda est, cum non sit profana, utpote a Scripturarum sensu non discordans.

It may well be that it was precisely the cause of these two factors that gave us the Johannine interpretation of the *κῆρυγμα*.

What the author of the Fourth Gospel did for his day was what Athanasius did in his day in different circumstances and what Aquinas did in his day, and what nobody has done in our own day, (save the single exception of F.R. Tennant, now outmoded in some respects), and that is to re-present and re-interpret the meaning of Christ in the thought forms of the day, and in answer to the spiritual needs of the human souls living at the time. The increasing gulf between the educated man of today, particularly the man of science, and the thought forms of the Church is disastrous, and makes Christianity unintelligible and irrelevant, presented all too often in a way which may be valid for the man of Christian experience, but meaningless for the man without that experience. And it is precisely in this way that the author of the Fourth Gospel set about his task.

It is by no means a "chose jugée" that the Fourth Gospel is late or even that it hailed from Asia Minor. (It is strange, but everything of unknown origin in the New Testament gets ascribed to Ephesus!). Gardner-Smith maintains in his book, "St. John and the Synoptic Gospels", that a Gospel is not a mere

presentation of the facts but an interpretation, and that an interpretation produced in Alexandria would be very different from that produced in Antioch or Rome. "Among believers well versed in the philosophical ideas of the age there would inevitably be an attempt to relate the essentials of the Gospel preaching to current philosophy, and the 'simple Gospel' would be rapidly absorbed in some inclusive gnosis. The development of theology would react upon the development of tradition, and before long the stories about Jesus told in some great centre of culture would differ considerably from the stories related in a Syrian village." p. 94. He believes that the Fourth Gospel gives an account of Christ's mission that would appeal to the *πνευματικοί* of his age, an amalgam of history and philosophy with the latter predominating. He suggests that John and Mark are contemporaries, and John may be a survival of a type of first century Christianity which owed nothing to synoptic developments and which originated in a quite different intellectual atmosphere.

Bernard shows (Xciv) that at some points the Fourth Gospel produces a tradition more primitive than that of the Synoptists. John's word for Christ's followers is *μαθηταί*, which goes right back to the earliest period, and never *ἀποστόλοι*. In the early part of the Gospel, by his disciples Christ is called "Rabbi", (which John at once translates for his readers), but by others is called *κύριε*, (Samaritan Woman, sick man at Bethesda, the Blind Man, and Mary and Martha). Later, the disciples call Him *ὁ κύριος*, or Maran. This process cannot be traced in the synoptists, and in this regard a more primitive historical

tradition is preserved in the Fourth Gospel. His allusions to the Baptism go back to a more authenticated tradition - for example, the dove was seen (*θεαθεῖν*), the sign for which John had been looking (Bernard ad. loc.). He says nothing of the heavens being opened, or the Voice, but wrote that the Spirit remained (*ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν*). A further instance can be given in the storm on the lake. John 6¹⁶⁻²¹. It is commonly said that John enhances the miraculous, but yet here there is no miracle at all, while Mark and Matthew both make it miraculous. There is no stilling of the storm, no *παύσις*, nor is it recorded as a sign. Further, John gives clearer testimony to what must have been an undoubted fact, that Christ had disciples in Jerusalem. There is here evidence for an important consideration, that in many respects the Fourth Gospel is more primitive than we have been led to believe. The tradition that this Gospel was that of an eye-witness, the only Gospel about which such a claim could be made, even if rejected, bears testimony to the fact that it has been considered primary and primitive. Renan came to the same conclusion, though by a different route.

J.N. Sanders in his "Fourth Gospel in the Early Church" C.U.P. 1939, maintains a similar position. After all, there are only two rivals in the field, Mark and John, and not four as we tend to imagine.

In short, there are stages of development in interpretation, and it is wrong to assume that the Fourth Gospel marks the first stage. It is an early stage of a continuous process. We need the creative genius of another John to interpret Christ to and for this generation, as John did for his own.

Before we can examine the interpretations of the great commentators in Section B, let us therefore examine the "Sitz in Leben" of the fourth Gospel, and from that vantage point we may form a sounder judgment of their exegesis.

First it is necessary to discuss the relationship between the supposed "Johannine" writings of the New Testament, and consider whether the Gospel, Epistles and Apocalypse are the works of one man (or school), or whether they are independent.

As to the relationship between the Gospel and the Apocalypse, Charles appears to furnish decisive evidence against their being works by the same author, or even of the same school. The vocabularies are different and so is the structure of the language. Although the word *Λόγος* is common to them, in Revelations 19¹³ it is not the Christ of the Fourth Gospel, but is rather the warrior of Wisdom 18¹⁵ f. Shailer Mathews says that on the question of authorship scholars have reached on "impasse", although the most recent work ascribes the Gospel and the Apocalypse to the same author, (Austin Farrer, "A Rebirth of Images" Dacre 1949.)

What then about the relation of the Gospel and the Epistles?

Tradition has ascribed the Gospel as written by John the son of Zebedee at Ephesus. Irenaeus is the first to state this (adv. Haer. II. p. 6. Harvey) :-

ἔπειτα, (i.e. after the Synoptists), Ἰωάννης ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ Κυρίου, ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ βῆθος αὐτοῦ ἀναπεσών, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξέδωκε τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας δικτρίδων.

He is the first to mention Ephesus as the place of composition. He also mentions (as a boy), having heard Polycarp (Eus.H.E. V 20) who had spoken of his acquaintance with John and others who had see the Lord. Irenaeus therefore identified John as the

Apostle and author of the Fourth Gospel, but it is by no means sure that this is a correct identification. There is evidence from Ignatius and Papias which suggests that John never was in Asia, that there was another John known to Polycarp, and that Irenaeus, anxious to assert the apostolic authorship, confused two distinct persons named John.

There is the evidence of Ignatius. Two of his letters are addressed to Rome and to Ephesus. In the former he mentions expressly the relation to Peter and Paul, and in the latter refers to their special claim to apostolic foundation on the grounds of being "associates in the mysteries with Paul" and saying nothing of John.

The evidence from Papias is more substantial. Irenaeus refers to him as "a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp" (adv. Haer. vol. II. p. 418), though according to Eusebius he reported only at second-hand. (H.E. III. 39). Papias' own words are (Preface to Oracles of the Lord) :-

εἰ δέ που καὶ παρακολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι,
 τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους· τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος
 εἶπεν ἢ τί Φίλιππος ἢ τί Θωμᾶς ἢ Ἰάκωβος ἢ τί Ἰωάννης ἢ
 Μαρθῆς ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν, ἃ τε Ἀριστὸν
 καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί,
λέγουσιν.

Papias distinguishes here between an apostle who is dead, (cf. the aorist εἶπεν), and an elder who is living, (cf. present λέγουσιν), and quite possibly, if the evidence is good enough, the John whom Papias heard was John the Elder, living in Asia.

Tradition has not been unanimous here, for Ephrem Syrus records a tradition that John wrote the Gospel at Antioch where

he lived until the time of Trajan, and if that tradition could live to the fourth century, when it was generally accepted that John did live in Asia, it shows that external evidence is not conclusive at all.

Further, there is the hesitation of Rome and the rejection of the Fourth Gospel by many individuals. Streeter delightfully says, (Four Gospels p. 437), on the matter of Hippolytus' (Rome 190 - 235 AD) "Defence of the Gospel and Apocalypse of John", that "No one defends what nobody attacks" and gives evidence of its attack from within the Church, by for example Gaius and others.

All this sort of evidence is marshalled in any standard work, (e.g. Bernard and Streeter), and it is not the purpose of this thesis to make such an enquiry, but it seems a reasonable position to take that there was an Elder in Asia identified with the son of Zebedee.

This John the Elder may well have written the Epistles, for in II and III John the author refers to himself as John Elder (ὁ πρεσβύτερος^{2,3}). Moreover, Polycarp makes a clear allusion to 1 John 4^{2,3} and II John 7. Eusebius (H.E. III. 39) says that Papias quoted from 1 John.

Let us turn to the internal evidence. It has been generally held that the Gospel and Epistles have such affinity that they are by the same author, but Professor Dodd in his Johannine Epistles (Moffat 1946) marshalls some disturbing evidence (ppxlx - lvi) that cannot be explained on this theory, and suggests that John the Elder wrote these three epistles (lxvi)

The main points he makes are :-

1. The difference of style, idiom and grammar.

2. Differences in content :-

(a) Old Testament - the Fourth Gospel has an extensive Old Testament background, (Abrahams says it is the most Jewish of the Gospels), and is a re-interpretation of it, as the early commentators saw, but there is no such stamp in the Epistles.

3. The hellenistic element is fused into and re-interpreted by a judaic mould in the Gospel, but allowed a freer play in the Epistles, the writer of which equates the Deity with an abstract idea (1 John 4⁸), an activity of mind wholly foreign to a Jew.

4. The Epistles appear more primitive than the Gospel e.g. The Second Advent, the doctrine of Christ's redemption, the doctrine of the Spirit.

The Epistles represent a stage not earlier in time but less discerning and mature in its handling than was the Fourth Gospel in the same situation. The Epistles and the Gospel are part of a common theology, as was Ignatius and Justin. It cannot be assumed that they were by the same man. It seems reasonable to see the Epistles as the work of the Asian John, in which case, the greatest light on the place of composition of the Gospel will derive (a) from internal evidence

(b) the external evidence of its reception and use.

Before examining the writers who show knowledge of the Fourth Gospel, it must be remembered that a similarity of outlook does not necessarily prove a knowledge of the Gospel.

Ignatius

There is here no certainty that Ignatius knew the Fourth Gospel. When you read his epistles you notice a general theological affinity, and feel a similarity of outlook. Ignatius believes in the eternal Father who reveals Himself in the Son, who is truly God, born of the virgin and suffered crucifixion. He rose and appeared to His disciples. Throughout His life He was obedient to the Father. Through Him men obtain salvation which is mediated through Baptism and the Eucharist. This is Johannine, but there are important differences, e.g. his treatment of the Holy Spirit. Even Bernard cannot declare "any conscious literary obligation to the Fourth Gospel" Op. cit p. Lxxi Inge in his chapter on Ignatius, seems to leave it an open question, and Sanders comes to the conclusion that one cannot declare "with any certainty that Ignatius knew our Fourth Gospel" (Op. cit pl4). Freiherr von der Goltz concludes that though Ignatius was influenced by Johannine thought, (quoted Drummond p. 258), he was unacquainted with the Gospel. Admittedly, though some scholars incline to the view that Ignatius may have been acquainted with the Fourth Gospel (or a summary of it), it would seem a sounder conclusion to see the influence of Johannine thinking but to be open on the matter of literary dependence. In a long passage in Hoskyns (Vol. I. 110-118) in which he gives a sensitive and penetrating estimation of Ignatius, the author maintains that the Ignatian and the Johannine writings are "evoked by a similar if

not identical situation" but at no point does Ignatius quote the Johannine writings or show any awareness of their existence.

Lightfoot in his "Apostolic Fathers" has all the literature relevant, and in Bernard there is a long list of references which show the similarities (Op. cit. lxxi), and in Sanders a shorter list (Op. cit. 12-14) of selected passages.

Polycarp (70-155/6) contains one passage (Philippians 7. 1)

πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἀν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστός ἐστιν

which sounds like a quotation from 1 John 4^{2,3} :-

πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα
ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστίν, καὶ πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν
ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστίν· καὶ τοῦτο ἐστίν τὸ πᾶν ἀντιχρίστου

But there are no allusions to the Gospel, though similarities exist in John 15¹⁶ with 9.12, and v.2 with John 5²¹, and John 6⁴⁴.

Barnabas, the date of whose epistle is uncertain, may have used the Fourth Gospel or vice versa. He may have used traditional sayings which were used by John, or they may both have shared the same environment. There is in both of them an interest in the Old Testament and a hostility towards the Jews, and both may well have been written where there was a powerful and hostile Jewish community, Alexandria for instance. In xii. 7. the Brazen Serpent is used as a type of Christ (John 3¹⁴) and Sanders considers this exegesis uncommon in early Christian literature. There may be a connection we cannot yet explain.

Hermas

Hermas illuminates the Fourth Gospel not by similarity but rather by contrast. In reading Hermas, written in a time of theological outlook similar to the Fourth Gospel, you get a clearer vision of the immense difficulty of the task which

confronted John, and a deeper estimate of the genius of his achievement. There is between Hermas and John a certain agreement in phraseology and to a lesser extent in thought, but Hermas serves to set John more clearly. In, for instance, Sim. VI. 4, 5, you have an account of the Shepherd's Christology, and it is common knowledge how muddled and confused it is. Had Hermas read the Fourth Gospel he could never have been so confused but what may be more important to see, is that both writers are engaged in presenting Christianity in an understandable form to their contemporaries and to turn from the Shepherd to John is to breathe again in God's air. Few factors contribute more to an appreciation of the Fourth Gospel than a study of the hellenistic background.

He speaks (Sim. IX. 12. 5) of baptism as a condition of entrance into the Kingdom of God which recalls John 3⁸. He refers to Christ as the Gate (ἡ πύλη Sim. IX. 12) which recalls John 10⁹. He speaks of the Law (τὸν νόμον) which Christ received from the Father (Sim. V. 6. 3.) There is no proof of his acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel. Further, he is unscriptural.

The Epistle to Diognetus

Except because of his ascription as "a disciple of the apostles" Diognetus should be set with the Apologists. The date and origin of the Epistle are uncertain, but Lightfoot places it circ. 150 A.D. with the last two chapters written in Alexandria. It is one of the earliest attempts of a Christian writer to address a wider public. There are resemblances as there are differences between this Epistle and the Fourth Gospel, and more it is impossible to say, but the Epistle shows the existence of a type of theology akin to the Fourth Gospel and to 1 John. It is interesting that Lightfoot ascribes chaps. XI, XII to Pantaenus.

The interpretation of the Christian gospel as presented by the Apologists suggests, even after allowing for their method and environment, that their teaching is in origin independent of the Fourth Gospel.

With the Apologists, (a few earlier Gnostics excepted), there are the first indisputable traces of the use of the Fourth Gospel.

First, the word Λόγος is frequent, but it is used differently by John. This may suggest that there was already an independent philosophical religious speculation and a mystical theosophy in existence, and that John gathered these up. The fact that the Apologists introduce the word without explanation, and this for pagan readers who would not know the Fourth Gospel, lends support to this position. The Apologists were writing for cultivated and intelligent pagans, and expressed themselves often in a very conciliatory manner, whilst John was not writing primarily for them at all; but when all allowances are made, it is difficult to say that their type of Logos theory originated in the Fourth Gospel. Further, the later Apologists show a greater and growing appreciation of the apologetic value of the Gospel, and this is significant.

In the second century Christianity was disliked because it was a novelty. Paganism was declining and men were looking rather more to its past than formerly. The Apologists met this intellectual climate by the bold step of declaring that Christianity was as old as the creation. To them the Church was the true Israel of the prophets. As Philo had done, they

maintained that the lawgivers, prophets and philosophers of Greece had borrowed from the books of the Old Testament. This claim the pagans admitted, rather surprisingly, e.g. the Pythagorean Mumenius said, *Τί γὰρ ἐστὶ Πλάτων ἢ Μωυσῆς ἀπικίζων*; In such a situation the Logos doctrine filled an indispensable role. The operation of the Logos had inspired pagans and prophets alike. Justin actually said that all who lived according to reason were Christians even if they thought themselves atheists, instancing Socrates and Abraham together (Ap. Xlvi. 1-3).

Everything good in pagan literature or philosophy was "Christian"

- *ὅσα οὖν παρὰ πᾶσι καλῶς εἴρηται ἡμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐστὶ*.

This bears some resemblance to John 1⁹ but John writes of religious enlightenment while Justin's terms of reference are very wide. Had he known John 1⁹ he would have quoted it.

In their doctrine of God the Logos is almost a necessity, for he bridges the gap between the idea of a God who is an Eternal Being and a universe he willed to create. This was one of the difficult transitions for men brought up in the current philosophical thought. The Logos was an attribute of God hypostasised into a "second God", *δεύτερος θεός*, as Justin actually calls him. As this term was introduced without explanation it must have been familiar already and not borrowed from the Fourth Gospel. Further, in the latter it is religious and not philosophical. In, for instance, Clement and Origen, who shared the apologists doctrine of God, you find an immediately different atmosphere. There is the reverence for the Fourth Gospel as Scripture, which the Apologists did not share, with an emphasis not on cosmology but on soteriology. Heracleon too is condemned here. There is, however, a change of emphasis in

the later Apologists, for one can discern a sense in which Theophilus is much nearer the Fourth Gospel.

Further, the Apologists have no clear idea of the Spirit, whom they identify with the Logos, and this is quite foreign to the Fourth Gospel's thought.

Lastly, their doctrine of salvation is one sided and intellectualist, and is in marked contrast to the mystical and sacramental doctrine of this subject in the Fourth Gospel. The Apologists give Christ as a teacher whose words bring salvation and this is not Johannine.

It would seem that in examining the Gospel as given by the Apologists their teaching is in origin independent of the Fourth Gospel.

To say a little more of them in particular :-
 Justin^{shows}/traces of the influence of the Fourth Gospel, but they may be reminiscences, and few passages, if any, can be certainly said to be independent on it. Justin's writings illustrate the first tentative use of the Fourth Gospel by an orthodox writer, and this very tentativeness makes it difficult to believe that Justin regarded the Fourth Gospel either as Scripture or as the work of an apostle.

His work against Marcion is lost unfortunately, and we cannot therefore know his idea of the New Testament. Canon. Justin would no doubt consider Marcion's list as defective, but in what way we cannot now tell.

His theology shows only a family likeness and in the matter of the Logos and the Spirit are different. Justin and the Fourth Gospel represent independent developments of a common type of theology, and the influence of the Fourth Gospel is

confined to details. Scholars have come to different conclusions, but it is hard to explain why he did not quote the Fourth Gospel in most obvious places and also why his theology is so much less mature and balanced than John's. Even Streeter is less certain than he says he is, for he drops a remark that Justin was working out his apologetic in deference to critical objections without reference to the Fourth Gospel. (Op. cit. 441).

In Tatian there are still clearer references. In fact, Tatian uses the Fourth Gospel not from which to quote but for his theology. His is the beginning of orthodox interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. But the real importance of Tatian is that though he was more a pupil of Justin in his thinking than a student of the Fourth Gospel, he did in his Diatessaron (A.D. 160) place the Fourth Gospel on equality with the other three. At the least, there was a sense in which the Fourth Gospel was canonical, or at any rate of canonical significance.

He did not fully assimilate the teaching of the Fourth Gospel, however. Spirit to him bears the meaning attached to it in the popular philosophy of the day, and his terminology is of the type of Justin's philosophical speculation independent of the Fourth Gospel, and Tatian did not seem to manage their reconciliation.

Athenagoras may have known the Fourth Gospel but in his quotations he seemed to desire not to quote it openly. In one case he quotes Prov. 8²² when John 1¹ was his obvious text. Whether this was because of the Alogi we cannot tell, but it is a fair comment to make that he was not in a position to quote the Fourth Gospel as Scripture

Theophilus

Theophilus is the first writer to ascribe the Fourth Gospel to "John", referring to him as one of the "inspired men" in quite a casual manner and not to him as an apostle :-

see Footnote below. (Ad. Autol II. xxlr) He quotes the Fourth Gospel here unmistakably, but in this case too, where one could expect him to quote, he often fails to do so. He also confuses Logos and Spirit which would indicate that he had not grasped the teaching of the Fourth Gospel on this point. Also, in support of his doctrine of the creation of the universe through the Logos (ad Autol. I. VII) he omits any mention of the Fourth Gospel, which indicates that his thought is not decisively influenced by its teaching.

Footnote:

ὁ θεὸς διδάσκουσιν ἡμῶς αἱ ἅγαι γραφαί, καὶ πάντες
οἱ πνευματοφόροι, ἐξ ὧν Ἰωάννης λέγει. Ἐν
ἀρχῇ ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ᾧν πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

Heracleon, whose work is the first to be examined in this thesis, proves at least that this work was valued in Gnostic circles as early as 160 AD. Possibly, the Gnostics were the first to value it, which would account for the disfavour the Fourth Gospel at first experienced in orthodox circles. The Alogi rejected both the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse.

These latter ascribed both works to Cerinthus. Irenaeus (adv. haer. III. xl. 9 ; vol. II. p. 51) refers to people who reject the Fourth Gospel as lending support to Montanism. The opposition seemed to centre in Rome where valentinus, Ptolemaeus and Heracleon had visited, and where also Justin and Athenagoras had connections, both of whom quote from the Fourth Gospel with reserve and never mention it by name. This is given further support by the way the Muratorian Canon strains to establish the legitimacy of the Fourth Gospel. This opposition came not from heresy but from orthodoxy, as Streeter emphasises (p. 440).

Further, there is the evidence of the two papyri, Rylands 457, and Egerton 2.

How can this evidence be best explained?

If the Gospel is ascribed to John the Son of Zebedee, the history of its reception by the Church is unintelligible : it would not have had to wait until the end of the second century to achieve recognition or to be quoted other than anonymously. The tradition that the Gospel was written by John the son of Zebedee in Ephesus is quite probable, and possibly because it supported the Ephesians in the Quartodeciman controversy. This could have happened quite easily for there is considerable likeness to the

Epistles which are by "John" and the identification of the two Johns could give the tradition. There is no evidence to compel ascription of the Gospel to Ephesus.

Indeed, it is to Alexandria that most of the evidence points.

(a) The Rylands & Egerton Papyri.

These establish the fact that the Gospel was to be found in Egypt before 150 A.D. This is the first evidence of the Gospel's existence.

(b) The evidence of the use which the Alexandrian Gnostics made of the Fourth Gospel. It is quite certain, at least, that Ptolemaeus used it, and that Heracleon actually wrote a commentary on it. This means that the Fourth Gospel was known and valued in Alexandria at a time when there is no evidence that any other church accepted it.

(c) The internal evidence points to the same conclusion. Here was the home of Philo and the authors of the Corpus Hermeticum. The Logos doctrine may have originated in several places at the same time, but the specific doctrine of the Logos in the Fourth Gospel combines the mystical, cosmological and soteriological emphases.

It should be noted that Wendt, (St. John's Gospel 1902), comes to the same conclusion after his examination of the internal evidence declaring that the author must have been a Hellenistic Jew of Alexandria, though he allows for the possibility of his moving to Asia Minor. Harnack actually says, (acc. to Wendt), "it is absolutely unknown to us that in the year 100 any other than an Alexandrian philosopher could have written the Prologue".

Wendt goes on to say that the Philmic speculation had no influence on the Gospel after the Prologue, and accounts for this as the author's effort to associate himself with it in order to set it right : it was made flesh, was the perfect response and the perfect interpretation.

In Paul's day there was a school of Alexandrines following Apollos who was a learned Alexandrian Jew converted to Christianity. Those who had not known the historic Jesus would be almost certain to make a synthetic faith of Christianity and Alexandrine speculation.

The dangers were and are obvious. Simple practical Christianity could be submerged and docetism strengthened, as the author of 1 John attempted to correct.

(d) The polemic of the Gospel is directed against Docetic Christianity and also Judaizing tendencies. It is noteworthy that the only other book in the New Testament for which an Alexandrian origin has been suggested is Hebrews, which also combats both tendencies. And further, the prominence of this Epistle in the various commentators may prove a point of the greatest weight. The way the commentators appeal for justification and enlightenment to Hebrews has been one of the most fascinating facts of these present studies, and it cannot be denied that both Hebrews and the Fourth Gospel gave the setting of the *εὐαγγέλιον* in its true historical setting of the Old Testament revelation. Other conclusions may readily be drawn from this, but they would tend to take us beyond the present confines of our quest

(e) The reluctance of the Church to accept the Fourth Gospel

29
can be readily explained if the Gospel originated in Alexandria a. Bauer believed that the early Christians of Alexandria did not come up to later standards of orthodoxy and believed there was a deliberate suppression of evidence. When all is said, we forget that orthodoxy was the innovation in Alexandria. A Gospel seized on by the Gnostics would be opposed by the conservatives : it was when orthodoxy truly saw that the Gnostics had both the *κρύπματα* all wrong and the Fourth Gospel as well, that the Fourth Gospel gained its real and abiding place. The Fourth Gospel itself proved the best weapon against Gnosticism, which weapon the Gnostics first thought was their own. From Clement on there is a development towards orthodoxy in Alexandria, culminating in Cyril and Athanasius, a development which seems to be largely due to an increasing use and insight into the Fourth Gospel. This process really began earlier than Clement, (but which cannot be traced because of the lack of literature), and was possibly started by, as it was controlled by, the Fourth Gospel. The Gnostics never really understood the Fourth Gospel, but used it to support opinions they had already worked out on other premises. That is why when you read them you sense that they are without the *κρύπματα*, while Origen is within.

In addition, there is the state of affairs in Alexandria. There is no evidence of early orthodox Christianity in Alexandria, the first we have is Pantaenus. All we know before him and Bishop Demetrius is of heretical characters.

E.G. The Epistle to Barnabas has an unorthodox view of the Old Testament. There are two heretical Gospels "The Egyptians" and "The Hebrews" which are early and not late, and which were quite probably the accepted Gospels in Alexandria. There are

the Gnostics, and it must be remembered that Valentinus was accepted as orthodox in Alexandria. There are moral eccentricities (Apol. xxix. 2. p. 45), to which also the letter of Hadrian testifies, (In Flavius Vopiscus, Vitas Saturnini Ch. 8), together with Alexandria's remarkable syncretising tendencies. If the letter is a forgery it still shows the reputation of the city equally well.

If the Gospel was written in Alexandria it is natural that it was resisted, though eventually by the instrumentality of Irenaeus, it became the "regula veritatis".

Who then wrote the Gospel? It is unlikely that a Galileean fisherman would be known to the High Priest. That the beloved disciple remained by the cross is not the synoptic account, for all the disciples forsook him and fled. The disciples in the Fourth Gospel are a Galileean group, and are only twice mentioned, in 6^{67,70} and 20²⁴, and it is quite certain that there were Jerusalem disciples e.g. Nicodemus and Joseph. In John 21², for instance, the Galileean disciples are grouped together and the writer adds "and two other of his disciples." καὶ ἄλλοι ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο. A Curious way of describing the party. John 21²⁴ can be understood to mean that the author was a Jerusalem disciple perhaps an Alexandrian Jew studying in Jerusalem, (as Paul did), and who was won over to Jesus. (R. Eisler in "The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel", Methuen 1938, hankers after a similar idea, but makes some highly imaginative postulates, though does see the author as a Jerusalem disciple and the son of Annas ben Sethi High Priest A.D. 6-15.) The author may have been an Alexandrian Christian, Jewish by birth who draw up the very

diverse incidents which make up the Fourth Gospel, which incidents he had as first hand traditions from a Jerusalem disciple, or even all of which he experienced at first hand.

The Gospel may first have been ascribed to John the son of Zebedee in Alexandria by the Gnostics, but what really determined the Gospel as the work of John the Apostle by the Catholic Church was the value the Gospel had in the decisive defeat of Gnosticism.

The Fourth Gospel may be much earlier than is generally assumed and may have been contemporary with, but independent of Mark. Its historical value has slowly but certainly received increasing recognition by modern scholars.

It would seem a fair hypothesis, and possibly the least unsatisfactory, to consider the Fourth Gospel as written in Alexandria by a man who appreciated fully not only the genuine Christian tradition of Christ's nature and mission and the need for its preservation but also the problems which the Gnostics felt needed solving, and he wrote his Gospel in order to point the true Christian solution to these problems but using Gnostic terminology in a thorough going attempt to present an ancient variety of Christianity in terms of the best scientific knowledge, for such in its day was Gnosticism. The author was so successful in this that for a time the Gnostics were taken in by it, until such men as Irenaeus, Clement and Origen proved their mistake to them.

It is striking throughout the examinations of all the early commentaries on the Fourth Gospel how ready Heracleon and Origen and Cyril perceived the meaning of the writer of the Fourth Gospel, and how slow even a scholar of ~~the~~ Chrysostom's

standing was to get inside the Fourth Gospel. Indeed he never did. It is true that Augustine did, (and without the wordy rhetoric of the East) but, of course, Augustine is "sui generis".

32

With that we have reached the point at which we must examine the commentaries of these men before we make any more judgments or conclusion, and so we turn to part B.

PART B.

Heracleon Page 35

Origen Page 60

Cyril of Alexandria Page 170

Chrysostom Page 288

Augustine Page 381

HERACLEON

Introductory note Page 35

Historical sketch of Gnosticism Page 35

Valentinianism Page 36

The Evidence - an examination
of the relevant
extant text. Page 38

Conclusions

(a) Heracleon as an interpreter. Page 50

(b) Heracleon's interpretation. Page 52

Heracleon, an Alexandrian by birth, and a Valentinian by faith wrote a commentary on the Fourth Gospel in the second half of the second century. He brought to the Gospel Gnostic preconceptions, and one can see him struggle with these seeking to justify them by the Fourth Gospel, and also at the same time, how his interest in the Fourth Gospel went a long way to simplify the mythological jungle of Gnosticism.

There are over forty fragments of Heracleon's commentary extant, preserved in Origen's commentary on John along with Origen's remarks upon them, some of which are favourable. One has to remember that they are only a chance selection, (and chosen, too, by an able opponent), but their evidence is cumulative. Further, for the examination under question there is a great deal of evidence in the exposition of Christ's meeting with the Samaritan Woman (4⁵ ff); a little on the healing of the nobleman's son (4⁴³ ff); and some illuminating comments "passim": altogether, enough evidence to make a reserved judgement.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF GNOSTICISM

There are two main types of Gnosticism, Asiatic and Egyptian. The former is fundamentally the product of Oriental-Hellenistic syncretism with a Christian colouring, while the latter represents a relentless transposition of the Christian *κῆρυγμα* into the ideology of the current religious speculation: the former tends to neglect the Fourth Gospel, the latter to make use of it. The Fourth Gospel itself presents the *κῆρυγμα* in the language of

current religious speculation, and, though it ultimately demolished the Gnostics in the hands of Irenaeus, Clement and Origen, yet the Gnostics were anxious to have its support and even attempted to build up a 'religious philosophy' on an exegesis of the Prologue which was dualistic and docetic.

36

The leading ideas on which all Gnostic systems are ultimately based appear to be pre-Christian. After the rise of Christianity some Gnostics adopted certain Christian ideas (the Asiatic Gnostics); while some Christians adopted Gnostic terminology (as the author of the Fourth Gospel), and others Gnostic ideology. Of these the former remained Christian, while the latter became Gnostics. The leading Gnostic ideas seem, (although Gwatkin gives the Gnostics a heavy criticism and finds it impossible to be precise about their ideas), to be these:-

- (a) A conception of God as Ultimate Reality, ineffable, absolute, transcendent, impassible.
- (b) The dualism of God and matter.
- (c) The inherent evil of matter.
- (d) God not the Creator : a multiplicity of divine powers in a degrading hierarchy.
- (e) The soul was pre-existent, and is now entombed in the body.
- (f) Salvation is a return of the divine soul, and an expiation of the 'misfortune' of creation. This salvation is achieved through $\gamma\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ imparted by a divine being, who descends to earth and reveals the saving truth. This divine being is Christ, but it is a Christ different from the Christ of the Gospels. He had no real body of flesh; he was a phantom; he was neither crucified nor did he rise from the dead.

VALENTINIANISM

This system of Gnosticism, based on Christian ideas and using the Fourth Gospel to a far greater extent than Basilides,

represents an attempt to commend Christianity to the syncretistic Alexandrians. Its popularity and influence, (witnessed to by the energy shown by the Catholic Fathers in refuting it), shows that it was the first system which had any real success in mediating between Christianity and paganism. It should be remembered that Valentinus' Christian origin, and his orthodoxy (in Alexandria) are unquestionable. It was only in Rome that his orthodoxy was challenged : Tertullian (adv. Vol. 1V) actually says that his secession from the Catholic church was due to his disappointment in not being elected a bishop. Further, the later Valentinians made increasing use of the Fourth Gospel, trying by this means to vindicate their own systems as having Apostolic authority.

This claim was disputed by the Catholics, Irenaeus in particular, (but for the purpose of this paper the claim is significant). More far-sighted than the conservative "Alogi", Irenaeus saw that the Fourth Gospel was the perfect weapon against the Gnostics. But, it could only be so used because it represented a true, and Gnosticism a false restatement of the $\kappa\acute{\eta}\rho\upsilon\gamma\mu\alpha$ in the terminology and the ideology of Hellenistic religious speculation.

The notable features of this elaborate Gnostic system are these :- (see essay appended Foakes-Jackson History of Christian Church A.D. 461. p 595 6th edition.)

- "(1) Its eclectic character : Valentinus borrows from Plato the idea of higher existences in the celestial world having their counterparts in the visible universe; from Indian pantheism, the doctrine that material existence is due to the degradation of something more noble; from Judaism, the declaration that creation is due to the working of God's Wisdom.

- (2) The peculiar importance given to the work of Horus or Stauros, as a negative and positive agency. As Horus, he defines the limits of existence : as Stauros he separates and destroys.
- (3) The redemptive work of Christ is regarded as a grand historical fact, though Valentinus explains it his own way".

38

THE EVIDENCE

The following instances are selected from the extant fragments as showing Heracleon's exposition of the text. There are other comments, and some of great interest, but not for the particular purpose of this paper.

Fragment 1 consists of Heracleon's comment on John 1³ :-

πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο , καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο

οὐδὲ ἓν . He glosses πάντα by ὁ κόσμος καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ

meaning by κόσμος the world of matter. He adds οὐ τὸν αἰῶνα

ἢ τὰ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι γεγονέναι διὰ τοῦ λόγου .

By αἰῶν he means the world of suprasensible reality (πλήρωμα).

Origen remarks πρὸ τοῦ λόγου γεγονέναι .

Heracleon, therefore seems to understand the λόγος not ὁ ἄνω

λόγος the offspring of Νοῦς , but the lower, the ἡσούς ,

differing here from Ptolemaeus and showing thereby a much greater

respect for the natural sense of scripture. It is here worth a

comment showing Heracleon's attention to minutiae:-

οὐ τὸν ἄφ' οὗ ἡ ὕφ' οὗ , ἀλλὰ τὸν δι' οὗ

Fragment 11 - John 1⁴

Heracleon expounds to mean that men were created by the

Demiurge, and that a select number who became the πνευματικοὶ

received in addition the light which the Λόγος bestowed and

which made them 'of the same substance' with Him.

there is an interesting argument between heracleon's comment and Origen's comment upon it, on the status of John Baptist and the prophets, Origen showing a greater respect for the Old Dispensation. Heracleon sees ^{the} significance in 'priests and levites' being sent to enquire of John - this is an instance where the commentator may be expressing the intention of the author of the Fourth Gospel.

With Fragment 11 opens a series of comments on Chapter II

beginning with verse 12 κατέβη εἰς Καφαρναούμ, in which Jesus' movements are interpreted allegorically as giving a brief resumé of the process of salvation. κατέβη εἰς

Καφαρναούμ is understood as the descent of the Saviour into the material world:- ταῦτα τὰ ὑλικά εἰς ᾧ κατήλθε.

The word κατέβη provided the clue, and corroborative evidence is provided by the fact that the author says nothing about Jesus' actions in Capernaum.

The πάσχα of verse 13 (Fragment 12) has to serve a double purpose - it is the type both of the Saviour's passion, as involving the death of the lamb, and of the repose of the saved.

In verse 13 ἑβδομάουμα signifies the ψυχικὸς τόπος into which Jesus ascended after his passion.

(Fragment 13). According to Brooke, ἑβδομάουμα signifies the Hebdomad the abode of the Demiurge, and an εἰκὼν of the Ogdoad the abode of Sophia symbolised by ἑβδομάδην.

————— In the New Testament the neut.pl. generally refers to the actual city while the fem.sing. is used in an ideal and figurative sense e.g. in ^{the} Apocalypse.

Those who sold in the Temple, (there is no mention of the buyers

in the Fourth Gospel), are the type of those who make religion a source of private gain.

Heracleon emphasises that Jesus actually made the 'whip of small cords' :- πεποιῆσθαι ἐκ σχοινίων ὑπὸ τοῦ

Ἰησοῦ , οὐχὶ παρ' ἄλλου λαβόντος . . .

This is because it represents the power and activity of the Holy Spirit. Then, says Origen, he makes an inference - that the cords were tied to a piece of wood - and finds in that the type of the cross, also made of wood. Further, Heracleon assumes that the σχοινία were made of thread, not leather, because it was not with anything dead that he cleansed the church of thieves and restored it as his Father's home.

Thus Heracleon expounds the Cleansing of the Temple as the descent of Jesus to the world, his passion, and ascension, and coming of the Holy Spirit, but after this point either Heracleon's allegory or Origen's report loses coherence and we are left with only isolated comments, e.g. :- Heracleon's treatment of 'forty six years'. Origen says that he cannot make sense of it as an historical fact, and complains that this does not bother Heracleon, who explains the significance by saying that Solomon took forty and six years to build the Temple, and that it is an image of the Saviour: he refers the six (the numerical symbol of matter) to the material form the Saviour assumed, and the forty (the Tetrads) to the principle breathed upon this material form and to the seed in it (Origen expounds the passage differently).

Frag. 17

The Samaritan Woman

The exposition is unavoidably fragmentary, but it is a

sustained and consistent allegorisation which transmutes all the things, persons, events and numbers in the narrative into types and symbols. Only Jesus seems in 'persona propria', though it is true to say that he has suffered the completest because the subtlest change of all. Origen's interpretation is typological rather than allegorical : he takes the Samaritan Woman to be the type of all heterodoxy, Jacob's well signifying the Old Testament scriptures. Heracleon finds the clue to the story in the equation of the Samaritan Woman with the *πνευματικὴ οὐσία* now found in the *κόσμος*.

Frag. 17 itself, (John 4¹³ f), explains the difference between the water of Jacob's well and that which Jesus promised to give. Unfortunately, Origen began the discussion in the lost Book 12 of his Commentary, and so we have lost the beginning of Heracleon's comments, too. But it appears that he took the water of the well to symbolise the old dispensation, which he allows to have given life of a kind - a concession many gnostics would not have made. This appears what is meant by the first quotation 'This life was feeble and temporary and deficient, and so was the glory according to it; for it was of this world', which adds Origen, he thinks to be proved by the fact that Jacob's cattle drank of it. This, says Origen, Heracleon said in order to 'disparage the ancient order' : it is of course consistent with the general Gnostic attitude to the Old Dispensation, though not extreme. Origen approves of Heracleon's comment on the water Jesus gives as , *ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ* ; and, of his explanation of John 4¹⁴ , *οὐ μὴ διψῇ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* as meaning :-

Αἰώνιος γὰρ ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ μηδέποτε φθειρομένη,
ὥς καὶ ἡ πρώτη ἡ ἐκ τοῦ φρέατος, ἀλλὰ μενουσα.
ἀναφαίρετος γὰρ ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν,
καὶ μὴ ἀναλίσκομένη μηδὲ φθειρομένη ἐν τῷ μετέχοντι αὐτῆς

Origen also approves of his comment on ἀλλομένου

as implying that those who receive this water became themselves
sources of everlasting life :-

Καὶ τοὺς μεταλαμβάνοντας τοῦ ζῶνθεν ἐπιχορηγούμενου
πλουσίως, καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκβλύσαι εἰς τὴν ἐτέρων
ζῶντιον ζωὴν τὰ ἐπικεχορηγημένα αὐτοῖς.

Then he notes that Heracleon praises her ready faith in
Jesus expressed by δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ (4)¹⁵.

In order to provide a connection between vv-15 and 16 ("go and
call thy husband and come here"), Heracleon adds "if thou wilt
receive this water". This appears to have been put in because of
his dogmatic preconceptions, according to which the Samaritan's
husband is τὸ πλῆρωμα αὐτῆς. Here πλῆρωμα
has a special sense; Heracleon shows himself to have moved away
from pure Valentinianism :- he uses ζῶν for πλῆρωμα in the
usual Valentinian sense, and now πλῆρωμα for the male ζῶν
complementary to the female; for the Samaritan woman appears to
represent Sophia, though the name is not mentioned in the
Fragments. The purpose of Jesus in calling her husband was that
they should receive the water of life which would enable her to
be re-united to her husband and so restored to the Pleroma:-

ἵνα συν ἐκείνῳ γενομένη πρὸς τὸν Σωτῆρα κομίσασθαι,
παρ' αὐτοῦ τὴν δύναμιν καὶ τὴν ἀνάκρασιν τὴν
πρὸς τὸ πλῆρωμα αὐτῆς δυναθῇ. H. 18.

Heracleon is, of course, justified in understanding the author of the Fourth Gospel to intend this episode to have a meaning other than its literal one; that he appreciates this is shown by his remark :-

οὐ γὰρ περὶ ἀνδρὸς κοσμικοῦ εἶπεν αὐτῇ
ἵνα κηδέσῃ, ἐπεὶπερ οὐκ ἠγνόει οὐκ
εἶχε νόμιμον ἄνδρα. (An important comment

for the purpose of this paper).

Heracleon has ^{υξ}εξ and not πέντε in 4¹⁷. There is no proof that this is not a genuine variant. If πέντε could be proved to have been in his text, he would be shown guilty of what heretics were often accused - of altering the text to suit their own book. Heracleon's comment is that the "six husbands" represent the world of matter with which she had committed fornication, and in which she had suffered indignity. Six always symbolises the world of matter, as seven the visible heavens, and eight the ideal heavens. Origen seizes on the inconsistency here displayed of making the πνευματικὴ οὐσία, which is 'ex hypothesi' divine and therefore sinless, commit πορνεία.

Fragment 20 expounds Jesus answer 4²¹ Πίστευέ μοι....

The ὄρος (Mt. Gerizim) signifies either the devil, or the world which is in his power. Thus the worship of Gerizim is the type of idolatry:-

~~ΕΡΑΚΛΕΩΝ~~:-

..... ἐπεὶπερ μέρος—ἐν ὃ διάβολος ὅλης
τῆς ὕλης, φησὶν, ἦν, ὃ δὲ κόσμος τὸ
σύμπαν τῆς κακίας ὅρος, ἔργμον οἰκητήριον
θηρίων, ᾧ προσεκύουν πάντες οἱ πρὸ νόμου
καὶ οἱ ἐθνικοί...

In contrast Heracleon sets the worship in the other mountain Jerusalem, which is the type of the worship of the created:-

Ὅρος μὲν ἐνόμισεν εἶναι τὴν κτίσιν ἣ οἱ ἐθνικοί
προσεκύουν. Ἱεροδόλωμα δὲ τὸν κτίστην, ᾧ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι
ἐλάτρευον

,we have already noted

signifies the ψυχικός τόπος, the seat of the 'psychic'

Δημιουργός. Both of these forms of worship, then, the one erroneous, and the other imperfect, are to be done away and replaced by the spiritual worship which Jesus introduces -

ὑμεῖς οὖν, οἰονεῖ οἱ πνευματικοί, οὔτε τῇ κτίσει,
οὔτε τῇ δημιουργῷ προσκηνήσετε, ἀλλὰ τῷ πατρὶ
τῆς ἀληθείας.

22

Fragment 21(John 4)

"Ye worship ye know not what".

Origen points out that ὑμεῖς refers to the Samaritans, while ἡμεῖς refers literally to the Jews, and ὅσον ἐπὶ τῇ ἀλληγορίᾳ to Jesus and His disciples. But Heracleon has to make the Samaritans stand for the Jews and Gentiles, and the Jews for the πνευματικοί. This is an interesting illustration of the different uses Heracleon and Origen make of ἀλληγορία. Origen seeks an allegory which has some connection with the literal

sense of the passage interpreted, while Heracleon allegorises in 45
the strict sense of the word - ἄλλα ἐγορεύει - since there
is no such connection between his allegories and the actual
characters in his text. (If Heracleon is allegorical, to speak
accurately Origen is typological).

Heracleon's interpretation makes it impossible for him
to be taken in any natural way , ὅτι ἡ ὠτηρία ἐκ
τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν . He explains it by
emphasising " ἐκ " - salvation first became a possibility within
Judaism, but is not to be found there now, since when that which is
perfect is come, then that which is imperfect is done away.

τὸ δίκειον τῷ πατρὶ refers to the
ἀπολωλυτὴ πνευματικὴ φύσις symbolised by
the Samaritan woman, and regarded by Heracleon as ὁμοούσιος
τῷ πατρὶ.

(This is refuted by Origen)

25

Fragment 25 (John 4)

Heracleon comments:- Προεδέχετο ἡ ἐκκλησία τὸν
Χριστὸν, καὶ ἐπέπειστο περὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τὰ πάντα μόνος ἐκείνος ἐπίσταται.

i.e. the Samaritan speaks as the symbol of the

πνευματικοί who form the ἐκκλησία .

28

Fragment 27 (John 4)

The woman left her waterpot.

Heracleon gives an allegorisation of the ὕδρια ,
which, when one remembers the symbolical value of water (both in the
Fourth Gospel and in Gnosticism) is appropriate enough, since the
ὕδρια is a vessel for carrying water. It represents ,

τὴν δεκτικὴν ζωῆς διάθεσιν καὶ ἐννοῶν καὶ
τῆς δυνάμεως

46

As the departure of the woman to Samaria is represented as the return of the now enlightened Sophia to preach to the souls in the κόσμος, Heraclleon finds the abandoning of the pitcher a little awkward.

After this point the thread of Heraclleon's comments are lost and we have to be content with one or two isolated fragments:

E.g. - "four months to harvest". Origen disagrees with Heraclleon's interpretation that the harvest is the harvest of the souls of the faithful. In short, Origen makes "four" represent the four elements of the material universe and so to material things in general, which must be transcended if the truth (symbolised by the harvest) is to be attained.

On his explanation of ὁ σπεύρων and ὁ θερίζων Heraclleon appears a little obscure, as Origen complained. The interest of his comments is that he seems to be moving away from the Gnostic position nearer towards that of the Fourth Gospel, and the lack of clarity may be explained by his rather syncretistic position. To explain: ὁ θερίζων he identifies with Christ, and therefore has to find a person symbolised by ὁ σπεύρων. When he calls both ὁ σπεύρων and ὁ θερίζων υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου he probably means two synonymous powers, one higher and one lower, as are the 'higher' and 'lower' Christs. A.E. Brooke in his note ad hoc conjectures that the two 'sons of man' probably answer to the two beings whose temporary union in Jesus of Nazareth Irenaeus criticises so strongly. The Son of Man who is ὑπὲρ τὸν τόπον

may be Sophia's husband: the two 'sons' may be the Christ whose ⁴⁷ flight Sophia mourned, and the Jesus whom the Christ entreated to send to her: the second is fairly obviously the Jesus who appeared among men.

On 4⁴⁰ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ δύο ἡμέρας (Fragment 38),

Heracleon gives two comments of interest for our examination.

(1) In order to guard against too intimate a contact between

Jesus and ὁ κόσμος, of which Samaria is the

symbol, he puts a rather forced sense on παρ' αὐτοῖς

- Jesus stayed beside not among them (not ἐν αὐτοῖς)

(2) He takes δύο ἡμέρας to be two 'ages', which are

either (a) the present αἰῶν and the future one ἐν γάμῳ

(the wedding feast symbolises the period of

bliss when ~~the~~ πνευματικὴ οὐσία

is restored to the πλήρωμα).

or (b) those before and after the Passion.

Heracleon then concludes his series of comments on the Samaritan woman by a sensitive remark true to religious experience, by adding μόνην with λαλιὰν, to give it its proper sense.

οὗτοι οὐκέτι διὰ μόνην ἀνθρώπινην μαρτυρίαν,
ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτὴν τὴν ἀλήθειαν πιστεύουσιν. (Fr. 39).

The remark gives an interesting indication of the regard Heracleon has for the Gospel which he is expounding.

The clue to Heracleon's interpretation is his identification of the father in the story with the Δημιουργός . . . The Δημιουργός rules the world of matter - κόσμος in Gnostic terminology - as viceroy of the Supreme God. His son, who lies ill at Capernaum, which, as being by the sea represents the lowest stage of matter (φ. Capernaum in Fragment 11), represents mankind as held in the grip of sin and ignorance, ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ

καὶ ἁμαρτήμασιν ᾗν . He deduces from the fact that the son was about to die, that the soul is not immortal :-
καὶ οὐκ ἀθάνατον γε εἶναι ἡγείται τὴν ψυχὴν ὁ Ἡρακλέων ,
ἀλλ' ἐπιτηδείως ἔχουσιν πρὸς σωτηρίαν .

The sense of the whole would appear to mean that this nature is capable of salvation by being assimilated to the higher nature which is spiritual: but "it requires signs and wonders before it can believe - it cannot λόγῳ πιστεύειν . "

(Brooke's introduction to Heracleon p 43)

Heracleon here sees man in so far as he is the creature of the Demiurge (God of Old Testament), as under Law, which kills men because their sin delivers them over to death (Romans 2²¹), and that the Saviour must 'come down' to man (see κατέβη Fragment 11¹² John 2¹²). That Jesus said ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ⁵⁰ (4) neither using the imperative nor claiming to give life Himself, is explained by Heracleon as due to Christ's meekness. The servants who inform the Nobleman of his son's recovery, represent the angels of the Demiurge, whose duty it is to watch over mankind. In this connection, the Demiurge is made out to be obedient to the Supreme God, which

is rather a different account of him from that given by the Gnostic systems.

Conclusions(a) Heracleon as an interpreter

Examining Heracleon's comments and comparing them with the Valentinian doctrines as reproduced by Iranaeus, Heracleon's comments have undergone a considerable modification in the direction of Catholic Christianity, and it is both fair and reasonable to suggest that this may be due to Heracleon's reading of the Fourth Gospel. We can say, that though Heracleon's gnosticism coloured his interpretation of the Gospel, yet his reading of the Gospel has modified his gnosticism. Origen, in spite of his eccentricity stands in and under the κήρυγμα Heracleon, for all his interest in the Fourth Gospel, stands without.

Bardenhewer (Patrology 25.5.) judges him too severely when he says that, "As a rule, the exegesis of Heracleon is not only very arbitrary but also absurd". He is often acute and accurate e.g.

in John 1¹⁸ he saw that οὐδείς πώποτε²⁶ was not part

of the Baptist's speech; in 1¹⁴ his remarks on the immanence of Logos; and also in 4¹⁴ his interpretation of ἄλλομένου :-
 τοὺς μεταλαμβάνοντας τοῦ ἄνωθεν ἐπιχορηγοῦμένου πλουσίως...
 He is often sounder than Origen, e.g. in Fragment 31 where he

expounds what it means for Christ to do the will of His Father; and also that Christ's mission was to save, and man's mission to know the Father. Fragment 50 on Confession is excellent, and on the prepositions in this passage, Westcott said that the criticism was "far truer in principle than much which is commonly written upon the prepositions of the New Testament" (Canon p.305).

The effort of interpreting Christianity to the 'intelligentsia' is and was the most difficult and vital of tasks - even Origen let himself be carried away into heresy (John 1.70 on the Holy Spirit and πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο).

The Fourth Gospel was written for such people and possibly in Alexandria(this statement is defended in the introductory work). Heracleon's is the first commentary extant to comment upon, and explain to the world of his day, the Johannine κήρυγμα : he was deceived by his own preconceptions, but he essayed the task.

Whilst Heracleon would no doubt consider the Fourth Gospel as historical, he discerned that the author of the Fourth Gospel used history, intending further meanings to be sought. This "further meaning" Heracleon attempted to elucidate - as did all the ancient commentators. Their technique was then considered as legitimate and acceptable: their opponents attacked their conclusions but not their technique; we consider that discernment was often clouded by preconception, particularly so in the case of Heracleon, much less so in the case of Augustine.

If we go on to say that the author of the Fourth Gospel intended this "further meaning", and then estimate the "further" meanings that early commentators did extract in times nearer the author's own day, comparing their different conclusions, it means that we have extracted in part at least, the original appeal of the Fourth Gospel, - the pre-requisite of presenting it to any age.

(b) Heracleon's Interpretation

From the foregoing studies it would seem fair to conclude that Heracleon saw the Fourth Gospel and expounded it as giving not a mere historical record of the Christ, but the historical record yielding a philosophy and a scheme of divine knowledge, with an understanding of the cosmos and man's place in it.

The nature of God is in itself unspotted, pure, invisible. He is Spirit, and can only be worshipped duly by those who are of the same nature as Himself, and whose worship is spiritual not carnal (Fragment 24). He is called in Fragment 20 :

ὁ πατήρ τῆς ἀληθείας .

Through the Λόγος all things came into being, except the Aeon and its original inhabitants (Fragment 1). According to Heracleon's interpretation of δῖα, he was the cause of the creation of the world by the Demiurge. The πνευματικοί were created by him. He is the true Creator, and is also called Χριστός . (Fragment 22). He is identified with the Saviour (Fragment 5.)

Of the Holy Spirit we only hear of him as driving out evil (Fragment 13).

The Demiurge is frequently mentioned. He is the immediate creator of the world (Fragment 1). He is typified by John Baptist (Fragment 8) who expresses his inferiority to the Christ. He is the Creator whom the Jews worshipped, and is represented by Jerusalem, the seat of the imperfect worship which was soon to pass away (Fragment 20). The worship offered to him by all his worshippers was carnal and mistaken (Fragment 22.) In

his interpretation of $\epsilon\acute{\sigma}\tau\iota\nu\ \delta\ \xi\eta\tau\omega\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\nu$,
 the Judge is the Demiurge, the Saviour's minister, who performs the
 will of Him to whom all judgement has been committed.

The διδάσκαλος is represented by the Mountain of
 Samaria (Fragment 20), which is one part of the whole mountain of
 evil, the $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ worshipped by all before the Law, and since
 the Law by the Nations of the Gentiles. He cannot stand in the
 truth, because his nature is not of the truth, but of its opposite,
 of error and ignorance. Falsehood is his own by nature; he is
 physically incapable of speaking truth: his nature is composed of
 error and falsehood (Fragment 47). His substance is different in
 kind from the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\kappa\acute{\eta}\ \omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ of the Saints (Fragment 45).
 He has desires but no will (Fragment 46).

This sketch covers Heracleon's general background and
 it shows the profound effect the Fourth Gospel had on his thinking,
 but it is when he begins to expound man's redemption that he reveals
 most clearly his use and therefore his understanding of the Fourth
 Gospel.

Mankind he divides into $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\iota$, $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\iota$
 and $\chi\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{o}\iota$ $\wedge$ $\beta\alpha\rho\kappa\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ (corresponding to $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, $\delta\eta\mu\iota\omicron\upsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$),
 and interprets the impact of Christ upon mankind in its differing
 spiritual types and conditions, and not the impact of J  sus upon
 certain men and women.

The $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\iota$ are consubstantial with God, and
 are destined to salvation. With the $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\iota$, it is not so. They are
 the children of the Demiurge and share his nature. They are
 represented by the Jews, who worshipped the Creator, the Demiurge,
 instead of the Father of Truth (Fragment 19), who thought they

knew God, but knew Him not, worshipping angels and months and moons (Fragment 21). They can be saved but cannot enter the Pleroma; the πρόναος, the sphere of the Levites' service, is the true symbol of their destined home. They are many in number and form the κληρίς in contrast to the small number of spiritual ἐκλογή. But we learn most about their nature in Fragment 40. Like the πνευματικοί they are entangled in ψαγή: and they are sick, sick unto death. It is the type that is sick not the individual. But the condition is not without hope: man in this condition can be saved(ἐπιτηδείως ἐχούσαν) - the corruptible puts on incorruption. Man in this condition is neither necessarily saved nor hopelessly lost.

The χοϊκοί are by nature sons of the Devil. The ψυχικοί can choose to become χοϊκοί by doing his works, but only the χοϊκοί are such by nature (Fragment 46). They are of the same substance with the Devil, and thus differ in kind from the other classes of men.

To set free the πνευματικοί, and to save those ψυχικοί who were capable of salvation, was the work of the Saviour on earth. Christ came down and took flesh as an ὁπόδημα (Fragment 8). The flesh was imperfect and fitly represented by the Lamb. 'He who taketh away the sin of the world' is the Higher Being, who dwells in the body. His journeys from the different spheres cannot mean much. Heracleon makes the Passion divide the two periods of the Saviour's sojourn on earth (Fragment 38), and sees also in the slaying of the lamb a type of Christ's Passion, as again the eating of it symbolises the Marriage Feast of the future (Fragment 12).

He appears publicly on earth, and the Demiurge (in John Baptist) acknowledges the superiority of the Saviour. His journey to Capernaum symbolises his descent into the world, but it is unsuitable for He can neither do nor say anything. The journey to Jerusalem represents His ascent to the psychic sphere; He cleanses the Holy of Holies, the home of the πνευματικοί, and also apparently the Levites' court, which belongs to the psychic. The powers of evil are driven out by the might of the Holy Spirit, and the Ecclesia becomes again the House of His Father. He goes down to Samaria to ~~rescue~~ rescue the spiritual church from the entanglements of matter, and the adulterous intercourse in which she had lived with her six husbands (Fragment 17); to restore her to her true husband above, and, for the present, to teach her the worship of the Father 'in spirit and in truth'. By her means, and later by His own words, the higher class of ψυχικοί are also rescued, and leave their former cosmic life. Thus the spiritual church is rescued: He gathers it in as a reaper, and sends forth his angels, represented by the disciples. The final consummation is the giving away of the πνευματικοί as brides to the angels, in the great Marriage Feast.

The redemption of the ψυχικοί is shown more clearly in the story of the βασιλικός of John 4⁴⁶. He is a petty king (Fragment 40), set over a small kingdom by the Great King. His kingdom is the τόπος μεσότητος, in the inferior part of which, represented by Capernaum, his son lies sick. His nature is psychic, as is His son's, which is represented by the number seven. This nature is capable of salvation, by being assimilated to the higher spiritual nature, but it is such that requires signs.

and wonders before it can believe : it cannot λογῶ πιστεύειν .
 Yet he is easily persuaded of the superior power of the Saviour.
 His angels, (slaves), report the progress of His subjects in
 consequence of Christ's coming. 'He and His House', i.e. those
 akin to His nature, i.e. the ψυχικοί , can be saved.

Though the evidence afforded by the extant fragments of
 Heracleon has limitations which are obvious, it is a fair
 inference to conclude that Heracleon in his commentary examined
 the episodes of the Gospel as symbolic of the various types
 of spiritual character and attitude of men. These types and
 conditions he understands according to his Gnostic preconceptions,
 (πνευματικοί , ψυχικοί , and σαρκικοί), but whatever worth his
 nomenclature might have, or even whatever spiritual categories
 in which we would care to describe man, it yet remains true that
 he understands that the Fourth Gospel presents man in his
 different spiritual conditions before the Word of God. The
 incident, whether it is the Samaritan Woman or the Nobleman, is
 always and invariably the soul of man in a certain condition
 confronted by God Himself, and is never the mere particular
 historical incident of a person meeting Jesus.

In additional support of this, there are four groups
 of facts :-

(a) The personages

The historical personages are interpreted. They are
 always more than their own being - even Jesus Himself is hardly in
 "persona propria"

E.G. The priests and levites who came to enquire of John Baptist
 are the Old Dispensation ; the Samaritan Woman is the πνευματικὴ
 οὐσία and the type of all heterodoxy ; the Samaritans, the

Gentile world; the Nobleman is the *Δημιουργός*, and his son mankind in the grip of sin and ignorance.

(b) The incidents

Historical incidents, too, are made to carry a further significance which is generally soteriological. E.G. the Cleansing of the Temple is the descent of Jesus to the world, his passion, ascension and coming of the Holy Spirit. The coming down to Capernaum (John 2¹²) is the descent of the Saviour to the material world to redeem man.

(c) The Places

Places, (like Capernaum and Mount Gerizim), are more than places; they are the material world into which the Saviour descended, or the false worship which he came to transform.

(d) Specific details

All details like numbers (the 46 years of building the Temple); dates; feasts; the water pot of the Samaritan Woman; the water in the well; the whip of small cords made by Jesus Himself, and made of living material not dead leather, attached to wood (the Cross) - all these details, to mention but a few, are made to carry an evangelical message.

It is of a significance that cannot be overlooked, that not only the historical facts which constitute the *κείμενα*, but the tiniest details should also carry an evangelical significance. If it be remembered, too, that Heracleon was a Gnostic, and Gnostics came to the New Testament for support of a gospel of salvation which they already believed on grounds other than the Christian Revelation, and with but little regard for the plain historic facts, a still further significance is given to his detailed handling of the text in such ^{an} evangelical manner. Quite certainly, Heracleon believed the Fourth Evangelist furnished his detail with a deliberate evangelical intent. .

Many of these interpretations are far fetched; few, if any, commend themselves to a modern scholar; and many of them may never have been intended by the Fourth Evangelist. But, it would seem that the Fourth Evangelist did mean his episodes and events, personages and places to convey some meaning beyond and inclusive of the plain historical meaning, whatever that meaning might be, and the important point to consider is not the particular follies of an early expositor, but the fact that he discerned the Evangelist to have some further intent, and endeavoured to expound it. Our task is to find that further intent, but first it is of importance to establish that the Fourth Evangelist did so wish his Gospel to be understood, and that the early commentators did so understand him, whatever value we assess to their particular expositions.

Therefore, it is of value to consider afresh exactly how our first commentators did actually understand the Fourth Gospel.

This technique of interpretation tends to appear distasteful to modern scholarship, but the fact that it was considered legitimate by the Fourth Evangelist himself and was even intended by him, cannot be denied or modified. Further, in no case was the technique itself ever condemned even by the Antiochenes, but rather the conclusions arrived at were condemned and considered false in the light of Catholic belief and practice :- and false generally on the ground that either too much concession was made to non-Christian learning, or that a particular commentator suffered from heretical preconceptions which warped his conclusions, (as Heracleon), or even from too fanciful an imagination. The Antiochenes were very much more sober and gave

a very healthy emphasis to literalism, but, as will be seen in the thesis ^{when} we come to examine the Antiochenes, even they used the allegorical method, but they used it with a better balance and sense of proportion. Further, they even welcomed it as conducive to the deepening of the spiritual life, provided the commentator did not try to establish or refute authoritative doctrine by allegorical argument - a sound logical position to assume.

If this technique of interpretation were established, and shown to apply in varying degrees to all the early commentators it may produce an emphasis in the modern exposition of the Fourth Gospel which would give a deeper understanding of the intent of the Fourth Evangelist.

With these remarks, we can now turn to Origen's "Commentary on the Fourth Gospel".

ORIGEN

1. Introduction

(a) Historical note Page 61

(b) Antecedents of his technique Page 64

2. Aims and methods

Page 72

3. Analysis of extant text with comments

Page 95

4. Main conclusions summarised

Page 164

1. INTRODUCTION(a) Historical Note

Origen, born in Alexandria about 185 A.D. succeeded Clement as head of the Catechetical School as a very young man and spent most of his life teaching there. Because of opposition from the Bishop of Alexandria he withdrew permanently to Caesarea in 231 where he founded a New Christian school on the Alexandrine line. He lost his life in the Decian persecutions about 254.

Origen set himself the great task of expounding Scripture - from the age of 18 till his death at 69 he devoted his great skill and knowledge to this work. It would seem that all the great commentators have been public expositors or preachers, and Origen was no exception : it is the living exposition of the written word that makes the word living - then, as now. At Alexandria his expositions took place in the school, but at Caesarea they were part of the church services. In this activity he gained extraordinary skill and facility, and gained the highest reputation, even beyond the limits of the Church.

His homilies, designed for a mixed audience and for edification, have their own limitation. Origen believed that there was very much in Scripture which lay beyond the ordinary mind's capacity and that the highest path was to search after the hidden sense of Scripture. In Vol. IV of his 'De Principiis' he sets down his views on scripture and speaks of the three senses of Scripture :-

- (a) the bodily (sematic) i.e. the obvious, matter-of-fact.
- (b) the psychical or moral i.e. edification for the pious.
- (c) the spiritual.

It is this latter sense that Origen seeks. He uses as many as 40 different names for this sense - heavenly, anagogic, intellectual, mystic, hidden. It is this sense that engages his interest. Scripture to him teems with mysteries, and to reveal these is the highest object of the interpreter. In addition therefore to his oral expositions (ὁμιλίαι) and the short notes (ἑρμηνεύσεις), we have the written τόμοι, in which he discusses Scripture without being hampered by the requirements of edification and according to the method which he alone recognises as adequate. This work he was enabled to carry out through the generosity of a rich patron Ambrosius who provided him with shorthand writers, seven at one time according to accounts. This Origen felt a very responsible and burdensome task not to be approached without fervent prayer, and the pressure of Ambrosius forced him to go on.

He was a great scholar and great theologian. He had a grasp of the philosophy and science of his day. His knowledge of Scripture was stupendous - it is difficult to believe he had no concordance, (he was his own concordance). He has a wealth of illustration, though this is not always a help. He is strong in grammar with a quick eye as to the meaning of a text. He is the first textual critic we ever had, even if modern criticism cannot now support his reasonings.

His want of historical feeling, together with his want of any conception of such a thing as growth or development in revelation, are grave weaknesses from the modern critical point of view. But his search for the transcendental beyond the facts makes him akin to the writer of the Fourth Gospel. What we need to find out in all New Testament exposition is what the author of the book intended to convey to his readers. The first problem is

the simple one of meaning, and no other commentator is more akin to the Johannine mind than Origen. There were greater commentators like Augustine, but the way Origen expounds the Fourth Gospel may well be the way the writer meant it to be understood, even if on many counts Origen failed to perceive that meaning.

Origen's method may well be the right one. The work lacks all traces of an authoritative, "ex cathedra" pronouncement. you feel to be overlooking a student at his work, and a modest, humble one, too. The commentary is not a finished treatise; it is a collection of materials for future use; it is a method.

The first five books were written at Alexandria before Origen's compulsory withdrawal from that city to Caesarea in 231. Book six had been begun at Alexandria, but the manuscript had been left behind, so that a new beginning had to be made at Caesarea. The work was again interrupted by the persecution of Maximian in 238 : volumes 22 to the end were written after that date. At the end of the 32nd. Tome, which is the last we possess, Origen has only reached John Xl³³l¹, but in his commentary on Matthew he says he has spoken of the two thieves in his work on John. In the days of Eusebius only 22 books had survived out of the whole number which seems to have been 39. We now possess books i, ii, vi, x, xiii, xix, xx, xxviii, xxxii, not all of which are complete, together with a few fragments. Book xiii begins in the middle of the story of the Samaritan woman. Books xix and xx are occupied with John 8. Book xxxii scarcely completes John 13.

(b) Antecedents of Origen's Technique

From the time that education was first conceived in Greece it was inevitable that the ancient poets should be the basis of that education, and Homer was the common text-book of the grammar-schools far on into Imperial times. Literary and moral education were considered inseparable, and the end of literary education was moral training. Though new ideas were beginning to grow, Homer, like all poets, was a plastic medium, and the sophists found no difficulty in preaching on Homeric texts. There was no traditional interpretation, and from him they drew their own meanings.

It was Homer's verses that were quoted, like verses of the Bible with us, to enforce moral truths, but further, the varying theories of physics and metaphysics all rested on Homer. Men found in Homer political science, military science, astronomy, medicine, gymnastics and surgery, but it was really the reading into him of the presuppositions of the expounder himself, rather than the plain meaning of the poet.

But these tendencies to draw a moral from all that Homer wrote, and to read philosophy into it, though common and permanent, were by no means universal. Literalists insisted that the words should be taken in their plain meanings, and immorality when it existed seen for what it was. This break between the older religion of the Homeric world and poetry on the one hand, and the new ideas on the other hand widened as time went on.

The symbolical method of interpretation stepped in to heal the breach. It is difficult to say when it began, but it was part of the general intellectual movement of the fifth century B.C. It was elaborated by the sophists, and is found in one of its forms

in Hecataeus explaining the story of Cerberus. Plato deprecated it, saying in this connection in "The Republic" p. 378d "The chaining of Hera, and the flinging forth of Hephaestus by his father, and all the fightings of gods which Homer has described, we shall not admit into our state, whether with allegories or without them". The method, however, grew, and by the first century of our era, the gods were rationalised into the powers of nature, and their battles the interaction of natural forces.

The method survived long after its original purpose failed. The habit of trying to find an "arrière pensée" became so inveterate that all great writers were treated as writers of riddles. It became a fixed idea in the minds of many men that religious truth especially must be wrapped up in symbol.

The Jews who had become students of Greek philosophy felt the same difficulty, and to the Pentateuch was applied the same technique. The consequences in this case were twofold : it enabled Jews educated in the Greek mould to hold their allegiance to their faith, and it also enabled them to commend their own scriptures to the Greeks.

Aristobulus (170 - 150 B.C.) made a beginning here, but the greatest contribution was made by Philo, who saw the hidden meaning not as physical, but as metaphysical and spiritual. A moral was found in every narrative, (literal meaning), and the narrative was interpreted symbolically (deeper meaning). In the case, for example, of Jacob at Bethel Gen. 28¹¹, the lying on stones and asking only for raiment and food, is the archetype of the soul disciplining itself and rising above riches of the world : the deeper meaning, that Jacob rests his mind on the intelligence, and places the burden of his life upon it. Here

is a Jew using the Greek method.

66

The earliest methods of Christian exegesis were continuations of the methods common to Greek and Graeco-Judaean writers. As the Greeks had found their philosophy in Homer, the Christians found their theology. But the method was applied in the main to the Old Testament because of the things that jarred on the Christian consciousness. As in the case of Homer, it was here suggested as a way out of the difficulty, that there was a human and a divine element in the Old Testament. So much could be admitted. But the allegorisation of a book like the Old Testament could not prevail, for to the Jew and to the Christian, God is not conceived so much in terms of Mind and its concepts, as in terms of Will and action. Both Judaism and Christianity are Revelation primarily on the field of history : their truth is apprehended in the realm of time and conduct, rather than the realm of eternity and speculation. Whereas Philo had dealt mainly with the Pentateuch, the Christian writers extended the scope and came to see the prophets too as a harp of which the divine spirit was the plectrum, to use a metaphor from Clement of Alexandria.

The prophets lent themselves to this method, for their message was so often a picture, or parable, a vision or dream. The prophet came to be looked on as the man giving a riddle from God relevant not only to the present but also with the future hidden in it.

Because it was an accepted method of interpretation, the Apologists used it, and used it with great effect as powerful arguments against both the Jews and the Greeks, "proving" how Christ is referred to again and again, and how it had all

come to pass as was foretold. (This method is still with us).

67

The Gnostics, however, first applied the method to the New Testament itself, the results of which are indicated in the earlier section of this thesis on Heracleon. They incurred here much opposition. It was probably their work that largely caused Origen to write his commentary on the Fourth Gospel, a Gospel which lent itself to this method, for quite obviously the author of the Fourth Gospel was writing much more ^{than} history. It can be discerned, that as similar as Origen's technique is to Heracleon's, yet Heracleon stands without the ~~κρυπτα~~ and Origen within : Heracleon, in common with Gnostics, sought to justify his position and presuppositions in the light of the Fourth Gospel; Origen, for all his faults, seeks as a humble student the real and inner meaning of the Fourth Gospel. In this, he had much success, as I hope to show : Heracleon is a complete Failure. The batteries of Irenaeus and Tertullian were brought to bear on the method with the greatest severity, yet still it gained ground. (The gain was probably due to the fact that the method served a purpose other than exegetical.)

Many approaching Christianity on its ideal side, found in the Old Testament, anthropomorphisms, improbabilities and the approval of immoralities by God. They thought of the Old Testament as the work not of God, but His rival, the god of this world, and saw the relation of the New Testament and the Old Testament as part of the larger contrast between darkness and light, evil and good, matter and spirit. This was the contention of Marcion whose influence on the Christian world according to Hatch was far larger than is commonly supposed. Those who

did not reject the Old Testament were very conscious of its difficulties. Origen stepped in using the technique applied to Homer, adopting it and elaborating it expressly with an apologetic purpose. Trained as he was in the Greek method, he maintained that the real difficulty men find is the lack of a spiritual sense. Without it, Origen would have been a sceptic. His technique with its justifications are given on the body of the thesis.

In this way, as a rationalising expedient for solving the difficulties of Old Testament exegesis, the allegorical method established for itself a place in the Christian church : it largely helped to prevent the Old Testament from being discarded and the conservation of the Old Testament was the conservation of allegory, not only for the Old Testament but for the New Testament. (It should be said in this context that the technique is common to all religions facing new thought with a holy and traditional scripture : it is truly a rationalist movement.) The technique is present too in the Mission field. The "Home Words", reporting missionary news, July 1948, gave an account of an ordination at Macine, of an ex-cook and house-boy from the Lourenço Marques, at which a member of his congregation read this address of greeting, 'To the Congregation of the Diocese of Lebombo, which is in festival at St. Augustine, Maciene..... We, the congregation of house-boys, in the Church at Lourenço Marques, feel happy and thankful because God has led our apostle, the Rt. Rev. Dennis of Lebombo, to search among the washers of clothes and dogs, and amongst the cooks, that perchance they might find one of us suitable to be a washer of men. In truth to His service there has been called Davida Mandlazi. To him

God has given the soap of the Word, that he may show his brothers how to walk in purity.'

It is present on the scriptures themselves for instance .:
⁴
 Hos. 12 Hosea sees Jacob's struggles as a struggle in prayer :- He had power over the angels and prevailed : he wept and made supplication unto him : he found him at Bethel, and there he spake with us. This was because an actual physical contest no longer harmonised with the prophetic conception.

Daniel interpreted Jeremiah's prophecy of the 70 years of exile (Jer. 29¹⁰) as 70 weeks of years, thus giving hope of redemption from the contemporary tyranny of the Greeks.

The Haggadah, the Halakah and the Midrashes of the Rabbis furnish parallel instances, not quite within the context of scripture, but of authority.

The New Testament furnishes similar instances, both in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in several of Paul's exegetical passages :-

²⁴
 (a) Gal. 4
 The Children of Sarah and Hagar :-

ἡτινὰ ἐστὶν ἀλληγορούμενα

¹⁶
 (b) Gal. 3
 Christ the seed of Abraham, in the sense that His seed is the Church, the spiritual Israel.

⁹
 (c) 1 Cor. 9
 Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn. Is it for the oxen that God careth, or saith he it altogether for our sake.

The Epistle to Barnabas furnishes a more extreme

tendency of the same outlook. Against the whole tendency of symbolical interpretation there was more than one form of reaction in both the Greek and Christian world.

1. The Apologists used the method as a weapon both of offence and defence. Tatian said the myth and the god vanish together. Eusebius treats it as a vain attempt of a younger generation to explain away (*ἀπαρκεῖται*) the mistakes of their fathers (Praep. Evang. 2.6. vol. iii. p.74)
2. The Greek philosophers (e.g. Porphyry) say the conclusions bear no relation to the scriptures but are only means of being credit and approbation to the defenders. (H.E. 6.19.5). Celsus says the scriptures do not admit of such interpretation, and that the interpretation is more difficult than the narrative.
3. It would seem from Origen's statement on John 10.13., and in other places, that many objected to the "digging wells below the surface", and he had opponents even in Alexandria. Eusebius mentions, too, a lost work of the scholar Nepos of Arsinoe, "A refutation of the allegorists". But its chief antagonist was Antioch. Alexandria was idealistic, Antioch realist; the former had a philosophy of dreams and mystery, the latter of logic and system: to the former Revelation was but an earthly jumping off ground to infinite space, to the latter, a positive fact given in the light of history. Allegorical interpretation was the outcome of one, literalism of the other. Lucian and Theodore are the great lights of Antioch. The outvoting of the Christology of the Antiochene school at the great ecclesiastical assemblies by the Christology of the Alexandrian school overshadowed the work of ^{the} Antiochene school. They maintained the literal, grammatical and

historical sense as the true sense of scripture, and are completely modern. (They are studied later in this thesis).

Though the allegorical method grew out of a tendency towards rationalism, historically it has turned out to be the support of irrationalism. As long as it was free, it was harmless, but when it became both authoritative and traditional it became the slave of dogmatism. The modern mind, since the growth of ^{the} historical method, examines literature in the sense in which it was written and for the time at which it was written, and does not believe that interpretation is only of the past.

But the writer of this thesis feels that the method should be seen in its original historical context as a rationalist movement desiring to accept new techniques and new knowledge without jettisoning the truth of an historical progressive revelation, which, because of its very value in leading men from where they were, had the fault of being partial, incomplete and sometimes false. It is intellectual insensitivity merely to write off the technique as fanciful and subjective and dangerous. It is all these, and has often been worse, but to discard the method is to throw away the key that might yet be filed down to open the door of the Fourth Gospel.

It is the writer's thesis that the presentation and interpretation of the *κῆρυγμα* by the writer of the Fourth Gospel is done by a man who used this technique legitimately and deliberately: that ancient commentators so understood him to do so, though to what extent is a matter for informed examination: that the pursuit of literal truth by the West may yet turn out to be (in matters of religious truth), an

'ignis fatuus' and that examination of the method may throw light on the Johannine problem.

2. HIS AIMS AND METHODS

Origen, unlike Heracleon, has left many reflections on his own work as an exegete, and these enable us to form some idea of his aims as he saw them, and of the preconceptions which he brought to his task. Throughout the extant portions of his commentary, even where his comments seem strange in thought and expression, the reader feels the ceaseless activity of an enquiring and vivid mind, and of a deeply Christian spirit.

The work was written at a considerable speed and must have undergone no revision. It was dictated to shorthand writers, and it also suffered interruption when he fled to Alexandria. It is discursive, as the spoken word tends to be, and like St. Paul's letters, shows everywhere anacoluthon, abrupt conclusions of quotations, and the like.

It is a misleading half-truth to dismiss Origen's interpretation of Scripture as allegorical, and therefore as of little value in the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel; It was this very method that he condemned in Heracleon, and described his own method as ἀναγωγή. The necessity for some method of interpretation other than the purely literal, (with which he always deals conscientiously), was due to the idea he held concerning the nature of Scripture, and due to the problems in which these ideas involved him. He believed

Scripture to be the 'Word of God', but that to take it always in its literal sense tends to produce unworthy ideas about God - hence his attacks on οἱ τῆς λέξεως δοῦλοι . Our present ideas, and our problems, are different from his, and our methods have changed. The historical method helps us to overcome some of the difficulties which Origen resolved by ἀναγωγή .

It is in "De Principiis" IV that Origen gives a most systematic exposition of his views, but they are exemplified and alluded to in his commentary on John. He shows here why he adopted the method of 'spiritual exegesis', (a description which includes ἀλληγορία and ἀναγωγή) : it was because men had lapsed into heresy because of their ignorance of scripture. They had been scandalised by particular passages, and had concluded that it was not therefore the Word of God; their conclusions were wrong because they had failed to see the spiritual sense of Scripture. Origen likens scripture to a human being with σῶμα , ψυχὴ and πνεῦμα , but this triple distinction has no practical significance and effect, and the real distinction is one of 'letter' and 'spirit'. Sometimes, there is no somatic or literal sense in a passage (de Princ IV 2.5.) - an example of this in his commentary is his comment on John 4³⁵ - "Say not ye, there are yet four months, and then cometh the harvest? behold, I say unto you, Lift up your eyes and look on the field, that they are white already unto harvest." - (Jn. 1.291), which is for Origen historically impossible. (Lightfoot in "Horae Hebraicae" considers the saying an Aramaic agricultural proverb). He says also that the real sense of

Scripture is revealed only to those able to receive it, and ⁵ 74
he quotes in illustration the typology of Jacob's Well (John 4)
which for him signifies the Old Testament Scriptures (John 1.253)
Thus to avoid scandal and heresy, one must seek the spiritual
sense of Scripture. In order to seek the spiritual sense he
follows the method of ἀλληγορία and ἀναγωγή. Origen permits
allegory when the literal sense is historically untrue or
derogatory of God's dignity, and occurs relatively infrequently
in him. In essence, it means the application of an entirely
alien sense to a text - ἄλλο ἄγορεύει. It is a development
of a method elaborated by pagan Alexandrian scholars in pre-
Christian times to explain away certain moral difficulties in
the Homeric poems by interpreting the poems as allegories of
nature. It was adopted by Philo to the interpretation of the
Old Testament, and it enabled him to impart into it the
whole of the eclectic Platonising Stoicism which passed for
philosophy in Alexandria in the early 1st Century A.D. . Philo's
use of allegory was so thorough going that he virtually ceased
to regard the Old Testament history as having any importance as
fact.

