

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jts-os\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

based on a conception which runs through earlier Irish writings, though it is possible that all these have been influenced by the description of the hundred-headed fiery dragon Parthemon in Brandes's version A, in whose mouth sinners are placed. In the older Latin version the description of the reception by the angels of the good and evil soul respectively, and the vision of God shewn to the latter, form a general parallel to the events that occur in the last of the Seven Heavens in the *Vision of Adamnan*, though there is evidence to shew that the whole episode of the Seven Heavens included in that vision is not peculiar to Ireland at all, but is derived from an external source.<sup>1</sup> Again, in the older Latin version St Paul looks back from the height of Heaven, and sees a great fire spread over the whole world; this resembles the incident in the vision of St Fursa where the saint, lifted up on high, looks downward, and sees four fires which subsequently unite into one.

In conclusion, it is clear that the mediæval versions of the *Vision of St Paul* were known in Ireland from an early date. Indeed, it could hardly be otherwise, when we realize the great popularity of the piece, as well as its use by the Anglo-Saxon Church,<sup>2</sup> the theological literature of which contains so many parallels to the Irish. It may be that some student, better acquainted with the contents of Irish MSS than the present writer, may be able to indicate a complete text. That the very oldest versions (especially the Latin) were studied in Ireland seems also probable.

ST JOHN D. SEYMOUR.

### SOME TECHNICAL TERMS OF GREEK EXEGESIS.

It has been said that the inheritance of Origen was divided into two parts, one of which passed to Alexandria and the other to Antioch; that his Platonism in thought and his allegorical interpretation of the Bible formed the Alexandrian share, while his critical activity and his devotion to the actual text of Scripture were maintained and continued by the scholars of Antioch. This statement, however, calls for one important qualification. It should be remembered that the tradition of Antiochene learning was from the earliest times connected with Aristotle and the rhetoricians, just as the tradition of Alexandria was

<sup>1</sup> An article on this subject by the present writer will appear in a forthcoming number of the *Zeit. für Celt. Phil.*

<sup>2</sup> The attitude of the Anglo-Saxon Homilist Aelfric towards the *Vision* is noteworthy. He asks indignantly, 'How do some men read the false composition, which they call the *Vision of St Paul*, when he himself said that he heard the secret words, which no earthly man may speak?'

Platonic. Origen was an Alexandrian and an exact scholar; the tradition which he left in his native place was substantially the same as that which he inherited there. The Antiochenes on their side took over from Origen just as much of his method as was congenial to their own established traditions: they inherited from him an ideal of scholarship, but retained their own technical equipment as students of rhetorical science.

The divergence between Alexandria and Antioch is reflected in the history of certain exegetical expressions.

(1) ἀλληγορεῖν, ἀλληγορία. Strictly speaking, ἀλληγορία is a σχῆμα λέξεως, a mode of *expression*, ἕτερα ἀνθ' ἑτέρων ἀγορεύων ἢ καὶ ἀλλόκοτα ἐπεισφέρων: thus it is defined by Quintilian as one of the τρόποι, as the continuous use of analogy, 'μεταφορά continuata'. But the noun and the verb have also a secondary meaning, that of allegorical *interpretation*. Thus Plutarch says (363 D) Ἕλλητες Κρόνον ἀλληγοροῦσι τὸν χρόνον, and Tatian *ad Gr.* 21 § 36 μηδὲ τοὺς μύθους μηδὲ τοὺς θεοὺς ὑμῶν ἀλληγορήσῃτε. Both uses are common in patristic Greek. In Clement of Alexandria the primary sense of these words is more common than the other; later writers, whether Alexandrine or Antiochene, use both with equal freedom.

