GREEKS, JEWS, HERETICS, AND THE CHURCH OF GOD

Ecclesiology in the Catechetical Lectures of St Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem

by

Kristian Akselberg
Pembroke College, Oxford

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of Theology and Religion of the University of Oxford in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Trinity Term, 2017

Faculty of Theology and Religion, Gibson Building, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, Oxford OX2 6GG


ΚΥΡΙΛ-
ΛΟΣ
ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΩΝ
ΕΙΣ ΜΙΑΝ
ΑΓΙΑΝ
ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΗΝ
ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙ-
ΑΝ.

Ἀπολυτίκιον τοῦ Ἁγίου Κυρίλλου
(*ἦχος γ΄. Τὴν ὡραιότητα*).

Στολήν τὴν ἔνθεον, ἀμφιασάμενος,
στῦλος ὁλόφωστος ὤφθης τῆς πίστεως,
τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἐν Σιών τὴν χάριν κεκληρωμένος·
ὅθεν ἐνδιέπρεψας εὐσεβείας τοῖς δόγμασι
καὶ πιστῶς ἐσκόρπισας τῆς σοφίας τὸ τάλαντον.
Καί νῦν ὑπέρ ἡμῶν ἐκδυσώπει,
Κύριλλε Πάτερ Ἱεράρχα.

Κοντάκιον τοῦ Ἁγίου Κυρίλλου
(*ἦχος γ΄. Ἡ Παρθένος σήμερον*).

Φερωνύμος γέγονε, τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίᾳ,
ὁ φωσφόρος λόγος σου, κῦρος οὐράνιον, Πάτερ·
γνῶσιν γὰρ τῆς ἀληθείας, Πάτερ, διδάσκων,
ἔλλαμψιν ἠθῶν ὁσίων καθυπογράφεις
καὶ παθῶν βραβεύεις λύσιν,
τῇ σῇ πρεσβείᾳ, θεόφρον Κύριλλε.

For Irene,
Maria Elisabeth, Johannes,
and Sofia.

ABSTRACT

The following study seeks to explore the subjects of Christianisation and Christian identity during the transitional period of the fourth century from an ecclesiological perspective, and argues that the very question of Christian identity is, indeed, an ecclesiological one. It approaches the subject through the writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, specifically his *Catechetical Lectures*, the earliest complete catechetical programme that has come down to us, making it an invaluable resource for anyone hoping to understand the Catholic Church's efforts to preserve and construct its identity in the wake of Constantine's formal conversion to its faith. Moreover, Cyril, who became bishop of the Holy City around 350, affords us a unique perspective on the question at hand, teaching as he did from the "very centre of the earth", following the creation of a Christian holy land and pilgrimage centre in the midst of what remained a largely pagan province, and in a city still central to Judaism. The ability to possess the sites and relics associated with the life of Christ and the Prophets for the first time in Christian history not only made the drama of salvation tangible in Jerusalem like nowhere else, but raised new and important questions around the extent to which this sacred topography was compatible with Christianity's departure from the temple-centred worship of the Old Testament. It also provides valuable insight into the relationship between the local and the universal as regards notions of the Church's catholicity, Cyril's definition of *καθολική* in his eighteenth lecture arguably being the earliest.

Membership of the Church, and therefore Christian identity, is for Cyril primarily ontological, defined and effected through mysteriological participation, with baptism — the believer's death, rebirth, and union with Christ — representing the dividing line between insider and outsider, a fact enforced by the so-called *Disciplina Arcani*, by which all knowledge of the Church's sacraments were jealously guarded from the unbaptised. The thesis explores how this notion of ontological membership underpins and informs Cyril's dealings with the various groups against which he sought to define his own community — the Greeks, Jews, and heretics — while also looking at the ecclesiological significance of the baptismal act itself.

CONTENT

Preface……..……..……...i

1. Life and Works……...……1

2. *Wash you, make you clean*: Ecclesiological images in Cyril's baptismal theology…….……...…….14

3. The Greeks: The development of an ecclesiological ontology as a response to Graeco–Roman religion and philosophy……..…….....47

4. The Centre of the World: Hagiopolitan pilgrimage as a spatial expression of catholicity…….……64

5. St Cyril and the Jews: The Church as the Second Israel……..…….…..95

6. The Tribe of Heretics: Heresiology as an expression of catholicity.…….124

7. Called But Not Yet Chosen: The catechumenate as a facilitator of catholicity…….....……..…….148

8. *We deliver to thee a mystery*: St Cyril's use of the *Disciplina Arcani* and its ecclesiological implications……...169

9. The Limits of Grace: St Cyril's rejection of heretical baptism and its ecclesiological implications.....……...195

10. Conclusion……..…220

Appendix 1 — The Jerusalem Creed……..…223

Bibliography…….....224

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Cyril's Works

Ad Const.	Epistola ad Constantium imperatorem
CL	Catechetical Lectures
Hom. Par.	Homilia in paralyticum
MC	Mystagogical Catecheses
PC	Procatechesis

Other Primary Sources

Ad Ill.	Ad Illuminandos Catechesis
AC	Apostolic Constitutions
Ad Comp.	Instructio ad Competentes
Ad Cyp.	Epistola ad Cyprianum
Adv. Haer.	Adversus Haereses
Adv. Jud.	Adversus Judaeos
1 Apol.	First Apology
Apol. C. Arianos	Apologia Contra Arianos
Ap. Trad.	Apostolic Tradition
Bapt. Diff.	De iis qui baptismum differunt
Bapt. Hom.	Baptismal Homilies
Cat. Stav.	Catéchèses Stavronikita (Wenger 1970, SC 50)
C. Cels.	Contra Celsum
Chron.	Chronicon
C. Io.	Contra Iohannem
Cod. Theod.	Codex Theodosianus
Comm. Cant.	Commentarii in Canticum canticorum
Comm. Jo.	Commentarii in Johannem
C. Sym.	Contra Sympronianum
Dem. Evang.	Demonstratio Evangelica
De Syn.	De Synodis
Dial.	Dialogue with Trypho
Doct. Christ.	De Doctrina Christiana
Enar. In. Ps.	Enarrationes in Psalmos
Ep.	Epistola
Ep. Afr.	Epistola ad Africanum
Ev. Jo. Tract.	In Evangelium Joannis Tractatus
Ex. Acc.	Expositio Accurata Fidei Orthodoxae
Ex. Apoc.	Explanatio Apocalypsis
HE	Historia Ecclesiastica
Hom.	Homily
Hom. In Gen.	Homiliae in Genesin
In Ep. Eph	In Epistulam ad Ephesios
In Jo.	In Johannem

S.Bapt.	In Sanctum Baptisma
In Mt. Hom.	Homilarium in Matthæum
In Ps. 118 Expos	In Psalmum David 118 Expositio
It. Hier.	Itinera Hierosolymitana
Jud. Et gent.	Contra Judæos et Gentiles
Lit. Interp.	Sacrae Liturgiae Interpretatio
Mart. Palest.	Martyrs of Palestine
Myst.	De Mysteriis
Ob. Theod.	De Obitu Theodosii Oratio
Pan.	Panarion
Ped.	Pedalion
Pereg.	Peregrinatio Egeriæ
P-K	Papadopoulos-Kerameus Series
Symp.	Symposium
Unit. Eccl.	Unitate Ecclesiae
Vita Const.	Vita Constantini
V. Rel.	De Vera Religione

Journals and Collections

ACW	Ancient Christian Writers
ANF	Ante-Nicene Fathers
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
DOP	Dumbarton Oaks Papers
FC	The Fathers of the Church
GCS	Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller
GOTR	The Greek Orthodox Theological Review
JECS	Journal of Early Christian Studies
JEH	Journal of Ecclesiastical History
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
NETS	New English Translation of the Septuagint
NPNF	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers
OCP	Orientala Christiana Periodica
PEQ	Palestine Exploration Quarterly
PG	Migne’s Patrologia Graeca
PL	Migne’s Patrologia Latina
PO	Patrologia Orientalis
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
SC	Sources Chrétiennes
SCI	Scripta Classica Israelica
SL	Studia Liturgica
SP	Studia Patristica
VC	Vigiliae Christianae
ZAC	Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum

PREFACE

Historians of the fourth century have long told the story of the obscure Jewish sect that, after three centuries of persecution, in a dramatic reversal of fortunes, became the favoured religion of its former oppressor, the Roman State. After the divinely inspired conversion of the Emperor Constantine, it was but a matter of time before the fading light of a tired and defeated paganism[1] was utterly extinguished, driven away by a superior monotheism "like the dust that the wind flings from off the land."[2] Even now, this "Christian 'representation' of the history of the fourth century has survived, in thinly laicized form, in the majority of modern narratives of the period."[3] In the light of more in-depth scholarship, however, it must be conceded that the reality of the Christianisation of the Empire, divinely inspired or not, was a far more lengthy and complex process, one we are still struggling to understand.

The attempt to forge a Christian identity is inseparably linked with the formation of a corresponding ecclesiology. While the subject has received significant attention among academics in recent years — the twentieth century has even been referred to as "the age of Ecclesiology"[4] — modern studies on ecclesiology have tended to deal only with the modern context. Although many such studies emphasise a return to the patristic sources, this return is largely utilitarian in nature, an attempt to mine such writings for concepts on which to build

[1] The term 'paganism', used by the early Christian Church to pejoratively describe the various forms of traditional Graeco-Roman religion, has fallen out of favour with many modern scholars mainly because an 'ism' "implies a degree of coherence, of self-consciousness and of doctrinal unity among the members of the group being defined by the word" that one cannot ascribe to the diversity of non-Abrahamic religious expression in the Late Antique Roman world (North 2005, 128). However, North points out that many of the favoured alternatives, while not pejorative, are equally imprecise (Ibid., 134). Limitations notwithstanding, I have chosen to use the term here, not only for the sake of convenience, but because it captures rather well the sharp dichotomous categories in which Cyril was wont to speak. See also Brown 1998b, 639.

[2] Psalm 1:4 (*NETS*). In my translated citations from *PC*, *CL*, and *MC*, I have used *NETS* where Cyril quotes the Old Testament directly, but keeping the standard English forms for biblical names. Chapter and verse numbering therefore correspond to said edition of the Septuagint. The translations themselves are a thorough revision of the older translations by Church (1872) and Gifford (1893), based on the critical editions of Reischl and Rupp (1848–60) and Piedagnel (2009), provided in the footnotes. New Testament citations are based on the Authorised Version and the English Standard Version.

[3] Brown 1998b, 633.

[4] Vlachos 1998, 9

and further current ecclesiological efforts, rather than seeking to understand the subtleties of the authors' own understandings of the Church. Discussions on the development of Christian identity have therefore largely remained within the field of historical anthropology, while purely ecclesiological studies have primarily come from modern creative theologians seeking to shed light on the Christian diversity and divisions of our own age.

Though limited to a particular confessional context, a good example of the pressing need for such study was the recent convocation of the so-called 'Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church',[5] held on the Greek island of Crete on Pentecost Sunday 2016, where, after nearly a century of preparation, the heads of all 14 autocephalous local churches belonging to the Eastern Orthodox Church were to gather for the first time for over a millennium.[6] Its subsequent near collapse as four churches[7] pulled out only a matter of weeks before the agreed date took many by surprise. While the issues raised were numerous, the use of the word "church" in the text *Relation of the Orthodox Church with the rest of the Christian world* became the primary point of contention. What does the word *church* mean in a dogmatic context? Of whom can it be used? Are there churches in addition to the *One, holy, catholic and apostolic Church* of the Creed, or does the designation *church* impart to whichever Christian community it describes membership, full or partial, of that *one Church*? The final text agreed upon by the council tried, not unexpectedly, to avoid these questions entirely, deciding instead to acknowledge only the "historical appellation" of other churches,[8] a formulation so brilliantly meaningless that its inclusion only served to highlight the depth of the divide it was attempting

[5] See the newly published volume edited by Maksim Vasiljević and Andrej Jeftic (2017).

[6] Although promoted as such, this is not entirely correct. The *Encyclical of the Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church* itself makes mention in section I.3 of a number of "councils of universal authority" held between 1341 and 1872. See Hovorun 2016.

[7] The patriarchates of Antioch, Moscow, Georgia, and Bulgaria. The patriarchate of Serbia, having initially declared their intention to abstain, later decided to rejoin, but only on the condition that the problematic texts would be up for revision.

[8] 'Σχέσεις της Ορθοδόξου Εκκλησίας προς τον λοιπόν Χριστιανικόν κόσμον', 6 (3 October 2017: https://www.holycouncil.org/-/rest-of-christian-world?_101_INSTANCE_VA0WE2pZ4Y0I_languageId=el_GR). This suggested compromise was put forward by the delegation representing the Church of Greece, which had seen significant opposition to the original wording from senior clerics and respected theologians alike.

to bridge. Indeed, this reluctance to directly address this divisive dogmatic question has deprived the conversation of much needed input from serious academic research, hampering any real progress and leaving it to the mercy of reactionary elements. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to provide any kind of definitive answer, but I hope it will be a useful aid to further exploration of the topic.

I have chosen to approach the subject at hand by focusing on the writings of the fourth century bishop of Jerusalem, Cyril, who belonged to the first generation of Christian bishops born into a Roman Empire led by a Christian emperor. The conscious efforts of Constantine to make Jerusalem, a hitherto typical pagan and Roman city, a religious centre of both the Empire and the Christian Church,[9] makes it key to the question of Christanisation, not only because it represented one of the most direct challenges of Christianity to the traditional cults, but also because the attempted creation of such a geographical midpoint at the place of its birth forced the Church to engage in internal reflection, specifically on the extent to which it belonged to or was to engage with the world.

The aim of this thesis is to look at how a figure so uniquely situated as Cyril attempted to define the nature and boundaries of the Church at this critical time in Christian history, when the Catholic Church saw itself become the favoured religion of the imperial powers in an empire still firmly entrenched in paganism. What had previously been an external enemy, capable of killing the body but not the souls of Christians,[10] had now, through mass conversions to Cyril's faith, in many ways become an internal threat, capable of rotting the Church from within. Catechists faced for the first time, not a sincere group of believers willing to risk life and limb to enter a proscribed community, but great numbers of converts seeking, not an encounter with the risen Christ, but social advancement or personal favours. I intend to look at

[9] Hunt 1997.
[10] cf. Matt. 10:28.

the ways in which Cyril responds to these newfound challenges while making use of the many new opportunities afforded to bishops like him. While it is unquestionable that the translation of episcopal authority from the purely ecclesiastical to the social and political had the potential to, and in many cases did, place personal ambition above piety and dogmatic fidelity, what we see in Cyril's writings is a fervent attempt to retain the purity of the pre-Constantinian Church, both in faith and practice. As the Church gains the acceptance and inclusion of the general society, the move of its hierarchy is towards exclusion of the other and a strengthening of the means thereto. I shall argue in this thesis that Cyril saw membership of the Church as primarily ontological, defined by baptism and wider participation in the mysteries, in which the old man was put to death and a new one formed in the bosom of the *ekklēsia*. His identification of these ontological and mysteriological boundaries of the Church with its visible, canonical boundaries meant that those on the inside and outside thereof belonged to radically and irreconcilably different worlds. While the cleft dividing these two worlds had previously been kept open by the sword of persecution,[11] the nominal Christianisation of the Empire caused a blurring of this dividing line and thus, amidst a sea of opportunity, presented the hierarchs of the fourth century with an urgent and serious challenge.[12]

A primary tool in responding to this challenge was catechism, which served to prepare future Christians for this radical border crossing, which involved an entirely new way of life and an abandonment of all that had formerly characterised them as outsiders. Cyril's collection

[11] The actual extent of Christian persecution and martyrdom in the first three centuries has been questioned by some recent scholars (see, for example, Moss 2013). However, even if we accept modern claims that the phenomenon was greatly exaggerated by early Christians, a perception of persecution would nonetheless have been a powerful tool in keeping the Christian and non-Christian worlds apart, a perception changed in the 4th century.

[12] Wolfram Kinzig (1976, 240) challenges Gerhard Ruhbach's assertion that the Church was ill prepared for this sudden change, lacking the criteria with which to describe its new relationship with the state, arguing that, while the Church was certainly "*psychologically*" ill prepared, the "theological traditions of the persecuted Church" developed during the third century were already at the Church's disposal, and would be the criteria with which it was to assess said relationship (id. 1993, 134). The defensive position of figures like Cyril, therefore, represented continuation, not abrupt change.

of *Catechetical Lectures* represents one of the oldest complete catechetical programmes, making him a particularly significant figure in this regard. Despite this, as the author of a recent article on Cyril laments, "this ecclesiastical Father is rarely remembered. An erudite inheritor and teacher of the 'apostolic doctrines (teachings)' at Jerusalem during the most critical and transitional 4th century of Christianity, he is forgotten or even unknown."[13] While a number of monographs on Cyril have appeared in the last decade,[14] in addition to a number of articles, he remains

> an understudied voice from the patristic period […] and his lack of substantial bearing or influence upon the debates of the second half of the century, often see him sidelined in studies of the era. He receives only passing mention in otherwise thoroughgoing monographs, and it is a rare university syllabus that dwells much on him between Nicea and Athanasius or the Cappadocians. Cyril is a catechist, a teacher, an exponent of baptism and Christian initiation, who uses 'another creed' (i.e. not that of Nicea) but otherwise is not heavily engaged in the expansive post-Nicene theological project. It is, however, precisely Cyril's lack of direct engagement in those disputes that makes his witness important.[15]

I therefore hope the present work will also fill a gap in our understanding of this witness.

Cyril explains the primary purpose of his catechetical programme in his fourth catechetical lecture, which acts as something of a summary of the subsequent fourteen lectures, namely to develop in those who were preparing for baptism — many of whom, he admits, had initially come for the wrong reasons[16] — the discernment necessary to distinguish between what is genuinely good and profitable, and the illusionary wisdom and beauty by which the devil seeks to devour the souls of men. He opens with a citation from Paul's epistle to the Colossians, "See to it that no one takes you captive by philosophy and empty deceit,"[17] and proceeds to explain that,

---

[13] Bekiares 2016, 7. Translation mine: "Σχεδόν ἤ μᾶλλον ἀγνοεῖ ἕναν περισπούδαστο κληρονόμο και διδάσκαλο τῶν «ἀποστολικῶν δογμάτων (*διδασκαλιῶν*)» στά Ἱεροσόλυμα τοῦ κρισιμότατου μεταβατικοῦ Δ΄ αἰώνα τῆς χριστιανοσύνης."

[14] See chapter 1.

[15] Steenberg 2009, 128–9.

[16] *PC* 5.

[17] "Βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης" — Col. 2:8.

> Evil imitates virtue, and the tares strive to be taken for wheat. They are like wheat in appearance, but the discerning recognise them by their taste. Even the devil t*ransforms himself into an angel of light*[18] […] We therefore need divine grace, a sober mind, and seeing eyes: lest eating the tares as wheat, we are hurt on account of our ignorance; lest taking the wolf for a sheep, we become his prey […] For this reason the Church admonishes; for this reason we hold the present teachings; for this reason, the lections are read.[19]

The military analogies employed in his *Procatechesis* are similarly defensive. Catechism is "an armour against the antagonist power; against heresies, against Jews, and Samaritans, and Gentiles," and although the baptismal candidates are told they "must learn how to throw [darts] at the Hellene"[20] and use the "sword of the Spirit" to "war the Lord's warfare", they are to do so, not to subdue them, but to "remain undefeated by every heretical thing."[21] One imagines, then, not an army advancing on their enemies in order to vanquish and colonise them, but a people besieged on all sides — by heretics, by Jews, by Samaritans, and by Hellenes — hurling down arrows in order to keep attackers from entering. In particular, "the Hellenes by their smooth tongues drag you away, *for honey drips from the lips of a prostituting woman*[22] […] This gives occasion to the teaching of faith, and explanations thereof."[23] While all were welcomed into the fold, the catechumenate ensured that those who chose to enter would not bring with them contagion from the outside. By giving them, through catechesis, the ability to discern what is the good, pleasing, and perfect will of God, the Church would be in a position

---

[18] 2 Cor. 11:14.

[19] *CL* 4.1 — "Μιμεῖται τὴν ἀρετὴν ἡ κακία, καὶ τὸ ζιζάνιον βιάζεται σῖτος νομισθῆναι· σχήματι μὲν πρὸς τὸν σῖτον ἐξομοιούμενον, ἐκ δὲ τῆς γεύσεως ὑπὸ τῶν διακριτικῶν ἐξελεγχόμενον. Καὶ ὁ Διάβολος μετασχηματίζεται εἰς ἄγγελον φωτὸς […]. Χρεία τοίνυν θείας ἡμῖν χάριτος, καὶ νηφαλίου διανοίας καὶ βλεπόντων ὀφθαλμῶν· ἵνα μήτε τὸ ζιζάνιον ὡς σῖτον φαγόντες, ἐξ ἀγνοίας βλαβῶμεν· μήτε τὸν λύκον πρόβατον ὑπολαβόντες, θηρευθῶμεν· […] Διὰ τοῦτο ἡ Ἐκκλησία νουθετεῖ, διὰ τοῦτο τὰ παρόντα διδασκαλεῖα, διὰ τοῦτο τὰ ἀναγνώσματα γίνονται".

[20] I have in many instances chosen to translate the word Ἕλληνας as *Hellene* rather than *Greek* as it better captures the cultural, philosophical, and religious connotations of the word as used by Cyril and his contemporaries.

[21] *PC* 10 — The full passage reads: "Ὅπλα γὰρ λαμβάνεις κατὰ ἀντικειμένης ἐνεργείας· ὅπλα λαμβάνεις κατὰ αἱρέσεων, κατὰ Ἰουδαίων, καὶ Σαμαρειτῶν, καὶ Ἐθνῶν· πολλοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἔχεις, πολλὰ βέλη λάμβανε· πρὸς πολλοὺς γὰρ ἀκοντίζεις· καὶ χρεία σοι μαθεῖν πῶς κατακοντίσῃς τὸν Ἕλληνα, πῶς ἀγωνίσῃ πρὸς αἱρετικὸν, πρὸς Ἰουδαῖον καὶ Σαμαρείτην· καὶ τὰ μὲν ὅπλα ἕτοιμα, καὶ τὸ ξίφος τοῦ Πνεύματος ἑτοιμότατον· δεῖ δὲ καὶ δεξιὰς τείνειν διὰ προαιρέσεως ἀγαθῆς, ἵνα πόλεμον Κυρίου πολεμήσῃς, ἵνα νικήσῃς ἀντικειμένας ἐνεργείας, ἵνα ἀήττητος γένῃ παντὶ αἱρετικῷ πράγματι."

[22] Prov. 3:5.

[23] *CL* 4.2 — "οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες, διὰ τῆς εὐγλωττίας κατασύρουσι· Μέλι γὰρ ἀποστάζει ἀπὸ χειλέων γυναικὸς πόρνης [...] Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ τῆς Πίστεως διδασκαλία, καὶ αἱ εἰς αὐτὴν ἐξηγήσεις γίνονται."

to transfigure them through the renewing of their mind, rather than itself being conformed to the world from which they had come.[24] This in turn allowed the Church to preserve what had hitherto been its most effective missionary tool, namely the exemplary moral conduct and commitment to God for which its initiated members were renowned.[25]

Although this is not a work on catechism *per se*, given the fact that our primary source is Cyril's series of *Catechetical Lectures* it seemed natural that the chapters of this thesis should reflect the same gradual movement of the outsider towards initiation into the Catholic Church, looking at how Cyril addresses the different groups of outsiders, arranged by their relative proximity to his own position — Hellenes, Jews, heretics, and catechumens — before finally turning to his understanding of the place of baptism within the process of initiation. However, unlike Cyril's catechumens, who were not given to understand the true nature of their participatory membership of the Church until after their initiation, I do not intend to leave the readers of this thesis in the dark until the very end. Therefore, after Chapter 1, which consists of a brief overview of Cyril's life and works, Chapter 2 first provides a clear framework for the thesis by looking at how Cyril understands the Church and ontological membership thereof by exploring the various ecclesiological images present in his baptismal theology: the Church as the hospital, new creation, and mother of its members, and as the bride and body of Christ. Our wider study of the borders of the Church — particularly notions of 'insider' and 'outsider' — begins in Chapter 3, where I explore Cyril's attitude to the Greeks, or Hellenes, and his unwillingness to engage with traditional Graeco-Roman thought and religion within the common framework of neo-platonic philosophy, as figures such as Origen had previously done. This lack of engagement owes to the development of a rival framework, one of Christian

[24] Cf. Rom. 12:2.

[25] On this, see the *Epistle to Diognetus* 5–7 (trans. Holmes 2007, 701–7), where the author identifies the distinctiveness of Christians as consisting not in their language, customs, dress, diet, or other exentricities, but in their exemplary moral character: "In a word, what the soul is to the body, Christians are to the world" (6.1) "These things do not look like human works; they are the power of God, they are proofs of his presence" (7.9).

ontology, which I argue is intrinsically ecclesiological, not only because the Church provides the necessary context for this ontology, but because mysteriological participation — that is, ontological membership — in the life of the Church was necessary for any genuine engagement with it.

The confrontation with paganism was not merely intellectual, of course, and so Chapter 4 looks at the spatial-geographical aspects of 'catholicity' — 'Catholic' being the unique signifier by which Cyril identified his Church — through the lens of fourth-century attitudes to pilgrimage and sacred topography, following Constantine's promotion of Jerusalem as a Christian holy land. Making reference to the recent reinterpretations of Ignatius of Antioch's use of the word *καθολική*, I argue that Cyril sees Jerusalem as the prototypical Church, which is then replicated and fully manifested in each local Catholic community, thus reconciling opposing concerns for the Church's universal and local dimensions.

Religious possession of Jerusalem leads naturally on to the theme of Chapter 5, namely Cyril's attitude to Judaism. The chapter argues that what we commonly call *Adversus Judaeos* literature was not, in fact, directed at Jews, but at Christians, and that Cyril's anti-Jewish polemic is concerned with establishing the notion of the Catholic Church as the New Israel, the one unique people and nation of the one God.

Having demarcated the Church vis-à-vis paganism and Judaism, Chapter 6 looks at Cyril's heresiology. In addition to establishing orthodoxy and doctrinal purity as a hallmark of catholicity, and therefore necessary to the very identity of the Church, Cyril's failure to distinguish between different types of heretics based on their relative doctrinal proximity to his own community betrays a binary insider–outsider view of Church membership and Christian identity, again pointing to the importance of membership of the Church as an ontological reality. This argument is continued in Chapter 7, where we meet a different kind of Christian

outsider: namely, the catechumen. While others have written about the near disappearance of the catechumenate in the fourth century — the institution having buckled under the weight of mass conversion — I instead argue that it became instrumental in preserving the Church's catholic identity by creating a buffer zone between it and the outside world, allowing it to formally embrace every type of person, all the while preserving intact its doctrinal and moral character by limiting those it admitted to baptism. Central to preserving the distinction between nominal Church membership as a social phenomenon and genuine Church membership through mysteriological participation was the so-called *Disciplina Arcani*, the practice of not divulging details of the Church's mysteries to the unbaptised, which reached its zenith in the fourth century. Cyril's use of the *Disciplina* to this end will be the focus of Chapter 8.

The *Disciplina* clearly draws up the borders of Church membership along mysteriological lines, and serves to emphasise the binary ecclesiological outlook of which I believe Cyril was a staunch proponent. This is compounded by his rejection of heretical, non-Catholic, baptism, which is the subject of Chapter 9. He rejects the validity of non-Catholic baptism, not out of intolerance or other anachronistically imposed attitudes, but because he considered it an ontological impossibility. As the rite of initiation into the Church *par excellence*, to speak of genuine baptism outside the Church was simply absurd, and separated membership from mystery in a way that either deprived baptism of its efficacy or deprived membership of its mysteriological and ontological character.

The common thread running through Cyril's engagement with the different groups mentioned above is the Cross of Christ, which stands at the centre of all of his ideas and arguments, just as it quite literally stood at the centre of the church where he presented them. Though long a signet of the Christian faith, it had only in Cyril's lifetime come into the possession of the Catholic Church as a physical relic. Far from being a mere political opportunist, as so many scholars assert, I argue that Cyril's ecclesiological vision is rooted in

his soteriology and a sincere concern for salvation.[26] His is in many ways a *stauro-ecclesiology*, an ecclesiology of the cross,[27] which he calls the "boast of boasts" of the Catholic Church.[28]

I owe a great debt of gratitude to Dr Yiannis Papadogiannakis, who supervised the initial stages of this work — as well as my Master's dissertation through which I was initiated into the works of Cyril and the subject of his ecclesiology — and Dr Mark Edwards, who supervised its completion, for their insight, guidance, and great patience. I would also like to thank H.E. Gregorios, Archbishop of Thyateira and Great Britain, the AG Leventis Foundation, and the Community of the Sisters of the Love of God, who helped finance my period of study. I am particularly grateful to H.G. Chrysostomos, Bishop of Kyaneon, without whose gracious support, both practical and financial, I would not have been able to complete the present study. I am also deeply thankful for the help of H.G. Kallistos, Metropolitan of Diokleia, who recommended my case for graduate studies at the University of Oxford, and the Very Revd Archpriest Stephen Platt, General Secretary of the Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius. Above all, I would like to thank my family: my parents, Arne and Elisabeth; my wife, Irene, for her unfailing love and support; and my children, Maria Elisabeth, Johannes, and Sofia, who, although responsible for significantly prolonging this process, have made these years my happiest.

[26] On Cyril's soteriology, see Doval 2001b; Hess 1997.

[27] The origins of which can perhaps be traced to Constantine's vision of the Cross (Eusebius, *Vita Const.* 1.28), though Cyril makes no mention of it in his extant writings.

[28] *CL* 13.1. See Patrick Prétot's recent monograph (2014), which explores the position of the cross in 4th century thought and liturgy with particular emphasis on the *Catechetical Lectures* of Cyril and the two most significant external witnesses to his liturgical context: the *Armenian Lectionary* and the *Intenarium* of Egeria the pilgrim.

Chapter 1 — Life and Works

"We know virtually nothing about Cyril's early life."[29] So begins nearly every other study on Cyril, and thus it is only appropriate for us to continue this tradition. Epiphanius mentions him having had a sister,[30] whose son he later appointed as bishop of Caesarea, uncle-to-nephew episcopal dynasties having been commonplace during the period. There are also unconfirmed suggestions of a monastic life preceding his ordination to the priesthood and episcopate,[31] and his distinguished oratorical skills suggests he came from a family with means to provide a corresponding education.[32] Beyond this, Cyril is generally thought to have been born in Jerusalem[33] in the year 315,[34] a mere two years after the so-called Edict of Milan, in which emperors Constantine and Licinius officially proclaimed religious toleration across the Roman world, thereby drawing to a close a long and bloody chapter in Christian history. Walker has called him "a child of the new age, who had never known an empire without a Christian on the throne."[35] At the age of ten, Cyril would have seen the Christian Church rise to prominence as the emperor, having moved the Empire's capital to Asia Minor, called

[29] Steenberg 2009, 129; Yarnold 2000, 3.

[30] Epiphanius, *Pan.* 73.37.5.

[31] Scholars who make this suggestion (Mader, 1891, 12; Paulin, 1959, 25; Doval, 2001a, 13; Drijvers, 2004, 32; Steenberg 2009, 130) point to the many positive references to the solitary life found in the *Catechetical Lectures*, particularly *CL* 12.33, where Cyril says, "Let the order also of solitaries acknowledge the glory of chastity for we men are not deprived of the dignity of chastity." While this could hint at an earlier, anchoritic lifestyle, it is not unthinkable that he could have numbered himself with virginal solitaries simply on account of his being an unwed clergyman. For Cyril's approach to celibacy more generally, see Noakes 2010.

[32] Sozomen (*HE* 3.14.41–42) lists Cyril among the seven hierarchs of the period most noted "on account of their great eloquence. […] The proof of their education is in the books they have written and left behind" (trans. *NPNF* 2.02, 653). Doval (2001a, 12) also suggests that Cyril's touching words on honouring one's parents "suggests that his own upbringing was a nurturing experience in a close-knit family".

[33] Telfer (1955, 19) suggests he may have been born in Caesarea, but Cyril's knowledge of the local topography of pre-Constantinian Jerusalem makes this a much more likely place of birth. It was, at any rate, almost certainly where he grew up.

[34] As Drijvers (2004, 31) notes, this date is an approximation based on a comment by Jerome that Cyril delivered his lectures as an *adolescens*, suggesting he would have been around 35 years of age in the year 350.

[35] Walker 1990b, 31.

together hundreds of bishops from across the *οἰκουμένη* to attend the Council of Nicea, where he presided, in the words of Eusebius, "like some heavenly messenger of God."[36]

The reasons for Constantine's convening of the Council appears to have been his desire for "a single accord and bond and a single union without distinction, so that, by the faith without division, all the Church may subsist in a single body of perfect will (comprising) the priesthood and the Empire."[37] The forging of this new bond between 'the priesthood and the Empire'[38] was to define the subsequent progress of the Church. Indeed, Dimitris J. Kyrtatas goes as far as to say that "the imperial intervention which he inaugurated secured the very existence of the 'universal' Church at a time when Christianity was on the verge of dissolving into an assortment of independent churches, communities and movements."[39] This is not to say that Constantine was altogether successful in establishing this 'single accord'. The Christological controversy persisted well after the Council's condemnation of Arius, something which, as we shall see, had a marked impact on Cyril's later career. Not only would he be subject to a number of exiles at the hands of his "Arian" opponents, but he also came under fire from many in the Nicene camp, seemingly because of the questionable circumstances under which he in the year 350 assumed the episcopal throne of Jerusalem — traditionally regarded as the see of James the Apostle and brother of Jesus — with some suggesting that his appointment was part of an Arian conspiracy to oust his orthodox predecessor Maximus, and that Cyril was made bishop following his death only on the condition that he repudiated the ordination he had received from him about a decade earlier.[40]

Constantine, no doubt from a genuine desire to glorify the God to whom he attributed his recent military victories, but also keen to display the new relationship between church and

[36] *Vita Const.* 3.10.
[37] Coleman-Norton 1966, 123.
[38] On the understanding of *Sacerdotium et Imperium* among the eastern Church Fathers, see Azkoul 1971.
[39] Kyrtatas 2005, 64.
[40] Yarnold 2000, 4. Drijvers 2004, 33.

state, embarked on an extensive and imposing building programme, which saw impressive and lavishly adorned churches spring up alongside, and in some cases replace, pagan shrines and temples. The impact of this imperial venture, recounted in considerable detail by the Church historian Eusebius, was perhaps nowhere felt more strongly than in the colony of Aelia Capitolina, the name bestowed on Jerusalem by the emperor Hadrian in the 130s "in honour of himself and Jupiter Capitolinus."[41] The man tasked with leading this building programme in Jerusalem, most notably the building of the Holy Sepulchre on what was believed to be the site of Christ's crucifixion and resurrection, was Macarius, who most probably had ordained Cyril to the deaconate, thus acting as the initiator of his clerical career. This same Macarius had also, according to some ecclesiastical legends, witnessed the miraculous finding of the True Cross.[42] While Cyril, the earliest witness to the event,[43] appears to have no knowledge of later legends describing the role of Empress Helen in the discovery of the relic, he himself citing only the involvement of Constantine[44], his very personal connection to the people involved in the event is nonetheless of great significance and probably accounts for the way in which the Cross, both as a physical relic and a symbol of faith is so important for him. The cross is "boasts of boasts" of the Catholic Church,[45] the "indestructible foundation" of Catholic doctrine, on which all other articles of faith are built,[46] and without which, salvation itself is a fantasy.[47] It is a crown

[41] Drijvers 2004, 1. See Galor and Gideon 2011; Patrich 2002; Isaac 1980; Bar 1998; Gibson and Taylor 1994; Cohn 1987.

[42] For text and commentary on the Greek and Latin accounts of the finding of the True Cross, see Edwards 2003.

[43] Belloc 1918.

[44] *Ad Const.*, 3. Despite Cyril's failure to mention Helen, Drijvers (2004, 73) argues that it is "not improbable that Cyril was responsible for the origin and composition of the story of Helena's *inventio crusis*". Barnes (1981, 382, n130) likewise suggests that the story is an invention either by Gelasius, Cyril's nephew, or Cyril himself. Drijvers suggests Cyril invented the story to promote the cross as the symbol cementing the relationship between the see of Jerusalem and the imperial house, represented by Macarios and Helena respectively. "Helena's partition of the Cross — one part was left in Jerusalem and another part was sent to Constantine — by which the alliance between Jerusalem and the imperial house was confirmed, is a clear expression of this" (Drijvers 2004, 72–73).

[45] *CL* 13.1

[46] *CL* 13.38

[47] *CL* 13.37

and trophy of salvation,[48] Christ's "very own sign,"[49] given to each of his soldiers to bear upon their brow.[50] It is the new Tree of Life, which opens paradise to mankind.[51] It is a witness to the truth of the Christian faith,[52] a "trophy against the gainsayers",[53] which has brought together all nations and overthrown their pagan superstitions;[54] it is the sign from heaven which will confute the disbelief of the Jews,[55] and from which the demons flee in terror when those who believe sign themselves with it.[56] In short, the Cross provides a common thread underpinning and connecting more or less every aspect of Cyril's thought, both theological and ecclesio-political, as I hope to demonstrate below.

More is thus known of Cyril's life post-ordination, with details provided by a number of ecclesiastical historians, such as Rufinus[57] — himself thought to have been ordained at Jerusalem by Cyril's successor, John[58] — Socrates Scholasticus,[59] and fellow Palestinian Sozomen.[60] There is also an Armenian *Vita Cyrilli*,[61] the only known *vita* of him to be composed,[62] which, along with the old *Armenian Lectionary*,[63] shows his important status in Armenia as the person to complete and perfect the development of the hagiopolitan liturgical tradition first initiated by James the Apostle.[64] The biographical content of these sources has received significant attention and assessment in the monographs by Yarnold, Doval, and

[48] *CL* 13.22, 40.
[49] *CL* 15.22
[50] *CL* 12.8
[51] *CL* 13.2
[52] *CL* 10.19
[53] *CL* 13.22
[54] *CL* 13.40
[55] *CL* 15.22
[56] *CL* 4.14
[57] *HE* (*PL* 21:461–540C).
[58] William Henry Freemantle, 'Life and Works of Rufinus' in *NPNF* 2.03, 1071.
[59] *HE* 2.38–3.25. See the critical editions by Hansen (1995) and Maraval (2005).
[60] *HE* 4–5 (*PG* 67:843–1130).
[61] Vienna Armenian Codex 224, c. 1428.
[62] Drijvers 2004, 62.
[63] See Renoux 1969–71, based on mms Jer 121 and Paris 44.
[64] Drijvers 2004, 63. For a study on the continued development of hagiopolitan (by this term, I simply mean that which pertains to the Holy City) liturgy post-Cyril, see Galadza (forthcoming 2017).

Drijvers, the latter essentially being an attempt to furnish these biographical accounts with a detailed exploration of the cultural, political and religious climate of the Jerusalem in which Cyril lived.[65]

Works

Despite the great importance of a figure such as Cyril for our understanding of the fourth century Church, only four works survive that are widely regarded to be his.

The Sermon on the Paralytic

Earliest among these is often thought to be *The Sermon on the Paralytic*, a rousing exhortation to faith based on the fifth chapter of John's Gospel. The only indication of the homily's early date, relative to Cyril's other works, is the concluding reference to "our father's teaching" [*πατρικῆς διδασκαλίας*], assumed by Stephenson and Yarnold[66] to be a reference to Cyril's bishop, due to preach next, implying that he was still a presbyter at the time of its delivery.[67] However, the phrase only appears in one manuscript,[68] with the only other extant manuscript[69] containing a very different ending, mentioning "practical teaching" [*πρακτικῆς διδασκαλίας*] rather than "fatherly teaching," suggesting that *πατρικῆς* is a corruption of *πρακτικῆς* or vice versa. In terms of context, either reading is possible: Cyril is either apologising because the length of his homily is delaying the bishop in delivering his, or because

[65] 'Chapter One: Life' in Yarnold 2000, 3–7; 'Chapter One: Cyril of Jerusalem and His Church' in Doval 2001a, 11–25; 'Chapter Two: Life and Works' in Drijvers 2004, 31–64. See also Gifford's introduction to *The Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem* in *NPNF* 2.7, 4–9, and McCauley and Stephenson 1969, 21–33. For a traditional, hagiographical account, see 'Τῷ αὐτῷ μηνὶ ΙΗ΄, τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Κυρίλλου, ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἱεροσολύμων' in Ἅγιος Νικόδημος Ἁγιορείτης, *Συναξαριστὴς τῶν Δώδεκα Μηνῶν τοῦ Ἐνιαυτοῦ (Τόμος τέταρτος: Μάρτιος–Ἀπρίλιος)*, (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ὀρθόδοξος Κυψέλη, 1982), 101–102.

[66] McCauley and Stephenson 1970, 222, n.69. Yarnold 2000, 22.

[67] Gifford remarks that, "In the Church of Jerusalem it was still the custom for sermons to be preached by several Presbyters in succession, the Bishop preaching last" (*NPNF* 2.7, 7), but he appears to deduce this from this particular reading of Cyril's sermon, not vice versa.

[68] Bodl. Roc 25, xi s.

[69] Paris, B. N. graec. 1447 [Regius 2030; ca. 1100]

his lengthy digressions, for which he apologises elsewhere in the sermon,[70] have distracted his listeners from its primary, practical point. While the former reading would date the sermon to sometime before the year 350, the alternate reading allows for a date as late as 386.[71] It is also possible to read "*πατρικῆς διδασκαλίας*" as "patristic teaching", which, given Cyril's appeal to the comments of "our fathers" as a basis for his biblical exegesis in his other works,[72] is not unreasonable and would again allow for the later date. A complete sermon on the *Presentation of Christ in the Temple* and a number of other fragments survive, but are generally through to be spurious.[73] The three fragments appended to Stephenson's translations, while thematically and theologically consistent with various Christological expressions found in Cyril's works, appear to be more developed and probably belong to his later Alexandrian namesake.[74]

The Letter to Constantius

Easier to date accurately is Cyril's *Letter to Constantius*, which he declares to be his first such letter following his accession to the episcopal see, presenting these "firstfruits" as a tribute to the emperor.[75] It can therefore be dated to 350–1 with some certainty. The letter is a report detailing the appearance of a cross of light in the skies above Jerusalem on the 7th of May 351.[76] The "the sign which appeared in the sky"[77] was visible for several hours and witnessed by the entire city, an event mentioned in a number of other sources.[78] While brief, the letter is of great importance due to the status afforded by the apparition to the city and see of Jerusalem and, not least, to Cyril himself. When Cyril says to Constantius that "in the days

[70] *Hom. Par.* 13.
[71] McCauley and Stephenson 1970, 222.
[72] *CL* 13.21
[73] See McCauley and Stephenson 1970, 239; Quasten 1960, 369; *PG* 33.1185–1210.
[74] McCauley and Stephenson 1970, 239–240.
[75] McCauley and Stephenson 1970, 231
[76] The Armenian Lectionary provides us with evidence that this day became part of the liturgical calendar in Jerusalem. See Drijvers 2004, 160.
[77] *ad Const.* trans. Yarnold 2000, 68.
[78] Philostorgius *HE* 3.26 (see Amidon 2007, 52) and Sozomen, *HE* 4.5. See also Drijvers 2009 and Yarnold 2000, 22.

of your Imperial Father, Constantine of blessed memory, the saving wood of the Cross was found in Jerusalem [but] now, Sire, in the reign of your most godly Majesty […] not from the earth but from the skies marvels appear",[79] it is not unthinkable that he was implicitly drawing a similar parallel between himself and Macarius. Furthermore, given the contentious circumstances under which Cyril had ascended to the episcopal throne of Jerusalem, the marking of the event by such a spectacular miracle would no doubt have been a useful way of convincing others that his election was both lawful and pleasing to God.[80] As both "local and foreign Christians, as well as visiting pagans" confessed faith in Christ and "hastened to the Holy Church"[81], it would have been Cyril, as senior cleric of said church, who stood there to receive them.

There is another letter purporting to be written by Cyril, *On how many miracles took place when the Jews received the order to rebuild the Temple, and the signs which occurred in the region of Asia*,[82] also involving a miraculous occurrence in Jerusalem and again featuring the conversion of multitudes to the Christian faith through the visible sign of the Cross. The letter — discovered in the 1970s[83] and published with an introduction, commentary, and English translation[84] — describes the failed attempt by Julian the 'Apostate' to restore Jerusalem's traditional religious cult by rebuilding the city's Jewish temple, a project eventually aborted after building efforts were thwarted by both earthquake and fire in 363.[85] [86] While most have accepted Brock's arguments against Cyrilline authorship, a position contested

[79] *ad Const* 3, trans. McCauley and Stephenson 1970, 232
[80] See Barnes 1993, 107.
[81] *ad Const.* 4, ibid.
[82] This is the title given in the manuscript *Harvard Syriac 99*, dated to 1899. An incomplete sixth-century manuscript of the same letter (*Add. 14609* — British Library) is simply titled 'Letter of Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem'.
[83] Brock 1976, 103–7.
[84] Brock 1977a.
[85] Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae* 22.5.4. Some attribute this to the Galilee earthquake of 363, while others blame sabotage or mere accident (see Marcus 1938, 8–12).
[86] Drijvers devotes an entire chapter of his monograph to the 'Rebuilding of the Temple' (Drijvers 2004, 127–152), a significant part of which focuses on the authorship and importance of this letter (see 137–152).

only by Philip Wainwright,[87] it could likely be a derivative of a Cyrilline original, or at least a Jerusalem origin that brings us close to Cyril.[8889]

The Catechetical Lectures & Procatechesis

Cyril's most significant work is his series of *Catechetical Lectures* (henceforth *CL*), delivered to baptismal candidates over the course of the Lenten fast before the feast of the Resurrection. The collection, thought by most to date from around the time Cyril became bishop,[90] is arguably the earliest complete series of catechetical instructions that has come down to us, making it incredibly important. With the exception of the first three, which focus on the necessity of and prerequisites for baptism, the *Lectures*, of which there are eighteen, are in essence a point-by-point explanation of the baptismal creed of Jerusalem.[91] Only the final lecture, on the article "In one, holy, catholic Church," is therefore explicitly ecclesiological in content. However, Cyril's brilliant effort to tie every clause of the Creed to his listeners' impending baptism, their new and radically different life as Christians, and their everyday lives in and around Jerusalem, fraught with spiritual dangers from pagan, Jewish and heretical foes, makes the entire collection rich pickings for anyone attempting to decipher his understanding of the Church.[92] Prefacing *CL* is the *Procatechesis* (henceforth *PC*), delivered prior to the

[87] Wainwright 1986. "The objections to the letter's authenticity have no foundation; the hypothesis of a forgery will not bear examination; much of the information in the letter clarifies points that are obscure in our other sources. The letter is, therefore, both a genuine addition to the Cyrilline corpus, and an important source that sheds new light on this strange episode" (Ibid., 292–3).

[88] For an overview of the dispute over authorship see Drijvers 2004, 138—149. He rightly remarks that "Wainright's view is diametrically opposed to that of Brock" (Ibid., 137) in his 1977 commentary, but in my recent conversations with Brock, he expressed uncertainty as to the question of authorship. I would therefore add to Drijvers' analysis that Brock's position should perhaps be seen as a decision to err on the side of caution, rather than the definitive rejection of Cyrilline authorship subsequent scholarship has presumed it to be.

[89] Louth 2004, 286.

[90] Yarnold 2000, 22.

[91] See *Appendix 1*.

[92] Voulgarakēs devotes a sub-section of his 1977 work to an overview of Cyril's ecclesiology followed, interestingly enough, by another on the sign of the Cross and a third on the relationship between Church and state, connections I will develop in this thesis. While this constitutes a useful summary of the themes at hand, the scope of his monograph does not allow for any in-depth treatment thereof, meaning that commentary is minimal, focusing only on Cyril's direct references to "the Church". Dragas (2008, 107) considers said work the most detailed study of *CL* to date.

catechetical programme itself, in which Cyril delivers an uplifting message to his listeners, impressing on them the lofty nature of their calling. While always mentioned in conjunction with *CL*, there are reasons for considering *PC* to be a separate work. In most manuscripts of *CL*, for example, the title introducing each lecture states that its content was 'improvised', not delivered from a written text, but no such statement is found with regards to *PC*.

The Mystagogical Catecheses

Also numbered with *CL* in certain collections are the *Mystagogical Catecheses* (henceforth *MC*), which provide the newly baptised with a retrospective explanation of the rituals of baptism, chrismation and the Eucharistic liturgy, although this is unquestionably a separate work, the authorship of which has been subject to a fair amount of controversy. Although generally thought to have been delivered by Cyril towards the end of his life, others maintain that they are even later, a work of Cyril's successor, John, while some suggest Cyrilline authorship and Johannine revision.[93] Doubts about Cyril's authorship first arose, according to the prominent Jesuit theologian Edward Yarnold, "during the post-Reformation controversies by Protestant writers who were embarrassed by their strong sacramental teaching."[94] These were revived in the 20th century, with the core arguments against Cyrilline authorship being the lack of sole attribution to Cyril in manuscripts,[95] the presence of certain liturgical features that are unlikely to have been there at the time *CL* was written, various discrepancies between the pre- and post-baptismal instructions, and that the content of *MC* does not appear to correspond to the programme of post-baptismal instruction anticipated in *CL* 18:33.[96]

[93] See Stroumsa 1999, 424–6.

[94] Yarnold 2000, 24.

[95] Ancient MSS are attributed to John alone, to both John and Cyril, or are entirely without attribution, though in cases where *MC* is appended to *CL*, additional attribution would be superfluous. See Yarnold 2000, 24–25.

[96] There is also the argument put forth by Beukers (1961), who suggests that the use of the plural *βασιλέων* in *MC* 5.8 is a reference to a period when the empire was governed by two emperors — either 364–367 or 378–386 —, arguing that *MC* should be dated to 383–386. Yarnold (1978, 143) rejects this argument, suggesting instead

The two most thorough treatments of the subject, evaluating earlier scholarship and textual evidence, are Swaans' 1942 work 'À Propos des Catéchèses Mystagogiques,'[97] which favours Johannine authorship, and Doval's 2001 work *Cyril of Jerusalem: Mystagogue*,[98] which argues in favour of Cyrilline authorship. Doval justifies the need for his revisiting the evidence by noting how "nearly every significant study dealing with the *Mystagogical Catecheses* included a treatment of the disputed authorship of the text*"*, but that the conclusions reached were widely divergent, and often displayed an ignorance of the findings of others. The arguments put forth by Swaans had subsequently been taken up and developed by figures such as Telfer, Bihain, Kretschmar, Renoux, Stephenson, Piédagnel, and Wilkinson,[99] among others, who all argue for Johannine or 'pseudo-Cyrilline' authorship, while the first serious rebuttal to Swaans came from Yarnold in his 1978 article, 'The authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem',[100] the content of which is essentially restated in his 2000 monograph on Cyril's life and works.[101] While Doval has the benefit of having nearly 60 years of further scholarship at his disposal, he does not seem to have settled the question of authorship "once and for all", despite claims of having done so. Although most subsequent works on Cyril appear to have accepted his conclusions, the issue remains contentious.[102] Juliette Day accuses

that the petition in *MC* is based on 1 Tim 2:2 — *ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις προσευχάς, ἐντεύξεις, εὐχαριστίας, ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπον, ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων*. In support of Yarnold's assertion, one need only look at equivalent petitions in later liturgical traditions. Even in the modern forms of the Liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom, the anaphora contains petitions for the "*εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ πιστοτάτων ἡμῶν βασιλέων*" and "*τῶν πιστοτάτων καὶ φιλοχρίστων ἡμῶν βασιλέων*" respectively, and both sets of petitions conclude with the words "*ἥρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν, ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβίᾳ καὶ σεμνότητι*", a direct quote from 1 Tim 2:2 (*Ἱερατικόν* [Ἀθήναι: Ἀποστολική Διακονία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 2009], 175, 134).

[97] Swaans 1942.

[98] Doval 2001a.

[99] Telfer 1955; Bihain 1963; Kretschmar 1956; Renoux 1956; McCauley and Stephenson 1970, 143–49; Piédagnel 1967, 565; Wilkinson 1999, 258.

[100] Yarnold 1978.

[101] Yarnold 2000, 22–32.

[102] Geōrgios Filias takes the Cyrilline authorship of *MC* for granted and opens his discussion on Cyril by saying that, "the first important source for catechetical teaching in the fourth century are the twenty-four Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem," numbering *MC* with *CL* (Filias 2009, 302 — Translation mine). He does however acknowledge the debate around authorship in vol. 2 (2016) of the same series (217, n.393). Gabriel Bunge (2016) describes *MC* as being Cyril's, but in the corresponding footnote says that it "likely stems from his successor, John II" (97, n1).

Doval of a one-sidedness that is unprecedented in earlier scholarship, suggesting that he is inconsistent and uneven in the way he treats John and Cyril as possible authors,[103] and dismissing his treatment of Cyril's life as "hagiographical."[104] Day is right to challenge the way in which Doval so easily dismisses the problem of attribution, which he considers the only reason the debate continues in the face of strong pro-Cyril evidence.[105] Even if it were the only problem remaining to be solved, it is significant enough for the door on John's authorship to remain open.[106] Yet Day appears to dismiss with the same ease as "a convenient device for the pro-Cyril camp"[107] the argument made by Yarnold that most of the apparent inconsistencies between *CL* and *MC* relating to liturgical rubrics and preferred theological motifs can be accounted for if *MC* dates to a year closer to the end of Cyril's life. Even allowing for a period of three decades, Day argues that the differences "would require such a comprehensive alteration of theological perspective that attribution to different authors is much more tenable."[108] This, to me, does not seem to be a realistic assessment of the malleability of human thought and receptiveness to new ideas. We are not speaking here of doctrinally conflicting ideas, and I can therefore see no reason why a shift in the theological motifs employed by the same author in relation to the sacraments could not have changed over the course of just a few years, let alone three decades. Indeed, it is somewhat ironic that a figure so often accused of shifting doctrinal allegiances as Cyril should simultaneously be thought to be so rigidly entrenched in his ideas that one could not reasonably expect to find a significant change in emphasis in two separate discussions of a topic over time. The proverbial nail in the coffin for

[103] Day 2007b, 285.
[104] Ibid.
[105] Since then, Donna R. Hawk-Reinhard (2013a) has provided an interesting codicological and text critical analysis of the authorship problem in which she convincingly accounts for the mixed authorial attribution found in the manuscript tradition. While she admits such a study cannot conclusively resolve the issue, it has done much to close some of the potential gaps in Doval's argument. See also chapters 2 and 3 of her PhD dissertation (2011, 65–172).
[106] McDonald 2002, 531.
[107] Day 2007b, 286.
[108] Ibid. Day provides a detailed comparison of Cyril's and John's theology and literary style in her monograph, *The Baptismal Liturgy of Jerusalem* (2007a, 16–22).

this particular argument against Cyrilline authorship may have come in the form of Abraham Terian's work on Macarius of Jerusalem's *Letter to the Armenians*, which, if correct, demonstrates that these rubrics and motifs were already part of the baptismal liturgy of Jerusalem before the time of Cyril,[109] and therefore tell us nothing about the date or authorship of *MC*.

For the study of liturgy, around which most earlier discussions about authorship have revolved, the important question is not so much who wrote *MC*, but rather what the identity of the author reveals about liturgical development.[110] If it is an early work of Cyrilline authorship, Jerusalem can be seen as the source of elements "found in later sources from neighbouring provinces"[111] — that Macarius wrote his *Letter to the Armenians* in order to bring Armenian praxis into harmony with that of his own see would certainly lend credence to this view — while Johannine authorship could point the Church of Jerusalem being the recipient, and not necessarily the cause, of local developments more widely. While this question is pertinent also to the present study, in as much as the influence of the Jerusalem See under Cyril's leadership can tell us something about his view of its position within the wider Church, the more direct problem here is the extent to which *MC* can give us an insight into Cyril's thought in general, and his ecclesiological vision more specifically. If *MC* is John's only in the sense of being a Johannine adaption of a Cyrilline text, as some suggest,[112] then this would not seriously undermine its value as a source of Cyril's views. If, however, authorship is entirely Johannine, it is valuable only for the purpose of comparison and contextualization. It cannot be assumed that John's views would have been those of his predecessor, particularly given that he was famed for heterodoxy.[113]

[109] Terian 2008. See also Johnson 2007, 142, n.57.
[110] Day 2007a, 12.
[111] Ibid. On this, see also al-Makary 2017.
[112] Yarnold 2000, 24. The latest work to favour this position is Hawk-Reinhard 2013a.
[113] Ibid., 27.

In my evaluation of the evidence presented, I am inclined to agree with Doval and Yarnold, and believe that their arguments justify my referring to *MC* as a Cyrilline work in this thesis. I acknowledge, however, that Johannine authorship is a possibility, and will for this reason largely restrict my use of *MC* to corroboration rather than basing any central part of my thesis solely on this particular source.

Chapter 2 — *Wash you, make you clean*: Ecclesiological images in St Cyril's baptismal theology

Before looking at Cyril's attitude to Greeks, Jews, and heretics, and what this reveals about his view of his own community, it seems appropriate first to examine relevant aspects of his baptismal theology in order to bring to the fore some of the core themes touched upon throughout this thesis; namely, the notions of mysterological participation and ontological membership of the Church as Christ Body. Entire theses could be, and indeed have been, written on the subject of Cyril's baptismal theology. Therefore, I will not here give a detailed explanation of the baptismal liturgy we find described in Cyril's writings, nor will I seek to restate the findings of previous studies on the subject, of which Hugh M. Riley's comparative study and Juliette Day's more recent work on the baptismal liturgy of Jerusalem are undoubtedly the most significant.[114] While making use of these, I will rather seek to uncover what Cyril's explanation of baptism can tell us about his understanding of the Church. Recently, similar studies have been undertaken looking at the works of Origen and John Chrysostom, though these naturally make use of the much broader body of literature bequeathed to us by these two authors, and do not have baptismal theology as their primary focus.[115]

The Church as a hospital

Cyril explains in *CL* 18 that the Church is *καθολική* because it, among other things, "wholly [*καθολικῶς*] treats and heals the whole class of sins, which are committed by soul or body."[116] In the same lecture, he explains that this is achieved through baptism:

[114] Riley 1974. Day 2007a.
[115] See Christo 2006.
[116] *CL* 18:23 — "τὸ καθολικῶς ἰατρεύειν μὲν καὶ θεραπεύειν ἅπαν τὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν εἶδος τῶν διὰ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἐπιτελουμένων."

> Therefore, God heals past wounds of soul and body by baptism; let us one and all jointly guard ourselves against future ones, that we may keep this bodily garment pure, and may not lose the salvation of heaven for practising fornication and sensual indulgence or any other sin for a short time, but may inherit the eternal kingdom of God. May God in his own grace deem you all worthy of this.[117]

Particularly in the Eastern Christian world, recent works by popular authors such as Hierotheos Vlachos and John Romanides mark a renewed interest in the topic of Christianity as *psychotherapeia*,[118] the healing of the soul, and the popularisation of the analogy of the Church as a hospital.

> The patristic tradition is neither a social philosophy nor an ethical system, nor is it religious dogmatism: it is a therapeutic treatment. In this respect it closely resembles medicine […]. The Fathers do not categorise people as moral and immoral or good and bad on the basis of moral laws. This division is superficial. At depth humanity is differentiated into the sick in soul, those being healed and those healed.[119]

> Christianity is mainly a Church […]. The work of the Church is therapeutic. It seeks to heal men's sicknesses, mainly those of the soul, which torment them. This is the basic teaching of the New Testament and of the Fathers of the Church.[120]

Although developed much more clearly in the works of later authors such as the Thessalonians Gregory Palamas[121] and Symeon the New Theologian,[122] we clearly see this notion of *therapeia* in Cyril. In *CL* 2, in which he develops what I would term an ecclesiology of repentance, he describes sin as "the most serious sickness of the soul […] but not an incurable one; terrible to the one who clings to it, but easy to cure when it is put off through repentance."[123] He continues,

> Do not say, 'I have fornicated and committed adultery, I have done terrible things, and not only once but many times; will he forgive, will he forget?'[…] Your

[117] *CL* 18:20 — "τὰ μὲν οὖν παρελθόντα ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος τραύματα θεραπεύει θεὸς διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, πρὸς δὲ τὰ μέλλοντα λοιπὸν ἑαυτοὺς ἀσφαλιζώμεθα κοινῇ πάντες, ἵνα καθαρὸν τοῦτον τοῦ σώματος τὸν χιτῶνα διατηρήσωμεν, καὶ μὴ δι' ὀλίγης πορνείας καὶ ἡδυπαθείας ἤ τινος ἄλλης ἁμαρτίας πρᾶξιν ἀπολέσωμεν οὐράνιον σωτηρίαν, ἀλλ' ἵνα κληρονομήσωμεν βασιλείαν θεοῦ αἰώνιον, ἧς πάντας ὑμᾶς τῇ ἑαυτοῦ χάριτι καταξιώσειεν ὁ θεός."

[118] These works are paralleled by a wide range of recent scholarship on philosophy as *therapeia*. See especially Nussbaum 2009. For the reception of Hellenistic *therapeia* in late antique Christianity, see 'From Stoic Agitations to Christian Temptations' in Sorabji 2000, 343–418.

[119] John Romanides, *Rōmaioi i Rōmioi Pateres tēs Ekklēsias (vol. 1)*, 22, 27, cited in Vlachos 1994, 30.

[120] Vlachos 1994, 26, 28–29.

[121] See, for example, *Three Texts on Prayer and Purity of Heart*, trans. Palmer 1998, 343–6.

[122] For a recent study, see Kapsalēs 2015.

[123] *CL* 2:1 — "Δεινὸν ἡ ἁμαρτία, καὶ νόσος χαλεπωτάτη ψυχῆς ἡ παρανομία [...] ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀθεράπευτον· δεινὸν τῷ κατέχοντι· εὐίατον δὲ τῷ διὰ μετανοίας ἀποτιθεμένῳ."

> accumulated sins do not surpass the multitude of the mercies of God; your wounds do not exceed the experience of the Chief Physician. Just give yourself to him in faith: tell the Physician about the passion.[124]

However, while he identifies repentance and confession of sins as the instigator of this healing, the context in which he speaks is baptismal, and therefore ecclesial.

> Brethren, since we have many examples of people who sinned, repented, and were saved, you should also confess to the Lord, that you will likewise be pardoned for your past sins, and be counted worthy of the heavenly gift."[125]

In his subsequent lecture on baptism, he identifies this gift as that of baptism, through which entry into the Church and remission of sins is obtained:

> You have until now stood outside the door; may you all be able to say, 'The King has brought me into his chamber.'[126] […] so that all your souls may be found 'not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing.'[127] I do not say, before you have received the gift (if so, why would you be now called to the forgiveness of sins?); but so that, on the gift being given, your conscience may be found blameless and keep pace with the gift.[128]

This is significant, for while the intention of the two modern authors cited earlier is to reclaim the Biblical emphasis on healing as something central to the Christian Gospel, rather than merely a peripheral set of miracle stories to demonstrate its veracity or power, of interest to us is the way in which Cyril and his contemporaries saw the Catholic Church as the context and facilitator of this healing, in particular with regards to baptism.

The New Testament is, of course, replete with stories of healing and there is no need to speculate on whence Cyril draws this therapeutic image, meaning we can with confidence rule out any necessary debt to Hellenistic philosophy. Few will not be familiar with the words,

---

[124] *CL* 2:6 — "Μὴ γὰρ εἴπῃς, Ἐπόρνευσα· ἐμοίχευσα· τὰ δεινά μοι πέπρακται, καὶ οὐχ ἅπαξ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλάκις· ἆρα συγχωρήσει; ἆρα παρέξει τὴν ἀμνηστίαν; [...] Οὐ νικᾷ σου τὰ συναχθέντα ἁμαρτήματα, τὸ πλῆθος τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ· οὐ νικᾷ σου τὰ τραύματα τὴν ἀρχιατρικὴν ἐμπειρίαν. Δὸς μόνον σεαυτὸν μετὰ πίστεως· λέγε τῷ ἰατρῷ τὸ πάθος·."

[125] *CL* 2:20 — "Ἔχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοὶ, πολλοὺς τύπους τῶν ἁμαρτησάντων, καὶ μετανοησάντων, καὶ σωθέντων, προθύμως καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐξομολογήσασθε τῷ Κυρίῳ· ἵνα καὶ τὴν συγχώρησιν λάβητε τῶν προγεγενημένων ἁμαρτημάτων, καὶ τῆς ἐπουρανίου δωρεᾶς καταξιωθῆτε."

[126] Song 1:4.

[127] Eph. 5:27.

[128] *CL* 3:2 — "Νῦν γὰρ τέως ἔξω τῆς θύρας ἕστηκας· γένοιτο δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς εἰπεῖν· Εἰσήνεγκέ με ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸ ταμεῖον αὐτοῦ· [...] ἵνα εὑρεθῇ πάντων ὑμῶν ἡ ψυχὴ μὴ ἔχουσα σπῖλον, ἢ ῥυτίδα, ἤ τι τῶν τοιούτων· οὐ λέγω πρὸ τοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν χάριν· [πῶς γὰρ, οἵγε ἐπὶ ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν ἐκλήθητε;] ἀλλ' ἵνα διδομένης τῆς χάριτος, ἀκατάγνωστος ἡ συνείδησις εὑρεθεῖσα συνδράμῃ τῇ χάριτι."

"They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance,"[129] wherein Christ identifies sin as a malady, himself as a physician, and repentance as a form of therapeutic treatment. Cyril even goes so far as to claim that the very name of Christ testifies to this:

> Jesus means according to the Hebrew 'Saviour,'[130] but in the Greek tongue 'the Healer', since he is physician of [souls] and bodies, curer of spirits, curing the blind in their senses, and guiding minds into light, healing the visibly lame, and guiding sinners' feet to repentance, saying to the paralytics, 'Sin no more,' and, 'Take up your bed and walk.'[131] For since the body was paralysed due to the sin of the soul, he first healed the soul in order to extend that healing to the body. If, therefore, anyone is suffering in soul from sins, he has the Physician […]. If anyone is surrounded by bodily passions, let him not be unbelieving, but let him draw near, for he heals these also.[132] [133]

"Take up your bed and walk" are the words of Christ spoken to the paralytic at the Pool of Bethsaida,[134] which is the topic of Cyril's only surviving sermon, rather fitting as it is not merely a discussion of a healing miracle, but one understood by many to typify the healing of the sinner through the waters of baptism.

John Chrysostom, for example, comments on this account in the following manner:

> What manner of cure is this? What mystery doth it signify? […] A Baptism was about to be given, possessing much power, and the greatest of gifts, a Baptism purging all sins, and making men alive instead of dead. These things then are foreshadowed as in a picture by the pool, and by many other circumstances […].

---

[129] Mark 2:17

[130] It should be noted that the word *σωτὴρ* also has therapeutic connotations. Bromiley (1985), for example, lists "curing from illness" as one of the senses in which a person can 'save' (see 1132–1140), while Lampe (1961, 1369) gives as his primary definition of σωτηρία preservation in sickness.

[131] John 5:12, 14.

[132] *CL* 10:13 — "Ιησοῦς τοίνυν ἐστὶ κατὰ μὲν Ἑβραίους σωτὴρ, κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν, ὁ ἰώμενος. Ἐπειδὴ ἰατρός ἐστι [ψυχῶν] καὶ σωμάτων καὶ θεραπευτὴς πνευμάτων· τυφλῶν μὲν αἰσθητῶν θεραπευτὴς, φωταγωγῶν δὲ τὰς διανοίας· χωλῶν φαινομένων ἰατρὸς, καὶ ποδηγῶν τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν, λέγων τῷ παραλυτικῷ· Μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε· καὶ, Ἆρον τὸν κράββατον σὸν καὶ περιπάτει. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ διὰ τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἁμαρτίαν παρελύθη τὸ σῶμα, προεθεράπευσε τὴν ψυχὴν, ἵνα ἐπαγάγῃ καὶ τῷ σώματι τὴν ἴασιν. Εἴ τις τοίνυν πάσχει τὴν ψυχὴν ἐν ἁμαρτίαις, ἔχει τὸν ἰατρόν […]. Εἴ τις καὶ σωματικοῖς περιβέβληται πάθεσι, μὴ ἀπιστείτω, ἀλλὰ προσερχέσθω, (θεραπεύει γὰρ καὶ ταῦτα)".

[133] Compare Clement of Alexandria — "Our good Pedagogue, he who is the Wisdom and Word of the Father and who created man, is concerned with the creature as a totality; he heals both body and soul, being the Physician of humanity and capable of healing all things." — (*Paedagogus* 1.6.2 [*PG* 8:252A]); John Chrysostom — "[God] is the only true physician both of souls and bodies" — (*Homilies Against Those Who Say that Demons Govern Human Affairs* 1.5, trans. *NPNF* 1.9, 250); Barsanuphius of Gaza — "May the Lord be with you, that great Healer of souls and bodies" — (*Ep.* 107, trans. Chryssavgis 2006, 129). For a comprehensive overview of patristic references, see Larchet 2002, 79–131, and id. 1991.

[134] John 5

> He causeth defilements of our bodies, and afterwards infirmities of different kinds, to be done away by water.[135]

At first sight, Cyril's interpretation seems to diverge from Chrysostom's in that it makes no explicit reference to baptism. Indeed, certain passages seem to reject any connection outright. Having first identified Christ as the source of living water, Cyril questions those who place their "hope in a pool" and limit their hope to a "poor water-cure" when they have "Him who walks upon the waters, who rebukes the winds, who holds sovereign sway over the ocean; who not only Himself walked on the sea as on a firm pavement but vouchsafed the like power to Peter."[136]

A careful reading of the sermon in light of *CL*, however, hints at a greater level of consistency than is immediately apparent. First, that we find no explicit reference to baptism should not surprise us, given that such a homily would have been delivered during what would correspond to the later 'Liturgy of the Word'[137] in the presence of catechumens, for whom knowledge of the mysteries was off limits in accordance with the *Disciplina Arcani*. Moving on to the content of the text itself, the images and expressions Cyril here employs in relation to the healing of the paralytic parallel those he uses in his discussions of baptism in *CL*:

> Christ came in order to be baptised, and might sanctify baptism.[138] He came to work wonders, walking upon the waters of the sea. Since then before his coming in flesh, "the sea saw him and fled; Jordan was turned backwards,"[139] the Lord took to

[135] *In Jo.* 5:1, trans. *NPNF* 1.14, 253–4.

[136] *Hom. Par.* 8–9, trans. McCauley and Stephenson 1970, 214.

"Why, then, fix your hope on a pool? You have Him who walks upon the waters, who rebukes the winds, who holds sovereign sway over the ocean; who not only Himself walked on the sea as on a firm pavement but vouchsafed the like power to Peter […]. There stood by the waters of the pool the Ruler and Maker of the water. To Him the cripple said: "I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool." The Saviour said to him: "Why do you await the troubling of the water when you can be cured with no trouble at all? Why wait for the movement that is seen? More swiftly is the mind's command performed by the word. Only look down into the swirling power of the spring and glimpse there God clothed in flesh; consider not the man whom your eyes see, but the invisible God who works through Him whom you see […]. Why set such narrow bounds to hope, intent on some poor water-cure? Arise: He who commands it is the Resurrection."

[137] 'Liturgy of the Word' signifies the first half of the Eucharistic Liturgy, consisting of psalmody, Scripture readings and preaching.

[138] Cf. Ignatius: "ὣς ἐγεννήθη καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ἵνα τῷ πάθει τὸ ὕδωρ καθαρίσῃ" (*Ephesians* 18, Holmes 2008, 196).

[139] Ps. 113:3.

> himself his body, that the sea might endure the sight, and Jordan fearlessly receive him.[140]

Thus, while the image of Christ's authority over water at first seems to divert our attention away from it in the sermon, in *CL* the same image is key to Cyril's baptismal theology. We also notice a similar Christological element. Likewise, his discussion of Peter's walking on the water in *CL* 5 is immediately preceded by a discussion on baptism in the context of the resurrection.[141] Also here, "He who commands it is the Resurrection." In the words "Why do you await the troubling of the water […]? Why wait for the movement that is seen?" we hear an echo of his aforementioned exhortation to the *φωτιζόμενοι* not to "regard the sacred bath as ordinary water, but rather [to] regard the spiritual grace that is given with the water."[142] Returning to Chrysostom's commentary, we can see more clearly how this relates to the Gospel account:

> It was not simply the nature of the water that healed, (for then [healing] would always have taken place,) but water joined to the operation of the Angel; so in our case, it is not merely the water that worketh, but when it hath received the grace of the Spirit, then it putteth away all our sins […]. [T]hen infirmity was a hindrance to him who desired to be healed, now each hath power to approach, for now it is not an Angel that troubleth, it is the Lord of Angels who worketh all.[143]

Thus, I would argue that, far from undermining the typological significance of baptism, Cyril seeks to highlight the invisible operation of God in the sacrament, and showing the baptism of Christ to be far greater than any normal operation of water, greater even than angelic wonderworking.[144]

---

[140] *CL* 12:15 — "παρεγένετο ὁ Χριστός, ἵνα βαπτισθῇ καὶ ἁγιάσῃ τὸ βάπτισμα. παρεγένετο ἵνα θαυματουργήσῃ περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τὸν ὑδάτων τῆς θαλάσσης. ἐπεὶ οὖν πρὸ τῆς ἐνσάρκου παρουσίας ἡ θάλασσα εἶδε καὶ ἔφυγεν καὶ ὁ Ἰορδάνης ἐστράφη εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, ἀνέλαβε τὸ σῶμα ὁ κύριος, ἵνα ἰδοῦσα ἡ θάλασσα ἀνάσχηται καὶ ὁ Ἰορδάνης ἀφόβως αὐτὸν ὑποδέξηται."

[141] *CL* 5:6–7

[142] *CL* 3:3 — "Μὴ ὡς ὕδατι λιτῷ πρόσεχε τῷ λουτρῷ· ἀλλὰ τῇ μετὰ τοῦ ὕδατος δεδομένῃ πνευματικῇ χάριτι."

[143] *In Jo.* 5:1, trans. *NPNF* 1.14, 254.

[144] Unlike Chrysostom, nowhere does Cyril make mention of an angel as the cause of the water's curative powers, suggesting he was in possession of a different Gospel text. Schnackenburg (1965, 182), notes that the "oldest Greek MSS, including P^{66} and P^{75}, do not [include mention of the angel], and are supported by part of the rest of the textual tradition. V. 4 is missing in D 0125 33 f l q vg^{codd} sy^{c} (sy^{s} has a lacuna here); it is found (with various variants) in A L Θ, the Koine group, the rest of the Vetus Latina, many Vulgate MSS (and Vg^{cl}), $sy^{p.pal.\ h}$, bo (but not in Papyrus Bodmer III), and a number of Church Fathers — Tertullian, Didymus, Cyrill of Alexandria, Chrysostom; there is some attestation for Tatian: in the Syriac (Ephraim), Arabic, Italian and Dutch translations".

What is particularly significant, both in the original text of John's account, as well as the patristic commentaries, is the double nature of the healing: "Behold, thou art made whole: sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee."[145] "He is a versatile doctor," Cyril declares, "sometimes healing the soul first, and then the body, sometimes following the reverse order […]. For if ever we find ourselves afflicted by sickness, grief or trouble, let no one lay it to God's charge […]. Each of us is scourged, 'fast bound with the ropes of his own sins'[146]."[147] As a psychosomatic being, the spiritual and physical ailments of man cannot be separated. For this reason, Cyril presents baptism, and therefore the healing work of the Catholic Church, as holistic in this respect:

> For since man is twofold, a composite of soul and body, the purification also is twofold: the bodiless one for the bodiless part, and bodily one for the body. The water cleanses the body, and the Spirit seals the soul.[148]

Cyril thus goes beyond the promises of the philosophers to treat only the soul, but affirms also the power of God to heal physical ailments. While Porphyry had called empty the philosophy that did not therapeutically treat the sufferings of the soul, contrasting it to the medical art which cast out the sickness of the body,[149] Cyril, in line with the Hebraic anthropology of Christian orthodoxy, sees as incomplete the therapy which does not concern the entire man. In response to Michel Foucault's identification of Hellenistic philosophy as a set of *techniques du soi*,[150] Nussbaum argues that this is something equally true of various religious movements,

---

Tertullian not only mentions the angel, but makes the parable foundational to his own baptismal theology. He suggests that, just as John the Baptist had prepared the way for Christ, so, "too, does the angel, the witness of baptism, 'make the paths straight' for the Holy Spirit" in the laying on of hands (*De Baptismo* 6, trans. *ANF* 3, 1495). Ambrose identifies the angel as a "figure of our Lord Jesus Christ who was to come? […] Why? Because he himself is the angel of great counsel" (*Sermons on the Sacraments* II:5, trans. Yarnold 2000, 111). Moreover, he clearly identifies the baptism prefigured as that of the Catholic Church: "In those days, he alone was cured who went down first; and this was in figure. How much greater is the grace of the Church in which all those who go down into the water are saved" (Ibid., 112).

[145] John 5:14

[146] Cf. Prov. 5:22

[147] *Hom. Par.* 17, trans. McCauley and Stephenson 1970, 219.

[148] *CL* 3:4 — "Επειδὴ γὰρ διπλοῦς ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος συγκείμενος, διπλοῦν καὶ τὸ καθάρσιον· τὸ μὲν ἀσώματον, τῷ ἀσωμάτῳ, τὸ δὲ σωματικὸν, τῷ σώματι. Καὶ τὸ μὲν ὕδωρ καθαίρει τὸ σῶμα, τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα σφραγίζει τὴν ψυχήν."

[149] *Letter to Marcella* 31. See Usener 1887, 221.

[150] Foucault 1984.

and that the uniqueness of philosophy lies rather in its commitment to truth, which alone can deliver "freedom from the tyranny of custom and convention."[151] While the philosopher's pursuit for truth creates a sharp divide between him and what Nussbaum terms "religious and magical/superstitious movements," we see in Cyril's therapeutic scheme something quite different. As will be demonstrated in the following chapters, Cyril completely rejected the baptisms of heretics, making truth an absolute criterion also for baptismal *therapeia*. The truth affirmed by Cyril, however, is that of the incarnate Word as "One Lord, Jesus Christ."[152] Referring to his divinity and humanity as "King and Physician"[153] respectively, he explains that "Jesus the King, when ready to heal, girded himself with the linen of humanity, and healed that which was infirm."[154] The reality of the incarnation, and emphasis on it as the means of man's twofold healing, means that the Cyril's uncompromising insistence on doctrinal truth does not distance Christianity from the "religious and magical/superstitious movements" which claimed to offer miraculous cures to the ailments of the body, but rather puts it into direct conflict and competition with them, all the while laying equal claim to the *psychotherapeia* of the philosophers.

Exorcistic Healing

[151] Nussbaum 2009, 5.

[152] Bunge (2006, 89) also identifies this as the unique feature of Christian "arcane discipline", in which, unlike the esotericism of Gnosticism, "gnosis does not pose its questions itself, but receives them from creation and salvation history, from the salvific work of God in his creation, as the Holy Scriptures testify". Focusing on Cyril and the text of *MC*, he argues that the role of the mystagogue was the imparting of *gnōsis* and revelation of arcane mysteries. "The keys to those 'mysteries' are not, however, constituted by an impersonal, eternal 'truth,' but rather by a person: Christ [and] the arcana of revelation are in principle accessible to anyone baptized into the faith" (Ibid., 91, 95). Stephenson highlights the connection between *gnōsis* and *therapeia* in Cyril, particularly the *Sermon on the Paralytic* — the baptismal nature of which has been established above — in which he calls Christ the "Physician of knowledge" (19), who by asking the sick man, "Wilt thou be made whole?", "led him on to knowledge" (6) (McCauley and Stephenson 1969, 6–12).

[153] *CL* 12.1 — "ὁμολογήσωμεν τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἰατροῦ τὴν παρουσίαν."

[154] Ibid. — "ὁ γὰρ βασιλεὺς Ἰησοῦς ἰατρεύειν μέλλων λέντιον ἀνθρωπότητος περιζωσάμενος ἐθεράπευσε τὸ νοσοῦν."

Furthermore, Cyril's presentation of the Incarnation — God's assumption of man's nature and life — as an act of healing poses a direct challenge to the compartmentalisation of the universe common to late Roman society, in which mortal man shared the lower realms, *in sentina mundi*, with the daemons to whom they could turn for help with the mundane problems too small and insignificant for an inapproachable God; a view also common among many Christians at the time.

In an age before the advent of modern medicine, when even a minor wound could prove fatal, many people, particularly those too poor to pay for repeated visits to the physician, had no choice but to make recourse to supernatural healing agents. The miracle stories of the New Testament would have resonated profoundly with Cyril's contemporaries, and therefore his insistence that Christ was the physician *par excellence*, and that his healing power was to be found within the Catholic Church, would certainly not have been overlooked as a fanciful theological digression. In terms of the appeal of such imagery, Rudolph Arbesmann, in his classic article on "The Concept of '*Christus Medicus*' in St. Augustine", argues that such language is nearly always employed when addressing those who "hardly distinguished themselves by their education."[155] This is an assertion challenged by William Harmless, who points to the frequent use of the same imagery in Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings.[156] While the nature of Cyril's works do not allow us to ascertain the extent to which his style or emphasis differed according to the socio-economic standing of his audience, the image of Christ the physician is central to his soteriology and baptismal theology and, like Harmless, I would also discourage the idea that his employment of it was a populist gimmick. This is not to say, however, that Cyril would not have understood the centrality of healing in the battle for Christianization. Throughout his mention of the subject, we clearly see the deep concern for

[155] Arbesmann 1954), 7.
[156] Harmless 2008, 127–53.

relatability emphasised by Nussbaum and Riley with regards to philosophy and mystagogy respectively.

Lucian, himself a key figure in our understanding of how early Christianity was perceived by their pagan contemporaries, says the following: "I revere the gods and I see their cures and the benefits they bestow by restoring the sick to health with drugs and medical treatment."[157] The same was true of many fourth century converts to Christianity, who pledged their allegiance to the Christian God, not on account of particular theological arguments, but rather his displays of power. Indeed, some pagans described Christianity as a religion "for the sick".[158] An epigram of Cyril's counterpart in Rome, Pope Damasus, attached the house church of the same, entices readers to seek holy baptism through promises of healing:

> This glorious spring contains the waters of health,
> and is able to cleanse human pestilence.
> Should you wish to know the benefits of these holy waters —
> the holy rivers grant a royal faith.
> Wash off the contagion of the old life in the sacred font.
> O most happy one, living reborn through the water;
> whoever seeks this spring relinquishes earthly matters,
> and tramples evil deeds underfoot.[159]

In his article, *Christianization and Religious Conflict*, Peter Brown opens with a reference to an account from the life of St. Thekla, in which pagan and Christian opponents attribute the healing of a certain Isocasius to the miracle-working of Sarpedon and Thekla respectively,[160] each seeing the cure as evidence for the superiority of their preferred deity.

Brown has in many ways spearheaded research into the role of thaumaturgy and power-displays in the process of Christianisation, and particularly the role of the 'Holy Man'.[161] While the holy man only really came into his own in the centuries after Cyril, much of what was

[157] *Philops.* 8 quoted in MacMullen 1997, 79.
[158] See Entralgo 1970 and Larchet 2002, 82.
[159] Inscription found in De Rossi, *ICUR* 2.135.6 (*Sylloge Virdunensis*), trans. Jensen 2012, 24.
[160] Brown 1998b, 633.
[161] See particularly Brown 2000b and id. 1971.

characteristic of their appeal then is also of relevance to this study. On the subject of healing, Brown notes that "Exorcism was the classic cure associated with the holy man; for it involved both the formal designation of an authoritative healing agent, on which the sufferer and his companions could focus their hopes, and the equally precise isolation and extrusion — often in satisfactorily visible form — of the disturbing element."[162] In the New Testament, too, a great number of Jesus' healings are effected through the driving out of evil spirits. Likewise, he bestowed upon his disciples "power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease."[163] With respect to the question of ecclesiology, this identification of exorcism as an apostolic, authoritative healing agent, is particularly important.

Returning to *CL* 2, he gives us a second cause for sin, that sickness which afflicts both soul and body:

> You are not the sole cause of the thing, but there is also another most evil prompter, the devil […]. It is he that puts desires into those who are persuaded by him. From him come adultery, fornication, and every kind of evil.[164]

In so doing he brings into the question of healing 'the powers of the air,' attributing also to them this malady of sin, which only the Church can catholically treat and heal. Further on, in *CL* 4, he warns the *φωτιζόμενοι* to

> flee from every diabolical operation, and be not persuaded by the apostate dragon, whose change from a good nature was of his own free choice, who can persuade the willing, but can compel no one. Also, do not give heed to astrology, nor (divinising by means of) birdwatching, nor omens, nor the mythical oracles of the Greeks. Do not allow yourself even to hear of Witchcraft, incantations, and the

[162] Brown 1971, 96. See Tertullian's *Apology* 1.23, where exorcism is used to disabuse onlookers of the notion that these spirits are gods worthy of worship, as they will inevitably confess to their demonic nature upon being interrogated by a Christian exorcist. Such is his confidence that he challenges his opponents to kill any Christian who cannot command these "gods".

