

Origen of Alexandria,  
*Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew,*  
Book 17

Translation & Notes

by

Justin M. Gohl

(2019)

Folios:

<https://bildsuche.digitale-sammlungen.de/index.html?c=viewer&lv=1&bandnummer=bsb00046889&pimage=00001&suchbegriff=&l=en>

Edition:

GCS 40. *Origenes Werke X. Commentarius in Matthaeum I* (1. Aufl. 1935: Erich Klostermann/Ernst Benz)—column numbers denoted by [K###]

Transcription:

[http://khazarzar.skeptik.net/pgm/PG\\_Migne/Origenes\\_PG%2011-17/Commentarium%20in%20evangelium%20Matthaei\\_.pdf](http://khazarzar.skeptik.net/pgm/PG_Migne/Origenes_PG%2011-17/Commentarium%20in%20evangelium%20Matthaei_.pdf)

Sigla Key for Greek text:

[ ] Text for erasure (*zu tilgen*)

< > Inserted text (*einzusetzen*)

\*\*\* Lacuna

Notes:

- Translation philosophy: While striving for clarity, I have not tried to produce an as fluid as possible English translation, but rather to reflect Origen's syntax and diction when able. Certainly, some of Origen's constructions remain opaque to me, but I have attempted to give a suitable reading of them pursuant to Origen's argument at a given place. And I have called attention to my own translation questions in footnotes. I welcome any suggestions to clarify or improve the translation, and will be happy to acknowledge that indebtedness.
- I use [ ] in the English text to denote words added for clarity in English but have no counterparts in the Greek text.
- All OT chapter and verse numbering is from the LXX.

## INTRODUCTION

The following is a provisional translation of Book 17 of Origen's *Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew*. This book covers the following pericopes from Matthew (Matt 21.23-22.33):

- §§1-3 – Matt 21.23-27, on the question of Jesus' authority
- §§4-5 – Matt 21.28-32, on the parable of the two sons
- §§6-12 – Matt 21.33-43, on the parable of the wicked vineyard tenants
- §§13-14 – Matt 21.45-46, on the varied response of religious leaders and crowd to Jesus
- §§15-24 – Matt 22.1-14, on the parable of the wedding feast
- §§25-28 – Matt 22.15-22, on "rendering to Caesar"
- §§29-36 – Matt 22.23-33, on the Sadducees' inquiry about the resurrection

Until just recently, with the publication of Ronald Heine's translation of what remains of Origen's *Commentary on Matthew*, to my knowledge no English translation of the Greek text of Books 15-17 was ever produced. The *Ante-Nicene Fathers* series contains a translation of Books 10-14 (Greek), and no reason is offered for why the translation was not continued. Aside from that, translations of occasional selections of the commentary can be found in, e.g., Balthasar's *Origen: Spirit & Fire*, the *Ancient Christian Commentary on Matthew*, and in other secondary scholarly discussions.

For this translation of Book 17, as with that of Books 15 and 16,<sup>1</sup> we did not have occasion to consult Ronald Heine's (assuredly superior) translation.<sup>2</sup> It is hoped that the side-by-side presentation of text and translation will be of benefit, in any case.

Some of the "highlights" from this specimen of Origen's work might include:

- An important discussion of Trinitarian terminology, use of the term *hypostasis* (§14)
- Language of *Apokatastasis* applied to the marital union of Christ and Church (§§15-16), and with a more cosmological sense in §19, quoting Acts 3.21
- An articulation of Divine Accommodation in revelation (§§17-19), with God as *anthropopathic* in connection with Philo's use/exegesis of Deut 1.31
- The "perpetual virginity" of the soul as spouse of the Logos (§21)
- An extended allegorical exegesis of the law of Deut 25.5-10 (§§31-32)
- Interesting allusions to questions of the Biblical canon with regard to the Sadducees, including the OT "apocrypha" (§35)

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.academia.edu/31581897/Origens\\_Commentary\\_on\\_Matthew\\_Book\\_15\\_-\\_An\\_English\\_Translation](https://www.academia.edu/31581897/Origens_Commentary_on_Matthew_Book_15_-_An_English_Translation)

<sup>2</sup> Ronald E. Heine, trans., *The Commentary of Origen on the Gospel of St. Matthew* (2 vols.; Oxford Early Christian Texts; Oxford University Press, 2018).

[K575]

*Τῶν εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Ὁριγένους ἐξηγητικῶν  
τόμος ιζ'.*

1. Καὶ ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν προσῆλθον αὐτῷ διδάσκοντι οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ λέγοντες· ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς; καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς ἕως τοῦ οὐδὲ ἐγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ (21.23-27).<sup>3</sup> Τριῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν ὡς ἀναγκαῖον ἀναγραψάντων τὸν προκείμενον λόγον, ἄξιον ἰδεῖν ὃ τί ποτε νοοῦντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ ἐπυνθάνοντο [K576] τοῦ σωτῆρος, οὐχ ἓν πύσμα, ἀλλὰ δύο προσάγοντες αὐτῷ, ἓν μὲν τὸ ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς; ἕτερον δὲ τὸ καὶ τίς σοι ἔδωκε τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην; καὶ τί βουλόμενος ὁ σωτὴρ ἐπὶ τούτου μόνου ἀντηρώτησεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ πρὸς τὸ πύσμα ἀποκρίνασθαι· ἐώρα γὰρ οὐκ ἀξίους ἐκείνους τῆς πρὸς τὸ πύσμα ἀποκρίσεως καὶ τῆς τοῦ προβλήματος διηγήσεως, ὅτι δὲ οὐχ, ὡς οἶονταί τινες, ἀπλᾶ ἐστὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν τρόπον καὶ εὐπερινόητα, ἀλλὰ μυστικὰ καὶ βαθείας δεόμενα καρδίας, δῆλον ἔσται ἐκ τῆς ἐπιστάσεως. φέρ' οὖν συναγορεύωμεν τῇ πιθανότητι τῶν ἀπλούστερον ἐκδεχομένων τὰ κατὰ τὸν τρόπον· φήσουσι γὰρ ὅτι δύο γενικὰς <ἐξουσίας> ἐπιστάμενοι, ἀμείνω μὲν τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ χειρίστην δὲ τὴν τοῦ διαβόλου, οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ ἐπυνθάνοντο τοῦ σωτῆρος, ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ τούτων τῶν δύο ποιεῖ τὰ τεράστια καὶ ἀπὸ τίνος αὐτὴν λαβὼν. εἴθ' ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ ἀντιλογῆσαι ἀντηρώτησεν, ἅμα καὶ ἐλέγξαι βουλόμενος τοὺς

[K575]

*Book 17 of Origen's explanations on the [gospel] according to Matthew.*

1. And after he came unto the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people came to him when he was teaching, and said, "By what sort of authority do you do these things?" etc., up to, I will not tell you by what sort of authority I do these things (Matt 21.23-27). Since the Three evangelists [all think it] necessary to record the present passage, it is a worthy endeavor to observe what *the chief priests and the elders of the people* possibly had in mind when they inquired [K576] of the Savior, presenting to him not one question but two—one being, *By what sort of authority do you do these things?*, and the other, *And who gave to you this authority?* And [it is worthy to observe] what it means that the Savior answers this one [inquiry] alone by asking a question in return so as to not answer the inquiry [altogether]. For he perceived that they were not worthy of an answer to the question and of an explanation of the problem. It is not the case, though, as some people suppose, that the matters involved in this passage are simple and easily understood, but it will become clear from careful attention that they are mystical and require depth of heart. Come, then, let us acknowledge the persuasiveness of those who offer a simpler reading of the things according to this passage; for they say that *the chief priests and the elders of the people* have two kinds of <authority> in mind, the better one that is of God and the worse that is of the devil, when they inquire of the Savior, *By what sort of authority* of these two [God or the devil] he does the wonders and from whom he received it. Then *Jesus*, so as to not enter into disputation, turns the

<sup>3</sup> καὶ τίς σοι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην; 24 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς καὶ γὰρ λόγον ἓνα, ὃν ἐὰν εἴπητέ μοι καὶ γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐρῶ ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ· 25 τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ Ἰωάννου πόθεν ἦν; ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; οἱ δὲ διελογίζοντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγοντες· ἐὰν εἴπωμεν· ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ ἡμῖν· διὰ τί οὖν οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; 26 ἐὰν δὲ εἴπωμεν· ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, φοβούμεθα τὸν ὄχλον, πάντες γὰρ ὡς προφήτην ἔχουσιν τὸν Ἰωάννην. 27 καὶ ἀποκριθέντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἶπαν· οὐκ οἶδαμεν. ἔφη αὐτοῖς καὶ αὐτός·

And who gave to you this authority? But Jesus answered and said, "Let me ask you one thing, which if you respond to me, then I will tell you by what sort of authority I do these things: The baptism of John, where did it come from? From heaven or from men?" They reasoned amongst themselves, saying, "If we say, 'From heaven,' he will say to us, 'Why therefore did you believe him?' But if we say, 'From men,' we fear the crowd, for they all hold John as a prophet." So they answered Jesus and said, "We do not know." He himself said to them,

<p>πυθομένους αὐτοῦ, ὡς παρὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον ποιήσαντος ἐν τῷ ἠπιστηκέναι Ἰωάννη [K577] τῷ βαπτιστῇ. καὶ ἦν αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀντερώτημα δύο οἰκονομούμενον, τὸν τε ἐπὶ τῇ εἰς τὸν Ἰωάννην ἀπιστίᾳ ἔλεγχον καὶ τὸ περισπᾶσαι τοὺς πυθομένους, ἵνα δόξῃ αὐτοῖς εὐλόγως μὴ ἀποκρίνεσθαι.</p> <p>ἀλλ’ εἴποι τις ἂν πρὸς ταῦτα ὅτι γελοῖον ἦν τὸ πυνθάνεσθαι ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ἐποίει ὁ Ἰησοῦς· οὐκ ἂν γὰρ ἀπεκρίνατο ὅτι ἐν τῇ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐξουσίᾳ, καὶ οὐ φημι ὅτι ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦτο οὐκ ἂν ἀπεκρίνατο, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ »ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ ἐπαιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα« εἴποι ἂν τοῖς πυνθανομένοις τὸ ἀληθὲς ὅτι ἐν τῇ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐξουσίᾳ ποιεῖ πᾶσαν δύναμιν καὶ »σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα«, ἐν οἷς καταπλήζεται καὶ ἀποπλανήσῃ »εἰ δυνατόν καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς«. εἰ δὲ οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνος εἴποι ἂν ἐν τῇ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐξουσίᾳ ποιεῖν τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ τέρατα τοῦ »ψεύδους«, τὰ »ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ ἀδικίας τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις« ἐπιτελούμενα, πόσω πλέον ὁ σωτὴρ οὐκ ἂν (εἰ καὶ μὴ ἀντηρώτησεν) ἄλλο τι ἀπεκρίνατο ἢ ὅτι ἐν τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ; πρὸς δὲ τὴν οὕτως προφανῇ ἀπόκρισιν καὶ ἐκείνους πυνθάνεσθαι [K578] καὶ τὸν σωτῆρα μὴ ἀποκρίνεσθαι, εὐηθες εἶναί μοι φαίνεται.</p>	<p>question around, intending at the same time to reprove those inquiring of him as though he were acting against the correct teaching [τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον] for their having not believed in John [K577] the Baptist. Indeed his rebutting question was suited to this dual [purpose], both to reprove their unbelief in John and to expose those who were inquiring, so that it might seem to them not to have answered satisfactorily.</p> <p>But someone might say to these things that it would have been absurd to inquire <i>by what sort of authority</i> Jesus was doing <i>these things</i>, for [Jesus] would not have answered that it was <i>by the authority</i> of the devil. Nor I do imply that [only] the Savior would not have answered this [question], but even “the man of sin, who is opposed and exalted against everything called God and piety” (2 Thess 2.3f) would not reply to those who inquire with the truth that he does all power and “signs and wonders” <i>by the authority</i> of the devil, by which things he will amaze and lead astray “even the elect if able” (Mk 13.22). Now, if even [“the man of sin”] would not say that he does the signs and wonders of the “false one” <i>by the authority</i> of the devil, which things are completed “in all deceit of unrighteousness to those who are perishing” (2 Thess 2.9f), how much more would the Savior (except he might reply with a question) not have answered in any other way than that [it was] <i>by the [authority] of God</i>? But it appears to me to be a simple matter, that the Savior does not answer those who inquire [K578] [because they are asking] for a “profane”<sup>4</sup> answer, as it were.</p>
--	---

<p>2. Μήποτ’ οὖν τὰ κατὰ τὸν τόπον τοιαῦτ’ ἐστίν. ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, περιεχούσῃ ἐπιστήμην θείων καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων καὶ τῶν τούτων αἰτιῶν, εἰσι »θησαυροὶ« ὁποίους δεῖ εἶναι τοὺς »τῆς σοφίας« θησαυροὺς καὶ »τῆς γνώσεως« καὶ εἰσιν οὗτοι »ἀπόκρυφοι« καὶ εἴ τίς ἐστιν ἀξιωθεὶς εἰδέναι τὰ »ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἃ οὐκ ἐξεστίν</p>	<p>2. Perhaps, then, this is what the present passage is about. In the wisdom of God, which encompasses the knowledge of divine and human matters and their causes,<sup>5</sup> there are “treasures” which must be the treasures “of wisdom” and “of knowledge,” and these are “hidden” (Col 2.3); and if there is someone who has been deemed worthy to understand the</p>
---	--

<sup>4</sup> I.e., “obvious.”

<sup>5</sup> An oft-quoted Stoic definition. Cf. Origen, *Fr. Prov.* 1.2 (PG 13:17B): Σοφία ἐστὶν ἐπιστήμη θείων καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων κατάληψις, going on to quote Wisdom 7.25-26, as he does as well in *CCels.* 3.72 (Chadwick, 176). The definition from *CCels* and *Comm. Matt.* occurs verbatim earlier in Philo (*De congressu eruditionis gratia* 1:79; cf. *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit* 1:182), and later reproduced, e.g., verbatim in St. Basil, *Homily* 12 (PG 31:389) in reference to Prov 1.2, and similarly in Ps-Procopius of Gaza, *Comm. Prov.* 1.2 (PG 87:1221). See references to Stoic sources in Mark DelCogliano, *Saint Basil the Great: On Christian Doctrine and Practice* (PPS 47; Yonkers: SVS Press, 2012), 55.

ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι», εἰδείῃ ἂν τὴν »ἐν μυστηρίῳ σοφίαν,« »τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην, ἣν προώρισεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς δόξαν« τῶν δικαίων. εἰσὶν οὖν ἐν τοῖς »τῆς σοφίας [K579] καὶ τῆς γνώσεως« ἀποκρύφους θησαυροὺς λόγοι βαθεῖς καὶ ἀπόρρητοι περὶ διαφόρων ἐξουσιῶν, γενικῶς μὲν δύο, εἰδικῶς δὲ καθ' ἑκατέραν τῶν δύο πλείοντες καὶ δυσθεώρητοι. αἱ δὲ γενικαὶ δύο ἐξουσίαι τοιαῦταί εἰσιν· αἱ μὲν εἰσι τοῦ κρείττοντος τάγματος, καὶ ὥσπερ εἰσὶν ἄνθρωποι θεοῦ οὐχ οἱ τυχόντες καὶ ἄγγελοι θεοῦ μακάριοι καὶ προφηταὶ τοῦ θεοῦ θεοφορούμενοι, οὕτως εἰσὶ τινες ἐξουσίαι τοῦ θεοῦ, περὶ ὧν ὁ ἀπόστολος Χριστὸν δοξολογῶν λέγει ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κολοσσαεῖς ὅτι· ἐστὶν ὁ σωτὴρ »εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως«, ἐν ᾧ »ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, εἴτε ὁρατὰ εἴτε ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι· τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται· καὶ αὐτός ἐστι πρὸ πάντων«. ἐν οὖν εἶδος τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν θεὸν αἱ ἐν Χριστῷ κτισθεῖσαι ἐξουσίαι, ἕτεραι παρὰ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τοὺς θρόνους καὶ [K580] τὰς κυριότητας· καὶ ἐκάστη ἐξουσιάζει τινῶν, τεταγμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τινὰ ἀπόρρητον ἀξίαν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀξίων ἐξουσιάζεσθαι κατὰ τὴν διαφορὰν αὐτῶν ὑπὸ ἐκάστην τῶν ἐξουσιῶν. καὶ »πολὺς« ἂν »ὁ λόγος καὶ δυσερμήνευτος« εἴη περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὰς ἐξουσίας ταύτας καὶ τῶν ἐξουσιαζομένων ὑπ' αὐτῶν πραγμάτων.

ὥς δὲ εἰσὶ τινες ἐξουσίαι τοῦ θεοῦ, οὕτως εἰσὶ καὶ ἐναντία ἀνάλογον τοῖς τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀνθρώποις καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις τοῦ διαβόλου. καὶ ἔστι γε τοῖς μηκέτι »πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα« παλαίουσιν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἐπαναβεβηκέναι τῇ δυνάμει πρὸς τὰ ὑπὲρ ταῦτα ἀγωνιζομένοις »ἡ πάλη« »πρὸς τὰς« ἀνταγωνιζόμενας τοῖς ἀθληταῖς τῆς θεοσεβείας »ἐξουσίας«. ὥς δὲ πλείονα τάγματα ἦν ὑπὸ τὸν θεόν, οὕτως καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐναντίᾳ χώρα οὐ μόνον ἐξουσίαι εἰσὶν ἀλλὰ καὶ κοσμοκράτορες »τοῦ σκότους τούτου« καὶ »πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας

“inexpressible sayings, which it is not lawful for man to speak” (2 Cor 12.4), he might then understand the “wisdom in a mystery,” “which has been hidden, which God predetermined before the ages for [the] glory” of the righteous (1 Cor 2.7). There are, then, in the hidden treasures “of wisdom [K579] and of knowledge” (Col 2.3) deep and ineffable words (*logoi*) that concern the different authorities, which on the one hand are of two general kinds, but on the other hand are of more numerous specific kinds and are difficult to contemplate with regard to the each of the two [general] categories. These are the two general categories of authority: on the one hand, there are the [authorities] that belong to the good order, and just as it is not by chance that there are men of God and blessed angels of God and God-bearing prophets of God, in the same way there are certain authorities of God, concerning which the Apostle, when glorifying Christ, says in the [letter] to the Colossians that the Savior is “Image of the invisible God, first-born of all creation,” in and by<sup>6</sup> whom “all things were created in the heavens and on earth, whether visible or invisible, whether thrones or dominions, whether rulers or authorities; all things were created through Him and for Him, and He is before all things” (Col 1.15-17). One form, therefore, of the things that are under God is the authorities created in and by Christ, which are different from the rulers and the thrones and [K580] the dominions. Each [authority] exercises authority over certain things, having been set in order by God on account a certain ineffable dignity over those who are worthy to be held under the authority of each of the authorities on account of their different [dignity]. Indeed, “the word” concerning the matters related to these authorities and of those who are held under their authority would be “much” and “difficult to explain” (Heb 5.11).

But on the other hand, just as there are certain authorities of God, so also there are opposing [authorities] that correspond to the men of sin and the angels of the devil (cf. Matt 25.41). Indeed, for those who are no longer wrestling “against flesh and blood,” but because they have ascended in ability<sup>7</sup> so that they are struggling with things that are higher, “the wrestling” [they engage in] is “against the” “authorities” who are struggling against the athletes of piety (Eph 6.12). And as there are numerous orders below God, so also in the opposing region there are not only authorities but also world-

<sup>6</sup> In this instance, and a subsequent one a few lines down, I have translated ἐν as “in and by” to capture both senses of agency and location/participation.

<sup>7</sup> τῇ δυνάμει, this could be connected either to the infinitive or to the participle “struggling [with power].”

ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις», τάχα δὲ καὶ ἀρχαί, ἐγὼ δ' οἶμαι ὅτι καὶ πάντα ὁμώνυμα τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐναντιότητα. [K581] διειληφότες οὖν οἱ τὰ διαφέροντα ὀνόματα κεκληρωμένοι ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, τουτέστιν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ, περὶ ἐξουσιῶν πλείονα <καὶ ταγμάτων τῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ μυστηρίων> εἴτε ἐκ παραδόσεων [εἴτε καὶ] ἐπιβάλλοντες εἴτε καὶ ἐξ ἀποκρύφου (οὐκ οἶδα εὐλόγως ἢ καὶ ἀλόγως) κινούμενοι, ἐώρων τὸν Ἰησοῦν τὰ τεράστια ἐπιτελοῦντα οὐ χωρὶς τινος συνούσης αὐτῷ ἐξουσίας. ταύτης οὖν τὸ εἶδος <καὶ τὴν ιδιότητα> ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπιστήμης τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μαθεῖν ἐβούλοντο ἢ τῆς δοκούσης αὐτοῖς εἶναι ἐπιστήμης ἐν αὐτῷ.

Καὶ εἰ μὲν ἦσαν ἀρχιερεῖς τινες ἅγιοι καὶ μακάριοι (ὅποῖος ὁ Ἀαρὼν ἢ ὁ Ἐλεάζαρ ἢ ὁ Φινεὲς [K582] ἢ ὅσοι ἐπαινετῶς τὰ τῆς λειτουργίας διετέλεσαν) οἱ πυθόμενοι τοῦ σωτῆρος τότε καὶ πρεσβύτεροι παραπλήσιοι οἷς κατ' ἐντολὴν θεοῦ Μωσῆς ἐξελέξατο, εἰκὸς ὅτι ὡς οὐ πειράζουσιν ἀλλὰ φιλομαθοῦσι καὶ ἀξίοις τῶν τηλικούτων μαθημάτων παρέστησεν ἂν ἀρξάμενος ὁ σωτὴρ λόγον, ὃν οὐδὲ ὁ κόσμος ὅλος χωρεῖν ἠδύνατο. καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἂν παρεδίδου τὴν ἐπιστήμην περὶ τῶν μακαρίων ἐξουσιῶν καὶ τῆς διαφορᾶς αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς αἰτίας τοῦ ἐληλυθέναι αὐτὰς ἐπὶ τὸ εἶναι ἐξουσίας καὶ τῶν ὑπ' αὐταῖς, εἴτε ψυχῶν εἴτε καὶ ὁποιωνποτοῦν λογικῶν, διεξώδευσε δ' ἂν καὶ τὸν περὶ τῶν ἐναντίων ἐξουσιῶν λόγον, καὶ τὰς διαφορὰς αὐτῶν παρέστησεν ἂν. εἰκὸς δ' ὅτι ἐδίδαξεν ἂν ἀνάλογον τῷ »ὁ νόμος« »διαταγεῖς δι' ἀγγέλων« καὶ τῷ »εἰ ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος ἐγένετο βέβαιος« (ἀνάλογόν φημι τῷ λόγῳ τῷ περὶ τῶν διακονησαμένων τῷ νόμῳ ἀγγέλων καὶ τῆς κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς ἐξουσίας), οἷον ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ διακονουμένη τῷ θεῷ ἢ ποίαις <ἐναντίαις ἐξουσίαις> ἕκαστον τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ τεραστίων γεγένηται, καὶ τίς μὲν ἢ ἐξουσία διακονουμένη τῇ μεταβαλοῦσιν εἰς ὄφιν ῥάβδῳ Μωσέως, τίς δὲ ταύτη ἐναντία διακονουμένη [K583] τῇ μεταμορφώσει

rulers “of this darkness” and “spiritual [beings] of the evil one in the heavenly places” (Eph 6.12), and perhaps also rulers, but for my part I think that all the [authorities] in the opposing realm [have a counterpart] with the same name (ὁμώνυμα) among the [authorities] of God. [K581] Having determined, therefore, that those who have inherited the different names in Israel, that is, *the chief priests and the elders of the people*, pertain to the mysteries of numerous authorities <and orders that are in heaven> whether they come to that position because of handing over<sup>8</sup> or they are moved from a hidden [cause] (I do not know if with good reason or even without reason), they were seeing Jesus performing terrible [deeds] not apart from a certain authority inherent to him. They were desiring to learn the form, therefore, <and the specific character> of this [authority] from the knowledge of Jesus or of the knowledge which seemed to them to be in Him.

So, if the *chief priests* who inquired of the Savior at that time were certain holy and blessed persons (of the sort as Aaron or Eleazar or Phineas [K582] or as many as performed the things of the liturgy in a praiseworthy fashion), and [the] *elders* were similar to those whom Moses had selected in accordance with the commandment of God (cf. Num 11.16), it would have been fitting for the Savior to begin by presenting a word, not as to those who would test [him] but to those desirous of learning and who are worthy of such great lessons, [a word] which the whole cosmos was unable to accept (cf. Jn 21.25). Now, would he have begun to deliver the knowledge concerning the blessed authorities and their differences and of the cause of their having come to be authority and of those under them, whether souls or rational beings of whatever kind, he would have also gone through the word concerning the opposing authorities, and he would have presented their differences. But it is fitting that he would teach a correspondence to “the law” “which was ordained through angels” (Gal 3.19) and to “if the word spoken through angels was confirmed” (Heb 2.2) (I say correspondence to the word which concerns those angels who were ministers to the Law and of the authority in accordance to the Scriptures), in the manner *By what sort of authority* was ministered to God or by what sorts of <opposing authorities> each of the terrible deeds in Egypt were effected, and what authority ministered to the changing of Moses’ staff into a serpent, and what opposing

<sup>8</sup> To punishment? The language here is dense—is Origen reflecting on how the authorities came to their positions, or only on their encounter with and questioning of Jesus?

τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν ῥάβδων εἰς δράκοντας· καὶ εἶπεν ἂν τὴν δύναμιν τῆς ἐξουσίας ἀφ' ἧς κατέπιεν ἡ τοῦ Ἀαρὼν ῥάβδος τὰς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων. εἶπε δ' ἂν καὶ τίς ἡ ἐξουσία τῆς εἰς χιόνα μεταβολῆς χειρὸς Μωσέως, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων ποία ἦν ἐξουσία συμπνέουσα καθ' ἕκαστον τοῖς ἐπαιδοῖς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων, ὅτε ἐδόκουν μιμεῖσθαι τὰ σημεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ οὕτως ἂν διεξώδευσεν τὰς δέκα τῶν Αἰγυπτίων πληγὰς καὶ τὴν κατ' αὐτῶν ἀποστολὴν δι' ἀγγέλων πονηρῶν. εἶπε δ' ἂν καὶ τίς ἐξουσία ὑπηρετήσατο τῇ διὰ τῆς ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης διόδῳ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ καταποντώσει τῶν Αἰγυπτίων, τίς τε ἐξουσία ὑπηρετήσατο τῇ διὰ ζύλου μεταβολῇ ὕδατος πικροῦ εἰς γλυκύτητα. εἶπε δ' ἂν καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἡ διηκονήσατο τῷ ἀπὸ πέτρας ὕδατι. καὶ ἤτοι τὴν αὐτὴν ἢ ἄλλην παρέστησεν <ἂν> ἐξουσίαν διακονησαμένην τῷ ὑετῷ τοῦ μάννα καὶ τῇ τῶν ὀρτυγομητρῶν ἐφόδῳ. εἶπε δ' ἂν καὶ τίς ἡ ἐξουσία ἡ τὸ αὐτὸ μάννα τῶν μὲν ἕξ ἡμερῶν τρέπουσα εἰς σκώληκας καὶ δυσωδίαν, τῇ δὲ τοῦ σαββάτου ἡμέρᾳ φυλάττουσα.

Καὶ τί με δεῖ ἀναλεγόμενον τὰ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τεράστια μέχρι τῆς Μωσέως τελευτῆς παριστάνειν, ὅτι εἶπεν ἂν ὁ σωτὴρ τὰ περὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας, εἰ [K584] ἦσαν ἄξιοι *οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ* τῆς πρὸς τὸ πύσμα αὐτῶν ἀποκρίσεως; καὶ σοὶ πάρεστι τὸ ἀνάλογον ἐπερχομένῳ τὴν ὅλην γραφὴν ὅρᾱν, τίς τε ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ στήναι τὸν ἥλιον κατὰ Γαβαὼν καὶ σελήνην κατὰ φάραγγα Ἑλῶμ, καὶ πολὺ πρότερον τοῦ διοδευθῆναι τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμὸν καὶ τοῦ παύσασθαι τὸ μάννα. καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς βίβλου δὲ τῶν Κριτῶν πολλὰ ἂν τοιαῦτα ζητηθεῖν καὶ εὑρεθεῖν, οἷον περὶ τὸν Γεδεὼν καὶ τὸν Σαμψών, παράδοξα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ τῶν Βασιλειῶν τὰ περὶ τὸν Σαμουὴλ καὶ τὸν Ἥλιαν καὶ τὸν Ἑλισσαῖον καὶ τὸν Ἐζεκιάν. καὶ οὕτως ἐπελθὼν ἂν ὁ σωτὴρ καὶ τὸ κατὰ τὰς διαφόρους ἐξουσίας διελθὼν μυστήριον ἐδίδαξεν ἂν ἐν *ποία ἐξουσία* καὶ πῶς ὑπερεχούση ἐποίει ἃ ἔβλεπεν ὁ λαὸς τεράστια, δοθείση αὐτῷ οὐκ ἀπὸ τινος ἀγγέλου καὶ λειτουργοῦ

[authority] ministered to this [K583] transformation of the Egyptian staffs into dragons; and he might mention the power of the authority from which the rod of Aaron swallowed those of the Egyptians (cf. Exod 7.10ff). And he would also mention a certain authority for the change of Moses' hand to snowy white, and from the opposing [authorities] some sort of authority was conspiring in each instance with the charmers of the Egyptians (Exod 7.11 et al), at the time they seemed to imitate the signs of God. And so also he would go through the ten plagues of Egypt and the sending down of them through evil angels. He might also mention a certain authority was serving for the passage of the people through the Red Sea and for the drowning of the Egyptians (Exod 14). A certain authority was serving the change of the water from bitter to sweet by means of a tree (Exod 15.23ff). He might also mention an authority which was serving for water from a rock (Exod 16.35). And he might present whether it was that authority or another that was serving for the rain of manna and for the provision of quail (Exod 16.13). He might say also that a certain authority was turning back the same manna from the six days into worms and filth, but preserving [it] for the day of the Sabbath (Exod 16.20).

And why is it necessary for me to provide a recounting of the wonders in the wilderness up to the death of Moses, seeing that the Savior would have said those things concerning the authority, if [K584] *the chief priests and the elders of the people* were worthy of an answer to their question? Indeed it is up to you to observe the correspondence as you traverse the whole Scripture, [inquiring as to] what authority made the sun and the moon stand in place against Gabaon and against the valley of Elam<sup>9</sup> (cf. Josh 10.12), and in numerous instances before the Jordan river was passed through (Josh 3-4) and the manna was made to cease (Josh 5.12). One might also inquire and find many such things—unexpected—in the book of the Judges, in the manner concerning Gideon and Sampson, but also from the Kingdoms the things concerning Samuel and Elias and Elisha and Hezekiah. And would the Savior have given a treatment in the same way, discoursing concerning the mystery about the different authorities, he would have been teaching *by what sort of authority* and how exceeding [the authority is by which] he was doing the wonders which the people were seeing, which was given to him not from some angel and minister of God nor through some

<sup>9</sup> A confusion for Αἰλῶν, it seems.



θεοῦ οὐδὲ διὰ τινος τῶν ὑποδεεστέρων τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ πατρός.	[authority] from those things that are inferior to God, but from the Father himself.
---	--

<p>3. Ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ ἐνταῦθα ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ οὐδαμῶς ἄξιοι ἦσαν τοιούτων θεωρημάτων, διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοῖς οὐκ ἀποκρίνεται ἀλλ' ἀντερωτᾷ, ἵνα διὰ τοῦ μὴ ἀποκρίνεσθαι ἐκείνους εἰς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου καὶ αὐτὸς πείσῃ εὐλόγως τοὺς πυθομένους, ὅτι μὴ μάτην αὐτοῖς ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων· οὐδὲ ἐγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ. [K585] ζητῶ δὲ κατὰ τὸν τόπον, εἰ ἕκαστος τῶν πεπονηκότων ἐν τινὶ ἐξουσίᾳ παράδοξα ἐν μιᾷ &lt;ἀεὶ&gt; πεποίηκεν, ἢ τινὲς μὲν κατ' ἀρχὰς ἐν τῇδε προκόψαντες δὲ ἐν τινὶ μείζονι. πλὴν ὁ σωτὴρ ἔοικεν ἐν μιᾷ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα πεπονηκέναι, ἢ ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρός· τὸ γὰρ οὐδὲ ἐγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ διδάσκοντος ἦν, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ &lt;μιᾷ&gt; μὲν πεποίηκεν· ἐν ποίᾳ δὲ οὐ παρέστησεν ἐκείνοις, οὐδὲ τὴν ιδιότητα αὐτῆς ἀνέπτυξε καὶ ὅσα ἂν ὥριστο περὶ αὐτῆς παριστὰς αὐτῆς τὸ ἐξαίρετον παρὰ τὰς λοιπὰς ἐξουσίας, ἐν αἷς οἱ πρὸ αὐτοῦ προφητῆται πεπονηκείσαν. καὶ νῦν δ' ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ διδάσκει ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τινες παραπλήσιοι ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις τοῦ λαοῦ πυνθάνονται μὲν αὐτοῦ, οὐ τυγχάνουσι δὲ τῆς ἀποκρίσεως, ἀνάξιοι τοῦ εἰδέναι περὶ ὧν βούλονται μαθεῖν. ζητήσει δέ τις, πότερον βουλούμενος αὐτοὺς ἀποσείσασθαι ἀποκληρωτικῶς ἐπύθετο περὶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου ὥς εἰ καὶ περὶ ἄλλου τινὸς τοιούτου πυθόμενος ἦν, ἢ ἀναγκαίως [K586] περὶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου ἐπύθετο, ἵνα πρὸς τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπόκρισιν τὰ ἀκόλουθα περὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας ἀποκρίνηται. ἐμοὶ δὲ φαίνεται μὴ ἀποκληρωτικῶς εἶναι τὸ κατὰ τὸν τόπον, ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ Ἰωάννης »φωνὴ βοῶντος« ἦν »ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου«, καὶ οὗτος ἦν περὶ οὗ ὁ προφήτης ἔλεγεν· »ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστελῶ τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου«, διὰ τοῦτο (οἶμαι) πυνθάνεται περὶ αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ἄγνων μὲν ὅτι ἐπισκοπήσαντες ἐροῦσιν· οὐκ οἶδμεν, διὰ τὰ</p>	<p>3. But since the <i>chief priests and elders of the people</i> here were in no way worthy of these contemplations, for this reason he does not answer them except to turn the question around, in order that through their not answering the things concerning John, he might persuade those who are inquiring with good reason that it is not in vain when he answers them, saying, <i>I myself will not tell you by what sort of authority I do these things</i>. [K585] I might inquire in regard to this passage whether he &lt;continually&gt; performs by one [authority] each of the things he has done by a certain <i>authority</i>, or [if] there is a progression [in authorities] that advances from a given [authority] in the beginning to something greater. The Savior certainly seems to have performed these things by one <i>authority</i>, which he received from the Father, for this [passage], <i>I myself will not tell you by what sort of authority I do these things</i>, was his way of teaching that, on the one hand, he has done [them] <i>by</i> &lt;one&gt; <i>authority</i>, but on the other hand he does not indicate to them <i>by which sort</i>, nor does he unfold its particular character or designate of what sort it is by presenting it as something preferred above the rest of the authorities, by which the prophets before him had performed [their deeds]. Even now, in the temple, the Church, Christ is there teaching in it and certain people who are similar to these chief priests and elders <i>of the people</i> are inquiring of him, but they do not obtain an answer, because they are unworthy to know about the things they desire to learn. But let someone inquire whether [Jesus] inquired about John at random desiring to throw them off, as though he was indeed inquiring about some other subject, or whether he inquired about John [K586] out of necessity, in order that by his answer about him he might answer the subsequent things concerning authority. Now it appears to me that the [question] in the passage is not to be taken as something random, but because John was “a voice crying in the wilderness: Prepare the way of the Lord” (Matt 3.3), and he was the one concerning whom the prophet said, “Behold I will send my angel before your face, who will prepare your way before you” (Mk 1.2), wherefore (I think) [Jesus] inquires concerning [John], not unaware that those who were</p>
--	--

ἀναγεγραμμένα, καθ' ὑπόθεσιν δὲ εἰπὼν ἂν πρὸς τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ τὴν ἀκόλουθον τῇ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εἶναι τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου ἀποκρίσει ἐξουσίαν.	overseeing would say, <i>We do not know</i> , on account of the things that have been recounted, but according to plan [when they respond to the question] with <i>from heaven</i> he would mention the authority commensurate with the answer that <i>the baptism of John is from heaven</i> .
---	---

<p>4. Τί δὲ ὑμῖν δοκεῖ; ἄνθρωπος εἶχε τέκνα δύο· προσελθὼν τῷ πρώτῳ εἶπε· τέκνον, ὕπαγε σήμερον ἐργάζου ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι &lt;μου&gt; καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς ἕως τοῦ ὑμεῖς δὲ ἰδόντες οὐ μετεμελήθητε ὕστερον τοῦ πιστεῦσαι ἐν αὐτῷ (21.28–32). Μόνος ὁ Ματθαῖος ἀνέγραψε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ περιέχουσιν τὸν περὶ τοῦ ἀπειθήσαντος Ἰσραὴλ τῷ θεῷ λόγον καὶ τὸν περὶ τοῦ πιστεύσαντος λαοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν· οὗτοι γὰρ τὰ δύο τέκνα, ἃ εἶχεν ὁ «ὡς ἄνθρωπος τροποφορῶν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ» θεός. καὶ οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ πρώτῳ, ὃν «ἐκτίσαστο» «ἀπ' ἀρχῆς», ὃν «προέγνω καὶ [K588] προώρισεν», εἶπεν αὐτῷ· τέκνον, ὕπαγε σήμερον ἐργάζου ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι μου. καὶ ὑπερέθετο φεύγων τὸ χωρίον τοῦτο διὰ τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ «καύσωνα» καὶ τοὺς καμάτους καὶ εἶπεν· οὐ θέλω· ἀλλ' ὕστερόν ποτε ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ μεταμεληθεὶς ἐπὶ τῷ εἰρηκέναι τῷ πατρί· οὐ θέλω ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα καὶ εἰργάσατο τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς. ἡνίκα μέντοι ὁ πρῶτος εἶπεν· οὐ θέλω, προσῆλθεν ὁ πατὴρ τῷ ἐτέρῳ καὶ εἶπεν ὡσαύτως. εἶτα ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ δεῦτερος εἶπε μὲν· ἐγὼ κύριε, οὐκ ἐλήλυθε δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν ἀμπελῶνα τοῦ λόγου καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ πατρὸς. καὶ φανερόν ὅτι ὁ εἰπὼν οὐ θέλω καὶ ὕστερον μεταμεληθεὶς καὶ ἀπελθὼν καὶ ἐργασάμενος εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἐποίησε τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς &lt;οὐ τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλὰ&gt; τῷ ἔργῳ· ὁ γὰρ τῷ λόγῳ ἐπαγγειλόμενος καὶ μὴ ποιήσας τοῖς ἔργοις ἡρνήσατο ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς. πρόσχες δὲ εἰ δύνασαι χρῆσθαι τῇ παραβολῇ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐλάττονα μὲν ἢ μηδὲν ἐπαγγελλομένους, μήτε παρθενίαν μήτε ἄλλην κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον &lt;πνευματικὴν&gt; πρᾶξιν, τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις παριστάντας τὰ ἐναντία, ἃ μηδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπηγγείλαντο κατὰ φωνὰς λόγων [K589] ἀγαθῶν πράξεων, ἔτι δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μεγάλα μὲν ἐπαγγελλομένους μηδὲν δὲ</p>	<p>4. What does it seem to you? A man had two children. Approaching the first he said, “Child, go out today and work in &lt;my&gt; vineyard etc., up to, but you, while seeing, did not repent afterwards by believing in him (21.28-32). Matthew alone records this parable, which seems to me to involve the teaching (<i>logos</i>) about Israel’s faithlessness to God and the [teaching] about the people from the nations who would believe, for there are two children, whom God has “as a man caring for his son” (Deut 1.31). Indeed, <i>approaching the first one</i>, whom “He acquired” “from the beginning” (Deut 32.6; Ps 73.2), “whom He foreknew and [K588] foreordained” (Rom 8.29), He said to him, <i>Child, go out today and work in my vineyard</i>. And he put it off, fleeing this region on account of the “scorching heat” (cf. Matt 20.12) in him and weariness from toils and <i>he said, I do not wish [to]</i>. But then <i>at a later time, having changed his mind</i> about having said to the father, <i>I do not wish [to]</i>, he went into the vineyard and performed <i>the father’s will</i> unto completion. When, however, the first [child] said <i>I do not wish [to]</i>, he approached <i>the other</i> [child] and <i>spoke in a similar fashion</i>. Then, the second child <i>answered and said, “I will, lord”</i>, but he did not go to the vineyard of the word and to the field of the father. Now it is apparent that he who said <i>I do not wish [to]</i> and <i>later changed his mind</i> and went and worked in the vineyard is the one who <i>performed the will of the father</i> &lt;not in word, but&gt; in deed. For he who professed with words yet did not do the works refused to do <i>the will of the father</i>. You should attend if one could apply the parable to those who, on the one hand, make an inferior profession or none at all—[professing] neither virginity nor any other &lt;spiritual&gt; practice that is in accordance with the gospel, and yet produce the opposite with [their] works, [such that they end up doing the very works] that they made no profession of at the beginning according to [Scripture’s] expressions of words [K589] [concerning] good practices—</p>
--	---

<p>κατὰ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν πράττοντας. ὁ μὲν γάρ τις οἶονεὶ λέγει· μεῖζον ἢ κατ' ἐμέ, παρθενίαν ταύτην οὐ θέλω, καί· τῆς ἐμῆς ἀξίας βέλτιον τὸ ἀποταξάμενον τῷ βίῳ σχολάζειν τῷ λόγῳ· ὁ δὲ φησιν ἕκαστον ἀκούων τῶν ἐν τῇ γραφῇ μεγάλων ἔργων· ἐγὼ κύριε. καὶ ἔστιν ἰδεῖν οἶονεὶ ἐκ μεταμελείας τινὰς ἐπιδιδόντας εἰς τὸ βέλτιον καὶ ἐπιμελουμένους ἑαυτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον παρὰ τὴν ἀρχῇθεν προσδοκίαν, ἄλλους δὲ προπετέστερον μὲν πολλὰ ἐπαγγειλαμένους τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀντιπράξαντας ταῖς ἐπαγγελίαις.</p>	<p>but also, on the other hand, to those who are professing great things but are not putting them into practice according to the gospel. For a person like the [first category] says, “<i>I do not wish</i> [to practice] virginity, because it is beyond me,” and “To have a life that is dedicated to spending time in the word is better than what I’m worth.” But when he hears each of the great works in Scripture he says, <i>I will, lord</i>. So one may see certain people who, contrary to initial expectation, advance to what is better as if from a change of mind and who give charge of themselves unto what is more excellent, while [there are] others who profess many things prematurely and come to practice works opposite to their profession.</p>
--	---

