

HIPPOLYTUS' COMMENTARY ON THE SONG OF SONGS
IN SOCIAL AND CRITICAL CONTEXT

by

Yancy Warren Smith

*Bachelor of Arts, 1984
Abilene Christian University
Abilene, TX*

*Master of Arts, 2003
Graduate School of Theology
Abilene Christian University
Abilene, TX*

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the

Brite Divinity School

in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in *Biblical Interpretation*

Fort Worth, TX

May 2009

ABSTRACT

This dissertation presents the first translation in English of the Georgian text of Hippolytus' commentary *On the Song of Songs* and discusses the authorship, provenance, rhetorical features, social setting, and hermeneutical proclivities of the *In Cant.* It argues for the traditional assumption that Hippolytus was a culturally eastern writer in Rome. This study builds upon previous musings by some scholars that the *In Cant.* is a work of baptismal instruction, arguing more precisely that it represents a mystagogy centering on the post-baptismal rite of anointing with oil as a symbol of receiving the Holy Spirit. The *In Cant.* should be imagined as performed in the convivial setting of a Paschal banquet. Such rites suggest a western provenance. Particular attention is given to the Greco-Roman context and Valentinian influences on the commentary. Hippolytus used New Testament passages, the Logos theology he inherited from Irenaeus, and also popular images of Greco-Roman domestic art as inspirations for his interpretation of the Song. Hippolytus used the Song to reinterpret popular images of Dionysus and Ariadne, the chariot of Helios and the zodiac, the Dioscuri Castor and Pollux, and Heracles and the Hesperides in the fabled Garden of the West. Themes of the commentary selected for discussion are Hippolytus' *Logos* theology, the attitude displayed by Hippolytus toward women, the synagogue, and heretics.

HIPPOLYTUS' *COMMENTARY ON THE SONG OF SONGS*
IN SOCIAL AND CRITICAL CONTEXT

APPROVED BY

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE:

Carolyn Osiek

Dissertation Director

David L. Balch

Reader

Jeff W. Childers

Reader

Edward J. McMahon

Ph.D. Director

Nancy J. Ramsay

Dean

COPYRIGHT ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

As author of this paper, I grant permission to the Mary Couets Burnett Library, Texas Christian University, to provide a photocopy of the paper to any requesting institution or individual, with the understanding that it be for scholarly use only.

Yancy W. Smith

Signature

2 April 2009

Date

WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted materials.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish photocopy or reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

To Nona†
and Lanette

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members for the time and effort they have spent working with me on this project: to David L. Balch whose inspiring lectures opened up for his students the interpretive potential of the conjunction of art and ancient Christian texts; to Jeff Childers whose teaching on oriental Christianities and languages laid the foundation of this work. His particular blend of patience and exacting, careful critique improved my translation of the Georgian text and saved me many an embarrassing gaffe. Of course any errors that remain are my own. Above all, thanks to my committee chair, Carolyn Osiek, whose profound knowledge of the social backgrounds and movements of early Christianity brought a transformation in in how I read Scripture. Her patient teaching, inspiration, helpful guidance, and the collegial environment she fosters will never be forgotten. I can only hope that this dissertation honors her effort. Also, special thanks to Jost Gippert and the team at *Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien*, an on-line joint project of the Institute of Comparative Linguistics of the Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main, the Ústav starého Predního východu of Charles University, Prague, the Institut for Almen og Anvendt Sprogvidenskab of the University of Copenhagen and the Departamento de Filología Clásica y Románica (Filología Griega) de la Universidad de Oviedo. This repository of otherwise difficult-to-find texts and helps is an invaluable resource for students of eastern European and central Asian languages and texts. Also, I am grateful to the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures and the Summer Workshop in Slavic, East European and Central

Asian Languages at Indiana University (SWSEEL) that provided a generous summer fellowship making possible an intensive study of the Georgian language. A travel grant from Brite Divinity School facilitated the time I spent in Bloomington at Indiana University, for which I am grateful as well. Dale Randolph and A. Brian McLemore, both of World Bible Translation Center, provided encouragement and financial and moral support as well as office space during the research and writing phases of this project. Thanks also to Brendan McConvery, of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth for helping me locate Ide M. Ní Ríain, translator of the nearly-impossible to-obtain English version of Ambrose's *Exposition on Psalm 118 (119)*, which allowed me to check the accuracy of my own translations of the Ambrose's quotations of Hippolytus. Her kind letter arrived on St. Patrick's Day. Finally, I am grateful to my friends and co-workers, John Andersen and Brian McLemore, who provided keen copy editing skills and went the extra mile in the final stages of this project.

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS.....	xi
Major Textual Witnesses of <i>On the Song of Songs</i> by Hippolytus	xiv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1 AUTHORSHIP, DATE, AND PROVENANCE.....	8
<i>The Date, Setting, and Influence of the Commentary</i>	8
<i>The In Cant. and the Hippolytus Question</i>	14
<i>The Case for a Western Provenance of the In Cant.</i>	33
<i>The Commentary on the Song of Songs and the Two Authors Theory</i> ..	109
<i>Summary</i>	110
2 GENRE, RHETORIC AND SOCIAL CONTEXT	111
<i>Speaker and Audience in the In Cant.</i>	112
<i>The Genre of the In Cant.</i>	153
<i>Hippolytus in his Social Context</i>	210
<i>Summary</i>	238
3 ANNOTATED TRANSLATION	240
<i>Introduction to the Commentary</i>	240
<i>Texts and Translation of the Commentary on the Song of Songs</i>	249
4 THEMES AND HERMENEUTICAL APPROACH	375
<i>Invective, Community Boundaries, and the Inner Chamber</i>	375
<i>Hermeneutical Starting Points</i>	382
<i>Hermeneutical Process: Typology, Mystery and Divine Economy</i>	427
<i>Selected Theme: Women and the Synagogue in the In Cant.</i>	451
<i>Chapter Summary</i>	473
5 CONCLUSIONS	475
APPENDIX 1 EUSEBIUS AND JEROME ON HIPPOLYTUS.....	485
APPENDIX 2 A HOUSE-CHURCH STATUE OF ROMA	493
<i>Archaeological Evidence Linking Hippolytus to Rome</i>	493
<i>More Archaeological Evidence Linking Hippolytus to Rome</i>	510

APPENDIX 3 EUCHARIST AND AGAPE IN TRAD. AP.	512
WORKS CITED.....	531
Chart 1: Structural Outline Introduction to <i>In Cant.</i>	170
Chart 2: Outline of the <i>In Cant.</i>	173
Chart 3: Works of Hippolytus Listed in Eusebius and Jerome	489
Chart 4: Statue List Compared with Lists in Eusebius and Jerome	498
Chart 5: The Community Meals of the <i>Therapeutae</i> and Roman Christians..	518

ABBREVIATIONS ¹

AEG	Abingdon Essential Guides
ADW	Heinz Fähnrich and Zurab Sarjveladze, <i>Altgeorgisch-deutsches Wörterbuch</i> . Lexicographia orientalis 5, Hamburg: H. Buske Verlag, 1999
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology
<i>Antichr.</i>	<i>De antichristo</i>
ASMA	Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity
<i>Ben. Is. Jac.</i>	<i>De benedictionibus Isaaci et Jacobi</i>
Botte	<i>La tradition apostolique de Saint Hippolyte: essai de reconstitution, Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen and Forschungen 39</i>
<i>Can. pasch.</i>	<i>Canon paschalis</i>
<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>In Canticum canticorum</i>
<i>Cant. Mos.</i>	<i>In canticum Mosis</i>
<i>Chron.</i>	<i>Chronicon</i>
<i>Chron. Pas.</i>	<i>Chronicon Paschale,</i>
<i>Comm. Dan.</i>	<i>Commentarium in Daniele</i>
<i>C.N., Noet.</i>	<i>Contra Noetum</i> or <i>Contra haeresin Noeti</i>
CSAH	Classical Studies and Ancient History
DACL	<i>Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie</i>
FGNKAL	Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur

¹All other abbreviations conform to the standard listing in *The SBL Handbook of Style For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* eds. Patrick H. Alexander, John F. Kutsko, James D. Ernest, Shirley Decker-Lucke, and David L. Petersen.

- Fr. Prov.* *Fragmenta in Proverbia*
- Fr. Ps.* *Fragmenta in Psalmos*
- Garitte *Traitées d'Hippolyte sur David et Goliath, sur le Cantique des cantiques et sur l'Antéchrist, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalis; Scriptorum Iberici 15/16 263/264*
- GG Bakar Giginėšvilma and Elguža Giunašvilma, eds. of the *Šaṭberd* ms
- GTS Grazer theologische Studien
- GPhil *Gospel of Philip*
- Haer.* *Refutatio omnium haeresium (Philosophoumena) = Refutation of All Heresies*
- Helc. Ann.* *In Helcanam et Annam*
- Itin. Eger.* *Itinerarium Egeriae, Egeria: Diary of a Pilgrimage*
- KGS Koptisch-gnostische Schriften
- LBS Library of Biblical Studies
- LCA NS Letteratura Christiana Antica Nuova Serie
- LHR NS Lectures on the History of Religions New Series
- MCL Martin Classical Lectures
- NTI John Ap* *Novum Testamentum iberice Apocalypsis Iohannis* [The Old Georgian Version of St. John's Apocalypsis]. On the basis of the edition by I. Imnaišvili, *Iovanes gamocxadeba da misi targmaneba, žveli kartuli versia*, Tbilisi 1961 (*žveli kartuli enis ḳatedris šromebi*, 7) edited by Jost Gippert and Vaxṭang Imnaišvili, Frankfurt a/M and Tbilisi, 1988-2000; TITUS version by Jost Gippert, Frankfurt a/M, 23.4.2000 / 1.6.2000 / 15.12.2002 / 20.3.2007
- NTI Paul AB* *Novum Testamentum iberice Epistolae Beati Pauli Apostoli* [The Old Georgian Version of St. Paul's Epistles] (Redaction AB). ed. K. Žocenize and Ḳ. Danelia, *Pavles epistoleta kartuli versiebi / Gruzinskie versii poslanij Pavla*, Tbilisi 1974 (*žveli kartuli enis ḳatedris šromebi*, 16) ed. by Jost Gippert and Vaxṭang Imnaišvili, Frankfurt a/M and Tbilisi, 1988-1998; v.l. ed. by Sopiḳo Sarželaze and Darežan Tvaltvaže, Tbilisi, 2005; TITUS version by Jost Gippert, Frankfurt a/M, 14.10.1998 / 26.12.1999 / 1.6.2000 / 15.12.2002 / 16.10.2005 / 15.9.2007

- NTI Paul CD* *Novum Testamentum iberice Epistolae Beati Pauli Apostoli* [The Old Georgian Version of St. Paul's Epistles] (Redaction CD), based on ed. K. ZoceniZe and K. Danelia, *Pavles epištoleta kartuli versiebi / Gruzinskie versii poslanij Pavla*, Tbilisi 1974 (Zveli kartuli enis katedris šromebi, 16) ed. by Jost Gippert, Vaxtang Imnaišvili, Sopižo Sarželaze and Darežan TvaltvaZe, Frankfurt a/M and Tbilisi, 1988-2005; v.l. ed. by Sopižo Sarželaze and Darežan TvaltvaZe, Tbilisi, 2005; TITUS version by Jost Gippert, Frankfurt a/M, 14.10.1998 / 26.12.1999 / 1.6.2000 / 15.12.2002 / 3.11.2005
- OCM Oxford Classical Monographs
- OHAS Oxford History of Art Series
- OTM Oxford Theological Monographs
- PF Papyrologica Florentina
- PHC A People's History of Christianity
- praef. preface
- PPS Popular Patristics Series
- RHAW Routledge History of the Ancient World
- Richard Marcel Richard. "Une Paraphrase grecque résumée du Commentaire d'Hippolyte sur le Cantique des cantiques." *Le Muséon* 77 (1964): 137-54
- SEA Studia Ephemeridis *Augustinianum*
- SoS Rab* *Song of Songs Rabbah*
- SNTW Studies of the New Testament and its World
- SupVC Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*
- TANZ Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter
- Trad. ap.* *Traditio apostolica = The Apostolic Tradition*
- TSHT Texts and Studies in the History of Theology; Edition Cicero
- Univ.* *De universo*
- VÖAW Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften

Major Textual Witnesses of *On the Song of Songs* by Hippolytus

Witness	Symbol	Publication information	Location, internet access, date, extent
Georgian mss	<i>T</i>	Shatberd Manuscript. Bakar Gigineišvilma and Elguža Giunašvilma, <i>Šatberdis krebuli X sauğunisa</i> (Tbilisi, 1979), 249-67. Parchment.	Tblisi, Institute of Manuscripts, codex S 1141. http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/ageo/satberd/satbe.htm . Chap. 1-27 on Song 1:1-3:7
	<i>J</i>	Unpublished, used in the edition of Gérard Garitte, ed. <i>Traité d'Hippolyte sur David et Goliath, sur le Cantique des cantiques et sur l'Antéchrist</i> . CSCO; <i>Scriptores Iberici</i> 15 263. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1965.	Library of the Greek Patriarchate, Georgian codex 44, Jerusalem, Israel. Laccuna in text from 16.2-20.3.
Greek paraphrase	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	Marcel Richard, "Une Paraphrase grecque résumée du <i>Commentaire d'Hippolyte sur le Cantique des cantiques</i> ," <i>Le Muséon</i> 77 (1964): 137-54.	Auct. T.2.5 (Misc. Greek codex 205, Bodleian Library, Oxford, England. VII century. Summary of chapters 1-27.

Paleo-Slavic florilegia	PS	Bonwetsch, G. Nathanael. "Hippolyts Kommentar zum Hohenlied auf Grund von Nikolai Marrs Ausgabe des Grusisinschen Textes." <i>Texte und Untersuchungen</i> , NF 8.2c (1902): 1-108.	Ms no. 579 ¹ of the Library of Zarsky; ms. no. 31 the countess Uwarow; ms no. 730 of the Troico-Sergiev Monastery; ² ms no. 548 of the Moscow Synodal Library; ms no. 673 of the Moscow Synodal Library 548 and 673 (XVII century) and ms no. 730 of the Troico-Sergiev Monastery (XVI century). ³
Syriac fragments		A few Syriac fragments survive, published by I. Rucher, <i>Florilegium Edessenum anonymum</i> , (SBAW, PHA; Munich: C.H. Beck, 1933), 8; Pitra, <i>Analecta sacra</i> , iv. 36, 40 with an English translation on page 306, 310.	
Armenian		J. B. F. Pitra, ed., <i>Analecta sacra</i> (Paris, 1876), ii, 232-5. Also published in Garitte, CSCO 266.	Venetian Mechitarist Codex 202 (1637), fos. 392-4, and 228 (1847). Mechitarist Monastery, Venice.

¹(28v—29r)

²(pages 256r—288v and 354v—360r)

³As of 2008, the existence of these mss in the National Library in Moscow is unconfirmed.

INTRODUCTION

The present study provides the first complete English translation of the Georgian and Greek texts of Hippolytus' commentary *On the Song of Songs*.¹ The translation accompanies an argument in support of a western provenance for the *In Cant*. Scholars suspected the extant fragments of the commentary were part of a Pascal liturgy.² The discovery of the complete Georgian commentary caused some, however, to doubt the earlier valuation at first. Bonwetsch, for example, remarked, "Ein Homilie in der strengen Sinne ist dieser Kommentar nicht, aber er besitzt doch noch ungleich mehr als *In Danielem* den Charakter einer Ansprache."³ The oral character and lack of full composition in the *In Cant*. is likely the result of its nature as a ὑπόμνημα, a set of speakers notes, meant for oral delivery.⁴ Thus, Hippolytus wrote the *In Cant*. as a homiletic guide for church leaders to aide in conducting the rites of Christian initiation for Passover, the preferred time for baptisms (*In Dan*. 1.16). The central argument of this dissertation seeks to establish and to explore the implications of this suggestion. I only came to the topic of liturgy late in this study. My habits of mind and my religious tradition, first in Churches of Christ and then in the Charismatic-Pentecostal renewal, did not prepare me for what I was to find in the

¹Hereafter, *In Cant*.

²Theodor Zahn, *Der Evangeliencommentar des Theophilus von Antiochien* (FGNKAL; Erlangen: Deichert, 1883), 61.

³G. Nathanael Bonwetsch, "Hippolyts Kommentar zum Hohenlied auf Grund von N. Marrs Ausgabe des Grusinischen Textes," *Texte und Untersuchungen*, NF 8, 2c (1902) 90, "The commentary is not a homily in the strictest sense, but indeed it exhibits the character of an oral address, not unlike that of the *In Danielem*."

⁴E.g., Quintilian, *Inst.* 10.7.30.

In Cant. This commentary has important implications for the history of mystagogy. Historians of liturgy generally admit that during the early third century Passover baptism seems to have been a western,⁵ rather than an eastern practice. This is an important preliminary clue about the provenance of the commentary. Therefore, the translation of the *In Cant.* is itself important for its contribution to the social history of early Christianity, its theology, and its liturgical development. Determining the provenance of the *In Cant.*, whether Asia Minor or Rome, is significant given current scholarly attention to the diversity within early Christianity. It is understood more clearly than before that the theologies and liturgies of the early church were “always earthed in a context.”⁶ This study will test the theory of a Roman provenance for the *In Cant.* by a close reading of the text to assess whether it bears tell-tale marks of a Roman milieu.⁷

My interest in Hippolytus originated from research conducted in the course of Bible translation research on the Song of Songs. While working with a team of translators on, *La Palabra de Dios para Todos*,⁸ from 1998 to 2003, I was shocked when the leader of a very large denomination in El Salvador objected to our (mis)translation of a verb in Song of Songs 3:6, where our text read “*viene allá del*

⁵See Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Rites of Christian Initiation: Their Evolution and Interpretation* (revised and expanded ed. Liturgical Press, 2007), 96.

⁶See the mantra by Frances M. Young, *The Theology of the Pastoral Letters* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge University Press, 1994), 1.

⁷One single provenance for the corpus of Hippolytus’ commentaries is no more likely than one provenance for Paul’s letters or Origen’s works.

⁸*La Biblia: La Palabra de Dios para Todos* (Fort Worth: World Bible Translation Center, 2005, 2008).

desierto” instead of “*sube del desierto*.”⁹ Our readers in San Salvador were part of a group that used the Song of Songs as a road map for spiritual perfection and the “directions” on that road taken by individual characters were extremely important to them! That was my introduction to the seriousness of the world of typological-allegorical interpretation and it spurred me on to discover more of the roots of the history of the interpretation of the Song. The root system of allegorical interpretation continues, in some sense, to nourish the lives of many Christians.¹⁰ References to Hippolytus’ *In Cant.* in modern printed commentaries were intriguing, but locating the sources was extremely difficult. Since most scholars cannot access the Georgian, Armenian, and Syriac fragments, discussions of the history of the interpretation of the Song of Songs usually omit Hippolytus and dwell on his younger, more radical and more sophisticated contemporary, Origen.¹¹ Some simply combine Hippolytus and Origen as if they use the same approach to the interpretation of the Song.¹²

Not knowing that I was pondering these issues, Carolyn Osiek suggested

⁹“He comes from there in the desert” instead of the more exact, “he comes up from the desert.”

¹⁰E.g. Tolkien’s famous words, “I suppose it is impossible to write any ‘story’ that is not allegorical in proportion as it ‘comes to life’; since each of us is an allegory, embodying in a particular tale and clothed in the garments of time and place, universal truth and everlasting life.” J. R. R. Tolkien, *The Letters of J.R.R. Tolkien* (Boston: Mariner Books, 1981), 212.

¹¹Richard Norris, *Song of Songs: Interpreted by Early Christian and Medieval Commentators* (The Church’s Bible; Eerdmans, 2003) and J. Robert Wright and Thomas C. Oden, *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, Old Testament IX, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon* (InterVarsity Press, 2005) both bypass Hippolytus.

¹²E. g., R. P. C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event: a Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen’s Interpretation of Scripture* (Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 251-2.

Hippolytus was an ancient Patristic figure in need of further research. That conversation led to a seminar paper that featured an annotated translation of *On the Song of Songs* of Garitte's Latin text of the *In Cant.* When I wondered out loud if this could become the basis of a doctoral dissertation, Osiek warned me that if I wanted to pursue this further it would require me to "learn Georgian." The summer term of 2005 was spent at the Summer Workshop in Slavic, East European and Central Asian Languages studying modern Georgian. With the help of Fähnrich's grammar of Old Georgian,¹³ I slowly began to learn to read ancient Georgian. Meanwhile both John Cerrato's, *Hippolytus between East and West: the Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus* and Allen Brent's *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension Before the Emergence of a Monarch-Bishop* convinced me that the study of second- and third-century patristic writers could be an engaging, relevant, and delightful exercise.

This dissertation takes a socio-rhetorical approach similar to the method of study advocated by Robbins and others.¹⁴ The first Chapter addresses issues of authorship and provenance. It lays a foundation for the argument that Hippolytus was a Roman Church leader at the beginning of the third century. It is admitted that the argument in favor of a Roman provenance for the *In Cant.* is allusive, indirect, and suggestive. My own experience living for more than ten years in Buenos Aires, Argentina caused me to empathize with the figure of an expatriate Hippolytus

¹³Heinz Fähnrich, *Grammatik der altgeorgischen Sprache* (Buske, 1994).

¹⁴Vernon K. Robbins, *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society, and Ideology* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 3, presents five points of view for socio-rhetorical analysis: inner texture, intertexture, social and cultural texture, ideological texture and sacred texture.

Romanus. That experience also taught me to view with suspicion facile statements about provenance indicators in general.

The question of the authorship of the Hippolytan corpus is a fascinating topic to which a number of monographs have been dedicated.¹⁵ Many scholars consider the corpus of Hippolytan works to be the product of at least two distinct authors.¹⁶ It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to argue the case of single or multiple authorship in the Hippolytan corpus. Most Hippolytan scholars today assume more than one author is responsible for these works. Evidence emerges from a close reading of the *In Cant.* that demonstrates a literary relationship between the commentaries and other Hippolytan works. Accordingly, to keep the writings and profiles of the principal “authors” separate for the purpose of this study, the convention of using Hippolytus #1 and #2 is adopted. Hippolytus #1 is the author of *The Refutation of all Heresies* and *The Chronicon*.¹⁷ Hippolytus #2 is the author of the *In Cant.*, most of the other commentaries, and *The Antichrist*.¹⁸

¹⁵Josef Frickel, *Das Dunkel um Hippolyt von Rom: ein Lösungsversuch; die Schriften Elenchos und Contra Noëtum* (GTS 13; Graz: Institut für Ökumenische Theologie und Patrologie an der Universität Graz, 1988); Allen Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension before the Emergence of a Monarch-Bishop* (SupVC 31; Leiden; New York; Köln: E.J. Brill, 1995); John A. Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West: The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus* (OTS; Oxford: Blackwell, 2002).

¹⁶Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 204-365.

¹⁷Brent, following Nautin, argued that the writer of *Haer.* the *Chronicon*, the Paschal calendrical tables on the statue, and the one mentioned by Eusebius, is not the writer of the commentaries, but Hippolytus #1, an the unnamed church leader who clashed with Callistus in Rome. He was the predecessor of Hippolytus #2.

¹⁸The convention adopted here is not meant to imply that, if there were two authors, both had the name Hippolytus.

Chapter Two concerns the social and religious context of the *In Cant*. Its focus is the rhetorical, social, and liturgical ambiance of the commentary. The second Chapter will suggest a setting for the *In Cant*. within the situation of an early house-church in Rome. I was amazed to discover that the imagery of the *In Cant*. is closely linked to Greco-Roman house-hold iconography. The visualizations available to Hippolytus' audience on the walls in their homes intrude upon the interpretation of Scripture. Early Christian house churches may well have been decorated with pagan murals, albeit reinterpreted as biblical images.¹⁹ Domestic art and ritual also extended to representations and practices associated with burial places found in Roman catacombs, which also may have influenced Hippolytus' interpretation of the Song.²⁰ The rhetorical function of the imagery of Hippolytus' commentary is partly to subvert polytheistic ideology by means of the gospel, not to advocate white washing their walls. The genre and rhetoric of the commentary is discussed as a function of its liturgical context as they apply to the setting of the celebration of Christian initiatory rites that culminate in a festive Passover banquet: i.e., as mystagogy.

The third Chapter presents translations of the Georgian text and various fragments and patristic quotations of the commentary with notes to assist the reader.

¹⁹See David L. Balch, *Roman Domestic Art and Early House Churches* (WUNT 228; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 168-94.

²⁰Carolyn Osiek, "Roman and Christian Burial Practices and the Patronage of Women," in *Commemorating the Dead: Texts and Artifacts in Context: Studies of Roman, Jewish and Christian Burials* (ed. Laurie Brink; Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 243-70; Janet H. Tulloch, "Women Leaders in Family Funerary Banquets," in *A Women's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity* (eds. Carolyn Osiek and Margaret Macdonald; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006), 164-93; Nicola Denzey, *The Bone Gatherers: The Lost Worlds of Early Christian Women* (Beacon Press, 2008), 18, 36-7, 142

The commentary in all its forms has suffered greatly in transmission. Yet the Georgian translation, the Greek epitome, the Paleo-Slavonic florilegia, the Armenian and Syriac fragments, as well as quotations in various church fathers, when taken together, allow near approximations to the contents of the original Greek commentary by Hippolytus #2.

Chapter Four deals primarily with the ideological and sacred texture of the commentary. The fourth Chapter will explore its basic hermeneutical approach and selected theological themes. The themes chosen for consideration in Chapter Four will be neither systematic nor exhaustive, but will center on the boundaries of threat and the sources of tension in Hippolytus #2's community: women, heretics, and the synagogue. Also discussed is the *Logos* theology of the commentary as a hermeneutical key to Hippolytus' interpretation of the Song. All these together represent for Hippolytus #2 primary difficulties in negotiating a Christian self-understanding within the third-century Roman Church.

CHAPTER 1
AUTHORSHIP, DATE, AND PROVENANCE

The Date, Setting, and Influence of the Commentary

Though the *In Cant.* is not the earliest Christian commentary,¹ it may be the earliest extant Christian commentary on the Song of Songs. Eusebius places Hippolytus #2 and his list of writings around the time of Alexander Severus, so a date before 235 C.E. is reasonable.² From its beginnings in the first century as a marginal Jewish movement of a few thousand Palestinian and Diaspora Jews, “Christianity” became a multi-ethnic network of diverse urban communities throughout the Roman and Parthian empires and grew to perhaps some two hundred thousand followers by the end of the second century.³ During the Severan period it enjoyed a modicum of favor, especially in Rome, where some elite members of the imperial court even

¹The *Comm. Dan.* by Hippolytus #2 is the other candidate for earliest surviving commentary. See Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 141; Jean Daniélou, *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture* (trans. John Austin; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973), 253; McConvery, “Hippolytus’ Commentary,” 211. Nevertheless, Heracleon’s earlier gnostic Christian commentary survives in extensive quotes in Origen’s *Commentary on the Gospel of John*.

²One cannot be certain that Origen made use of the *In Cant.* He composed the first part of his *Commentary on the Song* in 240 C.E. and his homilies around 244 C.E. If Origen did use *In Cant.*, the details of his exegesis do not show it. See R. P. Lawson, ed. *Origen, the Song of Songs, Commentary and Homilies* (ACW 26, Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1957), 4, 17.

³Rodney Stark, *The Rise of Christianity: a Sociologist Reconsiders History* (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1996), 7.

began placing inscriptions announcing their adherence to the Christian faith.⁴ Rome was a magnet that drew people from all over the empire who then settled into cultural enclaves and negotiated their differences with western culture in various ways.⁵ Members of the senatorial class, especially women from the East,⁶ were attracted to the worship of Jesus. Educated leaders like Hippolytus were making efforts to raise the quality and standards of Christian teaching by creating notebooks like the *In Cant.* for the instruction of new converts.

Scholars generally date the *In Cant.* early among the exegetical writings of Hippolytus #2, followed by *Antichr.* (ca. 200 C.E.) and *Comm. Dan.* (ca. 204 C.E.) during the outbreak of persecution that arose during the reign of Septimius Severus. The evidence for that date, however, is slim, and the criteria for an early dating are not clear. Brent's suggestion of a date for the *Comm. Dan.* after 222 C.E. is more probable.⁷ A later date for the *Comm. Dan.* opens up the possibility that the *Antichr.*, as well as the *In Cant.*, are also later, anywhere in the period of 211-235.⁸ If this slightly later dating is more accurate than the traditional early dating of these commentaries, then one reason none of these works appear on the so-called "statue of Hippolytus" could be that they were not yet written when the inscription on the statue was made.

The commentary itself contains little indication of the date, but what it does

⁴Paul McKechnie, "Christian Grave-Inscriptions From the Familia Caesaris," *JEH* 50 (2000): 427-41.

⁵See David Noy, *Foreigners at Rome: Citizens and Strangers* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 2000), 157-255.

⁶Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 118.

⁷Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 276-9.

⁸See above page 10.

contain is crucial. The value of the *denarius* in the late second and early third century fluctuated wildly. At the time of the composition of the *In Cant.*, Hippolytus considered a price of thirty *denarii* accessible to the poor (*In Cant.* 2.30). The idea that such a sum might be “easily accessible” to the poor betrays Hippolytus #2’s elite bias. Still, inflation and debasement may have made such a sum “more accesible.”

The period from Commodus to Diocletian is a sad chapter in the history of the *denarius*. From 180 to 274 C.E. debasement of the currency led to inflation and financial collapse.⁹ Debasement under Commodus triggered an abrupt doubling of prices (190-191 C.E.). Septimius Severus reversed such monetary policies; however, by the reign of Caracalla (211-218 C.E.) dramatic and sustained debasement probably brought serious inflation in *denarii*. Though direct evidence of price fluctuations is rare,¹⁰ the introduction during that period of a parallel *denarius*, the Antonianus, suggests as much. It is likely Hippolytus composed the *In Cant.* in this time period (211-218 C.E.) or slightly later, and that the reference here constitutes evidence of a high rate of inflation. An argument for composition much earlier than this date will need to take this reference into consideration. At the beginning of the third century, prices were at about two to three times the prices at the beginning of the second century. Changes were such that the public maintained, in general, confidence in the value of its coins until the crisis of 235 C.E., when serious stress on values from debasement began to affect public confidence in coinage.¹¹

Patristic quotations of the *In Cant.* noted in Chapter Three of this dissertation

⁹Kenneth W. Harl, *Coinage in the Roman Economy, 300 B. C. to A. D. 700* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 90-95; 270-289.

¹⁰Harl, *Coinage in the Roman Economy*, 280.

¹¹*Ibid.* 125-128.

demonstrate that the commentary had some influence on later Christian writers, though nothing like that of Origen's commentary and homilies. However, it is clear from both direct quotations and allusions in the *In Cant.* found in subsequent patristic writings¹² that he helped set, along with Origen's own *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, basic commonplaces in the development of a Christian interpretation of the Song. Hippolytus #2's view was that the beloved represents the church and the lover, Christ. He writes his commentary for new Christians, novices in the spiritual life. Origen, on the other hand, opined in his commentary that the Song was for the spiritual elite who had already been trained to ingest "strong meat." Indeed, he argued that "to those . . . who are being nourished with milk in Christ, not with strong meat, and are only beginning to 'desire the rational milk without guile'—it is not given to grasp the meaning of these sayings."¹³ Origen suggests that the study of the Song early in one's spiritual life is dangerous: "this book of the Song of Songs should be reserved for last." The numerous quotations in Ambrose's *Exposition of Psalm 118 (119)*, and *On Isaac and the Soul* especially indicate the influence of the *In Cant.* on Ambrose¹⁴ and his use of the Song of Songs in his mystgogical instruction *On the Sacraments* and *On the Mysteries*.

¹²Collected in Nathanael Bonwetsch, *Studien zu den Kommentaren Hippolytus zum Büche Daniel und hohen Liede* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897).

¹³Origen, *In Cant. praef.*, (Lawson, ACW), 26:22.

¹⁴In the majority of his works, however his valuation of the Song followed the exegetical orientation of Origen, with the identification of the soul as the beloved in the Song. See Pietro Meloni, "L'iflusso del Commento al Cantico di Ippolito sull'Expositio Psalmi CXVII di Ambrogio," in *Letterature Comparate: Problemi e Metodo. Studi in onore di Ettore Paratore* (Bologna: Pàtron Editore, 1981), 865.

The Severan Context of the In Cant.

Between the end of the second and the beginning of the third century the relations between the church and the Roman Empire were anticipating, in some respects, the so-called “Constantinian shift.”¹⁵ Eusebius regarded Severus Alexander as a friend of the church, as he did all the “good” emperors.¹⁶ The emperors that Eusebius considered “good” were those who did not persecute the church and paved the way for the new status quo inaugurated under Constantine. In particular it appears that a “Severan tolerance” permitted the church in Rome to better define its structure, especially the authority of the bishop and the relation between clergy and laity.¹⁷ Christians during the later Severan period also began to seek consideration and patronage from members of the noble class and, sometimes, members of the imperial household. For example, the Oxyrhyncus Papyrus III (n. 412) fragment of Julius Africanus’s *Κῆστοι* bears a dedication to the Emperor. And Alexander Severus, the

¹⁵This trend is further seen in the generation after Hippolytus when the Christians of Antioch appealed to emperor Aurelian to intervene in an internal church dispute over the control of church property during the dispute with monarchian bishop Paul of Samosata (272 C.E.).

¹⁶Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 82.

¹⁷Though Brent rightly criticizes an over exuberant attitude about the “Severan tolerance,” nevertheless his narrative of an early third-century Roman Church moving toward mono-episcopacy supports the thesis of both Enrico dal Cavolo, “I Severi e il cristianesimo: un decennio di ricerche (1989-1996),” *Aug* 8 (1999): 44, and Manlio Simonetti, “Una nuova proposta su Ippolito,” *Aug* 36 (1996): 13-46, that the closer relationship between some sectors of the church and the Roman elite as well as the relative tolerance to Christianity at this time led to a consolidation of power structures in the church.

son of the Empress Julia Avita Mamaea,¹⁸ “who considered it very important to be honored by the visit” (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.21.3) of Origen, preferred Julius Africanus for the construction of a library in the area near the Pantheon, close to the baths that the Emperor Alexander completed in 227. The mitigated rhetoric of opposition to the Roman empire in the *Comm. Dan.* and the *In Cant.* is consistent with the attitude illustrated by Origen and Julius Africanus and the inscriptions displayed on the so called “statue of Hippolytus.”¹⁹ It appears that the Severan policy itself “was generally one of persuasion and comprehension, despite Septimius’ prohibition of conversions [to Christianity], and isolated local judicial processes.”²⁰

The court of Alexander displayed an intense interest in religious matters. Of course, the portrayal of the Severans had apologetic value for Eusebius in his own time, and Severan interest in Christian wise men likely served the imperial purpose of consolidating power.²¹ Among third-century members of the imperial service in Rome, however, Christianity was attracting attention that was not completely

¹⁸Dietma Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990), 180.

¹⁹See Appendix 2, 493-510.

²⁰Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 88.

²¹See Karen Jo TorJesen, “Social and Historical Setting: Christianity as Culture Critique,” in *Social and Historical Setting: Christianity as Culture Critique* (ed. Frances Young *et al.*; Cambridge University Press, 2004), 184-85. The extension of citizenship beyond the cities to villages and towns throughout the Roman Empire under Caracalla was intended to expand the reach of the patronage of the imperial household and cult, among other things. It was a means of deepening a religious sense of sacramental unity with the Emperor as the “Lord of the world.” The treatment of the cities of the empire as if they were part of the city of Rome was an innovation that, under Decius, when all citizens were required to offer sacrifices to the civic gods as proof of loyalty to Rome, would eventually lead to empire-wide persecution

negative.²² For its part, the *In Cant.* displays an interest in the extension of Christianity among multiple strata of the society and exhibits the dynamic tensions that arise from a group gaining converts from both the elite and the poor in the society.

The In Cant. and the Hippolytus Question

Only a few decades after his death, no one knew for sure who the early third-century author Hippolytus #2 was, where he had lived or what he had written.²³ Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 6.22) states, in his list of Hippolytus' works that he wrote the *In Cant.* and that he was the “προεστῶς” of a church somewhere.” Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 61) mentions Hippolytus as the author of the *In Cant.* as well but admits he had not been able to find out the name of the city where he was bishop.²⁴ Some patristic references favor the supposition that Hippolytus was a Roman bishop, but other attributions make him a bishop in Arabia or Bostra.

Lampe,²⁵ and Brent,²⁶ and built upon the previous work of La Piana and

²²McKechnie, “Christian Grave-Inscriptions,” 427-41.

²³ See also Bardy, et al. eds., *Hippolyte: Commentaire sur Daniel*, 7. I am indebted to the important review article of Clemens Scholten, “Hippolytus between East and West: The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus,” *VC* 59.1 (2005): 85-92, for the substance of many comments on the next few pages.

²⁴Jerome says, *Hippolytus, cujusdam Ecclesiae episcopus nomen quippe urbis scire non potui* (*Vir. illus.* 61). “Hippolytus, the bishop of a church the name of whose city I have not been able to find out.”

²⁵Peter Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries* (trans. by Michael Steinhauser; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 299-308.

²⁶Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 368-535.

others²⁷ and argued forcibly that the monoepiscopate was late coming to Rome. For Brent, the very title of Hippolytus contributed to the confusion about his location. The transformation of the structure of the Roman Church at the end of the second and beginning of the third century was marked by a change in the understanding of the meaning of ἐπίσκοπος, “bishop.” Before the middle of the third century the term “bishop” was roughly equivalent to πρεσβύτερος, “presbyter.” Each church was organized with its group of presbyters led by a single “bishop.” The various bishops in the city were loosely related and chose a representative in charge of correspondence and the work of beneficence on behalf of the churches of other cities. By the middle of the third century, however, the churches in Rome had ceased to be so loosely organized and had adopted a church structure in which one bishop reigned supreme over all the other churches, who were led each by their presbyter, or priest.²⁸

Accordingly, options available for understanding the figure of Hippolytus were enigmatic. Fourth century patristic evidence suggested only two: a single western author, Hippolytus bishop of Rome or a single eastern bishop Hippolytus in various locations. The difficulty of harmonizing all the writings attributed to one figure eventually led to theories of multiple authorship of the corpus, either centered in Rome or in both Rome and “the East.” Those who argue for multiple authorship of the Hippolytan corpus consider Roman part of the corpus to be securely Roman, the

²⁷George La Piana, “The Roman Church At the End of the Second Century: The Episcopate of Victor, the Latinization of the Roman Church, the Easter Controversy, Consolidation of Power and Doctrinal Development, the Catacomb of Callistus,” *HTR* 18.3 (1925): 201-77; Gustave Bardy, “Le écoles romaines du second siècle,” *RHE* 28(1932): 501-532.

²⁸Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 430-2.

product of a Greek-speaking teacher of eastern cultural formation. The provenance of the other part of the corpus, including the commentaries and the Antichrist, is debated.²⁹

Following Brent, this Chapter endeavors to establish a modified, traditional view of the authorship of the *In Cant.*, that is: Hippolytus, a Roman presbyter-bishop, wrote the *In Cant.*³⁰ External evidence is indirect, circumstantial, and obscured by

²⁹The three major views are represented by Frickel, *Das Dunkel um Hippolyt von Rom*; Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*; and Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*. These works represent a re-assessment of the Hippolytus question as a result of the work of Nautin, *Hippolyte et Josipe*, largely responsible for deconstructing the older consensus inspired by the work of Johann Joseph Ignaz von Döllinger, *Hippolytus and Callistus* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1876), which solidified the view that Hippolytus, the writer and bishop, was the first antipope and revered as a martyr. Two major symposia held in Rome at the Instituto Patristico “Augustianum,” the acts of which were published as Manlio Simonetti, ed. *Ricerche su Ippolito* (13, Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1977), and Manlio Simonetti, “Aggiornamento,” *Nuove Ricerche* were a vindication of some of the views of Nautin. In reaction to the symposium, Frickel largely reasserted the view of Döllinger: the corpus of writings attributed to Hippolytus is from one author, a Roman bishop opposed to Callistus. Brent accepted the two-author aspect of Nautin’s views and argued for a Roman provenance for the corpus, based upon an intricate web of relations between the statue of Ligorio, its inscribed works and calendars, the *Liberian Catalogue*, and literary documents claimed to be part of the corpus, that Hippolytus #2 was a presbyter in a Roman church with more than one rival bishop in a period before the monarchical episcopate was established in Rome. He also argued that two or perhaps three authors from the same “church-school” community are responsible for the corpus of Hippolytan writings. Cerrato’s study was designed to strengthen “the viability of the suspicion that the writer of the commentaries was not a member of the communities at Rome” (258), but was a bishop in the East in some unknown church, perhaps in Asia Minor. According to Cerrato, Hippolytus the Roman martyr was not known as a writer and is not the author of *Haer.* (= *Contra omnium haeresium* or also known as *Philosophoumena*).

³⁰Many scholars consider the skepticism concerning the Hippolytan authorship of *Haer.* as well as the Roman provenance of the commentaries and other works unwar-

later understandings of church leadership found in the historiographical record.³¹ Can and examination of the *In Cant.*³² reveal that it fits a Roman context?³³

Eusebius places Hippolytus between mentions of the bishops of Bostra³⁴ and

ranted. See Whealey, "Pseudo-Justin's de Resurrectione: Athenagoras or Hippolytus," *VC* 60: 420-21. However, "No general consensus has been achieved on basic questions concerning Hippolytus' person and works, nor does it appear one is likely," Ronald Heine, "Hippolytus, Ps.-Hippolytus and the Early Canons," in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature* (vol. 1, ed., Frances Young et al., Cambridge University Press, 2004), 148.

³¹See Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 131, 353.

³²As well as the exegetical works *Commentarium in Daniele* (=Comm. Dan.), *De benedictionibus Isaaci et Jacobi*, (*Ben. Is.*; *Ben. Jac.*) and the doctrinal works *De Antichristo* (=Antichr.) and *Contra Noetum* (=Noet.), the unattributed *De Resurrectione* [PG 6.1572D- 1592A should also now be accepted as of Hippolytus #2. See Alice Whealey, "Hippolytus' Lost 'De Universo' and 'De Resurrectione': Some New Hypotheses," *VC* 50 (1996); Charles E. Hill, "Hades of Hippolytus Or Tartarus of Tertullian: The Authorship of the Fragment De Universo," *VC* 43.2 (1989): 105-26. The *De universo* (PG 10.796-801) is from an otherwise unknown Greek theologian. (Pace Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 269-70.) See Alice Whealey, "Pseudo-Justin's De Resurrectione: Athenagoras or Hippolytus?," *VC* 60 (2006): 420. The recent editions by Martin Heimgartner and ed., *Pseudojustin. Über die Auferstehung: Text und Studie* (PTS 54; Berlin New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2001); Alberto D'Anna, ed. *Pseudo-Giustino, Sulla Resurrezione: Discorso cristiano del II secolo* (Brescia: Editrice Morcelliana, 2001), do not show any awareness of Whealey's arguments for Hippolytan authorship.

³³Concerning the question of the authorship of the *Refutation of All Heresies* and allied documents that Brent argued powerfully to be from a predecessor of Hippolytus #2, this dissertation will not have much to say. Brent argued plausibly that the *Noet.* represents a *rapprochement* with the modalist monarchianism of the succession of Callistus against whom *Haer.* provided abundant invective. The hurdle for the minority of scholars who accept the same Hippolytus as the author of both the commentaries and *Haer.* are differences in cultural formation, style, and Christology between *Haer.* and the *Chronicon* on the one hand, and the *Antichr.*, *Noet.*, and the commentaries on the other.

³⁴In the medieval (post-seventh century) Armenian manuscript tradition, many of

Rome,³⁵ so the tradition of the attribution of provenance largely waivers between Arabia and Rome. With the discovery in Rome of a third-century monumental statue reconstructed by Pirro Ligorio in 1551 C.E. as a statue of Hippolytus seated on a throne, with inscriptions containing a list of Greek Christian literary works including some that were identified as Hippolytan, the issue seemed to be settled.³⁶ The Roman site of the statue's discovery, as reported by Ligorio, turned out to be very near a cult center of Hippolytus not excavated until the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.³⁷

When scholars in the twentieth century identified the Greek treatise *Against All Heresies* (*Philosophumena*, *Elenchos* = *Haer.*) as a work of Hippolytus, most doubt vanished. The author clearly seemed to be a Greek-speaking Roman. Hippolytus was

the works of Hippolytus #2 were attributed to Hippolytus of Bostra, including a fragment of the *In Cant.* See Gérard Garitte, ed. *Traité d'Hippolyte sur David et Goliath, sur le Cantique des cantiques et sur l'Antéchrist* (CSCO 266; Louvain: Secrétariat du CSCO, 1965), ix, and Gérard Garitte, "Une Nouvelle Source du 'De Fide' Géorgien Attribué à Hippolyte," *RHE* 63, 3-4 (1968): 842 n. 3. The phenomenon of Hippolytus Bostrensis is best explained by Armenian scholars making the same mistake as Rufinus, who understood Eusebius' ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Ἰππόλυτος as meaning that both Hippolytus #2 and Beryllus were leaders of the church in Bostra. It is also possible that Rufinus' Latin translation of Eusebius in the East during the medieval period led some Greek and Armenian scribes to attribute the works to Hippolytus of Bostra. As Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 72-75, cf. 82-85, himself admits, it is entirely possible that Gelasius's attribution of Hippolytan works to a Hippolytus of Bostra influenced these scribes. A similar mistake arose in Photius, noted by Miroslav Marcovich, ed. *Refutatio omnium haeresium* (PTS, Bd. 25. ed. Miroslav Marcovich; Berlin; New York: W. De Gruyter, 1986), 9. Photius misreads Jerome's misreading of Eusebius, which produced the anachronistic notion that Hippolytus #2 followed Jerome's example in his commentary writing!

³⁵Eusebius, *Eccl. hist.* 6.20

³⁶See page 493 below.

³⁷Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 3.

then considered a Greek antipope living in Rome, opposed to the legitimate Pope Callistus.³⁸ By the mid-twentieth century, however, dissatisfaction with this theory led to a vigorously defended minority position that Hippolytus was eastern, not the author of *Haer.* and not associated with Rome. Differences in the author's method, ethos, and theology led some to reject *Haer.* as the work of the writer of the commentaries and associated documents. Currently many scholars are skeptical that the works considered authentically Hippolytan by previous generations are from the same author. A significant minority reject the so-called "statue of Hippolytus" as authentically Hippolytan. At any rate, the commentary *On the Song of Songs* does not appear on the statue's inscription.³⁹

Still, most scholars accept that third-century Christians inscribed a table calculating the dates of the Christian Passover on the side of the statue's chair. Even skeptics of a connection between Hippolytus #2 and Rome must admit that the statue inscription demonstrates "Hippolytan authorship, [or] influence, of the [Paschal]

³⁸Döllinger, *Hippolytus and Callistus*; Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, corrected and extended. According to Brent, Rome did not yet have a "pope," even during the first third of the third century. Thus today Döllinger's reconstruction appears anachronistic. The hyphenated title presbyter-bishop is more appropriate for leaders of household-based churches in Rome at the beginning of the third century than either term used separately. Both of the words "pope," and "antipope" are anachronistic. Rather, churches in Rome appear to have been aligned in sometimes conflicting and competing groups or at times were cooperating networks of household based churches. See Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 204. Brent thinks in terms of a single bishop per congregation with multiple presbyters (430-1; 500); however, multiple arrangements likely occurred, with at least some bishops overseeing more than one house-church.

³⁹Accordingly, the evidence of the statue only affects considerations of the provenance indirectly. On the lists of Hippolytan works in Eusebius and Jerome, see below page 489; on the statue list, see Appendix 1 page 498.

tables.”⁴⁰ The Paschal tables on the statue match Eusebius’s description of the Paschal table he attributed to Hippolytus. However, the character and sex of the figure represented on the statue is not of the bishop Hippolytus or any other bishop. Margherita Guarducci demonstrated that the statue originally represented a woman, whom she suggested was the Epicurean philosopher Themista of Lampsacus.⁴¹ A group of Italian and French scholars exploited her analysis to strengthen the case against a Roman Hippolytus. Others, like Brent and Stewart-Sykes, retained the Roman Hippolytus, but argued that the statue was a community icon representing the work of at least two Roman authors. Brent also argued that the notice of Hippolytus in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.22 associated the name of Hippolytus #2 with some works of Hippolytus #1 (who was not named “Hippolytus,” according to Brent). The two were successive leaders of a single house-church community in Rome and that the statue itself contains a list of works written by two distinct yet related figures.⁴² The first of these was the author of *Haer.*, *Chronicon*. The second, author the

⁴⁰Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 103, “several . . . titles [on the statue] seem to correspond generally with Hippolytan titles, but the remainder are a mystery. The Paschal inscriptions of the statue harmonize in part with the Eusebian description of a Hippolytan Paschal computus (*h.e.* 6.22), suggestion Hippolytan authorship, or influence, of the tables.” Cerrato does not consider the strong indirect connections between the statue list and the author of *Haer.*

⁴¹M. Guarducci, “La Statua di ‘Sant’ippolito,” *Rendiconti della Pontifica Accademia Romana di Archeologia* 47 (1974-1977): 163-90; eadem, “La Statua di ‘Sant’ippolito,” in *Ricerche su Ippolito* (SEA 13; Roma: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1977), 17-30; eadem, “La ‘Statua di Sant Ippolito’ e la Sua Provenienza,” *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito* (SEA 30; Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1989), 61-74.

⁴²See Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 204-300.

commentaries corpus and editor of the works of his predecessor.⁴³

Skepticism concerning Hippolytus #2's connection to Rome and the statue now appears less justified.⁴⁴ Markus Vinzent recently proposed, on iconographical grounds, that the original statue portrayed the queen of the Amazons.⁴⁵ The name of the Amazon queen of Greco-Roman mythology was Hippolyta, with a son named Hippolytus.⁴⁶

Between East and West

The Italian scholars who followed Pierre Nautin,⁴⁷ and Brent and Stewart-Sykes,⁴⁸ illustrate the current scholarly impasse between East and West in Hippolytan studies. Clearly the traditional corpus of Hippolytan writings contains a mixture of eastern and western traditions. The one side resolves this problem by dividing the

⁴³Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 1-197, 205; Alistair Stewart-Sykes, ed., *On the Apostolic Tradition* (PPS; Chrestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002), 1-25.

⁴⁴Alice Whealey, "Pseudo-Justin's *de Resurrectione*: Athenagoras Or Hippolytus?," *VC* 60 (2006): 420-21.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*

⁴⁶Markus Vinzent, "Hippolyt von Rom und Seine Statue," in *Zur Zeit Oder Unzeit: Studien Zur Spatantiken Theologie-, Geistes- Und Kunstgeschichte Und Ihrer Nachwirkung ; Hans Georg Thummel zu Ehren* (ed. A. M. Ritter et al., TSHT 9; Mandelbachtal: Cicero, 2004); *item*, "Rome," in *The Cambridge History of Christianity* (vol. 1, ed. Margaret Mitchell and Frances M. Young; Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 397-413.

⁴⁷Nautin, *Hippolyte et Josipe*; Vincenzo Loi, "La Problemativa Storico-Letteraria Su Ippolito di Roma," *Ricerche su Ippolito* (SEA 13 Rome, 1977): 31-45; Manlio Simonetti, "Aggiornamento Su Ippolito," *Nuove Ricerche su Ippolito* (SEA 30; Rome, 1989); Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 140-4; 172-200.

⁴⁸Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*; Stewart-Sykes, ed., *On the Apostolic Tradition*.

corpus between two authors, one eastern and one western. These scholars have required historians of the early church to reconsider previous syntheses of how Hippolytus fits in the history of third-century Christianity. All have applied to the texts of church history the techniques of redaction criticism and tradition criticism learned from biblical scholars to tease out new insights. Cerrato's own work on Hippolytus #2 follows this path with closely argued case supporting Nautin, Loi, and Simonetti's theory of the eastern provenance of the commentary corpus. Cerrato's survey of the commentary genre is particularly helpful. He presents a case for the eastern provenance of some of the traditions in the *In Cant.*, particularly those shared with the *Epistle of the Apostles*. Concerning the *In Cant.* he argues that Hippolytus shows the effects of a close relationship with the New Prophecy, which, for him indicates an Asian Milieu.⁴⁹

On the other side, Brent and Stewart-Sykes, do directly address the authorship or provenance of the *In Cant.* It is assumed to be Roman. They combine redaction critical insights with keen social contextualization and argue that multiple authorship of the Hippolytan corpus fits with a succession of leadership in the same church-school of Rome. They argue that the eastern provenance of certain traditions in Hippolytus #2 does not necessarily indicate an origin in the East for all his writings. None of the scholars who argue for an eastern provenance of the corpus can demonstrate that the available evidence necessarily rules out the West for at least some of the works of Hippolytus #2. This study extends the Brent-Stewart-Sykes, hypothesis to a study of the *In Cant.* in search of evidence that supports a western

⁴⁹Cerrato, "Hippolytus' on the Song of Songs and the New Prophecy," *Studia Patristica* 31 (1997): 271.

provenance for the *In Cant*.

Cerrato's Eastern Provenance of the Commentaries

In the first part of Cerrato's book,⁵⁰ he employs the same Italian researchers Brent used to attribute to Hippolytus #1 the *Chronicon* and *De universo* as well as the works listed on the so-called "statue of Hippolytus" to a Greek author of the city of Rome. Cerrato, however, denies any direct connection between the works on the statue and either the author of *Haer.* or Hippolytus #2.⁵¹ Cerrato refers to the author of the commentaries as Hippolytus "the exegete," who lived somewhere in the East. He deals with the commentaries as a block, but addresses parts of specific works. In essence takes a cross section of each work he considers in search of provenance indicators. Cerrato does not consider whether the differences between the two groups of works ascribed to Hippolytus of Rome actually require two distinct authors. For him, the eastern origin of some of the traditions in the commentaries necessarily means that the exegetical writings are also of eastern provenance. Thus some scholars have rightly questioned the appropriateness of the title, *Hippolytus between East and West*.⁵²

His approach is to dismiss any connections in the available data that might possibly support the theory of a western author.⁵³ For example, any patristic sources that mention a Hippolytus in the West are eliminated from consideration because they do not say mention Hippolytus as an *author*. Yet the multiplicity of men named

⁵⁰Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 3-127.

⁵¹Ibid., 103.

⁵²Scholten, "John A. Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*," 85.

⁵³See especially, Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 102-3.

Hippolytus in patristic references, manuscript attributions, and hagiography in the West led Cerrato to the conclusion that not one of the western Hippolyti is the author of the commentaries.⁵⁴

In the second part of his book, Cerrato interprets the data and speculates about his results. Since Hippolytus was a fairly common name, and there were several men of the same name in the ancient church, Cerrato denies *a priori* any connections at all between any of the various Hippolyti in Eusebius.⁵⁵ In this way he warns that hasty identifications both in ancient as well as recent times led to erroneous conclusions.⁵⁶ This atomizing of the data, however, goes to such an extreme that Cerrato even makes a distinction between the Hippolytus in the *Depositio martyrum* of the *Codex-Chronography of 354*⁵⁷ and the Hippolytus of the epigram of Damasus.

⁵⁴Scholten, “John A. Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*,” 85.

⁵⁵Ibid., 86. At least in the case of Hippolytus in *Eccl. hist.* 6.20, 22, it is better to see these as a reference to the same author.

⁵⁶Ibid.

⁵⁷Prepared a little over one hundred years after the death of Hippolytus, the *Codex-Chronography of 354* is an important primary source for Roman social history. (Available on line »http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/index.htm#Chronography_of_354«). It is an almanac for the year 354 C.E. filled with important facts prepared for a wealthy Christian aristocrat named Valentinus. The almanac was a handsomely prepared codex, the core of which was a calendar. It contained a list of Roman bishops coordinated with the reigning consuls. Real dates for the periods of the bishops begin only with Pontianus. The almanac also included a list of holidays upon which martyrs were celebrated and the catacombs where they were celebrated. A diverse compilation of previous sources, it was full of useful lists, tables, and illustrations—information generally useful to a Roman aristocrat living in the fourth century. Other illustrated sections included depictions of the consuls of that year, and astrological signs. Less well known than it deserves, the text is a valuable compendium of data about Roman society. Furius Dionysius Philocalus, the most famous calligrapher of his day, was responsible for the manuscript including, probably, the illustrations. The illustrations were the earliest surviving full-page illustrations in a codex in

Most scholars would disagree with Cerrato. Taking a suggestion from Hanssens, Cerrato regards the supposed “Novatian” Hippolytus of Damasus as a separate Hippolytus. Further, without considering any other possibilities, he accepts a Hippolytus, martyr of Portus or Ostia, as the presbyter Hippolytus of the *Chronography*. He thus avoids the difficulty of having to explain the fact that both the Hippolytus of Damasus and Hippolytus, the Roman presbyter of the *Chronography*, are both buried in Via Tiburtina in Rome and both have August thirteenth as the celebration of their death.⁵⁸

Cerrato then adduces “early” references to an “eastern” Hippolytus, based on a fifth-century quotation of Hippolytus in Theodoret’s *Eranistes*. This argument, however, does not yield the desired results. While it is true that Hippolytus is listed among “eastern” writers in *Eranistes* 1.88, so are Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyon (!) and Justin who were from the East but migrated to the West. The rest of his evidence from Theodoret could be read to support the notion that Hippolytus is an easterner living in the West. Nothing in his eastern sources (in Eusebius, Jerome, or Theodoret) supports an “eastern” bishop Hippolytus, author of the “exegetical” writings. Furthermore these writers apparently had no knowledge of the church where he was

the history of western art. For a presentation and discussion of the text and context, see Michele R. Salzman, *On Roman Time: The Codex-Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990). See also Theodore Mommsen, “Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae ad C. Caesaris mortem,” (editio altera pars prior. Berlin: George Reimer, 1893), 254-79, which includes a commentary on the calendars; Idem, “Chronographus Anni CCCLIII,” *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctorum Antiquissimorum* (part 9: Chronica Minora Saec. IV-VII, vol. 1; Berlin, 1892, repr. Munich, 1981), 13-148, which contains much of the unillustrated Latin text.

⁵⁸Scholten, “John A. Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*,” 86.

bishop. Thus the earliest clear reference to an eastern Hippolytus is Gelasius of Rome (d. 496), whose attribution of provenance to Hippolytus as a bishop of Arabia is most likely based upon a misreading of Eusebius. All one may conclude from these early eastern sources is that Hippolytus was known as bishop and martyr.

The two lynch-pins of Cerrato's argument are: first, the earliest clear references to the provenance of Hippolytus describe him as an eastern author; second, that the tradition of commentary writing was, at the time of Hippolytus, an eastern and not a western phenomenon. The first argument hinges on the citation by Pope Gelasius of Rome of *Noet.*, which Cerrato affirms is the earliest reference to the provenance of any of Hippolytus #2's works. In order to establish this, he must eliminate important data. He must somehow remove Apollonius of Laodicea's attribution (before 392 C.E.) of the *Comm. Dan.* to a Roman bishop Hippolytus by alleging, without any manuscript evidence, a scribal expansion in the text of Apollonius. Even more unlikely, he must declare that the attribution of *Noet.* to Hippolytus, [Arch]bishop of Rome is completely wrong and doctrinally motivated. It is far more likely, however, that the incidental agreement between Apollonius and the ascription of the Greek manuscript of the *Noet.* record an authentic fourth-century tradition somewhat obscured by exaggeration (the addition of "arch-" to bishop) and misunderstood in the aftermath of the emergence of the monepiscopacy in Rome. Curiously, Cerrato does not raise the issue of whether Gelasius's own attribution of *Noet.* to a Hippolytus of Arabia might itself have been doctrinally motivated.

As for Cerrato's second argument, the conclusion does not follow from the premise. In succinct form the argument is that the Christian commentary genre is an eastern adoption of Greek educational practice. Therefore, the commentaries of

Hippolytus cannot have been written in Rome.

Cerrato's argument shows confusion concerning cultural formation and geographical location.⁵⁹ For him, the doctrinal and textual traditions of the commentaries, in particular the *Comm. Dan.* and the *In Cant.* are eastern traditions, the commentaries must have been written in the East.⁶⁰ Yet, Cerrato's focus on doctrinal and textual traditions neglects important western iconographical and liturgical connections that show Hippolytus to draw from both East and West.

Cerrato's foray into hagiographical material⁶¹ results in obfuscation. It sets up a subtle argument: (1) the multiplicity of men by the name of Hippolytus associated with Rome led scholars to the foregone conclusion that one of them had to be the writer of the commentaries. However, (2) since the earliest traditions about Hippolytus either give him no provenance at all or an eastern provenance, then he must have been eastern and not western. Such a treatment of the hagiographical tradition lacks the nuance required of a valid historical argument.⁶² At the end of a process of elimination, Cerrato ventures his own tentative suggestion, that Hippolytus was bishop in Laodicea or Ephesus.