[163] Matt. 10:1.

[164] *CL* 2:3–4 — "Οὐ μόνος δὲ σὺ καθέστηκας τοῦ πράγματος ἀρχηγός· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλος τίς ἐστι κάκιστος ὑποβολεὺς, ὁ διάβολος [...] οὗτος ἐμβάλλει τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τοῖς πειθομένοις· ἐκ τούτου μοιχεία, πορνεία, καὶ πᾶν εἴ τι κακόν."

> lawless practices of necromancy […] nor ever use amulets in sickness [in order that you may] enjoy the one salvation of the laver.[165]

Immediately prior to this he had forbidden them to read any of the books not read in the church. Thus, his warning against recourse to pagan forms of healing is here clearly linked to the identification of baptism with an exclusive salvation — the *one* salvation — and the Catholic Church as the only context of this salvation. Moreover, by labelling such pagan practices as diabolical, and attributing their effects to demonic operation, he directly associates paganism with the source of sickness itself. Recourse to the gods was not a cure, but a cause.

This is made all the more clear in the explanation of the pre-baptismal renunciation of Satan provided in *MC* 1, which features a similar, but this time clearer, exhortation to the newly illumined Christians:

> Now the devil's adoration is prayer in idol temples; acts performed in honour of soulless idols; the lighting of lamps, or burning of incense by fountains or rivers, as some people tricked by dreams or by evil spirits do, thinking to also find a cure for their bodily ailments [*Emphasis mine*]. Do not pursue such things. Augury, oracles, omens, or amulets, or spells written on leaves, magic, or other evil arts, and all such things, are the devil's adoration. Flee therefore from them. For if you fall into these after renouncing Satan and associating yourself with Christ, you shall find the tyrant more bitter. Perhaps this is because he previously treated you as his own, and spared you from his hard bondage, but he has now been greatly embittered by you. In this way you will be bereaved of Christ, and have experience of the other.[166]

Riley aptly describes this as "the exorcistic-healing motif," something Cyril shares with Theodoret of Cyrus.[167] Following the renunciation, at which point the candidates would enter

[165] *CL* 4:37 — "Φεῦγε δὲ πᾶσαν διαβολικὴν ἐνέργειαν, καὶ μὴ πείθου τῷ δράκοντι τῷ ἀποστάτῃ, ὃς ἐξ ἀγαθῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοπροαίρετον ἔσχε τὴν μεταβολήν· ὃς ἀναπεῖσαι μὲν δύναται τοὺς θέλοντας, ἀναγκάσαι δὲ οὐδένα. Καὶ μήτε ἀστρολογίαις, μήτε ὀρνεοσκοπίαις, μήτε κληδόσι πρόσεχε, μηδὲ ταῖς μυθώδεσι τῶν Ἑλλήνων μαντείαις. Φαρμακίαν, καὶ ἐπαοιδίαν, καὶ τὰ νεκυομαντειῶν παρανομώτατα πράγματα, μηδὲ μέχρις ἀκοῆς παραδέχου [...] μήτε ἐπιδέσμασιν ἐν νόσοις χρήσῃ ποτέ [...] τῆς μιᾶς τοῦ λουτροῦ σωτηρίας ἀπολαύσῃς."

[166] *MC* 1:8 — "Λατρεία δέ ἐστι διαβόλου, ἡ ἐν εἰδωλίοις εὐχή· τὰ πρὸς τιμὴν γινόμενα τῶν ἀψύχων εἰδώλων· τὸ ἅπτειν λύχνους, ἢ θυμιᾶν παρὰ πηγὰς ἢ ποταμούς, ὥς τινες ἀπ' ὀνειράτων ἢ ἐκ δαιμόνων ἀπατηθέντες, ἐπὶ τοῦτο διέβησαν, οἰόμενοι καὶ σωματικῶν παθῶν τὴν ἴασιν εὑρίσκειν· μὴ τοιαῦτα μετέλθῃς. Οἰωνοσκοπία, μαντεία, κληδονισμοί, ἢ περιάμματα, ἢ ἐν πετάλοις ἐπιγραφαί, μαγείαις, ἢ ἄλλαις τισὶ κακοτεχνίαις, καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα, λατρεία ἐστὶ διαβόλου. Φεῦγε οὖν ταῦτα· εἰ γὰρ τούτοις ὑποπέσοις μετὰ τὴν ἀπόταξιν τοῦ Σατανᾶ καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν σύνταξιν, πικροτέρου πειραθήσῃ τοῦ τυράννου, ἴσως ὡς οἰκείου περιέποντος πάλαι, καὶ τῆς πικρᾶς ἀνιέντος σε δουλείας, νῦν δὲ σφόδρα παρὰ σοῦ καταπικρανθέντος, καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ στερηθήσῃ, κἀκείνου πειραθήσῃ."

[167] See Riley 1974, 195–197 and 203–205.

the inner chamber, they would remove their clothing[168] and were anoined with "exorcised oil" [*ἐλαίῳ ἐπορκιστῷ*] by which they were cut off from the wild olive tree of the gentiles and were grafted into "communion of the good olive-tree Jesus Christ" [*κοινωνοὶ ἐγίνεσθε τῆς καλλιελαίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*], the oil thus becoming "a charm to drive away [*φυγαδευτήριον*] every hostile influence."

> For as the breathing of the saints, and the invocation of the Name of God, like the fiercest flame, scorch and drive out evil spirits, so also this exorcised oil, by the invocation of God and by prayer, receives such great power, as not only to burn and cleanse away the traces of sins, but also to chase away all the invisible powers of the evil one.[169]

The use of olive oil, almost synonymous with healing in the late antique world,[170] as a means of exorcism shows a clear link between healing and initiation into the Church. Moreover, by describing it as a charm against evil spirits, the causes of sickness, Cyril draws a direct parallel between the rites of the Church and the pagan charms he had earlier exhorted his listeners to avoid, thereby showing that recourse to such were no longer necessary. The concretely ecclesiological aspect of this act can be discerned from Cyril taking the oil of exorcism to signify the grafting on of those being baptised onto the good olive tree, the same tree from which the Jews had been severed due to their rejection and crucifixion of Christ.[171]

Exorcism was a regular fixture of the baptismal candidate's preparatory process. Juliette Day points out that, while Chrysostom indicates that the preliminary rites were done

---

[168] Riley suggests that the origin of this part of the rite lay in the belief that the demons made their dwelling in a person's clothing and might thereby enter into the water with the candidate if not removed (Ibid. 195 and 183–189). While Cyril explicitly rules out such a literal understanding of such a notion, it is possible that he has this in mind when describing its symbolism: "For since the powers of the enemy made their lair in your members, ye may no longer wear that old vestment; I do not at all mean the visible one, but that *old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts*."

[169] *MC* 2:3 — "Ὥσπερ γὰρ τὰ ἐμφυσήματα τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ ἡ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπίκλησις, ὥσπερ σφοδροτάτη φλόξ, καίει καὶ ἐκδιώκει δαίμονας, οὕτω τὸ ἐπορκιστὸν τοῦτο ἔλαιον ἐπικλήσει Θεοῦ καὶ εὐχῇ δύναμιν τηλικαύτην λαμβάνει ὡς οὐ μόνον καῖον τὰ ἴχνη τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀποκαθαίρειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἀοράτους τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐκδιώκειν δυνάμεις."

[170] The Epistle of James, for example, says, "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him. Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed" (5:14–16). We also see in this passage a clear connection between physical and spiritual health.

[171] See chapter 5.

apart from the initiation rite proper, and that they can therefore be seen as the completion of the preparatory process rather than the beginning of the initiation process, "we do not see this in Jerusalem, where they remain an integral part of the initiation rite."[172] This is significant, as it shows that Cyril considered the time of their baptism[173] to be the point at which they truly became members of the New Israel, grafted onto Jesus Christ, thus something he does not extend to the liminal status of the catechumen. Likewise, the exorcisms performed during the catechumenate culminated in the rites of initiation through which the powers of the devil were completely vanquished and the sickness of sin completely — 'catholically' — healed. Describing the blood of Christ, into whose death the candidate is baptised, as "the charm to scare evil spirits," Cyril explains how "the daring and shameless demon, the origin of evil, was following you even to the very streams of salvation [and] disappears in the water of salvation."[174] [175]

The Church as a New Creation

As has already been mentioned, the power of this 'water of salvation' is effected by the operation of the Holy Spirit.[176] Just as Cyril draws frequent parallels between the ineffectual charms of the pagans and the sacraments as effectual charms of the Church, so he frequently contrasts the sanctifying operation of the Holy Spirit to the defiling operation of sin and the

[172] Day 2007a, 51.

[173] I say baptism rather than anointing, as it is clear that Cyril regards all of these rites as comprising a single act of initiation, despite the fact that he separates them for didactic purposes. This is why baptism is called a 'seal' in *CL* while the same term is specifically applied to the post-baptismal anointing in *MC*. We see the same use of the word 'seal' in Gregory of Nazianzus' *S.Bapt.* (*PG* 36:4. See Salapatas 2010). Karl Olav Sandnes (2010) explores the baptismal use of *σφραγίς* in the 1st to 3rd centuries in his article on 'Seal and Baptism in Early Christianity'.

[174] *MC* 1:3 — "ἐνταῦθα τοῦ Ἀμνοῦ τοῦ ἀμώμου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ αἷμα δαιμόνων καθέστηκε φυγαδευτήριον […] καὶ σοὶ ὁ ἰταμός, ὁ ἀναίσχυντος καὶ ἀρχέκακος οὗτος δαίμων ἕως αὐτῶν ἠκολούθει τῶν σωτηρίων ναμάτων [...] καὶ οὗτος ἐν τῷ σωτηρίῳ ὕδατι ἀφανίζεται."

[175] For an overview of the historical development of exorcism in the rite of baptism, see Kelly 1985, particularly chapters 8–10.

[176] *MC* 3:3

devil. In *CL* 16, the first of Cyril's two discourses on the Holy Spirit, he explains that in the Scriptures, "sin also is called spirit […] but in another and opposite sense" and that "the unclean spirit, the demon, is also called 'spirit'." This unclean spirit

> violently uses another's body, another's instruments, as his own property; he throws down the one who stands upright; (for he belongs to the one who fell from heaven;) he perverts the tongue and distorts the lips. Foam (comes out) instead of words; the man is darkened; his eye is open, yet the soul does not see through it; and the miserable man gasps in terror before death. The devils are truly enemies of men, using them basely and pitilessly.[177]

In contrast to this rather frightful scene, the Holy Spirit "comes to save, and to heal, to teach, to admonish, to strengthen, to supplicate, to enlighten the mind."[178] A further parallel is drawn between the need for synergy. Those that receive "the saving seal [baptism], that wondrous one, at which devils tremble […] have need also of the disposition akin to it. For as a writing-reed or a dart needs someone to use it, so grace also needs believers."[179] "But if you remain with your evil intention […] do not expect to be given grace: for though the water will receive you, the Spirit will not accept you."[180] Accordingly Cyril makes clear that the devil "indeed suggests, but does not get the mastery by force over those who do not submit,"[181] just as he himself "has of his own free will become a devil, and received the appellation from his action."[182] Although freed from the bondage of sin and the devil in baptism, the endurance of this freedom is dependant on synergy, on the newly illumined Christian's continued aligning of his life with that of Christ. For, as we have already seen, "if you fall into these after

[177] *CL* 16:15 — "Ἐνταῦθα καλεῖται δὲ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία [...] ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑτέρως καὶ ἐναντίως [...] καλεῖται πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα, ὁ δαίμων […] σώματι γὰρ ἀλλοτρίῳ ὡς ἰδίῳ κεχρῆσθαι βιάζεται, καὶ ὀργάνῳ ἀλλοτρίῳ. τὸν ἑστῶτα καταβάλλει. οἰκεῖος γάρ ἐστι τοῦ πεσόντος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. παρατρέπει τὴν γλῶσσαν. στρεβλοῖ τὰ χείλη. ἀφρὸς ἀντὶ ῥημάτων. σκοτοῦται ὁ ἄνθρωπος. ἤνοικται ὁ ὀφθαλμός, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ οὐ βλέπει ἡ ψυχή. καὶ σπαίρει τρομικῶς ὁ ἄθλιος ἄνθρωπος πρὸ θανάτου. ἐχθροὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀληθῶς οἱ δαίμονες, αἰσχρῶς κεχρημένοι καὶ ἀνηλεῶς."

[178] *CL* 16:16 — "ἔρχεται γὰρ σῶσαι καὶ ἰάσασθαι, διδάξαι, νου θετῆσαι, ἐνισχῦσαι, παρακαλέσαι, φωτίσαι τὴν διάνοιαν."

[179] *CL* 1:3 — "ἐκεῖ τὴν σωτηριώδη δίδωσι σφραγίδα, τὴν θαυμασίαν, ἣν τρέμουσι δαίμονες [...] χρεία καὶ τῆς οἰκείας προαιρέσεως. Ὥσπερ γὰρ κάλαμος γραφικὸς ἢ καὶ βέλος χρείαν ἔχει τοῦ συνεργοῦντος, οὕτω καὶ ἡ χάρις χρείαν ἔχει τῶν πιστευόντων."

[180] *PC* 4 — "Εἰ δὲ ἐπιμένεις κακῇ προαιρέσει [...] σὺ δὲ μὴ προσδόκα λήψεσθαι τὴν χάριν· τὸ μὲν [γὰρ] ὕδωρ σε δέξεται, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμά σε οὐ δέξεται."

[181] *CL* 2:3 — "Ὑποβάλλει μὲν οὖν ἐκεῖνος, οὐ μὴν βίᾳ ἐπικρατεῖ τῶν μὴ πειθομένων."

[182] *CL* 2:4 — "διάβολος γέγονεν ἐξ οἰκείας προαιρέσεως, ἐκ τῆς πράξεως λαβὼν τὴν προσηγορίαν."

renouncing Satan and associating yourself with Christ, you shall find the tyrant more bitter."[183] The pre-baptismal renunciation described in *MC* is therefore not only personal, "I renounce you, Satan,"[184] but also involves renouncing everything associated with him, "and all your works […] and all his pomp […] and all your adoration."[185] While a rejection of Satan's service involves a rejection of that which directly relates to Graeco-Roman religious ritual, a rejection of his pomp[186] involves a much broader attack on pagan society, perhaps the reason why this clause alone uses the impersonal 'αὐτοῦ' rather than 'σου'. Things like "the madness of theatres, and horse-races, and hunting, and all such vanity" are all dismissed as unseemly, mad, frantic and soul-subverting.[187] Chrysostom likewise identifies the devil's pomp as "theatres, the racecources, and every sinful observance of days,"[188] adding also that "the madness to be adorned with pearls is one of Satan's pomps."[189] Cyril continues,

> Moreover, the things which are hung up at idol festivals, either meat or bread, or other such things polluted by the invocation of the unclean demons, are counted as the pomp of the devil. For as the bread and wine of the Eucharist before the invocation of the holy and worshipped Trinity were ordinary bread and wine, while after the invocation the Bread becomes the Body of Christ, and the Wine the Blood of Christ, so in the same way such foods of the pomp of Satan, even though they are ordinary by their own nature, become profane by the invocation of the demons.[190] [191]

By contrasting the participation in the food offered to idols at pagan festivals, to which we know many otherwise faithful Christians were frequently drawn, with participation in the

[183] *MC* 1:8 — "εἰ γὰρ τούτοις ὑποπέσοις μετὰ τὴν ἀπόταξιν τοῦ Σατανᾶ καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν σύνταξιν, πικροτέρου πειραθήσῃ τοῦ τυράννου."

[184] *MC* 1:4 — "Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι, Σατανᾶ."

[185] *MC* 1:5,6,8 — "Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι, Σατανᾶ [...] Καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔργοις σου [...] Καὶ πάσῃ τῇ πομπῇ αὐτοῦ [...] Καὶ τῇ λατρείᾳ σου."

[186] For a brief discussion on possible origins of the word 'πομπῇ,' see Boismard 1964a and Waszink 1947.

[187] *MC* 1:6 — "θεατρομανίαι, καὶ ἱπποδρομίαι, καὶ κυνηγεσία, καὶ πᾶσα τοιαύτη ματαιότης."

[188] *Twelfth Instruction* (Montfaucon 2) 52, trans. Harkins 1963, 189.

[189] *Twelfth Instruction* (Montfaucon 2) 48, trans. Harkins 1963, 188.

[190] *MC* 1:7 — "Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐν εἰδωλίοις καὶ πανηγύρεσι κρεμνώμενα, ἔσθ' ὅτε κρέα, ἢ ἄρτοι, ἢ ἄλλα τοιαῦτα μιανθέντα τῇ τῶν παμμιάρων ἐπικλήσει δαιμόνων, ἐγκαταλεχθείη ἂν τῇ τοῦ διαβόλου πομπῇ. Ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος τῆς εὐχαριστίας, πρὸ τῆς ἁγίας ἐπικλήσεως τῆς προσκυνητῆς Τριάδος, ἄρτος ἦν καὶ οἶνος λιτός, ἐπικλήσεως δὲ γενομένης, ὁ μὲν ἄρτος γίνεται σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ὁ δὲ οἶνος αἷμα Χριστοῦ· τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον, τὰ τοιαῦτα βρώματα τῆς πομπῆς τοῦ Σατανᾶ, τῇ ἰδίᾳ φύσει λιτὰ ὄντα, τῇ ἐπικλήσει τῶν δαιμόνων βέβηλα γίνεται."

[191] Compare, for example, Tertullian's discussion in his *De Spectaculis*. Although all things are created by God and ultimately belong to him, they are perverted through misuse and can thereby become a spiritual pollutant: "*Non ergo hoc solum respiciendum est, a quo omnia sint instituta, sed a quo conversa*" (2).

Eucharist, the unique prerogative of the baptised Catholic Christian, Cyril identifies baptism as the point at which a person moves from one society to another, one ontologically different from that to which was before.[192] In the West, Ambrose's *De Sacramentatis* describes a formula of renunciation that does not include 'pomp.' Instead, after the candidate has renounced "the Devil and his works", he is asked, "Do you renounce the world and its pleasures?"'[193] Boismard suggests that this second question is simply a transposition of the first.[194] I would suggest that, rather than simply being a redundant repetition, this second renunciation of the world corresponds to the renunciation of 'pomp' we find in Cyril's hagiopolitan formula. Thus, the candidate is not simply renouncing the person of Satan, but also his domain, this fallen world over which he has dominion.

Both *CL* 3 and *MC* 2 open with a reading from Romans 6, "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?",[195] which forms the central narrative of Cyril's explanation of the immersion ritual:

> As soon as you entered, you took off your tunic; and this was an image of *putting off the old man with his deeds*.[196] Having stripped yourselves, you were naked; in this also imitating Christ, who was stripped naked on the Cross, and by his nakedness *put off from Himself the principalities and powers, and openly triumphed over them on the tree*[197] […]. After these things, you were led to the holy font of divine baptism, as Christ was carried from the Cross to the sepulchre which stands before you. And each of you was asked whether he believed in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and you made that saving confession, and three times descended into the water, and ascended again; here also symbolically pointing to Christ's three-day burial […]. And, with that, you were both dying and being born; and that saving water was your grave and your mother […]. Let no one think, therefore, that baptism is merely the grace of forgiveness of sins, or simply that of adoption […] it is also the imitation of and communion in the true sufferings of Christ."[198]

[192] Milanović (2011, 83–4) points to the "vie d'une nouvelle creation" as a hallmark of Cyril's baptismal theology.

[193] Ambrose, *De sacramentis* 1.2.5; Nicetas of Remesiana, *Ad comp.* 6.1.5 (Gamber 1964, 126).

[194] Boismard 1964a, 108.

[195] v. 3.

[196] Col. 3:9

[197] Col. 2:15

[198] *MC* 2:2,4,6 — "Εὐθύς γ'οὖν εἰσελθόντες, ἀπεδύεσθε τὸν χιτῶνα· καὶ τοῦτο ἦν εἰκὼν τοῦ τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀπεκδύσασθαι σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν. Ἀποδυθέντες γυμνοὶ ἦτε, μιμούμενοι καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ γυμνωθέντα Χριστόν, καὶ τῇ γυμνότητι ἀπεκδυσάμενον τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας, καὶ μετὰ παρρησίας

We find a similar description in *CL*:

> Having descended dead in sins, you ascend made alive in righteousness. For if you have been *planted together in the likeness of the Saviour's death*, you shall also be deemed worthy of his resurrection. For as Jesus took upon himself the sins of the world, and died, that by putting sin to death he might rise again in righteousness. Thus, by descending into the water, and in a sense being buried in the waters as he was in the rock, you are also raised again *walking in newness of life*.[199]

Juliette Day appears to suggest that the candidate's identification with Christ's resurrection does not appear in *MC*.[200] This is a curious assertion given the author of *MC*'s appeal to the very same Pauline passages in what appears to be a near verbatim repetition of the above passage from *CL*:

> Paul cried with truthful precision, *For if we have been planted together with the likeness of his death, we shall be also with the likeness of his resurrection*.[201] He spoke well in saying, 'planted together.' For since the true Vine was planted in this place, we also by participation in the baptism of death have been planted together with him […]. And God, who has presented you *as those that are alive from the dead*, is able to grant you *to walk in newness of life*.[202]

Thus, in both texts, the candidate dies to the old world in baptism and is born anew, being planted together [*σύμφυτοι*][203] with the true Vine.[204] One gets the impression in certain places

---

ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ θριαμβεύσαντα [...] Μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπὶ τὴν ἁγίαν τοῦ θείου βαπτίσματος ἐχειραγωγεῖσθε κολυμβήθραν, ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ ἐπὶ τὸ προκείμενον μνῆμα. Καὶ ἠρωτᾶτο ἕκαστος εἰ πιστεύει εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρός, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Καὶ ὡμολογεῖτε τὴν σωτήριον ὁμολογίαν, καὶ κατεδύετε τρίτον εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ πάλιν ἀνεδύετε, καὶ ἐνταῦθα διὰ συμβόλου τὴν τριήμερον τοῦ Χριστοῦ αἰνιττόμενοι ταφήν [...] Καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἀπεθνήσκετε καὶ ἐγεννᾶσθε, καὶ τὸ σωτήριον ἐκεῖνο ὕδωρ καὶ τάφος ὑμῖν ἐγίνετο καὶ μήτηρ [...] Μηδεὶς οὖν νομιζέτω τὸ βάπτισμα ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν μόνον, καὶ υἱοθεσίας χάριν τυγχάνειν [...] καὶ τῶν ἀληθινῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων ἐν μιμήσει ἔχον τὴν κοινωνίαν."

[199] Rom. 6:4. *CL* 3:12 — "Νεκρὸς ἐν ἁμαρτίαις καταβὰς, ἀναβαίνεις ζωοποιηθεὶς ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. Εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτος ἐγένου τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Σωτῆρος, καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως καταξιωθήσῃ. Ὥσπερ γὰρ Ἰησοῦς τὰς οἰκουμενικὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀναλαβὼν ἀπέθανεν, ἵνα θανατώσας τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἀναστῇ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ· οὕτω καὶ σὺ καταβὰς εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τρόπον τινὰ ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν ἐνταφεὶς, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνος ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ, ἐγείρῃ πάλιν ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατῶν."

[200] Day 2007a, 81. "*MC* 2 expresses throughout that the immersion effects imitation of and participation in Christ's death not his resurrection," Ibid., 83.

[201] Rom. 6:5.

[202] vv. 6:13, 4. *MC* 2:7,8 — "μετὰ πάσης ἐβόα Παῦλος τῆς ἀκριβείας· "Εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα." Καλῶς δὲ καὶ τὸ "σύμφυτοι". Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα πεφύτευται ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή, καὶ ἡμεῖς κοινωνίᾳ τοῦ βαπτίσματος τοῦ θανάτου "σύμφυτοι" αὐτοῦ γεγόναμεν [...] Δυνατὸς δέ ἐστιν ὁ Θεός, ὁ παραστήσας ὑμᾶς ὡς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας, δοῦναι ὑμῖν ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατεῖν."

[203] Rom. 6:5. While many New Testament translations renders this simply as "united with", Cyril's connection of *symphytos* with *ampelos* — the planting with the vine — makes it clear that he relates this baptismal union to the Eucharist. Dragas' (2008, 47) rendering of *σύμφυτος* as "become one in nature with" is therefore quite appropriate.

[204] See Boismard 1964b.

that Day, in her desire to correct what she sees as Riley's conflation of *CL* and *MC*,[205] goes too far in the opposite direction, finding glaring differences where none exist. The image of the Vine is essentially the same as that of Christ as the good olive tree used at the application of the exorcistic oil. Moreover, the ecclesiological dimensions of this planting are seen clearly in *PC*, where Cyril, speaking of the candidates' upcoming baptism, says "may he plant [*φυτεύσοι*] you in the Church, and enlist you for himself, putting on you the armour of righteousness. And may he fill you with the heavenly things of the New Testament."[206] Baptism is thus identified as the moment at which one becomes a member of the New Israel, the Catholic Church, grafted onto the true Vine following the cutting off of the Jews.

The notion of planting also evokes another image so central to Cyril's understanding of baptism: our restoration to paradise.

> May the gate of paradise then be opened to each man and woman among you, may you then enjoy the Christ-bearing and fragrant waters, may you then receive Christ's appellation, and the energy of divine things[207] […] like stars of the Church, you shall enter in it, bright in body and radiant in soul."[208]

Gregory of Nyssa similarly says, "You are outside paradise, catechumens; you participate in the exile of our ancestor Adam. But now that the door is gradually opening to you, enter into the Paradise which you left."[209] Also in *MC*, Cyril identifies himself as one who leads the newly baptised by the hand into the "brighter and more fragrant meadow of paradise."[210] Following the westward renunciation of the devil and the world over which he rules, the candidate is

---

[205] See, for example, Day 2007a, 82.

[206] *PC* 17 — "φυτεύσοι δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ στρατεύσοι ὑμᾶς ἑαυτῷ, ὅπλα περιβαλὼν τῆς δικαιοσύνης· οὐρανίων δὲ πραγμάτων καινῆς διαθήκης πληρώσειε."

"The armour of righteousness" is identified as the post-baptismal chrism in *MC* (3:4). As such, it is safe to assume that the "planting in the Church" refers to the act of baptism — rather than a later laying on of hands, as will be demonstrated in chapter 9 — while the "heavenly things" are the Eucharistic Gifts.

[207] Again, the 'divine things' [*θείων πραγμάτων*] are almost certainly the Eucharistic elements, while the reception of Christ's appellation and the Christ-bearing waters refer to the post-baptismal anointing and the putting on of Christ through the triple immersion respectively, the same concepts we see described in *MC*.

[208] *PC* 15 — "τότε ὑμῶν ἑκάστῳ καὶ ἑκάστῃ παραδείσου θύρα ἀνοιχθῇ. Τότε ὑδάτων ἀπολαύσητε Χριστοφόρων, ἐχόντων εὐωδίαν. Τότε Χριστοῦ προσηγορίαν λάβητε, καὶ ἐνέργειαν θείων πραγμάτων...ὥσπερ ἀστέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, εἰσέλθητε φαιδροὶ τῷ σώματι, καὶ φωτεινοὶ τῇ ψυχῇ."

[209] *Bapt. Diff.* (*PG* 46.417CD–420C).

[210] *MC* 1:1 — "εἰς τὸν φωτεινότερον καὶ εὐωδέστερον λειμῶνα τοῦδε τοῦ παραδείσου χειραγωγήσω."

commanded to turn east,[211] "where the paradise of the Lord, which he planted towards the East, is opened to you; whence our forefather was exiled for his transgression."[212] Unlike Ambrose, whose use of directional symbolism matches that of Cyril,[213] Chrysostom and Theodore do not make mention of any *West-East* symbolism. Instead, the candidate turns to the figurative Golgotha, where at the 9th hour of the day, also the time of the renunciation in Chrysostom's mystagogy, Christ opened the gates of paradise to the repentant thief.[214] As the candidates proceed to take off their clothes, Cyril explains to them that "you were naked in the sight of all, and were not ashamed; for you truly bore the likeness of the first-formed Adam, who was naked in paradise, and was not ashamed."[215] Baptism is here presented as a return to the prelapsarian state of Adam, the old sinful man having been put to death, and the point of entry to a new paradise: the Church. "If they were then cast out of paradise because they ate from the tree, shall not believers now more easily enter into paradise because of the Tree of Jesus?"[216] It is a new paradise, for, as Chrysostom explains, "the bath is much better than the garden of Paradise. There can be no serpent here, but Christ is here initiating you into the regeneration that comes from the water and the Spirit."[217] Furthermore, Cyril maintains that

[211] Riley (1974, 82, n.180) makes reference to E. Peterson's suggestion that the Christian practice of praying towards the East was in opposition to the Jewish practice of facing Jerusalem (Peterson 1947). Given Cyril's frequent emphasis on the significance of hagiopolitan topography also in the context of baptismal rites, it seems unlikely that Cyril's eastward posture was intended to undermine the city's importance.

[212] *MC* 1:9 — "ἀνοίγεταί σοι ὁ παράδεισος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃν ἐφύτευσε κατὰ ἀνατολάς, ὅθεν διὰ τὴν παράβασιν ἐξόριστος γέγονεν ὁ ἡμέτερος προπάτωρ."

[213] *Myst.* 7 (Botte 2008, 158; Deferrari 1963, 7).

[214] Harkins (1963, 224, n.47) suggests that, despite their silence, it is nonetheless reasonable to presume that such a West-East movement did take place. Finn (1967, 69) cites the reference to the thief's entry to Paradise in support of this view. Riley (1974, 81–82, n.178), however, thinks this improbable, citing the "cumbersome ceremonial action" this would involve, a criticism repeated by Day (2007a, 53). Though I would be hesitant to offer an argument from silence, the position taken by Riley and Day does seem to be the more persuasive one. Not, however, on account of the turning being 'cumbersome' — ergonomics does not seem to have ever been a primary concern in liturgical development — but rather because rising to turn and then returning to a kneeling position would compromise the elaborate symbolism in kneeling and rising we see employed in both Theodore (see *Bapt. Hom.* 2.19 in Tonneau 1964, 398–400; Mingana 1933, 47) and Chrysostom (see Riley 1974, 64–68, for relevant citations).

[215] *MC* 2:2 — "γυμνοὶ ἦτε ἐν ὄψεσι πάντων, καὶ οὐκ ᾐσχύνεσθε. Ἀληθῶς γὰρ μίμημα ἐφέρετε τοῦ πρωτοπλάστου Ἀδάμ, ὃς ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ γυμνὸς ἦν καὶ οὐκ ᾐσχύνετο."

[216] *CL* 13:2 — "καὶ εἰ τότε διὰ τὸ ξύλον τῆς βρώσεως ἐξεβλήθησαν ἐκ παραδείσου, ἆρα διὰ τὸ ξύλον Ἰησοῦ νῦν εὐκοπώτερον οἱ πιστεύοντες εἰς παράδεισον οὐκ εἰσελεύσονται;"

[217] *P-K* 3:29, trans Harkins 1963, 170.

the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles at Pentecost was a repetition of God's breathing into the nostrils of the first formed man,[218] "His first [breath] having been stifled by wilful sins,"[219] and asserts that the same occurs in baptism.[220] Baptism therefore becomes a recapitulation of the creation event. Didymus, an Alexandrian contemporary of Cyril's, expresses it thus:

> The Holy Spirit as God renovates us in baptism, and in union with the Father and the Son, brings us back from a state of deformity to our pristine beauty […] he frees us from sin and death and from the things of this earth […]. He gives us heaven in exchange for earth, and bestows paradise with a bounteous hand.[221]

Central to Day's discussion on the immersion rituals is her assessment of Winkler's theory that the Pauline death-resurrection typology gradually came to replace an earlier typology of Christ's baptism within the Syrian baptismal rite.[222] Although an analysis of the merits or demerits of Winkler's hypothesis is beyond the scope of this study, a few aspects of Day's assessment are worth noting here. Although she rightly concludes that there is no evidence of such a shift in Cyril, since both are present in both *CL* and *MC*,[223] she fails to mention that the typology of Christ's baptism in the Jordan actually forms part of Cyril's death-resurrection typology. Christ's descent into the waters to bind the dragon is itself a type of his descent into the tomb, whereby he destroyed death by his resurrection.[224] Within the Syrian sources, Day identifies differences in the water-rites described by John Chrysostom and in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the latter understanding "the rite in terms of identification with Christ's death and resurrection,"[225] while the primary typology of the former "is the Jordan

---

By contrast, Cyril's reference to paradise in *PC* is immediately followed by a warning to beware that a "serpent by the wayside is watching the passengers [...] lest he bite thee with unbelief" (16). However, this only appears to refer to the period of Lenten catechesis, not the baptism itself.

[218] Gen. 2:7

[219] *CL* 17:12 — "ἐπειδὴ τὸ πρῶτον ἠμαυρώθη διὰ τὰς ἑκουσίους ἁμαρτίας."

[220] *CL* 17:14

[221] Didymus, *Trin.* 2.13, trans. Quasten, *Patrology*, 3:98 cited in Jensen 2012, 2.

[222] Winkler 1985.

[223] Day 2007a, 82.

[224] *CL* 3:11

[225] Day 2007a, 85.

event and 'rebirth'."[226] This is indeed so, but I would question her conclusion that "Chrysostom's understanding of the water rite is [therefore] based upon different theological presuppositions than *AC*."[227] While not part of his description of the water rite, Chrysostom's *Catechetical Lectures* describe baptism as "a burial and a resurrection"[228] and makes extensive use of the Pauline imagery, even making the same distinction between physical death and "the likeness of His death" in baptism that we find in *MC*.[229] She also points to the absence of "any reference to the waters of creation."[230] I find this curious as the very citation she then provides as evidence makes a clear reference to the first chapter of Genesis.[231] It is, indeed, strikingly similar to what we find in Cyril's explanation for the use of water in baptism: "Before all the events of the six-day creation, the Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters. Water was the beginning of the world: the Jordan was the beginning of the Gospel."[232]

In the other Pauline typology prominent in the works of Cyril and other writers — namely, the identification of the Exodus scene with baptism we find in 1 Corinthians[233] — we see the devil, the dragon bound in Jordan, drowned in the waters of baptism. "For Israel deliverance from Pharaoh was through the sea, and for the world deliverance from sins 'by the washing of the water with the word'[234] of God."[235] In *MC,* just as the Exodus was made possible through the blood of a lamb, so the devil's destruction in the water is made possible by the

[226] Ibid., 86.
[227] Ibid.
[228] *Cat. Stav.* 2.11, trans. Harkins 1963, 47.
[229] *P-K* 2.4, trans. Harkins 1963, 151–152. *MC* 2:7.
[230] Day 2007a, 86.
[231] "From the time when the Lord came forth from the waters of the Jordan, the water brings forth no longer 'crawling creatures having life', but rational souls bearing the Holy Spirit" (*Hom. on John 26*, trans. Goggin 1957, 251. Cited on p.86 of Day 2007a. Contrast this with Genesis 1:20: "Let the waters bring forth creeping things among living creatures".
[232] *CL* 3:5 — "καὶ πρὸ πάσης τῶν γενητῶν τῆς ἑξαημέρου κατασκευῆς, Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος. Ἀρχὴ τοῦ κόσμου τὸ ὕδωρ· καὶ ἀρχὴ τῶν εὐαγγελίων ὁ Ἰορδάνης."
[233] 1 Cor. 10:2–4 — "Our fathers [...] were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ."
[234] Eph. 5:26
[235] *CL* 3:5 — "διὰ τοῦ λουτροῦ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι Θεοῦ."

Blood of Christ.[236] Moses was, of course, not merely a deliverer, but one entrusted to lead the People of Israel to the Promised Land, a type of paradise. Accordingly, in *CL* 18, Cyril identifies the Church as "a type and copy of 'Jerusalem which is above [and] which is free'[237]."[238] It is not insignificant, then, that Cyril sees Joshua's typification of Christ primarily in baptismal terms:

> And Joshua the son of Nun bore a type of him in many things. For when he began to rule over the people, he began from Jordan,[239] whence Christ also, after he was baptised, began to evangelise.[240]

Thus what we see in *PC, CL,* and *MC* are not a collection of disparate and unconnected typologies, but a single, clear and unified narrative of the person's death, rebirth, and restoration to paradise through participation in Christ's passion, death and resurrection, by which the ruler of this world[241] is defeated, opening up the gates to the kingdom not of this world[242] where he himself is ruler, and of which the Church is a concrete manifestation.

The Church as Mother and Bride

The notion of rebirth in turn gives rise to another ecclesiological image, that of the Church as Mother. It was Cyprian of Carthage — of whom more will be said in the following chapters — who coined the famous phrase: "He can no longer have God for his father who has not the church for his mother."[243] He maintained that "The church is alone mother [...] from

[236] *MC* 1:2–3

In addition to the lamb's blood, Gregory of Nyssa, in his *Life of Moses*, having mentioned the drowning of Pharaoh as a type of baptism, also identifies the tree which Moses cast into the bitter waters of Marah (Ex. 15:22–25) as the Cross of Christ, and sees the ensuing miracle as a type of his resurrection (Book Two, 69).

[237] Gal. 4:26

[238] *CL* 18:26 — "τύπον δὲ ἔχει καὶ μίμημα τῆς ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἥτις ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶ."

[239] Josh. 3:1

[240] *CL* 10:11 — "Τύπον δὲ ἔφερεν αὐτοῦ ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ Ἰησοῦς κατὰ πολλά. Ἀρξάμενος γὰρ ἄρχειν τοῦ λαοῦ, ἤρξατο ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου· ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς βαπτισθεὶς ἤρξατο εὐαγγελίζεσθαι."

[241] Cf. John 14:30, 12:31; 2 Cor. 4:4.

[242] Cf. John 18:36

[243] *Unit. eccl.* 5–6, trans. Jensen 2012, 58.

her womb we are born, by her milk we are nourished, by her spirit we are animated."[244] Clement of Alexandria likewise interprets Scriptural references to believers as children to mean children of the Mother Church.[245] In *PC*, Cyril tells his listeners that "You who have been enrolled are become sons and daughters of one Mother,"[246] while *MC* explains that this takes place at the moment of baptism, at which "you were both dying and being born; and that saving water was your grave and your mother."[247] This water-womb imagery is one we find in numerous other fourth-century baptismal texts,[248] many of which are explicitly ecclesiological. Ephraim the Syrian, for example, couples with this image that of the priest as a mid-wife "who ministers to this womb as it gives birth."[249] Methodius, in his *Banquet*, explains how "the church must necessarily stand at the bath, giving birth [*ἀναγεννῶσα*] to those being washed,"[250] while Augustine, too, speaks of the "The whole Church, our mother, which exists in the saints [...] gives birth to each and every one."[251]

Cyril sees in the motherhood of the Church a fulfilment of that reoccurring Old Testament image, beginning with Sarah and ending with Elizabeth, of the barren woman who conceives miraculously. "This Holy Church," Cyril explains, "the mother of us all, which is the bride of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God (for it is written, *As Christ also loved the Church and gave himself for her*,'[252] and all the rest,) [...] before was barren, but now has many

[244] Ibid.

[245] "A mother draws her children near her; we seek our mother, the Church" (*Paedagogus* 1.21.1). See Hägg 2011, at 980–82.

[246] *PC* 13 — "Μιᾶς μητρὸς γεγόνατε υἱοὶ καὶ θυγατέρες, οἱ ἀπογραφέντες."

[247] *MC* 2:4 — "Καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἀπεθνήσκετε καὶ ἐγεννᾶσθε, καὶ τὸ σωτήριον ἐκεῖνο ὕδωρ καὶ τάφος ὑμῖν ἐγίνετο καὶ μήτηρ."

[248] For a comparative analysis of this image in Cyril, Ambrose, Chrysostom and Theodore, see Riley 1974, 302, 307, 317, 332. See also Ephraim the Syrian, *Hymns on Virginity* 7.5, 7 (trans. Brock 1983, 48–49) and *Hymni de ecclesia* 36.5; Pacian of Barcelona, *On Baptism* 6.2 (Hanson 1999, 92).

[249] *On Virginity 7.7*, trans. Brock 1983, 49. See Seppälä 2011.

[250] *Banquet* 8.6.187, trans. Musurillo 1958, 112.

[251] *Ep.* 98.5 (*PL* 33:361–2), trans. Teske 2001, 429.

[252] Eph. 5:25

children."[253] Chrysostom similarly marvels at "how many children this spiritual mother [the Church] has brought forth suddenly and in a single night!"[254] Elsewhere, Cyril speaks of the grace of the Holy Spirit bringing forth "the first-born children of this once barren Church."[255] That the Church is the Bride of Christ is significant also because it shows that the Christian Church is now the rightful inheritor of the unique spousal relationship between God and his chosen people we see described in the Old Testament; the New Israel having replaced the Old, the barren branch of the Jews having been cut off and a new fruitful branch having been grafted on.[256] Accordingly, Cyril warns his listeners not to return to their former state of barrenness:

> Henceforth you are planted in the noetic Paradise. You receive a new name, which you did not previously have. Until now you were a catechumen, but now you shall be called a believer. You are now transplanted among the noetic olive-trees, grafted from the wild into the good olive-tree [...]. You are made a communicant of the Holy Vine. Well, then, if you then abide in the vine, you shall increase as a fruitful branch; but if you do not abide, you shall be utterly consumed by the fire. Let us therefore bear fruit worthily. Let it not be that what befell that barren fig-tree should happen in us, that Jesus will not come now and curse us for our barrenness.[257]

With what is a remarkable consistency in his use of imagery, Cyril extends the Pauline death-resurrection typology also to his discussion of the Church as the bride of Christ. In *CL* 14, making use of the Song of Songs — which "you must not, accepting the vulgar, superficial interpretation of the words, suppose [...] is an expression of carnal, sexual love [...] it is [rather] the language of bridals with an immortal Lover, bridals pure and chaste"[258] — he presents Christ as "the Bridegroom and healer of souls"[259] and the Song as a poetic description of his

---

[253] *CL* 18:26 — "τῆς ἁγίας ταύτης καὶ μητρὸς ἡμῶν ἁπάντων. ἥτις νύμφη μέν ἐστι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, (γέγραπται γάρ· καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, καὶ ὅλα τὰ ἑξῆς,) [...] ἡ πρότερον μὲν στεῖρα, νῦν δὲ πολύτεκνος."

[254] *Cat. Stav.* 4:1, trans. Harkins 1963, 66.

[255] *CL* 17:24 — "τοῖς πρωτογόνοις τέκνοις τῆς ποτε στείρας ἐκκλησίας ταύτης."

[256] This is the primary subject of chapter 5.

[257] *CL* 1:4 — "Καταφυτεύῃ λοιπὸν εἰς τὸν νοητὸν παράδεισον. Λαμβάνεις ὄνομα καινὸν, ὃ πρότερον οὐκ εἶχες. Πρὸ τούτου Κατηχούμενος ἦς, νῦν δὲ κληθήσῃ Πιστός. Μεταφυτεύῃ λοιπὸν εἰς τὰς ἐλαίας τὰς νοητὰς, ἐξ ἀγριελαίου εἰς καλλιέλαιον ἐγκεντριζόμενος [...] Γίνῃ κοινωνὸς τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου. Ἀλλ' ἐὰν μὲν ἐπιμείνῃς ἐν τῇ ἀμπέλῳ, αὔξῃ ὡς κλῆμα καρποφόρον· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἐπιμείνῃς, ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς καταναλωθήσῃ. Καρποφορήσωμεν τοίνυν ἀξίως. Μὴ γένοιτο γὰρ, ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν γένηται τὸ, κατὰ τὴν ἄκαρπον ἐκείνην συκῆν, μή ποτε ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ νῦν καταράσηται διὰ τὴν ἀκαρπίαν."

[258] *Hom. Par.* 10, 215.

[259] *CL* 14:12 — "ὁ νυμφίος καὶ ὁ τῶν ψυχῶν θεραπευτής."

burial and resurrection. Also in the *Sermon on the Paralytic* does Cyril "meditate on the heavenly lessons of the Song, a Song that breathes chastity and tells of the Passion of Christ."[260] Again, in *CL* 13, we find these words: "This one [Adam] by the Tree fell away; you by the Tree are brought into Paradise [...]. Of this garden I sang of old to my spouse in the Canticles, and spoke to her thus. *I have come to my garden, my sister, my bride*[261]."[262]

A century earlier, Origen had, in the words of Jerome,[263] "surpassed himself" with his expositions on the Song of Songs.[264] In these we find many of the same images employed by Cyril, that of "the perfect Bride of the perfect Husband."[265] In contrast to Cyril, however, Origen develops two very separate parallel themes, now identifying the Bride with the "mind that has been purified," divinized through contemplation of God[266] and the soul that "falls deeply in love" with "the beauty and fairness of the Word of God,"[267] but at other times seeing her as "the Church of the firstborn that is in heaven" and "the heavenly Jerusalem […] our celestial mother" being wedded to Christ "our Ecclesiast."[268] What we see in Cyril is a marriage of these two separate approaches, forming a single psycho-ecclesial image of the Church-Bride as the unique context for the soul's intimate and personal relationship with God.[269]

The meeting of the Lover and his beloved takes place in the baptismal font, which Cyril identifies as the bridal chamber.[270] In both *PC* and *CL* 3, baptism is likened to the wedding

---

[260] *Hom. Par.* 11, 216.

[261] Song 5:1

[262] *CL* 13:31,32 — "ἐκεῖνος διὰ τοῦ ξύλου ἀπέπεσε, καὶ σὺ διὰ τοῦ ξύλου εἰσάγῃ εἰς τὸν παράδεισον [...] Προανεφώνησα ἐν ᾄσμασι περὶ τούτου τοῦ κήπου πρὸς τὴν ἐμὴν νύμφην, καὶ ταῦτα εἶπον πρὸς αὐτήν· εἰσῆλθον εἰς κῆπόν μου, ἀδελφή μου νύμφη."

[263] *Preface to the Translation of Origen's Two Homilies on the Song of Songs* in *NPNF 2.6*, 1033. For a recent treatment of Origen's baptismal theology, see Hällström 2011, 989–1009.

[264] See Decock 2010; King 2005; Miller 1988.

[265] *Comm. Cant.* Prologue 2 in Lawson 1957, 47.

[266] *Comm. Jo.* 32.27.338

[267] Lawson 1957, 30.

[268] Ibid., 52.

[269] For the debt owed by 4th century writers to other elements Origen's commentary, see for example the introduction to Norris 2012, xiii–liv.

[270] *CL* 3:2,16 — Again making use of the Song of Songs, he says: "Νῦν γὰρ τέως ἔξω τῆς θύρας ἔστηκας· γένοιτο δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς εἰπεῖν· Εἰσήνεγκέ με ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸ ταμεῖον αὐτοῦ· ἀγαλλιάσθω ἡ ψυχή μου ἐπὶ τῷ Κυρίῳ· ἐνέδυσε γάρ με ἱμάτιον σωτηρίου, καὶ χιτῶνα εὐφροσύνης· ὡς νυμφίῳ περιέθηκέ μοι μίτραν, καὶ ὡς

feast we find described in the parable in Matthew's Gospel,[271] while Cyril warns of the need for a right disposition and adequate preparation lest they be found without a wedding garment.

> Let the souls that are to be united to the noetic Bridegroom make themselves ready [...]. Make ready the vessels of the soul, cleansed by unhypocritical faith, for reception of the Holy Spirit. Begin at once to wash your robes by repentance, that you may be found clean when you are called to the bridal-chamber. For the Bridegroom invites all without distinction [...] but the same one then separates those who have come in [to the typological marriage]. May none of those whose names have now been enrolled hear the words, *Friend, how did you enter here, not having a wedding garment*?[272] [273]

That the one rejected from the wedding feast is bound and cast out into darkness, being "unworthy of the bridal torches,"[274] although applies first and foremost to the one approaching baptism ill prepared or with malintent, should not be overlooked when considering the question of ecclesiological boundaries and the presence of grace or salvation outside them. Therefore, pointing to the coming of "Jesus the Bridegroom of souls," Cyril exhorts his listners to prepare for this awesome encounter. "Were it your wedding day before you, would you not have disregarded all else, and started the preparation for the feast? And when you are about to consecrate your soul to the heavenly Bridegroom, will you not cease from carnal things, that you may win spiritual things?"[275]

Thus it is through the Church's union with Christ as his Bride that she, no longer barren, conceives recreated souls in the womb of the baptismal waters, becoming a new Eden for those

---

νύμφην κατεκόσμησέ με κόσμῳ [...] Ἡ γὰρ πρότερον δούλη ψυχὴ νῦν ἀδελφιδοῦν αὐτὸν τὸν δεσπότην ἐπεγράψατο· ὃς τὴν ἀνυπόκριτον ἀποδεχόμενος προαίρεσιν ἐπιφωνήσει· Ἰδοὺ, εἶ καλὴ ἡ πλησίον μου, ἰδοὺ εἶ καλή· ὀδόντες σου ὡς ἀγέλαι τῶν κεκαρμένων· διὰ τὴν εὐσυνείδητον ὁμολογίαν· καὶ ἐξῆς· αἱ πᾶσαι διδυμεύουσαι· διὰ τὴν διπλῆν χάριν, λέγω δὲ τὴν ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ Πνεύματος τελουμένην [...] Καὶ γένοιτο πάντας ὑμᾶς [...] ἀμώμως τῷ νοητῷ νυμφίῳ παραστάντας, τυχεῖν τῆς ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ."

[271] Matt. 22

[272] Matt. 22:12

[273] *CL* 3:1–2 — "αἱ δὲ μέλλουσαι ψυχαὶ τῷ νοητῷ νυμφίῳ συνάπτεσθαι, παρασκευαζέσθωσαν [...] Ἑτοιμάσατε τῆς ψυχῆς τὰ ἀγγεῖα καθαρὰ διὰ τῆς ἀνυποκρίτου πίστεως, πρὸς ὑποδοχὴν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Ἄρξασθε πλύνειν τὰς στολὰς ὑμῶν διὰ μετανοίας, ἵνα εἰς τὸν νυμφῶνα καθαροὶ κληθέντες εὑρεθῆτε. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ νυμφίος καλεῖ πάντας ἁπλῶς [...] διακρίνει δὲ λοιπὸν ὁ αὐτὸς, τοὺς ἔνδον εἰσελθόντας [εἰς τὸν τυπικὸν γάμον]. Μὴ γένοιτό τινα τῶν ὀνοματογραφηθέντων ἀκοῦσαι νῦν· Ἑταῖρε, πῶς εἰσῆλθες ὧδε, μὴ ἔχων ἔνδυμα γάμου;."

[274] *PC* 3 — "ἀνάξιος γάρ ἐστι λαμπάδων νυμφικῶν."

[275] *PC* 4.6 — "πρὶν ὁ νυμφίος τῶν ψυχῶν εἰσέλθῃ Ἰησοῦς [...]. Εἴ σοι γάμων ἡμέραι προέκειντο, οὐκ ἂν κατεφρόνησας πάντων, καὶ περὶ τὴν ἑτοιμασίαν τῆς ἑστιάσεως ἐγένου; μέλλων δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν καθοσιοῦν τῷ ἐπουρανίῳ νυμφίῳ, οὐκ ἀργήσεις σωματικῶν, ἵνα ἄρῃς πνευματικά;."

to whom she gives birth. Being ourselves incorporated into the Church at the selfsame moment, the baptismal font is also the bridal chamber wherein we join with the heavenly Bridegroom, putting on Christ while putting off the devil. And "may the soul which has once put him off, never again put him on, but say with the Bride of Christ in the Song of Songs, *I had put off my tunic, how could I put it on again*?"[276]

The Church is typified not only by the barren women of the Old Covenant, but also by the virginal birthgiving which heralded the New. In Italy, Zeno of Verona describes the way in which the Church in baptism, unlike a natural mother, gives birth without sully or toil,[277] while Chromatius of Aquileia describes the Church as "a spiritual ewe [which] gives birth to a flock of faithful even as sheep for Christ [...]. The church is shown by the bath as having just delivered, because by the grace of baptism it gives birth to sons for God."[278] The former is reminiscent of a fifth century inscription, further south in the Lateran, which declares that "Mother church as a virgin brought forth those who are born, whom she conceived by the divine breath and brought into being in the flowing water."[279] Ambrose calls Mary "the figure of the Church",[280] an image also employed by Methodius of Olympus[281] and Cyril of Alexandria.[282] The seventh century Northumbrian monastic, Bede the Venerable, goes so far as to say that "Christ is born again" in baptism.[283]

While *MC* does not feature direct allusion to the annunciation or virgin birth in the context of baptism, the post-baptismal anointing with chrism marks the moment at which the neophytes, having just been reborn through the baptismal waters, are "made christ, by receiving

[276] Song 5:3. MC 2:2 — "Ὃν μὴ εἴη πάλιν ἐνδύσασθαι τῇ ἅπαξ τοῦτον ἀποδυσαμένῃ ψυχῇ, ἀλλὰ λέγειν κατὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ Ἄισματι τῶν ᾀσμάτων τοῦ Χριστοῦ νύμφην· Ἐξεδυσάμην τὸν χιτῶνά μου, πῶς ἐνδύσομαι αὐτόν;."
[277] *Ep.* 1.32, 1.35, trans. Hamman 1967, 64–6.
[278] *Sermon* 17:3, trans. Ferguson 2009, 658.
[279] Giuseppe Cuscito, 'Epigrafi di apparato nei battiseri paleocristiani d'Italia', *L'edificio battesimale in Italia* 37, 462–466. Ferguson 2009, 769.
[280] "*Sed virgo, quia est Ecclesia typus" — Expos. Evang. s. Luc.* 2.7 (*PL* 15:1635–1636A).
[281] *Symp.* 7 (*PG* 18:381AB).
[282] *Hom. Div.*, 4 (*PG* 77:996C).
[283] *Ex. Apoc.* (*PL* 93:165–166).

the antitype of the Holy Spirit."[284] Emphasising this as the unique prerogative of the Church, Cyril explains that it is at this point that "you are called Christians, verifying the name also by your re-birth. For before you were deemed worthy of baptism and the grace of the Holy Spirit, you had properly no right to this title, but were advancing on your way towards being Christians."[285]

The Church as the Body of Christ

Implicit in *MC* 3, according to Day, is the notion that the blessing over the chrism included an *epiklēsis* of the Holy Spirit, comparable to the Eucharistic *epiklēsis* we find in *MC* 5,[286] a feature we do not find in those Syrian sources of the same period where a post-baptismal anointing had begun to appear, probably influenced by the Palestinian rite.[287]

> Just as the bread of the Eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no longer ordinary bread, but the Body of Christ, so also this holy myrrh is no longer ordinary — nor common, so to speak — with the invocation, but it is Christ's gift of grace, and, by the coming of the Holy Spirit, is made fit to impart his divinity.[288]

Interestingly, the Liturgy of St. James, to which *MC* is our earliest attestation, [289] makes use of the Annunciation as an ecclesiological image with reference to the Spirit's descent upon the

[284] *MC* 3:1 — "Χριστοὶ δὲ γεγόνατε, τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος τὸ ἀντίτυπον δεξάμενοι."

[285] *MC* 3:5 — "καλεῖσθε χριστιανοί, ἐπαληθεύοντες τῇ ἀναγεννήσει καὶ τὸ ὄνομα. Πρὸ γὰρ τοῦ καταξιωθῆναι ὑμᾶς τοῦ βαπτίσματος καὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος χάριτος, οὐκ ἦτε κυρίως ἄξιοι, ἀλλ' ὁδεύοντες προεβαίνετε τὸ εἶναι χριστιανοί."

[286] Day 2007a, 110.

[287] Ibid., 113. See *AC* 7, where the prayer over the chrism consists of a simple thanksgiving, which leads Metzger (1987, 105) to suggest that the post-baptismal anointing was merely the transposition of the pre-baptismal anointing. It does not seem to have appeared in Antioch by the time of Chrysostom (Green 1962). See also Harkins 1966.

[288] *MC* 3:3 — "Ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας, μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτός, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἅγιον τοῦτο μύρον οὐκ ἔτι ψιλόν, οὐδ' ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις κοινὸν μετ' ἐπικλήσεως, ἀλλὰ Χριστοῦ χάρισμα, καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου παρουσίας τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος ἐνεργητικὸν γινόμενον."

[289] John Fountoulēs (2005, 68) remarks that the liturgy described in *MC* "*εἶναι προφανῶς ἡ παροῦσα λειτουργία*". Although Cyril makes clear reference to an epiclesis (*MC* 5:7), whether the response in question would have been known to him, or is the product of later development is uncertain. For a discussion of this development, see Bradshaw 2002, 116–117; Fenwick, 1992); 'Οἱ εὐχαριστιακές μαρτυρίες στὶς πηγές τῶν Α΄–Δ΄ αἰώνων' in Filias 2016, 121–310 (see in particular pp.216–226 for a discussion of *MC*, and pp.324–343 for the development of the *epiclesis* more generally); Burreson 1997; Gelston 2010; Witvliet 1997; Cutrone 1978; Spinks 1989; A. Tarby 1972; Rodopoulou 1968.

bread and wine, when the people, anticipating the coming *epiklēsis*, reply to the celebrant saying, "*Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ δύναμις Ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι*."[290] Accordingly, Cyril not only places the post-baptismal anointing squarely within the boundaries of the Catholic Church, but also ties it to the Eucharist when he says the following:

> In ancient times, the blessed Isaiah prophesied about this saying, *On this mountain the Lord Sabaoth will make a feast for all nations*; — he calls the Church a mountain […] — *they will drink wine, they will drink joy, they will anoint themselves with myrrh*[291]."[292]

The prophet's reference to wine would almost certainly have been understood as a Eucharistic symbol, given the way in which he elsewhere identifies the cup and anointing in Psalm 22 as the Eucharist and post-baptismal chrismation respectively.[293] Matthew Finn notes that this particular psalm was often chanted as the neophytes marched from the baptistery towards the Eucharistic assembly.[294] It was only at this point, argues Day, that the candidates became full members of the church.[295]

Having received their wedding garment in baptism, the candidates are now made "children of the bridal chamber" and enter into the spiritual wedding feast typified by the one in Cana of Galilee.[296] Ephrem the Syrian, using psycho-ecclesial imagery akin to that of Cyril, also identifies Cana with the Eucharist, speaking simultaneously of the soul as God's bridal chamber, while calling it a "banquet for the whole Church."[297] Elsewhere, the same hymnographer proclaims that immediately after the baptismal "womb has given birth, the altar

---

[290] Fountoulēs 2005, 107.
[291] Is. 25:6.
[292] *MC* 3:7 — "Τοῦτο ἐκ παλαιῶν χρόνων ὁ μακάριος Ἡσαΐας προφητεύων ἔλεγε· "Καὶ ποιήσει Κύριος πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο", ὄρος δὲ καλεῖ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν [...] πίονται οἶνον, πίονται εὐφροσύνην, χρίσονται μύρον."
[293] *MC* 4:7. In *CL* 1:6, he cites the same Psalm of David, identifying the "waters of rest" as the waters of baptism, thus showing the inseparability of, not only baptism and chrismation, but baptism and the Eucharist in Cyril's mind.
[294] Finn 1992a, 16. See also Jeffery 1992.
[295] Day 2009, 120.
[296] *MC* 2
[297] *Hymns on Faith* 14, trans. Brock 1983, 18.

suckles and nurtures"[298] the candidates, an image we also find in Chrysostom, who describes the neophytes bringing to their mouths "the nipple of the spiritual Cup like infants at the breast."[299] The Eucharist, then, is an integral part of the initiatory process. As such, it forms part of Cyril's single death-resurrection-restoration narrative.

> Having been baptised into Christ, and put on Christ,[300] you have been made conformable to the Son of God. For God having predestined us to adoption[301] and made us conformable to Christ's glorious body.[302] Being therefore made partakers of Christ,[303] you are rightly called christs.[304]

MC, with the Apostle Paul,[305] affirms that it is through the Eucharist that the candidates have become "of the same body and the same blood" [*σύσσωμος καὶ σύναιμος*] with Christ: "For thus we come to bear Christ in us, because his Body and Blood are distributed through our members."[306] This gathering of believers into a single body is expressed rather beautifully by an Egyptian contemporary of Cyril's:

> As this bread was scattered upon the mountains and was gathered and became one, do You likewise gather Your holy Church from every nation and every country and town and village and household and make one living catholic Church.[307]

Serapion here makes the Eucharist a central feature of his ecclesiology, with reference to the same notion of assembly to which Cyril attributes the name *ἐκκλησία*.[308]

Although only *MC* is explicitly Eucharistic in content[309] on account of the *Disciplina Arcani* — the subject of chapter 8 — Donna Hawk-Reinhard, who has made significant

---

[298] *Hymns on Virginity* 7:8, trans. ibid. 49. He also attests to the way in which the Eucharist would immediately follow the baptismal rite, saying that "her children eat straight away, not milk, but perfect Bread!".

[299] *In Mt. Hom.*, 82.6.5 (*PG* 58:754).

[300] Gal. 3:27

[301] Eph. 1:5

[302] Phil. 3:21

[303] Heb. 3:14

[304] *MC* 3:1 — "Εἰς Χριστὸν βεβαπτισμένοι καὶ Χριστὸν ἐνδυσάμενοι σύμμορφοι γεγόνατε τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Προορίσας γὰρ ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς εἰς υἱοθεσίαν, συμμόρφους ἐποίησε τοῦ σώματος τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Μέτοχοι οὖν τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενόμενοι, χριστοὶ εἰκότως καλεῖσθε."

[305] See Giblet 1964.

[306] *MC* 4:3 — "Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ χριστοφόροι γινόμεθα, τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος εἰς τὰ ἡμέτερα ἀναδιδομένου μέλη."

[307] Serapion, *Euchologion* 13.1, trans. Barret-Lennard 1993, 26.

[308] *MC* 18:24 — "Ἐκκλησία δὲ καλεῖται φερωνύμως διὰ τὸ πάντας ἐκκαλεῖσθαι καὶ ὁμοῦ συνάγειν."

[309] See Frank 2001, particularly 623–630 for her analysis of *MC*.

contributions to the study of Cyril's Eucharistic theology, nonetheless sees a clear connection between baptism, Eucharist, and *theōsis* in *CL* 3.11, where Cyril states that Christ "partook of them [humanity], that having been made partakers [*lit.* communicants] of his presence in the flesh we might be made partakers also of his divine grace."[310] Christ participates in our human nature by taking flesh from the Virgin, while we in turn, by virtue of our baptism, can partake of that now divinized and gracefilled human nature through the Eucharistic participation of his body and blood, by which we become *χριστοφόροι*. She — rightly, in my estimation — proposes "a reading of Cyril's sacramental theology that is more than merely being brought into God's saving presence, but is the beginning of the eternal life of fellowship with the Triune God by being Christ-bearers who share in the divine nature and are Heavens on earth"[311], and asserts that this "sacramental *theōsis*" constitutes the basis of Cyril's ecclesiology;[312] the restoration of man effected by the sacraments "occurs only within the context of the church"[313]

The Church, of course, is not merely the facilitator or context making possible this union with and membership of Christ's body, but is itself that very Body of Christ. Membership of the Catholic Church is participation in the divine Incarnation.[314] Thus, when Cyril defines *ἐκκλησία* by referring to God's command to assemble (*ἐκκλησίασον*) the whole congregation at the door of the tabernacle (*σκηνῆς*),[315] it is by virtue of this Incarnation by which "the Word became flesh and tabernacled (*ἐσκήνωσεν*) among us."[316] It is the way in which Cyril sought

[310] "μέτεσχε τῶν αὐτῶν ἵνα τῆς ἐνσάρκου παρουσίας αὐτοῦ κοινωνοὶ γενόμενοι, καὶ τῆς θείας αὐτοῦ χάριτος κοινωνοὶ γενώμεθα". Hawk-Reinhard 2013b, 251. She coves the same passage in id. 2011, 320–24.

[311] She refers here to *MC* 5.11 — "Οὐρανοὶ δὲ εἶεν ἂν καὶ οἱ τὴν τοῦ ἐπουρανίου φοροῦντες εἰκόνα, ἐν οἷς ἐστὶν ὁ Θεὸς ἐνοικῶν καὶ ἐμπεριπατῶν."

[312] Hawk-Reinhard 2011, 366.

[313] Ibid., 365.

[314] Compare, for example, Augustine: "Let us rejoice then and give thanks that we have become not only Christians, but Christ himself. […] For if he is the head, we are the members; he and we together are the whole man" (*Ev. Jo. Tract.*, 21.8 [*PL* 35:1568]).

[315] *CL* 18:24. Cf. Lev. 8:3.

[316] John 1:14.

to define and delineate this mysteriological membership, and the journey of those outside the Church towards it, that we will now turn to in the subsequent chapters.

Chapter 3 — The Greeks: The development of an ecclesiological ontology as a response to Graeco-Roman religion and philosophy

The problem of Christianisation

After the Roman destruction of the Jewish Jerusalem of the Second Temple period at the end of the 1st century, "it became after 135 a Hellenic city with pagan sanctuaries and cults such as could also be found in many other cities and towns in the Roman East."[317] The Temple continued to lie in ruins, with only a statue of Hadrian, and possibly also one of Jupiter,[318] being erected on the site to remind its devotees of the failure of their rebellion against their Roman masters. Hadrian added insult to injury, forbidding Jews to inhabit Aelia and its surrounding territories, although the survival of one of Mount Sion's seven synagogues up to the time of Constantine may suggest that the edict was not always rigorously implemented,[319] as one Talmudic source does indicate.[320]

As the location of many of the most significant events in the life of Christ, and the home of the first Christian church, it should come as no surprise that a Christian presence had continued in the city since that time.[321] However, despite its rich biblical history, it was a community lacking both in numbers and influence. Prominence among the churches of Palestine had instead fallen to the neighbouring see of Caesarea, to whose jurisdiction the church of Aelia was subject.[322] Consistent with his expulsion of the Jews from the city, Hadrian, perhaps aware of the significance of Golgotha for its Christian contingent, had chosen

[317] Drijvers 2004, 1. For an overview of the pagan cults present in 2nd – 4th century Palestine, see Belayche 2011.
[318] Drijvers 2004, 4, n.14.
[319] Ibid., 9.
[320] Ibid., n.38. See Stemberger 2000, 40–43.
[321] For an overview of the Christian presence in Palestine before Constantine, see Mullen 2004, 22–33.
[322] See Downey 1975, 28–33.

to build on it a sanctuary for Venus, thereby making it unfit as a place of Christian congregation and devotion.[323]

The imperial building project sought to lift the city out of the shadows of obscurity and, adorned with royal splendour, bring it to the forefront of Christian consciousness. Eusebius recounts how the Emperor, having completely destroyed the sanctuary and the idols within it,

> gave orders by the stipulations of pious laws and by generous grants for a place of worship worthy of God to be built with rich and imperial munificence around the Saviour's cave [and] instructed those who governed the eastern provinces by generous and lavish grants to make the building out of the ordinary, huge, and rich […]. On the cave of the first divine manifestation of the Saviour, where he submitted to the experience of birth in the flesh, he bestowed appropriate honours […] he [also] dignified the monument on the mountain-top to his ascension into heaven.[324]

Writing as a theologian every bit as much as a historian, Eusebius suggests that on

> [o]bserving these things, one might well say that a fresh, new-made way of life seemed to have appeared just then, as a strange light after thick darkness lit up the mortal race; and one might confess that the whole achievement belonged to God, who had advanced the God-beloved Emperor to counter the horde of the godless. For, since men whose like had never been seen before had committed crimes against the Church such as had never been heard of since time began, God rightly produced a new thing himself, and by it achieved what had been known to no ear and seen by no eye.[325]

Cyril's account echoes that of Eusebius when he recounts to his listeners how

> by bribes of silver [the Chief Priests] persuade the soldiers; but they do not persuade the current kings. The soldiers then surrendered the truth for silver; but the kings now have, by piety, built this holy Church in which we are assembled, inlaid with silver and embossed with gold, the Church of the Resurrection of God our Saviour, and have embellished it with rarities of silver and gold and precious stones.[326]

While these developments certainly marked the beginning of something new and significant, Eusebius' image of a clean break with the past is at best a display of his love of

[323] Socrates, *HE* 1.9, 1.17.

[324] *Vita Const.* trans. Cameron and Hall 1999, 134, 137.

[325] *Vita Const.*, Ibid., 121.

[326] *CL* 14.14 — "διὰ δόσιν ἀργυρίου πείθουσι τοὺς στρατιώτας. ἀλλ' οὐ πείθουσι τοὺς νῦν βασιλεῖς. οἱ τότε μὲν στρατιῶται ἀργυρίου προδεδώκασι τὴν ἀλήθειαν, οἱ δὲ νῦν βασιλεῖς δι' εὐσέβειαν ἀργυρένδυτον καὶ χρυσοκόλλητον τὴν ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν ταύτην, ἐν ᾗ πάρεσμεν, τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος θεοῦ ἀναστάσεως ἐξειργάσαντο καὶ τοῖς ἐξ ἀργύρου καὶ χρυσοῦ καὶ λίθων τιμίων κειμηλίοις ἐφαίδρυναν."

hyperbole.[327] Although Constantine had been sure to replace prominent places of traditional Hellenic worship with Christian ones in order to illustrate the Empire's shift of allegiance from one to the other, a considerable proportion of the population of the Roman world "in the period from the death of Constantine in 337 to the ascension of Valentinian III at Ravenna in 425…remained largely unaffected by the claims of the Christian church."[328] This was true also of Jerusalem, and Christians did not constitute a majority anywhere in Palestine outside of the city.[329] Peter Brown argues that, because these were an "impenitently polytheistic" group, "the religious common sense of their age […] led them to assume a spiritual landscape rustling with invisible presences — with countless divine beings and their ethereal ministers,"[330] quite different to that proclaimed by the Church. Furthermore, it would be rather naïve to presuppose that those segments of the population that did submit to baptism consisted entirely of individuals convinced of the veracity of Christian doctrine based on a thorough understanding thereof. Nor did an acceptance of a new viewpoint or truth necessarily involve the rejection and exclusion of former ones, as such a *Weltanschauung* would have made the acceptance of a new deity alongside the old ancestral ones quite easy. As Garth Fowden remarks, "it was easy for an aggressive new god to gain footholds in polytheist territory, but difficult to conquer it definitely and possess it."[331] Thus, despite his own insistence on being the sole deity worthy of worship, the Christian God was but one of many in the minds of many Romans. As such, the idea that his worshippers should be defined by a distinct and other religious identity would not at all have been obvious to them. Indeed, the "division of the human race according to purely religious criteria, 'Christian' and 'gentile' [is] a dichotomy whose awesome generality could only have originated among Christians."[332] Such identities, rather than occurring naturally,

[327] See Brown 2013.
[328] Brown 1998b, 632.
[329] Drijvers 2004, 133.
[330] Brown 1998b, 632.
[331] Fowden 1998, 543.
[332] Brown 1998b, 632.

were a deliberate construct, an attempt to exert the uniqueness and superiority of Christianity over traditional Hellenic religion. In a social context where the figurative birth and death of gods was commonplace, and in which the prominence of particular cults waxed and waned, the rise of Christianity might have unsettled many but would not in and of itself have been an altogether foreign phenomenon. Moreover, that theological diversity among Christians existed more or less from the outset is a fact with near unanimous acceptance within contemporary scholarship, following the work of Walter Bauer in the first half 20th century.[333] J.B. Rives challenges the commonly held assumption that "an increase in the number of Christians is identical with the expansion of Christianity […] because the equation works only if by 'Christianity' we mean any sort of adherence to the Christian god."[334] Naturally, this poses serious problems for the traditional narrative of Christian expansion, and must therefore act as the lens through which any fruitful study of late antique ecclesiological developments looks at the subject.

The Church as the context of a new ideology

What distinguished Christianity from traditional forms of Hellenic religion was not simply its naming of the 'Unknown God' of the Athenians,[335] nor even its monotheism — a concept previously put forth by numerous philosophical schools.[336] Its uniqueness lay rather in its insistence on a totally new ideology, defined by Rives as consisting primarily of three key elements: exclusivity, homogeneity, and totalisation.[337] "Only when cult, myth and philosophy

[333] Bauer 1934.

[334] Rives 2005. E.D. Dodds makes a similar argument in his short but seminal work, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety* (1990), asserting that the plurality of religious cults and philosophical schools in Graeco-Roman society led to confusion and insecurity "in an age of anxiety", while Christianity's "totalist creed" and exclusivity meant one could find everything in one place (133–4).

[335] Acts 17:23

[336] See, for example, Van Nuffelen 2010 and 'End of the many: The roots of monotheism in Greek philosophy' in Schneider 2008 (39–52).

[337] Rives 2005.

were part of a single system of 'religion'," he argues, "could the variety of religious options be reduced to a simple choice between right and wrong."[338]

While I agree with the basic premise of Rives' position, I would argue that it was not the more abstract notion of "religion" which made such a choice possible, but the more tangible notion of the Church, where right and wrong were matters of visible membership and exclusive participation. More specifically, it is an ecclesiology grounded in an ontological mysteriology, with baptism as a gateway and necessary prerequisite to full participation in the sacramental life of the Church, which made possible such an absolute binary stance.[339] I will in what remains of this chapter look at the way in which Cyril challenges 'the Greeks' by this combining of cult with myth and philosophy,[340] that is, the insistence on the inextricable connection between membership of the Church as a mysteriological organism and Christian faith in its various forms.[341]

Myth

Alan Brown points out that, despite the fact that the term 'paganism' "demarcates indiscriminately the whole stretch of Greco-Roman religious belief, myth, rite and ritual[342] […] late antique Christian-pagan intellectual debate possessed considerable uniformity. For it was always conducted with reference to the framework of the Platonic philosophical thought of the day."[343] Already in the first century, the Apostle Paul had acknowledged that the Christian

[338] Ibid., 38.

[339] A point hinted at in Dodds 1990 (136): "A Christian congregation was from the first a community in a much fuller sense than any corresponding group of Isaic or Mithraist devotees. Its members were bound together not only by common rites but by a common way of life."

[340] See Löhr 2017.

[341] See chapter 2 for Cyril on pagan vs. Christian ritual.

[342] Celsus, of course, had complained that a dialogue with Christianity was near impossible because of the divergent beliefs of the numerous heresies (see *C. Cels.* 3.10–15).

[343] Brown 2008, 284–5. For a recent discussion on the interplay between Platonism and Christianity in late antiquity, see 'The Metamorphoses of Platonism' in Edwards 2015a (41–64).

Gospel was "foolishness to the Greeks,"[344] and much of the pagan critique of Christianity in the centuries that followed continued with this same line of argument.[345] It is not surprising, then, that Cyril's attitude when describing the various beliefs of the pagans is one of ridicule.[346] He chooses to fight fire with fire and likewise dismisses paganism on the grounds of it being foolish, hoping to disabuse his listeners of the notion that Greek thought was synonymous with intellectual rigour and rational integrity. However smooth their tongues, the honey dripping from their lips was mere sophistry. He begins his discourse on God by pointing out the absurdity of worshipping the created rather than the creator:

> Many have gone astray from the One God in various ways, some deifying the sun, so that at its setting, they remain godless during night time; others the moon, so that they have no god by day; others, the other parts of the cosmos; some, the arts; others, foods; others, pleasures; while some, manic after women, have set up on high the idol of a naked woman, and calling it Aphrodite, have bowed down to this lust through the visible sign; and others dazzled by the brightness of gold, have deified that and other matter.[347]

Elsewhere, he continues:

> Even though the great and good God is such, man carved a stone and said to it, *You are my god!*[348] O great blindness, from such greatness descending to such humiliation! The tree which God has planted, and the rain increased, and which is then burnt and turned to ashes, this is called god; but the true God is scoffed at. The wickedness of idolatry abounded; and cat, wolf, dog, were worshipped instead of God. The man-eating lion was worshipped instead of God who greatly loves mankind; serpent and dragon, counterparts of the one who cast us out of Paradise, were worshipped. The one who planted Paradise was scoffed at. I feel shame as I tell you that, even onions have been before now worshipped. Wine was given, *to gladden a human heart*,[349] and Dionysius was worshipped in the place of God. God made corn by saying, *Let the earth put forth herbaceous vegetation, seeding seed according to its kind* [*and according to likeness*],[350] that *bread might sustain a*

[344] Ἕλλησι δὲ μωρίαν — 1 Cor. 1:23

[345] For a summary of common pagan arguments and Christian counter-arguments, see Brown 2008; 'The Dialogue of Paganism with Christianity' in Dodds 1990 (102–138).

[346] In this respect, Cyril probably takes his precedent from Scripture. Compare, for example, Jer. 10:8, 14–15; 51:17–18.

[347] *CL* 4.6 — "Επεὶ οὖν ἐπλανήθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑνὸς Θεοῦ διαφόρως πολλοί· καὶ οἱ μὲν ἥλιον ἐθεοποίησαν, ἵνα δύνοντος ἡλίου, κατὰ τὸν τῆς νυκτὸς καιρὸν ἄθεοι μένωσιν· οἱ δὲ σελήνην, ἵνα ἐν ἡμέρᾳ Θεὸν μὴ ἔχωσιν· οἱ δὲ τὰ λοιπὰ μέρη τοῦ κόσμου· οἱ δὲ τὰς τέχνας· οἱ δὲ τὰς τροφάς· οἱ δὲ τὰς ἡδονάς· καὶ οἱ μὲν γυναικομανεῖς, γυμνῆς γυναικὸς εἴδωλον ἐν ὑψηλῷ στήσαντες, Ἀφροδίτην τε προσαγορεύσαντες, προσεκύνησαν διὰ τοῦ φαινομένου τὸ πάθος· οἱ δὲ τοῦ χρυσοῦ τὸ λαμπρὸν ἐκπλαγέντες, αὐτόν τε καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς ὕλας ἐθεοποίησαν."

[348] cf. Is. 42:17, Hab. 2:18–19,

[349] Ps. 103:15.

[350] Gen. 1:12.

> *human heart*;[351] whence then was Demeter worshipped? Fire even to this day is struck out from stones by collision; whence then Hephaestus, the maker of fire?[352]
>
> Whence the polytheistic Greek delusion? God is incorporeal; whence then the adulteries of which their so-called gods are accused? I will be silent of the changes of Zeus into a swan, and I am ashamed to speak of his transformations into a bull; for mooing is unworthy of a god. […] They also tell of deaths among their gods, and expulsions, and of them being struck by lightning; do you see from that greatness they have fallen?[353]

Scripture and epistemology

While a large number among the uneducated masses probably took the Greek myths at face value, their fictitiousness and literal nonsensicality was not only acknowledged by pagan intellectuals, but lay at the heart of the Platonic framework in which they operated.[354] They made a sharp distinction between the true meaning, or *λόγος*, of these *μύθοι*, and their literal reading. The deep wisdom of the ancients, who "were no ordinary men, but capable of understanding the cosmos and inclined to use symbols and riddles in their philosophical discussions thereof,"[355] could only be salvaged through a system of allegorical interpretation.[356] The inherent rationality of cultic ritual and behaviour could likewise be salvaged through such

---

[351] Ps. 103:15.

[352] *CL* 6.10 — "τοσούτου τοίνυν ὄντος ἀγαθοῦ καὶ μεγάλου τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἄνθρωπος λίθον γλύψας, τῷ λίθῳ εἶπεν, Θεός μου εἶ σύ. Ὦ μεγάλης ἀβλεψίας, ἐκ τοσούτου μεγέθους εἰς τοσαύτην ταπεινότητα κατελθούσης! Τὸ ξύλον ὅπερ ὁ Θεὸς ἐφύτευσεν, καὶ ὑετὸς ἐμήκυνε, καὶ ὕστερον κατακαυθὲν καὶ σποδὸς διάπυρος γινόμενον, τοῦτο μὲν Θεὸς ἀναγορεύεται· ὁ δὲ ἀληθὴς Θεὸς καταφρονεῖται. Ἐπεδαψιλεύσατο δὲ ἡ πονηρία τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας· καὶ αἴλουρος καὶ λύκος καὶ κύων ἀντὶ Θεοῦ προσεκυνήθησαν, καὶ λέων ἀνθρωποβόρος ἀντὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ φιλανθρωποτάτου προσεκυνήθη. Ὄφις καὶ δράκων, ἀντίμιμοι τοῦ ἐκβαλόντος ἡμᾶς ἐκ παραδείσου, προσεκυνήθησαν· καὶ ὁ τὸν παράδεισον φυτεύσας κατεφρονήθη. Αἰσχύνομαι λέγειν, πλὴν λέγω· καὶ κρόμμυα γὰρ ἤδη παρά τισι προσεκυνήθη. Οἶνος ἐδόθη, ἵνα εὐφραίνῃ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου· καὶ Διόνυσος ἀντὶ Θεοῦ προσεκυνήθη. Σῖτον ὁ Θεὸς εἰργάσατο διὰ τοῦ εἰπεῖν, Ἐξαγαγέτω ἡ γῆ βοτάνην χόρτου, σπεῖρον σπέρμα κατὰ γένος [καὶ καθ' ὁμοιότητα], ἵνα ἄρτος στηρίσῃ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου· καὶ πόθεν ἡ Δήμητρα προσεκυνήθη; Τὸ πῦρ ἐκ λίθων συγκρούσεως ἐξέρχεται μέχρι σήμερον· καὶ πόθεν Ἥφαιστος, πυρὸς ποιητής;"

[353] *CL* 6.11 — "Πόθεν ἡ πολύθεος τῶν Ἑλλήνων πλάνη; Ἀσώματος ὁ Θεός· καὶ πόθεν μοιχεῖαι παρὰ τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτῶν λεγομένοις θεοῖς κατηγοροῦνται; Σιωπῶ τὰς Διὸς εἰς κύκνον μεταβολάς· αἰσχύνομαι λέγων τὰς εἰς ταῦρον μεταμορφώσεις ἀνάξια γὰρ θεοῦ τὰ μυκήματα [...] Καὶ θανάτους καὶ ἀποπτώσεις καὶ κεραυνώσεις τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς λέγουσι θεῶν. Βλέπεις ἐκ πόσου μεγέθους ποῦ κατεληλύθασιν;"

[354] Brown 2008, 249.

[355] Cornutus, *De natura deorum* 35.75.18–76.5.

[356] As Edwards (2017, 144–5) notes, a distinction is made between *allēgoria* — "the construction of narratives with a hidden import" — and *allēgorēsis* — "the critical practice of detecting and expounding the hidden import of such narratives". While Plato thought the practice of *allēgorēsis* on ancient texts a futile venture, the Stoics "made *allēgorēsis* a tool of theology, and it furnished the Neoplatonists with spectacles that enabled them to see what Plato had overlooked in Homer".

use of allegory. As Brown notes, "the basis of such intellectual pagan attacks on Christianity was the denial of any legitimate allegorical interpretation of the Christian scriptures,"[357] the narratives of which were considered absurd.

In Origen's *Against Celsus*, we see the pagan critic of Christianity simultaneously suggesting that the Jewish scriptures are incapable of allegorical interpretation all the while "the more modest of Jewish and Christian writers give all these things an allegorical meaning […] because they are ashamed of these things."[358] Origen counters with a twofold response. Giving numerous examples of typological interpretations in the New Testament of the Old, he demonstrates that an allegorical approach to the Scriptures is itself inherently scriptural, and that one cannot therefore accuse Christians of turning to allegory as a response to challenges posed to them by non-Christians.[359] Furthermore, if anyone has cause to be ashamed, he argues, it is surely the Greeks, whose fables are not only absurd, but immoral. "We verily entertain such reverence for the name of God, and for His noble works of creation, that we would not, even under pretext of an allegorical meaning, admit any fable which might do injury to the young."[360] Christians can and do employ allegory, but allegory is not sufficient to redeem what is inherently immoral and shameful, and therefore also inherently *alogon*. The Scriptures of the Christian Church serve to build up even when read literally, making them superior to Greek myth.[361]

Cyril likewise highlights the incompatibility of immoral myth with divine truth: "The god of the Greeks is caught in adultery, yet they are unashamed. But if he is an adulterer, do

[357] Brown 2008, 253.
[358] *C. Cels.* 4.48, trans. *ANF* 4, 1193.
[359] *C. Cels.* 4.49–52. On Origen's use of allegory, see Ramelli 2011b; Reno 2006; Bergen 2005; Ludlow 2002; Martens 2012a; id. 2012b; Decock 2010; King 2005; Scalise 1987; Hanson 1959. On the Platonic sources of his understanding of *logos*, see Moore 2008.
[360] *C. Cels.* 4.48, trans. *ANF* 4, 1193.
[361] On the subject of Christian attitudes to pagan ethics in the fourth century through the lens of Ambrose's baptismal anthropology, see Smith 2011.

not let him be called god."[362] But while Cyril makes frequent use of typology and allegory in his exegesis of Scripture, he does so only in keeping with the Scriptural precedent referred to above by Origen.[363] Origen seemingly wants to demonstrate that the Christian Scriptures can stand up to scrutiny and meet the intellectual standards of their pagan critics, but Cyril shows little interest in appeasing Greek concerns or engaging with them on their terms.[364] For those with knowledge, the Greeks can easily be silenced "out of their own myths."[365] In response to the pagan inability to accept the notion of a self-sacrificing deity, he simply retorts, "If they are

[362] *CL* 6.11 — "Μοιχὸς ὁ παρ' Ἕλλησι θεὸς ηὕρηται, καὶ οὐκ αἰδοῦνται. Εἰ γὰρ μοιχός ἐστι, θεὸς μὴ καλείσθω."