But in Alexandrine usage ἀλληγορία is in principle a method of exegesis (or a mode of Scriptural utterance) which (a) is contrasted with literal interpretation (or significance), and (b) is discernible from the *content* of the text in question: for the Antiochenes, it is (a) a mode of literal expression, which is (b) indicated only by the *form* of the text. The Alexandrine was prepared to understand anything in the Bible, except moral precepts, *per modum allegoriae*; e. g. he would refuse to take literally any passages involving anthropomorphisms or contradictions. The Antiochene held to τὸ ῥητόν throughout, and explained anthropomorphisms, &c., as arising from the *ιδιότητες* of Hebrew diction. The definitions and discussions of ἀλληγορία which are found in Antiochene texts make these points clear, and shew also how small a place the Antiochenes allowed to this mode of diction. Thus Chrysostom says (*in Es.* v 7) that the treatment of Scripture as allegorical must not be allowed to depend upon the caprice of the interpreter—οὐκ ἐσμὲν κύριοι τῶν νόμων τούτων αὐτοί—but must be kept in strict subservience to the actual meaning of the text; and according to Isidore and Junilius, who codify from two different points of view the Antiochene theory, we shall only find ἀλληγορία when the *form* of Scripture indicates its presence. Thus according to Junilius (*Inst. reg.* i 5) the *proverbialis species* is only found in Proverbs and one or two other books: in this *species* 'licitum . . . est non textum scripturae ipsius considerare sed sensum'; in the others (prophecy, history, and *simplex doctrina*) allegory is only to be admitted

on the condition 'ut narrationis fidem praesentare necesse sit': i. e. it occurs in the forms of metaphor, imagery, comparison, and similitude. In Isidore, ἀλληγορία is one of twenty-two γενικώτατοι τρόποι: it is not specifically defined, but is described by instances—κατὰ ἀλληγορίαν, ὅταν τὰ ἀπειρα πλήθη συνεχῶς "ὑδατα" λέγη καὶ τὴν τούτων ἔφοδον "κατακλυσμόν". καὶ τὸ "ἔσται ὡς τὸ ξύλον τὸ πεφυτευμένον". καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος τὴν \* Ἄγαρ ἀλληγορεῖ.

Again, while the Alexandrians treated ἀλληγορία as a method of reaching a meaning other than that of the 'letter', the Antiochenes regarded it as a literal mode of expression: i. e. as one in which it was plain from the actual words employed that they were intended to be taken 'tropically'. They would not therefore attribute an allegorical meaning to any passage unless its primary and essential significance was figurative. This may be illustrated from Diodore of Tarsus (Intro. to Ps. cxix, ed. Mariès, in *Recherches de science religieuse* 1919). Discussing the story of Eve and the serpent, Diodore says that it is an αἰνigma rather than an ἀλληγορία: for if it were the latter, the serpent would have to be understood as a pictorial expression—ὄνομα μόνον ἐχρῆν εἶναι ὄφεις—whereas in fact there was a real serpent, but one through which the evil one spoke. To take the story as an allegory would involve an ἀνατροπή τοῦ ὑποκειμένου. Similarly Chrysostom held that in Gal. iv 24 St Paul used the expression 'allegory' καταχρηστικῶς, since the primary meaning of the story of Hagar was historical—it was not a mere metaphor. The three definitions given in Cramer's *Catena* on Gal. iv 24 appear also to deal with this alleged inexactitude of the apostle's language.

(2) θεωρία. The meaning of this term was discussed by Kihn (in the *Theol. Quartalschrift* 1880, and in his books on the school of Antioch and on Theodore of Mopsuestia and Junilius), and after him by Bardenhewer and others. Fresh light has recently been thrown upon it by Fr Vaccari in the first number of *Biblica*, the periodical issued at Rome by the Pontificium Institutum Biblicum. His new material is drawn (a) from the newly discovered fragments of Diodore, and (b) from the commentary on the minor prophets, printed among the works of Rufinus, which Dom Morin has shewn to be the work of Julian of Eclanum.

In the Alexandrian tradition θεωρία is practically synonymous with ἀλληγορία, as that word is with διάνοια. The antecedents of this use of the word are, I believe, Platonic. Examples of it are very plentiful. Thus according to Didymus of Alexandria, in the verse Ps. cxix 72, 'dearer to me than gold or silver', κατὰ θεωρίαν, silver means the λόγος and gold the νοῦς. Or, to take a specially illuminating instance, both Socrates and Sozomen say of Diodore that he devoted his attention to

the *ψιλὸν γράμμα, τὰς θεωρίας ἐκτρεπόμενος*. In the Alexandrian sense of *θεωρία*, this is intelligible and true; but to an Antiochene it would have sounded false and almost meaningless.