The second half of Cerrato's book⁶³ introduces a discussion of eastern traditions used in exegetical texts of Hippolytus, particularly in the *Comm. Dan.*, the *In Cant.*, and *Antichr.* Cerrato uncovers source materials in Hippolytus associated

⁵⁹Allen Brent, "St. Hippolytus, Biblical Exegete, Roman Bishop, and Martyr," *StVTQ* 48.2-3 (2004): 210.

⁶⁰The eastern textual traditions are overdone. See note 232 on page 470.

⁶¹Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 83-93.

⁶²Scholten, "John A. Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*," 85.

⁶³Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 127-250.

with the East that have escaped researchers till now. The principal arguments of the second part of Cerrato's book will be considered later.

The State of the Issue

The issue of provenance appears to be at an impasse. Neither the evidence adduced by Cerrato nor by previous scholars has been sufficient to establish the provenance of the commentaries attributed to Hippolytus.⁶⁴ The earliest sources, all from the fourth century or later, show confusion about the identity of Hippolytus #2. The case for provenance, therefore, must be based upon inductive and indirect evidence.⁶⁵ Cerrato used both deductive and inductive arguments to argue his case for an eastern Hippolytus. His central deductive argument was based on the premise that commentary writing was an eastern phenomenon. He then adds the dubious premise that the earliest clear attributions of provenance are eastern. The conclusion seem inevitable to him that Hippolytus is eastern.⁶⁶ He then supplemented the deductive argument with an inductive survey of the partial contents of the commentaries themselves, predicting that an eastern author would make use of eastern traditions. One of his principal exhibits was the *In Cant.* 24-25.

⁶⁴Vinzent, "Hippolyt von Rom und Seine Statue," in *Zur Zeit Oder Unzeit*, 125. The substantial body of literature about the statue is impressive.

⁶⁵The eastern formation of the author does not in any way preclude his living in Rome. See Graham Gould, "Review of *Hippolytus between East and West: The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus*," *JTS* 54 (2003): 313. See also Allen Brent, "Review of: *Hippolytus between East and West: The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus*," *JEH* 55 (2004): 342.

⁶⁶Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 25.

For Cerrato, the evidence available in the *In Cant.* only supports an eastern provenance. That evidence may be summarized as (1) Hippolytus' attitude toward women in ministry supports a milieu in which Montanism was influencing his church, this points to a provenance in Asia; (2) the theological traditions in the *In Cant.* are eastern; (3) literary traditions in the *In Cant.* point to the East. A reconsideration of the available evidence will show that Cerrato's skepticism toward a western provenance is not warranted.

Refutation of Cerrato's Principal Arguments about In Cant.

In Eusebius and Jerome, Hippolytus emerges as a writer of several commentaries (ὑπομνήματα). The *In Cant.* is included in their lists. Hippolytus' time period is generally the Severan period, during the first period in its history Rome was *de facto* governed by a woman.⁶⁷ This unique era in Roman social history appears to have left its mark on some of the works of Hippolytus,⁶⁸ though scholars have not often recognized the link between the prominent role of women in the social history

⁶⁷After the death of Septimius Severus (211 C.E.), a period famous for localized persecution against some Christians, four women of Syrian origin came to prominence in the Roman Empire: the "Severan Julias." Julia Domna, the second wife of Septimius Severus, bore him two sons that became emperors: Geta (211 C.E.) and Caracalla (211-217 C.E.). Septimius honored her with the title, "mother of the camp and the senate and the country," Her sister was Julia Maesa and her two daughters also each produced sons who were to be emperors. Julia Soaemias was the mother of Elagabalus (218-222 C.E.) and was assassinated along with him. Alexander was the youngest man till that time acclaimed Emperor of Rome. Despite his youth, Alexander's reign (222-235 C.E.) must have held out promise for a brighter future, after the insanity of Elagabalus' administration. The death of his powerful grandmother left Rome under the control of the Empress Mamaea.

⁶⁸See *Antichr.* 3; *Comm. Dan.* 1.22; *In Cant.* 24-25.

of the early third century and the rhetoric about women in Christianity in some of Hippolytus #2's works.⁶⁹ Cerrato attempts to show, "the view of women in the life of the community" of Hippolytus in the commentaries and allied doctrinal works is "distinctly different from that of the communities of Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and other patristic sources of the period."⁷⁰ According to Cerrato, Hippolytus #2 shows a proclivity to attempt to elevate the status of women, though the commentaries are not exempt from the influence of their patriarchal context. In contrast, the view of women in *Haer.* and *Trad. ap.*, sometimes attributed to Hippolytus, is much more in line with the previous patristic literary tradition.⁷¹

⁶⁹Before the writings of Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, what little that is known about the social location of women in the church may be gleaned from Hermas and apocryphal writings. See Carolyn Osiek et al., *A Woman's Place*, 136-41, 144-63; see also J. A. Woodhall, "The Socio-Religious Role of Women According to Hippolytus in the Light of the Early Christian Fathers" (Ph.D. Fordham University, 1980), 82, who based his study on the disputed *Trad. ap.* and *Haer.*, which he assumes are the product of the same author. He concludes that Hippolytus' attitudes to women are largely traditional and restrictive. Cp. Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 200, 206-11, attributes Hippolytus #2's more open view to a shared milieu with Montanism. Cerrato does not consider the possible effect of female patronage in the mainstream church or the sociopolitical climate in which women from the East rule the Roman Empire.

⁷⁰Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 211.

⁷¹On the question of the relation of *Trad. ap.*, to the Hippolytan corpus see Paul F. Bradshaw et al., *The Apostolic Tradition: a Commentary* (Heremeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2002); Stewart-Sykes, ed. *Apostolic Tradition*, 22-50; idem, "Re-dating the *Apostolic Tradition*: Some Preliminary Steps," in *Rule of Prayer, Rule of Faith: Essays in Honor of Aidan Kavanagh, OSB* (ed. John Baldovin, and Nathan Michell; Collegville, MN: Pueblo Liturgical Press, 1996), 3-17; idem, "*Traditio Apostolica*, the Liturgy of Third-Century Rome and the Hippolytean School or *Quomodo Historia Liturgica Conscribenda Sit*," *StVTQ* 48 (2004): 233-48; Allen Brent, "St. Hippolytus," 207-31.

It is beyond the scope of this dissertation on the *In Cant.* to deal thoroughly with a book as detailed and broad in scope as Cerrato's *Hippolytus between East and West*. As concerns the *In Cant.*, however, a rebuttal may be outlined as follows.

1. The idea that Greek speaking Christians did not write commentaries in the West is simply unsustainable.
2. Cerrato's argument concerns only a small portion of Garitte's Latin translation of the *In Cant.* Accordingly, he missed critical evidence in the *In Cant.* by failing to consider the rest of the book or its Georgian text.
3. Cerrato's contrast between Hippolytus #1 and #2 on women is overdrawn and based upon a misunderstanding of the Latin translation of the Georgian text. The attitude of Hippolytus #2 toward "women in ministry" is entirely consistent with a Roman setting.
4. Cerrato did not consider the iconographical references in the commentary at all. Some of the iconographical references in the *In Cant.* are endemic to the Roman context. To be sure, Hippolytus draws upon literary traditions that are eastern. Hippolytus, however, drew on at least one non biblical literary tradition that is western. The iconography of the *In Cant.* is discussed below.
5. Cerrato did not consider the liturgical setting of the *In Cant.* The liturgical practices, post-baptismal anointing and Easter baptism, found in the *In Cant.* are characteristically western. The liturgical context of *In Cant.* will be considered below and in Chapter Two.
6. Hippolytus adapts eastern theology and practice to his western context. He makes use of doctrinal and theological categories that are both eastern and western. If attention is paid to the transformation of eastern theology and practice, Hippolytus

- emerges as an easterner acculturating to a western context. This will be considered below and in Chapter Four.
7. The teachings and practices of Valentinus influenced Hippolytus' interpretation of the Song in the *In Cant.* Valentinus left a lasting impression on the churches in Rome because he lived and ministered there for up to three decades. The Valentinian interpretation of baptism as a nuptial rite, followed by anointing, and culminating in a banquet is western. Hippolytus' use of the Valentinian notion of the προβολή of the Λόγος shows the influence of a decidedly *western* theological trajectory from Justin to Tertullian and on to Novatian, Lactancius and Hilarius.⁷² Cerrato does not consider the problem of any specific heresy addressed in the *In Cant.* beyond a general consideration of "anti-gnostic" tendencies as an indicator of provenance. This will be considered in Chapter Four.
 8. Finally, Cerrato acknowledges the existence of Osburn's article on the western proclivities of the text of Hippolytus' commentaries and other exegetical works without comment. The New Testament text of Paul's letters in Hippolytus' commentaries is more consistent with a provenance in Rome than in Asia Minor, where one would expect his text to have more "Byzantine" influence. Since this point does not specifically concern the *In Cant.*, it will not be considered further. Osburn's conclusions, however, on the basis of a careful examination of the undisputed Greek writings of the corpus of Hippolytus #2 is that Hippolytus produced:

⁷²Antonio Orbe, *Hacia la primera teología de la procesion del Verbo* (Estudios Valentinianos 1; Rome: Universitas Gregoriana, 1958), 515-616.

a text demonstrating peculiarly ‘Western’ readings throughout [in agreement with the ‘Western’ bilinguals], while incorporating certain readings of distinctly Egyptian character especially in Romans and 1 Corinthians, but not significantly influenced by readings characteristic of Byzantine manuscripts.⁷³

The Case for a Western Provenance of the In Cant.

It has been shown that the principal arguments for an eastern provenance for the *In Cant.* are open to question. However, what positive case can be made for a western provenance for the commentary? (1) It will be argued that Greek Christian writers in the West did indeed write commentaries. (2) The literary relationship between the *Haer.* and the *In Cant.* suggests a Roman milieu for the *In Cant.* (3) The *In Cant.* shows that Hippolytus adapted eastern theology and practices to the western context. (4) The iconographic references in the *In Cant.* show both eastern and western influence; however, the western influences point to Rome as the provenance of the commentary. (5) The portrayal of women in the *In Cant.* is consistent with the third-century status of women as patronesses of Roman house-churches and leaders in popular Christian funerary rites.

Commentaries Written in the West by Greek Christian Writers

Commentary writing was, to a large degree, a feature of the second- and third century Greco-Roman educational milieu.⁷⁴ Christians both eastern and western wrote

⁷³Carroll D. Osburn, “The Text of the Pauline Epistles in Hippolytus of Rome,” *SCent* 2 (1982): 124, a study of the text of the New Testament used in the commentaries and *Antichr.* Given its fluid textual tradition, specific textual proclivities of the biblical quotes in the *In Cant.* have not been addressed by scholars.

⁷⁴Michael Trapp, “Philosophy, Scholarship, and the World of Learning in the Severan Period,” in *Severan Culture* (eds. Simon Swain et al.; Cambridge University

“commentaries,” just as their non-Christian counterparts who were interested in codifying and reinterpreting the knowledge produced by past generations preserved in writings considered canonical in a given field.⁷⁵

From before the Severan period (193-235 C.E.), Christian teachers increasingly used the commentary genre from Hellenistic models used in schools to give expression to Christian interpretations of Jewish as well as Christian holy books. Justin (*Apology* 1.67.3-6) attests to the weekly reading in the eucharistic assembly of the Old Testament along with a reading of the Gospels, an adaptation of earlier *Torah* and *Haftarah* reading practices attested as early as Luke, Philo, and Josephus.⁷⁶ Some Jews (elites or people with free time) may also have participated in similar midweek meetings for a more rigorous daily reading schedule.⁷⁷ It appears that, from the earliest times, some Christians adopted similar practices, meeting during weekdays in non-eucharistic gatherings. Judging from the cycle of readings that Origen in Palestine produced for his daily homilies and the prominence of Old Testament material produced by Hippolytus, Old Testament texts figured prominently in inter-

Press, 2007), 484-88.

⁷⁵Ibid.

⁷⁶Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 136-43.

⁷⁷Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 62 (also 139), “By the first century, a weekly ceremony featuring communal readings and study of holy texts had become a universal Jewish practice.” Apparently, however, great variety marked the communal reading and interpretive practices. The evidence does not support the notion of a set three-year or one-year practice among Jews or Christians. Philo, *Prob.*, 81-83, refers to an Essene Sabbath service with Torah reading presumably in the towns of Judea (*Hypoth.* 11.1), whereas a more rigorous schedule seems to have been the rule among the covenanters at Qumran (Josephus, *B. J.* 2.129-31), who met together daily at noon for a meal and the reading of holy texts.

week or daily meetings.⁷⁸ The list of works on the so-called “statue of Hippolytus” also attests to a similar cycle of instruction focussed on Old Testament interpretation in Rome.⁷⁹ In other words, Christians of Greek background were writing commentaries and this activity likely indicates an active culture of Scripture reading in group settings. Greeks in the West perpetuated cultural patterns of education in their expatriate context, it was Latin speaking Christians who lagged behind in the production of commentaries. Commentary writing may have begun in the East, as Cerrato says, but this observation is irrelevant in Rome by the time of Hippolytus. The list of works on “statue of Hippolytus” is itself evidence that Greek speaking Christian in Rome used and wrote commentaries.

The phenomenon of philobibliism of the second and early third centuries is a strong *prima facie* argument in support of the production and use of commentaries by at least some in the Roman church. Of course, literacy was not widespread in the ancient Greco-Roman world.⁸⁰ Harry Gamble remarks that the available evidence

⁷⁸Manlio Simonetti, *Origene esegeta e la sua tradizione* (LCA NS 2 Brescia: Morcelliana, 2004), 75:

. . . è difficile immaginare che queste serie organiche di omelie possano essere state predicate con cadenza soltanto settimanale in occasione della celebrazione eucaristica nella *dies dominica*, l’uzanza di tenere in chiesa riunioni infrasettimanali dedicate esclusivamente alla spiegazione del testo sacro, che vedremo attestata per la Cesarea di Palestina del tempo di Origene.

. . . it is difficult to imagine that this [the sermonic, exegetical writings of Hippolytus #2] organized series of homilies could have been preached only with the rhythm of the weekly meeting with the eucharistic celebration held on Sunday. The practice of having church meetings during the week dedicated exclusively to the explanation of the sacred text, we will see is attested by in Caesarea of Palestine from the time of Origen.

⁷⁹See page 498 below.

⁸⁰See William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University

offer[s] no reason to think that the extent of literacy of any kind among Christians was greater than in society at large. If anything, it was more limited. This means that not only the writing of Christian literature, but also the ability to read, criticize, and interpret it belonged to a small number of Christians in the first several centuries, ordinarily not more than [ten] percent . . .⁸¹ And yet the educational system and curriculum which supported the acquisition of literacy was a means of inculcating the elite values of the Empire,⁸² which co-opted Hellenism as a means of creating a diverse, but loyal citizenry. The production of commentaries on classical texts was an essential part of this system. By the end of the second century, the Christian movement was only beginning to reach its literary stride in this area.

Greco-Roman religions, however, tended to pass on ritual lore and teaching orally. Christians differed from that pattern by sharing in Jewish philobibliism and trusting in texts not only to record and preserve teaching,⁸³ but to provide it with the underpinnings of authority and antiquity. The informal speech forms of philosophical circles were commonly used for pastoral or psychagogical purposes on a popular level.⁸⁴ The abundance of commentaries indicates that, at least in some contexts, the discussion of texts, some of which could have been considered sacred in limited

Press, 1989), 222-5.

⁸¹Harry Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (Yale University Press, 1997), 2-7.

⁸²Yun Lee Too, "The Walking Library: The Performance of Cultural Memories," in *Athenaeus and His World* (D. Braund and J. Wilkins; Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2000), 120-23.

⁸³There are exceptions, viz., the inscription of the Iobacki in Athens, Johannes Kirchner, ed. *Decrees and Sacred Laws* (2nd ed; Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis Anno Posteriores, 3; Berlin: 1913), 644; Benjamin D. Meritt, "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 11.3 (1942): 282-5.

⁸⁴Note, for example, the popular uses of consolatory speech forms in the papyri, Juan Chapa, *Letters of Condolence in Greek Papyri* (PF 29 Florence: Edizione Gonnelli, 1998).

spheres, was sometimes, but rarely, practiced.⁸⁵

Though Christians had already produced a fair amount of literature, Origen perhaps understated when he said that “None of the saints has produced numerous compositions and set out his understanding in many books.”⁸⁶ Both Hippolytus and Origen are representatives of the figure of a Christian “walking library.”⁸⁷ They emblemize textual mobility in persons who free the Greco-Roman library from strict geographical location and discharge their service in the midst of a generally uncomprehending and unlearned world.⁸⁸ Still, the production of books, commentaries, and other kinds of compositions was a well-worn path to legitimacy among the elite for various schools of philosophy, was beginning to be so for the Christians of the second and third centuries.

By the fourth century, the works of Hippolytus, as well as other Roman authors, figured prominently in the library of Alexander in Aelia Capitolina consulted by Eusebius (including both Hippolytus and Gaius). Hippolytus was himself a representative of a growing, marked bookishness of the elite leaders in the early

⁸⁵Hans Theodor Anton von Prott and Ludwig Ziehen, *Leges Graecorum sacrae e titulis collectae*, (ed. Ioannis de Prott, Ludovicus Ziehen 2; Lipsiae: Teubner, 1896), 95-100, no. 51; also Kirchner, ed. *Decrees and Sacred Laws* 3:1368.1-160. Translation and discussion in Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 11-131; Everett Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 145-6.

⁸⁶Origen, *Comm. Jo. 5.3, Commentary on the Gospel according to John Books 13-32* (FC 89; trans. Ronald E. Heine; Washington, D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 1993).

⁸⁷Eunapius (346-ca.414), *Lives of the Sophists*, 456, describes the later contemporary of Hippolytus, Longinus (233-ca.301) as a βιβλιοθήκη . . . ἔμφυχος and a περιπατοῦν μουσεῖον, “a breathing . . . library” and “a walking museum.”

⁸⁸Too, “The Walking Library,” 116.

church.

What sort of author and reader can be imagined for the writer of the documents commonly accepted by scholars as from Hippolytus? One may well imagine Hippolytus himself as one who had sufficient wealth at his disposal to produce and store books in a library.⁸⁹ Hippolytus refers to baptism taking place in a garden, suggesting that the author made use of a peristyle type house. Libraries also adorned gardens in Roman elite houses and villas.⁹⁰ Plutarch's *Life of Lucullus* congratulates the Roman dignitary for establishing library in the peristyle enclosure of his villa which he made available to his friends. Plutarch remarks that it was a particular joy to the expatriate Greeks who went there "as to an hostelry of the Muses, and spent the day with one another, in glad escape from their other occupations" (*Lucullus* 42).

The works attributed to Hippolytus bear the stamp of the philobibliism of the late second and early third century. This period not only seems to have afforded economic and social conditions that encouraged the production of substantial quantities of books, but also of the stocking of libraries, as may be seen in the fragment of a work associated with the author of *Haer.* in Rome.

What [the followers of Theodotus the Cobbler] said might perhaps be plausible if in the first place the divine Scriptures were not opposed to them and there are also writings of certain Christians, older than the time of Victor, which they wrote to the Gentiles on behalf of the truth and against the heresies of their own time. I mean the words of Justin and Miltiades and Tatian and Clement and many others in all of which Christ is treated as God. For who is ignorant of the

⁸⁹On domestic collections of books see Plutarch, *Lucullus* 39-42.

⁹⁰On libraries in domestic gardens or peristyles see Eleanor W. Leach, *The Social Life of Painting in Ancient Rome and on the Bay of Naples* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 37-39, 49, 110.

books of Irenaeus and Melito and the others who announced Christ as God and man? And all the Psalms and hymns which were written by faithful Christians from the beginning sing of the Christ as the *Logos* of God and treat him as God. How is it possible that after the mind of the Church had been announced for so many years that the generation before Victor can have preached as these say?⁹¹

The depth and reach of early Christian literature implied by the author of this fragment indicates the existence of considerable collections of Christian books.⁹²

Trad. ap. 41.4 (Stewart-Sykes, 164) hints at the power of books for Christian readers. It suggests that reading a “holy book” was considered an appropriate substitute for a regular meeting “on a day there is no instruction.” Few people, however, owned books.⁹³

Lampe’s historical description of the transformation of some house-churches

⁹¹Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.28, ἦν δ' ἂν τυχὸν πιθανὸν τὸ λεγόμενον, εἰ μὴ πρῶτον μὲν ἀντέπιπτον αὐτοῖς αἱ θεῖαι γραφαί· καὶ ἀδελφῶν δὲ τινῶν ἔστιν γράμματα, πρεσβύτερα τῶν Βίκτορος χρόνων, ἃ ἐκεῖνοι καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ πρὸς τὰς τότε αἰρέσεις ἔγραψαν, λέγω δὲ Ἰουστίνου καὶ Μιλτιάδου καὶ Τατιανοῦ καὶ Κλήμεντος καὶ ἐτέρων πλειόνων, ἐν οἷς ἅπασιν θεολογεῖται ὁ Χριστός, τὰ γὰρ Εἰρηναίου τε καὶ Μελίτωνος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν τίς ἀγνοεῖ βιβλία, θεὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον καταγγέλλοντα τὸν Χριστόν, ψαλμοὶ δὲ ὅσοι καὶ ᾠδαὶ ἀδελφῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ πιστῶν γραφεῖσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν Χριστόν ὑμνοῦσιν θεολογοῦντες; πῶς οὖν ἐκ τοσούτων ἐτῶν καταγγελλομένου τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ φρονήματος, ἐνδέχεται τοὺς μέχρι Βίκτορος οὕτως ὡς οὗτοι λέγουσιν κεκηρυχέναι.

⁹²Vinzent, “‘Philobiblie’ im Frühen Christentum,” 115-17.

⁹³Epictetus gives book prices that may be compared, more or less, with those in the early third century. He states that a book by the Stoic Chrysippus sold for five *denarii* or twenty *sesterces* (Epictetus, *Discourses*, 1.4.16). Martial, *Epigrams*, 1.117.17 suggests that five *denarii* was the price of his first book of epigrams. These prices represent about five days wages. The value of the *denarius* in the late second and early third century fluctuated wildly so that, at the time Hippolytus wrote *In Cant.*, 30 *denarii* was considered a price accessible to a poor person. See below note 20 on page 520.

into house-schools as exemplified by Justin and his house-church school is also applicable to Hippolytus and his community in Rome.⁹⁴ Though Justin renounced *honoraria* for his services as teacher (Justin *Dial.* 58.1; cp. Tatian *Or.* 32.2), how were his books published?⁹⁵ If Paul's letter to the Romans might have cost, in time, materials, and scribal expertise upward of two thousand dollars⁹⁶ on some estimates,⁹⁷ what would have been the production costs of the first and second *Apologies* or any other of Justin's lengthy compositions? The *In Cant.*, for example might have cost the equivalent of 200-500 dollars to copy.⁹⁸ Total production costs would have been considerably higher. The production of books demanded a level of wealth or access to patronage.⁹⁹

When Galen was in Rome at the end of the second century, his impression was that groups of Christians seemed to resemble a philosophical school, albeit, in his opinion, a second or third rate school.¹⁰⁰ Galen's not completely negative attitude

⁹⁴Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 279-84.

⁹⁵Publication was more a means of attracting students and patrons and not a major source of revenue for the author, see Harry Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (Yale University Press, 1997), 82-143, especially 83.

⁹⁶The value is calculated in 2003 U.S. dollars.

⁹⁷The writer of PLond. Inv. 2110 from the early third century paid to have copies made of two books. He mentions paying two rates, 28 drachmas and 20.6 drachmas per 10,000 lines of text. An imperial edict of Diocletian in 301 C.E. confirms this rate structure. Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 275, n. 11. See also E. Randolph Richards, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing: Secretaries, Composition and Collection* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 167-9.

⁹⁸Based on a rough estimate of one drachma to U.S. 38.00 (2006), around 2000 to 2100 lines of text.

⁹⁹Ibid.

¹⁰⁰Theodotus is mentioned in the unattributed fragment in Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 5.28,

toward Christians is unique among recorded early opinions of non-Christians. In fact, Theodotus the cobbler, excommunicated by Victor and his church, was himself enthusiastic about Galen (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.28).¹⁰¹ This particular church-school is depicted as industrious in the production of books, copies of Scriptures, and studies (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.28.10).

Hippolytus #2 himself, or one of his school, described the church as “the fair school of grace” (τὸ καλὸν τῆς χάριτος διδασκαλεῖον).¹⁰² He refers to the church (*In Cant.* 8.3) as the flock of God gathered into corrals or pens to be cared for while they are “learning Christ.” Nevertheless, he seems to have preferred to use the term διδασκαλεῖον to refer to a heretical house-church such as the group led by Noetus (*Noet.* 1.8), as did Hippolytus #1 who, apart from his reference to Hellenistic schools

possibly from the author of *Haer.* or from Hippolytus, if these are not the same person. See Robert L. Wilken, “Early Christian Chiliasm, Jewish Messianism, and the Idea of the Holy Land,” *HTR* 79 (1986): 276; Robert Wilken, “Collegia, Philosophical Schools, and Theology,” in *The Catacombs and the Colosseum* (ed. Stephen Benko, and John J. O’Rourke; Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1971), 276-91, and the relevant texts cited in Richard Walzer, *Galen on Jews and Christians* (London: Oxford University Press, 1949), 10-16.

¹⁰¹On the anti-heretical treatise, called the Little Labyrinth, referred to in *Haer.* see R. H. Connolly, “Eusebius H. E. V, 28,” *JTS* 49 (1948). See also Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church*, 122-23.

¹⁰²*Fragmenta de Psalmis*: Χριστὸς δὲ λέγει «Ὅτι <ἀπεκάλυψας νηπίοις θηλάζουσι>>, Προφήταις λέγει, οἱ μέτοχοι πνεύματος ἁγίου, ὡς νήπιοι κακίας τε πόρρω ὑπάρχοντες, τὸ καλὸν τῆς χάριτος διδασκαλεῖον ὠκοδόμησαν, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐψάλλε πάλιν δικαίως Δαυίδ. Cited in Pierre Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des II et III siècles* (Patristica 2 Paris: Cerf, 1961), 52, and *idem*, *Le dossier d’Hippolyte et de Méliton dans les florilèges dogmatiques et chez les historiens modernes* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1953), 102-7. The cited text is from TLG. According to Brent, *On the Psalms* was from a third writer in the Hippolytan school. See Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 338-9.

of philosophy (1.18, 2; 5.24, 3), used the term to refer to groups he considered heretical, especially the “διδασκαλεῖον of Zephyrinus and Callistus” (*Haer.* 9.7.3; 9.12.20, 21, 26). The large body of works attributed to Hippolytus, over forty in total, as well as the evidence of the so-called “statue of Hippolytus,” supports the notion that such house-churches would likely have been viewed by outsiders as a school. Such house-church schools, with their love of books would have had recourse to scribal helpers like those used by Origen, Hippolytus #2’s younger contemporary. These groups would have required the significant help of patrons and patronesses with disposable income.¹⁰³ If, as Brent and Stewart-Sykes have proposed, two or three capable authors graced the community of Hippolytus, then the community would have appeared to have a scholastic orientation.¹⁰⁴ That large effort was expended to gain something, and that something was likely connected to gathering converts, maintaining the interest and support of the patrons and patronesses of the community, and keeping the members of the church from drifting away to other teachers.

Commentaries and exegesis were apparently a prime method used by Valentinian teachers in the West to reinterpret the “ecclesiastic” faith of psychic believers. Irenaeus¹⁰⁵ of Lyon claims Valentinians made use of written commentaries

¹⁰³Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church*, 122.

¹⁰⁴Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 339; Stewart-Sykes, *Apostolic Tradition*, 31.

¹⁰⁵Like later Christian commentaries on the Song, the *In Cant.* may depend on an earlier commentary of Irenaeus *On the Song of Songs* (a Syriac fragment in Harvey, 2:455). The use of Irenaeus’ commentary is difficult to demonstrate. Irenaeus’ commentary is no longer extant. William W. Harvey, ed. *Sancti Irenaei, episcopi Lugdunensis, Libros quinque adversus haereses* (Cantabrigiae: Typis Academicis, 1857), 2:455, cited in Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 231. For English translation, see Alexander Roberts et al., *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr*,

in their pursuit of converts from other Christian groups and he claims to have read some of them (*Adv. haer.* I, praef.).¹⁰⁶ Irenaeus was immediately concerned with Valentinian activity in the West. Ptolemy, author of the famous *Letter to Flora*, seems to draw upon a commentary tradition of Old Testament exegesis in his explanations to his student.

Since Valentinus himself was present for two or three decades in Rome, it is likely that Valentinian use of the commentary genre may well have influenced the production of commentaries in Rome. For example, the nuptial interpretation of baptism is evidenced in the gnostic Christian *Commentary on John* by Heracleon.¹⁰⁷ Valentinian inscriptional evidence in Rome and passages in the *GPhil* (§31; §59; §87; §122; also attest to this interpretation of baptism that predated Hippolytus.¹⁰⁸ The Valentinian writer of commentaries, Heracleon, was considered by Hippolytus #1 to be a representative of Italian Valentinianism (*Haer.* 6.30.3-7) and may have been from Sicily,¹⁰⁹ perhaps spending time with his teacher in Rome. The argument that Hippolytus was not likely to have written commentaries in the West because

Irenaeus (*ANF* 1; Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmanns, 1976).

¹⁰⁶This reference, mitigates the argument that Scripture commentary writing was an activity only known in the East before the time of Hippolytus. One is puzzled why Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 14, places the activity of gnostic commentary writing exclusively in the East.

¹⁰⁷See below page 420.

¹⁰⁸The wall paintings in the baptistery at Dura-Europos may also attest to the adaptation of nuptial imagery in baptism as practiced in Syria. See Dominic Serra, "The Baptistery at Dura-Europos: The Wall Paintings in the Context of Syrian Baptismal Theology," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 120 (2006): 67-78.

¹⁰⁹Anonymous, *Praedestinatus* 16, (PL 53:592b) *Hic in partibus Siciliae inchoavit docere*. He later was a teacher in Alexandria.

commentaries were an eastern phenomenon in Christianity is not established.

Fighting Heretics in Hippolytus

Valentinus had visited Rome sometime in the third decade of the second century. According to Irenaeus' information, the founder of "Valentinianism" remained in the imperial capital as a church leader for two or three decades.¹¹⁰ By 155-160 C.E. Justin was also living in Rome. The one mention "the Valentinians" receive in his *Dialogue with Trypho* (35.6) is of doubtful authenticity,¹¹¹ since Justin does not otherwise mention the name of Valentinus, does not describe any of his offending teachings, nor does he even use the term "gnostic."¹¹² Justin describes the martyrdom of a Christian teacher Ptolemaeus, as "a lover of truth, and not of a deceitful or false disposition [who] confessed himself to be a Christian (*Apol.* 2.2)." Very possibly this Ptolemy was the disciple of Valentinus of the famous *Letter to Flora*.¹¹³ This evidence, and the evidence in Irenaeus, suggests that the diverse groups of Christians in Rome were united with "Valentinians" in opposition to the Marcionites and that the Valentinians were thus in complete fellowship with the rest

¹¹⁰Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.4.3. The period of time for Valentinus' ministry in Rome may be calculated from dates for the three "episcopates" mentioned by Irenaeus, given in Adolf von Harnack, *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (trans. and ed. James Moffatt; Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 1904), 241-2. The idea of a succession of Roman bishops at this time is probably an anachronistic fiction. See also, e.g., Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 404-6. Dates for Valentinus, therefore, may be taken only as a rough indication. See Thomassen, "Orthodoxy and Heresy in Second-Century Rome," *HTR* 97.3: 241.

¹¹¹Pagels, "Hermeneutics and Ritual," *VC* 56 (2002): 345.

¹¹²Justin uses neither the term "gnostic," nor mentions the name Valentinus.

¹¹³Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 239.

of the Roman Church, at least until the time of Victor.¹¹⁴ Clearly, then, Valentinian ritual practice had ample opportunity to affect the ritual practice of non-Valentinian groups.

Like Irenaeus before him, Hippolytus #2's makes use of biblical exposition, as in the *In Cant.* in order to establish a boundary in the church. Either the "heretics" would be driven beyond the boundary or he would win them away from their teachers.¹¹⁵ Hippolytus received from Irenaeus' a disdain for the Valentinians. Irenaeus' concern was that Valentinian rituals fostered division within the catholic church.¹¹⁶ The Valentinians, however, were using the close study of biblical texts as preparation for a spiritual experience of "redemption" or "second baptism." It was the set of initiation rituals of Valentinians, sometimes called a "second baptism," that had such a powerful effect on its participants, that they constituted distinct groups, i.e., spiritual *versus* psychic, within Christian congregations. This two-tiered Christianity was a glaring road-block in the way of Irenaeus' project of "recapitulating" the diversity of early Christianity as the expression of one, world-wide faith.

Valentinus taught a dualistic version of Christianity that valued spirit over body and considered the physical creation the result of a malfunction in the world of the spirit.¹¹⁷ Still, Valentinus and his followers remained faithful to the church as

¹¹⁴Ibid., 391.

¹¹⁵Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 154. Irenaeus declares that his motive is love, that he loves the heretics better than they love themselves (*Adv. haer.* 3.25.7).

¹¹⁶For the social basis of Irenaeus' rejection of Valentinianism, see Elaine Pagels, "Irenaeus, the 'Canon of Truth,' and the 'Gospel of John': 'Making a Difference' Through Hermeneutics and Ritual," *VC* 56 (2002): 349. *Contra* Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 154."

¹¹⁷Diversity certainly existed in Valentinian ranks, though the specific characteriza-

reformers from within.¹¹⁸ They taught a reformed version of traditional Christian doctrines and based their teaching upon an interpretation of Christian Scriptures. Though in Justin's time, followers of Valentinus were probably still considered in the mainstream of the Christian movement,¹¹⁹ by the time of Irenaeus, the sense was growing among other groups of Christians that someone should mark the differences between "Valentinian" teaching and the "true doctrine" of the apostolic church. What concerned Irenaeus was the insidious threat to Christian unity coming from the "advanced" exegetical instruction that culminated in various forms of initiation that Valentinus' followers called ἀπολύτρωσις.¹²⁰

Irenaeus' harsh critique of Valentinian initiatory rites (*Adv. haer.* 1.21) suggests that they had broad appeal. According to these "gnostic" Christians, though Jesus himself received the baptism of John he said, "I have *another* baptism with

tions built upon Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus #1, and Tertullian about a split between "Italian" and "Eastern" Valentinianism on the nature of the body of the Savior may no longer tenable, Einar Thomassen, *The Spiritual Seed: The Church of the "Valentinians"* (NHS 60; 2006), 28 n. 3 and refs. there; Joel Kalvesmaki, "Italian versus Eastern Valentinianism?," *VC* 62.1 (2008): 79-89. For Hippolytus #2 in the *In Cant.* the Christ is the Wisdom/Logos embodied in such a way that when he suffers on the cross, the fragrant anointing of the Holy Spirit is released upon the world (1.8; 13.2-3). Salvation encompasses the flesh through divinization, "For a dew was brought out from fruit and descended from on high, that terrestrial creatures might be sealed for life which is this: *the Word descended that men might be able to ascend to heaven*" (13.4).

¹¹⁸ Pagels, "Hermeneutics and Ritual," *VC* 56: 344.

¹¹⁹ In the famous passage in Justin where the term "Valentinian" does occur (*Dialogue with Trypho* 3.5.6), he lists certain religious people who "confess themselves to be Christians," but who, according to him, are false Christians. They should rather be called by the names of their philosopher-mentors.

¹²⁰ Pagels, "Hermeneutics and Ritual," *VC* 56: 343.

which to be baptized” (Mark 10:38), referring to the spiritual baptism, which conveys τελειώσις; and “. . . they say that Paul, too, often has explicitly mentioned ‘the ἀπολύτρωσις which is in Christ Jesus.’” Thus, “the baptism of John was proclaimed with a view to repentance, but the redemption by Jesus was brought in for the sake of perfection” (*Adv. haer.* 1.21.2). Accordingly, the followers of Ptolemy taught (*Adv. haer.* 2, praef.) that the initiation of their baptized “ecclesiastical” brothers and sisters was inadequate to free them from subjection to cosmic powers. Such Valentinians cultivated a sense of mission to alleviate the ignorance and suffering of their less-illuminated friends through second baptism or sacrament (μυστήριον) of “redemption,” ἀπολύτρωσις (connoting release from captivity, or manumission from slavery).¹²¹

Irenaeus charged the Valentinians with deception *Adv. haer.* 3.15.2, accusing them of attracting simple believers unawares into private meetings where their faith was shaken and questions were raised about the validity of their redemption.¹²²

For this is the subterfuge of false persons, evil seducers, and hypocrites, as they act who are from Valentinus. These men discourse to the multitude about those who belong to the church, whom they do themselves term “vulgar,” and “ecclesiastic.” By these words they entrap the more simple, and entice them, imitating our phraseology, that these [dupes] may listen to them the oftener; and then these are asked regarding us, how it is, that when they hold doctrines similar to ours, we, without cause, keep ourselves aloof from their company; and [how it is, that] when they say the same things, and hold the same doctrine, we call them heretics? When they have thus, by means of questions, overthrown the faith of any, and rendered them non-contradicting hearers of their own, they describe to them in private the unspeakable mystery of their Pleroma. But they are altogether deceived, who imagine that they may learn from the Scriptural

¹²¹Ibid., 353.

¹²²Ibid., 353-4.

texts adduced by heretics, that [doctrine] which their words plausibly teach.
(Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* 3.15.2 *ANF*)

After the preparatory training, the prospective candidate is ready for
“redemption”:

It happens that their tradition (παράδοσις) respecting redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις) is invisible and incomprehensible, as being the mother of things which are incomprehensible and invisible; and on this account, since it is fluctuating, it is impossible simply and all at once to make known its nature, for every one of them hands it down just as his own inclination prompts. Thus there are as many schemes of “redemption” as there are teachers of these mystical opinions. And when we come to refute them, we shall show in its fitting-place, that this class of men have been instigated by Satan to a denial of that baptism which is regeneration to God, and thus to a renunciation of the whole [Christian] faith.
(*Adv. haer.* 1.21.1 *ANF*)

Valentinians, then, did not practice only one form of initiation, but developed various methods of ritual ceremonial initiation more or less consistent with the philosophical bent of their teaching. Irenaeus reports:

. . . some of them prepare a nuptial couch, and perform a sort of mystic rite (μυσταγωγίαν ἐπιτελοῦσθαι)(pronouncing certain expressions) with those who are being initiated, and affirm that it is a spiritual marriage which is celebrated by them, after the likeness of the conjunctions above. Others, again, lead them to a place where water is, and baptize them, with the utterance of these words, “Into the name of the unknown Father of the universe—into truth, the mother of all things—into Him who descended on Jesus—into union, and redemption, and communion with the powers’ sweet odor which is above all things.” (*Adv. haer.* 1.21.3 *ANF*)

Irenaeus’ description of the rites as “mystagogy” is telling. It entail an enhancement of the experience of initiation by associations with emotionally intense experiences of liminal crossing. The initiates were encouraged to participate in one or the other of two experiences: spiritual marriage and participation in the baptism of the

Spirit which Jesus had experienced: “into Him who descended on Jesus,” “and communion with the powers’ sweet odor which is above all things.” Irenaeus claims other Valentinians “repeat certain Hebrew words,” and he gives their supposed interpretations, which do not truly represent Hebrew or Aramaic phrases. Rather, they seem either like glossolalic utterances or made up phrases (by Irenaeus? by the Valentinian teachers?). The strange utterances are followed by declarations and responses which the new initiates learn to recite for the redemption ceremony.¹²³

The use of difficult, dark, and mystifying language in sources used for such ceremonies is not surprising. Nearly a century later than Hippolytus, Iamblichus (300 C.E.) notes that Pythagorean philosophical teachers made use of deliberately obscure utterances in their commentaries or “memoranda” and notes for initiates.

And in their dialogues and talks with one another, their memoranda (συγγράματα = ὑπομνήματα)¹²⁴ and notes, and further their treatises and all their publications, of which the greater number are preserved until our own times, they did not make readily intelligible to their audience . . . But in accord with the “silence” legislated for them by Pythagoras, they engaged in divine mysteries and methods of instruction forbidden to the uninitiated, and through symbols, they protected their talks with one another and their treatises. And if someone, after singling out the actual symbols, does not explicate them and comprehend them with an interpretation free from mockery, the things said will appear laughable and trivial to ordinary persons, full of nonsense and rambling. When, however, these utterances are explicated in accord with the manner of these symbols, they become splendid and sacred instead of obscure to the many. . . . And they reveal marvelous thought, and produce divine inspiration in those

¹²³The word συγγράματα here is specifically referring to the “commentaries” or “memoranda” mentioned before and after.

¹²⁴The use of ὑπομνήματα (commentaries) for initiates is a regular feature of this philosophical school. On the uses and contents of commentaries, see *Vit. Pyth.* 19.94; 29.157; 31.199; 35.253).

scholars who have grasped their meaning. (Iamblichus, *On the Pythagorean Way of Life* 23)¹²⁵

Irenaeus then shows how, after mysterious liturgical declarations and responses the initiate is baptized, the bystanders all together pronounce the liturgical “peace,” and the initiate is anointed with fragrant oil.¹²⁶ In all cases given in *Adv. haer.* 1.21.3 (not 1.21.4) “redemption” takes place during the initiation ceremony. Some decorate the initiation room as a bridal chamber, a few reject all physical rituals. The three ritual variants 1.21.3 all involve baptism in the name of the “trinity.” He says:

But there are some of them who assert that it is superfluous to bring persons to the water, but mixing oil and water together, they place this mixture on the heads of those who are to be initiated, with the use of some such expressions as we have already mentioned. And this they maintain to be the redemption. They, too, are accustomed to anoint with balsam. Others, however, reject all these practices, and maintain that the mystery of the unspeakable and invisible power ought not to be performed by visible and corruptible¹²⁷ creatures, nor should that of those [beings] who are inconceivable, and incorporeal, and beyond the reach of sense, [be performed] by such as are the objects of sense, and possessed of a body. These hold that the knowledge of the unspeakable Greatness is itself perfect redemption. (*Adv. haer.* 1.21.4 ANF)

Irenaeus’ description of the Valentinian rites seems to be based upon good research, as a comparison with documents discovered at Nag Hammadi shows.¹²⁸

¹²⁵Translation: John Dillon and Jackson Hershbell, *Iamblichus: On the Pythagorean Way of Life* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 127-9. See van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 34.

¹²⁶Pagels, “Hermeneutics and Ritual,” *VC* 56: 354 and van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 128-30.

¹²⁷On some believers refusing to participate in ritual, because it is visible and corruptible, see already Ignatius, *Smyr.* 8.1.

¹²⁸This topic is beyond the scope of this dissertation. See Pagels, “Hermeneutics

During the second century, baptismal practice in Christianity seems to have been diverse.¹²⁹ The Valentinians, however, seem to have been considerably more diverse in their practice. Nevertheless, the practice of the redemption nuptial is confirmed for Rome.¹³⁰ *GPhil* refers often and in several ways to a rite (*mysterion*) called *nymphios* or a spiritual marriage.¹³¹ When Valentinians and other early Christians drew a parallel between the ritual complex of initiation (baptism, anointing and a festive meal) and the celebration of nuptials, they were drawing upon a core cultural symbols linking meals and marriage or even meals and sex. The Christian transformation of these symbols into holy symbols involves not only a transformation of the initiate, but the creation of a new symbolic world out of these core cultural symbols. In the words of Paul, “if anyone in is Christ behold—a new creation!” As van Os has now shown, this ritual understanding is a spiritual interpretation of the celebration of Valentinian initiation rites that included a second baptism along with a festive meal.

The Hippolytan commentaries themselves on many points oppose those he calls “gnostics,” especially the Valentinians. The fragment of the commentary *In Mattheum*, for example is quite explicit:

and Ritual,” *VC* 56: 355.

¹²⁹Paul F. Bradshaw, *Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy* (2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

¹³⁰See page 420. Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 298-312.

¹³¹Because scholars have generally misunderstood the nature of the *GPhil*, they have differed on the nature of this rite. Van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” has shown that the document is a collection of notes comprising a manual for pre- and post-baptismal instruction (catechesis and mystagogy). This approach makes the best sense of *GPhil* and sheds light on western baptismal practices.

From the distribution of the talents: “If someone gets close to the heterodox they would make a statement nearly overthrowing him. For they might say Christ was a mere human in life, thus they deny the ‘talent’ of his divinity. Conversely, they confess God, rejecting the human being. They teach that the things seen by those who beheld him were hallucinations. He did not go about as a human being, but appeared as a kind of ghostly form. For when both Marcion and Valentinus along with the rest of the gnostics, separate the Word from the flesh, they cast away the one talent, the incarnation. (Hippolytus, *frag. in Mat.*)¹³²

The fragments of the commentary *De Apocalypsi* are concerned with the bodily resurrection of Christ, the genuineness of the virgin birth, and the advent of the antichrist. From the beginning of the *Antichr.*, Hippolytus states that he writes to refute the gnostic interpretation of the doctrine of the antichrist (*Antichr.* 1).¹³³

In the *In Cant.*, Hippolytus appears to be using a tactic borrowed from Irenaeus to refute heretics: take their theme, a text on which they base that theme, and show the faithful the error of the heretics by a counter usage of the very texts and themes they themselves employ. The Valentinians’ use of “commentaries” for pre-

¹³²H. Achelis, *Fragmentum in Matthaem Fragmentum de distributione talentorum* (Mat. 25.24). “Hippolyt’s kleinere exegetische und homiletische Schriften” (GCS 1.2 Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897):

ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ εἰς τὴν τῶν τάλαντων διανομὴν. Τούτους δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἑτεροδόξους φήσειεν ἂν τις γεινιᾶν, σφαλλομένους παραπλησίως. καὶ γὰρ κάκεινοι ἦτοι ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον ὁμολογοῦσι πεφηνέναι τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τὸν βίον, τῆς θεότητος αὐτοῦ τὸ τάλαντον ἀρνούμενοι· ἦτοι τὸν θεὸν ὁμολογοῦντες, ἀναίνονται πάλιν τὸν ἄνθρωπον, πεφαντασιωκέναι διδάσκοντες τὰς ὄψεις αὐτῶν τῶν θεωμένων, ὡς ἄνθρωπον οὐ φορέσαντα ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ δόκησιν τινα φασματώδη μᾶλλον γεγονέναι, οἷον ὥσπερ Μαρκίων καὶ Οὐαλεντίνος καὶ οἱ γνωστικοί, τῆς σαρκὸς ἀποδιασπῶντες τὸν λόγον, τὸ ἐν τάλαντον ἀποβάλλονται, τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν.

¹³³Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 18. Of course [Justin/Athenagoras] *On the Resurrection*, attributed by Alice Whealey, “Pseudo-Justin’s De Resurrectione: Athenagoras Or Hippolytus?” *VC* 60 (2006): 420-30 to Hippolytus, refutes the objections to the bodily resurrection that are based upon non-Christian philosophical commitments.

baptismal instruction would likely have suggested both the genre and the setting as well as the theme.¹³⁴ The *In Cant.* not only takes Songs, one of the sources of the nuptial language of Valentinians' rites, but also uses it for the purpose of instructing the believers on the mysteries of initiation. And it does so in a way that refutes what Hippolytus views as a Valentinian denigration of the flesh. It proposes a counter hermeneutic, but does more than simply oppose heretics. In the same way that Irenaeus used his counter-Valentinian exegesis of John to transform the creed and the tradition of the four-fold Gospel with John at the head, Hippolytus enlivens and enriches the baptismal celebration of his church by placing Song of Songs at the center of the interpretation of the rite.

In terms of function, Origen's own interpretation of the Song, as a means of contemplative illumination for the spiritually perfect and mature, is more like the nuptial "second" baptism of the Valentinians minus the rituals. Hippolytus saw the value of using the Song as a ritual text to preempt the attractiveness of heretical (Valentinian) initiations. It is important, however, to recognize that Hippolytus #2's use of the Song was only initiates. Hippolytus ends up deeply affected by Valentinus. Indeed, it is possible to read against the grain in the *In Cant.* and here the Valentinian exhortations behind the Hippolytan transformation of them. All who participate in such rituals experience the excitement of the mystery and, so to speak, re-experience their own initiation each time they are present for that of others.

¹³⁴A direction for further research would be a careful parallel reading of the *In Cant.* and the *GPhil.*

The Issue of Boundaries and the Relationship between In Cant. and Haer.

For Hippolytus the “little foxes” of Song 2:15 are also the foxes Samson captured, tied together and lit with torches (Jg 15:4-5). They are also Herod the “fox” (Lk 13:32) and are “false prophets” (Ez 13:4 LXX ἀλώπεκες for “jackals”), and thus, the heretics. Samson is apparently a figure of Christ or the representative of Christ; Samson’s wife is the church, and the foxes are the various heretics who are destined for the fire of judgment. Just as Samson joined the foxes tail to tail, so the representative of Christ gathers the foxes to tie them together. The purpose of that joining together is that “he might “make a demonstration of the[ir] dissimilarity and contrariness, for they also are enem[ies] to one another in word (or with respect to *Logos*)” (*In Cant.* 20.3) Both Iranaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 1.1-9; 1.11.1) and Hippolytus #1 (*Haer.* 4.35.5-7) argue against the Valentinianism as “a” false doctrine that was essentially multiform and contradictory. It is possible that “making a demonstration” refers here to a apodictic rhetorical form of refutation (ἐλεγχος) against heresies used from the time of Justin. If this is so, then here Hippolytus refers possibly to his work of refutation composed against heretics. This does not necessarily mean that Hippolytus refers directly to the *Haer.*, nevertheless, it invites a closer look.

The Issue of Boundary (ὄρος)

It is assumed to be written by Hippolytus #1, a Greek author of eastern formation living in Rome. Hippolytus # 2 in the *In Cant.* shares the primary concern of the *Haer.* 9, that is, the intra-church dispute over defining the boundary or ὄρος of the church. While defining the boundary of the church was not an exclusive Roman

concern, the issues addressed in the *In Cant.* match specific issues raised by the author of *Haer.* 9 in a way that strongly suggests a literary relationship if not common authorship. The Roman Church of the third century was extremely diverse. Patrons, presbyters and presbyter-bishops were in competition for recognition as leaders of the Christian movement.¹³⁵ Such social conditions also prevailed in the smaller cities of Asia Minor, though the bishops in Asian cities consolidated their power earlier than appears to have occurred in Rome.¹³⁶

In Rome, presbyter-bishops controlled both single house churches and networks of household groups that functioned as churches in their own right or as patron-client networks with quasi-church functions.¹³⁷ Hippolytus #1's comments on the reasons for his conflict with Callistus reveal the social structure of the Church in Rome at the beginning of the third century:

And many persons were gratified with the boundary he [laid down for the church] . . . Many of those he received had been rejected by numerous heretical

¹³⁵This arrangement had roots in the church's origins in the synagogue. On the early history, see Harry O. Maier, *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement and Ignatius* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier, 1991), 199-201. In Rome and Asia, a system of household churches based on patronage developed. The offices of bishop and presbyter was not strictly distinguished. Leadership was held by heads of households in a position to give patronage to the church. For the contrast with North Africa during this period, see Alastair Stewart-Sykes, "Ordination Rites and Patronage Systems in Third Century Africa" *VC* 56.2 (2002):115-130.

¹³⁶Current scholarship emphasizes the diversity in the origin and development of the monoepiscopate from region to region. For north Africa, see *Ibid.*, 115. For Asia, see Maier, *Social Setting of the Ministry*, 182-87; for Rome, see Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 397-408.

¹³⁷This reconstruction only varies slightly from that of *Ibid.*, 400-408, by stressing that presbyter-bishops could oversee networks of house churches, or quasi-churches.

groups. Others I had condemned and they had, accordingly, had been thrown out of the Church. People such as these went over to Callistus, and inflating the numbers of Callistian school. Callistus decreed, that, if a bishop was guilty of any sin, even if it were a mortal sin, he should not to be removed from his position of leadership. About that time, they began to appoint as clergy bishops, priests, and deacons, who had been married twice or even three times. But if any one who was already a member of the clergy got married, Callistus permitted such a person to continue in as clergy as if he had not sinned. To support this decision, he suggested that what the apostle had spoken about such people when he said: “Who are you to judge another man’s household servant?” He also declared that in the same way the parable of the tares had been uttered in reference such people: “Let the tares grow along with the wheat;” or, in other words, let those members of the church who are guilty of sin remain in the church. Furthermore he affirmed that Noah’s Ark was made as a symbol of the church. In it were dogs, wolves, ravens—every sort of clean and unclean thing. For that reason he gave the opinion that the church was analogous to the Ark. And he interpreted similarly as many passages of Scripture as he could collect that had some connection on this view of the subject. (*Haer.* 9.12.22-23 trans. by YWS).¹³⁸

Brent, Lampe and Thomassen provide the basic outline of a probable reconstruction of the history of late second- and early third-century Roman

¹³⁸ οὗ τῷ ὄρω ἀρεσκόμενοι πολλοὶ . . . ἅμα τε καὶ <οἱ> ὑπὸ πολλῶν αἰρέσεων ἀποβληθέντες, τινὲς δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ καταγνώσει ἐκβλητοὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὑφ’ ἡμῶν γενόμενοι, προσχωρήσαντες αὐτῷ ἐπλήθυναν τὸ διδασκαλεῖον αὐτοῦ. Οὗτος ἐδογματίσεν ὅπως, εἰ ἐπίσκοπ(ο)ς ἀμάρτοι τι, εἰ καὶ πρὸς θάνατον, μὴ δέη κατατίθεσθαι. ἐπὶ τούτου <οὖν> ἤρξαντο ἐπίσκοποι καὶ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διάκονοι δίγαμοι καὶ τρίγαμοι καθίστασθαι εἰς κλήρους. εἰ δὲ καὶ τις ἐν κλήρῳ ὦν γαμοίη, μένειν <δεῖν ἔφη> τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ ὡς μὴ ἡμαρτηκότα, ἐπὶ τ(οῦ)τῷ φάσκων εἰρησθαι τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀποστόλου ῥηθέν· «σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρῖνων ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην;» ἀλλὰ καὶ <τὴν> παραβολὴν τῶν ζιζανίων πρὸς τοῦτο ἔφη <λε>λέχθαι· «ἄφετε τὰ ζιζάνια συναύξειν τῷ σίτῳ», τουτέστιν <μένειν> ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας. ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ Νῶε εἰς ὁμοίωμα <τῆς> ἐ(κ)κλησίας ἔφη γεγονέναι, ἐν ἧ̄ <ἦσαν> καὶ κύνες καὶ λύκοι καὶ κόρα(κ)ες (καὶ) πάντα τὰ καθαρὰ καὶ ἀκάθαρτα, οὕτω φάσκων δεῖν εἶναι <καὶ> ἐν <τῇ> ἐκκλησίᾳ. ὁμοίως <δὲ> καὶ ὅσα πρὸς τοῦτο δυνατὸς ἦν συνάγειν, οὕτως ἡρμήνευσεν. (Text from Marcovich, PTS 25 TLG)

Christianity into which Hippolytus fits.¹³⁹ The historical diversity of the Roman church led to pressure to define its boundary or “ὄρος.” The key to successful control of the church in Rome was to define its ὄρος in such a way that it excluded the wrong people and included the right ones, leaving a group vibrant enough to thrive and cohesive enough to be controlled. The evidence suggests that a series of reformers attempted, but failed, to theologically define, unify or gain control of the socially fragmented Roman churches. These included Theodotus, Marcion, Valentinus, Hippolytus #1, Sabellius and Callistus. Hippolytus #1 and #2 were successive leaders of the same “church-school” in conflict with the church-school of Callistus as well as other rival factions of the church. After the passing of Callistus and Hippolytus #1, the leaders in the succession of both groups, Hippolytus #2 and Pontianus, eventually made peace with one another, excluding other groups like the gnostic Valentinians and the thorough-going anti-gnostic Monarchians like Sabellius and Noetus.¹⁴⁰ Even after the martyrdom of both Pontianus and Hippolytus #2, Novatian and others continued to dispute the right of the bishops to secure monarchal authority over the churches. In the mean time, the groups who represented the failed attempts at unity and reform were ironically branded as “heretics.”

¹³⁹Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 453-535, et passim; Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 385-408; Einar Thomassen, “Orthodoxy and Heresy in Second-Century Rome,” 241-56.

¹⁴⁰The monarchian Christology of Noetus condemned by Hippolytus represents an earlier polemical anti-gnostic (sc. anti-Cerentian and anti-Valentinian) Asiatic, Johannine Christology shared by Montanists, the *Epistula Apostolorum* 17 and Mileto of Sardis (fr. 15). See A. Stewart-Sykes, “The Asian Context of the New Prophecy and of *Epistula Apostolorum*,” *VC* 51.4 (1997): 432. Hippolytus’ own *Logos* theology represents another type, a further development of anti-gnostic Johannine Christology which shows more Valentinian influence.

In Cant. should be read in the context of the permeable and semi-permeable boundaries between such groups. Gifted Reformist leaders such as Valentinus significantly impacted the other churches in Rome in the period before a single bishop successfully gained control of most of the Roman Church.¹⁴¹ Hippolytus #2 was influenced by both Monarchian and Valentinian¹⁴² forms of Christianity.¹⁴³ Furthermore, his own *Logos* theology is an attempt to accommodate aspects of both forms of Christian teaching.

The Issue of Marriage between Social Classes

As an introduction for the newly baptized, Hippolytus #2 is particularly concerned with marriage. Hippolytus #1 is concerned as much for clergy marriage (as in the above passage) as with the marriage of noble class Christian women (αἱ ἐν ἁγίᾳ) who could not find Christian husbands. Hippolytus said that Callistus permitted them to “consider their [slave, or freedman] partner to be their husband without a legal marriage,” (9.12.24) which might have required them to lose their elite status. The result, Hippolytus argues, was that wealthy Christian women were resorting to abortion to avoid having children from such encounters. *In Cant.* 2.18-19 addresses

¹⁴¹Thomassen, “Orthodoxy and Heresy in Second-Century Rome,” 241-56.

¹⁴²Until late in the 2nd century Valentinians were an accepted part of the diverse Roman Church. See Gilles Quispel, “Origen and the Valentinian Gnosis,” *VC* 28.1 (1974): 29-42; Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 385-96, especially 385: “hardly any Roman Christian group excluded another . . . from the communion of the faithful.”

¹⁴³In such a context, the terms “orthodox” and “heretic” resist objective definition. All the major forms of Christianity (gnostic, monarchian, *Logos*, adoptionist, Monatanist) present in Rome would later have been branded as “heretical” in terms of subsequent doctrinal formulations of orthodoxy.

the issue of sexual relations between members of differing class as well. Though Tamar is commended for “appearing like a prostitute” because she desired the anointing, Joseph is commended for not entering into a sexual liaison with his noble class. By the anointing he did not wish to steal [anything], nor did he give himself to the lady [of his house] so that he would not be tainted with corruption” (*In Cant.* 2.19). This is precisely the issue addressed by *Haer.* 9.12.24, but from the side of Joseph the household slave. The dangerous and liminal place of the woman, however, is immediately underscored by Hippolytus, who commends “Blessed Phineas sought to avenge it, and with a spear he sought to pierce the prostitute and Zambri” (*In Cant.* 2.21). Callistus’ own decision about the proper ὄρος in such cases illustrates the variety of positions available in the early church on these issues. That the *In Cant.* is in such close agreement with *Haer.* argues strongly for a close relationship between the *In Cant.* and *Haer.*

The In Cant. and Hippolytan Acculturation

Easterners who lived in the West brought their culture and educational methods with them.¹⁴⁴ The church in Rome can be characterized, well into the third century, as an immigrant church,¹⁴⁵ thus a Roman provenance cannot be ruled out, simply if the *In Cant.* contains eastern traditions. Hippolytus #2 shows an acquaintance with the kind of rhetoric one would expect from a γραμματικός or a

¹⁴⁴See David Noy, *Foreigners at Rome: Citizens and Strangers* (Cardiff: Classical Press of Wales, 2000). The list includes historians like Cassius Dio, Herodian, Philostratus, as well as the physician and commentator Galen.

¹⁴⁵Markus Vinzent, “Rome,” 401.

καθηγητῆς,¹⁴⁶ or teacher of literature and letters. Teachers of Greek letters were in demand in late ancient Rome. Thus the Asiatic¹⁴⁷ background of Hippolytus #2, or even the presence of eastern traditions, should neither occasion surprise nor prejudice the provenance of the Hippolytan writings. Rather, one should think in terms of the transformation or adaptation of traditions.

The intricacy of acculturation and accommodation in the setting of a counter-cultural group such as a Christian church in a large city resist easy statements about cultural profile and identity. In every discussion of provenance, the complexity of these issues must be borne in mind. In the absence of direct indicators, the best approach is a patient inductive search for a pattern of provenance indicators.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁶See Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge Classical Studies) (Cambridge University Press, 2007), 18, 28, 155; Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 51, 53; Robert Butterworth, *Contra Noetum* (HM 2; London: Heythrop College, University of London, 1977), 20-30. The category “Asiatic rhetoric” was a foil for “deficient rhetoric” among Second Sophistic rhetoricians. *Asian rhetoric* emphasized *pathos*, “bombast and ostentation, . . . puffed up with a passion for a more vainglorious style of eloquence” (Quintillian *Inst. or.* 11.10.16-17; 6.1, 7; Cicero *Orat.* 2.28, 124). Little work has been done on the specific rhetorical features of the ancient commentary genre. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On the Ancient Orators* 1-2 remarks critically against it from his Isocratean, Second Sophistic perspective.