[363] For an overview of Greek exegetical traditions, see de Margerie 2009. On the influence of Origen and the Alexandrian tradition on Cyril, see Stephenson 1954. He argues that, although the style of scriptural exegesis in *CL* might appear more Antiochene than Alexandrian, Cyril's *Sermon on the Paralytic* clearly belongs to the latter school, and develops many of the mystical themes of Clement and Origen. The sermon, and not *CL* — a systematic programme of catechesis —, should be seen as representative of Cyril's general style and exegetical approach (See also id. 1957 and 'Cyril and "Gnosis"' in McCauley and Stephenson 1969 [6–11]). Lending credence to Stephenson's point is Drijver's observation about the *Letter to Constantius*, where, despite his promise that it would "not be skillfully composed of persuasive rhetorical phrases but in the words of the holy gospels it will testify to the facts as they occurred" (*ad Const.* 1, trans. Yarnold 2000, 68), Cyril employs ornate language which differs considerably from that of the *CL*, in which Cyril uses a straightforward style befitting his audience, thus showing himself to be a skilled and adaptable orator (Drijvers 2004, 160). These observations appears to have gone unnoticed by Prétot, who seems unable to reconcile Cyril's seemingly Antiochene approach to exegesis in *CL* with his "essentially Alexandrian" Christology (Prétot 2014, 195). On this, see also John Paul Gibson, 'Mimesis and Imitation: Symbol in Cyril of Jerusalem' in Academia. 9 August 2017: https://www.academia.edu/1034521/ Mimesis_and_Imitation_Symbol_in_Cyril_of_Jerusalem.

[364] Wolfson (1957) nonetheless describes Cyril as an "unconscious philosopher", not on account of direct engagement with Greek philosophy, but through his reliance on earlier patristic authorities who had introduced new philosophical concepts and terms into Christianity, or given a philosophical interpretation to existing Scriptural terms and concepts. See also Irinei Steenberg's (2017) article, 'How to Mock a Heretic'.

This is perhaps a tentative parallel, but one of the reasons for the later orthodox rejection of Origenism was the way in which it, at least implicitly, made the good (and therefore God) dependent on evil in order to be defined as good. True goodness was self-defined, in need of nothing else to define it. (For a recent discussion, see Skliris 2017). Similarly, to judge the truth of Scripture by any set of external criteria would itself be a denial of said truth.

Justin Martyr attributes anything valuable in the Greek philosophical tradition to Moses, "the first prophet, and of greater antiquity than the Greek writers" (*First Apology* 59). Christians, as inheritors of this tradition in unadulterated form, therefore had nothing to prove to the Greeks, whose tradition was incomplete and ultimately inferior. Compare the contemporary pagan philosopher Numenius of Apamea: "What is Plato but Moses Atticizing?" (Stern II, § 363a–e = Numenius, F. 8 [51,13 Des Places]). Among fourth century authors, Eusebius discusses the Greek indebtedness to Mosaic thought in detail in the 11th and 12th books of his *Praeparatio Evangelica*. On this subject, see, for example, Cook 2004; Whittaker 1967; Edwards 1990. See also Antonova 2005.

In his recent book *On Augustine*, Rowan Williams (2016) argues that Augustine's thought — particularly his method of scriptural exegesis, which is highly allegorical — differs significantly from the Platonism it may appear to resemble on account of having a very difference reference point: the Incarnate Logos. "God is *res*, and in respect of him, all else is *signum*", and this realization was available to Augustine only on account of his conversion — fulfilled and facilitated by baptism — and membership of the Catholic Church. See in particular chapters 2 ('The Soul in Paraphrase: Augustine as Interpreter of the Psalms') and 3 ('Language, Reality and Desire: The Nature of Christian Formation'), the latter of which was originally published as 'Language, Reality and Desire in Augustine's *De Doctrina*', *Journal of Literature & Theology* 3.2 (1989): 138–150. See also Harrison 1992.

[365] *CL* 13.37 — "ἐκ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς μυθολογουμένων."

not ashamed to worship those thunder stricken and hated by God, are you ashamed to worship the beloved Son of God, who was crucified for you?"[366] For Cyril, the authority of Scripture comes not from its susceptibility to any particular form of exegesis or compatibility with any intellectual framework, but from it being an expression of the Word of God through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, when Cyril expresses his shame and reluctance to speak aloud of the shameful fables of the Greeks, he does this not only to emphasise the disdain with which one should dismiss them, but as a way of juxtaposing them with the Christian Scriptures which, as a work of divine inbreathing, can draw men to salvation through their very proclamation.[367]

As Pamela Jackson notes, "For Cyril, then, what elicits this saving conviction is hearing, not arguments, but the proclamation of Scriptural witnesses (*martyres*), testimony (*martyria*), proofs (*apodeixeis*) and types, which the catechist plants in his listeners"[368]:

> For we have come together now, not to make a contemplative exposition of the Scriptures, but rather to be convinced of what we have believed. […] For we do not speak and preach with enticing words of human wisdom. We do not now stir up sophistical contrivances; for these are dissolved. We do not conquer words with words, for these come to an end; but we preach Christ crucified, who has already been preached aforetime by the prophets.[369]

---

[366] Ibid. — "εἰ ἐκεῖνοι τοὺς κεραυνωθέντας θεομισεῖς προσκυνοῦντες οὐκ αἰσχύνονται, σὺ τὸν θεοφιλῆ καὶ υἱὸν θεοῦ τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον ὑπὲρ σοῦ προσκυνεῖν αἰσχύνῃ;"

[367] Cf. *CL* 16.11, 9.13. See Jackson 1991b, 443.

Cyril, unlike Jerome, also considers the translation of the Greek Septuagint from which he was citing to be a work of the Holy Spirit (*CL* 4.34), which was no doubt one of the reasons he felt there was such power in its mere utterance. See also Law 2013.

[368] Jackson 1991b, 440.

[369] *CL* 13.9 — "συνεληλύθαμεν γὰρ οὐ γραφῶν ἐξήγησιν θεωρητικὴν ποιήσασθαι νῦν, ἀλλὰ πιστοποιηθῆναι μᾶλλον περὶ ὧν πεπιστεύκαμεν." Gifford here translates "*ἐξήγησιν θεωρητικὴν*" as "speculative exposition" (*NPNF* 2.7, 257). Stephenson, however, prefers "contemplative exposition," arguing that Cyril is not here dismissing *ἐξήγησιν θεωρητικὴν* in favour of another method, but is rather drawing a distinction between his ordinary, more allegorical, mode of preaching and that employed during catechism, which is more concerned with proofs (McCauley and Stephenson 1969, 6–7).

Antoine Paulin (1959, 209) suggests that the high scriptural content in the early patristic catecheses is what made them so appealing. It was not simply the dry recitation of dogma, but an exciting unravelling of a divinely inspired text containing a dramatic account of God's direct intervention in the lives of human beings.

CL 13.8 — "ὁ γὰρ λόγος ἡμῶν καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις. οὐ σοφιστικαὶ κατασκευαὶ κινοῦνται νῦν· ἐπεὶ διαλύονται. οὐ λόγοι λόγους νικῶσιν· ἐπεὶ παραλύονται. ἀλλὰ κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, ἐκ προφητῶν ἤδη τούτου προκηρυχθέντος."

The Scriptures of the New Testament, particularly the four Gospels,[370] provided reliable historical accounts of the life of Christ, and these written proofs could easily be corroborated by the sites by which Cyril was standing as he delivered his lectures. The life of Christ in turn fulfils the predictions of the Prophets, dispelling all doubt as to the reliability of the ancient stories of the Hebrews. Cyril therefore sees no need to demonstrate the truth of the Scriptures, but rather argues that it is from the Scriptures that one must provide proofs of sound teaching. "For all things concerning Christ are written down, and nothing is doubtful, for nothing is without witness. All things are inscribed on the monuments of the Prophets; clearly written not on stone tablets, but by the Holy Spirit."[371] "Do not be attentive to my skill of language, for perhaps you may be deceived, but unless you get the witness of the prophets on each point, do not believe what is said."[372] Questions, he says, "are for the unbelievers: but the words of the Prophets are for us who believe."[373] Accordingly, large parts of *CL* 13 are essentially an exercise in cross-referencing, where Cyril goes through the various events in the life of Christ, one by one, and provides for each the corresponding Old Testament references.

Even when the internal consistency of Scripture is questioned, it is from elsewhere in Scripture that Cyril demonstrates how two seemingly contradictory verses from the Old and New Testaments can be reconciled.[374] It is also due to his concern for the harmony of the Hebrew and Christian scriptures, and not in order to engage with any pagan framework of thought, that Cyril addresses one of the charges made by Celsus in the aforementioned epistle of Origen — namely that "God made nothing mortal, but immortal things alone, while mortal things are the works of others, and the soul is a work of God, but the nature of the body is

[370] See Greenlee 1955.

[371] *CL* 13.8 — "πάντα γάρ ἐστι τὰ περὶ Χριστοῦ ἔγγραφα, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀμφίβολον, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀμάρτυρον. πάντα ἐν στήλαις προφητικαῖς ἀναγέγραπται, οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶ λιθίναις, ἀλλ' ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου γεγραμμένα σαφῶς."

[372] *CL* 12.5 — "καὶ μὴ ταῖς ἐμαῖς εὑρεσιλογίαις πρόσεχε, δυνατὸν γάρ σε ἴσως κατασοφισθῆναι. ἀλλ' ἐὰν μὴ προφητῶν περὶ ἑκάστου πράγματος δέξῃ μαρτυρίαν, μὴ πίστευε τοῖς λεγομένοις."

[373] *CL* 18.14 — "Ἐκείνοις μὲν οὖν ταῦτα τοῖς ἀπίστοις, τὰ δὲ ἐκ τῶν προφητῶν ἡμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν."

[374] See, for example, *CL* 13.11.

different"[375] — and he does so again with appeal to Scripture, according to which God is the maker of both heaven and earth, and, furthermore, is almighty, the Greek word *παντοκράτωρ* denoting an active engagement with all as ruler and sustainer, rather than just might.

> By belief in 'one God,' we completely cut off every polytheistic delusion, using it as a weapon against the Greeks […] Now we add to this, that he is also 'Almighty'; and that, because of the Greeks and Jews [together], and all heretics. For some of the Greeks have said that God is the soul of the world. Others again, that his power reaches only to heaven, but not also to the earth. And some, deluded with him, and perverting the text which says, *And your truth as far as the clouds*,[376] have dared to limit God's providence to the clouds and the heaven, and to expropriate from God the things of the earth; forgetting that Psalm which says, *If I ascend into heaven, you are there; if I descend to Hades, you are present*[377].[378]

Cyril here not only rejects the opposing Greek errors of God's confusion with and disassociation from physical creation, but also the Greek, as opposed to Biblical, form of allegorical interpretation, by which some were reading such notions into the creation account. We see this more clearly in other fourth century writers. Ephrem the Syrian, for example, states the following:

> One must know that just as the heaven and earth which were created in the beginning are actually the heaven and the earth and not something else understood under the names of heaven and earth, so also everything that is spoken of as being created and brought into order after the creation of heaven and earth is not empty names, but the very essence of the created natures correspond to the force of these names.[379]

Basil the Great, likewise, offers a more direct response to such ideas in his *Hexæmeron*:

> I know the laws of allegory, though less by myself than from the works of others. There are those truly, who do not admit the common sense of the Scriptures, for whom water is not water, but some other nature, who see in a plant, in a fish, what their fancy wishes, who change the nature of reptiles and of wild beasts to suit their allegories, like the interpreters of dreams who explain visions in sleep to make them

[375] *C. Cels.* 4.54, trans. *ANF* 4, 1200.
[376] Ps. 35:5.
[377] Ps. 138:8.
[378] *CL* 8.1–2 — "Διὰ μὲν τοῦ πιστεύειν ΕΙΣ ΈΝΑ ΘΕΟΝ, πᾶσαν πολύθεον ἐκκόπτομεν πλάνην, ὅπλῳ κεχρημένοι τούτῳ πρὸς Ἕλληνας [...] Προστίθεμεν δὲ πρὸς ἐκείνοις, ὅτι καὶ ΠΑΝΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ ἐστίν. Τοῦτο δὲ καὶ διὰ Ἕλληνας καὶ Ἰουδαίους [ὁμοῦ] καὶ πάντας αἱρετικούς φαμεν. Ἑλλήνων μὲν γάρ τινες, ψυχὴν τοῦ κόσμου τὸν Θεὸν εἶπον· καὶ ἕτεροι, τὴν ἐξουσίαν αὐτοῦ φθάνειν εἰς οὐρανὸν μόνον, μηκέτι δὲ καὶ εἰς γῆν. Καί τινες πλανηθέντες μετ' ἐκείνων, κακῶς τῷ ῥητῷ συγχρησάμενοι τῷ λέγοντι, Καὶ ἡ ἀλήθειά σου ἕως τῶν νεφελῶν, ἐτόλμησαν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν πρόνοιαν ἕως νεφελῶν περιγράψαι καὶ οὐρανοῦ, ἀπαλλοτριῶσαι δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς· ἐπιλαθόμενοι τοῦ ψαλμοῦ τοῦ λέγοντος, Ἐὰν ἀναβῶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, σὺ ἐκεῖ εἶ· ἐὰν καταβῶ εἰς τὸν ᾅδην, πάρει."
[379] *In Genesim Commentarii* 1, trans. Mathews and Amar 1994.

> serve their own ends. For me grass is grass; plant, fish, wild beast, domestic animal, I take all in the literal sense. "For I am not ashamed of the gospel."[380]

Basil, of course, frequently rejects in the same work those who attempt to read Genesis as a historical, rather than theological, account of creation, dismissing this as futile, unprofitable, and contrary to the purpose for which the account was authored.[381] He is therefore advocating not so much for a literal reading of Scripture as for the rejection of those who subvert its intended meaning through allegory in order for it to conform to the 'Greek' intellectual framework.[382] In other words, it is a rejection of those who place this framework above the divinely inspired Scriptures as the ultimate criterion of truth. John Chrysostom, too, in his commentary on Genesis, says on the question of allegory that, "Not to believe what is contained in the Divine Scripture, but to introduce something else from one's own mind, this, I believe, subjects those who hazard such things to great danger."[383]

For Cyril, then, it is not by argument, but by the scriptural affirmation of the Creed — 'We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things both visible and invisible' — "that we may remember that he is both the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Maker of heaven and earth, and that we might be secured against the deviation of godless heretics, who have dared to speak evil of the All-wise Artificer of this world, and who, though they see with the eyes of the flesh, are blinded in the eyes of their mind."[384]

---

[380] *Homily* 9.1, trans. *NPNF* 2.08, 245

[381] Ibid.

[382] See, for example, Luttikhuizen 2005. For an overview of different hermeneutical approaches to Genesis, see Hendel 2013.

[383] *Hom. In Gen.* 13.3 (*PG* 53:18).

[384] *CL* 9.4 — "ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΜΕΝ ΕΙΣ ΈΝΑ ΘΕΟΝ, ΠΑΤΕΡΑ ΠΑΝΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΑ, ΠΟΙΗΤΗΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΓΗΣ, ΌΡΑΤΩΝ ΤΕ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΟΡΑΤΩΝ, ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, ὅτι αὐτός ἐστι Πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ πεποιηκὼς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν· καὶ ἵνα ἀσφαλιζώμεθα ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὰς ἐκτροπὰς τῶν ἀθέων αἱρετικῶν, τῶν τετολμηκότων κακῶς ἀναγορεύειν τὸν πάνσοφον τεχνίτην παντὸς τοῦδε τοῦ κόσμου, τῶν βλεπόντων μὲν σαρκὸς ὀφθαλμοῖς, τὰ δὲ ὄμματα τῆς διανοίας πεπωρωμένων."

What gives this an ecclesiological dimension is Cyril's assertion that these blind eyes of the mind can only receive sight through experiential, and not merely theoretical, knowledge. Once again, truth comes not by argument but by authoritative revelation, this time through mysteriological participation. "When you grasp by experience," he says, "the loftiness of the doctrines, then you will understand that the catechumens are unworthy to hear."[385] His contrasting those who grasp by experience with the catechumens — who were affiliated with the Catholic Church and nominal adherents of its teachings, but not yet baptised and thus not yet participants in its sacramental life — makes clear the nature of the participation of which he speaks. As I hope to demonstrate in the subsequent chapters of this thesis, Cyril regarded true baptism as the sole prerogative of the Catholic Church in visible, institutional form, being the means of entry thereto. With such an exclusivist mysteriology, the Catholic Church becomes the only context in which a person can receive empirical confirmation of Scriptural truth.

Philosophy — Development of ontology

The Christian challenge to Greek philosophy was also, as Brown suggests, primarily indirect in the fourth to seventh centuries. It took the form, not so much of polemic counterargument, as had been the case in previous centuries, but the development of a coherent ontological articulation, which constituted a decisive rejection of the prevailing philosophical framework rather than interaction with it.[386] Specifically, these ontologies demonstrated "that Christianity was not *alogon* but in fact could be expressed coherently as manifesting the true *logos* of being."[387]

[385] *PC* 12 — "ὅταν τῇ πείρᾳ λάβῃς τὸ ὕψωμα τῶν διδασκομένων, τότε ἂν γνώσῃ, ὅτι ἀνάξιοι οἱ κατηχούμενοι τῆς ἀκοῆς."
[386] Brown 2008, 267.
[387] Ibid.

Brown explains that, according to this orthodox ontology, particularly as articulated in the 7th century with Maximus the Confessor,[388] each creature is an expression of the free and *logikē* will of God, and therefore expressions of a *logos*, meaning that their ontological *logos* is "the divine meaningful volition that constitutes each being." Furthermore, since the will of God for every being is incorporation into Jesus Christ (*theosis*), "it follows that such incorporation is the ontological fulfilment of the intrinsic meaning (*logos*) of each and every created being. Jesus Christ is thus the divine *Logos* (meaning), constituting at once the ultimate content of the divine will for creation and the ultimate ontological meaning of created being.[389] As this incorporation was not merely moral, but primarily baptismal and Eucharistic, I would argue that also this challenge to pagan ontology was ecclesiological, not merely philosophical, because of its ultimately mysteriological character.

While we do not find an ontological articulation as developed and concise as this presented in Cyril's works, the foundational key elements are still present. In opposition to the fatalism which featured so prominently among rival groups, Cyril goes to great lengths to emphasise that the soul of man is possessed of freedom [*αὐτεξούσιον*], and this on account of it being made according to the image of its fashioner [*κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ πεποιηκότος*]. The soul is also immortal, though not innately so, as the 'Greeks' would have it, but "on account of God who made it immortal." The soul is also rational [*λογικὸν*] and a living creature [*ζῶον*], again on account of the God in whose image it is made.[390] The soul finds fulfilment when it becomes the vessel to which God imparts divine sonship,[391] when man becomes by grace what Christ is by nature. Necessary for this process is the sacrament of baptism:

> If you have piety without hypocrisy, the Holy Spirit will also descend on you [in baptism], and the fatherly voice shall likewise sound upon you, saying not, 'He is my son,' but, 'He has now become my son.' For 'is' belongs to [Jesus] alone, since

[388] In particular his *Ambigua ad Ioannem* 7. For a recent discussion, see Cvetković 2017, 13–28.
[389] Brown 2008, 271–2.
[390] *CL* 4.18
[391] *CL* 3:15

> *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God*.[392] To him belongs the, 'Is;' since he at all times is the Son of God; but to you belongs, 'Is now become;' since you do not have the sonship by nature, but receive it by adoption: He is eternal, while you receive this grace by advancement. […] Behold the power of baptism![393]

To the extent that baptism and the Eucharist[394] were necessary elements of the intrinsically Christological ontology developed from the fourth to the seventh centuries in opposition to that of Platonism, and to which these sacraments, in turn, were the sole prerogatives of the Catholic Church, what we see here, in effect, is the replacing of the old Platonic philosophical framework with the Church. Without the Church, the true ontological *logos* of each creature remains unfulfilled. Everything outside the Church thus becomes inherently *alogon* in the context of an exclusive ecclesiology.

Perhaps somewhat paradoxically, Cyril's Christological ontology also gives meaning to certain aspects of pagan thought which were previously *alogon*. Cyril sees idolatry first and foremost as a wound in need of healing, and this as a primary reason for the Incarnation of Jesus, whose name he identifies with the Greek *ἰώμενος*, or healer:[395]

> Did the Son of God therefore descend from heaven in vain? Or was it that he might heal such a great wound? […] The Father was scoffed at, the Son must correct the error: for He 'Through Whom All Things Were Made' must bring them all as offerings to the Lord of all. The wound must be healed, for what could be worse than this disease, that a stone should be worshipped instead of God?[396]

The anthropomorphisms of the Greeks, however, were not simply done away with, but were given meaning, *logos*, by the Logos becoming man:

---

[392] John 1:1.

[393] *CL* 3:14 — "Ἐὰν καὶ αὐτὸς ἔχῃς ἀνυπόκριτον εὐλάβειαν, κατέρχεται καὶ ἐπὶ σὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ φωνή σοι πατρικὴ ἄνωθεν ἐπηχεῖ· οὐχ, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου, ἀλλ' οὗτος νῦν γέγονεν υἱός μου. Ἐπ' ἐκείνου μὲν γὰρ τὸ, ἔστιν· ἐπειδὴ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος· ἐπ' ἐκείνου τὸ, ἔστιν· ἐπειδὴ πάντοτέ ἐστιν υἱὸς Θεοῦ· ἐπὶ δὲ σοῦ τὸ, νῦν γέγονεν· ἐπειδὴ οὐ κατὰ φύσιν ἔχεις, ἀλλὰ κατὰ θέσιν τὴν υἱοθεσίαν λαμβάνεις· ἐκεῖνος ἀΐδιός ἐστι· σὺ δὲ ἐκ προκοπῆς λαμβάνεις τὴν χάριν […] Βλέπεις τοῦ βαπτίσματος τὴν δύναμιν."

[394] See chapter 2.

[395] *CL* 10.13

[396] *CL* 6.11 — "Μή τι ἆρα μάτην Υἱὸς Θεοῦ κατῆλθεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἢ ἵνα τὸ τηλικοῦτον τραῦμα θεραπεύσῃ; [...] Πατὴρ κατεφρονεῖτο, ἔδει Υἱὸν διορθώσασθαι τὴν πλάνην. Ἔδει γὰρ τὸν, δι' οὗ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα, τῷ δεσπότῃ τῶν ἁπάντων προσενεγκεῖν τὰ πάντα. Ἔδει θεραπευθῆναι τὸ τραῦμα· τί γὰρ ἦν ταύτης τῆς νόσου χεῖρον, ἢ ἵνα λίθος ἀντὶ Θεοῦ προσκυνηθῇ;"

> Men forsook God, and made wooden effigies of men. Since therefore an image of man was falsely worshipped as God, God became truly Man, that the falsehood might be unravelled. […] The Lord took from us our likeness onto himself in order to save humanity: He took our likeness, that he might give greater grace to that which lacked; that sinful humanity might become partaker of God.[397]

Thus, as the means by which this divine participation is made possible, the Church represents not only the context for a new ontology to rival that of Greek thought, but becomes the only context in which aspects of the old could be salvaged.[398] John of Damascus was later to extend this incarnational argument to the veneration of matter more generally in his seminal work *On the Divine Images* during the 8th century Iconoclast controversy:

> Of old, God the incorporeal and formless was never depicted, but now that God has been seen in the flesh and has associated with human kind, I depict what I have seen of God. I do not venerate matter, I venerate the fashioner of matter, who became matter for my sake and accepted to dwell in matter and through matter worked my salvation, and I will not cease from reverencing matter, through which my salvation was worked.[399]

[397] Cf. 2 Peter 1:4. *CL* 12.15 — "Καταλιπόντες ἄνθρωποι θεὸν ἐδημιούργησαν ἀνθρωπόμορφα ξόανα. ἀνθρωπομόρφου τοίνυν ὡς θεοῦ ψευδῶς προσ κυνουμένου θεὸς ἀληθῶς ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο, ἵνα λυθῇ τὸ ψεῦδος [...] ἀνέλαβε τὸ ὅμοιον ἡμῶν ἐξ ἡμῶν ὁ κύριος, ἵνα δι' ἀνθρωπότητος σωθῶμεν. ἀνέλαβε τὸ ὅμοιον ἡμῶν, ἵνα τῷ λείποντι μείζονα δῷ τὴν χάριν, ἵνα ἡ ἀνθρωπότης ἡ ἁμαρτωλὸς θεοῦ γένηται κοινωνός."

Emmanuel J. Cutrone analyses the use of typology and εἰκών-μίμησις in *MC*, looking at how Christians become images of Christ through sacramental imitation. See his doctoral dissertation 'Saving Presence in the Mystagogical Catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem' (1975).

[398] On Christianity as the realisation and completion of classical Hellenic culture, with particular reference to concepts of *logos*, see Šijaković 2010.

[399] *Treatise* 1.16, trans. Louth 2003, 29.

Chapter 4 — The Centre of the World: Hagiopolitan pilgrimage as a spatial expression of catholicity

The brief historical overview provided in the previous chapter is intended not merely as a superfluous introduction or general contextualisation, but has been included because these historical developments, and Constantine's promotion of Jerusalem in particular, are inseparably linked to Cyril's understanding of the Church as catholic, and the place of his own see within such a scheme. It is in his eighteenth lecture, the only part of *CL* which is explicitly ecclesiological in nature, that Cyril provides us with one of the earliest definitions of this expression with reference to the Christian Church:

> [The Church] is called Catholic because it is throughout the inhabited world, from one end of the earth to the other; and because it teaches catholically [*καθολικῶς*] and completely one and all the doctrines due to come to human knowledge, concerning things both visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly; and because it subjugates every race of men, rulers and ruled, learned and unlearned to piety; and because it catholically [*καθολικῶς*] treats and heals every sort of sins, which are committed by soul or body, and possesses in itself every named virtue.[400]

The word *καθολική* itself derives from the adverb *καθ'ὅλον*, "according to the whole." Dulles points out that in "Greek profane usage [the word] has a wide range of meanings such as general, total, complete and perfect."[401] A great deal has been written on the changing attitudes towards Jerusalem as a holy city in the fourth century, and also specifically on Cyril's promotion of it as such. Those dealing with Cyril, however, are nearly entirely void of theological, let alone ecclesiological, content, and view his promotion of the Holy City as being almost purely political in nature. While it would be naïve to suggest that Cyril had no political

[400] *CL* 18:23 — "Καθολικὴ μὲν οὖν καλεῖται διὰ τὸ κατὰ πάσης εἶναι τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπὸ περάτων γῆς ἕως περάτων, καὶ διὰ τὸ διδάσκειν καθολικῶς καὶ ἀνελλιπῶς ἅπαντα τὰ εἰς γνῶσιν ἀνθρώπων ἐλθεῖν ὀφείλοντα δόγματα, περί τε ὁρατῶν καὶ ἀοράτων πραγμάτων, ἐπουρανίων τε καὶ ἐπιγείων, καὶ διὰ τὸ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων εἰς εὐσέβειαν ὑποτάσσειν, ἀρχόντων τε καὶ ἀρχομένων, λογίων τε καὶ ἰδιωτῶν, καὶ διὰ τὸ καθολικῶς ἰατρεύειν μὲν καὶ θεραπεύειν ἅπαν τὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν εἶδος τῶν διὰ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἐπιτελουμένων, κεκτῆσθαι δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ πᾶσαν ἰδέαν ὀνομαζομένης ἀρετῆς."

[401] Dulles 1985, 14.

ambitions whatsoever, to divorce his understanding of Jerusalem and its see from his wider theology in such a manner is both misleading and unnatural.

On the other end of the spectrum stands a short essay by M.P. Moroziuk, alone among studies on the topic of Cyril's ecclesiology, analysing the hierarch's use of the word *καθολική*,[402] which, in addition to pointing out the sparsity of existing studies on the topic, attributes this sparsity to a presumption on the part of scholars that Cyril uses the term 'catholic' only or predominantly in the sense of spatial universality, rather than coupling this notion with the more nuanced and multifaceted sense of ontological catholicity, denoting fullness, wholeness and completeness, quite clearly attested to in *CL*.[403]

In Moroziuk's view, the origins of its mistaken rendering as a reference only to the universal Church of Christ, as opposed to the local church of the bishop, stems from a particular reading of the Epistle to the Smyrneans of Ignatius of Antioch, "the first Christian writer to apply the term *καθολικὴ* to the Church."[404]:

> *ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω, ὥσπερ ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.*
>
> Wherever the bishop appears, there let the congregation be; just as wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the catholic church. [405]

The basic premise of his argument is that scholars have understood the word in a purely "geographical-spatial sense […] i.e. [as] the universal Church where Jesus Christ is, [as opposed to] the local Church where the bishop is […]. In the context of this interpretation Cyril's description of *καθολικὴ* is incomprehensible and [for this reason] went by the

[402] Moroziuk 1989.

[403] Drijvers cites Moroziuk, but seems to entirely ignore what he has to say. He translates Cyril's use of *καθολική* and *καθολικώς* as 'universal' and 'universally' respectively, and believes Cyril's intention was to teach his catechumens "'universal' Christian knowledge and to make them aware that they belonged to the universal, catholic, church" (Drijvers 2004, 97, n.1).

[404] Moroziuk 1989, 169.

[405] 8:2, trans. Holmes 2008, 254–5. Compare Cyprian of Carthage: "the bishop is in the Church and the Church in the bishop, and if someone is not with the bishop, he is not in the Church" (*Ecclesia in episcopo, episcopus in ecclesia, or ebi ecclesia ibi episcopus, ebi episcopus ibi ecclesia — Ep.* 66.69.8 [*PL* 4:406B]).

wayside."[406] As he points out, "if the Ignatian text is taken in isolation and examined only from the philological perspective […] the contrast between universal and local churches readily follows."[407] In context, however, it becomes apparent that the author had in mind something far more comprehensive, closer in meaning to its etymological origins. John Zizioulas, among the foremost of modern creative theologians, goes as far as to say that

> there is not a single indication in the text that would suggest this identification. It is clear from Ignatian ecclesiology as a whole that not only does a 'universal Church' not exist in Ignatius' mind but, on the contrary, an identification of the whole Christ and the whole Church with the local episcopal community constitutes a key idea in his thought.[408]

In the words of John Meyendorff, "[a]ccording to St. Ignatius, the 'catholic' Church was that Christian assembly which had accepted the whole of the divine presence in Christ, the whole truth, the fullness of life, and had assumed a mission directed at the salvation of the whole of God's creation,"[409] rather than a spatial concept. In the Martyrdom of Polycarp, we find the words "*τῆς κατὰ οἰκουμένην καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας*."[410] This

> had led scholars to similar conclusions [but] if one translated *καθολικὴ* by 'universal' in this text one would be confronted with an impossible tautology […]: 'The universal Church which is in the universe'! That in this document there is no such contrast between 'local' and 'universal' is shown by the fact that it speaks of Polycarp as being the bishop 'of the catholic Church which is in Smyrna.[411]

Mark Edwards, who maintains that the term catholic "seems to have been intended at first to comprehend the whole body of the elect, as opposed to the local congregation,"[412] here questions Zizioulas' linguistic analysis, pointing out that "if the term 'universal' indicates merely that the whole church is spoken of, it says nothing about the dimension of the

[406] Moroziuk 1989, 169.
[407] Ibid.
[408] Zizioulas 2004, 144.
[409] Meyendorff 1983, 7.
[410] *19:2* ed. Holmes 2008, 326.
[411] Zizioulas 2004, 144.
[412] Edwards 2009, 9.

church."[413] In other words, it is not a tautology to say that the church at its full extent is coterminous with the whole world.

Cyril, however, does not speak of 'the catholic Church throughout the world,' but rather explains that the Church is "called Catholic because it is throughout the world, from one end of the earth to the other,"[414] indicating that his definition of *καθολικὴ* clearly included a notion of spatial universality. This is further evidenced when he says, "For while the kings of particular nations have borders set to their authority, the Holy Catholic Church alone extends her unlimited power over the whole world."[415] However, while it is certainly possible to speak of the Church as "teach[ing] universally […] all the doctrines which ought to come to men's knowledge," as "universally treat[ing] and heal[ing] every sort of sin," or as universally "possess[ing] in itself every named virtue,"[416] such a rendering is obviously inadequate. Never in *CL* does Cyril distinguish, for example, between the universal teachings of the Church and the local teachings of heretics. Rather, as we shall address in more detail later, he contrasts the catholic teachings and catholic nature of his Church with the false, non-catholic teachings and the non-catholic churches of heretics that his hearers "may avoid their wretched meetings."[417]

In this context, 'catholic' quite clearly refers to the fullness of the Church's teaching and virtue, rather than simply their geographical application and manifestations. Consequently, Moroziuk's assertion that Cyril's words become more revealing when understood in the light of the more comprehensive interpretation of *καθολικὴ* is undeniably true.[418] He is also right in recognising the radically different situations to which Ignatius and Cyril were responding,

---

[413] Ibid., n.11.

[414] *CL 18:23* — "Καθολικὴ μὲν οὖν καλεῖται διὰ τὸ κατὰ πάσης εἶναι τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπὸ περάτων γῆς ἕως περάτων."

[415] *CL 18:27* — "βασιλέων μὲν τῶν κατὰ τόπον ἐθνῶν τῆς ἐξουσίας ὅρους ἐχόντων, μόνης δὲ τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην πᾶσαν ἀπεριόριστον ἐχούσης τὴν δύναμιν."

[416] *CL* 18:23

[417] *CL* 18:26. Commenting on *CL* 18, Jean-Claude Larchet (2012, 40) similarly concludes that, "L'extension geógraphique (la présence de l'Église ou des fidèles en tout lieu) peut être une manifestation ou un effet de la catholicité, mais n'en est cependant pas la conséquence nécessaire ni la condition (ou ce qui la vérifie)".

[418] *cf.* Moroziuk 1989, 172.

which led Cyril to "approach it from an entirely different angle."[419] However, their respective situations differed not only in their historical and ecclesiastical circumstances, as Moroziuk suggests, but also in the importance of Jerusalem, which colours Cyril's understanding of catholicity and allows him to harmonise its spatial and ontological aspects.

While Paul had declared that "faith comes from hearing,"[420] Christians could now, for the first time in history, point to tangible evidence in support of its claims. Cyril, as bishop of Jerusalem, therefore found himself in a completely unique position, teaching his catechumens while displaying for them the Tomb of Christ and the stone used to seal its entrance, literally pointing to Golgotha and the wood of the cross which once stood there, to the Mount of Olives from which Christ had ascended and to which he would return,[421]

> Since I clearly knew that seeing is far more persuasive than hearing, I waited for the present time; that finding you more open to the influence of my words from [the experience] of that evening [of your baptism], I might lead you by the hand into the brighter and more fragrant meadow of the Paradise before us.[422]

For the same reason, Jerusalem also stood at the centre of the Christian world with regards to pilgrimage.[423] As J. E. Taylor remarks,

> Christian pilgrimage soon exploded into a phenomenon that pagan pilgrimage could never have been. Pagan pilgrimages to sacred shrines had been predominantly local, and were frequently connected with festivals that occurred at specific times […] but gods of a different country, even though syncretized, could not attract a multitude of visitors from distant lands. […] Christianity was an altogether different religion, transcending ethnicity, local culture, and customs, and uniting Christians in a universal and common worship of one God, who participated in history at one general location. […] Christian pilgrimage to holy places was a radical innovation, a combination of an ancient story set in one particular landscape and the newly Christianized veneration of sites and things. [424]

[419] Ibid., 175.
[420] Rom 10:17
[421] On Cyril's use of sacred topography as a didactic tool, see Kalleres 2005.
[422] *MC* 1:1 — "Ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ σαφῶς ἠπιστάμην ὄψιν ἀκοῆς πολλῷ πιστοτέραν εἶναι, ἀνέμενον τὸν παρόντα καιρόν, ὅπως εὐπροσαγωγοτέρους ὑμᾶς περὶ τῶν λεγομένων ἐκ ταύτης λαβὼν τῆς ἑσπέρας εἰς τὸν φωτεινότερον καὶ εὐωδέστερον λειμῶνα τοῦδε τοῦ παραδείσου χειραγωγήσω."
[423] For a broader treatment of the phenomenon of pilgrimage, see Elsner and Rutherford 2005.
[424] Taylor 2003, 330–1.

Through the phenomenon of pilgrimage, then, Jerusalem became the focal point of the Christian *οἰκουμένη*, and in this way a visible attestation to the unity of the worldwide Catholic Church.

Why an emperor should wish to create or cultivate such a centre of religious unity within his realms requires little explanation. Nor does the desire of its bishops to grant the see with a degree of authority, honour and influence reflecting its importance and centrality. When Cyril became bishop of Jerusalem, it was, at least in administrative terms, considered inferior to the see of Caesarea. The seventh canon of the Council of Nicea had declared that:

> Since custom and ancient tradition have prevailed that the Bishop of Ælia should be honoured, let him, saving its due dignity to the Metropolis, have the next place of honour.[425]

That being said, there is considerable uncertainty around just how the Council viewed the hagiopolitan church. While the city being referred to as Aelia, rather than Jerusalem, could suggest a lack of interest in it as the stage of the prophetic and incarnational drama, for what other reason could it possibly be deserving of honour? The use of 'Aelia' need not indicate more than the canonists' desire for onomastic consistency with civil usage. Moreover, while the canon reserves for it the next place of honour after the Metropolis, every record of the signatories at Nicea lists Macarius of Jerusalem as having signed fifth, after the Archbishop of Antioch, and thus before the bishop of said Metropolis,[426] and Constantine addresses his ordinance "to Macarius and the other bishops of Palestine"[427] as if Macarius, not Eusebius, was Metropolitan.[428] This has led some to speculate that the Metropolis mentioned in the canon is

[425] Canon 7, trans. *NPNF* 2.14, 70.

[426] Eusebius signs fifth among Palestinians, Macarius first. See Turner 1899, 42–44.

[427] Eusebius, *Vita Const.* 3.52, trans. Cameron and Hall 1999, 141.

[428] It is interesting to note that Eusebius in the previous chapter (3.51) speaks of the letter as being addressed to himself. It is possible that Eusebius was referring to himself as one of the "rest of the bishops in Palestine," but in that case, his use of "me" rather than "us" seems curious, and one gets the feeling he wished to imply something more.

not, in fact, Caesarea, but Antioch.[429] Others have rejected the significance of the signatures, pointing out that the bishop of Aelia was not the only subordinate of Caesarea to precede it on the list of signatories.[430] It may be possible that, while the canon represents a measured reflection of the *status quo*, so as not to trouble the waters, the order of signatories was an expression of Constantine's personal favour as expressed in the aforementioned ordinance.

Half a century on — although it was not until Juvenal became bishop of Jerusalem that the Hagiopolitan See became an autocephalous patriarchate at the Council of Chalcedon in 451[431] — the Synodical Letter of 382, written in connection with the Ecumenical Synod in Constantinople a year earlier, had already abandoned the name Aelia in favour of "Jerusalem, the mother of all churches,"[432] no doubt on account of "the right reverend and most religious Cyril,"[433] who was in attendance at the council. While obviously an important element in Cyril's promotion of Jerusalem, I do not here intend to give much attention to the political dimensions of these developments, whether imperial or ecclesiastical, since much has already been written on the matter. Drijver's monograph on Cyril, for example, features an entire chapter on 'Promoting Jerusalem', which deals with the subject in great detail.[434] Instead, I wish to see what Cyril's promotion of Jerusalem, its holy sites and relics, and the phenomenon

[429] See Henry R. Percival's comments in *NPNF* 2.14, 70. Stephenson suggests that Jerusalem was not a "satellite of Caesarea, but […] a second, smaller metropolitan church in the south of Palestine" (McCauley and Stephenson 1969, 15). He cites F. J. A. Hort (1876, 59), who suggests that "all Palestine was subject to the supremacy of Antioch; and the metropolitan jurisdiction of Caesearea over the rest of Palestine was balanced by privileges peculiar to Jerusalem".

[430] See, for example, Barnes 1981, 218–220.

[431] See Session VII in Price 2005, 244–9. The proclamation of this particular session came in the wake of "much rivalry" between Maximus of Antioch and Juvenal of Jerusalem, who eventually came to the agreement that Antioch would have jurisdiction over "the two Phoenicas and Arabia" whereas Jerusalem would have jurisdiction over "the three Palestines." Particularly noteworthy is the way in which Maximus identifies his see with, and presumably bases his claims on, St Peter, whereas Juvenal, in the same manner, identifies his see as that of the Resurrection (Ibid., 247).

See also Honigmann 1950.

[432] *NPNF* 2.14, 396

[433] Ibid.

[434] See Drijvers 2004, 153–176. As Doval (2006, 125) points out in his review of this work, there is little evidence for Drijvers' heavy emphasis on Cyril's thirst for power as a driving force behind his promotion of Jerusalem.

of pilgrimage thereto can tell us about his understanding of the concept of catholicity, particularly in its spatial dimensions. In this chapter, I intend to demonstrate that the so-called 'reinterpreted Ignatian' model of catholicity is not in congress with later notions of spatial catholicity, but, at least in the case of Cyril, is integral to it. Furthermore, I believe the same ecclesiological model, when used to analyse the divergent opinions among prominent fourth century hierarchs on the subject of pilgrimage, enables us to account for said divergence more comprehensively than what is hitherto presented in most monographs on the subject, which, while impressively insightful and convincing with respect to the material they do cover, are lacking the theological and ecclesiological dimensions necessary to fully appreciate the works of the figures they seek to understand.

Origins of Hagiopolitan Pilgrimage

For the Christians of the fourth century, "[t]he opportunity to 'possess' Jerusalem was both […] a privilege, full of exciting potential, but it was also an awesome responsibility. They needed to deal with it, if possible, in a way that was […] in keeping with the essence of their faith,"[435] and, while the number of pilgrims continued to grow, may hierarchs of the Church were required to give serious thought as to the propriety of such a phenomenon. Christ had famously predicted the downfall of not only the Temple, but the Holy City itself, and had declared that "the hour is coming when you will neither on this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, worship the Father."[436] The sudden and expansive building programme that saw opulent churches and shrines spring up throughout the Holy Land invited the question: should the Church of the New Testament have a geographic centre in Jerusalem as the Church of the Old once had? That said, the assertion of many modern scholars that notions of sacred space in and

[435] Day 2007a, 134.
[436] John 4:21

of itself were altogether foreign to the pre-Constantinian Church, being contrary to the atopic worship of the coming hour promised by Christ, seems exagerrated.[437]

It was Macarius, Cyril's predecessor, who had been given the no doubt daunting task of overseeing the building of these new edifices, which, although perhaps unable to rival other monuments in size due to topographical restrictions, were intended to be the most splendid anywhere in the empire.[438] How much artistic license Macarius may have had over the works is unknown. However, as pointed out by Hunt, when describing the buildings in his itinerary, Eusebius fails to mention some rather prominent architectural features.[439] It is reasonable to assume, as does Hunt, that the reason for his omission is that these features were not yet present in his day, but were later additions, built after the episcopate of Macarius. Having a ready precedent in his predecessor, it seems possible that the overseer, if not also the instigator, of these later additions was Cyril himself.

While magnificent and splendidly adorned, the hagiopolitan basilicas were surprisingly small, with a square meterage more comparable to village churches than to the Constantinian basilica of St. Peter in Rome or the *Μεγάλη Ἐκκλησία* of New Rome, inaugurated by Constantius in the year 360. The basilica at the site of Christ's crucifixion and resurrection covered a length of no more than 50m, less than half that of St. Peter's in Rome, and the basilicas at the Mount of Olives or at Bethlehem less than a third.[440] These basilicas owed their relatively small size to the presence of larger areas of open space and colonnaded atria. As Hunt points out, the "open courtyard was unmistakably the main feature in the architectural

[437] Cf. John 4:21.
[438] Eusebius, *Vita Const.* 3:28, 30.1. See Wharton 1992; Conant 1958; id. 1956; Doval 1993.
[439] Hunt 1982, 12. See also Davies 1957; Walker 1989.
[440] Hunt 1982, 20–21.

scheme of the Holy Land buildings,"[441] one shared, not only by the primary sites at Golgotha, Bethlehem and the Mount of Olives, but also other sites, such as Mamre and Gerasa.[442]

The reason for these large open spaces and colonnades taking spatial precedence over the primary worship space of the basilica was precisely the desire to accommodate, and indeed encourage, this large number of pilgrims from far and wide descending on Jerusalem to see the places and venerate the objects associated with the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ. John Chrysostom gives us an idea of the popularity of hagiopolitan pilgrimage in the second half of the fourth century when he exclaims that, "The whole world runs to see the tomb which has no body."[443] The open air courtyards would thus have provided pilgrims with a place to rest as they were moving from site to site and allowed for a greater degree of movement to ease the inevitable throng of eager crowds.

As for whence this interest in hagiopolitan pilgrimage, scholars have long debated and speculated on the 'chicken and egg' question of which came first: the pilgrims or the emperor? Joan E. Taylor, for example, writes emphatically in favour of the latter, describing as 'sudden' the way in which "the church began to focus on earth" with the coming of Constantine.[444] Perhaps more remarkable is her Gibbon-esque claim that "Constantine brought to Christianity a pagan notion of the sanctity of things and places."[445] J. Z. Smith, along similar lines, asserts that "Constantine created, for the first time, a Christian 'Holy Land'."[446] Among opponents of this idea is Bitton-Ashkelony, who expresses doubts as to whether the actions of one man, "even the emperor himself," could account for the "penetration of the idea of earthly 'holy space' into the Christian consciousness," particularly because she views this idea as one that

[441] Ibid., 20
[442] Ibid.
[443] *Hom. in Ps. 109* 5 *(PG* 55:274A).
[444] Taylor 1993, 314. See also id. 1990.
[445] Ibid., 308.
[446] Smith 1987, 79.

"diametrically contradicts the New Testament or […] traditional Pauline view."[447] Taking a somewhat apophatic approach to the question, she admits that she has no clear solution to the origin of the phenomenon, but suggests that it should be seen as a "highly complex and evolutionary [development] deriving from a juxtaposition of various factors, of differing importance, prevailing in Mediterranean society,"[448] particularly the manifestations of local culture. Among competing theories, she mentions an older work of M. Halbwachs,[449] who argues that the formation of Christian traditions regarding the holy sites of Jerusalem was a gradual process rooted in the Christian collective memory, and the later article by R. A. Markus,[450] which sees pilgrimage as a natural outgrowth of the cult of the martyrs,[451] or at any rate that one paved the way for the other.

In line with the thesis put forward by Markus, Hunt[452] suggests as a possible origin of Constantine's building project in the Holy Land his letter to the eastern provincials following his victory over Licinius, in which he orders that the places "which are honoured by the bodies of the martyrs and stand as monuments to their glorious decease […] should be rightfully restored to the holy churches and conserved."[453] An imperial order demanding the return of such tombs to the Church would certainly have enabled Macarius and the hagiopolitan church to petition for the restoration of place of Christ's crucifixion and burial, monuments not only to a "glorious decease", but to a glorious resurrection.

Hunt thus suggests that by demolishing the temple of Venus and ordering the building of the new Christian complex, Constantine was responding to a long held and deep rooted desire by the Christian community at Jerusalem to have restored to them a holy site they had

[447] Bitton-Ashkelony 1999, 188–189.
[448] Bitton-Ashkelony 2005, 27–28.
[449] Halbwachs 1971.
[450] Markus 1994.
[451] Bitton-Ashkelony 1999, 189.
[452] Hunt 1982, 7.
[453] *Vita Const., Book II.40*, trans. Cameron and Hall 1999, 109.

"for generations believed to lie" in that spot.[454] In doing so, he entertains what Taylor dismisses as pure propaganda in Constantine's war on paganism.[455] "Christians were keen to convert pagans, but their actions were also motivated by sheer revenge. Pagans had to be punished."[456] This punishment took the form of demolition and confiscation of pagan places of worship around the Holy Land. "Wherever there was a pagan cult place, Christians could have a revelation that a biblical site — or a site important to a saint or martyr — lay covered,"[457] and by thus fabricating stories could legitimise their appropriation of pagan holy sites by claiming that the sites had been Christian all along. The additional accusations by certain Church Fathers that the pagans had stolen particular Christian sites, which they had then further defiled by making them places of idolatrous devotion, Taylor presents as an obvious example of projection.

Taylor's argument is founded on her refutation of the hypothesis put forth by Bellarmino Bagatti and Emmanuel Testa, and the followers of the so-called "Bagatti-Testa school", that the various holy places and grottos of the Holy Land were sustained by a group of heterodox Jewish-Christians who used these *grotte dei misteri* for the enactment of sacred rites.[458] Taylor concludes that there is "no evidence at all" for such an hypothesis,[459] and Jan Willem Drijvers considers her to have "irrefutably proven that a Jewish-Christian origin of the holy places is a myth and a scholarly invention."[460] Also among those who reject many of her conclusions, particularly regarding the impact of Constantine, this underlying aspect of her thesis is both accepted and lauded.[461] Interestingly, Taylor does acknowledge that "the

[454] Ibid.

[455] See in particular the subheading 'The Christian Appropriation of Sites' in chapter 13 of Taylor 1993, 318–332.

[456] Ibid., 318–19. As Timothy Barnes notes, Constantine's toleration of paganism did not extend to the institutions actively involved in the persecutions begun in 303 (Barnes 2002, 201).

[457] Ibid., 320.

[458] Bagatti 1971; Testa 1992.

[459] Taylor 1993, 295.

[460] Drijvers 1994, 86.

[461] See Bitton-Ashkelony 2005, 22, and Markus 1994, 261.

sepulchre containing the remains of Peter in Rome [was] visited at least from late in the second century (Guarducci 1960, 87). It is quite possible that early (predominantly Jewish-)Christians venerated it from the time of Peter's death, in the same way that other Jews venerated the tombs where the remains of the righteous dead were interred."[462] If the Christians of the second century were already venerating the tombs of saints and, more importantly, this was a continuation of a Jewish, rather than pagan, tradition, one might be forgiven for thinking that Taylor makes her argument from silence a little too forcefully. Some of the references to Paul, too, appear a little overstated. While he certainly shifts the focus from the type to the antitype, from the earthly to the heavenly, one cannot find in the verses cited to demonstrate a 'diametrical contradiction'[463] between fourth century and first century attitudes anything quite so forceful. Nor do we find in the writings of fourth century supporters of pilgrimage a deliberate undermining of these verses, to which also they make frequent reference.[464] Indeed, Wendy Pullan argues that the very notion of hagiopolitan pilgrimage served as an image of the believers' movement from the transient earth, where they were but sojourners and aliens, to the heavenly Jerusalem of which they were citizens.[465]

Providing us with an alternative narrative, the novelty of Markus' argument lies not so much in his attitude to the sudden impact of imperial policy, where he is very much in agreement with Taylor et al., asserting that this "can hardly be doubted" and presenting an "almost overnight" change in popular attitudes to the Palestinian holy sites.[466] Rather, he appeals to a notion of "a long established system of Christian sacred time" and argues that this sacred chronology can account for the emergence of sacred topography. While Taylor sees the

[462] Taylor 1993, 321–322.
[463] cf. Bitton-Ashkelony 1999, 189
[464] Cyril, for example, says of the Catholic Church that it is "a type and copy of the 'Jerusalem which is above, which is free, and the mother of us all' [Galatians 4:26]; which before was barren, but now has many children" (*CL* 18:26 — τύπον δὲ ἔχει καὶ μίμημα τῆς ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἥτις ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶ καὶ μήτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν, ἡ πρότερον μὲν στεῖρα, νῦν δὲ πολύτεκνος).
[465] Pullan 2005, 393–398. See also Lee 1988.
[466] Markus 1994, 262.

emergence of "holy places" as representing a major shift in the Catholic Church before and after Constantine, Markus argues that the practice stemmed from an attempt to combat precisely such a shift. The persecution endured by the Church in the first three centuries had become part of its identity. The Catholic Church was the Church of Martyrs, and the practice of revering them longstanding. While the so-called Edict of Milan brought to a welcome close a long and painful chapter in Christian history, it created something of an existential crisis for many. What would become of the Church of Martyrs if the period of martyrdom had come to an end? Much has been written on the rise of monasticism around the same period as an answer to the same problem: a bloodless martyrdom to sustain the Church in times of peace.[467] Markus argues that heightened focus on the cult of the martyrs became a way for peacetime Christians to connect with and keep alive the earlier period of martyrdom.[468] Not only were the memory of the martyrs kept alive by frequent visits to their tombs, but their constant prayers on behalf of the pilgrims, sometimes made manifest through miracles of healing, showed them to still be living members of the Church. In *MC* we see evidence that the intercession of the saints was already an integral part of the Eucharistic Liturgy at Jerusalem. After calling down the Holy Spirit to change the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ,

> we commemorate also those who have fallen asleep before us, first Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, that at their prayers and intercessions God would receive our petition.[469]

This commemoration at the liturgical Anaphora in many ways serves the same purpose as the reading of the *diptychs*, the list of other canonical bishops with whom one is in communion. The Theodosian Code, for example, appears to define the Catholic Church according to three requirements: apostolicity, Nicene orthodoxy, and Eucharistic communion with the primary

[467] See, for example, the classic work by Adolf Harnack (1911, 26).

[468] Markus 1994, 268–271

[469] *MC* 5:9 — "μνημονεύομεν καὶ τῶν κεκοιμημένων, πρῶτον πατριαρχῶν, προφητῶν, ἀποστόλων, μαρτύρων, ὅπως ὁ Θεὸς εὐχαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ πρεσβείαις προσδέξηται ἡμῶν τὴν δέησιν."

sees who have maintained this apostolic orthodoxy.[470] Unlike certain Latin hierarchs, who had already begun to hint that communion with Rome was a necessary prerequisite to both apostolicity and orthodoxy,[471] the Theodosian Code, although it defines the Catholic faith as "the divine religion Peter the Apostle transmitted to the Romans,"[472] mentions Alexandria in the same breath as Rome when discussing doctrinal orthodoxy, and lists the sees of Constantinople, Alexandria, Laodicea, Tarsus, Iconium, Antioch, Caesarea, Melitene, Nyssa, Scythia, and Martianopolis as those with which one must be in communion to "obtain the Catholic churches."[473] While the reading of *diptychs* served to illustrate the catholicity of a particular bishop by referring to the other catholic bishops with whom he was in communion, the commemoration of patriarchs, prophets, apostles, saints and martyrs served to show the unbroken tradition, the handing over, of catholic doctrine and praxis from the beginning to present time. Akin to Dix's concept of "sacred time," Dulles aptly terms this phenomenon "catholicity in time,"[474] a concept crucial to Cyril's anti-Jewish polemic, as we shall see in the subsequent chapter.

In his fifteenth catechetical lecture, Cyril also gives martyrdom an eschatological dimension as he says of the martyrs who will endure persecution following the rise of the antichrist:

> For I say that the martyrs of that time are above all martyrs. For the martyrs before these have wrestled with men only; but in the time of Antichrist they shall war against Satan in his own person.[475]

Thus, while it might have been the case that the Church

[470] *Cod. Theod.* 16:2.2–3

[471] See Dunn 2016.

[472] *Cod Theod* 16:2.2

[473] *Cod Theod* 16:2.3 — Theodosius' command that "the privileges granted to the Church of the City of Rome and to its clerics shall be firmly guarded" is merely an echo of the earlier decisions of Ecumenical Councils, the second of which extended these same privileges to the Church of New Rome, a fact that seems to undermine the idea that any concept of Petrine supremacy is intended here.

[474] Dulles 1985, 87–105.

[475] *CL* 15:17 — "ὑπὲρ γὰρ πάντας μάρτυρας ἐγώ φημι εἶναι τοὺς τότε μάρτυρας. οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρὸ τούτου μόνοις ἀνθρώποις ἐπάλαισαν, οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου αὐτῷ τῷ σατανᾷ αὐτοπροσώπως πολεμήσουσιν."

> previously crowned the holy martyrs with the varied and blooming crowns of patience amid persecutions and tribulations, and now in times of peace by God's grace receives her due honours from "*kings and those who are in high positions*",[476]

Cyril could nonetheless, through the unfailing promise of a new and final age of martyrdom even greater than the first, assure his listeners that the Church of which they now sought membership had not undergone any ontological shift as a result of imperial favour, despite the manifest differences in external circumstances.

It is this desire for chronological continuity, then, which Markus sees as the cause of the heightened emphasis on the cult of the martyrs and local pilgrimage. It was because the cult of martyrs was already a staple of Christian piety and an affirmation of the Church's catholicity that the veneration of the holy sites in Jerusalem and elsewhere in Palestine, and the concept of sacred space more generally, was accepted and found its way into the mainstream of Christian thought.

Cyril's attitude to pilgrimage

Eusebius, of whom mention was made earlier, had presided over the See of Caesarea, to which Aliea Capitolina was still subject at the time of Cyril's enthronement. It was perhaps not without consideration for his canonical jurisdiction that he had earlier claimed that the land of Judea "in no way excels the rest" of the earth, when commenting on the "far better land" the meek were promised in the Beautitudes.[477] Now, in an attempt to harmonise the words of Christ with contemporary imperial policy, he "became convinced that Christians needed to make a sharp distinction between the Temple and the city,"[478] as God's judgement rested only upon

[476] 1 Tim. 2:2. *CL* 18:27 — "πρότερον μὲν ἐν διωγμοῖς καὶ θλίψεσι τοὺς ἁγίους μάρτυρας τοῖς τῆς ὑπομονῆς ποικίλοις καὶ πολυανθέσιν ἔστεψε στεφάνοις, νυνὶ δὲ ἐν καιροῖς εἰρήνης θεοῦ χάριτι τὰ τῆς ὀφειλομένης ἔχει τιμῆς ὑπὸ βασιλέων καὶ τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχαῖς ὄντων."
[477] *Dem. Evang.* 3.2.10
[478] Walker, 1990b, 101.

the former, and the Jews who longed after its restoration, while Christian inhabitation of the city was entirely legitimate.

The stance taken by Cyril in this particular respect is in keeping with the revised view of Eusebius. He recognises that "because of Jesus' saying, *There shall not be left here one stone upon another*,[479] the Jewish temple opposite us is in ruin," but explains that "this fall was not indeed on account of the sentence, but it fell due to the sin of the transgressors."[480] He thereby avoids any possible theological improprieties with respect to Christian activities in the city, since they have no part in this 'sin'; but there end the similarities between the two. While Eusebius attempts simply to justify the zeal of his lauded emperor, but on the whole remains relatively indifferent, if not directly negative, with respect to Jerusalem as a centre of Christian devotion, Cyril is anything but complacent. He makes no attempt to reconcile an alleged pre-Constantinian negativity towards pilgrimage with the post-Constantinian situation, which he approaches quite matter-of-factly. Appealing to the day of Pentecost to demonstrate its antiquity, Cyril reminds his catechumens that "it has not arisen now that multitudes of strangers assemble here from all places, but they have done so since then."[481] He sees this coming together of people from all nations as baptised members of the Catholic Church — something essential to its character as *ekklēsia* — as a fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, and the Catholic faith of the emperor as a seal and affirmation of its truth. Building on the baptismal exegesis of the Genesis flood in 1 Peter 3, he says:

> The Holy Spirit descended upon the true Noah [Christ], the Maker of the second birth [baptism], who draws together into one the wills of all races, of whom the various dispositions of the animals in the ark was a figure: the one at whose coming the spiritual wolves feed with the lambs, in whose Church the calf, and the ox, and

[479] Matt. 2:42.

[480] *CL 10.11* — "καὶ διὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, Οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον, πέπτωκεν ὁ ἀντικρὺς ἡμῶν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ναός· οὐχ ὅτι ἡ ἀπόφασις τοῦ πεσεῖν αἰτία, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἡ ἁμαρτία τῶν παρανόμων γέγονε τοῦ πεσεῖν αἰτία."

[481] *CL* 17:16 — "οὐ γὰρ νῦν ἐνταῦθα ἤρξατο τῶν ξένων πλήθη συναθροίζεσθαι πανταχόθεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τότε."

> the lion, feed in the same pasture, as we see to this day world rulers guided and taught by Churchmen.[482]

We saw in the previous chapter how he elsewhere celebrates Constantine's efforts as heralding a new age of truth, contrasting the treachery of past rulers with the piety of the present, and Judas' betrayal of Jesus for financial gain with the lavish adornments Christian emperors had so generously bestowed upon the holy sites of Palestine.[483]

While *CL* only contains these passing references to the Emperor, lauding his godliness and piety, there survives, however, Cyril's *Letter to Constantius.* Like the *CL*, the Letter to Constantius Augustus never mentions Aelia Caesarea, but uses the name Jerusalem exclusively to refer to the city, and Cyril presents himself accordingly as 'Bishop of Jerusalem.' The purpose of the Letter seems obvious. It was Constantine's vision of a luminous cross that had brought about his conversion, and Cyril wished to convey to Emperor Constantius that the same favour that had visited his father some decades earlier had now visited him "during [his] reign so favoured by God."[484] Interestingly, Cyril makes no mention of Constantine's vision.[485] Instead, he confines the glory of the former sovereign to Jerusalem, citing rather the discovery of the cross of Christ, for which reason he says that Constantius has surpassed his "father's

[482] *CL* 17:10 — "τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον κατῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀληθινὸν Νῶε, τὸν τῆς δευτέρας γενέσεως ποιητήν, τὸν παντοίων γενῶν προαιρέσεις εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ συνάγοντα, ὧν τύπον ἔφερον αἱ διάφοροι τῶν ἐν τῇ κιβωτῷ ζώων καταστάσεις, οὗ κατὰ τὴν παρουσίαν οἱ νοητοὶ λύκοι συμβόσκονται μετὰ ἀρνῶν, οὗ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἔχει μοσχάριον καὶ ταῦρον καὶ λέοντα ἅμα βοσκομένους, καθὼς μέχρι σήμερον βλέπομεν ἄρχοντας κοσμικοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀγομένους καὶ διδασκομένους."

[483] See *CL* 14:14, 22. Kalleres (2005), expanding on a suggestion by Peter Walker (1990b, 272–3), hears in Cyril's descriptions of the Constantinian buildings some reservation, if not outright discontent. The buildings, she argues, had made many of the sites Cyril relies on to bring the salvation narrative to life for his listeners unrecognisable, obscuring the rock face of the tomb or the garden surrounding it. Moreover, the buildings emphasised a Christ risen in triumph, with the Rotunda drawing attention away from Golgotha and the Passion. Cyril's emphasis on the Cross, then, is a critique of an imperial, rather than soteriological, narrative shaping the sacred topography of Jerusalem. Her first assertion is perfectly plausible, but based entirely on inference. Cyril describing what the sites looked like previously does not necessarily mean he therefore disapproved of the changes. Her second assertion is contradicted by Yarnold (1985, 108), who attributes the over-emphasis on the resurrection to Eusebius, not Constantine, who designed the complex built over the site where his mother had found the relic of the cross "as a mystery-site connected with the death of Christ," a theme developed by Cyril's notion of "baptism [as] the initiation into the mysteries of Christ's death".

[484] *ad Const.* 2, trans. Yarnold 2000, 68.

[485] On the two apparitions, see Nicholson 2000.

piety with an even greater reverence for the divine, and in [his] time miracles have now appeared no longer from the ground but in the heavens."[486]

The Emperor is reminded that the Christ of whom he is a "most noble and pious fellow-worshipper […] accomplished the salvation of the world in Jerusalem according to the sacred Scriptures."[487] "In this place," he says, using rhetoric very similar to that of *CL*, "[he] trod death underfoot and wiped away the sins of mankind […] bestowed life, immortality and spiritual grace from heaven on all who believe in him."[488] He also emphasises the importance of the tangible as evidence for the Christian faith. In like manner as he tells his catechumens that their "very presence here now [should] persuade [them] of the Crucified,"[489] he relates to Constantius that those witnessing the miracle "had the evidence of their own senses that the holy faith of Christians is not based on the persuasive arguments of philosophy but on the revelation of the Spirit."[490] The miracle "prompted the whole populace at once to run together into the holy church […] Young and old, men and women of every age […] natives and foreigners, Christians and pagans visiting from abroad, all together as if with a single voice raised a hymn of praise to God's Only-begotten Son."[491]

The letter presents the Church of the Resurrection as an all-embracing microcosm, and pilgrimage thereto a source of Christian union. That the "citizens of Jerusalem, who saw this extraordinary wonder with [their] own eyes […] prayed at length in the holy places for your [i.e. Constantius'] blessed reign and shall likewise continue to do so"[492] is not mentioned simply as flattery. Rather, Cyril wishes to express the privileged position of those who dwell

[486] *ad Const.* 3, trans. Yarnold 2000, 69. N.T. Wright (2005) sees Paul's use of the Cross in his New Testament writings as a direct challenge to imperial authority — for whom it had been a symbol of order through coercion — and the redefinition of power. That the discovery of the Cross was an imperial venture was surely no coincidence, signifying the imperial reclamation, through faith, of the authority lost through faithlessness.
[487] *ad Const.* 6, trans. Yarnold 2000, 70.
[488] Ibid.
[489] *CL* 13.40
[490] *ad Const.* 4, trans. Yarnold 2000, 69.
[491] Ibid.
[492] *ad Const.* 5, trans. Yarnold 2000, 69.

in the Holy City, and the unique power of prayer conducted at its holy sites. While Christians had previously been persecuted for failing to honour the gods, whose favour ensured the prosperity and stability of the Empire, Cyril gently reminds the Emperor that it was now the prayer of Christians, and specifically those at Jerusalem, which conveyed God's favour upon his rule.

Furthermore, with this miracle Cyril attempts to demonstrate not only the holiness of Jerusalem's past, confined to relics and holy sites, but also of its present and future. One could also argue, as does Drijvers, that Cyril also wishes to draw attention to Jerusalem's eschatological significance. Cyril connects the apparition with "the testimony of the prophets and the words of Christ contained in the Gospels [which] has been accomplished now and will be accomplished again more fully […] *And then the sign of the Son of Man will appear in the sky*[493]."[494] In *CL* 15, he comments on this same verse, asking "but what is the sign of his coming? [...] Christ's own true sign is the Cross; a sign of a luminous Cross shall go before the King, declaring him who was formerly crucified."[495] His mention of the Mount of Olives from which Christ ascended into heaven, and to which the Acts of the Apostles suggests he shall return in the same manner,[496] may also be an allusion to this. Making a direct connection between Constantius' rule and these words of the Gospel, he urges his sovereign "above all people, to devote more frequent study of these words, because of what follows in this passage. For our Saviour's predictions demand our most reverent attention if we are not to suffer harm."[497]

[493] Matt. 24:30.
[494] *ad Const.* 6, trans. Yarnold 2000, 70.
[495] *CL* 15:22 — "Ἀλλὰ ποῖον τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ τὸ σημεῖον ἐστί; [...] σημεῖον δὲ ἀληθὲς ἰδικὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστιν ὁ σταυρός. φωτοειδοῦς σταυροῦ σημεῖον προάγει τὸν βασιλέα, δηλοῦν τὸν σταυρωθέντα πρότερον."
[496] Acts 1:11–12.
[497] *ad Const. 6*, trans. Yarnold 2000, 70.

In this way, Cyril successfully manages to use this miraculous occurrence to demonstrate Jerusalem's central position in the continuing Christian narrative, and to show that the cross is not merely a significant historical artefact, but is eternally "the trophy of the victory which our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ — the Only-begotten Son of God, won over death,"[498] and eternally connected to its place of origin.

Centre of the Earth

The importance of Jerusalem's holy sites is apparent also throughout *CL*, which is replete with references to them. Given that Cyril delivered the lectures in the Church of the Resurrection itself — *CL* at Golgotha and *MC* at the *Anastasis*[499] — it is little wonder that he would use the visual aids of Golgotha and Christ's tomb to enhance their impact on his hearers. However, his use of the local topography goes beyond this capacity. That Jerusalem was the "privilege of all good things"[500] was something of which "Cyril was himself convinced, and [he] sought to instil within his catechumens a similar conviction."[501] "Moreover," he says, reminding his hearers of their privilege, "concerning the place [of Christ's coming], you, being a Jerusalemite, know beforehand what is written in Psalm 131, *Look, we heard of it in Ephratha, and found it in the plains of the forest*.[502] For a few years ago the place was forested."[503]

Capitalising on his privileged geographical position, Cyril argues for the veracity of Scriptural events using not theological discourse but concrete visual evidence:

---

[498] *ad Const. 3*, trans. Yarnold 2000, 69.
[499] Filias 2009, 303.
[500] *CL 3:7* — "τὸ γὰρ ἁπάντων ἀγαθῶν ἀξίωμα ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις."
[501] Walker 1990b, 314.
[502] v. 6.
[503] *CL* 12:20 — "οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν τόπων ἱεροσολυμίτης ὢν προλαβὼν οἶδας καὶ τὸ ἐν ἑκατοστῷ τριακοστῷ πρώτῳ ψαλμῷ γεγραμμένον· ἰδοὺ ἠκούσαμεν αὐτὴν ἐν Ἐφραθά, εὕρομεν αὐτὴν ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις τοῦ δρυμοῦ. πρὸ ὀλίγων γὰρ ἐτῶν δρυμώδης ἦν ὁ τόπος."

> [I]f anyone does not believe these words, let him believe what is seen […]. For if, when crucified and buried, he had remained in the tomb, then we would have had shame: but now the one who was crucified on this Golgotha, has ascended into heaven from the Mount of Olives towards the East.[504]

By making the holy sites of Jerusalem the primary authenticator of Christian faith "which had [its] beginning in this place,"[505] he makes the city, and Golgotha in particular, the very centre of the earth and of Christianity itself.

> He stretched out his hands on the Cross, that he might embrace the ends of the inhabited world; for this Golgotha is the very centre of the earth. It is not my word, but it is a prophet who has said, *He has worked deliverance in the midst of the earth.*[506]

Christ, of course, spent most of his life outside Jerusalem, and "another crucial event for Christians, the Nativity, took place outside of Jerusalem [but] Cyril belittles it by noting that although Jesus descended from heaven in Bethlehem, 'he returned to heaven from the Mount of Olives'."[507] Instead of focusing on Christ's descent in Bethlehem, Cyril instead makes mention of the Holy Spirit

> who on the day of Pentecost descended on the Apostles in the form of fiery tongues, here, in Jerusalem, in the Upper Church of the Apostles; for all these privileges belong to us. Here Christ descended from the heavens; here the Holy Spirit descended from the heavens. And in truth it would have been most fitting, that as we speak about Christ and Golgotha upon this Golgotha, so we should speak concerning the Holy Spirit in the Upper Church; but since the one who descended here jointly partakes of the glory of the one who was crucified here, we also speak here about the one who descended there: for piety is indivisible.[508]

---

[504] *CL* 13:3, 4:14 — "εἴ τις οὐ πιστεύει τοῖς λόγοις, πιστευέτω τοῖς φαινομένοις [...]. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ σταυρωθεὶς καὶ ταφεὶς ἐναπέμεινε τῷ τάφῳ, εἴχομεν ἂν ἐπαισχύνεσθαι· νυνὶ δὲ ὁ ἐν τῷ Γολγοθᾷ τούτῳ σταυρωθεὶς, ἀπὸ τοῦ πρὸς ἀνατολὰς ὄρους τῶν Ἐλαιῶν ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν."

[505] *CL* 18:33 — "ἃ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐντεῦθεν εἴληφεν."

[506] Ps. 73:12. *CL* 13:28 — "Ἐξεπέτασεν ἐν σταυρῷ τὰς χεῖρας, ἵνα περιλάβῃ τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ πέρατα. τῆς γὰρ γῆς τὸ μεσώτατον ὁ Γολγοθᾶς οὗτός ἐστιν. οὐκ ἐμὸς ὁ λόγος· προφήτης ἐστὶν ὁ φήσας· εἰργάσω σωτηρίαν ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς."

[507] Bitton-Ashkelony 2005, 60. She refers to *CL* 14:23 — "εἰς μὲν γὰρ Βηθλεὲμ ἐξ οὐρανῶν κατελήλυθεν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνελήλυθεν."

[508] *CL* 16:4 — "καὶ ἐν τῇ πεντηκοστῇ κατελθὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐν εἴδει πυρίνων γλωσσῶν ἐνταῦθα ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐν τῇ ἀνωτέρᾳ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐκκλησίᾳ. πάντων γὰρ παρ' ἡμῖν ἔστι τὰ ἀξιώματα. ἐνταῦθα Χριστὸς ἐξ οὐρανῶν κατῆλθεν. ἐνταῦθα τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐξ οὐρανῶν κατῆλθεν. καὶ πρεπωδέστατον μὲν ἀληθῶς ἦν, ὥσπερ τὰ περὶ Χριστοῦ καὶ τοῦ Γολγοθᾶ ἐν τῷ Γολγοθᾷ τούτῳ λέγομεν, οὕτως καὶ περὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐν τῇ ἀνωτέρᾳ λέγειν ἐκκλησίᾳ. ἐπειδὴ δὲ τῆς δόξης τοῦ ἐνταῦθα σταυρωθέντος συναπολαύει τὸ ἐκεῖ κατελθόν, οὕτως τὰ περὶ τοῦ ἐκεῖ κατελθόντος ἐνταῦθα λαλοῦμεν. ἀμέριστος γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εὐσέβεια."

Philip S. Alexander presents an interesting study of Jerusalem, not as the centre (τὸ *μεσώτατον*) of the world, but its navel (*ὀμφαλός*), and the development of this idea throughout the centuries.[509] Although many earlier works refer to the importance and centrality of Jerusalem, the first instance in which we find "a clear cartographic image of the world as a whole, with Jerusalem placed at its center and called the 'the navel' of the earth" is the Book of Jubilees — or *Leptogenesis,* as it is also known — a Hebrew work dating to the second century B.C.,[510] though the complete work survives only in later Ethiopic retentions. The relevant reference appears in the context of Noah's dividing of the world between his sons following the great flood:

> And he knew that the Garden of Eden is the holy of holies, and the dwelling of the Lord, and Mount Sinai the centre of the desert, and Mount Zion — the centre of the navel of the earth: these three were created as holy places facing each other.[511]

The choice of wording is significant, 'navel' indicating not merely a geographical centre but evokes the image of a wellspring or source from which others draw life and nourishment. This, as I hope to demonstrate here, is central to Cyril's understanding of Jerusalem's place within the geographically catholic Church.

To illustrate the notion of ecclesiological catholicity in his essay *Church and Apostles,* Laurent Cleenewerck makes use of the hologram, which is, as he points out, a word derived from *ὅλης* and thus etymologically related to *καθολική*.[512] While cutting an ordinary photograph in half would result in two pieces, each bearing half of the original image, the two pieces of a hologram thus parted would each preserve the entire image of the original intact. In the same way, each local Eucharistic community, each diocese headed by a bishop, is not merely a constituent part of a larger catholic whole, but is a complete expression of the entire

[509] Alexander 1999. The same term was also used for the famous stone monument at Delphi. Parallels between Delphi and the Cross as Hellenic and Christian world centres respectively are explored in Ciholas 2003.
[510] See VanderKam 2001.
[511] Book of Jubilees 8:19, trans. Charles (1913).
[512] Cleenewerck 2013, 606.

Catholic Church, an undistorted image of the prototypical Eucharistic community. Thus is it possible for the Church to be "one in every place," the way in which Pacian of Barcelona defines the word *καθολικήν*.[513] As the site both of the first Eucharist, the Last Supper, and the first bishopric, headed by the Apostle James, to whom Cyril carefully refers as "the Bishop of this church,"[514] it is only natural that Jerusalem be identified as this prototypical community, the original holographic image reflected and reproduced in the life of each local Catholic church throughout the world.[515]

Thus, when Cyril asserts that the Church is "called Catholic because it is throughout the world, from one end of the earth to the other," it is because the Church, as the Body of Christ, embraces the entire world as did the outstretched arms of Christ crucified, and does so precisely by making the bounties and reality of this cosmic and unrepeatable event fully and entirely, rather than partially, present and available in every locality. Without suggesting that Cyril had no other concerns or ambitions with regards to his promotion of Jerusalem, I would argue that his ecclesiology, like the rest of his theology, is ultimately soteriological in nature, and has at its crux the Cross of Christ. When he tells his listeners that,

[513] *Ep.* 1:4, 21.

[514] *CL* 4:28.

[515] According to a tenth-century manuscript (Cod. sign. n. 125), the relics of James were discovered during the first year of Cyril's episcopate (see Drijvers 2004, 163–4). If correct, Cyril's frequent mention of James may be an allusion to this. His use of James is not dissimilar to the use of Peter by certain early Western writers. While we do not find in *CL* anything resembling the claims to universal jurisdiction based on petrine primacy that begin to appear in the 5th century with figures such as Popes Leo and Galasius, I do not think it unreasonable to suggest that a comparison could be made to Cyprian of Carthage. For Cyprian, "There is one God and one Christ, and one Church, and one Chair founded on Peter by the word of the Lord. It is not possible to set up another altar or for there to be another priesthood besides that one altar and that one priesthood" (*Ep.* 43.40.5). However, as noted by Theodor Damian (2010, 3), while he affords to the Church of Rome a primacy of honour on account of its petrine foundation, he "insists extensively on the equality, unity, and collegiality of the whole body of bishops in the Church". Christ confers the apostolic and episcopal authority first on the one, as a sign of unity, but then on the many, for "the others were also that which Peter was" (*De Unitate Ecclesiae* 4). Rome, then, is honoured as first on account of it being the prototype, but the authority of Peter is holographically replicated in each local bishop who holds to his confession and remains within the sacramental communion of the Church as defined by mutual recognition, which Cyprian calls the "cement" of the Church (*Ep.* 66.69.8). See also Seagraves 1993. A similar position is found in Gregory the Great, who uses petrine authority to promote Roman primacy, while categorically rejecting that this implies supremacy or universal jurisdiction (*Ep.* 6.25); see also the chapter on 'Ecclesiology and the Rhetoric of Episcopal Equality' in Demacopoulos 2015a (36–43), and id. 2015b.

> The holy wood of the cross is [Christ's] witness, which is seen among us to this day, and, through those who have in faith taken thereof, has from this place now almost filled the whole inhabited world,[516]

he provides us with an ecclesiological image. The wood of the Cross, divided into countless pieces, has made Golgotha present throughout the known world, each fragment carrying the same fullness of grace as the original whole.

We see this expression of catholicity more clearly elsewhere in reference to the Eucharist. The Liturgy of John Chrysostom, for example, confesses that "The Lamb of God is broken and distributed, broken yet not divided, ever eaten yet never consumed, but sanctifying those who partake."[517] One could argue that the same notion appears to be implicit in *MC* 5, where he warns communicants not to allow a single crumb to fall from the hand as they receive the Body of Christ, stressing that the most miniscule fragment of the consecrated bread is of no less value than the piece from which it fell.[518] No matter how many partake, all receive the same measure of sanctification, while the integrity and unity of the whole does not diminish. The same is true of each Eucharistic community, each diocese, as the expression of the catholic whole. Again, in *MC* 2, where baptism is described as the moment at which a person is joined to Christ, the true Vine, he is sure to point out that "the true Vine was planted in this place".[519] Its branches stretch throughout the world, but its roots are firmly planted in the sacred soil of the Holy City. For Cyril, then, Jerusalem seems to be the centre of the universal Catholic Church, not as a seat of administrative oversight, a position it never held before nor since, but as the source from which all else derives:

> Of this Jerusalem the prophet has said, *And after these things you shall be called the city of righteousness, the faithful mother city, Sion; for out of Sion shall go forth*

[516] *CL* 10:19 — "Τὸ ξύλον τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ σταυροῦ μαρτυρεῖ, μέχρι σήμερον παρ' ἡμῖν φαινόμενον, καὶ διὰ τῶν κατὰ πίστιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ λαμβανόντων, ἐντεῦθεν τὴν οἰκουμένην πᾶσαν σχεδὸν ἤδη πληρῶσαν."

[517] Μελίζεται καὶ διαμερίζεται ὁ Ἀμνός τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ μελιζόμενος καὶ μὴ διαιρούμενος· ὁ πάντοτε ἐσθιόμενος καὶ μηδέποτε δαπανώμενος ἀλλὰ τοὺς μετέχοντας ἁγιάζων.

[518] *MC* 5.21.

[519] *MC* 2:7 — "ἐνταῦθα πεφύτευται ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή."

a law, and a word of the Lord from Jerusalem,[520] which word has from hence been showered forth on the whole inhabited world.[521]

Common ecclesiological underpinnings of divergent attitudes to pilgrimage

This ecclesiological idea is one that potentially sheds new light on our understanding of the debate surrounding pilgrimage to the Holy Land in the fourth century. A number of weighty monographs have been written on the subject of pilgrimage and the attitudes of various fourth century figures thereto, but these, with the exception of one or two recurring themes, appear to overlook the question of ecclesiology entirely.[522] Claiming for his own community 'all the choicest privileges,' Cyril undoubtedly set himself apart from many of his counterparts, but I think it is necessary to understand also this divergence of opinion in light of the reinterpreted Ignatian model of ecclesiology. Of particular interest are the attitudes of the bishop of another Caesarea, Basil, and his brother Gregory of Nyssa, both of whom make the journey to Palestine during his time as bishop. While the most revealing aspect of Basil's writings is perhaps his silence, Gregory expresses his opinion with clarity, and it can be argued that he does so as a direct and personal challenge to Cyril's ideas. Although Gregory, upon returning from the journey, writes positively in his first letter about his experience of both the city and its holy sites,[523] other accounts of his visit are less favourable, questioning the purpose of such a pilgrimage and citing the decadence of the city's inhabitants as casting doubt on the holiness of the place.

[520] Is. 1:26; 2:3.

[521] *CL* 18:34 — "περὶ ἧς Ἰερουσαλὴμ ὁ προφήτης εἴρηκε· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα κληθήσῃ πόλις δικαιοσύνης, μητρόπολις πιστὴ Σιών, διὰ τὸν ἐκ Σιὼν ἐξελθόντα νόμον καὶ λόγον κυρίου τὸν ἐξ Ἰερουσαλήμ, ὃς ἐντεῦθεν εἰς ἅπασαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐξώμβρησεν."

[522] See, for example, Hunt 1982 and Bitton-Ashkelony 2005.

[523] In his third *Letter*, he writes: "Επειδὴ τοίνυν εἶδον μὲν καὶ αἰσθητῶς τοὺς ἁγίους τόπους […] τοσάυτης ἐπληρώθην χαρᾶς, ὅστε ὑπὲρ λόγον εἶναι τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τὴν διήγησιν." *Ep.* 3:3 (*SC* 363.126).

In his *Life of Macrina,* Gregory had explained that he visited the Holy City "*κατ' εὐχήν*" and to visit the places connected to the life of Christ.[524] Scholars have disagreed as to the meaning of Gregory's words, although the most commonly accepted meaning in this case is 'for the sake of prayer,' meaning the purpose of his trip was first and foremost a devotional one.[525] Elsewhere, however, Gregory portrays his mission as a political one, as a mediator between two conflicting parties in the nearby Arabian region.[526] So what is the cause of this about-face? Bitton-Ashkelony argues that Gregory's attitude has more to do with his feelings towards Cyril and his attempts to magnify the status of his bishopric than any concrete theological objection to pilgrimage to Jerusalem's holy sites.