In Theodore of Mopsuestia *θεωρία* is primarily used of prophetic vision. It is that intuition of things present and future which God granted to the prophets. The prophet, by the *ἐνέργεια* of the Divine Spirit, was rapt into an ecstasy, and *ἐν ἐκστάσει* he experienced communications which by a *τρόπος* familiar in Scripture could be described as seeing, or hearing, or as feeling 'the hand of the Lord' upon him. Theodore (in Nahum ii) explains the word *λήμμα*, the LXX equivalent of 'burden', as referring to this ecstatic state—*λήμμα . . . τοῦτο καλεῖ, ἐπειδὴ τοῦ πνεύματος ἢ χάρις ὡσπερ ἄθρόον ἐπιλαμβανομένη τῆς τοῦ προφήτου διανοίας πρὸς τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν αὐτὴν μεθίστη τῶν δεικνυμένων*<sup>1</sup>; only through such a violent diversion of the mind from present things was the prophet able *τῇ τῶν δεικνυμένων θεωρία προσανέχειν μόνη*.

The secondary use of *θεωρία* is also connected with the Antiochene psychology of prophecy, and certain other terms which have a certain shade of meaning in Antiochene exegesis must also be mentioned in order to explain it.

The fact that many parts of Scripture have a typical sense is due, as the Antiochenes held, to the divine ordering of history. The episode of the brazen serpent, or the exile and return, really happened: but they were made to happen in order to minister to higher things which were to succeed them. The gift of inspiration equipped the prophets to deliver utterances relevant to their own day, and also, at times, to speak in language so exalted that only a part of its content can be exhausted by referring it to the things of their own day. It was in these 'hyperbolic' passages, these 'sensuum cumuli', these 'excursus et excessus' of the prophetic mind, that the Antiochenes chiefly sought and found a typical significance.

It is the business of the exegete, while holding fast to the truth of history, to understand and explain this higher meaning of the text. He need not adhere to the *ψιλὸν γράμμα: οὐ κωλύμεθα*, says Diodore, *σεμνῶς ἐπιθεωρεῖν*: but he must remember that *ἱστορία* is not contrary to *ὑψηλοτέρα θεωρία: τοῖναντίον δὲ κρητὶς εὑρίσκεται καὶ ὑποβάθρα τῶν ὑψηλοτέρων νοημάτων*. The formal definition of *θεωρία* is found in Julian (Migne *P. L.* 21, 971 B), 'theoria est autem, ut eruditus placuit, in brevibus plerumque aut formis aut causis earum rerum quae potiores sunt considerata perceptio'; Fr Vaccari retranslates the definition thus, *θεωρία ἐστὶν ἐν εὐτέλεσι μάλιστα ἢ σχήμασιν ἢ πράγμασιν τῶν κρειττόνων διανοου-*

<sup>1</sup> *λήμμα* is used with the meaning 'enthusiasm' in Method. ed. Bonwetsch 97, 2 *μετὰ πολλοῦ λήματος καὶ εὐψυχίας*; but here there appears to be a confusion with *λήμᾶ*.

μένη κατάληψις. It probably comes from Diodore's lost work *τίς διαφορὰ ἀλληγορίας καὶ θεωρίας*: and Fr Vaccari understands the words 'ut eruditus placuit' to mean 'as the Antiochene fathers say'. It is possible, however, that the 'eruditi' may rather have been those rhetorical teachers from whom the Antiochenes derived their technical equipment.