This method was followed occasionally by St. Paul for
special purposes (e.g. Gal. 4²² on Abraham's two sons), and
more systematically by the author of Hebrews. It is found in an
extreme form in the Epistle to Barnabas, which represents the
ritual law as never having been intended by God to be obeyed
literally. It was probably the Gnostics who first began to
apply it to the New Testament in order to justify their

position by the Gospels, although their position remained alien to the Gospel even while they were claiming support from the Fourth Gospel. And, it cannot be denied, that John lends himself to this (or a similar) interpretation, for he is obviously saying far more than lies in a purely literal exposition of his Gospel. The task then, as now, was to keep on seeking the further interpretation of this hidden meaning.

When Origen adopted allegory proper he drastically reduced its application, recognising the historicity of the events of the Passion and of the Life of Jesus leading up to it as of decisive importance for the truth of Christianity. He was led to adopt it partly through a real sense of the mysterious nature of the Scriptural revelations, partly through the influence of a rigid idea of the inspiration of Scripture which made him accept as the 'Word of God' statements which his moral consciousness or his intelligence could not attribute to God in their plain sense, and which he had therefore to take in an unnatural sense. The doctrine of inspiration which made Origen put false meaning upon certain passages of Scripture is now generally abandoned, but this does not invalidate his other kind of 'Spiritual' interpretation which he calls ἀγαγωγή.

He regards Scripture as essentially God-given - *θεῖα*, *θεόπνευστος*, *ἐνθεος*, *πνευματική*. But this could only be fully appreciated after the Incarnation - which was both the proof and the revelation of the inspiration of the Scriptures which had prophesied it. (vide de Principiis p. 301) *IV. 1. 6.*

Λεκτόν δὲ ὅτι τὸ τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων ἐνθεὸν καὶ τὸ πνευματικὸν τοῦ Μωυσέως νόμου ἔλαμψεν ἐπιδημήσαντος Ἰησοῦ.

This refers primarily to the Old Testament, but it also applies to the New Testament.

Scripture to Origen is an inexhaustible treasure house of spiritual truth, which because of its very depth and richness is never adequately revealed in the actual words of the text. Indeed, the actual words conceal as well as reveal the meaning.

(cf. John II p. 11.18)

καὶ τοῦτο δὲ εἰδῶναι ἔχρην, ὅτι ὥσπερ ἐστὶ νόμος
 σκίαν περιέχων τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ κατὰ
 ἀλήθειαν καταγγελλομένου νόμου δηλουμένων, οὕτω καὶ
 εὐαγγέλιον σκίαν αὐστηρίων Χριστοῦ διδάσκει, τὸ
 νομιζόμενον ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων νοεῖσθαι.

Consistently with this conception he remarks (John I. p. 252) in the passage dealing with Jacob's Well that the Scriptures are only introductions to Christ.

εἰσαγωγαὶ οὖν εἰσὶν αἱ γραφαὶ ἀφ' ὧν ἀκριβῶς νοηομένων,
 νῦν ὀνομαζομένων πηγῆς τοῦ Ἰακώβ, ἀνελθετέον πρὸς
 τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἵν' οὖν ἡμῶν χαρίσῃται πηγὴν τοῦ
 ἀλλομένου ὕδατος εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. *Lucas 30-4.*

He also holds that our knowledge of Jesus changes our view of Scriptures : (f. John I 324) an allusion to Cana of Galilee where he interprets the two sojournings in Cana as Christ's two comings to earth; the present and the day of Judgment. Indeed, he argues in de Princ. IV. 1. 6, that it is the coming of Christ which proves that the Old Testament was divine.

Further, the actions of Christ on earth were *αἰνίγματα* of eternal realities (f. John I p.11) The word means a puzzle, but it carries the implication that it will reveal its meaning

to one who has the key. This key is 'spiritual exegesis' by which one is able to ascend from the literal to the spiritual sense of Scripture. (cf. John 8³⁷, 11 36), Where he discusses the spiritual meaning of the seed of Abraham and shows that the meaning cannot attach to the literal sense at all. Or, to look at the problem rather differently, the πνευματικὸν εὐαγγέλιον must be discovered within the αἰσθητὸν εὐαγγέλιον - and in seeking this Origen thinks he is seeking the real meaning of Scripture. It is here that the real significance of Origen's exegesis lies in the understanding of what the writer of the Fourth Gospel meant, even if, for other reasons, we consider this interpretation wrong.

He is fond of quoting both the example and the precept of Scripture in justification of his method. thus, he quotes ὁ νόμος πνευματικός (Ro. 3¹⁴) and he alludes to ἔχομεν δὲ τὸν θησαυρὸν τούτου ἐν δορακίνοις σκεύεσιν (2 Cor. 4⁷) connecting it with ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν. (John 1 p 7).

Since then the sense of Scripture is a treasure in an earthen vessel, Origen finds that it is in the Fourth Gospel that the treasure is richest and most obvious. It had already been described as the πνευματικὸν εὐαγγέλιον by Clement, but Origen says of it :-

Ἐγὼ δ' οἶμαι ὅτι καὶ δ' ὄντων τῶν εὐαγγελίων, οἶοναι
στοιχείων τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀπαρχὴν
τῶν εὐαγγελίων εἶναι τὸ προστετυγμένον ἡμῖν ὑπὸ σοῦ
κατὰ δύναμιν ἐρευνῆσαι, τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην...

(John 1 : p. 6: 1. 9 ff:)

by quoting their opening words, he continues (John I, p.6, 1.26ff

ἀλλὰ γε τηρεῖ τῷ ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος ἀναπεδόντι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοὺς
μείζονας καὶ τελειότερους περὶ Ἰησοῦ λόγους· οὐδεὶς γὰρ
ἐκείνων ἀκράτως ἐφανερώσεν αὐτοῦ τὴν θεότητα ὡς Ἰωάννης,
παραστήσας αὐτὸν λέγοντα· Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου·
Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωὴ· Ἐγώ εἰμι
ἡ ἀνάστασις· Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός.
(Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα)

The selection of texts is significant for it is, in a sense
a summary of the distinctive teaching of the Fourth Gospel. He
says further on, (I. p.7. 5ff) in a very beautiful passage
that only he who has lain on the bosom of Jesus and become
as Mary's own son can understand the Fourth Gospel. This is a
penetrating comment, as is his comment that the Fourth Gospel
is the first fruits of all scripture.

τολμητέον τοίνυν εἰπεῖν ἀπαρχὴν μὲν πασῶν γραφῶν
εἶναι τὰ εὐαγγέλια, τῶν δὲ εὐαγγελίων ἀπαρχὴν τὸ
κατὰ Ἰωάννην, ὃς τὸν νοῦν οὐδεὶς δύναται λαβεῖν
μὴ ἀναπεδὼν ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος Ἰησοῦ, μηδὲ λαβὼν
ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ τὴν Μαρίαν γινομένην καὶ αὐτοῦ μητέρα.

Also in another passage, writing of the disciple who lay
on Jesus' bosom. (John II. p. 189, ff.), the meaning was to
be understood symbolically of the love of Jesus for John,
showing John lying upon the Word and resting upon mystical
things; a relationship analogous to that of the Father and Son:

... τὸ συμβολικὸν τοῦτο παρίστησιν ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἀνακείμενος
τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τοῖς μυστικωτέροις ἐναναπαυόμενος,

ἀνέκειτο ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ λόγου, ἀνάλογον τῷ καὶ 79
αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ πατρὸς

This passage, in its collocation of i 18 with xiii 23, is in itself a good example of Origen's "spiritual" exegesis at its most suggestive : the connection between the passages can hardly be accidental.

Finally, Origen emphasises that prayer must not be neglected by the would-be exegete - for our Lord told us not only 'Knock and it shall be opened, seek and ye shall find', but also 'Ask and it shall be given you'. Vide the prayer with which he closes the preface, I. p 19. 18 ff.

ἤδη δὲ θεὸν αἰτῶμεθα συνεργῆσαι διὰ Χριστοῦ ἡμῖν
ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πρὸς ἀνάπτυξιν τοῦ ἐν ταῖς
λέξεσιν ἀναποτεθησαυρισμένου μυστικοῦ νοῦ .

Origen does not regard his results as achieved by any arbitrary method, for he is well aware of the fallacies of allegory proper as practised for example by the Gnostics : indeed he refers disparagingly to the Gnostics as τοῖς ἑτεροδόξοις, χαίρουσι ταῖς ἀλληγορίαις, and he makes fun of the pagans for allegorising Homer. His primary demand of the exegete is that he should catch the meaning intended by the author :-

δεῖ γὰρ τοῦ ἡθους ἀκουσαι καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ λεγομένου,
καὶ μὴ δοκοφαντεῖν μὴ κατακούοντας τοῦ βούληματος τοῦ λογοῦ.
(de Principiis p. 213). And the real βούλημα of the writer he sees in the 'spiritual' or 'mystical' sense.

This method is much older than either Clement or Origen. In Alexandria at the time of Origen there was a reaction from the

independence of philosophy in favour of an appeal to the authority of ancient oracles and writings (see Menzies Introduction to Origen in ANCL additional Vol. p. 291), and consequently the Alexandrian school treated Scripture as an inspired and infallible storehouse of truth - of truth, however, not patent to the simple reader, but requiring the spiritual man to discern its mystic import. The roots lie right back in the Jewish rabbinical treatment of the Old Testament, and in the Greek philosophy of Alexandria. With Philo, the great contemporary of Christ at Alexandria, rabbinical and Greek learning met, and Scripture being a divine authority and having to furnish evidence of Greek philosophical doctrines, the allegorical method was called to perform large services. To Philo's eyes all wisdom was contained in the Pentateuch, and many an idea of which Moses never dreamed had to be extracted from that ancient record. Clement and Origen established that technique in the Church.

As a method of interpretation, it rests upon the general Platonic conception of the nature of reality, which Origen accepted without questioning from Alexandrian philosophy. This regards the visible universe as the transient embodiment or mirror of eternal reality, and Origen's attempt to find the spiritual in the literal sense of Scripture is parallel and analagous to the ascent from sensible particulars to the ideal universal of Greek philosophers. ~~i.e. particular examples of beauty).~~ Just as for Plato the particular concrete instances of τὸ καλόν are necessary as ἐπαναδυσσοί leading up to the Form of τὸ καλόν, and only lead up to it if they are understood aright - they mean nothing to the uncultivated spirit

- so too for Origen the correct understanding of the literal sense is a necessary preliminary to the spiritual interpretation of Scripture.

The antecedents of Origen's technique are discussed at the end of this introduction, page 64.

In practice he is very sensitive to the shades of meaning of words and to niceties of construction and expression - to what in fact he calls ἑλληνικὴ ἀκριβολογία, see, for instance, his discussion of the 'variae lectiones' of Βηθανία and Βηθαβαρα²⁸ in John 1 (John 1. p. 158). He points out that there was no place

called Βηθανία by the Jordan as he had discovered by personal investigation :- γενομένοι ἐν τοῖς τόποις ἐπὶ ἱστορίαν τῶν ἰχνῶν Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν προφητῶν.

- but that there was one called Βηθαβαρα which was actually pointed out to him as the place where John baptised. One would have thought this sufficient to settle the matter as far as such evidence goes but he proceeds to "justify" the place Βηθαβαρα on "spiritual" grounds. (John 1. 158 10 ff.) :-

ἔστι τε ἡ ἐρμηνεία τοῦ ὀνόματος ἀκόλουθος τῷ βαπτίσματι τοῦ ἐτοιμάζοντος κυρίῳ λαὸν κατασκευασμένον. μεταλαμβάνεται γὰρ εἰς οἶκον κατασκευῆς, ἡ δὲ Βηθανία εἰς οἶκον ὑπακοῆς.

which is again appropriate for the home of Lazarus, Martha and Mary. This discussion gives an illuminating insight into Origen's mentality. It is certain that the place names of the Fourth Gospel had some significance, and Origen may have lighted upon that significance, or at least seen that there was a significance even if he found the wrong one.

Again in John 1.58 Origen draws attention to the distinction between $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ and $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ with and without the definite article (John i. 1.)

Again in John 1. 69, on John 1³, Origen says οὐδέποτε τὴν πρώτην χώραν ⁵ ἔχει τὸ δι' οὗ ², δευτέραν δὲ ἀεί comparing Ro. 1 and Heb. 1. He thinks this has some theological significance :- (John I p. 70 16) :-

οὕτω τοίνυν καὶ ἐνθάδε εἰ πάντα διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ κρείττονος καὶ μείζονος παρὰ τὸν λόγον. τίς δ' αὖ ἄλλος οὗτος τυγχάνη ἢ ὁ πατήρ;

1 p. 83 on the two uses of ἐν in Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος (John 1¹), ὁ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ (John 1⁴):-

Τηρητέον δὲ τὰ δύο Ἐν, καὶ τὴν διαφορὰν αὐτῶν ἐξεταστέον. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ἐν τῷ λόγος ἐν ἀρχῇ. δεύτερον δὲ ἐν τῷ ζωὴ ἐν λόγῳ.

He concludes that life was made in Him the Word, who was with the Father through whom all things were made. The Life is Christ, therefore he describes Himself as "The Way, the Truth and the Life". John 2¹³ Καὶ ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ πάσχα πῶν Ἰουδαίων. Origen asks the point of the additional epithet "of the Jews". He considers it to mean that there is a human Passover when it is not celebrated according to the mind of Scripture, and a divine one when carried out in ~~the~~ spirit and in truth. To speak of the Passover as of the Jews means as opposed to the divine : (1. 198. 29-32)

He supports his position by many biblical references, and quotes in support of this suggestion Is. 1¹³ f (p. 197)

and to avoid any misunderstanding points out (p. 199) that in 1 Cor. 5⁷ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτόθῃ Χριστός the word ἡμῶν stands for δι' ἡμᾶς. This is almost certainly an instance where Origen has caught the intention of the author.

11.103 f Origen discusses the difference between 'seeing' and 'tasting' death. (John 8^{51,2}). Seeing death meaning the ordinary and natural death of the man, tasting death meaning the eternal and spiritual death.

Scripture then is enigmatic and Origen thinks that it is right it should be so, as it is then comprehensible only to those who possess spiritual discernment and can use and understand it aright. In this indeed one may see an instance of God's mercy to the weak.

The fact that there are certain passages of Scripture which cannot be taken as literally true but spiritually, makes him believe that they were put in deliberately by the divine Λόγος who is the true author of Scripture, in order to provoke men to reflection, and to the discovery of the true i.e. spiritual sense of Scripture e.g. (de Princ. Bk. IV Chap. 2, 3.),

And this does not happen only in the Old Testament.

He gives further examples of what he means from the New Testament in the de Princ. IV. 3. 3 Lk. 10⁴, Lk. 6²⁹, Mt. 5²⁹, 1 Cor. 7¹⁸, Lk. 10⁴ μηδένα κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἀσπάσασθε Lk. 6²⁹ δεξιὰ διαγών τύπτεσθαι, Mt. 5²⁹ λαβεῖν ὀφθαλμὸν δεξιὸν σκανδαλίζοντα 1 Cor. 7¹⁸ μὴ ἐπισπάσθω

To these may be added from John's commentary the impossibility of fitting the Temptation into the narrative of the Fourth Gospel (Vol. 1. p. 184), and the awkwardness of the branches strewn in the road (l. 217) - a selection which reveals a surprising strain of rationalism in Origen.

To him everything has spiritual meaning though some things are, literally, nonsense. (de Princ. p. 331) :-

διακείμεθα γὰρ ἡμεῖς περὶ πάσης τῆς θείας
 γραφῆς , ὅτι πάντα μὲν ἔχει τὸ πνευματικόν ,
 οὐ πάντα δὲ τὸ σωματικόν . πολλαχοῦ γὰρ
 ἐλέγχεται ἀδύνατον εἶναι τὸ σωματικόν . . .

This same principle furnishes him with a key to the solution of the problem which has always embarrassed those who have held strict theories of the inerrancy of Scripture - viz :- the discrepancies of the Gospels in recording the same incident, He holds whenever he can to the simple view that different occasions are reported : thus speaking of the differences between Mk. 1⁷ and Mt. 3¹¹ he says (John 1. 151)

καὶ ἀκόλουθόν γε , μηδενὸς σφαλλομένου τῶν
 εὐαγγελιστῶν μηδὲ ψευδομένου , ὥς εἴποιεν ἂν οἱ
 πιστεύοντες , ἀμφοτέρω κατὰ διαφόρους καιροὺς
 εἰρηκέναι τὸν βαπτιστὴν καὶ ἕτερον καὶ ἕτερον
 νοῦν κινούμενον .

He also seeks to explain differences by means of the

individuality of the Evangelists - e.g. the Pharisees who came to John to be baptised John 1. 148 (23ff) -

ἔχοντες τοίνυν τὰς ὁμοίας λέξεις τῶν τεσσάρων ,
φέρει κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν ἴδωμεν ἰδίᾳ τὸν νοῦν ἐκάστης
καὶ τὰς διαφορὰς ...

He will even admit awkwardness of expression as a cause of
obscurity e.g. abruptness of transition John 4³³ - 4³⁴ 1.312 16f

... ὡς ἰδιώτης δὲ τῷ λόγῳ ὁ Ἰωάννης
δυσπαράστατος ἔφραδεν ὃ νενόηκεν .

But when all this is said, he still maintains his heroic
position that discrepancies and obscurities are there on the
literal level to preserve truth on the spiritual level. So that
ψεύδεσθαι , quoted above in l. 151 (p.), means to 'give
teaching which is religiously false', rather than simply 'tell an
untruth', which considerably modifies his position of the
inerrancy of Scripture.

It is worth considering his treatment of a particular passage
In 1.182 ff there is a real case of disagreement between the
Fourth Gospel and the Synoptic Gospels, in the account of Jesus' ¹
activity between His baptism and His appearance in Capernaum. He
sets out the conflicting passages on pp 182,3 and states the
dilemma at the bottom of p. 183. He then proceeds to an analogy -
suppose that four men in four different places each have a vision
of God and then write them down. The accounts are bound to be
different. Then, discussing parallel cases, he proceeds (p. 191)
to apply the principle to this particular case. The passage is
too large to quote, but his conclusion is an admission that the

episode of Cana in Galilee, being incompatible with the narratives of the Temptation in the Synoptic Gospels, is literally untrue, and so he has given an account of the significance it has for the Fourth Evangelist, for though the aim of an Evangelist was to speak truth literally and spiritually , yet he was not able to do both at the same time, he was to prefer the spiritual. This John did.

One other example of his treatment of discrepancies may be quoted - the Cleansing of the Temple (John 1. pp 206 ff.) He does not fall into the temptation of assuming two cleansings. Having recorded the various accounts at length he concludes (p. 210) that it is impossible to harmonise them literally :-

ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ὑπολαμβάνω ἀδύνατον εἶναι τῆς
μηδὲν πέρα τῆς ἱστορίας ἐν ταύτοις ἐκδεχομένοις
παρὰστῆσαι τὴν δοκοῦσαν διαφωνίαν σύμφωνον ὑπάρχειν.

Here again he removes the discrepancy by allegorising the account in the Fourth Gospel. Having noted the significance of Jerusalem as 'the city of the great King' he proceeds (p. 211) to explain the cleansing of the Church which has always been infested with the types symbolised by the money-changers and others whom Jesus cast out. He remarks that as such it is appropriately placed after the episode of Cana. He notes also that (p. 212) the action of Christ is also σημεῖον / θαύτερον - the sign of the approaching end of the Temple system. On p. 213 he raises a question which seems to have caused him some difficulty about accepting the narrative as that of an historical event i.e. whether a mere son of a carpenter could really do such a thing ;-

(I. 213. 17 ff.) - an interesting instance of his rationalism.

Whatever conclusions may be drawn from Origen's great work on the Fourth Gospel, it cannot be denied that he was an extraordinarily sensitive exegete, a theologian, and with a habit of mind akin to the writer of the Fourth Gospel. He boldly and openly attempts to recover that secondary spiritual meaning which the Gospel was meant to bear.

The author of the Fourth Gospel changed the date of the Cleansing for one of two reasons - historical or theological. On historical grounds the Synoptic date is more plausible, so it looks as if the change was made for the other reason - in fact, it made a suitable introduction to the theme of the conflict between Jesus and the Jews which runs through the Gospel. And this is not very different from saying that in the Fourth Gospel one finds, as Origen asserts in his trenchant phrase,

τὸ ἀληθὲς πνευματικὸν ἐν τῷ σωματικῷ ψευδεῖ .

Topographical and chronological details

Origen continually allegorises the very details of chronology and geography which conservative critics have considered the vivid touches of an eye-witness. Origen may well be right here, for these very details fail to yield a coherent chronology or accurate geography. He may well be near the Johannine mind in this respect.

The following examples indicate the kind of significance Origen draws from chronological and similar details :- 1.105 on John 1³⁹ :- ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ δέκατος ἀριθμὸς τετάρηται ὡς ἄγιος, οὕτως ὀλίγων μυστηρίων ἐν τῇ δεκάδι ἀναγραφόμενων γεγονέναι, νοητέον οὐ

ματην καὶ ἐν τῇ εὐαγγελίῳ τὴν δεκάτην ἀναγράφεσθαι ὥραν
τῆς τῶν Ἰωάννου μαθητῶν παρὰ τῇ Ἰησοῦ καταγωγῇ....

88

1.234 on John 2²⁰. where he takes 40 to mean the elements of
the world and six the creation of the world on the sixth day :-

ὅρα δὲ εἰ δυνατόν τὸν μὲν μὲν διὰ τὰ τέσσαρα τοῦ κόσμου
στοιχεῖα ἐν τοῖς ἀγωνισμένοις εἰς τὸν ναὸν
ἐγκαταταβύδμενα λαμβάνειν, τὸν δὲ ὅς διὰ τὸ τῇ
ἑκτῇ ἡμέρᾳ γεγενῆσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

Origen may be wrong in his allusion, but it is possible that his
suspicion, that the 46 years corresponded to no known period, is
sound. (e.g. Heracleon's comments). The 46 years is a feasible
figure if it is taken as referring to Herod's Temple which was
begun in 20.B.C.

For his treatment of place names one could refer again to the
interpretations of *Σηθανία* and *Σηθαβαρά* (I.158) also II.143
on *Ἐφραΐμ* (John 11⁵⁴) :-

ἑρμηνεύεται δὲ Ἐφραΐμ καρποφορία κ.τ.λ.

Types

Akin to the allegorisation of numbers and names is the
discovery of the typological significance of the various characters
which appear in the Fourth Gospel. One may instance three - the
Samaritan woman, the *βασιλικὸς* (Origen's reading) and his son, and
Lazarus.

The Samaritan woman is explained, (~~in a missing book~~) (I.248.6)

as, εἰκὼν , ὡς προείπομεν , (i.e. ^{in a} missing book),
 τυγχάνουσα γνώμης ἑτεροδοξούντων περὶ τὰς θείας ἀρχολογούμενων γραφάς...
 The βασιλικὸς and his son represent Ἀβραάμ καὶ τὸ Ἰσραηλιτικὸν
 γένος . (I.318).

From II.120 it appears that Origen understood the raising of Lazarus as typical of the raising of the soul from sin by Christ referring to those overwhelmed by evil shaking off their corruption from sin and finding the real active life of their soul. :-

καὶ τίνα γε οὐκ ἂν κινήσαι πρὸς τὸ πιστεῦσαι τῷ
 τοῦ Ἰησοῦ κηρύγματι καὶ ἀληθῶς, ὥσπερ ἐκ
 νεκρότητος καὶ δυσωδίας, τῶν πάντων ὑπὸ τῆς κακίας
 καταβεβαπτισμένων, ἀκροτάτῃ μεταβολῇ ἀποσεισμένων
 τῇ προστάξει καὶ συνεργείᾳ τοῦ λόγου, ὅς μόνον τὴν
 ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας πολλὴν δυσωδίαν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς
 κατέχοντας δεσμοὺς τὴν πορευτικὴν καὶ τὴν δραστηκὴν
 τῆς ψυχῆς δύναμιν, ἔτι δὲ χάρις τούτων καὶ τὴν
 θεωρητικὴν;

These and other typological exegeses will form the main body of the work on Origen, and will be considered in detail in their place.

In this connection Origen's letter to Gregory, (A.N.C.L. extra Vol. p. 295) is most significant. It shows how Origen considered the study of the Scriptures to be the highest of all studies, and how he regarded scientific learning, in which he himself was a master, as merely preparatory for this supreme learning. He typifies the spoiling of the Egyptians of their silver, gold and cloth for the house of God as the way a Christian is to see the learning of the world, and he considers, too, the

14 - Hadad, 90

dwelling of a man in Egypt (Ader the Edomite I Kings II¹⁴ - Hadad, 90 confused with Jeroboam) as the dwelling with disastrous consequences of a righteous man in the learning of the world. The letter is too long to quote here, but it is a very fine statement of Origen's position relative to pagan learning, as well as an example of his typological exegesis.

Manner of combining and showing the connection between different texts

A characteristic feature of Origen's 'spiritual' exegesis, which falls neither under allegory nor typology, is his habit of combining texts which often appear at first sight to have no obvious connection, e.g. I. p. 35. 1 15 ff.

.... ἔστιν ἡ ὁδὸς , ἐφ' ἣν ὁδὸν οὐδὲν αἴρειν δεῖ ,
οὔτε πρὸ πύραν οὔτε ἱμάτιον , ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ῥάσδον
ἔχοντα ὀδεύειν χρὴ , οὐδὲ ὑποδήματα ὑποδεδέσθαι
κατὰ τοὺς πόδας . αὐτάρχης γὰρ ἐστὶ πάντος ἐφοδίου αὐτῇ ἡ
ὁδὸς , καὶ ἀνενδεὴς τυγχάνει πᾶς ὁ ταύτης ἐπιδύνων

(Cf. John 14⁶, Lk. 9³, Mk. 6⁸f. Mt. 10¹⁰.)

I p. 39 Origen asks , πῶς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς ἀληθινὴ ἀμπελος ; τοῦτο δὲ
δῆλον ἔσται τοῖς συνιένουσιν ἀξίως χάριτος προφητικῆς τό .
Ὀῖνος εὐφραίνει καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου .

(John 15¹ , Psalm 104¹⁵)
48

He brings together John 8 and the parable of the Good Samaritan suggesting, (consistently with his principle that in the Fourth Gospel the words of the Jews generally have some profound meaning - e.g. Caiaphas), that Luke's parable of the Good Samaritan

shows the element of truth in the Jews' statement, that Christ was a Samaritan, for he was indeed a keeper of souls (which Jesus does not deny though he does deny that he 'has a devil'). II p. 118, Origen brings John 11⁴⁴,

Ἐξηλθεν ὁ τεθνηκὼς δεδόμενος τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας κειρίαις, into connection with Mt. 22¹³: Δὴ πάντες αὐτοῦ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας ἐκβάλετε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σκοτος τὸ ἐξώτερον.

II.p.120, In connection with the raising of Lazarus, Origen quotes John 5²¹: "Ὁ δὲ πατήρ ἐγείρει τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ ζωοποιεῖ οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς οὓς θέλει ζωοποιεῖ.

II.p.130, Origen suggests that the 'prophecy' of Caiaphas (John 11⁴⁹ f was analogous to the witness of the unclean spirits to Jesus (Mk. 1²⁴).

II. p.160, Origen suggests that Jesus washed the disciples feet, although he said, 'Ὁ λελουμένος οὐκ ἔχει χρεῖαν νίψασθαι, ἀλλ' ἔστι καθαρὸς ὅλος, (sic John 13¹⁰) on the principle expressed in Mt. 25²⁹, Πάντι τῷ ἔχοντι δοθήσεται καὶ προστεθήσεται.

One may also note as characteristic of Origen's commentary his habit of turning aside to give a practical lesson. In this respect he shows affinities both with Augustine and Chrysostom, both of whom were great teachers.

(a) E.g. I. p. 102. On 1⁷ Origen protests against the narrowing of the sense of the word μάρτυς line 23 - line 31. All who bear witness to Christ in word or in deed are truly "witnesses": the word should not be narrowed down to include only those who shed blood. Chrysostom made exactly the same point.

πᾶς δὲ ὁ μαρτυρῶν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, εἴτε λόγοις εἴτε ἔργοις εἴτε ὅπως ποτὲ ταύτῃ παρίστανται μάρτυς εὐλόγως ἀν' χρημάτων.

(b) I. pp. 275 f on John 4²⁷, where he uses the incident of Christ speaking to the woman at the well to give a lesson of humility.

Describing the incident he quotes :-

Ποιῶμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν.....

which he says applies to every man.

These are but two instances of a general habit.

His wrestling with the text

Finally, Origen's conviction that truth is as it were 'hidden' in Scripture leads him really to wrestle with his text, and to thrash out all the problems it suggests. This gives, incidentally, a valuable insight into the way in which his study of Scripture could lead him to develop his systematic teaching, (which does not develop out of itself as conclusions flow from premises in mathematics, but is elaborated as the growing religious consciousness probes into and questions its environment - of which Scripture is a large part). In one case at least, as we shall see, this zealous questioning actually involved Origen in heresy.

(a) Thus in John I. p. 70 line 19-21. Origen raises the fatal question :-

εἰ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο .

and then, having discussed various possibilities, he gives his verdict - I p. 71. line 6-14, - That the Father alone was unoriginate and the Holy Spirit to be more honourable than all the things made through the Word.

... πάντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου γενομένων τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα πάντων εἶναι τιμιώτερον.

This opened Origen up to the charge of teaching that both the Son:

and the Holy Spirit were creatures, and when, in the ^{fourth century} /, the Church was no longer a body of persecuted believers thinking bravely and freely but was grown into an established institution, she wrongly turned her zeal against all her sons who did not or had not conformed to the rigid type then in favour. Origen came under the ban, though he has never been without the support of the liberals.

(b) In I p.75 line 30-33 he answers the question which had been raised by others, whether the devil was θεῶ δημιούργημα , another problem raised by John 1³ :-

... θεοῦ ἐστὶ κτίσμα .

(c) 1. 286 line 27-29. On John 4³⁴ he asks ,

πῶς οὖν ἀτελὲς ἦν , ἔργον
τυγχάνον τοῦ Θεοῦ ;

Origen's answer to the questions is that man was perfect at his creation but became in a sense imperfect through sin.

I. 287.. II:-

ἀτελής διὰ τὴν παρακοὴν γεγόνε ἐπέμψθη
ὁ σωτὴρ ἵνα τελειώσῃ τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

(d) Origen appears to have been fascinated by the 'prophecy' of Caiaphas (John 11⁴⁹), and here he asks a question which clearly

reveals his universalist inclinations. He asks the meaning of Caiaphas' statement that "it is profitable for us" and asks in what sense the Holy Spirit spoke thus, and how Caiaphas was embraced in the dispensation. He believed that the Spirit was using the office and Caiaphas was but an unconscious mouth piece of truth. He believed that Christ came to abolish, consume and destroy the sin of the whole world :-

πάσαν τὴν ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου ἁμαρτίαν εἰς ἑαυτὸν
ἀναλάβων λῦσαι καὶ ἐξαναλῶσαι καὶ ἐξαφανίσει.

(II. 134. 25.) .

TOME 1.What Origen understands by the term Gospel

Origen begins by maintaining that the Christians are the true Israel, the people of God, divided into 12 tribes. This he discerns in the aspect of the hidden man of the heart, saying that the Christian Church are that people who are the Jew inwardly, circumcised in the Spirit. This he substantiates from John in his Apocalypse, (i.e. he assumes Revelation and the Fourth Gospel by John the Apostle), from the number that were sealed. The 144,000 sealed in the Apocalypse are converts to Christianity from the Gentile world.

The bearing of all this is that in the spiritual Israel, the true people of God, the high priests are those who devote themselves to the study of scripture : the highest vocation is the devotion to the exposition of the divine word. But the first fruits of their offering must consist in the study of the Gospel, which is the first fruits of all the scriptures. But first fruits are not first growth - the first fruits are offered when all the fruits are ripe. The first growth is the Law of Moses, but the first fruits the Gospel.

All Scripture is Gospel, but the Gospels are distinguished above other scriptures, including the rest of the New Testament.

As the Gospels are the first fruits of Scripture, so in John are the first fruits of the Gospel. Nobody can apprehend its meaning except he have lain on Jesus breast, and received from Mary to be his mother also. Such an one must he become who is to be

another John, and to have shown to him, like John, by Jesus Himself, Jesus as He is : for Mary had only one Son, and Christ called John Mary's son. John in his Gospel is "in loco Christi" :

καὶ τηλικούτου δε γενέσθαι δεῖ τὸν ἐρόμεν ἄλλον Ἰωάννην,
ὥστε οἶονεῖ τὸν Ἰωάννην διελθῆναι ὄντα Ἰησοῦν ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ .

I 7. 10 .

He who is accurately to apprehend what it contains must be able to say "we have the mind of Christ".

The Gospel is good news, and announces :-

- (a) the sojourn with men, on account of men, and for their salvation, of the first born of all creation, Christ Jesus.
- (b) the sojourn of the good Father in the Son with those minded to receive Him, and
- (c) a good for which men had waited, viz :- the coming of the Messiah.

Those of old worshipped really type and shadow. Further , the Gospels cause us to be able to see what is gospel in the Old Testament.

It must be remembered, however, that Christ sojourned before the bodily sojourn reported in the Gospels, in Moses and in the patriarchs. The Law is a shadow of the good things to come, so the Gospel also teaches a shadow of the mysteries of Christ. Origen discusses here the somatic and spiritual Gospel. The eternal Gospel, (i.e. the spiritual Gospel), presents clearly the meaning of Christ's discourses and acts which were truly enigma. But we need to understand both Gospels as men in the varying conditions require both, and we are therefore Christians both somatically and spiritually. We must offer to carnal men the

somatic Gospel of Jesus Christ and Him crucified. But should we find those who are perfected in the Scripture and bear fruit in it and love heavenly wisdom then we must minister to them the spiritual Gospel, viz :- the Word, which after it was made flesh rose to what it was in the beginning, God.

We must transform the sensible Gospel into a spiritual one. The sensible Gospel is only the facts which anybody can read for themselves. Our whole energy must be directed to the penetration of the deep things of the Gospel, and search out the Truth divested of Types. The true Gospel is the communication of divine power. The Gospel is Christ. Christianity is Christ.

In giving Christ we minister all good things. He gives Jesus as :- the life, the light of the World, the Truth, the way which leads to truth, the resurrection, the door, the wisdom, the power. The Gospel is manifold, and his choice of concepts is most significantly Johannine. He uses the phrase from Col. 1¹⁹, 2⁹ "it pleased God that the whole fulness of the Godhead should dwell bodily".

We must remember that the Gospel contains an account of all the ill deeds done to Christ, and these all have significance. As we treat our fellowmen, so we treat Christ. All our acts are part of the Gospel, and have an eternal significance.

The angels are not to be excluded from the ministry of evangelists, and Origen instances the angel and the shepherds on the first Christmas Day.

But the real beginning of the Gospel is in the Old Testament, and John Baptist is its type. John Baptist, who typifies the

Old Testament, also brings it to an end. ~~Origen who typifies the Old Testament, also brings it to an end.~~ Origen at length here attacks the views of the foolish heretics who connect the two Testaments with two different Gods. It is the Gnostics he is here attacking, and quite certainly he never has them far from his mind. This supports the view of some scholars who maintain that Marcion's influence was much stronger than has been admitted or recognised, (Hatch, for example).

The Gospel is not only in the Old Testament, but it is in the whole Universe and preached everywhere throughout the Universe (- an interesting opinion). But, enough of what the Gospel is, we must now proceed to the work in hand. He closes his introductory remarks with a prayer for aid to understand the mystical sense of the words before him.

The Text Proper : (All references to Origen's text are from Brook's recension. The first numeral is the volume of his text, the next page, and the next the line. The old numbering of rolls and paragraphs has been dropped and thus every quotation can be checked in an instant).

1

John 1 . (I.19.21.)

Origen examines the different meaning of the word $\epsilon\phi\alpha\rho\tau\eta$ under the senses of :-

- (a) space
- (b) time i.e. origin, the beginning of creation.
- (c) substance
- (d) type or copy
- (e) elements, and what is formed from them.
- (f) design and execution

and comes to the conclusion that the meaning of the text is that the "beginning" means in wisdom, which contained all things in

idea before they existed. Christ's character as wisdom is prior to his other characters. Happy is the soul who needs Him not as a physician, nor as a shepherd, nor in the role of redemption, but only in His characters as wisdom, the word and righteousness. Christ as the Word is primary to all meanings, both in origin, and in the individual fulfilment of the disciple's life.

The word is to be interpreted as another title of Christ.

Christ has many titles :-

1. I am the light of the world.
2. I am the resurrection.
3. I am the way the truth and the life.
4. I am the Son.
5. I am the good shepherd.
6. I am the Christ (in answer to the Woman of Samaria)
7. Master and Lord (John 13 v. 13).
8. Son of God. (John 10 v.36 - 17 v.1)
9. King (John 18 v.18)
10. True Vine (John 15 v.1)
11. I am the bread of life (John 6 v.35)
12. First and last. (Rev. 1 v.18)
13. Alpha and Omega (Rev. 22 v.13)

There are many to be gathered from the prophets :-

14. a chosen shaft (Is. 49 v.2)
15. a servant of God (Is. 42 v.1)
16. light of the Gentiles (Is. 49 v.6)
17. lamb (Jer. 11 v.19)

In addition one could collect many from the Gospels :-

18. Lamb of God by John Baptist (John 1 v. 29)
19. man, by John Baptist (John 1 vv.30. 31.)
20. Paraclete for our souls (1 John 2 v.1)
21. Propitiation (Rom. 3 vv 25,6)
22. Wisdom and Power of God (Cor. 1 vv 24.30)
23. Sanctification and Redemption
24. Great High Priest (Heb. 4 v.14)
25. Christ is also typified in the Old Testament under the names of Jacob, Israel and David.
26. In the Psalms He is the stone rejected (Ps. 118 vv 22.23)

We concentrate wrongly when we concentrate on the meaning of "word" in this context only or to the exclusion of the other descriptions. The Word is a separate essence. It is not the

deposited utterance of the Father, but a separate hypostasis - 100
a separate being and essence of His own. It is not an attribute
of God, but a separate person. When we understand the meaning
of this, we understand the other descriptions and character also.

Christ as Light - He and those He illuminates are the
light of the world. The Saviour illuminates the intellect so that
each of us may be able to discern the rest of the things in our mind.

I. 32. 2-5 :-

ὁ δὲ σωτὴρ, ὥς ὢν τοῦ κόσμου, φωτίζει οὐ σώματα ἀλλὰ
ἀσώματῃ δυνάμει τὸν ἀσώματον νοῦν, ἵνα ὡς ὑπὸ ἡλίου ἕκαστος
ἡμῶν φωτιζόμενος καὶ τὰ ἄλλα δυναθῇ βλέπειν νοητά.

He then goes on to say that those illumined have no need of
apostles and ministers.

I. 32. 7 :- οἱ ἐλλαμπόμενοι ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὰς αὐγὰς αὐτοῦ
κεχωρηκότες οὐδὲν τινων διακονουμένων ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν
δέονται....

He concedes the value of the ministry to those who do not receive
direct illumination from Christ, saying that the ministering
saints afford to them a lesser illumination. (This is an
important statement. The subsequent denunciations (from the West)
of Origen as an heretic, as vague as they were vehement, were
perhaps more directed against the liberalism of his outlook than
with specific statements. Possibly this is an instance of his
liberalism, which invoked then as now, intense opposition).

Origen then examines the other appellations of Christ.

Resurrection - The energy with which he causes the old deadness
to be put aside, and the new life he gives in its place, is a
resurrection. A state of "walking in newness of life".

The Way - Christ is the way for he is our progress in wisdom and in conduct. In this way we have need neither of wallet nor coat stick, nor shoes. The road itself is sufficient for all the supplies of our journey, and every one who walks on it wants nothing. A searching comment on the Christian pilgrimage. 101

Truth - He is the full Truth communicating to every creature his needs, according to his worthiness.

Life - He is the true and original life, and all sharing in it live in Christ the life which is true life. Living apart from Him means that we have neither His life nor His light.

Door and Shepherd - All men must proceed from the lower to the higher and He is the door through which they come to God, but as many people are like sheep, i.e. not hastening, and with a weakness and gentleness apart from all accuracy and reason, He shepherds them to the door.

Anointed (Christ) and King - It is ^{as} a man that he is anointed (Christ), but in respect of the divine in Him, King. They are together here, because Christ made the two natures one nature in Himself - the human and the divine. Those ^{to} whom Christ is a king are led in their approach to religion by their reasonable nature : those who have not advanced as far as their reason and see only sensible things are governed by the Word, by Christ.

Teacher and Master - A teacher and interpreter to those striving towards godliness, and a master to those who have the spirit of bondage with fear and are hastening towards wisdom and are found worthy to possess it.

Son - God speaks this (Mk. 1¹¹) and shows his exalted birth, and

this day is the "now", for with God all is endless time. This is precisely the burden of the whole Fourth Gospel, showing in its incidents man confronted with the eternal now, and also the reason why the Gospel will not divulge its message to the historical approach.

True Vine and Bread - Christ as true vine gladdening the spirit of man, and as bread making him strong and nourishing him.

First and last - As Christ is first and last, He is also all that lies between these. A completed unity : all in all : He is at the beginning in the man He assumed, He is present at the end in the last of the saints. This is not the same thing as Alpha and Omega. These latter Origen describes as the letters written on the tablets of heaven by which heavenly things are read, but the passage is very obscure in its allusions, at least for a modern reader.

Living and Dead (Rev. 1^{17,18}) - Means that we, bearing about in our body the dying of Jesus, might receive that life of His which is for evermore. We could not be helped by Christ in his original life since we are sunk in sin, so He came down to our deadness, and died that we might live in Him.

Sword - So far, the texts are those Jesus said about Himself by Himself.

2

Is. 49 - And he hath made my mouth like a sharp sword, in the shadow of his hand hath he hid me.

Christ is a sword that cuts through the disastrous friendship of soul and body, so that the soul may enter into friendship with God.

Servant - He is the lamb of God taking away the sin of the world, for His death reduced to impotence the powers which war against the human race. He sets free from sin, by a power beyond our words, the life of every believer. This is a continuous and present activity.

Paraclete - This expresses Christ's representation of us with the Father pleading for human nature and making atonement for it. Of this propitiation there was a type in the innermost part of the Temple, the Holy of Holies, viz :- the golden mercy seat placed upon the two cherubim. He is thus the power of God for us in our lives.

Wisdom - Origen believes that every sage, in proportion as he embraces wisdom, partakes to that extent of Christ, in that He is wisdom. This liberalism was typically Alexandrine, and though assented to by the Church for centuries, is now not so generally admitted. Origen says that every one greatly gifted with power also has a share in Christ. He is further our sanctification and redemption, for each of us is sanctified and redeemed through Him.

Righteousness - He is the supreme idea of righteousness for us in our lives.

The heretics draw a distinction between the just and the good, saying that the Demi-urge was just, while the Father of Christ was good. Origen thinks the distinction better applied to the Father and the Son. The Son is righteous and having received power to execute judgement will judge the world, and by His chastisement, His word, His orderings, and spiritual healing He will dispose

all things to receive at the end the goodness of the Father. God is alone good as Christ said, and Christ is His Agent. 104

In consequence of this function, He is our Great High Priest, restoring all things and all people to His Father's Kingdom, filling up all the defects.

Rod, flower, stone - Christ is David because He fights the battles of the Lord, and prepares peace for His Son, His people. He is called a rod (Is. 11¹) (or shoot)

"And there shall come forth a shoot (rod) out of the stem of Jesse" i.e. He is a rod to those who need a severer discipline But

He does not remain a rod as such for ever, for the rod eventually blossoms to a flower.
He was the stone set at nought by the builders, but now become the head of the corner.

He explains that he has gone into detail with these appellations of Christ because it is a baseless procedure to examine the meaning of the "Word" without first considering all these other meanings.

He sums up all the activities referred to above.

He was all these activities and is called the Logos because he takes away from us all that is irrational making us truly reasonable, thereby causing every detail of our life to reflect the glory of God.

But all men have some part in the Logos, seen in the gradual filling up of ideas in the human soul passing from boyhood to manhood, and also in that consummation which takes place only in the perfect. But He is found within the seeker, not without.

He is the Logos, further, in so far as he is the word and messenger from God to us revealing to our intellect the Father, for

He knows the Father.

27

105

(No one knows the Father save the Son - Mt. 11¹)

He quotes here too Ps. 45¹ about the heart "belching" forth a good word, saying that as "belching" produces suddenly some hidden wind into the world, so the Father produces hidden truth out of the mind but not continuously. (This is a good illustration of Origen's detailed exegesis).

We must remember that the word was "in the beginning". The word has His own definite place and sphere as one who has life in Himself and is a distinct person.

Origen has only commented on ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, by the end of Tome 1. The Fault of Origen is that he is prolix to an extreme degree, and several times in the course of his work he apologises for it. It further makes it acutely difficult to hold a sustained idea of his argument, or often even to find the plain meaning of what he is saying.

TOME 11

1

John 1

Origen reminds us that in the Old Testament the word is spoken of as coming to the prophet (Hos. 1¹, Is. 2¹, Jer. 14¹).

The Word comes to men but does not come to God : it comes to men who formerly could not receive its advent, it does not come to God because it is always with Him from the beginning.

In coming to the prophets it brought them illumination, and they saw things they had not seen before, and understood what they had not till then understood. The Logos is God, being with God from the beginning.

He then discusses in what way the Logos is God, and goes into some detail about the significance of the presence and the absence of the article. He says that some people deny the separate existence of the Logos altogether, or, they deny the divinity of the Son, giving Him a separate existence of His own, and making His sphere of essence fall outside that of the Father. It must be remembered that God is αὐτόθεος : the God : very God. Those formed after Him are God's, images as it were, of the prototype. But the archetypal image of all these images is the Word of God. He is at all times God by being with God, not possessing that of Himself, but by His being with the Father.

(It is interesting to note that in later centuries when Origen grew suspect, it was on his theology of the relation of Father to Son that he was alleged to default. He was accused of the heresy of subordinationism; and of other heresies, like (for instance) the nature of the soul, that all souls will be ultimately redeemed including the devil. This last named he denied in his own lifetime. See Butterworth's introduction to his "Origen on First Principles" S.P.C.K. 1936)

God is to the Word as God the Word is to reason in every creature. There are many Λόγοι, but we pray that the one Λόγος may be with us, who was in the beginning and was with God, God the Logos. The many Λόγοι he would seem to mean are the numbers of godless and irrational thoughts, which men in varying stages of darkness worship.

²
John 1 We have learned in what the Word was, in the beginning; with whom He was, with God; and who He was, God. So here he practically points by "This" to the above LOGOS-God, and gathers all three propositions into a fourth. "This was in the beginning with God".

There is not a plurality of Λόγος, as there is not a plurality of righteousness and wisdom : there is only one Truth. The Logos announces truth, and makes it simple and manifest to those fitted to receive it. He illustrates from Rev. 19¹¹⁻¹⁶ the word faithful and true, and of the white horse when the heaven is opened and the Word is seen riding on a white horse. This meant, that heaven is shut to the ungodly but open to the righteous. The followers ride on white horses and see all truth (white signifying higher knowledge). The Rider is faithful because he inspires faith, and is True, in respect of his relations to shadow type and image. He is not on earth as He is in heaven : on earth He is made flesh, and speaks through shadow, type and image. The war the Word carries on is against all that is irrational and wicked. The many diadems the Word wears, represent the many victories over the many revolting powers, and the name which no one knows represents what the Logos alone knows. The Word was clothed in garments sprinkled with blood, for His blood was poured out on earth. Our admission to heaven is brought about by His sojourn on earth. In the end the mysteries of God's wisdom will be precisely and clearly opened. The linen with which they are clothed signifies that linen grows from the earth, and may represent the dialects on earth, in which those voices which make clear announcements of things are clothed.

The careless will think ~~think~~ that this verse adds nothing, but it adds when or in what He was with God, i.e. 'in the

beginning'. The emphasis of "in the beginning" twice, may also mean that in the beginning was the Word as though by Himself and with none at all, and also, that He was in the beginning with God.

3(a)

John 1 All things were made through (διὰ) the Logos and not by (ὑπό) Him : they were made by a stronger and greater than He. Even the Holy Spirit was made through Him, the Logos being older than He, otherwise the Holy Spirit must be looked on as being created. There are three hypostases;- Father; Son; and Holy Ghost, and no thing is uncreated save the Father alone. The Holy Spirit is the first and most excellent creation of all, made by the Father through Christ. (This particular exegesis earned for Origen severe condemnation in later centuries)

3(b)

John 1 This may seem superfluous, but the meaning may well be that while nothing has been made apart from the Word, not only were all things made through the Word, but some also by the Word. There arises here the problem of evil, but to Origen the good is synonymous with a state of being, and evil with a state of not-being. A state of not-being is equivalent to nothing. Evil and wickedness are that which is not, and are ever against that which is.

Origen then devotes a couple of pages criticising Heracleon's view that the Logos is not the agent of creation.

There is a further point on this problem of evil. The Logos is not responsible for the evil in us. We outrage the Logos when we make Him assist in our Transgressions : He is still present as we sin, present to condemn us, for the very word that

is in us shall condemn us :-

"the word that I spake, the same shall judge him in the last day.
I spake not of myself" (John 12 v.48)

4

John 1

What does not derive life from the Logos does not live at all. All are dead who are not living to God. (Compare Origen's comments on the Raising of Lazarus.)

Compared with God no one is truly righteous, or can even be said to live. Life in its full sense belongs to God and none but Him. No living being besides God has life free from change and variation. Even Christ did not share the Father's immortality, because He "tasted death for every man". We are never justified before God.

Christ is many things to many people - shepherd, door, way and so on. After the Logos enters the soul, purifies it, and takes away all that is dead or weak, pure life then comes to the being who has thus made himself a fit dwelling for the Logos.

The Logos was never made, It existed from the beginning : but life, we read, was expressly created. The light of men can only be conceived in its relation to men.

But all darkness is capable of becoming light ; the natures of men are not so fixed from the first that they may pass from darkness to light. Indeed a change can happen either way.

Heracleon's view, that the Lord brought life only to the spiritual, Origen considers wrong, and refutes it here.

That the life is the light of men does not exclude the possibility that it may be a source of light to other beings also, or the higher powers are men, which statement Origen justifies

on the ground that men and angels are interchangeable terms in the Old Testament. Christ is the light of angels, too. God also is light : Life comes before light; though they are the same, yet they must be taken separately. By the term 'life' here, Origen means the higher life of reason.

⁵
John 1 .

The light of men, and their darkness, each forms a class embracing two distinct things. He who possesses the light of men and shares in its rays may perform works of light, and also, may know the light of knowledge. Similarly, in the opposite case, the man in darkness performs evil deeds, and hates his brother, which Origen describes as a fall from knowledge.

Christ is not like God quite free from darkness, since he bore our sins : He took upon Himself our darkness, that He might cause to vanish the darkness of our souls. Darkness pursues the light but fails to overtake it.

But all darkness is not evil, for there is much darkness around God in all that is unknown and beyond our knowledge. Think, too, of the dark treasures revealed in Christ.
³
Compare Lk. 12 . "whatsoever ye have said in the darkness shall be heard in the light"

Compare Origen's remarks on Judas, (II.195.12. In Rome Vat. 758 : Reg. 9 : Ven. 27.) In this connection Origen says, Light as Wisdom dissolves the ignorance of the mind, and righteousness makes straight the steps of the soul.

⁶
John 1

John was sent from the higher region to Israel, or in a deeper sense to the world of men. He discusses the "sending" of

Isaiah. He shows, in discussing the details of John Baptist's birth, that his soul was older than his body. He assents in general that the soul has an existence prior to its bodily existence, but that it is only in the case of saints is the word "sent" used, and it must be understood in the sense of being sent with the ministry of man's salvation. He suspects John Baptist to be a holy angel sent for ministering to our Saviour as forerunner.

Origen makes an argument from "The prayer of Joseph", (an apocalyptic Hebrew work).

Voice and word are distinct : John is voice, but Jesus is speech :- "I am the voice..... Zacharias lost his voice, because he disbelieved in the birth of the Voice, but received it again when the Voice, the forerunner of the Word, is born. Hence, also, John is a little older than Jesus for we receive a voice before a word. But John points to Christ - the voice pointing out the word.

Origen discusses the significance of the names of John's parents. Zacharias - memory; Elizabeth- oath of God, or seventh of my God; John - grace of God. The grace is born out of the seventh or sabbath of the memory of the old covenant.

The prophets also bore witness to Christ and told many things about Him. There are many ways the mind may be opened to the truth that God has taken on human nature e.g.

1. Many are affected by the foretelling in detail of the coming of the Christ and the facts of his teaching and works and resurrection.
2. Christ's stupendous acts of power were able to bring

to the faith those of Christ's own time, but lost their demonstrative force with the lapse of years, and began to be regarded as Legendary. A significant comment.

But the prophets do more than foretell, they teach theology e.g. the doctrine of the Godhead. Bearing witness is more than foretelling, it is bearing witness to the truth.

Origen enumerates and discusses the six testimonies of Baptist :-

- (1) He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he was before me.
- (2) That spoken to Priests and Levites : I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness.
- (3) There standeth one among you. (He reflects this may be the Reason)
- (4) Behold, the Lamb of God.
- (5) I beheld the Spirit.
- (6) With the two disciples, Behold the Lamb of God.
- (7) These culminate in the question "What seek ye? - Master where dwellest thou? - the seventh and perfect completion.

Come and see, they are bidden : Come - the practical part of life, and See - speculation coming in the train of right conduct. This they will find in Jesus' dwelling.

He points to the significance of Andrew turning in at the tenth hour, meaning to find the Son of God at last, and dwell with Him. The first fruit of this was that Andrew immediately finds his brother Peter, and brings him to Christ. (Here is the pastor and preacher speaking : it is a most important and significant example of Origen's interpretation of Scripture.)

John is everywhere a witness and forerunner of Jesus. He anticipates Christ's birth and thus comes to prepare a people for the Lord : he dies a little before Christ, that to those looking for freedom from death through Christ, he might again make ready a people for the Lord.

Why did John come specially to bear witness of the Light, and not of Life, or Word, or Beginning or any other conception of Christ? Men are in darkness and need light : if the light shines for them, they then shall partake of all the other conceptions of Christ.

He could not bear witness of the life because it was 'hid with Christ in God' and we are still girt about with the body of death. He could not bear witness of the Word, for it could only have been of the Word made flesh, and not the Word of God. Nor, indeed, of Wisdom, because we are only looking through a glass darkly and cannot behold pure truth. Perhaps in the second coming, John or Elias may bear witness about Life, Word and Wisdom.

End of Tome II

Of Tomes III, IV and V only the tiniest fragments are extant.

TOME VI

The work is taken up after a violent interruption which has driven Origen from Alexandria. He addresses himself to it again, with thanks for his deliverance and prayer for guidance.

John 1¹⁹
He condemns Heracleon's supposition that v 18 ... is spoken not by the Baptist but by the Disciple.

The prophets also had received the gift from Christ's fulness, and had received the second grace instead of the former; for, they too, guided by the Spirit, had attained, after their introduction in the figures, unto the sight of truth. Not all the prophets, but only many, desired to see what the apostles were seeing; the

superior and perfected ones among them have already beheld them. The Word of God taught the saints before His Advent, for he was 114 always working. These holy men of the Old Testament knew less than the apostles did of what Christ revealed to them, for they had the same teacher. The apostles are not to be deemed wiser than the fathers, or than Moses and the prophets : a refreshing comment. Origen attacks in this context, too, the gnostic idea that the God of the Old Testament and of the New Testament were different realities. (This view must have been stronger than we incline to suppose for it arises very frequently in Origen's exegesis).

He argues that John 1¹⁵⁻¹⁸ are the words of the baptist and not Evangelist. Christ is the Truth that was given, and since Truth is one, many truths flow from that one. Christ is found in every saint, and so from one Christ there came to be many Christs. (Origen uses the terms 'Christ' and 'Righteousness' as synonymous). The Law was given through Moses, not by Moses, but grace and truth have not only been given, but have even come into being through Christ. Truth, the prototype of the truth in rational souls, did not come into being through Jesus Christ, nor through any at all, but was made by God. The truth among men came into being through Christ.

John's second testimony to Christ was that he was a prophet. He confessed that he was not the Christ, and then subsequently, that he was not Elijah, the second great personage whom they expected. They then ask whether he is the prophet of Deut. 18¹⁵, whom they understood to be a second figure beside Christ. He said he was Isaiah's prophetic 'Voix of one cying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord'.

There are two missions to the Baptist : one from the Pharisees, and the other from the Pharisees and Levites combined. Origen stresses again the importance of students of scripture examining carefully by whom and when what is said is said. The questions of the Priests and Levites show gentleness and a willingness to learn, and agree well with the character of true and careful servants of God. The answers of John are straightforward and raise no difficulty. On the other hand, the Pharisees assail John with arrogant and unsympathetic words. Their mission was sent, not for information but condemnation, and to debar the Baptist from baptising, as if no one but Christ, Elijah, or the prophet ought to baptise. (There is an interesting point here on the complete faith in the accuracy and historicity of the text. There also lies concealed an important exegetical principle of Origen. He makes the words of the Jews and of all the opponents of Christ, (the best example of which is the prophecy of Caiaphas), all bear valuable teaching.)

There follows a messianic discussion with John Baptist, because it was natural to expect a Messiah at this time. Origen discusses the birth of John and his alleged identity with Elijah. He discusses also the nature of the soul and transcorporation, but says that these questions are too large to discuss here.

John is a prophet, but not the prophet. Origen says Heracleon failed to notice this point, and criticises him for passing over passages like this without taking sufficient note.

JOHN 1²²

They seek an answer.

He was the voice which alone was fitted worthily to announce

the Logos. He cries that all may hear, thus bringing help both to those who have departed from God, and to those who have lost the acuteness of their hearing. He likens the wilderness to the desert of the soul deprived of God and deserted of truth.

The Way of the Lord is narrow and Jesus is the Way. The Way is made straight :-

(a) by contemplation - in truth unmixed with falsehood

(b) by conduct - fitting action, after seeing truly.

The good Way was seen to be Jesus Christ. It is narrow for many cannot bear to walk in it and are lovers of the flesh : it is also hard pressed by those who use violence to walk in it. No staff and no shoes are needed on this journey, since the Way itself provides all that is necessary.

He discusses Heracleon's exegesis of the Voice and of John Baptist. He admits his good points, but gives an adverse judgement on the interpretation.

24-25

John 1

The Priests and Levites go away decently, but the Pharisees, as a seditious and divided set of people deal in rebukes. They came for baptism without the fruits of repentance, therefore the tree is to be cut down by the axe of the Word. Christ reserves for His disciples to baptise with water, himself with the holy Ghost and with fire.

Origen remarks on the conflation of prophecies here from Is. and Malachi in Mk. :-

"Behold I shall send my messenger before thy face" (Mal. 3¹)

"Prepare ye in the wilderness the way of the Lord" (Is. 40³)

and the addition of 'Make straight the way of the Lord' by John,

a statement which does not occur in the prophet. Origen reflects in detail on the statement of the four evangelists respecting John Baptist, the prophecies regarding him, and his words addressed to the different parties that came to him. (A piece of interesting textual criticism).

John's answer to "Why baptisest thou them?" :- His baptism was a bodily thing, he baptised with water. But there stood One among them whom they knew not : he was not worthy to "untie the latchet of His shoe". By this he conveys a riddle, that he is not fit to solve and to explain the argument about Christ assuming a human body, an argument tied up and hidden (like a shoe-tie) to those who do not understand it - so as to say anything worthy of such an advent, compressed as it was, into so short a space.

ἀνιπτόμενος τὸ σὺχ ἱκανὸς εἶναι τὸν περὶ τῆς ἐνδωματώσεως
αὐτοῦ λόγον , οἷον δεδεμένον καὶ κεκρυμμένον τοῖς μὴ
νοοῦσι , λῦσαι καὶ βαφηνίσαι , ὥστε ἄξιόν τι τῆς
τοσαύτης ἐπιδημίας εἰς οὕτω βαχύτητα συνεσταλμένης
εἰπεῖν .

(I.147.27-30)

Origen notes here that all the other evangelists say the same of John that he baptised with water, but One coming after him was to baptise with the Holy Ghost and with fire. He gives Matthew's testimony of John to Jesus, and notices that it is Mt. alone who adds "unto repentance"

ἐπὶ μετάνοιαν παρακαλῶν .

Origen allegorises the passage about the shoes. Mk. does not refer to bearing the shoes but "to stoop down and unloose" :-
κύψας λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα .

Origen assumes that the Evangelists cannot make a mistake or misrepresentation, and therefore the Baptist must have made these two statements at different times, and meant by them to express different things. The passage about the shoes has a mystic meaning. One shoe stands for the Incarnation and the other for the descent into Hell. It is a great thing to stoop down to the bodily features of Jesus' mission and untie each difficulty connected with the mystery of His Incarnation, such being as it were, His shoe-latchets. The fetter of obscurity is one, as the key of knowledge also is one. To set forth the meaning of Jesus' two journeys, he is able to untie the latches of the shoes of Jesus, "that he might be Lord both of the dead and the living" (Ro. 14⁹) Lk. and John give the phrase without mentioning "stooping down" - both suggest that we may loose the shoe latches of the Logos without stooping down because one's eyes are fixed on the height of the exaltation of the Logos. He discusses the differences between not being "sufficient" (synop - tists) and not being "worthy" (John). Origen deals with the possibilities and quotes Eccles. 18⁷.

ὅταν συντελέσῃ ἄνθρωπος τότε ἄρχεται,
καὶ ὅταν παύσῃται τότε ἀπορηθῆσεται.

I.153.22.

He suggests, however, that John was right in saying that the Baptist was not sufficient neither was he worthy to perform this great task of unloosing the latchet. The Synoptists say "shoes", but John "shoe". The significance of this may be that the Baptist knew nothing of the future, and referred only to the

present i.e. the present coming to earth and not the future descent into Hell. Concerning the,

μέσος ὑμῶν στήκει ἐν ὑμῖς οὐκ οἶδατε.

26
(1)

In the midst of them stands the Word, who is the same and steadfast, being everywhere established by the Father. The Word dwells with those who have prepared themselves, purified as they are by the lesser words for the perfect Word. First, stands the Father without turning or change ; and then, stands his Word, always carrying on His work of salvation, and even when He stands in the midst of men, not comprehended, and not even seen. He stands also teaching and inviting all to drink from His abundant spring.

It could be taken from Origen's comments, though it is difficult to say that he says as much, that "there standeth one among you whom ye know not" might be the ruling principle of Reason, though it is quite clear that Origen for himself means the Word made flesh. He stands also teaching, and inviting men to drink from His abundant spring.

Origen discusses Heracleon's interpretation. Heracleon says rather simply that it means that He is now present in the world and manifest to all.

Ἦδη παρεισὶ καὶ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ ,
καὶ ἐμφανὲς ἔστιν ἤδη πᾶσιν ὑμῖν .

I.158.28.

Origen disagrees very strongly, on the ground that the Word had already permeated the whole world.

¹⁰
John 1 ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν , καὶ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ γένητο .

He asks when did He fail to be in man? Was he not in Is. 61.1

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me....

1

and in Is. 65 "I am enquired of by them that asked not for me" 120
Was he not in David, Ps. 2⁶ . "I have set my King Upon the holy
hill of Zion."

He concedes the sound parts of Heracleon's exegesis as not unattractive οὐκ ἀπὸθέτως (I.156.16.), but disagrees strongly with Heracleon identifying God with the Demiurge here.

This section is very illuminating as far as Origen's interpretation is concerned. Conservative critics have justified these names in the Fourth Gospel as evidence of the historicity of the Gospel, but it is of the greatest significance that Origen, so much nearer in time and outlook to the writer of the Fourth Gospel, should have seen their meaning not in terms of history but of theological interpretation. Origen may have been wrong in his conclusion, but it indicated that he himself thought that the writer of the Fourth Gospel had a didactic intention and made history subserve that purpose.

He discusses the "variae lectiones" of Bethany and Bethabara. Origen says he has visited both places. Bethany was the town of Lazarus, Martha and Mary, was 15 stadia from Jerusalem and 180 stadia from the Jordan : there was no other place of the same name on the Jordan. But Bethabara is pointed out on the banks of the Jordan, and John is said to have baptised there. This is rational evidence, and can be estimated at its worth. But Origen then proceeds to "justify" his conclusion on etymological grounds. Bethany he says is the house of obedience, and Bethabara the house of preparation : quite obviously the latter is the real place and obviously the former is the place where Mary chose the better part, and Martha was much cumbered.

He proceeds to explain that the proper names of Scripture must not be neglected, and also that care must be taken in respect of the Greek copies of the scripture which are often incorrect in the matter of names. He gives, as an example, the reading Gerasenes (Mt. 8^{28,32}, Mk. 5^{1,13}, Lk. 8^{36,37}). Gerasa is a town in Arabia without sea or lake. A few copies have Gadarenes. Gadara is a town of Judea with no lake, no sea, nor overhanging banks. But Gergesa is an old town in the neighbourhood of the Lake of Tiberias, on the edge of which is a steep precipice abutting on to the lake, from which it is pointed out, the swine were cast down by demons. The name Gergesa means "dwelling of the casters-out", and is a prophetic reference to the dwellers who besought Jesus to depart. Origen says, also, that the same inaccuracies occur in the Old Testament, and that all names in scripture are important for interpretation.

Jordan, Origen interprets as their going down, and draws an antithesis between Moses as type of the Law, and Joshua as type of Christ. He sees the River as separating those who received their lots from Moses, and those who received them from Joshua (Jesus). John he points out baptised beyond Jordan. (The Baptist to Origen stands for the Old Testament.)

Christ is many things to many men, and is not the same to all. The voice of preparation calls from beyond Jordan for us to make ourselves ready to receive the spiritual word brought home by the enlightenment of the Spirit. Joshua who succeeded Moses was a type of Jesus Christ who succeeds the dispensation of the Law, and replaces it by preaching the Gospel.

He expounds the Baptism of the people of Israel in a way

that reminds us of St. Paul. The Baptism of Moses had something harsh and salt in it, and the people after the Baptism still lived in fear of their enemies. But the Baptism of Joshua took place in sweet and drinkable water, and is superior to the early one. The ark of the presence of the Lord was taken before them, a sheep was procured, and the children circumcised with a very sharp stone and thus purified. (Origen likens the sharpness of circumcision to the action of God's Word on the soul). They then kept the Passover, eating the unleavened bread of the corn of the holy land, and fresh food better even than manna. All this Origen interprets typologically thinking of the "true holy land and of Jesus above". One is reminded of the Easter hymn of St. John Damascene, Ἀίδωμεν πάντες λαοί. (English Hymnal 131).

It is worth remembering that Paul interprets the incident of Elijah and Elisha crossing the Jordan as a baptism of Elijah, a preparation to make him more fit for his assumption into heaven (2 K. 2^{8,11}). And Elisha himself, through this same Jordan received a double portion of Spirit.

The Jordan which was "smote" is a Type of the Word descending for us. Origen discusses the incident of the cleansing of Naaman in the Jordan, and the ineffectiveness of the rivers of religion of the enemies of Israel. The prophet himself did not heal, he merely directed to the healing agency. As none is good save God, no river is good save Jordan. He speaks of him who with faith washes his soul in Jesus :-

λέπρας ἀπαλλάξαι δυνάμενος τὸν μετὰ πίστεως
τὴν ψυχὴν λουόμενον εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

That is why the Psalmist speaks of the children of Israel weeping by the waters of Babylon, remembering with longing their own waters of Salvation.

123

The scripture is not speaking mainly of rivers that can be seen with the eye (Ezek. 29³⁻⁵) " I am against thee Pharaoh, King of Egypt, the great dragon that lieth in the midst of his rivers.....I will leave thee thrown in the wilderness....." There is no real bodily dragon, but the dragon who is our enemy. On washing in the Jordan, (which contains the spirit of God, as the rivers of Egypt the spirit of the enemy), we are cleansed from the foulest of all leprosy, receiving also a double portion of spiritual gifts, and are thereby made ready to receive the Holy Ghost since the Dove lights on no other stream.

John 1²⁹

Formerly the Mother of Jesus, as soon as she conceived, visited John's mother, now Jesus is seen by the Baptist coming to him. Origen sees a significance in going up to the hill country since no great thing can be entertained by those who are low : he sees, too, a significance in "on the morrow", being a token of John's improvement and progress i.e. Jesus coming in the ensuing enlightenment , the day beyond former things.

Chronology

- First day - testimonies given
- 2nd day - Jesus comes to John
- 3rd day - John standing with two disciples, looking on Jesus as he walks and saying "Behold the Lamb of God", urges those present to follow the Son of God.
- 4th day - He who came to seek the lost comes forth into Galilee, finds Philip and says "Follow Me"
- 6th day - Marriage in Cana

(Origen draws a little moral lesson in the fact that as Mary the greater came to Elizabeth the lesser, and Jesus the greater came to the lesser, so ought we to render help to those lower than ourselves). Origen remarks on the information given by Matthew alone, on the conversation of the Baptist with Jesus.

29

1.

There are five animals brought to the altar : bullock, sheep, goat, turtle-dove and pigeon ; and the ages of the first three may be subdivided into three :- bullock, ox, calf ; ram, sheep, lamb ; he-goat, goat, kid. He then who would accurately understand the rationale of the sacrifices, must understand of which heavenly things these were pattern and shadow, and also for what end each victim was prescribed. I.170.30.

ζητητέον οὖν τῷ δουλομένῳ ἀκριδῶς τὸν περὶ τῶν θυσιῶν πνευματικὸν καταλαβεῖν λόγον τίνων ἐπουρανίων ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιά ἐγένετο , καὶ ἕκαστον τῶν ζώων ἐπὶ τίνι νομοθετῇ ὁ λόγος θέσθαι .

5

Origen then quotes in this context Hebr. 8 :-

ὅτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιά λατρεύουσι τῶν ἐπουρανίων .

23

and Hebrew 9 :-

Ἀνάγκη οὖν τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματι τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τούτοις καθαρίσθαι , αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια κατίττοις θυσίαις παρὰ ταύτας .

A lamb was offered at the morning and evening sacrifices.

In the world of ideas, the only continual sacrifice for a man of reason is the Word growing to maturity, the Word who is symbolically described as the Lamb; and which is offered as soon as the soul receives illumination. This is the continual sacrifice, offered in the morning at the beginning, and offered again in the evening of life when the sojourn of the mind with

divine things come to an end. These are the morning and evening sacrifice of the saint in his life of thought, beginning as it were with the type of Christ, and, coming to the evening of his life, arriving at the bodily features of his manifestation. Jesus is a lamb in respect of his human nature. And He who led this lamb was Himself, our Great High Priest, God in Man, voluntarily offering the lamb :-

οὐδεὶς αἴρει τὴν ψυχὴν μου ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ
τίθωμι αὐτὴν ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ . 18
(John 10)

Origen then goes on to discuss how it is that sacrifice operates for the benefit of others. He instances Jephthah, and defends his vow on the grounds that it was because of this vow that the enemy (the Ammonites) was conquered. Martyrs, too, endured all sufferings, which men count evil, rather than allow themselves by their words to conform to the enemies of truth. These sacrifices operate for the benefit of others, maintains Origen, in this way : That the powers of evil are the weaker if they are defeated in battle, and the death of the holy martyrs has brought a defeat of these powers - "blunting the edge of the onset of evil powers against the sufferer, and their might being thus defeated and exhausted, many others of those whom they had conquered raised their heads and were set free from the weight with which evil powers formerly oppressed them". There is quite a "modernist" or "subjective" ring about this. The martyr himself, in offering his sacrifice, overcomes the power which opposed him. Many receive the benefit of this sacrifice, but the precise manner of this operation is not to be described. He likens it to a man who has destroyed a dangerous or poisonous

animal. The analogy makes an interesting parallel to our St. George and the Dragon, though it obviously breaks down because evil is never destroyed in any final sense.

Origen then proceeds to deal with the effects of the death of Christ, and His triumph over death. He speaks of Christ having blotted out our sins and nailed them to the cross. We must rejoice when we suffer afflictions, for in suffering the world is being conquered, and is being subjected to its conqueror, the powers of righteousness. Christ defeated all His enemies, even death, and returned in the Resurrection with the fruits of His Victory.

It is not all the sins of the whole world that the Lamb takes away. He does not remove the sins of those who do not grieve and suffer afflictions till the sin is taken away.

The Lamb takes away the sins in many ways, which Origen does not enumerate.

In this context the Word is often said to be synonymous with the Church. Origen does not agree here, and justifies his position by quoting several texts. He differentiates the Church and the Word - the light is the Church, and the Word those others who call on the Name

Tomes VII, VIII and IX not extant.

Tome X.

12

Tome X begins with John 2 immediately after the miracle of the changing of water to wine and so there is nothing in the commentary on this miracle. There are a few comments in fragments and other works which are worth quoting:- Fr. 74. on
30
John 10 . The first wine failed because 'the Law and the

Prophets were until John'. We, with whom Jesus sits at meat have abounded with good wine:-

127

ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφῆται μέχρι Ἰωάννου· (τὸ) καλοῦ οἴνου
ἐμφορέναι ἡμᾶς, οἷς συνανακεῖται Ἰησοῦς.

In De. Princ. IV. ii 5 we find that the significance of the two or three firkins is that scripture may have the three elements corresponding to body, soul, and spirit; that there are 6 water pots signifies those cleansed in the world, which was made in 6 days as a complete number.

Jesus comes to Capernaum. Origen quotes all the Gospels on this point in detail showing their differences, and as it is important to harmonise them, it proves that they must be interpreted spiritually.

The truth in these matters must lie in their spiritual meaning :- He observes that there is no place in John for the Temptation. He discusses in detail what happened between the Baptism and the Temptation in the varying accounts, concluding that the truth is not to be sought for in the inward and material letter. This point of view he sets forth at length.

Four men could be led by God at the same time to four different places, and see four different visions of God. The mistake lies in thinking of each historical statement materially, and failing to grasp its spiritual meaning and message.

Similarly, the evangelists use Christ's acts and sayings, and add to them in language implying things of sense, things made manifest to them in a purely intellectual way. They dealt freely with things which to the eye of history happened differently, and changed them so as to subserve the mystical

In times of conflict the evangelist preserves the spiritually true in what is literally false : I.187. 10-15

προέκειτο γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὅπου μὲν ἐνεχώρει ἀληθεύειν
πνευματικῶς ἅμα καὶ σωματικῶς, ὅπου δὲ μὴ
ἐνεδέχετο ἀμφοτέρως, προκρίνειν τὸ πνευματικὸν τοῦ
σωματικοῦ, σωζομένοι πολλὰς τοῦ ἀληθοῦς πνευματικοῦ
ἐν τῷ σωματικῷ, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, ψεύδει

Jesus is many things, according to the conceptions of Him, of which it is quite likely that the evangelists took up different notions, yet being in agreement with each other on the different things they wrote. The apparent discrepancies must be treated in the way of spiritual interpretation.

Similar things happen in Paul, who also makes contradictory statements about himself, and acts in opposite ways at different times.

Similarly, there are different accounts of the call of Peter, and also of the imprisonment of John Baptist, and Origen humbly asks who is able to understand all these things. As for the passage before us, it was fitting that after the feasting Jesus should come to the "Field of Consolation", to console those He was training for discipleship, and the soul which had conceived Him by the Holy Ghost.

But why are his brothers not admitted to the wedding? They go down with Him and His mother and disciples to Capernaum. Note "down". The brothers stand for His powers not called to the wedding : His mother for those bearing fruit. But he abode not

many days, for the lower field of consolation does not admit the illumination of many doctrines, being capable of only a few. Note this "not many days". It applies to his going "down" to the more needy, in which place he cannot stay. But to his disciples, who are to know all that human nature can know while it is here, he says, "Lo I am with you always" : and, as the rise of each new day upon the field of contemplation brings more days before the blessed, he says "till the end of the world".

The Saviour was not in His disciples but with them, so long as they had not arrived in their minds at the consum^mation of the age. When they do see consummation of the world which is crucified to them, then Christ lives in them i.e. as far as their efforts is concerned.

He considers in detail Heracleon's contribution on this text and criticises his comments that Jesus is not stated to have done anything in Capernaum, showing by quoting the other Gospels that He does many things there.

He considers further the significance of Capernaum, the place of consolation. Consolation comes to man in these three

ways :-

- (a) the sick are healed
- (b) the works of power done
- (c) the Kingdom is preached.

It is at this point that John adds this miracle, which Origen allegorises. "The leading sign of Christ was good cheer, and in the light of human experience it is also the most representative of Him. For the Word of God does not show forth His own beauty so much in healing the sick as in His tendering the temperate draught to make those glad who are in good health, and are able to join in the banquet".

Why "of the Jews". Origen interprets this seemingly unnecessary addition, (for no other nation had a passover), as a Passover kept by men in a way other than that intended by Scripture, the true Passover being observed in spirit and in truth by those who worship God in spirit and in truth. He instances in Scripture how the Lord does not call His own the institutions of sinners; and when Israel sin they are not the people of God but the people of Moses, (Ex. 8²¹⁻³). Thus the feasts, when they are hated by the Lord's Soul are said to be feasts of sinners, but when ordained by God, they are called the feasts of the Lord.

The festivals on earth are the types of the heavenly festivals, and perhaps the laws about meats are symbols of those things which will there nourish and strengthen our souls.

The spiritual meaning of the Passover :-

Resemblances

(a) The resemblances are that in the Jewish Passover a sheep is sacrificed, each taking one according to his father's house, and in the Christian Passover our Passover is sacrificed for us, viz:- Christ.

(b) Again, in the Jewish Passover unleavened bread is used, whilst in the Christian Passover it is the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth. These serve for a pattern and shadow of the heavenly uses of which we spoke, and not only such things as food and drink and new moons and sabbaths, but the festivals also are a shadow of things to come.

(c) A bone of it shall not be broken, Origen sees as fulfilled

ὁ βραχτιῶταί ... οὗ κατέαξαν αὐτοῦ τὰ σκέλη ...

53

(d) John 6 - The flesh here spoken of is the flesh of the lamb that takes away the sin of the world, and this is the blood, some of which was to be smeared on the door of the house in which the Passover was eaten. We should eat the flesh of the lamb in the time of the world which is night, and the flesh is to be roasted with fire and eaten with unleavened bread, for the Word of God is not flesh only.

(e) We eat the flesh of the lamb with bitter herbs and unleavened bread when we repent of our sins and grieve with sorrow. We must not eat the flesh raw, as slaves of the letter like irrational animals. We must strive to convert the rawness of scripture into well cooked food, not letting what is written grow flabby and wet, and thin. In eating we must begin at the head i.e. the principle and essential doctrine about heavenly things, and end at the feet, the last branches of knowledge of material things, spirits and demons. We must also deal with the entrails which are within and hidden from us, keeping the unity of scripture and not lacerating it. This is to be our nourishment only during the night of this dark life of ours, until the time of manna comes, the angels' food.

Material things are types of spiritual things, and historical things of the intellectual. The third Passover will be with myriads of angels.

In the Synoptic Gospels the Passover comes only at the end

of the ministry, but with John¹³ at the beginning.

John 2

The Cleansing of the Temple is with John, Jesus' second work, but with the other evangelists comes at the end. Origen sets out in great detail the Synoptists's account of the visit to Jerusalem. He then shows how similar John's second visit is to that of the Synoptists', which is their only visit. This discrepancy Origen considers impossible to harmonise literally.

He spiritualises the purging of the Temple.

Jesus went up to Jerusalem. Jerusalem is the city of the Great King, not lying in a hollow but built on a high mountain to which the tribes go up. There is a heavenly Jerusalem of which spiritually minded people are citizens. Jesus found in the Temple certain men making His Father's House a house of merchandise. But there are always such men in the Church : these are the money changers needing the strokes of the scourge Jesus made of small cords, and dealers in small coin who need their tables overturning. These he declares even want sweeping out. But he sees a further meaning. These occurrences are symbols of the fact that the services of the Temple are no longer to be carried on by the priests in the way of material sacrifice, and the time was coming when the Law could no longer be observed. The pouring out of coins bearing the stamp of material things and not of God, are the type of the taking away of the Kingdom of God from the Jews.

It may also be that the natural Temple is the soul skilled in reason, which because of its inborn reason is higher than the body to which Jesus ascends from Capernaum, the low-lying place

of less dignity, and in which, before Jesus' discipline was applied to it, earthly, senseless, and dangerous tendencies are found. These are driven away by Jesus in His Word, plaited out of doctrines and demonstrations and rebuke, to the end that His Father's House may be, not a house of merchandise, but a house of the service of God which is performed in accordance with heavenly and spiritual laws.

The ox is symbolic of earthly things, for he is a husbandman. The sheep of senseless and brutal things. The dove of empty and unstable thoughts. Small change, things thought good but not.