¹⁴⁷Manlio Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: an Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis* (trans. by John A. Hughes; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994), 31. Simonetti suggests that exegetical work of Hippolytus #2 may be considered an example of “the strengths and weaknesses of Asiatic exegesis,” though Hippolytus exhibits little training in the sophisticated rhetoric of the day.

¹⁴⁸Cerrato makes a deductive argument in his over-all approach. His major premise is that the late second- and early third-century commentaries are an eastern phenomenon. The minor premise is that Hippolytus writes commentaries in the late second or early third century. He concludes therefore, that his commentaries must be of eastern

Second- and third-century Rome was home to generations of Greek speakers from the *diaspora of Magna Grecia* in the south of Italy. It was also home to recent immigrants from the East. Immigrant groups held fiercely to their traditions while defending their identity as Romans. Tensions and contradictions abound in such groups. One might expect, therefore, a mix of both eastern and western features in the writings of Hippolytus. However, the presence of even a small number of western provenance indicators would suggest a provenance for the commentary in the West. The opposite case, that Hippolytus was a purveyor of certain western customs living in the East, has not been heretofore suggested by scholars.

Western Baptismal and Anointing Practice

Few customs can legitimately differentiate East and West during Hippolytus' time. However, pre- and post-baptismal anointing is one such custom.¹⁴⁹ The *In Cant.* features an extended peroration on baptismal anointing (*In Cant.* 2.1-35) that should be interpreted as post-baptismal, a feature of Roman and North African initiatory practice.¹⁵⁰ As in Tertullian, the conferring of the Spirit upon the newly baptized is

provenance. What this approach gains in clarity, it loses in strength. The major premise requires only one exception to be proven doubtful.

¹⁴⁹Johnson, *Rites of Christian Initiation*, 86-88.

¹⁵⁰With this may be contrasted the early eastern practice, the history of which has been elaborated in Sebastian P. Brock, "Studies in the Early History of the Syrian Orthodox Baptismal Liturgy," *JTS* 23 (1972): 16-64; idem, *The Holy Spirit in the Syrian Baptismal Tradition* (Gorgias Press Studies 4; Piscataway, NJ: 1979); Gabriele Winkler, "The Original Meaning of the Prebaptismal Anointing and Its Implications," in *Living Water, Sealing Spirit: Readings on Christian Initiation* (ed. Maxwell E. Johnson; Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1995), 58-81; Dominic E. Serra, "Syrian Prebaptismal Anointing and Western Postbaptismal Chrismation," *Worship* 79 (2005): 328-41; Paul F. Bradshaw, "'Diem Baptismo Sollemniorem': Initiation and

particularly associated with post-baptismal anointing (*In Cant.* 2.2, 5).¹⁵¹ In effect, it domesticates baptism, originally practiced by unmarried male ascetics like John the Baptist in the desert, by bringing it into the interpretive framework of the celebratory household meal. Such a pattern is already clearly discernible in Acts 16:25-34. Baptism and anointing thus become preparations for entry into the circle of those who commune at table: like the normal routine of women and men who prepare themselves for a banquet. Eastern pre-baptismal, non-exorcistic anointing grew out of an imitation of the anointing of Jesus by the Holy Spirit as King and Son of God, with no necessary connection to a meal time.¹⁵² *Didache* 9.5 shows how quickly the institution of the meal domesticated royal baptism.¹⁵³ In the *In Cant.* 2.8, even the waters of baptism must be first purified by the anointing. Baptism is, therefore, Hippolytus #2 a preparation for receiving the Spirit in the anointing and baptism is a

Easter in Christian Antiquity,” in *Eulogēma: Studies in Honor of Robert Taft, S. J.* (ed. E. Carr et al.; Rome: 1993), 41-51; Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries* (Michael Glazier Books, 1990), 263-6.

¹⁵¹Johnson, *Rites of Christian Initiation*, 87.

¹⁵²Ibid. “In comparison with the Syrian (and possibly Egyptian) tradition comes the most obvious distinction in rite and interpretation between early Eastern and Western Christianity. While in the Syrian East . . . the Holy Spirit was associated with the *pre-baptismal* anointing as the great *rushma* or “sign” of one’s baptismal assimilation by the Spirit to the Messiah-Christ, . . . in North Africa the prebaptismal and baptismal rites themselves are viewed as rites of purification and cleansing in *preparation* for the *postbaptismal* blessing or gift of the Holy Spirit.”

¹⁵³Μηδεις δε φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλ’ οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα κυρίου καὶ γὰρ περὶ τοῦτου εἶρηκεν ὁ κύριος Μὴ δώτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσὶ (Did. 9.5). “Let no one eat nor drink from your Eucharist[ic] feast, except those who have been baptized in the name of the Lord. For indeed concerning this the Lord has spoken, ‘Do not give what is holy to the dogs.’”

purifying bath preparing for the separate giving of the Spirit. One hundred sixty years later Ambrose of Milan made use of the Song in his mystagogical teaching perpetuating earlier western traditions¹⁵⁴ and Cyril of Jerusalem adapted the same for his eastern audience, also making use of the Song of Songs in baptismal instruction. In the West, Ambrose clearly used Hippolytus #2's *In Cant.* as an important source for his *Commentary on Psalm 118*, a series of sermons on the Christian ethical life for new converts. The nuptial theme in *GPhil*¹⁵⁵ and other Valentinian sources testify to an outline of baptismal practice with a remarkable homogeneity, despite rich doctrinal diversity in the West.¹⁵⁶ Christian baptismal practice reflected in Tertullian and the *Apostolic Tradition* (= *Trad. ap.*) also bear witness to this general outline,¹⁵⁷ while Irenaeus seems to indicate that it was a novelty to him. Of course, the canonical letter to the Ephesians attests, perhaps, to an early nuptial interpretation of baptism. It seems likely, however, that Hippolytus #2's use of the Song of Songs as a baptismal homily received its more immediate impetus from Valentinus, one of the truly creative theological geniuses of the early church. While shared traditions do not in themselves prove a western provenance for the commentary, they are consistent with a Roman provenance during the first part of the third century.¹⁵⁸ Scholars who have argued for an eastern provenance for the commentaries have neglected such ritual features of Hippolytus #2's works in general. One may conclude, then, that if

¹⁵⁴ Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, 5.5, 6 (Botte 122).

¹⁵⁵ Lubbertus K. van Os, "Baptism in the Bridal Chamber: The Gospel of Philip as a Valentinian Baptism Instruction" (University of Groningen, 2007), 113-66, presents a wealth of material on the background of pre-baptismal instruction.

¹⁵⁶ The terminology is from van Os, "Baptism in the Bridal Chamber," 29.

¹⁵⁷ See Johnson, *Rites of Christian Initiation*, 111. See Appendix 2 below, 520-530.

¹⁵⁸ See Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 299-308.

Irenaeus and the Asia Minor are the matrix of Hippolytus' baptismal thought, they have been transformed by life among Christians in the West.

Transformation of the Apocalyptic Tradition

Hippolytus' apocalyptic chiliasm may also bear the marks of western accommodation. It is more like the urbane accommodation of empire by Julius Africanus than the apocalypticism of the New Prophecy. Cerrato notes, but does not make a deep inquiry into the implications of Hippolytus' "mild" chiliasm for his interpretation. He merely assumes that Hippolytus #2's eschatology, expressed in *The Antichrist* [=Antichr.] and the *Comm. Dan.*, is a milder form of Asian chiliasm, so it must be Asian. However, the weakening of an otherwise more strident chiliasm is likely another result of Hippolytus' acculturation in Rome. In terms of eschatology, Hippolytus #2 blends both accommodation and critique of the Roman Empire. Hippolytus #2 clearly teaches in his *Comm. Dan.* and the *Antichr.* that the Roman Emperor, for all his evil, is not the Antichrist of prophecy.

If Hippolytus #2 was a Greek living in Rome, how would he, the disciple of Irenaeus, have regarded the world of Rome in which he lived? Irenaeus himself provides showed him the way. Irenaeus' own thought comes out of the fires of persecution in the church in Gaul. It is a pacified response, of a Christian determined to appear co-operative with the ruling power. He argues that, as the Israelites despoiled the Egyptians so "we may keep the property which we once acquired from the mammon of unrighteousness" (*Adv. haer.* 4.30.1). Yet, there is a difference: Irenaeus argues that the Hebrews owed the Egyptians nothing, but "we do owe the Romans the benefits of peace" (*Adv. haer.* 4.30.3). Indeed the earthly rule of the

Roman Empire under which Christians lived, as Irenaeus argued, had been appointed by God and not by the devil. Earthly governors “arouse fear, which restrains the savage strife of human beings with them; without such fear, people would devour one another like voracious fishes” (*Adv. haer.* 5.24.2).¹⁵⁹

For Hippolytus the dubious honor of the title “Antichrist” belongs, not to the emperor, but to a future Jewish leader to emerge from the future *breakdown* of the Roman Empire in which “democratic” regimes will lead to the manifestation of

Hippolytus’ Western Transformation of the *Logos* Tradition

The impetus to fit within his western context also may have also extended to the heart of Hippolytus’ *Logos* theology. Hippolytus #2’s own formulation of Irenaeus’ *Logos* theology is, according to Brent, a betrayal of it.¹⁶⁰ Irenaeus, arguing against the Valentinians to recapture the Gospel of John from the Valentinians, reformulated the ancient creedal symbol of faith under the heading of John as the primary Gospel of the church. He asserts that “in the beginning . . . the Word was with God” means that there was:

One God all powerful and one Christ Jesus, “through whom all things came into being” (1:3), he says, the same one “Son of God” (1:14); the same one “only begotten” (1:14; 1:18); the same one “Maker of all things” (1:3); the same one “true light enlightening everyone” (1:9); the same one “Creator of all things”

¹⁵⁹See Eric Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons* (Port Chester, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2002.), 150.

¹⁶⁰“It is . . . difficult to see how the author of the *El.* [= *Haer.*], had he lived to see the treatment of his work by C. N., would have concluded anything other than a betrayal of his original position by conceding too much to his original Monarchian opponents.” See Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 221-2, 335.

(1:3); the same one “coming to his own” (1.11) the same one that “became flesh, and dwelt among us” (1:14).” (*Adv. haer.* 1.9.2-3, ANF)

In the milieu of the Monarchian Roman Church, a formulation such as the above was problematic if proponents of *Logos* theology were to avoid the charge of ditheism (a veiled accusation of Valentinianism). Based on the close literary relationship yet subtle theological differences between the *Haer.*, and the works of Hippolytus #2, Brent argued that Hippolytus #2 was the editor and corrector of the works of Hippolytus #1. The writer of Scriptural commentaries appeared as a biblical conservative, condemning the *φλυαρία* of the Valentinians (*Noet.* 11.3). Nevertheless, he accommodated fundamental parts of the theology of Valentinus.¹⁶¹ As we have seen, this accommodation extended to Valentinian practice as well.

The *In Cant.* does not easily fit this picture. In chapter one, Hippolytus says in the Georgian text:

Because the Word, who was himself Wisdom, was crying out through [Solomon], and was also revealing to us what the Father desired to give to the prophets, [who] were made by the Word. [He] was [not] left without the evidence of wisdom, but he himself was not Wisdom. [Solomon] was experienced with Wisdom, so he said, “I existed before all the mountains were brought forth.”¹⁶² Now Wisdom was brought forth by the Father before all the mountains, by means of this Wisdom the beauty of his world was arranged. 1.7 So therefore Wisdom by means of the mani-fold grace of the Father was making manifest to us the adornment [of the world] by the command of the Father (*In Cant.* 1.6b-7a)

For Hippolytus, of course, the *Logos* is Wisdom brought forth by the Father and co-creator of the world. This formulation fits classical *Logos* theology, *Haer.* and the *Noet.* However, Hippolytus goes on to closely identify Christ and the Son with the

¹⁶¹Ibid., 366.

¹⁶²Cp. Prov 8:25 πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη ἐδρασθῆναι πρὸ δὲ πάντων βουνῶν γεννᾶ με.

preincarnate *Logos* in precisely the way Irenaeus does, “Now this Wisdom was certainly none other than Christ; and Christ is the Son. Since this is so, Paul the apostle bears witness and says: ‘But we preach Christ the power of God and the Wisdom of God.’” (*In Cant.* 1.8).

To be sure, the *In Cant.* recognizes that with the incarnation, something new was revealed, but he does not locate that something new in the transformation of the *Logos* from potential to perfect Son as in the *Comm. Dan.* and *Noet.* Rather, the transformation concerns the economy of salvation:

For, just as a vessel in which there is anointing oil, [which] has been guarded safely and sealed up, does not emit an aroma, nevertheless it continues to contain [the aroma], that is the potential, but when they release it, it emits its aroma both nearby to it and places far [are] filled [with it], so also the Word was in the heart of the Father, and so long as it had not gone forth, no one rejoiced in it all, but when the Father sent forth the Spirit of the aroma, the Word spread joy abroad to all. (*In Cant.* 2.5b)

Frickel’s suggestion is surely correct, that scholars must attend to the differing audiences with which Hippolytus had to deal.¹⁶³ Hippolytus speaks in differing ways to insiders and outsiders. It is reasonable to assume that Hippolytus, the *Logos* theologian, regarded his rivals as spiritual inferiors. With such an attitude the development of a *disciplina arcana* is only a step away. Thus some *Logos* Christians like Hippolytus may have had similar attitudes toward other types of Christians just as Valentinians regarded out-group Christians as their spiritual inferiors. Outsiders included the Roman Monarchian Christians and their leaders, addressed in the *Noet.* *In Cant.*, however, is written to insiders, new converts to Hippolytus’ group.

¹⁶³Josef Frickel, “Ippolito di Roma, Scrittore e Martire,” *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito* SEA 30 (1989): 39.

Accordingly, Hippolytus is freer to unveil the mysteries of the *Logos* Christology more openly.

Accordingly, it is only partly true that Hippolytus, writer of the commentaries and *Noet.*, radically compromised the *Logos* Christology he had inherited in order to avoid the charge of ditheism. It is necessary to suggest that Hippolytus may have wanted, in some circumstances, to appear to accommodate his theology to Monarchianism. In this way he paved the way toward a *rapprochement* with the larger church following the succession of Callistus.

Brent's argument, however, that the commentary writer made use of a gnostic (either Valentinian or Naassene) understanding of the procession of the *Logos* to downplay the personality of the pre-creation and the pre-incarnate *Logos* is sound for some of the works of Hippolytus #2 and not for others. The argument, however, that the theological differences between Hippolytus #1 and Hippolytus #2 are so great that the two sets of works could not possibly have come from the same mind needs to be reconsidered in the light of the sophistic bent of the author. Because the works attributed to Hippolytus are so closely related, Brent must argue, due to the very close relationship between the works attributed to Hippolytus #1 and the rest of the Hippolytan corpus, that Hippolytus #2 was the editor and corrector of most of the corpus. That is, the two groups of works must be from different authors, but their extremely close relationship reveals a common redactor.

We have traced within the [Hippolytan] corpus the movements of Christological conflict that involved a paradox. On the one hand there was a *rapprochement* with the conservative, Monarchian insistence on the unity of the Judeo-Christian God in the school of Callistus. On the other hand that *rapprochement* itself involved a radical incorporation of the requirements of the emanation of the *λόγος* from the Godhead that had their origins in the metaphysical assumptions of Hellenistic paganism. The editor and corrector of the *El.* [= *Refutation of all*

Heresies] block, Hippolytus, author of *C.N.* [*Noet.*] therefore, paradoxically appeared as the conservative scriptural commentator, condemning the φλθαρία of the Valentinians (*C.N.* 11.3) while accommodating fundamental parts of their theology.¹⁶⁴

The idiosyncratic Christology of Hippolytus may well be the result of his sophistic bent. For example, *Haer.* implicitly affirms that the pre-incarnate *Logos* is παῖς Θεοῦ without affirming he is Ὑιός Θεοῦ.¹⁶⁵ Thus there are not two Gods but two faces, πρόσωπα (*Ben. Jac.* 16; *Noet.* 10; 16.6). The *Comm. Dan.*, *Antichr.*, *Noet.*, and the *In Cant.* never refer to the pre-incarnate *Logos* as παῖς Θεοῦ and the *Noet.* explicitly denies the *Logos* is τέλειος Ὑιός before the incarnation (*Noet.* 4.10, 11 cf. *Antichr.* 3.1). Brent argues that the exegetical writings make the pre-incarnate *Logos* non-personal, while the writer of *Haer.* still adheres to a personal, pre-incarnate *Logos*. One suspects that Brent makes too much of this difference. Indeed the παῖς Θεοῦ and οὐ τέλειος Ὑιός may have essentially the same meaning. The phrase παῖς Θεοῦ, then may simply mask the author's true intentions. In other words, both Hippolytus #1 and #2 at times appear to de-emphasize the personality of the *Logos*. In

¹⁶⁴Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 366, cf. 72.

¹⁶⁵A similar confusion exists in Irenaeus, yet no one argues for two different authors of the *Adv. haer.* and the *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* (= *Epid.*). Irenaeus argues two different, contradictory notions about the effect that the anointing of the Spirit had upon the nature of Jesus as the Word made flesh and Son of God. See Daniel A. Smith, "Irenaeus and the Baptism of Jesus," *TS* 58.4 (1997): 627; Eric Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 133-4. Irenaeus argues two different positions. One is that Christ was already in possession of the Spirit and was Christ in virtue of the incarnation. That is why he could exercise supernatural judgment (*Epid.* 60). The second is that Jesus became anointed with the spirit at his baptism, the Word made flesh in Jesus became Jesus Christ at his baptism and that Jesus the human being was graced with the gifts of the Holy Spirit from that point on (*Adv. haer.* 3.9.3).

Hippolytus #2, however, the tendency is more marked than his predecessor.

Hippolytus #2 need not to have abandoned the “personality” of the pre-incarnate *Logos* altogether in *Noet.*, though he may have desired to appear to do so. Rhetorical considerations like this one complicate the chronology, for an author may feint, parry, retreat, and counter-attack in a manner that defies historical reconstruction after the fact. The insider script is the one to trust. With greater similarity, at the pre-creation stage the *Logos* is neither personal (*Haer.* 10.33; cf. *Noet.* 10.3, 1) nor separate from the mind of God. Given the particular interest in anointing and the economy in the *In Cant.* it is not surprising that theological ontology does not come up.

The polemical *Noet.* has this as its proper subject, ontology is useful as a boundary issue, for excluding others or defending oneself against others. It is a fighting doctrine. In the *Noet.* and *Haer.* Νοῦς Θεοῦ in itself contained the *Logos* and the universe. The abandonment in Hippolytus #2 of the term παῖς for the pre-existent *Logos* is likely a simple rhetorical strategy. Hippolytus #1 left himself open to the charge of ditheism by using the term παῖς. Callistus, a former slave, would have had no compunction about pressing the full personality of Hippolytus’ παῖς against him. Thus a “hidden transcript” about the personality of slaves lies beneath the conflict in *Haer.*, which adopts a severely critical attitude toward Callistus. He sneers at him for his former slave status (*Haer.* 9.12.1 Οικέτης ἐτύγχανε). Yet the *Antichr.* 3.13 contains a very generous passage about the availability of the *Logos* to all, including slaves: οὐδένα γὰρ ἀποβάλλεται τῶν ἑαυτοῦ δούλων. Hippolytus #1’s bitterly critical attitude toward Callistus may have led him to affirm the *Logos* as παῖς Θεοῦ without suspecting he would be criticized as a “ditheist.” If the commentaries, *Antichr.*, and *Noet.* were written subsequent to *Haer.*, then Hippolytus #2 drops the term entirely

when speaking of the pre-incarnate *Logos* when speaking to certain audiences. Conversely, if the commentaries and allied writings were written previous to *Haer.*, then the harshness against Callistus may represent the hardening and a retrenchment of a previous posture.

Hippolytus only wished to appear in some contexts to have accommodated his own views of the nature of the *Logos* (or those of a predecessor) to the more popular Monarchian views of the larger church-school community in Rome. If so, the real theological differences between *Haer.* and the group of writings associated with Hippolytus #1 on the one hand, and the commentaries, *Antichr.* and *Noet.* associated with Hippolytus #2 on the other, are not so great as to necessarily preclude common authorship.

An answer to the question of the literary and theological relationships of the Hippolytan corpus is beyond the scope of this dissertation; however, as Brent himself admits, supposed differences in literary, stylistic, and cultural factors can be explained either on the basis of one or more authors. Here we have argued that neither is the supposed theological difference too great to be entertained by the same person. The arguments against Hippolytan authorship of the entire corpus are weakened by the close literary relationship between these works.¹⁶⁶

The attempt to determine the order in which these works were written has not led to unanimous results. One may view the *Haer.* as a hardening of a previously

¹⁶⁶The earlier consensus that *Haer.* is the work of Hippolytus, also writer of the commentaries ascribed to him in Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 6.22 and Jerome *Vir. illus.* 61, that formed after the work of Döllinger, *Hippolytus and Callistus* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1876), can no longer be assumed, and is staunchly argued in Marcovich, *Refutatio*.

conciliatory attitude in the other works. Or, as Brent argued, *Haer.* may represent an earlier hard attitude followed by a more conciliatory attitude toward Monarchianism. Either reconstruction is possible. In any case, whether written after or before *Haer.*,¹⁶⁷ the *Comm. Dan.* and the *Antchr.* fits well with *Noet.*, as a part of a project of *accommodation* or an attempt at *rapprochement* between the *Logos* Christology of *Haer.* and the modalist Monarchian tendencies in the larger faction of the Roman Church in the succession of Zephyrinus. The *In Cant.*, however, Hippolytus has no compunction about naming the pre-incarnate *Logos* either Son or Christ, while the *Comm. Dan.* and *Antichr.* consistently maintain the distinct Christology of *Noet.*¹⁶⁸ in a way that does exhibit certain minor differences with *Haer.* In part, these exegetical and doctrinal documents show Hippolytus #2's sensitivity toward the accusation of ditheism leveled at him by Callistus and the Monarchians (*Haer.* 9.12.16).

It appears that the indiosyncratic view of Hippolytus #2 concerning the personality of the *Logos* is a feature of his accommodation to a western context. According to the first chapter of *Noet.*, the modalistic Monarchianism of Noetus was condemned in Asia Minor, in favor of more traditional *Logos* theology that held to the personality of the pre-incarnate *Logos*. That is, there are δύο πρόσωπα in God before the incarnation, but one πρόσωπον is not τέλειος υἱός until the incarnation. A paradox of provenance confronts us in the Christology of Hippolytus #1 and #2.

¹⁶⁷See Nautin, *Hippolyte et Josipe*, 58-62; Simonetti, *Contro Noeto*, 54. Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 301-45 follows Nautin, who argued that Hippolytus #2, author of the commentaries, *Noet.*, and *Antichr.* had read the *Haer.* Simonetti, however, argues that Hippolytus #1, author of *Haer.*, had read Hippolytus #2's works.

¹⁶⁸Meloni, "Cantico dei Cantici," *SEA* 13: 97-120, and Antonio Zani, *La cristologia di Ippolito* (Ricerca di Scienze Teologiche 22 Brixiae: Morcelliana, 1984).

Hippolytus #1 is clearly western, but appears more eastern in Christology. On the other hand the commentaries of Hippolytus #2, supposed by Nautin, Simonetti, Loi, and others to be eastern in provenance, appear more western in Christology.

Hippolytus #2 plays down the personality of the *Logos*, studiously avoiding the word *παῖς* to refer to the *Logos*. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that Hippolytus #2 is thereby accommodating the powerfully ensconced force of western Monarchianism in Rome. In the East, particularly in Asia Minor, there was no reason to be so accommodating of Monarchianism. The Hippolytus #1 of the *Haer.*, which is assumed by all scholars to be western, is true to the eastern *Logos* tradition and blithely uses the term *παῖς* while rejecting the charge of ditheism.

One might ask, with Marcovich and Whealey, if the differences between Hippolytus #1 and Hippolytus #2 are so great that two different authors is a necessary hypothesis. Earlier Orbe had argued, citing texts from *Haer.*, *Noet.*, and *Comm. Dan.* that both the *Noet.* (Hippolytus #2) and *Haer.* (Hippolytus #1) exhibited the same tendency to appropriate a form of the Valentinian doctrine of emission or emanation of the *Logos* on the basis of the divine will in the development of a doctrine of the *Logos*, while at the same time rejecting the teaching of Valentinus.¹⁶⁹ Brent perhaps emphasized too much the similarities between Hippolytus #1 and the *Logos* tradition of the apologists, though he admits that Hippolytus #1 shows a sensitivity to the

¹⁶⁹Antonio Orbe, *Hacia la primera teología de la procesión del Verbo, Estudios Valentinianos*, (vol. 1; Rome: Universitas Gregoriana, 1958), 616. Citing *Haer.* 10.33.1, he argues, “Por lo que hace a la *probole*, el autor del *Elenchos* no se detiene a canonizar el término valeniniano; peor, acepta la analogía fundamental de la pro-lación oral, y las especies de emisión tertuliana, como medio de legitimar la distinción personal entre el Hijo y el Padre.” One might add, however, that this move also affirms the unity of God prior to creation.

charge of ditheism (i.e. closet Valentinianism). In fact, Hippolytus #1 may evidence a pulling away from ascribing full Sonship to the *Logos* by declaring the pre-incarnate *Logos* the *παῖς θεοῦ*. Apparently Brent did not incorporate the work of Orbe, who shows that the author of Hippolytus #1 also demonstrated a willingness to bend concepts traditional within the Asian *Logos* theology of Irenaeus and some of the apologists nearly to the breaking point.¹⁷⁰ Thus, Hippolytus #2 emerges as a biblicist with a strong sophistic bent for accommodation (or acculturation). As Brent observes:

Though Hippolytus, author of the *Noet.* block, is a biblical exegete, the theology in terms of which he interprets Scripture is far more radical than that of the author of [*Haer.*] Furthermore, by the term “more radical” I must state at the outset that I mean “far more in accommodation with contemporary Graeco-Roman paganism.” I have emphasized more than once that the theology of [Hippolytus #1] represents a far greater coherence with the patristic tradition of Justin, Theophilus, Irenaeus and others than does the radical departure of *Noet.* from that tradition. Moreover, [Hippolytus #1] may have knowledge of systems of Greek philosophy, and of heretical thought, but these are held at arm’s length, as secular knowledge allows him mainly to detect the putative origins of what should not be believed rather than to illuminate what should be believed. [Hippolytus #2 in] *Noet.* on the other hand, in his doctrine of the *λόγος* and in his use of heretical texts, is far more prone to use such secular knowledge positively in order to unravel the meaning of the sacred texts.¹⁷¹

Whether the two blocks of writings are from two distinct writers or the result of one writer who adjusts his views over time is of less concern than the common social milieu and the shared elements of the social profile of Hippolytus #1 and Hippolytus #2. Brent’s characterization of Hippolytus #2 as accommodating earlier views, incorporating aspects of his enemies’ views, and adjusting his own views is an important aspect of the literary profile of Hippolytus #2 and aides in developing a

¹⁷⁰Orbe, *Hacia la primera teologia de la procesion del Verbo*, 611-16.

¹⁷¹Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 355.

social prosopology.

In Cant. and the Iconography of East and West

The rich symbolism of the *In Cant.* makes references at several points to images that turn up on the walls or floors of Greco-Roman homes, in Christian catacombs, or in synagogues either as paintings or mosaics. Some of the images Hippolytus injects into his interpretation turn up in the decorative motifs of later Christian churches in Rome. It might seem precarious to reconstruct the physical setting of a third-century written composition from such references. However, the ubiquity of such images in homes would necessitate that Hippolytus address the iconography that surrounded his audiences as they heard the Christian mysteries in the images of the Song. Thus, it is worthwhile to hazard speculation in this regard. The widespread phenomenon of elaborate decorations in homes of varying social levels is striking to modern visitors to places like Pompeii and Herculaneum. The interface of ancient Greco-Roman domestic art is a reality that few commentators on ancient Christian texts have addressed in their interpretations of these texts.¹⁷² These decorations often have mythological and allegorical themes.¹⁷³ The abruptness in the way Hippolytus inserts the iconographic references into his interpretation of the Song suggests that they were so well known and their associations with given symbols so inevitable it was unthinkable he would not allow the images in the homes of his audience to impact his interpretation of the Song and vice versa. Or, in some cases,

¹⁷²See Balch, *Roman Domestic Art and Early House Churches*, 62.

¹⁷³See Gilles Sauron, *La peinture allégorique à Pompéi: Le regard de Cicéron* (Editions A&J Picard, 2007).

the iconographic images may have been part of the physical surroundings in which the interpretation was originally performed. Balch has drawn attention in his survey of 194 domestic dining rooms to:

the visualization in Pompeian triclinia of Roman imperial ideology, of the divine will for human obedience, of the Isis cult, of Roman fascination with classical Greek theater, portraits . . . and the visual representation of banquet scenes, which are among the themes that would have been discussed by friends during the symposia/convivia that were enjoyed in those domestic spaces.¹⁷⁴

Balch adduces abundant textual evidence for the interplay of text, art, and dining in the ancient world. One quote he provides from Lucian in the second century illustrates well the convergence of text, performance, audience, art, and meal:

To me, at least, it seems that a splendid hall (οἶκος, house, decorated room) excites the speaker's fantasy and stirs it to speech, as if he were somehow prompted by what he sees . . . Then are we to believe that the passion for speech is not enhanced by beautiful surroundings? . . . Certainly, then, the beauty of this hall has the power to rouse a man to speech . . . Next to this picture is portrayed another righteous deed, from which the painter derived his model, I suppose from Euripides or Sophocles, inasmuch as they portrayed the subject in the same way. (Lucian, *De Domo* [Περὶ τοῦ οἴκου] 4.13.23, trans. Harmon in Loeb.)

It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to thoroughly discuss the iconographical references of the *In Cant.* and their impact on Hippolytus' mystagogical hermeneutic. At this point suggestive mention can only be made of the iconography that decorates the pages of Hippolytus' text. Several more pertinent themes could be plucked from the *In Cant.*, but the following eight will suffice for the main point here. Some of these will be discussed in Chapter Four:

Hippolytus describes Christ in androgynous terms as *Sophia-Logos* with

¹⁷⁴Balch, *Roman Domestic Art and Early House Churches*, 41.

breasts to nourish believers with his milk that is better than wine (*In Cant.* 1.7, 8; 2.1-3). Such a representation could have various sources, but, as will be seen, the narrative of the *In Cant.* suggests that Hippolytus was drawn upon the well known androgynous figure of Dionysus.¹⁷⁵

The *In Cant.* features a scene of Christ leaving the beloved and going “to the Gentiles” (*In Cant.* 6.2). A favorite theme of the Greek poetry and of domestic decoration of the Roman Empire was Dionysus’ return from conquest and the.¹⁷⁶ A further image of the mission of Christ appears in *In Cant.* 8 with the scene of the chariot, with multiple resonance with images of the Helios Chariot.

In the *In Cant.*, two women are interpreted as representing the synagogue or church of the Circumcision and the church of the Gentiles. Hippolytus playfully comments upon the darkness of their skin color. One is dark but beautiful; the other does not admit her darkness and is called upon to repent (*In Cant.* 4.1-2; 7:1-2). Such a description matches a scene in Ovid’s *Fasti*, for March 8 which is the entry for the myth of Ariadne and Dionysus. The teaching of Hippolytus on this image may draw from interpretations of such images as “the church of the Circumcision” and “the church of the Gentiles,” for the two women appear later as a recurrent symbol of the unity of the Roman Church in the fourth and fifth centuries.

But is there any sense in which the interpretation is uniquely suited to Rome?

¹⁷⁵See below page 388, 405-409. In Balch, *Roman Domestic Art and Early House Churches*, nine of the images he surveys are scenes of Dionysus and Ariadne. See the accompanying CD ROM, especially image # 246, cf. # 88, # 127, # 203, # 207, # 207a, # 222, # 252a, # 257.

¹⁷⁶Katherine M. D. Dunbabin, *Mosaics of the Greek and Roman World* (Cambridge University Press, 2001), 227-29.

In the *In Cant.* Hippolytus adapts this symbolism in a way that ties it to fourth- and fifth century Roman iconography. He sees twin female figures representing the church of the Gentiles and the church of the circumcision. This interpretation of the bride as two brides has a connection with later iconography that is distinctly Roman. A fifth century mosaic in the church of Sta. Sabina has the two women, the first of which holds a Bible written in Greek characters, the other holds one with Hebrew letters, on either side of the dedicatory inscription of the church.¹⁷⁷ The inscriptions indicate how these figures are to be understood. The “two figures are distinguished plainly . . . by their dress: the woman representing the church of the Gentiles is dressed as a Roman matron . . . The books they hold are distinguished by the lettering as Hebrew and Greek, the Old Testament and the New.”¹⁷⁸ A fourth-century (restored) mosaic in S. Pudenziana has two women placing garlands (*coronae*) upon the heads of Peter and Paul, representing the mission to the Jews and to the Gentiles

¹⁷⁷CVL MEN APOSTOLICVM CVM CAELISTINUS HABERET PRIMUS ET IN TOTO FVLGERET EPISCOPVS ORBE HAEC QVAE MIRARIS FVNDAVIT PRESBYTER VRBIS ILLRYICA DE GENTE PETRVS VIR NOMINE TANTO DIGNVS AB EXORTV CHRISTI NVTRITVS IN AVLA PAVPERIBVS LOCVPLES SIBI PAVPER QVI BONA VITAE PRAESENTIS FVGIENS MERVIT SPERARE FVTVRVM. “When Celestinus held the highest apostolic throne and shone forth gloriously as the foremost bishop of the whole world, a presbyter of the city, Illyrian by birth, named Peter and worthy of that great name, established this building at which you look in wonder. From his earliest years he was brought up in the hall of Christ—rich to the poor, poor to himself, one who shunned the good things of life on earth and deserved to hope for the life to come. (trans. from Unknown, “Dedication Mosaic (Detail),” (2008): Cited 03-01-2009. Online: http://www.sacred-destinations.com/italy/rome-santa-sabina-photos/slides/xti_9514pa80.htm.)

¹⁷⁸See description in Walter Lowrie, *Art in the Early Church* (New York: Pantheon Books:1947), 68, 146.

(cp. *In Cant.* 8.8).¹⁷⁹ The ornately carved door at S. Sabina has a similar motif, the *una sancta*, represented by a woman, holds garlands in both hands and crowns both Peter and Paul at the same time. Hippolytus' text was clearly known in Milan in the fourth century, as attested by the quotations in Ambrose. It should perhaps be incorporated as a footnote in the art history of this distinctly Roman iconography. While it is possible that Hippolytus' text was the origin of the iconography, it seems more likely that it bears witness to Christian iconography that already existed in the third century and of which the murals of Sta. Sabina and S. Pudenziana are developments. Thus iconography mentioned in this text of the third century was then perpetuated through the fourth and fifth centuries and memorialized the history that the "one holy church" was composed of two churches that once had been in conflict with one another. Peter and Paul represented these divergent tendencies in fractionalized Roman Church.

Christ is described as racing through the world in a quadriga, a chariot pulled by the four creatures representing the four Evangelists along with the twelve apostles. This image suggests that Hippolytus has in mind an image found in a third-century Roman catacomb and synagogues from the fourth century in Palestine: the chariot of Helios drawn by four horses and surrounded by the twelve signs of the zodiac. (*In Cant.* 8.1-7). It should also be remembered that Hippolytus previously mentions the Aquedat Isaac in traditional Jewish terms, "The blessed Isaac became desirous of [the anointing] and he wished to sacrifice himself for the sake of the world" (*In Cant.* 2.15). Afterward he describes the crucifixion of Christ as the representation of the "henna bunch" (Song 1.14; *In Cant.* 13.1), as a representation of the death of Jesus in terms that suggest contact with the Jewish interpretation of that passage of the Song

¹⁷⁹See image in Spier, *Picturing the Bible*, figure 81, 113.

in terms of the Aquedat. See below page 241.

Two male figures interpreted as Peter and Paul (*In Cant.* 8.8) suggest that Hippolytus is linking the apostles to the popular image of Castor and Pollux. While Castor and Pollux are ubiquitous as figures in Greco-Roman figural art, the interpretation as Peter and Paul would be distinctly Roman.

Vines ripe with fruit, showing the harvesting of grapes and the production of wine (*In Cant.* 13.1-4) is interpreted as the crucifixion of Christ and the release of the blessings of the Spirit on all human kind.

The commentary contains a second, more clearly defined scene of women and Christ. This time a triad intrudes upon an interpretation of the beloved in search of the lover by night. As Hippolytus explains, Martha and Mary as the beloved approach the tomb of Jesus as myrrhophores to anoint the body of Christ. Along with Eve, Christ/Adam, the serpent, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil—all make an appearance as well (*In Cant.* 24-25). Why this cast of characters? One might be tempted to say they are simply a function of theological imagination. However, something else is going on. The scene as described by Hippolytus has a nymphic quality and bears a striking resemblance to a visual widely spread visual representation.¹⁸⁰ One mosaic depicts Heracles¹⁸¹ taking the apples of the famous Hesperides, the three nymphs who guard the trees of the apples of immortality of

¹⁸⁰Jennifer Larson, *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore* (Cary, NC: Oxford University Press, 2001). 7, 46.

¹⁸¹For the image of Christ as Hercules/Heracles as a conflict of gods in the early third century, see David E. Aune, “Heracles and Christ: Heracles Imagery in the Christology of Early Christianity,” in *Greeks, Romans and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (ed. David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 3-19.

their garden in the West. These maidens, with the serpent Ladon, were the guardians of a tree of golden apples, located in the famous garden of the Hesperides at the western border of the river Okeanos, given to Hera as a wedding gift.¹⁸² As has been well argued by Aune, the figure of Heracles was a battle ground between apologists and detractors of late second- and in third century Christianity.¹⁸³ Hippolytus appears to re-interpret the imagery of Heracles and the Hesperides (and perhaps other common domestic images such as the apotheosis of Heracles) in terms of the resurrection and ascension to heaven.

Finally, a banquet scene of couches (*In Cant.* 27.1-10) is seen as representing the saints of both Old and New Testaments. The painting of banquet scenes on Roman houses and visualizations of joy and conviviality that the hosts desired to

¹⁸²Ibid., 7. See the mosaic from the early third century C.E. unearthed in Liria (Valencia, Spain). For the image, see <http://www.mlahanas.de/Greeks/Mythology/HesperidesMosaicLiria.html>. Accessed 03-27-2009. It is on display in the National Archaeological Museum of Spain (Madrid). Other well known representations are in Pompeii, one in the triclinium of the House of the Priest Amandus, a third style panel painting of Heracles in the Garden of the Hesperides. For the image see <http://www.sitesandphotos.com/catalog/actions-show/id-265054.html> Hesperides (RAP10654), accessed on 03-09-2009. The image is well known and ancient, a vase in the British museum, Dioscuri and Heracles BM E224, Artist/Maker Meidias Painter (eponym vase) shows in the upper register the Rape of the Leucippids by the Dioscuri; in the bottom register appears Heracles in the Garden of Hesperides accompanied by a group of Athenian tribal heroes (bottom). Attic red-figured hydria, ca. 420/400 BC. <http://www.mlahanas.de/Greeks/Mythology/DioscuriAndHeracles-BME224.html>, accessed 03-09-2009. For drawings of the vase registers, see <http://www.mlahanas.de/Greeks/Mythology/HesperidesGallery.html>, accessed on 03-09-2009.

¹⁸³See David Edward Aune, "Heracles and Christ: Heracles Image in the Christology of Early Christianity," in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (eds. David L. Balch et al.; Fortress Press, 1991), 3-19.

project for their guests are common. The theme of the banquet and the banquet ethos in connection with the *In Cant.* will be discussed in Chapter Two.

The individual images are themselves striking. They intrude as foreign material in the interpretation of the Song. Why did Hippolytus bring up these images and not others? One wonders how Hippolytus proceeds from text to interpretation. Even more impressive is the array of images. Can one imagine a Christian group in the early third century worshipping in a house decorated with Dionysiac scenes? It does not require much imagination to picture such a house. At the very least, such repertoires would have been part of the imperial ideology painted on the walls of the homes of new believers. The androgynous Dionysus with Ariadne is found in Pompeii. The famous late second century¹⁸⁴ House of Dionysus in Nea Paphos on the island of Cyprus contains mosaics that, arguably, could have been interpreted by Christians in such a way. The mosaics draw mainly upon Italian models, but images derived from Antiochene models also are also present. In one entrance to the house is a mosaic of Scylla and Glaucus.¹⁸⁵ In another one of Narcissus gazing into a pool of water. In another room Phaedra and Hippolytus also make an appearance. The largest and most important space in the house is a room that measures 11.50 m. x 8.50 m, enough room for over one hundred people at a time. Its floor depicts the triumph of Dionysus with a vine carpet with scenes from the harvesting of grapes, and the

¹⁸⁴Date argued in Christine Kondoleon, *Domestic and Divine: Roman Mosaics in the House of Dionysos* (Cornell University Press, 1995), 8-9.

¹⁸⁵It measures 1.32 m. x 1.22 m. It is estimated that it was found at the beginning of the 3rd century B.C. This mosaic was removed from some other location and was placed in the entrance to the House of Dionysus. The material used for its construction is not similar to that of the other mosaic constructions, as the pebbles used were unprocessed. Detailed descriptions in *Ibid.*, 10-15.

Dioscuri, the mythical twins Castor and Pollux.¹⁸⁶ Other houses with similar themes decorated in both mosaic and murals could have been chosen from Pompeii.

A room or suite with a medley of images such as these in the house church house of Hippolytus' is not at all beyond possibility. "Faced by a set of images in one room, or suite, viewers are always challenged to explore ways of reading them together—to devise links, to follow up contrasts, to see what makes for a rewarding story."¹⁸⁷ Christian art is only beginning to be distinguishable from polytheistic art in the third century, not because Christian homes did not have art, but because, for the most part, they were simply reinterpreting the polytheistic art of their time.¹⁸⁸ The imagery of the *In Cant.* suggests that Hippolytus was using the wall art in the house he imagined as the setting for the performance of his mystagogical homilies. The art interprets the Scripture and the Scripture, the art. At the same time, Hippolytus was superimposing a Christian narrative on polytheistic images, subverting them and

¹⁸⁶Cf. with Peter and Paul. See Herbert L. Kessler, "The Meeting of Peter and Paul in Rome: An Emblematic Narrative of Spiritual Brotherhood," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 41 (1987): 265-75, who traces origin of the images to the fourth or fifth century. The reference in *In Cant.* 8.8 seems to have two suggestions: fraternal mission, held up as an example for Jews who would believe and *concordia*, a central theme of *In Cant.* 8. Hippolytus describes Peter as "like a shepherd" and Paul as swift "like a steed." The reference in *In Cant.* 8.8 conveys the notion of *concordia apostolorum*, but uses a motif frequently employed in late antique art to express the idea of a fraternal mission, suggesting Castor and Pollux, an image frequently found in domestic decorations. The interpretation as Peter and Paul, however, is clearly a western phenomenon, *Ibid.*, 266, "either Roman or Italian."

¹⁸⁷See the discussion in Mary Beard and John Henderson, *Classical Art: From Greece to Rome* (OHAS; Oxford University Press, USA, 2001), 45.

¹⁸⁸See Graydon F. Snyder, *Ante Pacem: Archaeological Evidence of Church Life Before Constantine* (Mercer University Press, 2003); Balch, *Roman Domestic Art and Early House Churches*, 168-194.

capturing them for use in the Kingdom of God. It is a powerful tool for mystagogy, for it does not invite the hearers to white-wash their walls. Rather, it disarms the principalities and powers and places their powerful images in the service of Christ. It takes some of the most powerful formants of pagan identity captive and makes them slaves of the Gospel. Historians of early Christianity must now come to terms with the idea that early house-churches were decorated with reinterpreted pagan images. Baptism, instruction, worship and feasts would have been conducted in view of such images.

Women in the In Cant. as Patronesses and Leaders

This topic will be receive further treatment in Chapter Four; however, it is important to consider the episode of the myrrhophores at this point to advance the thesis that the teaching about women the *In Cant.* is consistent with a Roman context. Cerrato has argued that Hippolytus #2's views on Martha and Mary not only represent an idiosyncratic theology of the role of Martha and Mary in salvation history but also an idiosyncratic view of the role of women in the leadership of the church-school. As attractive as it is, the interpretation merits a healthy dose of suspicion. Methodologically, it is perilous to derive the historical reality from theological categories. Theology cannot be a straight-forward indicator of social reality. The rhetorical nature of Hippolytus #2's *exempla* in the *In Cant.* should put the reader on alert to his persuasive purposes. One who uses Hippolytus' *exempla* for historical reconstruction needs proceed with caution and attend to the rhetorical situation of the commentary. Finally, the meaning of Hippolytus #2's comments must constantly be sought in their concrete application to his audience, which is the

church-school gathered to welcome them and initiate them into the mysteries of their new faith.

Cerrato's assessment of the text of *In Cant.* 2.29 and 24.2; 25.1, 3 is clearly a minor breakthrough in Hippolytan studies.¹⁸⁹ The interest Cerrato has in "the theology of Martha and Mary" in the *In Cant.* is clearly based on its value as a provenance indicator for the commentary corpus.¹⁹⁰ Cerrato's treatment shows that Hippolytus, though an avid interpreter of the biblical text, is nevertheless willing to rewrite biblical texts that differ from strongly held oral traditions of his community.¹⁹¹ The detail of Cerrato's treatment of Martha and Mary reflects the importance of this theme to his argument. The conclusion suggests the focus of his considerations:

In general terms the elevated status of women reflected in the commentary on the Song blends well with the milieu of Montanism. While it is unthinkable to most Hippolytan scholars to associate Hippolytus the commentator with the New Prophecy, on this issue he shares a basic sense of direction.¹⁹²

This assessment assumes in general terms "the elevated status of women reflected in the commentary on the Song" without giving any evidence that, in fact, the commentary reflects such a status in concrete terms. As was seen above on pages 127-136, if it is valid to characterize the audience Hippolytus addresses in terms of the idealized figures he selects from the biblical narrative, a picture emerges of an audience that is socially diverse, including women and men of slave, freed, and

¹⁸⁹Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 180-3.

¹⁹⁰Ibid., 173, 184-200.

¹⁹¹Ibid., 200, speculates that the commentary narrative reflects an early "matronal loyalty" or that, perhaps local shrines to Lazarus or the tombs of Martha and Mary. He even finds a way of connecting the legend to Asia Minor.

¹⁹²Ibid.

freeborn status in various family relationships (father, mother, concubine, daughter, son). Hippolytus indeed gives certain women prominence: they are certainly not invisible in the *In Cant.*! However, even though women likely outnumbered men in Hippolytus #2's church-school, he still exhibits a tendency in the *In Cant.* to diminish their influence.¹⁹³

Do Hippolytus' references to women in the *In Cant.* indicate a Montanist milieu? Cerrato argues this case from *In Cant.* 24-25. In the course of commentary on Song 3:1ff, which speaks of the search of the beloved for her lover, *In Cant.* 24-25 develops, through the search of Martha and Mary for the risen Christ (relating it as the restoration of Eve), a "theology of Martha and Mary" by which Eve is designated as an "apostle." Seemingly at variance with the ethos toward women in the *Haer.*, Hippolytus manifests a positive attitude toward the status of women in the community, even affirming the "apostolic character of the ministry of women."¹⁹⁴

Cerrato accordingly raises a question about possible connections between Montanism and Hippolytus. Does the *In Cant.* represent "an example of early Montanist preaching on the Song, . . . an early catholic source exhibiting a high view of the role and status of women in the community of faith; . . . [or is it a text that] is catholic, but not at all related to the Montanist defense of women's ordination."¹⁹⁵ According to Cerrato, the second option is surely correct and Hippolytus is no Montanist.¹⁹⁶ He rightly observes that nothing else in the *In Cant.* that supports a

¹⁹³Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 48.

¹⁹⁴Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 208.

¹⁹⁵*Ibid.*, 227.

¹⁹⁶If the *On the Psalms* of Hippolytus are genuine, then Homily 3 identifies him as anti-Montanist. Even with the valuation of Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*,

Montanist theology. Nevertheless, Cerrato argues that Hippolytus demonstrates positive thoughts about Eve and women quite unlike the patriarchal leanings of such theologians as Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria. According to him, Hippolytus only speaks of women positively, and, oddly he concludes that this type of discourse indicates a provenance in the region of Asia Minor, where the Montanists lived.¹⁹⁷ For this reason Cerrato affirms that Hippolytus and Montanism share in a basic sense of direction.¹⁹⁸ He affirms that this is true for Hippolytus even though such a convergence between Hippolytus and Montanists must have taken place during the same period and in the same territory where tensions over Montanism were extremely high.¹⁹⁹

Cerrato brings up the possible influence of Phrygian Montanism on the basis of Epiphanius' report that the Montanists esteemed Eve and ordained women (*Pan.* 49.2).²⁰⁰ Epiphanius described that Montanists grant χάρις διδόντες τῇ Εύα, ὅτι πρώτη βέβρωκεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς φρονήσεως, “grace to Eve because she first ate

338-9, the homilies represent the anti-Montanist stance in a successive Hippolytan leader. On the anti-prophetic bent of this homily, see Alistair Stewart-Sykes, “Hermas the Prophet and Hippolytus the Preacher: The Roman Homily and Its Social Context,” in *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics* (eds. M. B. Cunningham and P. Allen; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 55.

¹⁹⁷Ernst, “Martha from the Margins,” 166, follows Cerrato, stating: “[The statements about the ordaining of Eve and Martha and Mary as apostles to the apostles] need to be heard in the context of the debates over the participation of women in church leadership in Asia Minor in the second and third century, specifically in the context of the New Prophecy.”

¹⁹⁸*Ibid.*, 200.

¹⁹⁹Scholten, “John A. Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*,” 89.

²⁰⁰*Ibid.*, 208.

of the tree of knowledge” (*Pan.* 49.2).²⁰¹ A little further on Epiphanius adds, *κἄν τε γὰρ γυναῖκες παρ’ αὐτοῖς εἰς ἐπισκοπὴν καὶ πρεσβυτέριον καθίστανται διὰ τὴν Εὐάν, ἀκούσωσι τοῦ κυρίου λέγοντος «πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα σου ἢ ἀποστροφῆ σου καὶ αὐτός σου κυριεύσει», “even if women among them are appointed to the office of bishop and presbyter because of Eve, they hear the Lord saying, ‘Your resort shall be to your husband, and he shall rule over you.’” The resemblance to *In Cant.* 25.5-6 is stunning. However, Epiphanius is not a reliable guide for early Montanism. So, Cerrato is correct to question whether the influence is from Montanism to Hippolytus or from Hippolytus to Montanism. His earlier suggestion, “that the Montanists of the fourth century used this Hippolytan text, or other earlier sources like it, to develop their Eve ordination argument” is surely more correct.²⁰² Therefore, “the commentary predates the development of the argument for the ordination of women.”²⁰³ If this is the case, then the evidence of Epiphanius is useless as an indicator of the Asian provenance of the *In Cant.* It is possible, however, that Epiphanius gives an indication, perhaps, of the Asian reception of the commentary in Montanist circles in the fourth century at roughly the same time that Ambrose was also making use of the *In Cant.* in his writings.*

So, is Hippolytus a representative of a community that maintains an affirmative, welcoming posture toward women in church leadership? This reconstruction does seem far from likely. A major weakness in Cerrato’s argument is

²⁰¹Ronald E Heine, *The Montanist Oracles and Testimonia* (PMS 14; Macon, GA: Mercer/Peeters, 1989), 135.

²⁰²Cp. Cerrato, “Hippolytus’ on the Song of Songs and the New Prophecy,” 271 with idem, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 208.

²⁰³Ernst, “Martha from the Margins,” 167.

that he assumes the author of a text develops his views as the mouthpiece, repeating the beliefs of his “community.”²⁰⁴ But, what if Hippolytus #2’s views were developed in considerable tension with his own community? Cerrato does not seem to value the individual personality of Hippolytus very highly. One might ask, why would he be different from Justin or Origen or bishops such as Theophilus or Irenaeus, who did not simply express the thoughts of the community in which they lived?²⁰⁵

Cerrato’s interpretation of *In Cant.* 24 and his statement that Eve is “symbolic of womankind”²⁰⁶ or that Martha and Mary are “agents of female salvation”²⁰⁷ are surprising. They are misguided for two reasons. First, his interpretation demands too much of the mental horizon of the author.²⁰⁸ Second, and more importantly, Hippolytus does not even apply the figures of Martha, Mary and Eve in the way Cerrato describes as symbols of womankind and agents of female salvation. Rather, *In Cant.* 24-25 concerns the recovery of the state of paradise enjoyed by the first humans with the man in his rightful place of leadership. Eve symbolizes womankind in solidarity with sin and deceitfulness. The joy of being agents of female salvation does not belong to women upon whom Hippolytus is supposed to look so favorably. Rather, Eve is the one who is restored by the liberating resurrection, but only to her ancestral role as a servant of her leader: Adam (her

²⁰⁴Ibid., 28; 150.

²⁰⁵Scholten, “John A. Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*,” 88.

²⁰⁶Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 190, 209.

²⁰⁷Ibid., 193.

²⁰⁸It is certain that some Christian groups had female leaders who could be thought of as ordained. See Kevin Madigan and Carolyn Osiek, *Ordained Women in the Early Church: A Documentary History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), passim; and Osiek *et al.*, *A Woman’s Place*, 158-63.

husband). Martha and Mary undo the first mistake of Eve by bearing witness of the resurrection of Christ as apostles to the apostles. The male apostles, however, reject the testimony of the women. Then Hippolytus vindicates the caution exercised by the apostles against the women! Finally, Christ still must confirm the resurrection report of the women (*In Cant.* 25.8 ff.). Cerrato mentions this passage but fails to consider its impact on his interpretation.²⁰⁹ For the audience, the application of this teaching is specifically relevant to Christian initiation and not ordination. The women beg Christ to “offer Eve” as an acceptable sacrifice to God and to receive the women into spiritual union with himself. The language of offering and spiritual union are baptismal and eucharistic.

What is this language about? Cerrato entertains the idea that the early traditions of Martha are more ancient memories of local female patronage.²¹⁰ He does not consider that Martha and Mary may also symbolize of female heads of household and that behind the prominence of women in the *In Cant.* in general and in chapters 24-25 in particular is tension in the community between Hippolytus and female patrons of the community.²¹¹ Peter Brown and Charles Bobertz pointed to tensions between official, male clergy and patrons of the community. These “patrons” of the community were, according to Brown, often female. Women as head of households in such a position of influence represented a danger and possible threat to the male

²⁰⁹Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 195.

²¹⁰Or, “matronal loyalty,” see *ibid.*, 200.

²¹¹See Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (LHR NS 13; New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 140-59.

leaders in the Christian community.²¹² Bobertz traced tension between clergy and patrons (or matrons!) as part of the motivation in the *Trad. ap.* for regulating meal celebrations of patrons and matrons involved in distributing needed relief among the poor through the practice of celebratory meals.²¹³ Osiek points out that many of the cemeteries that eventually became the property of the Roman church may have begun as private cemeteries in which some Christians were allowed to bury their dead. Many of these early cemeteries bear the names of women and indicate significant Christian dependence upon female patronages in the early third century.²¹⁴ During the late second and early third centuries, as much as male church-school leaders might have wished to snub the protectresses of the community, patronesses were necessary for the survival of the church-school.²¹⁵ Christian women, who became powerful through their connection to powerful men like Commodus' concubine Marcia, who was a Christian sympathizer if not a Christian, or through inheriting an estate from a wealthy husband, were vitally important for churches dependent upon family networks.²¹⁶ The encouragement that such women received (as well as men) to remain

²¹²For example Irenaeus reports (*Adv. haer.* 1.25.6) that Marcellina, a female teacher with some relation to Carpocrates, went to Rome during the time of the presbyter-bishop Anicetus (155-160 C.E.). She and her followers apparently used images, including images of Christ, and gave them honor. Images were completely unremarkable in Greco-Roman culture. As the so-called "statue of Hippolytus" suggests, the use of images by Christians may not have been as rare as is often thought in the early church.

²¹³Charles A. Bobertz, "The Role of Patron in the *Cena Dominica* of Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*," *JTS* 44.1 (1993): 170-84.

²¹⁴Osiek, "Roman and Christian Burial Practices and the Patronage of Women," *Commemorating the Dead*, 257-260.

²¹⁵Brown, *Body and Society*, 146.

²¹⁶Jewish synagogues also depended upon and honored their patronesses, see

celibate after the death of a spouse not only ensured the church-school of a pool of vital wealth for the support of its poor, it also blurred the spiritual status between the official male leaders and matrons and patrons of the community. That the official mainstream church-school leaders were willing to accept gifts from more well-to-do members is one central economic factor that accounts for the slow rise of the developing mainstream church at the expense of churches with more radical attitudes toward wealth and marriage. Such groups had “no possibility of accumulating resources for the church and of producing generations of children reared in Christian families.”²¹⁷

What made the history of the Christian church notably different from that of other religious groups was the constant anxiety of its clergy to define their own position against the principal benefactors of the Christian community. Early Christians came to expect that their leaders should possess recognizable and perpetual tokens of superiority to the laity: they might be expected to give evidence of a charismatic calling; they were encouraged, if possible, to practice perpetual continence; even when both these criteria were lacking, only they had received due ordination through the “laying on of hands.” This in turn, gave them an exclusive role in the celebration of the Eucharist that was the central rite of the Christian community. By these precautions, the clergy ensured that leadership of the church would not gravitate unthinkingly into the hands of its wealthiest and most powerful lay benefactors.²¹⁸

The dismissive attitude exhibited in the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim 2:12-15) was no longer possible by the year 200 C.E.

Attitudes toward celibacy and patronage hover in the background of the *In Cant*. Though the *In Cant*. does not *condemn* the sexual activity of Tamar, it extols

Bernadette J. Brooten, *Women leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional evidence and Background Issues* (BJS 36; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982).

²¹⁷Brown, *Body and Society*, 144.

²¹⁸*Ibid.*

the continence of Joseph (2.18, 19). It is therefore appropriate to assume that Martha and Mary, whose husbands receive no mention and who beg to be united to Christ (25.3) could represent women heads of household. Such women who were also independently wealthy could edge closer to the status of clergy, if they remained celibate, than many men who were sexually active with female partners.²¹⁹ By the mid-third century, the Roman Church supported 1,500 widows and destitute persons (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.43.11). Not all widows, however, were of low status, and such women were often mobile, active, and the sometimes the only lay persons who were able to accumulate all the respected attributes of holy, clerical status.²²⁰ They were often the most active members of the church, and, according to the references in the *In Cant.* 24-25 and *Comm. Dan.* 1.26 they were sometimes the most willing to learn from and give support to a teacher. In the list of works found on the side of the throne of the so-called “statue of Hippolytus” is one work dedicated to a woman. Thus, it is not necessary to assume with Cerrato that Hippolytus the commentary writer is part of a fringe group like the Montanists.

The most serious flaw, however, is his overly facile reconstruction of ideological and theological categories to construct the historical and social situation of *In Cant.* Eve is given the soteriological-typological distinction of “apostle” because of the “apostolic service” of Mary and Martha to the apostles. Cerrato does not mention that she is, an apostle to her husband Adam. Is it possible to transfer this symbolic category to life in Hippolytus #2’s church-school? Or is it possible, from language and within the mental horizon of Hippolytus, to infer an official ecclesiastical

²¹⁹Ibid., 146.

²²⁰Ibid.

status conferred on particular women in Hippolytus #2's church-school?

Cerrato admits that the text actually says nothing more than esteemed service to the apostles.²²¹ Still, he sees women's ordination to church office—as he assumes was practiced among Montanists (!)—shining like a star, glimmering in the horizon of the *In Cant.*²²²

Raising the ante even more, Cerrato weaves in other hypotheses and gives free rein to speculation. Thus Hippolytus #2's preference of Martha as a resurrection witness has to come from the knowledge of a tradition found in the *Epistula Apostolorum*.²²³ In his summary, the *Ep. ap.*, which he asserts could only have been composed in the East²²⁴ is Hippolytus #2's source of the Martha story. At the same time Cerrato affirms that the promotion of Martha in the *In Cant.* must be a polemical rejection of the gnostic Christian preference of Mary Magdalene as a resurrection witness.²²⁵ In addition, Cerrato sees connections in the *In Cant.* with with specific

²²¹Ibid., 200.