<p>5. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν παραβολὴν ἐπιφέρεται πρὸς μὲν τὸν εἰπόντα οὐ θέλω καὶ ὕστερον μεταμεληθέντα καὶ ἀπελθόντα τὸ ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οἱ τελῶναι καὶ αἱ πόρναι προάγουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, πρὸς δὲ τὸν εἰπόντα ἐγὼ κύριε καὶ μὴ ἀπελθόντα τὸ ἦλθε γὰρ Ἰωάννης πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ. καὶ πάλιν πρὸς μὲν τὸν πρότερον· οἱ δὲ τελῶναι καὶ αἱ πόρναι ἐπίστευσαν αὐτῷ, πρὸς δὲ τὸν εἰπόντα· ἐγὼ κύριε καὶ μὴ ἀπελθόντα καὶ τὸ ὑμεῖς δὲ [K590] ἰδόντες οὐ μετεμελήθητε ὕστερον τοῦ πιστεῦσαι ἐν αὐτῷ. ἐπιστήσας δὲ τις τοῖς ἀπὸ μοχθηροτάτου βίου προσερχομένοις τῷ λόγῳ καὶ πιστεύουσι τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ τοῖς αὐχοῦσι τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας καὶ ἀπιστοῦσι τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀκολάστως βιοῦσι καὶ ὠμότεροις πρὸς τοὺς ὁμοφύλους τυγχάνουσιν, ὥψεται τὸν Ἰησοῦ λόγον ἀληθῆ, ὅτι οἱ μὲν τελῶναι καὶ αἱ πόρναι προάγουσι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. ὁ δὲ ἰδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκεῖνος Ἰσραὴλ οὐδὲ μέχρι δεῦρο μεταμελεῖται, ἵνα κἂν ὕστερον πιστεύσῃ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. πρόσχες δὲ καὶ τῷ προάγουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐκ ἀποκλείοντι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ εἰσερχεσθαι &lt;ποτε&gt; εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ· οὐδεὶς γὰρ προάγει τὸν οὐδαμῶς ἐσόμενον ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ τόπῳ, ἐν ᾧ προῆξεν. ὅρα οὖν μήποτε ἐμφαίνεται ὅτι, ὅταν «τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ», τότε «πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται». νοεῖσθω δὲ ὁ Ἰσραὴλ</p>	<p>5. After the parable the text, <i>Amen I say to you that tax collectors and prostitutes will precede you into the Kingdom of God</i>, is applied to the one who said <i>I do not wish [to]</i> and later had a change of mind and went, but [the text], <i>for John came to you in the way of righteousness, and you did not believe him</i> [is applied] to the one who said <i>I will, lord</i> but did not go. Again to the first [is said]: <i>tax collectors and prostitutes believed on him</i>, but to the one who said, <i>I will, lord</i>, but did not go, <i>You, [K590] while seeing, have not changed your mind afterwards to believe on him</i>. Someone who gives attention to those who come to the word from a most wretched life and who believe on Christ, and to those who boast in the law and the prophets and yet do not believe in the Son of God and live intemperately and who happen to be more savage to those of their own race, will see that Jesus’ saying is true, that <i>the tax collectors and the prostitutes will precede Israel into the Kingdom of God</i>. But this Israel, while seeing Jesus, even up to the present still does not come to a change of heart, such that <i>afterwards</i> it might believe the truth. You should attend also to <i>They will precede you into the Kingdom of God</i>, [for it does] not [say] that Israel is barred from entering &lt;at any time&gt; <i>into the Kingdom of God</i>. For no one precedes someone [into a place] who will never be in that place into which he precedes. See, then, if perhaps he is suggesting that, whenever “the fullness of the nations comes in,” at that time “all Israel will be saved” (Rom 11.25f). But let “Israel” be understood not as</p>
--	--

<p>οὐχ ὁ «κατὰ σάρκα», ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν τῇ εὐγενείᾳ τῆς ψυχῆς          χαρακτηριζόμενος καὶ ἔχων μὲν τὸ εὐφυὲς πρὸς σύνεσιν καὶ τὸ          διορατικόν, οὐ μὴν ἀξίως τῆς εὐφυΐας ἀνατραφεὶς ἐν πίστει καὶ βίῳ          ἀγαθῷ. [K591]</p>	<p>the one “according to the flesh” (Rom 2.28), but as the one who has been          imprinted in the nobility of the soul and who has the innate quality for          understanding and the faculty of vision,<sup>10</sup> but has not not been raised in          faith and in the good life in a way that is worthy of this natural goodness.          [K591]</p>
<p>6. Ἄλλην παραβολὴν ἀκούσατε. ἄνθρωπος ἦν οἰκοδεσπότης ὃς          ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα, καὶ φραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέθηκε καὶ ὥρυξεν ἐν αὐτῷ          ληνὸν καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς ἕως τοῦ καὶ δοθήσεται ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς          αὐτῆς (21.33–43). Τῷ μὴ ἐπὶ πλεῖον βασανίζοντι τὰ τῆς παραβολῆς          μηδὲ ἐκάστην λέξιν ἐξετάζοντι πάνυ σαφῆς εἶναι δόξει οὕτως ἂν          διηγῆσεως τυχοῦσα. ὁ πρὸ ἡμῶν λαὸς καὶ «μερίς» ὢν τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ          φυτευθεὶς ἦν ἀμπελὼν ὑπὸ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν παραβολὴν οἰκοδεσπότη, καὶ ἡ          τοῦ θεοῦ φρουρὰ περὶ αὐτὸν ὁ φραγμὸς ἦν καὶ πύργος μὲν ὁ          ναὸς ληνὸς δὲ ὁ τόπος τῶν σπονδῶν, καὶ γεωργοὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ          σοφοὶ τοῦ λαοῦ, ἀποδημία δὲ τοῦ δεσπότη ὅτε κύριος ὁ συνὼν αὐτοῖς          ἐν νεφέλῃ «ἡμέρας» καὶ «στύλῳ &lt;πυρὸς&gt;» νυκτός, ἕως αὐτοὺς          καταφυτεύσει εἰσαγαγὼν «εἰς ὄρος ἅγιον» αὐτοῦ «καὶ εἰς τὰ          σκηνώματα αὐτοῦ», οὐκέτι οὕτως αὐτοῖς ἐπεφαίνετο. ὁ δὲ ἐγγίσας          καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν ὁ χρόνος ἦν τῶν προφητῶν ἀπαιτούντων [K592]          τὸν καρπὸν ἀπὸ τῶν γεωργῶν καὶ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, ἵνα ἦδη δείξωσι          παρελληφότες τὸν νόμον τὸ βεβιωκέναι κατ' αὐτόν. δοῦλοι δὲ οἱ πρὸς          τοὺς γεωργοὺς πεμφθέντες λαβεῖν τοὺς καρποὺς οἱ πρῶτοι προφηταί,          οὓς οἱ ἄρχοντες καὶ σοφοὶ τοῦ λαοῦ ὕβρισαν τύπτοντες, τινὰς δὲ καὶ          ἀνεῖλον καὶ ἄλλους λιθολεύστους πεποιήκασιν. ἄλλοι δὲ μετὰ τούτους          δοῦλοι πλείονες τῶν πρώτων ὁ καιρὸς τῶν πολλῶν προφητῶν, ὧν τὰ          ὀνόματα ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῶν Παραλειπομένων γέγραπται καὶ ἐν τῷ          Ἱερεμίᾳ καὶ τοῖς Δώδεκα καὶ τῷ Δανιήλ· εἶποι γὰρ ἂν τις καὶ τὸν          Ἀνανίαν, Ἀζαρίαν, Μισαήλ προφήτας γεγονέναι. καὶ τούτοις οὖν τοῖς</p>	<p>6. <i>Listen to another parable. There was a landowning man who          planted a vineyard, and set a wall around it and dug a winepress in it          etc., up to, And it will be given to a nation producing its fruits</i> (21.33-43).          To the person who does not examine the things of the parable further nor          inquires closely into each text, the present [reading] might seem to be a          sufficiently clear explanation. The vineyard planted by the landowner<sup>11</sup> in          the parable was the people [of Israel] before us, being indeed the          “portion” of God (cf. Deut 32.9), and the wall<sup>12</sup> around it was the          supervision of God. The tower was the temple, the winepress was the          place of the drink offerings, and the [vineyard] tenants were the elders          and sages of the people. The journey abroad of the master was the time          when the Lord was with them in a cloud “of day” and “a pillar &lt;of fire&gt;”          by night (Ex 13.21), until he planted them, bringing [them] “unto” his          “holy hill and unto his tabernacles” (Ps 42.3),<sup>13</sup> [at which time] he no          longer appeared to them in this way. The approaching <i>season for fruit</i>          was the time of the prophets who demanded [K592] the fruit from the          tenants and the vineyard, in order that they might demonstrate that,          having received the law, they were living in accordance with it. The          servants who were sent to the vineyard tenants <i>to receive the fruit</i> are the          first group of prophets, some of whom the rulers and the sages of the          people struck violently, some they destroyed, and others they stoned to          death. The other servants after these, who were more numerous than <i>the</i>  <i>first</i>, is the season (<i>kairos</i>) of the many prophets, whose names are written          in the Second [Book] of Paraleipomenon and in the [book] of Jeremiah,</p>

<sup>10</sup> This word is often used in Patristic etymologies of the name “Israel.” Cf. PGL, 373.

<sup>11</sup> More literally, “master of a household,” and perhaps with a fuller sense.

<sup>12</sup> Or hedge, fence, barrier.

<sup>13</sup> The Latin text of Origen’s commentary has the 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronouns of the LXX of Ps 42.3.

πλείοσι παρὰ τοὺς προτέρους προφήτας ὡσαύτως ἐχρήσαντο, τύπτοντες καὶ ἀναιροῦντες καὶ λιθοβολοῦντες. τελευταῖον δὲ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἀποστέλλει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἐντρέψαι δυνάμενον τὸν ἀμπελῶνα καὶ τοὺς γεωργοὺς. ἀλλ' οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ σοφοὶ τοῦ λαοῦ τὸν υἱὸν ἰδόντες, οὐ πάντῃ ἀναίσθητοι τῆς ἑαυτῶν γενόμενοι ὑπεροχῆς, κληρονόμον [K593] εἶναι αὐτὸν ὑπειλήφασιν. τολμῶσι δὲ καὶ ἀποκτεῖναι αὐτόν, ἵνα αὐτοὶ κύριοι τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος γένωνται, καὶ ἐκβαλόντες αὐτόν καὶ ἔξω κρίναντες τῶν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ πραγμάτων ἀπέκτειναν. καὶ εὐθέως ὁ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος κύριος ὃν ἀπέκτειναν ἐπιδημεῖ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ κακοὺς κακῶς τοὺς μὲν γεωργοὺς ἀπόλλυσιν, ἄλλοις δὲ γεωργοῖς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἑαυτοῦ παραδίδωσι τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ πιστεύσαντας, τουτέστι τὸν ἀμπελῶνα, οἱ ἀποδιδόασιν ἐν τοῖς ἰδίῳις καιροῖς τοὺς καρποὺς τῷ οἰκοδεσπότη. εἴτα εἰπόντων μετὰ τὴν παραβολὴν τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀνωτέρω πυθομένων τὸ «ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς;» τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει αὐτοὺς ὁ σωτὴρ ἀποκρίνεται, διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς προφητείας ὅτι ὑπ' ἐκείνων μὲν <τῶν οἰκοδόμων> ἀπεδοκιμάσθη, παρὰ δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐστὶν ἔντιμος καὶ κεφαλὴ τῆς ὅλης οἰκοδομῆς καὶ τῆς κατ' αὐτὴν συνοχῆς, καὶ κεφαλὴ γε θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τῶν εἰδόντων βλέπειν αὐτήν. εἴτα, προφητεύων περὶ τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν κλήσεως, φησὶ τοῖς μὴ πιστεύουσιν εἰς αὐτὸν διδασκάλοις Ἰουδαίων· ἀρθήσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ [K594] καὶ δοθήσεται ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς.

Ἀλλ', ὡς προείπαμεν, ὁλοσχερεστέρα τις καὶ οὐ κατὰ λέξιν ἐστὶν ἡ τοιαύτη διήγησις· πρὸς ἣν πολλὰ τις ἂν «πνευματικὸς» ὢν καὶ ἀνακρίνειν δυνάμενος «πάντα» ἐπαπορήσῃ, κρούων τὴν ἀσάφεια <ν αὐτῆς, τουτέστι τὴν> κεκλεισμένην θύραν τῶν ἐνταῦθα κεκρυμμένων

and in the Twelve, and in Daniel. For one might say that Ananiah, Azariah, and Misael had also been prophets (cf. Dan 1.6). And they treated this multitude [of prophets] *in the same fashion* as the first group, striking, destroying, and stoning. So lastly the landowner sends *his son*, our Lord Jesus Christ, who is able to turn [the situation] around with the vineyard and the tenants. But when the chief priests and the elders and the sages of the people *see the son*, being not altogether unaware of their own eminent position, they realize that he is [K593] the heir. But they dare to kill him so that they themselves might become lords of the vineyard, and casting him out and numbering<sup>14</sup> him *outside* the affairs of Israel *they killed him*. And immediately *the Lord of the vineyard* whom they killed appears, having arisen from the dead, and *he wickedly destroys the wicked* tenants on one hand,<sup>15</sup> and on the other, he hands over *to other tenants*—[that is,] his own apostles—*the vineyard*, that is, those who believe from the nation whom are yielding *the fruits* to the landowner *in their own seasons*. Then, about the same ones who inquired after the parable above, saying, “By what sort of authority do you do these things?” (Matt 21.23), the Savior answers them with the things from [the text], *He will wickedly destroy the wicked*, teaching them from the prophets that he would be rejected as unworthy by these <builders>, but in regard to God he is the honored head of the whole building and of the fitting together according to it, and [that he is] the head who is *marvelous in the eyes* of those who see it (cf. Ps 117.22-23). Then, prophesying concerning the calling [of those] from the nations, he says to those teachers of the Jews who do not believe on him, that *the Kingdom of God will be taken away from you* [K594] *and will be given to a nation producing its fruits*.

But, as we mentioned before, this explanation is something of a general overview<sup>16</sup> and not according to the letter.<sup>17</sup> Let someone who is

<sup>14</sup> Cf. κρίνω, LSJ A.II.1.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Matt 21.41. The idiom here is sometimes rendered: “He will bring those wretches to a wretched end” (NASU).

<sup>16</sup> On the term ὁλοσχερέστερον which Origen uses several times in Book 17 (cf. §§15, 17), see Gianluca Piscini, “L’Interpretation des Paraboles chez Origène: Originalité, Codification et Variations d’une Méthode Exégétique,” in *Revue des Études Tardo-Antiques* 5 (2015-16): esp. 55-56.

<sup>17</sup> In this case, κατὰ λέξιν seems to mean, not so much “literal” (vs. allegorical), but rather attentive to the specific wording of the passage and the questions/issues that are raised thereby.

νοημάτων, καὶ ὀρθῶς ζητήσας εὗροι καὶ αἰτήσας ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ λάβοι. καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ κατὰ τὸ μέτριον ἡμῶν τοιαῦτα εἰς τὸν τόπον φανταζόμεθα ὅτι ὁ μὲν οἰκοδεσπότης ἄνθρωπος ὁ θεὸς ἐστὶ, περὶ οὗ γέγραπται· «ἐτροποφόρησέ σε κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου ὡς εἰ τις τροποφορήσαι ἄνθρωπος τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ». οὕτως γάρ, διὰ τὸ τροποφορεῖν καὶ φέρειν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ὠφελεῖν τρόπον ἀνθρώπινον τὸν ὠφελοῦντα ἀνθρώπους, ἐν τισὶ παραβολαῖς λέγεται εἶναι ἄνθρωπος. καὶ ἐνταῦθα μὲν ἄνθρωπος οἰκοδεσπότης καλεῖται διὰ τὸν ἀμπελῶνα καὶ τὸν περικείμενον τῷ [K595] ἀμπελῶνι φραγμὸν καὶ τὴν ληνὸν ἣν ὥρυξε καὶ τὸν πύργον ὃν ὠκοδόμησε καὶ οὗς κέκτηται δούλους καὶ οὗς πέμπει πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς καὶ δεύτερον ἀποστέλλει πλείονας. ὡς οἰκοδεσπότης δὲ ἐξέδοτο γεωργοῖς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα, ἀφ' ὧν ἀφελὼν αὐτὸν δίδωσιν ἑτέροις. ἔτι δὲ πάλιν ἐν τοῖς ἀνωτέρῳ ἄνθρωπος οἰκοδεσπότης εἴρηται διὰ τούτων· «ὁμοία γάρ ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότη, ὅστις ἐξηλθεν ἅμα πρῶτῳ μισθώσασθαι ἐργάτας εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα αὐτοῦ» καὶ ὡς οἰκοδεσπότης γε ἀμπελῶνα ἔχει καὶ μισθοῦται γεωργοὺς, ἔστι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἐπίτροπος ὃς λέγει· «κάλεσον τοὺς ἐργάτας καὶ ἀπόδος τὸν μισθόν, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσχάτων ἕως τῶν πρώτων». ἐν δὲ τῇ περὶ τοῦ δείπνου παραβολῇ καὶ τῶν γάμων τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς κλήσεως οὐκ οἰκοδεσπότης ἀλλὰ βασιλεὺς εἴρηται· μεῖζων γὰρ ἢ οἰκοδεσπότης ἐστὶ πέμπων στράτευμα ὡς βασιλεὺς καὶ ἀναιρῶν τοὺς κρατήσαντας «τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ» καὶ ὑβρίσαντας καὶ ἀποκτείναντας αὐτούς, καὶ ἐν βασιλικῇ ἐξουσίᾳ, οὐχ ὡς οἰκοδεσπότης μόνον, «εἶπε τοῖς διακόνοις» δῆσαι «πόδας καὶ χεῖρας» τοῦ εἰσελθόντος εἰς τοὺς [K596] γάμους μὴ ἔχοντος «ἔνδυμα γάμου» καὶ ἐκβαλεῖν «αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ἐξώτερον σκότος». ὅτε δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἀνωτέρῳ λέγεται· «ἄνθρωπος εἶχε τέκνα δύο», οὔτε οἰκοδεσπότης οὔτε βασιλεὺς ὠνόμασται ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς ἄνθρωπος.

Εἰσὶν οὖν, ὥσπερ πολλαὶ ἐπίνοιαὶ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὰς θείας γραφάς, οὕτω καὶ διαφοραὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου αὐτὸν ὀνομάζεσθαι, ἥτοι ἀπλῶς ἢ οἰκοδεσπότην ἢ βασιλέα. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν κατὰ τὸν Ματθαῖον·

“spiritual” and is able to examine “all things” (cf. 1 Cor 2.15) analyze the many things [about this passage], knocking on<sup>18</sup> the [passage’s] obscurit<y, that is, the> closed door of the noetic things hidden here, and let him who inquires rightly find and let him who asks from God receive. Indeed we also, according to our own capacity, entertain such [ideas] about this passage, that the *landowning man* is God, concerning whom it is written: “The Lord your God cared for you in the way a certain man would care for his son” (Deut 1.31). For in this way, because he cares for men and it works to the benefit of men that he bear a human figure, in certain parables he is said to be a *man*. And here he is called a *landowning man* because of the *vineyard* and the *wall* surrounding the [K595] *vineyard* and the *winepress* which *he dug* and the *tower* which *he built* and the *servants* whom he possessed and sent *to the vineyard tenants* and the second *larger group* he sends. And as a *landowner* he *lent out the vineyard to tenants*, from whom he takes it and gives to others. Yet again in the passage above he is said to be a *landowning man* through these [words]: “For the kingdom of heaven is similar to a landowning man who went out early to hire workers for his vineyard” (Matt 20.1).<sup>19</sup> Indeed, as a landowner, he has a vineyard and hires tenants, and there belongs to him a manager to whom he says, “Call the workers and pay [them] the wage, beginning from the last up to the first” (Matt 20.8). In the parable concerning the wedding feast of his son and of the call (Matt 22.1-14) he is not said to be a landowner but a king, for he is greater than a landowner who, as a king, sends out troops and who destroys those who hold “his servants” and who abuse and kill them, and who in kingly authority, not only as a landowner, “says to the attendants” to bind “feet and hand” of him who entered into the [K596] wedding feast not having a “wedding garment” and to cast “him out into outer darkness” (Matt 22.11-13). And when in the passages above it is said, “A man had two children” (Matt 21.28), he is named neither a landowner, nor a king, but simply a man.

Therefore, just as there are many concepts (*epinoiai*) for God in the divine Scriptures, it is the case that there are different ways [that God]

<sup>18</sup> The verb here has the sense of *testing for authenticity*, as in tapping a vessel to see if its sound rings true. Also used for knocking on a door.

<sup>19</sup> On this parable, see *Comm. Matt.* 15.28-37.

<p>κατὰ δὲ τὸν Λουκᾶν ἡ ὁμοία τῇ ἐκκειμένῃ παραβολῇ ἄνθρωπον αὐτὸν ὠνόμασεν ἐν τῷ· «ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευεν ἀμπελῶνα, καὶ ἐξέδοτο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς». ἀλλὰ καὶ Μᾶρκος φησιν· «ἄνθρωπός τις ἐφύτευεν ἀμπελῶνα, καὶ περιέθηκεν αὐτῷ φραγμόν». πάλιν τε αὖ ὁ Λουκᾶς τὴν τῆς κλήσεως ἐκτιθέμενος παραβολὴν «ἄνθρωπός τις», φησὶν, «ἐποίησε δεῖπνον μέγα, καὶ ἐκάλεσε πολλούς». καὶ σὺ δὲ συναγαγὼν εἴ που ὠνόμασται ἄνθρωπος ὁ θεὸς καὶ «πνευματικὰ πνευματικοῖς» ἐν τῷ περὶ τούτου συγκρίνων λόγῳ καὶ ζητήσας ὀρθῶς τὰ κατὰ τοὺς τόπους, εὗροις ἂν ἀνάλογον τῇ ζητήσει σου πλείονα εἰς τὸ ἄνθρωπον λέγεσθαι τὸν θεόν. οὗτος δὲ ἐφύτευεν ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ἄνθρωπος ἀμπελῶνα, ὅντινα ἐπιμελέστερον ζητητέον, μὴ ἀβασανίστως παρερχόμενον τὴν τοσαύτην παραβολήν. [K597]</p>	<p>is named a man, whether simply [as “man”], or as landowner, or as king. Such is the case with Matthew, but according to Luke the similar [passage] to the present parable also calls him a man: “A man planted a vineyard, and lent it out to tenants” (Lk 20.9). Mark also says, “A certain man planted a vineyard, and he set around it a wall” (Mk 12.1). Again, in Luke’s version of the parable of the call, he says “a certain man put on a great feast, and he called many” (Lk 14.16). And you, gathering wherever God is named a man and discerning “spiritual things by spiritual things” (1 Cor 2.13) in the word concerning this, and seeking rightly the things about these passages, you may find in your investigation an abundance of comparable passages where God is called a man. This <i>landowning man planted a vineyard</i>, about which let us now more carefully inquire, so that this parable is not passed by without examination. [K597].</p>
<p>7. Τίς οὖν ὁ ἀμπελὼν ἕτερος ὢν παρὰ τοὺς γεωργοὺς τοὺς πρώτους καὶ τοὺς δευτέρους, ὃν ἐφύτευεν ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ἄνθρωπος; ὁ δὲ ἀμπελὼν οὗτος πρότερον μὲν ἐκδιδόμενός ἐστι γεωργοῖς ὑβρισταῖς, δεύτερον δὲ κατὰ τοὺς ἀποκριναμένους περὶ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος ἐκδιδόμενος ἄλλοις γεωργοῖς, οἵτινες δώσουσι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν, κατὰ δὲ τὸν σωτῆρα λέγοντα· ἀρθήσεται ἀφ’ ὑμῶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ δοθήσεται ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς. ἄρα γὰρ δεήσει ταῦτόν εἰπεῖν εἶναι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ ἀμπελῶνι, αἰρομένην ἀπὸ τῶν προτέρων &lt;γεωργῶν&gt; διδομένην δὲ ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς, ἢ ἄλλο μὲν εἶναι τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἄλλο δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; ἴδωμεν δὲ πρῶτον, παραστήσαντες ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ὅτι ἀμπελὼν καλεῖται ὁ λαός, εἰ δύνатаι ἐφαρμόσαι πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὸν τόπον τῇ τοιαύτῃ διηγήσει. φησὶν οὖν Ἡσαΐας· «ἄσω δὲ τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ ἄσμα τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου. ἀμπελὼν ἐγενήθη τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ ἐν κέρατι ἐν τόπῳ πίνονι. καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα καὶ ἐχαράκωσα, καὶ ἐφύτευσα ἄμπελον σωρήκ» [K598] καὶ</p>	<p>7. Is the vineyard, which the <i>landowning man planted</i>, different as relates to the first tenants and the second [group]? The vineyard is first given to insolent tenants, but second, against the defendants<sup>20</sup> concerning the vineyard, it is given to other tenants who will produce its fruit in their seasons, according to the Savior who says, “<i>The kingdom of God will be taken from you and will be given to a nation who produces its fruits</i>” (Matt 21.43). So, then, should it be said that the Kingdom of God itself is the vineyard, which is taken from the first &lt;tenants&gt; and given to a nation producing its fruit, or rather [should we say] that the vineyard is something other than the Kingdom of God? Let us first observe, as we furnish [proof] from the Scripture that the people are called a vineyard, if it is possible to harmonize all things regarding this passage with this explanation. Isaiah therefore says, “Now I will sing to my beloved a song of my beloved concerning my vineyard. My beloved had a vineyard on a high hill in a fertile place. And I set a wall around [it], and fenced [it] off, and I planted</p>

<sup>20</sup> κατὰ τοὺς ἀποκριναμένους περὶ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος. Taking this as a reference to the “first group” who are “in the dock,” so to speak. Cf. ἀποκρίνω, LSJ A.IV.2.

τὰ ἐξῆς ἕως τοῦ «ἐποίησε δὲ ἀνομίαν καὶ οὐ δικαιοσύνην ἀλλὰ κραυγὴν».

Ἐξεθέμην δὴ τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἡσαΐου ἄσμα βουλούμενος αὐτὸ συνεξετάσαι <ταύτη> τῇ παραβολῇ, εἰ κατὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ κεῖται ὁ ἀμπελὼν σηματομενόμενος ἐν ἐκατέρᾳ τῇ γραφῇ. καὶ ὅρα, τίνα μὲν ὅμοια ἔχουσιν αἱ ἐκτεθεῖσαι λέξεις τίνα δὲ οὐχ ὅμοια, ἵνα βλέπων τὰς διαφορὰς τῶν ὁμοίων πρὸς τὰ ἀνόμοια οὕτως ἐπιστήσης τῷ νῷ τῆς γραφῆς. ὅμοιον οὖν τὸ ἐφύτευσε ἀμπελῶνα, καὶ φραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέθηκε καὶ ὥρυξεν ἐν αὐτῷ ληνὸν καὶ ὠκοδόμησε πύργον τῷ «ἀμπελὼν ἐγενήθη τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ ἐν κέρατι ἐν τόπῳ πίονι. καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα καὶ ἐχαράκωσα, καὶ ἐφύτευσα ἄμπελον σωρήκ, καὶ ὠκοδόμησα πύργον ἐν μέσῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ προλήνιον ὥρυξα ἐν αὐτῷ». παράθεος γὰρ τῷ ἐφύτευσε ἀμπελῶνα τὸ «ἐφύτευσα ἄμπελον σωρήκ», καὶ τῷ φραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέθηκε τὸ «φραγμὸν περιέθηκα», καὶ τῷ ὥρυξεν ἐν αὐτῷ ληνὸν τὸ «καὶ προλήνιον ὥρυξα ἐν αὐτῷ», καὶ τῷ ὠκοδόμησε πύργον τὸ [K599] «καὶ ὠκοδόμησα πύργον ἐν μέσῳ αὐτοῦ». Κατ' ἀμφοτέρους δὲ τοὺς τόπους <ἀνόμοιον> περὶ τῶν καρπῶν λέγεται τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, παρὰ μὲν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ ὅτι «ἔμεινα τοῦ ποιῆσαι σταφυλὴν, καὶ ἐποίησεν ἀκάνθας», ἐν δὲ τῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου παραβολῇ σαφῶς οὐχ ὁ ἀμπελὼν κατηγορεῖται ὡς μὴ δεδωκὼς τοὺς καρποὺς ἐγγίσαντος τοῦ καιροῦ αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' οἱ γεωργοί, οἱ καὶ λαβόντες τοὺς τοῦ οἰκοδεσπότης δούλους ὃν μὲν ἔδειραν, ὃν δὲ ἀπέκτειναν, ὃν δὲ ἐλιθοβόλησαν. καὶ ἡνίκα ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλους δούλους πλείονας τῶν πρώτων, πάλιν οἱ γεωργοὶ κατηγοροῦνται ποιήσαντες αὐτοῖς ὡσαύτως. καὶ τρίτον δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ κατηγοροῦνται εἰπόντες· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτὸν καὶ σχῶμεν τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκβαλόντες αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος καὶ ἀποκτείναντες αὐτόν. καὶ ἐν μὲν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ αὐτῷ τῷ ἀμπελῶνι ἀπειλεῖ ὁ λόγος λέγων· «ἀφελῶ τὸν φραγμὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ [K600] ἔσται εἰς διαρπαγὴν, <καὶ> καθελῶ τὸν τοῖχον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔσται εἰς καταπάτημα. καὶ ἀνήσω τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου, καὶ οὐ μὴ τηθῇ οὐδὲ μὴ σκαφῇ, καὶ ἀναβήσεται εἰς αὐτὸν ὡς εἰς χέρσον ἄκανθα». ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτε «ταῖς νεφέλαις»

a choice vine,” [K598] etc., up to, “and it brought forth iniquity; and not righteousness, but a cry.” (Isa 5.1-2, 7).

I have quoted the song of Isaiah with the purpose of examining it together with <this> parable [to see] if in each Scripture the vineyard serves to signify the same thing. Note indeed that the texts quoted have certain similarities as well as certain differences, in order that, seeing the differences between the similarities and the dissimilarities, you may thus understand the mind of Scripture. The passage, *he planted a vineyard, and set a wall around it, and dug in it a wine press and built a tower*, is similar to “My beloved had a vineyard on a high hill in a fertile place. And I set a wall around [it], and fenced [it] off, and I planted a choice vine, and I built a tower in its midst, and I dug a wine vat in it” (Isa 5.1-2). For do compare *he planted a vineyard* to “I planted a choice vine,” and *he set a wall around it* to “I set around [it] a wall,” and *he dug in it a wine press* to “I dug in it a wine vat,” and *he built a tower* to [K599] “and I built a tower in its midst.” But there is <dissimilarity> with the regard to [how] both passages describe the fruits of the vineyard, for Isaiah that “I waited for it to produce grapes, yet it produced thorns” (Isa 5.4), while in the Gospel parable it is clearly not the vineyard that is being accused, as though not having produced fruits when their season was drawing near, but rather the vineyard tenants, whom received the servants of the landowner which they thrashed, and killed, and stoned. And when he sent another group of servants more numerous than the first, again the tenants are accused for treating them in the same way. The third time the tenants are accused, saying, *This is the heir; come, let us kill him and take his inheritance, and casting him out of the vineyard, and killing him*. In Isaiah also, the word threatens the vineyard, saying, “I will take away its hedge, and [K600] it shall be for spoiling; <and> I will pull down its wall, and it shall be for trampling. I will forsake my vineyard; and it shall not be pruned, nor dug, and thorns shall come up upon it as on barren land” (Isa 5.5-6). But also when he promis<es to command> “the clouds not to rain any rain upon it” (Isa 5.6), he threatens the vineyard, which the prophet says is the house “of Israel” and the “man of Judah,” which is not producing the fruit of



ἐντελεῖσθαι ἐπαγγέλλεται «τοῦ μὴ βρέξαι εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ὑετόν», τῷ ἀμπελῶνι ἀπειλεῖ, ὅντινα ὁ προφήτης εἶπεν εἶναι τὸν «τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ» οἶκον καὶ τὸν «ἄνθρωπον τοῦ Ἰουδα», μὴ ποιήσαντα τὸν καρπὸν, τὴν «κρίσιν» καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην, ποιήσαντα δὲ ἀκάνθας, τὴν «ἀνομίαν» καὶ τὴν «κραυγὴν». ἐν δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τὸν μὲν ἀμπελῶνα οὐδὲν εὐρίσκομεν πάσχοντα, ἀλλ' (εἰ δεῖ οὕτως εἰπεῖν) μᾶλλον προνοούμενον τοῦ φέρειν τοὺς οἰκείους καρποὺς τῷ οἰκοδεσπότη· προνοῶν γὰρ οὗτος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος αἶρει αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν προτέρων γεωργῶν, οἵτινες ἀποκρίνονται τῷ σωτῆρι πυθομένῳ καὶ εἰπόντι *ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, τί ποιήσει τοῖς γεωργοῖς ἐκείνοις;* καὶ *λέγουσιν*, εἴτε ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς ἀκολουθίας [K601] ἀναγκαζόμενοι εἴτε καὶ ἄκοντες (ἴν' οὕτως εἶπω) τὰ περὶ αὐτῶν προφητεύοντες, ὥς ἄρα *κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος ἐλθὼν τοὺς γεωργοὺς, καὶ προνοούμενος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος ἐκδώσεται αὐτὸν ἄλλοις γεωργοῖς, οἵτινες ἀποδώσουσιν αὐτῷ τοὺς καρποὺς ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἱερεμῖᾳ ἀκολουθῶς τῷ «ὁ γὰρ ἀμπελῶν κυρίου σαβαὼθ οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐστὶ, καὶ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Ἰουδα νεόφυτον ἡγαπημένον»* εἴρηται πρὸς τὸν ἁμαρτάνοντα λαόν· «ἐγὼ δὲ ἐφύτευσά σε ἄμπελον καρποφόρον πᾶσαν ἀληθινήν», καὶ ἀνάλογον τῷ «ἔμεινα ἵνα ποιήσῃ σταφυλὴν, ἐποίησε δὲ ἀκάνθας» καὶ τῷ «ἔμεινα <τοῦ> ποιῆσαι κρίσιν, ἐποίησε δὲ ἀνομίαν καὶ οὐ δικαιοσύνην ἀλλὰ κραυγὴν» τὸ «πῶς ἐστράφη<ς> εἰς πικρίαν, ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἄλλοτρία;»

Οὐκοῦν ὁρᾷς ἐν μὲν ταῖς προφητικαῖς λέξεσι τὸν λαὸν λεγόμενον εἶναι ἀμπελῶνα καὶ τὸν φυτεύσαντα αὐτὸν ἀπειλοῦντα καὶ λέγοντα αὐτῷ· [K602] «ἀφελῶ τὸν φραγμὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσται εἰς διαρπαγὴν» καὶ τὰ λοιπά, ἐν δὲ ταῖς εὐαγγελικαῖς οὐδεμίαν μὲν μέμψιν προσαγομένην τῷ ἀμπελῶνι πᾶσαν δὲ τοῖς γεωργοῖς, καὶ πρὸς τῷ μηδεμίαν εἶναι ἀπειλὴν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι καὶ πρόνοιαν αὐτοῦ γινομένην, ἵνα διδῷ τῷ οἰκοδεσπότη τοὺς καρποὺς ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν. καὶ οὐκ

“judgment” and righteousness, but is rather producing the thorns of “lawlessness” and a “cry” (Isa 5.7). But in the Gospel we find nothing about the vineyard experiencing suffering, but rather (if I may speak in this way) as being foreknown<sup>21</sup> to bear the fruit proper to itself for the landowner, for He foreknows about the vineyard that he will take it from the first tenants who answer the Savior when he inquires, saying, *When, therefore, the lord of the vineyard comes, what will he do to these tenants?* (Matt 21.40). And *they say*, whether out of constraint by the word and [its] sequence [K601] or indeed involuntarily prophesying (if I may speak thus) the things concerning themselves, that when the lord of the vineyard comes *he will wickedly destroy the wicked* tenants, and foreknowing the vineyard he will give it to other tenants, such as will give to him the fruits in their seasons. But in Jeremiah following [the passage], “for the vineyard of the Lord Sabaoth is the house of Israel, and a man of Judah is a beloved new planting,” it is said about the sinning people, “but I myself planted you a fruitbearing vineyard, completely true” (Jer 2.21), which is comparable to “I waited for you to produce grapes, but you produced thorns” (Isa 5.4), as also to this [passage], “I waited for you to produce judgment, but you produced lawlessness, and not righteousness, but a cry” (Isa 5.7) is to, “How did you turn to bitterness, the vineyard that is foreign?” (Jer 2.21).

Therefore, observe in the prophetic texts that the people is said to be a vineyard which was planted by him who destroys it and who says to it, [K602] “I will remove its wall, and it will be for plundering,” etc. But in the Gospel texts there is no blame presented against the vineyard, but all [blame] is on the tenants, and there is no destruction to the vineyard which is under his providential care, in order that it might produce the fruits in their seasons for the landowner. Indeed you may not be able, if you desire to preserve the precision of the Gospel scripture, to demonstrate clearly that the people is a vineyard. But perhaps the vineyard in the Gospel [parable] is the Kingdom of God, which is the very thing that occurs in the

<sup>21</sup> Origen’s caveat “if I may speak in this way” is his hedge against any kind of determinist understanding of the language of foreknowledge/providence (προνοέω) which implies *care* as much as it does *foresight*.

ἂν δύναιο, τὴν ἀκρίβειαν βουλόμενος σῶσαι τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς γραφῆς, τρανῶς παραστήσαι ὅτι ἀμπελῶν ὁ λαὸς ἦν. ἀλλὰ μήποτε ὁ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἀμπελῶν ἢ βασιλεία ἐστὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢ αὐτὴ (οἶμαι) τυγχάνουσα τῇ τῶν γραφῶν μετ' ἐπισκοπῆς θεοῦ διδασκαλίᾳ. τὸ γὰρ ἀρθήσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἢ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ δοθήσεται ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς ἐπιφερόμενον τῇ περὶ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος παραβολῇ σαφῶς (οἶμαι) δηλοῖ τὰ μυστήρια τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ βασιλείας λέγεσθαι εἶναι τὸν ἀμπελῶνα, ὃν ἐφύτευσεν ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ἄνθρωπος. τοῦτον δὴ τὸν ἀμπελῶνα, ὄντα (ὡς οἶμαι) νόμον καὶ προφητάς καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν θείαν γραφὴν, ἐξέδοτο ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος γεωργοῖς· προτέροις μὲν τῷ λαῷ ἐκείνῳ (καὶ γὰρ πρῶτοι [K603] «ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ»), δευτέροις δὲ ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς, τῇ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκκλησίᾳ. ἀλλ' ἔργον ἐξομαλίσαι οὕτω νοουμένου τοῦ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἀμπελῶνος τὸν περιτεθέντα αὐτῷ φραγμόν, οὐδὲν πάσχοντα ὅποιον <ὁ> ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα φραγμός, περὶ οὗ γέγραπται· «ἀφελῶ τὸν φραγμόν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔσται εἰς διαρπαγὴν», καὶ τὴν ὀρυχθεῖσαν ἐν αὐτῷ ληνὸν καὶ τὸν οἰκοδομηθέντα πύργον.

Καὶ ὅρα εἰ δυνάμεθα τὴν μὲν κατὰ τὴν θείαν γραφὴν φυσιολογίαν τὸν ἀμπελῶνα εἰπεῖν, τὸν δὲ ἀκόλουθον τῇ ἀληθεῖ φυσιολογίᾳ βίον ἐν ἀρετῇ καὶ καλλίστοις ἡθεσι καρποφοροῦντα λέγειν εἶναι τὸν τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος καρπὸν, τὸν δὲ λογικὸν τόπον καὶ πᾶν τὸ γράμμα τῆς γραφῆς τὸν φραγμόν εἶναι τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος περικείμενον ἔξωθεν ὡς μὴ κατοπτρεύεσθαι τοῖς ἔξωθεν τὸν ἀμπελῶνα καὶ τὸν ἐν κρυπτῷ μάλιστα καρπὸν αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ βάθος \*\*\* τῆς δεχομένης τοὺς καρποὺς τούτους ψυχῆς πᾶν ἐπιτόλαιον ἀποβαλούσης τὴν ὀρυχθεῖσαν εἶναι ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι ληνόν. [K604] ὁ δὲ οἰκοδομηθεὶς ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι πύργος, ἀνάστημα ἔχων καὶ διάρμα καὶ ὕψος ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀμπελῶνα καὶ τὸν φραγμόν καὶ τὴν ληνόν, ὁ περὶ θεοῦ (οἶμαι) λόγος ἐστὶ, ναὸς ὢν τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ θείου νοῦ. καὶ περὶ τοιούτου νομίζω λελέχθαι πύργου ὑπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος τὸ «τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν βουλόμενος πύργον οἰκοδομῆσαι οὐχὶ πρῶτον

teaching of the Scriptures with the oversight of God. For [the text] *The kingdom of God will be taken away from you and be given to a nation producing its fruits* which is presented in the parable concerning the vineyard clearly (I think) indicates that the *vineyard*, which the *landowning man planted*, is mentioned as itself being the mysteries of the kingdom of God. This *vineyard*, which is (as I think) the law and the prophets and all divine Scripture, *the Lord leased to the tenants of the vineyard*—first to this people [of Israel] (for indeed [K603] “they were” first “entrusted the oracles of God” [Rom 3.2]), second *to a nation producing its fruits*, [that is,] to the church from the nations. When the vineyard is understood in this way with respect to the Gospel [parable], the matter is resolved about the *wall* which surrounded [the vineyard], which experiences no suffering such as was the case with <the> “wall” in Isaiah, concerning which it is written, “I will remove its wall, and it will be for plundering” (Isa 5.5), and the *winepress* which was dug out *in it*, and the *tower* that is built.

And let us see if, on one hand, we can say that the *vineyard* is the natural science (φυσιολογίαν) according to divine Scripture, and on the other hand, [if we can] call the “fruit” of the vineyard the life which follows the true natural science which bears fruit in virtue and the most beneficial practices (καλλίστοις ἡθεσι), and [if we can] understand the *wall* which surrounds the outside of the vineyard to be the logical discipline (λογικὸν τόπον) and whole letter of Scripture, since the *vineyard* and especially the fruit hidden within it are not to be observed by those outside.<sup>22</sup> The depth \*\*\* of the soul who receives these fruits, after casting away all that is on the surface, is the *winepress* that is dug in the vineyard. [K604] The “tower” that is built in the vineyard, having prominence, elevation, and height over the vineyard, the wall, and the winepress, is (I think) the word (*logos*) concerning God, which is the temple of the divine meaning in it. It is about this tower that I reckon the Savior to have said, “Who among you, desiring to build a tower, does not first calculate,” if he

<sup>22</sup> τοῖς ἔξωθεν could just as well be translated as “by the heathen.”

