Death, Demons, and the Medium of the Message: Exploring the Exegesis of 1 Samuel 28:3-25 in the Early Church

Owain Caron James

Trinity College

Department of Theology and Religion

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

December 2021

Acknowledgements

There are many to whom I am grateful for the support that they have shown me over the course of writing this thesis.

Firstly, I am grateful for the financial support I have received. In particular, I would like to thank Ymddiriedolaeth James Pantyfedwen/James Pantyfedwen Foundation for contributing towards my tuition fees, and Trinity College, whose generosity, especially by offering me the role of Junior Dean, covered much of my living costs. My time as Junior Dean was very special to me, and I know that I shall never again eat as well as I did during that time!

I am also grateful to those who have provided academic support to me over the years. Thank you, firstly, to Dr Tristan Franklinos, who not only helped teach me Latin when I had almost none at all, but was also always willing to answer my questions and check my translations. For their academic support, I am also grateful to John Whitty and Harry Lines. When starting the MSt in Patristics, with little knowledge of the subject, Harry and John were always ready to answer the questions I was too embarrassed to ask of tutors. In truth, they have been more like teachers than colleagues to me, but good friends most of all. Thank you both for your patience. I am also grateful to Professor Mark Edwards for his support, particularly in advising my chapter on Origen and Eustathius. However, regarding academic support, I am most indebted to Professor Carol Harrison, my supervisor. Whenever I panicked or doubted my abilities, Carol always had a kind word of encouragement. Her kindness is matched by her keenness, and her thorough comments on my work have been invaluable. Under her tutelage, from the earliest stages of the MSt until now, my writing has improved markedly. In thanks, I promise to try to keep my verbosity to a minimum in future!

I should also like to thank those friends and family who have provided emotional support and encouraged me along the way. I would particularly like to thank the friends I have made during my time at Oxford, at both St Catherine's College and Trinity College. Their comradery has made these years very special. I am also grateful for the support I have received from Woodstock Road Baptist Church, and especially Andy Robinson, for his friendship and pastoral nurture. I am also grateful for Andy's recent hospitality. Most of all, for her emotional support, I should like to thank Elizabeth, my wife and the love of my life. When I

started this DPhil, I hardly knew Elizabeth. Now, at its conclusion, I don't know what I would have done without her. To use 1 Samuel 28 as an allegory, whenever I felt lifeless like Samuel, Elizabeth revived me; whenever I felt faint like Saul, she rejuvenated me. You have carried us both through these first few months of marriage and taken more than your fair share of responsibilities so that I could concentrate on finishing this thesis. I look forward to this next new chapter together, as I try and make up for the sacrifices you have made.

Finally, I am grateful to those rare individuals who have provided financial, academic, and emotional support to me, namely Professor Christine James and Professor E. Wyn James: or as I call them, '*Mam a Dad*'. Without their financial support, I would not have been able to start the DPhil; without their academic support, I would have struggled to complete it; and throughout they have supported me emotionally. *Diolch am bopeth rydych chi wedi ei roi i mi: fy hunaniaeth, gallu, iaith, ac am fy magu yn y Ffydd.*

Owain Caron James

Abstract: Short

This thesis will consider the reception history of 1 Samuel 28 in the early Church by analysing citations of the passage in detail, from the earliest Christian reference (Justin Martyr) to Augustine. Before approaching these sources, the study will set the context by considering Christian exegesis more broadly, and how Jewish writers understood 1 Samuel 28. The next chapter will consider those early Christian references to 1 Samuel 28 which believe that it was the real Samuel that was raised (namely Justin Martyr, Eusebius of Caesarea, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Diodore of Tarsus, Zeno of Verona, Ambrose of Milan, and Sulpicius Severus). The following chapter will consider those who argue that it was a demon in disguise that appeared (namely Tertullian, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrosiaster, and Jerome). Having considered both views, we shall then observe these differing readings in conflict by focusing on Origen's interpretation of the passage and Eustathius of Antioch's rebuttal of Origen's reading. The thesis will conclude with a detailed study of Augustine's exegesis of 1 Samuel 28, mapping how his understanding of the passage changes over time. Throughout this study we shall bring to light the particular history of the exegesis of this passage, and the important ideas, themes, and features, which typically appear as early Christians discuss it, from matters relating to Christ's descent to Hades, to the regular references to Luke 16:19-31 and 2 Corinthians 11:14-15. In the process, this thesis will contribute to a wider understanding of the authors under consideration, examining their theological convictions on themes such as death, demonology, and how they approached Scripture.

Abstract: Long

Outline

This thesis will offer a detailed history of the exegesis of the passage commonly referred to as 'Saul and the Witch of Endor' (1 Samuel 28:3-25) by early Christian theologians, from *c*.150-*c*.430. In many ways, it will extend upon and develop work first set out by K. A. D. Smelik in an article written in 1979 (comprising a brief survey of many references to this passage),[1] by providing a lengthier and more detailed narrative of the history of the exegesis of 1 Samuel 28. References to this passage can be found in the works of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, Eustathius of Antioch, Gregory of Nyssa, and Augustine, to name but a few key figures. Because of the relative frequency with which this passage is cited by a wide range of early Christian figures, the subject merits attention.

In order to thoroughly examine the history of the exegesis of 1 Samuel 28, key questions will be asked (and answered) of its exegetes. For instance, how is 1 Samuel 28 used? To what end? What do their comments tell us about the authors' wider theological views? While individual exegetes deserve attention, they must also be considered together: how do they resemble or differ from each other? Can they be sub-divided, and categorised accordingly? What factors or influences have shaped the similarities and differences identified here? Once these questions have been considered, a history can be formulated.

Some of the answers are self-evident. For instance, most of the references to 1 Samuel 28 are broadly similar in that they are generally used to make theological points regarding demonology and eschatology. Many also cite similar biblical passages, in particular Luke 16:19-31 (the rich man and Lazarus) and 2 Corinthians 11:14-15. A good number also refer, sometimes directly, to those who disagree with their own position on 1 Samuel 28. All this points to a fact which will be reaffirmed repeatedly throughout the thesis: that there was a lively network of discussion (and disagreement) surrounding this passage in Late Antiquity (although, unfortunately, many of the texts have not survived).

[1] Smelik (1979).

The sources may also be sub-divided in other ways. The most obvious of these sub-divisions is the exegete's consideration of what actually happened at Endor. Some, such as Justin Martyr, Origen, and Augustine (in his latter years), believed that the real Samuel was raised by the woman. Others, like Tertullian, Eustathius of Antioch, and Gregory of Nyssa, believed that the figure of 'Samuel' that appeared at Endor was a demonic illusion, and not the real prophet at all. Some sources are closely related to each other, such as Origen's *Homily on 1 Samuel 28* and Eustathius' treatise, *De engastrimytho*, written to directly combat Origen's interpretation of the passage in this homily.

It is evident that the references to 1 Samuel 28 vary widely, chronologically, geographically, and by genre; and while these factors will not be ignored, it is within thematic categories (detailed below) that they will be discussed in this thesis. Each chapter will discuss a different aspect of the history of the exegesis of the passage itself and other relevant sources. By so doing, we shall naturally focus upon the most significant, shared aspects of the references to 1 Samuel 28. However, to give each source the attention it deserves, this shared attention must also be intertwined with an appreciation and discussion of those references individually.

Significance and originality

As a detailed history of the exegesis of 1 Samuel 28 in early Christian literature, we shall consider important questions and issues that are specific to this passage, such as the agency behind Samuel's appearance, the nature of his appearance (i.e. real or illusory), and so forth. However, as we follow this passage's thread through a lengthy period of exegesis, the aim is for it to act as a microcosm from which issues of wider significance can be discussed.

One of the obvious areas of wider significance to which this passage speaks is early Christian exegesis more generally. As we consider how early Christians approached 1 Samuel 28, and their methods of interpreting this passage, we shed light on their wider approach to Scripture in general. Simply stated, by following this passage, we see Christian exegesis in practice. This is particularly significant since it has been said that Scripture and its interpretation has been relatively neglected as a topic of study in past scholarship of early Christianity, despite its importance. As Charles Kannengiesser put it in 2004, 'The centrality

of the Bible to the whole patristic reality is something that is not generally recognized.'[2] Since then, however, Christian exegesis has received increased attention and a renewed appreciation of its importance. This thesis aims to add its weight to this reconsideration of the significance of early Christian exegesis.

However, sometimes our consideration of 1 Samuel 28 will mean that this study speaks directly to issues surrounding the interpretation of Scripture which have been of keen interest to scholars. For instance, Origen of Alexandria's *Homily on 1 Samuel 28* and Eusebius of Antioch's treatise against Origen's reading of this passage, are key texts for anyone interested in the 'Alexandrian' and 'Antiochene' methods of scriptural interpretation, and the differences between them. Another issue of wider significance to studies of early Christian exegesis, which emerges through the close study of 1 Samuel 28, is the extent to which Christians were in contact with Jewish exegesis.

Because of its subject matter, our focus on 1 Samuel 28 will also lead us to a consideration of other theological ideas of import for the early Church. Death and the afterlife, the soul, demons, and magic, are all major themes which emerge in early Christian discussions of this passage. Consequently, this study aims to enhance our wider understanding of these topics in the early Church and contribute to on-going scholarship on these matters.

We have already noted Smelik's seminal work, upon which much of this thesis will build. However, this thesis will make a significant original contribution through its rigorous analysis of works referencing 1 Samuel 28 and their authors (going into far greater depth than Smelik's short article); its discussion of works which Smelik did not know or consider; and its differing foci and conclusions. More generally, a monograph of this length, dedicated to the reception history of one biblical passage is a relatively uncommon, perhaps even innovative, undertaking.

[2] Kannengiesser (2004), p.12.

Conclusions

Many of the conclusions of this thesis will relate to unique and specific issues which emerge from the study of 1 Samuel 28 in the early Church. We shall draw together our findings on how early Christian theologians read this passage. This will include a consideration of key and common features shared by our sources, such as regularly occurring references to Luke 16:19-31 and 2 Corinthians 11:14-15. We shall also reflect on some of the central issues of agreement and disagreement between various references to this passage (such as the nature of Samuel's appearance), suggesting reasons for these areas of similarity and difference. From the findings of this study, we shall conclude that there was a lively and varied discussion of this passage, particularly considering that some known early references to 1 Samuel 28 are no longer extant.

This localised study of early Christian exegesis will also make some conclusions of wider significance. It will offer a detailed consideration of some of the important issues surrounding early Christian exegesis, shedding light on areas of particular scholarly interest, such as the idea of an 'Antiochene' versus 'Alexandrian' reading of Scripture. The thesis will also draw broader conclusions highlighting what a study of the exegesis of 1 Samuel 28 in the early Church demonstrates concerning early Christian ideas about death, afterlife, demons, magic, and so forth.

Reflecting on the thesis as a whole, which focuses on one particular passage of Scripture and its occurrence across the works of early Christian writers, one hopes that these conclusions will highlight the merit of conducting a study such as this as a means of exploring early Christian exegesis and thought.

List of chapters

Introduction

Firstly, I shall offer a brief outline of 1 Samuel 28 itself, the themes it raises, and some of the ambiguous features of the narrative which led to differing interpretations. I shall then outline what has been said previously about the history of the exegesis of this passage, most

notably works by K. A. D. Smelik and by Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell.[3] I shall then set out the overall purpose of the dissertation, namely, to provide a history of the exegesis of 1 Samuel 28, and give an outline of where the discussion will lead.

Chapter 1 – Context

Two major contextual points are discussed in this chapter before setting out to consider early Christian references to 1 Samuel 28. Firstly, I shall consider early Christian exegesis more generally. A broad appreciation of how early Christian writers understood and approached Scripture will help us understand better their exegesis of 1 Samuel 28. Secondly, I shall consider the Jewish exegesis of 1 Samuel 28. Jewish writers in Antiquity faced many of the same problems as early Christians when interpreting this passage and some of the positions held in these Jewish texts are not dissimilar to those found in some Christian texts. Although we are uncertain to what extent Jewish and Christian writers were in contact with one another (although this study suggests that there was some interaction), varying explanations of 1 Samuel 28 have long been a feature in the history of its exegesis, a feature that early Christians continued.

Chapter 2 – Samuel Truly Appeared

This chapter will focus on references to 1 Samuel 28 which claim that the real Samuel appeared to Saul and the Medium of Endor. Many authors and their works fall into this category, and we shall consider Justin Martyr, Eusebius of Caesarea, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Diodore of Tarsus, Zeno of Verona, Ambrose of Milan, and Sulpicius Severus here. These references, their authors, the various contexts in which they discuss the passage, and the relevance of their interpretation to each author's wider theology will be examined.

[3] Greer and Mitchell (2007).

Chapter 3 – Samuel Did Not Appear

This chapter will discuss writers who believed that the 'Samuel' of this passage was not the prophet, but rather a demon in disguise. In particular, we shall consider Tertullian, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrosiaster, and Jerome. This chapter will follow a similar format to the previous one, discussing each reference in depth, including the context in which the text appears, its place in the wider frame of its author's thought, and in patristic thought more generally.

Chapter 4 – The Great Debate

This chapter will discuss the literary networks and debates surrounding 1 Samuel 28 in early Christianity. It will focus primarily on two of the longest extant sources dedicated to the interpretation of this passage, namely Origen's *Homily on 1 Samuel 28* and Eustathius' *De engastrimytho*, written in reaction to Origen. We shall consider what lies at the heart of their debate.

Chapter 5 – Augustine

Augustine made several references to 1 Samuel 28 in his works and warrants his own chapter because, unlike any other extant author from this period, he changed his mind on this passage over time, from believing that 'Samuel' was a demonic illusion, to the belief that it was the real Samuel that was raised. This chapter will map this change in Augustine's thought.

Reflections

Finally, I shall draw together the findings of this work, and consider future possible areas of study.

Table of Contents

Introduction 12
Chapter 1 – Context 23
Chapter 2 – Samuel Truly Appeared 65
Chapter 3 – Samuel Did Not Appear 125
Chapter 4 – The Great Debate 181
Chapter 5 – Augustine 281
Reflections 343
Appendices 350
Abbreviations 373
Bibliography 374

Infernal spirits, by whose pow'r
Departed ghosts in living forms appear,
Add horror to the midnight hour,
And chill the boldest hearts with fear:
To this stranger's wond'ring eyes
Let the prophet Samuel rise!

Witch of Endor, in Handel's *Saul*, Act 3, Scene 2

Introduction

Often referred to as the account of 'Saul and the Witch of Endor', 1 Samuel 28:3-25 has captured the attention of both ancient and modern readers. Early Christian writers were no exception. Like Handel, the early Church was intrigued by this unusual episode, and it was discussed by key figures of that time: Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, Jerome, and Augustine, to name but a few. This monograph will focus on the reception of 1 Samuel 28 in the early Church, *c*.150-*c*.430; or, more accurately, from Justin Martyr to Augustine. However, it is worth opening by considering why this passage has attracted so much attention, both in the early Church and beyond.

One reason is its significant place in the narrative sequence of Samuel–Kings. It comes as Saul, surrounded by Philistines and unable to seek the Lord's guidance, consults a magical practitioner, something expressly forbidden in the Pentateuch (cf. Deuteronomy 18:10-12). The figure of Samuel which emerges predicts Saul's defeat and David's ascension to the throne, events which soon occur (1 Samuel 31–2 Samuel 5). Although it had already been revealed that Saul would lose his kingdom to David (cf. 1 Samuel 15-16), this passage represents Saul's penultimate act before his demise, where his fate is seemingly sealed, and

is perhaps the lowest point of his kingship. It is partly its place within the drama of Saul's life which captivates.

However, simultaneously, it is also the way in which this passage stands alone, as a distinct narrative with its own themes and problems, which makes it so appealing. In particular, this microcosm has two key characteristics which have made it worthy of exploration: namely, it clearly discusses noteworthy themes, but presents them in an unclear way. Put another way, it raises obvious questions without answering them obviously. It is these contrasting features which made 1 Samuel 28 a subject of discussion, and even debate, in the early Church.

A passage worth discussing

Whatever one's interpretation, 1 Samuel 28 doubtlessly brings certain important subjects to mind. Perhaps the most obvious are magic and superstition. While other biblical passages discuss these 'in theory' (for instance, Leviticus 19:26, 20:27; Isaiah 8:19), 1 Samuel 28 is among the few passages which discusses them 'in practice', focusing on a particular practitioner and event.[4] Consequently, it raises questions, and should provide unique insights, into the nature of magic. What precisely did the Medium do? What were the limits of her power? What was its source?

1 Samuel 28 also clearly speaks to the matter of death and the afterlife. Saul wants to speak with a dead man, who appears and pronounces to Saul his fate. Again, this passage provides

[4] It is by no means alone in this; see, for example, Pharaoh's Magicians (Exodus 7:8–8:19), Balaam (Numbers 22–24), Simon Magus (Acts 8:9-24).

a unique perspective into these matters within a scriptural context, by allowing the dead to speak for themselves,[5] raising interesting questions. Where has Samuel been? How does this passage relate to our own end?

If one presumes it was Samuel himself who appeared, we are faced with considerations about human composition. What was the nature of the form that appeared? Was it tangible or otherwise? Resuscitated in body or spirit? 1 Samuel 28 could provide insight into the nature of the body and soul.

Other significant themes emerge naturally from this passage, such as prophecy. Samuel seems to speak the truth, apparently by ungodly means. What insight might this passage provide into the nature of prophecy? Does it matter how prophecy is achieved? Similarly, this passage raises questions about God's economy and providence. God neither acts nor speaks directly here. In fact, He pointedly ignores Saul's earlier petitions. What role does God play in these events?

A passage worth debating

While this passage may be innately interesting, it is simultaneously innately complicated. The text presents difficulties for interpreters, which may partly reflect the adaptation of 1 Samuel 28 as received from an earlier source.[6]

[5] Again, there are other examples, see Matthew 17:1-13; Luke 16:19-31.
[6] McCarter (1980), pp.421-3; Arnold (2004), pp.206ff.

One complexity of the passage is the woman's designation or 'profession'. In Hebrew she is referred to as *eishet ba-alat ov* (1 Samuel 28:7), which the NRSV translates as 'a woman who is a Medium'.[7] The key term, *ov*, is ambiguous, and can refer to 'the ritual pit used by the necromancer, the spirit called up by the necromancer, and the necromancer him or herself'.[8] Despite attempts at explaining the significance of the Hebrew and what her profession might have entailed,[9] seemingly involving interaction with dead spirits, ultimately the Bible does not describe such practices in detail, neither here nor elsewhere. This complexity in understanding the woman's title and craft was compounded for early Christian exegetes by the fact that they read this term in translation. In early Greek translations she was labelled ἐγγαστρίμυθος, and in Latin *pythonissa* (or *mulier pythonem habens* in the Vulgate).[10] These terms have their own complexities, and for early Christian writers would have brought Greco-Roman divinatory practices to mind,[11] further confusing their understanding of this Ancient Near-Eastern practice.

Following the example of Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell, when translating these Greek and Latin terms, we have rendered them as literally as possible, as 'belly-myther' (a neologism coined by Greer and Mitchell) and 'pythoness' respectively.[12] This is partly because these terms shape how some early Christians interpret this passage, but also because it will highlight the points when early Christians refer to the woman in terms which they considered to be biblical. Yet the question remains, how should we refer to the

[7] All of my scriptural quotations are from the NRSV.
[8] Kuemmerlin-McLean (1986), p.88.
[9] Ibid., pp.85-9; Arnold (2004), pp.201-4.
[10] '*mulier pythonem habens*' appears to be modelled on '*puellam quondam habentem spiritum pythonem*' in the Latin translation of Acts 16:16, where the Greek also contains the word πύθωνα.
[11] Greer and Mitchell (2007), pp.xi-xviii; see also Trencsényi-Waldapfel (1961).
[12] Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.xiv.

woman? Her infamous nomenclature is 'witch', a weighty term in modern parlance with anachronistic connotations. 'Necromantress' is possibly the best English rendering of the Hebrew, which early Christians generally did not read; 'ventriloquist', 'possessed-woman' and 'prophetess' are possible translations of these Greek and Latin terms. However, unless citing others, we shall refer to her as 'the Medium' for precisely the offhanded merit Greer and Mitchell ascribe to the term – it is 'vague enough to do the job'.[13] For our purposes, it expresses her connection with the dead, her intermediary status, and the divinatory aspect of her craft, while neither portraying the woman positively or negatively, nor suggesting that her powers are real or illusory.

If the Medium's very title is one complexity of this passage, perhaps raising more questions about her craft than it resolves, other details similarly cause confusion about her magical practice. Why does she cry out in a loud voice, as though surprised, when she sees the figure of Samuel, and how can she recognise the disguised Saul by seeing Samuel (1 Samuel 28:12)?

Another problematic detail is that the woman claims, in the Hebrew, to have seen *elohim* (1 Samuel 28:13). This plural noun can have a singular referent, and often designates the God of Israel. However, it can also mean 'god(s)', or 'divine being(s)', or even 'dead spirit(s)', either plural or singular.[14] The ambiguity of *elohim* means that it is not entirely clear what the Medium saw, and this was perhaps exacerbated for early Christians by its early Greek and Latin translations as Θεοὺς and *Deos* respectively, both meaning 'gods'. What were these 'gods' that the Medium saw?

[13] Ibid., p.xi.
[14] Arnold (2004), pp.202-3.

Other details of the text raise difficulties regarding the nature of Samuel's appearance. How can Samuel be seen by the Medium as an old man wearing clothes, yet simultaneously cannot be seen by Saul (1 Samuel 28:14)? Why is it, however, that Saul can seemingly hear Samuel's words? Regarding Samuel's reported speech, why does he complain of being disturbed by being brought up (1 Samuel 28:15)? What condition has he been in, and what precisely does he mean when he says that Saul will be with him (1 Samuel 28:19)? These are questions which all exegetes of this passage, including early Christians, must address.

One puzzling aspect of this passage which early Christian exegetes neglect to consider (but addressed by early Jewish commentators), is the Medium's actions in providing a meal and comfort for the faint Saul (1 Samuel 28:20-25). Why does the author, who is presumably critical of the Medium and her profession, present her as being so hospitable?[15]

With so many inherent ambiguities, it is unsurprising that this passage was a subject of debate in the early Church.

Difficulties for early Christian interpretation

Although we have alluded to difficulties which early Christians faced when interpreting 1 Samuel 28, particularly problems exacerbated by the translations they were reading, for the most part the complexities we have mentioned are universal for anyone wishing to

[15] For a convincing explanation of the author's intention regarding the Medium's concluding actions, see Reis (1997); for an alternative solution, see Kim (2018).

understand this passage. But early Christian exegetes also faced unique difficulties in interpreting it which other expositors, such as its modern literary critics, need not consider.

One such difficulty stems from the assumption shared by most early Christians that the text of 1 Samuel 28, and Scripture more generally, was divinely inspired and, consequently, inerrant. We shall consider this in greater depth in the next chapter, but suffice it to say that by viewing 1 Samuel 28 as authoritative, early Christians could not simply disregard this passage, but rather believed that it was somehow 'true' and even edifying. However, in what way it is 'true' is a question that remains. Is the passage literally true, or should it be read figuratively, or both? A more fundamental question would be, is every part of this passage equally accurate? Many of 1 Samuel 28's narrative details, and some of the key problems considered here, are relayed through the speech of Saul, the Medium and Samuel. Are these voices as 'true' as that of the third-person narrator, or could they be inaccurate opinion? Early Christians faced the problem of objective and subjective reality in Scripture when reading this passage. Another complexity caused by this early Christian view of Scripture is that its inerrancy belongs to the entirety of Scripture. Therefore, an early Christian reading of 1 Samuel 28 must accord with what Scripture says elsewhere. Conversely, another consideration faced by early Christian writers when discussing this passage is its place in Scripture's narrative of salvation. In particular, does 1 Samuel 28's position in the Old Testament, before the advent of Christ, affect how it should be read? For instance, what difference does Christ's coming make to the destiny of those, like Samuel, after death? What impact does Christ have on the power of magic? Therefore, alongside those themes which naturally emerge from 1 Samuel 28, such as magic and death, early Christian discussions of this passage lead to considerations of Scripture itself.

Just as early Christians balanced 1 Samuel 28 within Scripture's wider context (as they understood it), so too they balanced their understanding of this passage within their own, wider theological framework. Developing Christian doctrine, shaped by Scripture but also by tradition, impacted the way that early Christians understood this passage. In the case of 1 Samuel 28, perhaps the most important of these doctrines was the common understanding among early Christians that demons were involved in magical practices. Consequently, many early Christians discuss demons when reading this passage, despite there being no clear reference to demons in the text. Similarly, an early Christian writer's reading of 1 Samuel 28 must be balanced with their wider understanding of the afterlife, human nature, and so forth.

By highlighting the noteworthy themes and numerous difficulties that emerge when reading 1 Samuel 28, both generally and particularly for early Christians, it is unsurprising that this passage was discussed, and even debated, in the early Church. One might even say that this was inevitable.

Modern scholarship

Similarly, it is perhaps inevitable that this passage and its reception in the early Church has already attracted the attention of modern scholarship. Two works in particular have significantly contributed to research in this matter, setting foundations upon which this monograph is built.

The first of these is the work of K. A. D. Smelik.[16] In an article entitled 'The Witch of Endor: I Samuel 28 in Rabbinic and Christian Exegesis till 800 A.D.', Smelik provided a useful survey of the passage's earliest reception. Its findings are mostly accurate and helpfully compartmentalise the different interpretations of this passage. As its title suggests, the scope of Smelik's brief study was broader than the present one, in that it considered both Christian and Jewish exegesis over a longer period, whereas this thesis aims to provide a more detailed study of this passage's reception in the early Church, considering in depth individual references to 1 Samuel 28 and their context. Furthermore, there are ways in which Smelik's work requires revision. For instance, he does not cite some early Christian references to the passage, and aspects of his categorisations are not robust. Nevertheless, Smelik's work was a major influence in shaping this study.

The second and more recent work which has shaped this study is Greer and Mitchell's *The "Belly-Mother" of Endor: Interpretations of I Kingdoms 28 in the early Church*.[17] Building upon Manlio Simonetti's critical edition and Italian translation of discussions of 1 Samuel 28 by Origen of Alexandria, Eustathius of Antioch, and Gregory of Nyssa, which circulated together in manuscript traditions,[18] Greer and Mitchell compiled these and further early Christian references to 1 Samuel 28 in their original languages, with parallel English translations. Additionally, they provide useful introductory materials, which are particularly insightful in their discussion of Origen and Eustathius' lengthy interpretations of this passage. While Greer and Mitchell cover a similar period to this study, they do not cite many

[16] Smelik (1979).
[17] Greer and Mitchell (2007).
[18] Simonetti (1989).

of the sources considered here, and since their work is primarily a book of sources, analysis is understandably brief.

The present study

This study will consider 1 Samuel 28's reception in the early Church until Augustine, discussing individual authors and their citations in detail, thereby placing them in the context of their wider thought, and reflecting upon what their treatment of this passage reveals about their theology. As our study cannot consider every reference to the passage during this period, we shall focus on those citations of 1 Samuel 28 whose author's identity is certain, so we can confidently comment on those authors' wider thought. Further, we shall limit our scope chiefly to authors writing in Latin and Greek, and to references to 1 Samuel 28 which we can confidently date to that period.

As far as possible, these references will be considered chronologically, but also within certain themes or groupings. By taking this hybrid approach, we aim to trace how discussion of this passage developed over time, while also observing this development in specific contexts, and discussing citations of 1 Samuel 28 alongside other passages of particular relevance, partly with the aim of identifying influences.

What value might this consideration of 1 Samuel 28 in the early Church hold? The history of this passage's reception is interesting in its own right; it is a microcosm, with its own history, traditions, quirks, and developments. However, by narrowing the lens, concentrating on one passage's reception, whilst comparing it across the broad span of the early Church, we hope that this study will also bring into focus areas of wider significance for patristic scholarship.

We have noted the themes raised by this passage, and this study will offer an opportunity to consider how early Christians understood these ideas, in a way which allows for direct and nuanced comparison. In particular, this study provides an opportunity to reflect upon early Christian eschatology (especially the soul and its fate), magic, and demonology, and the way in which these themes are expressed, namely through Scripture itself; or, as this thesis' title suggests, it will particularly address the ideas of *Death, Demons, and the Medium of the Message* in the early Church.

This thesis follows a simple structure. In chapter 1, we shall establish some much-needed context by considering how early Christians understood Scripture in general, and reflecting on prior, or concurrent, interpretations of 1 Samuel 28 by Jewish exegetes. Continuing with how early Jews approached this passage, chapter 2 focuses on proponents of the view that it was the real Samuel that appeared, namely Justin Martyr, Eusebius of Caesarea, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Diodore of Tarsus, Zeno of Verona, Ambrose of Milan, and Sulpicius Severus. Chapter 3 considers a distinctly Christian understanding of this passage, namely that it was not Samuel who appeared, but a demonic illusion, as understood by Tertullian, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrosiaster, and Jerome. Chapter 4 will consider these views in conflict, in particular Origen's interpretation of this passage and Eustathius of Antioch's critical response to it. Finally, chapter 5 considers Augustine, who aptly closes the period under consideration as a rare example of one whose views on this passage developed over time, from believing that Samuel was a demonic illusion to the view that the prophet truly appeared.

Chapter 1 – Context[19]

Before considering how the early Church understood and utilised one section of Scripture in particular, namely 1 Samuel 28, let us briefly consider early Christian exegesis more generally.

Scholarship

For a long time, the Bible and its place in patristic thought did not receive the scholarly attention it deserved. Charles Kannengiesser observed that '[t]he centrality of the Bible to the whole patristic reality is something that is not generally recognized'.[20] John J. O'Keefe and R. R. Reno made similar claims about the relative neglect of the Bible in patristic studies.[21]

This should surprise us, for the Bible and its use should have been considered among the *most* important areas of study for scholars of early Christianity. O'Keefe and Reno highlight this succinctly, for 'it is biblical citation, paraphrase, and exegesis that underlies all the diversity of patristic literature as the great common denominator'.[22] Mark W. Elliott goes further: 'Scripture was the soul of Christian belief and practice from the beginnings of the church.'[23] Scripture and its interpretation is central to almost every aspect of life in the early

[19] Translations of primary sources are my own unless another English translation is cited in square brackets in the footnotes. Within those square brackets I also indicate when I have revised a translation. Further bibliographical details regarding those English translations can be found under 'primary sources' in the bibliography. Where one of the appendices in this thesis is cited, full bibliographical details are also given there.
[20] Kannengiesser (2004), p.12.
[21] O'Keefe and Reno (2005), pp.1-5.
[22] Ibid., p.3
[23] Elliott (2013), p.775.

Church and ever-present in early Christian treatises, letters, sermons, and all forms of Christian worship and devotion, even for those outside the orthodox tradition.

For early Christians, the Bible and its interpretation may be compared to the oxygen we breathe. The average person breathes about 22,000 times a day. While this involuntary, regular action usually goes unnoticed, breathing is unquestioningly of vital importance! Similarly, Scripture is cited so frequently and naturally in early Christian works that we can lose sight of its vitality. We might add that breathing is often only noticed when it is unusual, just as scholars often only remark on unusual uses of Scripture. The great number of 'unremarkable' scriptural citations, littered throughout any given early Christian work, inevitably goes unnoticed.

Increasingly, however, scholars have been addressing this imbalance, offering detailed studies on Scripture in patristic thought. Among some significant contributions, we might mention works by Frances Young,[24] *The New Cambridge History of the Bible,*[25] and the *Ancient Christian Commentary* series. Perhaps the culmination of this renewed focus is Kannengiesser's *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, informative in its own right, but offering a detailed history of the gradual growth of scholarship on this subject since the Second World War.[26]

[24] Young (1989); Young (1990); Young (1997).
[25] Paget and Schaper (2013).
[26] Kannengiesser (2004), esp. pp.25-113.

The Canon of Scripture

The books of Samuel, known as 1 and 2 Kingdoms in the Septuagint and the Vulgate, were accepted by most Christians (including many considered 'heretical') within the Old Testament canon. This is partly because 1 and 2 Samuel were already considered authoritative by many Jews,[27] and were included in both the Septuagint and the Hebrew Bible.

Origen's Old Testament, according to Eusebius, conformed to the shorter Hebrew Bible: 'there are twenty-two canonical books [τὰς ἐνδιαθήκους βίβλους], as the Hebrews have handed down, as many as the number of the letters there are according to them', a list which included for Origen '1 and 2 Kingdoms'.[28] Like Origen, Jerome too held a more conservative view of which books should be considered canonical. In his well-known *Prologus galeatus*, Jerome states that there are 22 books in the Hebrew Bible (replicating Origen's argument about the letters of the Hebrew alphabet), likely in response to contemporaries, such as Augustine, who accepted the larger canon of the Septuagint.[29] Among these 22 books, Jerome includes '*Samuel*… which we call First and Second Kingdoms'.[30] This reduced canon perhaps reflects a Jewish influence upon Origen and Jerome, since both engaged with their concurrent Rabbinical culture more than most other Christians, thus accepting the books accepted by the Jews around them.[31]

[27] Lim (2013), pp.35-53. The development of a 'Jewish Canon' is a complicated issue, and different Jewish groups did not universally accept the same texts; ibid., pp.1-16.
[28] Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, 6.25; see also Paget (2013), pp.553-4.
[29] Jerome, *Prologus galeatus*, 1; see Gallagher (2013), pp.99-106.
[30] Jerome, *Prologus galeatus*, 2.
[31] For Origen's contact with Judaism, see Dorival (2013), pp.605-8; Law (2008), pp.15-16; Martens (2012a), pp.135-6; Vogt (2004), p.551. For Jerome's contact with Judaism, see Williams (2006), pp.74-5; Rebenich (2002), pp.15, 55-6; Kamesar (2013), pp.657-8.

Other early Christians held a broader canon of Scripture, which included books 'to be set apart among the Apocrypha [*inter apocrypha seponendum*]', according to Jerome,[32] or 'outside of these', by Origen.[33] This broader canon reflects the texts circulating in the Septuagint at the time, the Greek translation of the Old Testament considered by many Christians to be just as authoritative as the original Hebrew. Augustine, for example, makes such a case, emphasising its divine origin by recounting the miraculous story of the 70 translators.[34] This larger canon which Augustine accepted, listed in *De doctrina Christiana*, also included 'four [books] of Kingdoms'.[35] As we might expect, those who accepted this broader canon usually did not exclude the books of Samuel.

Of course, not all who called themselves Christians accepted the authority of 1 Samuel. For instance, the Marcionites denied the authority of the Old Testament. Marcion claimed that the Old and the New Testaments were incompatible, and therefore did not include 1 Samuel in his limited canon, which consisted only of Luke's Gospel and some Pauline epistles.[36]

A common view of Scripture

Recent scholars, such as Young, have made strong cases emphasising continuity and common trends in how early Christians approached the Bible.[37] While all authors considered here have their own take on 1 Samuel 28, it is important that we do not set these authors

[32] Jerome, *Prologus galeatus*, 2.
[33] Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, 6.25.
[34] *civ. Dei*, 18.42-43.
[35] *doc. Chr.*, 2.8.13.26.
[36] Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, 1.27.2; Lieu (2015), pp.183ff.
[37] Young (1997); Young (2013).

entirely against each other. Instead, we should acknowledge the many significant shared features of early Christian exegesis.

We have already mentioned some commonalities in passing. Firstly, for the most part, our authors share a similar Old Testament canon. Similarly, relatively soon in the life of the Church, a largely accepted New Testament canon formed among early Christian authors. In the second century, Irenaeus of Lyons, in *Adversus Haereses*, quotes as authoritative from most of the texts now considered as comprising the New Testament.[38] Origen, Jerome, and Augustine list an identical New Testament canon, consisting of the 27 books which became commonly accepted;[39] a canon confirmed by councils by the turn of the fourth century.[40]

Another crucial commonality to which we have alluded is the centrality of the Bible and its interpretation for early Christian writers. One may pick up any Christian text and find innumerable scriptural references. This is true for all genres: from the apologies of Justin Martyr to the commentaries of Origen, the letters of Ambrose to the sermons of John Chrysostom, the histories of Eusebius to the hymns of Ephrem of Syria; for all, the Bible and its interpretation is of central importance.

The centrality of Scripture stems from another important commonality among early Christians, namely a shared view that the Bible was the authoritative, divinely-inspired word of God. Again, one need only open a few patristic works to see that Scripture is quoted as an

[38] The exceptions are Philemon, Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, 3 John, and Jude – although he may allude to Hebrews and James, see Grant (1965), p.155. However, Irenaeus does not deny the authority of these books. He also adds the Shephard of Hermas and 1 Clement.
[39] Origen, *Hom. Josh.*, 7.1; Jerome, *Epistle* 53.9; Augustine, *doc. Chr.*, 2.8.13.26-29.
[40] Ferguson (2002), p.320; Bruce (1988), pp.232-3.

absolute authority, a necessary proof for any point. Patristic writers also state this belief explicitly. Irenaeus, for instance, exhorts that 'the Scriptures are indeed perfect, since they were spoken by God's Word and his Spirit'.[41] Origen, in *De Principiis,* says that 'the divine Scriptures are divinely inspired [θεοπνεύστους]'.[42] John Chrysostom succinctly states that 'to read the Scriptures is to open heaven'.[43] Augustine summarises the patristic understanding of Scripture in *De Civitate Dei,* when he says that Christ 'established the Scriptures which are called canonical, of most eminent authority, in which we put our trust concerning those matters of which it is not expedient for us to be ignorant but which we are unable to know sufficiently by ourselves'.[44] The Bible, then, gives direct and accurate access to the Divine.

This belief in the divinity of Scripture leads to another common assumption expressed by many early Christian authors: that the Bible was inerrant. Clement of Rome, among our earliest extant Christian authors, writes, 'You have gazed into the sacred Scriptures, which are true, given through the Holy Spirit. You know that there is nothing unjust or counterfeit [παραπεποιημένον] written in them.'[45] Justin Martyr similarly writes that 'not one Scripture is contradictory to another'.[46] Later, Augustine would write, 'I have learned to grant this reverence and honour to those books of the Scriptures alone, which are now called canonical, so that I most firmly believe that none of their authors erred at all in their writing.'[47] This belief that Scripture is accurate and cannot contradict itself is the basis for an important shared exegetical principle among early Christians: that Scripture can explain

[41] *Adversus Haereses*, 2.28.2 [Grant (1997), p.88, revised].
[42] *Princ.*, 4.2.1 (Greek); see also 4.1ff.
[43] *Vidi Dominum*, *Hom.*, 2.2.
[44] *civ. Dei,* 11.3 [WSA 1.7, p.3, revised].
[45] 1 Clement, 45.2-3 [Loeb 24, pp.114-15, revised].
[46] *Dial., 65.2.*
[47] *Epistle* 82.1.3 [WSA 2.1, p.316, revised].

Scripture. Unclear passages should be read in the light of clearer ones. We shall regularly see this principle at work as we consider the exegesis of 1 Samuel 28.

A common narrative of Scripture

Having examined the shared patristic view of *what* Scripture is, let us consider their shared understanding of what Scripture was *about.* For early Christians read Scripture through a similar lens.

Early Christians generally agreed that Christ was the key to a proper understanding of Scripture. While this might be expected in the case of the New Testament, after Jesus' ministry, early Christians also believed that Christ was the fulfilment of Old Testament laws and prophecies; its true subject-matter. Christ, then, provides unity to the message, or *telos*, of Scripture in its entirety. This belief is expressed clearly by early Christian writers. Ignatius of Antioch states that 'Jesus Christ is the records [ἀρχεῖά]; the sacred records are his cross and death, and his resurrection, and the faith that comes through him.'[48] Irenaeus states that, 'when read by Christians [the law] is a treasure hidden in a field, revealed and explained by the cross of Christ...'[49] Hilary of Poitiers claims that '[e]very work contained in the holy volumes, announces by words [*dictis*], expresses by facts [*factis*], and confirms by examples [*exemplis*] the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ'.[50] When early Christians explain the Bible, they regularly claim that the passage in question relates to Christ.

[48] *Philadephians*, 8.2 [Loeb 24, pp.290-1, revised]; see also O'Keefe and Reno (2005), pp.27-8.
[49] *Adversus Haereses*, 4.26.1 [Grant (1997), p.118].
[50] *Tractatus Mysteriorum*, 1.1; see also O'Keefe and Reno (2005), p.42.

This, partly, explains the role of typology and allegory in early Christian exegesis, particularly when interpreting the Old Testament. Despite not mentioning Jesus directly, early Christian authors use typology and allegory to show that these texts' true subject is Christ. It is worth discussing briefly here what we mean by 'typology' and 'allegory'. Typology, a term coined after the patristic period, refers to the interpretive practice where narrative details in Scripture are connected to other parts of Scripture. These connections are usually clear, and it is the connection itself, and the meaning this carries, which is important. For example, Melito of Sardis, in his sermon *De pascha,* uses typology in 'seeing the mystery of the Lord taking place in the sheep, the life of the Lord in the slaughter of the sheep, the type of the Lord in the death of the sheep'.[51] Others joined Melito in using the paschal lamb as a type of Christ, including Paul himself in 1 Corinthians 5:7. The connections are clear: Christ and the lamb are blameless, both are sacrificed, both act as a salvific substitution for others. Similarly, Christ was seen in various other Old Testament figures such as Adam[52] and Moses.[53]

Allegory can also bring Christ into the picture when he appears to be absent. Often scholars have drawn a strict division between typology and allegory, but as O'Keefe and Reno rightly state, allegory 'is an extension of the typological strategy that does not limit itself to discerning patterns of and between events. Allegory is more fluid and ambitious.'[54] Allegory is a more elaborate connection between Scripture and ideas not found clearly in the passage, often requiring some explanation. Let us take an example from Origen, who was

[51] *De pascha*, 33.
[52] Tertullian, *An.*, 43.10; Hippolytus, *Contra Noetum*, 17.2-4; Methodius, *Symposium*, 3.3-4; see VanMaaren (2013), pp.275-97.
[53] Justin Martyr, *Dial*., 111; John Chrysostom, *Catecheses ad illuminandos*, 3.25-26; Augustine, *Trin.,* 4.15.20.
[54] O'Keefe and Reno (2005), p.21.

well-known for using allegory. In his first *Homily on Genesis*, discussing the creation of the sun and the moon, Origen states, 'Just as the sun and the moon are said to be the great lights in the firmament of heaven, so also are Christ and the Church in us.'[55] He explains that the light of these celestial bodies refers to the figurative light which Christ and the Church bring into the world; a light to show the truth of salvation and which enlightens minds to contemplate the divine.[56]

While Christ is the key to early biblical interpretation, this does not mean that he is always its direct focus. When early Christians explain biblical passages, they do not always refer directly to Christ; they might instead refer to the soul, the Church, the afterlife, or any number of other subjects. However, these things can only be exposited once Christ's place at the centre of their exegetical understanding has been established. As Origen says elsewhere in the first *Homily on Genesis*, Christ 'himself is "the light of the world" who also illuminates the Church by his light'.[57] Without Christ, the Church would be blind to Scripture's true meaning. Scripture is ultimately about Christ, the key that unlocks all interpretations of the Bible for early Christians.

It is also worth noting that early Christian authors read Scripture through other shared lenses, such as common doctrinal traditions. Most notably, Christian exegetes were influenced from an early point by the 'rule of faith' in how they read Scripture.[58] Such 'rules of faith' (flexible, oral traditions), later codified as 'creeds', summarise the main tenets of the

[55] *Hom. Gen.,* 1.7 [FC 71, p.55].
[56] Ibid.*,* 1.5-7.
[57] Ibid.*,* 1.5 [FC 71, p.55].
[58] For more on this, see Young (1990), pp.45-65; O'Keefe and Reno (2005), pp.119-28.

Christian faith, thus indicating what Scripture was 'about'.[59] Irenaeus refers to the 'Rule of Truth' and gives a version of its contents.[60] Elsewhere he states how this same 'Rule of Truth' allows one to read Scripture correctly against the fallacies of heresies such as Gnosticism, for 'whoever keeps the rule of truth unchanged within himself… recognised these names, phrases, and parables from the Scriptures, but does not recognize their blasphemous reasoning'.[61] Augustine similarly states, 'When… it is uncertain how it [Scripture] should be punctuated and articulated, one should consult the rule of faith [*consulat regulam fidei*], which has learnt from the plainer passages of the Scriptures and the authority of the Church…'[62] Such shared traditions shaped how many early Christians read Scripture.

A common education

Let us consider one final commonality significant for early Christian interpretation of Scripture, namely the classical background, most notably through education, shared by early Christian writers. Almost all early Christian authors were classically educated and steeped in classical culture, so it is unsurprising that this profoundly impacted patristic exegesis.

Young has been perhaps the most vocal on the significance of this shared classical education on early Christian exegesis, yet admits that there is a 'dearth of direct evidence about what went on in the *grammaticus*' classroom, or indeed how the rhetor would comment on literature. It was, like school teaching in every age, an oral medium.'[63] Despite this 'dearth',

[59] Young (1990), pp.48-9.
[60] *Adversus Haereses*, 1.22.1.
[61] Ibid., 1.9.4 [Grant (1997), p.53, revised]; see also Ayres (2020).
[62] *doc. Chr.*, 3.2.2.3 [Green (1995), p.133, revised].
[63] Young (1989), p.184.

we can still see the large impact classical culture had in forming Christian culture, particularly its exegesis.

Let us consider one example. Classical Rhetorical theory distinguished between the substance of a composition and its style of presentation. Quintilian, a first century AD Latin rhetor, makes this distinction clearly in his textbook *Instiutio Oratoria*. [64] While allusion, quotation and especially emulation are common in the works of classical writers, these were not considered important aspects of the 'style' of a classical composition. As Young comments, we do not find discussions of allusions and quotations in works focusing on 'style' by Longinus, Demetrius, nor by Aristotle.[65] Intertextuality is assumed. It is central to a work's substance. Quintilian also states that the words of others, if used well, carry 'more authority' than one's own – a function beyond mere persuasive style.[66] These ideas were foundational in developing how biblical citation and allusion were used by early Christian exegetes. Intertextuality is central to early Christian writing, citing different texts of Scripture, influenced by the surrounding classical culture. Moreover, when the Bible is cited, it is not for the sake of ornamentation, but rather to give authority and to substantiate the discourse. Simply, biblical allusion formed the content, not style, of patristic writing.

Classical education impacted how early Christians approached Scripture in other ways. For instance, early Christians viewed the Bible similarly to how classical education encouraged its students to view classical texts: with a respect for the antiquity of its contents, a belief in

[64] *Institutio oratoria*, 10.1-2; see also Young (1997), p.81.
[65] Young (1997), p.100.
[66] *Institutio oratoria*, 2.7.4.

the inspiration of its composition, and an expectation that there was a moral lesson to draw. Many other influences could be noted but are too numerous to consider here.

The pervasive influence of classical culture on Christianity was problematic for many early Christians. As the classical culture of the Greco-Roman world around them could not be easily separated from its pagan origins, almost every aspect of the education of early Christians was steeped in the influences of pre-Christian religion. Consequently, some of the most important questions patristic writers ask in this period encompass which aspects of their education were appropriate to apply to Christian life. This question was particularly apt when it came to interpreting Scripture. Was it appropriate to apply the same methods of interpretation to Scripture as classical education taught to apply to Homer? In some ways Scripture was like a classical text; mysterious, inspired, able to offer moral lessons. In other ways, it did not feel 'classical' – particularly its perceived crude style.

Many early Christians attempted to resolve this issue by appropriating classical culture to Christian culture. The most common way of doing this was by claiming that classical authors took their ideas from Old Testament figures who pre-dated them, thereby establishing the 'classical', antique status of Christianity, which claimed these Jewish patriarchs for their own. Simply, aspects of classical culture were acceptable and true because it was held that Moses pre-dated Plato. Justin Martyr provides an early example of this belief. He describes the creation of the universe in Platonic terms, namely that the universe was crafted from chaos or formless matter, but explains that these are not truly Plato's ideas. Rather, Plato

'borrowed' his ideas from Moses, who was 'older [πρεσβυτέρου] than the Greek writers',[67] and so Justin claims to be merely reworking these classical truths in their rightful Christian context. Other Christians made similar claims. For instance, Augustine claimed that Plato was introduced to Hebrew literature through the prophet Jeremiah.[68] Not only do such lines of argument cement Christianity's 'classical' status, but they also justify borrowing from classical culture, because classical culture, it is claimed, borrowed from the Judeo-Christian Patriarchs.

Augustine justifies Christianity's apparent indebtedness to classical education in another way. In *De doctrina Christiana*, he explains that 'those things which have not been established [by humans], but humans have discovered by investigation… should not be considered human institutions, wherever they are learnt'.[69] Augustine uses the example of 'history': 'Whatever the subject called history reveals about the order of past events, it helps us exceedingly in interpreting the holy books, even if learnt outside the church from early education.'[70] For instance, by use of history, we can determine when Christ was born, lived and died.[71] Yet Augustine is clear that history 'should not… be counted among human institutions. For what has already gone into the past and cannot be undone ought to be considered a part of the order of time, whose creator and controller is God.'[72] History, and the other best parts of classical culture, were not invented by pagans, but rather were discovered by them as an existing aspect of creation. The influences of classical culture on

[67] *1Apol.*, 59.2.
[68] *doc. Chr.*, 2.24.43.108.
[69] Ibid., 2.27.41.104 [Grant (1995), p.105, revised].
[70] Ibid., 2.28.42.105 [Grant (1995), p.105, revised].
[71] Ibid., 2.28.42.105-106.
[72] Ibid., 2.28.44.109 [Grant (1995), p.107, revised].

biblical interpretation, according to Augustine, do not derive from paganism, but from God and his creation.

Points of difference

As we have shown, early Christian exegetes shared much common ground in how they viewed and approached Scripture. However, scholars have often emphasised perceived differences in early Christian exegesis; for instance, the differences between 'Antiochene' and 'Alexandrian' exegesis. Typically, this distinction has emphasised that Alexandrians, in exegeting the Bible, made use of allegory to discern lofty, spiritual meaning, whereas the Antiochenes, by contrast, were primarily interested in the literal sense, particularly the *methodike* (the precise words) and *historike* (the context and sequence) of the text.[73] This is of particular relevance for this study because of Origen's *Homily on 1 Samuel 28* and Eustathius of Antioch's treatise reacting against Origen's interpretation of this passage. While this will be considered in detail in chapter 4, it is worth offering here a preliminary discussion of Alexandrian and Antiochene exegesis.

It is useful to begin by considering key definitions. No phrase can effectively summarise the entire patristic understanding of a given exegetical method in terms familiar to early Christian authors, and so anachronism is inevitable. Broadly speaking, by 'literal exegesis' I refer to interpretations according to the plain and obvious meaning of the text, usually with a particular focus on the precise words used in a passage, and its wider context in biblical history. We have already considered definitions of allegory and typology, which we might

[73] Trigg (1988), pp.23-34; Young (2013), p.736. For a summary of this traditional view and scholarship on Antiochene and Alexandrian exegesis, see DeCock (2020), pp.8ff; see also Clark (1999), pp.70-8.

generally categorise under 'figurative exegesis' (although typology, particularly, can blur the boundary between 'literal' and 'figurative').[74]

There are clear differences between how Origen interprets the Bible, representing the Alexandrian milieu, and how a theologian of the Antiochene tradition, such as Theodore of Mopsuestia, does. Let us, for instance, consider how these theologians understand the Song of Songs. For Origen, 'either the Church in relation to Christ is meant [*dirigitur*] under the designation of "Bride" and "Bridegroom", or the union of the soul with the Word of God'.[75] Origen believed that there could be multiple layers of understanding to Scripture, but especially that there were deeper, spiritual doctrines in the Bible which could only be understood when one has progressed in the faith, truths which allegory illuminated.[76] By allegorising the Song of Songs, Origen can make Christological, eschatological, and ecclesiological points (and so forth), which a literal discussion of the text alone, focusing on history, would not allow. Theodore, by contrast, takes this historical, literal approach, believing that the text refers factually to the wedding of Solomon and the daughter of Pharaoh.[77] Consequently, Theodore attributes little spiritual value to this text.[78] He was strict in his belief that a text has a single subject-matter (*skopos*), generally believing that the meaning of scriptural passages did not extend beyond its obvious literal sense.[79]

[74] Edwards (2018), p.77.
[75] *Comm. Cant.*, 1.1.2.
[76] *Princ.*, 4.2.6ff; Edwards (2013), pp.724-6.
[77] Theodore of Mopsuestia, *In Canticum Canticorum*.
[78] Indeed, Theodore perhaps did not consider Song of Songs to be Canon, see Leontius of Byzantium, *Deprehensio et Triumphus super Nestorianos*, 3.16 [Daley (2017), pp.422-5]; Zaharapoulos (1989), pp.33-4, 49-52; Greer (1973), p.225.
[79] Young (2013), p.742.

But not all Antiochenes were as strict as Theodore. Theodoret of Cyrrhus, although primarily interested in the *methodike* and *historike* of biblical exegesis,[80] agreed with Origen's allegorising on this point, stating that the Song of Songs was about the marriage of Christ and the Church.[81] Unlike Theodore, Theodoret allows for more than one *skopos per* passage, which included the use of prophecies, typology, and even figurative readings where the literal sense was untenable or elusive.[82] Conversely, Alexandrians were sometimes challenged by Antiochenes for their literal exegesis. We will see this in the case of Eustathius' treatise against Origen, where the Antiochene criticizes the Alexandrian's literal reading of 1 Samuel 28.[83] Christoph Schäublin claims that, unlike Alexandrians, Antiochenes 'rejected allegorical interpretation altogether and recognized only typology'.[84] Such a distinction is too simplistic, however. We have already noted Theodoret flirting dangerously with allegory. Further, as shown in our earlier discussion of typology and allegory, while there are differences between the two, these methods of interpretation also overlap. Both ultimately direct the reader's attention away from the passage's literal reading towards another, less overt meaning, bringing new relevance to the text. This is why O'Keefe and Reno state that '[a]llegory and typology are part of the same family of reading strategies'.[85] We should take care before drawing too sharp a distinction between them.

[80] Young (1989), pp.191-2. For more on *methodike* and *historike*, see ibid., pp.185-6; see also Young (2018), pp.341-2.
[81] Theodoret, *Comm. Cant.* (PG81, 45a); see also Young (2013), p.742.
[82] Young (1989), pp.191-2. Many ancient writers only use the term 'allegory' when the figurative reading is an alternative to an acceptable literal sense.
[83] Eustathius, *Engast.,* 21.1.
[84] Schäublin (2004), p.161.
[85] O'Keefe and Reno (2005), p.90.

The distinction between Antiochenes and Alexandrians has also been simplified by the anachronistic employment of modern terminology. For instance, 'typology' itself is 'an expression not found in ancient terminology', accentuating a sense of division.[86] Terms such as 'schools' (although difficult to avoid entirely), and even 'Antiochene' and 'Alexandrian' (if referencing strict, homogeneous categories) can also create a false sense of division. In the case of the Antiochenes, it appears there was not a 'school of Antioch' as an institution with teachers and administrators, as was true of Alexandria.[87] While many Antiochenes had student-teacher relationships, they are connected primarily by a shared theological and exegetical stance. Even in the case of the Catechetical School of Alexandria, there is uncertainty concerning whether it was a genuine, institutionalised academy, although there was certainly a shared intellectual milieu.[88] Thus, the Alexandrian and Antiochene 'schools' should not be viewed first and foremost as physical institutions, but rather as 'schools of thought', encompassing a spectrum of views; or better still, as traditions which affected certain authors to varying degrees.

If a simple binary understanding of Alexandrian *vs* Antiochene, especially along the lines of 'figurative' *vs* 'literal' interpretations, is too reductionist, the question remains, how exactly should we understand the 'Antiochene' and 'Alexandrian' distinction? To resolve such a large debate definitively is beyond the scope of an introduction, but we may consider some suggestions.

[86] Young (2013), p.738.

[87] Simonetti (1994), p.67; see however, DeCock (2020), p.2, n.2

[88] Young (2006), pp.490ff; Broek (1995); Oliver (2015), pp.2-3.

One distinction may simply be the emphasis given to the literal and figurative interpretation by these groups of theologians. Although Origen states that passages of Scripture are usually historically true, and a literal interpretation usually holds,[89] he acknowledges that this is not always the case: 'There are certain Scriptures which do not have the bodily sense [σωματικόν] at all… there are times when it is necessary to seek for the soul and spirit of Scripture alone.'[90] For Origen, Scripture always has a spiritual meaning, but not always a literal one. Thus, for Alexandrians, spiritual, allegorical interpretations have primacy of place. This is not true for Antiochene writers, although many maintained that deeper, spiritual interpretations of passages existed. *Theōria*, for Antiochenes like Diodore of Tarsus, referred to this – a spiritual reading which was supposed to build upon the plain sense and not contradict history.[91] However, Antiochene writers mostly focused on Scripture's literal interpretation, and believed that only occasionally did a passage contain an additional, figurative interpretation. For instance, Diodore believed that only verses 10-12 of Genesis 49 were Messianic; similarly, Theodore viewed only Psalms 2, 8, 44 and 109 as Messianic (Psalms already seen as Messianic by Jews).[92] For Antiochenes, there was always a literal explanation of a passage, rooted in history, which held primacy of place in their exposition of Scripture.[93] In short, Antiochenes always had a literal interpretation, but not always a spiritual understanding, whereas Alexandrians always maintained a spiritual reading, but not always a literal one.

[89] *Princ.*, 4.3.4.
[90] Ibid., 4.2.5 (Greek).
[91] Froehlich (1984), p.21; see also pp.20-2.
[92] Simonetti (1994), pp.68-70.
[93] Trigg (1988), p.34.

The difference between Antiochene and Alexandrian exegesis can partly be explained by differing theology, such as Christology. Typically, it has been understood that Alexandrian Christology emphasised the ontological unity of Christ's two natures, referred to as the 'word-flesh' (*logos-sarx*) framework, whereas Antiochenes adopted a 'word-man' (*logos-anthropos*) understanding, holding that the divine and human natures of Christ were complete and distinct. Although somewhat reductionist, these terms and distinctions, popularised by Alloys Grillmeier and his ground-breaking work on early Christology, still reflect genuine theological differences.[94] Such differences impact how individual passages were read. For example, Greer has shown that Christological differences profoundly shaped how Antiochene and Alexandrian theologians understood Hebrews.[95] Yet, Antiochene and Alexandrian exegesis cannot be divided exclusively along theological lines. For instance, Greer himself conceded that Origen exhibits characteristic traits of Antiochene theology, such as his emphasis on Christ's full humanity, and his insistence upon man's free will.[96] Recent scholarship has blurred simplistic Christological distinction between Antiochene and Alexandrian theologians further.[97] Nevertheless, the overarching point stands: theological motivations can partly explain the difference between Antiochene and Alexandrian exegesis.

Others have suggested that the differences between Alexandrian and Antiochene exegesis represent two different Greco-Roman educational ideals, namely the exegetical ideals of philosophy and rhetoric. Young makes this case: '…the Origenist tradition adopted the allegorical techniques of the philosophical schools, and the Antiochene reaction was the

[94] Grillmeier (1975). For a useful, recent overview of Antiochene and Alexandrian Christology, see Daley (2018), pp.174-99.
[95] Greer (1973).
[96] Ibid., p.64.
[97] Edwards (2009), pp.138ff; Daley (2018), pp.176ff.

protest of rhetoric against such a way of handling texts'.[98] This seems plausible. The pursuit of a deeper meaning behind a text, and the consequential use of allegory, can be seen as a characteristic 'Platonic' interpretive method, as in the Neoplatonic readings of Homer.[99] Similar approaches to texts are arguably exhibited in Alexandrian biblical exegesis in the works of Philo of Alexandria (with whom Origen was familiar), Origen himself, and Origen's later adherents.[100] Similarly, we know that classical rhetoric included a focus on the *methodike* and *historike* of a text in its interpretation, characteristic features in much Antiochene exegesis.[101] Even if one limits the philosophical, particularly Platonic, influence on authors like Origen in their reading of the Bible, as Mark Edwards does,[102] Young at least makes a case in arguing for the strong influence of rhetorical culture on Antiochenes. Even if the influence of philosophy on Alexandrians was limited, Young's narrative still makes sense as long as this philosophical influence was perceived by their Antiochene counterparts, which led to a reactionary counter-reading by Antiochenes along traditional rhetorical lines. Young, then, offers another possible piece of the jigsaw in understanding the difference between Antiochene and Alexandrian exegesis.

Having considered an example of exegetical difference relevant to this study, it is important to reiterate earlier conclusions: early Christian exegetes had more in common than separated them, and shared many ideas and influences when reading Scripture which run deeper than attempts to categorically separate exegetes from one another. On the other

[98] Young (1989), p.188.
[99] O'Keefe and Reno (2005), p.103; Edwards (2002), pp.128-9.
[100] Dawson (2000).
[101] Young (1989), pp.187, 190.
[102] Edwards (2002), pp.123-58.

hand, all authors have a mind of their own: their own background, context, audience and aims. This will be seen clearly in this study. Although there are many differences between how early Christian authors interpret 1 Samuel 28, they do not differ strictly according to the categories in which they are often placed, such as Antiochene or Alexandrian, East or West. Early Christian writers do not always interpret 1 Samuel 28 as we might expect them to, a point which can be applied to early Christian exegesis as a whole. This is what makes patristic exegesis so rich and vibrant a field of study.

***

Jewish interpretation

The interpretation of 1 Samuel 28 did not begin with patristic authors, of course. Included among the Nevi'im of the Hebrew Bible, the books of Samuel were interpreted by Jewish writers, who were also interested in this passage about the Medium of Endor. Thus, when early Christian authors write about 1 Samuel 28, there was already a pre-existing, separate tradition of interpreting this passage which continued into their era. Overall, Christian and Jewish interpretations of 1 Samuel 28 tended to differ from each other. Nevertheless, Christian and Jewish authors faced many common problems when exegeting this passage, and it is important to acknowledge that the interpretation of 1 Samuel 28 had an alternate history which both preceded and ran concurrently with its early Christian exegesis. During the course of this study, we shall consider how these traditions might have occasionally overlapped and impacted one another. Therefore, let us consider some significant Jewish texts which discuss 1 Samuel 28, to frame our later analysis of Christian interpretations within this wider context.

1 Chronicles 10:13-14

The earliest extant Jewish reference to this passage occurs in the Hebrew Bible itself, in the first book of Chronicles:

> So Saul died for his unfaithfulness; he was unfaithful to the LORD in that he did not keep the command of the LORD; moreover, he had consulted a medium, seeking guidance, and did not seek guidance from the LORD. Therefore the LORD put him to death and turned the kingdom over to David son of Jesse. (1 Chronicles 10:13-14.)

While Samuel–Kings and Chronicles cover a similar period of history, they were not written at a similar date. The books of Samuel and Kings were almost certainly composed during the First Temple Period (and definitely no later than the Babylonian Exile),[103] whereas Chronicles can be safely dated to the Second Temple Period.[104] Almost half of Chronicles has parallels with Samuel–Kings, and because of the lengthy period between their composition, it is unlikely that they shared a third 'common source'. Additionally, as textual errors and irrelevant expressions appear in both Samuel–Kings and their respective parallels in Chronicles, and Chronicles contains clear allusions to the narration of Samuel–Kings, we may safely assume that the writer of Chronicles knew Samuel–Kings directly.[105] In fact, Isaac Kalimi claims that 1 Chronicles 10:13-14 is proof that the Chronicler knew Samuel, arguing that it intentionally reworks the Samuel–Kings text as a chiasmus, inverting the order of the contents of 1 Samuel 28:6-7, indicating that the Chronicler was directly familiar with this passage.[106]

---

[103] Kalimi (2005), p.1.

[104] Kalimi (2004), pp.347-71. Kalimi suggests *c*.400 BCE as a reasonable date of composition.

[105] For these arguments, and others, see Kalimi (2005), esp. pp.3-4; see also Schweitzer (2011), p.124.

[106] For further details, see Kalimi (2005), p.251.

Having established that 1 Chronicles 10:13-14 probably refers directly to 1 Samuel 28, and thus can be considered 'exegetical', how does the author of Chronicles interpret this passage? As glancing as this reference might be, we can glean something of how the Chronicler understood this event.

In Chronicles, Saul is portrayed extremely negatively for seeking guidance from a medium. Because of this sin (among others) 'the Lord put him to death' (1 Chronicles 10:14). One can interpret 1 Samuel 28 itself as being critical of Saul. By describing the act of consulting a medium in the light of clear condemnations of this in the Pentateuch (cf. Deuteronomy 18:10-11), Saul is portrayed negatively. This is also implied in the passage since Saul, presumably during the better years of his reign, had banished such practitioners from Israel (1 Samuel 28:3). Samuel's questioning of Saul's actions (1 Samuel 28:15-16), and the prophet's following words of judgement, including his prediction that Saul will die the next day (1 Samuel 28:19), also suggest Saul's wrongdoing. Thus, the Chronicler's reading of 1 Samuel 28, and his negative portrayal of Saul, is reasonable, including his understanding that the act of consulting the Medium led to God taking Saul's life.[107] This would become a common reading, and later Rabbinical writers similarly list Saul's consultation of a medium among the sins which led to his downfall.[108] However, 1 Samuel 28 does not *explicitly* condemn Saul for visiting a medium, and certainly does not say that Saul will die because of this sin, as 1 Chronicles 10:13-14 states. Samuel actually says that Saul's punishment is because he did not destroy, as commanded, the Amalekites and their possessions entirely (1

[107] Zelewski (1989), pp.466-7.
[108] *Tanhuma Buber*, Leviticus 8.4; *Leviticus Rabbah*, 26.7.5.

Samuel 28:17-18; cf. 1 Samuel 15), and Samuel's words (and the earlier reference to his robe) echo the judgement given to Saul at the time (1 Samuel 15:27-29).

The Chronicler's portrayal of Saul here is particularly negative in other ways. Chronicles claims that Saul 'did not seek guidance from the Lord', consulting the Medium instead. This seemingly contradicts the 1 Samuel 28 account: 'When Saul inquired of the LORD, the LORD did not answer him, not by dreams, or by Urim, or by prophets' (1 Samuel 28:6; cf. 1 Samuel 28:15). In 1 Samuel 28, Saul appears to consult the Medium as a last resort, because God was ignoring his petitions. How might the Chronicler justify such a contradiction? Kalimi suggests that the Chronicler, at various points (e.g. 1 Chronicles 28:9; 2 Chronicles 15:2; 15:15), shows that God answers those who *truly* seek him, and abandons those who abandon him.[109] In Kalimi's words, 'For the Chronicler, the Lord's not replying to Saul could only stem from Saul's not asking/inquiring of the Lord with all his heart and might.'[110] Whatever the justification, the effect is an overwhelmingly negative image of Saul in 1 Chronicles 10:13-14.

This negative portrayal of Saul might be explained in two ways. Firstly, it may be seen as a means of bringing the account of 1 Samuel 28 more closely in line with the portrayal of consulting mediums found in the Pentateuch. If there is any moral ambiguity in 1 Samuel 28, 1 Chronicles 10:13-14 is clear that consulting mediums is wrong and deadly. In fact, Kalimi argues that 1 Chronicles 10:13-14 intentionally uses language reminiscent of Deuteronomy 18:10-11, making a strong case that 'textual harmonization' constitutes a part of the

[109] Kalimi (2005), pp.327-8.
[110] Ibid., p.328.

Chronicler's exegetical intentions.[111] The Pentateuch convinced the Chronicler that Saul's actions in 1 Samuel 28 constituted a serious sin, leading to his grave presentation of Israel's first King.

Secondly, the Chronicler's particularly damning report of Saul's consultation with a medium is consistent with his broader negative portrayal of Saul. Chronicles omits any positive details about Saul in 1 Chronicles 10, as Saul is introduced, and emphasises God's role in deposing him. Saul Zelewski suggests that Saul's depiction in 1 Chronicles 10 was intended to demonstrate that David's non-hereditary rise to kingship was legitimate, ideal, and ordained by God.[112] Certainly, Chronicles establishes a starker contrast between Saul and David than seen in Samuel–Kings: unflattering accounts of David are omitted in Chronicles, such as concerning Bathsheba (2 Samuel 11-12), and redeeming episodes are afforded to Saul in Samuel–Kings. In line with these aims, Chronicles presents Saul even more negatively than the original 1 Samuel 28 account.

Although brief, the Chronicler's reference to 1 Samuel 28 can still reveal something about how this passage was understood. Our next chronological reference to 1 Samuel 28 is also concise but is nevertheless a significant early Jewish reference to this passage.

Sirach 46:20

The book of Sirach, known also as Ben Sira or Ecclesiasticus, was composed by the Jewish scribe Yeshua ben Sira, *c.*180 BCE, originally in Hebrew, in the wisdom genre.[113] Little is

[111] Ibid., pp.139-40.
[112] Zelewski (1989), esp. pp.465-6.
[113] Reiterer (1997), p.37.

known about ben Sira, and speculation about his background varies, but his wisdom teachings indicate he was of great learning.[114] Although some of the Hebrew has survived, Sirach was best-known and transmitted in its Greek version, translated by ben Sira's unnamed grandson sometime after 132 BCE (and later in Latin and Syriac translations).[115] Although not included in the canon of the Hebrew Bible, Sirach was cited by many later Rabbinical Jewish authors, an indication of its popularity and influence.[116] However, Sirach's impact on Christianity was perhaps more significant. Its inclusion in the Septuagint by Jewish scholars in Alexandria meant that some later Christians adopted Sirach in their own biblical canon.[117] This is particularly significant for this study because, as shown in chapter 5, Augustine's reading of 1 Samuel 28 was directly impacted by Sirach's comments on this passage which, being part of his biblical canon, was therefore authoritative for him.

The allusion to 1 Samuel 28 comes as part of Sirach's 'Hymn in Praise of the Fathers', a poetic section comprising chapters 44-50. Here, the Patriarchs of Israel's history are praised, culminating in a description of Simon the high priest, generally understood as referring to Simon II.[118] In chapter 46, as part of 16 bicola dedicated to the Judges,[119] Sirach praises Samuel (who fulfilled multiple offices as judge, prophet, and priest),[120] concluding with these words:

[114] For an overview of the debate surrounding Sirach's identity, see ibid., pp.35-7.
[115] Ibid., p.37.
[116] Mack (1985), p.175.
[117] Ibid.
[118] However, James C. VanderKam suggests Simon I as a possibility, see VanderKam (2000), pp.236-8.
[119] Corley (2009), pp.31-2.
[120] Sirach 46:13-20; see Mack (1985), p.34.

> Even after he had fallen asleep, he prophesied and made known to the king his death, and lifted up his voice from the ground in prophecy, to blot out the wickedness of the people.[121] (Sirach 46:20)

Much has been written about ben Sira's use of Scripture, and questions raised about which texts were available to him, and which he viewed as canonical or not.[122] However, it seems certain that ben Sira directly knew and used Samuel. Pancratius C. Beentjes, for instance, notes allusions to Samuel in Sirach.[123] Furthermore, since Samuel–Kings far pre-dates Sirach, with its survival and canonical status suggesting its widespread popularity, it is reasonable to assume that Sirach here directly refers to 1 Samuel 28, as we shall assume for all future Jewish and Christian references to the events of Endor. Let us consider, then, how Sirach understood this passage.

A significant assumption that Sirach makes is that it was the real Samuel who prophesied from the dead. The subject of this verse is the same Samuel whose life is glorified in the preceding verses, praising Samuel since, although dead, he 'lifted up his voice from the ground in prophecy'. For early Christians, a debate emerged around this passage concerning whether it was the prophet himself who rose from the dead, or a demon in his image. Sirach's comments were illuminating for this debate, particularly for those Christians who accepted it among their biblical canon, since Sirach clearly suggests that Samuel actually appeared. However, Sirach's remarks betray no polemical motives, nor awareness of a debate about who appeared at Endor. It seems that the view that Samuel did not truly appear was uncommon among early Jewish readers of 1 Samuel 28 (as we shall see, later

[121] NRSV.
[122] Wright (2012), pp.363-5.
[123] Beentjes (2006), pp.176-8.

Jewish writers also assume that Samuel was truly raised),[124] and that such debates were unique to Christian interpretations of this passage. Sirach reflects a common assumption among Jewish contemporaries, and later Jewish writers, that it was the real Samuel who appeared at Endor.

Sirach also seems to share the Chronicler's negative perception of Saul, who is not mentioned by name in this section (nor elsewhere in Sirach), but referred to as the 'king'. Jeremy Corley reasons that '[t]his refusal to name Israel's first king (whose reign is narrated in 1 Sam 9–31) is presumably because of his faithlessness'.[125] This suggestion seems reasonable, likely reflecting in part Sirach's negative perception of Saul's summoning of Samuel. Corley also suggests that Sirach's words, 'made known to the king his death', allude to Jeremiah 51:31 ('tell the king of Babylon that his city is taken from end to end'), concluding that '[t]he sage boldly paints the end of Israel's first king with the colors of the downfall of Israel's arch-enemy, the king of Babylon'.[126] Perhaps influenced by the Chronicler, or by the Pentateuch's condemnations of consultations with mediums, Sirach's allusion to 1 Samuel 28 presents Saul negatively.

Sirach's closing remarks that Samuel 'lifted up his voice from the ground in prophecy, to blot out the wickedness of the people' are difficult to understand. To what does 'the wickedness of the people' refer? Again, Corley makes a reasonable suggestion. He posits that the people's sin was their desire to have a king like other nations, and that Samuel's

[124] It is not until the Geonic period that doubts concerning whether Samuel truly appeared emerge in Rabbinic literature; Smelik (1979), pp.163-4.
[125] Corley (2009), p.51.
[126] Ibid.

announcement of Saul's death brought an end to this iniquity, also implying that Samuel served a priestly, mediatory role in ensuring that Saul's death atoned for the people's iniquity.[127] If Corley is correct, this suggests two things about Sirach's reading of 1 Samuel 28. Firstly, it suggests, like 1 Chronicles 10:13-14, that Saul's death is directly linked to Samuel's summoning. If 'to blot out' refers to Saul's death, then Sirach suggests causation between Samuel's prediction and Saul's death, not a reiteration of a prior judgement. Again, we see a negative portrayal of Saul, whose death brings resolution. Secondly, it suggests that Sirach read this passage with the people of Israel in mind. This is unusual, since the 'people' are not mentioned in 1 Samuel 28. Although the war between the Israelites and the Philistines frames this passage, the 'people' play no active role in the events at Endor. However, according to Sirach's understanding of 1 Samuel 28, Samuel somehow resolved the people's iniquity from the grave (perhaps, as Corley suggested, by condemning to death the king that they had sinfully requested). What purpose does Samuel's priestly act of atonement for the people after death serve in this rendition of 1 Samuel 28? A consideration of why Sirach refers to this passage, and how it fits into the hymn's overall structure, might provide an answer.

Increasingly, scholars perceive chapter 50 of Sirach, praising Simon the high priest, as an integral part of the hymn. Thomas R. Lee states that 'the hymn does not treat each of the fathers equally, but... the focus of the whole is on Simon II, the high priest with whose praise the passage closes'.[128] Similarly, Corley describes chapter 50 as the 'climax of the poem'.[129] For such scholars, the poem's aim, in praising Israel ancestors, is partly to establish the

[127] Ibid., p.52.
[128] Lee (1986), p.81.
[129] Corley (2007), pp.43-63.

exemplary pedigree of Simon II. By doing this, Sirach 'grounds Simon's actions — and more importantly he positions his assessment of Simon's social, religious and political activities— within the framework of the actions and offices of these ancient figures'.[130] Thus, Sirach seeks to establish Simon II as a 'type' of Samuel, sharing in his glory. Why, then, does Sirach discuss Samuel's priestly function after death? How is this relevant to Simon II?

Although scholars debate whether Simon II was alive when ben Sira wrote,[131] there is evidence suggesting that he had already died (for example, Sirach 50:1 seemingly implies this). Siding with those scholars who argue that Simon was already dead, I suggest that Sirach here aims to connect Samuel's death with that of Simon II. If we suppose that the poem was composed after Simon II had died, to eulogise his memory, then its comments about Samuel's legacy after death take on added meaning. Sirach likely mentions Samuel's continued service after death among his praiseworthy deeds to also establish Simon II as one whose deeds transcended his earthly life. Simon's contribution to the renewal and vigour of temple worship, described in Sirach 50, will endure after him. This also explains why Sirach describes Samuel as performing a priestly function for the people, although dead, when the original 1 Samuel 28 narrative does not mention this. Both Samuel and Simon continue as priests after death. Corley notes that other sections of the hymn focus on spiritual activity after death (for example, Sirach 48:13-14).[132] Therefore, Sirach seems intent on establishing the idea, through his praise of Israelite ancestors, that Simon II's influence persists after his death. This, I suggest, partly motivates Sirach's reference to 1 Samuel 28. Thus, our study of

[130] Wright (2008), p.186.
[131] For scholars claiming that Simon was dead when ben Sira wrote, see Corley (2007), p.45; Collins (1997), p.106; VanderKam (2000), pp.236ff. For the view that Simon was still alive, see Mulder (2003), p.103.
[132] Corley (2009), p.52.

this passage provides another argument for the view that Simon II was dead by the time this hymn was written, thereby contributing to this scholarly debate.

Rewritten Bible

Other important Jewish references to 1 Samuel 28 come in the form of 'Rewritten Bible', a genre which retells biblical narrative, often with significant changes, omissions, and additions. Although writers in this genre often include other traditions about the biblical narratives they are reworking, and write and structure their retelling in original ways, it should be emphasised that biblical texts are foundational to these works. While scholars such as Charles Perrot distinguish sharply in early post-biblical writings between *texte expliqué* and *texte continué* (with 'Rewritten Bible' falling under the latter category of texts which continue, rather than explain, the biblical narrative), this is a false dichotomy.[133] Reworking requires, and reflects, an interpretation of the original text – it is *re*interpretation. As Bruce Norman Fisk states, 'whether the goal is to explain the received Biblical text or to incorporate Scripture into a fresh composition, the author's new work represents an interpretation of the biblical precursor'.[134] Thus, 'Rewritten Bible' can be considered 'exegetical'.

Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum

Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, whose unknown author is commonly referred to as Pseudo-Philo, is such a work of 'Rewritten Bible', and retells the 1 Samuel 28 narrative with significant differences. There is debate surrounding the work's composition, particularly

[133] Perrot and Bogaert (1976), pp.24-5.
[134] Fisk (2001), p.24.

whether it was written before or after the second temple's destruction.[135] In truth, we know little about its composition, although many scholars suggest a Palestinian origin, around the 1st century AD.[136] The general consensus is that the extant Latin text was translated from the Greek which, likewise, was translated from the original Hebrew.[137] Let us consider some ways in which this retelling differs from 1 Samuel 28, and their significance.

Many of the additions and omissions that Pseudo-Philo makes to 1 Samuel 28 concern Saul and, continuing the trend of Chronicles and Sirach, some of these changes portray Saul particularly negatively. Firstly, it is explained that Saul had only banished magical practitioners from Israel (1 Samuel 28:3) to 'make a name for himself'.[138] Thus, even Saul's good deeds are wrongly motivated. Secondly, Pseudo-Philo states that the Medium did not recognise Saul despite having seen him many times before. This distresses Saul, who says, 'I know that my appearance has changed, and the glory of my kingship has passed from me.'[139] Saul's physical decay seemingly represents his own moral decline and the weak state of his kingship. In the wider context of *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, scholars have stated that 'Saul is a model of the bad ruler'.[140] Saul's depiction in Pseudo-Philo's retelling of 1 Samuel 28 supports this. However, Pseudo-Philo does offer Saul redemption. After hearing Samuel's prophecy, Saul says, 'Behold I go to die with my sons, if my ruin is atonement for my iniquities [*si ruina mea exoratio est iniquitatum mearum*].'[141] Although Saul acknowledges his own wickedness, Pseudo-Philo portrays him as bravely setting out to welcome his own

[135] For a detailed account of both arguments, see ibid., pp.34-45.
[136] Ibid., pp.40-1; Murphy (1993), pp.4-6, 263ff.
[137] Fisk (2001), pp.40-1; Murphy (1993), p.4.
[138] Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 64.1 [Jacobson (1996), p.192].
[139] Ibid., 64.4 [Jacobson (1996), p.193].
[140] Murphy (1993), p.240.
[141] *LAB*, 64.9.

death, omitting 1 Samuel 28's description of Saul's collapse in fear (1 Samuel 28:20). Interestingly, in Pseudo-Philo, Saul's death serves a purpose. Like Sirach, Saul's death atones for wickedness, but not for the people's iniquity, but rather his own.

Pseudo-Philo also makes changes which are damning for the Medium of Endor. He identifies her as Sedecla, a Midianite gentile, and implies that she was the daughter of Aod the magician, thus associating her with one of Israel's archenemies in *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*.[142] She is also said to have practiced her illicit craft for forty years.[143] These added details cast the Medium in an unfavourable light. A major omission is also made. Pseudo-Philo excludes all mention of Sedecla's hospitality to Saul during his distress, offering a fattened calf and baking bread for the king and his servants (1 Samuel 28:21-25). Some have noted *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*'s favourable portrayal of women,[144] so how should we understand the particularly negative portrayal of this female? Cheryl Anne Brown reasons that this is the result of Pseudo-Philo's negative attitude towards gentile idolatry and associated practices,[145] considered a reoccurring theme in the text by scholars.[146] Thus, Pseudo-Philo allows no redeeming qualities for the Medium whose methods contravened true religion.

However, perhaps the most significant changes that Pseudo-Philo makes concern Samuel's appearance. Firstly, Pseudo-Philo adds details to explain the Medium's ambiguous words in 1 Samuel 28:13, which in the Hebrew says, 'I see divine beings/gods [*elohim*] ascending

[142] Ibid., 64.3; see 18.13; 34; 61.1; see also Brown (1992), pp.184-5.
[143] Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 64.5.
[144] Brown (1992), pp.203-5; Jacobson (2012), p.197; Murphy (1993), pp.258-9.
[145] Brown (1992), pp.203-4
[146] Jacobson (2012), pp.190ff; Murphy (1993), pp.252-4.

[*olim*] out of the earth.' To make sense of *elohim* and its plural verb, particularly since 1 Samuel 28 does not mention other figures appearing with Samuel, Pseudo Philo inserts these words by the Medium: 'You are asking me about divine beings [*diis*]. For behold his appearance is not that of a man. He is clothed in a white robe with a mantle placed over it, and two angels are leading him.'[147] Pseudo-Philo resolves this exegetical problem by clarifying that Samuel no longer looked manlike (his appearance is too splendid), and that angelic beings joined his ascension. Later Christian authors faced the same problem when reading 1 Samuel 28:13.[148] Origen, like Pseudo-Philo, suggests that perhaps angels appeared with Samuel, or the souls of other prophets,[149] a possible point of contact between Christian and Jewish writers. We have already noted Origen's familiarity with Jewish thought, and it is possible that Origen knew Jewish traditions which claimed that angels appeared with Samuel. Another addition found in Pseudo-Philo, absent in 1 Samuel 28, is the suggestion that Samuel thought the Day of Judgement had come:, saying 'I thought that the time of the repayment for my deeds might have drawn near [*Putavi quod appropinquasset tempus reddendi merces operum meorum].'*[150] As we shall see, later Rabbinic material similarly connect Samuel's resurrection with the Day of Judgement.

Perhaps most significantly, Pseudo-Philo adds detail clarifying how Samuel was raised, namely that he appeared at God's command:

> …do not boast, King, nor you, woman. You have not brought me, but rather that order which God spoke to me while I was alive, that I should come and announce to you that you have now heedlessly sinned against God a second time.[151]

---

[147] *LAB*, 64.6 [Jacobson (1996), p.193].
[148] Most early Greek and Latin translations of this verse also refer to 'gods' with a plural verb.
[149] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 7.1-3; see also Diodore, *Fragment*.
[150] *LAB,* 64.7.
[151] Ibid. [Jacobson (1996), p.193, revised].

Here we see the earliest extant consideration of the issue of agency in 1 Samuel 28. Prior references to this passage seem to have assumed that Samuel's summoning was at the hands of the Medium. However, as Smelik comments, 'Pseudo-Philo does not want to accept that this important prophet was submitted to the power of a necromancer, and he suggests that Samuel appeared at the command of the Lord.'[152] Perhaps Pseudo-Philo's comments indicate that the issue of agency was becoming a matter of contention among Jewish readers of this passage. While some suggested that Samuel appeared through the Medium's power, others like Pseudo-Philo denied this. As we shall see, later Christians also concerned themselves with, and differed on, this issue of agency in 1 Samuel 28. Some Christians suggested an alternative solution, arguing that a demon appeared rather than Samuel, and thus the Medium did not have power over the prophet. However, Pseudo-Philo, like other early Jewish writers, accepted unquestionably that this figure was none other than Samuel himself.

Antiquitates Judaicae

Josephus, the Jewish historian, retells Scripture in large parts of his *Antiquitates Judaicae*, completed 93-94 AD.[153] Although born in Jerusalem, and of priestly descent, Josephus wrote primarily in Greek and was clearly influenced by Greco-Roman culture.[154] In *Antiquitates Judaicae*, Josephus declares his audience to be Epaphroditus and others of the Greek-speaking world.[155] Although he probably anticipated some Jewish readers, its Hellenization

[152] Smelik (1979), p.162.
[153] Horbury (2013), p.316; Rodgers (2012), p.453.
[154] Feldman (2006a); Feldman (2006b); Chapman (2009).
[155] Josephus, *AJ,* 1.prologue.2.5-9.

and explanations imply an intended Greco-Roman audience.[156] Josephus apparently wrote this text to present the Hebrew Bible and Jewish history in a favourable light to those unfamiliar with it, in terms they would understand. Like Pseudo-Philo's retelling of 1 Samuel 28, Josephus' most notable alterations concern Saul, the Medium, and Samuel's appearance.[157]

Josephus, at this section's conclusion, eulogises Saul, particularly praising his bravery in accepting his fate pronounced by Samuel.[158] Pseudo-Philo made a similar point concerning Saul's willingness to face death. However, unlike Pseudo-Philo, Josephus heaps praise, describing Saul as 'just, courageous, and wise',[159] perhaps a surprising conclusion to this retelling of 1 Samuel 28. According to Louis Feldman, Josephus' description of Saul parallels Greco-Roman virtues ascribed to heroes.[160] Thus, Josephus portrays Israel's first king as an example, within the Jewish tradition, of a hero equal to those of the classical world, rendering Judaism both compatible with, and palatable to, Greco-Roman culture. The effect is a particularly favourable presentation of Saul, more so than in Pseudo-Philo's account of 1 Samuel 28.[161]

Josephus also presents the Medium favourably, in stark contrast to Pseudo-Philo, and more so than the original 1 Samuel 28 account. He does this initially by exaggerating the Medium's

---

[156] Rodgers (2012), p.453.

[157] Although these differences primarily reflect Josephus' thought, some changes may also reflect the particular biblical text he read, although we cannot be precisely certain of what this looked like for 1 Samuel 28. See Avioz (2015), pp.195-200; see also Ulrich (1978), esp. p.191; Kauhanen (2012), p.189; Feldman (1998), p.36. For more on Josephus and the book of Samuel, see Avioz (2015).

[158] *AJ*, 6.14.4.343-350.

[159] Ibid., 6.14.4.346.

[160] Feldman (1998), pp.520ff.

[161] However, until this encomium, Josephus had presented Saul quite negatively, see Avioz (2015), pp.53-5.

reluctance to perform her craft, inspired by 1 Samuel 28:9-10.[162] However, Josephus' most striking changes are his additions concerning the Medium's hospitality towards Saul. He adds that, although Saul was a stranger, who had forbidden her craft, the Medium sympathised with him and sacrificed her one calf (and 'only possession'!) to feed him, despite knowing that Saul would not live long enough to repay her.[163] The Medium is made an example of extreme hospitality, as Josephus explicitly states, 'It is noble, then, to imitate this woman and treat well all who are in need.'[164] Although it has been argued, in contrast to Pseudo-Philo's more philogynous attitude, that Josephus presents women unkindly,[165] here is an extremely positive portrayal of a female magical practitioner! Brown, once more, offers a reasonable suggestion in explanation: since hospitality was an important Greco-Roman ideal, Josephus utilised the Medium, despite her sex, to exemplify Jewish hospitality to strangers.[166] Josephus, thus, expands upon the Medium's kindness towards Saul to highlight that Jewish tradition shares this classical virtue. This also suggests that, unlike Pseudo-Philo who presents the Medium as a gentile, Josephus believed that she was an exiled Jew.

Josephus also clarifies certain aspects concerning Samuel's appearance. For instance, 1 Samuel 28 does not explain how, after seeing Samuel, the Medium realised that she was with Saul. Josephus adds a simple explanation: Samuel had told her who Saul was.[167] Josephus also elaborates upon 1 Samuel 28:13, where the Medium says that she sees 'god(s)' emerging from the earth. Josephus clarifies her words thus: '[she] said that she saw

[162] Josephus, *AJ,* 6.14.2.331-332.
[163] Ibid., 6.14.3.338–4.342.
[164] Ibid., 6.14.4.342.
[165] Brown (1992), p.204.
[166] Ibid., pp.201-5.
[167] *AJ*, 6.14.2.332.

someone coming up in a similar form to God'.[168] Unlike Pseudo-Philo, Josephus makes no suggestion that others came up with Samuel: instead, Samuel himself appeared divine-like to the Medium. Unlike Pseudo-Philo, Josephus seems to assume that the Medium was responsible for Samuel's summoning, although he does not consider the issue in detail.[169] However, like all early Jewish writers, Josephus certainly believed that it was the real Samuel who appeared.

Early Rabbinical writings

Later Jewish writings also refer to 1 Samuel 28, including allusions in the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmud, and *Tosefta Sotah*, which cannot be considered here in detail.[170] Aggadic Midrashim, such as *Leviticus Rabbah*, *Tanhuma Buber*, and *Pirke De Rabbi Eliezar* contain lengthy commentaries on this passage, which we shall consider as a representative sample of early Rabbinic thought on it. While the final compilation of these works may post-date the period under consideration, some content, and the traditions (including oral) these reflect, are much older.[171] Both *Leviticus Rabbah* and *Tanhuma Buber* cite 1 Samuel 28 when connecting Leviticus 20.27 ('When a man or a woman has a ghost or familiar spirit…') to its following verse 21.1 ('Speak unto the priests…'), understanding this as referring to the Medium and Samuel. Although they differ slightly, and *Tanhuma Buber* is shorter, these two texts clearly share sources since their content and structure are so similar. *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, which contains the biblical retellings and exegesis of the Rabbis, compiles some early Jewish comments about 1 Samuel 28.

---

[168] Ibid., 6.14.2.333; see also Avioz (2015), pp.52-3.
[169] Josephus, *AJ*, 6.14.2.333.
[170] *Babylonian Talmud*, Berakhot 12b; Shabbat 152b; Eruvin 53b; Chagigah 4b; Sanhedrin 65b; *Jerusalem Talmud*, Hagigah 2.1; Sanhedrin 7.13; *Tosefta Sotah*, 11.12.
[171] Fonrobert and Jaffee (2007), pp.2-3.