²²²Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 208. See Scholten, "John A. Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*," 89, who rightly observes that unfortunately no early sources support the official activity of women in early Montanism. Nor do any early anti-Montanist authors indicate female ordination among them. Only the fictitious testimony of Epiphanius in the fourth century supports this claim. Cerrato dutifully reports the fact that the epigraphic evidence of early Montanism is barely preserved (Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 206); however, he again raises the dubious inscriptions as if they were accurate historical documents (Ibid., 207). Moreover, his emphasis is on female office bearers and not female prophets, which does not fit the profile of Montanism.

²²³Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 198. See Scholten, "John A. Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*," 89.

²²⁴Ibid., 257.

²²⁵Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 196-8. Scholten, "John A. Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*," 89.

“gnostic” texts (2 *ApcJac* [NHC V, 3 and V, 4] and 1 *ApcJac*), from Syrian Jewish Christianity. For Cerrato, a close neighbor to Asia Minor in the East!²²⁶

Here the mantra of Frances Young is important, “theology is always earthed in a context.”²²⁷ It will not do to reconstruct the context of the *In Cant.* from a brief passage in his commentary (*In Cant.* 24-24). Nor is the context of the *In Cant.* a few theological ideas, gnostic texts and Montanist practices. Rather, scholars must come back to earth to houses-churches, initiates, audience and teacher and to the purpose of the commentary in context, that is to the rhetorical situation. Like the modern crime scene investigator, scholars need to look for signs of transfer between text and context that build up a pattern of provenance. Hippolytus directed *In Cant.* to the newly baptized in a situation in which women, in larger numbers than men, were coming to the faith. Wealthy women, some of senatorial class, were attracted to Christianity in larger numbers than were men of senatorial class.²²⁸ Some of them may have been widows seeking the comfort of community and the promise of significance and belonging in the church. The point of the interpretation of Song 3:1 ff. for Hippolytus is to commend Eve (i.e. women) for baptism and admittance to the community, because she has been transformed through a reversal brought about by Martha and Mary. Now Eve is restored as a helper to her husband, Adam. Now she can truly satisfy him with life-giving food (the gospel) and she can be clothed with a “garment of virtue,” which she and they have recovered to replace temporary fig leaves. The ordination to apostleship which Hippolytus gives to women in *In Cant.* 25 is not the

²²⁶These connections will be discussed in Chapter four.

²²⁷Frances Young, *The Theology of the Pastoral Letters* (Cambridge University Press, 1994), 1.

²²⁸*Ibid.*

high honor of hierarchy, but the “ordination” given to women who are active in the church, sometimes patronesses with or without influential husbands who are not believers. These women, then, are commended in the crucial role played by Martha and Mary. They “offer” the gospel (to their husbands?), and even consult with “apostles.” If we desire to draw a historical detail from this teaching, it is that Hippolytus may have in mind the apostolic succession in the leaders of his church. Yet in the *In Cant.*, the men do well to remain wary and look to confirmation for themselves from Christ alone. In this way the evil effects of the fall are reversed by the recapitulation wrought through the woman (Eve). In other words, the evil initiated by Eve is reversed through Eve’s representatives, Martha and Mary. In terms of social realities in the church, however, little changes. Hippolytus #2’s point does not go far beyond the exhortation of 1 Peter 3:1-6:

Wives, in the same way, accept the authority of your husbands, so that, even if some of them do not obey the word, they may be won over without a word by their wives’ conduct, when they see the purity and reverence of your lives. Do not adorn yourselves outwardly by braiding your hair, and by wearing gold ornaments or fine clothing; rather, let your adornment be the inner self with the lasting beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is very precious in God’s sight. It was in this way long ago that the holy women who hoped in God used to adorn themselves by accepting the authority of their husbands. Thus Sarah obeyed Abraham and called him lord. You have become her daughters as long as you do what is good and never let fears alarm you. (NRSV)

And yet, Hippolytus #2’s emphasis provides a much more positive interpretation to what is essentially the teaching represented in 1 Tim 2:11-15 and the other household codes of Colossians, Ephesians, and 1 Peter 3. In order to understand Hippolytus #2’s statements on women, an ideological critique informed by a

poststructuralist perspective is useful.²²⁹ Using theory, or “any standpoint from which we might challenge a text’s self understanding,”²³⁰ helps fill in gaps left by the social-historic approach in this dissertation and to contextualize the surprising, daring, but ultimately conventional statements of Hippolytus (*In Cant.* 25-27).

Feminist approaches to the history of ancient Christianity provide needed perspective that prevents easy assumptions that the rhetorical equating of women and Eve is anything other than condescension. In this passage Hippolytus makes use of a *topos* of Christian preaching, the universalizing and naturalizing concept of “woman.” Patristic authors saw woman’s subjection to man as “natural,” and the amalgamation of all women with Eve is a prime example of this *topos*.²³¹ In the same way as 1 Tim 2:11-15 blames Eve for limitations placed upon women’s activities and authority, Hippolytus “appeal[s] to the identification of women with Eve as a justification for their submission to men,”²³² and ultimately it has nothing to do with office in the church. Indeed, it would serve, by way of compensation, as a justification for

²²⁹Elizabeth A. Clark, *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 176-81.

²³⁰Paul Strohm, *Theory and the Premodern Text* (Medieval Cultures 26; Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), xiv.

²³¹Elizabeth Clark, ed. *Ascetic Piety and Women’s Faith: Essays on Late Ancient Christianity* (Studies in Women and Religion 20, Lewiston, NY: Mellon Press, 1986), 31-2.

²³²“The Church’s ever-increasing need for funds opened an avenue for women to gain importance in Christian circles despite their decisive exclusion from positions of ecclesiastical leadership,” Elizabeth Clark, “Patrons, Not Priests: Gender and Power in Late Ancient Christianity,” *Gender & History* 2 (1990): 253-74; eadem, “Ideology, History, and the Construction of ‘Woman,’” in *Late Ancient Christianity* (PHC 2, ed. Virginia Burrus; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 177.

woman's "exclusion from priesthood and public teaching office."²³³ With the "ordinatio"²³⁴ of *In Cant.* 25 Hippolytus contrasts sharply with the tone other church fathers, Tertullian in particular:

You are the Devil's gateway; you are the unsealer of that tree; you are the first foresaker of that divine law; you are the one who persuaded him whom the Devil was not brave enough to approach; you so lightly crushed the image of God, the man Adam; because of your punishment, that is, death, even the Son of God had to die. And you think to adorn yourself beyond your "tunics of skins" (Gen 3.21)? (Tertullian, *Cult. fem.* 1.1, 2; CCL 1.343)

Yet, Tertullian's famous "gateway" passage (quoted in Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex*²³⁵), when read with a measure of patience may not be as far from Hippolytus #2's treatment of women as one might like to think.²³⁶

The In Cant. and the Severan Rhetoric of Empire

The commentary calls for solidarity on the part of believers against "the proud," the "vanity of the world," "the Gentiles," and the "seducer." Similarly it includes the Jewish synagogue as a symbol of the world, "the gathering place of darkness" (*In Cant.* 1.5). The synagogue becomes a complex metaphor for Jews, some of whom reject but potentially could believe in Christ and others of whom believe in Christ. The diatribe with Jews is a central feature of the second part of the commentary, the principal narrative of the argument (*In Cant.* 3-19). Further, the

²³³Ibid.

²³⁴On Cerrato's faulty understanding of *ordinationem* in Garitte, see 459.

²³⁵Simone de Beauvoir and H. M. Parshley, *The Second Sex* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1953), 167.

²³⁶On Tertullian's gateway passage, see F. Forrester Church, "Sex and Salvation in Tertullian," *HTR* 68.2 (1975): 83-101.

commentary, to a lesser extent, calls for solidarity against “heretics.” These groups, addressed in various ways, represent differing attempts among Christians to establish identity and negotiate status and life within the context of the Roman Empire.

Negotiation with imperial society in Hippolytus, as in other early Christian literature, was complex, including strategies for survival, engaging in forms of protest and accommodation, at times including imagined violent judgment against the Roman Empire in the future.²³⁷ Christians struggled to keep the faith and maintain good relations with their neighbors, sometimes in creative ways.²³⁸ To strengthen the resolve of the faithful, Hippolytus used several images in the *In Cant.* which function as “hidden transcripts” to bring a critique of Roman imperial theology. One of these images is biblical the biblical figure of Solomon, who represents an idealized ancient philosopher king who was imagined to have taught the truth of the Christian trinity, especially the royal function of Christ, the Wisdom and *Logos* ruling over all creation in the books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Solomon. Such symbols are not only representations of Christian doctrine in a vacuum, but present a critique of the practices and doctrines of imperial theology.

From the time of Augustus the dominant ethos of the Roman Empire was expressed in part by its claim to be the legitimate caretaker of the ancient and respected culture of the Greeks. The Greeks, from the time of Alexander the Great had the divinely given right to rule the world. The Romans were the new Greeks. Such claims were supported by massive architecture, Roman copies of Greek art, the

²³⁷Warren Carter, *The Roman Empire and the New Testament: an Essential Guide* (AEG; Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2006), 4.

²³⁸Origen, *Contra Celsum* 8.13-25, admits, in a veiled way, that some Christians under duress might offer sacrifice to the emperor.

names chosen by emperors and, often, by scholarly Greeks of the period like Cassius Dio. The imperial administration of Alexander Severus especially touted Alexander as the new Alexander the Great.²³⁹ Diogenes Laertius, probably of the Severan period as well,²⁴⁰ argued that human beings and wisdom itself were the products of the Greeks.²⁴¹ They were the oldest and best human culture.²⁴² Both before and during the Severan period Christians and Jews busied themselves in an effort to resist these claims.²⁴³ Christians had to develop their claims indirectly, as did the Romans, by relying on their supposed right to co-opt the heritage of another people, the Jews, to lay claim to their own antiquity. Antiquity and wisdom were still keys to respectability and legitimacy in the Roman Empire during the Severan period. The chronographies attributed to Hippolytus and Julius Africanus attest to the strong motivation to forge a distinctly Christian ownership of both the past and the future, against Greco-Roman claims.²⁴⁴ Hippolytus #2's *In Cant.* fits well as a demonstration

²³⁹An emphasis on Alexander the Great by Roman emperors is a recurrent theme. See Balch, *Roman Domestic Art and Early House Churches*, 117, 141, 196, 207, with bibliography and images.

²⁴⁰Simon Swain, "Introduction," in *Severan Culture* (ed. Simon Swain et al., New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Tim Whitmarsh, "Prose Literature and the Severan Dynasty," in *item*, 38.

²⁴¹Diog. Laert. 1.1-3.

²⁴²Swain, "Introduction," *Severan Culture*, 2.

²⁴³The Jew Josephus is a well known proponent of this type of apologetic.

²⁴⁴See George Ogg, "Hippolytus and the Introduction of the Christian Era," *VC* 16 (1962): 12. The discussion of the relationship between *Comm. Dan.* the *Chronicon* and the *On the Pasqua* is attributed to Hippolytus. The chronological interest in *Comm. Dan.* 4 is largely pastoral: "The end of the world is not yet at hand. It is to endure in all for 6000 years, and so recently as in the reign of Augustus, when Christ was born in Bethlehem, it was but 5500 years old."

of this Christian ethos. In the introduction to the commentary, Hippolytus draws special attention to the spiritual narrative of the trinitarian economy in three Solomonic works: Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs (*In Cant.* 1.1-3). The figure of the Solomonic author, inspired by Wisdom, serves implicitly²⁴⁵ as a counterpoint to Roman Emperors who were encouraged to see themselves as the incarnation of *Logos*.²⁴⁶ If Solomon was the greatest and wisest of kings with the closest relationship to *Logos*-Wisdom of any earthly king (cf. *In Cant.* 2.24) then, by implication, no other king could lay greater claim to be the expression of *Logos*, “Solomon,” says Hippolytus, “had wisdom, he was, however, not Wisdom himself; he had wisdom from God as a grace; but he was not the grace itself, he was the son of David, but he was not himself the Christ” (*In Cant.* 1.3, cf. 1.6). The Wisdom that had

²⁴⁵The Georgian text at 1.12 is defective, and the Greek paraphrase adds, “The result was that in many cases they were carried on in the philosophical issues of those who are outside. For even in Plato and in Aristotle and the school of philosophy belonging to him were stolen not a few of the things of both the proverbs and issues of this man. But many things the divine evangelists brought to mind in a hidden way of the things rightly spoken by this man.” For the same view, see *Haer.* 10.27, “But, it does not seem irrational to prove that these nations that had their attention engrossed with the speculations of philosophy are of more modern date than those that had habitually worshipped the true God . . .” See Chappuzeau, “Auslegung,” *JAC* 19: 46, though no other works of Hippolytus express this idea, common enough in both Jewish and Christian apologetics, the addition in *CanPar* at the very least confirms that the use of the figure of Solomon has apologetic overtones.

²⁴⁶See Erwin R. Goodenough, “The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship,” *Yale Classical Studies* 1 (1928): *passim*; Bruno Blumenfield, “Classical and Hellenistic Sources for a Political Paul” (Ph. D. diss. Columbia University, 1997), 314-20. For the widespread notion that the king was the Living *Logos* (ἔμψυχος λόγος) and the embodiment of law (νόμος ἔμψυχος), see Glenn F. Chesnut, “The Ruler and the *Logos* in Neopythagorean, Middle Platonic and Late Stoic Political Philosophy,” *ANRW* 16.2 (1978): 1323, 1327.

been given to Solomon, that is the possession of the church, was also the means by which the world was created.

Now having been made worthy by grace through the Holy Spirit,²⁴⁷ he said: “He is the one who created all this²⁴⁸” (Wis 9:1; cf. Eccl 8:9). For he was not himself this [Wisdom], but he was listening and was taught by him “everything [that was] in him” (Jn 1:3). Because the Word, who was himself Wisdom, was crying out through him, and was also revealing to us what the Father desired to give to the prophets. [who] were made by the Word. [He] was [not] left without the evidence of wisdom, but he himself was not Wisdom. [Solomon] was experienced with Wisdom, so he said, “I existed before all the mountains were brought forth.” Now Wisdom was brought forth by the Father before all the mountains, by means of this Wisdom the beauty of his world was arranged. (*In Cant.* 1.3)

Solomon himself became the ideal figure of an earthly king, surrounded by wise counselors, producing wisdom, literature, scientific knowledge of nature by means of the divine Wisdom given him (*In Cant.* 1.10). For Hippolytus, Solomon provides a vision of the world that fuses the physical, the spiritual, and human history into one organic whole. Thus, the “beauty of this world” was arranged by Wisdom, who is Christ. Solomon and his court had been responsible for producing a prodigious legacy of learning (*In Cant.* 1.9, 10); however, light of the immensity of the flowering Greco-Roman learning, the scriptural resources of the church would have appeared paltry. Thus, the question arises of what happened to Solomon’s legacy (*In Cant.* 1.11). The answer is that in Scripture we have the representation of the best that the *Logos* revealed to the greatest King (*In Can.* 1.11-14). Hezekiah and the wise leaders of his court later made a selection of the literary production of Solomon in order to provide material that was fit for the edification of the church (*In Cant.* 1.14, 15). Thus

²⁴⁷Lit. “by the hand of the Holy Spirit.”

²⁴⁸That is, τὰ πάντα=the universe.

the Scriptures themselves distill the most ancient and best of knowledge and science. They support the legitimacy of the church as well and give it a claim on a past far more ancient than Rome.

The *In Cant.* also portrays “hidden transcripts” that express a strongly negative view of the world ruled by the Roman Empire. The world is a “gathering place (synagogue) of darkness” (1.5; 22.2). The words of the *In Cant.* here call to mind the prophetic “light” statements of Matthew 4:15-16 and Luke 2:32. In these passages the image of light is applied to the first appearance of Christ in Galilee. Hippolytus also applies the image to the ascent of Christ to heaven. In Hippolytus, the image encompasses the resurrection as well:

Consider the courses of righteousness, it descended into the underworld and hurried to heaven, for [it] was not retained in the shadows of this earth, but appearing as a light, it ascended to heaven, and flying forth from there also, shining as a great, brilliant star and the appearance of the sun of righteousness (Mal 4:2), on the Father’s throne he is glorified. (*In Cant.* 22.2)

The similarity of this statement to monumental images and coins of the apotheosis of Roman Emperors, which the hearers could have seen on a daily basis²⁴⁹ would not have been missed by the audience.²⁵⁰ The apotheosis of deceased emperors was a

²⁴⁹Images of apotheosis on Roman wall paintings projected imperial ideology. The apotheosis of Hercules was present in Nero’s Domus Transitoria. It also circulated before 79 C.E. in Pompeii in narrative art sequences of the Trojan war, e.g. the House of Octavius Quartio. See the color image of the apotheosis in the Collegium of the Augustales in Herculaneum in Balch, *Roman Domestic Art and Early House Churches*, 203, CD 266a.

²⁵⁰For images of a Gold aureas with an early third century of the *consecratio* (apotheosis) of Septimius Severus, see »http://www.britishmuseum.org/explore/highlights/highlight_image.aspx?image=k146051.jpg&retpage=17343« Accessed on 03-01-2009.

regular feature of Roman celebrations of the transition of power from the one emperor to his successor. With the exception of Commodus, the following emperors from Marcus Aurelius to the time of Alexander Severus were divinized upon their deaths and thus were celebrated by apotheosis:²⁵¹

- Marcus Aurelius
- Pertinax
- Commodus²⁵²
- Septimius Severus
- Geta
- Caracalla
- Severus Alexander

The connection of apotheosis and Easter would not have been lost on Hippolytus #2's readers either. In the final *peroratio* (*In Cant.* 26.1-27.10), Hippolytus provides an elaborate interpretation of the couch of Solomon, as a symbol of the resurrection

²⁵¹John Edwin Sandys and Sidney George Campbell, *Latin Epigraphy an Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions* (2nd ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1927).

²⁵²Commodus' case is complicated. After the death of Marcus Aurelius (180 C.E.), he had himself declared a god in life, ordered many busts of himself as Hercules, re-founded Rome with the name Colonia Commodiana, renamed all twelve months of the year after his titles, and named the army's legions *Commodianae* after himself. Within a year, however, he was murdered and the senate declared him an enemy of the people (i.e. de facto *damnatio memoriae*). Nevertheless, the army loved him and subsequent rulers (like Septimius Severus) had to restore his good name. See M. P. Speidel, "Commodus the God-Emperor and the Army" *JRS* 83 (1993): 109-114.

power of Christ manifested at various points throughout the historical economy of salvation (*In Cant.* 27.3). Beyond resonances with banquet practice, the “couch” and “couches” of *In Cant.* 27 function as a symbol of resurrection. Not only that of Christ, but also the resurrection of all those who trust in him. As Hippolytus, following Irenaeus, says, “For nectar was brought out from the fruit and descended from on high, that terrestrial creatures might be sealed for life which is this: the Word descended that men might be able to ascend to heaven” (*In Cant.* 13.4). The resurrection power of the Son of God previously prefigured in the history of salvation, now is made available to all, “By righteousness the Word became the interpreter of the revealed mystery . . . from Adam until Christ was raised and the mystery of the truth was clearly made known [i.e., was made public in the incarnation of the Word]. So the couch of Solomon revealed him.” It is a couch which brings rest to the weary, resurrection to the dead and healing to the sick. It constitutes a democratization of apotheosis in which the death of Christ, by the resurrection, brings hope of glory to all. As such, the interpretation in *In Cant.* 26-27 would have resonated unmistakably with current practices celebrating apotheosis, the divine honors awarded to dead imperial elites. Herodian explains unique aspects of the Roman customs to his Greek audience when he relates the death of Septimius Severus (211 C.E.):

It is the custom of the Romans to deify those of their emperors who die, leaving successors; and this rite they call ἀποθεῶσις. On this occasion a semblance of mourning, combined with festival and religious observances, is visible throughout the city. The body of the dead they honor after human fashion, with a splendid funeral; and making a waxen image in all respects resembling him, they expose it to view in the vestibule of the palace, on a lofty ivory couch of great size, spread with cloth of gold. The figure is made pallid, like a sick man. During most of the day senators sit round the bed on the left side, clothed in black; and noble women on the right, clothed in plain white garments, like

mourners, wearing no gold or necklaces. These ceremonies continue for seven days; and the physicians severally approach the couch, and looking on the sick man, say that he grows worse and worse. And when they have made believe that he is dead, the noblest of the equestrian and chosen youths of the senatorial orders take up the couch, and bear it along the Via Sacra, and expose it in the old forum. Platforms like steps are built upon each side; on one of which stands a chorus of noble youths, and on the opposite, a chorus of women of high rank, who sing hymns and songs of praise to the deceased, modulated in a solemn and mournful strain. Afterwards they bear the couch through the city to the Campus Martius, in the broadest part of which a square pile is constructed entirely of logs of timber of the largest size, in the shape of a chamber, filled with faggots, and on the outside adorned with hangings interwoven with gold and ivory images and pictures. Upon this, a similar but smaller chamber is built, with open doors and windows, and above it, a third and fourth, still diminishing to the top, so that one might compare it to the light-houses which are called *Phari*. In the second story they place a bed, and collect all sorts of aromatics and incense, and every sort of fragrant fruit or herb or juice; for all cities, and nations, and persons of eminence emulate each other in contributing these last gifts in honor of the emperor. And when a vast heap of aromatics is collected, there is a procession of horsemen and of chariots round the pile, with the drivers clothed in robes of office, and wearing masks made to resemble the most distinguished Roman generals and emperors. When all of this is done, the others set fire to it on every side, which easily catches hold of the faggots and aromatics; and from the highest and smallest story, as from a pinnacle, an eagle is let loose to mount into the sky as the fire ascends, which is believed by the Romans to carry the soul of the emperor from earth to heaven; and from that time he is worshipped with the other gods. (Herodian *Hist.* 4.2)²⁵³

The *In Cant.* 26.1-27.10, while celebrating the power of the resurrection of Christ, also presents a parody of the “vanity of the [customs of the Roman] world” (27.1) contrasting it with the effective power of the Word. On such a reading, then, the “seducer” against whom the sixty patriarchs guard is the devil who leads the (Roman)

²⁵³Herodian, *History of the Roman Empire : From the Death of Marcus Aurelius to the Accession of Gordian III* [first on-line edition by Roger Pearse from »<http://www.turtullian.org>«, with notes by Jona Lending](trans. and ed. Edward C. Echols; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961, accessed 11-05-2008), available from »<http://www.livius.org/he-hg/herodian/hre000.html>«.

world astray (27.12). In their life subsumed in darkness, the “Gentiles” (read: peoples of the Roman world) were desolate toward God (26.1), but have become fruitful toward God through the Word. The elites of the Roman Empire are “the proud” (21.2) who reject God’s Word. But Hippolytus holds them up for scorn in the light of Easter. Thus, by the use of parody and indirect critique, the *In Cant.* encourages, or “consoles” its audience in its struggle against the seduction of the ever present imperial theology.

A cursory reading of the commentary will quickly reveal that a central feature of the interpretation of the relationship of the beloved and the lover is the imagination of an alternate reality for the church under the leadership of Christ.²⁵⁴ While this topic will be dealt with more extensively in Chapter Four, a quick summary will be helpful to demonstrate the relationship of the commentary to the Severan rhetoric of empire. The writer characterizes the Song as a “consolation.” It provides relief from the pain of loss, hope to cope with loss, or preparation to endure loss. Christians were subjected to repeated loss and pressure to conform to the multitude of patriotic shows of piety toward civic gods, including the dead emperors and often the living emperors, who were seen as the embodiment of *Logos*, or reason. In this way Rome’s rule was validated as by divinity and the thinking of all fair-minded people. The *Logos* theology of the second and third centuries, despite its headiness, was useful among elites who were coming to faith because it made use of Stoic language traditionally used in imperial theology. It held the promise of a

²⁵⁴The discursive or liturgical creation of an alternative world of religion (gods, power or magic, and symbol) is one of the ways oppressed people negotiate life and create hidden transcripts to speak about and resist oppressive power.

counter-reason, a counter to the pervasive, total power of the imperial majesty. Part of the consolation and excitement of the Song is to discover the Word (the *Logos*) in the Song and to plumb its mysteries as a description of the working out of Christian salvation in the context of history. Salvation would eventually lead to the overthrow of the evil empire and the renewal of human life free from sin and oppression.

Hippolytus reads the erotic Song as a script for the dramatic relationship between church, Israel, and God that brings Christ, the real Emperor, who is near to his beloved people (*In Cant.* 1.5). Christ comes with royal, kingly power (*In Cant.* 11.1), yet the relationship of following Christ's commands is described in terms of the sweetest intimacy (*In Cant.* 1.1-3 *et passim*). The envoys of Christ, the apostles, are not like the envoys of Rome, they reject violence and build the church with peace, not with the sword (*In Cant.* 8.5); their preaching brings about the edification of the world and constructs peace alternate to the *pax Romana* (*In Cant.* 8.7). The suffering of Christ on the cross is, ironically, how the powerful, royal word, the "good news" of Christ, conquers or "goes forth" into the world (*In Cant.* 13.4). Just as Rome's theology and εὐαγγέλιον is universal, so also the gospel has universal reach (*In Cant.* 8.7). In the legitimate succession of her leaders, the apostles remain with the church (*In Cant.* 16.2). The arguments given above concerning the relevance of western, imperial apotheosis traditions serve as a counterpoint to the eastern traditions discussed by Cerrato.

The Commentary on the Song of Songs and the Two Authors Theory

A survey of the literature on the problem of the single or multiple authorship of the Hippolytan corpus reveals that the issue is moot until additional evidence becomes available. It is certainly possible that more than one author is responsible for the Hippolytan corpus; however, it appears that the evidence does not require that more than one author is responsible for *Haer.*, *Chron.*, the commentaries, the *Anitchr.* as well as Pseudo-Justin, *Res.* The differences between these documents are minor and could be attributed to changing ethos of the author, differing levels of completion as well as differing audiences and redactors. Moreover, differing ways various Hippolytan scholars have attempted to work out the order of composition suggests that this issue is at a stand still.²⁵⁵

Still, no theory of provenance for the writings of Hippolytus is possible without some speculation and, thus, the definitive treatment of authorship awaits the discovery of further evidence. The key question is whether the admitted differences between *Haer.* and the *Chronicon* on the one hand and the exegetical writings (*Antichr.*, *Comm. Dan.*, *Noet.*, *In Cant.*, *Ben.*, *Is.*, *Jac.*) on the other are so great that they cannot be reconciled as the product of one author. Brent attempted to prove the negative. The essence of his argument is that the difference in cultural profile between Hippolytus #1 in *Haer.* and *Chron.* and Hippolytus #2 is too great and the works must be by different authors.

²⁵⁵See note # on page #.

Summary

This chapter has examined the perplexing issues relating to the Hippolytus question with specific applications to the provenance of the *In Cant.* The two author theory, accepted by many scholars, remains unproven. The order in which the Hippolytan documents were written remains open to question, and any kind of life of Hippolytus is beyond the reach of historians. Concerning scholarly opinion about Hippolytus, Heine has said: “No general consensus has been achieved on basic questions concerning Hippolytus’ person and works, nor does it appear one is likely.”²⁵⁶ A careful consideration of the *In Cant.*, however, provides some clues that link the author to Rome. For example, as has been seen, the convergence of ILCV 2807, *Haer* 9.12.24, and *In Cant.* 2.18-19, indicates a close relationship with early-third century concerns regarding marriage between the freeborn and freedmen or slaves. The writings of Hippolytus display a pattern of acculturation to the West, though they also preserve eastern traditions both in terms of theology and liturgical practice. The iconographical references of the *In Cant.* are point to both eastern and western traditions. Finally, a rebuttal of Cerrato’s argument in favor of a Montanist milieu was offered which established that the *In Cant.* fits well within a western context.

²⁵⁶Ronald Heine, “Hippolytus, Ps.-Hippolytus and the Early Canons,” in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature* (vol. 1, ed. Frances Young et al.; Cambridge University Press, 2004), 148.

CHAPTER 2 GENRE, RHETORIC AND SOCIAL CONTEXT

The classical statement on “the rhetorical situation” by Bitzer is a helpful heuristic tool for imagining the *In Cant.* as Hippolytus delivered it.¹ Understanding the rhetorical situation of the commentary involves recognizing and delimiting the audience.² Furthermore, it is a recognition of the problem or exigence³ that called forth the particular expression the speaker imagined could be improved somehow by his speech. Finally, it involves an appreciation of relevant context or constraints⁴ that may affect the outcome of the speech. Also important in the rhetorical situation is the choice of genre by the speaker. The choice of genre responds to social expectations and reshapes or conforms to them in the process of delivery. Accordingly, this chapter presents a definition of the genre along with a reconstruction of the audience, exigence, and relevant contextual constraints of the *In Cant.*

¹Lloyd Bitzer, “The Rhetorical Situation.” *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 1-14.

²Ibid., i. e., “those persons who are capable of being influenced by discourse and of being mediators of change.”

³Ibid., “An imperfection marked by urgency; it is a defect, an obstacle, something waiting to be done, a thing which is other than it should be.”

⁴Ibid., “made up of persons, events, objects and relations which are parts of the situation because they have the power to constrain decision and action needed to modify the exigence.”

Speaker and Audience in the In Cant.

Hippolytus shared the assumptions of Greco-Roman culture about proper ways of argumentation, presentation, and persuasion in discourse, or “rhetoric,” thus an appreciation of the use of ancient methods of speech creation, elaboration, and delivery set the stage for a careful reading of the commentary. The adoption of the commentary form shows an appreciation for the value of education, παιδεία, or “training for moral excellence,” especially beyond the grammar school, centered on rhetoric.⁵ For the ancient world the existence of commentaries on a given text shows that text was used in teaching.⁶

Interestingly, it seems to be an almost universal constituent of the rhetoric of commentaries to portray this activity [teaching] as no more than the logical extension to what the author of the source text was doing. The commentator thereby becomes part of a living didactic tradition originating in the source text, and he benefits from the social significance attached to tradition. True culture and erudition was believed to be based on *auctoritas* . . .

The commentator can pursue contemporary interests and ask contemporary, possibly anachronistic questions of the texts he is teaching. His work is anchored in those texts, but there is no closure, no natural limit to creative interpretation.⁷

In effect, a commentary regularly uses the source text as if it were directed in by the author’s own idea of the teaching task. Hippolytus makes use of a

⁵Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 143.

⁶Ineke Sluiter, “Commentaries and the Didactic Tradition,” in *Aporemata: Kritische Studien Zur Philologie: Commentaries—Kommentare* (ed. Glenn Most *Aporemata: Kritische Studien Zur Philologie*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 173.

⁷Sluiter, “Commentaries and the Didactic Tradition,” *Aporemata*, 173.

commonplace in teaching rhetoric, the *τρόπος τῆς διδασκαλίας*. The *In Cant.*, in particular, is a good example of this method. For example, Solomon “composes third [book], in communion with the Holy Spirit, a work in which the Holy Spirit instructed (ἀναγγέλλω = from *κατηχέω*?) many people for praise (=έγκωμιω [?]),” (1.5; cf. 1.14; 13.1; 15.3; 20.1; 23.2; 24.2; 27.9 cp. 2.3 [x2]). Thus, Hippolytus is not merely teaching a lesson in the commentary. Rather, he is building a reputation and solidifying his status as well. At the same time, he characterizes the audience and prescribes roles for his hearers as well in the course of his interpretation.

The commentary functioned as an aide to memory. Teachers often made use of extensive notes in lecturing their students. These “*commentarii*” or “*ὑπομνήματα*”⁸ were also produced by students, who desired to remember instruction offered by their teachers. The teachings of Epictetus, for example, appear to be taken from notes taken down during the philosopher’s lectures. And Quintillian introduced his *Institutio oratoria* with a *caveat emptor* against other versions of his teaching that were circulating in writing: two such works were already in circulation. Since they were not of the quality that he would have liked and had been produced “in a way much as their pen could follow,” he produced his own work.⁹

No reason suggests the situation was any different among Christians.¹⁰ Augustine suggested that teachers prepare well and, if possible, compose notes. Those who compose well are encouraged to take what they compose and commit it to

⁸See page 51.

⁹Quintillian did not often write down his own lessons, but preferred to use loose-leaf “*commentarii*” or notebooks (*Ins. or.* 10.7.30).

¹⁰Van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 33.

memory and only then deliver it.¹¹ The delivery should always be responsive to the listeners and as interactive as possible.

The use of rhetorical analysis of ancient texts that takes into account rhetorical assumptions of ancient writers and audiences is a means of access to a major aspect of the ancient context.¹² Robbins advocates a similar approach,¹³ blending rhetorical criticism with attention to ancient social realities and ideologies, a supplement to more traditional historical criticism used by a number of scholars.¹⁴ The analytical framework of rhetorical criticism ideally derives from works on rhetoric by Greco-Roman authors. Kennedy suggests four recursive phases of analysis:

- 1) *Determine the rhetorical unit.* The unit generally has a minimum a beginning or “proem,” a middle, or “body,” and an end, “epilogue.”
- 2) *Determine the rhetorical situation.* Who are the actors, what are their relationships and relative status, what response does the speaker wish from the audience? What problem is the communication designed to remedy?
- 3) *Determine the issue, the “species” and “stasis.”* The type or species of rhetoric predominant in the communication helps determine the issue:
 - a. Deliberative rhetoric advises a course of action for the future.¹⁵ The issue is determining the advisability of a future course of action.

¹¹Ibid., and Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine* 4.29(63); NPNF 1.2.596.

¹²George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 10, 32-38.

¹³Robbins, *Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse*, 3.

¹⁴David B. Fowler et al., eds., *Fabrics of Discourse: Essays in Honor of Vernon K. Robbins* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2003).

¹⁵Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, 39-72.

- b. Epideictic rhetoric uses praise, blame or invective to strengthen the audience's adherence to some shared value either as an end in itself or as the basis for some policy of action.¹⁶ The issue is either strengthening the experience of adhesion to community and or enhancing the honor of the performer(s).
 - c. Judicial rhetoric pleads a judgment, condemnation, acquittal, or redefinition of an issue concerning a past occurrence.
- 4) *Observe the arrangement of the material.* What are the subdivisions, what are their persuasive effects, and how do they work together to carry out the rhetorical strategy in the given rhetorical situation?

The judicial and deliberative types of speech were the primary focus of ancient rhetorical handbooks.¹⁷ On the other hand, most homilies tend to be epideictic in nature, with the aim of strengthening adhesion to community values through deepening Christian group identity and beliefs. Only when the preacher advocates a particular course of action is it considered deliberative. Homilies may be judicial, but are not properly considered judicial unless the audience has the power to implement a judgment. When a preacher presents arguments against a group or an individual, and the audience has no power to act, then the preacher is practicing invective, the

¹⁶Ibid., 74 Kennedy remarks that epideictic style “tends to amplification and is fond of ornament and tolerant of description and digression.”

¹⁷In the context of classical rhetoric, those who practiced judicial rhetoric sought a determination (through the available means of persuasion) from those considered competent to judge about the guilt or innocence connected with past actions in order to apply community standards to such actions. Those practicing deliberative rhetoric (such as politicians) sought secure support for or consideration of courses of action in the future. Those practicing epideictic rhetoric sought to affirm community values in various contexts including ritual ones.

negative form of epideictic.¹⁸

The relationship between Christian oratory and classical rhetoric is ambivalent. Christian orators both denounced and used elements of classical rhetoric.¹⁹ Scholars have sometimes remarked that Hippolytus is untouched by rhetorical art. This impression may reflect the state of various stages of completion in different compositions by Hippolytus. The *Noet.* appears to be more carefully elaborated and corrected.²⁰ And, while it is clear that Christian rhetoric, especially the sermon or homily, was “a phenomenon which made its way gradually into ancient culture from its fringes,”²¹ these forms participated in the popular rhetorical culture of the time. Classical sources represent, for the most part, the elite and are not “popular” rhetoric. Christians, however, preserved many examples of sermons that exhibit a broad range of ability and conformity to more formal types of rhetoric, as described in the handbooks and parallel examples of the rhetorical art of the elite. Some are more or less finished products and they come from a broad range of circumstances. Accordingly, Cunningham and Allen discuss topics emerging from a recent collection of studies in early Christian homilies:

- 1) *What stage of preparation or performance does the text represent?* Stages range from preparation, helps for oral delivery, to editing and redaction, purely textual

¹⁸Ibid., 74. In the *In Cant.* Hippolytus #2 weaves invective in and out of his presentation in his treatment of heretics and Jews.

¹⁹van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 76.

²⁰For this reason Butterworth, *Contra Noetum*, was able to present a cogent argument for *Noet.*’s rhetorical art.

²¹Folker Siegert, “Rhetoric in Practice: Homily and Panegyric Sermon,” in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B. C. -A. D. 400* (ed. Stanley Porter; Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997), 421.

- transmission? Translation occurs at any stage along the way.
- 2) *In what sort of context should the text be understood?* What is the identity of the speaker, the composition of the audience, the type of location, and the liturgical circumstances?
 - 3) *How may the text be classified?* What is the genre, style, and what are its means of persuasion?
 - 4) *What are the contents of the homily?* What is the biblical or traditional subject matter and the means of interpretation?²²

Of these aspects #4 will be discussed in Chapter Four, the current Chapter is focused on #3, while #2 is divided between Chapter One and the present Chapter.

Kennedy's classical rhetorical analysis does not consider aspect #1. The text of the *In Cant.* does not appear to be a polished product, but is rather a series of notes, with a full introduction. The exposition of the text covers most of the text of Song 1:1-3:7, but omits any special treatment of verses 2:4-7; 2:11-13, 16-17; 3:2, 5. Along with the introduction the three perorations (see below page 172 ff.) use the figure of anaphora to amplify aspects in the text that are particularly important for the speaker/author. The rest of the "commentary" represents various stages of completion. Whether Hippolytus planned to cover all the Song is unlikely; his commentaries all deal with portions of texts rather than systematically working through entire books. The *In Cant.* may be compared with the *GPhil*, which, as van Os has argued, was a series of notes designed for baptismal instruction among

²²Mary B. Cunningham and Pauline Allen, *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics* (New History of the Sermon 1; Leiden Boston: Brill, 1998), 1-20.

Valentinians.²³ *In Cant.* is a closer reading of a continuous biblical text than any of the textual comments based on biblical texts discussed in the *GPhil*. However, it is not as well elaborated as Hippolytus #2's *Comm. Dan.* which does not seem to be as tied to "the preoccupations of preaching."²⁴

The Household Context of Baptism and Anointing

Passover baptism and post-baptismal anointing are commonly understood as features of western Christianity.²⁵ As suggested implicitly by *In Cant.* 2.7-9 and explicitly in the *Commentary on Daniel* (= *Comm. Dan.*) 1.16, Hippolytus #2 preferred Passover baptism in conjunction with a post-baptismal anointing.²⁶ The household context of these rites provides the stage for the meaningfulness of these rites, for early liturgy is also earthed in a context. As will be seen in this section, Hippolytus' biblical interpretation in a house-church setting bears the imprint of that setting. In *Comm. Dan.* it is imagined as taking place in a *παράδεισος*, "enclosure" or "garden." The symbolism of time, place, and celebratory elements of the rites of initiation are crucial and the nuptial interpretation of baptism, unmistakable. The language also suggests connections to Eden and the Jordan River.²⁷

²³Van Os, "Baptism in the Bridal Chamber," 80-1.

²⁴Pelletier, *Lectures du Cantique des Cantiques*, 216.

²⁵Bradshaw, "'Diem Baptismo Sollemniorem,'" in *Eulogêma*, 41-51; Serra, "Syrian Prebaptismal Anointing and Western Postbaptismal Chrismation," 328-341.

²⁶Note the purification of "the waters" of baptism at *In Cant.* 2.7, 8 mentioned with a post-baptismal anointing.

²⁷Similar evocations of the holy waters of the Nile dominate the garden peristyles of devotees of Isis in Pompeii and Herculaneum, see Balch, *Roman Domestic Art and Early House Churches*, 29-34.

What more “appropriate day” than the day of the Passover? In which the bath is prepared in a garden for those destined to the flames and the church is washed as was Susanna and presented as a pure bride to God. And Faith and Love are as the two slave-maids who prepare [for the celebration] oil and unguents for those who are being washed.²⁸ (*Comm. Dan.* 1.16)

The references to garden bathing, slaves, and unguents helps to locate Hippolytus as a member of the class of men and women who lived or moved comfortably in a wealthy peristyle home in a home that imitated the styles of the wealthy.²⁹ He imagines such a context as the regular location for Christian baptism. This does not mean that he was of upper class, since similar type houses in Pompeii and Herculaneum have been shown to be the property of wealthy freedmen.³⁰

In terms of physical reality, the text refers to a pool for outdoor bathing or recreation. Some houses had deep swimming pools, others fish ponds also deep enough for immersion, and typically located in a garden, that is, in a peristyle within a house or a villa.³¹ Wallace-Hadrill describes a *domus* and *insula* neighborhood

²⁸Ποίαν «εὔθετον <ἡμέραν>» ἀλλ' ἢ τὴν τοῦ πάσχα; ἐν ἣ τὸ λουτρὸν ἐν παραδείσῳ τοῖς καυσομένοις ἐτοιμάζεται καὶ <ἡ ἐκκλησία ὡς> Σωσάννα ἀπολουομένη καθαρὰ νύμφη θεῷ παρίσταται; <καὶ> ὡς <αἱ δύο παιδίσκαι αὐτῆ παρακολουθοῦσαι> πίστις καὶ ἀγάπη, <αἱ παρακολουθοῦσαι> τὸ ἔλαιον καὶ τὰ σμήγματα τοῖς λουομένοις ἐτοιμάζουσιν. Text from *Hippolyte. Commentaire sur Daniel* (ed. Maurice Lefèvre et al., SChr 14; Paris: Cerf, 1947).

²⁹Balch, *Roman Domestic Art and Early House Churches*, 44-47.

³⁰Ibid., 46.

³¹See page 180 below. Decorative and symbolic functions of murals with lush garden scenes painted on walls, even on the walls of peristyle gardens is discussed in Roger Ling, *Roman Painting* (New York: CUP, 1991), 149-153. Walls painted with shrubs and orchards gave the illusion that space and vegetation were more expansive than reality. Paintings such as the were also suggestive of a mysterious world of divine myth, and allegory beyond the walls. See Gilles Sauron, *La peinture allégorique à Pompéi: Le regard de Cicéron* (Editions A&J Picard, 2007). Christians who met in homes that were not so well appointed to have a pool deep enough for immersions of

complex in which the peristyle garden of the *domus* abuts a public bath and both poor and wealthy lived in community.³² The more private corollary, a decorated indoor baptistery as at Dura-Europos is surrounded by painted garden scenery.³³

From early in the second century, at least in the West, baptisms were celebrated along with eucharistic meals.³⁴ As in all Christian churches, the context for these activities was the house-church. Thus the *In Cant.* provides a rare window into a particular Christian interpretation of initiatory banqueting practices and their regulation.³⁵ Such practices shared many specific features with those of non-Christian

initiates could have made use of the public baths (θήραμα), which also had pools, see Ann O. Koloski-Ostrow, “The City Baths in Pompeii and Herculaneum,” in *The World of Pompeii* (ed. Pedar W. Foss and John J. Dobbins; New York: Routledge Press, 2007), 224-256.

³²Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, “*Domus* and *Insulae* in Rome: Families and Households” in *Early Christian Families in Context: an Interdisciplinary Dialogue* (David L. Balch and Carolyn Osiek; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 3-18.

³³In this *domus ecclesiae*, the baptistry is decorated with images, many of which also are found in the *In Cant.*: Adam and Eve, the Good Shepherd, images of healing. Another Durene image found in other works of Hippolytus is David and Goliath. Neither the Ten Virgins (often understood, however, as the Women at the Tomb), the healing of the paralytic, nor Peter walking on water (images on the baptistry wall) are mentioned in the *In Cant.* The baptismal nuptial theme is clearly represented and may indicate Valentinian influence at Dura-Europa, see Serra, “The Baptistery At Dura-Europos,” 67-78. On Valentinianism and gnostics in Mesopotamia, see Kraeling, *The Christian Building*, 119-126.

³⁴Tertullian, *Cor.* 3; Justin *Apol.* 1.65-67; [pseudo-Hippolytus], *Apostolic Tradition* (=Trad. ap.) 21-26. See Alistair Stewart-Sykes, ed., *On the Apostolic Tradition* (PPS; St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2002), 110-47.

³⁵See White, “Regulating Fellowship in the Communal Meal,” 180-1. On the Greco-Roman background of Christian banqueting practice, Katherine Dunbabin, *The Roman Banquet: Images of Conviviality* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); also the work of New Testament scholars Dennis Edwin Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist: the Banquet in the Early Christian World* (Minneapolis:

associations and with the Greco-Roman institution of the celebratory meal in general. The festive, household-centered³⁶ occasion of the context³⁷ envisioned by Hippolytus for baptism fits the *In Cant.* well,³⁸ with both baptism and anointing brought into the orbit of the Roman banquet as rituals appropriate for celebrating the joining of initiates to the community.³⁹

Elite Romans were accustomed to going to a bath (*terme*) before the evening convivium and Christian baptism easily fits this pattern, though the significance of

Fortress Press, 2003), 1-72, and Matthias Klinghardt, *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft: Soziologie und Liturgie frühchristlicher Mahlfeiern* (TANZ 13; Tübingen Basel: Francke Verlag, 1996).

³⁶On water in a Roman city, see Balch, *Roman Domestic Art and Early House Churches*, 213.

³⁷Passover baptism of catechumens appears to have been preferred by sectors of the western church in the second century. According to Bradshaw, “‘Diem Baptismo Sollemniorem’,” in *Eulogēma*, 41-51, the preference for Passover baptism was limited largely to Rome and North Africa for a brief period of about fifty years. See also Raniero Cantalamessa, *L’omelia In S. Pascha dello pseudo-Ippolito di Roma* (Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 1967), 285-7.

³⁸That *In Cant.* represent a “baptismal liturgy in an Easter vigil service” is assumed without further reflection Cerrato who argues for an eastern provenance for the commentary corpus: Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 142; 197, who advances the theories developed by Pierre Nautin, *Hippolyte et Josipe. Contribution a l’histoire de la litterature chretienne du troisieme siecle* (Paris: Cerf, 1947); Vincenzo Loi, “La Problematica Storico-Letteraria su Ippolito di Roma,” *Ricerche su Ippolito* (SEA 13; Rome, 1977); Manlio Simonetti, “Aggiornamento su Ippolito,” *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito* (SEA 30; Rome, 1989): 75-130.

³⁹Marcel Metzger, *History of the Liturgy: The Major Stages* (Liturgical Press, 1997), 53, remarks concerning anointing, “We probably have here the effect of the customs of antiquity, where baths were ordinarily followed by massages of with oil. If this is so, the baptismal anointings would have to be seen as the Christianization of cultural customs (inculturation). Christians transformed these commonplace customs into expressive gestures visually showing the effects of the baptismal mystery.”

Christian baptism goes far beyond the common cultural pattern and transforms it into a rite of initiation to a community. One may speculate that non-elite Romans would not often be invited to the *convivia* of the elite and that the Christian practice represents a democratization of this pattern.⁴⁰ What is true in regard to domestic decoration is also true in regard to domestic rituals,

This phenomenon is not simply one of mimicry (“aping one’s betters”); the sheer insecurity of the freedman or the *novus homo* in the social structure drove him to affirm and legitimate his social standing by drawing on the cultural language of the dominant class.⁴¹ Though the initiation into Christianity may have had real social disadvantages, it also had corresponding advantages.

In Cant. may be seen as a Christian example of the *θεολογία*, or sermon, similar to analogous speeches delivered during the celebratory symposia of certain Greco-Roman religious associations.⁴² However, an even closer parallel to Hippolytus’ commentary in the *In Cant.* is found in Philo’s description of the banquets of the *Therapeutae*.⁴³ Philo does not describe initiation rites. Rather he

⁴⁰Balch, private communication, 11-19-2008.

⁴¹Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 14.

⁴²For the notion of a *θεολογία* or sermon in a religious banqueting association, see Franciszek Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1969), 95-100, no. 51; Benjamin D. Meritt, “Greek Inscriptions,” *Hesperia* 11.3 (1942): 283-7, no. 50. Part of the second-century ritual elaboration of the yearly springtime *Anthesteria* of the Iobakchoi (worshippers of Bacchus) was a “sermon” that Neikomachus “began to make during his priesthood in order to distinguish himself.”

⁴³The literature on Philo’s *Therapeutae* is considerable. Unresolved is the issue of the group’s relation to the Essenes. Joan E. Taylor and Philip R. Davies, “The So-Called Therapeutaie of *De Vita Contemplativa*: Identity and Character,” *HTR* 91.1 (1992): 24, argue that the group of *Vit. cont.* came from educated, hellenized, elite Jewish circles in Alexandria and were a tiny and distinctive philosophical group, most likely unrelated to the sect of Essenes in Judaea. Other scholars link the two groups.

describes a idealized way of life practiced among a group of Jewish monks and nuns. One of their practices was to regularly observe a philosophical banquet complete with sermon on sacred texts using an allegorical method. The meal exhibits the harmony and unity of the *Therapeutae* with one another and with God. The lives of those who pursue union with the divine are viewed as a corollary to a sacrificial meal (*Vita. cont.* 81-82). The sermon leads finally to the platonic union of male and female in dance and song in a climactic union of the community with God (*Vita. cont.* 83-90).

The sermon delivered in the context of the philosophical symposium of the *Therapeutae* gives way to an ascetic meal with “sacred food” (*Vit. cont.* 81), The meal and symposium are themselves held in a “refractory” or συμπόσιον (*Vit. cont.* 83).⁴⁴ Philo’s banquet represents a special occasion, a recurring gathering taking place

See Marcel Simon, *Jewish Sects at the Time of Jesus* (1960. J. H. Farley, trans.; reprinted Philadelphia- Fortress, 1967) 120-30. Geza Vermes and Martin Goodman, eds, *The Essenes according to the Classical Sources* (Sheffield. JSOT, 1989) 76; and Roland Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus Quellenstudien zu den Essenertexten un Werk des judischen Historographen* (Kampen Kok Pharos, 1993): 41-47 For a survey of those who link the *Therapeutae* with the Essenes, see Jean Ri-
 aud “Les Thérapeutes d’Alexandrie dans la tradition et dans la recherche critique jusqu’aux découvertes de Qumran,” *ANRW* 2 20 2 (1987) 1189-1295, esp. 1241-64. Troels Engberg-Pedersen, “Philo’s *De Vita Contemplativa* as a Philosopher’s Dream,” *JSJ* 30 (1999): 40-64, revives the old proposal that the group is purely an ideal, constructed by Philo for the purposes of his ongoing debate with the Greco-Roman philosophers, or otherwise fictive (Richaud, *op. cit.*, 1202-10). For an excellent argument for the historicity of the group on the basis of what is missing and included in Philo’s rhetoric, see David M Hay, “Things Philo Said and Did Not Say about the *Therapeutae*,” *SBL 1992 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta Scholars Press, 1992) 673-83. Peter Richardson, *Building Jewish in the Roman East* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2004), 151-164, presents convincing arguments that ruins in Kelia near Lake Meraotis was the site of the community of *Therapeutae* described in Philo’s *Vit. cont.*

⁴⁴Philo apparently used the word συμπόσιον both for the dining/drinking hall of the

after a period the members of the community had spent seven weeks mostly in solitude. Philo notes that “love” (ἔρωσ) is typical of discourse at both philosophical and common banquets. A central theme of Philo’s description of the *Therapeutae* is the unity of the group who pursue heavenly love by which they are carried away [ὑπ’ ἔρωτος ἀρπασθέντες οὐρανό] (*Vit. cont.* 13).⁴⁵ They drink in as if it were wine what is beloved of God [σπάσαντες τοῦ θεοφιλοῦς] (*Vit. cont.* 85). The goodness of their practice procures for them love (φιλίαν) from God in return as their reward (*Vit. cont.* 90). The sermon given by the president, προεδρῶς, (*Vit. cont.* 79) of the banquet concerns contemplative truths and the practice of virtues for the good of the community extracted from a sacred text. The message of the sermon supports the Philo’s overall theme of love for God in the *Vit. cont.* Philo describes the method of discourse used in the sermon in the following manner:

And these explanations of the sacred Scriptures are delivered by mystic expressions in allegories, for the whole of the law appears to these men to resemble a living animal, and its express commandments seem to be the body, and the invisible meaning concealed under and lying beneath the plain words resembles the soul, in which the rational soul begins most excellently to contemplate what belongs to itself, as in a mirror, beholding in these very words the exceeding beauty of the sentiments, and unfolding and explaining the symbols, and bringing the secret meaning naked to the light to all who are able by the light of a slight intimation to perceive what is unseen by what is visible.⁴⁶

Philo gives two different descriptions of the *Therapeutae*’s banquets

community (*Vit. cont.* 71?, 83) and the after-meal dessert and entertainment at a banquet (40, 41, 44, 48, 57, 58, 64). See Peter Richardson, *Building Jewish in the Roman East* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2004), 160.

⁴⁵Translation from C. D. Yonge, *The Works of Philo Judaeus: the Contemporary of Josephus* (vol. 4; Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, 2006), 18.

⁴⁶*Ibid.*

(symposia or convivium *Vit. cont.* 28ff. and 64ff.). In the latter description an elder makes a discourse, discusses questions arising in holy Scripture (*Vit. cont.* 75), gives an exposition of Scripture (*Vit. cont.* 77), an allegory, in which the words of Scripture are mirrors (*Vit. cont.* 77-78). Here is a symposium where themes of discussion come from a text, holy Scripture, as in Hippolytus. Philo does not use the Song of Songs, but in *Vit. cont.* he narrates about a discourse on males and females becoming in as they dance and sing in antiphonal choruses. This description is quite unusual in either a Jewish or Christian worship of God. As will be made abundantly clear, the *In Cant.* shares with the *Vit. cont.* the theme of love (ἔρωσ and φιλία), oral commentary on mystic expressions in sacred texts, the banquet context involving holy food, and the ideal union of male and female in Christ as well as the presentation of representatives of the human community as a sacrifice.

Both Hippolytus and Philo also compare their symbolic interpretation of holy Scripture as looking into a mirror (cf. *In Cant.* 4.4-5).⁴⁷ Thus for Philo and Hippolytus, and in the New Testament the apostle Paul, interpreting oral and/or written sacred stories is compared to seeing in a mirror. The interpretation of sacred texts (oral or written) takes place in conjunction with a meal. The topic of discussion concerns love, especially love for God, and unity in the groups represented. These points of contact lead to the twin conclusions that the commentary fits well as a symposium speech or the notes from which such a speech could be extemporized, and that Paul, Philo, and Hippolytus share in common cultural patterns from which they

⁴⁷He is interpreting 2 Cor 3:18, but Paul uses a similar figure of the interpretive process involving *prophecies* in 1 Cor 13:12. My thanks to David Balch for pointing this striking parallel out to me.

draw the elements of their feasts. It is also quite possible that Philo's account in *Vit. cont.* has directly influenced Hippolytus.⁴⁸

So, the *In Cant.* is "earthed in the context" of the house-church. It also is very likely to have a strong connection to a banquet context. But what is the likelihood that a specific link can be made to celebrations in the context of Passover? It has already been seen that Hippolytus has a preference for Passover baptisms. A clue to this particular use of the commentary is given in the Armenian fragments *In Cant.* 25.10:

Now, since these things happened, O beloved, behold, he makes peace, causing the synagogue of the Jews to cease and glorifies the mystery of the resurrection. We are those who worship every day in so far as we are making very glorious the holy festival, rejoicing with the angels.

These lines are missing from both the Georgian and the Paleo-Slavonic texts of the commentary. So they may be safely considered a scribal addition or an adaptation of the commentary. Nevertheless, the lines point the reception of the commentary, used during the "holy festival," most likely Easter. The commentary itself contains a call to receive post-baptismal chrismation (*In Cant.* 2.6) and emphasizes Passover gospel events of the death (*In Cant.* 13.1-4) and resurrection (*In Cant.* 24-25) of Christ. Finally, the *In Cant.* seems particularly appropriate as a springtime text, which, again points either to Easter (or Pentecost), as appropriate times for baptismal and mystagogical instruction.

The frequent celebration of household meals was an important feature of

⁴⁸For the use of *Vit. cont.* by patristic authors of both the East and West including Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Cyprian, see Fred C. Conybear, ed. *Philo about the Contemplative Life: or the Fourth Book of the Treatise Concerning Virtues* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895), 318, 202, 349, 212, 256, etc.

early Christianity. Among other functions, the meal setting represented a crucial context for interchange between wealthy patrons and clients who were less well-off. Tensions were bound to arise between church members who were not formally recognized in official roles as leaders of the church and yet were needed by the leaders to make significant material contributions for the benefit of the community. In other words, the leaders were patrons, but not all patrons were recognized as official church leaders. The controversies in the literature, as well as documents like the so-called *Apostolic Tradition*, reflect a social context of transition from networks of loosely-governed, house-church groups often in tension or outright conflict with one another to a more regulated and centralized vision of church life. The agonistic life of the raucous Roman house churches replete with outbursts of strife is consistent with its Greco-Roman context. Such disturbances continued in Rome right through the third and fourth centuries punctuated occasionally by violent clashes.⁴⁹

The Audience in the In Cant.

The text of *In Cant.* itself does not directly specify the type of audience the speaker had in mind; however, the text does give indirect clues. One may assume that the audience was mixed in terms of status, sex, and ethnic background.⁵⁰ The first reason, which will be explored more fully below in connection with the ritual context

⁴⁹A particularly violent example was that between the followers of Pope Damasus and Pope Ursinus in 366 that resulted in the deaths of as many as 200 supporters of Ursinus when the *domus ecclesiae* in which they were sheltered was torched. See Nicola Denzey, *The Bone Gatherers*, 160.

⁵⁰Inscriptional and documentary evidence for this assertion and its implications will be discussed below. See 2.1.4.

of the commentary, is that the likely social context of the commentary was part of the celebration of a Christian Passover banquet. At such an event, people of various status levels could be present at the same time (some as guests and some as servants).⁵¹ The second reason emerges from the examples of men and women chosen from biblical heroes by Hippolytus as examples for his audience. He appears to have selected them to hold up a mirror in the biblical text to reflect the audience.⁵² Hippolytus used both examples of men and women, of slave, freed-slave, and freeborn, of matron-patron status, and of varying occupations as objects of praise and blame in his perorations. For example, the multiple list of men and women who “desired the anointing (*myron*),” (2.9-34) suggests such an audience on the assumption that Hippolytus chose his biblical figures to help his audience identify with his interpretation of the Song.

The figure of the beloved-bride is dynamic. She is described as “dark,” which suggests a sinful past; yet she presents the idyllic figure of a shepherdess who is also a woman of noble birth (5.1; 9.2). The figures of Martha and Mary also suggest freeborn women of matronly status. (25.1-10) Martha becomes the woman who anointed Christ (2.29), contrary to the explicit statement of the Gospel of John 12:1-8.⁵³

⁵¹The culmination of the commentary (*In Cant.* 26-27) describes the *κλίνη* of Christ and the *κλίνας* of the ideal participants at the banquet who include both heroes of the biblical past as well as those who have come to Christ for rest, healing and salvation in the present.

⁵²On the use of sacred scriptural stories as a mirror, see *In Cant.* 4.4-5; *Vit. cont.* 75, cf. 1 Cor 13:12; 2 Cor 3:18. See above, page 125.

⁵³Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 184-200, suggests that the re-writing of this passage in John and the post-resurrection scene gives prominence to Martha is a result of (1) anti-gnostic polemic and (2) veneration of a maternal figure in the oral

The final peroration of heroes (the biblical, human lineage of the *Logos*) who participate in the *κλίση* of Christ include the prophets and the noble men of Christ's lineage. These men, in Hippolytus #2's typological understanding, are symbolized in the Song by the "sixty mighty men" in the retinue of the king. The *Logos* is said to issue from their loins while at the same time they were created by the *Logos*. Men form the core of the list; however, women, slaves and freedmen are included in the litany. The range of status differential would likely have been present in Hippolytus #2's audience (27.2-5), gathered for a Passover banquet. However, only one woman is mentioned as actually reclining on a couch, the "leader's daughter who was twelve years old" (27.4). She appears, possibly, as a representative of a higher class of persons in Hippolytus #2's potential audience. Three women are also included as attendant, though "blessed," figures. One (a widow) prepares a couch (for Elijah) providing matronly support for his ministry as a prophet. Her son rests on a couch. Another is the impoverished woman healed of her issue of blood while Jesus is on the way to heal the ruler's son. She is represented as hurrying to the couch (representing Jesus himself) and grasping the hem of "his garment" (27.2-5). Women preface and conclude the list emphasizing a conscious inclusion of women in the mirror image of community that Hippolytus holds up for his readers in the text. The inclusion of women in the lineage of those who produced the *Logos* attests to the importance of women who exercised matronly functions in the community and provided important financial resource for the leaders. However, their inclusion in an otherwise exclusively male list as adjuncts to the list (except for the virgin Mary) indicates, perhaps an ambivalence in the attitude of Hippolytus toward the matronly figures

tradition known to Hippolytus #2.

with whom he must deal.