Her primary argument in support of this assertion, which is also of particular interest with respect to the notion of catholicity, is that Gregory and Basil were themselves heavily involved with and staunchly supportive of local pilgrimage and the veneration of local saints.[527] His apparent scepticism regarding the holy sites of Jerusalem notwithstanding, Gregory views the cult of the martyrs as an integral part of Christian worship, and that "those who recognize the fruits of piety (*τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας καρπόν*) must honour the martyr."[528] Such an attitude to local pilgrimage would certainly not be possible were their disapproval of pilgrimage to Jerusalem based on a purely theological aversion to sacred space. Indeed, Gregory even makes the remarkable statement that "From this visit [to Jerusalem] we gained only one advantage: we found proof from comparison that our own [sites] are holier than those foreign places."[529]

[524] *Vitae Macrinae* 1.7–9 (*SC* 178.138).
[525] Bitton-Ashkelony 2005, 49
[526] *Ep.* 2:11 (*SC* 363.118).
[527] Numerous letters of Basil's contain pleas to bishops of other provinces, asking them to support him by their attendance. An example is his letter to Eusebius of Samosata, in which he pleads with him "to take a seat at the synod we convene every year on the seventh of September in memory of blessed Eupsychius" — *Ep.* 100 (*SC* 2.184).
[528] Bitton-Ashkelony 2005, 36. *De sancto Theodoro* 4 (*PG* 46:737B).
[529] *Ep.* 2.15 (*SC* 363.121)

The second argument in support of Ashkelony's theory is Gregory's focus on the moral corruption of Jerusalem's population. As has already been pointed out above, Cyril too is frank about the city's illicit activities, from which he tries to steer his listeners. Yet, while Gregory seemingly views immorality as evidence for a place's lack of holiness,[530] Cyril makes no such connection. Indeed, that these monuments remain in spite of the city's paganism, Judaism, heresy and corruption is for him a testimony to their holiness. Such behaviour was by no means limited to Jerusalem. Basil himself vehemently condemns the inappropriate behaviour displayed by the women of Caesarea.[531] Other contemporary figures, including John Chrysostom in Antioch and Gregory of Nazianzus, likewise condemned the drunkenness, sexual promiscuity, lewd songs, and the interest of so many in commerce rather than piety which so often accompanied these events.[532] Once again, this would appear to reveal a personal or political, rather than theological motivation on the part of Gregory.

Among the Latin Fathers, opinion on pilgrimage is divided. Jerome's aforementioned pilgrimage, or rather emigration, to Jerusalem took place in 383, meaning he arrived in the city in the immediate aftermath of the Council of Constantinople, at which Cyril had been an active participant. The extent to which his perspective on pilgrimage to Jerusalem was shaped by the city's bishop cannot be ascertained. However, we see strong parallels between the sentiments put forth in the writings of Jerome and those expressed by Cyril in *CL*. Addressing the negative words about Jerusalem in the Gospel, Jerome, like Eusebius and Cyril, draws a sharp distinction between the Jews, upon whom the curse of God rests, and on the city itself,[533] thereby avoiding any possible antinomy. Not only that, but he regards the destruction of the Temple as an act of sanctification.[534] In his *47th Letter*, Jerome boldly declares, quite contrary to Gregory of Nyssa,

[530] *Ep. 2.10* (*SC* 363.116)
[531] *Hom. 14* (*PG* 330:444D–464A).
[532] Bitton-Ashkelony 2005, 38–9. See also Brown 2000a for a more detailed treatment of this subject.
[533] *Ep. 46.5*
[534] Ibid.

that to worship at the sites of Christ's earthly life "*pars fidei est*."[535] He does this with full awareness of the pre-Constantinian reservations that still held sway among many at the time. While it is not possible to say with any certitude whether he was responding to particular individuals or to general prevailing attitudes, his works on the subject are very much apologetic in tone, raising and then refuting possible arguments against Jerusalem's sanctity.[536]

His treatment of Matthew 27:51–53 is particularly interesting. While Origen and Eusebius both interpret "*ἁγίαν πόλιν*" as referring to Jerusalem, Jerome dismisses such an interpretation as nonsensical, seeing it instead as a reference to the heavenly Jerusalem.[537] He argues that, if the earthly city is meant, then there is no proof of the events having ever occurred.[538] For Jerome, like Cyril, seeing is believing. Tangible evidence of the historicity of the Holy Scriptures is for them both an essential part of the Christian faith, which gives to Jerusalem and its holy sites a real and continuing significance for all who follow that faith. To allow for a Scriptural occurrence without corresponding proofs would undermine this emphasis on the tangible. His frequent use of the word *hic* to emphasise the particularity of Jerusalem also echoes that of Cyril.[539]

Much like Gregory of Nyssa, however, Jerome's enthusiasm was short lived and was replaced by an attitude of ambivalence.[540] Robert Markus argues that Jerome's newfound position "reflects the heritage of reserve about holy places still powerful in the fourth century."[541] Joshua Prawer likewise sees Jerome's turnaround as a concession to "the official interpretation of the learned Church."[542] This explanation does not sufficiently explain the

[535] *Ep.* 47.2
[536] Bitton-Ashkelony 2005, 72
[537] *Ep. 46.8*
[538] Ibid.
[539] Bitton-Ashkelony 2005, 84.
[540] *Ep. 58.4*. See Pullan 2005, 400–407.
[541] Markus 1990, 87.
[542] Prawer 1996, 320. See also Elm 1989.

cause of Jerome's change of heart. Such sentiments would in all probability be less prevalent in Palestine than elsewhere, and it seems strange that he would feel pressured to conform to the "learned Church" during his stay there.

A much more probable explanation is provided by F. M. Abel, "who suggests that the shaky relationship between Jerome and the monks in Bethlehem on the one hand and with the church in Jerusalem and the monks on the Mount of Olives on the other should be seen as the main reason for Jerome's change of track."[543] The details of the conflict are unfortunately beyond the scope of this study,[544] but suffice it to say that Jerome's party, headed by Epiphanius of Salamis, had fallen foul of John, Cyril's successor, when the latter reacted negatively to Epiphanius ordaining a priest to serve in Bethlehem, a region he felt was under the jurisdiction of Jerusalem.[545] Jerome, in response to the incident, composed his *Contra Johannem Hierosolymitanum*. In the work, Jerome describes being prohibited entry to the holy places in Jerusalem and Bethlehem.[546] It is during this period that he wrote his *Letter 58*, in which he makes many of his disparaging remarks against Jerusalem. Thus it would seem theological discourse on the subject of pilgrimage is invariably influenced by the volatile nature of church politics, and only as consistent as human relationships. However, even if Ashkelony and Abel are right to suggest that aversion to hagiopolitan pilgrimage was for some politically, rather than theologically, driven, this does not solve the problem of discord, for were all otherwise of one mind on the matter, they would not have been in a position to express this aversion with such relative ease.

Returning to Gregory's statement that "our sites are holier [than Jerusalem's]," I would argue that, while resulting in a radically different attitude to Jerusalem itself than Cyril's, it is

[543] Bitton-Ashkelony 2005, 87. See Abel 1920, 133–34; Cardman 1982.
[544] For a detailed treatment of the situation, see Kelly 1975, 198–209.
[545] See *C. Io.* 11 (*PL* 347:382A).
[546] *C. Io.* 42 (*PL* 347:411B).

actually predicated on the very same notion that drives Cyril's enthusiasm for pilgrimage. For Cyril, the importance of Jerusalem lies in its being the prototypical local church, which is then replicated, along the aforementioned holographic model, in every episcopal locality throughout the world, there making present the fullness of the Catholic Church. Yet it is precisely this notion of replication that allows Gregory to speak of his own sites and his own territory as being Jerusalem's spiritual equal. Thus, when Bitton-Ashkelony speaks of "the deep division between the conceptions of Gregory of Nyssa and Cyril of Jerusalem regarding this issue," I would object to her use of the word 'deep'. A division there certainly was, but this disagreement around the question of Jerusalem and the propriety of hagiopolitan pilgrimage need not be the result of different ecclesiological positions. It is not a deep conceptual division, but rather a superficial disagreement between those who thought it appropriate to honour Jerusalem as the source, the prototype, replicated in all local churches, and those who saw in such activity the implicit suggestion that the local church was lacking; that it was not a replica but a partial derivative of the Jerusalem prototype. Even in one of his most explicit expressions of Jerusalem's importance, Cyril appears to add a caveat indicating that, despite its pre-eminence of honour, the Holy City did not have a monopoly on grace or holiness:

> Also this honour [the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost] is ours; and we do not speak of the good things which have happened among others, but of those which have been granted among us.[547]

[547] *CL* 17:13 — "ἡμέτερον γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἀξίωμα, καὶ λαλοῦμεν οὐ περὶ τῶν παρ' ἑτέροις γεγενημένων ἀγαθῶν, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν κεχαρισμένων."

Chapter 5 — St Cyril and the Jews: The Church as the Second Israel

The parting of the ways

The question of how to regard Jerusalem was naturally connected to the wider question of the relationship between Christianity and Judaism, which had been a vexing and ever present question for Church leaders since apostolic times. The Book of Acts records how the apostles and presbyters assembled in Jerusalem to consider the claim of those men who had come "from Judea and were teaching the brothers, 'Unless you are circumcised according to the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved'."[548] Cyril mentions how "the Apostles and James the bishop of this church, have already been diligent [about this matter]: and the Apostles and presbyters write a Catholic epistle to all the nations,"[549] deciding against the need for gentile converts to observe the burden of Mosaic Law, careful to point to his own authority as successor to the president of that apostolic council. In his attempt to deal with this problem, Cyril must undoubtedly have felt a particular responsibility rested on his shoulders, not only as successor to James, but as bishop of what still remained the spiritual centre of Judaism.[550] It is telling, for example, that the only work attributed to Clement of Alexandria, a city with a significant Jewish community,[551] which could be termed *adversus Iudaeos* was, as we are informed by Eusebius, commissioned by Alexander of Jerusalem,[552] a predecessor of Cyril's, perhaps pointing to a particular and longstanding interest in the subject by the hagiopolitan hierarchy.

[548] Acts 15:1

[549] *CL* 4:28 — "ἤδη καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ Ἰακώβῳ τῷ ταύτης τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπῳ σπουδὴ γέγονεν. Καὶ γράφουσιν οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι καθολικὴν ἐπιστολήν."

[550] The 8th century homily 'On the Passion and the Resurrection', a Coptic pseudography bearing Cyril's name, actually suggests that Cyril was a Jewish convert to Christianity, presumably to connect him with the early lineage of Hebrew bishops, or to simply to lend weight to his anti-Jewish apologetic. See van den Broek 2013, 119.

[551] For a discussion on the influence of Jewish-Christians on the Alexandrian liturgical tradition, see al-Makary 2017. For Jewish influence on the Syriac tradition, see Rouwhorst 1997.

[552] *HE* 6.13.3. See Carleton Paget 1998.

Already in the *Didache*, a work significant not only for its very early date[553] but also in that it is very much a Jewish-Christian text,[554] we see a clear distancing of the Christian community from the observances of the Jews. Christians are told to fast on Wednesday and Friday rather than Monday and Thursday, so as not to let their fasts coincide with those of the 'hypocrites.'[555] Likewise, recitation of the Lord's Prayer thrice daily served to distinguish Christian prayer from that of the 'hypocrites.'[556] We see a similar sentiment expressed in the *Didascalia*, a third century document which draws heavily on the *Didache* and purports to have been written by the Apostles at the aforementioned gathering in Jerusalem. Interestingly, although it tells Christians not to join in the festivities of the Jewish Passover, but to fast in remembrance of Christ's Passion,[557] this fast, and its accompanying prayers, is offered "that the Lord may not remember to them [the Jews] their guilt unto the end, on account of the perfidy which they showed unto our Lord, but may give them a place for repentance, and conversion for the pardon of their iniquity."[558] Thus while this distancing from the Jews is unambiguous, it is done with a heavy heart, not with the near triumphant attitude we often encounter in later works. James Carleton Paget gives a very interesting overview of the early pagan sources that attest to the so-called "parting of the ways" paradigm:

---

[553] See Holmes (2008, 337), who favours a date close to the end of the first century, while Milavec (2003, ix) believes it to be older than the canonical Gospels, written in the generation following the death of Christ.

[554] I am hesitant to use the terms 'Jewish Christianity' and 'Jewish Christian' which, despite being a well-established and commonplace feature in academic works, have been so variously defined and can refer to such a broad category of groups, some of which are entirely artificial constructs, that it is largely tautologous and unhelpful. I am inclined to agree with Carleton Paget's suggestion that academic discourse might be better served were it to be done way with, along the lines of Michael William's attempt to replace the term Gnosticism with "biblical demiurgical traditions", and define each group or idea variously covered under the 'Jewish Christian' umbrella individually (Carleton Paget 2010, 319–320). Thus, while I might make use of the term 'Jewish Christian' where applicable, I shall define it as and when it occurs.

[555] *Didache* 8.

[556] *Didache* 8:2

It is not entirely clear who these 'hypocrites' are. If one assumes a connection here with Christ's frequent use of this appellation in his dealings with the Pharisees, it would appear to refer to non-Christian Jews in general. However, it is probably more likely that the charge of hypocrisy is directed at those who claim to have accepted Christ while continuing to cling to observance of Jewish custom, which is the way in which Paul appears to use the term in Galatians 2 (see Vermès 2012, 23–25). In either case, the evidence points to a conscious distancing of Christians from Jews.

[557] Accordingly, Cyril cites the prophecy of Amos (8:10), "And I will turn your feasts into mourning," in connection with Jesus' crucifixion on the Passover (*CL* 13:25).

[558] *Didascalia* 21, trans. Gibson 1903, 99.

> Nero, we are told by Tacitus, was apparently able to differentiate between Jews and Christians as early as 64 C.E., at least in the city of Rome. Tacitus himself, writing some fifty years after this event, acknowledges the origins of the Christian movement in Judea but does not go on to associate it with the Jewish *ethnos* […]. Strikingly also, given his negative opinions of the Christians, he never mentions their association with the Jews in what most take to be his strongly polemical account of the latter in his *Histories* (*Hist.* 5.1–13).[559]

He goes on to list similar evidence from Suetonius, Pliny the Younger, Celsus, and Tertullian's mention of the pagans who "slander the Christians as 'the third race'."[560]

Despite such evidence, the paradigm itself has been challenged by a number of scholars,[561] perhaps most aggressively by Daniel Boyarin in his 2004 monograph *Border Lines*. In it he argues that the division between Judaism and Christianity is an artificial construct imposed by those in power, one he likens to the partitioning of India and Pakistan or modern day Israel and Palestine.[562] It is, he asserts, an invention of so-called separatists, beginning with the advent of *adversus Iudaeos* literature in the second century, and in particular with Justin Martyr,[563] who were seeking to create something which did not yet exist in reality. In the absence of a monolithic Judaism or Christianity, he makes the argument that, until the conversion of Constantine, we should not speak of Jews and Christians, but rather various types of Jews occupying different positions along a Judaeo-Christian continuum.[564]

Boyarin's views are certainly among the more extreme, and cannot be said to be representative of a rather divided scholarly community.[565] However, this does not mean he is altogether wrong to challenge the "parting of the ways" paradigm. As Paula Fredriksen rightly notes, the "answer — and indeed, the question itself — depends upon what evidence we consider. An awareness of separation, even a principled insistence upon separation, seems

[559] Carleton Paget 2010, 9–10.
[560] For the most recent studies on Christians as the *tertium genus*, see Gruen 2017 and Skarsaune 2017.
[561] See, for example, Becker and Reed 2003.
[562] Boyarin 2004a, 1.
[563] See also Boyarin 2001 and id. 2004b.
[564] An appraisal of Boyarin's 'wave theory' can be found in Miller 2007.
[565] Carleton Paget 2010, 1–17.

clearly attested in some early mid-second century writers (Ignatius, Marcion, Justin); equally clearly, we see strong indications of persistent, intimate interactions."[566] In his defence of what he deems a "mildly separatist" view, one towards which I too am inclined,[567] Carleton Paget nonetheless affirms that his arguments "in response to the criticisms of the 'parting of the ways' paradigm are not attempts to reinstate that paradigm."[568] The problem is further exacerbated by the fact that very rarely do Jews refer to themselves as such unless in contact with Gentiles — when petitioning the Roman government, for example. In internal exchanges, as we see throughout the pages of the Old Testament, the term Israel is preferred; 'Jew' only specifically denoting a member of the tribe of Judah or an inhabitant of the land Judaea. That Jews did not self-identify as such, while Christians, too, referred to themselves using the appellation 'Israel' makes convergence very difficult to discern on a nominative basis.

What is curious about the position of Boyarin and others is their identification of Justin Martyr as the originator of separatism, when it is in Ignatius of Antioch that we first encounter the terms 'Judaism' and 'Christianity',[569] while it is in Justin Martyr that we see clear evidence of convergence, the latter explicitly disagreeing with those who refuse to "have any intercourse with or extend hospitality to" Torah observant Christians[570] and calling those among them who do not attempt to persuade others to imitate them "kinsmen and brethren."[571] Origen also points to such a convergence, mentioning "that there are some who accept Jesus, and who boast on that account of being Christians, and yet would regulate their lives, like the Jewish multitude,

[566] Fredriksen 2003, 61.

[567] That is "the thesis that relatively early on, for whatever reason, whether by design of not, Jews and Christians were, in the main, discernible groups occupying different spaces for the purposes of worship (broadly social separation), and were perceived as different […] but that such a reality did not exclude interaction and convergence" (Carleton Paget 2010, 17–18).

[568] Ibid., 17.

[569] Ἐὰν δέ τις Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ἑρμηνεύσῃ ὑμῖν, μὴ ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ. ἄμεινον γάρ ἐστιν παρὰ ἀνδρὸς περιτομὴν ἔχοντος Χριστιανισμὸν ἀκούμειν ἢ παρὰ ἀκροβύτου Ἰουδαϊσμόν [But if anyone expounds Judaism to you, do not listen to him. For it is better to hear about Christianity from a man who is circumcised than about Judaism from one who is not] — *Philadelphians* 6.1, trans. Holmes 2008, 246. See Schoedel 1978. See Robinson 2009.

[570] For a recent study of the role of the Torah in Judaism, from the writing of Deuteronomy to the advent of Christianity, see Collins 2017. Particularly relevant is chapter 8 on 'Paul, Torah, and Jewish Identity' (159–82).

[571] *Dial. 47*. See also Rokéah 2002.

in accordance with Jewish law — and these are the twofold sect of the Ebionites, who either acknowledge with us that Jesus is born of a virgin, or deny this, and maintain that He was begotten like other human beings."[572] These Ebionites are also mentioned by Irenaeus of Lyons, who supplies us with the following information:

> Those who are called Ebionites agree that the world was made by God; but their opinions with respect to the Lord are similar to those of Cerinthus and Carpocrates.[573] They use the Gospel according to Matthew only, and repudiate the Apostle Paul, maintaining that he was an apostate from the law. As to the prophetical writings, they endeavour to expound them in a somewhat singular manner: they practise circumcision, persevere in the observance of those customs which are enjoined by the law, and are so Judaic in their style of life, that they even adore Jerusalem as if it were the house of God.[574]

Following Irenaeus, Cyril lists the Ebionites with "Cerinthus [who] 'caused destruction in the Church,' and Menander, and Carpocrates."[575] Cyril's mention of Irenaeus in *CL* 16[576] points to his reliance on his *Against Heresies* here,[577] and it should not be assumed that he had any contact with such a group. Cyril does not appear to know anything about the additional information on the Ebionites we find in the *Panarion* of Epiphanius of Salamis, written shortly after *CL*, which casts doubt on Gieseler's assertion that "Dieser lichteste Zeitpunkt in der Geschichte […] der Ebioniten fällt unstreitig um das Jahr 400"[578] and seems in keeping with the current theory that Epiphanius in all probability used 'Ebionite' as something of an umbrella term to describe a number of different heresies, some of which he may have encountered in Cyprus, but that he is unlikely to have had first hand knowledge of Irenaeus' group.[579]

---

[572] *C. Cels.* 5.61, trans. *ANF* 4, 1323. On convergence in the 4th century, see Kinzig 1991.
[573] That is, they viewed Jesus as a mere man, the son of Mary and Joseph.
[574] *Adv. Haer*. 1.26.2, trans. *ANF* 1, 992.
[575] *CL* 6:16 — "Κήρινθος γὰρ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἐλυμήνατο, καὶ Μένανδρος, καὶ Καρποκράτης· Ἐβιωναῖοί τε, καὶ Μαρκίων, τὸ τῆς ἀθεότητος στόμα."
[576] v.6.
[577] McDonnell (1994, 197) suggests he might have known Irenaeus' works via Eusebius.
[578] Geisler 1819, 279.
[579] See 'The Ebionites in recent research' in Carleton Paget 2010, 335–379.

Like many other patristic writers, Cyril couples the Ebionites with Marcion,[580] contrasting the two extremes in attitudes to Judaism: Marcion's total rejection of the Old Testament on the one hand, and the Ebionite rejection of the books of the New Testament, save only the Gospel of Matthew, on the other. He appears to have the Ebionites in mind when commenting on a passage in Luke's Gospel — "his father and his mother marvelled at him"[581] — "words which the children of heretics snatch up, saying he was begotten of a man and a woman."[582] Elsewhere he tells us to "spit upon those who say that the Saviour's birth was of husband and wife; who have dared to say that he was the child of Joseph and Mary."[583]

The purpose of Adversus Iudaeos literature

The mention of Marcion raises important questions as to the very nature of *adversus Iudaeos* literature and the extent, if any, of actual contact between the Christian and Jewish communities. As a series of catechetical homilies covering a broad range of subjects, the *Catechetical Lectures* themselves cannot be termed *adversus Iudaeos* as such, and, given the enforcement of the *Disciplina Arcani*,[584] we know that Jews would not have been in a position to hear nor, as his preface suggests,[585] read it. However, its content nonetheless shows clear parallels with *adversus Iudaeos* literature and his obvious reliance on Irenaeus and, elsewhere, Clement,[586] make an analysis of the origins and purpose of such literature in the pre-

[580] "It is striking how often Marcion and 'Ebion' are mentioned together in patristic texts." Taylor 1990, 322–3. In n.45 (p.332) she provides the following examples: "Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer*. 3,11,7; Tertullian, *de Praescr*. 30,3–5,11; Origen, *in Ep. ad Rom*. 3,11; Methodius, *Symp*. 8,10; Ambrose, *De Fide*, 5,8,105; Jerome, *in Gal*. 1,1; *in Tit*. 3,10–11; Pacianus, *Ep.* 1,1; Rufinus, *Expos. symb*. 37; Cassianus, *De Incarn. dom*. c. Nest. 3,5; Ps-Augustine, *Serm*. 169,5; Alexander Minorita, *Expos. in Apoc*. 2,2,2."

[581] Luke 2:33

[582] *CL* 7:9 — "ὅπερ ἁρπάζουσιν αἱρεσιωτῶν παῖδες, ἐξ ἀνδρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ γυναικὸς γεγεννῆσθαι λέγοντες."

[583] *CL* 12:31 — "καταπτύσωμεν καὶ τῶν λεγόντων ἐξ ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς εἶναι τὴν γέννησιν τοῦ σωτῆρος, τῶν τολμησάντων εἰπεῖν ὅτι ἦν ἐκ τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ καὶ τῆς Μαρίας."

[584] See chapter 8 below.

[585] See epigraph to chapter 8.

[586] Clement, himself an author of an *adversus Iudaeos* work, is mentioned in *CL* 18:8, where Cyril borrows from his *First Epistle to the Corinthians* the image of the *phoenix* as a symbol of and evidence for the resurrection

Constantinian period pertinent to this study. Moreover, the fact that we find many of the same anti-Jewish sentiments expressed in the *Sermon on the Paralytic*[587] means that these were ideas openly propagated among catechumens and others who may have been in attendance during the Liturgy of the Word before the dismissal. On the question of Cyril's audience, the question of interest is whether the anti-Jewish elements in his writings are purely theoretical and didactic in nature, or whether these were born out of actual contact between the two communities and were for the practical benefit of his listeners and readers.

Many scholars have made the argument that anti-Jewish polemics, perhaps somewhat paradoxically, were necessary in order to assert Christianity's roots and fulfilment of the Old Testament. The debate hearkens back to Harnack's 1883 work, in which he argues that Christian *adversus Iudaeos* literature was in fact *adversus gentes*.[588] The relative novelty of Christianity, for example, was not only a cause for its rejection among Jews, but also within Roman society, which tolerated Judaism on account of its antiquity but viewed Christians with suspicion. As Wolfram Kinzig observes,

> By calling the Christians adherents 'of a novel and harmful superstition', Suetonius, for instance made clear that he saw in them a threat for the *raison d'être* of the community, since the self-definition of the Roman state, and its claim to power, were based precisely on its strict observance of the *mos majorum* which was in the first place interpreted in religious terms.[589]

In the early centuries after Christ, Harnack opines, the primary concern for the Christian community was to legitimise their novel faith by demonstrating it to be a continuation of Judaism. While Constantine's conversion had put an end to any existential threat to Christianity, the fight for intellectual legitimacy was one that continued unabated. We can clearly see such a concern in Cyril's work:

(See Himuro 1998, 530–2). He is not mentioned in connection with Judaism, but we can nonetheless infer from this that Cyril was familiar with his work.

[587] For the full text, see Ibid., 209–222.

[588] Harnack 1883.

[589] Kinzig 1993, 123.

> But since the disobedient Jews are persuaded by the Divine Scriptures, but speak against the Resurrection of Jesus, forgetting all that is written, it would be good to answer them as follows: For what reason, while you say that Elisha and Elijah raised the dead, do you gainsay the Resurrection of our Saviour? Is it because we now have no living witnesses to what we say? Well, you should also bring forward witnesses to the events of that time. But that is written—this is also written: why then do you receive the one, and reject the other? Those who wrote that history were Hebrews; the apostles were also all Hebrews: why then do you disbelieve the Jews? Matthew who wrote the Gospel wrote it in the Hebrew tongue; and Paul the preacher was a Hebrew of the Hebrews; and the twelve Apostles were all from the Hebrews: then fifteen Bishops of Jerusalem were appointed in succession from the Hebrews. What then is your reason for allowing your own, and rejecting ours, when these also are written by Hebrews from among you?[590]

Cyril even grounds the novelty of Christianity in the Old Testament, presenting it as an argument in favour of its veracity and its simultaneous continuity with and superiority over what went before:

> Let us test the Jews: Do you serve the Lord, or not? Show then your new name. For you were called Jews and Israelites in the time of Moses, and the other prophets, and after the return from Babylon, and up to the present time. Where then is your new name? But we, since we serve the Lord, have the new name: "new" indeed, but the *new name, which shall be blessed on the earth*.[591] This name caught the world in its grasp: for Jews are only in a certain region, but Christians reach to the ends of the inhabited world: for it is the name of the Only-begotten Son of God that is proclaimed.[592]

---

[590] *CL* 14:15 — "Ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐ πείθουσιν αἱ θεῖαι γραφαὶ τοὺς ἀνηκόους Ἰουδαίους, ἐπιλαθόμενοι δὲ πάντων τῶν γεγραμμένων ἀντιλέγουσι τῇ ἀναστάσει τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καλὸν ἂν εἴη πρὸς αὐτοὺς οὕτως ἀντειπεῖν. τίνι τῷ λόγῳ τὸν Ἐλισσαῖον καὶ τὸν Ἠλίαν νεκροὺς ἐγηγερκέναι λέγοντες τῇ ἀναστάσει τοῦ ἡμετέρου σωτῆρος ἀντιλέγετε; ὅτι νῦν ἄρα ζῶντας ἐκ τῶν τότε μάρτυρας οὐκ ἔχομεν τῶν λεγομένων; οὐκοῦν καὶ ὑμεῖς παραστήσατε τῶν τότε γεγονότων μάρτυρας. ἀλλ' ἔγγραφον ἐκεῖνο. καὶ τοῦτο ἔγγραφον. διὰ τί οὖν τὸ μὲν ἀποδέχεσθε, τὸ δὲ ἀποδοκιμάζετε; Ἑβραῖοι ἔγραψαν ἐκεῖνα. καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι πάντες Ἑβραῖοι. διὰ τί οὖν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἀπιστεῖτε; Ματθαῖος ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἑβραίδι γλώσσῃ τοῦτο ἔγραψε, καὶ Παῦλος ὁ κῆρυξ Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων, καὶ οἱ δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι ἐξ Ἑβραίων. εἶτα δεκαπέντε ἱεροσολυμῖται ἐπίσκοποι ἐξ Ἑβραίων κατὰ διαδοχὴν κατέστησαν. τίνι τοίνυν τῷ λόγῳ ἀποδέχεσθε μὲν τὰ οἰκεῖα, τὰ δὲ ἡμέτερα ἀποδοκιμάζετε, καὶ ταῦτα ὑπὸ τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν Ἑβραίων γεγραμμένα;"

[591] Is. 65:15.

[592] *CL* 10:16 — "Ἐξετάσωμεν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους· δουλεύετε τῷ Κυρίῳ ἢ οὐ; δείξατε οὖν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν τὸ καινόν. Ἰουδαῖοι γὰρ καὶ Ἰσραηλῖται ἐπὶ Μωσέως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων προφητῶν ἐκαλεῖσθε, καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος ἐπάνοδον καὶ μεχρὶ τοῦ παρόντος. Ποῦ οὖν τὸ ὄνομα τὸ καινόν; Ἡμεῖς δέ, ἐπειδὴ δουλεύομεν τῷ Κυρίῳ, ἔχομεν τὸ ὄνομα τὸ καινόν· καινὸν μέν, ἀλλ' ὄνομα τὸ καινόν, ὃ εὐλογηθήσεται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Περιεδράξατο τῆς οἰκουμένης τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα. Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν γὰρ μέχρι χώρας τινός, χριστιανοὶ δὲ μεχρὶ περάτων τῆς οἰκουμένης· τὸ γὰρ τοῦ μονογενοῦς Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καταγγέλλεται ὄνομα."

Cyril is here engaged with what was already in his day a longstanding project, evidenced, for example, in the writings of Justin Martyr. In addition to large sections of his *First Apology* (cf. chapters 31–53), Justin's *Dialogue With Trypho* is almost entirely devoted to proving how the notions of a new covenant and a new people are grounded in the promises and predictions of the Old Testament prophets, who in his *Hortatory Address to the Greeks* he presents as Christian teachers to whom the pagan philosophers are indebted (cf. chapters 8–36).

Also against figures within the Christian community — the prime example being the Marcion with whom mention of the Ebionites is often coupled — was such an interaction with the Old Testament necessary. Some, such as Harnack, took this as evidence pointing to an internal discussion rather than an active engagement with Judaism. Opponents point to the fact that, with such a heavy emphasis on the Old Testament writings,[593] Christians would be hard pressed not to come into contact with Jews. As Geoffrey Dunn helpfully summarises,

> Stroumsa and Carleton Paget have divided a number of their colleagues into two camps, each representing one of the two approaches. Juster, Simon, Krauss, Williams, Parkes, Blumenkranz, Wilken, Blanchetière, Horbury, de Lange, Wilson, and MacLennan are allocated to the first group, who support the notion of ongoing contact between Christians and Jews [and] scholars like Harnack, Barnes, Rokeah, Schreckenberg, Ruether, Taylor, Johnson, Gaston, and Efroymson [are allocated] into the second camp of those who assert that the anti-Judaic literature was written for a Christian readership to help with questions of self-identity.[594]

I shall limit my comments here to Miriam Taylor's 1995 work,[595] which is representative of modern manifestations of Harnack's ideas,[596] and Carlton Paget's critique of it.[597]

Key to Taylor's thesis that the Jews spoken of in *adversus Iudaeos* literature are symbolic is first the fact that Christian anti-Judaism, unlike pagan anti-Judaism, was largely exegetical and text-based in nature, lending credence to the idea that it was largely a theoretical construct, [598] and second her rejection of proselytising activity among the Jews,[599] which meant Christians could not be responding to Jews as an active rival group. To her remarks about exegesis, Carleton Paget points out that "there is much more evidence than she in fact concedes

[593] See Jackson 1991b, 431–50.
[594] Dunn 2008, 19–21.
[595] Taylor 1995.
[596] Although Taylor (1995, 4–5) rejects "Harnack's view that the Jews depicted in the Christian writings were stereotypical figures adopted for purely literary purposes", it would seem the differences between this and her own view of Jews as "symbolic figures who play an essential role in the communication and development the church's own distinctive conceptions of God's plan" are not particularly substantial when contrasted with Simon's 'conflict theory' which sees Jews as members of an active rival group (Simon 1986).
[597] 'Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity' in Carleton Paget 2010, 43–76.
[598] Ibid., 119.
[599] Taylor 1995, 11–20.

for contact between Christians and Jews at the exegetical level."[600] Origen certainly had ample contact with Jews in this respect. In his *Letter to Africanus*, explaining that the book of Tobias is not in use among the Jews, he stresses that this he "learned from the Jews themselves."[601] N. R. M. de Lange observes that "Origen realised early the importance of consulting the Jewish scholars on the question of the transmission and canon of the Bible. Nor was he the first father to turn to the Jews for help."[602] We may look to Justin Martyr, too, who cites five separate instances of Jewish corruption of the text of Scripture.[603] "I wish you to observe," he says to Trypho, "that they [the Jews] have altogether taken away many Scriptures from [the LXX] but since I am aware that this is denied by all of your nation, I do not address myself to these points."[604] Eusebius also informs us of Melito of Sardis, who "visited the east [Palestine] and arrived at the place where [he] obtained precise information about the Old Testament books."[605] Then, of course, there is the rather quaint remark by Celsus comparing the dispute between Jews and Christians to searching for "the shadow of an ass,"[606] something which may have its roots in the unfounded charge by some pagans that Christians "adore the head of an ass."[607] Taylor's notion that textual argumentation is evidence of lack of contact in the pre-Constantinian period does not seem convincing. In Cyril too, exegetical disputes are placed clearly in the context of dialogue: "If you are ever led into discussion […] become learned in many things, and then silence the Jews out of the prophets."[608]

[600] Carleton Paget 2010, 60.
[601] *Ep. Afr.* 13.
[602] De Lange 1976, 50.
[603] See Tkacz 2011.
[604] *Dial.* 71, trans. *ANF* 1, 626.
[605] *HE* 4.26.14, trans. Williamson 1989, 135.
[606] *C. Cels.* 3.4.
[607] Caecilius, who mentions this charge along with the equally absurd notion that "they worship the genitals of their priests," admits that he is unsure as to their veracity but justifies mention of them on the basis of 'no smoke without fire' (See Benko 1986, 58).
[608] *CL* 13:37 — "Καὶ ἐὰν εἰς συζήτησίν ποτε ἐμπέσῃς [...] μᾶλλον δὲ πολυμαθὴς γενόμενος Ἰουδαίους ἐπιστόμιζε ἐκ τῶν προφητῶν."

On the question of proselytism, Taylor accepts the existence of proselytes and the fact that many Gentiles found Judaism appealing, but she discounts evidence of active missionary activity.[609] Although she fails to take into account imperial legislation forbidding conversion to Judaism,[610] the evidence she presents is convincing.[611] However, as Carleton Paget argues, it stands only on account of the very limited, aggressive way in which she, or rather Goodman and McKnight[612] upon whom she relies, defines proselytic mission. Rather, to cite Carleton Paget, a missionary religion could be defined

> as one, which in a variety of ways, makes it clear that conversion to that religion is a desirable thing. This need not show itself exclusively in […] 'aggressive' forms […] (polemic against other beliefs; the sending out of missionaries etc.), but could manifest itself in an openness to outsiders, expressed in a desire to publicize beliefs, engage in debate and so on.[613]

He cites G. F. Moore, who, "[w]hile he holds Judaism to be the first great missionary religion of the Mediterranean, he explicitly denies that Jews sent missionaries out into the *partes infidelium* preferring to see the synagogue as the major instrument of mission."[614] We can see this at play quite clearly in Cyril's mind, when he says, "By means of the Divine Scriptures, which they misinterpret, those of the Circumcision deceive those who come to them; studying them from childhood until old age[615] and growing old in ignorance."[616] The Jews 'deceive

[609] Taylor 1995, 16–17.

[610] Carleton Paget 2010, 53. See also Linder 1987.

[611] This is not to say, however, that evidence for active mission does not exist. We know, for example, that the *Martyrdom of Pionius* was cited by Jews to highlight the dangers involved in adherence to the Christian religion, certainly in an attempt to dissuade fellow Jews from succumbing to the lure of the new Messianic sect, but perhaps also to attract non-Jews to their own side. For a detailed look at this martyrology, see Fox 1986, 754.

[612] Goodman 1992. McKnight 1991.

[613] Carleton Paget 2010, 159. As I argue in chapter 7, the Catholic Church saw 'passive' mission — primarily through the living of a holy life as a witness to its transformative power — as just as important as any 'aggressive' form.

[614] Ibid. Also, Moore 1927.

[615] Is. 46:3.

[616] *CL* 4.2 — "οἱ δὲ ἐκ περιτομῆς, διὰ τῶν θείων γραφῶν, ἃς παρεξηγοῦνται κακῶς, τοὺς προσερχομένους ἀπατῶσιν· ἐκ παιδίου μελετῶντες ἕως γήρως, καὶ ἐν ἀμαθίᾳ καταγηρῶντες."

By looking at the *Sermon on the Paralytic*, we can see that Cyril levels against the Jews of his own day the same accusation he makes against the Pharisees described in the Gospel, who, though they "had learnt the law and practiced it from childhood to old age, they had become unteachable in their advanced years […] The one whom the learned lawyers did not recognize was recognized by those who had no eyes to read with" (5, trans. Yarnold 2000, 72).

those who come to them', but do not themselves go out. But who were these Christians who sought out Jews in this manner?

The Jewish presence in Jerusalem in the 4th century

By the time of the fourth century, the church had long broken its early connection with the synagogue, and the Christian community had become overwhelmingly gentile in composition, this even before the time of post-Constantinian mass conversion. The problem was no longer one of so-called 'Jewish Christians' attempting to impose upon non-Jews the observance of the Law, but of the 'Judaizers': usually gentile Christians whose acquaintance with Judaism was borne out of their Christian faith, and whose observance of Jewish ritual had not preceded their conversion to Christianity. Most famous among patristic works dealing with Judaizers is undoubtedly John Chrysostom's *Κατά Ιουδαίων*, a somewhat misleading title since the homilies are directed not at Jews, but at those Christians who observed Jewish laws and customs. As Chrysostom's Antioch was home to a large and influential Jewish community, the question of whether the phenomenon described in his work underlies Cyril's anti-Jewish polemics cannot be made without first looking at the much debated status of Jews in fourth century Aelia Capitolina.

We are told by Eusebius that, following the Bar Cochba revolt in 135, "the entire [Jewish] race has been forbidden to set foot anywhere in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, under the terms and ordinances of the law of Hadrian which ensured that not even from a distance might Jews have a view of their ancestral soil. Aristo of Pella tells the whole story."[617] Stemberger suggests the fact that the expulsion of Jews from the Holy City led to the instalment

[617] *HE* 4.6.3, trans. Williamson 1989, 108.

of its first Gentile bishop, Marcus — something alluded to by Cyril[618] — means that this probably also included Christians of Jewish origin.[619] This is possible, although it could simply be that a Gentile bishop, as a leader and figurehead of his community, would be looked upon more favourably by the authorities than one of Jewish origin, even if the presence of such a one in the city would have been tolerated.[620]

A tenth century source suggests that this legislation was renewed by Constantine, but, assuming this to be the case, with considerable modifications that allowed Jews to settle nearby in the surrounding area.[621] Oded Irshai suggests that the renewal of legislation was more likely local than imperial.[622] Constantine's own attitude towards the Jews is difficult to discern, but, while negative references to them do exist, one cannot detect any particular effort to suppress them.[623] Even if we do suppose such a conscious legislative effort, argues Wilken, "that policy was not carried through in the years after his death. Indeed, one has the distinct impression that a great gulf lies between the time of Constantine and the age of Theodosius I."[624] Even then, Neusner points out, "the Jews of the land [of Israel] and of the Roman Empire in general continued to enjoy state recognition and protection."[625] The Council of Nicea in 325 had appointed a Christian patriarch of Judaea to rival the Jewish one, which enjoyed legal support under Constantine.[626] Whatever the case may be, as was demonstrated in the previous chapter,

[618] "Fifteen bishops of Jerusalem were appointed in succession from among the Hebrews" [εἶτα δεκαπέντε ἱεροσολυμῖται ἐπίσκοποι ἐξ Ἑβραίων κατὰ διαδοχὴν κατέστησαν] (*CL* 14:15).

[619] Stemberger 2000, 40.

[620] François Blanchetière (1998, 195) speaks of the law applying to "Jews, Christian or not", but does not provide any further evidence.

[621] Drijvers 2004, 9.

[622] Irshai 1995.

[623] See Stemberger 2000, 43–47.

[624] Wilken 1983, 52.

[625] Neusner 1987, 18.

[626] See Edwards 2003, xxxv, and Stemberger 2000, 230–68.

It is undoubtedly to these privileges Cyril is reacting when he says "I am ashamed to speak of their recent acts concerning those who are now called Patriarchs among them, and what their descent is, and who their mother is. However, I leave it to those who know" [αἰσχύνομαι γὰρ λέγειν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόσφατα περὶ τῶν καλουμένων παρ' αὐτοῖς νῦν πατριαρχῶν πράγματα, καὶ τί τὸ τούτων γένος, καὶ τίς ἡ μήτηρ. καταλιμπάνω δὲ τοῖς εἰδόσιν] (*CL* 12:17).

the rigour with which imperial legislation was enforced was to a large extent dependant on the zeal and interests of local government. I would argue, with Drijvers, that observance of Hadrian's law prohibiting Jewish settlement gradually slackened over time and that many Jews returned to the vicinity of the Holy City,[627] though his suggestion that they also settled in the city itself is one I would question on the basis of the witness of the Bordeaux Pilgrim, who mentions that the Jews would come annually to mourn at the ruins of the temple and then depart,[628] the account of an eye-witness being more telling than legislation. However, there seems to be little doubt that the inhabitants of Aelia Capitolina would have had regular intercourse with a small but permanent Jewish community, albeit outside the confines of the city proper.

Stemberger only hesitantly refers to Cyril as proof of Jewish settlement near Jerusalem, adding that this "might also be a standard admonition with no concrete occasion."[629] As some of the above citations have already demonstrated, a thorough reading of *CL* should quickly disabuse one of any such doubt. When Cyril says "I wish you to make safe what I am going to say, because of the Jews,"[630] he clearly anticipates the possibility of future confrontation. Likewise, he presents his apologetics as an armament against the attacks of heretics and as a weapon with which to defeat them:

> Be persistent with the catechising, and even if we should prolong our discourse, let not your mind be tired out. For you are receiving weapons against the adverse power, you receive weapons against heresies, against Jews, and Samaritans, and Gentiles. You have many enemies; take up many darts, for you have many to hurl them at: and you have need to learn how to strike down the Greek, how to fight against heretic, against Jew and Samaritan.[631]

---

[627] Drijvers 2004, 9. His citation of second century Talmudic references to this effect are particularly convincing (19, n.13). See also Avi-Yonah 1976, 164.

[628] *It. Hier.* in *CSEL* 39.22.

[629] Stemberger 2000, 42.

[630] *CL* 10:8 — "Ὧδε μοι λοιπὸν ἀσφάλισαι, διὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, τὸ λεχθησόμενον."

[631] *PC* 10 — "Παράμενε ταῖς κατηχήσεσιν· εἰ καὶ πολλὰ παρατείνωμεν λέγοντες, μήποτε ἡ διάνοιά σου ἐκλυθῇ· ὅπλα γὰρ λαμβάνεις κατὰ ἀντικειμένης ἐνεργείας· ὅπλα λαμβάνεις κατὰ αἱρέσεων, κατὰ Ἰουδαίων, καὶ Σαμαρειτῶν· πολλοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἔχεις, πολλὰ βέλη λάμβανε· πρὸς πολλοὺς γὰρ ἀκοντίζεις· καὶ χρεία σοι μαθεῖν πῶς κατακοντίσῃς τὸν Ἕλληνα, πῶς ἀγωνίσῃ πρὸς αἱρετικὸν, πρὸς Ἰουδαῖον καὶ Σαμαρείτην."

The mention of Samaritans here is of particular interest. Since the second century, the Samaritans had expanded far beyond Samaria and had established significant communities in the coastal plain of Palestine.[632] A large Samaritan presence is attested to in Caesarea, the See to which Cyril's was subject.[633] Cyril mentions them several times throughout *CL*, always in conjunction with the Jews. The exception is his eighteenth lecture, where he challenges the Samaritan denial of the resurrection, the absence of Jews in this discourse being owed to the triumph of Pharisaism over Sadducism following the destruction of the temple in the first century. Cyril's interest in the Samaritans is clearly local, and his coupling of them with the Jews, besides the obvious Torah connection, suggests that his concern for them was much the same: "Fall not away either into Samaritanism, nor Judaism: for Jesus Christ henceforth has delivered you. Keep away from all observance of Sabbaths, and from calling any indifferent foods 'common' or 'unclean'."[634]

The Judaizers

This final citation of Cyril's attests to the appeal Judaism still had for Gentile Christians,[635] and reveals concerns very similar to those expressed in the aforementioned sermons of John Chrysostom. The Golden-mouth warns his listeners that,

> the festivals of the pitiful and miserable Jews are soon to march upon us one after the other and in quick succession […] There are many in our ranks who say they think as we do. Yet some of these are going to watch the festivals and others will join the Jews in keeping their feasts and observing their fasts. I wish to drive this perverse custom from the Church right now […] to cure those who are sick with the Judaizing disease.[636]

[632] Stemberger 2000, 19.

[633] Ibid.

[634] *CL* 4:37 — "Καὶ μήτε εἰς Σαμαρειτισμὸν ἢ Ἰουδαισμὸν ἐκπέσῃς· ἐλυτρώσατο γάρ σε λοιπὸν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός. Πάσης σαββάτων παρατηρήσεως ἀπόστηθι· καὶ τοῦ, κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον λέγειν τι εἶναι τῶν ἀδιαφόρων βρωμάτων."

[635] "Au IV^{e} siècle, à Jérusalem, le débat s'est radicalisé. À en croire Cyrille, les Juifs apparaissent comme une véritable menace" (Prétot 2014, 183).

[636] *Adv. Jud.* 1.5 (*PG* 48:850), trans. Harkins 1979, 3–4.

Elsewhere he says,

> Before I draw up my battle line against the Jews, I will be glad to talk to those who are members of our own body, those who seem to belong to our ranks although they observe the Jewish rites and make every effort to defend them. Because they do this, as I see it, they deserve a stronger condemnation than any Jew.[637]

What immediately stands out when reading these words is the emphasis he places on the fact that these are "in our ranks" and "members of our own body." The Judaizers are not an external threat, not a heretical group or sect, but members of the Catholic Church. He laments that while catechumens fast but abstain from the Paschal Eucharist on account of their being uninitiated, these Judaizers, already baptised, abstain in order to celebrate the Jewish Passover in its stead.[638] While Chrysostom is primarily concerned with those Christians who join in the Passover celebrations in the synagogue, accusations of judaizing was also levelled against those whose celebration of the Christian Pasch merely coincided with the Jewish one, despite no actual contact with the Jews. The historian Sozomen, for example, remarks how around the time of Ambrose, "the Novatians of Phrygia, contrary to their ancient custom, began to celebrate the festival of the Passover on the same day as the Jews."[639] There is no reason to suggest that those who observed the Quartodeciman Easter necessarily did so in imitation of the Jews — they were simply keeping the traditional Paschalion of Asia — but the fact that it is thus recorded by ecclesiastical historians and others is telling.

While he argues for an uninterrupted tradition of Christian observance of Jewish practices from the earliest times, Wilken suggests that the abundance of fourth century sources dealing with Judaizing point to a resurgence of the phenomenon at that time.[640] The attractions of Judaism for Christians were many. First among these was certainly the antiquity of Judaism and the view that the Jews were the keepers of the Old Testament. Augustine, for example,

[637] Ibid. 4.3.4.
[638] Ibid. 3.5.1
[639] *HE* 6.24, trans. *NPNF* 2.02, 805. The same sentiment is found in Socrates (*HE* 4:28).
[640] Wilken 1983, 73.

calls the Jew "the bearer of the books from which the Christians believed,"[641] while Chrysostom speaks of the "Scriptures which are guarded by them."[642] We have already seen how Cyril challenges the claim to antiquity and how he accuses the Jews for deceiving "those who come to them" by misinterpreting the Scriptures, which they in vain study from childhood without ever becoming privy to its truths.[643] Wilken notes that among "the simple and uneducated, the books had magical powers and were capable of working wonders and miracles,"[644] and further posits the efficacy of Jewish magic as a cause of the Judaizing phenomenon.[645] Chrysostom rails against those who defend their visits to the synagogue on health grounds:

> 'They promise to make me well, so I go to them.' Then you must reveal the tricks they use, their incantations, their amulets, their charms and spells […]. Let me go so far as to say that even if they really did cure you, it is better to die than to run to God's enemies and be cured that way. What use is it to have your body cured if you lose your soul?[646]

Cyril devotes a great deal of time to the discussion of magic, incantations and amulets. Although he seems to identify these specifically with paganism, in one instance he immediately goes on to mention Samaritanism and Judaism, which could imply a connection between the two.[647] However, the lack of a clear correlation means that it is not possible to discern the extent to which the appeal of Jewish magic might have posed a problem in Palestine.

The problem of Judaizing — while quite different from the issues concerning the "parting of the ways" paradigm in that it concerns a Gentile Christian embracing of Jewish practices, rather than the extent of Jewish acceptance of the new Christian message — in many ways brings us back full circle to one of the original questions posed in light of that paradigm:

---

[641] "*Codicem portat Judæus, unde credit Christianus*" — *Enar. In Ps.* 56.9 (*PL* 36:666).
[642] "*τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς φυλαττομένων Γραφῶν*" — *Jud. Et gent.* 2 (*PG* 48:815).
[643] *CL* 4.2.
[644] Wilken 1983, 80.
[645] Ibid., 83–88.
[646] *Adv. Jud.* 8.5, trans. Harkins 1979, 207.
[647] See *CL* 4.37.

what is the purpose of *adversus Iudaeos* and to what extent was it an attempt to forge a reality which did not in fact exist on the ground? Isabella Sandwell argues that "Neither Christian nor Greek nor Jewish identity existed essentially or objectively in Chrysostom's world. Rather, Chrysostom continually had to construct them out of a situation where many practices were shared by people whatever their religious alliance."[648] There is much truth to what she suggests about the forging of separate Greek and Christian identities, as has already been explored in the previous chapter, but I would question the way in which she approaches Jewish and Christian identities in the same way. In this respect she relies on the aforementioned arguments of Boyarin, placing her own thesis on one extreme of the scholarly spectrum. Jews had long been a distinct category under Roman law; Diocletian, for example, had exempted the Jews from offering libations, a privilege he did not extend to Christians. Even if only of limited impact in reality, this legal distinction further developed under Constantine, and later quite forcefully with the *Theodosian Code*.[649] While perhaps rarely examined, circumcision, a rite which even the most ardent judaizer generally thought a step too far, was prohibited for all but Jews. Official conversion to Judaism, too, was clearly prohibited by law, both ensuring a degree of physical and societal separation. Moreover, the blurring of the borders between Judaism and Christianity occasioned by Judaizing was almost entirely one sided. It was not a problem of Jews participating in Christian worship, nor were they, like the Ebionites, selective in their acceptance in Christian ideas, representing a sort of midway point between the two. As such, the suggestion that Jewish and Christian identities were obscure to the point of being non-existent, and that figures like Chrysostom struggled to construct these out of thin air, does not appear to reflect the reality.

[648] Sandwell 2007, 5.
[649] See Stemberger 2000, 22–40, and Wilken 1983, 49–55, for a summary.

Of course, to borrow the words of Wilken, "as useful as this distinction [between judaizing Christians and Jewish Christians] is for certain purposes, it obscures one significant fact: the chief identifying mark of both groups was the same: observance of Jewish law."[650] Although the theological divide between Judaism and Christianity was clear, Cyril, like John Chrysostom, is undeniably engaged in the strengthening and defining of these identities in an attempt to form a clear and unambiguous Catholic one, making attitudes to Torah observance and the incompatibility of Jewish and Christian Old Testament exegesis definitive signets of membership in the Church.

In their defence, the Judaizers would appeal to the words of Christ: "Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfil them,"[651] but for Cyril, the meaning of this was clear: Christ's fulfilment of the Law and the Prophets meant, not the continuation of Old Testament ritual, but the completion of the Old Covenant in order to usher in the New.

> [The] Holy Spirit, who in agreement with Father and Son has established the New Covenant in the Catholic Church,[652] has set us free from the burdens of the law that are hard to bear — I am talking about those (laws) dealing with things common and unclean, and foods, and sabbaths, and new moons, and circumcision, and sprinklings, and sacrifices; which were given for a time, and *had a shadow of the good things to come*,[653] but which, when the truth had come, were rightly withdrawn.[654]

As Christians, he says, we are to "raise our thoughts higher than the Jews."[655] To cling to the observance of these laws and ritual prescriptions was tantamount to a denial of their fulfilment in Christ and the New Covenant he had established with his people. How much more so when,

---

[650] Wilken 1983, 70.
[651] Matt. 5:17.
[652] One could also render this "on account of the Catholic Church".
[653] Heb. 10:1.
[654] *Cl* 17:29 — "Τοῦτο τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ συμφωνίᾳ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ τὴν καινὴν διαθήκην ἐπὶ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας συστησάμενον, ἠλευθέρωσεν ἡμᾶς τῶν δυσβαστάκτων τοῦ νόμου φορτίων, τῶν περὶ κοινοῦ καὶ καθαροῦ καὶ βρωμάτων λέγω, σαββάτων τε καὶ νουμηνιῶν, καὶ τῆς περιτομῆς, περιῤῥαντηρίων τε καὶ θυσιῶν, ἃ κατὰ καιρὸν μὲν δοθέντα σκιὰν εἶχε τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς ἀληθείας συνεστέλλετο δικαίως."
[655] *CL* 7:2 — "Ταύτῃ γὰρ ἂν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀνώτερα φρονοίημεν."

in order to continue the observance of these rituals, you join company with the people who denied and crucified Christ! "He [is] no better off than a mule," chides Chrysostom, "if he, who professed to worship Christ, would drag someone off to the dens of the Jews who had crucified him."[656] The charge of deicide, references to which are replete in Cyril's works, are part of what Wilken terms 'the rhetoric of abuse.'[657] Cyril refers to them as impious,[658] disbelieving,[659] having a "murderous spirit",[660] "unwilling to hear,"[661] "willingly suffering from their habit of unbelief […] for it continues to be their custom to wickedly oppose the truth […] always prepared to refute, and reluctant to believe."[662] Cyril makes these accusations all the more real for his audience by his appeals to hagiographical topography:

> Rejoice, all you that mourned before,[663] when you heard of the Jews' acts of insolence and transgression: for the one they scorned in this place is risen again [and] there are many witnesses to the Saviour's resurrection […] the rock of the tomb which received him; also the stone shall rise up against the face of the Jews, for it saw the Lord; and the stone which was rolled away itself bears witness to the resurrection, lying there to this day.[664]

The purpose of such language seems obvious, namely to discourage contact with the Jews by making them seem unpalatable, but the theological grounding of the rhetoric makes apparent the underlying cause of such a desire.

Anti-Jewish ecclesiology

[656] *Adv. Jud.* 3.4, trans. Harkins 1979, 12.
[657] Wilken 1983, 123–7.
[658] *CL* 6:33
[659] *CL* 12:16
[660] *CL* 10:12
[661] *CL* 13:24
[662] *CL* 7.3, 12:21, 13:7 — "Ἀλλ' Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν τὰ συνήθη τῆς ἀπιστίας [...] ἔθος γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐστιν ἄνωθεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ κακῶς ἀντιπίπτειν [...] οἱ πάντοτε εἰς ἀντίῤῥησιν ἕτοιμοι καὶ ὀκνηροὶ πρὸς πίστιν."
[663] Cf. Is. 66:10 — "Rejoice with joy all you who mourn over her [i.e. Jerusalem]".
[664] *CL* 14:1, 22 — "χαίρετε πάντες ὅσοι πρότερον ἐπενθήσατε τὰς Ἰουδαίων τόλμας τε καὶ παρανομίας ἀκούσαντες· ὁ γὰρ ὑβρισθεὶς ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐνταῦθα πάλιν ἠγέρθη [...] Πολλοὶ μάρτυρές εἰσι τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἀναστάσεως [...] πέτρα τοῦ μνήματος ἡ ὑποδεξαμένη, καὶ ὁ λίθος ἀντικαταστήσεται εἰς πρόσωπον Ἰουδαίων, αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶδε τὸν κύριον. καὶ ὁ λίθος ὁ τότε ἀποκυλισθεὶς οὗτος μαρτυρεῖ τῇ ἀναστάσει μέχρι σήμερον κείμενος."

More important for our purposes than these sociological questions, however, and what justifies this study of Cyril's anti-Judaism separately from his wider heresiology, is the way in which he and others like him used this kind of anti-Jewish discourse to define the very nature and purpose of the Christian Church itself:

> Before, the Psalmist sang, *Bless God in the Church*,[665] *the Lord from Israel's fountains*.[666] But after the Jews were cast away from his grace because of the things they did against the Saviour, the Saviour built out of the Gentiles a second holy Church of us Christians, about which he said to Peter, *And upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it*.[667] And David, prophesying of both these, said plainly of the first which was cast away, *I hated the church of evildoers*; but of the second which is built up he says in the same Psalm, *O Lord, I loved your house's majesty*; and immediately afterwards, *In the churches I will bless you, O Lord*.[668] For now that the one Church in Judea is cast off, the Churches of Christ are increased over all the inhabited world; and of them it is said in the Psalms, *Sing unto the Lord a new song, his praise is in a Church of devout*.[669] This the prophet follows by saying to the Jews, *I have no will among you, says the Lord Almighty*; and immediately afterwards, *For from the rising of the sun to its setting, my name is glorified among the nations*.[670] Concerning this Holy Catholic Church Paul writes to Timothy, *That you may know how you ought to behave yourself in the House of God, which is the Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of the truth*.[671]

In order for the Catholic Church to be the true Israel of God, the old one must have been cast out, and membership of the latter necessitates exclusion from the former. Accordingly, the adoption of the appellation 'Israel' by the Christian Church, as hinted at above, does not signify

---

[665] For the sake of consistency, I have here departed from the *NETS* version, which here translates *ἐκκλησία* as 'assembly' rather than 'church'.

[666] Ps. 68:26

[667] Matt. 16:18

[668] Ps. 25:5, 8.

[669] Ps. 149:1.

[670] Mal. 1:10–11.

[671] 1 Tim. 3:15. *CL* 18:25 — "Πρότερον μὲν οὖν ᾔδεν ὁ ψαλμῳδός· ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ εὐλογεῖτε τὸν θεὸν τὸν κύριον, ἐκ πηγῶν Ἰσραήλ. ἀφ' οὗ δὲ διὰ τὰς γενομένας κατὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐπιβουλὰς ἀπεβλήθησαν Ἰουδαῖοι τῆς χάριτος, δευτέραν ᾠκοδόμησεν ἐξ ἐθνῶν ὁ σωτὴρ τὴν τῶν χριστιανῶν ἡμῶν ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν, περὶ ἧς εἶπε τῷ Πέτρῳ· καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς. Περὶ δὲ ἀμφοτέρων τούτων προφητεύων σαφῶς ἔλεγεν ὁ Δαβίδ, περὶ μὲν τῆς πρώτης ἀποβληθείσης· ἐμίσησα ἐκκλησίαν πονηρευομένων· περὶ δὲ τῆς δευτέρας τῆς οἰκοδομουμένης ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ψαλμῷ φησι· κύριε, ἠγάπησα εὐπρέπειαν οἴκου σου· καὶ ἐξῆς εὐθύς· ἐν ἐκκλησίαις εὐλογήσω σε, κύριε. τῆς γὰρ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ μιᾶς ἀποβληθείσης κατὰ πάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης λοιπὸν αἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πληθύνουσιν ἐκκλησίαι, περὶ ὧν ἐν ψαλμοῖς εἴρηται· ᾄσατε τῷ κυρίῳ ᾆσμα καινόν, ἡ αἴνεσις αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ὁσίων. οἷς ἀκόλουθα καὶ ὁ προφήτης πρὸς Ἰουδαίους εἶπεν· οὐκ ἔστι μοι θέλημα ἐν ὑμῖν, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ, καὶ ἐξῆς εὐθύς, διότι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἡλίου μέχρι δυσμῶν τὸ ὄνομά μου δεδόξασται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. περὶ ταύτης τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας γράφει πρὸς Τιμόθεον ὁ Παῦλος· ἵνα εἰδῇς ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ πῶς δεῖ ἀναστρέφεσθαι, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος, στῦλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας.."

convergence or solidarity, but rather intense competition with Judaism over who can rightfully lay claim to a unique, covenantal relationship with God. Referring to the Parable of the Tenants,[672] Cyril comments, "it is somewhere written, 'Israel is my first-born Son,' but just like Reuben, Israel is the rejected first-born; for he went upon his father's couch, and Israel cast the Son of his Father out of the vineyard, crucifying him."[673] God has come to destroy the former tenants of the vineyard and has given it to others. By faith and baptism the Gentiles "are adopted into the sonship of Abraham,"[674] while with the Jews "there is not a cluster of salvation left, not even a trace, for their vine is cut down,"[675] for "when the Jews sinned, [they sinned] not against man, but against God-made-man. Woe to their soul!"[676] Accordingly, speaking on the blood and water which gushed forth from the side of Christ at the crucifixion, Cyril explains that "the blood is for the Jews, and the water for the Christians: for upon them as plotters came the condemnation from the blood; but to you who now believe, the salvation by water."[677] "By all things," John Chrysostom comments on the same parable, "He shows that they [the Jews] should be cast out for unbelief and the Gentiles brought in."[678] The point about unbelief is an important one, for it is for this alone that Cyril condemns the Jews.[679] "What can

[672] Matt. 21, Mark 12, Luke 20.

[673] *CL* 11:4 — "καί που γέγραπται· Υἱὸς πρωτότοκός μου Ἰσραήλ. Ἀλλ', ὡς ὁ Ῥουβὴν, πρωτότοκος ἦν ἐκπεπτωκὼς ὁ Ἰσραήλ. Ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν κοίτην τοῦ πατρός· ὁ δὲ Ἰσραὴλ τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκβαλὼν ἐκ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, ἐσταύρωσεν."

[674] *CL* 5:6 — "Τῇ τοίνυν ὁμοιότητι τῆς πίστεως εἰς υἱοθεσίαν ἐρχόμεθα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ."

[675] *CL* 14:6 — "παρ' οἷς οὐ καταλέλειπται βότρυς σωτηρίας, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐπιφυλλίς. ἐκκόπτεται γὰρ ἡ ἄμπελος αὐτῶν."

[676] *CL* 13:12 — "ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐκ εἰς ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλ' εἰς θεὸν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα ἥμαρτον Ἰουδαῖοι, οὐαὶ τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτῶν."

[677] *CL* 13:21 — " Ἰουδαίοις μὲν τὸ αἷμα, χριστιανοῖς δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ. ἐκείνοις μὲν γὰρ ὡς ἐπιβούλοις ἡ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος καταδίκη, σοὶ δὲ τῷ πιστεύοντι νῦν ἡ διὰ ὕδατος σωτηρία."

Cyril also draws a parallel between the 'side' [πλευρᾶς] of Christ and the creation narrative of Genesis in which "the woman, who was formed from the side, led the way to sin" (*CL* 13:21). While Cyril only speaks of Christ's piercing as undoing that sin of Eve, John Chrysostom builds upon it a profound ecclesiological image: "Just as at that time God took the rib of Adam and formed a woman, so Christ gave us blood and water from His side and formed the Church" (*Cat. Stav.* 3.18, trans. Harkins 1963, 62). It does not seem unreasonable to posit that Cyril might also have held to a similar view but that his reluctance to discuss the Eucharist with the catechumens prior to their reception of it as baptised believers made mention of it in *CL* inappropriate. The brevity of *MC* 4 on the Eucharist means we should not infer too much from the absence of a 'blood and water' reference there.

[678] *In. Mt. Hom.* 48 (*PG* 58:641).

[679] In *Hom. Par.*, Cyril draws a parallel between the physical infirmity of those lying around the Sheep Pool and their unbelief, which "was rife among the Jews" (2). While the paralytic, on account of his faith, was healed "the Jews remained ill and had no desire to be cured" (13, trans. Yarnold 2000, 76).

be a greater sin than to crucify Christ?" he asks. "Yet even of this baptism can purify,"[680] for "out of the Jews, those who crucified Christ, this great number believed, and were baptised in the Name of Christ, and 'continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine'."[681]

The replacing of the Old Israel by the New also signifies a change from a localised and insular Church to one that is universal, "for Jews are only in a certain region, but Christians reach to the ends of the inhabited world,[682]" a theme central to the definition of catholicity we encountered in the previous chapter. What exactly he means by "a certain region" when he would not have been unaware of the vast Jewish diaspora is not entirely clear. It probably refers to the Jews belonging to a single ethnos, historically attached to the Promised Land in the Palestinian region — their past presence in Babylon or Egypt had of course been a cause for lament. His point remains, however: "Persians believe, and Hebrews do not believe."[683]

The greatest proof of God's abandonment of the Jews was the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem in 70 A.D., bringing to an end the Old Testament sacrificial system, which for Christians had typified the sacrifice of Christ, the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. Again with reference to the Parable of the Tenants, the *Didascalia* makes a direct connection between the fall of the Jewish Temple and the rise of the Church:

> "He hath removed and forsaken the nation, and Jerusalem is forsaken […] they have obeyed not the Lord, and He hath abandoned the vineyard, and behold, your house [the Temple] is left unto you desolate […]. God therefore hath left the Nation, and hath filled the Church, and hath considered her the mount of [His] habitation, and the throne of glory, and the house of exaltation […] for one only is the Church which is the mountain of the Sanctuary of God."[684]

We hear a similar sentiment expressed in *CL*:

---

[680] *CL* 3:15 — "Τί μεῖζον τοῦ σταυρῶσαι Χριστόν; καὶ τούτου καθάρσιόν ἐστι τὸ βάπτισμα." On baptism and purification, see Petersen 2011, 3–35.

[681] Acts 2:42. *CL* 17:21 — "ὡς ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τῶν τὸν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωκότων ἐκείνων πιστεῦσαι τοσούτους καὶ ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ βαπτισθῆναι καὶ προσκαρτερεῖν τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων." Cyril's views do not, therefore, represent an absolutist supercessionism, but something more akin to that of Paul in Romans 11, where the return of the Jewish people through faith is anticipated and desired.

[682] *CL* 10:16 — Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν γὰρ μέχρι χώρας τινὸς, χριστιανοὶ δὲ μεχρὶ περάτων τῆς οἰκουμένης.

[683] *CL* 13:7 — "Πέρσαι πιστεύουσι, καὶ Ἑβραῖοι οὐ πιστεύουσιν."

[684] *Didascalia* 23–24, trans. Gibson 1903, 105.

> He saw your destruction, he beheld your downfall, he lamented the Jerusalem which was then; for the one *which now is*[685] shall not be lamented; for that Jerusalem crucified the Christ, but that *which now is* worships him.[686]

This witness was all the more powerful for Cyril and his listeners, as they stood just meters away from the ruined Temple Mount which had been deliberately left undeveloped to emphasise that very point.[687] Cyril is careful to point out the cause of the Temple's destruction, which was on account of Jewish disbelief and not an undermining of the Temple's sanctity:

> We worship, therefore, the Father of Christ, the Maker of heaven and earth, *the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*[688]; to whose honour the former temple also, opposite us here, was built. For we shall not tolerate the heretics who sever the Old Testament from the New, but we shall believe Christ, who says of the temple, *Did you not know that I must be in my Father's house*?[689] And again, *Take these things hence, and make not my Father's house a house of merchandise*.[690] Thus he most clearly confessed that the former temple in Jerusalem was his own Father's house.[691]

When discussing the advent of the antichrist, who Paul says shall "seat himself in the temple of God,"[692] Cyril juxtaposes the ruined Temple of the Jews with his own Church of the Resurrection, a prominent symbol of Christianity's newfound dominance, "which out of the Christ-loving disposition of the Emperor Constantine of blessed memory, was both built and beautified as you see"[693]:

> What temple then? He means the destroyed Temple of the Jews. For let it not be that it should be the one in which we are! Why do we say this? In order that we are not thought to favour ourselves. For if he comes to the Jews as Christ, and desires to be worshipped by the Jews, he will more greatly delude them by placing great importance on the Temple, giving the impression that he is the man of the

---

[685] Gal. 4:25

[686] *CL* 13:7 — "εἶδεν ὑμῶν τὴν ἀπώλειαν, ἐθεώρησε τὴν ἀπόπτωσιν. ἐθρήνει τὴν Ἰερουσαλὴμ τὴν τότε· ἡ νῦν γὰρ οὐ θρηνηθήσεται. ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐσταύρωσεν, ἡ δὲ νῦν προσκυνεῖ τὸν Χριστόν."

[687] See *CL* 10:11. On the relationship between the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Temple Mount, see Ousterhout 1990 and Irshai 2009.

[688] Ex. 3:6

[689] Luke 2:49

[690] John 2:16

[691] *CL* 7:6 — "Προσκυνοῦμεν τοίνυν τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ποιητὴν, τὸν Θεὸν Ἀβραὰμ, Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ· οὗ πρὸς τιμὴν καὶ ὁ πρότερος ἀντικρὺς ἡμῶν ἐνταῦθα ναὸς ᾠκοδόμητο. Οὐ γὰρ ἀνεξόμεθα τῶν αἱρετικῶν τῶν τὴν παλαιὰν τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης ἀποσχιζόντων· ἀλλὰ τῷ Χριστῷ πεισθησόμεθα, τῷ λέγοντι περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ· Οὐκ ᾔδειτε, ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Πατρός μου δεῖ με εἶναι; καὶ πάλιν· Ἄρατε ταῦτα ἐντεῦθεν, καὶ μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Πατρός μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου. Δι' ὧν σαφέστατα τὸν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις πρότερον ναὸν, οἶκον εἶναι τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ Πατρὸς ὡμολόγει."

[692] 2 Thess. 2:4.

[693] *CL* 14:22 — "ὁ τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας οὗτος οἶκος ὁ τῇ φιλοχρίστῳ προαιρέσει τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς μακαρίας μνήμης Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ βασιλέως οἰκοδομηθείς τε καὶ ὡς ὁρᾷς οὕτως φαιδρυνθείς."

> race of David, who shall build up the Temple (built) by Solomon. And the Antichrist is coming when there shall not be left one stone upon another in the Temple of the Jews, according to the judgement pronounced by our Saviour. [694]

He must have remembered these words with some trepidation as the emperor Julian, sworn enemy of the Catholic Church, allied himself with the Jews of Jerusalem and ordered the rebuilding of the Temple only years later.[695] His eventual failure to fulfil this task, and his premature death shortly thereafter, would certainly have served to strengthened the symbolism of the empty Temple Mount for the Holy City's Christians. Chrysostom, living in a post-Julian era, declares that "the testimony of time puts the gag of silence on [the Jews'] shameless words […] not only fifty years but many more than one, two, or three centuries have passed since Jerusalem was captured. And never has there been seen a single trace or shadow of change for which you were waiting […] the temple will never be rebuilt."[696] Taking into account his audience, the Judaizers, the fact that Chrysostom gives such a thorough response to the Jewish claims regarding the eventual rebuilding of the Temple might suggest that this was something to which certain Christians, under the influence of Jewish exegesis, also looked. This would explain why Cyril devotes so much time to the antichrist's deception of the Jews by means of the Temple, once again juxtaposing the falling away of the old Israel on account of their unbelief and the new Israel, the Church of believers:

> The children of the Jews, by rejecting the one that came and looking for the one who comes in evil, rejected the true Christ, and the deceived wait for the deceiver. Also in this the Saviour is found to be true, who said, *I have come in my Father's name, and you received me not: but if another shall come in his own name, him you will receive* […] Let the Jews, then, be led astray, since they so will: but let the Church of God be glorified.[697]

---

[694] *CL* 15:15 — "ποῖον ἄρα ναόν; τὸν καταλελυμένον τῶν Ἰουδαίων φησίν. μὴ γένοιτο γὰρ τοῦτον ἐν ᾧ ἐσμέν. διὰ τί τοῦτο λέγομεν; ἵνα μὴ νομιζώμεθα χαρίζεσθαι ἑαυτοῖς. εἰ γὰρ ὡς Χριστὸς πρὸς Ἰουδαίους ἔρχεται καὶ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων προσκυνεῖσθαι βούλεται, ἵνα αὐτοὺς μειζόνως ἀπατήσῃ, περισπούδαστον ποιεῖται τὸν ναόν, ὑποψίαν διδούς, ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐκ γένους Δαβὶδ ὁ τὸν ὑπὸ Σολομῶνος ναὸν κατασκευασθέντα μέλλων οἰκοδομεῖν. Ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ Ἀντίχριστος τότε, ὅταν ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῶν Ἰουδαίων λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον μὴ μείνῃ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἀπόφασιν."

[695] For a full treatment of Cyril and Julian's attempt to rebuild the Temple, see chapter 5 of Drijvers 2004, 127–52.

[696] *Adv. Jud.* 3.14–4.1, trans. Harkins 1979, 109–10.

[697] *CL* 12:2–3 — "Ἰουδαίων δὲ παῖδες, τὸν μὲν ἐλθόντα ἀθετοῦντες, τὸν δὲ κακῶς ἐρχόμενον προσδοκῶντες, τὸν μὲν ἀληθῆ Χριστὸν παρῃτήσαντο, τὸν δὲ πλάνον οἱ πλανηθέντες ἐκδέχονται, ἀληθοῦς καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τοῦ

Moreover, the sign by which believers are to recognise the genuine return of the Messiah, is precisely the symbol of Jewish disbelief and betrayal:[698]

> But what is the sign of his coming? Lest an adverse power dare to imitate it. *And then shall appear*, He says, *the sign of the Son of Man in heaven*.[699] Now Christ's own true sign is the Cross; a sign of a luminous Cross shall go before the King, declaring the one who was formerly crucified, in order that the Jews who previously pierced and plotted against him may *mourn tribes by tribes*[700] when they see it .[701]

There is a sharp contrast between the mourning of the Jews and the reactions of the Jerusalemites who were "overcome both with fear and joy at the divine vision [of the luminous cross above the Mount of Olives]. Young and old, men and women of every age […] natives and foreigners, Christians and pagans visiting from abroad, all together as if with a single voice raised a hymn of praise to God's Only-begotten Son the wonder-worker."[702] Gregory of Nyssa extends this also to the Judaizers:

> For in truth, as the Gospel says, "when he shall come in his glory escorted by the angels"[703], he is scarcely bearable and visible to the righteous. He who is impious and follows the Judaizing heresy remains without a share in that vision, for let the impious be removed, as Isaiah says, and "he shall not see the glory of the Lord."[704][705]

Later legends detailing the discovery of the true Cross by Helen, the mother of Constantine, are coloured by a similar anti-Jewish character.[706] Although a number of variants

---

σωτῆρος εὑρισκομένου τοῦ εἰπόντος· Ἐγὼ ἐλήλυθα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρός μου καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετέ με, ἐὰν δὲ ἄλλος ἔλθῃ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ ἰδίῳ, ἐκεῖνον λήψεσθε [...] Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν οὖν πλανάσθωσαν, ἐπειδὴ θέλουσιν, ἡ δὲ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ δοξαζέσθω."

[698] On this point, see 'La Croix Annoncée par les Prophètes: Le signe qui juge les Juifs dans l'attente du Second Avènement' in Prétot 2014 (181–6).

[699] Matt. 24:30.

[700] Zach. 12:12.

[701] *CL* 15:22 — "Ἀλλὰ ποῖον τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ τὸ σημεῖον ἐστί; μή ποτε τολμήσῃ δύναμις ἐναντία μιμήσασθαι. καὶ τότε φανήσεται, φησί, τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. σημεῖον δὲ ἀληθὲς ἰδικὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστιν ὁ σταυρός. φωτοειδοῦς σταυροῦ σημεῖον προάγει τὸν βασιλέα, δηλοῦν τὸν σταυρωθέντα πρότερον, ἵνα ἰδόντες οἱ πρότερον ἐκκεντήσαντες καὶ ἐπιβουλεύσαντες Ἰουδαῖοι κόψωνται φυλαὶ κατὰ φυλάς."

[702] *Ad Const.* 4, trans. Yarnold 2000, 69.

[703] Matt. 25:31

[704] Is. 26:10

[705] *Life of Moses, Book 2*, trans. Malherbe and Ferguson 2006, 100.

[706] Also marked by an anti-Jewish sentiment is a famous, though clearly fictitious, account of her own conversion, which sees her trying persuade her son of the superior merits of Judaism before Pope Silvester's miraculous defeat of a group of rabbis initiates her own acceptance of Christianity (Edwards 2003, xxxi).

exist,[707] they share a common narrative in which she embarks on a pilgrimage to the Holy City and, while there, interrogates the remnants of the local Jewish community as to the whereabouts of the relic. One of their number, rather fittingly named Judas, admits he had the secret passed on to him from previous generations, but only under torture does he reveal its location.[708] As we have seen, Cyril does not betray any knowledge of Helen's discovery of the relic, even though he provides the earliest reference to the true Cross,[709] compounded by Egeria's attestations to its presence in Jerusalem at his time.[710] Her involvement is, however, mentioned as early as Ambrose's *On the Death of Theodosius,* references also being made by Rufinus and Paulinus of Nola,[711] making it pertinent to our discussion. One could certainly see Cyril juxtaposing the described Jewish attempts at subversion with Christian revelation, the Jews' attempt to hide the sign of their crime of disbelief only heightening the bitterness of their shame as it appears radiantly and openly in the heavens for all to see.

Also in the Syriac *Letter on the Rebuilding of the Temple* it is the cross that becomes the signet of Jewish unbelief. The author recalls God's sentence upon "the city of the crucifiers" and how the building plans were sabotaged, first by adverse weather and subsequently by a great earthquake, that "His truth might be seen by His worshippers in the face of the audacity of the Jews who had crucified Him." The Jews seek refuge at the doors of the synagogue, but these are flung open by a great explosion and a ball of fire which consumes many of those standing outside. A great number, along with pagans, immediately confess their faith in the God of the Christians and hasten to receive baptism. He that persisted in his unbelief, however, "found his clothes openly reprove him, having the mark of the cross stained on them." In the

[707] See Edwards 2003.
[708] Ibid., 73, 86.
[709] For this and the use of the *Inventio* in the battle of rival sees for primacy, see ibid., xxxix.
[710] 36.5 —Wilkinson 1999, 155.
[711] *Ob. Theod.* 43–7 (*PL* 1400A–1401C); *HE* 10.7–8 (*PL* 21:475C–478A); *Ep. 31* (*PL* 61:326B–330B).

end “there was not a single person left in the city who had not received the sign or mark of the living cross in heaven. And it instilled great fear in all.”[712]

The cross, being the boast of Jerusalem which features so prominently throughout all of Cyril’s works, as well as those associated with him, is central also to his anti-Judaism. As the means of Christ’s death according to the flesh, the cross is at once the symbol of Old Israel’s rejection of God, and his abandonment of them, and the redemption and victory of the New Israel. It was the sign in which the godly emperor had been told to conquer and spread to the entire world what had previously been confined to a single region.

Conclusion

In order to fully understand the purpose and meaning of Cyril’s anti-Judaism, and arguably the fourth century corpus of *adversus Ioudaeos* literature in general, it is necessary to move beyond the confines of the various false dichotomies which appear to epitomise so much of the scholarship on the subject. Harnack and Taylor’s dichotomies of didactic and pragmatic, insider and outsider, certainly are not applicable. Catechetical in nature, Cyril’s writings are primarily didactic and targeted at a limited group of insiders, but, at the same time, they anticipate contact and confrontation and imply a secondary, external dissemination of information through debate and dialogue. One should not, therefore, assume that the apologetic elements in *CL* were not born out of actual challenges from Jewish exegetes, rather than the fictional straw men envisaged by Harnack. Likewise, the desire to strengthen separatism and definite identities through the use of rhetoric does not, as Sandwell suggests, mean that such identities therefore did not yet exist in reality. Moreover, while the tone and style of Cyril’s rhetoric may be formed by a variety of sociological factors, his primary message is underpinned

[712] The ‘sign’ presumably refers to baptism while the ‘mark’ refers to the cross stained on the clothing of the unbelievers.

by a fundamental theological concern, rooted in his understanding of the Scriptures: the Church as the only Israel of God, a truth upon which his entire ecclesiology is based. Lastly, I think it goes without saying that there is a vast and unbridgeable chasm between the theologically inspired anti-Judaism of the patristic age and the vile anti-Semitism which plagued European thought in later centuries, though the former was often misused to justify the latter.[713]

[713] While now generally avoided in modern theological discourse, one place such patristic anti-Jewish polemic survives even today is in the form of liturgical poetry and hymnography. For a recent treatment of this, see Bucur 2017, 39–60.

Chapter 6 — The Tribe of Heretics: Heresiology as an expression of catholicity

"Now then," to use the words of Cyril, "let me finish what remains to be said about [the article], 'In one holy Catholic Church,' on which, though one might say many things, we will only say a little."[714]

The dispute over who constituted the true Israel of God was not just a Jewish-Christian one. Christians themselves were widely divergent in their beliefs and practices, and the early centuries A.D. saw an intense struggle for legitimacy and prominence between a myriad of competing Christian groups. Mark Edwards notes that, "As early as the third century [the] body [of Christians] was so divided that the catholic church was merely one of a number of communions."[715] "Not only among the Gentiles has the devil waged this contest," says Cyril, "but many falsely called Christians, wrongfully designated by the sweet name of Christ."[716]

While modern scholarship might define Cyril's legacy by his importance for liturgical studies, hagiographical tradition remembers him first and foremost as a great apologist, not only against pagans and Jews, but as a champion of Orthodoxy standing up to the false teachings of Christian heretics. This is only natural, as large sections of *CL* are heresiological in nature, and the fact that we find late heresiological works bearing Cyril's name, such as the 17th century Slavonic work *Kyrillova Kniga*,[717] or *Book of Cyril*, is testament to his enduring influence in this genre of literature.

[714] CL 18:22 — "λεγέσθω δὲ τὰ λείποντα καὶ τέως διὰ τὸ καὶ εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, περὶ ἧς πολλὰ μὲν εἰπεῖν δυνατὸν ἦν, δι' ὀλίγων δὲ ἐροῦμεν."
[715] Edwards 2009, 9.
[716] *CL* 6:12 — "Καὶ οὐ μόνον ἐν τοῖς ἐθνικοῖς ἐπηγωνίσατο ταῦτα ὁ διάβολος· ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἤδη καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν χριστιανῶν ψευδῶς λεγομένων, τῶν τῷ εὐωδεστάτῳ Χριστοῦ ὀνόματι κακῶς προσαγορευομένων."
[717] *Kirillova Kniga* (Moscow: Moscow Printing House, 1644).

As with his references to Judaism and paganism, Cyril's heresiology indicates that at least a number of the groups he mentions had an active presence in Palestine, and presupposes contact and interaction. From an ecclesiological standpoint, the particulars of each heresy and Cyril's responses to them are not of great interest. Drijvers, for example, provides a very good summary of the various groups and doctrines mentioned in *CL*, and to do the same here in detail would thus be quite superfluous.[718] What is of great interest, however, is the way in which Cyril seemingly makes no attempt to distinguish between these various heresies. While he paints certain groups as being more dangerous than others, presumably because they would have posed an immediate threat to his listeners, he does not depart from his threefold categorisation of those outside the Church as either Greeks, Jews or heretics. In many instances he makes no attempt to identify the heresies at all, and will frequently list numerous errors prefaced only by a warning to keep away from "those who say" [*τῶν λεγόντων*] such things, without any attempt to explain who they might be. In the context of a less binary *Religionsanschauung*, one in which different Christian groups occupied different spaces on a spectre of orthodoxy and heresy, one would expect to see greater care to identify these and categorise them accordingly. In Cyril's Catechism, however, various forms of Gnosticism,[719] which posit a multiplicity of gods — the benevolent Father of Christ standing in opposition to the malevolent creator of the visible universe — as well as mocking accounts of Manichaean rejections of the material world and necessities of life, are spoken of in the same breath as Sabellian modalism, Arianism, and other theological errors which at first would probably have seemed like little more than semantical pedantry to many of his listeners. This, of course, would

[718] In order of appearance: Arianism; Valentinianism; Marcionism; Manichaeism; Sabellianism; Docetism; Marcellus of Ancyra, Simon Magus, Cerinthus, Menander, Carpocrates, the Ebionites, and Basilides. 'Pagans, Heretics, Jews, Gnostics and Manichaeans' in Drijvers 2004, 97–126.