Leviticus Rabbah and *Tanhuma Buber* offer a fascinating explanation as to how the Medium suddenly recognised Saul after seeing Samuel emerge (1 Samuel 28:12). They state that when a ghost appears to an ordinary person, it appears feet first, whereas to a king it appears headfirst.[172] Thus, from the way Samuel appeared, the Medium could deduce that it was King Saul who visited her. Diodore of Tarsus refers to a similar idea, suggesting a point of contact between Christian and Jewish readings of 1 Samuel 28.[173] Another issue which these texts address is the plural reference to 'divine beings coming up' (1 Samuel 28:13). Unlike Pseudo-Philo's suggestion that angels came up with Samuel, these texts (including *Pirke De Rabbi Eliezar*) state that other righteous men appeared with him (*Tanhuma Buber* specifies Moses).[174] As mentioned earlier, Origen also makes this suggestion, perhaps further indicating his familiarity with Jewish readings of 1 Samuel 28.[175]

All these texts connect our passage with the Day of Judgment by associating Samuel's resurrection with the final resurrection of the dead.[176] *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* explains that righteous men followed Samuel up because they thought that it was the Day of Judgement, stating also that the dead will rise clothed as proven by Samuel's cloak (1 Samuel 28:13-14).[177] *Leviticus Rabbah* and *Tanhuma Buber* add that Samuel was afraid because he thought the Day of Judgement had arrived.[178] In application, they argue *a fortiori* that if the great prophet Samuel was afraid, how much more should we fear the Day of Judgement. That

[172] *Leviticus Rabbah*, 26.7.2; *Tanhuma Buber*, Leviticus 8.4.
[173] Diodore, *Fragment*.
[174] *Leviticus Rabbah*, 26.7.2; *Tanhuma Buber*, Leviticus 8.4; *Pirke De Rabbi Eliezar*, 33.
[175] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 7.1-3.
[176] Cf. Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 64.7.
[177] *Pirke De Rabbi Eliezar*, 33; cf. 1 Samuel 28:14.
[178] *Leviticus Rabbah*, 26.7.3; *Tanhuma Buber*, Leviticus 8.4.

these Rabbinical writers would use 1 Samuel 28, a passage about the dead appearing on the plain of the living, to discuss the resurrection of the dead is unsurprising, for an identifying theological belief of the Pharisaic tradition (in opposition to the Sadducees), from which Rabbinic Judaism emerged, was the resurrection of the dead.[179] Like the earlier Jewish texts considered, these works do not question that it was the real Samuel that appeared, as some Christians would. Smelik suggests that this is because of the more prevalent and acceptable place divination held in Judaism, and because they were more influenced by an Old Testament, rather than classical, worldview.[180] However, as Smelik notes, medieval Jewish readers would eventually question whether Samuel was truly raised.[181]

All three texts conclude their discussion of this passage with praise for Saul. For instance, *Leviticus Rabbah* and *Tanhuma Buber* describe him as being 'righteous'.[182] Much of the praise Saul receives relates to his death. Like Pseudo-Philo and Josephus, *Leviticus Rabbah* and *Tanhuma Buber* praise his obedience to God in willingly going to battle, even taking his sons with him, aware of his certain demise.[183] All three texts explain that Samuel's words 'tomorrow you and your sons shall be with me' (1 Samuel 28:19) should be understood positively, affirming Saul's place among the righteous after death.[184] Thus, as in earlier Jewish writings, Saul's death is understood in redemptive terms. This is clearest in *Pirke De Rabbi Eliezar*, which states that Saul's death atones for his own life, an idea also found in Pseudo-Philo.[185] For these Rabbinical writers, Saul's death marks a glorious end to Israel's

[179] Raphael (2009), p.156.
[180] Smelik (1979), p.178.
[181] Ibid., pp.163-4.
[182] *Leviticus Rabbah*, 26.7.4; *Tanhuma Buber*, Leviticus 8.4.
[183] *Leviticus Rabbah*, 26.7.4; *Tanhuma Buber*, Leviticus 8.4.
[184] *Leviticus Rabbah*, 26.7.4; *Tanhuma Buber*, Leviticus 8.4; *Pirke De Rabbi Eliezar*, 33.
[185] *Pirke De Rabbi Eliezar*, 33.

first king, rather than suggesting his downfall. Once again, Saul is portrayed remarkably positively.

Further details of these texts, and other Rabbinical material, could be explored. However, the above provides a broad sense of how Rabbinical Jews approached this passage.

Conclusion

It is worth asking again to what extent was there contact between Jewish and Christian exegesis of 1 Samuel 28? The relationship between Christianity and Judaism is a particularly fascinating aspect of the period under consideration. It was once thought that a sharp, stark distinction existed between the two, 'The Parting of the Ways' to quote James Parker.[186] Although the issue of Jewish-Christian interchange is still a matter of considerable debate,[187] scholars now tend to emphasise a measure of continuity between Christianity and Judaism, the complexity of their interaction (in both directions), and regard their distinction as a more gradual divergence.[188] Although one suspects that evidence of interaction with Jewish thought is more likely to be observed in earlier Christian writings,[189] recent scholarship has emphasised that interaction persisted, and perhaps never truly 'parted' at all.[190] In the case of some earlier Jewish texts, such as Josephus' *Antiquitates Judaicae*, it is quite likely that many early Christians authors were aware of their content, including interpretations of 1 Samuel 28. In terms of concurrent, Rabbinical exegesis, interaction with Christian thought is

[186] Parkes (1961), pp.71ff.
[187] Schröter, Edsall, and Verheyden (2021).
[188] For more on 'the parting of the ways', see ibid.; Becker and Reed (2003); see also Dunn (2006b); Lieu (1994); Lange (1976).
[189] For example, on Tertullian, see Binder (2012).
[190] See especially Becker and Reed (2003).

more difficult to ascertain. Yet, Smelik addresses this question, and reaches a well-considered conclusion:

> …though mainly the Rabbinic and Christian exegeses of I Sam. 28 differ, there are many similarities in interpretation… Rabbinic exegesis at least must have been known to some Christian writers. But apparently Rabbinic and Christian exegetes did not influence each other very much on this subject. Since they share, however, most of the basic principles of interpretation regarding the Scriptures, Patristic and Rabbinic exegesis are far more congenial to each other than to the rationalistic exegesis of later times.[191]

In the case of 1 Samuel 28, Jewish and Christian traditions of interpretation did differ, and as they developed, grew further apart. However, there does seem to be some contact between their interpretations of this passage, considered below as connections arise in the Christian texts under focus in this work. It should also be noted that many Christians continued the basic early Jewish understanding of this passage observed here, by arguing that it was the real Samuel that appeared, in some way or another. It is the proponents of this view in particular, the subject of the next chapter, who primarily show signs of contact with Jewish exegesis. However, many Christians diverged from this understanding, and thought that a demonic illusion appeared rather than Samuel. Although this is not to deny any Jewish influence on their reading of 1 Samuel 28, it is less apparent. Christian proponents of this view, without any known early Jewish precedent, will be the focus of chapter 3.

[191] Smelik (1979), pp.178-9.

Chapter 2 – Samuel Truly Appeared

In the early Church, unlike the Jewish discussions we have considered, a stark difference of opinion would emerge surrounding 1 Samuel 28, namely whether it was the real Samuel who appeared or rather a demonic illusion. Although early Christian discussions of 1 Samuel 28 can differ in nuanced ways, this is the main, binary way by which we can categorise our texts. This chapter will focus on proponents of the view, continuing the legacy of earlier Jewish exegetes, that it was the real Samuel that appeared, beginning with Justin Martyr and considering expressions of this view up until the turn of the 5th century.

Justin Martyr

Justin Martyr (*c*.100–*c*.165) is best-known for his apologies in defence of the Christian faith; for developing a theory of the Logos; and for his own martyrdom.[192] His reference to 1 Samuel 28 occurs in section 105 of *Dialogus cum Tryphone*.[193] As we shall see, Justin is of the view that it was the real Samuel who appeared.

Given the Jewish exegesis of 1 Samuel 28, it seems appropriate that the earliest extant Christian reference to this passage emerges in a text with a profound Jewish connection. Although we will question to what extent Justin represents true interaction with Jewish people and thought, it is undeniable that Judaism serves as an important backdrop, even springboard, for his exegesis of 1 Samuel 28. Despite classical influences on its genre and

[192] For Justin's life and thought, see Minns (2000), pp.258-69; Chadwick (1965), pp.275-97.

[193] A text once ascribed to Justin argues a demon appeared instead of Samuel: Pseudo-Justin, *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos*, 52. This text is certainly spurious, and probably from the 5th or 6th century (some have suggested Theodoret as an author), see Toth (2014), esp. pp.596-7; Smelik (1979), p.165, n.1.

presentation,[194] this 2nd century apologetic text, presented as a dialogue between Justin and a Jew named Trypho, seems evidently concerned with Judaism. Furthermore, Justin seeks to persuade Trypho on issues relevant to a Jewish audience, particularly that Christ has abrogated the old law and covenant with new ones, and that Christ is the Messiah of whom Scripture speaks, expressions of Justin's supersessionism, his view that the Church, not the Israelites, are God's chosen people.[195] Although Judaism seems to be contextually important to this work, it is important to note that scholars generally agree that *Dialogus cum Tryphone* does not represent a real conversation between Justin and a Jew (and certainly not Rabbi Tarphon as was once suggested).[196] Trypho is essentially an imaginary interlocutor whose words come from Justin, although Justin probably drew some of his material from real-life experiences and may well accurately represent the views of Jews he had met.

Despite this evident Jewish focus, the true subject and intended audience of the Dialogue is a contested matter, worth addressing briefly.[197] Scholars debate whether it was written for a Jewish,[198] pagan,[199] or Christian audience,[200] or some combination of the above. Matthijs den Dulk has recently continued this debate, making a strong case that *Dialogus cum Tryphone* was composed to oppose 'Christian Demiurgists' (a term coined by Dulk), referring

[194] For classical influences on Justin, and particularly the influences of Platonic dialogues in shaping *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, see Rajak (1999), pp.63-8; Edwards (1991), pp.17-34 (esp. pp.18-21).
[195] Allert (2002), pp.223ff. For the replacement of the old covenant with the new, see Justin Martyr, *Dial.*, 11ff (esp. 11.2). For Scripture's prediction of Christ, see *Dial.*, *passim* (esp. 32ff). For more on supersessionism in the Dialogue, see Rajak (1999), pp.62, 71-2.
[196] For a discussion of Trypho's identity, see Goodenough (1923), pp.91-5; Setzer (1994), pp.129, 134-5; Trakatellis (1986), pp.287-97; Halton (2003), p.xii; Chadwick (1965), p.280.
[197] Tessa Rajak gives a helpful summary of this debate, Rajak (1999), pp.75-80; see also Setzer (1994), p.129.
[198] This is the traditional view, but a Jewish audience has been proposed again recently by scholars, see Allert (2002), pp.37ff.
[199] German scholarship pioneered this view in the late nineteenth century, see Harnack (1883), pp.77-8; Overbeck (1882), p.448, n.1; see also Dulk (2018), p.38.
[200] See Dulk (2018), esp. pp.38-46; Cosgrove (1982), pp.209-32.

to those, such as Marcion, who distinguished between the God of the Jewish Scriptures and the Father of Christ, and who also denied the divine inspiration of the Jewish Scriptures.[201] For instance, Dulk understands that, when Justin argues that Christ is the fulfilment of the Jewish Scriptures, citing proofs even his Jewish interlocutors agree are persuasive, he does this partly to persuade Christians who denied the authority of those Scriptures.[202] However, there are weaknesses to Dulk's claims. To give one example: parts of his argument are built on speculation concerning the contents of Justin's lost 'Syntagma', which ultimately cannot be proved.[203] Nevertheless, even if one finds Dulk's case for a Christian audience compelling, he also acknowledges 'Justin's evident interest in persuading non-Jesus-believing Jews of the truth of his Christian message'.[204] Craig D. Allert strikes a similar balance, although with greater emphasis on the Jewish audience, suggesting that 'the *Dialogue* was written for a Jewish audience...', but that Justin 'may have had Jewish Christians as well as Gentile Christians in mind'.[205] Allert's arguments include Justin's own stated ambitions. For example, Justin claims to prove that the Scriptures speak of Christ '[i]n the hope that someone among you [the Jews listening] may be found, by the grace of the Lord of the Sabbaoth, to be of the remnant lasting into eternal salvation'.[206] Justin here alludes to his belief, referred to elsewhere in the Dialogue,[207] that a remnant of Jews are yet to be saved. Allert argues that a genuine concern for converting Jews, stemming from his eschatological beliefs about the

[201] Dulk (2018), esp. p.4.
[202] Ibid., pp.45-6, 74-9. For instance, see Justin's Christological reading of Scripture in *Dial.*, 60.4-62.5, and Trypho's consequent affirmation of the strength of Justin's arguments in *Dial.*, 63.1; see also Trakatellis (1986), pp.294-5.
[203] Dulk (2018), pp.24-6.
[204] Ibid., p.69.
[205] Allert (2002), p.61. Allert is influenced by the conclusions of Stylianopulos (1975), pp.32-44.
[206] *Dial.*, 32.2; see Allert (2002), p.58.
[207] *Dial.*, 55.3, 64.2-3.

Jewish remnant, lies behind Justin's composition of *Dialogus cum Tryphone*.[208] Therefore, if we follow either of these scholarly conclusions, we must accept that Judaism has some place in Justin's focus as he writes the Dialogue. Even if one denies that *Dialogus cum Tryphone* was written for Jews, it must be accepted that Judaism is an important literary device for Justin (through Trypho), thereby making Judaism contextually important to understanding this text.

Before analysing Justin's comments on 1 Samuel 28, it is worth setting this reference in context. Justin has been arguing with Trypho that Jesus is the Messiah predicted by the Jewish Scriptures and particularly, since chapter 89, that the Scriptures show that Christ must be crucified.[209] Beginning in chapter 98, Justin sets out to prove that Psalm 22 refers to Christ, particularly his crucifixion.[210] Psalm 22 was already associated with Christ's crucifixion in the New Testament, particularly in the Gospels,[211] and it seems that this material (in some form) was available to Justin through his oft-mentioned 'Memoirs of the Apostles', frequently cited in this section of the Dialogue to support his case.[212] In fact, 13 of Justin's 15 explicit references to the 'Memoirs' appear in this section (*Dial*., 98-107) on Psalm 22,[213] suggesting that these writings particularly influenced his connecting Psalm 22 and Christ's crucifixion. Thus, Justin continues this tradition of reading this psalm Christologically.

---

[208] Allert (2002), pp.58-60.
[209] *Dial.*, 89ff.
[210] Ibid., 98ff.
[211] Mark 15:24-34; Mathew 27:35-46; Luke 23:34; John 19:24.
[212] Evidently Justin had access to Gospel (or at least proto-Gospel) writings. Allert suggests 'in all probability the Memoirs are the Synoptic Gospels (and possibly the Gospel of John)', Allert (2002), p.100; see also pp.15-25, 188-202.
[213] Ibid., pp.188-9.

The reference to 1 Samuel 28 (see Appendix A) comes as Justin argues that Psalm 22:19-21 refers to Christ's petition that his soul would be delivered after death (see Luke 23:46). He uses 1 Samuel 28 to reinforce this Christological reading of Psalm 22:19-21, words supposedly written from Jesus' perspective, by establishing two points. Firstly, that the soul survives after death: Justin states, 'And I have demonstrated to you [ἀπέδειξα ὑμῖν] that souls survive [μένουσιν] on the basis of the fact that even Samuel's soul was summoned by the belly-myther [ἐγγαστριμύθου], as Saul deemed worthy [ἠξίωσεν].'[214] Unfortunately, this is only the summary of a prior argument, and possibly much lengthier discussion, concerning 1 Samuel 28. 'I have demonstrated to you [ἀπέδειξα ὑμῖν]' alludes to an earlier reference to this passage by Justin, no longer extant, which established that souls live on after death.[215] The 'to you' (ὑμῖν) implies that these comments were made earlier in the Dialogue, to its audience,[216] and it has been suggested that the great lacuna in section 74 once contained this reference to 1 Samuel 28.[217] Wherever it was, it appears that copyists failed to transmit this discussion. As disappointing as this may be for this study's purposes, it is perhaps fitting – ironically – that a part of our earliest known reference to 1 Samuel 28 is missing. As we shall see, a key aspect of the history of 1 Samuel 28's exegesis in the early Church is that much has not survived. While there are plenty of extant references to 1 Samuel 28, we know that even more once existed but are now lost. In short, the reception history of 1 Samuel 28 is richer than it seems at first glance. However, at least in Justin's case, we have this discussion's conclusion.

---

[214] *Dial.*, 105.3.

[215] Smelik (1979), p.171. Miroslav Marcovich, in his edition of *Dialogus cum Tryphone,* emends this so that a previous discussion of 1 Samuel 28 is not implied, although it is unclear why this is preferred, see Marcovich (1997), p.251. Thomas P. Halton also follows this emendation, see Halton (2003), p.158 (esp. n.43).

[216] This is the most likely explanation, although Professor Carol Harrison has suggested to me the possibility that Justin is referring to another of his works. Either way, this reference has not survived.

[217] Archambault (1909a), p.lxxiv; (1909b), pp.148-9, n.4.

Yet this absence leaves us with questions unanswered about how Justin understood the soul and its fate. Nor do Justin's comments here indicate much concerning what he had said. For instance, he does not state from where Samuel was raised (although, if under the authority of evil angels, we may perhaps assume Hades), nor suggest whether this destination differs now because of Christ. To further our understanding of Justin's thoughts on these matters, it is tempting to supplement this missing passage with what he says elsewhere. However, this is not easily accomplished, since Justin is not always clear about what he actually believes. Greer discusses this:

> In sum, we can find a bewildering array of ideas in Justin's writings. Righteous souls after death have the possibility of going to heaven. All souls after death must await the time of judgment and resurrection. It is possible that the souls of the wicked will perish after they have been sufficiently punished. The second coming of Christ need not be tied to a millennium. There will be a millennium, but it is not clear whether the resurrection precedes or follows it. The only certain conclusion is that it is impossible to put together what Justin says in any coherent framework.[218]

In short, Justin's theology is not systematic.[219] However, while detail and clarity are lacking, it seems that Justin, on balance and in broad terms, understands that souls survive after death, awaiting the resurrection of the body,[220] and that the nature of this interim period will differ: 'For the souls of the pious stay in a better place, whereas the souls of the unrighteous and evil stay in a worse place, waiting for the time of judgement there.'[221]

---

[218] Greer (2007), p.xl.

[219] For a useful summary of Justin's eschatological beliefs, including some of his inconsistencies, see Daley (1991), pp.20-2; Hill (2001), pp.23-7.

[220] Justin Martyr, *1Apol.*, 18-19; *Dial.*, 5; see Daley (1991), p.21.

[221] *Dial.*, 5.3; see Daley (1991), p.21.

Having reminded his audience of his prior discussion concerning 1 Samuel 28, building upon its premise that souls survive death, Justin makes a second point from this passage relevant to his reading of Psalm 22:19-21, namely that 'all the souls [πᾶσαι αἱ ψυχαί] of those who in this way were righteous and prophets used to fall [ἔπιπτον] under the authority of powers such as these, which also agrees exactly with the circumstances in the case of that belly-myther'.[222] For Justin, 1 Samuel 28 proves that souls, even of righteous people, can fall under the authority of evil powers after death. This supplements his Christological reading of Psalm 22:20-21, explaining that these words refer to Christ's 'request that his soul be saved from the sword, from the mouth of the lion, and from the hand of the dog [which] was a request that no-one should have dominion over his soul'.[223] Thus, the Psalm reflects Christ's prayers that his soul would not face the same fate as those such as Samuel. As final proof that Psalm 22:19-21 refers to Christ, Justin records Jesus's words from the 'Memoirs', 'Father, into your hands I commend my spirit' (Luke 23:46).[224] According to Justin, these words, recorded as Christ's last in Luke's Gospel, are a prayer that God will protect his soul from the sway of evil powers, like Psalm 22:19-21, supporting his case that this Psalm refers to Christ and his crucifixion.

Likely aware that the prospect of one's soul falling under the control of evil angels might frighten his audience, Justin addresses this issue and offers comfort for Christians, saying: 'And his [Christ's] request that his soul be saved… was a request that no-one should have dominion over his soul, so that, when we come to the end [ἐξόδῳ] of our life, we may ask

[222] *Dial.*, 105.4.
[223] Ibid., 105.3.
[224] Ibid., 105.5.

the same thing of God, who can turn aside every shameless, evil angel from taking our souls',[225] and later 'Therefore, God also teaches us through his Son to struggle in every way to become righteous and to ask at the end [of life] that our souls not fall to any such power.'[226] Justin's message is simple: follow Christ. By emulating Christ's example, both in living righteously and particularly in asking God to protect our souls, we need not face the same fate as those like Samuel.

Overall, Justin's train of thought is easy to follow. There are, however, some ambiguities. For instance, does he mean to imply that Christ could possibly have fallen under the sway of evil angels when he prayed for his soul's delivery, or does Christ pray this purely for the benefit of his followers, as an example to follow. The former seems an unlikely conclusion, and Justin's words 'so that… we may ask the same thing of God…'[227] and 'God… teaches us through his Son…',[228] may suggest he has the latter in mind. Nevertheless, this is not explicit.

Having analysed the passage in detail, it is worth making some reflections. The first point, perhaps self-evident, is that 1 Samuel 28 is an auxiliary passage for Justin, used to support his reading of the Scripture in focus, namely Psalm 22. Although an important proof text, 1 Samuel 28 is not Justin's primary focus, consequently his exegetical remarks lack detail. Nevertheless, his reading of this passage fits neatly into the wider themes and motivations of the Dialogue. For instance, Justin's reading of 1 Samuel 28 is tied significantly with Judaism. We have already noted the importance of Judaism for *Dialogus cum Tryphone,*

[225] Ibid., 105.3.
[226] Ibid., 105.5.
[227] Ibid., 105.3.
[228] Ibid., 105.5.

since Jews were the probable intended audience, or were at least contextually important for Justin as a mouthpiece (through Trypho) for his views. This wider interest in Judaism is important for this section specifically. By proving that Psalm 22 should be read Christologically (supported by his reading of 1 Samuel 28), Justin shows that Christ's crucifixion was foretold by the Jewish Scriptures, challenging contrary Jewish beliefs espoused by Trypho and his companions.

However, the discussion surrounding 1 Samuel 28 itself says something further about Judaism in Justin's thought, and how it relates to Christianity. When discussing souls and how they can fall under the sway of evil forces, Justin distinguishes between the two covenant periods, clearly implying that Christianity is superior to Judaism.[229] Before Christ, even righteous souls were subject to the authority of evil angels. Therefore Samuel, despite being a prophet, came under the Medium's power. By contrast, Christians can avoid this fate by living righteously and seeking God's protection. This reading fits into the Dialogue's wider themes since, as mentioned above, an important idea underpinning Justin's arguments in this text is the supersessionist notion that Christ has abrogated the old covenant with a new one.[230] Thus, it is fitting that Justin shows that, under the new order of things, Christ offers greater security for souls after death than existed previously for Jews. As we shall see, authors such as Apollinaris of Laodicea express similar views when discussing 1 Samuel 28, arguing that 'the accounts concerning the soul of Samuel have necessarily been recorded, so that we might know the difference between the law and Christ' since 'the law did not give freedom from the Devil… But Christ "shattered the bronze gates and broke the iron bars" (Ps

[229] Greer (2007), p.xxxiv.
[230] Tessa Rajak argues that supersessionism is at the core of *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, see Rajak (1999), p.62.

106:16; Isa 45:2).'[231] Like Apollinaris, when referring to 1 Samuel 28, Justin indicates that Christianity offers superior protection from evil powers after death than the old covenant. Referring to those like Samuel who lived pre-Christ, Justin says: 'It appears also that all the souls [πᾶσαι αἱ ψυχαί] of those who in this way were righteous and prophets used to fall [ἔπιπτον] under the authority of powers such as these, which also agrees exactly with the circumstances in the case of that belly-myther.'[232] Justin makes the bold claim that the soul of every single person was once under the authority of evil powers. In stark contrast, for those, like Christ, who live righteously and ask God for their souls' protection, God 'can turn aside every shameless, evil angel from taking our souls'.[233] It is possible, just as one suspects that Christ could not actually fall under the sway of demons in Justin's thought, despite Christ's prayers to the contrary, that Justin understands the same to be true for his followers.[234] At the very least, 'πᾶσαι αἱ ψυχαί… ἔπιπτον' suggests that *some* Christians, if not all, now avoid falling under the authority of such powers. Justin's point is clear, betraying some of his anti-Jewish polemical intentions in writing this treatise. For Justin, Christianity is superior to Judaism and, unlike even the righteous prophets of the Jewish Scriptures, the souls of Christians can be kept safe from evil powers after death (at least if they imitate Christ). Thus, anti-Jewish polemic is central to Justin's use of 1 Samuel 28.

[231] Apollinaris, *Fragment* [see Appendix C]. Christ's descent to Hades is central to Apollinaris' understanding of 1 Samuel 28, distinguishing between the afterlife in the two covenant periods. Origen argues this too, see *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 10.1-5; see also Greer (2007), p.xxxiv.

[232] *Dial.*, 105.4.

[233] Ibid., 105.3.

[234] Greer (2007), p.xxxiv.

Justin's exegetical method has been described as typological,[235] and his use of Scripture in this section of the Dialogue affirms this. Justin is intent on making sense of Scripture by connecting historical realities with one another, highlighting God's divine economy. This can be seen clearly in the way he connects Psalm 22 with Christ's crucifixion, such as by linking the prayer of verses 19-21 with Christ's prayer in Luke 23:46. The words of Psalm 22 point forward, historically realised in Jesus Christ. How then does 1 Samuel 28 fit into Justin's typological method? Its significance, for Justin, lies as an *exemplum* which sheds light on other parts of Scripture. What happened to Samuel's soul, according to Justin, is precisely what Psalm 22 and Christ's prayer in Luke 23:46 ask for protection against. Thus, in a sense, one could say that Samuel serves as an 'anti-type', contrasting with Christ and his followers, who do not suffer the same fate.

It is also worth reiterating the Christological focus of Justin's exegesis. In fact, this is what gives shape to Justin's typological reading, since Christ illuminates Scripture's meaning and ultimately connects these distinct historical realities into one divine economy.[236] Justin's Christological interest is self-evident in this section of the Dialogue*,* by reading Psalm 22 as referring to Christ. His use of 1 Samuel 28 also serves this Christological interest, by setting Christ's prayer, and the notion of souls falling under the authority of evil powers, into context, with Samuel (as suggested above) acting as an anti-type to Christ. Thus, Christ is at the heart of Justin's citation of 1 Samuel 28. Allert describes Justin's exegesis as 'functional exegesis', observing that 'Justin's exegesis was not governed by any precise rules, but that it

[235] Allert makes this case, see Allert (2002), pp.221-53; see also Chadwick (1965), p.297.
[236] Allert (2002), pp.252-3.

followed the needs that Justin was required to meet.'[237] Certainly, Justin's exegesis here, his typological and Christological focus, serves the Dialogue's wider motivations. In section 105, distinct periods of history and disparate writings are connected through the reality of Christ's historical appearance, proving Justin's point that Christ's crucifixion was prophesied by Scripture and, thus, planned by God. Therefore, Justin's exegesis here is influenced by a Jewish context, since his typological and Christological reading serve his arguments, against Jews, that the Jewish Scriptures are about Christ.

Although Justin utilises 1 Samuel 28 to serve these wider purposes, we can glean aspects of how he understands this passage specifically. The major issue of debate we shall observe in early Christian discussions of 1 Samuel 28 concerns the nature of Samuel's appearance, particularly whether it was the real Samuel who appeared or a demonic illusion. Although Justin betrays no awareness of this debate, he clearly sides with those who believe that Samuel truly appeared at Endor, for his whole argument rests on the fact that Samuel's example proves that souls survive after death and that souls can fall under the sway of evil powers. This argument cannot be made if one supposes that Samuel in 1 Samuel 28 was not actually a soul at all, but rather a demon in disguise. We can also infer from Justin's words that demons were involved in the events of 1 Samuel 28. He states that God 'can turn aside every shameless, evil angel [ἀναιδῆ πονηρόν ἄγγελον] from taking our souls',[238] before immediately giving the example of Samuel's summoning by the Medium. Justin elsewhere elucidates his view that demons are fallen, evil angels,[239] a common early Christian

[237] Ibid., p.253.
[238] *Dial.*, 105.3.
[239] *2Apol.*, 5. For more on Justin's conception of fallen angels, see Reed (2004); Reed (2005), pp.162-74.

understanding, influenced partly by certain Scriptural allusions, but mostly by popular Enochic literature.[240] Thus, Justin implies that demons played a role in Samuel's appearance. That is not to deny the role of human agency in raising Samuel, since Justin says that 'Samuel's soul was summoned by the belly-myther, as Saul deemed worthy'.[241] The precise role each party plays in summoning Samuel is unclear. Justin possibly implies that while Saul *asks*, and the Medium *summons*, it is accomplished *through* the power of evil angels. Nevertheless, Justin *is* clear that each party played a part; although in Saul's case, Justin's verb choice ('ἠξίωσεν') may suggest a more passive, consenting role for Israel's king.

K. A. D. Smelik also notes Justin's belief that the real Samuel was raised by evil angels, but claims that such views were 'unacceptable to most Christian exegetes'.[242] Smelik explains that Justin held this view because 'in his time theological reflection was not very advanced and there was opportunity to hold peculiar views. Moreover, in the East the belief in the power of daemons has always been stronger than in the West.'[243] I would argue that Justin's views are less 'peculiar' than Smelik suggests. Smelik himself notes many examples of early Christians who read 1 Samuel 28 similarly to Justin, including major figures such as Origen, Ambrose, and Augustine.[244] However, there are also others who espouse this view, either ignored by Smelik or unknown to him, indicating that this view was more common in early Christianity than Smelik suggests. For instance, a surviving fragment of Apollinaris, uncited

[240] Some significant passages for identifying fallen angels with demons are Genesis 6:1-4; Matthew 25:41; Luke 10:18; 2 Peter 2:4; Jude 1.6; see also 1 and 2 Enoch. For more on fallen angels in early Christian thought, see Reed (2005).
[241] *Dial.*, 105.4.
[242] Smelik (1979), p.171.
[243] Ibid., p.177.
[244] Ibid., p.164.

by Smelik, shows that he held similar views to Justin on 1 Samuel 28.[245] This is not to mention the possibility that many early Christian interpretations of this passage which have not survived from this period (of which there is a dearth for Justin's time) may have agreed with Justin. Justin's lost comments on 1 Samuel 28 may have alluded to others who discussed this passage. We can never know. However, as all surviving Jewish exegesis of this passage up to (and beyond) this period assumed that Samuel really appeared and, excluding Pseudo-Philo, that this was at the hands of the Medium,[246] it seems likely that most of the earliest Christian interpretations of 1 Samuel 28, at this early stage of 'the parting of the ways', would have followed this traditional Jewish reading. Justin probably represents a standard reading of this passage at his time of writing (and prior). Smelik's conclusion that Justin's thoughts are an oddity, as though they belong to an intellectual vacuum, seem unfounded and unlikely. Therefore, despite Justin's application of this passage for an anti-Jewish polemical purpose, in a sense he represents a continuation of the Jewish understanding that it was the real Samuel appeared. As we shall see, many later theologians read 1 Samuel 28 in a similar way.

Eusebius of Caesarea

Eusebius of Caesarea has long been recognised as an impressive scholar, particularly as a 'pioneer in the field of ecclesiastical history'.[247] However, his impressive literary output in other genres has increasingly received attention, including his biblical scholarship, with recent scholars emphasising his importance as an exegete.[248] It is likely that Eusebius only

[245] Apollinaris, *Fragment*.

[246] See chapter 1.

[247] Foakes-Jackson (1993), p.61; see also Hollerich (2013), p.629.

[248] Armstrong (2013), p.xxi; Hollerich (1999), pp.1-5; see also Wallace-Hadrill (1960), pp.99.

wrote two full commentaries, both lengthy and seemingly written later in his life (probably completed sometime after the council of Nicaea); namely, the *Commentary on the Psalms* and the *Commentary on Isaiah*.[249] It is in the latter that Eusebius refers fleetingly to 1 Samuel 28.

Eusebius' *Commentary on Isaiah* is significant in many ways. Firstly, it is the earliest complete extant Christian commentary on Isaiah.[250] It is some achievement that Eusebius completed this lengthy commentary, especially one that influenced later authors such as Jerome and his *Commentary on Isaiah*.[251] Origen had attempted to write a commentary on Isaiah, to which Eusebius regularly refers,[252] but this was never completed (it went as far as Isaiah 30:6) and survives in fragments.[253] Eusebius' *Commentary* is also significant in its extensive use of Origen's Tetrapla (or Hexapla), which compiled alternative versions of the Old Testament side-by-side for the sake of comparison; a useful exegetical tool for any biblical scholar.[254] Eusebius regularly refers to (and even occasionally prefers over the Septuagint) the Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, to ascertain Scripture's intended meaning.[255] Thus, we see Eusebius' indebtedness to Origen's biblical criticism, as well as something of the Tetrapla/Hexapla's

[249] Hollerich (1999), pp.8-9; Hollerich (2013), pp.640-1; Barnes (1981), p.97; Barnes (2009), pp.9-10. Some argue that Eusebius wrote commentaries on other books, see Johnson (2014), p.78.
[250] Armstrong (2013), pp.xxi, xxvi-xxvii.
[251] Jerome, *Comm. Isa.*, prologue; see also Armstrong (2013), pp.xxvi-xxvii; Hollerich (1999), pp.8-9, 17-18, 54-7; Wallace-Hadrill (1960), pp.59-60.
[252] Eusebius clearly wrote with Origen's *Commentary on Isaiah* near-at-hand, and notes at which parts of Isaiah the volumes of Origen's *Commentary* ended, see Eusebius, *Comm. Isa.*, 7.5-9; 10.7-11, 22-23; 13.16; 14.4-7, 8-21; 16.7-8; 30.5.
[253] For more on Origen's *Commentary on Isaiah*, see Armstrong (2013), p.xxvi; Hollerich (1999), pp.46-8.
[254] Johnson (2014), pp.77-8; Hollerich (1999), pp.5-6, 74-9; Hollerich (2013), pp.646-8; Barnes (1981), p.98. Eusebius' familiarity with the Hexapla likely stemmed from his time under Pamphilus, copying and correcting manuscripts of the Hexapla.
[255] Hollerich (1999), pp.77-9.

broader influence upon Christian exegesis. Finally, the *Commentary* is significant as a source of insight into Eusebius' exegetical method. In the *Commentary's* preface, Eusebius explains his theory of interpretation for Isaiah:

> At times the Spirit delivered revelations to the prophet plainly, so that in turn there was no need for allegory in the explanation of the message, but to have only the mere words themselves. But at other times, [the Spirit communicated] either through symbols and circumstances, or placing meaning in key words and even in names.[256]

Despite Origen's influence on him,[257] Eusebius adopts a bipartite structure for understanding Scripture, as opposed to Origen's tripartite theory of interpretation.[258] For Eusebius there are only two levels to Scripture, the literal meaning and the figurative one; and unlike Origen, Eusebius does not give primacy to figurative interpretation and, if anything, prefers the literal.[259] The difference between these two levels of biblical interpretation has been compared to a 'modern historian's distinction between fact and interpretation, or event and meaning'.[260] The literal understanding of prophecy is its factual fulfilment in historical event, whereas its figurative understanding is the religious meaning realized by these events.[261] Underpinning and bridging both levels of interpretation is the greatest characteristic of Eusebius' exegesis – his interest in history. Best-known as a historian, it is unsurprising that Eusebius employs disciplines like chronology, ethnography, mythology, and geography to understand Scripture. Also, when interpreting Isaiah, Eusebius is interested in detailing the

---

[256] Eusebius, *Comm. Isa.*, prologue [Armstrong (2013), p.1, revised]. For a lengthy discussion of Eusebius' interpretive method in *Commentary on Isaiah*, see Hollerich (1999), pp.67-102.
[257] For Origen's influences on Eusebius, see Hollerich (1999), pp.46-8, 91-2; Barnes (1981), pp.97-101; Johnson (2014), pp.16-18.
[258] Origen, *Princ.*, 4.2.4; Armstrong (2013), pp.xxvii-xxviii.
[259] Zamagni (2011), pp.174-6; Armstrong (2013), pp.xxvii-xxviii; Wallace-Hadrill (1960), pp.82-7; Barnes (1981), pp.102-3.
[260] Hollerich (1999), p.88.
[261] Ibid.

literal fulfilment of prophecy in history; and in his figurative interpretation, he often explores divine dispensation and salvation history, the inner meaning of events as part of God's greater plan.[262] Despite his preference for literal interpretation, Eusebius does not completely disregard Origenian allegory, as Jerome complains,[263] such as in his regular allegorizing of animals in Scripture.[264] It has been observed that, just as Caesarea lies between Antioch and Alexandria, so too Eusebius' exegesis lies somewhere between the traits associated with these two camps.[265] Eusebius has a strong concept of the unity of Scripture and makes use of allegory, characteristics associated with Alexandrian exegesis. However, his preference for literal interpretation and his strong interest in history is closer to what some might expect to see in Antiochene exegesis. As D. S. Wallace-Hadrill summarised, 'Eusebius was too devoted a disciple of Origen to be a good Antiochene in exegesis, too Palestinian to be a thorough-going Alexandrian.'[266]

Eusebius' brief reference to 1 Samuel 28 (see Appendix B) occurs as he expounds Isaiah 7:11, 'Ask a sign of the Lord your God; let it be deep as Sheol or high as heaven'.[267] From his passing comments, we can glean two things about how Eusebius understands this passage. Firstly, he clearly believes that God is responsible for the events of 1 Samuel 28. God is an

---

[262] Ibid., pp.69-71, 88-93; Hollerich (2013), pp.649-52; Johnson (2014), pp.74-6; Wallace-Hadrill (1960), pp.74-87; Barnes (1981), pp.100-2.

[263] Jerome, *Comm. Isa.*, 5.preface; 5.18.2; see also Armstrong (2013), p.xxix; Hollerich (1999), pp.54-5.

[264] For example, see Eusebius, *Comm. Isa.*, 11.7; see also Wallace-Hadrill (1960), p.87; Hollerich (1999); Armstrong (2013), pp.xxix-xxx.

[265] Wallace-Hadrill (1960), pp.96-7; see also Hollerich (1999), pp.95, 100-2; Zamagni (2011).

[266] Wallace-Hadrill (1960), p.97.

[267] Eusebius, *Comm. Isa.,* 7.10-13. Eusebius may also allude to 1 Samuel 28 in *Comm. Isa.,* 37.21. In his translation, Jonathan J. Armstrong implies that 'ἄλλος' and 'ἕτερος' refer to premonitions made by Samuel on different occasions, which could mean that 'πάλῖν ἕτερος τοῦ βασιλέως Ἰσραήλ θάνατον προαγορεύει' refers to 1 Samuel 28, see Armstrong (2013), p.183. However, as implied by Joseph Ziegler in the biblical references to his edition of the commentary, it is likelier that 'ἄλλος' and 'ἕτερος' refer to other prophets, see Ziegler (1975), p.237. This reading is preferred since Samuel did not predict Saul's ill health, and a reference to 1 Samuel 28 would not fit Eusebius' argument, since he is considering premonitions fulfilled during the lifetime of the prophets who made them.

active agent because, when discussing signs 'from the Lord your God', Eusebius describes Samuel's appearance as a 'sign [σημεῖον]… produced for Saul'. We can also infer that Eusebius believed it was the real Samuel that was raised in 1 Samuel 28. This can be assumed partly because Samuel's appearance is a sign from God (an inappropriate depiction for a demonic illusion); but, most importantly, because 'Samuel's' premonition is said to occur 'after his death', suggesting that the figure who prophesied to Saul is the same Samuel that had previously died. Certainly, Eusebius gives no hint that he thought 'Samuel' was a demonic apparition. Eusebius' view that the real Samuel was raised by God is similar to Justin, since he too thought the real Samuel appeared; but dissimilar also, since Justin emphasises the role of evil forces, whereas Eusebius emphasises God's action. It appears that Smelik did not know about Eusebius' comments on 1 Samuel 28.[268]

Eusebius uses 1 Samuel 28 as an auxiliary source to expound Isaiah 7:11. In many ways, the passage is utilised in a manner typical of Eusebius' exegetical method already described. Firstly, we observe his interest in history, an interest which permeates his exegesis, by referring here to many events in Israel's past, including those of 1 Samuel 28, to clarify Isaiah 7:11. In fact, not only does Eusebius refer to history, but he uses Isaiah 7:11 (together with 1 Samuel 28) to make a significant point *about* history, particularly about how God himself interacts with it. Eusebius offers perspective on God's divine economy, by describing how God interacted in human history through signs from above and below, a wider feature of Eusebius' thought already noted.

[268] Smelik (1979).

We also see one of Eusebius' most important exegetical principles at work in his reference to 1 Samuel 28. In the words of Armstrong, 'Perhaps Eusebius's first and last principle of interpretation is… that Scripture is to interpret Scripture. Eusebius's most consistent hermeneutical principle is to introduce the reader to other passages of Scripture that share a common vocabulary and theological theme.'[269] This was an important, common patristic exegetical principle, noted in the opening chapter, which also shapes Eusebius' exegesis, as his citation of 1 Samuel 28 exemplifies. For Eusebius, Scripture is the best tool for expounding Scripture, and so when Isaiah 7:11 refers to a sign from the Lord from the depths, it is unsurprising that Eusebius explains this by citing other relevant passages. Fuelling this intertextual approach to exegesis is his strong concept of the unity of Scripture, a belief he shared with Origen, allowing Eusebius to move between passages of Scripture at will.[270]

One final question remains: to what extent did Origen influence Eusebius' citation of 1 Samuel 28? We have already alluded to indirect ways in which Origen shaped Eusebius' interaction with this passage. For instance, by using Origen's Tetrapla, Eusebius can easily connect Isaiah 7:11 to 1 Samuel 28 through the references to 'Hades' in the variant translations of Isaiah (instead of βάθος, meaning 'depth', in the Septuagint). However, it is possible that Origen also directly impacted how Eusebius reads this passage. We know that Eusebius, from a young age,[271] was intimately familiar with Origen's works, and it seems

[269] Armstrong (2013), p.xxx; see also Wallace-Hadrill (1960), p.93.
[270] Eusebius, *Comm. Isa.,* 43.7; cf. Origen, *Princ.*, preface.4; *Hom. Lev.*, 13.4; see Hollerich (1999), pp.69-71, 88-93; see also Wallace-Hadrill (1960), pp.93-5.
[271] This access to Origen from his youth came through his time under Pamphilus, see Hollerich (1999), pp.1-2, 5-6, 46; Hollerich (2013), p.630.

probable that he knew some of Origen's various allusions to 1 Samuel 28.[272] Eusebius, often described as Origen's 'protégé',[273] may have been influenced by Origen's reading of this passage. Certainly, both share the view that Samuel was truly raised.[274] In light of this, it is worth entertaining the prospect that Eusebius followed Origen more specifically again. As noted above, Eusebius was familiar with, and influenced by, Origen's *Commentary on Isaiah*, and although never completed, it went further than Isaiah 7:11. Did Origen refer to 1 Samuel 28 at the equivalent point in his commentary, possibly (as the compiler of the Tetrapla) by also connecting the reference to 'Hades' in these alternative translations with 1 Samuel 28? Although possible, because this section of the commentary is missing, we cannot know the full extent of the influence of Origen's *Commentary on Isaiah* on Eusebius' *Commentary*.[275] Jerome, also familiar with Origen's commentary,[276] refers to 'some' who connect this verse with 1 Samuel 28 at the equivalent point in *Commentary on Isaiah* (despite himself believing that 'Samuel' was a demonic apparition),[277] which might further suggest that Origen cited 1 Samuel 28 at this point. However, since it has been shown that Jerome's *Commentary on Isaiah* was especially dependent on Eusebius' *Commentary*,[278] it is safer to assume that

[272] For instance, Origen cites 1 Samuel 28 in his commentaries on Matthew and John, works Eusebius knew; see Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, 6.24.1; 6.25.3-7; 6.36.2; 6.28. We shall consider Origen's exegesis of 1 Samuel 28 in detail in chapter 4.
[273] Armstrong (2013), p.xxvii; Hollerich (1999), pp.13, 91, 97.
[274] Cf. Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 6.1.
[275] Armstrong (2013), p.xxvi
[276] Jerome, *Comm. Isa.*, prologue; 1.2.22; 3.6.9-10; see also Armstrong (2013), p.xxvi; Hollerich (1999), pp.47, 54-5.
[277] In his commentary, Jerome states how 'most think [*plerique putant*]' that Saul received such a 'sign from the depth' when Samuel appeared, probably referring to Eusebius, and possibly also Origen. However, Jerome implies that Saul only 'appeared to have raised [*visus est suscitasse*]' Samuel, see Jerome, *Comm. Isa.*, 3.7.10-11. For clearer expressions of his view that 'Samuel' was a demonic apparition, see Jerome, *Comm. Matt.*, 1.6.34; *Comm. Ezek.*, 4.13.17-23.
[278] Armstrong (2013), pp.xxvi-xxvii; Hollerich (1999), pp.18, 56-7; Wallace-Hadrill (1960), p.59.

Jerome is simply referring to Eusebius.[279] Either way, we see here an example of one person's use of 1 Samuel 28 significantly shaping another's.

Apollinaris of Laodicea

Apollinaris of Laodicea (*c*.315-*c*.390)[280] is best known for his Christology, deemed heretical towards the end of his life by his contemporaries,[281] and officially condemned in 381 by the Council of Constantinople.[282] Attempting to emphasise the unity of Christ's human and divine natures, Apollinaris' heresy was to deny Christ a human rational soul (*nous*) in his incarnation, replaced instead with the Divine Logos.[283] This was seen as denying Christ's full humanity, considered unacceptable on soteriological grounds by those such as Gregory Nazianzen, who argued that '[w]hat is not assumed [by Christ] is not cured, but what has been united to God has also been saved'.[284]

However, for most of his life, Apollinaris was well-respected as a Christian thinker, even by those who later condemned his Christology. He earned a reputation as a staunch defender of Nicene theology, so much so that Basil of Caesarea, a later critic, apparently deferred to

[279] Supporting this conclusion is the fact that Eusebius and Jerome's commentaries share many other common features in their expositions of Isaiah 7:11 beyond their citation of 1 Samuel 28; cf. Jerome, *Comm. Isa.*, 3.7.10-11.

[280] Lienhard (2006), pp.61-2; Quasten (1960), p.377.

[281] Particularly by the Cappadocians, see Gregory of Nyssa, *Antirrherticus*; *Adversus Apollinaristas*; Gregory Nazianzen, *Epistle* 101, 102; Basil, *Epistle* 263.4, 265.2; see also Bebis (2005), pp.423-4; Capone (2013), pp.315-31.

[282] Young (2010), p.253; Quasten (1960), p.383; Bebis (2005), p.424.

[283] For more on Apollinaris' Christology, see Beeley (2011), pp.378-85; Norris (1980), pp.22-3; Grillmeier (1975), pp.329-40; Riedmatten (1948), pp.239–60; Raven (1923); Daley (2018), pp.127-33.

[284] Gregory Nazianzen, *Epistle* 101.32. This echoes earlier notions, such as by Origen, see *Dial.*, 7.5-7 ('For the whole human being would not have been saved, if he had not assumed the whole human being'). Similar ideas can also be found in Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses,* 5.14.1ff; Tertullian, *Carn. Chr.*, 10; *Marc.*, 2.27; see also Daley (2018), p.127; Beeley (2011), pp.404-5.

Apollinaris on matters of Nicene doctrine.[285] In fact, Apollinaris' adherence to Nicene orthodoxy probably explains his particular Christological emphasis, in the light of Arian subordinationism, that Christ's *nous* was entirely divine.[286] Apollinaris made other significant contributions to early Church intellectualism, such as providing versions of the Bible in classical forms during Julian the Apostate's reign, when Christians were forbidden from studying classical texts.[287]

Most importantly for this study, Apollinaris was also a respected biblical exegete. Jerome attended Apollinaris' lectures on the Scriptures,[288] and claimed that Apollinaris had written 'innumerable volumes on the Holy Scriptures',[289] apparently characterised by their brevity.[290] Unfortunately, as is usually the fate of the works of those deemed heretics, most of Apollinaris' vast literary output, including his exegetical works, has not survived, or only in a fragmentary state.[291] Despite his contemporary reputation as a biblical exegete, little attention has been devoted to this, likely due to being overshadowed by scholarly interest in Apollinaris' controversial Christological position, and the dearth of surviving exegetical material on which to comment.

---

[285] Basil, *Epistle* 361; also *Epistle* 363; see also Giulea (2018); Prestige (1956), pp.1-37; Gemeinhardt (2007), pp.292-4; Young (2010), pp.252-3. However, Basil denied corresponding with Apollinaris (except much earlier in life, as a layman), see Basil, *Epistle* 224.2; also Bebis (2005), p.424; Capone (2013), pp.315-19; and there are some doubts about the authenticity of their correspondence, see Radde-Gallwitz (2017), pp.74-5; see also Fedwick (2004), pp.903-12.

[286] Quasten (1960), pp.381-2; Wolfson (1958), p.21.

[287] *Socrates, H.E.*, 3.16.1ff*; Sozomen, H.E*., 5.18.3-5; see also Raven (1923), p.137; Prestige (1956), p.13.

[288] Jerome, *Epistle* 84.3; see also Ceulemans (2011), p.444; Prestige (1956), p.14; Lienhard (2006), pp.61-2; Gemeinhardt (2007), p.288.

[289] Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, 104; see also Mühlenberg (1992), p.132; Bebis (2005), p.423; Quasten (1960), p.377. Basil also sarcastically remarks on Apollinaris' voluminous output that 'he has filled the world up with his books', see Basil, *Epistle* 263.4; also *Epistle* 265.2; see also Raven (1923), pp.152-3.

[290] Jerome is critical of Apollinaris' brevity, see Jerome, *Comm. Isa.*, prologue; *Comm. Hos.,* prologue; see also Raven (1923), pp.131-2, 155; Quasten (1960), p.378.

[291] Ceulemans (2011), pp.431-2; Bebis (2005), p.423

Apollinaris' reference to 1 Samuel 28 survives as a fragment passed down through the catenae. It is through these chains, collecting together a variety of authors' comments on a given Scriptural passage, that much of Apollinaris' exegesis (and other early Christian exegetes) have endured, since 'the compilers… often sacrificed considerations of orthodoxy in favor of content-related selection motives'.[292] Although we are indebted to the catenae for preserving material otherwise lost, it is important to remember that these passages are merely brief extracts of their respective authors' works, set outside of their original context, carefully selected by their compilers to serve their own purposes. Such fragments may not offer the representative sample of the whole of Apollinaris' exegetical method and wider thought that we desire. The frustration when using the catenae, as Reinhardt Ceulemans concludes, is that 'on the one hand, they offer the only data one can work with but on the other hand one realizes the limited results one can draw from them'.[293] We cannot easily ascertain details of composition from such fragmentary evidence, such as when they were written. In the case of this fragment discussing 1 Samuel 28 (see Appendix C), some suggest that Apollinaris wrote much of his work, including his exegetical material, earlier in his life (particularly 345-360).[294]

To begin with this chapter's central focus, Apollinaris clearly believed it was the real Samuel that was raised at Endor. In no uncertain terms, he states that Samuel's 'soul was held fast in Hades and was conjured up [ψυχαγωγηθείσης] by a demon', and explicitly says concerning the alternate belief that 'a demon… appeared in the form [φανέντα τῷ σχήματι] of Samuel'

[292] Ceulemans (2011), p.432.
[293] Ibid.
[294] Raven (1923), p.131.

that 'Scripture has not taught this'. We can also glean many further things from the fragment regarding how Apollinaris understood this passage. Firstly, Samuel was in Hades at the time of summoning. We shall consider the significance of this in greater detail later. For now, suffice it to say that Apollinaris believes that even righteous people (like Samuel) went to Hades after death because, before Christ came, 'death reigned' (Rom 15:4), a belief Apollinaris shares with Origen as they interpret this passage.[295] Tied closely to this is Apollinaris' understanding that Samuel's soul 'was conjured up [ψυχαγωγηθείσης] by a demon', i.e. that demons were responsible for Samuel's appearance. Through 1 Samuel 28, Apollinaris shows that demons, before Christ, had authority over the souls of even the righteous in Hades, or as Apollinaris later explains, the 'law [i.e. the period before Christ] did not give freedom from the Devil…' This point, too, is supported by others when reading 1 Samuel 28, such as Justin Martyr.[296] It is also worth noting the particular emphasis regarding agency that Apollinaris places in his reading of this passage. When discussing 1 Samuel 28, neither Saul nor the Medium are named by Apollinaris, and Samuel is passively led up (ψυχαγωγηθείσης). Rather, the emphasis is placed on demonic agency since Samuel is said to have emerged 'by a demon'. This emphasis reinforces Apollinaris' point that, before Christ, the righteous (such as Samuel) were under the control of demons while in Hades. We might also speculate, since Apollinaris specifies that it was Samuel's 'soul [ψυχῆς]' that was brought up, that Samuel's appearance was non-physical (i.e. without a body), although Apollinaris does not give enough detail to elaborate on this. Finally, before considering Apollinaris' main purposes in citing this passage, there is another facet of his reading of it which is of particular interest, namely his awareness of the alternate reading that 'Samuel'

[295] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 8.1; 9.7-11; 10.2; see also Greer (2007), p.xxxvi.
[296] *Dial.*, 105.4; see also Greer (2007), pp.xxxvi-xxxvii.

was a demonic illusion. This is interesting for two reasons. Firstly, Apollinaris' awareness of counter readings of 1 Samuel 28 suggests that there was a strong literary tradition and network discussing it. Although we cannot infer from his comments which specific opponents he had in mind, or whether their interpretations have survived, Apollinaris gives a glimpse of wider, vibrant discussions of this passage in the early Church beyond his own. Secondly, this further contradicts Smelik's conclusion that the view that the real Samuel was raised by demons was 'unacceptable to most Christian exegetes',[297] whereas opinions that Samuel appeared as a demonic illusion 'correspond with what we can expect from Christian exegetes of this period'.[298] For those theologians who did believe Samuel truly appeared, Smelik reasons that they 'did not realize that their interpretations of I Sam. 28 had some implications that could not easily be reconciled with the general tendency in theology…'[299] Apollinaris' fragment challenges Smelik's conclusions since Apollinaris evidently did not come to his view out of ignorance, as Smelik implies of other theologians. Apollinaris is clearly aware of the alternate view, and even follows through with the wider theological implications of his reading of 1 Samuel 28, as we shall consider below. Smelik was seemingly unaware of this fragment by Apollinaris, which further undermines his opinion that believing the real Samuel was raised by demons was a minority view among early Christians.

Having considered how Apollinaris understood 1 Samuel 28, let us consider this passage's wider significance for Apollinaris' thought. He opens by stating, 'There are some who do not recognise the grace of Christ that has taken [μετατιθεῖσαν] souls from Hades through the destruction of the kingdom of death', before citing 1 Samuel 28 to support this point. Later

[297] Smelik (1979), p.171.
[298] Ibid., p.177
[299] Ibid.

he states even more explicitly, 'the accounts of the soul of Samuel have necessarily been recorded, so that we might know the difference between the law and Christ [γνῶμεν τί νόμος τί Χριστός], that the law did not undo the curse [ἔλυσεν τὴν ἀράν], but Christ did (cf. Gal. 3:10-14)'. Apollinaris states that the passage's purpose is to teach us about Christ's descent to Hades, and the difference between the law and Christ (i.e. supersessionism). Although these two points are connected, we shall treat each individually.

Firstly, 1 Samuel 28 informs Apollinaris' view regarding Christ's descent to Hades. Samuel serves as an example of the 'righteous people before the coming of Christ' that were captive in Hades, in the period when '"death reigned" until Christ came and abolished it [κατήργησεν] and gave souls the way up [ἄνοδον] and the change of position to the heavenly places [τὴν εἰς τὰ οὐράνια μετάθεσιν]'. Origen, like Apollinaris, also ties 1 Samuel 28 with Christ's descent to Hades, a major point of similarity in their reading.[300] However, while Origen emphasises Samuel's important role in Hades preparing the way for Christ's descent there,[301] Apollinaris' Samuel is not said to have a special purpose for Christ's descent, but merely serves as an example of one of Hades' captives. Apollinaris comments on Christ's descent to Hades in other surviving fragments of his exegetical material, perhaps suggesting it was an important doctrine for him.[302] What, then, can we learn of Apollinaris' conception of Christ's descent to Hades from this fragment on 1 Samuel 28? Apollinaris tells us little concerning Christ's journey to Hades. His descent is not mentioned explicitly, but Apollinaris does note Christ's ascent from Hades, 'opening the way up through his own ascent to souls held fast'. Nor does Apollinaris specify which part of Christ's person

[300] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam.* 28, 6.3-10; 10.1-5.
[301] Ibid., 6.7-10; 8.1-5.
[302] Apollinaris, *Fragment 33 on Psalm 39.4cd*; see also Mühlenberg (1992), p.137.

descended to Hades (a point considered by other early Christian writers),[303] which might have been particularly interesting in the light of Apollinarian Christology.[304] Instead, Apollinaris is interested in the outcome of Christ's descent, emphasising its victory. Through Christ comes 'the destruction of the kingdom of death'; '"death reigned" until Christ came and abolished it'; he undid the curse; and '"shattered the bronze gates and broke the iron bars"', speaking in similar terms to what we find in Gregory of Nyssa.[305] Apollinaris almost seems to describe the very end of Hades. So great is Christ's victory, and because Apollinaris emphasises that 'this gift comes from God, not the power of souls, or the strength of human righteousness', Apollinaris risks accusations of teaching universal salvation. It is by God, not human merit, that souls are led up, and Apollinaris speaks of 'souls' in general terms, without specifying precisely who these liberated souls are. Perhaps these words are best understood if we assume that Apollinaris is writing with a Christian audience in mind, whom he believes has received the grace of Christ (along with Old Testament believers), and so Hades has specifically been destroyed for them. However, without further context and due to the fragmentary nature of his extant material, we cannot fully grasp Apollinaris' understanding of Christ's descent to Hades.

[303] Origen, representing a tripartite anthropology, argues that Christ's spirit went to the hands of the Father, his soul to Hades, and his body to the tomb, see *Dial.,* 6.9–8.17; see also *Comm. Jo.*, 1.31.220; 32.30.377; 32.32.392; *Comm. Matt.*, 12.3. Gregory of Nyssa makes only a bipartite distinction, with Christ's soul going to Paradise, and his body to Hades/the tomb (but, in opposition to Apollinaris, the Word remained with both), *De tridui spatio* (GNO 9, pp.277, 280, 291-4); *Epistle* 3.22; *Antirrheriticus* (GNO 3.1, pp.153-4, 178, 211, 224-6); see also Daniélou (1970), pp.174-85; Greer (2007), pp.lxxvi-lxxviii. Origen's prooftext for sending Christ's soul to Hades is the application of Psalm 16:8 to Christ at Acts 2:27, whereas Gregory seems to have noticed that the subsequent words of Peter in Acts seem to conflate the soul in Hades with the body in the tomb.

[304] Greer (2007), p.lxxi.

[305] Gregory, *De tridui spatio* (GNO 9, p.280). Apollinaris' comments probably precede Gregory's description here, in his sermon preached at Easter 382, although we cannot be certain.

Tied closely with this first point, Apollinaris also uses 1 Samuel 28 to highlight the difference between the law and Christ. Apollinaris states that 'the law did not undo the curse, but Christ did'. Under the law, before Christ came with grace, all souls went to Hades and even righteous souls (as 1 Samuel 28 proves) fell under the sway of demons.[306] Apollinaris is clear, 'The law did not give freedom from the Devil so as to give release [μεταθεῖναι] from Hades.' The best the law could do, presumably by pointing forward to Christ, was 'provide some encouragement in Hades by the hope of Christ'. By contrast, Christ's descent and victory (which brings the 'destruction of the kingdom of death' and so forth), implies that evil powers no longer have authority over righteous souls. Christ, unlike the law, has brought victory over Hades and its demons. Like Justin (and Origen), Apollinaris' reading of 1 Samuel 28 leads to supersessionist reflections.[307] These authors agree that, through Christ, there is greater hope and security after death than in the period under the law, as 1 Samuel 28 proves through Samuel's captivity to evil forces. Thus, for Apollinaris, 'the accounts of the soul of Samuel have necessarily been recorded, so that we might know the difference between the law and Christ', the difference being Christ's superiority over the law in providing victory over the forces of Hades through his descent there, and consequently Christ's superior protection for souls after death, who are no longer in Hades.

Before concluding, it is worth considering Apollinaris' exegetical method. Perhaps the most important feature of his reading of 1 Samuel 28 is its Christological emphasis. He regularly refers to Christ in this fragment, particularly his descent to Hades, and states clearly that 1 Samuel 28 was recorded to illustrate 'the difference between the law and Christ'. For

[306] Greer (2007), p.xxxvi.
[307] Justin Martyr, *Dial.,* 105.4-5; Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 9.7–10.1-5; see also Greer (2007), p.lxxi.

Apollinaris, 1 Samuel 28 is ultimately about Christ, to highlight his superiority over the law. This Christological focus is consistent with the findings of research on Apollinaris' surviving exegetical fragments.[308] It is perhaps fitting, since Apollinaris is best-known for his controversial Christological doctrine, that his exegesis is also characterised by its focus on Christ.

Apollinaris' reading of 1 Samuel 28 also appears consistent with how his exegesis has generally been characterised by both his contemporaries and later scholars. These have noted that Apollinaris' exegesis is distinguished by its literality and brevity.[309] Certainly, this fragment does not contradict this assessment. The extract we have is concise, although we cannot know whether this reflects the brevity of the original document, or whether it comes from a much lengthier discussion. Apollinaris' interpretation is also devoid of allegory, building his argument upon a literal understanding that Samuel was truly raised, and placing this within its context in salvation history. Some have noted a similarity in how Apollinaris and Jerome read Scripture: in their shared soberness, value for the Old Testament, and restraint from using allegory.[310] While this may be generally true, and understandable considering Apollinaris taught Jerome biblical exegesis, in the case of 1 Samuel 28 Jerome disagrees with Apollinaris by arguing that 'Samuel' was a demonic illusion.[311]

It is also worth considering how this section reflects Apollinaris' exegetical method in other ways, particularly whether he should be identified as 'Antiochene' or 'Alexandrian'. Many

[308] Mühlenberg (1992), pp.134ff; Devreesse (1959), p.129.
[309] Jerome, *Comm. Isa.*, prologue; *Comm. Hos.*, prologue; see also Young (2010), p.254; Raven (1923), pp.155-7; Quasten (1960), pp.377-8.
[310] Riedmatten (1956), p.562; Raven (1923), pp.131-2.
[311] Jerome, *Comm. Matt.*, 1.6.34; *Comm. Ezek.*, 4.13.17-23.

scholars have suggested that Apollinaris belongs to the Antiochene milieu, due to his aforementioned favouring of literal interpretations of Scripture, because he taught in Antioch, and because of the role he played in the Antiochene schism.[312] Conversely, his connection with Alexandria has also been noted: his father came from there, his friendship with Athanasius of Alexandria is well-attested, and 'because of the close links between his theological stance and what became the typical Alexandrian Christology', namely his *logos-sarx* model for understanding the person of Christ.[313] Charles E. Raven highlights effectively how Apollinaris' scriptural exegesis does not conform easily to either category.[314] Raven's findings ought not surprise us, since in chapter 1 we noted that a strict, binary distinction between 'Antiochene' and 'Alexandrian' methods of reading scripture is too simplistic. A wider consideration of Apollinaris' reading of 1 Samuel 28 illustrates these blurred lines further. Apollinaris maintains a literal reading of the passage, arguing that it was the real Samuel that appeared. Perhaps contrary to expectations, this is in direct opposition to Antiochenes like Eustathius who argue that Samuel was a demonic illusion, although 1 Samuel 28 makes no mention of demons.[315] Furthermore, despite Apollinaris elsewhere attacking Origen of Alexandria's theology,[316] they share a remarkably similar reading of 1 Samuel 28, particularly the Christological lessons they draw, devoid of allegory, maintaining that Samuel appeared. Origen and Eustathius will be considered in detail in chapter 4, however such comparisons support the case that the exegesis of Apollinaris, and the early Church more generally, defy simple categorisation.

---

[312] Ceulemans (2011), pp.431, 444-6; Apollinaris taught Jerome in Antioch, see Jerome, *Epistle* 84.3; see also Prestige (1956), p.14; Gemeinhardt (2007), p.288; Young (2010), p.245; Raven (1923), pp.131-2. For his role in the Antiochene schism, see Lienhard (2006), pp.61-2; Daley (2018), pp.129-30.

[313] Young (2010), p.246; see also Raven (1923), pp.128, 160-1; Daley (2018), p.127.

[314] Raven (1923), pp.156-7.

[315] Eustathius, *Engast.,* passim.

[316] Raven (1923), pp.131, 159-60; Bebis (2005), p.423.

Diodore of Tarsus

Diodore of Tarsus (died *c*.390), a native of Antioch, is usually considered a leading figure of the 'Antiochene' school, who influenced later theologians such as John Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia, whom he taught.[317] In terms of his Christology, Diodore understood Christ's person through the *logos-anthropos* model associated with Antiochenes (although he may not have used this terminology),[318] emphasising the two distinct natures in Christ, in opposition to the *logos-sarx* Christology associated with Alexandrians (including Apollinaris) that emphasised the unity within Christ's person.[319] Diodore's exegesis is also often considered typically Antiochene because of his focus on historical, literal interpretations of Scripture, with a tendency to avoid multiple readings and allegory.[320]

Ironically, despite heated disagreements over Christology between Apollinaris and Diodore during their lifetimes,[321] their surviving references to 1 Samuel 28 share much contextually. Diodore, like Apollinaris, was condemned as a heretic for his Christology (in Diodore's case, as a predecessor of Nestorianism); consequently, much of Diodore's work has not survived (even less so than Apollinaris, despite his role in Apollinaris' condemnation).[322] Diodore's only complete extant work is his *Commentary on the Psalms*.[323] Like Apollinaris, Diodore's

[317] For biographical details, see Behr (2011), pp.48-59; Rooy (2009), pp.125-6. For Diodore's influence on other 'Antiochenes', see Hill (2003), pp.25-6; Hill (2005b), p.xi; Young (2010), p.255; Beeley (2011), p.387.
[318] Kelly (1977), pp.301-9; Greer (1966), pp.327-41.
[319] Kelly (1977), pp.290-5; Beeley (2011), pp.376-407; Daley (2018), p.174; Behr (2011), pp.59-60.
[320] For broader discussions of Antiochene exegesis, see Hill (2005a); Nassif (1993), pp.437-70; see also O'Keefe (2000), pp.83-104; Wallace-Hadrill (1982), pp.27-51; Hill (2005b), pp.xxxiv-xxxvi; Behr (2011), pp.35-41; Rooy, (2009), pp.120-34. See also chapter 1.
[321] Behr (2011), pp.59-60, 84-5; Beeley (2011), pp.376-8, 388-95.
[322] Beeley (2011), pp.385-6; Hill (2005b), pp.xi-xiii; O'Keefe (2000), pp.103-4; Behr (2011), pp.83-129. For Diodore's opposition to Apollinaris, see Daley (2018), pp.129-30; Grillmeier (1975), pp.352-60; Riedmatten (1948), pp.240-1; Young (2010), p.254; Raven (1923), p.133.
[323] Hill (2005b), pp.xii-xiii; Behr (2011), pp.51-2; Daley (2018), p.179.

interpretation of 1 Samuel 28 (like most of his other exegetical material) survives as a fragment in the catenae. Thus, we face the same limitations when using this source material as we noted when discussing Apollinaris, most notably its limited context.[324] However, unlike Apollinaris, Diodore's 'fragment' represents a much lengthier and more detailed discussion of 1 Samuel 28 (see Appendix D).

In this fragment, Diodore presents differing interpretations of 1 Samuel 28. Firstly, he considers the view that Samuel was truly raised by the Medium and her demon, presenting evidence to the contrary. Then he considers the interpretation that Samuel was actually a demonic illusion, refuting this also. Finally, Diodore presents his own view, that Samuel truly appeared but through the will and power of God. Thus, like the other authors in this chapter, Diodore concludes that it was the real Samuel that appeared in 1 Samuel 28, not a demonic illusion. However, unlike those such as Justin Martyr and Apollinaris,[325] Diodore does not believe that Samuel appeared by evil forces, but rather by God. Consequently, Greer calls Diodore's conclusions a 'mediating interpretation'.[326] Likewise, Smelik describes such views as a 'middle position' (although, like Apollinaris' fragment, Smelik seemingly did not know Diodore's specifically).[327] This, too, seems to be the view of Eusebius of Caesarea and Ambrose of Milan, although they do not elaborate enough for us to be certain.[328] Since those who argue that the real Samuel appeared, often do not stated explicitly who was

[324] See our earlier comments on Apollinaris for a lengthier discussion; see also Young (2010), p.255; Beeley (2011), p.386.
[325] Justin Martyr, *Dial.,* 105.3-5; Apollinaris, *Fragment*. This may be Origen's view, see *Comm. Jo.*, 20.42.393; although Origen appears to recognise elsewhere that this is a problematic position, see *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 2.4-5; see also Greer (2007), p.xlvii.
[326] Greer (2007), p.lxxiii.
[327] Smelik (1979), p.174.
[328] Eusebius, *Comm. Isa.,* 7.10-13; Ambrose, *Comm. Luk.*, 1.33.

responsible (whether God, the Medium and/or demons), they have been grouped together in this chapter despite Diodore presenting these as differing, distinct readings. It is a reminder that interpretations of 1 Samuel 28 are not monolithic, and within the categories we have set there are nuances of opinion.

Perhaps the most striking feature of Diodore's treatment of 1 Samuel 28 is its careful consideration of variant readings. Diodore does not create straw men. He seems to be familiar with opposing views and represents them quite accurately. This is best exemplified in his discussion of the second view, that 'Samuel' was a demonic illusion. Although Diodore does not name his opponents, the arguments he presents closely reflect ones seen in Tertullian, *Martyrium Pionii*, and particularly Eustathius of Antioch. One such argument that Diodore recites is that, since Samuel's prophecy was incorrect because Saul and Jonathan did not die 'tomorrow' (1 Samuel 28:19) but sometime afterwards, the figure of 'Samuel' must have been a demon in disguise. This is similar to an argument made by Eustathius, who recounts events to show that Saul actually died two full days later (or on the third day as Diodore states), proving that 'Samuel's' prophecy was false.[329] Diodore also notes how some argue that a demon could have simply 'guessed [ἐστοχάσατο]' this prediction that Saul and Jonathan would die, inferring this from their awareness that Saul's kingdom had been handed to David. Eustathius similarly argues that 'Samuel's' prophecy was the 'guessing [στοχαζόμενος]' of a demon observing events.[330] Both Diodore and Eustathius use a form of στοχάζομαι to refer to this 'guessing', further suggesting that Diodore may have known Eustathius' interpretation. Diodore also cites scriptural proof used by those who argue that a

[329] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 13.1-3.
[330] Ibid., 13.7; see also 23.

demon appeared in Samuel's guise, namely 2 Corinthians 11:14: 'Satan disguises himself as an angel of light'. This passage was commonly cited in discussions of 1 Samuel 28 to support the position that 'Samuel' was a demonic illusion, including by Eustathius, as we shall see.[331] Thus, through Diodore, we get a sense of a wider, lively network of discussion surrounding 1 Samuel 28, and observe some of the common traditions concerning its interpretation. Although we cannot be certain who Diodore is writing against, it seems possible that he was familiar with Eustathius' interpretation of 1 Samuel 28, especially considering their mutual connection with Antioch.[332] Whoever Diodore had in mind, he evidently knew interpretations that argued a demon appeared in the guise of Samuel.

Diodore also appears to have known other sources beyond those arguing that 'Samuel' was a demonic illusion. Some of his own ideas have parallels in the works of others. For instance, Diodore argues that the 'gods [θεούς]' the Medium sees (1 Samuel 28:13), were actually 'holy and heavenly powers [δυνάμεις ἁγίας καὶ οὐρανίους]' that came up with Samuel. Diodore probably has angels in mind. This is an important idea for Diodore, and one of the reasons he supposes that God raised Samuel, 'to glorify his own prophet through those present with him'. Origen espouses a similar idea, suggesting that perhaps angels or other prophets emerged with Samuel, to account for the 'gods' that the Medium saw.[333] Diodore, likely familiar with Origen as a critic, may have known his interpretation of 1 Samuel 28.[334] However, this idea also occurs in Jewish sources. Pseudo-Philo states that two angels came

[331] Ibid., 4.9; see also *Martyrium Pionii*, 14.10; Tertullian, *An.*, 57.8. Origen was also aware of this argument from 2 Corinthians 11:14-15, see *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 4.6-9.
[332] Schäublin (1981), p.763.
[333] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 7.1-3.
[334] Hill (2005b), pp.xi-xii.

up with Samuel,[335] while early Rabbinic sources suggest that righteous figures (like Moses) joined the prophet.[336] That Diodore perhaps knew Jewish discussions of 1 Samuel 28 is suggested further by his comments on how Samuel appeared standing up, headfirst, which was unusual for the Medium to see, 'since some say of the dead [τῶν τετελευτηκότων], at least those summoned by belly-mythers, that they are brought up [ἀνάγονται] as in the manner many infants are born [τίκτεται], directed upwards by the feet, while others say [they come] horizontally [ὑπτίως], like buried corpses'. Early Rabbinic writers similarly suggest that Samuel's appearance 'standing' was unusual, arguing that the Medium could identify the disguised Saul by seeing Samuel (1 Samuel 28:8, 12), because when the dead are summoned for a normal person, they appear feet first, but for a king they emerge headfirst.[337] Such discussions have no other extant parallel in early Christian sources, possibly suggesting that the 'some people' Diodore had in mind were Jewish writers. A further indication that Diodore had read Jewish discussions of 1 Samuel 28 is his addition of God's speech to Samuel, a creation of Diodore's, reminiscent of the embellishments that characterise the Jewish rewritten Bible genre (cf. Samuel's speech in Pseudo-Philo).[338] Here, Diodore explains, through God's voice, that the other main reason why God raised Samuel was to show the prophet the extent of Saul's depravity and, consequently, why Samuel's prayers on Saul's behalf fell on deaf ears. While positing a connection between Diodore and early Jewish sources, it is worth noting that Pseudo-Philo is an early explicit proponent of the view that Samuel appeared at God's command, not by the Medium.[339] Perhaps Diodore was familiar with such Jewish interpretations of 1 Samuel, which influenced his own reading.

---

[335] Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 64.6.
[336] *Leviticus Rabbah*, 26.7.2; *Tanhuma Buber*, Leviticus 8.4; *Pirke De Rabbi Eliezar*, 33.
[337] *Leviticus Rabbah*, 26.7.2; *Tanhuma Buber*, Leviticus 8.4.
[338] Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 64.7-8.
[339] Ibid., 64.7; see also Smelik (1979), pp.161-2; Greer (2007), p.lxxii.

Certainly, Diodore's brief mention of how Jews might have received 1 Samuel 28, and his apparent allusion to the future conversion of Jews ('the time of the conversion [ἐπιστροφῆς] of the Israelites'), suggests his wider interest in Judaism.

Regarding the first view Diodore refutes, that the real Samuel appeared through the Medium, too little information is given to suggest who Diodore may have had in mind. This is the position of his long-time opponent Apollinaris, whose interpretation Diodore may have known. Justin is another possibility, as is Origen.[340] Perhaps Diodore had other interpreters in mind entirely. Nevertheless, the overall and immediate impression one gets from Diodore's exegesis of 1 Samuel 28, from his balanced consideration of other readings, is that he is a careful, well-read expositor of Scripture.

We see the same careful attention to detail in how Diodore approaches the semantics of 1 Samuel 28. He is interested in the exact wording of the text and its significance. Diodore explains that Scripture does not say that the Medium raised Samuel, merely that she 'saw' him. The Medium was surprised by what she saw, which explains why 'the woman cried out with a loud voice' (1 Samuel 28:12), implying she lacked control. Diodore also argues that, because the Medium saw 'gods' (1 Samuel 28:13), others must have come up with Samuel; and since she makes a point of remarking 'I see a man standing [ὄρθιον]' (1 Samuel 28:14), this suggests that this was not the usual position of dead people when raised by mediums. It is worth reminding ourselves, particularly regarding this last example, that Diodore is closely

[340] As we shall see in chapter 4, Origen is unclear in *Hom. 1 Sam. 28* about how Samuel appeared but suggests in *Comm. Jo.*, 20.42.393, this was by the Medium.

reading the text in Greek, and that his reading of 1 Samuel 28 is shaped by this.[341] In the Masoretic Text, the Hebrew suggests the Medium sees a man 'coming up', not 'standing', as ὄρθιον (common in early Greek translations) implies. Nevertheless, in the form available to him, the details of this passage suggest to Diodore that the Medium was not responsible for raising Samuel. Continuing, Diodore argues that Scripture is explicit that Samuel himself appeared since 'divine Scripture says plainly [ἄντικρυς] that Samuel, when he had appeared [παραγεγονώς], said to Saul, "Why have you disturbed me by bringing me up?" and again, "Why do you ask me? Has the Lord turned from you and sided with your neighbour?"' (1 Samuel 28:15-17). Diodore takes Scripture at its word when it says, 'Samuel said', as proof that it was actually Samuel who spoke.

Diodore is also interested in the precise definition of words and uses this to counter variant readings. For those arguing that 'Tomorrow you and Jonathan will be with me' (1 Samuel 29:19) must have been spoken by a lying demon because Saul and Samuel did not die the next day, Diodore claims that 'tomorrow' need not necessarily mean the next day. Rather, it can refer to 'the nearness of the event to come [τὴν ἐγγύτητα τοῦ συμβησομένου], as also "today if you will hear his voice" (Psalm 95:7) does not signify the day upon which it was spoken [καθ᾽ ἣν ἐρρέθη], but the time of the conversion of the Israelites'. Here Diodore employs the universal Christian exegetical principle, already observed in other exegetes of 1 Samuel 28, of using Scripture to clarify obscurities in other passages. In this case, Diodore's consideration of how Scripture refers to time elsewhere informs how he defines 'tomorrow' in 1 Samuel 28. It is worth making an important aside here. When citing 1 Samuel 28:19,

[341] This is partly the case also for Diodore's consideration of 'gods' in verse 13. Although *elohim* carries some of this ambiguity in the Hebrew, it can possess a singular referent, and/or refer to 'divine beings' more generally, in a way 'θεούς' does not, thus requiring elaboration by Diodore.

Diodore quotes Samuel as saying 'Tomorrow you and *Jonathan*', which differs from the Masoretic Text and other translations, which read, 'Tomorrow you and *your sons*' (italics added).[342] This difference is almost certainly due to a variation in the 'Lucianic' recension that Diodore read.[343] This recension was particularly popular among theologians associated with Antioch, and Eustathius and Theodoret cite 1 Samuel 28:19 similarly, as does Gregory of Nyssa .[344] Conversely, other early Christian writers, like Origen and Sulpicius Severus, are closer to the Masoretic Text in how they cite this verse.[345] This reminds us that we cannot speak of Scripture as a monolith and assume that all patristic writers are reading the same text of 1 Samuel 28. This is important, since it follows that textual variances can lead to variances in exegesis. Just as we acknowledged that Diodore's interpretation can be shaped by the Greek (as opposed to Hebrew) translation he is reading, so too the particular Greek version he reads can have an impact. However, in the present context, this variance does not have a significant bearing on how Diodore approaches this passage, since the weight of his exegetical interest is on the word 'tomorrow', accepted across versions of this verse,[346] and in refuting claims that a demon could have guessed such a prediction (regardless of how many sons this guess included). Thus, it seems Diodore's understanding of this verse was not particularly influenced by this variation.

---

[342] Brock (1996), pp.181, 187. I do not necessarily assume Masoretic priority, and it is possible that the Lucianic recension reflects an older tradition, see Kauhanen (2012), esp. pp.183-5; Brock (1996), esp. pp.303-7.
[343] See Hill (2005b), pp.xv-xvi; Rooy (2009), pp.125-6; see also Marcos (1994), pp.27-37; Wallace-Hadrill (1982), p.30.
[344] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 12.10; 14.6; 15.5; Theodoret, *Quaest. in I Reg. 28* (PG80, 592); Gregory, *Pyth.*, 105; see also Brock (1996), pp.181-2, 192.
[345] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 5.3-4; Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.*, 1.35.1; Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones,* 27.2.
[346] The authors mentioned above include 'tomorrow', or the equivalent idea, in their citations. Others also include 'tomorrow' when partially citing this verse (without indicating who will die with Saul), see Jerome, *Comm. Matt.*, 1.6.34.

Diodore's interest in the exact words of Scripture, and their precise meaning, in his approach to 1 Samuel 28 is consistent with how others have characterised Diodore's exegesis more broadly. Frances Young states that Diodore's 'main concern was elucidation of the actual words and sentences of scripture, providing etymologies, trying to discern "the scriptural" sense of words by comparing texts, looking at the context and sequences of thought, paraphrasing to bring out the meaning'.[347] Certainly, many of Young's observations are exemplified in Diodore's discussion of 1 Samuel 28. Such an approach to Scripture is perhaps only to be expected of one described as 'le véritable fondateur' of Antiochene exegesis,[348] since Antiochene exegesis has typically been characterised by its 'literal' approach.[349] However, Diodore also exemplifies why we cannot be reductionist in our definition of 'Antiochene' exegesis. Although his focus is on the words of Scripture, Diodore makes the case that 'tomorrow' may not literally mean the next day, despite this being its clear and obvious meaning.[350] Thus, as has been previously argued, 'Antiochene' exegetes cannot simply be characterised as entirely 'literal' readers of Scripture.[351] Further complicating such categorisation is the fact that Diodore openly contradicts interpretations of 1 Samuel 28 similar to that of Eustathius of Antioch, while his own view and some of his arguments are more akin to Origen of Alexandria.

We also see Diodore's interest in history, alluded to by Young, shaping how he approaches this passage. This is evident in his attempt to establish the sequence of events surrounding 1

[347] Young (2010), p.255; see also Behr (2011), pp.36-40.
[348] Olivier (1980), p.ciii.
[349] See the discussion of Antiochene and Alexandrian exegesis in chapter 1. See also O'Keefe (2000), p.86.
[350] Diodore make a similar point elsewhere, see *Comm. Ps.*, 47.9d; see also Hill (2005b), pp.xxvii-xxviii.
[351] Many scholars attest to the complexity of defining Antiochene exegesis, perhaps best expressed in Nassif (1993), pp.437-70; see also Wallace-Hadrill (1982), p.32; O'Keefe (2000), pp.88-90; Behr (2011), pp.36-42.

Samuel 28 to prove that Saul could have died the following day, 'since the following events of the narrative are a resumption [τὰ ἐξῆς τῆς ἱστορίας ἀνάληψις ἐστιν] of the entire affair and the war'. Thus, Diodore establishes the chronology of events to support his reading of 1 Samuel 28. He is not only interested in chronology, but also in setting this passage in the context of its original, intended readership. By referencing the Jewish reaction to 1 Samuel 28, Diodore seems interested in its pre-Christian setting, and how this passage was originally received.

Diodore's exegetical interest in history has been well-documented by scholars, a trait also associated with 'Antiochene exegesis'.[352] Although they held a pre-modern view of history, for Diodore and other Antiochenes, generally speaking, 'the key to good exegesis was never to let the interpretation of individual texts slip out of their context in the Bible's whole story of salvation history, as they understood it'.[353] This explains why Diodore is so interested in establishing the chronology around this passage, and why he even considers how a Jewish audience would have received it. Diodore's interest in placing 1 Samuel 28 in its historical context perhaps also explains why this lengthy interpretation of Scripture does not have a Christological element to it.[354] Christ is not mentioned once.

[352] O'Keefe (2000), pp.88-9, 103; Daley (2018), pp.175-6. However, once more we cannot be reductionistic here, and only speak broadly of Antiochene interest in history, for as Wallace-Hadrill reminds us, 'Exegesis at Antioch was not monolithic', see Wallace-Hadrill (1982), p.39.
[353] Daley (2018), p.176. Other scholars also point out that Diodore and other 'Antiochenes' did not have a modern view of history, see O'Keefe (2000), pp.86-90; Behr (2011), pp.36-7.
[354] Behr (2011), pp.78-9.

Zeno of Verona

Little of certainty can be said of Zeno of Verona.[355] We know that he was bishop of Verona and scholars generally agree that we can date this ministry to a period sometime between 360-80. All that survives of his work is a collection of his sermons.

Zeno's reference to 1 Samuel 28 occurs in his sermon 'On the Resurrection'. He argues against those who deny the resurrection, beginning by proving that souls survive after death, a fact acknowledged by earlier pagan writers and also proven by the fact that some are possessed by deceased spirits.[356] However, for Zeno, Scripture itself provides the clearest evidence for this, and he cites passages that suggest that souls survive after death.[357] 1 Samuel 28 is the first of these scriptural proofs that Zeno presents (see Appendix E).

Zeno clearly believes it was the real Samuel who was raised. Not only does the prophet appear to Saul 'without ambiguity [*sine ambiguitate*]', but he even responds to the king's questioning. Further, Zeno's entire argument rests on the premise that souls survive death, therefore his reference to 1 Samuel 28 only serves its purpose if Samuel really appeared. Although Zeno offers no detail concerning how Samuel was raised, he refers to Saul, noting that he was the one who desired to inquire of Samuel, emphasising Saul's culpability.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of Zeno's discussion of 1 Samuel 28 is the implication that Samuel can prophesy (or 'sing' [*canit*]) better dead than he could alive. Although others

[355] For more on Zeno's life and times, see Jeanes (1995), pp.7-17; Palanca (1970), pp.1-6; Mascari (1996), pp.107-9; Everett (2016), pp.61-2.
[356] Zeno, *Tractatus*, 1.2.1.1–1.2.3.7.
[357] Ibid., 1.2.4.8ff.

acknowledge that Samuel kept his prophetic gift after death, an idea found as early as in Sirach,[358] Zeno is the first to suggest that death improved Samuel's prophetic abilities. This point certainly serves the sermon's wider ambitions: to highlight the glorious, improved state that awaits after death, particularly the final resurrection.[359] It also seems likely that pastoral concerns lie behind this emphasis, supported by his further observation: 'Whence it is pleasing to exclaim: he has "departed", more than he has "died" [*Profectus potius est iste, quam mortuus*].' We see similar notions of death as departure in other early Christian writers, and Tertullian uses a very similar expression, seemingly to create a more comfortable image of death.[360] Thus, Zeno appears to comfort the sermon's audience, reminding them that death can improve their estate (as it did for Samuel), and so should be regarded as merely a departure, as for a journey. Amidst his constant reminders of the reality of death, he is careful to alleviate his congregation's worries. Here we are reminded of the importance of genre, since Zeno's exegetical remarks on 1 Samuel 28 seem to be shaped by his congregation's needs and concerns. It is an important reminder that even complex passages like 1 Samuel 28 can (and at times must!) serve pastoral purposes.

We cannot say with certainty how familiar Zeno was with other interpretations of this passage. Many have speculated that Zeno was from Africa, partly because of the influence of African writers such as Tertullian on him,[361] and some have identified Tertullian's influences in this sermon (we have already noted an example of similar expression).[362] It is worth

[358] Sirach 46:20; see also Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 9:1-6; Augustine, *cura mort.,* 15.18; *Dulc. Qu.*, 6.5.
[359] *Tractatus*, 1.2.1.1–1.2.3.7.
[360] Tertullian, *De Patientia*, 9.3; see also Jerome, *Adversus Jovinianum,* 1.26; *Epistle* 60.13; 118.4.
[361] Mascari (1996), pp.107-8; Jeanes (1995), pp.15-17. However, Zeno's African origins have not been universally accepted, see Vokes (1966), pp.130-4.
[362] Bigelmair (1934), p.184.

noting that Tertullian and Zeno's reference to 1 Samuel 28 have aspects in common. Both come as part of a wider discussion of the soul's fate after death.[363] Both references are preceded by discussions of the antiquity of these ideas in classical thought,[364] as well as discussions of exorcism.[365] Both cite the story of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31) as a companion text to support their point.[366] Despite these commonalities, Tertullian and Zeno differ dramatically in their understanding of what occurred at Endor. As we shall see, Tertullian believed that Samuel did not really appear, but instead was a demon in disguise.[367] This is because he believes the dead will not be summoned from their waiting state until the general resurrection.[368] Zeno, on the other hand, attempts to prove more broadly that souls survive after death, which Samuel's true appearance supports. In this sense, Zeno uses 1 Samuel 28 similarly to how Justin Martyr used this passage to prove 'that souls survive'.[369]

It seems unlikely that Zeno's reading of 1 Samuel 28 influenced others, at least during the period in question, considering how few early references there are to him. For instance, Jerome, Zeno's contemporary, did not include the bishop of Verona in his *De viris Illustribus*.[370] The first extant reference to Zeno comes after his death, further suggesting that he was not particularly influential during his lifetime.[371] This is perhaps unsurprising if Zeno's main creative output was his preaching, suggested by his scant surviving material.

---

[363] Tertullian, *An.,* 54–58.
[364] Ibid., 54.1-4.
[365] Unlike Zeno, Tertullian denies that the spirits of the deceased can possess people, and instead these are demons lying about their identity; *An.*, 57.5.
[366] Zeno, *Tractatus*, 1.2.4.9-10; cf. Tertullian, *An.*, 57.11.
[367] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.8-9.
[368] Ibid., 55.5; 56.7.
[369] Justin Martyr, *Dial.*, 105.4 (see Appendix A).
[370] Palanca (1970), pp.6-10.
[371] Ambrose, *Epistle* 56.1; see also Humphries (1997), pp.69-70; Everett (2016), pp.61-2; Jeanes (1995), pp.9, 14; Vokes (1966), p.130; Palanca (1970), pp.1-6.

The possible exception might be Ambrose of Milan, who knew of Zeno and who will be considered below.

While we cannot be precisely certain regarding influences, Zeno certainly exhibits common features associated with discussions of 1 Samuel 28, suggesting his engagement with wider traditions of interpreting this passage. The most obvious of these are the Scriptures Zeno cites alongside 1 Samuel 28, most notably Luke 16:19-31. This passage is regularly cited by early Christians when discussing 1 Samuel 28, such as Tertullian, Eustathius of Antioch, and Gregory of Nyssa.[372] It is perhaps unusual that Zeno keeps company with the likes of these, since their view that 'Samuel' was a demonic illusion is partly informed by this passage's description of a great chasm (Luke 16:26) separating those in Hades and Abraham's Bosom.[373] For them, Luke 16:19-31 proves that Samuel could not have crossed this chasm to the realm of the living, nor could evil King Saul have been 'with' Samuel after death (1 Samuel 28:19). Nevertheless, others who believed that Samuel truly appeared also cite this passage. Origen uses Luke 16:19-31 to support his case that, before Christ's descent to Hades, the way had not been opened to Paradise, which is why the rich man could see Abraham and why Samuel could be summoned.[374] Augustine uses these passages side-by-side when discussing how the living and dead can interact with one another.[375] Zeno cites these passages together as examples that support his wider point that souls survive after death.

[372] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.11; Eustathius, *Engast.*, 14.6-13; Gregory*, Pyth.*, 102–103; see also *Martyrium Pionii*, 14.7.
[373] Greer (2007), p.xlv.
[374] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 9.7-11.
[375] Augustine, *cura mort.*, 15.18.

Zeno cites another passage occasionally referred to alongside 1 Samuel 28, namely the account of Christ's Transfiguration (Matthew 17:1-8; Mark 9:2-8; Luke 9:28-36).[376] Interestingly, considering Zeno's suggested African link, Moses and Elijah's appearance at Christ's Transfiguration is cited alongside 1 Samuel 28 by Evodius of Uzalis and Augustine of Hippo. Evodius cites these passages together as proof that souls must occupy some form of body after death, since Samuel and Moses were tangibly observed, despite having died.[377] Augustine uses Moses's appearance at Jesus' Transfiguration, alongside 1 Samuel 28, to support his case that the dead can appear to the living.[378] For Zeno, again, these accounts simply prove that souls live on after death. It is also worth noting that Zeno cites Jesus' words to the penitent thief, 'Today you will be with me in Paradise' (Luke 23:43), alongside 1 Samuel 28, as does Eustathius of Antioch.[379] Although Eustathius directly connects these two passages, using Luke 23:43 to inform his understanding of 1 Samuel 28, for Zeno these passages, like all the others mentioned, are simply connected in how they prove that souls live on after death. Nevertheless, Zeno cites passages which commonly feature alongside 1 Samuel 28, suggesting that he engaged with wider traditions of interpreting this passage.