The opening of the final peroration seems also to highlight a desire on Hippolytus #2's part to include representative slaves and laborers when he addressed those "exhausted, from many cares, [who] recuperate on a couch, so that the weariness of [their] labor may pass from [them], in the same way we who [have been] converted from the vanity of the world, remove our heavy load of sin, which had been placed on our shoulders. Falling on our knees before Christ, we have found a place of rest like a couch" (27.1). Of the commended examples Hippolytus used the figure of Joseph to represent three different types of individual: a freeborn person, a slave, and a freedman who became a "divine consultant"⁵⁴ in the service of the royal (or the imperial) household.⁵⁵ As a male slave, Joseph is commended for upholding to his hurt the sexual mores of the community. Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob seem to represent free men with pedigree and honor. Abraham and Jacob explicitly represent immigrants. Moses, Aaron, and Phineas (mentioned together) may represent people of priestly class. Joshua, David, and Solomon, mentioned together, may represent ideal types of ruling class individuals. Daniel, Ananias, Azarias, and Misael represent confessors, an important social role ascribed considerable status in the early church.

Evidence analyzed by Lampe suggests that women likely outnumbered men

⁵⁴The practitioners of similar professions are excluded from church membership according to *Trad. ap.* 16.14, but the commendation of Joseph (and commendation of Daniel in the *Comm. Dan.*) suggests that perhaps such rules could have been applied flexibly. Exceptions might be made for "divine counselors" with the right credentials, placement, and relationship to church leaders.

⁵⁵McKechnie, "Christian Grave-Inscriptions," 427-41, gathers inscriptional evidence suggesting that a significant number of imperial slaves in the service of the emperor felt free enough to openly publish their allegiance to Christ during the later Severan period. The figure of Joseph would have appeal to such people.

in the ancient church-school in Rome at the beginning of the third century, yet there is a tendency in the literature to diminish their influence.⁵⁶ Such seems to be the case with the relative lack of female representation in this list. Still, the women in Hippolytus #2's list of the first peroration, though fewer than the men, exhibit similar status differential. Tamar represents the slave class, while Mary the mother of Jesus and Martha represent freeborn women. Hippolytus, in *In Cant.* 2.18 congratulates Tamar, who "desired greatly to take hold of [the anointing], and made herself look like a prostitute toward Judah [to obtain it]." However, the commendation of Tamar is counter-balanced with the commendation of "Blessed Joseph loved this [the anointing of *myron*], and he suffered, by being sold he went down to Egypt. In as much as he did not wish to steal [anything], nor did he give himself to the lady of his house so that he would not be tainted with corruption" (2.19). Judah gives Tamar to his son Er as a wife (Gen 38:6). The language implies that she is of slave class. And, since Judah himself married a Canaanite woman, it is likely that Tamar was also a foreign woman.⁵⁷ The ambiguity of the place of the slave-class woman, who out of "desire for the anointing" makes herself "look like a prostitute" to obtain it is underscored by and placed in deliberate contrast with the commendation of Phineas for the holy murder of Zambri and the prostitute also "out of zeal for [the anointing]" (2.21). A more stark expression of ambivalence is not possible.

The commendation of Tamar points to what must have been the situation of many women in early Christianity forced to endure ambiguous moral situations, who nevertheless were able to take advantage of connections with powerful men. The

⁵⁶Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 48.

⁵⁷Gary H. Oller, "Tamar," *ABD* 5: 315.

author of *Haer.*, for example, honorably mentions Marcia, the concubine of Commodus, who was well-placed to obtain the release of Christians deported to the mines in Sardinia (9.12.10). The *Trad. ap.* 16.15-16 also recognizes the acceptability of the concubine who is faithful to her husband, though *Trad. ap.* rejects both the concubine who is sexually unfaithful to her master and the man who cohabits with a woman without proper marriage.⁵⁸ Apparently, the concubine of a man who wished to be Christian would have been in an extremely tenuous position.

On the other hand Hippolytus #2's commendation of Joseph who "did [not] give himself to the lady of his house" illustrates the importance of the issue of sexual relations (and, by extension, marriage) between freeborn women and household male slaves. This issue was a particular point of contention between Hippolytus #1, author of *Haer.* and the *διαδοχή* of Callistus (*Haer.* 9.12.24), exacerbated by the differential in numbers between women and men of higher status who converted to Christianity. Since women of higher status outnumbered their male counterparts,⁵⁹ in order to marry *Christians*, they would have to resort to men of lower status. Sometimes those lower status men were slaves (as exemplified by Joseph). The author of *Haer.* writes:

⁵⁸Prohibitions against unfaithful concubines and men with concubines do not occur outside *Trad. ap.* or literature derived from it. This passage of *In Cant.* strikes a remarkable harmonic note with *Trad. ap.*, See Bradshaw et. al., *Apostolic Tradition*, 94; Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (Lectures on the History of Religions NS 13; New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 29, 147, 151, 390, 393.

⁵⁹Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 119, gives as corroborating evidence Tertullian's awareness of a similar problem in North Africa (*Ad uxor.* 2.8.3 ff.): "To a Christian believer it is irksome to wed a believer inferior to herself in estate, destined as she will be to have her wealth augmented in the person of a poor husband!" He gives four third century inscriptions in Rome of Christian women of senatorial class who were united to men of lower class.

When women from the noble class (αἱ ἐν ἀξίᾳ), who were unmarried and in the heat of their youthful passion desired to marry, and yet were unwilling to give up their class (ἐαυτῶν ἀξίαν) through a legal marriage (διὰ τοῦ νομίμως γαμηθῆναι), he [Callistus] allowed to choose a partner, whether slave or free (οἰκέτην εἴτε ἐλεύθερον), and to consider the partner to be their husband without a legal marriage. From that time on the alleged believing women began to resort to contraceptive methods and to corset themselves in order to cause abortions, because, on account of their lineage and their enormous wealth (διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν καὶ ὑπέρογκον οὐσίαν), they did not wish to have a child from a slave or from a commoner.⁶⁰ (*Haer.* 9.12.24 trans. YWS)

According to *In Cant.* 2.18-19, a Christian slave woman was sexually available to her master, but a Christian man who was a slave must avoid such relations, as did Joseph in Potiphar's house. This accords well with *Haer.* 9.12.24 and represents exactly the same posture: a Christian male slave was forbidden to “marry” his female mistress. Before this time, no evidence exists for Christian discussion of the status of concubines whether in Christian or in non-Christian homes; however, evidence that male concubinage did in fact occur among other Christian groups (e.g., followers of Callistus) in Rome is attested by *Haer.* and the Christian funeral inscription *ILCV* 2807.⁶¹ The inscription, decorated with a fish and an anchor, is in the

⁶⁰ Οὗ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ ἡσθέντες τοῖς δόγμα<σι> διαμένουσιν ἐμπαίζοντες ἑαυτοῖς τε καὶ πολλοῖς. ὧν τῷ διδασκαλείῳ συρρέουσιν ὄχλοι· διὸ καὶ πληθύνονται, γαυριώμενοι ἐπὶ ὄχλοις <συρρέουσι> διὰ τὰς ἡδονάς, ἃς οὐ συνεχώρησεν ὁ Χριστός. οὗ καταφρονήσαντες οὐδέν<α> ἁμαρτεῖν κωλύουσι, φάσκοντες αὐτὸν ἀφιέναι τοῖς εὐδοκοῦσι. καὶ γὰρ καὶ γυναῖξιν ἐπέτρεψεν, εἰ ἄνανδροι εἶεν καὶ ἡλικία γε [τε] <εἰς ἄνδρα ἐκ>καί<ι>ντο, <αἱ> ἐν ἀξίᾳ, εἰ <τὴν> ἑαυτῶν ἀξίαν [ἦν] μὴ βούλοιντο καθαιρεῖν διὰ τοῦ νομίμως γαμηθῆναι, ἔχει<ν> ἕνα, ὃν ἂν αἰρήσωνται, σύγκοιτον, εἴτε οἰκέτην εἴτε ἐλεύθερον, καὶ τοῦτον κρίνειν ἀντὶ ἀνδρός <τὴν> μὴ νόμῳ γεγαμημένην. ἐνθεν ἤρξα<ν>το ἐπιχειρεῖν <αἱ> πιστὰ λεγόμενα ἀτοκίους φαρμάκοις καὶ <τῷ> περιδεσμεῖσθαι πρὸς τὸ τὰ συλλαμβανόμενα καταβάλλειν, διὰ τὸ μῆτε ἐκ δούλου βούλεσθαι ἔχειν τέκνον, μῆτε ἐξ εὐτελοῦς, διὰ τὴν <αὐτῶν> εὐγένειαν καὶ ὑπέρογκον οὐσίαν. (Marcovich, PST 25 TLG)

⁶¹Ibid., 24, 36, 120, 339; McKechnie, “Christian Grave-Inscriptions,” 430, 437,

Cemetery of Hermes at Rome, and dated 234 C.E. The daughter of the couple was given the name of the mother, which suggests that the husband had formerly been of slave class.⁶²

<i>Ti. Cl. Marcianus et Cornelia Hilaritas Corneliae Paulae par(entes) fecr. quae vix. ann. X. dieb. VIII. dec. X kal. Aug. Max. et Urb. cos. [piscis, ancora] decesit Serotina pride kal. Martias <m>. <X>. dier. XX Δioc<l. ζ> (cons.).⁶³</i>	Titus Claudius Marcianus and Cornelia Hilaritas parents of Corneliae Paulae made (this) for her who lived 10 years 8 days. Died on the 10th calends of August while Maximus and Urbanus were consuls [image of fish and anchor] she died before the bloom [of life]. On the calends of March . . . on the 20th day of the consulship of Diocletian (they set it up).
---	---

The couple would have become parents of Cornelia Paula about two years after the death of Callistus (222 C.E.), since the girl died in 234 C.E. Titus Claudius, as Lampe suggests, could have been a freedman of the imperial Claudian family. He also speculates that Cornelia Hilaritas might have been a member of the Cornelian family, members of which were consuls in 199 C.E. and 216.⁶⁴ The intersection of the

441.

⁶²Ibid, 120, n. 10.

⁶³Ernst Diehl et al., eds., *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres* (Berolini: Apud Weidmannos, 1925); Ernst Diehl et al., *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres Supplement* (Berolini: Apud Weidmannos, 1967). Available on the *Greek Documentary Texts* (CD-ROM #3 Packard Humanities Institute, 1991-2006) 1. *Inscriptions* (Cornell, Ohio State, et al.), *Christian Inscriptions, Late Antique Latin*, Diehl, Iscr. Lat. Chr. Vet. I-II.

⁶⁴Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 120.

evidence of *Haer.*, *ILCV* 2807, and *In Cant.* presents a known social problem in the church-schools of Rome in the early third century from three different optics: ant-heretical, inscriptional, biblical interpretation for new converts. Here is strong evidence for a western provenance of the *In Cant.* and a connection to the *Haer.*

The Virgin Mary (*In Cant.* 2.28), who became the mother of the Word, and Martha, who carried the oil of anointing, or *myron*, to pour over Christ (*In Cant.* 2.29), “with all intercession and consolation,” frame the life of the savior of the world in the *In Cant.* Hippolytus #2 (*In Cant.* 26-27) puts great stress on the passionate pursuit of the risen Christ by Martha and Mary. Along with these key references to women, the very framework of the narrative relationship between the lover (Christ) and the beloved highlights a theme that gives prominence to feminine characters. The prominence of female characters may indicate the presence of important women in the community. Such a community profile fits the so-called “statue of Hippolytus,” which was also a feminine figure. In the list of Hippolytan works on the statue one work is addressed to a woman, Severina, perhaps a well-placed patroness of Hippolytus and his group.

Hippolytus #2 also gives attention to varying status levels that might have been present at the Passover celebration banquet during the reading of his commentary. The price of thirty *denarii* (*In Cant.* 2.31) offered to Judas for betraying Christ is transformed, strangely, into a representation of the accessibility of Christ, “It is found that in the passion he was sold for thirty *denarii*. For he was worth such in truth that for an easy price he was sold and that the poor also easily could attain him. So it was, beloved.” By the third century inflation had, apparently, reduced the value, and thus altered the symbolic meaning of the price for Jesus’ betrayal.

The synagogue is directly addressed in various places in the text. The poverty or relative disadvantage of certain Jews appears to be a topic of the commentary (*In Cant.* 6.2)⁶⁵ It is possible that some of the converts that Hippolytus #2 hoped would be present at the Christian gathering where *In Cant.* was recited would be of Jewish origin and, perhaps, poor.⁶⁶

Rhetorical Features of the Early Christian Instruction of New Converts

Siegert discussed the early Christian homily and panegyric against the background of Hellenistic rhetoric,⁶⁷ concluding that the homily in a church-school, similar to homilies in synagogues, was an informal treatment of sacred texts or doctrine unique in the ancient world. According to Siegert, in the non-Christian world the interpretation of sacred texts was not a subject of public speaking. For this reason the homily form was of no concern to polytheistic teachers of rhetoric. It is true that much of early Christian literature classed as homiletic does not exhibit profound influence from polytheistic schools of rhetoric, and that the exegetical sermons of Christians and Jews may have been “unique”⁶⁸ in the specific literature they treated. Yet Siegert’s statement lacks nuance. Several Christian authors anticipated Gregory

⁶⁵Jewish poverty is especially clear in the *CantPar* 6.2. The Jewish community would have enjoyed varying levels of wealth. The Christian message and patronage could have been attractive to poor Jews (just as the reverse was also the case).

⁶⁶See Stark, *Cities of God*, 138-9.

⁶⁷Folker Siegert, “Rhetoric in Practice: Homily and Panegyric Sermon,” *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric*, 421-44.

⁶⁸This is, however, a uniqueness shared by all other commentators of whatever sort. See the comments on uniqueness in Jonathan Z. Smith, *Drudgery Divine: on the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of late Antiquity* (JLCR 14; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).

of Nyssa's passing from the school room to notoriety in Christian writing.⁶⁹ In the West Tertullian, Minucius Felix, and Cyprian all draw attention from classicists because of the evidence they provide for schooling in rhetoric among Christians.⁷⁰ The reference in the third-century Loginus *On the Sublime*, that used portions of biblical texts as an illustration of the sublime style, indicates a somewhat begrudging recognition of Christian and Jewish rhetorical culture by some in the ancient world. The Hippolytus may have had contacts with the Severan household.⁷¹ The Severans certainly did with Origen (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.21.4; 28.1). Men of letters among polytheists were already taking careful note of Christianity (Lucian, Celsus, Galen). The lack of mention of Christianity by intellectuals of the Severan period does not come from ignorance. Indeed, it has been argued that Diogenes Laertius' polemical

⁶⁹See Michael Winterbottom, "Cyprian's *Ad Donatum*," in *Severan Culture*, 190. These three "provide almost the only light on literary Latin during the Severan period."

⁷⁰See Jonathan Powell, "Unfair to Caecilius? Ciceronian Dialogue Techniques in Minucius Felix," *Severan Culture*, 177-89; Catherine Conybeare, "Tertullian on Flesh, Spirit, and Wives," in *item*, 430-9.

⁷¹See Hans Achelis, *Hippolytstudien* (TU 16.4, NF, 1.4; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897); Marcel Richard, "Quelques Nouveaux Fragment de Pères," in *Opera Minora* (1 Turnhout: Brepols, 1976), 5. The fragment published by Richard is from a letter to the Empress Mamaea referring to the age of the world from creation to the birth of Christ as 5,500 years based on the dimensions of the ark of Noah. The same idea is found in *CommPsalm* cited by Theodoret (PG 83; 85D-88A). This figure corresponds to the math that can be derived from the chronological tables (ἀποδείξις) on the so-called "statue of Hippolytus," which, along with the *Chronicon*, also often attributed to Hippolytus #2. However, the original text of Hippolytus #2 of *Comm. Dan.* 4.24.3-6 appears to revise this figure to 5,502 years. Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 274-79, sees this as evidence that Hippolytus #2 revised the chronology of his predecessor, the author of *Haer.* and the *Chronicon*, as well as altering some dates on the statue with the notation "according to Daniel."

statements about the antiquity of Greek culture “only make sense against a background of Christian apologetic claims that Christians, through the Jews, were the oldest philosophy.”⁷²

Therefore, it may be said that Siegert’s conclusion is not entirely warranted. In adopting the commentary genre, Christians were participating in the general rhetorical movement of the period. The momentous changes created by the proclamation of citizenship for all under Caracalla irrevocably transformed the intellectual and spiritual landscape of the Roman Empire. One of the effects was a perceived need to “gather and define the traditional Greek experience” through the intense literary output of compendia and commentaries on earlier works perceived to be canonical in their various fields.⁷³

The essential Christian quality of the homily seems to have been in its subject matter and its intimate connection between theology and morality, not so much its distinctiveness of form or style. Van Os points to other reasons that might lend a non-standard rhetorical form to the homily. For example, the sense of familiarity between the pastor and the congregation within the context of liturgy, along with the use of traditional sources of authority like Scripture and credal symbol contribute to a sense of uniqueness. In these settings the context often precluded the need for some formal rhetorical features used to establish ethos.⁷⁴ Hippolytus maintains this sense of

⁷²Simon Swain, *Severan Culture*, 26-27; Tim Whitmarsh, “Prose Literature and the Severan Dynasty,” *idem*, 38-39. By the fourth century, rhetoric was becoming more strongly represented in circles of Christian leadership. Augustine’s pursuit of Ambrose because of his rhetorical skill indicates a shift in the center of gravity in rhetorical culture from polytheistic circles to Christian circles.

⁷³Swain, *Severan Culture*, 26.

⁷⁴van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 76.

familiarity, despite the formality of interpreting a text in a meal-time context, by his constant direct address to the hearers and his references to them as “beloved.”

The type of instruction used for teaching candidates for baptism and the recently baptized is a specific type of epideictic rhetoric. It has features of protreptic speech, that is speech designed to call a someone to commitment or conversion. But protreptic in mystagogy and catechesis is used as supporting material for the more pervasive aim of strengthening commitment to Christian values. Initiatory instruction seeks to go beyond protreptic to provide the conditions to support a deeper transformation of identity. Clement of Alexandria, ca. 200 C. E., commented on this type of Christian rhetoric in the *Instructor*. He characterized instruction for the new convert using the terms hortatory (ὁ προτρεπτικός), suggestive (ὁ ὑποθετικός), and consolatory (ὁ παραμυθητικός) forms of discourse. The first is intended to modify and redirect ingrained habits, the second is focused on specific practices, and the third is directed toward healing the affections or passions. Nothing in this characterization is exclusively Christian. Christian pedagogy for initiates was primarily practical and not theoretical and its purpose was to improve or train the soul in the life of virtue, rather than to teach or to comment on an intellectual life *per se*. The description that follows in the *Instructor* (1.2.2), characterizing parenetic, or counseling, discourse that heals through the condemnation of bad examples and the commendation of the good certainly would have been recognizable to anyone versed in ancient rhetoric as one form of the epideictic species of rhetoric. Clement considered that the healing of the soul through such instruction could potentially lead to more speculative knowledge, but the primary need of the new convert or the sick at heart was healing and not knowledge, “The Word first exhorts, then trains, and finally teaches” (*Paed.*

1.3.3).

The redirecting, healing function is perhaps one of the reasons Hippolytus has abundant references to well known pagan mythical images.⁷⁵ Such images were in the homes of his new converts. The option of repainting homes with Christian images was not practicable. Part of the power of the *In Cant.* is to use the occasion of the teaching afforded by the Song to reprogram the converts responses to their world of myth, which was painted on their walls!

This healing of passions, described by Clement as psychagogy or therapy, was a major element of Hellenistic philosophy as it was popularly practiced. As Nussbaum shows:

The Hellenistic philosophical schools in Greece and Rome—Epicureans, Sceptics, and Stoics—all conceived of philosophy as a way of addressing the most painful problems of human life. They saw the philosopher as a compassionate physician whose arts could heal many pervasive types of human suffering. They practiced philosophy not as a detached intellectual technique dedicated to the display of cleverness but as an immersed and wholly worldly art of grappling with human misery. They focused their attention, in consequence, on issues of daily and urgent human significance—the fear of death, love, sexuality, anger and aggression.⁷⁶

Christian initiation also focused on worldly, daily issues but blended these common themes with other-worldly, apocalyptic themes and with absolute trust in the God of Jesus Christ, Scriptures,⁷⁷ and God's earthly representatives, who included approved

⁷⁵See above, pages #-#.

⁷⁶Martha C. Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics* (MCL, NS 2 Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 3.

⁷⁷See *Trad. ap.* 41.4, on days “when there is no instruction and each one is in his own house, he should take a holy book and read in it as much as seems profitable.” The reading of holy books, as a substitute for the Christian gathering, would require the existence of libraries in the *domus ecclesiae*. The many other references to in-

teachers and other community patrons. It is this particular substructure of authority that sets the rhetoric of Christian initiation apart from similar non-Christian rhetoric, not necessarily the mode of argumentation or presentation.⁷⁸ The characterization of at least some of the Roman house-churches as schools for the learning of virtue is confirmed by Galen's testimony.⁷⁹ The picture of church-school life in *Trad. ap.* 35.39.41 with frequent references to instruction, including that of catechumens,⁸⁰ accords with the comments of Galen.⁸¹

The In Cant. as a Banquet Speech

What evidence supports the notion that the *In Cant.* was originally a Paschal homily, as argued by Chappuzeau and accepted by Cerrato against Bonwetsch⁸²? One Armenian fragment contains an allusion to the celebration of the feast of Easter as the

struction (both daily and weekly occasions points to a scholastic orientation in the house churches described in the *Trad. ap.* such as the orientation of the church of the *In Cant.*

⁷⁸Contra van Os, "Baptism in the Bridal Chamber," 76-80, and others, who see a distinct mode of rhetoric among Christians. I would argue Christian distinctiveness in rhetoric is more difficult to prove than to assert.

⁷⁹See Richard Walzer, *Galen on Jews and Christians* (London: Oxford University Press, 1949), 57, 65, who provides the text of pertinent extracts from Galen plus a very thorough commentary on their social and philosophical setting.

⁸⁰van Os, "Baptism in the Bridal Chamber", 178.

⁸¹Origen's own function in Alexandria as teacher in a "catechetical school" exemplifies a house-church oriented in a similar way towards daily instruction of catechumens. He was also later made presbyter and teacher by the bishop of Caesarea in another church who wanted Origen to fulfill a similar position there. See Stewart-Sykes, *Apostolic Tradition*, 162.

⁸²Bonwetsch, "Kommentar zum Hohenlied," 90, considers this suggestion by Zahn unconfirmed.

context of the commentary: “We are those who worship every day even as we gloriously keep the holy festival, rejoicing with the angels” (25.10). The reference to a “holy feast” and “rejoicing with the angels” likely refers to Paschal celebration. Cerrato affirmed Chappuzeau’s suggestion, and made use of some of the commentary’s Pascal themes in his treatment of the eastern sources of the commentary; nevertheless, he ignored the importance of ritual function as a consideration of provenance.⁸³ Still, as Bonwetsch pointed out, direct evidence is slim for an original Easter context for the commentary.

Some indirect lines of evidence may be developed to support Chappuzeau’s suggestion. First, the emphasis in the commentary on the events surrounding the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ (*In Cant.* 25-27) suggest, *prima facie*, a connection to the Passover.⁸⁴

Second, a later tradition in both Ambrose⁸⁵ and Cyril of Jerusalem linking springtime baptismal catechism and mystagogy to the Song of Songs recalls⁸⁶ the *In Cant.* Cyril of Jerusalem, for example, in *Catecheses* 14.10, quoting Song of Songs

⁸³Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 140-4, 172-200.

⁸⁴The resolution of the Quartodeciman controversy in the late second century tended to paschalize the regular Sunday celebration in a way that was not necessarily part of its previous regular function. See Alistair Stewart-Sykes, “Mimesis and Typology and the Institution Narrative: Some Observations on *Traditio Apostolica* 4 and its Afterlife,” in *Wilderness: Essays in Honour of Frances Young* (ed. Frances M. Young, and R. S. Sugirtharajah; JSNTsup 295; London; New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2005), 106-19.

⁸⁵For Ambrose, see Pietro Meloni, “L’influsso del *Commento al Cantico* di Ippolito sull’*Expositio Psalmi CXVIII* di Ambrogio,” in *Letterature Comparete, Problemi E Metodo: Studi in Onore Di Ettore Paratore* (Bologna: Pàtron, 1981), 864-6.

⁸⁶Jean Daniélou, *The Bible and the Liturgy* (Notre Dame, Ind: University of Notre Dame Press, 1956), 192.

says: “‘The winter is past . . .’, it is already spring. And this is the season, the first month with the Hebrews, in which occurs the festival of the Passover. . .” The roots of this tradition may lie in a common past with Judaism,⁸⁷ but more likely in the common third-century Christian tradition attested in Tertullian, Hippolytus, and *GPhil* in which baptismal catechesis, imagery from the Song of Songs and Passover are linked.

Third, the content of the commentary strongly suggests that it originally functioned as part of the teaching surrounding baptism. Hippolytus elsewhere states that Passover is the preferred season for baptism (*Comm. Dan.*16). Tertullian also directly states that Passover was the best time for baptism (Tertullian, *Bapt.* 19), and he (as well as Clement of Alexandria) makes use of bride and groom symbolism to describe baptism.⁸⁸ *GPhil* 7; 109, a liturgy of baptism for Valentinians that characterizes mainstream Christians as the “Hebrews,”⁸⁹ associates its baptismal ritual of initiation with the transition from winter to summer, the crucifixion, the cross, and the (Passover) lamb. Such metaphors are, as van Os says, “remarkable for a Gnostic Christian writing,”⁹⁰ because of their ties to the “apostolic” church-school.

⁸⁷Ibid. Unfortunately, no direct evidence of the use of the Song during Passover is available for this period. The Wisdom of Solomon, however, was apparently a Passover meditation arising from a period of intense social pressure against the Jewish community in Alexandria. One could reason that the Wisdom of Solomon would have been a fitting substitute for the Song of Songs as a reflection centering on the Passover festival in a dark time in which the Song of Solomon would not have seemed appropriate. See note 100 on page 148.

⁸⁸Daniélou, *Bible and the Liturgy*, 191-2; Pelletier, *Lectures du Cantique des Cantiques*, 152-60.

⁸⁹van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 126-9, 157.

⁹⁰Ibid., 129.

Some have argued that these traditions may depend upon earlier Jewish traditions of reading the Megillah of the Song of Songs during the Passover festival.⁹¹ Hippolytus' and Tertullian's preference for Passover season for baptism as well as the linkage of baptism to the bride and groom imagery of Song of Songs, suggests a possible previous Jewish link between proselyte baptism, the reading of the Song of Songs Megillah, and Passover. The comments of Heracleon and *GPhil* on the linkage between the Song and nuptial baptism, and those in Origen from the scholia on Song of Songs 3:6 further confirms that an early patristic linkage between the Song of Songs and Passover may depend upon Jewish tradition.⁹²

⁹¹For the suggestion of Jewish origin of the Passover-Song of Song connection, see Daniélou, *Bible and the Liturgy*, 191-2.

⁹²Origen, *Scholia in Canticum canticorum* (PG 17:280.16), ἡβουλήθη τοίνυν ἡ νύμφη καταβάσα εἰς τὸν κήπον τῆς καρύας, τουτέστιν ἐκπεσοῦσα τὰ παραδείσου πρὸς τὴν ἐπίμοχθον ταύτην ζωὴν, ἰδεῖν παράδοξόν τι γέννημα τοῦ χειμῶνος ῥέοντος μαύρου ποταμοῦ· ἢ, κατὰ Σύμμαχον, κατέβη μαθεῖν εἰ ἡ φάρυγξ τοῦ βίου ὀπώρας ἔχει· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰδεῖν εἰ ἦνθησεν ἡ ἄμπελος, διαφεύγουσα τὸν χειμῶνα· καὶ τὸ ἔαρ φθάσασα, τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ Πάσχα καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀζύμων ἑορτῆς· τότε γὰρ φιλεῖ ἀνθεῖν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἡ ἄμπελος· καὶ εἰ ἦνθησαν αἱ ῥόαι, ὧν ὁ καρπὸς πολὺς, καὶ τάξει περιειλημμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ λέπους· ᾧ ὁμοίωται τὸ μῆλον τῆς νύμφης· ἐκεῖ δὲ, φησὶ, δώσω σοι τοὺς μαστοὺς μου, τουτέστι τὸ ἡγεμονικόν·

For the bride wished to descend into the garden of nut trees, that is, once she fell in respect to the things of paradise to the toilsomeness with respect to this life, she went down to see a certain paradoxical product of the winter which flows with a dark river or, as a companion in battle, she went down not just to learn if the breath/throat of life has a temperate time but also to see if the vineyard had bloomed, fleeing the winter and arriving at spring, the time of the Passover and of the feast of unleavened bread then for in Judea the vine loves to bloom and when the pomegranate blooms, which bears abundant fruit there and it is surrounded by a husk that makes it look like an apple of the bride, but there, she says, I will give you my breasts, which is to say, the leading part [of my soul]).

The evidence here is indirect, but it is significant that the time for the soul “to give its leading part” to the Lord is during the Passover season.

On this point it is worth considering if a text from the fourth century may shed light on the Paschal context in which the *In Cant.* was used. The *Apostolic Constitutions*, a Syrian compilation of texts which reworks traditions in the *Didascalia*, and *Trad. ap.*, centers on church-school order. It says of the Passover celebration:⁹³

For this reason we advise that you also fast these days, just as we fasted during the time he was taken from us, until the evening. And for the rest of the days before [Good] Friday at the ninth hour or in the evening, let each one eat, or as one has the ability, but from the evening of the fifth day until the cock-crow [of Sunday] we eat nothing until the beginning of the dawn of the first day of the week, which is the Lord's day, continue the vigil, after the evening until cock-crow, and, when gathered in the assembly, continue the vigil, praying all the while and invoking God during your vigil, reading the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms until the cock crows; *once you have baptized your catechumens*, read the Gospel with fear and trembling, and announce salvation/deliverance to the people, *bring your mourning to an end and pray to God that he may convert Israel and that to them may be given an occasion of conversion and pardon for their impiety* for the judge, who was a stranger, “washed his hands, and said, ‘I am innocent of the blood of this just person: you must see to it.’ But Israel cried out, ‘His blood be on us, and on our children.’” (*Const. ap.* 5.19.3 trans. *ANF* 7, 446-7 with modifications)⁹⁴

⁹³Note, *In Cant.* 3.3, a tradition cited as from the “apostle,” finds its way into the *Const. ap.* 8.44 at a later date.

⁹⁴Emphasis YWS. Text in Marcel Metzger, *Les constitutions apostoliques* (SC 320, 329, 336 Paris: Cerf, 1985), 271-3. Διδ παραινοῦμεν καὶ ὑμῖν νηστεύειν ταύτας, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐνηστεύσαμεν ἐν τῷ ληφθῆναι αὐτὸν ἀφ' ἡμῶν, ἄχρις ἑσπέρας, Ἐν δὲ ταῖς λοιπαῖς ταῖς πρὸ τῆς παρασκευῆς ἐνάτῃ ὥρᾳ ἢ ἑσπέρᾳ ἕκαστος ἐσθιέτω, ἢ ὅπως ἄν τις δύνῃται, ἀπὸ δὲ ἑσπέρας πέμπτης μέχρις ἀλεκτροφωνίας ἀπονησιζόμενοι, Ἐπιφωσκούσης μιᾶς σαββάτων, ἣτις ἐστὶ κυριακῆ, ἀπὸ ἑσπέρας ἕως ἀλεκτροφωνίας ἀγρυπνοῦντες καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ συναθροιζόμενοι γρηγορεῖτε, προσευχόμενοι καὶ δεόμενοι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῇ διανυκτερεύσει ὑμῶν, ἀναγινώσκοντες τὸν Νόμον, τοὺς Προφήτας, τοὺς Ψαλμοὺς μέχρις ἀλεκτροφώνων κραυγῆς· καὶ βαπτίσαντες ὑμῶν τοὺς κατηγουμένους καὶ ἀναγνόντες τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ καὶ προσλαλήσαντες τῷ λαῷ τὰ πρὸς σωτηρίαν, παύσασθε

This text is from fourth-century Syria. However, it bears witness to the migration of a western practice to the East (Paschal baptism). As such it also bears witness to the much earlier practice (witnessed in Justin *Apol.* 1.65-67 and Tertullian *Res.* 8.2.3) of baptism as a preparation for participation in a feast. The *Const. ap.* continues, after rehearsing gospel events of the passion:

For this reason do you also, now [that] the Lord is risen, offer your sacrifice, concerning which He made a constitution by us, saying, “Do this for a remembrance of me;” and thenceforward *leave off your fasting, and rejoice, and celebrate a feast*, because Jesus Christ, the pledge of our resurrection, is risen from the dead. And let this be an everlasting ordinance till the consummation of the world, until the Lord come. For to Jews the Lord is still dead, but to Christians He is risen: to the former, by their unbelief; to the latter, by their full assurance of faith. For the hope in Him is immortal and eternal life.⁹⁵ (*Const. ap.* 5.19.3 trans. *ANF* 7, 446-7 with modifications)

A feast is then declared for the evening. The baptism of catechumens presupposed in this passage apparently represents a diffusion of the practice of Paschal baptism from Rome and North Africa in the second and third centuries. Because these practices are developments from earlier practices,⁹⁶ despite its late date, this outline of events helps clarify the structure⁹⁷ and give contextual cues given cues the *In Cant.* For example, in the introduction to the *In Cant.* Hippolytus suggests that the Song is useful for “consolation.” The Passover context clarifies this reference to Song of Songs as consolation. *Consolatio* from bishop for pilgrims in the events

τοῦ πένθους ὑμῶν καὶ δεήθητε τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιστραφῆναι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ λαβεῖν αὐτὸν τόπον μετανοίας καὶ τῆς ἀσεβείας ἄφεσιν·

⁹⁵Emphasis by YWS.

⁹⁶The Eucharist and the feast appear to be quite distinct, which does not appear to have been the case, judging from the traditions in *Trad. ap.*

⁹⁷See page 172.

recorded by the fourth-century Egeria is a *topos* of the celebrations Holy Week (*Itin. Eger.* 36), not least because of the gruelling schedule of readings, prayers, vigils, and pilgrimages to holy sites in the area of Jerusalem. The same consolation theme is found in the second century *Ep. ap.* 8-9. It is likely that Christian Paschal celebrations Rome in the third century would have had similar features of mourning, consolations, and joy. The setting of the consolatory event of the Passover banquet would have been particularly appropriate for the epideictic mode of protreptic speech geared toward the healing of the soul.⁹⁸ The *Const. ap.* and further information from the second-century *Ep. ap.* makes the connection clear. During the buildup to the feast of the Passover, the community re-enacts the stress, trauma, and mourning of Holy Week. Daily fasting and vigil heighten the awareness of the remembered events and provide a common base of bodily experience. The recitation of the gospel events by the congregation along with catechumens who anticipate dying with Christ in baptism also remind the more experienced believers of their own “first blush of faith” (*In Cant.* 9.1). Egeria reports in the diary of her pilgrimage to the Holy Land (ca. 381–384) of the outpouring of mourning at the Good Friday service in Jerusalem:

At each reading and at every prayer, it is astonishing how much emotion and groaning there is from all the people. there is no one, young of old, who on this day does not sob more than can be imagined for the whole three hours because the Lord suffered all this for us. (*Itin. Eger.* 37 trans. Gringas, ACW).

Both *Const. ap.* and *Ep. ap.* also point to the experience of mourning and the end of mourning (παύσασθε τοῦ πένθους ὑμῶν) in connection with the celebration of Easter. That the end of mourning is brought about by consolation is a *topos* in the

⁹⁸See page 139.

popular practice of ancient consolatory psychagogy.⁹⁹

Finally, for ancient Jews the figure of Solomon himself may have had an appeal as a topic of celebration and conversation during the Passover banquet. It was possible for certain Jews to interpret the figure of Solomon so that he became a counterpoint to the domination of the Jews by their Romans overlords. The commemoration of Solomon evoked an idealized past of Jewish freedom. Such a use of the figure of Solomon appears by the first century in the *Wisdom of Solomon*, which likely had a connection to Passover celebrations in Alexandria.¹⁰⁰ The tradition of using Solomon as a point of reference to bolster Jewish confidence in the face of their Roman rulers continued in Josephus (*Ant. Jud.* 8.42-49).¹⁰¹ Around the time of Hippolytus, the same kind of comparisons were used by Rabbi Levi who synchronized the date of the founding of Rome with the date when King Solomon

⁹⁹On consolation theory (a true cottage industry) and practice in the ancient world, see Paul A. Holloway, *Consolation in Philippians* (SNTMS 112; Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Robert C. Gregg, *Consolation Philosophy* (PMS 3; Cambridge, MA: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1975); Arnold Führer, *Tod, Trauer und Trost in Ciceros Tusculanischen Schriften und Malebranches Schrift Entretiens sur la mort: eine phänomenologische Untersuchung* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2002); Horst-Theodor Johann, *Trauer und Trost eine quellen- und strukturanalytische Untersuchung der philosophischen Trostschriften über den Tod* (München: W. Fink, 1968); J. H. D. Scourfield, *Consoling Heliodorus: a Commentary on Jerome, Letter 60* (OCM; New York: Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, 1993); Chapa, *Letters of Condolence in Greek Papyri*.

¹⁰⁰Baruch M. Bokser, *The Origins of the Seder: the Passover Rite and Early Rabbinic Judaism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 22.

¹⁰¹Josephus boasts that Solomon surpassed all the ancients (including the Egyptians) in wisdom. Then he compares Solomon's powers of exorcism favorably with Vespasian's power of healing and exorcism.

married the daughter of the Egyptian Pharaoh Neco.¹⁰² This sort of comparison functioned apologetically by showing how Israel was more ancient than Rome; however, it also may have had a consolatory function, enhancing Jewish self image *vis-a-vis* the Romans by affirming similarities in the world-wide scope of their cultural visions while at the same time differentiating Jews from their Roman masters.¹⁰³ The figure of Solomon functioned as an idealized king parallel, yet superior, to the ancient kings of Rome.¹⁰⁴

Political resonances of engagement and distance with Rome in the Passover, the celebration of liberation from Egypt (Ex 11-15), and the idealization of God's kingship of the world were significant aspects of the banquet from the earliest times. Josephus attests to Jewish awareness at the end of the first century that festival celebrations like Passover provided incentive and opportunity for revolt (*B. J.* 1.88; 5.244; 2.224; *Ant.* 20.106). In an influential article, Stein drew numerous parallels between the Greco-Roman banqueting practices and the development of the Passover Seder that highlighted its political aspects. He compared the blessings in praise of God as king said over the cups to the practice of giving epideictic speeches at

¹⁰²Louis H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 103.

¹⁰³Warren Carter, *John and Empire: Initial Explorations* (New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2008), 160.

¹⁰⁴According to Ashkenazic tradition, the Song of Songs is read on the Sabbath of Passover week, though Sephardic tradition recommends the reading of the Song of Solomon on each Friday evening. Nevertheless, no early direct evidence exists to confirm the antiquity of these traditions, so little or nothing can be said about whether Hippolytus #2 was influenced by Jewish practice or, for that matter, whether the influence went the other way.

banquets in honor of the emperor.¹⁰⁵ The blessing of God over the cup is significant since, from the time of Augustus the practice of saying a blessing for the emperor became a part of banquet ideology. Augustus decreed that a libation be offered to the emperor at all banquets, public and private (Dio of Prusa, *Or.* 51.19.17; Horace, *Od.* 4.5.31-40).¹⁰⁶ Petronius parodies this custom when his dinner guests shout out, “Blessed be Augustus, father of his country” at the spectacle of elaborately filled cakes (Petronius, *Sat.* 60.7). The “blessing in song” of the Passover that praised God as king of the universe contrasted with the culturally appropriate praise of the emperor. No direct evidence exists as early as the third century that the figure of Solomon and the Song of Songs were part of the celebration at the Jewish Passover banquet,¹⁰⁷ and so the question of whether Christians (Hippolytus) first adapted the Song for Passover use or whether Jewish practice was the precedent for the Christian use remains open. Hippolytus, on the other hand, apparently led the way for a the full-fledged use of the Song for Passover celebrations among Christians. It is important to note that the Christian rhetoric of initiation is meant to foster a change of allegiance from any rival divinity to Jesus Christ. The emperor was one of these rival divinities.

The *In Cant.* contains an extended introduction, an allegorical-typological

¹⁰⁵S. Stein, “The Influence of Symposia Literature on the Literary Form of the Pesah Haggadah,” *JJS* 8 (1957): 26-7.

¹⁰⁶Blake Leyerle, “Meal Customs in the Greco-Roman World,” in *Passover and Easter: Origin and History to Modern Times* (ed. Paul F. Bradshaw and Lawrence A. Hoffman 5; Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame), 38.

¹⁰⁷For the liturgical reading of the megilloth (Song of Songs at Passover, Ruth at the Feast of Weeks, Lamentations of the 9 of Ab, Ecclesiastes at the Feast of Tabernacles, and Ester at Purim), the earliest direct reference is post-Talmudic (*Soferim* 14:3). See Emil Schürer et al., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B. C. -A. D. 135)* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1973), 2:452.

interpretation of the text *whose topic is heterosexual love symbolizing spiritual love for God*. As mentioned above, Philo's *Vit. cont.* contains two accounts of a meal and symposium of a group characterized by *ἔρωσ* for God. It made use of the allegorical interpretation of holy Scripture accompanied by singing and dancing.¹⁰⁸ The *In Cant.* contains encomia on rituals of a post-baptismal kiss, the anointing with fragrant oil, and the celebration of Passover (*κλίνη Χριστοῦ*)¹⁰⁹ These activities accord well as preparations for a ritual banquet. The remarkable parallels with Philo's *Vit. cont.* also have similar contours with 1 Cor in which Paul's language reflects a similar symposium context for the reading of the letter complete with drinking and discussion of the Corinthian worship practices. Chapters 8 and 10 discuss polytheistic meals. Chapter 11 contrasts the Christian eucharistic meal. Following this are chapters 12 and 14 on speaking in worship. Paul's teaching includes "love" (1 Cor 13) though the topic is agape, not eros, of course. Given the parallel to Philo, at whose symposium there is both a critique of Plato's view of love and an alternative proposal, do we not have two examples, Philo and 1 Cor 8-14, where "love" is a sympotic theme?

The treatment of the Song of Songs as a love song about King Jesus and his beloved. This relationship reinterpreted as a treatise concerning community boundaries and moral regulation is an appropriate symposium topic¹¹⁰ for a church-school which, in part, views itself as a philosophical school in the process of

¹⁰⁸See page 125 in the introduction.

¹⁰⁹The *κλίνη* of Christ to which *In Cant.* 26-27 alludes draws upon common banquet ethos prevalent in ancient symposium practice. See Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 2-46. The themes of rest, healing, resurrection, and salvation invite a comparison to Jewish practice on the one hand and polytheistic practice on the other (cp. the *κλίνη* of Sarapis).

¹¹⁰According to Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 49.

constantly negotiating its relationship with the Roman Empire. A rhetorical and social analysis of the author-audience relationship, in conjunction with available inscriptional evidence from Rome at the beginning of the third century, provides important context for the commentary.

The ritual expectations of the liturgical setting at a banquet and the implicit rules and social relationships prescribed by the banquet/Passover setting guided Hippolytus #2's ethos and the audience's interpretation of the commentary.¹¹¹ The remarkably uniform and conservative Greco-Roman education system socialized young people to take up roles in society in which they practiced an ideal of moral excellence, or παιδεία, which was appropriately deferential to imperial authority. In this system commentaries on Homer and other authors provided the template for moral instruction that forged a common culture of deference to such authority. Christians adopted a variety of practices from the Greco-Roman schools that often conducted their business in private homes. Christian churches, therefore, made use of social spaces also used by schools. Schools were conducted for groups of both males and females and of mixed social status, including both slave and free children of various families. Church-schools developed an informal shadow educational system with different (monotheistic, exclusivist) theology, curriculum, and religious authoritative texts, in ambiguous resistance to the educational system that supported imperial theology and a polytheistic world view. For example, in the list of proscribed

¹¹¹Similarly it today may strike one as odd to read that John Wesley felt his heart "strangely warmed" as someone read from the introduction to Luther's *Commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, yet more understandable if we imagine the small group context of the Christian "society on Aldersgate-street." See Herbert W. Mansfield, "A Society in Aldersgate Street," *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society* 19 (1934): 77-80.

occupations teachers of young children are discouraged from becoming catechumens (*Trad. ap.* 16.5), because they used the literature of mythology for their lessons and must necessarily commend what they teach (Tertullian, *Idol.* 10). In eastern versions of the *Trad. ap.* 16.5 a concession is made for teachers who have no other livelihood. However, the *Canons of Hippolytus* and the *Testamentum Domini* allowed teachers to continue in their professions if “at all times to those whom he teaches and confesses that what the Gentiles call gods are demons, and says before them everyday there is no divinity except the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.”¹¹² Reading was itself a more social, oral activity than an activity of private study for which commentaries are mostly used today.

The Genre of the In Cant.

Seasonal Constraints on the Interpretation of the Song

Gertrude Chappuzeau was not the first to suggest that the *In Cant.* was not intended as a systematic commentary and that the original function of the *In Cant.* was a *baptismal* instruction, or homily¹¹³ for Passover performance.¹¹⁴ Building on earlier suggestions concerning its function, she focused on the Rabbinic precedents, taking a more rigorously historical approach to the Rabbinic material than had Riedel.¹¹⁵ In suggesting a Passover context for the original homily, she built upon the

¹¹²Bradshaw, et al., *Apostolic Tradition*, 94.

¹¹³Johannes Quasten, *Initiation aux pères de l'église* (Paris: Cerf, 1955), 207.

¹¹⁴Chappuzeau, “Auslegung,” *JAC* 19: 91, “Bei dem Kommentar Hippolyts handelt es sich zweifellos um einen Predigttext, wahrscheinlich um eine Osterpredigt.”

¹¹⁵Wilhelm Riedel, *Die Auslegung des Hohenliedes in der Jüdischen Gemeinde und der griechischen Kirche* (Leipzig: Deicher, 1898).

foundation of Zahn's opinion based upon knowledge of the small Armenian fragment available at that time.¹¹⁶ The Georgian text had not at that time been discovered. Riedel challenged Zahn, alleging that such a connection must await further corroborating evidence, for "the reference in the Armenian fragment could indeed be the product of a later convention."¹¹⁷ The discovery of the Georgian text proved Riedel correct. Zahn had placed too much weight on a text that turned out to be no part of the original, judging from a comparison of the Georgian and the Paleo-Slavonic texts. When Bonwetsch published his version of Marr's Russian translation of the *In Cant.* along with the Paleo-Slavic florilegia, he considered Zahn's theory still "unconfirmed" as far as the commentary as a whole, though he admitted that *In Cant.* 3.1-5 was likely part of a Paschal homily.¹¹⁸

The connection, however, with Passover should be accepted for the following reasons:

- The use of the gospel narrative of the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ as the hermeneutical key to the Song of Songs suggests a Passover connection.
- Hippolytus states explicitly that the function of the Song is consolation (1.5), and the consolatory function—bringing an end to a period of ritual mourning

¹¹⁶Zahn, *Evangeliencommentar*, 61; Johannes Quasten, *Initiation aux pères de l'église* (Paris: Cerf, 1955), 207.

¹¹⁷Riedel, *Auslegung des Hohenliedes*, 52.

¹¹⁸Cp. Bonwetsch, "Hippolyts Kommentar," 90-1; with Theodor Zahn, *Evangeliencommentar*, Forschungen, 61 See also Anne-Marie Pelletier, *Lectures du Cantique des Cantiques: de l'enigme du sens aux figures du lecteur* (AnBib Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1990), 219.

for the death of Jesus Christ—is appropriate for the context of Passover.¹¹⁹

- The *In Cant.* is a mystagogy focused on the anointing of new converts. It is appropriate for the Passover season since Hippolytus favors baptism and anointing at Passover.¹²⁰
- Discussion of the Song is appropriate to the Passover context as a springtime holiday.¹²¹ Some of the narrative images of love early in the *In Cant.*, (chapters 3-7) are drawn from the well-known myth of Dionysus and Ariadne, celebrated in Rome on March 8, in a form found in Ovid's *Fasti*.¹²² A corollary to the Ariadne-Dionysus myth is the group of narrative images occurring late in the *In Cant.* (24-26) drawn from the myth of Heracles' taking of the apple of eternal life from garden of the West, attended by the Hesperides nymphs.
- Finally, the Armenian text of *In Cant.* 25.10, while having no claim to originality, should be seen as a notation concerning the ancient reception of

¹¹⁹See page 146.

¹²⁰This does not preclude its use at other times. A preference for Passover baptism is strongly attested in both Rome and North Africa in the late second and early third century, but not in other places at that time. See page 179.

¹²¹See note 92 on page 144.

¹²²On the use of the Dionysus/Ariadne motif, see page 388. This point supports the notion argued by John Heeren, "Another View of Easter and Passover," *ASR* 49 (1984): against Eviatar Zerubavel, "Easter and Passover: On Calendars and Group Identity," *ASR* 47 (1982): 581-2, that early adoption of Christian Paschal celebrations away from 14 Nisan served as much the function of inclusion of a constituency of polytheists as much as it served the separation of Christian observance from dependence upon Jewish decisions. On the early Quartodeciman controversy see Cyril C. Richardson, "The Quartodecimans and the Synoptic Chronology," *HTR* 33.3 (1940): 177-90.

the *In Cant.* that preserves authentic data about its traditional use.

Little is known about either Christian Easter celebrations or Jewish Passover traditions before the third century, such a study becomes somewhat complicated. While Jewish and Christian Passover and Easter celebrations did experience some mutual cross-pollination,¹²³ great local diversity in practice among both Jews and Christians render the extent and the precise traces of that complicated relationship often impossible to trace with certainty.¹²⁴ Some Christian groups (the Quartodecimans) adopted a Christianized version of Passover celebration early on, while other groups did not begin celebrating Easter until much later as a Saturday-Sunday celebration with a focus on the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ with little influence from Jewish practice. Both of these kinds of groups were present in Rome. During the late second century, Bishop Victor of Rome attempted to standardize the Christian practice of Passover celebrations among the churches of

¹²³Israel J. Yubal, "Easter and Passover as Early Jewish-Christian Dialogue," in *Passover and Easter: Origin and History to Modern Times* (ed. Paul F. Bradshaw, and Lawrence A Hoffman; 5; Notre Dame, Ind: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999), 103-4, remarks:

The Jewish view that sees Judaism as always influencing Christianity, but never the other way around, is theologically grounded, based on the assumption that Judaism is the mother-religion of Christianity. But early Christianity and Tannaitic Judaism are two sister religions that took shape during the same period and under the same conditions of oppression and destruction. There is no reason not to assume a parallel and mutual development of both religions, during which sometimes Judaism internalized ideas of its rival rather than the other way around. During the second and third centuries there were all kinds of Jews and all kinds of Christians, all struggling against pagan Rome and all sharing the centrality of the messianic idea and the ritual of Passover.

¹²⁴ Paul F. Bradshaw, "Jewish Influence on Early Christian Liturgy: A Reappraisal," (2008): n.p. Cited 07-01. Online: »<http://jcrelations.net/en/?area=Articles>«.

Rome. The Quartodeciman Christians, following the Matthean order of the events, celebrated a Paschal meal on 14 of Nisan in honor of the last supper of the Lord, who was crucified on the 15th. The Hippolytan community adapted eastern traditions to their western milieu. Judging from the Paschal table inscribed on the so-called “statue of Hippolytus,” they affirmed that Christ died on the 14 Nisan, following the Johannine order of events, and had celebrated a non-Paschal meal the night before. However, they celebrated Easter on the following Sunday. The Hippolytan community endeavored to abolish the Quartodeciman observance of Passover (*Haer.* 8.18.1-2)¹²⁵ and thus aligned themselves partially with Victor. The need felt by the same group to compile their own tables to predict the date of Easter each year, rather than face the embarrassment of having to approach the synagogue to ask when Passover would fall, is an indication of a continuing struggle among some Christians in Rome to establish their own independent identity and to weaken the connection to Jewish customs.¹²⁶ The community that made use of the so-called “Hippolytus statue”

¹²⁵See also the citation of a work by Hippolytus #2, *Refutation of All Heresies* (not that of Hippolytus #1) in the *Chron. Pas.* in Hans Achelis, ed. *Hippolyt's kleinere exegetische und homiletische Schriften* (GCS 1.2, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897), 270; Raniero Cantalamessa et al., eds., *Easter in the Early Church: an Anthology of Jewish and Early Christian Texts* (Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1993), #45, #46, #49, #156-7. As does *Haer.*, Hippolytus #2 argues that if Christ celebrated the supper that instituted the Eucharist on 13-14 of Nisan, it could not have been a Jewish Passover meal. In this way Hippolytus #2 agrees completely with *Haer.* with Clement of Alexandria, *On the Pascha*, frg. 28 (text in Ludovicus Dindorfius, ed. *Chronicon Paschale* (CSHB 1, 1832), 1:13-14, (=PG 92.81), and with Apollinaris of Hierapolis, (despite the fact that Apollinaris is a Quartodeciman, he agrees with Hippolytus #2 on the date of Christ's death (i.e., the Johannine date), Apollinaris argues that, since Christ is the true Passover sacrifice, the Pascha should be *celebrated* on 14 Nisan.

¹²⁶Bradshaw, “Jewish Influence on Early Christian Liturgy,” n.p. internet source.

jealously sought to distinguish themselves by means of a dating of Easter independent of Rabbinic calculations.¹²⁷ Hippolytus sided with Victor.

Jewish and Christian Passover celebrations in form, ideology, and literary description developed as part of the common Greco-Roman social institution of the Symposium.¹²⁸ For western Christians, the Passover season worked well as a time to incorporate new converts into the church.¹²⁹ As rites developed, different groups experimented with new forms to enter into the festive time and make it more productive as a time for newcomers.¹³⁰ *In Cant.* should be seen as an aide for the celebration of baptism during Passover. It provides a point of entry into the dynamic traditions of initiation among Christians.¹³¹ It also testifies to the rich practice of western, post-baptismal anointing. *In Cant.* provides a window into Christian banquet practice and regulation;¹³² it is perhaps best seen as a Christian example of *θεολογία*

¹²⁷See T. C. G. Thornton, "Problematical Passovers, Difficulties for Diaspora Jews and Early Christians in Determining Passover Dates during the First Three Centuries A. D.," *SP* 20 (1989), 402-8; Anscar Chupungco, *Shaping the Easter Feast* (Washington, DC 1992), 43 ff.; 61 ff.

¹²⁸See Osiek and Balch, *Families in the New Testament World*, 193-214.

¹²⁹Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 47-65; Bradley, "The Roman Family At Dinner," in *Meals in a Social Context*, 35-48.

¹³⁰Note the reference to purification of "the waters" of baptism at *In Cant.* 2.8 mentioned in the context of a post-baptismal anointing of consecration by the Holy Spirit.

¹³¹Bradshaw, "Diem Baptismo," has argued convincingly that the preference for Passover baptism was limited largely to Rome and North Africa for a very brief period of about 50 years. See also Raniero Cantalamessa, *L'omelia In S. Pascha dello pseudo-Ippolito di Roma, Ricerche sulla teologia dell'Asia Minore nella seconda metà del II secolo* (Milano: Vita e pensiero, 1967), 285-7.

¹³²L. Michael White, "Regulating Fellowship in the Communal Meal: Early Jewish and Christian Evidence," in *Meals in a Social Context: Aspects of the Communal Meal in the Hellenistic and Roman World* (ed. Inge Nielsen and Hanne Nielsen; ASMA 1. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1998), 180-1.

or a “sermon” analogous to a speech delivered during the celebratory symposia of religious associations marking their own springtime rituals.¹³³

The Speaker’s Choice of Genre

Hippolytus, like others with a modicum of Greek rhetorical training in the ancient world would have thought in terms of genres or species of rhetoric, as discussed by Cicero, in the *Orator*. In the case of epideictic speeches like the *In Cant.*, a specific problem is almost impossible to define, because an epideictic speech has the general purpose of affirming community values and identity.¹³⁴ Cicero remarks that this kind of rhetoric “unconnected with the battles of public life” and its “ornamentation is done of set purpose . . . words correspond to words as if measured of equal phrases, frequently things inconsistent are placed side by side, and things contrasted are paired; clauses are made to end in the same way and with similar sound” (*Orator* 37 LCL trans.). The *In Cant.* reads like a text-book case of epideictic

¹³³On the practice of pronouncing a θεολογία, a “sermon,” in some religious banqueting associations, see Franciszek Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1969), 95-100, n. 51. Part of the second-century ritual elaboration of the yearly springtime banquet of the Iobakchoi (worshippers of Bacchus) was a “sermon” that, according to the inscription, Neikomachus “began to make during his priesthood in order to distinguish himself.”

¹³⁴See David Edward Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003), 162. Quoting L. G. Perleman, *The New Rhetoric and the Humanities: Essays on Rhetoric and Its Applications* (Boston: Reidel, 1979), “[The] epideictic gener is not only important but essential from an educational point of view, since it too has an effective and distinctive part to play—that, namely of bringing about a consensu in the minds of the audience regarding the values that re celebrated in the speech.”

rhetoric.

The *In Cant.* differs greatly in rhetorical approach from modern commentaries meant to be consumed by single individuals reading in quiet contemplation. Intended to be *performed* as a celebration by a presbyter-bishop, the *In Cant.* establishes a hierarchical relationship between speaker and audience from the start. “We must proclaim to those who will hear, for it is the representation (*lit.* type) of the people that entreats the heavenly Word to kiss them, because [the people] wish to join [together] mouth to mouth. For [the people] wishes to join the power of the Spirit to itself.” (*In Cant.* 2.2).¹³⁵ The social context involves a stylized set of relationships which allows Hippolytus to establish a rhetorical stance based upon his authority and status in the community as the mystagogue, or interpreter of mysteries. Like some earlier (*GPhil*) and later mystagogical compositions (Ambrose *De Mysteriis*, Cyril of Jerusalem, *Mystagogical Instructions*), it was composed as a notebook, an aid for memory in extemporaneous delivery. It is thus a ὑπόμνημα in a double sense of the word. While the *In Cant.* provides the audience with questions concerning the meaning and application of the text Song of Songs 1:1-3:8 for the

¹³⁵The kiss refers to a special boundary marker separating the baptized from the unbaptized, cf. *GPhil* §31 (trans. van Os, 52): “For the perfect conceive through a kiss and give birth. Therefore, we too kiss one another, receiving conception from the grace that is within one another.” Cf. *Trad. ap.* 21.22-25 (trans. Stewart-Sykes, 112): “And after [baptism and prayer], pouring the sanctified oil from his hand and putting it on his head he shall say: ‘I anoint you with holy oil in God the Father Almighty and Christ Jesus and the Holy Spirit.’ And signing him on the forehead he shall give him the kiss and say: ‘The Lord be with you.’ And he who has been signed shall say, ‘And with your spirit,’ And thus he shall do to each. And thenceforth they shall say prayers with all the people; they shall not pray with the people until they have performed all these things. And after they have prayed they should give the kiss of peace.”

purpose of creating a deeper understanding of the rites of Christian initiation and preserves many of the characteristics of an original oral performance.¹³⁶

The reinforcement of community values and identity is achieved by a two part strategy: (1) Hippolytus praises the wondrous mysteries of the “inner chamber” (*In Cant.* 3.1; 25.2) of the Christian life, and (2) he defines the periphery and boundaries (*In Cant.* 1.4 “sound dogma”; 2.7 the “ordinance” of anointing; 8.2, the “just ordinance”) of the church beyond which lie heresy and the danger of judgment (*In Cant.* 20.3). The establishment of identity through an impressive, shared experience of Christ and boundary markers is strengthened by invective or casting blame on the enemies of the community, the heretics and the synagogue. The image of Solomon’s sixty men who wear the sword at their hip is an image of the protective boundary of the church that keeps the pure church separate from the pollution of unbelief. The sixty men who wear a sword at their side “who expel the seductor, that he might not be able to come near” (*In Cant.* 27.12) likely represent the presbyter-

¹³⁶This is evidenced in the frequent form of address to the audience as “beloved” and “O beloved” (x 12), but also “synagogue” (x 1) and then exclamations such as “O man” (4), “O people” (5), “O people (that is, Israel),” “O blessed children,” “O David, righteous person,” “O women (Martha and Mary at the grave of Jesus),” “O new resurrection,” “O courage,” “O great mysteries,” “O economy of the new grace,” “O longed for voice,” “O truth,” etc. This characteristic Hippolytan trope for initiating a exclamatory praise is also found in Philostratus, *Letter to Loginus*, printed in Simon Swain et al., eds. *Severan Culture* (Cambridge University Press, 2007), xix. Even more frequently the author switches from third person, to the second person, singular or plural, when the Song provides a motive (x 23). On the other hand the use of the first person plural, indicating the *exegete* in contrast to the *audience* is more rare (x 6). (The first singular is completely absent.). At several places Hippolytus uses a rhetorical question (x 17). In longer interpretations, the verse is repeated at the end of the discussion to form an oral *inclusio*. See Chappuzeau, “Auslegung,” *JAC* 19: 46.

bishops of the wider Christian community.