The practical working of the definition can be seen, e.g., in Theodore's comment upon Zech. ix 9, 'Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Sion'. Here, he says, we have a passage which must not be understood to speak at one moment of Zerubbabel and at another of Christ, but one which primarily applies to Zerubbabel, yet speaks of him in language so hyperbolic that the prophecy could not be completely fulfilled in him; its final fulfilment is only to be found in Christ. The history of Zerubbabel is relatively a *brevis causa*: but in it we are able to perceive, by *θεωρία*, 'eae res quae potiores sunt'. In order to do this there is no need to desert the *ἀκολουθία* (*contextus*) of Scripture: the actual text here has, as Chrysostom would say (Migne *P. G.* 55, 209), a *διπλῆ ἐκδοχή*, which we must discern as such, *τά τε αἰσθητὰ νοοῦντες καὶ τὰ νοητὰ ἐκδεχόμενοι*.

To the complete fulfilment of prophecies already verified in part the Antiochenes apply the terms *ἐκβαίνειν*, *ἐκβασιν ἔχειν*, *πέρας τυχεῖν*. Cf. Theod. Mops. *in Joel* ii 28 *πολλῶν δε τοιούτων ὄντων ἐπὶ τῆς θείας γραφῆς παρόμοιον προδήλως ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ παρὸν . . . ἐκβέβηκε δὲ ἅπαντα μετὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐπὶ τοῦ δεσπότην Χριστοῦ: in Mich.* v 1, 2 *τό γε ἀληθές τῶν εἰρημένων πέρας τὴν ἐκβασιν εἴληφεν ἐπὶ τοῦ δεσπότην Χριστοῦ: Theodoret in Zeph.* xiii 16 *ἀκριβῆ . . . τὴν ἐκβασιν*. The *ἐκβασις* bears always some resemblance to that which typified it, but is always greater and higher—*ἔστι μὲν τις μίμησις τῶν πραγμάτων, πολὺ δὲ τὸ διάφορον τούτων πρὸς ἐκεῖνα* (Theod. Mops. *prol. in Ion.*). The signs which the *πρόχειρος ἔννοια* supplies are *εἰκόνας, σκιαί, παραβολαί*: the things signified are real, they are *αὐτὰ τὰ πράγματα, τὸ μέγεθος τῆς ἀληθείας*.

It is strange that Theodore of Mopsuestia should have been supposed to teach that the New Testament merely accommodates the prophecies of the Old to Christ. In the main, his teaching is the direct contrary of this. The connotation of the word *σῶμα* in Antiochene writers is worth noting in this connexion. Whereas in Origen *σῶμα* stands for the lowest sense of Scripture, which is of little value in comparison with its *ψυχὴ* and *πνεῦμα*, in Theodore it stands for the highest and fullest meaning, i.e. for the substantial fulfilment of prophecy in Christ. In Adrian this particular use of the word is not found: but he insists (*Isagoge* § 133) that the *σῶμα* is all-important; in it, and not beyond it, is the deepest meaning of the Bible to be found; *μηδὲν περαιτέρω φαντάζεσθαι τοῦ σώματος* is the cardinal rule of exegesis.

(3) *τροπικός*. Since *ἀλληγορία* was that one of the *τρόποι* in which Alexandrian exegesis was most interested, the word *τροπικός*, in that tradition, is practically equivalent to 'allegorical'. Technically, however, *τροπολογία* is simply any form of speech which is not *κυριολογία*: it is a clothing of the bare bones of fact with a grace that is not their own—cf. Trypho *περὶ τρόπων*, *Rhet. Gr.* III p. 191 *τῆς φράσεως εἶδη ἐστὶ δύο, κυριολογία τε καὶ τρόπος . . . τρόπος δὲ ἐστὶ λόγος κατὰ παρατροπὴν τοῦ κυρίου λεγόμενος κατὰ τινα δῆλωσιν κοσμηωτέραν ἢ κατὰ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον*. The Alexandrian or secondary sense of the word and its cognates is as old as Origen at least. It seems to be universal in writers connected in any way with Alexandrian tradition from Origen onwards.<sup>1</sup> In Antiochene writers, on the other hand, the primary sense is the normal one. Thus in Theod. Mops. *in Hos.* iv 3 *τροπικῶς λέγει κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός* means 'using a *figurata dictio* as he commonly does'. In what sense, then, was the word *τροπικοί* applied to the Macedonians or Pneumatomachi? That application is found in Athanasius (*ad Serap.* i 2, 10), and had clearly become common before Athanasius took up arms in the Macedonian controversy. Both Athanasius and Didymus refer to it with irony; the latter calls his opponents *ποικίλοι καὶ πολύτροποι*, and the former rounds off an exegetical argument with a play upon the word: the Macedonians, he says, appeal to the text (Amos iv 13) *ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ στερεῶν βροντὴν καὶ κτίζων πνεῦμα*, asserting that it declares the Spirit to be a *κτίσμα*; whereas the prophet really means that God 'establishes' that thunder of which the sons of thunder were the heralds, the unshakeable Gospel of the Kingdom: and in contrast with this *inconussa ueritas* the Macedonians are *τῷ ὄντι τροπικοί*, vacillating creatures.