Ambrose of Milan

Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, is perhaps best-known for his opposition to Arianism, his challenges to imperial authority, and his contributions to music in the West.[380] However, his exegetical accomplishments should also be acknowledged, seen especially in his preaching

[376] Zeno, *Tractatus*, 1.2.4.9.
[377] Evodius, *Epistle* 158.6.
[378] Augustine, *cura mort.*, 15.18.
[379] Zeno, Tractatus, esp. 1.2.14.31-32; cf. Eustathius, *Engast.*, 14.6.
[380] For more on Ambrose's life and times, see Dudden (1935a); Dudden (1935b); McLynn (1994).

and commentaries.[381] Ambrose adopted Origen's method of reading Scripture, identifying three levels of interpretation – literal, moral and spiritual.[382] Like Origen, Ambrose was most interested in Scripture's spiritual interpretation, and utilised allegory to unlock its deeper meanings. We see these principles at work in Ambrose's *Commentary on Luke*, which fleetingly mentions 1 Samuel 28.

This commentary on Luke's Gospel was adapted from homilies delivered by Ambrose towards the end of the 370s, probably edited in its present form at some point in the following decade.[383] The influences of Origen, Eusebius, and Hilary of Poitiers are extensive in the work.[384] Its reference to 1 Samuel 28 occurs as Ambrose explains Luke 1:15, 'he will be filled with the Holy Spirit while still in his mother's womb' (see Appendix F).

Ambrose argues that John the Baptist, while in his mother's womb, did not possess the 'spirit of life [*spiritus uitae*]', but instead possessed the 'Holy Spirit [*spiritu… sancto*]' (or the 'Spirit of Grace [*spiritus gratiae*]'). Ambrose makes the following distinction: 'The spirit of life is one thing, and another the Spirit of Grace. One takes its beginning at birth, leaving at death; the other is not confined by time, or age; nor is it extinguished by death, or shut out by the womb of the mother.' It is in this context, to support his point that the Holy Spirit can exist even where the spirit of life is absent, that Ambrose gives other examples from Scripture, including that 'Samuel, after death, according to the testimony of Scripture, did not keep silent about the future'. Ambrose's comments lead to fascinating reflections,

[381] Ambrose's exegesis has received increasing attention, see Bonney (2011), p.50, n.1.
[382] Swift (1999), p.42; Dudden (1935b), pp.457-8; Griffiths (2016), pp.204-5.
[383] Griffiths (2016), pp.204-5; Tissot (1956), p.11; Ramsey (1997), pp.59-60.
[384] Dudden (1935b), p.694; Tissot (1956), pp.16-17; Griffiths (2016), pp.206-7.

although these are complicated by the imprecision of the terminology he uses. He seemingly conflates the 'Holy Spirit' within John the Baptist (and Mary) with the 'Spirit of Grace'. This Spirit is said to contrast with the 'spirit of life', where '*spiritus*' here probably holds an intentional *double entendre*, meaning 'spirit' but also 'breath', alluding to the 'breath of life' that God gave Adam to animate him from the dust (Genesis 2:7). Ambrose, like Origen, believed that humanity's composition was tripartite – corresponding to body, soul, and spirit – substantiating Paul's words in 1 Thessalonians 5:23.[385] However, while Ambrose likely understood the 'spirit of life' as referring to humanity's higher faculties, the technical details of human composition are not his focus.[386] Instead, he appears to speak in broader terms, from the perspective of the earthly body. The 'spirit of life' is simply the 'breath of life' in the human body, the period when the body is animated, from birth to death. It is this bodily perspective which leads Ambrose to intimate that the 'spirit of life' is 'extinguished by death',[387] although he evidently believed in the soul's survival after separation from the body.[388] Ambrose speaks like this to highlight the superiority of the 'Spirit of Grace', which refers to the person and work of the third person of the Trinity, whose operations transcend natural, earthly lives. Thus, Ambrose cites 1 Samuel 28 to illustrate that the Holy Spirit can even work through the dead, showcasing the abounding, unrestricted nature of God's grace. However, while Ambrose's true focus is the transcendent divine economy of the Holy Spirit, his comments do raise interesting anthropological considerations. For instance, Ambrose clearly suggests that human life starts at birth, not conception. Further, concerning his understanding of 1 Samuel 28, although this passage's relevance to his point is clear, does he

[385] Ambrose, *De Paradiso*, 11.53; cf. Origen, *Princ.*, 4.2.4.
[386] For more on Ambrose's anthropology, see Foley (1995), pp.40ff.
[387] Ambrose speaks in similar terms in *De Cain*, 2.9.35.
[388] Ambrose, *De excessu fratris Satyri*, esp. 2.21; see also Jones (2007).

truly mean to suggest that the 'spirit of life' was absent from Samuel when he spoke? Alongside Samuel, Ambrose notes how the Holy Spirit worked through the corpse of Elisha (2 Kings 13:20-21); did the Holy Spirit similarly work through Samuel's body somehow, speaking through his corpse in the absence of his 'spirit of life'? This seems unlikely and, in truth, Ambrose does not offer enough information to suggest in what manner he thought Samuel appeared.[389] Ambrose does not consider such complexities; his point is more basic: God can work beyond the natural beginning and end of earthly lives.

Although but a brief allusion to 1 Samuel 28, it is worth considering how it relates to the broader issues relevant to this thesis. Firstly, Ambrose clearly believed that the real Samuel appeared at Endor. Samuel is stated to have died, and his message about the future exemplifies the continued work of the Holy Spirit, indicating that this was not a demonic illusion in Ambrose's view. Secondly, although Ambrose does not state how Samuel was raised, God seemingly plays an important role, since Samuel's predictions are the work of the 'Spirit of Grace'. Citing this passage, Smelik categorised Ambrose as believing Samuel was raised by evil forces.[390] This is unsubstantiated, and it seems more probable that Ambrose belongs to Smelik's category of those believing that Samuel appeared at God's command. Thirdly, like Justin Martyr and Eusebius, Ambrose uses 1 Samuel 28 to support his exposition of another passage, in this case Luke 1:15. Ambrose clearly exhibits the common early Christian exegetical principle that Scripture should explain Scripture, probably particularly influenced by Alexandrian emphasis on the unity of Scripture. However, on the

[389] If anything, particularly due to his more negative view of the body, it seems likelier to me that Ambrose might suggest Samuel's appearance was non-physical, see Ambrose, *De excessu fratris Satyri*, 2.20.
[390] See Smelik (1979), p.164 (although Smelik later acknowledges the possibility that Ambrose believed Samuel was raised by God, see p.174, n.51).

matter of exegesis, despite the influences of the likes of Origen of Alexandria and Ambrose's apparent penchant for figurative exegesis (observed throughout the *Commentary*), Ambrose's consideration of Luke 1:15 (together with 1 Samuel 28) is perhaps unexpectedly literal, adhering to Scripture's plain and obvious meaning. Perhaps this can be explained by considering Origen. Mark Edwards says that 'Origen never allegorized what scripture appeared to say about the soul', since Scripture's comments on the human composition was the foundation of Origen's interpretive method.[391] As we shall see, this may partly explain Origen's own literal interpretation of 1 Samuel 28. Since Ambrose, like Origen, held a similar tripartite understanding of Scripture, perhaps he does not allegorise Luke 1:15 because of its reference to 'spirit', and the anthropological considerations he can draw about the 'spirit of life' by its literal interpretation. More importantly, a plain reading of Luke 1:15 leads Ambrose directly to a consideration of the Holy Spirit – an evidently 'spiritual' subject. Thus, Ambrose's literal consideration of Luke 1:15 naturally leads upwards to the 'spiritual', to the 'spirit of life' and the 'Spirit of Grace', without the need for figurative exegesis. To support this reading, Ambrose interprets 1 Samuel 28 plainly also, since the account exemplifies literally the difference between the 'spirit of life' and the 'Spirit of Grace'.

Our mention of Origen leads to another area of significance concerning Ambrose's citation of 1 Samuel 28, namely the question of influence. We have already mentioned the influence of figures such as Origen and Eusebius, both upon this text and on Ambrose generally. In fact, his contemporary, Jerome, severely criticises Ambrose for the derivative nature of his works, accusing him of plagiarism.[392] Despite these extensive influences on Ambrose, especially

[391] Edwards (2002), p.89.
[392] Jerome, *Prologue to Didymus the Blind's De spiritu sancto*, 19–33; cf. Rufinus, *Apologia*, 2.27ff; see also Griffiths (2016), pp.200-2.

Origen's *Homilies on Luke* on the first book of Ambrose's *Commentary on Luke*, there is no equivalent section connecting Luke 1:15 and 1 Samuel 28 in their works (although it is possible that this link was made, but is no longer extant, for instance in Origen's lost *Commentary on Luke*).[393] Notwithstanding Jerome's critique, it seems that Ambrose has here made an original exposition of Luke 1:15 by connecting it with 1 Samuel 28. However, his reading of 1 Samuel 28 may have been influenced in other ways. Both Origen and Eusebius believed that Samuel truly appeared, and it is possible that Ambrose was familiar with their interpretations.

Another possible influence on Ambrose was Zeno of Verona. Ambrose makes the earliest extant reference to Zeno, already dead and described as 'Zeno of blessed memory'.[394] Evidently, the bishop of Milan knew of the bishop in nearby Verona. Perhaps it is significant that Ambrose, like his fellow Italy-based Bishop Zeno, believes that it was the real Samuel that was raised.[395] Further still, both Ambrose and Zeno refer to Samuel's continued prophetic role after death.[396] Although uncertain, it is possible that Ambrose knew how Zeno read 1 Samuel 28, particularly if Zeno's sermons were circulating in the region.

Another interesting consideration is whether Ambrose influenced other interpretations of 1 Samuel 28. Augustine was particularly influenced by Ambrose, especially in matters of exegesis,[397] and would also himself conclude that it was the real Samuel that emerged

[393] Griffiths (2016), pp.203-5, 224-5; Mee (2001), p.vi.
[394] Ambrose, *Epistle* 56.1.
[395] Zeno, *Tractatus*, 1.2.4.8.
[396] Cf. Sirach 46:20.
[397] Augustine, *Confessiones,* 6.4.6; see also Asiedu (2001), p.299.

(although he initially believed 'Samuel' to have been a demonic illusion).[398] Was Augustine familiar with his old mentor's position on 1 Samuel 28, and did he eventually follow his reading? Although possible, we cannot tell. Nevertheless, Ambrose seems to make an original contribution to the reception history of 1 Samuel 28 in the way he connects this passage with Luke 1:15 to discuss the abounding nature of God's grace through the Holy Spirit.

Sulpicius Severus

Sulpicius Severus (*c*.360-*c*.425), born to a noble family of Aquitaine, was a well-educated Christian writer, best known for his *Vita Sancti Martini* (a hagiography of Martin of Tours), and his Chronicle.[399] It is in this latter work, a chronicle spanning from Creation to his own day, that Severus refers to 1 Samuel 28. Completed *c*.403,[400] Severus' Chronicle is among the later citations of this passage considered here.

Our claim that Severus was well-educated is supported by the testimony of Paulinus of Nola,[401] his contemporary and correspondent, and by the classical influences on his works (as well as the general quality of his writing).[402] In this vein, the Chronicle attempts to retell biblical and early Christian history in a classical style, drawing inspiration from those such as

[398] See chapter 5.
[399] For Severus' biographical details, see Stancliffe (1983), pp.15-19; Goodrich (2015), pp.1-22; Andel (1976), pp.1-2.
[400] There is a strong consensus for this date, see Goodrich (2015), p.14; Andel (1976), pp.11-12; Senneville-Grave (1999), p.16; Stancliffe (1983), p.80; Williams (2011), p.283.
[401] Paulinus of Nola, *Epistle* 5.5.
[402] Goodrich (2015), pp.2-3; Senneville-Grave (1999), pp.40-6; Stancliffe (1983), pp.16-17, 40, 55-8.

Sallust and Tacitus,[403] and by seamlessly incorporating the classical past into its narrative.[404] As such, and also due to its brevity, the Chronicle could not replace Scripture, as Severus makes clear in his preface.[405] Almost like a secular history, as Richard J. Goodrich states, 'His work was to be a straightforward, sequential recollection of events, stripped of miracle and spiritual significance.'[406] Nevertheless, it is still a distinctly Christian chronicle. Severus' main source for the Chronicle (including the section in question) was the Old Testament. Judeo-Christian history is still Severus' primary focus. He was also influenced by early Christian writers, particularly Christian historians such as Eusebius and Hippolytus.[407]

In terms of overall structure, almost three quarters of the Chronicle is dedicated to the period before Christ's birth. The subsequent history, covering from Christ's birth to Severus' own day, focuses primarily on the persecution of Christians, and the Arian and Priscillianist controversies. As one might expect, the reference to 1 Samuel 28 comes in the former section, in book 1, as Severus recounts the history of Israel's first king. In the Chronicle*'s* preface, Severus promises to record large swathes of history concisely.[408] True to his word, Severus' retelling of 1 Samuel 28 is much briefer than its source (see Appendix G).

---

[403] Severus acknowledges his use of classical sources, see *Chron.*, preface.2; see also Andel (1976), pp.7, 39ff; Stancliffe (1983), pp.58-61; Senneville-Grave (1999), pp.40-3; Goodrich (2015), pp.14-15.
[404] For instance, see Severus' reference to the Battle of Marathon, *Chron.*, 2.9.3; see also Williams (2011), pp.283-7.
[405] Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.*, preface.3.
[406] Goodrich (2015), pp.14-15.
[407] For the influences of Christian writers on Severus, see Williams (2011), pp.283-4; Andel (1976), pp.7-10, 26ff; Senneville-Grave (1999), pp.34-9; Stancliffe (1983), pp.62-70.
[408] Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.*, preface.1.

Before continuing, it is important to remind ourselves that, although Severus does not set out to explain 1 Samuel 28, the very process of reconstructing Scripture is an exegetical act. Speaking of Severus in the Chronicle, G. K. van Andel perceptively states that

> …by way of omissions, some of which he acknowledged, others of which he passed over in silence, by way of alterations in the sequence of events, accentuations and commentaries, not to mention the choice of his literary models, his own personal ideas come to light, either deliberately or unintentionally'.[409]

Thus, in how Severus *presents* this passage, we see something of how he *understood* it.

He presents us with a simple, plain reading of 1 Samuel 28 – a matter-of-fact retelling. This is unsurprising considering the work's genre as a chronicle, more interested in recording facts than interpreting them.[410] Despite this, Severus acknowledges that there are deeper readings of Scripture. From allusions in the Chronicle, including the preface,[411] Severus seems to have had a concept of *mysteria* that was influenced by Hilary of Poitiers; a typological reading of Scripture.[412] Occasionally in the Chronicle, we see direct allusions to Hilary's typological reading of the Old Testament, such as the deeper significance of Lamech's murder prefiguring 'a future mystery'.[413] However, if Severus believed there was a mysterious, typological reading of 1 Samuel 28, he makes no allusion to it. Evidence suggests that Severus himself was more comfortable in reading Scripture in a straightforward, historical sense.[414] Thus, in the case of 1 Samuel 28, he adheres closely to the literal words, retelling the simple, historical narrative.

---

[409] Andel (1976), p.26.
[410] Williams (2011), p.288; Goodrich (2015), pp.14-15.
[411] Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.*, preface.3.
[412] Hilary of Poitiers, *Tractatus Mysteriorum*, 1.1ff; see also Williams (2011), pp.289-90; Andel (1976), pp.3-4, 8-9, 68-9; Stancliffe (1983), pp.42-4.
[413] Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.*, 1.1.1; cf. Hilary of Poitiers, *Tractatus Mysteriorum*, 1.9-10; see also Stancliffe (1983), pp.42-3; Williams (2011), pp.287-8.
[414] Paulinus of Nola, *Epistle* 23.27; see also Stancliffe (1983), p.43.

Although Severus omits many details in his retelling, the key facts included indicate that he believed that the real Samuel appeared. Severus states, matter-of-factly, that 'Samuel… had been summoned' by Saul, and that 'Samuel' spoke with the king thereafter. That Samuel truly appeared is also implied by how Severus structures the narrative to highlight the fulfilment of Samuel's prophecy. By placing the events of 1 Samuel 31 (the deaths of Saul and his sons in battle with the Philistines) immediately after Samuel's prophetic words in 1 Samuel 28, Severus emphasises the accuracy of the prediction, implying that it was the real prophet speaking. Certainly, there is no hint in Severus' retelling of the passage that Samuel's appearance was delusive.

Severus, it appears, believed that Samuel appeared by the Medium and the evil spirit within her; 'through a woman, whose entrails a spirit of error had filled [*per mulierem, cuius uiscera spiritus erroris impleuerat*]'.[415] Certainly, God does not appear to be responsible, whose silence is emphasised. The precise role of the magical practitioner and evil spirit here, and how they relate, is unclear – Severus only mentions them in passing, paying greater attention to Saul and Samuel, and their actions. Saul futilely seeks God, consults Samuel illicitly, and later falls on his own sword. Samuel's death, appearance and accurate prediction of Saul's demise are similarly central to Severus' narration of events. The highlight of his retelling of 1 Samuel 28 is their interaction: Saul's consultation of Samuel, and Samuel's damning premonition to Saul in response. Through this, Severus emphasises the conflict and contrast between the evil king and God's righteous prophet. This is consistent with the way

[415] See also Smelik (1979), pp.164, 172, 177.

Saul and Samuel are presented in the Chronicle more generally.[416] Through the biblical material that Severus chooses to include, omit, or adapt, Saul's faults are highlighted, casting him in an especially negative light, whereas Samuel is depicted particularly positively, often for rebuking Saul for his sins.[417]

This depiction of Saul and Samuel is consistent with the Chronicle's wider themes, and sheds light on how the work fits together as a whole. In his retelling of the Old Testament, Severus portrays kingship as a 'reprehensible institution'.[418] His adaptations, more so than his source material, emphasise that Israel's history was full of bad kings, and that even 'good kings' usually yielded to temptations sooner or later.[419] These kings clashed with priests and prophets, who correctly protest the ruler's actions, often for meddling where they ought not in matters of religion.[420] Andel convincingly shows that these emphases 'have an exemplary purpose and contain a moral lesson for Severus' contemporaries'.[421] Severus wanted to demonstrate the fallibility of Roman emperors, the problems that arise from their inappropriate involvement in ecclesiastical matters, and the clergy's important role in correcting emperors. This also explains why Severus dedicates such disproportionate space in his account of history post-Christ to the persecution of Christians and to the events surrounding the Arian and Priscillianist heresies. Like Israel's bad rulers, Severus' account of

---

[416] See *Chron.*, 1.31-35.
[417] For instance, Severus omits important biblical accounts of Saul's successes (such as his prophesying, 1 Samuel 10:9-13), and omits negative accounts of Samuel, such as his failings through his sons (1 Samuel 8:1-5).
[418] Andel (1976), p.77; cf. Severus, *Chron.*, 1.24.3; 1.31.1-2.
[419] For instance, King Joram of Israel's victory over Moab is omitted, accentuating his depravity, see *Chron.*, 1.44.1. 'Good' King Solomon, despite his wisdom, still commits idolatry, but the Queen of Sheba's flattering visit is omitted (1 Kings 10:1-13), see *Chron.*, 1.38-39; see also Andel (1976), pp.76-80.
[420] *Chron.*, 1.32.2; 1.37.1; 1.43.1–1.44.1; see also Andel (1976), pp.80-3.
[421] Andel (1976), p.83; see also pp.76-116; see also Goodrich (2015), pp.15-16; Senneville-Grave (1999), pp.48-50.

Christian persecution illustrates how bad emperors can be.[422] Like Israel's 'good' kings, Severus' account of the Arian and Priscillianist controversies shows how damaging (even with good intentions) the actions of emperors can be, particularly when they meddle in priestly affairs, highlighting the need for priests to oppose emperors when necessary.[423] In the case of the Arian crisis, Constantius II is easily misled by the Arians, interfering where he should not, to the detriment of the Church, opposed by the prophet-like figure of Hilary of Poitiers.[424] In the Priscillianist affair, we see Maximus interfering in church matters, leading to what Severus considers to be unnecessary deaths, this time with Martin of Tours cast in the prophetic role.[425] By this theme, Severus connects Old Testament history with more recent events, making the Chronicle a cohesive whole. His reading of 1 Samuel 28 fits within this broader narrative. We see Saul's failings, meddling with matters and seeking God where he ought not, his demise predicted by the rebuking prophet. Thus, 1 Samuel 28 furthers Severus' message for his readers. Consequently, it is unsurprising that he believes that it was the real Samuel that was raised. A reading of 1 Samuel 28 that presented 'Samuel' as a demonic illusion would have detracted from this wider purpose, preventing Severus from exemplifying a prophet's moral superiority over an evil king.

Alongside these wider motivations, it is also worth considering how other authors may have influenced Severus' interpretation of 1 Samuel 28. After the Bible, Eusebius' Chronicl*e* is Severus' most important source for his own Chronicle.[426] Although Severus displays independence from Eusebius (for one thing, Eusebius' Chronicle does not cite 1 Samuel 28!),

[422] *Chron.*, 2.28-32.
[423] See Andel (1976), pp.85-116.
[424] *Chron.*, 2.35-45; see Andel (1976), pp.94-7.
[425] *Chron.*, 2.46-51; see Andel (1976), p.115.
[426] Andel (1976), p.29; Senneville-Grave (1999), p.35.

Severus was evidently familiar with Eusebius' work. As shown above, Eusebius believed it was the real Samuel that was raised, and perhaps Severus knew this. Severus was also familiar with Ambrose,[427] whom we have also shown believed that Samuel really appeared. Perhaps Severus knew how Origen read this passage too. He certainly knew the works of those sympathetic to Origen. We have mentioned Eusebius and Ambrose, but we also see Hilary of Poitiers' influences on Severus' work,[428] and we know through Paulinus' correspondence that Severus had some connection with Rufinus;[429] all major supporters of Origen. It also seems that Severus was familiar with Origen's ideas, directly or indirectly.[430] Although we cannot ascertain whether Severus knew how others read 1 Samuel 28, this conjecture is perhaps strengthened when we consider his relationships with Jerome. Although Severus used Jerome,[431] there are hints in Severus' works, explored in depth by Goodrich, that their relationship was strained.[432] If this is the case, perhaps it is unsurprising that Severus' reading contrasts with how Jerome interprets 1 Samuel 28, who argued that 'Samuel' was a demonic apparition.[433] Although we cannot be certain whether Severus' reading of 1 Samuel 28 was influenced by others, we do see emerging something of a group of theologians sympathetic to Origen who understand this passage in a similar way.

There may have been another important influence on Severus' reading of 1 Samuel 28, namely the Jewish historian Josephus. Scholars have considered whether Severus knew

---

[427] Senneville-Grave (1999), p.38; Stancliffe (1983), p.66; Andel (1980), p.282.
[428] Andel (1980), pp.282-3; Williams (2011), pp.289-90; Senneville-Grave (1999), pp.36-8; Stancliffe (1983), pp.42-3, 65-6.
[429] Paulinus of Nola, *Epistle*, 28.5; see Goodrich (2015), p.14; Goodrich (2007), pp.195-6; Stancliffe (1983), p.69.
[430] For instance, Sulpicius Severus, *Dialogi*, 1.6-7; *Vita sancti Martini*, 22.4-6; see also Andel (1980), pp.278-85; Senneville-Grave (1999), p.39.
[431] Stancliffe (1983), pp.67-9.
[432] Goodrich (2007), pp.189-210; Goodrich (2013), p.93; see also Stancliffe (1983), pp.297-311.
[433] Jerome, *Comm. Matt.*, 1.6.34; *Comm. Ezek.*, 4.13.17-23.

Josephus' work, either directly or indirectly (through Eusebius or others).[434] Severus' account of 1 Samuel 28 may shed light on this question, suggesting that he knew Josephus directly. Firstly, Severus' choice to include an account of 1 Samuel 28, when other earlier, extant Christian chronicles had not, may suggest he was influenced by Josephus' own retelling of this Old Testament passage in *Antiquitates Judaicae*.[435] Severus' and Josephus' accounts share key details too.[436] Both believe that Samuel was truly raised, and both retell events in a way that highlights that Samuel's prediction came true (in Josephus' case, through his eulogy to Saul).[437] The two accounts of this passage might also agree in another fascinating way. An important motif running through the Chronicle are warnings against associating with foreigners.[438] Thus, it is surprising that Severus does not use the Medium of Endor as an opportunity to further this agenda. However, this might be explained if we suppose that, like Josephus,[439] Severus believed that the Medium was an exiled Jew, not a foreigner. Such commonalities in their reading of 1 Samuel 28 strengthen suggestions that Severus knew Josephus, and again suggest a connection between Christian and Jewish interpretations of this passage.

Conclusion

We have seen that many early Christian exegetes understood 1 Samuel 28 in the same basic terms that early Jews did: namely, that Samuel truly appeared, either by malign means or through the power of God. Nevertheless, they still view this passage through a distinctly

[434] Andel (1976), pp.43ff; Senneville-Grave (1999), p.42.
[435] This challenges Andel's claim that 'Josephus cannot be regarded as the direct source for any one passage in the Chronicle', see Andel (1976), p.46.
[436] See our earlier analysis of Josephus in chapter 1.
[437] Josephus, *AJ*, 6.14.4.343-350.
[438] *Chron.*, 1.7.3; 1.23.1; 2.3.2; 2.10.2; see also Andel (1976), pp.74-6.
[439] Josephus, *AJ*, 6.14.2.327ff; see Brown (1992), pp.201-5.

Christian lens. In the case of Justin, the account points to the better protection afforded to Christians than existed for Samuel; in a similar vein, Apollinaris sees this passage as referring to a period before Christ's descent to Hades. As we shall see, Origen in his *Homily on 1 Samuel 28* speaks in similar terms. Zeno cites 1 Samuel 28 to comfort his Christian congregation that souls survive, in an improved state, after death. Ambrose uses 1 Samuel 28 to explain a New Testament passage and to prove that the work of the Holy Spirit transcends earthly lives. For Suplicius Severus, his presentation of Saul and Samuel fits into his wider message concerning emperors, and the need to oppose them when they meddle inappropriately in matters of religion, a narrative informed by events of recent Christian history. Eusebius and Diodore's citations of 1 Samuel 28 are perhaps the exception; their comments do not overtly betray their Christian, as opposed to Jewish, context of writing in this instance, [440] possibly indicating the influence of Jewish interpretations of this passage on them.[441]

Another reading would emerge among early Christians, a distinctly Christian interpretation with no known Jewish parallel in this period, namely that Samuel was a demonic illusion. Those who subscribed to this view are the subject of the next chapter. Why, then, did so many early Christians understand this passage as the Jews had? For individual authors, we have made tentative suggestions concerning why they came to the opinion that Samuel was truly raised, and who may have influenced them. For instance, for some, it may have been the influence of Origen of Alexandria, the most important proponent of this view, to be

[440] Ironically, the distinctly Christian comments that Diodore makes are when he rehearses the arguments of his opponents, who cite 2 Corinthians 11:14.

[441] We have mentioned possible points of contact with Jewish writers in the case of Diodore already. Although Eusebius does not betray this in his brief remark on 1 Samuel 28, he certainly knew Jewish writings, including Josephus' work, see Hollerich (1999), p.146; Hata (2007); Hardwick (1989); see also Inowlocki (2006).

considered in chapter 4. However, in truth, these citations of 1 Samuel 28 represent a diverse range of periods, regions, genres, languages, and purposes. Simply, there is no clear pattern or connection which might account for why these authors thought Samuel was truly raised rather than the view considered in our next chapter.

Chapter 3 – Samuel Did Not Appear

Although the earliest extant discussion of 1 Samuel 28, by Justin Martyr, suggested that Samuel truly appeared, the second oldest surviving reference to this passage, by Tertullian, argues that Samuel was a demonic illusion, establishing two distinct interpretations from the very beginning. As we shall see, the view that Samuel did not appear was also held by many other theologians throughout the period under consideration.

Tertullian

Despite his fame, much of Tertullian's life is shrouded in mystery. We can be certain that most of his surviving literary activity occurred roughly in the period 195-220,[442] and his life seems to have revolved around Carthage.[443] From his writings, it is also evident that Tertullian was classically educated and skilled in rhetoric.[444] Towards the end of his literary career, Tertullian became increasingly influenced by Montanism, and was perhaps eventually a full convert to the 'New Prophecy'.[445] Concerning other details of his life, significant doubt has been cast about the accuracy of ancient accounts, such as Jerome's claims that Tertullian was a priest and the son of a centurion.[446] Furthermore, assertions that Tertullian was once a lawyer arise from his erroneous conflation with the Roman jurist Tertullianus, also partly based on ancient accounts.[447]

[442] Dunn (2004), p.5; Barnes (1985), pp.30-56, 325-9.
[443] Dunn (2004), p.3; Barnes (1985), pp.10, 194-5.
[444] Dunn (2004), pp.3-4; Waszink (2010), p.xiv; Barnes (1985), pp.195-210.
[445] Dunn (2004), pp.4-5; Barnes (1985), pp.131-42; Daley (1991), p.34.
[446] Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, 53.1; Barnes (1985), pp.3-21; see also Dunn (2004), p.2.
[447] Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, 2.2.4. For the case against this conflation, see Barnes (1985), pp.22-9; Waszink (2010), p.xiv.

Despite the obscurity in his personal history, Tertullian was clearly a theologian of great import. His works are the earliest surviving extensive corpus of Christian Latin writings, and thus are important witnesses to early Christian theology in the West. However, because he wrote at an early stage in the development of Christian doctrine, and due to the polemical character of his works, Tertullian's own thoughts are not always consistent across his works.[448] In other words, Tertullian's theology is not systematic. Rather, his importance as a theologian stems from the antiquity, even originality, of his thought and expression, and his later influence.[449] This is also Tertullian's value for this study, for in *De Anima* we find the earliest extant reference to 1 Samuel 28 which suggests that 'Samuel' was a demonic illusion, a view adopted by many later theologians.[450]

Based on the Montanist elements it contains and its allusions to Tertullian's other works and recent historical events, it is generally believed that *De Anima* is among Tertullian's later works (written *c*.210).[451] According to Tertullian, *De Anima* was written to address questions regarding the soul that had not been considered in his previous work on this subject, *De censu animae*, a lost treatise against Hermogenes' understanding of the soul's origin and its original essence (with which Tertullian expects his readers to be familiar).[452]

---

[448] Barnes (1985), pp.151-5; see also Dunn (2004), p.7.
[449] Tertullian seems to have influenced important theologians such as Cyprian, Jerome, and Augustine, as well as lesser-known figures like Zeno of Verona, see Waszink (2010), pp.xiii-xiv.
[450] Like Justin Martyr, a work spuriously attributed to Tertullian also contains an allusion to 1 Samuel 28; see Pseudo-Tertullian, *Carmen Adversus Marcionitas*, 3.126-129. Tertullian certainly did not write this – see Pollman (1991), pp.15ff., supported also by the fact that this work suggests Samuel truly appeared, contrary to Tertullian's view in *De Anima*.
[451] Waszink (2010), pp.5*-6*; Barnes (1985), pp.30-56, 326-8; Dunn (2004), pp.5-7.
[452] Tertullian, *An.,* 1.1; 3.4; Waszink (2010), pp.7*-14*.

In *De Anima*, Tertullian's stated target is erroneous ideas about the soul found in pagan philosophy.[453] However, since these philosophers are 'the patriarchs of the heretics', Christian heretics and their doctrines are probably Tertullian's true targets.[454] Having addressed a variety of issues concerning the soul (from affirming its corporeality, to refuting the doctrine of metempsychosis), Tertullian considers death and the soul's fate in the final sections of the treatise. He explains that 'the underworld [*inferi*]… is in a dug-out part of the earth, and is a desolate place in the deep, and is a depth concealed in the very innermost parts of the earth [*in fossa terrae et in alto vastitas et in ipsis visceribus eius abstrusa profunditas*]',[455] which the souls of the dead occupy. In the underworld (which some have equated with Hades),[456] informed by the account of the rich man and Lazarus, Tertullian differentiates between where souls reside, with the righteous waiting 'in Abraham's bosom' (Luke 16:22).[457] It seems these lower regions should be distinguished from the 'region of Paradise [*paradisi regio*]' where the Martyrs go after death,[458] but with this exception in mind, Tertullian states that 'every soul is kept safe in the underworld [*inferos*] until the Day of the Lord'.[459] Thus, the underworld is conceived as an interim state until the final resurrection. Tertullian's reference to 1 Samuel 28 comes as he addresses counter-arguments to this view.[460] In particular, he considers claims that magic can contact the dead

---

[453] Tertullian, *An.*, 1.1.
[454] Ibid.*,* 3.1; see also 18.1-4; 23.6*;* Waszink (2010), p.7*.
[455] Tertullian, *An.*, 55.1. It seems this discussion of the underworld is informed by Irenaeus, see *Adversus Haraeses*, 5.31.1-2; see also Hill (2001), p.28.
[456] For instance, Charles E. Hill identifies this as 'Hades', see Hill (2001), p.27ff.
[457] Tertullian, *An.*, 55.2; however, elsewhere Tertullian identifies *inferi* as being distinct from 'Abraham's bosom', see *Marc.*, 4.34.11ff.
[458] Tertullian, *An.*, 55.4 [Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.11]. I disagree with David E. Wilhite's recent assertion that 'Paradise' is another region of *inferi* for Tertullian, see Wilhite (2020); Tertullian comments elsewhere seem conclusive on this matter, see *Res.*, 43.4.
[459] Tertullian, *An.*, 55.5 [Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.11, revised]. For more on Tertullian's eschatology see Greer (2007), pp.xxxiv-xxxvii, xli-xlv.
[460] Tertullian, *An.*, 56-57.

(who, according to Tertullian, should be confined to the underworld).[461] His response is simple: 'What shall we say about magic? What almost everyone says: it is a deception'.[462] Tertullian's reference to 1 Samuel 28 occurs as he attempts to prove the deceitful nature of magic that claims to raise souls from the dead (see Appendix H).

Since 1 Samuel 28 serves Tertullian's broader argument, let us first focus on how this section informs our understanding of his wider theology, beginning by gleaning interesting details concerning Tertullian's understanding of magic and his demonology. The first noteworthy point is that these two subjects are evidently closely connected for Tertullian, who refers regularly to demons (or evil spirits) in *De Anima* 57's discussion of magic. Magic and demons are so closely tied that he speaks of them interchangeably, almost as being synonymous. But how do they relate? Tertullian is clear that magic's apparent success is the result of demonic trickery.[463] Thus, magical practitioners perform their art by the power of demons. 1 Samuel 28 serves as a case in point. Samuel did not really rise by the Medium; Saul was merely deluded by a demonic apparition. The close relationship between magic and demons is further suggested by the fact that Tertullian states that the evil spirit was 'in the false prophetess [*pseudoprophetide*]'.[464] A demon was dwelling within the Medium. Tertullian does not detail how exactly the relationship between demons and magical practitioners works, but if the Medium of Endor's experience is the norm, we might conclude that all magical practitioners are possessed by demons in Tertullian's thought. This perhaps explains why he speaks so interchangeably of magic and demons. If magical practitioners are

[461] Ibid., 57.1ff.
[462] Ibid., 57.2 [Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.17, revised].
[463] Ibid., 57.6.
[464] Ibid., 57.9.

possessed by demons, then this suggests that they are under their control, perhaps implying that the Medium, like Saul, is a victim of demonic delusion. Based on Tertullian's comments in *De Anima*, demonic forces are the main agents responsible for the events of 1 Samuel 28, and perhaps for magic more generally. However, in *Apologeticum*, Tertullian uses different language to describe the relationship between magical practitioners and demons, stating that magical practitioners 'have the power of the angels and demons that have been invited [*invitatorum*] standing with them [*adsistentem sibi*]'.[465] This creates an alternate impression of close, yet distinct, partners, emphasising the practitioner's part by invocation (although still acknowledging that the power comes from demons). It is worth remembering that Tertullian's theology is not systematised, and that these nuances may be the result of his different audiences, opponents, and the context of the argument in these works. Perhaps Tertullian's emphasis on the agency of practitioners in summoning demons better supports *Apologeticum*'s attack on the pagan world,[466] whereas the emphasis on demonic agency through possession in *De Anima* better supports Tertullian's argument that demonic power is delusive, fooling even the practitioners themselves. However, perhaps Tertullian reconciled these ideas somehow – for instance, once the demon was invited by the practitioner, they then took control by possession. Whatever the case may be, these passages agree in portraying an intimate relationship between magical practitioners and demons, and in stating that the power behind magic is demonic.

Two other important characteristics relating to demons and magic are apparent from Tertullian's comments in *De Anima*. The first, and most obvious, feature is that demonic

[465] Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 23.1. Tertullian also mentions demonic possession in this section, although not specifically with regards to magical practitioners, see *Apologeticum*, 22–23.
[466] For more on *Apologeticum*'s purpose and audience, see Keresztes (1966).

power is delusive. Before coming to 1 Samuel 28, Tertullian has made this point clearly. He describes magic as 'a deception [*fallaciam*]',[467] and also states 'Nor is it, however, a great thing for one to deceive the outer eyes [*exteriores oculos circumscribere*], for whom the inner sight of the mind [*interiorem mentis aciem*] is very easy to blind'.[468] Tertullian also gives scriptural examples that highlight the fraudulent power of magicians.[469] Similarly, magic's delusive nature is central to Tertullian's reading of 1 Samuel 28, since he believes that Samuel's appearance was essentially a trick. This is immediately indicated by Tertullian, saying 'it was no less permitted for the pythian spirit [*pythonico… spiritui*] to fashion [*effingere*] the soul of Samuel'.[470] *Effingere*, meaning 'to fashion' or even 'to imitate', implies that 'Samuel' was made, not summoned, and thus was not truly Samuel but a forgery. Tertullian supports this reading with scriptural passages that show that Satan can imitate angels (2 Corinthians 11:14), and even God himself as the anti-Christ (cf. Matthew 24). If Satan can do this, Tertullian's argument *a maiore ad minus* is that '[h]e hardly hesitated [*Dubitavit, si forte*] at that time to assert himself the prophet of God'.[471] Tertullian then states unequivocally that, by possessing both the Medium and Saul, the demon 'easily lied' about Samuel's appearance.[472] In *Apologeticum*, he similarly emphasises the deceitful, illusory nature of demons and the magical arts,[473] revealing some consistency in Tertullian's thought.

[467] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.2.
[468] Ibid., 57.6.
[469] Ibid., 57.7.
[470] Ibid., 57.8.
[471] Ibid.; see Waszink (2010), p.583.
[472] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.9.
[473] Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 22–23.

The second feature of demons and magic demonstrated in this section of *De Anima* almost runs contrary to this prior assertion: Tertullian establishes that demons have real, efficacious power. When he describes magic as 'a deception', he does not mean to suggest that magic has no power whatsoever. Tertullian did not consider the magic of his day as we might that of a modern stage magician, although he still viewed it as illusory. On the contrary, for Tertullian, these deceptions are convincing precisely because of the demonic power behind them. In the case of magic claiming to bring up the dead, compared to other practices he has mentioned, Tertullian admits that the deceit 'is clearly more effective because both a phantom is manifested [*phantasma praestatur*], and because a body is fashioned with it'.[474] Furthermore, although insubstantial compared to the deeds of Moses and the Apostles, Tertullian concedes that 'the snakes of the magical staffs were seen by Pharoah and the Egyptians as bodies' and that 'Simon and Elymas the magicians also did many things against the apostles'.[475] There is a tangible power behind magic, also expressed in Tertullian's understanding of 1 Samuel 28. A demon was able to 'fashion the soul of Samuel',[476] and some form of 'phantom [*phantasma*]' appeared.[477] If we combine this with Tertullian's earlier comments, that when a *phantasma* is produced 'a body is fashioned with it [*corpus affingitur*]',[478] this suggests that Tertullian believed that the demonic illusion of 1 Samuel 28 appeared tangibly, adding to its persuasiveness.

The demonic forces behind Samuel's illusion are powerful in another way, for they almost seem omnipresent. As Tertullian states, 'it was the same spirit, both in the false prophetess

[474] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.6.
[475] Ibid., 57.7.
[476] Ibid., 57.8.
[477] Ibid., 57.9.
[478] Ibid., 57.6.

and the apostate'.[479] The spirit acting in 1 Samuel 28 seems to have been in two places simultaneously. At first glance, this claim is problematic, for one assumes that while Tertullian states elsewhere that God 'exists everywhere', [480] this characteristic does not extend to demons. Tertullian is unclear how a demon could have resided in both the Medium and Saul, but two possible solutions emerge from his extensive discussion of demons in *Apologeticum*. The first could be that, since Satan is described there as 'the chief of that evil kind [i.e. demons]',[481] perhaps Tertullian understands that the Medium and Saul were ultimately under Satan's influence.[482] Thus, although occupied by different spirits, both the Medium and Saul were under the rule of one master, Satan – a synecdoche of sorts. This option is perhaps strengthened by the fact that Tertullian may refer to Satan's direct involvement in the events of 1 Samuel 28, although this is grammatically unclear.[483] A second solution is offered in the same section of *Apologeticum*. Tertullian states, 'Every spirit is winged. This is true of angels and demons. Therefore, they are everywhere in a moment. The entire world for them is a single place… their swiftness is thought to be divine, because its nature is unknown.'[484] Thus, due to their immense speed, demons can be 'everywhere in a moment', aiding their deceptions.[485] This swiftness might explain how Tertullian believed an evil spirit could occupy both the Medium and Saul simultaneously. In whatever way Tertullian reconciled this, his claim that the same spirit influenced multiple people simultaneously suggests that demons are powerful.

---

[479] Ibid., 57.9; cf. Eustathius, *Engast.*, 30.2.
[480] Tertullian*, Adversus Praxean,* 23.
[481] Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 22.2.
[482] This is how Waszink resolves this issue, see Waszink (2010), p.584.
[483] It is not clear what the subject of 'Dubitavit' is in *An.*, 57.8 – whether it refers to 'daemonio' or 'satanas' in the previous clauses. If it does indeed refer to Satan, then perhaps so too does 'eundem spiritum'.
[484] Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 22.8.
[485] Augustine would later espouse a similar idea, see *divin. daem.*, 3.7.

There is, however, an important caveat to this. Although demons are powerful, Tertullian indicates that their power is limited and inferior to that of God. For instance, Tertullian has shown that Pharoah's magicians were no match for Moses, nor Simon and Elymas for the Apostles. This point is also supported by Tertullian's reading of 1 Samuel 28. He believes that a demon could not have truly raised Samuel, stating 'let it be far from us to believe that the soul of any saint whatsoever, much less that of a prophet, was drawn forward [*extractam*] by a demon'.[486] Tertullian clarifies later that only God can truly raise the dead,[487] which explains why a demon resorted to merely conjuring Samuel's image. Raising the dead is beyond the limits of demonic power. In a sense, such limitations explain why demons must deceive: their power cannot rival God's, and so they use the means at their disposal to convince others that it does. This agrees with their purpose as set out in *Apologeticum*, namely that demons aim to steal God's rightful glory, which is why Tertullian explains there that pagan gods are really demons and pagan miracles accomplished by demonic power.[488] Nevertheless Tertullian still affirms that demons have real power. While he believes that demons and magic are deceptive, he means this in the sense that they do not have as much power as they claim, and certainly cannot rival God's power. Thus, in *De Anima* 57, demonic power is both deceitful and efficacious simultaneously, consistent with what we see elsewhere in Tertullian's thought, such as when he describes in *Apologeticum* demons curing diseases that they themselves have caused.[489]

[486] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.8.
[487] Ibid., 57.12.
[488] Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 22.7ff; cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *Pyth.*, 105; Augustine, *divin. daem.*, 2.6.
[489] Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 22.11. We find a similar idea in Augustine, *divin. daem.*, 5.9.

Tertullian's reading of 1 Samuel 28 also aids our understanding of the fate of souls in his thought. As mentioned earlier, Tertullian has previously concluded that 'every soul is kept safe in the underworld until the Day of the Lord'.[490] It is in this context that he discusses magic, refuting its apparent proof that the dead are not permanently confined to the underworld, which is why 1 Samuel 28 is introduced. By concluding that 'Samuel' was a demon in disguise, Tertullian supports his overarching argument that the dead remain in the underworld indefinitely until the resurrection. Samuel could not have been summoned because his soul was in the underworld, therefore the figure must have been a demonic illusion. Tertullian's theological convictions seem to shape his reading of 1 Samuel 28, and not vice versa.[491] In a way, this is obvious, since he does not appeal to specific details from 1 Samuel 28 to support his reading.[492] Rather, it seems another passage is more important in shaping his view, namely the account of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31). It is this passage, he claims, that 'has sufficiently established that the underworld lies open to no soul at all', since Lazarus was not allowed to report his condition to the living.[493] It seems that the conclusions drawn from this passage inform Tertullian's eschatology, and thus his view that 'Samuel' was a demonic illusion.

Let us also consider what Tertullian's treatment of 1 Samuel 28 suggests about his exegetical method. Scholars broadly agree with J. H. Waszink's assessment that '[t]here is no one

---

[490] Tertullian, *An.*, 55.5 [Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.11, revised]. It seems he did not hold this view earlier in life, believing that there was access to Paradise before the resurrection, see Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 47.13; see also Hill (2001), pp.29-30.

[491] Greer also makes this point, see Greer (2007), p.xlv.

[492] Tertullian does not cite the passage directly, nor does he draw arguments from its details to support his claims that 'Samuel' was a demonic illusion. Instead, he appeals to external sources (such as 2 Corinthians 11:14) and established theological convictions to support his case that Samuel did not truly appear.

[493] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.11. This passage seems to have been particularly important for Tertullian in shaping his understanding of the soul and the afterlife, see *An.*, 7; 9.8; 55.2; 58.1; *Marc.*, 4.34.10ff; see also Greer (2007), pp.xliii-xlv.

exegetical method in Tertullian'.[494] This has been attributed to Tertullian's rhetorical training and the polemical nature of his works (reflecting his desire to counter his opponents' arguments by any means necessary), and also the nascent period of discussion surrounding exegetical method to which Tertullian belonged.[495] That is not to deny that he had general principles, or 'norms' (as Waszink puts it),[496] when reading Scripture, but these are not universal, absolute rules. For instance, while Tertullian may generally veer towards literal interpretations of Scripture, he sometimes reads it allegorically and affirms its value, without a clear framework for doing so.[497] While Waszink, and others, argue that Tertullian only applied allegory when literal interpretation seemed impossible,[498] Geoffrey D. Dunn makes a persuasive case that the way in which Tertullian reads Scripture depends on his opponents and their arguments in each specific case, and the influence of his rhetorical background.[499] Thus, if his opponents read a passage literally, Tertullian would read it allegorically, or vice versa, to counter their position, and Dunn explains that '[t]he fact, as Waszink points out, that Tertullian most often favored the literal over the allegorical was not, I am suggesting, because he himself distrusted allegory or typology but because his opponents so often turned to it'.[500] If this is the case, one might describe Tertullian's exegetical method as polemical, even relativist, since it adapted depending on the specific needs of his arguments. Waszink and Dunn's views are not mutually exclusive, since the literal interpretation was always impossible when it disagreed with Tertullian's argument! Yet, Tertullian's approach

[494] Waszink (1979), p.17; see also Dunn (2006a), p.141.
[495] Waszink (1979), pp.17-31; Dunn (2006a), pp.141-55.
[496] Waszink (1979), pp.26-9. Eric Osborn frames this in terms of preference for simplicity, see Osborn (1997), pp.161-2.
[497] For Tertullian's use and affirmation of allegorical readings on occasions, see *Marc.*, 3.5.3; 3.14; *Res.*, 20ff; see Waszink (1979), pp.29-30; Dunn (2006a), pp.152-3; Osborn (1997), p.162; Hanson (1961), pp.273-5.
[498] Waszink (1979), pp.29-30; Trigg (1988), p.40.
[499] Dunn (2006a), pp.152-5; see also Dunn (2004), p.15.
[500] Dunn (2006a), p.153; see also O'Malley (1967), pp.125-9.

to 1 Samuel 28 seems to favour Dunn's nuance. While a reading which implied that Samuel really appeared was impossible for Tertullian, since it contradicted his wider eschatological understanding and passages such as Luke 16:19-31, his interpretation of 1 Samuel 28 seems ultimately to be shaped by his argument. Tertullian is not interested in exegeting this passage, but in its utility in supporting his argument. In other words, Tertullian does not appeal to the text's details to support his claims; rather, he unhesitatingly reads 1 Samuel 28 in a way that proves his point. Simply, 1 Samuel 28 is an auxiliary passage, cited for polemical utility. If one supposes that Tertullian's opponents first cited this passage, a point considered below, then this strengthens the case that Tertullian's exegesis is ultimately shaped by his polemical intentions. Thus, we see this polemical, rhetorical trait, described by Dunn, in Tertullian's exegesis of 1 Samuel 28 – a reading of Scripture which readily adapted to the argument at hand. In this sense, although they understood 1 Samuel 28 differently, Justin and Tertullian approach this passage similarly. Just as Justin's exegesis has been described as 'functional exegesis',[501] with his reading of 1 Samuel 28 serving his argument, so we might describe Tertullian's approach. For both, Scripture, and its interpretation, is a tool to be utilised for argument's sake – pliable to the context of argument rather than shaped by a firm exegetical framework. That Tertullian and Justin share such an approach to Scripture is unsurprising considering their place as early Christian apologists, who were well-versed in rhetoric.

We also observe other 'norms' of Tertullian's exegesis, as identified by Waszink, on display in his reading of 1 Samuel 28, namely an appeal to 'clearness' (unambiguous passages) and

[501] Allert (2002), p.253.

'frequency' (multiple passages) when interpreting Scripture.[502] While occasionally Tertullian could appeal to the 'rule of faith' for clarity on how to read certain passages,[503] in the case of 1 Samuel 28 this would not have clarified whether the real Samuel was raised or not. Instead, Tertullian appeals to multiple, clearer passages of Scripture to support his reading of this text. This is why he refers to 2 Corinthians 11:14, 'Satan himself may be transformed into an angel of light', and Gospel references to false Messiahs (cf. Matthew 24:24).[504] For Tertullian, if Satan can imitate angels and even God himself, as these passages prove, then demons are more than capable of imitating Samuel. His reading of 1 Samuel 28 is also supported by his later citation of Luke 16:19-31, which 'has sufficiently established that the underworld lies open to no soul at all', which applies to the prophet Samuel. Thus, we see multiple 'clearer' passages informing what might otherwise be a singular difficult section to understand. Tertullian's method of using Scripture to illuminate Scripture is a common early Christian exegetical principle, as we have already observed and shall observe again. Underlying this method is Tertullian's stated belief in the unity of the Scriptures, due to its common authorship by the Holy Spirit.[505]

We have already mentioned Tertullian's opponents in passing. Greer has tried to identify the ideas that Tertullian refutes in this section of *De Anima*. He postulates that Tertullian's opponents argued that 'definitive punishments and rewards [are] immediately meted after death', before the final resurrection, although Greer admits that it is hard to reconstruct Tertullian's opponents' views.[506] An interesting consideration is whether Tertullian's

[502] Waszink (1979), pp.27-8; cf. Tertullian, *Res.*, 19; *Adversus Praxean*, 20.
[503] Waszink (1979), pp.24-6.
[504] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.8.
[505] Ibid. 21.5; *De Pudicitia*, 19.3-4; see also O'Malley (1967), pp.123-5; Waszink (1979), pp.28-9.
[506] Greer (2007), p.xlii; see also pp.xli-xlv.

opponents first cited 1 Samuel 28 to support their position. Perhaps Tertullian has someone specific in mind when he says, 'let it be far from us to believe that the soul of any saint whatsoever, let alone a prophet, was drawn forth by a demon…'[507] 1 Samuel 28 could easily be used to prove that all souls do not remain indefinitely in the underworld until the resurrection. At the very least, Tertullian displays an awareness of the alternate view of this passage. Justin Martyr once cited 1 Samuel 28 to prove 'that souls survive on the basis of the fact that even Samuel's soul was summoned by the belly-myther', although this discussion is now lost.[508] The subject-matter concerning the survival of souls is similar to Tertullian's, and Justin's use of Samuel's appearance to prove that souls survive after death would have directly contradicted Tertullian's view that all souls remain in the underworld until the resurrection. We also know that Tertullian was familiar with Justin.[509] It is possible that Tertullian has this lost discussion in mind when considering opponents, both in his wider discussion of souls and in citing 1 Samuel 28, although lack of evidence makes such identification impossible.

Finally, let us consider the wider implications of Tertullian's reading of 1 Samuel 28 for the reception history of this passage in the early Church. We shall observe many aspects of his reading repeated in other interpretations of 1 Samuel 28. For instance, later authors cite 2 Corinthians 11:14-15 and Luke 16:19-31 alongside their citation of 1 Samuel 28, particularly those who held that Samuel was a demonic illusion, as discussed below. Like Tertullian, Eustathius later refers to Pharaoh's magicians (Exodus 7:8-12) alongside 1 Samuel 28, to similarly demonstrate the insubstantial, illusory nature of magic in comparison to God's

[507] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.8.
[508] Justin Martyr, *Dial.*, 105.4 (see Appendix A).
[509] O'Malley (1967), pp.148, 163; Daley (1991), p.34.

power.[510] Eustathius also states that Saul and the Medium were possessed by a demon, even suggesting, like Tertullian, that it was one demon operating in 1 Samuel 28.[511] Yet while *De Anima* is the earliest surviving source to argue that 'Samuel' was a demonic illusion, and it is fascinating to observe aspects of Tertullian's interpretation repeated in later authors, it has been postulated that Tertullian drew upon an even earlier source.[512] Fragments of a work believed to belong to Hippolytus (or identified by Pierre Nautin as Josipus), show a similar eschatological understanding, rooted in Luke 16:19-31, to that seen in Tertullian.[513] It is also believed that Hippolytus (or Josipus), based on the list of works on a statue on the Via Tiburtina in Rome and what Jerome records in *De Viris Illustribus*, wrote a commentary entitled *De Saul et Pytonissa*, which has not survived.[514] This text is a candidate for an antecedent. Thus, it is probable that a reading that Samuel was a demon in disguise is older than extant sources might immediately suggest. Whatever the case may be, this view would certainly find many later proponents.

---

[510] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 9.1-5.
[511] Ibid., 4.1; 4.8; 30.2.
[512] Greer (2007), pp.xxxiv-xxxvi, xlvi-xxlvii; Nautin and Nautin (1986), pp.78-9; Simonetti (1989), p.13, n.11.Their arguments are partly based on the assumption that, despite their similarities, the author of *Martyrium Pionii* did not know Tertullian and thus they shared an earlier source. Even conservative estimates separate their composition by several decades but, more importantly, *Martyrium Pionii*'s consideration of 1 Samuel 28 is probably a later addition to the text. Scholars argue that the anti-Jewish polemic in the relevant section feels out of place, and this section (including its discussion of 1 Samuel 28) does not appear in the earliest extant versions of the text in the Armenian and Old Church Slavonic, see Gibson (2001), p.358; Simonetti (1955), pp.30-1; Zwierlein (2014), pp.38-40, 93-6. Nevertheless, many other aspects of their arguments concerning Hippolytus/Josipus still hold.
[513] Hippolytus, *De Universo*. Although Hippolytus is the usual attribution for this fragment, Nautin suggests a 'Josipe' of Rome, see Nautin (1947), pp.71-9. Hill also argues Hippolytus is a misattribution for this fragment, but acknowledges its connection in some way with Tertullian (especially *De Anima*), even suggesting Tertullian himself as the author, see Hill (1989), esp. p.122.
[514] Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, 61.2. A fragment on 1 Samuel 28, once ascribed to Hippolytus, has survived, although this is considered a misattribution, see Pseudo-Hippolytus, *In. Reges fragm.*; see also Smelik (1979), p.165, n.21.

Basil of Caesarea

Basil of Caesarea (330-379) earned his epithet 'The Great' as a staunch defender of Nicene doctrine and a prominent opponent to Arian and Apollinarian heresies.[515] He made a significant contribution to Christian thought on the Holy Spirit,[516] as well as to the theology and practice of communal monasticism.[517] His other epithet, as a 'Cappadocian Father', he shared with his brother, Gregory of Nyssa, and his close friend, Gregory Nazianzen, all being influential in the development of early Christian theology and whose familial, ecclesiastical, and intellectual circles revolved around the Cappadocian region.[518]

Basil refers to 1 Samuel 28 is in his *Commentary on Isaiah*. Although attributed to him for centuries, Erasmus of Rotterdam in the 15th century cast significant doubts on the authenticity of its Basilian authorship.[519] In the following years Erasmus' views found support, leading to the common designation of 'Pseudo-Basil' as the author of the text, including by Smelik.[520] However, recent scholarship, led by Nikolai A. Lipatov, has reasserted the *Commentary on Isaiah*'s Basilian authorship, proving that its original designation was correct.[521] Only 16 chapters of the commentary survive, and the reference to 1 Samuel 28 occurs as Basil seeks to explain Isaiah 8:19, 'Seek the belly-mythers [ἐγγαστριμύθους], and the ones speaking out of the earth, empty-talkers' (see Appendix I).

[515] Ayres and Radde-Gallwitz (2010), p.460; Chadwick (2001), pp.332-3, 341.
[516] Ayres (2004), p.211ff.
[517] Ayres and Radde-Gallwitz (2010), p.460.
[518] Rousseau (1994), pp.1-26; Hildebrand (2014), pp.2-9.
[519] Lipatov (2001), p.iii.
[520] Smelik (1979), p.165.
[521] Lipatov (1993).

Like Tertullian, Basil belongs to the camp of those who believed a demon appeared rather than Samuel. In alliance with the Medium, demons disguised themselves as the prophet, and forged a convincing prophecy from what God has already promised, to deceive Saul. Although Isaiah 8:19 makes no reference to demons, Basil is clear that the feats of 'belly-mythers', and other forms of superstition, are 'executed by demons'. Thus, this section of Basil's commentary, including his reference to 1 Samuel 28, informs our understanding of his demonology, a central feature of which is the deceptive nature of demons. Basil's language throughout this section (for instance, 'operations of deceit [ἐνέργειαι πλάνης]'), suggests the illusory, deceitful nature of superstitious activities operated by demons. Their deceptive nature is shown clearer still when Basil explains how great feats of power in the pagan world are actually demonic deceptions. When effective counsel concerning bodily diseases is received by superstitious means, this is not to the credit of superstition, since demons are (compared to humans) 'more discerning of material properties [διορατικώτεροι εἶναι τῶν ὑλικῶν ἰδιωμάτων], and have regard to the qualities of plants [ἐπισκέφθαι ποιότητας βοτανῶν], and the appropriate action from these for the afflictions'. Demons are merely knowledgeable in natural properties, and they themselves do not cause the efficacy of their cures. Pagan cures are not miraculous, but rather utilise God's creation effectively (and so one could say, these cures come from God). Similarly, in the case of fortune-telling, demons cannot truly tell the future, despite appearances. Instead, they deceptively create this impression by stating what has already happened, but not yet known, or by inferring what will happen by what God has already promised and ordained. The deceptive nature of demons is affirmed further by Basil's reading of 1 Samuel 28. The fact that demons 'dressed themselves up in the mask of Samuel [οἱ κατασχηματίζοντες ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὸ τοῦ Σαμουὴλ πρόσωπον]' shows their deceptive nature. Basil seems to employ theatrical language here,

since κατασχηματίζω means 'to dress up', and thus πρόσωπον in this context probably refers to the masks of ancient Greek theatre, used to change character. Thus, 'Samuel's' appearance is portrayed as the dramatic, fictitious performance of demons. The deception goes further still since, according to Basil, demons 'narrated as their own decree [ἀπόφασιν] what had been pronounced [ἐξενεχθεῖσαν] by God' when 'Samuel' prophesied (1 Samuel 28:16-19). This prior 'decree... by God' likely refers to the events of 1 Samuel 15, where God, through Samuel, rejects Saul as king for not completely destroying the Amalekites and promises his kingdom to another. Thus, Basil postulates, a demon repurposed God's words to create the impression that they 'announced to Saul… his future defeat'. Eustathius of Antioch, writing prior to Basil, similarly suggests that the demon imitating Samuel merely repeated what Samuel had already stated when alive, referring directly to 1 Samuel 15.[522] Basil's portrayal of demons as deceitful is consistent with Morwenna Ludlow's findings, who has shown that deceit was one of the three key vices ascribed to demons by the Cappadocians, used to hinder humanity's freedom of choice and bring about its destruction.[523] Although the deceptiveness of demons can be considered a general trend in early Christian demonology, already observed in Tertullian,[524] Ludlow's portrayal of Cappadocian demonology fits what we see in Basil. Ludlow also describes another demonic vice evident in Cappadocian theology, namely their envy. This motivates their desire to see humanity's downfall, of whom they are jealous.[525] Aspects of this are evident in Basil's depiction of demons in this section. He is clear that demons create deceptions 'for the ruin of those tempted by them [τῶν πεπειραμένων αὐτοῖς]', motivated by the prospect of

[522] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 12.1-9.
[523] Ludlow (2012), pp.195-6.
[524] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.
[525] Ludlow (2012), pp.196-7.

bringing people to destruction (because they envy humans, if Ludlow is correct). Thus, Basil not only tells us *how* demons operate, but also *why*, probably explaining their actions in 1 Samuel 28 also. Since their 'operations of deceit are… for the ruin of those tempted by them', this surely applies also to the 'demons… who dressed themselves up in the mask of Samuel'. The motivation behind their delusion was Saul's downfall.

Although Basil portrays demons as deceptive, like Tertullian, he is also clear that they possess great abilities. For instance, demons can identify and cure diseases by their expert understanding of the natural.[526] This suggests that demons are very knowledgeable, possibly indicative of their longevity of experience compared to humans. Basil's suggestion that demons can make such observations easily might also imply that they are keen-sighted. Demons' vast knowledge also extends to events which have already happened but unknown to humans, which they use to give the impression that they can predict the future. Additionally, relaying such information to humans so quickly, before the news reaches them, suggests that demons are not constricted by time and space as humans are. As though ever-present, their special properties allow demons to know God's promulgations, which they reiterate as their own words, as Basil explains happened during the events of 1 Samuel 28. Perhaps Basil believed that demons possessed immense speed, which is how Tertullian explains how demons make predications.[527] Basil's reading of 1 Samuel 28 also alludes to another demonic ability: shapeshifting. He states that 'demons… dressed themselves up in the mask of Samuel', probably thinking that demons can do this because they possess finer, immaterial bodies, with special properties, although Ludlow notes that '[t]he Cappadocians

[526] Cf. Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 22.11.
[527] Cf. Ibid., 22.8-9.

write little specifically about demons' bodies'.[528] Yet such beliefs that demons had unique, finer bodies were common,[529] as were associated beliefs in their longevity, keen sight, great speed, and shapeshifting.[530]

Isaiah 8:19 specifically discusses magical practitioners, and so Basil's exposition also comments on these. While he is clear that superstition and divination are enabled by demons, humans still play a significant role. Basil states that 'those who have stuck fast to idols, and have given heed to dreams [ὀνείροις] and to omens [κληδόσι] and to the divinations of demons [μαντείαις δαιμόνων}, they themselves both disregard the truth and counsel us to ask for such things'. Thus, Basil portrays pagans who adhere to superstition as important advocates for demonic practices. Similarly, in his explanation of 1 Samuel 28, he places great emphasis on the Medium's role, alongside demons, in deceiving Saul. Basil states that 'the belly-myther announced to Saul through demons his future defeat'. Both demons and practitioner come together to orchestrate the events of 1 Samuel 28. Later Basil is clear that mediums, exemplified in 1 Samuel 28, are aware of the deceptive nature of their practice: 'the Gentiles often urge us to the deceptions of demons, saying "Seek out the belly-mythers, the ones speaking out of the earth". For they do not dare say that their words are from the heavens themselves. So also that woman mentioned in Kingdoms [Βασιλείαις, i.e Samuel–Kings] conversing with Saul, said "I see gods coming up from the earth."' The Medium knows that her words are base, not from heaven, which is how Basil explains 1 Samuel 28:13. Following this, speaking of mediums generally, although likely still with the Medium of Endor in mind, Basil unequivocally affirms the lying nature of these practitioners,

[528] Ludlow (2012), p.200.
[529] Origen, *Princ.*, preface.8; Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 22.5; Augustine, *divin. daem.*, 3.7–4.8.
[530] Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 22.1ff; Augustine, *divin. daem.*, 3.7–4.8; see also Smith (2008).

explaining that each 'fashions the lie from within his own heart, aiming at [παραστοχαζόμενος] the desires of those observing, and says what is useful to him for the deceit of the unintelligent'. Basil portrays these practitioners, including the Medium of Endor, as being knowingly deceitful. Thus, the relationship between practitioner and demon is presented as akin to a partnership, with both sides displaying agency, as opposed to one side manipulating the other. This contrasts with how others present 1 Samuel 28, who imply that the Medium herself was also deceived, the view of Basil's own brother, Gregory of Nyssa.[531] In this respect, of all the theologians considered here who believed a demon appeared rather than Samuel, Basil creates the clearest distinction between practitioner and demon. This distinction is blurred in other authors, such as Tertullian and Eustathius, who suggest that the woman was possessed by a demon, and speak interchangeably about the Medium and the demon as though both are synonymous.[532] Basil, however, does not consider demonic possession in this section nor insinuate that the Medium was inhabited. For Basil, both demon and practitioner are important but distinct agents in the events of 1 Samuel 28. Saul, however, appears to be more helpless, even a victim; an example of 'those who are prone to deceit' and of 'the unintelligent [ἀνοήτων]'.

Finally, let us consider Basil's exegetical method, and how this relates to his reading of 1 Samuel 28. Scholars have come to different conclusions concerning Basil's method of exegesis. Commonly, he has been seen as a literalist, even an 'Antiochene',[533] a view based primarily on his strong statements against allegory in his best-known work*, Hexameron*.[534]

---

[531] Gregory*, Pyth.*, 104.
[532] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.9; Eustathius, *Engast.*, 3.3; 4.1; see also *Martyrium Pionii*, 14.7.
[533] Tieck (1953), pp.2-3, 158-9; see also Hildebrand (2014), p.48.
[534] Basil, *Hexameron*, 9.1; see Hildebrand (2014), p.48.

However, others have observed that this is not the case throughout his corpus, such as in his *Homilies on the Psalms* 'wherein he used almost exclusively spiritual interpretation'.[535] Scholars have considered whether these differences reflect a change in Basil's views over time (perhaps influenced by his correspondence with Diodore of Tarsus), with the *Hexameron*'s more literal approach reflecting his mature expression,[536] or whether these differences simply reflect a different audience at the time of delivering these homilies.[537] There is little conclusive evidence to support either supposition. Any picture is blurred further by the fact that, despite his comments, there are allegorical elements to the *Hexameron*'s exegesis, and thus it seems that Basil always appreciated the need for some figurative interpretation.[538] When considering such questions, it is also worth noting Origen's influence, whose works Basil and Gregory Nazianzen compiled in the *Philokalia* earlier in their careers.[539] Basil was familiar with, if not sympathetic towards, Origen's thought, who tended to favour 'spiritual', figurative readings. How, then, does this section of Basil's *Commentary on Isaiah* inform our understanding of his exegesis? If anything, it muddies the water further. Any expectation of Basil as a literalist, even 'Antiochene', is both affirmed and denied. Although his reading of Isaiah 8:19 is not allegorical, neither is Basil interested in setting the verse in its original Jewish context, preferring to discuss the superstitious practices of his own day; nor is he tied strictly to the letter, such as by discussing demons when Isaiah does not. The same is true for Basil's reading of 1 Samuel 28. While not a 'figurative' reading, Basil adds demons disguised as Samuel to the narrative, unmentioned in the original passage, which perhaps one would not expect of a 'literalist'.

---

[535] Hildebrand (2014), p.48; see also pp.51-2.
[536] For Basil's correspondence with Diodore, see Basil, *Epistle* 135, 160.
[537] Hildebrand (2014), pp.53-5; see also Lim (1990), p.364.
[538] Hildebrand (2014), p.53.
[539] Rousseau (1994), pp.11ff; Ayres and Radde-Gallwitz (2010), pp.459-61; Chadwick (2001), pp.331-2.

However, this reading puts him in agreement with Eustathius of Antioch, possibly affirming the Antiochene character of his exegesis, although this simultaneously puts him at odds with the Antiochene with whom he corresponded (and by whom, it has been argued, he was influenced), namely Diodore of Tarsus, who believed the real Samuel was raised.[540] Similarly, the notion that Basil was a figurative reader of Scripture, influenced by Origen, is also complicated by this reading. Although Basil does not read 1 Samuel 28 strictly to the letter, this puts him in direct disagreement with Origen, the famed allegorist, who believed Samuel was truly raised. This confused picture of Basil's exegesis reflects the reality of how he read the Bible and the complexity of patristic exegesis. Basil utilised both literal and non-literal methods when reading Scripture and was influenced by multiple, sometimes contrasting, readers of Scripture.

Yet not every aspect of Basil's exegesis defies categorisation and explanation, and he displays traits that were commonly accepted across early Christian interpreters. Most notably, he uses 1 Samuel 28 to clarify Isaiah 8:19, using one part of Scripture to illuminate another. This is a typical early Christian exegetical method, stemming from Basil's belief in the unity of Scripture and its divine inspiration by the Holy Spirit.[541]

Gregory of Nyssa

Gregory, bishop of Nyssa, who lived *c*.335-395, was born to a high-ranking family and received a good education.[542] Alongside his older brother Basil of Caesarea, and close friend

[540] See Hildebrand (2014), pp.48, 53-6; cf. Diodore, *Fragment*.
[541] Basil, *De spiritu sancto*, 21.52; *Bapt.*, 2.4; see also Hildebrand (2014), pp.40-3; Tieck (1953), p.2.
[542] For more on Gregory's life and works, see McGuckin (2018), pp.7-28; Meredith (1999).

Gregory of Nazianzus – his fellow 'Cappadocians' – Gregory of Nyssa played an important role in the development of early Christian doctrine, particularly orthodox Christology and Trinitarian theology, in opposition to Arianism and Apollinarism.

Gregory devotes a lengthy discussion to 1 Samuel 28 as part of a letter to Theodosius (see Appendix J), a bishop about whom we know little.[543] In this text (commonly entitled *De Pythonissa*) Gregory responds to Theodosius' questions about 1 Samuel 28 (and other passages of Scripture), posed to him in a now lost letter. Although Theodosius' letter is lost, his evident interest in 1 Samuel 28, and the lengthy discussion Gregory devotes to its explanation, immediately suggests there was a wider understanding that 1 Samuel 28 was an important, even notoriously difficult, passage to interpret. Theodosius's missing letter, which may have contained his own preliminary thoughts on the passage, is also a reminder that further interpretations of 1 Samuel 28 once existed but have not survived. However, we do have access to Gregory's thoughts on this passage, making the case that 'Samuel' was a demonic illusion.

A characteristic of Gregory's treatment of 1 Samuel 28, immediately apparent, is his awareness of other readings. When introducing 1 Samuel 28, he refers to it as 'the disputed matter [ἐπιζητούμενον νόημα] concerning Samuel',[544] a comment which suggests Gregory was aware of wider discussions of the passage. His awareness of variant readings is then made explicitly clear, when he opens by stating, 'It has pleased some of those before us to suppose that the conjuring [ψυχαγωγίαν] of that sorceress for Samuel is true',[545] before

[543] Greer (2007), p.lxxii, n.71.
[544] Gregory, *Pyth.*, 101.
[545] Ibid., 102.

considering this opinion in depth. Although not his own view, Gregory clearly knew that some argued that the real Samuel appeared in 1 Samuel 28.

Although Gregory does not mention his sources, he cites an argument very similar to one found in Diodore.[546] Diodore suggests that God himself is responsible for raising Samuel. Gregory similarly cites the view that God 'allowed [συγχωρῆσαί]' Samuel to be raised, although this view's proponents seem to qualify this by saying that Samuel appeared 'through such magical arts [μαγγανείας]'.[547] More significantly, both texts note a similar purpose behind God's action. Diodore argued that Samuel was raised by God for him to see the depth of Saul's wickedness and, therefore, understand why God ignored Samuel's prayers for Saul. The argument Gregory rehearses is that God raised Samuel 'so that Samuel might see he was putting forward lies to God on behalf of him [Saul], saying he was hostile to the belly-mythers when at that time he was seeking by divination through their sorcery the ascension of his soul'.[548] In both cases, Samuel is raised to correct his ignorance about Saul and understand the futility of his supplications. The main thread of these arguments is remarkably similar, suggesting perhaps Gregory was aware of Diodore's reading of 1 Samuel 28 or certainly one like it.[549]

It is also likely that Origen was among Gregory's sources for those arguing it was the real Samuel that was raised. Gregory was very familiar with Origen's works,[550] and as one of the

[546] Diodore, *Fragment*.
[547] Gregory, *Pyth.*, 102.
[548] Ibid.
[549] Greer (2007), p.lxxii.
[550] For Origen's impact on Gregory, see McGuckin (2018), pp.22-5; Beeley (2018), pp.108-9; Ramelli (2018a); Ludlow (2002), pp.45-66; Meredith (1999), pp.21-5.

main proponents of this view, it seems probable that Gregory knew Origen's interpretation of 1 Samuel 28. Moreover, Gregory opposes similar lines of argument to that found in Origen's *Homily on 1 Samuel 28*. Gregory asks 'how will slaves of the letter establish this in accordance with narrative meaning [καθ' ἱστορίαν]?', since it would necessitate accepting that 'gods' actually appeared with Samuel.[551] This is reminiscent of language and argument used by Origen in his discussion of the 'narrative [ἱστορία]' and 'narrative persona [διηγηματικὸν πρόσωπον]' to establish what actually happened at Endor.[552] Further, Origen appeals to the 'narrative voice [ἡ διηγηματικὴ φωνὴ]' and its statement that 'Samuel said…' (1 Samuel 28:15), to prove that Samuel really appeared.[553] Thus, perhaps Gregory has Origen in mind when he states 'if Scripture says "And Samuel said" (1 Samuel 28:15), let such a statement not trouble the intelligent'.[554]

Similarly, for his own view that Samuel was a demonic illusion, Gregory presents arguments that appear in earlier sources, suggesting familiarity with prior proponents of it. Firstly, to establish that Samuel could not have appeared, Gregory cites the story of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31), arguing 'when I consider the chasm in the Gospel… firmly fixed between both the wicked and good… I do not accept such assumptions to be true'.[555] Because of this great, uncrossable chasm after death between the righteous and the unrighteous, Gregory believes it was impossible for Samuel to appear to Saul and the Medium. This use of Luke 16:19-31, to establish the eschatological distinction between the righteous and unrighteous to support their reading of 1 Samuel 28, was common, and seen

[551] Gregory, *Pyth.*, 105; see Smelik (1979), p.168.
[552] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 2.1-3, 4.1-4; see chapter 4.
[553] Ibid., 4.8-9.
[554] Gregory, *Pyth.*, 105–106.
[555] Ibid., 102–103

in Tertullian and Eustathius among others.[556] Alongside this, Gregory makes another common argument: 'Since, therefore, Samuel is great among the saints, but sorcery [γοητεία] is an evil asset [πονηρὸν… κτῆμα], I am not persuaded that Samuel, having been established in so great a place of his own rest [ἀναπαύσεως], passed through that impassable chasm [ἀδιόδευτον ἐκεῖνο χάσμα] to the impious, neither willingly nor unwillingly [οὔτε ἑκὼν οὔτε ἄκων]…'[557] Gregory emphasises Samuel's greatness, both in his stature as a saint and (informed by Luke 16:19-31) in his place of rest, and suggests that such a person could not forcibly be made to appear nor would he choose to voluntarily. That Samuel was beyond the influence of evil forces is an argument found in earlier sources, such as in Eustathius.[558] Gregory, however, connects these two arguments, namely Luke 16:19-31's eschatology and Samuel's superiority, since Samuel's ascendancy over evil is partly due to the greatness of his resting place. Thus, while Gregory repeats familiar ideas, he co-presents these two arguments in a way hitherto unseen to create a troubling dilemma for his opponents: on the one hand, Samuel could not have been forced to appear, for neither Samuel nor a demon could have passed through the uncrossable chasm between them; on the other, Samuel would not have appeared willingly, since he would not want to leave his rest with the pious to fraternise with the wicked. Simply, in any imaginable scenario, it could not possibly have been Samuel that appeared. However, even aspects of this argument may have been drawn from an earlier source, since Ambrosiaster, a near-contemporary of Gregory, makes a similar argument that Samuel would not have appeared either willingly or unwillingly, perhaps suggesting a common source, a point we shall consider when we turn to

[556] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.11; Eustathius, *Engast.*, 14.7-13; see also *Martyrium Pionii*, 14.7.
[557] Gregory, *Pyth.*, 103.
[558] Eustathius, *Engast.,* 11.3; see also *Martyrium Pionii*, 14.7; Tertullian, *An.,* 57.8.

Ambrosiaster.[559] There are further ways in which Gregory's view parallels earlier discussions of those who argued 'Samuel' was a demonic illusion. For instance, both Gregory and Tertullian establish that the demon deceived Saul by playing off his expectations.[560] Gregory displays many points of contact with Basil of Caesarea, his brother and teacher,[561] whose discussion of 1 Samuel 28 he may well have known. In both Basil and Gregory, we see a lengthy discussion of demons and magic alongside their reference to 1 Samuel 28, a similar depiction of magic as demonic deceit, and a similar reading of 1 Samuel 28 which sees a demon appear in Samuel's guise.[562] However, the similarities between Gregory and Basil's discussion of this passage run deeper than this, as discussed below.

Gregory also seems to be aware of counter arguments to his opinion. If demons are so deceptive and Samuel was really a demonic delusion, then how could the figure correctly prophesy that 'Tomorrow you and Jonathan will be with me' (1 Samuel 28:19)? Origen, for instance, argues along such lines, believing that a demon could not have made such a prediction.[563] Gregory resolves this problem with a two-pronged argument. Firstly, he argues that the prophecy merely seemed authentic because the demon 'counterfeited that one's [Samuel's] speech and… uttered the pronouncement logically expected to come to pass', based on what had already happened.[564] Eustathius, dealing with this same issue in reaction to Origen's argument, similarly argues that the demon's predictions merely repeated what

[559] Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones*, 27.1.
[560] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.9.
[561] Gregory, *Epistle* 13.4-6; see Ludlow (2000), p.21.
[562] Basil, *Comm. Isa.*, 8.218.
[563] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 5.3-4. Diodore also suggests this, see Diodore, *Fragment*. The capacity of demons to foretell the future was evidently a point of controversy in Gregory's time, since the Athanasian *Vita Antonii* attributes a long speech to the hero in which he asserts (chapters 31-34) that demons often guess the future correctly on the basis of present knowledge, but cannot predict it with certainty.
[564] Gregory, *Pyth.*, 105.

Samuel said when alive,[565] and that the demon could have guessed what would happen by observing prior events.[566] Importantly, Basil also argues this, suggesting the demon merely 'narrated… what had been pronounced by God'.[567] Secondly, on the offensive, Gregory flips the argument on its head by arguing to the contrary, that the words 'Tomorrow you and Jonathan will be with me' actually prove that it was a demon speaking. Gregory claims that 'the demon convicted [ἤλεγξε] itself' with these words since, as reading Luke 16:19-31 proves, the righteous Samuel would not be with wicked Saul after death.[568] Eustathius argues a similar point, using the same terminology, that 'the demon, having lied, is convicted of his own accord [αὐτοτελῶς ἐλέγχεται]'.[569] This similarity in language, together with the other commonalities mentioned, suggests that Gregory knew Eustathius' treatise against Origen. As part of this discussion, Gregory offers an unusual idea. While most authors who thought Samuel was a demonic illusion emphasise that 'Samuel's' supposed words were inaccurate lies,[570] Gregory claims, despite establishing the deceptive nature of demons, that the demon spoke the truth to Saul! By accident ('not wishing to') the demon 'told the truth', since it 'did not lie when it said that Saul will be with it'.[571] This evidently rests on the premise that unrighteous people (like Saul) and demons dwell together after death, separate from the likes of Samuel. Thus, Gregory argues, the demon emulating Samuel accidently spoke the truth, since Saul would be with the demon who was actually speaking after death.

---

[565] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 12.1-9.
[566] Ibid., 23.1-8. Diodore's opponents also seems to argue that a demon could have merely guessed this prophecy, see Diodore, *Fragment*. For more on demons as good 'guessers', see Augustine, *divin. daem.*, 3.7ff.
[567] Basil, *Comm. Isa.*, 8.218.
[568] Gregory, *Pyth.*, 105.
[569] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 13.3; see also 13.1-8. Eustathius argues that these words convict the demon because he believes the prophecy incorrectly predicts when Saul will die (i.e., not the next day) and because, due to the version of this passage Eustathius is reading, he believed a prediction from Samuel would have also stated that Saul's sons would have died with Jonathan.
[570] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.9; Eustathius, *Engast.*, 13.4-9; see also a young Augustine, *Simpl.*, 2.3.3.
[571] Gregory, *Pyth.*, 105.

However, although this idea has no known precedent, again Ambrosiaster notices this paradox and makes a similar point, that in a sense the demon spoke the truth, suggesting that even this idea may not be Gregory's own.[572]

Throughout *De Pythonissa*, Gregory displays familiarity with contradictory understandings of this passage, and demonstrates that much of his own position is possibly indebted to earlier discussion of 1 Samuel 28. In sum, Gregory is aware of wider, common traditions of interpreting 1 Samuel 28.

How, then, does Gregory's discussion of 1 Samuel 28 inform our understanding of his wider theology? First, let us consider his eschatology. As alluded to earlier, Gregory's understanding of the afterlife, which informs his exegesis of 1 Samuel 28, is shaped by his reading of the account of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31). From this passage, Gregory envisions an uncrossable chasm both between the living and the dead, and between the 'wicked' and the 'good' after death.[573] Interestingly, Gregory does not name these two distinct destinations after death directly, nor does he describe them in detail. Instead, he refers euphemistically to the 'repose of the righteous', or the place where 'the chorus of the holy ones' or 'the chorus of evils ones' are.[574] Perhaps this suggests that, for Gregory, these places are ultimately characterised by those who dwell there and their moral character. Certainly, unlike Luke 16:19-31 itself, Gregory does not here distinguish between these places according to the blessings and punishments received. It is the distinction between people, not places, that is emphasised, serving his argument that Samuel would not visit

[572] Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones*, 27.4.
[573] Gregory, *Pyth.,* 102ff.
[574] Ibid*.,* 103.

wicked people, willingly or otherwise. This is consistent with how others have characterised Gregory's theology of the afterlife. While his description of the abode of the righteous is more concrete elsewhere in his corpus, offering more specific terms such as 'Paradise' and the 'bosom of Abraham',[575] Greer states that Gregory envisions 'not so much a place as the condition of the righteous after death'.[576] We certainly see this in his depiction of the afterlife in *De Pythonissa*, which focuses on the inhabitants of these places, as opposed to their locale.

Greer also observes that Gregory 'can sometimes think of that condition as preliminary and sometimes gives the impression that it is their final destination', and that it is not always clear how this works alongside his theology of the resurrection.[577] Certainly, in *De Pythonissa*, Gregory speaks vaguely of the afterlife, and is not entirely clear whether the conditions mentioned are temporary or otherwise. Gregory *is* clear in the sharp distinction he draws between the destinies of the righteous and unrighteous after death, indicated through his repeated dichotomy between them, and by paying considerable attention to 'that impassable chasm' mentioned in Luke 16:26, the impenetrable space prohibiting passage to and from where the righteous dwell.[578] In fact, this chasm, this space between spaces, receives more attention than the places it divides. While this emphasis serves Gregory's argument that Samuel could not have crossed into the realm of the living, this clear, uncrossable distinction in the afterlife also creates a sense of finality. The wicked and righteous are separate and cannot be moved or mixed after death. This might suggest that

[575] Gregory, *De vita Moysis*, 2.246-247; *Vita sanctae Macrinae*, 24.
[576] Greer (2007), p.lxxv; see also Danielou (1970), pp.182-3; cf. Gregory, *De an. et res.*, 68ff (GNO 3.3, pp.48ff.).
[577] Greer (2007), p.lxxv.
[578] Ibid.

Gregory is discussing the final destination of souls here, including the persisting, separate condition of the unrighteous.[579] However, it is more likely that he is considering a preliminary state in *De Pythonissa*. His reference to the 'repose [ἄνεσιν] of the righteous' may suggest its impermanence, a state of temporary 'relaxation'.[580] This would also seem to be consistent with Gregory's wider thought. He suggests the existence of a preliminary space elsewhere,[581] and expresses in many places his belief in future restoration (*apokatastasis*) which would bring an end to the distinction between righteous and wicked in the afterlife.[582] Thus, although unclear, in *De Pythonissa*, Gregory seems to describe a state during the period when souls are separated from the body after death, awaiting the final resurrection.

We also learn much about Gregory's understanding of demonology and magic from this section. He establishes the motivation of demons. As the 'common enemy of all', demons aim 'to damage humanity in its very vital parts [εἰς αὐτὰ τὰ καίρια]' and for them to be 'cast away [ἀποβληθῆναι] from the God who gives life'.[583] Demons are depicted as the enemies of humanity, who desire its downfall. Later, Gregory notes that demons also act as they do 'so that humans withdraw from God to devote themselves to the worship of demons'.[584] While this outcome is again detrimental for humanity, it seems also that demons desire to steal the rightful worship that God deserves through their actions.

[579] This is not the only place where Gregory seems to suggest this, see *De beneficentia,* 10.
[580] Gregory, *Pyth.,* 103.
[581] Gregory, *Vita sanctae Macrinae*, 24; see also Greer (2007), p.lxxv; Danielou (1970), pp.208-9.
[582] Gregory, *De vita Moysis,* 2.82; *Hom. Cant.,* 15.468ff. See Ludlow (2000), pp.77ff; Daley (1991), p.85ff.
[583] Gregory, *Pyth.,* 103.
[584] Ibid., 104.

According to Gregory, demons achieve their ambition of ruining humanity and stealing worship from God through deception. The 'deceptive nature of demons' is central to Gregory's depiction of them, noted multiple times, supporting Ludlow's claim that deceit was one of the key three vices of demons in Cappadocian thought,[585] a point already supported by Basil's reading of 1 Samuel 28.[586] Gregory's depiction of demons here is not unusual, and a similar understanding is found across patristic literature.[587]

Gregory also considers specific acts of deception by demons, namely divinatory practices: 'so that humans might not turn to God, the deceptive nature of demons has cunningly contrived many ways of knowing the future: auguries [οἰωνοσκοπίας], divinations from omens [συμβολομαντείας], oracles [χρηστήρια], inspections of livers [ἡπατοσκοπίας], necromancy [νεκυίας], frenzies [ἐνθουσιασμούς], possessions [κατοκωχάς], inspirations [ἐμπνεύσεις], and many other such things'.[588] Gregory suggests that divinatory practices are designed by demons to distract people from God. In stating this, not only does Gregory establish that demonic power is behind such magical practices, as commonly assumed by early Christian writers, but he goes further still by suggesting that demons actually invented, or 'contrived [ἐτεχνάσατο]', these practices. Gregory was not the first to suggest such ideas, comparable to beliefs that the 'watchers' taught magical practices to humanity, found in 1 Enoch 7-8.[589] Thus, Gregory emphasises the role of demons in magical practices, since they invented them. The list of practices itself which, by its length and variety, feels comprehensive and all-

[585] Ludlow (2012), pp.195-6.
[586] Basil, *Comm. Isa.*, 8.218.
[587] Bradnick (2017), pp.18ff.
[588] Gregory, *Pyth.,* 103.
[589] Cf. Justin Martyr, *2Apol.,* 5; see also Kahlos (2015), p.154.

inclusive, is probably intended by Gregory to highlight that all forms of divination originate from demons.

In terms of how these magical practices work, not only have demons devised them, but they also enable them to work by conforming events to people's expectations. For those observing birds, demons shape their flight; for those observing livers, demons make them throb; for all practices, 'the demon displays to those who are deceived each method according to the observation by deceit which has been interpreted as a sign'.[590] We can glean a few things from this. Firstly, divination, even if unapparent to the observer, is demonic and deceptive at its core. Two somewhat contrasting points follow. On the one hand, demons have power, shaping events to create convincing effects that make these divinatory practices 'work'. On the other, however, Gregory simultaneously suggests the 'inability' of demons by these illusions. Divination practices do not work in and of themselves, and demons must rely on deceit to persuade that they are efficacious. Gregory notes the limitations of demonic power elsewhere in *De Pythonissa* since demons are 'unable to pass through the chasm' described in Luke 16:19-31.[591] Gregory also balances both the ability and inability of demons in his reading of 1 Samuel 28. He states that the demon 'changed itself [ἐσχηματίζετο] into different forms in a shadowy way [σκιοειδῶς] before the eyes of the weak woman'.[592] Thus, demons can shapeshift. However, at the same time, the demon resorts to imitating Samuel because it could not truly resurrect him. Similarly, although accurate, the demon's prediction merely inferred this 'from what had

[590] Gregory, *Pyth.,* 104.
[591] Ibid., 103.
[592] Ibid., 104.

been made apparent'.[593] Thus, while demons orchestrated the events of 1 Samuel 28, this was only in a delusive capacity. This section, in particular, bears many similarities to Basil's discussion of 1 Samuel 28.[594] Like Gregory, Basil discusses different magical practices (including divination) and how they are accomplished by deception. Both also explain that, among their abilities, demons can shapeshift, which is how they imitated Samuel, and demons can make educated guesses about the future, which is how they predicted Saul's doom.

This leads to the issue of agency in magic. Gregory emphasises the role of demons, far above the practitioner or observer, in executing magical practices. According to Gregory, demons devised these practices and make them 'work', not people. Moreover, the deceptive nature of divination seemingly reduces the responsibility of practitioner and observer, who are apparently duped by demons unwittingly. This is true of how Gregory presents 1 Samuel 28 also. The Medium is said to have been 'habitually deceived [ἠπατᾶτο ἐκ συνηθείας]' by the demon, who confounds her with its disguising.[595] This is reinforced by Gregory's regular designation of the Medium as *τὸ γύναιον*, a term for woman here used in a derogatory sense to suggest the Medium's feebleness, indicating the pathetic, weak-minded nature of her character. The Medium's responsibility is further diminished by Gregory's reference to 'the demon abiding in the belly-myther [τὸ παραμένον τῇ ἐγγαστριμύθῳ δαιμόνιον]',[596] since this inhabitation seems to play an important role in her delusion. According to Gregory's depiction, then, the woman lacks good judgement. This is far from Basil's portrayal of an

[593] Ibid., 105.
[594] Basil, *Comm. Isa.*, 8.218.
[595] Gregory, *Pyth.,* 104.
[596] Ibid.

equal, well-informed partner with the demon, a significant point of departure between the two.[597] For Gregory, Saul is deceived further still, being 'astounded [κατεπλάγη]' by events, and actually sees nothing.[598] Although Gregory would likely assign a degree of responsibility to Saul and the Medium, compared to the role of demons in 1 Samuel 28 they are portrayed as naïve and unwitting. Thus, we see a strong emphasis on the role of demons in Gregory's theology of magic.

In terms of the wider history of magic, the divination practices that Gregory lists might suggest what was commonly practiced in his day. In the case of medieval Christian writers, often writing from monastic seclusion, one suspects that they were unfamiliar with the superstitions of lay people, and that their discussions of magical practices are primarily an intellectual exercise.[599] Gregory, however, surrounded by pagan culture in the Christianising Greco-Roman world, was probably more familiar with the superstitious practices of his day. Thus, his list may reflect the most common practices he encountered, including those of non-Christians in wider society, but perhaps also the persisting superstitions of converted Christians that Gregory knew of, perhaps even in his own congregation. For two of the practices listed, Gregory's passing remarks suggest what they entailed. In the case of 'auguries [οἰωνοσκοπίας]', he suggests that the practice is interested in the type of bird observed, such as an eagle, and their movements. For the 'inspections of livers [ἡπατοσκοπίας]' (haruspicy), Gregory notes that 'the throbbing of the liver' is among the

[597] Ibid.
[598] Ibid., 105
[599] For instance, see Thomas Aquinas, *Sum.*, II-II.Q96.

observations made for divining.[600] Thus, we get a sense of which practices he had in mind, and possibly what was commonly practiced around him.