Controversies in the Roman Church during the second century may have provided part of the impetus for using the Song as a baptismal homily.¹³⁷ From the beginning of the Christian movement, the Old Testament,¹³⁸ inherited from the synagogue, was the most trusted of its Scriptures. It was a source rich in symbolic representation, puzzles for endless discussion, prophecies, and moral training, not to mention debate and conflict. Those Greco-Roman polytheists who were baptized into Christ were also baptized into a world of Biblical images that provided a rich source for reinterpreting the images of their own world: those on coins, walls, books, home utensils, mosaics and monumental art.

The setting in time and the space (both social and physical) imagined for the speaker and audience is also critical for an understanding of the commentary. Several features of the commentary indicate that it had a ritual role preparation for a worship feast.¹³⁹ Recent research on the importance of the context and development of the social history of the community meal in early Christianity helps to shed light on the *In Cant.* and the interpretive methods of Hippolytus #2.¹⁴⁰ Thus part of the

¹³⁷For a description of these rites in conjunction with an in depth study of *GPhil*, see van Os, "Baptism in the Bridal Chamber," 127-35.

¹³⁸An interest in a symbolic representation of the church as a woman, the bride of God goes back to ancient Israel (Hos; Jer 2), to the New Testament (2 Cor 11.1, 2; Eph 5:21-32; Rev 21:1ff) and the second-century Hermas, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian. Valentinians developed a nuptial understanding of baptism and by the mid-second century Irenaeus could comment upon their preparation of a nuptial couch and feast in conjunction with baptism.

¹³⁹The regulation of drinking wine (*In Cant.* 2.4), the imagery of anointing (2.8ff), the imagery of grapes harvest (13.1ff), the abundant eucharistic imagery (24-25), the imagery of *encomium*, or speech in praise, of the κλίνη of Christ (26-27).

¹⁴⁰Matthias Klinghardt, *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft: Soziologie und*

relevant contextual constraints of the rhetorical situation of the *In Cant.* in its liturgical context which fits within the larger Greco-Roman Banquet tradition.

Summary of Contents and Themes of the In Cant.

The *In Cant.* contains an extended introduction, an allegorical-typological interpretation of Song of Songs that develops a spiritual narrative of conversion and unity in the context of the celebration of rites of Christian initiation. Like the approach to Scripture interpretation in Philo's *On the Contemplative Life*, Hippolytus' interpretation might be characterized as a contemplative study.¹⁴¹ Its highly stylized

Liturgie frühchristlicher Mahlfeiern (Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 13 Tübingen Basel: Francke Verlag, 1996), 494-22; Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist*; Carolyn Osiek and David L. Balch, *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1997), 192-222; Nielsen and Nielsen, *Meals in a Social Context*; Blake Leyerle, "Meal Customs in the Greco-Roman World," in *Passover and Easter: Origin and History to Modern Times* (ed. Paul F. Bradshaw, and Lawrence A. Hoffman; Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999); Hal Taussig, "Greco-Roman Meals and Performance of Identity: A Ritual Analysis," Unpublished Seminar paper in Society of Biblical Literature, *Meals in the Greco-Roman World* (2004): Cited 6-6. Online: »<http://www.philipharland.com/meals/GrecoRomanMealsSeminar.htm>«; Peter Lampe, "The Eucharist: Identifying With Christ on the Cross," *Int* 48 (1994): 36-49; Peter Lampe, "Das Korinthische Herrenmahl Im Schnittpunkt Hellinistisch-Roemischer Mahlpraxis und Paulinischer Theologia Crucis (1 Kor 11, 17-34)," *ZNW* 82 (1991): 36-49.

¹⁴¹See *In Cant.* 1.13 and notes. A close reading of Philo alongside the *In Cant.* provides numerous helpful clues as to how Hippolytus viewed his interpretive method, e.g.

"And the interval between morning and evening is by them devoted wholly to meditation on and to practice of virtue, for they take up the sacred scriptures and philosophize concerning them, investigating the allegories of their national philosophy, since they look upon their literal expressions as symbols of some secret meaning of nature, intended to be conveyed in those figurative expressions ... they

introduction (*In Cant.* 1) gives the listeners what, from the speaker's point of view, the audience should know before understanding the true meaning of the Song. According to Hippolytus #2, that meaning is an expression of God the Father's redemption of sinful human beings subsumed in the darkness of the world. In the Georgian text, the synagogue is introduced in *In Cant.* 1 as a symbol of the darkness of the world (*In Cant.* 1.5). The redemption process is effected by the generation of the "Trinity,"¹⁴² the expression of the Father's heart of love for the world. Thus, for Hippolytus #2, the Trinity is supremely a doctrine of salvation and not truly a doctrine of original divine ontology. Father, *Logos-Sophia*-Son, and Spirit bind God to flesh to transform the flesh of sinful people into deified humans. This theology of salvation is worked out in the creation, the choice of Israel, the incarnation of the *Logos* (taking place progressively throughout the life of the Savior), the release and sending of the Spirit as a result of Christ's death on the cross, and the redemption of the synagogue and the Gentile church, now separate entities through unbelief, but with the prospect of glorious unity in Christ.

The interpretation of the Song is designed to enhance the role of the teacher

do not occupy themselves solely in contemplation (οὐ θεωροῦσι μόνον), but they likewise compose psalms and hymns to God in every kind of metre and melody imaginable ..." (Philo, *vit. cont.* 28)

Nevertheless, the essential distinction is Hippolytus' Christological focus.

¹⁴²Hippolytus explicitly rejects the term "emanation" (against Valentinus and the gnostics) in favor of "out pouring":

For this reason this word is to be avoided, for this reason [the text] does not at all mean, "anointing oil emanated" but "anointing oil poured out." } [It happened] in various ways over many through outpourings because what emanates is contemptible, nevertheless what [was] poured out did not diminish from the vessel itself (lit. even) and it filled the surroundings.

It would be anachronistic, however, to assume the word "Trinity" entails the full Nicene concept for Hippolytus.

by prescribing for the church a hermeneutical pathway for interpreting biblical symbols of salvation. It also enriches the practices of initiation with a wealth of nuptial symbols, as well as biblical and mythical allusions. Hippolytus #2 constructs his interpretation mindful of rhetorical devices and structures designed to persuade and impress. Besides the formal, didactic introduction, or *schema isagogicum* (*In Cant.* 1), he develops an *exordium* (*In Cant.* 2), which opens in the mode of praise celebrating those who wish to join in intimacy with God through the *Logos* and the Holy Spirit. The commentary then celebrates the anointing of believers by the *Logos*-Spirit. It uses the figure of *anaphora*, one rhetorical form of *amplification*, and develops it into a full *peroration*¹⁴³ on the initiatory rite of anointing with fragrant oil as a central rite separating those who choose a life of obedience to God from those who hate and despise him.¹⁴⁴ The image of anointing oil diffused by the name of God symbolizes the beautiful fragrance of the *Logos* poured out from the Father.¹⁴⁵ The *In*

¹⁴³For the meaning of these Latin terms (and their Greek equivalents) along with ancient references and examples, see David E. Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003).

¹⁴⁴*In Cant.* 26-27 uses the image of the “couch of Solomon” to symbolize a celebration or gathering of *couches* (thus the odd use of the plural κλίνη Σολομῶν, Χριστοῦ and κλίναι) that appear to represent the physical gathered people of God in the 60 generations of elect from Adam to Christ. The generations are said to produce the flesh of the incarnate *Logos*. This complex image in turn signals a lived reality, a well-appointed baptismal feast at which the gathered community reclines. It is preceded by *In Cant.* 24-25, which has a strong eucharistic theme similar to that of the story of the travelers to Emmaus in Luke 24. The connection of rest, healing, resurrection, and salvation in *In Cant.* 26-27 has reminiscences of the meals celebrated in honor of other healing deities and demigods (viz., the κλίνη of Sarapis, feasts in the temples of Aesclepius).

¹⁴⁵The κλίνη of Christ (*In Cant.* 26-27) is a complex image representing a banquet

Cant. celebrates the transforming power of the grace of Father, *Logos*, and Spirit. Hippolytus #2 then develops a complex *narrative* of conversion (*In Cant.* 3.1-19.3) by means of images of the Song that he weaves together with *exhortations* to repentance directed toward the church and past the church to the Jewish synagogue. Woven into the fabric of the interpretation are moments important in Hippolytus #2's theological time (the generation and incarnation of the *Logos*), gospel events surrounding the baptism, crucifixion of the Christ, and the world-wide proselytizing mission launched by Christ and the apostles. The synagogue represents the world that does not know Christ, the "gathering place of darkness" (*In Cant.* 1.5). It also represents the Jewish people in a complex way: the faithful of Israel who participated in the incarnation of the *Logos* (*In Cant.* 26), as well as the unbelieving Jews who rejected Christ, and the Jewish people who accept him. The Gentile church and the synagogue as they are represented in Hippolytus were also celebrated in Roman iconography.¹⁴⁶ In the commentary they are rivals in a complex love triangle with Christ (*In Cant.* 3-7) that is resolved only through an encounter with the resurrected Christ in which Eve is redeemed. Thus the commentary celebrates an encounter with the resurrected Christ who ascends to heaven which transformations synagogue and church: "from these things that he pacifies¹⁴⁷ the synagogue and the church is

scene.

¹⁴⁶Cf. the Roman iconography of two female figures representing two churches. A mosaic of the fifth century in S. Sabina uses two female figures to distinguish "the church from among the Gentiles" and "the church from the Circumcision." A similar fourth century (restored) mosaic in S. Pudenziana, has two women placing garlands (*coronae*) upon the heads of Peter and Paul, representing the mission to the Jews and to the Gentiles (cp. *In Cant.* 8.8).

¹⁴⁷The "pacification" of the synagogue is a rhetorically ambivalent way of speaking of the transformation brought to Jewish communities by the proclamation of the

glorified” (*In Cant.* 25.10). The commentary concludes (*In Cant.* 26-27) with a second *peroration* that celebrates the rest, healing and celebration of the couch of Solomon/couches of Christ, which Hippolytus #2 interprets as a symbol of a great banquet of past and present saints. The interpretation weaves canonical and non-canonical together with polytheistic mythical themes. In addition, Hippolytus #2 makes use of themes and devices, especially the nuptial-baptism theme that appear to have been developed previously by groups like the Valentinians. The unique weaving of elements reveals a Hippolytus #2 willing to experiment with diverse material taken from Jewish, polytheistic, and rival church circles in an effort to consolidate his vision of the faithful and draw more carefully the lines that separate the faithful Christian from unbelieving Jews, and dangerous “heretics.”¹⁴⁸

Gospel. See Allie M. Ernst, “Martha from the Margins: An Examination of Early Christian Traditions about Martha” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Queensland, 2006), 164.

¹⁴⁸For the second and third centuries, the use of “mainstream” versus “non-mainstream” of the various streams of Christianity is not possible (*contra* Lubbertus K. van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber: The Gospel of Philip as a Valentinian Baptism Instruction” [University of Groningen, 2007], 4, n. 21, 5, n. 23). The stream metaphor is useful, since at the end of the second and beginning of the third century, the Jesus movement has very deep social cleavages. As Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (trans. Robert Kraft, Gerhard A. Krodel; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), describes, what in some places would later become recognized as heresy as sometimes the first form of Christianity that appeared. In Rome Quartodeciman, Valentinian, Callistan, Marcionite, Monarchian-Sabellian, Hippolytan, Theodotan, Carpocratian and other streams of Christianity existed in uneasy tension. Nevertheless, the literature of some of these groups (Valentinian, Hippolytan) is self-conscious of differences in essence and marginal in numbers as compared with other groups (i.e. Callistan) in the Christian movement. See van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 5. See also Rodney Stark, *Cities of God: the Real Story of how Christianity Became an Urban Movement and Conquered Rome* (San Francisco: Harper, 2006), 141-81.

Hippolytus #2 interprets the Song of Songs as a love song about King Jesus and his beloved(s). Such a topic is appropriate for a symposium¹⁴⁹ in a church that views itself as a philosophical school in the process of an ongoing negotiation of its identity in competition with the synagogue and Christians of rival groups in the context of the Roman Empire. An analysis of the rhetorical structure and social context of the commentary shows that Hippolytus #2's relationship with women, who provided informal leadership in his community as patronesses, was fraught with tension. The development of these issues in conjunction with the translation of the *In Cant.* will be seen to support a western provenance for the commentary.

Determining the Rhetorical Unit and Arrangement

Use of the Schema Isagogicum

The introduction to the commentary and the perorations that frame the largest part of the composition (2.1-35; 26-27) show that Hippolytus likely conceived of the commentary as a whole, complete where it left off.¹⁵⁰ If this is so, it implies that the author conceived of the work as a unity, for a single purpose. The first chapter has the putative purpose of introducing audience to the author, Solomon; however, the divine author is the real subject of the introduction. It is God in the form of Wisdom, the *Logos* or the Holy Spirit. Hippolytus also introduces the reader to the typological interpretation of the Song of Songs using a typical introductory form that provides an

¹⁴⁹ According to Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist*, 49.

¹⁵⁰ Against Pelletier, *Lectures du Cantique des Cantiques*, 218. While is possible, however, that Hippolytus intended to use the Song as an extended mystagogy beyond Song 3:7, but no evidence either in the manuscript tradition or in patristic quotations suggest this. All sources seem to stop where the Georgian text stops.

important contribution to understanding the structure and rhetoric of the commentary.

As is well known, ancient philosophical Neoplatonist commentators on Aristotle habitually began their interpretation of Aristotelian works according to a defined *schema isagogicum*.¹⁵¹ The questions typically discussed were:

- 1) the aim, theme, purpose, or intent (sometimes considered separately) of the work (πρόθεσις, σκόπος);
- 2) the position of the work in the particular corpus or canon;
- 3) the utility (χρήσιμον) of the work;
- 4) the authenticity (γνήσιον), especially if the authenticity had been doubted for any reason;
- 5) the explanation of the title (ἄτιον τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς) if the title itself was difficult to understand or raised some question;
- 6) the division of the work into parts, chapters, or sections (διάρσεις, τομὴ εἰς κεφάλαια ἢ τμήματα ἢ μέρη);
- 7) to what part or division of philosophy (ὑπὸ ποῖον μέρος, ἀνάγεται).

Hadot and Neuschäfer discovered independently of one another that Origen, in the mid-third century, used four of these preliminary questions in his *Commentary on the Song of Songs*.¹⁵² Mansfield, in his detailed study of ancient prolegomena,

¹⁵¹Jaap Mansfeld, *Prolegomena: Questions to be Settled before the Study of an Author or a Text* (Philosophia antiqua, 61 Leiden New York: E. J. Brill, 1994), 10-11. The following list is derived from Mansfield.

¹⁵²Mansfeld notes the independent discoveries of Ilsetraut Hadot, *Simplicius: Commentaire sur les catégories* (Philosophia Antiqua 50-51; New York: E. J. Brill, 1989), 36-40; Bernhard Neuschäfer, *Origenes als Philologe* (SBA 18 Basel: F. Reinhardt, 1987), 1:77, emphasizes the philosophical coloring of Origen's prologue under the heading, "die Topik des Canticumkommentar prologs," 1:77; Christoph Schäublin, *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese*

demonstrates that Origen actually discussed five of these issues in his prologue as well as an issue important in Proclus' discussion of Plato's dialogue, the issue of the *dramatis personae*.¹⁵³ Hippolytus mentioned or discussed all the issues in his prologue in *In Cant.* 1 and in the course of *In Cant.* 2 touches directly on the issue of the *dramatis personae*. An outline of *In Cant.* 1 demonstrates that Hippolytus structures the introduction according to the questions typical of the *schema isagogica* in as complete a fashion as does Proclus, including a reference to the question of the authenticity of the Song. So, once again, Hippolytus shows a sensitivity to the genre expectations of his audience and projects the ethos of a serious teacher. The introduction provided by Hippolytus raises and answers the question of what the reader or hearer must know to understand the Song and the commentator's purpose in making use of the Song. An overview of the introduction below reveals that the *schema isagogicum* is, in fact, the central organizing feature of the introduction.

Chart 1: Structural Outline Introduction to *In Cant.*

1. Disclaimer about the authors, divine (Wisdom) and human (Solomon) though royal not to be confused with divinity—Solomon had the gift of wisdom, he was not Wisdom (his life is separate from Wisdom) (1:1-2a)
2. Place in canon of Scripture, specifically the Solomonic canon (1.2b-3)
 - a.) Three books exhibit the Trinity: Father, Son, Holy Spirit
 - 1.) Proverbs, the secret of the Father
 - 2.) Ecclesiastes, the Son of God in riddles
 - 3.) Song of Songs, composed in communion with the Holy Spirit for

(Köln: P. Hanstein, 1974). Mansfeld notes the use of additional members of the *schema isagogica* in Origen and other early Christian commentary writers.

¹⁵³Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 12.

praise (of the love of Christ and the church)

3. Purpose of the three books of Solomon: though three, the books express a unity, representing the Trinity 1.3b-5
 - a.) Song of Songs, in praise of the unity of the Holy Spirit
 - b.) Proverbs, the Father as source of wonderful wisdom
 - c.) Ecclesiastes, the darkness of the world overcome through the Son
4. Utility of the Song of Songs: give consolation, knowledge of God (1.6-10)
 - a.) *Bioi* of Solomon and Wisdom contrasted
 - 1.) Wisdom or *Logos* Wis 9:1 was with God before creation
 - 2.) Solomon as a prophet to the *Logos* spoke to us
 - 3.) Wisdom (*Logos*) brought forth before the mountains, the beauty of this world arranged by the *Logos*
 - 4.) Throughout history Wisdom or *Logos* is making known in various ways the economy of salvation and continues to speak to the faithful through the knowledge of the Father's will given to them.
 - 5.) The Wisdom or *Logos* is Christ
 - 6.) 1 Cor 1:23—Christ the Wisdom of God
 - b.) Solomon spoke by the Holy Spirit
 - 1.) A new praise (encomium) [of the love between Christ and the church]
 - 2.) The new praise foreshadows a mystery of revelation (i.e., of Christ and the church)
 - 3.) Wrote by speaking “before a scribe transcribes them”
 - 4.) The legendary wisdom of Solomon
5. The issue of authenticity and the loss of the majority of Solomon's works (1.11)
6. Divisions of the Song of Songs (1.12)
 - a.) 1.12 Books lost, explanation of title, but of each type of writing the best was preserved by Hezekiah and his court.
7. Explanation of title “Song of Songs” (1.13-15)

- a.) 1.14 Notice from Prov 25:1 shows that the selection process was guided by the Spirit, for the edification of the church
 - b.) 1.15 The most unique and noteworthy examples were chosen
8. Reiteration of purpose, believers, place in the canon, P-E-SoS together form an “ancient spiritual narrative” of the Trinity, which the Spirit now sings to the faithful

Proclus’ complete introductions (from the fifth century) clearly depend upon earlier widely diffused pedagogical tradition, as the evidence in both Origen and now here from Hippolytus shows. Mansfeld explains that Origen must have made a living as a professional *grammatikos*, teaching both literary and philosophical treatises of Plato and possibly Aristotle that were furnished with such introductions.¹⁵⁴ A similar statement may also be true for Hippolytus and, whether or not Hippolytus was a *grammatikos* before becoming a Christian teacher, his choice of the *schema isagogicum* (more complete, but less elaborate than Origen’s) exhibits his intention to portray himself as a teacher of philosophy, familiar with the expectations of an educated audience that sets out to study a canonical text that required comment.

Overall Structure of the Commentary

Apart from the introduction, the structure of the rest of the commentary is not entirely clear. The author does not follow structural units of the text of Song itself, but seems to adapt his comments to his didactic purpose. Hippolytus makes use, however, of several features including introduction formulae, *inclusio*, *exordium*, *anaphora*, *peroration*, direct questions to interlocutors, cross referencing, and summaries which all determine the rhetorical units of the commentary. The structural

¹⁵⁴Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 56.

outline offered below views the text as offering an introduction and three homiletical units. Such a structure is suggested in the introduction of the commentary, “the Song of Songs, which is hardly more than three songs (praises) *composed of 300 lines*” (*In Cant.* 1.11b).¹⁵⁵

Song of Songs is an unruly text. At every turn Hippolytus must dominate and forestall other possible meanings to legitimate his typological interpretation. In offering the text as a sort of introduction to the Christian life for new believers, the text often escapes him. It leads the reader away from the point he wishes to establish. The interpretation is therefore in constant danger of breaking down. Nevertheless, typological and allegorical readings of difficult ancient texts was a well-worn path taken often by the *grammaticus* and teacher of rhetoric, so Hippolytus was in familiar territory.

Chart 2: Outline of the *In Cant.*

- A. Introduction 1.1-15 following the typical *schema isagogicum* current in philosophical school commentaries during the second and third centuries: what the reader/hearer must know to understand the Song
- B. Homily #1 on the anointing with *myron*, a symbol of receiving Christ and the Spirit 2.1-35; texts: Song 1:1.2, 3, 4a. Introduction formula: “Now come, let us see what lies ahead” (*In Cant.* 2.1-4a)
 - 1. Exordium:¹⁵⁶ Kiss and the *myron* of the name: “It has been given to us to administer these things”
 - a.) Symbolic approach to the *dramatis personae*: A symbol of the people who desire to join with the Spirit (as did Solomon)
 - b.) Definition of terms: Kiss, breasts of Christ (law and gospel), sweeter than

¹⁵⁵On the textual problem, see the annotated translation at 1.11.

¹⁵⁶Meloni, “Cantico dei Cantici,” *Aug* 13: 100-1.

wine is the milk of commandments—love of God

2. Exhortation to catechumens: draw out milk from these breasts to be a witness “built up and perfected” and to receive the anointing and understand its significance (2.4b-8)
 - a.) *Myron* symbolizes the *Logos* that went forth from the Father (*In Cant.* 2.4, 5)
 - b.) *Myron* symbolizes of the incarnation of the *Logos* that brings joy
 - c.) Consolation of *protherapeia*: the anointing with *myron* (*Logos*, Spirit) brings rejection from outsiders
 - d.) The mystery of the incarnation is a narrative poured out from the Father, yet did not diminish in force
3. First peroration, Hippolytus exhorts audience to receive anointing (2.9-30):
 - a.) Provides examples of righteous men and women who loved or hated the anointing (the *Logos*)
 - 1.) Judas betrayed Christ (hated the anointing) negative example;
 - 2.) Noah versus Ham (2.10)
 - 3.) Eber loved anointing versus Nimrod who hated it (2.11-13)
 - 4.) Abraham, Isaac, Jacob versus Esau 2.14-16
 - 5.) Joseph loved anointing despite being sold into slavery (2.17)
 - 6.) Tamar loved anointing and made herself look like a prostitute, led to godly offspring (2.18)
 - 7.) Joseph, opposed to stealing and sexual activity with owner’s wife, loved anointing (2.19)
 - 8.) Moses zealous of the anointing, he is avenger of Israel (2.20)
 - 9.) Aaron loved it (he was anointed priest) (2.21)
 - 10.) Phineas loved it; Zambri did not; with zeal for the anointing, Phineas killed Zambri and his prostitute (2.21)
 - 11.) Joshua loved it and circumcised the people with a stone (2.22)
 - 12.) David loved the anointing and is a symbol of the anointed one; came from the heart of the Father; his lineage gave human life (flesh) to the Word made flesh (2.23)
 - 13.) Solomon longed for the anointing and received Wisdom (2.24)

- 14.) Daniel and his three friends loved the anointing and received a visit from the *Logos* while in the fiery furnace (2.25, 26)
- 15.) Joseph loved the anointing and became a divine consultant of a king (2.27)
- 16.) Mary loved it and became mother of the *Logos* (2.28)
 - i.) A new mystery: Martha carried the anointing and poured it on Christ “with all intercession and consolation” this one is also for those truly just and to whom it is revealed (2.29)
 - ii.) Judas hated the anointing (2.31-31)
 - α.) He tried to rob the poor (2.30)
 - β.) The anointing, however, is made available to the poor (2.31)
 - iii.) The churches are like the young virgins who love Christ, they are dressed by order of Christ, they have been attracted to Christ (2.32-34)
4. Summary exhortation: follow Christ to be bound to the “greatest things” in order to hold desire for carnal things in check (2.35)

C. Homily #2 Topic: Repentance or Conversion with a diatribe on the conversion of the Jews (3.1-22.10)

1. The king who brings the beloved into his chambers is Christ (3.1-5.3)
 - a. The beloved is black but beautiful (sinful but beloved)
 - b. She must overcome her former identity as a sinner and a shepherdess
 - c. She neglected her own vine.
2. Christ is also a Shepherd, especially for those (especially Jews?) who will be bold enough to reveal their love for him (6.1-7.2)
 - a.) “Follow me barefoot” (be willing to give up everything (7.3)
 - b.) Israel is no longer as a flock for you (7.4)
 - c.) Go to the Gentiles, you will be glorious if you repent (7.5-8.1).
3. Transition on repentance: Christ compares the faithful of the church-school to a mare among the chariots of Pharaoh; he gives a blessing on those who repent (8.1-3)
 - a.) The mare was from the people, which reminds Hippolytus of the apostles symbolized by the steeds of Helios (not mentioned by name) (8.2, 3)

- b.) The four Evangelists represented by the four steeds (8.4-7)
- 4. The four Evangelists are four steeds united in harmony with a driver (8.8) who stirred up the nations (Zodiac symbol of Helios with chariot and four horses found in ancient synagogues and in ancient Christian funerary art)
- 5. The consolation of significance (recompense for loss and exclusion): “that you may leave an impression on the world” (8.8, 9)
 - a.) The (Jewish) synagogue also called to repentance/conversion (8.8)
 - b.) Repetition of opening theme from heading in 8.1 (8.9a)
- 6. Promise of honor for those that repent 8.9b-12.1
 - a.) Beauty and honor (9.1)
 - b.) The inheritance of the gospel exceeds the “gold and silver” of the Jewish law (10.1)
 - c.) Until Christ comes in kingly power, the Spirit is the chrism of grace for the conversion of both Gentile and Jew (11.1)
 - d.) Transition to heading on the crucifixion. Christ is bound to the flesh by love and because of this love that “bound” him to the flesh, he was able to be “crushed” like grapes, i.e., incarnation is an expression of love, making salvation of the flesh (creation) possible
- 7. The figure of the “bound one” represents atonement (building on the *aqedat* Isaac)
 - a.) The interpretation of the lover, like a sack of “nard of *kyprou*” between the beloved’s breasts interpreted as Christ crucified and raised (12.2; 13.1a)
 - b.) Wounded, he gives off his aroma, his transforming presence (13.1b)
 - c.) Like the harvesting of nard and as the Father had to open his mouth, the Son had to be cut open to reveal his power (13.2, 3a)
 - d.) Because he was great, he appeared abased, rich made poor for us. He humbled himself and arose to spread his transforming power (13.3b)
 - e.) The Word glorified himself on earth, hurried to heaven, and descended so that people might ascend (13.4)
 - f.) Transition: because of this development, the beloved is beautiful (14.1)
- 8. The beauty of the beloved (14.2-19.3)

- a.) She is forgiven (14.2b)
 - b.) Encouragement of the newly converted, who received wisdom (15.1)
 - c.) Her love is toward Christ (15.2a)
 - d.) Grace from the Spirit for those who flee to Christ (15.2b-3)
 - e.) Cypress dwelling of beloved and lover, patriarchs and apostles (16.1, 2)
 - f.) She carries the lover's fragrance, praises her own beauty (17.1, 2)
 - g.) Beloved and lover praise one another, return to the *myron* theme (19.1) from Homily #1 (18.1-19.1)
 - h.) Exhortation to bold witness in professing Christianity, "with a seal on the forehead" (19:2-3)
9. Peroration on the leaping Word (incarnation and resurrection) (20.1-22.10)
- D. Homily #3 Hippolytus praises the incarnation, resurrection, and the passionate pursuit of Christ with an encomium on the women (myrrhophores) who cling to Christ (22.10-27.10)
- 1. Encomium of the women who reverse the effects of sin brought into the world through Eve: Martha, Mary as apostles to the apostles. They represent Eve who now walks in order, and is received as an offering to Christ¹⁵⁷ (23.1-25.10)
 - 2. Peroration on the κλίνη of Christ, a festive symbol of resurrection 26.1-27.10

A perusal of the above outline will reveal the use of an introductory formula (invitation) opening the homily (*In Cant.* 2.1) and a peroration (2.9-34) and summary exhortation (2.35) that appears to close the first speech comprised of the combination of the Introduction and Homily #1. The topic of this peroration is an encomium on zeal for obtaining and love for the anointing of fragrant *myron* (oil) that symbolizes the Word present in the Holy Spirit. No special formula opens the next section marked Homily #2; however, the end of Homily #2 (only about five percent longer

¹⁵⁷Note that the language about receiving Eve as an offering is likely baptismal. Cp. *Comm. Dan.* 1.16 where those who are being prepared for baptism are called "On that day bath is made ready for those 'that fire would consume.'"

than the Introduction and Homily #1 combined) is clearly marked by a return to the anointing theme of the end of the Homily #1 (19.1-3). The fact that Homily #2 returns to the theme of anointing at the end may indicate something about its nature. The theme, repeated often throughout Homily #2 is Repentance or Conversion; however, the Jewish synagogue is directly addressed as an interlocutor throughout Homily #2 and urged to repent. The attentive reader may recall that fictitious dialogue with an absent interlocutor is an element of diatribe, similar to Paul's use of diatribe in Romans or Galatians. Addressing Jews seems to have been a common theme in ancient Paschal homily, as the example of Miletus's *De Pascha* shows. Thus the repeated direct address to Jews does not indicate that Jews were expected to be members of Hippolytus #2's audience, though it is possible some Jews could have been converting to Christianity and vice-versa at this time. Rather, the second Homily may well function as a digression, using the power of an indirect approach to convince the audience of the strength of the identity and values shared with the speaker. The synagogue presents a counter example in the author's praise of the love between Christ and the church. It was a common didactic element in the tool box of a teacher in the ancient world. The second homily closes with the second peroration, 22.1-22.10, which focuses on the Gospel of the *Logos*' descent to earth and return to heaven opening up the path of salvation. Homily #3 is marked by a short peroration on the leaping Word and a much longer peroration on the κλίση of Christ (26.1-27.10). The long peroration marks Homily #3 as a climactic moment in the entire series.

Is the In Cant. a Pascal Homily Giving Mystagogical Instruction?

The sources for liturgical history in the second and third centuries are scarce. A preference for Passover baptism does not seem to have been widespread in the second century and may have only been a temporary experiment that soon faded away.¹⁵⁸ Bradshaw has argued¹⁵⁹ that the absence of references to Paschal baptism outside of North Africa and Rome prior to the fourth century makes it clear that Easter baptism was “never the normative practice in Christian antiquity.” The Quartodeciman Paschal celebration in Sardis as evidenced in Melito’s *Peri Pascha* does not appear to have included baptism.¹⁶⁰ Post baptism anointing for receiving the Holy Spirit appears in Antioch and further east later than the third century.¹⁶¹ Then it

¹⁵⁸Bradshaw and Hoffman, *Passover and Easter: the Symbolic Structuring of Sacred Seasons* (Two Liturgical Traditions 6; Notre Dame, Ind: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999), 36, 42-3, 45-6, 49-50, 51 n. 6, 52 n. 15, 54 n. 48, 55, 65, 201.

¹⁵⁹Bradshaw, “Diem Baptismo,” 51.

¹⁶⁰Alistair Stewart-Sykes, *The Lamb’s High Feast: Melito, Peri Pascha, and the Quartodeciman Paschal Liturgy at Sardis* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 42; Boston: Brill, 1998), xii, 176-182; *contra* Raniero Cantalamessa, *L’omelia In S. Pascha dello pseudo-Ippolito di Roma. Ricerche sulla teologia dell’Asia Minore nella seconda metà del II secolo* (Milano: Vita e pensiero, 1967), 282-328, and others read into *Peri Pascha* of Bishop Mileto the practice of baptism; however, nothing in the text supports it. Apparently, however, Passover baptism was not practiced in Asia Minor in the second century by the Quartodecimans.

¹⁶¹On this see especially Winkler, “The history of the Syriac pre-baptismal anointing in the light of the earliest Armenian sources,” *II Symposium Syriacum* (OCA 205, 1978), 317-24, and “Original meaning,” 24-45; also Brock “The Syriac Baptismal Ordines with Special Reference to the Anointings,” *Studia Liturgica* 12 (1977), 177-83, and “The transition to a post-baptismal anointing in the Antiochene rite,” in *The Sacrifice of Praise: Studies in honour of A.H. Couratin* (ed. B. Spinks; Ephemerides Liturgicae, Subsidia 19, 1981), 215-25.

would seem that the confluence of Passover celebration, baptism, and post-baptismal anointing represented in *Comm. Dan.* 1.16 strongly suggest a western social milieu for the mystagogical instruction of the *In Cant.*¹⁶² Hippolytus does not necessarily exclude other times or places as suitable for baptism. He also shows that baptism in his church-school included post-baptismal anointing (with fragrant oil, or $\mu\upsilon\sigma\theta\omicron\nu\nu$) associated with the Holy Spirit. Tertullian, in *Bapt.* 19 also shows a similar predilection for Passover baptism:

The Passover affords a more than usually solemn day for baptism; when, withal, the Lord's passion, into which we are baptized, was completed. Nor will it be incongruous to interpret figuratively the fact that, when the Lord was about to celebrate the last Passover, he said to the disciples who were sent to make preparation, "You will meet a man carrying water." He points out the place for celebrating the Passover by the sign of water. After that, Pentecost is a most joyous space for conferring baptisms; wherein, too, the resurrection of the Lord was repeatedly proved among the disciples, and the hope of the advent of the Lord indirectly pointed to, in that, at that time, when He had been received back into the heavens, the angels told the apostles that "He would so come, as He had withal ascended into the heavens;" at Pentecost, of course. But, moreover, when Jeremiah says, "And I will gather them together from the extremities of the land in the 'feast-day,'" he signifies the day of the Passover and of Pentecost, which is properly a "feast-day." However, every day is the Lord's; every hour, every time, is apt for baptism: if there is a difference in the solemnity, there is no distinction in the grace. (trans. Thelwall, ANF)

From references to rites of Christian initiation scattered throughout the other writings of Tertullian, Bradshaw pulls together the sketch of an order of initiatory rites known by Tertullian around 200 C.E. They were:

- Preparation, "with frequent prayers, fastings, bendings of the knee, and all night vigils, along with the confession of all their sins" (*Bapt.* 20);

¹⁶²Of course, it might be possible that Hippolytus is a purveyor of western rites in the East.

- Prayer over the water, invoking the Holy Spirit to sanctify it (*Bapt.* 4);
- Renunciation of the devil (*Cor.* 3.2; *Spec.* 4);
- Threefold interrogation about the Christian faith “in the words of the rule [of faith]” and triple immersion (*Cor.* 3.2; se also *Mart.* 3.1; *Prax.* 26; *Bapt.* 6; *Praescr.* 36; *Pud.* 9.16; *Spec.* 4);
- Anointing (*Bapt.* 7.1; *Res.* 8.3);
- Signing with the cross (*Res.* 8.2, 3)
- Imposition of hands (*Bapt.* 8.1; *Res.* 8.3);
- Prayer for the first time with other Christians (*Bapt.* 20.5);
- Eucharist, including partaking of milk and honey (*Cor.* 3.2).

The sequence from baptism, anointing, signing with the cross, imposition of hands, and Eucharist is used by Tertullian as an illustration that “the flesh is, in fact, the hinge of salvation” (*Res.* 8.2). The passage marked by initiation is from old Adamic flesh to the new substance of humanity in Christ, generated by pure water and clean spirit. He elaborates this in a way that unites the movement from baptism to eucharistic feast in organic fashion:

Since the soul, in consequence of its salvation, is chosen to the service of God, it is the flesh which actually renders it capable of such service. The flesh indeed, is washed, in order that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed, that the soul may be consecrated; the flesh is signed with the cross, that the soul too may be fortified; the flesh is overshadowed with the imposition of hands, that the soul also may be illuminated by the Spirit; the flesh feeds on the body and blood of Christ that the soul likewise may fatten on its God. They cannot then be separated in their recompense, when they are united in their service.¹⁶³

Hippolytus, in the *In Cant.*, read with *Comm. Dan.* 1.16 and the list

¹⁶³Tertullian, *Res.* 8.2.3.

constructed from Tertullian in mind, has similarities and differences with the list drawn from Tertullian. Indirect and cryptic references to baptismal rites are to be expected in a mystagogical instruction.¹⁶⁴ The possible references to the elements or an order of baptismal events are, of course open to interpretation, since they are more or less indirect and allusive.

- Preparation for baptism: a previous fast may be implied in *In Cant.*:

25.7b Behold, from now on she is made happy through the tree of life and through the confession. From that tree, she tasted Christ. She has been made worthy of the good and [her] heart desired its nourishment. 25.8 From now on she will no longer either crave or proffer to men food that corrupts; she has received incorruptibility; from now on she is in unity and [is] a helper, for Adam leads Eve. O good helper, with the gospel offering (*or* sacrificing) [it] to her husband!¹⁶⁵ This is why the women evangelized the disciples. (25.7b, 8 Georgian text)

- The sanctification of the water:

“The aroma of the fragrance [is] your name spread abroad;” see the aroma of the *myron* which is spread abroad. It was poured out into the belly and created a newly begotten man. It was sent down over the waters and the waters were purified. It was spread abroad to the peoples, and it gathered the peoples. (*In Cant.* 2.8 Georgian text)

- The renunciation of Satan:

25.7 O new consolations! Eve is being called an apostle! Behold from now on the fraud of the serpent is understood and [Eve] no longer goes astray. From now on [she understood] the one she saw from that moment she hated and

¹⁶⁴Doval, *Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogue*, 55-57, discusses the character of Cyril’s mystagogy in contrast to his catechetical teaching, “The interest of the mystagogue is now to draw attention to the rites in a more contemplative than discursive way. . . . The mystagogue stays very close to the actions and images of the rites and enhances the experiential dimension by the regular use of typology and imaginative examples.”

¹⁶⁵Lit. “with the gospel to husband an offering (or with offerings).”

considered as an enemy who seduced her through desire. From now on that tree of seduction would not seduce her. (*In Cant.* 25.7a Georgian text)

- The threefold interrogation and confession is not mentioned directly; however, in the introduction the discussion of the relation of the three Solomonic books (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs) is structured to correspond to the threefold confession and interrogation (*In Cant.* 1.1-10). The profession of faith is mentioned (*In Cant.* 19:3).
- The anointing with fragrant oil (*In Cant.* 2.1-34, especially 2.9) is a central component of the *In Cant.* and probably refers to the post-baptismal anointing (cp. *Comm. Dan.* 1.16).

2.9 Receive the vessel, O man, and come and draw near, that you may be able to be filled by means of the anointing oil. Receive this precious anointing oil. Do not sell it for three hundred *denarii*, but be freely anointed. Do not act like Judas so that you become grieved, but put on¹⁶⁶ Christ with faith, that you may be a fellow-heir (John 12:5; Gal 3:26-27).

- The “overshadowing of the laying on of hands” to bestow the Spirit appears to be mentioned allusively (*In Cant.* 15.2):

15.2 “Behold you are handsome, my nephew, and also handsome, casting a shadow on my couch.”¹⁶⁷ What does he mean to say concerning his residence¹⁶⁸? For, “upon the couch you are casting a good shadow” teaches us the grace of the Spirit, that overshadows all who will encounter burning heat.¹⁶⁹ (*In Cant.* 15.2, 3; *Dan. Com.* 1.16; cp. Tertullian, *Res.* 8.2.3)

¹⁶⁶Or, following Garitte, *deponere super caput (tuum)* “put upon [your] head” (Garitte).

¹⁶⁷Song 1:16 ἰδοὺ εἶ καλὸς ὁ ἀδελφιδὸς μου καὶ γε ὥραϊος πρὸς κλίνη ἡμῶν σύσκιος.

¹⁶⁸Or “inheritance, dominion.”

¹⁶⁹*CantPar* 15.2 πᾶσι τοῖς καυσουμένοις. Cp. *Dan. Com.* 1.16, “those destined for the flames” are baptized and anointed with fragrant oil by Faith and Love.

- Signing with a seal on the forehead is mentioned (*In Cant.* 19:3).
- Prayer for the first time with Christians not mentioned.

Eucharistic celebration is implied in the description of the wedding feast (27.6, the κλίνη of Christ). The feast is also a central component of the last part of the *In Cant.* corresponding to the anointing in 2.1-34. It should also be noted that Hippolytus mentions wine (*In Cant.* 2.1-3; cp. 27.6) but not bread. Christ, however, is mentioned as food (*In Cant.* 25.7, the fruit of the tree of life). Milk is used as a symbol of the commandments (*In Cant.* 2.3).

Given these references and the probability, in accordance with the suggestion of Zahn, Chappuzeau, and Cerrato, that the *In Cant.* is part of an initiation ceremony, it is appropriate to ask whether the commentary was intended for a pre-baptismal *or* post-baptismal. The fact that the “purification of the waters” gets only a passing reference and the *anointing* of the hearers is heavily emphasized favors a post-baptismal setting for the commentary (*In Cant.* 2:1-34). Yet the long teaching does not entirely seem appropriate to be delivered in one chunk. Rather, as suggested in the structural analysis above, the *In Cant.* may represent stages of teaching during a pre-baptismal vigil culminating in the eucharistic celebration referenced in 27.1 ff. Even so, viewing the *In Cant.* as a part of the vigil, a teaching orienting the newly baptized to their new life in Christ, aids in understanding Hippolytus #2’s commentary, and in particular helps clarify the language concerning the participation of women in the community. (See *In Cant.* 25-26.)

The Mystery of the Passover

The rich associations connected with springtime Passover made it particularly appropriate as a high celebration for early Christians in Rome and around the empire. During the second-century Christianity was transformed from a movement among Jews and God-fearers into a Greco-Roman cult whose constituents were largely non-Jewish.¹⁷⁰ Christian groups proliferated and became entrenched mostly in the larger urban areas around the Mediterranean Sea, in areas serviced by cults such as those of Isis, Dionysus, and Demeter.¹⁷¹ They put down roots, used their homes for cult activities, such as the one discovered in Dura-Europos, and eventually remolded them for cult use. Christians celebrated like most other groups, using the institution of communal meals and baptisms that reminded those who participated in them of celebrations of other mystery groups they knew. For this reason Justin Martyr was compelled to make the claim that mystery groups such as those who worshipped Mithras copied their ceremonies from ancient prophecies about Christianity!¹⁷² Initiates in these cults practiced ritual cleansing before “sacred” meals.¹⁷³ Cult meals

¹⁷⁰See Hans-Josef Klauck, *The Religious Context of Early Christianity: a Guide to Graeco-Roman Religions* (SNTW; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000), and Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985); idem, *Ancient Mystery Cults* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), for overviews.

¹⁷¹Stark, *Cities of God*, 101-17; van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 51.

¹⁷²Justin Martyr, *Dial*, 70; *Apol*, 1.24; see van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 51.

¹⁷³Almost any type participated in the “sacred.” See Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 67-85.

often imitated patterns like that dedicated to Demeter and practiced in Eleusis.¹⁷⁴ Practices—not the cult itself, which was not exportable—experienced there were adapted and exported to home-grown cults-groups around the Mediterranean like those of Isis and Dionysus.¹⁷⁵ Initiation typically takes place at night when people are hungry and tired. Ritual fasting intensified the experience which was also retold and explained by the mystagogue.¹⁷⁶ Prayers, rituals, and simple representative objects were used to make the myth capable of being ritually experienced by the initiate. Cult leaders insisted on secrecy so that the experience would not be spoiled for those initiated later.

Christianity lived, moved, and breathed in this atmosphere. Partially for this reason, Easter and also Pentecost became preferred dates for baptism in some sectors of the church. These dates favor reenactment, since they are connected to the crucifixion, the resurrection and the giving of the Spirit.¹⁷⁷ These practices are in line with the recommendations for baptism given in *Trad. ap.* 17-23, though Passover season is not specifically mentioned for baptism in the *Trad. ap.*

Many Romans were eager to adopt oriental religious practices that promised avenues to modulate fate. The practices and the explanations that accompanied them (compensators¹⁷⁸ in sociology of religion terms) promised enjoyment in an afterlife

¹⁷⁴Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 78, 80, 285-6.

¹⁷⁵See Reinhold Merkelbach, *Isis Regina, Zeus Sarapis: die griechisch-ägyptische Religion nach den Quellen dargestellt* (Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1995), 137-85. On Dionysus, see Klauck, *Religious Context of Early Christianity*, 106-17.

¹⁷⁶van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 51.

¹⁷⁷Tertullian, *Bapt.* 19; Hippolytus #2, *Comm. Dan.* 1.16.

¹⁷⁸The language of Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge, *A Theory of Religion* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1996), 326. Compensators

and maintained appeal throughout the Greco-Roman period. The banquet practices of such groups also provided arenas for the enjoyment of life in the here and now.¹⁷⁹

Christians were no different in this regard and shared mealtimes filled with ritual significance which were part of the complex mix of real rewards and compensators offered by early Christians. For example, Tertullian describes the ideal life of a Christian couple, replete with the *pleasures* of “the banquet of God.”

What kind of yoke is that of two believers, sharing one hope, one desire, one discipline, one and the same service? They are brother [and sister in Christ], both fellow servants, there is no difference [between them] either of spirit or of flesh; no, they are truly “two in one flesh.”¹⁸⁰ For, where the flesh is one, the spirit is one as well. Together they pray, together prostrate themselves, together perform their fasts; mutually teaching, mutually exhorting, mutually sustaining. They are equally together in the church of God; equally they are at the banquet of God;¹⁸¹ equally in difficult situations, in persecutions, in receiving refreshment. Neither hides anything from the other; neither shuns the other; neither is troublesome to the other. With a feeling of freedom, they visit the sick,

are “postulations of reward according to explanations that are not readily susceptible to unambiguous evaluation.”

¹⁷⁹Or “rewards,” which, according to Stark and Bainbridge, *Theory of Religion*, 325, are “anything humans will incur costs to obtain.”

¹⁸⁰These words call to mind the Hellenistic ideal of friendship in addition to Gen 1:16 ff. See Diogenes Laertius, *Aristotle*, 11, the *topos* of friendship is a fitting allusive characterization of the ethos of the banquet in the ancient world. On friendship dynamics see John T. Fitzgerald, “The Function of Friendship Language in Philippians 4:10-20” in *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament* (SupNT 82; New York: E. J. Brill, 1996), 105-24.

¹⁸¹No reason exists to imagine the *convivio Dei* to which Tertullian refers as anything other than a full meal called in honor of Christ. The *cena* was not as elaborate, though it could be formal. The *convivium* was more elaborate and entertainment (including the reading or reciting of texts) was expected. See Bradley, “The Roman Family At Dinner,” *Meals in a Social Context*, 37. As such, whether or not the meal was eucharistic is beside the point. Shared meals were a regular part of the ancient Christian life.

they relieve the indigent. Alms are given without the fear that one will torment the other for it; sacrifices are made without second guesses; each one carries out daily duties without one making life difficult for the other: there is no stealthy making of the sign [of the cross], no trembling greeting, no muttered blessings. Between the two echo psalms and hymns; and they mutually challenge each other concerning which shall better sing to their Lord. When Christ sees and hears such things, he rejoices. To these He sends His own peace. Where two are, there Christ is with them. Where He is, there the Evil One is not. (Tertullian, *Ad ux.* 2.8)¹⁸²

During the period of the Roman Empire before the Constantinian turn, the market in which religious products were offered was a fairly open market. The principal competitors in the ancient market of religious rewards (including annual festivals and community meals) and services were mystery religion groups, philosophical schools, the Jewish synagogue, and various breakaway Christian groups. Christians were dependent slaves in non-Christian households, as well as freedmen who were clients of their former masters, or freeborn in client-patronage relationships. Constituents such as these felt the push and the pull to take part in festivals that featured polytheistic ritual.

Several factors made these festivals attractive. Dining with friends was a favorite pastime and if meat was involved, all the more fun. Foreign, especially eastern cults, and especially the cults of Isis and Serapis, were wildly popular and had important cult centers scattered in almost every port city of the Mediterranean. Christian churches were more likely to be represented in cities with temples to Isis and/or Serapis than in cities that did not have this cult, thus they developed an ethos of competition with such cults. As numbers of adherents grew and more well-to-do individuals joined a cult, the quality of the observances was likely to improve and

¹⁸²Adapted from *ANF* 4:48.

both attractiveness and pressure within patron-client groups would increase participation in banquets. In addition, the pervasive religious influence of imperial ideology and theology was expressed in gratitude for imperial patronage in religious processions, sponsored banquets, games, trade and work guilds. Believers felt constant pressure leading to various kinds of accommodation, negotiation, and renegotiation of their relationship with empire. Christian practice and theology developed in continual interaction with these forces as believers struggled to gain adherents as well as to secure and maintain allegiance to group values and practices.

In such an atmosphere, Christians naturally developed rituals that competed with other mysteries and served to transmit group values, consolidate adherence to group identity, provide opportunities for new adherents and converts to be incorporated into the group, and provide avenues of catharsis and pride for saints to transform the negative aspects of adherence to Christ into sources of strength.

Hellenistic Jewish Passover practices underscored the note of freedom and liberation from oppression. Religion and politics in the ancient world were embedded in the household.¹⁸³ The household Passover also had a political dimension. For non-Jewish Christians, the gospel narrative gave the entryway for the ancient observance of Passover. Yet components of the Jewish festival provided an interpretive matrix for the repetition of the gospel narrative. Paul says:

“Clean out the old yeast so that you may be a new batch, as you really are unleavened. For our Paschal lamb, Christ, has been sacrificed. Therefore, let us celebrate the festival, not with the old yeast, the yeast of malice and evil, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth” (1 Cor 5:7-8).

¹⁸³K. C. Hanson and Douglas E. Oakman, *Palestine in the Time of Jesus: Social Structures and Social Conflicts* (Fortress Press, 2008), 5-6.

The oldest testimony to the observance of the Jewish Passover as a meal among Christians is found in the *Gospel of the Ebionites*.¹⁸⁴ Quotations in Epiphanius suggest that Ebionite Christians avoided meat on the Passover, and Origen suggests they “celebrate the Passover with unleavened bread and water, once a year.”¹⁸⁵

The Egyptian *Ep. ap.*, which may be dated to the second half of the second century, between 160 and 170 C.E.,¹⁸⁶ has Jesus command the celebration of Passover as a commemoration:

[The Lord said,] “And you therefore celebrate the remembrance of my death which is the Passover; then will one of you who stands beside me be thrown in prison for my name’s sake, and he will be very grieved and sorrowful, for while you celebrate the passover he who is in custody did not celebrate it with you. And I will send my power in the form of my angel, and the door of the prison will open, and he will come out and come to you to watch with you and to rest. And when you complete my *Agape* and my remembrance at the crowing of the cock, he will again be taken and thrown in prison for a testimony, until he comes out to preach, as I have commanded you.” And we said to him, “O Lord, have you then not completed the drinking of the passover? Must we, then, do it again? And he said to us, “Yes, until I come from the Father with my wounds.”¹⁸⁷

The allusion to Peter’s prison escape story in Acts is unmistakable, but told as part of an assumed Passover celebration. If Hippolytus drew directly from it *Ep. ap.*, as Cerrato suggests, its focus on Paschal celebration suggests that the *In Cant.* made use of its traditions because of appropriateness to the Paschal theme. It is valuable as a point of comparison because not only does it describe the celebration of the Passover,

¹⁸⁴Dominique Gonnet, “La Pâque de Pères de L’église,” *La Maison-Dieu* 240. (2004): 34.

¹⁸⁵Cantalamesa et al., eds., *Easter in the Early Church*, #12.

¹⁸⁶Wilhelm Schneemelcher and R. McL. Wilson, eds., *New Testament Apocrypha* (Louisville, KY: Clarke & Co./Westminster John Knox Press, 1991), 1.251.

¹⁸⁷*Ibid.*, 1.257-8.

as it was likely celebrated in North Africa, it also alludes to the vigil-fast that continued until the “cock-crow,” which was then followed by “the memorial/remembrance that [the apostles should] celebrate” as well as the familial “*Agape*” meal. The reference to “drinking” an allusion to the “cup” (Luke 22:17-18), echoes the Eucharist. These tentative references reveal a schema followed by churches in North Africa (and Rome). The schema included a fast, an all night vigil, readings of the Old Testament Scriptures and the breaking of the fast at the third hour of the morning with an *Agape* meal as the eucharistic meal.¹⁸⁸ During this time baptism was also probably administered,¹⁸⁹ since as a bath it logically formed part of the progression toward a meal.

Baptismal instruction in the *Trad. ap.* is not specifically tied to Easter.

Rather, it describes (*Trad. ap.* 16.1-8) how an adult who desired to “hear the word for

¹⁸⁸It is unclear in the *Ep. ap.* 15 whether the eucharistic meal takes place at cock-crow or later in the day. Also the relationship between the *Agape* and the eucharistic meal is unclear. The Ethiopic text strangely places the *Agape* and the Eucharist “at the crowing of the cock,” while the Coptic text can be read as leaving a considerable gap between the end of the vigil and the (logical) evening celebration of the eucharistic/*Agape* meal. Conversely, it may be read as stating that a Eucharist remembrance was held in the morning and that (logically) an *Agape* was held later on in the day. A comparison with this text and the order of events for baptismal celebration in the *Trad. ap.* 17-21 (see below page 523) and baptismal passover celebration in *Ap. Const.* 5.19 suggests that the end of the vigil in the morning was a time for baptism, which is not mentioned due to the narrative constraints of the *Ep. ap.* See above page 145.

¹⁸⁹Othmar Perler, ed. *Meliton de Sardes: Sur la Pâque et fragments* (SC 123; Paris: Cerf, 1966), 25 is a bit too specific on some of the details “on peut reconstituer le schéma suivant: ‘Pendant la vigile du 14 au 15 nisan, on lisait et on commentait le douzième chapitre de l’Exode. Au chant du coq, vers 3 heures du matin, le jeûne était rompu par une *Agape* suivie de l’eucharistie. Entre la lecture commentée et l’*Agape* suivie de l’eucharistie, on a dû administrer le baptême.’”

the first time” was taken to “the teachers” and interviewed to see if the person was a suitable candidate for conversion.¹⁹⁰ Then the catechumen should “hear the word for three years” (*Trad. ap.* 17.1). Such a period is comparable to the length of time the Disciples spent in training with Jesus, according to the Gospel of John. It was also known to the Hippolytan community as the probationary period for a new member wishing to join the Essenes, or the time spent preparing for entry into some philosophical schools.¹⁹¹ After the three-year period, the catechumen was to “hear the Gospel” (*Trad. ap.* 20.2). Apparently, then, the period before “hearing the Gospel” would have entailed hearing interpretations of selected Old Testament Scriptures.¹⁹² Like the Passover celebration mentioned above, the *Trad. ap.* establishes a baptismal pattern of Friday fasting and Saturday baptism and anointing with oil (*Trad. ap.* 20-22), though it does not explicitly tie this typical order to Passover.¹⁹³

After the commonplaces of the introduction to the *In Cant.*, the first homily briefly mentions baptism in the context of a homiletic development on the topic of anointing (*In Cant.* 2.1-34). The following homily (*In Cant.* 3-19) again and again returns to the twin themes of the salvation of the gentile church and the conversion of

¹⁹⁰The evidence from the *Trad. ap.*, according to most scholars, can credibly be traced to the third century and most would localize the origin of the work in Rome. This, however, is debated.

¹⁹¹See, however, Bradshaw, et al., *Apostolic Tradition*, 96-8, who is skeptical that a set three-year period of catechumenate can be established for the third century.

¹⁹²Pelletier, *Lectures du Cantique des Cantiques*, 214. Such practices could account for the focus on Old Testament Scriptures in Hippolytus #2’s commentaries that emerged in strength in the aftermath of the struggle against Marcion in the mid-second century.

¹⁹³*Trad. ap.* may be illustrative of the rites of some churches in Rome during the third century C.E.

the Jews as *Const. ap.* prescribes. The final homily reiterates the theme of salvation that has come through the Jews by means of the incarnation of the Word and the resurrection (*In Cant.* 20.1-27.10).

Particularly noteworthy is that the commentary, rather than feature baptism prominently, instead features the anointing of *myron* (*In Cant.* 2.9-2.34; 19:3). A brief reference to baptism does appear, in conjunction with the anointing, “

See the aroma of anointing oil poured out; it was taken into the womb and created a new[ly] begotten human [The Spirit] was *sent down over the waters and it purified the waters*. It was poured out to the Gentiles, and it congregated the Gentiles. It was poured out over Israel, nevertheless those who were disobedient did not accept the aroma. Now the mystery has been poured among Israel and the Gentiles came together who believed it. (*In Cant.* 2.8)

The Holy Spirit that descended on the water at the baptism of Jesus is more prominent than the allusion to baptism, because the anointing of water is seen as purifying. This likely means that Hippolytus thought of baptism itself as purifying in preparation for receiving the anointing of the Spirit. In liturgical time, the reference to baptism has already taken place. For this reason, the anointing referred to in *In Cant.* 2.9-34 must be a post-baptismal chrismation, a sealing with the Spirit, (according to *Trad. ap.*, with the oil of thanksgiving) and not an exorcistic anointing.¹⁹⁴ Post-baptismal anointing was a feature of western, not eastern Christian initiatory practice.

Given the limitations of the evidence the aim is not to deal with precise ritual details and liturgical formulae but to draw attention to connections that provide some constants in late antique descriptions of central rituals. At the same time, writers both earlier and later than Hippolytus accessed the Song of Songs to describe Christian

¹⁹⁴Cf. Serra, “Syrian Prebaptismal Anointing and Western Postbaptismal Chrismation,” 328.

initiation. Ambrose, in the fourth century, made extensive use of Hippolytus #2's commentary, so a trajectory of interpretation may be charted that allows for additional insight for the history of interpretation and reception of Hippolytus #2's interpretations.

Material from late antique initiation into mystery cults and initiation practices in philosophical schools are quite illuminating. "Gnostic" Christian baptismal rituals also help shed light on Hippolytan Christian baptismal practice. Certain Christian and Jewish Paschal practices also provide context for an understanding of the *In Cant*.

During the first four centuries of the Christian movement there developed a remarkably structured set of instructions and rituals that richly added to Christian initiation rites that were regularly practiced. This tradition gave rise to baptismal catechisms to which the Song of Songs is closely related.¹⁹⁵ For example, Cyril of Jerusalem, quoting Song of Songs in *Catecheses* 14.10, says: "'The winter is past . . .', it is already spring. And this is the season, the first month with the Hebrews, in which occurs the festival of the Passover. . . ." The roots of this tradition likely lie in the common past with Judaism, and point, perhaps, to a traditional reading of Song of Songs during the Passover festival among Jews.¹⁹⁶ The *GPhil* 7 and 109, is a gnostic Christian liturgy of baptism for Valentinians, that characterize mainstream Christians as the "Hebrews." It associates the baptism ritual of initiation with the transition from winter to summer, the crucifixion, the cross, and the (passover) lamb. Such metaphors are as van Os says, "remarkable for a Gnostic Christian writing,"¹⁹⁷ because of their

¹⁹⁵Daniélou, *Bible and the Liturgy*, 192.

¹⁹⁶Ibid.

¹⁹⁷van Os, "Baptism in the Bridal Chamber," 129.

ties to the “apostolic” church.

The use of symbols from the Song of Songs during Passover for the instruction of catechumens is attested in Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and in the Valentinian *GPhil*¹⁹⁸ and, as some have ventured to guess, may depend upon earlier Jewish traditions of reading the Megillah of the Song during the Passover festival.¹⁹⁹ The figure of Solomon was an appropriate bridge for conversation between both Jews and Romans in the second and third centuries.²⁰⁰ For example, the third-century Rabbi Levi synchronized the date of the founding of Rome with the date when King Solomon married the daughter of the Egyptian Pharaoh Neco.²⁰¹ This kind of comparison shows how Jews were eager to enhance their image with Romans by affirming their similarities and the world-wide scope of their cultural visions.²⁰²

Both Ambrose of Milan and Cyril of Jerusalem in the fourth century, attest to the widespread use of the Song in this way. The *Procatechesis* of Cyril opens with unmistakable references to the Song:

¹⁹⁸Daniélou, *Bible and the Liturgy*, 191-2; van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 126, 127, 129, 157; Pelletier, *Lectures du Cantique des Cantiques*, 152-160.

¹⁹⁹For the suggestion of Jewish origin of the Passover-Song of Songs connection, see Daniélou, *Bible and the Liturgy*, 191-2.

²⁰⁰Viz., a Greek and a Scythian compare the relative value of friendship and use the figure of the king as a typical exemplum, *Toxaris*, LCL trans. 63-67.

²⁰¹Louis H Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 103.