<p>ψηφίζει», εἰ δύναται θεῖναι τὸν θεμέλιον καὶ ἐκτελέσαι, «ἵνα μὴ» «ἄρξωνται οἱ θεωροῦντες ἐμπαίζειν» τῷ μὴ τε λειώσαντι; διὰ γὰρ παραβολῆς κάκει δοκεῖ μοι λέγεσθαι ὅτι μέλλων θεολογεῖν σκόπησον, εἰ δύνασαι ἀρξάμενος πάντα ἃ ἀπαιτεῖ σε ὁ λόγος εἰς θεολογίαν τελειῶσαι, ἵνα μὴ ἀρξάμενος τῶν τῆς εὐσεβείας δογμάτων ἀτελῇ καταλίπῃς τὸν περὶ θεοῦ πύργον καὶ στεφάνην αὐτῷ μὴ ἐποικοδομήσης· εἰ γὰρ στεφάνην οὐκ ἐποικοδομήσεις, πεσεῖται τις ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ θεοῦ ἐννοίας καὶ ἀποθανεῖται. [K605] τοῦτον δὴ τὸν (ὡς ἀποδεδώκαμεν) ἀμπελῶνα ἐξέδοτο γεωργοῖς, τῷ πρὸ ἡμῶν λαῷ, ὁ θεός, καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ περιωπὴν, δούς ἀφορμὰς τοῖς γεωργοῖς, ἐξ ὧν αὐτὸς ἐφύτευσε καὶ περιέθηκε καὶ ὥρυξε καὶ ὠκοδόμησε, τοῦ φέρειν τοὺς καρποὺς ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν. ἤγγισαν μὲν οὖν καθ' ἕκαστον οἱ καιροὶ τῶν καρπῶν, οἶμαι δ' ὅτι καὶ &lt;γενικῶς&gt; ὅλῳ τῷ λαῷ. τὸ δὲ ἐγγίσει τοὺς καιροὺς τῶν καρπῶν ἀκριβῶς μὲν διηγήσασθαι ἕξως μείζονός ἐστιν ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ καρδίας πολλῷ καθαρωτέρας καὶ διορατικ&lt;ωτέρ&gt;ας παρ' ἡμᾶς. ὅμως δὲ κατὰ δύναμιν ἐπιβαλοῦμεν οὕτως τῷ τόπῳ, ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν καθένα.</p>	<p>is able to lay the foundation, and to finish [it], “so that those who are observing might not begin to ridicule [him]” when he does not finish? (Lk 14.28-29). For through the parable it seems to be said there that one who is beginning to theologize should examine if you are able to complete all the things that the word (<i>logos</i>) demands of you, lest by not beginning with the teachings of piety you thereby leave the <i>tower</i> concerning God in an unfinished state, and you do not build up a border for it. For if you do not build up a border, someone may fall from the understanding concerning God, and die. [K605] This <i>vineyard</i> (as we have recounted) God <i>leased out to tenants</i>, to the people before us (i.e., Jews), and <i>He goes on a journey</i> to his own summit, giving resources to the <i>tenants</i>, from which he himself had <i>planted, surrounded, dug out, and built</i> for [them] to bear <i>fruits in their seasons</i>. The seasons of <i>the fruits</i> drawing near, therefore, [refers] I think both to each [person individually], but also &lt;generally&gt; to the whole people. But to explain the drawing near of the seasons of <i>the fruits</i> precisely is for someone at a higher state than us and who has a much purer and more perceptive heart than us. Nevertheless, let us, according to [our] ability, devote ourselves in this way to the passage, beginning from things one by one.</p>
<p>8. Καὶ νοείσθω ἐν ἐκάστη ψυχῇ ὁ λόγος ἄμπελος πεφυτευμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ οἰκοδεσπότου, καὶ ἀμπελῶν αἱ ἀφορμαὶ πάντων &lt;τῶν&gt; ἀναγκαίων εἰς σωτηρίαν προβλημάτων. ὥσπερ οὖν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀμπελῶν ἐστὶ τις καιρὸς ὅτε ἐκφύει φύλλα, καὶ ἄλλος ὅτε τὰς ἀρχὰς τῶν καρπῶν δείκνυσιν ἔτι βραχείας, καὶ ἄλλος ὅτε κυπρίζει τὰ δειχθέντα, &lt;καὶ ἄλλος ὅτε ὀμφακίζει [K606]&gt; καὶ ἄλλος ὅτε περκάζει, καὶ ἄλλος ὅτε καιρὸς ἐστὶ τοῦ τρυγᾶν τετελειωμένους τοὺς καρποὺς καὶ ἐτοιμοὺς πρὸς τὸ φέρειν οἴνου ποιότητα—οὕτως ὁ μὲν πρῶτος τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῆς ζωῆς καιρὸς κατὰ τὴν νηπιότητα ἐχέτω τὴν ἄμπελον οὐδὲν περικειμένην ἀλλὰ μόνον ἔχουσιν τὸ ζωτικόν· εἴτ' ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὁ λόγος συμπληροῦσθαι ἀρχεται, ὁ καιρὸς ἔστω τῆς πρώτης ἀνθήσεως, ὅσον δὲ προκόπτει γεωργουμένη ἡ ψυχὴ τοσοῦτον καὶ ὁ γεωργούμενος</p>	<p>8. Indeed, let the “grapevine” which has been planted by the “Landowner” (Matt 21.33) be understood as the reason (<i>logos</i>) that is in each soul (Isa 5.2), and the “vineyard” is the resources of all defences necessary for salvation. Therefore, just as there is a certain season for vineyards when it produces foliage, and another when it shows even slightly the beginnings of fruits, and another when its blooming is plainly seen, &lt;and another when it is unripe [K606]&gt;, and another when it ripens, and another when it is the season to gather in <i>the fruits</i> that have been matured and prepared with quality for making wine—so also, let the first season of life for humans according to infancy pertain to the grapevine which has nothing surrounding it, and all it has is life. Then, as soon as reason begins to suffuse [a person], let that season be the first bloom. As the soul being cultivated continues to advance, in such a fashion also the</p>

<p>ἀμπελῶν δείγματα φέρει μελλόντων βοτρυῶν, κυπριζόντων μὲν καὶ ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας (μελλούσης ἀρετῆς) φερόντων κατ' ἀρχάς, ὕστερον δὲ ἤδη καὶ ὁμακίζόντων, ὅτε κακία μὲν &lt;νεότητι ἐν&gt;εστὶν οὐχ ἡ παραμένουσα δὲ ἀλλ' ἡ ἀναγκαίως ὑφισταμένη καὶ οὐδέποτε νευομένη ἐπὶ τὸ χειρόν, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ (εἰ δεῖ οὕτως ὀνομάσαι) ἐπ' ἀρετὴν ὀδεύουσα. ἐὰν δὲ παραμένη ἡ κακία, καὶ μὴ χρησώμεθα ἄλλη ὥς ἐπ' ἀρετὴν διόδω αἰεὶ αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπ' ἀρετῇ προκοπὴν ἄγοντες, γίνεται ὁμοφᾶξ, [K607] ὃν φαγὼν τις κατὰ τὸν προφήτην αἰμωδιᾷ. ἐπὶ πλεῖον δὲ τις προκόπτων οἶονεὶ περκάζουσιν μὲν οὐδέπω δὲ τε τελειωμένην ἔχει τὴν σταφυλὴν. ἔστι δὲ τις &lt;καὶ&gt; μετὰ τὴν προκοπὴν κατάστασις σπουδαία, ὅτε ἡ γεωργηθεῖσα ἄμπελος φέρει τὸν καρπὸν, βότρυας ἀγάπης τελείους καὶ χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης καὶ μακροθυμίας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν, ἃ παρὰ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ κατείλεται καὶ ἐν μυρίαις ἄλλαις γραφαῖς. ἔστι γὰρ τις βότρυς κατὰ τὸ «μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι» καὶ ἄλλος κατὰ τὸ «μακάριοι οἱ πενθοῦντες» καὶ ἄλλος κατὰ τὸ «μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς» καὶ ἄλλος κατὰ τὸ «μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοὶ» καὶ ἄλλος κατὰ τὸ «μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ». καὶ τί με δεῖ καταλέγειν τοὺς αἰτίους τῶν μακαρισμῶν βότρυας; ταῦτα δὲ ἐπὶ πλεῖον ἐξήτασα ἅτε τὸ ὅτε ἤγγισεν ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν, νοῆσαι καὶ σαφηνίσαι θέλων.</p>	<p>vineyard being cultivated produces samples of the coming grapes, which indeed, while they are blooming, bear at the beginning a sweet-smelling savor (cf. Eph 5.2) (of the virtue to come), yet after [emerging] are still unripe, when vice is &lt;inherent in youth&gt; but does not endure, but is necessarily resisted<sup>23</sup> and is never inclined to what is worse, but is continually (if one must put it in such a way) travelling to virtue. But if vice endures, and we do not make use of another pathway, as though for virtue, leading [the soul] continually to the advancement unto virtue, [then] it becomes sour grapes, [K607] which, according to the prophet, when one eats, “sets [one’s teeth] on edge” (cf. Jer 38.29-30). But someone who is advancing further has, as it were, a bunch of grapes that is turning dark but is not yet perfected. There is indeed an excellent<sup>24</sup> state (<i>katastasis</i>) that comes after advance, when the grapevine that has been cultivated bears fruit, the grape cluster of perfect love, joy, peace, and longsuffering, and all the rest which are listed by the Apostle (Gal 5.22) and in a myriad of other Scriptures. For one kind of grape cluster is indicated with, “Blessed are the poor in spirit,” and another with, “Blessed are those who mourn,” and another with, “Blessed are the meek,” and another with, “Blessed are the peacemakers,” and another with, “Blessed are the pure in heart” (Matt 5.3ff). Yet why must I list [all] the grape clusters that are the causes of blessedness? But I examined these things to such an extent because I wanted to understand and clarify this [text], <i>When the season of fruits drew near</i> (Matt 21.34).</p>
---	--

<p>9. Τοῦ οἰκοδεσπότου δὲ ἐστὶ &lt;μόνου&gt; καὶ τῆς θείας ἐπιστήμης αὐτοῦ [K608] εἰδέναι τὸν ἐκάστου τῶν ἀνθρώπων καιρὸν, πότε ἤγγισε καὶ πότε ἔτι πόρρω ἐστὶν ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν. καὶ ἡμεῖς δέ, ἐὰν ἐπὶ πλεῖον ἐπιστήσωμεν συγκρίνοντες τὸν χρόνον ἀφ' οὗ ἐκλήθημεν τῷ παντὶ χρόνῳ τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν, δυνησόμεθα ὁρᾶν πῶς τινες ὥσπερ «ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τὸν χρόνον, πάλιν χρεῖαν» ἔχουσι</p>	<p>9. It is for the “landowner” &lt;alone&gt; and for his divine understanding [K608] to know the season of each person in humanity, what time <i>the season of fruits is drawing near</i> and at what time it is still far away. For our part, if we might understand further by comparing the time from which we were called to the whole time of our faith, we may be able to see how certain people, just as “those who ought to be teachers on account of time,” have “need again” of being taught “certain elementary principles &lt;of the</p>
---	---

<sup>23</sup> The construction ἀλλ' ἡ ἀναγκαίως ὑφισταμένη admits of several possible readings.

<sup>24</sup> The expression κατάστασις σπουδαία can imply zeal, abundance.

διδάσκεσθαι «τίνα τὰ στοιχεῖα <τῆς ἀρχῆς> τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ». οὕτως ὀφείλοντες τινες, ὅσον ἐπὶ τῷ χρόνῳ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκονομίας καὶ τῷ κατὰ τὴν κλῆσιν ἀπάντων, ἤδη φέρειν τοὺς καρπούς, ἢ πάντως οὐκ <ἔχουσιν ἢ ὀφείλοντες ἔχειν τελείους> ἔχουσι μὲν ἀκαίρως δὲ κυπρίζοντας καὶ οὐκ ἐν καιρῷ ὀμφακίζοντας. εἰ νενόηταί σοι δὴ καθ' ἕκαστον, πῶς δεῖ ἐκλαμβάνειν τὸ ὅτε δὲ ἡγγισεν ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν, μετάβα (εἰ δύνασαι) τῷ λόγῳ ἐπὶ τοὺς παραλαβόντας διὰ Μωσέως τὸν νόμον, ὅτι κἀκείνων ἡγγισέ ποτε ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν καὶ ἀπέστειλε τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ δούλους πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς τοὺς πρώτους πιστευθέντας «τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ» ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαβεῖν [K609] τοὺς καρπούς τοῦ ἐν ἐκάστῳ ἀμπελῶνος. εὐχερὲς μὲν οὖν εἰπεῖν ὅτι δούλους λέγει τοὺς προφήτας. ἀλλὰ ζητητέον πῶς ἀποστέλλονται πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς λαβεῖν τοὺς τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος καρπούς. εἶποι γὰρ ἂν τις ὅτι οὐκ ἐπὶ τῷ λαβεῖν ἀποστέλλονται τοὺς καρπούς οἱ προφηταί, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ γεωργῆσαι μᾶλλον καὶ συνεργῆσαι τοῖς καρποῖς.

Ὅρα οὖν εἰ δυνάμεθα λέγειν τὰ πνευματικὰ καρπώματα καὶ τὰς θείας προσφοράς δίδοσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν γεωργησάντων τὸν ἀμπελῶνα τοῖς ἀποστελλομένοις δούλοις, ἵνα προσαγάγῃσιν ὡς ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ τοὺς καρπούς τοῦ προσφέροντος <λαοῦ>. ἀλλὰ λαβόντες οἱ γεωργοὶ ἐν τῷ λαῷ τοὺς ἀποσταλέντας δούλους λαβεῖν τοὺς καρπούς τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, ὃν μὲν ἔδειραν, ὡς «τὸν Μιχαῖαν ἐπάταξεν εἰς τὴν σιαγόνα» «Σεδεκίας υἱὸς Χαναάν», ὅτε καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ προφητεύσαντι ὁ ψευδοπροφήτης· «ὅποιον πνεῦμα κυρίου τὸ λαλήσαν ἐν σοί;» ὃν δὲ ἀπέκτειναν, ὡς Ζαχαρίαν «μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου», ὃν δὲ ἐλιθοβόλησαν, ὡς τὸν Ἀζαρίαν [K610] υἱὸν τοῦ Ἰωδαὲ τὸν ἱερέα, καθάπερ γέγραπται ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῶν Παραλειπομένων· ἡνίκα γὰρ «πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐνέδυσεν τὸν Ἀζαρίαν τὸν τοῦ Ἰωδαὲ τὸν ἱερέα, καὶ ἀνέστη ἐπάνω τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ εἶπε· τάδε λέγει κύριος· τί παραπορεύεσθε τὰς ἐντολάς κυρίου; καὶ οὐκ εὐοδωθήσεσθε· ὅτι ἐγκατελίπετε τὸν

beginning> of the oracles of God” (Heb 5.12; Rom 3.2). In the same way there are certain people who, as far as the time of the economy of God and to the [time] of everyone with regard to their calling, ought already to be bearing fruits, yet they do not <have> all [their fruit] <or while they ought to have perfect [fruit]> what they have is blooming out of season and is not ripening in [its] season. If this is how you might understand [the passage] with regard to individuals, how should one understand the text, *But when the season of fruits drew near*, one must transfer (if one is able) [the passage] to the word about those who received the law through Moses, for indeed *the season of fruits drew near* at that time for those people and *he sent* his own *servants to the first tenants* who had believed “the oracles of God” for the sake of *receiving* [K609] *the fruits* of the vineyard in each [of them]. It is easy, then, to say that he calls the *servants* the prophets. But one must inquire how they are sent *to the tenants to receive the fruits of the vineyard*. For one might say that the prophets are not sent so as *to receive the fruits*, but rather to tend [the vineyard] and to co-labor for the fruits.

See, then, if we could say that the spiritual fruitages<sup>25</sup> are the divine offerings that those who are tending *the vineyard* give to the servants who are sent, in order that they, acting as priests, might bring to God *the fruits* which the <people> offer up. But *the tenants* among the people *took the servants* who were sent *to receive the fruits* of the vineyard, and *some they beat*, as with “Michaiah” whom “Zedekiah son of Canaan” “struck on the cheek” when also the false prophet said to him who was prophesying, “What manner of spirit of the Lord is it that speaks by you?” (3 Kgdm 22.24); *some they killed*, as with Zechariah “between the temple and the altar” (Matt 23.35), and *some they stoned*, as with Azariah [K610] son of Jodae the priest, just as it is written in the second [book] of Paraleipomenon, for when “the spirit of God came upon Azariah the son of Jodae<sup>26</sup> the priest, and he arose before the people and said: ‘Thus says the Lord: why do you walk against his commandments? And you do not keep on the good path, for you have forsaken the Lord, and he will forsake you’,” [then] “they attacked him, and they stoned him at the command of king Joash in the court of the house of the

<sup>25</sup> This is a customary LXX word for burnt offering.

<sup>26</sup> That is, Jehoiada.

κύριον, καὶ ἐγκαταλείψει ὑμᾶς», «ἐπέθεντο αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐλιθοβόλησαν αὐτὸν δι' ἐντολῆς Ἰωᾶς τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν αὐλῇ οἴκου κυρίου. καὶ οὐκ ἐμνήσθη Ἰωᾶς τοῦ ἐλέους οὗ ἐποίησε μετ' αὐτοῦ Ἰωδαὲ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐθανάτωσε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. καὶ ὡς ἀπέθνησκεν, εἶπεν· ἴδοι κύριος καὶ κρινάτω».	Lord. So Joash did not remember the mercy which Jodae his father had shown him, and he killed his son. And as he was dying, he said, 'May the Lord see and may he judge'" (2 Chron 24.20-22).
---	---

<p>10. Ἐξῆς ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ παραβολῇ ὅτι <i>πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλους δούλους πλείονας τῶν πρώτων, καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτοῖς ὡσαύτως</i>. πλήρης δὲ ἡ γραφή ἐστὶ τῶν συμβεβηκότων τοῖς προφήταις, οὓς <i>ἀπέστειλεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ, ἵνα τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῶν ἀναφέρωσιν ὡς ἅγιοι ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ διὰ τῶν εὐχῶν</i>. ὕστερον δὲ <i>ἀπέστειλε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ</i> μετὰ τοὺς προφῆτας τὸν Χριστόν. ζητήσεις δέ, πῶς ὁ ἀποστέλλων τὸν υἱὸν λέγει μὲν· <i>ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου</i>, ὡς οὐ προκαταλαβὼν [K611] δὲ τὸ μέλλον αὐτῷ συμβαίνειν τοῦτο εἶπεν· οὐ γὰρ φαίνονται κατὰ τὸ ῥητὸν ἐντραπέντες αὐτόν. καὶ φάσκειν γε ἐν τούτοις μὴ προεγνωκέναι τὸ μέλλον τὸν πατέρα τοῦ ἀποσταλέντος υἱοῦ, ἀλλὰ ἐψεῦσθαι ἄλλα εἰπόντα ἄλλων γενομένων, ἀσεβές. <i>πάλιν τε αὖ εἶπεῖν ὅτι ἐνετράπησαν αὐτὸν οἱ γεωργοί, παρὰ τὴν ἐνάργειάν ἐστιν· οἱ γὰρ γεωργοὶ ἰδόντες τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς</i>. ὁ μὲν οὖν τις εἰς ταῦτα φήσει ὅτι ἀναγκαῖον συμβῆναι τὸ <i>ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου</i>, εἰ καὶ μὴ τότε συμβέβηκεν. ὁ δὲ τις ἐρεῖ ὅτι οὐκ εἶπεν ὁ πατὴρ πέμπων τὸν υἱόν· λήψεται ὁ υἱός μου τὸν καρπὸν ἀπὸ τῶν γεωργῶν, ἀλλ' ὅτι <i>ἐντραπήσονται</i>· ἐνετράπησαν μὲν γὰρ τῷ ἐγνωκέναι ὅτι <i>οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς ἦν καὶ εἰρηκέναι αὐτοὺς ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος</i>, οὐ πάντως δέ, εἰ ἐνετράπησαν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπλήχθησαν, ἥδη καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐντρεπομένων πεποιήκασιν. [K612]</p>	<p>10. Next in the parable it is [said] that <i>again he sent other servants more numerous than the first, and they treated them in similar fashion</i>. The Scripture is full of the things that befell the prophets, whom <i>he sent</i> for the sake of the people, in order that the [prophets], as holy priests, might offer up the [people's] fruit to God through [their] prayers. <i>Later</i>, after the prophets, <i>he sent his son</i>, the Christ. But you should inquire how when he sends <i>the Son</i> he says, <i>They will respect my son</i>, and yet he speaks as though he is not anticipating [K611] what was about to happen to him, for according to the letter they do not appear respectful of him. Yet it would be impious to say that in these matters the father did not know beforehand what would happen when he sent the son, but that he was deceived when he spoke about one set of things and other things happened. And furthermore, to say that <i>the tenants</i> respected him is contrary to the evidence, for <i>when the tenants see his son they say to themselves, 'This is the heir'</i> etc. Someone, then, may say in regard to these things that it must necessarily happen that <i>they will respect my son</i>, even if it did not occur at that particular time. But someone else might say that the father, when sending the son, did not say, "My son will receive the fruit from the tenants," but that <i>they will respect</i> [him]. For on the one hand they did in fact respect [him] in that they knew that <i>this</i> was <i>the</i> son and in that they said <i>among themselves</i> that <i>This is the heir</i>, but on the other hand, not completely, since they respected and yet abused him from the beginning, as they had already done the things of people who have regard [for him]. [K612]</p>
---	--

11. Ἄμα δὲ καὶ ζητήσῃ τις, τίνες οὗτοι οἱ γεωργοὶ οἱ εἰπόντες· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν. οὐ γὰρ φαίνονται Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτείναντες αὐτὸν ὡς υἱὸν τοῦ οἰκοδεσπότου. καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο δὲ φήσῃ τις ὅτι, ἡνίκα διελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὅστις εἷη, τινὲς εἶπον ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός, πρὸς οὓς ἀπεκρίναντο ἄλλοι· «ὁ Χριστὸς ὅταν ἔρχηται, οὐδεὶς γινώσκει πόθεν ἐστὶ· τοῦτον δὲ οἶδαμεν πόθεν ἐστίν». εἶτ' ἐπεὶ ἀπὸ τῶν σημείων καὶ τῶν τεραστίων καὶ θείων δυνάμεων πληττόμενοι ἐφρόνουν μὲν αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐχ ὡμολόγουν δέ, καὶ ἀληθὲς μὲν τὸ ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου, ἀληθὲς δὲ καὶ τὸ (ἀπεγνωκότων αὐτῶν ὅτι εἷη ὁ υἱὸς) λελέχθαι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν. διὰ τοῦτο φησὶν ὁ σωτὴρ· «κἀμὲ οἶδατε καὶ οἶδατε πόθεν εἰμί». ἐπιστήσας δὲ τις τοῖς ἀναγεγραμμένοις περὶ τοῦ Ἡρώδου, ἡνίκα [K613] ἔμαθεν ἀπὸ τῶν μάγων τετέχθαι τὸν βασιλέα «τῶν Ἰουδαίων», ὁψεται ὅτι δύνανται οἱ ἀποκτείναντες τὸν σωτῆρα, ἐγνωκότες ὅτι υἱὸς εἷη, οὐδὲν ἤττον ἐπιβεβουλευκέναι αὐτῷ. καὶ γὰρ ὁ Ἡρώδης, μαθὼν ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων ὅτι «ἐν Βηθλεὲμ» «γεννᾶται ὁ Χριστὸς» καὶ συγκαταθέμενος ὅτι Χριστὸς εἷη ὁ γεννώμενος, ἀποστέλλει μὲν αὐτοὺς λέγων· «πορευθέντες ἀκριβῶς ἐξετάσατε περὶ τοῦ παιδίου, ἵνα κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν προσκυνήσω αὐτῷ», οὐδὲν δ' ἤττον ἐπανελθόντων αὐτῶν ἐπεβούλευσε τῷ παιδίῳ, οὐκ ἀπιστῶν ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς ἦν. οὐκ ἂν γὰρ πάντῃ ἀπιστῶν πάντα τὰ παιδιά ἀνεῖλε «τὰ ἐν Βηθλεὲμ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὁρίοις αὐτῆς ἀπὸ διετοῦς καὶ κατωτέρω κατὰ τὸν χρόνον ὃν ἡκρίβωσε παρὰ τῶν μάγων»· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπίστευσεν αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν τὸν προφητευόμενον καὶ ἐβούλετο αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι καὶ τὸ ὅσον γε ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτόν.

Οὕτως οὖν δύνανται καὶ οἱ ἐπιβουλεύσαντες τῷ σωτῆρι ἐγνωκέναι μὲν (οὐχ ὥστε καὶ εἰς ἄλλους φθάσαι τὸν λόγον αὐτῶν, [K614] ἐν ἑαυτοῖς γὰρ εἶπον· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος), οὐδὲν <δ'> ἤττον αὐτὸν ἀνῆρηκέναι. ᾤθησαν γὰρ ἀποκτείναντες τὸν Χριστὸν

11. At the same time, one must also inquire about these vineyard tenants who say, *This is the heir; come, let us kill him*. For the Jews do not appear to have killed him as though<sup>27</sup> a son of the landowner. And to this issue one might say that when they converse with one another as to who he may be, some of them say that “This is the Christ,” to whom others answer, “When the Christ comes, no one will know from where, but we know from where he comes” (Jn 7.27). So, since they were struck with awe from the signs and wonders and divine powers, they thought him to be the Christ of God, but they do not confess [him], such that it is both true that *they will respect my son*, and true when it is said, *This is the heir; come, let us kill him* (for they had rejected that he was the son). On this account the Savior says, “You know me and you know where I come from” (Jn 7.28). Someone who inquires into the things written concerning Herod, when [K613] he learned from the magi that the king “of the Jews” had been born (Matt 2.2), will see that those who killed the Savior were capable, while recognizing that he was son, of having perpetrated no small scheme against him. For indeed when Herod learns from the scribes that “the Christ is to be born” “in Bethlehem” (Matt 2.5) and agrees that the one who was born was the Christ, he sends them, saying, “As you go inquire precisely concerning the child, in order that I may go and worship him” (Matt 2.8), but when they departed he perpetrated no small scheme against the child, while not disbelieving that he was the Christ. For anyone who was completely disbelieving would not destroy all the children “that were in Bethlehem and its regions from age 2 and down according to the time which he determined from the magi” (Matt 2.16). But he did indeed believe him to be the prophesied Christ and he intended to kill him and insofar as it was up to him he would have killed him.

In the same way, then, those who conspired against the Savior could have known [that he was the Christ] (or else they would not have spoken their word to one another, [K614] for *they said among themselves, This is the heir*), <yet> destroyed him nonetheless. For when they killed the Christ, not understanding about his resurrection (“for if they had

<sup>27</sup> This could be read, it seems, either “as though he were the son of the landowner” or “in the same way as the son of the landowner [was killed].”

καὶ μὴ νοοῦντες αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀνάστασιν («εἰ γὰρ ἔγνωσαν, οὐκ ἂν τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης ἐσταύρωσαν») αὐτοὶ κύριοι ἔσεσθαι τῶν πραγμάτων, ἐπεὶ ἀπετύφλωσαν αὐτοὺς ἡ κακία αὐτῶν καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν μυστήρια θεοῦ, καὶ ὡς μὴ ἐγνωκότες αὐτὰ ἐξέβαλον ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος τὸν υἱὸν καὶ ἀπέκτειναν αὐτόν. τὸ δὲ ἐξέβαλον ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος τοιοῦτον εἶναί μοι φαίνεται· τὸ ὅσον ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς, ἀλλότριον αὐτὸν εἶναι ἔκριναν καὶ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος καὶ τῶν γεωργῶν, ἡνίκα κατεψηφίζοντο αὐτοῦ τὴν πρὸς θάνατον ψῆφον. καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ σωτὴρ πυνθάνεται τῶν καὶ αὐτῶν γεωργῶν πονηρῶν λέγων αὐτοῖς ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, τί ποιήσει τοῖς γεωργοῖς ἐκεῖνοις; οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῶν κριθησόμενοι καὶ καταδικασθῆσόμενοι ὡς κακοὶ κακῶς ἀπολούμενοι καὶ μηκέτι μέλλοντες ἔχειν «τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ», τὸ κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει αὐτούς, καὶ τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἐκδώσεται ἄλλοις γεωργοῖς, οἵτινες ἀποδώσουσιν αὐτῷ τοὺς καρποὺς ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν. [K615] καὶ οἶονεὶ προφητεύουσιν ὁμοίως τῷ Καϊάφᾳ τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ «τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου», καὶ «ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ» μὴ εἰρηκότε τὸ ἀληθές, ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ «ἀρχιερεὺς» ἦν <προφητεύσαντι>· προφητεύουσι δὲ περὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν ὅτι δώσουσι τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ τοὺς καρποὺς ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν.

known, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory” [1 Cor 2.8]), they were intending for themselves to become the lords over the matters [of the vineyard], since their vice had blinded them and they did not understand the mysteries of God. And so, not understanding these [mysteries], *they cast the son out of the vineyard and killed him*. This text, “*they cast him out of the vineyard,*” suggests to me that, insofar as it related to them, they judged him to be a foreigner to both the vineyard and the tenants, when they cast the condemning vote for his death. The Savior inquires about these things from, indeed, the wicked tenants themselves, when he says to them, *When the Lord of the vineyard comes, what will he do to these tenants? And they say to him—*[anticipating] from their own mouth that they will be judged and will be condemned as the wicked who are destroyed *wickedly* and as about to no longer possess “the oracles of God” (Rom 3.2)—that *he will destroy the wicked ones wickedly, and the vineyard will be given to other tenants, such as will give to the fruit in their seasons*. [K615] They are, as it were, prophesying in a fashion similar to Caiaphas the high priest “of that year,” who <prophesied> because he was “high priest” but did not speak the truth “from himself” (Jn 11.51). But they are prophesying concerning the nations that they will give *the fruits in their seasons* to the landowner.

12. Εἴτα ὁ σωτὴρ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς αὐτοὺς δυσωπεῖ, νομίζοντας εἶναι καὶ οἰκοδόμους τοῦ λαοῦ, ὅτι λίθον αὐτὸν ὄντα καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθέντα ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ πατὴρ θήσῃ τῆς ὅλης οἰκοδομῆς κεφαλὴν, συνέχοντα δύο γωνίας παλαιᾶς καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης καὶ δύο λαῶν οἰκοδομάς. τοιοῦτον γάρ ἐστι τὸ οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς· λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας· [K616] παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη, καὶ ἔστι θαυμαστή ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν; κεῖται δὲ ἡ λέξις ἐν τῷ ἑκατοστῷ ἑπτακαίδεκάτῳ Ψαλμῷ, ὃς ἐστι πρὸ τοῦ πολυστιχωτά του Ψαλμοῦ τεταγμένος, καὶ ἔχει οὕτως τὸ ρητόν· «λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας· παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη, καὶ ἔστι

12. Then, with passages from their own Scriptures, the Savior silences those who consider themselves to be the builders of the people, [saying] that he is the very *stone* which was rejected by them which the Father will put as the *head* of the whole building, connecting the two corners of the Old and New Covenants and the two buildings of nations. For such is the text, *Have you never read in the Scriptures: ‘The stone which the builders rejected, this one has come to be the head of the corner; [K616] this has happened from the Lord, and it is marvelous in our eyes’?* (Matt 21.42). The text comes from the 117<sup>th</sup> Psalm, which is placed in order just before the Psalm of many verses (πολυστιχωτά), and whose text reads in this way: “The stone which the builders rejected, this has come to be the head of the corner; this has happened from the Lord,



θαυμαστή ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν. αὕτη ἡ ἡμέρα ἦν ἐποίησεν ὁ κύριος, ἀγαλλιασώμεθα καὶ εὐφρανθῶμεν ἐν αὐτῇ». καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο τῶν περὶ Χριστοῦ προφητευομένων δύναται δυσωπῆσαι τὸν ἀγνωμόνως ἐξετάζοντα τὰ γεγραμμένα, καὶ τοῦτο ἐν αὐτοῖς ἂν ταχθεῖ. εἰ γὰρ μὴ περὶ λίθου ὁ προφήτης ἀναισθήτου ταῦτα λέγει, ὡς εἶποι τις ἂν ἡλίθιος ἀνὴρ, δῆλον ἂν εἴη ὅτι ὁ ἀποδοδοκιμασμένος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν τῷ λαῷ ἐκείνῳ σοφῶν καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων Ἰησοῦς, οὗτος ἀληθῶς ἐγένετο ὡς κεφαλὴ ἐκκλησίας εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας, ἐνῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνάγων τὰς δύο διαθήκας. καὶ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ κεφαλὴ δῶρον παρὰ κυρίου τῇ ὅλῃ οἰκοδομῇ δεδομένη καὶ θαυμαστὴ κεφαλὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, δυναμένων αὐτὴν βλέπειν. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, ἐπεὶ ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες τοῦτον τὸν λίθον, ἦρθη μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν γεωργῶν ἐκείνων καὶ τῶν οἰκοδόμων ἐκείνων [K617] «τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ», ἐν οἷς ἦν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐδόθη δὲ ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς. εἰ δὲ ἀληθὲς τὸ <ἀρθήσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ> δοθήσεται ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς, δηλονότι οὐδενὶ τῶν μὴ ποιούντων τοὺς καρποὺς τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ βασιλείας δίδεται ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ βασιλεία· οὐδενὶ γὰρ βασιλευομένῳ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας δίδεται ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ βασιλεία.

Ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις πῶς, εἰ μηδενὶ δίδεται ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ βασιλεία τῷ μὴ ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς, ἐδόθη ἐκείνοις ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ βασιλεία ἀφ' ὧν ἦρθη, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον· ἀρθήσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ; καὶ πρόσχες εἰ δυνάμεθα, ὡς ἐν τηλικαύτῃ δυσχερείᾳ ὄντες οὐ πάνυ τι εὐαποδότου προβλήματος, ἐπιστήσαντες τῇ διαφορᾷ τῶν εἰρημένων περὶ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος πρότερον καὶ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ δεύτερον, ἐπιλύσασθαι τὸ ζητούμενον. [K618] οὐκ εἴρηται δὴ περὶ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος ὅπερ εἴρηται περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ. περὶ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος κατὰ τὸ πρότερον γέγραπται ὅτι ἐξέδοτο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς, περὶ δὲ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ ὅτι δοθήσεται ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς. ἦν δ' ἂν ἄλυστον τὸ κατὰ τὸν τρόπον εἰ, ὥσπερ

and it is marvelous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord made, let us rejoice and let us delight in it” (Ps 117.22-24). And if something else of the things prophesied concerning Christ is able to silence the one who investigates without any sense the things that have been written, let this also be applied to them. For unless the prophet says these things in reference to an insensate rock (λίθου ἀναισθήτου), as someone might say that a man is “stone-dumb” (ἡλίθιος),<sup>28</sup> it should be obvious that Jesus who was rejected by the sages and high priests and elders and scribes among this people, *this One* truly became the *head of the corner* as the head of the church, uniting and gathering the two covenants into one and the same [building]. Indeed he is the head which is a gift given from the Lord to whole building and the head is *marvelous in our eyes*, those [of us] who are able to see it. And on account of this, since *the builders rejected this stone*, [K617] “the oracles of God” (Rom 3.2)—in which was the Kingdom of God—were taken from these tenants and these builders, but was given *to a nation producing its fruits*. But if it is true that <*the kingdom of God will be taken from you and*> *will be given to a nation producing its fruits*, manifestly *the kingdom of God* is not given to those who do not produce *the fruits* of the Kingdom of God, for *the Kingdom of God* is given to no one who is being ruled by sin.

But someone might say, if *the Kingdom of God* is not given to anyone who does not produce its fruits, how was *the Kingdom of God* given [in the first place] to those ones from whom it was [then] taken, in accordance with what is said: *The Kingdom of God will be taken from you*? Even though we are in such a great difficulty with a problem that has no ready solution, do attend if, having inquired into the difference of the things said first concerning the vineyard and second concerning the kingdom of God, we are able to elucidate the question that has been asked. [K618] What is said concerning the kingdom of God is not said concerning the vineyard. For it is written concerning the vineyard in the first place that *he rented it out to the tenants*, but concerning the kingdom

<sup>28</sup> Origen notes the perjorative pun in Greek whereby the word “stone” is associated with an epithet for “foolishness.”

ἐξέδοτο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς γεγραμμένον <ἦν> ἐπὶ τοῦ προτέρου, οὕτως εἶρητο καὶ περὶ τοῦ δευτέρου· ἐκδοθήσεται ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς, καὶ εἰ, ὥσπερ εἶρηται περὶ τῶν δευτέρων· καὶ δοθήσεται ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς, εἶρητο καὶ περὶ τῶν προτέρων ὅτι ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἡμεῖς εἰς τὸν τόπον ἐπηπορήσαμεν καὶ τὸ φανὲν ἡμῖν εἰρήκαμεν· ὁ δὲ βέλτιον δυνάμενος καὶ [K619] νοεῖν καὶ λέγειν, ἐκεῖνος ἡμῶν μᾶλλον ἀκουέσθω.

of God that *it will be given to a nation producing its fruits*. The issue with this passage would be unsolvable if the [phrase] *he rented it out to the tenants* <which was> written about the first, was also said in reference to the second: “he will rent it out *to a nation producing its fruits*,” and if, just as it was said concerning the second, *it will be given to a nation producing its fruits*, it was also said concerning the first that “he gave *it to tenants*.” These are the questions we have raised about this passage and we have spoken what occurred to us. But should there be one who is better both at [K619] understanding and speaking, do listen to him rather than us.

13. Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τὰς παραβολὰς αὐτοῦ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι περὶ αὐτῶν λέγει· καὶ ζητοῦντες κρατῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐφοβήθησαν τοὺς ὄχλους, ἐπεὶ εἰς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον (21.45-46). Ἀκούσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τὰς παραβολὰς αὐτοῦ, ὧν τῆς μὲν ἐτέρας ἀρχὴ ἦν· «ἄνθρωπός τις εἶχε τέκνα δύο», τῆς δὲ λοιπῆς· «ἄνθρωπος ἦν οἰκοδεσπότης ὃς ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα», ἔγνωσαν ὅτι περὶ αὐτῶν λέγει· κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἐτέραν παραβολὴν ὅτι εἶπεν ὁ δεῦτερος υἱός· «ἐγὼ κύριε, καὶ οὐκ ἀπηλθε», κατὰ δὲ τὴν λοιπὴν ὅτι, ἐπεὶ εἶρηται αὕτη κατὰ τὰ λελεγμένα κατὰ τῶν ἀμαρτανόντων προτέρων γεωργῶν, <ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε> τὸ «ἄρθήσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ δοθήσεται ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς». καὶ γνόντες ὅτι περὶ αὐτῶν λέγει, ἐζήτησαν μὲν αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι καὶ ποιῆσαι αὐτῷ ὅτι ποτ' ἂν δυνηθῶσιν· οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν δέ, ἐπεὶ μὴ οἰοί τε ἦσαν ὑπομεῖναι ὄχλων ὁρμὴν τῶν [K620] ἐχόντων τὸν Ἰησοῦν εἰς προφήτην. καὶ ὅσοι γε ἐπιβουλευτικῶς βούλονται κρατῆσαι τὸν λόγον, ἴν' ὡς κεκρατημένον παρ' αὐτοῖς κατέλωσιν αὐτόν, οὗτοι οὐκ ἂν ποτε κρατήσαιεν <οὔτε θανατώσαιεν> αὐτόν, τῶν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ὄχλων προφήτην τινὰ τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτὸν ὑπολαμβανόντων, περισπώντων τοὺς βουλομένους αὐτὸν κρατεῖν καὶ ἐπιβουλεῦσαι αὐτῷ.

13. And when the chief priests and the Pharisees heard his parables, they knew that he was speaking about them; and seeking to seize him they feared the crowds, since they held him [to be] a prophet (21.45-46). When the chief priests and the Pharisees heard his parables, the first of which was “A certain man had two sons” (Matt 21.28), and the next, “There was a landowning man who planted a vineyard” (21.33-44), they knew that he was speaking about them: with regard to the first parable, what he said about the second son, “‘I will, Lord’, but he did not go” (Matt 21.30), and with regard to the next [parable] that, since in accordance with the things recorded it was said against the first group of tenants who were sinning, <Jesus said,> “the kingdom of God will be taken from you and will be given to a nation producing its fruit” (Matt 21.43). And knowing that he was speaking about them, they sought to seize him and to do to him whatever they could then; but they were unable, since they were not of the sort to stand up to the opinion of the crowds who [K620] held Jesus [to be] a prophet. And these people desired to seize the Word treacherously, so that having seized him they might destroy him, [but] they would not at that time seize <nor even kill> him, [because] the crowds supposed him [to be] some sort of prophet of God, [and thus the crowds] restrained those who desired to seize him and to plot against him.

<p>Μετὰ ταῦτα ἰστέον ὅτι τῶν ζητούντων κρατεῖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν διαφοραὶ εἰσιν. ἄλλως γὰρ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐζήτουν κρατῆσαι αὐτόν, ἄλλως ἢ ἐν τῷ Ἄισματι τῶν ἁσμάτων νύμφη, &lt;ἦ&gt; ζητήσασα αὐτόν καὶ ἀναστᾶσα καὶ κυκλοῦσα ἐν πόλει, «ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις» μόγις ποτὲ εὔρεν αὐτόν, ὅτε μικρὸν παρήλθε τοὺς τηροῦντας καὶ κυκλοῦντας «ἐν τῇ πόλει» καὶ εὐροῦσα ἐκράτησεν αὐτόν, ὅτε καὶ λέγει· «ἐκράτησα αὐτόν καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆσω αὐτόν, ἕως οὗ εἰσάγαγον αὐτόν εἰς οἶκον μητρός μου καὶ εἰς ταμιεῖον τῆς συλλαβούσης με». ἀλλὰ [K621] καὶ αὐτὴ &lt;αὕτη&gt; ἡ νύμφη κατ' ἀρχὰς μὲν τοῦ Ἄισματος τῶν ἁσμάτων «ἐκράτησά» φησιν «αὐτόν εἰς οἶκον μητρός μου καὶ εἰς ταμιεῖον τῆς συλλαβούσης με», πρὸς δὲ τῷ τέλει τοῦ αὐτοῦ βιβλίου, ὡς προκόψασα καὶ ἐτέρως αὐτόν μέλλουσα κρατεῖν καὶ βέλτιον παρὰ τὸ πρότερον, φησίν· «εἶπα· ἀναβήσομαι ἐν τῷ φοίνικι, κρατήσω τῶν ὕψεων αὐτοῦ». ἵνα δὲ νοήσης τοὺς ζητούντας αὐτόν κρατῆσαι ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ Φαρισαίους καὶ μὴ κρατοῦντας αὐτόν, κατανόησον ὅτι ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν ἄλλων παρὰ τὸν Χριστοῦ λόγον λόγων οἷόν τέ ἐστι κρατῆσαι καὶ περιδράσασθαι &lt;καὶ χωρίσαι&gt; τοῦ νοῦ (τῶν ὀτιποτοῦν δογματισάντων) καὶ τεθεωρημένως ἀνατρέψαι αὐτόν καὶ (ὡς ἡ γραφὴ ὠνόμασε) συμβιβάσαι. *** οὕτω γὰρ ὁ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον σοφός, ὡς «πνευματικός» ἀνακρίνων «πάντα, αὐτὸς δὲ ὑπ' οὐδενός» ἀνακρινόμενος, ἀνακρίνει μὲν καὶ βασανίζει καὶ διελέγχει τοὺς ἄλλους [K622] λόγους εἴτε τῶν τοῦ κόσμου σοφῶν εἴτε τῶν ἐν ταῖς αἰρέσεσι διαπρέπειν δοκούντων, οὐ κατακρίνεται δὲ οὐδὲ καταλαμβάνεται ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ νοῦς τοῦ Χριστοῦ οὐδὲ κρατεῖται ὑπὸ τῶν προθεμένων αὐτόν ἀνατρέπειν· «τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου, ὃς συμβιβάσει αὐτόν;» καὶ σαφὲς ὅτι, εἴπερ μέλλει τις συμβιβάσαι τινὸς νοῦν, πρότερον αὐτόν γνώσεται καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο</p>	<p>After these things one must observe that there are differences among those who are seeking to <i>seize</i> Jesus. For it is one thing for <i>the chief priests and the Pharisees</i> to seek to <i>seize him</i>, and another thing when the bride in the Song of Songs (cf. Song 3.1-4) [tries] with difficulty at one point to find him “in the markets and in the open places,” after &lt;she&gt; sought for him and arose and went about in the city. Then a little later she eluded those guarding and surrounding “the city,” and when she found him she seized him, then she says: “I seized him and I would not let him go, until they brought him unto the house of my mother and unto the inner chamber of her who conceived me” (Song 3.4). But [K621] this &lt;same&gt; bride who at the beginning of the Song of Songs says “I seized him [...]”<sup>29</sup> for the house of my mother and unto the inner chamber of her who conceived me” (Song 3.4<sup>30</sup>), towards the end of the same book, as though pursuing him another time and about to seize him in a better way than the first time, says, “I said, I will ascend in the palm tree, I will seize his heights” (Song 7.9). ^But in order that you might understand <i>the chief priests</i> and Pharisees who are seeking to <i>seize him</i> and yet do not seize him, you should observe that when it comes to words that are other than the word of Christ <i>to seize</i> is as it were to grasp<sup>31</sup> &lt;and to divide&gt; the meaning<sup>32</sup> (of those who are opining on whatever [subject]) and with deliberation<sup>33</sup> to overthrow it and (as the Scripture terms it) to come to terms [with it] (cf. 1 Cor 2.16). *** For just as he who is wise according to the gospel, who as a “spiritual person” judges “all things, but” is judged “by no one” (1 Cor 2.15), judges and tests and reproves other [K622] words whether of the sages of the world, or of those who seem to be eminent in heresies, but the mind of Christ in him is not condemned nor apprehended nor seized by those who intend to overthrow it: “for who knows the mind of the Lord, who will instruct him?” (1 Cor</p>
---	---

<sup>29</sup> As is evident, this quotation seems to be elliptical, hence our inserted ellipsis.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. also Song 8.2.

<sup>31</sup> περιδράσσω, PGL, 1064, especially def. B.3. An intellectual grasping/controlling.

<sup>32</sup> Or “mind” (τοῦ νοῦ), along with the subsequent reference to the “mind of Christ.”