Finally, let us consider Gregory's understanding of the Bible and exegetical method, as informed by this section of *De Pythonissa*. One central exegetical method exhibited by him is his use of Scripture to illuminate Scripture. We have already discussed how Gregory uses Luke 16:19-31 to inform his reading of 1 Samuel 28. He also cites Psalm 96:5, which in his Greek edition states that 'all the gods of the nations are demons', to prove that the 'gods' seen by the Medium were actually demons.[601] Gregory also refers to the account of Balaam (Numbers 22-24) to support his case that 'we find it the custom of Scripture in many places… to relate what seems to be instead of what is'.[602] Just as 1 Samuel 28 refers to 'Samuel' when it really means 'the one thought to be Samuel',[603] so Balaam refers to 'God' (Numbers 22:8) when Scripture is really referring to 'the one thought to be god by Balaam, not the one who truly is God'.[604] Thus, Gregory clarifies the difficulties of 1 Samuel 28 by using other passages of Scripture. Using 'clearer' passages of Scripture to explain 'obscurer' ones was a common early Christian exegetical principle, which, for Gregory, is rooted in his belief in the unity of Scripture, entirely inspired by God.[605]

Gregory's comments on Numbers 22–24 have further significance for understanding his exegesis. He argues here that Scripture does not always mean what it literally says, and so

---

[600] Gregory, *Pyth.*, 104.
[601] Ibid., 105; see Smelik (1979), p.168.
[602] Gregory, *Pyth.,* 106. Origen's views on true prophecy through the mouth of the ungodly are now discussed in chapter 6 of Hall (2021).
[603] Cf. Augustine, *Simpl.*, 2.3.2.
[604] Gregory, *Pyth.,* 106.
[605] Gregory, *Contra Eunomium III,* 5.8ff; see Ludlow (2002), pp.53, 60.

'Samuel' in 1 Samuel 28 and 'God' in Numbers 22:8 mean something other than what is named. Similarly, Gregory criticises 'slaves of the letter [οἱ δοῦλοι τοῦ γράμματος]', since such a reading would require that real 'gods' came up with Samuel.[606] Thus, Gregory indicates that he does not identify his own reading as being strictly literal. Although he is not truly figurative, his interpretation of 1 Samuel 28 adds significant detail, veering away from what the passage literally states by arguing that 'Samuel' was a demon in disguise. This is perhaps what one would expect from Gregory, who was influenced by Origen's exegetical method, and who placed great value on figurative readings of Scripture.[607] Thus, his criticism of overly literal interpretations, and his own reading, which pushes beyond what the words of 1 Samuel 28 explicitly say, is consistent with these wider exegetical tendencies. Having said this, somewhat ironically in the case of Gregory's reading of 1 Samuel 28, this actually puts him at odds with Origen's interpretation, who read 1 Samuel 28 'in accordance with the word [κατὰ τὸν λόγον]', affirming that Samuel truly appeared.[608] Gregory's reading is actually more akin to Eustathius' interpretation – a strange ally considering the Antiochene penchant for literal interpretation not shared by Gregory. Thus, we see unlikely authors coming together in agreement in their understanding of 1 Samuel 28, demonstrating that patristic exegesis does not always conform to expectations, and highlighting the danger of strictly compartmentalising the exegetical method of early Christian authors.

Gregory agrees with Eustathius and differs from Origen on an even more fundamental point concerning Scripture, namely the text of Scripture itself. Gregory cites 1 Samuel 28:19 as

---

[606] Gregory, *Pyth.,* 105.
[607] Gregory, *Hom. Cant.,* prologue; Heine (1984); McGuckin (2018), pp.23-4; see also Ludlow (2002), pp.53, 60. However, Ludlow also emphasises ways in which Gregory and Origen's hermeneutic differ, pp.53-5.
[608] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 2.3 [Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.35].

'Tomorrow you and Jonathan will be with me',[609] its apparent rendering in the Lucianic recension, a Greek version of the Bible commonly associated with Antioch. Eustathius quotes this verse similarly, as do others such as Diodore and Theodoret, by referencing 'Jonathan'.[610] Origen, however, cites this verse as 'Tomorrow both you and *your sons* shall be with me [italics added]', like the Masoretic Text.[611] While this nuance may not impact Gregory's argument, it is again interesting that Gregory follows Eustathius' version of Scripture instead of Origen's, who generally had a greater impact on Gregory's thought.

Having considered *De Pythonissa* in detail, it is worth briefly mentioning a passing reference Gregory makes to 1 Samuel 28 in a letter to another Eustathius,[612] *De Sancta Trinitate* ('On the Holy Trinity').[613] This reference is not discussed at length here since the allusion to 1 Samuel 28 is so fleeting, and because Gregory echoes arguments in *De Pythonissa*, already considered. In the section in hand, Gregory has been arguing that the term 'God' is appropriate for the Holy Spirit. To support this case, he employs an argument *a maiore ad minus*, since '[d]ivine Scripture does not refrain from using this homonym [ὁμωνυμίας], not even concerning matters that are absurd, when it names [κατονομάζῃ] idols with the appellation of "God" [τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ προσηγορίᾳ]'.[614] Thus, Gregory argues, if idols are referred to by Scripture as 'gods', then surely this name is appropriate also for the Holy Spirit. Gregory's argument here, that when Scripture says 'god' it does not always refer to one that is truly God, is one he makes in *De Pythonissa.* Similarly, Gregory supports this view

[609] Gregory, *Pyth.,* 105.
[610] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 12.10; 14.6; 15.5; Diodore, *Fragment*; Theodoret, *Quaest. in I Reg. 28* (PG80, 592).
[611] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 5.3-4.
[612] Eustathius was a Christian physician, see Radde-Gallwitz (2011), pp.89-90.
[613] This letter was once ascribed to Basil, but it has been shown to be Gregory of Nyssa's work, see Silvas (2007), pp.232-4.
[614] Gregory, *De Sancta Trinitate* (GNO 3.1, p.9).

by citing Psalm 96:5, 'all the gods of the nations are demons', as he does in *De Pythonissa*. He also offers two familiar examples, side by side, of instances where Scripture uses the term 'god' when something other than the true God is meant. The first is 1 Samuel 28:13: 'the belly-myther in her divinations [μαντείαις], conjuring [ψυχαγωγοῦσα] for Saul the souls requested, is said to have seen "gods"'.[615] Clearly Gregory is suggesting that the 'gods' the Medium saw were not truly 'gods', probably alluding to his belief, expressed in *De Pythonissa,* that these were demons, suggested also by his earlier citation of Psalm 96:5. Following this, Gregory cites another familiar example: 'Balaam… is stated by Scripture to have received counsel from God' (cf. Numbers 22:8), although he really received 'instruction from demons' .[616] As shown above, Balaam's example is used alongside 1 Samuel 28 to support this same basic point in *De Pythonissa*. Although Gregory's comments serve a different argument concerning the Holy Spirt, this section of *De Sancta Trinitate* is very similar to what we see in *De Pythonissa*.[617] Gregory seems to be recycling material here.[618] While we cannot glean anything new concerning how Gregory understood 1 Samuel 28 from *De Sancta Trinitate*, it reinforces what we have already established from *De Pythonissa*, in particular that the Medium did not really see 'gods' appear and that Scripture can mean something other than what it literally says.

[615] Ibid.
[616] Ibid., (GNO 3.1, pp.9-10).
[617] Silvas (2007), p.234; Greer (2007), p.lxxiii, n.73.
[618] Although it seems that *De Sancta Trinitate* borrows from Gregory's lengthier discussion in *De Pythonissa*, although unlikely, it could be the other way around. *De Pythonissa* has been tentatively dated to sometime after the Council of Constantinople in 381, see Maraval (2017), p.21, whereas some recent scholarship has placed *De Sancta Trinitate* prior to this Council, see Turcescu (2005), p.62; however, Silvas argues that *De Sancta Trinitate* should be dated after 381, see Silvas (2007), p.235.

Ambrosiaster

One of the great unanswered questions of the early Church is the true identity of 'Ambrosiaster'.[619] It has been established for some time that the *Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles* and *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti CXXVII* (and other minor works), were composed by the same pen, often misattributed in manuscripts to Augustine and Ambrose (from whom Ambrosiaster's pseudonym derives).[620] Evidence suggests that these texts were initially circulated anonymously, probably intentionally by their author,[621] leading to these false attributions and making establishing the author's name a near-impossible task, despite the best efforts of scholars.[622] Yet while his name will likely remain unknown, his identity is not a complete mystery. We can be fairly certain that he was active in Rome and was probably a Presbyter.[623] Evidence suggests that he flourished during the latter years of Damasus' papacy, and his works are generally dated to the 370s and 380s.[624] Ambrosiaster's *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti CXXVII* comprises a miscellany of questions and answers, with individual questions likely written and compiled at different times, occasionally adapted from other works, and even the complete form of which Ambrosiaster seemingly revised during his own lifetime.[625] Primarily, as David G. Hunter states, 'the questions concern difficulties in the interpretation of Scripture'.[626] Thus, in Question 27,

---

[619] Bussières (2007), pp.30ff; Hunter (2009), pp.6ff.

[620] The term Ambrosiaster has been claimed to be coined by Erasmus, but credit for it should be given to the Benedictines of St Maur, see Lunn-Rockliffe (2007), pp.11-12, 28-32.

[621] Lunn-Rockliffe (2007), pp.19-20, 25-9; Hunter (2009), pp.5-9; Hunter (2004), p.308.

[622] Hunter (2009), pp.6-7; Lunn-Rockliffe (2007), pp.33-5, 61-2, 84-5.

[623] Lunn-Rockliffe (2007), pp.49-50, 61-6, 85-6; Lunn-Rockliffe (2010), pp.21-2; Hunter (2009), pp.6-7, 15-16; Bruyn (2011), p.464.

[624] Chadwick (2001), p.379; Hunter (2009), pp.6-7; Lunn-Rockliffe (2007), pp.12-13.

[625] Hunter (2009), p.9; Bussières (2011), pp.54-5; Lunn-Rockliffe (2007), p.15; Lunn-Rockliffe (2010), pp.22-3; Lunn-Rockliffe (2011), pp.79-80. Ambrosiaster also seem to have revised his *Commentary on Romans* during his lifetime, see Bruyn (2011), p.465.

[626] Hunter (2004), p.308.

Ambrosiaster dedicates an entire section to the question 'did the Pythoness summon Samuel, and might he have been seen by her, and might he have spoken to Saul, which the narrative recounts in the book of Kingdoms [i.e. Samuel–Kings]?' (see Appendix K).

It is significant that Ambrosiaster asks this question in the first place. Some of Ambrosiaster's questions are probably based on real queries asked of him. [627] Therefore this question concerning 1 Samuel 28 was also possibly asked of him, suggesting wider interest in this passage's interpretation beyond Ambrosiaster's own. However, the *quaestio* genre had a long classical tradition, which early Christians adopted, and thus the question may merely be a trope, a creation of Ambrosiaster's own mind.[628] It is also possible that this question has been adapted from another of his works,[629] although this earlier discussion could also have been motivated by wider interest in 1 Samuel 28. As we shall see, Ambrosiaster's answer certainly seems to be aware of other readings of this passage, although we cannot infer precisely who Ambrosiaster has in mind.

Ambrosiaster's answer is substantial, entirely dedicated to proving that Samuel did *not* really appear in 1 Samuel 28. Rather, he suggests that a demon appeared in Samuel's guise. Consequently, we can glean much about Ambrosiaster's demonology from this section. The first thing to note is the particular emphasis he places on the Devil.[630] Satan, it seems, is primarily responsible for the events of 1 Samuel 28. While some authors tend to refer

[627] Lunn-Rockliffe (2007), pp.69-71.
[628] Ibid., pp.64-71.
[629] A homily or commentary, perhaps, see ibid., pp.71-4.
[630] Ambrosiaster speaks interchangeably of 'the Devil' and 'Satan' since, as he explains elsewhere, 'the Devil… is Satan', see *Quaestiones,* 84.3.

generally to 'demons' when discussing this passage,[631] Ambrosiaster focuses on their singular leader, elsewhere described as 'the chief of all error'[632] and 'the chief of the leaders in error'.[633] This reflects a broader trend in Ambrosaister's demonology, and the *Quaestiones* makes greater reference to the 'Devil' and 'Satan' than 'demons'.[634] Thus, Ambrosiaster's emphasis on the Devil in his reading of 1 Samuel 28 seems typical. He also offers insight into the Devil's nature. Two motivations seemingly inspire the Devil's actions in the events of 1 Samuel 28. Firstly, 'he endeavours for this, that he may be worshiped as though God'.[635] The Devil desires to steal God's rightful adoration, motivating him to take Samuel's appearance because this led to Saul prostrating before him under Samuel's guise. The real Samuel would not have allowed himself to be worshipped in this way. Secondly, the Devil is motivated by his deceptive nature, his desire to sow error, which explains his conjuring of this delusion. The language of trickery and deception is regularly used throughout Ambrosiaster's discussion of this episode.[636] For instance, he states that Satan 'adorned himself [*se subornauit*] in the appearance [*habitu*] and name [*nomine*] of a righteous man', and that this was 'a delusion [*praestigium*] of Satan'.[637] By this, Satan 'pretends to hold the good in his power' and shake the faith of God's worshippers.[638] The deceptive nature of demons is a belief regularly expressed by those arguing that a demon appeared rather than Samuel. However, Ambrosiaster also observes, somewhat ironically, concerning the prediction 'Tomorrow you will be with me' (1 Samuel 28:19), that '[i]t can be understood as the truth, if it were not mentioned concerning the name of Samuel [*si de Samuhelis nomine taceatur*],

[631] Cf. Tertullian, *An.*, 57.8-9; *Martyrium Pionii*, 14.7-13; Gregory, *Pyth.*, 103–105.
[632] Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones,* 98.1.
[633] Ibid., 111.13.
[634] My own estimations: see especially ibid., 2; 9; 31; 70; 90; 98; 111; 116; 118.
[635] Ibid., 27.3.
[636] Ambrosiaster affirms the Devil's deceptive nature elsewhere, see ibid., 84.3.
[637] Ibid., 27.1.
[638] Ibid.

since Saul was going to be with the Devil'.[639] Thus, in a sense, Satan was truthful, because Saul would be with him after death. This irony, that the demon in disguise spoke the truth, is observed also by Gregory of Nyssa, as noted above.[640]

Ambrosiaster also alludes to some of the Devil's special abilities, which aids these nefarious intentions. The most obvious of these is his ability to shapeshift and create illusions, which is how the Devil 'adorned himself in the appearance and name of a righteous man'.[641] Ambrosiaster supports this by citing 2 Corinthians 11:14, 'even Satan transforms himself in an angel of light'.[642] As already noted, this passage is commonly cited alongside 1 Samuel 28, particularly by those arguing a demonic illusion appeared, suggesting again that Ambrosiaster knew other discussions of it.[643]

Additionally, Ambrosiaster suggests that the Devil possesses keen perception. He states, concerning 'Samuel's prophecy', that 'this thing deceives some, that concerning the death of Saul and his sons, this might not have been counterfeited [*non sit mentitus*]'.[644] Evidently, Ambrosiaster knew that, for some, the fact that the prophecy came true suggested that Samuel truly appeared.[645] Some early Christian writers resolved this by stating that the demon merely recited what Samuel prophesied during his lifetime and what God had clearly ordained.[646] Ambrosiaster offers an alternative solution: 'certain signs tend to appear with

---

[639] Ibid., 27.4.
[640] Gregory, *Pyth.*, 105. We cannot date either reference to 1 Samuel 28 certainly enough to indicate who said this first, see Maraval (2017), p.2.
[641] Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones*, 27.1.
[642] Ibid.
[643] For example, see Tertullian, *An.*, 57.8; *Martyrium Pionii*, 14.10; Eustathius, *Engast.*, 4.9; Philastrius, *Diversarum Haereseon liber*, 26.6; Augustine, *Simpl.*, 2.3.2.
[644] Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones*, 27.2.
[645] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 5.3-4.
[646] Basil, *Comm. Isa.*, 8.218; Eustathius, *Engast.*, 12.1-9.

those who are about to die [*morituris*], indeed by which the protection of God having been removed is understood [*a quibus dei protectio amota uidetur*]. How much more the Devil, whom the prophetic oracles [*profetica oracula*] have testified was lofty with angelic majesty [*angelica maiestate sublimem*], concerning whose greatness the Apostle says, "or do you ignore the heights of Satan?"' (Revelation 2:24).[647] Thus, Ambrosiaster solves this exegetical problem by suggesting that Satan's accurate prediction that Saul and his sons would soon die was made by observation, keener than that of humans. He probably understood that these powers stemmed from the Devil's particular composition. In the above quotation he alludes to his belief, stated explicitly elsewhere in the *Quaestiones,* that the Devil was once a leader among angels, who fell in rebellion.[648] Probably due to this angelic status, Ambrosiaster states elsewhere in the *Quaestiones* that the Devil 'is neither corporeal nor mortal [*neque corporeus est neque mortalis*]'.[649] Applying this to Ambrosiaster's understanding of 1 Samuel 28, this incorporeality may allow Satan to shapeshift into Samuel, and his immortality may give him the experience to perceive that Saul would soon die.

Despite these abilities, Ambrosiaster does set limits to Satan's power, implying that the Devil's deceptions, although typical of his character, are partly the result of necessity. Ambrosiaster argues that a holy man such as Samuel could not have fallen under the sway of evil magical forces involuntarily, otherwise evil would be triumphant over good and 'righteousness has no right to vote [*nullum suffragium habet iustitia*]', that is to say, no

[647] Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones*, 27.2. This is similar to an argument found in Pseudo-Hippolytus, *In. Reges fragm*. Ambrosiaster's citation of Revelation 2:24 reflects the *Vetus Latina*.
[648] Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones*, 2. These beliefs have old roots, see Laato (2013), esp. 17ff; Pagels (1995), esp. pp.35ff; Wray and Mobley (2005).
[649] Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones*, 31.1.

power of choice.[650] Nor, Ambrosiaster reasons, would Samuel have appeared voluntarily before the unrighteous, 'for whoever departs from this world righteous remains righteous'.[651] Thus, Ambrosiaster establishes, because of Samuel's holiness, that there is no imaginable situation in which Samuel could have appeared. This argument, that Samuel would not have appeared either willingly or unwillingly, is remarkably similar to how Gregory of Nyssa framed this issue.[652] Therefore, according to Ambrosiaster, since Satan cannot truly summon Samuel, he resorted to feigning his appearance. In a similar vein, although Satan can make accurate predictions, Ambrosiaster suggests that this was accomplished by keen observation rather than true foreknowledge.[653] Perhaps Ambrosiaster's clearest indication of Satan's limitations is his closing remark: 'the Devil, concealed underneath his veil [*sub uelamine latens*], always betrays himself [*prodit se*] while he devises things which would horrify the people through whom he endeavours to deceive'.[654] As in the case of 1 Samuel 28, Ambrosiaster claims that the Devil always gives the game away by acting differently to the person he is imitating. Although his abilities are impressive, Satan's lies can be discovered.

Concerning how the Devil interacts with magic and its practitioners, Ambrosiaster offers little. He evidently connects them, since this passage about the Medium leads him to discuss the Devil's role in this event. He also clearly condemns magical practices, describing Saul as 'insane [*demens*]' for resorting to such means.[655] However, Ambrosiaster does not explain

[650] Ibid., 27.1. This is a similar notion to *Martyrium Pionii*, 14.5.
[651] Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones*, 27.1. The idea that Samuel remained holy after death perhaps has a parallel with those who describe Samuel's prophetic role continuing after death, see Sirach 46:20; Zeno of Verona, *Tractatus*, 1.2.4.8.
[652] Gregory, *Pyth.,* 102–103.
[653] Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones*, 27.2.
[654] Ibid., 27.4.
[655] Ibid., 27.2.

how the relationship between practitioner and the Devil works, and barely refers to the 'Pythoness'. In sum, Satan's role in the events of 1 Samuel 28 is emphasised by Ambrosiaster and the Medium's role is unclear.

The section also displays aspects of Ambrosiaster's eschatology. He clearly distinguishes between the destinations of Saul and Samuel after death, noting the 'great separation of sinners and the righteous'.[656] His view is informed by his reading of Luke 16:19-31, cited to prove that Samuel did not truly appear to Saul, since the figure 'lied about a man overwhelmed with sin soon being with the most righteous Samuel' (cf. 1 Samuel 28:19).[657] This was a commonly cited passage and argument by those who believed that 'Samuel' was a demonic illusion, including Gregory of Nyssa, suggesting Ambrosiaster engaged with wider discussions of this passage.[658] Thus, we see Ambrosiaster creating a clear dichotomy between the destinies of Samuel and Saul, between the righteous and unrighteous, in the afterlife.

However, other aspects of Ambrosiaster's eschatological vision are unclear. Greer argues that those who thought Samuel truly appeared tended to believe that all went to Hades, although in different conditions, and were under the control of demons until Christ's underworldly descent opened the way to Paradise.[659] Thus, righteous souls before Christ were unsafe, which explains the events of 1 Samuel 28. Conversely, regarding those who thought a demon appeared rather than Samuel, it has been suggested that they believed

[656] Ibid., 27.4
[657] Ibid.
[658] Gregory, *Pyth.*, 105; see also Tertullian, *An.*, 57.11; Eustathius, *Engast.*, 14.7-13.
[659] Greer (2007), pp.xxxvi-xxxvii

that souls, even after Christ, remain in an interim state, either in a place of repose or torment, until the resurrection.[660] In this view, the interim place of repose is secure, free from demonic influences, and so Samuel could not have been summoned. Applied to Ambrosiaster, this would suggest that the place 'with Abraham in comfort [*refrigerio*]' is a euphemism for the state of the righteous in this interim period before the final resurrection, and the 'fire of Gehenna [*ardore gehennae*]' the interim destination of the unrighteous.[661] However, it is unclear which eschatological vision best fits Ambrosiaster, and he could have understood Luke 16:19-31 as describing the state of things in Hades before Christ's descent there, as Origen did.[662] Certainly, Ambrosiaster elsewhere exhibits a belief in Christ's underworldly descent, which has meant that 'the way to Heaven has been given to souls [*animabus ad caelum data facultas*]',[663] seemingly contradicting the view of an 'interim state' until the resurrection that has been associated with his understanding of 1 Samuel 28. In short, Ambrosiaster's opinion that Satan appeared instead of Samuel does not automatically suggest a certain eschatological vision.

Ambrosiaster's discussion of 1 Samuel 28 also provides insight into his relationship with the Bible. For instance, his discussion of this passage sheds light on the biblical text he used. Ambrosiaster used the *Vetus Latina* and was critical of Jerome's efforts at revision.[664] It seems that his version of 1 Samuel 28:19 referred to the demise of Saul and his *sons*,[665] not Saul and *Jonathan*, as some editions read (such as the Lucianic recension).[666] This suggests

[660] Ibid.
[661] Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones*, 27.3.
[662] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 9.9-10.
[663] Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones,* 121.1.
[664] Bruyn (2011), pp.466-7; Chadwick (2001), p.380; Lunn-Rockliffe (2007), p.40; Hunter (2004), p.308.
[665] Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones*, 27.2.
[666] Considered in our discussion of Gregory of Nyssa, above.

that the Old Latin that Ambrosiaster used, at least for this verse, was more similar to the Masoretic Text and, ironically, Jerome's Vulgate.

More significant still is how this passage contributes to our understanding of Ambrosiaster's exegetical method. He has been described as a 'fairly literal-minded exegete',[667] who devoted little attention to allegory.[668] Consequently, one might expect him to read 1 Samuel 28 in a way which did not insert a demonic illusion which is not explicitly mentioned. Perhaps aware of this, Ambrosiaster insists that he is 'in accordance with the words of the narrative [*historiae*]',[669] and will not overlook 'the things which have been expressed by the words [*uerbis expressa sunt*]'.[670] In a sense, Ambrosiaster is true to his word. He is interested in the voice of 'the historian [*historicus*]' who records the events of 1 Samuel 28, i.e. the narrative voice. He differentiates between this voice and the opinions of those present at Endor, stating that 'the historian described the understanding of Saul and the appearance of Samuel, expressing the things which were said and seen, making no mention if they might have been true or false'.[671] Thus, Ambrosiaster distinguishes between the subjective and objective reality of 1 Samuel 28. In doing this, he pays close attention to the precise words of Scripture, seen clearest when discussing the semantics of 1 Samuel 28:14 that Saul 'understood that this one was Samuel'. Ambrosiaster infers from one word, 'understood [*intellexit*]', that this is all from Saul's perspective.[672] This is significant since Ambrosiaster establishes that Saul was 'insane' – his viewpoint is unreliable. This distinction between the

[667] Hunter (2009), p.19.
[668] Although he does make use of figurative exegesis in the form of typology, see Bussières (2011), pp.50-3.
[669] Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones*, 27.1.
[670] Ibid., 27.3.
[671] Ibid.
[672] Ibid.

opinion of the characters and the reality of events is reminiscent of Origen's discussion of 1 Samuel 28, who similarly distinguishes between the 'narrative persona [διηγηματικὸν πρόσωπον]', inspired by the Holy Spirit, and the viewpoint of others.[673] However, regarding 1 Samuel 28:14, Origen believes that Saul objectively knew that Samuel appeared.[674] Eustathius, opposing Origen, makes the same point as Ambrosiaster: 'the knowledge of the demon-possessed man happens to be worth as much as the proclamation of that woman also serving the words up to him' – Saul's opinion is unreliable.[675] Perhaps these similarities indicate that Ambrosiaster was, in some way, familiar with Origen and Eustathius' discussion of 1 Samuel 28. Regardless of this, Ambrosiaster's attention to the literal and historical here supports how his exegesis has generally been characterised.

It has also been observed by Marie-Pierre Bussières that, when exegeting, 'Ambrosiaster tends always to keep the broader context in mind, which as a result often leads him to explain a passage by making reference to another, or by drawing upon more quotations from the Scriptures'.[676] While using Scripture to explain Scripture is a common feature of early Christian exegesis, Ambrosiaster uses this method regularly. We certainly see this in his exegesis of 1 Samuel 28, where he cites many other passages of Scripture, such as 2 Corinthians 11:14, Revelation 2:24, and Luke 16:19-31, to support his interpretation.

Throughout our consideration of Ambrosiaster we have noted points of contact with other authors. Some of these are common features that emerge in many discussions of 1 Samuel

[673] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 4.2-7.
[674] Ibid., 4.7.
[675] Eustathius, *Engast.,* 7.3 [Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.79, revised]; see also 3.9–4.1; 7.1-8.
[676] Bussières (2011), p.51.

28, including in Gregory of Nyssa, such as Ambrosiaster's reference to Luke 16:19-31. However, Gregory and Ambrosiaster share two particular points not observed elsewhere in earlier discussions of 1 Samuel 28, namely that, in a manner, the demon spoke the truth; and that Samuel would not have appeared either willingly or unwillingly. These points are framed in a similar way, and yet these texts were written at a similar date but in entirely different milieux and languages, and so it seems unlikely that either of these authors directly knew the other's discussion of 1 Samuel 28. It appears that both are drawing from an earlier, 'common' source (or sources) no longer extant, although we need not assume direct knowledge of this shared source, whose ideas may have been transmitted to them through intermediaries. One candidate for an original proponent of these ideas is Hippolytus of Rome, whom we know discussed 1 Samuel 28, seemingly at length, but this exposition has not survived.[677] This important Greek writer, typically associated with Rome, may be the perfect bridge between Gregory's Greek milieu and Ambrosiaster's Latin context in Rome, even if this was through intermediaries.

Jerome

Jerome (*c*.347-420), doctor of the church, requires little introduction. His greatest achievements were perhaps in the realm of biblical scholarship, most notably his contributions to the Vulgate and his biblical commentaries, all of which were strongly shaped by his conviction concerning the *Hebraica Veritas*, his strong deference to the Hebrew.[678] Jerome makes a few passing references to 1 Samuel 28, across different works, which collectively clarify how he understood this passage.

[677] Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, 61.2
[678] Jay (2004), pp.1096-7, 1102; Williams (2006), pp.127-9; Kamesar (2013), pp.673-4.

Most of Jerome's allusions to 1 Samuel 28 emerge in his commentaries and supplement his exegesis of other passages. This application of 1 Samuel 28 exhibits the common exegetical method of using Scripture to explain Scripture, reflecting Jerome's belief in the unity of Scripture.[679] His earliest reference to 1 Samuel 28 comes in his *Commentary on Matthew*, written *c*.398.[680] Here, explaining Matthew 6:34, 'Do not be anxious about tomorrow', Jerome notes that '"Tomorrow" in the Scriptures is taken to mean a time to come'.[681] Among his scriptural examples to support his case, Jerome notes that 'in the phantom [*fantasmate*] of Samuel, the Pythoness says to Saul: "Tomorrow you will be with me"'. Although brief, Jerome seems to suggest that Samuel's appearance was illusory. This is partly indicated by the term *fantasmate* but is confirmed by Jerome's suggestion that the words 'Tomorrow you will be with me' were actually spoken by 'the Pythoness', not Samuel. Thus, 'Samuel's' words were fabricated by another in his image, although Jerome offers little detail concerning how this occurred.

Jerome's understanding of this passage is made progressively clearer in his later commentaries, his last major undertaking, on Isaiah (408-10), Ezekiel (410-14) and Jeremiah (which he began in 414 but died before completing).[682] In each of these he refers, briefly, to 1 Samuel 28. In his *Commentary on Isaiah*, referring to Isaiah 7:10-11 ('Seek a sign for yourself from the Lord your God in the depth of the underworld…'), he states that '[m]ost think that Saul received a "sign" from the earth and from the "depth of the underworld"

[679] Crawford (2013), pp.137-53; Jay (2004), p.1106.
[680] Jay (2004), p.1098; Kamesar (2013), p.658.
[681] Jerome, *Comm. Matt.*, 1.6.34.
[682] Kamesar (2013), pp.658-9.

when he appeared to have raised Samuel by means of the incantations and magic arts'.[683] Although subtle, the phrase 'appeared to have raised Samuel [*Samuhelem… uisus est suscitasse*]' may suggest that Jerome did not himself think that this was the case. Of greater note is Jerome's comment 'most think [*plerique putant*]*'*. It is unclear whether Jerome is arguing that a majority thought that the real Samuel appeared to Saul, or whether he is specifically arguing that most read this verse in Isaiah as applying to 1 Samuel 28 in this way. Either way, this comment suggests that, from Jerome's experience, 1 Samuel 28 was widely discussed and it was commonly understood that Samuel truly appeared at Endor. This is significant because it directly contradicts Smelik, who suggests that a reading that the real Samuel was raised by 'magic arts' was a minority view, incompatible with orthodox theology.[684] Jerome, whose early Christian library was extensive,[685] evidently did not agree! It is likely that this comment partly stems from Jerome's knowledge of Eusebius' *Commentary on Isaiah*, from which he certainly drew and who associated 1 Samuel 28 with these words in Isaiah.[686] It is quite probable that Origen, whose commentary on Isaiah has not survived, but which influenced Eusebius's commentary,[687] also made a similar reference. Certainly, Jerome was very familiar with Origen's oeuvre, and likely knew of his understanding of 1 Samuel 28. Perhaps, then, Jerome's reference here to this passage exemplifies the derivative nature of his biblical exegesis, particularly from Origen and his followers, observed by scholars.[688] For although Jerome distanced himself from Origen,

---

[683] Jerome, *Comm. Isa.*, 3.13.7.10-11 [ACW 68, p.167].
[684] Smelik (1979), pp.171, 177. Patricia Cox Miller makes a similar point, see Miller (1984), pp.139-40.
[685] Williams (2006), pp.147-60.
[686] Eusebius, *Comm. Isa.*, 7.10-13; see also Jay (2004), p.1112; Armstrong (2013), pp.xxvi-xxvii; Hollerich (2013), pp.8-9, 17-18, 54-7; Wallace-Hadrill (1960), pp.59-60.
[687] Jay (2004), p.1112; Williams (2006), pp.121-2, 151-2.
[688] For Origen's, and his followers', influence on Jerome, see Jay (2004), pp.1095-6; Rebenich (2002), pp.26-7, 42-4, 54-5; Kamesar (2013), pp.656, 670-1; Daley (1991), p.101; Williams (2006), pp.45ff.

particularly later in life (when he wrote this commentary), and even disagrees with how the likes of Origen and Eusebius read 1 Samuel 28, he still discusses Isaiah (and 1 Samuel 28 alongside it) with such interpretations in mind. This simultaneous dependence on and dismissal of Origen is characteristic of Jerome's thought.

In his next commentary, on Ezekiel, Jerome's reference to 1 Samuel 28 occurs as he explains Ezekiel 13:17-18, 'And you, son of man, set your face against the daughters of your people who prophesy out of their own heart…'[689] Prompted by these verses' focus on females, Jerome considers specifically woman who have come under the influence of evil spirits (although he acknowledges that men are also guilty of this). Here he considers how Jews understood these verses in Ezekiel, stating, 'The Hebrews, however, say that these women were instructed in the wicked arts [*maleficis artibus*] through necromancy and a pythian spirit [*per necromantias et pythicum spiritum*], as it was for the one who appeared to have raised the soul of Samuel.'[690] In similar terms to his prior citation of 1 Samuel 28, his comment that the Medium 'appeared to have raised the soul of Samuel [*visa est suscitasse animam Samuelis*]' may allude to 'Samuel's' delusive nature. We also get a sense in this section of how Jerome views magical practitioners. He is clear that practitioners, such as the Medium of Endor, act wickedly and are inspired by demonic spirits – Jerome's condemnation of their actions and character is strong. He both affirms the demonic nature of magical practices, but also focuses on the agency of the practitioners themselves. We also observe in these comments a notable characteristic of Jerome's exegesis and his work more generally, namely his appeal to Jewish knowledge. Although he may be partly emulating Origen's

[689] Jerome, *Comm. Ezek.*, 4.13.17-23 [ACW 71, pp.132-3, revised].
[690] Ibid. [ACW 71, p.134, revised].

interest in Jewish learning, Jerome himself was in contact with Jews.[691] Thus, it is quite possible that he was genuinely familiar with what 'the Hebrews say' concerning Ezekiel 13:17-18. Scholars have noted that a typical feature of Jerome's exegesis, particularly in his commentaries on the prophets, is his deference to Jewish learning, a point supported by Jerome's allusion to 1 Samuel 28 here.[692]

Jerome's most illuminating allusion to 1 Samuel 28 comes in his final commentary, on Jeremiah, as he seeks to explain Jeremiah 11:11-12, particularly the words, 'they will even cry out to me [the Lord], and I will not listen to them', explaining that Saul suffered this fate (see Appendix L). Some of what is said here affirms what has already been gleaned elsewhere, namely that the Medium's superstition used demons, and that such practices are evil pursuits which should be avoided. Although Jerome does not explicitly state whether Samuel's appearance was illusory or not, this section adds other important detail. Unlike his other references to 1 Samuel 28, this section focuses on Saul, emphasising his culpability and the reprehensibility of his actions. Tied to this, Jerome also provides here a clear moral and practical application for this passage: even if God is not listening to us, seeking him through illicit means is never acceptable; instead, we must persist in prayer until he relents.

Although his own allusions to 1 Samuel 28 are significant, perhaps Jerome's greatest contribution to the history of early Christian interpretation of this passage are his references to other works which discussed it but are now missing. In *De Viris Illustribus*, Jerome refers

[691] Williams (2006), pp.74-5; Rebenich (2002), pp.15, 55-6; Kamesar (2013), pp.657-8.
[692] Williams (2006), p.97; Rebenich (2002), pp.55-6; Kamesar (2013), pp.673-4.

to a work by Hippolytus of Rome, '*De Saul et Pytonissa*',[693] and to one by Methodius of Olympus ('*contra Origenem'*), '*De Pytonissa*',[694] neither of which are extant. These probably lengthy works, dedicated entirely to 1 Samuel 28, were seemingly well-known and likely influential on other interpretations of this passage, and are a major loss for this study's purposes. Through Jerome's record-keeping, we are reminded that there were likely many such discussions of 1 Samuel 28 during the period, written or orally delivered, which are completely lost to us. In a sense, we can only ever write a portion of this passage's history.

Conclusion

As was the case in the last chapter, it is perhaps striking that there is no obvious rationale for why the authors we have considered came to the view that 'Samuel' was a demon in disguise. While there are common threads in their interpretations, such as the citation of Luke 16:19-31, we have seen a mixture of periods, languages, locations, and circles represented. However, perhaps further light on this issue will emerge as our investigation continues. In chapters 2 and 3, we have considered the earliest extant proponents of these respective views (Justin Martyr, for the opinion that Samuel truly appeared, and Tertullian in this chapter, who thought this was a demonic delusion), as well as numerous other interpretations which followed these. However, we have yet to consider the most important and lengthiest surviving discussions of 1 Samuel 28 from this period, the subject of the next chapter.

[693] Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, 61.2.
[694] Ibid., 83.1.

Chapter 4 – The Great Debate

With such room for disagreement over how to read 1 Samuel 28, not only in the clear dichotomy of interpretation regarding whether Samuel was truly raised or not, but also on other aspects of this difficult, ambiguous passage, it is unsurprising that early Christian writers came into direct conflict with one another over its interpretation. We have already noted occasions when early Christian discussions of 1 Samuel 28 allude to opposing interpretations.[695] This chapter will focus on this conflict in greater detail by examining an example of direct disagreement on how to read this passage, namely the great debate between Origen of Alexandria and Eustathius of Antioch.

Origen and Eustathius

While many aspects of the history of the interpretation of 1 Samuel 28 have been relatively unexplored, this cannot be said of Origen's *Homily on 1 Samuel 28* and Eustathius' response, *De engastrimytho contra Origenem* ('On the Belly-Myther, against Origen'). There have been a few works that have considered these texts in detail,[696] as well as many passing references.[697] This attention is primarily due to the light these texts may shed on the issue of 'Alexandrian' and 'Antiochene' theological and exegetical conflict. The prospect of analysing any 'Antiochene' directly debating with any 'Alexandrian' would suffice to draw the attention of many scholars. However, when the subjects in question are Origen of Alexandria and Eustathius of Antioch, both considered founding, influential figures for their respective

[695] Apollinaris of Laodicea, *Fragment*; Diodore of Tarsus, *Fragment*; Gregory of Nyssa, *Pyth.*, 101–102; Ambrosiaster, Quaestiones, 27.
[696] Miller (1984); Trigg (1995); Mitchell (2006); Mitchell (2007a); Greer (2007).
[697] Young (1989), pp.193-5; Young (1997), pp.163ff; Connor (2000), pp.75-101; Behr (2011), pp.38-40; Cartwright (2015), pp.53-7; Edwards (2002), pp.88-9, 151; Wallace-Hadrill (1982), pp.31-2.

schools, the prospect alone excites, particularly since Eustathius' treatise is the only complete extant work by this elusive figure.

As these texts have already been explored in some detail, we are unlikely to tread much new ground here. Nevertheless, as the lengthiest and most important texts from our period that refer to 1 Samuel 28, Origen and Eustathius demand considerable attention. Nor have we been able to escape them thus far. We have already alluded many times to Origen and Eustathius' views and the points of contact with the interpretations of others. However, we will discuss them here in detail for the very reason that has brought them so much scholarly attention: their conflict.

Origen of Alexandria

Origen, in extant works alone, made multiple references to 1 Samuel 28. In his *Commentary on John*, he makes two passing allusions. In book 20, responding to the Pharisees who claimed that 'Abraham died, and so did the prophets' (John 8:52), Origen states that they are in a sense correct, and that they would be correct in understanding 'that Samuel also, when because of death he was under the earth, was brought up by the belly-myther, who thought the gods were somewhere below the earth and said "I saw gods ascending from the earth" (1 Samuel 28:13)'.[698] Yet, Origen simultaneously states that the Pharisees had not understood that Abraham and the Prophets were also alive, in respect to spiritual, eternal life. This brief allusion suggests three things about Origen's understanding of 1 Samuel 28. Firstly, although Samuel was physically dead, he was also somehow spiritually alive.

[698] *Comm. Jo.*, 20.42.393; see also Trigg (1995), p.225.

Secondly, it seems the Medium is responsible for raising Samuel, since he was 'brought up [ἀνήγετο] by the belly-myther'. Finally, Origen explains the exegetical difficulty of the Medium seeing 'gods ascending from the earth' by ascribing to her the belief that gods dwelled under the earth, suggesting her observation is caused by pagan error. While some interpreters of 1 Samuel 28 imply that the Medium was Jewish,[699] Origen is here akin to Pseudo-Philo, who was clear that she was a gentile.[700]

A second allusion to 1 Samuel 28 comes later in the *Commentary on John*, as Origen considers how the despicable high priest Caiaphas was able to prophesy (John 11:49-53).[701] To explain this, he cites examples in Scripture, particularly Saul and others in 1 Samuel, who prophesy despite being sinners. Alongside these, Origen states, 'Nor [ought one] omit to mention the things concerning the belly-myther and Samuel in these passages, from which Saul learned that he would be destroyed together with his sons on the next day.'[702] Since Origen is, by his own admission, unclear whether Caiaphas' prophecy was from the Holy Spirit,[703] his comments concerning 1 Samuel 28 are consequently unclear, particularly since, unlike the other examples he mentions, Samuel was himself a true prophet. However the burden of Origen's point seems to be that, although by unvirtuous means, Samuel's prophecy was still a true one, although Origen is unclear whether this was by the 'Holy Spirit' or 'another power [ἄλλης δυνάμεως]'.[704] This section also suggests that Origen prefers the

[699] Cf. Josephus, *AJ*, 6.14.3.338–6.14.4.342; see Brown (1992), pp.201-5.
[700] Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 64.3; see 18.13; 34; 61.1; see also Brown (1992), pp.184-5.
[701] *Comm. Jo.*, 28.13.98ff.
[702] Ibid., 28.17.148; see also Trigg (1995), p.225.
[703] *Comm. Jo.*, 28.22.191; Greer (2007), pp.liii-lv. For a detailed consideration of prophecy in Origen's thought, including the 'problem' of Caiaphas, see Hall (2021), esp. pp.133-5.
[704] *Comm. Jo.*, 28.17.146.

reading 'you and your sons', rather than 'you and Jonathan' for 1 Samuel 28:19, a common variance among early Christian biblical texts.[705]

Origen also alluded to 1 Samuel 28 in another gospel commentary, namely his *Commentary on Matthew*, as he explains the parable of the vineyard workers (Matthew 20:1-16). He argues that the 'vineyard' in the passage included workers who are 'outside of the vineyard', referring to being outside of their body. Yet despite being 'outside' the vineyard, they are still at work, 'For the souls of the workers invited into the region of the landowner, which have been released [ἀπαλλαγεῖσαι] from the body, are not in idleness. Samuel, indeed, worked outside the body by prophesying… [καὶ Σαμουὴλ γοῦν ἔξω σώματος εἰργάσατο προφητεύων]'.[706] Here Origen makes a similar point to what we observe in Sirach and later in Zeno of Verona and Augustine: that Samuel continued his prophetic role after death.[707] These words also suggest that his appearance in 1 Samuel 28 was, in some way, without the body, although this is not to say that Origen suggests that Samuel's soul appeared entirely incorporeally.[708] Later in this section, Origen also suggests something of the nature of where Samuel was residing: 'when someone perceives the place where Samuel was spending his time [τὸν τόπον ἔνθα διέτριβε Σαμουὴλ] and subsequently contemplates the workers who were called before the eleventh hour, he will see in what manner the earlier ones bore the burden and burning heat of the day [ὄψεται, τίνα τρόπον ἐβάστασαν τὸ βάρος καὶ τὸν

[705] The Lucianic recension seems to have preferred 'you and Jonathan', whereas Origen cites a Greek version akin to the Masoretic Text.
[706] Origen, *Comm. Matt.*, 15.35 [Heine (2018), p.226, revised]; see also Trigg (1995), p.225.
[707] Sirach 46:20; Zeno, *Tractatus*, 1.2.4.8; Augustine, *cura mort.*, 15.18.
[708] Cf. Origen, *Princ.*, 1.6.4; see Edwards (1992), pp.25, 31ff.

καύσωνα τῆς ἡμέρας οἱ πρότεροι]'.[709] Although Origen does not elaborate, it seems that he is referring to Samuel's dwelling in Hades, a place of struggle and heat for him.

Origen also refers to 1 Samuel 28 in a *Homily on Jeremiah*. Seeking to explain Jeremiah 18:2, 'Get up and go down to the house of the potter and there you will hear my words', Origen understands this as a command to 'go down' and make sense of things that are 'below'.[710] As an example of this, he states: 'and perhaps because of this, Samuel at that time was taught about the underworld [τὰ καταχθόνια] when he descended below [καταβέβηκε κάτω] and was in Hades, not so that he might be judged in Hades, but so that he might be an examiner [κατάσκοπος] and contemplator [θεωρητὴς] of the mysteries of the underworld [τῶν μυστηρίων τῶν καταχθονίων]'.[711] Origen's suggestion here is that Samuel's descent to Hades was didactic, for his spiritual growth, and not due to a sentence placed upon him, perhaps suggesting that it was Samuel's choice to descend.

While the focus of this chapter is conflict *between* authors over their reading of 1 Samuel 28, it is also worth noting possible conflict *within* authors. For while most of what Origen says in these allusions agree with his *Homily on 1 Samuel 28*, some aspects differ. In his *Commentary on John*, Origen explains that the Medium refers to 'gods' ascending due to her misguided religious beliefs, but in the *Homily on 1 Samuel 28* he explains this by suggesting that angelic beings or other holy people came up with Samuel.[712] Later in the *Commentary on John*, if Origen is suggesting an inferior, evil spirit played a role in Samuel's prophecy,

[709] *Comm. Matt.*, 15.35 [Heine (2018), p.227, revised].
[710] *Hom. Jer.*, 18.2.
[711] Ibid., 18.2; see also Trigg (1995), p.225.
[712] *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 7.1-3; cf. *Comm. Jo.*, 20.42.393.

then this might contradict his comments in the *Homily on 1 Samuel 28*, where he is emphatically clear that that a demon could not make such a prophecy.[713] In the *Commentary on Matthew*, Origen implies that Samuel's experience in Hades was somehow tortuous. Yet how can this be reconciled with Origen's expressed belief, found in the homily, that the righteous were in 'Abraham's bosom' prior to Christ's descent to Hades?[714] Finally, Origen's explanation in his *Homily on Jeremiah*, that Samuel descended to Hades for pedagogical reasons, differs from that given in the *Homily on 1 Samuel 28*, that Samuel descended as a prophet to prepare the way for Christ's descent to Hades.[715]

While these citations may differ somewhat to what we see elsewhere, particularly in the *Homily on 1 Samuel 28*, there is another possible allusion to 1 Samuel 28 by Origen, not yet mentioned, which stands completely at odds with all his other interpretations. In a fragment ascribed to Origen, it states in its entirety that

> The Belly-Myther did not draw up Samuel, for that is impossible. Nor, having come up, did he speak the truth. Now investigate who this is and through what power he came up [τίς δὲ οὗτος καὶ διὰ ποίας δυνάμεως ἀνέβη, ζήτει].[716]

Without further context, it is difficult to ascertain the precise meaning and significance of this fragment. It clearly suggests that the Medium was not responsible for bringing up Samuel. This is immediately at odds with allusions considered above, such as the *Commentary on John,* which suggests the Medium was responsible.[717] Yet this fragment goes further, implying that Samuel did not come up at all, by stating that it was 'impossible

[713] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 5.4; cf. *Comm. Jo.*, 28.17.148.
[714] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 9.8-9; cf. *Comm. Matt.*, 15.35.
[715] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 6.3ff; cf. *Hom. Jer.*, 18.2.
[716] Origen, *Fragment on 1 Samuel 28*.
[717] Origen, *Comm. Jo.*, 20.42.393. This may also be Origen's suggestion in *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 2.5, although this is ambiguous – see later discussion.

[ἀμήχανον]' for the Medium to bring up Samuel and that this 'Samuel' spoke untruthfully, and by posing, rather ominously, the question of who appeared and by what means. Perhaps this alludes to a demon appearing rather than Samuel. Certainly, other scholars have understood this fragment along these lines.[718] This is completely at odds with what Origen says both in the allusions already considered and in the *Homily on 1 Samuel 28*, which clearly imply that the real Samuel appeared and prophesied. How, then, can we resolve this blatant disagreement? Some have suggested that this fragment may reflect a later change in Origen's understanding, that he eventually believed the real Samuel did not appear.[719] If this suggestion is correct, then Origen – like Augustine – changed his understanding of this passage during his lifetime. However, since some of these texts (like *Homily on Jeremiah 18*, *Commentary on John,* and *Commentary on Matthew*) are thought to span the last 20 years of Origen's career, it seems more likely that this fragment, which we cannot date, was composed prior to these other references to 1 Samuel 28, if authentically by Origen.[720] If Origen indeed changed his view, it may have been the other way. However, if Origen's understanding of this passage changed, this was not highly publicised, since neither Eustathius nor any other writer of this period mention it, a point which could certainly have been used against Origen. As Smelik suggests, it is possible that this fragment is spurious, as there is little evidence to support its attribution to Origen.[721] If these words do represent Origen's genuine oeuvre, he may have been misquoted or misunderstood. Perhaps he was citing opponents, imaginary or otherwise, as he does in the *Homily on 1 Samuel 28*; his own

[718] Smelik (1979), p.171, n.45.
[719] Ibid.
[720] Trigg (1995), p.225.
[721] Smelik (1979), p.171.

words, but the views of others.[722] Similarly, Joseph Trigg suggests this may have been a hypothetical possibility presented by Origen, perhaps even one he opposed, and thus this fragment misrepresents him.[723]

Whether we accept this fragment as authentic or not, the point remains that we see differing, even conflicting, readings of 1 Samuel 28 by Origen in these various citations. In a sense, this is typical of him. Scholars have labelled him a 'speculative' theologian, as opposed to 'systematic', for his willingness to suggest controversial and contradictory possibilities, perhaps exacerbated by the voluminousness of his writing.[724] In pursuit of the truth, he made suggestions for the purpose of discussion which he may not himself have truly agreed with, a method dubbed by Henri Crouzel as 'théologie en recherche'.[725] Thus, to speak of Origen as being occasionally in conflict with his own interpretation is unsurprising. However, this raises the question as to what extent we should treat the *Homily on 1 Samuel 28* as a priority for our analyses and as best representing Origen's understanding of 1 Samuel 28, as this chapter intends. While accessing Origen's 'true' beliefs can be an arduous task, it seems reasonable to treat this homily as the closest we can come to a comprehensive, accurate account of Origen's view of this passage. It is by far his longest and most detailed discussion of 1 Samuel 28, suggesting a higher degree of consideration and interest in accuracy on his part, when compared with passing allusions. While Origen's homilies were often delivered *ex tempore*,[726] it seems that, of all his references to 1 Samuel 28, this is the furthest developed

[722] For instance, Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 3.1ff, contains many such 'quotations' by opponents of views Origen himself does not hold. This would not be the only time Origen was attributed with the views of his opponents, based on what he had formulated in order to refute, see Edwards (1992), pp.29-30.
[723] Trigg (1995), p.225.
[724] Ibid., p.236; Daley (1991), pp.47-8.
[725] Crouzel (1985), p.267.
[726] Castagno (1998), p.69; cf. Origen, *Hom. Lev.*, 8.5.

and most incisive. Further, as a homily, probably delivered to a range of listeners, including the 'simpliciores', it seems reasonable that Origen would have adhered to his more concrete, certain thoughts on this passage, as opposed to more complex, speculative musings reserved for the initiated. At the very least, this homily warrants the most attention because, in posterity, it came to represent Origen's views of 1 Samuel 28 for other early Christian writers, including opponents considered below, and for later scholars. With these reasons in mind, let us to turn to Origen's *Homily on 1 Samuel 28*, and the conflict it exhibits and inspired.

Homily on 1 Samuel 28[727]

Addressing his audience, Origen opens this homily by referring to the four passages of 1 Samuel that had been read (comprising 1 Samuel 25–28), the last of which he describes as 'the famous narrative [ἡ ἱστορία ἡ διαβόητος] concerning the belly-myther and concerning Samuel'.[728] On this occasion, Origen is speaking as a guest at the church in Jerusalem, possibly 240-242, invited to preach by Alexander of Jerusalem.[729] Since, according to Origen, each passage could occupy a service or more, he asks the presiding bishop to choose which passage he should preach on.[730] Inevitably, Alexander chose for Origen 'the matters concerning the belly-myther'.[731] Although subtle, this opening immediately suggests something of the wider discussion that surrounded 1 Samuel 28. By describing this narrative as 'famous [διαβόητος]', Origen indicates that it was already well-known, even well-discussed, by his own day. Wider intrigue is further suggested by the fact that Alexander,

[727] All translations of the homily are taken or revised from Greer and Mitchell (2007).
[728] *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 1.2.
[729] Nautin and Nautin (1986), pp.57-65; Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.33, n.2; Trigg (1995), p.224.
[730] *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 1.1-3.
[731] Ibid., 1.3.

although limited in choice, chose this passage for Origen, probably due to the passage's controversial content-matter and the dispute surrounding it. The prospect of hearing Origen wading into this thorny debate must have been too tempting to resist.

Throughout the sermon, this sense of controversy surrounding 1 Samuel 28 pervades. Early on, although clear about his belief that Samuel was truly raised, Origen acknowledges that this is a complicated, disputed passage, stating: 'Are [these things] true, or are they not true? To say they are not true promotes unbelief, and it will come down on the heads of those who say it, but to say they are true presents to us an inquiry and a difficulty.'[732] However, Origen follows this by claiming that those arguing that a demon appeared rather than Samuel 'have opposed [ἀντιβλέψαντας] Scripture'.[733] The dispute is set out clearly, and the homily opens in polemical terms.

This polemical tone is central to the sermon, with Origen regularly referring to different opinions. Broadly speaking, the work can be divided into two parts, responding to two main objections by Origen's opponents.[734] The first part constitutes a defence against those who argue that the account is false, that Samuel was not raised, and the witnesses (particularly the Medium) are untrustworthy. They suggest that 'the belly-myther… is lying. Samuel was not brought up [ἀνήχθη]; Samuel does not speak',[735] and a demon appeared. In response, by a close literal reading of the passage, paying considerable attention to the inspired 'narrative voice', Origen argues that Scripture is clear that Samuel himself appeared. The homily's

[732] Ibid., 2.5.
[733] Ibid., 3.1.
[734] Greer notes these two objections, see Greer (2007), p.xlix.
[735] *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 3.1. This is not too dissimilar to the fragment attributed to Origen cited above, further supporting the case that this fragment cites a position with which Origen actually disagreed.

second half responds to another objection, namely how can the prophet Samuel be in Hades?[736] Origen shows that, like Christ, Samuel descended to Hades for good reasons. Let us consider each part in turn.

Part 1: The 'narrative sense'

Origen focuses here on the exegesis of 1 Samuel 28 and how it should be read. He begins by establishing that he will consider this passage according to the 'narrative sense [τῆς ἱστορίας]', not the 'elevated sense [τῆς ἀναγωγῆς]',[737] and that 'the truth is necessary [ἀναγκαία] in accordance with the word [κατὰ τὸν λόγον]'.[738] We shall consider why Origen, the 'Alexandrian allegorist', reads 1 Samuel 28 in such a way later. In contrast to his approach, Origen mentions those who say 'I do not believe the belly-myther. The belly-myther says she has seen Samuel. She is lying. Samuel was not brought up; Samuel does not speak. Rather, just as there are some false prophets who say "thus says the Lord" – and the Lord has not spoken – so also this demon lies when it promises to bring up the one commanded [προστασσόμενον] by Saul.'[739] Origen describes these as '[t]hose who assert this narrative is not true', who question how Samuel could be in Hades and raised by a Medium.[740] The issue at hand, then, is the veracity of the passage and the witnesses present. For Origen, Scripture indicates that 'the one who has been brought up is really Samuel', and to argue otherwise is to 'say things contrary to what is written [τοῖς γεγραμμένοις]'.[741]

[736] Ibid., 6.3ff.
[737] Ibid., 2.1.
[738] Ibid., 2.3.
[739] Ibid., 3.1.
[740] Ibid.; see also 3.2-5.
[741] Ibid., 4.1.

Paying attention to the details of 1 Samuel 28, Origen proceeds to investigate the precise words of Scripture.

Of great interest to Origen is establishing the identity of the 'narrative persona', the third-person narrator of the passage (see Appendix M.1). Appealing to writing conventions, he argues that the third-person narrator is the authorial voice. Since the author of these words is the Holy Spirit, the narrative voice must be accurate, even inerrant. From this we can glean a few wider points. Firstly, it affirms Origen's belief in the divinely inspired status of Scripture, and that 1 Samuel should be considered among this inspired corpus.[742] He also suggests how Scripture is inspired: although humans write the words, 'the author is the Holy Spirit [συγγραφεὺς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον] who sets the humans in motion [κινῆσαν]'. The verb 'κινῆσαν', which can also mean 'move' or 'stir up', carries a sense of forceful movement by the Holy Spirit. While humans may hold the pen, the divine guides the hand. The significance of this for Origen's reading of 1 Samuel 28 becomes apparent when the narrative voice says, 'the woman saw Samuel'. Since this is the narrative voice speaking, it is the infallible Holy Spirit itself that says that the Medium saw Samuel. Interestingly, while Origen clearly suggests here the divinely-inspired nature of the third-person narrative voice, this raises questions about the status of the subjective voice. How, if at all, are the reported words of the Medium inspired? Origen does not answer this.

However, he continues by considering such reported words. The Medium says, 'I saw gods coming up from the earth', and that '[a]n older man is coming up, and he is wrapped in a

[742] Cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, 6.25; see also Paget (2013), pp.553-4; Martens (2012a), pp.194-5, 224. We considered Scripture's divine inspiration in chapter 1.

double cloak (an ephod)' (1 Samuel 28:13-14). Origen remarks that 'she says she has even seen the priestly vestment [τὸ ἱμάτιον τὸ ἱερατικόν]', details confirming that she has indeed seen Samuel.[743] Origen claims to know how his opponents would respond, stating that they cite 2 Corinthians 11:14-15: 'No wonder. For even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light. So it is no great thing, if his ministers also disguise themselves as ministers of righteousness.'[744] These words suggest that wicked forces can pose as the righteous, and applied to 1 Samuel 28 support the case that 'Samuel' was actually a demon in disguise. As we have seen, Origen is correct: these verses were commonly cited by proponents of this interpretation.[745] This suggests several things. Firstly, Origen's opponents and their views are real – not just strawmen. Although nameless, Origen is evidently engaging with actual exegetes and their thoughts. Thus, this passage is indicative of a wider discussion of 1 Samuel 28, particularly of proponents of the view that Samuel was a demon, prior to Origen. Tertullian cites this passage to argue that a demon appeared rather than Samuel, and so perhaps Origen knew of this earlier exposition.[746] However, it is more likely that Origen is referring to works no longer extant,[747] thereby hinting at a greater discussion, now lost. Since many surviving works, mostly composed after Origen, cite 2 Corinthians 11:14-15, this reference shows that there were long-lasting 'common traditions' of interpreting 1 Samuel 28. Through these identifiable, shared features, our extant materials can at least somewhat reflect these missing, earlier interpretations.

---

[743] *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 4.5.

[744] Ibid., 4.6.

[745] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.8; *Martyrium Pionii*, 14.10; Eustathius, *Engast.,* 4.9-10.

[746] For instance, see Tertullian, *An.*, 57.8.

[747] There seems to have been some contact between Origen and Hippolytus of Rome during their lifetime, and so perhaps Origen was responding to his missing work '*De Saul et Pytonissa*' which probably preceded Origen's discussion, see Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus,* 61.2. However, Origen may well be referring to nonextant interpretations of which there is no record.

In response to those who cite 2 Corinthians 11:14-15, Origen returns to the 'narrative persona'. According to this voice, the woman truly saw Samuel. If this were not the case, he retorts, Scripture would have clarified this, and should have read: 'The woman saw a demon that was pretending [προσεποιεῖτο] to be Samuel', or likewise 'it is written, "Saul knew that it was Samuel." If it were not Samuel, it should have been written, "And Saul believed [ἐνόμιζεν] that it was Samuel."'[748] Thus, Origen argues, Scripture would have been clearer if Samuel had not truly appeared. Rather, the narrative voice indicates otherwise: 'Scripture, which it is necessary to believe, says… "Samuel said"' (1 Samuel 28:15),[749] and 'Again Scripture said nothing other than it was Samuel himself who said, "Why have you asked me?..."' (1 Samuel 28:16).[750]

Two main points emerge from Origen's investigation of this passage thus far. Firstly, the reliable, authoritative voice of the third-person 'narrative persona' representing the Holy Spirit states matter-of-factly that Samuel appeared and spoke during the events of 1 Samuel 28. The second point, building upon this, is that Scripture would have used different, clearer language, were this not the case and a demon appeared rather than Samuel.

Origen continues his investigation by considering Samuel's prophecy. Referring to 1 Samuel 28:17-18, he argues: 'A demon cannot know about the kingdom that has been appointed to David.'[751] He seems to believe such a prophecy is beyond the abilities of demons. Rather,

[748] *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 4.7.
[749] Ibid., 4.8.
[750] Ibid., 4.9.
[751] Ibid., 5.1.

Origen suggests these words are true, emanating from God.[752] After all, Samuel said similar things when alive (1 Samuel 15:16-23),[753] the implication being that these words in 1 Samuel 28 belong to the same person. Origen cites other details of Samuel's prophecy, such as 'Can a demon know this of a king that has been appointed with prophetic anointing [χρίσματος προφητικοῦ] (cf. 1 Samuel 10:1), that tomorrow Saul was destined to depart life, and his sons with him?' (1 Samuel 28:19).[754] Again, for Origen, this knowledge is beyond a demon's ability. Incidentally, this last citation suggests something of the text of Scripture Origen uses. As we have noted, the Lucianic recension differs on 1 Samuel 28:19, saying 'you and your son Jonathan', but Origen, who probably had multiple versions of this passage at his disposal for study,[755] favours a Greek reading closer to the Masoretic Text.[756]

Through his close reading of 1 Samuel 28, focusing on its precise wording, Origen concludes, 'May these things demonstrate that the things that have been written are not false [ψευδῆ] and that the one who has come up is Samuel.'[757] For Origen, the account of 1 Samuel 28 is clear and true. As we shall see, his reading of this passage would later face fierce criticism, particularly from Eustathius. However, it is worth reemphasising, despite claims by Smelik and Miller that this reading by Origen was unusual for the time, many other early Christian commentators came to a similar conclusion.[758]

---

[752] Ibid., 4.10.
[753] Ibid., 5.2.
[754] Ibid., 5.4.
[755] See Dorival (2013), pp.608ff; Law (2008), pp.1-21; Martens (2012a), pp.45-9.
[756] That Origen and the MT render this verse similarly is unsurprising, since there is evidence that Origen's own recension moved its Greek closer to the MT, see Salvesen (2003), pp.240ff.
[757] *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 6.1.
[758] Smelik (1979), pp.177-8; Miller (1984), pp.139-40. Justin Martyr, Apollinaris, and eventually Augustine, are but some of the important writers discussed in this thesis who held a similar view to Origen.

Part 2: Samuel in Hades

Origen admits that questions remain concerning this passage, which his opposition have tried to avoid answering by denying Samuel appeared: 'What, then, is the belly-myther doing here? What is the belly-myther doing regarding the bringing up of the righteous man's soul?'[759] To answer this, in this second main section of the homily, Origen returns to a particular question raised by his 'opponents', namely how Samuel could be in Hades. Origen considers at length why Samuel was in Hades, against those who deny this, and the eschatological significance of this literal reading for his listeners. His main arguments for why Samuel was, indeed, in Hades are as follows:

1. *Christ descended to Hades*

To those who ask incredulously, 'Samuel in Hades?', Origen would reply, 'Who is greater, Samuel or Jesus the Christ?'[760] The answer is clear: Christ. To prove that Samuel was in Hades, Origen argues *a maiore ad minus* that if Christ, being so great, descended to Hades, then why not Samuel. This, his first and main argument, runs throughout this second section.

Origen first proves that Scripture teaches that Christ went down to Hades, claiming that Psalm 15, a reading affirmed later by the Apostles, teaches this clearly (cf. Ps. 15:10; Acts 2:27, 31).[761] It seems Origen does not expect his opponents to object to this and swiftly moves on to those who agree that 'Christ has descended to Hades [εἰς ᾅδου καταβέβηκεν]'.[762] Certainly, this was a commonly held view – his later opponent, Eustathius

[759] *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 6.1.
[760] Ibid., 6.3.
[761] Ibid., 6.3-6.
[762] Ibid., 6.6.

of Antioch, did not disagree with him on this point.[763] For those who accept this teaching, Origen explains, 'He has descended to those regions not as a slave of those there, but as a master to overcome…'[764] At this point he cites Psalm 22, which he understands as referring to Christ's struggle in Hades.[765] Justin Martyr similarly links Psalm 22 to Christ and 1 Samuel 28 and, as Origen will soon do, suggests the lot of the dead improved after Christ, although Justin does not directly refer to Christ's descent to Hades. This particularly close point of similarity may suggest that Origen was familiar with Justin's reference to 1 Samuel 28, who also believed that Samuel really appeared.[766]

Origen clearly expresses Christ's purpose in Hades: 'the Saviour has descended to save [ὁ σωτὴρ κατελήλυθεν σώσων]'.[767] How Christ effects this is considered below. However, by demonstrating that Christ descended to Hades, Origen opens the possibility that the same is true for Samuel. If the holier one went to Hades, so too could the less holy.

2. *Other prophets descended to Hades*

Similarly, Origen argues that, since other prophets descended to Hades to prepare the way for Christ, so too did Samuel.[768] He asks, 'Why are you afraid to say that every place has need of Jesus Christ? A place needing Christ has need of the prophets.'[769] If Christ descends to Hades, so must his prophets. Origen specifies that this was Moses' role there.[770] This was

[763] Eustathius, *Engast.,* 18.1-2; 20.5.
[764] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 6.6.
[765] Ibid., 6.6-7.
[766] Justin Martyr, *Dial.,* 105.1-5. There is little concrete evidence that Origen knew Justin, but he certainly knew Tatian, Justin's pupil, see Origen, *De oratione*, 24.5; Secord (2021), pp.116-17.
[767] *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 6.7.
[768] Ibid., 6.7ff.
[769] Ibid., 7.4.
[770] Ibid., 6.8-9.

also true for John the Baptist, of whom Origen says 'there was nobody greater among those born of women… do not be afraid to say that he has descended to Hades, proclaiming my Lord in advance, so as to foretell that he will come down [ἵνα προείπῃ αὐτὸν κατελευσόμενον]'.[771] That Origen mentions John the Baptist in this context makes sense for, as we shall see, he casts Samuel in a similar prophetic role. Samuel prepares the way for Christ's descent to Hades, just as John had done in life for Christ's earthly ministry (and, Origen adds, as John continued to do in Hades). In a lengthy aside (which he denies was a digression),[772] Origen explains why John asks, 'Are you the one who is coming, or should we expect another?' (Matthew 11:3) despite knowing Jesus was the Christ.[773] Origen concludes that John asks this because 'he was doubtful and perhaps disbelieving how such a glorious one will go down both as far as Hades [μέχρις ᾅδου] (Ps 15:10) and as far as the abyss [μέχρι τῆς ἀβύσσου] (Rom 10:7)'.[774]

Significantly, that other prophets were in Hades also solves an exegetical difficulty for Origen, for this might explain the Medium's words, 'I saw gods coming up from the earth' (1 Samuel 28:13). Origen suggests that 'perhaps, holy souls of other prophets have come up together [συναναβεβήκασιν] with Samuel',[775] and so the Medium saw these other prophets who were with him in Hades. Origen also offers an additional solution, that angels possibly appeared with Samuel: 'Perhaps you will inquire if angels were in their spirits [ἦσαν ἐπὶ τῶν πνευμάτων αὐτῶν] (the prophet says, "The angel speaking in me" [Zech 1:9]), or if angels

[771] Ibid., 7.4; see Sheerin (1976).
[772] *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 8.1.
[773] Ibid., 7.5-11.
[774] Ibid., 7.11.
[775] Ibid., 7.2.

came up together with the spirits [μετὰ τῶν πνευμάτων συναναβεβηκότες]'.[776] There is some unclarity in the manuscript tradition in this part,[777] but Origen certainly seems to suggest that angels may have been a component of the cohort that the Medium saw, and even seems to refer in passing to his belief that angels are assigned to each person's soul.[778] This suggestion that other holy figures (whether humans or angels) came up with Samuel occur in other discussions of this passage, particularly in Jewish sources (as we considered in chapter 1). For Origen's first idea, early Rabbinic writers suggest that other righteous people emerged with Samuel.[779] For Origen's second notion, Pseudo-Philo similarly suggests that angels appeared with Samuel, another point of contact between Origen's interpretation of 1 Samuel 28 and this author.[780] We know that Origen was in contact with Jews and was more familiar than most with Jewish thought.[781] Although Diodore would later suggest a similar idea, possibly himself betraying a knowledge of Jewish interpretations of 1 Samuel 28,[782] due to *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*'s early date of composition, this may be a distinctly Jewish understanding of this passage which Origen reintroduces in a Christian context. At the very least, it suggests some interaction between Jewish and Christians readings of this passage, proving again that these groups did not interpret the Bible entirely independently from one another, and further evidence for the 'powerful intertextuality between the two exegetical traditions' which Philip Alexander describes.[783] Of course, this exegetical difficulty which Origen faces is partly caused by this passage's translation, since *elohim* can be understood as

[776] Ibid., 7.3.
[777] Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.49, n.29.
[778] This view is expressed more clearly elsewhere, see Origen, *Hom. Luk.*, 12.4; 35.3; *Comm. Matt.*, 13.5; 13.26-28; *Princ.,* 1.8.1; 2.10.7; 3.2.4; *Cels.,* 5.4; 8.27; 8.36; see also Daniélou (1955), pp.238ff; Trigg (1991), pp.46ff.
[779] *Leviticus Rabbah*, 26.7.2; *Tanhuma Buber*, Leviticus 8.4; *Pirke De Rabbi Eliezar*, 33.
[780] Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 64.6.
[781] For Origen's contact with Judaism, see Blowers (1988); Dorival (2013), pp.605-8; Law (2008), pp.15-16; Lange (1976).
[782] Diodore, *Fragment*. Diodore is the only other Christian I am aware of who mentions this.
[783] Alexander (2009), p.1.

singular, suggesting Origen's dependence on the Greek, despite his familiarity with the Hebrew text.[784]

In summary, Origen has established that 'if all Christ's prophets, as forerunners of Christ, have descended to Hades before Christ, so also Samuel has descended there'.[785]

3. *Samuel descends with a purpose*

Building upon these arguments, Origen offers three reasons why Samuel descended to Hades, motives which confirm that Samuel did indeed descend there.

The first was to prepare the way for Christ. As Origen says, 'Jesus was in Hades, and the prophets before him, and they proclaimed in advance Christ's coming.'[786] Thus, Origen envisions a role for Samuel in preparing a way for Christ's descent to Hades to captive sinners. In a sense, these prophets, whom Origen argues prophesied about Christ before his incarnation, continue their earthly duties in Hades. Samuel and the other prophets play a role reminiscent of John the Baptist's earthly ministry, whom Origen includes among these prophets, preparing the way in Hades for the greater one to come. Therefore, Samuel and the prophets are 'forerunners [πρόδρομοι] of Christ'.[787] As an aside, we might note that Origen's comments here support Jean Daniélou's assertion of the important place of the 'Forerunner' in Origen's thought.[788]

---

[784] The Hebrew and its Greek transcription comprised the first two columns of Hexapla, see Dorival (2013), pp.608-11.
[785] *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 8.1.
[786] Ibid., 6.10.
[787] Ibid., 8.1.
[788] Daniélou (1955), p.246ff.

In a similar vein, Origen argues that Samuel descended to Hades because he remained a prophet, even after death. He did not descend to Hades 'in an ordinary way, but as a holy man'.[789] Samuel kept his holy status, even in Hades, for 'wherever a holy person might be, he is holy'.[790] Just as when Christ descended to Hades, he was still Christ, Origen reasons the same is true for Christ's prophets. For, 'Christ was Christ even when he was below [Χριστὸς Χριστὸς ἦν καὶ κάτω ὤν]… and while being in the place below, he was above in purpose [προαιρέσει]. So also, the prophets and Samuel… can be in the place below, but are not below in purpose [προαιρέσει].'[791] Regarding Samuel's prophetic abilities, Origen states explicitly that 'Samuel did not throw away the prophetic gift [τὴν χάριν τὴν προφητικὴν]'.[792] This is similar to how Samuel is presented in Sirach, and later in Zeno of Verona and Augustine; as a prophet continuing his role although dead.[793]

The third reason that Samuel descended to Hades was to go where he was needed. To illustrate this, Origen uses the repeated imagery of a physician tending to the sick: 'why is it absurd [ἄτοπόν] that physicians [ἰατροὺς] should descend to the sick [τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας]? Why is it absurd that the chief of physicians, too should descend to the sick',[794] building upon Jesus' words, 'Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick' (Matthew 9:12). Thus, it makes sense that Christ and the prophets would descend to where they are needed most, to Hades. Returning to a point made earlier, while he doubts that

[789] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 8.1.
[790] Ibid., 8.1.
[791] Ibid., 8.2-3.
[792] Ibid., 9.2; see also 9.5-6.
[793] Sirach 46:20; Zeno, *Tractatus,* 1.2.4.8; Augustine, *cura mort.,* 15.18; *Dulc. qu.*, 6.5.
[794] *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 6.9.

demons can prophesy,[795] Origen has no problem accepting that physicians (i.e. Christ and the prophets) must attend to the sick: 'Let physicians go to places of suffering soldiers [καμνόντων στρατιωτῶν], and let them enter wherever the stenches [δυσωδίαι] of their wounds [τραυμάτων] are. The physician's kind-heartedness produces this [τοῦτο ὑποβάλλει ἡ ἰατρικὴ φιλανθρωπία].'[796] Origen's imagery here is evocative and vivid. Physicians go where the sickness is greatest; to wars and infected wounds. In fact, this is almost a requirement for a good physician, as Christ and the prophets must for the sickness of sin. Origen later asks, if Samuel persists as a prophet after death, 'Does he prophesy to heaven? To whom? To the angels, who have no need of it?'[797] Heaven does not need Samuel. However, 'the person who has died [ὁ κοιμώμενος]… had need of the prophets so that again the prophets might preach [κηρύξωσιν] to him the coming of Christ [τὴν Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημίαν].'[798] In other words, in Hades, Samuel was where he was needed.

4. *Christ had not yet opened the way to Paradise*

The final reason that Origen gives for Samuel being in Hades is his most important and leads to the homily's climactic ending: 'above all, before the coming of my Lord Jesus Christ… it was impossible to pass by the things that were appointed [τὰ τεταγμένα] to guard the way to the tree of life…', referring to the Cherubim and flaming sword mentioned in Genesis 3:24 (see Appendix M.2). Origen suggests that the route to Paradise was obstructed until Christ came, 'thus Samuel was not able to pass through the flaming sword, nor Abraham'. Samuel was in Hades because the way to Paradise was closed to him. To prove that even Abraham

[795] Ibid., 8.3.
[796] Ibid., 8.4-5.
[797] Ibid., 9.5.
[798] Ibid., 9.6.

was in Hades, Origen cites a passage familiar to this study, Luke 16:19-31, explaining that the rich man in torment can see Abraham because they are both in Hades, although Origen admits he is far away, probably alluding to a difference in their state. Most early Christians who cite Luke 16:19-31 alongside 1 Samuel 28 use this passage, particularly its mention of the 'uncrossable chasm', to support their case that a demonic illusion appeared.[799] However, Origen uses it to support the opposite view.[800] Perhaps, as in the case of 2 Corinthians 11:14-15, Origen knew the Scriptures his opponents used, intentionally arguing his case from the same evidence. Certainly, as a regular companion text to 1 Samuel 28, Origen's use of Luke 16:19-31 suggests he was aware of broader discussions around this passage and common traditions of its interpretation. Origen concludes by stating, 'the patriarchs, the prophets and everyone used to wait [περιέμενον] for the coming of my Lord Jesus Christ so that he might open the way': before Christ descended to Hades, all waited in Hades, including Samuel.

'Something more'

While this concludes Origen's explanation for Samuel's presence in Hades, the homily does not end there (see Appendix M.3). Developing this last point, Origen concludes with a message of eschatological hope for his congregation: 'we, the ones who have come to the completion of the ages [συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων] (Hebrews 9:26), we have something more... If we depart from this place, having been virtuous and good, not being loaded with the burdens of sin… we shall not descend to the place where those who died used to wait [περιέμενον] for Christ before his arrival.' Unlike Samuel, the way to the tree of life has since

[799] Tertullian, *An.,* 57.11; *Martyrium Pionii*, 14.7; Eustathius, *Engast.,* 14:7-13; Gregory, *Pyth.*, 102–103.
[800] While Zeno of Verona and Augustine cite 1 Samuel 28 and Luke 16:19-31 side-by-side, unlike Origen (and the authors who propose Samuel was a demon) they do not use one passage to inform their understanding of the other, see Zeno, *Tractatus,* 1.2.4.8-10; Augustine, *cura mort.,* 15.18.

been opened. The Christian faith promises better, and Origen's audience can look forward to Paradise. This promise of 'something more [περισσὸν… τι]' is reminiscent of the way Justin Martyr considers 1 Samuel 28. Both Origen and Justin argue that Samuel's appearance is tied to the fact that this event occurred before Christ,[801] implying the superiority of Christianity over Judaism. This counters Michael G. Azar's claim that such linear supersessionism, 'especially one that regards the older things as spiritually inferior to the newer, does not apply easily to Origen'.[802] This point of contact with Justin suggests again that Origen may have been familiar with his reading of 1 Samuel 28.

Origen's closing words connect 1 Samuel 28 with the parable of the vineyard workers, as in his *Commentary on Matthew*: 'listen to the parable, he gave the denarius "beginning with the last", but the first supposed that they "will receive" something "more" (Matthew 20:8-10). Therefore, you who have come last, you are the first to receive your wages from the master in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom is the glory and power forever and ever. Amen.' While Samuel and the patriarchs may have started their work earlier, Christians receive their reward first and immediately.

Reflections

Regarding how Origen understood the events of 1 Samuel 28, although he asks, 'What, then, is the belly-myther doing here?...',[803] he does not clearly answer this question. At times he seems to suggest that the Medium was responsible for raising Samuel. For instance, Origen

[801] Justin Martyr*, Dial.,* 105.3-5. Apollinaris would eventually make this same point, see Apollinaris, *Fragment*.
[802] Azar (2016), p.171. Although he qualifies Origen's supersessionism, Azar does not completely deny its presence in Origen's thought, pp.157-72.
[803] *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 6.1.

asks 'if such a great man were beneath the earth and the belly-myther brought him up, does a demon have authority over a prophetic soul [ψυχῆς προφητικῆς]?', before implying the answer is in the affirmative but that this requires further investigation.[804] However, Origen also talks of how 'the belly-myther *seems* [ἔδοξεν] to have brought up [ἀνενηνοχέναι] Samuel [italics added]', possibly implying that she did not actually do this.[805] Elsewhere he suggests that prophesying about the kingdom of God is beyond the capabilities of demons,[806] an unusual argument if he supposed that demonic forces had power over life and death, especially over God's prophet. Although demonology is not discussed in detail in the homily (perhaps further suggesting demonic absence in the events of 1 Samuel 28), from what Origen presents, demons have clear limitations. This is consistent with what Origen states elsewhere in his corpus, that demons can only act by divine permission.[807] Furthermore, as Origen describes Samuel's continued prophetic role after death, one suspects that he thought Samuel appeared by his own will, or the will of God. Certainly, this is Trigg's understanding of the homily, who states, 'Samuel, then, was not under the control of a petty demon; he did appear to Saul, but he did so not under compulsion.'[808] This might explain why Origen does not present the relationship between the Medium and the demon in clear terms. He speaks of the woman and the demon interchangeably, without defining their precise roles.[809] Consequently, although Origen clearly closely associates magical practitioners with demons, we are left unclear as to how this relationship works. Perhaps Origen did not dwell on this because he believed neither were truly responsible for raising

[804] Ibid., 2.5.
[805] Ibid., 1.2.
[806] Ibid., 4.9; 5.1-4; 8.3.
[807] *Cels.,* 8.31-32.
[808] Trigg (1995), p.228.
[809] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, *passim.*

Samuel. Nevertheless, Origen does not set out clearly in this homily how Samuel was raised.[810]

Regarding Origen's eschatology, particularly his understanding of the afterlife, the homily offers more detail. Christ's descent to Hades is central to Origen's understanding of 1 Samuel 28. Although Christ's precise actions in Hades are unspecified, his role is evidently soteriological: 'the Saviour has descended to save'; and the result clear – Christ has opened the way to Paradise for those who had been in Hades and those yet to die.[811] For Origen, Christ has gone down as the chief physician to heal the sick,[812] and to conquer death.[813] This triumphant, salvific presentation of Christ's descent to Hades is akin to what we see in Apollinaris' fragment on 1 Samuel 28, which similarly argues that Samuel appeared because this event preceded Christ's descent to Hades, but that Christ's victory over death means Christians need not face the same fate.[814] In terms of the afterlife itself, prior to Christ's descent, Origen explains that all ('the patriarchs, the prophets and everyone')[815] went to Hades, waiting for Christ, with the prophets preparing the way for Christ's coming. Thus, Hades pre-Christ is an intermediary space, for both the righteous and unrighteous. However, Origen's proof that all went to Hades before Christ, the story of the rich man and Lazarus, simultaneously suggests that there were different experiences there, a common dual conception we have seen already proposed by Tertullian, although Origen does not specify how this dichotomy works.[816] However, unlike Tertullian, Origen is clear that Hades is not

[810] Elsewhere, Origen perhaps implies the Medium was responsible, although this might merely reflect the brevity of his comment there, see *Comm. Jo.*, 20.42.393.
[811] *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 6.7.
[812] Ibid., 6.9-10.
[813] Ibid., 6.6.
[814] Apollinaris, *Fragment*.
[815] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 9.10.
[816] Origen, *Princ.*, 4.3.10; cf. Tertullian, *An.*, 55ff; see also Daley (1991), p.55.

the destiny of the Christian. He does not mention in the homily what happens to those who cannot enter Paradise after Christ's descent to Hades, although he does briefly discuss Paradise itself.[817] Origen's use of Eden imagery suggests Paradise shares Eden's prelapsarian characteristics.[818] Like Eden, it is typified, according to Origen, as the place of God's presence, 'where God the gardener is', as well as the place 'where the blessed and elect and the holy ones of God are', [819] and by deliberate omission, where wickedness is not, being unable to pass the flaming sword guarding the tree of life.[820] Elsewhere, Origen associates these same key characteristics (the all-consuming presence of God, a place for the good, and the absence of evil) with Paradise, when 'the end has been restored to the beginning [*finis ad principium reparatus*]'.[821] In the homily, we seem to see an expression of Origen's oft-quoted maxim, 'for the end is always similar to the beginning [*Semper enim similis est finis initiis*]'.[822] Consequently, the homily offers a broad outline of Origen's concept of the afterlife: both righteous and unrighteous once remained in Hades, but Christ's descent there now means that the righteous after death have the immediate, realised promise of Paradise.[823]

[817] What happens to Hades after Christ is generally unclear in Origen's thought, see Daley (1991), p.55.
[818] Origen's comments on 'Eden' are fragmentary, see Heine (2005), pp.138-9. There has been some debate as to whether Origen conceived Eden as 'an actual, perceptible place here on earth', see Martens (2012b), esp. p.536; Martens denies this. For Mark Edwards' response, affirming that Eden for Origen was a place on earth, see Edwards (2019), esp. pp.166-8; see also Martens (2019); Edwards (2021a), pp.13ff. Interestingly, Eustathius mentions Origen's understanding of Eden in passing, and possibly quotes from Origen's lost *Commentary on Genesis*, see Eustathius, *Engast.*, 21.2-3; see also Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.127, n.69. According to Eustathius, Origen has relegated the garden to the realm of 'myth', suggesting it was not a real place on earth.
[819] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 9.11.
[820] Ibid., 9.7ff.
[821] *Princ.*, 3.6.3.
[822] Cf. ibid., 1.6.2.
[823] See Hill (2001), pp.188-9.

But how can what Origen outlines here be reconciled with his teaching regarding *apokatastasis*?[824] Origen's use of the term 'Paradise';[825] his use of Eden imagery implying restoration (in God's presence);[826] and even his reference to Christians having 'come to the completion of the ages [συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων]' (Hebrews 9:26),[827] suggests a finality to the immediate rest Christians experience at death. Yet, how does this fit alongside the climactic end which he describes, where God shall be 'all in all'?[828] It is possible that Origen, for the purposes of this homily, is exaggerating the promise of immediate glory that his congregation will experience at death. However, we may be able to reconcile Origen's comments here with his thoughts elsewhere. In *De principiis*, Origen states that 'the saints who depart from this life will remain in some place situated upon the earth [*permanebunt in loco aliquo in terra posito*], which the divine Scripture calls Paradise [*paradisum*], as if in some place of learning and, so to speak, an auditorium or school for souls… [*uelut in quodam eruditionis loco et, ut ita dixerim, auditorio uel schola animarum]*'.[829] Described as 'Paradise', the purpose of this 'school for souls' is for souls to progress through stages in their contemplation of God and draw nearer to him.[830] Origen, seemingly, describes this same process later in *De principiis*, but as one of gradual purification into the condition where 'God shall be all in all' (cf. 1 Corinthians 15:28).[831] Thus, the homily seems to refer to the beginning of this lengthy, but certain, process that souls face after death. As Brian E. Daley

[824] For more on Origen and *apokatastasis*, see Crouzel (1989), pp.257ff; Ramelli (2013c), pp.1ff.
[825] A term usually associated with 'the condition of the rational beings both before their fall and after they have fulfilled their destiny in the *apokatastasis*', see Greer (2007), p.lii; cf. Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 9.11.
[826] Ibid., 9.11.
[827] Ibid., 10.1.
[828] *Princ.*, 3.6.1ff.
[829] Ibid., 2.11.6 [Behr (2019), p.143, revised].
[830] Ibid., 2.11.6-7.
[831] Ibid., 3.6.6.

states, 'the process of eschatological fulfillment has already begun, but is by no means complete'.[832]

It is important to consider what place the body and the resurrection may play in this process.[833] For while Origen maintains that '[a]ll souls… according to their proper nature are incorporeal [*omnes animae… secundum propriam naturam incorporeae sunt*]',[834] he is also clear that God alone is truly incorporeal and that all other beings must possess some form of body.[835] Furthermore, since Origen's 'school for souls' is said to be a place on earth,[836] Mark Edwards argues convincingly that these souls 'must be part of an entity which is capable of occupying space'.[837] Origen also seems to refer to the soul and the body *together*, 'this entire bodily substance of ours [*omnem hanc nostram substantiam corporalem*]', undergoing the gradual process of purification before eventually acquiring a spiritual body.[838] The death of the earthly body, it seems, is an important aspect of this process. In *Contra Celsum,* citing 1 Corinthians 15:35-54, Origen describes the process in which, by death, 'what is sown a natural body, is raised a spiritual one'.[839] These points appear to support Edwards' case that, when Origen refers to two resurrections, he does not mean to imply different occasions, but that the first resurrection refers to the immediate process of perfection for the righteous at death, in a suitable body, and the second to the later

[832] Daley (1991), p.49.
[833] Greer considers this issue in relation to 1 Samuel 28; see Greer (2007), pp.lvff.
[834] *Princ.*, 1.7.1 [Behr (2019), p.61, revised].
[835] Ibid., 1.6.4; 2.2.2; 4.3.15; *Cels.*, 7.32; see also Crouzel (1989), pp.240-1; Edwards (1992), pp.33-5; Ramelli (2018b).
[836] Origen, *Princ.*, 2.11.6.
[837] Edwards (2002), p.110. This is supported by Origen's comments in *Cels.*, 7.32; see also Edwards (1995); Edwards (2021).
[838] Origen, *Princ.*, 3.6.6 [Behr (2019), p.227]; see also Edwards (2002), p.109.
[839] *Cels.*, 5.22-23.

restoration of the wicked.[840] If this is the case, then although the process of purification is extended, there is but one resurrection for the righteous, and so Origen can rightly say in the homily that his congregation can immediately enter Paradise.

Although the passage presents the opportunity, Origen does not use 1 Samuel 28 to consider eschatological points relating to anthropology directly. He does not discuss openly the nature of the body, soul or spirit in the afterlife, nor suggest much regarding the nature of Samuel's appearance. Although Origen primarily refers to the 'souls [ψυχαί]' of the dead in Hades,[841] he tells us little else about them,[842] and while some of these comments suggest that Samuel was a soul also, it is striking that the clearest references to Samuel being a soul come in the form of two ambiguous questions[843] and one supposed reference in a corrupt part of the text.[844] However, in line with our discussion above, and since, as we shall consider below, Origen elsewhere refers to the physical descriptors of 1 Samuel 28 to prove that souls occupy some form of body after death, it would seem that Edwards is correct in suggesting that the term 'souls' in the homily 'includes the body, since no immaterial being could be fixed in an abode beneath the ground'.[845]

Much writing has been dedicated to Origen as 'biblical scholar', particularly his exegetical method.[846] Let us return to the question posed earlier: why does Origen interpret this

[840] Edwards (1995). For the alternate view, see Hill (2001), pp.182-4.
[841] The only reference to the 'spirits [πνεύματα]' of the dead is in Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 7.3, where he speaks of angels coming up with the spirits of the prophets. If there is any reason for this, it might be because Origen would only want to associate angels with a person's highest faculty.
[842] Ibid., 6.6; 7.2; 8.3; 9.6.
[843] Ibid., 2.5; 6.1.
[844] Ibid., 7.1; see Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.49, n.28.
[845] Edwards (1995), p.512; see also Crouzel (1989), p.241; Greer (2007), pp.lvff.
[846] For instance, see Torjesen (1986); Lauro (2005); Martens (2012a).

passage in such a literal way, considering his supposed penchant for figurative interpretation? We must first reaffirm the literal, narrative-focused character of Origen's exegesis of 1 Samuel 28. This appears to be the case, with Origen's expressed intention to read the passage 'in accordance with the word [κατὰ τὸν λόγον]'. However, Patricia Cox Miller argues that the homily is fundamentally typological, claiming that Samuel's descent and ascent from Hades is a type of Christ's descent and ascent there.[847] While there is indeed a parallel, it could be argued that the link is too direct, linear, and interdependent to be considered typological. Samuel is not truly a 'type' of Christ: Origen connects Samuel to Christ because he literally precedes Christ to Hades, preparing the way for him. Simply, Origen presents Samuel and Christ's descent and ascent from Hades together, as part of the same narrative sequence. Origen's second supposed use of typology is more speculative again, by Miller's own admission (she describes this as 'implicit').[848] Miller argues that the Medium in the homily serves as a type for Christ – the Medium, who 'defeats' the death of Samuel by raising up his soul, points forward to how Origen presents Christ in the homily's conclusion, defeating death and bringing up souls to Paradise. This is how Miller makes sense of Origen's unanswered questions: 'What, then, is the belly-myther doing here? What is the belly-myther doing regarding the bringing up of the righteous man's soul?' [849] Her place is to serve as typology. If Miller is correct here, then this certainly would constitute typology proper. However, if this was Origen's intention, he does not make the connection between the Medium and Christ overtly. Further, such a comparison between Christ and a magical practitioner, even if figurative, seems crude, and particularly unbecoming of one

[847] Miller (1984), pp.142-3.
[848] Ibid., pp.143-5. Mitchell makes a similar case, see Mitchell (2007a), pp.cii-ciii.
[849] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 6.1

who so vigorously defended Christ against the accusation of being a magician.[850] It is more likely that Origen's questions simply refer to the role of the Medium in the actual occurrence of events. Even if we accept Miller's suggestion, and that this formed a part of Origen's elevated reading, one can hardly claim that this speculation of typology is central to Origen's exegesis here. His only direct reference to any form of typology is his passing comment that Joshua was a type of Jesus.[851] While there may be typological allusions, it is really Origen's literal, narrative-focused reading which lies at the heart of the homily's exegesis of 1 Samuel 28.