Origen raises the difficulty of accepting this story as it is written, (a) on the grounds of the possibility of a carpenter driving out thousands of Sheep, cattle and people, and of overturning the tables etc. and not receiving retaliation; and (b) to think of Jesus beating with a scourge. "if it happened" he says, it was greater than the changing of water into wine which was a dealing with soul-less matter. for here it was soul and will of thousands of men.

(There are here two important points :-

- (a) the literalism of Origen and his rationalism
- (b) the matter of fact aside "if it actually took place"

ἢ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὴν γυγόνηται. (I.214.14.)

The whole passage is illuminating, but it is rather long to quote here)

Origen treats of Matthew's account, and questions the historical detail of the incident of the Triumphal Entry. How could Jesus ride in on an ass and a colt at the same time? Why two beasts for such a short journey? Would Jesus let people strew

their clothes in the road? Would not the branches be a hindrance lying in the path of the ass? Matthew further refers to the buyers and the sellers being cast out, and Origen thinks that rather a large number. (Perhaps Origen is attacking the literalists here. It indicates that the "spiritual" exegesis of Origen was not universally accepted.)

What is the truth of the matter?

Jesus is the Word of God entering the soul (Jerusalem). The riding on the ass freed from its bonds by the disciples is the entering in the simple language of the Old Testament. That there are two disciples means, in the first place, him who applies what is written to the service of the soul showing the allegorical sense, and in the second place, him who brings to light the good and true things which lie in the shadow.

But He also rides on a young colt and this is the Word entering in the form of the New Testament. In both alike, we find the truth which purifies, and drives us away from all thoughts of selling and buying.

The garments and the branches serve to raise still higher above the ground the words of scripture, as His bearers tread on reasonable expositions. The multitudes coming before and after signify angelic ministrations, some coming first to prepare the way, and others following in His train.

Origen sees significance even in the fact that the village is un-named for in comparison, he says, with heaven, the whole earth is but a village.

In Mk. and Lk. he sees the significance of the foal as the

when the true Lord claimed His own.

John 2¹⁸

The Jews stand for *οἱ σωματικοί*

Both the Temple and the body of Jews are types of the Church.

Though all the stones be broken down and scattered abroad at the hands of those who by plots, persecutions and afflictions break the unity of the Body, (signifying here the individual members of the Church), yet the Body will rise on the third day after the present day of the evil, and the following day of the end.

The whole body of Christ's saints is crucified and is risen with Him, walking in a newness of life. The members of Christ will one day be brought together to the fulness of body, becoming one body.

Every one who is of Christ's nature is purified by Jesus and puts away the irrational things and things that savour of selling, on account of the zeal of the Logos that is in Him. They are destroyed to be raised again by Jesus "in 3 days" - the first the 'earthly' day, the second the 'psychical', the third the 'spiritual'. This was the charge brought against Jesus at His trial.

Forty six years was not a right figure for the building of the Temple. In Kings 1 - 5¹⁸ it takes a period of less than eleven years. As Solomon's Temple was destroyed, this may refer to Ezra's Temple, in which case we cannot discuss the accuracy of the 46 years. Heracleon says that the 6 stands for matter and the 40 for the tetrad which is inspiration. In a similar way, Origen speaks of the 40 indicating the 4 elements, and the 6 the

Origen's opinion is that the Temple spoken by Christ is the Church. It is extremely difficult to allegorise all the details as found in the Old Testament but he believes :- The Body is the Church, a house of God, built of living stones, a spiritual house for a holy priesthood (1 Peter 2⁵). The Son of David who builds this house is a type of Christ (text corrupt). He builds it during a profound peace when all wars were at an end, and builds it in Jerusalem on earth, so that it is no longer moveable like the tabernacle. Perhaps if all his enemies become Christ's footstool, and the last enemy Death is brought to nought, there will be the most perfect peace when Christ will be Solomon, the "Peaceful". Each living stone, according to his work here, will be a stone of that Temple. The management is all to be entrusted to holy powers.

Origen discusses the difficulties in taking the details of the building of the Temple in a literal sense and allegorises them. He spiritualises further Solomon's Temple building, and breaks off to say that John spoke of the Temple of his Body. He quotes the promises in the prophets addressed to Jerusalem as referring to the Church, and still to be fulfilled. It was after Jesus resurrection that the disciples saw the meaning of Christ's words here, and saw of what heavenly things they were the pattern and shadow. The perfection of our faith will be given to us at the great resurrection from the dead of the whole Body of Christ which is His Holy Church. "Now I know in part then shall I know even as I am known"

He draws a distinction between believing in the name of

πολλοὶ ἐπίστευον εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
αὐτὸς δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς

Jesus does not trust himself to those who believe in his Name. We must cleave to him, not his Name. Many believed in his Name, but only a few believed in him, and that means those who walk in the straight and narrow way found by the few.

He needed no man's testimony, but the statement is not necessarily exclusive of higher beings.

Jesus knew powers better or worse, which reside in man.

Tomes XI and XII not extant.

Tome XIII (Beg. John 4¹²)

The beginning of the exegesis of the Samaritan Woman is lost but there are a few fragments preserved at the end of Brooke's Vol. II which are interesting and instructive.

(a) As water quenches the thirst and cleanses the body, so the streams of Jesus teaching quench the thirst of unbelief, and cleanse the defilement of sin. (Fr. 54. Rome, Vat. 758; Reg. 9 : Ven. 27). (II. 269. line 17-end).

.... τὰ νοερά καὶ οὐράνια τῆς διδασκαλίας τοῦ
Ἰησοῦ νάματα ἱσται μὲν τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς
ἀπιστίας δίψαν, καθαίρει δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν
τῶν ὑπαδμάτων

(b) Fr. 55. Rome, Vat. 758 : Reg. 9 Ven. 27. Corderius p. 123
Jacob's well signifies the scripture of Moses:-

(c) Law was only given for men for a short time, the Gospel is its fulfilment.

(II.270. Lines 4-8) (Fr. 56 Rome, Vat. 758: Reg.9 : Ven 27.
 Corderius p 124)

(ὁ νόμος ἐστὶ) μέχρι καιροῦ τινὸς, ὡς τὴν πόσιν
 τοῦ ἐρμηνευομένου φρέατος διαρκεῖν μέχρι
 ἀναδείξως μείζονας ὕδατος.

The story of the Samaritan Woman is a good instance of the exposition of an incident when the person concerned is considered as a spiritual type. In this exposition Origen actually says that the Samaritan Woman is an image of the heterodox mind really in need of Jesus.

... εἰκὼν ... τυγχάνουσα γνώμης ἑτεροδοξούντων περὶ τὰς θείας
 ἀσχολουμένων γραφὰς ...

(I. 248.5-9)

She had drunk of the well reputed to be deep (i.e. the Old Testament scriptures signified by the well of Jacob) and had never ceased, nor was her thirst assuaged.

.... ἐκ τοῦ νομιζομένου αὐτῇ δεθέως εἶναι
 φρέατος οὐκ ἀνεπαύετο

I. 248. 9-11

This is the experience of all who drink in this fashion, but the Word of Christ is a continuing source solving all questions

and bearing the mind upwards to eternal life.

But it is a good thing to come and drink of the spring of Jacob, not calling it like the Samaritan Woman a φρέαρ (which is a cistern).

καλὸν ἐστὶ πίνειν πρῶτον ἐκ τῆς πηγῆς
τοῦ Ἰακώβ

I. 250. 31.

Jesus Himself had come to the spring and further he invited the Samaritan Woman to 'come hither'.

There are some of the more excellent and divine mysteries which cannot be contained in scripture and some not even in human speech at all.

ἕνα μὲν οὐ κεχώρηκε γραφὴ , ἕνα δὲ οὐδὲ ἀνθρώπινη φωνή .

I. 251. 19.

He quotes the many things that John had to omit (John 21²⁵), and the voice from the thunders John was prevented writing (Rev. 10⁴) and also Paul's groanings that could not be uttered (2 Cor. 12⁴)

Scripture contains only small rudiments of the whole of knowledge and slight introductions to it.

οἶμαι δὲ τῆς ὅλης γνώσεως στοιχεῖά τινα ἐλάχιστα καὶ βραχυτάτως εἶναι εἰσαγωγὰς ὅλης γραφῆς , κ' ἂν πάνυ νοηθῶσιν ἀκριβῶς .

I. 251. 31.

Jacob's well, of which Jacob once drank but now no longer, and his sons once drank, but now no longer drink, is the whole of scripture, but Jesus' water is above what is written.

ἡ μὲν πηγὴ τοῦ Ἰακώβ ... ἡ πᾶσα εἶναι γραφὴ
τὸ δὲ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὕδωρ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται .

Everybody is not able to discover this higher truth unless he becomes like them, lest hearing them he is overcome (252⁷⁻⁸) 140

The greater things could not occur to the mind of man because he had not yet the mind of Christ. Now, having this, we know the things freely given (χαρισθέντα) by God, which things we speak not in words taught by human wisdom, but by the Spirit of God.

Consider whether the human wisdom can call any dogmas true, except the rudimentary truths and those arrived at by the human mind. (252²⁶⁻²⁸).

The scriptures are but introductions, let us ascend to the higher truth of Jesus. Those who take up scripture wrongly drink as the Samaritan Woman did before believing in Jesus (253¹⁰⁻¹³):-

ἡ πρὸ τοῦ πιστεῦσαι εἰς Ἰησοῦν .

(There is an illuminating parallel drawn by Origen in this connection in Genesis Hom. VII 5, p.80 where he says the Church drinks of the springs of the Gospels and Apostles which never fail.... It drinks also of the wells when it draws and searches out every deeper thing of the Law, quoting John 4 vv 13-14).

The Samaritan Woman asked for this living water, that she may no longer be distressed by thirst nor come all the way to Jacob's spring in order to draw, but might be able apart from Jacob's water to contemplate the truth even as angels do, beyond man's power:-

θεωρεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀγγελικῶς καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων δυναθῆναι. I.253.25.

Angels do not need the water of Jacob for each has a spring within him. But one cannot receive the water from the Word, unless one has first been diligently occupied in drawing from Jacob's well and going beyond to the higher truths, not spending time at the elementary stages.

The husband is the law governing the soul. When the mind is in this condition it is joined to what is not its lawful husband, and therefore seeking its lawful husband, the mind says "I have no husband" i.e. no lawful husband.

141

The Spring of Jacob was the perfect place for the husband to be exposed by Jesus, for here Jesus showed that the husband was dead and the soul had another husband.

Let the soul see that this old law is no lawful husband, but that truth is her lawful husband, reigning for ever and subduing the enemies. I. 254³⁰⁻³²

ἀλλ' αἰδῶ μενοῦντι καὶ βασιλεύοντι, πάντας τε τοὺς ἐχθρούς ὑποτάσσοντι.

Origen proceeds to allegorise the five husbands as the five senses which communicate to man sensible and material things, the journey of the soul in the Old Testament. I. 255²⁰⁻²⁴

πέντε ἄνδρας καθ' ἐκάστην τῶν αἰσθήσεων ἀνδρός τινος γινομένου

Jesus comes and brings us to the consciousness of the sixth husband bringing the soul to spiritual things : that is why we say "I love no husband".

In the discussion of the feud between the Jews and the Samaritans, Origen says that the Jews are the figures of those holding sound principles, and the Samaritans heterodox.

Ἰουδαῖοι ... εἰκόνες εἰσὶ τῶν τοὺς ὑγιαίνοντας φρονούντων λόγους, Σαμαρεῖς δὲ τῶν ἑτεροδόξων. I. 259. 31.

As the hour spoken by the Lord has not yet come, when neither ⁱⁿ this mountain nor in Jerusalem will they worship the Father, we must shun the mountain of the Samaritans and worship God in Zion, the City of the Great King. This he explains as the Church built of living stones, wherein is a holy priesthood, and special sacraments are offered to God by the spiritual who have

understood the spiritual law:-

142

τὰ ἀληθινὰ ἱεροσόλυμα, ἣ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐκ λίθων ᾠκοδομημένη
ζωντάν, ἐνθα ἱεράτευμα ἁγίων, πνευματικῶν θυσίαι
προσφέρονται τῷ θεῷ ὑπὸ τῶν πνευματικῶν καὶ τὸν
πνευματικὸν νενοηκότων νόμον.

He discusses the symbolism of the two places Gerizim and
Jerusalem and then speaks of the πνευματικοί worshipping
in truth.

²²
John 4

Origen says the "you" is the Samaritans as far as the
reading goes, but the heterodox as far as the ἀναγωγή goes.
"We" is the Jews, viz :- those changed and saved by the Word.

(One is reminded in this context of the Mediaval tag :

Littera gesta docet : quid credas allegoria
Moralis quid agas : quo tendas anagogia.)

(In Con. Celsus VI 70, p. 686 Origen says that the Father ought
not to be worshipped in fleshly sacrament but in spiritual : nor
ought He to be worshipped in figures but in truth, which came
through Christ after the Law was given by Moses.)

(In criticising Heracleon's exposition of this passage he dismisses
Gnostic worship as a fiction and myth, and refers to the hidden
spiritual Jewish principles. It is difficult to understand all
that might be meant here, but it may indicate that Gnosticism or
at least the Gnostic approach was more prevalent than has generally
been thought.

... τὸν ἐν κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαίου καὶ τοὺς λόγους
τοὺς πνευματικοὺς Ἰουδαϊκοὺς . I. 264. 4 .)

The true worshippers are those who worship in spirit and not
flesh, in truth and not figure.

ἐν πνεύματι καὶ μὴ σαρκὶ , καὶ ἐν
ἀληθείᾳ καὶ μὴ τύποις -----

I 265. 8

The man enslaved to the letter, that kills and has not partaken of the Spirit that gives life, nor follows the spiritual things of the Law is no true worshipper

Concerned with figures and corporal things he worships God in Figure and not truth. He speaks of a man freeing himself from type and approaching truth, and instancing Paul and Timothy (Ac. 16³, 18¹⁸, 21²⁶) :-

ἐλευθερώσας τῶν τύπων προσαγάγῃ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ----

The true worship will be when we see God face to face.

He dismisses Heraclion's exegesis of the passage concerning intermediaries and the Jews being images of those in the Pleroma, describing him and his like as "myth-makers of he knows not what".
(267³) .

Origen discusses anthropomorphic conceptions of God and says we must see these statements spiritually, and understand and worship God as the angels.

John 4²⁵⁻⁶

Origen asks himself how the Samaritan Woman limited to the Pentateuch sought a Messiah. He says there are certain passages referring to Christ figuratively and obscurely. (274²⁵⁻⁸) .

He instances :- Jacob's blessing of Judah. Gen. 49⁸⁻¹⁰
 Balaam's prophecies. Numbers 24, 7f 17f.
 Moses blessing on Judah. Deut. 33 v.7

He again instances the heterodox mind at the spring of Jacob seeking a more perfect Word. I.275⁹⁻¹¹

ὃν ὑπολαμβάνει εἶναι τελειότερον λόγον τοῦτον Χριστὸν

and also calls her a soul scorning Zion and trusting in the mountain of Samaria. I.276²⁰⁻³.

ψυχῇ ἐξουθενούσῃ Σιών, καὶ πεποιθυία ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος Σαμαρείας.

John 4²⁸

He commends the woman for leaving her water pot and going to help her townsfolk, and we too should leave external things to hasten to impart benefit to others. This is the literal meaning. (Note Origen's drawing of moral guidance out of the literal meaning.) She lays aside the receptacle which drew the teaching of her former views counting them cheap, receiving the spring within her.

The Samaritans ask Jesus not to abide in the City but with them, i.e. in their mind, (to take over their leadership ἡγεμονικῶς) : they left their City, to come to him.

Such things are well adapted for allegory, Origen writes :-
 τοιοῦτά τινα δηλοῦται ἀκριβέστερα εἰς τὰς ἀναγωγὰς ----

It is said that he went into the city, for in a spiritual sense all the dispensation of help to the Samaritans took place beside Jacob's spring. I.279¹⁷⁻²⁰

ὅσον γὰρ ἐπὶ τῷ νοητῷ πᾶσα ἡ οἰκονομία τῆς ὠφελείας τοῖς Σαμαρεῦσιν παρὰ τῇ πηγῇ γεγένηται τοῦ Ἰακώβ.

(An instance of the spiritual interpretation being subserved by

the historical : it is the evangelists spiritual interpretation that is primary).

145

The disciples bring food to Him that He may feed them more - (text very defective here) - but he treats of the surface meaning and the deeper meaning of these words. He makes some use of the Parable of the Foolish Virgins but the text is too corrupt to understand everything : He likens the disciples to being asleep like the Foolish Virgins. He speaks of the different foods as suitable for souls in varying conditions but for the rational and spiritual (νοητός) man, spiritual bread and wine are needed. No man knows anything about the spiritual food that Christ received from His Father. In Fragment 59 (Rome, Vat. 758; Reg. 9 : Ven 27) he wonders if this passage can be understood in the sense of Daniel receiving food in Babylon, and Elijah from the angel and ravens. (1 Kings 17⁶, Bel. & the Dragon v. 34 ff).

35

John 4

Origen discusses in detail the exact meaning of "the four months to harvest", and its place and time. Truth is with difficulty attained by human nature, and after kinship with the things belonging to the four elements (i.e. rudiments) we pass over them, and apprehend the truth. 291¹⁸⁻²⁰

ὅτι πάντες ταῦτα καταλήψονται τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

The operative word is four not months, for it could not have been either days or years - a comment which shows that for Origen the significant issue in Scripture is its interpretation. Towards the end of his comments on the Samaritan Woman he equates ignorance of the spiritual sense of scripture with living in

Further, in his comments on the Nobleman's son he considers the honouring of the dead letter and the consequent loss of the spirit as garnishing the tombs of the prophets. (314¹¹⁻¹⁵)

The "Lift up your eyes" is spiritual without anything literal and is a common phrase of scripture (291⁶⁻⁹). (Is.40²⁶) (Lk.6²⁰ 13¹¹)

The harvest is the harvest of truth, the consummation of works gathering ⁱⁿ truth. 291²¹.

ἡ συντέλεια τῶν συγκομιδῶν τῆς ἀληθείας ἔργων.

The inner sense is intentionally alusive, for the majority are evil minded, ²⁷⁻³⁰ 291 . . .

μάλιστα ἐπεὶ καὶ τοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ σωματικωτέρους λανθάνειν ὁ λόγος βούλεται, κρύπτων μὲν τὸ μυστικόν, ἐμφαίνων δὲ τὸ ἀπλούστερον εἰς τὸ σαφές εἶναι νομίζεσθαι τοὺς ἀπαγγελλομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος λόγους.

The Word urges the disciples to lift up their eyes upon the field of scripture, and upon the fields of the principle in ever existing things, that one may behold the whiteness and brightness of the truth which is everywhere.

ἵνα τὴν λευκότητα καὶ τὴν λαμπρότητα θεάσῃται τις τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας πανταχοῦ φωτός.

I. 295.3ff.

It is in this connection referring to the scripture that he says that no-one is a true disciple of Jesus who has not lain on Abraham's bosom.

Origen examines in detail the many senses in which the word "harvest" is used in scripture and concludes as above that the harvest is the clear principle of the explanation of the

scripture. The sower and the reaper here indicate respectively ¹⁴⁷ Moses and the prophets, and the Apostles. Let genuine disciples lift up their eyes and behold the fields sown by Moses and the prophets and reap the harvest, and so rejoice reaper and sower together in the age to come. Origen suggests that if we doubt his interpretation we must consider that the Transfiguration was a harvest in which sowers and reapers rejoiced together (300²⁰⁻²⁵).

A greater than the scriptures was among them ; it was an exceptional sojourn, and it was fitting that exceptional things should be spoken. In His power the apostles had sown seeds greater than ever known by Moses and the prophets, arriving at surpassing visions of truth.

πολλαπλασίονα φθάσαι τῆς ἀληθείας θεάματα .

I.303. 1.

Moses and the prophets lived under the Law, the Christians under the Gospel. Yet they rejoice together, one end being laid up for both from one God through one Christ in one Holy Spirit. (The frequent mentions of the one God both of Old and New Testament indicates the power of Gnosticism.) The Word makes clearer the labours of the sowers.

John 4³⁹

Those entangled in heresy forsake the city of false doctrines and coming forth from it believe soundly.

John 4⁴⁰

Origen brings Matthew 10⁵ *Εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν μὴ ἀπέλθῃτε, καὶ εἰς πόλιν Συμμεριτῶν μὴ εἰσελθῃτε,* against this passage. This passage must mean to enter into false knowledge, for it expressly omits the statement of His actually entering the City and records the Jews coming to Him. And he abode with them is all the text says. He abides but two days^{for} they could not admit His third day. The Word of the woman brings them

to Christ but the increase follows on His Word. Origen makes
the delightful comment, 309¹⁹⁻²⁰

148

ἀεὶ γὰρ μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν ἔστι, μηδεπώποτε
καταλείπων αὐτούς.

John 4⁴²

It is better to see Christ without teachers or intermediate instruments :-

καὶ βέλτιόν γε ἔστιν αὐτόπτην γενέσθαι τοῦ λόγου
καὶ χωρὶς ὀργάνων διδάσκοντος ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ καὶ
φαντασιῶντος οὐ διὰ τῶν διδασκόντων τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν,
εὐρίσκον τρανότητά τοὺς τῆς ἀληθείας τύπους...

I. 309. 27ff.

(Perhaps this is one of the passages that brought about Origen's unpopularity in orthodox circles)

It is clear that for Origen the Samaritan Woman represented the soul of man. This figure was treated as the human soul unenlightened, in the power one after another of its material senses (five husbands), seeking its real Master. At first before the well of Jacob and ever continuing to thirst under such a ministration, the soul finds the eternal spring of Christ.

The Nobleman's Son

There is an interesting statement by Origen on his opinion of John as a writer

καὶ τάχα τὸ μὲν βούλημα τοῦ ῥητοῦ τούτου ἔστιν, ὡς ἰδιώτης
δὲ τῷ λόγῳ ὁ Ἰωάννης δυσπαράστατως ἔφραδεν ὁ νενόηκεν.

I: 312. 15.

Note too, Judea is read as a symbol of something superior and Galilee inferior. (312²⁸).

John 4⁴⁶

Origen discusses whose king's officer he is and then

says "granting the literal meaning, let us examine what he and his son may symbolise"

149

φέρει δὲ κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν ἡμῶν ἐρευνήσωμεν τίνος οὗτος
σύμβολον εἶναι δύναται καὶ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ .

I. 317. 27 f.

and begins to examine every detail.

He takes the king's officer as Abraham; that his son was sick at Capernaum and about to die is Israel, grown weak in its religion and the observance of the divine laws, come near to dying to God, and in fever from the fiery darts of the Enemy. From 2 Mac. 15¹⁴ (Jeremiah prayeth much for the people and the holy city), it is clear that the departed saints are concerned about the People, and therefore Abraham asks the Saviour to save Israel.

ὅρα τοίνυν εἰ δυνατόν ἐκλήμβανειν ἡμῶς ὅτι ὁ Ἀβραάμ
βασιλικὸς τις ὢν , νοσήσας αὐτῷ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ
ἀποθνήσκειν μέλλοντος , ἀξιοῖ βοηθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος
ἡμῶν τὸν κείμενον , γενόμενος πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ
ἐρωτῶν ἵνα καταβῇ καὶ ἰάσῃται αὐτοῦ τὸν υἱόν ,
ἔμελλε γὰρ ἀποθνήσκειν .

I. 318. 30 ff.

Origen justifies his exegesis on a scriptural basis, and though it appears fanciful to us, yet, on his own premises, it is thoroughly rational.

John 4⁴⁸

The son's recovery is spoken of as salvation :- (τὴν
σωτηρίαν αὐτοῦ) I. 319. 22. The seventh hour was that of rest:-

ὁ ἀριθμὸς ἀναπαύσεως I. 319. 26.

The son was healed in the field of comfort, and is a type of sick

γένος τι κεκμηκότων μὲν ὡς πάντα
δὲ ἔξω καρπῶν γεγενημένων

I. 319. 27.

Origen considers the salvation of the nobleman an image of the salvation of certain rulers at Christ's coming. He proceeds to examine at length Heracleon's interpretation.

54

John 4

The two visits of our Saviour to Cana may be taken as symbols of His two visits to the earth. On the former visit He gladdens us with wine, (He changes the water of Scripture into wine) : on the second He releases from fever and cures the nobleman's son. He observes that the son fell sick because Jesus was not there οὐκ ἦν ὁ πῶς Ἰησοῦς, I. 325. 12., a comment similar to his comment on the death of Lazarus, as is his comment that it was the word of Jesus that healed him. The nobleman's son, the centurion's servant and Peter's wife's mother were all sick at Capernaum, and all were healed by day.

No wonder has taken place in scripture without being a sign and symbol of something beyond that perceived by the senses

σημεῖον καὶ σύμβολον ἑτέρου παρὰ τὸ
αἰσθητῶς γεγενημένον. I. 327. 5.

The people believe because of the marvellousness ; it is performed however to convey a sign :-

ὑμῶν μὲν πιστεύοντων διὰ τὸ θαυμάσιον, ὑμῶν δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα καὶ
διὰ τὸ ὅδ' ἐστὶ σημεῖον ἐπιτελούντων αὐτό. I. 327. 19.

This last comment is a penetrating comment in a Gospel like the Fourth Gospel for the miracles are reported in quite a different way and for a different purpose than are the miracles in the Synoptists. All of John's miracles were signs of another

quite final healing, while in the Synoptists the meaning of the miracles is exhausted with the explanation of the cure. John 151
meant his signs to bear ^acertain super-temporal meaning, and this the ancient commentators knew - whether they are right in every particular is another consideration. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that John's Gospel was a fabricated one - though a fabric more valid than the synoptic Gospel. The supreme disclosure is to begin to discover what this fabric was as it existed in the mind of John.

Origen takes this entire incident as an allegory of the salvation of Israel by its Messiah.

Tomes XLV - XLVII (covering John 5¹ - 8^{19a}) not extant.

¹⁹
VOL. 11 Tome XLX beg. John 8
John 8^{19b}

Origen says that this is one of the texts which the Gnostics think clearly establishes that the God whom the Jews worshipped was not Christ's Father. That the Pharisees did not "know", Origen interprets in three ways :-

- (a) Not knowing in the sense of not understanding the scriptures
- (b) Knowing as a stage beyond believing, they having believed but not being in a state of knowing.
- (c) Knowing as being absorbed into and united to God.

He concludes very firmly, quoting Acts 7^{2f}, and Rom. 1-7 :-

ὁ αὐτός ἐστι θεὸς τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τοῦ κόσμου δημιουργὸς πολλαχόθεν ἔστι θεωρεῖν.

Before leaving this verse he makes the comment that as one enters the Holy of Holies by steps, so Christ is our steps.

²⁰
John 8

Places have a significance :- εὐρήσεις τὸ τῆς προσθήκης εὐλογον.

The coins are the divine words impressed with the image of the Great King :- τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως

ἐντετυπωμένην ἔχοντες

Let each man therefore contribute to the up-building of the Church bringing what he can into the spiritual treasury.

152

ἐπὶ τὸ νοητὸν γαζοφυλάκιον ὃ δύναται (II. 11. 16)

being a tried banker discerning genuine from counterfeit pretending to be real :- προσποιούμενα εἶναι δόκιμα (II. 11.10.)

(Origen more than once refers to this being "tried bankers", though the reference seems obscure). To the Treasury Jesus brought the words of eternal life, and teaching about God and Himself. More valuable than any coin was "I am the Light of the World", and "If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also"

21

John 8

To preserve the truth in our soul is to keep Jesus; to depart from the truth is to die in our sins. "Ye shall die" is taken in a sense in which death is the last enemy of Christ : to "die in sin" means we shall never follow Jesus. He considers sin~~der~~ under three heads :- the soul's death, the soul's sickness, and complete loss of the soul. (18²⁸⁻³⁰)

22

John 8

Origen refers to the secret tradition and books of the Jews. (20¹³⁻¹⁷). This is not to be taken in the simple sense but in accordance with some tradition about the Christ . 23³⁻⁷.

κατὰ τινα περὶ Χριστοῦ παράδοσιν

It is also giving a malicious name to the tradition of Christ's death. 24²⁷⁻²⁹

κακοῦ θέστερον ὀνομάζοντες τὸ κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν
περὶ τοῦ θανατοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ

II. 24. 27.

23

John 8

Origen takes the "beneath" to mean of worldly and material ideas as against the invisible, but a soul can be removed from one region to another. In fact, this was Christ's work. Origen says that "I am not of this World" may mean the

dwelling of Jesus in the spiritual world and leading his disciples to it. This is a revealing comment showing Origen's Christology.

153

ἡ ψυχὴ εἶναι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐμπολιτευομένη τῇ ὅλῃ κόσμῳ
ἐκείνῳ καὶ πάντα αὐτὸν ἐμπεριερχομένη, καὶ χειραγωγούσα
ἐπ' αὐτὸν τοὺς μεθεπτευομένους.

II. 31. 7 ff

John 8²⁴

To die in one's sins is to die in a state of unbelief. This is the exact Johannine position. Belief is a state of having coalesced with the Word, and death is unbelief.

John 8²⁵

The question of their seeking His identity marks his greatness

Tome XLX breaks off here.

Tome XX

John 8³⁷

Origen interprets seed and child spiritually, in that a seed has not grown and therefore the Word can have no place with him who has not advanced from being Abraham's seed to becoming his child.

John 8³⁸

Origen again repudiates the belief that the Father of Christ is other than the God who gave the Law and Prophets (43¹⁹⁻²¹).

John 8³⁹

A true child of Abraham is a spiritual man doing the whole sequence of things of which Abraham's history is an allegory 26²¹⁻³

δεῖ πᾶσαν τὴν κατὰ τὸν Ἀβραάμ ἀλληγοροῦντα ἱστορίαν ἕκαστον
πνευματικὸν ποιῆσαι τῶν πεπραγμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

Come forth from thy country : the Lord rewards obedience. Lot is the symbol of all who accompany him. The journey to Sichem is the descent of the mind. God's appearance to Abraham is his

appearance to us. Hai is the feasts. He concludes ,

154

ἅτινά ἐστὶν ἀλληγορούμενα , ὡς πνευματικοὶ πνευματικῶς
ποιεῖν πειραδόμεθα .

John 8⁴⁰

There is no time when the man Jesus was not present in human life : the spiritual dispensation of Jesus was always with the saints.

John 8⁴¹

To be a son of the devil is to do his works. None is that by constitution, and all can become Sons of God. All who have not been born of God have been born not from the true bride but the harlot, viz :- matter.

John 8⁴²

Not all powers are sent by God. Also, the soul of Jesus existing in its perfection was sent by God and received a body from Mary :-

ἐκεῖθεν ἐξηληλυθυῖα (i.e. from God)... ἀνέλαβε
τὸ ἐκ τῆς Μαρίας σῶμα .

II. 62. 20f

John 8⁴³

'Hear' means to 'understand', 'know' to comprehend.

John 8⁴⁴

These desires are not the desires of the devil as such, but what he makes men desire for themselves. Origen distinguishes too between a "willing" (βούλησις) as a good longing ὀρέξις , and an ἐπιθυμία , which is an irrational or excessive longing. We are free to will the works of God or the devil : but more than willing God's desires is demanded, but effecting His work. Origen's accurate scholarship and strong ethical sense should be noted. He resists Heracleon's comment that the men in question were of the nature of the devil. He says the essential nature is the same in a good ear as in a bad ear, a good eye and a bad

eye. A holy being is of the same nature as the devil. There is a deeper cause why the ear does not hear and the eye see, as there is analogically in the soul that refuses to receive the word. Children of the devil are such not so much by nature as by works.

John 8⁴⁴

Manslaying is interpreted as spiritual sin and death; and life, being "in Christ". To stand in the truth is to hold sound doctrine steadfastly. This position accrues with difficulty and after many struggles, but no human being can stand fully in truth. He considers the devil as deceived about truth and deceiving others, yet not wholly false. A lie comes from the nature of the lying spirit, but Truth is from God.

John 8⁴⁵

Many admire Jesus but do not accept his words and habits.

John 8⁴⁶

It should be our vocation to copy Christ so that none can convict us of sin. We are not of God and sufficiently cleansed to see His truth : we must pray for belief. Origen's moral teaching here, which is sound in itself, should be noted as a typical tendency of his exegesis, as well as for its intrinsic worth.

John 8⁴⁷

Nobody hears God's words by being by nature from God, but by receiving power to become a child of God. Hearing is to be understood in the sense of understanding and realising.

John 8⁴⁸

He discusses what could be the likely significance of being called a Samaritan, but makes no strong conclusion :-

- (a) perverting Jewish things,
- (b) becoming a Samaritan to win the Samaritan,
- (c) Samaritan means keeper - Christ is a keeper of men's souls.

Jesus alone of mankind had not a devil - Origen ascribes all the varying sins as possession by devils. He honours God by His perfect life. The one who seeks and judges is God, and here he differs from Heracleon who considers that Moses is here meant.

51
John 8

Who keeps Jesus' word shall never see death. Origen considers Moses and the prophets as having kept the word and therefore living.

52
John 8

Origen draws a special point in the word "tasting" death as against "seeing" death. Tasting is to be understood as putting forth things opposed to the words of eternal life (104¹⁰⁻¹²) which is spiritual death, and "seeing death" means the natural experience that comes to every mortal man. Christ is greater than Abraham and the prophets, for they all prophesied of Him.

End of Tome XX.

Tomes XXl to XXVll no longer extant.

Tome XXVlll

Tome XXVlll opens in the middle of the Raising of Lazarus
John 11³⁹, but there are some valuable fragments covering vv 1-39
(a) 11¹ Fr. Rome, Vat. 758; Reg. 9 : Ven. 27.

Origen discusses the two Lazaruses and considers their identity different. This Lazarus is from Bethany, house of obedience, and being obedient is a friend of Jesus. Even Jesus' friend may fall sick when Jesus is absent, and even die.

(b) 11² Fr. 78. Mary is the same woman who anointed the Lord with ointment, now sitting at His feet, a disciple.

(c) 11⁴ f. Fr. 79. This sleep may represent the death of the unenlightened.

(d) 11⁹ Fr. 137. The 12 hours are the 12 Patriarchs and 12 Apostles the sun of whom is Christ.

(e) 11¹⁴ Fr. 79. Jesus must come to the dead man, if the dead man is to rise. It was to teach the disciples that Lazarus' death was due to Jesus' absence.

(f) 11¹⁶ Fr. 79. Thomas understood Jesus to die in order to go and preach to the departed, or that it is not possible to live with Jesus unless we die with Him, or that he saw danger arising from the Jews.

(g) 11¹⁷ Fr. 79. Four belongs to things material and lowly e.g. 400 years in bondage; Moses fasted 40 days, as did Elijah and Christ, and that is why Lazarus is dead for four days. But Christ was free among the dead and rose in the holy number 3.

(h) 11¹⁸ Fr. 80 Bethany (house of obedience) is fifteen furlongs from Jerusalem (vision of peace) and 15 is the number of the steps of the Temple. This 15 comprises 7 for the Sabbath and 8 for the Circumcision. The characters in the story are all considered as types :-

ἔπερ δὲ σύμβολον ἐστὶ Μαρία μὲν τοῦ θεωρητικοῦ βίου ,
 Μάρθα δὲ τοῦ πρακτικοῦ , Λάζαρος δὲ τοῦ μετὰ τὴν
 πίστιν ἐν ἁμαρτίαις γενομένου .

II. 290. 13f.

Martha ran to Jesus, but Mary waited to receive Him, as alone able to bear His presence. Origen notes that Mary fell at Jesus' feet, but not Martha.

(i) 11³⁸ There is an interesting comment in Fr. 84 on Lazarus' tomb being in the rock and not a built one, Origen saying that only a house or temple or anything profitable to the living should be built.

There must be no delay in carrying out Christ's commands.

John 11⁴¹

Jesus lifts up His eyes removing His thoughts from intercourse here below to the Father above all. Jesus' prayer is heard without uttering it, for His first words are thanks for having been heard. Perhaps He even saw the soul of Lazarus return or even brought by those assigned to such offices. Origen says the spiritual application is obvious. He interprets Lazarus' death as the person lapsed from faith being dead to God. The crowd around is the unbelievers marvelling at a soul dead to virtue now returned to it:-

II. pp. 115, 116.

ἡ δὲ κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἀναγωγὴ ἐκ τῶν προαποδεσμεύων οὐ δοχευρῆς.
 ἦγθε γὰρ τὸν μετὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν φιλίαν ἡμαρτηκότα καὶ νεκρὸν γενόμενον τῷ Θεῷ
 δυνάμει θεῆς παλινδραμῆσαι ἐπὶ τὴν ζωὴν, καὶ ἔτυχε, καὶ εἶδεν ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ
 ζωτικὰ κινήματα, ἐφ' οἷς εὐχαριστεῖ τῷ πατρὶ
 καὶ περιεστῶς γε οὕτως ὁ ὄχλος θαυμάζει εἰ οὕτω δυσώδης ἀπο τῶν πρὸς
 θάνατον ἡμαρτημάτων τις γεγεννημένος καὶ ἀποθανὼν τῇ ἀρετῇ ἐπαλινδρόμησεν ἐπ' αὐτήν.

There are many Lazaruses who, after friendship with Jesus, have fallen sick and died and after this been called again by Jesus :-

χρὴ δὲ εἰδέναι ὅτι εἰδί τινες καὶ νῦν Λάζαροι, μετὰ τὴν φιλίαν
 Ἰησοῦ ἀποθανόντες καὶ ἀποθανόντες καὶ ἐν μνημείῳ καὶ νεκρῶν χωρὰ
 μέναντες μετὰ νεκρῶν νεκροὶ, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο τῇ εὐχῇ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ
 ζωοποιηθέντες. II. 116. 20 ff.

Such a person comes from his state of death bound by sin (i.e. the grave clothes) unable to move or see, until Jesus commands the bands to be loosed, and bids him proceed on his way.

No particular person is commanded to loose him : perhaps it was addressed to the Angels because of the spiritual application of the passage.

διὰ τὴν κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἀναγωγὴν

(119¹⁰).

He carried out this action to convince the Jews, and many were converted to belief. Only those who saw believed.

τοῦτέστι θεωρήσαντες καὶ συνέντες ἃ ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς,
ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν.

John 11^{47f}

Origen sees this as the spirit of literal Judaism wanting to overthrow the spiritual teaching of Christ, and this is still enacted even then, but they plot against the Truth and cannot prevail.

John 11^{49ff}

A man may prophesy without being a prophet, as a man may do a righteous act and not therefore be righteous. Origen discusses at very great length this prophecy of Caiaphas saying it was a true one, for Christ was the sinless sacrifice that took away the sin of the world. He did literally die for the people and on his account the nation did not perish.

Origen emphasises the fact that Caiaphas was high Priest for that year, and he and no other prophesied. It was a true prophecy though he will not say whether it was of the Holy Spirit, and he concludes (138⁴⁻⁸) that it was Jesus wish so to die.

John 11⁵⁴

Jesus' retirement teaches the lesson that we should not rush into martyrdom. (T.S. Eliot makes Becket see this as the supreme temptation). He takes his disciples to Ephraim (fruitfulness). To this day Jesus is with his disciples near the wilderness and is present with fruitfulness. He links the passage with the birth of Ephraim who was born in a time of affliction. The whole is rather fine exegesis, but it must be noticed how names of people, places and even incident subserve the didactic purpose.

The true purification was not before the Passover but at it.

End of Tome XXVlll

Tomes XXlX, XXX and XXXl not extant.

Tome XXXll

1-6

John 13

Origen observes that washing takes place before not after a meal. He allegorises the incident in this manner :- Dinner is the first meal on setting out on the spiritual life and supper is the final one, the meal of reason for those who have advanced. In other words, the Old Testament is the dinner, and the New Testament the supper. Those who sup with Jesus at the end of life need only the extremities which associate with the earth cleansing, and only Jesus can do that. Origen actually says that the literal meaning subserves the evangelist's spiritual intention :- He rises from supper and stops supping, for they cannot have part with Him (i.e. spiritual sharing) unless he wash them. He insists on the incident being interpreted "spiritually"

διεγέρων ἡμῶν τὸν νοῦν ἐπὶ τὸ νοητὸν

II.149. 29.

νοητῶς νοεῖν τὰ παρατιθέμενα ἐν τοῦτοις τῆς ψυχῆς σώματα

II.155. 16f.

The water is the word (156¹⁴⁻¹⁷).

6-11

John 13

Peter's sin is like those who, in their believing, purpose excellent things, but because of their ignorance do otherwise. On the question of why our Lord did not begin with Peter he makes an interesting reference on searching the scriptures for the smallest point. Origen considers that Jesus washed feet which already had been washed because, though they were clean as among men, they were not also with God, and only Jesus could give this

true cleansing. The washing was done after the devil had put ¹⁰¹ the betrayal into Judas' heart. The cleansed disciples were now to take good tidings to men's souls:-

καθαροῖς τοῖς ποσὶν ἐπι/βαίνειν ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχαῖς. II. 162. 30
Origen considers Peter as being used to speak falsely that the Truth may be clearer. A very interesting comment.

ὁ δὲ βλέπων λυσιτελέστερον εἶναι τὸ ἐν τούτῳ
ψεύσασθαι τὸν Πέτρον τοῦ ἀληθεῶσαι II. 163. 12f.

This method is defended and Origen challenges his enemies to bring out the meaning of the words in another way (164⁷⁻¹⁰). He draws his moral, that without this experience our feet will not be able to bear the good news of good things.

Vs. 12-15 Only Jesus could have washed the inner man. He makes a bold comment about the disciple being as his master. (ὅτι μηκέτι λέγεται τοῦ διδασκάλου) II. 168. 2. It is a harsh thing to take the command literally, i.e. the washing of feet, but there were evidently the literalists to contend with. The incident must be taken figuratively or else a flattering household servant is blessed. He that eateth My bread is taken as sharing mysterious nourishing teachings. (174¹⁸⁻²⁰)

Vs. 19-20 We are to increase our faith, and ever look out for the true Teacher and the false. Note Origen's tendency always to draw a practical conclusion for life.

V 21 He distinguishes between soul and spirit : considering soul as neutral and capable of either vice or virtue, but the spirit as not admitting of evil things. He says, incidentally, that he had examined the whole of scripture to come to this conclusion - an interesting side light.

V 22 Judas must not have been wholly wicked to have remained

unsuspected by the other eleven.

162

Vs. 23-9 It was John who was lying in Jesus' bosom, but Origen interprets the phrase symbolically, and draws his moral, exhorting us to action that we may lie in Jesus' bosom too.

V 30 Judas not only went out but went out from Jesus. It was a right discernment in Origen to perceive that ἦν δὲ νόξ was not a random comment: εἰκὼν τυγχάνουσα τῆς γενομένης ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ

ἰούδα νυκτός ... II. 197. 11.

Vs. 31-2 He discusses the word "glory" at great length concluding that glory is the accurate knowledge of God, and meditated on in pure contemplation.

V 33 "Little" children means that their soul is yet small. The spiritual pilgrimage is from servant to disciple, then a little child, then a brother of Christ and a son of God. He here defines a disciple :-

μικθάνοντα ἀπὸ τοῦ τηλικούτου διδασκάλου τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. II. 206.15.

He interprets "I am with you" spiritually, for Christ was not in Judas even when he handed him the sop.

The commentary ends with a discussion on following Jesus, and though the disciples could not follow Jesus literally, (not having yet the spirit and Jesus not yet being glorified), yet we are to follow Him until we can say that our soul cleaves to him.

This concludes the examination of the extant text of Origen on the Fourth Gospel, together with the fragments collected by A.E. Brooke.

It is a picture of the exposition of our then ablest commentator, soon after the year 200 A.D., and gives a real idea of how the Fourth Gospel was understood and expounded in early days. The

exposition was not likely to be a "local" one merely, for Origen 163
had great influence on the exegesis of scripture. Its dangers
as a technique are obvious and were obvious, and indeed were offset
by the great work of the Antiochenes. But it is important as
evidence to show how the Fourth Gospel was first understood.
Every detail of person, incident or place is believed to lead man
from the finite and temporal to the infinite and eternal, and the
problem of history resolved in seeing historic fact not as past
but as an eternal now. There is no past, present or future :
there is only the eternal.

Origen knew that John had seen Truth, and he was anxious
that we should see, in the exposition of the incidents and facts
that John had assembled and interpreted, that we should see through
these the Word made flesh confronting us in our lives. This was
the purpose of the Evangelist, and though we would disagree with
much of Origen's interpretation, yet he had rightly discerned
John's purpose. This was Origen's importance in his own day, and
since the rise of the historical method, makes him of peculiar
relevance again in our own time.

4. MAIN CONCLUSIONS SUMMARISED

The facts in support of the thesis are expounded in detail in the analytical section just concluded, and are not going to be recapitulated here, but it may help to have in conclusion a summary statement of some of the points that give support to the thesis. The points are indicative and interpretative, and not exhaustive or final : the detailed work which justifies them lies in section three .

In the first place it would seem that, similar to Heracleon, Origen expounds the episodes of the Fourth Gospel as symbolic of various types of spiritual attitude and character. Origen has, of course, other principles guiding his exegesis : e.g. the exposing of Gnosticism on scriptural grounds; the justifying of Christianity as against Judaism, also on scriptural grounds; the desire to find the plain grammatical sense ; the pastoral tendency to draw a moral for living; and other principles. All of these are shown in the work above, but this thesis is trying to show, and possibly emphasise, the over-all prevailing tendency of Origen's spiritual symbolic interpretation.

Let us recall some suggestive examples under several groupings (All these points are considered in detail ad loc.)

Group I. The Incidents.

(a) The changing of the water into wine.

In the fulness of time the Law and the Prophets having failed, Jesus the true and expected Messiah has come bringing the good wine of the Kingdom of Heaven. (This was a traditional sign of the coming of the Messiah, and would be considered in no other way by a Jew). Jesus first sign was to superannuate Judaism.

(b) The Cleansing of the Temple.

The Temple, following ^{of} necessity on the supercession of the Law, has with this now served its purpose and is no longer needed. Christ swept it away and offers men the Gospel. The Gospel and not the Law is alone adequate to man's salvation.

(c) The Samaritan Woman.

Origen interprets the incident as the soul of man unable to find satisfaction in Judaism, ever seeking therefore to assuage its natural thirst, and ever continuing to find the well of Judaism unable to meet its need. Christ comes and certainly and finally satisfies the soul's real need.

(d) The Nobleman's Son

The nobleman is Abraham whose son Israel is about to die, and without Christ will die. Christ restores to him his life. This is Israel's salvation. Israel is now the true Israel.

(It is worth commenting here that Origen's emphasis on Judaism as a force spent and replaced by Christianity is shared by the Fourth Evangelist himself, and is, in part, the 'raison d'etre' of the Fourth Gospel.)

(e) Lazarus

Every character in this episode is considered as a spiritual type - Mary is the contemplative, Martha the worker and the like obvious moralisings. But the central character, Lazarus, is interpreted deliberately and in detail as the type of man's soul. He is the soul lapsed from faith and being alienated from Christ, (who is therefore far away), falls sick and consequently dies. Christ comes and raises the soul to life again, though even when restored, it has its grave clothes clinging to it i.e. it is still liable to lapse into sin and die again.

(f) The Footwashing

This is the spiritual cleansing of the inner man which

only Christ can do.

Group II. Personages.

166

Andrew is interpreted as the missionary, John the type of pure discipleship, Peter the type of faith and action, and so on.

John Baptist baptising beyond Jordan is the type of the Old Covenant, when Israel had not yet reached the Promised Land (i.e. the kingdom of Heaven). He cries so that all might hear him : he cries in the wilderness (i.e. the desert of the soul deprived of God and deserted of truth). He is unworthy to untie the latchet : i.e. he cannot unravel the mystery of the Incarnation.

Group III Places

The variant reading of Bethany and Bethabara are discussed, as are those of Gerasa, Gadara and Gergesa, but it is the spiritual interpretation of the place name that finally is made to resolve the difficulty, and not textual criticism or fact finding as such.

Capernaum is the field of consolation near to the wilderness where Christ cured and brought consolation to so many.

Gerizim stands for heterodox worship, and Jerusalem stands for Zion where all shall worship in spirit and in truth.

Group IV. Dates, Numbers, Feasts and incidental detail

"On the morrow" means the dawn of spiritual enlightenment. That Jesus did not stay the third day with the Samaritans, meant that He could not reach to perfection with them.

Andrew turned in at the tenth hour, the hour of perfection. The four days of Lazarus' death, the four months to harvest, the forty and six years of the Temple's building and so on, all carry an interpretation and an evangelical significance.

The feasts are the earthly types of what heaven has yet to offer us. Origen refers to three Passovers :-

167

- (a) that which gave to the ancient children of Israel deliverance from their earthly enemy at the hand of Moses.
- (b) that which gave to the New Israel (the Church), deliverance from their spiritual enemy, by the redemption effected by Christ.
- (c) that which will be celebrated with myriads of angels.

The incidental detail is rich beyond assessment, as might have been expected, but only a few of the suggestive details are recapitulated here.

Christ's shoes were allegorised and signified his Incarnation. The harvest was the harvest of truth, Capernaum was a journey down, but Jerusalem a journey up. Moses was the sower, the apostles the reapers. Not a single detail escaped comment by Origen, even down to the use of particular prepositions, and the presence or absence of the article. ἡν δὲ νόη is the darkness into which Judas plunged his soul.

In this connection, too, his typological exposition of the Old Testament must be noticed. Abraham's history is the allegory of man's salvation. The crossing of the Red Sea and the entry into the Promised Land all prefigure and typify man's salvation and his entry into the Kingdom of Heaven.

It is true that all scripture lends itself to spiritual interpretation, and all its incidents and details can be made to bear a message. Indeed this has been the basis of both hymnody and homiletics. Further the same technique enjoyed universal application by the Fathers, (with the natural and obvious exception of the teaching of Jesus which was expounded in its

real and intended meaning). But in the particular case of the 168
Fourth Gospel, it is no simple spiritualising as such, as for
instance in the case of the exposition of the Good Samaritan
in say Augustine. It is not a merely original and valuable
eliciting of truth : it is the stark confrontation of man with
Truth Itself. John has a single and simple principle unifying
his selection of incidents and events. Christ had come in the
fulness of time prepared from the Creation of the world as God's
Last Word to man. Man in all his conditions is confronted by
God made Flesh. Man's answer is final and determinative for now
and all time. God has spoken in flesh and blood, what is man's
reply : what is his reader's reply. John himself has seen the
eternal significance of the Incarnation, and nothing matters
more than that man should have this presented to him, and in
a way which he could see and understand. Every incident, and for the
commentators if not for John himself every detail as well,
suberves his intent, so that man in his varying spiritual
conditions may perhaps see, believe and have life eternal. So
Origen understood John, and quite possibly John meant himself to
be understood.

Origen's exegesis is regrettably incomplete, but there is
sufficient evidence to indicate that his exegesis of the Fourth
Gospel was a typological and spiritual exposition of the soul
of man in its varying conditions or experiences, sometimes sick,
sometimes lost, sometimes even dead, but always with a possibility
of restoration in Christ - In Origen it is very largely the
soul of man as it had been elevated but never saved by Judaism.

But evenso, this is a true interpretation of the emphasis to the Gospel which the Fourth Evangelist had himself made in the first place.

We must now turn to consider the commentaries of Chrysostom, Augustine, and Cyril all of which are fortunately extant.

CYRIL

1. Introduction Page 171
 - (a) Introductory note (p.171)
 - (b) A modern note on the Christological controversy. (p.172)
 - (c) Cyril's background (p.175)

2. Cyril on John Page 180

3. Conclusions Page 280
 - (a) Scripture (p.280)
 - (b) The Eucharist (p.283)
 - (c) The broad lines of the exegesis (p.284)

CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA

The commentary on St. John has usually been regarded as St. Cyril's great work. Yet its very greatness is at once its weakness, for rather than an exposition of John's text it is a dogmatical exposition of the Incarnation with a striking treatment throughout of the significance of that Event in the quickening of our own life, covering the Holy Trinity, the Union of the Godhead and Manhood in Christ, the Eucharist as our means of Union with Him, our free-will and consequent reward or Doom. In his first short introduction Cyril explicitly states that his purpose is not to stretch the Gospel to its full extent but to set forth a "dogmatical exposition.....against the false doctrines of them that teach otherwise".

The whole bite of Cyril's powerful arguments lies in the fact that he believed himself to be in a struggle for Truth, the outcome of which was eternally significant. The intellectual climate which produced councils and creeds received its just Nemesis in the long and sad tale of persecution and intolerance, controversies and anathemas. History has supported Cyril, but the Church then as now could hardly afford such a Pyrrhic victory, over what really were her own children. It cannot be denied that dogmas and formularies of an ancient Council do not settle the intellectual struggles of a later age. All these controversies are still with us - the West lost the East, and as a new intellectual conflict on a wholly different plane emerges between East and West again, those who might have

been the allies of the re-creating element of a liberal Christianity are as estranged from us as are the Eskimo or the African Pygmy.

It might be easy to condemn fifth century Cyril with twentieth century eyes, but Cyril's temper is still with us and indeed strongly entrenched.

The writer hopes to say a little about the Christological controversy from a modern angle with a view to preparing the way to give the background of Cyril's thought. The whole would then serve as an introduction to what Cyril did say on the Fourth Gospel. Lastly, there will follow some summaries and comments with conclusions.

A modern note on the Christological Controversy.

The doctrine taught by Cyril, that the flesh of Christ was transformed by the indwelling of the Logos into something supernatural, capable of producing Divine life in the sacraments may be destructive of the doctrine of the incarnation and tend towards Docetism. Leaving out any historical considerations, a strong objection to the doctrinal aspect of the Virgin Birth of our Lord, is that if His birth was different from that of other men, He was not a real man.

Further, Cyril regarded with the deepest abhorrence the thought that Christ possessed a free will (like Apollinarius in this respect). Christ was ἀτρέπτος i.e. incapable of change and not possessed of any freedom of will or choice of good and evil. The fact of Christ's sinlessness is thereby deprived of any meaning at all. The insistence on Christ's unchangeable

nature which runs throughout the commentary was possibly conditioned by the pressure of the Arian doctrine that the Logos was *πρῶτος*, and also by the indifference the Alexandrians showed to the human element in the Gospel story.

As to the first point it could be argued, that if the Logos were a creature called into being before Time in order that God might create the Universe (Arianism), then he might have been like Satan able to choose between good and evil, and have been accepted as Son because He chose the good. To acknowledge Christ as capable of sin is to admit Him as *πρῶτος*, which concedes the whole Arian position. To have maintained, on the other hand, that Christ as Logos was unchangeable, but that He could have sinned in His human manifestation, seemed to justify Apollinarianism, and further, makes a tetrad not a Trinity in the Godhead.

As to the second point, it was in fact the Antiochene school which prevented the Christology of the Church becoming a development of an idea of Christ which swallowed up the historical Christ. Faith for Cyril does not seem to start from the historical Christ, but from the *θεὸς λόγος*, and is occupied only with Him. One gets the impression in Cyril that his mind is already made up and that he uses the facts to justify an intellectual conviction which could have been arrived at by a journey other than from Nazareth. He could have been a Christian even without the historical revelation. Not that he ignored the historical Christ but rather it is an unhistorical analysis of the Person of Christ.

This being so, the modern attitude in seeking for the historic Jesus makes St. Cyril difficult to grasp or even

understand. He is aware of those passages which refer to Christ's human will, but takes up the position that Christ suffered in the flesh but not in the Godhead - ἀπαθής, ἑμπαθεύει. We can see Cyril struggling to maintain the truth that it was all a matter of the condescension of God and not the mere exaltation of a man. Cyrils theology is monophysite, (as Alexandria still is), and opens him up to a charge of Docetism; and Theodore with the Antiochene theologians gave a new impulse to a valuable emphasis.

Perhaps we should admit that there is no formula which can do justice to the facts. Dogma always is the father of doubts, and produces more questions than it does answers. In the matter of ^{the} Incarnation, scripture presents us with a paradox and a dualism which transcends human categories: the scriptures may be a wrong interpretation of the events, but that fact of the paradox or dualism remains, and the scriptures are together with our experience, our only source. The truth would seem to lie between two positions :-

- (a) Regard Christ as mere man like Moses, Socrates or Confucius.
- (b) Regard Him as a Divine mind in a human body, and therefore entirely free from human infirmities, incapable of doubt, ignorance and temptation.

Neither position meets the facts either of history or experience, and both simplify from opposite view points. The Scriptural view, and the most difficult one, is between these simplifications: i.e. He possessed a human mind with its essential limitations united with the fulness of the Godhead.

The balance of these two positions is what we understand as orthodoxy, but that balance is not the same in every age, and I doubt if it can be the same in any two individuals. Cyril achieved perhaps all that was possible in his age. The fault is not in Cyril's position but in our accepting Cyril's position as final and ultimate, for of all things now the supreme need is for a Christology expressed in the thought forms of, and relative to the needs of man in his great struggle towards a new understanding both of himself and of society. The categories of death and resurrection are no longer real to the scientific mind or even to the modern uneducated mind, as valid as they might be to a man of religious experience. In a sense we need to do for our day, what Cyril and the Greek fathers did for their time, and which indeed every age must do for itself. That is to work out in the thought form of the day the significance of Christ and His relevance to the then situation in a manner that answers the human needs and at the same time satisfies the human intellect.

To turn then to Cyril's background before examining his commentary.

The Church of Alexandria was in a sense older than Christianity and this explains how side by side with the profoundest wisdom and wisest liberality of thought there go the most awful exhibitions of fanaticism and ferocity. The great school of Greek philosophy was at its zenith when the mob tore a man in pieces and devoured him; and when the great Cyril was defining the creed of Christendom the populace, urged on by frantic monks, tore the beautiful Hypatia to death limb from limb.

Cyril's fiery denunciations of fellow Christians who thought differently is hardly in the spirit of the Master and may very largely be due to his background.

176

Serapis was strongly entrenched. There was also a liberal and active Judaism which had translated its scriptures into Greek and had evinced its Sympathy with paganism by trying to show that the sages of Greece had learned their wisdom from Moses and the prophets. In the Christian history, Alexandria is notably absent : there is no mention of an Alexandrian community in the New Testament, and Apollos, the only Alexandrian mentioned, hailed from Ephesus. The Comopolitanism^{and} the intellectual activity of the great Graeco-Egyptian city favoured the growth of Jewish and heathen Gnosticism. But the same influence which had helped to produce a Philo, a Basilides or a Valentinus led to the making of men like Origen who refuted Gnosticism in its own terms and on its own evidence, and later to Cyril and the other theologians who as pioneers of Christian philosophy saw all things in one as a rational and connected whole. The Alexandrines were not Gnostics nor even easy-going "liberals." They started on the basis of the revealed faith, and went out to admit the truth of much of their opponents' position. The temper which gave the answer to Gnosticism eventually gave Christendom its creed. Whatever their errors, they had submitted to Christ, and were within the *κηρυγμα* while their enemies were without. They welcomed knowledge, saw all pagan knowledge as a struggle to find Christ, and believed knowledge not an opposite of faith but the indwelling of the Logos. They thought of themselves not the custodian of a revealed faith but the inheritor of all the wisdom

of the ages and the possessor of the key to the future. They
believed that all knowledge was of God and could be unified
under the rule of Theology. This was and still is a most powerful
position to take up.

177

The difficulty of understanding how our Lord could be at once God and Man presented itself from the first. The Gnostics attempted to solve the question by denying His humanity; he was only a man in appearance (δοκῆς). The Fathers resisted by insisting of the reality of the flesh. But the problem was not answered. The Arians said that if Christ had taken all man's nature upon Him He must have been of a half-divine nature, capable of change (μεταβάς) and therefore capable of sin. This Apollinarius set himself to refute maintaining that the Logos occupied the place of the human rational soul in Christ, taking to Himself a human body and an animal soul. Apollinarius saw that if Christ were only an inspired man he was not man's Redeemer. The contradictions seemed irreconcilable, and yet the Christian conscience and the testimony of the Gospels alike demand that Christ should be Perfect Man and Perfect God. Cyril maintained this truth and history is on his side, as is also the experience of Christians down the ages, whether we say with Newman :-

"And that a higher gift than grace
Should flesh and blood refine,
God's presence and his very Self,
And Essence all-divine.

O generous love! that he who smote
In Man for man the foe,
The double agony in Man
For man should undergo: "

(English Hymnal No. 471
verses 4 & 5)

"Christ by highest heaven adored,
Christ, the everlasting Lord."

In this situation the Antiochene School under Diodore and Theodore now rose to its fame and glory. Its theologians were scholarly and critical, attaching great importance alike to the grammatical sense of the Scripture and the Humanity and historical character of our Lord. Theodore spoke as if there were two Sons and though he did speak of the Manhood and Godhead being joined in Union (*ἕνωσις*), he preferred to speak of the natures held together by conjunction (*συνάφεια*). Stress was laid on the humanity of Jesus and the freedom of His Will. (Harnack said that the thought that Christ possessed a free-will was the lodestar of their Christology). As grace does not transform nature but elevates it, so the manhood of Jesus remained manhood when conjoined with His Divinity. Theodore died in full communion with the Church but Nestorius, who Bethune-Baker maintains was not nestorian, earned the opposition of the laity for his views on the Incarnation. The word *δμοούσιος* being philosophical had made little popular appeal but the word *θεοτόκος*, dear to popular devotion became the very watchword of truth or error. No doubt Nestorius' character had much to do with the emotion for he was a hotheaded persecutor, anxious to keep on friendly terms with Caesar, and lacking in charity and true sincerity. It is interesting to recall that the opposition came not from clerics but from the laity.

This conflict brought in Cyril, the great champion. His conduct will merit censure, even though he be less easy to

assail as a theologian. To refute Nestorianism and avoid Apollinarianism was a feat.

He entered the stage with antiquity on his side, for he was not innovating but rather refuting an error. He was most anxious to show

- (a) The unchangeableness of Christ - it was impossible for Him to sin.
- (b) The Incarnation was not the taking of a human personality by the Logos, but the assumption of humanity itself. The Logos took all human nature and became the Second Adam.
- (c) In this way man is redeemed from sin by participating in the flesh which the Saviour has glorified.
- (d) This flesh is received by man in the Eucharist, and in its life-giving properties received from the Logos is the means of bestowing Divine life on man. This latter point is basic to Cyril's position.

Leo formally settled the matter at Chalcedon but it was at a cost - the divisions of the Eastern Church were made permanent and the beginning of the great Schism laid.

After these introductory remarks we must now examine the text in order, and summarise his actual comments.

The TextINTRODUCTION

In his short introduction Cyril says that only those illumined should evangelise and humbly protests that he should keep silence. But Paul was compelled to speak and in the Old Testament God sent his leaders to teach his people. He realises the danger of speaking sacred things, but he declares the heretics must be attacked. He refers to the Old Testament as grosser examples leading us by the hand to the idea of spiritual things (3¹⁶). The books of the heretics he likens to the alien cities which the children of Israel had to overcome.

As in Leviticus 1³⁻⁹ an offering of the herd is first demanded yet for poverty's sake a pair of pigeons is acceptable or even a handful of flour, so Cyril makes his offering.

his plan is to render a dogmatical exposition against the heretics, not to Develop the book to its full extent. (Note the assumption that the book could be so "stretched")

JOHN 1¹

"Beginning " is the most backward point that human thought can reach. It does not mean in time but rather in source. He is co-existent and in-existent at the same time, as e.g. heat in a fire; the former cannot exist except in the latter. Beginning may also mean sovereignty.

The Father and the Son are distinct in person,

but of one essence. The case is proved from scripture, that the Father is in his own person, and Son likewise, the holy Ghost being counted in them as God, even though nothing is for the present enquired into regarding Him. The Son is God both by nature, and in no wise either inferior to or unlike the Father. The Father and Son in-exist, as sweetness and the honey, heat and the fire.

JOHN 1²

He animadverts against Eunomius here, separating the Son from the Word. He examines the heresy at great length and quotes Eunomius' words, and others, verbatim, before showing their error.

The Son he insists knows the Father perfectly, and knows all things of Himself i.e. he needs no telling. Cyril makes an illuminating remark in this chapter and refers to the Fourth Evangelist as "enlightened" by the Divine Spirit unto the Knowledge of things to come". He describes the work of John as all but saying "Throw off sin, the yoke of the law, receive the spiritual worship; let shadow now depart, recede afar, the Truth hath beamed". (He carefully distinguishes nouns as with and without the article in scripture.) He says it is quite incredible to imagine the voice of God as being given forth in sound. It does not say that the voice was uttered by the Father but that it came for the sake of the disciples.

In his deep refutation of the heretical views he bases his whole thinking on the scriptures.

1³

This was written against the polytheism of the Greeks.

Cyril expounds the nature of Christ and emphasises that He is external to all things. He works with the Father and is not separate in His work : the Persons of the Trinity are not severed one from another. Heretics he condemns as taking only the texts that seem on their side. God the Son created man equally with the Father, for They are co-existent and co-workers.

1⁴

That which was made, in it was Life. (St. Cyril punctuates thus, with many of the Fathers and C. D. L.). Cyril expounds that the Son is not originate but is by Nature Life, though of the essence of God the Father. Were he originate, he would be partaking of himself. He analyses seriatim the heretical expositions of this text.

Continuing, Cyril expounds further that the Son is by Nature light and therefore not originate, but of the essence of God the Father, as Very Light from Very Light. The Son is God because he gives Light: He illumines and is not illumined : it is the creature who is illumined, the Creator who illumines.

1⁵

this is an expansion of the thought above. It is of the nature of things created to be darkness; the Son, Light.

1^{6,7}

Cyril sees the Evangelist and Baptist together as two witnesses to substantiate the truth of the words. At the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established (Deut. 19¹⁵). His readers knew him himself, and John Baptist was sent by God.

John was a lamp, Christ the Light.

1 Christ is enlightener, but not enlightened. The Saints, as John, have light, but it is a light not from themselves. (St. Augustine makes the same comment)

1 9-10

Christ alone is the true Light; the creature, being created, only participates in that Light. This statement he verifies at some lengths from many texts from both the Old and New Testament. He shows from his scriptural references that man cannot be saved by his own Light from God. The soul of man does not exist prior to the body, nor is the embodiment (as some say) a consequence of former sin. The creature receives Light, and when it communicates light, even then it is not the light but is merely lending light. The Son alone lights and gladdens the creature with His own light. He is in the the world everywhere at all time, but prior to his Incarnation was apprehended only in idea, but now in the flesh he was more manifest, giving a grosser perception of the knowledge of God, made human by wonders and mighty deeds. He says, interestingly, that the mind is sharper than the tongue, which can never stretch forth unto the measure of the truth.

He dismisses, in no uncertain terms, the view that the soul pre-exists and for previous transgressions was sent down in a body. He argues his case in some detail and quotes the scriptures frequently. He maintains that souls are not created before their bodies but souls and bodies are alike created in blessing to us from God. Bodies are given us not for punishment, but in God's good pleasure.

Christ is the Creator not the created. All things 184
are from the Father through the Son in the Holy Ghost. The
world did not know Him through its own blindness and ignorance.

1 11

Israel did not receive Him because of its
unbelief. The world knew Him not, but Israel received Him not;
the world is subsequently lighted through repentance and faith,
and Israel returns to the darkness from which they had come.

1 12

Israel was rejected, the Gentiles received.

1 13

Israel was the people of God in type only - the Law,
circumcision and the like were but a shadow of things to come.
We have the full truth, for the Holy Trinity dwells in us.

1 14

The Word did not come into flesh but was made
flesh, that we might become rich, and offer our flesh as a
sort of first-fruit of human nature.

God the Son works as God, the rest as servants.

1 15

He refers to the two Johns as two witnesses of Christ,
and "foster-brothers in truth". To come after and be preferred
before, is to be ~~is to be~~ interpreted spiritually, as John
merely sets forth the glory of Christ : John is originate, but
Christ is not so. All that we have is a gift from the fulness of
Christ.

1 17

Emmanuel is greater than Moses, to whom, alone of

all men God spoke openly and not in riddles. The ways in which Christ is superior to Moses are instanced by way of contrast, and Cyril says we no longer have types and shadows, but glorious and pure ordinances. Christ's glory is that of God, the Saints' glory is that of man.

1 18

God is truly unseen, and even in the Old Testament visions He was not seen but only a picture likeness was felt by visionaries. The Son is in the Father, and from the Father, and has even the Father in Him ; they are inherent, and co-existing. That he is in the bosom of the Father figuratively expresses the one-ness with Him of God the Son. He says of things showing a deeper meaning :-

τύποι γάρ εἰσὶ πῶς τῶν νοητῶν τὰ
ἐμφανεέστερα, καὶ χειραγωγεῖ πρὸς
κατάλυσιν τῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς τὰ ἐν ἡμῖν.

I. 159. 25.

1 19, 20

John confessed to be only a witness.

1 21

The priests and Levites boasting of their knowledge of the law show their real ignorance.

1 22, 23

He was only the voice foretold in the prophets.

1 24

And they had been sent from the Pharisees.

ἀπεσταλμένοι as A.B.C.L. & not οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι.

1

They are caught in a conceit of wisdom, rather than having an accurate knowledge of the scriptures. They were desirous that none be illustrious except themselves. John humbly says he is merely preparing Christ's way with a baptism of water.

The mention of the place where the scene took place as Bethabara beyond Jordan, Cyril interprets as a sign of careful and accurate narration. This is quite a departure from Origen and Augustine, who, while accepting the topographical details as accurate, see in all of them a further spiritual meaning.

This may have been due in part to Cyril's express purpose of presenting dogma in refutation of the heretics.

29-30

1

The law of Moses was but a type and a shadow, Christ, dimly pictured before, is now clearly seen as the perfect Lamb that takes away the world's sin.

31

1

John Baptist knew not Christ of himself, else would his testimony be his own ; his testimony is of God.

32-33

1

The Son is Perfect and by nature God; it is of His fulness that we have received. If Christ the begotten were not perfect, God could not be perfect. Man lost the image of the divine by his own sin. This image could be restored only by the Spirit of God : This passage is important for Cyril for it lies behind his whole understanding of Christ's redemptive work and was denied in one way or another by his opponents. Cyril felt

that without this there could be no real Redemption, this

187

Spirit Christ brought again to man:

... ἡμῖν δι' ἑαυτοῦ λαμβάνει τὸ Πνεῦμα, καὶ ἀνατεοῖ τῇ φύσει
τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἀγαθόν. I. 184. 30.

The Spirit was essentially inherent in Christ, as it is in

God - this is scriptural "And when they were come over against

Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia; and the Spirit of

Jesus suffered them not." (Acts 16⁷) John Baptist was sanctified,

but Christ is essentially holy. He enlarges here the theme that

the Son and the Holy Ghost are in intimate union, and bases his

position on Scripture, in particular where Paul seems to equate

the presence of the Spirit with the being "in Christ". Cyril

is animadverting against the heretics with great energy and force here.

34

1

John Baptist testifies that Christ is the Son of God :

the intimate union between Father and Son, Cyril describes under

the metaphor of heat and fire, each being of each other and in

each other, yet other than each other.

35-36

1

John Baptist repeats himself again for the benefit of his listeners.

37

1

The value of the repetition is seen in that the repetition induced the two disciples to follow Jesus. Cyril exhorts all teachers to learn a lesson from this.

38

1

The Lord looks on them who turn to Him, as they show their readiness to learn more. Cyril again draws a moral ~~lesson~~ here.

Come and see indicates that in these matters we must always act quickly. The house is not printed out, but the way is indicated, for it is important not only that we should learn where the House (i.e. the Church) is, but should enter it in faith:-

ἔλθεῖν εἰς αὐτόν διὰ τῆς πίστεως, ἰδεῖν τε τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ μυστικῶς δηλονότι τελούμενα. I. 194. 8.

That it was the tenth hour indicates that it was the latter end of the world when the mystery of the Saviour was made known to man. This is in direct fulfilment of Isaiah 54¹³ "And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of thy children". The house of Jesus ^{stands for} the Church of Christ. The incident is taken as an "image" of the disciple's pilgrimage. (εἰκόνα)

1⁴⁰⁻⁴²

Andrew brings Simon : Jesus sees all that is in him and re-names him Peter, for on him he was to build his Church.

1⁴³

He likewise saw what was in Philip. Philip seeks Nathanael an action which is commended. That the scripture does not speak of Nazareth Cyril agrees, but he says that Jesus was not born in Nazareth but in Bethlehem, and this is a direct fulfilment of Micah 5² "But thou, Beth-lehem Ephrathah, which art little to be among the thousands of Judah, out of thee shall one come forth unto me that is to be ruler of Israel; whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting."

1
Christ proves that He is God by his fore-knowledge.

48-49

1
Nathanaël's curiosity is aroused, but Christ said he knew him before he had seen him. This convinces Nathanael of his divinity for only God can read hearts (Psalm 7⁹ - "Oh let the wicked come to an end, but establish thou the righteous: For the righteous God trieth the hearts and reins")

1
50

Christ said that he would see greater things yet. That angels should minister to Him shows that he is by nature Son of God.

The Marriage at Cana

JOHN 2

Cyril gives as one of the reasons for Jesus' attendance at the wedding that He might expel the old shame of Child-bearing. (κατήφεισαν). Christ begins his miracles at his mother's instance showing honour to parents. He merely transorders things that he had already made. At this miracle Christ effected :-

- (a) the honouring of women
- (b) the curse on women abolished
- (c) Christ's glory shown
- (d) the faith of the disciples confirmed

After considering the historical incident, Cyril examines what is signified.

The Saviour is the Bridegroom, the Bride human nature. The marriage is consummated on the third day, which signifies the fullness of time. It was in Cana which was in the country of the Gentiles who gladly accepted, and not in Jerusalem the Jews of

which rejected Him. The Saviour comes to the marriage not of his own accord for he was bidden. That the wine failed means that the Law perfected nothing, and Christ set forth the better wine. That the ruler marvelled indicates the wonder of the priesthood (i.e. ruling God's House) at Christ's doctrine.

The miracle is interpreted as the incarnation of the Logos in the fulness of time. The old dispensation had failed, and humanity needed the coming of the Divine Son to effect its redemption. The exposition is treated as a type of man's redemption. (The commentary breaks off at verse 11)

Cleansing of Temple

14
2

The Jews are despising the Law and thinking only of their own gain.

15
2

The scourge was fitting for it was the punishment of slaves, for they were slaves in so far as they had not accepted the Son who would have made them free.

16
2

That He refers to the Temple as My Father's House and not Our Father's House, indicates His conception of His unique Sonship.

Cyril contrasts this incident with the previous, where Christ feasts with the Galileans (Gentiles) and makes them sit down at the Banquet in His Father's House. The disobedient Jews He will scourge and cast out. The incident is considered as a Type of the rejection of the Jew, and the acceptance of the Gentile.

17
2 Already the disciples are showing growth in knowledge.

18
2 His authority is demanded. They speak foolishly of the 46 years building of the Temple, forgetting God who had created the whole universe in 7 days. Christ referred to His own Body as a Temple. This is unique in scripture and shows the special Sonship of Christ.

23-25
2

He did not commit himself to the many that believed in him in Jerusalem. Long growth and diligence are needed for maturity of life. Christ knows the heart, and as only God knows this, then is He divine.

JOHN 3

Nicodemus

Nicodemus is double minded and comes in the dark, addressing Jesus as a mere man. Jesus says only the Spirit can give him re-birth but Nicodemus does not understand for he is still carnal. The new birth in baptism is two-fold, for body and soul, and is born of the Spirit. (Cyril here quotes Galatians 4¹⁹ and 1 Corinthians 4¹⁵). He shows how Christ heaps on illustrations to make clear His teaching, like the air which is in itself unseen, yet in its working is seen. Still Nicodemus does not understand, so in verse 11 Jesus asks Nicodemus merely to accept in simple faith what he cannot understand, giving, according to the Law, the Three Witnesses. The tragedy of the Jews was that they could neither understand Christ from "their great unlearning", nor receive him in faith. If Nicodemus failed to understand the earthly things how could he understand heavenly things for no man hath ascended to heaven. (Cyril makes

a doctrinal aside and shows how Christ never divided the God from the Man for they were both one in Christ.)

The brazen serpent fixed aloft was a type of Christ. Christ did not dwell on supernatural things but descended to show Nicodemus that he must interpret the history of his own people aright. He treats carefully of the history and then shows that it is a type of the mystery of the Incarnation. For the serpent signifies sin which was devouring man and biting his soul with a poison sting. There was no escape except by help from heaven. Christ came in the likeness of sinful man and thereby condemned sin. To gaze on Him, or search the scriptures for their meaning, was to find salvation. The lifting up was the Crucifixion and the clear manifestation of Him to the world.

God in His love for the world gave not a creature but a Son, i.e. of His own nature who came not as a giver of the law that condemneth but of grace that justifieth. He came not to condemn the world but to free it and hear it. In this he frees Nicodemus from his worry about the law.

Christ tries not to condemn. Only those who knowingly reject Christ are condemned, and theirs is self-condemnation, preferring darkness to light. Knowledge says Cyril is an aid to the holy life.

Nicodemus is considered as the Type of Judaism which cannot understand Christ, and which in its very wisdom condemns itself to darkness.

22
3

The Baptism of John was a preparation and introduction to the more perfect one of Christ, as Moses was for the Gospel.

Cyril sees the Jews as striving to cause jealousy between John and Christ, not that they were interested in Christ, but rather were against John's work of ministering cleansing not through the Law but through baptism. 193

But John Baptist turns all the praise on to Christ and gives a careful explanation respecting the Saviour. There is nothing good in man, but is wholly the gift of God : with what He gives we must be thankful. John Baptist himself reminds them of what he had previously said, and asks them to consider the scripture which taught that the Christ must have a fore-runner.

Cyril sees here a type of thing spiritual :-

σωματικῶν παραδειγμάτων παχύτης ἀκριβοστάτην εἰσφέρει πολλάκις τῶν πνευματικῶν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν. I. 236. 21.

John Baptist the friend of the Bridegroom. He is completely satisfied, for his only wish has come true and his Bridegroom has come : that mankind should leave him for its true Bridegroom is right and proper.

Christ must increase and John Baptist decrease, like the star before the sunrise or like the stake beside a growing flower

31
3

from above means from God. This Cyril justifies from the Scriptures which, says he, are alone to be followed :-

Οὐ τοῖς παρ' ὑμῖν σαθροτάτοις, ὡς βέλτιστοι, λογισμοῖς, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ καὶ μόνοις τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀκολουθήσομεν γράμμασιν. I. 241. 16.

John Baptist is the earth born and can never be more than an adviser : John, as God, works within. And yet his testimony is not received.

To receive Christ's testimony as true is to admit that He is by nature God. The prophets were imparted grace through the Son, but in Christ the God-head dwelleth bodily. Christ and the Father are one. The Son was both sent by God and speaketh the words of God.

3³⁵

The properties of God the Father are in the Son essentially and by nature not by participation. Human language is weak to express divine things. All things were given to this Son of man, a particular proof of which is the vision of the son of man receiving his kingdom in Daniel 7^{9,10,13,14}.

True life enters through faith, but the unbeliever shall not see life.

conclusions

Note Cyril bases his ~~quasi~~/almost invariably on a diligent search of the scriptures:-

χαρῆναι δὲ ὅμως ἀκριβεστάτην ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς
γράμμασι ποιῆσθαι τὴν δάσκανον . I . 259. 24

περιαθρεῖτω δὲ πάλιν ὁ φιλοζητητῆς τὴν
τοῦ νούματος δύναμιν . I . 260. 25

JOHN 4¹

The Samaritan Woman

The Son knows all things and does all things at the ^E proper time .

Christ had to go through samaria, He had not yet turned from the Jews, though his journey was a type of the impending loss of Jesus by Israel.

That He sat on Jacob's well as He went to the land of the

Gentiles indicates that there shall never be lost, even in that 195
going away, the love to the patriarchs and the Old Testament.

That He wearied is an important doctrinal point, for it
proves that He was both divine and human.

He makes a delightful comment on the text "it was about the
sixth hour," to the effect that the preposition "about" indicates
the accuracy and honesty of the writer.

In spite of the exclusiveness of the Jews, Jesus opens
conversation, and rouses in her a wish to learn by darkly saying
she does not know to whom she is speaking. He induces her to
marvel at the gift of God, and then says she should have asked
of Him. Water everywhere in scripture means the Divine Spirit.

The woman awakes unto faith in Christ and He shows her the
incomparable difference between the spiritual waters and the
grosser ones. The Grace of the Holy Ghost is here called water.

Still she does not fully grasp his meaning, Christ bids her
call her husband because the masculine mind is quicker to learn.