<sup>33</sup> τεθεωρημένως, PGL, 1379. Other suggestions: *with circumspection/carefully; spiritually.*

<p>συμβιβάσει· «νοῦν» δὲ «κυρίου τίς» γνώσεται «ὅς συμβιβάσει αὐτόν»; ἀλώσεται γὰρ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἴξει αὐτῷ. καὶ ταῦτα δέ μοι λελέχθω διὰ τὸ καὶ ζητοῦντες αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι ἐφοβήθησαν τοὺς ὄχλους, ἐπεὶ εἰς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.</p>	<p>2.16; Isa 40.13).<sup>34</sup> [So] also it is clear that, since someone who is about to instruct the mind of someone, he must first know him and after this he will instruct; but “who” will know “the mind of the Lord, who will instruct him”? For he will be caught by him and he will yield to him. These are the things that I would offer in regard to [the passage], <i>And seeking to seize him they feared the crowds, since they held him [to be] a prophet.</i></p>
--	--

<p>14. Πλὴν κὰν εὐφημῶσιν οἱ ὄχλοι τὸν Ἰησοῦν, φρονοῦσι μὲν τι περὶ αὐτοῦ ἀληθές, οὐ μὴν &lt;καὶ&gt; τὸ μέγεθος συνιᾶσιν αὐτοῦ. ἦν μὲν γὰρ Ἰησοῦς καὶ προφήτης, ὡς δῆλον τῷ νοήσαντι τὸ «προφήτην ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ἀναστήσει ὑμῖν κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ· αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε κατὰ πάντα ὅσα ἂν λαλήσῃ» ὁ προφήτης ἐκεῖνος. ὃς δ' ἂν «μὴ ἀκούσῃ τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου ἐξολοθρευθήσεται<sup>35</sup>». πλὴν οὐχ ἡ ὑπεροχὴ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ αὐτὸν εἶναι ἦν ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ υἱὸν θεοῦ πρωτότοκον «πάσης κτίσεως» καὶ εἰκόνα «τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου», ἐν ᾧ «ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, εἴτε ὁρατὰ εἴτε ἀόρατα», καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. καὶ μᾶλλον ἦν αὐτοῦ ἡ ὑπεροχὴ ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν σοφίαν τὴν λέγουσαν· «ὁ θεὸς ἐκτήσατό με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ», πρὸ τοῦ τι ποιῆσαι, καὶ «πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσέ με ἐν ἀρχῇ, πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γῆν ποιῆσαι» καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. καὶ τούτους γε τοὺς ὄχλους οὕτως φρονοῦντας περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐτοιμῶς ἔχοντας ὑπερπολεμεῖν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς πολεμοῦντας, φοβοῦνται οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, καὶ οὐ δύνανται, ἵν' ἐπιβουλεύσωσι θέλοντες κρατῆσαι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, κρατῆσαι αὐτοῦ. ἐνταῦθα μὲν οὖν γέγραπται· ἐπεὶ</p>	<p>14. While indeed the crowds may speak well of Jesus, [in that] they perceive something true about him, yet they by no means understand his greatness. For Jesus was indeed a prophet, as is evident to the one who understands, “A prophet from your brothers the Lord your God will raise up for you like me; Him shall you hear in all things such as” this prophet “will speak” (Deut 18.15). He “who does not listen to this prophet will be utterly destroyed” (Deut 18.19). Yet his supremacy was not that he was a prophet but in the fact that he is Son of God, firstborn “of all creation” and image “of the invisible God,” in whom “all things in heaven and on earth were created, whether visible or invisible,” etc. (Col 1.15f). And even more so, his supremacy comes from the fact that he himself is Wisdom who says, “God acquired me a beginning of his ways for his works” (Prov 8.22<sup>36</sup>), before making anything, and “before the age he founded me in the beginning, before making the earth,” etc. (Prov 8.23-24). Because these crowds were thinking this way<sup>37</sup> about him and were prepared to fight on his behalf against those would fight [against him], <i>the chief priests and the Pharisees</i> feared [the crowd] and were unable <i>to seize</i> him, despite conspiring with the intention to <i>seize</i> Jesus. Here therefore it is written: <i>since they held him [to be] a prophet</i>; and by this you should conclude that the crowds, even though according to</p>
--	---

<sup>34</sup> See Balthasar, *Origen: Spirit & Fire*, par 424 (pg. 173). Balthasar renders the crucial line rather freely as follows: “It is possible to grasp the spirit of each and every system, gain control of it and, as scripture says, come to terms with it.” The term συμβιβάω seems to answer to the earlier term “to divide” (χωρίζω), and unlike in 1 Cor 2.16 where it has the sense of “instructing,” here it seems to connote a bringing together as in “concluding.”

<sup>35</sup> ἐξολοθρευθήσεται This reading must be Hexaplaric; it is not the LXX.

<sup>36</sup> Origen interestingly diverts from the LXX rendering of this verse, using “acquired” rather than “created,” as well as having “God” as subject rather than “Lord.” The Latin text of the Commentary has “created” (*creavit*).

<sup>37</sup> I.e., that Jesus was a [mere] prophet.

εἰς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον· παρὰ τοῦτο δ' ἂν ποιήσῃς ὅτι οἱ ὄχλοι, κἄν μὲν τῇ λέξει ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν ἔχουσιν, εἰς ὃ τι ποτ' ἂν ἔχουσιν αὐτόν, πολλῶ ἔλαττον ἔχουσιν αὐτόν οὗ ἐστίν, [K624] οὐ φθάνοντες οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τὴν «ἐκ μέρους» γνῶσιν τῶν «ἐκ μέρους» αὐτὸν γινωσκόντων καὶ οὐδὲν <ἄξιον> τρανοῦντες περὶ αὐτοῦ.

Τοῦτο δὲ λέγω περὶ τῶν ἀληθῶς περὶ αὐτοῦ φρονούντων. οὐ νομιστέον γὰρ εἶναι <ὑπὲρ> αὐτοῦ τοὺς τὰ ψεύδη φρονοῦντας περὶ αὐτοῦ φαντασία τοῦ δοξάζειν αὐτόν, ὅποιοί εἰσιν οἱ συγχέοντες πατὴρ καὶ υἱοῦ ἔννοιαν καὶ τῇ ὑποστάσει ἓνα διδόντες εἶναι τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν, τῇ ἐπινοίᾳ μόνῃ καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασι <μόνοις> διαιροῦντες τὸ ἐν ὑποκείμενον. καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν αἱρέσεων φαντασία τοῦ μεγάλα περὶ αὐτοῦ φρονεῖν «ἀδικίαν εἰς τὸ ὕψος» λαλοῦντες καὶ κακῶς λέγοντες τὸν δημιουργὸν οὐκ εἰσιν <ὑπὲρ> αὐτοῦ· οὐ γὰρ εἰσι «μετ'» αὐτοῦ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἰσι «κατ'» αὐτοῦ, «ὅ γὰρ μὴ ὦν (φησὶ) μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστίν». οὕτω δὲ κἄν συνάγωσιν οἱ μὴ τὰ ἀληθῆ περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ φρονοῦντες ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ, σκορπίζουσι μᾶλλον ἢ συνάγουσι. φησὶ γὰρ ὁ σωτήρ· «καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ' ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει»· καὶ πρόσχες [K625] ὅτι μὴ εἴρηται ἀπλῶς· «ὁ μὴ συνάγων σκορπίζει», ἀλλὰ μετὰ ἀκριβοῦς προσθήκης τῆς «μετ' ἐμοῦ», δεῖ γὰρ τὸν συνάγοντα μετ' αὐτοῦ συνάγειν. νοήσεις δὲ τὸν μετ' αὐτοῦ συνάγοντα ἐπιστήσας τῷ «συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ σατανᾷ

the text they held him [*to be*] a prophet, which while holding him to be something he indeed was<sup>38</sup> yet in so doing they held him to be much less than he actually is, [K624] they had not come either to the knowledge “in part” of those who know him “in part” (1 Cor 13.9) nor were they clear concerning his <dignity>.

Now I say this concerning those who hold a true way of thinking concerning him. For we must not consider that they are “for” him<sup>39</sup> who think false things concerning him with the notion of glorifying him, such as those who conflate the understanding of Father and Son, supposing the Father and the Son to be one in subject [τῇ ὑποστάσει ἓνα], distinguishing the one subject [τὸ ἐν ὑποκείμενον]<sup>40</sup> with concept alone and with names <alone>.<sup>41</sup> Indeed those from the heretical sects who by an imagination of thinking great things concerning him speak “unrighteousness unto the height” (Ps 72.8) and say wicked things about the Creator are not “for” him, for they are not “with” him and therefore are “against” him, for he says, “the one who is not with me is against me” (Matt 12.30). Thus if those who do not think in a true way about the Son might gather in the name of Jesus, they scatter rather than gather. For the Savior says, “The one who does not gather with me scatters” (Matt 12.30). But you should also attend [K625] that it is not simply said, “The one who does not gather scatters,” but with the precise addition of “with me,” for it is necessary that he who gathers does so with Him. You will understand [what it means for] one to gather with him should you inquire into [the passage], “when you are gathered, along with my spirit, with the power of the Lord Jesus to deliver over such a one to Satan for the

<sup>38</sup> Such is our labored attempt to render this clause: εἰς ὃ τι ποτ' ἂν ἔχουσιν αὐτόν lit. “they may hold him for something he then [was].”

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Mark 9.40 (Klostermann mistakenly points the reader to Mk 12.40.)

<sup>40</sup> Cf. ὑπόκειμαι, PGL 1449, def. 2: “τὸ ὑποκείμενον as equivalent of ὑπόστασις,” referencing Origen, *Comm. Jn.* 10.37.

<sup>41</sup> That is, the modalists do not think that the names “Father, Son, Holy Spirit” refer to an ontological or personal differentiation in the Godhead, but are purely nominal terms for the one God denoting different modes of external relationality. See G. L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought*, 160-1, though Prestige seems unaware of the *Comm. Matt.* passage. Cf. *Comm. Jn.* 2.10.75-76 (Heine, 114), a passage which is (regrettably) amenable to the *filioque* teaching: Ἡμεῖς μέντοι γε τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις πειθόμενοι τυγχάνειν, τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ ἀγέννητον μηδὲν ἕτερον τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι πιστεύοντες, ὡς εὐσεβέστερον καὶ ἀληθὲς προσιέμεθα τὸ πάντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου γενομένων τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα πάντων εἶναι τιμιώτερον, καὶ τάξει <πρῶτον> πάντων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς διὰ Χριστοῦ γεγεννημένων. 2.10.76 Καὶ τάχα αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ μὴ καὶ αὐτὸ υἱὸν χρηματίζειν τοῦ θεοῦ, μόνου τοῦ μονογενοῦς φύσει υἱοῦ ἀρχῆθεν τυγχάνοντος, οὗ χρήζειν ἔοικε τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διακονοῦντος αὐτοῦ τῇ ὑποστάσει, οὐ μόνον εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἀλλὰ καὶ σοφὸν εἶναι καὶ λογικὸν καὶ δίκαιον καὶ πᾶν ὁτιποῦν χρὴ αὐτὸ νοεῖν τυγχάνειν κατὰ μετοχὴν τῶν προειρημένων ἡμῖν Χριστοῦ ἐπινοιών. Cf. “Holy Spirit,” in *Westminster Handbook of Patristic Theology*, p. 168-9; McGuckin, “Trinity in the Greek Fathers,” in *Cambridge Companion to the Trinity*, p. 61.

εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός»· τὸ γὰρ «συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ» δηλοῖ τὸν συνάγοντα μετ' αὐτοῦ. καὶ οὐκ ἂν λέγοις τὸ «συναχθέντων ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ» ἀρμόζειν τοῖς ἥτοι μετὰ τοῦ κακῶς βιοῦν συνάγουσιν ἥτοι συναγομένοις ἢ μετὰ τοῦ κακῶς καὶ ἀσεβῶς φρονεῖν περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ.

Ταῦτα καὶ διὰ τὸ τοὺς ὄχλους φρονοῦντας περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τοὺς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ πολλῶ ἔλαττον φρονοῦντας τῆς ἀξίας αὐτοῦ, λέγεσθαι εἰς προφήτην αὐτὸν ἐσχηκέναι. συνεξετάσας δὲ τούτοις τὴν τοῦ Λουκᾶ περὶ τῶν ὁμοίων λέξιν τρανότερον (οἶμαι) κατασκευάσεις τὰ προειρημένα· ὅστις φησί· «καὶ ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ· οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς [K626] καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν ἀπολέσαι, καὶ οὐχ εὑρίσκον τί ποιήσουσιν· ὁ γὰρ λαὸς ἅπας ἐξεκρέματο αὐτοῦ ἀκούων». καὶ ἐν τούτοις γὰρ δηλοῦται ὅτι οἱ τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν προϊστάμενοι παρανόμως ὄχλων (ὀνομαζόμενοι ἀρχιερεῖς) καὶ γραμματεῖς (ἐχθροὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ) καὶ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ ζητοῦσι μὲν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπολέσαι καὶ ἀφανίσει τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ πίστιν· οὐχ εὑρίσκουσι δὲ τί ποιήσουσιν εἰς ὅπερ βούλονται ἀνύσαι, ἅτε προληφθέντος παντὸς τοῦ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύσαντος λαοῦ καὶ ἐξηρημένου τῆς εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀγάπης καὶ ἐκκρεμαμένου ἐν τῷ ἀκούειν τῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἔστι γε τοῦτο ἰδεῖν μέχρι τοῦ δεῦρο, τίνα τρόπον ζητοῦσι καθελεῖν οἱ προβαλλόμενοι τὴν θεραπείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς ἀρχιερεῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν θείαν γραφὴν ὡς γραμματεῖς καὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ὡς [οἱ] πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ, <καὶ> ζητοῦσιν ἀπολέσαι τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἐξαφανίσει τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ δόξαν, πάντα εἰς τοῦτο ἀκολούθως τῷ βουλήματι τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν πράττοντες, οὐ μὴν εὑρίσκοντες τί ποιήσουσιν, ἵνα τὸν ἐξηρημένον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λαὸν ἀποστήσωσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπαλείψωσιν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς διανοίας αὐτῶν. [K627]

destruction of the flesh” (1 Cor 5.4-5), for “when you are gathered, along with my spirit, with the power of the Lord Jesus” indicates the one who is gathering with him. You would not say that “when you are gathered in the power of the Lord Jesus” agrees with those who either gather together in a wicked manner of life or are gathered with a wicked or impious manner of thinking concerning God or his Christ.

[We have said] these things on account of the crowds who are said to have held *him [to be] a prophet*, and are “for” him yet are entertaining opinions about Jesus that are much inferior to his [actual] dignity. Were you to inquire about this passage [in Matthew] in connection with the narrative of Luke that covers the same matters in (I think) a clearer way, you would confirm the things we have just said. The [narrative] says, “And he was teaching daily in the temple, and the chief priests and the scribes and the elders of the people were seeking to destroy him, yet they were finding no way to do anything, for the whole people was spellbound as they listened to him”<sup>42</sup> (Lk 19.47-48). For in this passage it is indicated that those who are unlawful leaders of the Jewish crowds<sup>43</sup> (who are named chief priests) and the scribes (who are hostile to Jesus) and the elders of the people are seeking Jesus to destroy him and to erase his name from among men along with the faith concerning him. But they were finding no way to do what they wanted to accomplish, since the whole people had previously received and believed on him and were devoted in their love for Jesus and were spellbound as they listened to his teaching and his discourse (τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ). One should also observe that up to this point there is a certain figural pattern (τίνα τρόπον), with those who perform the service of God as his chief priests, and the divine Scripture as scribes, and the leadership as elders of the people seeking to condemn him, <and> they are seeking to destroy Jesus and to erase his reputation, doing all this as though in lockstep with the counsel of their ancestors, except they find no way to do anything, such that they might drive away from him the people that are devoted to Jesus and might expunge him from their mind. [K627]

<sup>42</sup> Cf. NRSV for translation of ἐκκρεμάννυμι as “to be spellbound.”

<sup>43</sup> Latin text of commentary assumes “words” (λόγων) here.

<p>Τάχα δὲ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἡντινοῦν δόξαν ἔχοντες περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πρεσβεύοντες περὶ αὐτῆς ἀλλοτρίως τῆς Ἰησοῦ διδασκαλίας ἀπολέσαι μὲν θέλουσι τὸν Ἰησοῦν, οὐ δύνανται δέ, ἐπεὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος αὐτοῦ ἐκκρέμαται ἀκούων. ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ οἰσιτισινὸν συγγράμμασιν ἧς δῆποτε σοφίας προσέχοντες καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τροπικῶς λεγόμενοι γραμματεῖς ἀπολέσαι θέλουσιν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τὸν Ἰησοῦν, οὐ μὴν εὐρίσκουσιν εἰς τοῦτο ἀνύσιμον ὃ ποιήσουσι. καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, &lt;οἱ ἀλλότριοι&gt; τῆς Ἰησοῦ διδασκαλίας λόγιοι Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων, ἀπολέσαι θέλουσι τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἀλλ' οὐ δύνανται νικώμενοι ἀπὸ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐκκρεμαμένου τοῦ διδασκάλου ἐν τῷ ἀκούειν καὶ συναισθάνεσθαι τῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ. καὶ ὁ Μᾶρκος δὲ τὰ παραπλήσια ὑποβάλλει λέγων· «καὶ ἤκουσαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς, καὶ ἐζήτουν πῶς αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν· ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ αὐτόν, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἐξεπλήσσετο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ». πᾶς γὰρ ὁ λαὸς Χριστοῦ ἐκπλήσσεται «ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ», καὶ οὐδὲν δύναται γενέσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν προειρημένων ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων, ζητούντων ἀπολέσαι τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐκλῦσαι [K628] τὴν ἐκκληζιν παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ.</p>	<p>Perhaps indeed all those who hold that sort of opinion concerning the deity and who rule as elder in a way foreign to the teaching of Jesus concerning it, desire to destroy Jesus, but they are not able, since the whole crowd is spellbound when they hear him. But also those who attend to any writings whatever whose wisdom is from whatever time and because of this are called figuratively scribes, they desire to destroy Jesus from humanity, yet they find nothing they can do to bring this about. And all the elders, &lt;the&gt; learned men [λόγιοι] of the Greeks and barbarians &lt;that are foreign&gt; to the teaching of Jesus, desire to destroy Jesus, but they are unable to prevail over the whole people of Jesus, which is spellbound to the Teacher when they hear him and perceive together his teaching. Mark also suggests similar things, when he says, “And the chief priests and the scribes heard, and they sought how they might destroy him, for they were afraid of him because the whole crowd was astonished at his teaching” (Mark 11.18).<sup>44</sup> For the whole people of Christ is astonished “at his teaching,” and the aforementioned chief priests and scribes are not able to do anything when they seek to destroy Jesus from humanity and to diffuse [K628] the astonishment of his whole people.</p>
<p>15.<sup>45</sup> Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε πάλιν ἐν παραβολαῖς αὐτοῖς λέγων· ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ, ὅστις ποιῶν γάμους τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ ἀπέστειλε τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς ἕως τοῦ· πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσι κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί (22.1–14). Καὶ αὕτη ἡ παραβολὴ ὁλοσχερέστερον νοουμένη δόξει σαφὴς εἶναι, ἐν ᾗ ἄνθρωπος μὲν βασιλεὺς τροπικῶς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ</p>	<p>15. <i>Jesus answered and spoke again to them in parables, saying, ‘The kingdom of the heavens is like unto a man who is king, who put on a wedding feast for his son and sent his servants, etc., up to, For many are called, but few are chosen (22.1-14). The meaning of this parable seems, in general terms, to be clear, in which the God and Father of Christ Jesus is figuratively said to be a man who is king, and the wedding feast of the</i></p>

<sup>44</sup> It is to be noted that this Markan editorial comment comes after the temple cleansing, not after the vineyard parable, the editorial comment for which is in Mark 12.12.

<sup>45</sup> After completing my own translation, I discovered the translation of the commentary on this parable in vol. 4 of M. F. Toal, trans. and ed., *The Sunday Sermons of the Great Fathers: A Manual of Preaching, Spiritual Reading and Meditation* (vol. 4: “From the Eleventh Sunday after Pentecost to the Twenty-fourth and Last Sunday after Pentecost; Swedesboro, NJ: Preservation Press, 1996), 209-17. Toal’s translation is based on the text in *Patrologia Graeca* 13. Some notes of translation comparison can be seen in our footnotes.

εἶναι λέγεται, οἱ δὲ γάμοι τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως ἡ ἀποκατάστασις τῆς νύμφης ἐκκλησίας Χριστοῦ πρὸς Χριστὸν τὸν νυμφίον αὐτῆς. οἱ δὲ ἀποστελλόμενοι δοῦλοι καλέσαι τοὺς κεκλημένους εἰς τοὺς γάμους οἱ κατὰ καιρὸν εἰσι προφηται ἐπιστρέφοντες τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ διὰ τῶν προφητειῶν ἐπὶ τὴν εὐφροσύνην ἀγομένην ἐπὶ τῇ ἀποκαταστάσει τῆς ἐκκλησίας πρὸς Χριστόν. οἱ δὲ μὴ θέλοντες ἔλθειν προηγουμένως ὄντες κλητοὶ οἱ μὴ ἀκούοντες [K629] τῶν λόγων τῶν προφητῶν ἦσαν, οἱ δὲ ἀποστελλόμενοι ἄλλοι δοῦλοι ἄλλο ἄθροισμα προφητῶν, τὸ δὲ ἡτοιμασμένον ἄριστον, ἐν ᾧ οἱ ταῦροι τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τὰ σιτευτὰ αὐτοῦ τεθυμένα ἦν, αἱ στερεαὶ ἦσαν καὶ λογικαὶ τῶν μυστηρίων τοῦ θεοῦ τροφαί· οὕτω δὲ καὶ πάντα ἔτοιμα, οἱ περὶ πάντων τῶν ὄντων λόγοι <ἔτοιμοι>, οὓς («ὅταν ἔλθῃ τὸ τέλειον») οἱ τῇ κλήσει ἀκολουθήσαντες φάγονται καὶ πίνουν. ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν κεκλημένων διὰ τῶν προφητῶν οἱ μὲν μόνον ἡμέλουν τῶν λεγομένων καὶ τοῖς βιωτικοῖς ἐσχόλαζον πράγμασιν, οὐ μὴν καὶ ἐπονηρεύοντο <κατὰ τῶν προφητῶν, ἄλλοι δὲ καὶ ἐπονηρεύοντο> κατ' αὐτῶν, διὰ τοῦτο τὴν διαφορὰν αὐτῶν παραστήσαι βουλόμενος εἶπεν· οἱ δὲ ἀμελήσαντες ἀπῆλθον, ὃς μὲν ἐπὶ τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρόν, ὃς δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ· οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ κρατήσαντες αὐτοῦ τοὺς δούλους ὕβρισαν καὶ ἀπέκτειναν (22.5-6).

Εἴτα ἀκολούθως <ταύτη> τῇ ὁλοσχερεστέρᾳ διηγήσει ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ βασιλέως νοεῖται, ἣν καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος περὶ Ἰουδαίων ὀνομάζων [K630] λέγει· «ἔφθασε δὲ ἡ ὀργὴ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς εἰς τέλος». εἴτα προφητεύεται ὁ κατὰ Ἰουδαίων πόλεμος καὶ ἡ ἅλωσις Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἡ ἀναίρεσις τοῦ λαοῦ μετὰ τὴν Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημίαν ἐν τῷ καὶ πέμψας τὸ στράτευμα αὐτοῦ ἀνείλε τοὺς φονεῖς ἐκείνους καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν ἐνέπρησε (22.7).

king's son is the restoration (ἡ ἀποκατάστασις) of the bride, Christ's church, to Christ, her bridegroom. The servants who are sent *to call those who have been summoned to the feast* are the prophets who, in their season, turned back those from the people through their prophecies to the joyous festivity that accompanies<sup>46</sup> the restoration of the church to Christ. Those who do not want to come despite being the first to be called are those who did not listen [K629] to the words of the prophets, and the other servants who are sent are another group of prophets, and the *meal* that is prepared, in which there are *the oxen* of the king and his *sacrificed fatlings*, are the solid and rational foods of the mysteries of God. So also *all the things prepared* are the *logoi* <prepared> concerning all existing things, which are what ("whenever the perfect may come" [1 Cor 13.10]) those who obey the call eat and drink. Now, among those who were summoned through the prophets there were some who only neglected the things [the prophets] spoke because they were occupied with the matters of this life but they did not act wickedly <against the prophets, whereas there were others who did act wickedly> against them. It is because he wishes to present this difference between them that he says: *But they were negligent and went away, one to his own farm, another to his business; and the rest of them seized his servants and abused and killed [them]* (22.5-6).

So, the wrath of the king should be understood in accordance with <this> general explanation, about which the Apostle speaks in reference to the Jews: "The wrath is coming on them unto the end" (1 Thess 2.16). Then the war against the Jews is prophesied, and the conquest of Jerusalem and the destruction of the people after the coming of Christ [when he says], *And sending his army he destroyed those murderers and burned their city* (22.7).

<sup>46</sup> ἄγω, LSJ IV.1 has the sense of "celebration."



16.<sup>47</sup> τὸ δὲ τότε λέγει τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ· ὁ μὲν γάμος ἔτοιμος, οἱ δὲ κεκλημένοι οὐκ ἦσαν ἄξιοι· πορεύεσθε οὖν ἐπὶ τὰς διεξόδους τῶν ὁδῶν, καὶ ὅσους ἂν εὑρητε καλέσατε εἰς τοὺς γάμους (22.8-9) ἀναφέροίτο ἂν ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀποστόλους λέγοντας Ἰουδαίους· «ὁμῖν ἦν ἀναγκαῖον ἀναγγεῖλαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀναξίους κρίνετε ἑαυτοὺς, ἰδοὺ στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη». αἱ διεξοδοὶ οὖν τῶν ὁδῶν τὰ <ἐκτὸς τῶν ἐθνῶν> ἔξω τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐστὶ πράγματα, παρ' αἷς οἱ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων εὐρισκόμενοι καλοῦνται εἰς τοὺς γάμους, συναγόντων τῶν ἀποστόλων πάντας οὓς ἂν εὕρωσιν. [K631] εὕρισκον δὲ τοὺς ἀκούοντας καὶ οὐκ ἐφρόντιζον καλοῦντες πότερον ποτε πρὸ τῆς κλήσεως πονηροὶ ἢ ἀγαθοὶ ἦσαν οἱ καλούμενοι· πάντας γὰρ τοὺς εὐρισκομένους ἐκάλουν. ἀγαθοὺς δὲ νομιστέον ἐνταῦθα ἀπλούστερον λέγεσθαι τοὺς μετριωτέρους τῶν ἐρχομένων ἐπὶ τὴν θεοσέβειαν, οἷς ἐφαρμόζοις ἂν τὸ τοιοῦτο ἀποστολικόν· «ὅταν δὲ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οἱ τοιοῦτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσι νόμος· οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυροῦσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως». καὶ ἐπλήσθη γε ὁ Χριστοῦ <καὶ> τῆς ἐκκλησίας γάμος καὶ ἀποκαταστάντων <τῷ θεῷ>, τῶν εὐρεθέντων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἀνακειμένων ἐπὶ τῷ εὐφρανθῆναι ἐπὶ τοῖς γάμοις.

Εἴτ' ἐπεὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς καλεῖσθαι <μὲν ἔ>δει, οὐ μὴν ὥστε τοὺς πονηροὺς μένειν πονηροὺς, ἀλλὰ μεταμφιασμένους καὶ ἀποθεμένους τὰ ἀλλότρια τοῦ γάμου ἐνδύματα ἐνδύσασθαι τὰ τοῦ γάμου, [K632] «σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ, χρηστότητα, ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραότητα, μακροθυμίαν» (ταῦτα γὰρ ἐστὶ τὰ τοῦ γάμου ἐνδύματα), διὰ τοῦτο ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰσέρχεται θεάσασθαι τοὺς ἀνακειμένους, πρὶν αὐτοῖς παραῆλθαι τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον ἄριστον, τοὺς ταύρους καὶ τὰ τεθυμένα σιτιστὰ καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔτοιμα, ἵνα θεασάμενος τηρήσῃ μὲν τοὺς ἔχοντας ἐνδύμα γάμου καὶ εὐφράνῃ καταδικάσῃ δὲ τοὺς ἐναντίους. εἰσελθὼν

16. The passage, *Then he said to his servants, 'The wedding feast is prepared, but those who have been called are not worthy. Go therefore into the intersections of the highways, and call whomsoever you might find to the wedding feast (22.8-9)*, might be referred to the apostles of Jesus Christ who say to the Jews, "It was necessary for us to announce the word of God to you, but since you judge yourselves unworthy, behold we are turning to the nations" (Acts 13.46). The "intersections of the highways," therefore, are the <heathen> matters <of the nations> outside of Israel, at which [place] those whom the apostles find are called *to the wedding feast*, with the apostles gathering together all whom they might find. [K631] They find those who listen and they do not determine beforehand when they call whether those who are called are wicked or good, for they call all those who are found. One should consider *good ones* here to be a simpler way of referring to those more moderate<sup>48</sup> folk among those who come to the divine piety, with whom you might bring this apostolic [saying] into agreement: "Whenever the nations who do not have the law do by nature the things of the law, these ones though not having a law are law for themselves. Such ones demonstrate the work of the law written on their hearts, with their conscience testifying together" (Rom 2.14-15). Indeed the *wedding feast* of Christ <and> the church *is filled with the guests* who were found by the apostles and have returned <to God> so as to enjoy the wedding feast (22.10).

Then, since it was necess<ary on the one hand> that both the *wicked and good* be called, not so that the *wicked* might remain wicked, but so that having stripped off and put away garments alien to the wedding feast they might be clothed with the [garments] of the *wedding feast*, [K632] [namely] "the bowels of compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness and patience" (Col 3.12) (for these are the clothes of the *wedding feast*)—for this reason *the king* enters *to observe the guests*, before whom the prepared *dinner* was presented, [consisting of] oxen and *the sacrificed fatlings* and *all the things prepared*, in order that having observed he might keep those who have the *garments of the wedding feast* and rejoice [with them], but condemn the opposite group. *After entering*, therefore, he finds a certain person among

<sup>47</sup> Klostermann treats this as a continuous paragraph with the preceding par. 15.

<sup>48</sup> τοὺς μετριωτέρους. Toal's rendering "more virtuous" seems too strong.

οὗν εὐρίσκει τινὰ τῶν κεκλημένων καὶ ἐληλυθότων ἐπὶ τὴν κλῆσιν μὴ ἀλλάξαντα ἑαυτοῦ τὸ ἦθος μηδὲ ἐνδυσάμενον *ἔνδυμα γάμου* καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· πῶς εἰσῆλθες ὧδε μὴ ἔχων *ἔνδυμα γάμου*; εἶτ' ἐπεὶ ὁ ἁμαρτῶν καὶ μὴ ἀνακαινωθεὶς μηδὲ ἐνδυσάμενος τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ὡς μὴ ἔχων «τόπον ἀπολογίας» φιμοῦται, διὰ τοῦτο γέγραπται τὸ ὁ δὲ *ἐφιμώθη*. καὶ οὐκ ἄρκει γε τὸ ἐκβληθῆναι τοῦ γάμου τὸν ἀτιμάσαντα τὴν κλῆσιν· δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν διακόνων τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν πρὸς τοῖς δεσμοῖς τεταγμένων, δεθέντα τὴν πορείαν ἥ [K633] οὐκ εἰς δέον ἐχρήσατο καὶ τὴν δραστήριον δύναμιν ἐν ἣ πρᾶξιν ἀγαθὴν οὐκ ἐτέλεσεν, οὐ μόνον ἀπὸ τοῦ γάμου ἐκβληθῆναι, ἀλλ' ὥστε καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀλλότριον φωτὸς <παντὸς> καταδικασθῆναι τόπον, ἔνθα σκότος ἦν τὸ ὡς ἐν σκότεσι βαθύτερον καὶ καλούμενον *σκότος ἐξώτερον*. καὶ εἴ τις γε ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν κλῆσιν ἐλθὼν τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς τοὺς γάμους τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, δοκεῖ μὲν ὑπακούειν καὶ ἔρχεσθαι μετὰ τῶν κεκλημένων, οὐ μὴν ἐνδέδυται τὸ προειρημένον *ἔνδυμα γάμου*, ταῦτα πείσεται καὶ δεθεὶς *ποδῶν καὶ χειρῶν* ἐκβληθήσεται εἰς τὸ *σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον*, ἔνθα κατὰ τὸ «οὐαί, οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι κλαύσετε», ὁ *κλαυθμὸς* τοῖς τὰ τοῦ κλαυθοῦ καὶ θρήνου ἄξια ἁμαρτήσασιν· κλαύσονται δὲ θρηνοῦντες τὰς ἰδίας ταλαιπωρίας. εἴθ' ἵνα παραστήσῃ ὁ λόγος τὸν φόβον καὶ τὸν τρόμον καὶ τὰ σκυθρωπὰ πράγματα καὶ τοὺς πόνους ἐν οἷς ἔσονται οἱ μὴ ἐν δεδυσμένοι *ἔνδυμα γάμου*, εἶπε τὸ *ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς* καὶ οὐ μόνον ὁ *κλαυθμὸς*, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ *βρυγμὸς τῶν ὁδόντων*. [K634] καὶ ἐπιφέρεται τῇ ὅλῃ παραβολῇ, διὰ τὸ πολλοὺς δεδηλωσθαι τοὺς κληθέντας οὐ πάντας δὲ ἐληλυθέναι ἀλλ' ὀλίγους ἐξ αὐτῶν, τὸ *πολλοὶ εἰσι κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί*.

those who were summoned and who have come because of the call who has not changed his character (τὸ ἦθος) nor clothed himself with the *garment of the wedding feast*, and he says to him: 'How did you enter here not having a wedding garment?' Then, since the sinner who has neither been renewed nor clothed with the Lord Jesus Christ, as though not having a "place of defense" (Acts 25.16), is silenced, on account of which it is written, *But he was silent*. And it is not sufficient for him who has dishonored the call to be cast out of the wedding feast, for he who is bound with chains by the appointed servants of the king, [having been bound] to the manner of life in which [K633] he did not do what is required and to the effectual power in which he did not bring good practices to completion, must not only be cast out from the wedding feast, but must be condemned unto a place estranged from <all> light, such that the darkness is so deep in darkness as to be called *outer darkness*.<sup>49</sup> Now if someone among us who, because of the call of the king, has come *unto the wedding feast* of his Son, seems to obey and to come along with those who are summoned, except he is not clothed with the aforementioned *garment of the wedding feast*, these things will befall him and being bound *hand and foot* he will be cast out *unto the outer darkness*, where in accordance with the [passage], "Woe to those who laugh now, for you will weep" (Lk 6.25), *the weeping* [will be] for those who sinned in ways worthy of weeping and lamentation, and they will weep, lamenting their own hardship. Then, in order that the word might present the fear and the trembling and the gloomy matters and the pains in which they will be who are not clothed with the *garment of the wedding feast*, it says that *there will be weeping* and not only *weeping*, but also *gnashing of teeth*. [K634] And the [phrase] *many are called, but few chosen* is applied to the whole parable on account of the many who are indicated as having been called, and yet only a few of them, not all, have come.

17. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὁλοσχερέστερον εἰς τὴν παραβολὴν λελέχθω, πειρασόμεθα δὲ ἐπανελθόντες ἐρευνῆσαι κατὰ τὴν παροῦσαν δύναμιν

17. Let these things be said in a general way about the parable, but we will also attempt to ascend in our inquiry insofar as our present ability

<sup>49</sup> Perhaps Origen's comment suggests a rendering such as "outside of darkness," in the sense of *extreme darkness*—a darkness so dark as to be beyond darkness.

αὐτήν, ἐὰν ἄρα βοηθηθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς σοφίας πνεύματος  
 δυνηθῶμέν τινα καὶ βαθύτερα εἰς τὴν παραβολὴν εὐρόντες  
 οἰκοδομῆσαι καὶ κατὰ τὸ εὐλογον σιωπῆσαι ἢ αἰνίξασθαι ἢ ἐκθέσθαι.  
 ἡ βασιλεία τοίνυν τῶν οὐρανῶν ὁμοιωθή κατὰ μὲν τὸν βασιλεύοντα  
 ἄνθρωπον βασιλεῖ, κατὰ δὲ τὸν συμβασιλεύοντα τῷ βασιλεῖ τῷ υἱῷ  
 αὐτοῦ, κατὰ δὲ τὰ βασιλευόμενα τοῖς δούλοις καὶ τοῖς κεκλημένοις εἰς  
 τοὺς γάμους, ὧν οἱ μὲν οὐκ ἤθελον [τοῦ] εἰσελθεῖν, οἱ δὲ ἀμελήσαντες  
 τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν ἀπῆλθον, ὃς μὲν εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρόν, ὃς δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν  
 ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἄλλοι <δὲ> κρατήσαντες τοὺς δούλους ὕβρισαν καὶ  
 ἀπέκτειναν. ἔτι τῶν βασιλευομένων ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ στράτευμα τοῦ  
 βασιλέως, καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν <διεξόδων τῶν> ὁδῶν συναγόμενοι πονηροὶ  
 καὶ ἀγαθοί, ἕως ἐπλήσθη ὁ γάμος [K635] ἀνακειμένων, καὶ ὁ ἐν τοῖς  
 ἀνακειμένοις οὐκ ἔχων ἔνδυμα γάμου, καὶ οἱ κελευσθέντες διάκονοι  
 δῆσαι τὸν μὴ ἔχοντα ἔνδυμα γάμου ποδῶν καὶ χειρῶν καὶ ἐκβαλεῖν  
 αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον.

Ἐδύνατο μέντοι γεγράφθαι ὁμοιωθῇ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν  
 βασιλεῖ χωρὶς τῆς ἀνθρωπος προσθήκης. ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ πρόσκειται καὶ τὸ  
 ἄνθρωπον, ἀναγκαῖον καὶ τοῦτο διηγήσασθαι, οὕτως ἂν (ὡς ἐμοὶ  
 δοκεῖ) σαφηνισθέν. τῶν μὲν πρὸ ἡμῶν ποιήσας τις βιβλία νόμων ἱερῶν  
 ἀλληγορίας, τὰς ὡς περὶ ἀνθρωποπαθῆ παριστάσας λέξεις τὸν θεὸν  
 διηγούμενος καὶ τὰς τὸ θεῖον αὐτοῦ ἐμφαινούσας, ἐνὶ μὲν ῥητῷ  
 ἐχρήσατο περὶ τοῦ ὡς ἀνθρωπον λέγεσθαι εἶναι τὸν θεὸν ἀνθρώπους  
 οἰκονομοῦντα, τῷ «ἐτροποφόρησέ σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου ὡς εἴ τις  
 τροποφορήσαι ἀνθρωπος τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ», ἐνὶ δὲ περὶ τοῦ μὴ ὡς  
 ἀνθρωπον εἶναι τὸν θεόν, τῷ «οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρωπος ὁ θεὸς διαρτηθῆναι».

permits it, if with the help of the Spirit of wisdom we might be able to  
 inquire into something of the deeper matters involved in the parable, seeking  
 to edify and when it is fitting to be silent, or to speak in riddles [when fitting]  
 or to expound. *The kingdom of the heavens*, then, in regard to the one who  
 rules, *is like unto a man who is king*, and with regard to one who co-rules  
 with the king, *to his son*, and with regard to those who are ruled [is like unto]  
 both the servants and those who are called *unto the wedding feast*, among  
 which there are those who *do not want to enter*, and *those who are negligent*  
 to enter and *go away, one to his own farm, another to his business*, <while>  
 still others who *seize the servants, abuse and kill [them]*. Further, among  
 those who are ruled there is also “the army of the king,” as well as those evil  
 and good people who are gathered from the “<intersections of the>  
 highways,” until *the wedding feast is filled [K635] with guests*. And there is  
 one among the guests who does not have a *wedding garment*, and the  
 servants who are ordered to bind him who does not have a *wedding garment*  
*hand and foot and to cast him out into the outer darkness*.

It certainly could have been written, *the kingdom of the heavens is*  
*like a king*, without the addition of [the word] “man.” But since the word  
*man* is present [in the text], this must also be explained in such a way (as it  
 seems to me) as to become clear. Now someone before us has composed a  
 book of allegory on the sacred laws,<sup>50</sup> and when he described the texts which  
 present God as though subject to human suffering [ὡς περὶ ἀνθρωποπαθῆ]  
 and those [texts] which show forth his divinity, he used one text for when  
 God is spoken of as a man adapting [himself] to [other] men, that “The Lord  
 your God cared for you in the way a certain man would care for his son”  
 (Deut 1.31),<sup>51</sup> but another [text] with regard to God not being a human, that  
 “God is not as a man so as to waver” (Num 23.19).

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Philo, *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* 94ff; *Quod deus sit immutabilis* 53-54; *De somniis* 234ff; and Origen's discussion of this same topic in *Hom.*  
*Jer.* 18.6.3ff (Smith, FOC 97, p. 198ff).

<sup>51</sup> See above par. 4, 6, for the same text/argument.

18.<sup>52</sup> ἡμεῖς δὲ πολλὴν ἀφθονίαν ἔχομεν ἀπὸ τῶν [K636] εὐαγγελικῶν περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ παραδειγμάτων, ἐν οἷς *ὡμοιώθη* κατὰ τινὰς παραβολὰς *ἄνθρωπον*. χρησόμεθα οὖν ταῖς ἄνθρωπον ὀνομαζούσαις παραβολαῖς τὸν θεὸν εἰς ἀπολογία τῶν ὅσον ἐπὶ ταῖς λέξεσιν ἀνθρωποπαθῇ φασκουσῶν εἶναι τὸν Χριστοῦ πατέρα, καὶ φήσομέν γε πρὸς τοὺς ἑτεροδόξους, διὰ τὸ μὴ νενοηκέναι τὰ οὕτως λεγόμενα ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς γράμμασι προσκόποντας τῷ θεῷ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου κτίσεως ὅτι, εἴπερ *ἄνθρωπον* ὡμοίωται (κατὰ τὰς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου παραβολὰς) ὁ θεός, διὰ τί ἀκολούθως ταύταις ταῖς παραβολαῖς οὐ παραδέχεσθε παραβολὴν εἶναι τὴν ὀργὴν <καὶ> τὸν θυμὸν καὶ τὴν μεταμέλειαν καὶ τὴν ἀποστροφὴν τοῦ προσώπου καὶ τὴν κάθισιν καὶ τὴν στάσιν καὶ τὸν περίπατον τοῦ θεοῦ; τὸν γὰρ ἀναγεγραμμένον ἐν ταῖς προφητείαις ὕπνον αὐτοῦ ἦτοι οὐ παρετήρησαν ἢ ὁμολογήσουσιν εἶναι παραβολὴν. καὶ ἔτι πρὸς ἐκείνους ἐροῦμεν ὅτι, εἰ μὴ βούλεσθε, ἀκολούθως τῷ ἐν παραβολῇ ἄνθρωπον λέγεσθαι τὸν θεόν, ἐν παραβολῇ ἀκούειν τῶν ἀνθρωποπαθῶς περὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπαγγελλουσῶν γραφῶν, παραστήσατε πῶς ἄνθρωπος ὁ τῶν ὅλων κατὰ τὸ [K637] εὐαγγέλιον λέγεται θεός, οὐδὲν ἀνθρώπινον (ὥς ὑμεῖς ὑπολαμβάνετε) λεγόμενος ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ.

Ἐκ περιουσίας δὲ ἐλέγξομεν αὐτοὺς μηδὲ τὰ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης γράμματα ἐζητακότας, ἐν οἷς κατὰ τὴν ἐνταῦθα παραβολὴν ὁ ποιὼν *γάμους* τῷ *υἱῷ* αὐτοῦ *βασιλεὺς* ἄνθρωπος *ὠργίσθη* ἐπὶ τοῖς μὴ θελήσασιν κατὰ τὴν κλῆσιν αὐτοῦ *ἐλθεῖν εἰς τοὺς γάμους* καὶ τοῖς ἀμελήσασιν μὲν τοῦ δειπνῆσαι *εἰς τοὺς γάμους*, ἀπεληλυθόσι δὲ *εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρὸν* ἢ *ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν*, *ὠργίσθη* δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς κρατήσασιν *τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ* καὶ ὑβρίσασιν καὶ ἀποκτεῖναι. λεγέτωσαν γὰρ ἡμῖν πότερον ὁ ὠργισθεὶς οὗτος, ἅτε ποιὼν *γάμους* τῷ *υἱῷ* αὐτοῦ, ὁ πατήρ ἐστι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ ἄλλος τις παρὰ τὸν (ὅσον ἐπὶ τῇ παραβολῇ)

18. But we have plenty of material at our disposal from the [K636] the evangelical examples concerning God, in which *he is like unto a man* according to certain parables. Let us use, therefore, those parables which name God as a man for a defense of the [passages] which affirm—in so far as the literal text is concerned—that the Father of Christ is subject to human suffering [ἀνθρωποπαθῇ], and let us suggest to the heterodox who, because they have not understood the things spoken in this way in the Old [Testament] Letters, have taken offence at the God [both] of the Law and Prophets and of the creation of the cosmos<sup>53</sup> that, if indeed (according to the Gospel parables) God is similar *to a man*, why would you not accept, in a way consistent with these parables, [it] as a parable [when Scripture speaks of] God's wrath <and> anger, regret (cf. Hos 11.8) and the turning away of [his] face, and [his] sitting, standing, and walking? For what is described as his sleep in the Prophetic [scriptures] either let them not observe carefully or let them confess to be a parable. Again we would say to such people that, except you choose to hear as parabolic speech<sup>54</sup> those scriptures which describe him as subject to human suffering in a way consistent with God being called a man in a parable, you should present how it is that the God of all who is said to have nothing human in himself (as you yourselves would maintain) is called a *man* in the [K637] Gospel.

From this abundance of resources let us reprove those who do not examine closely the writings of the New Covenant, in which according to the present parable the man *who is king*, who puts on a *wedding feast for his son*, *becomes angry* at those who do not wish *to come in to the wedding feast* in accordance with his summons and who are neglectful of dining *at the feast*, and instead go away *to their own farm or business*, but [the king] also *becomes angry* at those who seize his servants and abuse and kill them. For let them tell us whether this [father] who gets angry, seeing that he put on a *wedding feast for his son*, is the Father of Christ, or his Father is someone other than he who gets angry (insofar as the

<sup>52</sup> Klostermann treats this as a continuous paragraph with the preceding par. 17.

<sup>53</sup> I.e., Marcionites.

<sup>54</sup> The force of “in a parable” shifts here to *parabolical*, i.e., figurative speech (not a literary form).