Having confirmed that Origen primarily focuses on the literal sense of 1 Samuel 28, we can now ask why. We have already considered, in chapter 1, the reductionist nature of describing Origen and his fellow Alexandrians as 'allegorists', diametrically opposed to Antiochenes, like Eustathius, who were 'literalists'.[852] Origen viewed literal, historical readings as worthwhile, with the power to edify, and that such a reading of a passage should usually be maintained.[853] In *De principiis*, Origen states that 'there are by far more passages which are true according to the narrative than of those woven with a purely spiritual meaning [πολλῷ γὰρ πλείονά ἐστι τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀληθευόμενα τῶν προσυφανθέντων γυμνῶν πνευματικῶν]'.[854] Evidently, for Origen, 1 Samuel 28 is one of these majority passages. However, it is worth noting that, although he considers the passage according to the letter here, Origen does not deny that 1 Samuel 28 has a spiritual, figurative reading. In

[850] Origen, *Cels.,* 1.6; 1.38; 1.68 and *passim*.
[851] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 9.8; cf. *Hom. Josh.*, 1.
[852] See also Trigg (1995), pp.232-5; Young (1997), pp.164, 182-3; Young (1989), pp.193-5; Mitchell (2006), pp.356-7; Bostock (1987), pp.43-5.
[853] *Princ.*, 4.2.6; 4.3.4.
[854] Ibid., 4.3.4 (Greek) [Behr (2019), p.268, revised].

De principiis, he suggests that there is always a spiritual interpretation for each passage, although a literal one may not always be present.[855] In the homily, while Origen mentions that some passages cannot be understood literally, such as the stories of Lot and his daughters (Genesis 19:30-38) and Tamar and Judah (Genesis 30:1-30), he does not state likewise, although its narrative reading holds, that 1 Samuel 28 cannot be read spiritually.[856] In fact, when he says to his audience that 'we have not yet arrived at the benefits of the "elevated sense" [τῆς ἀναγωγῆς]',[857] and that he will read the passage 'in accordance with the word' because it 'touches all people',[858] he seems to suggest that there is another, spiritual reading of 1 Samuel 28 appropriate for advanced Christians. What this reading might have been, we cannot know. Perhaps this deeper meaning was connected to the parable of the vineyard workers (Matthew 20:1-16), referenced in the final words of the homily,[859] and in his *Commentary on Matthew*,[860] or it might relate to the implicit typology that Miller senses.[861]

Why, then, does Origen focus on the literal, 'narrative sense' in this instance? There are many possible reasons. Firstly, the text's genre may have made this more likely. Origen spoke these words to a crowd, probably of mixed ability. Perhaps he offered this simpler 'narrative sense' for the benefit of the 'simpliciores' (those present less-advanced in the faith).[862] Certainly, this is the virtue of the narrative sense which Origen notes in *De*

[855] Ibid., 4.2.5.
[856] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 2.2-3.
[857] Ibid.*,* 2.1.
[858] Ibid., 2.3.
[859] Ibid., 10.5.
[860] Origen, *Comm. Matt.*, 15.35.
[861] Miller (1984), pp.142-5.
[862] Karen Jo Torjesen notes the impact genre can have on Origen's exegesis, see Torjesen (1986), pp.60, 68-9. For more on Origen and the 'simpliciores', see Martens (2012a), pp.27-8.

principiis: 'That there is benefit to be had from the first interpretation [i.e. the narrative sense], and in this respect it is of profit, the multitude of those who have believed genuinely [γνησίως] and more simply [ἁπλούστερον] testify [μαρτυρεῖ].'[863]

Another possible reason for Origen's adherence to the 'narrative sense' is the occasion of the homily's delivery, on two counts. The first is the location, in Jerusalem. As a guest speaker in a less familiar setting,[864] perhaps Origen was either unconfident in this audience's ability to grasp the 'elevated sense', or more cautious in presenting an elevated, allegorical reading, and the more speculative theology that usually accompanies it, to an audience that was not his own. The other aspect of the occasion which possibly encouraged the homily's 'narrative' focus, is the constraint on time that Origen faced, both in preparation and delivery. Although Origen's homilies were often seemingly delivered *ex tempore*, on this occasion the passage was chosen for him at the very last minute by another.[865] With little time to gather his thoughts, a literal narrative reading might have seemed the most straightforward approach for Origen. Additionally, he appears aware that he was constrained by time in terms of delivery, noting that 'it is necessary to speak briefly [χρὴ ἐπιτεμνόμενον εἰπεῖν]'.[866] Again, aware of time limitations, Origen may have considered a simpler, literal reading to be the most appropriate approach here.

However, the most compelling explanation for Origen's narrative-focused, literal approach to this passage is the subject-matter it allows him to explore. Firstly, by discussing the

[863] *Princ.*, 4.2.6 (Greek) [Behr (2019), p.255, revised].
[864] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 1.3; Nautin and Nautin (1986), pp.57-65.
[865] Castagno (1998), p.69; Trigg (1995), p.224.
[866] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 1.1-3.

'narrative sense', Origen can engage with a debate he clearly knew, and prove that his opponents have misunderstood 1 Samuel 28 by arguing a demon appeared rather than Samuel. To contribute to this wider discussion about what actually happened in 1 Samuel 28, Origen must consider this passage in historical, literal terms. A figurative reading, moving beyond the passage's historicity, would not have contributed to this debate effectively. More importantly, dealing with this passage according to its 'narrative sense' allows Origen to discuss two of his favourite subjects: Christ and eschatology. The Christological and eschatological character of Origen's exegesis is evident and widely observed.[867] Peter W. Martens frames Origen's tendency to eschatological readings as one of Scripture's core messages particularly along the lines of a motif of 'the soul's journey to God',[868] an analysis that aptly fits this homily's message of hope for souls who journey to Paradise. Martens also argues that Christ is at the heart of Scripture's message for Origen, even in the Old Testament – the most important biblical theme of all.[869] This point, too, is validated by the homily's focus on Christ, particularly his descent to Hades. Usually, Origen is liberated by figurative interpretation to discuss such themes, appealing to the 'elevated sense' of passages, especially in the Old Testament, that otherwise appear unrelated to these subjects.[870] However, in the case of 1 Samuel 28, the 'narrative sense' presents that opportunity most effectively. A simple narrative reading, affirming that Samuel was indeed in Hades, allows Origen to discuss ideas such as Christ's underworldly descent, the prophets in Hades, and future hope in Paradise.[871] In other words, had Origen allegorised this account

[867] Lauro (2005), pp.70-6, 128-9; Martens (2012a), pp.212-21.
[868] Martens (2012a), pp.212-16.
[869] Ibid., pp.216-21; see also Behr (2019), p.xlviii.
[870] Lauro (2005), pp.70-6; King (2005), pp.269-70.
[871] Greer (2007), p.xxxii.

and raised doubts about the historicity of Samuel's sojourn from Hades, then he could not have made these same Christological and eschatological points.

In terms of Christology, Origen's reading of 1 Samuel 28 places significant emphasis on Christ, whose descent to Hades is central to Origen's message. However, particularly in terms of eschatology, Origen explicitly states that the hopeful message of future, unobstructed entry to Paradise (enabled by Christ), motivates his literal reading of this passage. He states in the opening that '[s]ome narratives do not touch us [οὐχ ἅπτονται ἡμῶν], and others are necessary [ἀναγκαῖαι] for our hope',[872] later adding 'since the narrative about Saul and the belly-myther touches all people, its truth is necessary in accordance with the word'.[873] Thus, Origen identifies his literal reading of 1 Samuel 28 as being 'necessary for our hope'. This 'hope [ἐλπίδα]' seemingly refers to the homily's conclusion, where Origen shows that Christians, unlike Samuel and the patriarchs, can expect Paradise, not Hades, after death. He repeats this point, stating that these 'are holy, great, and ineffable [ἀπορρήτων] words concerning our departure [ἐξόδου]' from life,[874] and clearer still, that 'both the narrative sense and its examination are necessary so that we may see what there is for us after our departure [ἀναγκαία καὶ ἡ ἱστορία καὶ ἡ ἐξέτασις ἡ περὶ αὐτῆς, ἵνα ἴδωμεν τί ἡμᾶς ἔχει μετὰ τὴν ἔξοδον]'.[875] Origen is clear that the narrative meaning of 1 Samuel 28 leads to eschatological reflections. In the conclusion, when expounding this message of hope, Origen states 'there is no-stumbling block [πρόσκομμα] in relation to this passage, but everything has been marvellously written and has been

[872] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 2.1.
[873] Ibid., 2.3.
[874] Ibid., 4.10.
[875] Ibid., 5.1.

understood by those to whom God might have revealed it. We, the ones who have come to the completion of the ages, we have something more.'[876] Evidently, this eschatological message of hope is central to Origen's decision to read this passage according to its 'narrative sense'. Thus, we have confirmed Edwards' point, when explaining Origen's literal interpretation of 1 Samuel 28, that 'Origen never allegorized what scripture appeared to say about the soul, because a literal division of the person into body, soul and spirit was the charter for his own ascription of a threefold meaning to the text',[877] since Origen discusses the experiences of souls and their final destination in this homily. Simply, a literal interpretation of events leads Origen up naturally, with the souls, from the depths of Hades to the heights of Paradise: Origen had no need of allegory for anagogy.[878]

However, while the homily speaks to more debateable aspects of Origen's exegesis, we should not forget less controversial, but equally important, principles of his exegesis displayed here. We have already noted Origen's belief in the inspired, divine nature of the biblical text, particularly the third-person narrative voice, expressed in the homily. This is central to how Origen reads this passage and his understanding of Scripture.[879] Because Scripture is divinely inspired throughout, another common principle regularly applied throughout the homily is Origen's use of Scripture to explain Scripture: difficult passages can be illuminated by clearer ones. Multiple passages, many of which we have noted in passing, are used to support his reading of 1 Samuel 28. Similarly, vice versa, in Origen's other references to 1 Samuel 28 across his corpus noted above, he uses this passage to elucidate

[876] Ibid., 10.1.
[877] Edwards (2002), p.89. Greer makes a similar point, see Greer (2007), p.xxxii.
[878] See Mitchell (2006), p.357.
[879] Origen, *Princ.*, 4.1ff.

others. This common feature of Origen's exegesis constitutes a crucial element of how he approaches Scripture.[880] In Martens' words, 'This exegetical principle is at work on seemingly every page of Origen's exegetical corpus.'[881]

Finally, let us close as we opened, by reflecting upon Origen's opposition. Throughout this homily, Origen sets out his view clearly in opposition to others, particularly those arguing that a demon appeared rather than Samuel. Evidently, he had real opponents in mind, and was aware of real arguments for this position. Who these opponents were precisely, we cannot know. Perhaps Origen was aware of Tertullian's reading, or perhaps of Hippolytus of Rome's work, not extant (but which possibly set out this opposing view in a particularly comprehensive and influential way).[882] Yet, as Trigg notes, 'Given the widespread interest in the passage, we need not assume… that Origen was necessarily responding to a single specific literary work.'[883] Whoever Origen has in mind, he is consciously contributing to a real debate, 'a debate that was already taking place'.[884] His critical view of his opponents is also clear. They 'have opposed Scripture',[885] and are apparently not 'right-minded [εὐγνώμονα] in hearing the Scriptures'.[886] Origen evidently views them as deficient exegetes. Yet despite voicing his opposition, he generally presents his opponents amicably, in a relatively favourable light, calling them 'our brothers [ἡμετέρων ἀδελφῶν]'.[887]

---

[880] Martens (2012a), pp.61-2, 201-3; Young (1997), pp.133-7. Origen refers to this method explicitly, see *Cels.*, 7.11; *Comm. Matt.*, 10.15; 17.17; *Comm. Jo.*, 6.127.
[881] Martens (2012a), p.62.
[882] Greer (2007), pp.xxxiv-xxxvi, xlvi-xxlvii. The Nautins identify this author as Josipe, see Nautin and Nautin (1986), pp.78-9; Simonetti (1989), p.13, n.11.
[883] Trigg (1995), pp.224-5.
[884] Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.ix.
[885] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 3.1.
[886] Ibid., 4.1.
[887] Ibid., 3.1.

Moreover, he acknowledges that this passage is difficult to understand, seemingly alleviating his opponent's guilt. Origen states that the passage 'presents to us an inquiry and a difficulty',[888] and thrice describes its interpretation as a 'trial [ἀγών] (or 'struggle')'.[889] Further, he admits that the opposing exegetes argue 'persuasively [πιθανῶς]',[890] although wrongly, ostensibly praising their rhetorical ability. While he disagrees entirely with his opponents' exegesis, Origen does not question their Christian identity. As we shall see, Eustathius does not afford Origen the same amicability.

Methodius of Olympus

Before continuing to Eustathius, we must first consider Methodius of Olympus, for Eustathius was not the first to take issue with Origen's interpretation of 1 Samuel 28. Active during the late 3rd and early 4th centuries, Methodius was an early, influential anti-Origenist, who shaped the anti-Origenist language of Epiphanius and influenced Origen's later condemnations.[891] Evidently, Methodius also influenced the anti-Origenist of interest to us here, namely Eustathius. In *De engastrimytho*, Eustathius states, 'For Methodius, who is worthy of holy memory, has sufficiently written about this speculation [of Origen] and has clearly demonstrated before all that he [Origen] inadvisably gave an opening to the heretics when he defined [ὁρισάμενος] the resurrection as one of form [ἐπὶ εἴδους] but not of the body itself [ἐπὶ σώματος αὐτοῦ].'[892] By Eustathius' time of writing, it appears that Methodius, 'worthy of holy memory [τῆς ἁγίας ἄξιος μνήμης]', had died, possibly alluding to

[888] Ibid., 2.5.
[889] Ibid., 4.1; 4.10; 6.2.
[890] Ibid., 4.1.
[891] Dechow (2017), p.125; Patterson (1997), p.229.
[892] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 22.5; see also Trigg (1995), p.224.

his contested martyrdom.[893] This suggests the *terminus post quem* for Eustathius' *De engastrimytho* being after Methodius' death *c*.311.[894] Eustathius here seems to refer to Methodius' *De resurrectione*, a work directly critical of Origen's resurrection theology.[895] Particularly, Eustathius refers to Methodius' criticism against Origen that his understanding of the resurrection was deficient, and that it was only of 'form [εἴδους]' and not corporeal enough. Clearly, then, Eustathius knew and read Methodius, who played some role in shaping Eustathius' thought against Origen.

Interestingly, in *De resurrectione*, Methodius preserves another passing allusion Origen made to 1 Samuel 28. The relevant part, from the third book, has survived in Greek through a citation by Photius (also abridged in Old Slavonic).[896] Here, Methodius cites Origen, seemingly from Origen's own treatise 'On the Resurrection', now lost,[897] thereby bringing Origen's comments to us indirectly. Methodius records Origen's comments on the rich man and Lazarus. Origen's opponents were apparently of the view that Luke 16:19-31 referred to the period after the resurrection and we might surmise that they used the physical descriptors noted in that passage as proof that they are 'with bodies [μετὰ τῶν σωμάτων]'.[898] However, Origen believes that Luke 16:19-31 describes the condition of people 'before the arrival of the Saviour, and before the completion of the age, and because of this, before the resurrection [πρὸ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ Σωτῆρος καὶ πρὸ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πρὸ τῆς ἀναστάσεως]', [899] as the rich man's five brothers could not

[893] Patterson (1997), pp.16-21.
[894] Bracht (2017), p.1; Dechow (2017), p.125.
[895] Patterson (1997), pp.141-99.
[896] Dechow (2017), pp.127-8; Greer (2007), p.lv.
[897] Greer (2007), p.lv.
[898] Methodius, *Res.,* 3.17.2.
[899] Ibid., 3.17.5; Greer (2007), p.lv.

have been warned 'since nobody remains behind [καταλείπεται] in life after the resurrection'.[900] In a sense, this is consistent with what we have already seen in Origen's *Homily on 1 Samuel 28*, where he argues that the events of Luke 16:19-31 took place in Hades (specifically before Christ's descent there).[901]

According to Methodius, Origen continues by addressing the physical features described in Luke 16:19-31 ('tongue', 'finger', 'Abraham's bosom', 'reclining') and suggests 'perhaps the shape [σχῆμα] of the soul at the time of its departure [from life], being similar to its dense and earthly body [τῷ παχεῖ καὶ γηΐνῳ σώματι], can be apprehended [λαμβάνεσθαι] in this way'.[902] 1 Samuel 28 also serves as proof of this, since 'Samuel appearing, as it is clear [Σαμουὴλ φαινόμενος, ὡς δῆλόν ἐστιν]… being visible proves that he was wearing a body [ὁρατὸς ὢν παρίστησιν ὅτι σῶμα περιέκειτο], if we might be very compelled by proofs to declare that the essence of the soul is incorporeal of itself [τὴν οὐσίαν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀσώματον εἶναι καθ᾽ ἑαυτήν]'.[903] There appears to be a lacuna here,[904] but Origen seemingly refers to the fact that the Medium could see Samuel, whom she describes with physical features (1 Samuel 28:14). Thus, Methodius preserves for us another allusion by Origen to 1 Samuel 28 which affirms the real appearance of Samuel.

Although he appears to maintain the incorporeal nature of souls, Origen seems tenuously to posit here that souls 'wear a body' after death, similar in 'shape [σχῆμα]' to its corporeal

[900] Methodius, *Res.,* 3.17.2.
[901] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 9.9.
[902] Methodius, *Res.,* 3.17.2-3.
[903] Ibid., 3.17.4.
[904] Greer (2007), pp.lv-lvi, n.37.

body, as indicated by the examples of 1 Samuel 28 and Luke 16:19-31.[905] As noted above, this is consistent with Origen's wider thought since, although he states that souls are in essence incorporeal,[906] he maintains that God alone is truly incorporeal, and that souls must occupy a body of sorts.[907] It would seem, then, that Origen did not conceive of the 'souls' to which he refers in the homily, nor indeed Samuel himself, as being entirely disembodied.

Methodius himself does not cite 1 Samuel 28 in what survives of his *De resurrectione.* However, we know that he had dedicated an entire treatise, *De Pytonissa*, 'against Origen', as Jerome attests, but this has not survived.[908] That text would almost certainly have provided a detailed exposition of 1 Samuel 28, a true loss for the purposes of this study and a further reminder that we can only tell the history of this passage in part. Regarding the contents of this text, we can only hazard a guess. One might expect, considering its opposition to Origen, that it proposed a demon appeared rather than Samuel. However, if this was the case, and considering that this work was sufficiently well-known for Jerome to record, and considering Eustathius attests to his own familiarity with Methodius, why did Eustathius, in his own attack against Origen on this passage, not mention Methodius' similar enterprise? Perhaps Eustathius does not mention it because Methodius disagreed with Origen along other lines (perhaps on the nature of soul's appearance) and that Methodius maintained Samuel truly appeared. Conversely, Eusathius' dependence on Methodius might be too great for him to care to admit.

[905] Edwards (2002), p.109.
[906] Origen *Princ.*, 1.7.1.
[907] Ibid., 1.6.4; 2.2.2; 4.3.15; see also Crouzel (1989), pp.240-1; Edwards (1992), pp.33-5.
[908] Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus,* 83.1.

In truth, regarding Methodius' understanding of 1 Samuel 28, we are limited to conjecture. It suffices to conclude that Eustathius' treatise was certainly not the first to oppose Origen's interpretation of 1 Samuel 28, and it appears that Methodius influenced Eustathius' treatise in some now indeterminate way.

Eustathius of Antioch[909]

Probably composed around the 320s,[910] *De engastrimytho* is significant as the only complete extant work by Eustathius of Antioch, considered a seminal figure in shaping later Antiochene theology. For the purposes of this study, its prime significance is its specific, detailed disagreement with Origen over the interpretation of 1 Samuel 28. Anti-Origen polemic is laced throughout this treatise. Direct and indirect references to Origen's own views are foundational to its structure – its *raison d'être*. Due to the length of Eustathius' treatise – several times the length of Origen's homily and by far the longest single extant reference to 1 Samuel 28 – a comprehensive analysis is not possible here. For understanding the text's content and structure, it is worth consulting Margaret M. Mitchell's useful compositional analysis of it.[911] Instead we shall take a more thematic approach, while also attempting to keep in mind the treatise' argumentative structure.

The first point to note is the polemical methodology which gives the treatise its structure. From the outset, Eustathius is clear that he and his audience are dissatisfied with Origen's interpretation of 1 Samuel 28 – his motivation for writing this text,[912] which seems to have

[909] All translations of *De engastrimytho* are taken or revised from Greer and Mitchell (2007).
[910] Patterson (1997), p.21; Cartwright (2015), p.54; Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.ix.
[911] Mitchell (2007b), pp.cxxxix-clvii.
[912] Eustathius, *Engast.,* 1.1-3.

had a profound impact on how Eustathius presented this treatise. He states, 'I consider it not unsuitable to yoke together his entire interpretation [πᾶσαν μὲν ὁμοῦ συζεῦξαι τὴν ἐξήγησιν αὐτοῦ] with this explanation of the letter [τῇδε τοῦ γράμματος ὑπαγορίᾳ]',[913] and also, 'Origen's statements must be put forward first, and then in the proper order one may examine earnestly the meaning opposing to those [τὰ μὲν Ὠριγένεια προτακτέον ἐν πρώτοις, ἰδίᾳ δὲ τάξει καὶ τὸν ἀντιπίπτοντα νοῦν ἐκείνοις ἐξετάσαι σπουδαστέον].'[914] These comments probably refer to the fact that Eustathius included a copy of Origen's homily (and perhaps additional material) alongside this treatise as he circulated it.[915] This practice of transmitting Origen's *Homily on 1 Samuel 28* and Eustathius' *De engastrimytho* together, which Eustathius began, apparently persisted in the manuscript tradition.[916]

Eustathius' stated reasons for binding Origen's interpretation to his own are twofold. Firstly, so that he cannot be accused of misrepresenting his opponent.[917] The second reason for holding these two investigations 'side-by-side' is to allow 'scholars to choose the better opinion from the two'.[918] To elaborate on this, Eustathius uses contest imagery. A horse, or a runner, or a wrestler, however impressive they may appear individually, can only truly be judged in competition with others.[919] Thus, Eustathius argues, the proximity of his own arguments to Origen's does not suggest approval on his part, but serves to highlight the superiority of his argument. Eustathius' argument here may have been particularly significant. His justification for replicating Origen's thought, despite his heterodoxy, may

[913] Ibid., 1.4.
[914] Ibid., 1.7.
[915] Greer and Michell (2007), p.63, n.1.
[916] Ibid., pp.viii-x.; Nautin and Nautin (1986), pp.11-13; Declerck (2002), pp.lvii-lx.
[917] Eustathius, *Engast.,* 1.4.
[918] Ibid., 1.5.
[919] Ibid., 1.6.

have emboldened later scribes, even after the Origenist controversies, to continue to copy Origen's homily, ensuring its survival today.

Eustathius' interest in 'side-by-side comparison [παραλλήλου συγκρίσεως]' seems to have also shaped the treatise' *internal* structure.[920] He almost records Origen's homily twice since, throughout the treatise, he methodically considers Origen's arguments, citing Origen's own words, and then counters them – a repeated process central to the text's structure. By this method, and by speaking of Origen as though still alive,[921] Eustathius creates a sense of real debate with Origen, although decades apart.

While considering the polemical nature of this text, is it worth noting Eusathius' particularly venomous invective against his opponent. In the opening Origen is said to 'thirst for popularity [δοξοκοπίᾳ]'.[922] He accuses Origen of having 'erred [ἐσφάλη] from the truth',[923] and later even of 'blasphemy [βλασφημίας]'.[924] Regularly, Eustathius descends into sheer insult. He is caught almost indecisively between accusing Origen of being either ignorant or evil.[925] On the one hand, he accuses Origen of being 'simple-minded [εὐήθης]';[926] on the other, of being a cunning liar, even 'ingenious [κομψὸς]', with nefarious aims.[927] Perhaps Eustathius' greatest insult is when he twice refers to Origen as an 'old crone'.[928] This may partly represent a rhetorical technique of discrediting the opposition with slander, by saying

[920] Ibid., 1.5.
[921] Mitchell (2006), p.360; cf. Eustathius, *Engast.,* 4.3-5.
[922] Eustathius, *Engast.,* 1.3.
[923] Ibid., 4.2.
[924] Ibid., 17.3.
[925] Eustathius expresses this also in ibid., 26.1.
[926] Ibid., 4.7.
[927] Ibid., 3.4.
[928] Ibid., 17.2; 21.7.

'that they are not worthy of belief because of age'.[929] More importantly, this is similar to how Eustathius describes the Medium.[930] Eustathius makes this comparison clearer still when he states that Origen 'seems to me to speak no less insanely [φρενοβλαβῶς] than that woman'.[931] By presenting Origen as the Medium's *doppelganger*, a point observed also by Mitchell,[932] Origen is marred with her negative attributes as an insane, superstitious liar, who fraternises with demons. Just as the Medium confounds and falsely represents God's word through 'Samuel', so too Origen leads astray and misinterprets Scripture. Certainly, by comparing Origen to a magical practitioner, alongside these other insults (of which there are many more), Eustathius does not treat Origen with the same amicability that Origen afforded his own opponent. This early vilification of Origen would eventually become commonplace, particularly after the Origenist controversies.

A debate already begun

Eustathius also provides evidence for a debate surrounding 1 Samuel 28 beyond his own disagreement with Origen. He addresses the treatise to Eutropius,[933] who had evidently asked Eustathius for his opinion on 1 Samuel 28 because Eutropius himself was 'not satisfied' with Origen's interpretation of this passage.[934] Although Eutropius' comments have not survived, it seems that his understanding of 1 Samuel 28 was closely aligned with Eustathius'. At the very least, this provides evidence of a wider discussion of 1 Samuel 28 (and particularly of Origen's interpretation) no longer extant – another reminder that we can

[929] Mitchell (2007a), pp.cix-cx, n.74.
[930] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 3.3; 29.1.
[931] Ibid., 20.4.
[932] Mitchell (2007a), pp.cix-cx.
[933] For more on Eutropius' identity, see Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.ix; Cartwright (2015), p.13; Spanneut (1948), pp.59-60.
[934] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 1.2.

only observe a portion of this passage's rich literary history. This point is supported further still by Eustathius' comment, '… I know well that there are not a few others dissatisfied with what he rashly set down' but that also 'some are led astray by what he wrote'.[935] Eustathius, then, claims to know of people who agreed *and* disagreed with Origen's position, giving the impression that a vibrant discussion of this passage, and particularly of Origen's interpretation, was taking place in Eustathius' day. No extant source citing 1 Samuel 28 can be confidently dated between Origen's writings and Eustathius' treatise, and certainly none mention Origen directly, and so it appears Eustathius is referring to views now lost to us. We can suggest an identity for one of these mystery critics of Origen's interpretation, an author whom we know wrote against Origen's reading of 1 Samuel 28 in this period,[936] one with whom we know Eustathius was familiar,[937] namely Methodius and his *De Pytonissa*. Eustathius' comments also suggest that this wider discussion was fairly balanced: Origen's view is said to have its critics, but also its followers. Both positions, that either the real Samuel appeared or a demonic illusion, seem to have been common in Eustathius' day. This contradicts Smelik's claims that Origen's reading of this passage was unusual, even untenable, for Christians in this period, representing the 'exceptional views' of a 'very original thinker'.[938]

Further evidence of a wider discussion surrounding 1 Samuel 28 can be found throughout the treatise, particularly in points of similarity with other surviving texts that discuss this passage, both preceding and succeeding this treatise. These similarities – in expression,

[935] Ibid., 1.2-3.
[936] Jerome, *De viris Illustribus*, 83.1.
[937] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 22.5; see also Trigg (1995), p.224.
[938] Smelik (1979), p.177.

argument, and evidence – show that there were common traditions of interpreting this passage, suggesting widespread, developed discussion. These commonalities will be considered as they emerge.

Eustathius and Scripture

Like Origen, Eustathius believes he is reading 1 Samuel 28 according to the 'very letter of the narrative [αὐτὸ τὸ τῆς ἱστορίας γράμμα]'.[939] Assuming that his audience has read Origen's interpretation, Eustathius sets out in opposition his own 'literal' interpretation of the passage, focusing on the precise words and what he considers to be the narrative's obvious meaning.

After running through the passage, and its relevant verses, Eustathius summarises his view early on: 'it is clear that the sense of the divine letter said [ἡ τοῦ θείου γράμματος ἔφησεν ἐκδοχὴ] absolutely nowhere that Samuel was brought up through the belly-myther'.[940] Referring to Origen's argument that the 'narrative persona' states that Samuel appeared, Eustathius retorts that the narrative voice does not say this at all. Rather, Eustathius believes that a demon appeared, and any suggestion to the contrary in the passage is due to the words of unreliable witnesses – the deceitful Medium with a 'demon raging with frenzy [ἐκβακχεύοντος] in her', and Saul who was 'deranged [παράφρων]'.[941] These two interconnected points are introduced early in the treatise and developed throughout.

[939] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 2.1.
[940] Ibid., 3.8.
[941] Ibid., 3.9.

Let us consider the first of these two ideas, that the narrative voice does not suggest that Samuel appeared. Eustathius believes that a close reading, according to the letter, does not support Origen's supposed literal reading. Thus, much of Eustathius' treatise is dedicated to establishing the sequence of events and distinguishing between what the narrative voice says and the opinions, even intentional misdirections, of those present. Eustathius does not disagree with Origen that Scripture's narrative voice represents the authoritative viewpoint of the Holy Spirit but believes that Origen's reading 'appears contradictory to the sense of the narrative [ἐναντία φαίνει τῇ τοῦ διηγήματος ἐκδοχῇ]'.[942] In making this case, Eustathius responds directly to Origen's arguments. Origen had claimed that, if the narrative persona intended to suggest that a demon appeared instead of Samuel, this would have been written more clearly.[943] To counter this, Eustathius employs Origen's own argument against him. If the passage referred to the real Samuel, why would it not clarify that the Medium had seen Samuel's soul, by saying something like 'I saw a prophetic soul [προφητικὴν ψυχήν]', instead of using confusing physical descriptors.[944] Eustathius later applies this same logic to other passages to further discredit Origen. He cites Elijah's contest with Baal's prophets, where Scripture states that '[t]hey prophesied until the afternoon had passed' (1 Kings 18:29).[945] Although Scripture does not specify whether they prophesied true things or not, Eustathius takes it as obvious that they were not true prophets, and so 'it ought to have said, according to Origen's rule [κατὰ τὴν Ὠριγένους ἀπόφασιν], "They prophesied as they saw fit, saying nothing true…"'[946] This is significant for Eustathius, 'for if the same person is the author [συγγραφεύς] of both passages, he draws out a similar meaning from both [ὅμοιον ἐξ

[942] Ibid., 4.5.
[943] Cf. Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 4.7.
[944] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 6.2-3; see also 5.1–6.9.
[945] Ibid., 8.4.
[946] Ibid., 8.5.

ἀμφοῖν ἀνάγει τὸν νοῦν]'.[947] Eustathius seems to refer to more than just their common authorship by the Holy Spirit, but to his belief that these passages, as part of 1-4 Kingdoms of the Septuagint, were penned by the same human hand.[948] For Eustathius, the simple narrative of 1 Samuel 28 provides enough context to show that the Medium did not really raise Samuel but, contrary to Origen's suggestion, the author tends not to spell out the obvious, as 1 Kings 18 proves.[949]

To further support this point, Eustathius cites another contest in Scripture between one of God's people and superstitious practice, namely the account of Moses and Pharaoh's magicians (Exodus 7:8ff). Although the magicians apparently accomplish miracles, and indeed the narrative states that 'the magicians of the Egyptians did likewise by their charms' (Exodus 7:11),[950] Eustathius reasons that such magical acts cannot compare with acts from Heaven.[951] The fact that Moses' snake devoured those of the magicians suggests their illusory nature,[952] nor should we believe that such magicians 'can animate [ψυχῶσαι] dead wood' – such power was beyond them.[953] And why would the magicians have added to the plagues already sent by God, increasing the suffering of their fellow Egyptians?[954] Again, by Origen's logic, Eustathius argues that the passage should have read, 'The magicians of the Egyptians did things seemingly almost equal [τὰ παραπλήσια τῷ δοκεῖν]'.[955] Yet, the author had made it clear by calling them 'magicians [ἐπαοιδῶν]', and by naming the Medium 'belly-

[947] Ibid., 8.6.
[948] Origen probably did not view Samuel–Kings as a literary unity in the same way, see Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, 6.25.
[949] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 8.7.
[950] Ibid., 9.2.
[951] Ibid., 9.4.
[952] Ibid.
[953] Ibid., 9.5.
[954] Ibid., 9.6-9.
[955] Ibid., 9.11.

myther', that 'each of these acts was accomplished by spurious illusions [φαντασιοκοπίαις ἕκαστα διεπράττετο κιβδήλοις]'.[956] Tertullian also cites Pharaoh's magicians alongside his discussion of 1 Samuel 28 to make a similar point about the illusory nature of magic, and while Eustathius may not have known Tertullian directly, it is an indication of his awareness of pre-existing discussions on these subjects.[957]

Let us consider the second of these points, the unreliable nature of the witnesses (Saul, the Medium, and later 'Samuel'), and how this should shape a literal reading. In setting the scene for 1 Samuel 28, Eustathius highlights Saul's demented condition by turning to a Medium, asking 'is there anyone who does not recognize that he was driven to savage passions [ἀγρίοις ἠλαύνετο θυμοῖς] by the demon…?'[958] Similarly, Eustathius refers to the Medium as 'this demon-possessed… old crone [ἡ κακοδαίμων… αὕτη γραῦς]'?[959] Eustathius highlights that this demonic influence has compromised Saul and the Medium, and that Origen's position forces one 'to believe either the demon-possessed Saul as having described accurately with a true grasp of knowledge, or a boasting demon, even promising to summon [μεταπέμπεσθαι] righteous souls from Hades'.[960] Eustathius furnishes this point by citing John 8:44, where Christ describes the Devil as 'a liar and the father of the lie'.[961] The point is clear: Saul and the Medium's association with demons, who are devious by nature, indicates their unreliability as witnesses. Speaking as though Origen is still alive, repurposing the homily's words, Eustathius suggests that Origen would respond by saying 'the demon has

[956] Ibid., 9.12-14. Eustathius considers the significance of the term 'ἐγγαστρίμυθος' later in greater detail, see 26.10ff.
[957] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.7.
[958] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 2.7.
[959] Ibid., 3.3.
[960] Ibid., 4.1.
[961] Ibid., 4.2.

not spoken these things, but rather, the narrative voice of the author [ἡ διηγηματικὴ τοῦ συγγραφέως φωνή]. And the author of the words is believed to be the Holy Spirit – not a human being.'[962] As we shall consider in greater detail, Eustathius does not disagree with Origen's basic premise that the 'narrative voice' represents the words of the Holy Spirit and thus is accurate. He does, however, dispute which words constitute this 'narrative voice', and which should be read in light of the unreliability of the witnesses. Therefore, when Origen suggests that it is the infallible narrator who says, 'Whom shall I bring up for you?' (1 Samuel 28:11),[963] Eustathius rightly criticises this, stating that these are actually the Medium's words.[964] The very rules that Origen himself set out regarding the authority of the narrative voice, authored by the Holy Spirit, would not apply to these words.

Interestingly, later in the treatise (see Appendix N.1), Eustathius suggests that Origen eventually retracted this, apparently claiming that his prior assertion that the narrator said, 'Whom shall I bring up for you?', was due to 'forgetfulness [λήθῃ]'. These words lead to an important aside for, alongside other statements made by Eustathius in this section, they imply that Origen discussed 1 Samuel 28 on another occasion, as other scholars have suggested.[965] Eustathius notes how Origen, 'after having been refuted by those understanding most correctly all along', was 'defending himself again with a second exposition [δευτέρᾳ πάλιν ἀπολογούμενος ἐξηγήσει]…' This suggests that there were some in Origen's own day who wrote against his reading of 1 Samuel 28, thereby providing further

[962] Ibid., 4.5; cf. Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 4.2-4.
[963] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 4.2-3.
[964] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 3.4-6; 4.6-7.
[965] Greer and Mitchell (2007), pp.ix-x; see also Nautin and Nautin (1986), pp.86-9, 210-13. Hitherto this section, Eustathius seems, quite evidently, to have been citing or paraphrasing the surviving homily, contrary to Cartwright's claim, see Cartwright (2015), p.37.

evidence for a wider debate around this passage which has not survived. More significantly, this reference to a 'second exposition' suggests strongly that Origen discussed this passage again in a form that has not survived. Further, Eustathius cites Origen discussing 1 Samuel 28 with words not found in his extant works, quoting, 'It [Scripture] has not said if he [Samuel] has come up willingly [ἑκουσίως]. For you do not have it laid out [κείμενον] if the belly-myther brought him up. Let someone refute me after having read the Scripture.' Eustathius understands these words to prove that 'when refuted face-to-face, he clearly denied the very thing he held before from thoughtlessness', and notes that Origen later admitted his earlier error (in the homily) of attributing the words 'whom shall I bring up for you' to the Holy Spirit. Eustathius then states of Origen that 'when dragged unwillingly, he admitted that the woman did not bring up the prophet's soul'. Unless these words are another example of Eustathius' rhetorical technique of προσωποποιία, seen throughout the treatise, giving Origen new life by putting imagined words in his mouth,[966] this is further strong evidence that Origen discussed this passage again. If this is the case, there are significant ramifications. Eustathius observes, as we have done, that Origen is not entirely clear in the *Homily on 1 Samuel 28* how Samuel was raised. He asserts that Origen is 'caught between two opinions [ἐπαμφοτερίζων]' and argues that Origen contradicts himself. We have postulated, based on our own examination of the homily, that Origen implies, albeit ambiguously, that Samuel did not appear at the Medium's command (perhaps instead by the power of God). Eustathius however, acknowledging the same ambiguity, takes Origen's comments in the homily as suggesting that the Medium *was* responsible for raising Samuel but that he tentatively retracted this view in this second discussion of 1 Samuel 28. This

[966] Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.147, n.93; Mitchell (2007b), p.cliii, n.22.

change of heart, as perceived by Eustathius, is significant on two counts. Firstly, it gives further credence to our view that Origen subtly suggested in the first homily that the Medium did not raise Samuel. Thus, Eustathius is not observing a change in Origen but, rather, a clarification of his earlier position. Secondly, it raises further scepticism that the fragment ascribed to Origen, discussed above, which implies it was not truly Samuel that appeared, authentically represents his view.[967] Certainly, suggestions that this fragment represents a later view seem unlikely,[968] since Eustathius states that Origen at an even later stage than the homily is still entrenched in his belief that the real Samuel appeared, even in the face of opposition.

From Eustathius' comments, it appears that even in this second discussion Origen does not say outright how Samuel was raised, simply that the Medium was not responsible. It would also seem that Origen discussed whether Samuel appeared willingly or not, apparently questioning the notion that Samuel was brought up forcibly by the Medium.[969] Perhaps Origen implied here that Samuel appeared voluntarily, or by God's will. Although Eustathius states that Origen discussed this passage again 'at length [συχνά]', we cannot glean more about its content from Eustathius' comments. Similarly, regarding the format of Origen's 'second exposition [δευτέρᾳ… ἐξηγήσει]', we cannot surmise which form this took – although various suggestions have been made: another homily, extracts from another text, or even a lacuna in or an addendum to the original homily.[970] Nor can we certainly identify

[967] Origen, *Fragment on 1 Samuel 28*.
[968] Smelik (1979), p.171, n.45.
[969] That Samuel appeared unwillingly is perhaps suggested by the words 'Why have you disturbed me by bringing me up?' (1 Samuel 28:15). An interesting consideration might be whether Gregory of Nyssa and Ambrosiaster, who themselves discuss whether Samuel appeared willingly or unwillingly, were somehow familiar with this discussion by Origen, perhaps drawing on an opponent who challenged him on this, cf. Gregory, *Pyth.*, 103; Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones*, 27.1.
[970] Greer and Mitchell (2007), pp.ix-x; Nautin and Nautin (1986), pp. 86-9, 210-13; Declerck (2002), pp.xcix-c.

the contemporary opponents to Origen's exegesis of 1 Samuel 28, who apparently refuted him 'face-to-face', nor be certain what form this criticism took. However, to add a novel suggestion, wherever Origen originally made these comments, perhaps Eustathius is citing him through an intermediary. This might account for his many allusions to Origen's opponents in this section, and why, although being aware that Origen spoke 'at length' again, Eustathius dedicates so little space to this other exposition. Further, it may solve another puzzle, namely why these additional comments on 1 Samuel 28 have not survived alongside Origen's homily in the manuscript tradition, when Eustathius promised to attach Origen's comments with his own.[971] Perhaps Eustathius did not send these comments to Eutropius, or if he did these were eventually not reproduced by copyists, perhaps because of their indirect, fragmentary nature. Simply, Eustathius did not have the entirety of this second discussion before him. We have an obvious candidate for this proposed intermediary, Methodius of Olympus. Methodius reproduced Origen's comments at length, in dialogue format, in *De resurrectione* (a text which Eustathius seemingly knew),[972] and there even appears to be lacuna in the section where Origen discusses Samuel's appearance.[973] A dialogue format might also accommodate Eustathius' comments that Origen received 'face-to-face [ἀντιπροσώπως]' opposition, although Methodius was not truly speaking to Origen directly. Similarly, Methodius may also have cited Origen's 'second exposition' in his lost *De Pytonissa* (against Origen). Whatever the case may be, once more, we are confronted with the fact that there was a wide, vibrant discussion of 1 Samuel 28 in the early Church that is beyond our reach.

---

[971] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 1.4-7.; see Greer and Mitchell (2007), pp.viii-x.
[972] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 22.5.
[973] Methodius, *Res*., 3.17.4; Greer (2007), pp.lv-lvi, n.37. If this contained Origen's 'second exposition', then this might suggest Origen made these comments in his own *De resurrectione*, see Greer (2007), p.lv.

Returning to Eustathius' own interpretation, he argues that even those aspects of the third-person narrative which suggest that Samuel actually appeared to the Medium and Saul should be read in light of the unreliability of these witnesses. Conceding that the authoritative narrative voice states that the Medium 'saw Samuel', Eustathius argues that the demon-possessed Medium saw an image she conjured up.[974] To support his case that a demon took Samuel's shape, Eustathius cites 2 Corinthians 11:14-15, 'For even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light. So it is no great thing, if his ministers also disguise themselves as ministers of righteousness.'[975] As we have seen, this is a commonly-cited passage when discussing 1 Samuel 28 in the early Church, particularly by those who argued a demon appeared rather than Samuel – a passage Origen also cites as proof offered by his opponents.[976] Thus, Eustathius argues that the Medium 'saw', but that Scripture implies her vision was clouded. Similarly, dealing with Origen's argument that the narrative voice states that 'Saul knew it was Samuel' (1 Samuel 28:14), Eustathius argues that 'the knowledge of the demon-possessed man happens to be worth as much as the proclamation of that woman also serving the words up to him'.[977] The unreliable character of Saul and the Medium is a repeated point, and Eustathius regularly disparages their reputation as witnesses with slurs questioning their sanity, such as 'deranged', 'out of their mind', 'demented', etc.[978] A reading of the narrative voice must take this unreliability of the witnesses into account.

---

[974] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 4.8-9.
[975] Ibid., 4.9.
[976] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 4.6; see also Tertullian, *An.*, 57.8; *Martyrium Pionii*, 14.10; Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones*, 27.1.
[977] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 7.3.
[978] Ibid., *passim.*

Later in the treatise, Eustathius also highlights the unreliability of 'Samuel', by establishing that he was a demonic illusion. Among his arguments for this is the fact that Saul bows down before him, which is evidence for three reasons. Firstly, had this been the real Samuel, he would have rebuked Saul for bowing to him instead of God.[979] Secondly, why would a king bow to an ordinary citizen?[980] And thirdly, why did Saul bow to Samuel, a man, rather than the 'gods' the Medium mentioned?[981] Instead, 'the Devil changed himself into various forms, exerting himself to be worshiped by the ruler so that, from this, he might deceive as many people as possible to unknowingly bow down to him'.[982] Thus, Eustathius argues, 'Samuel' is really the Devil who wishes to be worshipped.[983] He supports his case with many further arguments. For instance, he argues that Samuel could not have appeared by compulsion, as the figure indicates, since Scripture teaches that demons are controlled by holy men, not vice versa.[984] Eustathius also claims the real Samuel would have condemned Saul more sternly for consulting a Medium.[985] However, one of Eustathius' main concerns is to prove that the figure did not truly prophesy, since it was a demon. He claims that the Devil 'craftily repeats what Samuel when alive had already foretold would happen to Saul'.[986] Thus, any aspect of the prophecy that may seem true, did not derive from the figure speaking. Similarly, aspects of 'Samuel's' prophecy are said to be false, such as the figure's words, 'Tomorrow you and your son Jonathan will be with me' (1 Samuel 28:19). According to Eustathius' timeline, Saul did not actually die the next day, and his other sons, not just

[979] Ibid., 10.9.
[980] Ibid., 10.10-11.
[981] Ibid., 10.11-12.
[982] Ibid., 10.13.
[983] Ibid., 10.14-17.
[984] Ibid., 11.1ff.
[985] Ibid., 11.10ff.
[986] Ibid., 12.1.

Jonathan, died with him.[987] Alongside this, Eustathius adds that the demon 'also impiously blasphemed [ἐβλασφήμησεν ἀσεβῶς]', since he adapted Jesus' words to the penitent thief, 'Today you will be with me in Paradise' (Luke 23:43). [988] Additionally, by implying that Samuel and Saul would be together after death, the demon suggests that there is no difference between the destiny of the righteous and unrighteous, despite the evidence of the account of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31).[989] By such arguments, Eustathius proves that the figure claiming to be Samuel was actually a lying demon in disguise, and therefore his testimony is unreliable.

More could be said of Eustathius' literal interpretation of 1 Samuel 28, and his arguments for this reading extend into other territories considered below, such as demonology and eschatology. However, these two points: that the narrative voice does not say plainly that Samuel appeared, and that the witnesses were unreliable, are foundational to Eustathius' literal interpretation. He establishes that his reading is in line with the 'very letter of the narrative', that his is the obvious narrative meaning in opposition to Origen's own literal interpretation. This conflict between Origen and Eustathius' exegesis of this passage has received much scholarly attention.[990] Scholars are particularly interested in what light these texts might shed on patristic exegesis, particularly on what has been traditionally considered as the binary, opposing schools of thought between the Alexandrian and Antiochene interpretive method. Typically, Alexandrian theologians have been characterised as interpreting Scripture allegorically, whereas Antiochene theologians interpret Scripture with

[987] Ibid., 12.10ff.
[988] Ibid., 14.6. Eustathius noticed the similarity of these expressions, which caught out the author of *Martyrium Pionii* who accidently conflates them, see *Martyrium Pionii,* 14.12.
[989] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 14.6ff.
[990] Trigg (1995); Young (1989), pp.193-5; Mitchell (2006).

a literal, historical emphasis.[991] Yet, as we concluded earlier on the basis of modern scholarship, such a basic dichotomy between Alexandrian and Antiochene exegesis does not hold up.[992] So too, close consideration of Eustathius' treatise against Origen supports this, both affirming and denying typical depictions.

In many ways, Eustathius interprets 1 Samuel 28 as might be traditionally expected. As we have seen, he makes it abundantly clear that he reads the passage according to the plain, literal sense intended by its author, and tries to show, time after time, that he (not Origen) is interpreting the narrative sense of the passage correctly. Eustathius pays close attention to what precisely is written, distinguishing between what is said by the authoritative narrative voice and the viewpoints of others. He considers words closely, as seen in his discussion of the significance of the name 'belly-myther', defining the different aspects of the compound and its wider history.[993] Eustathius' interest in history is also exhibited when discussing the common authorship of 1 Samuel 28 and 1 Kings 18,[994] and from the outset he is interested in setting this passage in its wider context and defining the exact sequence of events. These features are precisely what we might expect of Antiochene exegesis. Similarly, Eustathius' criticism of Origen's exegesis also appears to be typical. He says Origen's usual method was 'to allegorize all the Scriptures [πάσας ἀλληγορῆσαι τὰς γραφὰς]',[995] and lists various passages that Origen allegorized: the fruit bearing trees in the garden of Eden (Genesis 2:5-

[991] Of course, this characterisation of this view is simplified, see DeCock (2020), p.8ff. For this traditional distinction, see Wallace-Hadrill (1982), pp.27-51; Grant and Tracy (1984), pp.52-72; Simonetti (1994), pp.34-83.
[992] See especially Young (1997); see also Nassif (1993); Clark (1999), pp.70-8. This is not to deny that there is a distinction to be made, as Miriam DeCock has recently and effectively set out, see DeCock (2020).
[993] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 26.10ff.
[994] Ibid., 8.6.
[995] Ibid.

9),[996] the wells dug by Abraham (Genesis 26:18-22),[997] the earrings and bracelets of Isaac and Rebekah (Genesis 24:22),[998] the names of Job's daughters (Job 42:14),[999] and the raising of Lazarus (John 11:1-44).[1000] Here, Eustathius criticises Origen for destroying 'the entire factual history [πραγματείαν] of the words, having turned to another sense [ἕτερον νοῦν,]', and for 'seeking hidden meaning [θεωρῶν]' where there is none.[1001] Eustathius similarly argues that by 'allegorizing [ἀλληγορῶν] everything from "names [ὀνομάτων]," he [Origen] destroys the foundations of affairs [τὰς τῶν πραγμάτων ὑποθέσεις]'.[1002] As proof that Origen's emphasis on names is ill-founded, Eustathius notes that many figures in Scripture share the same name but are of contrasting character, such as Judas (the betrayer vs the apostle), Zechariah (the evil king vs the prophet), and Ananias (Daniel's companion vs the high priest).[1003] How can anything meaningful be drawn from such names without contradiction, Eustathius reasons. Therefore, when Eustathius refers to Origen 'allegorising', he understands this as reading Scripture figuratively in such a way as to undermine the historicity of the events described, and in a way that seems subjective to him.[1004] Eustathius' depiction of Origen as an allegorist who undermines history is typical of the Antiochene vs Alexandrian dichotomy as traditionally depicted.

However, in many ways, Eustathius' treatise challenges this traditional depiction which his comments above seem to reinforce. Firstly, the literal character of Origen's exegesis of 1

---

[996] Ibid., 21.2-3, possibly citing a lost commentary on Genesis, see Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.126, n.69.
[997] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 21.5; cf. Origen, *Hom. Gen.*, 7.5; 10.2; 11.3; 12.5.
[998] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 21.6; cf. Origen, *Hom. Gen.*, 10.4.
[999] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 21.7. Origen's *Commentary on Job* is lost.
[1000] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 21.8-12; cf. Origen*, Comm. Jo.,* 28.6.39ff. However, Origen did not deny that Lazarus was actually raised by Christ as well, see Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.129, n.77.
[1001] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 21.5; 21.10.
[1002] Ibid., 22.2.
[1003] Ibid., 22.2-4.
[1004] As we have alluded to, and shall consider below, this is not a very fair characterisation of Origen.

Samuel 28 immediately suggests this, although Eustathius is keen to point out that this is unusual for Origen, 'having attempted to allegorize all the Scriptures, he does not blush to understand this [passage] alone according to the letter [ἐπὶ τοῦ γράμματος]'.[1005] For Eustathius, Origen's reading of 1 Samuel 28 is the exception that proves the rule, for the allegorist's singular attempt at literal exegesis is found lacking. However, Eustathius' characterisation seems unfair. Origen often upheld the literal reading of Scripture, and in *De principiis* explicitly praises its virtues, stating that passages should be understood as historically realised in the majority of instances.[1006] In fact, perhaps inadvertently, when Eustathius states that Origen 'does not pay attention to its body [αὐτῷ σώματι] right-mindedly',[1007] he recalls Origen's tripartite senses of Scripture, particularly the clearly-defined place the literal (or bodily) sense has within Origen's exegetical methodology.[1008] Thus, Origen's exegesis of 1 Samuel 28 is not truly exceptional, but rather is further proof that reductionist distinctions between Alexandrian and Antiochene exegesis, even if seemingly endorsed by leading Antiochenes themselves, do not hold up.

Eustathius' own exegesis further blurs the distinction he tries to establish between his own and Origen's interpretive method. While Eustathius argues that his reading is according to the plain sense, and certainly cannot be described as allegorical, nevertheless his interpretation is less immediately obvious than Origen's, and requires additional detail beyond what is said in the text, particularly regarding the involvement of demons. While there are narrative details that may suggest this for Eustathius, there is no explicit reference

[1005] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 21.1. He repeats this point in ibid., 22.7.
[1006] See earlier discussion; Origen, *Princ.*, 4.2.6; 4.3.4.
[1007] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 21.1.
[1008] Origen, *Princ.,* 4.2.4-6.

in 1 Samuel 28 to demonic participation. Therefore, while Eustathius may claim that Origen did 'not narrate what is manifest from its logical sequence [οὐδ' αὖ τὸ σαφὲς ἐξ αὐτῆς ἱστορῆσαι τῆς ἀκολουθίας]',[1009] on the interpretive spectrum, one could argue that Origen's exegesis is the more 'literal' of the two, since he maintains that events transpired as they were said, seen, and heard. This irony is seemingly not lost on Eustathius either, which is why he notes that this literal interpretation by Origen is exceptional and, using Origen's own insult against him, argues this was not done 'right-mindedly [εὐγνωμόνως]'.[1010] Contrary to expectations, roles are reversed, and an Alexandrian's overly literal exegesis is criticised by an Antiochene.

Some scholars have even suggested that there are stronger figurative elements to Eustathius' interpretation of 1 Samuel 28 than might first meet the eye.[1011] As noted earlier, Eustathius regularly describes Origen in terms associated with the Medium – as an 'old crone',[1012] who 'contrives ill-fated divination [δυσδαίμονα παρασκευάσῃ μαντείαν]',[1013] 'wishing to pile up [ἐπεισκυκλῆσαι] means of idolatry [ἰδωλολατρείας ὄργανα] and inventions of necromancy [νεκυομαντείας εὑρήματα] on the chorus of the church'.[1014] Additionally, Eustathius takes issue with Origen and the Medium for similar reasons: both are liars, who pull words from thin air (fabricating myths) and misrepresent what God has to say. Therefore, Mitchell argues that Eustathius' interpretation of 1 Samuel 28, and his presentation of the Medium, serves as an allegory for Origen and his exegesis to convict him

[1009] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 22.7.
[1010] Ibid., 21.1; cf. Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 4.1.
[1011] For more detail, see Mitchell (2007a).
[1012] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 17.2; 21.7; cf. ibid., 3.3; 29.1.
[1013] Ibid., 21.1.
[1014] Ibid., 3.4.

of the same crimes against the truth – and so to Eustathius belongs 'the supremely figurative reading'.[1015] Whether this was Eustathius' intention or not, concrete examples of figurative exegesis certainly exist in the fragments of his surviving works.[1016]

Other aspects of Eustathius' treatise blur this typical distinction further, where one could say that he exhibits characteristics typically considered 'Alexandrian'. We have already noted Eustathius' criticism of Origen's over-emphasis on the significance of 'names'.[1017] Nevertheless, Eustathius concludes his treatise by etymologising at length the Medium's designator, 'belly-myther', and its significance.[1018] He states 'For if "*engastri-mythos*" ["belly-myther"] is interpreted to indicate by derivation "a myth having been fabricated in the belly," and the composition of the myth is given shape and put together persuasively within a belly, it does not pronounce the truth but the opposite – a lie.'[1019] Eustathius defines 'myth [μῦθός]' as being untrue by citing the classical education that both he and Origen would have received, for 'the rhetorical handbooks clearly indicate that "a myth is a fabrication composed with persuasion …" [αἱ… ῥητορικαὶ δηλοῦσι τεχνογραφίαι σαφῶς ὅτι μῦθός ἐστι πλάσμα συγκείμενον μετὰ ψυχαγωγίας]'.[1020] A myth is not true, despite being written to appear so. Among his arguments, Eustathius cites Plato, who describes even Hesiod and Homer as 'having composed false myths'.[1021] Arguing *a maiore ad minus* (or as Mitchell coins, 'from Homer to Hag'),[1022] Eustathius reasons that if Plato 'declares the poetry of

[1015] Mitchell (2007a), p.cxix.
[1016] Cartwright (2015), p.55.
[1017] See especially Eustathius, *Engast.*, 22.1-4.
[1018] Ibid., 26.10–30.1.
[1019] Ibid., 26.10.
[1020] Ibid., 27.2. This is a common definition in rhetorical handbooks, see Greer and Mitchell (2007), p.151, n.98.
[1021] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 28.5; cf. Plato, *Resp.*, 2.377.
[1022] Mitchell (2007a), p.cxvii.

Homer and Hesiod to be false myths' then how much more so the words of the Medium, 'when even the name [τοὔνομα] of the belly-myther suggests this meaning.[1023] For 'if the name itself has been rightly assigned… the belly-myther seems to fabricate a myth in her belly... the demon lurking in her inner organs consumes her and disables her thinking and, he utters from her belly, composing mythic fictions [μυθώδη πλάσματα συγκροτῶν].'[1024] For Eustathius, the Medium's name is proof of her unreliability and should shape how one reads this passage. According to Mitchell, such etymologising was 'a standard ancient exegetical practice that was itself not far from allegorization'.[1025] Considering Eustathius' criticism of Origen's emphasis on 'names', a remarkably heavy weight is placed on the value of names in Eustathius' interpretation. Again, these authors appear to have more in common than Eustathius might care to admit.

This leads to another point which blurs the traditional Alexandrian/Antiochene divide. While etymologising the name 'belly-myther', Eustathius makes use of his classical learning to support his case. He alludes to other sources, but as noted above, he cites Plato at some length.[1026] Traditionally, one of the accusations against Origen was his overdependence on classical pagan thought, particularly that he was extensively influenced by Platonic thought.[1027] While the influence of classical culture is certainly observable throughout Origen's corpus, when comparing their respective interpretations of 1 Samuel 28, these influences are more overtly present in Eustathius. Like most early Christian intellectuals,

[1023] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 29.1.
[1024] Ibid., 30.1.
[1025] Mitchell (2007a), p.cxvi.
[1026] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 28.1–29.1; see also 27.1–29.4.
[1027] For a defence of Origen against this traditional charge of being a 'Platonist', see Edwards (2002). However we define Origen's relationship with Platonic thought, and there were certainly influences, scholars now broadly agree that Origen was a Christian first, see Edwards (2021a), pp.19-20; Martens (2015), pp.618-20.

Eustathius too was steeped in classical culture from his earliest education. Inevitably, this learning impacted how both Origen and Eustathius read Scripture, as has been clearly demonstrated by the works of Young and Mitchell in the context of the debate between Origen and Eustathius.[1028]

It is also worth outlining the obvious common exegetical traits these texts share. Firstly, both authors believe that Scripture is authoritative, inspired by the Holy Spirit, particularly its narrative voice. This is expressed by Origen in his homily, and Eustathius agrees with him on this. When referring to Origen's argument regarding the authoritative voice of the 'persona of the Holy Spirit',[1029] Eustathius does not object to the principle, but rather its application.[1030] He notes 'the Holy Spirit did not say that Samuel had come up but described the words of the belly-myther… In no way was it [the Holy Spirit] in contradiction [ἐμάχετό] with itself and all the other Scriptures.'[1031] Like Origen, Eustathius exhibits a belief here in the inerrancy and unity of Scripture, due to its authorship by the Holy Spirit.[1032] They may disagree about what this narrative voice is trying to say, but their understanding of its significance is shared.

[1028] Young (1989); Young (1997), pp.161ff; Mitchell (2006); Mitchell (2007b). Young, despite revaluating this traditional dichotomy, somewhat affirms the distinction in exegetical method between Origen and Eusathius, partly on the basis of this education. Mitchell, however, blurs this distinction further by rendering exegesis as being pliable to argument. However, both would agree that Origen and Eustathius' shared classical education was an important commonality and that the core of their disagreement concerning 1 Samuel 28's interpretation goes beyond differences in exegetical method.
[1029] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 4.2-3; cf. Eustathius, *Engast.*, 3.4.
[1030] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 3.5-6.
[1031] Ibid., 25.7.
[1032] Cf. Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 4.2-3; *Princ.*, pr.1; *Comm. Jo.*, 5.5. We considered Scripture's divine inspiration and its inerrancy in chapter 1.

This view of Scripture leads to an important application, observed in Origen and Eustathius, both in their discussions of 1 Samuel 28 and across their works, namely that Scripture should be used to explain Scripture. We have noted many occasions where Origen cites Scripture to clarify Scripture. We have also observed this in our consideration of Eustathius' treatise. Regularly, Eustathius cites various passages to support his reading of 1 Samuel 28. This point is both exemplified and elaborated upon most clearly in one particular section of *De engastrimytho*, where Eustathius counters Origen's scepticism that a demon could have prophesied, which Eustathius also denies, but considers far more likely than supposing a demon raised the real Samuel.[1033] To support this, Eustathius notes scriptural examples which suggest that prophesy can come from unlikely sources. Firstly, he cites Caiaphas' prophecy, despite his plotting to kill Jesus (John 11:47-53).[1034] Eustathius then cites the testimony of Deuteronomy 13:2-4, which states that even if prophets perform signs (and thus seem to have power), but promote idolatry, they ought to be rejected.[1035] Following this, Eustathius cites other key verses from the Pentateuch, Deuteronomy 18:9-12 and Leviticus 20:27, which condemn 'belly-mythers' and other magical practitioners.[1036] From these citations, Eustathius confirms the idolatrous, impious nature of such practitioners and consequently the worthlessness of the Medium's testimony.[1037] Having used these passages to support his reading of 1 Samuel 28, Eustathius explicates the principle, 'Do the divine Scriptures contradict [ἀντιδοξοῦσιν] themselves? Is a single judgment in contradiction [ἡ μία μάχεται ψῆφος] with the many? Well then, even if there is any contradiction, the many

[1033] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 24.1ff; cf. Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 4.9–5.4.
[1034] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 24.3-5. Interestingly, Origen makes a similar point in his *Commentary on John* when discussing Caiaphas' prophecy, where he also refers to 1 Samuel 28, see *Comm. Jo.*, 28.17.148.
[1035] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 24.6-7.
[1036] Ibid., 24.12-15.
[1037] Ibid., 25.1-3.

prevail [ἐπικρατοῦσιν αἱ πολλαί]. And besides, on the contrary, in this way, with unanimous agreement [ὁμοφώνῳ συνῳδίᾳ], they condemn belly-mythers as performing unholy deeds.'[1038] Eustathius sets out the theory he has been practicing: if a passage appears to be contradictory, then it should be considered in the light of clearer and more numerous evidence. Since Scripture is unified, and cannot contradict itself, ambiguous passages can be clarified by other passages. Eustathius continues by citing examples from 2 Kings, noting the consistency in Scripture that the unjust King Manasseh turned to 'belly-mythers' (2 Kings 21:6), while the righteous King Josiah removed them (2 Kings 23:24).[1039] Finally, Eustathius turns to 'another reputable witness [μάρτυς ἄλλος ἀξιοφανής]', citing Isaiah's condemnation against 'belly-mythers', particularly as 'empty-talkers [κενολογοῦντας]' (Isaiah 8:19-21).[1040] Therefore, Scripture consistently portrays 'belly-mythers' as evil, untrustworthy, and useless, which should inform one's understanding of 1 Samuel 28. We see the principle of Scripture illuminating Scripture both explained in theory and applied in practice by Eustathius – a principle he shares with Origen.

As a further similarity, both Origen and Eustathius are steeped in similar traditions surrounding 1 Samuel 28's interpretation. For instance, Eustathius cites 2 Corinthians 11:14-15,[1041] the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31),[1042] and Caiaphas the High Priest's prophecy (John 11:49-53),[1043] just as Origen does when explaining 1 Samuel 28. This common approach extends into the theological themes they discuss when interpreting this passage –

[1038] Ibid., 25.3-4.
[1039] Ibid., 25.4-6.
[1040] Ibid., 25.8-12. Basil also connects Isaiah 8:19-21 with 1 Samuel 28, see Basil, *Comm. Isa.*, 8.218.
[1041] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 4.9; see also Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 4.6.
[1042] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 14.6-13; see also Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 9.9.
[1043] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 24.3-5; see also Origen, *Comm. Jo.*, 28.17.148.

for instance both make points on Christology, demonology, and eschatology. While the points they make may differ, both discuss 1 Samuel 28 in similar terms. These commonalities suggest that Eustathius and Origen interpret 1 Samuel 28 as part of the same framework, or meta-narrative.

Our consideration of Eustathius' interpretation of 1 Samuel 28 suggests that the differences between Origen and Eustathius' exegetical method have been overstated. Perhaps the most concrete distinction between their approach to the Bible, as observed by their reading of 1 Samuel 28, is the very text they use. In one instance this impacts Eustathius' argument significantly. When he cites 1 Samuel 28:19, words apparently spoken by 'Samuel' to Saul, he quotes 'And tomorrow you and *your son Jonathan* will be with me [italics added]'.[1044] Other early Christian writers cite this verse similarly,[1045] apparently reflecting the wording of the Lucianic recension, the biblical text commonly associated with Antiochene theologians. Origen, on the other hand, as previously noted, quotes this verse as 'Tomorrow you and *your sons* will be with me [italics added]'.[1046] Similarly, Origen is not alone in this reading, which more closely follows the Masoretic Text.[1047] This seemingly small difference impacts Eustathius' interpretation. Since he is of the view that a demon spoke these words, he attempts to prove that this premonition regarding Saul's future demise was not true. Firstly, he argues that Saul did not actually die 'tomorrow', but the day after that.[1048] However, his second argument is that '…he also said that only Jonathan together with his father would end up [καταλῆξαι] with him. But on the contrary, the narrative voice of the text recounts [ἡ

[1044] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 12.10ff.
[1045] Cf. Diodore, *Fragment*; Theodoret, *Quaest. in I Reg. 28* (PG80, 592); Gregory, *Pyth.*, 105.
[1046] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 5.3-4.
[1047] Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones,* 27.2; Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.,* 1.35.1.
[1048] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 13.1-3.

διηγηματικὴ τοῦ γράμματος ἀγορεύει φωνὴ] that Saul was slain together with his three sons and not only with one…'[1049] Eustathius argues that the supposed prophecy is deficient since it only notes that Jonathan would die, although the narrator would later state clearly that Saul's other sons also died with him (1 Samuel 31:2). This argument is entirely dependent on the version of the text Eustathius is reading, since Origen's text refers more generally to 'sons'. A distinction between Origen and Eustathius can be made clearly here, as they are literally not reading from the same page.

However, overall, we have seen that these authors appear to have more in common in how they relate to Scripture than was once thought. This is not to deny their differences. Evidently, Eustathius perceives that his own interpretive method contrasts with Origen's, arguing that Origen allegorises where he ought not. As we considered in the opening chapter, it is probably fair to state that Alexandrians, like Origen, preferred figurative interpretation and accepted a multiplicity of meaning, whereas Eustathius, and his Antiochene counterparts, would limit this scope and tended towards the historical, narrative meaning. Yet, it seems Eustathius and Origen would agree on a key point: that the literal meaning holds when it is tenable and must be resolved when it is not. In the case of 1 Samuel 28, Origen holds that a literal understanding of Samuel's resuscitation can be maintained, whereas Eustathius does not. Of course, Eustathius would not consider his own interpretation as 'non-literal' or 'allegorical' – arguing that Scripture gives every indication needed that his reading is the plain and obvious one. Although he and Gregory of Nyssa come to a similar understanding of 1 Samuel 28, whereas Gregory calls those of the opposite

[1049] Ibid., 13.4.

view 'slaves of the letter' [οἱ δοῦλοι τοῦ γράμματος]',[1050] and thus seems willing to consider his own reading as non-literal, Eustathius would have considered himself a faithful servant to the letter, arguing that his reading of the narrative does not lead to doctrinal error. Therefore, as others have suggested,[1051] it seems that it is primarily theological concerns that distinguish Eustathius and Origen's reading of 1 Samuel 28, not exegetical method. Let us, therefore, consider key matters of doctrine which emerge in Eustathius' treatise.

Demonology

Of Eustathius' theological concerns, the treatise's demonological interest is apparent throughout. While Origen also discusses demons when interpretating 1 Samuel 28, in Eustathius' case demons are central to his interpretation, playing a pivotal role by appearing in Samuel's guise.

As noted above, Eustathius regularly establishes that both Saul and the Medium were possessed by demons. For instance, he states that Saul 'was driven to savage passions [ἀγρίοις ἠλαύνετο θυμοῖς] by the demon',[1052] and later explicitly describes him as 'demon-possessed Saul [δαιμονιζομένῳ Σαοὺλ].[1053] Similarly, of the Medium, he states that there was a 'demon raging with frenzy [ἐκβακχεύοντος] in her',[1054] and that she was 'under demonic influence [ὑπὸ δαιμονῶντος]'.[1055] The demonic influence over these two is affirmed time and again, which for Eustathius means that their vision is clouded and that they are out

[1050] Gregory, *Pyth.*, 105.
[1051] Young (1989), p.194; Cartwright (2015), pp.56-7.
[1052] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 2.7.
[1053] Ibid., 4.1.
[1054] Ibid., 3.9.
[1055] Ibid., 7.4.

of their mind.[1056] Clearly he believed that demons have the power to possess and manipulate humans.

Another feature of demons expressed by Eustathius is their ability to create illusions and shapeshift which, like possession, aids their lying. This point is central to his understanding of 1 Samuel 28. Early in the treatise, Eustathius argues that '[t]he beast [θὴρ], indeed, is accustomed to change himself into the forms of many different people [εἰς πολυπροσώπους ἑαυτὸν ἐξαλλάττειν ἰδέας]', before citing 2 Corinthians 11:14-15 in support of this.[1057] As shown above, 2 Corinthians 11:14-15 was regularly cited by those arguing that a demon appeared rather than Samuel, since it suggests that demons can pose as righteous people. If a demon can appear as an angel, then how much easier a prophet. That 'Samuel' was a demonic illusion is repeated clearly throughout the treatise, particularly as Eustathius argues that 'Samuel's' words and actions fit a demon better than the prophet.[1058] He even suggests that demons can take multiple forms simultaneously in order to deceive. This deception is supposedly utilised by demons to fulfil their own fake prophecies, thereby appearing to predict truly. Therefore, even if a demon appears to correctly predict the beginning of a war, Eustathius asks 'who is the culprit [αἴτιός] of all wars?… Does he not transform himself [μεταμορφούμενος] differently in other places, becoming at one and the same time a self-appointed messenger, a witness, and a warlord, slipping into the inner parts of people [εἰς τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐνδόσθια παρεισδύς]?'[1059] In fact, in the treatise's conclusion, Eustathius suggests that the demon did this during the events of 1 Samuel 28. In this last section, which

[1056] For example, see ibid., 7.7-8.
[1057] Ibid., 4.9.
[1058] Ibid., esp. 10.7ff.
[1059] Ibid., 13.9-10.

constitutes the clearest expression of how he understands this passage, Eustathius makes the illusory nature of events abundantly clear. The demon causes 'various hallucinations [διαφόροις ἰνδάλμασιν]' and 'transforms into all sort of shapes [παντοδαποῖς ἐξαλλάττεται σχήμασι]' to create the impression that Samuel appeared.[1060] Additionally, this section states clearly that, during the events of Endor, the demon 'being many-faced [πολυπρόσωπος], he pretends [ὑποκρίνεται] just as much both to come up from the earth and to call out... he seems to present [δοκεῖ παριστᾶν] another coming up besides the one calling, but it is the same one running about here and there changing forms… [ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ τῇδε κἀκεῖσε περιτρέχων ἀλλάττει τὰς ἰδέας]'.[1061] Simultaneously, the demon assumed Samuel's shape and also the Medium calling him. Therefore, here, Eustathius again attests that demons can create multiple, simultaneous deceptions and, further, can seemingly be in multiple places at once. Perhaps contradicting this somewhat, he also suggests in this section the possibility of demon co-workers aiding this demon's deception, a point also made earlier in the treatise as Eustathius seeks to explain the 'gods' the Medium saw (1 Samuel 28:13).[1062] In this section, then, Eustathius describes the various demonic abilities of creating illusions, shape shifting, and even bilocation and demonic coalitions, to explain the events of 1 Samuel 28.

Eustathius notes other attributes that demons utilise to suggest they can prophesy. For instance, demons are knowledgeable of past events and Scripture, and use these to make predictions. Eustathius argues that any truth the demon disguised as Samuel spoke was based on predictions made by the real Samuel when alive, as well as by observation of

[1060] Ibid., 30.1-2.
[1061] Ibid., 30.2.
[1062] Ibid., 10.1-2.

history and events.[1063] These words are suggestive of demonic omnipresence, witnessing all of this, but certainly attests to their deep bank of knowledge. This supernatural knowledge is also suggested later in the treatise. While Eustathius emphasises that demons do not have *fore*knowledge nor knowledge of spiritual things, he claims it is reasonable to assume that they have access to public information and can know corporeal things.[1064] Additionally, he notes that the demon knows Scripture: although 'poorly trained [κακομαθῶς], he knows what has been written [τὰ γεγραμμένα]'.[1065] Thus, demons use their knowledge of events, history, and Scripture to make reasonable predictions, without foreknowledge – they are merely 'conjecturing [στοχαζόμενος]'.[1066] Origen and Eustathius are ostensibly in agreement here. Origen argues that a demon could not have prophesied in 1 Samuel 28,[1067] as does Eustathius. The difference is that while Origen raises doubts that the speaker was a demon, Eustathius raises doubts about the 'prophecy' itself.

Yet, while Eustathius' position is generally, and emphatically, that demons cannot prophesy, there are places where this is confused and, conversely, he suggests that they may have some foreknowledge. This is seen when Eustathius refers to 1 Kings 22:15-23, which describes a deceiving spirit with access to God's throne room, who was clearly aware that King Ahab was going to die in battle.[1068] Evidently the spirit actually knew what would happen in the future, and so Eustathius concludes 'that the Devil knows beforehand [προμεμάθηκεν ὁ διάβολος] the evils inflicted upon the unrighteous'.[1069] The fate of the

[1063] Ibid., 13.5-7.
[1064] Ibid., 23.4-5.
[1065] Ibid., 23.8.
[1066] Ibid., 13.7.
[1067] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 4.9; 5.1; 5.4.
[1068] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 14.1-5.
[1069] Ibid., 14.5.

wicked is known to demons, the implication being that Samuel's demonic imposter may similarly have known about the fate in battle of another wicked king, Saul, despite Eustathius saying only a few lines earlier that 'with a lack of foreknowledge [ἀπορίᾳ προγνώσεως], the demon declared nothing true'.[1070] Again, later in the treatise, Eustathius argues 'that the demon prophesied nothing, as we have earlier shown. But even if he happened to have spoken words worthy of prophecy, one ought not thus to suppose that the demon brought up spirits and souls from Hades', before continuing to cite the example of Caiaphas.[1071] Although he introduces this section by stating that the demon of 1 Samuel 28 did not prophecy, he cites examples suggesting that prophecy can come from unlikely, even unworthy, sources. How Eustathius can reconcile these contradictory ideas is unclear. The likeliest solution is that, for rhetorical purposes, Eustathius is simply covering all bases. His reasoning is as follows: the demon in Samuel's guise did not truly prophesy but, *even if he had*, this would not be sufficient evidence to prove that Samuel himself spoke instead.

Eustathius is much clearer about another ability that demons certainly lack, namely the ability to raise the dead. Arguing against what he perceives to be Origen's position, that a demon raised Samuel,[1072] Eustathius claims early in the treatise that 'a demon does not bring up anyone's soul'.[1073] This point also constitutes his closing remarks, that the demon 'summons from Hades neither the souls of the prophets nor the spirits of the righteous nor angelic dignity', since such power 'belongs exclusively and above all to the nature of the divine'.[1074] For Eustathius, power over life and death, particularly of the righteous, belongs

[1070] Ibid., 13.5.
[1071] Ibid., 24.2-3.
[1072] We have already noted that Origen probably did not believe this at all.
[1073] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 4.8.
[1074] Ibid., 30.5-6.

to God alone, and so a demon could not have truly raised the prophet. While demons may have many special abilities, Eustathius is clear that their power has limitations and cannot rival God's.

Perhaps the key characteristic of demons, as portrayed by Eustathius, is their deceptive nature. Demons' power has limitations – they cannot prophesy nor raise the dead – and therefore they must rely on their other abilities to deceive, such as their ability to possess, create illusions, and their vast knowledge. In the case of 1 Samuel 28, these create the *impression* that the real Samuel appeared and prophesied to Saul. The deceptive character of demons is also stated explicitly by Eustathius, particularly when he cites Christ, who calls the Devil 'a liar and the father of the lie' (John 8:44),[1075] concluding that 'the demon, as is his custom, boldly lied' in 1 Samuel 28.[1076] Throughout the treatise, Eustathius regularly accuses the demon of 1 Samuel 28 of lying.

Finally, Eustathius explains what motivates demons. Ultimately, it is to take away God's rightful worship. Referring to Saul bowing before 'Samuel' (1 Samuel 28:14), Eustathius states that 'the Devil changed himself into various forms, exerting himself to be worshiped by the ruler so that, from this, he might deceive as many people as possible to unknowingly bow down to him'.[1077] He supports this reading by referring to Christ's temptation in the wilderness, where the Devil promises Christ all the kingdoms of the world if Christ bows down and worships him (Matthew 4:8-9).[1078] Thus, if the Devil was willing to say this to

[1075] Ibid., 4.2.
[1076] Ibid., 4.3.
[1077] Ibid., 10.13.
[1078] Ibid., 10.14-19.

Christ, in the case of 1 Samuel 28, 'how is it not clear that, wishing to be worshiped equally with God, he was doing these things?'[1079] By deceiving Saul, the demon promotes idolatry by making God's anointed king bow to him instead of God. Similar motivations seem to be behind the demon's desire to be seen as being able to raise the dead, an ability which belongs to God alone.[1080] Through such deceptions, the demon makes himself equal with the divine.

Eustathius' depiction of demons in this treatise is commonplace, akin to the demonology already encountered in this study, and similar to the abilities and characteristics ascribed to demons in his contemporary Athanasius' *Vita Antonii.*[1081] So too, from Origen's depiction of demons in his corpus, where he likewise attests to the supernatural abilities of demons, their deceptive nature, and also their limitations, it seems unlikely that Origen would disagree drastically with Eustathius' expressed demonology. [1082] Eustathius perceives one major difference between their demonology, which could be a significant theological distinction shaping how both authors read 1 Samuel 28. He claims that Origen suggests that a demon raised Samuel, thereby having power over the souls of the righteous, whereas Eustathius argues that this goes beyond demonic abilities. Yet, as we have suggested, Origen probably did not actually believe that demons raised Samuel and would probably have agreed that demons could not have done this themselves. Perhaps this misunderstanding of Origen's position lies at the root of Eustathius' disagreement with him.

[1079] Ibid., 10.17.
[1080] Ibid., 3.3-4; 30.5-6.
[1081] Athanasius, *Vita Antonii*, 23.1ff.
[1082] Origen, *Cels.*, 3.25; 4.92; 5.5; 6.45; 8.31-32; *Princ.*, 3.2.1ff; see also Tzvetkova-Glaser (2013).

Magic

It is worth also considering briefly Eustathius' understanding of magic and superstition. Much of what has already been said of Eustathius' demonology applies also to his understanding of magic, which utilises demons. Just as demons are portrayed as deceptive and illusory, magic is described in similar terms. This is seen most clearly when Eustathius cites the episode of Moses and Pharaoh's magicians (Exodus 7:8ff).[1083] Although they seemed to copy Moses' signs, the magicians 'created an illusion of the apparitions [ἐφάνταζε τὰς ὄψεις]'.[1084] The illusory, deceptive qualities of their magic are proven by the fact that Moses' staff swallow up those of the magicians.[1085] Eustathius goes as far as to say that these magicians were no more impressive than 'jugglers in the theatre'![1086] Through this example, Eustathius establishes that the events of 1 Samuel 28 were similarly 'accomplished by spurious illusions'.[1087]

Due to their demonic association and because they are illusory deceptions, Eustathius emphasises that magical arts are illicit and should not be pursued. This is particularly suggested when he cites other passages in the Pentateuch, namely the condemnations against magical practitioners found in Leviticus 20:27 and Deuteronomy 18:9-12.[1088] With these condemnations in mind, Eustathius describes such superstition, including the actions of 'belly-mythers', as 'loathsome things [τὰ βδελύγματα]'.[1089]

[1083] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 9.1ff.
[1084] Ibid., 9.4.
[1085] Ibid.
[1086] Ibid., 9.10.
[1087] Ibid., 9.14.
[1088] Ibid., 24.11-15.
[1089] Ibid., 24.11.

Again, as with his demonology, there is little regarding Eustathius' understanding of magic that Origen would have disagreed with. However, as we have noted, Eustathius seems to think, probably incorrectly, that Origen ascribes too much power to such demonic arts.

Agency

Having considered demonology and magic, it is worth briefly noting the issue of agency. The central role of the demon in the events of 1 Samuel 28 is without question, who imitates Samuel's form. Further, Eustathius' presentation of Saul and the Medium as being deluded and possessed by a demon implies diminished responsibility on their part, despite their clear moral failings. However, particularly in the case of the Medium, Eustathius sometimes emphasises her own deceptions and lies,[1090] even hinting that she played a role in casting these illusions.[1091]

Responsibility for the events of 1 Samuel 28 is blurred further by the close, almost indistinguishable, association of the Medium and demons. In fact, Eustathius occasionally conflates the two, such as when he asks '…how much more necessary is it not to believe a demon promising to summon souls from Hades and righteous spirits'.[1092] Eustathius never describes Saul as a demon. In fact, he sets out this difference clearly when he states that it is blasphemous 'to believe either the demon-possessed Saul… or a boasting demon, even promising to summon righteous souls from Hades'.[1093] Saul is said to be possessed by a demon, but the Medium *is* a demon. At times the Medium's demonic identity suggests her

[1090] Ibid., 3.6; 3.9; 16.7-8.
[1091] Ibid., 4.9; 25.7.
[1092] Ibid., 24.9; see also 3.3.
[1093] Ibid., 4.1.

culpability, for instance when Eustathius states that 'the Pythian prophetess [πυθόμαντις], since she saw the demons from the same womb [ὁμογαστρίους] as her, just as any siblings from the same womb exalt kin from the same mother [οἷα δή τινας ὁμοκοιλίους ἀδελφοὺς ἐπαίρουσα τὰ ὁμομήτρια γένη], she cried out "I have seen gods coming up from the earth."'[1094] Eustathius describes the Medium as being of the same family as the demons who appeared, therefore acting in a way that aids them. However, in the treatise' final section, although affirming that the one who summoned Samuel was a demon,[1095] the Medium appears here to be without control. In explaining the significance of 'belly-myther', Eustathius claims that the demon was lurking in her inner organs, fabricating lies (or 'myths') from her belly. Dwelling inside the Medium, the demon 'consumes her and disables her thinking [αὐτὴν ἐπινέμεται καὶ βλάπτει τὴν φρόνησιν]' and 'leads her soul by various hallucinations [διαφόροις ἰνδάλμασιν ὑπάγει τὴν ψυχήν]'.[1096] Here, their close association by possession diminishes the Medium's agency. By speaking of the Medium and the demon so interchangeably, the point Eustathius wants to make is clear: magical practitioners and their arts are closely associated with demons. However, what remains unclear, partly due to this close connection, is the precise role each party plays in the events of 1 Samuel 28.

Angelology

This treatise also provides some insight into Eustathius' angelology. He certainly considers angelology to be a theological point of departure between himself and Origen's understanding of 1 Samuel 28, and discusses the subject in response to Origen's suggestion that angels appeared with Samuel to explain why the Medium saw 'gods', in the plural,

[1094] Ibid., 20.1.
[1095] Ibid., 30.2.
[1096] Ibid., 30.1.

coming from the earth (1 Samuel 28:13).[1097] Eustathius argues that Saul's choice in bowing down before 'Samuel', rather than these supposed angels, is an indication of the fraud taking place. This is because, according to Eustathius, the angels would have been greater in number and because 'the flamelike dignity of angels is always far better than that of humans'.[1098] Eustathius here expresses a belief in the holiness and superiority of angels over humans; a more worthy object of worship than Samuel.

Later in the treatise, Eustathius rejects Origen's view that angels appeared with Samuel on other grounds. Firstly, neither the demon nor the Medium had the authority to summon angels.[1099] Again, the superiority of angels is implied, not only above human authority but also that of demonic forces. Additionally, Eustathius notes that angels could not possibly have 'come up' with Samuel, since Christ alone descended to Hades.[1100] Rather, 'the angels on every occasion stand near to God [τῷ θεῷ παρεστᾶσιν ἑκάστοτε], being eager to fulfil their due services, but they do not dwell in Hades'.[1101] Later, Eustathius explains that 'to summon the chorus of angels… God alone and his most divine [θειότατος] Son have the authority to accomplish this'.[1102] Summoning angels is far beyond the abilities of evil forces. In fact, in his conclusion, Eustathius adds that angels mock the Devil, since their superiority is evident.[1103]

[1097] Ibid., 10.11-13; cf. Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 7.3.
[1098] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 10.12-13.
[1099] Ibid., 20.3.
[1100] Ibid., 20.5.
[1101] Ibid., 20.6.
[1102] Ibid., 23.6.
[1103] Ibid., 30.5.

While Eustathius may present this as a point of departure between his own and Origen's understanding of 1 Samuel 28, again one suspects that Origen would not have strongly disagreed with Eustathius' angelology.[1104] If, as we have suggested, Origen believed that the real Samuel appeared, but not by demonic compulsion, then the same would apply in theory to the angels who appeared with him. Origen would have agreed with Eustathius regarding the superiority of angels over demons and human magical practitioners, expressed elsewhere,[1105] and if he thought angels had appeared with Samuel, Origen would probably have suggested that they came voluntarily or at God's command. However, Origen does seem to postulate that the angels could have ascended from Hades (without suggesting why they were below), which would contradict Eustathius' argument that angels are 'in the heavens', always in close proximity with God (and certainly not in Hades).[1106] Similarly, although Eustathius does not acknowledge Origen's passing reference to companion angels, the fixed presence of angels with God that Eustathius describes, constantly attending to him (not humans), suggests this might have been another point of difference. However, it is important to note that the angels' ascent with Samuel is merely a suggestion by Origen to explain the reference to 'gods', alongside the possibility that other prophets came up with Samuel, which he may prefer.[1107] He does not express the appearance of angels as a certainty. Here we see Origen's speculative theology working against him once more, presenting possibilities which he himself may not have believed, and thereby inviting objection.[1108] However, even if there are differences in Origen and Eustathius' angelology,

[1104] For more on Origen's angelology, see Daniélou (1955), pp.220-45.
[1105] Origen, *Cels.*, 4.29; 5.2; 8.27; 8.34; 8.36; *Princ.*, 1.6.2-3; 1.8.1ff.
[1106] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 20.4-6.
[1107] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 7.2-3. The ascension of other prophets is Origen's first suggestion, and best complements his point that the prophets, pre-Christ, were in Hades. In fact, his reference to angels appearing with 'spirits' in the plural suggests that this option is in addition, not opposition, to the prophets appearing.
[1108] Trigg argues that Origen's speculative approach is at the heart of Eustathius' opposition to Origen, see Trigg (1995), pp.236-8.

since this is a peripheral point of Origen's interpretation of 1 Samuel 28 and Eustathius' critique in response, it seems that a more important theological distinction is at the root of Eustathius's disagreement with Origen's reading of this passage.

Christology

One might expect Christology to be a fruitful point of consideration for identifying distinction between Eustathius' and Origen's thought, for it is Christology, alongside exegetical method, which has typically been considered an identifying distinction between Alexandrian and Antiochene theology. As previously noted, it has been said that Alexandrian theologians tended towards a *logos-sarx* Christology, emphasising the unity between Christ's human and divine nature, whereas Antiochenes understood Christ in *logos-anthropos* terms, emphasising the distinction between these two natures. Traditionally, again, Alexandrians tended to emphasise Christ's divinity, whereas Antiochenes tended to emphasise his humanity.[1109] Certainly this treatise provides insight into Eustathius' understanding of Christ, and thus wider Antiochene Christology. As we shall see, Eustathius both affirms and denies expectations.

One of Eustathius' earliest Christological references in the treatise occurs as he describes Christ's temptation by the Devil in the wilderness (see Appendix N.2). In this section, Eustathius affirms clearly the two aspects of Christ, his humanity and divinity; these are set out in binary terms – they are distinct, almost conveyed as opposites to one another.[1110] This is typical of depictions of Antiochene Christology. Eustathius describes Christ's divine aspect

[1109] For the seminal discussion of early Christology, which popularised these terms and these distinctions, see Grillmeier (1975), esp. 'Part Two'.
[1110] The construction 'μὲν… θεὸν,… ἄνθρωπον δὲ' suggests this contradistinction.

in terms of being 'God in deed and action and God's genuine Son in nature [ἔργῳ… καὶ πράξει θεὸν καὶ φύσει θεοῦ γνήσιον υἱόν]'. Here, Eustathius does not describe Christ as being 'God in nature' outright, but qualifies his divinity as stemming from God, almost as an expression of God's divinity. On the other hand, Christ is said to be 'a pure man [ἄνθρωπον… καθαρόν]', without qualification. At the same time, he appears willing to ascribe the epithet 'God' to the earthly Christ, referring to the Devil 'being at war with God [θεομαχῶν]', of Christ acting in 'a manner suitable of God [θεοπρεπῶς]' and 'appropriate for God [ἴδιον… θεῷ]'.[1111] Similarly, Eustathius' description of Christ being 'God in deed [ἔργῳ] and action [πράξει]' may represent another example, as Sophie Cartwright has observed elsewhere in *De engastrimytho*, of 'the Word as the acting subject in Christ's earthly actions, whereas in the anti-Arian works, the human being, strengthened by the Word, is invariably the acting subject.'[1112] Therefore, the Christology of Eustathius in *De engastrimytho* does not appear to contradict either later Alexandrian or later Antiochene models.

There is a particularly fascinating consideration in this section regarding how Eustathius describes Christ's composition. He refers to Christ's πρόσωπον which, if Eustathius is echoing Origen's usage when discussing 1 Samuel 28,[1113] and how he himself uses it elsewhere in the treatise,[1114] means something like 'persona' or 'identity'. If so, this possibly refers to Christ's entire being. Immediately after this, regarding Christ's dual aspects (his divinity and humanity), Eustathius describes Christ as being 'God's genuine Son in nature [φύσει]'. If φύσει applies also to Christ's human aspect, then we have a dyophysite

[1111] Ibid.
[1112] Ibid.
[1113] Cf. Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28,* 4.2; 4.8; 6.2.
[1114] Cf. Eustathius, *Engast.*, 3.4; 7.7; 16.10.

construction here not dissimilar to the formulation 'two natures in one person', as would later be defined in the Council of Chalcedon 451.[1115] Although the Council may have intended to affirm Cyril of Alexandria's Christology and lacked sympathy for Antiochenes,[1116] this dyophysite Christological definition was acceptable to Antiochenes such as Theodoret of Cyrrhus, albeit with his own understanding of its meaning.[1117] Perhaps Theodoret's amenability to such a definition can be partly explained by the use of these terms by Eustathius when describing Christ, an earlier Antiochene precedent. Thus, one could say that this aspect of the Chalcedonian definition belongs to both Antiochene and Alexandrian Christological traditions.[1118]

Eustathius discusses Christ again later in the treatise, at some length,[1119] as he considers Origen's application of Christ's descent to Hades to 1 Samuel 28. Although Eustathius maintained this doctrine, he particularly objects to Origen's claim that Christ 'while being in the place below, he was above in purpose [προαιρέσει]'.[1120] Eustathius' primary objection is that he believes that Origen writes 'as though discoursing about a man only [ἀνθρώπου… μόνου], but no longer also paying regard for his [Christ's] divine nature [θείας… φύσεως]'.[1121] Here, again, we see Eustathius apply the term φῦσις to Christ's divinity. The reason why Eustathius believes that Origen's comments make light of Christ's divinity is because he believes that all who go to Hades, even the unrighteous, are above in terms of

[1115] For a detailed account of the Council and its context, see Price and Gaddis (2005), pp.1-85. For more on Chalcedon scholarship, see also Daley (2018), p.1ff.
[1116] Price and Gaddis (2005), p.66; Edwards (2009), p.171.
[1117] Clayton (2007), esp. pp.283ff; Schor (2011), pp.201ff.
[1118] Henry Chadwick similarly argues that the Chalcedonian definition belongs to both traditions, see Chadwick (1991); although, as Edwards argues, Antiochene contribution to this Chalcedonian definition may have been limited, see Edwards (2009), p.171; see also Price and Gaddis (2005), p.66.
[1119] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 17.3–19.4.
[1120] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 8.2.
[1121] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 17.5.