The mention of the husband was "a plea for making known
hidden things". He could obviously help her no more as a man, and
therefore appealed to her as a prophet.

Seeing he was a prophet and a Jew, she spoke of the superiority
of the worship of the Samaritans over the Jews, but Jesus replies
in terms of the true worship.

Christ says, the Samaritans are ignorant of what they worship,
but not the Jews, who have both the Law and the Prophets, and
await the Messiah who is to be born of Judah. When Christ says
"we worship" it is as man that He worships, but as God is He
worshipped. He instances here the paying of the temple tax which

was to prove (a) that we all have one Lord

(b) depicting mental and spiritual fruits of

worship which is in truth a tribute

This lies hid in the letter of the Law :-

... ἔγκεκρύφθαι τῷ νομικῷ γράμματι ... I. 282. 9.

Type shall be transferred to truth, and the shadow of the Law to spiritual worship.

Christ revealed himself to her, as he does to all souls travelling in the beginning of faith (Cyril moralises here on the method of Christ which should be adopted by all true teachers).
 Luke 12⁴⁹ "I came to cast fire upon the earth; and what will I, if it is already kindled?" Cyril says that Jesus has put the spark into the ^{Samaritan Woman} ~~mouth~~ and leaves it to kindle to a flame. (He moralises again on this incident as a pattern for the preacher who must not refuse to help women).

Cyril sees in her leaving her water pot and bringing her townsfolk to Christ a great lesson for us all. He notes her wisdom not in announcing Him to the Samaritans as Christ, which would have been disbelieved, but as a man who told her all she had ever done.

The obedience of the Samaritans is a conviction of the hardness of the heart of the Jews.

The Saviour neglects food to save souls, and thus should all His teachers do:-

... διδασκάλους ἐσόμενοις τόπον ἑαυτὸν εἰσφέρειν ...
 I. 292. 24

Referring to the harvest, Christ takes advantage of the occasion to teach further spiritual truths. The harvest is ready for the apostles sown as it was by the prophets and to be garnered

into the Church of God. The apostles and prophets, co-workers, shall be honoured equally. 197

The Samaritans put the Jews to shame in coming to Christ, while they had driven Him out. He abode two days with them and taught them.

The Galileans received Him because of His wonders at the feast, and thereby showed themselves superior to those instructed in the Law.

The incident is handled as the indication that Christ may turn from Judaism which was but a shadow to the full truth. This truth is sought after by the Gentiles of which the Samaritan Woman ~~South West~~ is a type. To all who struggle to learn the truth, the Messiah reveals Himself. The Samaritan Woman ~~South West~~ is considered as the type of mind not brought up in Judaism, but which, though in darkness and ignorance, yet struggles to find God. This mind finds Him, whereas the Jewish mind with its old dispensations allows this dispensation to be a barrier between them and God.

The Nobleman's Son.

47-54
4

Jesus name was powerful in Cana and the nobleman, not seeing His true dignity, yet believed in powers which are really the divine prerogative. Jesus says they need wonders before they will believe. The nobleman protests in faith, and Christ benefits even the stumbling. In "Go thy way" is Faith : in "thy son liveth" is the fulfilment of his longings granted by the Divine.

In His one command he heals two souls. He works faith in the father, and life in the child.

Cyril does not make as much out of the incident as does

Origen, for example, yet you can discern him considering the mind which, though ignorant, yet has faith.

198

The Healing of the Impotent Man

JOHN 5¹

Christ has been shown as convincing the aliens by one particular act, and now is seen in Jerusalem. In the case of the aliens He received great followings from his word, but in the case of the Jews persecution.

What is the spiritual interpretation of the incident? Christ's departure to Galilee meant His going into the world of the Gentiles after his crucifixion. That He returned at Pentecost signifies that there will be a return of the Saviour to the Jews in the last ages of the present world. That the paralytic was healed before the full time of the Law (i.e. 38 years is two short of 40) means that Israel will yet be healed by obedience and faith :-

εἰκόνα καὶ τύπον τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων πληθύος αὐτὸν εἰσηγάγομεν,
ὥς μελλούσης ἐν ὑστέροις θεραπεύεσθαι καιροῖς . I. 308. 22.

That only one should be healed at the stirring of the waters which took place at Pentecost at the giving of the Law indicated healing was for the Jews alone.

Jesus commands as God would, and does not pray as a prophet might. He was healed by obedience and faith. They should be healed in the last day (i.e. Sabbath), and that he was commanded to walk and disobey the Sabbath meant that the old letter should become of no effect.

Christ is to us an example of flight wisely chosen.

The Jews persecute Jesus, but do not know the scriptures.

Joshua broke the Sabbath and did not refuse the victory over Jericho when he destroyed the enemy and broke down the walls.

199

This example is the type of Jesus' action. The Jews do not understand that Jesus does the things that the Father wills, for He is the living Will and Power of the Father. God worketh just the same on the Sabbath day.

19
5

Cyril says Jesus repeats himself in order to ensnare (επαγχεύων) the hearers into the findings of the truth. That He can only do what He sees the Father do is a lesson for us that we should bring every thought to the obedience of Christ. The Son is by no means inferior but does equal works with God. The angels worshipped Him for He is God by nature. "Cannot" is not spoken as of necessity or of weakness, but of the stability of nature. As the Father worketh, and is merciful on the Sabbath, so is Christ.

20
5

The Father approves all the Son's deeds, and it all arises from their knowledge of each other. He claims equality with the Father even though a Man, and says that they will see greater works to make them marvel. Christ's authority and power will not stop at the healing of a paralytic but they will see greater, e.g. the Resurrection : note that it is the Son who quickens the dead as does the Father, thereby doing the works of the Godhead

22
5

All judgment is the Son's which shows that He is Word and God. God created through the Son and will judge through Him.

23
5

The Scriptures declare one God classing with the Father the

son and the Spirit. He animadverts against the heretics here basing his position on scripture, and reducing their position ad absurdum.

200

5²⁴

This word is added as a share to obedience.

5²⁵

The "dead" may be understood to mean those dead in the ordinary sense of the word, or those not called through faith unto eternal life. Cyril says the text refers directly to the day of Judgement when Christ shall be the Judge.

5^{26/7}

As Son of Man he receives power to judge, as Son of God power to quicken.

5^{28/9}

This is a repetition of what has been said already

5³⁰

This re-expresses more simply what the Jews have already misunderstood. The Son has all the power of the Father and there is One Will in all the Trinity. Christ is both Law-giver and Law-keeper. When Christ says "I cannot", there is the implication that the Jews do. God works on the Sabbath, and Christ does.

5³¹⁻²

Christ's witness is God Himself, not Himself. John Baptist bore witness to Him. He does not reject this human witness, as he does not that of Nicodemus, but He only offers it as weighty in the eyes of the Jews and ^{therefor} more likely to save them.

BOOK III

The six chapters of Book III are devoted to the enlargement of the earlier themes.

John Baptist is a lamp in so far as a lamp does not shine by its own light. The Creator is Light, the creature enlightened. In John's light they rejoiced for a season. This Cyril describes as the common interpretation of the passage, but says that the word of the Saviour extends to deep meanings.

John was a lamp. This was a fulfilment of Exodus 27²⁰ - 28 when the lamp was directed to be placed in the Temple and to burn for ever, the oil of which was the Holy Ghost. The lamp was without the veil, illuminating the Church, but not behind the veil. The light burned during the night which signified the term of the present life. That the section in Exodus was followed by the choice of priests symbolised the choice of the apostles after John Baptist.

The Scribes and Pharisees were convicted alike of folly and transgression of the Law in refusing to accept John Baptist's ministry. Cyril quotes Luke 7^{29,30}, "And all the people when they heard, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected for themselves the counsel of God, being not baptized of him," in support of his position, and most apt quotation.

Cyril refers to Christ as trans-elementing^{the letter to the spirit,}

ἐκ τῆς κατὰ τὸ γράμμα παχύτης εἰς πνευματικὴν θεωρίαν
μεταστοιχείων τὰ τοῖς ἀρχαιότεροις ἀνιχνυομένως εἰρημέναι. I. 373.8.

The Son is God and does the works of God. It is as God that he has, and as Man that he receives.

God the Son answers unuttered thoughts. The Scribes and Pharisees did not know or understand their own scriptures. The

giving of the Law was an image of a spiritual reality and God was neither seen nor heard. The grossness of the letter must be refined into spiritual contemplation. That Moses brought the people forth is a token that none come to God unled and un-instructed but are led by the Law. That the mountain top was wrapped in smoke indicates how far beyond our understanding is God. That God should be thought of in terms of fire means that He enlightens and avenges. No longer is there the stammering speech of Moses but the very sound of a trumpet. The voice was not the voice of God, but a voice made by God. It was the foolishness of the Jews to imagine that God could be seen other than through His Son. God cannot be seen apart from Christ.

39-40
5

The Jews had reduced the study of the Old Testament to material for gainsaying, for they had refused to see Christ, and that was the purpose of the whole scripture to prepare for him. The Son hath glory though man withhold it: the Jews rejecting Christ will receive anti-Christ.

44
5

Jesus said that the Pharisees who cared more for vain glory than piety, were condemned by Moses himself in whom they boasted. Moses will lead them or else accuse them, for Christ is shadowed in the Law. e.g.

(~~Chapter XXXV~~) Deuteronomy 18¹⁵⁻¹⁹. He shows how the Incarnation was bound to come in the form in which it did. Moses was a type of Christ :-

τύπος ἐν νοοῦτο Χριστοῦ καὶ πάλαι Μωυσῆς ...
I. 393. 5.

Christ was the exact mediator, God and Man. Further as Moses gave ²⁰³ the old law, Christ has given the new : Moses words were types and shadows, Christ's the truth :-

Τόποι μὲν ἦσαν τὰ δι' ἐκείνου καὶ σκιαὶ, ἀλήθεια δὲ τὰ διὰ Χριστοῦ.
I. 395. 6.

Τὸν διὰ τύπου σχηματισμὸν τῶν ἐπὶ Χριστῇ μυστηρίων...
I. 395. 26.

The incident is treated as representing Jewry impotent in its Judaism. The very dispensation which foretold Christ, and which was intended to bring them to Him, made them impotent, and only the power of Christ freed them.

¹
JOHN 6 The Feeding of the Multitude.

The departure of Christ signifies the transferring of his grace to the Gentiles where he is protected from the evil Jews. The Feast of Tabernacles signifies the gathering of all souls to the heavenly Jerusalem where they receive their true tabernacle. That He departed across the sea indicates the great gulf that was between them. Cyril refers to the loss of Pharoah in the Red Sea, and sees the loss of the Jews in the Sea likewise.

²⁻⁴
6

A great multitude followed him when he turned from His People, and He went up into a mountain where His loyal followers ascended too.

⁵⁻⁷
6

Cyril moralises on the duty of hospitality. As for the miracle the gross typical dress must be cut away. Christ sets before them Himself, as Bread from Heaven. Philip is questioned because Philip is slow of understanding (e.g. John 14⁸). He comments on the poverty of the disciples in having no money to buy bread. He shows Philip's slow advance, and the word "whence" referring not

to their careless ness in having nothing but to their entire
uncare for money. The Divine Power is superior to the natural
order of things.

8-9

6

Andrew's slow apprehension exalts Christ's might. Cyril draws
a comparison in the feeding of the children of Israel under
Moses (Numbers 11) when God said "Will the Lord's hand suffice
not?". Littleness of faith is the worst of all evils: the things
that are above us are received by faith and not investigation.
The wages of unbelief are most bitter : even Moses lost the
promised land because of his unbelief (Numbers 20¹⁰⁻¹²).

It was Christ who worked through Elias and filled the widow's
cruse and barrel.

The Evangelist mentions grass for it was a country where they
could sit down, but mention of the men only is made in accordance
with Numbers 1^{2,3}. Christ supplies rest and spiritual food to the
men, indicating that the food can be given only to those who quit
themselves like men, and not to the effeminate or undeveloped.

Christ gives thanks as a pattern to us, and as man ascribes
all the power to the Divine. He speaks in a lowly manner here as
man, with a view to assisting us.

The Evangelist states the number of the loaves and fishes
precisely for a purpose. The five barley loaves signify the
five books of Moses, barley indicating their coarseness. The
fishes signify the food brought in by fishermen, i.e. the
disciples, and are the Apostolic and Evangelic preaching. By
mingling the new with the old, the Saviour nourishes men unto
eternal life.

The fragments prove that the miracle was real and not illusory,

and also that to expend a little from God brings great reward. 205
That there were twelve indicates that every disciple working
for God receives full reward. He again draws the parallel
between His rejection by the Jews and His reception by aliens.

15
6

All honour and glory on this earth are to be rejected and
a lowliness cultivated. Christ refuses kingship as untimely and
departs to the mountain alone, signifying He will go to heaven

alone
16-21
6

He leads on His disciples who are to be the world's teachers
by teaching them through miracle. The darkness and storm frighten
the disciples and Cyril remarks that their danger was the absence
of Christ. Christ appears and not only frees them from danger
but from toil and sweat. Christ is our deliverance from all
danger and the accomplishment of achievements beyond our hope.

He further sees Christ's coming on the water as Christ's Second
Coming when the Church gains her haven.

22-3
6

Nothing is hidden but is made known. Cyril moralises on the
need for Christian disciples never to seek praise or glory.

6 23-7

The addition of "the day following" when the crowds find
Jesus means that at last some will find Him. But it is of no use
then to seek things from Him or to try to follow Him; for then
He will appear as Judge.

27
6

Cyril describes sowing to the flesh, and sowing to the spirit.
Merely to sow to the flesh is to sow to destruction : to sow to

the spirit is to save body and soul alike.

206

God and Man are one in Christ giving the Spiritual Food.

He again treats at length of the relation of Father and Son and the criticisms of erroneous views. The Son is God lest the creature share some Divine attribute. Each Person exists, and the Godhead is not separated. This he illustrates from the Law (Exodus 30^{12.13}) Every man must give half a shekel : this is the shadow of Christ for the two halves are understood in the one coin. The Son and the Father are both in one nature and each separate in part. As each half shekel in no way differed from the other, so were we to think of Father and Son.

28-9

6

Christ is treated with arrogance and no profit is received.

A learner must be humble. Christ does not ask for belief in Himself but in Him whom God sent. That means that hitherto the Jews have looked but to types and do not see the Truth. The Jews seek a sign, not any chance one, but comparable to that of Moses who fed the Israelites with manna for 40 years in the wilderness. But this sign was not Moses' doing, but God's. Moses was the minister not the bestower. Manna was not the Bread from Heaven, but Christ is. The mistake of the Jews lies in their clinging to the typical observances and failing to grasp the Truth in Christ. This he proves from scripture:

(.) Exodus 16¹⁻³

Egypt represents the present world in which the soul is in bondage. When God speaks to us, we feel this bitter bondage, and leaving it come to Christ Himself finding a more spiritual state in the wilderness. Then are we tempted of the flesh to return to our old ways. God sends us the Bread from Heaven and we recover

our God-loving habit of mind. The Israelites were not punished 267
at the first for God looked on them as babes, but were punished
subsequently.

The manna was to be gathered daily, hinting that when the
Truth appeared the old legalities should be abolished.

That manna was not to be gathered on the Sabbath but gathered
in double quantity means that the Son is Christ's Coming who
brings two-fold grace with Him - the Law and the Gospel. Quails
were given in the evening : that indicated the Law when man was
in darkness, for a quail is an earthly bird flying yet not leaving
the ground. In the morning, when the mist had dispersed, the
Israelites were to be given the Manna i.e. Christ.

Further the quails covered the camp but the manna was all
around the camp i.e. the Law for the Jews, but the Gospel for the
world. "Manna" means "what is this" in Syriac, as Christ was
unknown among the Jews.

That the seed was like a coriander and small (λεπτόν), Cyril
sees the Divine Word subtle, too, (λεπτή), and cools the passions
(The coriander is said to have a cooling effect). Moses commanded
that the manna had not to be left till morning when it stank, thus
the shadows of the Law are superfluous when the Sun has risen.
The Jews who hold on to Judaism in the time of Christ, produce
worms and corruption. Cyril rejoices in the depth of the scripture :-
ἀκατάληπτος γὰρ ὄντως ἡ εὐκεκρυμμένη δυνάμις ταῖς θεοπνεύστοις γραφαῖς.
Aaron treasured manna in a golden pot, thus will the Christian
soul receiving the heavenly treasure be a precious vessel kept in
the presence of the Great High Priest attaining eternal life.

How ignorant the Jews were who could not see this.

The Jews think only of the profit of the flesh. Jesus speaks with a veil over his words to the wise, but to the foolish he speaks plainly making their unbelief indefensible. When Joshua (Jesus) was in command of the Israelites, they crossed the Jordan, received the circumcision and were then fed on bread not manna. Thus when the Law was shrouded, Jesus comes to us, we crossed the Jordan, then received the spiritual circumcision at the hand of the twelve stones, (disciples). We then entered the Kingdom of Heaven (the Promised Land), needing no longer the manna but True Bread. Jesus contrasts his ministry with Moses', for the Jews speak of the latter's ministry as that of the Lawgiver. His gives spiritual and incorruptible blessings while Moses gave earthly and corruptible blessings, the true significance of which is seen in Christ. All this was foretold in the scripture., Isaiah 6⁹⁻¹⁰ "And he said, Go, and tell his people, hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of his people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and turn again, and be healed."

As man, he attributes all power to God who is about to bring in the Gentiles even if the Jews were to be rejected.

To be cast out means to eternal doom, and Christ will not cast away any that come to Him through faith. This Cyril reads as a veiled threat to the Jews.

This passage does not prove the subjection of the son to

200

the Father, as the heretics urge. The holy Trinity has but One Will. Obedience and subjection do not imply inferiority, for the Son is Con-substantial, and of identity of essence. The Son is the archetype of honour to parents. the Will of the Father and Son are the same.

⁴⁰
6

It is God's Will that men see the Christ and find in him eternal life. They are co-workers. Belief in the Son is important, for in Him man finds life.

⁴¹
6

The mind of the Jew stumbles for it looks only to earthly things. Now, as in former times, they shall be punished by the Serpent, and find death.

⁴²
6

Had the Jews known their scriptures would they not have known that Christ would come in the flesh? He moralises here and says we too should look on the saints for their spiritual work, and not in regard to their bodily appearance.

⁴³⁻⁴
6

As God, Jesus knows the hearts, and as God, quickens.

⁴⁵⁻⁷
6

The prophets witness to Jesus. The Persons of the Trinity each exist, but their working is one.

God Himself is never seen. Christ promises eternal life i.e. Himself.

⁴⁸⁻⁵⁰
6

The manna was not a life-giving but an aid against hunger; the true Bread gives eternal life, of which manna was the Type.

Christ came "in some way" to undergo punishment for all. Because His Flesh is full of His Word, He gives life in His Flesh. As all men fell in the first-formed unto death, all men will rise in the First-born to a resurrection - some to life, some to doom.

Referring to Bread, Cyril examines its use in the scripture:-
Numbers 15¹⁷⁻²¹: Christ was the first fruits of our bread offered up.

Leviticus 24¹⁻⁷: The twelve loaves are the apostles, and the light of the pure oil (i.e. Holy Spirit) burning without the veil was John. All this was done on the Sabbath, showing that the meaning was made manifest in the last times of the earth, and also that when the Saviour came we had a sabbath from sin. All were to be spread on the table in Church. The Saviour was thus pre-typified by bread in the Law.

52-3
6

The wise search into the harder sayings, the proud disown them. To say "how?" to God is disloyal to Him. Faith antecedes knowledge (He is as Augustine on this point)

Christ imparts life with His Body (i.e. touch) e.g. The Raising of Jairus Daughter Luke 8⁵⁴. The Widow's Son at Nain Luke 7¹².

Let not the Jews think we have discovered new mysteries, for the truths are all foreshadowed in the Old Testament. He instances the Passover lamb being sacrificed saved the Israelites from death and Christ saying, except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood you have no life in you, commenting

that the Jews ought to have felt themselves pre-instructed.

διὰ τῶν Μωυσαϊκῶν προπαιδαγωγηθέντι βιβλίῳ. -- I. 532.13.

211

54

6

If Christ is eaten, our life is forever one with Him who is the true Manna.

55

6

He again contrasts the manna and water in the wilderness as types of the true food and drink of the Christian.

56

6

To eat Christ's Flesh, and drink His Blood is to make ourselves one with Him.

57

6

The Son is not a partaker of Life from another (even God), but is rather Life by Nature, as being begotten of God the Father, who is God by Nature. In Christ the Father is seen.

58

6

Manna was not the True Bread, for all the Israelites ate of it and died : it was but the type.

59

6

Christ spoke in the synagogue, i.e. not in secret (Issiah 45¹⁹ Faith in Christ is the bringer of life, and disobedience brings death. There follows an interesting topographical note on Capernaum . Cyril takes the mention of the town to show the accuracy of the Johannine account, and the truth of his record. Origen interpreted places, too, allegorically.

60-61

6

Fault was found with Christ's teaching; in the same way as their forefathers craved for the flesh pots of Egypt while God was giving them manna; they rejected the True Bread .

Be not offended at this : Christ's Body can do more than give life; it can rise to heaven. Cyril emphasises that it was Christ's body that should rise, and asked the heretics to take note. Further, he clearly teaches that He has come from heaven, if He ascends there : the Word was made flesh. This point is a basic one in Cyril's theology.

It is because the Body is God the Son's that it gives life, for it was united with the life-giving word, and this was its power i.e. the Word is Spirit. The Son and the Spirit are inseparable.

In a letter to a bishop named Calosyrius on the reservation of the Sacraments for the sick, he condemns those who "senselessly" imagine the efficacy of the Sacrament to be lost with keeping. (quoted by Bright, Age of the Fathers volume II page 424.)

Cyril argued from the Eucharistic participation of Christ's Body, to the divine one-ness of Christ's person : because Christ's body is received in the Eucharist as life-giving, therefore it must be the Body of one who is personally God, for the body or flesh of a mere man could never be lifegiving, no matter how intimate his union with God might be.

This is important in Cyril's theology.

The Jews blind themselves, as the scripture foretold. Grace is given to the cleansed and believing. The Jews rejected Christ, as was fore-typified in the scriptures when the disbelievers never entered the Promised Land (i.e. The Kingdom of Heaven).

Those diseased in sight hate the sun, and must live in dark

places. Cyril again quotes the scriptures. Joshua and the spies gave report of the promised land, but some of them said bitter things. These God ordered to return to Egypt. God's rejection follows on man's rejection of Him.

⁶⁷
6 To let go the faith is death.

⁶⁸
6 To cleave to Christ is to have endless life. This is fore-typified in Numbers 9¹⁵⁻²⁰ when the children of Israel had God with them under the form of tabernacle, and cloud and fire. They were to set out with the tabernacle and with it to halt : this is the type of the presence of Christ. Cyril proves his case in more detail, though he mentions that this technique is not interesting to all:-

παρεκβατικός μὲν οὖν δόξειεν εἶναι τῷ
 τυχόν ὁ περὶ τούτων λόγος... I. 565. 20.

It may indicate some opposition to this technique. He says, however that nothing in the scriptures is without meaning:-

ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν ὑψημμένων ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς τῶν εἰκαίων οὐδέν. I. 566. 4.

Exodus 40¹⁻² The pitching of the Tabernacle signifies the Body of Christ in whom the Godhead dwelt. That it should be pitched in one day is to be understood the existing life in which he became man : that it was in the time of the new moon, the renewing of ourselves by the Saviour, when we experienced a new season. The first month indicates the spring time when the dark winter is past.

Exodus 40³ The ark signified the Body of Christ. It was covered with a veil and overlaid with gold and made of undecaying wood, for it was incorruptible. The veil indicated that many never saw the Word, overlaid with gold as covered with honour; the Law deposited

in it was a type of the Word of God dwelling in it.

The ark did not accompany the disobedient (Numbers 14⁴⁴).
When it was borne round Jericho (Joshua VI) the walls fell by shouting, signifying when Christ is borne by His Saints and proclaimed to the World the enemy is overthrown.

Exodus 40⁴ The loaves were set upon the table signifying the Body of Christ. When David and his company ate the shewbread, there was indicated the partaking of the Gentiles. In the same passage he says that the candlestick giving light to the whole house prefigures Christ.

The position before the door of the Tabernacle of the altar of burnt offering, indicates that there is no approach to God save through the sacrifice of Christ. The tabernacle was the Leader of the Israelites when they were to set out or rest : similarly is Christ our Leader. Every detail is made to subserve the Incarnation.

69

6

It is in faith that we must build all knowledge.

70-71

6

A man is free to choose good or ill. Cyril shows that in this passage Christ shows that He knew the future when He said that one should betray Him.

The whole of the chapter is interpreted as a commentary on the Eucharist fore-typified in the history of the Israelites, and yet not grasped by them. Cyril's exposition here is almost at its highest - it is a fine and powerful interpretation of the meaning of the Sacrament.

The Feast of the Tabernacles

JOHN 7¹

Jesus is forced to leave the Jews and turn to the Gentiles.

10,11

Cyril quotes Leviticus 1 where the sacrifice is slain on the north side of the altar as a prophecy of this event.

³⁻⁵
7 Jeremiah 12⁶ "I have forsaken mine House, I have left mine heritage; I gave my loved Soul into the hand of her enemies," (LXX) speaks of the despising by one's brothers and the house of one's father, and then the ultimate acceptance. Cyril says that this is precisely what happened in Christ's case when his brothers first ejecting Him later became apostles. Cyril draws attention to the house of one's father as indication of the Virgin Birth.

⁶⁻⁸
7 There is a time for Christ. The brethren can go up to the Feast for the world does not hate them. His words to His brethren are truly to Jewry : He cannot partake in their shadow worship, for He awaits the time of the true assembly. Cyril quotes here Hosea⁵ 9, and Zechariah 14¹⁶ referring to Christ's feast.

⁹⁻¹⁰
7 Christ gladly dwells in Galilee but does not give Himself wholly before His saving cross. He goes secretly, not for the Feast, but to teach. (God too of old, refused to accompany the people of Israel, and yet went Exodus 33^{1,2}.)

¹¹
7 The Jews miss Jesus, as did the Greeks. One must not only seek Christ, but turn to Him in obedience.

¹²⁻¹³
7 The pastors of the Jews are criticised (Jeremiah 12¹⁰⁻¹¹, and Jeremiah 10²¹)

¹⁴
7 Jesus speaks in the Temple in secret, the appropriate place for the Divine to speak. Cyril quotes Exodus 25²¹⁻² where God spoke to Moses in the Tabernacle in secret. In this Moses was a

type of Christ.

7¹⁵⁻¹⁷

Christ as God is both Wisdom and Understanding innate : He knows all things naturally. His Word cannot be other than God's.

7¹⁸

Christ gave the old Law and now beautifies it.

ἔχει τοῦ γράμματος μεταμόρφωσιν εἰς ἀλήθειαν
ἡ εὐαγγελικὴ πολιτεία . I. 606. 24 .

7¹⁹⁻²¹

Christ does not accuse the Jews merely of individually transgressing the Law, but that the whole nation of the Jews had made the law of Moses of no account. (an important point.)

7²²

Moses made the custom of his forefathers of more honour than the sabbath, therefore a custom is made of more honour than the Law.

7²³

Circumcision is to take care of a man and this care surpasses the ordinance of the sabbath.

7²⁴

Why blame the Son when you do not blame Moses? This is to insult the Divine.

When Israel came out of Egypt God gave them His Laws. The Sabbath signified the rest ~~at~~ which was to come to the saints at the end of the age when they would be in Christ. The commandment about the sabbath was a call to remember i.e. when our position about faith in God had been made secure, we were to remember the promise of the end of the ages, and from this there follow the remaining laws. The sabbath was the type of their everlasting inheritance. He proves this from the Old Testament and from the Epistle to Hebrews. Did not David still look for this (Psalm 27¹³)

coming long after the Promised Land?, (for the Promised Land as such was already long inherited?)

The collecting of sticks (sticks feeding fire meaning therefore sin) by a man on the Sabbath (Numbers 15³⁶), which offence was punished by stoning to death, signifies that in that blessed state there shall be no more sin.

The provision of a double quantity of manna for the Sabbath (Exodus 16²⁵⁻²⁶) signifies that when that time comes the opportunity for toil will have passed : it will be an enjoying of the things for which they have already worked. No burden will then be carried, and none shall leave the gates of the heavenly Jerusalem. (Jeremiah 17²¹⁻²).

The significance of the Circumcision :-

To Abraham circumcision came as a confirmation to a faith he already possessed. Those who desire a nearness to God must be cleansed first. Circumcision is the application of steel to that part of the body whence and wherein is the birth of pleasures : we cannot approach God without the prior sharp working of the Divine Word when we cut away delight in baser things so that we can do only the Will of God. This is the meaning of the Circumcision of the Spirit spoken by Paul. It took place on the eighth day by reason of the Resurrection of Christ.

Abraham was 99 years old when he was circumcised for circumcision is a vestibule to perfection. (i.e. 100 years)

Ishmael was circumcised in his 13th year, for only the free could be circumcised on the eighth day. Ishmael not only fell from the 8th but from the 12th :

8th - signifies the saving preaching of the Resurrection.

13th - signifies the thrusting away of belief from the Apostles.

Ishmael was not free.

24-26

218

Exodus 4 Moses was attacked by his destroyer, and

Zipporah circumcised her son with a sharp stone and stayed the destroyer. Moses own circumcision (i.e. the Law) did not avail to save him, but the true circumcision of the spirit (performed by the Church i.e. Zipporah) effected his delivery. The stone is a type of Christ : note also the use of a stone by Joshua having crossed the Jordan. These innocent children are a type of the new people : we too must first come over the mystic Jordan. This took away the reproach of Egypt (Joshua 5⁹) and made them ready to partake of the lamb of the Passover (Joshua 5¹⁰⁻¹¹)

In our own case, we cannot partake of the Lamb nor the new food of the Gospel, unless we have crossed the mystic Jordan, received the circumcision from the Living Word, and rubbed off the spot of our reproach.

That no uncircumcised shall partake of the Passover, indicates that he cannot partake who has lost nothing in respect of pleasures of evils : but that he must first be circumcised, means that after this experience of purification he may partake of Christ.

Joshua died and was buried with his flints of circumcision i.e. our salvation is in the death of our Joshua.

Circumcision precedes the sabbath, but is really akin to it.

He begs his readers to understand spiritually here :-

οὐ γὰρ δήπου τῷ παχέϊ τῆς ἱστορίας προεδρεύομεν τύπῳ, προσβαλόμεν
δὲ μᾶλλον πνευματικῶς τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ Πνεύματος. I. 642. 10.

To cut off pleasure is in fact a birth of true life. A man may rest from sin but not be free from it. Sabbath means his rest, but Circumcision the very cutting away. Cyril concludes that we shall

never rest from sin unless we have the force of the will on our side - (a true psychological comment) - but to be released from its power is not our work but Christ's (equally sound).

²⁵⁻²⁷
7

It was the time of the Feast of the Tabernacles when Jesus was thronged, but the evangelist refers only to the words of the Jerusalem people. There is about this a *σχημα βιβλίου*.

It is to show the responsibility of the rulers who would be known only to the Jerusalem people. The Silence of the rulers is emphasised. Further, the Jews did not know their scriptures, for by refusing to acknowledge Christ on the ground that they would never know Christ's origin. Cyril quotes Isaiah 53⁸, Isaiah 7¹⁴ and Micah 5.

²⁸
7

The rulers should know Christ and His origin, if they know their scriptures.

Christ has not come of Himself, but He that is true sent Him.

At the same time it is true that they did not know Christ and His origin, for He came from God. Only the Son sees the Father, and He is God. Only the Son knows the Father, but He knows Him in a way known only to Himself, for unutterable are the things of God.

³⁰
7

Christ came to the Cross by His own Will, and not because of the violence of the Jews. Similarly, in our own case, if we are wholly subject to time then we have no free will, and God^{is} de-throned. Cyril illustrates his case by the destruction of the Assyrians by the Angel of the Lord at the siege of Jerusalem. It is God who directs our affairs and cares for us. Cyril further instances Jesus's words at the marriage in Cana, that His hour was not yet come.

Cyril shows the favourable reaction of the common people as against the hostility of the religious rulers. Through the latter the former perished.

The true answer would have been to have taught clearer truth about the Christ, but instead officers were sent :-

ἔδει ταῖς ἐκ προφητῶν μαρτυρίαις πληροφροῦναι, καὶ διὰ πάσης ἀπαξικλῆως ἴοντας τῆς θείας γραφῆς, ἀπονίψασθαι μὲν τὰ ἐκ τῶν ὀχλίων ἐγκλήματα ----
ἐκ μέδου ποιῆσθαι σποδείζουσι τὸν Χριστὸν... I. 676. 14ff.

An illuminating comment on the weight of the Old Testament.

There is the obvious meaning κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον, and the deeper ἐν παραβύθῳ darkly signified ἀνιγματοδῶς. He had come to give them Life, and they had rejected him : when they would fain find the Giver of Life the opportunity will have gone. This is proved from scripture Hosea 5⁶, 2 Corinthians 6², Galatians 6¹⁰. Cyril illustrates how that in his day opportunity is portrayed as bald behind but with much hair in front, meaning that she can be seized when she confronts you, but not once she has passed you.

Where Christ comes they cannot. The surface meaning (

(ἀπεριεργότεραν τὴν θεωρίαν) is obvious, but the deeper meaning is that of the ultimate rejection of the Jews from the Divine Marriage Feast.

The "grovelling" minds of the Jews imagine Christ is about to go to the Gentiles; this is wrong, but it is a true prophecy.

³⁶
7 Not commented upon.

³⁷
7 The last day of the Feast, Jesus asks the thirsty to come to Him and drink. The Feast of the Tabernacles, as Cyril teaches earlier in this commentary, signifies the thrice longed for time of the resurrection; the taking of boughs a recovery of Paradise about to be given by Christ. As these boughs are to be taken from the brook at the end of the feast, so is Christ seen in that brook (Psalm 36⁷⁻⁸ Isaiah 66¹² LXX) inviting the Jews to drink of Him in the last day of the Feast.

³⁸
7 Cyril quotes numerous passages from the Psalms, Isaiah and the New Testament and shows how Christ makes not a literal quotation but an interpretation:- ... ἐρμηνεύσας δὲ μᾶλλον τὸ πρὸς διάνοιαν
I. 689. 17.

³⁹
7 That the Spirit was not yet, Cyril explains thus :- Obviously the Spirit guided the prophets and was there before Christ. The Spirit illuminated them of old time, but He indwells in us. Man was originally made in incorruption, but turning to sin, lost the Spirit, and therefore became both corruptible and prone to sin. God, planning to gather up all things in Christ, promises to renew man and restore His Spirit. For that reason, Christ is called the Second Adam, (1 Corinthians 15⁴⁵), and the Spirit did not come till after the Resurrection. That is why, too, the least in the Kingdom of Heaven was preferred before John Baptist. (Cyril's technique is guided by reason and confirmed by scripture :-
... διὰ λογισμῶν ἴοντες σοφῶν, καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς
θείας γραφῆς δεδαιούμενοι λόγοις... I. 693. 10.

7 ⁴⁰⁻⁴¹

The people search the scriptures about Christ, and wrongly believe the Prophet (Deuteronomy 18¹⁸) to be other than the Christ. The people are willing to believe as distinct from their rulers who are not.

7 ⁴²

The Jews are perplexed not knowing that He was born in Bethlehem but was brought up in Nazareth. Cyril's proof-texts are: Psalm 132¹¹ and Micah 5².

7 ⁴³

The people are divided because they know not Christ, nor the scriptures.

7 ⁴⁴

He is not taken, as the time for His Passion is not yet fulfilled.

7 ⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷

Implies that the people as a whole were with Christ.

7 ⁴⁸⁻⁹

The Pharisees are really ignorant of the Law.

7 ⁵⁰

Nicodemus is condemned by the Pharisees on the same ground as they condemn the people - ignorance of the scriptures.

The story of the Woman taken in adultery is omitted by St. Cyril from this place, and he proceeds to John 8¹².

JOHN 8 ¹²

That Christ is the Light of the World implies a threat that He will turn from Israel to the world.

Christ is compared to the cloud and the pillar of fire which led Israel night and day.

8

Witness to oneself does not necessarily involve falsehood.

Christ was God from God, and knew of His return to God.

15

8

It was wrong to condemn Christ on the grounds that He was a man. Cyril says of the flesh :-

οὐδὲν ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ πλημμέλημα διὰ
τὸν ἄνθρωπον εἶναι φημι I. 720. 28
μέγα καὶ τίμιον χρῆμα τὸν ἄνθρωπον . . . I. 721. 3.

The condemnation that Christ will make of the Jews, is not that they were men, but that they rejected Christ.

17-18

8

The Father and the Son are co-witnesses. The Jews do not even keep the Law they admired.

19

8

Here is shown the earthly-mindedness of the Jews. But there is an implication that Christ was illegitimate. From this Christ gently leads them away.

20

8

Christ was the very Treasury, the stronghold of the Pharisees, and they were not able to lift their hand against him, for Christ saved us of His own volition at what hour He chose .

21

8

Christ tries to dissuade them from unbelief. To die in sin is to undergo eternal death and be shut out from the heavenly kingdom.

22

8

Omitted.

23

8

From beneath indicates that the Jews are subject to death; from above means, not from heaven, but of the eternal generation from the Father.

The Son is by Nature God, and in no sense originate : this is witnessed to by God Himself (Hebrew 1⁵). He proves that angels are lower than the Son.

²⁴
8 Unbelief means death. This is all foretold in the Old Testament

²⁵
8 Cyril discusses a matter of punctuation to emphasise the "Who art Thou? " with scorn. Christ was sent to minister to the Jews first, but in their rejecting Him, their place was given to the Gentiles.

²⁶
8 The folly of despising low birth. The Judge now rejected will one day condemn the Jews of many sins. Christ bides his time. The Jews are fighting right against God.

²⁷
8 The Jews would not be led upward from knowledge of the Son to conception of the Father.

²⁸
8 We lose all hope if we do not accept Him as Saviour and Redeemer.

²⁸
Again 8 . God permits the consequences of rejection.

²⁸
Again 8 After the Passion of Christ, the Risen Lord leaves the Jews in darkness, and goes to the Gentiles : then will the Jews know that He is the Light of the World.

²⁸
Again 8 The Cross will be to the Jews an evident sign of his being by Nature God, for He will frustrate the Cross by rising from the dead. Matthew 12³⁹⁻⁴⁰, the sign of Jonah, is understood as a prophesy of the Resurrection.

²⁸
8 The Son is God, and is one in Will and Mind with the Father. Here he refers to Arius as a "bitter wild beast" and "a fighter

against Christ"and condemns his exposition of this text. Cyril explains his own orthodox position on the relation of the Father to the Son. The Son's works on earth are little, compared with His creation of all. That Christ could do nothing of Himself did not signify inequality with respect to the Father. The Father and the Son are distinct in person : that Christ was taught of God implies identity of Nature. Christ did not speak as a minister of God, or a disciple, but as the fruit of His own nature.

29
8

"With me"does not mean in the sense in which God is with a prophet - "with me" here means, of the same nature. God must do God's works. The choice of evil is ours not God's.

30
8

The scriptures are hard to understand, and need a wise man to find out their meaning. Christ gained many but not all the people, and hereby is a lesson for all teachers.

31
8

The more obvious meaning τὸ νοῆσαι προχείρως is put in antithesis to the hidden meaning. The latter is described as moving from the letter and the type to the Divine Word:-

ἐκ τούτων ἀγωγῶς τε καὶ πράως διδαγμάτων ἐξέλκων
τῶν Μωσαϊκῶν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ παρ' αὐτοῦ . II. 57. 16.

They must leave the Mosaic types and shadows of the Law, for salvation lies in the spiritual teachings and in the gospel preachings:-

.... μηκέτι τοῖς διὰ Μωσέως προστέπηχθε τύποις.....

.... [ὁωτηρία] ἐν μαθήμασιν τοῖς πνευματικοῖς ,
καὶ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελικοῖς καὶ δι' ἐμοῦ κηρύγμασιν.

To sum up, Christ is the author of both Testaments.

8³²

Leaving the types and figures we should resolutely go forward to the Truth Itself i.e. Christ:-

τὰ ἐν τύποις ἀρέντας καὶ ἀνιγμάσιν, ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἵέναι
γοργῶς τὴν ἀλήθειαν, τυπείτω, Χριστὸν..... I. 59. 22.

Christ brought the Israelites out of Egypt. He it was who was teaching them in the sacrifice of the lamb. If the Types gave such advantages, how much more then the Reality? The sacrifices never gave salvation, as the prophets always said : we are justified only by faith in Christ.

8³³

To claim birth from Abraham was folly, for Abraham's claim was not his birth but rather his faith. Further, the Jews had been in bondage to the Egyptians, Babylonians and Assyrians : they know neither that bondage, nor their real bondage to sin.

8³⁴

Christ presses home the vital point that a sinner is in bondage to sin. Rulers can free a man from the bondage of flesh, but only God from the bondage of sin (i.e. spiritual bondage). Abraham found freedom in faith to Christ-ward : the Jews should find freedom not in Abraham, who cannot grant it anyhow, but where Abraham found it.

8³⁵

Those adopted remain with God, the bondmen are rejected; like the sheep and the goats. The created decay, only the Son, God, abides.

8³⁶

The Free makes free. Joseph was a slave yet free : Esau was free yet a slave.

8³⁷

The "seed" signifies those who do in like manner, not kinship of the flesh.

Cyril omits *ἐμὸν* (as do B.L.), and takes *ποτέρε* as imperative.

He interprets therefore again, that the Son has one Will with the Father, and commands the Jews to do the works of the Father.

39

The Jews believe Jesus a bastard.

40

The Jews show no resemblance to Abraham in conduct for they fight against God.

41

The Devil is their father. Christ is born of fornication.

42

How can you who claim God as your Father not love Him that is of God? There is an eternal and a temporal generation of the Son.

43

The Jews failed to understand Christ, for He bears them away from the worship after the Law and introduces them to a strange transition (*διεγωγὴν*) of life. They cannot hear Christ, because they are fore-mastered by their passions.

44

The time of Christ's Advent was the beginning of the end for the devils. The Devil's first wickedness caused his fall, but he remained in perversity and brought death into the world. Cain was the first son of Adam after sinning, and he was a murderer. The Jews are not otherwise in their attitude to Christ. Israel's worship of the Law was like Cain's i.e. earthly. Christ's sacrifice was like the righteous Abel's. God rejected Cain's (the Jews') but accepted Abel's (Christ's). Cain's reaction was envy, hatred, murder, as the Jews' was too.

(Verse 45 not specially commented upon)

46

8

Sin here means falsehood. Christ cannot be convicted of not giving the Truth. Cyril Says this is bound to be the meaning of Sin here, and was not meant in respect of the breaking of the sabbath for instance. If the Jews were of God, they would believe Christ. Not all Jews are condemned, but rather the scribes and Pharisees.

47

8

To hear the voice of God is not meant in any physical sense, but in the sense of hearing with the understanding.

48

8

Jesus is described as a Samaritan meaning that he was indifferent to the Law : possessed with a devil because it is the wont of the devils to seize on God's glory.

49-50

8

Christ honours His father, and He who emptied Himself in no sense seeks His own glory. God's vengeance is sure on those who reject Him.

51

8

Life is life for ever and comes only to him who keeps the word, which means much more than hearing it.

52

8

Christ has a devil in the sense that He is making himself God, and claiming that He will accomplish that which God had not wrought in the case of Abraham and the prophets. They could not see that Christ was not referring to the death of the body.

53

8

Cyril says that this speech is "overshadowed with some deep meaning" :-

Επεκρίσμενος ρυθίσαν ἑαυτῷ τὴν διάνοιαν ὡδίνων ὄραται

54

8

Human glory is nothing, as even Abraham and the Prophets said

II. II. 23.

229

themselves (Genesis 18²⁷, and Isaiah 40⁶, Psalm 103¹⁴). Christ's reply is that it is God which glorifies Him : He is Eternal and has God's Glory, for He is of God's essence.

⁵⁵
8 The mere knowing that God is God, is not knowledge of Him : the Jews are really ignorant of God. The Son is God because He is the Son of the Father and therefore Eternal. Jesus truly knew God, and was co-eternal with Him and therefore not subject to decay. To deny this would be to be false.

⁵⁶
8 My Day means Christ's Advent. That Abraham saw this day is not "open to View" (πλατὺς). Cyril suggests it was when Abraham, executing the priest's office, offered for sacrifice Isaac, who was a type of Christ. He suggests further that the promise to Abraham that he should be a father of many nations (Genesis 17⁴) foretells the turning to the Gentiles.

Christ proves in these words that the fathers believed Him eternal and not recent (πρόσφατος) or newly-made (ἀρτιγενής) : the Jews cannot see before the eyes, what Abraham did see even through a veil.

⁵⁷
8 The Jews hopelessly blind wonder how Christ has seen Abraham. When Christ sees that his hearers cannot penetrate the veil over His words, He speaks plainly.

⁵⁸
8 Christ is not only before Abraham but before all time.

⁵⁹
8 Cyril interprets Christ hid himself as rendering himself invisible. That He went into the Temple shows that ~~while~~ He cannot be seen by those who hate Him, but is manifest always to them that love Him.

Cyril expounds the passage as the coming of Christ and the failure of the Jews not only to understand Him, but to understand their own scriptures.

Man Born Blind

JOHN 1X

Christ sees the man and he is set "as a token" that he will leave the Jews and turn to the Gentiles. This man is the type of the Gentiles bereft of the true knowledge of God, and bereft from their first age (i.e. from birth). There is a significance seen in that Christ was "passing by". Christ strictly speaking came (ἐπεδήμησεν), not for the Gentiles, but for Israel's sake alone. He transferred His Mercy to the Gentiles as "by the way" (ὡς ἐν παρόδῳ) (ἐπιδημία is used habitually by St. Cyril for the first Advent))

All this Cyril sees foretold in the scriptures e.g. Deuteronomy 32²¹ "And every armed man of you will pass over Jordan before the Lord, until he hath driven out his enemies from and before him."

Light and the recovery of sight are the wisdom and the redemption found in Christ.

9²

The disciples' inquisitiveness is for us. Christ refutes both the Jewish error of believing that the blindness was caused by his own or his parents' sin, and the Greek error of the pre-existence of souls. He disapproves of the mingling of Greek error with the doctrines of the Church :-

πλάνην Ἑλληνικὴν τοῦ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἀναφύρειν δόγμασιν οὐ καταδείσαντες.
II. 136. 21

and the indulging of private fancy :-

... τῶν ἰδίων ἡττώμενοι, θελημάτων... II. 136. 21

(Origen held the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls). Cyril

believes the error to be due to a misinterpretation of Exodus 34⁵⁻⁷.

He makes an interesting aside that these words are the words of God and not the words of Moses as some think:-

αὐτοῦ (i.e. God) καὶ οὐχ ἑτέρου τινὸς τὸν λόγον εἶναι φημεν, καὶ ὡς καθάπερ οἶονται τινες τοῦ πανδόξου Μωυσέως. II. 140. 10.

God would not visit innocent children with the father's sin, but

God will visit the 3rd and 4th generation continuing in sin. From

the passage Cyril teaches the mercy of God. He further shows from

Ezekiel 18 that the soul is responsible for its own sins. He

further illustrates his point from 1 Kings 21 - Naboth and Ahab.

Ahab averts the punishment, as did Ahaziah his son, as did Joram

the son of Ahaziah but it fell on Ahab's wicked house on the person

of Joram's son Ahaziah, and 70 other sons of Ahab.

³
9

Christ makes no contribution as to the reason for the man's blindness. We cannot comprehend why the innocent should be stricken with disease at birth and Christ's answer was to draw off our curiosity, as He did when the disciples were enquiring about the end of the world and Christ's Second Coming (Acts 1⁷⁻⁸).

The man suffers : let us rejoice in the power from above when the Physician makes him whole.

⁴
9

The time is not for curiosity but for work and zeal. Day in scripture often means this life, as distinct from night which means death.

He administers a sharp rebuke to those who interpret spiritually, things that should be taken historically.

⁵
9

These words were spoken in a single sense and with reference to the occasion. He must work his works, and one of these surely is to give light to bodily eyes.

9 The man does not ask Christ, but Christ approaches him : the Gentiles similarly were approached by Christ. That it happened on the sabbath is a type of the last age of this present world.

As to the details of the miracle e.g. clay, spittle, Siloam, Cyril says "some deep meaning lies buried". Clay - He formed us originally and is now making good what is lacking. Spittle - the Gentiles must share in Christ's body. Siloam - an image of Baptism (the one sent). The man showed the real obedience of the Gentiles.

8-9

9 The man makes his own testimony.

10

9 The man is a type of the converts preaching to the Jews.

11

9 The blind man esteems Christ as a holy man.

12-15

9 The Pharisees are more blind than the very blind man, considering the observance of the sabbath as of more importance than the healing of a man's blindness, and seek to convict Jesus of law breaking.

16

9 Some Pharisees argue that he is not from God because he breaks the sabbath, forgetting that Joshua took Jericho on a sabbath day. They are divided, for the doing of work on a sabbath does not necessarily involve sin.

17

9 They again question the man, who answers boldly and justly. Cyril infers that the man himself has little regard for his apparent transgression of the sabbatical law.

18-23

9 The Pharisees attempt vainly to force the parents to deny the truth of the miracle.

The man is re-called, and they who should lead cling to their self-imposed ignorance. The scriptures foretell this very event
 Isiah 35⁵⁻⁶ "Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing : for in the wilderness shall waters break out and streams in the desert."

The man's understanding was illuminated as were his physical eyes.

They cross question the man, who asks the Pharisees if they want to be disciples too. They reply they are Moses' disciples, and Cyril says that Israel died in the Mosaic types, and was buried in the shadow of the letter.

Cyril's real gravamen against the Pharisees is their real ignorance of the scriptures while they yet believe they know them very well e.g. "We know....."

Even the man rebukes the Pharisees. All Jews waited for Messiah who would interpret the higher counsel of God and open the eyes of the blind. This Jesus had done. Further, the tradition (Isiah 53⁸) that Christ would be unrecognised is fulfilled in their very own words.

God does not hear sinners, therefore this Man must not be a sinner. Also, the man declares that Christ has shown Himself greater than Moses.

Miraculous powers indicate holiness and Cyril proves his point from the scriptures.

⁹ The man was expelled, as were all Jews who confessed Christ.

³⁵⁻⁶

⁹ His profession of faith is rewarded. The proper object of faith is belief in Christ.

³⁷

⁹ Christ speaks of faith in Himself and in no sense separates the humanity from the divinity.

³⁸

⁹ His faith leads him to worship. It is worship in spirit and prefigures the worship of the Gentiles.

³⁹

⁹ Obstinate unbelief blinds the eyes and brings its own judgment. The Pharisees lost even that sight which they had. Blindness is equated with the being bereft of the knowledge of God. It is Christ who restores the sight. Even the Jews who ought to have seen failed to recognise Christ as their Messiah and were equally blind. But they, unlike the rest of humanity, continued in their blindness, and this was the supreme tragedy.

¹⁻⁵ The Good Shepherd
JOHN 10

The connection between this passage and the previous one though seemingly inapposite is clear. It is on the question of leadership which the Pharisees claim for themselves : but Christ sees them as blind and describes Himself as the Door through which men must enter. None of those who believed in Him would be called away by their voices. He makes an interesting aside on the Church's teachings & doctrines from the inspired scripture, and setting forth the evangelic and apostolic word".

⁶⁻⁹

¹⁰ The Jews failed to understand even this parable, therefore Christ expressly says that He is the Door meaning that only through

faith in Him are we admitted into relationship with God. No prophet and no apostle was such on His own election but on the calling of God : this divine call is the mark of true leadership. By thieves and robbers the Prophets were not meant. All who seek for spiritual leadership without the Divine sanction must perish.

10

All shall receive life, but the more abundant life means to participate in the Holy Spirit: for the latter there will be eternal glory with Christ, for the former condemnation into Hades.

11-13

Christ contrasts His own leadership with that of the Pharisees in the image of a shepherd who will give his life for his sheep and an hireling who flees at the very sign of danger. They consented to foreign control claiming to have no king but Caesar, and with-out leadership the people were scattered.

14

The Jews had not grasped their own scriptures. e.g. Ezekiel 2-6 . Knowledge means friendly relationship and loving intimacy. In this way Christ is a mediator on our behalf relative to God i.e. He knows God as God, and He knows man as Man. But on our part it is only belief in Him that makes available for us this relationship with Him as Man, and, the relationship with God. Christ was the Good Shepherd for He would strive for His sheep until death.

16

Christ's "sheep" include the Gentiles, and this may be proved from scripture Isaiah 55⁴, Psalm 47¹, Psalm 47^{7,8}, Psalm 49¹⁻³.

This was spoken here to show the Pharisees that Christ therefore was fore-announced, and He Himself the person foretold.

17

Not only did Christ die - this in itself would not have availed - but he took his life again i.e. He rose from the dead.

He thus saved our nature perfectly - defeating death and effecting for us a new nature. The Father always loved the Son, but especially for redeeming men.

236

¹⁸
10 Christ was in no sense forced or compelled to come. He came willingly. He and His Father have one Will. He is not inferior to the Father, but does what befits his participation in man's nature.

¹⁹⁻²¹
10 Some are convinced and others not.

²²⁻²³
10 Jesus was not at the feast as a partaker but rather to use the opportunity to preach. The feast might be the Dedication either of Solomon or Zerubabel. As it was winter all the people would no doubt be in the porch, where the Evangelist says Christ was.

Holidays were a good time to teach for then men had leisure - an interesting point - for a hard-working peasant community almost all the teaching would take place at the Temple feasts or the Sabbath synagogue worship.

²⁴⁻²⁸
10 It is better that He should be recognised as the Christ not from His words, but rather from His attributes and what the scriptures foretell. He directs the Pharisees to the testimony of His works which He does in His Father's name. All who follow Christ no longer serving the shadows of the Law find eternal life and exemption from death. Cyril adds that life may mean also the mystical blessing by which Christ implants in us His own life by participation of His own Flesh. An illuminating comment with respect to his doctrine of the Eucharist.

Scriptural language is often metaphorical, and the hand of Christ here means the power of Christ. There is distinction of Persons, yet one-ness of Deity. That Christ and the Father are one means relative to the one-ness of their Essence. He reminds the Arians that it was in this sense that the Jews so understood Him and which Christ never refuted. The Jews rushed to kill him, on a charge of blasphemy, but Christ prevented them for his hour was not yet come. Why then, Christ answers, was Psalm 82⁶ not blasphemous. This question was asked so that Christ could show the Pharisees their ignorance of the scriptures. If men to whom the Word of God came were called God, then how not He who does God's works? Cyril warns of the limited capacity of human language and likens the description of God by words as measuring the heavens by a span. He instances the use of words in scripture which cannot be taken literally e.g. God "sitting" on the cherubim Psalm 80¹. God "Coming down" to earth Genesis XI. Divine things transcend human words.

No creature can do the Father's works, though any creature can confess the Father. This was the proof of Christ's equality with God, which equality the Jews would not see.

Christ leaving Jerusalem and going to Jordan typifies the leaving of Judea and going to the Church of the Gentiles which possesses the fountains of Baptism. There many come to him crossing through Jordan, and there Christ abode with them. Jeremiah and all the prophets lead us to Christ who is found beyond Jordan.

JOHN XI

The sickness had not come in order that the Son of God should be glorified, but now that it had come Christ as God foreknew that the result would be to the glory of God. Christ was determined in this incident "to set forth the weakness of death" :-

ἔρχεται γὰρ ὁ Κύριος ἀθενοῦντα δεῖξαι τὸν θάνατον

II. 265. 20

and it was Christ's plan not to heal Lazarus while sick but to raise him when dead.

7-10

11

The disciples expostulate at Christ's intention of returning to Judaea, but Christ explains that He must walk among the Jews bringing them the light from His presence until the time of His crucifixion.

11-15

11

Lazarus is a worthy cause for Him to return to Jerusalem, indeed He must not fail. It was right for Christ to refer to death as sleep, for He had made man for immortality. In the sight of God the temporary death of our body is really a sleep and nothing different. Misunderstanding Christ's reference to sleep the disciples urge Christ not to go. But Christ replies that Lazarus is dead, and dead because Christ was not there. Christ says "Let us go unto him" as unto a living person.

16

11

Thomas shows little faith in Christ.

17

11

The number of days is mentioned explicitly that the miracle may be seen as marvellous, and also that it may never be said that Lazarus had been raised from sickness. The other detail that many Jews were there, is added for the same reason

²⁰
11

Martha acts but Mary remains in thought.

²¹⁻²⁴

11

Martha explicitly says that her brother had died, not because it was of man's nature to die, but rather that Christ had not been there. She gently chides Christ for his apparent tardiness and stumbles in addressing him as she would a saintly man, though she shows that she believes in a resurrection.

²⁵⁻²⁷

11

Christ is the Resurrection and the Life. The reward of faith in Christ is eternal life. Merely to be restored to life for punishment is death. All men will die and cannot be saved that experience. Christ speaks of the general resurrection when all shall be raised up. The confession of faith is the parent of eternal life : this is a model to the Churches. That Martha confessed this faith on behalf of the dead Lazarus is a type of the baptismal confession of a sponsor at baptism on behalf of a child or a sick person.

²⁸

11

Mary's hurried departure was interpreted as an emotional release visiting the tomb, whereupon the Jews followed her. This accounts for the number of the people at the tomb. Cyril makes a special comment here on the Evangelist's zeal for the truth, and considers every detail historically true.

³²

11

Mary, too, says that Lazarus would not have died prematurely had Christ been there. Cyril offers a remark, too, to the effect that we should not reprove mourners having this example before us. Further, he refers to Christ's humanity when he wept.

11

Christ did not ask the locality of Lazarus' grave because of ignorance, but for the sake of the spectators. Cyril draws a parallel with God's question to Adam (Genesis 3⁹) "Adam, where art thou?"

11³⁶

Christ did not weep over much, thereby showing us that we should not give way overmuch in grief for the dead. He wept not only for Lazarus but for the whole of humanity being subject to death. The Jews malignantly ask why He could not do for Lazarus what He had done for the blind man, an act beyond man's nature in each instance.

³⁸⁻⁴¹11

He did not roll away the stone Himself, teaching that it is superfluous to work wonders when there is no necessity for them.

Martha cannot understand or believe, but Mary does not doubt.

Christ strengthens Martha's faith.

11⁴²

Christ's will and God's Will are One, therefore Christ speaks for the multitude standing by. He tried to show the Jews that He performed everything with God. Similarly the loud cry to Lazarus was given for the Jews. Lazarus' resurrection is a type of the general resurrection. Cyril enlarges here to the effect that at the Feast of Tabernacles, a memorial of trumpets was to be made. This is a type of the resurrection when everyman's soul shall take its new tabernacle. The trumpet call is paralleled in Christ's loud cry.

The Jews were commanded to free Lazarus, that they might remain in no doubt. At the general resurrection we shall be set free from sin, in a like manner.

it is treated as the resurrection of the soul of man :-

Λάμβανε δέ μοι τὸ θαῦμα καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐντὸς . εἰ γὰρ ὁ νοῦς ἡμῶν ἀπαθάνοι Λαζαρος, δεῖ μετα ἐξομολογήσεως, ὡς Μέρθαν καὶ Μαρίαν, τὴν ὑλικὴν σάρκα καὶ τὴν σεμνοτέραν ψυχὴν προσελθεῖν τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ παρακαλέσαι . καὶ ὅς ἐπιστὰς, τὴν ἐπικειμένην τῇ μνήμῃ ἀρθῆναι κελεύει πύρωσιν, καὶ φωνήσῃ μεγάλη φωνῇ τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς σάλπιγγος Δεῦρο ἔξω τῶν τοῦ κόσμου περιδωμάτων, καὶ τὰς σειρὰς λύσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, ὥστε δύνασθαι κινεῖσθαι ἀραρότως πρὸς ἀρετὴν II, 292.15-23

note the clever play upon the words μνήμη (memory) and μνημεῖον (tomb).
the passage is quoted at some length, for, in respect of Cyril, it could almost bear the whole burden of proof for the thesis.

45-6
11

Many believe, but others report Him to the Pharisees.

47-8
11

The Pharisees, who by now ought to have seen His Messiahship, seek to kill Him, realising that Christ meant the end of Judaism.

49
11

He considers Caiaphas' prophecy, and the truth of it. Christ did mean the end of Judaism and the Law. Caiaphas spoke true for he was in the position of a prophet, though the prophecy was given to his priesthood not his person. Caiaphas says that the death of Jesus would be for the Jewish nation only, but the Evangelist says it will be for all mankind, who will be gathered together again worshipping One God in the fold of the Church.

From that moment the Pharisees took counsel together to destroy Him .

54
11

Christ retired from their anger, whereby we learn to retire from the angry.

11

The Evangelist passes over suddenly to the Passover. That it was referred to as the Passover of the Jews, Cyril interprets as a typical exposition, for the true Passover is that of the Christians who eat the flesh of the true lamb. All must be cleansed before the Passover and no unclean may partake of it - all of which types are spiritually fulfilled in the case of the Christians.

56-7

11

Cyril mentions the various reasons for Christ not coming up to the Feast openly in the first place.

The miracle is treated in every respect as an historical incident accurately told but it carries for Cyril a deeper meaning. It is the story of man's soul which dies when Christ is absent, and which is restored to life when the Master comes.

1-2

JOHN XII

Christ observes the customs of the Feast. The mention of Lazarus eating with Him was a reminder of Christ's God-befitting power.

12³

While Martha was serving, Mary showed her love by anointing Christ.

12⁴⁻⁸

She incurred Judas' condemnation, but it is more important to bring presents to God than to honour the poor. Her act had a mystical significance.

12⁹

A multitude had come to see Lazarus and Christ.

12¹⁰⁻¹¹

The chief priests think it important to put Lazarus to death.

12¹²⁻¹⁹

The people receive Christ quoting the messianic scriptures. The ass is a type of the Gentiles being led to the Jerusalem

above, of which Jerusalem was the type. The disciples did not at first understand these things, but after Christ's Resurrection they put away their blindness. The multitude went out to meet Him because they had heard how He had raised Lazarus. The Pharisees were angry that they were ineffective.

20-22

12

Greeks were present at the worship in Jerusalem in the capacity of enquirers. Philip is afraid to bring the Greeks to Christ for the Gospel was intended for Israel and therefore takes counsel with Andrew.

23

12

Christ's "hour is come" - i.e. the hour of His Passion and His glorification. His Death will bear much fruit, as a grain of wheat dying. The loving of life is the holding of life firmly for oneself. To follow Christ in manly courage and endurance here is to reach the same place and share the Divine glory of Christ, and to be honoured by the Father.

27-29

12

Christ felt fear and alarm showing His human soul. It is expressly stated that Christ's soul was troubled thereby dispelling the suggestion of the heretics. It would seem that Cyril refers here to the Manes. He says :

ὁ γὰρ μὴ προσείληπται, οὐδὲ βέβωσται. II. 318. 9.

This is central to Cyril's understanding of the doctrine of the Incarnation.

The glory of Christ lies in His death : this is a pattern for our lives .

Christ felt all our affections. In Him therefore is all our glory, for all were subdued by God's Word dwelling in the flesh. In this way is He the Perfect Saviour.

There is a note translated from the Syriac to the effect that St. Cyril is reproving Arius and Eunomius for believing that the Divine Nature dwelt in Christ's body in the place of the soul. The text is incomplete here. The editor attempts to complete it by this translation from the Syriac.

30

12

The miraculous voice is not described as the voice of God, which description would have given an opening to the heretics. (A rather shrewd comment!) Even the miraculous voice, sent for the sake of the people, failed to turn them from their impiety.

31-33

12

Now were the Gentiles to be delivered : now was the devil to be cast into Hades. By "lifting up" Christ meant the Cross, which shows that He offered Himself voluntarily.

34-37

12

The multitude, too, understood that Christ meant crucifixion when He said "lifted up". Cyril says that the use of euphemisms was common practice. The Son of Man did "abide for ever". The people were in darkness because of their unbelief. The way of salvation lies in faith in Him through whom a man comes to knowledge of the Father. Cyril again speaks of Christ's departure as miraculous. The people did not believe Christ, even when they saw with their own eyes.

38-40

12

The Jews blinded themselves by their obstinacy as Isaiah said.

42-43

12

Many of the rulers believed on Him but they did not confess, preferring their place in the synagogue.

12 Christ was one with the Father. To believe on him and to

see Him is to see and believe the Father.

46

12 He was the Light come in fulfilment of prophecy.

47-48a

12 Lacking.

48b

12 Those who refuse this saving faith are self-condemned.

There then follow four fragments from the Syriac, the proper position of which is uncertain. The essence of the fragments is a maintenance of the equal reality of Christ's Godhead and Manhood over against the heretics.

49

12 Christ justifies his position as being a fulfilment of the Law.

This point should not be overlooked for Cyril, and indeed all the ancient commentators, pay this regard to the Old Testament. The early *κῆρυγμα* was based entirely on this e.g. Stephen's speech in Acts and the Pauline Epistles. It is an emphasis that modern scholarship has tended to underestimate. The point against the Jews is that they both failed to honour the Law itself, and they turned a deaf ear to Christ, although he openly declared himself the Prophet foretold in the Law.

The title "Prophet" befitted him not as God but in his human nature. The Jews failed to see Christ as the transformation of types into their true significance.

That He has received a commandment of God in no sense indicates inferiority to God. He is the living and personal Word of the Father, the medium of interpreting what is in the Father, and the bringing to light of the set ~~and~~ will and purpose of His

own Father. In no sense will Cyril permit any detraction as regards Christ's essence or dignity. He makes a fine defence of the Incarnation and quotes the Kenosis passage Philippians 2⁶⁻⁸. Indeed Cyril's main thesis seems to be an apologia of the incarnation over against those who misinterpret it, (like the Arians and other heretics), not forgetting those who have not understood it. Granting Cyril's premises, his whole presentation is most formidable and possibly irrefutable.

JOHN XIII¹

Herein is shown that Christ's love is infinite for knowing that the Jews were seeking his life he continued to the end loving his disciples.

2-5
13

What position could have been more attractive and brilliant than that of the Apostles in their friendship with God? Christ taught them humility and made Himself their εἰκὼν, and in teaching them teaches us.

6-7
13

St. Peter impulsively protests but Christ explains that he will understand later. The meaning is that unless a man washes away his sin and defilement by the grace of Christ, he will remain without a taste of the Kingdom of Heaven.

9
13

He explains Peter's conduct, and teaches the lesson that we should keep our tongues in restraint.

10-11
13

Christ's appeal is to each man's conscience, and even to Judas He forbearingly shows him every kindness. This is as God behaves towards man.

12-17
13

It was not merely an example of humility : the point is that

their Lord and Master acted thus.

247

This lesson the disciples must learn and put into practice continually.

¹⁸
13 The treachery of Judas raises two points for Cyril

- (a) If Christ was all-knowing, why did He choose Judas?
- (b) If it had to be, where was Judas power of Choice and therefore his responsibility? In answer Cyril says :-
 - (a) It is not very profitable to ask why God allowed certain men to be called who eventually failed him e.g. Saul. God made men with free-will. To choose evil is to make oneself a captive : this brings rejection by God. Judas could always have saved himself.
 - (b) The fulfilment of prophecy is no excuse for sin. It shows rather that the Holy Ghost has spoken in scripture, which fact is a support to our faith.

¹⁹⁻²⁰
13 Christ's prediction was a proof that He was the Christ. Real prophecy is meant to convince us of truth when the event does happen. To reject the Son was to reject God in effect.

²¹
13 Cyril makes a most enlightened statement on the necessity of anthropomorphisms, but warns that they mislead. In particular, he refers to the vague expression of Christ's soul being "troubled" as merely the best word, but in no sense Christ conveying a precise meaning.

²²
13 The emotion of the disciples arose from the fact that they all knew Christ's words would be fully verified, and yet could not imagine who would be led away.

Peter instigates John, but no answer is given save to quote Psalm 41⁹ and Psalm 45¹³⁻¹⁴.

John's happiness, in being next to God, was due to his purity. In his purity he saw Christ's glory (John 1¹⁴), not in any bodily sense but by a "subtle and perhaps incomprehensible process."

Cyril describes the working of Satan against the human soul - how he works as a counsellor, showing our weaknesses to be virtues and then ends as the master and possessor of our soul. He speaks of noble emotions, devotion and the Eucharist as the best antidote to Satan. An interesting analysis. Of the latter he says:-

[The Eucharist] καταργεῖ γὰρ μάλιστα δὴ τοῦτο τοῦ διαβόλου τὸν ἀνδροκτόνον ῥόν. II. 369. 8.

Cyril's regard for Catholic practice is strong and should be noted, running parallel as it does with his marked dogmatic tendency.

Cyril reflects on the danger of the initial yielding to evil thoughts, and the consequences of so doing.

28
13

Christ addressed Satan in Judas and foreknew His own victory over him in the saving Cross. Satan was going headlong to his own ruin. He makes the penetrating comment that the request to Satan to act quickly was not the request of one about to die, but of one about to be victorious.

29
13

Christ's words were not understood. Either Judas was sent to buy, or to give to the poor. Cyril moralises here on the

duty of giving to the poor, for then and then only can we truly keep the feast.

249

13³⁰
With his soul in darkness, Judas is hastened by Satan lest he repent. Pharoah hurried the Jews in the same way.

13³¹⁻³²
Christ can only teach after Judas has gone, and left Him with His true disciples.

Christ had often been glorified before, but His Passion brought Him the greatest glory. His death was offered for the whole of mankind, and in His resurrection the door to eternal life was opened. The Father is glorified in the Son's glory.

13³³
Men are as nothing compared with God. Though Christ be absent as Man, he is present as God. The disciples will grieve His departure, which he foretold, that they might be prepared for it. The faithless Jews would never find Him, but he would be with the disciples to the end.

13³⁴
The new commandment is to love as Christ loved us. The Law asked us to love the brethren, Christ loved us more than himself, and we must imitate Him. Love is the chief Christian grace and the mark of Christ's disciples.

13³⁵⁻³⁸
In answer to Peter's question, who speaks for them all, Christ gently refrains from a direct answer lest he hurt them. Peter could not follow Him to the world above now, yet he would follow Him hereafter. But there is a deeper meaning, that the disciples had not as yet received the Holy Spirit. And further, that Peter was to follow Christ in crucifixion e.g. John 21¹⁸⁻¹⁹.

Peter protests he will follow Christ anywhere, as Thomas

16
did earlier (11).

250

Christ, with deep consideration, suggests that Peter will fail.

¹⁻
JOHN XLV

The disciples lose heart at the thought that their chief will betray His Master three times in a single night, and Christ infuses into them confidence. The secret of confidence is an untroubled heart, and the need is for faith. Cyril draws attention to the words "believe also in me" as being remarkable for a Jewish audience, and again states the importance of true belief in God and Son as of the same essence.

²⁻³
14

Christ first entered heaven that we might follow, and be again restored to see the Father's face.

⁴
14

Through Christ alone will that way be found. The prophets had always foretold the way to Jerusalem, the free, the city of the saints. And this way must not be rejected.

⁵⁻⁶
14

Christ called Himself the Way, the Truth and the Life. The Way in so far as He was the road to heaven, the Truth in so far as He is the unerring conception of God, the Life in so far as He alone can restore to us incorruption. We come to God in two ways:

(a) by becoming holy

(b) by faith and contemplation.

We can do these two things only by the help of Christ, and therefore no man comes to God except through Christ.

A knowledge of Christ begets a knowledge of the Father. The way to eternal life is to strive with all diligence to know Christ. The unitarian knowledge of God is insufficient : the

the trinitarian knowledge is alone adequate to bring to God. It is folly to pretend to a knowledge of the Divine Nature by the human intellect, but by a knowledge of Christ and His works a man can by contemplation ascend to Him. He emphasises here the importance of true knowledge of the Son as being of God's essence and not possessing certain attributes of the Father gathered from without as heretics maintain : Christ is very God. The disciples know God because they know Christ. They had known before that Jesus was the Christ, but had not understood about "the Way." "Henceforth" spoke of the future : the Law of Moses had turned men from gods to God, but Christ, by His words and works had shown men the nature of the Father.

⁸⁻⁹
14

No man has ever seen God : the contemplation of Christ is fully sufficient as a representation of the essence of the Father. Philip's request may have been prompted by the arguments of the Jews. The Jews said that the great Moses led the people to meet God (Exodus 19¹⁷), but Christ gave no such proofs. Cyril attacks the heretics, (in particular the Adoptionists), and maintains that Christ is Himself God, and necessarily so. The Son is uncreate, and is God of God. The heretics cannot prove their position from Divine Scripture.

The old manifestations of God e.g. a consuming fire did not show God's Nature, as Christ shows God's nature.

¹⁰
14

The words and works of Christ are truly those of the Father. The Word was from the beginning contained in the Father's essence.

¹¹
14

The Nature of the Father and the Son is identical.

Cyril points out that Christ does not ask for belief on the

ground of His words but of His works. Words may be falsely used, but works cannot be so used. The proof of Christ's divinity lay in that He was in the Father and the Father in Him. Cyril here discusses the errors of the heretics, and maintains with great ~~face~~^{or} the position of Christ's true nature as God's. Christ is uncreate, begotten of the Father and of His Essence. He accuses the heretics of falsely interpreting to suit their own position certain texts, but himself covers a vaster field, criticising the explanation of the heretics and showing the soundness of his own position. To deny what he describes as the true nature of the Son is equivalent to denying the Father. In this sustained argument Cyril's whole appeal is to scripture and its rational exposition. Indeed Cyril's entire position throughout his works is based on the scriptures interpreted by reason, and it is on these grounds alone that he refutes the heretics. He is accurate, logical and severe : his orthodoxy is unimpeachable and uncompromising.

12-14
14

Christ enlarges lest there be misunderstanding. It is not God, but Jesus Himself who will give power to do greater things. Jesus did not mean that his disciples were to receive power to make moons and suns etc., but power that was appropriate to man. The greater things meant that after death Christ's limitation would go, and He would be free to work in them the greater works, in company with His Father. He will then also grant all requests, for He will then be as God, a Co-Giver with the Father, one in His Nature with the Father and the Spirit.

15
14

Love gives the necessary disposition to act aright, and its proof is the practice of the Gospel teaching.

The Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son, Cyril adducing further the proof of this by reference to the breathing on the disciples by Christ when He gave them the Spirit. Christ refers to Him as "another" Paraclete, for Christ Himself is also a Paraclete. The worldly-minded do not receive the Spirit.

The Evangelist teaches the right understanding of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit., and shows how Christ equates the Holy Spirit with Himself. The Spirit is one with the Son. Without the Spirit man would be powerless to effect his salvation:-

ἀμήχανον γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ψυχὴν κατορθῶσαι τι τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔχουσιν τῶν οἰκείων κρατῆσαι παθῶν, ἢ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος ὀξείας διαδρᾶναι τὸ μέγεθος, μὴ τῇ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος τεταχισμένην χάριτι, καὶ αὐτὸν ἔχουσιν κ' ἐν ἑαυτῇ διὰ τοῦτο Χριστόν. II. 472. 22 ff.

The Paraclete is offered to all, but received only by some, for every man is an accessory cause of his possessing or failing to possess the Spirit. The evil shall reach man, and the good, Heaven.

"In that day" we shall know because we ourselves, renovated after His likeness shall ascend to heaven unto eternal life.

Cyril then discusses the aim of the Incarnation, for, to understand that will clear up the difficulties. Paul understood it in two

ways (Romans 8³⁻⁴)

(a) To effect what Law could not do, that man may defeat sin and walk in a true spiritual condition.

(b) To destroy death and deliver men from the fear of death to eternal life (Hebrew 2¹⁴⁻¹⁵) 254

(This last is not strictly Pauline but of course Cyril believed it so)

But John added another :-

(c) To make men Sons of God (John 1¹¹⁻¹³).

All three being summed up as the restoration to man of his ancient estate.

Cyril goes on to say that it was for man's salvation that Christ was Incarnate. Originally man had been made in the image of God by the inbreathing of the Spirit. Blessed with free will, (which Cyril describes as a divine attribute), man turned and fell. Man henceforth could never escape death save by recovering his ancient grace and partaking once more in God. For this end the Son became man, that uniting Himself with the flesh that was perishing He might restore it to its own life and make it through Himself partaker of God the Father. In this sense is He Mediator; He wears our nature, remoulding it to His own Life : He is also Himself in us, for we have all been made partakers of Him.

In this way can the text be understood. In the Resurrection they would understand that Christ being Life by nature had knit them through Himself unto God the Father, who is also Life by nature making them partakers in His incorruption.

14²¹

All will rise, but some to punishment which will be worse than any death, and others to life in Christ. The Resurrection is not eternal life. He describes eternal life as a state of perfect divine knowledge :-

τροφῆς δὲ τρόπος πνευματικὸς, ἡ τελεία περὶ Θεοῦ γνῶσις

A man who has faith is a man who has laid the Gospel commandments to heart and fulfils them. He possesses the mind of Christ.

14²²

Cyril describes the men of God as possessing purity of heart which gives to them the gift of the Spirit. He compares them with those who display their knowledge in bare logical processes with a chance acquaintance of the divinity of Christ. Judas enquires why all men will not find true knowledge. But the "world" signifies the worldly-minded who have yoked their understanding to the vanity of the world and not "all men". Christ is specially manifested to His disciples.

14²³

The knowledge of the saints was different from the knowledge of the vulgar who perhaps knew merely that there was no idol in the world. The minds of the former are illumined and are ready to apprehend Divine mysteries. Only those with an intimate connection with Him and keeping His commandments can receive His grace. The reward is the indwelling of Father and Son, which can take place only through the Spirit. The Spirit is not created, as some of the heretics believe. Cyril deals carefully with this conception of the Spirit and the Father and Son dwelling in a man, and attacks false doctrines, in particular, that of the Anomeans. Again, his judgments are based on scripture and reason.

14²⁴

God can abide only in the virtuous and pure, the others, because of His very own nature, he must abandon.

The Mosaic dispensation was preparatory and a shadow or

type : Christ showed us reality itself, and made the Shadow
superfluous. When Christ says that His word is the Father's,
He is emphasising the Divine origin of the Gospel.

25-6

14

The complete revelation lies in the Holy Spirit.

27

14

The great strength of the disciples would lie in that the
spirit would always be with them, giving them peace in all situations.
The completion of all good is that God should dwell in us by the
Spirit.

Christ was to leave them, but He would be ever with them
in the Spirit.

28

14

Christ was bound, once his dispensation to us was
accomplished, to return to His own glory. Heaven received him
when He left this earth to an equality with God the Father. The
Father was greater than the Son, for He was in the form of a
servant until His dispensation was fulfilled, after which He
ascended to His own natural glory which He had at the beginning,

Cyril goes to great length when he is discussing the
Nature of Christ. The heretics here come in for severe criticism
and these he refutes by logic and scripture, as is Cyril's usual
custom. The heretical argument involves a duality of Gods, but
the orthodox belief in the relation between Father and Son
demonstrates their equality.

29

14

Christ prophesied that the faith of the disciples was to be
confirmed by Him and they would reflect on His promises and see
that all was true.

30-31

14

There was no time left for speech, for Christ's Passion was

at hand, the beginning of man's salvation, Christ was the second Adam defeating corruption and granting life. That the prince of this world was to have nothing in Him meant that he was not to be convicted of sin. 257

Cyril interprets "Arise, let us go hence" mystically, meaning the call, open to all and of passing from one stage to a higher : death to life, from corruption to incorruption, and by Him and with Him from one place to another. Christ points the way to incorruption and life with God : we have neither an elder nor an angel but the Lord of all to guide us. The whole passage is very lofty.

JOHN XV¹

It is the Holy Spirit that unites us in Christ. That God is the husbandman means that the whole trinity functions in the salvation of man. We are nourished by Christ, and tended and watched over by God - none of the Trinity functioning alone would save us - but all work together.

The heretics showed from this that as Christ likened Himself to a vine and His Father to a husbandman then were they of differing essences. But Cyril "fired with religious zeal" enters "on the contest of words and arguments" :-

....ζήτησεν τῷ φιλοθέῳ κεκινημένους καθεῖναι τὴν μάχην
τὴν ἐν λογισμοῖς τε καὶ λόγοις. II. 540. 1.

This sums up Cyril's general position. His criticism of the heretics is their error of arguing from allegory. It is interesting in this connection to remember that though few used the allegorical interpretation more than Origen yet he never proved

doctrine or refuted an opponent by means of an allegorical argument. To him it was a method of teaching spiritual truth, as it was to Augustine, a method the value of which it is difficult to deny. Cyril sums up his rather long comments on this verse by proving his position from scripture, the significance of which act cannot be overlooked.