<p>ὀργισθέντα πατήρ ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ. ἐκατέρως δὲ στενοχωρηθήσονται, εἴτ' ἐκ τοῦ μὴ θέλειν τὸν ὀργισθέντα ποιοῦντα <i>γάμους τῷ υἱῷ</i> πατέρα εἶναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ τὴν ὀργήν, εἴτ' ἐκ τοῦ ἀναγκάζεσθαι διὰ <i>τοὺς γάμους</i> καὶ τὸν υἱὸν παραδέχεσθαι ὅτι αὐτὸς εἷη ὁ πατήρ Χριστοῦ καὶ ὅτι ὀργίζεται. [K638] ἐὰν δὲ διήγησιν τῷ ὀργίζεσθαι πειραθῶσι φέρειν, φήσομεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι· ὦ οὗτοι, τίς ἡ ἀποκλήρωσις, μὴ φεύγειν μὲν τὸν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ποιοῦντα <i>γάμους τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ</i> διὰ τὴν ὀργήν καὶ ἄλλον ζητεῖν, ἐν δὲ τῷ νόμῳ καὶ τοῖς προφήταις διὰ τὸ αὐτὸ τῆς ὀργῆς ὄνομα καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια αὐτῇ ζητεῖν ἀναπλάττειν ἕτερον παρὰ τὸν [τοῦ] νόμου καὶ προφητῶν θεόν;</p>	<p>parable is concerned). They will find themselves in difficult straits with either option, either because they do not want him who puts on the <i>wedding feast for the son</i> and gets angry to be the Father of Christ on account of the anger, or because of <i>the wedding feast</i> and the son they will be compelled to accept that He is indeed the Father of Christ and that He gets angry. [K638] And if they can manage to bear this explanation of getting angry, we would say to them: O you men, does it not seem absurd to on the one hand flee Him who puts on <i>the wedding feast</i> in the Gospel <i>for his son</i> on account of wrath and to seek another [god], but then to seek to fashion another [god] than the God of the Law and Prophets because the term for wrath and [other terms] similar to it [are used for God] in the Law and the Prophets?<sup>55</sup></p>
<p>19. Ὅσον οὖν ἄνθρωποι ἐσμεν, καὶ οὐ συμφέρει ἡμῖν τὸν πλοῦτον «τῆς χρηστότητος» τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὸ «πολὺ πλῆθος τῆς χρηστότητος» αὐτοῦ κεκρυμμένης ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (ἵνα μὴ βλαβῶμεν) θεωρεῖν, ἀναγκαίως <i>ὁμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ</i>, ἵνα ἀνθρώποις λαλήσῃ ὡς ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἀνθρώπους οἰκονομήσῃ μὴ χωροῦντας οἰκονομηθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, πάντα μένοντος θεοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ λέγειν διὰ προφητῶν καὶ ἐν τῷ οἰκονομεῖν ἀνθρώπους. καὶ τότε παύσεται ὁμοιουμένη <i>ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ</i>, ὅταν παυσάμενου ζήλου καὶ ἐριδος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν παθῶν καὶ ἀμαρτημάτων καὶ τοῦ «κατὰ ἄνθρωπον» περιπατεῖν, ἄξιοι γενώμεθα ἀκοῦσαι ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ· «ἐγὼ εἶπα· θεοὶ ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ ὑψίστου πάντες», [K639] ἢ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, μηκέτι πράττοντες τοιαῦτα ἐφ' οἷς λέγοιτ' ἂν &lt;ἡμῖν&gt;· «ὤμεις δὲ ὡς ἄνθρωποι ἀποθνήσκετε». ἐγὼ δ' οἶμαι ὅτι οὐ μόνον τὸ <i>ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ</i> ὁμοιοῦσθαι τὴν βασιλείαν <i>τῶν οὐρανῶν</i> παύσεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλα μυρία ὧν χρήζει ἀμαρτωλὸς ἄνθρωπος, οἷον γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ὡσηέ· «ἐγὼ δὲ εἰμι ὡς πάνθηρ τῷ Ἐφραΐμ, καὶ ὡς λέων τῷ οἴκῳ</p>	<p>19. Insofar, therefore, as we are men, and we are not suited to contemplate the wealth “of the benevolence” of God (Rom 2.4) and the “exceeding abundance of” his “benevolence” (Ps 30.20) which has been hidden by him (so that we are not injured), <i>the kingdom of the heavens is necessarily like unto a man who is king</i>, in order that he might speak to men as a man and might accommodate himself [οἰκονομήσῃ] to men who could not accept to be accommodated to [οἰκονομηθῆναι] by God while remaining absolute God except by speaking through the Prophets and by accommodating himself [ἐν τῷ οἰκονομεῖν] to men.<sup>56</sup> And at some time <i>the kingdom of the heavens</i> will cease being similar <i>to a man</i>, whenever zeal and strife and the rest of passions and sins and going about “in a human manner” cease (cf. 1 Cor 3.3), and we become worthy to hear from God, “I said, You are all gods and sons of the Most High” (Ps 81.6), [K639] or of His Christ, no longer practicing such things about which he would say &lt;to us&gt;: “But you will die as men” (Ps 81.7). Indeed I myself think that not only will the similarity between the kingdom <i>of the heavens</i> and the <i>man who is king</i> cease, but also a myriad of other things of which</p>

<sup>55</sup> Both OT and NT, Origen is insisting, require an allegorical reading strategy based on a theology of God’s use of accommodation in his self-revelation.

<sup>56</sup> Toal translates this *oikonomew* word group as “govern,” which does not seem to quite fit Origen’s argument.

<p>Ἰούδα», καὶ ἐν ἄλλῳ τόπῳ· «ἀπαντήσομαί» φησιν «αὐτοῖς ὡς ἄρκτος ἀπορουμένη». παύσεται οὖν ποτε ὢν ὡς πάνθηρ καὶ ὡς λέων καὶ ὡς ἄρκτος ἀπορουμένη, ὅτε διὰ τὸ τοὺς τάδε πεποιηκότας μηκέτι χρήζειν τοῦ ὡς πάνθηρος καὶ τοῦ ὡς λέοντος καὶ τοῦ ὡς ἄρκτου &lt;ἀπορουμένης θεοῦ&gt;, αὐτὸς οὐκέτι ἔχων τοὺς &lt;τοιούτους&gt; τοιούτου ἑαυτοῦ χρήζοντας, ἐμφανίσει ἑαυτὸν «καθὼς ἐστίν». ἐγὼ δὲ οὕτως ἀκούω καὶ τοῦ «ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον», ἐπεὶ ὅσον μὲν &lt;ἐν ἡμῖν&gt; ἐστὶ τὰ τοῦ καταναλίσκεσθαι ἄξια, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον «ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ ἐστὶ καταναλίσκον» ἐκεῖνα· ἐπὶ δὲ ἀναλωθῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ καταναλίσκοντος [K640] πυρὸς τὰ πεφυκότα ὑπ' ἐκείνου ἀναλίσκεσθαι, τότε οὐκέτι μὲν ἔσται «ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον», μόνον δὲ ὡς εἶπεν Ἰωάννης φῶς, λέγων· «ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστίν». τούτων δὲ κινηθέντων πρόσχες εἰ δύνασαι τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου καθολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς οὕτως ἔχον· «ἀγαπητοί, νῦν τέκνα θεοῦ ἐσμεν, καὶ οὕπῳ ἐφανερώθη τί ἐσόμεθα. οἶδα μὲν ὅτι ἐὰν φανερωθῇ ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα, ὅτι ὁψόμεθα αὐτὸν καθὼς ἐστίν», τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον ἐκλαβεῖν. νῦν μὲν γάρ, κἂν ἀξιώθωμεν βλέπειν τὸν θεὸν τῷ νῷ καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, οὐ βλέπομεν «αὐτὸν καθὼς ἐστίν» ἀλλὰ καθὼς διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν οἰκονομίαν ἡμῖν γίνεται· ἐπὶ δὲ τέλει τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ τῆς «ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων ὧν ἐλάλησε διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων· ἐξ αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ», ὁψόμεθα αὐτόν, οὐχ ὡς νῦν, ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλ' ὡς πρέπει τότε, ὃ ἐστίν.</p>	<p>a sinful man might be needful, in the manner it is written in Hosea: “I myself am like a panther to Ephraim, and as a lion to the house of Judah” (Hos 5.14), and in another place, “I will encounter them” he says “as a bereaved she-bear” (Hos 13.8). He will cease at one time being as a panther and as a lion and as a bereaved she-bear, when because the created things here are no longer needful of &lt;God&gt; as panther and as lion and as a &lt;bereaved&gt; she-bear, he no longer has &lt;these things&gt; needful of Him in this way, he manifests himself “just as he is” (1 Jn 3.2). This is the same way I understand this [text], “Our God is a consuming fire” (Deut 4.24), since insofar as &lt;in us&gt; there are things that are worthy of being consumed, it is for that reason that “Our God is a fire consuming” such things. But whenever he might consume with the consuming [K640] fire those things that are by nature consumed by it, then “our God” will no longer be “a consuming fire,” but only Light, as John says, “God is Light” (1 Jn 1.5). Having advanced these [arguments], do attend if you are able to accept in the same way this passage of the catholic epistle from John which reads: “Beloved ones, now we are children of God, and it has not yet been manifested what we will be. I know that if he is manifested, we will be like him, for we will see him just as he is” (1 Jn 3.2). For now, though we may be [made] worthy to see God in the mind and the heart, we do not see “him just as he is,” but just as he becomes for us in the economy on our behalf. But at the end of things and of the “restoration of all things which he spoke through the mouth of his saints, from the age of his prophets” (Acts 3.21), we will see Him, not as [we do] now, what He is not, but as is fitting then, what He [truly] is.</p>
<p>20. Ἐπαξ δὲ ταῦτα εἰπόντες εἰς τὸ ὁμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία [K641] τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ δυνάμεθα καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν εὑρεῖν τοῦ συνεχῶς τὸν σωτῆρα υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἢ υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου ἑαυτὸν ὠνομακεῖναι, δηλοῦντα ὅτι, ὥσπερ ὁ θεὸς ἀνθρώπους οἰκονομῶν ὡς ἐν παραβολαῖς ἄνθρωπος λέγεται, τάχα δὲ πως καὶ γίνεται, οὕτως καὶ ὁ σωτὴρ προηγουμένως &lt;μὲν&gt; υἱὸς ὢν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ «θεός» ἐστὶ καὶ</p>	<p>20. Once these things have been said about the passage, <i>The kingdom [K641] of the heavens is like unto a man who is king</i>, we are able also to discover the reason why the Savior continually refers to himself by the name “son of the man” or “son of man.” This indicates that, just as God who accommodates himself to men is called a man as in parables, and perhaps also somehow is [a man], so in the same way the Savior, who &lt;on the one hand&gt; is initially Son of God and “God” (Jn 1.1) and the Son</p>

<p>υἱὸς «τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ» καὶ «εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου» οὐ μένει δὲ ἐν ᾧ ἐστι προηγουμένως, ἀλλὰ γίνεται κατ' οἰκονομίαν (τοῦ ἐν παραβολαῖς λεγομένου ἀνθρώπου ὄντος δὲ θεοῦ) υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, κατὰ τὸ μιμεῖσθαι, ὅταν ἀνθρώπους οἰκονομῇ, τὸν θεόν, λεγόμενον ἐν παραβολαῖς καὶ γινόμενόν πως ἄνθρωπον. καὶ οὐ χρή τινα ἄνθρωπον ζητεῖν κἀκεῖνου λέγειν υἱὸν εἶναι τὸν σωτῆρα, ἀλλὰ σπάντα ἐπὶ τῆς ἐννοίας τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῶν λεγουσῶν παραβολῶν αὐτὸν εἶναι ἄνθρωπον συνετῶς ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ἑαυτὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. παρ' ἡμῖν μὲν οὖν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις <i>ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν</i> &lt;ἀνθρώπῳ&gt; βασιλεῖ, [K642] παρὰ δὲ τοῖς κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς λεγομένοις θεοῖς, ὧν «ἐν συναγωγῇ ἔστι ὁ θεός, ἐν μέσῳ θεοῦς» διακρίνων, <i>ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐστὶν ὁμοία θεῷ βασιλεῖ</i>.</p>	<p>“of his love” and “image of the invisible God” (Col 1.13, 15), and yet does not remain in [the state] he was in initially, but when he accommodates himself to men [ἀνθρώπους οἰκονομῇ], he becomes “son of man” (of him who, while being God, is called a man in the parables) in the economy in accordance with imitating God who is called man in parables and somehow is a man. ^There is no need to seek out a certain man from this one to call the Savior to be son, but only to listen with understanding to the understanding of God and of the parables which refer to him as a being a man where he calls himself son of man.<sup>57</sup> For our part, therefore, [it is] for men that <i>the kingdom of the heavens is like unto &lt;a man who is&gt; king</i>, [K642] but for those who are called “gods” in the Scriptures, with whom “God stands in the synagogue, in the midst of gods” judging (Ps 81.1), <i>the kingdom of the heavens is similar to God who is King</i>.</p>
---	--

<p>21.<sup>58</sup> ζητήσεις δὲ εἰ, ὥσπερ ἐν ἀνθρώποις τοῖς ὑποδεεστέροις (ὅσον ἐπὶ τῇ ἑαυτῶν φύσει) ἀγγέλων καὶ θρόνων καὶ κυριοτήτων καὶ ἀρχῶν καὶ ἐξουσιῶν <i>ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ</i>, &lt;οὕτως&gt; ἐν θρόνοις <i>ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν θρόνῳ βασιλεῖ</i>, κυριότησι δὲ κυριότητι βασιλεῖ, ἀρχαῖς δὲ ἀρχῇ βασιλεῖ, καὶ ἐξουσίαις ἐξουσία βασιλεῖ. φήσει γάρ τις· τίς ἡ ἀποκλήρωσις τοῖς μὲν ἐλάττωσιν ὡμοιωσθαι τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ, τοῖς δὲ κρείττωσιν ἀνθρώπων μὴ τὸ ἀνάλογον τούτῳ γίνεσθαι;</p> <p>Οὗτος δὲ ὁ ὁμοιωθεὶς ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ ποιῶν γάμους τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ ἀπέστειλε τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ καλέσαι τοὺς κεκλημένους εἰς τοὺς γάμους. καὶ ἐπιστήσεις εἰ, ὥσπερ &lt;ἐπὶ τῶν σωματικῶν&gt; ἄλλη ἡ γαμουμένη νύμφη παρὰ τοὺς καλοῦντας δούλους καὶ τοὺς κεκλημένους εἰς τοὺς γάμους, οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν μυστικῶν πραγμάτων οἱ μὲν τινές</p>	<p>21. You should inquire if, just as with men who are inferior (insofar as their own nature is concerned) to angels and thrones and principalities and rules and powers <i>the kingdom of the heavens is similar to a man who is king</i>, &lt;so also&gt; with thrones <i>the kingdom of the heavens is similar to a throne which is king</i>, and a principality to a principality <i>who is king</i>, and to rulers a ruler <i>which is king</i>, and to authorities an authority <i>who is king</i>. For someone might say, what is the reason that<sup>59</sup> <i>the kingdom of the heavens</i> is compared to a man who is king for inferior things, but with things greater than men there would be no analogy for this?</p> <p>Now He who is like unto <i>a man who is king</i>, who puts on a wedding feast for his son, sent his servants to call those summoned to the feast. And you should attend carefully that if, just as &lt;with regard to somatic realities&gt; when any other bride is getting married there are <i>servants</i> who call and there are <i>those summoned to the wedding feast</i>, so in the same way with regard to</p>
--	--

<sup>57</sup> Toal's rendering: "But we must not then seek out what man, and then say the Saviour is His Son, but, resting on this notion of God, and following the parables that speak of Him as man, let us listen carefully when He speaks of Himself as *the Son of man*" (p. 214).

<sup>58</sup> Klostermann treats this as a continuous paragraph with the preceding par. 20.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Lampe, PGL, 197, for this expression

<p>εἰσιν ἀναλαμβανόμενοι [K643] εἰς τὸ σύστημα τῆς νύμφης, ἄλλοι δὲ εἰς τὴν τάξιν τῶν ἀποστελλομένων δούλων <i>καλέσαι τοὺς κεκλημένους εἰς τοὺς γάμους</i>, καὶ τρίτοι παρὰ τούτους οἱ κεκλημένοι <i>εἰς τοὺς γάμους</i>. θεὸς δ' ἂν εἰδείη τὰ διάφορατά γατα τῶν ψυχῶν ἢ σὺν αὐταῖς καὶ δυνάμεων, καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ τούσδε μὲν ἐπὶ τὸ σύστημα τῆς νύμφης ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι, ἑτέρους δὲ ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους τοὺς διακονουμένους &lt;ταύτη&gt; τῇ κλήσει, καὶ ἄλλους ἐπὶ τοὺς καλουμένους. ἐν πνευματικοῖς δὲ γάμοις κοινωνίαν νόει λόγου νυμφίου &lt;ὑποδοχὴν&gt;, τόκον δὲ καλῶς ποιούμενα νύμφης ψυχῆς, γαμουμένης λόγῳ καὶ μὴ φθειρομένης ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καθ' ἐκάστην τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν κοινωνίαν ἀφθαρσίας μεταλαμβανούσης καὶ γεννώσης, ὅποια γένοιτο ἐκ τοιούτων γάμων λογικὰ γεννήματα.</p>	<p>mystical matters there are some people who are retrieved [K643] for the party of the bride, but others in the order of the servants who are sent <i>to call those summoned to the feast</i>, and a third group besides [namely,] those who are summoned <i>to the feast</i>. God would show the different orders of souls or of the powers with them, and the reason for the retrieval of such a one to the party of the bride, [and would show] others by <i>the servants</i> who are administering &lt;this&gt; call, and still others by those who are summoned. And let one understand the &lt;reception&gt; of the Bridegroom as communion [κοινωνίαν] with the Logos in the spiritual wedding feast, and childbirth [τόκον] as the good things produced from ^the bride which is the soul who is married to the Logos and is not spoiled by him,<sup>60</sup> but also the communion with him in regard to each person which makes them partakers of incorruption and of birth, such that rational offspring might come from these marriages.<sup>61</sup></p>
<p>22.<sup>62</sup> καὶ ἐν τοιούτοις γάμοις νόει τὸ ἐτοιμαζόμενον ἄριστον ἐκ στερεᾶς ἐν πνευματικοῖς λογίοις τροφῆς. καὶ τὸ στερεὸν τῆς τροφῆς τροπολογούμενόν [K644] μοι νόει ἐν τοῖς ταύροις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ πνευματικὸν τῆς αὐτῆς θεωρίας ἐν τοῖς θυομένοις σιτιστοῖς, καὶ τὴν ἄλλην δὲ ποικιλίαν, τὴν ἀνάλογον τοῖς σωματικοῖς πνευματικὴν θεωρίαν, &lt;ἐν&gt; τῷ καὶ τὰ πάντα ἔτοιμα. ὁ γὰρ βασιλεὺς ἐν δαυιλείᾳ βασιλικῇ ἀξίως τῆς βασιλείας καὶ τοῦ πλούτου ἑαυτοῦ τὸ τοιοῦτον ποιεῖ ἄριστον.</p> <p>Δοκεῖ δὴ μοι εὐγενῶν τινων ψυχῶν Ἰσραηλιτικῶν γεγονέναι ἢ προηγουμένη κλησις <i>εἰς τοὺς γάμους</i>. προηγουμένως γὰρ διὰ τῶν καλούντων τῷ τῆς διδασκαλίας λόγῳ βούλεται ὁ θεὸς ἥκειν εἰς τὴν μακαρίαν ταύτην ἐστίαν τοὺς πρὸς σύνεσιν εὐφροσύνης. καὶ ἔστιν</p>	<p>22. And in these wedding feasts one might understand the <i>meal</i> that is prepared [to be] from the solid food in the spiritual Oracles [of Scripture] (cf. Heb 5.12). And in my figurative reading [K644] let one understand in the oxen the solidity of the food, but also the spiritual [quality] of its contemplation in the sacrificed fatlings, and the other various items [as] the spiritual contemplation on analogy to somatic things, &lt;in&gt; the [figure] of <i>all the things prepared</i>. For the king in his regal abundance puts on a <i>meal</i> such as is worthy of the kingdom and of his own wealth.</p> <p>It seems to me that the call <i>to the feast</i> first took place for certain Israelite souls of noble stock. For initially God desires to have those more well-disposed for understanding come to this blessed hearth through those who call by the word of the teaching. Yet it is evident that they do not</p>

<sup>60</sup> The resonance of this line with the Orthodox Hymn *Axion Esti* (Megalynarion to the Theotokos) is striking—“who without corruption bearest God the Word, truly Theotokos, [we magnify you]” (τὴν ἀδιαφθόρως Θεὸν Λόγον τεκοῦσαν, τὴν ὄντως Θεοτόκον). So, it would seem that Origen is propounding something like the “perpetual virginity” of the soul.

<sup>61</sup> The text between the carrots (^) has also been translated in Balthasar, *Origin: Spirit & Fire*, par. 744 (pg. 269).

<sup>62</sup> Klostermann treats this as a continuous paragraph with the preceding par. 21.



<p>             ἰδεῖν ὅτι οὐ θέλουσιν οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὴν κλῆσιν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀποστέλλονται ἄλλοι δοῦλοι προκαλοῦμενοι τοὺς μὴ θέλοντας ἐλθεῖν καὶ ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, εἰ ἔλθοιεν οἱ κεκλημένοι, μεταλήψεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐτοιμασθέντος ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀρίστου, καὶ ταύρων τῶν ὡς ἐν καθαροῖς πάντων τῶν καθαρῶν μειζόνων, καὶ σεσιτευμένων τῇ ποικίλῃ καὶ πολλῇ ἀποδείξει τῶν [K645] εἰς ἕκαστον πρόβλημα νοημάτων. οἷον· γὰρ σιτιστὸν παρατίθησι λόγον ἢ διηρημένον καὶ ἐν τροπολογίᾳ λεγόμενον τεθυμένον ὁ τὴν περὶ τοῦ προκειμένου προβλήματος ἀπόδειξιν πολλὴν φέρων καὶ πλήρη. ὡς εἰ (καθ' ὑπόθεσιν) ὀλίγα τινὰ καὶ ἀσθενῆ φέροιτο εἰς τὴν τῶν προβλημάτων ἀπόδειξιν κατὰ τὰ δοκοῦντα κατασκευάζειν αὐτά, εἶεν ἂν τὰ τεθυμένα λεπτά τινὰ καὶ ἰσχνὰ καὶ (ἴν' ὁμοίως ὀνομάσω) ξηρὰ καὶ ἄσαρκα. ἀλλ' οὐ τοιαῦτα τὰ ἐτοιμασθέντα ἐν τῷ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀρίστῳ, ἐν ᾧ φησιν· οἱ ταῦροί μου καὶ τὰ σιτιστὰ τεθυμένα, οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὰ πάντα ἔτοιμα, ἴν' ἐν τῇ στάσει τῶν παίδων καὶ τῇ λειτουργίᾳ τῶν πνευματικῶν οἰνοχόων ἕκαστος τῶν διακόνων φέρῃ εἰς τὸ ἄριστον τεταγμένος ἐκεῖνα μάλιστα, ἐν οἷς ἔμαθε διακονεῖσθαι. καὶ προτρεπόμενός γε τοὺς (ὡς εἶπον) κατὰ τὴν παραβολὴν δευτέρους, εἶπε τὸ ἰδοὺ τὸ ἄριστον ἡτοίμασα, οἱ ταῦροί μου καὶ τὰ σιτιστὰ τεθυμένα, καὶ πάντα ἔτοιμα· δεῦτε εἰς τοὺς γάμους. [K646] </p>	<p>             desire <i>to come</i> at the call, and because of this, servants other than those previously called are sent to those who do not desire <i>to come</i> and proclaim that, if those who are summoned might come, they would partake of the meal that has been prepared by the king, [consisting] of the oxen which are [the thoughts] among the pure that are greater than all the pure ones,<sup>63</sup> and of [the thoughts] which have been fattened on the grain of various and abundant demonstration of the things [K645] pertaining to each question. For he who produces a full and abundant demonstration concerning the question at hand presents a word, as though it were a fatling, which is divided and sacrificed when it is communicated in a figurative reading.<sup>64</sup> So if (according to this interpretive premise [καθ' ὑπόθεσιν]) one might produce something small and feeble for the demonstration of problems in accordance with the things that they seem [able] to prepare, it is as though the [animals] sacrificed are lean, meagre, and (if I may name it like this) dry and fleshless. But such are not the things that have been prepared in the king's dinner, about which it says, <i>My oxen and sacrificed fatlings</i>, and thus <i>all the things prepared</i>, in order that in the places of the servants and in the service [τῇ λειτουργίᾳ] of the spiritual cupbearers each of the servants stationed might bring to the <i>meal</i> these excellent things, in which he has learned to be a servant. And so he is encouraging the second group (as I would say) in the parable when he says, <i>Behold, the meal is prepared, my oxen and the sacrificed fatlings, and all things prepared; Come to the feast.</i> [K646] </p>
--	--

<p>             23. Ἀλλ' οἱ προηγουμένως καλούμενοι ὡς πτωχοὶ καὶ ἄποροι τὸν νοῦν ἀμελήσαντες ἀπῆλθον, περιέποντες τὰ ἴδια καὶ εὐφραίνόμενοι μᾶλλον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἢ οἷς ἐπηγγέλλετο διὰ τῶν ἀποσταλέντων δούλων ὁ </p>	<p>             23. But those who are called in the first place, as though poor and inexperienced in mind, <i>were negligent and went away</i>, tending to their own matters and rejoicing over them rather than over that which the king </p>
---	--

<sup>63</sup> That is, oxen as the supreme clean animal used for sacrifice are a figure of the higher noetic contemplations among the pure “Israelite” souls. Klostermann references the anonymous excerpts from the *Scholia Commentary on Matthew* of Peter of Laodicea, 247.7f: ἤτοι ταῦροι μὲν ἡ λογικὴ καὶ ὡς ἐν καθαροῖς μειζόν τροφή, σιτιστὰ τὸ πνευματικῶς ἡδὺ τῆς θεωρίας κτλ. “whether oxen are the rational food that is greater among the pure, [and] fatlings that which is spiritually pleasing in contemplation, etc.”

<sup>64</sup> That is, figural reading of Scripture—and the process of rational inquiry generally—is analogous to the sacrificial act. Origen makes this same kind of contemplation in *Peri Pascha* 26-29 (Daly, pp. 41-43)—the preparations of the Paschal Lamb and its consumption are understood in terms of Scriptural reading.

βασιλεύς. καὶ ὅρα ὅτι ὁ μὲν τις αὐτῶν ἔχων ἴδιον ἀγρὸν οὐκ ἦλθεν εἰς τοὺς γάμους, ὁ δὲ ἐμπορίαν κεκτημένος μιμεῖσθαί πως θέλων τὰ λεγόμενα ἐν τῇ περὶ τοῦ ἐμπορίου τῶν μαργαριτῶν παραβολῇ, ζητοῦντος τοὺς «καλοὺς μαργαρίτας» καὶ εὐρόντος «ἓνα πολύτιμον» καὶ ἀποδομένου τοὺς πολλοὺς, ἵνα ἀγοράσῃ τὸν ἓνα. πλὴν οὐκ αἴσιος ἡ ἐμπορία αὕτη, ἐφ' ἣν ἀπελθὼν ὁ κεκλημένος οὐ μετέλαβε [K647] τοῦ ἐτοιμασθέντος τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀρίστου καὶ τῶν τεθυμένων ταύρων καὶ σιτιστῶν καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐτοιμῶν. ὅσοι μὲν οὖν τῶν διορατικῶν κληθέντες οὐκ ἔρχονται εἰς τὴν κλήσιν, οὐ μὴν καὶ τοὺς ἀποσταλέντας δούλους ἐπὶ τὸ καλεῖν ὑβρίζουσι καὶ ἀναιροῦσι, μετριώτεροί εἰσι τῶν ταῦτα τετολμηκότων καὶ ἀναπαύονται ὅς μὲν εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρὸν, ὅς δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ ἐμπορίᾳ αὐτοῦ. οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ παρὰ τούτους ἴδωμεν τίνες εἰσὶ. δοκεῖ δὴ μοι ὅτι ἐκπεπτώκασιν οὗτοι ἐπὶ παρασκευὴν ἐριστικῶν καὶ σοφιστικῶν λόγων, ἐν οἷς κρατοῦντες τῶν ἀποστελλομένων δούλων οὐ παρεσκευασμένων πρὸς τὸ λύειν σοφίσματα ἢ κρατεῖν δοκοῦντες, ὑβρίζουσι τοὺς διακονουμένους τῇ κλήσει. καὶ ἔστι γε ἰδεῖν τοὺς προσπεπονθότας τῇ ἀσκήσει τῶν θείων λόγων καὶ μετὰ τῆς θείας σοφίας βουλομένους αὐτοὺς πρεσβεύειν, ὑβριζομένους ὑπὸ τῶν διορατικῶν μὲν οὐ βουλομένων δὲ πιστεύειν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ· τινὰς δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ ἀναιρουμένους ὑπ' ἐκείνων, οἷς ὁ βασιλεὺς ὀργισθῆναι λέγεται, ἐπειδὴ «ἔφθασε ἡ» καλουμένη «ὀργὴ ἐπ' αὐτούς».

Τὸ δὲ ἔργον τῆς ὀργῆς ἐστὶ [K648] πεμφθῆναι τὸ στράτευμα τοῦ βασιλέως, ἥτοι τὸ «πληθὸς τῆς οὐρανίου στρατιᾶς» ἢ τοὺς τεταγμένους ἐπὶ τῶν κολάσεων ἀγγέλους· καὶ ἀναιροῦσί γε τοὺς

accounted [to them] through the servants who were sent. You should also note that a certain person among them who has *his own farm* did not come *to the feast*, but one who had acquired *a business* desired in some way to imitate what was said in the parable concerning the selling of pearls, about the person who sought the “good pearls” and found “one of great value” and gave away the many so as to buy the one (Matt 13.45). Certainly this business was inopportune, since he who had been called went away because of it and did not participate [K647] in the meal prepared by the king and of the sacrificed oxen and fatlings and all the things prepared. Such ones, then, who are called and are perceptive [τῶν διορατικῶν]<sup>65</sup> yet do not come at the call, but in no wise abuse and kill those servants who were sent, are more respectable [μετριώτεροί] than those who dared [to do] these things, and they take [their] leave, one *to his own farm*, another *to his business*. But let us take a look at the remaining group which differs from the others, as to what sort they are. It seems to me that these ones have fallen away<sup>66</sup> by the preparation of combative and sophistic words, by which they seize, or seem to seize, the servants who are sent who have been prepared to refute the sophisms, and abuse those who are administering the call. One might also observe that it is those who are devoted to the exercise of the divine words and who desire to cultivate themselves<sup>67</sup> with the divine wisdom that are abused by those who are indeed perceptive but who do not desire to believe in the truth. It is because of certain ones of them and those who are destroyed by them that the king is said to become angry, wherefore “the wrath” as it called “has come on them” (1 Thess 2.16).

The operation of wrath is [K648] *the army* of the king which is sent out, whether it is the “abundance of the heavenly army” (Lk 2.13) or those angels that have been assigned for [administering] punishments, and they

<sup>65</sup> This term is sometimes used in an etymological interpretation of the name “Israel” (which the Fathers understood as “man who sees God”). Cf. e.g., Origen, *Fr. Prov.* 1.1 (PG 13.17B): Ἰουδαῖοι εἰσιν, ὁ Ἰσραὴλ, ὃν εἰρηνικὸς Σωτὴρ βασιλεύει ὡς διορατικῶν, ἐὰν ὧσιν ἀληθῶς Ἰσραὴλ. Οὐ γὰρ ὅσοι σπέρμα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, πάντως καὶ τέκνα, τῷ μὴ ποιεῖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ (‘These “Jews” are the Israel which the peaceful Savior rules as those endowed with the power of seeing, if they truly be Israel. For not all such as are of the seed of Abraham are also children (cf. Rom 9.7), because they do not do the works of Abraham (cf. Jn 8.39).’).

<sup>66</sup> Cf. ἐκπίπτω A.2.a. Lampe, PGL, 436.

<sup>67</sup> The verb πρεσβεύω, here used positively, is susceptible to a variety of meanings—it has the sense of being devoted to something, along with maturing or improvement, and attainment of self-mastery and responsibility to rule.

<p>φονεῖς τῶν διακόνων τοῦ λόγου καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν ἐμίπηρσιν ὁ βασιλεὺς. οἰονεὶ γὰρ πόλις &lt;ἀσεβῶν&gt; καὶ σύστημα καθ' ἑκαστὸν ἐστὶ τῶν συγκεκροτημένων ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ «τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου» δογμάτων, ἣν ἐμίπηρσιν ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ἐξαφανίζει, ὥς ἐκ μοχθηρῶν οἰκοδομημάτων συνεστηκυῖαν. καὶ ἐπὶ ποτε κατανοήσεως καθαίρεσιν εἴτε «ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως» εἴτε ὁποιοῦντο τῶν λόγων ἐπαγγελιομένων ἀλήθειαν, καὶ ἀνατροπὴν αὐτῶν γενναίαν, μὴ ὄκνει λέγειν τὸ τοιοῦτον γεγονέναι ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐμιπράντων τὰς τῶν ἐχθρῶν τῆς ἀληθείας &lt;τοῦ θεοῦ&gt; πόλεις. ἐνεπρήσθη μέντοι καὶ ἡ πόλις τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς διδασκαλίας μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημίαν, ἥς ἐμπρησθείσης εἶπε τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀποστόλοις [K649] Χριστοῦ ἢ ἀγγέλοις θεοῦ τεταγμένοις ἐπὶ τῆς κλήσεως τῶν ἐθνῶν· ὁ μὲν γάμος ἔτοιμος, οἱ δὲ κεκλημένοι οὐκ ἦσαν ἄξιοι· πορεύεσθε οὖν ἐπὶ τὰς διεξόδους τῶν ὁδῶν, καὶ ὅσους ἐὰν εὑρητε καλέσατε εἰς τοὺς γάμους. καὶ ἔστιν ἰδεῖν ἀπὸ πάσης ὁδοῦ ἰδιωτικῶν καὶ οὐκ ἰδιωτικῶν δογμάτων τῶν κατὰ τὰ ἔθνη τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ πόλεων καὶ κωμῶν καὶ τόπων τοὺς καλουμένους εἰς τοὺς γάμους ἀπὸ τῶν προσταχθέντων τοῦτο ποιεῖν. ἐξελθόντες δὲ οἱ δούλοι, εἴτε ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ οἱ Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι, εἴτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνδον ὁρίων ἐν οἷς ἦσαν οἱ μακάριοι ἄγγελοι, καὶ ἐλθόντες εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ συνήγαγον καὶ συνάξουσιν πάντας οὓς ἐὰν εὑρωσιν, πονηροὺς ***, ἵνα ἀποθέμενοι τὴν πονηρίαν (τὸ ἀλλότριον τοῦ γάμου ἔνδυμα) καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι μετὰ τῶν λεγομένων &lt;ἔργων&gt; ἀγαθῶν τὸ ἔνδυμα τοῦ γάμου πληρώσωσιν τὴν τοῦ γάμου ἐστίαν ἑαυτῶν ἀνακειμένων. [K650]</p>	<p>destroy <i>the murderers</i> of the servants of the Word and <i>the king</i> sets fire to <i>their</i> whole city. For it is as if the system with respect to each of the doctrines which have been compiled in the wisdom “of the rulers of this age” (1 Cor 2.6) were a city &lt;of impious people&gt; that <i>the king</i> burns down and razes, as though having been established by wretched builders. And whenever you observe the pulling down whether “of falsely-named knowledge” (1 Tim 6.20) or whatever sort of words which profess of truth, and their violent<sup>68</sup> refutation, do not shrink back from saying that such a thing came to pass by the armies of God who set fire to the cities of the enemies of the truth &lt;of God&gt;. The city of Jewish teaching was indeed set on fire after the coming of Christ, which having been set on fire <i>the king</i> says to <i>his</i> servants, the apostles [K649] of Christ or to the angels of God arranged for the call of the nations: <i>The wedding feast is prepared, but those who have been summoned are not worthy. Go, then, to the intersections of the highways, and whosoever you find, call [them] to the feast.</i> And one should observe that he orders those [who are sent that] those who are called <i>to the wedding feast</i> [are to be] from every way of doctrine whether private or public such as is in accordance with the customs [τὰ ἔθνη] of the nations, cities, villages and places. <i>The servants who went out</i>, whether the apostles of Christ from Judea and Jerusalem, or the blessed angels from the regions wherein they were, and came <i>to the highways</i> and <i>gathered</i> and will gather <i>all whom</i> they might find, wicked ones ***, in order that having put away wickedness (the <i>garment</i> foreign to the wedding feast) and having been clothed with the good &lt;works&gt; which are called the <i>garment of the wedding feast</i>, they might fill up the hearth of the wedding feast with their own <i>guests</i>. [K650]</p>
--	---

<p>24. Ἐπὶ οὖν πλησθῇ ὁ γάμος ἀνακειμένων καὶ προσαναπαυσασμένων τῇ πίστει καὶ τῇ θεοσεβείᾳ, τότε εἰσελεύσεται ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπιθεωρῆσαι καὶ κρῖναι περὶ τῶν ἀνακειμένων, ἵνα τὸν μὲν οὐκ ἔχοντα ἔνδυμα γάμου ἐλέγξας κολάσῃ, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς τὸ</p>	<p>24. When, therefore, <i>the wedding feast is filled up with guests</i> and they have come to rest at the [Christian] faith and piety, then <i>the king</i> will come in to inspect and to judge with regard to the <i>guests</i>, so that after convicting the person who does not have <i>the wedding garment</i> he might punish [him], but to</p>
---	---

<sup>68</sup> γενναῖος, LSJ A.II.

ἡτοιμασμένον ἄριστον παραθῆ καὶ τὰ τεθυμένα σιτιστὰ μετὰ τῶν ταύρων καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα ὅσα ἡτοίμασεν. ἓνα δὲ εἶδε τὸν οὐκ ἐνδεδυμένον ἔνδυμα γάμου, εἰς ἓν γένος ἢ εἶδος ἀναφέρων τοὺς τὴν πρὸ τῆς πίστεως κακίαν τηρήσαντας καὶ μὴ ἀποδυσασμένους αὐτήν. καὶ μέμφεται γε τῷ τοιούτῳ, ὡς κακῶς ποιήσαντι κατὰ τὸ τετολμηκέναι εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τοὺς τοιούτους γάμους μὴ ἀναλαβόντι τὸ τοῦ γάμου ἔνδυμα, τὸ ὕφασμα τῆς ἀρετῆς, τὸ λαμπρὸν ἱμάτιον, περὶ οὗ Σολομῶν ἐν Ἐκκλησιαστικῇ ἐνετείλατο λέγων· «ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἔστωσαν τὰ ἱμάτιά σου λευκά». φιμοῦται δὲ ὁ τολμήσας εἰσελθεῖν χωρὶς ἐνδύματος γάμου εἰς τὸν λαμπρὸν τοῦτον γάμον [K651] καὶ οὐ δύναται λέγειν· ὅστις ὡς ἄξιος κολάσεως καὶ κρίσεως καταδικάζεται ὑπὸ τοῦ εἰπόντος τοῖς διακόνοις (ἄλλοις παρὰ τὰ ἄνω στρατεύματα), ἵνα δῆσαντες αὐτοῦ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας οἷς οὐκ εἰς δέον ἐχρήσατο (οὔτε γὰρ ἦν ἔδει πορείαν περιεπάτησεν οὔτε ἃς ἐχρῆν πράξεις ἐπετέλεσεν), ἐκβάλωσιν αὐτὸν οὐ μόνον ἔξω τῆς ἐστίας τοῦ γάμου ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὸ ἐξώτερον σκότος καὶ πάντα φωτὸς ἀμιγές, ἵνα διψήσας φωτὸς μετὰ τὸ γεγονέναι ἐν σκότῳ τῷ ἐξωτέρῳ κλαύση πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον αὐτὸν εὐεργετῆσαι κάκειθεν ῥύσασθαι θεόν, καὶ τοὺς ὁδόντας βρύξῃ τοὺς διὰ τὴν κακίαν φαγόντας τὸν ὄμφακα καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αἰμωδιάσαντας. τοῦ γὰρ φαγόντος τὸν «ὄμφακα οἱ ὁδόντες» αἰμωδιάσουσιν· ὄμφακα δὲ κάκεῖ νομιστέον λέγεσθαι τὴν κακίαν τοῦ μὴ <ἐπιλανθανομένου τῶν «ὀπίσω» μηδ'> ἐπεκτεινομένου «τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν» ἀλλὰ παραμείναντος αὐτῇ, δέον ὁδεῦσαι ἐπὶ τὸ πέπειρον καὶ γλυκεῖαν ποιῆσαι τὴν τῆς ἀρετῆς σταφυλὴν. [K652]

Ἐπιφέρει δὲ ὅλη τῇ παραβολῇ διὰ μὲν τοὺς πολλοὺς τῶν κεκλημένων καὶ μὴ γενομένων ἀξίων τὸ πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν κλητοί, διὰ δὲ τοὺς εἰσελθόντας εἰς τὸν γάμον καὶ ἀνακλιθέντας ἐκεῖ ὡς ὀλίγους τὸ ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί. καὶ εἴ τίς γε κατανοήσῃ τὰ πολυάνθρωπα ἄθροίσματα τῶν (ἵνα ἀπλούστερον ὀνομάσω) ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ ἐξετάσῃ, πόσοι μὲν οἱ βιοῦντες ἐπιεικέστερον<sup>69</sup> καὶ μεταμορφούμενοι «τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοός», πόσοι δὲ οἱ ῥαθυμότερον πολιτευόμενοι καὶ

the rest he might present the *meal* that has been prepared and *the sacrificed fatlings* with the oxen and *all* the rest of the things such as he prepared. Now the one whom *he sees* who *has not been clothed with the wedding garment* refers to one kind or form [of people] who retain the vice [they had] before the faith and do not strip themselves of it. And he censures this person as having acted wickedly in that he dared to enter into this wedding feast without taking on *the garment of the wedding feast*, the robe of virtue, the bright garment, about which Solomon commanded in Ecclesiastes, saying, “Let your garments be white at all times” (Eccl 9.8). Yet the one who dared to enter into this bright feast without the wedding garment is silent [K651] and not able to speak; he is condemned as one worthy of punishment and judgment by him who says *to the servants* (which is another group different from the armies [mentioned] above) that they should *bind him hand and foot* by which [members] he did not put to use for what is fitting (for he neither walked in the manner of life he ought, nor did he complete the practices he should have) and they should cast *him* out, not only outside the hearth of the feast, but even should ca<st [him] int>o *the outer darkness* that is completely devoid of light, so that ^after thirsting for light after having been in the outer darkness he might cry out to the God who is able to show kindness and to save him even from there, and he might gnash the teeth which on account of vice ate the sour grapes and therefore were set on edge (cf. Jer 38.20; Ezek 18.2). For “the teeth” of him who ate the “sour grapes” are set on edge, and one must consider that “sour grapes” here are referring to the vice of him who is not <forgetting the things “behind” nor> stretching forth “to the things before” (Phil 3.13) but is remaining with it, when he should rather move on to produce the ripe and sweet grape cluster of virtue. [K652]

He concludes the whole parable with *for many are called* on account of the many who were called and yet were not worthy, and *but few are chosen* on account of those few who entered the wedding feast and reclined there. And if someone might consider the numerous human throng of the churches (if I may put it more simply) and inquire as to how many of them live in a more modest fashion and are being transformed “by the renewal of

<sup>69</sup> There is an error here in the online transcription which reads ἐπιεικέστερον. ([http://khazarzar.skeptik.net/pgm/PG\\_Migne/Origenes\\_PG%2011-17/Commentarium%20in%20evangelium%20Matthaei\\_.pdf](http://khazarzar.skeptik.net/pgm/PG_Migne/Origenes_PG%2011-17/Commentarium%20in%20evangelium%20Matthaei_.pdf))

<p>συσχηματιζόμενοι «τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ», ἵδοι ἂν ὅτι χρήσιμός ἐστιν ἡ λέγουσα τοῦ σωτῆρος φωνή· πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσι κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί. Καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ λέλεκται· «πολλοὶ ζητήσουσιν εἰσελθεῖν καὶ οὐκ ἰσχύσουσι» καὶ «ἀγωνίζεσθε εἰσελθεῖν διὰ τῆς στενῆς πύλης, ὅτι ὀλίγοι εὐρίσκουσιν αὐτήν».</p>	<p>the mind,” whereas how many are conducting themselves in a more careless fashion and are [still] being conformed “to this age” (Rom 12.1), one might see that the expression of the Savior is useful: <i>for many are called, but few are chosen</i>. Indeed it reads elsewhere, “Many will seek to enter and they will not be able” and “do struggle to enter through the narrow gate, for few will find it” (Lk 13.24).<sup>70</sup></p>
<p>25. Τότε πορευθέντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον κατ' αὐτοῦ ὅπως αὐτὸν παγιδεύσωσιν ἐν λόγῳ καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς [K653] ἕως τοῦ καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἀπῆλθον (22.15–22). Τὸ βούλημα τῆς ἐκκειμένης λέξεως κατὰ τὸ ῥητὸν τοιοῦτον εἶναι μοι φαίνεται. Ἰουδαῖοι, ἅτε ἰδίαν ἔχοντες τὴν κατὰ τὸν Μωσέως νόμον διδασκαλίαν καὶ πολιτείαν ἀπεξενωμένην τῆς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀγωγῆς καὶ δόγμα ἔχοντες τὸ λέγον· «ἕως θανάτου ἀγωνίσαι περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ κύριος πολεμήσει περὶ σοῦ», ἀνθίσταντο τοῖς κρατοῦσιν αὐτῶν ἔθνεσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ παραβῆναι τὸν νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ πολλάκις γε ἄρδην ἀπολέσθαι κεκινδυνεύκασιν ἐπὶ Ῥωμαίων βουλομένων ἀνδριάντα Καίσαρος εἰσαγαγεῖν εἰς τὸν νεὼν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀνθιστάμενοι καὶ κωλύοντες τοὺς ἰσχυροτέρους αὐτῶν γενομένους ἐκ τοῦ ἡμαρτηκέναι Ἰουδαίους. εὕρομεν δὲ ἐκ τῶν κατὰ τὸν χρόνον Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἱστοριῶν γραφάς, ὡς ἄρα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου ἐκινδύνευσεν ὁ λαός, τοῦ μὲν Πιλάτου βιαζομένου ἀνδριάντα Καίσαρος ἀναθεῖναι [K654] ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῶν δὲ καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν κωλυνόντων· τὸ δ' ὅμοιον ἀναγέγραπται</p>	<p>25. Then the Pharisees came and took counsel against him so that they might entrap him in speech etc., [K653] up to, and they withdrew from him and went away (22.15-22). The intention of the present passage according to the literal sense appears to me to be as follows. The Jews at that time had their own teaching and way of life [πολιτείαν] in accordance with the law of Moses which estranged [them] from the Gentiles' manner of conduct, and they had a teaching which said, “I will struggle for the truth unto death, and the Lord will fight for you” (Sirach 4.28). And so they resisted the nations who ruled them because they did not want to transgress the law of God. Indeed they were put in danger of utter destruction numerous times by the Romans who desired to introduce a statue of Caesar into the temple of God, [with the Jews] resisting and hindering those who had become stronger than them because the Jews had sinned. But we find from the records of the histories with regard to the time of Tiberius Caesar, how the people were endangered then by Pontius Pilate, with Pilate attempting to erect a statue of Caesar [K654] in the temple and of those who prevented [it] beyond [their] ability.<sup>71</sup></p>

<sup>70</sup> The text between the carrots (^) has also been translated in Heine, *Origen: Scholarship in the Service of the Church* (Oxford, 2010), 245.