[719] It is now generally accepted that "Gnosticism" as a unified religious system is a modern, scholarly construct. For a recent study of how the term has been variously used and defined in Late-Antique lituerature and modern scholarship, see Edwards 2017. See also King 2017 and Hayes 2017.

have made them all the more dangerous, since the insufficiently catechised might fall into the snares of such heretics quite unwittingly. For this reason, Cyril warns them:

> If ever you are sojourning in cities, inquire not simply where the Lord's House is (for the other heresies of the profane also attempt to call their own grottos houses of the Lord), nor simply where the Church is, but where is the Catholic Church. For this is the peculiar name of this Holy Church, the mother of us all, which is the bride of our Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God.[720]

Read in light of this passage, it becomes clear that Cyril's lumping together of all forms of heresy into a single group is part of a binary division of all Christians into Catholics and non-Catholics, the faith of the Church and those who depart from it. Once outside and separated from the Catholic Church, the severity of error is of little relevance; what matters is adherence or non-adherence to the Catholic party.

Notwithstanding the use in the Book of Acts of "the way" (*ἡ ὁδός*) to designate the religious movement led by the Apostles of Jesus[721], the Gospel of Matthew makes it clear that Christ, in his own words, did not simply bring a particular set of teachings, but founded a Church,[722] a distinct and discernible community of believers, albeit variously defined. 'Christianity' as an umbrella term covering a variety of heterodox groups together with the orthodox Catholic party, based on a lowest common denominator, is rejected by figures like Cyril. To the extent that there is room for variance, it is possible only within the Catholic Church. Just as "all the gods of the nations are demons,"[723] so are non-Catholic churches dens of profanity, and Christians outside the Catholic Church are falsely so-called.[724] The Apostle

[720] *CL* 18:26 — "Κἄν ποτε ἐπιδημῇς ἐν πόλεσι, μὴ ἁπλῶς ἐξέταζε ποῦ τοῦ κυριακὸν ἔστι (καὶ γὰρ αἱ λοιπαὶ τῶν ἀσεβῶν αἱρέσεις κυριακὰ τὰ ἑαυτῶν σπήλαια καλεῖν ἐπιχειροῦσι), μηδὲ ποῦ ἔστιν ἁπλῶς ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἀλλὰ ποῦ ἔστιν ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. τοῦτο γὰρ ἰδικὸν ὄνομα τυγχάνει τῆς ἁγίας ταύτης καὶ μητρὸς ἡμῶν ἁπάντων. ἥτις νύμφη μέν ἐστι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ,"

[721] Acts 9:2, 19:9, 19:23.

[722] Matt. 16:18

[723] Ps. 95:5 LXX (*NETS*)

[724] Cyprian of Carthage says clearly of the Novatians that, because they are separated from the Catholic Church, they cannot be said to have any church at all, since the Church of Christ is one and unique. Moreover, being outside the Church, their creedal confession of the "holy Church" makes theirs a different Creed — despite employing identical wording to that of the Catholics — expressing a different dogma (*Ep.* 69.6 [*PL* 4:404]).

Paul, of course, had himself spoken, not of Greeks, Jews, and Christians, but of Greeks, Jews, and the Church of God.[725]

What is particularly interesting about the above passage is that, while other appellations such as 'Christian' or 'church' are used by a number of different groups, the claim of Cyril's party to the title 'Catholic' appears to be entirely uncontested, for which reason he is able to refer to it as its *ἰδικὸν ὄνομα* and give his hearers complete assurance that they will not unwittingly join with heretics so long as they seek out the congregations which identify themselves by this name. We find an almost identical passage in the letters of Cyril's Spanish contemporary, Pacian of Barcelona:

> Suppose, this very day, I entered a populous city. When I had found Marcionites, Apollinarians, Cataphrygians, Novatianists, and the rest of that kind who call themselves Christians, by what name should I recognize the congregation of my own people, unless it were called "Catholic"? […] This name "Catholic" does not ring of Marcion, nor of Apelles, nor of Montanus; nor does it take heretics as its originators.[726]

The unique claim of catholicity thus appears to have been equally uncontested in the West. It is telling that Sympronian, the Novatian to whom Pacian's epistle is addressed, does not at any point challenge this claim, but rather takes issue with the name itself.[727] "The Communion of the Church which is Catholic," says Augustine, "is called Catholic not only by its own members but also by its enemies. Whether they will or no, heretics and schismatics use no other name for it than the name of Catholic."[728]

That we should see this in the fourth century is not surprising. By the time Cyril came on the scene, the catholic identity of his party had received official acknowledgement by the imperial authorities, who had assembled the members of this party — not that of the

[725] 1 Cor. 10:32

[726] *Ep.* 1 *C. Sym.: De Catholico Nomine* 3:3, trans. Hanson 1999, 20–21.

[727] Ibid.

[728] *V. Rel.* 7:12, trans. Burleigh 1953, 232. "*Tenenda nobis est Christiana religio, et ejus Ecclesiæ communicatio, quæ Catholica est, et Catholica nominatur, non solum a suis, verum etiam ab omnibus inimicis. Velint nolint enim ipsi quoque hæretici, et schismatum alumni, quando non cum suis, sed cum extraneis loquuntur, Catholicam nihil aliud quam Catholicam vocant*" (*PL* 34:128)

Novatianists or others — at Nicea, and even before it was enshrined in law in the Code of Theodosius, the use of the term in Constantine's decrees and letters gave it a legal status that would have made it near impossible for any rival group to gainsay.

This does not mean, however, that this recognition of the Catholic party, which "emerged as victorious from the conflicts of the second and third centuries" and to which nearly every modern form of Christianity owes its origin,[729] was simply an arbitrary consequence of Constantine's personal whims. Despite the presence of numerous competing groups and a less precise definition of catholic orthodoxy, we nevertheless see that, as early as the second century, "there were clearly communities of Christians who were perceived, even by non-Christians, as belonging together, as the 'Great Church,' and who identified themselves, together, in various ways and through various practices, as orthodox in distinction to heretics."[730] Mark Edwards, likewise, argues that "while there was evidently some difference of belief and much diversity in the expression of belief, there was no unregulated ferment of opinion such as is posited by those who speak of different and competing Christianities."[731] Rather he maintains that a concern for orthodoxy was present from the very beginning, "that so long as a gospel has been proclaimed it has always been accompanied by harangues against false professors."[732] This he attributes to the "*episkopoi* or overseers, who were formidable guardians of a norm which they believed to be that of Paul and the evangelists, [and] intolerant of locutions or conceits that were not of apostolic provenance; consequently they saw only a polar antitype to the gospel in other systems."

[729] Erhman 2003, 4.
[730] Behr 2013, 9.
[731] Edwards 2009, 1.
[732] Ibid.

The bishop as a prerequisite for catholicity

The fourth-century bishop was a significant and multifaceted figure. He was not merely an administrator, but an ascetic, holy man, philanthropist, theologian, and martyr, actively engaged in every aspect of the Christian community's spiritual and practical struggles.[733] While earlier scholarship is wont to overemphasise the radical movement of the Church from charismatic to institutional — and therefore the importance of the bishop as an institutional figure — during the reign of Constantine, gaining the ear of the imperial authorities inevitably elevated the bishop to a position he had not occupied earlier on the world stage.[734]

As we have already seen, Ignatius of Antioch establishes a clear connection between the person of the bishop and the catholicity of the Church in the immediate aftermath of the New Testament period.[735] [736] Cyril Hovorun argues that Ignatius saw the word unity (*ἑνότης*) as "a synonym for church" and that "'Catholic' for Ignatius meant keeping together as opposed to standing aside."[737] His various epistles were written out of this concern for the "unity of the church as a single universal community."[738] Thus, although Ignatius promoted a monoepiscopacy in the Church, he saw this episcopacy "not in terms of authority, but as a means of preserving the catholic / non-sectarian character of community."[739] Nikolaos Loudovikos argues for a similar reading of Ignatius, asserting that the figure of the bishop as distinct from the rest of the presbytery emerges not "as an individual clothed in authority or the centre of an institutional structure,"[740] but as a response to the need "for someone who in the post-apostolic Church would serve the liturgical manifestation of the unity of the multiple

[733] See Rapp 2005; Sterk 2004; Drake 2000.

[734] Constantine draws parallels between episcopal and imperial roles when he refers to himself as the "bishop of those outside" the Church (*Vita Const.* 4.24).

[735] Epistle to the Smyrneans 8.2

[736] For an overview of the role of the Bishop in the first to fifth centuries, see Patsavos 2007. Ignatius of Antioch is discussed on pp.35–38.

[737] Hovorun 2015, 49.

[738] Ibid.

[739] Ibid.

[740] Loudovikos 2015, 27.

congregations of a region against the schisms. […] The ministry of the unity of the Church thus appears to be the sole motive" for distinguishing the episcopate from the presbytery, although he regards this distinction as an internal one "within the one unitary rank of bishop-presbyter."[741]

Moroziuk asserts that "[w]hereas Ignatius stresses the need of the hierarchy for catholicity, no such stress is evident in Cyril."[742] Generally speaking, this is a rather curious statement to make about a man so frequently charged with political intrigue and episcopal self-promotion as Cyril. However, it also does not ring true when taking into account the content of Cyril's own words. Moroziuk himself admits that "Cyril identifies this highly charismatic society with the external Church of which he was a presbyter and bishop and which alone he believed endowed with every virtue and charism that led to eternal life."[743] If catholicity is coterminous with the external Church, then surely the hierarchy, whom Cyril identifies as the "doorkeepers" (*θυρωρῶν*)[744] responsible for inclusion in and exclusion from said Church, are a necessary prerequisite for catholicity. We see in *CL*, not only clear reference to bishops, presbyters and deacons,[745] but the Apostle James is repeatedly referred to, not as "apostle" but as first bishop of Jerusalem.[746]

> Let no heretic ever persuade you to slander the Resurrection. For to this day the Manichees say that the Resurrection of the Saviour was illusionary and not true […]. He was seen of James, his own brother, and first Bishop of this diocese. Seeing then that such a Bishop originally saw the risen Christ Jesus, then you, his disciple, should not disbelieve him.[747]

---

[741] Ibid., 26–27. Following an assertion first made by P. N. Harrison (1936, 85–88), Brent (2007) suggests that Ignatius' attempt to introduce a threefold hierarchy of bishop, presbyter, and deacon had caused serious unrest in the church, and that his subsequent martyrdom was an attempt on the part of the civil authorities to quell the resulting disorder. His arguments are convincingly refuted by Azize (2015) and Weinandy 2005 (73, n.4), who argue that Ignatius was "merely clarifying and expounding […] the evident implications and consequences" of an already recognised ecclesiastical order.

[742] Moroziuk 1989, 175.

[743] Ibid.

[744] *PC* 4

[745] See, for example, *CL* 17:35

[746] *CL* 4:28, 14:21

[747] *CL* 14:21 — "μή ποτέ σέ τις αἱρετικὸς πείσῃ δυσφημῆσαι τὴν ἀνάστασιν. μέχρι γὰρ σήμερον Μανιχαῖοι λέγουσι φαντασιώδη καὶ οὐκ ἀληθῆ τοῦ σωτῆρος τὴν ἀνάστασιν γεγονέναι [...] ἔπειτα ὤφθη Ἰακώβῳ, τῷ ἑαυτοῦ

Cyril is here quite unequivocal in identifying himself as heir both to James' apostleship and to his doctrinal authority as a witness of the resurrection. A disciple of Cyril's is a disciple also of James. It is quite clear, then, that Cyril saw the person of the bishop, by virtue of his apostolic succession,[748] as a safeguard and expression of doctrinal catholicity and ecclesial unity in much the same way as Ignatius had done, and that his unique ability to bear witness to the orthodox faith made him a necessary element in the definition of catholic identity in opposition to that of heretics and schismatics. Irenaeus of Lyons expresses it thusly:

> Wherefore it is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the Church,—those who, as I have shown, possess the succession from the apostles; those who, together with the succession of the episcopate, have received the certain gift of truth, according to the good pleasure of the Father. But [it is also incumbent] to hold in suspicion others who depart from the primitive succession, and assemble themselves together in any place whatsoever, [looking upon them] either as heretics of perverse minds, or as schismatics puffed up and self-pleasing, or again as hypocrites, acting thus for the sake of lucre and vainglory. For all these have fallen from the truth. And the heretics, indeed, who bring strange fire to the altar of God—namely, strange doctrines—shall be burned up by the fire from heaven, as were Nadab and Abihu.[749] But such as rise up in opposition to the truth, and exhort others against the Church of God, [shall] remain among those in hell, being swallowed up by an earthquake, even as those who were with Chore, Dathan, and Abiron. But those who cleave asunder, and separate the unity of the Church, [shall] receive from God the same punishment as Jeroboam did.[750]

Irenaeus is one of the very few extra-biblical non-heretics mentioned by name in *CL*, appearing in the preface to Cyril's catalogue of heresies, where he is dubbed the 'exegete' (*ὁ ἐξηγητὴς*).[751] The fact that Cyril makes mention of a number of heresies which do not seem to have had any presence in fourth century Palestine, and therefore would have had little practical relevance to his hearers, suggests some degree of reliance on *Against Heresies* from which the above citation is taken. Taking into account Dulles' concept of catholicity in time, Cyril asserts the catholicity of the Church and delineates its borders through his heresiology, not only by

μὲν ἀδελφῷ, ἐπισκόπῳ δὲ πρώτῳ τῆς παροικίας ταύτης. τοιούτου τοίνυν ἐπισκόπου πρωτοτύπως ἰδόντος ἀναστάντα τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν σὺ ὁ τούτου μαθητὴς μὴ ἀπιστήσῃς."

[748] Arnold (1953) gives particular attention to James and the Church of Jerusalem in his seminal work *The Apostolic Succession in the First Two Centuries of the Church*.

[749] Lev. 10:1–2

[750] *Adv. Haer.* 4.26.2, trans. *ANF* 1, 1237.

[751] *CL* 16:6

establishing a divide between orthodoxy and heresy, between full and incomplete teaching, but makes the very exercise itself an expression of catholicity by making reference to Irenaeus and showing himself to be a successor of this legacy.

Like Ignatius of Antioch, Irenaeus is another personage seminal to the formation of early catholic identity whose work and intentions have undergone a re-evaluation by modern scholarship. As John Behr notes, the "discovery over the past century of long-lost texts written by those whom [Irenaeus] opposed […] it is claimed, give us access to early alternative and equally legitimate approaches to Christianity, ones that were marginalized, excluded, and condemned by patriarchal bishops, among whom Irenaeus stands first in line."[752] "Who does not think of Luther?" asks von Harnack, portraying Marcion as a brave defender of the true Gospel as he singlehandedly stands before the gathering of an intolerant Roman hierarchy, seeking to exclude all who did not conform to their catholic orthodoxy.[753] However, Behr argues that, in fact, the opposite was true. Part of what made the church catholic — "that is, all-encompassing"[754] — was its ability and willingness to tolerate and include diversity of opinion.

Adapting one of the themes in Irenaeus' own theology,[755] he describes this catholic diversity as "a symphony, comprised of different voices throughout time, each lending themselves to the melody being played, with different timbres and tonalities, inflections and themes, and each in turn being shaped by the symphony."[756] While Edwards defines orthodoxy as "whatever is taught in any epoch by the majority of bishops" and catholicity as concurrence

[752] Behr 2013, 1.
[753] Harnack 1924. Quoted translation: id. 1990, 18.
[754] Behr 2013, 12.
[755] cf. *Adv. Haer.* 4.14.2
[756] Behr 2013, 9.
Compare Cyril Hovorun's (2016) argument that, "Only the polyphony of the Church can secure her infallibility. Only when the voices abandon their hierarchical solitude and join together, they utter truth […]. The pleroma that endorses the polyphony of the Church is the process of reception" (67).

with this majority,[757] Behr maintains that his catholic symphony is not "constructed by any individual voice or all the voices together but is governed by its own rhythm and rules,"[758] namely the "'canon of truth', by which Irenaeus does not mean […] a set of doctrines detached from the Scriptures and their interpretation, but rather an expression, which can vary depending on context, of the coherence of Scripture as a mosaic of Christ."[759] He goes on to argue that "the purpose of the 'canon' was not to demarcate a set of teachings that must be accepted and to curtain reason or further thought, but instead to make further reflection possible."[760] Thus when Irenaeus "lists the successors of teachers in Rome, all of whom, he claims, have consistently taught the same, this is not cast in terms of maintaining, statically, an original deposit of teachings separate from the Scriptures […] but that in their preaching […] these figures were all part of the same symphony, with all the diachronic and synchronic diversity that this entails."[761] Similarly, Cyril's appeal to Irenaeus is an attempt to demonstrate that he too forms part of this scriptural mosaic, this symphony conducted by the living tradition of the apostles, handed down to him by "the bishops of old, the presidents of the Church."[762]

In the case of Marcion, "that mouthpiece of ungodliness" and "inventor of mischief", as Cyril dubs him,[763] it was his attempt to impose his *alien God* on the rest of the church, and their subsequent refusal to accept this novel deity, which had caused him to sever himself from the "symphony of the one body of Christ" in order to play "similar but separate tunes."[764] Even if, as Epiphanius suggests, the scene here is one of excommunication,[765] Marcion had given them an ultimatum that left them with little other choice, and had shown himself to be the

[757] Edwards 2009, 7.
[758] Behr 2013, 9.
[759] Ibid., 11.
[760] Ibid.
[761] Ibid., 10.
[762] *CL* 4:35
[763] *CL* 6:16. For a comprehensive work on Marcion, see Lieu 2015. Cyril is discussed on pages 386 and 396, n.13.
[764] Behr 2013, 10.
[765] *Panarion* 42.2.8

intolerant one, attempting, as he did, "to force decisions on other congregations by means of a synod."[766] This "contest of wickedness was aided also by Valentinus," says Cyril. Yet also here, as Einar Thomassen argues convincingly, one does not see a teacher of false doctrines hounded out of the church by an intolerant catholic hierarchy, but rather a reformer who, with his followers, gradually "decided to withdraw from the division and strife plaguing Roman Christianity, in order to be, all by themselves, the true spiritual church in unified self-sufficiency."[767] Larry W. Hurtado also considers a "readiness to recognize one another (despite their differences)" and "accommodate diversity" to be a defining feature of "proto-orthodox Christianity," pointing to the New Testament inclusion of four divergent Gospel accounts, in contrast to Marcion's use of a single Gospel, and its willingness to place the Epistle of James alongside those of Paul, the only apostle considered valid by the Marcionites.[768] "In the case of the Valentinians, too, those who did not embrace the reform fell outside 'the church'."[769] It was thus the tolerance of the catholic party, and the intolerance of Valentinus towards such diversity, that had caused his rift from the church.

Cyril, of course, belongs to a very different time and context to that of Irenaeus, and we begin in the fourth century to see a shift in the genre of heresiology as older Christian sectarian structures gave way to ecumenical councils and increasingly sophisticated theological definitions."[770] While the constant refinement of dogmatic definitions saw the borders of orthodoxy steadily closing in on and increasingly limiting the space available for doctrinal variation, inclusivity remained for many a defining characteristic of the Catholic Church. As Edwards points out, its leaders saw as another proof of its catholicity "its willingness to tolerate the tares alongside the wheat, and to offer terms of readmission to those whom others put

[766] Lampe 2003, 393. Cited by Behr 2013, 26.
[767] Thomassen 2004, 254. See also id. 2011.
[768] Hurtado 2016, 11–12.
[769] Thomassen 2004, 254.
[770] Lyman 2017, 296.

beyond the reach of mercy."[771] Just as with the aforementioned heretics, it was the Novatianist and Donatist schismatics' intolerance of catholic tolerance that had led to, not an expulsion, but their wilful departure from the Church and the establishment of a rival communion.

Speaking as he is to those not already baptised, Cyril's extensive discourse on repentance, the subject of his second lecture, is ultimately connected to the forgiveness of sins in baptism, and not necessarily applicable to the post-baptismal repentance rejected by said schismatics. Indeed, Cyril's rejection of re-baptism is justified precisely on the grounds that, "otherwise it might be said, 'Although I have failed once, I shall set it right a second time,' whereas if you fail once, the thing cannot be set right."[772] However, he elsewhere urges his hearers not to be troubled by the misconduct of clergy or laity, pointing out that such discord is an inevitability predicted by Christ himself, and thus not a reason to doubt the Church.[773]

Even on the subject of dogma, while the room for variance had been greatly limited in an age of councils, the underlying principles that had previously allowed for such variance were still very much in effect. That is to say, the formulation of dogma was not a philosophical exercise by which catholic bishops sought to devise a coherent and comprehensive system of belief, subsequently excluding any teaching that did not fit and cutting off from the Church those who taught or believed them. Instead, the formulation of dogma was driven by practical concerns, in so far as its purpose was to safeguard the possibility of salvation. The apophaticism of catholic hierarchs[774] was not an arbitrary process of exclusion aimed at achieving homogeneity, but rather the exclusion of teachings about God, man, and the nature of things which made salvation impossible.

---

[771] Edwards 2009, 9.

[772] *PC* 7 — "ἐπεὶ ἦν εἰπεῖν· Ἅπαξ ἀποτυχὼν, δεύτερον κατορθῶ· ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅπαξ ἀποτύχῃς, ἀδιόρθωτον τὸ πρᾶγμα."

[773] *PC* 13, *CL* 15:7

[774] That is to say, their attempt to approach dogmatic questions by negation; by excluding doctrines and ideas inapplicable to God.

> Hate those who say that Christ was crucified only in our imagination; for if he was crucified according to our imagination, and salvation is from the Cross, then salvation is also imaginary. If the Cross is fantasy, the Resurrection is also fantasy; but *if Christ be not risen, we are yet in our sins*.[775] If the Cross is fantasy, the Ascension is also fantasy; and if the Ascension is fantasy, then the second coming is also fantasy, and everything that follows is unsubstantial.[776]

Theological orthodoxy thus becomes a prerequisite to catholicity. For just as the Church is catholic according to Cyril, "because it teaches catholically and completely one and all the doctrines due to come to men's knowledge, concerning things both visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly,"[777] in order to bring man to salvation by "catholically treat[ing] and heal[ing] all manner of sins,"[778] so can it remain catholic only by excluding all the doctrines which detract from this salvific catholicity, this doctrinal fullness and integrity. The doctrinal consensus of the Church is not catholic because it is a consensus *per se*. Rather, a consensus emerges out of a common concern for salvation, soteriology being the 'canon of truth', the underlying governing principle ensuring the harmony of the "catholic symphony."[779] With this musical image in mind, it is rather apt that Byzantine hymnography describes Cyril as a "harp of the All-Holy Spirit […] playing a hymn of the manifestation of Christ […] in two natures."[780] Demetrios Bekiares captures the soteriological core of *CL* by describing it as a work expressing

[775] 1 Cor. 15:17

[776] *CL* 13:37 — "μίσησον τοὺς λέγοντας, ὅτι κατὰ φαντασίαν ἐσταυρώθη. εἰ γὰρ κατὰ φαντασίαν ἐσταυρώθη, ἐκ σταυροῦ δὲ ἡ σωτηρία, καὶ ἡ σωτηρία φαντασία. εἰ φαντασία ὁ σταυρός, φαντασία καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις. εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐγήγερται, ἔτι ἐσμὲν ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν. εἰ φαντασία ὁ σταυρός, φαντασία καὶ ἡ ἀνάληψις. καὶ εἰ φαντασία ἡ ἀνάληψις, φαντασία ἄρα καὶ ἡ δευτέρα κάθοδος, καὶ πάντα λοιπὸν ἀνυπόστατα."

[777] *CL* 18:23 — "καὶ διὰ τὸ διδάσκειν καθολικῶς καὶ ἀνελλιπῶς ἅπαντα τὰ εἰς γνῶσιν ἀνθρώπων ἐλθεῖν ὀφείλοντα δόγματα, περί τε ὁρατῶν καὶ ἀοράτων πραγμάτων, ἐπουρανίων τε καὶ ἐπιγείων."

[778] Ibid.

[779] See, for example, Welch 1994, who challenges the claims of earlier scholars, such as Ezra Gebremedhin (1977), who hold that the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria informed his theology of Eucharist and worship. Instead, he makes the case that the Christological position which won the day at the Council of Ephesus was based on Cyril's understanding of the Eucharist, namely that a diophysite Christology made it impossible for the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist to be life-giving, and therefore salvific.

[780] "Λύρα ὤφθης Πνεύματος, τοῦ παναγίου Θεόφρον, ἀναφωνοῦσα μέλος ἐπιφανείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃν ἐν δυσὶ ταῖς φύσεσιν ἐκήρυξας, θέλγων τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν." See 3rd Ode of the Canon of Matins under Day 18 of the March volume of the *Menaion* (*Μηναίον τοῦ Μαρτίου (3rd Edition)* [Athens: Ἀποστολική Διακονία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 2011], 181).

"Christological, pneumatological, hagiotriadic, ecclesiological, eschatological and orthodox salvation."[781]

The Cross

As with his refutation of Judaism, the symbol of the cross is central to Cyril's soteriology. "Every deed of Jesus is a boast of the Catholic Church," he says, "but her boast of boasts is the cross."[782] In a line similar to Athanasius and others, Cyril insists that the efficacy of the crucifixion necessitates an orthodox Christology.[783]

> Let us then not be ashamed of the Cross of our Saviour, but rather boast in it. *For the preaching of the Cross is unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness,*[784] but to us salvation […]. For it was not a mere man who died for us […] but the Son of God, made man […]. Jesus then suffered in truth for all men; for the Cross was no illusion, otherwise our redemption is an illusion also. His death was not imaginary, for then is our salvation also a myth [...]. For it was no common man who suffered, but God made man, striving for the prize of patience […]. He was not a literal sheep, not a mere man, not just an angel, he was God made man. The lawlessness of sinners was not so great, as the righteousness of him who died for them.[785]

[781] Translation mine. Bekiares 2016, 8. Additionally, Steenberg (2009) sees Cyril's theology as being "wholly, and perhaps more notably than in earlier sources, theology as anthropology," and argues that he, in this respect, "sets him in line with earlier authors such as Irenaeus and Tertullian" rather than his contemporaries and that "the degree to which his anthropological discussions grounds his description of divine realities, advances the project of those earlier writers" (129).

[782] *CL* 13:1 — "Καύχημα μὲν τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ πᾶσα πρᾶξις Ἰησοῦ, καύχημα δὲ καυχημάτων ὁ σταυρός."

[783] Though somewhat dated, the only truly in-depth study of Cyril's Christology is found in Neiderberger 1923. The first part of his thesis is an exposition on Cyril's understanding of the pre-incarnate Logos, while the second deals with the Logos Incarnate. Towards the end of his final chapter, he provides a beautiful summary of Cyril's soteriological scheme in *CL* (116–122), in which "Kreuz und Auferstehung zusammenbilden also die eine große Erlösungstat" (121), through which the whole world is renewed and redeemed. While Neiderberger is right to say that, "Die Allgemeinheit der Erlösung ist aber nicht so zu verstehen, daß die Menschheit nicht auch das ihrige tun müsse, um den Himmel wieder zu gewinnen," (122) his thesis differs from the present one in that he regards the Catholic Church as little more than the training ground in which man acquires the knowledge necessary to attain this renewal, rather than the very ontological context in which it could be lived and experienced.

[784] 1 Cor. 1:18

[785] *CL* 13:3, 4, 6, 33 — "Μὴ τοίνυν ἐπαισχυνώμεθα τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ σωτῆρος, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἐγκαυχώμεθα. ὁ γὰρ λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ Ἰουδαίοις μέν ἐστι σκάνδαλον, ἔθνεσι δὲ μωρία, ἡμῖν δὲ σωτηρία [...] οὐ γὰρ ἦν ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος […], ὁ ὑπεραποθνήσκων, ἀλλὰ υἱὸς θεοῦ, θεὸς ἐνανθρωπήσας […]. Ἔπαθεν οὖν Ἰησοῦς κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων. οὐ γὰρ δόκησις ὁ σταυρός, ἐπεὶ δόκησις καὶ ἡ λύτρωσις. οὐ φαντασιώδης ὁ θάνατος, ἐπεὶ καὶ μυθώδης ἡ σωτηρία [...] οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἄνθρωπος εὐτελὴς ὁ πάσχων, ἀλλὰ θεὸς ἐνανθρωπήσας καὶ τὸν τῆς ὑπομονῆς ἀγωνιζόμενος ἆθλον [...] οὐκ ἦν πρόβατον αἰσθητόν, οὐκ ἦν ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος, οὐκ ἦν ἄγγελος μόνον, ἀλλὰ θεὸς ἐνανθρωπήσας. οὐ τοσαύτη ἦν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ἡ ἀνομία, ὅση τοῦ ὑπεραποθνήσκοντος ἡ δικαιοσύνη."

> The Lord took on him from us our likeness in order to save humanity: He took our likeness, that he might give greater grace to that which lacked; that sinful humanity might become partaker of God.[786] […] Christ was twofold, Man is what was seen, God in what was not seen […]. For neither is it devout to worship the mere man, nor is it pious to speak of him only as God, separate from his humanity. For if Christ is God, as he indeed is, but without assuming humanity, then we are strangers to salvation. Let him therefore be worshipped as God, but let it be believed that he became human; for neither is there any profit in calling him man without his divinity, nor is it salvific if we do not confess his humanity together with his divinity. Let us confess the presence of the King, and the Physician."[787]

More bluntly expressing the centrality of the Cross in the context of his soteriological vision, Cyril warns his listeners: "If you deny the Cross, the eternal fire awaits you. I speak severely, that you may not experience severity."[788]

Prétot suggests that, "parmi ceux qui niaient la réalité de la crucifixion, Cyrille semble viser avant tout les manichéens."[789] In this context, the Cross was not only a defence against those who wished to undermine either the human or divine nature in Christ, or separate the one from the other, but also against those who sought to separate the Old Testament from the New. While much of fourth-century *Adversus Iudaeus* literature sought to demonstrate the latter Scriptures as the legitimate continuation and fulfilment of the former, *Adversus haereses* literature had to tackle the problem from the opposite direction, countering the claims of those who attributed the authorship of the Hebrew Scriptures to diabolical inspiration by showing them to be the foundations of the Christian Gospel. In his discussion of Old Testament

[786] *CL* 12:15 — Cyril use of *ὅμοιον* here is same as his use of *ὅμοιον κατὰ πάντα* to describe Christ's relationship to the Father (see *CL* 4.7; 11.4, 9, 18). He also speaks of God being like unto himself (*ὅμοιον ἀεὶ ἑαυτῷ ὄντα — CL* 6.7). It is quite clear that his use of *ὅμιος* is entirely consistent with Nicene orthodoxy, and does not indicate any form of 'semi-Arianism'.

[787] *CL* 12:5, 4:9, 12:1 — "ἀνέλαβε τὸ ὅμοιον ἡμῶν ἐξ ἡμῶν ὁ κύριος, ἵνα δι' ἀνθρωπότητος σωθῶμεν. ἀνέλαβε τὸ ὅμοιον ἡμῶν, ἵνα τῷ λείποντι μείζονα δῷ τὴν χάριν, ἵνα ἡ ἀνθρωπότης ἡ ἁμαρτωλὸς θεοῦ γένηται κοινωνός [...] Διπλοῦς ἦν ὁ Χριστὸς, ἄνθρωπος μὲν τὸ φαινόμενον, Θεὸς δὲ τὸ μὴ φαινόμενον [...] οὔτε γὰρ τὸν ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον προσκυνεῖν ὅσιον, οὔτε θεὸν μόνον λέγειν χωρὶς τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος εὐσεβές. εἰ γὰρ θεὸς ὁ Χριστός, ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ ἔστι, μὴ ἀνέλαβε δὲ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, τῆς σωτηρίας ἀλλότριοι καθεστήκαμεν. προσκυνείσθω μὲν ὡς θεός, πιστευέσθω δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἐνηνθρώπησεν. οὔτε γὰρ τὸ λέγειν ἄνθρωπον ἄνευ θεότητος ἐπωφελές, οὔτε τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα μὴ συνομολογεῖν τῇ θεότητι σωτήριον. ὁμολογήσωμεν τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἰατροῦ τὴν παρουσίαν."

[788] *CL* 13.38 — "ἐὰν ἀρνήσῃ τὸν σταυρόν, μένει σε τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον. σκληρὰ λέγω, ἵνα μὴ σκληρῶν πειραθῇς."

[789] Prétot 2014, 187. As Peter Brown (1969) notes, "In the fourth century, Manichaeism was rife as a crypto-Christianity in Antioch and Palestine" (69). See also Stroumsa 1989.

prophecies, Cyril points not only to general references to the propitiary sacrifice of Christ, but specifically references to wood [ξύλο] as images of the physical relic in his possession: "Throughout [the Old Testament], life comes by means of wood."[790]

> Having touched on things connected with Paradise, I am truly amazed at the truth of the types. In Paradise was the fall, and in a Garden the salvation. From the Tree came sin, and until the Tree sin lasted.[791]

In his recollection of the story of Abraham preparing to slaughter Isaac — a type of God the Father giving up his only-begotten Son for the salvation of the world — Cyril mentions, not the knife in Abraham's hand, but the wood on which he laid his son.[792] Other such references are the wood of Noah's Ark, the wooden rod with which Moses parted the Red Sea, and the piece of wood by which he sweetened the bitter waters of Marah.[793] He suggests there are many more, but "I pass by the greater part of the types, to keep within compass."[794]

Thus, being the common thread running through the books of the Old Testament and tying them to those of the New, the cross for Cyril "sert de critère de discrimination entre les fidèles et les manichéens"[795] and other heretics. This applies not only to belief in the crucifixion, but also its visible sign. Just as the relic of the True Cross had become for Cyril a tangible sign of the Church's spatial catholicity, so the emphasis on the cross for catholic orthodoxy was not just theoretical but also became a visible signet of Catholic identity, allowing believers to recognise one another. Twice Cyril exhorts his listeners to "openly seal [the sign of the cross] on your foreheads," and to "make this sign when eating and drinking, sitting, lying down and rising up, speaking and walking: in a word, at every act."[796]

---

[790] *CL* 13.19

[791] Ibid. — "Καὶ ἐπειδὴ τῶν κατὰ παράδεισον ἠψάμεθα πραγμάτων, τεθαύμακα ἀληθῶς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τῶν τύπων. ἐν παραδείσῳ ἡ ἀπόπτωσις, καὶ ἐν κήπῳ ἡ σωτηρία. ἀπὸ ξύλου ἡ ἁμαρτία, καὶ μέχρι ξύλου ἡ ἁμαρτία."

[792] *CL* 5.5

[793] *CL* 13.20

[794] Ibid.

[795] Prétot 2014, 187.

[796] *CL* 4:14 — "σὺ φανερῶς ἐπὶ μετώπῳ σφραγίζου [...] Ποίει δὲ τοῦτο τὸ σημεῖον, ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων· καθήμενος, κοιταζόμενος, ἐξανιστάμενος, λαλῶν, περιπατῶν· ἁπαξαπλῶς ἐν παντὶ πράγματι."

> Let us not them be ashamed to confess the crucified one. Let the cross be our seal made with boldness by our fingers on our foreheads, and on everything; over the bread we eat, and the cups we drink; in our comings in, and goings out; before our sleep, when we lie down and when we rise up; when we are on the road and when we are at rest. Great is that protection! It is a free gift for the poor, without toil for the sick, since its grace is also from God.[797]

The visible sign of the cross was not just for the benefit of other Catholics, but also for their opponents, being an apologetic tool as effective as any spoken word or written work of heresiology:

> [S]et up the faith of the Cross as a trophy against the gainsayers. For when you are going to dispute with unbelievers concerning the Cross of Christ, first make with your hand the sign of Christ's Cross, and the gainsayer will be silenced.[798]

This made Cyril's exiles at the hands of his Arian adversaries particularly problematic. Despite a quarter of a century having passed since the Synod of Nicea, the 'Arian' controversy remained volatile and ever present. Unlike most of the other heresies listed in *CL*, 'Arianism' was an internal threat, with both parties laying claim to the Catholic Church.[799] Control of the same episcopal sees would frequently alternate between orthodox and 'Arian' parties, the incumbent being ousted either by popular opposition or imperial displeasure, as Cyril experienced on no less than three occasions. For him, these exiles would not simply have been the expulsion from a prominent building or city,[800] not simply a loss of face, but the loss of holy sites on which Cyril sought to legitimise his party, and the falling into the hands of his rivals the relic which was the signifier of Catholic identity *par excellence*. [801]

---

[797] *CL* 13:36 — "Μὴ τοίνυν ἐπαισχυνθῶμεν ὁμολογῆσαι τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον. ἐπὶ μετώπου μετὰ παῤῥησίας δακτύλοις ἡ σφραγὶς καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων ὁ σταυρὸς γινέσθω, ἐπὶ ἄρτων βιβρωσκομένων καὶ ἐπὶ ποτηρίων πινομένων, ἐν εἰσόδοις, ἐν ἐξόδοις, πρὸ τοῦ ὕπνου, κοιταζομένοις καὶ διανισταμένοις, ὁδεύουσι καὶ ἠρεμοῦσι. μέγα τὸ φυλακτήριον, δωρεὰν διὰ τοὺς πένητας, χωρὶς καμάτου διὰ τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς, ἐπειδὴ καὶ παρὰ θεοῦ ἡ χάρις."

[798] *CL* 13:22 — "τρόπαιον στῆσον τὴν πίστιν τοῦ σταυροῦ κατὰ τῶν ἀντιλεγόντων. ὅταν γὰρ μέλλῃς περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ συζητεῖν πρὸς ἀπίστους, προαπόστειλον τῇ χειρὶ τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ φιμοῦται ὁ ἀντιλέγων."

[799] That both sides of the argument considered themselves to be Catholic is clearly attested to in Jerome's *Apologia Adversus Libros Rufini* 1.8 where he says that Eusebius "formerly leader of the Arian party […] has proved that Origen was, from his point of view, a Catholic, that is, from ours, an Arian" (trans. *NPNF* 2.1, 90).

[800] Peter Van Nuffelen (2007) argues that Cyril's exiles did not entail expulsion from Jerusalem, but only from the various buildings and institutions its recognised archbishop would have been in possession of.

[801] On the connection between Cyril's promotion of the Cross in the context of the Arian controversy, see 'Cyrille et la crise arienne dans la deuxième moitié du iv^{e} siècle' in Prétot 2014 (194–6).

Cyril's 'Arianism'[802]

Although a recent work introduces Cyril to readers as "the famous anti-Arian bishop",[803] many modern scholars, rather surprisingly, not only overlook Cyril's heresiology, but frequently accuse him of an ambition driven theological flexibility, putting political gain before fidelity to dogma, and happily changing his position whenever it served his interests. Drijvers, for example, asserts that for Cyril, "doctrinal purity was apparently subordinate to the aim of establishing the primacy of Jerusalem."[804] Van Nuffelen, too, despite his criticisms of Drijvers' interpretation of the available biographical material, paints Cyril as a mere opportunist with little regard for doctrine.[805]

Were this indeed the case, Cyril's attitude to those he saw as heretics would have little to teach us about his ecclesiology, or that of the fourth century in general. The problem, though, is that these accusations have no basis in Cyril's own writings or actions. As Doval notes in his review of Drijver's work, "No evidence exists of Cyril's teaching or defending unorthodox positions, nor is there any need to speculate that he did so to protect himself politically."[806] Given that neither Drijver's nor Van Nuffelen's theses rest on this compromised image of Cyril, it seems safe to dismiss this as little more than an eisegetical literary device employed to emphasise Cyril's political motivations. Indeed, Van Nuffelen's view that Cyril's exiles were in fact only exclusion from the Church of the Resurrection while he maintained his own rival congregations elsewhere in the city, seems, if anything, to support the idea that Cyril was not open to doctrinal compromise.

[802] See Gregg 1985.
[803] Van den Broek 2013, 71. On this work, see also Campagnano 1980.
[804] Drijvers 2004, 177. He admits, however, that "from his extant writings no Arian leanings can be found" (Ibid., 34).
[805] Van Nuffelen 2007.
[806] Doval 2006, 125.

In part, questions surrounding Cyril's doctrinal integrity stem from allegations that he was at one point an 'Arian'. Drijvers points to the ninth century *Chronography* of Theophanes, in which he takes great pain to explain why Cyril addressing the 'Arian' emperor Constantius as "most pious" or his failure to use the term *homoousios* in *CL* is not in fact evidence of him harbouring 'Arian' sympathies.[807] Drijvers thinks, rightly in my opinion, that Theophanes doth protest too much, and that he would probably not have gone to such length to emphasise Cyril's orthodoxy were it not suspect in the minds of some of his readers. However, Theodoret's lauding of Cyril as "an earnest champion of the apostolic decrees,"[808] which Drijvers cites in conjunction with Theophanes, is not an unusual feature of hagiographical literature and does not necessarily betray any such concern.[809] An unequivocal attack on Cyril's doctrinal stance comes from Jerome, who, in his *Chronicles*, numbers Cyril among the 'Arians'.[810] Although resident in the Holy Land, Yarnold urges readers to approach Jerome's accusation with caution, noting that his character references are often less than objective, and that his dismissal of Cyril might have more to do with his personal conflict with his successor, John, than with any actual evidence of heterodoxy on Cyril's part. Indeed, Juliette Day notes that Jerome does not repeat his accusations in his *De Viris Illustribus*, written a decade later.[811] In the fourth century, unjustly accusing an opponent of heresy for ecclesio-political gain was, after all, not an uncommon tactic.[812] The ecclesiastical historians Sozomen and Socrates also speak of Cyril as having been a former "Macedonian," a position he was forced to renounce at the Council of Constantinople in 381.[813] As Yarnold points out, they may be accurate insofar as Macedonius

[807] Drijvers 2004, 181. Theophanes. *Chron.* AM 5847; trans. Mango and Scott.
[808] Theodoret. *HE* 2.26.6
[809] Drijvers 20004, 181.
[810] Jerome, *Chron.* (*PL* 27:683). See Yarnold 2000, 4, and Drijvers 2004, 182.
[811] Day 2007a, 17.
[812] Stephens 2015, 221, See chapters 3 and 4 for examples.
[813] Sozomen, *HE* 7.7; Socrates *HE* 5.8. Also condemned at the same council was the doctrine of Apollinarius, who denied the complete humanity of Christ. This controversy appears to have been particularly heated in Jerusalem, so much so that Gregory of Nyssa was sent to the Holy City a year after said council to pacify things. There is nothing in *CL* to suggest Cyril would have sided with the Apollinarian position before his participation in the council (see, for example, Gifford's remarks in *NPNF* 2.07, 234, n.1354), nor any evidence to suggest he

also spoke of the Son as of 'like', rather than 'same', essence with the Father. However, the similarities end there. Cyril repeatedly stresses the divinity and co-equality of the Holy Spirit with the other two persons of the Trinity throughout *CL*, making any subsequent renunciation of a 'Macedonian' position wholly redundant.[814] Indeed, Byzantine hymnography speaks of Cyril as a "radiant star amid the council of the Fathers" who, "with the cords of grace, choked the godless Macedonius, who was insanely blasphemous and openly committed iniquity against the Holy Spirit of God."[815]

It is possible that Cyril may not have felt entirely comfortable with the language at Nicea, or may have avoided it for the sake of unity, and that this may have led others to suspect his orthodoxy.[816] However, given the vigour, some might even say vitriol, with which he writes against his doctrinal opponents, the notion that he would arbitrarily change or hide his allegiance for political gain does not ring true.[817] Instead, rather than any having clear theological basis, both modern and ancient accusations of Arianism appear to come, not from any of Cyril's writings, but by his personal relationships rendering him suspect by association, in particular the circumstances surrounding his consecration as bishop of Jerusalem. According

---

did not agree or understand the decision of the council. A more likely reason for the intervention seems to be Cyril's recent return from eleven years of exile in 379, at which point he probably did not have full support of all his clergy ('La crise Appolinariste à Jérusalem' in Prétot 2014, 197–199). See the articles in Bergjan et al. (2015); particularly relevant is Susanna Elm, 'Apollinarius of Laodicea and Gregory of Nazianzus: The Early Years' (3–18), and Johannes Zachhuber, 'Derivative Genera in Apollinarius of Laodicea' (93–114).

[814] Yarnold 2000, 7.

[815] The entire verse reads as follows: "Τῇ σοφίᾳ τῶν λόγων σου, καὶ τῷ φέγγει τοῦ βίου σου, ὡς ἀστὴρ πολύφωτος ἀξιάγαστε, μέσον Συνόδου διέλαμψας, Πατέρων τὸν ἄθεον, Μακεδόνιον νευραῖς, ἀποπνίξας τῆς χάριτος, εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον, καὶ ζωῶσαν τὰ πάντα θεῖον Πνεῦμα, βλασφημάσαντα ἀφρόνως, καὶ προφανῶς ἀνομήσαντα" (*Μηναίον τοῦ Μαρτίου (3rd Edition)* [Athens: Ἀποστολική Διακονία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 2011], 179).

[816] According to Gwynn (2007), the 'Dedication' Council of Antioch in 431 was for a time considered more important than Nicea. Although the authority of the Nicene canon on Easter seems to have been universally recognized, it is not certain its version of the Creed was treated as a canon. It may be the case that it was initially a statement binding only on the bishops present at the council, rather than a universally binding test of orthodoxy. For a discussion of the role and development of canon law in the fourth century, see Stephens 2015. Some MSS of *CL* actually place the Nicene Creed at the end of 18.22, but this is thought to be a scribal addition. See Yarnold 2000, 88.

[817] As noted by Gregg (1985), "it was that very traditionalism [of Cyril's] which caused him […] to favour a creedal formula (like the creed of Jerusalem) in which the articles, as he put it in *Lecture* 5.12, 'were not composed as seemed good to men, but the most important points collected out of all the scripture make up one complete teaching of faith.' Opposition to Nicea, in the mid-fourth century, did not itself counter-indicate Arianism" (87).

to Socrates and Sozomen, Cyril was appointed to the see following an Arian conspiracy to oust the orthodox Maximus, but while Acacius of Caesarea and Patrophilus Scythopolis, the orchestrators of said coup, would not have chosen Cyril if they did not regard him as one of their own, it would be overly hasty to subsequently infer from this that he was open to doctrinal compromise.

Non-acceptance of what was then the first and only ecumenical council was by no means indicative of heterodoxy, and moreover, non-use of Nicea did not necessarily mean non-acceptance. We should therefore be careful not to impose anachronistic binary categories of 'Nicean' and 'anti-Nicean' on fourth century figures based simply on their terminological preferences. Yarnold notes, for example, how even "such a staunch defender of orthodoxy as Hilary of Poitiers claimed to have had no knowledge of Nicea or the *homoousion* until the eve of his exile in 357."[818] While we normally regard Nicea as the Catholic defeat of Arianism, Sabellianism was for many an equally, if not more, dangerous threat,[819] for which reason many figures of an otherwise staunchly orthodox bent were uneasy with the novel and unbiblical term *homoousios*, which was open to misinterpretation.[820] Others might have been quite happy with the term, but simply felt their existing formulae were perfectly fit for purpose, and thus so no need to employ it. For many, *homoi* meant, not similar, but like. In the same way that two identical objects are like one another in every respect, but are not the same object, so the persons of the Holy Trinity are identical, like one another in every respect, but are not the same person. It is difficult to read Cyril's formulae, that the Son is "like in all things" [*ὅμοιον κατὰ*

[818] Yarnold 2000, 5; Hilary, *de Syn.* 91 (*PL* 10:486).

[819] Canons dealing with the reception of converts, for example, insist on the re-baptism of Sabellians while Arians are merely to be received by chrism (See canon 7 of the First Council of Constantinople). As Rowan Williams (2005, 2) reminds us, despite the way in which even modern study of Arius "has often continued to accept, consciously or not, the image of this heresy as the radically 'Other'," his ideas, although clearly untenable, would not in and of themselves have appeared particularly extreme in comparison to many other non-Catholic trends. See also Niederberger 1923, 39–62.

[820] Wolfson (1957, 15) challenges the notion that a lack of Scriptural warrant was a primary concern for Cyril, given that his preferred term *homoios* is equally absent from the Bible. The closest we get is John 5:19, which refers not to nature but to action: "ἃ γὰρ ἂν ἐκεῖνος ποιῇ, ταῦτα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοίως ποιεῖ".

πάντα] and "in all things like" [*ἐν πᾶσιν ὅμοιος*] the Father, [821] in any other way. Thus understood, the *homoiousion*[822] did not represent a departure or undermining of Nicene orthodoxy, but gave greater precision in expressing both the equality and distinction of the divine persons.[823] As Bindley concludes, Cyril's "teaching embraced all that the ὁμοούσιον stood for."[824] Edwards notes that even Athanasius, whose name is practically a synonym for consubstantiality, was for a time open to compromise, not insisting on use of Nicene terminology for many years after the council.[825] This concern for balance is evident in Cyril's lecture, where he exhorts his listeners to stay well away from either extreme:

> [Christ] did not say, "I and the Father am one," but, "I and the Father are one;" that we should neither separate them, nor work them into a filiopaternal[826] fusion [...]. Neither let us every say, "There was a time, when the Son was not;" nor let us accept filiopaternity [...]. Neither let us, thinking to honour the Son, call Him the Father; nor, supposing to honour the Father, imagine the Son to be some one of the creatures. But let the One Father through the One Son be worshipped, and let not their worship be separated [...]. Let us neither make a separation nor confusion, nor must you ever say that the Son is foreign to the Father, nor accept those who say that the Father is at one time the Father, at another, the Son; for these things are strange and impious, and not the teachings of the Church.[827]

The idea put forth by Drijvers, that Cyril is being deliberately vague by his reluctance to use the term *homoousios*, as well as his failure to mention Arius by name, in order to more easily

---

[821] See *CL* 4:7 and 11:4.

[822] As Barnes (2006) points out, no one used the term *homoiousios* as their own shibboleth, but rather the term "*ὅμιος κατ' οὐσίαν*".

[823] For an analysis of Cyril's use of the word *ὅμοιος*, see Hawk-Reinhard (forthcoming 2017).

[824] Bindley 1917, 599. See also Zachhuber 2000, who argues that the acceptance of the Nicene Creed by former "homoiousians" at the Antiochene Synod of 363 A.D. was not driven by a desire for compromise, as commonly assumed, but by close agreement with Athanasius' Trinitarian thought.

[825] Edwards 2009, 120–8. See also chapter 3 of Steenberg 2009 (104–127, esp. 112).

[826] Lampe (1961, 1426) provides a precedent for this rendering of *υἱοπατορία* by using "Filiopatrian" to designate those who hold to the theological position here described.

[827] *CL* 11:16–18 — "Καὶ πάλιν οὐκ εἶπεν· Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἕν εἰμι· ἀλλ', Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν· ἵνα μήτε ἀπαλλοτριώσωμεν, μήτε συναλοιφὴν υἱοπατορίας ἐργασώμεθα [...] Μήτε λέγωμεν τό, Ἦν ποτε, ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ὁ Υἱός· μήτε υἱοπατορίαν καταδεξώμεθα [...] Μήτε, διὰ τὸ νομίζειν τιμᾶν τὸν Υἱὸν, Πατέρα αὐτὸν ἀναγορεύσωμεν· μήτε, διὰ τὸ τιμᾶν τὸν Πατέρα νομίζειν, ἕν τι τῶν δημιουργημάτων τὸν Υἱὸν ὑποπτεύσωμεν. Ἀλλ' εἷς Πατὴρ, δι' ἑνὸς Υἱοῦ προσκυνείσθω, καὶ μὴ μεριζέσθω ἡ προσκύνησις [...]. Καὶ ἵνα εἴπω συντομώτερον, μήτε χωρίζωμεν, μήτε συναλοιφὴν ἐργαζώμεθα. Καὶ μήτε ἀλλότριόν ποτε τοῦ Πατρὸς εἴπῃς τὸν Υἱόν· μήτε καταδέξῃ τοὺς λέγοντας, τὸν Πατέρα ποτὲ μὲν πατέρα, ποτὲ δὲ υἱὸν εἶναι· ἀλλότρια γὰρ καὶ ἀσεβῆ ταῦτα, καὶ οὐκ Ἐκκλησίας τὰ διδάγματα." For a more detailed analysis of the anti-Arian references in *CL* 11, see the relevant endnotes in Yarnold 2000, 198–9.

While Yarnold rightly sees *CL* 11:14 as being a refutation of the Arian position (Ibid., 199), Cyril's rejection of two principles (*Οὔτε δύο εἰσὶν ἀρχαί· ἀλλὰ κεφαλὴ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ὁ Πατὴρ, μία ἡ ἀρχή*) also seems directed at gnostic dualism.

alter his official position for the sake of political expediency is not consistent with manner in which Cyril speaks. First of all, there is nothing at all vague about his reference to the Arian slogan "There was a time, when the Son was not," which to anyone familiar with the controversy would have been every bit as clear as mentioning Arius by name. Moreover, one would not expect of someone being deliberately ambiguous to refer to the notion that the Son was begotten in time as "the greatest impiety."[828] Cyril even apologises to his listeners for repeating his refutation of the Arian doctrine so frequently, saying "I know I have said these things many times, but they are said so often for your safety."[829] One rarely repeats *ad nauseam* that which one would rather not mention at all, and the reason Cyril gives for this repetition suggests that he is arming his listeners with apologetical arguments with which to defend the orthodox position in their inevitable encounters with Arians.

Drijvers suggested reading of the text paints a very different picture. He cites a comment at the end of *CL 5*, where Cyril, after having required of the candidates that they commit to memory the Symbol of Faith, tells them never to receive any other teaching "even if we ourselves change our minds and contradict what we are now teaching."[830] According to Drijvers, this "remark apparently gave Cyril the freedom to deviate from the orthodox faith that he taught his baptismal candidates, and it seems that he did so although probably not for theological but for political reasons."[831] If this strategy was indeed what Cyril had in mind, it was a rather poor one. For someone seeking political support, encouraging his listeners to put aside any person allegiance for the sake of doctrinal preservation would have been nothing if not counterproductive. However, Drijvers' real error is ignoring that this statement, authored by a man who rarely utters a single sentence without making use of some kind of Scriptural

[828] *CL* 11:8 — "ἀσέβεια μεγίστη."
[829] *CL* 11:13 — "οἶδα πολλάκις ταῦτα εἰρηκὼς, ἀλλὰ πολλάκις ταῦτα εἴρηται ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν ἀσφαλείας."
[830] *CL* 5:12
[831] Drijvers 2000, 183.

reference, is a paraphrase of the words of the Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians, which he proceeds to cite immediately thereafter: "Even if we or an angel from heaven should preach to you a gospel contrary to the one we preached to you, let him be accursed."[832] Far from betraying a disregard for orthodox doctrine, Cyril is here declaring anathema all who choose to stray from it. Given this disregard for context, one cannot help but get the impression that Drijvers is producing evidence to fit an already determined conclusion.

From the evidence available to us, we can only conclude that Cyril took doctrine very seriously indeed, and that his heresiology therefore is key to understanding his ecclesiology and concept of Christian identity.

[832] Gal. 1:8

Chapter 7 — Called but not yet chosen: The catechumenate as a facilitator of catholicity

Occupying a liminal position between the heretics and non-Christians outside the Church and the baptised believers within it were the catechumens.[833] These were more than mere inquirers, having undergone a formal, preliminary stage of initiation in which their commitment to the Catholic Church was declared and examined, yet they were not considered members of the Church proper, being excluded from participation in, and knowledge of, its sacramental life. Augustine, for example, speaks of them as having entered the "great household" (*domo magna*), but only as servants,[834] not sons, and compares them to the members of the people of Israel before the Exodus, who were not given manna to eat until they had passed through the waters of the Red Sea; types of Eucharist and baptism respectively.[835] Gregory the Theologian, Cyril's contemporary in Constantinople, says catechumens are "but on the threshold of piety" and must be baptised in order to "come inside, cross the court, observe the Holy Things, look into the Holy of Holies, and be in company with the Trinity."[836] Much has been written on the form and development of the catechumenate in the fourth century,[837] and to provide a detailed account of this in the present study seems unnecessary. What is of interest here is what the changes to the catechumenate in the fourth century can tell us about the question of membership and Christian identity.

[833] From the verb κατηχέω, which Gavrilyuk (2007, 21) variously defines as "retentir", "faire résonner aux oreilles", "instruire de vive voix" and "indiquer le droit chemin", suggesting that the latter definitions of verbal instruction "plus tard a prévalu dans la pratique chrétienne".

[834] Interestingly, one of the reasons early Christians decided to name their gatherings ἐκκλησία rather than συναγογή was probably that it connoted freedom and liberation, since ἐκκλησία always denoted a gathering of free people in pre-Christian Greek political culture. See Hovorun 2017, 51–52.

[835] Ev. Jo. Tract. 11.4 (*PL* 35:1476).

[836] *Oration* 40:16

[837] See, in particular, Gavrilyuk 2007, Dujarier 1979, Finn 1992b, Harmless 1995. See also Ferguson 1993, in which the articles by Lawrence D. Folkemer ('A Study of the Catechumenate', 244–265), A. Turck ('Aux origines du catéchumènat', 266–278), and Jean Daniélou ('La Catéchèse dans la Tradition patristique', 279–292) are of particular relevance.

Paul Gavrilyuk, in what probably represents the latest comprehensive study on the development on the catechumenate, gives three primary reasons for its formation in the second century: "l'expansion rapide du christianisme dans tout l'Empire romain, la rupture definitive avec le judaïsme, et l'apparition d'écoles hérétiques."[838] This effort to systematise the preparation for baptism continued until it "flourished in its full form" in the third and fourth centuries.[839] As Gavrilyuk further notes, the process of catechism in the second century consisted of two stages:

> d'abord l'entrée dans l'assemblée des catéchumènes après un soigneux entretien préalable, ensuite un deuxième entretien, trois ans plus tard, et l'inscription dans le groupe des candidats au baptême. Les gens sélectionnés de cette facon recevaient alors le baptême après une période de préparation brève mais intense.[840]

His source for the length of the first stage is the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hyppolytus. Even if we take this to be representative for the third century,[841] it seems to be little more than a recommendation, the actual duration being determined on a case-by-case basis:

> Let him who is to be a catechumen be a catechumen for three years; but if any one be diligent, and has a good-will to his business, let him be admitted: for it is not the length of time, but the course of life, that is judged.[842]

For Origen too, the 'course of life' was central to the purpose of the catechumenate. Responding to accusations by Celsus that the Church could not be taken seriously because it invited and took in both the uneducated[843] and the immoral,[844] he stresses that "it is not the same thing to invite those who are sick in soul to be cured, and those who are in health to the knowledge and study of divine things."[845] Only after a period of profound inner transformation,

> when those who have been turned towards virtue have made progress, and have shown that they have been purified by the word, and have led as far as they can a

[838] Gavrilyuk 2007, 65.
[839] Folkemer 1993, 286.
[840] Gavrilyuk 2007, 184. Folkemer (1993, 288) notes how Bingham (1843, 270–4) had presented a fourfold division of the catechumenate, but concludes that the references cited "do not really support his views".
[841] This is by no means certain. See, for example, Johnson 2007, 115–120. Ekenberg (2011, 1019) regards this as a fourth-century addition not supported by any pre-fourth century sources.
[842] *Ap. Trad.* 17, trans. *ANF* 7, 495.
[843] *C. Cels.* 3.44.
[844] Ibid., 3.59.
[845] Ibid., 3.59. Also here, he is likely referring to the two stages of the catechumenate: the first, a time of moral formation, the second, a shorter period of theological instruction.

> better life, then and not before do we invite them to participation in our mysteries. 'For we speak wisdom among them that are perfect.'[846]

In other words, the catechumenate was essential to preserving the twofold catholicity of the Church, allowing it, on the one hand, to universally call all people to salvation, breaking through all social borders and boundaries,[847] all the while, on the other hand, keeping its own mysterological boundaries intact in order to preserve unchanged and undefiled the fullness (catholicity) of faith and praxis, "by which it catholically treats and heals every sort of sin."[848]

Celsus' criticism and Origen's reply also highlight the need for keeping up appearances, which for the early Christian Church was essential as its key missionary strategy lay not in argument but in practice. As we saw in chapter 3, the claim to moral superiority was central to the Christian critique and rejection of pagan myth, thought, and society. Salvation may have been by faith,[849] but faith was known by its fruits,[850] and a faith not demonstrated by works was dead.[851] Jesus had given his disciples a simple missionary strategy, "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven,"[852] one we see frequently referred to in the Pauline and Petrine epistles, where upstanding conduct and obedience to authority is a sure way to convert the non-believers around you.[853] Indeed, even today, when asked to demonstrate the indemonstrable, Jesus' resurrection from the dead, one of the primary arguments put forth by modern Christian apologists remains the way in which it was attested to by the behaviour of those who claimed to have witnessed it.[854] Conversely, as Cyril explains in his commentary on the Lord's Prayer,[855] failure of the faithful

[846] Ibid.
[847] Cf *CL* 18:27
[848] *CL* 18.23
[849] Eph. 2:8
[850] Matt. 7:16
[851] James 2:14–26
[852] Matt. 5:16
[853] See in particular Rom. 13, Col. 3, Eph. 5–6, 1 Peter 2–3.
[854] See, for example, Wright 2003 and Swinburne 2003.
[855] *MC* 5. "Hallowed be Thy name" is understood to mean that others will glorify the name of God by Christians "doing things worthy of holiness."

to live up to their calling was a primary cause for others to reject the Gospel: "The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you."[856]

Although Christian apologetical materials are both early and abundant, one finds precious little on the subject of evangelism or mission,[857] and the evidence seems to suggest that the rapid spread of Christianity in the early centuries was in large part due to people observing the transformative power of Christian faith in the lives of its adherents. Justin Martyr, for example, though certainly no stranger to anti-Greek polemic, cites the "wonder" and intrigue aroused by the conduct of Christians, their "strange patience" when wronged, the honesty with which they conducted their business, their meekness and kindness, as the reason so many had abandoned "the ways of violence and tyranny" and sought membership of the Christian Church.[858] The *Epistle to Diognetus* likewise highlights that the distinctiveness of the Christian community consists not in their customs, language, or dress, but in their kindness, self-constraint, generosity, and willingness to endure insults and punishment.[859] Augustine, commenting on a passage in the Song of Songs — *Your teeth are like a flock of sheep*[860] —, rather delightfully describes the saints as "the teeth of the Church", who by their exemplary conduct and holy manner of life "tear men away from their errors, and bringing them into the Body of the Church, with all their harshness softened down, just as if they had been torn off and masticated by teeth."[861]

Cyril likewise appeals to the orderliness and moral superiority of the Catholic Church as a demonstrable proof of its claims:

> What has the dignity of the Church to do with the abomination of the Manichees? Here there is order, here there is discipline, here there is dignity, here there is purity:

[856] *MC* 5; Rom. 2:24.
[857] Kreider 2016, 10.
[858] 1 *Apol*. 16.2–3
[859] *Diogneus* 5–7 (Holmes 2007, 701–7).
[860] Song 4:2
[861] *Doct. Christ.* 2.5.7 (*PL* 34:38), trans. *NPNF* 1.2, 1211.

> here even to look upon a woman to lust after her[862] is condemnation. Here there is marriage with dignity, here there is patient continence, here there is virginity in honour equal to the Angels: here there is partaking of food with thanksgiving, here there is gratitude to the Creator of the world. Here the Father of Christ is worshipped: here are taught fear and trembling before the one who sends the rain: here we glorify the one who makes the thunder and the lightning.[863]

By keeping converts to Christianity at arm's length until they had reached an adequate level of moral conduct and integrity, the Catholic Church was able to preserve the very thing that had attracted them in the first place: its power to heal and transform, which Cyril identifies as one of the hallmarks of its claims to catholicity.[864] The catechumenate thus sought to exclude, not only to protect, but ultimately to include. These, I believe, are the primary causes for the changes to the catechumenate witnessed in the post-Constantinian era.

Collapse or expansion?

Michel Dujarier, in his short but seminal work *A history of the Catechumenate*,[865] paints a picture of the virtual collapse of this vital transformative period in the fourth century. While the initial growth of the catechumenate in the third century had led to the development of a rather rigid process, its unprecedented expansion following the conversion of Constantine had resulted in a noticeable relaxation of discipline, and "quality unfortunately gave way to quantity."[866] Gone was the initial stage of scrutiny,[867] and most of those entering the

[862] Matt. 5:28

[863] *CL* 6.35 — "τί τὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας σεμνὸν, πρὸς τὸ [τῶν] Μανιχαίων μυσαρόν; Ὧδε τάξις, ὧδε ἐπιστήμη, ὧδε σεμνότης, ὧδε ἀγνεία· ὧδε καὶ τὸ ἐμ βλέψαι γυναικὶ πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν, κατάγνωσις. Ὧδε γάμος σεμνότητος, ὧδε ἐγκρατείας ὑπομονὴ, ὧδε παρθενίας ἰσάγγελον ἀξίωμα· ὧδε βρωμάτων μετοχὴ μετὰ εὐχαριστίας· ὧδε εὐγνωμοσύνη πρὸς τὸν τῶν ὅλων δημιουργόν. Ὧδε ὁ Πατὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ προσκυνεῖται· ὧδε φόβος καὶ τρόμος διδάσκεται τοῦ βρέχοντος· ὧδε τῷ βροντῶντι καὶ ἀστράπτοντι δοξολογίαν ἀναπέμπομεν."

[864] *CL* 18.23. McDonald (1998, 99) remarks how Cyril "sublimate[s] moral teaching into apologetics and dogmatics, so that the end product of the catechumenate is a neophyte whose sincerity is grounded in the orthodox faith which he is confident will produce virtuous behavior in stark contrast to that of the errorists".

[865] Dujarier 1979.

[866] Ibid., 79.

[867] According to the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus (15 and 16), in addition to establishing the intentions of those wishing to join the catechumenate, they were also asked about things such as their marital status, whether they were slaves (in which case, permission from their master was required), and their employment, with particular

catechumenate were no longer interested in spiritual growth, culminating in their union with Christ in baptism, but were interested only in the social benefits afforded to them by formal affiliation with the Catholic Church. "What the 'candidates' sought to obtain," he asserts, "was simply the title of 'Christian'; they had no true desire for baptism."[868] J. Patout Burns subsequently argues that as the social boundaries between Church and wider society became increasingly blurred "the social identity of a Christian was regularly established by rituals other than baptism." "Baptism, therefore, ceased to function as the ritual of a radical border crossing from one society to another",[869] while "the catechumenate was the customary status of the nominal Christian,"[870] according to Frederic Van der Meer. That the title 'Christian' preceded mysteriological initiation is made clear by Canon 7 of Constantinople I when it says of the reception of certain heretics, "On the first day we make them Christians; on the second, catechumens;[871] on the third, we exorcise them […] then we baptize them."[872]

Ramsey MacMullen, in some respects an apple not far fallen from the tree of Gibbon, regards conversion in the fourth century on the whole as little more than an outward change of allegiance, "conversion known only by external signs."[873] He cites such examples as the hoard of Arab tribesmen converted to Christianity by the wonderworking of Symeon the Stylite,[874] who arrived, as Theodoret records, "in companies, two or three hundred at the same time, sometimes even a thousand, disown[ing] with shouts their ancestral imposture; and smashing

occupations being impediments to admission. Similar conditions were imposed on those entrusted with the task of instructing them. See Gavrilyuk 2007 (99–106) and Filias 2009 (298–299).

[868] Dujarier 1979, 81.

[869] Burns 1993a, 44.

[870] Van der Meer and Mohrmann 1959, 357.

[871] The word 'catechumens' here corresponds to what Cyril calls *φωτιζόμενοι* — i.e. candidates for baptism.

[872] *NPNF* 2.14, 389.

We cannot be certain to what extent Cyril himself was comfortable with this nomenclature. He says to the *φωτιζόμενοι,* "You are called Christian; be tender of that Name," [*CL* 10:20] but whether he calls them this in view of their impending baptism, or whether he would extend use of the title to the general catechumenate is unclear. Also in his introductory remark preceding his first lecture he warns the reader not to let it fall into the hands "of catechumens, nor of any others who are not Christian." Again, whether he is here grouping catechumens with, or distinguishing them from non-Christians is unclear.

[873] MacMullen 1984, 52.

[874]Ibid., 2.

in front of this great luminary the idols they had venerated and renouncing the orgies of Aphrodite."[875] "There is no chance whatsoever," he opines, "that those among them who touched the bishop thereafter returned to the desert without returning to their desert ways — no chance that, in renouncing their little household icons, they also renounced the pillaging of their enemies and the avenging of their own dead."[876] Making the argument that the Church itself accepted this form of superficial conversion, he suggests that "it would be arbitrary to insist on a stricter definition of 'Christian' than did the church itself."[877]

The *Letter On the Rebuilding of the Temple* provides us with a most appropriate example of the kind of outward conversion alluded to by MacMullen. Having seen the synagogue doors thrown open by a mighty burst of flame which consumed many of the Jews gathered outside,

> the entire populace, Jew and Christian alike, cried with one voice, saying 'There is but one God, one Christ, who is victorious'; and the entire people rushed off and tore down the idols and (pagan) altars that were in the city, glorifying and praising Christ, and confessing that He is the Son of the Living God. And they drove out the demons of the city,[878] and the Jews, and the whole city received the sign of baptism, Jews as well as pagans, all together, so that we thought that there was not a single person left in the city who had not received the sign or mark of the living Cross in heaven.[879]

We find a similar account presented in the *Letter to Constantius*, in which Cyril describes how

> the whole population [of Jerusalem], overcome with joy mingled with fear of the heavenly vision [of the luminous cross], hastened to the Holy Church: young and old, people of both sexes and every age, even to the maidens closeted in their homes, local and foreign Christians, as well as visiting pagans — all with one accord, and as with a single voice, extolling Christ Jesus our Lord, the Only-begotten Son of God, the worker of wonders. For were they not the sensible recipients of an object lesson that the holy doctrine of the Christians 'is not in the persuasive words of wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit and of power,'[880] a doctrine not announced only by men, but now attested by God from Heaven?[881]

[875] Price 1985, 166–7.
[876] MacMullen 1984, 3.
[877] Ibid., 52
[878] See Johannessen 2016.
[879] v.6, trans. Brock 1977, 275.
[880] 1 Cor. 2:4
[881] *Ad Const.* 4, trans. McCauley and Stephenson 1970, 232–3.

It is interesting to note the connection he makes between catechesis and miracles, regarding the latter as the seal and demonstrable proof of the veracity of the former.

Dujarier further argues that this nominalism among catechumens, demonstrated by such conversion stories, in turn "triggered a second and inverse deviation: the indefinite postponement of baptism."[882] Thus, the structured three-year period mentioned by Hippolytus in the third century had in the fourth become a largely unstructured nominal membership, in many cases beginning in early infancy and ending only at one's deathbed. A structured programme of catechesis was comprised solely of the second stage of the catechumenate, the intensive period of doctrinal instruction immediately before baptism, meaning that catechumens "were to accomplish in a few weeks the vital transformation that, in the preceding century, required two to three years".[883] The indifference of many catechumens "constituted a scandal that was highly amusing to the pagans" and, as a consequence, "bishops hurried the catechumens into baptism, with all the attendant dangers of formalism."[884]

There are a number of problems with this picture of helplessness and inevitable decline. While Cyril's letter presents superficial conversion in a style very similar to Theodoret, there can be no doubt as to the rigour with which he vetted his candidates prior to enrolment, and the importance he placed on catechesis. Indeed, all the authors MacMullen immediately cites in support of his argument — Augustine, Theodoret, Gregory — are catechists. His words regarding the strictness of the Church's definition of 'Christian' are therefore at the very least in need of clarification. While the Church clearly saw this form of conversion as legitimate and genuine, not to mention a useful propaganda tool, its acceptance of it was not wholesale or unqualified. Whether Symeon's Ishmaelites failed to renounce pillage and vendetta upon their

[882] Dujarier 1979, 81.
[883] Ibid., 98.
[884] Ibid., 84.

return home, as MacMullen asserts, is unknown to us. What is certain, however, is that bishops like Cyril would under no circumstance admit such a person to baptism were this the case, as we shall see below, both from his own words and first-hand descriptions of the vetting process.[885] Therefore, whatever such a conversion may have meant, it did not suffice for membership in the mysteriological body of the Church. Such a person might bear the title 'Christian', but would remain firmly outside the locked doors of the Eucharistic assembly.

Returning once again to Burns, what the phenomenon of external conversion shows us is that, while the "identity of a Christian was regularly established by rituals other than baptism," bishops like Cyril strove to maintain, and even heighten, the importance of baptism as a form of radical border crossing, a dividing line separating the external and superficial from the internal and sincere.

Dujarier's assumptions about the length of the pre-Nicene catechumenate are also problematic. As already mentioned above, *Apostolic Tradition* 17 indicates that the duration of the first stage of the catechumenate was likely left to the discretion of the local bishop, and it is not at all clear how long it would have been in practice for most people. Moreover, "this single reference is," according to Johnson, "not corroborated anywhere in liturgical texts before the late-fourth century *Apostolic Constitutions* (ca. 381). And the early-fourth century *Canons of Hyppolytus* 12, clearly based on some version of the *Apostolic Tradition* 17, mentions only an exclusive forty-day baptismal preparation period."[886] The Council of Elvira, Johson notes, provides the earliest parallel with *Apostolic Tradition* 17, mentioning a two-year catechumenate, but also mandates that it be postponed a further one to three years (canons 4 and 73) — even indefinitely (canon 73) — should the need arise.[887] As such, Johnson considers

[885] Wilkinson 1999, 161–3.
[886] Johnson 2007, 117–18.
[887] Ibid., 118.

it more likely that mention of a three-year catechumenate is in fact a fourth-century addition to the *Apostolic Tradition* rather than an insight into standard third-century practice.[888] A more recent work by Geōrgios N. Filias again takes Hippolytus as representative of third-century practice, and contends that the Council of Elvira's two-year catechumenate simply signifies its end, but does so without reference to Johnson or other recent discussions.[889] The point remains: our ignorance of third-century practice simply does not allow us to speak confidently about a 'reduction in discipline' in the fourth.

Moreover, the pre-Nicene provisions for the indefinite prolonging of the catechumenate would suggest that this was not merely down to deterioration of motives, as Dujarier asserts. While it would be naïve to suggest that nominalism played no part whatsoever, or that one can attribute the deferral off baptism to a single cause, I would concur with Gavrilyuk's assertion that the evidence points in quite another direction:

> Pour Michel Dujarier, on diffère le baptême parce que la ferveur des catéchumènes s'est refroidie et la discipline ecclésiale affaiblie. Mais on peut penser au contraire que c'est précisément parceque l'Église n'avait en rien abaissé ses exigences morales que beaucoup de païens sympathisants du christianisme, profondément conscients de la responsabilité qu' entraînerait leur future situation de baptisés, n'osaient pas faire le pas décisif vers la fontaine baptismale.[890]

It was on account of a heightened, not relaxed, emphasis on the decisiveness of baptism as representing a radical, ontological change, that less committed catechumens chose to defer what they simply did not feel ready for. As Cyril makes clear to his listeners :

> We may not receive Baptism twice or thrice; otherwise it might be said, 'Although I have failed once, I shall set it right a second time,' whereas if you fail once, the thing cannot be set right.[891]

[888] Ibid.

[889] Filias 2009, 299, n.34.

[890] Gavrilyuk 2007, 188. Drijvers (2004) agrees — "One of the reasons for postponing baptism undoubtedly was the strict moral conduct required of baptized Christians" — yet cites only Dujarier's point about insufficient motivation (87, n.91).

[891] *PC* 7 — "Οὐκ ἔνι δὶς καὶ τρὶς λαβεῖν τὸ λουτρόν· ἐπεὶ ἦν εἰπεῖν· Ἅπαξ ἀποτυχὼν, δεύτερον κατορθῶ· ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅπαξ ἀποτύχῃς, ἀδιόρθωτον τὸ πρᾶγμα."

Sincere belief in baptism as an expedient for the remission of sins, and an acute awareness of the fact that there would be no second chances thereafter, is, in my opinion, a far more likely explanation for than the one put forth by Dujarier. The frequent exhortations of various Church Fathers against this deferral[892] are undoubtedly born of the same concern for salvation, not simply because it was embarrassment.[893] Nor should these exhortations be understood apart from corresponding exhortations to moral improvement. They represent, not a lowering of standards, but a positive affirmation of the new manner of life to which the baptised are called. There are clear parallels between the deferral of baptism by catechumens and the practice of infrequent participation in the Eucharist among the baptised.[894] Again, this arose not out of indifference, but for fear of communing unto condemnation as per the sterns warnings of both Scripture[895] and ecclesiastical authorities, and again, the episcopal exhortations to more frequent participation represented not a relaxation of practice, but were a call for the baptised to live up to the seriousness of their calling.

As for entry to the catechumenate, Gavrilyuk suggests the falling away of the initial vetting process one saw in the third century was due to the end of persecution. [896] One should also take into account the internal causes for the growth of the catechumenate, for example Rodney Stark's suggestions that Christianity's popularity among women, due to the comparatively high status afforded to them by the Church, led to higher birth rates among

[892] For a comprehensive list, see 'The Delay of Baptism' in Ferguson 2009 (617–33).

[893] As Hanula Gergeley (2013) notes, Cyril does not seem to express any concern about the postponement of baptism (107), but this tells us very little given that he is addressing himself to individuals already enrolled for baptism, which makes it unreasonable to expect mention of the issue in *PC, CL* or *MC*. Stephenson does cautiously suggests that Cyril's call for Constantius to add knowledge onto "the foundation of his previous faith" might be a hint that the time had come for the emperor to accept baptism (*Ad Const.* 5), but the text allows for little more than speculation.

[894] See, for example, Canon 80 of the Quinisext Council (Nicodemus 2003, 290); Canon 11 of Sardica; Chrysostom's *In Ep. Eph.* 3.4–5 (*PG* 62:28–30) and *In Mt. Hom.* 82.5 (*PG* 58:744); John Cabasilas' *Lit. Interp.* 42 (*PG* 150:457D–460A).

[895] 1 Cor. 11:29 — For anyone who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgment on himself..

[896] Gavrilyuk 2007, 184.

Christians than their pagan neighbours.[897] These factors would have made a pre-catechumenal vetting process both unnecessary and impracticable, without indicating any fundamental change in attitude on the part of the Church. Rather than speaking of the collapse of the catechumenate proper in the fourth century, I would instead suggest that we speak of its expansion. As we shall see, far from falling away due to the pressures of the post-Constantinian situation, the catechumenate became an essential tool for bishops seeking to tackle them.

The Catechumenate as the frontier of the Church

The making of catechumens involved such things as the performance of formal prayers, the laying on of hands, signing with the sign of the cross, and the tasting of salts, as Augustine — a catechumen from childhood — makes mention of in his *Confessions*.[898] By these rites a person was granted access to the 'Liturgy of the Word' at which they heard the Scriptures and received instruction in the Christian faith in the form of sermons, often addressing them directly,[899] after which prayers would be read over them before they were dismissed. This quite substantial participation in Church life would suggest that they did not see themselves as complete outsiders. As will be mentioned in chapter 9, Firmilian of Caesarea posits that heretics who were received into the Catholic Church without re-baptism should be numbered among the catechumens. It must, then, be possible to speak of some form of membership even before baptism. The question is what kind of membership?

Unlike a definite period of preparation of only a few years, a more open-ended catechumenate allowed for the creation of formal, yet liminal, membership of the institutional Church for those who were unsuited or unprepared for incorporation into the Church proper,

[897] Stark 1996. See also Johnson 2007, 116.
[898] Augustine, *Confessions*, 1,1,11.
[899] See, for example, Harmless 1995, 56–7.

the Body of Christ. In other words, by drawing a distinction between the Church as a mysteriological ontology and the Church as a sociological reality, fourth century developments thus reflect a shrewd answer to the question of how, with imperial recognition, the Church could be in the world, but not of it.[900] Thus, while nominal membership of the catechumenate may have caused a blurring of the lines between the Church and wider society, I would argue that the catechumenate is precisely what allowed baptism to remain the radical border-crossing from one ontological reality to another. In his 2017 work, *Scaffolds of the Church*, Cyril Hovorun presents an interesting attempt to reconcile the binary, exclusive ecclesiology of Cyprian of Carthage with the seemingly implicit acknowledgement of sacramental grace outside the Church's canonical boundaries over subsequent centuries.[901] He argues that the Roman Empire at the time of Cyprian "did not have borders; it had *frontiers* that constantly moved. These frontiers were supposed to expand as far as possible and had to include as much land and as many people as possible. The frontiers were not lines but territories,"[902] and within these sometimes vast and populous frontiers were people who were neither barbarians nor fully covered by the protection of the *Pax Romana*. When Cyprian denies the possibility of sacramental grace outside the boundaries of the Church, what he really means, accordingly to Hovorun, is that there is no salvation beyond its frontiers, while the ecclesiastical status of those within the frontier-territory cannot be entirely discounted.

While I remain to be convinced that this image of frontiers is what Cyprian had in mind when speaking of Church membership, I do think it provides us with a most apt description of

[900] Cf. John 17.

[901] He mentions, for example, Georges Florovsky's assertion that, "Whatever Cyprian said about the unity of the Church and mystery can be and should be accepted. However, one should not draw the line of the Church body only through the dots of canon law" (Florovsky 1934, 17), but considers him unsuccessful in his various attempts to reconcile these two elements (Hovorun 2017, 177). See also Cohen 2007; Stavrou 2013.

By "implicit acknowledgement of sacramental grace outside the Church's canonical boundaries", I refer, for example, to the refusal to re-baptise or re-ordain converts from another Christian confession (a *de facto* acknowledgement of said confession's true baptism and ordination), even if official statements on the question of validity remain ambiguous or negative.

[902] Hovorun 2017, 179.

the fourth-century catechumenate. The catechumenate represented a steadily expanding frontier-territory surrounding the Church. Those within it did not have the salvific benefit of membership — they were not yet citizens of heaven[903] — but, as non-mysteriological participants and bearers of the name 'Christian', nor were they numbered with the Greeks, Jews, and heretics beyond it. The size of this territory would increase or decrease depending on the rate at which those within it were brought into the Church proper through baptism, a factor in turn dependant on the preparedness of said people for such membership. The expansion of the frontiers necessarily precedes the expansion of membership, but the two need not correlate. It is Dujarier's failure to see the catechumenate as a frontier, as a buffer zone, and not merely a period of structured formation, that causes him to draw such pessimistic conclusions from what is an otherwise fair description of the problems faced.[904]

The problem of the 'Second Church', to borrow the title of Ramsey McMullen's 2009 volume on popular Christianity from the 2nd to the 4th century,[905] — namely, the discrepancy between official teaching and popular practice and opinion — had existed since the beginning; and that it heightens following the legalisation of Christianity is unquestionable. To get an understanding of the chasm that in many cases existed between official and popular religion in the fourth century, one need only look at the myriad of modern examples of the same phenomenon, such as the discrepancy between the official condemnation of artificial contraceptives by the Roman Catholic Church and their near universal use by its members.[906] While the broadening of the first stage of the catechumenate represented a managed response to the new challenges facing the fourth-century Church, so a corresponding effort to develop

[903] Cf. Phil. 3:20.

[904] Doval (2001a, 29–35) provides a brief overview of the fourth-century developments and challenges to the catechumenate, generally reiterating the conclusions made by Dujarier.

[905] MacMullen 2009.

[906] See *Catechism of the Catholic Church* 3.2.2.6.2370. I use this example only because it is one frequently surveyed and cited.

the second stage also became necessary to "safeguard the requirements for admission to baptism."[907] If, as Filias remarks, "the 4th century could be characterised as the golden age of catechesis", [908] this is the result of the Church seeking to preserve the integrity of baptism as an initiation into a new and ontologically different way of life at a time "when authentic conversion and properly motivated desire to enter the Christian community could no longer be assumed on the part of the candidates."[909]

Vetting and enrolment

Prefacing the second stage of the catechumenate was a rigorous vetting process before candidates could have their names enrolled for baptismal preparation, at which point they, now among the *φωτιζόμενοι*, would be counted worthy to hear expositions of the basic doctrines of the Catholic Church contained in the Creed.[910] As the works of Cyril are silent as to many of the formalities which surround his lectures, our source for these processes is the *Peregrinatio,* or *Itenarium,* of the pilgrim Egeria — also Aetheria — who visited the Levant between 381 and 384.[911]

> Names must be given in before the first day of Lent, which means that a presbyter takes down all the names before the start of the eight weeks for which Lent lasts here […]. Once the priest has all the names, on the second day of the Lent at the start of the eight weeks, the bishop's chair is placed in the middle of the Great Church, the Martyrium, the presbyters sit in chairs on either side of him, and all the clergy stand. Then one by one the ones who are seeking baptism are brought up, men coming with their fathers and women with their mothers. As they come in one by one, the bishop asks their neighbours questions about them: 'Is this person leading a good life? Does he respect his parents? Is he a drunkard or a boaster?' He asks about all the serious human vices. And if his inquiries show him that someone has not committed any of these misdeeds, he himself puts down his name; but if someone is guilty he is told to go away, and the bishop tells him that he is to amend

[907] Dujarier 1979, 97.
[908] Filias 2009, 301. Translation mine.
[909] Johnson 2007, 119.
[910] Cf. *PC* 1.
[911] Wilkinson 1999, 1. Egeria's identity is explored in an article by Hagith Sivan (1988). In addition to establishing a likely Spanish origin, Sivan casts doubts on previous assumptions that she had monastic or aristocratic affiliations, suggesting that she was instead a layperson of the urban bourgeoisie. What is interesting is her concluding argument that pilgrimage created an opportunity for Christians of different social classes to unite in a common enterprise (Ibid., 72). Pilgrimage, and therefore Jerusalem, thus represents a unifying phenomenon on the vertical plane as well as the horizontal.