Cyril moves on to say that the reference is to the Blessed Sacrament by which Eternal Life is implanted in us. Life is shared with Christ both spiritually and corporally - this Cyril refers to as "the fellowship of the flesh:"

.. τῆς σαρκὸς κοινωνίαν .. II. 544. 7.

πνευματικῶς καὶ σωματικῶς, ἄμπελος μὲν ὁ Χριστός, κλήματα δὲ ἡμεῖς.
II. 544. 13.

It is by refusing to see the truth in which Christ is a Vine in a corporal sense that the heretics go wrong. This is a very significant comment showing how the heresies affected the doctrine of the Church and the Eucharist. To deny Christ is to involve denial of the Father, as to deny the Father involves denial of Christ. He adds the interesting illustration that no creature produces anything different in kind from itself, how then should God do so? Finally, he says that the logical end of these heresies is to make God human or men divine.

The whole passage is important doctrinally and is treated at length. It is of special interest to note that Cyril interprets Christ's words here as referring to the doctrine of the Eucharist.

15²

Our union with Christ is of the mind, the manner of the love requires us to keep His commandments. He likens the dead branches to those whose union is in "mere barren confessions

of faith", an illuminating point from such a champion of dogmatic orthodoxy. Faith without works is dead, therefore the branches need purging : to be purged means to lose the fear of doom and judgment. This is true of us all in a general way, but Cyril sees a particular allusion to the Jews cut off by God.

¹⁵₃

It is the Son who fulfils the activity of the Father, for it is the Word that purgeth us. The Father acts through the Son.

Cyril warns against pressing the application too far to avoid inconsistency.

Christ says that they will be saved not by what they eat and drink, not in doctrines of baptisms, nor yet in sacrificial atonements but in firm faith and godly works.

Cyril speaks of the beauty of holiness in this connection.

¹⁵₄₋₆

Union is best maintained and preserved through love, as the example of the holy apostles teaches us.

¹⁵₇

Goodness is unbroken union with Him, the keeping in mind the Gospel lessons, and the true knowledge of doctrine. Faith is insufficient for that union, for the very devils acknowledge His Unity and His Existence. A right faith tends to good works and proper requests in prayer.

¹⁵₈₋₁₀

We must do Christ's Will, as He accomplished God's Will, and in this way abide in Christ's love, as Christ abode in God's.

¹⁵₁₁

Christ encourages His disciples by His words and example for our joy may be like Christ's.

¹⁵₁₂₋₁₃

Christ's love was boundless : by His words and example He

encourages the disciples to preach the Gospel boldly.

260

¹⁴⁻¹⁵

15

We are made friends of God through obedience and sacrifice, as Abraham was called the friend of God by obedience and sacrifice. The Gospel dispensation is more ancient than the Law - i.e. that which is by faith and friendship towards God.

¹⁶

15

Christ encourages the zeal of his disciple. He had brought people who did not know Him to know God and bear fruit for God, and His disciples are to do likewise, and to have a yearning for souls and bring them to God.

¹⁷

15

Christ forewarns His disciples of the hatred of the world, but they were not to seek to please men, nevertheless. Hatred by the world was a proof of virtue and was to be expected. The disciples were to preach the Gospel fearlessly, regardless of affronts.

The disciples are forearmed against persecution by the example of Christ.

Their duty is to preach the Word, and not to be depressed with seeming lack of success, but merely to preach and leave the result to God.

²¹

15

The perils and sufferings they undergo on behalf of Christ are spiritual gains. Those who reject Christ's servants reject both Father and Son.

²²

15

Christ foretells to the disciples that God will judge those who reject Him.

To hate Christ is pure atheism, even though the Jews did so out of respect for the Law. It is a heavier charge on the Jews for they saw Christ and His miracles, and have therefore least excuse. Cyril describes their sin as "gross contumacy". Yet it was all foretold in the scriptures, though the Jews had not the slightest reason for hating Him. Christ worked greater miracles than Moses.

The mention again of the Spirit makes Cyril stress the importance of Father Son and Spirit being equal, and with the equality the unity.

JOHN 16¹⁻⁷

These remarks, foretelling the conduct of the Jews, are meant by Christ to exhort His disciples to endurance. They were told to expect what did actually happen, in the case for example of Stephen and Paul. But the zeal of the Jews was not according to knowledge : to reject the Apostles is to reject God. (He quotes 1 Samuel 8⁷). Christ's prophecy will increase their faith, and it was given for no other reason, for He who knows the future must be God. Christ's prophecy was rendered necessary because of His departure, for when He was with them He could Himself maintain their peace of mind. He sympathises with them in their suffering, but speaks of their silence in not asking where He was going.

It was well for Christ to be present in the world in the flesh, but when His work was completed He ascended to the Father. Both these events brought us advantage. He had wrought man's salvation and just as in His Resurrection, He renewed in us the power of escaping corruption, He now opens out for us

the path heavenwards, and restores the race of man to the Presence of the Father. He entered heaven as the first fruits of humanity. His earthly mission fulfilled, He must of necessity go to the Father. The only way for man to be changed to a life well-pleasing to God was by fellowship in, and partaking of the Holy Spirit, and the most fitting time for the descent of the Spirit was the ascent of the Son. The Spirit had always changed people - Saul, (1 Samuel 10⁶), and Paul, (2 Corinthians 3^{17,18}).

16⁸⁻¹¹

Christ goes on to demonstrate the work of the Spirit.

- (a) Reproof of sin - the ignorant and unbelievers will die in their sins.
- (b) Reproof of righteousness - He will hold converse with those who believe in Christ after His Ascension. These condemnations apply both to the non-Jews and Jews alike.
- (c) Reproof of the Comforter. Satan will be condemned by his being no longer able to prevail over those impressed by the seal of the Spirit.

16¹²

Christ comforts them with the hope of new revelations.

The full Gospel message cannot as yet be given, and the deeper mysteries of the faith are suitably reserved for the spiritual revelation which was to come from the Spirit. The Apostles had much to learn concerning the mysteries of the new revelation, even though all had been previously disclosed by the prophets e.g. Peter refusing to admit the necessity of the Cross, Matthew 16²², and Peter's vision, Acts 10¹⁰⁻¹³.

The Spirit of the Truth was Christ's own Spirit and

therefore nothing alien. Even though their own knowledge would be limited, yet the full vision of the truth will have gleamed upon them entire and undefiled.

All the Holy Spirit gives would be in accord with Christ's teaching and about Christ, for He is consubstantial with the Son.

¹⁴⁻¹⁶

16

The Holy Spirit is naturally of God, and in the Son, and through Him and in His substance. There is complete similarity and equality between the Son and the Father, for there exists perfect union between them. It is difficult to express the relations of the Persons of the Holy Trinity in language at all, for we must speak as though God were even as we, and this is not the case. Christ's discourse is meant to soften the disciples' suffering with the hope and joy of the Resurrection. Cyril interprets the passage as a proof of Christ's love in going to preach to the departed.

¹⁷⁻²⁴

16

As the disciples do not understand, Christ adds further information. He ~~pre~~pare^ss them for His departure, but tells them that their sorrow will be turned to joy. When the Spirit comes the disciples will have no need of asking Christ, for they will have "a right belief concerning the holy and Consubstantial Trinity" (This he equates with perfect knowledge). The disciples were to ask in the name of Christ.

²⁵

16

The time when Christ should no more speak to them in proverbs but plainly was either the coming of the Holy Spirit, or the end of the world. In that day we shall have no need of

²⁶⁻²⁷
16

The Father will readily grant all their requests made in the Son's name; the disciples, by their right faith, had made themselves acceptable to God.

²⁸⁻³⁰
16

Christ's Divinity was proved by His Ascension. This was the complete answer to the railings of the Jews. When Christ foretold it, His Divinity was accepted completely by the disciples: His Omniscience won them over from an enquiring faith to a stable belief.

³¹
16

Christ warns them that their confirmation is not yet, for they will all desert Him : when the spirit is come then will they be strong e.g. Acts 5²⁹. "We must obey God rather than men : for we cannot but speak the things which we saw and heard." Christ was not afraid because He had the Father : we should take courage in God's service for we are not alone, God is with us.

³²
16

In the world they would have trouble. But they could not be vanquished. Their peace was to rest in Him, in whom they would conquer, for Christ was superior to sin and conquered death.

¹⁻⁶
17

Cyril warns that we should not consider that the son has any lack of God-befitting glory, because Christ said "Father, glorify Thy Son". God's glory must always hold first place. God both gave and received glory : and Christ spoke both as God and Man.

God gave the Son the power and in that sense is to be understood the meaning of God giving glory to the son : how the Son returned glory is to be understood as the Son saving

mankind, and in their salvation (i.e. eternal life), giving glory to God. 265

True salvation i.e. eternal life, lies in a true knowledge of God, and a true knowledge of God can be found only on the knowledge of the Son. This latter he describes as:-

ζωὴ γὰρ ἡ γνῶσις, ὡς ὅλην ᾠδίνουσα τοῦ μυστηρίου
τὴν δύναμιν, καὶ εἰσκομίζουσα μὲν τῆς μυστικῆς εὐλογίας
τὴν μέθεξιν, δι' ἧς τῷ ζῶντι καὶ ζωοποιῷ προσοικειούμεθα Λόγῳ.

II. 669. 10ff.

and later:-

[Knowledge of God, (in which eternal life) is] μητέρα καὶ
τροφὸν τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, ᾠδίνουσιν ὥσπερ ἐν ἰδίᾳ
δυνάμει καὶ φύσει τὰ τῆς ζωῆς αἷτια καὶ εἰς αὐτὴν
ἀπορέοντα.

II. 669. 25 ff.

A most interesting light on Cyril's estimation of the importance of the Eucharist.

He commends the Jewish belief in one God as sound, but its weakness lay in that it refused to accept the further revelation in Christ.

The thought of Christ glorifying God and then asking God to glorify Him does not indicate the Son's inferiority but rather is Christ speaking in reference both to His human and divine nature.

We glorify God by our good deeds - not that God lacks glory - and our return is the glory from God. Similarly Christ glorified the Father by accomplishing His mission and was about to enter again His former glory with the Father. Christ's redemptive work had been done as God, and not in any ministerial capacity. Even in His humiliation He never relinquished His own glory, and Cyril says this is the precise meaning of the

6-8

17

The Father's glory is shown by Christ's works. The name Father is greater than the name God, for the latter explains only His Majesty, but the former His Nature. (Cyril adds an interesting point. He says that the plural of God in Genesis 1²⁶ indicates the Holy Trinity). It was Christ's work to reveal the Fatherhood of God. All things are God, and were given to Christ as Man. The disciples accepted His origin from the Father, submitted their souls to His words, and therefore accepted His Divine mission. Cyril emphasises time and again, that in this passage Christ speaks both in His character as a man, and in His character as God.

9-10

17

Christ is the Priest who is above the Law, for the mosaic ceremonial is a type of Christ's mediation : Christ mediated here as a Man, like Aaron, and mediated for those who were the Father's, i.e. the disciples. Christ and the Father are both glorified in the disciples.

11-13

17

Christ still blends the human and the divine element, and the unity of the disciples resembles the unity of the purpose of Father and Son. To leave them bodily was not to leave them really, for the Godhead could not lose His own attributes, and therefore they would always have Him. Christ's divine activities must not be attributed to the flesh but rather to the Divine power of the Word : Christ can suffer no change in His eternal nature. Cyril expounds the passage as the maintenance by Christ of the twofold conception of His Nature following on

Judas fell of his own volition : the scripture foretold but did not compel his action.

Our joy is the knowledge of Christ's Divinity.

¹⁴⁻¹⁷

17

Christian life is dissevered from the world. Christ, who was not of this world, put himself in this world on a level with us, for our encouragement. Christ is not among creatures for His Word was above the Law, a new Divine Law changing the type into truth. Satan, being of necessity a foe, renders Divine assistance necessary, and God, being holy, takes pleasure in the holy.

¹⁸

17

The Father, Son and Spirit are essentially one. The Saviour sanctified himself by offering Himself for us : we sanctify ourselves by the Spirit through Christ. The disciples are sent into the world as He was sent into the world, and therefore need sanctification. They were the first to receive it, and the sanctification lay in the offering of themselves to God, for everything offered to God is sanctified.

Man is saved by the Eucharist and the quickening power of the Spirit.

Cyril issues a caveat that our thought forms are largely conditioned by the requirements of human reason.

²⁰

17

Christ prayed for all mankind, not only His disciples. No man attains union with God save by his remoulding by the Spirit. When Christ teaches His essential unity with the Father, He desires us to be blended together in the power of the Holy Trinity.

Since the Incarnation we are at one with each other and with God both in a bodily sense and in a spiritual sense. This bodily union we find through the Eucharist, the spiritual union through the Spirit. Cyril's pastoral instinct should not be overlooked here together with his emphasis on the Eucharist. He interprets Ephesians 2¹⁴⁻¹⁶, 1 Corinthians 10¹⁷, Ephesians 4¹⁴⁻¹⁶, Ephesians 4²⁻⁶ as eucharistic teaching.

17²²⁻²⁴

The Son dwells in us in a corporal sense as Man by the mystery of the Eucharist, and in a spiritual sense as God by the working of the Holy Spirit. By receiving Christ in these two senses, corporally and spiritually, we are partakers of the Divine Nature.

Those united with the Father in this way enjoy the blessedness of being with Christ, and also see his glory.

Man's redemption was foreknown by the Father.

17²⁵

Christ called the Father righteous because man was created for good works, and needed, since he had fallen, sanctification through the Spirit, union with God, and an eternal resting place in the heavens, which the Father effected in Christ. Christ was here thanking God for this.

17²⁶

The mutual revelation of both Father and Son demonstrates the Divinity of the Son. Man could not have known this by means of his own understanding, but only through Christ

JOHN 18¹⁻²

Christ had instructed the disciples in the mystery, and shrinking not from His great purpose went out into the Garden of

Gethsemane. In a very beautiful passage Cyril says the garden typified Eden, for in it were all places summed up, and in it was consummated our return to man's ancient condition. In Paradise the trouble began, in the Garden began the suffering which undid the harm:-

ἐν παραδείσῳ μὲν γὰρ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς σκυθρωπῶν συμβέβηκεν
ἡ ἀρχή, ἐν κύπῳ δὲ καὶ τὸ Χριστοῦ πάθος δέχεται τὴν ἀρχήν,
ἀπάντων ἡμῶν τῶν πάλαι συμβεβηκότων εἰσφέρειν τὴν
ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις. III. 15. 20.

18³⁻⁶

The lanterns and torches are ridiculed by Cyril : they who protected themselves against the mere twilight, took no thought of the eternal night. It was His Divine glory that made the people unable to recognise Him, and one day all the human race will be overcome and fall to the ground.

18⁷

Christ goes forward and saves His disciples, for His care extends to all believers.

St. Peter's action is our warning and example, for our weapons are not of the flesh. Christ taught perfect meekness. Peter's action was strictly in accordance with the Law. That he struck off the right ear typified the inability of the Jews to hear aright, i.e. to hear their own traditions but not Christ.

18¹¹

Christ bowed to the Father's pleasure which was to effect man's salvation through suffering.

18¹²⁻¹⁴

The Jews bound Christ who loosed us from the chains of sin. He makes no comment on Caiaphas prophecy as do the others.

Peter and John follow. John was an eye-witness and did not get his information from another : he was known to the High Priest, but friendship is not stated. While John was within, Peter was without.

Peter's denial springs from his desire to be with Christ, and his behaviour is a pretence to be one of the household.

Caiaphas out of malice questions Jesus about His disciples and about His teaching. Christ replied that he had always taught openly to the world, in the Temple and synagogues, and never secretly. He invites them to listen to the enemies he had convinced on a former occasion (John 7⁴⁵⁻⁷).

The officer struck Jesus, because Cyril imagines he was one of the officers who was previously convinced. The enormity of his sin lay in that he had turned against Christ, whence also his uncalled for emotion. Cyril draws attention to Christ's gentleness.

18²⁴⁻²⁷

Peter's frailty is shown that we may learn that human nature without the Spirit of God, (which as yet had not been given to the disciples), is weak.

18²⁷⁻³²

Cyril scorns the inconsistency which with crime on its hands can haggle about not defiling itself in a Gentile's house. He shows from several quotations from scripture that their own writings condemn them.

Pilate by his questioning showed himself less guilty than the Jews. They replied that they could not put Him to death for they had purified themselves for the Feast.

The charge was the malicious one of kingship, which put Pilate on his guard. Christ dispelled Pilate's suspicion by saying not that He was not a King, for His Kingdom was not of this world.

37
18

His Kingdom was that of Truth, in which the devil was conquered, and which all lovers of Truth recognise, and which Pilate could not do.

38
18

Pilate endeavours to release Christ by appeasing the mob, : realising there was no substance to their charge. Cyril discusses the custom of releasing a prisoner at Passover, for the authority of which he had searched the scriptures, and the only reference that was appropriate was Numbers 35²²⁻²⁵. Evenso, Christ is rejected and Barabbas demanded.

1-3
JOHN 19

Though no fault was found in Him by Pilate, Christ was punished that we might go free.

5-7
19

The rulers were foremost in the crime, as John carefully explains, both in what led up to the arrest and the subsequent events. Pilate refused to be responsible. When the charge of kingship failed, and after Pilate's verdict of innocence, the Jews resorted to the charge of blasphemy (Leviticus 24^{15,16}).

Christ had called Himself the Son of God, but His works, which Cyril indicates in a long list, testified to His claim which moreover, had been foretold in the scriptures.

8-11
19

The claim to divinity startled Pilot and disposed him to believe Christ. He asked Him where He came from and Christ was

silent, (again fulfilling the scriptures). When Pilate said he had power of life and death, Christ replied that his power lay in that Christ allowed Himself to suffer willingly. Pilate was not acquitted of complicity in guilt.

¹²
19

The Jews return to their former charge, and Pilate is overcome against his better judgment. The Jews are reproached by Pilate, and show unfaithfulness to God in saying they had no king but Caesar. Cyril draws attention several times to the fact that it was the leaders who were the cause of the error of the common people in rejecting Christ. Pilate delivered Christ to the Jews.

¹⁶⁻¹⁸
19

Christ bore the curse of death for us, and His death was the renewal of mankind. We too must bear the Cross, bidding farewell to the world for Christ's sake, remembering man's tendency to fail in the strife as Peter did before us.

The two thieves are a type of the Jews and Gentiles, the former being transgressors of the Law, the latter idolatrous. And in another manner, the thieves teach that those who are crucified with Christ are united with Him.

¹⁹⁻²²
19

The inscription signified that the curse of Adam which all men share was now abrogated. The three languages typify the universality of Christ's Kingdom.

²³
19

The dividing of Christ's garments and the casting of lots Cyril sees as a direct fulfilment of Psalm 22¹⁸. This prophecy of more detail indicates the Divine nature of Christ who knew the future, and also that He was the Messiah of prophecy.

Cyril very humbly suggests that he has another thought on

the matter. The division of the garments into four and the retention of the coat whole indicates the division of the world into four quarters whose salvation was assured by the wholeness of Christ's body. The latter is interpreted eucharistically. Cyril enlarges on the Passover in this connection showing that in all cases one lamb only was to be divided in one house, and was never to be taken from house to house but eaten if necessary by the uniting of families in one house (Exodus 12⁴⁶). He adds even, that if one liked to consider the wholeness of the coat as proof of the virgin birth, he had no objection. He adds that any speculation which did no damage to the faith is quite commendable:-

--- τῆς ἀρίστῆς ὅντα διαβολῆς εὐρήματα .

III. 89. 21.

19 25-27

The women grieve not understanding the mystery. Christ still honoured the Law by his tenderness to his mother, and commended her to the best of his disciples John, who could explain the profound mystery of the crucifixion.

19 28-29

The vinegar they gave him was in direct fulfilment of Psalm 49²¹. John mentions the details of the act which details are not mentioned in Luke and Mark. This Cyril explains as due to the number of people engaged in the act. The lesson to be drawn is that the enemies of the Spirit persecute the good man until his last breath.

Christ did not merely die, but gave up His Spirit to God.

Cyril enlarges here on the meaning of death and shows how it is but the consignment of the soul to a loving Father - of course, for the righteous only - and in a real sense Paul was right when he said that it was better to depart and be with Christ. The rending of the veil signified that God had revealed the Holy of Holies and made the way to the inmost shrine open to believers. The Law in all its typology and mystery is now laid before us for us to understand in simplicity of faith, for that veil which protected its letter was now torn.

Cyril seems to go further here than the Epistle to the Hebrews does, in making the interesting point that the veil actually shielded the scrolls of the Law which he describes as the letter of the Law.

That the veil was completely torn from top to bottom indicates the utter completion of revelation.

He makes the further remark that as a man when God is offended or blasphemed tears his garments, so, at the moment of Christ's death, the very Temple rent its garments as it were. He offers this further remark rather humbly, but it indicates deep reflection on the passages on which he comments.

Cyril scorns those who parade respect for the Law while crucifying the Lord.

In the shedding of water and blood the sacraments are typified - Baptism and the Eucharist. The Evangelist carefully records two quotations from Scripture confirming that He was the Christ foretold.

Surprisingly, Cyril makes no reference here to the Passover Lamb 275
not having its bones broken. In fact, Cyril's whole handling of
the Passion narrative is marked by quiet restraint and brevity.

38-42

19

Joseph of Arimathæa shames the inhumanity of the Jews.

That Nicodemus was also identified with Joseph Cyril mentions
as being a proof of the signification of the tomb for subsequent
Christianity. The new tomb in the garden indicated that Christ's
death is the harbinger of our entry into Paradise. Cyril remarks
on the Evangelist's detail, which shows overwhelmingly that Christ
died, the basic necessity of our faith.

1-9

JOHN 20

Mary, devoted to Christ, makes the discovery of the empty
tomb and brings Peter and John. Cyril stresses the fact that
there were two men who saw the empty tomb, and that they would
withdraw from the tomb while it was still dark lest they be
seized by the Jews.

Mary sees the angels who ask why she weeps at a time of
such great victory. The presence of the angels certifies that no
harm could have happened to Christ's Body. Cyril proceeds to
explain why it was that the disciples were not granted the vision.
His reason is that the disciples had the evidence before their
eyes and then trusted and understood the scriptures, but the
woman, who would not know the scriptures needed the testimony of
angels to convince her. The disciples had no need of this
revelation, but the woman had. Cyril says womankind is slow of
understanding:-

βραδεία μὲν πὺς εἰς σύνεσιν ἢ γυνή, μᾶλλον δὲ
σύμπαν τὸ θηλειῶν γένος. III. 113. 25.

Mary did not recognise Jesus either because it was rather dark or His Divine Glory concealed Him.

From the Garden of Eden, it was woman's fate to be rich in sorrow, and it was fitting that the New Adam should remove that curse from Mary, the type of womanhood. Christ repulses Mary for she was not in a condition to touch the heavenly Body of Christ and similarly the Church must not allow the unbaptised to receive the Eucharist. It should be noted in these passages that Cyril equates the Sacrament with the Body of Christ.

Mary is given the honour of announcing the great tidings to the disciples, that Christ had ascended to God, His Father by Nature, and His God by His Incarnation.

Christ's appearance to the Apostles indoors was a proof that He was by nature God, and by showing His Hands and Side He proved that it was the body which had hung upon the cross. Cyril stresses the importance of understanding why Christ appeared in this particular form of His earthly Body rather than His Holy Body as being to prove that Christ conquered the death of the body. The reward of Christ's presence is Peace, and to those whose hope is in Him, joy without ceasing.

The time was now come, and Christ ordained them for His mission, as the Father had sent Him : to call to repentance, to minister to those in bodily or spiritual plight, to follow God's Will rather than their own and to save the world by their teaching. (It is an interesting summary of the Christian mission).

At the same time, Christ gives them the Holy Spirit, in this proving that Christ and the Holy spirit are consubstantial, and that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son.

To those who cavil that the Spirit was given at Pentecost, Cyril ²⁷⁷ says that Christ performed in the persons of His disciples the first instalment of what was to come to pass on a wider scale at Pentecost.

Thomas received the gift "in absentia", an act of which Eldad and Medad furnish an illustration.

The remission or retention of sins is done in two ways

(a) by admission to Baptism

(b) granting pardon to those who repent.

But all this is done really by the Spirit but through human instrumentality.

Thomas' want of faith was a blessing for us who come after. Thomas did not ^{want} merely to see the Lord, but rather to see the nail marks and spear hole as proofs not that the Lord lived but that He had risen.

²⁶
20

Cyril draws attention to the minuteness of John's detail.

The eighth day is the Lord's day when Christ appears among those assembled on His account : note that it was on the first day of the week when He appeared before. Similarly do we all meet now, and we experience the presence of Christ and touch His Flesh. Our Eucharist is a further proof of Christ's Resurrection .

Cyril raises the difficulty how it was possible to bear the marks of corruption in an incorruptible body. Cyril maintains that Christ retained the marks in His Body for the satisfaction of men and angels as the convincing proof that no other body was raised than that which suffered death. It was natural for the disciples to doubt, for, even when they had seen the Risen Christ, they were afraid believing they had seen a spirit : in

this way Christ had established their faith, and Thomas could only say "My Lord and my God". Cyril adds that the use of the article shows Jesus Christ to be the one Lord.

29

20

This is a promise and a hope to those who tend to doubt and need greater convincing. Cyril says we should accept the teaching of our instructors.

30-31

20

Only those signs best able to convince that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God had been inserted by John.

Christ, though God and man, is yet one, and to teach otherwise is a serious charge. He is One as our personality is one comprising as it does, soul and body.

It should be noted that in Cyril how lofty is his doctrine of the Eucharist. The Eucharist is for him a Presence as real as the Resurrection, and his deep experience of the Eucharist is the most real medium to him in accounting for the Resurrection and the reality of the Risen Lord.

1-6

JOHN 21

To strengthen their faith, Jesus gives the disciples a third visit. Cyril links the incident with the promise that they were to become fishers of men and starts what he describes as "a spiritual train of thought". The Law had caught no souls and all was still in darkness devoted to the worship of Types and shadows. Not that the Law was to be despised therefore. Far from it. The Israelites had really spurned the Law and followed the traditions of men. When the dawn broke, i.e. Christ's Light appeared, God asked them for food, (i.e. human souls e.g. John 4³⁴), and nothing was there. The Gospel net had now to be let down on the right side i.e. indicating superiority to the Law and the

prophets. The harvest was greater than a human harvest, for they were relying not on their own labours but Christ's power.

279

The beloved disciple saw the meaning of the miracle before the rest. Christ was already standing there with a fire and fish - He had begun the work which the disciples were to continue.

The number 153 signifies :-

100 - The complement of the nations

50 - Israel, the elect Remnant

3 - Trinity which all must praise ceaselessly.

After all their pain and tribulation the disciples would sit down with Christ and share the deep spiritual food. The disciples did not eat the food themselves, it was given them by Christ.

¹⁵
21

St. Peter's threefold denial of Christ is forgiven by his threefold confession of love. The lesson is that the Chief Shepherd cannot be pleased unless the disciples care continually for the health of the fold. The tenor of the passage is the care of the Church.

Christ foretells Peter's crucifixion as a consequence of his taking care of the sheep of the fold. The command "Follow me" meant more than discipleship, but an invitation to share the death experienced.

²⁰
21

Peter enquires concerning John's fate. But what difference to a man can it make to know of his brother's fate, Cyril asks, though he imagines that Peter was seeking the comfort of knowing that John might share the same death.

It is clearly written that John wrote all this and bears

testimony to its truth, and though infinitely more could have been written, what has been written is adequate.

280

CONCLUSIONS .

(a) Scripture

Cyril expressly says that his main purpose in writing this massive commentary on the Fourth Gospel was to correct error. The enemies of the Church he believed to be within the fold rather than without, and it is significant in itself that he chose to refute error by a painstaking exegesis of scripture rather than by any specific philosophical work addressed to the heretics as such.

The warm heart and love of souls that characterised Augustine as also his picturesque and powerful language, are absent in Cyril. Nor had he the deep concern of Origen that men should understand truly. He has rather a consuming passion to prove and convince from scripture the truth of a dogmatic position and that is at once the weakness of the whole commentary, even if history has considered that his most valuable work.

It is important to see at the outset the central and unchallengeable place that scripture occupied in Cyril's theological position, and this in its plain and pure sense. He never followed the speculations and reasonings fashionable in his time but "rather the Divine Scriptures and Sacred Writings only". (John 3³¹) "Most accurate scrutiny must be made in holy Scripture" (John 3³⁶) and the "pure force of the thought" must be considered. Not for Cyril were the wild flights of fancy so dearly loved by the Alexandrines. Indeed, the "spiritualising"

of the whole of scripture was deplorable to him, and he always resisted "stretching" the plain meaning to use his own term. He shows a profound reverence for the pure meaning of the historical scripture, and in no single instance does he prove a dogmatic position by anything but the pure literal exposition of scripture. This does not always seem to be realised or even admitted, but in Origen too, who rose to the highest flights of spiritual interpretation there is the same principle i.e. dogma rests on the plain meaning of the scripture and on that alone : whatever deeper meaning may be drawn is in no sense authoritative but of value for the individual's spiritual life.

He accepts topographical detail as evidence of the Evangelist's integrity and accuracy (John 1²⁴, John 6⁵⁹); discusses grammatical issues e.g. the article (John 1²), punctuation (John 8²⁵) and only allows speculation if it does no injury to the faith (John 19³⁰). At the same time, his spiritual comments on certain passages are models of restraint and humility, and are highly illuminating e.g. his comments on Christ's crown of thorns and purple robe (John 19¹⁻³), and also his treatment of the dividing of Christ's garments, and the rending of the Temple veil. When he is non-controversial he can be most apt and to the point. His antithesis of the Garden of Eden and the Garden of Gethsemane where man's trouble began and was ultimately resolved has a refreshing flavour both of paradox and poetry. His restrained handling of the Passion narrative is most impressive.

Scripture is to him the last word, and nothing is true that is not in the scriptures (John 8⁴⁴). Every detail had a meaning and a purpose (John 6⁸⁸), and their depth past human finding

(John 6³²). There is a strong rational strain in him and he follows the argument wherever it leads (John 20²⁶), and where there is a difficulty considers it over and over again from several aspects. The Old Testament is fulfilled in the New Testament in every detail, and his eucharistic exegesis of the crossing of the Red Sea is both detailed and illuminating. The Old Testament is indeed the type of the New Testament in every detail, and there is scarcely a page of the commentary which is not alive to its Old Testament type. Moses gave but the shadow and type, and the supreme folly of the Jews was that they failed to comprehend the very meaning of their own scriptures, clung to the shadow and type and rejected the Truth. The Law gave the type and pattern of Christ's teaching. Cyril's severity against the Jews is matched only by his treatment of the heretics.

It is scripture that is both the ground of his dogmatic position, and the basis of his whole refutation of the heretics.

(a) Cyril scorns those whose only connection with Christ is in "mere barren confessions of faith" (John 15²). His orthodoxy is guided by reason and confirmed by scripture (John 7³⁹), and these are very strong grounds. We might deplore the heavy doctrinal atmosphere of the entire commentary, but his express purpose was to refute false doctrine and teach true doctrine, and in fairness to this work, that must never be forgotten. He had a deep sense of loyalty to the Church and abhorred schism and heresy. (John 10¹⁻⁵) Men had to adhere "to the doctrines of the Church" and her "rule of faith" (John 17¹⁸) (See also his section on John 12²⁷⁻⁸).

(b) His animadversion against the heretics though understandable for reasons given earlier, cannot be condoned. We have not so learned Christ. To refer to Arius as a "bitter wild beast" is hardly in the spirit of the New Testament (John 8²⁸). Though, at the same time, when one bears in mind how Jerome could revive the memory of his dear friend Rufinus because of a difference of opinion on ~~the~~ Origen, referring to him as "the buried scorpion" and "the many-headed hydra which had now ceased to hiss", perhaps one could be a little less reluctant to condemn remembering the historical situation.

In fairness, his entire condemnation of the heretics is scriptural. Their entire weakness lay in that they could not prove their case from scripture (John 14⁹). Indeed, their condemnation was that they "belched forth what was in their own mind" and not the Holy Spirit. There runs throughout his entire commentary the sense in which right belief in Christ was a matter of life and death, as it was in truth to Cyril. The consequences of wrong belief were eternal doom and condemnation.

(b) The Eucharist

Christ came to give men eternal life, and nothing could convey the significance the Eucharist held for. Cyril more than when he described it as "the mother/^{and}nurse of eternal life". (John 17³). Whenever he takes the role of the pastor and guide, he unfailingly turns to consider the importance of the Eucharist and its place in the Christian's pilgrimage.

It is the effective antidote to the murderous poison of the devil (John 13²⁷), the very Presence and Proof of the Risen Lord, the Incarnation that ever abides in the Church. To partake of

this Sacrament is to gain "actual physical unity" with Christ (John 17²⁰). The feeding of the multitude is a careful exposition of the Eucharist to Cyril, as it can scarcely be denied, it was deliberately meant by the Evangelist.

Every detail of the crucifixion e.g. the dividing of the garments, the rending of the veil, the wounding by the spear etc. is expounded in pure eucharistic language. There again, it is certain he sees the Evangelist's intention.

In the appearances of the Risen Lord, He is taken to be equivalent to the Sacraments of the Church, and the tiniest detail even to the days of the appearances made to yield the thought that in the Eucharist we have with us now our Ever Present Lord.

It would be difficult to over-rate the centrality of the Eucharist to Cyril's dogmatic position, for there is scarcely a page in his work where either it is not mentioned or its reality assumed.

(c) The broad lines of the Exegesis

(being a summary of points made in the previous analysis)

To Cyril the Fourth Gospel was strictly historical in

every detail, but to him it was history with a meaning. There is absent from him the flights of fancy of other Alexandrines, for he has a sober and strict historical sense, but this makes his spiritualising of the events even more effective. There is the strictest regard for the history, but all of the events carry a deep spiritual significance, which he gives or suggests in the most quiet terms.

This thesis maintains both that such was the intention of the Evangelist, and thus have commentators interpreted him.

The Marriage at Cana teaches the coming of Christ in the

fulfilment of time. It is a parable of the Incarnation and an allegory of man's redemption. The water of the Law is changed into the new spiritual Power of the Gospel, intoxicating man and giving him a new spirit.

The Cleansing of the Temple gives the rejection of the Jews and the turning of God's Messiah, unwanted by God's People, to the Gentiles.

Nicodemus is the rejection of Judaism at its loftiest. In him Cyril teaches the typological history of the Jews, and the defeat of sin only in Christ, who alone brings salvation. Judaism is condemned not by Christ, but by itself.

The Samaritan Woman is the finding of the Messiah by the Gentile mind. It is a critical point. Christ cannot win those to whom He was sent and He turns to the outside world.

The nobleman whose son was sick meant for Cyril the mind which was really ignorant but yet had faith enough to seek out Christ.

The Impotent Man is man in the grip of Judaism, impotent, and waiting for "a man" to put him into the pool and therefore save him. "The man" who came was Christ. Judaism, meant to prepare the way for Christ, yet held the Jews spiritually impotent and needing truly Jesus to deliver them.

The feeding of the multitude is a pure allegory of the Eucharist set against the Old Testament background of the history of the Israelites. Christ was alone the True Bread, and the Jews could not understand the significance of their own history and God's dealings with them neither in Moses' day, nor in Christ's. The theme of the failure of the Jews to understand runs throughout Cyril's commentary.

The man born blind is treated as an allegory of the soul's ignorance of God, and the theme of blindness is made to apply to the Jewish attitude to Christ whom God had sent.

Christ alone is the Good Shepherd, for only he can lead and save the sheep.

Lazarus is the soul of man dead because Christ is absent. The soul is restored to life when the Master is present.

The rest of the narrative consists of the supper discourses and passion narrative and the incidents as such end with Lazarus. But a few words could be added on Cyril's attitude to the disciples.

They were, of course, considered purely as historical personages, but he spiritualises their characteristics e.g. in the calling of the disciples and also the striking off of Malchus' ear by Peter "given as a pattern expressly for our learning" (John 18¹⁰).

Cyril was writing to combat error and maintain orthodox Christianity, and therefor made a limited and qualified use of allegory and spiritualisation. Orthodoxy to Cyril meant in the main :-

- (a) a true and firm hold of the meaning of scripture
- (b) full allegiance to the Christian Society and the receiving of Christ in the Eucharist.

The Fourth Gospel was the perfect weapon in this battle. It was both the key to the scriptures and also the sanction for sacramental union with Christ in the fellowship of the Church. For that reason, Cyril's commentary is his greatest work.

His exegesis of the Fourth Gospel lends much support to the contention of the thesis though not to the same extent as Origen. But Origen had not the same dogmatic battle to win: he had a freer pen, and his work is in a sense "less responsible"

Cyril makes the incidents and episodes bear some spiritual interpretation, as the above examination shows. It would seem fair to maintain that Cyril believed the Fourth Gospel to have an intended spiritual interpretation, and whatever value we assess to his discernment of it , it is important to realise that Cyril did understand the Fourth Evangelist to have this further intent, and also that he never lost sight of this, even though he was engaged on what he thought was primarily an elucidation of Christian doctrine.

CHRYSOSTOM

1. Chrysostom on John	Page 289
2. Chrysostom as an Interpreter of Scripture.	Page 354
(a) The Antiochene School and his place in it.	Page 354
(b) Chrysostom himself and his witness to society.	Page 357
(c) As an Interpreter of Scripture	Page 361
1. Scholar and critic	Page 361
2. Interpreter of the Old Testament	Page 365
3. Interpreter of the New Testament	Page 370
3. Conclusions summarised	Page 375

CHRYSTOSTOM ON JOHN.Preface.

1.

Men flock to hear a musician, or to see a rhetorician or athlete, yet how much more should they hasten to hear him who brings the Divine Word.

John comes before them dressed in the robe of truth itself. No longer is he the fisherman speaking, but the Holy Ghost is speaking through him. We must bring calm into our souls that the Spirit may speak to us: be wholly cleansed before we can fathom the depths of John. The need is for an earnest will, and to avoid the heathen practices of the games, the plays and all the rest of "Satan's pageant" (*παμπήγς*).

¹
John 1 .

11.

John is giving not his own doctrines but utterance to the Divine voice. He was of very humble birth and occupation, unlettered and ignorant, but yet gave the wonderful truths of the Spirit. He contrasts him with the ancient philosophers who gave nothing of these truths but indeed often had a harmful effect on morality, whilst John gives the teaching from God and is infallible: whilst they were always changing their ground, John was immovable. The sheer proof of this is that John's Gospel has occupied all the habitable world, whereas the philosophers are all but forgotten.

At the very outset, John speaks of Christ not God, but in speaking of the Word, he speaks of the Father also, for the Father

cannot be described but only known in His workings, as under Light, Life or Word. By these many attributes we begin to apprehend God.

There is no point earlier than in the beginning, and the human mind fails even to reach that. As far as we can go, there is always the beginning beyond. There was nothing before God.

Chrysostom warns here that the presence of many desires in the soul darkens the power of seeing the Divine truths. Worldly thoughts must always be excluded. All must listen earnestly that Chrysostom can sow.

Same Text.

III.

He exhorts them to a greater zeal (even in the case of children), as the safeguard against Satan.

"Was" relative to us signifies past time, but to God, eternity. All created things have had a beginning: but the Word has eternal being. The Word was not begotten but was with God, (meaning His eternity as to person [ἐν ὁμοστασίῳ]), and also was God.

Peter and Paul taught first our Lord's manhood, but it was only what He did Himself when He first showed Himself as a prophet and good man, but showed His real nature subsequently by His works and words. Christ also declared His perfect likeness to God, particularly in this Gospel.

It is vainglory which, in its tyranny, blinds us to truth. When analysed, the desire for human glory is both empty and unreasonable, and brings many evils. Men ought to seek the honour which comes from God.

Same Text.

IV.

The Synoptists first dealt with Christ's conception, birth, bringing up and growth; but John begins immediately with His

Eternal generation, that minds may not dwell on these matters but engage immediately with eternity.

This Word is a Being with substance, co-eternal with the Father. It is not to be imagined that the Word is junior to or younger than God. A good analogy is the sunlight and the sun. The Son is co-eternal and of one essence with the Father: Infinite and Eternal, and with the Divine attributes. He was not created, and is in no way to be understood as part of Creation.

He exhorts his hearers to understand this, and to win the victory over self. Wrong conduct does not come from an evil hour nor a wicked spirit, but from one's own spirit.

3-5
John 1 .

V.

Moses (in Genesis) spoke of God's creation of material things, but John in one sentence embraces all of these with the things above.

The Son is the True Life, and all created things were made by Him. As Creator, the Son is not inferior to the Father, and the same expressions are used of the Father, the Son and the Spirit interchangeably.

Death and error are overcome by the preaching of Christ, and darkness cannot overcome it. We see the Light when we have cleansed our own soul from the darkness of sin.

6-8
John 1 .

VI.

John Baptist was sent from God, and carried not his own word, but the word from God. Christ had no need of a testimony or a witness; John Baptist was sent for the sake of men, that they hearing a kindred voice more readily, would be able to hearken to the Word

ore easily. This word cannot be heard even by the man of faith and knowledge, unless these latter are accompanied by a holy life.

9-10

John 1

Vll.

Chrysostom warns against presumptuous enquiry, for presumption as the cause of Adam's fall. Curiosity in matters we can never solve brings weariness, and also the provocation of God.

There are several ways of wiping out our sins:-

- (a) continual self-accusation and remembrance of them
- (b) to bear malice against none who have offended us, and forgive the trespasses of all who have trespassed against us.
- (c) giving of alms and showing mercy to the poor.
- (d) constancy in prayer
- (e) fasting, provided it be attended with kindness to others.

ame Text.

Vlll.

He lights every man coming into the world, but many deliberately close the eyes of their mind and wilfully deprive themselves of the gift.

John refers again to the eternal existence of the Only-begotten. Chrysostom severely condemns Paul of Samosata here for deliberately denying in the face of the text, the Personality of our Lord before His birth, and also for selling his soul for the sake of a woman.*

The corrupt world did not recognise Jesus, though Christ was seen and heard by the Patriarchs, though not in the flesh. Similarly many now did not know God, attributing the Universe to chance, devils, or even that God is malign. It is those who are closely attached to present things who cannot know Him.

He warns that a man cannot serve two masters and that the service of Mammon is hard and thankless. (He makes an interesting parallel in comparing the service of Mammon with being fixed to the clay and brick-making).

Note: Zenobia queen of Palmyra, who supported Paul after his deposition is obviously intended. It is a matter of regret that Paul did not remain satisfied with the popularity he enjoyed from the masses and the flattery he seemed equally to enjoy from women and not aspire to be a theologian, for, though condemned he could not be removed by the Church, which eventually had to invoke the aid of a pagan Emperor.]

11-13

John 1

1X

Christ came to His own, (which might mean either the Jews, or mankind in general), and His own received Him not: but this had been the standing wonder of the prophets, too. Even with Christ daily among them, teaching and working miracles, and the scriptures behind them, yet they still failed to accept Christ. The Jews fell through unbelief and pride. But their discontent is unreasonable, for the call of the Gentiles is no loss to the Jews.

He closes moralising on the evils of pride, which may be avoided by:-

- (a) reflecting on our own nature and our own sins
- (b) reflecting on the torments of Hell
- (c) reflecting on the transitory nature of the things of this world.

same text)

X.

God will not compel service. God has a great care

For man, for even those who have been His enemies, He receives unto Himself when they repent e.g., Paul. Indeed Paul's life was a pattern¹⁶ for all coming after (1 Tim. 1¹⁶). Those who accept Christ are made sons of God though no mention is made of the punishment of those who reject Him. Their punishment is that they lose this sonship, though Chrysostom goes on to add the fire and torment.

The power on the character of faith in Him is like the fire which burns the clay into gold. He equates faith in Him with Baptism. We are not made sons, but receive the power to become sons and can equally lose it ourselves.

God gives the grace, but man supplies the faith. But faith is unavailing without a holy life, which is the wedding garment required.

14(a)
John 1

XI.

He earnestly exhorts them to study the scriptures, particularly the reading for the day they come to church.

God's Son became Man that He might make the sons of men children of God; His condescension was the means of raising us.

Chrysostom emphasises the reality of the flesh: He did not change His Essence to flesh, but took flesh to Himself, His Essence thereby remaining untouched. God's nature is absolutely ~~un~~changeable²⁶ (Ps. 101²⁶) He was made Flesh and dwelt among us - there is no matter of appearance. By a union (*ένώσει*) and conjoining (*συνάψις*), God the Word and the Flesh are One.

He concludes with a call to look carefully into the state of our souls. Man's nature is hopelessly fallen: it is Christ that raises it, and man must make his own return for God's mercy.

14(b)

John 1

XII.

We could not have beheld Christ's glory had it not been shown to us by means of a body like our own. But it was the glory of the only begotten of the Father, and in no sense like the glory of the Old Testament characters like Moses, Elijah etc. They appeared as servants who have a Master, but He as Lord and Ruler of all. Not only did He have stars, angels, and prophets to be witness to Him, but both the Father and the Spirit testified.

The whole Creation indeed acknowledged Him; evil spirits fled, Satan retired, death retreated and the sick and dead were made whole. In short, Christ repaired man's nature, and healed man's soul.

But Christ is admired not only because of the miracles but by reason of His sufferings. It was the latter that Christ described as His glory. Yet there is a greater glory to come, and it is blessedness to behold that glory, and damnation to be deprived of it. The only defence is through good works.

15

John 1

XIII.

The Evangelist emphasises John's ministry and testimony because John Baptist was held in great veneration by the Jews (Cf. Josephus). Further, if a man speaks of his own life, his witness is naturally suspect, therefore Christ was testified to by another-viz:- John Baptist. True, the Voice from heaven was there, but only the spiritually minded heard that, (a very interesting comment): the voice of John Baptist had continually to declare that the less spiritually minded should learn. John Baptist was taught of God (John 1 ³³) and not by men. John did not immediately testify that Jesus was the Christ,

the Son of God, but led them little by little by dark sayings to prepare the Jews to receive Christ. Had he done so, his testimony would have been rejected immediately as absurd, because of Christ's slowly appearance, but in their gradual experience of Christ they would recall the testimony of the Baptist.

Christ is before John Baptist in that His Being is first. The past tense is often used by the prophets to speak of the future (Isiah 53^a, Psalm 22⁷, Ps. 41^{16,18}, Ps. 69⁹, Ps. 21²¹).

The true giving of glory to God is in our actions and not with sacrifices and religious services. But our giving must be pure and truly living. Merely to give of our gains, which are ill-gotten and deprive others, is a grave injustice. To live as he advises will mean to receive much loving-kindness and mercy and pardon for what we have done amiss.

Note: Chrysostom's advanced thinking and brave outspokenness both here and throughout his preaching should be noticed. His advanced social views, (which are only Christianity, when all is said), incurred him much trouble in his own day relative to the Court, and indeed among his clergy, but he was always dearly loved of the people.

16-17
John 1

XLV.

Christ is the perfection, and is Himself not the participator but the Very Fountain of Life, Light and Truth. To take of any material thing lessens the amount of that thing, but not so to take of Christ, who is like a flame lighting others and in its giving of its light does not suffer. The grace that we have received

grace is the new grace in Christ, of which the old grace of the
 Testament was but its type.

Chrysostom examines some Old Testament "typical" ideas:

Son - the Jews were sons of God, yet were they slaves; we are now free.

Worship - the Jews were called holy in so far as they refrained
 from idols: we are holy not by refraining only, but by
 acquiring the Holy Spirit.

Even the things of the law were grace, as was our very
 nation, and also the possession of conscience. John skilfully compares
 Christ with Moses and not John Baptist, and this not by persons but
 rather by facts.

Turning from the giving of grace to the giving of truth,
 Chrysostom says that the Old Testament dispensation was the type and
 pattern of which Christ's was the Reality. He instances:-

(a) The taking of the Lamb (Exodus 12³), and contrasts Christ's
 becoming the Lamb itself and offering Himself.

(b) Exodus 17¹². The Amalekites warred against the Jews and Aaron
 and Hur held up Moses' arms, but Christ Himself stretched out
 His own hands on the Cross. The type was given and the Truth
 came.

Chrysostom again concludes with an exhortation to zeal
 sincerity. The efficacy of the Gospel depends on its right
 application.

18
 a l

XV.

David prefaced many of his psalms with *עִי שֹׁמֵר*
הַשָּׁמַיִם, and therefore the understanding must be employed.

Chrysostom warns against anthropomorphism. No one has seen God at any time: only the Son and the Holy Ghost have seen Him, for no created creature can see the Uncreated. Even the angels saw Christ only after He was created. And only the Son knows God. That Christ is in God's bosom means that He is of the same power and essence: no created thing could be in God's bosom.

14

When God spoke to Moses (Exodus 3) He described Himself as "I am": similarly is the Son from everlasting to everlasting.

Now God has spoken more perfectly and clearly in His Son. The Jews had Moses, we have Moses' Lord. Therefore ought our wisdom to be so much the loftier. We are members one of another. In this connection he has a very fine passage where he says God gave us one earth, one sun, one roof (sky), one table (earth), one country (heaven) and one bread and one cup. The last are significant. God gave us all equality, and inequality has crept in because of the pride and avarice of the wealthy. We are divided by things earthly, but all of these things are but a shadow to those who possess the bond of charity from above.

The beauty and loftiness of Chrysostom's teaching was one of the main factors which brought the bitter opposition of the Constantinople court, and also indeed, from the clergy found in such places.

19-27
John 1

XVI.

The Jews sent priests and Levites out of envy. It is he who does the wrong that receives the injury: no destruction comes to the recipient. John answers them gently to make their wickedness more obvious.

In outward appearance Christ was inferior to the Baptist, and the Jews resented being sent from John Baptist to Christ. The Jews had sent their best men from Jerusalem itself.

For the third time John Baptist confessed he was not the Christ. The Jews' intent was to turn John Baptist away from his purpose and bring him over to their own side. He both denied being Elias, and also the Prophet (Deut. 18¹⁵) who was truly the Christ, and said he was the Voice foretold by Isaiah.

Τὰ δὲ ἡμέτερα σκιά καὶ εἰκὼν . ἄλλον γὰρ χρὴ τὸν
τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπιθήδοντα παραγενέσθαι . XVI . 3 .

Pride destroyed the devil, as it does us. He considers far worse than fornication or adultery. The latter have some justification in desire, but pride is purely a disease of the soul. He speaks of the perilous condition of a proud soul relying on its wealth which it will one day leave, and which is master not even of a single hour. Let us transfer our riches to the eternal heavens: for this we have no need of camels and asses but only the poor, the lame, the crippled and the infirm. The whole passage is most elevated.

28-34

John 1

XVII

John had fear neither of person nor place, and bravely proclaimed Christ. Chrysostom sees the significance of the mention of the place, (which he corrects to Bethabara), as being before all the people, and also as having value as circumstantial evidence.

Christ came again to John the second time that John might recognise Him as the Lamb of God, The Lamb foretold in type in the Law was now here in reality to take away the sin of the world.

That John Baptist refers to Christ as "before" him, Chrysostom interprets as a refutation of the "madness of Paul of Samosata". He knew Him not i.e. it was not a recognition following on human friendship but arising from divine revelation. John came baptising to bring the Jews to Christ: without the baptism there could have been no multitude. The descent of the Spirit declared Christ: John could not give the Spirit. Christ needed no baptism, but rather baptism needed the power of Christ.

John Baptist repeatedly(συνεχῶς) asserts that he did not know Christ that it should be clearer to men that his testimony was not his own but God's.

Chrysostom further goes on to argue that the miracles of Christ's childhood are therefore false :-

Ἐντεῦθεν ἡμῖν λοιπὸν δῆλον, ὅτι καὶ τὰ σημεῖα ἐκεῖνα
 ἃ παιδικὰ εἶναι φάσι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ψευδῆ καὶ πλάσματα
 τινῶν ἐπειδαγόντων ἐστίν. XVII . 3

Christ was recognised by John only when the Spirit descended on Him, though John Baptist knew of Christ's coming by a revelation from God.

The Jews did not see the Spirit, for they did not possess "the vision of the understanding": they even refused to see when Christ was restoring men to health and life. Zachariah, Daniel and Ezekiel, and Moses saw many things that others never saw, as only three of the disciples saw the Transfiguration(⁴¹ Q Ac 10)

Chrysostom offers the illuminating remark that the evangelists omitted many of Christ's miracles, but all the details of approach were carefully and accurately recorded by each one. This he

gives as evidence of their veracity. He also deplores the fact that Christians cannot justify their faith(as a physician in his physic or a weaver in his cloth),and how they stand before the attacks of heathen without opening their mouth. Men defend a dancer or an athlete with more power than they do Christ. Christians must learn to defend their faith positively,and not stop short merely at the confession of sin.

(.X. Chrysostom's critical faculty should be noticed here).

35

John 1

XVlll.

John Baptist speaks a second time,for all human nature needs continual reminders,and he is but ploughing the mind that the seed ^{may} ~~might~~ take root,which,once being done,the human mind has no need of reminders. The Baptist's desire was to bring men to Christ,and therefore he particularised his message and pointed Christ out specifically.

He compares Christ to the Bridegroom and John to the best man and draws the important conclusion that it was the Bridegroom who came to the bride and not vice versa,i.e.God came to man,man's nature did not go up to God.

The prophets proclaimed Christ absent,as did the apostles:John alone proclaimed Him present.The Lamb takes away the sin of the world:i.e. ever present action.

The 10th hour was a good hour to give this teaching because "stomachs are not burdened with meats".(Note Chrysostom's literalness).The two disciples followed desiring to learn truth privately and humbly.Only one disciple is mentioned by name because it behoved not to say more than was necessary.

They were questioned by Christ by way of encouragement, and only asked Christ's abode.

All things are secondary to the hearing of the Word of God. When our spiritual appetite fails it is the scriptures that will revive it.

He enlarges finally on the evils of idle talking, and gives some heavy criticisms of the morals and social customs of his day.

41, 42.

John 1

XLX.

Great advantages arise when human beings come together in genuine and pure intercourse. Andrew calls Peter who comes immediately: it does not say that Peter believed but that he was brought to Jesus.

Christ uses prophecy to reveal His Divinity and open it out by predictions, as in the case of Nathaniel and the Samaritan woman. Prophecies bring men over not less than miracles, and are free from the appearance of boasting: miracles open themselves to slander, but prophecy cannot. Christ used this method of prophecy relative to Nathaniel and Simon, but not with Andrew and Philip who had been prepared by John Baptist.

Christ altered names eg. Simon and James and John as did God with Abraham, Sarah and Jacob.

We too have a new name, that of Christians, and we must not act unworthy of it. Our very life should be given for our King who is our Head.

Further, we must not be "nailed" to our possessions. They are *χρήματα* i.e. things to be used: we must rule them, not let them use us.

Philip was brought not by a disciple but by Christ Himself whom he perceived as Him of whom Moses and the Prophets wrote. He brought Nathanael, who was a candid and exact (ἀκριβὴς) man. He knew the scriptures and that Christ must come from Bethlehem; the seeming contradiction took him to Christ Himself whom he addressed as to a man. Christ replied showing His foreknowledge (πρόρρησιν) which convinced him satisfying his caution (ἀκριβείαν) and proving his fairness.

As he showed joy in his obedience, so ought we in our obedience. Let us make it our meat to do the will of Him that sent us. Christ is truly confessed by the works we do.

49 4
John 1 - 2

XXI

Close search and earnest prayer are required to see even a little way into the divine scriptures:-

δεῖ μὲν ἐρεύνης ἀκριβοῦς , δεῖ δὲ καὶ εὐχῆς ἐκτενούς ,
ἵνα δυνήθωμεν μικρὸν τι διαβλέψαι πρὸς τὰ ἔδυστα
τῶν θείων λόγων .

XXI. 1.

Nathanael confessed Christ to be the King of Israel. But to be the King of Israel was still to be only a man, and therefore would Nathanael see greater things. On the other hand, when Peter confessed Him to be Christ, there was, as there could be, no greater vision; therefore on him who could see so far Christ was to build His Church. Gradually Christ leads Nathanael upward, speaking of the ministry of angels. To this Nathanael makes no reply and therefore Christ adds nothing further.

The Marriage at Cana

Christ was invited to the wedding as an ordinary acquaintance

i.e. with His brothers and mother.

John explicitly says that this miracle was the beginning of miracles, and therefore precludes any idea of there being miracles before this. His mother suggested the miracle knowing at least of His holy birth. Christ rebuked her, not that he was not obedient to his parents, but that His Ministry was His own to fulfil, and requests to be of value must come from those who feel the need.

It was of no profit to Mary that she bore Christ; relationship to Christ is nothing without the fruit of good works. The true relationship is one of obedience: we do not know the names of Christ's brothers now, yet the apostles are known the world over.

Even good ancestors are no protection, but only our own good works. We must never deceive ourselves in this.

4-10
John 2

XXII.

Preaching the Word is hard, but if you first prove it in our works, the toil is removed.

"Christ's hour" meant the convenient season for the work intended: everything is in season, for even the Gospel had to be preceded by the Law. But first, man must feel his own need, before Christ can work for him.

It is clearly stated that the vessels were water vessels and had never contained wine. Christ used this water for two reasons:-

- (a) that all may know that it was in fact water, for the vessels had been filled by the servants and not Christ.
- (b) to refute those who teach that all matter is evil.

Christ only performed what He has always done in transmuting the rain into grape fruit. (Augustine makes this precise comment)

The evidence given was not from drunken men but from the ruler of the Feast. But even this miracle was not revealed to all. Christ acted, and allowed his actions gradually to win men's minds.

The miracles of Christ are more perfect than the operations of nature. As Jesus worked then, He now ever changes our weak and unstable wills, that our wills be no longer washy (*διὰ ῥέτιν*), but have body (*ἐπεστυμμένον*), and bring gladness to ourselves and others. The "watery" people are the lovers of this world. But it does not even pay them in its own coin, for luxury and wantonness give but sickness and disease. Such men even lose the natural joy of appetite which comes only to those who abstain, for where there is no desire, how can there be pleasure. The poor, because they are poor, have more pleasure than the rich.

Man's true delight is in the Lord. (Psalm 37⁴).

John 2 11-22

XXIII.

Christ showed His glory, but only His disciples believed on Him.

He returned to Capernaum only that He might bring back His mother in respect, but He proceeded after a few days to Jerusalem where He cleansed the Temple. (Chrysostom teaches two cleansings). Christ's taking of a scourge was justified in that He was defending not Himself but others.

This act of zeal and vengeance made Christ's position strong, in that He was about to act in seeming transgression of the Law yet He had fought for the Temple and the Law.

The Jews asked for a sign to justify His conduct. Christ's sign was the raising up of the "Temple" in 3 days—a sign

which only the disciples understood, and even then only long after. They had as yet not received the Spirit, the unspeakable grace of which brought to their mind the teaching of Christ.

He closes with an exhortation to almsgiving - our light is only kept burning by this oil which can be procured only from the poor, and which light will burn till the Bridegroom comes and receives us.

John 2²³ 4
-3 .

XXIV.

Many believed on Christ now, but He committed Himself to the disciples only, not to those whose faith was based only on miracles. Signs are really only for non-believers, for the faithful have the teaching.

Nicodemus

Nicodemus came to Jesus by night, entangled in Jewish infirmity. Even so did Christ disclose to him, even in this condition, very exalted doctrines, enigmatically that He could lead him up from his low thoughts. Although Nicodemus recognised Christ as a teacher from God, yet by Christ's reply it was implied that Nicodemus was still outside the gate of true knowledge. Nicodemus holds on, still desiring truth. (Chrysostom adds that the word *ἀνωθεν* may mean either from above, or from the beginning).

Nicodemus asked the wrong question "How...?". Many fall because of this wrong asking. Nicodemus is perplexed but he does not look Christ.

The soul is darkened not only by unreasonable curiosity, but also by corrupt manners. To see the higher teaching we must first present an honest soul and an upright life. The soul possessed by passions (*ἐμπαιθυ*) cannot behold anything great or noble.

He ends with an appeal for the cleansing of our life and the kindling of the light of knowledge.

We are not to sow among the thorns(the cares of this life and the deceitfulness of riches).Let us burn the thorns by the fire of the Spirit and sow the olive which is ever green,light-giving,food-bearing and wholesome.All these qualities has almsgiving.Not even death can cause this plant to wither.

(Nicodemus continued)

XXV.

Christ explains that the re-birth of water and the Spirit is as possible as it is necessary.Still Nicodemus does not understand.Spiritual things should not be committed to argument:Spiritual things are objects of faith.Man was^s formed originally of earth and water:he now is to be reformed by water and by the Spirit.

Christ could have instanced the soul to Nicodemus to prove His point,but it was no good in this case,so chose to refer to the wind.

He who made man in the image of God now has united him with Himself.We cannot understand the making of Adam:nor can we understand the making of Eve from the rib nor Abel from the seed-why should we expect to understand the spiritual re-birth.

47

Water is necessary for this Birth.(Ac 10⁴⁷).Baptism is a generation when the old man is buried under the water and the new man rises.

He calls in conclusion for unity in true spiritual brotherhood,and for the giving of alms.Alms are lent to Christ:-let us feed Christ here,that He may ever feed us beyond:let us bring Him into our house now,and He will prepare our mansions for us+let us give the little that we may gain the great. He likens this life to a perpetual seed-time,the harvest of which will come afterwards.

Nicodemus(Continued)

XXVI.

We who were not worthy to live in Paradise are offered a re-birth into Heaven. In Genesis 1²⁰ the waters brought forth life, but now that our Lord is entered into Jordan new spiritual life is brought to birth. This birth is not according to essence(οὐσία) but according to honour and grace. Christ tries to teach him by the analogy of that nearest the spirit i.e. wind: why does Nicodemus hesitate to accept the teaching about the Spirit when he accepts the wind yet being unable to see it or control it.

Chrysostom instances the Old Testament types of the New Birth viz:-the swimming of the axe head, the crossing of the Red Sea and the cleansing of Naaman. The barren and aged women who conceived by God's agency are even types of the Virgin Birth. Christ gently chides Nicodemus for being a master of Israel and yet not knowing these things.

Chrysostom moralises here on the importance of never getting agry with an opponent, and warns against the evils of anger and clamour.

Nicodemus(continued)

XXVII.

The criticism of Christ towards Nicodemus is not lack of understanding, but lack of belief. Christ proceeds to speak of the cross, not literally but by the ancient type of the serpent in the wilderness. His purpose was to teach

- (a) old things are akin to new
- (b) Christ did not come unwillingly to His Passion
- (c) the Passion is man's salvation.

By the type the Jew escaped temporal death, by the Cross believers escape eternal death: there the serpent healed the serpent's

bites, here Jesus cures the wounds of the spiritual(νοητοῦ)
 dragon: there he who looked is healed, here he who looks (with
 understanding) puts off his sins, and so on in ^{this} ~~their~~ parallel vein.
 Note that Jesus did not say hang on the cross but lifted up i.e.
 in order to be proper to the type(εὔγους τοῦ τύπου).
 This exposition is almost parallel to that of Augustine.

Chrysostom dwells on the marvellous love of God. These truths are grasped only in faith.

How ungracious is man. He will not give his money to Christ, and yet had we 10,000 lives ought we not to lay them down for Christ. Christ hungered that we may be fed, went naked to provide us with an incorruptible garment. Wherefor fine stores of clothes, or even fine clothes at all? The adornment of the soul is with those only who live in virtue.

Chrysostom says these things not so much because he cares for the poor, as for their souls. Poverty did Lazarus no harm, yet nothing could rescue Dives.

Nicodemus (continued)

XXVlll.

We must not presume on God's mercy: the present life for trial, the second for crowning. There are, moreover, two Advents of Christ. Unbelievers are judged already either in so far as they thereby lose the light, or because it is inevitable, inasmuch as the sentence is passed though the penalty is not yet exacted. The believer is not judged, though of course he will answer for his works. The judgement is that the darkness is preferred to light. Even the Heathens say that people will not come to their faith ^{because} ~~because~~ they will not leave off sin.

He contrasts Christ's handling of Nathanael as compared with that of Nicodemus. The former knew the scripture; Nicodemus, possessed by fear had to be disturbed by Christ that the fear may be cast out. Unbelief proceeds from an evil conscience.

We are to eschew vain-glory which is the root of covetousness and hatred. Destroy this and we can so live on earth as though it were heaven. This is true glory. Seek this glory and we have both glories: seek both glories and lose both the human and the divine.

22
John 3

XXIX

Christ worked where there were concourses of people that His teaching should be heard by many. He did not baptise for He had not yet given the Spirit, but His disciples did so because they wanted to bring many to the saving doctrine. John too was baptising and bringing the people to Christ. Both baptisms were intended to bring people to Christ.

John's disciples were jealous of Christ's work. John's reply indicated that the complainers were warring against God, yet it was a gentle consolation to know that it was God's work and therefore was bound to succeed. John came only to bear witness to Christ.

He concludes then on the dangers of vain-glory. It can be avoided only when we despise the riches of this earth and look to the other riches.

31-34
John 3

XXX.

John is of the earth, but Christ is from above and testifies of above. He who disbelieves Christ, disbelieves the Father also.

Chrysostom exhorts his hearers to study the scriptures, for though he always telling them so, yet he sees their life "nailed to the things of this life!" Those who strive for truth therefore have but little rest. The scriptures are useless unless carefully studied. The indifference of his hearers is a grief to him.

55-6

3

XXXI.

A man may believe rightly on the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, without a right life his right faith avails him nothing.

4. ¹ The Samaritan Woman. (XXXI continued)

Christ departed to soften the malice of his enemies, -to go to Samaria.

Chrysostom describes the history of Samaria and its acceptance of the Law of Moses but not the Prophets. The Jews abominated them, as did other nations, although the Samaritans claimed Abraham and Jacob as their forefathers. The Evangelist mentions the Samaritans to show that the rejection of the Jews had happened long ago.

Chrysostom moralises on Christ's activity, and His carelessness for His food as a model for all disciples. He compares how the Jews had rejected Christ away, but the Samaritans drew Him to them.

The woman had come for another purpose, and Christ asked for drink, dismissing conventional observances. He contrasts with the Jews the woman's gentle answers and her desire to learn. She takes his words literally and does not understand, yet still answers gently. Jacob used the well and ever since there has been no better water: if Christ cannot give this water without her help how then can He offer better water.

In a similar discussion with the Jews about living water they profited nothing, and even stoned Him at the mention of Abraham, but the woman gently and patiently seeks to learn, and perseveres until

she has found what she seeks.

This woman abides by Christ yet not knowing or understanding Him, and in difficult physical circumstances; yet in the morning in cool and shade His hearers are wearied by His own words. He calls them to imitate her and commune with Christ, Who stands even then in their midst. This life is a time of preparation for an immortal state: we must never be "nailed to this earth".

xxxll

Scripture calls Grace either Water or Fire, both of which are descriptive of its operation. Christ gently leads her on to see that He is greater than the Patriarch Jacob. The woman looks at the facts, but the Jews could not even do that. She is superior to Nicodemus, and even goes out as an apostle to bring others to Christ.

Christ refers to her husband, that by His prophecy she may be drawn more closely to Him. She is not offended, but seeing that He is a Prophet, begins immediately to discuss doctrines. Chrysostom here chides his listeners with an ardour inferior to that of the Samaritan Woman. How few of his listeners read and discuss matters of doctrine. Even those with books boast of their lettering or binding, but keep them in cases and not in their hearts. He commends the sincere study of the Bible, and deplores the heathen games. It is a far greater sight to see a man wrestling with and defeating the devil, than any combat in the arena. He even describes these places as "assemblies of devils" not theatres of men.

xxxlll

Neither Jew nor Samaritan possessed anything comparable to what was about to be given: it is faith that opens up everything. Christ exalts what is Jewish and so persuades the woman to a greater heed of His words. Jewish worship is only a type of the true: Christ is

not opposed to the Law. The true worshippers do not serve God in a place but rather in spirit: true worship is spiritual. It is not concerned with bodily ablutions but is the purity of the mind. True sacrifice is not of sheep and calves but of oneself to God. Circumcision, burnt offerings, incense are but types: now all is in truth.

Christ does not lead the woman on by scripture, as He does in the cases of Nathanael and Nicodemus, for a woman would not know the scriptures: He led her on by prophecy and water. To her, fair-minded and desirous to learn, Jesus revealed Himself.

His disciples were amazed but did not question Him for what had happened was of no importance to them.

John who lay on Christ's bosom could question Christ and this is he whom we should imitate. John was loved for his great gentleness and meekness. It was lowliness that made Moses great, and it was Christ's first beatitude. All goodness without humility avails nothing. He finally exhorts them to almsdoing which is the means of bringing true honour.

XXXIV

The woman left her waterpot for spiritual things, as the apostles before her had left their nets, and brings the people to this Man, asking if He be Christ.

Christ's meat is to save us: He spoke darkly that the disciples may think more and therefore see more clearly. The field and the harvest signify the same thing i.e. the multitude of souls ready for salvation. Metaphor is used here (alike in the Old Testament), to make the discourse more vivid and more easily remembered.

The prophets had sown, and the apostles were to reap

their labours, and both rejoice together. (This shows, says Chrysostom, the intimate connection between the Old Testament and the New Testament). It was easier to reap than to sow, and indeed, already before their eyes the Samaritans were coming.

He commends the woman's action in not shielding her sin from men that Christ may be preached more effectively. How we hide our sin from men, and yet care not when God sees it all. He calls them to self-judgement and to repentance: the end is at hand, Christ's Coming will be sudden.

XXXV.

He compares the Jews unfavourably with the Samaritans who had received Christ. It is only want of sincerity or candour (*ἀγνωμοσύνη*) that prevents a soul grasping truth. The Samaritans saw Jesus as the Saviour of the World.

John 4⁴³⁻⁵⁴The Nobleman's Son

XXXV. (cont.)

The Samaritans had received Him because of His words, and the Galileans because of His miracle. Jesus moved on to Cana to confirm them in the faith they had gained by his miracle and was there met by the nobleman (Chrysostom says that he is not the man mentioned in ⁵ Matthew 8).

The nobleman's mind was in a state of half-belief, (for he only believed when he had checked up on the servants). Christ draws him on to fuller belief. Christ heals the father sick in mind to show that His teaching is important, and that His care is for souls rather than bodies. Miracles are only for the unbelieving, and this miracle was needed to teach faith to the nobleman.

Released from his fear, he escaped (*διέκυψε*) into faith.

Chrysostom moralises on the tendency to serve God only in the moment of ease, yet a true servant rejoices in affliction and enjoys the presence of God.

John 5.

The Impotent Man

XXXVI.

A mystery is signified here, for these things are written as a figure or type showing in outline the things to come. The mystery is Baptism purging all sins and making men alive instead of dead. The water needed an Angel, and in Baptism it is not the water but the operation of the Spirit. Now that the Lord of Angels is come, there is no exhaustion of Grace. This miracle was done that men might know that diseases of the soul could be cured. The 38 years indicated the perseverance of the man, and for this cause Christ selected him.

Chrysostom contrasts this perseverance with His hearers' sloth. Labour is of God's appointment; indeed, God joined labour and virtue. Without labour joy perishes.

XXXVII.

Meekly and without accusing, the paralytic explains that he is never healed because nobody puts him into the water. Gradually Christ prepares him for faith. The miracle is complete for he carries his bed.

Jesus did not make a pre-requisite of faith in this case for the man did not know who He was. The man's faith was instant, and even when attacked by the Jews for carrying his bed on the Sabbath, he courageously silenced them. The man who could heal him would have his audience.

The Jews did not ask who had healed him, but kept emphasising the seeming transgression. Jesus concealed Himself that the Word may speak for itself.

Envy disables the eyes of the soul:we ought to grieve for ills not for good.Any sin can plead an excuse,but what can envy say for itself. It is worse than fornication and adultery,for it is the mother of murder:it has destroyed Churches and indeed the whole world.It is war not against one's brother but against God;it is its seeming unimportance that makes it so deadly.We must tear up envy and implant charity in our souls.

XXXV111.

This man's disease had been produced by his sins.Christ's words showed also that there is a hell,and that punishment is endless.All our sickness must be borne thankfully. In this case, Christ showed strong proof of His Divinity referring to his past sins.

In reply to the attacks of the Jews,having to defend Himself and not His disciples,(in which case He referred to David), He refers to God working and Himself working. He claimed equality with God:from the charges from which you absolve God, absolve Me is His answer.He can do nothing in opposition to the Father nor alien to Him;the equality is precise;all is done by one Will(*γυναιξ*) and Power and Might.

The Jews could not believe Christ because they sought honour from one another and not from God.This vain-glory will bring all our virtues to nought:we must seek the glory from heaven which will cast this one out.We must not live for this world:let us take breath and make some account of our souls,too.

23-30

John 5

XXXIX.

There is the Last Judgement which we must always bear in mind.The Son is as the Father without any difference of essence,

and His descriptions of His relation to the Father are adapted to earthly apprehensions. Believers in Him are led on to the Father. He promises that even the dead shall hear His Voice, a promise He fulfilled. The Father has life, so has the Son life, and to the Son God had committed judgement. (He says that Paul of Samosata punctuates this passage wrongly and therefore draws a wrong meaning from it). He takes Christ's words here to the putting down of syllogisms for others draw the conclusions. He deliberately modified His words about the judgement being His own, in consideration of the opinions of the Jews. The Will of Christ was one with the Will of God.

He commends to them wisdom with simplicity both in doctrine and in living. Let us act towards others, as we desire our Master to act towards us: let us forgive as we desire to be forgiven. Our trespasses disappear by not remembering wrongs. Love of our neighbour is the way to eternal life. We can't buy heaven by almsdoing he colourfully declares, meaning that heaven is won in giving our goods for the poor, favourite theme of Chrysostom.

31-8

John 5

XL.

Studying the scriptures is like mining gold: without skill the gold is lost. The error of heretics lies in not expounding the scripture in its true sense.

Christ's witness of Himself must be true, for He speaks as God. He further adduces the witness of John, the witness of His works, the witness of the Father and the witness of scripture. John Baptist was sent for the sake of the Jews who understood this human testimony: that John was a torch, his light being not his own but the Spirit's. The works could not be gainsaid. They had never seen nor heard the Father

and they had not His word abiding in them.

In conclusion he moralises on keeping the word of scripture and never to forget in particular that money is the root of all evil: to hold fast to good works and continue in almsgiving.

39-47

John 5

XLl.

The call was not merely to read the scriptures but to search them, for their treasures were not on the surface. Christ did not need human honour, but the fault of the Jews lay in that they did not love God in persecuting Christ. The cause of their unbelief was that they sought honour from one another and not the honour that only comes from God. Not that Christ is their accuser: rather Moses is. If they receive not Christ, they will receive the enemy of God. To accuse the Jews on not keeping the Law was an impressive argument.

In conclusion, therefore, we must cast out all wickedness from our souls and never more contrive any deceit. Virtue is the mother of all blessings, and the fear of God true wisdom.

1-15

John 6

Feeding of the Five Thousand.

XLl1.

This Evangelist does not refer to all the miracles that Christ did, but devotes the greater part of his book to the discourses and sermons. The miracles are for those in a grosser state. Jesus left them to commune with God as we should do.

It was the time of the Passover and Jesus was taking His disciples into Galilee as a sign that He was annulling the Law. He makes Philip, (most needful of instruction), realise the lack as God did to Moses when He asked "What is that in thy hand?"
²
 (Exodus 4), and tests him that he should learn the significance of the miracle. Andrew rises higher than Philip remembering as

Chrysostom suggests Elisha (2 Kings 4⁴³). (Chrysostom moralises on the simple diet of these great men). He does not rise high enough however.

Christ uses created matter, not from necessity but as a refutation of Marcion. . He told them to sit down before He had performed the miracle, which is a proof that He knew the outcome at the start.

Christ first gave thanksgiving to God, as we should do before all meals. There was a further point here in that it indicated to the multitudes that He was working with God. He contrasts the meagreness of the servants with the abundance of the Master.

The purpose of the fragments was to show that the miracle had been ^{no} illusion, and that there were twelve baskets was meant to teach the disciples the significance of the miracle which significance the crowd did not see for they asked for another sign.

Because they had been filled, the crowds wanted to make Christ King, but He despised earthly dignities and needed nothing that earth affords. We too should despise the glory of this world which is but a slavery. The true glory for man is immortal glory. Does a man not deserve anger when he passes by a ^{poor} man ~~and~~ and gives his money to a dancer or an harlot. There is a strict account to be given hereafter

16 - 25

John ~~16~~ 6

XLIII.

The disciples out of love for the Master had waited until it was dark. Christ did not appear in order to teach them two things:-

(a) how great an evil it is to be forsaken by Him

(b) His great power

The disciples beheld special miracles, viz:—the Transfiguration, the walking on the sea and the Resurrection.

They received Him into the ship which with a favourable wind was now near the land.

The multitudes, though not witnesses of the miracle, were allowed to suspect. This was a greater miracle than the crossing⁸ of the Red Sea. Chrysostom sees it as a fulfillment of Job 9

Which alone spreadeth out the heavens,
and treadeth upon the waves of the sea.

Yet the multitudes desired only another miracle.

Let us then while giving thanks for the things of sense be more than thankful for things spiritual. Without the latter, the former are of no value. Christ taught us to pray only for our daily bread in His prayer, that we accepting bare necessity, will care only about things spiritual.

John 6²⁶

XLIV

No account is to be made of earthly food but of spiritual. The Jews are carnally minded. We are to combine diligence with carefulness in these earthly matters, but Christ provides the food which nourisheth the soul, and this alone truly matters.

Let us learn to ask of God the right things. The things of this life we only enjoy here, and if we have few of them we do not thereby suffer. Neither the splendours nor the pains of this life

have much power, but the things to come are eternal. Nothing that comes to an end can be very desirable, therefore let us cling to the things that endure.

John 6²⁸

XLV.

Christ is still unable to penetrate the obtuseness of the Jews. They introduce the idea of manna because their whole mind is on carnal things, their soul is parched up. Christ does not refute them on their own ground, but leads them on to learn that the manna came not from Moses but from God. Not that the manna was fake but rather was it a type and not the very truth. The true bread was He whom God sent to give life to the world. Still the Jews crave for this bread.

Christ said He was this bread, not speaking of His Body but of His Godhead. They did not ask of this teaching, but merely murmured. They refused to believe, and made pretend, for a cloak of their unbelief, that it was a hard saying.

Whoever does not believe on Him transgresses God's Will. It is God's Will that man come to Christ and be saved: through Christ we have access to God. Faith in Christ is no ordinary thing but is stimulated by God. Whether we are taught, or whether we believe is our own choice, but it was God's Will that Christ should come, and the Will of Christ is one with the Will of the Father.

Chrysostom emphasises Christ's dwelling on the Resurrection, reminding us that God's providence is not to be measured by present things alone but in view of eternity. The thought of the Resurrection is both a check and a corrective. He warns them of the men of Noah's day, and of Lot's time being faced with calamity without any warning, and in a similar way will the Resurrection happen.

There could be no justice of God without a Resurrection:those who disbelieve in a Resurrection are those who live an unholy life.

John 6⁴¹⁻⁵²

XLVI.

When Christ gave the Jews bread,they wished to make Him king:when He gave them spiritual teaching,they murmured at Him.

That no man comes to Christ except the Father draws him, does not take away our free will,(as the Manichees declare),but means that man needs help. It is God that teaches man:of old time men learned of God by the hands of men,but now by the Son and the Holy Ghost.

He is the bread of life,meaning either the faith in Him or His own body.The fathers ate the manna and are dead,but to eat this food means to live forever.All these things were but a type and shadow, for the reality was present before them.

Unbelief arises from wrong questioning.As Nicodemus,they asked "How?" These men received no benefit from the teaching.But we are joined to the Body of Christ in Holy Communion:-

Διὰ τοῦτο ἀνέμixin ἑαυτὸν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἀνέφωρε τὸ
σῶμα αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὑπαράξωμεν. XLVI. 3.

The blood of the Old Testament was the type of Christ's Blood.As the blood frightened away death at the Passover,so Christ's Blood destroys death now.As blood cleansed the priests, so Christ's Blood cleanses our sins. Indeed,the Christian mysteries are full of awe,and must be approached with pureness for our salvation. It is a dangerous thing to receive the sacraments unworthily.

John 6^{53-end}

XLVII.

When Christ taught them to eat His Flesh and drink

His Blood, He was speaking sober fact and not an enigma. To do so meant to dwell in Him, and as he lived for ever with the Father, to partake meant to enjoy eternal life. He who eats Christ shall live by Christ. This teaching is a confirmation of the doctrine of the Resurrection and of eternal life.