<sup>71</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities* 18.55-59: “55 But now Pilate, the procurator of Judea, moved the army from Caesarea to Jerusalem, to take their winter quarters there, in order to abolish the Jewish laws. So he introduced Caesar's effigies, which were upon the ensigns, and brought them into the city; whereas our law forbids us the very making of images; 56 on which account the former procurators were wont to make their entry into the city with such ensigns as had not those ornaments. Pilate was the first who brought those images to Jerusalem, and set them up there; which was done without the knowledge of the people, because it was done in the night time; 57 but as soon as they knew it, they came in multitudes to Caesarea, and interceded with Pilate for many days that he would remove the images; and when he would not grant their requests, because it would tend to the injury of Caesar, while yet they persevered in their request, on the sixth day he ordered his soldiers to have their weapons secretly, while he came and sat upon his judgment seat, which seat was so prepared in the open place of the city, that it concealed the army that lay ready to oppress them; 58 and when the Jews petitioned him again, he gave a signal to the soldiers to surround them, and

γεγονέναι καὶ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους Γαίου Καίσαρος. καὶ στοχαζόμεθα ὅτι, ὅσον μὲν ἐπεσκοπεῖτο ὁ λαὸς καὶ τὸν λεγόμενον κατὰ τοὺς προφήτας φραγμὸν περιτετείχιστο «ὁ ἀμπελὼν τοῦ κυρίου οἴκος Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ τὸ ἡγαπημένον νεόφυτον αὐτοῦ ἄνθρωπος Ἰούδα», οὐδὲν τηλικούτον ἐγένετο. τὸ παραδοξότατον δέ· αὐτὸς πρῶτος ἐτόλμησε μιᾶναι τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ Πιλάτος, ὃ παρέδωκεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

Καὶ κατὰ τὸν χρόνον οὗν τοῦ σωτῆρος, ἡνίκα φόρον ἐπετάχθησαν δοῦναι Ἰουδαῖοι Ῥωμαίοις, σκέψις καὶ βουλὴ ἦν ἐν Ἰουδαίοις περὶ τοῦ πότερον καθήκει τοὺς ἀνακειμένους τῷ θεῷ καὶ μερίδα ὄντας αὐτοῦ διδόναι φόρον τοῖς ἄρχουσιν ἢ ὑπὲρ ἐλευθερίας πολεμεῖν, εἰ μὴ συγχωροῖντο ζῆν ὡς βούλονται, [K655] καὶ μὴ διδόναι φόρον. καὶ ἱστορήται ὅτι Ἰούδας μὲν ὁ Γαλιλαῖος, οὗ μέμνηται καὶ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἀποστόλων Πράξεσιν, ἀποστήσας πολὺ πλῆθος Ἰουδαίων, ἐδίδασκε μὴ δεῖν διδόναι Καίσαρι φόρον μηδὲ κύριον ἀναγορεύειν τὸν Καίσαρα· ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν αὐτοῦ τετράρχης πείθειν ἐβούλετο τὸν λαὸν εἶκειν τῇ παρουσίᾳ καταστάσει καὶ μὴ αὐθαίρετον αἰρεῖσθαι πρὸς ἰσχυροτέρους πόλεμον, διδόναι δὲ τοὺς φόρους. καὶ ἡ προκειμένη δὲ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου λέξις οὐ σαφῶς μὲν <ἀλλὰ> ἐμφαίνει τὰ τοιαῦτα, τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ βεβασανισμένως ὁρᾶν τὸ ἐκκείμενον ῥητὸν παρίστησι ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχειν. χώραν γὰρ οὐκ

Something similar is recorded to also have happened in the times of Gaius Caesar.<sup>72</sup> Indeed we would venture to guess that, insofar as the nation was being watched over and “the vineyard of the Lord, the house of Israel, and the man of Judah his beloved planting” (Isa 5.7) was fortified all around by what the prophets called a “wall” (φραγμόν),<sup>73</sup> nothing so terrible took place. But rather something even more unexpected: the first person mentioned above, Pilate, to whom [the Jews] handed over Jesus, dared to defile the temple of God.

And in the time of the Savior, then, when the Jews were being compelled to pay tribute to the Romans, there was speculation and deliberation among the Jews as to whether it was proper for those who are devoted to God and who are his portion (cf. Deut 32.9) to pay tribute to those ruling [them] or rather to fight them for the sake of freedom, unless they might be granted to live as they choose, [K655] and not pay tribute. It is related in history that Judas the Galilean, whom Luke mentions in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 5.37), who led a great many Jews in revolt, taught that it is not necessary to pay tribute to Caesar nor to profess Caesar as lord.<sup>74</sup> But in his time the Tetrarchy desired to persuade the people to yield to the present state and not to choose of their own free will for a war with those who are stronger, but to pay tribute. Yet the present text of the Gospel does not evince <any> of these things clearly, but for

threatened that their punishment should be no less than immediate death, unless they would stop disturbing him, and go their ways home. 59 But they threw themselves upon the ground, and laid their necks bare, and said they would take their death very willingly, rather than the wisdom of their laws should be transgressed; upon which Pilate was deeply affected with their firm resolution to keep their laws inviolable, and presently commanded the images to be carried back from Jerusalem to Caesarea.” Cf. *Wars of the Jews* 2.169ff.

<sup>72</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities* 18.261: “Hereupon Gaius, taking it very heinously that he should be thus despised by the Jews alone, sent Petronius to be governor of Syria, and successor in the government to Vitellius, and gave him orders to make an invasion into Judea, with a great body of troops; and, if they receive him and erect his statue willingly in the temple of God; but, if they were obstinate, to conquer them by war, and then to do it.”

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Isa 5.2, which could equally be translated as *hedge* or *fence*.

<sup>74</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities* 18.23-25: “But of the fourth sect of Jewish philosophy, Judas the Galilean was the author. These men agree in all other things with the Pharisaic notions; but they have an inviolable attachment to liberty; and say that God is to be their only Ruler and Lord. They also do not value dying any kinds of death, nor indeed do they heed the deaths of their relatives and friends, nor can any such fear make them call any man lord; 24 and since this immovable resolution of theirs is well known to a great many, I shall speak no further about that matter; nor am I afraid that anything I have said of them should be disbelieved, but rather fear that what I have said is beneath the resolution they show when they undergo pain; 25 and it was in Gessius Florus' time that the nation began to grow mad with this distemper, who was our procurator, and who occasioned the Jews to go wild with it by the abuse of his authority, and to make them revolt from the Romans ...”

<p>εἶχον &lt;ἂν&gt; Φαρισαῖοι βουλόμενοι παγιδεῦσαι ἐν λόγῳ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἀποστείλαντες ἑαυτῶν τοὺς μαθητὰς μετὰ τῶν Ἑρωδιανῶν πυθέσθαι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, πότερον ἔξεστι δοῦναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι ἢ οὐ, εἰ ὁμολογούμενον ἦν ὅτι οὐ δεῖ δοῦναι, καὶ εἰ συμπεφωνημένον ἦν τὸ &lt;μὴ&gt; δίδοναι.</p>	<p>the person who is able to look with close scrutiny the text at hand presents such things in this way. For the Pharisees who desire to entrap Jesus in speech would have no position [to do so], so they sent their own disciples with the Herodians to inquire of Jesus, whether <i>it is lawful to pay tax to Caesar or not</i>, if he would confess that it is not necessary to pay, and if he agreed with &lt;not&gt; paying.</p>
--	---

<p>26. Καὶ ὅρα εἰ μὴ δηλοῦται τὰ τῆς ἐκκειμένης ἱστορίας ἐκ τοῦ τοῦ [K656] βουλομένους παγιδεῦσαι ἐν λόγῳ τὸν Ἰησοῦν Φαρισαίους μὴ μόνους ἀπεσταλκέναι τοὺς μαθητὰς ἑαυτῶν πευσομένους περὶ τοῦ κήνσου, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τῶν Ἑρωδιανῶν. εἰκὸς γὰρ ὅτι ἐν τῷ λαῷ τότε οἱ μὲν διδάσκοντες τελεῖν τὸν φόρον Καίσαρι ἐκαλοῦντο Ἑρωδιανοὶ ὑπὸ τῶν μὴ θελώντων τοῦτο γίνεσθαι· οἱ δὲ φαντασία ἐλευθερίας κωλύοντες δίδοναι τὸν φόρον τῷ Καίσαρι, ἐδόκουν εἶναι οἱ ἀκριβοῦντες τὰ Ἰουδαίων μαθήματα Φαρισαῖοι. εἰ δὲ μὴ βούλεται τις ταῦθ' οὕτως ἔχειν, δηλωσάτω πῶς βουλόμενοι αὐτὸν παγιδεῦσαι ἐν λόγῳ ἀποστέλλουσι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν μαθητὰς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, ἀποστέλλουσι δὲ καὶ τοὺς Ἑρωδιανούς πευσομένους περὶ τοῦ φόρου. ποία γὰρ παγὶς ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀποκρίνεσθαι τὸν Ἰησοῦν, εἴτε βούλεται κῆνσον δίδοσθαι Καίσαρι εἴτε μὴ, εἰ μὴ (ὡς ἀποδεδώκαμεν) κωλύοντος μὲν αὐτοῦ δίδοναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι, ἔμελλον Ἑρωδιανοὶ παραδίδοναι αὐτὸν Ῥωμαίοις, ὡς ἀποστασίαν διδάσκοντα, ἐπιτρέποντος δὲ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἔμελλον κατηγορεῖν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὡς βλέποντος εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπου μᾶλλον ἢ περ διδάσκοντος ἐν ἀληθείᾳ τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ; βασάνισον δὲ παρὰ σαυτῷ ὅτι οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων [K657] μαθηταὶ λέγοντες· διδάσκαλε, οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς εἶ καὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ διδάσκεις, καὶ οὐ μέλει σοι περὶ οὐδενός, οὐ γὰρ βλέπεις εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπου οἷον προκαλοῦνται αὐτὸν διὰ &lt;τούτου&gt; τοῦ ἐπαίνου ἐπὶ τὸ μὴ λαβεῖν πρόσωπον τῶν Ἑρωδιανῶν καὶ τῶν οἱ ἐφρόνουν τὰ Καίσαρος, ἵνα ἀποφηνάμενος κατὰ τὸ βούλημα τῶν Φαρισαίων περὶ</p>	<p>26. You should also observe whether it is indicated in the present story that the Pharisees [K656] who desired to ensnare Jesus in speech sent not only their own disciples to inquire concerning the tax, but also along with the Herodians. For it was fitting that among the people at that time those who were teaching that tribute should be paid to Caesar were called Herodians by those who did not want such a thing to happen, whereas those who, by an imagination of freedom, refrained from the paying of tribute to Caesar seem to have been the Pharisees who had exacting knowledge of Jewish precepts. But should someone not want to take this in this way, let them indicate how those Pharisees who desire to entrap him in speech send their own disciples, but they also send the Herodians who are inquiring concerning the tribute. For what sort of snare would it have been when Jesus answered whether or not he wished that tribute be paid to Caesar, except (as we have proposed) that if he refused to paying tribute to Caesar, the Herodians were about to hand him over to the Romans, as though teaching apostasy, and should he allow [paying tribute], the Pharisees were about to condemn Jesus as though seeking to please man<sup>75</sup> rather than teaching “the way of God in truth”? Examine for yourself that it is the Pharisees’ [K657] disciples who say, <i>Teacher, we know that you are true and you teach the way of God in truth, and that you show deference to no one, for you do not look unto the face of man</i>, as though they are encouraging him through &lt;this&gt; praise to not show partiality to the Herodians who also have in mind <i>the things of Caesar</i>, in order that when, in accordance with the Pharisees’ plan, he pronounces that one should not pay tribute to Caesar, he might be handed</p>
--	---

<sup>75</sup> Lit. “looking at the face of man” as per the Gospel text.

τοῦ μὴ δεῖν Καίσαρι διδόναι φόρον, ὑπ' αὐτῶν παραδοθῇ τοῖς Ἑρωδιανοῖς. ὅρα δὲ καὶ τὸ γινώσκοντες ὅτι Ἰησοῦς τὴν πανουργίαν αὐτῶν εἶπε· τί με πειράζετε, ὑποκριταί; οὐκοῦν ἦδει πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων μετὰ πανουργίας αὐτῷ προσερχομένων, ἵνα ὅτι ποτ' ἂν ἀποκρίνηται ἐκ τῆς ἀποκρίσεως ἐπιβουλεύσωσιν αὐτῷ.

Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἐκ τοῦ προκειμένου εὐαγγελίου λελέχθω εἰς τὸν τόπον ὡς πρὸς τὴν λέξιν, οἷς συνάδει καὶ τὰ τοῦ Μάρκου καὶ τοῦ Λουκᾶ ῥητὰ [K658] περὶ τῶν ὁμοίων, ὡς δυνατόν σοι παραθεμένῳ τὰ εὐαγγέλια καὶ συνεξετάζοντι αὐτὰ ἀλλήλοις ἰδεῖν· οὐκ ἄλλος γὰρ νοῦς ἐστὶ παρὰ τοῦτον εἰρημένος τῷ Ματθαίῳ περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸν τόπον, καὶ παραπλησίως Ματθαίῳ παρὰ τῷ Μάρκῳ. ἅμα δὲ καὶ διδασκόμεθα ἀπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν μὴ τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν λεγομένοις καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐνδόξοις φαινομένοις προφάσει τῆς εἰς θεὸν εὐσεβείας προσέχειν, ἀλλὰ <τοῖς> ὑπὸ τῆς ἐξετάσεως καὶ τῆς ἀκολουθίας τοῦ λόγου παρισταμένοις. πρόσχες γὰρ ὅτι, ζητουμένου τοῦ εἰ δεῖ διδόναι Καίσαρι κῆνσον ἢ μή, οὐχ ἀπλῶς ἀπεφάνητο τὸ δοκοῦν ἑαυτῷ ἀλλὰ εἰπὼν ἐπιδείξατέ μοι τὸ νόμισμα τοῦ κῆνσου ἐπύθετο, τίνος ἢ εἰκῶν καὶ ἢ ἐπιγραφῆς, καὶ εἰποῦσιν ὅτι Καίσαρος, ἀπεκρίνατο ὅτι δεῖ ἀποδιδόναι τῷ Καίσαρι τὰ αὐτοῦ αἰτοῦντι καὶ μὴ ἀποστερεῖν αὐτὸν τῶν ἰδίων φαντασίᾳ θεοσεβείας· οὐ δῆπου δὲ τὰ μὲν Καίσαρος ἀποδιδόναι δεῖ τῷ Καίσαρι οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ οὐ κωλύεται τις ἀποδιδόναι Καίσαρι τὰ Καίσαρος ἀποδιδόναι τῷ θεῷ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ.

over to the Herodians by them. Note also the passage: *Jesus knew their craftiness and said, 'Why are you testing me, you hypocrites?'* So he understands that he is being tested by the Pharisees who approached him with craftiness, such that in whatever way he answered they would conspire against him from [his] answer.

Let these things be said, therefore, about the present passage from the Gospel according to the literal meaning, with the accounts of Mark and Luke agreeing [K658] with similar things recorded, insofar as you are able to see by setting the Gospels side by side and closely examining them one to the other. For there is no difference in meaning [in Luke]<sup>76</sup> from what is said by Matthew about the matters in the passage, and similarly with Matthew in regard to Mark. In all cases, we are taught by our Savior not to devote ourselves to those things that are said by the masses and, for this reason, appear as esteemed from a pretense of piety to God, but rather [devote ourselves] <to the things> [that are said] which are commended by examination and coherence of reason. For you should attend that, when asked whether or not it is necessary to pay tax to Caesar, he did not simply pronounce what seemed [right] to himself but he said, *Show me the coin used for the tax*, and he inquired, *Whose image and inscription is this?* When they said that it was *Caesar's*, he answered that it is necessary to render *to Caesar* his *things* when he asks [for them] and not to defraud him of his own things from an imagination of piety. Certainly one must not render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, while not [rendering] to God the things that are God's, and yet a person who renders to Caesar the things that are Caesar's is not hindered from rendering to God the things that are God's.

27. Δύναται δὲ τις τὰ κατὰ τὸν τόπον οὕτως τροπολογῆσαι. συνεστήκαμεν ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος (ὑπερκεῖσθω δὲ νῦν λέγειν ὅτι καὶ ἐκ πνεύματος) καὶ ὀφείλομέν τινα διδόναι ὥσπερ εἰ φόρον σωμάτων ἄρχοντι λεγομένῳ Καίσαρι, τὰ ἀναγκαῖα τῷ σώματι, ἔχοντα

27. But someone could offer a figurative reading of this passage in this way. We are composed of both soul and body (and let what excels [them] now be mentioned, that [we are composed] also of spirit) and we are obliged to pay some tribute, as it were, of [our] bodies to the ruler who is called Caesar, [namely,] such things as are necessary for the body,

<sup>76</sup> Implied?



<p>τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ τῶν σωμάτων ἄρχοντος σωματικὴν· ταῦτα δὲ ἐστὶ τροφή καὶ σκέπη καὶ ἀναγκαία διανόησις καὶ ὕπνοι. καὶ ἄλλα ὀφείλομεν, ἐπεὶ ἡ ψυχὴ φύσει κατ' εἰκόνα ἐστὶ θεοῦ, τῷ βασιλεῖ αὐτῆς θεῷ, ἅπερ ἐστὶ συμφέροντα καὶ κατάλληλα τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς φύσει καὶ οὐσίᾳ· ταῦτα δὲ εἰσιν &lt;πάντα&gt; αἱ ἐπ' ἀρετὴν ἄγουσαι ὁδοὶ καὶ αἱ κατ' ἀρετὴν πράξεις. οἱ οὖν διδασκόμενοι τὸν νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ τῶν τοῦ σώματος πραγμάτων καὶ ὀφειλομένων αὐτῷ οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ δοξάζουσιν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἀνάλογον ποιοῦσι τοῖς συμβουλευούσι μὴ διδόναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι, ὅση δύναμις νηστείας καὶ ἀγρυπνίας κακοῦντες τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἀποχῇ πάσῃ τῇ διὰ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὰς ἀναγκάς αὐτοῦ πράξεις. ἕτεροι δὲ παρὰ τούτους εἰσίν, οἱ ἀτρανώτως μὲν διαλαμβάνουσι περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸν τόπον, φαντάζονται δὲ ὅτι καὶ τῷ σώματι χρὴ διδόναι τὰς ὀφείλας. ἀλλ' ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν «ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ», τρανῶς χωρίζων τὰς εὐλόγους τῷ σώματι ὀφείλας ἀπὸ τῶν &lt;πνευματικῶν&gt; ὀφειλῶν τῆς ψυχῆς φησιν· <i>ἀπόδοτε τὰ Καίσαρος τῷ Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ</i>· εἰκόνα γὰρ ἔχει Καίσαρος καὶ σωματικῶν πραγμάτων ὁ φόρος, ὃν μόνον καὶ οὐδὲν πλέον αὐτοῦ ὀφείλομεν τῷ σώματι. [K661]</p>	<p>which has the somatic image of the ruler of bodies. These necessities include food, sight, rest, and sleep. And we are also obliged to [pay] other things to God who is the king of the [soul], since the soul is by nature in the image of God, and such things as are commensurate with and appropriate to the nature and essence of the soul. These are &lt;all&gt; the ways which guide [the soul] to virtue and the practices in accordance with virtue. Those, then, who are teaching the law of God with regard to the matters of the body and the things owed to it will not glorify those things. For they do the equivalent of those who conspire not to pay tax to Caesar, insofar as possible they afflict the body with fasting and vigils and they practice every [kind of] abstinence with respect to the body and its necessities. But there is another group, different than those [just mentioned], who do not clearly apprehend the things concerning this passage. They imagine that one must also pay their obligations to the body. But our Savior “the Logos of God,” clearly distinguishing the legitimate obligations to the body from the &lt;spiritual&gt; obligations of the soul, says, <i>Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and the things of God to God</i>, for the tribute to somatic things has an image of Caesar, which is all that what we are owe to the body, and nothing more. [K661]</p>
--	--

<p>28. Οἶδα δὲ καὶ ἄλλην εἰς τὸν τόπον τοιαύτην φερομένην διήγησιν. ὁ μὲν ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐν τροπολογίᾳ καλεῖται Καῖσαρ ὁ δὲ &lt;πάντων&gt; τῶν αἰώνων βασιλεὺς ἐν οὐδενὶ συμβόλῳ τυγχάνων θεὸς πανταχοῦ ὀνομάζεται. ἐπεὶ τοίνυν ἔχομεν τινα τοῦ ἄρχοντος τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, τουτέστι τὰ κατὰ κακίαν, καὶ οὐ πρότερον δυνάμεθα ἀποδιδόναι τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ, ἐὰν μὴ ἀποδῶμεν, ἀποθέμενοι πάντα τὰ τῆς κακίας, τῷ Καίσαρι τὰ τοῦ Καίσαρος, διὰ τοῦτο ὁ σωτὴρ ἐπιδειχθέντος τοῦ νομίσματος καὶ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ εἰκόνος φησιν· <i>ἀπόδοτε τὰ Καίσαρος τῷ Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ</i>. καὶ τοῦτο δὲ κατὰ τὸν [K662] τόπον σκοπήσωμεν ὅτι, ἐὰν ποτε πειραζόμενοι ὑπὸ τῶν ζητούντων ἀφορμὰς, προτεινόντων προβλήματα &lt;τινα&gt; οὐχ ἵνα μάθωσιν ἀλλ' ἵνα ὅση δύναμις ἡμῶν κατηγορήσωσιν, ἀκούωμεν</p>	<p>28. I know that another explanation could be proffered for this passage. The ruler of this age is figurately called Caesar, but the King of &lt;all&gt; ages who involves no symbol at all is everywhere named God. Since, then, we have something of the ruler of this age, that is, the things according to vice, we are not at first able to render <i>to God the things that are God's</i>, unless we render <i>to Caesar the things that are Caesar's</i> when we put away all the things of vice. Because of this the Savior says to the one who shows him the coin and the image on it, <i>Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's</i>. And let us observe with regard to the passage that, if ever we are tested by those who seek pretexts, presenting &lt;certain&gt; problems not so that they might learn but so that they might, as far as possible, condemn us—let us listen to our words based in experience—we are obliged neither to be completely</p>
---	---

<p>λόγους πειραστικούς ἡμῶν, οὔτε πάντη σιωπᾶν ὀφείλομεν οὔτε ὥς ἔτυχεν ἀποκρίνασθαι, ἀλλὰ περιεσκεμμένως καὶ μετὰ περισκέψεως, εἰς τὸ (ὅση δύναμις) ἐκκόψαι τὰς ἀφορμὰς «τῶν θελόντων» ἀφορμὰς, καὶ διδάσκειν ἀνεπιλήπτως τὰ σῶζοντα τοὺς βουλομένους ἐν τῇ ἀκούειν σῶζεσθαι. δύνανται δὲ οἱ μὲν <i>Φαρισαῖοι</i> λαμβάνεσθαι εἰς τοὺς διδασκάλους τῶν διαφόρων Ἰουδαϊκῶν παραδόσεων, οἱ δὲ Ἑρωδιανοὶ εἰς τὸν νομιζόμενον παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς βασιλικὸν Ἰουδαίων τῶν οὕτως ἀπλούστερον λεγομένων λόγον. ἀφ' ἑκατέρων οὖν πυνθάνονται τοῦ σωτῆρος τὰ περὶ τοῦ κήνσου. ὁ δὲ αὐτοῖς ἀποκρίνεται, ὥς ἀποδεδώκαμεν· πλὴν ἐπεὶ οὐ μαθεῖν βούλονται ἐκ τοῦ ἐρωτᾶν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ παγιδεῦσαι ἐν λόγῳ καὶ πειράζειν αὐτόν, διὰ τοῦτο ἀκούσαντες τὰ δοκοῦντα αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸ πύσμα αὐτῶν καὶ θαυμάσαντες, [K663] ὅτι μὴ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἀφορμὰς τοῦ αὐτῷ ἐπιβουλεύειν οὐκ ἔμειναν μὲν παρ' αὐτῷ, ὥς οἱ μαθηταί, οὐδὲ ἀπλῶς ἀπῆλθον, ὥς περὶ ἄλλων γέγραπται, ἀφέντες δὲ αὐτὸν ἀπῆλθον. καὶ τοιοῦτοί γέ εἰσιν οἱ ἀφιέντες τὸν λόγον καὶ ἀπιστοῦντες αὐτῷ καὶ ἀπίοντες ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μετὰ τὸ ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ. καὶ οὐχ ἁμαρτήσῃ λέγων περὶ τῶν μετὰ τὸ ἀκοῦσαι ἀποστάντων καὶ τοῦ ἀκούειν, ὅτι οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἀφέντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπῆλθον· ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐροῦμεν τὸ τῆς νύμφης· «ἐκράτησα αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκα αὐτόν».</p>	<p>silent nor to answer haphazardly,<sup>77</sup> but circumspectly and with circumspection, to (as far as possible) stamp out<sup>78</sup> the pretexts “of those who desire” pretexts (2 Cor 11.12), and to teach unassailably the things that save those who desire, by hearing, to be saved. The Pharisees could be taken as the teachers of various Jewish traditions, and the Herodians as that word which the masses deem “royal treasury” of the Jews who are thus called “simpler.” From each of them, therefore, they inquire of the Savior about the matter of tax. But he answers them, in the way we have set forth: Now since they do not desire to learn when they ask him, but to entrap him <i>in speech</i> and to test him, for this reason <i>when they heard</i> the things he said in response to their inquiry they marveled, [K663] for he did not give them pretexts to conspire against him, [and so] they did not remain with him, as the disciples, nor did they simply <i>go away</i>, as it is written concerning the others, but <i>they withdrew from him and went away</i>. Such people are those who withdraw from the Logos and are unfaithful to him and are absent from him after hearing him. Indeed it would not be wrong to say that this is about those, after hearing, reject even hearing, for they <i>withdrew from Jesus and went away</i>. But as for us, let us say what the bride [says], “I held him, and I would not leave him” (Song 3.4).</p>
<p>29. Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ Σαδδουκαῖοι λέγοντες μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, ἕως τοῦ ἐξεπλήρουντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ. (ματθ. 22, 23–33). τὰ δὲ ἰσοδυναμοῦντα τούτοις ἢ τὰ αὐτὰ αὐτοῖς εἴρηται καὶ παρὰ τῷ Μάρκῳ καὶ τῷ Λουκᾷ ἐν ἄλλαις κατ' ὀλίγα λέξεσιν. Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ· ποία ἢ ὅτε «πορευθέντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι [K664] συμβούλιον ἔλαβον κατ' αὐτοῦ ὅπως αὐτὸν παγιδεύσωσιν ἐν λόγῳ», καὶ πυνθάνονται τὰ περὶ τοῦ κήνσου; εἰκὸς γὰρ ὅτι, ἀποκριναμένου τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν περὶ τοῦ κήνσου, καὶ εἰπόντος·</p>	<p>29. On the same day, Sadducees came to him and said, “There is no resurrection” etc., up to, <i>They were astounded by his teaching</i> (22.23–33). Mark and Luke have said things of equivalent force or indeed the same as [Matthew’s] account, with different readings in some small details (Mk 12.18ff; Lk 20.27ff). <i>On the same day</i>: Which day but [the one] when “the Pharisees [K664] came and took counsel against him so that they might entrap him in speech” (Matt 22.15), and they made inquiry with regard to the matter of the tax? For it was fitting, when our Savior answers concerning the tax, and says, “Render therefore to Caesar</p>

<sup>77</sup> ὥς ἔτυχεν “as it happens,” as a matter of chance.

<sup>78</sup> A pun of sorts with the theme of “image” in context?

«ἀπόδοτε οὖν τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ», καὶ θαυμασάντων <πάντων> τὴν ἀπόκρισιν αὐτοῦ, ᾠήθησαν οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι, εἰδότες αὐτοῦ τὰς συνετὰς ἀποκρίσεις, ἥτοι αὐτοὶ διὰ τῆς ἐπαπορήσεως παραστήσειν ἑαυτοὺς κρείττονα λόγον ἔχοντας, μὴ εἶναι λέγοντας ἀνάστασιν τῶν ἐλπίζόντων αὐτήν, ἣ τάχα καὶ μαθήσεσθαι, πῶς δύναται εἶναι ἀνάστασις κατὰ τὴν Μωσέως γραφὴν καὶ ποῖος ὁ βίος ἔσται τῶν ἀναστησομένων. παρατήρει δὲ ὅτι σχεδὸν πᾶσα ἡ τοῦ καιροῦ τούτου τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν διδασκαλία πρὸς πεύσεις ἐγίνετο. καὶ πρῶτόν γε «ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν προσήλθον αὐτῷ διδάσκοντι οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ λέγοντες· ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς; καὶ τίς ἔδωκέ σοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην;» πρὸς οὓς ἀντερωτήσας τὰ περὶ Ἰωάννου ἔδοξεν εὐλόγως παρητησθαι τὴν πρὸς τὸ βούλημα αὐτῶν ἀπόκρισιν. εἶτα μετὰ τοῦτο λέγει παραβολὴν τὴν περὶ τῶν δύο τέκνων, τοῦ τε <μὴ> ὑποσχομένου [K665] ἐργάσασθαι «ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι» καὶ [μὴ] ἐργασαμένου, καὶ τοῦ ἐπαγγειλαμένου μὲν μὴ ἐργασαμένου δέ. εἶτα μετὰ ταῦτα λέγει τὴν περὶ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος παραβολὴν καὶ τῶν ἀποκτεινάντων γεωργῶν τοὺς δούλους καὶ τὸν υἱόν, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς τούτων περὶ τῶν εἰς τοὺς γάμους κλητῶν ἄλλην παραβολήν. καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο δευτέραν πεῦσιν τὴν περὶ τοῦ κήνσου ἀνέγραψεν ὁ Ματθαῖος, καὶ τρίτην τὴν τῶν Σαδδουκαίων περὶ ἀναστάσεως ἐπαπόρησιν. ἀλλὰ καὶ τετάρτη μετὰ ταύτην ἐπερώτησις γεγένηται ἀπὸ τινος Φαρισαίου πειράζοντος αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ· «ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ;» τοσοῦτων δὲ ἐρωτήσεων προσαγομένων αὐτῷ καὶ αὐτὸς «συνηγμένων τῶν Φαρισαίων ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοὺς» τὰ «περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ».

Οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι μέντοι λέγοντες μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν, οὐ <μόνον> τὴν ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ τῶν ἀπλουστέρων ὀνομαζομένην ἀνάστασιν σαρκὸς ἠθέτουν, ἀλλὰ καὶ παντελῶς ἀνῆρουν τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς οὐ μόνον ἀθανασίαν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπιδιαμονήν, οἰόμενοι μηδαμῶς ἐν τοῖς Μωσέως γράμμασι σημαίνεσθαι τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς μετὰ ταῦτα

the things of Caesar and to God the things of God” (Matt 22.21), and they <all> marvel at his answer, that the Sadducees might suppose, when they saw his intelligent answers, that either through the difficulty they have their own better word to present, saying that there is no resurrection for those who are hoping for it, or perhaps even to learn how there could be a resurrection according to writing of Moses and what kind of life it will be for those who are raised. Do observe that almost every teaching of our Savior at this time comes in reply to questions. First “when he comes to the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people come to him while teaching and they say, ‘By what sort of authority do you do these things? And who gave to you this authority?’” (21.23-27), to which he replies with the question concerning John, thinking it right to decline to answer because of their intention. Then after this he speaks a parable about the two children, one which does <not> consent [K665] to work “in the vineyard” and yet works, and the other who promises [to work] but does not work (21.28-32). Then after this he speaks the parable about the vineyard and the vineyard tenants who kill the servants and the son (21.33-46), which is followed by another parable about those called to the wedding feast (22.1-14). And after this Matthew recorded a second question about the tax (22.15-22), and a third difficult problem from the Sadducees about the resurrection (22.23-33). But there is indeed a fourth questioning after this which comes from a certain Pharisee who tests him concerning, “What is the great commandment in the law?” (22.36). And when questions such as these are being brought to him, Jesus himself “asks the Pharisees when they were gathered together” things “concerning the Christ” (22.41-46).

^To be sure, when *the Sadducees* say that *there is no resurrection*, not <only> do they reject the *resurrection* of the flesh as it is termed in the custom of the simpler folk, but they also completely deny not only the immortality of the soul but also [its] continued existence (ἐπιδιαμονήν), as they think that the life of the soul after [this life] is nowhere indicated in the writings of Moses.<sup>79</sup> The same teaching to the Sadducees [K666] concerning the human soul is the opinion up to the present day of the

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Origen, *Hom. Lk.* 39.

ζωήν. τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ τοῖς Σαδδουκαίοις [K666] δόγμα περὶ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχῆς φρονοῦσι μέχρι τοῦ δεῦρο Σαμαρεῖς καὶ οἱ δοκοῦντες ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶναι νομομαθεῖς καὶ ἕως θανάτου ἀγωνιζόμενοι περὶ τοῦ Μωσέως νόμου καὶ τῆς περιτομῆς. τοῦτο δὲ τὸ περὶ ἀναστάσεως σημαινόμενον (λέγω δὲ τὸ παρὰ Σαδδουκαίοις καὶ Σαμαρεῦσιν, <τοῖς> ἀθετοῦσι τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς μετὰ ταῦτα ζωήν) νοοῦντές τινες <καὶ> τῶν κατὰ τὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου χρόνον Κορινθίων ἐδογματίζον μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν, περὶ ὧν ταῦτα γράφει «εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται ἐκ νεκρῶν ὅτι ἐγήγερται, πῶς λέγουσιν ἐν ὑμῖν τινες ὅτι ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν;» ὅτι δὲ οἱ ἐν Κορίνθῳ λέγοντες μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν κατὰ τὸ Σαδδουκαίων σημαινόμενον ἠθέτουν [τὴν ἀνάστασιν] τὴν ἐπιδιαμονὴν τῆς ψυχῆς, δῆλον ποιεῖ ἐκ τοῦ «εἰ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ ἡλπικότες ἐσμέν ἐν Χριστῷ μόνον, ἐλεεινότεροι πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐσμέν». ὅπερ ἐπιμελῶς ἐξετάσας ὅπει ὅτι ὁ μὲν ἀθετῶν τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ [K667] πεπιστευμένην ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, κἂν ψευδόμενος ἀθετῇ, οὐ πάντως ἐν «τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ ἐν Χριστῷ» ἡλπικῶς ἔστι «μόνον». ἵνα γὰρ καθ' ὑπόθεσιν μὴ ἢ ἀληθῆς ἡ πεπιστευμένη παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀνάστασις, οὐκ «ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ζωῇ» ἡλπικε «μόνον» «ἐν Χριστῷ» ὁ ἐκείνην ἀθετῶν ζώσης τῆς ψυχῆς, οὐκ ἐκεῖνο μὲν ἀπολαμβάνουσιν τὸ σῶμα ἐνδυομένης δὲ αἰθερίον τι καὶ κρεῖττον. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ «ἐλεεινότεροι πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐσμέν», εἰ τὴν μὲν ψυχὴν λέγομεν ζῆν καὶ ὑπάρχειν, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦτο μὴ περιτιθεῖμεν αὐτῇ μηδὲ λέγομεν ἀπολαμβάνειν αὐτό.

Ἔτι δὲ εἰς κατασκευὴν τοῦ πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον τοῦτο μάλιστα ἵστασθαι τὸν ἀπόστολον ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους προτέρᾳ συγγραφήσῃ καὶ τῷ «εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν; τί καὶ ἡμεῖς κινδυνεύομεν πᾶσαν ὥραν;» καὶ τῷ «εἰ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ἐθηριομάχησα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, τί μοι τὸ ὄφελος; εἰ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, φάγωμεν καὶ πίνωμεν, αὔριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν». ἔστω γὰρ τὸ νομισθὲν παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀληθὲς εἶναι

Samarians and those who seem to have been instructed in the Law from them and are struggling unto death for the Law of Moses and circumcision. Some of the Corinthians in the time of the Apostle <also> believed this interpretation of the resurrection (I mean as according to the Sadducees and Samaritans, <who> reject the life of the soul after [this life]), and they were teaching that *there is no resurrection*, concerning which he writes these things: “But if Christ is preached as raised from the dead, how do certain people among you say that there is no resurrection of the dead?” (1 Cor 15.12). But that those in Corinth who were saying that *there is no resurrection* of the dead in accordance with the interpretation of the Sadducees were [also] rejecting the continued existence of the soul, he makes clear from, “if we are only hopeful in Christ in this life, we are most pitiable of all men” (1 Cor 15.19 sbq). Wherefore one who gives careful examination will see that the one who rejects the resurrection of the dead as believed in the church [K667], even though he might reject while being deceived, he is not completely hopeful “in Christ only” in “this life.” For in order that, according to [our] supposition (καθ' ὑπόθεσιν), the resurrection as believed by the masses might not be true, he who rejects this [understanding] of the life of the soul does not have hope “in this life alone,” [for he hopes] not for the recovery of this body, but of being clothed with one that is ethereal and better. But “we are” not “most pitiable of all men” if we should say that the soul lives and exists, but we would not attach this body to it, nor say that it recovers [this body].

Yet for the construction of something better than this interpretation [of the resurrection] the Apostle presents in the First [Epistle] to the Corinthians, we might also avail ourselves of, “If the dead are not at all raised, why indeed are they baptized for their sake? Why indeed are we endangered every hour?” (1 Cor 15.29-30), as well as, “If according to man<sup>80</sup> I fought with beasts in Ephesus, what is the benefit to me? If the dead are not raised, ‘let us eat and drink, for on the morrow we die’” (1 Cor 15.32). For let what is deemed by the masses to be true, not be true as concerns the resurrection of the dead, how does it follow from

<sup>80</sup> κατὰ ἄνθρωπον can be variously translated: “from human motives” (NAS), “in the manner of men” (NKJV).

<p>μη εἶναι ἀληθὲς τὸ περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν, πῶς τούτῳ ἀκολουθεῖ τὸ μάτην ἡμᾶς κινδυνεύειν [K668] ὑπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν ἀγωνιζομένους; πῶς δὲ οὐδὲν ὄφελος τῷ διὰ Χριστὸν θηριομαχήσαντι *** οἰκονομουμένη κατ' ἀξίαν, τὸ δὲ πρότερον σῶμα μη ἀπολαμβάνει; πῶς δὲ ἀκολουθεῖ τῷ <i>μη εἶναι</i> σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν τὸ «φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν, αὔριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν»; οὐ ταῦτα δὲ φαμεν ἀπιστοῦντες τῷ ἐν Ἡσαΐα γεγραμμένῳ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον· «ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ» ἢ τῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰὼβ λεγομένῳ· «ὅτι ἀένναός ἐστιν ὁ ἐκλύειν με μέλλων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἀναστήσαι τὸ δέρμα μου τὸ ἀνατλοῦν ταῦτα». οὐκ ἀπιστοῦμεν δὲ οὐδὲ τῇ ἀποστολικῇ φωνῇ λεγούσῃ· «ζωοποιήσει τὰ θνητὰ ὑμῶν σώματα διὰ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ἐν ὑμῖν». ἀλλ' ὅση δύναμις καθαίρωμεν τὸ ἐν τῇ ἐκκειμένη λέξει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σημαινόμενον ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνάστασις φωνῆς, διὸ παρεθέμεθα καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς προτέρας πρὸς Κορινθίους ῥητά.</p> <p><i>Προσῆλθον οὖν τῷ Ἰησοῦ Σαδδουκαῖοι, οἵτινες ἔλεγον μη εἶναι ἀνάστασιν, ἀνάστασιν δὲ τὴν (ὡς ἀποδεδώκαμεν) κατ' αὐτούς, καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν ἡμῶν τὸν κύριον [K669] λέγοντες· Μωσῆς εἶπεν· ἐάν τις ἀποθάνῃ μη ἔχων τέκνα, ἐπιγαμβρεύσει ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναστήσει σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ.</i></p>	<p>this the folly for us to be endangered [K668] who are struggling for the sake of the salvation of our souls? And how is there no benefit to our fighting beasts on account of Christ *** as each one has been administered according to merit, but one ought receive back the first body? How does it follow from <i>there being no resurrection</i> of the flesh that “let us eat and drink, for on the morrow we die” (1 Cor 15.32)? We do not say these things while disbelieving what was written by Isaiah in this passage, “All flesh will see the salvation of God” (Isa 40.5), or that which is said by Job, “for he who is about to deliver me from the earth is everlasting, and he will raise my skin that endures these things” (Job 19.25-26). Nor do we disbelieve the apostolic voice which says, “He will make alive our mortal bodies through His Spirit which indwells us” (Rom 8.11).<sup>81</sup> But insofar as we are able, let us clarify what is signified by the term “resurrection” in the text set out in the Gospel, wherefore we have set forth these words from the First [Epistle] to the Corinthians.</p> <p><i>Sadducees came to Jesus, therefore, which are those who say that there is no resurrection, but the resurrection (as we have set forth) according to them, and they question again our Lord [K669] saying, “Moses said, if someone dies without having any children, his brother will take his wife as next of kin and will raise up seed for his brother” (22.24 / Deut 25.5).</i></p>
<p>30. ἄξιον οὖν εἰς τοῦτό μοι δοκεῖ παραθέσθαι τὴν Μωσέως λέξιν, εἰς ἣν ἀνέφερον Σαδδουκαῖοι τὰ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ γεγραμμένα ὑπ' αὐτῶν εἰρησθαι. ἔχει οὖν οὕτως ἐν τῷ Δευτερονομίῳ τὸ ῥητόν· «ἐάν δὲ κατοικήσωσιν ἀδελφοὶ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, καὶ ἀποθάνῃ εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν» καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς [K670] ἕως τοῦ «οἶκος τοῦ ὑπολυθέντος τὸ ὑπόδημα». τούτου δὴ τοῦ ῥητοῦ οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι, ὡς τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς ἀναστάσεως μη ἔχοντες, φαύλως ἀκούσαντες καὶ μηδὲν θεοῦ ἄξιον ἐνθυμηθέντες εἰς</p>	<p>30.<sup>82</sup> I think it a worthwhile endeavor here to set forth the text of Moses, unto which the Sadducees are said to have appealed in what is written about them in the Gospel. The text runs as such in Deuteronomy: “If brothers should live together, and one of them dies,” etc., [K670] up to, “the house of him who has had his sandal loosed” (Deut 25.5-10). The <i>Sadducees</i>, as they have no hope of the resurrection, hear this text in a faulty way, not considering the present law in a way at all worthy of God. They suppose that it would follow from <i>there being a resurrection</i> that the husband<sup>83</sup> will be</p>

<sup>81</sup> Sections of the text between the carrots (^) have also been translated in Balthasar, *Origen: Spirit & Fire*, par. 341 (pg. 142).