> his ways before he may come to the font. He asks the men and the women the same questions. But it is not too easy for a visitor to come to baptism if he has no witnesses who are acquainted with him.[912]

Filias makes the point that the need for sponsors, or godparents, became particularly acute in the fourth century, as the numbers of catechumens made it impossible for the official representatives of the Church to judge the disposition or oversee the progress of each individual catechumen.[913] That Chrysostom calls them not only *ἀναδεχόμενοι*, signifying their role as persons responsible for receiving the candidate into the Church, but also gives them the title 'spiritual father' (*πατήρ πνευματικός*),[914] would suggest the witnesses had gained a rather intimate personal knowledge of the candidates prior to enrolment. Dujarier is therefore right to suggest that catechumens "were not closely supervised by the authorities in structured groups,"[915] but the importance given to the supervision of sponsors and the ease with which candidates are turned away on the basis of negative witness accounts seem to completely contradict his assertion that the "Church seemed to be more preoccupied with 'pushing' spiritless candidates to baptism" than with genuine conversion.[916]

Of course, the rigour with which candidates were examined did not prevent some less suitable candidates from slipping through the cracks, which is why we see continued exhortations to moral conversion and the laying aside of vice even after the candidates had been formally approved.[917] Cyril himself acknowledges that many of his listeners had "come on another pretext", such as paying court to a Christian woman or to please a Christian master.[918] As I argue in the next chapter, certain changes in liturgical emphasis and rules regarding the appointment of neophytes to influential positions served to mitigate the effects

[912] *Pereg.* 45.1–4, trans. Wilkinson 1999, 161–63.
[913] Filias 2009, 308.
[914] John Chrysostom, *Cat.* Stav. 2.9 (*SC* 50, 138). See Gavrilyuk 2007, 225–26.
[915] Dujarier 1979, 94. See also id. 1962.
[916] Dujarier 1979, 94. This is despite his concession that the examination described by Egeria "apparently was carefully done" (Ibid., 99).
[917] Ibid., 94–100.
[918] *PC* 4. See also Harmless 1995, 80–81.

of this unwanted but inevitable phenomenon. MacMullen acknowledges the fact that, far from being satisfied with a mere increase in number, figures such as "Saint Ambrose and, later, Saint Augustine devote a good deal of attention to insincere conversion."[919] Eusebius famously deplored "the unspeakable deceit on the part of those who slipped into the Church and adopted the false façade of the Christian name."[920] That Cyril shared these sentiments is immediately apparent from his opening words in *PC* and the emphasis he places on the intentions of the individual believer. He cites the example of Simon the sorcerer, who, when he came "to the washing […] was baptised, but," on account of his unworthiness and faithlessness, "was not enlightened. He covered his body with water, but did not enlighten his heart with the Spirit. His body went down and came up; but his soul was not buried with Christ, nor raised with him."[921] Dujarier, too, admits that the development of the Lenten catechumenate was the result of bishops like Cyril drawing "upon traditional doctrine according to which salvation is only granted in the sacrament to those having faith and living in conformity to that faith."[922]

It is also true, as Filias points out, that "Chrysostom admits as candidates for baptism categories of people not admitted by earlier texts, such as the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus of Rome. He therefore bears witness to a change in the Church's stance."[923] But should we infer from this change that the Church, at least implicitly, no longer saw baptism as the radical border-crossing it previously had been? I would argue that the bishops of the fourth century use this change to assert quite the opposite. It is precisely because baptism is a radical border-crossing, from one ontological reality to another, and not merely a formal affirmation of an existing one, that Cyril is able to welcome his insincere converts: "[I] receive you, as one who

[919] MacMullen 1984, 57.
[920] *Vita Const.* 4.54.2, trans. Cameron and Hall 1999, 174.
[921] *PC* 2 — "Προσῆλθέ ποτε καὶ Σίμων τῷ λουτρῷ ὁ μάγος· ἐβαπτίσθη, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐφωτίσθη· καὶ τὸ μὲν σῶμα ἔβαψεν ὕδατι, τὴν δὲ καρδίαν οὐκ ἐφώτισε Πνεύματι· καὶ κατέβη μὲν τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἀνέβη· ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ οὐ συνετάφη Χριστῷ, οὐδὲ συνηγέρθη."
[922] Dujarier 1979, 85.
[923] Filias 2016, 309–10. Translation mine. See John Chrysostom, *Cat.* Stav. 1.25.

has indeed come with a wrong intention, but will be saved by a good hope."[924] He devotes the entirety of his second lecture to the subject of repentance and forgiveness, and its placement between the first and third lectures — both focusing on the transformative power of baptism — makes it clear that he sees this forgiveness as being granted through the font. No sin is too great; no past wrong need be a cause for despair. For

> great is the baptism which is set before you. It is a ransom to captives; the forgiveness of sins; the death of sin; the rebirth of the soul; the garment of light; the indissoluble holy seal; the chariot to heaven; the luxury of paradise; a foretaste of the kingdom; the gift of adoption.[925]

Whatever status had been gained by entrance into the catechumenate, baptism alone represented a clean break with the past and a new beginning. The pre-baptismal preparation is, according to Cyril, not in itself a prerequisite for the ontological change inherent in baptism, but its purpose is rather to adequately equip the newly enlightened believer for this radically new way of life:[926]

> Show through ascesis that your heart is innerved. Cleanse your vessel, in order to receive the gift fully. For remission of sins is given equally to all, but the communion of the Holy Spirit is given according to the faith of each. If you have done little, you shall receive little; but if you have laboured much, the reward is great.[927]

He thus exhorts his listeners to make good use of their final few weeks before baptism. They are to confess their sins and regularly attend exorcisms, catechism, and church services, such attendance being "required by the clergy".[928] He also insists that these things become yet more important after baptism, and issues a stark warning to those who fail to diligently observe them:

> For if it was good before the reception, then it must surely be good after the bestowal. If it was appropriate for you to be watered and tended before you were

[924] *PC* 5 — "καταδέχομαί σε, κακῇ προαιρέσει μὲν ἐλθόντα, ἐλπίδι δὲ ἀγαθῇ σωθησόμενον."

[925] *PC* 16 — "Μέγα, τὸ προκείμενον βάπτισμα· αἰχμαλώτοις λύτρον· ἁμαρτημάτων ἄφεσις· θάνατος ἁμαρτίας· παλιγγενεσία ψυχῆς· ἔνδυμα φωτεινόν· σφραγὶς ἁγία ἀκατάλυτος· ὄχημα πρὸς οὐρανόν· παραδείσου τρυφή· βασιλείας πρόξενον· υἱοθεσίας χάρισμα."

[926] On this, see Gergeley 2013, 101–7.

[927] *CL* 1.5 — "δεῖξον ἐν ἀσκήσει, τῆς καρδίας σου τὸ νενευρωμένον. Καθάρισόν σου τὸ ἄγγος, ἵνα πλείονα δέξῃ τὴν χάριν. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἄφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἐξ ἴσου δίδοται τοῖς πᾶσιν· ἡ δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου κοινωνία, κατ' ἀναλογίαν δεδώρηται τῆς ἑκάστου πίστεως. Ἐὰν ὀλίγα κάμῃς, ὀλίγα λαμβάνεις· ἐὰν δὲ ἐργάσῃ πολλὰ, πολὺς ὁ μισθός."

[928] *CL* 1.5–6

> grafted in,[929] is it not much more right after planting? […] if you then abide in the vine, you shall increase as a fruitful branch; but if you do not abide, you shall be utterly consumed by the fire.[930]

The Lenten catechumenate

Following enrolment, Egeria continues her description with details of how the catechetical programme unfolded during the forty days[931] of Lent.[932] Having first attended the abovementioned exorcisms first thing in the morning, the *φωτιζόμενοι* enter the Martyrium and sit in a circle around the bishop's chair. The Bishop proceeds to give a three-hour long lecture, from six to nine in the morning — that is, during the interval between the two divine offices:

> His subject is God's Law; during the forty days he goes through the whole Bible, beginning with Genesis, and first relating the literal meaning of each passage, then interpreting its spiritual meaning. He also teaches them at this time all about the resurrection and the faith.
>
> And this is called 'catechesis'. After five weeks' teaching they receive the Creed, whose content he explains article by article in the same way as he explained the Scriptures, first literally and then spiritually. Thus all the people in these parts are able to follow the Scriptures when they are read in church, since there has been teaching on all the Scriptures from six to nine in the morning all through Lent, three hours' catechesis a day.[933]

There has been much debate among liturgical scholars as to how one might reconcile Egeria's description of a seven-week period of daily discussion of both Scripture and dogma — the Creed not being divulged until the fifth week — with Cyril's set of eighteen lectures, fifteen of

---

[929] Cf. Rom. 11

[930] *CL* 1.6, 4 — "Εἰ γὰρ πρὶν λάβῃς, καλὸν τὸ γινόμενον, ἆρα οὐχὶ καὶ μετὰ τὴν δόσιν καλόν; Εἰ πρὶν ἐγκεντρισθῇς, ἀσφαλὲς τὸ ποτίζεσθαι, καὶ γεωργεῖσθαι· μετὰ τὴν φυτείαν ἆρ' οὐχὶ πολὺ κάλλιον; [...] ἐὰν μὲν ἐπιμείνῃς ἐν τῇ ἀμπέλῳ, αὔξῃ ὡς κλῆμα καρποφόρον· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἐπιμείνῃς, ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς καταναλωθήσῃ."

[931] A forty-day fast is mentioned as an existing custom in the 5th canon of the Council of Nicea. As Gavrilyuk (2007) notes, however, the number forty is symbolic, and the actual duration of the "forty days" varied according to local custom (190–191). Socrates' *Historia Ecclesiastica* gives details of widely divergent practices in Rome, the Balkans, and Egypt, where the "forty day" period of fasting ranged from three to seven weeks. "It is indeed surprising," he remarks, "that thus differing in the number of days, they should both give it one common appellation; but some assign one reason for it, and others another, according to their several fancies" (*HE* 5.22, trans. *NPNF* 2.2, 334). It was commonly assumed that the forty days of Lent originated as an extension of the short preparatory fast before Easter, but recent scholarship has suggested it is an amalgamation of practices. It likely arose as a combination of the forty-day post-Theophany fast — commemorating Christ's forty-day fast in the desert following his baptism in the Jordan — observed in the Alexandrian tradition with the three-week periods of baptismal preparation observed elsewhere. These preparatory periods were pre-Paschal in Rome and North Africa, but unrelated to Easter in other traditions. For a detailed overview, see 'Baptismal Preparation and the Origins of Lent' in Johnson 2007 (201–18).

[932] For a detailed overview of the catechetical programme in Jerusalem, see Doval 2001a, 35–57.

[933] *Pereg.* 46.1–3, trans. Wilkinson 1999, 162.

which focus on the Creed. A detailed overview of the various attempts to harmonise these two sources is provided by Maxwell E. Johnson,[934] who arrives at what seems to be the most plausible conclusion, namely that *CL* was delivered Monday to Saturday during the fifth, sixth, and seventh weeks of Lent, while the first four weeks of the fast would have been devoted to Biblical exegesis.[935] This also explains Cyril's frequent and matter-of-fact appeals to Scriptural proofs in support of his theological arguments throughout *CL*. That the *φωτιζόμενοι* are familiar with the quoted passages is taken for granted, strongly suggesting recent and thorough Scriptural study beyond what one would expect them to have gained through general attendance at services while still catechumens.

Egeria paints a picture of lively interaction between bishop and listeners, with the latter frequently interrupting to ask questions or make loud remarks. She points out that the bishop, although he may have known Syriac,[936] speaks exclusively in Greek, relying on a presbyter to translate his preaching into Syriac for the benefit of non-Greek locals, while Latin-speaking travellers have to make due with an improvised translation from a bilingual listener.[937] It is unclear whether the "faithful" asking questions are the baptismal candidates themselves or those baptised members of the Church who would also come to listen to the lectures, but more pertinent to the discussion at hand is the exclusion of the catechumens who, she says, "do not come in while the bishop is teaching."[938]

Only the *φωτιζόμενοι*, not the catechumens, were allowed to hear the dogmas contained in the Creed, which they received only verbally lest any written record should fall into wrong hands.[939] In *PC* Cyril warns that if the Catechumen hears any of these teachings, he will not

[934] Johnson 1988. See also Day 2005 and id. 2007a, 23–25.
[935] Ibid., 27. On the use of the Old Testament in the Armenian Lectionary, see Villadsen 1989.
[936] Syrian Aramaic according to Telfer 1955, 35.
[937] *Pereg.* 47.3–5, trans. Wilkinson 1999, 163.
[938] *Pereg.* 46.1, trans. Wilkinson 1999, 162.
[939] "This [the Creed] I wish you to remember even in the very phrase, and to rehearse it with all diligence among yourselves, not writing it on paper, but by memory graving it on your heart as on a monument: being

understand what he hears, but will "find fault with the thing, and scoff at what is said,"[940] words which might appear more appropriately addressed to a Jew or pagan than to someone who bears the title 'Christian'. Even the Lord's Prayer, and with it the ability to address God as one's own Father, was limited to the baptised.[941] Withholding from them the pearls and that which was holy, one would be forgiven for thinking that Cyril still numbered catechumens among the dogs and swine. And although Cyril speaks to the *φωτιζόμενοι* about the meaning and significance of baptism, details about the shape of the ritual itself is withheld even from them, a practice more stringent than what we find elsewhere. Thus, although the catechumen could claim some degree of membership in the Church as a social institution, he remained, in the eyes of Cyril at least, very much an outsider: "Before you were a catechumen, now you will be a believer."[942] The following chapter will look in more detail at Cyril's use of the so-called *Disciplina Arcani* — the discipline of secrecy — to emphasis the difference between social and mysteriological membership, and to highlight baptism into the Body of Christ, not entry into the catechumenate, as the definitive form of Christian initiation.

watchful, during your exercise, lest haply some of the Catechumens overhear the things delivered to you." *CL* 6:12.

[940] PC 12 — "οὕτως ὁ κατηχούμενος, ἐὰν ἀκούσῃ παρὰ πιστοῦ· καὶ ὁ κατηχούμενος φρενιτιᾷ, οὐκ οἶδε γὰρ τί ἤκουσε, καὶ ἐλέγχει τὸ πρᾶγμα, καὶ ἐκμυκτηρίζει τὸ λεγόμενον."

[941] Incidentally, it is in *MC* that we find the first mention of the Lord's Prayer in the context of the Divine Liturgy.

[942] *CL* 1:4 — "Πρὸ τούτου Κατηχούμενος ἦς, νῦν δὲ κληθήσῃ Πιστός."

Chapter 8 — We deliver to thee a mystery: St Cyril's use of the *Disciplina Arcani* and its ecclesiological implications

> *You may give these Catechetical Lectures to those approaching baptism to read, as well as those believers who have already received the bath, but by no means give them to Catechumens, nor to any others who are not Christians; as you shall answer to the Lord. And if you make a copy of them, write this in the beginning, as before the Lord.*[943]

These fearful words, with which Cyril prefaces his *Catechetical Lectures*, attest to the unbridgeable chasm which, despite their status as nominal Christians, separated the catechumens from baptised believers. The *Disciplina Arcani*, or discipline of secrecy, refers to this early Catholic practice of denying to the non-baptised not only participation in but also knowledge of, the divine mysteries that formed the very centre of the Church's life and worship, perhaps most concretely expressed by their dismissal following the 'Liturgy of the Word'.[944] While this discipline of silence was never the subject of canonical regulations,[945] its observance among Catholics in the 4th century was more or less universal.[946] The introduction to Athanasius' *Defence Against the Arians* relates with no little disdain that "they are not ashamed to parade the sacred mysteries before Catechumens, and worse than that, even before heathens: whereas, they ought to attend to what is written, *It is good to conceal the secrets of*

[943] Τὰς τῶν Φωτιζομένων κατηχήσεις ταύτας, τοῖς μὲν τῷ βαπτίσματι προσερχομένοις, καὶ τοῖς τὸ λουτρὸν ἔχουσιν ἤδη πιστοῖς, εἰς ἀνάγνωσιν παρεχόμενος, μὴ δὸς τὸ σύνολον μήτε κατηχουμένοις, μήτε ἄλλοις τισὶ τοῖς μὴ οὖσι χριστιανοῖς· ἐπεὶ τῷ Κυρίῳ λόγον δώσεις. Καὶ ἐὰν ποιῇς ἀντίγραφον, ὡς ἐπὶ Κυρίου ταῦτα πρόγραψον.

[944] Even in their modern forms, after a prayer for their eventual union to the Catholic Church through baptism, the liturgies of the Eastern Churches include a call for the dismissal of the uninitiated before commencing the 'Liturgy of the Faithful', where the focus changes to the Eucharist itself. Significantly, the Anaphora opens with the recitation of the Creed, which is immediately preceded by the deacon's call for the doors to be locked and guarded, lest any improper person should be made aware of its content. In the Liturgy of St. James, an early form of which is attested to in *MC*, the deacon exclaims shortly after the reading of the Gospel: "*Μή τις τῶν κατηχουμένων, μή τις τῶν ἀμυήτων, μή τις τῶν μὴ δυναμένων ἡμῖν συνδεηθῆναι. Ἀλλήλους ἐπίγνωτε· τὰς θύρας· ὀρθοὶ πάντες*" (Fountoulēs 2005, 99–100). For the dismissals in the Byzantine liturgies of St. Basil the Great and St. John Chrysostom, see Ibid., 249.

[945] Perrin 2009, 73.

[946] Yarnold 1994, 56. Actual observance, however, varied. See Day 2001.

a king[947]*.*"[948] Chrysostom compares those who "idly and indiscriminately open their mouths to everyone" about the divine mysteries to Eve's eating of the forbidden fruit.[949] As Yarnold observes,[950] we find similar fourth-century attestations in Rome,[951] Milan,[952] Verona,[953] Egypt,[954] Antioch,[955] North Africa,[956] Constantinople,[957] and Cappadocia.[958] However, the *Disciplina* was perhaps nowhere more strictly observed than in Cyril's Palestine, as we have seen from Egeria's eye-witness testimony. Cyril, then, being one of its most forceful proponents, is undoubtedly one of our most valuable sources when trying to understand the significance and purpose of the discipline of secrecy.[959]

As Michel Yves Perrin notes, scholarship dealing with the *Disciplina Arcani*, a term first coined some three centuries ago by the Calvinist Jean Daille in reference to Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite,[960] "est marquee au coin de la polémique confesionnelle."[961] As the worshipping community abandoned the humble settings of private homes and emerged from the darkness of catacombs into the grandeur and magnificence of imperial basilicas, significant changes also occurred with respect to the shape and outward form of the Divine Liturgy, although its basic structure, content, and meaning was maintained. Many of these

[947] Tobit 12 :7

[948] *Apol. C. Arianos* 11, trans. *NPNF* 2.4, 404–5.

[949] *Hom. In Gen.* 16.6 (*PG* 53:126).

[950] Yarnold 1994, 56–58.

[951] *Letter of Pope Innocent I to Decentius, A.D*. 416 (*PL* 20:551ff).

[952] "Every mystery ought to be hidden and, so to speak, concealed in a faithful silence so as not to be inconsiderately published to profane ears" (Ambrose, *De Abraham* 1.38 [*PL* 14:436]).

[953] Zeno, *Tractatus* 2.7.14 (*PL* 11:309).

[954] Serapion, *Anaphora* 6 (see Jasper and Cuming 1975, 67).

[955] *AC* 2.57.40.

[956] Augustine, *Hom.* 132 (*PL* 38:734). See also his *Ev. Jo. Tract.* 11.

[957] "This is all that may be divulged of the Sacrament, and that is not forbidden to the ear of the many. The rest you shall learn within the Church by the grace of the Holy Trinity; and those matters you shall conceal within yourself, sealed and secure" (Gregory Nazianzen, *Oration* 40.45. trans. *NPNF* 2.7, 750).

[958] "The uninitiated were not even allowed to be present at the mysteries; how could you expect these teachings to be paraded about in public documents?" (Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto* 27.66, trans. Anderson 1980, 99).

[959] The only recent monograph dealing exclusively with the notion of liturgical secrecy, for example, limits its discussion on Late Antiquity solely to the works of Cyril. See chapters 1 and 2 in Malesic 2009 (35–74).

[960] Perrin 2009, 120

[961] Ibid., 122.

developments, however, occurred not simply on account of a change of venue.[962] Of far greater importance was the influx of vast numbers of converts, whose previous place of worship had not been the catacombs, but the temples of Jupiter and Aphrodite. Protestant critics of the Roman Catholic Church argued that the changes to the Christian liturgy effected by these converts amounted to a synthesis between Christianity and Graeco-Roman religions, what would to the early Christians have been regarded as a woeful yoking of believers and unbelievers, righteousness and unrighteousness, light and darkness. They saw the introduction of liturgical secrecy as clear evidence of a post-Constantinan fall into corruption and an unholy fusion of Christianity with Graeco-Roman mystery cults.[963] Roman Catholic apologists, on the other hand, claimed quite the opposite, namely that this practice of secrecy accounted for the relatively late evidence for certain disputed practices. Indeed, the *Disciplina* was described as the "letzte Zuflucht katholischer Geschichtsbeweise"[964] in order to explain the disparity between the early Church and "den neuen Verkehrtheiten der modernen römischen Kirche." Perrin notes that, while "cet argument qui occupa une place centrale dans les controverses érudites jusqu'au début du XXe siècle, est, sauf exception, à peu près délaissé dans l'historiographie contemporaine."[965]

Consequently, it is necessary for modern students of this important phenomenon to reassess the value of existing secondary literature on the subject, and resort to an honest and fresh analysis of the relevant primary sources when attempting to discern the origins of the practice and the potential influences of Graeco-Roman religion.

[962] See, for example, 'The Problem and Development of the Ordo: the Fourth & Fifth Centuries', chapter 3 of Schmemann 2003 (91–149). Of particular interest is his observation that, while the *pomp* of paganism remained suspect, the conversion of the Emperor meant that "the Imperial court ceremonial, which was religious in character […] was more 'admissible' for the Church" and therefore had significance influence on the development of Christian liturgy by comparison (Ibid., 121).

[963] See Nock 1952.

[964] Von Hase 1878, 34412. See also 'Der Durchbruch der Vorstellung von der "Arkandisziplin des vierten Jahrhunderts" in der protestantischen Forschung' in Jacob 1990 (73–96).

[965] Perrin 2009, 739–40.

Biblical Origins

A person of the fourth century would certainly not have found the prevalence of the *Disciplina* to be something at odds with the Scriptures recited during the 'Liturgy of the Word', to which also the uninitiated catechumens were admitted. Christ had himself explained to his disciples that to them "has been given the secret of the Kingdom of God, but for those outside, everything is in parables; so that they may indeed see but not perceive and may indeed hear but not understand; lest they should turn again and be forgiven."[966] His parables, then, were not merely a method by which to convey his teaching to a wider audience, but also to conceal their essence from those unable to receive it: "He who has ears to hear, let him hear."[967] Cyril, as he responds to the heresies of Mani in *CL* 6, offers his listeners a rather lengthy exposition of this particular feature of the New Testament, relating it directly to the *Disciplina*:

> Then Mani answers him: "And what sort of God blinds? For it is Paul who says, *In whom the God of this world has blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the Gospel should shine unto them*."[968] But Archelaus responds well: "Read a little before: *But if our Gospel is veiled, it is veiled in them that are perishing*."[969] Do you see that it is veiled in them that are perishing? For it is not right *to give the things which are holy unto the dogs*.[970] Again, "Is it only the God of the Old (Testament) that has blinded the minds of unbelievers?" Has not Jesus himself said, *For this cause speak I unto them in parables, that seeing they may not see*? Was it out of hate for them that he willed them not to see? Or because of their unworthiness, since *their eyes they had closed*.[971] For where there is wilful evil, there is also a withholding of grace: *for to him that has shall be given; but from him that has not shall be taken even that which he seems to have*.[972] We could also say, as some explain (for it is not a disparaging word) that, "If he really did blind the thoughts of unbelievers, he blinded them for a good reason, that they might look afresh at what is good. For he did not say, "He blinded their soul", but, *the thoughts of unbelievers*. And the meaning is something along these lines: 'Blind the fornicator's lewd thoughts, and the man is saved. Blind the robber's rapaciousness and thieving and rapacious thought

[966] Mark 4:11.
[967] *Cf.* Matt. 11:15, 13:9; Mark 4:9; Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, 29, 3:6, 13, 22.
[968] 2 Cor. 4:4.
[969] 2 Cor. 4:3
[970] Matt. 7:6
[971] Matt. 13:15
[972] Matt. 13:12

> of the robber, and the man is saved.' But if you will not understand it in this way, then there is yet another interpretation: The sun also blinds with dim sight, and those with diseased eyes are blinded and hurt by the light. Not that the sun [is] blinding, but that the eye's substance cannot see. In the same way, unbelievers, being diseased in their heart, cannot look upon the radiance of the divinity. Nor did he say, "He has blinded their thoughts, that they should not hear the Gospel", but that *the light of the glory of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ should not shine unto them*. For all are permitted to hear the Gospel, but the glory of the Gospel is reserved only for Christ's genuine children. The Lord therefore spoke in parables to those who could not hear:[973] but explained the parables in private to the disciples.[974] [For] the brightness of the glory is for the enlightened, the blinding for the unbelieving. It is the custom that these Mysteries, which the Church now explains to you who are transferring out of the catechumenate, are not explained to the Gentile. For we do not explain the mysteries concerning Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to a Gentile, nor do we speak plainly of the mysteries before Catechumens; but we often speak about [many things] in a veiled way, so that the believers who know may understand, and those who do not know may not be hurt.[975]

We find the same connection in the commentary of John Chrysostom:

> And in many other places too He saith that corruption of life is the cause of men's not receiving the more perfect doctrines. Wherefore He commands not to open the doors to them; for indeed they become more insolent after learning. For as to the well-disposed and intelligent, things appear venerable when revealed, so to the insensible, when they are unknown rather. "Since then from their nature, they are not able to learn them, let the thing be hidden," saith He, "that at least for ignorance they may reverence them. For neither doth the swine

[973] v.13

[974] Mark 4:34

[975] *CL* 6:28–29 — "Εἶτα ὁ Μάνης πρὸς τοῦτον λέγει· Καὶ ποῖος Θεὸς τυφλοῖ; Παῦλος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ λέγων· Ἐν οἷς ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, εἰς τὸ μὴ διαυγάσαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. Ὁ δὲ Ἀρχέλαος καλῶς ὑποκρούσας, Προανάγνωθί, φησιν, ὀλίγον. Εἰ δὲ καὶ κεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν, ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἐστὶ κεκαλυμμένον. Ὁρᾷς, ὅτι ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις κεκάλυπται; Οὐ δεῖ γὰρ διδόναι τὰ ἅγια τοῖς κυσίν. Εἶτα, ἆρα μόνος ὁ τῆς παλαιᾶς Θεὸς ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων; Ἰησοῦς δὲ αὐτὸς οὐκ εἴρηκε, Διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλῶ, ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσι; Μὴ μισῶν αὐτοὺς, ἐβούλετο μὴ βλέπειν; ἢ διὰ τὸ ἀνάξιον, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν; Ὅπου γὰρ αὐτοπροαίρετος πονηρία, ἐκεῖ καὶ ἀποχὴ τῆς χάριτος. Τῷ γὰρ ἔχοντι δοθήσεται· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος, καὶ ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἀρθήσεται. Εἰ δὲ δεῖ, καὶ ὥς τινες ἐξηγοῦνται, τοῦτο εἰπεῖν· οὐ φαῦλον γὰρ τὸ ῥῆμα· εἰ καὶ ἐτύφλωσε τῶν ἀπίστων τὰ νοήματα, ἐπὶ καλῷ ἐτύφλωσεν, ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἀναβλέψωσιν. Οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν, Ἐτύφλωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν ψυχήν· ἀλλὰ, τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων. Τὸ δὲ λεγόμενον, τοιοῦτόν ἐστι· τύφλωσον τοῦ πόρνου τὰ πορνικὰ νοήματα, καὶ σέσωσται ὁ ἄνθρωπος. Τύφλωσον τοῦ λῃστοῦ τὸ ἁρπακτικὸν καὶ λῃστρικὸν, καὶ σέσωσται ὁ ἄνθρωπος. Ἀλλ' οὐ θέλεις οὕτω νοῆσαι· ἔστι καὶ ἄλλη ἐξήγησις. Τυφλοῖ καὶ ὁ ἥλιος τοὺς ἀμβλυωποῦντας· καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμιῶντες τυφλοῦνται, βλαπτόμενοι ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτός· οὐχ ὅτι τυφλωτικός [ἐστιν] ὁ ἥλιος, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἡ ὑπόστασις τῶν ὀμμάτων οὐ βλέπει. Οὕτω καὶ οἱ ἄπιστοι, νοσοῦντες τὰς καρδίας, οὐ δύνανται ἐνιδεῖν τῆς θεότητος ταῖς ἀκτῖσιν. Καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν, Ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἀκοῦσαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· ἀλλ', εἰς τὸ μὴ διαυγάσαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τῆς δόξης τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀκοῦσαι τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, πᾶσιν ἐφίεται· ἡ δόξα δὲ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, τοῖς Χριστοῦ γνησίοις μόνοις ἀφώρισται. Ἔλεγεν ὁ Κύριος τοῖς μὲν ἀκοῦσαι μὴ δυναμένοις ἐν παραβολαῖς· τοῖς δὲ μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυε κατ' ἰδίαν τὰς παραβολάς. Ὁ αὐγασμὸς [γὰρ] τῆς δόξης τοῖς πεφωτισμένοις, ἡ τύφλωσις τοῖς ἀπίστοις. Ταῦτα τὰ μυστήρια, ἃ νῦν ἡ Ἐκκλησία διηγεῖταί σοι τῷ ἐκ κατηχουμένων μεταβαλλομένῳ, οὐκ ἔστιν ἔθος ἐθνικοῖς διηγεῖσθαι. Οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ ἐθνικῷ τὰ περὶ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος διηγούμεθα μυστήρια, οὐδὲ περὶ τῶν μυστηρίων ἐπὶ κατηχουμένων λευκῶς λαλοῦμεν· ἀλλὰ [πολλὰ] πολλάκις λέγομεν ἐπικεκαλυμμένως, ἵνα οἱ εἰδότες πιστοὶ νοήσωσι, καὶ οἱ μὴ εἰδότες μὴ βλαβῶσι."

> know at all what a pearl is. Therefore since he knows not, neither let him see it, lest he trample under foot what he knows not."[976]

For those in charge of enforcing the *Disciplina* in the fourth century, then, the exclusion of the unbaptised from the Eucharistic assembly was a practice firmly rooted in the words of Christ, and one of unbroken continuity with the New Testament Church. Dom Gregory Dix, in his classic work *The Shape of the Liturgy*, also traces the *Disciplina* back to the New Testament, noting that Christian worship was from the outset "a highly *exclusive* thing."[977] However, he attributes this, not to the cryptic parables of Christ, but to the setting in which he instituted the first Eucharistic gathering: the upper room, "in circumstances arranged with a seemingly deliberate secrecy."[978] He notes that, while the synagogue and the outer court of the Temple were open to gentiles, "the rules which excluded all who were not jews [sic], either by race or by a thoroughgoing 'naturalisation' as proselytes, from all *domestic* intercourse with jews were strict."[979] Although the Church ceased being predominantly Jewish early on, the domestic and exclusive character of specifically Christian worship prevented the development of an open and public form of worship even as it became overwhelmingly gentile in character, despite the fact that the "state was not yet officially hostile, and it would have been comparatively easy to organise some sort of public worship, open to all who might chance to enter."[980] He further asserts that this is in no way in congress with the extraordinary missionary zeal we know characterised the early Church. "Propaganda meetings," he says, "were rigidly separated from 'worship', so that they were not even accompanied by prayer,"[981] and while the Gospel was announced through the reading of scripture and verbal instruction, the non-baptised were invariably turned away before any form of prayer, not to mention the Eucharistic celebrations.

[976] *In Mt. Hom.* 7.1, trans. *NPNF* 1.10, 286–7.
[977] Dix 1960, 16.
[978] Ibid.
[979] Ibid.
[980] Ibid., 17.
[981] Ibid.

Dix finds favour with Yarnold, who refers to him when proposing possible New Testament origin for the "rudimentary *disciplina arcani* [which] can be observed in early centuries."[982]

The *Disciplina* in the 2nd and 3rd centuries

Earlier, Jungmann, who is otherwise dismissive of pagan influences in Christian worship,[983] had followed a hypothesis quite different to that of Dix and argued, not only that the *Disciplina* "cannot be proven to have existed before the third century," but that it is "the sole example which can be adduced with some certainty" of a Christian borrowing of customs and institutions connected with the ancient mysteries.[984] Alois Stenzel, likewise, argues against the existence of the *Disciplina* prior to the third century, basing himself primarily on Justin Martyr's discussion of matters that, in the fourth, would have been entirely unacceptable.[985] This late date is significant, he says, because "Die Notwendigkeit einer Geheimhaltung hätte erheblich früher noch dringender bestanden," and by the third century the introduction of such a thing would have been too little too late.[986] The purpose of its introduction, then, was almost certainly not practical, nor could it simply have been to avoid casting pearls before swine, for, were that the case, "sonst müßte sie praktisch so alt sein wie die Kirche selber. Und eben dies ist die Arkandisziplin nicht."[987]

More recent scholarship on the subject, however, cautiously shies away from such unequivocal statements and is characterised more by questions asked than questions answered.

---

[982] Yarnold 1972, 258.

[983] "I think we can safely answer that the pagan mysteries did not, directly or indirectly, affect Christian worship in its inception. Those evolutionary theories of religious history — proposed by scholars like Lietzmann and Loisy — which try to explain Christianity entirely in terms of a more or less happy syncretism of paganism and Judaism, with the mysteries playing a special role […] are today abandoned or at least greatly restricted in scope" — Jungmann 1960, 152.

[984] Ibid., 159.

[985] Stenzel 1958, 150.

[986] Ibid.

[987] Ibid., 148–9.

Perrin's stresses that "[l]a prudence est donc de mise"[988] and elsewhere concludes that "[l]a boîte noire des origines de l'arcane paraît encore fermement scellée, et le processus d'arcanisation du christianisme dans la Grande Église conserve bien des secrets."[989] In the second century, Justin Martyr appears to speak openly to a pagan audience concerning the details of both the ritual of baptism and the Eucharistic liturgy, suggesting he was not aware of any discipline of secrecy, although he is careful to add that "no one is allowed to partake [of the Eucharist] but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that is for remission of sins."[990] The question which immediately arises here is whether his *Apology* was indeed aimed at a pagan readership, or whether it was intended for internal consumption. In the latter case, discussion about the Mysteries reveals little about the extent to which secrecy was normative, if at all, but even if we were to assume former, the question remains: can Justin be considered representative or is he the exception to prove the rule? As shall be discussed in greater detail below, we know that even at the height of the *Disciplina*'s importance in the fourth century, actual implementation of it varied greatly, as Juliette Day has demonstrated.[991] Given that the Christian communities of earlier centuries were more idiorhythmic in almost every sense, the fact that we should find one or even several authors who speak openly about the Mysteries cannot be taken as conclusive proof of a later date of origin for the *Disciplina*, nor that such a practice was unknown to them. Daniel Schwartz, with reference to the same article by Day, appears to take this view, maintaining that liturgical secrecy was encouraged "at least from the beginning of the second century", citing Justin Martyr only as an example of lax observance, not evidence of later origin.[992]

[988] Perrin 2009, 759.
[989] Perrin 2008, 130.
[990] 1 *Apol.* 66, trans. *ANF* 1, 495.
[991] Day 2001.
[992] Schwartz 2009, 45–6.

The same is true of the passage in Irenæus of Lyons in which he describes the arrest by pagans of the servants of certain Christian catechumens, who under duress reveal to them details of the Eucharist.[993] For Perrin, this suggests that catechumens in second century Lyons were familiar with the Eucharistic rites.[994] While possible, the evidence is by no means conclusive, and it could well be that it is for the exceptional nature of the story that Irenæus considers it worthy of retelling. Nor are other early sources sometimes cited as explicit rejections of the *Disciplina* by any means as unambiguous as some would have it. Guy Stroumsa offers a revised reading of some of these sources in the second chapter of his work *Hidden Wisdom: Esoteric Traditions and the Roots of Christian Mysticism*.[995] He points, for example, to Irenæus' refutation of Gnostic groups who claimed to possess secret teachings of Christ, which earlier works used as proof of the Church's freedom of the same.[996] A careful look at the text shows that it does not constitute an outright rejection of such secret teachings, but only of their preservation outside the Catholic Church:

> If the Apostles did know secret mysteries which they might have taught to the 'perfect,' separately and unknown to the others, it was primarily those in whose care they placed the churches themselves to whom they would have transmitted these mysteries, for they wanted those whom they left as successors and to whom they transmitted their own teaching mission to be absolutely perfect and irreproachable in every respect.[997]

Likewise, Origen's response to the accusation levelled at the Church by Celsus, namely that the Christian communities are secret, and therefore illicit, certainly does not attest to absence of the *Disciplina*.[998] Rather than arguing in favour of its legality under Roman law, he maintains that it "is not irrational […] to form associations in opposition to existing laws, if done for the sake of the truth."[999] Although he rejects the notion that Christianity is a mystery religion,

[993] *Fragment 13* (Harvey 1857, 482).
[994] Perrin 2009, 754.
[995] Stroumsa 2005, 27–45.
[996] See ibid., 30, 35. Such an argument is, for example, put forward by Battifol 1923.
[997] Irenæus, *Adv. Haer.*, 3.3.1, trans. Stroumsa 2005, 39.
[998] *C. Cels.* 1.1. See Stroumsa 2005, 32–33.
[999] *C. Cels.* 1.1, trans. *ANF* 1, 861.

pointing to the doctrines of Christ's virgin birth, death and resurrection, which "almost the entire world is better acquainted with […] than with the favourite opinions of philosophers,"[1000] he adds to this that the notion "that there should be certain doctrines, not made known to the multitude, which are (revealed) after the exoteric ones have been taught, is not a peculiarity of Christianity alone, but also of philosophic systems."[1001] He makes reference to "all the mysteries that are celebrated everywhere throughout Greece and barbarous countries",[1002] not to suggest that they are akin to Christian rites, but to point to the legality of this form of limited ritual secrecy as invalidating Celsus appeal to Roman law for polemical purposes. Why Schwartz mentions Origen's *Against Celsus* as an example of lax observance of the *Disciplina* is unclear.[1003] Celsus appears to have a knowledge of the Scriptures, but his familiarity with Christian baptism, which Schwartz cites as evidence, is limited to Scriptural descriptions of Christ's baptism in the Jordan, and does not reveal any knowledge of the Christian ritual beyond what any Greek speaker could surmise from the word *βάπτισμα* itself.[1004]

Conversely, while Yarnold interprets Tertullian's plea that his wife not remarry, lest her second husband be a pagan who might catch her in the practice of daily self-communion,[1005] as him "taking it for granted that the pagan will not otherwise know anything about the Eucharist",[1006] Perrin suggests it might be a simple "conseil de prudence."[1007] He supports this interpretation by Tertullian's appeal to Paul "qui in naui coram omnibus eucharistiam fecit,"[1008] concluding that "qu'il ne connaît pas de *disciplina*."[1009] Whatever the case may be, the fact

[1000] *C. Cels.* 1.7, trans. *ANF* 1, 867.
[1001] Ibid.
[1002] Ibid.
[1003] In *C. Cels*. 4.45, Origen considers the refusal of the biblical authors to hide "even what is to their discredit" a sign of their "love of truth", but he is here talking about the perceived moral failings of certain biblical characters, not things comparable to the mysteries of the *Disciplina*. Indeed, in the same passage, he seems reluctant to impart to Celsus the mystical truths expressed by the biblical text under discussion.
[1004] Schwartz 2009, 46.
[1005] *Ad Uxorem* 2.5.
[1006] Yarnold 1972, 56.
[1007] Perrin 2009, 752.
[1008] Tertullian, *De oratione* 24 (*PG* 1:1299B).
[1009] Perrin 2009, 752.

remains that very nature of the *Disciplina* itself means its origins will probably always remain impossibly elusive. Evidence of secrecy will by definition be limited, while the failure of certain authors to respect such a discipline could be the exception that proves the rule. However, although the details surrounding the origins of the Disciplina remains an open and enigmatic question, marked by ambiguity, the scant evidence we do possess gives us valuable insight necessary for understanding Cyril's use of it in the fourth century. At the very least, the unambiguous witness of Hippolytus in the 3rd century means we can with confidence do away with the arguments previously put forth by the sectarian polemicists of earlier centuries of a fourth century origin.[1010]

Assimilation or wall of separation?

However, despite this and earlier attestations to the *Disciplina*, "it is not until the fourth century that the system becomes fully developed."[1011] Thus, while Perrin rightly concludes that we can reject "l'hypothèse d'une émergence de cette pratique du silence en réaction à la révolution constantinienne et à la l'institutionnalisation croissante des Églises au tournant du IVe siècle,"[1012] it would be a mistake to suggest that its increased emphasis at this time did not constitute such a reaction, at least in part. Thus, although he erroneously speaks of it arising "*after* Constantine legalised Christianity and the empire began to Christianize",[1013] I would concur with the general hypothesis put forward by Malesic in his monograph, namely that Cyril and others used the *Disciplina* as a "defence against opportunism and imperial authority."[1014]

[1010] "Yet if there is any other thing that ought to be told [to converts], let the bishop impart it to them privately after baptism; let not unbelievers know it, until they are baptized: this is the white stone of which John said: 'There is upon it a new name written, which no one knoweth but he that receiveth the stone'." (*Ap. Trad.* 23.14, trans. Easton 1934, 49).
[1011] Yarnold 1972, 258.
[1012] Perrin 2009, 747.
[1013] Malesic 2009, 37.
[1014] Ibid., 53.

We have already touched on the question of possible borrowing from Graeco-Roman religions, specifically the mystery cults. While a wholesale borrowing from pagan mystery cults is generally dismissed by scholars today,[1015] a limited degree of influence is discernible when looking at changes in the language used to describe the Christian sacraments, though not the content of the rites themselves.[1016] Many scholars see in this as a paganisation, so to speak, of Christianity; not necessarily in the sense of a corruption of or departure from the Way of the New Testament, but as the natural reaction of a Church which, emboldened by imperial support, no longer felt threatened by a waning paganism, and hence at liberty to borrow from it that which it considered conducive to its own message.[1017] However, as demonstrated in the opening chapter above, Cyril was by no means complacent about the threat of paganism, to which a considerable portion of *CL* is devoted. I would argue that the contrary is true. By depriving the unbaptised of knowledge of the mysteriological rites, the *Disciplina* widened the gap between the faithful and the nominal Christian, thereby contributing to a strengthening of ecclesiastical boundaries. "In this respect, secrecy helped Cyril assert the primacy of the worshipping community, rather than the purportedly 'Christian' public sphere, in forming the person's Christian identity."[1018] Those among the vast influx of converts who joined the ranks of the catechumens in Constantine's wake must have had a keen sense of the limited scope of their position within the Church. Even if Day is correct in suggesting that "there can have been few secrets left for a fourth century catechumen"[1019] due to lax enforcement, the catechumen would not know there were no further secrets to be revealed at his baptism beyond the ones he had already become aware of through the careless chatter of the *fideles*. The impact of the

[1015] Figures like Reitzenstein and Bousset even went as far as to suggest the Pauline theology of the New Testament has its basis in the themes of pagan mysteries (Yarnold 1972, 61; Rahner 1963, 3–45).

[1016] Yarnold 1972, 66; Graf 2011, 101–118. For a discussion of possible pagan influence on Christian mysticism more generally, see chapter 3, 'Man and the Divine World' in Dodds 1990 (69–101). He notes, for example, Clement's use of *ἐποπτεία* in *Strom.* 7.11, but admits the author's use of the word is unclear, making the link somewhat tentative (96).

[1017] Jungmann 1960, 158.

[1018] Malesic 2009, 40.

[1019] Day 2001, 270.

Disciplina would therefore remain the same. Perhaps this is what Ambrose has in mind when he says "If anyone [after seeing the baptismal font] should perhaps be thinking of saying, 'Is that all?', I say, 'Indeed it is all'. […] What is unseen is much greater than what is seen."[1020] It may be that the disappointment of the candidates comes not, as Yarnold suggests, from the Christian mysteries lacking the pomp and grandeur of Graeco-Roman mystery cults,[1021] but rather that they feature no more than what they had already learnt beforehand. Ambrose's reference to things unseen might therefore be an assurance that there were indeed secrets of which they were previously unaware. The *Disciplina* therefore allowed Cyril to distinguish between those converts who were content to remain as catechumens as nominal Christians, and those who had converted for more meaningful reasons. It also allowed him to subject the latter to the rigorous vetting process described above by Egeria, and subsequently catechesis, whereby he could disabuse them of the many erroneous views and preconceptions they inevitably brought with them. The *Disciplina*, then, far from being an accommodation of pagan thought and practice, was an attempt to stem the tide of its influence.

Moreover, as the new religion began to interest the masses, whatever their intentions, the only hope of maintaining any semblance of mysteriological secrecy was a more stringent and systematic enforcement of the *Disciplina*. When we look at the reason Cyril himself gives for his observance of the *Disciplina*, we see that his primary concern is, not only the unworthiness of the uninitiated, but the harm they will suffer on account of their unpreparedness.

> Let no man say to you, 'What harm can come from me also knowing it?' The sick also ask for wine; but if it is given to them at the wrong time, it causes phrenitis, and two evils follow: the sick man dies, and the physician is reproached. That is how it also is with the catechumen should he hear from the believer: the catechumen

[1020] *S* 1.10, trans. Yarnold 1972, 64.
[1021] Ibid.

> is maddened, for not understanding what he has heard, he finds fault with it, and scoffs at what is said, and the believer is condemned as a traitor.[1022]

Elsewhere he repeats this warning, explaining that "before catechumens we do not speak plainly of the mysteries: but many things we often speak in a veiled way, that the believers who know may understand, and they who know not may get no hurt."[1023] As Day points out, this "[f]ear of derision by non-believers features often."[1024] She cites Athanasius, who explains that:

> We ought not then to parade the holy mysteries before the uninitiated, lest the heathen in their ignorance deride them, and the Catechumens being over-curious be offended.[1025]

Ambrose, too, employing a play on the word *enkryphia*, meaning both 'cakes' and something hidden, warns his readers

> lest by untimely speech you should commit mysteries half-baked, so to speak, to faithless or weak ears and the hearer be repelled and feel repugnance and loathing. If he tasted them more fully baked he would enjoy the taste of spiritual food.[1026]

Chrysostom likewise explains that

> neither will they [the non-baptised] themselves be at all profited thereby, but rather the more damaged, and to thee they will cause endless difficulties. Let them hearken, who shamelessly associate with all, and make the awful things contemptible. For the mysteries we too therefore celebrate with closed doors, and keep out the uninitiated, not for any weakness of which we have convicted our rites, but because the many are as yet imperfectly prepared for them.[1027]

This can be traced back to Paul's warning to the Corinthians that condemnation, and even physical illness and death, await those who partake of the Eucharist unworthily.[1028] Twice Cyril refers to the casting of pearls before swine in connection with those *φωτιζόμενοι* [1029] who allow themselves to be baptised without a faithful disposition,[1030] and in his commentary on the

---

[1022] *PC* 12 — "Μή ποτέ σοί τις εἴπῃ· τί βλάπτῃ, ἐὰν κἀγὼ μάθω; Καὶ οἱ νοσοῦντες τὸν οἶνον ζητοῦσιν· ἀλλ' ἐὰν ἀκαίρως δοθῇ, φρενῖτιν ἐργάζεται· καὶ δύο κακὰ γίνεται, καὶ ὁ νοσῶν ἀπόλλυται, καὶ ὁ ἰατρὸς διαβάλλεται· οὕτως ὁ κατηχούμενος, ἐὰν ἀκούσῃ παρὰ πιστοῦ· καὶ ὁ κατηχούμενος φρενιτιᾷ, οὐκ οἶδε γὰρ τί ἤκουσε, καὶ ἐλέγχει τὸ πρᾶγμα, καὶ ἐκμυκτηρίζει τὸ λεγόμενον· καὶ ὁ πιστὸς ὡς προδότης κατακρίνεται."

[1023] *CL* 6:29 — "οὐδὲ περὶ τῶν μυστηρίων ἐπὶ κατηχουμένων λευκῶς λαλοῦμεν· ἀλλὰ [πολλὰ] πολλάκις λέγομεν ἐπικεκαλυμμένως, ἵνα οἱ εἰδότες πιστοὶ νοήσωσι, καὶ οἱ μὴ εἰδότες μὴ βλαβῶσι."

[1024] Day 2001, 270.

[1025] Athanasius, *Apol. C. Arianos* 11, trans. *NPNF* 2.4, 405.

[1026] *De Cain et Abel* 1.35–7 (Schenkl 1897).

[1027] *In Mt. Hom.* 7.1, trans. *NPNF* 1.10, 287

[1028] 1 Cor. 11.

[1029] Compare Justin Martyr: Καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν φωτισμὸς, ὡς φωτιζομένων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μανθανόντων (*1 Apol.* 61, *PG* 6:421)

[1030] *CL* 1:3, 17:36.

Lord's Prayer he warns the newly illumined not to let themselves be a cause for God's name to be dishonoured among the heathen.[1031] This suggests his emphasis on secrecy was part of a wider concern to protect his flock against the consequences of irreverence. However, this does not mean he wasn't also concerned with more immediate consequences of derision. A little information is dangerous, and a catechumen who, in the absence of sufficient catechism, had misunderstood the information leaked to him by believers might well be driven straight into the arms of heretics or even pagans who held to a seemingly simpler or more agreeable creed. Likewise, once given over to mockery of Christianity, a pagan would be unlikely to ever darken the door of a church where he might be disabused, first of his misconceptions about Christianity, and subsequently of "the polytheistic error of the Greeks."[1032]

The *Disciplina* was not only a defensive missionary tool. While the mysteries themselves were secret, Cyril was open about the fact that this was the case. Malesic speaks of Cyril's "promotion of secrecy", borrowing the term "secretism" from the ethnographer Paul Christopher Johnson.[1033] Secrecy, he argues, suggests value. To share knowledge of the mysteries openly would be to cheapen them in the eyes of others. Keeping them from the uninitiated, on the other hand, made the *fideles* a privileged category, and made baptism the only means of accessing these hidden treasures. The purpose of this "secretism", then, was to spark the curiosity of outsiders and make baptism desirable.[1034] The fact that Cyril does not divulge details of rituals prior to the candidates actually having undergone them would ensure that their curiosity would not be satisfied before it had borne fruit. The *Disciplina*, then, can be seen as yet another example of the Catholic Church excluding in order to include, temporarily keeping the few at bay in order to reach out to the many.

[1031] *MC* 5:12.
[1032] *CL* 6:11 — "ἡ πολύθεος τῶν Ἑλλήνων πλάνη."
[1033] Johnson 2002.
[1034] Malesic 2009, 42–8.

For the reasons already laid out above, I must disagree with those who reduce the purpose of the *Disciplina* only to "secretism", and suggest that it was in essence no more than a mere gimmick. However, there is much that lends credence to the theory that, for Cyril, "secretism" was one reason among many. Cyril is clear that many of those who have come to him have come out of "idle curiosity",[1035] wishing merely to "pry into what is given."[1036] Although he rejects this as sufficient grounds for baptism, he is happy to capitalise on it, saying,

> I accept this angler's bait, and receive you, as one who has indeed come with a wrong intention, but will be saved by a good hope. Maybe you did not know where you were coming to, nor what net was taking you. You are within the ecclesiastical nets, allow yourself to be taken.[1037]

Moreover, as already mentioned above, we know Cyril was at the forefront of the development of a stational liturgy, centred around the sacred topography of Jerusalem. While the mysteries remained secret, Cyril spearheaded a movement which saw other aspects of Christian worship paraded through the streets for all to see. As with Constantine's building project, the development of stational liturgy was a clear attempt to assert the dominance of Christianity, and served as a direct challenge to the traditional forms of Graeco-Roman worship. It is perfectly reasonable to posit that the *Disciplina* served a similar purpose.

Already in the second and third centuries, prominent figures like Clement of Alexandria, Justin and Tertullian were drawing parallels between pagan and Christian mysteries, even claiming that the former were a false imitation of the latter.[1038] These parallels, then, were not points of contact but of conflict. Jungmann presents the following excerpt from Clement as representative:[1039]

[1035] *PC* 4

[1036] *CL* 3:7

[1037] *PC* 5 — "Δέχομαι τὸ δέλεαρ τοῦ ἀγκίστρου, καὶ καταδέχομαί σε, κακῇ προαιρέσει μὲν ἐλθόντα, ἐλπίδι δὲ ἀγαθῇ σωθησόμενον. Ἴσως οὐκ ᾔδεις ποῦ ἔρχῃ, οὐδὲ ποία σε σαγήνη λαμβάνει· γέγονας εἴσω δικτύων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν· ζωγρήθητι."

[1038] See Jungmann 1960, 152–63.

[1039] Ibid., 158. Clement is thought to have been an initiate in the pagan mysteries, and thus speaks from experience. See Sheridan 2008.

> Come, O madman, not leaning on the thyrsus, not crowned with ivy; throw away the mitre, throw away the fawn-skin; come to thy senses. I will show thee the Word and the mysteries of the Word. [Christianity] is the mountain beloved of God, not the subject of tragedies like Cithaeron but consecrated to dramas of the truth, — a mountain of sobriety shaded with forests of piety […]. [C]asting away from thee both divination and Bacchic frenzy, allow thyself to be led to the truth […] thou, old man, who saw not Thebes, shalt see the heavens. O truly sacred mysteries! O stainless light![1040]

We see similar comparisons in *MC*, where pagan charms are juxtaposed with the Christian sacraments, in which the blood of Christ "is made a charm to scare evil spirits."[1041] Cyril would certainly have been aware of the parallels between Graeco-Roman mystery cults and the secret rites into which he was initiating his listeners, and it can only be expected that he would make every effort to capitalise on the *Disciplina* to this effect. Far from representing "the era of decadence", as Jungmann calls it, I believe terminological borrowings from the pagan mysteries should be understood as serving the same purpose. Much like the Church's use of the term 'Israel' did not constitute a conflation with the Jewish community, but competition with it, so borrowing the language of the pagan mystery cult represented an effort, not to conform to it, but to supplant it. Per our discussion in chapter 3, one could perhaps also argue that the *Disciplina* provides meaning, *logos,* to the hitherto *alogon* notion of mystery within paganism.

Language of fear and trembling

On the subject of this linguistic influence, of particular relevance to the question of the *Disciplina* is the rise in the fourth century of language of "fear and trembling" in the liturgy.

[1040] *Protrepticus* 12.119f., quoted in Jungmann 1960, 155–6.

One can hear echoes of Clement, who is cited elsewhere in *CL*, when Cyril addresses the *φωτιζόμενοι* regarding their coming initiation into the mysteries: "For we, the ministers of Christ, have admitted every man, and holding as it were the place of door-keepers, have left the door unfastened. You have been free then to enter with a soul bemired with sins, and a defiled purpose. You have entered: you have passed, you have been enrolled. Do you see these venerable arrangements of the Church? Do you see her order and discipline, the reading of the Scriptures, the presence of the religious, the course of teaching? Let then the place affect you, and the sight sober you" (*PC* 4). See also *CL* 6:35, where he makes a very similar statement about the superiority of the church community, again in connection with initiation into the mysteries.

[1041] *MC* 1:3

Studies on the subject of 'fear and awe' in the context of Christian liturgical rites emerge as early as 1909 with Edmund Bishop's article *Fear and Awe Attaching to the Eucharistic Service*.[1042] Bishop writes that such language emerges, or at least becomes intensified within the context of the fourth century Eastern Church, and thus affecting a significant change in the "religious sentiment in regard to the Eucharist".[1043] He argues that the essence of such a change was to transform what "was preeeminently the sacrament of love" into one "invested with attributes of cultural dread."[1044] Although he is unable to "trace back this idea further than St Cyril of Jerusalem […] it is enough to shew that it was prevalent in some quarters by the middle of the fourth century."[1045] He refers here to *MC*'s description of the anaphora, referring to the moment in which the priest calls upon the people to have their "hearts on high" (*Ἄνω τὰς καρδίας*) as "that most awful [lit. 'hair-raising'] hour" (*ἐκείνην τὴν φρικωδεστάτην ὥραν*), urging the people not to dwell on earthly things but to have their hearts "with the Lord" (*πρὸς τὸν Κύριον*).[1046] Bishop continues by drawing parallels with 'the preacher of Antioch', John Chrysostom, who employs similar language to that of *MC*. That Bishop regards this as a distinctly Greek phenomenon can be deduced from the fact that he attributes Narsai's strong emphasis on the idea of awe and dread, not to the tradition of the East-Syrian Church, which had developed quite independent of the Greek-speaking churches, but rather to an Antiochene borrowing towards the end of the fourth century.[1047]

[1042] Bishop 1909.
[1043] Ibid., 93.
[1044] Ibid.
[1045] Ibid. See also Quasten (1960), according to whom Cyril is "the first theologian to call this Eucharistic sacrifice 'awful' or 'awe-inspiring' (*φρικωδέστατος*), preparing the way for this particular religious sentiment found also" in other fourth-century sources (376).
[1046] *MC* 5:4. Hawk-Reinhard, in her 'Cyril of Jeusalem's Teachings Regarding the Proper Fear of God'(forthcoming), building on the semantic domains of Louw and Nida (1988, §25V, §53G, §87B, §36C), analyses Cyril's varying uses of words relating to fear and awe in *CL* and *MC* more broadly.
[1047] Bishop 1909, 96.

Gregory Dix concurs with Bishop, calling the use of such language in *MC* "unexampled in any previous writer treating of the eucharist."[1048] While conceding that this is something "not wholly out of connection with the past," Dix is nonetheless of the opinion that "Cyril stands out as the representative of an innovation destined to a long future."[1049] Like Bishop, he too sees this primarily as a Greek tradition which, after becoming common place among Syrian writers like Chrysostom, later influenced the Eastern liturgies. The West, however, remained more or less untouched by this.[1050] As Auxentios of Photiki rightly notes, the influence of paganism is taken for granted by nearly all scholars writing on the subject, most of whom unquestioningly follow the path prepared by Bishop.[1051] But, citing Quasten,[1052] he convincingly demonstrates that the language of 'fear and awe' was far more abundant in earlier texts than Bishop suggests.[1053] As with the *Disciplina*, what we see in the fourth century is not a novel introduction, but an intensification of something already present in Christian liturgy much earlier, perhaps even with possible New Testament roots. However, while he is successful refuting many of the assertions put forth by Bishop and others as to the late origins of such language, he does little to provide an alternative narrative explaining why its use actually did become intensified and more widespread in the fourth century.

Quasten[1054] and Jungmann[1055] do go some way to constructing such a narrative, both attributing this localised appearance of 'fear and trembling' language to theological disputes surrounding the Arian controversy. Pointing to the great frequency with which this form of expression is used in the liturgies of the so-called Monophysites, eager to emphasise the fullness of Christ's divinity, they both suggest that it sought to emphasise Christ's Godhead

[1048] Dix 1960, 200.
[1049] Ibid.
[1050] Ibid.
[1051] Photiki 1996, 58.
[1052] Quasten 1954.
[1053] Photiki 1996, 65–7.
[1054] Quasten 1951, 72.
[1055] Jungmann 1965, 248.

and that its occurrence in the fourth century was in reaction to those who questioned precisely this:

> They laid less and less stress on the human aspects of Christ's personality, on His relationship to us as friend and brother. For it was His divinity that had to be defended, and so the emphasis was on the rights that He exercises, His might as the judge of living and the dead.[1056]

This is certainly a plausible explanation, but I would argue that in addition to theological concerns, ecclesiology was equally if not more important. While the *Disciplina* and accompanying catechism would have gone some way to help sift the wheat from the chaff, these alone could not stem the tide of ill prepared or insincere converts from paganism.

When Cyril addresses those who have come to him for the wrong reasons, he is speaking, not to catechumens, but to *φωτιζόμενοι*, those who had already managed to slip through the cracks and be enrolled for baptism. Only the clarity of their own conscience, which Cyril's opening lectures repeatedly attempt to prick, stood in the way of their descent into the baptismal font and subsequent entry into the mysteriological life of the Church. Elsewhere, he even states that "the Church is filled with heretics in disguise."[1057] Georg Kretschmar writes in the *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* how the liturgy in the fourth century took on "den Charakter einer öffentlichen Institution," arguing that the services were sheared of their former intimacy and instead formal events which place a heavy emphasis on the distinction between the sacred and the profane, the insider and outsider.[1058] I would suggest that an increased emphasis on fear and reverence served to complement the *Disciplina* as a form of post-baptismal safeguard, temporarily keeping neophytes at a distance and giving them further time to shed the *Weltanschauung* they had brought with them. That Cyril sees fear as proper to neophytes rather than seasoned believers is made clear when he tells the *φωτιζόμενοι*: "You

[1056] Ibid., 198.
[1057] *CL* 15:9 — "πεπλήρωται ἡ ἐκκλησία κεκρυμμένων αἱρετικῶν."
[1058] Kretschmar 1977b.

are just now in the turn of the scale, to be received or not to be received. You must not imitate those who are free from care, but cherish fear."[1059] We hear here an echo of the well known biblical dicta: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom"[1060] and "Love casts out fear."[1061] Further evidence of this is found in the fact that, by the fourth century, the newly-baptised were not permitted to take part in the Offertory, which otherwise involved the active participation of the laity.[1062] Ambrose insists that this was reserved for established Christians who had a good understanding of its meaning.[1063] Of possible relevance is also the third canon of the Council of Laodicea, convened in the mid-fourth century, which forbids the ordination of the recently baptised to the sacerdotal order, which likely included the offices of cantor, reader and subdeacon, and perhaps also that of door-keeper. When looking at Day's article detailing the observance of the *Disciplina* in the fourth century, one notices a correlation between those locations where the *Disciplina* was most stringently observed and where language of fear and awe was most prominent,[1064] suggesting the two served the same purpose. It is certainly no coincidence that we see the introduction of the altar curtain around this time,[1065] and perhaps even more telling that it is once the *Disciplina* begins to disappear that the Emperor Justinian finds it necessary to prescribe the reading of priestly prayers aloud, the clergy having found silent recitation the only way to preserve their sanctity in the presence of an increasingly nominal congregation.[1066]

[1059] *PC* 13 — "σὺ δὲ ἀκμὴν ἐν ζυγῷ στήκεις, ἢ δεχθῆναι, ἢ μὴ δεχθῆναι· μὴ μιμήσῃ τοὺς ἔχοντας τὸ ἀμέριμνον, ἀλλὰ μέτελθε τὸν φόβον."

[1060] Ps. 111:10; Prov. 1:7, 9:10.

[1061] 1 Joh. 4:18. I would argue that it is in this context that we must read Cyril's use of Deut. 4:10 — "ἐκκλησίασον πρόσμε τὸν λαόν, καὶ ἀκουσάτωσαν τὰ ῥήματά μου, ὅπως ἂν μάθωσι φοβεῖσθαί με" — when defining ἐκκλησία in *CL* 18.24.

[1062] Yarnold 1994, 41.

[1063] *In Ps. 118 Expos.*, Prologus 2; (*PL* 15:1198–1199).

[1064] Day 2001.

[1065] Dix 1960, 481.

[1066] See 'Παράγοντες που ἐπέδρασαν στὴ διαφοροποίηση τῆς παραδόσεως τῆς εἰς ἐπήκοον ἀναγνώσεως τῶν εὐχῶν' and 'Ἡ ἀντίδραση τοῦ Ἰουστινιανοῦ καὶ οἱ ἐξέλιξεις που ἐπηκολούθησαν ἕως τὸ πρώτο χειρόγραφο εὐχολόγιο (Τέλη Η΄ αἰώνα)' in Filias 1997 (47–76). Despite the emperor's best efforts, silent recitation has remained standard practice in the Byzantine rite until today (See 'Εὐχές που ἀναγινώσκονται "μυστικώς" ἤ "χαμηλόφωνως"' in Ibid., 93–128).

Mysteriological and doctrinal secrecy

Having focused at length on ideas of secrecy and mystery, we have yet to address the extent of this secrecy. Jungmann asserts that the "[o]bjects of the *disciplina arcani*, which, therefore, had to be kept secret, were not so much certain doctrines, but certain practices and formulae — chiefly Baptism and the celebration of the Eucharist and what is connected with it."[1067] This does not appear to be entirely true of the *Disciplina* as practiced in Jerusalem. While it is the case that detailed knowledge of rites was guarded more jealously than knowledge of doctrine, the former being withheld even from the *φωτιζόμενοι*, it is nonetheless in the preface to *CL*, which for that reason avoids all discussion of ritual, and not *MC*, that we find the fearful warning against relating anything of what was said to the catechumens or non-Christians. Schwartz suggests that "Cyril of Jerusalem urged caution with respect to matters of Christian theology."[1068] It is unclear to what extent the passage he cites as proof[1069] necessarily implies any doctrinal, as opposed to ritual, secrecy. On the one hand, Cyril is adamant that "to hear the Gospel is permitted to all," but then suggests that the explanation of its real meaning is reserved for believers. "The mysteries concerning Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,"[1070] which he forbids them to speak of in front of heathens and catechumens could arguably refer to baptism, which was characterised by a Trinitarian invocation, were it not for the fact that it appears in the lecture 'On the Unity of God', not those on baptism. Cyril also clearly states that he is referring to the "mysteries, which the Church *now* [emphasis mine] explains to you." 'Now', before baptism, while Cyril would not divulge details of the mysteries until after it had taken place.

[1067] Jungman 1965, 194.
[1068] Schwartz 2009, 42.
[1069] *CL* 6:29. See p.182 above.
[1070] *CL* 6:29

Stroumsa correctly remarks that previous research on the *Disciplina*[1071] has been almost exclusively focused "on *ritual* action, *dromena*" while ignoring "the traditions of esoteric *teaching*, the *legomena*."[1072] Without implying a direct Pythagorean influence on Judaism,[1073] he takes as his starting point the "striking similarities between the manner in which…secret traditions were developed and protected among" them,[1074] and, although he concedes that his thesis "risks being rejected as 'speculative' by some scholars,"[1075] he argues in favour of "the possibility of Jewish influence at the origin of the Christian *arcana*."[1076]

Cyril appears to do away with any notion of doctrinal esotericism by his insistence that his listeners pay no heed to that which is not to be found in Scripture:

> Why then are you overly concerned about things which not even the Holy Spirit has written in the Scriptures? You who do not know the things which are written, are you overly concerned about the things which are not written? There are many questions in the Divine Scriptures; what is written we do not comprehend, why are we overly concerned about what is not written?[1077]

And again:

> For on the divine and holy Mysteries of the Faith, we should not even make a casual remark without the divine Scriptures: nor be drawn aside by mere probabilities and the artifices of argument. Do not then believe me only because I tell you these things, unless you receive proof from the divine Scriptures the proof of what is set forth: for this salvation of our faith does not come from convincing arguments, but by proof from the divine Scriptures.[1078]

[1071] Although he refers to this body of literature as "immense", the limited selection he presents is remarkably lacking in contemporary sources, dating largely from the beginning of the previous century (Stroumsa 2005, 29, n.8), and his assertion that "on this subject the articles in the great encyclopedias remain essential" (Ibid., 30) appears to call this immensity into question.

[1072] Stroumsa 2005, 29.

[1073] Cf. Clement's discussion of *De symbolis Pythagoræ* in *Stromatum* 5.5 (*PG* 9:45C–56B).

[1074] Ibid., 28.

[1075] Ibid., 29.

[1076] Ibid., 31.

[1077] *CL* 11:12 — "Τί τοίνυν πολυπραγμονεῖς, ἃ μηδὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔγραψεν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς; Ὃ τὰ γεγραμμένα μὴ γινώσκων, τὰ μὴ γεγραμμένα πολυπραγμονεῖς; Πολλὰ ζητήματά ἐστιν ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς· τὸ γεγραμμένον οὐ καταλαμβάνομεν, τί τὸ μὴ γεγραμμένον πολυπραγμονοῦμεν."

[1078] *CL* 4:17 — "Δεῖ γὰρ περὶ τῶν θείων καὶ ἁγίων τῆς Πίστεως μυστηρίων, μηδὲ τὸ τυχὸν ἄνευ τῶν θείων παραδίδοσθαι γραφῶν· καὶ μὴ ἁπλῶς πιθανότησι καὶ λόγων κατασκευαῖς παραφέρεσθαι. Μηδὲ ἐμοὶ τῷ ταῦτά σοι λέγοντι, ἁπλῶς πιστεύσῃς· ἐὰν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῶν καταγγελλομένων ἀπὸ τῶν θείων μὴ λάβῃς γραφῶν. Ἡ σωτηρία γὰρ αὕτη τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν, οὐκ ἐξ εὑρεσιλογίας, ἀλλὰ ἐξ ἀποδείξεως τῶν θείων ἐστὶ γραφῶν."

Also the most frequently cited example of orthodox esotericism in the fourth century, the twenty-seventh chapter of Basil the Great's *On the Holy Spirit*, which gives equal status to a secretly transmitted apostolic tradition alongside the written tradition of Scripture, is primarily concerned with ritual practice, such as the sign of the cross, the direction of prayer, and other sacraments, all of which are found in Cyril.[1079] Indeed, of Basil's first example, the sign of the cross, Cyril tells his listeners to "make this sign when eating and drinking, sitting, lying down and rising up, speaking and walking: in a word, at every act."[1080]

Other sections of *CL* would also suggest that Cyril does not call for secrecy of doctrine *per se*, but only in its creedal form:

> In order that the soul may not perish from ineducation, we comprehend in a few verses the whole doctrine of the faith. This I wish you to remember even in the very phrase, and to rehearse it with all diligence among yourselves, not writing it on paper, but by memory engraving it on your heart: being careful during study, lest some of the Catechumens overhear the things delivered to you.[1081]

The Symbol of Faith, of course, was not merely a statement of doctrine but had a ritual function. It was first and foremost a baptismal creed[1082] and, if kept secret, would be known only by those who had received the bath of regeneration. William Harmless likens it to "a secret 'password' that marked one off as an orthodox Christian."[1083] Cyril demands that his listeners keep it "with godly fear" and likens it to being given a deposit of money, one God will require back from them.[1084] Similar analogies are also employed by Augustine and Ambrose,[1085] the latter vowing to "throw out as a cheat" anyone who dares to reveal its wording to the

[1079] *De Spiritu Sancto* 27.66–68, 98–103.

[1080] *CL* 4:14 — "Ποίει δὲ τοῦτο τὸ σημεῖον, ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων· καθήμενος, κοιταζόμενος, ἐξανιστάμενος, λαλῶν, περιπατῶν· ἁπαξαπλῶς ἐν παντὶ πράγματι.". Whether Cyril considered this symbol the prerogative of the initiated, or one equally appropriate for the catechumen, is not possible to discern from his writings.

[1081] *CL* 5:12 — "ὑπὲρ τοῦ, μὴ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξ ἀμαθίας ἀπολέσθαι, ἐν ὀλίγοις τοῖς στίχοις τὸ πᾶν δόγμα τῆς πίστεως περιλαμβάνομεν. Ὅπερ καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς λέξεως μνημονεῦσαι ὑμᾶς βούλομαι καὶ παρ' ἑαυτοῖς μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς ἀπαγγεῖλαι, οὐκ εἰς χάρτας ἀπογραφομένους, ἀλλ' ἐν καρδίᾳ τῇ μνήμῃ στηλογραφοῦντας· φυλαττομένους ἐν τῷ μελετᾶν, μή πού τις Κατηχούμενος ἐπακούσῃ τῶν παραδεδομένων."

[1082] The recitation of the Creed had not yet become part of the Eucharistic liturgy.

[1083] *Augustine and the Catechumenate*, 278–9. In the Liturgy of St. James, believers are called by the deacon to "recognize one another" (Ἀλλήλους ἐπίγνωτε) immediately prior to its recitation (Fountoulēs 2005, 100)

[1084] *CL* 5:13

[1085] Malesic 2009, 48–51.

uninitiated.[1086] I would furthermore suggest that there is a didactic element here. Though an outsider might be able to hear the doctrines of the Church confessed and expounded intellectually, he lacks the "ecclesiological context of interpretation" of the aforementioned *regula fidei*, whereby the believer, "through the living ecclesial experience of communion within the Body of Christ",[1087] is able to grasp experientially what doctrinal formulations can only hope to approximate. Only the baptised and initiated could truly say "Πιστεύομεν" and furnish the words of the Creed with true meaning. In this sense, Stroumsa is not entirely wrong in identifying some concept of non-ritualistic esotericism within the Christian Orthodoxy of the fourth century.

Conclusion

The novelty of the *Disciplina* is generally exaggerated by scholars, and what we see in the fourth century is merely a strengthening of an existing feature of Christian worship. Cyril's primary concern therefore does indeed seem to protect the sanctity of the mysteries from those unworthy to hear or see them, and in turn those unprepared to receive them from physical and spiritual harm. However, it is unquestionable that it also became a powerful regulatory tool in the process of Christianisation and formation of Christian identity. It served both to propagate Christianity among followers of traditional Graeco-Roman religion, pitting the worship of the Church against the mystery cults of the Greeks, while simultaneously guarding against the undue influence of paganism on Christianity, ensuring that, among those who did choose to make the move, only those with sincere motives and sufficient instruction were admitted to membership of the mysteriological body of the Church. It did this by making the sincerity of the worshipping Church, rather than the superficial allegiances of the public sphere, the real

[1086] Ambrose, *Explanatio symboli* 2 (in Faller 1955).
[1087] Jovanović 2013, 135.

context for forming a genuinely Christian identity. The *Disciplina* is thus instrumental in turning the catechumenate into the 'buffer zone' described in the previous chapter, clearly distinguishing between the nominal and committed, the Church as a social institution and a mysteriological body, the Body of Christ. It was membership of the latter which truly mattered for Cyril, and baptism was its only point of entry. But which baptism? It is to this question we will now turn.

Chapter 9 — The Limits of Grace: St. Cyril's rejection of heretical baptism and its ecclesiological implications

"*There is one Lord, one faith, and one baptism: none but the heretics are re-baptised, since their former baptism was not baptism*."[1088]

This short yet remarkable passage from *PC* gives us great insight into Cyril's understanding of the borders or limits of the Church. This chapter seeks to provide an overview of the various elements he sees as indispensable for a baptism to be 'valid' — a term with scholastic overtones that has now fallen out of favour with many scholars, particularly in the East, but which I employ here for the sake of expedience — and the implications of this on his wider understanding of the Church, particularly its limitations. Particular attention will be paid to his assertion above that the baptism of heretics is not baptism, but merely a false imitation thereof, and how his understanding of the uniqueness of Catholic baptism is intimately connected to his 'exclusivist' theology. I will look at how the arguments put forth during the controversy over 'rebaptism' which raged in the third century between the churches of Rome and North Africa were received and developed by Cyril and his contemporaries in the following century in response to the new challenges of the post-Constantinian era.

The two diverging schools of thought on the issue of baptisms performed outside the canonical limits of the Church are normally associated with Cyprian of Carthage and Stephen of Rome.[1089] Stephen viewed baptisms performed by those "coming from any heresy whatsoever" as genuine, provided use was made of the correct form, [1090] and that to receive

[1088] *PC* 7 — "Εἷς γὰρ Κύριος, καὶ μία πίστις, καὶ ἓν βάπτισμα· μόνον γὰρ αἱρετικοί τινες ἀναβαπτίζονται· ἐπειδὴ τὸ πρότερον οὐκ ἦν βάπτισμα."

[1089] For a comprehensive overview, see part 5 of Burns and Jensen 2014 (165–232).

[1090] The *Didache* is undoubtedly the earliest extra-Biblical source we have detailing the correct form of baptism: "Baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit in running water. But if you have no running water, then baptize in some other water; and if you are not able to baptize in cold water, then do so in warm. But if you have neither, then pour water on the head three times in the name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit", trans. Holmes 2008, 355). This pouring over the head would involve the candidate standing, with the water then subsequently covering the entire body. In a report of Epiphanius of Salamis of a sickbed baptism,

such a person into the Catholic Church via baptism would constitute re-baptism — an unacceptable denial of the scriptural and creedal profession of 'one baptism'.[1091] The Cyprianite position, on the other hand, is summarised by John Zizioulas as the identification "of the canonical limits of the Church with the charismatic Church."[1092] Readers will undoubtedly be familiar with his famous assertion: "*Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*,"[1093] which formed the cornerstone also of his understanding of baptism, and on which basis he argued against the validity of any sacrament performed outside of the Catholic Church and demanded that both heretics and schismatics alike be received into the Church via Catholic baptism — one cannot speak of re-baptism if a genuine baptism had not previously been conferred. Despite their differences, it must be noted here that Stephen appears to have shared with Cyprian the underlying presupposition that the Holy Spirit does not work — at least not sacramentally — outside the Catholic Church. It was his separation of baptism from the subsequent imposition of hands, through which the candidate received the Holy Spirit, that allowed for him to speak of genuine baptism among heretics while simultaneously upholding what we can perhaps call an 'exclusivist pneumatology'.[1094] It is not until Augustine, who taught that the sacraments of

for example, we can gather that even where immersion was not possible, water was nonetheless poured over the entire body of the candidate (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30.4.3–7 and 30.6.1–4, trans. Williams 1987, 122–4. See also Ferguson 2009, 625). Eusebius, describing how Novatus "as he lay in bed […] received baptism by affusion," even questions "if it can be called baptism in the case of such a man" (*HE* 6.7.4, trans. Williamson 1989, 217) and that his ordination had subsequently "been resisted by all the clergy and many of the laity; because it was unlawful that one who had been affused on his bed on account of sickness as he had been should enter into any clerical office" (Ibid., 739). The twelfth canon of Neo-Caesarea seems to suggest that this particular rule probably had more to do with the inability of the sick person to consciously participate in the baptism (n.2132 Ibid.). Nonetheless, we can see the importance placed on the need for correct form, involving invocation of the Holy Trinity with a triple application of water over the entire body, preferably by immersion. In the ninth century, Emperor Leo VI celebrated the fact that it was no longer necessary to prohibit baptism in private chapels for fear of unorthodox ritual, as had been the case in earlier centuries, presumably also that of Cyril (Noailles and Dain 1946, 149–150).

[1091] It should be noted here that Stephen's position is known to us only in sporadic citations by others. Thus, the position here attributed to him is based on the arguments to which Cyprian is responding, and the anonymous treatise *On Rebaptism* in which we find the fullest surviving argument in favour of the Roman position in the third century.

[1092] Zizioulas 1985, 22.

[1093] "Outside the Church there is no salvation." While not an original utterance — Irenaeus of Lyons having made a nearly identical statement in *Adv. Haer.* (4.2) — the notion was greatly developed and cultivated by Cyprian.

[1094] Cyprian, *Ep.* 47.5.1 trans. Clark 1989, 241. This assumes Cyprian's representation of Stephen's views are accurate, and in agreement with the anonymous tract *On Rebaptism*. Ferguson (2009) suggests the laying on of

heretics are 'valid' despite being inefficacious and irregular on account of their separation from the Church, that we find a truly alternative approach to the question of grace outside of the Church.[1095]

While J. Patout Burns attributes the divergence of Stephen's and Cyprian's views to the small and intimate nature of the church in Carthage as opposed to the large and diverse community at Rome, creating attitudes of exclusivity and inclusivity respectively,[1096] David Heith-Stade suggests that the diverging positions represent different ecclesiological emphases: eschatological[1097] and pneumatological. He posits that Stephen's Roman church had a less developed baptismal theology than other local churches, and that it might have "emphasized the eschatological aspect of baptism, i.e. purification from the present sinful world",[1098] whereas Cyprian's pneumatological ecclesiology

> perceived the church of the new covenant as the new life in the communion of the Holy Spirit. The early church did, however, think that the ecclesial reality of the new covenant was visible; the later Augustinian and Protestant notions of distinction between the visible and invisible church would have been alien to the Christianity of the first centuries.[1099]

---

hands in this context was not related to the reception of the Holy Spirit, but rather akin to the reconciliation of penitents, and that it tells us little about Stephen's baptismal pneumatology (384).

[1095] Alkiviadis 2009, 33. An analysis of Augustine's baptismal theology with particular reference to the North African re-baptism controversy, see Patout Burns 2011. For patristic attitudes to schism vis-à-vis sacraments, see Greenslade 1964.

Augustine's sermons praise Cyprian for his concern for correct ecclesiology and the unity of the Catholic Church, but without validating the particularities of his position, especially as regards baptism. Cyprian was a holy man, but not even saints are infallible, seems to be the message hiding behind the adulation (see, for example, Sermon 312 *On the Birthday of Cyprian, the Martyr*, 6, trans. Brown 1948, 70–1). Cardman (1999) suggests that Augustine in this way "selectively shapes the churches' memory of Cyprian and limits the kind of appeals that can be made to it. By laying claim to the example of Cyprian's charity, Augustine in effect puts charity before doctrine, the practice of unity before sacramental unanimity" (28–29). Augustine's selective use of Cyprian is also discussed in two articles in Bakker et al. 2010: Matthew Alan Gaumer, 'Dealing with the Donatist Church: Augustine of Hippo's nuanced claim to the authority of Cyprian of Carthage' (181–202); and Paul van Geest, 'Pectus ardet Evangelical pietate, et pectori respondet oratio: Augustine's neglect of Cyprian's striving for sincerity' (203–217).

[1096] Patout Burns 1993a, 41–42. For socio-political influences on Cyprian's ecclesiology, see also id. 2002; Howard-Brook 2016, 161–177; Stuart Hall 2006.

[1097] On baptism and eschatology, see Ramelli 2011a.

[1098] Heith-Stade 2010c, 404. Popkes (2011, 1059–60) suggests the North African church was more concerned with validity (Rechtmäßigkeit) of baptism, while the Roman church saw baptism more as a means of salvation (heilsvermittelnd), but this dichotomy seems to undermine prominent soteriological and pneumatologial underpinnings of Cyprian's position. It was, after all, the absence of salvation outside the Church which caused him to deny the validity of baptisms performed outside the Church.

[1099] Ibid., 403.

J.P. Burns, like many others, refers to "the success of the Roman position in the controversy over schismatic baptism" and asserts that the "future practice of the church […] followed not the position of Cyprian but that of Stephen."[1100] I intend to demonstrate that this is not at all applicable to the East, even after it became the seat of imperial power. Contrary to his claims, there the position of Cyprian prevailed also after the conversion of Constantine, albeit in nuanced form, and baptism remained the primary ritual by which, not only the canonical, but also mysteriological and charismatic borders of the Church, were defined. Although delivered at the very heart of this period in a church endowed with significant imperial patronage, Cyril's lectures present us with a view of baptism that clearly places him in the company of Cyprian rather than Stephen. As we shall see below, this rigorous and uncompromising approach — characterised by the same "fearless consistency" Georges Florovsky attributes to Cyprian[1101] — was the dominant position throughout the East, also in the fourth century. Again, I would argue that it is the blurring of the boundaries between the ecclesiastical and wider social spheres in the fourth century that forced bishops like Cyril to place a renewed emphasis on the importance of baptism as a "ritual of radical border crossing", and as such the sole prerogative of the Church. In their attempt to create a society that did not exist in the fourth century — or rather, to manifest societally what already existed ontologically — one could perhaps say that figures such as Cyril were, as Isabella Sandwell suggests, "construct[ing] reality through text."[1102] Making baptism a clear and visible border to denote this desired society was paramount in the efforts to do so.

[1100] Patout Burns 1993a.

Despite evidence to the contrary, this idea is one that continues to be presented as a given even in recent works. Hovorun (2015, 48), for example, states that, "The African church disapproved of the interventions of Stephen. The later universal church's reception, however, favoured the position of Stephen concerning baptisms outside the church, not that of Cyprian". Dagfinn Stærk (2010, n.14), in his annotated republication of selected works of Cyril, likewise argues that "Kyrill mente at alle heretikere måtte døpes om igjen i den katolske kirke. De fleste av kirkefedrene var imidlertid uenig i dette." ("Cyril held that all heretics must be baptised again in the Catholic Church. The majority of the Church Fathers, meanwhile, disagreed with this" — translation mine).