From the relics of Macedonian exegesis which are to be found in Athanasius, Didymus, and the *Dialogi de Trinitate* of Ps-Athanasius, the sense in which the Macedonians were called *τροπικοί* can be plainly seen. Two passages in Didymus are specially illuminating:—

(a) *ταῖς ἔξωθεν τέχναις ἀποκέχρηται καὶ ἐπ' ἄλλα καὶ ἄλλα μεταφέρειν ἐπιχειροῦσι τὰ οὕτως σαφῶς εἰρημένα.*

(b) *εἰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τῶν τυχόντων ἢ βιωτικῶν πραγμάτων ἦν αὐτοῖς ἡ διάλεξις, καλῶς ἂν αὐτοῖς ἔσθ' ὅτε χρεῖα ἐγένετο συμπλάσσειν μύθους τινάς, καὶ ἀριστοτελικῇ δῆθεν δεινότητι καὶ τῇ ἐν λόγοις τέχνῃ ὡς Εὐνόμιος περιστρέφειν τὸ πρᾶγμα καὶ συσκοιάζειν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.*

Didymus has here two charges to bring against his opponents—their exegetical method is essentially the same as that of the extremest

<sup>1</sup> St John of Damascus retained the stricter and more technical use: but in the instance on p. 1344 *β τροπολογία δὲ ἐστὶν ἀβέβαιος ἀπόδειξις*, the example which he gives, which is one of *προσαποποιία* (*ὡς ὅτε θάλασσα εἶδεν καὶ ἐφυγεν*), may have been derived from the Antiochene Isidore.

Arians, and it is based upon the logic and rhetoric of the schools. The first of these charges may be illustrated from Gregory of Nazianzus's attack upon Eunomius (*Or. Th.* v 7): it is a trick of Arian logic, he says, to rely upon logical traps, and to weave together strings of disjunctive syllogisms. The logic of the Macedonians was also in fact of this type: a familiar example, and one of which both Eunomians and Macedonians made use, is the argument that if the Spirit is neither *κτίσμα* nor angel, but proceeds from the Father, He must be a Son: and if so, the Logos and Spirit are brothers, and the Logos is not *μονογενής*; if on the other hand the Spirit is from the Son, *οὐκοῦν πάππος ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ τοῦ πνεύματος* (Didymus ed. Mingarelli, p. 189, cf. Ath. *ad Serap.* i 16). The dependence of the Macedonians upon the technicalities of logic and rhetoric is even more obvious. They were confronted with proof-texts such as Ps. cxlii 10 *τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἀγαθὸν* [so *NC<sup>a</sup> RT*] *ὀδηγήσει με*; and they argued that while the word *ἀγαθός* is sometimes so used as to make it clear that the Godhead of its subject is implied, it is also used in many other ways: men may be called good *συνωνύμως*, things and *ἀνυπόστατα* may be called good *ὁμωνύμως*; similarly men may be called holy, and a *σκόληξ* such as the locust may be called the great power of God (Didym. p. 128 f.). But we must pay no heed to *ὁμωνυμίαι*, *συνωνυμίαι*, or *ὁμοιολεξίαι* as though they implied identity of *οὐσία*.