<sup>82</sup> Klostermann treats this as a continuous paragraph with the preceding par. 29.

<sup>83</sup> Throughout “man” and “woman” are interchangeable with “husband” and “wife.”

τὸν ἐκκείμενον νόμον, ᾠήθησαν ἀκολουθεῖν τῷ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν τὸ καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα ἄνδρα πάλιν ἔσεσθαι ἀναστάντα ἄρρενα μόρια ἔχοντα, καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα γυναῖκα ἀναστήσεσθαι σῶμα γυναικεῖον περικειμένην. καὶ ταπεινῶς ὑπολαμβάνοντες λέγεσθαι τὰ περὶ ἀναστάσεως ἐκ τοῦ ταῦτα αὐτοῖς νομίζειν ἀκολουθεῖν, πλάσαντές τινα μῦθον τὸν περὶ ἑπτὰ ἀδελφῶν γαμησάντων μίαν γυναῖκα, ἐπηπόρουσαν τίνος ἂν γένοιτο γυνή τοιαύτη ἀναστᾶσα, φθάσασα ἅπαξ ἑπτὰ χρηματίσαι ἀνδρῶν γυνή. ἐδύναντο δὲ καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ τοιοῦτου πλάσματος ἐπαπορῆσαι ἐκ τῶν πολυγάμων γυναικῶν, τάχα δὲ καὶ πολυγάμων ἀνδρῶν. καὶ ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν ἀποκρινόμενος αὐτοῖς τὸ μὲν βούλημα τοῦ κατὰ Μωσέα νόμου οὐ διηγῆσατο, ὡς οὐκ ἀξίους γνώσεως τηλικούτου μυστηρίου [K671]· μόνον δὲ ἀπ<λῶς ἀπ>εφήνατο λέγων καὶ τὰς θείας γραφὰς ἀπαγγέλλειν περὶ τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως ὅτι ἐκεῖ μὴ εἰσι γάμοι, ἀλλὰ γίνονται οἱ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνιστάμενοι ὡς οἱ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄγγελοι, καὶ ὥσπερ οἱ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄγγελοι οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμοῦνται, οὕτω (φησὶ) καὶ οἱ ἀνιστάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν. ἐγὼ δ' οἶμαι διὰ τούτων δηλοῦσθαι ὅτι οὐ μόνον κατὰ τὸ μὴ γαμεῖν καὶ τὸ μὴ γαμεῖσθαι ὡς οἱ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄγγελοι γίνονται οἱ καταξιούμενοι τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ τὸ μετασχηματιζόμενα αὐτῶν τὰ σώματα «τῆς ταπεινώσεως» γίνεσθαι τοιαῦτα, ὅποῖα ἐστὶ τὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων σώματα, αἰθέρια καὶ αὐγοειδὲς φῶς.

Ξενίζον δὲ τι τοὺς πολλοὺς τῶν πιστευόντων δόγμα ζητῆσαι τις ἂν, τάχα μὲν καὶ πολλαχόθεν σαφῶς δ' ὅτι καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἐπαπορῶν, εἰ ὥσπερ εἰσὶν οἱ ἀνιστάμενοι ἐκ νεκρῶν ὡς οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τάγμα τι ἀγγέλων, μεταβάλλοντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, οὕτως καὶ ἄλλοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄγγελοι, ἀνθρωποὶ ποτε ὄντες καὶ καλῶς ἀγωνισάμενοι ἐν ἀνθρώπου σώματι, γεγόνασιν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄγγελοι ὡς τινες ἕτεροι πρὸ αὐτῶν. ὁ δὲ τὸ ξενίζον τοῦτο δόγμα ζητῶν ἐκ τῆς προκειμένης λέξεως [K672], τάχα δὲ καὶ ἀλλαχόθεν, ὁράτω περιθρήσας ὅλην τὴν τε γραφὴν καὶ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν πραγμάτων, καὶ τί ἔπεται τῷ ταῦτα τιθέντι, <καὶ> σκοπεῖτω εἰ χρὴ παραδέξασθαι τοιοῦτον λόγον ᾧ ἔπεται τοιαῦτα ἅτινα δηλοῦται ἐκ τοῦ «ἀγγέλους κρινοῦμεν» καὶ τοῦ «εἰς ἃ

raised again as a man having male parts, and likewise that a woman will be resurrected as the wife having a body that is female as at present. And taking hold in lowly fashion of the things said concerning the resurrection of the dead as from their reckoning to follow these things, they fashion some sort of myth that concerns *seven* brothers marrying one *woman*, and so pose the problem of *whose wife* she would be when raised, one woman having come to be named for seven husbands. They could also have posed the problem apart from this form of women with many marriages, perhaps also [in the forms] of men with many marriages. Yet when our Savior answers them, he does not explain the intention of Moses' law, as though they are not worthy of the knowledge of so great a mystery [K671]. Rather, he simply makes a pronouncement, saying only that the divine Scriptures proclaim that there in the resurrection of the dead there are no marriages, but those who are resurrected from the dead become *as the angels in heaven*, and just *as the angels in heaven neither marry nor are married*, so also (he says) it is with those who are resurrected from the dead. I myself think it is made clear through these things that not only will those who are accounted worthy of the resurrection from the dead be *as the angels in heaven* with respect not only to not marrying or being married, but also with respect to their bodies "of lowliness" (Phil 3.21) being transformed to be such as the angels whose bodies are ethereal and brilliant light.

But someone might inquire about a certain teaching that is shocking to the masses of believers, perhaps indeed for many reasons but clearly because of the difficulty posed here, whether [it is the case that] just as those who are raised from the dead are *as the angels in heaven* and a certain rank of angels, changing over from men [to angels], in the same way also other *angels in heaven*, who were men at one time and have struggled well in the human body, have become *angels in heaven* as with certain others before them. Let the person who seeks this shocking teaching from the present text [K672], and perhaps also from other places, observe so as to make full inspection of the whole Scripture and the sequence of matters, and what remains at the disposal of one who asserts these things, <and> let him inspect if such a teaching should be accepted by someone who has at hand such things as are indicated from the passage, "we will judge angels" (1 Cor 6.3) and from [the passage], "into which things angels desire to look" (1 Pet

<p>ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι». εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰούδα προσοιτό τις ἐπιστολήν, ὁράτω τί ἔπεται τῷ λόγῳ διὰ τὸ «ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν». ὁράτω δὲ ὁ τὰ τοιαῦτα τολμῶν ζητεῖν, πῶς αὐτῶν δεῖ ἀκούειν τῶν ἐν Γενέσει γεγραμμένων ὅτι «ιδόντες οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὅτι καλαὶ εἰσιν, ἔλαβον ἑαυτοῖς εἰς γυναῖκας ἀπὸ πασῶν ὧν ἐξελέξαντο». σαφῶς δὲ τὰ κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἐπαπορῆσαι καὶ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν αὐτῶν ἐπισκοπῆσαι καὶ χάρτη πιστεῦσαι τὴν τῶν τηλικούτων σαφήνειαν, μήποτε οὐκ ἀσφαλὲς ἦ· ἀρκεῖ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον παρακεκινδυνεύκεναι.</p>	<p>1.12). And if one might also admit the Epistle of Jude, let him see what is at hand in the word on account of “the angels who did not keep to their own rule but abandoned their own dwelling have been kept in eternal chains under darkness for judgment of the great day” (Jude 6). Let him who dares to inquire about such things observe how one must hear those things that are written in Genesis that “when the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were beautiful, they took to themselves for wives from all those whom they chose” (Gen 6.2). Perhaps it was not without danger even to clearly pose the difficult problems involved in this passage and to make careful observation as to their sequence and to believe with delight the clarity of such great matters, for it is sufficient indeed for us to have courted danger to the degree [we already have] with the things [we have] said.</p>
<p>31. Οὐκ ἄκαιρον δὲ νομίζω ἅπαξ ἐκθεμένους τὴν λέξιν τοῦ νόμου ἀπὸ τοῦ Δευτερονομίου, ἰδεῖν [K673] ὁποῖόν γέ ἐστίν αὐτοῦ τὸ βούλημα. ζητητέον οὖν ἐν αὐτῷ τίς ἢ μία γυνὴ καὶ τίνες οἱ δύο ἄνδρες οἱ ἀλλήλων ἀδελφοί, &lt;ὧν&gt; πρότερον μὲν γαμῶν ὁ ἕτερός &lt;ἐστὶ&gt; τὴν γυναῖκα οὐ καρποφορῶν δὲ ἐξ αὐτῆς, δεῦτερον δὲ γαμῶν ὁ τοῦ τεθνηκότος ἀδελφός καὶ γεννῶν παιδίον ἐξ ὀνόματος τοῦ τετελευτηκότος. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ζητήσεις τίς ἐστὶν ὁ μὴ βουλόμενος «λαβεῖν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἑαυτοῦ» καὶ διὰ τοῦτο «ἐναντίον τῆς γερουσίας» ὑπολυόμενος «τὸ ἐν ὑπόδημα» καὶ ἐμπτυόμενος «εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον» ὑπὸ τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ ἀναβάσης «ἐπὶ τὴν πύλην» καὶ λεγοῦσης· «οὐ θέλει ὁ ἀδελφός τοῦ ἀνδρός μου ἀναστῆσαι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐν Ἰσραὴλ». ζητηθεῖ δ' ἂν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ καὶ τίς ἢ γερουσία καὶ ἡ πύλη ἐφ' ἣν ἀναβαίνει «ἡ γυνή» λέγουσα τὰ γεγραμμένα. ὅτι μὲν οὖν σεμνόν τι εἶναι καὶ αἰδοῦς ἄξιον χρῆ πεπεισθαι πάντα νόμον ἐπαγγελλούμενον εἶναι θεοῦ ἢ μὴ ὄντα σεμνὸν μὴ εἶναι νόμον θεοῦ, πᾶς ὁ μὴ πάντῃ ἀσύνητος ὁμολογῆσαι ἂν· εἰ δὲ εὐρίσκομεν ἡμεῖς τὸ τοῦ νόμου τούτου σεμνὸν καὶ αἰδέσιμον ἢ μὴ, πρῶτον μὲν ὁ θεὸς ἂν εἰδείῃ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς αὐτοῦ, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ ὁ κατὰ τὴν [K674] γραφὴν ὀνομαζόμενος δόκιμος τραπεζίτης καὶ εἰδὼς</p>	<p>31. I do not think it inopportune, having already set out the text of the law from Deuteronomy, to see [K673] what its intention is. We must inquire in this [passage], therefore, as to the identity of this one wife and these two men who are brothers of one another, &lt;of whom&gt; &lt;it is&gt; the other [brother] who first marries the woman but does not bear offspring from her, but when the brother of the one who dies marries [her] in the second place and begets a child from the name of the one who has died. And after these things, you should inquire who it is who does not want “to take the wife of the brother for himself” and because of this the wife unlooses “the one sandal” “against the older” and spits “on [his] face” and ascends “to the gate,” saying, “My husband’s brother is not willing to raise up his brother’s name in Israel” (Deut 25.7ff). You might also inquire in the passage as to the identity of the elder [assembly] and the gate to which “the woman” ascends when she says the things written. For let everyone who is not completely without sense confess, then, being fully persuaded that every law which is announced to be of God contains something noble and is worthy of reverence, or that what is not noble is not a law from God; but whether or not we ourselves find the nobility and dignity of this law, first God and his Christ would know, and after this also he who is called according to [K674] Scripture the tester of the table</p>

«πάντα» δοκιμάζειν καὶ τὸ μὲν «καλὸν» κατέχειν, ἀπέχεσθαι δὲ «παντὸς εἶδους πονηροῦ». φέρε οὖν τὸ προκείμενον πρόβλημα νομικὸν διηγήσασθαι θέλοντες, ἐπικαλεσάμενοι τὸν εἰπόντα· «φθέγξομαι προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς», εἰπόμεν «καλὸν» μὲν εἰ <κατέχομεν> τὰ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ διδόμενα, εἰ δὲ μὴ γε τὰ ὑποπίπτοντα ἡμῖν εἰς τὸν τόπον· κρινεῖ δὲ ὁ ἐντυγχάνων τοῖς λεχθησομένοις.

Δοκεῖ δὴ μοι κατὰ μίαν διήγησιν γυνὴ εἶναι ἢ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ψυχῇ, γαμουμένη πρότερον μὲν τῷ τοῦ νόμου γράμματι καὶ μὴ τεκνοῦσα ἐξ αὐτοῦ, δεύτερον δὲ τῷ πνευματικῷ νόμῳ καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου καρποφοροῦσα καὶ γεννῶσα καὶ μὴ ἀφισταμένη ἐν τῷ γεγεννημένῳ τῆς πρὸς τὸν ἀποθανόντα αὐτῇ νόμον γράμματος τιμῆς. καὶ τάχα ἐκάστη ἢ ἐσομένη μακαρία ψυχὴ καὶ τροπικῶς <λεγομένη> γυνὴ πάντως γαμεῖται πρότερον κατὰ τὰς εἰσαγωγὰς τῷ τοῦ νόμου γράμματι, ὃς ἀποθνήσκει προκοπτοῦσης τῆς γυναικὸς ψυχῆς, ἵν' αὐτὴ τοῦ σεμνοτέρου καὶ τεκνοποιοῦ ἐπιτύχη γάμου, ὅτε «σωθήσεται διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας», ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα μείνη «ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ καὶ ἀγιασμῷ μετὰ σωφροσύνης», οὐ σωθησομένη πρὸ τῆς τεκνογονίας ἢ χωρὶς αὐτῆς. [K675] τέκνα δὲ τῆς γυναικὸς ταύτης ψυχῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ δευτέρου ἀνδρός, τοῦ πνευματικοῦ νόμου, τὰ κατ' αὐτόν ἐστιν ἔργα. ἀδελφοὶ δὲ <δύο> καὶ ἀπὸ μιᾶς μητρὸς διανοίας γεννῶμενοι οἱ δύο νόμοι \*\*\*, οἵτινες ἀεὶ κατοικοῦσιν «ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό»· οὐ γὰρ κεχώριστα ὁ οἶκος αὐτῶν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων, ἀλλ' «ἀδελφοί» εἰσι καὶ ἀμφοτέραι αἱ ἐκδοχαὶ ὡς ἐν οἴκῳ ἐνὶ τῷ περιέχοντι αὐτοὺς γράμματι. [K676] καὶ ὅρα εἰ μὴ τοῦτο δηλοῦσθαι δύναται ἐκ τοῦ «ἂν δὲ κατοικῶσιν ἀδελφοὶ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό». εἴτα ἐξῆς ἐστι· «καὶ ἀποθάνῃ εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν, σπέρμα δὲ μὴ ἦ αὐτῷ», ἃ κατὰ δύναμιν διηγησάμην. ἴδωμεν δὲ καὶ τὸ «οὐκ ἔσται ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ τεθνηκότος ἔξω ἀνδρὶ μὴ ἐγγίζοντι», καὶ τίς μὲν γυνὴ ψυχὴ παραβαίνει τοῦτον τὸν νόμον τίς δὲ τηρεῖ. ὡς ἐν τοιοῦτοις δὴ τόποις ὑπολαμβάνω μετὰ τὸν θάνατον τῆς κατὰ τὸ γράμμα ἐκδοχῆς τοῦ νόμου καὶ τὴν ἀνατροπὴν αὐτῆς τὴν μὲν τινα ψυχὴν ποιοῦσαν παρὰ τὴν θεῖαν ἐντολήν, γυναῖκα πρότερον γενομένην τοῦ τεθνηκότος καὶ ἐκείνῳ πιστεύσασαν, «ἔξω» πάντα γίνεσθαι τοῦ νόμου «ἀνδρὶ μὴ

and who knows to test “all things” and to accept “what is good,” but to reject “every form of evil” (1 Thess 5.21f). Come, then, as we desire to explain the problem before us from the law, and calling upon him who said, “I will utter problems from the beginning” (Ps 77.2), let us speak what is “good” provided <we accept> the things given by him, but otherwise [we have said] the things that occurred to us about the passage. Let the [reader] who engages these reflections [of ours] be the judge.

It seems to me that according to one explanation, the woman is the soul of man, who is first married to the letter of the law yet does not bear [offspring] from it, while in the second place [she is married] to the spiritual law and bears fruit from it and begets and does not abandon what is begotten to her of from the letter for the law which dies. Perhaps in fact each soul who would be blessed and is figuratively <called> woman is always at first married to the letter of the law in accordance with initiation, which [husband] dies when the soul *qua* wife advances, such that she might be attached to a more noble and child-producing spouse, at which time “she will be saved through childbearing” (1 Tim 2.15), when the children remain “in faith and love, holiness and moderation,” [the soul] not being saved before childbearing or apart from it. [K675] The children of this woman *qua* soul that come from the second husband, the spiritual law, are the works in accordance with it. <Two> brothers which are begotten from one mother, the intellect, are the two laws \*\*\*, which continually dwell “together” (Deut 25.5; cf. Ps 132.1), for their house is not divided from one another, but the “brothers” are both interpretations together in the letter which contains them as though in one house. [K676] And see if this is not able to be indicated from, “And brothers may dwell together” (Deut 25.5). Then this follows, “And one of them died, and there was no seed for him” (Deut 25.5), which I have explained as able. But let us also look at the text, “The wife of him who died will not be [married] to a man outside [the family] who is not near” (Deut 25.5), and who is the wife-soul who transgresses this law, and who it is who keeps [the law]. So, then, in these passages I take it that a certain soul who, after the death of the interpretation of the law according to the letter and its



<p>ἐγγίζοντι», ὅτε παραδέχεται λόγον αὐτὸν &lt;μὴ&gt; ἐγγίζοντα *** τῇ ἐκδοχῇ τοῦ γράμματος, [K677] ἀλλὰ πάντῃ ἀλλότριον (τοιαῦται δὲ εἰσιν αἱ τῶν ἑτεροδόξων ψυχαί, αἷς καὶ ἡ ἐκδοχὴ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν νόμον γράμματος ἐτελεύτα, καὶ οὐκ ἐβουλήθησαν τῷ &lt;ἀεὶ&gt; «ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ» ἐκείνῳ οἰκοῦντι γαμηθῆναι πνευματικῷ νόμῳ, ἀλλὰ τινι «ἔξω» ἀμφοτέρων τούτων λόγῳ καὶ μηδαμῶς «ἐγγίζοντι» κοινωνῆσαι). ἑτέραν δὲ ψυχὴν &lt;γυναῖκα εἶναι τήν&gt; κατὰ θεὸν βιοῦσαν ἀποθανόντος καὶ ἀνατραπέντος τοῦ προτέρου ἀνδρός, οὐ βουλομένην «ἔξω» γενέσθαι καὶ «ἀνδρὶ μὴ ἐγγίζοντι», ἀλλὰ γαμουμένην τῷ ἀδελφῷ τοῦ τετελευτηκότος καὶ «ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ» αὐτῷ οἰκήσαντι, ὅτε «ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ ἀνδρός αὐτῆς εἰσέρχεται πρὸς αὐτήν» καὶ γίνεται ἕνδον τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῆς καὶ λαμβάνει «αὐτὴν ἑαυτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα» καὶ συνοικεῖ αὐτῇ τῇ ψυχῇ ἐπὶ μακαρισμῷ [K678] αὐτῆς, ἅτε κατὰ τὸ βούλημα τοῦ θεοῦ γαμουμένης τῷ δευτέρῳ καὶ πνευματικῷ νόμῳ. «τὸ δὲ παιδίον ὃ ἐὰν τέκη» καὶ γεννήσῃ ἡ συνοικήσασα τῷ δευτέρῳ καὶ πνευματικῷ ἀδελφῷ ψυχὴ γυνή, καθίσταται «ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος» τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ «τοῦ τετελευτηκότος», καὶ γίνεται οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ προτέρου μὲν ὁμώνυμος δὲ τῷ προτέρῳ· ὄνομα γὰρ τῷ γεννήματι ἐκ τοῦ πνευματικοῦ νόμου ἐστὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τετελευτηκότος, ἐπεὶ κάκεῖνος ἐκαλεῖτο νόμος &lt;νόμος&gt; θεοῦ, καὶ οὐ χρὴ γε ἐξαλείφεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ διορατικοῦ καὶ ἀληθῶς Ἰσραὴλ «τὸ ὄνομα» τοῦ ἀποθανόντος ἀνδρός, κἂν αὐτὸς ἐξαλειφθῇ.</p>	<p>annulment, works against the divine commandment, is the wife who first belonged to the man who died and was faithful to him, and she became [married] completely “outside” [the family] of the law “to a husband who was not near,” when she accepted a word which was &lt;not&gt; near *** to the interpretation of the letter, [K677] but completely foreign (and such are the souls of the heterodox, for whom the interpretation of the letter according to the law kills, and they are not willing to &lt;continually&gt; be married to the spiritual law who lives “together” with this one [according to the letter], but to a certain teaching (λόγῳ) “outside” [of the family] of the both of them and who in no way has communion “with the one who is near”). And [I take it that] another soul &lt;is the wife&gt; of the first husband who dies and is annulled, who living according to God does not want to be [married] “outside” [the family] “to a husband who is not near,” but who is married to the brother of the one who dies and who lives “together” with him, when “the brother of her husband comes in to her” and is inside her soul and takes “her for himself as wife” and cohabits with her soul for her [K678] blessedness, inasmuch as it is in accordance with the will of God that she is married to the second spiritual law (cf. Rom 7.14). “But the child which she might bear” and beget—she, the wife-soul who cohabits with the second spiritual law—is appointed “from the name” of his brother “who had died” (Deut 25.6), and [the child] exists not from the first but shares a name with the first, for the name [given] to the offspring from the spiritual law is the name of the one who had died, since each law is called &lt;a law&gt; of God, and there is no need for “the name” of the husband who has died to be erased from the true Israel who has the power of vision, even should he himself be erased.</p>
--	--

<p>32. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἐκ μέρους εἰρήσθω περὶ τοῦ νόμου. θεοῦ δὲ ἡμῖν πάλιν ἢ καὶ μᾶλλον χρεία, ἐν Χριστῷ φωτίζοντος τὸν νοῦν ἡμῶν πρὸς θεὸν τῶν ἐξῆς. «ἐὰν» γὰρ «μὴ βούληται (φησὶν) ὁ ἄνθρωπος λαβεῖν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀναβήσεται ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν πύλην ἐπὶ τὴν γερουσίαν καὶ ἐρεῖ» τὰ</p>	<p>32. Let these things be said in part concerning the law, with it again being even more necessary for us to have God enlightening our mind in Christ for inspection of the things that follow. For “if the man does not wish (it says) to take the wife of his brother, then the wife of his brother will ascend to the gate to the elder and will say” the things that follow (Deut 25.7). Now first, you should note that, in [K679] so far as &lt;on the</p>
---	---

ἐπιφερόμενα. καὶ πρῶτόν γε παρατήρει ὅτι, ἐς [K679] ὅσον <μὲν> καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἐποίει τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου προστεταγμένον, καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ εἰσιὼν πρὸς αὐτὴν συνῶκει αὐτῇ καὶ ἐτέκνου ἐξ αὐτῆς, ἄνθρωπος οὐκ εἴρητο ἀλλὰ «ἀδελφός» ἀνδρὸς τῆς γυναικός· ὅτε δὲ οὐ βούλεται «λαβεῖν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ» καὶ «οὐ θέλει ἀναστῆσαι τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ τὸ ὄνομα ἐν Ἰσραὴλ», καὶ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τῆς γερουσίας «τῆς πόλεως» λέγει· «οὐ βούλομαι λαβεῖν αὐτήν» καὶ ἀτιμοῦται ὑπολυόμενος «τὸ ὑπόδημα» καὶ ἐμπύεται «εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον» ἀπὸ τῆς γυναικός καὶ μετονομάζεται, ἵνα «τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ» ᾦ «[ὁ] οἶκος τοῦ ὑπολυθέντος τὸ ὑπόδημα», τότε <οὐκέτι ἀδελφός ἀλλ'> «ἄνθρωπος» λέγεται· οἶονε γὰρ διὰ μὲν τῆς τηρήσεως τοῦ νόμου ἐλέγετο αὐτῷ τὸ «ἐγὼ εἶπα· θεοὶ ἐστε <καὶ υἱοὶ> ὑψίστου <πάντες>»· διὰ δὲ τοῦ τὰ ἐναντία τῷ νόμῳ ποιεῖν οἶονε ἐλέγχεται ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου φάσκοντος πρὸς αὐτόν· «ὕμεις δὲ ὡς ἄνθρωποι ἀποθνήσκετε». καὶ πρόσχες εἰ δύνασαι νοῆσαι [K680] μετὰ τὸν θάνατον τῆς ἐκδοχῆς τοῦ γράμματος εἶναι ἄλλην <τινὰ> ἐκ δοχῆν τοῦ νόμου διημαρτημένην καὶ οὐ πνευματικὴν οὐδὲ ἀνεπίληπτον, πλὴν τὴν γένεσιν ἔχουσιν <ἐκ τοῦ νόμου> ἡμαρτημένην μὲν ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς ἀφορμῆς τῶν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γεγραμμένων ἀρχομένην, καὶ οὐ βουλομένην «ἀναστῆσαι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ» καὶ τιμῆσαι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ νόμου. οὐ βούλεται δὲ ἡ τοιαύτη ἐκδοχὴ παραλαβεῖν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ ψυχὴν· οὐδὲ γὰρ θέλει καρποφορῆσαι ἐπὶ τῷ δοξάζσει τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τεθνηκότος ἀδελφοῦ. διὸ ἡ γυνὴ οὐ κάτω ἔστηκεν ἢ ἐτοίμη τιμῆσαι τὸν πρότερον ἄνδρα αὐτῆς, ἀλλὰ ἀναβαίνει «ἐπὶ τὴν πύλιν» καὶ τὴν εἴσοδον τῆς πόλεως ἑαυτῆς ἔχουσιν καὶ «γερουσίαν». καὶ νοεῖσθω ταῦτα γινόμενα κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὴν εἰς αὐτὴν εἰσαγωγὴν καὶ εἴσοδον.

Ἐλέγχει οὖν ἡ γυνὴ τὸν μὴ βουλόμενον ἄνδρα καρποφορῆσαι τὸν τοιόνδε λόγον καὶ λέγει· «οὐ θέλει ὁ ἀδελφός τοῦ ἀνδρός μου ἀναστῆσαι [K681] τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐν Ἰσραὴλ». εἶτα «ἡ γερουσία τῆς πόλεως» ἐκείνης ἐξετάζουσα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἄνδρα πυνθάνεται εἰ ἀληθῶς οὐ βούλεται. ἀποκριναμένου δὲ ἐκείνου τὸ μὴ

one hand> the wife was doing what was prescribed by the law, and the man who goes into her cohabits with her and bears a child from her, he is not referred to as “man” but as “brother” of the wife’s husband. But when he does not wish “to take the wife of his brother” and “he does not want to raise up the name of his brother in Israel,” and he is summoned by the elders “of the city” and says, “I do not want to take her” and she is dishonored and takes off “her sandal” and the woman spits “in his face” and he undergoes a name change, in order that “his name” might be “house of the one who removed the sandal,” then he is <not longer> called <brother but> “man” (Deut 25.8-10). For it is, as it were, through the keeping of the law that it is said to him, “I myself said, ‘You are <all> gods <and sons> of the Most High’” (Ps 81.6), but [it is] by doing things opposed to the law that, as it were, he is reproved by the word which says to him, “But you will die as men” (Ps 81.7). And you should attend if you might be able to understand [K680] how it is that after of the death of the interpretation of the letter there is a <certain> other [interpretation] which goes astray from the interpretation of the law and is neither spiritual nor blameless, clearly having its origin <from the law> [from which it] goes astray but beginning from the pretext of those things written in the law, yet not wanting “to raise up the name of his brother” (Deut 25.7) and to honor the name of the law. Such an interpretation does not want to accept the wife-soul of his brother, for he does not wish to produce offspring so as to glorify the name of his brother who has died. Wherefore the wife who is prepared to honor her first husband does not stand below, but she ascends “to the gate” and the entrance of her own city which has the “elder-council.” Indeed let these things that happen be understood as concerning with the church and the initiation and entrance into her.

The wife, therefore, reproves the husband who does not want to produce offspring with the word as follows, saying, “The brother of my husband does not want to raise up [K681] the name of his brother in Israel.” Then “the elder-council of” this “city” examines this man and inquires as to whether he is truly unwilling. When he answers that he is not willing, she approaches the man who is not willing to raise up seed

βούλεσθαι, προσέρχεται αὕτη πρὸς τὸν μὴ βουληθέντα ἐξαναστῆσαι σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γερουσίας ἐλέγχει αὐτὸν καὶ ἀτιμάζει ὑπολύουσα «τὸ ὑπόδημα αὐτοῦ τὸ ἓν». καὶ σκόπει ἐν τούτοις διὰ τὸ «λύσαι τὸ ὑπόδημα ἐκ τῶν ποδῶν σου» εἰρημένον πρὸς Μωσέα καὶ Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὸ «<οὗ> οὐκ εἰμι ἐγὼ ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος αὐτοῦ», γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λουκᾶν καὶ <ἐν τῷ> κατὰ Μάρκον καὶ ἐν τῷ κατὰ Ἰωάννην, μήποτε οὐ ταυτὸν ἐστὶ τὸ λύσαι τὸ ὑπόδημα τῷ ὑπολύσαι· οὐ γὰρ ὑπολύσασθαι κελεύεται Μωσῆς ἢ Ἰησοῦς, οὐδὲ Ἰωάννης περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ὠνόμασε τὸ ὑπο<λύσαι [K682] ἀλλὰ τὸ> λύσαι. οὗτος οὖν ὁ παρανομῶν οὔτε ἐξ ὅλων ὑπολέλυσται οὔτε πάντῃ τῇ ὑποδέσει κεκόσμηται, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἡμισείας ἐκάτερον ἔχει. διὸ ἐμπτύει «εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ» ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς γερουσίας ἐλέγξασα αὐτὸν γυνή· ἐμπτύει γὰρ πᾶσα ψυχὴ τῷ οὐ τεκνοποιοῦντι οὐδὲ καρποφοροῦντι λόγῳ, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀνατροπῆς ὑπολύει αὐτὸν ἐν οἷς πταίει καὶ «ἀποκριθεῖσα» λέγει ὅτι «οὕτως ποιήσουσι τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ὃς οὐκ οἰκοδομεῖ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ». καὶ πρόσχες πάλιν ἐνταῦθα ὅτι [K683] δεῦτερον τὸ ἄνθρωπος ὠνόμασται ἐπὶ τοῦ ἁμαρτάνοντος, νῦν δ' ἤδη καὶ μὴ οἰκοδομοῦντος «τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ». πᾶς οὖν ὁ βλέπων τοῦτον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὑπολυόμενον ἀπὸ γυναικὸς καὶ ἐμπτυόμενον καὶ ἀκούων αὐτῆς λεγούσης· «οὕτω ποιήσουσι τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, ὃς οὐκ οἰκοδομεῖ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ», «πάντα πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν» τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ποιείτω· εἰ γὰρ μὴ οἰκοδομήσαι «τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ» <νόμου>, ὑπολυθήσεται «τὸ ἐν ὑπόδημα» καὶ ἐμπτυθήσεται καὶ «τὸ ὄνομα» παντὸς τοῦ τοιούτου «ἐν Ἰσραὴλ» παρὰ <πᾶσι> τοῖς ὁρώσι «κληθήσεται οἶκος τοῦ ὑπολυθέντος τὸ ὑπόδημα».

Ἰδωμεν δὲ καὶ δευτέραν εἰς τὸν ἐκκείμενον τόπον διήγησιν, καὶ ἔστωσαν δύο νόμοι ἀδελφοί, καθ' οὓς ὁ μὲν τηρήσας τὸν πρότερον οὐκ ἦν «ἄνομος θεοῦ», ὁ δὲ τὸν δεῦτερον φυλάσσων ἐστὶν «ἐννομος Χριστοῦ». καὶ νόει μοι κατὰ τὴν Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν τεθνηκέναι τὸν πρότερον νόμον, ἄνθρωπον τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχῆς, ἐπεὶ μὴ «δεδοξασται τὸ δεδοξασμένον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει» πρότερον «ἐνεκεν

for his brother, and she reproves him before the elder-council and dishonors him by taking off “one of his sandals.” Indeed you should note in these passages because of “loosing [λύσαι] the sandal from your feet” which is mentioned in reference to Moses and Joshua (Exod 3.4; Josh 5.15) as well as [the passage], “<of whom> I am not worthy that I might loose [λύσω] the strap of his sandal” (Lk 3.16; Mk 1.7; Jn 1.27), which is recorded in [the Gospel] according to Luke, <in> Mark, and in John, that perhaps this loosing [λύσαι] of the sandal is not the same thing as taking off [ὑπολύσαι]. For neither Moses nor Joshua is bid to “take off,” nor did John name [the action] concerning the Savior as taking <off [K682] but as> loosing. This transgressor, therefore, neither has everything taken off, nor is completely adorned with shoes, but he has each [done] halfway. Wherefore the wife who reproved him before the elder-council spits “in his face,” for every soul spits on the one who does not produce children nor bears fruit by reason, and through the annulment she removes from him [one of the things] by which he stumbles and “answering” she says that “Such is the way they treat a man who does not build up the house of his brother” (Deut 25.9). And you should attend again here that [K683] a second time he is named “man” because he sinned, but now as well for not building up “the house of his brother.” Everyone, then, who sees this man [whose sandal] was taken off by the woman and who was spat upon and heard her say, “Such is the way they treat a man who does not build up the house of his brother,” let him do “all things for the building up” of the brother (cf. 1 Cor 14.26), for unless he build up “the house of his brother” <the law>, “the one sandal” will be taken off and he will be spat upon and “the name” of every such person “in Israel” “will be called” by <all> who see [him] “a house of one whose sandal was untied.”

Let us also look at a second explanation of the passage at hand, and let the brothers stand for two laws, according to which he who keeps the first is not “without a law of God,” but he who guards the second is “in-lawed to Christ” (1 Cor 9.21). And I would understand a man with the soul of men as the first law which died at the appearing of Christ, since “what is glorified” first “in this case is” not “glorified” “because of the

τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης δόξης» τῆς κατὰ [K684] τὸ δεύτερον· δεύτερον δὲ νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀδελφὸν ὄντα τοῦ προτέρου καὶ διὰ Μωσέως καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγον, ὃς καὶ τὸν πρότερον ἐγέννησε. κατοικούντων οὖν τούτων τῶν δύο ἀδελφῶν «ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ» μάλιστα κατὰ τὴν παρουσίαν ἀπέθανεν ὁ εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ οὐκ ἦν αὐτῷ σπέρμα. ἀλλὰ ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ τεθνηκότος μετὰ τὸν θάνατον τοῦ προτέρου ἀνδρός, ἡ ὑπὸ νόμον ψυχὴ, οὐ γίνεται «ἔξω ἀνδρὶ μὴ ἐγγίζοντι»· ἐγγίζει γὰρ ἀνὴρ, ὁ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου νόμος, ὡς ἀδελφὸς τοῦ ἀνδρός τεθνηκότος τῷ προτέρῳ νόμῳ, καὶ εἰσέρχεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ. οἷον ὡς ἐπὶ παραδείγματος ἰδέ μοι τὴν Παύλου ψυχὴν «ὑπὸ νόμον», εἴτα διὰ Χριστὸν ἐξαγοράσαντα αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου γενομένην ὑπὸ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. καὶ ὅρα εἰ μὴ ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀνὴρ τῆς Παύλου ψυχῆς, καὶ οὐδὲν ἦττον ἀποθανόντος ἐκείνου ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ τεθνηκότος οὐ γέγονεν «ἔξω», ὡς οἴονται οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν αἱρέσεων, οὐδὲ «ἀνδρὶ μὴ ἐγγίζοντι». ὁ γὰρ «ἀδελφὸς τοῦ ἀνδρός αὐτῆς» εἰσῆλθε πρὸς αὐτὴν καὶ ἔλαβεν «αὐτὴν ἑαυτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα» καὶ συνώκησεν αὐτῇ, καὶ γέγονεν ὁ καρπὸς καὶ τὸ γέννημα καὶ «τὸ παιδίον» καὶ τὸ τεχθὲν «ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ τετελευτηκότος» [K685]. κατὰ γὰρ τὸν πνευματικὸν νόμον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὀνομάζει πάντα, καὶ οὐκ ἐξήλειπται τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τετελευτηκότος, ὅτε ἐλήλυθεν ὁ νόμος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου· παρὰ γὰρ τῷ ἀληθινῷ Ἰσραὴλ τηρεῖται καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ προτέρου. τίς δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ὁ μὴ βουλόμενος ἄνθρωπος «λαβεῖν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἑαυτοῦ» ἢ ὁ ἐν ταῖς αἱρέσεσι λόγος, μὴ βουλόμενος τὴν τιμήσαν ψυχὴν τὸν πρότερον ἄνδρα καὶ τὴν μνήμην τοῦ προτέρου ἀνδρός παραδέξασθαι; καθ' οὗ ἀναβαίνει ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ «ἐπὶ τὴν πύλην», περὶ ἧς λέλεκται τὸ «αὕτη ἡ πύλη τοῦ κυρίου, δίκαιοι εἰσελεύσονται ἐν αὐτῇ» καὶ ἀναβαίνει «ἐπὶ τὴν γερουσίαν» καὶ διαμαρτύρεται περὶ τοῦ μὴ βουλομένου «ἀναστῆσαι σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ἐν Ἰσραὴλ» μηδὲ τιμῆσαι τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ Μωσέως νόμον. ἐπὰν οὖν «ἡ γερουσία» πύθῃται τοῦ τοιοῦτου ἀνθρώπου εἰ ἀληθῆ περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγει ἡ γυνὴ καὶ οὐ βούλεται ἐξαναστῆσαι σπέρμα

surpassing glory” which is in accordance [K684] with the second (2 Cor 3.10). And the second the law of Christ, which is the brother of the first and through Moses and his son, reason, he begot indeed the first.<sup>84</sup> With these two brothers dwelling “together,” therefore, especially with regard to the appearing [of Christ], one of them dies and he has no seed. But the wife of the first husband who dies—the soul under the law—after [his] death she does not go [get married] “outside [the family] to a man who is not near,” for the husband—the law of the gospel—is drawing near, as brother of the man who died to the first law, and he goes in to the wife of his brother. Such is the case in the example, as I see it, in the soul of Paul “under law” (1 Cor 9.20), when because Christ redeems him from the law [his soul] came under the gospel (cf. Gal 3.13). And do observe that unless the husband of Paul’s soul die, and the wife of the one who died does not [marry] “outside” [the family] with anyone inferior to this man who dies, as those from the heretical sects suppose, nor [does she marry] “a man who is not near.” For the “brother of her husband” went in to her and took “her for himself as wife” and he cohabitated with her, and [as a result] there came the fruit and offspring and “the child” who was born “from the name of the one who had died” [K685]. For in accordance with the spiritual law, the gospel names all things, and the name of the one who had died is not erased, at the time when the law of the gospel had come, for the name of the first is indeed preserved by the true Israel. But who is the man after these things who does not want “to take the wife of his own brother,” other than the teaching (*logos*) in the heresies which does not want the soul who honors the first husband and the memory of the first husband to be accepted? Against this [man] the wife of his brother ascends “to the gate,” concerning which it is said “This is the gate of the Lord, the righteous will enter into it” (Ps 117.20), and she ascends “to the elder-council” and bears witness concerning [the man] who does not want “to raise up seed for his brother in Israel” nor to honor the law of God through Moses. When, therefore, “the elder-council” inquires of this man if what the wife says about him is true, that he is not willing to raise

<sup>84</sup> The syntax here is odd. The sense seems to be that “reason” (*logos*) is an initial, lower offspring of the spiritual law

τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ, τότε προσέρχεται «ἡ γυνή» τοῦ τεθνηκότος «ἐναντίον τῆς γερουσίας» καὶ ὑπολύει «τὸ ὑπόδημα τὸ ἐν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποδὸς αὐτοῦ», ἵνα κἂν ἡ ὑποδεδεμένος τὸ Χριστοῦ ὄνομα, ὑπολελυμένος τε ἡ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ὄνομα καὶ διὰ τοῦτό γε οὐκ ἐνδόξως οὐδὲ ἀληθῶς τὸ Χριστοῦ φορῶν ὄνομα. ἐμπύει δὲ καὶ «εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον» τοῦ τοιούτου [K686] ἡ γυνή καὶ ὀνειδίζει ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ αὐτῷ, καὶ οὐ βουληθέντι θεοποιηθῆναι ἐκ τοῦ καρποφορῆσαι· καὶ φησιν οὕτω παντὶ ἔσεσθαι τῷ μὴ οἰκοδομήσαντι «τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ», τοῦ εὐαγγελικοῦ λόγου, ὃς νομικός ἐστι καὶ προφητικός. καὶ ἄλλο ὄνομα οὐχ ἔξει ὁ μὴ οἰκοδομῶν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ παρὰ τοῖς Ἰσραηλίταις ἢ τοῦτο ὅτι «οἶκός» ἐστὶν οὗτος «τοῦ ὑπολυθέντος τὸ ὑπόδημα». πᾶς οὖν ὁ ἐν αἰρέσεσι, μάλιστα ταῖς διακοπούσαις τὴν θεότητα καὶ τὸν νόμον ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου χωρίζουσας, καλινδούμενος «οἶκός» ἐστὶ «τοῦ ὑπολυθέντος ὑπόδημα», ἐμπυόμενος «εἰς πρόσωπον» καὶ ὑπολυόμενος «τὸ ἐν ὑπόδημα».

Καὶ τρίτην δὲ τοιαύτην ὑπόνοιαν εἰς τὸν τόπον ἐξεδεξάμεθα, ἣν διὰ βραχέων ἐροῦμεν. γυνή μὲν ἡ σοφία εἴρηται διὰ τὸ «ταύτην ἐζήτησα νύμφην ἀγαγέσθαι ἐμαυτῷ», <ἦν> καὶ ἐρᾶν δεῖ κατὰ τὸν εἰπόντα Σολομῶνα· «ἐράσθητι αὐτῆς, καὶ τηρήσει σε», ἀνὴρ δὲ αὐτῆς ὁ σοφός. ἐὰν οὖν ὁ σοφὸς μὴ γεννήσας τινὰς ἐκ τῆς σοφίας ἀπαλλαγῇ τοῦ βίου, ὁ κατοικήσας μετ' αὐτοῦ ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀναπαυσάμενος λόγοις πρεσβευέτω τῶν αὐτῶν, ἵνα γεννηθῇ ἐκ τῆς σοφίας ὁ κλέος περιποιήσων τῷ ἀπαλλαγέντι τῆς συμβιώσεως <τῷ> τὸν καρπὸν [K687] παραστήσαι. εἰ δὲ μὴ βούλοιο πρεσβεῦσαι ὁ καταλειπόμενος ἀδελφὸς τῶν λόγων, ἀτιμασθήσεται ὑπὸ τῆς σοφίας ἐξ ἡμισείας αὐτὸν ὑπολυούσης· οὔτε γὰρ οὐχ ὑπολυθήσεται ὁ τοιοῦτος οὔτε τελείως ὑπολυθήσεται. εἰς δὲ κατασκευὴν τοῦ τὸν νόμον ἄνδρα λέγεσθαι κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν γυναικὸς τῆς ψυχῆς, παραθησόμεθα τὰ ἀπὸ

up seed for his brother, then “the wife” of him who had died comes “before the elder-council” and she takes off “one of the sandals from his feet,” in order that even if he may be bound with the name of Christ, he may indeed have the name of God taken off and because of this not be nobly nor truly bearing the name of Christ. The wife also spits “in the face” of this person [K686] and reproaches him as [being only] a man, since he did not want to be made divine<sup>85</sup> from bearing fruit. And it speaks in this way to everyone who will not build up “the house of his brother,” the evangelical teaching, which is the law and prophetic [scriptures]. Indeed the person who does not build up his [brother’s] name will not have a name with the Israelites other than this, that he is “house of the one whose sandal was taken off” (Deut 25.10). Every person who is wallowing in the heretical sects, then, especially those which divide the deity and separate the law from the gospel, is “a house of the one whose sandal was taken off,” who is spit upon “in the face” and whose “one sandal” is taken off.