This is clear from the scriptures. God fed the Jews for 40 years without harvest or corn: much more will He be able to do now. The old covenant promised length of life and many days, but now it is life having no end, revoking the punishment of sin.

Christ taught in the synagogue, as He taught in the Temple, because He could teach the greater numbers and also to show that He was not opposed to the Father.

The Jews find it difficult. Christ leads them away from the thought that Joseph was His father to bring their mind to a spiritual condition such as could grasp His words. His words are divine and spiritual and bring no profit to the carnally minded.

Christ showed His foreknowledge in knowing that some would not believe Him and who would betray Him before these events happened, which Chrysostom interprets as an attribute of deity. The disciples who left Him "went back" and did not merely depart, i.e. they lost the faith that they had.

The disciples needed Him, not He the disciples, but Christ used no compulsion in holding them. They had nothing else in the world to which to turn, for Christ gave them the words of eternal life. But Christ replied that one was to be excepted, hoping to check Judas' wickedness.

Christ made not the traitor manifest, yet allowed him not to be hidden. He first said that some believe not, and then next that

one of them was a devil. Christ uses no compulsion but is entirely persuasive. Salvation(as perdition)lies in our own will.

He warns of Judas' fate, who being so long with Christ yet fell,to put His hearers on their guard. To neglect the poor is the same condemnation as is to receive the Mysteries unworthily. He warns against the misuse of riches and marvels at those who feed dogs and starve men;who cover themselves with gold and leave Christ unclothed.We must not care for present things but rather desire those which are to come.We should encourage each other in this doctrine.

1-8

John 7

XLV111.

Christ appeared or concealed Himself entirely at His own volition,showing thus His Manhood and Godhead and refuting both Marcion and Paul of Samosata.

John passes over an interval of five months in which he records but one incident.Chrysostom suggests that the incidents chosen were chosen because of a polemic value,particularly with respect to non-believers,in this case His brethren.These men had seen the water changed into wine,but because of an evil mind and of envy were unable to believe. Christ merely replied that His hour ~~was~~ not yet come.He went to Jerusalem but not openly,for His purpose as yet was to instruct rather than suffer.

He moralises on Christ's gentleness with His critics and begs his hearers to avoid all anger.

9-24

John 7

XLIX.

The Jewish rulers sought to take Him even at the Feast which was a mark of their depravity,and though many people looked favourably on Christ,they were cowed by their rulers.

When He came up in the middle of the Feast the crowds were held by the power of His teaching. If they were to cast out the envy and hatred from their hearts they would see the truth of Christ's teaching to be very God's. Christ sought only His Father's glory, and never His own, nor even the honour of man.

The Jews accuse Him of breaking the Sabbath and making Himself equal with God. Yet none of them keep the Law themselves. Christ broke it in order to save, they transgress and subvert the Law. Christ merely tells the truth, they seek to murder Him. Christ continues to confute them from their own Law: they were insulting Moses as well as Christ. The circumcision is more authoritative than the Sabbath and yet circumcision is not of the Law but the fathers. The priests break the Sabbath in this respect, and yet He has done a thing greater than circumcision by saving a man.

We are to be just at all times, for only in this way by our actions, shall we escape the fire and find the Kingdom.

25-36

John 7

L.

The Jewish hearts were set not to believe, and therefore their judgement was perverted. Their fault was moral not intellectual. They cannot touch Him for His hour was not yet come. The common people are still rather impressed by the miracles, though Chrysostom observes that John has only told three so far, implying that there were many more unmentioned.

At this point the Pharisees ordered Him to be taken, and Christ foreshows His death as being in no sense an ordinary death. They would need Him then, but would never find Him. None but the righteous could be with Him.

These words were spoken to the Jews but they may apply to us. Covetousness and hardheartedness destroy the Spirit. If we cannot see Christ when He is Hungry or suffering, He shall never see us when we entreat Him.

John 7³⁷⁻⁴⁴

L1.

His hearers are to be convinced not merely by miracle, but rather by a true understanding of scripture. The power of living water was to be the possession of the Holy Ghost Who was to be given after the Crucifixion, and who had dwindled away in the world and had been lost for centuries. There was confusion and disbelief but none asked Christ to elucidate.

Chrysostom says the malice of the Jews received its due reward for they lost their freedom and their worship, whilst Christ's message contrives to spread, and he warns his hearers against avenging themselves, for evil can be cured only by good. This teaching he says is even given by the pagans and yet Christians fall behind them.

John 7⁴⁵⁻⁵²

L11.

The officers, sent by their superiors, were subdued by one single sermon, not needing even miracles. Truth appeals instantly to the impartial mind. Nicodemus upbraids the Pharisees showing that they neither know nor keep the Law.

(The history of the woman taken in adultery is omitted by all the Greek commentators).

John 8¹²

While they discuss as to whether a prophet can come out of Galilee, Christ cries that He is the Light of the World.

Christ's witness to Himself was a true one, for God can give only a true witness. The witness of two men is accepted, why not the witness of the Father and the Son? Chrysostom draws the conclusion that Christ is of the same substance and equal to the Father. God cannot be known except through the Son: therefore to blaspheme the Son is to blaspheme God.

We should glorify the Son by our works. Light is good not to ourselves but to others. We should guard against sin: sin is best seen not when being done but afterwards.

20-30
John 8

L111.

It is emphasised continually that Christ's death was of His own dispensation and not of His enemy's planning, and that where He went they would never come. When they were benefitted and healed they would not know Christ, but they would know Him in the Judgement.

Chrysostom comments on how when Jesus spoke simply many believed on Him, and exhorts his ~~listeners~~ listeners therefore to a careful reading of the Scriptures, especially the Gospels. He adds the practical point that they ought to obtain bibles of their own.

31-47
John 8

L1V.

All the Jewish matters were types, but they should know the truth and the truth should make them free from their sins. The Jews were insensible to the bondage of sin from which God alone can deliver. A relationship to Abraham had no power to save, but rather did salvation lie in the right direction of their will(κατὰ

προαίρεσιν). The Jews were not true children of Abraham but were children of the devil, and hated Christ because they hated truth.

As the carnal Jews were alien from God and from Abraham we must learn to give up all worldly things for heavenly and shun luxury and avarice.

John 8⁴⁸

LV.

Christ answers vehemently when God is attacked, but meekly when Himself is attacked. Eternal Life is the keeping of Christ's saying. Christ's day was the Crucifixion, which Abraham foreshowed typically by the offering of the ram and Isaac. Christ was greater than Abraham, for Abraham longed to see Christ's day. As the Father used "I am" of Himself, so also did Christ, signifying continuous being irrespective of time.

He moralises against envy which deadens the soul and ends in utter ruin.

John 9¹⁻⁵

The man born blind

LV1.

Christ saw the man and deliberately determined to heal him. The disciples were perplexed, for they believed that blindness was the result of sin, and this man could not have sinned before his birth. To Christ, it was but another opportunity for God's glory to be manifested. Chrysostom says that the evils of this world are not evil, nor the good good, sin alone is evil:-

Ὡς περ οὖν τὰ κακὰ οὐκ ἔστι κακὰ τὰ κατὰ τὸν παρόντα
 βίον . οὕτως οὐδὲ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἀγαθὰ . ἀλλ' ἀμερτικά
 μόνῃ κακὸν , πῆρωσις δὲ οὐ κακόν . LV1 . 1.

In making being from not-being, Christ showed Himself the Architect of Creation. The real work of God is faith, and this life is its proper sphere.

How Many expend this life in building fine houses, but give no thought to their future resting place. The giving of alms now obtains mansions in heaven later.

6-16
John 9

LVII.

Although Chrysostom's interpretation is literal and non-allegorical, historical and not imaginative, in this incident he goes a long way towards interpreting the incident spiritually, and also, which is rare for Chrysostom, the details of the story are made to bear an interpretation. He begs his hearers to search the scriptures for in their depth is hidden meaning:-

καίτοι γε αὐτόθεν ὅσα ἔκολα, πολλὴν ἐν τῷ
θεῷ διάνοιαν ἔχειν ἀποκεκρυμμένην. LVII. 1.

Christ made clay of his own spittle to show that the power came not from the ground but from his mouth. The man was sent to Siloam covered with clay, that many would see the incident and enquire its meaning. By sending him to Siloam He proved that He was not estranged from the Old Covenant :-

Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις καὶ ἐκεῖνο βούλεται κατασκευάζειν, ὅτι
οὐκ ἑλλοτρίος ἐστὶ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῆς Παλαιᾶς,
πέμπων εἰς τὸν Σιλωάμ. LVII. 1.

That it was Siloam (sent), meant that it was Christ's work: Christ who was sent by God. Chrysostom here quotes 1 Corinthians 10⁴ showing that as Christ was the Spiritual Rock, so also He was the spiritual Siloam. He also adds a comment to the effect that the sudden coming in of the water signified Christ's unexpected appearance. It is rather a difficult comment to understand, but the significant fact is that even Chrysostom interpreted these details

allegorically or rather spiritually.

He makes a good deal of the man's unquestioning obedience which he maintains is the spring of true faith.

That Christ healed a beggar, when the beggar had never asked Him, shows the loving condescension of God coming to save all men.

γὰρ ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ πάντων ἀφίκετο . LVII . 1.

Chrysostom considers the beggar's courage and truthfulness when questioned by the Jews, and also Christ's humility in withdrawing immediately the miracle was done. There is division of opinion among the people and the rulers alike. From this he moralises that division may be a good thing for evil company is a great danger to ourselves and also an offence to others.

¹⁷
John 9

LVIII.

Though the Jews spoke against Christ yet the man maintained that Christ was a prophet, and the truth is made brighter by the perverseness of the Jews. This Chrysostom describes as littleness of soul , μικροψυχίαν . With malicious subtlety they try to persuade the parents against Jesus, and in hypocrisy tell them to give the glory to God not to Christ. To give glory to God is belief in His Son.

Having won a moral victory over the Jews, the beggar speaks boldly. They profess to be Moses' disciples for they know that God spoke to Moses. The blind man marvels that they did not know this man who could do such miracles. The Jews slander him as having been born in sin because of his blindness (which Chrysostom says is not true), and cast him out because of his love of truth.

He shows him as a model of behaviour for his hearers when Christianity is assailed. This boldness can be gained by a careful hearing of the Scriptures:-

ἐὰν ταῖς Γραφαῖς προσέχωμεν , καὶ μὴ
παρόργως αὐτὰς ἀκούωμεν . LVIII . 4 .

He deprecates the love of sport and theatre and the neglect of religion, and exhorts them to follow virtue.

34

John 9

LIX

Those who are cast out for Jesus' sake are found by Jesus, (Note the continuation of the spiritual interpretation), and are recompensed by the greatest of blessings, being joined to the company of the disciples. The blind are led to confess Christ, therefore is Christ come for judgement. In condemning Christ, the Jews condemn themselves. Chrysostom actually says here that the passage has a spiritual meaning.

Ἐνταῦθα δέ δύο λέγει ἀναβλέφεις καὶ δύο
τυφλόγητας , τὴν τε αἰσθητὴν , τὴν τε νοητὴν .

LIX . 1 .

1-13

John 10

LX.

The two distinguishing marks of a robber are (a) that he does not enter openly and (b) that he does not come in by the door, which is scripture. Those who climb up some other way are the scribes who teach not the scriptures but the commandments of men. Moses might be signified by the doorkeeper. The stranger means the anti-Christ.

All that came before Christ are false, but Moses and

the patriarchs are not referred to here, it is the people like Theudas and Judas.

Christ refers to His Passion. The wolf is to be interpreted spiritually as Satan:-

ἔστι δὲ ἐνταῦθα καὶ νοητὸν ὑποπτεῖν αἰνέον .
Λικ . 3 .

Let us abide by this shepherd. The only thing that can hinder our salvation is our revolt from Him. We cannot serve Him and Mammon. Chrysostom concludes with a very fine exhortation to care for the poor and needy and so serve Christ.

It should be noted that Chrysostom interprets the incident spiritually, although that is not of very great importance as the teaching is obviously an allegory.

14-21

John 10

There are two kinds of thief:-the one who kills(Theudas) and the one who gives no care(Jews). Christ is the Good Shepherd who gives His mortal life that others may have eternal life. Christ's death was freely willed and the promise to take it again was a prophecy of the Resurrection.

The Jews ascribed Christ's works to the power of the devil, which showed that they were greater than belonged to man.

Chrysostom again ~~concludes~~ concludes with an exhortation to imitate Christ in His gentleness with His enemies. He begs the urgency of giving and the care of all who suffer, instancing prisoners in particular. He analyses social wrongs with the keenest perception and reminds them that all are sinners and therefore God's mercy to them should make them merciful to each other. Sin lies in the intent not only in its commission.

Christ replies in meekness to His questioners to the effect that His works were His witness and testimony. His questioners do not follow because they do not belong to Him. None can take His followers from His hand as they could not from God's: the Son has equal power with the Father, and He does the works of the Father.

Whenever Christ utters anything sublime he retires. Here He retires to Jordan, justifying all that John had testified of Him. He confirms many disciples, being now freed from His enemies.

From praise of retirement, Chrysostom moves to the advising of women whose duty it is to live in retirement at home giving counsel to their husbands. Finery fails to please long, and only the virtuous soul can please forever.

Lazarus

LX11.

Chrysostom emphasises that ^{it}/is those dear to God who suffer most. Christ delays so that it could not be said that He had recovered a man from a coma but not from death. The disciples are afraid to return to Judah but Christ encourages them. Christ is glad that Lazarus is dead for the disciples sake, and Chrysostom realises that Christ's conversation is "dark" and with a double meaning.

Bethany is only two miles from Jerusalem and many Jews would be there. Martha and Mary show an immediate trust in Christ. Christ Himself is the giver of Life and of Resurrection, and He leads Martha up to a fuller understanding. She does not fully understand His words.

Chrysostom breaks off to criticise severely the prevalent indecency of mourning and the Bacchanalian conduct of the women and compares them adversely with Martha and Mary, and not least with the heathen. Christians in their mourning show no confidence in

their belief in the Resurrection. The true honour to the departed is by almsgiving and public service.

30-41
John 11

LX111

Christ does not force Himself into the miracle but rather is entreated all the time. The recording of Christ weeping and groaning is meant to show us that Christ was truly human. Chrysostom observes that while the Synoptists emphasise Christ's humanity in referring to the agony, the sweat and the like, John does so by referring to Christ's sorrow.

The manner of the miracle i.e. making the Jews remove the stone was meant to prove the genuineness of the miracle.

Christ teaches the importance of faith with righteousness. Chrysostom shows the victory of faith in the person of the disciples, over reason in the person of the Greek philosophers. But faith without holiness is nothing, and adultery and fornication exclude a man from heaven, and all such should be excluded from Church.

41
John 11

LX1V.

Chrysostom speaks of Christ's condescension in saying things that were for man's salvation, and instances expressions in the Old Testament which were unworthy of God and were yet spoken that men could understand Him. (An interesting comment for a literalist). Another reason for Christ's condescension that the Father had heard Him was that His hearers knew the Father but not Himself. The idea of the condescension of God is central to Chrysostom's theology.

Christ prayed at the grave-side in order to convince the people around that His and the Father's Will were one. But He called Lazarus forth by the power of His Own Voice and not in the

name of God, thus claiming equality. Christ ordered the bystanders to unwrap Lazarus, and quietly commanded them to let him go.

The Pharisees refuse to see that this sign proves Christ's divinity, but call Him a man and pretend that He makes their relationship with Rome very difficult. Chrysostom enlarges on the evils of envy, malice and selfishness, and says we should mourn for them rather than for the dead.

LXV,

Of Caiaphas' prophecy, Chrysostom says that grace used his mouth but never touched his heart, but when they had killed Christ the grace removed to the apostles, this being the significance of the rending of the veil of the Temple.

Though it was the time of the Feast, yet Christ retired to the wilderness with His disciples while all the others went up to Jerusalem. While the Jews were purifying themselves they plotted to destroy Christ.

1-8
John 12

LXV. (cont'd.)

Here is a further proof of the genuineness of Lazarus' resurrection. Mary honours Christ as God. Judas rebuked her but Christ does not rebuke Judas, desiring yet to save him. The mention even of His death, that He would not be a long time with them did not soften Judas.

The love of money is an accursed love, for covetousness is idolatry. The heathen idolater sacrifices but oxen and sheep, but avarice demands the terrible price of a man's soul.

8
John 12

LXVI.

The Jewish leaders plan to destroy Lazarus too, for they are angry at the multitudes leaving the Feast merely to see Lazarus.

The multitudes proclaimed Him the Messiah as He entered Jerusalem. Chrysostom interprets the riding on an ass not merely as an act of humility but as signifying Christ's bringing of the Gentiles subject to Him:-

τὸ ἀκάθαρτον τῶν ἐθνῶν γένος ἐμελλεν
ὑποχείριον ἔχειν . ΛXVI . 1.

The multitudes now acclaim Him as more than a prophet, and they could rejoice greatly, for He who had come to them was their True King. It was the raising of Lazarus that had brought the multitude to His side.

The Greeks seek Him out, and Christ realises that that is His hour, and that the Cross was the step to the calling of the Gentiles. It was wrong to persevere with the Jews when they had rejected Him, therefore the Cross and the calling of the Gentiles were related events. As corn bears fruit only when it dies, so does Christ; this the disciples did not understand until afterwards, and that was why they fled.

He warns against Marcion and the Gnostics here who deny the Resurrection. The real answer to heresy is a truer understanding of scripture. He warns too against heathen philosophy which gives no true answers to the meaning of life particularly with reference to God, matter, body and soul. And concludes with an appeal to brotherly kindness and hospitality, with almsgiving.

25-33

John 12

LXv11.

The pleasures and possessions of this world are to be hated: this is to follow Christ, and to follow Him means to experience a resurrection. Christ knew what the Cross meant, for He asked His

Father to save Him from it, yet He faced it, that the Father should be glorified. The Voice was heard but the grosser people could not understand its message: it was sent for them not to reassure Christ. It was Christ's death ~~that~~ would bring the victory over Satan and the glorification of the Father. But it was the death and resurrection that would draw men not merely the death, and God wants our obedience not only our faith.

John 12 ³⁴⁻⁴⁰

LXV111.

The Jews know rightly that Christ abides for ever, and Christ replies that His death is merely a removal of the Light and ~~and~~ advises them to walk while they have the light. Jesus then hid Himself from them lest their ill-will burst into action. Yet they did not believe on Him, as Isaiah had foretold (Isaiah 53⁴⁰ and 6¹⁰). God gives up only those who abandon Him.

Even so, we must always care for our brethren and bear one another's burdens.

John 12 ^{42-end}

LX1X

Through love of honour the Jews lost true faith. But faith in Christ was as faith in God, for Father and Son were consubstantial. Christ calls Himself Light, a divine appellation, and delivers from darkness and mental error to faith in the Father. Christ did not come to judge the world; His Word judges, for His Word is God's. He knows His Word gives eternal life because He is one with the Father; even to the end He humbly continues to give God's Word, and the Jews make their own perdition in rejecting Him.

He concludes with a warning against vain-glory and its damage to the soul.

Chrysostom speaks of Christ's forbearance towards Judas even to the end, and of His love to His own. The reference to His own in this world shows that He was the God both of the dead and the living. Christ's humility and abasement are a lesson for us. Peter refuses with vehement love, but is checked and told he will understand everything later. The disciples are not clean in so far as they are free from sin: but are so far clean, as having received the light of the Word, they are free from Jewish error. The washing means the cleansing of conscience.

Καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖ λουτρὸν οὐ τὸ δι' ὕδατος λέγει τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν,
ἀλλὰ τὸν τῆς συνειδήσεως καθαρμόν. LXX. 2
(Some MSS have δημιουργίας for συνειδήσεως. The Latin text
- Pontificum - has "conscientiae".)

He concludes with an exhortation for his hearers to be clean and learn to do well, particularly in regard to the care of widows and orphans.

That Christ is both their Lord and Master means that He is consubstantial with God. His action is a model for us; the true greatness lies in humility. True blessing lies not only in the knowing, but in the knowing and doing. But there was a traitor in their midst and Christ saved him and gave him the opportunity of repentance.

These things are written that we should not bear malice towards those who injure us, for they injure themselves really and not us, unless we allow the deeds to hurt us.

Further, even in the Old Testament this truth is exemplified, when men were guided by their own nature alone:-

Οὐδὲ γὰρ ὑποθήκας ἐγγράφους εἶχον ἐκεῖνοι τότε ,
οὐδὲ δίκων παραδείγματα . ἀλλὰ γυμνῇ καθ'
ἐαυτὴν ἡ φύσις ἠγωνίζετο . ΛXXI . 3 .

E.g. Moses, Noah, Joseph. What excuse have they in the light of Joseph's forgiving life, who lived before the Law and before Grace, if they cannot approach his example.

John 13 20

LXXI.

If the disciples are true to Christ, they will enjoy both the toil of their mission and the love of men.

Yet Christ is troubled because of the presence of the traitor, who was insensible even to the giving of the sop. Chrysostom believes that the remark of Christ's of giving the sop to the traitor was heard only by John, and that is why the other disciples did not understand even when Judas went out, and even John did not understand what Judas went out to do.

Chrysostom says the significance of the reference to its being night when Judas went out is that he could not be deterred even at that hour. All the other commentators see a spiritual significance in the reference to night, but Chrysostom interprets it quite literally.

Christ's glory was in the Cross and was not to wait for the Resurrection.

Christ then sorrowfully tells His disciples of the dangers ahead of them that they could be prepared for them. He was to be removed to a place to which they could not go. But the company would never be extinguished for a new commandment was being given

them: the commandment of love, the foundation of all virtue.

Christians must not fail here, for it is this failure that prevents the conversion of the heathen.

36

John 13

LXXIII.

Peter said he would follow Christ to the extent of laying down his life, but Christ gently handled him that he might teach himself by his fall. Peter fell not because he had lost his love, but had lost divine aid.

1-7

John 14

LXXIII(cont'd)

They were not to be troubled on that ground (that Peter their leader would fail before morning), but were to remember that nothing could prevail against faith in Christ and God. They would not finally be cut off, but would be with Christ. Christ gives them the opportunity of asking the way. He is the Way; therefore they would never need the hand of man to guide them; He was the Truth, for with Him was no falsehood; He was the Life, for even when they died they would find life. To see God means by intellectual perception and knowledge. They saw God not in His unveiled Essence but clothed with flesh.

He concludes with an exhortation to purity, that his hearers may always see God. Man is cleansed in the first instance by the font, but after baptism there are other ways, e.g. almsgiving. But we are not to give of that superfluity which has been stolen from others, for this is worse than offering a putrid animal for a sacrifice.

These words prove that the Father and Son cannot be separated, and indeed gave rise to Sabellianism. The Son is no other than what the Father is, yet continuing to be a Son. God cannot be seen with the eyes, but knowledge of Him can be found in knowledge of Jesus. The Father and the Son are consubstantial: the very words and works of Christ are of the Father.

Further, when Christ had gone, the disciples would do still greater works. He would abide with His disciples continually and even show greater power.

He exhorts his hearers to offer themselves a living sacrifice to God and avoid all sin and evil, seeking to serve the poor and needy, not merely with their substance, but with their minds.

God requires the love which is shown by works. In the Holy Spirit, Who was to be sent when Christ left them, was to be found One like unto Christ. The Son and the Holy Spirit are two Persons, but one substance. But the Holy Spirit should not be as Christ in flesh and blood, but shall dwell in their very souls and never leave them. The full proof of the disciples' love was the keeping of His commandments, and the reward of obedience is the Presence of Christ. Christ told them all this beforehand, so that when it did come to pass the disciples would not think they were experiencing an apparition or an illusion.

He who does not love Christ does not keep His words; and, as these words are the Father's, therefore he does not love God. It is necessary for Christ to depart that the Comforter should come, who would comfort them in their afflictions and lead them on to comprehend all things. Peace with Christ is a remedy for all the

world's troubles. Christ went forward to His end willingly, and despising the Devil .

To His disciples He bequeathed the Spirit, and in the power of His Spirit they were invincible in all situations and against all people.

The words "Arise, let us go hence" were meant to take the disciples to a place more free from interruptions for He had yet much teaching to give.

1-10

John 15

LXXV1.

As pruning benefits the fruit growing properties of the branch so do persecutions make men stronger. The fruitless branch is destroyed but the true disciple bears fruit and thereby glorifies the Father. Christ loves His disciples, therefore they were to fear nothing and abide in His love, keeping His commandments.

Love must be shown in actions. Covetousness must be avoided. We have been ransomed by Christ and yet are the slaves of gold.

11-end

John 15

LXXV11.

Christ was anxious that the disciples should not be stopped because of His Passion, but rather should continue in their mission. The mark of their discipleship and its bond was love. Christ had chosen them and they were to continue to bear fruit: His command was that they were to love one another. They would be hated by the world, but they were to rejoice in that. He had been hated too, and in hating the Son they were hating the Father. The Spirit of Truth would come sent from the Father and the Son, and would also bear witness to His words.

John 16¹⁻⁵

LXXV11(cont'd.)

Christ was preparing his disciples for the certain eventuality of persecution. Christ foreknew this and made them strong, and though the heathen persecuted on the alleged grounds of wickedness, when it eventually took place their courage was aroused.

He concludes with moralisings on the virtue of suffering for God, and reflects on the eternal destiny of the faithful. Under any trial the thought of God and the reward of faithfulness are a great support. Virtue is its own reward but carries, too, a heavenly reward. Further, let us always be kind to the poor. To be ever seeking security here makes us hard-hearted and reluctant to give.

John 16⁶⁻¹⁵

LXXVlll.

Christ rebukes the disciples for their despondency, the only justification of which is sin and not hardship. He knew all these things from the beginning, but never spoke to them about them as long as He was with them. It was true kindness to speak the truth. The Holy Spirit would reprove the world, and in His work would convict the world of sin, by the great works which would be performed through the apostles; of righteousness, because the Son would be accepted of the Father; of judgement, because in the Resurrection Satan would be finally defeated and cast out. All that Christ had yet to say would be given them by the Spirit Who would speak the words of the Son.

The Spirit would lead them into all truth for Christ could take them only so far.

It is important to see that the three Persons in the Trinity are equal in power. The Father could effect the whole, as could the Son and the Spirit. Christ is preparing the disciples

for belief in the Holy Spirit.

Chrysostom concludes by praising unanimity and concord. Love multiplies strength and is indeed man's best protection: it is independent of place.

16

John 16

LXXIX

Christ tests their feelings by repetition (verse 19 is omitted in Chrysostom's commentary). But their grief will engender joy, and their grief will be short but the joy endless. The reference to childbirth is given a mystical interpretation:-

Αἰνίσσεται δὲ ἐνταῦθα καὶ τι μυστικόν . ὅτι
ἔλυεν αὐτὸς τοῦ θανάτου τὰς ῥύνας , καὶ νέον
ἄνθρωπον ἀπογεννηθῆναι πέποιθε . LXXIX . 1.

He saw in it, too, an allusion to Christ's Resurrection. That they should ask nothing in that day proves that He is from God. Though Christ was now speaking darkly, in the time of the Resurrection He would make all things plain. Our Lord answers the very thoughts of His disciples. They are not to be despondent about the sorrows of the world, for they will always have peace in Christ.

As far as Chrysostom is concerned not even death shall master the Christian. The thought of heaven should make them despise the world. We are strangers and sojourners here and our city is God's. Affronts must be borne because of our belief, and all carnal attachments should be avoided. Many love harlots more than they love God, and yet the good life gives more pleasure than the immoral one, for it gives love, joy and peace.

1-5
John 17

LXXX.

Our Lord comes to the cross willingly. He has power over all flesh, which means that His preaching is to be extended to all the world, but only those who receive Him get eternal life. The Son is true God equally with the Father. His human nature was to be glorified in the Resurrection and Ascension to the Father.

Men deprive themselves of reigning with the Son of God for the sake of worldly pleasures, which give them slavery. We are free in proportion to the fewness of our wants. Riches are called usables (*χρήματα*) meaning that they are to be used and not kept, for if we do not we are possessed by the riches and in no sense possess them.

6-17
John 17

LXXXI.

Christ had manifested God's name both by words and works. He is not opposed to the Father and it was the Father's Will to give the disciples to our Lord: Father and Son are unanimous. The disciples had kept God's word in believing in His Son, and our Lord prays for those whom the Father had given Him. Christ is glorified in His disciples, and loses none but by their own fault.

He concludes with an exhortation to care and earnestness for a right study of the Scripture. As children care more for their toys than for the real experiences of life, so do many grown ups have a childish desire for worldly things which are but toys. He begs them not to bring loss upon themselves and return to the haven with a valueless cargo of straw and chaff. Almsdoing is the medicine of the soul.

14-end
John 17

LXXXII.

The disciples are not of this world but are citizens of heaven. Christ cares for them and prays the Father to sanctify them through His Spirit of Truth. God's word is truth. As Christ was sent by God into the world, so Christ sends His disciples; similarly, as Christ sanctified and offered Himself so are the disciples sanctified and offered. The sanctification in the Old Testament was a type of this sanctification:-

νοὺν δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τύπῳ , ἀλλ' αὐτῇ
τῇ ἀληθείᾳ . LXXXII . .

Christ was praying not only for His disciples but for all those whom they should save, that all may be in unity with the Father and the Son. This unity must be maintained by love, and is greater even than the miracles. Christ is in them and God in Him. This passage proves Christ's distinct personality and therefore refutes the Sabellians, and also proves the consubstantiality of the Son thereby refuting Arius. Our Lord's prayer is summed up in love. God is known only through the Son, and to have Christ abiding in them means the keeping of the faith and perfect love.

He calls his listeners to believe and love God.
Church going is worse than useless without good works.

1
John 18

LXXXIII.

Christ willingly entered His Passion and we equally should be ready to depart this life. He entered the garden, a place known to Judas, and in so doing fearlessly, He comforted His

disciples. When the hired soldiers came He went forth to meet them, but He showed His divine power when He caused Himself to be unrecognised even by Judas, which was proof that even then He could have evaded His captors had He desired. He asked that His disciples should be allowed to go free.

Chrysostom contrasts Peter's wild conduct before the gift of the Holy Spirit with his meek conduct after the gift of the Holy Spirit. It is accurately recorded that it was the right ear, and that the particular servant was named so that the men of that time may check the veracity of the record. Chrysostom also emphasises Christ's healing of an enemy.

The Evangelist draws attention to Caiaphas' prophecy that the death of Jesus was the salvation of the world. Peter and John follow into the palace of the High Priest. Christ is questioned, but tells the High Priest to ask those who heard Him, for which remark He is struck by an officer and sent to Caiaphas.

As to Peter's betrayal, Chrysostom says it shows how little we can trust ourselves and how much we need God.

Chrysostom scorns the scruples of the Jews in desiring not to be polluted by entering the Judgement Hall and yet at the same time be plotting to murder Christ.

Pilate is perplexed and seeks a specific accusation. Christ criticises Pilate who merely accepts the mob's opinion, and seeks not to find out for himself. Christ's kingdom was neither human nor perishable.

In conclusion, Chrysostom moralises on our Lord's example, as a lesson of humility and meekness.

Christ makes no comment when Pilate discusses His case, but as soon as he asks questions about His Kingdom, He teaches him. Pilate had taken Him away privately for he suspected greatness in Him. Pilate first states Him innocent and then attempts to set Him free. He scourges Him and allows Him to be maltreated in an attempt to assuage the anger of the Jews, but to no avail. Barrabas is chosen, and Christ rejected, led away to be crucified.

Pilate is afraid when he hears that Christ had made Himself out to be the Son of God, but Christ does not answer his further questions. Still Pilate tries to release Him, but the Jews corner Pilate by saying that they have no king but Caesar and questioned Pilate's loyalty.

In reflecting on all that our Lord experienced, we learn to return good for evil. Chrysostom regrets that the pagans often put the Christians to shame in this respect, and that Christians attend too little to divine things and are wholly given to things of this life. They make too little provision for the journey to the next world.

Christ's sacrifice is likened to that of Isaac who bore the wood as He bore the Cross. But it was only the type and was never consummated as Christ's was. Christ died where Adam lay buried, and where death lay effected the victory. The crucifixion with the thieves is a fulfilment of Isaiah 53 ¹². Pilate's proclamation, made in three languages, is a fulfilment for all time that Christ was king. Still fulfilling prophecy, the soldiers parted His garments, but not His coat.

Chrysostom discusses the meaning of the seamless coat and refers to those who believed that it signified His divinity in

being woven "from the top". Chrysostom, literal to the end, says that for his part, he interpreted it merely that the garment was of a single piece of cloth and not of strips, indicating Christ's simple fashion. It is revealing in that this passage, taken very widely as of a spiritual interpretation, should be interpreted by Chrysostom so naively and simply, and shows his method, and that of the Antiochene School, in a very clear light.

Before the Cross Christ is seen sweating, agonised and fearing, but on the Cross He is untroubled and commits His mother to John. He thereby teaches us that when we embark on a fearful course, though we may fear beforehand, yet when embarked on, we should consider all things possible and easy. Even death should be faced bravely, though neither feared nor sought.

It was the weaker sex who stood by the Cross. Henceforth all things were transformed. Our Lord's forethought for His mother is evidence that ~~xxx~~ He was born of her, and is therefore a refutation of Marcion.

He thirsted, (as the scriptures foretold), was cruelly given vinegar, and then in calmness died.

The thieves had their legs broken but Christ had His side pierced, fulfilling Zechariah 12¹⁰. He refers to the water and the blood; the first is baptism which regenerates, and the second is the flesh and blood which nourishes. When we receive the cup we should recall that we are drinking from His side:-

Ἐν τῷ θέν ἄρχην λαμβάνει τὰ μυστήρια, ὅταν
προσέῃς τῷ φρικτῷ ποτηρίῳ, ὡς ἀπ' αὐτῆς πίνων
τῆς πλευρᾶς, οὕτω προσέῃς. ΛΚΧΧV. 3.

John himself saw all this and testifies accordingly.

The Paschal Lamb is a type of Christ, who fulfilled the type
(Exodus 12⁴⁶, Numbers 9¹²) in reality. John's emphasis on the Old Testament is given to prove that though the crucifixion shocked men, yet it was foretold in detail in their own scriptures. John's motive was that they should "believe"

Joseph and Nicodemus show affection, and give Jesus a good burial with spices to preserve His body for a long time. He was not buried as a criminal, but was accorded a magnificent Jewish burial.

It was providential that He was buried alone, and that the tomb was near and known, for it obviated a good deal of slander and suspicion about the Resurrection not being really true.

John 20.

LXXXV(cont'd.)

Mary Magdalene saw the stone rolled away and ran, without examining the tomb, to seek an explanation from the disciples. Chrysostom observes on the accuracy of John in reporting this incident when Mary knew nothing clearly, and also in describing how he himself did not enter the tomb though Peter, coming later, did so. All the details about the clothes lying indicate that no man had moved the body, but it had passed through the clothes.

Chrysostom reflects on the folly of expensive funerals. The disciples did not make the magnificent burial but the Jews, (as was their custom). It should not be a practice of Christians, for it proceeds from vain-glory. The best way to clothe the dead is by alms-doing, for these garments perish neither by worm nor moth nor thief, but will be worn at the Resurrection. What excuse have we adorning

a body which is consumed by corruption and worms, and neglect Christ who is going about naked, ~~thirsty~~ and a stranger. Alms doing profits the dying and the dead.

10

John 20

LXXXV1.

Mary remained at the tomb. Looking in she saw angels who asked her why she was weeping. She still knew nothing of the Resurrection and was seeking Jesus' body. Jesus appears in an ordinary form, lest she be terrified. Still she does not see, and Jesus reveals Himself in His Voice. He forbids Mary to touch Him, (for He is journeying to His Father, and is not to be looked on with the same feelings as before), but tells Mary to go and inform the disciples, to whom He appears that evening. He brings them His peace: that which He has promised in word He brings to reality in fact, and gives thereby an exact faith. He is now victorious in fact, and no longer making appeal to the Father, gives the disciples the authority of their mission with the power of the Holy Spirit. The gift and power of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is One.

He exhorts his listeners to seek after the +Holy Spirit. He considers the dignity and danger of the priest's office. Even when the priest is unworthy he is yet to be honoured, for what he dispenses is not his own but God's.

24

John 20

LXXXV11.

Chrysostom draws attention to the veracity of the record, when not even a single fault of a disciple is hidden. Christ appears for the sake of one disciple, but his doubt was present before he had received the Holy Spirit and not afterwards. He also remarks that the disciples believed before they had seen the Risen Lord on the evidence

of the empty tomb. Christ exhibited the appearances on His Risen Body and actually ate with the disciples to convince them that it was none other than Himself. John records fewer appearances than the other evangelists, but what he did record were chosen as effective for belief: number could not compel belief.

John 21.

LXXXV11(cont'd)

Chrysostom emphasises the significance of the phrase that Jesus "showed Himself" i.e. He was seen only when He decided to be seen. The disciples were back to their trade, not having yet received the Holy Spirit. He appears on the bank and Peter and John again show their temper, the one fervent, the other lofty, the one keen the other clear-sighted, the one recognises first but the other comes first. They are afraid of the Risen Lord as they sit down to eat. Lest they imagine it is all a dream they are commanded to haul in the fish they have caught.

Let us exert ourselves that we see that Face. If we love Christ everything here will appear a shadow. But yet we love money too much and bring on ourselves all manner of evils. Virtue alone brings calm pleasure.

15
John 21

LXXXV111.

The love of neighbour gives us approval by God more than anything, and that is why Christ charged Peter to care for His sheep. He picked on Peter because he was the leader, and also to show that he had forgiven him after his denial. Christ foretold his martyrdom which He described not as death but the glorifying of God.

Peter enquires of John for they were very close in friendship, but is rebuked by Christ.

His task is to accomplish his own work and not bother himself about another.

John mentions again that he himself wrote of these things. Chrysostom says that the reason for this is that he was the last to write a Gospel and received much opposition. But it was Christ (some MSS God) who had moved him to the task and therefore he was impelled. This is a very interesting comment, for it is well known that the Fourth Gospel was not received immediately and is generally assigned therefore to a date much later than is really warrantable. The writer of this thesis believes that the Fourth Gospel is much earlier than is generally admitted, and is a *κῆρυγμα* wholly independent of the *Marcan κῆρυγμα*, (the only other one we have), and as an interpretation of Christ is equally valid, and possibly more valuable. Chrysostom goes on to say that John has written fearlessly of a painful truth, the wicked rejection of Christ by the Jews, and certainly never sought favour. He further adduces his own testimony and challenges men to scrutinise the circumstances. He alone stayed to the very end, the Cross itself.

He exhorts therefore to a ceaseless unfolding and searching of the scriptures, and the avoiding of worldly interests. A righteous man in his righteousness receives the first fruits of the kingdom here and now, and an evil man likewise in his conscience the beginning of punishment.

A. THE ANTIOCHENE SCHOOL AND HIS PLACE IN IT.

In his reference to the Council held at Antioch to consider the case of Bishop Paul in 269, Eusebius refers to the work of Malchion, president of the school of Greek learning at Antioch. (Eus. H.E. vii. 29). Brief though the mention is, it shows that there was at Antioch a school similar to the Catechetical School at Alexandria in which sacred studies were not divorced from secular learning.

The Antiochene school was deeply influenced both by the Syrian outlook and the Alexandrine outlook. Origen's second home was Caesarea, and in it, he had a marked and continuing liberalising effect (Neander. Ch. Hist. ii. p474). Origen was at once the most mystic of allegorists, and the most scholarly of critics.

The tendency towards transcendentalism had always been marked in Alexandria, but Origen crystallised a tendency into a system. He was well nigh the originator of this system of biblical interpretation and with it combined his genius of spirit, and great scholarship as a grammarian. Alexandria appropriated the former, and Caesarea the latter. The Antiochene school did in fact develop a very positive system of exact logical and grammatical interpretation, as well as reacting very strongly against the Alexandrine system of allegorisation. They discarded the allegorical treatment of Scripture, and maintained its primary and simple meaning.

Its real strength was its weakness when it came to interpret Scripture in the form of the Fourth Gospel.

The other influence was that of the Syriac School in Edessa, the position of which was a mean between that of Origen and that of Antioch. Chase considers that this school had a wide influence and combined literalness with allegory, instancing the wide influence of Lucian at this time, and also of Dorotheus. The school was distinguished for its wide culture and learning. Antioch drew from these two streams of Syria and Alexandria.

The time of the greatest influence of the Antiochene school was in the Fourth Century. Two factors turned scholars to a deeper understanding of the Scriptures:-

(a) The acceptance of Christianity as the recognised religion of the Empire, which had the effect of making the Apologist into the Exegete.

(b) The fight against Arianism which compelled theologians to interpret the Scriptures.

The works of Athanasius for example are one continuous appeal to Scripture, and the interpreters saw the value of sober logical and exact methods of interpretation. (Although, it is important to see, that no interpreter was ever fanciful or allegorical on matters of doctrine or of Christ's teaching: they were all far more literalist than they are given credit for,). The " Bluthezeit " then of the Antiochene School may be regarded as the product of internal proclivities and external circumstances.

New men have more influenced the interpretation of Scripture than Diodore. His works are lost but not his effect. He resisted paganism without under Julian, and within under Arius, but his great influence was on the lives of his scholars. As an interpreter,

Socrates says that he avoided allegory and investigated the literal sense of Scripture, and from the traces of his comments still preserved to us, this would seem a fair judgement.

Such was the setting in which Chrysostom began, but before turning our thoughts in detail to the man and his interpretation of Scripture, we must just make a brief note on the decline of this school of which he was its greatest light, and its influence on Christendom.

The saint himself was restored to his rightful place within a generation of his martyrdom, but Nestorianism brought suspicion on the school and completely paralysed its energies. The harmful effects of doctrinal dispute are too well known to any scholar to need mentioning, and not the least of these was the appalling check given to Biblical studies. No scholars arose to fill the places of these great Antiochenes. Without Chrysostom, the influence might have perished altogether, for Diodore and Theodore were suspect. Saintly John was never suspect, and his writings have never been used in any party dispute.

The first influence can be traced in the Greek Catenists from the 6th to the 11th century who mined the great wealth of the Antiochenes.

The second was in the Syriac and Eastern Asiatic Churches. When the Nestorians found no home within the Empire they moved to Edessa and were ^{driven} ~~driven~~ from there to Nisibis, where a strong school flourished reflecting the mind of Theodore. It is a fact, even if regrettable, that the expositions of Theodore, (possibly our greatest exegete), are still available only in Syriac, which rather closes him to western students generally.

The third was in the West. The West was always kind to Chrysostom and in his exile gave him much support and loyalty, and through him the Antiochene School made its mark here.

(As for his influence in later times, during the Reformation Chrysostom's reputation stood higher in England than it did on the continent. Luther found him uncongenial but Erasmus wrote of him, " hic sic miscuit utile dulci ut nemo felicius. Sed inter varia spiritus dona, praecipue in illo eminet τὸ διδακτικόν . " In his preface to the Bible, Cranmer quoted a long passage written by "the noble doctor and most moral divine S. John Chrysostom". In the Homilies "the learned and Godly doctor Chrysostom" is quoted more often than any other Father, except Augustine. He is quoted in the margin of the A.V. Acts 13¹⁸ and is the only one so quoted. His collect is familiar to every Englishman).

B. CHRYSOSTOM HIMSELF.

To turn now to the man himself, and his place in society.

Chrysostom had the rich endowments of a great mind, and the spiritual beauty of a pure religious life. With this combination of gifts, he earned in his own day the reward of a famed preacher, and in a later day, the glory of the martyr for truth and righteousness.

He had an infinite capacity to toil and endure for his Master, and the complete inability either to compromise his message or conform to the world. His natural gift of eloquence was at once the ally and instrument of a hopeful temper, a firm will and a large heart: as in all great preachers, these gifts were intensified by a vivid sensitivity to the realities of the Christian Faith, and also by a heart

on fire with divine love. He was not called to be a champion of the faith in a time of controversy, like Athanasius or Cyril, but was a powerful protagonist in the Church's witness for truth and righteousness against a worldly and corrupt court on the one hand, and a nominal time-serving Christianity on the other. Chrysostom failed to break the one or change the other: his triumph lay in his integrity, his suffering and his death.

Returning to Antioch where he had studied under the heathen sophist Libanius, after failing to find salvation in monasticism and ruining his health in the effort, he was priested in 386. He achieved success immediately as a great preacher, for allied to his great gifts he had the unerring instinct of seizing on the topical event and converting it to Christ.

It is a strange irony of history that Chrysostom's greatness was seen by that wicked scoundrel of the bedchamber Eutropius, who persuaded Arcadius to make Chrysostom Patriarch of Constantinople. He must have known his man, for Chrysostom was literally captured and forced into this high office.

The saintly scholar first had a refreshing effect on Constantinople. Characteristically, he gave away all the riches of his predecessors for the building of hospitals and care of the poor, and lived alone in the greatest simplicity almost without food. He reformed and punished a very lax clergy, and sent missionaries to Persia and Scythia. Above all he fearlessly preached the truth and this was the cause of his earthly downfall (or heavenly ascent). It distressed Eutropius and turned him into a bitter enemy when he found that his nominee was no sycophant but rather an incomprehensible firebrand who could not understand the ways of the men of the world.

(Yet it is to Chrysostom's abiding glory, that when Eutropius fell on evil times, it was to the saint he had injured that he finally turned for help, and not to his "friends"). The Emperor had no mind at all. The traditions of the See of Constantinople were all on the side of flattery and time-serving, and a Patriarch who loved Christ and man and was not disobedient to the heavenly vision was either incomprehensible or even embarrassing. Theophilus of Alexandria, (who had been foiled in his effort to place his own nominee in the See), was against Chrysostom from the start. Finally, the Empress Eudoxia, the fiery Frank maiden, at first a devotee of the bishop, turned against him with all the fury of an unprincipled and masterful woman.

On the other hand, Chrysostom had the weakness of his strength. He was never fitted for such office, and he knew it. He had no genius for government, as for example, Ambrose (whose life gives many interesting parallels). At heart he was a severe, inflexible monk of no patience with men weaker than himself, and incurred all the unpopularity that inevitably comes to a reformer. He was another John Baptist in type.

While he enjoyed the patronage of the court, he did good work. Indeed he was so beloved of the common people, that his enemies realised that the only way he could be removed was by intrigue, and the Origenistic controversy gave the opportunity. Condemned by a partisan conference at The Oak on a few trivial charges (not Origenism), Eudoxia persuaded Arcadius to banish him. Chrysostom nobly offered himself, knowing the severity of the punishment his people would incur should they demonstrate. This they did to a man when they found their leader gone, and Eudoxia terrified out of her

wits by an earthquake which she thought God's reply to her sin, suddenly gave way and the prelate was brought back in torchlight and song to his own Cathedral.

Knowing Chrysostom,(and knowing the world),the day was but delayed and not averted. Eudoxia,through Theophilus,engineered another council in 403 which deposed Chrysostom,but which Chrysostom ignored and quietly went on working incensing his enemies to a fury. After frightful scenes of fighting and bloodshed ,Chrysostom was taken away to the Tauris mountains.Strangely enough,relieved of the strain,the old man recovered new strength,enough to further missions and correspond with his sympathisers throughout the Empire."Never did sorrow,illness or other anxieties turn aside our John from the anxiety as to propagating the Faith". This was too much for his enemies who ordered him on a three months march to the Euxine. They desired his death,but wanted circumstances to do it for them. Cruel whippings were given if anybody stopped on the road to speak to the great man making his last pilgrimage. His guards were ordered to give him neither rest nor refreshment and were promised reward if the saint should not make the journey. He did not.

Thus died one of our greatest men,praising God for all things.Whatever his faults,his witness in life and in death to the cause of righteousness and to the rightful independence of the Church against the usurped authority and corrupt influence of the imperial court,(which wrecked not only Chrysostom but indeed the Christianity of the East for it was first a prey to heresy and then to Islam),rises to a saintly grandeur. That one of the most eminent bishops should combine with a corrupt court to harry and destroy the Church's greatest teacher and preacher,indicates that the Eastern

Church was a temporal rather than a spiritual organisation, and for this reason succumbed.

C. AS AN INTERPRETER OF SCRIPTURE.

His Antiochene training and his "Sitz im Leben" shed a flood of light on Chrysostom's exposition of Scripture. The former made his exegesis literal and the second moral. More than that he scarcely ever went. His sole desire was to make Christ more real and religion more relevant.

The homilies on the Fourth Gospel which we are examining are not an exposition of the Fourth Gospel in any real sense at all. As Cyril made the Fourth Gospel a medium of presenting theology, so Chrysostom made it a medium of presenting morality. To say this is to condemn neither, for each was making the Gospel relevant to the live issues of his day. Chrysostom was right. Theology pure would have been no help in the situation which confronted him, for it would have removed men's minds from the real issue and given support implicitly to their wickedness. Only Chrysostom would know how urgent it was that man should see the vision of God's will for them before it was too late. (How frequently he refers to that urgency and the Judgement waiting a wrong decision!). Had Chrysostom succeeded, or even had there been another one or perhaps two such, to carry on and fulfil his work, the whole story of Eastern Christendom, might have told another and better tale.

Let us then examine Chrysostom as a scholar and critic, and then turn to him as an interpreter of Scripture.

1. As a scholar and critic.

In his popular exposition, Chrysostom did not shrink

from a technical discussion of grammatical minutiae, and felt bound to bring out latent shades of meaning or the precise force of ambiguous words. In all his work he turned a scholarly accuracy to his service.

The later writers of the Antiochene School showed little interest in pure textual questions, and Chase thinks that this is probably due to Chrysostom's belief that the matter of the text had been largely or authoritatively settled. Consider a few of these textual questions that appear in Chrysostom:-

- (a) The discussion of variant readings is rare:- e.g.

²⁸
John 1 ταῦτα ἐγένετο ἐν βηθανίᾳ

He decides in favour of βηθαβσαῖ, doubtless following Origen (Westcott and Hort), but his real reason is plausibility, and not textual criticism as such. The same principle determines his reading of ἦσαν in John 17⁷.

- (b) Questions of punctuation receive more frequent and more adequate treatment:-

³⁴
John 1 χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἐν ᾧ
 γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν.

He does not allow the stop after οὐδὲ ἐν as the heretics do in their desire to speak of the Holy Spirit as a creature.

²⁷
John 5 Chrysostom would put the stop after κρίσιν ποιῆν and then continue, ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶ μὴ θαυμάζετε. The ordinary punctuation he assigns to Paul of Samosata, adding that in it all connection is sacrificed.

³⁸
John 7 Chrysostom meets the difficulty as to the quotation by putting the stop(ὑποτίξαι δεῖ) after ἡ γραφή. "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture said". The following clause is then the Lord's

(c) Like all preachers Chrysostom quoted from memory and this must account often for some of his readings:-

- John 5¹³ He substitutes ἐξέκλινεν for the harder word ἐξένωσε .
 John 6⁴⁶ He substitutes ἐκ for παρὰ .
 John 7¹ He reads :- οὐ γὰρ εἶχεν ἐξουσίαν ἐν τῇ
 Ἰουδαίᾳ περιπατεῖν ,

explaining that the strong expression refers to Christ's human nature.

- John 8⁵⁷ He reads τεσσαράκοντα for πενήκοντα .
 John 11⁵⁴ He substitutes Ἐφρατά for Ἐφραίμ .

Two things must be borne in mind:-

- (i) Many changes had come over the Greek language,
 and (ii) Chrysostom was giving the spoken word to humbler folk.

(d) The Article. He pointed out its importance and emphasis in words like ὁ λόγος , ὁ Χριστός , ὁ προφήτης , where it served to isolate the noun. In doctrinal issues he presses the point hard, for instance, in respect to the Son and His titles. When heretics expounded καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος as implying inferiority of the Deity of the Son, Chrysostom urged several arguments:-

- (1) the anarthrous θεός is used of the Father ,
 (2) in this passage the article is superfluous.

(3) the expression πνεῦμα ὁ θεός
must be compared .

(4) the words ὁ θεός⁸ are applied
to the son in Hebrews 1 .

(e) The Verb

The importance of the present tense is that it denotes
continuing action - John 1²⁹ . He takes away the sin of the
world and is ever doing so.

In the passage ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος ,
he says that ὦν applied to man denotes present time, but
when used of God implies eternity, so that the word ἦν when
referring to our human nature signifies past time and that
completed, but when it relates to God expresses eternity.

(f) Conjunctions, particles etc.

Often ὅτι is discussed contending a final or
consecutive sense, e.g. John 9³ , 9³⁹ , 11⁴ and 17¹² . Of course,
there lies behind this the much deeper issue of the nature of
Antiochene theology, which considered that God is good, man is
free, Evil is permitted, not caused, by God, and man is free
to choose the good or the evil. (cf. the treatment of Judas).

Again ὅτι in John 12³⁹ where Chrysostom says that a
result is meant not a reason.

Or again ὡς does not denote comparison or
likeness but means a strong assertion (John 1¹⁴)

John 1³ διὰ in πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο does
not imply inferiority because other scriptures contradict

such a meaning, and also the preposition is used of the Father in
 1 Corinthians 1 .

) He occasionally uses the etymology of a word to help
 out his exegesis as for instance *χρῆματα* where he
 emphasises the transitoriness of wealth which we are to use and
 not allow it to use us.

This list of grammatical points is indicative and in
 no sense complete, but it would not be fair to the Antiochene school
 to omit it.

So then, let us turn to Chrysostom's handling of the
 Old Testament and then of the New testament.

2. As Interpreter of the Old Testament

Chrysostom, unlike Theodore, accepted the Canon of the
 LXX, without question, but like most of the Greek Fathers was no
 Hebrew scholar, and therefore was wont to use the LXX as a final
 authority and to argue from it as from the original. When he is
 considered as an expounder of the Old Testament, we really
 consider him as an expounder of the Greek Bible.

The Marcionites and the Manicheeans fiercely assailed
 the place early Christianity gave to the Old Testament, but
 Chrysostom held firm to the conviction that the writers of the
 New Testament were the kith and kin of the writers of the Old
 Testament. To him there was only one body, i.e. the faithful:-
 the faithful who are, the faithful who were, and the faithful who
 shall be. In his comments of John 8⁴⁵⁻⁷ he says, ".....if they

As far as the historical books were interpreted, their historical character must be honestly recognised, or the spiritual significance would be missed or marred. Doctrine must be built on the rock of historical interpretation.

As examples:-

1. The formation of Eve from Adam teaches the true relation of woman to man, and God's kindness to man.
2. Abraham's 318 servants is read in a literal and homely manner.
3. The eighth day for Circumcision was chosen by a merciful God that the pain would be less.

Chrysostom could and did find a spiritual meaning on an historical event (e.g. The Passover), but first he considered the historical event as pure history, and only rarely did he allegorise. He was very kind to the Patriarchs in their sins, (this had always been the custom), but he was perfectly natural with other personages e.g. David, whom he considered a murderer and adulterer.

At the same time, the typological character of Old Testament history was clearly recognised, and this fact saved the Antiochenes both from a servility to the letter and also from the vagaries of the allegorist. There were three different ways of interpreting, Chrysostom maintained (V. 188. 6).

(a) Literal

(b) Other than literal (e.g. the wolf shall lie down with the lamb)

(c) Two-fold sense i.e. We must grasp the actual and historical and also interpret the spiritual (τὰ τε αἰσθητὰ νοούμενα καὶ τὰ νοητὰ ἐκδεχόμενοι) as in the story of Isaac.

In the case of (b) Scripture generally interprets itself, in the case of (c) the important Old Testament types are included. It is of interest to note some of these latter:-

- α Noah - a type of Christ.
- β The Ark - the Church; the dove; the Holy Spirit; the olive leaf, the kindness of God.
- γ Leah and Rachel - the synagogue and the Church respectively.
- δ The Burning Bush - our Lord's Body, which died but was not held by death.
- ε Rahab and Ruth - the Church, exalted by the love of Christ.

There is a measure of fancy here, and it is interesting to record these in an Antiochene, but it is important to notice his constant anxiety to preserve the true historical character of the type. He said that he was not an irresponsible exponent (κύριος), but could only allegorise when he was following the mind of scripture.

To turn to his handling of the prophets. Again, it is of paramount importance to know the historical setting in which the words were given. For instance, whilst the ancient commentators saw in Isaiah 4¹ "seven women shall take hold of one man" an evangelical prophecy, Chrysostom saw in it the severe destruction of males in war. Being severely historical, he tended to look for historical forecasts. Even in poetry as e.g. the Psalms, Chrysostom still keeps in view the historical setting.

The prophet is not a μάγισ like Balaam. He is a conscious agent moved by the Holy Spirit. Neither is he a στοχαστής, a man of the world speaking from a long experience.

Nor is he merely a *εὐαγγελιστής*, for he speaks only of some of Christ's life, He is the *ἐρμηνευτής τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and the manner of his vision permits of no interpretation in human language.

From this conception arises Chrysostom's emphasis of the prophet as a preacher, and a moral power. Also, he was always sensitive in prophecy to the deep diapason of the rejection of Jewry, together with the minuteness of the Messianic prophecies.

Four main Canons of interpretation seem to emerge in his treatment of the Prophetic Books:-

1. A passage used by our Lord or by the New Testament writers was decisive as to its prophetic character and meaning.
2. A prophecy may lie embedded in a passage having no connection with the passage.
3. The force of a prophecy is not spent on those to whom it originally applies.
4. Conclusions based on these principles are perfectly valid for Christian doctrine i.e. a Psalm may "prove" a point of Christian doctrine and establish it, like for instance the Divine Nature of our Lord, or even His Humanity.

As far as the sapiential books are concerned, though there is little preserved, it would seem that Chrysostom considered himself freer to allegorise here than elsewhere. Perhaps it was that grammar and logic were of little help in interpreting proverbs or even, that the Catenists preserved only a few colourful interpretations.

3. As Interpreter of the New Testament.

Chrysostom notes that only two of the disciples wrote Gospels, and both were of humble birth. The common factor of all four was their truthfulness, and while pointing out the differences between John on the one hand and the Synoptists on the other he notes that the former does not neglect Christ's human life nor the latter His eternal pre-existence. (Vll. 7 Vlll. 27, 96, 101). He notices, too, the differences between the Synoptists themselves and believed Matthew to be the earliest and Luke and Mark followers of his Gospel.

The later date of the Fourth Gospel suggests an explanation of its characteristics. Many events recorded by the Synoptists are therefore omitted by John (Vlll. 97). Hence, too, the complete silence as to the Lord's prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem. At the same time, the impression is that he gives an early date to John although it is the last Gospel, for he considers references to people like Malchus and Lazarus (ad loc.) and places like Bethany and Bethabara (ad loc.) as given for verification by eye witnesses.

While the Fourth Gospel is for him definite enough, yet again and again he points out that the facts of our Lord's life occupy less space here than in the Synoptists. The aim of the Evangelist was "to devote the larger part of his Book to the words and discourses of the Lord" (Vlll. 248). "This Apostle is very lofty, full of many sublime doctrines, and lingering over them more than over aught else". The other Evangelists had treated of the Lord's earthly life (τῷ τῆς οἰκονομίας

λόγῳ

); Saint John's special function was to bear

witness to His Divinity(Vll.7).But this "Spiritual Gospel" is not the ideal rdmance of a docetic phantom ,e.g.in matters like the weeping of Jesus he speaks more pointedly than the Synoptists. Indeed,the Incarnation is τὸ κεφάλιον in the matter of our salvation. You sense in Chrysostom's commentary a strong background of the Anomoean heresy which emphasises his teaching on our Lord's real humanity.

It should perhaps be added here that there was only One Gospel to Chysostom.Their disagreements served only to emphasise the independent integrity of each.

Lastly,Chrysostom warns against illusory parallels between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists.There are two callings of the disciples and two eleansings of the Temple. The Nobleman of John is not the Centurion of Matthew,and Matthew's paralytic is not John's. Twice the Lord walked on the sea:twice was He anointed.

Before discussing the Johannine discourses,it is convenient to indicate Chrysostom's attitude to miracles and also to parables.

In the Old Testament miracles were wrought mainly to impress non-Israelites or overawe the conqueror in Egypt or Babylon,though some were performed purely for the sake of the children of Israel e.g.in the wilderness. When pure religion was established miracles ceased. In the New Testament they were the outward signs of a great spiritual crisis,Christ's credentials, vouchsafed for the dullness of man. He who converts the rain into wine converts Eis water into wine. He was active in a more personal and immediate manner.This was a proof of His equality with the

Father. But, always the didactic note is struck: teaching is for the thoughtful, signs for the fuller minds. Consider, as an example, the healing of the paralytic, the purpose of which was to teach the grace of baptism as a remedy against sin.

The main object of parables was to put Himself on a level with His hearers, though Chrysostom often remarks on Christ's difference of method when He is dealing with the Scribes and Pharisees. (A point T.W.Manson develops with great profit in his "Teaching of Jesus"). Parables also give a savour to His teaching and make it more abiding. And what is most interesting of all, and most illuminating too, the purpose of them was not doctrine but virtue. Further, he disliked pressing every detail of a parable into service: he always discerned the leading thought and developed that.

In his interpretation of the Fourth Gospel the dogmatic interest is stronger, yet never to the exclusion of Christainity as a practical and instant way of life. Chrysostom is always the teacher and preacher of the homely reality of our Master and only incidentally the theologian.

To illustrate:-

In the Nicodemus incident theology is discussed. In the first place a truer understanding of the nature and practice of Baptism (v.12) on Baptismal Regeneration, also the Virgin Birth (that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit) together with the Divinity of the Holy Spirit.

In the charge of Sabbath breaking (John 5¹⁷) he defends the disciples by reference to David, but Himself by reference to the Father whom he claimed in a special

378

sense as his own(*ἰδιόζωντος*). The unity of Father and Son is emphasised here.

In John 7 he discusses Christ's appearing and disappearing at His own volition which proved His Manhood and His Godhead thereby refuting both Marcion and also Paul of Samosata.

In the Bread of Life discourse it would be quite fair to say his interpretation is Eucharistic, though it must be admitted not wholly so. The Bread might mean either His Body, or the saving doctrines and faith in Him. This shows Chrysostom's genuine and impartial fairmindedness in seeking the true interpretation of a passage as intended by its author.

In the Raising of Lazarus Christ prays to God at the grave side to show that His Will and God's Will are one, and in calling Lazarus forth in His Own Name, and not in the Name of God, there is an assertion of equality with God.

As for the Supper discourses they are in part controversial and directed against the assaults of Arians, Sabellians and Macedonians. This was perhaps inevitable, even if regrettable; controversy is a wrong activity for an interpreter of Scripture, e.g. in John 14²⁰ he discusses the unity of Essence; in John 16²¹ the Resurrection, for a man is born, not a child, and in John 20 the doctrine of the Ascension.

As far as Chrysostom's interpretation of Acts goes (his work on Acts is not universally considered as genuine), we can use his own words:- "The Gospels are a history of what the Christ did and said; the Acts of what the other Paraclete did and said".

The main lines of the Apostolic teaching are laid down. The Apostles say little of Christ's Divinity but emphasise His coming from the Father. He sees in Acts the detailed working out of a Divine *oikonomia*.

With regard to his interpretation of Paul there is nothing striking to say, beyond that Chrysostom was an admirer and was "continually in his company". He seemed to have an extraordinary idea of Paul's "illiteracy", (alleged!), which no student of the New Testament can share. He was also very ignorant of Jewish customs and modes of thought and frequently failed to understand because of this. He was also insensitive to Paul's metaphors, as he was to some extent to Christ's poetry and paradox. But he knew that each Epistle was written for a purpose and that an Epistle could not be interpreted until that purpose was clearly understood. And in this connection, the historical context of each Epistle was of crucial importance. He was always wary of drawing conclusions from particular texts, and always strove to understand the context and the mind of the author. He had a quick eye for the pastoral in Paul, but of course he was a true pastor himself which was the root cause of his relevance and sincerity as a preacher. His main Canons of interpretation may be summarised :-

- (a) Knowing the date, place, purpose, general plan and comparison with the other Epistles.
- (b) The mind and intent of the writer must be examined and no conclusions drawn from mere "bare words".
- (c) The importance of studying a text in its entirety and its context. For instance, "Paul interprets his meaning in the words which follow". IX. 531. D

CONCLUSIONS

To Chrysostom the plain, historical, grammatical and literal sense of Scripture was the primary and almost exclusive one. Even in places, like for example *3v δευδς*, where every commentator has seen a spiritual significance, Chrysostom stubbornly interprets in its primary sense of fact - it was night, and that was the fact.

Chrysostom lends little support to the seeking of interpretative principles in the early commentators. Indeed, the entire school of Antioch stands utterly apart. The school made a great contribution to Biblical studies, and the reading of their comments and criticisms is singularly modern and refreshing. It produced a valuable balance to the rather unpredictable exegesis of the allegorical schools.

But, it had great failings. It was insensitive to all the colour of Christ's teaching, His poetry and paradox. The Bible after all is not history, but the interpretation of history, and that in the special sense of God's action in history. The historical and philological techniques are essential to any true exegesis, but unaided they yield impoverished and barren conclusions. Indeed many modern commentaries stop short here, and Hoskyns produced a much needed stimulus to theological exposition in his commentary. Without insight into the spirit and meaning of a passage, grammar and logic defeat their purpose.

A close reading of Chrysostom however, shows that he was in no sense bound to the literal technique, and as indicated in the text, often gave an allegorical or spiritual interpretation. Before discussing the Johannine incidents, it is worth mentioning a few instances of spiritual interpretation in him.

For example, he contrasts the disciples and speaks of them as types, e.g. in the cases of Nathanael and Nicodemus and in the discussion of the Samaritan Woman and her comparison with the Jews. Light and darkness are considered as truth on the one hand, and sin and error on the other. He interprets history as a type of Christian salvation e.g. in the deliverance from Egypt, the story of the Passover and other details of Jewish history. The significance of the riding on the ass is not merely to show humility but the subjection of the Gentiles to Him. The foot washing means the washing of conscience. In John 16¹⁶ childbirth is given a mystical interpretation. All these instances are discussed more fully in their place in the text, and are only given here to show that even Chrysostom used the allegorical or spiritual interpretation. They are in no sense exhaustive, but are simple instances which occur to the memory. With Chrysostom, however, you have the feeling that he never goes further in his spiritual interpretation than Scripture had already gone before Him, in, for example, Paul, and his interpretation of the Old Testament, and also in John and in Hebrews. Though the spiritual interpretation is not marked or even obvious, it is yet there, but limited and guarded.

To examine the Johannine incidents:-

The water and the wine

As Jesus worked then, changing water into wine, so the new works still changing our weak and unstable wills that they may be no longer washy (*διαρρεῖν*) but have body (*ἐπεστυμμένον*), and in the change bring gladness to ourselves and others. The watery people are those of this world.

The Cleansing of the Temple

This incident is expounded as an historical event without any spiritualising.

Nicodemus

Chrysostom speaks of Nicodemus entangled in Jewish infirmity, coming to Jesus by night, and failing to learn because of asking the wrong question. Only a cleansed life, illuminated by the Light of Knowledge can understand Christ.

He develops the incident as an exposition of Baptism, and discusses the Old Testament types in much detail. Here he declares that Nicodemus' real sin is unbelief, and moves on to consider unbelief and its effects on the human soul.

He does not say that Nicodemus is a type of the human soul, but certainly considers him as such.

The Samaritan Woman.

He compares her very favourably with Nicodemus and also with Jewry, neither having the desire to learn which she shows; he even chides his listeners with the same condemnation.

Chrysostom expounds the passage to indicate that what the woman was seeking was spiritual things and it was precisely those to which Christ was leading her. Water as such is not ~~discussed~~ discussed at all. Further, the field and the harvest indicate souls ready for salvation. He also makes the point of the real connection between the Old Testament and the New Testament for the prophets had done much of the sowing). The whole incident is expounded as the soul's seeking for truth, which is its salvation, and which is given by Christ. This exposition is very similar to that of most of the Fathers.

The Nobleman's Son

Chrysostom emphasises the cure of the nobleman rather than his son and this is significant. The value of the sign lay not in the cure of the physical disease of the son, but in the cure of the spiritual disease of the father - the disease of half-belief, or even unbelief. Christ showed here that His real purpose was to heal the sick in mind by His teaching, and that His real care was for souls rather than bodies.

The Impotent Man

At the outset, Chrysostom describes the incident as a mystery, signifying Baptism in type and figure. As the water needed an angel, so the water of baptism needs the Spirit. The miracle was to show men that Christ's desire was to cure souls. The 38 years is spiritualised.

The disease had been produced by the man's sins. It was the man's sin that was being removed by the work of Christ, and his cure was complete, for he walked by himself.

The incident is treated as the salvation of man in sin by the coming of Christ to cure him.

The feeding of the 5,000

The important part of Christ's work lies in the discourses and sermons, the signs are given for people of lower spiritual discernment i.e. they are meant to teach and signify something other than they were.

Chrysostom here actually spiritualises Christ's journey from Jerusalem to Galilee as a sign that He was annulling the Law.

His parallels with Moses and Elisha are given to emphasise the didactic significance of the sign. In other words, the event is spiritualised - as of course the Evangelist meant it to be.

The Jews in their obtuseness do not see the spiritual teaching, but keep their mind on manna. But manna was a type and not the truth, and the truth was Christ.

This truth Chrysostom interprets in two ways:-

- (a) Faith in Him and His Teaching
- (b) Receiving of Him in the Eucharist.

Both are equally taught, although more time is given to the latter. He refers here to the blood in the Old Testament frightening away death at the Passover as the figure of Christ's blood destroying death for the believer. This teaching, of the believer receiving Christ's Body and Blood, he describes as fact and not enigma. God had fed the Jews for 40 years without harvest or corn, now, under the New Covenant, He shall feed His children and give them not merely long days but eternal life. Such words are of no profit to the carnally minded.

The Man born blind

Many of the details in the incident are made to carry a spiritual significance e.g. the clay and the spittle, and the pool Siloam, and are examined in their place.

Chrysostom says that the real work of God is bringing faith to man, and this is the significance of Christ giving sight. It is in this context that the incident is interpreted (see the discussion ad loc).

Again it is revealing to find Chrysostom giving the historical incident a spiritual meaning.

ST. AUGUSTINE

1. Summary of his exegesis of the Fourth Gospel. Page 382

2. Conclusions

Page 453

(a) St. Augustine as expositor, with a note on his philosophical position. (p. 453)

(b) His exegesis of the episodes of the Fourth Gospel. (p. 471)

1. Summary of his exegesis of the Fourth Gospel.

1-5

John 1

Lofty mountains are the first to reflect the light of the sun, so John the Evangelist was one of the elevated souls first to receive and reflect the Light of Truth. But such only reflect the light, and are not a light in themselves.

Christ is God's idea, i.e. His Word, the Inner Word made known in act. A carpenter has an idea of a chest and makes one; the chest decays, but the idea remains; thus is God's idea to be understood.

The Word of God was not made, for by it was all created being made. The life of all created things is in the Word, as the living idea is in the mind of the artist. The Word is the light of rational men, seen only by the pureⁱⁿ/heart. Men cannot see this Life in Christ : as men, blinded by dust cannot see, so men because they are blinded by sin,, cannot see spiritually.

6-14

John 1

The Cross is the plank on which one can cross the sea of this world to God. Christ walked the sea to show there was a way over the sea. Despise not the plank.

John came to point out Christ - he reflected Christ as an object reflects the sun when one cannot look at it.

He was in the world from the beginning - not by local habitation, but within it as its Creator. world-lovers knew him not, but some received Him. The Only Son came to make brethren to Himself, i.e. adopted sons.

God was born of men, that men might be born of God. Born of God that He might create us : born of woman that He might re-create

us. "By flesh the ill, by flesh the remedy." Earth makes the eye sore, yet earth in the form of salve heals it. His majesty is only seen by His humility.

15-18

John 1

The Law prepared sick souls for the Physician. The Physician is Man seen, and God unseen. Man is better than the animals in the respect of being in the image of God. The Word of God is the Light and Life of all minds. It was manifest in the flesh, but only to the faithful. These receive of his fulness, grace for grace. The first grace received was grace to believe : then eternal life for believing. We never deserved anything but punishment, therefore, what we did receive was grace, granted gratuitously. Grace for grace is life eternal. Death came by the first Adam, life by the second, the one a man only, the other God man. This grace was not in the Old Testament, but it made ready for the Physician who was to come in grace and truth : it bound him in bandages till the Physician came. He cures with sharp medicines.

The law was given by a servant : it made men guilty. The pardon was given by an Emperor : it set the guilty free.

Grace and truth did not come by Moses for no man had seen God except Christ who was in the bosom of the Father. It was an angel that spoke to Moses bearing the type of the Lord : he could not see God. The Jews have the same Decalogue, but the reward promised to them was the destruction of their enemies, and the gift of the promised land. Our promise is eternal life. Our real longing is for righteousness. Love God not for reward, let Himself be the reward.

19-33

John 1

The Prophets foretold, but John pointed out with his finger. Christ first came concealed, but next comes manifestly. John must

have been great to have been believed as the Christ.

384

The Jews stumbled over Christ as a small stone. But he was the stone cut out of the mountains without hands which grew into a mountain and filled the earth. (Daniel 2). Without hands indicates Christ born of a Virgin, without act of man.

John was prophecy itself. "ego sum ipsa prophetia". (Hom. 4)⁷
He humbly said that he was not worthy even to unloose His latchet, and from this reproves the Donatists' pride, and says it is the Lamb of God not they who remove sin. (It was the Donatists' belief that only a holy priesthood was valid, but Augustine maintained that the unworthiness of a minister did not invalidate the sacraments). Christ allowed himself to be baptised that none should think himself above it : He came to die for men, and therefore had to be baptised for men.

³³
John 1

John knew Jesus to be Christ, but there was a regard in which he "knew Him not." What John administered is called John's Baptism: our baptism is wholly the Baptism of Christ . i.e. Authority is His, but the ministry His servants'. The Baptism is Christ's, whether ministered by good or bad (contra Donatists). What is a bad minister where there is a good Lord? Donatists rob men of Christ and therefore are worse than heathen persecutors.

³³
John 1

The Holy Spirit came under the form of a dove, to teach us to mourn like a dove. The Holy Spirit came in two forms (a) dove and (b) fire

- (a) Upon the Lord when he was baptised - simplicity
- (b) Upon the disciples when they met together - fervency.

In the Baptism was manifested Trinity - Father in the Voice, Son in the man and Spirit in the Dove. The authority of Baptism

lies in Christ, not in the minister. (contra Donatists). The disciples are to go to all nations and baptise them.

Catholics allow the baptism of Donatists and they, the baptism of evil ministers of their own. Baptism itself is not sufficient for salvation. Faith without charity, is valueless. Augustine here justifies the deprivation of the endowments of Heretics.

John 1 34-51

Christ was the Lamb, whose blood redeemed the world; the Lamb who after death slew the lion (Devil). To resort to heathen practices is to give place to the Devil.

The two disciples came and abode with Him. Let us make a house in our heart where He may come and teach us. The tenth hour indicates that Jesus was the fulfilment of the 10-commandments - Christ was the "Master" of the Law. By Him, as our Lawyer, we petition the Heavenly Emperor.

Nathanael is specially commended by Christ, but is not an apostle, because he was learned; he was without guile, and without the duplicity that cloaks sin. He was under the fig tree, signifying, under the shadow of death. He represents the Elect lying under sin, but foreknown, called and justified.

The heavens opening and angels descending and ascending Augustine refers to the dream of Jacob, who, in anointing the stone, pre-figured Christ the anointed one. The angels ascending and descending are the preachers who in imitating Christ ascend, and in preaching Him descend.

John 2¹⁻⁴

The same Lord turns rain into wine every year and we do not marvel. The growth of a seed is a continuous wonder. God performs an occasional miracle to rouse men from slumber to worship Him. It is a greater miracle for one to be born, than for one to be made alive from the dead. Miracles are only more strange not more mighty than the daily operations of God i.e. of Christ. We turn our faces to the things done and our backs to God.

Something mysterious and sacramental lies concealed in this miracle.

The mystery of the marriage is that Christ is wedded to our flesh.

The mystery of "Woman, what have I to do with thee", heretics absurdly infer as to mean Christ had no mother, but heretics handle the Word^{with}/partiality. He begs His hearers to knock by prayer and not to approach the gate of truth wrangling. First, believe all that is written, then seek to understand what is written. Augustine animadverts against the Manichees and the astrologers. His mother was requiring a miracle : but a miracle could only be wrought by His divine nature and His mother^{was the mother}/of His human nature. He did not recognise her here, but did on the cross, when His human nature was dying. Christ's hour was of His own Will, not of necessity. His mission was to be performed first.

John 2¹⁻¹¹

What is the inner significance of this miracle?

Christ came to the marriage to approve of marriage as an Institution.

The water in this miracle signifies Prophecy which had never failed to speak of Christ. In water wine is in a sort latent.

Read the prophetic books, and if you do not discern Christ, they are flat and insipid. Discern Christ and they now taste and even inebriate.

387

Quoting Luke 24⁴⁴⁻⁷, Augustine says that it was in the Law, Prophets and the Psalms that Christ said he was prophesied. The disciples were void of understanding : this was water. He opened their understanding, that was to change the water into wine. He did not turn the water out - He changed it. The old scripture is from God, but has no taste apart from Christ.

The six water pots are the six ages of the world :-

1. Adam-Noah, 2. Noah-Abraham, 3. Abraham-David, 4. David-the Captivity, 5. Captivity-John Baptist, 6. John Baptist-end of world.

Man was made on the sixth day because in this sixth age is the renewal of our mind in Christ. The "two or three" firkins indicates the Trinity ; the Holy Spirit being understood in the presence of the Father and the Son.

He then enlarges on the significance of each of these periods:-

1. While Adam sleeps, Eve is formed from his side. When Christ is dead, His side is smitten with a spear that there may flow forth sacraments to form the Church.
2. Christ was foreshadowed in Noah, and in the Ark the whole world. All animals signify all nations. By wood the world was delivered, on wood the Life of the world was crucified.
3. Abraham. His son bore the wood to his own sacrifice, as the Lord bore His own cross.
4. David. The emphasis is to all nations. And here Augustine says that the four letters of Adam represent the four corners of

the earth in Greek :-

388

Ἀνατολή	(E)	A
Δύσις	(W)	D
Ἄρκτος	(N)	A
Μεσημβρία	(S)	M

5. The stone cut out from the mountains breaks all the kingdoms of the earth (Dan. 2³⁴⁻⁵). This stone, rejected by the builders, is now the head of the corner.

6. John Baptist declared it in his preaching. He concludes that the six water pots figuratively represent prophecy as reaching to all nations.

At the end of this section on Augustine conclusions are drawn and discussed, but at this stage it is worth pointing out that the miracle is made to tell the story of man's redemption in Christ, foreordained from the foundation of the world.

THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE.

John 2 12-21

The brethren of the Lord are those who do His will. The sellers are typified by those who seek their own :- i.e. the sellers of doves are those who sell the Holy Spirit for temporal seats, (He instances here Simon Magus and the Donatists); the sellers of oxen are those who sell the scriptures and give not Truth; the sellers of sheep are those who sell their very congregations. We too must be eaten up with zeal for the House of God : each in his own place must win souls for Christ

The temple of Christ's body is of Adam. In Adam the 46 years are accounted for :-

A	-	1
D	-	4
A	-	1
M	-	40
		<u>46</u>

The temple was 46 years in building and Christ in 3 days raised it up :

389

Augustine makes his allegory centre round the renewing of the Temple by Christ. To Augustine the Temple stands for Adam i.e. mankind unredeemed, and eventually destroyed. But man is saved by Christ, and is raised up to eternal life with God.

NICODEMUS

John 2²³ - 3⁵

Many believed in Him but He did not trust Himself to them : their belief, as that of Nicodemus, was conditioned by miracle. Jesus only trusts Himself to those who are born again. Nicodemus came at night - he came to the Light in the darknes..

As the Israelites through baptism in the Red Sea came to receive manna, so Christians in Christ's Baptism receive the Bread of Life. All the enemies were slain in the sea, all ours (i.e. sins) in Baptism. Moses bringing his people through the sea to the manna, is the figure of Christ through Baptism bringing His people to the living bread. That the sea was the Red sea signified the Baptism of Christ consecrated with His blood.

Nicodemus does not understand this. The Spirit speaks to him but he is of the flesh and cannot hear. He knew only the birth from Adam and Eve, that from God and the Church he did not know.