²⁰²One might compare Solomon marrying daughter of Egyptian Pharaoh Neco with Alexander the Great marrying Roxane (327 B.C.E.), visually represented in the triclinium (20) of the Casa del Bracciale d’oro in Pompeii. See Balch, *Roman Domestic Art and Early House Churches* 207.

Already there is a fragrance of blessedness upon you. O you who are soon to be enlightened: already you are gathering the spiritual flowers, to weave heavenly crowns: already the fragrance of the Holy Spirit has breathed upon you: already you have gathered round the vestibule of the King's palace; may you be led in also by the King! For blossoms now have appeared upon the trees; now may the fruit ripen! (*Procat.* 1.1)²⁰³

Cyril has left a condensed report of his baptismal instructions given annually at Easter. The pilgrim's diary of Egeria (*Itin. Eger.* 29-38) which began with Lazarus Sunday and concluded with the Easter vigil shows that such instructions in the fourth century Jerusalem church could take several hours. The liturgy allowed sufficient time for prayer, exorcism, anointing, singing, reading of Scripture, instruction or homily and discussion and meals at home.

In the East, Cyril was a purveyor of western initiation practices,²⁰⁴ which he blended with eastern practice. He structured the twenty-one-day period of instruction carefully.²⁰⁵ After an introductory *Procatechesis* were another seventeen *Catechetical Lectures*, roughly following the order of the traditional Jerusalem credo. Five *Mystagogical Instructions* were delivered in the days following baptism. Only the initiated could attend. Although no text is extant, in 351 C.E. a final exhortation was foreseen, as is announced in the last Catechesis program summary: “. . . and at the end of all, how for the time to come you must behave yourselves worthily of this grace both in words and deeds, that you may all be enabled to enjoy the life everlasting.”

Jewish holidays particularly Passover, were attractive to some non-Jews.²⁰⁶

²⁰³ *Procatechesis*, *NPNF*, Ser. II, vol. 7, with modifications (=PG 33.333A).

²⁰⁴ Daniélou, *Bible and the Liturgy*, 192.

²⁰⁵ See van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 29.

²⁰⁶ Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World Attitudes*, 356, 376. See also the

A Talmudic passage mentions discussions between Hillel and Shammai on admission of proselytes before Passover for the Passover meal (*Pesahim* 87A; 92B). If early evidence pointed to a use of Song of Songs during the Passover, then it would seem a natural development in Christianity that the newly baptized should be instructed in their new faith using elements of the Song of Songs. Any direct connection awaits further research.

That Martha and Mary, likely understood as the sisters of Bethany, appear in the *In Cant.* as witnesses of the resurrection seems to have a connection to traditional liturgical practice in Jerusalem.²⁰⁷ A fraction of a sermon on the raising of Lazarus is by Hippolytus extant, and the Martha and Mary pair appear elsewhere in the Hippolytan corpus as resurrection witnesses. About one hundred fifty years after Hippolytus, the diary of Egeria shows that Christians in Jerusalem begin Holy Week celebrations with Lazarus Sunday, a visit to a stational church commemorating Lazarus' tomb. Apparently an association (a liturgical one?) of the raising of Lazarus

body of evidence gathered by Stein, "The Influence of Symposia Literature on the Literary Form of the Pesah Haggadah," 13-44.

²⁰⁷*Ep. ap.* 9; *Itin. Eger.* 29. The western Ambrosian Missal (earliest mss are from the 10th or 11th centuries,) contains a transitory in the Mass of the Friday of the week after Easter that has "Mary and Martha" visiting the tomb. A possible explanation of this material is that Ambrose used the *In Cant.* for some of his liturgical material as evidenced in *De Isaac et Anima* and the *Exposition of Psalm 118 (119)*. A tradition derived from Hippolytus' works known in Milan would have received powerful reinforcement from pilgrims visiting Jerusalem. Anton Baumstark, "Hippolytos und die außerkanonische Evangelienquelle des äthiopischen Galiläa-Testaments," *ZNW* 15 (1914): 332-35, disputes this connection and instead argues that the tradition comes from the lost Gospel of the Egyptians. Baumstark's suggestion seems unnecessarily complicated. For a fuller discussion, see Ernst, "Martha From the Margins," 175-8.

with the resurrection of Christ was already part of the Johannine Gospel tradition and the presence of the sisters from Bethany at the empty tomb of Jesus would have been a natural development of oral tradition. Ernst discusses the early and geographically wide-spread traditions linking Mary and Martha to the story of the empty tomb of Jesus and argues that they are parallel Johannine oral traditions that are as ancient as the written traditions inscribed in the Gospel. She suggests that Martha was an early figure of apostolic authority in the Johannine community.²⁰⁸ The appearance of Mary and Martha were an early commonplace of Easter celebration. As witnesses of the resurrection, they suggest an Easter-Passover context for the *In Cant.*

Along with the Easter imagery (see *In Cant.* 25-27), the assumption that the commentary was intended for use as sermonic material in a Paschal context is supported by the Jerusalem manuscript that bears the title “*Sermon* of the blessed Father Hippolytus on the Song of Songs.”²⁰⁹ Homiletic features abound in the direct address to the listeners.²¹⁰ Furthermore, the entire commentary concludes with a short, liturgical doxology “glorifying God to whom is glory and power for ever and ever” (27.12).²¹¹ Pelletier contrasts the more oral, homiletic nature of the commentary with the more literary *Comm. Dan.* by Hippolytus.²¹² Nevertheless, she suggests that *In Cant.* is still a reworking of previous homiletic material into the written form of a

²⁰⁸Ernst, “Martha from the Margins,” 409.

²⁰⁹The Tbilisi manuscript bears the title, “Interpretation of the Song of Songs *spoken* by the blessed Hippolytus,” Garitte, CSCO 266: 22.

²¹⁰Chappuzeau, “Auslegung,” *JAC* 19: 46, notes the abundant use of second person direct address as well as other features.

²¹¹McConvery, “Hippolytus’ Commentary,” 214.

²¹²Pelletier, *Lectures du Cantique des Cantiques*, 216.

commentary, preserving the sermonic elements captured by a tachygraphist.²¹³ The connection felt by Chappuzeau with baptismal instruction, still, has not received the attention it deserves. Such a liturgical, Paschal, and baptismal (or rather, mystagogical) context for the commentary connects it with the use of the Song of Songs in other ancient baptismal instruction for catechumens and the recently baptized.

For a time during the fourth century an effort appears to have been made to standardize Paschal baptism along with the prominent use of the Song of Songs. Such a movement is confirmed by Cyril of Jerusalem, who was a purveyor of western traditions. This move was not universal, but depends upon late second and early third-century baptismal practice, as Hippolytus and Tertullian confirm, at least for North Africa and Rome. The celebration of baptism as nuptials appears to have been a development of western Christianity. While Tertullian writes that “Passover affords a more than usually solemn day for baptism” (*Bapt.* 19)—Passover is, in fact, the best day for baptism, with Pentecost in second place²¹⁴—he also writes of baptism as the nuptials of the believer. He says, “When the soul comes to the faith, it is received by the Holy Spirit. The flesh accompanies the soul in this wedding with the Spirit. O blessed marriage, if it allows no adultery” (*An.* 41.4; cf. *Res.* 63). Origen has a similar idea as well, “Christ is called the bridegroom of the soul, whom the soul espouses when she comes to the faith” (*Hom. Gen.* 10.4).²¹⁵ Though the theme of baptism as

²¹³Ibid., 222.

²¹⁴Cheslyn Jones et al., ed., *The Study of Liturgy* (rev. ed. London: SPCK, 1978), 121.

²¹⁵Daniélou, *Bible and the Liturgy*, 192, notes that in Tertullian the spouse is the Holy Spirit, while in Origen he is Christ. Hippolytus #2, however, appears to use both

nuptials derives from biblical precedents,²¹⁶ the exquisite development of the theme as a metaphor for initiation may be traced to Valentinian interpretations of baptism as early as the mid-second century.²¹⁷ Groups such as the Valentinians and Marcionites do not seem to have deviated greatly with respect to the actual rites associated with baptism in the second century.²¹⁸ For example, when *GPhil* speaks of baptism, it does not seem to have in mind any novel ritual, but, so far as one may tell, the kind of rite generally referred to in sources as diverse as the *Didache*, Justin's *Apology* 1, and

notions *at the same time*: "Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth, because your breasts are much better than wine, and as an aroma of *myron* your name has been spread abroad . . . this is a symbol of the people that entreat the Word from heaven to kiss them, because [the people] wish to join [with him] mouth to mouth. For [the people] greatly desire to join with the Spirit himself" (*In Cant.* 2.1).

²¹⁶It may point to a previous use of the Song in connection with initiation, Pelletier, *Lectures du Cantique des Cantiques*, 152; however, many other precedents exist. See Robert M. Grant, "The Mystery of Marriage in the Gospel of Philip," *VC* 15 (1961): 129-37. It seems that Valentinus greatly extended the use of nuptial imagery for initiation.

²¹⁷See Robert M. Grant, "Mystery of Marriage," *VC*: 138; van Os, "Baptism in the Bridal Chamber," 91, see especially 93-6. Note, however, that Tertullian did not criticize Valentinians for innovating rituals when he ridiculed the Valentinian teaching of the brotherly nuptials of the σὺζυγοὶ in the πλέρωμα (Tertullian, *Contra Valentinus*, 7.32). Marcion set up his own "church" in the mid-second century to purge it of Jewish elements. Valentinus attempted to remain within the mainstream church, maintaining both Scriptures and rituals, with different interpretations. For both, the ritual starting point were practices current in the Roman Church or conscious adaptations, *op. cit.*, 127.

²¹⁸Elaine Pagels, "Ritual in the Gospel of Philip," in *The Nag Hammadi Library after Fifty Years: Proceedings of the 1995 Society of Biblical Literature Commemoration* (ed. John D. Turner, Anne McGuire; NHMS 44; Leiden: 1997), 281. See also eadem, "The 'Mystery of Marriage' in the Gospel of Philip," in *The Allure of Gnosticism: The Gnostic Experience in Jungian Psychology and Contemporary Culture* (ed. Robert A. Segal et al.; Chicago: Open Court, 1995).

Trad. ap. The sparse and varied evidence available clearly does not support a uniform baptismal practice among second and third-century Christians. The practice of baptism reflected in *GPhil* appears to have links with western practice. The *GPhil* mentions removal of clothing (75.20-26), descent into water (64.24; 72.30-73.1; 77.10-15), and immersion with the threefold name (“Father, Son, and Holy Spirit”) pronounced over the person to be baptized (67.20-22). Apparently baptism was also followed by anointing with oil (69.5-14; 67.4-9) and the kiss of peace (59.1-6) and was concluded by participation in the Eucharist. There also appears to have been a preference for celebrating these rites in the context of Passover (7 and 109).²¹⁹ In support of Chappuzeau’s suggestion that the *In Cant.* fits the context of Christian initiatory rites around the Passover celebration, it may be said that the *In Cant.* makes uses of themes connected to the Christian celebration of Passover, namely: the initiation of catechumens (in the west), a call for the repentance of Israel, the death and resurrection of Christ, boldness in witness in the face of persecution, and allegiance to Christ as king.

²¹⁹van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 105. See page 423.

The In Cant. as Mystagogy.

The *In Cant.* is a mystagogical instruction with a focus on the rite of post-baptismal anointing, considered to have been a western practice.²²⁰ Mystagogy is catechetical instruction that takes place after baptism. It concerns the rites of Christian initiation and the deeper meaning of these rites. This is certainly a major thrust in the *In Cant.*, which may be fruitfully compared with later mystagogical instruction especially that of Ambrose of Milan whose *De Mysteriis* may depend, in part, on Hippolytus' use of the Song. It is well known that Ambrose made use of the *In Cant.* in his other works.²²¹

Extensive teaching before baptism in Christianity probably depends upon Jewish models of proselyte instruction. Proselytes were given teaching in the commandments and the meaning of conversion before receiving proselyte baptism (*b.*

²²⁰Thus, Hippolytus pre-dates by over 150 years the rise of mystagogy at the end of the fourth century in the homilies of Ambrose, Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, and Theodore of Mopsuestia. See Enrico Mazza, *Mystagogy: A Theology of Liturgy in the Patristic Age* (Pueblo Pub Co, 1989), x. For comparative description of rites, see Hugh M. Riley, *Christian Initiation; a Comparative Study of the Interpretation of the Baptismal Liturgy in the Mystagogical writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Ambrose of Milan* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1974).

²²¹See the abundant footnotes with quotations of Ambrose in Chapter Three. Another fruitful set of comparisons may be made with the *Catechetical Lectures and Mystagogical Instruction* by Cyril of Jerusalem. By the time of Cyril of Jerusalem, catechesis and mystagogy became considerably more developed than during Hippolytus' time. The creed then formed the basic text of the cycle of instruction, Jan W. Drijvers, *Cyril Of Jerusalem: Bishop And City* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae; Brill Academic Publishers, 2004), 53-63. However, it is likely that older catechetical and mystagogical practices, influenced Cyril. This is an area for further research.

Yebam. 47a-b). The teaching of the two ways in the *Didache* 1-7 and the *Epistle of Barnabas* 18-20 appear to be dependent upon Jewish models of basic teaching like the *Rule of the Community* from the Dead Sea Scrolls. Justin Martyr attests to the use of pre-baptismal instruction in Rome as early as the second century: “As many as are persuaded and believe that the things taught and said by us are true and promise to be able to live accordingly” are led to the water (*Apology* 1.61). Recently Van Os has argued convincingly that the second-century *Gospel of Philip* is a Valentinian instruction manual comprising both catechesis and mystagogy.²²² Irenaeus’ *Proof of the Apostolic Teaching*²²³ or his source may have been a manual for catechetical instruction.²²⁴ The *Apostolic Tradition* 16-20, often attributed to Hippolytus, suggests that catechetical instruction included teaching on Scripture, doctrine, and morals.²²⁵ The emphasis in the *In Cant.* on mysteries may be taken as the early evidence of the beginning of a movement toward a *disciplina arcani*, or secret teachings and experiences for for the newly baptized.

Origen, a younger contemporary of Hippolytus was employed as an instructor of catechesis by the Bishop of Alexandria (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.3). In Origen’s own commentary *On the Song of Songs* he suggests that the study of the Song should be reserved for the spiritually mature,²²⁶ and not for recent converts. This suggests that perhaps others such as Hippolytus used the Song as a starting point for

²²²van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 31-40.

²²³See Everett Ferguson, “Irenaeus’ *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching* and Early Christian Catechesis,” *SP* 18.3 (1989): 119-140.

²²⁴Joseph P. Smith, *St. Irenaeus: Proof of the Apostolic Preaching* (ACW 16; Paulist Press, 1978), 14-18.

²²⁵See Everett Ferguson, “Catechesis, Catechumenate,” *EEC*, 223-26.

²²⁶For the contrast between Origen and Hippolytus on this point, see above page 11.

the instruction for new converts. Origen himself noted that the topic of the Song is reminiscent of the kind of topic frequently discussed at banquets.

Among the Greeks, indeed, many of the sages desiring to pursue the search for truth in regard to the nature of love, produced a great variety of writings in dialogue form, the object of which was to show that the power of love is none other than that which leads the soul from earth to lofty heights of heaven, and the highest beatitude can only be attained under the stimulus of love's desire. Moreover, the disputations on this subject are represented as taking place at meals, between persons whose banquet consists of words and not of meats. And others also have left us written accounts of certain arts, by which this love might be generated and augmented in the soul. But carnal men have perverted these arts to foster vicious longings and the secrets of sinful love. (Origen, *On the Song, praef.* (Lawson, ACW 26:23-24).

Apparently there was sufficient demand, however, for sermonic treatments on the Song so that Origen himself could not keep from sermonizing on the Song for an audience of “babes and sucklings in every day speech.”²²⁷ Origen's spiritual, allegorical interpretation traces in the Song the love of God in the individual soul. By contrast, Hippolytus #2 interprets the Song as a treatment Christ and the Christian community. The church is personified as the church of the Gentiles and the church of the Circumcision, celebrating baptism, anointing, and the Eucharistic banquet. The Song announces repentance to the Jewish synagogue, and warns the faithful against heretics. In contrast to Origen, Hippolytus seems to have urged new Christians to immerse themselves in the imagery and interpretation of the Song as soon as they emerged from the baptismal font. From indications in the *In Cant.* itself, it appears that the context Hippolytus #2 imagined for that discussion was the Christian

²²⁷Origen, *Homilies on the Song, praef.* translated by Jerome (Lawson, ACW 26:265). In the homilies, however, he offers not “meat” but only a “taste” of the interpretation of the Song, Lawson, ACW 26:18.

banquet.

Both Ambrose's *De Mysteriis* and Cyril's *Mystagogical Instructions* (385 C.E.)²²⁸ appear to be speaker's notes to aid other priests in the instruction of new converts.²²⁹ The *In Cant.* has a similar style as speaker's notes, comparable also to the *Gospel of Philip*.²³⁰ However, it is important at this stage to understand the commentary as a part of a larger whole of catechesis and mystagogy. Hippolytus uses the diverse symbols of the Song to explain the meaning of the rites of initiation²³¹ and to glorify the unity of the church with Christ, the unity of the church in bringing Jew and Gentile together, and the unity of the church against heretics. Perhaps the central theme is the "unity of the Holy Spirit" (*In Cant.* 1.4) as symbolized by the rite of anointing with the fragrant anointing oil known as *myron* (2.3-35).²³²

²²⁸For Cyril's authorship of the *Mystagogical Lectures*, see Alexis James Doval, *Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogue: the Authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses* (PMS 17; Washington, D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 2001).

²²⁹Van Os, "Baptism in the Bridal Chamber," 33-35.

²³⁰*Ibid.*, 80-1.

²³¹See below 168-178.

²³²The Georgian term სავსებელი, *sacxebeli*, "anointing oil," is matched in the Greek paraphrase by μύρον (*In Cant* 2.1; *Greek CantPar* 2.1 et passim) and the Latin *unguentum* in Ambrose's quotations of the *In Cant.* (see *In Cant.* 13.2, n. 2). Hippolytus invites his audience to receive anointing after the only reference in the commentary to the waters of baptism (*In Cant.* 2.7, 9), suggesting that the anointing concerned is post-baptismal. Hippolytus says the Spirit descended over the waters to purify them (2.8) in such a way that leaves no place for pre-baptismal anointing to receive the Holy Spirit, as was the early practice in the East. See Bradshaw, "'Dium Baptismo Sollemniorum,'" in *Eulogêma*, 41-51; Gabrielle Winkler, "Original Meaning of the Prebaptismal Anointing and Its Implications," *Worship* 52.1 (1978): 24-45; Serra, "Syrian Prebaptismal Anointing and Western Postbaptismal Chrismation," 328-341; *idem*, "The Baptistry At Dura-Europos," 67-78.

Mystagogy and the Logos Basilikos

Hippolytus expressly characterizes the Song commentary as “praise” inspired by the Holy Spirit, and his commentary itself conforms to this imagined genre of “praise.”²³³ Christian preaching very often centered upon the praise of God and Jesus Christ. What were the social functions of such praise? Praising a god in a gathering such as a church-school or association brought honor to the object of the praise and to the one delivering the praise (see, for example IG III2 1368.111-117, especially ὁ ἱερεὺς δὲ ἐπιτελείτω, θεολογίαν, ἐκ φιλοτειμίας). Praising the god strengthened adherence to group values by giving honor to the group.²³⁴ Hippolytus, in like manner, honors Jesus Christ in the *In Cant.* as King, *Logos*, Wisdom, the *Helios-like driver of the chariot with four horses*, crucified by Rome, resurrected in defiance of Rome and taken up into glory. Such praise has important political implications.²³⁵ The type of encomium of Jesus Christ that Hippolytus develops in the Song of Songs bears similarities with the λόγος βασιλικός.

The λόγος βασιλικός was one of the more common epideictic topics of symposia. The “imperial/kingly praise” was a special kind of *genus laudativum*, or ἐγκώμιον.²³⁶ As Menander Rhetor describes this type of speech, it focuses on the

²³³ According to the evidence in Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 61, this type of rhetorical form was apparently exploited by Hippolytus #2 in similar contexts. See page 487.

²³⁴ Text excerpt: ὁ ἱερεὺς δὲ ἐπιτελείτω τὰς ἐθίμους λειτουργίας σιβάδος καὶ ἀμφιετηρίδος εὐπρεπῶς καὶ τιθέτω τὴν τῶν καταγωγίων σπονδὴν σιβάδι μίαν καὶ θεολογίαν, ἣν ἤρξατο ἐκ φιλοτειμίας ποιεῖν ὁ ἱερασάμενος Νεικόμαχος.

²³⁵ See Warren Carter, *John and Empire*, 19-49.

²³⁶ It should be noted that Song of Songs is described *In Cant.* by Hippolytus #2 as composed “in communion with the Holy Spirit, a work in which the Holy Spirit in-

good qualities of the king or emperor and amplifies them. The speaker of this kind of *encomium* must affect personal inadequacy for the task of lauding the emperor (cf. *In Cant.* 2.2, “may I be worthy!”). Since this rhetorical task was quite common, to describe it, Menander gathered features from such speeches dating from the fourth century B.C.E. Patterns of this type were modified and copied at least until the fifth century C.E.²³⁷ The genre of praise was already a common symposium topic. Singing a hymn to divinity (Bacchus or Zeus) was the typical way to open and close a philosophical symposium (Plato, *Symp.* 176a; Plut, *Quest. conv.* 615b; [Plut.] *Mus.* 1c).²³⁸ Menander, in his influential description of an encomium on behalf of the emperor, recommends a long, full-blown panegyric complete with closing prayer. This form seems also to have been adopted by Jews observing the Passover as well. In such contexts, the blending of the discussion and use of Jewish and Christian texts, also a feature of Jewish meal-time discussions, easily became texts for the praise of God or Jesus as king in the banquet context. Christian initiation during Passover time and as preparation toward full participation in the Eucharist may be seen as protracted preparation designed to orient the new convert to the praise of a spiritual emperor. Participation in a meal conducted by the religious-philosophical school advocating this conversion would have been a natural occurrence.

structed many people for praise” (*In Cant.* 1.4), and “praise to give [forth] the joy of the Holy Spirit and to give the delight of consolation, and [thereby] the knowledge of God is made manifest to many” (1.5).

²³⁷Stein, “The Influence of Symposia Literature on the Literary Form of the Pesah Haggadah,” 13-44.

²³⁸See also Plut, *Sept. sap. conv.* 146d, describing a dinner in honor of the Goddess Aphrodite. The meal both began and ended with repeated words of praise to the goddess (150d and 164d).

Philosophical schools, associations, synagogues, and churches were groups in which meals, liturgy, and speeches or the discussion of literature define the group's identity. Particularly in philosophical schools, canonical lists and the succession of approved teachers and authors (διαδοχή) could be rehearsed, read, and their works discussed in commentary style. A similar discussion format in less formal settings is in evidence as well, e.g., *Attic Nights* (2.22.1; 2.27; 3.19)²³⁹ as well as in Suetonius, *Terrence*.²⁴⁰ The discussion of literature, albeit pictured as long quotations from memory from “walking libraries” in a “λόγοδειπνον” is integral to the presentation of the banquet in Athanaeus' *Deipnosophists*.²⁴¹ Philo's *On the Contemplative Life* provides a prime example of meal-time biblical interpretation.²⁴² Thus commentaries fit the context of an Christian meal context in the same way audio visual presentations or before and after dinner speeches fit the banquet context today. It should be remembered that Christian instruction took place mostly in homes, and that, furthermore, homes were often the context in which “schools” were held. Besides the performance and status enhancement of the speaker, the principle function of the

²³⁹Aulus Gellius, *The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius* (LCL, 195 200 212 Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960), 182-83. This reference in Klinghardt, *Mahlfeiern*, 61, was kindly called to my attention by Dr. David Balch.

²⁴⁰Keith Bradley, “The Roman Family at Dinner,” in *Meals in a Social Context*, 39, citing Suetonius, *Terrence 2* (LCL, Rolfe; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970), 454-7.

²⁴¹See various articles in David Braund and John Wilkins, eds. *Athenaeus And His World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire* (CSAH; University of Exeter Press, 2000). Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 201, refers to Lucian, *Symp.* 17, where a disorderly banquet has one man making a speech while another reads from a book out loud and everyone is drunk. The meal would not have to be disorderly for someone to read from a book and comment upon it.

²⁴²See above 122, and below page 517.

praising and blaming associated with epideictic rhetoric was the affirmation of community values. Encomia achieved this aim through its principal devices of comment, amplification through allegorization, and exhortation, as well as praising expressions of values considered good by the group and blaming examples and values the group was encouraged to reject.

The *In Cant.* shares numerous features with the type of speech given in praise of the emperor; however, it is not a praise of the Roman Emperor and Solomon is only superficially the object of the praise. Rather, Christ the king (*In Cant.* 3.1) is the true object of praise throughout the commentary. From the beginning, Hippolytus clarifies that Solomon was visited by Wisdom and enabled to speak marvelous mysteries concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit for the edification of the church-school. Yet, Solomon is in no way divine, and Hippolytus uses amplification in the proem to give Solomon a good measure of praise as a sort of prophetic king (*In Cant.* 1.1-15). Wisdom, the *Logos*, brought forth before the world was created and incarnated in Christ, is the king praised in the work. When Hippolytus begins to speak of this mystery he affects inadequacy, as the third-century Menander Rhetor stipulates (*In Cant.* 2.2). Quintilian also says of this type of praise, “In praising the gods our first step will be to express our veneration of the majesty in general terms, next we shall proceed to praise the special power of the individual god and the discoveries whereby he has benefited the human race” (*Inst. or.* 3.7.6).

Hippolytus in his Social Context

The church began in private homes and eventually these were remodeled for exclusive church use as the *domus ecclesiae* in Dura-Europos. However, the possession of a large *domus ecclesiae* would not itself have precluded other house-church meetings taking place in patrons' homes. Neither would a *domus ecclesiae* like the one in Dura-Europos necessarily preclude the celebration of large feasts of seated or reclining participants at meals.²⁴³ In addition to church activities in homes, Christians continued traditional cult activities at the graves of family members and martyrs.²⁴⁴ Cult activities in such places as catacombs became a source of religious innovation on a popular level where non-official leadership might emerge among Christians.²⁴⁵ At issue for the third century was the ritual and structural boundary that defines a church from a non-church ritual event. The definition of what did and did not constitute officially recognized church ritual and who could and could not conduct rituals was at the heart of the struggle over church leadership and control. To the extent that such matters resisted definition, "church" and "Christianity" remained a more or less loosely defined expression of popular Greco-Roman religion with contested centers and boundaries. Though one presbyter-bishop might gain a greater following and control over church polity and ritual for a time, in Rome none was

²⁴³Against White, "Regulating Fellowship," *Meals in a Social Context*, 193. See below page 512.

²⁴⁴Osiek, "Roman and Christian Burial Practices and the Patronage of Women," 243-70; Tulloch, "Women Leaders in Family Funerary Banquets," in *A Woman's Place*, 164-93; Denzey, *The Bone Gatherers*, 18, 36-7, 142.

²⁴⁵Tolluch, "Women Leaders," in *A Woman's Place*, 170.

entirely successful in establishing authority over the others until the deaths of Hippolytus and Pontianus (235 C.E.) as recorded in the *Codex-Chronography of 354*. At the same time, the churches in Rome had a significant history of cooperation, banding together to send financial aid to churches outside of Rome and maintaining written correspondence with these groups.

Even in the case of a church that used a *domus ecclesiae* like that of Dura-Europos, the church could still have been composed of various households that in some cases continued to function as quasi-churches. Churches were then networks of households including patrons, clients, and brokers.²⁴⁶ For various reasons, women often became the patrons of their household networks.²⁴⁷ The *In Cant.* appears to exhibit a tension between speaker and audience that fits such a reconstruction. Hippolytus #2 insists that the Song of Songs contains profound counsels or mysteries²⁴⁸ that require the benefit of expert interpretation to facilitate the joining of

²⁴⁶For this terminology and the system of status it implies, see Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (3rd ed.; Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 96-100; Stephen Joubert, "One Form of Social Exchange Or Two? 'Euergetism,' Patronage, and Testament Studies - Roman and Greek Ideas of Patronage," *BTB* 30.1 (2001): 17-25. Cited 03-29. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0LAL/is_1_31/ai_94331628

²⁴⁷For a discussion of the role of women within the house churches of early Christianity, see Carolyn Osiek et al., *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006). The nature of household space as woman's space provided a context in which, in some cases, women functioned in the roles usually thought to have been occupied by men. See Kevin Madigan and Carolyn Osiek, *Ordained Women in the Early Church: a Documentary History* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005).

²⁴⁸It has long been recognized that Georgian *In Cant.* is a translation from and Armenian *Vorlage*. Many places cannot be understood apart from this assumption. The Georgian word *ბრძანება* or "counsel," for example, is used in many cases in the commentary where the meaning requires "mystery," where in the original the Greek word

initiates to the group of Christians. The kiss is a means of sharing in the power of the Spirit, shared in the presence of the leader who represents Christ to them:

What is the will of the Spirit, for what [is its] force, or what might be the interpretation (lit. indication, sign) of this mystery? We must proclaim to those who will hear, for it is the representation (*lit.* type) of the people that entreats the heavenly Word to kiss them, because [the people] wish to join [together] mouth to mouth. For [the people] wishes to join the power of the Spirit to itself.” (*In Cant.* 2.4)

At the same time, Hippolytus #2 gives particular emphasis to several female biblical characters and holds them up for special praise. Indeed, he is prepared to rewrite scriptural traditions for this purpose. For example, Martha becomes the woman who anoints the Christ:

O new mystery and those truly just to whom it was revealed! With desire Martha carried this anointing oil, which she sprinkled on Christ with all intercession and giving of consolation. (*In Cant.* 2.29)

This trend of rewriting the Gospel narratives culminates in chapters 24-25, where two matronal figures, Martha and Mary, are described as “apostles to the apostles,” bearing the news of the resurrection of Christ to the original disciples. By their action they represent the reversal of the curse unleashed by Eve because of her disobedience to God and her dishonorable deception of Adam.

It will be important to ask whether Hippolytus #2’s simultaneous focus on the figures of Martha and Mary and insistence upon his own (or his deputies’) role as

μυστήριον appears, as can be deduced from a comparison between *CantPar* 1.9 and *In Cant.* 1.9. However, the Georgian term has to do exclusively with deliberative processes. The most likely reason the Georgian translator chose this term is that he misunderstood the Armenian word in his *Vorlage*.

interpreter(s) of biblical mysteries and initiatory rites is an expression of tensions felt between official leaders and the matrons-patrons of the church community in which Hippolytus #2 operated as a leader. Particular attention must be paid to the rhetoric of the praise of women in the *In Cant.* What it offers with one hand may be easily withdrawn by the other. Perhaps the key questions are, does Hippolytus honor the figures of women as a way of honoring patronesses of the community in hopes of continued patronage? Or, as others have suggested, is Hippolytus' language a reminiscence of females in authoritative roles in the tradition of the community? Or, is Hippolytus' language a theology for female ordination to ministry in the community?

The Greco-Roman Banquet Tradition

The commentary also participates in thematic aspects that accord with the broader, typical practice of the Greco-Roman festive meal. The rituals marked in the commentary (baptism, anointing, and finally reclining at “couch” in *In Cant.* 2.27) follow the basic outline of preparations for a meal.²⁴⁹ Indeed, baptism and the anointing with myrrh or fragrant oils is brought into the orbit of the meal and therefore redefined as preparations for the festival (or “mystery” 2.2, 23; 24.4; 25.10 [Arm,]; 26.3). The *In Cant.* also directly addresses the topic of drinking to excess in a way that would be appropriate to a festive meal imagined as the context of the reading of the commentary.

“I have loved your breasts more than wine.” Not however [referring to] that wine which is mixed by Christ, but to the wine which in the past made Noah

²⁴⁹During the second century in the East, anointing representing the Spirit was followed by baptism. *In Cant.* follows a “western” order of baptism and post-baptism anointing representing the Holy Spirit.

slow-witted by intoxication, and which deceived Lot, “we love your sources of milk more than this wine,” for the breasts through Christ were the two commandments. It makes one joyful, but does not wish to make one slow witted. For this very reason also the apostle says, “Do not be drinking too much wine to the point of intoxication.”²⁵⁰ 3.4 Now for this reason, beloved, it says, “I have loved your breasts more than wine.” (*In Cant.* 3.3-4)

Wine diluted with water was the normal table beverage in the ancient world.²⁵¹ Justin also refers to the practice of drinking “water and mixture” (ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κραύματος, *Apol.* 1.65.3; οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ *Apol.* 1.67.4). The reference in the *In Cant.* 2.3 casts Christ as the symposiarch,²⁵² who is in charge of determining the proper ratio of water to wine for the purposes of the symposium (see Plato, *Symp.* 176E, 177D, 213E; Plutarch, *Quaes. conv.* 620A).²⁵³ In addition, Hippolytus also recommends the commandments²⁵⁴ of the law as “eternal nourishment,” (*In Cant.* 2.3)

²⁵⁰The reading of Eph 5:18 in the Georgian NT textual tradition closely follows the Greek, καὶ μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνω. But, *In Cant.* resembles more closely Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.*, 2.2.28 Μὴ πίνετε οἶνον ἐπὶ μέθῃ; *Const. ap.* 8:44, Μὴ πίνειν οἶνον εἰς μέθην and Tobit 4:15, οἶνον εἰς μέθην μὴ πίνῃς, than Eph 5:18 in either Gk, or Georgian text traditions. Ambrose, depending upon *In Cant.*, has a similar text at *Exp. Ps.* 118.2.7: *diligamus ubera tua super uinum, sic tamen bibens, ut non absorberetur uino, sed gratia eius laetitiam cordis hauiret, non corporis ebrietate titubaret.* “We love your breasts better than wine,’ nevertheless it means drinking in such a way as not to guzzle wine, but that by his grace one might imbibe joy of heart, and not drink to drunkenness of the body.” Text in Ambrose, *Expositio psalmi CXVIII: Pars V* (VÖAW), 23.14-17.

²⁵¹See Everett Ferguson, “Justin Martyr and the Liturgy,” *ResQ* 36 (1994): 274; idem, “Wine as a Table-Drink in the Ancient World,” *ResQ* 13.3 (1970): 141-53.

²⁵²Conversely, the symposiarch of the Christian feast would naturally be thought of as fulfilling a role representing Christ.

²⁵³References in Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 33-4.

²⁵⁴The twin breasts of Christ are the commandments of the new and old law that nourish the faithful.

as in Philo (*Vit. cont.* 75), other Jewish sources,²⁵⁵ and Tertullian (*Apol.* 1.39) The spiritual nourishment of those who discuss topics of the divine Scriptures is their after-dinner conversation at a feast.

Origen mentions in the introduction to his commentary on the Song that its topic of carnal love was a *topos* of sympotic literature, “the disputations on this subject are represented as taking place at meals, between persons whose banquet consists of words and not of meats.”²⁵⁶ His statement that “many of the sages desiring to pursue the search for truth in regard to the nature of love, produced a great variety of writings in dialogue form, the object of which was to show that the power of love is none other than that which leads the soul from earth to lofty heights of heaven” recalls Plato’s *Symposium*. It also warrants the argument that Hippolytus’ *In Cant.* itself fits the context of the banquet.²⁵⁷ The *In Cant.* also shows numerous points of contact with sympotic literature.

In the course of Hippolytus #2’s comments on the Song, he draws in numerous figures from both the Old and the New Testaments. As seen above (page 127), many of these characters were chosen in order to present examples with which

²⁵⁵Ben Sira (39:8; 9:15-16) also suggests that, among the activities of greatest importance that take place at the meal of scholars is the discussion about the law. See Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 139. The covenanters at Qumran also studied the law together during the evening meal (1QS 6:6-8). Second and third-century Mishnaic references to rabbinic meals also feature discussion of the law as part of the regular “table talk” (*t. Ber.* 4.8.98; cf. the descriptions of the Passover meal, *m. Pesach* 10.1-9).

²⁵⁶Origen, *In Cant.* praef. See earlier in this Chapter, 204.

²⁵⁷One may speculate that Origen’s *In Cant.* was written as a response to the practice exemplified by Hippolytus’ *In Cant.* of using the Song as a text for the initiation of new converts.

the audience can identify. Also, characterization of these figures is their connection to themes of symposium literature. The characterization of incidental and central figures of the *In Cant.* that Hippolytus selects for comment fits the sympotic context and shapes his “ancient spiritual narrative” (*In Cant.* 1.16) in terms of the symposium. The genre of symposium literature provides a rich range of stock characters pertinent both to the characters found the *In Cant.*²⁵⁸ as well as the ethos constructed for both speaker and audience in the speech: the host, the whiner, the uninvited guest, the physician, the late-arriving guest, the insulted guest, the heavy drinker, and the pair of lovers, the prostitute, the seducer. All either make make cameo appearances or are referenced in one way or another in the commentary. Heretics play the role of seducer (another sympotic stock character) who, as the uninvited guest, must be threatened (20.2) and defended against (27.12). Noah represents the heavy drinker (2.3), who is held up for momentary scorn, and Hippolytus encourages the audience to practice moderation, though *not* abstinence, for this would upset the value of joyousness in the Greco-Roman (and Hippolytan) ideal (cp. *In Cant.* 2.6, 7; 3.2): “the wine that is mixed by Christ makes one joyful, but does not wish to make one slow witted” (*In Cant.* 2.5). In the commentary Jesus also plays the role of physician (another stock figure in the banquet literary tradition), bringing rest and healing to the banquet participants. Of the typical stock characters, only the jester, and the late-arriving guest make no appearance, though, as will be seen in the next Chapter, the apostles in the resurrection scene may perhaps be understood as the late-arriving guests (after Martha and Mary) to the miracle of Easter (*In Cant.* 25-26).

²⁵⁸Josef Martin, *Symposion, die Geschichte einer literarischen Form* (Paderborn, D.R.: F. Schöningh, 1931), from the reference in Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 49.

A triad of characters plays a central role in shaping the development of the *In Cant.*'s narrative. The speaker-interpreter plays the role of host, but also casts Christ in the role of host, as the one who mixes the wine for the feast (*In Cant.* 2.3).²⁵⁹ The church of the Gentiles and the Lord are the pair of lovers. The synagogue plays the part of an insulted guest and whiner, though through repentance she may become one with the church as the church from the Circumcision. As Smith remarks concerning the array of motifs in Greco-Roman Symposium literature, "among the stock motifs was the use of the quarrel or contest as a *topos* on which to build [the] narrative [about the symposium]."²⁶⁰ The lover's quarrel among Christ, the synagogue, and the host is a recurrent theme in the commentary. Though Martin's presentation largely concerns the narrative format of the symposium literature, these motifs occur outside the genre, as may be seen in the way Hippolytus develops certain characters in accordance with symposium *topoi*, "That is to say, the symposium narrative became embedded in the culture and profoundly influenced meal practices as well as literary descriptions through the [Greco-Roman] period."²⁶¹

Analysis of these themes could be extended. Hippolytus makes significant use of symposium themes and images in the *In Cant.* and the sympotic themes shape the ethos, the narrative, and the themes of the commentary raising the sympotic references to the level of a central motif. Do these themes and symbols amount to evidence that the *In Cant.* was intended to be read or performed at a banquet or

²⁵⁹Therefore, he introduces the speech (chapt. 1), defines the dual law of Moses and Christ as spiritual nourishment, and offers an appropriate comment on limiting the drinking of wine (2.3) that is mixed by Christ.

²⁶⁰Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 49.

²⁶¹*Ibid.*

whether themes and images of the symposium find their way into the commentary written to be read at any time? It will be argued below that the sympotic motif also deeply shapes Hippolytus #2's characterization of his *audience*. If this assertion is true, then the likelihood is that Hippolytus indeed wrote the commentary in part at least for banquet performance. Its first peroration ended with a rousing rehearsal of biblical characters who desired the anointing, followed by the invitation to receive the anointing (2:1-35). Thus *In Cant.* 1-2 is appropriate for a post-baptism homily. If one imagines a response from the audience, it becomes necessary to imagine the commentary is composed of more than one homily to be delivered at different points during the Passover celebration which culminated in a feast. This is important for three reasons. First, provides an immediate payoff for the understanding and enjoyment of the commentary. Second, if the *In Cant.* can be shown to have been written for use both in the celebration of baptism and a Christian banquet, its potential as a source for the social history of church and liturgy at the beginning of the third century is enhanced. Some scholars have argued, either on the basis of archaeological evidence or the reading of texts, that the practice of full scale eucharistic banquets was in the process of disappearing by the third century, and that indications suggest that by the beginning of the second century the use of the full-scale banquet (whether for the Eucharist or the “*Agape* feast”) were quickly being abandoned.²⁶² While the practice of banqueting together may have been on the wane, it may be expected that the practice died a slow death, particularly in connection with certain holidays like Passover. Moreover, the fact that the commentary appears to unify the baptismal celebration and, presumably, the celebration of the Eucharist and the *Agape* feast that

²⁶²White, “Regulating Fellowship,” *Meals in a Social Context*, 181.

follows, one may see in the very writing of the commentary the impulse to bring all these events under the control of one leader. This same tendency has been noted for the *Trad. ap.*²⁶³ The third reason that a connection between the *In Cant.* and a full-scale celebratory meal may be important is that the *In Cant.* may then show how the ideology of the banquet gives birth to theology.²⁶⁴

Without a doubt, meals were a hub of the house-church life during the first two centuries (see, for example, 1 Cor 11: 17-34; cf. Pliny *Ep.* 10.97.7, Ignatius *Smyrn.* 8.1-2, Jude 12, Justin, *Apol.* 1:65-67; Clement of Alexandria *Paed.* ii.1; Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, XXXI, Tertullian, *Apol.* 1.99. The *Martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas*, 5). Osiek and Balch trace at least three types of important meals during this period, the Eucharist, the *refrigerium*, and the *Agape* feast.²⁶⁵ The relationships between these meals are difficult to establish. Nevertheless, all these meals share a typology; they represent variations on the Greco-Roman banquet and they share in the practice, ethos, and ideals that Mediterranean peoples characteristically express through common banquet practices. Thus, even though one may agree with Chappuzeau and Cerrato that the *In Cant.* is part of an Easter celebration, yet much can be learned by setting it in the context of the Greco-Roman banquet. Easter celebrations, in the West and in Asia Minor, at least, were an epicenter of great religious and theological controversy, and the Easter celebration was a high holy day, central to the celebratory calendar of religious feasts.²⁶⁶ In Rome as well as in North Africa, baptisms on Easter, incorporated a baptismal fast and vigil culminating in a

²⁶³Ibid.

²⁶⁴See Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 279-87; Klinghardt, *Mahlfeiern*, 493-518.

²⁶⁵Osiek and Balch, *Families in the New Testament World*, 210-14.

²⁶⁶Cantalamessa et al., eds., *Easter in the Early Church*, 1-23.

feast.

A connection between a biblical commentary and a drinking party may not be immediately obvious. Flexibility within the institution of the Greco-Roman festive meal allowed for variation in the adaptation of the meal and symposium by groups of friends, philosophical schools, associations of various sorts, as well as cultic groups. Joyous celebration (εὐφροσύνη) was serious business in the ancient world, the chief element of the ethos of the banquet and, as Dennis Smith has shown, filled with serious, religious implications. Contributing to the sense of pleasure and joyousness at meal were various forms of ritual entertainment that could including songs, speeches, the discussion of texts, songs, prayers and dialogues on a variety of philosophical subjects. Plutarch observed that:

the most truly godlike seasoning at the dining table is the presence of a friend, an intimate and well-known companion—not merely because he feasts and drinks with us, but because he participates in the give and take of conversation, at least if there is something profitable and reasonable in what is said. Wherefore it is right that discourse, no less than friends, should be welcomed to the dinner only of proven quality. (*Quaest. conv.* 697C-E)

Along with traditions and rituals generally practiced by celebrants at a festive dinner, a rich literary tradition developed describing festive occasions on the basis of idealized practice either through representations of best practices at banquets or by means of social critique and comic satire of banquets that, for one reason or another, often did not conform to the ideal. Philosophical texts such as the two homonymous works called *Symposium* by Plato and Xenophon, Plutarch's *Table-Talk*, and the *Dinner of the Seven Wise Men* give evidence of the idealized picture entertained by students of philosophical schools. Lucian lampoons banqueting practices current in his day in his *Symposium* (also called *The Carousal*, or the *Lapiths*), and his

Saturnalia work because the idealized vision of the banquet still exerted influence, though actual practice fell woefully short of the ideal. Petronius's *Satyricon* pokes fun at the pretentiousness of the banquets offered by the wealthy non-elite and their clients, but lurking behind his satire are the real banquets of the elite. Philo's *On the Contemplative Life* builds an idealized version of the banqueting practices of a group of Egyptian Jewish monks and nuns, the *Therapeutae*, who resemble the Essenes. The entire treatise is a critique of Greco-Roman banqueting practice (especially 40-63).²⁶⁷ Thus the literary banquet tradition was both derived from practice and influenced practice. The influence of banquet literature included discussion of the nature of the banquet, appropriate discussion topics, and proper table manners that continually make the past present by perpetuating rituals handed down from previous generations.

Festive meals had discernible contours that expressed the social relationships of the participants. Diners generally reclined at meals, though some sources also describe people seated at table. Reclining was a sign of elite status often emulated by others of lower status. In preparations for a meal, guests would visit a local bath since they anticipated participating in a meal in which personal space could be quite close.²⁶⁸ Christian baptism before taking the Eucharist, fits this general cultural pattern, but transforms it. Guests who walked along dirty streets to the dinner would at

²⁶⁷Osiek and Balch, *Families in the New Testament World*, 194. The structure and ideas of this paragraph are taken from Osiek and Balch.

²⁶⁸Jérôme Carcopino et al. *Daily Life in Ancient Rome: the People and the City at the Height of the Empire* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003), 245-55; W. A. Becker and Karl Friedrich Hermann, *Charikles, Bilder altgriechischer Sitte, zur genaueren Kenntniss der griechischen Privatlebens* (Leipzig: F. Fleischer, 1854), 318-20.

the very least require that the guest recline with washed feet.²⁶⁹ Slaves usually performed such tasks (Plato, *Symp.* 175A; Petronius, *Satyr.* 31; Lk 7:44; Jn 13:1-11), and at some point either before or during the meal, fragrant oil (sometimes mixed with myrrh, Dio *Or.* 62.6.4) might be distributed to allow the guests to freshen up. *Christian post-baptismal anointing conforms to this general pattern and transforms it into part of the initiation rites for entry into the community.* Guests would be shown by servants to their respective places at table, and generally assigned by status.²⁷⁰ Jews, Greeks, and Romans all had earlier traditions of sitting for meals on stools or chairs. They all, however, adopted the posture of reclining for meals, which meant that those who reclined needed slaves to serve food and wine.²⁷¹

Baptism, post-baptismal anointing, and reclining at a celebratory meal all form a part of the common cultural pattern of elite convivial practice. One may speculate that such initiatory practices represented a democratization of elite practice. As Wallace-Hadrill has argued with regard to domestic engineering and decoration would also be true in regard to domestic ritual. Baptism, anointing and reclining at an initiation celebration in a Eucharistic convivium would have been a democratization of a general elite practice. Christian initiation would have made a way for slaves, freedmen, and others to affirm and legitimate social standing by drawing upon the cultural language of the dominant class.²⁷²

²⁶⁹This is particularly noted in sources for Greek banquets, viz., the refrain in Plato, *Symposium* 175A “So the attendant washed him and made him ready for reclining.”

²⁷⁰J. H. D’Arms, “Slaves At Roman Convivia,” in *Dining in a Classical Context* (ed. William J. Slater Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991), 171-83; Leyerle, “Meal Customs in the Greco-Roman World,” 40.

²⁷¹Osiek and Balch, *Families in the New Testament World*, 194.

²⁷²See Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, 14.

Scholars have often believed that the earliest traditions concerning women and children indicate that they would only attend banquets held among family members,²⁷³ and that women would normally be seated, exhibiting the way meals display the hierarchical order of the dominance of the *paterfamilias*. This picture is derived from funerary decorations that depict women seated in the company of dining men, and literary references such as Valerius Maximus (early first century C.E.), who remarks that the traditional Roman way of dining is for women to be seated next to their husbands' couches. He suggests disdainfully that the newer custom is for women to recline with their husbands at banquet (2.1.2).²⁷⁴ The second-century C.E. Lucian tells of Alcidamus, the Cynic, who arrived too late for a couch and preferred to mill about the room or recline on the floor rather than sit at a stool, since "it is womanish and weak to sit on a chair or on a stool" (Lucian, *Symp.* 13-14). Dining customs varied in the East and West. Many years earlier than Valerius Maximus,

²⁷³See the treatment in Osiek et al., *A Woman's Place*, 160-3.

²⁷⁴*Feminae cum uiris cubantibus sedentes cenabant. quae consuetudo ex hominum conuictu ad diuina penetrauit: nam Iouis epulo ipse in lectulum, Iuno et Minerua in sellas ad cenam inuitabantur. quod genus seueritatis aetas nostra diligentius in Capitolio quam in suis domibus conseruat, uidelicet quia magis ad rem pertinet dearum quam mulierum disciplinam contineri.*

Women used to sit with their husbands when they dined. This human banqueting custom affected even the divine sphere: for instance when Jove himself reclined on his couch, Juno and Minerva were invited to sit in chairs at the meal. In our age this strict custom our age is rather more carefully observed in religious gatherings that in private dwellings, clearly because keeping such discipline pertains more to goddesses than to women. (trans. YWS).

Text from: Valerius Maximus. *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* (ed. C. Kempf; Valerii Maximi Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium Libri Novem cum Iulii Paridis et Ianuarii Nepotiani Epitomis, 1888), PHI CD-ROM. Version 5.3, 1991.

Cornelius Nepos²⁷⁵ gave as a reason for Roman supremacy over the Greeks the fact that Roman women felt no shame about appearing in public and dined at banquets with their husbands (*Vir. illus.* praef. 6-7). For example, Livia shows that women could have it either way: she dined with her husband, Augustus, in public but also celebrated banquets separately (Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 48.44.3; 55.2.4; 57.12.5). This evidence is taken to mean that married women were dining with men in public banquets, either seated or reclining. Customs in the East, however, were still generally more strict, with a tendency for women to dine separately. Yet, side by side dining rooms in some house floor plans in Pompeii might indicate sexually separate dining practices even in Italy.²⁷⁶ Thus, the traditional understanding of the evidence is that the custom of women dining, and especially reclining with their husbands was a Roman innovation from the West, arising in imperial times.

Matthew Roller has recently²⁷⁷ questioned this traditional understanding of the evidence. He argues that actual practice did not conform to the conservative picture in either the literature or the art of the period. Rather, women actually did dine and recline with their husbands in public from an early period and this practice exhibited their licit sexual connection.²⁷⁸ Thus, symbolic representations, literary or artistic, say more about social ideals than actual practice. In the case of the *In Cant.*, the depiction of the heroes of the faith as reclining on couches has both men and

²⁷⁵100-24 B.C.E., see Cornelius Nepos, *Cornelii Nepotis Vitae: the Lives of Cornelius Nepos* (LCL; trans. by John C. Rolfe, 3d ed; Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1894).

²⁷⁶See Osiek and Balch, *Families in the New Testament World*, 16, 228 n. 29, who include the prime example of the famous House of the Vettii.

²⁷⁷Matthew Roller, "Horizontal Women: Posture and Sex in the Roman Convivium," *AJP* 124.3 (2003): 377-422.

²⁷⁸Roller, "Horizontal Women," 399.

women reclining, presumably, together (*In Cant.* 27). With the celebration of Passover, one should imagine high festive occasion with both men and women present. It is important to note, however, that simply because some Christians may have reclined for the Passover celebration (as did the Jews), does not mean that in all Eucharistic meals such was still the practice.

Often, as tools of the master of the house, slaves would observe and reinforce the status distinctions of the guests not only in the order of reclining arrangements, but also in the size and quality of portions of food and drink. Those most favored by the host would be given more and higher-quality portions, while those least favored would be given less and poorer quality rations (Pliny, *N. H.* 14.14.91; Pliny *Ep.* 2.6.2-5; Martial *Epig.* 9.2; Juvenal *Sat.* 5.125-7; Lucian *Merc. cond.* 14.26.27).²⁷⁹ The meal itself (δεῖπνον, *cena*) might consist of several courses accompanied by wine mixed with water including appetizers, and a main course accompanied with bread. At some point during the meal, a transition took place. The tables were cleared and the table set or an entirely new a new table or brought in for dessert and the main drinking party (συνπόσιον, *convivium*). Anyone might be chosen as the designated mixer of wine for the after dinner table-talk time for which entertainment was provided either by the guests themselves or by the host. A bit of wine was poured out as an offering to the host god. The symposium was then underway. Though the drinking party was often only attended by men (or by women who were sexually available). Christians developed a banqueting tradition in which both men and women participated, which, if Roller is correct, was not out of the ordinary, especially in the West. Tertullian speaks of an ideal marriage as one in which husband and wife are

²⁷⁹Leyerle, "Meal Customs in the Greco-Roman World," 40.

friends who “are equally together in the church of God; equally they are at the banquet (*convivium*) of God” (*Ad. ux.* 2.8). If the “church” and the “*convivium Dei*” are thought of as separate occasions, as is possible,²⁸⁰ one of the ways Christians maintained and regulated the party was to require the host to secure the blessing of an officially recognized leader of the church.²⁸¹ It is likely that both eucharistic and non-eucharistic meals were part of the tradition of the church that grew together from an original local diversity of practices. As Klinghardt has argued, there is no need to assume a linear development of the distinct meal practices for which evidence is available in the early documents. The various meals-types functioned to build community solidarity, differentiate Christian identity from out-groups, and provide a means of expressing patron-client relationships within the community. It is also likely that the feasts practiced by Christians produced a significant attraction for outsiders who might see in the solidarity of the community a place to belong and flourish. Other groups such as Epicureans, also practiced regular banquet times for the purpose of building group cohesion and exemplifying the virtues of the group in such a way

²⁸⁰See White, “Regulating Fellowship,” *Meals in a Social Context*, 180. The “church” would be the larger community gathered for the Eucharist. The *convivium Dei* would perhaps be the *Agape* or private banquet held celebrated at home with the blessing of the bishop-presbyter.

²⁸¹Lampe, “Das Korinthische Herrenmahl Im Schnittpunkt Hellinistisch-Roemischer Mahlpraxis und Paulinischer Theologia Crucis (1 Kor 11, 17-34),” *ZNW* 82 (1991): 184, n. 4. In English, idem, “The Corinthian Eucharistic Dinner Party: Exegesis of a Cultural Context (I Cor, 12:17-34),” *Affirmation* 4 (1991): 1-16, especially 1-6. Lampe builds upon and corrects his source: Dennis E. Smith, “Social Obligation in the Context of the Communal Meals: A Study of the Christian Meal in 1 Corinthians in Comparison with Graeco-Roman Communal Meals,” unpublished Th.D. diss., Harvard University, 1980.

that included women.²⁸²

The Roman Context

The size and diversity of the city of Rome was a major factor contributing to the deep diversity of the Christian movement. Sub-cultural enclaves were transplanted from all parts of the Roman Empire while still representing, perpetuating, and adapting in varying degrees the interests of their regional and ethnic constituencies. The sheer size of the population and its diversity encouraged the formation of a fragmented mosaic of churches more or less loosely related to one another with no strong central authority.²⁸³ While many eastern Christian communities had such an authority in their bishops, Rome came late to this arrangement.²⁸⁴ Rather, it appears that only by the late second or early third century did Rome develop a true mono-episcopacy.

A similar type of organization seems to have been the case in the Jewish

²⁸²Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 58-62.

²⁸³From the social theoretical perspective of Stark, *Cities of God*, 91, “in the absence of an external standard, [subgroups set off by social cleavages of greater or lesser depth] would lead to the multiplication of different religious explanations.”

²⁸⁴Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, describes in detail the history of the effects of social cleavage in the networks of the “fractionalized” church of Rome, following the research of La Piana, “The Roman Church At the End of the Second Century,” *HTR* 18:201-77; Brent, “St. Hippolytus,” 207-31, provides a useful correction of these previous views, arguing that consolidation of the mono-episcopate did not occur in Rome until the first half of the third century. Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 398-457, pushes the full adoption of the mono-episcopate a generation later than either La Piana or Lampe. His principal reason is that the *Codex Chronography of 354* does not establish true regnal dates for bishops until the time of Pontianus (d. 235).

community in Rome. As Harry Leon argued, “no good evidence exists for a body exercising supervision over Roman Jewry as a whole or for an officer holding authority over the religious activities of the group.”²⁸⁵ Rather, each congregation had its *archisynagogus* who had control over the religious activities of the group, and he had the help of at least one assistant. Other affairs of the congregation appear to have been under the supervision of a group of elders, a *gerusia* under the leadership of a *gerusiarch*. The Roman synagogues also developed other honorary offices for both men and women.

As a comparison of synagogue architecture and church architecture in Dura-Europos indicates, Christian architectural development lagged behind Synagogal architecture, but represented some similar trends.²⁸⁶ churches developed from household groups and their growth depended upon face-to-face social networks that interacted in homes. It is logical to assume that, even when Christians converted homes for exclusive religious activities, that the Christian use of non-converted homes continued to be an important space for the interaction of Christian and non-Christian social networks and that a tension between these centers (official and unofficial) was an ongoing problem for leaders who wished to consolidate control of religious and social functions.

At an early stage in Rome, as in other cities, the Christian movement developed multiple house-churches that were more or less related; however, the social cleavage between subgroups represented citizens of Rome, Italians, and groups from

²⁸⁵Harry J. Leon, with an introduction by Carolyn Osiek, *The Jews of Ancient Rome* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995), 194.

²⁸⁶Michael, “Regulating Fellowship in the Communal Meal,” *Meals in a Social Context*, 177-205.

every corner of the Roman Empire. Groups naturally divided culturally, linguistically, and economically which encouraged a multiplicity of household centers to remain rather independent from one another. At the same time, parallel development of increasing immigrant acculturation in Rome led to the consolidation of networks of house churches through patron-client loyalty. The household of the presbyter-bishop included the networks of house churches led by presbyters supported by the households of deacons, teachers, exorcists, and assorted functionaries and non-titled persons. Patron-client relations commonly defined the status of the various households and exhibited the practices of reciprocity expressed in part through banquets and feasts.²⁸⁷ In such conditions the line between private meal and church-school banquet was blurry, leading to potential conflict. Such a living community practiced devotion to Jesus Christ in religious activities centered in households and especially in fellowship around food and table in the dining room.²⁸⁸ As Christian groups spread across the port cities of the Mediterranean and beyond, their groups grew both in numbers and complexity, and the center of gravity for religious activities shifted from home and dining room to houses remodeled in such a way as to accommodate larger numbers of participants (*domus ecclesiae*). Various types of meals that expressed traditional relationships of reciprocity and patronage persisted in the context of individual homes, but the power to regulate the community shifted to those designated as deacons, presbyters, and especially the bishop. Nevertheless,

²⁸⁷Bobertz, "The Role of Patron in the *Cena Dominica* of Hippolytus," 170-84.

²⁸⁸See Andrew Brian McGowan, "Food, Ritual, and Power," in *Late Ancient Christianity* (A People's History of Christianity ed. Virginia Burrus; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2005); Osiek and Balch, *Families in the New Testament World*, 193-214.

older patterns persisted in new forms.

The Refrigerium Meal

At the burial of an individual Roman, the mourners celebrated a *refrigerium*. Typically, friends of the family of the deceased would visit the bereaved for the sake of consolation and bring food, or would send a food offering along with a letter of condolence.²⁸⁹ Care of one's ancestors was an important family and moral duty (*pietas*). Though the care of one's ancestors was usually a private duty, so friends could be expected to help.²⁹⁰ For example, the theme of the papyri letters of condolence is, "Bear this bravely!" Thus the *refrigerium* provided an occasion for solidarity, consolation and reciprocal expressions of friendship. Private funerary societies or collegia existed and, with the help of a wealthy patron, assisted members of the collegium with the expenses connected with the funerary banquets (*refrigerium*) held at the site of the tomb for family members and close friends.²⁹¹ Christian *refrigeria* were practiced as occasions of joy. And the note of cynicism and bitterness prevalent in many polytheistic funerary inscriptions was absent.²⁹² As was

²⁸⁹Chapa, *Letters of Condolence*, passim. Several of the letters of condolence mention the food-gift. Though this practice is attested in Egypt, it was likely practiced in Rome as well.

²⁹⁰The death of popular public figures was an exception to the rule.

²⁹¹An important new analysis and synthesis of Christian funerary practices in the Roman context is by Janet H. Tulloch, "Women Leaders in Family Funerary Banquets," in *Women Leaders in Family Funerary Banquets* (eds. Carolyn Osiek and Margaret Macdonald; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006), 164-93. See also Nicola Denzey, *The Bone Gatherers*.