'purpose' since they 'yearn constantly to be kept in the highest dwellings'.[1122] Thus, according to Eustathius, Origen 'did not understand that "the Word," being "God" (John 1:1) [θεὸς ὢν ὁ λόγος], is present everywhere all at once [ἀπανταχοῦ πάρεστιν ἀθρόως] not by "purpose", but rather by the excellence of his divinity [ἀρετῇ τῆς θεότητος]'.[1123] Eustathius claims that Christ is omnipresent due to his divinity, and thus was above and below ontologically speaking, not merely in outlook or intent. Eustathius' strong emphasis on Christ's divinity, claiming that Origen has ignored this, is again a reversal of what we might expect.

As Eustathius describes the sequence of Christ's descent to Hades, he describes the destruction of Christ's 'temple [ναὸν]' and the descent of 'the soul [ψυχὴ] of this human tabernacle [ἀνθρωπείου σκηνώματος]' to Hades.[1124] Since, earlier, when describing Christ as a 'pure man', Eustathius also praises him as 'a marvel of a temple [ναοῦ χρῆμα]',[1125] and as he here specifies that it is the 'soul' of the 'human tabernacle' that descends to Hades, it seems that, by 'temple', Eustathius is referring to Christ's whole humanity (not merely his body). The use of temple imagery to refer to Christ's full humanity is considered a typical feature of Antiochene Christology, a trait to which Eustathius seems to conform.[1126]

Eustathius explains that, when Christ's human soul descended to Hades, 'it was strengthened by divine power [θεσπεσίᾳ κεκραταίωται δυνάμει] because of the constant association of God the Word [τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ λόγου συνουσίαν], so that he also had

[1122] Ibid., 17.7; see also 17.5-8.
[1123] Ibid., 17.8.
[1124] Ibid., 17.9.
[1125] Ibid., 10.14.
[1126] Daley (2018), p.174.

authority overseeing all things [παντέφορον]'.[1127] Similarly, Eustathius later states, 'Christ's holy soul, by living together with God the Word [τῷ θεῷ συνδιαιτωμένη καὶ λόγῳ], travels to all places at once [πάντα… ἐκπεριπολεῖ συλλήβδην]'.[1128] Certainly, here, Eustathius suggests close unity between Christ's human and divine aspects, describing them as 'mingling' and even being 'consubstantial' (συνουσίαν can carry this sense), and 'co-habiting' (συνδιαιτωμένη). The result of this unity is that the Word's divine characteristics, its omnipresence, can be ascribed also to Christ's human soul. Again, we do not see here the strictly divisive Christology associated with Eustathius' later works, and Antiochene Christology more generally.[1129] However, importantly, throughout this section, Christ's salvific actions, primarily his descent to Hades (but also his death),[1130] are ascribed to his human aspect, which is 'strengthened by divine power'. Therefore, a sense of distinction is maintained, since these divine attributes only belong to Christ's humanity by association and since, in typical Antiochene fashion, Christ's humanity is stated to be the agent of Christ's earthly actions.[1131]

To further prove that Christ was not just above in 'purpose', Eustathius cites Luke 23:43 again, 'when he came to the subterranean regions [καταχθονίους… τόπους], at the same time he also led the soul of the thief that very day [αὐθήμερον] into Paradise'.[1132] Supported by his reading of John 3:13, Eustathius posits that Christ's human soul (due to its association with the Word) is simultaneously both in Hades and Paradise (and, indeed, everywhere).[1133]

[1127] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 17.10.
[1128] Ibid., 18.5.
[1129] Cartwright (2015), p.54.
[1130] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 17.9.
[1131] Cartwright (2015), p.54.
[1132] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 18.1.
[1133] Ibid., 18.3ff.

Eustathius ends this segment on Christ in quasi-doxological praise of his divine aspect, to emphasise his omnipresence. He cites Wisdom 18:14-16 and its grandiose description of the 'all-powerful Word' and its far-reaching presence.[1134] Eustathius also describes Christ as 'the only begotten Son of God [ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ]'.[1135] Although this is biblical terminology (cf. John 1:18),[1136] Eustathius here echoes the Nicene Creed, seemingly affirming that Christ's divine aspect is co-eternal with God, begotten not made.[1137] Also like the Nicene Creed, Eustathius immediately follows this by considering Christ's role in Creation, 'through whom' all things 'have been made [γεγόνασιν]', and like the Creed continues to consider Christ's role as Judge at the end of time.[1138] If this text has correctly been dated to a period before the Council of Nicaea, as Cartwright claims,[1139] then Eustathius' words here might challenge another of her claims – that 'there is little evidence that Eustathius was the source for the Nicene Formula's key theological terms'.[1140] Otherwise, it suggests the prevalence of some of these formulations pre-Nicaea,[1141] or that *De engastrimytho* requires a later dating. The purpose of Eustathius' splendid portrayal of Christ is to show that 'he fills all things in all ways by the excellence of his divinity [θεότητος ἀρετῇ δηλονότι πάντα πληροῖ πανταχῶς]'.[1142] Thus, Eustathius argues, Origen is incorrect: Christ was not merely 'above in purpose' but was present there 'by the working of divinity [θειότητος ἐνεργείᾳ]'.[1143]

[1134] Ibid., 19.1.
[1135] Ibid., 19.2.
[1136] Cf. ibid., 18.6.
[1137] For a recent consideration of the Nicene Creed, see Edwards (2021).
[1138] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 19.2.
[1139] Cartwright (2015), p.54.
[1140] Ibid., p.17.
[1141] Edwards (2021).
[1142] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 19.2.
[1143] Ibid., 19.3-4.

Although Eustathius sets these Christological points in opposition to Origen, in reality it seems that they agree on many points. Both agree that Christ descended to Hades between his crucifixion and resurrection, and that this was to free captive souls.[1144] Nor would Origen have likely disagreed with Eustathius' on his only concrete Christological charge against him, namely that Christ was more than just 'above in purpose' when he was in Hades. In *Dialogus cum Heraclide*, reflecting his tripartite anthropology, Origen argues that Christ's 'body was in the tomb, his soul in Hades, his spirit he committed to the Father [ὸ σῶμα ἐν τῷ μνημείῳ, ἡ ψυχὴ ἐνᾴδου, τὸ πνεῦμα παρέθετο τῷ Πατρί]'.[1145] Thus, Origen would agree with Eustathius that Christ was ontologically 'above' in some capacity. Eustathius does not reflect Origen fairly here, since Origen's point in the homily is that Christ and the prophets share a common προαιρέσει which is 'above' while in Hades, since Samuel and the prophets could not be said to exist 'above' in a true capacity as Christ does. Where it seems Eustathius and Origen might truly disagree concerns Christ's ascent, not descent, between his death and resurrection. Both apparently agree that it was Christ's soul which descended to Hades, but while Origen speaks of Christ's 'spirit' ascending in *Dialogus cum Heraclide*, Eustathius states that it is the soul again that ascends due to its unity with the all-present Word. Therefore, as Cartwright also observes, it seems that Eustathius' anthropology differs from Origen's by primarily emphasising a body-soul dualism.[1146] It is unclear to what extent Origen would attribute the divine attribute of 'omni-presence' to Christ's soul specifically, as Eustathius does, during the period it was in Hades and separate from its spirit. In *Contra Celsum*,

[1144] Ibid., 17.9.
[1145] Origen, *Dial.,* 7.17-18; see also 6.9–8.17.
[1146] Cartwright (2015), pp.156-7. This also explains why Eustathius speaks of 'souls' and 'spirits' interchangeably, see *Engast.*, 3.3; 6.1; 10.6; 24.3; 24.9; 30.5.

however, Origen states that Christ's 'mortal body [θνητὸν… σῶμα] and the human soul in him [ἀνθρωπίνην ἐν αὐτῷ ψυχὴν]… not only by communion [οὐ μόνον κοινωνίᾳ] but also by unity [ἑνώσει] and by mixture [ἀνακράσει], received the greatest things and sharing in His divinity was transformed into God [τῆς ἐκείνου θειότητος κεκοινωνηκότα εἰς θεὸν μεταβεβληκέναι]'.[1147] Here, in even stronger terms than Eustathius uses to denote this unity, Origen describes Christ's human soul as 'mixing' with the subject of the previous sentence, 'God… the very Logos',[1148] so that he is 'transformed into God'. As such, although Origen would have ascribed such divine attributes to Christ's spirit,[1149] I do not think he would disagree with Eustathius that Christ's soul in Hades was omnipresent also.[1150] Importantly, however, even if these are matters of difference, Eustathius does not articulate these issues, and so this does not seem to account for their different readings of 1 Samuel 28.

Nor do other points of Christology appear to lie behind their disagreement surrounding this passage. Certainly, Eustathius does not seem to disagree with Origen along a traditional Antiochene/Alexandrian distinction. While we have certainly seen Christological features which could typically be classified as Antiochene in *De engastrimytho*, we have also shown that Eustathius' Christology is untypical in places, and even appears closer to what would typically be considered Alexandrian Christology. Eustathius himself certainly does not frame his disagreement along Christological lines. As noted above, and as seems to be the consensus, this may partly reflect Eustathius' undeveloped Christology, since *De engastrimytho* is thought to have been composed prior to the Council of Nicaea.[1151] In truth,

[1147] Origen, *Cels.*, 3.41 [Chadwick (1980), p.156, revised].
[1148] Ibid.; see also *Princ.*, 2.6.3; 4.4.4.
[1149] Edwards (2009), p.91.
[1150] Greer intimates this also, see Greer (2007), p.lxix; see also Cartwright (2015), pp.133ff.
[1151] Greer (2007), p.lxx; Cartwright (2015), p.54; Declerck (2002), pp.cccxciv-cccxcvi; Spanneut (1948), p.60.

Origen in the homily is most interested in what Christ *does* not who he *is*, and Eustathius takes no issue with these actions. Similarly, while Eustathius claims that Origen's understanding of Christ differs from his own, this is neither substantiated by his representation of Origen nor, indeed, by the relatively little attention he pays to Christology in the treatise and in forming his own interpretation of 1 Samuel 28. While Origen and Eustathius would have certainly disputed over matters of Christology had they every truly met, something else must surely account for the profound differences in how they understood 1 Samuel 28.

Eschatology

Finally, let us consider Eustathius' eschatology, particularly the soul and its destiny. As part of this, we shall also consider Eustathius' anthropology. Regarding the nature of the soul and its characteristics, while presenting hypothetically the possibility that the real Samuel appeared in 1 Samuel 28, Eustathius states that '[i]f she [the Medium] brought him up incorporeally [ἀσώματον], then she did not raise up Samuel, but a form of spirit [πνεύματος ἰδέαν]. For the self that has been composed of soul and body is Samuel [ὁ γὰρ ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἡρμοσμένος οὗτός ἐστι Σαμουήλ], since a human being has a proportionate mixture of both [ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ κρᾶσιν ἔχων ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἀνάλογον]'.[1152] As already observed in Christ's composition, Eustathius presents a bipartite anthropology in all people, understanding humans to be composed of body and soul.[1153] This 'mixture' is important for him, asserting that both are required to be a 'human being'. Thus, emphasising the importance of the body, Eustathius argues that it could not have been truly 'Samuel' who

[1152] *Engast.*, 5.3.
[1153] Cartwright (2015), pp.156-7.

appeared if this appearance was not physical. While this section makes further references to the soul, much of Eustathius' own views are masked by the hypotheticality of the discussion. However, he does state that 'clothes are fitted to bodies rather than the souls',[1154] arguing that the reference to Samuel wearing a cloak is a red herring. By these comments, Eustathius seems to emphasise the soul's incorporeality.

There appear to be points of departure here between Eustathius and Origen, which may have shaped their diverging readings of 1 Samuel 28. Firstly, substantiating the words of 1 Thessalonians 5:23, Origen tends to speak of human composition in tripartite terms; body, soul, and spirit.[1155] To the contrary, Eustathius presents a bipartite anthropology, although this difference does not seem to account for their variant readings. However, Eustathius' view that these binary aspects together are necessary to form a 'human being' is more significant in this regard. Since Eustathius presumes the figure that was seen appeared without a body, he concludes that this bodiless being could not truly be 'Samuel', but rather a shadowy, demonic figure.[1156] Thus, Eustathius emphasises the importance of the body to the entire human identity.[1157] Origen would probably have disagreed with Eustathius on two counts. Firstly, Origen, who believed that the soul was the locus of the will,[1158] and who tended to emphasise the inner man over the outer, would probably not have taken issue in describing Samuel's soul as truly representing Samuel.[1159] Secondly, Samuel was not entirely without a body for Origen. As we have noted, it seems that Origen believed that souls always

[1154] *Engast.*, 6.6.
[1155] Origen, *Princ.*, 4.2.4; *Dial.,* 6.20ff; *Comm. Rom.,* 1.12.1-2. It seems Eustathius is aware of Origen's three senses of Scripture, and so he probably also knew of Origen's tripartite anthropology which informed this, see Eustathius, *Engast.*, 21.1.
[1156] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 5.3-5; 6.5.
[1157] Cartwright (2015), pp.83ff.
[1158] Origen, *Hom. Gen.,* 1.15; Crouzel (1989), pp.88-9; Decock (2011), p.79.
[1159] Origen, *Princ.,* 2.10.1; see Jacobsen (2019), p.40.

occupy some form of body, and even argued from 1 Samuel 28, according to Methodius, that after death this form is in some semblance [or σχῆμα] of its earthly body.[1160] Methodius took issue with Origen for stating that this degree of corporeality did not belong to the soul itself.[1161] Cartwright, however, has convincingly argued that Eustathius, despite his admiration of Methodius, seems to agree with Origen that souls are innately incorporeal.[1162] Eustathius' issue with Origen here, it seems, is that he disregards the importance of the body itself.

That Eustathius is concerned with defending the importance of the body is further supported by his comments later in the treatise, when he refers to Methodius' opposition to Origen on the issue of the resurrection. While Eustathius does not go into detail, claiming that Origen's errors on the resurrection are too voluminous and that Methodius had 'sufficiently written' on this matter, he and Methodius' main objection is that Origen 'defined the resurrection as one of form [ἐπὶ εἴδους] but not of the body itself [ἐπὶ σώματος αὐτοῦ]'.[1163] Eustathius, it seems, takes issue with the corporeality of Origen's doctrine of the resurrection. On this matter, they certainly appear to disagree. Origen held a doctrine of the resurrection,[1164] as Eustathius and Methodius observe also, although it is difficult to grasp.[1165] Based on the testimony of 1 Corinthians 15:35-51, Origen did not believe that the resurrection was one of 'flesh and blood', but that a 'spiritual body' shall be acquired.[1166] Although this spiritual body shall retain the εἶδος of its earthly body, Origen thought it would be materially different and

[1160] Methodius, *Res.,* 3.17.2-4; Edwards (2002), p.109; see Cartwright (2015), pp.128-33.
[1161] Methodius, *Res.,* 3.3.4–5; Cartwright (2015), p.129.
[1162] Cartwright (2015), pp.128ff.
[1163] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 22.5.
[1164] Origen, *Cels.,* 5.17ff; 7.32ff; *Princ.,* 2.10.1-3.
[1165] Cerioni (2019), p.22; Edwards (2009), p.93ff.
[1166] Origen, *Cels.,* 5.22; see also *Princ.,* 2.10.1-3.

far more tenuous.[1167] However, as Cartwright states, 'Eustathius is adamant that our resurrection bodies will be corporeal, and the same in substance as the current body'.[1168] While they may disagree on this, it is not immediately clear how this criticism of Origen relates to Eustathius' argument nor his reading of 1 Samuel 28, since Eustathius must have believed that this passage refers to a period between Samuel's death and the final resurrection.[1169] It is possible, however, since Origen emphasises in his homily immediate entrance into Paradise, that Eustathius is trying to maintain the importance of the final resurrection as the ultimate destiny of believers. Thus, Eustathius' issue with Origen's resurrection 'of form' is not only its substance, but its realisation, since Eustathius believes (perhaps rightly) that this eschatological event is less significant in Origen's thought.[1170] Therefore, as Greer concludes, 'there is much to be said for understanding one of Eustathius's motives as related to defending the resurrection of the body'.[1171]

De engastrimytho also offers insight into how Eustathius understood the fate of souls before the resurrection. This is seen in particular as he attempts to prove that the imposter Samuel's claim that Saul would be with him the next day (1 Samuel 28:19) cannot be true, but rather a demonic lie designed to show 'that the righteous person does not differ at all from the wicked'.[1172] Eustathius proves that these words are untrue by referring to Luke 16:19-31. Although the miserly rich man's misdeeds do not compare to Saul's, after death the rich man 'was handed over to the unceasing flames of fire [ταῖς ἀκοιμήτοις ἐδόθη φλοξὶν

[1167] Methodius, *Res.,* 1.22-23; Origen, *Cels.*, 7.32; see also Edwards (2002), p.109; Cerioni (2019), p.29; Decock (2011), p.81; McGlothlin (2018), p.255.
[1168] Cartwright (2015), p.118.
[1169] Ibid.
[1170] See our earlier discussion of Origen's concept of the resurrection.
[1171] Greer (2007), p.lx.
[1172] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 14.7.

τοῦ πυρός]', while the poor man 'rested in the bosom of the forefather Abraham [ὁ μὲν εἰς κόλπους ἔληξε τοῦ προπάτορος Ἀβραάμ]'.[1173] In particular, Eustathius emphasises Abraham's words, that each man had received their fitting reward and that an uncrossable chasm lies between the righteous and unrighteous after death (Luke 16:25-26).[1174] Applying this to 1 Samuel 28, due to this uncrossable distinction at death between the righteous and unrighteous, 'it has been established that Saul, being unrighteous, is not with the prophet Samuel'.[1175] Eustathius summarises his argument *a fortiori* as follows: 'If the rich man cannot be with the poor man… how much more is the wretched man [Saul] unworthy to enjoy the fellowship of the saints.'[1176]

In these arguments, Eustathius demonstrates how he conceives the afterlife. Firstly, he is clear that after death there are two destinations, one of torment for the wicked, the other of repose for the righteous. More importantly, he understands that these destinations are entirely separate, emphasising the uncrossable chasm between them. This point is significant for Eustathius' reading of 1 Samuel 28, for it would make it impossible for evil King Saul to have been with Samuel (or Jonathan)[1177] after death. Thus, Origen and Eustathius use Luke 16:19-31 to make entirely contrasting eschatological points in support of their reading of 1 Samuel 28. Origen emphasises the fact that Abraham (and Lazarus) could be seen by the rich man in Hades, albeit from a distance, suggesting that they were, in a sense, together.[1178] Therefore, before Christ descended there, the righteous were in Hades

[1173] Ibid., 14.7-9.
[1174] Ibid., 14.10ff.
[1175] Ibid., 14.12.
[1176] Ibid., 14.13.
[1177] Ibid., 15.5-7.
[1178] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 9.9.

where Saul would also be, and so Samuel's words in 1 Samuel 28:19 were accurate. By contrast, Eustathius emphasises the sense of distinction between the unrighteous and righteous after death suggested by the passage, proving that 'Samuel's' words in 1 Samuel 28:19 must be a lie. Eustathius' application of Luke 16:19-31 to 1 Samuel 28 is certainly the more common, cited primarily by those arguing that a demon appeared rather than Samuel,[1179] and seems to have been a foundational text for this view.

Eustathius does not explain whether this view of the afterlife equally applies to the period before or after Christ for, as Greer observes, while he clearly believes in Christ's descent to Hades, he is unclear about what difference this makes.[1180] Nevertheless, Eustathius *is* clear that there is a distinction in the afterlife between the righteous and unrighteous. At no point, even before Christ's descent to Hades, were they together, in contrast to Origen, who uses 1 Samuel 28 to make this precise point. Any implication that Saul and Samuel shared the same fate disturbs Eustathius in a way that it does not for Origen. This different eschatological vision of the afterlife seems partly to account for their differing reading of 1 Samuel 28.

What lies behind the debate

We have found that the difference between Origen's and Eustathius' understanding of 1 Samuel 28 does not conform to a basic dichotomy between Alexandrian and Antiochene exegetical method as this debate was once characterised.[1181] Nor have we found support for Trigg's view that Eustathius takes issue with Origen's speculative approach to biblical

[1179] Tertullian, *An.,* 57.11; *Martyrium Pionii*, 14.7; Gregory, *Pyth.*, 102–103.
[1180] Greer (2007), p.lx.
[1181] Quasten (1960), p.303.

interpretation.[1182] It is only Origen's tentative suggestion that prophets or angels came up with Samuel that would fall into that category, but this does not seem to be Eustathius' main issue with Origen's interpretation. Instead, our analysis has found support for Young's view that 'Eustathius is really worried about the doctrines Origen deduces from the text, not about his allegorical method'.[1183] Despite Eustathius' accusations of Origen's deficiencies as an exegete, this does not appear to be the heart of his issue with Origen's interpretation of 1 Samuel 28. Having considered the different theological themes raised by Eustathius, we have seen his disagreements with Origen on a range of points. Some of these are based upon misunderstandings of what Origen says, accidental or otherwise. We have also noted points of genuine disagreement. It is likely that a combination of all these doctrinal issues of difference played their part in shaping this debate. However, I suggest that one issue of misunderstanding and one area of real difference primarily lies at the heart of Eustathius' disagreement with Origen.

Firstly, Eustathius has misunderstood the power that Origen allows demons and magical practitioners. Understandably perhaps, Eustathius believes that Origen suggests that a prophet was raised by demonic means. Although we have suggested that Origen did not actually believe this, the notion of affording such power to demonic forces disturbs Eustathius. He seems worried that acknowledging the efficacy of such superstition will draw some to seek it. Therefore, on many occasions, Eustathius suggests that Origen is promoting idolatry and pagan superstition.[1184] This would also explain why Eustathius maintains that Origen still essentially taught that the Medium brought up Samuel even in Origen's 'second

[1182] Trigg (1995), pp.236-8.
[1183] Young, (1989), p.194.
[1184] For instance, see Eustathius, *Engast.*, 3.4; 5.6; 7.3; 21.1; 26.8; Greer (2007), pp.lxx-lxxi.

exposition' of the passage where he seems to deny this.[1185] Greer and Cartwright suggest this as a primary motivation for Eustathius in writing the treatise.[1186]

Secondly, as we have shown, there seems to be a considerable, genuine difference in their eschatological vision, as expressed in their interpretations of 1 Samuel 28, particularly their understanding of the soul and its fate. Some scholars have argued that differing eschatological visions may account for the different interpretations of 1 Samuel 28 more generally.[1187] They argue that thinkers such as Justin Martyr and Origen, generally seen as emphasising the immortality of the soul and its journey, argue that Samuel's fate is not ours and we have an immediate hope of Paradise. For this application to make sense, Samuel must have been the real prophet. According to this theory, proponents of the alternative reading, like Tertullian and Eustathius, want to emphasise the climactic importance of the physical resurrection, believing that souls will remain in Hades or Abraham's bosom (informed by Luke 16:19-31) until this time. Souls are not on a journey, they are static, and Samuel's soul will remain in this 'waiting room' until the general resurrection. Thus, it was not the real Samuel who appeared at Endor, but a demon in disguise. However, Greer is correct in noting that, while perhaps these issues partly account for these differing interpretations, we should not think that 'the significance of 1 Kgdms 28 is entirely restricted to this issue'.[1188] This alone cannot account for Origen and Eustathius' differing readings of this passage, although it may explain it in part.

[1185] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 26.7.
[1186] Greer (2007), pp.lxx-lxxi; Cartwright (2015), p.126.
[1187] Greer (2007), pp.xxxii-xxxvii; see also Nautin and Nautin (1986), pp.81-4.
[1188] Greer (2007), p.lxxxiii.

Perhaps we should also consider their differences in interpretation as an issue of influence and tradition. We have noted, in Eustathius' case, the importance of Methodius' influence, although the extent of this, particularly regarding how Eustathius read 1 Samuel 28, is uncertain. However, it appears that Eustathius interprets 1 Samuel 28 as one familiar with pre-existing claims that Samuel was a demonic illusion, which perhaps the critics of Origen's interpretation which Eustathius notes in the opening represent.[1189] Similarly, Origen was not the first to propose his view that it was the real Samuel that appeared, and had his own influences (including, perhaps, Jewish exegetes). Thus, Eustathius' and Origen's interpretations are shaped by diverging traditions and earlier proponents. While concrete theological differences may have shaped their interpretations, Origen and Eustathius' intellectual context, such as who they read, must have shaped their view of 1 Samuel 28 also. Simply, these differing readings were competing intellectual traditions in their own right.

The wider debate

In a sense, these texts almost serve as a synecdoche for the entire debate around 1 Samuel 28. Between them, Origen and Eustathius cover many of the features that emerge in discussions of 1 Samuel 28 in this period. Certainly, the debate extends far beyond them, with many of the authors already considered displaying an awareness of, and participating in, this wider debate. Yet, in Origen and Eustathius' case, polemic is at the heart of their interpretation of 1 Samuel 28. This great debate is central to the narrative behind their interpretation.

[1189] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 1.2.

Yet other references to 1 Samuel 28 exist beyond this spectrum; 'apolemical' if you will. These are references which do not make clear what happened at Endor, although they often indicate an awareness of this greater debate. John Chrysostom refers to 1 Samuel 28 on several occasions,[1190] but is not clear whether it was the real Samuel or a demon who appeared. On this debate, as Trigg concludes, John Chrysostom 'left the question open'.[1191] Similarly, Gregory Nazianzen mentions in passing that '…Samuel was dragged up [ἕλκεται], or it seems so [ἢ δοκεῖ], by the belly-myther'.[1192] He is evidently aware that there are differing views but does not clearly state his own.[1193]

Another writer who does not state his understanding of 1 Samuel 28 clearly is Evagrius Ponticus. In his *Kephalaia Gnostica*, the 61st Kephalaion states:

> If God is the God of the living and is not of the dead, and on the other hand, according to the word of the holy Moses, necromancers ask the dead questions, the female necromancer did not evoke Samuel from among the dead, if it is true that he is not dead but living.[1194]

While this appears to be a denial that Samuel was raised by the Medium, it still leaves two options: that the living Samuel was raised by God; or a demon took his place in imitation.[1195] Smelik assumes that Evagrius thought a demon appeared rather than Samuel,[1196] but this is a major assumption since Evagrius makes no mention of demons, nor indicates that 'Samuel's' appearance was delusive. If this was Evagrius' view, these omissions are surprising

[1190] John Chrysostom, *Hom. Tit.*, 3.2; *Hom. Matt.*, 6.3; 86.3.
[1191] Trigg (1995), p.223.
[1192] Gregory Nazianzen, *Orationes*, 4.54.
[1193] Smelik (1979), p.165, n.22.
[1194] Evagrius Ponticus, *Kephalaia Gnostica*, 6.61.
[1195] In theory, another option could be that a demon, not a necromancer, raised Samuel; but this seems unlikely considering his view that Samuel was alive with God.
[1196] Smelik (1979), pp.165-6.

considering his heightened demonology,[1197] a common feature of ascetic communities. Although Evagrius regularly refers to demons in his works, he makes no mention of them at this obvious juncture; but nor does he indicate that the real Samuel appeared through God. Nevertheless, Evagrius' comments do seem suggestive, as though he was aware that this passage was contentious and eliminates one possibility, that the Medium brought up Samuel. Perhaps Evagrius knew that some of his major influences, such as Origen[1198] and Basil of Caesarea,[1199] disagreed on how to read this passage, and consequently chooses not to clarify his own position.

These refences show that many authors who consider 1 Samuel 28 do not state clearly how they understood its events. As with every great debate, there are those who sit on the fence. Yet, as with any great debate, there are those unusual individuals open-minded enough to change their minds. In the case of this particular debate, it is Augustine of Hippo.

[1197] Brakke (2006), pp.48-77, 241-6.
[1198] Casiday (2006), pp.5, 30; Ramelli (2013a), pp.117-37; Ramelli (2015), pp.xi-xiii; Ludlow (2012), p.182.
[1199] Casiday (2006), pp.5-10; Casiday (2013), pp.9-10, 15-16; Stafaniw (2010), pp.27-8; Ramelli (2013a), pp.119-20; Ramelli (2015), pp.xii-xiv; Ludlow (2012), p.182; Sinkewizc (2003), p.xvii.

Chapter 5 – Augustine

Augustine of Hippo (354-430) requires little introduction. Of all the authors considered in this work, the best known is Augustine, who greatly influenced the development of Christianity and philosophy, particularly in the West.[1200]

Augustine referred to 1 Samuel 28 in six of his writings.[1201] These are: *Ad Simplicianum, De doctrina Christiana, Epistle* 43, *De anima et eius origine, De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*, and *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus*. His earliest reference to 1 Samuel 28, in *Ad Simplicianum*, is by far his lengthiest original discussion of this passage. By contrast, the other works make only fleeting reference to it (his lengthy treatment of this passage in *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus* almost exactly repeats his answer in *Ad Simplicianum*, as Augustine himself states).[1202] Since most of Augustine's works have survived due to his importance in the Western tradition, and as *Retractationes* catalogues most of his writings, we can be relatively certain that the above constitute the majority, if not all, of Augustine's published literary references to this passage.[1203] If, then, we also note the letters written to Augustine which refer to 1 Samuel 28, such as Evodius' extant epistle[1204] and letters by Simplician and Dulcitius, which have not survived,[1205] we can identify much of Augustine's literary engagement with this passage throughout his life. When considered in the light of his

[1200] For broad discussions of Augustine's life, times, and thought, see Brown (2000); O'Donnell (2005).
[1201] There is also an allusion to 1 Samuel 28:3 in *Contra Faustum,* 22.65, but which goes no further. *Retractationes* also mentions this passage when discussing *Ad Simplicianum*, see *Retractationes,* 2.1.2.
[1202] Augustine, *Dulc. qu.,* preface; 6.2; see also *Retractationes*, 2.65
[1203] A few of Augustine's works are lost. For a summary of these, see Fitzgerald (1999), p.530. *Retractationes*, despite its value, is not a complete list of Augustine's corpus, see Ramsey (2010), p.11.
[1204] Evodius' letter is numbered in editions, and henceforth referred to as *Epistle* 158.
[1205] Augustine notes these in *Simpl.*, 1.preface, and *Dulc. qu.,* preface.

extensive corpus, and compared with the lengthy discussions of 1 Samuel 28 by the likes of Origen and Eustathius, Augustine's engagement with this passage was relatively modest.

That he wrote comparatively little on 1 Samuel 28 is not unexpected. Augustine, generally, dedicated less attention to Old Testament exegesis, with the clear exceptions of Genesis and the Psalms, to which he frequently turned (as did most early Christian writers).[1206] We know that the Old Testament, and its perceived crude style and subject matter, was a major stumbling block for the young Augustine in coming to the Christian faith. In fact, in *Confessiones* he goes as far as to say that the Old Testament had once seemed 'absurd'.[1207] Despite overcoming this hurdle in his acceptance of Christianity, mainly by adopting the allegorical hermeneutic of his mentor Ambrose,[1208] Augustine was never as comfortable in his exposition of the Old Testament as he was of the New. Frederick Van Fleteren states, 'The Old Testament prefigures the New' in Augustine's thought – its fundamental purpose is to point forward.[1209] Carol Harrison claims that 'Augustine did not know the whole of the Bible uniformly well and there are large gaps in his knowledge, especially of the Old Testament'; consequently, we should not expect a lengthy treatment of passages like 1 Samuel 28.[1210]

Why, then, conclude with Augustine? There are numerous reasons. Firstly, we must qualify our previous discussion by stating that some of Augustine's references to 1 Samuel 28 may not have survived. For instance, if he is estimated to have preached between 4,000 and

[1206] Harrison (2013), p.684.
[1207] Augustine, *Confessiones*, 6.4.6.
[1208] Ibid.
[1209] Fleteren (1996), p.126.
[1210] Harrison (2013), p.684.

10,000 sermons, of which only around 950 have survived, then it is quite likely that Augustine preached on this passage, possibly on several occasions.[1211] Secondly, his reputation as one of the greatest theologians of Late Antiquity, if not of all time, makes even the crumbs he offers enough to satisfy. Finally, and more importantly, in the little that he does offer, Augustine makes for a fascinating, unique case-study: no other early Christian commentator on this passage besides Augustine is known to have altered their exegesis during their lifetime. It is a notable mark of Augustine's character that he was willing to admit that he was wrong and alter his opinion; to develop and change over time.[1212] One need only consider his varied interpretations of Genesis during his lifetime as proof of this, such as his changing view of marriage and sexual intercourse before the Fall.[1213] Peter Brown notes that it was this essential characteristic, as 'a man who changed', which made Augustine such an appealing figure of study for him.[1214] It is quintessentially Augustine that, despite only briefly referencing 1 Samuel 28, he still changes his mind on it! More fascinating still is the fact that this change of thought can be mapped out in some detail.

To map this change, this chapter will first determine the order and date of composition of Augustine's texts which cite 1 Samuel 28. Only once their chronological order has been established can we confidently chart Augustine's train of thought. We shall then consider each of Augustine's references to 1 Samuel 28 (as well as Evodius' *Epistle* 158 to him) in detail and in turn. However, before proceeding to the issue of dating these texts, Smelik's seminal work must be discussed once more.

[1211] Rosenberg (2013), pp.420-1; see also Ramsey (2010), p.15.
[1212] Michael Cameron mentions this, particularly Augustine's changing framework for reading Scripture, which is relevant for our focus, see Cameron (2012), pp.13-14.
[1213] See Schreiner (1988), pp.150-4. Compare Augustine, *Gn. adv. Man.*, 1.19.30, with *Gn. litt.,* 9.3ff.
[1214] Brown (1972), p.9.

Prior considerations

In 1979, Smelik noted that Augustine changed his mind in his understanding of 1 Samuel 28: 'For a long time Augustine could not decide whether Samuel did or did not appear, but in the end he resolved that Samuel himself was resuscitated. We can trace the evolution of his ideas on this subject from two of his writings…',[1215] namely *Ad Simplicianum* and *De cura pro mortuis gerenda*. Smelik correctly identified the stark difference of interpretation between these texts, noting that in *Ad Simplicianum*, '[i]n the end, after stating how hard it is to decide this matter, Augustine reluctantly pronounces that a daemon appeared at Endor', while later, in *De cura pro mortuis gerenda*, 'Augustine is now convinced that Samuel himself appeared'.[1216]

However, Smelik's discussion of Augustine is far from comprehensive, partly because it is only a brief survey. Firstly, he does not cite Augustine's reference to 1 Samuel 28 in *De anima et eius origine*, where he is first seen to change his mind. Secondly, although he cites them, Smelik barely discusses Augustine's other references to this passage. Consequently, because Smelik does not consider the whole range of sources available, his analysis is binary, and does not convey the gradual development in Augustine's thought we shall identify below. Most importantly, while Smelik shows us something of 'how' Augustine changed his mind, he does little by way of explaining 'why'.

[1215] Smelik (1979), p.173.
[1216] Ibid.

More recently, in a discussion heavily influenced by Smelik's work, Paula Johanna Rose mentioned Augustine's interpretation of 1 Samuel 28 as an aside in her commentary on *De cura pro mortuis gerenda*.[1217] Like Smelik, she does not discuss some key texts, such as *De anima et eius origine*. Moreover, we will here contest her opinion that Augustine's view of 1 Samuel 28 was entirely unchanged by the time of writing *De doctrina Christiana*.[1218] Contrary to the notions of progress and development argued in this chapter, Rose presents Augustine's change in the binary terms which Smelik first introduced.

Chronology

To chart the development of Augustine's thoughts on 1 Samuel 28, we must first establish the sequence in which the relevant texts were written. While we shall postulate probable dates of composition, our concern is primarily with the *order* of writing, since it is the chronology of these texts in relation to each other that will disclose the narrative of process and change.

The first three texts Augustine wrote which refer to 1 Samuel 28 were composed at a similar date, in close succession. These are *Ad Simplicanum*, *De doctrina Christiana* and *Epistle* 43. As they can all be dated *c*.396,[1219] it is important to establish their order.

Augustine's letters are difficult to date, and it is impossible to ascertain the chronology of *Epistle* 43 in relation to *Ad Simplicianum* and *De doctrina Christiana.* However, since the

[1217] Rose (2013), pp.412-17.
[1218] Ibid., p.416.
[1219] For *Ad Simplicanum*, see Ramsey (2008), p.161; Fitzgerald (1999), p.xlviii, p.798; Perler (1969), pp.165-6. For *De doctrina Christiana*, see Green (1995), pp.xi-xii Robertson (1958), p.ix. For *Epistle* 43, see Fitzgerald (1999), p.299; Teske (2001), p.157.

extract only discusses 1 Samuel 28 briefly, and reveals little about Augustine's understanding of the passage, fixing a precise chronology is not imperative in this case. Thus, our primary focus is on establishing the order of writing *Ad Simplicanum* and *De doctrina Christiana*.

Every indication suggests that *Ad Simplicanum* was Augustine's earliest reference to 1 Samuel 28, followed by his comments in *De doctrina Christiana*. The two strongest pieces of evidence for this are Augustine's comments in *Retractationes* and the Leningrad Codex. In *Retractationes*, composed *c*.427,[1220] Augustine lists his works (excluding his letters and sermons) and offers comments on and corrections to them in the twilight of his career.[1221] *Ad Simplicianum* is listed before *De doctrina Christiana,* separated by two other books (*Contra epistulam Manichaei quam vocant fundamenti* and *De agone Christiano*).[1222] This is partly how we can date these texts *c*.396, since Augustine states concerning *Ad Simplicianum* that 'of the books which I endeavoured with as a bishop the first two were for Simplician…'[1223] Therefore we can date this work, and *De doctrina Christiana,* soon after Augustine's ordination in *c*.395.[1224] More importantly, he also suggests the order in which he wrote these works. We can trust the sequence of composition *Retractationes* establishes for several reasons. Firstly, if Augustine's chronology is incorrect, the book would have failed in its fundamental purpose. *Retractationes* begins by stating,

[1220] Ramsey (2010), p.11.
[1221] Augustine had apparently intended to include his letters and sermons, see *Retractationes,* prologue.1; *Epistle* 224.2. For more on *Retractationes,* see Ramsey (2010), pp.11-14.
[1222] Augustine, *Retractationes*, 2.1-4.
[1223] Ibid., 2.1.1
[1224] There is little consensus on the exact date of Augustine's ordination. Serge Lancel summarises 'this thorny question of dates', identifying that it must have been sometime between May 395 and 28 August 397, see Lancel (2002), p.184. Lancel makes a strong case for the summer of 395, as does O. Perler in Perler (1969), pp.164-75; see also Steinhauser (1995), p.36. Although contestable, 395 seems the most probable date.

> For, whoever would read my works in the order in which they were written, perhaps he will discover how we progressed in writing. So that he may do this, I shall take care in this work as much as I can so that he might know this order.[1225]

Therefore, we are using *Retractationes* exactly as Augustine intended: to map his development of thought over time. Scholars have speculated that he catalogued his compositions partly to explain the level of detail in *Retractationes.*[1226] Another reason for trusting the accuracy of *Retractationes* for establishing this order is that it is consistent with the evidence of the Leningrad Codex, considered below.

When William M. Green discussed the Leningrad Codex in 1959, one can sense his excitement. He made a remarkable claim: to have found the earliest extant manuscript containing Augustine's work, which he believed to be contemporary with him.[1227] The Leningrad Codex, prefaced by a letter to Simplician (*Epistle* 37), contains four of Augustine's texts: *Ad Simplicianum*, *Contra epistulam Manichaei quam vocant fundamenti*, *De agone Christiano* and the first two books of *De doctrina Christiana*. What is significant is that these texts are compiled in the same order they appear in *Retractationes*, that is, as the first four texts Augustine wrote as a bishop. This is significant because several scholars believe that the Leningrad Codex preceded *Retractationes*. Green was the first to postulate a very early date for the Codex (*c*.396),[1228] believing such an early date is supported by the manuscript's content, such as the fact that it contains an incomplete edition of *De doctrina Christiana* (a point to which we shall return), indicating that it was compiled before *De doctrina*

[1225] Augustine, *Retractationes*, prologue.3.
[1226] Green (1959), p.197.
[1227] Ibid., pp.191-7.
[1228] Ibid., p.193, n.3.

Christiana's completion *c.*427.[1229] Since the texts of the Codex treat differing subjects, their unity stems from the fact that they followed each other chronologically, and Green sees this manuscript as the 'Gesammelte Work' of Augustine's first works as a bishop, which would make the most sense to compile fairly soon after his ordination.[1230] In 1968, Almut Mutzenbecher provided a detailed study of the Codex, describing its contents, palaeography, decoration, and marginalia.[1231] These details led Mutzenbecher to believe, contrary to Green, that the manuscript did not originate directly from Hippo, because of its scribal inaccuracies, but that it could have been made at Carthage.[1232] Building on Mutzenbecher's research, Kenneth B. Steinhauser also postulates an early date for the manuscript, and his variation on Green's theory is most convincing. Steinhauser argues that the letter to Simplician (*Epistle* 37)*,* is 'the key to understanding the Leningrad Codex and its composition'.[1233] He postulates that the whole manuscript was compiled as a gift from Augustine himself to Simplician in Milan, and that the letter is not only a preface for *Ad Simplicianum* but for the entire Codex.[1234] As a gift to his close friend, Augustine compiled his texts to date, including the answers to the questions that Simplician had requested, and sent the Codex to him.[1235] Coinciding with Mutzenbecher's findings, Steinhauser believes that Augustine sent his texts from Hippo to Carthage, to be produced into the Codex as we now have it (with this recopying accounting for the textual errors which Mutzenbecher noticed).[1236] Among Steinhauser's other arguments that this was a *Festschrift* for Simplician

[1229] Ibid., p.194.
[1230] Ibid., p.195.
[1231] Mutzenbecher (1967-1968), pp.406-50; Steinhauser (1995), p.34.
[1232] Mutzenbecher (1967-1968), p.422; Steinhauser (1995), p.34.
[1233] Steinhauser (1995), p.39.
[1234] Ibid., pp.39-40.
[1235] Ibid., p.38.
[1236] Ibid., p.40. Steinhauser offers his own evidence, but also builds upon Bernhard Bischoff's work, who argues for an established Christian book-trade in Carthage, see Bischoff (1990), p.184.

in Milan, is that the title-page wording *Aurelii Augustini ad interrogata Simpliciani* extends across two columns, while the text titles only extend across one, suggesting that 'the entire manuscript is identified as being sent to Simplician'.[1237] Furthermore, the earliest marginalia and corrections can be traced to Northern Italy, which would make sense if it began circulating from Simplician in Milan, and the manuscript's lavishness would also coincide with Augustine's sending it as a gift.[1238] Therefore, the Leningrad Codex seemingly represents an even earlier testimony than *Retractationes* regarding the order in which these texts were written.

However, there are complexities worth addressing. The first is that *De doctrina Christiana* was evidently begun at a much earlier date than its completion, with Augustine having left the project for about three decades.[1239] He testifies to this in *Retractationes*: 'When I had discovered them unfinished, I preferred to finish the books On Christian Teaching [*libros de doctrina christiana*] than abandoning them in this way to pass over to other things to be revised. Therefore, I completed the third book…', stating the precise point from which he continued, and that he added a fourth book.[1240] Thus, while writing *Retractationes c*.427, Augustine completed the final sections of *De doctrina Christiana*. However, since the relevant passage occurs in the second book of *De doctrina Christiana*, his comments on 1 Samuel 28 can be dated *c*.396.

[1237] Steinhauser (1995), p.41; see also p.40.
[1238] Ibid., pp.40-1.
[1239] For more on this interruption, see Kannengiesser (1995).
[1240] Augustine, *Retractationes*, 2.4.1

Nor is it possible that Augustine edited this section when revisiting the work *c*.427, for *De doctrina Christiana* was evidently an established text in its incomplete form before Augustine completed it. There is plenty of evidence for this. Firstly, only the first two books of *De doctrina Christiana* are included in the Leningrad Codex, which we have already established (partly because of the omission of the latter books) was probably compiled soon after Augustine became bishop. These books of *De doctrina Christiana* were circulating before its completion, making it difficult for Augustine to edit later. This is supported by the fact that the *De doctrina Christiana* of the Codex differs little from other versions, including its reference to 1 Samuel 28.[1241] Augustine also references *De doctrina Christiana* in *Contra Faustum*,[1242] 'generally dated between 397 and 400'.[1243] It is unlikely he would have alluded to an unpublished, unfamiliar text, thereby supporting the early dating of some standard form of the early books of *De doctrina Christiana* (e.g. the Leningrad Codex). Finally, Augustine would not have mentioned this text so early in *Retractationes*, with corrections, if he had edited its earlier sections *c*.427.[1244] There simply would be no need for corrections if the first books were not already widely circulating texts. Thus, we can be certain that Augustine's reference to 1 Samuel 28 comes from his first attempt at writing *De doctrina Christiana*, *c*.396.

Another complexity in establishing the order of *Ad Simplicianum* and *De doctrina Christiana* is that Augustine probably often worked on several works at the same time, rendering it

[1241] Scribal errors have already been noted, but there are no major differences, see Green (1959), p.194, n.2. Admittedly, whole sections of book 2 are missing in the Leningrad Codex, but the relevant passage is included, see Mutzenbecher (1967-1968), p.410.
[1242] Augustine, *Contra Faustum*, 22.91.
[1243] Green (1995), p.xxi; see also p.xxii; see also Green (1959), p.193; Bonnardière (1965), p.39.
[1244] Green (1959), pp.192-3.

difficult to assume a sequence. R. P. H. Green makes this case for these two works, arguing that Augustine began *De doctrina Christiana*, halted and wrote *Ad Simplicianum*, before returning to finish *De doctrina Christiana* (up to book 3).[1245] Green partly argues this because he believes that some earlier sections of *De doctrina Christiana* pre-date April 397, his established *terminus post quem* for *Ad Simplicianum*. He argues that Augustine uses language which suggests that he was writing to someone of episcopal rank in *Ad Simplicianum*, and in what is usually considered to be its dedicatory letter, *Epistle* 37. [1246] Since Simplician, on the death of Ambrose, became Bishop of Milan in April 397,[1247] this would establish that *Ad Simplicianum* was written after this date. However, Green's case is unconvincing. Firstly, Simplician had a crucial role in Augustine's conversion and spiritual growth.[1248] As Serge Lancel states, Augustine addresses Simplician in a way appropriate for his spiritual father, a man he revered.[1249] This makes sense, since one suspects that Augustine would have more clearly mentioned Simplician's ordination, or the recent death of their mutual companion Ambrose, were Simplician a bishop at the time of writing *Ad Simplicianum*. Furthermore, if *Ad Simplicianum* was written after April 397, then this would mean that Augustine went an unusually long time without writing following his ordination.[1250] Even if Green is correct that parts of *De doctrina Christiana* were written before April 397, because his *terminus post quem* for *Ad Simplicianum* is unconvincing, we can simply suggest an earlier date for *Ad Simplicianum* than Green suggests (instead of postulating, as he does, that Augustine went back and forth between writing these two

[1245] Green (1995), pp.xi-xii.
[1246] Ibid., p.xii. We have already established that *Epistle* 37 need not be the dedicatory letter to *Ad Simplicianum* alone, which weakens Green's point.
[1247] McLynn (1994), pp.366-7.
[1248] Augustine, *Confessiones*, 8.2.3ff.
[1249] Lancel (2002), p.189. Perler also makes a strong case for this, see Perler (1969), pp.165-6.
[1250] Sébastien (2010), p.348.

texts).[1251] Yet, even within Green's internal logic, since the reference to 1 Samuel 28 comes quite late in book 2, Green would probably accept that this section of *De doctrina Christiana* was written after completing *Ad Simplicanum*, when Augustine supposedly returned to this work.

All told, the arguments that *Ad Simplicianum*, particularly the section we have in mind, was written before *De doctrina Christiana* are compelling. Firstly, this is the order established in both *Retractationes* and the Leningrad Codex. Moreover, since *Ad Simplicianum* and *De doctrina Christiana* are separated by another two texts in the chronology Augustine sets out (in *Retractationes* and the Codex), and our reference comes quite late in *De doctrina Christiana's* second book, we have a moderate margin of error to assume that this part of *Ad Simplicianum* was written first. As shown below, this order also makes the best sense of Augustine's development of thought on 1 Samuel 28. Consequently, Augustine's earliest known literary contact with this passage was Simplician's lost letter asking him to explain it.

Returning to *Epistle* 43, although we cannot confidently suggest its place beside *Ad Simplicianum* and *De doctrina Christiana*, it is possible, as we shall argue in the case of *De doctrina Christiana*, that the letter's ambiguity and lack of detail when discussing 1 Samuel 28 was intentional, reflecting an intellectual change from *Ad Simplicianum*. Furthermore, it seems plausible that Augustine refers to this passage in *Epistle* 43 after Simplician had inquired of him about it, thus bringing it to Augustine's attention. For these reasons, I have tentatively placed its composition after *De doctrina Christiana*.

[1251] A date closer to 395 for *Ad Simplicianum*, probably closer to Augustine's ordination, is preferable to 397, see Perler (1969), pp.164-6.

One thing is certain; on the evidence of *Ad Simplicianum*, *De doctrina Christiana*, and *Epistle* 43, *c*.396 was an important time for Augustine's interaction with this passage. Simplician's prompting possibly sparked his interest. Augustine's next reference to the passage would come over twenty years later.

After these texts, and before Augustine's last three citations of this passage, came Evodius of Uzalis' letter to Augustine, *Epistle* 158. Many scholars date this letter *c*.414 although, as mentioned above, dating Augustine's letters can be difficult.[1252] Regardless of its exact date, this letter slots safely between those works dated *c*.396, and Augustine's next writings on this subject (early-to-mid-420s).

It seems Augustine went more than two decades without offering a single word on 1 Samuel 28. However, as with his earlier citations, when Augustine finally mentions it again, he does so in relatively quick succession. The first of these references occurs in the fourth book of *De anima et eius origine*.[1253] Scholars generally agree that *De anima et eius origine* was written *c*.420, between Evodius' epistle and Augustine's next reference to this passage, *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*.[1254] Additionally, *De anima et eius origine*'s place within *Retractationes,* between *De doctrina Christiana* and *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*, separated by several books, clearly suggests that it comes next chronologically.[1255]

[1252] Teske (2004), p.40, and Fitzgerald (1999), p.302, suggest 414/415; Parsons (1953), p.ix, suggests 412/14.
[1253] For more on its context of writing, see Augustine, *Retractationes*, 2.61; see also Preus (1985), pp.4-6; Teske (1997), pp.467-9.
[1254] Teske (1997), p.468; Preus (1985), p.2; Fitzgerald (1999), p.22.
[1255] Augustine, *Retractationes*, 2.61.

The last two texts in which Augustine refers to 1 Samuel 28, *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda* and *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus*, were written at a similar time, late in Augustine's career. Their position in *Retractationes* suggests this, and scholars usually propose various dates from the early-to-mid-420s.[1256] However, as Paula Johanna Rose has noted, most scholars when proposing dates 'rather seem to rely on dates presented by predecessors'.[1257] In reality, these texts are difficult to date. *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*, the focus of Rose's work, 'reveals no clues as to its dating' internally.[1258] To establish that work's date, Rose relies upon carefully dating the other text with which we are concerned, *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus*. Her reasoning is simple, and her methodology sound. *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda* immediately precedes *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus* in *Retractationes*.[1259] *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus* also includes an extract from *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda,* which Augustine states he wrote 'recently [*nuper*]'.[1260] In this reference, Augustine also seems to imply that he has completed *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda* in its entirety, a particularly important fact for our purposes, especially since *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus*'s reference to *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda* precedes its reference to 1 Samuel 28. Thus, we have clear-cut evidence that Augustine had completed his reference to 1 Samuel 28 in *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda* before proceeding to write on this passage in *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus*. Rose, primarily by building upon the work of Mutzenbecher and Perler,[1261] convincingly dates *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus* to about August 424.[1262] Therefore, *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda* was written not long before this, earlier in 424. In the course of establishing these dates,

[1256] Rose provides a table of dates proposed by scholars for both these texts in Rose (2013), p.9.
[1257] Ibid., p.8.
[1258] Ibid., p.7.
[1259] Augustine, *Retractationes*, 2.64-65.
[1260] Augustine, *Dulc. qu*., 2.2-3.
[1261] Mutzenbecher (1969-1970); Perler (1969), pp.373-80. For a summary of these arguments, see Rose (2013), pp.9-12.
[1262] For her whole argument, see Rose (2013), pp.7-12.

Rose proves that *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda* preceded *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus*. In accord with this timeline, it seems plausible that Dulcitius' initial letter of questions, now lost, preceded Augustine's writing of *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda* (or at least the relevant section), and brought 1 Samuel 28 to Augustine's mind, since he notes that he took several months to reply to Dulcitius.[1263] Once *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda* was completed, and less constrained by time, he answered Dulcitius' questions.

It is worth stating that the arguments rehearsed above regarding dating and chronology are supported by developments which we shall observe concerning Augustine's understanding of 1 Samuel 28, with the order proposed fitting neatly together to create a flowing narrative of evolution.

Ad Simplicianum[1264]

Augustine first discussed 1 Samuel 28 in *Ad Simplicianum*. As the title suggests, he is writing to his good friend, Simplician, who became Bishop of Milan after Ambrose and who played an important role in Augustine's conversion.[1265] In this text, Augustine considers various questions posed to him by Simplician, including one on 1 Samuel 28. His answer is by far his longest original discourse on this passage. Its length might be explained by Augustine's addressee.

[1263] Augustine, *Dulc. qu.,* preface.
[1264] All translations of *Ad Simplicianum* are taken or revised from WSA 1.12, pp.175-231.
[1265] Augustine, *Confessiones*, 8.2.3. For more on Simplician, see Fitzgerald (1999), pp.799-800.

Augustine and Simplician's amicable relationship is evidenced by Augustine's portrayal of Simplician as a mentor-type figure for him in *Confessiones*,[1266] and by their written correspondence, such as Augustine's willingness to answer Simplican's questions at length. Augustine was not always as forthcoming to such petitions from others, as Steinhauser has observed.[1267] Augustine, in *Epistle* 37, certainly seems to respect Simplician and asks him to give his thoughts and correct his works.[1268] Therefore, out of due consideration for the one who had asked him the question, Augustine considers this passage at length.

What then does Simplician prompt Augustine to say regarding it? In the second book of *Ad Simplicianum*, Augustine considers Simplician's questions concerning 'the books of Kingdoms [*Regnorum*]', i.e. Samuel–Kings.[1269] Here, Augustine answers the question, 'whether the unclean spirit [*spiritus immundus*] that was in the Pythoness was able to bring it about [*agere*] that Samuel was seen by Saul and spoke with him'.[1270]

He begins by stating that, in one sense, it is 'not a difficult question'.[1271] The answer is, simply, yes; this is certainly possible. Although not actually his own view at the time, Augustine opens his answer by arguing from the perspective that Samuel truly appeared.

Firstly, he deals with the issue of whether the 'unclean spirit' could have spoken with Samuel. Scripture shows that this is possible. Augustine cites the example of Satan, 'the

[1266] Augustine, *Confessiones,* 8.2.3ff.
[1267] Steinhauser (1995), p.35; see Augustine, *Epistle* 54.1.1; 102.1.
[1268] Augustine, *Epistle* 37.
[1269]Augustine, *Simpl.*, 2.preface; see also *Retractationes*, 2.1.2.
[1270] Augustine, *Simpl.,* 2.3.1.
[1271] Ibid.

prince of all unclean spirits', in the book of Job, who spoke with God himself (Job 1:6-12; 2:1-6), which is 'a much greater marvel'.[1272] The argument *a maiore ad minus* is clear – if the most unclean spirit can speak with God and test Job, 'the most righteous of men', then an unclean spirit could have spoken with the prophet Samuel.[1273] The truth, Augustine continues, cannot be confined 'because the truth [*ueritas*], which is present everywhere [*ubique praesens*], speaks through any creature it may want to any creature it may want, nor therefore is it of great benefit to whom God speaks'.[1274] Demonstrating his talents as a rhetor, Augustine employs familiar Imperial images to support his case. He notes how the Emperor does not speak to those about whose benefit he cares most, but more regularly speaks to the criminals whom he condemns to execution.[1275] Similarly, truth can associate itself with the unworthy, which is how 'even an unclean spirit was able to speak with the soul of a holy man'.[1276] Augustine maintains, 'for it is what is said that is of importance';[1277] in other words, the message and its source are more important than its medium and recipient.

This understanding of how 'truth' works is akin to Augustine's theology of the sacraments in relation to Donatism. Donatists, following the teaching of Tertullian and Cyprian,[1278] believed that it was harmful to administer the sacraments outside the true church, as they perceived that Catholics were doing.[1279] Like the Levitical priests of the Old Testament, bishops had to

[1272] Ibid.
[1273] Ibid.
[1274] Ibid.
[1275] Ibid.
[1276] Ibid.
[1277] Ibid.
[1278] Tertullian, *Bapt.,* 15; Cyprian, *De Unitate*, 11; see also Bonner (2002), p.289; Frend (1985), pp.119-20, 135-7.
[1279] For instance, see the words of Petilianus, recorded in Augustine, *Contra Litteras Petiliani,* 2.2.4; see also Bonner (2002), p.289.

be pure to administer the sacraments correctly, and thus the Donatists believed, as Gerald Bonner states, that '[t]he validity of the sacraments depends on the worthiness of the minister'.[1280] For this reason, Donatists would often re-baptise Catholic converts to Donatism.[1281] Augustine completely opposed these ideas. In *De Baptismo*,[1282] he emphasises the Christological nature of the sacraments, stating that 'the baptism of Christ when consecrated by the words of the gospel, even by the adulterous and to the adulterous, howsoever shameless and unclean they may be, it is holy, because its own sanctity cannot be defiled, and divine excellence aids its own sacrament [*ipsa eius sanctitas pollui non potest et sacramento suo diuina uirtus adsistit*]…'[1283] Tied to his wider understanding of sin and grace, Augustine understands that all are sinful and that none who administer the sacraments are worthy, just as none are worthy to receive them. The sacraments are Christ's gracious gifts to man and their *virtus* derives from their giver. Returning to Augustine's comments in *Ad Simplicianum*, we see that truth, like the sacraments, is constant and its purity cannot be tarnished, because its value comes from God, who graciously gives it. God can speak the truth by whatever means he wishes, to whoever, and its validity does not stem from its mediator. This idea was particularly important for Augustine to establish, because this notion, that 'the truth is of his Lord, wherever one has discovered it', was partly how he justified adopting aspects of classical culture into Christianity in *De doctrina Christiana*.[1284]

[1280] Bonner (2002), pp.289-90; see also Augustine, *Contra Litteras Petiliani,* 3.20.23ff.
[1281] Augustine, *un. bapt.*, 13.22; *Epistle* 43.8.21; see also Maier (1987), p.165; Frend (1985), pp.119-20, 189; although they sometimes did not rebaptise, see pp.167-8.
[1282] Fitzgerald (1999), p.xliii; Lancel (2002), p.279.
[1283] Augustine, *bapt.*, 3.10.15; see also Bonner (2002), p.292.
[1284] Augustine, *doc. Chr.*, 2.18.28.72.

In *Ad Simplicianum*, Augustine then considers the more fundamental issue behind Simplician's question, namely the disturbing notion 'that He [God] might have allowed a wicked spirit to summon the soul of a righteous man'.[1285] Even in the way that Augustine frames this issue, he does not conceive for a moment that an evil spirit raised Samuel by itself, but that God 'allowed [*licuerit*]' this. Augustine responds by arguing *a fortiori*, that if Samuel's invocation by wicked spirits 'disturbs [*mouet*]', then 'is it not a greater wonder that Satan took the Lord himself and set him upon the pinnacle of the temple' (cf. Matthew 45).[1286] Just as we cannot fathom how the Devil could have such authority over Christ, we must accept that Samuel's resuscitation is similarly mysterious, or, as Augustine sarcastically asserts, 'unless perhaps someone might say that the Devil had easier freedom in taking the living Lord from where he wanted and placing him where he wanted than in summoning the spirit of the dead Samuel from his dwelling-place'.[1287] Augustine's argument is simple, if Satan can have this power over the *living* God, why should we be surprised that he could control the *dead* prophet? Augustine offers another Christological example, Christ's crucifixion, to further this point. If Christ 'allowed himself to be seized and bound and mocked and crucified and slain by the Jews themselves… doing the Devil's deeds', then we should not be surprised that Samuel could also have fallen under the sway of evil forces.[1288] For Augustine, the key to understanding these episodes in Christ's life, and also Samuel's appearance, is God's ultimate sovereignty. Augustine states that what happens to Christ does not disturb us because we know 'the Lord willed and allowed it to happen, with no diminishment of his power and divinity'.[1289] The Devil could only do these things to Christ

[1285] *Simpl.,* 2.3.1
[1286] Ibid.
[1287] Ibid.
[1288] Ibid.
[1289] Ibid.

with permission. Supported by these passages of Scripture, Augustine states that 'it is not absurd to believe that there was permission from some dispensation of the divine will [*ex aliqua dispensatione diuinae uoluntatis*], so that neither unwilling nor by the dominion and subjugation of magical power [*ut non inuitus nec dominante atque subiugante magica potentia*], but willing and obeying the concealed disposition of God [*sed uolens atque obtemperans occultae dispositioni dei*], which was hidden [*latebat*] from that Pythoness and Saul, the spirit of the holy prophet might have consented for himself to be exhibited to the sights of the king, intending to strike him with divine judgement'.[1290] A key and fascinating feature of God's providence described here is its secret nature, whereby, unbeknown to themselves, evil forces act to fulfil a hidden purpose, just as those who killed Christ did not see that they were doing God's will. Therefore, Augustine suggests that God was at work in raising Samuel (if he truly appeared) at Endor, not just evil forces. Without God's permission, demons have no power.

Despite being one of Augustine's earlier texts, these ideas in *Ad Simplicianum* are consistent with Augustine's wider, later thought. In *De divinatione daemonum*, although Augustine explains that demons possess certain properties which support them to foretell things,[1291] and that their predictions can be accurate,[1292] ultimately demons can only make correct premonitions when 'the most omnipotent and most just God permits them'.[1293] This idea, that demons are limited by God's providence, appears elsewhere in Augustine's corpus.[1294] His conception of providence is both strong and complex, for he understands that God has

[1290] Ibid.
[1291] *divin. daem*, 3.7–5.9.
[1292] Ibid. 6.11–7.11.
[1293] Ibid. 1.2.
[1294] For another example, see Augustine, *Trin.,* 3.8.13.

both an intrinsic and extrinsic relationship to Creation.[1295] On the one hand, Augustine states that God has inserted into Creation *rationes seminales* or 'hidden seeds [*occultis seminibus*]', from which all things begin, develop, and reach their final form 'as if from original instructions [*ab originalibus tamquam regulis*]', an idea possibly stemming from Neo-Platonic influences upon him.[1296] Thus, in *De Genesi ad Litteram*, Augustine states that God 'completed all his works on the sixth day', and although 'it is clear that he [God] makes many new things which he did not make then', these emerge from the development of the *rationes seminales*, as God 'by a hidden power sets his entire creation in motion [*mouet itaque occulta potentia uniuersam creaturam suam*]'.[1297] God, therefore, organises future developments from the very beginning. However, God still retains an active, extrinsic role in his Creation. Augustine is clear that these developments in Creation would not happen 'if he who formed them stopped guiding them with his providential motion [*prouido motu administrare cessaret*]'.[1298] Furthermore, the *rationes seminales* can, as a result of a hidden potential, develop differently (but consistently) from their usual pattern of unfolding when God interacts with them (as in the case of miracles).[1299] Thus, God's providential hand is present at both the setting and the continual development of Creation in Augustine's thought. These notions are consistent with his central beliefs, which became most apparent in his opposition to Pelagianism, concerning humanity's inherent sinfulness and need for grace, which emphasises God's activity in salvation.[1300] Throughout his corpus, Augustine generally stresses God's activity, an emphasis that apparently started as he wrote the first

[1295] For more on Augustine's conception of providence and free will, see Bonner (2007).
[1296] Augustine, *Trin.,* 3.8.13; see also Oliver (2016), p.387.
[1297] *Augustine, Gn. litt.,* 5.20; see also Oliver (2016), p.389.
[1298] *Augustine Gn. litt.,* 5.20.
[1299] Ibid., 6.14; 9.17.
[1300] See Bonner (2007), p.121.

book of *Ad Simplicianum,* concerning which he would state that, in the process of its writing, he 'endeavoured on behalf of the free choice of the human will [*libero arbitrio uoluntatis humanae*], but the grace of God conquered [*uicit dei gratia*]'.[1301] This same focus on God's activity is precisely what we see in this latter section of *Ad Simplicianum*, as he postulates that Samuel might have truly appeared, but only if God permitted. Of course, free will also has its place in Augustine's thought. He maintained that, although God was necessary to prompt the will into action, one's will is free to act upon that prompting as it pleases.[1302] Free will and providence, although paradoxical, work harmoniously together for Augustine. He gives some indication of how this works when he states in *Enchiridion* that '[h]e who gladly does the will of his master serves as though a freeman',[1303] citing 2 Peter 2:19 and echoing Pauline notions of being slaves either to sin or to God (Romans 6:15-23). True freedom comes from subjecting our wills to God's. Thus, it is important to note that while Augustine believes that the events of 1 Samuel 28 happen within the framework of God's sovereignty, both in *Ad Simplicianum* and all his later considerations of this passage, Augustine would also maintain the personal culpability of the demons and humans present for any wrongdoing.

In closing his consideration of the possibility that Samuel appeared, Augustine seems to be aware that some might raise a moral issue regarding God's providential actions here (despite stressing God's hidden motivations). By allowing the righteous to be summoned by the wicked, is God not undermining the good and giving legitimacy to evil forces? Augustine

[1301] Augustine, *Retractationes*, 2.1.1; see also Bonner (2007), p.82. Evidently the first book of *Ad Simplicianum* was a turning point in Augustine's understanding of grace and God's activity, which is why, even later in life, he recommended his readers to return to it, see Augustine, *praed. sanct.*, 4.8.
[1302] Augustine, *Epistle* 2*.7: see also Bonner (2007), p.84.
[1303] Augustine, *ench.,* 9.30.

denies this by emphasising that there is no shame for Samuel in his summoning. As an example from the realm of the living, Augustine states that many good people are summoned into the presence of evil ones, and even work with them, when 'duty requires righteousness [*officium postulat aequitatis*]', just as Samuel did, but 'with the constant beauty of their virtue maintained [*seruato atque inconcusso decore uirtutis suae*]'.[1304] This, as Boniface Ramsey states, seems to be a rare acknowledgment in early Christian thought of the possibility of good and wicked working together for the pursuit of justice, without bringing shame on the good, which Ramsey describes as 'the beginnings of a theology of politics'.[1305] Since Samuel is not shamed in any way by his appearance, God's allowing demons to raise Samuel is justified. Therefore, in answer to Simplician's question, an evil spirit could have done these things, with God's permission.

Yet, while Augustine has hitherto valiantly argued the case for Samuel's true appearance, this is not actually his own view. He proceeds to offer what he considers to be 'another, easier solution and a more profitable understanding [*alius facilior exitus et expeditior intellectus*]': that 'a kind of phantasm and imaginary illusion was produced by the Devil's machinations [*aliquod phantasma et imaginariam inlusionem diaboli machinationibus factam*]' rather than Samuel.[1306] Although this figure is referred to as 'Samuel' in 1 Samuel 28, this is not a problem for Augustine, who states that both in everyday life and in Scripture, things are regularly called by the names by which they appear, not what they actually are. For instance, in art, one would refer to figures in a painting by their proper names, without acknowledging that they are merely depictions. As Augustine says, we would call them

[1304] Augustine, *Simpl.,* 2.3.1.
[1305] Ramsey (2008), p.226, n.48.
[1306] Augustine, *Simpl.,* 2.3.2

'Cicero' or 'Sallust' or 'Achilles'.[1307] Augustine supports this same idea with an example from Scripture: the Cherubim fashioned from metal are referred to as 'Cherubim' in Exodus 25:18, although they are clearly not angelic beings in reality.[1308] Augustine argues the same point by appealing to dreams. In day-to-day life and in Scripture (such as Pharaoh's dreams about the ears of corn and cows), one does not specify that things seen within a dream are not real; instead one simply refers to them as they appear.[1309] Thus, 'it is no wonder that Scripture says "Samuel" was seen, even if perhaps the apparition of Samuel appeared by the machination of him who transforms himself as an angel of light and his ministers as ministers of righteousness' – the latter part referencing 2 Corinthians 11:14-15,[1310] a passage noted many times in this study. The implication behind Augustine's discussion here, of course, is that demons can shapeshift and create illusions. [1311]

In the following section, Augustine addresses another concern regarding this understanding of 1 Samuel 28, namely that 'true things were foretold by the evil spirit to Saul'.[1312] This is similar to the issue he dealt with earlier when explaining how demons could have the power to raise the real Samuel. Augustine's answer to this is the same: that 'when God wishes someone to know true things even through base and infernal spirits [*infimos infernos que spiritus*]… he may bestow [*impertiat*] some kind of divination [*aliquid diuinationis*] even to such spirits'.[1313] Evil spirits can only make accurate predictions with God's consent, according to his purposes. Interestingly, Augustine here suggests that demons gather this accurate

[1307] Ibid.
[1308] Ibid.
[1309] Ibid.
[1310] Ibid.
[1311] Cf. Augustine, *civ. Dei*, 10.10; *divin. daem*., 4.8. For a recent consideration of demons as creators of false appearances in Augustine's thought, see Wiebe (2021), p.124ff.
[1312] *Simpl.,* 2.3.3.
[1313] Ibid.

information from 'what they hear from angels',[1314] an idea found elsewhere in his corpus.[1315] However, again, Augustine emphasises that evil spirits 'only hear as much as the Lord and ruler of all either commands [*iubet*] or permits [*sinit*]'.[1316] To prove that evil spirits can speak the truth, Augustine cites New Testament examples, namely the demons that recognised Christ as the Son of God (Matthew 8:29) and the soothsaying slave-girl who spoke accurately of Paul's authority (Acts 16:17).[1317] Therefore, Augustine establishes that the figure of Samuel telling the truth does not automatically mean that he could not be a demon. As noted above, Augustine's basic understanding of demonic divination here – that demons can predict accurately, but only with God's permission – remained unchanged later in life, expressed clearly in his lengthiest discussion of this matter in *De divinatione daemonum*.[1318]

Although demons have access to the truth, Augustine notes in *Ad Simplicianum* that they 'mix in lies [*miscent… fallacias*]' with it to deceive effectively;[1319] a common demonic technique, and a point he will soon reiterate in *De doctrina Christiana.*[1320] Augustine believes that lying might account for how this 'Samuel' is 'assuredly false' when he says that Saul will soon be with him, since Saul is bad and Samuel is good.[1321] Augustine here cites Luke 16:19-31, the story of Lazarus and the rich man, to illustrate the absolute separation between the good and bad after death, speculating that, because of the 'great void [*magnum chaos*]' described (Luke 16:26), Samuel's message was false and Saul would not be with Samuel,

[1314] Ibid.
[1315] Augustine, *Trin.,* 4.17.22-23; *Jo. ev. tr.* 7.6; *divin. daem*., 6.10; 8.12; see also Klein (2018), p.71.
[1316] Augustine, *Simpl.*, 2.3.3.
[1317] Ibid.
[1318] Augustine, *divin. daem*., 1.1-2.
[1319] Augustine, *Simpl.*, 2.3.3.
[1320] Augustine*, doc. Chr.*, 2.23.35.87.
[1321] Augustine, *Simpl.*, 2.3.3.

suggesting a demonic deception was occurring.[1322] However, Augustine concedes that if Samuel is referring broadly to the fact that Saul will join him in the state of being dead, then Samuel's statement is correct.[1323]

Augustine's closes his answer to Simplician somewhat inconclusively, believing 'in accordance with either understanding, that text has a solution which is not contrary to the faith [*secundum utrumque intellectum habere exitum illam lectionem qui non sit contra fidem*]'.[1324] He can see both sides of the argument and accepts that neither reading of 1 Samuel 28 is manifestly heretical. Not all theologians were as open-minded, as exemplified by Eustathius' vitriol against Origen's interpretation. Augustine explains that further research might shed light on the matter, perhaps in the realm of whether human souls appear with bodily features, or in what circumstances a righteous soul might be able to appear. [1325] As shown below, further research would indeed eventually illuminate this issue for Augustine.[1326] Nevertheless, he concludes from the available evidence that Samuel was most likely a diabolical illusion.[1327] On this conclusion, Smelik remarked, 'In the end, after stating how hard it is to decide this matter, Augustine reluctantly pronounces that a daemon appeared at Endor.'[1328] Although Smelik is partly correct here, Augustine is perhaps more convicted in his opinion that Samuel was a demon in disguise than he might first seem.[1329] Certainly, he sees logic to both sides, but he still held that a conjured image was more likely than the alternative. This balanced discussion of 1 Samuel 28 probably reflects a trait of

[1322] Ibid.
[1323] Ibid.
[1324] Ibid.
[1325] Ibid.
[1326] Cf. Augustine, *Dulc. qu*., 6.5.
[1327] Augustine, *Simpl.*, 2.3.3.
[1328] Smelik (1979), p.173.
[1329] Ibid.

Augustine's writing style, particularly in his early texts. Henri-Irénée Marrou notes how he often offers two interpretations rather than one when explaining a biblical text.[1330] J. T. Lienhard speculated that this might be the influence of Augustine's education in Dialectic, which had given him a 'dialectical mind'.[1331] Dialectic is difficult to define, since different schools of philosophy often understood it differently, and also because its definition often had a double aspect; but, generally speaking, it was one of the liberal arts taught in classical education.[1332] It was Plato who established Dialectic as an art, understanding it to refer to both the method of philosophical dialogue, where two or more parties rehearsed differing opinions on a matter and tested hypotheses to discover the truth by reasoned arguments, and also the pursuit for truth itself, 'the path to understanding unchanging essences',[1333] or 'the science of reality'.[1334] These two aspects are linked, since the method is itself the study of truth, for Plato thought that Dialectic was 'the only acceptable form of philosophical reasoning'.[1335] Influenced by classical thinkers,[1336] Augustine understood Dialectic in a similarly nuanced way, as both 'the knowledge of good disputation' [*scientia bonae disputationis*],[1337] and 'knowledge of truth' [*scientia ueritatis*],[1338] and was well-versed in it

[1330] Marrou (1958), p.456.
[1331] Lienhard, (1996), p.21.
[1332] For more on Dialectic and its history, see Rescher (2007), pp.119-39.
[1333] Timmerman and Schiappa (2010), p.37.
[1334] Evans (1977), p.7. For more on Plato and Dialectic, see Kennedy (1999), pp.58-9; Timmerman and Schiappa (2010), pp.37-40.
[1335] Kennedy (1999), p.58.
[1336] Marrou notes Aristotle's influence in shaping Augustine's understanding of Dialectic as the practical art of discussing, and Stoicism in shaping his views of Dialectic as the study of the laws which govern the steps of reason (or Dialectic as 'logic'), see Marrou (1958), p.195. Jean Pépin similarly notes this Aristotelian and, particularly, Stoic influence, see Pépin (1976), pp.71-2, 97-8, 165. It is worth noting Platonic influences on Augustine as well, which probably shaped his understanding of Dialectic. For more on Augustine and Platonism, see Augustine, *Confessiones*, 7.9.13-15; see also Beatrice (1989), pp.248-81. Alfred Warren Matthews states that, in Augustine's time, Dialectic combined elements from these three schools of thought, see Fitzgerald (1999), p.269. Thus, Augustine was product of his time.
[1337] Augustine, *ord.,* 2.18.47.
[1338] Augustine, *Contra Academicos*, 3.13.29. Marrou and Pépin note this double distinction in Augustine too, see Marrou (1958), pp.195, 240; Pépin (1976), pp.161-6. Augustine perhaps makes this double distinction

from his own high-quality classical education.[1339] Augustine certainly saw the value of Dialectic earlier in his career,[1340] and near the writing of *Ad Simplicianum*, in book 2 of *De doctrina Christiana*, he states that '[t]he discipline of disputation [*disputationis disciplina*] is exceedingly effective in getting into and unravelling all kinds of questions which are in the sacred texts'.[1341] The dialogical nature of Dialectic allowed alternative sides to be considered and encouraged multiple approaches in the pursuit of Scripture's true meaning and, as such, was a useful exegetical method. This is precisely its application in *Ad Simplicianum*, its methodology meaning that this section of *Ad Simplicianum* appears to make a strong case for both viewpoints. Thus, the presentation of multiple arguments in this text is partly a stylistic feature. Consequently, although Augustine may not have been entirely certain on this passage, we should take his well-thought-out conclusion seriously – that Samuel's delusive appearance was the likeliest scenario. As we shall see, by the time of writing *De doctrina Christiana*, Augustine presents an even more inconclusive treatment of 1 Samuel 28. However, he concludes this answer to Simplician by returning to the original question. Whatever precisely happened at Endor, Augustine is certain 'that something of this sort was accomplished [*tale aliquid factum*] by the evil devices of that Pythoness'.[1342] Whether true or delusive, Samuel's appearance was accomplished by the Medium and the evil spirit within her.

---

clearest in *Cresc.*, where Dialectic is described as the 'skill of disputing [*peritia disputandi*]' (1.13.16) but that it can also 'discern the truth from falsehood [*verum discernit a falso*]' (1.15.19).

[1339] Augustine, *Contra Academicos,* 3.13.29; see also Lienhard (1996), p.21; Harrison (2000), pp.47-8.

[1340] While Augustine evidently viewed this discipline positively at this earlier point in his life, scholars debate whether Augustine's views towards Dialectic became more sceptical later in life. For an overview of this debate, see Heßbrüggen-Walter (2005), pp.184-5.

[1341] Augustine, *doc. Chr.*, 2.31.48.117. This is not to say that Augustine did not have reservations about Dialectic, and he advises how it can be used appropriately (2.31.48ff). Ambrose, Augustine's mentor, was suspicious of Dialectic; see Ambrose, *De Fide*, 1.5.42; see also Heßbrüggen-Walter (2005), pp.191-3.

[1342] Augustine, *Simpl.*, 2.3.3.

Having considered the text in detail, broader conclusions can now be drawn. Aspects of Augustine's interpretation appear to be original, such as his innovative arguments making use of Imperial imagery or principles from the world of art. However, he also draws from wider discussions of this passage. For instance, when Augustine explains why Scripture was not clearer when using the name 'Samuel' if it was really referring to a demonic illusion,[1343] he seems to be responding to an objection similar to one made by Origen, who asks 'For what reason would it not say, "The woman saw a demon that was pretending to be Samuel"?'[1344] Like Augustine, Eustathius and Gregory of Nyssa also respond to such an objection.[1345] Perhaps Augustine was familiar with some of these. He also counters another common objection: that 'Samuel' could not have been a demon because he prophesied true things,[1346] a point also made by Origen.[1347] Furthermore, Augustine suggests a response similar to Eustathius' refutation of Origen on this very point: that 'Samuel's' prophecy was not actually true, since Saul and Samuel would not be together after death on the basis of Luke 16:19-31, indicating the figure's deceptive, demonic nature.[1348]

Augustine's awareness of others who wrote on this passage is also suggested by his use of Scripture. Luke 16:19-31, Jesus' account of Lazarus and the rich man, was often used by those arguing that a demon appeared rather than Samuel, to prove that Samuel's message was false, since Saul and Samuel (righteous and unrighteous) could not have been together after death.[1349] This is how Augustine uses this passage too. Further, Augustine alludes to 2

[1343] Ibid., 2.3.2.
[1344] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 4.7.
[1345] Eustathius, *Engast.*, 6.3ff; Gregory, *Pyth.*, 105–106.
[1346] Augustine, *Simpl.*, 2.3.3.
[1347] Origen, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 4.9–6.2.
[1348] Augustine, *Simpl.*, 2.3.3; cf. Eustathius, *Engast.*, 14.6–15.7.
[1349] Tertullian, *An.*, 57.8; Eustathius, *Engast.*, 14.6-13; Gregory, *Pyth.,* 102–103; see also *Martyrium Pionii,* 14.7. Origen is an exception, and cites this passage for the alternative position, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 9.9.

Corinthians 11:14-15, another passage commonly cited when supporting a case for an illusory Samuel, as Tertullian, Eustathius, and Ambrosiaster do.[1350] Augustine clearly engages with common traditions of interpreting this passage, although it is difficult to ascertain which works he may have known. Scholars debate how well Augustine knew Origen,[1351] but it is possible that Augustine addresses some of Origen's arguments for the position that the real Samuel appeared. However, there are two particularly strong candidates for shaping Augustine's writing, namely Tertullian and Ambrosiaster. In Tertullian's case, Augustine clearly had some knowledge of his fellow North-African.[1352] It seems probable that Augustine knew this influential Latin writer's understanding of 1 Samuel 28, being the earliest surviving proponent of the view that Samuel was a demonic illusion and who, like Augustine, cites both Luke 16:19-31 and 2 Corinthians 11:14-15 alongside this passage. Augustine also had some familiarity with Ambrosiaster's work,[1353] and their discussions of 1 Samuel 28 bear obvious resemblances: Latin texts answering a question about this passage as part of a wider Question/Answer format expositing biblical passages. More importantly, both texts ultimately come to the same conclusion concerning 1 Samuel 28 and cite some of the same Scriptures to support their case. Perhaps Augustine was familiar with Ambrosiaster's similar enterprise. Since he claims that 'deeper and more complicated investigation [*profundiore et perplexiore inquisitione*]' is necessary, it seems likely that he had already done *some* research by reading the thoughts of others on this passage.[1354]

[1350] Tertullian, *An.,* 57.8; Eustathius, *Engast.*, 4.9; Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones,* 27.1; see also *Martyrium Pionii*, 14.10. Origen is also aware that this Scripture was used by the opposing view, *Hom. 1 Sam. 28*, 4.6.
[1351] Heidl (2003); Ramelli (2013b); Keech (2012).
[1352] Bardy (1953); see Augustine, *civ. Dei*, 7.1. This is not to say that Augustine's view of Tertullian was always favourable, see *b. vid.*, 4.6–5.7
[1353] Keech (2012), p.107ff; Hunter (2009), p.6; Beatrice (2013), p.134; see also Leeming (1930).
[1354] Augustine, *Simpl.*, 2.3.3.

Certainly *Ad Simplicianum* reveals some form of interaction with the literary tradition surrounding 1 Samuel 28.

Augustine's discussion of agency also warrants further analysis. Interestingly, in both the hypothetical possibilities that he offers, he emphasises the role of demons over that of the Medium in raising Samuel or conjuring his image. Although the Medium seems to have some role, this is secondary in focus compared to the actions of the evil spirit within her. In both possible explanations, Augustine understands demons to be the active agents, although God, in his sovereign judgment, allows this. Thus, his understanding of this passage leads Augustine to simultaneously ascribe much power to demonic forces, while restricting their actions to the will of God. This mysterious balance re-emerges in Augustine's corpus when discussing superstition. For instance, in *De Civitate Dei*, when explaining how Pharaoh's magicians, aided by demons, could accomplish their great feats, Augustine states that 'they were permitted to accomplish certain marvels [*facere quaedam mira permissi sunt*]'.[1355] Here, as in *Ad Simplicianum*, Augustine holds the role of demons and God hand in hand. This aspect of his understanding of 1 Samuel 28, where demons act within God's sovereignty, did not change as his views developed.

De doctrina Christiana

Augustine wrote the section of *De doctrina Christiana* with which we are concerned not long after *Ad Simplicianum*. This proved to be one of his most influential and important works because it set out how one should interpret and teach Scripture, a problematic issue for

[1355] Augustine, *civ. Dei*, 10.8.

many Christians. In the first three books of *De doctrina Christiana*, Augustine primarily deals with the matter of biblical exegesis, and the appropriate methods to use, while in the final book he discusses how, once the truths of Scripture have been discovered, they should be delivered in preaching (*modus inueniendi; modus proferendi*). It was partly necessary to discuss these matters because many Christians were suspicious of the pagan classical tradition, but were simultaneously steeped in it through their education and wider culture, and consequently were unsure whether it was appropriate to adopt classical techniques to interpret Scripture, and classical rhetoric to convey it to others.[1356] While Augustine's motivations for writing this book have been the subject of lengthy debate,[1357] he clarifies these issues, explaining which aspects of classical culture should be adopted or avoided, and provides a framework for dealing with Scripture.

De Doctrina Christiana refers briefly to 1 Samuel 28 in book 2. It comes as part of Augustine's most significant treatment of superstition and demonology in all his writings, where he explains illicit superstitious activities (such as magic and astrology) – an aspect of pagan culture he believes should be shunned – within a comprehensive, semiotic framework. Robert Markus established Augustine's semiotic understanding of magic and superstition in

[1356] For Christianity's problematic relationship with classical culture, and how this impacted the writing of *De doctrina Christiana*, see Harrison (2000), pp.52-63.

[1357] For more on this debate, see Green (1995), pp.ix-xi; Harrison (2000), p.58, n.48. The debate is primarily between whether Augustine is seeking to create a Christian culture or trying to establish how Christian education should be delivered. This, however, is a false dichotomy. Luc Verheijen understands the section from which our reference comes (*doc. Chr.,* 2.19.29-2.42.63) as a charter for a Christian culture, but that most of the text concerns how one interprets and conveys Scripture, see Verheijen (1974), pp.10-20. As Harrison notes, 'This apparent digression is in fact intrinsic to, and complements, the work as a whole', since Augustine, to establish how one should interpret Scripture, must consider and respond to classical culture, and how it shapes the Christian culture that reads Scripture, see Harrison (2000), p.59. The reference in question (*doc. Chr.*, 2.23.35.88) is part of this wider discussion of classical culture, as Augustine considers, and condemns, pagan superstition.

1994 and his seminal work remains the fullest available discussion on it.[1358] At the beginning of the second book, Augustine explains, 'For a sign [*signum*] is a thing, besides the spectacle which brings it to the senses, which of itself makes some other thing come to mind; just as when a footprint has been seen we think that the animal whose footprint it is has passed by…'[1359] He applies this same idea to magic and superstition. Superstitious activities themselves are merely signs which indicate the relationship between demons and those who invoke their power or, in Augustine's words, they are 'certain consultations [*consultationes*] and agreements [*pacta*] of meanings [*significationum*] approved and allied [*foederati*] with demons'.[1360] Magic is essentially a language through which these two groups communicate and establish their relationship.

The reference to 1 Samuel 28 comes as Augustine argues that demons can sometimes predict correctly and tell the truth. He explains that it is not because they 'speak falsehoods' that pagan divinatory practices should be avoided, [1361] rather, they should be shunned because of the evil forces which they invoke, and Augustine uses scriptural examples of truthful demonic divination, and clear commands to avoid them, to prove his point. It is in this context, as another proof of the occasional accuracy of demonic predictions, that our passage is cited.

'Nor, however, because the apparition [*imago*] of the dead Samuel foretold the truth [*vera praenuntiavit*] to King Saul through such sacrilege by which that apparition was presented,

[1358] Markus (1994), pp.375-88.
[1359] Augustine, *doc. Chr.*, 2.1.1.1 [Green (1995), p.57, revised].
[1360] Ibid., 2.20.30.74.
[1361] Ibid., 2.23.35.88.

are they less abhorrent.'[1362] This reference to 1 Samuel 28 is both brief and ambiguous – being exactly what makes Augustine's use of the passage significant. Smelik noticed the ambiguity of this 'unclear remark' but made no attempt at explaining it.[1363] This chapter, however, will argue that Augustine is purposely ambiguous here, probably because he is now less sure than when writing *Ad Simplicianum* regarding the nature of Samuel's appearance. By using uncertain terms, Augustine indicates his own uncertainty, and marks the beginning of the 180º turn found in his later interpretations of this passage. At the very least, Augustine does not conclude with the same clarity as in *Ad Simplicianum* that Samuel was a demonic apparition.

A key word in assessing this passage is *imago*.[1364] D. W. Robertson, Jr, translates this as 'image', a perfectly reasonable rendering.[1365] Consequently, if the figure is described as 'the image of the dead Samuel', although 'image' need not have a delusive connotation, one might be inclined to argue that Augustine is talking in terms of illusions, in line with his discussion in *Ad Simplicianum*. However, other translations are possible. R. P. H. Green translates *imago* as 'ghost', another valid translation,[1366] thereby rendering the reading as 'the ghost of the dead Samuel', suggesting that it was a true vision of the real Samuel, not a demonic illusion, that appeared to Saul. Dictionaries confirm that both are possible translations of *imago*.[1367] By *imago*, Augustine clearly means that some sort of spectacle appeared to Saul, but in and of itself *imago* does not suggest whether Samuel was real or

[1362] Ibid.
[1363] Smelik (1979), p.173, n.49.
[1364] Rose also notes this word's significance and its plurality of possible meanings, see Rose (2013), p.416.
[1365] Robertson (1958), p.59.
[1366] Green (1995), p.99.
[1367] Glare (1990), p.831; Lewis and Short (1969), p.888.

illusory, and one suspects that Augustine uses this word for that very reason. To reflect this uncertainty, I have rendered *imago* as 'apparition'. Rose disagrees, claiming that we should understand *imago* in a delusive sense because she does not believe that Augustine had enough time to change his mind since *Ad Simplicianum*.[1368] This claim is unsubstantiated, and ignores the change of tone between this reference to 1 Samuel 28 and that in *Ad Simplicianum*, which Smelik also noticed.[1369] A consideration of how *imag*o is used in Augustine's works more generally might shed light on how it should be understood in *De doctrina Christiana*. Rose appeals to a singular example in his works where *imago* refers to an imitation, not a person, to prove that he is not referring to the real Samuel in *De doctrina Christiana*.[1370] However, Augustine uses this word in various ways in his corpus. Most notably, as in the case of other patristic writers, *imago* has important theological connotations for Augustine, since humanity is said to have been created in God's image (*imago Dei*).[1371] More significantly, Augustine also describes Christ as being *Imago Dei*. In *De Trinitate*, he states 'by the example of his [Christ's] image [*imaginis exemplo*], let us also not depart from God, for we too are the image of God, although certainly not an equal one [*nos imago dei sumus, non quidem aequalis*]'.[1372] *Imago* in this context clearly does not refer to a deceptive illusion, but to how Christ and humankind (albeit not in an equal capacity) genuinely reflect God. As Edmund Hill states, 'The primary form of image for Augustine was not, as it is for us, the statue or picture, but the reflection in water or in a glass.'[1373] Since God and man, and even God and Christ, are distinct entities for Augustine, this use of *imago*

[1368] Rose (2013), p.416.
[1369] Smelik (1979), p.173, n.49.
[1370] Rose (2013), p.416, n.25.
[1371] For an example of this use, see Augustine, *Confessiones,* 13.22.32; cf. Genesis 1:26-28. For *Imago Dei* in Augustine's thought, see Boersma (2016); Drever (2013).
[1372] Augustine, *Trin.,* 7.3.5; see Boersma (2016), p.259.
[1373] Hill (1991), p.234, n.24.

does not unequivocally support a case that it was the real Samuel that appeared either. Nevertheless, if we take *imago* as referring to a similar concept here in *De doctrina Christiana*, Samuel's *imago* would share a genuine similarity to the figure he represents, not as a delusive illusion. *Imago*, according to this common theological usage, might suggest that the figure which appeared in 1 Samuel 28 was visibly like Samuel although also distinct from his old self. This would make sense, since Augustine probably did not believe that Samuel was resurrected *physically* at any point in his understanding of this passage. Read this way, Augustine had already changed his mind by the time of writing *De doctrina Christiana*. However, without further elaboration by Augustine on how he wishes this term to be understood, we cannot be certain. But this is exactly the point: for one can argue that Augustine uses this ambiguous term, without explanation, precisely because he did not want to be too specific, due to his own uncertainty in interpreting this passage.