Those born of the Church are the children of Sarah, the free woman ; those born of heresy are the children of the bondwoman - but of the seed of Abraham. There are three patriarchs - Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Jacob (Israel) had twelve sons, the twelve tribes. In the people of the Jews was pre-figured the Christians. In these cases there are births of freewomen and of bondwomen, i.e. some are baptised by God, and some by evil men. As in the case of Jacob and

Esau, the seed is the same but diverse are born. Two peoples strive within the Church's womb : but there is a coming to Light. But remember the seed of Jacob issued in Children of bondwomen who yet inherited the Kingdom, (justifying baptism by unworthy ministers, contra Donatists). Ishmael playing with Isaac was persecuted : beware of heretics playing with and deluding the faithful. Hagar's duty was to return to her mistress. The repression of heresy and schism by the secular arm is defended; the Donatists murder souls, what right have they to complain of the destruction of their body? Their "Martyrs" are more likely staged suicides.

John 3⁶⁻²¹

Baptism is one because the new birth is one, whether within or without the Catholic Communion. The baptised without need not fear if they return and the baptised within must not therefore presume. Humility is the way to the New Birth. Christ descended because of us, let us ascend because of Him : by dying He saved us from death.

The elevation of Moses' serpent he describes as a figure of Christ. The people Israel were lying in the desert dying from the bites of the serpents. The serpent signified death and sin. The serpents' bites meant death, and they were saved from death by a serpent lifted up on a pole in the desert. Because of the serpent's bite the serpent was erected. Likewise they looking upon the death of Christ are made whole from the bite of sins. The difference between the figure and reality is that while the figure brought temporal life, reality brings eternal life. Not to believe is to be self-condemned. Man accusing himself thenceforth works with God. The beginning of good works is the confession of evil works and this is a continual process.

The story of Nicodemus is the story of Judaism which cannot interpret the action of God in their own history nor yet in the work of Christ. He is handled as a real person, but the significance is not in Nicodemus but rather in the religion of which Nicodemus is at one both the type and representative. (Further remarks on the significance of the incident and Augustine's interpretation of it are made at the end of this section).

22-29

John 3

John's greatness shows Christ's majesty. We must see with the understanding that Christ is God, the King of all the earth. We come to God ^hthrough Christ.

When we eat food, the food is used and wastes away as we are made afresh, : when we feed on righteousness we are made afresh and what we eat remains entire. All that is severally good, we find entire and whole in God. This point is considered in fuller detail in the essay on Augustine's philosophical position and is particularly Johannine and central to Augustine. All experience inheres and coheres in God, without whom there is no understanding at all. The divine factor gives unity and meaning to all values.

Christ was baptised that baptism be honoured. Baptism must not be despised : as Israel was not quit of the Egyptians until they had come to the Red Sea, so no man is rid of his sins until he has come to the fountain of Baptism.

John, sending men from himself to Christ, showed himself the friend of the Bridegroom. The true friend of the absent Bridegroom is jealous for the Bridegroom, not for himself. It is heretics who seize for themselves the Bridegroom's due. Christ's persecutors forbore tearing His garment, yet Christians divide His Church. Christ bought all mankind and not a part : schism makes

all grace unprofitable. Donatists allege supernatural evidence, but miracles, as they may be wrought by evil men, are not in themselves notes of the Church.

29-36

John 3

John is enlightened but Christ is the enlightener. John was born when the days were shortening, Christ when the days were lengthening : John's death was by diminishing, Christ's by elevation. In this way, the human in us decreases, that the divine may increase.

THE SAMARITAN WOMAN

1-42

John 4

The things said there are great mysteries and similitudes of great things; feeding the hungry soul, refreshing the weary :-
 Dicta enim ibi sunt magna mysteria, et magnarum similitudines rerum; pascentes animam esurientem, reficientes languentem. XV. 1
 things full of mysteries and teeming with signs of spiritual truths :-

plena mysteriis, et gravida sacramentis. XV . 5

these things hint at something and bid us knock :-

Omnia ista innuunt aliquid, indicare volunt aliquid ; intentos nos faciunt, et pulsemus hortantur. XV. 6.

His journey is the assumption^p of flesh for us - that He was wearied, the limitation of the Divine in flesh. As Adam asleep received a wife of his rib, so Christ asleep gave in the piercing of His side the Sacraments : in His weakness we are made strong.

The 6th hour is the sixth age :-

1. Adam - Noah
2. Noah - Abraham
3. Abraham - David
4. David - the Captivity
5. Captivity - the Baptist
6. Present

The woman is the type of the Church coming to Him ignorant.

She came from aliens as the Church came not from the Jews but aliens. She represents us and is the figure not the verity :-

Forma Ecclesiae, non iam justificatae, sed iam justificandae XV.10

Audiamus ergo in illa nos, et in illa agnoscamus nos, et in illa gratias Deo agamus pro nobis. Illa enim figura erat, non veritas, quia et ipsa praemisit figuram, et facta est veritas. Nam credidit in eum, qui de illa figuram nobis praetendebat. XV. 10 (This is an important quotation for this thesis). In asking for drink

Jesus was asking for the woman's faith. The woman continues to knock :- Aliud intelligens et carnaliter sapiens

quodammodo pulsat, ut aperiat magister quod clausum est. XV. 13

Obviously Jesus is speaking in a spiritual manner - qui evidentius, quia non carnaliter, sed spiritualiter loquebatur. XV. 14

The water in the well is pleasure of the world drawn by the water vessels of lust and never satisfying. The calling of the husband is the bringing in of understanding :-

praesentia intellectum tuum. XV. 19

and
adsit ergo intellectus ut capiatur, et ipse intellectus erit fortasse vir animae. XV. 18

⁹
(Ps. 32) the distinguishing virtue of humankind, and Christ is the Light of the Understanding.

Again in the case of the five husbands we have to search more deeply. Some have taken them to signify the Pentateuch, but Augustine thinks the five former husbands of the soul to be the five senses. The soul is governed by the five senses until it comes of age, and then is ruled by reason, its true and eternal husband and ruler. This husband had not succeeded to the five husbands of this woman, therefore the woman was in error and must

first call her true husband in.

394

She turns to a discussion of worship, but the true Temple is within oneself. She says that when the Messiah has come he will show them all things - on this she called in her husband, and Christ then said that He was the Messiah. Note that Augustine makes the Incarnation a direct appeal to the intellect. On learning Christ, she flung away lust and preached Christ.

In the meantime, his disciples bid Him eat, but His meat is doing God's will translating her into His own body, for His body is the Church. He was fervent for the work and was sending out workmen. The prophets were the sowers, the disciples reapers : where the apostles sowed, the angels will reap. Their joy shall be equally shared, for all receive the wages of eternal life.

Many learn of Christ by report. He then abideth with them two days, i.e. gives two precepts of charity (i.e. the love of God and the love of neighbour) and they believe more firmly that He is the Saviour of the world.

As with Origen the passage is treated as an allegory of the human soul on its earthly pilgrimage, (as seen in the history of Israel now for the first time made clear in Christ), and its redemption in the coming of Christ who seeks and saves. There is about Augustine's comments a much deeper conception of the Church and a sensitivity to the Sacraments not found in Origen. He is truly Catholic rather than individualistic in his exegesis.

Every detail is seen as bearing a deeper spiritual truth, and Augustine is at pains to show this ever and over again. The exegesis is spoken in the pulpit and not written in the study, and therefore lends itself to the spiritualising of its content. But Augustine would feel he was not dealing with a mere historical

occurrence but is interpreting what Dodd describes as an "event" i.e. history with meaning. This is precisely what every writer both in the Old Testament and the New Testament had to say.

THE NOBLEMAN'S SON

John 4⁴³⁻⁵⁴

Augustine remarks that the Samaritans believed because of His word only without the display of signs and Wonders, but the Galileesans required these latter, and even then but a few believed. The Galileesans he likens to the Jews, the Samaritans to the Gentiles who have believed without a sign .

Rather unfortunately for our purposes this homily is one of Augustine's shortest and he draws no more out of it than the rejection of the Jews and the acceptance of the Gentiles. He says that the meaning of the passage is obvious, and that he commended it to his hearers but does not enlarge on it.

Origen treats the passage at length as the redemption of Israel, and it would have been interesting to have compared the exegesis of Augustine.

THE POOL OF BETHESDA

John 5¹⁻¹⁸

Only one was healed, for Christ's goodness was aimed not at the restoration of bodies but what souls may understand for their everlasting benefit. All that Christ restored temporally were eventually overcome by death, but all that were restored spiritually shall never die.

The pool signified the people of the Jews (Rev. 17¹⁵ water is signified by people). These people were shut in by the five books of Moses as by the five porches, but they only delivered up the ailing and never healed them. The water was disturbed by

an angelic invisible power, and this signifies Jesus for they 396
never recognised Him. To step into the water is humbly to believe
in Christ's Passion.

The years under which the man suffered (38), denotes man
under the law because forty is the perfect number and thirty-eight
falls short of that number by two, i.e. the twofold precept of love,
in which the Law and the Prophets are perfected.

The impotent man needed a man to help him, but that Man came
who is God. Two commands were given :-

- (a) take up thy bed
- (b) walk

(a) signified the love of neighbour which is the burden we must
carry, and (b) signifies that doing this we shall proceed on our way

That Jesus was not seen means we are bearing our neighbour
and on our way to God, but Him to whom we walk we do not see. We
cannot see Jesus in a crowd, nor can we find God except in solitude.
But the man finds Him in the Temple, the holy place.

'Bear ye your neighbour and walk, and then ye shall find Him
where ye needs no words of men.'

The Sabbath is a sacrament fulfilled in Christ. For Jesus,
being God, after His work was done, on the sixth day of the week
bowed His head and rested from His works in the sepulchre. He was
still doing the works of God and the people foolishly wished to
put Him to death.

John 5¹⁹

The Evangelist's technique, (being one who had drunk deep
secrets from Christ) feeds both the simple and advanced :-

parvulorum mentes intentas excitare possint.....

grandiusculis autem quibusque mentibus et ad aetatem quamdam

interius virilem pervenientibus, dat aliquid verbis his.....

Christ speaks that man may be agitated and troubled and being troubled should come to the Physician.

(Origen too thought that the difficulties of scripture were deliberate, so that man may wrestle with them, and in wrestling find truth he could find in no other manner. Note also Augustine's comment in the next homily
 omnis quaestio nisi intentum fecerit proposita, non delectabit
 exposita (Hom. 19 sec. 5.))

Mysteries must be approached with awe, not with eagerness to understand at once.

Augustine then moves into an attack on Arianism and concludes on the curing of mental blindness as being slow and painful. The eye salves are - not to lie, swear, commit adultery, steal, defraud. It is painful to change, but that which bites, heals.

19-30

John 5

Augustine is still considering the same text for he spent almost the whole of Homily XVIII in an attack on Arianism. He continues the theme, discoursing on the relation of the Father and the Son.

There is a spiritual resurrection in this life of them that hear the Son of God and obey : from the death of infidelity to the life of faith; from the death of falsehood to the life of truth; from the death of iniquity to the life of righteousness.

Fit proinde iam quaedam resurrectio, et transeunt homines a morte quadam ad quamdam vitam : a morte infidelitatis, ad vitam fidei; a morte falsitatis ad vitam veritatis; a morte iniquitatis, ad vitam iustitiae. XIX. 8

This is a resurrection of the dead before the resurrection of the dead. quamdam resurrectionem mortuorum ante resurrectionem mortuorum , XLX. 9.. Lazarus passed from death not to life

eternal but to life among men : this resurrection, (i.e. to eternal life), now is.

398

There are two resurrections - the resurrection into eternal life which we now enjoy, and the resurrection which we shall enjoy at the last being equal with the angels.

He again discusses at length on the relation of the Father and Son who is co-equal, co-eternal God.

There is a resurrection of the mind but let us not let go our faith in the resurrection of the flesh which some deny. He quotes 2 Tm. 2¹⁷⁻¹⁸. "and their word will eat as doth a gangrene: of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; men who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already, and overthrow the faith of some"

There is a resurrection of the mind through Christ as Son of God; of the flesh, through Christ as Son of Man. He openly understands a resurrection of bodies :-

..... aperte intelligimus corporum resurrectionem. XLX. 17

The Form of Man will be seen by just and unjust : the Form of God, in the Beatific Vision.

John 5¹⁹⁻²³

The same passage of scripture is under discussion and Augustine says that John's words trouble the wrong-hearted, but exercise the right-hearted. This homily, too, is largely anti-Arian, dwelling on the nature and relation of Father and Son.

John 5²⁴⁻³⁰

Through Christ we pass to life, and it is these who so pass that shall not come to judgement. The unbelievers, though in a sense living, are really dead. He calls His hearers to life, and instances Lazarus as an emblem of this spiritual resurrection :-

Clamavit Dominus ad sepulcrum Lazari, et quatrIduanus mortuus
resurrexit. Qui putebat, in auras processit, sepultus erat,
lapis superpositus erat, vox Salvatoris irrupit duritiam lapidis :
et cor tuum ita durum est, ut nondum illa vox divina te rumpat!

Surge in corde tuo, procede de sepulcro tuo. Etenim mortuus in
corde tuo tanquam in sepulcro jacebas, et tanquam saxo malae
consuetudinis gravabaris. Surge, et procede. Quid est, Surge et
procedere? Crede, et confitere. Qui enim credidit, surrexit; qui
confitetur, processit. XXII. 7

Surgunt homines qui mortui erant, transeunt ad vitam, ad vocem
Filii Dei vivunt, de illo, perserverantes in fide ipsius. XXII. 8

But there are two resurrections. The first in the present
hour in which some partake (i.e. the righteous), the second in the
last hour when all will partake (i.e. righteous and unrighteous),
for the reward of their life lived on earth.

John 5³¹⁻⁴⁰ (and recapitulation of vv 19-40)

Christ has many witnesses - Moses, Prophets, John, His own
works and also Himself. Man's mind is enlightened only by God.
As the soul alone makes the body to live.

The resurrection of the soul and the body is the end of the
Gospel :-

Et tota praedicatio dispensatioque per Christum haec est, fratres,
et alia non est, ut resurgant animae, resurgant et corpora. XXIII. 6

(Note Augustine's comment on "digging" in scripture and compare
it with Origen's "wrestling" with scripture :-

.. quam ecce iam triduo versamus atque tractamus, et pro viribus
fodimus, donec ad petram perveniamus. XXIII. 6.

The passage is handled largely as above on the relation of
Father and Son, and the bringing of spiritual resurrection.

John 6¹⁻¹⁴

Miracles are meant to teach :-

Miracula quae fecit Dominus noster Jesus Christus, sunt quidem divina opera, et ad intelligendum Deum de visibilibus admonent humanam mentem. XXIV. 1

and,

Hoc ergo adnotum est sensibus, quo erigeretur mens, et exhibitum oculis ubi exercebatur intellectus, ut invisibilem Deum per visibilia opera miraremur, et erecti ad fidem et purgati per fidem, etiam ipsum invisibiliter videre cuperemus, quem de rebus visibilibus invisibilem nosceremus. XXIV. 1

But the miracles are no more miraculous than the daily operations of God which are too commonplace to be thoroughly understood.

We must search the depths of this miracle.

The five loaves are the five books of Moses - not wheaten but barley loaves because they belong to the Old Testament. Barley kernel is set in a coating of husk and the husk is tenacious requiring labour to strip it. (Origen made a similar comment that barley was inferior to wheat). Thus is the Old Testament enveloped in a covering of casual sacraments, but if we get to its kernel, it feeds and satisfies. The lad is the people of Israel in a childish state carrying not eating. Carried, the loaves were a burden, opened, they fed :-

Illa enim quae portabat, clausa onerabant, aperta pascebant, XXIV. 5

The two fishes were the two persons^s in the Old Testament who were anointed for the service of the people - Priest and King. The Person came who was both of these and He broke the bread which

was thereby multiplied. In breaking open the scriptures He made 401
many more. Christ rent the veil. He brought to light the
ignorance of the disciples.

Every detail is valuable :-

Nihil igitur vacat, omnia inuunt, sed intellectorem requirunt. XXIV.⁶
(As Origen here). The very 5,000 indicates a people under the
Law. That they sat on the grass is that they are carnally minded
for All flesh is grass Is. 40⁶. The fragments are truths of hidden
import which the ~~the~~ multitude cannot receive and therefore are
entrusted to the apostles, whence twelve baskets.

Christ is indeed a Prophet because He is the Word of God
without which no prophet can prophesy.

The whole incident is treated as an allegory of Israel
hungering in want of God, and at the ministry of Christ receiving
all its fullness of spiritual nourishment.

THE WALKING ON THE SEA

John 6 15-40

Christ escaped into the mountain when they tried to make
Him king, meaning that his loftiness could not be understood and
His kingdom was not yet, nor even of the sort the people imagined.

The Great High Priest had passed within the veil - meanwhile
His disciples in the boat (i.e. the Church) were in the dark, for
the Light was not with them. The darkness increases, love waxes
cold, iniquity abounds - these are the waves that trouble the ship :
the tempests and winds are the clamours of evil speakers. Still
the ship kept moving. The 25 or 30 furlongs indicate the Law (i.e.
5 x 5) and the Law made perfect (i.e. 6 a perfect number) : to them
who fulfil the Law cometh Jesus, and He cometh treading the waves.
It is natural to fear even for disciples, but that must happen, in

the end the shore is reached, the way moves to the goal, and Christ says "It is I".

All these things have a spiritual meaning :-

Omnino confirmat et insinuat nobis in mysterio dicta esse illa omnia; et facta in magno sacramento, ut aliquid significarent. XXV. 9

He draws attention therefore to the discourse following, showing the import of the Evangelist's record :-

Ille post miraculi sacramentum, et sermonem infert, ut si fieri potest, qui pasti sunt, pascantur, et quorum satiavit panibus ventres, satiet et sermonibus mentes; sed si capiunt. XXV. 10

Many seek Jesus that they may receive benefit in the present time :-

Quam multi non quaerunt Jesum, nisi ut illis faciat bene secundum tempus..... XXV. 10

Seek Jesus for Himself. They had sought Jesus for another meal, as the Samaritan Woman for drink. On the people asking what they should do they were told to believe, as that was the great work :-
Ideo noluit discernere ab opere fidem, sed ipsam fidem dixit esse opus. XXV. 12.

On the preference of the manna to Christ's food, Augustine says that Moses promised a temporal kingdom :-

Ille plenum ventrem promittebat in terra, sed cibo qui perit : iste (i.e. Christ). promittebat cibum non qui perit, sed qui permanet in aeternⁿum XXV. 12

The manna signified Christ, the Bread Heaven. The people wanted this Bread (as the Samaritan Woman in a parallel situation wanted water) to be free from need.

Augustine invites his hearers to think further :-

Obsecro vos, simul pulseamus; exeat ad nos aliquid quod nos pascat,

and humbly seek. Pride is the root of all sin and it is this that must be purged before health comes : other treatments are playing with symptoms. For this reason, that the cause of all diseases might be cured, the Son of God came down in lowly form. The master of lowliness is come, and all who come to Him will never be cast out, because only the proud are cast out.

41-59
John 6

The Bread of Heaven requires the hungering of the inner man, but it must be God's righteousness that is sought, not man's idea of it :

..... justitiam quae de caelo descendit, justitiam quam dat Deus, non quam sibi facit homo. XXVI. 1.

They understood not the Bread coming down from Heaven because they were filled with their own righteousness. The righteousness of God is Christ, man's righteousness is the Law. To murmur against Christ is to be insensitive to His call, for true men are drawn to Christ, as a nut draws a child because of love of the object. The greatest draw to the soul is Truth, who is the soul's blessedness. The Father teaches by His word i.e. by Christ. Christ imparts eternal life.

He is the Bread of Life, but it is important that one receive it in innocence and in a forgiving spirit. In nothing is God offended more than by murmuring. Augustine equates the Bread of Life with the Sacrament. The old "sacramenta" were diverse, but all alike signified the same spiritual reality.

Sacramenta illa fuerunt : in signis diversa sunt; in re quae significatur paria sunt. XXVI. 12

In the sentence before this there is a variant reading which

gives two meanings to the passage, but the meaning is clear that the old "sacramenta" signified the spiritual reality which we now receive in the Eucharist.

The virtue of the Sacrament comes in a right understanding of it :-

Sed quod pertinet ad virtutem Sacramenti, non quod pertinet ad visibile Sacramentum : qui manducat intus, non foris; qui manducat in corde, non qui premit dente. XXVI. 12

The Sacrament is death to some; the Reality, life to all :-

.....sumitur; quibusdam ad vitam, quibusdam ad exitium : res vere ipsa cuius sacramentum est, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium, quicumque eius particeps fuerit. XXVI. 15

Augustine here makes an interesting observation about the frequency of the Eucharist : alicubi quotidie, alicubi certis intervallis dierum.

It is to dwell in Christ and have Christ dwelling within.

....in Christo manere, et illum manentem in se habere. XXVI. 18

This is Cyril's position precisely.

60-71

John 6

Augustine stresses unity :-

Haec dicuntur ut amemus unitatem, et timeamus separationem. Nihil enim sic debet formidare christianus, quam separari a corpore Christi. XXVII. 6

Christ's hearers did not understand because they had no faith:

Per fidem copulamur, per intellectum vivificamur. Prius haereamus per fidem, ut sit quod vivificetur per intellectum. XXVII. 7

To go back from Christ is to follow Satan. Eternal life is in the ministration of the Sacraments :-

Vitam enim aeternam habes in ministracione corporis et sanguinis tui. XXVII. 9

The wicked are God's instruments for God, as was Judas : God elects to choose evil to turn it for good. Augustine shows an interesting doctrine of election here. Augustine expounds the whole passage as a pastor commending to his flock the right receiving of the Sacraments, the remaining in the unity of the Lord's Body as its members, and the quickening of our souls by His spirit.

1-13
John 7

Augustine says it is quite right to withdraw from persecution, an example our Lord set us.

He interprets Christ going up to the Feast secretly as meaning that He Himself was latent in that Feast. When the holy day was half over, he taught openly.

Israel and its Law were shadows of things to come.

Omnia quae dicta sunt antiquo populo Israel in multiplici scriptura sanctae Legis, quae agerent sive in sacrificiis, sive in sacerdotiis sive in diebus festis, et omnino in quibuslibet rebus quibus Deum colebant, quaecumque illis dicta et praecepta sunt, umbrae fuerunt futurorum. XXVIII. 9

Augustine is with Origen here. He quotes 1 Cor. 10¹¹, Rom. 10⁴, Col. 2^{16,17}. The meaning of this shadow is :- we have been brought out of the bondage of evil, crossed the Red Sea (blood of Christ) and our enemies are dead behind us, and we, living in tabernacles wait for the promised land. The passage is rather long to quote, but every detail is made to carry a typological significance, even the making of bricks of clay is to be busied with earthly desires.

He refers, too, to the thirst being satisfied from the Reck which was Christ - the two blows are two beams of the cross. Et sitis nostra de petra impletur in eremo : Petra enim erat Christus, et virga percussa est, ut aqua manaret. Ut autem

manaret, bis percussa est, quia duo ligna sunt crucis. XXIX. 9

406

Augustine's interpretation of the Feast is interesting and lengthy. The Fourth Evangelist evidently attached both importance and significance to the Jewish Feasts, for John's interpretation of Christ's teaching evolves from the Feasts in so many cases. In precedent, Paul had already committed Christian exegesis to interpretation of this sort.

John 7¹⁴⁻¹⁸

Augustine speaks largely of the Trinity and against the Sabellians, and makes the true point that the important issue is not to believe Christ but to believe in Him.

John 7¹⁹⁻²⁴

He discusses Christ's words about circumcising on the Sabbath, and considers circumcision a type of the stripping of the flesh by the knife of stone (the Lord Christ). (This is precisely what Paul understands by Christ's Circumcision Co. 2¹¹, Eph. 4²²). That it was to be performed on the eighth day signified the Resurrection which took place on the Sunday - i.e. circumcision prefigured resurrection : our circumcision is Christ's Resurrection. He compares the Old Man of the Old Testament seeking after earthly things :-

terrena quaerebant a Domino; terra enim promissionis, victoria ab inimicis, fecunditas pariendi, multiplicatio filiorum, abundantia ^ructuum, quae illis omnia a Deo quidem vero et bono, tamen ut carnalibus promissa sunt, omnia haec fecerunt illis Vetus Testamentum. XXX. 7 - with the New Man of the New Testament desiring Heavenly things :-

Ad desideranda coelestia, ad concupiscenda sempiterna, ad patriam quae sursum est et hostem non timet, desiderandam, ubi non perdimus amicum, non timemus inimicum; ubi vivimus cum bono affectu,

sine ullo defectu; ubi nemo nascitur, quia nemo moritur; ubi nemo iam proficit, quia nemo deficit; ubi non esuritur, et non sititur, sed satietas est immortalitas, et cibus veritas.....
 aliam spem valde habemus. XXX. 7

25-36
John 7

Christ came in the fullness of time - even His life could not be taken from Him until He gave it up. Augustine speaks of the many prophesies heralding His coming.

Denique ubi venit plenitudo temporis, venit et ille qui nos liberaret a tempore. XXXI. 5

37-9
John 7

The mind is the seat of enjoyment and even in another person it is his mind we love rather than his body. The beauty of the body is the mind, the beauty of the mind, God. The Living Water flows from the heart in goodwill to men. The drink Christ offers is the Holy Spirit, and it was not yet given, for the resurrection had not happened : there had been the Spirit in the prophets and others, but it was yet to come in a special way. It is in the Church that the Spirit is given, speaking as it does with the tongues of all nations. We shall receive the fullness of the Spirit in our own resurrection.

THE WOMAN TAKEN IN ADULTERY

40 - 8¹¹
John 7

From the story of the woman taken in adultery he moralises on the truth that man is given space to correct his ways. God grants pardon, but man must keep what He has commanded in order to come to that which He has promised.

12
John 8

God's saving mercy is over all His works but in a special sense over man. Who follows now, shall have the light : faith

first, light afterwards. Christ first appears as the Way. This life is full of strife, in the world, and even within our own personality. But when it ends, immortality shall follow, and peace. Walk now in the light, in the hope of this promise.

John 8¹³⁻¹⁴

All prophecy testifies to Christ but when the Day comes we shall need neither scripture nor gospel.

John 8¹⁵⁻¹⁸

He begins on a very interesting note on the difference between the Fourth Evangelist and the other three, and later refers to the emblems of the four evangelists taken from Ezekiel and the Apostles :- man (Mark), ox (Luke), lion (Matthew), eagle (John).

In this context Augustine treats of the nature of Christ and animadverts against those who deny His Godhead and those who deny His Manhood.

It is vital to lay hold of the Johannine truths and not be lost in heresy : of these truths "let him receive who can, and whose cannot let him believe":-

Dicam ergo; capiat qui potest, credat qui non potest. XXXVI. 7.

Sabellianism and Arianism are each true against the other : Catholicism is true against both. St. Cyril made exactly the same argument in a parallel situation as against Nestorianism and Appolinarism.

John 8¹⁹⁻²⁰

He expressly says in this hour that the words scarcely need discussing, but that the fancies of heretics compel him :-
.... nec discutiendas fuisse si fieri posset, nisi haereticorum commenta compellerent. XXXVII. 6

John 8²¹⁻⁵

Christ is from above, all men are of the world. The sinners die in their sin because they refuse to believe Christ. Christ

is True Being, subject to no change, and calls Himself the "I AM".

He is incarnate that He might speak as Man to man.

409

26-7

John 8

Discusses the relationship between Father Son and Holy Ghost in the Trinity.

28-32

John 8

In no sense must God be thought of as having bodily form, but the Son as incarnate must be so conceived. God sent the Son but never left Him - sent Him as in flesh but remained with Him. From that lowly foundation of faith in Him the full superstructure of Truth rises. Truth is seen as it really is.

Man's weakness is that he does not sufficiently desire his eternal home, but gets attached to the world. We are in this world to make a journey; this life is the inn, to be used to help us forward, and to be left behind.

31-6

John 8

The Truth i.e. Christ gives perfect freedom. The Jews were often in bondage, but the worst bondage is to be the slave of sin, from which He alone can deliver men, who alone of men was without sin. Many are still the slaves of sin : even the most righteous are still only partly free. Sin is still in us, but let it not reign. (There is an illuminating practical point on the power of mind in the day of temptation :-

Mens enim si teneat arma, membra non moventur in ministerium furentis peccati. XLI. 12

Sin shall wax weaker and weaker until all death is swallowed up in victory. He also likens the Church to the inn that took in the wounded man for healing.)

37-47

John 8

The Jews boasted of their descent from Abraham, but they

were unworthy sons. But God hath raised His heirs not according to the seed of the flesh but through Christ. The true children of God accept Christ, because His Godhead is the goal of their journey, and His Manhood the way.

The Jews were children of the devil, by imitation not generation. He animadverts against the Manicheans here. He says all nature is good, but man's nature is vitiated by an evil will : Bona est enim omnis natura; sed vitiata est hominis natura per voluntatem malam. Quod fecit Deus non potest esse malum, si ipse homo non sit sibi malus..... XLII. 10.

This point is enlarged later in the section on Augustine's philosophical position, and is basic to Augustine's whole understanding both of God and man. Of God, in the sense that He is found in history willing and acting; of man in that he is found of God in seeking to do His will.

The devil was a murderer from the beginning when he "murdered" the first man by sowing an evil word in his heart. Homicida dicitur diabolus..... ad hominem venit, verbum malum seminavit, et occidit. XLII. 11

The fault and corruption of man's nature came by persuasion of the devil.

48-59
John 8

Christ did not deny being a Samaritan, for Samaritan means keeper and He is our Keeper or Saviour.

When Christ spoke of not seeing death he spoke not of the death of the body, but of the eternal death in hell :-

..... videbat Dominus aliam mortem, de qua nos liberare venerat, mortem secundam, mortem aeternam, mortem gehennarum, mortem damnationis cum diabolo et angelis ejus. XLIII. 11

and speaking of the righteous dead he said :-

Si ergo illi vivunt, laboremus sic vivere, ut cum illis
vivere possimus cum mortui fuerimus. XLIII. 13

411

Abraham saw Christ's day in swearing "Put thine hand under my thigh,
and swear by the God of Heaven" signifying the coming of God in
the flesh. He remarks on Jesus fleeing the stoning :-

Tanquam homo a lapidibus fugit : sed vae illis a quorum lapideis
cordibus Deus fugit. XLIII. 18

THE MAN BORN BLIND

John 9

He again says that there are both works and words :-

Ea quippe quae fecit Dominus noster Jesus Christus stupenda atque
miranda, et opera et verba sunt : opera, quia facta sunt; verba,
quia signa sunt. XLIV. 1

The man is mankind in general born blind by original sin :-

Si ergo quid significet hoc quod factum est cogitemus, genus
humanum est iste caecus. XLIV. 1

and also,

Si vitium pro natura inolevit, secundum mentem omnis homo caecus
natus est. XLIV. 1

(Two very important quotations for the subject of this thesis.)

The cure, of making clay of spittle, was Christ's incarnation.

Christ was the Sent, and in washing in that Pool, Baptism in
Christ is signified. Christ came to work the works of God, while
it is day. Christ is the Day, bringing light to the world : it
is night when Christ is not there, and therefore none can work :-
Ergo nescio quae nox erit, quando ibi Christus non erit; ideo
nemo poterit operari. XLIV. 5

The man looked different now that he could see. The true Sabbath
is to cease from slavery to sin. Being washed and cleansed and

seeing he now showed belief in Christ. Blindness is sin :-

Cum sit caecitas ipsa peccatum. XLIV. 17

and therefore the Pharisees were blind. They who think they see, and seek not the Physician, remain blind.

The miracle is treated as the story of mankind's blindness through sin, and of its restoration in Christ.

It is disappointing how brief Augustine is in these vital passages, and prolix in dealing with heretics or the relation within the Trinity. His defence is that the meaning is obvious. This is rather illuminating evidence for this thesis i.e. it was obvious for what purpose the miracle was written.

He also says in Homily LIX that he does not spend much time on the passages whose meanings are manifest :-

.... sed poterimus ea quae sunt operosius disserenda ipso
adjuvante disserere, si non in eis quae manifesta sunt immoremur.
John 10¹⁻¹⁰ LIX. 1

The passage of the door of the sheep-fold is subjoined to that of the man born blind. Christ feedeth us by what is clear, and exerciseth us by what is obscure :-

Pascit enim manifestis, exercet obscuris XLV. 6

There is no eternal life apart from Christ (i.e. entrance through this door). Those who climb another way are philosophers in their vanity, pharisees in their pride, heretics in their error, (Arians and Sabellians are mentioned by name). The fold is the Catholic Church and has a humble entry (Christ); the exalted prefer to climb only to fall. They are called thieves because they misappropriate the sheep who belong to another. These terms have a deep meaning :-

Tecta sunt haec, plena quaestionibus, graviora sacramentis. XLV 6. XLV

In XLVII he says that the preacher who tries to enter into the heart in any way other than Christ is a thief :-...

.... si aliud (i.e. other than Christ) praedicem, per aliam partem conabor ascendere. XLVII. 2

He expressly places the prophets in a category other than thieves and robbers for they came with Him, in so far as they saw His coming and spoke words from Christ to prepare His coming.

(Words signify in themselves nothing; it is their meaning that matters :-

Significando enim verba sunt : tolle significationem verbo, strepitus inanis est. XLV. 9)

Some sheep stray because they listen to another voice and therefore do not hear Christ's voice. The true sheep are foreknown, predestined, justified and glorified :-

Praescitis, praedestinatis, justificatis, glorificatis..... XLV. 12

Let us enter through the Door to things propounded but not expounded

.... intremus ad ea quae proposuit, nec exposuit. XLV. 14

Christ does not say so here, but the Shepherd signifies Him. To go in and out signifies thinking and then working - a fine thought.

Pessem quidem dicere ingredi nos, quando interius aliquid cogitamus; egredi autem, quando exterius aliquid operamur..... XLV. 15

John 10¹¹⁻¹³

Who are the thieves and robbers, the hirelings and the wolf? Hirelings are pastors who seek their own : these hirelings serve a purpose even so, and often bring people to Christ. They preach Christ by word, if not by deed, and to preach Him is their task.

The wolf is the devil. It is right sometimes for the faithful to flee persecution. They flee from the wolf when they are afraid to rebuke and punish sin.

John 10¹⁴⁻²¹

He interprets the one fold as meaning the Catholic

Church and animadverts against heretics for dividing it, Donatus 414
in particular.

That He was not sent but to the lost sheep of Israel, Augustine explains that Christ's bodily mission was spent in Israel and then He came to the Gentiles in the form of His messengers. He again dwells on Christ's nature in the passage of laying down his life and treats of the heretics, Apollinarists, in particular, who say that Christ did not have a human soul. To lay down the soul is to die for Christ, but only Christ could take it up again.

John 10²²⁻⁴²

Augustine notes a significance in details like,
It was winter (John 10²²) :-

..... et frigidi erant : ad illum enim divinum ignem accedere pigri erant. XLVIII. 3

The pasture the sheep find is eternal life : the true sheep have been predestined and will never suffer at the hand of wolf or thief.

He treats at length of the divinity of Christ and His relation to the Father which the Jews did not apprehend, i.e. He slipped out of their grasp :-

Non eum apprehenderunt, quia manus fidei non habuerunt. (Augustine is referring, of course, not to grasping Jesus physically but spiritually). XLVIII. 11

Other Jews believed in Him :-

Judaei volebant apprehendere discedentem, apprehenderunt isti permanentem, where the same thought is pursued. XLVIII. 12

1-54

LAZARUS

John 11

He prefaces his exposition by the comment that to resuscitate is a smaller thing than to create :-

.....quid mirum est si resurrexit unus per illum, cum tot
 quotidie nascantur per illum? Plus est homines creare quam resuscitare
 Augustine always stresses the fact that the ordinary XLIX. 1
 providential work of God is more wonderful and even more "miraculous" than
 the miracles Christ performed.

There is a reference to the composition of the Gospel that
 the things chosen were selected for man's salvation :-

..... electo sunt autem quae scriberentur, quae saluti credentium
 sufficere videbantur. XLIX Par. 1

Augustine believed that the flesh would be resurrected in
 the last day :-

ille in novissimo die ad unam vocam cineres est restitutus in
 carnem. XLIX. par. 1

It is important to realise that in the Gospel there are three
 dead persons raised to life and to this there is a significance :-

Tres tamen mortuos a Domino rescutitatos in Evangelio legimus,
 et forte non frustra. XLIX. 2

Mark well, all believers undergo a resurrection, and all sinners
 a death :-

omnis qui credit, resurgit..... omnis qui peccat, moritur. XLIX. 2

Yet man who knows he must die, still prevents death; and though
 knowing he must live, he does not seek to be sinless. Man seeks
 to defer his bodily death, yet is slow to seek eternal life, which
 God has offered us in such simple terms. These three resurrections
 are figures of the resurrection of souls :-

..... bene intelligimus tres illos mortuos quos in corporibus
 suscitavit, aliquid significare et figurare de resurrectionibus
 animarum quae fiunt per fidem..... XLIX. 3

(a) The daughter of the ruler of the synagogue.

Sin is a death of the soul, but sometimes sin is only in thought. The death is within, for the evil has not yet issued forth in a deed. This, the raising of the girl who lay dead at home, signifies latent sin.

(b) The young man at the City gates.

Evil has been consented to and delighted in, the dead has been carried outside the City gate. Even him the Lord raised, and returned him to his mother. Repent and the Lord will raise thee and return thee to thy mother, the Church

Si peccasti, poeniteat te : et resuscitat te Dominus, et reddet Ecclesiae matri tuae. XLIX. 3

(c) Lazarus.

Lazarus' is the most dreadful kind of death - he is the habitual sinner, and stinks with an evil reputation :-

Dicis ei, Noli, facere. Quando te audit quem terra sic premit, et tunc corumpitur, et molo consuetudinis praegravat ur?. p.3.

Magna reus est, quem mortis quatriduum et illa significat sepultura. XLIX. 19

The earth is heavy upon him and he rots away and cannot therefore hear you. Christ raised even him, but it was a greater resurrection to raise his sister Mary.. (He considers the possibility that the two Marys are not identical). He again says, as he always does in these acted parables of obvious meaning, that much of the matter is plain and passes over it :-

.... quoniam multa in hac lectione manifesta sunt, expositionem in singulis non quaeramus..... XLIX. 4.

He yet spends hours of discourse on arguing against the heretics on the nature of the Godhead and on Christology. This means that the Gospel was considered by his hearers as being the theological

417
interpretation that Augustine rightly assumes it to possess: it was the spiritual meaning that seemed primary, or even possibly there was no other meaning at all. It also means that there was much controversy, and catholic orthodoxy had many vigorous rivals. Augustine lays far too much stress on theological orthodoxy, and when this is set against his immense intellect and penetrating spiritual insight it can only mean that in his historical situation he considered that an important issue. It may in part have been a battle with his own thinking when one thinks of his own spiritual pilgrimage, but on reading his works you cannot escape the impression of the urgency and primacy of the conflict for theological orthodoxy. It must have been very real, for no man of Augustine's stature would have spoken so severely against other men claiming Christian allegiance, unless he sensed a real danger in the strength of the particular heresies. From our point of view it seems a matter of regret that intellectual controversy should so often take precedence over theological exposition, particularly in relation to a work like the Fourth Gospel.

Lazarus was sick because Jesus was absent :-

Ibi ergo Domino constituto, infirmabatur in Bethania Lazarus...XLIX.4

(Origen makes the same comment) The sickness was not unto death because Christ purposed a miracle which would bring belief and thereby avoid death :-

Hoc ergo ait, non est ad mortem, quia et ipsa mors non erat ad mortem; sed potius ad miraculum, quo facto crederent homines in Christum, et vitarent veram mortem. XLIX. 6

Christ yet waited four days, which has a significance :-

...quia certe et ipse numerus dierum intimat aliquid sacramentum.
XLIX 6

That there were twelve hours in the day meant that there was Christ and His twelve disciples - it was a call to faith.

418

Death to Jesus was but a sleep, for from it, all must one day awake for the Judgement. He returns to the four days and says, as in the blind man all of mankind is signified, so in Lazarus many i.e. all of us are born blind (sinners), but not all of us die in our sins as hardened habitual sinners.

Quomodo enim in illo caeco intelligimus quodammodo humanum genus, sic forte et in isto mortuo multos intellecturi sumus. XLIX. 12

When man is born he is born straightway into death, i.e. the sin of Adam - that is one day. He grows up and learns natural law e.g. doing good to others. But this he also transgresses - second death. The Law was given and transgressed - third death. The Kingdom of Heaven is preached. Men again transgress the Gospel - fourth death. Well may the corpse stink - yet God does not deny mercy.

We shall all rise again on the Last Day, but some experience a resurrection now. Many by-standers expected the mere raising of Lazarus, but it was performed that we should rise again from sin :- Certe tota expectatio erat circumstantium ut revivisceret Lazarus, unus mortuus quatrduamus : audiamus, et resurgamus. XLIX 14

He instances sins by which people were loaded down as from custom and calls for renewal. Faith is life :-

Ergo anima tuae animae fides est. XLIX 15

He troubled Himself because He willed to be troubled : our trouble should be our conscience, and if we groan for our sin then is there hope of resurrection :-

In voce ^rfementis apparet spes resurgentis. XLIX. 19

The word ^rεμεβατο, ^rfemebat, denotes indignation rather than

sorrow. The Greek expositors took it to mean the rebuking of Christ's manhood by His Godhead. Augustine seems to understand this fremitus as the expression of Christ's indignation at sin. He instances here the stilling of the storm as the storm of the heart, and what we need to do is to awake the sleeping Christ :-
In corde enim tuo somnus Christi, oblivio fidei. XLIX. 19

Where have ye laid Him? - a man in this condition is not known to God :-

..... sic perditum hominem quasi nescit Deus. XLIX 20
He brings in support Matthew 7²³, "I know you not, depart from me", and Gen. 3⁹, when man had sinned, "Adam where art thou?" The stone on the grave is the Law (which was written in stone). Take away the stone means preach grace.

r

It took groaning, weeping and crying with a loud voice to effect his awaking eventually. He came forth bound i.e. still in sin and he was to be loosed and let free by ministerial absolution. (Origen here contrasts Christ's resurrection in which the grave clothes were left behind, but Augustine does not draw the same analogy)

Many Jews conspired to undo Christ, for they were afraid of losing temporal things :-

Temporalia perdere timuerunt, et vitam aeternam non cogitaverunt ac sic utrumque amiserunt. XLIX 26

As does Origen, Augustine emphasises Caiaphas' prophecy that one man should die for the people, and says that the Evangelist attributes it to the High Priest for it was concerning a Divine Sacrament.

Christ withdrew from persecution - a lesson for us all, and which Augustine taught many times.

Three facts should be noted at this stage, without waiting for the end of the section :-

(a) Augustine prefaces his exposition of the Raising of Lazarus by saying that the incidents of the Gospel were chosen for man's salvation.

(b) that it is not the mere Raising of Lazarus that matters, but that we should understand and rise again from sin.

(c) that the raising of Mary from sin was a greater resurrection than the Raising of Lazarus.

Augustine's handling of the incident is the story of man's soul rising from the death of sin by the powers of Christ.

Lazarus dies only because Jesus is not with him. The four days dead mean that his soul had passed through all the stages of death, till now it actually stank and not even God knows his whereabouts.

1. Adam's death - to which every man is born
2. Death following on the disobedience of Natural Law.
3. Death following on the disobedience of the Mosaic Law.
4. Death following on the disobedience of the Gospel.

These comments are very telling evidence for the purpose of this thesis.

⁵⁵ 11
John 11 - 12

The Passover was a shadow until Christ should come; and at His coming the sign would pass away whilst the truth would be kept. He was the sheep who was slaughtered. The blood which was put on the Jews door posts, we now sign on our foreheads. As that kept off the destroyer, so the sign of Christ keeps away our destroyer. As the Jews could not find Jesus, let us show them where He is.

That Lazarus ate was a proof that it was a true resuscitation 421

The anointing of Christ's feet is the serving of Christ in righteousness. The ointment was of costly spikenard (*πρότικῃ*) meaning of faith. He calls his hearers to anoint the feet of Christ and by good living to follow His footsteps. As the hair is a superfluity of the body, give of superfluity to the poor. The house was filled with the odour, as the world is filled with the good odour of Christ by the holy living of the saints. This good odour is death to the wicked because it excites their envy.

That Christ had Judas among the twelve, means that we should tolerate evil men and not divide the body of Christ. The wicked, represented by Judas, have not Christ always. There is an interesting exposition here where he says that the disciples do not represent one man but a type. Origen took up the same position. It is significant to note that the disciples were more than historical personages but were spiritual types to the early commentators :-
Quia non unus est Judas. Unus malus corpus malorum significat; quomodo Petrus corpus bonorum, imo corpus Ecclesiae, sed in bonis. L. 12
Peter denotes the Church. The good man has Christ now and always:-
Si bonus es, si ad corpus pertines, quod significat Petrus; habes Christum et in praesenti et in futuro. L. 12

The evil man has Him now in a sense, but will "not always" have Him. Even the good were not to have his bodily presence always, but his Divine presence.

John 12
12-26

The people cried Hosanna to a spiritual King :-
..... *sed rex Israel, quod mentes regat, quod in aeternum consulat, quod in regnum coelorum credentes, sperantes, amantesque perducatur.*

The colt signified the Gentiles who had not received the Law, whilst the ass was the true Israel which knew her master's crib. 422
Though the Jews wish to kill Him the Gentiles wish to see Him at the feast, and this is the earnest of the fulness of the Gentiles. When Jesus spoke of the corn of wheat falling into the ground and dying, he spoke of Himself. He discusses the meanings of hating one's life to find it, but deprecates very strongly the seeking of martyrdom. (T.S. Eliot makes this Becket's supreme temptation). To minister unto Christ is to do all for His sake, and walk in Christ's ways not one's own. The reward is eternal life, the presence of Christ. Not all ministers are good (e.g. Judas who administered the finances). They are true who walk in Christ's ways. And a true minister must minister as unto Christ, and not of vainglory or cupidity. He reminds his hearers that all Christians are ministers, and not clerics only.

²⁷⁻³⁶
John 12

Christ's soul was troubled not through weakness but of mercy, for a pattern to troubled souls that they should resign their will to the will of God. That the judgment of this world was now, meant not the final judgment but the expulsion of Satan from Christ's redeemed. Satan had been expelled from hearts before, but now he was to be expelled from such a large number of hearts.

Satan will still continue to tempt, but it is one thing to reign within, and another to assault without. Augustine discusses the various meanings of the "all" that Christ draws to Himself after being lifted up.

The Jews stumbled at Christ because their hands sought to kill Him.

³⁷⁻⁴³
John 12

Christ is the arm of the Lord, for as humanly speaking, the

arm is the agent of the mind, so God's Word was His instrument by whom the Father wrought all things. He criticises the Sabellians here, implying that they used this text of the outstretched arm in illustration of their doctrine of the Divine self-extensions (πλατυβάς, ἐκτάσεις) and self-contractions (συστολαί).

The prediction that the Jews would not accept Christ must not be read as that God caused their sin but rather foreknew it. God hardens the heart by leaving the evil will to itself.

The important issue is to progress in the spiritual life not to grasp at what is too hard :-

Quod si nos ultimus dies proficientes invenerit, ibi discemus quod hic non potuimus. LIII. 7

Let us not emphasise free will so as not to feel the need for Divine aid, and on the other hand let us not assume that temptation cannot be overcome. To exalt unduly free-will, is to thwart faith in Christ. Some are blinded for a time, and in their darkness seek Christ. True faith overcomes the love of human glory.

44-50

John 12

To believe on Christ is to believe Him co-equal with God and to see in Him the Father who sent Him. He distinguishes between believing the Apostles, and believing on Christ : the apostles are lights, but made light by the Light. The Word Christ spoke is Himself. The Eternal Word is made known by the spoken and written word.

1-5

John 13

He interprets the Passover as the "transitus" of Israel out of Egypt and as a type of Christ's transitus from this world through the death on the Cross, and also as His people's transitus from their house of bondage.

He comments that "coena facta" does not mean supper ended but made, i.e. set.

424

It is important to see that Christ's lowliness is set with His greatness - He washed their feet knowing that the Father had given all things into His hands, washing the feet even of him whose hands were in the act of wickedness.

That He laid aside His garments is the laying aside of His glory : that He took a towel was to take upon Him the form of a servant. Proud man would have been lost had not a lowly God found him :-

.....quia homo superbus in aeternum periret nisi illum Deus humilis inveniret. par. 7.

6-10
John 13

Peter shrank back in humility. If he was not to be saved except by being washed by Christ, then let his hands and head be cleansed.

Augustine interprets the incident that the disciple is made clean by Baptism. But thereafter the disciple must live in the midst of human affairs and thereby soils his feet which must be cleansed by Christ alone. To have our feet washed by Christ is to direct the ways of our spiritual steps in Christ, and have ourselves continually cleansed by Him.

Continuing the exposition, he refers to Cant. 5² where the woman (Church) is afraid to open the door to her "fratruelis" lest she soil her feet which were washed. This is spoken to all who fear, after being cleansed in Baptism, to move through human affairs and thus soil the feet; also to those preachers who opening the door to Christ yet find themselves castaways, as it is less dangerous to the soul to hear the Truth than preach it. "Open to me", (Cant 5²)

he expounds as the Head of Christ waxes cold for night (iniquity) is come, and the dew and drops of it are those who wax cold and fall. The cry "Open to me" is "Preach Christ", and is Christ calling to His saints.

I have put off my coat, how shall I put it on, Augustine interprets as the dying of the great preachers of the Gospel who are now stripped of the flesh.

He appeals to his hearers that once cleansed let them go about the world preaching Christ, and as they are defiled in that work, let Christ wash their feet.

¹⁰⁻¹⁵
John 13

He develops the text in illustration of the simple moral lesson of humility, but reminds them of its deeper meaning i.e. no matter how much we may have progressed in the path of righteousness we yet soil our feet as we move about the earth, and therefore must allow Christ to wash away the sin. That this was given to us as an example means that we should confess our sins one to another and pray for each other, and thereby in a sense cleanse one another. We loose on earth, that we may be loosed in heaven :-
.....quod aliis etiam dimittimus, hoc est in terra solvimus, solvatur in coelo. LVlll. 5

¹⁶⁻²⁰
John 13

He discusses the sense in which Judas was chosen and yet was not chosen. He attacks the Arian doctrine of gradations. The authority of one who is sent lies in the authority of Him that sent Him.

²¹
John 13

Christ was troubled in spirit for us. This Augustine defends as ^aagainst the philosophers who deny perturbation to the mind of the wise man. Augustine expects the Christian mind to suffer, to

sorrow, and to fear for others, and also to fear for himself lest he be lost to Christ. Fear, sorrow, love and gladness are valid to the Christian on just causes. When Christ took our nature He took its liability to perturbation : but Christ was not troubled but rather troubled Himself. He raised these emotions within Himself by His own powers, as by His own power He had taken on man's whole nature.

John 13²¹⁻⁷

The separation of Judas from the fellowship (in the sense of removing the tares before the harvest) perturbed Christ, and this is made into a prefigure of the severance of schismatics and heretics.

Referring to the one who leant on Jesus' bosom, Augustine says it was the way of all writers of scripture to preserve anonymity :-

Quid enim deperit veritati, quando et res ipsa dicitur, et modo quodam dicendi jactantia devitatur? LXI. 4

Judas in evil manner received that which was good and turned it to evil.

John 13²⁶⁻³¹

To the evil man good is a bane, and to the good evil is a boon. Augustine speaks of the receiving of the Sacrament unworthily as coming to the Lord's table a foe. Judas he sees as the instrument of Christ for our salvation. That a bag was kept signified the rightness of the Church keeping funds. On Judas going out into the night he says the night went out and the Day uttered its word.

John 13³¹⁻²

Christ left with the disciples after Judas had left is a type of His glory in the end of the world when all the unclean

have been removed. The passage is also interpreted as a foretelling of the resurrection.

John 13³³

That He is to be with His disciples a little while longer meant that He would be with them in His Bodily Presence until the Ascension, or in mortal flesh until the Passion. The disciples could not follow Christ because they were not ready for death, resurrection, or glory.

John 13³⁴⁻⁵

Love is a part of the Old Testament teaching, too. The old commandment is made new in Christ and in us. We are to love as Christ loved us, as a physician loves the sick, not for their disease but for the health he wishes to restore. Our distinguishing mark is that we have love one to another.

John 13³⁶⁻⁸

Augustine speaks against those who excuse Peter (S. Ambrose), and says it was a sinful denial of Christ and a sin. Peter's fall was a warning against self-confidence. The chief of all apostles failed, an example that in no circumstances should a man presume upon himself. It is foolish to defend Peter here, for he admitted his guilt in weeping.

John 14¹⁻³

Fear not death for God raises us to life again. After learning that even the chief apostle would betray him, Christ assured them in their perturbation that after all temptations they will dwell where Christ is, with God. All are alive and there is no degree in living in eternity - all receive the penny from the householder. Since the saints love each other, the diverse dignities serve for

enrichment and not invidiousness.¹ The mansions already exist, 428
but are being prepared too, in so far as he prepares dwellers for
them. He prepares us by leaving us, for when He is absent then we
must live by faith :-

Eat ergo Dominus et paret locum; eat ne videatur, lateat ut
credatur. Par. 3

Christ never goes away really : He goes by being unseen and comes by
appearing.

John 14⁴⁻⁶

The disciples knew the way, because Jesus Himself was the way :
Christ goes to Himself, and we go to the Father through Him. He
went back through the flesh which was led from death to life. He
illustrates this point from the human word. If a word is spoken the
speaker, in a sense, comes with it; and if it is retained when the
speaker is finished, the speaker has returned to himself but has
in some way remained with the hearer.

1. Footnote : (Augustine says categorically that the passage must
not be expounded to mean that there are separate places for unbap-
tised infants. This, which Augustine refutes, was the doctrine of
Vincentius Victor, whose two books written against Augustines gave
occasion to the treatise "de Anima et ejus origine". In fact, the
Pelagians taught the same thing :-

"datis enim eis (parvulis) extra Regnum Dei locum salutis et
vitae aeternae, etiamsi non fuerint baptizati.

c. duas Epist. Pelagian. 1. 40

The Council of Carthage May 418 anathematised this precise view. The
date of the Homily we are examining is 416 A.D. and the treatise
419 A.D.)

John 14⁷⁻¹⁰

To receive us unto Himself means that we shall be in Him who is Himself the Eternal Life : we shall be partakers of the Life, and no one shall be able to separate us from either the Father or the Son. To know the Father is to know the Son, but that is not to say that they are the same person as do the Patripassions. To know Christ is to know the Father, not only because He is the Way to the Father but because of their inseparable unity.

John 14¹⁰⁻¹⁴

Augustine shows how the heretics abstract a text in isolation from the rest of scripture, and, if taken together, as for example in the case of Sabellius and Arius, cancel each other out. Each will find Truth, as they reciprocally learn from each other.

The emphasis in "for the works' sake", means that if Father and Son were separate, no work could be done. The greater works the disciples shall do were to be the preaching of the Gospel to the world, and the healing of men even by their shadow. This was Christ working in them. i.e. Christ will do works through them greater than He could do without them.

It is not whatsoever we ask indiscriminately but what we ask in the name of Jesus Christ - Jesus being Saviour and Christ meaning King. As the physician does not satisfy the sick man's craving except in so far as his cravings will benefit him, so Christ the Saviour deals with man : He grants things only for man's salvation. Further, requests are often deferred rather than denied, as in the case of Thy Kingdom Come, and the purpose always is that the Father may be glorified.

John 14¹⁵⁻¹⁷

The Holy Spirit is promised both to him that has not that He may be had, and to him that has that He may be had the more. The

Spirit cannot be seen by those who love the world, but He dwells 430
in the faithful.

18-21

John 14
The world does not see Christ any longer for it only saw the
Man not the God, but the disciples should see Him because He would
rise with that same flesh, and the disciples would see Him and
touch Him. He promised to the disciples a resurrection as His, at
the end of the world :-

Quoniam nemo ad mortem nisi per illum (i.e. Adam), nemo ad vitam
nisi per Christum. Quia nos viximus, ⁽¹⁾ mortui sumus : quia
vixit ipse, vivemus nos. Mortui sumus illi, quando viximus nobis :
quia vero mortuus ille pro nobis, et sibi vivit et nobis. Quia
enim vivit ille, et nos vivemus. Nam sicut per nos mortem habere
potuimus, non sic et vitam per nos habere possumus. LXXV. 3

The mutual indwelling of Christ and His people is begun now : we
believe this now, and shall behold it in the future. Through the
love of Christ we now find faith. If we keep this faith He will
love us to the end when we shall see, and thus receive the reward
of our faith.

22-4

John 14
The Resurrection was not beheld by the ungodly (the world) but
only by the faithful : that was the meaning of how He would soon
manifest Himself to the disciples though not to the world. In that
same body He will come to judge the world. It is important to
remember that it is Father, Son and Holy Spirit who dwell together
in the heart of a believer :-

1) Footnote : earlier MSS "quia nobis viximus, but most MSS "quia
nos viximus", reading above from Migne.

Deus Trinitas, Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, veniunt ad nos, dum venimus ad eos 431

et in nobis eorum non transitoria mansio, sed aeterna. LXXVI. 4

The world are those who do not love Jesus.

25-7

John 14

There is a peace which Christ gives to His Church now, at His going to the Father, and a peace He shall give them when He brings them to His Father. It is this latter peace that He describes as "my" peace. Our peace we have when in unity of heart we conquer the adversary, and in it we long for the peace wherein we shall have no adversary.

27-8

John 14

The man was leaving, but the God was remaining :-
a quibus homo abscedebat, Deus non derelinquebat. LXXVII. 1.

In the Incarnation the form of a servant was taken not the form of God forsaken :-

Forma quippe servi accessit, non forma Dei recessit : haec est assumpta, non illa consumpta. LXXVIII. 1

As Incarnate the Son is less even than the Holy Spirit, as He is less than Himself. He discusses Arianism. The Father and the Son are one in regard that the Word was God; the Father is greater in regard that the Word was made flesh. He would further say that the child Christ was less even than His parents: Let us acknowledge the twofold substance of Christ : the divine by which He is equal with the Father, the human than which the Father is greater. Christ's ascension was the exaltation of man's nature.

The homily is an exposition of Augustine's understanding of the Incarnation and the doctrine of the Trinity.

The things that are seen are there only to give us faith

in the things that are not seen :-

^{rebus}
sed ex/quae videntur, agitur in nobis ut ea credantur quae non
videntur. LXXIX. 1

This statement is central to Augustine's interpretation of the
Fourth Gospel.

Christ was to be seen as ascended to the Father, which having
seen, the disciples would then believe that He was Christ the Son
of the Living God, who had power to do this when He had foretold it,
and to foretell it before He did it. Satan is prince of this
world only in so far as he is prince of its creatures : the term
world signifies lovers of this world. Christ arose to pay the
death that we owe.

1-3

John 15

Christ as the Vine and we the branches signifies that He is
the head of the Church and we His members. Christ is in a real
sense the husbandman too, for He cleanses by His word. Man needs
constant cleansing that he may be more and more fruitful. Augustine
stresses that it is the Word that cleanses not merely the water,
for the Word added to the water makes that a sacrament. Christ
said the same when He washed the disciples feet. He actually
says that the Word of faith can cleanse even a child :-

Hoc verbum fidei tantum valet in Ecclesia Dei, ut per ipsam⁽¹⁾
credentem, offerentem, benedicientem, tingentem, etiam tantillum
mundet infantem; quamvis nondum valentem corde credere ad
justitiam, et ore confiteri ad salutem. LXXX. 3

Footnote : (1) ipsam following Louvain
ipsum following Migne, and the Benedictine.
Either: the Word effects this, or the Church effects
this.

John 15

The branches (disciples) cannot live apart from the vine (Christ), and receive all their nourishment from the tree. He develops this to show that without the grace of Christ a man cannot be christian. He attacks here the views which came to be known as Pelagianism and shows that they are not scriptural and that without grace a man is lost. He is the vine in so far as He is Man, the grace He gives by virtue of His divinity :-

Quamvis autem Christus vitis non esset, nisi homo esset; tamen istam gratiam palmitibus non praeberet, nisi etiam Deus esset.

LXXXI. 3.

He even says that death lies in man's free-will :-

Verum quia ita sine ista gratia non potest vivi, ut et mors in potestate sit liberi arbitrii. LXXXI 3.

Branches severed from the Vine are of no use even to the carpenter - the choice lies either in the fire or in the Vine. Abiding in Christ we ask only for those things that are with the mind of Christ, whereas in the world our prayers are often for what is inexpedient. Christ's words abide in us only in so far as we do the things He commanded, and love the things He promised : true abiding is not to abide in the memory merely, but to manifest in deed.

8-10

John 15

God's is the grace and God's is the glory : therefore the fruit of the disciples is the Father's glory. The disciples shall be seen to continue in Christ's love if they keep His commandments. To continue in Christ's love is to continue in His grace, but the cause of our love and obedience is Christ's love of us in the first place. Man is nothing without the grace of God : and even the Man Christ is true only in so far as He is in God. It is an act of

grace that God took Manhood into Himself.

¹¹⁻¹²
John 15

434

The joy of Christ is in rejoicing on behalf of us, and our joy is to have fellowship with Him. Joy is equivalent to grace. But Christ's joy is not increased because of us, but rather ours is fulfilled in Him. His has existed from eternity in the saints. Christ's command to love is new that we do not persevere in the old, and given as "my" commandment that we do not despise it. Where love is, nothing is lacking; where it is not, nothing is profitable: Ubi ergo charitas est, quid est quod possit deesse? ubi autem non est, quid est quod possit prodesse? LXXXIII. 3

There follows a very fine statement on the primacy of love. Those who truly love each other find God in their love.

¹³
John 15

The Christian love must go as far as to offer life, if need be, but that death does not place him on a par with Jesus. Christ lay down His life and took it again - we cannot do that. Further, a brother cannot die to remove another brother's sin : Christ's death was not an example we should copy, but a benefit for which we should be grateful.

Six MSS add, that a man might die like Him but not redeem like Him :-

Imitari quis morientem potuit, nemo autem redimentem.

We must imitate Him with pious obedience, and not audaciously compare ourselves with Him.

¹⁴⁻¹⁵
John 15

Christ's servants are not truly servants but friends, for they serve not in the fear of bondage, but rather in the fear of holy reverence. They are aware that all the good in them is of Christ's doing.

When Christ said He had let his disciples know all things that the Father had revealed to Him, He was speaking of the future really, but it was spoken of as in the past as a measure of its certainty. (As the Hebrew prophets used the perfect tense for a future event). He chose us, we did not choose Him. If we hypothesise merit then there was no grace :-

Non est enim gratia, si praecesserant merita..... 2.

Christ's election is of free grace, and faith and love are not its cause, but its fruits. That we were chosen to bring forth fruits, means that we had no fruit for which He should elect us.

17-19

John 15

The fruit which Christ commands us to bear is love, and without Him we cannot bear it. And except we love God we cannot love one another :-

Hac diligimus invicem, hac diligimus Deum. LXXXVII. 1

Love is the very ground of all virtues - then follows a very beautiful passage, at the end of section one, but which is rather too long to quote here.

The world is bound to hate us when it sees that we do not like what it loves, but we are to remember that it hated Him before us. We are to love the world and hate the world : to love the people but hate its sin.

21-2

John 15

He tells his hearers that all disciples of Christ must expect persecution from the world as He received it.

22-3

John 15

The great sin was to reject Christ :-
Adventus quippe ejus quantum credentibus salutaris, tantum non credentibus exitiabilis factus est. LXXXIX. 1

He excuses those who have never had Christ preached to them and those born before Christ but he says of the latter that there is the standard of law (Ro. 2¹²). Of the rest, all without Christ shall perish, though he distinguishes degrees of perdition. The diversity of punishment is as great as the diversity of sin, but this is known only to God. (Augustine makes the same point that without Christ men perish in Enarr Ps. 118. Sermon 25 par.3)

²³
John 15

As it is difficult to see into another man's heart, a good man may mistakenly hate even the good - much more the bad hate God whom they do not know.

²⁴⁻⁵
John 15

The sin of the Jews was that in seeing Christ working and speaking they yet did not believe in Him. Without this sin, then all the other sins could be pardoned. He refers to Christ's miracles but argues that similar miracles are paralleled in the Old Testament. Where Christ excelled was in the great amount of healing of men's bodies : Christ was not meaning either the Virgin Birth (which only the apostles learned), or the Resurrection, (which had not yet taken place), both of which are unparalleled. Christ can do all things by Himself, but no man can do anything without Him. All great works were done by His doing, whereas His works He wrought by Himself.

²⁶⁻⁷
John 15

The Paraclete bears witness of Christ by making men believe on Jesus whom they do not see. The Apostles bear witness having been with Him from the beginning, but it is the Holy Spirit coming down on them which makes them do so. He instances Peter betraying Christ before the Paraclete was come, and preaching Him boldly after He had come. It was not enough to cheer them by His example,

but He must also fill them with His Spirit.

John 16¹⁻⁴

Christ tells them what things they must suffer : e.g. expulsion from the synagogue. He quotes John 12^{42,3} about the chief rulers who believed on him but did not confess him lest they should be expelled from the synagogue. They believed on Christ, but not as He would have them believe. Self-righteousness and ignorant zeal made the Jews persecutors. They would even think that to kill them would be God's service - this is a witness of the power of their mission.

John 16⁴⁻⁷

The disciples were instructed about the Paraclete only on Christ's imminent departure, for hitherto they had had His bodily presence. They were sad to know that His Presence was about to be removed, but Christ knew that the inner sight is better. Christ must depart to wean them from His bodily presence : but when Christ withdrew bodily, the Father and Son with the Holy Spirit were present spiritually. The Spirit was to be with Christ, not instead of Christ.

John 16⁸⁻¹¹

The Holy Spirit would reprove the world of sin, righteousness and judgement. i.e.

sin - not to believe on Christ - the sin of unbelief retains all other sins;

righteousness - the righteousness of those who have not seen Christ but yet have faith in Him;

judgement - the world which does not believe in Christ, the prince of which is the devil.

John 16¹²⁻¹³

The truths of which Christ forbore to speak, it is presumptuous to define. It is absurd to say that these things were the sort of things one finds in later apostolical writing. It is the

knowledge which comes from an "inward beholding and hearing", :-
(interiore conspectu et auditu. XCVI. 4), which a man finds
as he goes forward in love in the holy Spirit. we shall all
then be taught of God :-

Sic fiet ut non a doctoribus exterioribus illa discatis, quae
noluit Dominus tunc dicere, sed sitis omnes docibiles Deo. XCVI. 4
No man can attain this full knowledge in this life. The Holy
Spirit gives us the "earnest" and ultimately will give us the
fulfilment. The Holy Spirit shall teach all truth, when He shall
more and more shed abroad love in your hearts.

The Holy Spirit teaches the faithful as much of spiritual
things as each is able to receive, and sets the heart on longing to
know. We cannot yet bear the truth as known by angels. Augustine
warns his hearers against the heretics who pretend that their
esoteric doctrines are the truth which Christ forbore to speak.
Their mysteries are profane novelties.

The Church has no esoteric doctrine : the same teaching is
to one milk, to another meat, for the latter hears not more but
understands more. The babes and the full-grown hear the self-same
truths, the latter understand more. The weak must not be over-
burdened. Growing Christians go on to a fuller knowledge they
do not go off to a knowledge of another kind. Preachers of a new
Gospel are accursed. The truth is one for all, according to the
measure of each.

John 16¹³

The appearances of the dove and tongues of fire were transient
manifestations, for no created nature was assumed by the Holy Ghost.
In the Divine nature, knowledge is not by preceptions but uniform,
and one with the Essence and eternal. Augustine animadverts

against anthropomorphism. Similarly, the inner man, when it learns, assumes in its intelligence the names of all senses; its knowledge and its essence are one. Christ does not speak of Himself because He is not of Himself : He speaks of Him from whom He proceeds. The Holy Spirit hears by being, and is by proceeding. As the Spirit of the Father, and Spirit of the Son, He proceeds from the Father and the Son. All that the Father has, is given to the Son.

13-15

John 16

The Holy Spirit glorified Christ in the world, but the glory given to Christ by all heretics is false glory - the heretics he mentions are the Arians, the Photinians and the Manichees. None of them is good, and Christ is none of them. Many pagans praise Christ but are mistaken : it is of interest that Augustine in this connection justifies the pagans villification of Christians, but dismisses their gratuitous praise of Christ : Christ's true glory is in the Church alone. In no sense have we to think that the Holy Spirit is less than the Son, and the Son than the Father as do the heretics, for to the catholic thinker there are no gradations of essence in the Trinity.

16-23

John 16

"A little while" may be understood of Christ's death and the joy of the disciples in His Resurrection, but is better understood of His Ascension, and the little while of the Church's travail. This little while seems long to us because it is yet going on, but there will be in Christ nothing left to be desired, nothing hidden to be required, in the final of His Coming.

23-8

John 16

The disciples would truly ask in Christ's name, when taught no more in proverbs. In the Coming of Christ however, the Son

does not ask the Father, but the Father and Son together hear him that asks, (but only the spiritual man ascends to this idea).

Christ's intercession is apprehended in the unity of the Godhead.

The Father loves His own work in us.

29-33

John 16

Christ spoke to the Apostles as to children, for they did not yet receive the Holy Spirit as they were to receive Him after the Resurrection. He allowed Himself to be questioned for the sake of the questioners that they might learn, and also for any who subsequently might read or hear His answers. When Christ was arrested, it was not merely that the disciples forsook Him with their bodies, but with the mind and lost thereby faith in Him. The end of Christ's teaching was Peace in Christ.

¹

John 17

Peace in Christ is the end of our whole Christian calling. The Father, Son and Holy Spirit speak together in the hearts of Their spiritual ones. Christ's hour was fixed by Himself in the Divine counsels. The true glorification of Christ in the form of a servant began with His Resurrection.

2-5

John 17

The Father was glorified by the Son in so far as God was made known to the world outside Jewry by the preaching of Christ Risen, that the Son should give eternal life to all, given Him by God. Eternal life is to know the Father and the Son who makes the Father known. The knowledge of God shall be perfect when there will be no more death.

For Christ to have finished His work, Augustine, seeing that it is not yet finished, says that predestination makes the future as sure as the past. For true prophecy the tense is immaterial, and he quotes Ps. 22^{16,17} where it says they pierced

my hands and my feet. Christ prays to be glorified with the Father, with the glory which He had before the world was; not by conversion of the Manhood into God but with the glory which it had. His immortality with the Father was predestined from everlasting.

6-8

John 17

Christ had manifested God's name to the other disciples. The name He had manifested was not the name of God, which was already known to the Jews, but the name of Father. The chosen disciples were given by God (who had all power) to the Son as Man. The true knowledge of the disciples sprang from their true belief, but that true knowledge and belief came only after the Holy Ghost was sent.

9-13

John 17

As Christ is co-equal with the Godhead He has co-equal ownership of all holy creatures. Christ is no more in the world, (i.e. not at that moment of speaking, but after His Ascension). He commends to the father those whom He is about to leave and prays that they might be one as He and the Father are one. Augustine explains that God the Father had even been with them and that John is differentiating the Persons not their Natures. Even when the Son withdrew His bodily presence, He still with the Father, retained the spiritual custody. Christ had retained all that God gave Him, except the one predestinated to perdition, according to Scripture (Ps. 109). As Man he received the elect that they might have His joy; as God He gave them it to be fulfilled in Him.

14-19

John 17

The saints though not of the world, nevertheless must needs live in the world and therefore still need sanctification. Christ as God sanctified Himself as Man, and in Himself sanctifies the

saints, His mystical body.

John 17²⁰

Christ prayed not only for the Apostles, but for all His, who either then or afterwards believed on Him through their word, or through the word by whomsoever preached.

John 17²¹⁻³

All believers are morally one with God in Christ. The world which believes is the elect world. To them He gives the glory of immortality, God in Christ reconciling the world. Christ is in the saints bringing them to perfect bliss. God loved the elect even when they were at enmity with Him, for in all His creatures He loves His own work. By the largeness of His Grace he bringeth the members of Christ into equality with the angels.

John 17²⁴⁻⁶

The Father and the Son have one Will as they have one Spirit. When Christ said of His disciples that they should be "with Me where I am" it meant either in the glorified humanity of the future, or in respect of His Godhead with Him in spiritual vision. The words that follow are that the disciples should see. What they see is the only true God, which is the Trinity. Then shall the saints be with Christ in God. Knowledge of God is withheld from the ungodly, but mercifully given through Christ to the elect, His members.

John 18¹⁻¹²

The long discourse over, Augustine comments on how John moves over directly to the arrest in the garden and leaves out things that are written in the synoptists, though there is nothing contradictory in the synoptists as against the Fourth Evangelist. Judas brings soldiers, not Jews, and therefore there was official backing to this work. Augustine comments on the ignorance of men

who brought force against Jesus, against whom nothing could prevail except by His wish. Christ's divine power, latent in the flesh struck terror and dismay to His enemies. (How much more in the judgement!). That the Jews went backward and fell to the ground signified the forsaking of heavenly things for earthly things :-

.... a Judaeis expectatur Antichristus, ut retro redeant, et in terram cadant, quoniam deserentes coelestia, terrena desiderant. CXII. 3
John mentions the name of the man who lost his ear. Malchus means one that shall reign. The cutting off the the ear and healing it again signifies the renewal of the hearing by cutting off the oldness, and this happened to one who shall reign with Christ. Further that he was a servant indicated that he was in bondage, and when soundness was imparted, liberty was pre-figured.

There is an interesting point in the reproof of Peter which Augustine interprets as indicating not the prefiguring of anything, but the pure defence of His Master.

In suo quippe facto ille discipulus magistrum defendere voluit, non quod significandum est cogitavit. CXII. 5

John 18¹³⁻²⁷

Peter's denial of Christ contrasted with the constancy of the martyrs. Christ did speak openly to the world which means that many heard Him, even though few understood.

When Christ was struck He did not offer the other cheek in the literal sense : the following of Christ's precepts are done not by outward show of the body, but by preparedness of the heart. (Note the absence of literalness in the exposition).

Augustine assumes that Annas and Caiaphas held office in alternate years.

Augustine scorns the Jews not wishing to be defiled by entering the house of a gentile, and yet not feeling defiled by their crime :-

Habitaculo videlicet contaminarentur alieno, et non contaminarentur scelere proprio. CXLV. 2

He scorns the spirit that is anxious to keep a feast and not troubled about putting a man to death. They try to put the death of Jesus on to Pilate to whom, as Christ foretold, they would deliver Him.

John 18 ³³⁻⁴⁰

Christ's question showed that it was the Jews who wished to destroy Him, not the Romans. His kingdom was not of the world, but in it. His kingdom is those who believe on Him. He agrees that He was a king but He was born into the world to bear witness to the Truth, i.e. to Himself. All of the truth hear with the inner ears, i.e. believe on Him : but not only hear Him but obey Him. Augustine believes that Pilate did not wait for an answer to his question "What is Truth?", for his mind was on the problem of freeing Christ immediately.

Augustine sees in the choice of Christ, the choice of the slaughter of the innocent, a type of the True Passover, and how the erring Jews in spite of themselves held fast to the truth. This is exactly what was in the mind of the Fourth Evangelist when he wrote his Gospel. Note also that it was the High Priest Caiaphas who prophesied that Christ must die that the people may live. John's method of interpreting the primitive historic *κρίσις* theologically is clearly seen here, and most certainly expounded by Augustine. Augustine is in the direct line of Johannine exposition :-

Sed umbra veritatis a Judaeis errantibus tenebatur, et mirabili dispensatione divinae sapientiae per homines fallaces ejusdem umbrae veritatis implebatur; quia ut verum Pascha fieret, Christus velut ovis immolabatur. CXV. 5

It is to be noted that over and over again Augustine seems to clinch his argument by displaying the fact that what he is saying at any particular moment of his exposition is only what has been pre-figured in the Old Testament : he is only laying bare what is really there. This is common to the ancient expositors, and presumably was ever present to their minds. See a parallel instance in the phrase "according to the scriptures" in the Nicene Creed, a phrase not easy to demonstrate in the light of modern criticism, but a "sine qua non" of ancient thought and therefore of its exposition. Be that as it may, it is to be emphasised that the scriptures are thoroughly hebraic and not least the Fourth Gospel, which possibly because of its introductory idea of the Logos, is too commonly assumed to be Greek. The ancient emphasis is a right emphasis, even if it is right to draw conclusions that differ from theirs.

1-16

John 19

Pilate had Jesus scourged in an effort to mitigate the wrath of the Jews. Jesus submitted to the mockery of the soldiers in fulfilment of scripture and as a pattern for all martyrs. It was the seed of humility sown then that greatly multiplied in history. John sees Pilate as trying to content the malice of the Jews without delivering Jesus to death. That Jesus did not speak was a fulfilment of Is. 53⁷. "He opened not His mouth". His silence like the lamb's, was the silence of innocence. The power above Pilate's he interprets as Caesar's. He sees Pilate acting because

of fear, the Jews because of ill-will, and the sin of the Jews the greater, though Pilate was by no means innocent.

446

17-22
John 19

Mark says Christ was crucified at the third-hour and John at about the sixth hour. Augustine reconciles this :-

- (a) by showing that it was the third hour when the Jews clamoured for His crucifixion.
- (b) It was not the sixth hour of the day but of the Preparation. If the Preparation is reckoned from the ninth hour of the night (the hour when the chief priests pronounced Christ's death sentence), then Christ's crucifixion took place at the sixth hour of the Preparation, i.e. the third hour of the day. Augustine does not dogmatise here.

That Christ was crucified with thieves is a fulfilment of Is. 53¹² - "He was numbered with the wicked".

That Jesus was King of the Jews means that He is King of all the true spiritual descendants of Abraham, Jew and Gentile alike, children of the spiritual Sarah who cast from the house of liberty the bondwoman and her sons.

23-4
John 19

Though all the evangelists mentioned the parting and casting lots upon His garments only John has unfolded the matter, and given the detail found in Ps. 22¹⁸.

Augustine proves that the Gospels do not contradict each other here. The four parted raiment of Christ signified His Church diffused through the four parts of the world. The coat signifies unity held together by charity for it was woven from the top. It is without seam that at no time should it be unseamed : it gathers all into one - from here comes the word catholic. That lots should be cast is a yielding to God's judgement and not man's merit - here is the Grace of God signified given in unity to all. Things may signify good things though done by evil men. He instances

in this connection the cross and the symbolism of its properties :-

breadth - good works in the breadth of charity
length - perseverance
height - rising, signifying the supernal end
depth - hidden in the ground, yet from which all eminent
and apparent arises.

447

(Augustine has Eph. 3¹⁸ in mind)

On the Cross is signified every good we get.

John 19²⁴⁻³⁰

Christ's hour was coming. He had repulsed His mother in the water to wine miracle, since He was acting in His Godhead : that to which Mary had given birth was now hanging on the Cross and therefore He acted in His Manhood and commended her to John. Christ here inculcates the duty of filial piety. Augustine makes the poetic comment that the Good Teacher spoke from the wood of the cross as He might the wood of his chair :-

tanquam lignum illud ubi erant fixa membra morientis, etiam cathedra fuerit magistri docentis. CXLX. 2

Augustine says she was not received into John's home for the disciples had nothing now, but merely into his own care or responsibility. His thirst is a fulfilment of Ps. 69²². The Jews themselves were the vinegar, i.e. the wine of the Patriarchs and Prophets degenerated. The sponge he sees as their heart fraudulent with its hollow hiding places. The hyssop was the lowliness of Christ which they believed themselves to have covered, which humility cleanses the soul (Ps. 51⁷). The reed was the Scripture, for the sound of a reed comes out with the tongue. The giving of Jesus vinegar by the Jews was an acted parable of their own wickedness.

John 19³¹ - 20⁹

Jesus' side was "opened" that the door of life might be thrown open, from which the Sacraments of the Church have flowed

out, without which there is no entering into true life. He instanced Noah, opening the side of the ark, by which should enter the living creatures that should not perish in the flood, by which creatures was prefigured the Church. The first woman was made out of the side of man as he slept and was called Life, and mother of all living. Here the second Adam slept on the cross that from His side His wife should be formed. The spiritual Eve was formed from the side of the second Adam. He comments on the fulfilment of scripture :- the bones that were not to be broken, and, they shall look on Him whom they pierced. He sees further that the sacrificing of the sheep in the Old Law for the Passover was the shadow of the Lord's Passion. Ex. 12⁴⁶ He quotes Is. 53⁷, Zech. 12¹⁰.

Augustine commends the solicitude of Nicodemus and Joseph. He outlines the Resurrection narrative almost in John's words and says the meaning is obvious and needs no explanation. He says that every detail has a meaning but he had no leisure :-
Neque hoc utique vacat, sed mihi ad ista non vacat. CXX. 9
 Augustine remarks that what the disciples saw was the empty tomb not the Resurrection and what they believed was the woman's words. Belief in the Resurrection itself came only later.