This contention is stated by the Macedonians in the form of a general principle of exegesis: *τὰ ἀλληγορικῶς ἢ προσηγορικῶς ἢ μεταφορικῶς ἢ ὁμωνύμως λεγόμενα οὐ χρῆ εἰς δόγματος ἀκρίβειαν παραλαμβάνειν* (ap. Didym. p. 234). This principle underlies practically the whole of the exegetical matter preserved to us in the records of the Macedonian controversy; and its incessant application explains the sense in which the nickname *τροπικοί* was given to the heterodox party. They were called *τροπικοί* because they were for ever trying to explain Biblical texts as instances of one or other of the *τρόποι* recognized by the rhetoricians, the students of *ἡ ἐν λόγοις τέχνη*.

If the question is asked how the Macedonians came to be thus addicted to the use of rhetorical technicalities, the answer is that their exegetical methods were simply those which had been in vogue at Antioch, and wherever Antiochene influence was predominant, for almost a couple of centuries. There was nothing singular in Macedonian exegesis except its polemical concentration upon fine technical points. Its principles were those which had been inherited from Lucian by the Arians, and also by many who were not Arians; and I believe that we may trace them back to a period even earlier than that of Lucian.

The essential identity of Macedonian exegesis with that of the Antiochenes is easily demonstrable from the *Isagoge* of Adrian, a hand-



book of exegesis compiled early in the fifth century. On the one hand, every line of Adrian can be illustrated from Theodore of Mopsuestia or Theodoret; on the other, every one of the technical points raised by the Macedonians finds illustration and justification in Adrian. The *Isagoge*, indeed, is simply a study of those *ιδιώματα* of Hebrew utterance which the exegete must be prepared to detect; one of its three parts is entirely devoted to an enumeration of the *τρόποι*, and among the *τρόποι* are found precisely those locutions upon which the Macedonians laid such excessive emphasis: *κατάχρησις, μετωνυμία, προσωποποιία*, and the rest.

That this sort of exegetical science is older than Lucian might be shewn by examples of early Monarchian exegesis. It will suffice here to refer to Eus. *H. E.* v 28, where the anonymous anti-Monarchian writer quoted by Eusebius has just the same complaint against his opponents that we find in Didymus: like the Macedonians in later days they are addicted to *ἀριστοτελική δεινότης* and to *αἱ ἐξωθεν τέχναι*—they are admirers of Aristotle and Theophrastus, *ταῖς τῶν ἀπίστων τέχναις εἰς τὴν τῆς αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν γνώμην ἀποχρώμενοι, καὶ τῇ τῶν ἀθέων πανουργίᾳ τὴν ἀπλήν τῶν θείων γραφῶν πίστιν κατηλεύοντες.*

H. N. BATE.

### ON THE PUNCTUATION OF ST JOHN VII 37, 38

IT is true as well as trite to say that there is more to be done for our better understanding of ancient documents in the way of improving the punctuation than in the way of emending the text: and of this the Fourth Gospel offers some striking examples. Long ago I tried to shew that in Jo. i 14 those editors went quite wrong who, in order to connect *πλήρης* at the end with *ὁ λόγος* at the beginning of the sentence, treated the intervening words *καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός* as a parenthesis, whereas *πλήρης* is there used indeclinable and belongs to either *δόξαν* or *μονογενοῦς*.<sup>1</sup> On the present occasion my object is to make a similar attempt to go back upon the current editorial tradition with regard to Jo. vii 37, 38, and, as before, to accumulate a mass of early evidence in favour of another grouping of the clauses. The patristic evidence for this passage is not so unanimous as for Jo. i 14: but on the other hand the improvement in the sense and connexion seems to me even more undeniable.

In Westcott and Hort's edition (and I find no material difference in Tischendorf, in R. V., in A. V., or in the ordinary Vulgate texts<sup>2</sup>) the text is printed thus:

<sup>1</sup> *J. T. S.* i (Oct. 1899, July 1900) pp. 120, 561.

<sup>2</sup> That is, with regard to the punctuation of the clauses, with which alone I am here dealing. There is, of course, a well-known variation of reading in verse 39,