The lack of detail Augustine offers here is another clue that he is uncertain and is purposely unclear. As *Ad Simplicianum* illustrates, Augustine was very much aware that this was a contentious passage. He could easily have clarified his thoughts in this section of *De doctrina Christiana* by qualifying *imago* with 'demonic' or 'real' or another revealing term. But he chooses not to. In *Ad Simplicianum*, Augustine considers why Scripture was not clearer when designating 'Samuel' a demonic illusion.[1374] In light of this, it is odd that Augustine would be unclear himself so soon after writing these words. After showing a clear awareness of the debate in *Ad Simplicanum*, why not make his own position obvious? However, to posit that Augustine's ambiguity was accidental, as Rose implies, on an issue he knew was contentious,

[1374] Augustine, *Simpl.*, 2.3.2.

would be to undermine his intellect dramatically. Rather, this lack of clarity makes best sense if we understand it as being intentional, because of his own uncertainty. This is not the only time we see Augustine being purposely unclear in his writings: his reference to 'certain books of the Platonists' which were given to him earlier in life, is a remark which has led to much scholarly speculation.[1375] Thus, when it suited him, Augustine is known to occasionally obfuscate in his works.

Despite this obscurity, Augustine is clearer about one matter concerning 1 Samuel 28 in *De doctrina Christiana* than in *Ad Simplicianum*. In *Ad Simplicianum* (informed by Luke 16:19-31), he suggests that aspects of 'Samuel's' prophecy might have been untrue, although he is not definitive about this. However, in *De doctrina Christiana,* Augustine is unreserved that the figure 'foretold the truth [*vera praenuntiavit*] to King Saul'. This change might be another indication that Augustine now believed it was the true Samuel that appeared and delivered a true prophecy, not a deceptive demonic illusion. However, conversely, Augustine seeks to prove the potential veracity of demonic divination in this section of *De doctrina Christiana*. After referring to 1 Samuel 28, he cites the example of the slave-girl from whom Paul exorcised an evil spirit (Acts 16:16-18), as proof that demons can speak true things.[1376] Further, Augustine has already argued in *Ad Simplicianum* that God can speak truth by whichever means he wishes.[1377] Thus, although the truthfulness of 'Samuel's' prophecy in *De doctrina Christiana* may well be a clue that Augustine now suspects that the true Samuel appeared, this is not concrete evidence.

[1375] Augustine, *Confessiones,* 7.9.13; see also 7.20.26. For some of the speculation regarding this reference, see Beatrice (1989), pp.248-81; O'Donnell (1992), pp.421-4; Quinn (2002), p.411.
[1376] *doc. Chr.*, 2.23.35.88.
[1377] *Simpl*., 2.3.1.

We certainly should not take Augustine's clear indication in *De doctrina Christiana* that demons were involved in the events of 1 Samuel 28 as proof that he believed Samuel was a demonic illusion. According to *Ad Simplicianum*, whether the real Samuel appeared or a demonic illusion, demons were at work. While Augustine is clear in *De doctrina Christiana* that demons were responsible for the 'abhorrent [*exsecranda*]' events at Endor, the nature of their activity is not specified and this does not automatically mean that it must have been a demonic illusion. To say this would be to contradict Augustine's affirmative answer to Simplician's question of 'whether the unclean spirit that was in the Pythoness was able to bring it about that Samuel was seen by Saul and spoke with him', whatever happened.[1378] On this note, however, Augustine reaffirms a point in *De doctrina Christiana* that he makes several times elsewhere, that such demonic power is only possible by 'some divine decision'.[1379] In short, God is still in control, despite the efforts of demons.

It is worth noting that many aspects of this section of *De doctrina Christiana* borrow from *Ad Simplicianum*. For instance, the power of demons and God's ultimate authority are important concepts to both discussions. Both also use the same biblical passages, namely Paul's exorcism of the soothsaying slave-girl (Acts 16:16-18), along with 1 Samuel 28, to prove the same point, that demons can speak truth. It is in the light of *Ad Simplicianum*, as a continuation of his thoughts on this text, that this section of *De doctrina Christiana* is best understood.

[1378] Ibid.
[1379] *doc. Chr.*, 2.23.35.87.

Why, then, having already discussed 1 Samuel 28 thoroughly in *Ad Simplicianum,* does Augustine move to a more ambiguous exegesis in *De doctrina Christiana*? The answer is simple: he had begun the process of changing his mind on this passage. The seeds of change can be found in *Ad Simplicianum*. Augustine argues admirably for both sides, and while he concluded on the side of Samuel being a demonic illusion, he could evidently see the merits of both interpretations. Clearly, this stance had progressed to uncertainty by the time of writing *De doctrina Christiana*.

Another consideration may be significant in understanding why Augustine began to shift in his opinion. In *De doctrina Christiana*, he establishes what he considers to be the scriptural canon. Earlier in book 2, among a long list of other texts, Augustine states that 'Ecclesiasticus' [i.e. Sirach] should be considered within the 'canon of the Scriptures'.[1380] This would later become vital in forming his opinion that it was the real Samuel that was raised, since Sirach 46:20 seems to confirm that the real Samuel appeared. As we shall see, in both *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda* and *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus*, Augustine cites this passage as his crowning proof that it was the real Samuel who appeared,[1381] and it seems the discovery of this passage was instrumental in changing his mind.[1382] Since Augustine establishes Sirach's canonicity *and* refers to 1 Samuel 28 in book 2, we cannot overstate the significance of this part of *De doctrina Christiana* for charting Augustine's thought on this passage. However, this raises the question: is it significant that Augustine begins to change his mind in the same book in which he establishes Sirach's canonicity? Rose argues that Augustine would not have discovered this passage in Sirach during the period between

[1380] Ibid., 2.8.13.26-27.
[1381] Augustine, *cura mort.,* 15.18; *Dulc. Qu.*, 6.5.
[1382] This seems to be the implication in Augustine, *Dulc. Qu.*, 6.5.

writing *Ad Simplicianum* and *De doctrina Christiana*, but there is no reason why this could not be so. Furthermore, Augustine could have known of the passage before writing *Ad Simplicianum*, but after establishing Sirach's canonicity, was only beginning to understand its ramifications on his reading of 1 Samuel 28. Whatever the truth, book 2 of *De doctrina Christiana* certainly marked an important change in Augustine's thought on this passage. He has moved from a tentative conclusion that Samuel was a demonic illusion to a stage of uncertainty, which would later lead him to the alternative conclusion. Remarkably, then, this passage in *De doctrina Christiana* shows us when Augustine began to change his mind.

Epistle 43

Augustine's *Epistle* 43, addressed to Donatist leaders at that time ('Glorius, Eleusius, the Two Felixes, and Grammaticus'), appeals for unity on the matter of the Donatist schism.[1383] In this letter, Augustine condemns the Donatists for creating division within the Church, and to prove the wickedness of their intolerance, cites examples of important biblical figures who bore patiently with sinners among God's people. Among this list of notable personages, Augustine notes that 'David tolerated Saul his persecutor, who abandoning heavenly things with wicked conduct, sought out the lower regions by magical arts [*magicis artibus inferna quaerentem*]'.[1384] This reference to 1 Samuel 28 is brief, excluding all mention of Samuel. David is the focus, and Saul's role serves to highlight David's patient endurance. All we can glean from this discussion was that Augustine believed that Saul 'sought out the lower regions' with magic, and that he condemns such actions. Since he establishes in *De doctrina Christiana* the demonic character of 'magical arts [*magicarum artium*]',[1385] it is also worth

[1383] See Parsons (1951), p.182, n.1.
[1384] Augustine, *Epistle* 43.8.23.
[1385] Augustine, *doc. Chr.*, 2.20.30.74.

noting from Augustine's reference to *magicis artibus* that he understands that demons were somehow involved in the events of 1 Samuel 28. Otherwise, this reference reveals little about how Augustine understood this passage.

However, if we assume that Augustine wrote this letter at a similar time to *De doctrina Christiana*, it is not impossible that this lack of detail was, again, intentional. He probably referred to 1 Samuel 28 since the passage was on his mind at this time and David's endurance of Saul's evil suited his argument, but due to his growing uncertainty, Augustine chose not to explain precisely what happened. His uncertainty, therefore, is intentionally cloaked by obscurity and brevity. However, while this is plausible, since we cannot be certain when the letter was written, its brevity and lack of clarity could be coincidental. Nevertheless, if this letter was written after *De doctrina Christiana*, as suspected, then it is probable that Augustine is being purposely vague because of his own uncertain stance concerning the events of this passage.

Evodius' Epistle 158

Several years passed between Augustine's comments on this passage in his first three references (*c*.396) and his last three (in the 420s). But that is not to say that he did not consider it during those years, as Evodius' letter to Augustine, *Epistle* 158, proves.

Evodius was an old friend of Augustine, having known him since his early years as a Christian. At the time of writing this letter, Evodius was Bishop of Uzalis, a small city near Carthage.[1386]

[1386] For more on Evodius, see Fitzgerald (1999), p.344.

It is clear from their interactions that Augustine was the intellectual superior in the relationship. Evodius often asked questions of his old companion and gave great weight to Augustine's instructions.

In *Epistle* 158, Evodius tries to justify to Augustine his belief that souls, between the body's death and resurrection, occupy some form of body.[1387] The bishop postulates that this could either be an entirely new body given to the soul during this interim period, or that a lighter part of the body (made of air or ether) never leaves the soul. Either way, Evodius posits an aerial, spiritual body for the soul after death. He argues that souls, although incorporeal, must always occupy some sort of body, otherwise it would be impossible to distinguish one soul from another.[1388] Evodius cites Luke 16:19-31 to support his case, since this passage clearly shows that people are distinguishable from one another after death, and also argues from the episode of Lazarus and the rich man that 'if they are held in places, they are held in bodies [*si locis tenentur, corporibus tenentur*]'.[1389]

It is in this context that Evodius states, 'it is agreed that Samuel was seen in the body [*in corpore*] when he was summoned [*excitatus est*] at the request of Saul'.[1390] His argument is that, since Samuel was 'seen in the body' (probably referring to the physical descriptors ascribed to him in 1 Samuel 28:14), his soul must have occupied some tangible vessel; therefore, souls must have bodies after death. By making this argument, Evodius clearly believed that Samuel himself was raised. He immediately follows this use of 1 Samuel 28

[1387] Evodius*, Epistle* 158.5-6.
[1388] Ibid., 158.5.
[1389] Ibid., 158.5.
[1390] Ibid., 158.6.

with the example of Moses at Christ's Transfiguration (cf. Matthew 17:1-13), who 'came to the Lord on the mountain in a body', despite being dead and buried.[1391] Both passages are used in tandem to show real people returning from the dead in some physical capacity. While Evodius postulates these beliefs about souls, his tone is questioning, and he defers to Augustine to seek his approval on this matter.

From these remarks, like Augustine, Evodius seems to be aware of literary traditions surrounding 1 Samuel 28. This is immediately indicated by his citation of Luke 16:19-31 alongside 1 Samuel 28, a common feature of discussions of this passage which we have noted many times. However, more specifically, Evodius' reference to 1 Samuel 28 seems very similar to Origen's discussion of it as preserved by Methodius (see chapter 4). Origen argued that souls occupy some manner of body between death and the general resurrection, which Henri Crouzel likens to the Platonic notion of souls occupying a corporeal envelope 'made of corporeal pneuma which for the Platonists formed the joint between the body and the soul and lived on after death'.[1392] Like Evodius, Origen cited 1 Samuel 28 and Luke 16:19-31 as evidence for this.[1393] These distinct commonalities suggest that Evodius may have had some contact with Origen's ideas.

Augustine's reply has survived (*Epistle* 159), although he does not refer directly to 1 Samuel 28 and his answer is frustratingly brief: 'If, however, you wish to briefly hear how it is understood by me: by no means am I of the opinion that the soul departs from the body

[1391] Ibid.; cf. Zeno, *Tractatus,* 1.2.4.9.
[1392] Methodius, *Res.,* 3.17.2-3; see Crouzel (1989), p.241.
[1393] Methodius, *Res.,* 3.17. Elsewhere, like Evodius, it seems Origen also cited Moses and Elias' appearance at Christ's Transfiguration to inform his understanding of the soul's fate and the resurrection, see Methodius *Res.,* 3.4-5; see also Patterson (1997), p.172.

with a body [*animam e corpore exire cum corpore*].'[1394] We cannot glean much about Augustine's own thought from this, but he seems to suggest, in disagreement with Evodius' musings, that souls are without a body after death (at least before the resurrection). This is consistent with Augustine's wider thought. As will become apparent in his next discussion of 1 Samuel 28, Augustine believed that souls are innately incorporeal. After the death of the earthly body, souls are separated from any type of body, which is why Augustine states in *De civitate Dei* that 'they patiently and longingly anticipate the resurrection of their bodies'.[1395] In *De Genesi ad Litteram*, Augustine states that 'the spirits of the deceased would need to receive their bodies in the resurrection', again implying that souls are bodiless until then .[1396] However, beyond this interim period, as the above quotations also suggest, Augustine understands that the body and soul will be reunited in the resurrection and, importantly, as he elaborates in *De Genesi ad Litteram*, that the body is necessary for a better vision of God 'so that what was its [the soul's] burden might be its glory'.[1397] Thus, Augustine conceives a positive future for the body, and his conception of the resurrection body, at least in his later texts, is a physical one but without 'the corruption itself of flesh and blood'.[1398] His understanding of this seems to have changed over time, and he corrects himself in *Retractationes* for having earlier understood Paul's words that 'flesh and blood will not inherit the kingdom of God' (1 Corinthians 15:50) to mean that 'there will not be flesh and blood, but a heavenly body [*non erit caro et sanguis, sed caeleste corpus*]' in the future

[1394] Augustine, *Epistle* 159.1.
[1395] Augustine, *civ. Dei*, 13.20.
[1396] Augustine, *Gn. Litt.,* 12.35.
[1397] Ibid.
[1398] Augustine, *Retractationes*, 2.3; similarly, see *Sermon* 362.13.14.

resurrection.[1399] Despite this physical conception of the future resurrection, until then souls are entirely incorporeal after death in Augustine's thought.

Although Augustine evidently disagreed with Evodius that souls occupy bodies between death and the resurrection, *Epistle* 159 does not shed any further light on 1 Samuel 28. For even if Augustine denies that Samuel appeared physically, as his blunt answer to Evodius suggests, 'Samuel' could still be the disembodied soul of the real Samuel or, equally, a demon in disguise. Simply, Augustine's comments here do not indicate whether he thought Samuel was real or illusory.

Nevertheless, although Evodius was intellectually dependent on Augustine, Augustine would soon openly agree with Evodius that Samuel truly appeared. In fact, Augustine even uses some of the same arguments as Evodius to support his altered view. This raises the interesting question concerning the extent to which Augustine's change of thought was influenced by others. Could Evodius' letter to Augustine, which argues that the real Samuel appeared, have had an influence?

De anima et eius origine

After over two decades without mentioning 1 Samuel 28, Augustine again refers to this passage, once again in direct reply to another person's prompting. In *De anima et eius origine* we see the next development of Augustine's thought, as he moves from uncertainty

[1399] Augustine, *agon.*, 32.34. For the correction, see *Retractationes*, 2.3; for this later understanding, see also *civ. Dei*, 13.20.

to stating – albeit not as emphatically as he will later – that he believed it was the real Samuel that was raised.

The reference is, again, brief. Augustine wrote this treatise in response to Vincent Victor, who had, in a now lost text, criticised Augustine's understanding of the soul after reading his letter to Optatus, where Augustine had admitted that he was ignorant on the matter of the origin of the soul and had asserted that the soul is 'not a body but a spirit'.[1400] Our reference comes from the fourth book of *De anima et eius origine*, as Augustine deals with Victor's belief that 'the soul is a body'.[1401] Whereas Evodius maintained that souls were incorporeal but occupied some sort of body after death, it seems that Victor was of the view that souls are innately corporeal. Both, however, agreed that the soul's existence after death was not bodiless. Augustine's reply to Victor was therefore like his reply to Evodius in this regard, that souls are 'entirely incorporeal [*omnino incorpoream*]'.[1402] In particular, as Augustine deals with Victor's evidence for his position (which includes the testimony of Luke 16:19-31),[1403] he cites 1 Samuel 28 (see Appendix O.1).

We can infer from Augustine's words when discussing 1 Samuel 28 ('as you yourself also recalled'), that Victor also mentioned this passage. Based on Augustine's comments, Victor presumably argued that the reference to Samuel's clothes suggests that souls are corporeal, and his reason for citing 1 Samuel 28 is therefore similar to Evodius. However, unlike his

[1400] Augustine, *Epistle* 190.1.4; see *Retracationes,* 2.61; see also Teske (1997), p.468. Augustine seems to understand man's composition in bipartite terms, comprised simply of body and soul, where *anima* refers to 'the inclusive name', whereas *spiritus* refers to the 'soul's particular power of rational thought', according to Preus (1985), p.49. For more on Vincent Victor and the context of writing, see Fitzgerald (1999), p.22; Preus (1985), pp.4-6; Teske (1997), pp.467-9.
[1401] Augustine, *an. et or.*, 4.2.2; see also 4.12.17.
[1402] Ibid., 4.12.18.
[1403] Ibid., 4.15.21ff.

response to Evodius, Augustine's reply to Victor indicates how he himself understood 1 Samuel 28. He uses 1 Samuel 28 and Luke 16:19-31 in tandem to assert that, contrary to Victor's view, while souls may have the 'likeness of a body [*similitudinem corporis*]', they do not have a 'real body [*uerum corpus*]'. Against Victor's arguments, Augustine offers two solutions as to why Scripture ascribes physical features to the dead in these passages. Firstly, these physical descriptions reflect a spiritual reality. Thus, Scripture does not mean that the rich man is physically thirsty, but rather points to his real spiritual suffering. To explain the reference to Samuel's clothes, Augustine posits another solution, that 'both his soul [*anima*] and its appearance [*habitus*] bore the likeness of a body [*similitudinem corporis haberet*]'. Souls can seem to appear physically, although they are actually incorporeal. In the book's concluding remarks, Augustine states clearly that 'souls have in themselves the incorporeal likenesses of bodies [*corporum similitudines incorporeas*], but souls themselves are not bodies'.[1404] His use of 1 Samuel 28 supports this over-arching point.

The most significant feature of Augustine's reference to 1 Samuel 28 here, although he does not acknowledge this, is that he evidently now believes that Samuel truly appeared. Firstly, his description of Samuel as 'holy' strongly suggests this, as does his reference to Samuel appearing 'after his death', being appropriate descriptions for the prophet Samuel himself, not a demonic illusion. Secondly, Augustine's entire argument rests on the premise that Samuel was really raised. If Samuel was a demonic illusion, his arguments for Samuel appearing as a bodiless soul would become irrelevant. Moreover, Augustine links Samuel with the rich man of Luke 16:19-31, who was a certainly not a demonic illusion. Augustine

[1404] Ibid., 4.24.38.

would not confuse his analogy by mixing an example of a soul with a demonic illusion. In short, this whole section can only work on the basis, and presumably the shared assumption with Victor, that it was the real Samuel that appeared. Their debate concerns the nature of this appearance. Thus, in the process of arguing that souls are incorporeal, Augustine demonstrates his new belief that Samuel appeared as a disembodied soul, and not as a demon in disguise as he once thought.

Two key aspects of this section highlight the broader literary tradition and wider discussions surrounding this passage. Firstly, Augustine's clear indication that Victor had previously discussed 1 Samuel 28 offers a glimpse of wider discussions of this passage in Augustine's day. Although we do not have direct access to Victor's half of their dialogue, it provides another example of direct conflict over this passage in this period. Further, by acknowledging Victor's discussion of 1 Samuel 28, one is reminded that Augustine is, once more, prompted to engage with this passage by the comments of another, just as he was by Simplician's question. It seems that it is only because of Victor's prompting that Augustine discusses this passage after such a long period of neglect. Secondly, based on Augustine's comments, it seems that Luke 16:19-31 was an important passage for Victor's arguments,[1405] who also seemingly used it alongside 1 Samuel 28. The use of these two passages together is a main feature of the 1 Samuel 28 literary tradition, as observed many times in this study.[1406]

This passage in *De anima et eius origine* marks a significant change: it is the first outright indicator that Augustine had altered his reading of 1 Samuel 28, suggesting now that it was

[1405] Ibid., 4.15.21ff.

[1406] Victor seems to have cited these passages together, as Origen and Evodius did, to suggest a corporeal aspect to souls after death (although Origen and Evodius would disagree that souls themselves are bodies).

the real Samuel that appeared. However, Augustine does not acknowledge this change here, nor offer any indication of why he altered his view. These emerge in later works.

De Cura pro mortuis gerenda

In the next text, *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*, Augustine expresses this change of thought further. By now he is emphatic in his view that it was the real Samuel that appeared to Saul.

This short treatise is addressed to Paulinus, Bishop of Nola.[1407] Paulinus had been asked by Flora, a devout noblewoman, whether burying her son, Cynegius, near the tomb of St Felix would be of any advantage to Cynegius' soul.[1408] Paulinus believed that it would, but thought it best to consult his old friend, Augustine, on this matter. *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda* was Augustine's reply to the query. Fundamentally, the text deals with the relationship between the dead and the living, and how these two separate spheres can and should interact.

Why does Augustine refer to 1 Samuel 28 once more in *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*? One possible explanation is that, as in *c*.396, the passage was on his mind because of the prompting of another. As already noted, around the time he wrote *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda* Augustine received a letter from Dulcitius asking him to explain this passage to him, but Augustine took some time to answer Dulcitius' questions.[1409] However, as suggested earlier, although that reply, *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus*, was written after *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*, it is possible that Dulcitius' letter to Augustine about 1 Samuel 28 preceded his writing of *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*, and thus this passage was thrust upon his mind

[1407] For more on Paulinus, see Leinhard (1977), pp.24-32; Rose (2013), pp.10-19.
[1408] Augustine, *cura mort.,* 1.1.
[1409] Augustine, *Dulc. qu*., preface.

as he wrote *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*. External influence seems to be a common trend in Augustine's interactions with this passage. The other reason why 1 Samuel 28 is used, of course, is its subject matter. The relationship between the living and the dead is central to *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*, and few passages in Scripture deal as directly with this idea as 1 Samuel 28.

The reference to this passage occurs as Augustine discusses interaction between the living and the dead, particularly what the dead can know about the living and what contact they may have. Although Augustine has been arguing that the dead generally do not engage with the affairs of the living,[1410] he states that some interaction is possible.[1411] It is in this context that he cites 1 Samuel 28 (see Appendix O.2), to support two ideas. Firstly, to support his earlier point that the dead can know about the affairs of the living if revealed to them, and 'even to know the future by the Spirit of God's revealing'.[1412] Secondly, 1 Samuel 28, alongside other biblical examples he cites, proves that 'some of the dead are also sent [*mitti*] to the living'.[1413]

In contrast to the opinion he once held, Augustine now says that 'the deceased prophet Samuel… predicted the future…' By referring to Samuel as a 'prophet [*propheta*]' and as being 'deceased [*defunctus*]', Augustine clearly refers to the real Samuel, not a demonic illusion. He further separates himself from his former view by stating that 'some suppose

[1410] Augustine, *cura mort.,* 14.17.
[1411] Ibid., 15.18; see also Rose (2013), p.410.
[1412] Augustine, *cura mort.,* 15.18.
[1413] Ibid.

that it was not Samuel himself who was able to be summoned by magical arts, but that some spirit so coinciding with the evil works fashioned his likeness…'

We will consider below the evidence Augustine provides for his new view. However, it is worth noting first that, despite this major shift, aspects of Augustine's view remain unchanged. He still emphasises the role of evil forces, suggesting that Samuel was raised 'by magical arts [*magicis artibus*]'. Since, as shown above, Augustine's definition of magic always has a demonic character, we should understand that evil spirits played a role in raising the real Samuel. Thus, Augustine seems to adopt the hypothetical position that he had set out (but rejected) in *Ad Simplicianum*: that the real Samuel was raised by the Medium and her evil spirits. He seemingly attributes great power to demonic forces here by suggesting that they can summon the dead. Of course, he would probably qualify this, as he so often does in his other writings (including in *Ad Simplicianum*), by stating that God ultimately permits demons to have such power. While this is not said explicitly in *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*, Samuel's role is consistent with this notion. Despite the evil forces that raised Samuel, Augustine states that 'Samuel prophesied [*prophetauerit*]', since this is Sirach's testimony, which says, concerning Samuel, that '[e]ven after he had fallen asleep, he prophesied and made known to the king his death, and lifted up his voice from the ground in prophecy, to blot out the wickedness of the people' (Sirach 46:20).[1414] Despite the magic which raised him, Samuel prophesies the truth and performs God's will, suggesting that God is in control.

[1414] NRSV.

Augustine has two main arguments for Samuel's true appearance, proofs we can assume were significant in altering his opinion. The first, and most important, is Sirach's testimony, which clearly suggests that it was the real Samuel that appeared. As Augustine clarified in *De doctrina Christiana*, he believes that Sirach is canonical and therefore authoritative.[1415] This is significant because, immediately following his list of canonical texts in *De doctrina Christiana*, Augustine explains that 'the evidence of certain passages may take away the perplexity of uncertain ones', [1416] highlighting this as a useful exegetical technique. Of course, as we have seen, the practice of using Scripture to interpret Scripture was a common hermeneutical method in the early Church and one which Augustine regularly applies throughout his corpus. This is exactly what Augustine does here in *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*. Once Augustine had read this passage in Sirach, because he accepts its authority and it teaches that Samuel was truly raised, his change of thought was inevitable. Since Augustine also quotes Sirach in *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus*, this text was evidently central in forming his new view that the real Samuel appeared at Endor.

Augustine's acceptance of Sirach as canonical was not universal, particularly by those who followed the Hebrew Canon. Jerome, for instance, states explicitly that Sirach is not canonical.[1417] Augustine even acknowledges that some are 'opposed to this book outside of the canon of the Hebrews because it is not in it [*huic libro ex hebraeorum quia in eo non est canone contradicitur*]'. But that is not to say that Augustine's view was uncommon. Cyprian

[1415] Augustine, *doc. Chr.*, 2.8.13.26-27.
[1416] Ibid., 2.9.14.31.
[1417] Jerome, *Prologus galeatus,* 2. In fact, Gallagher postulates that Jerome here is reacting to North Africans, like Augustine, who included texts that Jerome considered deuterocanonical within the canon of Scripture, see Gallagher (2013), pp.105-6.

and Ambrose regularly appealed to Sirach in their works as though it were Scripture,[1418] and contemporaneously to Augustine, it was made canonical in synods at Hippo (393) and Carthage (397), [1419] and by Pope Innocent I (405).[1420] However, in a pre-emptive response to this possible objection, Augustine introduces a second biblical example of the dead appearing to the living. Unlike Sirach's contested canonical status, Augustine cites sources which few orthodox Christians could deny. First, he cites the Pentateuch, generally accepted among Christians, to establish that Moses is 'certainly read… as having died in Deuteronomy' (Deuteronomy 34:5). He then cites an account which appears in each synoptic gospel, again texts widely accepted by Christians, where Moses 'appeared to the living' with Elias at Christ's Transfiguration (cf. Matthew 17:3). Although Augustine primarily uses this account to affirm his general point that the dead can visit the living, it also justifies his understanding of 1 Samuel 28 (and Sirach's testimony). Interestingly, Augustine does not distinguish between these events, even though 1 Samuel 28 involved dark forces, while Moses' appearance at Christ's Transfiguration was clearly a righteous event. This is possibly because, as Augustine has affirmed as far back as *Ad Simplicianum*, God is ultimately sovereign over all such acts.[1421]

Fascinatingly, in *Epistle* 158, Evodius also cited Moses at Christ's Transfiguration alongside 1 Samuel 28. [1422] While Evodius uses these passages together as proof that souls occupy some form of body after death, a point with which we have already shown that Augustine does

[1418] For instance, Cyprian, *Testimonia ad Quirinum,* 3.95-97; Ambrose, *De officiis*, 2.7.37. Augustine was very familiar with these two and their works.
[1419] Munier (1972-1973); Fitzgerald (1999), pp.217-18.; Hefele (1876), pp.395-400, 406-9, 468-9.
[1420] Innocent I, *Epistle* 6.7.13.
[1421] *Simpl.*, 2.3.1.
[1422] Evodius*, Epistle* 158.6.

not agree, it is interesting that both Augustine and Evodius cite these passages together while maintaining Samuel's true resuscitation. This possibly suggests that Augustine changed his view under the influence of others, even an intellectual inferior like Evodius. Augustine also conforms to wider literary tropes we have come to expect of those discussing 1 Samuel 28. Preceding this section of *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*, Augustine uses the account of Lazarus and the rich man to inform his understanding of the condition of the dead, particularly that they are limited in their knowledge of the circumstances of the living.[1423] Once more, Luke 16:19-31 and 1 Samuel 28 are referenced in the same breath to make sense of the afterlife. Augustine also indicates awareness of other opinions on this passage, mentioning that 'some suppose' that Samuel's image was fabricated by evil spirits – but neglects to mention that this, indeed, was once his own view! Regardless, the above points suggest that Augustine was familiar with other interpretations of this passage. In *Ad Simplicianum*, he acknowledged the need for 'deeper and more complicated investigation, which exceeds the limits of either my strength or time' into the matter of 1 Samuel 28. [1424] It seems that by the time he wrote *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*, Augustine had managed to find both 'strength and time'. As already noted, it is likely that his understanding of 1 Samuel 28 was influenced by the interpretations of others that he had read since writing *Ad Simplicianum*, perhaps including Evodius' comments. Perhaps, also, Augustine conducted some of this research after receiving Dulcitius' letter, which asked about 1 Samuel 28.

Nevertheless, it seems Augustine also conducted his own, independent research. His crowning proof is Sirach, and he is the first known Christian writer to use this to prove that

[1423] Augustine, *cura mort.*, 17-18.
[1424] Augustine, *Simpl.*, 2.3.3.

Samuel truly appeared to Saul. Since Sirach's canonicity was not universally accepted, not every theologian would have given this evidence so much weight. For Augustine, however, it was enough. With this evidence, Augustine clearly shows on which side of the debate he is now, and why. However, he does not acknowledge that he had once held the alternative view: this acknowledgment is found in *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus*.

De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus

Dulcitius, a tribune of Emperor Honorius,[1425] wrote to Augustine asking eight questions, of which one concerned 1 Samuel 28. This layman's interest in the passage, the letter he sent, and the response he received, further supports the case that a wide network of discussion existed surrounding 1 Samuel 28 in Late Antiquity, apparently extending beyond the clergy to laymen like Dulcitius. Dulcitius' letter has not survived, but Augustine quotes his question in full: 'Did the Pythoness, according to the narrative [*iuxta historiam*], summon [*euocauerit*] the prophet Samuel himself from the underworld [*inferno*]?'[1426] Augustine answers by recycling his answer to Simplician verbatim.

Initially, this seems problematic. Why, if he now disagrees with his position in *Ad Simplicianum*, would Augustine re-use this answer? There are numerous reasons. Firstly, he had a demanding schedule. As he explains in the preface to Dulcitius, Augustine was too busy to write new, original answers, because doing so 'would be most laborious for me nor would it help you further in any way'.[1427] Acknowledging this in *Retractationes*, Augustine thought that *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus* almost 'should not have been recounted in this

[1425] Augustine, *c. Gaud.,* 1.1.1. For more on Dulcitius, see Ramsey (2008), p.235.
[1426] Augustine, *Dulc. Qu.*, 6.1.
[1427] Ibid., preface.

work among my books, because it is made up from things which were written by me before in other places…'[1428] With the exception of question five,[1429] each answer comes from his other works, and thus, Augustine answers Dulcitius from when 'Simplician… once inquired this of me'.[1430] Because his answer to Simplician was by far his longest, most comprehensive treatment of this passage, it made best sense to reuse this work. Another reason for recycling his previous answer, despite disagreeing with its overall conclusion, was because it covered a lot of useful ground, setting out both sides of the argument, and encouraging further research. Finally, Augustine still agreed with two key aspects of his overall conclusions to Simplician's answer: that it was *possible* for demons to raise the real Samuel, and that demons were responsible for what happened at Endor, with God's permission.

However, since Augustine replicates an old text, we must be cautious in applying it to his current views. Furthermore, as we have already studied these exact words in detail, and because, as shown below, he had since developed his thoughts, there is little value in revisiting these re-copied words. What *should* occupy our attention is the material Augustine added, which makes it abundantly clear that his opinion had now changed. For, after copying himself verbatim, Augustine adds an original concluding section (see Appendix O.3).

In this addendum, Augustine distances himself from what he 'wrote in reply at the time', yet approving his observation that 'more careful investigations' may be necessary, since, by his own 'later investigation', he had discovered new evidence, which completely altered his view, namely the testimony of Sirach. This is the only evidence Augustine cites here, and as

[1428] Augustine, *Retracationes.*, 2.65.
[1429] Augustine, *Dulc. Qu.*, preface; *Retracationes*, 2.65.
[1430] Augustine, *Dulc. Qu.*, 6.2.

this is also how he supports his reading of 1 Samuel 28 in *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*, it was clearly his crowning and sufficient proof that Samuel truly appeared.

While most of the text constitutes his old position verbatim, his closing remarks contradict it, incontrovertibly displaying his change of thought. It is almost fitting that *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus* is Augustine's last reference to 1 Samuel 28, as it holds both his former and later views side by side. Although he is not critical of himself, and even praises his foresight in stating the need for more research, Augustine implicitly admits his mistake by contrasting his past and present beliefs clearly. He discreetly concedes his past ignorance, the only time he acknowledges his altered view, and states his new understanding of this passage. By doing so, Augustine confirms, once and for all, that his interpretation of 1 Samuel 28 had entirely altered between his first exegesis and his last.

Conclusion

Although we have discussed other aspects of these texts by Augustine, one matter stands out: namely his change of thought concerning the identity of the figure that appeared at Endor. Over the course of this chapter, we have constructed a narrative displaying how Augustine's mind changed gradually on this subject, challenging the binary terms in which Smelik narrates this change.[1431] In *Ad Simplicianum,* Augustine proposed that 'Samuel' was a demonic illusion. Soon afterwards, in *De doctrina Christiana* (and possibly also in *Epistle* 43), we can begin to see Augustine change his mind. In *De anima et eius origine*, for the first time, he shows his change of thought clearly, now believing that Samuel himself had

[1431] Smelik (1979), p.173.

appeared. In *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda* and *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus* Augustine offers proof for this new view, and particularly in *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus,* acknowledges that he had altered his understanding. While Smelik correctly identifies Augustine's set-off point and eventual destination in terms of his understanding of 1 Samuel 28, he neglects to take the journey into account, thereby losing an integral aspect of Augustine's interaction with this passage.

It is worth considering whether other developments in Augustine's thought impacted his reading of 1 Samuel 28, that is, whether we can tie his change of view to a wider trend. Firstly, it has been argued that, during his earlier years, Augustine tended to read Scripture figuratively, whereas later in life his exegesis became more literal.[1432] His growing predilection for the plain sense is often supported by comparing his approach to Genesis across the years. While still a layman, Augustine's exegesis of Genesis in *De Genesi adversus Manicheos* was very allegorical whereas later, in *De Genesi ad litteram*, his approach is much more literal.[1433] Applied to 1 Samuel 28, one might suggest that when writing *Ad Simplicianum* earlier in life, Augustine was more comfortable in adding a demon to the narrative whereas, later in life, he preferred the (arguably) more obvious reading that Samuel himself appeared. However, it has been shown that Augustine was consistent across his life in maintaining the importance of both literal and figurative interpretations of Scripture.[1434] More importantly, this explanation cannot account for Augustine's changing view of 1 Samuel 28, since he did not define either reading of that passage as 'figurative' in *Ad Simplicianum*. In the beginning of book 2, Augustine states that he will not interpret

[1432] Bonner (1970), p.552ff.
[1433] Ibid., p.552.
[1434] Fleteren (1996), pp.126-8; Harrison (2013), p.691.

Samuel–Kings figuratively when responding to Simplician's queries (even though he claims these books are 'figurative', like all the Old Testament), since that would require more work on his part, and Simplician had asked him not to.[1435] Therefore, it seems that Augustine believed that both possibilities he sets out for 1 Samuel 28 – that the real Samuel appeared, and that Samuel was a demonic illusion – were in accordance with a literal, historical reading of the passage. Simply, he did not view his earliest reading, that Samuel was a demon, as being figurative. Tied to this, since Augustine's supposed earlier penchant for figurative exegesis is linked to Ambrose's influence upon him,[1436] who was in turn influenced by Origen,[1437] it has also been argued that, earlier in life, Augustine viewed Origen's thought more favourably (which he perhaps received, unwittingly or otherwise, through Ambrose),[1438] whereas later he became more hostile to Origen.[1439] This, too, cannot account for the change in Augustine's interpretation of 1 Samuel 28, since his later position actually aligned more closely to Origen and Ambrose's understanding of this passage than his earlier one, as both believed that Samuel truly appeared.

Another change that has been claimed to occur in Augustine's thought is that, although once sceptical about miracles, later in life he became more convinced that miracles could happen in his own time.[1440] Consequently, he may have been more amenable to the view that Samuel was truly resuscitated as his thought on this developed. However, this again does not adequately account for Augustine's change in his understanding of 1 Samuel 28, since he

[1435] Augustine, *Simpl.,* 2.preface; see also Ramsey (2008), p.165.
[1436] Augustine, *Confessiones*, 6.4.6; see also Keech (2012), p.117; Fleteren (1996), p.108.
[1437] Jerome*, Epistle* 84.7; Pierce (2019), p.443; Fleteren (1996), p.108.
[1438] Ramelli (2013b), p.292ff; Heidl (2003).
[1439] Augustine, *civ. Dei,* 11.23; *haer.*, 43.
[1440] Brown (1984), pp.7-8; Eller (1949), p.181. Compare Augustine, *vera rel.*, 25.47, with *civ. Dei*, 22.8.

always believed that miracles occurred in Scripture, and even explicitly denies that he ever thought miracles did not happen in his own time.[1441] It has also been argued that Augustine became increasingly intolerant of lying and deception later in life.[1442] Thus, if he became uncomfortable with the notion that God would allow such deception to take place, this may explain why he later denied that 1 Samuel 28 speaks of a demonic illusion. However, many argue that Augustine remained consistently intolerant of lying throughout his life,[1443] and in the case of 1 Samuel 28, he clearly ascribed any deception to demonic forces in *Ad Simplicianum*, which he always maintained were deceitful.[1444]

Therefore, Augustine's developing understanding of 1 Samuel 28 does not neatly fit into notions of broader change in his thought. Rather, the clearest explanation for why he changed his understanding of this passage is the simplest, and the one we have set out already, namely that Augustine discovered Sirach's comments on 1 Samuel 28. Believing this text was authoritative, he simply applied the common early Christian exegetical principle of using Scripture to explain Scripture to make sense of 1 Samuel 28.

Despite this major change in Augustine's understanding of 1 Samuel 28, it is important to note that some aspects of his interpretation remained unaltered. Augustine consistently proposes that what happened at Endor was accomplished through evil spirits, by magic, but within God's providential plan. This is clearly evident in *Ad Simplicianum*, but we have also seen that this appears to be the implication in *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*. Therefore,

[1441] Augustine, *Retractationes,* 1.13.7; 1.14.5.
[1442] Puffer (2016).
[1443] Hermanowicz (2018), p.727; Feehan (1990), pp.67-8.
[1444] Cf. Augustine, *civ. Dei*, 21.6.

rather than changing to an entirely new position, Augustine seems to adopt the first view that he had set out in *Ad Simplicianum*, but which at the time he had rejected.

Another reoccurring feature across his discussions of this passage is the role of others in prompting his musings. This is clear in the case of *Ad Simplicianum* and *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus*, where he responds directly to questions on 1 Samuel 28. Yet, it is possibly because of these questions by Simplician and Dulcitius that Augustine also included references to this passage in other works he was writing near the time. Simplician's query might have prompted the references to 1 Samuel 28 in *De doctrina Christiana* and *Epistle* 43, while Dulcitius may have caused the same in *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda*. In the case of *De anima et eius origine*, Augustine directly addresses how Vincent Victor interpreted this passage, offering his own understanding in response. Even *De Cura pro mortuis gerenda* is a response to Paulinus of Nola's queries about the dead, which naturally led Augustine to this passage. It may be the case that Augustine himself was not particularly interested in 1 Samuel 28, which may explain why his references to this passage primarily survive in letters and treatises responding to questions. However, even if Augustine was not personally interested in this passage, this is not to deny its important place in the history of patristic exegesis. Quite the opposite, in fact. Augustine discusses 1 Samuel 28 because of the prompting of both laymen and clerics, indicating wide interest in this passage in Late Antiquity. It is because of this wider attention that Augustine was prompted to share his own thoughts on this passage. Alongside this evidence, other aspects of Augustine's interactions with 1 Samuel 28 appear to reflect wider early Christian discussions of 1 Samuel 28, such as his regular citation of Luke 16:19-31. Further, some of the themes Augustine discusses alongside 1 Samuel 28, like the nature of the body and soul (particularly in *De anima et eius*

origine)*,* seem to tie into the wider discussions to which we have alluded, such as those by Origen, Evodius, and Vincent Victor himself, who all cite 1 Samuel 28 in a similar context.

However, as shown above, Augustine is also original in how he approaches 1 Samuel 28, from his first discussion in *Ad Simplicianum*, with its balanced, dialectical approach, to his last in *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus*, and his use of Sirach as his crowning proof. The change of thought itself, which is central to Augustine's interaction with 1 Samuel 28, is also unprecedented.

To close this thesis with Augustine is appropriate. His exegesis of this passage would soon be quoted by theologians from the 6th century onwards,[1445] thereby having a major impact on the next stage in the history of this passage's reception. More importantly, ending with a living, developing exegesis of this passage, and witnessing Augustine's genuine and fluid attempt at finding its correct interpretation, is a fitting way to conclude the rich and fascinating history of the exegesis of 1 Samuel 28 in the early Church.

[1445] For instance, see Eugippius, *Thesaurus,* 305; Rabanus Maurus, *Commentary on 1-4 Kingdoms*, 1.29; Isidore of Seville, *Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum, in Regum I*, 20.

Reflections

When recounting the reception history of 1 Samuel 28, some reoccurring features have emerged. One such point is the fact that many discussions of this passage have evidently not survived. For example, we know of other expositions by Justin Martyr and Origen which have not survived, letters inquiring about 1 Samuel 28 which probably discussed it (such as by Simplician and Dulcitius), and we have seen many allusions to opposing interpretations which we cannot easily identify. The most notable losses are Hippolytus and Methodius' works dedicated to the discussion of 1 Samuel 28.[1446] In other words, this is a history we can only tell in part.

This point is reinforced by another frequent observation: namely that the sources considered here have many aspects in common. Even if some were influenced directly by earlier, known sources, these commonalities probably reflect a much wider discussion, beyond what is now extant, representing established traditions of interpreting 1 Samuel 28. Let us consider the most important, regular commonalities observed here. Firstly, certain theological points often emerge alongside discussions of this passage. For those who believed that Samuel truly appeared, 1 Samuel 28 was often cited to discuss the superiority of Christianity over Judaism and, tied to this, Christ's descent to Hades and the changes this effected, as well as the power of prophecy which can continue even after death. For those arguing that Samuel was a demonic illusion, thereby inserting demons into the narrative, discussions of 1 Samuel 28 regularly accompany considerations of magic and demons. The soul and the afterlife are discussed by proponents of both views. Other common features

[1446] Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus,* 61.2; 83.1.

include the regular citation of certain scriptural passages alongside 1 Samuel 28, such as reference to Pharaoh's magicians, Christ's Transfiguration, and Isaiah 8:19. However, by far the most important biblical references cited alongside 1 Samuel 28, in terms of both their frequency and their importance in shaping argument, are 2 Corinthians 11:14-15 and Luke 16:19-31, particularly (although not exclusively) for those arguing Samuel was a demonic illusion. 2 Corinthians 11:14-15 proves for early Christian writers that evil forces can assume the appearance of the righteous, therefore Samuel could have been a demonic illusion. The account of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31) offers a vision of the afterlife which informs both views of our passage, although the 'uncrossable chasm' (Luke 16:26) is particularly significant for those who believed that the real Samuel could not, in any way, have been with Saul after death.

While these aspects of the passage's history have come to light, others remain elusive. In particular, we have found no clear-cut pattern for explaining why some theologians concluded that Samuel truly appeared, while others held that a demon appeared. Certainly, these views cannot be simply nor comprehensively compartmentalised within common distinctions made by scholars of this period, such as East vs West or Antiochene vs Alexandrian. We have seen a range of authors, from various backgrounds, come to each view. This is not to deny any trend whatsoever. Although difficult to quantify, since most references to 1 Samuel 28 do not cite their sources, it seems that certain influences might have been important in shaping individual theologians' understanding of this passage. For instance, it may be the case that those who believed Samuel truly appeared were particularly influenced by Jewish interpretations of this passage, or some may have been influenced by Origen. Yet authors particularly familiar with Jewish thought, like Jerome,

believed that Samuel was a demonic illusion, and authors one might have expected to follow Origen do not, and vice versa.[1447] Such an explanation cannot, therefore, completely account for the differences observed here.

Another possible reason why early Christian writers understand 1 Samuel 28 as they do relates to wider theological convictions. For instance, it has been suggested that differing eschatological visions can account for different approaches to the passage.[1448] It has been argued that those who thought that the real Samuel appeared understood this in the context of Christ's descent to Hades, whose advent liberated souls from Samuel's fate, and thus these Christian writers emphasise the soul's journey and its immediate access to Paradise after death. On the other hand, those who believed that 'Samuel' was a demon in disguise thought that immediate access to Paradise for souls downplayed the importance of the resurrection and the body itself, and accordingly held that Samuel and current believers are fixed in an interim state until the resurrection. While this may partly explain the differences between interpretations of 1 Samuel 28, Greer has noted complications to this narrative, with authors of the view that the real Samuel appeared still holding a doctrine of the resurrection, and those who denied Samuel's resurrection still maintaining that Christ descended to Hades.[1449] Furthermore, we have noted some who actually contradict this supposed eschatological pattern,[1450] and have observed citations of 1 Samuel 28 which are seemingly uninterested in the soul and its fate.[1451] Moreover, in the case of many authors

[1447] For the former, consider Gregory of Nyssa, and the latter, Diodore of Tarsus.
[1448] Greer (2007), esp. pp.xxxii-xxxvii.
[1449] Ibid., pp.xxxvi-xxxvii, lxxxiii.
[1450] For example, Ambrosiaster, whose wider eschatological vision and interpretation of 1 Samuel 28 do not seem to match this pattern.
[1451] For instance, see Ambrose, *Comm. Luk.*, 1.33-34; Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.*, 1.35.1.

who cite this passage, we do not have a clear enough outline of their wider eschatological vision to make a robust assessment. Thus, the explanation for these different interpretations of 1 Samuel 28 cannot be limited to eschatological differences alone.

Another possible theological distinction which might account for different readings of 1 Samuel 28 is their authors' understanding of demons and magic. One could argue that those who thought that Samuel was truly resuscitated ascribed more power to demons, whereas those who thought that a demon appeared rather than Samuel were keen to deny that demonic forces possessed such power, particularly over the righteous. However, even if this is true in some cases, this explanation cannot completely account for the distinctions we have encountered. For the view that the real Samuel appeared, some, like Diodore, clearly argue that God was responsible for raising Samuel. He effectively blurs the distinction between these views, since those who thought that Samuel was a demonic illusion would probably not deny that God could accomplish such a thing. In fact, the majority of those who believed that Samuel truly appeared, even if they thought that demonic forces played a role, if pressed, would probably qualify their opinion by stating that demons could only accomplish this with God's permission.[1452] Furthermore, it seems that proponents of both views generally conceived of demons in a similar manner: as fallen angels with limited power, who are deceptive, and aim to ruin humanity and take God's worship, and so forth. It is not clearly the case that differing conceptions of magic and demons can explain differing interpretations of 1 Samuel 28.

[1452] This is akin to the view that Augustine first sets out in *Simpl.*, 2.3.1.

Neither can the different approaches to 1 Samuel 28 be fully explained by supposed different exegetical methodologies, such as exegetes tending towards literality viewing the passage in one way, and those favouring figurative exegesis viewing it another way. Firstly, none of the interpretations considered here are truly figurative. There are no clear examples of typology when reading 1 Samuel 28 in the early Church, where elements of the narrative are said to pre-figure later parts of Scripture;[1453] nor is allegory used when interpreting it, to make more indirect connections. Rather, close attention is paid to the letter, each author assuming that the narrative, as they understood it, was historically realised. Nor is it the case that those authors typically associated with figurative interpretation tended towards the view which added a demon to the narrative, which is not explicitly mentioned in 1 Samuel 28. Rather, we have seen a mixture of exegetes, some usually associated with a more literal approach to Scripture, and others a more figurative approach, falling into both camps. Indeed, one of the certain conclusions of this study is the complexity of early Christian biblical exegesis. Exegetes do not always interpret 1 Samuel 28 as one might expect, and it appears that wider theological convictions and the context of argument are more important than exegetical method in shaping how early Christians interpreted this passage. That is not to deny any consistency in early Christian interpretations of 1 Samuel 28. We have observed, across this study, certain exegetical principles consistently at work, especially the common application of Scripture to explain Scripture and the use of clearer passages to illuminate ambiguous ones. We have seen many passages cited alongside 1 Samuel 28 to clarify its interpretation. We have also seen 1 Samuel 28 used as the auxiliary text to interpret another

[1453] The possible exception is Justin Martyr, see chapter 2.

passage. This principle, of course, reflects the common early Christian understanding that Scripture is a unity, authoritative and divinely inspired.

While we may not have established clear categories which allow us to group together authors of the same view, this study has nevertheless demonstrated the importance of the individual. Each author is unique, with their own motivations and context of argument for reading 1 Samuel 28 as they do, as well as their own wider theological context which shapes their approach to this text. While we have not identified clear-cut trends which tie the proponents of each position together, this study has provided much insight into individual authors, their approach to this passage, and their wider theology. In other words, while we may not be able to neatly categorise interpreters of 1 Samuel 28 by their eschatology, demonology, exegetical method, or other criterion, this study has contributed to our comprehension of how individual authors understood such topics.

Future research

It is worth concluding with suggestions how future studies might build upon this work. Additional references to 1 Samuel 28 might be considered and, in the case of those cited here, more detailed analysis could be offered than constraints of time and space allowed in this monograph. In particular, further consideration might be given to citations of 1 Samuel 28 by authors whose identities are uncertain and are difficult to date, including references by Pseudo-Justin, Pseudo-Tertullian, and Pseudo-Hippolytus.[1454] The most notable reference of this type, perhaps, is that in *Martyrium Pionii*, cited by Greer and Mitchell as belonging to

[1454] See Pseudo-Justin, *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos*, 52; Pseudo-Tertullian, *Carmen Adversus Marcionitas*, 3.126-129; Pseudo-Hippolytus, *In. Reges fragm*. We have alluded previously to these texts and their spurious status.

this period.[1455] However, that reference to 1 Samuel 28 might be a later addition to the original text, since the earliest manuscripts do not contain it,[1456] nor can we be certain of its authorship. Further detailed work on these anonymous texts, particularly in identifying their place in the reception history of this passage (if not their authorship), might prove insightful by revealing further spheres of influence and patterns of interpretation.[1457]

Another possible future line of research might be a similar, in-depth consideration of scriptural passages which appear to have been important in informing how early Christians read 1 Samuel 28 and in shaping their wider theology. A detailed consideration of how early Christians received 2 Corinthians 11:14-15 might shed further light on early Christian demonology and explain how and why this passage was applied to 1 Samuel 28. Regarding early Christian eschatology, Luke 16:19-31 was a particularly important text, and so a thorough consideration of this passage might illuminate how early Christians understood the soul and the afterlife, thereby providing further context for understanding how 1 Samuel 28 was read in the early Church.

Notwithstanding the above, this study of the early Christian reception of 1 Samuel 28 has made its own contribution to patristic scholarship, particularly in illuminating how early Christians understood 'death, demons, and the medium of the message'.

[1455] *Martyrium Pionii*, 14.1-16; see Greer and Mitchell (2007), pp.26-31; see also Greer (2007), pp.xlv-xlvii.
[1456] Gibson (2001), p.358; Simonetti (1955), pp.30-1; Zwierlein (2014), pp.38-40, 93-6.
[1457] There are other texts we were unable to include in this study because of various constraints. A particularly notable omission is Philastrius, *Diversarum Haereseon liber*, 26.1ff. Others include Ephrem of Syria, whose Syriac context was beyond our expertise, see Smelik (1979), p.165, n.21. Other references have been omitted that just fall beyond the period under consideration, see Cyril of Alexandria, *De adoratione in spiritu et veritate*, 6 (PG 68, 432); Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Quaest. in I Reg. 28* (PG 80, 589-596); Eucherius of Lyons, *Instructiones*, 1.451-458.

Appendices

Appendix A – Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 105.3-5

The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.2-5 [revised translation].

(105)3. And his [Christ's] request that his soul be saved from the sword, from the mouth of the lion, and from the hand of the dog was a request that no-one should have dominion over his soul, so that, when we come to the end [ἐξόδῳ] of our life, we may ask the same thing of God, who can turn aside every shameless, evil angel from taking our souls. 4. And I have demonstrated [ἀπέδειξα ὑμῖν] to you that souls survive [μένουσιν] on the basis of the fact that even Samuel's soul was summoned by the belly-myther [ἐγγαστριμύθου], as Saul deemed worthy [ἠξίωσεν]. It appears also that all the souls of those who in this way were righteous and prophets used to fall [ἔπιπτον] under the authority of powers such as these, which also agrees exactly with the circumstances in the case of that belly-myther. 5. Therefore, God also teaches us through his Son to struggle in every way to become righteous and to ask at the end [of life] that our souls not fall to any such power. For when he gave up his spirit on the cross, he said, 'Father, into your hands I commend my spirit' (Luke 23:46), as I have learned this also from the memoirs [ἀπομνημονευμάτων].

Appendix B – Eusebius of Caesarea, *Commentary on Isaiah*, 7.10-13 (44)

Commentary on Isaiah, trans. Jonathan J. Armstrong and ed. Joel C. Elowsky (Downers Grove, Ill.; InterVarsity Press, 2013), p.36 [revised translation].

Instead of 'in the depths [βάθος]' or 'in the heights [ὕψος]', Symmachus says: 'Ask for yourself a sign from the Lord your God, go down into Hades or up to the heights [ὕψος].' And Aquila: 'Inquire for yourself a sign from the Lord your God, go down into Hades or up above [μετεώρισον].' And Theodotion: 'Ask for yourself a sign from the Lord your God, go down into Hades or up to the heights [ὕψωσον].' We might understand that 'the sign in the depths or in the heights' is from the Scripture of Moses. For concerning the signs in Egypt which happened [γενομένων] through Moses, it was said: 'He sent out signs and wonders in your midst, O Egypt [Ps. 135:9].' From the earth came [ἐτύγχανεν] frogs and locust and lice and flies, and from heaven came hail and fire and the three days of darkness. Someone may even say that the sign produced [γενόμενον] for Hezekiah had come [γεγονέναι] from Heaven, 'When the sun stepped backwards and the shadow ran the other way ten steps' [Is. 38:10; Sir. 48:23; 2 Kings 20:11]. Indeed a sign from the depths was produced for Saul [ἐκ βάθους δέ ἦν σημεῖον καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ Σαοὺλ γενόμενον], when Samuel, after his death, foretold [his fate]… [ὅτε Σαμουήλ μετὰ θάνατον αὐτοῦ προμηνύει].'

Appendix C – Apollinaris of Laodicea, *A fragment from the Catenae*

The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.158-9 [revised translation].

There are some who do not recognise the grace of Christ that has taken [μετατιθεῖσαν] souls from Hades through the destruction of the kingdom of death. They have not believed the Scripture concerning Samuel, how his soul was held fast in Hades and was conjured up [ψυχαγωγηθείσης] by a demon. But it was not necessary for those believing in Scripture to fashion for themselves a demon who appeared in the form [ὡς φανέντα τῷ σχήματι] of Samuel – Scripture has not taught this. Rather they should have seen that, even if there were righteous people before the coming of Christ, 'death reigned' (Rom. 15:4) until Christ came and abolished it [κατήργησεν] and gave the way up to souls [ἄνοδον ἔδωκε ταῖς ψυχαῖς] and the change of position to the heavenly places [καὶ τὴν εἰς τὰ οὐράνια μετάθεσιν]. For this gift comes from God, not the power of souls, or the strength of human righteousness. Therefore, the accounts concerning the soul of Samuel have necessarily been recorded, so that we might know the difference between the law and Christ [γνῶμεν τί νόμος τί Χριστός], that the law did not undo the curse [ἔλυσεν τὴν ἀράν], but Christ did (cf. Gal. 3:10-14). The law did not give freedom from the Devil so as to give release [μεταθεῖναι] from Hades, except so much as to provide some encouragement in Hades by the hope of Christ. But Christ 'shattered the bronze gates and broke the iron bars' (Ps. 106:16; Isa. 45:2), opening the way up through his own ascent to souls held fast. For it says, 'he ascended on high; he made captivity itself a captive; he gave gifts among humans' (Eph. 4:8; Ps. 67:19).

Appendix D – Diodore of Tarsus, *A fragment from the Catenae*

The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, in eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.160-65 [revised translation].

Some suppose [οἴονται] that Samuel was brought up [ἀνηνέχθαι] by the belly-myther, missing the truth entirely [πολύ τῆς ἀληθείας διαμαρτῶντες]. For Scripture did not say that the belly-myther brought him up [ἀνήγαγεν], but narrates that she said to Saul 'Whom shall I bring up for you?' and that Saul said 'Samuel.' She did not bring him up [ἀνήγαγεν], but 'saw' him when he appeared [παραγεγονότα]. Since this was not the customary way those summoned by belly-mythers were brought up [ἀνάγεσθαι], immediately 'the woman cried out with a loud voice' (1 Samuel 28:12). And when she was asked what she had seen [θεασαμένη], she cried out saying 'I saw gods [θεούς] coming up from the earth' (1 Samuel 28:13). And she said to him, 'I see a man coming up from the earth standing [ὄρθιον], shrouded in a double cloak [ἀναβεβλημένος διπλοΐδα]' (1 Samuel 28:13-14). It was not by the craft of the woman, or the power of the demon operating [ἐνεργοῦντος] in her, that Samuel came up. As soon as Saul said 'Bring up Samuel for me' (1 Samuel 28:11), the woman instead of one saw many, whom she called 'gods'. For which reason (supposing she sees many instead of one, and 'gods') she is astonished, since she wished to either summon or to bring up a man. For she would not have attempted to bring up her own gods like the dead, nor would she have said 'I see a man standing [ὄρθιον]', if customarily those summoned by her were brought up standing. For the novel event was worthy of wonder and exclamation, of which even the woman lacked experience, since some say of the dead [τῶν τετελευτηκότων], at least those summoned by belly-mythers, that they are brought up [ἀνάγονται] as in the manner many infants are born [τίκτεται], directed upwards by the feet, while others say [they come] horizontally [ὑπτίως], like buried corpses. Therefore, since both many had come, although that woman wanted to summon one, and they had appeared [παραγεγόνασιν] both before her summons and standing (which seemed strange to see), the woman said, 'I see gods' – that is to say this deed was not accomplished by a craft such as hers, but was unusual and of a divine power.

Some suppose the demon operating [ἐνεργοῦντα] through the woman, and deceiving [ἐξαπατῶντα] many, appeared [ὦφθαι] in the form of Samuel and conversed [διειλέχθαι] with Saul. I do not think this is right [οὐ καλῶς οἶμαι]. For God did not allow [συνεχώρει] the deceit to happen in the form of Samuel. But they do have something to say to these things. For it is proved [δείκνυται], they say, the demon is lying by what it says to Saul 'Tomorrow you and Jonathan will be with me' (1 Samuel 28:19), since what he said did not happen on the next day, but on the third day. But they are mistaken [σφάλλονται]. For it would not be possible [οὐ γάρ ἂν ἔχοιεν] to prove that Saul died on the third day after the words of Samuel, since the following events of the narrative are a resumption [τὰ ἑξῆς τῆς ἱστορίας ἀνάληψις ἐστιν] of the entire affair and the war. For divine Scripture did not say that Saul died 'on the third day' after the belly-myther spoke, rather, having described Saul's error [πλάνην] and Samuel's judgment [ἀπόφασιν] against him, it takes up the account again from the beginning. But even if it were not [μὴ ἔχοι] as we say, they do not gather that even the word 'tomorrow' does not signify [δηλοῖ] at all times the following day, but sometimes it signifies the nearness of the event to come [τήν ἐγγύτητα τοῦ συμβησομένου], as also 'today if you will hear his voice' (Ps. 95:7; Hebrews 3:7) does not signify the day upon which it was spoken [καθ᾽ ἣν ἐρρέθη], but the time of the conversion [ἐπιστροφῆς] of the Israelites.

One might see what I am saying also in another way. For from where did the demon get the idea [πόθεν γάρ τῷ δαίμονι] that not only Saul would be killed [ἀναιρεθήσεται], but also Jonathan? The demon guessed, they say; for knowing that God had removed [ἐξέβαλε] Saul from the kingdom, having handed it over to David, he knew [συνεῖδεν] that it was also necessary for the sons to perish together [καὶ τοὺς υἱούς ἀνάγκη συναπολέσθαι] with the father. But we should say that things that have been guessed [τὰ κατὰ στοχασμόν] do not always come to pass (for it can be believed [ἐνδέχεται] and not happen). And how is it that the demon would have been willing to risk, by guessing, the truth reputed by him [αὐτῷ τὴν νομιζομένην ἀλήθειαν]? But why do I investigate [ἐπεξεργάζομαι] these things? Divine Scripture says plainly [ἄντικρυς] that Samuel, when he had appeared [παραγεγονώς], said to Saul, 'Why have you disturbed me by bringing me up?' and again, 'Why do you ask me? Has the Lord turned from you and sided with your neighbour?' (1 Samuel 28:15-17).

They say, 'Satan disguises himself [μετασχηματίζεται] as an angel of light' (2 Corinthians 11:14), as Paul said. But God, sparing Israel, for he had known their weaknesses and their inclination to impiety [τὸ πρός ἀσέβειαν ἐπιρρεπές], would not have allowed [οὐκ ἄν συνεχώρησεν] a demon in the form of Samuel to appear [παραγενέσθαι]. But on the contrary, they say 'God struck the Jews with amazement [δή ἔπληττεν τούς Ἰουδαίους] so that they believed [τὸ νομίζειν αὐτούς] Samuel had been brought up [ἀνηνέχθαι] by the power of the belly-myther.' What, then, should one say to them? Scripture has not said that the woman's demon disguised itself [μετεσχηματίσατο] into Samuel. To the contrary, it said that Samuel had appeared [παραγέγονε] – which struck the Jews with even more amazement [ὅ μᾶλλον ἔπληττεν τούς Ἰουδαίους], supposing [οἰομένους] Samuel had been brought up [παράγωγον γενέσθαι τόν Σαμουήλ] by a demon-possessed woman. If, however, someone were to say that Samuel did not appear by the summoning of the belly-myther [πλήν εἰ μὴ λέγοι τις τὸ μὴ καλεσάσης τῆς ἐγγαστριμύθου παραγενέσθαι τόν Σαμουήλ], and that the belly-myther said 'I see gods coming up from the ground', since she supposed that Samuel and those who appeared with him were gods, he has glorified God who is so great and mighty – he is in agreement with what we think [συνᾴδων οἷς ἡμεῖς νοοῦμεν].

He understands it in this way [ἔχει δὲ οὕτως]. Since, while Samuel was alive, Saul persecuted the belly-mythers, on whose behalf Samuel often interceded [ἱκετεύων] with God but was not listened to, at the time when Saul did not hesitate [ὤκνησεν] to bring him up [ἀναγαγεῖν αὐτόν] through the belly-myther, God brought up [ἀνάγει] Samuel and with him holy and heavenly powers [δυνάμεις ἁγίας καὶ οὐρανίους]; firstly, to glorify [δοξάζων] his own prophet through those present with him; and secondly, to explain to him, because this is Samuel, and all but saying this very thing he explained: 'At the time when you were in the flesh the belly-mythers and the seers and the diviners were being persecuted. But now he [Saul] hopes to bring you up through them, and has become so lawless that he acted profanely through such deeds to prevail, he supposed, over the enemy [καὶ τοσοῦτον ἀνομίσας ὡς δι᾽ ὧν ἀσεβεῖ κρατεῖν, αὐτόν οἰηθῆναι τόν ἐχθρόν]. This is the one on whose behalf you prayed [προσηύχου]. Having known these things beforehand, and having seen these evil things happen by him, foreknowing these things I did not listen to you. Therefore, do not be disheartened since you were disregarded [παρακουσθείς] at that time, but know that what occurs through God (τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ γινόμενα) takes place with wisdom.'

These are our opinions, but let whatever view which appears to hold better prevail (ταῦτα παρ᾽ ἡμῶν, κρατείτω δὲ ὅπερ ἄν φανείῃ κρεῖττον ἔχειν).

Appendix E – Zeno of Verona, *Tractatus,* 1.2.4.8 ('De Resurrectione')

Zenonis Veronensis Tractatus, in B. Löfstedt (ed.), CCSL 22 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1971), p.17 [own translation].

In the first book of Kings, Samuel, that excellent priest, having already settled his account with the law of death [*Samuel egregious ille sacerdos mortis iam lege dispunctus*], not only exhibits his presence, without ambiguity, to Saul the king, who desired him, but also responds to his inquiries, and sings more freely, though dead, than he had been accustomed to sing when alive [*liberiusque canit mortuus, quam canere consueverat vivus*]. Whence it is pleasing to exclaim: he has 'departed', more than he has 'died' [*unde libet exclamare: Profectus potius estiste, quam mortuus*].

Appendix F – Ambrose of Milan, *Commentary on Luke*, 1.33-34

Ambroise De Milan: Traité sur L'Évangile de S. Luc, Vol. 1, ed. Gabriel Tissot, SC 45 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1956), pp.63-4 [own translation].

33. It says, 'he will be filled with the Holy Spirit while still in his mother's womb'. There is no doubt that this promise from the angel is true, since Saint John, before he was born, while still living in his mother's womb, manifested the grace of the Spirit that he had received. For, while both his father and mother had not performed any marvels before, when leaping in the womb of his mother, he proclaimed the advent of the Lord. Thus, indeed, you have that, when the Lord's mother came to Elizabeth, she said to her 'Behold, as soon as your greeting reached my ears, the child leaped in my womb'; he did not yet have the spirit of life, but the Spirit of Grace [*nondum enim erat illi spiritus uitae, sed spiritus gratiae*]. So also, elsewhere, we can see the reality of life preceded by grace which sanctifies [*Denique et alibi uiuendi substantiae praecurrere sanctificandi gratiam potuimus aduertere*], since the Lord said: 'Before forming you in the womb, I knew you and, before you left the womb, I sanctified you and set you as a prophet among the people' (Jeremiah 1:5). The spirit of life is one thing, and another the Spirit of Grace [*Alius enim est spiritus uitae huius, alius gratiae*]. One takes its beginning at birth, leaving at death; the other is not confined by time, or age; nor is it extinguished by death, or shut out by the womb of the mother [*Ille nascendo sumit exordium, moriendo defectum; iste non temporibus, non aetatibus cohercetur, non obitu exstinguitur, non aluo matris excluditur*]. So also, Saint Mary, filled with the Holy Spirit, prophesied, and Elisha, who had died, revived the corpse of a dead man in contact with his body (2 Kings 13:20-21), and Samuel, after death, according to the testimony of Scripture, did not keep silent about the future [*Samuhel post mortem secundum scripturae testimonium futura non tacuit*].

34. It says, 'And he will be filled with the Holy Spirit.' Truly, the one who possesses the Spirit of Grace lacks nothing, and the one who receives the Holy Spirit has the fullness of the greatest virtues.

Appendix G – Sulpicius Severus, *Chronicle*, 1.35.1

Sulpice Sévère: Chroniques, ed. Ghislaine de Senneville-Grave, SC 441 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1999), p.178 [own translation].

At that time, Samuel had died *[Ea tempestate Samuel diem functus est*]. Saul, when the Philistines waged war, consulted God, but no response was given back to him. Then, through a woman, whose entrails a spirit of error had filled, he consulted Samuel who had been summoned [*Tum per mulierem, cuius uiscera spiritus erroris impleuerat, Samuelem euocatum consulit*]. He [Saul] was told by him [Samuel] that he, on the following day, with his sons, having been defeated by the Philistines, will fall in battle. Accordingly, the Philistines, having pitched their camp on enemy soil, drew up the battle line on the following day. David, however, had been sent away from the camp, because they hardly believed he would be faithful to them against his own people. But the battle having been joined, and Hebrews routed, the sons of the king fell. Saul, having fallen from his horse, so he would not come into the control of the enemy alive, fell on his sword.

Appendix H – Tertullian, *De Anima*, 57.6-11

The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, in eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.16-21 [revised translation].

(57)6. So also in that other form of magic [*specie magiae*], which is believed to tear away resting souls from the underworld [*quiescentes animas evellere ab inferis*] and display them in view [*conspectui*], this power is not another form of deceit. It is clearly more effective because both a phantom is manifested [*phantasma praestatur*], and because a body is fashioned with it [*corpus affingitur*]. Nor is it, however, a great thing for one to deceive the outer eyes [*exteriores oculos circumscribere*], for whom the inner sight of the mind is very easy to blind [*cui interiorem mentis aciem excaecare perfacile est*]. 7. Indeed, the snakes of the magical staffs were seen by Pharoah and the Egyptians as bodies, but the true ones of Moses devoured the lie (Exodus 7:8-12). Certainly, Simon and Elymas the magicians also did many things against the apostles, but the affliction of blindness was not because of deceptions (Acts 8:9-24; 13:8-11). What is novel about the imitation of the truth by an evil spirit [*quid novi aemulatio veritatis a spiritu immundo*]? Behold today confidence elevates the [magical] arts themselves of that same heretical Simon [i.e. the Simonians][1458] to such a degree so that they even promise [*spondeant*] to remove the souls of the prophets from the underworld [*inferis*]. 8. Indeed, I believe that they can with falsehood; for indeed once it was no less permitted for the pythonical spirit [*pythonico tunc spiritui*] to fashion [*effingere*] the soul of Samuel, when Saul consulted the dead after God. Yet, let it be far from us to believe that the soul of any saint whatsoever, much less that of a prophet, was drawn forward [*extractam*] by a demon, having been taught that 'Satan himself may be transformed into an angel of light' (2 Corinthians 11:14), not to speak of into a man of light, and he will even assert [*asseveraturus*] himself to be God in the end and will produce signs even more monstrous 'to overturn, if it were possible to be done, the elect' (Matthew 24:24). He hardly hesitated [*Dubitavit, si forte*][1459] at that time to assert himself the prophet of God, and especially to Saul, in whom he was himself already lingering [*morabatur*]. 9. You should not suppose that there was one who was accomplishing the phantom [*phantasma administrabat*], and another who was consulting it [*commendabat*]. Rather, it was the same spirit, both in the false prophetess [*pseudoprophetide*] and the apostate, who easily lied about what he had created to be believed [*facerat credi*], through whom Saul's treasure in that place was where his heart was (Matthew 6:21), where obviously God was not. And therefore, through the one he [Saul] was determined to see, by him he believed and saw [*Et ideo per quem visurum se credidit vidit*], because through the one he saw he also believed [*quia per quem vidit et credibit*]. 10. If also, concerning dreams [*nocturnis imaginibus*],[1460] it is supposed that the dead have often been seen without deception [*non frustra mortuos visos*] (for indeed the Nasamonians try to obtain special oracles by spending the night near the tombs of ancestors, as Heraclides or Numphadorus or Herodatus write, and the Celts for the same reason stay out all night near the tombs of brave men, as Nicander affirms), we experience the dead in dreams no more truly than the living. Rather, we experience the dead in the same way as both the living and all things which are seen. For things are not true because they are seen, but because they have actually taken place [*adimplentur*]. Trust in

[1458] Waszink (2010), p.581.
[1459] Waszink (2010), p.583.
[1460] Waszink (2010), p.585.

dreams is declared because of their accomplishment, not because of their observation. 11. However, the Lord has sufficiently established that the underworld lies open to no soul at all [*nulli autem omnino inferos patere*], in the evidence [*in argumento*] of that reposing poor man and the groaning rich man, from the person of Abraham, unable to be removed from that place to report of the condition of the underworld [*non posse inde relegari renuntiatorem dispositionis infernae*], which indeed could have been permitted at that time so that Moses and the Prophets might have been believed...

Appendix I – Basil of Caesarea, *Commentary on Isaiah*, 8.218

Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah, trans. Nikolai A. Lipatov (Mandelbachtal: Edition Cicero, 2001), pp.264-5 [revised translation].

Those who do not accept [οἱ μὴ καταδεχόμενοι] the word of the Gospel, who disregard [οἱ ἐξουθενοῦντες τὸ κήρυγμα] true teaching as folly, and who are made to stumble on account of the cross, whenever we counsel them to return to knowledge, they propose to us in turn [ἀντιπροτείνονται ἡμῖν] recommendations from their own error, saying 'Seek' not the Lord, but 'the belly-mythers [ἐγγαστριμύθους], and the ones speaking out of the earth, empty-talkers [τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς φωνοῦντας, τοὺς κενολογοῦντας].' And of this, experience is a witness. For those who have stuck fast to idols, and have given heed to dreams and to omens and to the divinations of demons [ὀνείροις καὶ κληδόσι καὶ μαντείαις δαιμόνων προσέχοντες], they themselves both disregard the truth and counsel us to ask for such things [ἡμῖν συμβουλεύουσι τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐξαιτεῖν]. Because operations of deceit [ἐνέργειαι πλάνης] are executed by demons for the ruin of those tempted by them [τῶν πεπειραμένων αὐτοῖς]; who now indeed bring about certain visions in dreams [ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις φαντασίας τινὰς περιιστώντων], which either have counsel for bodily afflictions, or predict the future [ἢ συμβουλὴν ἐχούσας πάθους σωματικοῦ, ἢ προαγορευούσας τὸ μέλλον]. But demons are able to comprehend such things; with regard to the afflictions of the body, because they are more discerning of material properties [διορατικώτεροι εἶναι τῶν ὑλικῶν ἰδιωμάτων], and have regard to the qualities of plants [ἐπισκέφθαι ποιότητας βοτανῶν], and the appropriate action from these for the afflictions [τὸ ἀπ' αὐτῶν πρὸς τὰ πάθη κατάλληλον]; with regard to the future [τῶν μελλόντων], they often foretell things which have already happened, but are not yet known to us, so that they announce things that will be for us [ὡς ἐσόμενα ἡμῖν ἀναγγέλλουσιν]. It is just like if someone from among us [i.e. humans], having heard of someone's arrival, were to announce this to the one expecting him as a future event, seeking through the deception the glory of seeming to be a prophet [ἠν ἐκ τοῦ δοκεῖν προφήτης εἶναι δόξαν δι' ἀπάτης θηρώμενος]. So also demons often announce things that have been arranged [τὰ διατετυπωμένα], things made known publicly by a decree of God [ἀ ἀποφάσει Θεοῦ δημοσιευθέντα], to those who are prone to deceit [τοῖς πρὸς ἀπάτην εὐκόλως ἔχουσιν]. So also the belly-myther [ἡ ἐγγαστρίμυθος] announced to Saul through demons his future defeat. For demons were the ones who dressed themselves up in the mask of Samuel [οἱ κατασχηματίζοντες ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὸ τοῦ Σαμουὴλ πρόσωπον] who, because they heard of the judgement upon Saul, narrated [διηγοῦνται] as their own decree [ἀπόφασιν] what had been pronounced [ἐξενεχθεῖσαν] by God. Thus, the Gentiles often urge us to the deceptions of demons, saying 'Seek out the belly-mythers [τοὺς ἐγγαστριμύθους], the ones speaking out of the earth.' For they do not dare say that their words are from the heavens themselves. So also that woman mentioned in Kingdoms [ἐν ταῖς Βασιλείαις, i.e Samuel–Kings] conversing with Saul, said 'I see gods coming up from the earth.' For such is the intent [ἐπίνοια] of belly-mythers: They promise to bring up souls who have died for the revelation of the things sought for [εἰς φανέρωσιν τῶν ἐπιζητουμένων]. Then, he [Isaiah] brings his own opinion which he has about the purposes of such people, and denounces them as idle-talkers [ἀποφαίνεται αὐτοὺς ματαιολόγους], saying 'Empty-talkers, who speak out of their belly', truly speaking from their own will. For he [the belly-myther] does not speak having been taught from outside, but fashions the lie from within his own heart [ἀναπλάσας ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ καρδίᾳ τὸ ψεῦδος], aiming at [παραστοχαζόμενος] the desires of those observing, and says what is useful to him for the deceit of the unintelligent [τῶν ἀνοήτων].

Appendix J – Gregory of Nyssa, *De Pythonissa ad Theodosium episcopum* (*Letter to Theodosius concerning the Belly-Mythe*r), 101-106

*The 'Belly-Mythe*r' *of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church*, in eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.166-73 [revised translation].

101. First, therefore, since even among the other topics, the disputed matter concerning Samuel was placed first, 102. I shall set out [my opinion] in a few words, so far as is possible by God's granting. It has pleased some of those before us to suppose that the soul-conjuring of that sorceress for Samuel is true [ἥρεσέ τισι τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἀληθῆ νομίσα τῆς γοητίδος ἐκείνης τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ Σαμουὴλ ψυχαγωγίαν], and offering some argument such as this in support of this assumption of theirs: that Samuel being grieved upon the rejection of Saul (1 Samuel 15:35; 16:1) and constantly bringing this matter to the Lord, was saying 'Saul has done what you will, he cleared from the people the sorcery produced by the belly-mythers for the deceit of humanity [τὴν ἐκ τῶν ἐγγαστριμύθων γινομένην γοητείαν ἐπὶ ἀπάτῃ τῶν ἀνθρώπων].' And on account of the prophet being greatly vexed by the Lord not wanting to be reconciled with the rejected one, they say that God allowed [συγχωρῆσαί] the soul of the prophet to be brought up [ἀναχθῆναι] through such magical arts [διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης μαγγανείας], so that Samuel might see he was putting forward lies to God on behalf of him [Saul], saying he was hostile to the belly-mythers [ταῖς ἐγγαστριμύθοις], when at that time he [Saul] was seeking by divination through their sorcery the ascension of his soul [τὸν τηνικαῦτα διὰ τῆς αὐτῶν γοητείας τὴν ἄνοδον τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ μαντεύσαντα]. But I, when I consider the chasm in the Gospel (Luke 16:26), which the patriarch, or rather the patriarch's Lord, says has been firmly fixed between both the wicked and good, how it is impossible both for the condemned 103. to pass over to the repose of the righteous [ὡς ἀμήχανον εἶναι τοῖς τε κατακρίτοις ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν δικαίων ἄνεσιν διαβῆναι], and for the saints to go across to the chorus of evil ones [καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις πρὸς τὸν τῶν πονηρῶν χορὸν διαπερᾶσαι], I do not accept such assumptions to be true, having been taught to believe to be true the Gospel alone. Since, therefore, Samuel is great among the saints, but sorcery is an evil asset [πονηρὸν δὲ κτῆμα ἡ γοητεία], I am not persuaded that Samuel, having been established in so great a place of his own rest [ἀναπαύσεως], passed through that impassable chasm to the impious [τὸ ἀδιόδευτον ἐκεῖνο χάσμα πρὸς τοὺς ἀσεβοῦντας διήρχετο], neither willingly nor unwillingly [οὔτε ἑκὼν οὔτε ἄκων]. Unwillingly, he certainly still would not have endured this, because the demon was unable to pass through the chasm and remove the saint who was in the chorus of the holy ones [ἄκων μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἂν ἔτι ὑπέμεινε τῷ μὴ δύνασθαι τὸ δαιμόνιον διαβῆναι τὸ χάσμα καὶ ἐν τῷ χορῷ τῶν ὁσίων γενόμενον μετακινῆσαι τὸν ἅγιον]. Willingly, he would not have done this, because he neither wished nor could he bear to be mingled with the wicked [ἑκὼν δὲ οὐκ ἂν τοῦτο ἐποίησε τῷ μήτε βούλεσθαι ἐπιμιχθῆναι τοῖς κακοῖς μήτε δύνασθαι]. For the change of place to the opposite [ἡ πρὸς τὰ ἐναντία μετάστασις] is not wanted by the one who is among the good from amongst whom he is with [τῷ γὰρ ἐν ἀγαθοῖς ὄντι ἀβούλητον ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν οἷς ἐστιν ἡ πρὸς τὰ ἐναντία μετάστασις]. But even if someone were to concede him to wish this, nevertheless [εἰ δέ τις καὶ βούλεσθαι δοίη], the nature of the chasm does not permit the passage [ἡ τοῦ χάσματος φύσις οὐκ ἐπιτρέπει τὴν πάροδον].

What, then, is it that we reckon concerning these things? The common enemy of all is hateful of human nature, whose every thought and effort is to damage humanity in its very vital parts [πᾶσά

ἐστιν ἐπίνοια καὶ σπουδὴ εἰς αὐτὰ τὰ καίρια βλάπτειν τὸν ἄνθρωπον]. What so great a blow is there against the vital parts of humans as to be cast away [ἀποβληθῆναι] from the God who gives life and to willingly desert to the destruction of death? Since, therefore, whoever, according to the way of life of those who love bodily things, is eager to have some knowledge of the future, by which they hope for either an escape from evil things or guidance to matters on their mind, for this reason, so that humans might not turn to God, the deceptive nature of demons has cunningly contrived many ways of knowing the future [πολλοὺς τρόπους τῆς τοῦ μέλλοντος γνώσεως ἡ ἀπατηλὴ τῶν δαιμόνων ἐτεχνάσατο φύσις]: auguries [οἰωνοσκοπίας], divinations from omens [συμβολομαντείας], oracles [χρηστήρια], inspections of livers [ἡπατοσκοπίας], necromancy [νεκυίας], frenzies [ἐνθουσιασμούς], possessions [κατοκωχάς], inspirations [ἐμπνεύσεις], and many other such things. 104. And the very form of prediction from a certain deceit someone might suppose to be true [καὶ ὅπερ ἄν τις εἶδος προγνώσεως ἔκ τινος ἀπάτης ἀληθὲς εἶναι νομίσῃ], in that manner the deceptive demon discloses itself to justify the mistaken assumption of the one who has been deceived [ἐν ἐκείνῳ τὸ ἀπατηλὸν δαιμόνιον παραφαίνεται εἰς δικαίωσιν τῆς ἡπατημένης ὑπολήψεως τοῦ πεπλανημένου]. In this way also the demon makes the flight of the eagle to conform to [συνδραμεῖν] the hope of the one who has been keenly observing, and [so also with] the throbbing of the liver, and the derangement which takes place from the swelling of the cerebral membranes [τὴν ἐκ τοῦ φυσώδους γινομένην τῶν μηνίγγων παραφορὰν], and a distortion of the eyes. And the cunning of the demon displays to those who are deceived each method according to the observation by deceit which has been interpreted as a sign [ἕκαστον κατὰ τὴν σημειωθεῖσαν ἐκ τῆς ἀπάτης παρατήρησιν], so that humans withdraw from God to devote themselves to the worship of demons, through whom they believe such things are achieved.

Therefore, one form of deceit also was that of the belly-mythers, whose trickery [μαγγανεία] was believed to be able to drag up [ἐφέλκεσθαι] the souls of those who have departed [τῶν κατοιχομένων] back to life above. Thus, when Saul became in despair of salvation, because the whole army of all the Philistines moved together against him, and having come to this idea, that Samuel would suggest to him some way of salvation, the demon abiding in the belly-myther [τὸ παραμένον τῇ ἐγγαστριμύθῳ δαιμόνιον], through whom the weak woman was habitually deceived [δι’ οὗ ἠπατᾶτο ἐκ συνηθείας τὸ γύναιον], changed itself [ἐσχηματίζετο] into different forms in a shadowy way [σκιοειδῶς] before the eyes of the weak woman, but not one thing appeared to Saul of the things which the weak woman saw. For because he engaged in sorcery [ὡς γὰρ ἥψατο τῆς γοητείας], and phantoms were already with the weak woman before her eyes [καὶ ἤδη τῷ γυναίῳ ἦν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τὰ φαντάσματα], the demon contrived this proof that the appearances were true, to make himself known when he had at first 105. been hidden in the form of disguise [πίστιν τοῦ ἀληθῆ τὰ φαινόμενα εἶναι ταύτην ὁ δαίμων ἐμηχανήσατο τὸ πρῶτον αὐτὸν κεκρυμμένον ἐν τῷ εἴδει τοῦ προσχήματος διασαφῆσαι], whereby Saul was all the more astounded [κατεπλάγη], as though the woman would not be deceived henceforth, since her magical power did not fail to recognise the individual form [ὡς οὐδὲν ἔτι τῆς γυναικὸς σφαλησομένης τῷ τὸ ἰδιωτικὸν σχῆμα τὴν γοητικὴν δύναμιν μὴ ἀγνοῆσαι]. Therefore, since she said she had seen ‘gods’ coming up, and a man ‘standing’ in a double cloak, how will slaves of the letter establish this in accordance with narrative meaning [πῶς στήσουσι τὸ καθ’ ἱστορίαν οἱ δοῦλοι τοῦ γράμματος]? For if Samuel truly is the one who appeared, therefore in truth the ones who appeared by the sorceress [τῆς φαρμακίδος] are also gods. But Scripture calls the demons ‘gods’ [θεοὺς δὲ ἡ γραφὴ τὰ δαιμόνια λέγει], for ‘all the gods of the nations are demons’ (Psalm 96:5). Was, then, the soul of Samuel with the demons? Certainly not!

Rather, the demon that always answered the sorceress took with it other spirits for the deception of both the woman herself and of Saul who was deceived through her, and it made the demons to be considered gods by the belly-myther, but it assumed the form being sought after [αὐτὸ δὲ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιζητούμενον εἶδος ἐσχηματίσθη], and counterfeited that one's [Samuel's] speech and, to infer the very thing that was probable from what had been made apparent [ὅπερ εἰκὸς ἦν ἐκ τῶν φαινομένων λογίσασθαι], he uttered the pronouncement logically expected to come to pass as if in the form of a prophecy [τὴν ἐκ τοῦ ἀκολούθου ἐκβήσεσθαι προσδοκηθεῖσαν ἀπόφασιν ὡς ἐν εἴδει προφητείας ἐφθέγξατο]. He was not wishing to, but nevertheless, the demon convicted itself when he told the truth that 'Tomorrow you and Jonathan will be with me' (1 Samuel 28:19). For if it was truly Samuel, how did he allow the one who has been charged with every wickedness to be with him? But it is clear that the evil demon that appeared instead of Samuel did not lie when it said that Saul will be with it. And if Scripture says 106. 'And Samuel said' (1 Samuel 28:15), let such a statement not trouble the intelligent [μὴ ταρασσέτω τὸν ἐπιστήμονα ὁ τοιοῦτος λόγος], but let him deem it to be added, *the one who is thought to be Samuel* [ἀλλὰ προσκεῖσθαι νομιζέτω, ὅτι ὁ νομισθεὶς εἶναι Σαμουήλ]. For we find it the custom of Scripture in many places to relate what seems to be instead of what is [εὑρίσκομεν γὰρ τὴν γραφικὴν συνήθειαν πολλαχοῦ τὸ δοκοῦν ἀντὶ τοῦ ὄντος διεξιοῦσαν], as in the case of Balaam, when he said 'I shall hear what God will say within me' (cf. Numbers 22:8), but afterwards, because Balaam learned that it was pleasing to God to not to curse the Israelites, he no longer went away 'as was his custom to consult the flight of birds' (cf. Numbers 24:1); for the inattentive one, in the former place, will think that the true God conversed with Balaam, but the additional passage demonstrates that Scripture addressed by name the one thought to be God by Balaam, not the one who truly is God. Therefore, here also, the one thought to be Samuel counterfeited the word of the true Samuel [ὁ δόξας εἶναι Σαμουὴλ τοὺς τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Σαμουὴλ ὑπεκρίνατο λόγους], the demon having cleverly imitated the prophecy from what was likely [εὐφυῶς τοῦ δαίμονος ἐκ τῶν εἰκότων μιμουμένου τὴν προφητείαν].

Appendix K – Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi testament CXXVII*, 27

Pseudo-Augustini: Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti CXXVII, ed. Alexander Souter, CSEL 50, (Vienna: Tempsky, 1908), pp.54-6 [own translation].

Question 27: Indeed, did the Pythoness summon Samuel [*PITHONISSA SAMUHEL EXCITAUERIT*], and might he have been seen by her, and might he have spoken to Saul, which the narrative [*HISTORIA*] recounts in the book of Kingdoms [i.e. Samuel–Kings]?

1. I estimate this to be an unworthy undertaking, if in accordance with the words of the narrative the reality might have been favoured [*Indignum facinus aestimo, si secundum uerba historiae commodetur adsensus*]. How was it possible that a man both holy from his birth and righteous in life by his works could have been dragged up by the art of magic [*arte magica adtraheretur*]. Or, if he was not dragged up, he consented? For it is contrary to believe either about a righteous man. For if he has been brought up against his will, righteousness has no right to vote [*nullum suffragium habet iustitia*]; if, however, of his own free-will, he lost the spiritual merit [*misit meritum spiritalis*] which when he was situated in the flesh he had acquired; which is exceedingly absurd, for whoever departs from this world righteous remains righteous. Besides, on the contrary, this is a delusion of Satan [*hoc est praestigium satanae*], who, so that very many might fall, even pretends to hold the good in his power; which the Apostle says, among other things, 'even Satan transforms himself in an angel of light' (2 Corinthians 11:14). Indeed, in order that he might cause an error in which he was glorified, he adorned himself in the appearance and name of a righteous man [*in habitu uiri iusti et nomine se subornauit*], so that, in no respect to increase the hope which they were preaching, he might lie to the worshippers of God [*ut nihil proficere spem, quam praedicabant, dei cultoribus mentiretur*], since he feigned the righteous departing from this place to be in his own power.

2. But this thing deceives some, that concerning the death of Saul and his sons, this might not have been counterfeited [*non sit mentitus*], as though it were a great thing for the Devil to foresee the death of a body before the day, when certain signs tend to appear with those who are about to die [*cum signa quaedam soleant apparere morituris*], indeed by which the protection of God having been removed is understood [*quippe a quibus dei protectio amota uidetur*]. How much more the Devil, whom the prophetic oracles have testified was lofty with angelic majesty [*quem angelica maiestate sublimem profetica oracula fuisse testantur*], concerning whose greatness the Apostle says, 'or do you ignore the heights of Satan?' (Revelation 2:24). Therefore, why is it astonishing if he was able to foresee [Saul's] death impending near, when it might be from this by which he deceives and he wants himself to be worshiped in the power of God [*cum hoc sit unde fallit et se in dei potestate uult adorari*]? For Saul, being insane, was effected with such dimness, that he fled to the Pythoness [*nam tanta hebetudine demens effectus est Saul, ut ad pithonissam confugeret*]. For having been corrupted on account of his sin, he consulted [*contulit*] these things which he himself had condemned.