John 20¹⁰⁻²⁹

The woman with stronger affection remained on the spot. That there was an angel at the head and at the foot signified that Christ's Gospel is to be preached from the beginning to the end. Her sorrow was that she now had nowhere to go to console her sorrow, but the angels preached consolation to her.

He debates on the prohibition "Touch Me not", and concludes that Mary is a figure of the Church of the Gentiles which did

not believe on Christ until after the Ascension . Faith in Christ must not terminate in His Manhood.

By breathing on the disciples He signified that the Holy Spirit is not the Father's only but His. The charity of the Church remits the sins of them that have part in her, but retains the sins of them that have no part in her.

The unbelief of Thomas is reproved, and the faith of the Gentiles commended,

John 20³⁰ - 21¹¹ 30-31

Augustine sees in 20 the end of the book which is deliberately put there to emphasis the narrative following, which is a sacred emblem of the Church in the resurrection of the dead.

Augustine explains that the disciples were back to their own craft as a lawful means of subsistence. He instances Paul working with his own hands, but adds that it was lawful for a preacher to live of the Gospel, though they may forego this right. Christ both fed the preachers and at the same time enriched the Gospel by the sign of the inward and spiritual truth.

He explains the miracle : that there were 7 disciples signifies the end of time. In the morning Jesus stood on the shore, which being the end of the sea, signifies the end of the world. Peter drew the whole net to the shore to Christ. Augustine draws a parallel with the first draught of fishes, which Christ gave at the beginning of His preaching. In the first, the net contains good and bad which is what the Church now is, but in the resurrection of the dead only the good will be found. In the latter the nets were lowered on the right side of the ship signifying the good, but in the former merely let down. In the former the net was breaking because of schisms, here the net was whole. There the

boats nearly sank as the Church now groans under its evils, here the fish were brought to the end of the shore, many of them hidden from sight as the departed are now, only to be brought to Christ at the end of the world. Two hundred cubits indicate like the two ships in the first draught/circumcised and the uncircumcised.

The number 153 he explains as the Spirit (7) added to the Law (10), 153 being the sum of all the numbers from 1-17. He also takes the number 3 as a symbol of the Trinity, and the triple 50 as bringing out the ideal of unity in the Spirit who is revealed in a 7-fold operation ($50 = 7 \times 7 + 1$). (Origen according to Isho'dad understood it as the Blessed Trinity $50 \times 3 + 3$)

It is clear that so long as the accuracy and supposed oddity of the number be explained as preserving the memory of the Evangelist who helped to count the fish (Plummer), no true interpretation of the narrative as a whole is possible. The fathers are right, as against some of the recent critics (like Plummer and other conservative scholars), that John had a deliberate symbolic intent in writing that number, though what John's intent was is not clear. It is a more obvious indication of John's whole technique in the use of detail, which conservative scholars have not admitted, as deliberately subserving his theological purpose. It may be that the number has the simple meaning of being/perfect number, and thus representing the perfect catch of fishes, and in that the perfect harvest of redeemed souls. The number 17, as Hoskyns points out, is a prime number of the form $2^n + 1$ a form of great interest to mathematicians. He further says the Greek zoologists believed that there were 153 kinds of fishes, and makes the illuminating comment that when Jerome comments on Ezek 47

he refers to this figure 153, and the disciples therefore make the perfect catch of fish, one of every kind. (Hoskyns Vol. 11 pp. 661-2). The net contained only great fishes for all are great in the Church of the Elect.

12-19
John 21

He interprets that none durst ask Him as none durst doubt Him.

The meal he explains :- the roasted fish was Christ in His Passion. Christ is the Bread descended from Heaven. This the disciples and the whole Church partake of in a dinner. That there were 7 disciples denotes the final blessedness of all saints.

For Peter's thrice denying there is a thrice confessing. By the threefold emphasis on feeding Christ's sheep is shown the need of feeding them as Christ's and not one's own, for self-love is the source of all evils in the Church. The love for Christ should grow into a spiritual ardour that should overcome the natural fear of death.

vv 18 and 19 Augustine interprets as a prophecy of Peter's Crucifixion.

19-25
John 21

He discusses the idea of John never dying, with its traditions. He discusses Peter and John and the mystery that though Peter loved more, yet John was more beloved.

Augustine cannot adequately explain this. He speaks of this life as a life of suffering even to the Saints, and looks at the sin and punishment of this life. He thinks Peter represents the Church, by virtue of the primacy of his apostleship, and following Christ through suffering. The Rock on which the Church was to be built was not Peter but Christ, upon which foundation Peter himself was built. Peter he sees as Action, ("follow me"),

informed by the example of Christ's Passion : John he sees as Contemplation, ("tarry until I come"), to be perfected when Christ comes.

That which follows Christ is the fullness of patience reaching even unto death, that which tarries until Christ come, the fullness of knowledge then to be made perfect.

Peter is the life of faith and action, John the life of thought and sight. Augustine considers them as two spiritual types :-

Quas duas vitas Petrus et Johannes figuraverunt, singulis singulas. CXXIV. 7

The whole Church as St. Peter follows Christ, and as St. John waits till He comes.

(There is an interesting aside. Augustine says some expositors think that the reason John was loved more than the others by Christ was that he never married, but that could not be supported by scripture :-

Hoc quidem in Scripturis canonicis non evidenter apparet.....
CXXIV. 7

(a) Saint Augustine as Expositor.

(with a note on his philosophical position).

To Augustine scripture was the quarry from which he drew all his materials, and preaching the method by which he brought home to the minds of his hearers the truths he had mined.

He believed that the careful study of scripture alone fitted a man for preaching and in his *de Doctrina Christiana* (Prol⁴) he makes a delightful argumentum ad hominem against those who despised even the art of reading on the ground that divine grace was sufficient. He instances the enlightenment of the Ethiopian eunuch, which was brought about, not by an angel, but by human words and a human tongue opening the scriptures.

He speaks (serm cccxii. 25) of basing his sermon on the authority of Holy Scripture and not on the sand of human suggestions.

To Augustine's ideal expositor a very wide and thorough general education is required. He must know Hebrew and Greek and the subsidiary subjects of grammar, rhetoric and dialectic, so that the subtleties of the thought may be grasped. History helps to relate our knowledge of scriptural events to world events. A general knowledge helps us to understand circumstances, figures, allusions and the like. [Augustine suggested the compilation of a Bible dictionary (*de Doctrina Christiana* ii 59)]. It demanded a knowledge of the philosophy of the heathen, especially the Neo-Platonists. He instances

here the example of the Israelites, who when they came up out of Egypt, borrowed from their heathen neighbours gold and silver and raiment.

61

(de Doctrina Christiana ii ~~22~~). It is of interest that he instances this spoiling of the Egyptians, for Origen instanced the same incident to illustrate the same principle.

To Augustine the primary principle of exegesis is to discover what the author actually meant (Conf. 12.27), but the difference between Augustine and a modern expositor in this respect is that Augustine does not give the actual words their finality, but feels wholly free to draw other truths from the words. This is not to say that his mind runs along the lines of arbitrary allegorisations or prejudiced interpretations, for when he goes beyond his text it is often in difficult or ambiguous passages. Where he goes beyond his text, he goes beyond it rather as ^apoet does, in seeing beyond a particular experience or episode. The incident is never doubted, or made to look hypothetical: he remains rooted to the account, but his spirit soars beyond, inviting others to follow (Something will be said about Augustine's philosophic position below). His exposition, even when allegorical, lacks any sense of finality or even authoritativeness, and in many passages he illuminates difficult passages by quoting similar but simpler passages of scripture.

On this matter of allegorisation, which tends to be too readily condemned by moderns, he knew that in dealing with heretics or schismatics it was useless to appeal to allegorical interpretations, which always admits an arbitrary element. He founded his doctrine and his teaching on the plain literal meaning. Allegory really was for the believers and the faithful. Granted a man's loyalty to the historical

Christian revelation, it is difficult to see how allegorisation can be other than an enrichment. The disaster of allegorisation was (and is) when its "findings" become authoritative, as for example in apocalyptic.

Further, he maintained that the allegorical sense must not oust the literal sense, but he built upon it. In Serm. ii. 7, when about to give an allegorical interpretation of the ram at the sacrifice of Isaac as prefiguring Christ, he warns his hearers "... when you hear expounded the symbolical meaning of a passage of scripture which narrates facts, you should first believe that what you read happened as it is stated; lest the foundation of fact being removed, you should seek to build, as it were, in the air."

He excepts from this, passages, which in their literal meaning make for bad ethics or false doctrine. This is thoroughly rational, and as long as men had not grasped the principles of historical evolution, progressive revelation, and the human element in scripture, it was the only course. Allegorisation was truly a rationalist movement. Caird makes the point in respect of Philo in his "Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers" ii 187:-

"(The allegorical method) served in fact the same purpose which in modern times has been served by the theory of evolution, enabling men to connect the present with the past, without allowing that connection to become a hindrance to progress". The past is linked to the present without prejudice to the future. The ~~allegorical~~ allegorical method did great service in the early Church converting the ethics of the Old testament.

It cannot be denied, even so, that Augustine did have a

clear understanding of the principle of historical evolution, which, if consistently carried out, might have rendered him in certain "historical" respects, independent of the allegorical method.

Further he recognises that some passages of scripture are true, not for their own sake, but to bind others together (Cm. Faustum XXII. 94)

If then these two points be borne in mind, i.e. the question of historical development, and the matter of connecting other passages, it is obvious that Augustine was not an allegorist because he was forced by necessity but for other reasons. An important reason is that he was a pulpit expositor, and though the method attracted because of the great scope it gave to his mind, yet the chief advantage was that as a method it is peculiarly gripping to hearers. He even says as much in de Doctrina Christiana ii. 7:- He speaks in general words of churchmen redeeming the world and bringing its members to the Church, and then asks why that statement does not grip in that form; yet if the statement is made from scripture, and then allegorised, how gripping it is. The scripture he quotes is from Cant ² ⁶ ~~2~~ 4, 6 and sees the churchmen as the teeth of the church, tearing men from their errors and breaking down their hardness as if masticated by teeth: he sees further, in their coming as shorn sheep, the figure of men who have laid down the burdens of the world like fleeces, and rising from the water (baptism) giving birth to twins, the twin commandments of love, and none were barren (of the fruit of love).

He says, too, (de Doctrina Christiana iii 36, Serm 32.6) that the scriptural use of figures is wholly free and devoid of artificiality. The system of symbolism is not fixed. The lion may be the tribe of Judah, or the Devil; the serpent the Tempter, or the wisdom of the saints.

Further, the method is present in scripture itself (see remarks on Origen).

Many books say that Augustine knew no Hebrew and little Greek. This seems difficult to admit. He seems at least to have a working knowledge of Hebrew names. He objected to Jerome's translation from the Hebrew, and in a man of Augustine's stature and integrity, this would mean at least some knowledge of Hebrew. His objection may have arisen because of his prejudice towards the LXX which he believed was divinely inspired and not a mere translation, but after all he does quote Hebrew words. Quite certainly his alleged ignorance of Greek is exaggerated, possibly because of his humbly saying in "Contra Litteras Petilianus" "I indeed have studied Greek very little, indeed almost not at all". (The writer remembers the late Canon Quick protesting he was no linguist, but yet he had an uncommon perception into the meaning of a text and always offered a most illuminating and original translation).

The appeal must be to the facts. In many cases in his comments, he refers to the Hebrew text. He wrote six books on the verbal differences of the first six books of the Bible and compared the Latin with the LXX verse by verse. In his commentary on John he frequently appeals to the Greek text. In Contra Julianum i.26 he quotes Chrysostom, but makes his own translation of Chrysostom's actual text because the current version was inaccurate.

He can remark on the force of a particular tense, notes a construction like accusative of limitation and discriminates between synonyms. It seems fair to posit at least a good working knowledge of Greek, and some understanding of Hebrew. In philological scholarship he was inferior to Origen and also to Jerome.

As regards the general equipment desiderated in an expositor - grammar, logic, rhetoric, philosophy, history and general knowledge - he was well provided.

To instance a few examples of his practice.

He shows a sound knowledge of critical principles when he discusses the confusion in Mathew 27⁹ of Jeremiah and Zechariah. In *De Concensu Evangelistarum* iii.29 he questions manuscripts which have vague titles like "by the prophet". He also gives most weight to the Greek MSS which come from churches which have a reputation for learning and research (*De Doctrina Christiana* ii.22).

He describes interpolation (*C. Faust* x.3) when used to maintain opinions arrived at on other grounds as "the last gasp of a heretic in the grip of truth" ("manifesta veritate faucibus pressis, anhelitu saucio dicitis esse falsata."). The Manichaeans were the great exponents of Interpolationskritik. They accepted the New Testament, but rejected as spurious passages which did not square with their views. He says it is one thing to reject the New Testament like the pagans, but it is another to reject parts and not put one's case to the test of the examination of other MSS but merely to make oneself the rule of truth.

When he met the attack of Faustus on the disagreement of the synoptists he instanced several ways in which the one event

could be differently reported and actually suggests a possibility of the science of historical criticism, if these ideas were reduced to rule (C. Faust xxxiii. 8).

In cxiii 4 he does not screw down the literal meaning of the command to turn the other cheek but interprets the principle behind the command.

Numbers, figures, incidents, words all have a meaning drawn from them.

Augustine connects preaching and exegesis, for preaching is ~~the~~ making known the ascertained meaning. His preaching shows sensitivity to rhetoric and to style - length of sentence, choice of word, rhythm of speech, and not least a very convincing power of epigram. But the tractates lack the oratorical finish and the condensation of style of which he was perfect master, for they are the work of a preacher intent only on having his hearers understand. At times one could regret the amount of polemic particularly in the earlier tractates on the matter of Donatism. Yet these very sermons were the means of bringing back great numbers to the Church. The Arian heresy, which was believed dead, was showing symptoms of life, and it is never far from his mind. Pelagianism, though not mentioned by name, was present, and in his full handling of the doctrine of grace and the sharp disapproval of advocates of the opposite error we can sense his positive dealing with this error.

His distinguishing qualities as an interpreter are to be seen in his profound religious earnestness, his heartfelt appreciation of the perfect harmony and unity of God's Word,

his firm persuasion that nothing there is accidental and ^{un}meaning, but every utterance full of truth and power for all ages; that to believe is the way to understand; that things obscure, startling, and apparently contradictory in the Scriptures are not only useful as a discipline of faith, but hint of the presence of a hidden spiritual significance.

The whole impression of Augustine is a peculiar and intimate sharing of his mind with his hearers. He never dominates; there is no "ipse dixit". It is a standing marvel that such deep doctrinal sermons and such detailed reference to the scriptures should be offered to these North African people. He struggles to reach their hearts through their understanding, insisting that he can do no good if the Holy Spirit be not in their hearts.

He never fears of handling difficulties lest he unsettle^x the less educated. In the discrepancy between John 1³¹ and Mathew 3¹³ he discusses it freely, and derives an argument against the error of the Donatists. (John 1³¹ . John the Baptist says he did not know Jesus. Mathew 3¹³⁻¹⁴ . John the Baptist refuses to baptise Jesus for he himself needed baptism at Jesus' hands.) The argument is effective because it is supported by other considerations, even if one would prefer the solution of Theodore of Mopsuestia (in answer to the cavil of Julian), or of Chrysostom.

The Apologists, and the School of Alexandria began the process of transforming and adapting Hellenic philosophy to the needs of the Christian theological tradition, but the decisive steps were taken in the 4th and 5th Centuries by a group of philosophical theologians Eastern and Western, who make this period one of the most fruitful in Christian thinking. Saint Augustine was the greatest of these and not least for his own original philosophy.

There is no separation in Augustine's mind of theology and philosophy. Like Plato, (to whom he is often likened), he is a great originator, ceaselessly providing productive ideas rather than a finished system. The homogeneity of his mind comes largely because of a deep and transforming inner experience, which gave unity to his personality. It is therefore important to say a word about his inner development. (a) Augustine knew Christian faith and Scriptures all his life, and his mind was never free from their influence. (b) Augustine was attracted to Manicheism by the easy solution it offered to the problem of evil, a problem which ever exercised his mind. (This fact explains much of Augustine's great power, for his thinking is the truth of human need, rather than the truth of pure thought). He was also deeply affected by Manicheean materialism. From the latter he was delivered by the study of the Neo-Platonists, Plotinus in particular, who convinced him that God was a Spirit and not the fantastic luminous body of the Manichees.

(c) It is important to remember that Augustine in his spiritual pilgrimage passed through a painful period of scepticism, and this explains why there is about his mature thought a certainly of "having arrived" where he is. He here anticipated Descartes and undoubtedly influenced him.

The only Hellenic philosophy which permanently influenced Augustine was the Platonism of Plotinus. Two years before his conversion, as he was acquiring a deeper understanding of Christianity at the feet of St. Ambrose, he learned through Victorinus (who was attempting to elucidate the doctrine of the Trinity as against the Arians by the help of Plotinus' philosophy), an interest in Plotinus. He was struck by the agreement of Plotinus' teaching with that of the Scriptures, as expounded by St. Ambrose, above all, the Fourth Gospel. He was delivered from materialism and identified Plotinus' teaching about the Divine Mind with that of the Logos Doctrine (A.H. Armstrong says this was an error Augustine never saw). He was sensitive to the differences between Neo-Platonism and Christianity, see e.g. Conf. VII.9 but yet, within the limits set by the authority of the scriptures interpreted by Catholic tradition, he allowed Plotinus to influence him very much. It cannot, however, be over-emphasised that it is always from the Bible he starts, and not Plotinus, and the Bible remains the dominant influence.

The foundation principle of Augustine's thought was the utter helplessness of man to do anything right, or think anything true by himself, without God. Before enlarging on this, his idea of God must be considered. God to him was as He is in all the great Christian Fathers; and quite other than Plotinus'

idea(which anyhow is not too clear).He is the simple and only Absolute Reality.He is the entire Fullness of Being(from whom all creation is derivative);the Transcendent Unity. The conception of the Divine Hierarchy is dropped,and there is shown the Trinity-in-Unity. This transmutation is most marked in Augustine.He affirms the Being and then the Trinity of God.(the Eastern Fathers started from the Three Divine Persons). Augustine does not consider the Unity and the Trinity separately,the one attainable by reason and the other by revelation as the Thomists do. All true thinking begins and ends with the Trinity:as Trinity He creates us,as Trinity we can know Him.(There is a modern movement of thought away from Aquinas to Augustine in Religious circles - e.g. the writings of Przywara).

This vision of the single Power and Act which is the Divine Being,infinite in all His perfections made Augustine sensitive to the dependence of all creation on God,and in particular fallen man. Augustine knew he could neither see the truth,nor act rightly when he had seen it,by his own strength. To a man beginning here,Hellenic philosophy offers no help. It was St.Paul who taught Augustine to look to Divine grace for his desperate helplessness. He sees creation as unable even to exist without God's sustaining presence. This conviction is basic to his understanding of creation, his theory of knowledge,and in his idea of the good life where the redeemed soul finds its God.

Creation.

- A. Like all other Christian thinkers Augustine believed that the whole world was created out of nothing by God.

His description of the formative element in the created universe is thoroughly Platonic. Things are imperfect copies of God's perfection, images of the Forms in the mind of God. Creation made these Forms into images, and everything is good made by God. Evil is not a positive force but always negative, a defect, an imperfection, a lack of order. This doctrine is still widely accepted. He sees God's immediate presence in all things. Yet Augustine is as clear as any Platonist, about the necessity of transcending the visible universe, of passing from body to spirit, from spirit to God. How the soul ascends derives directly from his doctrine of God, and His relation to man shown on the stage of history. And it is this precisely that Augustine's commentary on the Fourth Gospel seeks to elucidate; or to say the same thing in another way, it is this precisely that the Fourth Evangelist tried to make clear in his compilation of his Gospel.

This would seem to be an important point, for this philosophic position lies behind much of his exposition. To take almost a random instance. He expounds the Feeding of the Five Thousand with the barley loaves. Nothing in the incident is understood purely as an historical event, though Augustine believed it to be, but every detail down to that of the toughness of a barley husk transcends its visible meaning and finds its eternal significance. But each incident has more to it even than the sum of its composite parts, (as rich as Augustine shows them to be);

over all there is seen the hand of God in history working man's redemption, now wayward, now lost, now blind, now dead but always in any condition redeemable.

This leads us to a discussion of Augustine's conception of time, but before we leave his doctrine of creation there are two things to add:-

- (a) Augustine proves the existence of God from the insufficiency of all things to account for themselves - "All things cry out that they are made". All things made are non-necessary and relative, and therefore demand God as their cause and support.
- (b) God is the only real cause of everything which happens. God implanted formative principles at the Creation like seeds, which in the fullness of time carry out their work. Everything emerging late was really directed by God in His single creative act.

To turn then to his idea of history and time. The Universe was created not in time, but rather time was created with it. God is eternal: there is no change in Him. Therefore there can be no time, because time is the way our minds measure change and motion. Only created things can exist in time. Time is a mental phenomenon: it is a "stretching-out of the soul". The past is memory, the future expectation, the present attention: the present is the only dimension in which time truly exists, and that is impermanent always vanishing away into the past. He breaks utterly away from the Greek idea of cyclic time. Time for him is the measure of a single, ~~irreversible~~ irreversible, unrepeatable, rectilinear movement of history: it is the measuring of history by human

consciousness. This is the first philosophical theory of time inspired by the Christian Revelation: it is thoroughly original. It can be read with great clarity behind his exposition of the Fourth Gospel in which he interprets God's work in sending His son the Light and Life of darkened and dying souls, and man redeemed waiting and working for its completion.

This theory of time illuminates the pure spirituality of Augustine's thought. His thinking moves in an ellipse whose two foci are God, and the human soul. Like Plotinus he tends to turn away from the external, material world and concentrate on the inner spiritual reality. The forms in matter are "vestigia" of God: but the human soul is an image of God, a separate, independent and complete spiritual substance adapted by God to use a body. It is the soul that has the life and power, actively dominating the body for its own purposes. Further, the thought content is not derived exclusively from its sense perceptions, but these latter are the gates to full knowledge. In all Augustine's exposition you see him peering through these gates, these sense experiences, to the eternal beyond. But the soul is only a creature, and no more - a crucial point for Augustine. Moreover, it is a fallen creature. Therefore, a creature utterly unable to act or even exist without Divine support and assistance, and as fallen, plunged into the depths of misery and need. It is most striking in Augustine's exposition to find always that vivid sense of man's actuality and real condition. Always he speaks to us - we are the blind man crying for light and sight, we are the dead man needing the word of Christ to restore us to life and communion with God in Christ. Here, the writer feels, Augustine has seen the exact significance of all the incidents and

episodes John put together for his interpretation of the $\kappa\acute{\eta}\rho\upsilon\gamma\mu\alpha$. To John the $\kappa\acute{\eta}\rho\upsilon\gamma\mu\alpha$ was the act of God in the fullness of time, offering to mankind in its varying stages of darkness and death the true Life, and the incidents and episodes he chose were to speak to man under forms representative of varying spiritual conditions of soul.

To Augustine, man's whole being was vitiated, and as a consequence could neither truly know without Revelation, nor truly act without Redemption.

B. His theory of knowledge

It was not only or even primarily through a right understanding of things and events that man found a knowledge of God. It was a knowledge of himself.

Though corrupted, man yet had God, for without Him he would die. The ordinary natural operations depend on God, though they will never give him happiness or lead him to God. He says he can be certain of one thing, that he exists, (anticipating Descartes). Why cannot he be wrong? If he is wrong, he must even so exist in order to be wrong. "Si fallor, sum".

To refute scepticism means:-

(a) Man has immediate cognisance of at least one spiritual reality, i.e. himself as a thinking subject, and not through the senses. Augustine's highest form of knowledge is immediate contact of the mind with spiritual intelligible reality, and the first step here is consciousness of our self as a living, thinking reality.

(b) We know one truth, and therefore can know others. Truth

is necessary, immutable, eternal, always and universally true, How then does it enter a world like ours? Truth is the illumination of our mind by the Forms in the Mind of God, and these Forms are in Christ, the Divine Wisdom. He is our only Master, and can teach us truth in the sphere of natural and supernatural knowledge. He leads our minds towards Him and teaches us about His own existence through our knowledge of the simplest truths, and then completes our knowledge and makes it sufficient for the attainment of our last end through Revelation. This is precisely the Johannine process.

To Augustine, in knowing oneself, knowing that we know truth, we prove the existence of God, for only God can be Truth and can account for the presence of universal truths in our minds. This derives directly from his philosophical position on the doctrine of Creation - we move from the depths of ourselves to the depths of God. To Augustine there could not be a self at all without God, and in all his exposition of the scriptures you find him beseeching his hearers to grasp this simple truth. He is not precise in what way the concepts are formed, but all illumination comes from God and is in no sense a doctrine of Recollection.

Purpose of Knowledge

For Augustine the end of all knowledge is happiness, and man can find his full happiness only in union with God. Speculation or knowledge which does not help the soul in this pilgrimage is but vain curiosity.

This position means the primacy of the will in the search for God. The Greek idea of Truth expressed in terms of mind, ^{and} its ideas was not for Augustine. To him Truth was comprehended in terms of will and its concrete actions: i.e. God could be understood

under this category, and man could find Him on the same terms. The direction of the will shapes and determines man's life. The will is free, but if we choose wrongly, our freedom is enslaved. But man on his own can but choose wrongly. Only ~~sans~~ God's grace renders him free, i.e. free not to sin (or in the highest degree inability to sin). De co~~re~~ptione et gratia Xll.33). Augustine believed that the Platonists saw God afar off but could not reach Him, because they could not accept the humiliation of the Word made Flesh and dying on the cross for our salvation. In Han. 11.4 he has the beautiful passage about the plank of the cross alone allowing us to cross the sea that separates us from God.

C. How the good life is found

The determining factor is will and its driving force love. "Pondus meum amor meus; eo feror quocumque feror". (Con Xlll.9.10) To live rightly is to love rightly: and only God's grace allows us to do that. Without his grace we grasp the secondary, transitory and partial goods of this earth, which we should use really to bring us to God. Here lies the essence of sin according to Augustine - the enjoying as ends what we should use as means, a wrong direction of desire to a lower good in preference to a higher good. This love is the driving force of all social life, and the division of mankind is between those who desire their proper end God above all else, and those who choose the earthly goods as ends rather than means. These two societies ("cities") make Jerusalem and Babylon.

The Church is the appointed means by which Jerusalem is made known to us in the manner appropriate to this transitory life.

The Earthly City (Babylon) has no form but is manifest in all states. The warfare between these two cities dominates the whole course of history and is more than a struggle between Church and State, though of course it often takes that form. It is the conflict between right love and perverted love, in which every man and State must take sides.

In these concluding remarks we have made a survey of Augustine the expositor: his attitude to Scripture, and a summary of his theological and philosophical position. In this latter, we have touched upon his idea of God and man, Creation and time, knowledge and the good life, for these are the main conceptions which illuminate his exegesis of the Fourth Gospel. It has not been in any sense intended as a full statement of Augustine's position, but rather of the more limited field of those principles which lie behind his exposition of the Fourth Gospel. For that reason, the instances are largely drawn from his commentary on the Fourth Gospel, and the points are made mainly to illuminate Augustine's handling of the themes of the Fourth Evangelist.

In conclusion then, we are ready to turn to a discussion of his handling of the Johannine episodes and to see to what extent he considered John as presenting the incidents and personalities as historical types of the soul of man in its varying states and conditions. John lay bare the theological foundations of the observable history of Jesus: let us then sum up how Augustine expounded these.

(b) His exegesis of the episodes of the Fourth Gospel.

John the Baptist.

John the Baptist is considered as the summing up of all prophecy and in Hom.1V.7, Augustine actually sums up John the Baptist's words, "I am prophecy itself".

The calling of the disciples.

Augustine's handling of the call of the disciples is revealing. (Hom.V11). He says that the two disciples have already been called by the lake side. The incident therefore means more than this calling of the disciples which has already taken place. The two disciples follow at the tenth hour, and that means they have reached the end of the commandments and are following therefore a new Master, who will give a new Law, and with whom they seek to abide.

Simon's name was changed to Petra, and in his name the Church was shadowed forth: and none is safe save he that builds on this rock (Mathew 7²⁴⁻⁷). Augustine interprets the changing of Simon's name didactically.

Nathanael was not chosen as a disciple because he was learned in the Law, (modern scholars identify Nathanael with Bartholomew but not so the ancients, e.g. Augustine, Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyassa etc.). Referring to Psalm 65.4, Augustine explains that the Lord did choose orators, but only after He had chosen fishermen; rich men, only after He had chosen poor men; emperors, only after workers, lest all of these should think they were chosen for the merits of scholarship or wealth and the like. Nathanael was under the shadow of death under the fig tree, for

the fig leaf indicates sin(Genesis 3⁷). The incident is interpreted as meaning the seeking out of the true Israel.

The seeking out of Nathanael was Christ redeeming mankind which was lying under the condemnation of sin - Nathanael he interprets as the calling of the Church. The Church, the True Israel, are the people living by faith.

The name even of Malchus, the servant of the High Priest, is mentioned by the Evangelist with a purpose, for Malchus means him that reigneth, i.e. when the old hearing is cut away, and a new hearing restored by Christ, then shall that man reign with Him. (Hom. CX11)

In Hom. CXXIV John actually says, in speaking of Peter and John, that Peter was the type of Action, and John the type of Contemplation.

The Changing of the Water into Wine.

In this sign there is at once something mysterious and sacramental. Augustine deplores the fact that men look at the miracle rather than its meaning, and this in itself is a good point for this thesis. This considering the sign as an historical event without interpretation, Augustine describes as turning the back to God.

The central theme of the sign is Christ's coming in the Flesh. The conversion of the water to wine is the conversion of the flat, insipid drink of the scriptures converted into the new intoxicating Spirit filled drink of Christ.

He describes in detail the whole history of man from Adam, showing God's redemptive power at work from that time. The opening of Adam's side when Eve, the mother of all living,

was born, prefigured the opening of Christ's side when the life-giving Sacraments issued forth. As Noah once saved the world by wood (the Ark), so Christ now saves the world by wood (the Cross). Every detail carries an evangelical significance.

The writer of the thesis suggests that this was precisely the intent of the Fourth Evangelist, and the tedious and repetitive discussions on the historicity of the event on the part of some modern interpreters bring a fog where once was clarity of vision. It might have been thought, that as the discussion of the historicity could never end, (for the necessary facts are not and can never be satisfactorily known), some scholars might have been quicker to see that they were raising a wrong issue as far as the intent of the Evangelist goes, and were on a road marked "no thoroughfare". R.G. Collingwood in his autobiography maintained that true knowledge is a process of question and answer, and the important issue is to ask the right question. It is obvious that the ancient commentators were more sensitive to the real issues of interpretation than have been many of our moderns, and had the art of asking the right questions, as far as the intent of the Fourth Evangelist goes.

Whatever value is set on Augustine's conclusions is a matter of personal judgment. The real issue for this thesis is whether his technique is right and also whether the Fourth Evangelist intended his work so to be understood. The writer of the thesis would answer in the affirmative to both questions.

The Cleansing of the Temple.

The natural details of the incident are moralised

upon in the obvious way of the cleansing of the Church of all self-seekers. The deeper significance of the event is made to bear a soteriological significance. The Temple is Adam, mankind unredeemed and ultimately destroyed, but by Christ redeemed and restored to full communion with God.

Nicodemus.

In the coming of Nicodemus the Pharisee to Jesus by night, Augustine sees the coming of Israel from its darkness to the light of Christ. Augustine gives an account of the journey of Israel from bondage in Egypt to the Promised Land. The enemy slain in the Red Sea is the destruction of sin in baptism consecrated by Christ's blood. Their receiving in the wilderness the manna, is the Christian's receiving of The True Bread of Life. He says that this ^{is} what Christ meant, but being in the flesh Nicodemus cannot hear the Spirit. Augustine goes on to show the two streams in the people of Israel, the free and the bond, though both of the same seed. He gives as examples Sarah and Hagar, and Jacob and Esau.

He continues the history of Israel. As they lay in the desert dying from the bite of serpents and were saved from temporal death by the elevation of the serpent, so the true Israel dying from sin is brought to eternal life by the cross which was the true reality of which Moses serpent was the figure.

Nicodemus is handled by Augustine as the type of Israel. Nicodemus' difficulties are our own difficulties, too. The Evangelist is at pains to show that Nicodemus failed to understand and emphasises why, so that the reader may not remain in the same darkness. The Evangelist is not primarily concerned

with Nicodemus who merely passes out of the episode, but is deeply concerned that the reader may understand. This was John's technique, and Augustine saw this crystal clear.

The Samaritan Woman.

The Samaritan Woman figures, to Augustine, the coming of the Church to its Saviour. Devoid of reason (her lawful husband), and in the grip of lusts which never satisfy her, she cannot come to Christ until Reason has sway, and lust is removed. When she had learned Christ, she flung away lust, and preached Christ. (Augustine's emphasis on Reason is most refreshing).

The episode is treated as the pilgrimage of the soul to Christ, and the effect of Christ, when He is understood. (The exegesis is almost autobiographical).

The thought of the exegesis centres round the Incarnation and the Redemption, when considering the Divine aspect; and when considering the human aspect, the experience of man's soul in its ignorance and sin confronted by its real Lord. Indeed, the incident is made to tell this story, and though we may not like to go as far as Augustine, (in interpreting, for example, the five husbands or the two days he stayed with the Samaritans), the present writer believes that it was this story the Fourth Evangelist was actually telling and not the mere incident of the woman at the well, and that Augustine rightly so discerned it.

The Healing of the Nobleman's Son.

Augustine seems only to draw from this incident the point that the Samaritans believed in Christ

without a miracle but not His own people; and he likens the Samaritans to the Gentiles who accept Christ not having seen a miracle, and the Galileans, His own people, to the Jews.

Origen and Heracleon made a great deal out of this incident interpreting it as the salvation of Israel. Augustine seems only to draw a moral and not develop any real soteriological significance.

The Impotent Man.

The impotent man is Jewry, shut in by the Law and waiting for the Spiritual Power of Jesus. The man he waited for was Jesus Christ, who released him from his impotency and set him on his journey.

The Feeding of the Five Thousand.

This incident is made to tell the redemption of Israel. Israel is in great hunger, and its own scriptures (the loaves) which were meant to feed, are but a burden to them (i.e. carried). Though the grain of the bread is hard to get at, (which is true of barley), Christ performed the work, and in so doing opened up the whole meaning of God's redemptive work in history. The people under the Law and carnally minded (sitting on the ground) receive the bread, and their hunger was alleviated. Christ makes plain the meaning of the story of Israel, and then a great and new Israel is born and nourished at His Hand.

The Walking on the Water is interpreted as the coming of Christ to a Church tossed about and troubled, and in darkness. He also makes the incident convey the idea that finally when the Law is fulfilled, Christ comes to those who have fully kept the Law.

Christ coming up to the Feast secretly and then coming out openly teaching half-way through the Feast, Augustine interprets as Christ being latent in the Feast, but subsequently openly proclaimed. He again gives a resumé of the history of Israel showing it as a shadow of our own spiritual pilgrimage - brought out of bondage, the Red Sea crossed, our enemies slain, and living in tabernacles in expectation of the Promised Land.

The Woman taken in Adultery he sees as man given space by a merciful God to mend his ways.

The Man born blind.

The man born blind is mankind in general, born blind by original sin. The coming of Christ cleanses man and restores to him his sight. After being washed and cleansed by Baptism in Christ, (the Sent One i.e. Siloam) the man is now in a condition to show belief in Christ. This is the story of every man's pilgrimage: every man is born a sinner and therefore is blind. Only Christ coming to earth, (the significance of the clay and spittle), can restore to man his sight. To this passage is subjoined the teaching of the sheep, the brigands and the shepherd. The fold is the Church and one can enter only through Christ.

The Raising of Lazarus.

The restoring of the dead Augustine interprets as the resurrection of the soul, dead through sin. He handles the varying states of death and its reasons, showing how God yet never denies mercy. It is the resurrection of our soul that is being discussed.

Lazarus is the habitual sinner far gone in his sin: so far gone, that he actually is rotten and stinks, and has thereby alienated himself from God, who therefore cannot find him. From this sleep, God in His mercy raises him. Augustine beseeches his hearers over and over again to realise that he is not speaking to them about the mere Raising of Lazarus, but is begging them to take heed and understand that the incident speaks of their own soul dying to sin. Their conscience must be stirred and troubled, and in that groaning their faith would be resurrected and they would live again. He actually equates faith with life.

This incident is the climax of the Fourth Gospel, though of course it is not so in the Synoptists. It is bound to be the Johannine climax, for hitherto John has recorded the soul of man in its various conditions confronted by God's Word: - the good, orthodox, yet closed mind of Nicodemus; the superstitious, ignorant, yet open mind of the Samaritan woman; the indifferent, worldly mind of the soldier, who is yet willing to believe; the secluded mind of the impotent man unwilling to believe; the ever present rebellious Jews resisting God's Word; nature yielding to it; the mind of the materialist, satisfied with bread and wanting therefore a king of this sort; the idealist, though not understanding fully, yet perseveres as many turn back; the multitude, untouched and unconvicted; the sinner, convicted: man in his blindness; man without God dying and therefore reaching what is the last experience of our mortal life.

Lazarus is the only turning point such a Gospel could have. Indeed, after Lazarus, the only sequel was for the

High Priest to command Christ's death.

The rest of the Gospel is Christ's Being, His Teaching and His rejection, and the story of those eight days when man slowly realised that Truth could not be slain and that nothing mattered so much as our perception of this.

Augustine should not be left without a brief but relevant digression on his use of the Old Testament. He hardly ever seems to comment on the New Testament except through the Old Testament. It is not only that the Old Testament is fulfilled in the New Testament, but rather that every detail of the Old Testament and, in particular, the history of the people of God shows in shadow and type the working of God's salvation for man, which salvation was finally completed in Christ. Israel's bondage is our slavery to sin, and the story of Israel is but the story of our own redemption written in historical characters. Although this emphasis is made by some modern scholars (e.g. Canon A. Richardson and Canon Phythian-Adams), it is not generally followed in exposition even if it is admitted. But this is exactly how the New Testament writers understood the Old Testament, e.g. the speeches in Acts, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Pauline Letters, and this thesis gives much evidence to show that the writer of the Fourth Gospel worked in this thought-form. Certainly Augustine so understood him and so interpreted him. Further, the teaching of Christ at the Feasts shows an inescapable connection with the scripture readings of those Feasts, as some modern research work on the ancient Jewish lectionaries of Christ's day, though as yet unpublished, is beginning to show, though that is perhaps something to be more fully worked out. If this point

were thoroughly established it would show that not only did the ancient commentators rightly see the construction and form of the Gospel but it would show also a new conception of the composition of the written Gospel, particularly the Fourth. The point is very relevant to the exegesis of the Fourth Gospel, as is the centrality of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the exposition of the Fourth Gospel by the ancient commentators, but to discuss these would mean taking the thesis too far, so we must return to our summing up of Saint Augustine's method of exegesis.

The technique can be made to embrace almost every fact and detail, as in fact Augustine made it do, e.g. the anointing of Christ's feet with ointment ($\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\kappa\eta$), is a call to the reader to anoint Christ by works of righteousness and faith. The draught of fishes is the perfect fulfilment in the Last Day of Christ's redemptive work in the saving of mankind, when there is no division, no breaking of nets, and the perfect number, one hundred and fifty three, are brought to the feet of Christ. The roasted fish indicates Christ in His Passion.

Every number - the five husbands of the Samaritan Woman, the thirty-eight years of the impotent man's infirmity, the forty six years of the building of the Temple - all are made to bear some part of the truth of the Evangel. The very touches like $\eta\upsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \nu\acute{o}\xi$ and $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omega}\nu\ \eta\upsilon$, together with all the topographical detail, which conservative scholars have always thought of as the vivid touches of an eye-witness, all come alike into the evangelical crucible.

The Feasts are preparatory to the coming of Christ: Circumcision prefigures, in the stripping of the flesh, the Resurrection.

In the telling of the significance of the details of the Passion narrative, Augustine rises to great heights. The obvious signs, like the seamless robe and the piercing of Christ's side giving birth to the Sacraments, are discussed, but even details like the vinegar, (the Jews who are the wine of the patriarchs and prophets gone bad), come under his eagle eye. In this connection almost all commentators have seen that the detail in the Passion narrative was intended to bear a significance beyond that of simple descriptive fact, and indeed of a peculiar and particular evangelical and soteriological significance. What has been generally recognised as a true technique in expounding the meaning of the Passion narrative, has not been generally recognised as a true technique in expounding the meaning of the rest of the Gospel.

To discuss all these points in any detail would be to re-present the evidence adduced earlier in this section. Suffice it to say, that all of these incidents, episodes and details are made to bear an evangelical significance. John may never have intended all the specific meanings adduced by ancient commentators, and quite possibly Origen was right in saying that the only one ever to understand fully the Fourth Gospel will be another son of Mary (as John), and one who (as John) has lain in Christ's bosom, but it seems difficult and profitless to deny that John had this further intent, and the task of the commentator is to plumb John's depth. The ancient commentators give overwhelming evidence that they believed John to have written with this further intent.

And that has been the burden of this thesis.

PART C.

- Corroboration of the thesis in the work of
some modern interpreters.

PART C. CORROBORATION IN MODERN INTERPRETERS.

The thesis would be incomplete without a discussion on whether its contention finds any corroboration in the work of modern or recent interpreters.

John was avowedly theological and interpretative.

Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἐνώπιον τῶν μαθητῶν, ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένα ἐν τῇ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ. ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα πιστεύετε ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. Jn 20³⁰⁻³¹.

He selected from abundant material with a view first to create a particular conviction in his readers, and then in virtue of that conviction to bring life to them. The man Jesus is the Christ in whom all types and prophecies are fulfilled, and also the Son of God equally near to all the children of God. The whole narrative must therefore be interpreted with a continuous reference to these two ruling truths made clear by the experience of the life of the Church; and also to the consequence which flows from them, that life is to be found in vital union with Him who is made known in this character(ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ). Each element is of equal moment. The one (Jesus is the Christ) bears witness to the special preparation which God had made; the other (Jesus is the Son of God) bears witness to the inherent

universality of Christ's mission. The one establishes the organic union of Christianity with Judaism; the other liberates Christianity from Jewish limitations, and offers redemption to all mankind.

The Fourth Gospel is distinguished from the synoptists because it is designed deliberately to illustrate and establish an assumed conclusion. Compared with the avowed purpose of Saint Luke (¹⁻⁴1), it can be said that the one impulse was doctrinal and the other historical. But it is of extreme importance that this fact should neither be exaggerated nor misinterpreted. Christian doctrine is history as John laboured to show. The Synoptic narratives are implicit dogmas, no less truly than Saint John's dogmas are concrete facts. The one states the historical facts without explaining them: the other interprets them. But in both cases the exactness of historical truth is paramount. John gives an explanation of the Enigma the Synoptists merely present.

This has been realised from earliest times down to our own, from the day and possibly before that, when Clement of Alexandria called it the "spiritual" gospel. But this theological interpretation, though a truth, can, if overemphasised, cause us to lose sight of another very important truth about the Fourth Gospel, i.e. that the Fourth Evangelist realised that a true theology must be built both on the objective foundation of history, and also, at the same time, on the subjective foundation of personal experience. This John did in his Gospel, by showing that what was historically true and spiritually real for some particular personalities as they were confronted by the Word made Flesh, may be experientially true for all who come after.

The two points,

(a) the objective foundation of history, and

(b) the subjective foundation of personal experience
need a little elucidation.

(a) The objective foundation of history.

It is a fact that the whole of the evangelical data of the history of Jesus of Nazareth is embodied in the Fourth Gospel. This is not obvious at first sight because the lofty theological interpretation the history is made to bear tends to obscure the simple facts. But the facts as such are there, the very same facts that are the foundation of the apostolic preaching as recorded in Acts, and the basis of Paul's writings in his Epistles. In this connection it is worth recalling that, in many instances, the Johannine *κῆρυγμα* is of a tradition more primitive than that of the synoptic tradition, and as against the latter may be more genuine and accurate, (as, for example, in the case of the date of the Crucifixion). There has been a real and commendable movement in recent times to assess the historical value of the Fourth Gospel more highly. Under the same heading it must be said that for John all his incidents did happen on the plane of history. Whatever conclusions the reader may make on the historicity of particular events, like say the Raising of Lazarus, it is certain for John that he believed them historical. Some of them he may have experienced himself, or possibly all of them, or alternatively got some of them from another source or sources. The problem of the historicity may never be resolved. The only tolerable intellectual position to take up is that they were

quite real to John and he believed them historical. John's whole Gospel is a fraud and a scandal if it is looked upon as a poem, the truths of which are quite real whether or not they ever happened. John would have sacrificed his whole position to the Gnostics and Docetists, if his incidents had come out of his own mind or even from a vision. To "rationalise" the incidents, as many modern interpreters do, (Renan, for instance, in the Raising of Lazarus, or even Howard in the Miracle of the Changing of the water into wine), is to lose the Fourth Gospel as a Gospel, even if it is preserved as a great spiritual poem. But John was an evangelist rather than a poet: poetry may elevate but can never redeem a man. Streeter said in "The Four Gospels" p.389, that the whole life and death of Christ was an acted parable, but "it is essential surely to his whole theological position, whether against the Docetic Gnostics, who denied the reality of Christ's human body, or against the passionless Christ of Cerinthus, to affirm that the parable really was acted out (Streeter's italics) in the plane of material existence in this world of fact." He selected his incidents not on the ground of historical plausibility but simply according to his purpose as an evangelist. He had either to choose to handle his material as a chronological historian or as a theologian, and he chose the latter course. The synoptic gospels in themselves are incomplete, and offer no explanation of the facts they present. The "theological" Fourth Gospel is the true key to the "historical" Synoptic Gospels.

(b) The second point about the subjective foundation of personal experience is that nothing is true that is not experienced as truth. The historical event is only relevant when it passes into a spiritual experience. To transmute the transitory historic incident into the permanent personal and subjective experience of the reader was the intent of the Fourth Evangelist, and his technique was to select certain "typical" experiences of man in varying conditions of mind and spirit confronted by the Word made Flesh.

Without elaborating on the familiar ground of the differences between the Synoptic presentation and the Johannine presentation, (which differences are well known to students of the Bible and would in any case obscure the point at issue), it is important to find some explanation of the pattern of the Johannine presentation. With the Synoptists there is no real chronology, but there is a chronological development. There is neither in John. The Messiahship of Christ is an open secret from the first chapter, and what really happens, is that man in all conditions meets God and his reactions are described. Against Him they judge themselves, and as the last word is with God, He appears to vindicate His claim, giving the faithful communion with God here, communion which culminates in eternity by the power of the Holy Spirit. This is precisely what did happen. The Synoptic account of the gradual disclosure in time is true from man's point of view, but 'sub specie aeternitatis' the Johannine account is the real one. John's interest is not in the past or the future, but in the "now" which is ultimate and non-chronological.

Streeter (page 368) maintained that John wrote in the full Hebrew tradition of prophecy:- " And,for myself, I must say that the more often I read the discourses of the Fourth Gospel the more it is borne in upon me that its author was regarded, by himself, and by the Church for which he wrote, as an inspired prophet". The prophets put God's words into flesh, but now His word was flesh, God's Word was now confronting men. By selection of historical types,he showed the human soul in all its forms before and under judgment of the Word,and transformed history into eternity,by transmuting the transitory experiences of life into their real meaning of eternal spiritual truth,or to use the famous phrase of von Hügel, he was " striving to contemplate history 'sub specie aeternitatis' and to englobe the successiveness of man in the simultaneity of God ".(Encycl. Brit.) This is the only way that man can see Truth,i.e. in an experience,even if it takes the experience of another soul to give his own soul the experience. This is the way a soul truly learns. Similarly, the real path to God is found on this personal and experiential level. John is fundamentally right when he makes Jesus say, " I am the way, the truth and the life, no man cometh unto the Father, but by me ".(John 14⁶)

Ideas are only real in so far as they are ingredient in the world of events. The events that John chooses are events of the soul of man confronting the Divine Word. The only way to the Father is through Jesus. To John Reality is not to be found in the supernatural world,nor in the visible world, but in the world of appearances better understood. The Fourth

Gospel stands sui generis, and some modern criticism makes of this gospel a fugitive in the intellectual and theological world. It never deals with myth, mysticism or symbol as such: its theme is Truth, and the writer's only anxiety is that men might see the Truth and do the Truth before it was too late to see or do anything. The truth lies in and beyond the experiences, which are types leading men to Reality, whether we are discussing water or bread. But it is real water, as it is real bread. The truth is in and beyond the fact, the person, the event, the experience, the word spoken; but, it is ingredient in these, and does not exist on its own, as it were - at least as far as mortal man is concerned. Every thing is truly a sacrament, conveying divine truth to him who can see and believe. It is the experience a soul goes through that is the operative power in faith. And in this connection it should be observed, that there is always a time lag in the Fourth Gospel before the experience is understood or assimilated. The blind man "wist not Who it was", the disciples "knew not that it was Jesus", the Nobleman found out only the next day, the impotent man did not know Who healed him.

John's real task was just how this Truth should be presented. Since this reality can only be perceived through the senses, the most appropriate representation is a combination of naturalism with abstraction, i.e. the ordinary, factual material rightly interpreted by thought. The historical only carries a meaning when it is interpreted and then understood, e.g. at the moment when Christ broke bread, no doubt Caiaphas was breaking bread, and the Emperor was breaking bread. All three happened, but only

one needed an interpretation. And it is significant that John, the most sacramental of the Evangelists gave his eucharistic teaching not in the place where the meal actually took place, but round an event the significance of which he interprets at great length. Without that interpretation of that *σῆμα* in the long eucharistic discourse we could never have had the teaching. The Last Supper does not carry John's eucharistic teaching but an event witnessed by thousands. We have narrowed down the eucharistic teaching to the Eucharist proper, but we would be well refreshed to find again the New Testament emphasis of John. We have made the Bread of Life almost equivalent to the Sacrament, but this is magic and not religion, and the interesting fact about Chrysostom in his exposition of the passage is that he makes the Bread mean both the Sacrament and also the Word of Christ. This is nearer the mind of John, and also of Christ. In John the crucial thing is to interpret rightly the significance of his events. Thousands witnessed the events yet few saw their meaning. He calls us to witness them again that with him we may see and then believe and be saved. And the same use of event characterises the whole of John. He does not discuss Judaism as such but deals with Nicodemus: he does not discuss ignorance, as such, but deals with the Samaritan Woman. There is no development here: the Son of God confronts all men from the start. He handles man in all his spiritual conditions and attitudes. There is the good informed mind of Nicodemus, orthodox and closed; there is the ignorant and superstitious mind of the Samaritan Woman, which is yet naively open to Christ. In the soldier you have the indifferent man of the world, tough

and hard, but yet willing to believe; in the impotent man you have the secluded, religious mind, stuffy and unwilling to believe. You find the materialist satisfied with bread wanting to make Christ his King, on his own terms; you find the idealist, who failing even to understand, yet will follow, though many turn back. There is the vast concourse of the rebellious Jews and the still vaster concourse of the multitude who never see and remain unconvinced.^①

Moving on from these particular types, each of which does not necessarily apply to every soul, John progresses to the two conditions which always apply to every human being, though in varying degrees: spiritual blindness and spiritual death.

The tragedy of the Fourth Gospel is that men do not see. The glory of Abraham was that he saw Christ's day: the tragedy of the Jews was that they resisted it and would not see. This rejection of Christ is the diapason of the Fourth Gospel.

John never meant the Blind Man to be taken only as a physically blind man. In war, men lose and sometimes regain their sight, but remain much the same. This man is unrecognisable. Further, it is scriptural to equate sight with knowledge of God, (Isaiah 32, Isaiah 60). The story is not told as a mere story, for it was more. Also, in the text, mental blindness is discussed. All Christian men know that they are born blind, and learn to see truly only after the touch of Christ. The Second Birth is our real birth, to which the first was but preliminary. The dust of common earth and water from the lips of Christ combine to give us the power of spiritual sight. It is always in John the control of the material by the

^①
(Footnote:- If the Woman taken in adultery is Johannine, you have in addition the sinner facing God, and God saving her.)

spiritual, the natural inspired by the Divine that is the way to Truth. No thing, and no human being, can be explained as it is, apart from the divine factor, which alone gives it significance. It is true equally of one's own being and of the history of man.

Similarly in the story of Lazarus. Christ is in some place distant, and the soul therefore dies losing its relation to God in Christ. (In this context even the disciples are types: Thomas the doubter is defeatist, and suggests they all die with Christ; Martha busies herself but in so doing cannot bring Christ to the dead soul; Mary brings Christ to the very place of death). The Word makes Lazarus live, but unlike Christ, who left His grave clothes behind, the human soul even when resurrected comes forth bound in its grave clothes, hand, foot and head. The grave clothes are very clinging, and on this earth the human soul cannot attain full experience of God.

This is the only turning point the Johannine presentation could have. Caiaphas, the figurehead or type of Tradition, commands that Christ be blotted out, and in the divine irony cryptically prophesies that this One Man should die that the people may live. There is the Christian *κῆρυγμα*. How fascinating that Caiaphas the High Priest should make that prophecy: and how significant! The whole of the Old Testament dispensation from Abraham to Caiaphas bears witness to the Son of God, wittingly or unwittingly.

The rest of the Gospel is the logical working out of this decision of Caiaphas. Christ withdraws and teaches the disciples before He is destroyed, or as John rightly calls His Death, His Glorification. The Religious Authority and the

irreligious world combine to destroy Him, but man slowly discerns that the Truth could not be slain, and nothing mattered so much as the disciples' perception of this. Though they had been shattered by the pain, disaster, sorrow and evil of life; humiliated by their own weakness before it; even when they turned their back on their idealism and returned to the humdrum activity of life; yet, the dawn broke, their Master received them with nourishment, and recalled them to their apostleship.

This presentation does not destroy the historical *κρύπματα* but rests upon it, and makes its meaning more explicit. Of all the commentators we have examined, they all, in differing degrees, see that the Fourth Evangelist meant so to present his Gospel, and interpreted him accordingly. Heracleon, Origen and Augustine open up the Gospel unrestrainedly, and Augustine in particular derives a great deal from the Fourth Gospel. Cyril is much more restrained because he was engaged in a doctrinal dispute, and to have interpreted spiritually in such matters would have given away his whole position at once. None of the Fathers ever interpreted a doctrinal issue spiritually, nor did they ever "spiritualise" either the teaching of Christ, or the historical events which are the foundation of the *κρύπματα*. The spiritualising technique receives very scant treatment at the hands of many modern writers undeservedly. Chrysostom, as might be expected was severely literal, but very practical and moral, indeed, it would be difficult to find any writing on Christ's teaching that is at the same time so elevating and so refreshing. But the Gospel is not morals although it is moral.

That had been already offered in Judaism. Morals cannot save a man. That is the direct and merciful work of God Himself redeeming His Creation. Looking at all the great early commentators, it would be Chrysostom who least understood the Fourth Gospel and who left us with the poorest commentary. But even he, as is explained ad. hoc. spiritualised and interpreted typologically when occasion arose, or need demanded.

Such interpretation is not without support, as we may notice if we turn to consider the work of some modern scholars. Hoskyns maintained that the virtual disuse of the Fourth Gospel impoverished quite disastrously the whole field of modern Christian theology, and his great, though unfinished commentary, was a plea for a much needed emphasis. Davey, in his preface to the Commentary, says that the last three generations of English scholars have propounded no conclusions about the Fourth Gospel but only hypotheses, and that they have never succeeded in re-instating it as an unquestionable fundamental Christian source. William Temple must have felt this too, when he published his "Readings" in 1939. (The limitation of the latter book is that the author was concerned primarily with what the Fourth Gospel had to say to him in his situation, and left untouched the problem of what precisely the writer of the Fourth Gospel was saying to his own situation - though, of course, what he found the Holy Spirit saying to him is of the highest value. The book is a great work but does not help our immediate problem). J.N. Sanders in his "The Fourth Gospel and the Early Church" (C. U. P. 1939) gives an indirect

testimony here. He shows the importance of the Fourth Gospel not only in the theological battle against the heretics, but in the Church's formulation of her own doctrinal position. The then theological neglect (1939) of the Fourth Gospel he considered the greatest theological weakness of modern times.

With the rise of the historical method, the authority which the Fourth Gospel had enjoyed as being the work of an eye-witness, waned, and it began to be regarded as something alien and difficult. It still enjoys prestige in worship, and even in preaching, but it is yet a source of intellectual embarrassment to educated Christians. To talk about it as mystical, or to wait for the rise of an oriental or Indian scholar to interpret it, is equivalent to surrender. Hoskyns was fundamentally right when he tackled the whole problem on the theological level, and used philology and all the other tools of an expositor for what they are, the tricks of the trade. The rise of the modern historical method has not illuminated all the scriptures. There are books like Jonah, Job, and the apocalyptic writings which demand other and differing techniques, but most important of all is the Fourth Gospel. That is why the expositions of the early commentators are so illuminating, for they set out primarily to make clear John's meaning. That is not to make a plea for the abolition of the historical method - far from it - but to seek to resolve the problem which, in the case of John, the historical method has presented. A real step forward in this resolution is made if the burden of

this thesis is true, (i.e. that John made a deliberate selection of interpretative personages and events), particularly if it can find some corroboration in the work of modern scholars.

The great weakness of much modern work on the fourth Gospel, however, has been due to the continual assumption that the text would finally yield to historical and psychological investigation. Many critics have assumed that somewhere or other in human experience - Greek thought, mysticism, mythology, history or devotion - the obscurities would vanish, and the Fourth Gospel come to rest. This assumption has hindered a just appreciation of the Fourth Gospel. Let us justify that statement. In the great ferment of ideas and theories coming mainly from Germany, English scholars seemed reluctant to be carried away. English scholarship has always been cautious, competent and constructive, and against these new ideas appeared conservative and defensive. Sanday, Stanton, and even a unitarian like Drummond maintained doggedly and definitely the apostolic nature of the Fourth Gospel, together with its authority and historicity. When E.F. Scott wrote his vigorous book "The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology" (1906) although he contended that the Fourth Gospel was a re-interpretation of Christianity for hellenists, with a polemic undertone against Jewry, Gnosticism and the Baptist sect, and with an over-all teaching on the true nature of the Church, he did what many others have done, that is, to propound theories rather than answer questions. Burkitt attacked the historicity, and said

John was concerned mainly with ideas and not facts. Inge, in some brilliant encyclopaedia articles maintained that the Gospel could be explained on the grounds of symbolism, allegory and mysticism, as also did von Hügel, Peake, Brooke and Moffat have stoutly maintained that the historical and allegorical are not mutually exclusive and have done great service in checking the tendency to abandon the historical element. Bacon, who has had a very strong and continuous effect in this Country, particularly among students, is severely critical. The Fourth Gospel is the Synoptic Gospel heavily worked over in Rome about 150 A.D. with a scheme of the religious festivals superimposed with typical "signs" and discourses of Jesus.

It is revealing to consider how tentative and hypothetical much recent work has been. Gardner took up a position similar to Scott. Strachan tried to detect the redactor's hand, whilst maintaining the historical value of the Gospel. Latimer Jackson, in his small book summing up the critical position in 1918, is extremely cautious and non-committal. Burney, who possibly overstated his case, gave a valuable corrective to the position as represented, say, by Inge. Armitage Robinson saw the work as that of a creative and original mind. Charnwood considered it a devotional re-writing of history. Nolloth vigorously supported tradition. Burch thought the Gospel was early, independent of Mark and written in Aramaic. As illuminating as these writers have been, their technique hindered a full and just appreciation of the Fourth Gospel.

Admittedly, much modern work is neutral to this thesis, for it sets out to answer questions other than that of interpretation. Further, the thesis is not an attempt to assess all recent work, but to justify in this connection two contentions

(a) that the pure historical, mythical, mystical or devotional lines of interpretation lead to an impasse and,

(b) because the Fourth Gospel cannot be so assessed without doing violence either to scholarship or intellect, there may be found another way of interpretation which can contain the temporal and eternal in one thought form without sacrifice to the reality of one and the truth of the other.

The Fourth Evangelist addressed himself to the problem of the relation between the finite and temporal and the infinite and eternal. The Evangelist set about it in an unusual way both as to the formulation of the problem and the understanding of its meaning. This is precisely what we have to unfathom. It would seem that all the early commentators accepted the technique, though there is much evidence that the Church did not readily accept it at first, and it was only when the Church saw that the solution to their doctrinal problems had already been seen and formulated by John that his Gospel rose to its leading position. Admittedly, the problem became really acute in the rise of modern criticism, but John's genius in his selection of historical personages and incidents at grips with eternity was the greatest contribution to the problem.

Hoskyn's commentary gives much confirmation of that view of the Fourth Gospel which my study of the ancient commentators has suggested. For example, he says (p. 224 Vol. I) that in instances like Nicodemus, the Samaritan Woman, the Blind Man, Lazarus, and the Beloved Disciple he is saying something to all men and not describing events :-

"The Evangelist does not inform his readers whether Nicodemus believed or disbelieved, just as he gives them no information concerning the later history of the Samaritan woman, or of the man born blind, or of Lazarus, or even of the Beloved Disciple. This is not because they are to him no more than symbols, but because he is concerned with the meaning of the mission of Jesus for all men. The discourse therefore must not end otherwise than by leaving Nicodemus faced by the final issue of faith and unbelief of salvation and judgement. To have satisfied the curiosity of his readers, even if he could have done so, would have disturbed the seriousness of the discourse and made it a mere historical incident." This is saying a great deal .

Davey, in his introductory essay, (based on Hoskyns' findings but not written by Hoskyns), says that this selection of a few incidents and personages confronting Jesus is not an arbitrary limitation of the field of phenomena but has the contrary effect of bring^{ing} the whole Cosmos within the range of observation. p. xliv. "Not only the Old Testament manna, but the universal phenomenon of bread, and behind bread, of the necessity of eating : not only the Baptism of John, but ceremonial washing, and behind it, the universal significance of water : not only Biblical themes like shepherds and sheep and vines, but the contexts of the human ordering of the means of life and the

natural order of growth and fertility, now bear witness to the glory of God in Jesus, and are accordingly perceived to have theological significance. Even the compassionate acts of Jesus, the restoring of sight to the blind, of life to the dead, and the titles of Jesus, Word or Son, once they have been authenticated in His glorification, illuminate theologically the fact of human paternity, the fact of speech, the facts of life and death, of darkness and light." The theological significance of history can be interpreted when it is detached from its chronological context and is narrated non historically (xlvi). The event of Jesus comes to be THE event which bestows upon all events their theological meaning. He justifies the whole technique by saying that this treatment of history was forced upon John by the history he had experienced, and is in no sense an idiosyncrasy of his environment or temperament (lvii). It would be difficult to find thinking on the Fourth Gospel more forthright or illuminating.

On the other hand, some of the dominant types of modern interpretation have notably failed to make real sense of the Fourth Gospel. Loisy and Heinrich Holtzmann though one was a French Roman Catholic and the other a German Protestant represent, (together with others like Strauss, Bruno Bauer, Ferdinand Christian Baur, Schweigler, Julicher, and Reville) a position which may be described as orthodox and critical. Their general position was that John loses himself in his discourses and that his religious meditations, in which it is difficult to distinguish the symbol from the fact, give us a Johannine Christ and a Johannine theology. Mysticism is its theme, and mystical union its end. The allegories show through their intelligible experiences

a supernatural counterpart, as in Alexandrine allegories. The Incarnation is metaphysical rather than religious or moral, and knowledge of Him a theological conception. The synoptic eschatology gives place to a hellenic immortality realised in the here and now. It is the syntheses of Judaism and Hellenism, and the giving of the former to the hellenic world. This position was largely shared by men like Burkitt, E.F. Scott, Inge, and Bacon though in some respects these latter represented a more advanced type of criticism. Yet, with all the light and truth that this type of interpretation contains, the very heart of the Fourth Gospel i.e. history and its true meaning, the issue which the Fourth Evangelist saw so brilliantly and conveyed with such energy, is not only not understood and interpreted, but has a fog cast round it.

Others resisted the conclusion that the Fourth Evangelist had transferred the sphere of revelation from the realm of historical fact to the inner world of mystical thought and experience, and among these were on the whole our own English scholars, together with the Roman Catholic scholars like Lagrange, Schanz and Knabenbauer. The men associated with this traditional orthodox position are men like Bleek, de Wette, Reuss, Luthardt, Godet, Zahn, Lepin, Grandmaison and Tillman. The great Dominican Lagrange is possibly the greatest of this school, and its position cannot be disregarded. They maintain, with the Author himself, that the work is avowedly historical, both in word and deed. The theological significance of the book lies in its actual history, all of which carries further significance, though the Author selected the facts most significant

of God's work in Christ. The style and Johannine nature of the Gospel are by no means denied but rather attested. The purpose of the book was to give readers a solid basis for faith, but also it was a polemic against Docetism and Gnosticism. Yet all the time, it is an historical document.

Even this does not satisfy, as it would not have satisfied the Fourth Evangelist. For the Evangelist himself forbade his readers ever to rest even on this important and particular history. His very words are nothing, unless interpreted by the Spirit. Even He Himself is merely a son of man :-(John 8⁵⁴

"Jesus answered, If I glorify myself, my glory is nothing : it is my Father that glorifieth me; of whom ye say, that he is your God") and his words and actions meaningless,(John 7¹⁶⁻¹⁸ "Jesus therefore answered them, and said, My teaching is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak from myself. He that speaketh from himself seeketh his own glory : but he that seeketh the glory of him that sent him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him"), if we think of Him only on an historical plane. He stabs history to the heart in showing that it does not contain in itself its own evident, analysable and describable meaning. The expression of the ultimate blasphemy is "Whom makest thou thyself". The whole section of Jesus at the Feast of Tabernacles is central to this issue of history and event with its meaning and interpretation.

Yet, the critical *via media*, hoping to disentangle the interpretation from the facts and doing justice both to modern scholars and to orthodoxy at the same time, lands us in an impasse.

On this road the seeming breaks and contradictions of the Fourth Gospel suggest a handling of it on the lives of the Pentateuch, yet the Fourth Gospel will not be divided into strata. R.H. Strachan and others have worked on this line with unsatisfactory results. When scholars try to suggest which is history, which interpretation and which the work of the redactor they either admit defeat, or join the orthodox. In any case, the method permits of too much subjective speculation and does not yield firm and fair conclusions. When Harnack said that the Fourth Evangelist could only be used with caution and indeed hardly used it himself at all, the Fourth Gospel began to disappear from the scene. Renan, in a valiant justification of his own high regard for the Fourth Gospel, showed that the Gospel had a great historical value, and in many places showed a tradition more primitive than that of the Synoptists. He believed that Nicodemus and the Samaritan Woman and other personages in the book were genuinely historical and that the interviews with Jesus did happen, but he was wrecked on the rock of the Raising of Lazarus, and his rationalisation of the event. He angered conservatism and was dismissed by liberalism. He could not disentangle history from interpretation. It is quite disconcerting to reflect how many fine and competent scholars allow themselves to be wrecked on this most obvious of rocks. It is not that Renan failed, or the other scholars either for that matter; it is the method that fails. What Jesus is to the faith of a Christian, he was in the flesh.

To turn now to our English scholars - men like Wescott, Lightfoot, Sanday, Abbott, Stanton, Drummond, Scott Holland,

Burney, Bernard and Howard. Sanday, Lightfoot and Stanton took up a defensive role against the German critics, but it was not a mere resistance to new thought, it was because they perceived that the critical method raised as many problems as it solved, and the right was not always on the side of the "advanced". For this they are often condemned as conservative, but it would be to blind oneself to the facts not to see that by refusing to be led away they really saw further than their contemporaries. Bacon took up the critical continental position and tried to show the prophetic humanitarian Jesus disentangled of Pauline - Johannine speculations, and he certainly has had a strong influence on the student life of recent years. But English scholars have been uneasy here, and they have never closed the door tight. They have always seen that even Mark is a heavily doctrinal document, and have refused to be carried away by hypotheses. Lightfoot, Sanday, Stanton, Plummer and Bernard followed along the road of the minutiae of critical investigation and were most competent in that field, too, but always they seem to stop and stand defensively. Their weakness was that they seem to assume that history and theology are ultimately identical factors : they never say as much, but that position is implied. They were never satisfied with the liberal edifice of Jesus laid in Galilee and completed in Nicea, so they fall back on tradition. It was the historical work of an eye witness. Even the unitarian scholar Drummond gave great and unexpected support here in his very readable book "The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel", Williams and Norgate. 1903.

The historical and theological problem of the Fourth

Gospel still remains unsolved. But many scholars have shed light on the problem and indicated the lines on which advance might be made e.g. Westcott. In his work there is much corroboration for this thesis. Westcott turned to the Fourth Gospel as a theologian, and at a time when the historians had not yet driven the theologians out of the field. A surface judgment of his work would be that it was a monument of learned conservatism : but his theology saves him, and his introductory essays see much further than many other commentators, who cannot have assessed rightly his valuable and permanent contribution to the study of the Fourth Gospel. E.G. these statements from his introduction :-

"He regards everything on its divine side. For him the eternal is already; all is complete from the beginning, though wrought out step by step upon the stage of human action. All is absolute in itself, though marred by the weakness of believers. He sees the past and the future gathered up in the manifestation of the Son of God. This was the one fact in which the hope of the world lay. Of this he had been assured by the evidence of sense and thought. This he was constrained to proclaim : 'We have seen and do testify'. He had no laboured process to go through : he saw. He had no constructive proof to develop : he bore witness. His source of knowledge was direct, and his mode of bringing conviction was to affirm (pp. lxxii, lxxiii)." "As Christ Jesus He 'establishes the organic union of Christianity with Judaism'; as the Son of God, He 'bears witness to the inherent universality of His mission and liberates Christianity from Jewish limitations'" He brings Paul and John together, and makes the New Testament cohere. Whereas Faith in the Synoptists is the particular

manifestation of spiritual energy that brings physical deliverance. in John it is the active transference of the whole being into another life altogether. John gave the historical basis of Paul's preaching. The shape of John is determined by a design to "illustrate and establish an assumed conclusion". The synoptic Gospels contained the basic historical facts and teaching which experience interpreted, but John reviews the facts in the light of their interpretation. The incidents of the Fourth Gospel are for Westcott precise history :- "The historic interest of St. John in the substance of his narrative is..... purified and made more intense by the dogmatic significance with which he feels that each event is charged". He sees that the Evangelist used his own language and style, but that they conveyed the meaning of the Lord more precisely. The Gospel was not a supplement to the others, a further interpretation or an additional speculation : it stands in its own right as a mature expression of apostolic experience perfected by the teaching of the Holy Spirit. John "works out his own design, and it is our first business to consider how he works it out."

This has been the precise concern of this thesis, with which there has been incorporated an examination of the ancient commentators and the light they throw on the problem. In further support of the thesis, Westcott showed that John's incidents and episodes were chosen for a specific effect.

"He takes just so many events and so much of each as will illustrate the central truth which he finds in a particular view of the Person of Christ" Iv.

".....the characters which move about the Lord offer typical representations of faith and unbelief in their trials and issues" lxxv.
He showed, too, that it is to John we owe almost all our

knowledge of the disciples, for to John they represented "types 506 of faith". He instances our knowledge of Nathanael, Nicodemus, Andrew, Philip, Thomas, the beloved disciple, John the Baptist, the Samaritan Woman, and Mary Magdalene. From him, too, derives all our insight into the characters of Caiaphas, Pilate and Judas. We see these he argues because they are all shown "in the light of Christ's presence". In fact, the entire section of his introduction entitled "The Characters" could be quoted verbatim, except that it is rather long for inclusion in a thesis. And before leaving this point, it is worth referring to his discussion of the two opposite characters, the learned rabbi Nicodemus and the ignorant villager the Samaritan Woman, as they were confronted by Christ unfolding the mysteries of the Kingdom. His discussion goes right to the heart of the Johannine intent, and gives at the same time a corroboration to this thesis that could hardly be over-estimated. Other "characters" are given a similar and appropriate interpretation.

Scott Holland, in his posthumous work "The Fourth Gospel" (1920); likewise approached his work as a theologian. He saw that the synoptic gospels are not self-sufficient and complete and offer no explanation of the presentation they offer us. They leave Jesus as an enigma, an enigma which belongs to the synoptic gospels by the very nature of their construction. St. John was in possession of the solution of this enigma and he wrote his Gospel to make it known to others. Scott Holland understood the synoptic gospels via the Fourth Gospel, which provided the proper and satisfactory theological interpretation of the enigmatic man Jesus of the former. The existence of the synoptic

gospels evoked the Fourth Gospel and conditioned its form and matter. Armitage Robinson held a similar view. This position led Scott Holland to a conservative opinion of the Fourth Gospel, but his whole approach is most refreshing.

The Fourth Gospel both to Westcott and Holland was the key to the biblical literature as a whole, and that is why their work is lasting so long. The synoptic Christology demands the Johannine interpretation. John saw this just as clearly as he saw that the simplest thing in life is unintelligible without the divine factor behind it. To the Evangelist this was the Truth to which most men are blind, and even when stated, takes much grasping.

There is confirmation to be found in W. Lock's small but very able commentary in Gore's Commentary. He outlines John's purpose as :-

- (a) to supplement the Synoptic narrative.
- (b) to show Christianity as the fulfilment of all Judaism in its worship and hopes.
- (c) to show the development of the Church in the light of Christ's teaching.
- (d) to show that Christianity was the fulfilment of all religious and philosophical speculation.

For this purpose Lock maintained that John chose incidents which he described as "symbols of God's eternal working" p. 241. All the material world is now charged with a rich and new meaning. He has seen "thousands spiritually fed, the eyes of spiritually blind opened, the dead in sin quickened into life". p.241. These incidents are to us a "warning and example".

It would seem then incontrovertible that the assumption that somewhere or other in human experience - Greek thought,

mysticism, devotion, mythology and even history - the Fourth Gospel would eventually come to rest is an "ignis fatuus".

Frankly, the Fourth Gospel will not yield in the end either to historical or psychological investigation. The very fact that these techniques lead invariably to an impasse indicates that they are only partially true and at their best inadequate. The suggestion of this thesis that John's design was the deliberate handling of personages and incidents to set forward the eternal truth of the work of the Son of God appearing on the plane of history as Jesus the Christ, and given :-

- (a) as a necessity arising from the very historical facts.
- (b) in the only way the human mind could grasp the significance of God's work

is a suggestion that may yet bring a ray of light in a field of experience which is dark not so much for the simple, but rather for the scholar. The need is not for us to go back on our scholarship, but forward, through it and beyond. Moreover, there is a great deal of support for this contention in the work of modern scholars : explicitly by men like Westcott, Scott Holland, Hoskyns, Davey, and W. Lock, and implicitly by the vast number of scholars who have been anxious to avoid finality in their work and keep the question open. The evidence may not be conclusive but it is yet convergent.

This thesis is primarily an examination of the way in which the early commentators Heracleon, Origen, Cyril, Chrysostom, and Augustine expounded the Fourth Gospel, and their expositions illuminate not only the purpose and intent of the Fourth Evangelist but interpret him in a way that is truer to his mind

than many modern expositors. But at the same time it is also a discussion of the present situation which has arisen since the advent of the scientific historical movement. The ancient commentators are studied because their technique is not wholly irrelevant when the Fourth Gospel is to be interpreted. If the thesis serves to help towards a reconsideration of the problem of the Fourth Gospel, its work will have been largely done. But behind the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel there lies the interpretation of the Gospel itself, and with the Gospel the interpretation of the Biblical literature as a whole. The "spiritualising" of the ancient commentators, (too easily condemned and far too readily maligned), may yet be the right technique to understand the Fourth Gospel : it may yet turn out, if sensitively filed, to be the key that will open us out into the large room in which John thought and lived. It would be difficult to over-rate the importance of placing the Fourth Gospel into the centre of our theology, and there without sacrifice of scholarship or intellect.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The nature of these studies is such that my time has been spent in close application to the details of the texts of the commentators themselves, and conclusions are drawn almost entirely from these analyses. The bibliography is not extensive mainly for the reason that the commentators are made to speak for themselves, and also because there is very little work published on the subject of the thesis.

The Texts :-

Heracleon	: Texts and studies Vol. I No. 4	A.E. Brooke Cambridge 1891
Origen	: In evangelium Ioannis	A.E. Brooke Cambridge 1896
Cyril	: In D. Joannis Evangelium	P.E. Pusey Oxford 1872
Chrysostom	: Homiliae in Ioannis Evangelium	Montfaucon Paris 1836
Augustine	: In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus	Migne.

The last three have translations in the Library of the Fathers which I have used. The other two are not translated.

Articles :-

The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers - Committee of the Oxford Society of historical theology-Frowde 1905

Exegesis	- Catholic Encycl.
Origen	- D. C. B.
Heracleon	- D. C. B.
Allegory	- E. R. E.
Allegory	- Jewish Encycl.
Alexandrine Theology	- E. R. E.
S. John (von Hugel)	- Encycl. Brit.

S. Augustine	- Various Writers	-	1930
Appasamy	- Christianity as Bhakti Marga	- London	1927
Appasamy	- The Johannine doctrine of Life	- London	1934
Armstrong	- Introduction to Ancient Philosophy	- London	1947
Augustine	- Confessions de doctrina Christiana		
Bacon	- The Fourth Gospel in research and debate	-	1918
Bernard	- The Gospel according to S. John I.C.C.	- Edinburgh	1928
Bethune Baker	- History of the Christian Doctrine	-	1903
Bardenhewer	- Patrology	- Freiburg	1908
Bigg	- Christian Platonists of Alexandria	-	1886. repr. 1913
Box	- Priest as Student (essay on Fathers)	- London	1939
Bright	- Age of the Fathers (Two vols.)	- London	1903
Burney	- The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel	-	1922
Bury	- The Fourth Gospel and the Logos Doctrine (symbolism and allegory)	- Cambridge	1940
Butterworth	- Origen on First Principles	- London	1936
Chase	- Chrysostom	- Cambridge	1887
Collinson	- Key to the Fathers		1813
Coneybeare	- Examination of the Fathers		1839
Dods	- Expositors' Bible	- London	1910
Drummond	- Character & Authorship	- London	1903
Eisler	- The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel		1938
Farrer	- Rebirth of Images	- London	1949
Godet	- Commentary (trans.)	-	1888-9
Grant	- The Bible in the Church	- New York	1948
Gwatkin	- Early Church History		1909
Hatch	- Hibbert Lectures	-	1888
Scott Holland	- The Fourth Gospel	-	1923
Hoskyns	- The Fourth Gospel (Two vols)	- London	1940

Howard	- The Fourth Gospel in recent criticism & interpretation	- London	1931
	- Christianity according to St. John	- London	1943
Roakes-Jackson	- History of the Christian Church	- Cambridge	1891
Latimer	- The Fourth Gospel	- Cambridge	1906
Lightfoot	- Apostolic Fathers	- London	1893
Lock	- Gore's one volume Commentary	- London	1928
Lofthouse	- Father and Son	- London	1934
Mac Gregor	- The Gospel of John	-	1928
Mead	- Fragments of Gnostics (p. 391)	1900 (2nd ed.)	1906
Einar Molland	- The Conceptions of the Gospel in the Alexandrine Theology	- Oslo	1938
Montgomery	- S. Augustine	-	1914
Nolloth	- The Fourth Evangelist	- London	1925
Odeburg	- The Fourth Gospel	-	1929
Origen	- de Principiis Koetschau	- Leipzig	1913
Pope	- S. Augustine of Hippo	-	1937
Reville	- Le Quatrieme Evangile	- Paris	1902
Sanday	- Criticism of the Fourth Gospel	-	1905
Sanders	- The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church	- Cambridge	1939
	Lectures on Heracleon, Origen & Clement	- (Unpublished)	
Scott	- The Fourth Gospel	- Edinburgh	1906
Schmiedel	- The Johannine Writings	- London	1908
Sparrow Simpson	- S. Augustine's Episcopate	-	1944
Smith	- Ante-Nicene Exegesis Six vols.	- London	1925
Strachan	- The Fourth Evangelist	-	1925
Streeter	- The Four Gospels	-	1924
Swete	- Patristic Study p.157		1902
Temple	- Readings in S. John's Gospel	-	1939
Tixeront	- Patrology		1920

Torrey	- The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel	-	1923
Wendt	- St. John's Gospel	-	1902
Westcott	- The Gospel according to S. John -		1908
	History of Canon of New Testament -		1870

I wish to acknowledge a particular debt to :-

Sanders for the general background to Part A, and also for his unpublished lectures on Heracleon, Clement, and Origen.

Chase . for his work on Chrysostom.

Wescott and Hoskyns for their invaluable commentaries.