Let us set forth this third concept for this passage, which we will express succinctly. Wisdom is called a “Wife” on account of “I sought for this bride to be brought for myself” (Wisdom 8.2), <whom> indeed it is necessary to love according to Solomon who said, “Love her, and she will keep you” (Prov 4.6), and the wise person is her husband. If, then, the wise person who has not begotten any [offspring] from wisdom might depart this life, let the brother who dwells along with him and takes rest in these words take charge over them, in order that the renown surrounding the one who departs from the wedded life might beget so as to present the fruit from wisdom [K687]. But should the remaining brother not wish to take charge of the words, he will be dishonored by wisdom who removes from him half, for neither will this person not be removed nor be removed completely. About Scripture’s practice [κατασκευῇ] of calling the law “husband” and the soul “wife,” let us set forth the things which read as such from the [Epistle] to the Romans, “Or

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Norman Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 140ff. on Origen’s terminology for deification. In n. 43, Russell lists eight instances where Origen uses this verb in a positive Christian context, the present passage as one instance.

<p>τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους οὕτως ἔχοντα· «ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε, ἀδελφοί, γινώσκουσι γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ, ὅτι ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ;» καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς ἕως τοῦ «γενομένην ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ». εἴρηται δὲ πλείονα ἡμῖν εἰς τὸν τόπον διηγουμένοις τὸ χωρίον του&lt;τι&gt; τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολῆς ἐν τοῖς εἰς αὐτὴν ἐξηγητικοῖς.</p>	<p>are you ignorant, brothers, for I speak to those who know the law, that the law acted as lord of man for as long as you live?” etc., up to, “I became to another husband” (Rom 7.1-3). We have spoken more completely about the passage when we explained the pericope with &lt;this [text]&gt; of the Epistle to the Romans in our exegetical discussions about it.</p>
<p>33. ταῦτα μὲν, εἰ καὶ μετὰ παρεκβάσεως λελέχθαι δοκεῖ, εἰρήσθω εἰς σαφήνειαν τοῦ παρὰ Μωσεὶ νόμου, οὗ μνησθέντες οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι ἐπύθοντο τοῦ σωτῆρος λέγοντες τὸ Μωσῆς εἶπεν· ἐάν τις ἀποθάνῃ μὴ ἔχων τέκνα [K688] καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.</p> <p>Φέρε δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα τὰ ἄλλα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐξετάσωμεν τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἥσαν δὲ παρ' ἡμῖν ἐπὶ ἀδελφοί· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος γήμας ἐτελεύτησε καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. ὁ μὲν Ἡσαΐας ἐν τῇ προφητείᾳ φησὶν· «ἐπλήρυνται ἐπὶ γυναικες ἀνθρώπου ἐνὸς λέγουσαι· τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν φαγόμεθα καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια ἡμῶν περιβαλούμεθα· πλὴν τὸ ὄνομα τὸ σὸν κεκλήσθω ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, ἅφελε τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν ἡμῶν». οἱ δὲ προσελθόντες Σαδδουκαῖοι τῷ σωτῆρι τὸ ἀνάπαλιν τῇ προφητείᾳ φασὶ περὶ ἀνδρῶν ἐπὶ γαμησάντων μίαν γυναῖκα. πλάσμα δὲ δοκεῖ μοι εἶναι τὸ πρόβλημα αὐτῶν, προθεμένων διὰ τοῦ πλάσματος τὸν περὶ ἀναστάσεως ἀθετῆσαι λόγον καὶ οἰηθέντων ἀκολουθεῖν τῇ ἀναστάσει τὸ ἕκαστον τῶν ἀνισταμένων τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχειν σχέσιν πρὸς οὓς εἶχεν ἐν τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ, ἵν' ὁ μὲν ἀνὴρ ἀπολάβῃ καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα μετὰ τὸ τυχεῖν ἀναστάσεως, ὁ δὲ πατὴρ μείνῃ ἐν τῇ σχέσει τῇ πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ ὁ ἀδελφὸς πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφόν. ἡγνῶσιν δὲ ἄρα ὅτι ὁ δημιουργὸς πάντα ποιῶν πρὸς τὸ χρήσιμον, ὅπου μὲν γένεσις ἐστὶ καὶ φθορά, [K689] πεποίηκεν ἀναγκαίως τὰς τοιαύτας σχέσεις, ἵν' ὁ μὲν τις ἢ ἀνὴρ διὰ γυναικὸς διακονούμενος παίδων γενέσῃ, οἱ δὲ γεννώμενοι σχῶσι τι ἐκ τῆς διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν γενέσεως συγγενέας, ὄντες ἀδελφοί· γενέσεως δὲ ἔργον ἦν καὶ πατὴρ καὶ υἱὸς καὶ μήτηρ καὶ θυγάτηρ. εἰ οὖν ἐν τῇ</p>	<p>33.<sup>86</sup> We have said these things—even if it seems we have engaged in a digression—for clarification of the law from Moses of which the Sadducees make mention and inquire of the Savior, saying, <i>Moses said, “If someone dies who does not have children,”</i> [K688] etc.</p> <p>Come, then, let us inquire about other things in the Gospel after this which are from, <i>But there were seven brothers to us, and the first wife died</i>, etc. On the one hand, Isaiah says in his prophecy, “Seven women will grasp for one man, saying, ‘We will eat our bread and we will use our own garments for clothing; just let your name be called upon us, and remove our reproach’” (Isa 4.2). The <i>Sadducees</i> who come to the Savior reverse the categories in the prophecy to seven men marrying one <i>woman</i>. And it seems to be that it is this form that causes their problem, when they set forth through the form the teaching rejecting the resurrection and think it follows that <i>in the resurrection</i> each of those who are raised has the same relationship as he had in this life, such that the man would receive back the wife after the resurrection takes place, and the father would remain in the same relationship to the son and brother to brother. They are ignorant that while the Creator made all things with regard to usefulness, where procreation is also corruption, [K689] he made these types of relationships out of necessity, so that, on the one hand, a certain man might be provided through a woman for the procreation of children, and on the other hand those who are begotten might, being brothers, have some kinship through their common origin. The work of procreation was also [for the relationships of] father and son and mother and daughter. If then, those who are counted worthy of a privilege because they lived well</p>

<sup>86</sup> Klostermann treats this as a continuous paragraph with the preceding par. 32.

μακαριότητα οἱ γέρως ἀξιούμενοι διὰ τὸν ἐνεστηκότα αἰῶνα ἐν ᾧ καλῶς ἐβίωσαν ἐν ἐκείνῃ ἔσονται τῇ ζωῇ, καὶ οὐδεὶς τῶν μὴ ἀγωνισαμένων ἐνταῦθα καταξιοῦται τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, δηλονότι ὧν ἐνταῦθα διὰ γενέσιν χρεία ἦν, ταῦτα οὐκ ἔσται ἐκεῖ. οὐδὲν γὰρ παρέλκον ὁ θεὸς ποιεῖ οὐδὲ μάτην τι παρ' αὐτῷ γίνεται. ἐχρῆν δὲ ὁρᾶν <τότε> τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους τὸ ἀκόλουθον αὐτῶν τῇ ὑπονοίᾳ περὶ τοῦ ἑκάστων ἀπολήψεσθαι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα, ὅτι πάλιν ἐκεῖ τεκνογονίαι καὶ παίδων γενέσεις καὶ θάνατοι· εἰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ νόσοι, εἰ δὲ γενέσεις καὶ νηπιότητες καὶ προβάσεις ἀπὸ νηπιότητος ἐπὶ τὸ συμπληροῦσθαι <τὴν> διάλεκτον καὶ ὕστερον τὸν λόγον καὶ ἐν τῇ συμπληρώσει τοῦ λόγου κακίαν, καὶ μόλις ποτὲ πάλιν ἀρετὴν ἐν ὀλίγοις τοῖς ζητοῦσιν αὐτὴν εὐρίσκεσθαι. [K690]

Τούτων δὲ τί ἂν εἴη ματαιότερον; καὶ βέλτιόν γέ ἐστι μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν τοῦ τοιαύτην εἶναι ὁποῖαν ὑπενόουν οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι, ὑπολαμβάνοντες ἀκολουθεῖν τῇ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσει τὸ ἀπολαμβάνειν ἑκάστων τὴν γυναῖκα· ᾧ ἀκόλουθον ἦν καὶ ἑκάστων τῶν εἰρημένων ἔσεσθαι. εἴπερ οὖν καινὸς αἰὼν ἐστὶν ἐλπιζόμενος καὶ (ὡς ὠνόμασεν Ἡσαΐας) «οὐρανὸς καινὸς καὶ γῆ καινὴ» καὶ ὡς ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ γέγραπται «ποτήριον» καινῆς διαθήκης, ἀπὸ ἀμπέλου οἶμαι καινῆς, ἕτεροῖα δεῖ εἶναι πάντα τὰ τῆς ἐκεῖσε ζωῆς καὶ ἀληθῶς μακάρια. ὥσπερ δέ, ὡς ὁ λόγος ἀπέδειξεν, ἠκολούθησε τῷ εἶναι γυναῖκα καὶ ἄνδρα τὸ ἔσεσθαι καὶ τέκνα πατέρων καὶ ἀδελφούς ἀδελφῶν καὶ μητέρας τῶν γεννωμένων, οὕτω μήποτε ἀκολουθεῖ τῷ μὴ εἶναι γυναῖκα ἢ ἄνδρα τὸ μηκέτι ἔσεσθαι πατέρα καὶ μητέρα καὶ ἀλλήλων τινὰς ἀδελφούς, τάχα οὐ περὶ μελλόντων μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν παρεληλυθότων. ἐκεῖ γὰρ οὐκέτι τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα γένους ἔσται μνήμη παρὰ τοῖς εὐλόγως ἀκούουσι τοῦ «μὴ μνημονεύετε τὰ πρῶτα, καὶ τὰ ἀρχαῖα μὴ συλλογίζεσθε· ἰδοὺ ποιῶ καινὰ πάντα». καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι αἰῶνι οὐ χρηματίσει πατὴρ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ὁ Θάβρα οὐδὲ τοῦ Ἰσμαῖλ καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Χεττούρας [K691] ὁ Ἀβραάμ, τάχα δὲ οὐδὲ τοῦ Ἰσαάκ· «τὰ γὰρ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθε» καὶ τότε

in the present age they will exist in that life in the more blessed state, and no one of those who have not struggled here will be accounted worthy of the resurrection of the dead, clearly then those things that were useful here for procreation will not be present there. For God does nothing extraneous nor does anything useless come to be on his account. One must see <then> that it would follow from the Sadducees' assumption concerning each [husband] receiving back his own wife, that there would again be child-bearing and begetting of children and death. And if these things, then also sicknesses, and if begettings, then also infants and advancements from infancy unto the attainment of <the> language and later, reason, and with the fulfillment of reason, [the attainment of] vice, and only then again [the attainment of] virtue which is found by those few who seek it. [K690]

But what would be more useless than these things? Indeed it would be better if there *were no resurrection* than for there to be such a kind of situation as the *Sadducees* supposed, assuming that it follows from the resurrection of the dead that each person will receive back his wife, which will belong in consequence to each of those [husbands] mentioned. Since, therefore, it is a new age that is hoped for and (as Isaiah names it) “a new heaven and a new earth” (Isa 66.22) and as it is written in the Gospel a “cup” of the new covenant (Lk 22.20), I think from a new vine, it is necessary that all these diverse things pertaining to this other life are indeed truly blessed. Just as, as the Word indicates, it would follow from there being wife and husband that there would also be children of fathers and brothers of brothers and mothers of those who are begotten, in the same way perhaps it would follow from there not being wife or husband that there would no longer be father and mother and certain brothers of others, perhaps not concerning future things only but also of things that have passed away. For there memory will no longer be of the kind according to the flesh for those who hear [the passage] in a reasonable way, “Do not remember the first things, and do not reflect upon the beginning things; behold I am doing new things” (Isa 43.18f). And in accordance with this, in the age to come Terrah will not be named the father of Abraham, nor Abraham of Ishmael and of those from Keturah, [K691] perhaps even not of Isaac, “for old things have passed away” and then it will be said, “Behold all things have become new” (2

λεχθήσεται τὸ «ἰδοὺ γέγονε καινὰ πάντα». εἰ δέ ἐστιν ἄλλως τις παρὰ «τὸ κατὰ σάρκα» ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἐτέρως παρὰ τὰ ἐν γενέσει πράγματα πατὴρ καὶ υἱός, οὐκέτι διὰ γυναικὸς οὐδὲ δι' ἀσχημόνων μερῶν τοῦ σώματος, ἀλλὰ ἀνάλογον τῷ καὶ τὸν σωτῆρα υἱὸν εἶναι τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐπιστήσῃ ὁ δυνάμενος τὰ τηλικαῦτα ὀρθῶς ζητεῖν χωρήσας «τὸ πάντα» ἐρευνῶν «πνεῦμα, καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ».

Ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ τούτων τὸ ἐτεροῖον καὶ ὥσπερ ὁμώνυμον παραλαμβάνω, λέγω τὰ ἀδελφοῦ καὶ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ γυναικὸς καὶ ἀνδρός. ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν ἀληθὲς καὶ τὸ οὐτε γαμοῦσιν οὐτε γαμίζονται, ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ὡς οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ἀληθὲς δὲ καὶ τὸ ὡς ἐν παραβολῇ εἰρημένον περὶ ἐτεροῖου παρὰ τοὺς ἐπὶ γῆς γάμους ἐν τῷ «ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ, ὅστις ποιῶν γάμους τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ» καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς [K692] καὶ ἐν τῷ «τότε ὁμοιωθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν δέκα παρθένοις, αἵτινες λαβοῦσαι τὰς λαμπάδας αὐτῶν» καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. οὐκοῦν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν γαμεῖ γάμον παρὰ πάντα γάμον, ὃν ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδε καὶ οὖς ἤκουσε «καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου» ἀνέβη· καὶ ἔσται ὁ σεμνὸς καὶ θεῖος ἐκεῖνος καὶ πνευματικὸς γάμος ἐν ἀρρήτοις ῥήμασιν, ἃ μὴ ἔξεστιν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλεῖν. ζητήσῃ δὲ τις εἰ ἀνάλογον τῷ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν τοῦ νυμφίου γάμῳ εἰσὶ καὶ ἄλλοι γάμοι ἢ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν μόνος ὁ νυμφίος, καταργήσας πάντα γάμον, γαμεῖ γάμον, οὐχ ὅπου «ἔσσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν», ἀλλ' ὅπου κυριώτερόν ἐστιν εἰπεῖν ὅτι ἐν πνευμᾷ εἰσιν ὁ νυμφίος καὶ ἡ νύμφη. ἀλλ' ὅρα μήποτε ὀλίσθης ἀκούων τοιούτων λόγων πρὸς τὸ τὴν περὶ τῶν αἰώνων μυθοποιίαν, ἀρρένων καὶ θηλειῶν, παραδέξασθαι κατὰ τοὺς ἀναπλάσαντας τὰς συζυγίας αὐτῶν οὐδαμῶς <οὐσας οὐδ'> ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων δηλουμένας.

Cor 5.17). If there is something other than a brother “according to the flesh” (Rom 9.5f) and a father and son different from the matters involved in procreation, no longer through a wife nor through the shameful parts of the body, but analogous to [how] the Savior is Son of God, let the one who is able attend so as to inquire into such great things rightly, accepting “the spirit” which searches “all things, even the depths of God” (1 Cor 2.10).

But I take not only the difference and just as similarity about these things, I say the [same] things of brother, and father, and son, but also concerning wife and husband. *For* it is true that *in the resurrection* of the dead *they will neither marry nor be married, but they are as the angels in heaven*, but what is said as though in a parable is also true concerning a differentiation from the wedding feasts on earth in the passage, “The kingdom of the heavens is like unto a man who is king, who put on a wedding feast for his son” (Matt 22.2), etc., [K692] and in the passage, “At that time the kingdom of the heavens will be like unto ten virgins who take their lamps” (Matt 25.1), etc. ^Therefore, *in the resurrection* of the dead the son of the king will celebrate a marriage feast that is beyond any marriage feast which eye has seen and ear has heard “and” has ascended “to the heart of man” (1 Cor 2.9). This noble and divine spiritual wedding feast will be in inexpressible words, which it is not lawful for man to speak (cf. 2 Cor 12.4). But let someone inquire if there are other wedding feasts analogous to the wedding feast of the bridegroom *in the resurrection* of the dead, or whether *in the resurrection* of the dead the bridegroom alone, abolishing every wedding feast, will celebrate a wedding feast, not where “the two will be as one flesh” (Matt 19.5), but where it is more properly said that the bridegroom and bride become one spirit. But watch lest you slip and fall when hearing these words so as to accept the myth-making concerning male and female aeons, in accordance with those who fashion their “unions” (τὰς συζυγίας)<sup>87</sup> <which> in no way <exist nor> are indicated by the holy Letters.<sup>88</sup>

<sup>87</sup> An aspect of Valentinian Gnostic thought ([http://gnosis.org/library/valentinus/Syzygy\\_Valentinian.htm](http://gnosis.org/library/valentinus/Syzygy_Valentinian.htm)).

<sup>88</sup> The text between the carrots (^) has also been translated in Balthasar, *Origen: Spirit and Fire*, par 989 (pg. 355).



34. Ἐπεὶ οὐδεμιᾶς τροπολογίας δεῖται τὸ πύσμα τῶν Σαδδουκαίων [K693] περὶ τῶν ἐπτὰ ἀδελφῶν ἐσχηκότων μίαν γυναῖκα, φέρε κατανοήσωμεν τοὺς τοῦ σωτῆρος περὶ ταῦτα λόγους, ἐν οἷς φησι· *πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ. ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ὡς οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*. πρὸς τοῦτο δὲ ζητήσῃ τις τοιαῦτα· ὁ λέγων σωτὴρ τοῖς Σαδδουκαίοις· *πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ* ἐμφαίνει κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς παρίστασθαι τὸ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν μὴ εἶναι γάμους, ἅτε τῶν ἀνθρώπων <ὁμοιωθ>ησομένων τοῖς ἐν οὐρανῷ ἁγγέλοις παρ' οἷς οὐκ ἔστι γάμος. ποία οὖν γραφὴ δηλοῖ ὅτι ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται; καὶ ποῦ τοῦ νόμου ἢ τῶν προφητῶν μαθάνομεν περὶ τῶν ἀναστησομένων ὅτι ἔσσονται ὡς οἱ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἁγγελοι; σαφῶς γὰρ τοιαῦτα ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ γραφῇ οὐχ εὐρίσκομεν. κατὰ μὲν τὸν Λουκᾶν τοῦτο οὐ ζητηθήσεται, ἀναγράψαντα τὸν σωτῆρα εἰρηκέναι· «οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου γεννῶσι καὶ γεννῶνται, γαμοῦσι [K694] καὶ γαμίσκονται» καὶ <τὰ> ἐξῆς καὶ μὴ εἰπόντα ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ τι πρὸς τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς ταῦτα δηλοῦσθαι. κατὰ δὲ τὸν Ματθαῖον ζητηθεῖν ἂν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὸν Μᾶρκον· κατ' αὐτὸν γὰρ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε τοῖς Σαδδουκαίοις· «οὐ διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾶσθε μὴ γινώσκοντες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ; ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν, οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίσκονται, ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ὡς οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς».

Ἐκαστος μὲν οὖν τῶν ἐπιστησάντων τῇ ἐπαπορήσει ἡμῶν ζητεῖτω ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν παριστάμενα τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος εἰρημένα περὶ τῶν μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν. ἡμεῖς δὲ τοιαῦτα φήσομεν ὅτι περιέχουσι ταῦτα αἱ γραφαὶ οὐκ αὐτολεξεῖ οὐδ' ὥστε τοῖς τυχοῦσι νοηθῆναι, ἀλλ' ἐν τροπολογίᾳ. «σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν» καὶ νομοθετήσας τινὰ περὶ γυναικῶν καὶ ἀνδρῶν καὶ διηγησάμενος γάμους δικαίους, οὐ περὶ τούτων προηγουμένων λέγει ἃ ἐκ τῆς προχείρου λέξεως ἐκλάβοι τις ἂν, ἀλλὰ περὶ ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς προαπεφήναμεν παραθέμενοι τὰ περὶ [K695] τοῦ γάμου τοῦ

34. Since the Sadducees' inquiry [K693] concerning the seven brothers who had one wife requires no figurative reading, come let us consider the Savior's words concerning these matters, where he says, *You are in error, not understanding the Scriptures nor the power of God, for in the resurrection they neither marry nor are married, but they are as the angels in heaven* (Matt 22.29-30). In regard to this someone way inquire as follows: When the Savior who says to the Sadducees, *You are in error, neither understanding the Scriptures nor the power of God*, he is exhibiting that the reality that there are no marriages *in the resurrection* of the dead is presented in accordance with *the Scriptures*, seeing that men <will b>e made like the angels *in heaven* with whom there is no marriage. How, then, does Scripture indicate that *in the resurrection they neither marry nor are married*? And where in the law and the prophets do we learn about those who will be raised that they will be *as the angels in heaven*? For clearly we do not find such things in the old [covenant] scripture. According to Luke this is not what is inquired about, who records the Savior as having said: "The sons of this age beget and are begotten, they marry [K694] and are married" (Lk 20.34), e<t>c.. [Jesus] does not say anything in this passage to the Sadducees concerning these things being indicated in the Scriptures. As with [the account] according to Matthew one might inquire similarly also according to Mark, for according to him Jesus answers and says to the Sadducees, "Do you not error concerning this, not understanding the Scriptures or the power of God? For whenever the dead are raised, they neither marry nor are married, but they are as the angels in the heavens" (Mk 12.24f).

Let each of those who give their attention to our difficulty inquire from the Scriptures about the present things which the Savior said in regard to matters after the resurrection. As for us, we affirm these things, that the Scriptures contain these things, not in such a way as to be understood by the bare text itself nor by chance, but in a figurative way. For when "the law which has a shadow of the good things to come" (Heb 10.1) legislates certain things concerning husbands and wives, and gives accounts of righteous marriages, it does not speak concerning these things primarily such that one might apprehend the matters from the literal text at hand, but [it is speaking] concerning such things as we ourselves

<p>σωτήρος &lt;καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας&gt; ἐσομένου ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι αἰῶνι. οἷον &lt;εἰ&gt; «Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἓνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἓνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας, καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας», οὐ πάντως στήναι με δεῖ ἐπὶ τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ γάμου τῆς ἐλευθέρας καὶ τῆς πρὸς τὴν παιδίσκην κοινωνίας· ταῦτα γὰρ «ἐστὶν ἀλληγορούμενα». ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ «ἐνεκεν τούτου καταλείπει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν», οὐχ οὕτως ἀκουστέον τοῦ λεγομένου ὡς οὐδὲν μυστήριον δηλοῦντος· «τὸ» γὰρ «μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστὶ» καὶ (ὡς Παῦλός φησιν) «εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν» ἀναφερόμενον. καὶ πρὸ βραχέος δὲ ἐκθέμενοι τὸ περὶ τῆς γαμουμένης τῷ ἀδελφῷ τοῦ τετελευτηκότος ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς ὡς ἐδυνήθημεν ἐξητάσαμεν τὸ βούλημα τοῦ νόμου. εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι μυρίοι περὶ γυναικὸς καὶ ἀνδρὸς νόμοι (ὡς περὶ τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ ἀποστασίου καὶ περὶ τῶν δύο γυναικῶν ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ γινομένων, μιᾶς μὲν ἀγαπωμένης [K696] ἐτέρας δὲ μισουμένης, καὶ περὶ τῆς γαμουμένης αἰχμαλώτου τῷ αὐτῆς ἐρασθέντι, γαμουμένης δὲ μετὰ τὸ ζύρασθαι καὶ ἐν πενθικοῖς κλαῦσαι τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς), ὧν ἕκαστος τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ θεῖον ἔχει ἐν τῇ εὕρισκομένη ἀληθινῇ τροπολογίᾳ. εἴ τις οὖν ἀναγινώσκων τὸν νόμον καὶ τὰ περὶ γάμων γυναικῶν καὶ ἀνδρῶν διεξερχόμενος οἶεται μηδὲν πλέον τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ γράμματος σημαινομένων *** δηλοῦσθαι, πλανᾶται μὴ εἰδὼς τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ.</p>	<p>mentioned before when we proposed that these things [K695] pertain to the marriage of the Savior &lt;and the church&gt; which will happen in the age to come. In the manner &lt;if&gt; “Abraham had two sons, one from the bond woman and one from the free woman, and the one from the bond woman was begotten according to the flesh, while the other from the free woman was [begotten] through the promise” (Gal 4.22f), it seems completely unnecessary to me to establish about the sensible marriage of the free woman [that it is] a common nature with the bond woman, for these things “have been allegorized” (Gal 4.24). But if indeed “when a man will forsake his father and mother and will cleave to his wife, and the two will become one flesh” (Gen 2.24), we should not then hear what is said as though indicating no mystery, for “this mystery is great” and (as Paul says) applies “to Christ and to the church” (Eph 5.32). And to be brief in setting forth the matter concerning her who was married to the brother of the man who had died, so far as we are able, let us inquire about the intention of the law. Indeed there are a multitude of other laws concerning husband and wife (as concerning the book of divorce [Deut 24.3] and concerning two wives being for one husband [Deut 21.15], with one being loved [K696] and the other hated, and concerning the marriage of a captive woman to the one who loves her, and the marriage after shaving and in mourning apparel crying over her father and mother [Deut 21.11-14]), all of which have a noble and divine [sense] which is to be found in the use of true figurative reading. If someone, then, who reads the law and converses with the things regarding the marriage of husbands and wives thinks that nothing fuller is indicated than the matters signified by the letter ***, he is in error, not knowing <i>the Scriptures or the power of God</i>.</p>
<p>35. Ζητήσαι δ' ἂν τις εἰ &lt;τὸ&gt; πλανᾷσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς λεγόμενον τοῖς Σαδδουκαίοις, μὴ προσιεμένοις ἄλλην γραφὴν ἢ τὴν νομικὴν, ἀναφορὰν ἔχει καὶ ἐπὶ ἐτέρας παρὰ τὸν Μωσέως νόμον γραφὰς. ὁ μὲν οὖν τις φήσει κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐγκαλεῖσθαι τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους ὅτι μὴ προσιέμενοι τὰς ἐξῆς τῷ νόμῳ γραφὰς πλανῶνται μὴ εἰδότες αὐτάς. ἕτερος δὲ ἐρεῖ· ἀρκεῖ πρὸς τὸ τὴν [K697] πλάνην ἐλέγχεσθαι τῶν Σαδδουκαίων τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι αὐτοὺς τὰς κατὰ</p>	<p>35. But someone might inquire if &lt;the&gt; [passage], <i>You are in error, not knowing the Scriptures</i>, which is said to the Sadducees who did not recognize any other Scripture than the Law, has reference to other Scriptures than the Law of Moses. This person, therefore, might say in respect of this same passage that the Sadducees are so called because in not recognizing the Scriptures which come after the Law they are in error since they do not know them. Another person might say: it is sufficient for the Sadducees to be reproved of error for not understanding the Scriptures according to Moses</p>

Μωσέα γραφάς τῷ μὴ ἐκλαμβάνειν τὸν ἐν ταύταις θεῖον νοῦν. δύο μέντοι γε πράγματά φησι μὴ εἰδέναι τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους, ἐν μὲν τὰς γραφάς, ἕτερον δὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀφ' ἧς δυνάμεως τὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως γίνεται καὶ ἡ καινὴ ἐν αὐτῇ ζωὴ. δύναται δὲ τις <λέγειν> τὸ μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰδέναι λέγεσθαι τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους ἀναφέρειν ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν τὸν σωτῆρα· ἐπεὶ Χριστὸς θεοῦ δυνάμεις ἐστὶ καὶ θεοῦ σοφία, καὶ ἡγνόνουν αὐτὸν οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι, ὡς μὴ εἰδότες τὰς περὶ αὐτοῦ γραφάς μηδὲ οἷα διακονήσεται τῇ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσει τῶν σωθησομένων. ὁ δὲ μὴ ἀρεσκόμενος τῷ διὰ τῆς τροπολογίας λύεσθαι τὸ περὶ τοῦ πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπηγορημένον, δυεῖν θάτερον ποι<εῖν δε>ήσει, ἢ ἀπιστήσῃ τοῖς ἐκκειμένοις ῥητοῖς ὡς οὐ καλῶς ἀναγεγραμμένοις, τῷ μὴ ἂν τὸν σωτῆρα τὰ μὴ γεγραμμένα εἰρηκέναι ὡς γεγραμμένα, ἢ τολμήσῃ ἀπιστῆσαι ὡς οὐκ ἀληθεύσαντι τῷ Ἰησοῦ. [K698] καὶ τρίτος δ' ἂν τις, ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀποκρύφους καταφεύγων λόγους, ἔνθα δοκεῖ σαφέστερον τὰ περὶ τῆς μακαρίας γεγράφθαι ζωῆς, φήσῃ ἐπ' ἐκείνους τὴν ἀναφορὰν εἶναι τῶν ἐνταῦθα γεγραμμένων ἐν τῷ πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς. καὶ ὅρα εἰ μὴ πάντοθεν ἀτόποις περιπεσεῖται διὰ τὸ φεύγειν τὴν τροπολογίαν. εἴτε γὰρ τῇ γραφῇ ἀπιστεῖ, παρὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν ποιήσῃ λόγον· εἴτε τῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὡς κατὰ σάρκα Ἰουδαῖος τὸ τοιοῦτο ποιήσῃ· εἴτε ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀποκρύφους <λόγους> καταφεύζεται, οὐκ ἐπὶ ὁμολογούμενον πρᾶγμα παρὰ τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν ἐλεύσεται. διόπερ ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἄλλως φαίνεται δύνασθαι λύεσθαι τὸ πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίσκονται ἢ διὰ τῆς ἀνάλογον κειμένης ἀλληγορίας παρὰ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Γαλάτας ἐπιστολῇ περὶ παιδίσκης καὶ ἐλευθέρας, ἀποδοθησομένης καὶ εἰς τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς ἔνθα περὶ ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς λέλεκταί τι. καὶ ὥσπερ πλανῶνται οἱ διὰ τὸ μὴ τροπολογεῖν τὰ προφητικὰ οἰόμενοι μέλλειν ἡμᾶς [K699] μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν σωματικὰ βρώματα <καὶ πόματα>, ἐπεὶ <καὶ> αἱ λέξεις τῶν <προφητικῶν> γραφῶν τοιαῦτα περιέχουσιν, οὕτως καὶ τὰ περὶ γάμων γεγραμμένα καὶ ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν

such that they apprehend the divine meaning in them. To be sure, however, he claims that the Sadducees do not know two things: one, the Scriptures, and the other, the power of God, which is the power by which those of the resurrection and the new life in it comes to be. Yet someone could also <say> that when the Sadducees are said not to know the power of God, the Savior is referring to Himself, since Christ is the Power of God and Wisdom of God (1 Cor 1.24), and the Sadducees are ignorant of him, since they do not understand the Scriptures concerning Him, nor of the manner He will minister the resurrection from the dead for those who will be saved. The person who is not satisfied with explaining the passage in question, *You are in error, not knowing the Scripture nor the power of God*, by means of figurative interpretation, plunges into a dilemma which is a ca<use for peti>tion, either he will disbelieve the passage before us as though not having been recorded well, with the Savior having spoken of things as Scripture that are in fact not Scripture, or he will dare to disbelieve Jesus as though he were not truthful. And a third person, fleeing to the apocryphal words, whence it might seem that something clearer has been written concerning the life of blessedness, might appeal to these as what is being referred to in the things written here when [it says] *You are in error, not knowing the Scriptures*. Do note how one may fall into untoward [positions] on all sides because of fleeing figurative interpretation, for if he disbelieves the Scripture, he will be acting against the Church's teaching (παρὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν ποιήσῃ λόγον), and if [he disbelieves] Jesus, he will be acting just as the Jew according to the flesh; if he flees unto the apocryphal <words> he will not arrive at a matter confessed together by those who have believed. Wherefore it appears to me that there is no other way one can explain the passage, *You are in error, not knowing the Scripture nor the power of God, for in the resurrection they neither marry nor are married*, except through the rule of allegory supplied by the Apostle in the [letter] to the Galatians in reference to the bond-woman and the free-woman (cf. Gal 4.22), which is to be put into use for the rest of the Scriptures where something is read about a husband and wife. Indeed, just as they are in error who, because they do not interpret the prophetic [writings] figuratively, think that [K699] after the resurrection we will eat and drink somatic food <and drink>, since <indeed> the texts of the <prophetic> Scriptures contain such things, so also [they are in error] who keep to the literal sense of the things written concerning marriages and husbands and wives, and who think that we will make use of conjugal

τηροῦντες ἐπὶ τοῦ ῥήτου καὶ οἰόμενοι συνουσίαις ἡμᾶς καὶ τότε χρῆσεσθαι, δι' ἧς οὐδὲ σχολάζειν ἐστὶ «τῇ προσευχῇ» δυνατὸν ἐν μολυσμῷ πως ὄντων καὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ τινὶ τῶν χρωμένων ἀφροδισίοις.	relations at that time, on account of which things one is not able to devote time “to prayer” (1 Cor 7.5) by the defilement in some fashion of existing things and by a kind of impurity of those who engage in sexual pleasures.
---	---

<p>36. Μετὰ ταῦτα ζητῶ πότερον τὸ πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ μόνον ἀναφέρεται τὸ ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίσκονται ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ὡς οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. οὐ γὰρ εὐρίσκω, ποῦ τῆς γραφῆς λέγονται οἱ σωθησόμενοι εἶναι ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· εἰ μὴ ἄρα τις καὶ τοῦτο φήσκει δηλοῦσθαι ἐν τῷ «σὺ δὲ ἀπελεύσῃ πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας σου μετ' εἰρήνης, τραφεὶς ἐν γήρᾳ καλῷ» καὶ &lt;τῷ «προσετέθη πρὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ» ἢ&gt; [K700] τῷ «προσετέθη πρὸς τὸ γένος αὐτοῦ». ἢ τῷ ἐν Δευτερονομίῳ λεγομένῳ περὶ ἀνθρώπου ὡς τεταγμένου ὑπὸ θεοῦ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς· ἐαυτῷ δὲ τὴν λέξιν τηρήσας εὐρήσεις. ἐξῆς τοῦτο ἔστιν ἰδεῖν τὸ περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ λέγοντος· ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰακώβ· οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων. καὶ εἰς τοῦτο δὲ φήσομεν ὅτι μυρία δυνάμενος περὶ τοῦ ὑπάρχειν τὴν μέλλουσαν ζωὴν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις παραθέσθαι ἀπὸ προφητῶν ὁ σωτὴρ, τοῦτο οὐ πεποίηκεν, διὰ τὸ τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους μόνην προσίσθαι τὴν Μωσέως γραφήν, ἀφ' ἧς ἐβουλήθη αὐτοὺς συλλογισμῷ δυσωπῆσαι τοιοῦτό τι δηλοῦντι· ὁ θεὸς εἶπε Μωσεῖ· «ἐγὼ εἰμι θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακώβ», ἡνίκα ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου ἐχρημάτισεν αὐτῷ. ἦτοι οὖν ὁ θεὸς θεὸς ὄντων ἐστὶν ἢ θεὸς οὐκ ὄντων. ἀλλ' ἄτοπον λέγειν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ὁ εἰπὼν &lt;«ἐγὼ εἰμι» ὁ ὢν&gt;, «τοῦτό μοι [K701] ἐστὶν ὄνομα», τῶν οὐδαμῶς ὄντων θεός ἐστιν. εἰ δὲ τοῦτο ἄτοπον, ὄντων θεός ἐστι καὶ ζώντων καὶ ὑφεστηκότων καὶ αἰσθανομένων τῆς χάριτος, ἧς αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς ἐδωρήσατο, θεὸν ἐαυτὸν ἀναγορεύων αὐτῶν καὶ λέγων· «τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ μνημόσυνον αἰώνιον». ζῶσιν ἄρα αἰσθανόμενοι τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ὁ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ Ἰακώβ &lt;καὶ&gt; καθ' ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἰδίως χρηματίζει θεός· οὐ γὰρ</p>	<p>36. After these things I might inquire whether [the passage], <i>You are in error, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God</i>, is referring only to, <i>for in the resurrection they neither marry nor are married</i>, or also to <i>but they are as the angels in heaven</i>. For I do not find where in Scripture those who will be saved are said to be <i>as the angels in heaven</i>, except someone might say that is what is indicated by, “You will depart to your fathers with peace, you will be buried at a good age” (Gen 15.15) and &lt;by, “he was added to his people” (Gen 25.8), or&gt; [K700] by, “he was added to his race” (Gen 35.29). Or by what it is said in Deuteronomy about a man as assigned an order by God in heaven (Deut 4.32), but you should find the text to check for yourself. The next passage we observe reads, <i>concerning the resurrection of the dead have you not read what was said to us by God who says, ‘I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob’? God is not the God of the dead but of the living</i> (Matt 22.31-32). Now about this we might say that the Savior could have provided a myriad [of passages] from the prophets about the existence men will have in the life to come, yet he did not do this because the Sadducees only recognize the Scripture of Moses, from which he intended to silence their syllogism by demonstrating this fact: God says to Moses, “I am God of Abraham and God of Isaac and God of Jacob” (Exod 3.6), when He gives His name from the bush. Either, then, God is the God of those who exist, or is God of those who do not exist. But it is improper to say that the God who says, “&lt;I am&gt; the Existing One,” “this is [K701] my name” (Exod 3.14-15), is God of those who in no way exist. And if this is improper, He is God of those who exist, who are alive, and subsist, and who perceive [His] grace, with which God has gifted to them, calling Himself their God and saying, “This is my eternal remembrance” (Exod 3.15). They are living, then, who perceive God and his grace—Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—&lt;and&gt; God names Himself in respect to each of them individually. For it is not written, “I am God of Abraham” and Isaac and Jacob, but “I am God of Abraham, and God of Isaac, and God of Jacob” (Exod 3.6). Indeed, Matthew,</p>
--	---

γέγραπται· «ἐγὼ θεὸς Ἀβραάμ» καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, ἀλλ' «ἐγὼ εἰμι θεὸς Ἀβραάμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακώβ». καὶ οὕτως γε ἀνέγραψαν Ματθαῖος καὶ Μάρκος καὶ Λουκᾶς, ἵν' (οἶμαι) παραστήσωσι τοῖς προσέχουσι τῇ ἀναγνώσει ὅτι καθ' ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ὁ θεὸς θεός ἐστι, τοῦτ' ἐξαίρετον αὐτοῖς χαρίζομενος. οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν ὅμοιοι τοῖς Ἑβραίοις, ἵνα συλληπτικῶς ὥσπερ ἐκείνων οὕτω καὶ τούτων ὁ θεὸς λέγεται. [K702] ἐπ' ἐκείνων μὲν γὰρ γέγραπται· «ὁ θεὸς τῶν Ἑβραίων ἀπέστείλε με», ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων κατὰ ἕνα, ἵνα παραστήσῃ ὁ λόγος ὅτι εἷς Ἀβραάμ ισότιμος ὅλῳ ἔθνει Ἑβραίων ἐστίν· οὐ γὰρ ἐπίσης ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς θεὸς Ἀβραάμ καὶ θεὸς Ἑβραίων. τὸ δ' ὅμοιον ἐρεῖς καὶ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτὸν εἶναι τοῦ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεοῦ τοῦ Ἰακώβ ὡς θεὸν τῶν Ἑβραίων. τοιαύτης δὲ τιμῆς ἡξιῶσθαι νομίζω καὶ τὸν Ἥλιαν, διὸ ἀναγέγραπται ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν Βασιλειῶν· «ὁ θεὸς Ἥλιου».

Τοῦ μὲν οὖν Ἀβραάμ θεὸς μόνον ἦν ὁ θεός, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τοῦ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ τοῦ Ἰακώβ. τοῦ δὲ κρείττονος αὐτῶν σωτῆρος ἡμῶν οὐ μόνον θεός ἐστιν ὁ θεός, ἀλλὰ καὶ πατήρ. διὸ καλῶς λέγεται παρὰ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ· «εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ». οὗτος δὲ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, οὗ «εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ», ἐχαρίσατο τοῖς γνησίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς τὸ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι αὐτῶν οὐ μόνον θεὸν ἀλλὰ καὶ πατέρα. φησὶ γὰρ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν πρὸς τὴν Μαριάμ· «μή μου ἅπτου, οὐπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου· πορεύου δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου καὶ εἰπὲ αὐτοῖς· ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν [K703] πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ θεόν μου καὶ θεὸν ὑμῶν». ἐγὼ δ' οἶμαι ὅτι τότε καὶ τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ τῷ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ τῷ Ἰακώβ ἐχαρίσατο, ἵνα μηκέτι μόνον θεὸς ᾗ αὐτῶν ὁ θεός ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ πατήρ. ὁ δὲ Λουκᾶς προσέθηκε τῷ «οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων», κειμένῳ καὶ παρὰ Ματθαίῳ καὶ Μάρκῳ, τὸ «πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν». ὅπερ ἦν οὐχ ὁ τυχὼν ἔπαινος τῶν πατριαρχῶν, ἅτε τοῦ τηλικούτου σωτῆρος ἡμῶν μαρτυροῦντος αὐτοῖς οὐ μόνον ὅτι ζῶσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτι ὁ ζῶσι θεῷ ζῶσι καὶ οὐκ ἄλλῳ τινί. τοῦτο δὲ τὸ «πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσι» καλὸν παντὶ τρόπῳ ἀσκεῖν ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀναλαβεῖν, ἵνα πάντες μηδενὶ ἄλλῳ ἢ τῷ θεῷ ζήσωμεν ἐν Χριστῷ.

Mark, and Luke all record it in this way so that (I think) they might present to those who have the reading before them that God is the God of each of them, because he has bestowed upon them this special grace. For they were not similar to the Hebrews such that God might be called their [God] in the same way, in a kind of equivalent identification, as [he is called the God] of these ones (i.e., the Patriarchs). [K702] For in regards to the [Hebrews] it is written, “The God of the Hebrews sent me” (Exod 7.16), but in regard to [the Patriarchs he is called] their [God] individually, in order that the word [of Scripture] might show that Abraham as an individual is of equal honor as the whole nation of the Hebrews, for God is not equally God of Abraham and God of the Hebrews. You might say something similar concerning Him being God of Isaac and God of Jacob as [in contrast to] God of the Hebrews. I think that Elijah was also deemed worthy of such an honor, for it is written in the Fourth Book of Kingdoms, “The God of Elijah” (4 Kgdm 2.14).

God, then, is the God of Abraham uniquely, but in way that is similar also to [being God] of Isaac and of Jacob. But God is not only the God of our Savior who is better than the [Patriarchs], but [God is] also Father [of the Savior]. Wherefore it is rightly said by the Apostle, “Blessed is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ” (2 Cor 1.3). This Jesus Christ, whose “God and Father is blessed,” bestowed upon his genuine disciples the reality of [God] Himself being not only their God but also [their] Father. For he says to Mary after rising from the dead, “Do not touch me, for I have not yet ascended to My Father; but go to my brothers and say to them, ‘I am ascending to [K703] My Father and your Father, even My God and your God’” (Jn 20.17). I personally think that it was at that time that He bestowed to Abraham, and to Isaac, and to Jacob, that God might no longer be only their God, but right then [their] Father. Luke adds to the text, “God is not God of the dead but of the living,” as it reads in Matthew (22.32) and Mark (12.27), “for all live by him” (Lk 20.39). Although this does not happen to be a commendation of the Patriarchs, seeing that our Savior who is so great testifies to them not only that they live, but also that one who lives, lives by God and by none other (cf. Gal 2.19-20). For this passage “for all live by him” is good for us to practice and to take up with every passage, so that we all might live to no one other than to God in Christ. *When the crowds heard the succinct demonstration from the writings of Moses concerning the*

<p>τὴν δὲ ἐν βραχυλογίᾳ ἀπόδειξιν ἐκ τῶν Μωσέως γραμμάτων, τοῖς μόνῃς ἐκεῖνα παραδεχομένοις ὡς θεῖα περὶ τοῦ ζῆν τοὺς πατριάρχας, ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἐξεπλήσσοντο, τὴν διδαχὴν ἀποδεχόμενοι τοῦ σωτῆρος σοφωτάτην καὶ δυναμένην τοὺς δυσπίστως ἔχοντας ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς αὐτόν.</p>	<p>Patriarchs being alive to those who accept only those [writings] as divine, <i>they were astonished</i>, and they accepted the wiser teaching of the Savior which was able to refute those who were disbelieving on him.</p>
--	---