[1101] Florovsky 1986, 14.

[1102] Sandwell 2007, 12–13.

As demonstrated in the preceding chapters, baptism is for Cyril quite clearly a rite of initiation, which marks a person's entry into the Catholic Church, and thereby serves to clearly demark her canonical boundaries. Although certain post-baptismal safeguards were put in place to protect the sanctity of the mysteries from those who may have slipped through the cracks — such as greater use of 'fear and trembling' language in the liturgy or the exclusion of the newly baptised from the offertory — the waters of baptism nonetheless remained the moat separating those outside the Church from those within. Baptism precedes everything, for even though "Jesus Christ was the Son of God, he nonetheless did not evangelise before baptism. If the Master himself entered upon his time in regular order, should we servants venture out of order?"[1103] This is all well and good, but to what extent do the canonical limits of the Church correspond to her charismatic limits? Are the mysteries, or sacraments, accomplished only in the Church, or is the presence of the Church made evident precisely by the accomplishment of sacraments?[1104] To answer these questions, it is necessary to look at the various features which for Cyril distinguish true baptism from false baptism.

The operation of the Holy Spirit in baptism

In *PC*, Cyril warns those who may have enrolled for baptism with wrong intentions not to "expect to be given grace: for though the water will receive you, the Spirit will not accept you"[1105] and "though men baptise you, the Holy Spirit will not baptise."[1106] Thus, while outward baptism might suffice for formal entry into the mysteriological body of the Christian Church, the rebirth occasioned by the operation of the Holy Spirit, which unites the believer to

[1103] *CL* 3:14 — "Ιησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν· ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εὐηγγελίσατο· εἰ ὁ δεσπότης αὐτὸς μετήρχετο κατὰ τάξιν τὸν καιρὸν, ἆρά γε οἱ δοῦλοι τολμᾶν ἀτάκτως ὀφείλομεν;"
[1104] Florovsky 1986, 15.
[1105] *PC* 4 — "σὺ δὲ μὴ προσδόκα λήψεσθαι τὴν χάριν· τὸ μὲν [γὰρ] ὕδωρ σε δέξεται, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμά σε οὐ δέξεται."
[1106] *CL* 17:36 — "νῦν ἄνθρωποί σε βαπτίζουσι, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμά σε οὐ βαπτίσει."

the death of Christ and raises him to his resurrection, necessitates the good disposition of the one approaching the mystery. For while "the water envelopes outwardly […] the Spirit perfectly baptises also the soul inwardly."[1107] This is not to suggest that he relegates the outward forms of the mystery to a mere formality. He goes to great length to emphasise the sanctifying power also of the material elements involved, insisting that we "do not regard the sacred bath as ordinary water […] For as the sacrifices at the altars, being ordinary by nature, by invocation of the idols become polluted, so contrariwise, ordinary water, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, and of Christ, and of the Father, gains a sanctifying power."[1108] Citing the example of Cornelius and his companions described in the Acts of the Apostles,[1109] Cyril notes that, although they had already received the gift of the Holy Spirit on account of their faith, the Apostle Peter nonetheless commanded them to be baptised. "Neither he who is baptised with water, without the granting of the Spirit, has the entire gift; nor one virtuous in his works, without the seal given through water, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven."[1110] His emphasis, then, is on the need for synergy. True membership of the Church — or rather, the difference between being a healthy member rather than an ailing or withered one — is based on man's active participation in, rather than passive reception of God's grace. Moreover, it is clear from this that the importance of baptism for Cyril lies both in the imparting of the spiritual

[1107] *CL* 17:14 — "ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν ὕδωρ ἔξωθεν περιχεῖται, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ἔνδοθεν ψυχὴν βαπτίζει ἀπαραλείπτως."

[1108] *CL* 3:3 — "Μὴ ὡς ὕδατι λιτῷ πρόσεχε τῷ λουτρῷ [...] Ὥσπερ γὰρ τὰ τοῖς βωμοῖς προσφερόμενα, τῇ φύσει ὄντα λιτὰ, μεμολυσμένα γίγνεται τῇ ἐπικλήσει τῶν εἰδώλων· οὕτως ἀπεναντίας τὸ λιτὸν ὕδωρ Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Χριστοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὴν ἐπίκλησιν λαβὸν, δύναμιν ἁγιότητος ἐπικτᾶται." This was also an important response to the Manichean or Gnostic rejections of the material creation as evil.

[1109] Acts 10:44–48

[1110] *CL* 3:4 — "Οὐδὲ ὁ τῷ ὕδατι βεβαπτισμένος, μὴ καταξιωθεὶς δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος, τελείαν ἔχει τὴν χάριν· οὐδὲ κἂν ἐνάρετός τις γένηται τοῖς ἔργοις, μὴ λάβῃ δὲ τὴν δι' ὕδατος σφραγίδα, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν."

We find the same idea expressed in John Chrysostom. God here "does not suffer […] the baptism to take place upon a command of Peter, but, when He has made it evident how […] they have believed that assuredly Baptism is the remission of sins, then forthwith comes the Spirit upon them." He calls this reception the "most essential part of the business, the baptism with which [the Apostles] were baptised." However, rather than suggesting that this renders water baptism unnecessary, he argues that God shows the spiritual grace of baptism in order to convince unbelievers of its efficacy. *Homilies on Acts* 24, trans. *NPNF* 1.11, 296.

gifts to the believer, and his initiation into the Church as a visible entity, made discernible by its canonical borders, in which to continue his spiritual journey.

As alluded to above, the third century debate between Cyprian and Stephen was essentially a question of the Holy Spirit's role and operation in the rite of baptism.[1111] Central to Cyprian's baptismal theology is the imparting of the Holy Spirit to the person being baptised. Since the Holy Spirit does not work outside the canonical boundaries of the Church, the notion of baptism outside the Church is for him an utter absurdity. The anonymously authored tract *On Rebaptism* says to the contrary that "it would suffice, after that baptism which [heretics and schismatics] have received outside [the Church] indeed, but still in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord,[1112] that only hands should be laid upon them by the bishop for the reception of the Holy Spirit."[1113] Like Tertullian before him,[1114] the author does not understand baptism as involving a reception of the Holy Spirit, but simply as making one ready for such a reception later through the imposition of hands. In the context of such a scheme, the Holy Spirit need not necessarily be present among heretics for them to administer genuine baptism, since they are perfectly capable of providing the valid form. Firmilian, Basil's predecessor as bishop of

[1111] On the interplay between Christology and Pneumatology in modern ecclesiological constructions, see Berger 2007.

[1112] Ferguson (2009, 395) suggests "the appeal to the power of Christ's name was not an alternative baptismal formula". He cites Firmilian, who clearly seems to believe the Trinitarian baptismal formula was the norm among the Romans, saying of them that "They consider there is no need to inquire who it is who has administered baptism, arguing that the person baptised can have obtained grace merely by the invocation of the Trinity, of the names of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." (*ad Cyp.* 9.1) 'In the name of Jesus,' then, does not necessarily refer to an alternative baptismal formula. It could instead mean that which is prescribed by, or done in accord with the teachings of Jesus. In this case, it signifies simply that the baptism is orthodox in its outward form. John of Damascus says as much in *Ex. Acc.* (Book 4.9): "But those who were not baptized into the Holy Trinity, these must be baptized again. For although the divine Apostle says: *Into Christ and into His death were we baptized*, he does not mean that the invocation of baptism must be in these words, but that baptism is an image of the death of Christ. For by the three immersions, baptism signifies the three days of our Lord's entombment. The baptism then into Christ means that believers are baptized into Him" (trans., *NPNF*, 724). For a discussion on the history of the baptismal formula, see Whitaker 1993; Lars Hartman 2011.

[1113] *On Rebaptism* 1, trans. *ANF 5*, 1567.

[1114] "Not that the Holy Spirit is given to us in the water, but that in the water we are made clean by the action of the angel, and made ready for the Holy Spirit" (*De Baptismo* 6.1, trans. Evans 1953, 15). Tertullian, however, totally rejects the baptism of heretics as possessing any kind of validity, claiming that since "they have it not in proper form, there is no doubt that they have it not at all, and there is no possibility of enumerating a thing which is not in any one's possession. Also they cannot have it given them, since they have it not" (*De Baptismo* 15.2, trans. Evans 1953, 33. See Norderval 2011).

Caesarea in Cappadocia, in words akin to those spoken by Christ in response to the Pharisees regarding the baptism of John,[1115] demands from defenders of heretical baptism to tell him whether they regard it as being of the flesh or of the spirit. "If they say flesh, then their baptism is no different from that of the Jews […] But if they say the spirit, then we must ask how it is possible for them to have spiritual baptism when they do not have the Holy Spirit."[1116] Moreover, he argues, since "as many as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ,"[1117] do they claim that "Christ may indeed be with heretics but not the Holy Spirit"?[1118] [1119] Irenaeus of Lyons, with whose writings we know Cyril was familiar,[1120] says clearly that "Where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and every kind of grace."[1121] In concord with Irenaeus, John Chrysostom likens the Church to an army camp, the boundaries of which are determined by the Holy Spirit.[1122] That he repeatedly refers to baptism as initiation into the Church[1123] suggests a position akin to that of Firmilian.

The notion of a Spirit-less baptism is also at odds with Cyril's clear statements regarding the operation of the Holy Spirit in baptism. As we have seen above, he emphasises that the "Sacred bath is not as ordinary water [for] after the invocation of the Holy Spirit [it]

[1115] Matt. 21:25, Mark 11:30, Luke 20:4.
[1116] *Ad Cyp.* 13.1
[1117] Gal. 3:27
[1118] 12.1, trans. Clarke 1989, 248.
[1119] On the question of separating the work of Christ from that of the Holy Spirit, an interesting question is the role here played by Christology. While Cyril clearly distinguishes between the divinity and humanity of Christ, he does not, as Leo of Rome was to do a century later in his infamous Tome, speak of "the Word performing what appertains to the Word, and the flesh carrying out what pertains to the flesh" [*Tome* 4, trans. *NPNF 2.12*, 111–2] but holds the person of Christ as the single actor of both: "Christ was twofold, man in what was seen, God in what was not seen: eating truly as man like us, (for he had like feelings of the flesh with us,) but feeding with the five loaves the five thousand as God: dying truly as man, but as God raising him who had been dead for four days: truly sleeping in the ship as man, and walking on the waters as God […] Although he was scorned by men and beaten as a man, yet He was acknowledged by the creature as God; for the sun, seeing his Lord outraged, hid his light in trembling, not enduring the sight" [*CL* 4:9–10]. There is also the theopaschitic clause in *CL* 13.33, cited in chapter 4 above. In the context of a Christological framework that understands the death and resurrection of Christ, into which Paul says we are baptised, as pertaining not only to his human nature, but to the single person of God the Word made flesh, the notion of a spiritless baptism would certainly be a problematic one.
[1120] *CL* 16:6
[1121] *Adv. Haer.* 3:24.1, trans. *ANF* 1, 1151.
[1122] *Hom.* 11, (*PG* 60:528–9). See Christo 2006.
[1123] See, for example, *Ad Ill.* (*PG* 49:223–240). An English translation can be found in *NPNF* 1.09, 219–239.

gains a sanctifying power."[1124] If the water used for baptism needs to be consecrated and sanctified for a baptism to take place, the presence of the Holy Spirit is obviously required at the baptism itself. We find the same sentiment expressed by John Chrysostom: "When you see the water and the hand of the priest touching your head, you may not think that this is merely water, nor that only the hand of the bishop lies upon your head […] for it is the grace of the Spirit which sanctifies the nature of the water and touches your head together with the hand of the priest."[1125] While he holds that it is "through the words and the hands of the priest [that] the Holy Spirit descends upon you,"[1126] the Spirit's role in sanctifying the water is nonetheless paramount.[1127] Basil the Great, too, writes that "if there is any grace in the water, it [comes] from the Spirit's presence."[1128] The author of the *Didascalia* goes so far as to argue that denying the operation of the Holy Spirit in baptism amounts to the unforgivable sin of blaspheming the Holy Spirit.[1129]

Furthermore, speaking of their imminent baptism, Cyril tells his catechumens that "the Holy Spirit is about to set a seal on your souls" and further that "the water cleanses [man's] body, the Spirit seals the soul."[1130] Elsewhere he says that the Spirit "to this day seals the souls in baptism"[1131] and that he is at baptism "present in readiness to seal your soul and he shall

[1124] *CL* 3:3

[1125] *Cat. Stav.* 2.10, trans. Harkins 1963, 47.

[1126] *Cat. Stav.* 2.25, trans. Harkins 1963, 52

[1127] For a recent treatment of the liturgical significance of the sanctification of water, see Lockwood 2017. See also Brandt 2003 and Fisher 1957.

[1128] *De Spiritu Sancto* 15:35, trans. Anderson 1980, 59.

[1129] *Didascalia* 26, trans. Gibson 1903, 111.

Optatus of Milevis appears to suggest that it is rather a denial of the operation of the Spirit in chrismation that amounts to the unforgivable sin. Listing the three stages of the baptismal rite — exorcism, baptism, and anointing — in his *Fifth Book Against the Donatists*, he connects the final of these to the operation of the Spirit, saying "let it be far from us to ever exorcize one who is sound in faith, let it be far from us ever to call back to the font one who is already washed; let it be far from us ever to sin in the Holy Spirit" (trans. Edwards 1997, 101). Likewise in his Seventh Book, chrism is connected with the reception of the Holy Spirit and the repetition of the anointing is specifically condemned before mention is made of the unforgivable sin (Ibid., 143). It should be pointed out that he is here only condemning the re-chrismation of Catholic Christians, while indicating that the laying on of hands for reception of the Holy Spirit is necessary for the baptized who wish to join the Catholic Church.

[1130] *CL* 3:3–4 — "μέλλει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σφραγίζειν ὑμῶν τὰς ψυχάς [...] Καὶ τὸ μὲν ὕδωρ καθαίρει τὸ σῶμα, τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα σφραγίζει τὴν ψυχήν."

[1131] *CL* 16:24 — "τοῦτο μέχρι σήμερον ἐν βαπτίσματι σφραγίζει τὰς ψυχάς."

give you that seal at which demons tremble."[1132] In *MC*, reception of the Spirit is mentioned not in connection with the immersion in water, but on being "given the chrism, the antitype with which Christ was anointed; and this is the Holy Spirit,"[1133] although the word *sphragis* is not used.[1134] Cyril also makes mention of how Moses and Peter both "give the Spirit by the laying on of hands. And the grace shall also reach [the catechumens], who are about to be baptised; yet in what manner I do not say, for I will not anticipate the proper time."[1135] Juliette Day argues that because "*Cats* [=*CL*] has no reference […] to anointing in connection with the Holy Spirit […] we might wish to read into this statement that the candidates received the Spirit by the imposition of hands."[1136] However, his reluctance to reveal the manner in which the Spirit is given suggests that it was under a different form, most probably through chrism. It also explains why no mention is made of anointing elsewhere in *CL*.[1137]

Like Chrysostom, even if Cyril regards the post-baptismal anointing as the moment at which a person is sealed by the Spirit, the fact that he uses this term elsewhere in connection with water is evidence of the liturgical unity of the two acts in his thought. As Zizioulas explains, while the laying on of hands in the West became separated from baptism with water, being seen as a *confirmation*, as Leo the Great was later to call it in the fifth century,

> [t]his development remained strange to the East where no idea of a 'completion' or 'confirmation' of baptism appeared, apparently because of the liturgical and theological unity in which baptism and confirmation were always kept. There, an understanding of confirmation in such a successive role in relation to baptism was so strange that in areas like Syria, and perhaps Palestine, the order of the two in the

[1132] *CL* 17:35 — "τοῦτο γὰρ ἕτοιμον πάρεστι σφραγίσαι σου τὴν ψυχήν, καὶ δίδωσι σφραγίδα, ἣν τρέμουσι δαίμονες."

[1133] *MC* 3:1 — "Καὶ ὑμῖν ὁμοίως ἀναβεβηκόσιν ἀπὸ τῆς κολυμβήθρας τῶν ἱερῶν ναμάτων χρῖσμα, τὸ ἀντίτυπον ὃ ἐχρίσθη Χριστός. Τοῦτο δέ ἐστι τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα."

[1134] For Juliette Day (2011, 1192), "the absence of σφραγίς in *MC* seems to us to be a significant criteria for attributing that work to anyone other than Cyril".

[1135] *CL* 16:26 — "ἐπὶ Μωυσέως διὰ χειροθεσίας ἐδίδοτο τὸ πνεῦμα. καὶ Πέτρος διὰ χειροθεσίας δίδωσι τὸ πνεῦμα. μέλλει δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ σὲ τὸν βαπτιζόμενον φθάνειν ἡ χάρις. τὸ δὲ πῶς οὐ λέγω. οὐ γὰρ προλαμβάνω τὸν καιρόν."

[1136] Day 2010, 81.

[1137] Day 2011, 1192.

> liturgy reversed, and, contrary to Western practice, baptism itself was called 'perfection'.[1138]

It seems reasonable to posit that this Syro-Palestinian practice of anointing with chrism before baptism,[1139] although not the practice Cyril himself employs, may be what he is referring to when commenting on the case of Cornelius in the Book of Acts as mentioned above: "Yet after the gift of the Spirit, the Scripture says, that Peter commanded them to be baptised in the name of Jesus Christ: that the soul having been regenerated through their faith, the body also, by means of water, might share the gift" [emphasis mine].[1140] The fact that it is by Peter's words that the Spirit descends on Cornelius and his companions is consistent with the view that the Holy Spirit operates only within the Church, being administered by virtue of the apostolic office conferred on the holy priesthood, as shall be mentioned below.

Ephesians 4:5

Another feature central to the discussion of the reception of schismatics and heretics by baptism was the notion of the 'one baptism.' In the Jerusalem Creed, as quoted by Cyril, it appears in the following form: "And in one baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins; and in one holy Catholic Church."[1141] As we have seen, he explains that, "We may not receive baptism twice or thrice […] if you fail once, the thing cannot be set right; for there is one Lord, and one faith, and one baptism: none but heretics are re-baptised, since their former baptism was not baptism."[1142] For Cyril, then, the 'one baptism' confessed in the Creed is not merely a

[1138] Zizioulas 1969, 649.

[1139] See Brock 1972.

[1140] *CL* 3:4 — "καὶ μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριν ἡ γραφή φησιν, ὅτι προσέταξεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ βαπτισθῆναι· ἵνα τῆς ψυχῆς διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἀναγεννηθείσης, μεταλάβῃ καὶ τὸ σῶμα διὰ τοῦ ὕδατος τῆς χάριτος."

[1141] *CL* 18:22 — "καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν Καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν." See Appedix 1.

[1142] *PC* 7 — "Οὐκ ἔνι δὶς καὶ τρὶς λαβεῖν τὸ λουτρόν [...] ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅπαξ ἀποτύχῃς, ἀδιόρθωτον τὸ πρᾶγμα. Εἷς γὰρ Κύριος, καὶ μία πίστις, καὶ ἓν βάπτισμα· μόνον γὰρ αἱρετικοί τινες ἀναβαπτίζονται· ἐπειδὴ τὸ πρότερον οὐκ ἦν βάπτισμα."

reference to its unrepeatability, in contrast to such groups as the Marcionites who allowed multiple baptisms, but is quite clearly understood in conjunction with the 'one Church' confessed in the subsequent article. His use of Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians further sets forth the need for 'one faith,' namely that of the Catholic Church, and confines the worship and operation of the 'one Lord' to that community. We see the same interpretation presented by the canons of the Apostolic Constitutions, thought to have appeared in Syria at the end of the fourth century:

> If any Bishop or Presbyter baptise anew anyone that has had a true baptism, or fail to baptise anyone that has been polluted by the impious, let him be deposed, on the ground that he is mocking the Cross and death of the Lord and failing to distinguish priests from pseudopriests.[1143]

Worth mentioning is also Book 16 of the Theodosian Code, which condemns as "unworthy of the priesthood that bishop who repeats the sanctity of baptism by unlawful usurpation and, against the teachings of all, contaminates this act of grace by repetition,"[1144] but makes clear that this prohibition applies only to those "who had been initiated into the mysteries of the Catholic sect."[1145]

> We hear in Cyril echoes of Cyprian, who also makes use of Ephesians, stating that,
>
> it has been delivered to us that there is One God, and One Christ, and one hope, and one faith, and one Church, and one Baptism appointed only in the one Church, from which unity whosoever shall depart must needs be found with heretics […] Peter, likewise, setting forth an upholding unity, has charged and admonished, that we can only be saved by the one only Baptism of the one Church […]. [A]ll converted to the Church from whatsoever heresy, be baptized with the alone legitimate Baptism of the Church.[1146]

Stephen, on the other hand, understood the 'one baptism' as referring merely to the number of times it could be administered, regardless of the faith or canonical status of the person administering it, unless, that is, an incorrect formula or irregular use of water was involved.

[1143] *Canon* 47, trans. *NPNF* 2.14, 1155.
[1144] 16.6.1, trans. Pharr 1952, 463.
[1145] 16.6.6, trans. ibid., 465.
[1146] *Ep.* 73:11, trans. *ANF* 5, 933.

Both sides accused the other of violating the oneness of baptism, Stephen claiming Cyprian was guilty "of innovations beyond what was handed down"[1147] by re-baptising those who had already received baptism with water, and Cyprian accusing Stephen's party of making "two Baptisms, in that they say there is Baptism among the heretics also."[1148]

The Ministers of Baptism

In *CL* 17, furthering the idea that the 'one baptism' is the sole prerogative of the Church, Cyril seems to suggest that the baptiser should be a member of the priesthood:

> For, at the time of baptism, when you draw near to the bishops, or presbyters, or deacons, (for its grace is everywhere, in villages and in cities, on the uneducated and the learned, on slaves and on freemen, for this grace is not of men, but the gift is from God through men) draw near to the minister of baptism, but pay no heed to the face of the one you see, but remember that Holy Spirit of whom we are now speaking.[1149]

Although the meaning is not entirely clear, '*ὁ βαπτίζων*' appears to refer to the clergy, in which case his words about grace speak about the social ranks to which the members of the priesthood may belong, rather than suggesting that anyone has the authority to baptise on the basis that "this grace is not of men, but […] from God through men."[1150] The point here, then, is once again not to undermine the importance of outward form, but to emphasise the mystery as a participation in the grace of God rather than its automatic imparting through a mechanical process. Clarification is provided by Gregory the Theologian: "let everyone be trustworthy for purification, provided that he is one of those who have been approved, not of those who are

[1147] *Ep.* 73:1

[1148] *Ep.* 70:1

[1149] *CL* 17:35 — "κατὰ γὰρ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ βαπτίσματος, ὅταν προσέλθῃς ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων ἢ πρεσβυτέρων ἢ διακόνων (ἀπανταχοῦ γὰρ ἡ χάρις, καὶ ἐν κώμαις καὶ ἐν πόλεσιν, καὶ ἐπὶ ἰδιωτῶν καὶ ἐλλογίμων, καὶ ἐπὶ δούλων καὶ ἐλευθέρων, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἡ χάρις, ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ δι' ἀνθρώπων ἡ δόσις), σὺ μὲν προσέρχου τῷ βαπτίζοντι, προσέρχου δὲ μὴ προσέχων τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ φαινομένου, ἀλλὰ μέμνησο τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου τούτου, περὶ οὗ νῦν ὁ λόγος."

[1150] While *ἐλλογίμων* could here mean 'elect', suggesting the ordained clergy, its juxtaposition with *ἰδιωτῶν* makes such a reading unlikely.

openly condemned, and not a stranger to the Church."[1151] Thus, 'everyone' does not mean that simply anyone may baptise, but rather that, among those authorised by the Church (i.e. the clergy), candidates should not show respect of persons since the baptism is made efficacious by the Holy Spirit, not the personal piety of the baptiser. Pacian of Barcelona makes the same point with greater clarity in his first Letter:

> Let no one look down on a bishop in consideration merely of the man [for] neither charism, nor baptism, nor remission of sins, nor the renewal of the body were granted to his sacred authority, because nothing was entrusted to him through his own assumption of such; but rather, the whole has descended to him from apostolic authority.[1152]

Conversely, Optatus of Milevis, of whom more shall be said later, appears to base his acceptance of schismatic baptism, at least in part, precisely on the idea that the identity of the baptiser was not a prerequisite for validity.[1153] Cyril's phrasing manages to avoid the Donatist error against which Optatus is reacting, without succumbing to his tacit acceptance of the baptism of non-Catholics.

The *Letter to the Armenians*, authored by Cyril's predecessor Macarius, explicitly states that "this authority [to baptise] belongs to bishops and priests alone, and that it is not right for deacons to perform it, for they are attendants".[1154] It seems strange for Cyril to mention deacons alongside bishops and priests were they forbidden to perform baptisms under Macarius. Juliette Day accordingly suggests that the quote from the *Letter to the Armenians* is the work of a later redactor.[1155] This is probable, although given the ambiguity of Cyril's statement, it is possible that he here refers to the deacon in a different capacity, as performing a helping role in

[1151] *In sanctum baptisma* [*Oration* 40] 26 (*PG* 36:396), trans., *NPNF* 2.7, 735.

[1152] *Ep.* 1.2, trans. Hanson 1999, 26.

[1153] "In the celebration of this sacrament of baptism, there are three aspects, which you will not be able to augment, diminish or omit. The first aspect concerns the Trinity, the second the believer and the third the agent. But we are not to accord the same weight in the scale to each of these. For I see two as necessary and one as all but necessary: the Trinity, without which the rite cannot be carried on, holds prime place; this is followed by the faith of the believer; next now comes the person of the agent, which cannot be of similar authority." *Against the Donatists* 5:4 trans. Edwards 1997, 102.

[1154] Terian 2008, 81.

[1155] Day 2011, 1181, 1189–90.

conjunction with a priest or bishop. Day suggests such roles as leading the candidate in reciting the formula of renunciation, or leading them by hand to the baptismal font.[1156] The *Didascalia Apostolorum*, generally thought to be a 3rd century work of Syrian origin, allows both priests and deacons to perform baptisms, but only at the behest of the bishop.[1157] The presence or absence of the bishop in such a circumstance is not indicated, but believers are instructed to honour "the Bishops […] those who have begotten you anew by means of water, those who have filled you with the Holy Ghost,"[1158] signifying the close involvement of the bishop in the process. The right to perform baptisms is not, however, extended to deaconesses, women being quite explicitly forbidden from doing so.[1159] Instead, a deaconess would only perform those roles that would be inappropriate for a male minister when the (invariably nude) candidate was female, such as anointing prior to immersion and receiving her as she rose from the water.[1160] This could be seen as lending credence to the opinion that Cyril probably allowed his deacons to baptise, but might also give an idea as to what the role of an assisting deacon might have been were this not so. Whatever the case, it is nonetheless clear that the one baptism of the Church can only be administered by a validly appointed agent of the same.

According to the author of *Rebaptism*, baptism performed by 'lower clergy',[1161] is incomplete and in need of fulfilment, much like those performed outside the Church altogether:

> [I]f by necessity it [baptism] should be administered by lower clergy, let us wait for the result, that it [the Holy Spirit] may either be supplied by us [bishops], or reserved to be supplied by the Lord. If, however, it should have been administered by strangers, let this matter be amended as it can and as it allows. Because outside the church there is no Holy Spirit, sound faith moreover cannot exist, not alone among heretics, but even among those who are established in schism.[1162]

[1156] Ibid., 1200.
[1157] *Didascalia* 16, trans. Gibson 1903, 78
[1158] *Didascalia* 9, ibid., 50.
[1159] *Didascalia* 15, ibid., 75
[1160] *Didascalia* 16, ibid., 78
[1161] A term normally denoting subdeacons, anagnosts, and psalts, though it might also denote such roles as exorcist, door-keeper, and acolyte. See, for example, *Excursus on the Minor Orders of the Early Church* in *NPNF* 2.14, 305–308.
[1162] Ferguson 2009, 387–8.

If baptism administered by lower clergy is considered lacking in the grace of the Holy Spirit, how much more that which has been administrated by a layman, not to mention those outside the Church altogether!

Again, the united nature of the sacraments is of significance here. Baptism and chrismation were not, as is generally the case today, isolated rituals performed independently of the Eucharistic assembly.[1163] Instead, they took place precisely within the context of that assembly, and it was the consequent reception of the Body and Blood of Christ that completed this threefold reception of grace and initiation into the Church. In this context, when we consider the bishop as primarily being the head of the Eucharistic assembly, we can instantly see both the importance and the necessity of his role in the sacraments of baptism and chrismation. Given the bishop's integral role in the process of enrolment and catechesis leading up to baptism, as described above by Egeria, to entrust the performance of the mystery itself to lay-baptisers would have been very inconsistent if nothing else. It was clearly not something entrusted to anyone of low degree. As Cyril says with reference to John the Baptist, "for since great was the grace of Baptism, so must its minister be great."[1164]

Hallmarks of True Baptism

To summarise, true baptism is for Cyril one in which the faith and good intention of the believer work in cooperation with the Holy Spirit in order for him to die with Christ, to receive the gift of the Spirit, and to be regenerated in both soul and body. This one and unrepeatable baptism is that of the 'one holy Catholic Church', outside of which the sacramental operation of the Holy Spirit is wholly absent and does not exist among those who do not hold to the

[1163] See Dragas 2011.
[1164] *CL* 3:6 — "Επειδὴ γὰρ μεγάλη βαπτίσματος ἦν ἡ χάρις, ἐδεῖτο καὶ μεγάλου τοῦ προστάτου."

correct ‘one faith’ in the ‘one Lord’. As such, the baptism should only be performed by an orthodox member of the priesthood of that same Church, although the efficacy of the mystery does not depend on any other aspect of his person, since the grace of baptism comes from the Holy Spirit, not the baptiser. The only exception is that of the martyrs, “who even without the water receive the kingdom.”[1165] “For the Saviour […] when his side was pierced, gave forth blood and water: that in times of peace men should be baptised with water, in times of persecution with their own blood.”[1166] If true baptism means dying with Christ in the water, as Cyril says repeatedly, to die a martyr’s death in the name of Christ must certainly be baptism *par excellence*. Accordingly, Cyril notes how “the Saviour knew to call martyrdom, baptism, saying, *Can you drink of the cup which I drink of, and be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with*?.”[1167] He also draws a parallel between the public confession of martyrs and the confession made by the baptismal candidate.[1168] This is significant in that he makes an orthodox confession of faith a necessary prerequisite for baptism even where all other regular elements are absent.[1169] It is no wonder, then, that he would discard the baptism of those who were unable to make such a confession on account of their heresy.

[1165] *CL* 3:10 — “Εἴ τις μὴ λάβοι τὸ βάπτισμα, σωτηρίαν οὐκ ἔχει· πλὴν μόνων μαρτύρων, οἳ καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ ὕδατος λαμβάνουσι τὴν βασιλείαν.”

While there is no evidence from *CL* to suggest that Cyril himself had any first-hand experience of martyrdom — Cyril having been born after the time of Diocletian and *CL* having been delivered before the brief reign of Julian — martyrdom nonetheless featured prominently in the collective memory of Christians of his time. Although Eusebius informs us that Jerusalem’s Christian community did not suffer heavily during the persecutions of the early fourth century, with only a deacon, Valens, being subjected to a martyr’s death [*Mart. Palest.* 11.4], his audience were by no means strangers to the idea.

[1166] Ibid. — “Λυτρούμενος γὰρ τὴν οἰκουμένην ὁ Σωτὴρ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν νυγεὶς, ἐξήγαγεν αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ· ἵνα οἱ μὲν ἐν καιροῖς εἰρήνης ἐν ὕδατι βαπτισθῶσιν, οἱ δὲ ἐν καιροῖς διωγμῶν ἐν οἰκείοις αἵμασι βαπτισθῶσι.” The same idea is reiterated in 13:21: “For since in the Gospel the salvific baptism is twofold, that namely bestowed by means of water on the illuminated, and that to holy martyrs in persecutions through their own blood, there came out of that salvific Side blood and water (ἐπειδὴ γὰρ διπλῆ τίς ἐστι τοῦ σωτηρίου βαπτίσματος ἐν εὐαγγελίοις ἡ δύναμις, μία μὲν ἡ τοῖς φωτιζομένοις δωρουμένη δι' ὕδατος, δευτέρα δὲ ἡ ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων ἐν διωγμοῖς δι' οἰκείου αἵματος, ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς σωτηρίου πλευρᾶς αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ)”. For Cyprian’s view of blood baptism, see Popkes 2011, 1056–58.

[1167] Mark 10:38. *CL* 3:10 — “Καὶ τὸ μαρτύριον γὰρ οἶδε βάπτισμα καλεῖν ὁ Σωτὴρ, λέγων· Δύνασθε τὸ ποτήριον πιεῖν ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα, ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθῆναι;”

[1168] Ibid.

[1169] Pacian of Barcelona, among others, is quite clear that heretics and schismatics who were put to death could not be counted among the martyrs. “Even though [Novatian] was slain, yet he was not crowned. Why not? Because

Canon 7 of the Council of Constantinople

While not among Cyril's own writings, his presence at the second Ecumenical Council of 381 makes its 7th canon, concerning the method by which members of various schismatic and heretical groups should be received into the Catholic fold, particularly relevant to our discussion. Already before Cyril's rise to the episcopal ranks, the first Ecumenical Council at Nicea had made provisions for receiving 'Cathari,'[1170] or Novatians, into the Catholic Church without baptism,[1171] while insisting on the baptism of those coming from the non-Trinitarian Paulianists,[1172] showing that the question of how to receive non-Catholics had already become a widespread and pertinent problem in the Church. At Constantinople I, we are presented with a much more thorough list of schismatic and heretical groups and the appropriate manner of their reception:

> As for those heretics who betake themselves to Orthodoxy, and to the lot of the saved, we accept them in accordance with the subjoined sequence and custom; viz.: Arians, and Macedonians, and Sabbatians, and Novatians, those calling themselves Cathari, and (those calling themselves) Aristeri, and the Quartodecimans, otherwise known as Tetradites, and Apollinarians we accept when they offer libelli and anathematize every heresy that does not hold the same beliefs as the catholic and apostolic Church of God, and are sealed first with holy myrrh on their forehead and their eyes, and nose, and mouth, and ears; and in sealing them we say: "A seal of a free gift of Holy Spirit." As for Eunomians, however, who are baptized with a single immersion, and Montanists, who are here called Phrygians, and the Sabellians, who teach that Father and Son are the same person, and who do some other bad things, and (those belonging to) any other heresies (for there are many heretics here, especially such as come from the country of the Galatians: all of them that want to adhere to Orthodoxy we are willing to accept as Greeks. Accordingly, on the first day we make them Christians; on the second day, catechumens; then, on the third day, we exorcize them with the act of blowing thrice into their face and into their ears; and thus do we catechize them, and we make them tarry a while in the church and listen to the Scriptures; and then we baptize them.[1173]

---

he was outside the communion of the Church, he was outside the boundaries of concord, he was far away from that mother of whom he who is a martyr must be a part" (*Ep. 2*.5 trans. Hanson 1999, 36).

[1170] See Tripp 1977.

[1171] *Canon* 8 (Nicodemus 2003, 133).

[1172] *Canon* 19 (Ibid., 147).

[1173] Canon 7 (Ibid., 163), trans. *NPNF* 2.14, 389. It should here be noted that the evidence points to a much later date for this particular canon, probably the middle of the fifth century (Ibid., 388), well after Cyril's time.

How, then, do we understand the Council's decision to receive certain groups by chrismation alone, rather than baptism, in light of what has been written above? In Cyril's numerous lists of heresies, we find the names of the groups recommended by the Council for reception by anointing and baptism alike, without any obvious distinction being made between them, Cyril referring to them collectively as "the tribe of heretics."[1174] Likewise, his insistence that heretics' "former baptism was not baptism" is not in any way qualified, but refers equally to all heresies without distinction. The Council, then, seemingly presents us with a departure from Cyril's own practice. However, variance in practice need not imply variance on the underlying theological level. As we shall see, Cyprian's basic premise that baptism outside the Catholic Church was impossible was upheld even by those open to a less rigorous *praxis*.

Schism as an internal division

While such people as Tertullian, Stephen, Cyprian, and Fermillian made no distinction between the reception of heretics and schismatics, since both were outside the Church, their fourth century successors seemed to adopt a more nuanced position in this respect. The writings of the aforementioned Optatus of Milevis, a particularly interesting figure in that he is both a contemporary of Cyril and a compatriot of Cyprian, are especially noteworthy in this respect. In his critique of the Donatist practice of rebaptizing Catholics, he repeatedly asserts that a sharp distinction must be drawn between heretics, "exiles from the truth who have deserted the sound and truest creed [and] fallen from the bosom of the church through their impious sentiments,"[1175] and schismatics, who are "undoubtedly brethren, though not good ones,"[1176]

However, it is clearly representative of what later became normative and enables us to contextualize the ideas we already see in Cyril's contemporaries. See also Edwards 1997, 188, n.18. The canon is repeated, with additions, as the 95th canon of Trullo (see Nicodemus 2003, 304).

[1174] *CL* 6:12

[1175] Edwards 1997, 11.

[1176] Ibid., 2.

and reproaches the Donatists for joining the two. In this they, not he, followed Cyprian.[1177] However, his purpose here is to point to the glass house in which the Donatists, clearly guilty of schism, place themselves by insisting on such a scheme.[1178] One should not, then, regard this as an attack on the Cyprianite stance from which he admittedly differs, but on the inconsistency of the Donatist one. Indeed, what one sees is almost a plea not to have to "strike you together with them in a single judgment."[1179]

Making use of the analogies of the flood and circumcision, "defending the unity of baptism in the Triune name", Optatus decries the Donatists who "brazenly and illegally repeat the baptism of which these two are figures".[1180] He commends them, however, for saying that "heretics cannot possess the gifts of the church"[1181] and that they have "different and false baptisms, by which he who is soiled cannot wash."[1182] Like Cyril, he does not consider the rebaptism of heretics a repetition of baptism since correct form must be accompanied by an orthodox creed.[1183] It is the rebaptism of the orthodox that he deplores. Thus we see in Optatus a position that is in some ways closer to Cyprian and Cyril than to Stephen and the anonymous

[1177] Edwards points out that "the fact that the Donatists rebaptized those catholics who joined them, whereas the catholics did not repeat any baptism administered in the proper form, was cited by some Donatists as a proof that they had a better claim to be the one church of Christ." — Ibid., xxiii.

It is interesting to note that the Council of Laodicea (363–634), in its 7th canon, refers to the schismatic groups of the Novatians and Quatrodecimans as 'heresies', but admits them to communion through renunciation, confession, and chrismation. This suggests that even among those who were wont to group together heretics and schismatics, a *de facto* distinction between the two was upheld.

[1178] Edwards 1997, 10.

[1179] Ibid., 12.

[1180] Ibid., 5.

[1181] Ibid., 9.

[1182] Ibid., 12.

[1183] That being said, it is difficult to say just to what extent Optatus here differs from Stephen, who accepted the baptisms of those coming from 'any heresy whatsoever', since he appears to accept the use of a Trinitarian baptismal formula as valid profession of orthodoxy and only labels as heretics those who distort the doctrine of the Trinity.

In his *Second Discourse Against the Arians* (42–34), Athanasius makes clear that correct form must be accompanied by correct faith: "For this reason, the Saviour did not simply command to baptise, but first says, "Teach", and then, "Baptise in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit", in order that correct faith may proceed from learning, and that faith will accompany the consecration of baptism. There are also many other heresies too, which only make use of the names, but, as I have said, not in a right sense nor with sound faith. The water they administer is therefore without profit and lacking in piety, so that the one sprinkled therewith receives the pollution of irreligion rather than redemption" (*PG* 26:237B).

author of *On Rebaptism*. Even where he differs from Cyprian, this difference appears to lie in his understanding of the nature of schism rather than in his view of baptism or the presence of grace outside the Church. He continues: "To you schismatics, on the other hand, although you are not in the catholic church, these things cannot be denied, because you have administered with us the true and common sacraments."[1184] At first glance, he appears to place the Donatists squarely outside the boundaries of the Church. The opening of his *Second Book*, however, would suggest that what he refers to here is their myopic refusal to recognise the Church outside of Africa. Believing "the reason for calling [the Church] catholic is its international and universal diffusion,"[1185] Optatus could not call the Donatists members of a *Catholic* Church when they recognised no one but their own little community "in a tiny portion of Africa,"[1186] regardless of whether there was any evidence of 'collaborators' — the original reason for the Donatist schism — in the various other parts of the empire. And yet, emphasising that "Christ declared his bride to be one,"[1187] he seems disappointed that the Donatists "have stated that in Africa there are not two parties, but two churches."[1188] Optatus seemingly does not understand schism to be a wholesale departure from the one Church, but as the creation of an erring party within it, or otherwise belonging to it. "The house of God is one; those who have chosen to form a party by going outside have made a wall, not a house, because there is no other God to inhabit another house […]. The wall belongs to the house, but is not a house; and your party is like a church, but is not catholic."[1189] Through a primarily sacramental ecclesiology, an administrative schism — although the worst of sins and cause for great condemnation — does

[1184] Edwards 1997, 12.
[1185] Ibid., 29.
[1186] Ibid.
[1187] Ibid., 42.
[1188] Ibid.
[1189] Ibid., 79. We see the same image of the wall used later in the 15th Canon of the First–Second Council of 861, which distinguishes schismatics, who have broken away from the unity of the Church, from those who temporarily 'wall themselves off' [*ἀποτειχίζοντες*] from an erring party within the Church until said party had been officially and synodically condemned or exonerated. Indeed, the latter preserve the unity of the Church by defending the doctrinal orthodoxy it necessitates: "*οὐ σχίσματι τὴν ἕνωσιν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας κατέτεμον, ἀλλὰ σχισμάτων καὶ μερισμῶν τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἐσπούδασαν ῥύσασθαι*." See Nicodemus 2003, 358.

not negate "the true and common sacraments." His difference with Cyprian, then, lies not so much in his ecclesiological presuppositions, but rather in his interpretation of the historical act of schism. One could perhaps see in Optatus an attempt, though not necessarily a conscious one, to harmonise the positions of Cyprian and Stephen, and, as Edwards suggests, an anticipation of "Augustine's cardinal premises that we can have a church without ministers, but not a church without Christ."[1190] However, the lack of depth and consistency in his arguments makes it difficult to accurately compare his thought to that of others. It might therefore be better to look separately at each of his presuppositions rather than attempt to construct from them a coherent theological or ecclesiological scheme.

Reception *κατ' οἰκονομία*

In the East we see a greater level of consistency and continuity. Basil the Great, for example, also distinguishes between heretics and schismatics, adding to the list 'unlawful assemblies', insisting that those in the first group must be baptised, but allowing for the second to be received by chrism alone, while the third, who are still within the Church, need only repent. However, unlike Optatus, he clarifies that he follows his predecessor Firmilian in disregarding the baptisms of both heretics and schismatics, but adds that the latter may be accepted by "economy in behalf of the multitude."[1191] In this context, the distinctions made by the 7th Canon of 381 are quite telling. Eunomian baptism is to be rejected on account of it

[1190] Edwards 1997, xxv. For a discussion of Augustine's understanding of grace, see Dupont 2015.

[1191] "For it appeared to the ancients to be a reasonable rule that any baptism should be utterly disregarded that has been performed by heretics, or, in other words, by those who have been utterly separated from the Church and who differ from the Orthodox in respect of faith itself, and whose difference is directly dependent of faith in God. As for the baptism of schismatics, on the other hand, it appeared to the Synod of Cyprian and of my own Firmilian that it too ought to be disregarded and rejected, seeing that the schismatics—the Novatians, I mean, the Encratites, the Sarcophores, the Aquarians, and others—have separated in principle form the Church, and after separating have not had the grace of the Holy Spirit in them any longer, as the impartation of it has ceased; hence as having become laymen they have had neither the spiritual gift nor the authority to baptize or to ordain, and consequently those who are baptized by them, as being baptized by laymen, have been ordered to be baptized with the true Baptism of the Catholic Church. Yet inasmuch as it appeared reasonable to some Fathers of Asia for the Baptism of schismatics to be deemed acceptable for the sake of some economy in behalf of the multitude, let it be accepted." *(Canon 1)*

involving but a single immersion, while Sabellians see the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as a single hypostasis, and therefore cannot be truly said to invoke the Holy Trinity in baptism. The distinction, then, is one of form and intention.

We see this clearly with respect to one heretical group recommended for reception by baptism by the Council, which presents a common foe to all those hereto mentioned, namely the Montanists "here called Phrygians." Interestingly, it is none other than Cyril who "was the first to call the adherents of the New Prophecy movement 'Montanists'," [1192] objecting to the fact that "these Montanists were called, falsely indeed, by the common name of Christians." [1193] Following the work of Stéphane Gsell at the beginning of the 20th century, it has commonly been held that the primary objection to the validity of Montanist baptism was the wording of their baptismal formula: "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of *dominus* Muntanus." [1194] "What basis to be regarded as authentic," asks Basil, "has the baptism of these who baptise into Father, Son, and Montanus or Priscilla? For they have not been baptized who have been baptized into something not handed down to us." [1195] William Tabbernee, however, disputes this, arguing that "the text and the context of Basil's statement make it clear that he did not assume the Montanists had actually altered the traditional baptismal formula. Rather, he argued the case that baptizing, even with the correct formula but with an heretical understanding of that formula, invalidated baptism." [1196]

Those baptisms performed outside the Church, but which are orthodox in form and intent, may thus be received, as Basil suggests, "by economy on behalf of the multitude" [*οἰκονομίας ἕνεκα τῶν πολλῶν*]; that is, when there is a pastoral need. However, the fact that

[1192] Tabbernee 2011, 930.
[1193] *CL* 16:8 — "τοὺς Μοντανούς, ψευδῶς μέν, ὁμωνύμως δέ, καλεῖσθαι χριστιανούς."
[1194] Taken from a fourth century inscription (*IMont71*) discovered at Khenchela.
[1195] *Ep.* 188.1 (*PG* 32:668A).
[1196] Tabbernee 2011, 922. Cyril, too, lists as Montanus' primary error that he "dared to say that he was the Holy Spirit," although he, uniquely among patristic authors, also attributes to him both infanticide and cannibalism (*CL* 16:8).

he maintains reception of schismatics by baptism as normative, all the while holding the repetition of a genuine baptism to be blasphemous, shows that he did not understand the baptism of schismatics to have any real validity until it was sanctified by the person's reception into the Catholic Church.[1197] This sets him well apart from Stephen of Rome, for whom any baptism with correct form was both valid and unrepeatable, albeit void of the Holy Spirit. Consequently, the 7th canon of the Council of 381 need not signify a departure from Cyril's view on baptism, nor does it call into question its ecclesiological implications, but is a response to a pressing pastoral problem.[1198]

[1197] Canon 1 of St Basil also states, regarding schismatics, that "*τὸ δὲ τῶν ἀποσχισθέντων, ὡς ἔτι ἐκ τῆς Ἐκκλσίας ὄντων, παραδέξασθαι*" (Nicodemus 2003, 587). Troitsky (1975, 43–5), argues that Basil's use of the preposition *ἐκ* means that this should be translated "as recently being from the Church", rather than "still belonging to the Church". Again, if Basil saw schismatics as still "belonging to the Church" and possessed of true baptism, his preference for baptising those who returned to the unity of the Catholic communion would have been both inconsistent and indefensible, whereas their "recently being from the Church" would account for his willingness to accept the decision of certain Asian bishops not to baptise them, on the grounds that this might expedite their return to said Church, without this compromising his own stance and preference.

[1198] The debate around re-baptism saw a brief revival in the 18th century, following the 1755 decree of patriarchs Cyril V of Constantinople, Matthew of Alexandria, and Parthenios of Jerusalem, which demanded the re-baptism of Roman Catholic converts to Greek Orthodoxy ('Ὅρος τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας, συνταίνων μὲν τὸ θεόθεν δοθὲν ἅγιον βάπτισμα, καταπτύων δὲ τὰ ἄλλος γενόμενα τῶν αἱρετικῶν βαπτίσματα' in Karmiris 1953, 989–91), a departure from the 1484 stipulation that they be received with chrism alone (Karmiris 1953, 987–9). This change in practice was based not on the standing of the Roman Church vis-à-vis the relevant Eastern Patriarcates *per se*, but on the prevalence among Western Christians of baptism by sprinkling or affusion, rather than threefold immersion, which was not seen to constitute valid baptismal form as per the 7th canon of Constantinople. Nicodemus the Hagiorite (1749–1809) expands on this argument in his highly influential compendium of canon law, the *Πηδάλιον*. In his commentary on *Apostolic Canons* 46 and 47 he appeals to Basil's concept of *οἰκονομία* to reconcile the Cyprianite position that there are no sacraments outside the canonical boundaries of the Church with the historical practice of receiving certain Christians without re-baptism. He argues that, while the *ἀκρίβεια* of the Church's stance on heretical baptism requires the re-baptism of all who were previously baptised outside of its canonical borders, the principle of *οἰκονομία* nonetheless allows for the reception of those whose heretical baptism observed the correct form (*εἶδος*), matter (*ὕλη*), and type (*τύπος*) by chrism alone when necessary and expedient, citing in this case the military might of Western Christendom as the reason *οἰκονομία* had been employed for Roman Catholics following the failed reunion attempts at the Council of Florence (1431–1449) (Nicodemus 2003, 51–65). See Heith-Stade 2010b, and id. 2010c. Although short-lived, the 18th century controversy is testimony to the resilience of Cyprianite baptismal thought in the Christian East, where Augustine remained a much less major figure.

There is also an argument to be made that many of those belonging to the groups received by chrism alone may have previously belonged to the Catholic party, and therefore possessed their one and unrepeatable baptism. A possible counter argument is near verbatim repetition of the same canon in the 95th canon of the Council in Trullo nearly three centuries later (692), when this could not have possibly been the case. However, canon 1 of the same council seems to indicate that such repetition did not necessarily serve any other purpose than to summarise the previous canonical corpus. Therefore, one need not necessarily interpret Trullo's repetition of Constantinople I's canon 7 as a reflection of 7th century practices surrounding the reception of converts. See *NPNF* 2.14, 673, 789.

Conclusion

Returning to the Montanists, one can sense in Cyril's words a personal grievance against Montanus who "having fixed his abode at Pepuza, a tiny village in Phrygia […] falsely named it Jerusalem."[1199] As we have already seen, Cyril's historical and topographical promotion of Jerusalem as the geographical centre of the Christian world stood in sharp contrast with a detached and spiritualised Jerusalem that allowed it to be identified with an "insignificant hamlet." However, there is no evidence to suggest that they had a presence in Jerusalem before or during Cyril's time as bishop.[1200] Although Egeria makes clear that foreigners could only enter the Jerusalem catechumenate with great difficulty, [1201] her own presence at catechetical lectures is evidence that these would have been well attended by pilgrims from far and wide,[1202] and this fact likely accounts for the attention Cyril pays to heresies with which he and other Jerusalemites were not in direct contact. The real significance of his mention of the Montanists, then, is that it shows his heresiology to go beyond the immediate threat various heterodox groups may have posed to his catechumens to broader theological and ecclesiological concerns which were universal in their application. While Patout Burns attributes Cyprian's 'exclusivism' to the intimate nature of the Carthaginian church, Cyril's lectures — being catechetical rather than pastoral in nature — clearly approach heretical baptism from a standpoint that is principled rather than merely pragmatic and immediate, making it as applicable to the distant pilgrim as the local resident. It is this principled stance, rooted first and foremost in ecclesiological and theological coherence, that accounts for the consistency we see on the matter in the East, despite the radical social and political changes it underwent in the beginning of the fourth century.

[1199] *CL* 16:8 — "καὶ Πέπουζαν μικρότατον κωμύδριον ἐν τῇ Φρυγίᾳ καταλαβὼν καὶ ψευδῶς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ὀνομάσας τοῦτο."

[1200] Tabbernee 2011, 930.

[1201] *Pereg.* 45:4 in Wilkinson 1999, 162.

[1202] Cf. *Pereg.* 47:2 in Ibid., 163.

Chapter 10 — Conclusion

As the very manifestation and reality of the Christian's ontological union with Christ through mysteriological participation, the Catholic Church, as a visible and clearly defined community, underpins every aspect of Cyril's theological and pastoral thought. As such, a correct ecclesiology — that is, correctly identifying the visible Christian community that comprised Christ's own Body — was from a soteriological perspective as important as the profession of an orthodox Christology or Triadology. Only in the Catholic Church does man attain to that for which idolater and philosopher alike had searched in vain; only in the Catholic Church are spatial and temporal borders broken down, and people of every land, tongue, and race called together and united as a single nation, the Israel of God; the Catholic Church not only possessed the fullness of truth, but alone provided the key to grasp it; not only exhorted people to virtue, but alone provided the grace with which to obtain it.

As I hope to have demonstrated, the question of Christian identity, forged through catechesis and realised through the sacraments, is ultimately an ecclesiological one. Moreover, the Church represents not simply one marginal aspect of patristic thought but the very framework in which it operates. The field of ecclesiological studies is thus integrally tied to the field of patristics, and vice-versa. It is too often overlooked that the Church Fathers were not merely academic theologians, occupied with abstract metaphysical theories, but priests and shepherds, whose theological thought was informed by their lived experience in the liturgical and pastoral life of the Church, and whose desire to express this thought was driven by their concern for the salvation of the souls entrusted to their care. It is therefore insufficient to study their doctrinal works in isolation. In Cyril's case, one cannot hope to understand adequately the theological and doctrinal nature of his works without considering the ecclesiological ramifications of his catechetical programme and his vision of entry into the Catholic Church.

Cyril thus opens up a window, as it were, for us to reconsider our approaches to other patristic figures.

As we have seen, modern scholarship continues to take for granted that Stephen of Rome's position on baptism, and subsequently Augustine's understanding of extra-ecclesial sacraments, gained near universal acceptance in subsequent generations, but that this is demonstrably not the case. While Cyril's rather uncompromising stance on the baptism — and therefore also the ecclesial reality — of those outside the Catholic Church perhaps appears unpalatable today, what we see in his writings is actually a remarkable balanced and multidimensional approach to the efficacy of the mystery of initiation. His emphasis on the work of the Holy Spirit in cooperation with the personal faith of the believer avoids the automatic approach of Stephen, in which the mystery is seemingly regarded as a mechanical process, or, in language more appropriate to Cyril's time, a set of magical incantations. Nor does his assertion that the sacramental operation of the Holy Spirit is found only within the Church necessitate its complete absence from the lives of those outside its borders. Indeed, it is the Spirit, he claims, who had brought his listeners to him in the first place. [1203]

In an age of transition and religious competition, the clarity and consistency he offered were of paramount importance, and by defining the boundaries of the Church by means of a visible and distinct ritual, performed in a specific ecclesiastical context, Cyril avoids the grey areas that arise when Church membership is thought of merely in terms of adherence to a particular philosophical or doctrinal position, the niceties of which are often far beyond the grasp of the ordinary layperson. It is by visibly defining its borders by baptism that Cyril can

[1203] *PC* 1

unambiguously tell his listeners about "where the Catholic Church is. For this is the peculiar name of this holy Body, the mother of us all, which is the bride of our Lord Jesus Christ."[1204]

However, the pertinence of such an ecclesiological vision to Cyril's own historical context does not mean it has nothing of relevance to ours. While such a binary ecclesiology might seem undesirable today, I believe that a clear understanding of the various presuppositions upon which Cyril built such an ecclesiology can tell us much that is of benefit for the construction of modern ecclesiological schemes. Just as modern theology needs to come to terms with the findings of Biblical criticism, modern ecumenical efforts are unlikely to progress without serious attention to the findings of patristic scholars. While the Augustinian position is welcome insofar as it allows for a recognition of the 'other' as 'valid' — though this is question is perhaps less pertinent today as multi-denominational societies increasingly give way to multi-religious ones, where the 'other' has neither priesthood nor sacraments in need of recognition — it ultimately raises more questions than it answers. It has allowed ecumenical efforts to get off the ground, but these efforts have seemingly grown stagnant, and a change in perspective may be necessary to breathe new life into future ventures. Moreover, the Augustinian position approaches the problem of ecclesiology from a position of juridical minimalism, otherwise quite foreign to current approaches to theology, while Cyril represents a holistic, organic maximalism. As I wrote in the preface to this work, I do not presume to give any definite answers to these questions here, but believe we should not be too hasty in dismissing as irrelevant or out-dated the ecclesiological insights of figures like Cyril or Cyprian based on a superficial reading and anachronistic appraisal of their works; we might then find that they indeed have much to profit us.

[1204] *CL* 18:26 — "ποῦ ἔστιν ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. τοῦτο γὰρ ἰδικὸν ὄνομα τυγχάνει τῆς ἁγίας ταύτης καὶ μητρὸς ἡμῶν ἁπάντων. ἥτις νύμφη μέν ἐστι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ."

Chapter 11 — Appendix 1: The Jerusalem Creed

(Reconstructed from the *Catechetical Lectures*)[1205]

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεόν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων.

[Καὶ] εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὸν κατελθόντα[1206] [τὸν σαρκωθέντα καὶ] ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, [τὸν] σταυρωθέντα [καὶ ταφέντα καὶ] ἀναστάντα [ἐκ νεκρῶν] τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρα, καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, καὶ καθίσαντα ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρός, καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. [Καὶ] εἰς ἕν ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, τὸν Παράκλητον, τὸ λαλῆσαν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, καὶ εἰς ἕν βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν Καθολικὴν[1207] Ἐκκλησίαν καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

We belive in one God, the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all things visible and invisible.

[And] in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten from the Father as true God before all the ages, by whom all things were made, who descended [became flesh] and became human, [who] was crucified [and buried, and] rose [from the dead] on the third day, and ascended into the heavens, and is seated at the right hand of the Father, and is coming in glory to judge the living and the dead, whose kingdom has no end. [And] in one holy Spirit, the Paraclete, who spoke through the prophets, and in one baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins, and in one holy Catholic Church, and in the bodily resurrection and in life everlasting.[1208]

[1205] See Kelly 2006, 183. The bracketed words are not found in the main body of *CL*, but only the editor's headings. See also McCauley and Stephenson 1969, 60–62.

[1206] The addition of *τὸν κατελθόντα* does not appear in Kelly's reconstruction, but is proposed by Davies (1955, 218–221), who argues for its inclusion given both its use, in conjunction with *ἀνελθόντα*, in more or less all other creeds of the same period, and its incidental use in the writings of Cyril.

[1207] I have chosen to capitalise Καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν because of the way in which Cyril uses it as the proper name of his Church.

[1208] Translation mine.

Chapter 12 — Bibliography

ST. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM: PRIMARY TEXTS

Migne, Jacques Paul (ed.), *Epistola ad Constantium imperatorem* (*PG* 33:1165-1178).

— *Homilia in paralyticum juxta piscinam jacentem* (*PG* 33:1132-1164).

Müller-Kessler, Christa, and Sokoloff, Michael (eds.), 1999, *A Corpus of Christian Palestininan Aramaic (vol. 5): The Catechism of Cyril of Jerusalem in the Christian Palestinian Aramaic Version* (Groningen).

Piédagnel, Auguste (ed.), and Paris, Pierre (trans.), 2009, *Cyrille de Jérusalem: Catéchèses mystagogiques (deuxième edition)*, in: *SC* 126.

Reischl, W.C., and Rupp, J. (eds.), 1848, 1860, *Catecheses ad illuminados 1-18*, 2 vols. (Munich) (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1967).

Rōmaios, Antōnios (ed.), 1991, *Κατηχήσεις τοῦ Ἁγίου Κυρίλλου Ἱεροσολύμων* (Karea, Greece).

ST CYRIL OF JERUSALEM: PRIMARY TEXTS IN TRANSLATION

Belsheim, Johannes (trans.), 1882, 'Kyrills Katecheser over Trosbekjenelsen', *Vidnesbyrd af Kirkefædrene* 5 (Oslo).

Brock, S.P. (trans.), 1977, 'A Letter Attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem on the Rebuilding of the Temple', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London 40:2*, 267–86.

Church, Richard William (trans.), 1872, *The Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril: Archbishop of Jerusalem* (London).

Cross, F. L. (ed.), 1951, *Lectures on the Christian Sacraments: The Protocatechesis and the Five Mystagogical Catechesis* (London).

Dragas, George D. (trans.), 2008, *The Holy Sacraments of Baptism, Chrismation and Holy Communion: The Five Mystagogical Catechisms of St. Cyril of Jerusalem* (Rollinsford).

Gifford, Edwin Hamilton (trans.), 1893, *The Catechetical Lectures of St. Cyril: Archbishop of Jerusalem* (*NPNF 2.07*, 2-401).

Johnson, Maxwell E., 2017, *Lectures on the Christian Sacraments: Greek Original & English Translation* (Yonkers, NY).

McCauley, Leo P., and Stephenson, Anthony A. (trans.), 1969–70, *The Works of Cyril of Jerusalem*, The Fathers of the Church, vols. 61, 64 (Washington, D.C.).

Stærk, Dagfinn (trans.), 2010, *Kyrill av Jerusalem: Dåpskatekeser* (Oslo).

PRIMARY SOURCES[1209]

Ambrose of Milan

Botte, Bernard, 2008, *Des Sacrements, Des Mystères, Explication du Symbole*, SC 25 (Paris).

Deferrari, Roy J. (trans.), 1963, *Saint Ambrose: Theological and Dogmatic Works*, FC 44 (Washington, D.C.).

Faller, Otto (ed.), 1955, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera (vol. 7)*, CSEL 73 (Vienna).

Schenkl, Karl (ed.), 1897, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera (vol. 1)*, CSEL 32 (Vienna).

Ammianus Marcellinus

Seyfarth, Wolfgang (ed.), 1978, *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, 2. vols. (Leipzig).

Apostolic Constitutions

Metzger, Marcel (ed.), 1985–87, *Les constitutions apostoliques*, 3 vols., SC 320, 329, 336 (Paris).

Augustine

Teske, Roland (trans.), 2001, *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century* (New York).

Barsanuphius of Gaza

Chryssavgis, John (trans.), 2006, *Barsanuphius and John: Letters (Vol. 1)*, CF 113 (Washington, D.C.).

Basil the Great

Anderson, David (trans.), 1980, *St Basil the Great: On the Holy Spirit* (Crestwood, NY).

Giet, S. (ed.), 1968, *Basil de Césarée: Homélies sur l'Hexaéméron (2nd ed.)*, SC 26 (Paris).

Pruche, P. Benoît (ed.), 1947, *Basile de Césarée: Sur le Saint-Esprit*, SC 17 (Paris).

Book of Jubilees

Charles, Robert Henry (trans.), 1913, *The Apocrypha and Pseudographia of the Old Testament in English* (Oxford).

Bordeaux Pilgrim

Geyer, P. (ed.), 1898, *Itinera Hierosolymitana*, CSEL 39 (Vienna).

[1209] Where reference is made to a text from Migne's *PG* or *PL*, or an English translation is quoted from Schaff's *ANF* or *NPNF*, these are indicated in the footnotes and do not appear in this bibliography.

Canons of the Ecumenical Councils

Nicodemus, Monk (ed.), 2003, *Πηδάλιον τῆς Νοητῆς Νήος τῆς Μίας Ἁγίας Καθολικῆς καὶ Ἀποστολικῆς τῶν Ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας (13th ed.)* (Athens).[1210]

Chromatius of Aquileia

Lemarié, Joseph (ed.), *Chromace d'Aquilée, Sermons,* 2 vols. SC 154, 164 (Paris).

Cornutus

Osannus, F. (ed.), 1844–5, *De natura deorum* (Göttingen).

Cyprian of Carthage[1211]

Bévenot, M. (ed.), 2006, *Cyprien de Carthage: Unité de l'Église catholique*, SC 500 (Paris).

Clarke, G. W., 1984, 84, 86, 89, *The Letters of St. Cyprian of Carthage*, 4 vols., ACW 43, 44, 46, 47 (New York).

Hartel, W. (ed.), 1871, *Cyprian, Opera Omnia II*, CSEL 3.2 (Vienna).

Didache

Holmes, Michael W. (ed. tans.), 2008, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations (3rd ed.)* (Grand Rapids, MI), 344–69.

Didascalia Apostolorum

Funk, F.X. (ed.), 1905, *Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum*, 2 vols. (Paderborn).

Gibson, Margaret Dunlop (trans.), 1903, *The Didascalia Apostolorum in English* (London).

Ephrem the Syrian

Mathews, G., and Amar, Joseph P. (trans.), 1994, *St Ephrem the Syrian: Selected Prose Works. Commentary on Genesis. Commentary on Exodus. Homily on Our Lord. Letter to Publius* (Washington, D.C.).

Tonneau, R.M. (eds.), 1955, *Sancti Ephraem Syri in Genesim et in Exodum*, CSCO 152 (Louvain).

Ephrem the Syrian

Brock, Sebastian (trans.), 1983, *The Harp of the Spirit* (Oxford).

Epicurius

Usener, Hermann (ed.), 1887, *Epicurea (a collection of fragments and reports)* (Leipzig).

Epiphanius of Salamis

Holl, Karl (ed.), 1915, *Epiphanius: Ancoratus und Panarion*, 3 vols., GCS (Leipzig).

[1210] This edition is based on the 1864 edition published by Sergios Raphantēs in Zakynthos, Greece.

[1211] Note that Firmilian's *Epistola ad Cyprianum* cited in this work survives as *Ep.* 75 in the Cyprianite corpus.

Williams, Frank, 2009 & 2013, *The* Panarion *of Epiphanius of Salamis*, 2. vols. (Leiden).

Eusebius of Caesarea

Cameron, Averil, and Hall, Stuart G (trans.), 1999, *Eusebius' Life of Constantine: Introduction, translation and commentary* (Oxford).

Favrelle, G. (ed.), 1982, *Eusèbe de Césarée, La préparation évangelique XI*, SC 292 (Paris).

Williams, G.A. (trans.), 1989, *Eusebius: The History of the Church* (London).

Winkelmann, F., 1975, *Eusebius' Werke (vol. 1):Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin*, GCS (Berlin).

Gregory Nazianzen

Moreschini, Pr. Claudio (ed.), 1990, *Grégoire de Nazianze : Discours 38–41*, SC 358 (Paris).

Gregory of Nyssa

Daniélou, Jean (ed.), 1968, *Grégoire de Nysse: La vie de Moïse (3rd ed.)*, SC 1 (Paris).

Malherbe, Abraham J., and Ferguson, Everett (trans.), 2006, *Gregory of Nyssa: the Life of Moses* (New York).

Maraval, Pierre (ed.), 1971, *Grégoire de Nysse: Vie de sainte Macrine*, SC 178 (Paris).

Maraval, Pierre (ed.), 1990, *Grégoire de Nysse: Lettres*, SC 363 (Paris).

Silvas, Anna M. (trans.), 2007, *Gregory of Nyssa: The Letters: Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Leiden).

Gregory Palamas

Palmer, G.E.H., et al. (eds.), 1998, *The Philokalia: The Complete Text (vol. 4)* (London).

Hippolytus of Rome

Botte, Dom B. (ed.), 1968, *La Tradition Apostolique*, SC 11 (Paris).

Easton, Burton Scott (trans.), 1934, *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* (Cambridge).

Ignatius of Antioch

Epistle to the Ephesians — Holmes 2008, 182–201.

Epistle to the Philadelphians — Holmes 2008, 237–47.

Epistle to the Smyrneans — Holmes 2008, 148–261.

Martyrdom of Polycarp — Holmes 2008, 306–333.

Irenaeus of Lyons

Harvey, W.W. (ed.), 1857, *Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis libri quinque adversus haereses* (vol. 2) (Cambridge).

Rousseau, P. Adelin (ed.), 1952–82, *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les hérésies*, 9 vols., SC 34, 152, 153, 210, 211, 263, 264, 293, 294 (Paris).

Jerome

Donaldson, Malcolm Drew (trans.), 1996, *A Translation of Jerome's Chronicon With Historical Commentary* (New York).

Helm, R. (ed.), 1956, *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*, GCS 47 (Berlin).

Lardet, Pierre (ed.), 1983, *Jérôme: Apologie contre Rufin*, SC 303 (Paris).

John Chrysostom

Brottier, Laurence (ed.), 1998, *Sermons sur la Genèse*, SC 433 (Paris).

Harkins, Paul W. (trans.), 1979, *John Chrysostom, Discourses against Judaizing Christians*, FC 68 (Washington, D.C.).

Pièdagnel, A. (ed.), 1990, *Jean Chrysostome: Trois Catéchèses*, SC 366 (Paris).

Wenger, A. (ed.), 1970, *Jean Chrysostome: Huit Catéchèses Baptismales*, SC 50 (Paris).

John of Damascus

Kotter, Bonifatius (ed.), *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, 5. vols. PTS 7, 12, 17, 22, 29 (Berlin).

Louth, Andrew (trans.), 2003, *St John of Damascus: The Treatises on the Divine Images* (Crestwood, NY).

Justin Martyr

Bobichon, Philippe (ed.), 2003, *Justin Martyr: Dialogue avec Tryphon (édition critique, traduction, commentaire)* (Fribourg).

Munier, M. Charles, 2006, *Justin Martyr: Apologie*, SC 507 (Paris).

Macarius of Jerusalem

Terian, Abraham, 2008, *Macarius of Jerusalem: Letter to the Armenians, A.D. 335. Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary* (Crestwood, NY).

Methodius of Olympus

Musurillo, Herbert (trans.), 1958, *St. Methodius: The Symposium. A Treatise on Chastity*, ACW 17 (Westminister, MD).

— 1976, *Méthode d'Olympe: Le Banquet*, SC 95 (Paris).

Nicetas of Remesiana

Gamber, Klaus (ed.), 1964 *Instructio ad competentes* (Regensburg).

Optatus

Edwards, Mark (trans.), 1997, *Optatus: Against the Donatists* (Liverpool).

Labrousse, J. (ed.), 1995–6, *Optat de Mileve : Traité contre les Donatistes*, 2. vols. SC 412, 413 (Paris).

Origen

Borret, Marcel (ed.), 1976, *Contre Celse I–V*, SC 132, 136, 147, 150, 227 (Paris).

De Lange, M. Nicholas (ed.), 1983, *Lettre à Africanus sur l'histoire de Suzanne*, SC 302 (Paris).

Pacian of Barcelona

Granado, C., 1995, *Pacien de Barcelone : Écrits*, SC 410 (Paris).

Hanson, Craig L. (ed.), 1999, *Iberian Fathers (vol. 3): Pacian of Barcelona, Orosius of Braga* (Washington, D.C.).

Philostorgius

Amidon, Philip R., 2007, *Philostorgius: Church History* (Atlanta)

Serapion of Thmuis

Barret-Lenard, R.J.S. (ed. trans.), 1993, *The Sacramentary of Serapion of Thmuis* (Nottingham)

Socrates Scholasticus

Hansen, Günther Christian (ed.), 1995, *Sokrates Kirchengeschichte*, GCS 1 (Berlin)

Maraval, Pierre, and Périchon, P. (eds.), 2004–7, *Socrate de Constantinople: Histoire ecclésiastique, Livres I–VII*, SC 477, 493, 505, 506 (Paris).

Sozomen

Sabbah, M. Guy (ed.), 2005, *Sozomène: Histoire eccléastique. Livres III–IV*, SC 418 (Paris).

Tertullian

Evans, Ernest (ed. trans.), 1953, *Tertullian*: *De Oratione* (London).

Munier, Charles (ed.), 1980, *A Son Épouse*, SC 273 (Paris).

Refoulé, P. François, 1957, *Tertullien : Prescription contre les hérétiques*, SC 46 (Paris).

— 2002, *Tertullian : Traité du baptême*, SC 35 (Paris).

Turcan, Marie (ed.), 1986, *Les Spectacles*, SC 332 (Paris).

Theodore of Mopsuestia

Mingana, A. (trans.), 1933, *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer and the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist* (Cambridge).

Tonneau, R., and Devresse, R. (eds.), 1961, *Les Homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste*, StR 145 (Rome).

Theodosian Code

Mommsen, Theodore, and Krueger, P. (ed.), 1905, *Codex Theodosianus* (Berlin).

Zeno of Verona

Löfstedt, B. (ed.), 1971, *Zenonis Veronensis Tractatus*, CCSL 22 (Turnhout).

SECONDARY SOURCES

Aasgaard, Reidar, 2011, 'Ambrose and Augustine: Two Bishops on Baptism and Christian Identity', in: David Hellholm et al. (eds.), *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum* 3 vols. (Berlin; New York), 1253–82.

Abel, F. M., 1920, 'Saint Jérome et Jérusalem', *Miscellanea Geronimiana* (Rome), 131–55.

Aghiorgoussis, Maximos, 2005, 'The Unity of the Church: An Orthodox Point of View', *GOTR* 50:1–4, 141–186.

— 2010, 'The Meaning of Christian Baptism for the Baptized and for the Church', *GOTR* 55:1–4, 19-48.

Alexander, Philip S., 1999, 'Jerusalem as the Omphalos of the World: On the History of a Geographical Concept', in: Lee I. Levine (ed.), *Jerusalem. Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (New York), 104–119.

Alexis-Baker, Andy, 2009, '*Ad Quirinum* Book Three and Cyprian's Catechumenate', *JECS* 17:3, 357–380.

Al-Makary, Athanasius, 2017, *A Summary of the Liturgical History of the Church of Alexandria: The First Through the Fourth Centuries* (Los Angeles, CA).

Ando, Clifford, 1996, 'Pagan Apologetics and Christian Intolerance in the Ages of Themistius and Augustine', *JECS* 4:2, 171–207.

Andreopoulos, Andreas, 2010, 'The Holy Spirit in the Ecclesiology of Photios of Constantinople', in: D. V. Twomey and J. Rutherford (eds.), *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church* (Dublin), 151–63.

Antonova, Stamenka E., 2005, 'Barbarians and the Empire-Wide Spread of Christianity', in: W. V. Harris (ed.), *The Spread of Christianity in the First Four Centuries* (Leiden), 69–86.

Arbesmann, Rudolph, 1954, 'The Concept of *Christus Medicus* in St. Augustine', *Traditio* 10, 1–28.

Arnold, Ehrhardt, 1953, *The Apostolic Succesion in the First Two Centuries of the Church* (London).

Athanasiadi, Polymnia, 1993, 'Dreams, Theurgy and Freelance Divination: the Testimony of Iamblichus', *JRS* 83, 115–130.

Attridge, Harold W., and Hata, Gohei (eds.), 2006, *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism* (Detroit).

Avi-Yonah, M., 1976, *The Jews of Palestine: A Political History from the Bar Kokhba War to the Arab Conquest* (Oxford).

Ayres, Lewis, 2008, ‘Articulating identity’, in: Frances Young et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge), 414–463.

Azize, Joseph, 2015, ‘Ignatius of Antioch on the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy: Logic and Methodology’ *Phronema* 30:2, 105–136.

Azkoul, Michael, 1971, ‘Sacerdotium et Imperium: the Constantinian Renovatio according to the Greek Fathers’, *Theological Studies* 32, 431–64.

Bagatti, Bellarmino, 1971, *The church from the circumcision: history and archaeology of the Judeo-Christians* (Jerusalem).

Bakke, Odd Magne, 1999, ‘Kyrkjeleg einskap hos Cyprian – eit spørsmål om kjærleik og tolmod’, *NTT* 100, 105–155.

Bakker, Henk, et al. (eds.), 2010, *Cyprian of Carthage: studies in his life, language and thought* (Leuven).

Baldovin, John F., 1987, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development and Meaning of Stational Liturgy* (Rome).

— 1989, *Liturgy in Ancient Jerusalem* (Nottingham).

Bar, Doron, 1998, ‘Aelia Capitolina and the Location of the Camp of the Tenth Legion’, *PEQ* 130, 8–19.

Bardy, Gustave, 1949, *La Conversion au Christianisme Durant les Premiers Siècles* (Paris).

— 1956, ‘Cyrille de Jérusalem’, in: Alfred Baudrillart et al. (eds.), *Dictionnaire d’histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique, vol. 13* (Paris), 203–215.

Barnes, M.R., and Williams, D.H. (eds.), 1993, *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts* (Edinburgh).

Barnes, Timothy D., 1981, *Constantine and Eusebius* (London).

— 1982, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (London).

— 1984, *Early Christianity and the Roman Empire* (London).

— 1991, ‘Pagan Perceptions of Christianity’, in: I. Hazlett (ed.), *Early Christianity: Origins and Evolution to A.D. 600. In Honour of W.H.C.* (London), 231–43.

— 1993, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, MA).

— 1994, *From Eusebius to Augustine* (Aldershot).

— 2002, ‘From Toleration to Repression: The Evolution of Constantine’s Religious Policies’, *Scripta Classica Israelica* 21, 189–207.

— 2006, “A Note on the Term ‘Homoiousios’”, *ZAC* 10, 276–85.

— 2010, *Early Christian Hagiography and Roman History* (Tübingen).

— 2011, *Constantine: Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire* (Malden, MA).

Bastiaensen, A.A.R., 1962, *Observations sur le vocabulaire liturgique dans l’Itinéraire d’Égérie* (Nimègue).

Battiful, P., 1923, ‘Arcane’, *DTC* 1:2, 1738–1758.

Bauer, Walter, 1934, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen).

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).

Bediako, Kwame, 1992, *Theology and Identity: The Impact of Culture upon Christian Thought in the Second Century and in Modern Africa* (Oxford).

Behr, John, 2013, *Irenaeus of Lyons: Identifying Christianity* (Oxford).

Bekiares, Demetrios, 2016, ‘St. Cyril of Jerusalem the Catechist (+386) and his catechetical teachings for our ecclesiastical formation’ [Μπεκιάρες, Δημήτριος. ‘Ὁ Ἅγιος Κύριλλος Ἱεροσολύμων ὁ Κατηχητής (+386) καί ἡ Κατηχητική του διδασκαλία για την ἐκκλησιοποίησή μας’], in: *The 2016 Diptychs of the Church of Greece* [*Δίπτυχα 2016 τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος*] (Athens), 7–32.

Belayche, Nicole, 2001, *Iudaea-Palestina: The Pagan Cults in Roman Palestine (Second to Fourth Century)* (Tübingen).

Benko, Stephen, 1986, *Pagan Rome and the Early Christians* (Indianapolis, IN).

Bentley, G., 1943, ‘Catholicity’, *Sobornost* 27, 14–19.

Bergen, Jeremy M., 2005, ‘Origen on the Authorial Intention of Scripture’, *Conrad Grebel Review* 23.3, 85–93.

Berger, Calinic (Kevin M.), 2007, ‘Does the Eucharist Make the Church? An Ecclesiological Comparison of Stăniloae and Zizioulas’, *SVTQ* 51:1, 23–70.

Bergjan, Silke-Petra, et al. (eds.), 2015, *Apollinarius und seine Folgen* (Tübingen).

Berten, I., 1968, ‘Cyrille de Jérusalem, Eusèbe d’Émèse et la théologie semi-arienne’, *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 52, 38–75.

Berzon, Todd S., 2016, *Classifying Christians: Ethnography, Heresiology, and the Limits of Knowledge in Late Antiquity* (Oakland, CA).

Beukers, Cl., 1961, 'For our Emperors, Soldiers and Allies: An Attempt at Dating the twenty-third Catechesis of Cyrillus of Jerusalem', *VC* 15, 177–84.

Bihain, E., 1962a, 'La source d'un texte de Socrate (H.E. II, 38, 2) relatif à Cyrille de Jérusalem', *Byzantion* 32, 81–91.

— 1962b, 'Le Contre Eunome de Théodore de Mopsueste: Source d'un passage de Sozomène et d'un passage de Théodoret concernant Cyrille de Jérusalem', *Le Muséon* 75, 331–355.

— 1963, 'Une vie arménienne de S. Cyrille Jérusalem', *Le Muséon* 76, 319–48.

— 1966, *La tradition manuscrite grecque des oeuvres de S. Cyrille de Jérusalem*, PhD diss.: University of Louvain.

— 1973, 'L'épître de Cyrille de Jérusalem à Constance sur la Vision de la Croix (BHG^3 413)', *Byzantion* 43, 264–96.

Bindley, T. Herbert, 1917, 'On Some Points, Doctrinal and Practical, in the Catechetical Lectures of St. Cyril of Jerusalem', *AJT* 21:4, 598–607.

Bingham, Joseph, 1843, *Antiquities of the Christian Church* (London).

Bird, Frederick, 2002, 'Early Christianity as an Unorganized Ecumenical Religious Movement', in: Anthony J. Blasi et al. (eds.), *Handbook of Early Christianity: Social Science Approaches* (Walnut Creek, CA), 46–225.

Bishop, Edmund, 1909, 'Fear and Awe Attaching to the Eucharistic Service', in: Dom R.H. Connolly (ed.), *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai* (Cambridge), 92–97.

Bissoli, Giovanni, 1981, 'S. Cirillo di Gerusalemme: omelia sul paralitico della piscine Probatica', *Liber Annuus* 31, 177–90.

Bitton-Ashkelony, Brouria, 1999, 'The Attitudes of Church Fathers towards Pilgrimage to Jerusalem in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries', in: Lee I. Levine (ed.), *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (New York), 188–9.

— 2005, *Encountering the Sacred: The Debate on Christian Pilgrimage in Late Antiquity* (London).

Blanchetière, François, 1998, 'The threefold Christian anti-Judaism', in: Graham N. Stanton and Guy G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Cambridge).

Bludau, Augustinus, 1924, 'Der Katechumenat in Jerusalem im 4. Jahrhundert', *Theologie und Glaube* 16, 225–42.

Bobrinskoy, Boris, 2012, *The Mystery of the Church* (Yonkers, NY).

Bocur, Bogdan, 2017, ‘Anti-Jewish Rhetoric in Byzantine Hymnography: Exegetical and Theological Contextualization’, *SVTQ* 61.1, 39–60.

Boismard, M.E., 1964a, ‘I Renounce Satan, his Pomp and his Works’, in: A. George (ed.), *Baptism in the New Testament* (London), 107–122.

— 1964b, ‘Baptism and Renewal’, in: A. George et al. (eds.), *Baptism in the New Testament* (London), 211–24.

Bokedal, Tomas, 2013, ‘The Rule of Faith: Tracing Its Origins”, *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 7:2, 233–55.

Bonnery, A., 2000, ‘Les plus anciennes descriptions du Saint Sépulcre, témoins du pèlerinage à Jérusalem’, *Cahiers de Saint-Michel de Cuxa* 31, 143–148.

Borgehammar, Stephan, 1991, *How the Holy Cross Was Found: From Event to Mediaeval Legend* (Stockholm).

Bowes, Kim, 2008, *Private Worship, Public Values, and Religious Change in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge).

Boyarin, Daniel, 1997, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley, CA).

— 1999, *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism* (Stanford, CA).

— 2001, ‘Justin Martyr Invents Judaism’, *Church History* 70:3, 427-61.

— 2004a, *Border Lines: The Partitioning of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia).

— 2004b, ‘The Christian Invention of Judaism’, *Representations* 85:1, 21–57.

Bradshaw, Paul F., 1983, *Daily Prayer in the Early Church* (London).

— 1996, ‘The Homogenization of Christian Liturgy – Ancient and Modern’, *SL* 26, 1–15.

— 1998, ‘The Gospel and the Catechumenate in the Third Century’, *JTS* 49.1, 143–52.

— 1999, ‘The Influence of Jerusalem on Christian Liturgy’, in: Lee I. Levine (ed.), *Jerusalem. Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (New York), 251–9.

— 2002, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* (London).

Brändle, Rudolf, 2011, ‘Johannes Chrysostomus: Die zehn Gaben (τιμαί oder δωρεαί) der Taufe’, in: David Hellholm et al. (ed.), *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum*, 3 vols. (Berlin), 1233–52.

Brandt, Oluf, 2003, 'The symbolism of water in early Christian baptisteries', *Current Swedish archaeology* 11, 11–24.

Braun, Willi (ed.), 2005, *Rhetoric and Reality in Early Christianity* (Waterloo, ON).

Bremmer, Jan N., 2010, *The Rise of Christianity Through the Eyes of Gibbon, Harnack and Rodney Stark* (Groningen).

Brent, Allen, 2007, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Martyr Bishop and the Origins of Episcopacy* (London).

— 2010, *Cyprian and Roman Carthage* (Cambridge).

Broek, Roelof van den, 1990, 'Der Bericht des koptischen Kyrillos von Jerusalem über das Hebräerevangelium', in: Peter Nagel (ed.), *Carl-Schmidt Kolloquium an der Martin-Luther-Universität 1988* (Wittenberg), 165–79.

Brock, S. P., 1972, 'A Short Melkite Baptismal Service in Syriac', *Parole de l'Orient*, 119–30.

— 1976, 'The Rebuilding of the Temple Under Julian: a New Source', *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 108, 103–107.

— 1977a, 'A Letter Attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem on the Rebuilding of the Temple', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 40:2, 267–86.