3. But if someone on account of the narrative [*historiam*], and the things which have been expressed by the words [*uerbis expressa sunt*], thinks it ought not to be overlooked, so that the account of the narrative might not be worthless, indeed he will do well, if, however, by no means he takes this for an account of the reality, but for the vision and understanding of Saul. Also, indeed, the false one that was fashioned was not able to have good understanding. For the historian described the understanding of Saul and the appearance of Samuel, expressing the things which were said and seen, making no mention if they might have been true or false [*historicus enim mentem Saul et*

habitum Samuhelis descripsit ea quae dicta et uisa sunt exprimens, praetermittens si uera an falsa sint]. For, what does he say? Hearing in what appearance the one that had been summoned was [*audiens in quo habitu esset excitatus*], it says, 'he understood that this one was Samuel' (1 Samuel 28:14). Whatever he might have understood, he recounted, and, because he did not understand well, against Scripture, he worshiped something other than the Lord, and thinking it was Samuel he worshiped the Devil, so that Satan might have the reward of his deception [*ut fructum fallaciae suae haberet satanas*]. For he endeavours for this, that he may be worshiped as though God. For if Samuel had truly appeared to him [Saul], the righteous man would certainly not have permitted himself to be worshiped, who had preached that God alone ought to be worshiped. And how was this man of God, who was with Abraham in comfort [*refrigerio*], saying to the man worthy of pestilence in the fire of Gehenna [*dicebat ad uirum pestilentiae dignum ardore gehennae*] 'Tomorrow you will be with me' (1 Samuel 28:19)?

4. By these two indicators, improvident Satan betrayed the simplicity of his own deceit, because he both permitted himself to be worshiped under the appearance and name of Samuel against the Law, and because he lied about a man overwhelmed with sin soon being with the most righteous Samuel, since there is a great separation of sinners and the righteous [*et uirum peccatis pressum, cum magna distantia peccatorum et iustorum sit, cum Samuhele iustissimo futurum mentitus est*]. It can be understood as the truth, if it were not mentioned concerning the name of Samuel [*si de Samuhelis nomine taceatur*], since Saul was going to be with the Devil. For he [Saul] migrated to the one whom he worshiped. Therefore, the Devil, concealed underneath his veil, always betrays himself while he devises things which would horrify the people through whom he endeavours to deceive [*semper ergo diabolus sub uelamine latens prodit se, dum ea confingit quae horreant personis, per quas fallere nititur*].

Appendix L – Jerome, *Commentary on Jeremiah*, 2.105; 11.11-12

Commentary on Jeremiah, ed and trans. Michael Graves (Downers Grove, Ill.; InterVarsity Press, 2011), p.74 [revised translation].

'Therefore, the Lord says these things: behold I bring on them evil things, from which they will not be able to avoid; they will even cry out to me, and I will not listen to them. Then the cities of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem will go and cry to the gods to whom they make offerings, but they will not save them in the time of their trouble.'

God will not listen in their time of need and trouble, because they also had been unwilling to hear the voice of the Lord. Saul also suffered this: namely when, greatly fearing the army of the Philistines, he had not been worthy to receive the word of the Lord, he turned to the Pythoness [*conuersus est ad pythonissam*], so that he might learn from idols what he should have wrenched out from the Lord by perseverance in prayer and weeping [*quod instantia orationis ac fletuum a domino debuit extorquere*]. Through which we learn that, even if the Lord does not listen, we by no means ought to stop [seeking God] nor ought we flee to demons [*etiamsi dominus non exaudierit, nequaquam esse cessandum nec confugiendum ad daemonas*], which are not able to help their worshippers; rather we ought to turn to the aid of God, who, when angered, is quickly appeased and alters his judgement [*qui cito iratus flectitur et mutat sententiam*], if also those, by whom he had been caused to be made angry, reform [*si et hi, quibus iratus fuerit, commutentur*]. However, all of this, at the time which it was spoken, pertains to the tribe of Judah and the city of Jerusalem, for whom captivity is impending.

Appendix M – Origen

Appendix M.1 – Origen, *Homily on 1 Samuel 28,* 4.2-4

The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, in eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.38-41 [revised translation].

(4)2. For what are the things that have been written? 'And the woman said, "whom shall I bring up for you?"' (1 Samuel 28:11). Which persona [πρόσωπόν] is the one saying, 'the woman said'? Is it the persona of the Holy Spirit [ἆρα τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος], from whom Scripture is believed to have been composed, or the persona of someone else [ἢ πρόσωπον ἄλλου τινός]? For the narrative persona [τὸ γὰρ διηγηματικὸν πρόσωπον] everywhere (as those who are familiar with all sorts of discourses also know) is the persona of the author [πρόσωπον τοῦ συγγραφέως]. And the author in the case of these words is believed to be not a human, but the author is the Holy Spirit [συγγραφεὺς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον] who sets the humans in motion [κινῆσαν]. 3. Therefore, the Holy Spirit says, 'And the woman said, "whom shall I bring up for you?" And he said, "Bring up Samuel for me."' Who says, 'And the woman saw Samuel, and the woman cried out in a loud voice saying…'? 4. We will say to that one who has bombarded [καταβομβήσαντα] us with such things and saying incessantly how Samuel was not in Hades, 'The woman saw Samuel.' The narrative voice [ἡ διηγηματικὴ φωνὴ] said this 'and the woman cried out in a loud voice and said to Saul, "Why have you misled me? You are Saul!..."'

Appendix M.2 – Origen, *Homily on 1 Samuel 28,* 9.7-11

The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, in eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.58-9 [revised translation].

(9)7. And above all, before the coming of my Lord Jesus Christ it was impossible for anyone to pass by to where the tree of life was [ἀδύνατον ἦν τινα παρελθεῖν ὅπου τὸ ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς], it was impossible to pass by the things that were appointed [τὰ τεταγμένα] to guard the way to the tree of life. 'He appointed the Cherubim and the flaming sword which was turning [τὴν φλογίνην ῥομφαίαν τὴν Στρεφομένην] to guard the way to the tree of life' (Genesis 3:24). 8. Who was able to make a way [ὁδοποιῆσαι]? Who was able to make anyone pass through the flaming sword? Just as there was nobody to make a way through the sea except for God and the pillar of fire, the pillar of light from God, just as there was nobody to make a way through the Jordan except for Joshua (that Jesus was a type [τύπος] of the true Jesus), thus Samuel was not able to pass through the flaming sword, nor Abraham. 9. On account of this, even Abraham was seen by the one being punished, and 'Being in torment, the rich man, lifting his eyes, sees Abraham'; even if 'He sees from afar', nevertheless he sees him, 'and Lazarus in his bosom' (Luke 16:22-23). 10. Therefore, the patriarchs, the prophets and everyone used to wait for the coming of my Lord Jesus Christ [περιέμενον οὖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου μου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημίαν καὶ πατριάρχαι καὶ προφῆται καὶ πάντες], so that he might open the way. I am the way (John 14:6). I am the door (John 10:9). He is the way to the tree of life, so that it might come to pass 'If you pass through the fire, the flame will not burn you' (Isaiah 43:2). 11. What sort of fire? 'He appointed the Cherubim and the flaming sword which was turning [τὴν φλογίνην ῥομφαίαν

τὴν Στρεφομένην] to guard the way to the tree of life.' Therefore, because of this, the blessed used to wait there [περιέμενον οἱ μακάριοι ἐκεῖ], making a plan [οἰκονομίαν ποιοῦντες], and unable to be where the tree of life is, where the Paradise of God is [ὅπου ὁ παράδεισος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ], where God the gardener [γεωργός] is, where the blessed and elect and the holy ones of God are.

Appendix M.3 – Origen, *Homily on 1 Samuel 28,* 10.1-5

The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, in eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.58-61 [revised translation].

(10)1. Therefore, there is no-stumbling block is relation to this passage [Οὐδὲν οὖν πρόσκομμα κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἐστίν], but everything has been marvellously written and has been understood by those to whom God might have revealed it. We, the ones who have come to the completion of the ages [οἱ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων ἐληλυθότες] (Hebrews 9:26), we have something more [περισσὸν δέ τι ἔχομεν ἡμεῖς]. 2. What is this something more? If we depart from this place, having been virtuous and good, not being loaded with the burdens of sin [μὴ ἐπαγόμενοι τὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας φορτία], we ourselves, too, shall pass through [διελευσόμεθα] the flaming sword, and we shall not descend to the place where those who died used to wait for Christ before his arrival [καὶ οὐ κατελευσόμεθα εἰς τὴν χώραν ὅπου περιέμενον τὸν Χριστὸν οἱ πρὸ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ κοιμώμενοι]. And we shall pass through, not at all being harmed by the flaming sword [διελευσόμεθα δέ, μηδὲν βλαπτόμενοι ὑπὸ τῆς φλογίνης ῥομφαίας]. 3. 'The work of each, of whatever sort it is, the fire itself will test. If anyone's work will be burned up, he will suffer a loss, but he himself will be saved in this way as through fire' (1 Corinthians 3:13, 15). Therefore, we shall pass through. 4. We even have something more [καὶ πλέον ἔχομέν τι], and we cannot, having lived well, depart badly [καὶ οὐχὶ δυνάμεθα καλῶς βιώσαντες κακῶς ἀπαλλάξαι]. Neither the ancient nor the patriarchs nor the prophets said what we can say, if we have lived well [οὐκ ἔλεγον οἱ ἀρχαῖοι οὐδὲ οἱ πατριάρχαι οὐδὲ οἱ προφῆται, ὃ δυνάμεθα ἡμεῖς εἰπεῖν, ἐὰν καλῶς βιώσωμεν]: 'For it is better to depart and be with Christ' (cf. Philippians 1:23). Thus, for this reason, having something more and much gain (cf. Philippians 1:21) by having come to the completion of the ages [διόπερ οὕτως ἔχοντές τι πλέον καὶ πολὺ κέρδος ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων ἐληλυθέναι], we are the first to receive the denarius (Matthew 20:8). 5. For listen to the parable, he gave the denarius 'beginning with the last', but the first supposed that they 'will receive' something 'more' (Matthew 20:8, 10). Therefore, you who have come last, you are the first to receive your wages from the master in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom is the glory and power forever and ever. Amen.

Appendix N – Eustathius of Antioch

Appendix N.1 – Eustathius, *De engastrimytho*, 26.2-6

The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, in eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.146-49 [revised translation].

(26)2. But it is as if being caught between two opinions [ἐπαμφοτερίζων], having said 'What, then, is the belly-myther doing here? What is the belly-myther doing regarding the bringing up of the righteous man's soul?', he thoughtlessly fled in a loss of reason, indicting to another this very thing that he did himself. Attributing the whole thing to Scripture itself, he strongly insists that Samuel has been brought up, but no longer would he dare to repeat 'Who brought him up'. 3. I suppose that even after having been refuted by those understanding most correctly all along, defending himself again with a second exposition [δευτέρᾳ πάλιν ἀπολογούμενος ἐξηγήσει], he said that the passage of the belly-myther is to be maintained [τετηρῆσθαι μὲν ἔφη τὸν τῆς ἐγγαστριμύθου τόπον]. Then, he both says that 'It has been written that the belly-myther brought somebody up', and that 'it has been recorded that Saul spoke to Samuel'. 4. Having repeated the same such things at length, with great nonsense, he adds again, 'It has not said if he has come up willingly [ἑκουσίως]. For you do not have it laid out [κείμενον] if the belly-myther brought him up. Let someone refute me after having read the Scripture.' 5. Therefore, when refuted face-to-face [ἀντιπροσώπως], he clearly denied the very thing he held before from thoughtlessness [ἠρνήσατο λευκῶς ἅπερ ἀβουλίᾳ πρόσθεν ἐδόξασεν]. For earlier he determined that Scripture itself has said, rather than the woman, 'Whom shall I bring up for you?' But here, obviously being caught, he was eager to escape an accusation with forgetfulness [ἐκφυγεῖν ἐσπούδασε λήθῃ τὴ αἰτίαν]. 6. Thus, everywhere he boldly sets out opinions contradicting himself, just as doubtlessly, then, he is here caught fighting with his own opinion, having been pressed to flee the criminal suit [οὕτως ἑκασταχοῦ μαχομένας ἑαυτῷ δόξας ἐκτίθεται γυμνώς, ὥσπερ οὖν ἀμέλει κἀνταῦθα γνωσιμαχήσας ἑάλω, τὴν ἐγκληματικὴν ἀποδρᾶναι δίκην ἐπειχθείς]. Since, when dragged unwillingly, he admitted that the woman did not bring up the prophet's soul, let him say who is the one who brought it up (for he remained unchangeably fixed, having determined only that it has been brought up).

Appendix N.2– Eustathius, *De engastrimytho*, 10.14-16

The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, in eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.92-3 [revised translation].

(10)14. Indeed, why is it strange to say this, since having beheld the persona of Christ [τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πρόσωπον εἰσιδὼν], on the one hand he [the Devil] saw within God in deed and action and God's genuine Son in nature [ἔργῳ μὲν ἔνδοθεν ἑώρα καὶ πράξει θεὸν καὶ φύσει θεοῦ γνήσιον υἱόν], but on the other hand, he looked upon one having been clothed on the outside a pure man, undefiled, spotless, and a marvel of a temple, very beautiful, consecrated, inviolate [ἄνθρωπον δὲ καθαρόν, ἄχραντον, ἀκηλίδωτον ἐξωτάτω περικείμενον ἐποπτεύων καὶ ναοῦ χρῆμα περικαλλές, ἀφιερωμένον, ἀσύλητον], nonetheless, he approached to tempt him without hesitation, since it is his custom to be at war with God [οὐδὲν ἧττον ἐκπειράσων αὐτὸν ἀμελλητὶ προσῄει θεομαχῶν

εἰωθότως]? 15. When he challenged [Christ] the first and the second time by himself, he was defeated, having been wrecked miserably, again in another way, having changed his custom, he endeavoured to show to him the entire circumference of this world and its kingdoms, and overconfident with madness and lying, he boasted 'I will give to you all these things, if you were to fall down and worship me? (Matthew 4:9). 16. The ungodly one, then, let loose such statements on that occasion, thinking to incite to anger the traits of forbearance [οἰόμενος εἰς ὀργὴν ἐκκαλέσασθαι τὰ τῆς ἀνεξικακίας ἤθη], and through such a way supposing to lay hold of him [καὶ διὰ τοῦ τοιοῦδε δοκῶν ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι]. But the Lord silenced the avenging demon with patience in a manner suitable of God [μακροθυμίᾳ δὲ κατεσίγασε τὸν ἀλάστορα θεοπρεπῶς ὁ κύριος]. For it would be appropriate for God to bear all things forbearingly [ἴδιον γὰρ ἂν εἴη θεῷ πάντα ἀνεξικάκως φέρειν].

Appendix O – Augustine

Appendix O.1– Augustine, *De anima et eius origine*, 4.19.29

Answer to the Pelagians: The Punishment and Forgiveness of Sins and the Baptism of Little Ones, The Spirit and the Letter, Nature and Grace, The Perfection of Human Righteousness, The Deeds of Pelagius, The Grace of Christ and Original Sin, The Nature and Origin of the Soul, trans. Roland J. Teske and ed. John E. Rotelle, WSA 1.23 (Hyde Park, N.Y.: New City Press, 1997), pp.552-3 [revised translation].

Why, then, did the rich man desire a drop of water in the lower regions [*apud inferos*]? Why did holy Samuel appear after his death clothed in his usual garment, as you yourself also recalled [*commemorasti*]? Did the former want to restore the ruins of his soul just like his flesh by the nourishment of liquid? Did the latter depart from the body clothed [*numquid iste de corpore uestitus exierat*]? But in the former case the pain was real by which his soul was tortured, but nevertheless it was not a real body for which he sought nourishment, so also the latter was able to appear clothed, although he was not a body, rather both his soul and its appearance bore the likeness of a body [*et iste sic potuit apparere uestitus, ut non corpus esset, sed similitudinem corporis haberet et anima et habitus*]. Indeed, the soul itself does not extend and compress into clothing as into members of the body, so that it is formed also from this [*neque enim se anima sicut in membra corporis ita et in uestimenta porrigit et coartat, ut etiam inde formetur*].

Appendix O.2 – Augustine, *De cura pro mortuis gerenda,* 15.18

Sancti Aureli Augustini, ed. Iosephus Zycha, CSEL 41 (Vienna: Tempsky, 1900), pp.651-2 [own translation].

For the deceased prophet Samuel even predicted the future to the living King Saul [*nam samuhel propheta defunctus uiuo regi sauli etiam futura praedixit*]: Although some suppose that it was not Samuel himself who was able to be summoned by magical arts, but that some spirit so coinciding with the evil works fashioned his likeness [*quamuis nonnulli non ipsum fuisse, qui potuisset magicis artibus euocari, sed aliquem spiritum tam malis operibus congruentem illius existiment similitudinem figurasse*]: Although the book of Ecclesiasticus, whom Jesus the son of Sirach is said to have written and because of some similarity of expression is pronounced to be of Solomon, contains in praise of the fathers that, even dead, Samuel prophesied (Sirach 46:20) [*quod samuhel etiam mortuus prophetauerit*]. But even if one is opposed to this book outside of the canon of the Hebrews because it is not in it [*sed si et huic libro ex hebraeorum quia in eo non est canone contradicitur*], what are we to say about Moses, who is certainly read both as having died in Deuteronomy (Deuteronomy 34:5) and in the Gospel with Elias, who is not dead, to have appeared to the living (cf. Matthew 17:3)[*qui certe et in deuteronomio mortuus et in euangelio cum helia, qui mortuus non est, legitur adparuisse uiuentibus*]?

Appendix O.3 – Augustine, *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus,* 6.5

Responses to Miscellaneous Questions, trans. Boniface Ramsey and ed. Raymond Canning, WSA 1.12 (Hyde Park, N.Y.: New City Press, 2008), p.263 [revised translation].

These are the things which I wrote in reply at the time concerning the Pythoness and Samuel [*haec sunt quae tunc de pythonissa et samuele rescripsi*]. But how I may not have spoken in vain that we should think in this occurrence that the simulated apparition of Samuel was made present by the wicked work of the Pythoness, but that, in all caution, we ought not object to more careful investigations [*sed quam non frustra dixerim, pedetemtim nos in hac re gesta simulatam samuelis imaginem maligno pytonissae ministerio praesentatam existimare debere, ne inquisitionibus diligentioribus praescribamus*], my later investigation made clear [*mea posterior inquisitio declarauit*], when I found in the book of Ecclesiasticus, where the fathers are praised in order, that Samuel himself was likewise praised because he was said to have prophesied even dead [*quando inueni in libro ecclesiastico, ubi patres laudantur ex ordine, ipsum samuelem sic fuisse laudatum, ut prophetasse etiam mortuus diceretur*].

Abbreviations

- ACW Ancient Christian Writers (New York: Paulist Press)
- CCSG Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca (Turnhout: Brepols)
- CCSL Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina (Turnhout: Brepols)
- CSEL Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (Vienna: Tempsky)
- FC The Fathers of the Church (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press)
- GNO Gregorii Nysseni Opera (Leiden: Brill)
- Loeb Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press and London: Heinemann)
- NRSV New Revised Standard Version
- PG Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca, ed. J. P. Migne
- PL Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Latina ed. J. P. Migne
- SC Sources Chrétiennes (Paris: Éditions du Cerf)
- WSA The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century (Hyde Park, N.Y.: New City Press)

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

Ambrose of Milan

De Cain
CSEL 32.1, pp.339-409 [Latin edition].

Comm. Luk. / Commentary on Luke
SC 45, 52 [Latin and French parallel].

Epistle 56
CSEL 82.2, pp.84-97 [Latin edition].

De excessu fratris Satyri
CSEL 73, pp.207-325 [Latin edition].

De fide
CSEL 78 [Latin edition].

De officiis
Ambrose, De officiis. Volume 1: Introduction, Text, and Translation, ed. and trans. Ivor J. Davidson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) [Latin and English parallel].

De Paradiso
CSEL 31.1, pp.265-336 [Latin edition].

Ambrosiaster

Quaestiones / Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti CXXVII
CSEL 50 [Latin edition].

Apollinaris of Laodicea

Fragment / A Fragment from the Catenae on 1 Samuel 28
The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.158-9 [Greek and English parallel].

Fragment 33 on Psalm 39.4cd
Psalmenkommentare aus der Katenenüberlieferung, ed. Ekkehard Mühlenberg, Vol. 1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1975), p.14 [Greek edition].

Athanasius of Alexandria
Vita Antonii
SC 400 [Greek and French parallel].

Augustine of Hippo
agon. / De agone Christiano
CSEL 41, pp.101-38 [Latin edition].

an. et or. / De anima et eius origine
CSEL 60, pp.303-419 [Latin edition].
WSA 1.23, pp.473-559 [English translation].

bapt. / De Baptismo
CSEL 51, pp.145-375 [Latin edition].

b. vid. / De Bono Viduitatis
CSEL 41, pp.305-43 [Latin edition].

civ. Dei / De civitate Dei
CCSL 47-48 [Latin edition].
WSA 1.6-7 [English translation].

Confessiones
Loeb 26-27 [Latin and English parallel].

Contra Academicos
CSEL 63, pp.3-81 [Latin edition].

Contra Faustum
CSEL 25.1, pp.251-797 [Latin edition].

c. Gaud/ Contra Gaudentium Donatistarum Episcopum
CSEL 53, pp.201-74 [Latin edition].

Contra Litteras Petiliani
CSEL 52, pp.3-227 [Latin edition].

Cresc. / Ad Cresconium grammaticum partis Donati
CSEL 52, pp.325-582 [Latin edition].

cura mort. / De cura pro mortuis gerenda
CSEL 41, pp.621-60 [Latin edition].

doc. Chr. / De doctrina Christiana
Augustine: De Doctrina Christiana, ed. and trans. R. P. H. Green (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995) [Latin and English parallel].

divin. daem / De divinatione daemonum
CSEL 41, p.599-618 [Latin edition].

Dulc. qu. / De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus
CCSL 44a, pp.253-97 [Latin edition].
WSA 1.12, pp.241-69 [English translation].

ench. / Enchiridion ad Laurentium de fide spe et caritate
CCSL 46, pp.49-114 [Latin edition].

Epistle 37
CSEL 34.2, pp.63-4 [Latin edition].

Epistle 43
CSEL 34.2, pp.85-109 [Latin edition].

Epistle 54
CSEL 34.2, pp.158-68 [Latin edition].

Epistle 82
CSEL 34.2, pp.351-87 [Latin edition].
WSA 2.1, pp.315-34 [English translation].

Epistle 102
CSEL 34.2, pp.544-78 [Latin edition].

Epistle 159
CSEL 44, pp.497-502 [Latin edition].

Epistle 190
CSEL 57, pp.137-62 [Latin edition].

Epistle 224
CSEL 57, pp.451-54 [Latin edition].

Epistle 2*
CSEL 88, pp.9-23 [Latin edition].

Gn. adv. Man. / De Genesi adversus Manicheos
CSEL 91 [Latin edition].

Gn. litt. / De Genesi ad Litteram
CSEL 28.1, pp.3-435 [Latin edition].

haer. / De haeresibus
CCSL 46, pp.283-345 [Latin edition].

Retractationes
CCSL 57 [Latin edition].

praed. sanct. / De praedestinatione sanctorum
PL 44, 959-992 [Latin edition].

ord. / De Ordine
CSEL 63, pp.121-85 [Latin edition].

un. bapt. / De Unico Baptismo
CSEL 53, pp.3-34 [Latin edition].

Jo. ev. tr. / *In Johannis evangelium tractatus*
CCSL 36 [Latin edition].

vera rel. / De vera religione
CCSL 32, pp.187-260 [Latin edition].

Sermon 362
PL 39, 1611-1634 [Latin edition].

Simpl. / De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum
CCSL 44 [Latin Edition].
WSA 1.12, pp.175-231 [English translation].

Trin. / De Trinitate
CCSL 50, 50A [Latin Edition].

Babylonian Talmud

The William Davidson Edition < https://www.sefaria.org/texts/Talmud > [English translation].

Basil of Caesarea

Bapt. / De Baptismo
SC 357 [Greek and French parallel].

Comm. Isa. / Commentary on Isaiah
PG 30, 118-668 [Greek and Latin parallel].
Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah, trans. Nikolai A. Lipatov (Mandelbachtal: Edition Cicero, 2001) [English translation].

Epistle 135
Loeb 215, pp.306-11 [Greek and English parallel].

Epistle 160
Loeb 215, pp.399-41 [Greek and English parallel].

Epistle 224
Loeb 243, pp.312-21 [Greek and English parallel].

Epistle 263
Loeb 270, pp.88-101 [Greek and English parallel].

Epistle 265
Loeb 270, pp.104-19 [Greek and English parallel].

Epistle 361
Loeb 270, pp.330-35 [Greek and English parallel].

Epistle 363
Loeb 270, pp.340-43 [Greek and English parallel].

Hexameron
SC 26 [Greek and French parallel].

De spiritu Sancto
SC 17 [Greek and French parallel].

Clement of Rome

1 Clement
Loeb 24, pp.34-151 [English and Greek parallel].

Cyprian

Testimonia ad Quirinum
CSEL 3.1, pp.35-186 [Latin edition]

De Unitate / De Catholicae Ecclesiae Unitate
CSEL 3.1, pp.209-33 [Latin edition]

Cyril of Alexandria

De adoratione in spiritu et veritate
PG 68, 133-1126 [Greek and Latin parallel].

Diodore of Tarsus

Comm. Ps. / Commentary on the Psalms 1-50
CCGS 6 [Greek edition].

Fragment / A Fragment from the Catanae on 1 Samuel 28
The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.160-1 [Greek and English parallel]

Eucherius of Lyons

Instructiones
CCSL 66, pp.77-216 [Latin edition].

Eugippius

Thesaurus
PL 62, 561-1088 [Latin edition].

Eusebius Of Caesarea

Comm. Isa. / Commentary on Isaiah
Eusebius Werke IX: Der Jesajakommentar, ed. Joseph Ziegler (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1975) [Greek edition].
Commentary on Isaiah, trans. Jonathan J. Armstrong and ed. Joel C. Elowsky (Downers Grove, Ill.; InterVarsity Press, 2013) [English translation].

Hist. eccl. / Historia Ecclesiastica
Loeb 153, 265 [Greek and English parallel].

Eustathius of Antioch

Engast. / De engastrimytho contra Origenem
The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.62-157 [Greek and English parallel].

Evagrius Ponticus

Kephalaia Gnostika
Evagrius's Kephalaia Gnostika: A New Translation of the Unreformed Text from the Syriac, ed. and trans. Ilaria Ramelli (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005) [English translation].

Evodius of Uzalis

Epistle 158
CSEL 44, pp.488-97 [Latin edition].

Gregory Nazianzen

Epistle 101
SC 208 pp.36-69 [Greek and French parallel]

Epistle 102
SC 208 pp.70-85 [Greek and French parallel].

Orationes 4
SC 309, pp.86-293 [Greek and French parallel].

Gregory of Nyssa

Adversus Apollinaristas
GNO 3.1, pp.119-28 [Greek edition].

De an. et res. / De anima et resurrectione
GNO 3.3 [Greek edition].

Antirrheriticus / Antirrherticus adversus Apollinarem
GNO 3.1, pp.131-233 [Greek edition].

De beneficentia
SC 588, pp.182-215 [Greek and French parallel].

Contra Eunomium III
GNO 2, pp.3-311 [Greek edition].

Epistle 3
SC 363, pp.124-47 [Greek and French parallel].

Epistle 13
SC 363, pp.194-201 [Greek and French parallel].

Hom. Cant. / Homilies on the Song of Songs
Gregory of Nyssa: Homilies on the Song of Songs, ed. and trans. Richard A. Norris (Jr) (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012) [Greek and English parallel].

Pyth. / De Pythonissa ad Theodosium episcopum

The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.166-77 [Greek and English parallel].

De Sancta Trinitate
GNO 3.1, pp.3-16 [Greek edition].

De tridui spatio
GNO 9, pp.273-306 [Greek edition].

De vita Moysis
SC 1 [Greek and French parallel].

Vita sanctae Macrinae
SC 178 [Greek and French parallel].

Hilary of Poitiers

Tractatus Mysteriorum
SC 19 [Latin and French parallel].

Hippolytus of Rome

Contra Noetum
Hippolytus of Rome: Contra Noetum, ed. and trans. Robert Butterworth (London: Heythrop College, 1977) [Greek and English parallel].

De Universo (fragment)
Fragmente vornicdnischer Kirchenvater aus den Sacra Parallela, ed. Karl Holl, Texte und Untersuchungen 5.2 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1899), pp.137-43 [Greek edition].

Ignatius of Antioch

Philadelphians
Loeb 24, pp.284-95 [English and Greek parallel].

Innocent I

Epistle 6
PL 20, pp.495-502 [Latin edition].

Irenaeus of Lyons

Adversus Haereses
SC 264, 294, 211, 100**, 153 [Latin/Greek and French parallel]
Irenaeus of Lyons, trans. Robert M. Grant (London: Routledge, 1997) [English translation].

Isidore of Seville

Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum, in Regum I
PL 83, 391-410 [Latin edition].

John Chrysostom

Catecheses ad illuminandos
SC 50 [Greek and French parallel].

Vidi Dominum, Hom. 2
PG 56, 107-112 [Greek and Latin parallel].

Hom. Tit. / Homilies on Titus
PG 62, 663-700 [Greek and Latin parallel].

Hom. Matt. / Homilies on Matthew
PG 57-58 [Greek and Latin parallel].

Justin Martyr

1Apol. / Apologia prima pro Christianis ad Antoninum Pium
Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies, eds and trans. Denis Minns and Paul Parvis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp.80-269 [Greek and English parallel].

2Apol. / Apologia secunda pro Christianis ad senatum Romanum
Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies, eds and trans. Denis Minns and Paul Parvis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp.270-323 [Greek and English parallel].

Dial. / Dialogus cum Tryphone
Iustini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone, ed. Miroslav Marcovich, Patristische Texte und Studien 47, (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1997) [Greek edition].
The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature: 2007), pp.2-5 [Greek and English parallel for section 105].

Jerome

Adversus Jovinianum
PL 23, 211-338 [Latin edition].

Comm. Ezek. / Commentary on Ezekiel
PL 25, 15-490 [Latin edition].
ACW 71 [English translation].

Comm. Hos. / Commentary on Hosea
PL 25, 815-946 [Latin edition].

Comm. Isa. / Commentary on Isaiah
PL 24, 17-678 [Latin edition].
ACW 68 [English translation].

Comm. Jer. / Commentary on Jeremiah
CSEL 59 [Latin edition].
Commentary on Jeremiah, ed. and trans. Michael Graves (Downers Grove, Ill.; InterVarsity Press, 2011) [English translation].

Comm. Matt. / Commentary on Matthew
SC 242, 259 [Latin and French parallel].

Epistle 53
CSEL 54, pp.442-65 [Latin edition].

Epistle 60
CSEL 54, pp.548-75 [Latin edition].

Epistle 84
CSEL 55, pp.121-34 [Latin edition].

Epistle 118
CSEL 55, pp.434-45 [Latin edition].

Prologue to Didymus the Blind's De spiritu sancto
SC 386, pp.136-41 [Latin and French parallel].

Prologus Galeatus (*Prologus in libro Regum)*
SC 592, pp.322-37 [Latin and French parallel].

De viris Illustribus
Gerolamo: Gli Uomini Illustri, ed. and trans. Aldo Ceresa-Gastaldo (Florence: Nardini Editore, 1988) [Latin and Italian parallel].

Jerusalem Talmud

The Jerusalem Talmud, Second Order: Mo'ed, ed. and trans. Heinrich W. Guggenheimer (New York: De Gruyter, 2010) [English translation for Hagigah].

The Jerusalem Talmud, Fourth Order: Neziqin, ed. and trans. Heinrich W. Guggenheimer (New York: De Gruyter, 2010) [English translation for Sanhedrin].

Josephus

AJ / Antiquitates Judaicae
Loeb 242, 490, 281, 326, 365, 489, 410, 433, 456 [Greek and English parallel].

Leontius of Byzantium

Deprehensio et Triumphus super Nestorianos
Leontius of Byzantium: Complete Works, ed. and trans. Bryan Daley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp.413-523 [Greek and English parallel].

Leviticus Rabbah

Judaism and Scripture: The Evidence of Leviticus Rabbah, trans. Jacob Neusner (Chicago, Ill.: Chicago University Press, 1986) [English translation].

Martyrium Pionii

The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.26-31. [Greek and English parallel for sections 12-14].

Melito of Sardis

De pascha
SC 123 [Greek and French parallel].

Methodius Olympus

Res. / De resurrectione
Methodius, ed. D. G. Nathanael Bonwetsch (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1917), pp.219-424 [Greek edition].

Symposium
SC 95 [Greek and French parallel].

Origen of Alexandria

Comm. Cant. / Commentary on the Song of Songs
SC 375, 376 [Latin and French parallel].

Comm. Jo. / Commentary on John
SC 120, 157, 222, 290, 385 [Greek and French parallel].

Comm. Matt. / Commentary on Matthew
Origenes Werke X: Matthäuserklärung, ed. Erich Klostermann (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1935) [Greek edition].
The Commentary of Origen on the Gospel of St Matthew, Vol. 1, ed. and trans. Ronald E. Heine (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018) [English translation].

Comm. Rom. / Commentary on Romans
SC 532, 539, 543, 555 [Latin and French parallel]

Cels. / Contra Celsum
SC 132, 136, 147, 150, 227 [Greek and French parallel]
Contra Celsum, ed. and trans. Henry Chadwick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), reprint [English translation].

Dial. / Dialogus cum Heraclide
SC 67 [Greek and French parallel].

Fragment on 1 Samuel 28
Origenes Werke III, ed. Pierre Nautin (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1983), p.299 [Greek edition].

Hom. 1 Sam. 28 / Homily on 1 Samuel 28
The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.32-61 [Greek and English parallel].

Hom. Gen. / Homilies on Genesis
SC 7 [Latin and French parallel].
FC 71, pp. 47-224 [English translation].

Hom. Jer. / Homilies on Jeremiah
SC 232, 238 [Greek and French parallel].

Hom. Josh / Homilies on Joshua
SC 71 [Latin and French parallel].

Hom. Lev. / Homilies on Leviticus
SC 286, 287 [Latin and French parallel].

Hom. Luk. / Homilies on Luke
SC 87 [Latin and French parallel].

Princ. / De Principiis
SC 252, 268 [Latin/Greek and French parallel].
Origen on First Principles: A Reader's Edition, trans. John Behr (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019) [English translation].

De oratione
Origenes Werke II, ed. Paul Koetschau (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1899), pp.297-403 [Greek edition].

Paulinus of Nola

Epistle 5
CSEL 29, pp.22-39 [Latin edition].

Epistle 23
CSEL 29, pp.157-201 [Latin edition].

Epistle 28
CSEL 29, pp.240-47 [Latin edition].

Philastrius

Diversarum Haereseon liber
CCSL 9, pp.217-324 [Latin edition].

Pirke De Rabbi Eliezar

Pirke De Rabbi Eliezar, ed. and trans. Gerald Friedlander (London: Bloch, 1916) [English translation].

Plato

Resp. / De Republica
Loeb 237, 276 [Greek and English parallel].

Pseudo-Hippolytus

In. Reges fragm.
Hippolytus Werke: Kleinere Exegetische und Homiletische Schriften, ed. Hans Achelis (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897), p.123 [Greek edition].

Pseudo-Justin

Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos
PG 6, 1249-1400 [Greek and Latin parallel].

Pseudo-Philo

LAB / Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum
A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation, Vol. 1, ed. and trans. Howard Jacobson (Leiden: Brill, 1996) [Latin and English parallel].

Pseudo-Tertullian

Carmen Adversus Marcionitas
Das Carmen adversus Marcionitas: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung Und Kommentar, ed. and trans. Karla Pollmann (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991) [Latin and German parallel].

Quintilian

Institutio oratoria
Loeb 124, 125, 126, 127, 494 [Latin and English parallel].

Rabanus Maurus

Commentary on 1-4 Kingdoms
PL 109, 9-280 [Latin edition].

Rufinus of Aquileia

Apologia (Contra Hieronymum)
CCSL 20, pp.37-123 [Latin edition].

Socrates Scholasticus

H.E. / Historia Ecclesiastica
SC 477, 493, 505, 506 [Greek and French parallel].

Sozomen

H.E. / Historia Ecclesiastica
SC 306, 418, 495, 516 [Greek and French parallel].

Sulpicius Severus

Chron. / Chronicle
SC 441 [Latin and French parallel].

Dialogi
SC 510 [Latin and French parallel].

Vita sancti Martini
SC 113 [Latin and French parallel].

Tanhuma Buber (Leviticus)

Midrash Tanhuma (S. Buber Recension): Exodus and Leviticus, Vol.2, trans. John T. Townsend (Hoboken, N.J.: Ktav, 1997) [English translation].

Tertullian

Marc. / Adversus Marcionem
SC 365, 368, 399, 456, 483 [Latin and French parallel].

Adversus Praxean
Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas, ed. and trans. Ernest Evans (London: SPCK, 1948) [Latin edition and English translation].

An. / De Anima
Quinti Septimit Florentis Tertulliani De Anima, ed. J. H. Waszink, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae (Leiden: Brill, 2010) [Latin edition].
The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church, eds and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp.32-61 [Latin and English parallel for sections 54-58].

Apologeticum
Tertullian: Apologeticum, ed. Carl Becker (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1952) [Latin and German parallel].

Bapt. / De Baptismo
CSEL 20, pp.201-18 [Latin edition].

Carn. Chr. / De carne Christi
SC 216 [Latin and French parallel].

De Patientia
SC 310 [Latin and French parallel].

De Pudicitia
SC 394 [Latin and French parallel].

Res. / De resurrectione carnis
Tertullian's Treatise on the Resurrection, ed. and trans. Ernest Evans (London: SPCK, 1960) [Latin and English parallel].

Theodore of Mopsuestia

In Canticum Canticorum
PG 66, 699-700 [Latin edition].

Theodoret of Cyrrhus

Comm. Cant. / Commentary on the Song of Songs
PG 81, 27-214 [Greek and Latin parallel].

Quaest. in I Reg. 28
PG 80, 589-596 [Greek and Latin parallel].

Thomas Aquinas

Summa Theologiae
Summa Theologiae: Latin Text and English Translation, Introductions, Notes, Appendices, and Glossaries, ed and trans. Thomas Gilby, 61 vols, (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1964-81) [Latin and English parallel].

Tosefta Sotah

The Tosefta: Translated from the Hebrew, trans. Jacob Neusner, 6 vols (New York: Ktav, 1977-86) [English translation].

Zeno of Verona

Tractatus 1.2 ('De Resurrectione')
CCSL 22, pp.15-23 [Latin edition].

***

SECONDARY SOURCES

Alexander, Philip (2009), '"In the Beginning": Rabbinic and Patristic Exegesis of Genesis 1:1', in Emmanouela Grypeou and Helen Spurling (eds), *The Exegetical Encounter between Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill), pp.1-29.

Allert, Craig D. (2002), *Revelation, Truth, Canon, and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae (Leiden: Brill).

Ameling, Walter (2008), 'The Christian lapsi in Smyrna, 250 A.D. (Martyrium Pionii 12-14)', *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 62, No. 2, pp.133-60.

Andel, G. K. van (1976), *The Christian Concept of History in the Chronicle of Sulpicius Severus* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert).

Andel, G. K. van (1980), 'Sulpicus Severus and Origenism', *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 34, No. 3, Sep., pp.278-87.

Archambault, Georges (1909a), *Justin: Dialogue avec Tryphon*, Vol. 1 (Paris: Picard).

Archambault, Georges (1909b), *Justin: Dialogue avec Tryphon*, Vol. 2 (Paris: Picard).

Armstrong, Jonathan J. (2013), *Commentary on Isaiah* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press).

Arnold, B.T (2004), 'Necromancy and Cleromancy in 1 and 2 Samuel'*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. 66, No. 2, April, pp.199-213.

Asiedu, F. B. A. (2001), 'The Song of Songs and the Ascent of the Soul: Ambrose, Augustine, and the Language of Mysticism', *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 55, No. 3, pp.299-317.

Avioz, Michael (2015), *Josephus' Interpretation of the Books of Samuel* (London: Bloomsbury).

Ayres, Lewis (2004), *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Ayres, Lewis (2020), 'Irenaeus and the 'Rule of Truth': A Reconsideration', in Lewis Ayres and H. Clifton Ward (eds), *The Rise of the Early Christian Intellectual* (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp.145-64.

Ayres, Lewis and **Radde-Gallwitz**, Andrew (2010), 'Basil of Caesarea', in Lloyd P. Gerson (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity,* Vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.459-70.

Azar, Michael G. (2016), 'Origen, Scripture, and the Imprecision of "Supersessionism"', *Journal of Theological Interpretation*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp.157-72.

Bardy, G. (1953), 'Saint Augustin et Tertullien', *L'Année Théologique Augustinienne*, Vol. 13, pp.145-50.

Barnes, T. D. (1981), *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).

Barnes, T. D. (1985), *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*, revised edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Barnes, T. D. (2009), 'Eusebius of Caesarea', *The Expository Times*, Vol. 121, No. 1, October, pp.1-14.

Beatrice, P. F. (1989), 'Quosdam Platonicorum Libros: The Platonic readings of Augustine in Milan', *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 43, No. 3, Sept., pp.248-81.

Beatrice, P. F. (2013), *The Transmission of Sin: Augustine and the Pre-Augustinian Sources*, trans. Adam Kamesar (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Bebis, George S. (2005), 'Apollinaris of Laodicea', in Lindsay Jones (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion*, 2nd ed., Vol. 1 (Detroit, Mich.: Macmillan Reference USA), pp.423-4.

Becker, Adam H. and **Reed**, Annette Yoshiko (eds) (2003), *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Beeley, Christopher A. (2011), 'The Early Christological Controversy: Apollinarius, Diodore, and Gregory Nazianzen', *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 65, No. 4, pp.376-407.

Beeley, Christopher A. (2018), 'Gregory of Nyssa's Christological Exegesis', in Anna Marmodoro and Neil. B. McLynn (eds), *Exploring Gregory of Nyssa: Philosophical, Theological, and Historical Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.93-109.

Beentjes, Pancratius C. (2006), 'Canon and Scripture in the Book of Ben Sira (Jesus Sirach / Ecclesiasticus)', in Pancratius C. Beentjes (ed.), *'Happy the One who Meditates on Wisdom' (SIR. 14,20): Collected Essays on the Book of Ben Sira* (Leuven: Peeters), pp.169-86.

Behr, John (2011), *The Case Against Diodore and Theodore: Texts and their Contexts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Behr, John (2019), *Origen: On First Principles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Bigelmair, Andreas (1934), *Des Heiligen Bischofs Zeno Von Verona Traktate* (Munich: J. Kösel & F. Pustet).

Binder, Stéphanie E. (2012), *Tertullian, On Idolatry and Mishnah Avodah Zarah: Questioning the Parting of the Ways between Christians and Jews* (Leiden: Brill).

Bischoff, Bernhard (1990), *Latin Palaeography: Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, trans. Daibhm O. Cróinin and David Ganz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Blowers, Paul M. (1988), 'Origen, the Rabbis, and the Bible: Towards a Picture of Judaism and Christianity in Third-Century Caesarea', in Charles Kannengiesser and William Lawrence Petersen (eds), *Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press), pp.96-116.

Boersma, Gerald (2016), *Augustine's Early Theology of Image: A Study in the Development of Pro-Nicene Theology*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology (New York: Oxford University Press).

Bonnardière, Anne-Marie La (1965), *Recherches de Chronologie Augustinienne* (Paris: Etudes augustiniennes).

Bonner, Gerald (1970), 'Augustine as Biblical Scholar', in P. R. Ackroyd and C. P. Evans (eds), *Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. 1: From the Beginnings to Jerome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.541-63.

Bonner, Gerald (2002), *St Augustine of Hippo: Life and Controversies*, 3rd edition (Norwich: Canterbury Press).

Bonner, Gerald (2007), *Freedom and Necessity: St. Augustine's Teaching on Divine Power and Human Freedom* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press).

Bonney, Gillian (2001), 'The Exegesis of the Gospel of Luke in the *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam* of Ambrose and in the *In Lucae evangelium expositio* of Bede as observed in the Figure of Elisabeth', *Journal of Ancient Christianity*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp.50-64.

Bostock, Gerald (1987), 'Allegory and the Interpretation of the Bible in Origen', *Literature and Theology*, Vol. 1, No. 1, March, pp.39-53.

Bowersock, G. W. (1995), *Martyrdom and Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Boyarin, Daniel (1999), *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press).

Bracht, Katharina (2017), 'Methodius Olympus: State of the Art and New Perspectives', in Katharina Bracht (ed.), *Methodius Olympus: State of the Art and New Perspectives* (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp.1-17.

Bradnick, David (2017), *Evil, Spirits, and Possession: An Emergentist Theology of the Demonic* (Leiden: Brill).

Brakke, David (2006), *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).

Brock, Sebastian (1996), *The Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of 1 Samuel* (Torino: S. Zamorani).

Broek, Roelof van den (1995), 'The Christian "school" of Alexandria in the Second and Third Centuries', in J. W. Drijvers and A. A. MacDonald (eds), *Centres of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-modern Europe and the Near East* (Leiden: Brill), pp.39-47.

Brown, Cheryl Anne (1992), *No Longer Be Silent: First Century Jewish Portraits of Biblical Women* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press).

Brown, Colin (1984), *Miracles and the Critical Mind* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans).

Brown, Peter (1972), *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine* (Eugene, Oreg.: Wipf and Stock Publishers).

Brown, Peter (2000), *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography,* new ed. with an epilogue (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press).

Bruce, F. F. (1988), *The Canon of Scripture* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press).

Bruyn, Theodore de (2011), 'Ambrosiaster's Interpretation of Romans 1:26-27', *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 65, No. 5, pp.463-83.

Bussières, Marie-Pierre (2007), *Ambrosiaster: Contre les païens (Question sur l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament 114) et Sur le destin (Question sur l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament 115)*, SC 512 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf).

Bussières, Marie-Pierre (2011), 'Ambrosiaster's Method of Interpretation in the Questions on the Old and New Testament', in Josef Lössl and John W. Watt (eds), *Interpreting the Bible and Aristotle in Late Antiquity: The Alexandrian Commentary Tradition between Rome and Baghdad* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate), pp.49-65.

Cameron, Michael (2012), *Christ Meets Me Everywhere: Augustine's Early Figurative Exegesis* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Capone, Alessandro (2013), 'Apollinaris, Basil and Gregory of Nyssa', *Journal of Ancient Christianity,* Vol. 17, No. 2, pp.315-31.

Cartwright, Sophie (2015), *The Theological Anthropology of Eustathius of Antioch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Casiday, A. M. (2006), *Evagrius Ponticus* (London: Routledge).

Casiday, A. M. (2013), *Reconstructing the Theology of Evagrius Ponticus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Castagno, Adele Monaci (1998), 'Origen the Scholar and Pastor', trans. Frances Cooper, in Mary B. Cunningham and Pauline Allen (eds), *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics* (Leiden: Brill), pp.65-87.

Castelli, Elizabeth (2004), *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Cerioni, Lavinia (2019), 'Bodily Souls? Paradoxical Bodies in Origen's Theology of Progress', *Journal of Ancient Christianity*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp.21-35.

Ceulemans, Reinhart (2011), 'Apollinaris of Laodicea in the Catenae as a Source of Hexaplaric Readings', *Journal of Ancient Christianity*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp.431-49.

Chadwick, Henry (1965), 'Justin Martyr's Defence of Christianity', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* Vol. 47, No. 2, March, pp.275-97.

Chadwick, Henry (1991), 'The Chalcedonian Definition', *Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Early Church* (Aldershot: Variorum), pp.1-12.

Chadwick, Henry (2001), *The Church in Ancient Society: From Galilee to Gregory the Great* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Chapman, Honora (2009), 'Josephus', in Andrew Feldherr (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.319-31.

Clark, Elizabeth (1999), *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press).

Clayton, Jr, Paul B. (2007), *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus: Antiochene Christology from the Council of Ephesus (431) to the Council of Chalcedon (451)* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Collins, J. J. (1997), *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press).

Connor, Steven (2000), *Dumbstruck: A Cultural History of Ventriloquism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Corley, Jeremy (2007), 'A Numerical Structure in Sirach 44:1–50:24', *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. 69, No. 1, Jan., pp.43-63.

Corley, Jeremy (2009), 'The Portrait of Samuel in Hebrew Ben Sira 46:13-20', in Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richer (eds), *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature* (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp.31-56.

Cosgrove, Charles H. (1982), 'Justin Martyr and the Emerging Canon: Observations on the Purpose and Destination of the Dialogue with Trypho', *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 36, No. 3, pp.209-32.

Crawford, Matthew R. (2013), 'Scripture as "One Book": Origen, Jerome, and Cyril of Alexandria on Isaiah 29:11', *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. 64, No. 1, April, pp.137-53.

Crouzel, Henri (1985), *Origéne* (Paris: Lethielleux).

Crouzel, Henri (1989), *Origen*, trans. A. S. Worrall (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

Daley, Brian E. (1991), *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Exegesis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Daley, Brian E. (2018), *God Visible: Patristic Christology Reconsidered* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Daniélou, Jean (1955), *Origen*, trans. Walter Mitchell (Eugene, Oreg.: Wipf and Stock Publishers).

Daniélou, Jean (1970), *L'être et le temps chez Grégoire de Nysse* (Leiden: Brill).

Dawson, David (2000), 'Plato's Soul and the Body of the Text in Philo and Origen', in Jon Whitman (ed.), *Interpretation and Allegory: Antiquity to the Modern Period* (Leiden: Brill), pp.89-107.

Dechow, Jon F. (2017), 'Methodius' Conceptual World in His Treatise *De resurrectione'*, in Katharina Bracht (ed.), *Methodius Olympus: State of the Art and New Perspectives* (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp.125-48.

Declerck, José H. (2002), *Eustathii Antiocheni Opera*, CCSG 51 (Turnhout: Brepols).

DeCock, Miriam (2020), *Interpreting the Gospel of John in Antioch and Alexandria* (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature).

Devreesse, Robert (1959), *Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois (fragments tires des chaînes)* (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana).

Dorival, Giles (2013), 'Origen', in James Carleton Paget and Joachim Schaper (eds), *The New Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. 1: From the Beginnings to 600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.605-28.

Drever, Matthew (2013), 'Redeeming Creation: *Creatio ex nihilo* and the *Imago Dei* in Augustine', *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, Vol. 15, No. 2 April, pp.135-53.

Dudden, F. Homes (1935a), *The Life and Times of St. Ambrose*, Vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Dudden, F. Homes (1935b), *The Life and Times of St. Ambrose*, Vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Dulk, Matthijs den (2018), *Between the Jews and Heretics: Refiguring Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho* (London: Routledge).

Dunn, Geoffrey D. (2004), *Tertullian* (London: Routledge).

Dunn, Geoffrey D. (2006a), 'Tertullian's Scriptural Exegesis in *de praescriptione hereticorum*', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp.141-55.

Dunn, James D. (2006b), *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*, 2nd edition (London: SCM Press).

Edwards, Mark Julian (1991), 'On the Platonic Schooling of Justin Martyr', *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp.17-34.

Edwards, Mark Julian (1992), 'Origen No Gnostic; Or, On the Corporeality of Man', *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. 43, No. 1, April, pp.23-37.

Edwards, Mark Julian (1995), 'Origen's Two Resurrections', *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. 46, No. 2, pp.502-18.

Edwards, Mark Julian (2002), *Origen against Plato* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Edwards, Mark Julian (2009), *Catholicity and Heresy in the Early Church* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate).

Edwards, Mark Julian (2013), 'Figurative Readings: Their Scope and Justification', in J. Carleton Paget and J. Schaper (eds), *The New Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. 1: From the Beginnings to 600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.714-33.

Edwards, Mark Julian (2018), 'Origen and Gregory of Nyssa on the Song of Songs', in Anna Marmodoro and Neil B. McLynn (eds), *Exploring Gregory of Nyssa: Philosophical, Theological, and Historical Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.74-92.

Edwards, Mark Julian (2019), 'Origen in Paradise: A Response to Peter Martens', *Journal of Ancient Christianity*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp.163-85.

Edwards, Mark Julian (2021a), 'Origen, Plato and the Afterlife', *International Journal of the Platonic Tradition*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp.160-83.

Edwards, Mark Julian (2021b), 'The Creed', in Young Richard Kim (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Council of Nicaea* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.135-57.

Eller, Meredith F. (1949), 'The Retractationes of Saint Augustine', *Church History*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp.172-83.

Elliott, Mark W. (2013), 'Exegetical Genres in the Patristic Era', in J. Carleton Paget and J. Schaper (eds), *The New Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. 1: From the Beginnings to 600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.775-97.

Evans, J. D. G. (1977), *Aristotle's Concept of Dialectic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Everett, Nicholas (2016), *Patron Saints of Early Medieval Italy AD c.350 800: History and Hagiography in Ten Biographies* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies).

Fedwick, P. J. (2004), 'Towards a New Critical Edition of All the Letters by Basil of Caesarea' in P. J. Fedwick, *Studies of Basil of Caesarea and His World: An Annotated Bio-Bibliography*, Bibliotheca Basiliana Universalis 5 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp.903-12.

Feehan, Thomas (1990), 'The Morality of Lying in St. Augustine,' *Augustinian Studies*, Vol. 21, pp.67-81.

Feldman, Louis (1998), *Josephus' Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press).

Feldman, Louis (2006a), 'Josephus', *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered* (Leiden: Brill), pp.301-32.

Feldman, Louis (2006b), 'The Influence of the Greek Tragedians on Josephus', *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered* (Leiden: Brill), pp.402-32.

Ferguson, Everett (2002), 'Factors Leading to the Selection and Closure of the New Testament Canon', in L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders (eds)*, The Canon Debate* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson), pp.295-320.

Fisk, Bruce Norman (2001), *Do You Not Remember?: Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Fitzgerald, Allan D. (ed.) (1999), *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans).

Fleteren, Frederick Van (1996), 'Augustine's Principles of Biblical Exegesis, De doctrina christiana Aside: Miscellaneous Observations', *Augustinian Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp.107-28.

Flint, Valerie (1999), 'The Demonisation of Magic and Sorcery in Late Antiquity: Christian Redefinitions of Pagan Religions', in Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark (eds), *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Ancient Greece and Rome* (Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania Press), pp.279-348.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J. (1933), *Eusebius Pamphili, Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and First Christian Historian: A Study of the Man and his Writings* (Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons).

Foley, Donna M. (1995), 'The Religious Significance of the Human Body in the Writings of Ambrose of Milan', DPhil thesis, University of Ottowa.

Fonrobert, C. and **Jaffee**, M. (2007), 'Introduction: The Talmud, Rabbinic Literature, and Jewish Culture', in C. Fonrobert and M. Jaffee (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.1-14.

Frend, W. H. C. (1985), *The Donatists Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa*, reissue (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Froehlich, Karlfried (1984), *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church* (Philadelphia. Pa.: Fortress Press).

Gallagher, Edmon L. (2013), 'Jerome's *Prologus Galeatus* and the OT Canon of North Africa', *Studia Patristica* 69, pp.99-106.

Gemeinhardt, Peter (2007), 'Apollinaris of Laodicea: A Neglected Link of Trinitarian Theology between East and West?', *Journal of Ancient Christianity*, Volume 10, No. 2, pp.286-301.

Gibson, E. Leigh (2001), 'Jewish Antagonism or Christian Polemic: The Case of the Martyrdom of Pionius', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 3, Fall, pp.339-58.

Ginzberg, Louis (2003), *The Legends of the Jews*, trans. Henrietta Szold and Paul Radin, 2nd edition (Philadelphia, Pa.: Jewish Publication Society).

Giulea, Dragoş Andrei (2018), 'Basil of Caesarea's Authorship of Epistle 361 and His Relationship with the Homoiousians Reconsidered', *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 72, No. 1, pp.41-70.

Glare, P. G. W. (1990), *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, reprint (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Goodenough, Erwin R. (1923), *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Jena: Frommann).

Goodrich, Richard J. (2007), 'Vir Maxime Catholicus: Sulpicius Severus' Use and Abuse of Jerome in the Dialogi', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol 58, No. 2, April, pp.189-210.

Goodrich, Richard J. (2013), 'Satan and the Bishops: Origen, *Apokatastasis*, and Ecclesiastical Politics in Sulpicus Severus' *Dialogi*', *Adamantius*, Vol. 19, pp.84-96.

Goodrich, Richard J. (2015), *Sulpicius Severus: The Complete Works,* ACW 70 (New York: Paulist Press).

Grant, Robert M. (1965), *The Formation of the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row)

Grant, Robert M., and **Tracy**, David (1984), *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible*, 2nd ed., revised and enlarged (Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press).

Green, R. P. H. (1995), *De Doctrina Christiana* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Green, William M. (1959), 'A Fourth Century Manuscript of Saint Augustine', *Revue Bénédictine* Vol. 69, pp.191-7.

Greer, Rowan A. (1966), 'The Antiochene Christology of Diodore of Tarsus', *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp.327-41.

Greer, Rowan A. (1973), *The Captain of Our Salvation: A Study in Patristic Exegesis of Hebrews* (Tübingen: Mohr).

Greer, Rowan A. (2007), 'Some Observations on the Texts Translated: Theological Perspectives', in Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (eds), *The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church* (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature), pp.xxxi-lxxxiii.

Greer, Rowan A., and **Mitchell**, Margaret M. (2007), *The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church* (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature).

Griffiths, Susan B. (2016), 'Ambrose the Appropriator: Borrowed Texts in a New Context in the Commentary on Luke', in H. A. G Haughton (ed.), *Commentaries, Catenae and Biblical Tradition: Papers from the Ninth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, in association with the COMPAUL project* (Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press), pp.199-225.

Grillmeier, Aloys (1975), *Christ in Christian Tradition, Volume One: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, trans. John Bowden, 2nd rev. ed. (London: Mowbray).

Hall, Claire (2021), *Origen and Prophecy: Fate, Authority, Allegory, and the Structure of Scripture*, Oxford Theology and Religion Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Halton, Thomas P. (2003), *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho*, ed. Michael Slusser, Selections from the Fathers of the Church, Vol. 3 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press).

Hanson, R. P. C. (1961), 'Notes on Tertullian's Interpretation of Scripture,' *The Journal of Theological Studies,* Vol. 12, No. 2, October, pp.273-9.

Hardwick, Michael E. (1989), *Josephus as an Historical Source in Patristic Literature through Eusebius* (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press).

Harrison, Carol (2000), *Augustine: Christian Truth and Fractured Humanity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Harrison, Carol (2013), 'Augustine', in James Carleton Paget and Joachim Schaper (eds), *The New Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. 1: From the Beginnings to 600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.676-96.

Harnack, Adolf von (1883), 'Die Altercatio Simonis Iudaei et Theophili Christiani nebst Untersuchungen über die antijüdische Polemik in der alten Kirche', *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp.1-134.

Hata, G. (2007), 'The Abuse and Misuse of Josephus in Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, Books 2 and 3', in Shaye J. D. Cohen and Joshua J. Schwartz (eds), *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: Brill), pp.91-102.

Hefele, Karl Joseph von (1876), *A History of the Councils of the Church, from the Original Documents*. *Volume II: A.D. 326 to A.D. 429*, trans. H. N. Oxenham (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

Heidl, György (2003), *Origen's Influence on the Young Augustine: A Chapter of the History of Origenism* (Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press).

Heine, Ronald E. (1984), 'Gregory of Nyssa's Apology for Allegory', *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 38, No. 4, pp.360-70.

Heine, Ronald E. (2005), 'The Testimonia and Fragments Related to Origen's Commentary on Genesis', *Journal of Ancient Christianity*, Vol .9, No. 1, pp.122-42.

Hermanowicz, Erika T. (2018), 'Augustine on Lying', *Speculum*, Vol. 93, No. 3, pp.699-727.

Heßbrüggen-Walter, Stefan (2005), 'Augustine's Critique of Dialectic: Between Ambrose and the Arians', in Karla Pollmann and Mark Vessey (eds), *Augustine and the Disciplines: From Cassiciacum to Confessions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.184-205.

Hildebrand, Stephen M. (2014), *Basil of Caesarea* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic).

Hill, C. E. (1989), 'Hades of Hippolytus or Tartarus of Tertullian? The Authorship of the Fragment De Universo', *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 43, No. 2, Jun., pp.105-26.

Hill, C. E. (2001), *Regnum Caelorum: Patterns of Millennial Thought in Early Christianity*, 2nd edition, *Mind* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans).

Hill, Edmund (1991), *The Trinity*, WSA 1.5 (Hyde Park, N.Y.: New City Press).

Hill, Robert C. (2003), 'Psalm 41 (42): A Classic Text for Antiochene Spirituality', *Irish Theological Quarterly*, Vol. 68, No. 1, pp.25-33.

Hill, Robert C. (2005a), *Reading the Old Testament in Antioch* (Leiden: Brill).

Hill, Robert C. (2005b), *Diodore of Tarsus: Commentary on Psalms 1-51* (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature).

Hollerich, Michael J. (1999), *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah: Christian Exegesis in the Age of Constantine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Hollerich, Michael J. (2013), 'Eusebius', in James Carleton Paget and Joachim Schaper (eds), *The New Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. 1: From the Beginnings to 600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.629-52.

Horbury, William (2013), 'Biblical Interpretation in Greek Jewish Writings', in James Carleton Paget and Joachim Schaper (eds), *The New Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. 1: From the Beginnings to 600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.289-320.

Humphries, Mark (1997), 'Zeno and Gallienus: Two Gentleman of Verona', *Classics Ireland*, Vol. 4, pp.67-78.

Hunter, David G. (2004), 'Fourth-century Latin writers: Hilary, Victorinus, Ambrosiaster, Ambrose', in Frances Young, Lewis Ayres, Andrew Louth (eds), *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literatur*e (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.302-17.

Hunter, David G. (2009), '2008 NAPS Presidential Address: The Significance of Ambrosiaster', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 1, Spring, pp.1-26.

Inowlocki, Sabrina (2006), *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors: His Citation Technique in an Apologetic Context* (Leiden: Brill).

Jacobsen, Anders-Christian (2019), 'The Nature, Function, and Destiny of the Human Body – Origen's Interpretation of 1 Cor 15', *Journal of Ancient Christianity*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp.36-52.

Jacobson, Howard (2012), 'Biblical Interpretation in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*', Matthias Henze (ed.), *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans), pp.180-99.

Jay, Pierre, (2004), 'Jerome', in Charles Kannengiesser (ed.), *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, Vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill), pp.1094-179.

Jeanes, Gordon P. (1995), *The Day Has Come! Easter and Baptism in Zeno of Verona* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press).

Johnson, Aaron P. (2014), *Eusebius* (London: I. B. Tauris).

Jones, David Albert (2007), *Approaching the End: A Theological Exploration of Death and Dying* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Kahlos, M. (2015). 'The Early Church', in D. Collins (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Magic and Witchcraft in the West: From Antiquity to the Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.148-82.

Kalimi, Isaac (2004), 'The Date of the Book of Chronicles', in J. Harold Ellens, Deborah L. Ellens, Rolf P. Knierim and Isaac Kalimi (eds), *God's Word for our World, Vol.1: Biblical Studies in Honour of Simon John De Vries* (London: T&T Clark International), pp.347-71.

Kalimi, Isaac (2005), *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns).

Kamesar, Adam (2013), 'Jerome', in J. Carleton Paget and J. Schaper (eds), *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*, *Vol. 1: From the Beginnings to 600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.653-75.

Kannengiesser, Charles (1995), 'The Interrupted *De doctrina christiana*', in Duane W. H. Arnold and Pamela Bright (eds), *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press), pp.3-13.

Kannengiesser, Charles (2004), *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, Vol. 1-2 (Leiden: Brill).

Kauhanen, Tuukka (2012), *The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Keech, Dominic (2012), *The Anti-Pelagian Christology of Augustine of Hippo, 396-430* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Kelly, J. N. D. (1978), *Early Christian Doctrines*, 5th edition (London: Adam & Charles Black).

Kennedy, George A. (1999), *Classical Rhetoric & Its Christian and Secular Tradition: From Ancient to Modern Times*, 2nd, revised edition (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press).

Keresztes, Paul (1966), 'Tertullian's Apologeticus: A Historical and Literary Study', *Latomus*, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp.124-33.

Kim, Koowon (2018), 'Why Is the Woman of Endor Portrayed as a Heroine?', *Expository Times*, Vol. 129, No. 9, pp.399-407.

King, J. Christopher (2005), *Origen on the Song of Songs as the Spirit of Scripture: The Bridegroom's Perfect Marriage-Song* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Klein, E. (2018), *Augustine's Theology of Angels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Kuemmerlin-Mclean, Joanne Kay (1986), 'Divination and Magic in the Religion of Ancient Israel: A Study in Perspectives and Methodology', PhD thesis, Vanderbilt University.

Laato, A. (2013), 'The Devil in the Old Testament', in E. Koskenniemi and I. Fröhlich (eds), *Evil and the Devil*, The Library of New Testament Studies (London: Bloomsbury), pp.1-22.

Lancel, Serge (2002), *Saint Augustine*, trans. Antonia Nevill (London: SCM Press).

Lange, N. R. M. de (1976), *Origen and the Jews: Studies in Jewish-Christian Relations in Third-Century Palestine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Lauro, Elizabeth Ann Dively (2005), *The Soul and Spirit of Scripture within Origen's Exegesis* (Leiden: Brill).

Law, T. M. (2008), 'Origen's Parallel Bible: Textual Criticism, Apologetics, or Exegesis', *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. 59, No. 1, April, pp.1-21.

Lee, Thomas R. (1986), *Studies in the Form of Sirach 44–50*, SBL Dissertation Series 75 (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press).

Leeming, Bernard (1930), 'Augustine, Ambrosiaster and the Massa Perditionis', *Gregorianum*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp.58-91.

Lewis, Charlton T., and **Short**, Charles (1969), *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Lienhard, Joseph T. (1977), *Paulinus of Nola and Early Western Monasticism* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag).

Lienhard, Joseph T. (1996), 'Reading the Bible and Learning to Read: The Influence of Education on St. Augustine's Exegesis', *Augustinian Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp.7-25.

Lienhard, Joseph T. (2006), 'Two Friends of Athanasius: Marcellus of Ancyra and Apollinaris of Laodicea', *Journal of Ancient Christianity*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp.56-66.

Lieu, J. (1994), '"The Parting of the Ways": Theological Construct or Historical Reality?', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, Vol. 17, No. 56, pp.101-19.

Lieu, J. (2015), *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Lim, Richard (1990), 'The Politics of Interpretation in Basil of Caesarea's *Hexameron*', *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 44, No. 4, pp.351-70.

Lim, Timothy H. (2013), *The Formation of the Jewish Canon* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press).

Lipatov, Nikolai A. (1993), 'The Problem of Authorship of the Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah Attributed to St. Basil the Great', *Studia Patristica*, 27, pp.42-8.

Lipatov, Nikolai A. (2001), *Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah* (Mandelbachtal: Edition Cicero).

Ludlow, Morwenna (2000), *Universal Salvation: Eschatology in the Thought of Gregory of Nyssa and Karl Rahner* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).

Ludlow, Morwenna (2002), 'Theology and Allegory: Origen and Gregory of Nyssa on the Unity and Diversity of Scripture', *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, Vol. 4, No. 1, March, pp.45-66.

Ludlow, Morwenna (2012), 'Demons, Evil and Liminality in Cappadocian Theology', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 2, Summer, pp.179-211.

Lunn-Rockliffe, Sophie (2007), *Ambrosiaster's Political Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Lunn-Rockliffe, Sophie (2010), 'Ambrosiaster Revising Ambrosiaster: Introduction', *Revue d'Etudes Augustiniennes et Patristiques*, Vol. 56, No.1, Jan., pp.21-4.

Lunn-Rockliffe, Sophie (2011), 'Bishops on the Chair of Pestilence: Ambrosiaster's Polemical Exegesis of Psalm 1.1', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 1, Spring, pp.79-99.

Mack, B. L. (1985), *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's Hymn in Praise of the Fathers* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press).

Maier, J. L. (1987), *Le dossier du donatisme, Vol. 1: Des origines a la mort de Constance II (303-361),* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).

Maraval, Pierre (2017), *Lettre Cononique, Lettre sur la Pythonisse et Six Homélies Pastorales,* SC 588 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf).

Marcos, Natalio Fernández (1994), *Scribes and Translators: Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum (Leiden: Brill).

Marcovich, Miroslav (1997), *Iustini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone*, Patristische Texte und Studien 47 (Berlin: De Gruyter).

Markus, Robert (1994), 'Augustine on Magic: A Neglected Semiotic Theory', *Revue d'Études Augustiniennes et Patristiques,* Vol. 40, No. 2, pp.375-88.

Marrou, Henri-Irénée (1958), *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*, 4th edition (Paris: Boccard).

Martens, Peter W. (2012a), *Origen and Scripture: The Contours of the Exegetical Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Martens, Peter W. (2012b), 'Origen's Doctrine of Pre-Existence and the Opening Chapters of Genesis', *Journal of Ancient Christianity*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp.516-49.

Martens, Peter W. (2015), 'Embodiment, Heresy, and the Hellenization of Christianity: The Descent of the Soul in Plato and Origen', *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 108, No. 4, pp.594-620.

Martens, Peter W. (2019), 'Response to Edwards', *Journal of Ancient Christianity*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp.186-200.

Mascari, Michael A. (1996), 'Zeno, Gaudentius, and Chromatius: The Dynamics of Preaching in Northern Italy (360-420)', PhD thesis, The Catholic University of America.

McCarter, P. Kyle (1980), *1 Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday).

McGlothlin, Thomas D. (2018), *Resurrection as Salvation Development and Conflict in Pre-Nicene Paulinism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

McGuckin, John Anthony (2018), 'St Gregory of Nyssa', in Anna Marmodoro and Neil B. McLynn (eds), *Exploring Gregory of Nyssa: Philosophical, Theological, and Historical Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.7-28.

McLynn, Neil (1994), *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press).

Mee, Michael (2001), *Commentary of Saint Ambrose on the Gospel According to Saint Luke* (Dublin: Halycyon Press).

Meredith, Anthony (1999), *Gregory of Nyssa* (London: Routledge).

Miller, Patricia Cox (1984), 'Origen and the Witch of Endor: Toward an Iconoclastic Typology', *Anglican Theological Review*, Vol. 66, No. 2, April, pp.137-47.

Minns, Denis (2000), 'Justin Martyr', in Lloyd P. Gerson (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, Vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.258-69.

Mitchell, Margaret M. (2006), 'Rhetorical Handbooks in Service of Biblical Exegesis: Eustathius of Antioch Takes Origen Back to School', in John Fotopoulos (ed.), *The New Testament and Early*

Christian Literature in Graeco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune (Leiden: Brill), pp.349-67.

Mitchell, Margaret M. (2007a), 'Patristic Rhetoric on Allegory: Origen and Eustathius Put on Trial', in Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (eds), *The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church* (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature), pp.lxxxv-cxxiii.

Mitchell, Margaret M. (2007b), 'Compositional Analyses', in Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (eds), *The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church* (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature), pp.cxxv-clvii.

Moss, Candida (2010a), 'On the Dating of Polycarp: Rethinking the Place of the Martyrdom of Polycarp in the History of Christianity', *Early Christianity*, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp.539-74.

Moss, Candida (2010b), *The Other Christs: Imitating Jesus in Ancient Christian Ideologies of Martyrdom* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Moss, Candida (2012), *Ancient Christian Martyrdom: Diverse Practices, Theologies and Traditions* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press)

Mühlenberg, Ekkehard (1992), 'Zur exegetischen Methode des Apollinaris von Laodicea', in J. van Oort and U. Wickert (eds), *Christliche Exegese zwischen Nicaea und Chalcedon* (Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos), pp.132-47.

Mulder, O. (2003), *Simon the High Priest in Sira 50: An Exegetical Study of the Significance of Simon the High Priest as Climax to the Praise of the Fathers in Ben Sira's Concept of the History of Israel* (Leiden: Brill).

Munier, Charles (1972-1973), 'La tradition manuscrite de l'Abrégé d'Hippone et le Canon des Écritures des églises africaines', *Sacris Erudiri*, Vol. 21, pp.43-55.

Munier, Charles (1974), *Concilia Africae, A. 345–A. 525*, CCSL 149 (Turnhout: Brepols).

Murphy, Frederick J. (1993), *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Musurillo, Herbert (1972), *Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Mutzenbecher, Almut (1967-1968), 'Codex Leningrad Q.v.I.3 (Corbie): Ein Beitrag zu seiner Beschreibung', *Sacris Erudiri*, Vol. 18, pp.406-50.

Mutzenbecher, Almut (1969-1970), 'Zur Datierung von Augustinus *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus*', *Sacris Erudiri*, Vol. 19, pp.365-79.

Nassif, Bradley (1993), 'The "Spiritual Exegesis" of Scripture: The School of Antioch Revisited', *Anglican Theological Review*, Vol. 75, No. 4, pp.437-70.

Nautin, Pierre (1947), *Hippolyte et Josipe: contribution a l'histoire de la littèrature chrétienne du troisième siècle* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf).

Nautin, Pierre, and **Nautin**, Marie-Thérèse (1986), *Origène: Homélies Sur Samuel*, SC 328 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf).

Norris, Jr, Richard A., (1980), *The Christological Controversy* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press).

O'Donnell, James J. (1992), *Augustine: Confessions*, Vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

O'Donnell, James J. (2005), *Augustine, Sinner & Saint*: *A New Biography* (London: Profile Books).

O'Keefe, John J. (2000), '"A Letter that Killeth": Toward a Reassessment of Antiochene Exegesis, or Diodore, Theodore, and Theodoret on the Psalms', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 1, Spring, pp.83-104.

O'Keefe, John J., and **Reno**, R. R. (2005), *Sanctified Vison: An Introduction to Early Christian Interpretation of the Bible* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Oliver, Simon (2016), 'Augustine on Creation, Providence and Motion', *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, Vol. 18, No. 4, October, pp.379-98.

Oliver, W. H. (2015), 'The Catechetical School in Alexandria', *Verbum et Ecclesia,* Vol. 36. No.1, Art. #1385, 12 pages. http://dx.doi. org/10.4102/ve.v36i1.1385.

Olivier, Jean-Marie (1980), *Diodori Tarsensis commentary in Psalmos, Vol. 1: Commentarius in Psalmos I–L*, CCSG 6 (Turnhout: Brepols).

O'Malley, T. P. (1967), *Tertullian and the Bible: Language–Imagery–Exegesis* (Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt).

Osborn, Eric (1997), *Tertullian: First Theologian of the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Overbeck, Franz (1882), 'Über die Anfänge der patristischen Literatur', *Historische Zeitschrift*, Vol. 48, No. 3, pp.417-72.

Pagels, Elaine (1995), *The Origin of Satan* (London: Penguin Books).

Paget, J. Carleton (2013), 'The Interpretation of the Bible in the Second Century', in J. Carleton Paget and J. Schaper (eds), *The New Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. 1: From the Beginnings to 600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.549-83.

Paget, J. Carleton, and **Schaper**, J. (eds) (2013), *The New Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. 1: From the Beginnings to 600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Palanca, Louis (1970), 'The Prose Rhythm and Gorgianic Figures in the Sermons of St. Zeno of Verona', PhD thesis, The Catholic University of America.

Parkes, James (1961), *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue: A Study of the Origins of Antisemitism* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Jewish Publication Society of America).

Parsons, Sister Wilfrid (trans.) (1951)*, St Augustine Letters, Vol. 1 (1-82),* FC 12 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press).

Parsons, Sister Wilfrid (trans.) (1953), *St Augustine Letters, Vol. 3 (131-164),* FC 20 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press).

Patterson, Lloyd George (1997), *Methodius of Olympus: Divine Sovereignty, Human Freedom and Life in Christ* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press).

Pépin, Jean (1976), *Saint Augustin et la Dialectique* (Villanova, PA: Villanova University Press).

Perler, O. (1969), *Les Voyages de saint Augustin* (Paris: Études augustiniennes).

Perrot, C., and **Bogaert**, P. M. (1976), *Pseudo-Philon: Les antiquités bibliques. II. Introduction Littéraire, commentaire et index*, SC 230 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf).

Pierce, Alexander H. (2019), 'Reconsidering Ambrose's Reception of Basil's Homiliae in Hexaemeron: The Lasting Legacy of Origen', *Journal of Ancient Christianity*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp.414-44.

Pollmann, Karla (1991), *Das Carmen adversus Marcionitas: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Prestige, G. L. (1956), *St Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*, ed. Henry Chadwick (London: SPCK).

Preus, Mary C. (1985), *Eloquence and Ignorance* in *Augustine's On the Nature and Origin of the Soul,* (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press).

Price, Richard, and **Gaddis**, Michael (2005), *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press).

Puffer, Matthew (2016), 'Retracing Augustine's Ethics: Lying, Necessity, and the Image of God', *The Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 44, No. 4, pp.685-720.

Quasten, Johannes (1960), *Patrology*, *Vol. 3, The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature from the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Chalcedon* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press).

Quinn, John M. (2002), *A Companion to the Confessions of St. Augustine* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing).

Radde-Gallwitz, Andrew (2011), '*Ad Eustathium de sancta trinitate'*, in V. H. Drecoll and M. Berghaus (eds), *Gregory of Nyssa: The Minor Treatises on Trinitarian Theology and Apollinarism* (Leiden: Brill), pp.87-109.

Radde-Gallwitz, Andrew (2017), 'The Letter Collection of Basil of Caesarea', in Cristiana Sogno, Bradley K. Storin, and Edward J. Watts (eds), *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide* (Oakland, Calif.: University of California Press), pp.69-80.

Rajak, Tessa (1999), 'Talking at Trypho: Christian Apologetic as Anti-Judaism in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*', in Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman and Simon Price (eds), *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.59-80.

Ramelli, Ilaria L. E. (2013a), 'Evagrius and Gregory: Nazianzen or Nyssen? Cappadocian (and Origenian) Influence on Evagrius', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, Vol. 53, No. 1, pp.117-37.

Ramelli, Ilaria L. E. (2013b), 'Origen in Augustine: A Paradoxical Reception', *Numen*, Vol. 60, No. 2-3, pp.280-307.

Ramelli, Ilaria L. E. (2013c), *The Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis: A Critical Assessment from the New Testament to Eriugena* (Leiden: Brill).

Ramelli, Ilaria L. E. (2015), *Evagrius's Kephalaia Gnostika: A New Translation of the Unreformed Text from the Syriac* (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature).

Ramelli, Ilaria L. E. (2018a), 'Gregory of Nyssa on the Soul (and the Restoration)', in Anna Marmodoro and Neil B. McLynn (eds), *Exploring Gregory of Nyssa: Philosophical, Theological, and Historical Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.110-41.

Ramelli Ilaria L. E. (2018b), 'Origen', in A. Marmodoro and S. Cartwright (eds), *A History of Mind and Body in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.245-66.

Ramsey, Boniface (1997), *Ambrose* (London: Routledge).

Ramsey, Boniface (2008), *Responses to Miscellaneous Questions*, WSA 1.12 (Hyde Park, N.Y.: New City Press).

Ramsey, Boniface (2010), *Revisions*, WSA 1.2 (Hyde Park, N.Y.: New City Press).

Raphael, Simcha Paull (2009), *Jewish Views of the Afterlife*, 2nd edition (Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers).

Raven, Charles E. (1923), *Apollinarianism: An Essay on the Christology of the Early Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Rebenich, Stefan (2002), *Jerome* (London: Routledge).

Reed, Annette Yoshiko (2004), 'The Trickery of the Fallen Angels and the Demonic Mimesis of the Divine: Aetiology, Demonology, and Polemics in the Writings of Justin Martyr', *Journal of Early Christian Studies,* Vol. 12, No. 2, Summer, pp.141-71.

Reed, Annette Yoshiko (2005), *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Reis, Pamela Tamarkin (1997), 'Eating the Blood: Saul and the Witch of Endor', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, Vol. 22, No. 73, pp.3-23.

Reiterer, Friedrich Vinzenz (1997), 'Review of Recent Research on the Book of Ben Sira (1980-1996)', *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28-31 July 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands* (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp.23-60.

Rescher, Nicholas (2007), *Dialectics: A Classical Approach to Inquiry* (Frankfurt: Ontos Verlag).

Riedmatten, Henri de (1948), 'Some Neglected Aspects of Apollinarist Christology', *Dominican Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp.239-60.

Riedmatten, Henri de (1956), 'Le texte des fragments exégétiques d'Apollinaire de Laodicée', *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, Vol. 44, No. 4, pp.560-6.

Rives, J. B. (1999), 'The Decree of Decius and the Religion of the Empire', *Journal of Religious Studies* Vol. 89, pp.135-54.

Robertson, Jr, D. W. (1958), *Saint Augustine: On Christian Doctrine* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall).

Rodgers, Zuleika (2012), 'Josephus's Biblical Interpretation', in Matthias Henze (ed.), *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans), pp.436-64.

Rooy, H. F. van (2009), 'Reading the Psalms Historically: Antiochene Exegesis and a Historical Reading of Psalm 46', *Acta Theologica*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp.120-34.

Rose, Paula Johanna (2013), *A Commentary on Augustine's De Cura pro mortuis gerenda: Rhetoric in Practice* (Leiden: Brill).

Rosenberg, Stanley P. (2013), 'Beside Books: Approaching Augustine's Sermons in Oral and Textual Cultures of Late Antiquity', in G. Partoens, A. Dupont, and M. Lamberigts (eds), *Ministerium Sermonis II: Philological, Historical and Theological Studies on Augustine's Sermones ad Populum* (Turnhout: Brepols), pp.405-42.

Rousseau, Philip (1994), *Basil of Caesarea* (Berkley, Calif.: University of California Press).

Salvesen, Alison (2003), 'A Convergence of the Ways? The Judaizing of Christian Scripture by Origen and Jerome', in Adam H Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed (eds), *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), pp.233-58.

Schäublin, Christoph (1981), 'Diodor von Tarsus', in G. Krause and G. Müller (eds), *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, Vol. 8 (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp.763-7.

Schäublin, Christoph (2004), 'The contribution of Rhetorics to Christian Hermeneutics', in Charles Kannengiesser (ed.), *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient* Christianity, Vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill), pp.149-63.

Schmidt, Brian B. (1995), '"The Witch" of En-dor, 1 Samuel 28, and Ancient Near Eastern Necromancy', in Marvin W. Meyer and Paul A. Mirecki (eds), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power* (Leiden: Brill), pp.111-29.

Schor, Adam M. (2011), *Theodoret's People: Social Networks and Religious Conflict in Late Roman Syria* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press).

Schreiner, Susan E. (1988), 'Eve, the Mother of History: Reaching for the Reality of History in Augustine's Later Exegesis of Genesis', in Gregory A. Robbins (ed.), *Genesis 1–3 in the History of Exegesis: Intrigue in the Garden* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press), pp.135-86.

Schröter, Jens; **Edsall,** Benjamin A., and **Verheyden**, Joseph (eds) (2021), *Jews and Christians – Parting Ways in the First Two Centuries CE?: Reflections on the Gains and Losses of a Model* (Berlin: De Gruyter).

Schweitzer, Steven J. (2011), 'The Temple in Samuel–Kings and Chronicles', in Jeremy Corley and Harm van Grol (eds), *Rewriting Biblical History: Essays on Chronicles and Ben Sira in Honor of Pancratius C. Beentjes* (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp.123-38.

Sébastien, Louis (Le Nain de Tillemont) (2010), *The Life of Augustine. Part 1, Childhood to Episcopal Consecration (354-396)*, trans. Frederick Van Fleteren (New York: Peter Lang).

Secord, Jared (2021), *Christian Intellectuals and the Roman Empire: From Justin Martyr to Origen*, (University Park, Pa: Penn State University Press).

Senneville-Grave, Ghislaine de (1999), *Sulpice Sévère: Chroniques,* SC 441 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf).

Setzer, Claudia J. (1994), *Jewish Responses to Early Christians: History and Polemics, 30-150 C.E.* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press).

Sheerin, Daniel (1976), 'St. John the Baptist in the Lower World', *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp.1-22.

Silvas, A. M. (2007), *Gregory of Nyssa: The Letters* (Leiden: Brill).

Simonetti, Manlio (1955), *Studi agiografici* (Rome: Signorelli).

Simonetti, Manlio (1989), *La Maga di Endor: Origene, Eustazio, Gregorio di Nissa* (Florence: Nardini).

Simonetti, Manlio (1994), *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, trans. John A. Hughes (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

Sinkewizc, Robert E. (2003), *Evagrius of Pontus: The Greek Ascetic Corpus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Smelik, K. A. D. (1979), 'The Witch of Endor: I Samuel 28 in Rabbinic and Christian Exegesis Till 800 A.D.', *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 33, No. 2, June, pp.160-79.

Smith, George A. (2008), 'How Thin is a Demon?', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, Vol. 16, No. 4, Winter, pp.479-512.

Spanneut, Michel (1948), *Recherches sur le écrits d'Eustathe d'Antioch avec une edition nouvelle des fragments dogmatiques et exégétiques* (Lille: Facultés Catholiques).

Stafaniw, Blossom (2010), *Mind, Text and Commentary: Noetic Exegesis in Origen of Alexandria, Didymus the Blind and Evagrius Ponticus* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang).

Stancliffe, Clare (1983), *St. Martin and his Hagiographer: History and Miracle in Sulpicius Severus*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Steinhauser, Kenneth B. (1995), 'Codex Leningradensis Q.v.I.3: Some Unresolved Problems', in Duane W. H. Arnold and Pamela Bright (eds), *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press), pp.33-43.

Stylianopoulos, T. (1975), *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press).

Swift, Louis J. (1999), 'Ambrose', in Everett Ferguson (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Early Christianity: Second Edition* (New York: Routledge), pp.41-4.

Teske, Roland (trans.) (1997), *Answer to the Pelagians: The Punishment and Forgiveness of Sins and the Baptism of Little Ones, The Spirit and the Letter, Nature and Grace, The Perfection of Human Righteousness, The Deeds of Pelagius, The Grace of Christ and Original Sin, The Nature and Origin of the Soul*, ed. John E. Rotelle, WSA 1.23 (Hyde Park, N.Y.: New City Press).

Teske, Roland (trans.) (2001)*, Letters 1-99*, ed. John E. Rotelle, WSA 2.1 (Hyde Park, N.Y.: New City Press).

Teske, Roland (trans.) (2004), *Letters 156-210*, ed. Boniface Ramsey, WSA 2.3 (Hyde Park, N.Y.: New City Press).

Tieck, William A. (1953), 'Basil of Caesarea and the Bible', PhD thesis, Columbia University.

Timmerman, David M., and **Schiappa,** Edward (2010), *Classical Greek Rhetorical Theory and the Disciplining of Discourse* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Tissot, Gabriel (1956), *Ambroise de Milan: Traité sur l'Évangile de S. Luc*, Vol. 1, SC 45 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf).

Torjesen, Karen Jo (1986), *Hermeneutical Procedure and Theological Method in Origen's Exegesis* (Berlin: De Gruyter).

Toth, Peter (2014), 'New Questions on Old Answers: Towards a Critical Edition of the *Answers to the Orthodox* of Pseudo-Justin', *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. 65, No. 2, October, pp.550-99.

Trakatellis, D. C. (1986), 'Justin Martyr's Trypho', *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 79, No. 1-3, pp.287-97.

Trencsényi-Waldapfel, I. (1961), 'Die Hexe von Endor und die Griechisch-Römische Welt', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, Vol. 12, No. 1-3, pp.201-22.

Trigg, Joseph W. (1988), *Biblical Interpretation* (Wilmington, Del.: Glazier).

Trigg, Joseph W. (1991). 'The Angel of Great Counsel: Christ and the Angelic Hierarchy in Origen's Theology', *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. 42, No. 1, April, pp.35-51.

Trigg, Joseph W. (1995), 'Eustathius of Antioch's Attack on Origen: What Is at Issue in an Ancient Controversy?', *Journal of Religion*, Vol. 75, No. 2, April, pp.219-38.

Turcescu, Lucian (2005), *Gregory of Nyssa and the Concept of Divine Persons* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Tzvetkova-Glaser, Anna (2013), '"Evil is not a Nature": Origen on Evil and the Devil', in Erkki Koskenniemi and Ida Fröhlich (eds), *Evil and the Devil* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark), pp.180-9.

Ulrich, Jr, Eugene Charles (1978), *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press).

VanderKam, J.C. (2000), 'Simon the Just: Simon I or Simon II?', in J. C. VanderKam (ed.), *From Revelation to Canon. Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (Leiden: Brill), pp.224-40.

VanMaaren, John (2013), 'The Adam-Christ Typology in Paul and its Development in the Early Church Fathers', *Tyndale Bulletin*, Vol. 64, No. 2, pp.275-97.

Verheijen, Luc (1974), 'Le De Doctrina Christiana de saint Augustin', *Augustiniana*, Vol. 24, pp.10-20.

Vogt, Hermann J. (2004), 'Origen of Alexandria (185-253)', in Charles Kannengiesser (ed.), *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient* Christianity, Vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill), pp.536-74.

Vokes, F. E. (1966), 'Zeno of Verona, Apuleius, and Africa', *Studia Patristica* 8, pp.130-4.

Wallace-Hadrill, D. S. (1960), *Eusebius of Caesarea* (London: Mowbray).

Wallace-Hadrill, D. S. (1982), *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Waszink, J. H. (1979), 'Tertullian's Principles and Methods of Exegesis', in W. R. Schoedel and R. L. Wilken (eds), *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition: In Honorem Robert M. Grant* (Paris: Beauchesne), pp.17-31.

Waszink, J. H. (2010), *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani De Anima*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae (Leiden: Brill).

Wiebe, Gregory D. (2021), *Fallen Angels in the Theology of St Augustine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Wilhite, David E. (2020), 'Tertullian on the Afterlife: "Only Martyrs are in Heaven" and Other Misunderstandings', *Journal of Ancient Christianity*, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp.490-508.

Williams, Megan Hale (2006), *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press).

Williams, Michael Stuart (2011), 'Time and authority in the Chronicle of Sulpicius Severus', in Alexandra Lianeri (ed.), *The Western Time of Ancient History: Historiographical Encounters with the Greek and Roman Pasts* (New York: Cambridge University Press), pp.280-97.

Wolfson, Harry A. (1958), 'Philosophical Implications of Arianism and Apollinarianism', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol. 12, pp.3-28.

Wray, T. J and **Mobley**, Gregory (2005), *The Birth of Satan: Tracing the Devil's Biblical Roots* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Wright (III), Benjamin G. (2008), 'The Use and Interpretation of Biblical Tradition in Ben Sira's Praise of the Ancestors', in Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér (eds), *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira: Papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Shime'on Centre, Pápa, Hungary, 18-20 May, 2006* (Leiden: Brill), pp.183-207.

Wright (III), Benjamin G. (2012), 'Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Ben Sira', in Matthias Henze (ed.), *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans), pp.363-88.

Young, Frances (1989), 'The Rhetorical Schools and Their Influence on Patristic Exegesis', in Rowan Williams (ed.), *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.182-99.

Young, Frances (1990), *The Art of Performance: Towards a Theology of Holy Scripture* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd).

Young, Frances (1997), *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Young, Frances (2006), 'Towards a Christian *paideia*,' in Frances M. Young and Margaret M. Mitchell (eds), *Origins to Constantine, Vol. 1 of The Cambridge History of Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.485-500.

Young, Frances (2010) [with Andrew Teal]*, From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and Its Background*, 2nd edition (London: SCM Press).

Young, Frances (2013), 'Traditions of exegesis', in J. Carleton Paget and J. Schaper (eds), *The New Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. 1: From the Beginnings to 600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.734-51.

Young, Frances (2018), *Ways of Reading Scripture: Collected Papers* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Zaharapoulos, Dimitri Z. (1989), *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Bible: A Study of His Old Testament Exegesis* (New York: Paulist Press).

Zamagni, Claudio (2011), 'Eusebius' Exegesis Between Alexandria and Antioch: Being a Scholar in Caesarea (A Text Case from Questions to Stephanos I)', in Sabrina Inowlocki and Claudio Zamagni (eds), *Reconsidering Eusebius: Collected Papers on Literary, Historical, and Theological Issues* (Leiden: Brill), pp.151-76.

Ziegler, Joseph (1975), *Eusebius Werke IX: Der Jesajakommentar* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).

Zelewski, Saul (1989), 'The Purpose of the Story of the Death of Saul in 1 Chronicles X', *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 39, No. 4, October, pp.449-67.

Zwierlein, O. (2014), *Die Urfassungen der Martyria Polycarpi et Pionii und Das Corpus Polycarpianum, Band 2: Textgeschichte und Rekonstruktion. Polycarp, Ignatius und der Redaktor Ps.-Pionius* (Berlin: De Gruyter).