— 1977b, 'The Syrian Baptismal Ordines (with special reference to the anointings)', *SL* 12:4, 177–83.

— 1998, *The Holy Spirit in the Syrian Baptismal Tradition* (Kottayam, Kerela).

Bromiley, Geoffrey W., 1985, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI).

Brown, Alan, 2008, 'The intellectual debate between Christians and pagans', in: Augustine Casiday et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity (vol. 2)* (Cambridge), 248–78.

Brown, Peter, 1968, 'Christianity and Local Culture in Late Roman Africa', *JRS* 58:1–2 (1968), 85–95.

— 1969, 'The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Roman Empire', *JRS* 59:1-2, 92–103.

— 1971, 'The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity', *JRS* 61, 80–101.

— 1992, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison).

— 1997, *Authority and the Sacred: Aspects of the Christianisation of the Roman World* (Cambridge).

— 1998a, 'Asceticism: Pagan and Cristian', in: Averil Cameron and Peter Garnsey (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History (vol. 13)* (Cambridge), 601–31.

— 1998b, ‘Christianization and Religious Conflict’, in: Averil Cameron and Peter Garnsey (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History (vol. 13)* (Cambridge), 632–64.

— 2000a, ‘Enjoying the Saints in Late Antiquity’, *Early Medieval Europe* 9, 1–24.

— 2000b, ‘Holy Men’, in: Averil Cameron et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History (vol. 14)* (Cambridge), 781–810.

— 2013, ‘Constantine, Eusebius, and the Future of Christianity’, *SVTQ* 57:2, 117–33.

Brown, Robert Tarver, 1948, *A Study of the Five Sermons of St. Augustine on St. Cyprian the Martyr Including Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Ph.D. diss.: The University of Southern California).

Bucur, Bogdan G., 2017, 'Anti-Jewish Rhetoric in Byzantine Hymnography: Exegetical and Theological Contextualization', *SVTQ* 61:1, 39–60.

Buell, Denise Kimber, 1999, *Making Christians: Clement of Alexandria and the Rhetoric of Legitimacy* (Princeton).

— 2005, *“Why This New Race:” Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity* (New York).

Bunge, Gabriel, 2016, *Spiritual Fatherhood: Evagrius Ponticus on the Role of the Spiritual Father*, trans. Luis Joshua Salés (Yonkers, NY).

Burreson, Kent J., 1997, ‘The Anaphora of the Mystagogical Catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem’, in: Paul F Bradshaw (ed.), *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers* (Collegeville, MN), 131–52.

Busse, H. and Kretschmar, G., 1987, *Jerusalem Heiligtumstraditionen in altkirchlicher und frühislamischer Zeit* (Weisbaden).

Cabrol, Fernand, 1895, *Les églises de Jérusalem. La discipline et la liturgie au IV^{e} siècle* (Paris).

Calivas, Alkiviadis C., 2009, ‘Receiving Converts into the Orthodox Church: Lessons from the Canonical and Liturgical Tradition’, *GOTR* 54:1-4, 1–76.

Camelot, Pierre-Thomas, 1970, ‘Notre sur la Théologie Baptismale des Catéchèses Attribuées à Saint Cyrille de Jérusalem’, in: Patrick Granfield et al. (eds.), *Kyriakon, Festschrift Johannes Quasten, 2 vols*. (Münster), 724–9.

Cameron, Alan, 2011, *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford).

Cameron, Averil, 1991, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse* (Berkeley).

— 2008, ‘The Violence of Orthodoxy’, in: Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zelletin (eds.), *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity* (Tübingen), 102–14.

Campagnano, Antonella, 1980, *Ps. Cirillo di Gerusalemme. Omelie Copte sulla Passione, sulla Croce e sulle Vergine* (Milano).

Cardman, Francine, 1982, 'The Rhetoric of Holy Places: Palestine in the Fourth Century', *SP* 17.1, 18–25.

— 1984, 'Fourth-Century Jerusalem: Religious Geography and Christian Tradition', in: Patrick Henry (ed.), *Schools of Thought in the Christian Tradition* (Philadelphia, PA), 49–64.

— 1999, 'The Praxis of Ecclesiology: Learning From the Donatist Controversy', *CTSA Proceedings* 54, 25–37.

Carleton Paget, James, 1998, 'Clement of Alexandria and the Jews', *Scottish Journal of Theology* 51:1, 86–98.

— 2007, 'The Definition of the Terms *Jewish Christian* and *Jewish Christianity* in the History of Research', in: Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Christian Centuries* (Peabody, MA).

— 2010, *Jews, Christians and Jewish Christians in Antiquity* (Tübingen).

Carpenter, H.J., 1993, 'Creeds and Baptismal Rites in the First Four Centuries', in: Everett Ferguson (ed.), *Conversion, Catechumenate, and Baptism in the Early Church* (London), 367–78.

Casel, Odo, 1960, *Das christliche Kultmysterium (4th Edition)* (Regensburg).

Chadwick, Henry, 1985, 'Augustine on Pagans and Christians: Reflections on Religious and Social Change', in: Derek Beales and Geoffrey Best (eds.), *History, Society and the Churches: Essays in Honour of Owen Chadwick* (Cambridge), 9–28.

Chalassery, Joseph, 1995, *The Holy Spirit and Christian Initiation in the East Syrian Tradition* (Rome).

Chantraine, H., 1993–4, 'Die Kreuzevision von 351: Fakten und Probleme', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 86–87, 430–441.

Christo, Gus George, 2006, *The Church's Identity Established* (Rollinsford).

Chryssavgis, John (ed.), 2016, *Primacy in the Church: The Office of Primate and the Authority of Councils (Vol. 1)* (Yonkers, NY).

Ciholas, P., 2003, *The Omphalos and the Cross: Pagans and Christians in Search of a Divine Center* (Macon, GA).

Clasen, H., 1956, *Die Arkandisziplin in der altern Kirche* (Ph.D diss.: University of Heidelberg).

Cleenerwerck, Laurent, 2013, ‘Appendix B: Matthew 16:18 — Church and Apostles’ in ed. id. *EOB: The Eastern / Greek Orthodox New Testament* (CreateSpace, 2013), 601–47.

Coakley, James Farwell, 1984, ‘A Syriac Version of the Letter of Cyril of Jerusalem on the Vision of the Cross’, *Analecta Bollandiana* 102, 71–84.

Coleman-Norton, P.R., 1966, *Roman State and Christian Church,* 3 vols. (London).

Cochrane, Charles Norris, 2003, *Christianity and Classical Culture* (Indianapolis).

Cohen, Jeremy, 1976, ‘Roman Imperial Policy towards the Jews from Constantine until the End of the Palestinian Patriarchate (c. 429)’, *Byzantine Studies* 3.1, 1–29.

Cohen, Shaye J. D., 2001, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley).

Cohen, Will, 2007, ‘Sacraments and the Visible Unity of the Church’, *Ecclesiology* 4:1, 68–87.

Collins, John J., 2017, *The Invention of Judaism* (Oakland, CA).

Contant, Kenneth John, 1956, ‘The Original Buildings at the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem’, *Speculum* 31:1, 1–48.

— 1958, ‘The Holy Sites at Jerusalem in the First and Fourth Centuries A.D.’, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 102.1, 14–24

Cook, John Granger, 2004, *The Interpretation of the Old Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism* (Tübingen).

Cooper, Adam Glyn, 2002, *Holy Flesh, Wholly Deified: The Place of the Body in the Theological Vision of Saint Maximus the Confessor* (Ph.D Thesis: University of Durham).

Coquin, R. G. and Godron, G., 1990, ‘Un encomion copte sur Marie-Madeleine attribué à Cyrille de Jérusalem’, *Bulletin de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale* 90, 169–212.

Costache, Doru, 2012, ‘Christianity and the World in the *Letter to Diognetus*’, *Phronema* 27:1, 29–50.

Cregg, Robert C., 1985, ‘Cyril of Jerusalem and the Arians’, in: id. (ed.), *Arianism* (Cambridge, MA), 85–109.

Crowe, S.P., 2006, ‘Neither Fish nor Fowl? A New Look at the Armenian Commentary on St. Cyril of Jerusalem’s Lenten Catechetical Lections Traditionally Ascribed to Gregorios Arsharuni’, *Le Muséon* 119, 307–21.

Cuming, G.J., 1974, ‘Egyptian Elements in the Jerusalem Liturgy’, *JTS* 25, 117–24.

Cummings, Owen. ‘Cyril of Jerusalem as a Postliberal Theologian’ in *Worship* 67 (1993), 155–64.

Cuscito, Giuseppe, 2001, 'Epigrafi di apparato nei battiseri paleocristiani d'Italia', *L'edificio battesimale in Italia* 37, 462–6.

Cutrone, Emmanuel J., 1975, *Saving Presence in the Mystagogical Catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem* (Ph.D diss.: University of Notre Dame).

— 1978, 'Cyril's Mystagogical Catecheses and the Evolution of the Jerusalem Anaphora', *OCP* 44, 52–64.

Cvetković, Vladimir, 2017, '"All in all" (I Cor. 15, 28): Aspects of the Unity between God and Creation according to St Maximus the Confessor', *Analogia: The Pemptousia Journal for Theological Studies 2*, 13–28.

Damian, Theodor, 2010, 'The Theology of St. Cyprian of Carthage: The Unity of the Church and the Role of the Bishop', *Sophia Institute Studies in Orthodox Theology* 3, 91-102.

Daniélou, Jean, 1952, 'L'histoire du salut dans la catéchèse', *La Maison-Dieu* 30, 19–35.

— 1993, 'La Catéchèse dans la Tradition patristique', in: Everett Ferguson (ed.), *Conversion, Catechumenate, and Baptism in the Early Church* (London), 279-93.

Dauphin, Claudine, 1998, *La Palestine byzantine: Peuplement et populations* (Oxford).

Davies, J.G., 1955, 'An Addition to the Reconstituted Creed of Jerusalem', *VC* 9:3, 218–21.

— 1957, 'Eusebius' Description of the Martyrium at Jerusalem', *American Journal of Archaeology* 61.2, 171–3.

Day, Juliette, 2001, 'Adherence to the *Disciplina Arcani* in the Fourth Century', *SP* 35, 266–70.

— 2005, 'Lent and the Catechetical Program in mid-4th Century Jerusalem', *SL* 35, 129–47.

— 2007a, *The Baptismal Liturgy of Jerusalem* (Aldershot).

— 2007b, Book review: '*Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogue: The Authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses* by Alexis James Doval', *JTS* 58.1, 285–8.

— 2010, 'Cyril of Jerusalem on the Holy Spirit', in: D. Vincent Twomey and Janet E. Rutherford (eds.), *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church* (Dublin), 73–85.

— 2011, 'The Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem: A Source for the Baptismal Liturgy of Mid-Fourth Century Jerusalem', in: David Hellholm et al. (eds.), *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum*, 3 vols. (Berlin; New York), 1179–1204.

De Bruyn, Theodore S., 2006, 'P. Ryl. III.471: A Baptismal Anointing Formula Used as an Amulet', *JTS* 57, 94–109.

Decock, Paul B., 2010, ‘Origen’s Christian Approach to the *Song of Songs*’, *Religion & Theology* 17, 13–25.

De Lange, N.R.M., 1976, *Origen and the Jews: Studies in Jewish-Christian Relations in Third-Century Palestine* (Cambridge).

Deddens, K., 1975, *Annus Liturgicus? Een onderzoek naar de betekenis van Cyrillus van Jeruzalem voor de ontwikkeling van het ‘kerkelijk jaar’* (Goes).

— 1975, ‘Cyrille de Jérusalem et l’année liturgique’, *Questions liturgiques* 56, 41–5.

Demacopoulos, George E., 2013, *The Invention of Peter: Apostolic Discourse and Papal Authority in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia, PA).

— 2015a, *Gregory the Great* (Notre Dame, IN).

— 2015b, ‘Are All Universalist Politics Local? Pope Gelasius I’s International Ambition as a Tonic for Local Humiliation’, in: Geoffrey D. Dunn (ed.), *The Bishop of Rome in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, Surrey), 141–154.

Devos, Paul, 1967, ‘La date de voyage d’Égérie’, *Analecta Bollandiana* 85, 156–94.

Digeser, Elizabeth DePalma, 2000, *The Making of a Christian Empire: Lactantius and Rome* (Ithaca, NY).

Delacroix, G., 1865, *Saint Cyrille de Jérusalem. Sa vie et ses œuvres* (Paris).

Dix, Dom Gregory, 1960, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London).

Dodds, E.R., 1947, ‘Theurgy and its Relationship to Neoplatonism’, *JRS* 37, 55–9.

— 1990, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety: Some Aspects of Religious Experience From Marcus Aurelius to Constantine* (Cambridge).

Doval, Alexis James, 1993, ‘The Location and Structure of the Baptistery in the *Mystagogic Catechesis* of Cyril of Jerusalem’, *SP* 26, 1–13.

— 1997, ‘The Date of Cyril of Jerusalem’s Catecheses’, *JTS* 48, 129–32.

— 2001a, *Cyril of Jerusalem: Mystagogoue* (Washington D.C.).

— 2001b, ‘Cyril of Jerusalem’s Theology of Salvation’, *SP* 37, 453–61.

— 2006, ‘Review: Cyril of Jerusalem: Bishop and City’, *JECS* 14:1, 124–5.

Downey, Glanville, 1975, ‘Caesarea and the Christian Church’, *Bulletin of American School of Oriental Research. Supplimentary Studies* 19, 23–42.

Dragas, George Dion, 2011, 'The Seal of the Gift of the Holy Spirit: The Sacrament of Chrismation', *GOTR* 56:1-4, 143–60.

Drake, H.A., 2000, *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance* (Baltimore).

— 2005, 'Models of Christian Expansion', in: W.V. Harris (ed.), *The Spread of Christianity in the First Four Centuries* (Leiden), 1–13.

— 2006, 'The Impact of Constantine on Christianity', in: Noel Lenski (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine* (New York), 111–36.

— 2008, 'The church, society and political power', in: Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity (vol. 2)* (Cambridge), 403–28.

Drijvers, Jan Willem, 1994, 'Review of Joan E. Taylor, *Christians and the Holy Places*', *VC* 48:1, 86.

— 1997, *The Finding of the True Cross: The Judas Kyriakos Legend in Syriac* (Leuven).

— 1999, 'Promoting Jerusalem: Cyril and the True Cross' in Jan Willem Drijvers and John W. Watt (eds.), *Portraits of Spiritual Authority: Religious Power in Early Christianity, Byzantium, and the Christian Orient* (Leiden), 79–95.

— 2000, 'Cyril of Jerusalem and the Rebuilding of the Jewish Temple (A.D. 363)', in: Caroline Kroon and Daan den Hengst (eds.), *Ultima Aetas: Time, Tense and Transience in the Ancient World. Studies in Honour of Jan den Boeft* (Amsterdam), 123–5.

— 2004, *Cyril of Jerusalem: Bishop and City* (Leiden).

— 2009, 'The Power of the Cross: Celestial Cross Appearances in the Fourth Century', in: Andrew Cain and Noel Lenski (eds.), *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity* (Farnham), 237–50.

Droge, Arthur J., 1992, 'The Apologetic Dimensions of the *Ecclesiastical History*', in: Harold W. Attridge and Gohei Hata (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992, 492-509.

Dujarier, Michael, 1962, *Le parrainage des adultes aux trois premiers siècles de l'Église; recherché historique sur l'évolution des guaranties et des étapes catéchuménales avant 313* (Paris).

— 1979, *A History of the Catechumenate: the First Six Centuries* (New York).

Dulles, Avery, 1985, *The Catholicity of the Church* (Oxford).

Dunn, Geoffrey D., 1998, 'Tertullian and Rebekah: A Re-reading of an "Anti-Jewish" Argument in Early Christian Literature', *VC* 52, 119–45.

— 2004, 'Heresy and Schism according to Cyprian of Carthage', *JTS* 55.2, 551–74.

— 2008, *Tertullian's Aduersus Iudaeos: A Rhetorical Analysis* (Washington D.C.).

— 2016, *The Bishop of Rome in Late Antiquity* (London).

Dunn, James D. G., 1970, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London).

Dupont, Anthony, 2015, '*Peccatum* and *Gratia* in Augustine's Anti-Donatist *Sermones ad Populum*: Attested Presence and Specific Treatment of Two Key Concepts of Augustine's Anti-Pelagian Doctrine', in: Anthony Dupont et al. (eds.), *A Uniquely African Controversy: Studies on Donatist Christianity* (Leuven), 311–48.

Edsman, C. M., 1957, 'A Typology of Baptism in Hippolytus', *SP* 2, 35–40.

Edwards, Mark, 2002, *Origen against Plato* (Aldershot).

— 2003, *Constantine and Christendom* (Liverpool).

— 2006, 'The Beginnings of Christianization', in: Noel Lenski (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine* (New York), 137–58.

— 2009, *Catholicity and Heresy in the Early Church* (Surrey).

— 2015a, *Religions of the Constantinian Empire* (Oxford).

— 2015b, 'Porphyry and Cappadocian Logic', *GOTR* 60:3-4, 61–74.

— 2017, 'The Gnostic Myth', in: James Carleton Paget and Judith Lieu (eds.), *Christianity in the Second Century* (Cambridge), 137–50.

Edwards, Mark, et al. (eds.), 2002, *Apologetics in the Roman Empire* (Oxford).

Edwards, M.J., 1990, 'Atticizing Moses? Numenius, the Fathers and the Jews', *VC* 44.1, 64–75

Efroymson, David P., 1980, 'Tertullian's Anti-Jewish Rhetoric: Guilt by Association', *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 36.1, 25–37.

Ekenberg, Anders, 2011, 'Initiation in the *Apostolic Tradition*', in: David Hellholm et al. (eds.). *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum*, 3 vols. (Berlin), 1011–50.

Elsner, Jaś, and Rutherford, Ian, 2005, *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman & Early Christian Antiquity* (Oxford).

Elm, Susanna, 1989, 'Perceptions of Jerusalem Pilgrimage as Reflected in Two Early Sources on Female Pilgrimage (3rd and 4th centuries A.D.)', *SP* 20, 219–23.

Entralgo, P. Lain, 1970, *Maladie et culpabilité* (Paris).

Erhman, Bart D., 2003, *Lost Christianities: The Battle for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew* (Oxford).

Esbroeck, Michel van., 1973, 'Une homélie sur l'église attribuée à Jean de Jérusalem', *Le Muséon* 86, 283–304.

Evers, Alexander, 2012, 'Augustine on the Church (Against the Donatists)', in: Mark Vessey (ed.), *A Companion to Augustine* (West Sussex), 375–85.

Feiertag, J. L., 2000, 'À propos du rôle des juifs dans les traditions sous-jacentes aux récits de la croix', *AB* 118, 241–64.

Fenwick, John, 1986, *Fourth Century Anaphoral Techniques* (Nottingham).

— 1992, *The Anaphoras of St. Basil and St. James: An investigation into their common origin* (Rome).

Ferguson, Everett (ed.), 1993, *Conversion, Catechumenate, and Baptism in the Early Church* (London).

— 1997, 'Exhortations to Baptism in the Cappadocians', *SP* 33, 1–17.

— 2009, *Baptism in the Early Church* (Grand Rapids, MI).

Festugière, Andrè-Jean, 1954, *Personal Religion Among the Greeks* (Berkeley, CA).

Filias, Geōrgios, 1997, *Ὁ Τρόπος Ἀναγνώσεως τῶν Εὐχῶν στὴ Λατρεία τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας* (Athens).

— 2009, *Λειτουργική, Τόμος Α΄* (Athens).

— 2016, *Λειτουργική, Τόμος Β΄* (Athens).

Finn, Thomas Macy, 1967, *The Liturgy of Baptism in the Baptismal Instructions of St. John Chrysostom* (Washington, D.C.).

— 1992a, *Early Christian Baptism and the Catechumenate: Italy, North Africa, and Egypt* (Collegeville, MI).

— 1992b, *Early Christian Baptism and the Catechumenate: West and East Syria* (Collegeville, MI).

Fisher, J. D. C., 1957, 'The Consecration of Water in the Early Rite of Baptism', *SP* 2, 41–46.

Flannery, Edward H., 1991, 'La croix dans les relations entre juifs et chrétiens', *Service international de documentation judéo-chrétienne* 24, 5–12.

Florovsky, Georges, 1934, 'О границах Церкви', *Путь* 44, 15–26.

— 1986, ‘The Limits of the Church’, *Sourozh 26*, 13–24.

Folkemer, Lawrence D., 1993, ‘A Study of the Catechumenate’, in: Ferguson, Everett (ed.). *Conversion, Catechumenate, and Baptism in the Early Church* (London), 244–65.

Folgerø, Per Olov, 2009, ‘The Text-catena in the Frescoes in the Sanctuary of S. Maria Antiqua in Rome (705-707 A.D.). A note on its link to the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of jerusalem’, *Bollettino della Badia di Grottaferrata* 3.6, 45–66.

Foucault, Michel, 1984, *Histoire de la sexualité (vol. 3)* (Paris).

Fountoulēs, Iōannēs, 2005, *Κειμενα Λειτοθργικης, Τευχος Γ’: Θείαι Λειτουργίαι* (Thessaloniki).

Fowden, Garth, 1998, ‘Polytheist Religion and Philosophy’, in: Averil Cameron (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History (vol. 13)* (Cambridge), 538–60.

— 2005a, ‘The Individual and the Gods’, in: Alan Bowman et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History, 2nd ed. (vol. 12)* (Cambridge), 538–52.

— 2005b, ‘The World-View’, in: Alan Bowman et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History, 2nd ed. (vol. 12)* (Cambridge), 521–37.

Frank, Georgia, 2001, ‘“Taste and See”: The Eucharist and the Eyes of Faith in the Fourth Century’, *Church History* 70, 619–43.

— 2008, ‘From Antioch to Arles: Lay devotion in context’, in: Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity (vol. 2)* (Cambridge), 531–47.

Frankfurter, David, 2008, ‘Christianity and paganism: Egypt’, in: Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity (vol. 2)* (Cambridge), 173–88.

Fredriksen, Paula, 2003, ‘What “Parting of the Ways”? Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City’, 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), 35–64.

— 2008, *Augustine and the Jews: A Christian Defence of Jews and Judaism* (New York).

Freeman-Grenville, G. S. P., 1987, ’The Basilica of the Holy Sepulchre, Jerusalem: History and Future’, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 2, 187–207.

Frend, W.H.C., 1993, ’The Winning of the Countryside’, in: Everett Ferguson (ed.), *Conversion, Catechumenate, and Baptism in the Early Church* (London), 91–104.

Frøyshov, Stig Simeon R., 2006, ‘Søndagsnattens vigilie i Jerusalems oppstandelseskirke, biskoppelig og monastisk’, *MCPL* 21, 39–52.

— 2008, ‘Den Hagiopolitiske Rite: Jerusalems Oldkirkelige Liturgi’, *Lære og Liv* 34:1, 50–9.

Galadza, Daniel, 2017 (forthcoming), *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem* (Oxford).

Galor, Katharina, and Avni, Gideon, 2011, *Unearthing Jerusalem* (Winona Lake, IN).

Galvão-Sobrinho, Carlos R., 2006, ‘Embodied Theologies: Christian Identity and Violence in Alexandria in the Early Arian Controversy’, in: H.A. Drake (ed.), *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices* (Aldershot), 321–31.

Garitte, Gérard, 1963, ‘Les Catéchèses de S. Cyrille de Jérusalem en arménien : fragments d’un manuscrit du IX^{e} siècle’, *Le Muséon* 76, 95–108.

Garrett, James Leo, 1988, ‘The Priesthood of All Christians: From Cyprian to John Chrysostom’, *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 30.2, 22–33.

Gavrilyuk, Paul L., 2007, *Histoire du catéchuménat dans l’église ancienne* (Paris).

Gebremedhin, Ezra, 1977, *Life-Giving Blessing: An Inquiry into the Eucharistic Doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria* (Uppsala).

Geisler, J.K.L., 1819, ‘Uber die Nazaräer und Ebioniten’, *Archiv für alte und neue Kirchengeschichte* 4.

Gelston, Anthony, 2010, ‘Cyril of Jerusalem’s Eucharistic Prayer: The Argument from Silence’, *SP* 39, 301–5.

Gergeley, Hanula, 2013, ‘A katekumenek keresztelési előkészülete Jeruzsálemi Cirillnél’, in: Déri Balázs (ed.), *ΑΓΙΟΝ KÖNYVEK, 1. kötet: Conversio* (Budapest).

Giannarelli, E., 2003, ‘Egeria: A Journey Through Liturgy, Exegesis and Devotion’, in: Pauline Allen et al. (eds.), *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church (vol. 3)* (Brisbane).

Giblet, Jean, 1964, ‘Baptism — The Sacrament of Incorporation into the Church, according to St Paul’, trans. David Askew, *Baptism in the New Testament* (Baltemore), 161–86.

Gibson, Shimon and Taylor, Joan E., 1994, *Beneath the Church of the Holy Sepulchre Jerusalem* (London).

Goldenberg, Robert, 2008, ‘The destruction of the Jerusalem Temple: Its meaning and its consequences’, in: Steven T. Katz (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism (vol. 4)* (Cambridge), 191–205.

Goldhill, Simon (ed.), 2001, *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire* (Cambridge).

Goodblatt, David, 2008, ‘The political and social history of the Jewish community in the Land of Israel, c.235-638’, in: Steven T. Katz (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism (vol. 4)* (Cambridge), 404–30.

Goodman, Martin, 1992, ‘Jewish Proselytizing in the First Century’, in: Judith Lieu et al. (eds.), *The Jews among Pagans and Christians: In the Roman Empire* (London).

— 1994, *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford).

Grant, Robert M., 1992, ‘Eusebius and Imperial Propaganda’, in: Harold W Attridge and Gohei Hata (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism* (Detroit), 658–83.

— 1980, *Eusebius as Church Historian* (Oxford).

Graf, Fritz, 2011, ‘Baptism and Graeco-Roman Mystery Cults’, in: David Hellholm et al. (eds.), *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum*, 3 vols. (Berlin), 101–18.

Greco, I., 1976, ‘San Gregorio di Nissa Pellegrino in Terra Santa’, *Salesanium* 38, 109–25.

Green, Bernard, 2010, *Christianity in Ancient Rome: The First Three Centuries* (London).

Green, H. Benedict, 1962, ‘The Significance of the Pre-Baptismal Seal in St. John Chrysostom’, *SP* 6, 84–90.

Greenlee, J. Harold, 1955, *The Gospel Text of Cyril of Jerusalem* (Copenhagen).

Greenslade, S. L., 1964, *Schism in the Early Church* (London).

Gregg, Robert C., 1985, ‘Cyril of Jerusalem and the Arians’, in: id. (ed.), *Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments* (Cambridge, MA), 85–110.

Groh, Dennis E., 1971, ‘Tertullian’s Polemic against Social Co-Option’, *Church History* 40.1, 7-14.

Gruen, Erich S., 2017, ‘Christians as a “Third race”: Is Ethnicity at issue?’, in: James Carleton Paget and Judith Lieu (eds.), *Christianity in the Second Century* (Cambridge), 235–249.

Gwynn, David, 2007, *The Eusebians* (Oxford).

Hägg, Henny Fiskå, 2011, ‘Baptism in Clement of Alexandria’, in: David Hellholm (ed.), *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum*, 3 vols. (Berlin; New York), 973–87.

Halbwachs, Maurice, 1971, *La topographie légendaire des evangiles en terre sainte: Etude de mémoire collective* (Paris).

Hall, Stuart George, 1982, ‘Stephen of Rome and the One Baptism’, *SP* 17.2, 796–98.

— 1987, ‘Stephen of Rome and the Baptismal Controversy’, *Miscellanea historiae ecclesiasticae* 8, 78–82.

— 2000, ‘The Organisation of the Church’, in: Averil Cameron et al. (ed.), *The Cambridge Ancient History (vol. 14)* (Cambridge), 731–44.

— 2006, ‘Ecclesiology forged in the wake of persecution’, in: Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity (vol. 1)* (Cambridge), 470–483.

Hällström, Gunnar af, 2011, ‘More Than Initiation? Baptism According to Origen of Alexandria’, in: David Hellholm et al. (ed.), *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum*, 3 vols. (Berlin; New York), 989-1009.

Hamman, Adelbert (ed.), 1967, *Baptism: Ancient Liturgies and Patristic Texts* (Staten Island).

— 1980, *L’Initiation chrétienne. Cyrille de Jérusalem: Catéchèses mystagogiques; Ambroise de Milan: Traité des mystères; Jean Chrysostome: Sermon aux néophytes* (Paris).

Hanson, Richard, 1959, *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Source and Significance of Origen’s Interpretation of Scripture* (Louisville, KY).

— 1985, *Studies in Christian Antiquity* (Edinburgh).

Harkins, Franklin T., 2005, ‘Nuancing Augustine’s Hermeneutical Jew: Allegory and Actual Jews in the Bishop’s Sermons’, *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 36, 41–64.

Harkins, P. W., 1966, ‘Pre-Baptismal Rites in Chrysostom’s Baptismal Catechesis’, *SP* 8, 219–38.

Harmless, William, 1995, *Augustine and the Catechumenate* (Collegeville, MI).

— 1997, ‘Christ the Pediatrician: Infant Baptism and Christological Imagery in the Pelagian Controversy’, *Augustinian Studies* 28–2, 7–34.

— 2008, ‘Christ the Pediatrician: Augustine on the Diagnosis and Treatment of the Injured Vocation of the Child’, in: Patrick McKinley Brennan (ed.), *The Vocation of the Child* (Grand Rapids, MI).

Harnack, Adolf von, 1883, *Die Altercatio Simonis Iudaei et Theophili Christiani nebst Untersuchungen über die antijuudische Polemik in der alten Kirche* (Leipzig).

— 1911, *Monasticism: Its Ideals and History and the Confessions of St. Augustine* (London).

— 1924, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott: Neue Studien zu Marcion (2nd ed.)* (Darmstadt)

— 1961, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (New York).

— 1990, *The Gospel of the Alien God*, trans. John E Steely and Lyle D. Bierma (Durham, NC).

Harrison, Carol, 1992, *Beauty and Revelation in the Thought of Saint Augustine* (Oxford).

Harrison, P.N., 1936, *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians* (Cambridge).

Hartman, Lars, 2011, 'Usages – Some Notes on the Baptismal Name-Formulae', in: David Hellholm (ed.), *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum*, 3 vols. (Berlin; New York), 397–413.

Hauerwas, Stanley, 2010, 'Defending Constantine: The Twilight of an Empire and the Dawn of Christendom', *Christian Century* 127:21, 48–51.

Hawk-Reinhard, Donna R., 2011, *From Χριστιανοί to Χριστοφόροι: The Role of the Eucharist in Christian Identity Formation according to Cyril of Jerusalem* (Ph.D diss.: Saint Louis University).

– 2013a, 'Transmission Implications Regarding the Authorship of Cyril of Jerusalem's Mystagogic Catecheses', in: Kenneth B. Steinhauser and Scott Dermer (eds.), *The Use of Textual Criticism for the Interpretation of Patristic Texts: Seventeen Case Studies* (Lewiston, MA), 37–76

– 2013b, 'Cyril of Jerusalem's Sacramental *Theōsis*', *SP* 66, 247–56.

— 2017 (forthcoming), 'The Role of the Holy Spirit in Cyril of Jerusalem's Sacramental Theology', *SP* 93.

— Forthcoming, 'Cyril of Jerusalem's Teachings Regarding the Proper Fear of God', in: Ann W. Astell (ed.), *Saving Fear: The Charged Dynamic of Fear and Love in Christian Spirituality* (Notre Dame, IN).

Hayes, Andrew, 2017, *Justin Against Marcion* (Minneapolis).

Heers, Peter Alban, 2015, *The Ecclesiological Renovation of Vatican II: An Orthodox Examination of Rome's Ecumenical Theology Regarding Baptism and the Church* (Simpsonville, SC).

Heid, S., 1989, 'Der Ursprung der Helenalegende im Pilgerbetreib Jerusalems' in *JbAC* 32, 41–71.

— 1991, 'Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende', *AB* 109, 73–108.

Heith-Stade, David, 2010a, 'Eastern Orthodox Ecclesiologies in the Era of Confessionalism', *Theoforum* 41, 373–85.

— 2010b, ‘Receiving Converts in the Orthodox Church: A Historical-Analytical Study of Eighteenth Century Greek Canon Law’, *Oskircheliche Studien* 59.1, 99-110.

— 2010c, ‘Receiving the Non-Orthodox: A Historical Study of Greek Orthodox Canon Law’, *Studia Canonica* 44, 399–426.

Hendel, Ronald, 2013, *The Book of Genesis: A Biography* (Princeton, NJ).

Herbert, Laura, 2009, ‘Pagans and Christians in Late Antique Aphrodisias’, in: Calvin B. Kendall (eds.), *Conversion to Christianity from Late Antiquity to the Modern Age* (Minneapolis), 85–114.

Hess, Hamilton, 1997, ‘Soteriological Motifs in the *Catechetical Lectures* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem’, *SP* 32, 315–19.

Hill, Joyce, 1983, ‘From Rome to Jerusalem: An Icelandic Itinerary of the Mid-Twelfth Century’, *The Harvard Theological Review* 76:2, 175–203.

Himuro, Misako, 1998, ‘The phoenix in The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians’, *Renaissance Studies* 12:4, 523–544.

Hirshman, Marc, 1995, *A Rivalry of Genius: Jewish and Christian Biblical Interpretation in Late Antiquity* (Stonybrook).

Hoffman, Lawrence A., 1990, ‘The Jewish Lectionary, the Great Sabbath, and the Lenten Calendar: Liturgical Links between Christians and Jews in the First Three Centuries’, in: J. Neil Alexander (ed.), *Time and Community* (Washington, D.C.), 3–20.

Hofmann, Johannes, 2016, 'Autorität und Wandel der Bestimmungen der ersten vier ökumenischen Synoden. Zum Vorrang der alten Hauptkirchen des Römischen Reiches und zum Aufstieg Konstantinopels und Jerusalems', *Orthodoxes Forum* 30.2, 163–80.

Hollerich, Michael J, 2002, ‘Hebrews, Jews and Christians: Eusebius of Caesarea on the Biblical Basis of the Two States of the Christian Life’, in: Paul Blowers et al. (eds.), *Dominico Eloquio: Essays on Patristic Exegesis in Honour of Robert Wilken* (Grand Rapids, MI), 172–84.

Honigmann, Ernest A. J., 1950, ‘Juvenal of Jerusalem’, *DOP*, 209–79.

Horrell, David G., 2002, ‘Becoming Christian: Solidifying Christian Identity and Content’, in: Anthony J. Blasi et al. (eds.), *Handbook of Early Christianity: Social Science Approaches* (Walnut Creek, CA), 309–35.

Hort, F.J.A., 1876, *Two Dissertations* (Cambridge).

Hovorun, Cyril, 2015, *Meta-Ecclesiology: Chronicles on Church Awareness* (New York).

— 2016, ‘Critique of the Church through the Prism of the Panorthodox Council’, *Theologia* [Θεολογία] 87, 63–72.

— 2017, *Scaffolds of the Church: Towards Poststructural Ecclesiology* (Eugene, OR).

Howard-Brook, Wes, 2016, *Empire Baptized: How the Church Embraced What Jesus Rejected 2nd – 5th Centuries* (Maryknoll, NY).

Hunt, E.D., 1982, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire AD 312-460* (Oxford).

— 1990, 'Review: The Helena Legend', *The Classical Review, New Series* 40:2, 390–1.

— 1997, 'Constantine and Jerusalem', *JEH* 48, 405–24.

Hurtado, Larry W., 2016, *Destroyer of the gods: Early Christian distinctiveness in the Roman world* (Waco, TX).

Inglizean, V., 1964–5, 'The Letter of Cyril of Jerusalem to the Emperor Constantius: Study and Text', *Handes Amsorya* 78, 289–300, 449–58; 79, 1–16.

Irichinschi, Eduard, and Zelletin, Holger M. (eds.), 2008, *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity* (Tübingen).

Irshai, Oded, 1995, 'Constantine and the Jews: The Prohibition against entering Jerusalem — History and Hagiography', *Zion* 60, 129–178.

— 1996, 'Cyril of Jerusalem: The Apparition of the Cross and the Jews', in: Ora Limor and Guy G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews* (Tübingen), 85–104.

— 1999, 'The Jerusalem Bishopric and the Jews in the Fourth Century: History and Eschatology', in: Lee I. Levine (ed.), *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York), 204–20.

— 2009, 'The Christian Appropriation of Jerusalem in the Fourth Century: The Case of the Bordeaux Pilgrim', *Jewish Quarterly Review* 99:4, 465–86.

Jackson-McCabe, Matt (ed.), 2007, *Jewish-Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts* (Minneapolis).

Jackson, Pamela, 1991a, 'Cyril of Jerusalem's Treatment of Scriptural Texts Concerning the Holy Spirit', *Traditio* 46, 1–31.

— 1991b, 'Cyril of Jerusalem's use of Scripture in Catechesis', *Theological Studies* 52, 431–50.

Jacob, Christoph, 1990, "*Arkandisziplin", Allegorese und Mystagogie: Ein neuer Zugang zur Theologie des Ambrosius von Mailand* (Frankfurt).

Jacobs, Andrew S., 2004, *Remains of the Jews: the Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity* (Stanford).

— 2016, *Epiphanius of Cyprus: A Cultural Biography of Late Antiquity* (Oakland, CA).

Janeras, S., 1986, 'A propos de la catéchèse XIVe de Cyrille de Jérusalem', *Ecclesia Orans* 3, 307–18.

Jasper, R.C.D., and Cuming, G.J., 1975, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed* (Collegeville, MI).

Jeanes, G.P., 1989, 'How Successful was Baptism in the Fourth Century A.D.?', *SP* 20, 379–83.

Jeffery, Peter, 1992, 'The Lost Chant Tradition of Early Christian Jerusalem: Some Possible Melodic Survivals in the Byzantine and Latin Chant Reportories', *Early Music History* 11, 151–90.

Jenkinson, W. R., 1964, 'The Image and Likeness of God in Man in the Eighteen Lectures on the Credo of Cyril of Jerusalem', *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 40, 48–72.

Jensen, Robin M., 2012, *Baptismal Imagery in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI).

Johannessen, Hazel, 2016, *The Demonic in the Political Thought of Eusebius of Caesarea* (Oxford).

Johnson, Maxwell E., 1988, 'Reconciling Cyril and Egeria on the Catechetical Process in Fourth-Century Jerusalem', in: Paul F. Bradshaw (ed.), *Essays in Early Eastern Initiation* (Bramcote), 18–30.

— 1995, 'From Three Weeks to Forty Days: Baptismal Preparation and the Origins of Lent', in: id. (ed.), *Living Water, Sealing Spirit* (Collegeville, MN), 118–36.

— 2007, *The Rites of Christian Initiation (2nd ed.)* (Collegeville, MN).

Johnson, Paul Christopher, 2002, *Secrets, Gossip, and Gods* (New York).

Jovanović, Zdravko, 2013, 'St Irenaeus, Regula Fidei and the Ecclesiological Context of Interpretation', *Philotheos* 13, 134–40.

Jungmann, Josef A., 1960, *The Early Liturgy* (London).

— 1965, *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer* (New York).

Kalleres, Dayna S., 2002, *Exorcising the Devil to Silence Christ's Enemies: Ritualized Speech Practices in Late Antique Christianity* (Ph.D. diss.: Brown University).

— 2005, 'Cultivating True Sight at the Center of the World: Cyril of Jerusalem and the Lenten Catechumenate', *Church History* 74, 431–59.

— 2015, *City of Demons: Violence, Ritual, and Christian Power in Late Antiquity* (Oakland, CA).

Kapsalēs, Geōrgios, 2015, *Τα πάθη και η θεραπεία τους κατά τη διδασκαλία του αγίου Συμεών του Νέου Θεολόγου* (PhD: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki).

Kariatlis, Philip, 2012, 'Affirming Koinonia Ecclesiology: An Orthodox Perspective', *Phronema* 27:1, 51–66.

Karmiris, J. (ed.), 1953, *Τὰ Δογματικά καὶ Συμβολικὰ Μνηνεία τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας (vol. 2)* (Athens).

Katz, Steven T., 2008, 'The Rabbinic response to Christianity', in: Steven T. Katz (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism (vol. 4)* (Cambridge), 259–98.

Kaufman, Peter Iver, 1991, 'Tertullian on Heresy, History, and the Reappropriation of Revelation', *Church History* 60.2, 167–79.

Kavanagh, Aidan, et al. (eds.), 1976, *Made, Not Born: New Perspectives on Christian Initiation and the Catechumenate* (Notre Dame).

— 1991, *The Shape of Baptism: The Rite of Christian Initiation* (Collegeville, MI).

Kazarov, Mikhail, 2012, *Christianizing the Roman Empire* (Saarbrücken).

Kelly, Henry Ansgar, 1985, *The Devil at Baptism* (Ithaca, NY).

Kelly, J.N.D., 1975, *Jerome, His Life, Writings and Controversies* (London).

— 2006, *Early Christian Creeds (3rd ed.)* (London).

Kile, Chad, 2005, 'Feeling Persuaded: Christianization as Social Formation', in: Willi Braun (ed.), *Rhetoric and Reality in Early Christianities* (Waterloo, ON), 219–48.

Kim, Young Richard, 2015, *Epiphanius of Cyprus: Imagining an Orthodox World* (Ann Arbour, MI).

King, Christopher J., 2005, *Origen on the Song of Songs as the Spirit of Scripture: The Bridegroom's Perfect Marriage-Song* (Oxford).

King, Karen L., 2017, '"The Gnostic Myth": How Does Its Demise Impact Twenty-first Century Historiography of Christianity's Second Century?', in: James Carleton Paget and Judith Lieu (eds.), *Christianity in the Second Century* (Cambridge), 122–36.

Kinzig, Wolfram, 1976, 'Die politische Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea', in id. *Die Kirche angesichts der Konstantinischen Wende* (Darmstadt), 236–58.

— 1991, '"Non-Separation": Closeness and Co-Operation Between Jews and Christians in the Fourth Century', *VC* 45:1, 27–53.

— 1993, ‘The Idea of Progress in the Early Church until the Age of Constantine’, *SP* 24, 119–34.

Kinzig, Wolfram, et al. (ed.), 2011, *Liturgie und Ritual in der Alten Kirche: Patristische Beiträge zum Studium der gottesdienstlichen Quellen der Alten Kirche* (Leuven).

Kohlgraf, Peter, 2001, *Die Ekklesiologie des Epheserbriefes in der Austlegung durch Johannes Chrysostomus* (Ph.D. diss.: Bonn).

Kolandjian, S., 1960, ‘New Fragments from a Manuscript of the 9th Century by Cyril of Jerusalem’, *Yerevan: Banber Matenadarani* 5, 201–308.

Kreider, Alan, 2016, *The Patient Ferment of the Early Church: The Improbable Rise of Christianity in the Roman Empire* (Grand Rapids, MI).

Kretschmar, Georg, 1956, *Studien zur früchristlichen Trinitätstheologie* (Tübingen).

— 1957, ‘Die frühe Geschichte der Jerusalemer Liturgie’, *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 2, 22-46.

— 1977a, ‘Recent Research on Christian Initiation’, *SL* 12, 87–106.

— 1977b, *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* (Berlin).

Kyrtatas, Dimitris J., 2005, ‘The Significance of Leadership and Organisation in the Spread of Christianity’, in: W. V. Harris (ed.), *The Spread of Christianity in the First Four Centuries* (Leiden), 53–68.

Lages, Mario F., 1969, ‘Étapes de l’evolution de carême à Jérusalem avant le Ve siècle. Essai d’analyse structurale’, *Revue des Études Armeniénnes* 6, 67-102.

Lahey, Lawrence, 2007, ‘Evidence for Jewish Believers in Christian-Jewish Dialogues through the Sixth Century (excluding Justin)’, in: Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus: the Early Centuries* (Peabody, MA), 518-39.

Lampe, G. W. H., 1961, *A Greek Patristic Lexicon* (Oxford).

— 1967, *The Seal of the Spirit* (London).

Lampe, Peter, 2003, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries* (Minneapolis).

Lane Fox, Robin, 1986, *Pagans and Christians* (San Francisco).

Langnes-Øyen, Ola, 2003, ‘Djevel og demon i senantikk kristen dåp: En analyse av Kyrill av Jerusalems mystagogiske katekeser’, *Chaos 40*, 29–45.

Larchet, Jean-Claude, 1991, ‘Le Christ Médecin’, *Thérapeutiques des maladies spirituelles* (Paris), 391–44.

— 2002, *The Theology of Illness* (Yonkers, NY).

— 2012, *L’Eglise corpus du Christ*, 2 vols. (Paris).

Law, Timothy Michael, 2013, *When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible* (Oxford).

Lebon, J., 1924, ‘La Position de Saint Cyrille de Jerusalem dans les lutes provoquées par l’arianisme’, *Revue d’Histoire Ecclésiastique* 20, 181–210+357–86.

Lee, A.D., 2000, *Pagans and Christians In Late Antiquity* (London).

Lee, Peter K., 1988, ‘The Concept of the City of God in Early Christian Thought’, *SP* 18:2, 99–107.

Leithart, Peter, 2010, *Defending Constantine: The Twilight of an Empire and the Dawn of Christendom* (Downers Grove, IL).

Lenski, Noel (ed.), 2006, *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine* (New York).

Leone, Anna, 2008, ‘Christianity and paganism: North Africa’, in: Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity (vol. 2)* (Cambridge), 231–47.

Liebeschuetz, J.H. W.G., 1979, *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion* (Oxford).

Lieu, Judith, 2002, *Neither Jew Nor Greek?: Contructing Early Christianity* (New York).

— 2015, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic* (Cambridge).

Lieu, Samuel N.C., 2008, ‘Christianity and Manichaeism’, in: Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity (vol. 2)* (Cambridge), 279–95.

Linder, Amnon, 1987, *The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation* (Detroit, MI).

— 2008, ‘The legal status of the Jews in the Roman Empire’, in: Steven T. Katz (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism (vol. 4)* (Cambridge), 128–73.

Lockwood, Christopher, 2017, ‘Hagiasmos: Water Symbolism in Orthodox Christianity', *SVTQ* 61.1, 5–38.

Löhr, Winrich, 2017, ‘Modelling Second-Century Christian Theology: Christian Theology as *Philosophia*’, in: James Carleton Paget and Judith Lieu (eds.), *Christianity in the Second Century* (Cambridge), 151–168.

Loudovikos, Nikolaos, 2015, *Church in the Making: An Apophatic Ecclesiology of Consubstantiality* (Yonkers, NY).

Louth, Andrew, 2004, 'Palestine: Cyril of Jerusalem and Epiphanius', in: F. Young et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge), 283–8.

Louw, Johannes P, and Nida, Eugene A., 1988, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains (2nd ed.)* (New York).

Ludlow, Morwenna, 2002, 'Theology and Allegory: Origen and Gregory of Nyssa on the Unity and Diversity of Scripture', *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 4.1, 45–66.

Luttikhuizen, Gerard P, 2005, *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions* (Leiden).

Lyman, J. Rebecca, 2007, 'Heresiology: The invention of "heresy" and "schism"', in: Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity (vol. 2)* (Cambridge), 296–313.

MacMullen, Ramsay, 1984, *Christianizing the Roman Empire* (London).

— 1990, *Changes in the Roman Empire: Essays in the Ordinary* (Priceton, NJ).

— 1993, 'Two Types of Conversion to Early Christianity', in: Everett Ferguson (ed.), *Conversion, Catechumenate, and Baptism in the Early Church* (London), 26–44.

— 1997, *Christianity and Paganism in the Fourth to Eighth Centuries* (London).

— 2009, *The Second Church: Popular Christianity A.D. 200-400* (Atlanta).

MacMullen, Ramsay, and Lane, Eugene N., 1992, *Paganism and Christianity 100-425 C.E.* (Minneapolis).

Macomber, W.F., 1966, 'The oldest known text of the anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari', *OCP* 32, 335–71.

Mader, J., 1891, *Der heilige Cyrillus, Bischof von Jerusalem, in seinem Leben und Schriften nach den Quellen dargestellt* (Einsiedeln).

Malesic, Jonathan, 2009, *Secret Faith in the Public Square* (Grand Rapids, MI).

Maraval, P., 2003, 'Les catéchèses baptismales (et mystagogiques) de Cyrille de Jérusalem et le témoignage d'Égérie', *Connaissance des Pères* 91, 29–35.

Marcus, Jacob, 1938, *The Jew in the Medieval World: A Sourcebook, 315–1791* (New York).

Margerie, Bertrand de, 2009, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégèse, I: Les Pères grecs et orientaux* (Paris).

Maria, Jyothy, 2013, 'Against the Sacrament of the World: Baptism and its Opposing Disorder in Alexander Schmemann's Teachings', *ETJ* 17.2, 128–44.

Markus, R.A., 1990, *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge).

— 1994, 'How on Earth Could Places Become Holy?', *JECS* 2:3, 257–71.

— 2008, 'Social and historical setting', in: Frances Young et al. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge), 399–413.

Marrou, Henri-Irénée, 1981, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité, tome 2: Le monde romain (6^{e} éd)* (Paris).

Martens, Peter W., 2012a, *Origen and Scripture: The Contours of the Exegetical Life* (Oxford).

— 2012b, 'Origen against History? Reconsidering the Critique of Allegory', *Modern Theology* 28.4, 635–56.

Mason, Steve, 2007, 'Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History', *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38, 1–56.

Maxwell, Jacklyn L., 2006, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge).

Mazza, Enrico, 1989, *Mystagogy: A Theology of Liturgy in the Patristic Age* (New York).

— 1995, *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer* (Collegeville, MN).

— 1999, *The Celebration of the Eucharist: The Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation* (Collegeville, MN).

McCauley, Leo P., and Stephenson, Anthony A., 1969, *The Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem (vol. 1)* (Washington D.C.).

— 1970, *The Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem (vol. 2)* (Washington D.C.).

McDonald, William P., 1998, 'Paideia and Gnosis: Foundations of the Catechumenate in Five Church Fathers' (Ph.D. diss.: Vanderbilt University, Nashville).

— 2002, 'Book Review: "Alexis James Doval, *Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogue*"', *JECS* 10:4, 529–31.

McDonnell, Kilian, and Montague, George T., 1994, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence form the First Eight Centuries (2nd, Revised ed.)* (Collegeville, MI).

McGowan, Andrew B., 2014, *Ancient Christian Worship: early church practices in social, historical, and theological perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI).

McKnight, Scot, 1991, *A Light Among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period* (Minneapolis, MN).

McPartlan, Paul, 2016, *A Service of Love: Papal Primacy, The Eucharist & Church Unity* (Washington, D.C.).

Metallinos, George D., 1994, *I Confess One Baptism…* (Daphne, Greece).

Meyendorff, John, 1983, *Catholicity and the Church* (Crestwood, NY).

Milanović, Jovan, 2009, 'Baptême chez saint Grégoire Palamas', *Philotheos* 9, 128–51.

— 2011, 'Le baptême et la tradition patristique', *Philotheos* 11, 77–97.

Miller, Patricia Cox, 1988, 'Poetic Words, Abysmal Words: Reflections on Origen's Hermeneutics', in: Charles Kannengieser and William L. Petersen (eds.), *Origen of Alexandria: His World and Legacy* (Notre Dame), 165–78.

Miller, Stuart S., 2007, 'Roman Imperialism, Jewish Self-Definition, and Rabbinic Society: Belchaye's "Iudaea-Palestina", Schwartz's "Imperialism" and "Jewish Society", and Boyarin's "Border Lines" Reconsidered', *AJS Review* 31:2, 329–62.

Momigliano, Arnaldo (ed.), 1970, *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford).

Moore, Edward, 2008, 'Christ as Demiurge: The Platonic Sources of Origen's Logos Theology in the Commentary on John', *Philotheos* 8, 200–7.

Moore, G. F., 1927, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, I. The Age of the Tannain* (Cambridge, MA).

Moroziuk, R.P., 1989, 'Some Thoughts on the Meaning of ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΗ in the Eighteenth Catechetical Lecture of Cyril of Jerusalem', *SP* 18:1, 169–78.

Moss, Candida, 2013, *The Myth of Persecution: How the Early Christians Invented a Story of Martyrdom* (New York).

Mullen, Roderic L., 1997, *The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem* (Atlanta, GA).

— 2004, *The Expansion of Christianity: A Gazetteer of the First Three Centuries* (Leiden).

Müller-Kessler, Christa, and Sokoloff, Michael (eds.), 1999, *The Catechism of Cyril of Jerusalem in the Christian Palestinian Aramaic Version* (Groningen).

Nautin, P., 1961, 'La date du *de viris illustribus* de Jérôme de la mort de Cyrille de Jérusalem et de celle de Grégoire de Nazianze', *RHE* 56, 33–35.

Neusner, Jacob, 1987, *Judaism and Christianity in the Age of Constantine* (London).

Nicholson, Oliver, 2000, 'Constantine's Vision of the Cross', *VC* 54:3, 309–23.

Niederberger, Basilius, 1923, *Die Logoslehre des hl. Cyrill von Jerusalem: Eine Dogmengeschichtliche Studie* (Paderborn).

Noailles, P., and Dain, A. (eds.), 1946, 'Les novellas de Leon VI le Sage', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 66, 149–150.

Noakes, Kenneth, 2010, 'Cyril of Jerusalem and the Spectrum of Renunciation', *SP* 39, 295–9.

Nock, Arthur Darby, 1952, 'Hellenist Mysteries and Christian Sacraments', in: Zeph Steward (ed.), *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World II* (Oxford), 791–820.

— 1993, 'The Spread of Christianity as a Social Phenomenon', in: Everett Ferguson (ed.), *Conversion, Catechumenate, and Baptism in the Early Church* (London), 1–25.

— 1998, *Conversion* (London).

Norderval, Øyvind, 2011, 'Simplicity and Power: Tertullian's *De Baptismo*', in: David Hellholm et al. (eds.). *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum*, 3 vols. (Berlin; New York), 947–72.

Norris, Frederick W., 2007, 'Greek Christianities', in: Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity (vol. 2)* (Cambridge), 70–117.

Norris, Richard A., 2012, *Gregory of Nyssa: Homilies on the Song of Songs* (Atlanta).

North, J.A., 2005, 'Pagans, Polytheists and the Pendulum', in: W. V. Harris (ed.), *The Spread of Christianity in the First Four Centuries* (Leiden), 125–43.

Norton, Peter, 2007, *Episcopal Eletions 250-600: Hierarchy and Popular Will in Late Antiquity* (Oxford).

Nussbaum, Martha C., 2009, *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics* (Princeton, NJ).

Odahl, Charles M., 2010, *Constantine and the Christian Empire (2nd Edition)* (Hoboken).

O'Keefe, John J., and Reno, R.R., 2005, *Sanctified Vision: An Introduction to Early Christian Interpretations of the Bible* (Baltimore).

Olszewski, Marek-Titien, 1995, 'L'image et sa function dans la mosaïque byzantine des premières basiliques en Orient: L'iconographie chrétienne expliquée par Cyril de Jérusalem (314-387)', *Cahiers archéologiques* 43, 9–34.

Ousterhout, Robert, 1990, 'The Temple, the Sepulchre, and the Martyrion of the Saviour', *Gesta* 29:1, 44–53.

Papadogiannakis, Yannis, 2012, *Christianity and Hellenism in the Fifth-Century Greek East* (Cambridge, MA).

Papanikolaou, Aristotle, 2016, ‘Eucharist, Councils and Primacy’ [*Εὐχαριστία, Σύνοδοι καὶ Πρωτεῖο*], *Theologia* [Θεολογία] 87, 25–48

Parkes, James, 1974, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue* (New York).

Pasquato, O., 1998, ‘Spirituality and Prayer in the Baptismal Catecheses of St. Cyril of Jerusalem’, in: Raymond Canning (ed.), *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church* (Queensland), 39–60.

Patout Burns, J., 1993a, ‘Social Context in the Controversy between Cyprian and Stephen’, *SP* 24, 38–44.

— 1993b, ‘On Rebaptism: Social Organization in the Third Century’, *JECS* 1:4, 367-403.

— 2002, *Cyprian the Bishop* (London).

— 2011, ‘The Efficacy of Baptism in Augustine’s Theology’, in: David Hellholm et al. (eds.), *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum*, 3 vols (Berlin; New York), 1283–1303.

Patout Burns, J. and Jensen, Robin M., 2014, *Christianity in Roman Africa* (Grand Rapids, MI).

Patrich, Joseph, 2002, ‘On the Lost Circus of Aelia Capitolina’, *Scripta Classica Israelica* 21, 173–88.

Patsavos, Lewis J., 2007, *A Noble Task: Entry into the Clergy in the First Five Centuries* (Brookline, MA).

Paulin, A., 1959, *Saint Cyrille de Jérusalem: Catéchète* (Paris).

Perler, O., 1950, ‘Arkandisziplin’, *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 1, 243–73.

Perrin, Michael-Yves, 2008, ‘*Arcana Mysteria* Ou Ce Que Cache La Religion: De Certaines Pratiques De L’Arcane Dans Le Christianisme Antique’, in : Matthias Riedl and Tilo Schabert (eds.), *Religions – The Religious Experience = Religionen – Die Religiöse Erfahrung* (Würzburg), 119–42.

— 2009, ‘Norunt Fideles: Silence et eucharistie dans l’orbis christianus antique’, in: Nicole Bériou et al. (eds.), *Pratiques de l’eucharistie dans les Églises d’Orient et d’Occident (Antiquité et Moyen Âge) vol. 2* (Paris), 737–63.

— 2010, ‘The Limits of the Heresiological Ethos in Late Antiquity’, in: David M. Gwynn and Susanne Bangert (eds.), *Religious Diversity in Late Antiquity* (Leiden).

Perrone, Lorenzo, 1999a, ‘“Four Gospels, Four Councils” — One Lord Jesus Christ: The Patristic Development of Christology within the Church of Palestine’, *Liber Annus* 49, 357–96.

— 1999b, '"The Mystery of Judaea" (Jerome, Ep. 46): The Holy City of Jerusalem between History and Symbol in Early Christian Thought', in: Lee I. Levine (ed.), *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York), 221–39.

Petersen, Anders Klostergaard. 2011, 'Rituals of Purification, Rituals of Initiation', in: David Hellholm et al. (eds.). *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum*, 3 vols. (Berlin; New York), 3–40.

Peterson, E., 1947, 'Die geschichtliche Bedeutung der jüdischen Gebetsrichtung', *Theologische Zeitschrift* 3, 1–15.

Photiki, Auxentios of, 1996, '"Fear and Trembling" Language in Fourth- and Fifth-Century Liturgical Texts: From Bishop to Schmemann to a Corrected View', in: Chrysostomos of Etna et al. (eds.), *Four Essays on Orthodox Liturgical Issues* (Etna, CA), 58–81.

Piédagnel, Auguste, 1967, 'À propos des Catéchèses Mystagogiques de Cyrille de Jérusalem', *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 55:4.

— 1970, 'Les Catéchèses Mystagogiques de Saint Cyrille de Jérusalem: inventaire de la tradition manuscrite grecque', *SP* 10, 141–5.

Popkes, Enno Edzard, 2011, 'Die Tauftheologie Cyprians: Beobachtungen zu ihrer Entwicklungsgeschichte und schrifthermeneutischen Begründung', in : David Hellholm et al. (eds.), *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum*, 3 vols. (Berlin; New York), 1051–70.

Prawer, Joshua, 1996, 'Christian Attitudes Towards Jerusalem in the Early Middle Ages', in: id. (ed.), *The History of Jerusalem: The Early Muslim Period, 638-1099* (Jerusalem), 311–348.

Prétot, Patrick, 2014, *L'adoration de la Croix* (Paris).

Price, R. M., 1985, *A history of the Monks of Syria by Theodoret of Cyrrhus* (Kalamazoo, MI).

— 1989, 'Pluralism and Religious Tolerance in the Empire of the Fourth Century', *SP* 20, 184–8.

— 2005, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, 2 vols. (Liverpool).

Pritz, Ray A., 1988, *Nazarene Jewish Christianity* (Leiden).

Pullan, Wendy, 2005, '"Intermingled Until the End of Time": Ambiguity as a Central Condition of Early Christian Pilgrimage', in: Jas Elsner and Ian Rutherford (eds.), *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity: Seeing the Gods* (Oxford), 387–409.

Quasten, Johannes, 1951, ‘Mysterium Tremendum: Eucharistische Frömmigkeitsauffassungen des vierten Jarhunderts’, in: A. C. Mayer (ed.), *Vom Christlischen Mysterium* (Düsseldorf).

— 1954, ‘The Liturgical Mysticism of Theodore of Mopsuestia’, *TS* 15, 431–9.

— 1960, *Patrology (vol. 3): The golden age of Greek patristic literature from the Council of Nicea to the Council of Chalcedon* (Utrecht).

Rahner, Hugo, 1963, *Greek Myths and Christian Mystery* (London).

Ramelli, Ilaria L. E., 2009, ‘Origen, Patristic Philosophy, and Christian Platonism: Re-Thinking the Christianisation of Hellenism’, *VC* 63, 217–63.

— 2011a, ‘Baptism in Gregory of Nyssa’s Theology and Its Orientation to Eschatology’, in: David Hellholm et al. (eds.), *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum*, 3 vols. (Berlin; New York), 1205–31.

— 2011b, ‘The Philosophical Stance of Allegory in Stoicism and Its Reception in Platonism, Pagan and Christian: Origen in Dialogue with the Stoics and Plato’, *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 18.3, 335–71.

Ramsey, John (Patrick), 2015, *The Place of St Peter in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy: A proposed ecclesiological perspective inspired by the Areopagite to provide a theoretical framework for the hierarchal structure of Orthodox churches* (Ph.D diss.: University of Winchester).

Rankin, David I., 1995, *Tertullian and the Church* (Cambridge).

— 2004, ‘Class Distinction as a Way of Doing Church: The Early Fathers and the Christian *Plebs*’, *VC* 58, 298–315.

Rapp, Claudia, 2005, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition* (Berkeley, CA).

Reinbold, Wolfgang, 2000, *Propaganda und Mission im Ältesten Christentum: Eine Untersuchung zu den Modalitäten der Ausbreitung der Frühen Kirche* (Göttingen).

Reis, David M., 2009, ‘Thinking with Soul: *Psychë* and *Psychikos* in the Construction of Early Christian Identities’, *JECS* 17.4, 563–603.

Reno, R. R., 2006, ‘Origen and Spiritual Interpretation’, *Pro Ecclesia* 15.1, 108–26.

Renoux, Athanase, 1965, ‘Les Catéchèses Mystagogiques dans L’Organisation Liturgique Hiérosolymitaine du IVe et du Ve Siècle’, *Le Museon* 78, 355–9.

— 1969–71, ‘Le Codex Armenien Jerusalem 121’, *PO* 35.1 and 36.2.

— 1972, ‘Une version arménienne des catéchèses mystagogiques de Cyrille de Jérusalem?’, *Le Muséon* 85, 147–53.

Richardson, Peter, 2008, ‘The beginnings of Christian anti-Judaism, 70-c.235’, in: Steven T. Katz (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism (vol. 4)* (Cambridge), 244–58.

Riley, Hugh M., 1974, ‘Christian Initiation: A Comparative Study of the Interpretation of the Baptismal Liturgy in the Mystagogical Writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Ambrose of Milan’, in: Johannes Quasten (ed.), *Studies in Christian Antiquity (vol. 17)* (Washington D.C.).

Rives, J., 2005, ‘Christian Expansion and Christian Ideology’, in: W.V. Harris (ed.), *The Spread of Christianity in the First Four Centuries* (Leiden), 15–42.

Robinson, Thomas A., 2009, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Jewish-Christian Relations* (Peabody, MA).

Rodopoulou, P., 1968, *Ἡ θεία λειτουργία κατὰ τὰς μυσταγώγικὰς Κατηχήσεις τοῦ Κυρίλλου Ἱεροσολύμων* (Athens).

Rokéah, David, 2002, *Justin Martyr and the Jews* (Leiden).

Rouwhorst, G., 1997, ‘Jewish Liturgical Traditions in Early Syriac Christianity’, *VC* 51.1, 72–93.

Rubenson, Samuel, 2000, ‘Katekumenatet: Katekese, dåb og medlemsoptagelse i oldkirken’, in: Hans Raun Iversen (ed.), *Dåb og medlemskab i Folkekirken: Seksten forelæsninger fra Københavns Universitet* (Frederiksberg), 31-42.

Rubin, Zeev, 1982, ‘The Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Conflict Between the Sees of Caesarea and Jerusalem’, in: L. I. Levine (ed.), *The Jerusalem Cathedra 2* (Jerusalem-Detroit), 79–105.

— 1999, ‘The Cult of the Holy Places and Christian Politics in Byzantine Jerusalem’, in: Lee I. Levine (ed.), *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York), 151–62.

Russel, A.G., 1937, ‘The Jews, The Roman Empire, and Christianity, a.d. 50-180’, *Greece and Rome* 6:18, 170–8.

Ruth, Lester, 2010, *Walking Where Jesus Walked: Worship in Fourth-Century Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids, MI).

Salapatas, Anastasios, 2010, ‘The Liturgical Theology of Initiation in the Sermon “On Holy Baptism” by Gregory of Nazianzus’, *Orthodoxes Forum* 24:2, 181–92.

Salaville, Severien, 1914–15, ‘Une question de critique littéraire : Les Catéchèses Mystagogiques de S. Cyrille’, *Échos d’Orient* 17, 531–7.

Salzman, Michele Renee, 2008, ‘Christianity and paganism: Italy’, in: Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity (vol. 2)* (Cambridge), 210–30.

Salzman, Michele Renee, 2006, ‘Rethinking Pagan-Christian Violence’, in: H.A. Drake (ed.), *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices* (Aldershot), 265–85.

Sandnes, Karl Olav, 2011, ‘Seal and Baptism in Early Christianity’, in: David Hellholm et al. (eds.), *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum*, 3 vols. (Berlin; New York), 1441–81.

Sandwell, Isabella, 2005, ‘Outlawing ‘Magic’ or Outlawing ‘Religion’? Libanius and the Theodosian Code as Evidence for Legislation Against ‘Pagan’ Practices’, in: W.V. Harris (ed.), *The Spread of Christianity in the First Four Centuries* (Leiden), 87–124.

— 2007, *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews and Christians in Antioch* (Cambridge).

Satterlee, Craig Alan, 2002, *Ambrose of Milan’s Method of Mystagogical Preaching* (Collegeville, MN).

Saxer, Victor, 1996, ‘Cyrill von Jerusalem und die Heilige Schrift: Was er von ihr lehrt and wie er sie gebraucht’, in: George Schöllgen and Clemens Scholte (eds.), *Stimuli: Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann* (Münster).

Scalise, Charles J., 1987, ‘Allegorical Flights of Fancy: The Problem of Origen’s Exegesis’, *GOTR* 32.1, 69–88.

Scarborough, Jason M., 2009, ‘Primitive, Unique, and True: Eusebius and the Legacy of His *Ecclesiastical History*’, *SVTQ* 53:1, 67–97.

Schindler, Laurenz, 1911, *Altchristliche Arkandisziplin und die antiken Mysterien* (Tetschen).

Schmemann, Alexander, 2003, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (Crestwood, NY).

Schneider, Laurel C., 2008, *Beyond Monotheism: A theology of multiplicity* (Abingdon).

Schoedel, William R., 1978, ‘Ignatius and the Archives’, *Harvard Theological Review* 71:1–2, 97–106.

Schwartz, Daniel Lewis, 2009, *Christian Education and Worship in the Making of the Late-Antique Church: Paideia and Cult in the Catechetical Homilies of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (Ph.D. diss.: Princeton).

Schwartz, Seth, 2005, ‘Roman Historians and the Rise of Christianity: The School of Edward Gibbon’, in: W.V. Harris (ed.), *The Spread of Christianity in the First Four Centuries*, 147–60.

Seagraves, R., 1993, *Pascentes cum Disciplina: A Logical Study of the Clergy in the Cyprianic Correspondence* (Fribourg).

Seppälä, Serafim, 2011, ‘Baptismal Mystery in St. Ephrem the Syrian and *Hymnen de Epiphania*’, in: David Hellholm et al. (eds.), *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum*, 3 vols. (Berlin; New York), 1139–77.

Shaw, Brent, 2011, *Sacred Violence: African Christians and Sectarian Hatred in the Age of Augustine* (Cambridge).

Sheridan, Mary C., 2008, ‘The Influence of Non-Christian Ideas in the Second Century C. E. on Clement of Alexandria and His Teachings’, *Philotheos* 8, 160–99.

Šijaković, Bogoljub, 2010, ‘Hellenic Gifts out of Christian Hands’, *Philotheos* 10, 153–6.

Simon, Marcel, 1986, *Verus Israel: A Study of Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire 135-425* (Oxford).

Simonetti, Manlio, 2002, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis* (New York).

Sirks, A.J.B., 2007, *The Theodosian Code: A Study* (Friedrichsdorf).

Sivan, Hagith, 1988, ‘Who Was Egeria? Piety and Pilgrimage in the Age of Gratian’, *The Harvard Theological Review* 81.1, 59–72.

Skarsaune, Oskar, 2017, ‘Ethnic Discourse in Early Christianity’, in: James Carleton Paget and Judith Lieu (eds.), *Christianity in the Second Century* (Cambridge), 250–264.

Skarsaune, Oskar, and Hvalvik, Reidar (eds.), 2007, *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries* (Peabody, MA).

Skliris, Dionysios, 2017, ‘From Domination to Impassibility: Overcoming the dialectic between dominator and dominated per the thought of Saint Maximus the Confessor’, *Analogia: The Pemptousia Journal for Theological Studies* 2, 145–65.

Smith, Jonathan Z., 1987, *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual* (London).

— 1990, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity* (Chicago).

Smith, J. Warren, 2011, *Christian Grace and Pagan Virtue* (Oxford).

Sorabji, Richard, 2000, *Emotion and Peace of Mind* (Oxford).

Spinks, Bryan D., 1989, ‘The Jerusalem Liturgy of the Catecheses Mystagogicae: Syrian or Egyptian?’, *SP* 18.2, 391–5.

Stanton, Graham N., 1985, ’Aspects of Early Christian-Jewish Polemic and Apologetic’, *New Testament Studies* 31:3, 377–92.

Stanton, Graham N., and Stroumsa, Guy G., 1998, *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Cambridge).

Stark, Rodney, 1996, *The Rise of Christianity: A Sociologist Reconsiders History* (Princeton).

Stavrou, Michel, 2013, 'Relations œcuméniques et reconnaissance du baptême des autres Églises', *Contacts* 243, 519–33.

Steenberg, Irinei, 2017, 'How to mock a heretic: methods of paratextual subversion from the classical world to Byzantium', in: Anne H. Groton (ed.), *Ab omni parte beatus: Classical Essays in Honor of James M. May* (Mundelein, IL).

Steenberg, Matthew C., 2009, *Of God and Man: Theology as Anthropology from Irenaeus to Athanasius* (New York).

Stemberger, Günter, 2000, *Jews and Christians in the Holy Land* (Edinburgh).

Stenzel, Alois, 1958, *Die Taufe: eine genetische Erklärung der Taufliturgie* (Innsbruck).

Stephens, Christopher W.B., 2015, *Canon Law and Episcopal Authority* (Oxford).

Stephenson, Anthony A., 1954, 'St. Cyril of Jerusalem and the Alexandrian Heritage', *TS* 15, 573–93.

— 1957, 'St. Cyril of Jerusalem and the Christian Gnosis', *SP* 1, 142–6.

— 1972, 'St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Trinitarian Theology', *SP* 11, 234–41.

Sterk, Andrea, 2004, *Renouncing the World yet Leading the Church: the Monk-Bishop in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA).

Stroumsa, Gedaliahu G., 1989, 'Gnostics and Manichaeans in Byzantine Palestine', *SP* 18.1, 273–8.

Stroumsa, Guy, 1999, 'From Cyril to Sophronius: the Christian Literature of Byzantine Jerusalem', in: Yoram Tsafrir and Shmuel Safrai (ed.), *The History of Jerusalem: The Roman and Byzantine Periods (70–638 CE)* (Jerusalem), 417–40.

— 2005, *Hidden Wisdom: Esoteric Traditions and the Roots of Christian Mysticism* (Leiden).

— 2008, 'Religious dynamics between Christians and Jews in late antiquity (312-640)', in: Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity (vol. 2)* (Cambridge), 151–72.

Stroumsa, Guy G., and Limor, Ora (eds.). 2006, *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land: From the Origins to the Latin Kingdoms* (Turnhout).

Swaans, W.J., 1942, 'À Propos des Catéchèses Mystagogiques Attribuées à saint Cyrille de Jérusalem', *Le Museon* 55, 1–42.

Swanson, R. N. (ed.), 2000, *The Holy Land, Holy Lands and Christian History* (Rochester).

Swinburne, Richard, 2003, *The Resurrection of God Incarnate* (Oxford).

Tabbernee, William, 2007, *Fake Prophecy and Polluted Sacraments: Ecclesiastical and Imperial Reactions to Montanism* (Leiden).

— 2011, 'Initiation/Baptism in the Montanist Movement', in: David Hellholm et al. (eds.), *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum,* 3 vols. (Berlin; New York), 918–45.

Tarby, A., 1972, *La prière eucharistique de l'Église de Jerusalem* (Paris).

Tarschnischvili, Michel, 1959, *Le grand lectionnaire de l'Église de Jérusalem* (Louvain).

Taylor, Joan E., 1990, 'Phenomenon of Early Jewish-Christianity: Reality or Scholarly Invention?', *VC* 44:4, 313–34.

— 1993, *Christians and the Holy Places: The Myth of Jewish Christian Origins* (Oxford).

Taylor, Miriam, 1995, *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity: A Critique of the Consensus* (Leiden).

Telfer, William (ed.), 1955, *Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa* (Philadelphia, PA).

Terian, Abraham, 2008, *Macarius of Jerusalem, Letter to the Armenians, A.D. 335* (New York).

Testa, Emmanuele, 1992, *The faith of the Mother Church: an essay on the theology of the Judeo-Christians* (Jerusalem).

Theodoropoulos, Augustinos, 2015, *The Divine Mystagogy of St Ambrose of Milan* [*Ἁγίου Ἀμβροσίου Ἐπισκόπου Μεδιολάνων Ἡ Θεία Μυσταγωγία*], (Piraeus, Greece).

Thomassen, Einar, 2004, 'Orthodoxy and Heresy in Second-Century Rome', *HTR* 97.3, 241–56.

— 2011, 'Baptism among the Valentinians', in: David Hellholm et al. (eds.), *Ablution, initiation, and baptism: late antiquity, early Judaism, and early Christianity = Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe : Spätantike, frühes Judentum und frühes Christentum,* 3 vols. (Berlin; New York), 895–915.

Tkacz, Catherine Brown, 2011, *Ἀλήθεια Ἑλληνική: The Authority of the Greek Old Testament* (Etna, CA).

Torchia, N. Joseph, 1999, 'The Significance of Chrismation in the Mystagogical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem', *Diakonia* 32:2, 128–44.

Török, László, 2005, *Transfigurations of Hellenism* (Leiden).

Townsend, Philippa, 2008, 'Who Were the First Christians? Jews, Gentiles and the *Christianoi*', in: Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zelletin (eds.), *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity* (Tübingen), 212–30.

Trevett, Christine, 2001, 'Charism and Office in a Changing Church', in: Alan Kreider (ed.), *The Origins of Christendom in the West* (Edinburgh), 179–203.

Tripp, David, 1977, 'Initiation Rites of the Cathari', *SL* 12:4, 184–94.

Troitsky, Hilarion, 1975, *The Unity of the Church*, trans. Margaret Jerinec (Montreal).

Trombley, Frank R., 1994, *Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370-529 (vol. 1)* (Leiden).

— 2008, 'Christianity and paganism: Asia Minor', in: Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity (vol. 2)* (Cambridge), 189–209.

Trout, Dennis, 1996, 'Town, Countryside, and Christianization at Paulinus' Nola', in: Ralph W. Mathisen and Hagith Sivan (eds.), *Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity* (Aldershot), 175–86.

Turck, A., 1993, 'Aux origins du catéchuménat', in: Everett Ferguson (ed.), *Conversion, Catechumenate, and Baptism in the Early Church* (London), 266–78.

Turner, C. H., 1899, *Ecclesiae Occidentalis monumenta iuris antiquissima cahonum et conciliorum graecorum interpretations latinae* (Oxford).

Vannier, Marie-Anne (ed.), 2009, *Les Pères et la naissance de l'ecclésiologie* (Paris).

Van den Broek, Roelof, 2013, *Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem: On the Life and Passion of Christ: A Coptic Apocryphon* (Leiden).

VanderKam, James C., 2001, *The Book of Jubilees (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha)* (Sheffield).

Van der Meer, Frederic, and Mohrmann, Christine, 1959, *Atlas of the Early Christian World* (London).

Van Nuffelen, Peter, 2007, 'The Career of Cyril of Jerusalem: A Reassessment', *JTS* 58:1 (Oxford), 134–46.

— 2010, 'Pagan Monotheism as a religious phenomenon', in: id. and S. Mitchell (eds.), *One God: Pagan Monotheism in the Roman Empire (1–4th cent. A.D.)* (Cambridge), 16–33.

— 2011, 'Eusebius of Caesarea and the Concept of Paganism', in: L. Lavan and M. Mulryan (eds.), *The Archaeology of Late Antique 'Paganism*' (Leiden), 89–109.

— 2013, 'The Life of Constantine: The Image of an Image', in: A. Johnson and J. Schott (eds.), *Eusebius of Caesarea: Traditions and Innovations* (Cambridge, MA), 133–49.

Vasiliadis, Petros, 1966, 'The Understanding of Eucharist in St. John's Gospel', in: L. Padovese (ed.), *Atti del VI Simposio di Efeso su S. Giovani Apostolo* (Rome), 39–52.

— 2015, 'The Biblical (New Testament) Foundation of Baptism: Baptismal Theology as a Prerequisite of Eucharistic Theology', *GOTR* 60:3-4, 11–44.

Vasiljević, Maksim, and Jeftic, Andrej (eds.), 2017, *Synodality: a Forgotten and Misapprehended Vision. Reflections on the Holy and Great Council 2016* (Alhambra, CA).

Vermès, Géza, 2012, *Christian Beginnings: from Nazareth to Nicaea (AD 30-325)* (London).

Vešović, Milosav, and Putnik, Noel, 2009, 'Pagan and Christian Consolation', *Philotheos* 9, 90–8.

Vgenopoulos, Maximos, 2013, *Primacy in the Church from Vatican I to Vatican II: An Orthodox Perspective* (DeKalb, IL).

Villadsen, Holger, 1989, 'Brugen af Det gamle Testamente i det ældste lektionar fra Jerusalem', *Overleveringen fra Herren* (Sabro), 35–57.

Vlachos, Hierotheos, 1994, *Orthodox Psychotherapy* (Levadia, Greece).

— 1998, *The Mind of the Orthodox Church* (Levadia, Greece).

— 2003, 'Baptismal Theology', *Orthodox Tradition* 20:2, 42–5.

Von Hase, K, 1878, *Handbuch der protestantischen Polemik gegen die römisch-katholische Kirche* (Leipzig).

Voulgarakēs, Elias A., 1977, *The Catechisms of Cyril of Jerusalem: Missionary Considerations* [*Αἱ Κατηχήσεις τοῦ Κυρίλλου Ἱεροσολύμων: Ἱεραποστολική Θεώρησις*] (Thessaloniki).

Wainwright, Philip, 1986, 'The Authenticity of the Recently Discovered Letter Attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem', *VC* 40, 286–93.

Walker, P.W.L., 1989, 'Eusebius, Cyril and the Holy Places', *SP* 20, 306–14.

— 1990a, 'Gospel Sites and "Holy Places": The Contrasting Attitudes of Eusebius and Cyril', *Tyndale-Bulletin* 41, 89–108.

— 1990b, *Holy City, Holy Places? Christian Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century* (Oxford).

— 1995, 'Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the 4th Century', in: Anthony O'Mahony et al. (eds.), *The Christian Heritage in the Holy Land* (London), 22–34.

Warmington, B.H., 1985, 'The Sources of Some Constantinian Documents in Eusebius', *SP* 18, 93–8.

Wasznik, J. H., 1947, ‘Pompa Diaboli’, *VC*, 13–41.

Weinandy, Thomas G., 2005, ‘The Apostolic Christology of Ignatius of Antioch: The Road to Chalcedon’, in: Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tucket (eds.), *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford), 71–84.

Welch, Lawrence J., 1994, *Christology and Eucharist in the Early Thought of Cyril of Alexandria* (San Francisco).

Werblowsky, R. J. Zwi, 1957, ‘On the Baptismal Rite According to St. Hippolytus’, *SP* 2, 93–105.

Westra, L.H., 2010, ‘How did Symbolum come to mean “Creed”?’, *SP* 45, 85–91.

Wharton, Annabel Jane, 1992, ‘The Baptistery of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem and the Politics of Sacred Landscape’, *DOP* 46, 313–325.

Whitaker, E.C., 1993, ‘The History of the Baptismal Formula’, in: Everett Ferguson (ed.), *Conversion, Catechumenate, and Baptism in the Early Church* (London), 379–90.

Whittaker, John, 1967, ‘Moses atticizing’, *Phoenix* 21.3, 196–201.

Wilken, Robert L., 1983, *John Chrysostom and the Jews* (London).

— 1984, *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them* (New Haven).

— 1988, ‘Palestine: A Christian Holy Land’, *The Biblical Archaeologist* 51:4, 214–217+233–237.

— 1992, *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought* (London).

Williams, Rowan, 2001, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI).

— 2010, ‘Defining Heresy’, in: Alan Kreider (ed.), *The Origins of Christendom in the West* (Edinburgh), 313–35.

— 2016, *On Augustine* (London).

Winkler, Gabrielle, 1985, ‘The Blessing of the Water in the Oriental Liturgies’, *Concilium* 178, 53–61.

— 1978, ‘The Original Meaning of the Prebaptismal Anointing and its Implications’, *Worship* 52, 24–5.

Wischmeyer, Wolfgang, 2001, ‘A Christian? What’s that? On the difficulty of managing Christian diversity in Late Antiquity’, in: M.F. Wiles and E.J. Yarnold (eds.), *SP* 34 (Leuven), 270–81.

Witvilet, John, 1997, ‘The Anaphora of St. James’, in: Paul F. Bradshaw (ed.), *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayer* (Collegeville, MI), 153–72.

Wright, N.T., 2003, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (London).

— 2005, *Paul in Fresh Perspective* (Minneapolis, MI).

Wolfson, Harry A., 1957, 'Philosophical Implications of the Theology of Cyril of Jerusalem', *DOP* 11, 1–19.

Yarnold, Edward, 1972, 'Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries in the Fourth Century', *Heythrop Journal* 13:3, 247–67.

— 1975, 'Did St Ambrose know the Mystagogic Catechesis of St. Cyril of Jerusalem?', *SP* 12, 184–9.

— 1978, 'The Authorship of the *Mystagogical Catecheses* attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem', *Heythrop Journal* 19, 143–61.

— 1981, 'Cyrillus von Jerusalem', *Theologische Realenzyklopedie* (Berlin), 261–6.

— 1985, 'Who Planned the Churches at the Christian Holy Places in the Holy Land?', *SP* 18, 106–9.

— 1994, *The Awe-Inspiring Rites of Initiation: The Origins of the R.C.I.A. (2nd Edition)* (Edinburgh).

— 1997, 'Anaphoras without Institution Narratives?', *SP* 30, 395–410.

— 2000, *Cyril of Jerusalem* (New York).

Yoder, John Howard, 2009, *The Jewish-Christian Schism Revisited* (Grand Rapids, MI).

Zachhuber, Johannes, 2000, 'The Antiochene Synod of AD 363 and the Beginnings of Neo-Nicenism', *ZAC* 4, 83–101.

— 2013, 'The Rhetoric of Evil and the Definition of Christian Identity', in: Paul Fiddes and Jochen Schmidt (eds.), *The Rhetoric of Evil* (Würzburg), 193–218.

— 2015, 'Derivative Genera in Apollinarius of Laodicea', in: Silke-Petra Bergjan et al. (eds.), *Apollinarius und seine Folgen* (Tübingen), 93–114

Zerfass, R., 1968, 'Die Schriftlesung im Kathedraloffizium Jerusalems', *Liturgiewissenschafliche Quellen und Forschungen* 48 (Münster).

Zizioulas, John D., 1969, 'Some Reflections on Baptism, Confirmation and Eucharist', *Sobornost* 5:9, 644–52.

— 1985, 'Orthodox Ecclesiology and the Ecumenical Movement', *Sourozh* 21, 16–27.

— 2001, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church* (Brookline, MA).

2004, *Being As Communion* (London).