²⁹²Jeff Childers, "Funerary Practices," *EEC* 443-44.

typical in Roman culture at the anniversary of the death of a family member, meals were also celebrated. By the third century, the church-school, functioning as a fictive extended family, celebrated in the same way the anniversary of the death of martyrs and other important members of the church-school. The Easter celebrations enshrined the anniversary of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. The *refrigerium*, as practiced by Christians, was concerned not only with the celebration of the memory of the deceased, but especially with the hope of the resurrection. In this sense they participated in the ethos of celebrations of Easter. Perhaps for this reason the *In Cant.* is described by the author as being a “consolation of the Holy Spirit” (*In Cant.* 1.5) and consolation appears to have been an important theme of celebrations of Easter (*Const. ap.* 5.19.3; *Itin. Eger.* 77).

The *In Cant.* has an important connection to the *refrigerium* tradition that suggests that popular, Christian funerary practice had an effect upon the eucharistic celebration of Easter. Scholars have often debated the significance of early Christian funerary art that depicts women lifting a cup.²⁹³ Especially important are the paintings in the catacomb known as *SS. Marcelino e Pietro*. The frescoes depict eight banquet scenes with painted inscriptions from the late third or early fourth century for the burial chambers of wealthy Roman Christians.²⁹⁴ Janet Tolluch discusses the importance of these frescoes, implements of celebrations such as tables, plates, cups, amphorae and bowls, as well as the symbolism of the use of wine in the celebration of the dead as an act that affirms and strengthens the deceased family member’s new

²⁹³Tolluch, “Family Funerary Banquets,” 165, 166.

²⁹⁴*Ibid.*, 164.

status as a divine being.²⁹⁵ Christians were instructed that wine was appropriately consumed in celebrations of the dead, “otherwise it would be reproach of what God made for cheerfulness.” Christians, however, were not to drink to excess, since that lead to “sorrow,” “unease,” and “babbling” (*Const. ap.* 8.44).²⁹⁶

The private, family nature of rites for the dead did not require the presence of a priest. According to Tolluch, “Since there were no institutionalized rites for death that would require the presence of a priest, the path was clear for women to act as leaders in funerary ceremonies and the commemoration rites after burial.”²⁹⁷

Tolluch’s analysis includes a selection of banquets scenes whose gestures and inscriptions suggest the representation of women offering words of benediction over the meal and toasts over the wine. On that basis, she is able to reconstruct a toast dialogue between the guest and the host in the case two of the paintings.

Guest 1: <i>Misce nobis</i>	(Mix wine for us . . .)
Host 1: <i>Agape</i>	(Love and Affection!)
Guest 2: <i>[P]org[e] c[a]lda</i>	(Offer warm water . . .)
Host 2: <i>Irene</i>	(Peace!)
Guest 1: <i>[Po]orge calda</i>	(Offer warm water . . .)
Host 1: <i>Agape</i>	(Love and affection!)
Guest 2: <i>Misce</i>	(Mix [wine] . . .)
Host 2: <i>Irene</i>	(Peace!)

The *In Cant.* 25 has a similar dialogical scene in between the resurrected Christ and the two myrrhophores who desire to be taken up to heaven rather than be

²⁹⁵Ibid., 172.

²⁹⁶The language of this passages is also used in the *In Cant.* 3.3.

²⁹⁷Tolluch, “Family Funerary Banquets,” 172.

left to their fate on the earth. The passage does not replicate a dialogue, but seems to be based upon some such dialogue as reconstructed by Tolluch:

O blessed woman, who did not wish to be separated from Christ. 25.4 For this reason she says: “When I withdrew a little ... I found him, the one whom my soul loves” (Song 3:4) Receive, O my heart! Mix it with the Spirit, strengthen it, perfect it, so that it also may be able to join with the heavenly body. Mix this my body with [the] heavenly body. Drink it as wine, taken it, make it go up to heaven then a newly mixed cup, that [the woman] may follow the one she desires and not go astray, no longer with a bruised heel nor having touched the tree of knowledge (Cf. Gen 3:15). But from now on [she is] victor over the tree through death. 25.5 Receive Eve, that no longer gives birth with sighs, for pain has been driven out, as well as sighing and distress (Is 35:10). From now on receive Eve who now walks in proper order,²⁹⁸ receive her and know this offering which has been provided to the Father. Make a new offering, no longer is she naked, no longer clothed with the fig leaf. No, but clothed through the Holy Spirit, she has put on a beautiful garment, of which there is no corruption.

...

25.8 From now on she will no longer either crave or proffer to men food that corrupts; she has received incorruptibility; from now on she is in unity and [is] a helper, for Adam leads Eve. O good helper, with the gospel offering (*or* sacrificing) [it] to her husband! This is why the women evangelized the Disciples.

...

25.10 Now, beloved, it is clear from these things that he pacifies (*or* brings peace) the Synagogue and the church is glorified.

This text perhaps indicates a certain tension between the speaker in the *In Cant.* and practices prevalent in his audience. Hippolytus #2 here read back and forth between the Song and the gospel accounts of Matthew, Luke, and John. The scene at the tomb allows a reading of the gospel scene in terms of the funerary practices from

²⁹⁸See note on the English translation in Chapter Three *ad. loc.*

his own time. Also intruding on the scene is an episode of the redemption of Adam and Eve accompanied by Martha and Mary. The snake and the tree of deception of Gen 3 also appears in Hippolytus' interpretation. How does this cast of characters make their appearance in the interpretation of the Song? The source is not just theological imagination, for third century art depicts the scene of Heracles plucking an apple, club in hand from a tree entwined with a serpent and with three Hesperides nymphs in the background.²⁹⁹ Furthermore, if the episode of Martha and Mary is a re-interpretation of the myth of Hesperides and Heracles as was popular in paintings and mosaics, hovering in the background of this passage is the archetype of divine marriage of Christ and the church.³⁰⁰ The comparison between the dialogue reconstructed by Tolluch, the resulting image of female leadership in funerary rites and texts like that of Hippolytus deserve more research.

The Agape Meal

Another type of meal practiced by Christians was the "love feast" or *Agape*. The *Agape* seems to have been a banquet designed by the "haves" of the church-school to meet the needs of the "have nots." It appears to be a demonstration of the *pietas* or (cf. Jas 1:27 θρησκευεῖα) or familial solidarity. Entry into the *Agape* seems to have tended to be fairly open, since Jude 12 seeks to regulate the boundary of who can be present at the *Agape* and who cannot (if Jude is indeed speaking of what is later called

²⁹⁹See above, page 80 for references.

³⁰⁰On the image of divine marriage, see Osiek, "The Bride of Christ (Ephesians 5:22-33: A Problematic Wedding," in M. Nissinen and R. Uro *Sacred Marriages: The Divine-Human Sexual Metaphor from Sumer to Early Christianity* (Winona Lake, WI, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2008), 371-392.

the *Agape* meal). Perhaps the counter-cultural meal described by Jesus in Luke 14:12-14 is the inspiration of and represents the early ideal of the *Agape*. As such it was an exhortation to make concrete the stipulations of Isaiah 58 in order to secure the blessings of heaven (or the resurrection). The poor and disabled are to be regarded as family members. Luke describes a similar type of table fellowship in Acts 2:42-47; 20:7-12 as “breaking the bread.” Though some scholars argue that the Eucharist and the *Agape* were originally the same meal, these were clearly distinguished in some parts of the church-school (Asia Minor and Antioch) by the early second century.³⁰¹ For example, Ignatius of Antioch strongly recommends that the churches of Asia Minor bring the practices of baptism, the Eucharist, and “doing *agape*” under the authority of the bishop.³⁰²

The *Agape* meal described by Tertullian is almost certainly not a eucharistic meal.

Yet about the modest supper-room of the Christians alone a great ado is made. Our feast explains itself by its name. The Greeks call it ἀγάπη, i.e., affection. Whatever it costs, our outlay in the name of piety is gain, since with the good things of the feast we benefit the needy; not as it is with you, do parasites aspire to the glory of satisfying their licentious propensities, selling themselves for a belly-feast to all disgraceful treatment, but as it is with God himself, a peculiar respect is shown to the lowly. If the object of our feast be good, in the light of that consider its further regulations. As it is an act of religious service, it permits no vileness or immodesty. The participants, before reclining, taste first of prayer to God. As much is eaten as satisfies the cravings of hunger; as much is drunk as befits the chaste. They say it is enough, as those who remember that even during the night they have to worship God; they talk as those who know that the Lord is one of their auditors. After we wash our hands and lights are brought in, each one is asked to stand forth and sing, as he can, a hymn to God, either one from the holy Scriptures or one of his own composing—a proof of the measure of our

³⁰¹Osiek and Balch, *Families in the New Testament World*, 212.

³⁰²Thomas Finn, “Agape (Love Feast),” *EEC*, 24-25.

drinking. As the feast commenced with prayer, so with prayer it is closed. We go from it, not like troops of mischief-doers, nor bands of vagabonds, nor to break out into licentious acts, but to have as much care of our modesty and chastity as if we had been at a school of virtue rather than a banquet. (*Apol.* 1.39)

The *Agape* is described in language typical of the Greco-Roman Symposium, though it is critical of banqueting abuses. It describes first the meal, then the drinking and entertainment (or conversation). After the meal comes washing of the hands (since the absence of forks made the hand the typical eating instrument). Then lights are brought in and Scriptures are used in performed along with songs and prayer. Tertullian connects these Christian activities with those of philosophical schools and underscores the educative aspect of dining in the ancient world by remarking that the results in modesty and chastity are the same as if the participants “had been in a school of virtue.” Several aspects of the *In Cant.* recall the description of the *Agape*, including its educative character and concern to inculcate “modesty and chastity,” its celebrative focus, and its concern for the poor.

The practice of celebrating separate *Agape* and eucharistic feasts is quite different from the practice established by Paul, who depends on the mutual solidarity expressed in the meal itself for exemplifying and sustaining the virtues on the churches he established. Not only was dining together a way of portraying higher and lower status differential, dining was also a way of strengthening group identity and solidarity by declaring who was *in* and who was *out*. The issue in Gal 2:11-14 was not simply circumcision, but how Jews and Gentiles were to have any sort of meaningful fellowship as Christ-followers. Some if not most of the Jews viewed eating with non-Jews in the context of a meal with Jewish religious significance as a

threat to their own sacred identity.³⁰³ Paul viewed the boundary between Jesus followers and non-Jesus followers as far more important than the boundary between Jews and non-Jews. Eating together was an important mechanism for defining identity. For this reason Paul criticized Jesus followers in Corinth who continued to associate with a man involved in immoral practices. He tells them “not even to eat with such a person” (1 Cor 5:11).³⁰⁴ Paul implies that those who support the behavior of the wayward believer in this way pollute the fellowship of believers. On the other hand, when Paul confronts the issue of whether Jesus’ followers should respond to dinner invitations from their unbelieving friends (1 Cor 8-10), he ultimately allows those who see no harm in it to do so. The assumption made here is that the influence of the believer whose consciousness (συνείδησις) of God is strong and who participates in the reciprocity of exchanges of dinner invitations has the potential of raising the unbeliever’s consciousness of the God of Jesus’ followers. Finally, the passage in 1 Cor 11:23-35 shows that the meetings of Christ-followers in Paul’s circle of influence were organized around a communal meal meeting in the dining room of the host’s home. The celebration of Eucharist was part of the festive dinner. The social abuses against which Paul inveighed threatened not only the character of the meal as the “Lord’s” δεῖπνον (1 Cor 11:20), they also spoiled the lofty (Greco-Roman) ideals of equality, friendship, and joyousness that should be thought to prevail on such an occasion. Paul’s rhetoric makes it clear that the participants also referred to their meal together as “the Lord’s meal.” However, the abuses which they allowed, according to Paul, were putting the individuals responsible in the place of

³⁰³White, “Regulating Fellowship,” *Meals in a Social Context*, 179.

³⁰⁴Ibid.

the Lord, turning it into a “private” or “individual meal” (ἴδιον δεῖπνον). The meaning of this phrase is debated, but it seems likely that the point Paul makes is that the meal was no longer enhancing community solidarity. That is, the dinner guests were indulging in unequal sharing of portions in the meal, according to their status. The ἴδιον δεῖπνον is the one in which “equality” is not practiced in terms of portions served and other activities.³⁰⁵ As Plutarch observed, “where each guest has his own private portion, companionship perishes” (Plutarch, *Quest. conv.* 643F-644A).

Summary

This Chapter has approached the *In Cant.* inductively for evidence of the social context of the commentary. Rather than reading the commentary as a work in isolation, its audience would have “heard” the commentary in a particular oral context, the celebration of Passover/Easter and the initiation of new converts to Christianity. This Chapter suggests that, for this early commentary, its oral use in a liturgical setting is an important part of understanding its genre. The evidence of the *Trad. ap.* was discussed, but bracketed. It should not be ignored, even though some of its elements may not reflect Roman practice or may be later developments beyond the early third century.

In structure, the commentary consists of several sections. This Chapter has shown that these sections form part of a Passover celebration in which mystagogical instruction interprets the rites following baptism in preparation for a Paschal feast. A comparison of similar literature like the *GPhil* as well as the instructions for Passover celebration in *Const. ap.* 5 provide context for the instruction and explain why certain

³⁰⁵Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 191-193..

topics appear.

The contextualization of the commentary as part of a meal-time celebration also explains certain elements, such as instruction on the use of wine and symbolism of offering in the scene in which Martha and Mary encounter the resurrected Christ. Roman domestic and funerary art provide the keys to interpreting this difficult passage. The association of Martha and Mary with nymphs dedicated to caring for the dead at a tomb and with the Hesperides, represents an attempt by Hippolytus to give Christian meaning to ancient funerary rites. It may also be an effort to enhance the honor of female patronesses in the community.

A consideration of the literary profile of the author in Chapter One discovered important aspects of the commentary that point to a western provenance. The theological proclivities of the commentary point to the western acculturation of an eastern *Logos* theologian. Demonstrably western concerns regarding marriage between the freeborn and freedmen or slaves turn up in *In Cant.* 2.18-19. A consideration of the commentary in terms of its rhetorical problem and context in Chapter Two itself turns up certain other western features, especially some of the iconographical references of the *In Cant.* that appear to be specific to Rome: i.e., Castor and Pollux as Peter and Paul and the church of the Circumcision and the church of the Gentiles as women. Of course, the practice of Passover baptism and post-baptismal anointing representing the Holy Spirit are indicators consistent with the western acculturation of an eastern writer.

CHAPTER 3
ANNOTATED TRANSLATION

Introduction to the Commentary

Antecedents in Jewish Interpretation

The Commentary on Song of Songs by Hippolytus is perhaps the earliest¹ surviving Christian commentary on Scripture.² The commentaries of Hippolytus reveal a confluence of their Greco-Roman and Jewish environments. A fragment of what may have been a Jewish commentary on the Song was discovered in Qumran (4Q240).³ Unfortunately, the fragment has not been published. The existence of such

¹The fragmentary quotations of the Valentinian Heracleon preserved in Origen represent the earliest adoption of the commentary genre by Christians.

²In Christianity Hippolytus #2 “inaugurates exegesis which [*sic*] follows the scriptural texts,” *Message Evangélique et Culture Hellénistique au II et III siècle* (Tournai: Desclee, 1961), 251. Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 141, supports this view in his recent study of the commentaries of Hippolytus. See also McConvery, “Hippolytus’ Commentary,” 211–222. Nevertheless, Valentinian Christian commentaries preceded Hippolytus #2 and, given the anti-Valentinian program of Irenaeus, provided an impetus for the adoption of the genre by Irenaeus’ student. See Hippolytus #2, *frag. In Mattheum* that explicitly refers to the anti-Valentinian thrust. The content of *In Cant.* suggests, compared with the *Tripartate Tractatus* and the *Gospel of Philip* and what is known of Valentinian initiatory rites (van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 1-35), that Valentinian commentaries provided an impetus for this commentary, as they did for Origen’s *Commentary on John*. See Quispel, “Origen and the Valentinian Gnosis,” 29-42.

³4Q240 or 4Q Canticles^a appears on J. T. Milik’s list of discovered and identified fragments. Subsequent lists of manuscripts included it, some have begun to drop it

a commentary, however, at least suggests a prehistory of Jewish and Jewish Christian oral interpretation upon which Hippolytus depends⁴ for some of his material. Hippolytus cites no sources, yet many of his comments suggest that he is re-working Jewish material. For example, Joshua is commended for circumcising the Israelites (*In Cant.* 2.8). Hippolytus refers in traditional Jewish terms to the binding of Isaac, who “he wished to sacrifice himself for the sake of the world” (*In Cant.* 2.15). Early Jewish interpretations recorded in fifth and sixth century compilations of the midrash *SoS Rab* connect the henna bunch (Song 1.14; *In Cant.* 13.1) with the binding of Isaac or the merits of Abraham. The rabbinic interpretation of *SoS Rab* 1.14 in two interpretations (Song 1:14; 4:13) rests upon the double meaning of the root כִּפַּר, *qfr*, meaning either “to atone” or “ransom” as well as the “henna.” The connection between atonement/henna and Isaac/Abraham/Christ is striking. It seems likely that Hippolytus took over a pre-existing Jewish Christian interpretation of the henna bunch as a symbol of atonement in which Christ had already been substituted for Isaac. Hippolytus seems to pass this tradition on without understanding the underlying Hebrew connections. In some cases what he passes on appear to be non-Christian Jewish tradition. For example, in an earlier passage he refers to the sacrifice of Isaac in traditional terms as atonement for the world. Because of his zeal for the

from the list. The photograph of it has not been accounted for and no details of the fragment are known. See Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H Schiffman, *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989-1990* (STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 24 n. 3; 30 n. 19.

⁴See Chappuzeau, “Die Auslegung des Hohenliedes Durch Hippolyt von Rom,” 45-81 for a careful weighing of some aspects of the connection between Hippolytus and later rabbinic interpretation.

anointing of the Holy Spirit, Isaac desired to suffer on behalf of the world: “The blessed Isaac became desirous of [the anointing] and he wished *to sacrifice himself for the sake of the world* (cf. Gen 22).” (*In Cant.* 2:15, emphasis mine).⁵

Translation of the Georgian Text

The following translation of Hippolytus’ *Commentary on the Song of Songs* (*In Cant.*) is the first English translation of the Georgian text of this commentary of Hippolytus.⁶ The translation attempts to be as literal as possible but does not attempt always to maintain the exact word order. Nor does the translation always translate the same Georgian word with a one word English equivalent. The Georgian text is the only complete extant version of the commentary, translated before the ninth century from an earlier Armenian translation.⁷ According to Garitte, however:

The unknown translator who, in the ninth century at the latest, translated the compositions of Hippolytus from Armenian into Georgian was far from being a talented interpreter; and his version is often unclear, inconsistent or incomprehensible, even making the omissions and corruptions that spoil both

⁵Indeed, R. Hanina bar Hama (*SoS Rab* 1:14.iv.7B-G, Neusner, 133), a contemporary of Hippolytus, relates that God said to Abraham: “if your children fall into transgression and wicked actions, I shall discern which great man there is among them who can say to the attribute of Justice: “Enough!” and I shall take him and treat him as the pledge in their behalf.”

⁶The original Greek of the commentary is no longer extant. The Georgian text, by Garitte, CSCO 264, is also provided with a modern Latin translation in *item*, CSCO 264. The Georgian text used in this translation is based on B. Gigineišvili and El. Giunašvili, ed. შატბერდის კრებული X საუკუნისა (Tbilisi, 1979: edition electronically prepared by J. Gippert, Berlin/Bamberg/Frankfurt a/M. 1986-1998; Titus version by Jost Gippert, Frankfurt a/M. 2/28/1998-12-27-2002, «[http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/ageo/satberd/satbe, htm](http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/ageo/satberd/satbe.htm)»), 249-67.

⁷Bonwetsch, “Hippolyts Kommentar,” 17.

closely related extant copies, the result is that the Georgian version is often an unintelligent word for word and therefore often unintelligible [translation], that blindly reproduces the terms of his model . . . It is often necessary to guess at the Armenian substratum in order to understand the Georgian text, on which it rests.⁸

Fragments of Hippolytus' commentary are also extant in Armenian, Paleo-Slavonic, Greek, and Syriac. Apart from a reference in Jerome⁹ and a few quotations preserved in other writers such as Ambrose of Milan, the text of the commentary was completely unknown until the nineteenth century.¹⁰ A little over a century ago the situation abruptly changed with the publication of a longer Armenian fragment.¹¹ A few years later the Russian scholar Nicolai Marr identified and translated into Russian the tenth-century manuscript in the library of the Šaṭberd monastery in Georgia. It contained a Georgian translation of seven of Hippolytus #2's works including *In Cant.* and fragments of the *Chronicon Pascale*.¹² Gottlieb Nathanael Bonwetsch

⁸Garitte, CSCO 264.II:

Le traducteur inconnu qui, au IXe siècle au plus tard, a fait passer de l'arménien en géorgien le traité d'Hippolyte était loin d'être un interprète de talent; sa version est souvent obscure, incohérent, voire incompréhensible; même en faisant la part des omissions et des détériorations qui peuvent déparer les deux copies étroitement apparentées qui nous en sont conservées, il reste que la version géorgienne n'est souvent qu'un mot à mot inintelligent—et partant souvent inintelligible—, qui reproduit à l'aveugle les termes de son modèle ... Il est souvent nécessaire, pour comprendre le texte géorgien, de deviner le substrat arménien sur lequel il repose.

⁹*De viribus illustribus* 51, (PL 23:597-719).

¹⁰These fragments were included in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* and were translated into English by the editors of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. See Hippolytus PG 10:627–30, Hippolytus: 'Fragments,' in *ANF*, 5:176.

¹¹J. B. Pitra, *Analecta Sacro Spicilegio Solesmensi Parata, II Patres Anteniceni* (Frascati, 1884), 232–5.

¹²Nicolai Marr, [Commentary on the Song, Georgian and Russian, 1901] *Ippolit Tokolvani piesni piesnei; gruzunkii tekst po ruskopisi X, vek: perevod s armianska-*

translated Marr's work for the academic community in the West in *Texte und Untersuchungen* series in 1902.¹³ A more recent copy of the same group of Hippolytan works in Georgian was discovered in the Greek Patriarchal Library of Jerusalem in 1924. A Greek paraphrase of the commentary (=CantPar Greek) was discovered in the Bodleian library published in 1964 by Marcel Richard. The *CantPar Greek* follows the commentary closely, but is ineptly done with omissions and elaborations; however, it confirmed that the commentary as preserved in the Georgian manuscripts was likely the entire work, ending at Song 3:7.¹⁴ Garitte used both Georgian manuscripts and evidence from the paraphrase for his critical edition—with a Latin translation—for the *Corpus Christianorum* series in 1965.¹⁵

The text and notes given below are based upon a comparison between Garitte's collation of two Georgian exemplars¹⁶ belonging to the same manuscript

go (s. odnoi paleografisheskoiu taletseiu) izleidoval perevel i izadal N. Marr St. Petersburg: Tip. v. o. Kirschbauma, 1901).

¹³Bonwetsch, *Hippolyts Kommentar*, included a collation of texts of the paleo-Slavic florilegia in German translation. This work was the culmination of Bonwetsch's earlier studies on Hippolytus #2 in *Studien zu den Kommentaren Hippolytus zum Büche Daniel und hohen Liede* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897) and in Bonwetsch and H. Achelis, *Hippolytus Werke*, (GCS 1.1; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1897), in which he discusses patristic references to the *In Cant.* as well as other fragments of the commentary.

¹⁴Marcel Richard, ed. "Une paraphrase grecque résumée du Commentaire d'Hippolyte sur le Cantique des cantiques," *Le Muséon* 77 (1964): 137-54.

¹⁵Garitte, CSCO 263, 264.

¹⁶The Tbilisi Text (=T), otherwise known as the Šaṭberd manuscript kept in the Institute of Manuscripts, Tbilisi, Georgia: Tbilisi Codex S 1141, which dates from 973-976 C.E. and the Jerusalem Text (=J), in the library of the Greek Patriarchate, Jerusalem: Georgian Codex 44, from the 12-13th century, both belong to the same manuscript lineage. Facsimiles of these manuscripts have not been available for this

lineage and the later collation of the same Georgian texts by B. Gigineišvili and E. Giunašvili. Although the electronic version of Šaṭberd was used as the basis of the Georgian text presented here, it was carefully compared with the text offered by Garitte, resulting in a few corrections to the electronic text.¹⁷

Notes, Apparatus, and Text

The florilegia and patristic quotations that survive attest to the continued use of the *In Cant.* into the fourth century and beyond. In some places patristic quotations, particularly those of Ambrose, provide evidence for the original Greek text of the commentary. The state of the Georgian text complicates this effort, since the Georgian version is preserved in two extant manuscripts (*T* and *J*) which preserve two different forms of the same translation. The two manuscripts do preserve a text forms that is closely related. Nevertheless, they are not closely related enough to be dependent either one upon the other or on an immediate common manuscript.¹⁸ Rather, they preserve two streams of the same text-type. This means that even when *T* and *J* are compared, the original of the Georgian text remains elusive, with no way to correct the text because of the lack of witnesses.

study. The detailed notes of Garitte on each manuscript were used as a basis of the textual annotations for the Georgian text. See list of manuscripts on page *xiv*.

¹⁷Jost Gippert at the Department of Comparative Linguistics (Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft) of the University of Frankfurt kindly responded to all my e-mails concerning corrections to the electronic text of the *In Cant.* of Hippolytus #2. The wealth of material available from the TITUS website (*Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien*) on the Georgian (and other) languages provided to scholars free of charge made this study possible.

¹⁸Garitte, CSCO, 264.VI.

The Greek text of *CantPar* appears in the translation footnotes in order to facilitate speculation about the underlying Greek text of Hippolytus. Unfortunately, the condition of the Georgian text is discouraging.¹⁹ According to Garitte, where Greek fragments exist with which to compare the Georgian translation, the poor quality of the Georgian translation is evident. Especially in the more abstract introduction to the commentary, the Georgian translator loses his footing and translates with limited understanding.²⁰ For this reason we understand the commentary often as through a glass darkly, but, when the Georgian text has the support of the Greek paraphrase and a patristic citation or the reading of a florilegium, confidence in the authenticity and/or accuracy of the translation increases. The Paleo-Slavonic florilegia is an independent witness, though it is often only a rough adaptation of the original Greek text.

The translation is provided in side-by-side format along with the text of the edited Šaṭberd manuscript, the basis for the translation.²¹ A third and sometimes a fourth or fifth column enrich the English translation of the Georgian text of *In Cant*.

¹⁹The textual proclivities of *T* and *J*'s Georgian text of Aphrahat's *Demonstrations* 6 can be tested. Another Georgian ms. (=A) preserves a different text type with a more authentic form. This text can be verified against Syriac and Armenian texts. Such a comparison reveals a set of tendencies in the tradition of the translation behind *T* and *J* in which omitted, modified and corrupt passages appear when compared with A. In the case of Aphrahat, the deficiencies can be identified and corrected. No similar recourse is available for the *In Cant*, where *T* and *J* are the only witnesses. The result is a text "médiocre, altéré et mutilé," Garitte, *Traité d'Hippolyte* CSCO 263, vii.

²⁰Garitte, CSCO 264.II.

²¹Original page numbers of the Šaṭberd manuscript and the page numbering of the edition of Giginešvili and Giunašvili are available in the on-line text.

with the English translation alongside (*CantPar*) the text of seventh century Greek paraphrase (*Greek CantPar*) edited by Richard, a translation of the extensive paleo-Slavic florilegia, and the Armenian florilegia.²² The footnotes are mostly of two types: notes on the text and notes on the translation. The notes on the translation also include the LXX version of the lemma cited in the Georgian text Hippolytus. Only textual notes deemed important enough to affect the translation are noted.

A Note on the Armenian Vorlage of the Georgian Text

Scholars have long accepted that the Georgian text is best explained by recourse to an Armenian *Vorlage*.²³ The notes in the following translation suggest that in some places the mistranslation may have occurred at the Armenian stage.

Hellenophile Georgian scholars did translate some Greek texts into Georgian during

²²Bonwetsch notes that Paleo-Slavonic (=PS) fragments include Ms no. 579 (28v—29r) of the Library of Zarsky, Ms no. 31 the countess Uwarow, Ms no. 730 of the Troico-Sergiev Monastery (pages 256r—288v and 354v—360r, Ms, no. 548 of the Moscow Synodal Library, Ms, no. 673 of the Moscow Synodal Library 548 and 673 (seventeenth century) and ms no. 730 of The Troico-Sergiev Monastery (sixteenth century). All these texts have long since been transferred to the National Library in Moscow. Bonwetsch's German has been used for comparison with the Georgian text. Armenian fragments include Codex Venetianus Mechitaristus 202 (1637), fos. 392-4 and 228 (1847), published by J. B. F. Pitra, *Analecta sacra* (Paris 1876), 2.232-5 and Garitte, CSCO 263/264 (1965). A few short Syriac fragments survive, published by I. Rucher, *Florilegium Edessenum anonymum* (SBAW, PHA; Munich: C. H. Beck 1933), 8; Pitra, *Analecta sacra* 4:36, 40 with English translations 306, 310. German translation of the Armenian, Syriac and Paleo-Slavonic fragments are available in Bonwetsch, *Werke*, 1.1 (GCS 1), 341-74, Bonwetsch, "Hippolyt's Kommentar" TU, also published translations of the fragments along with a translation of the Russian translation of the Georgian text provided by Marr. See note 12 on page 244.

²³Marr, *Ippolit*, XV-XVI, LII-LIX; M. Mercier, *PO* 27.1-2 (1954): 21-22.

the period in which *In Cant.* was translated (between the seventh and ninth centuries C.E.), nevertheless, most works were translated from Armenian,²⁴ since most direct Christian contacts were with Armenia²⁵ in this early period of Georgian literary development.

Garitte adduces several examples in support of this claim. The most telling example, however, demonstrates beyond reasonable doubt that an Armenian text lies behind the Georgian translation. When *In Cant.* is comparable to *Greek CantPar* the word that represents $\mu\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ or “mystery,” in the Georgian text is ზრახვა, “*zraxvai*.” The Georgian term only has the deliberative meaning of “counsel,” “mind,” “thought,” or “plan.” For example, *NTI Paul CD Rom 8:7*: რად არს ზრახვა იგი სულისა, “what is the mind of the Spirit.” It never has the meaning “mystery.” Garitte rightly translates this word as “*mysterium*,” because one must assume an Armenian *Vorlage* of *In Cant.* The Armenian խորհուրդ , *xorhurd* has a semantic range that includes both “thought,” “intention,” “counsel,” or “mystery,” “symbol,” “sacrament.”²⁶ Whether the translation occurred in a monastery outside Georgia or with Georgian territory itself, the underlying text seems to have been an Armenian text.

²⁴J. Neville Birsall, “Georgian Paeleography,” in *Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus*, vol. 1 *The Kartvelian Languages* (ed. Alice C. Harris; Delmar, NY: Caravan Books, 1991), 110-11.

²⁵*Ibid.*

²⁶See Garitte, CSCO 264.111.

Commentary on the Song of Songs by the Blessed Hippolytus

Georgian

1.1 სობრძნე აქუნდა სოლომონს,
 არა თუ თვთ სობრძნე იყო; მადლი
 ჰოვა ღმრთისა მიერ, ხოლო არა
 თუ თვთ თავადი იგი მადლი იყო;
 შვილი იყო დავითისა, ხოლო არა
 თუ თვთ თავადი ქრისტე იყო.
 1.2 მ[ო]ქმადლ² ღმრთისა მიერ
 სამთა წიგნთა გამოთქუად³
 სოფელსა შინა, რომელთა სამთა
 წიგნთა ძალს რას-მე გამოაჩინებს
 სულსა წმიდსა წინამძღურებ-
 ითა, რამეთუ მოძღურებითა
 მადლი სათა მოპოვნილ სიტყუა
 იგი და სობრძნისა მის თანა
 დამკვლრებითა არა უნაწილო
 ღმრთისაგან იქნებოდა.

In Cant.

1.1 Solomon had Wisdom

^a He was, however, not Wisdom himself; he found grace from God; but he was not grace itself, he was the son of David, but he was not himself the Christ.

1.2 He was graced by God to expound in the world three books, in which three books he reveals a certain force under guidance of the Holy Spirit because the message gained through the instruction in grace⁴ and the Wisdom that dwelt with him⁵ would be only from God.^b

CantPar

1.1 Great was the wisdom of Solomon, who was attested by God. “Before you there was not another and after you there will not arise [another] like you.”^a 1.2 There is much that is difficult and wearisome in the undertaking, nevertheless very often we wished to give explanation so that both the great love of wisdom which rested upon him and where it came from [might be understood], as well as which, how many, of what kind were his books and how he wrote them.

Greek CantPar

1.1 Πολύς ἐν σοφίᾳ Σολομών, ὁ μαρτυρηθεὶς ὑπὸ θεοῦ. Ἐμπροσθέν σου οὐκ ἐγένετο ἄλλος καὶ μετὰ σε οὐκ ἀναστήσει ὁμοίός σοι. 1.2 Πολύς ἐστι καὶ δυσεργή- νευτος καὶ ἀκηρὸς πρὸς ἐγχείρησιν, ἀλλ’ ὅμως καὶ πολυτάχως ἡβουλή- θημεν τὰ δι’ αὐτὸν ὑπεξελθεῖν, ὅπως τε τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ τί ἐστι καὶ πόθεν ὁ τοσοῦτος τῆς σοφίας ἔξωθεν αὐτοῦ ἀνεπέταυτο, τίνες δὲ αὐ βίβλοι καὶ ποταπαὶ καὶ πόσαι καὶ πῶς αὐτὸς ἐξῆλθε.

¹Garitte follows *J* in omitting იგი.

²In *T* this word is completely erased, see Garitte.

³So *J T* but perhaps a scribal substitution for გამოქუად, “create,” see also v.3 below.

⁴Or perhaps “blessed teaching.” Garitte translates “*magisterio gratiae*” = “instruction” or perhaps “teaching office” (?).

⁵Lit. “with him through-habitation” (cf. Wisd. 8:9).

^aMany verbs of perception and also “have” and other are constructed so that the English subject appears as the Georgian indirect object often in cooperation with the character vowels *o / u*, *s* and *j*.

^bLit. “the Wisdom with him through-habitation not without-part from-God would-be/be-made.”

“The paraphraser uses a Scriptural encomium of Solomon, unlike the *In Cant*.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
<p>1.3 სამსა რას-მე განყოფასა განუჩინებს, რამეთუ სამნი ესე წიგნი ნებითა სულისა წმიდოსათა და ნეტარისა მის პირისა სულისა წმიდოს-გან გამოთქუნეს. რამეთუ სული წმიდა არს, რომელი გამოიტყოდა სამებას, რათა მადლი მამისა და ძისა და სულისა წმიდისა განითქუას.¹ 1.4 რამეთუ წინადაწარ სობრძნით გამოიტყვს იგავთა, რომელთა მიერ დასაკრებელი და გამოუჩინებელი მადლი მამისა და გამოთქემის,</p>	<p>1.3 He assigns for them^a a certain three-fold division (<i>or</i> economy), since these three books were expounded^b by the will of [the] Holy Spirit and through [his] blessed mouth it was declared by the Holy Spirit. For it is [the] Holy Spirit that would give utterance to [the] Trinity^c in order that the grace of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit might be spread abroad.^d</p> <p>1.4 Since with prophetic wisdom (<i>or</i> beforehand) [he] expressed Proverbs (<i>lit.</i> parables) through which the wonderful and invisible (<i>or</i> unrevealed) grace of the Father is expounded,</p>	<p>1.3 Τρεῖς τοίνυν αὐτοῦ βιβλούς ἀνοθεύτους εὐρίσκομεν, τὴν τε παροιμίαν, τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν καὶ τὸ ᾄσμα τῶν ἀσμάτων. 1.4 Ὅπως δὲ τινες καὶ τὴν λεγομένην σοφίαν παναρετοῦ εἰς αὐτὸν περικλεώσωιν, ἥτινα ξένην καὶ ἀλλοτριαν αὐτοῦ ἐπιστάμεθα, οὐ μόνον ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων καὶ μακαρίων πατέρων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς βίβλου.</p>	<p>1.3 So then we find three genuine books: the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs. 1.4 In as much as some attribute to him (Solomon) the all-virtuous Wisdom, which we know is other and different from him, not only from the ancient and blessed fathers but also from the book itself.</p>

¹ *J* has გამოთქას, “express, say, expound” see Garitte, *ad loc.*

^a *Lit.* “it/for it.”

^b See note 3 on page 345 above.

^c Cf. “With respect to the power, God is one; but with respect to the economy [i.e., the story of how this power expresses itself], the manifestation is triple” (*Haer.* 8.2).

^d Cp. *CantPar* 1.3, 5, 9.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
<p>და შესკრებელი წიგნთაგან, რომელ დაბეჭდულნი სიტყვთა¹ მის მიერ² მეცნიერებისათჳს³ გვჩუენნა, რამეთუ ძმ იყო. მესამედ ერთობით სულისა წმიდსას რასმე განაგებს, რომლისა შესხმასა მას სული წმიდაჲ ასწავებდა მრავალთა.</p>	<p>and a church from the books^a which he made known to us [through] obscure words^b the knowledge [of the one who] is from him, for he was the Son.^c A third [book] he composes with a certain unity^d of the Holy Spirit in praise of which the Holy Spirit taught many.^e</p>	<p>Τὰ τε σκέμματα καὶ τοὺς τρόπους, τὰς παρὰβολὰς τε καὶ τὰ αἰνίγματα, τὰς τε ἐνεργείας καὶ τὰ μυστήρια, ὅσα ἐν τοῖς τρισὶ βιβλίοις τοῖς μετὰ πόνου ἐντυγχάνουσι γνώριμα, ξένην καὶ πάλιν τοῦτων ὑποτιθῆμι.</p>	<p>The issues and the style, the comparisons and the dark sayings, the [divine] inspirations and the mysteries—whatever worthy of note people find difficult to read in these three books, I propose to treat the strangest of these.</p>

¹Garitte reads with *T* სიტყუათა (with an erased -თ-); *J* has სიტყუას, gen. sg., “word” or “Word.”

²Written above the line in a second hand in *T*.

³მეცნიერებისას *J*.

^aRead, “the book of Ecclesiastes.” Or, “[they are to be] a gathering from [the] books.” See Garitte, CSCO 264.23.

^bThe Georgian text has a nominative, as if modifying “dark things,” but it should be read as a dative.

^cGeorgian mistranslated a reference to Eccl. *CantPar* 1.7 is closer to the original meaning.

^dLit., “with-unity.” Garitte translates “una,” though he notes the literal reading. His use of the feminine suggests he sees a reference to the “una [ecclesia].” The coordination of *ერთობით* (dative) “with one” and *რომლის* suggests that the text of Hippolytus may have read *Τὸν δὲ τρίτον ἐνόηται πνεύματος ἁγίου τινὶ συνέγραψεν αἰνεῖσι ἢ τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐδίδασεν πολλοῖς*, “And the third [book] he composed in a certain unity of the Holy Spirit in praise of which the Spirit taught many.” The theme of unity is prominent in the *In Cant*.

^e*Cp. CantPar* 1.4 where the paraphraser suggests the purpose of Hippolytus’ *In Cant*.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
<p>1.5 აწ სამნი ესე ერთობის წიგნ იქმნეს, ხოლო მესამე იგი იყო აღბეჭდვითა სულისა წმიდისათა, რამეთუ პირველ მამად დასაკვრებელ და სიმლიდრე სიბრძნისაგან გამოთქმულ ქუეყანად შესაკრებელ ბნელისად ძისა მიერ უწყებითა და ბეელ ბულისხმის-ყოფითა სოფელსა გამოთქმულ. მესამე შესხმა. განსამხიარულებულად სულისა წმიდისა და განსაცხრობელად ნუგეშინის-ცემისა, და ცნობად ღმრთისა გამოჩინებულ ყოფილ მრავალთა.</p>	<p>1.5 Now these three books were produced from a unity.^a Moreover the third book was by means of a symbolic representation of the Holy Spirit,^b for in the first [book]^c the Father represented as wonderful and wealth of wisdom. [So in the second book] the Earth was said to be a synagogue^d of darkness to be known through the Son and and the gloom of the world [was] comprehended^e [through him]. The third [book] is a [work of] praise for the joy of the Holy Spirit and to give the delight of consolation, and [thereby] the knowledge of God is made manifest to many.</p>	<p>1.5 Ὁπως τε πάλιν μυστηριωδῶς καὶ πάλιν κεκαλυμμένως τὰς βιβλούς ταύτας τὰς τρεῖς τῇ ἁγίᾳ τριάδι συντάξαε.</p>	<p>1.5 [Next he treats] the way in which again mysteriously and altogether cryptically he composed these books by the Holy Trinity.</p>

^aThe “unity” is unity in diversity of God, which for Hippolytus is also manifest in the unity of the church.

^bLit., “by way of a representation of the Holy Spirit.”

^cAn adverbial construction in Georgian. See Garitte, CSCO 264.21.

^dOr gathering place, “შესაკრებელ,” is also used for “synagogue” (cf. 8.8; cp. 8.2) and likely represents συναγωγή in Hippolytus’ original text.

^eEcc1. represents the Son’s action as agent of the Father in creation. This passage nicely reverses the failure of the *darkness* to “comprehend” the light (Jn 1:5) by affirming that the *light* has comprehended the darkness.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
<p>1.6 აწ მის მაღლისა ღირს-ყოფილ ზეკლითა სულისა წმიდისათა იტყვს: “ესე არს, რომელმან დაჰზადა ესე ყოველი”^a. არა თუ თვთ თაკადი ესე იყო, არამედ იყო მსმენელ და სწავლულ მის მიერ ესე ყოველი მის თანა, რამეთუ სიტყუაჲ იგი მის მიერ ღაღადებდა, რამეთუ თვთ სობრძნე იყო და აჩუენებდა ჩუენდა მოზართ ამაჲს, რომელი უნდა მამას მინიჭებდად წინაჲსწარმეტყუელთა სიტყვსა მის მიერ მყოფელთა; რომლისა სობრძნისაგან არა უნაწილო იყო, არამედ [არა]¹ თვთ სობრძნე იყო და სობრძნც ამის თანა წურთილ იყო. რომელი-იგი იტყოდა, კითარებელ:</p>	<p>1.6 Now^a having been made worthy by grace through the Holy Spirit,^b he said: “He is the one who created all this”^c (Wis 9:1; cf. Eccl 8:9). For he was not himself this [Wisdom], but he was listening and was taught by him “everything [that was] in him” (Jn 1:3). Because the Word, who was himself Wisdom, was crying out through him, and was also revealing to us what the Father desired to give to the prophets, [who] were made by the Word. [He] was [not] left without the evidence of wisdom, but he himself was not Wisdom. [Solomon] was experienced with Wisdom, so it was</p>	<p>1.6 Τὴν τε γὰρ παροῦσιαν εἰς τὸν πατέρα μυστηριωδῶς συγγράψας, ἐλάλησε, μυστηριῶς φησὶν, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ τῷ Σολομώντι, ἐν οἷς φέρεται ὁ πατὴρ περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἰδίου καὶ ὁμοουσιου μυστηριῶν τινα μέλλοντα ἐκβήσεσθαι ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς.</p>	<p>1.6 He spoke the proverb, and composed it mysteriously for the Father, he says, as from his the Father himself to Solomon, in which matters the Father communicates certain mysteries concerning his own Son who shares his nature that would eventually be fulfilled for us at the end of days.</p>

¹ *T* and *J* both omit არა, however, 1.1 requires არა. It fell out due to homoeoarchon: არამედ არა.

^a In many places the Georgian mechanically translates აწ, “now” (a strictly temporal adverb). The Armenian *արդ, ard* can be either a particle “moreover,” “again” or a temporal adverb, just as the Greek *νῦν*.

^b Lit. “by the hand of the Holy Spirit.”

^c That is, τὰ πάντα=the universe.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
<p>“წინასწარ ყოველთა მთათა ვიშეგ მე”*. აწ შობილ სობრძნც იგი მამისა მიერ წინასწარ ყოველთა მთათა, რომელსა სობრძნისა მიერ განგებულ შეუნიერება¹ იგი ამის სოფელსა. 1.7 რამეთუ ესრცთ სობრძნე პირად-პირადთა მით მადლითა მამისადთა გჭრუნებლად შეგკობილუბასა ბრძანებითა მამისადთა. ამას-ვე სოფელსა სობრძნისა მის² თანადმკვდრებითა სოლომონის მიმართ იტყვს: “მე სობრძნე ლავებკვდრე შენ თანა, ზრახვად ლა მეცნიერება”*.</p>	<p>said, “I existed before all the mountains were brought forth.”^{2a} Now Wisdom was brought forth by the Father before all the mountains, by means of this Wisdom the beauty of his world was arranged. 1.7 So therefore Wisdom by means of the manifold grace of the Father was making manifest to us the adornment [of the world] by the command of the Father. At the time of Wisdom’s dwelling in the world with Solomon she said to him, “I, Wisdom, have lived with you as mystery (or counsel)^b and knowledge.”^{2c}</p>	<p>1.7 Τόν τε ἐκκλησιαστικὴν εἰς Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ καὶ ὅσα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ αἰνύματα, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐκείνους αἰνιγματωδῶς καὶ κεκασυμμένως ἐξέθετο· πῶς δὲ δηλοῖ τὴν ἐξ ἑθνῶν ἐκκλησίαν τοῖς μὴ παρέρχως ἀναγιγνώσκουσι καὶ πῶς τὰ τοῦ κόσμου “ματαιότης ματαιότητων, τὰ πάντα ματαιότης”, ἀπερὸ ὃ Χριστὸς ὕστερον ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διδάξας φαίνεται.</p>	<p>1.7 Ecclesiastes refers to Christ the only begotten Son of God and as many enigmas as there are in the church, but he is put forward in a enigmatic and hidden way. And how he indicates the church of the Gentiles to those who do not read it in a trifling way and to whom the things of the World are “vanity of vanities, all is vanity,” which Christ later, once he taught them in the gospel, makes evident.</p>

¹შენება J, “building, construction.”

²T and J read instrumental სობრძნითა მით, “by/when-dwelling.” Garitte and Giginésvili and Giunašvili read genitive.

³Cp. Prov 8:25 πρὸ τοῦ ὄθι ἐδραστήηται πρὸ δὲ πάντων βουρῶν γεννᾷ με.

⁴Hippolytus’ text, following Prov 8:12 (LXX) read βουλή. The Georgian *Biblia Mxetica* has ზრახვა. Garitte translates as “mysterium,” due to the assumed Armenian *Vorlage* of *In Cant*. ზრახვა in Georgian has deliberative meaning only: “counsel, mind” e.g. *NTI Paul CD Rom 8:7*: რად არს ზრახვა იგი სულისა, “what is the mind of the Spirit.” The Armenian *სიղწი-ი-რე, xorturd*, with the semantic range “thought, intention, counsel, mystery, symbol, sacrament.” See Garitte, CSCO 264.111. In most occurrences of this word, clearly the translation should be “mystery.”

⁵Cp. Prov 8:12 ἔγω ἡ σοφία κατεσκήνωσα βουλήν καὶ γνώσιν καὶ ἔννοιαν ἐγὼ ἐπεκαλεσάμην.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
<p>აწ მეცხიერება მიმადლებულ მორწმუნეთა ნებასა გვთნობს მამისა ზნახვითა. 1.8 აწ ესე სობრძნც არა¹ თუ სხუად იყო, არამედ ქრისტე და ქრისტე არს ძმ. და რამეთუ ესრეთ არს ესე, წამებს პავლე მოციქული და იტყვს: “ქრისტეს თუ² ვკვადგებთ, ძლიერებასა ღმრთისასა და ღმრთისა სობრძნეს”*. 1.9 აწ ესე სობრძნც ითქუმის პირისგან ნეტარისა სოლომონის³, კეთილსა მადლსა სულსა ნიჭსა გამოთქემითა შესხმასა ახალს. რამეთუ შეასწმიდა შესხმასა ახალს, მოსწავებითა ზნახვასა გამოცხადებისასა, ვინაჲ გული სხმისსყოფელ არს, რომელ მერმე ყოფად იყო თქუმაღ, რომელთა სიტყუათა წინადაწარ დასწერს მწერალი იგი გამოთქემითა სახობათა და შესხმათა.</p>	<p>Now since knowledge [is] blessed by the will of the faithful, [Wisdom] makes proclamation to us by the mystery of the Father. 1.8 Now this Wisdom was certainly none other than Christ; and Christ is the Son. Since this is so, Paul the Apostle bears witness and says: “But we preach Christ the power of God and the Wisdom of God” (1 Cor 1:23). 1.9 Now this Wisdom was spoken by the mouth of the blessed Solomon as a good grace, a gift of the Spirit, by the expressions of a new praise. Since he was celebrating [with] a new praise by announcing (or foreshadowing) a mystery⁴ of revelation, from which it becomes understandable [that he] spoke what would later happen. He gave expression to such words in songs and praises before the scribe transcribes them.</p>	<p>1.8 Τὸ δὲ ἄσμα τῶν ἄσ μμάτων τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεύματος λόγια ὅπως τε αὐτὸ παρῆχει καὶ τὸ ἄσμα καὶ τὸ ψάλλειν καὶ τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ διάφορα καὶ πῶς τὴν ἐξ ἔθνων ἐκκλησίαν ποτὲ μεμελα- νωμένην ταῖς παραπτώ- μασιν ἐφραίδρυνε καὶ ἤνωσεν ἑαυτῷ λαμπρῦνας διαφόροις χαρίσμασι. 1.9 Μυστηριωδῶς τοίνυν ὁ Σολομὸν τὰς τρεῖς βιβλους ταύτας εἰς τὴν ἀγίαν τριάδα συνέγραψε. [Καὶ ὁ Ἰππόλυτος τρεῖς λέγει τὰς βιβλους]. Ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὸ προκειμένον τῆς βιβλου προΐεμεν. Ἐγ- γραψας ἡμῖν διατὶ ἄσμα ἀσμάτων καλεῖται;</p>	<p>1.8 The Song of Songs is the oracles of the Spirit so that it provides the song and the singing and the different gifts and how the church of the Gentiles, blackened as it was with transgressions, became clean and he united it to himself after making it brilliant with differing gifts. 1.9 So Solomon composed these tree books mysteriously with reference to the Holy Trinity. (And Hippolytus mentions the books). But let us proceed to the book that lies before us, you have written to us why it is called Song of Songs.</p>

¹ არაჲ *J*, “nothing.”

² *J* has ქრისტეს თვს, “Christ himself.”

³ სოლომონის გან *J* “from Solomon.”

⁴ See above note b on page 254.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
<p>1.10 რამეთუ იოკუმის მისთვის, ვითარმედ წართქუმულ მის მიერ სამათსთა იგავთა და ზუთათსთა შესხმათა და ნამუთაფან ლიბანისათა კიდრუ მცენარეთამდე, რომელ ერდთა ზელა-ცა და მფრინველთათს და მკეცთათს და ქუეწარმბრომელთათს, რომელი იძრვის ქუეყანასა ზელა*.</p>	<p>1.10 That is why [such a thing] is said about him in as much as [there are] three thousand proverbs (lit. parables) and five thousand songs (praises) by him, [concerning topics ranging] from the spruces of Lebanon to the plants that are on the wall (or flat roof), also concerning winged creatures and beasts and reptiles (3 Kgdms 5:12-13) that move on the earth.</p>	<p>1.10 Τρισχλίας παρφοβιάς και πεντακισχλίας ὠδῶς ἰστόρησε, φησί, Σολομὼν και ἀπὸ τῆς κέδρου τοῦ λιβάνου ἕως τῆς ὑσώπου τῆς ἐπὶ δώματος και ἀπὸ πετεινοῦ ἕως ἔρπετοῦ και θηρίου τοῦ ἔρποντος ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. Ὅτι μὲν οὖν δυσνόητον τὸ πρῶβλημα που δισεγγείρητον, παντὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ και γῆς, ξύλου τε και θηρίου και πετεινοῦ και ἔρπετοῦ και πάντων τῶν φαινομένων οὐ παρέλιπέ τι ὧν οὐχ ὑπεξῆλθε, τῶν μὲν ζηλούντων και μιμουμένων τὰ ὑποδείγματα, τῶν δὲ φεύγειν και ἀποτρέπειν τοὺς τροπούς, ὡς ἐκάσταω κατὰ δύναμιν. avoid as they are able.</p>	<p>1.10 He says Solomon narrated three thousand parables and five thousand songs. Even [of topics ranging] from the cedar of Lebanon to the hyssop grown on a house and from the bird to the creeping thing and the beast creeping on the earth. Now the issue difficult to understand and hard to grasp is clear to each person so that he did not fail to treat any material analogy whether from heaven or earth, tree or animal, bird or reptile or anything that appears to the senses, things that people in the normal way either desire and imitate or flee and avoid as they are able.</p>

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>In Cant Cat</i>	<i>In Cant Cat</i>
1.11 და სადა არს ესე ყოველი ცოდ-დიდი მეცხიერება? ანუ სადა არს ზრახვა მრავლით უბითიდან თქუმული? დაეფარა. ანუ კინ-მე ¹ არს, რომელმანმცა	1.11 And where is all this grand knowledge? Or where is the mystery spoken so long ago? It was hidden. Or who is it that declared these things? Where are the books? Because there are only these few proverbs which were spoken with Wisdom. There is besides another book, Ecclesiastes, ordered into 708 lines, and the Song of Songs, which is hardly more than three praises <i>composed of 300 lines</i> . ¹	1.11 Ποῦ τοίνυν πᾶσα ἡ τοιαύτη δὲ τὰ μυστήρια τὰ κειρυσμένα; Ποῦ αἱ παρσβολαὶ καὶ τὰ αἰνίγματα τὰ τοιαῦτα; Ποῦ δὲ αἱ βιβλοὶ; Ἀναφαίνονται γὰρ μόναι παρσβολαὶ αὐται αἱ γεγεννημένοι ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ. Ὀλίγαι γὰρ. Ἀναφέρεται δὲ καὶ ἕτερον βιβλίον τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστοῦ, στίχοις ψη'. Ἀναφέρεται δὲ καὶ τὸ ᾄσμα τῶν ᾄσματων, ἑγγυῖς που ἢ πλεόν τ'.	1.11 Where then is all this wealth of knowledge? Where are the hidden mysteries? For there are only these proverbs and enigmas. Where are the books? For there are only these proverbs which came through Wisdom. For they are few. And there is another book, Ecclesiastes, which has 708 stichoi and also the Song of Songs which has more or less 300 stichoi.	1.11 Καὶ ποῦ πᾶσα ἡ πλουσία αὕτη γνώσις; ποῦ δὲ τὰ μυστήρια ταῦτα; καὶ ποῦ αἱ βιβλοὶ; ἀναφέρονται ἄναφέρονται γὰρ μόνα αἱ παρσομίαι καὶ ἡ σοφία καὶ ὁ ἐκκλησιαστὴς καὶ τὸ ᾄσμα τῶν ᾄσματων.	1.11 And where is all this wealth of knowledge? And where these mysteries? And where are the books? For there remain only the Proverbs and the [book of] Wisdom and Ecclesiastes as well as the Song of Songs. ¹

¹ კინ interrogative vs. indefinite relative pronoun *J*.

² რომელ, “which,” *J*.

³ სამასის *J* “three hundred.”

⁴ Lit. “three praises” but *CantPar* 1:11, reads “708 stichoi,” for Eccl and “300 stichoi” for the Song. Bonweitch suggested the *In Cant.* covered “three” songs; “300,” in *J*, however, as also in *CantPar* (homoeoarchon). The Claromontanus stichometry (ca. 300 C.E.) lists Song with 300 stichoi. Nicephorus gives 280 stichoi, see Henry B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: CUP, 1914), 345; also Bruce Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 230, 310.

⁵ The frag. is from Simon Maria de Magistris, *Acta martyrum ad Ostia tiberina sub Claudio Gothico* (Romae: [s.n.], 1795), (*In Cant Cat*). See Bonwetsch and Achelis, *Hippolytus Werke*, 343. “Wisdom” is a book rather than inspirer of

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>In Cant Cat</i>	<i>In Cant Cat</i>
1.12 აწ რეცა თუ ყოველი-ვე იგი წიგნი წარწემელელ. ხოლო თუ ვის-მე ტყუვილ უჩნდეს წერილი იგი, ნუ იყოფინ! არამედ მრავალ დაკლებულ იყო წერილოთჲ ამათ, რომლისათვის მკუთარი იგი მონიჭებად მადლი ყოფად რომელთათვის- მე სახეთა, და წინასწარ დაწერა შესხმაჲ ამათ მიუწყებს მრავალთა წინასწარ განწესებულთა ამათ შესხმათა,	1.12 Now it seems almost all those books are lost. Now God forbid that to anyone the Scripture will appear to be lying! For on account of that this [book] was made strictly to present ² [it] as a gift [and] for [it] to be a blessing in any instance. ^a He indeed previously wrote song[s], this he announces concerning these many previously composed songs	1.12 Ποῦ οὖν ἄρα τὸ πλήθος παρέδραμε; Τὶ δὲ ἄρα; Πάντα τὰ βιβλία αὐτοῦ ἀνίψεται ἢ ψεύδεται ἢ γρᾶφι; Ἀλλὰ μὴ γένοιτο. Τὸ ἐπιτομον γὰρ μᾶλλον ἢ χάρις τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ποιήσασθαι εὐδόκησεν ὡς τε πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄπορα τὰ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου ἦθῃ, ὥστε καὶ πλειστοις τῶν ἕξω τῶν αἰνιγμάτων αὐτοῦ ἐμφορηθῆναι.	1.12 Where did the majority go? What then, have all the books been taken away or is the Scripture lying? Never! Rather, the grace of the Holy Spirit was pleased to produce a representative summary, because it was customary for this man [to express] many things that are difficult. The result was that in many cases they were carried on in the philosophical issues of those who are outside.	1.12 τί οὖν; ψεύδεται ἢ γρᾶφι; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ πολλὴ μὲν τις ὕλη γεγένηται τῶν γρᾶμμάτων, varied	1.12 What then [does it mean]? That the Scripture is lying? Never! But the quality [<i>lit.</i> , “matter”] of his writings varied

¹ *J* omits -ვი, “almost.”

² Cp. Greek Τὸ ἐπιτομον ... ποιήσασθαι, which probably represents original wording.

^a Garitte translates, *propter quod promptus (est) ille donare (et) gratiam facere nonnullis modis*, “For which [reason] it was made ready to give [it even] to make [it] a grace/blessing in many ways.”

Prov. Cp. *CantPar* and *In Cant*. Anastasius of Sinai (PG 89:592-593) also has a frag. of this paragraph.

Georgian	In Cant.	Greek CantPar	CantPar	In Cant Cat	In Cant Cat
<p>1.13 რამეთუ იტყვს მეუხებთა მისა, ვითარმედ ბუთ სასნო იგახნა წარსუქნა. ბოლო აქა რაარჩოვებს, ვითარმედ მესხმას მესხმასასა [...]</p>	<p>In Cant.</p> <p>1.13 even as it says in the [book of] Kings that he pronounced five thousand proverbs, here, however, he repeats^a [the word], for [it is called] the Song of Songs [...]^b</p>	<p>καὶ Πλάτωνι γὰρ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλει καὶ τοῖς περὶ αὐτὸν σοφοῖς λέγεται ἀποκλέψαι οὐκ ὀλίγα τινὰ τῶν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου παροιμιῶν τε καὶ αἰνιγμάτων. Πολλὰ δὲ καὶ οἱ θεῖοι εὐ- αγγελισταὶ ὑπειμνή- σθησαν ἐν κρυφῇ τῶν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου κατορθωμάτων. 1.13 Τὶ οὖν; Ἄπαντα ἔσιωπήθη;</p>	<p>For even in Plato and in Aristotle and the school of philo- sophy belonging to him were stolen not a few of the things of both the proverbs and issues of this man. But many things the divine evangelists brought to mind in a hidden way of the things rightly spoken by this man. 1.13 What then, did they all fall silent?</p>	<p>In Cant Cat</p> <p>1.13 ὡς δηλοῖ τὸ λέγειν ᾄσμα ᾄσμάτων.</p>	<p>In Cant Cat</p> <p>1.13 as is clear with the phrase “Song of Songs.”</p>

^a რაარჩოვებს “repeats-it” rather than *minuit*, “diminish” (as in Garitte).

^b The Georgian text is defective. A comparison of both the *CantPar* and *In Cant Cat* indicate that: “*What then? Does this mean that Scripture is lying? Never! But there was a great deal of material from the scribes*” should be supplied to the text. *In Cant Cat* 1.12 points to the theme of the missing text in the words. *CantPar* 1.12 has a longer version. The reference to Plato and Aristotle is also possibly Hippolytan.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>In Cant Cat</i>	<i>In Cant Cat</i>
ბოლო რომელს იტყვს, კითარებელ შესმა მათ შესმბათთა მოგუასწავებს, რამეთუ აქუნდა მის თანა შეკრებულად ხუთათასნი, ერთს მას შინა მკუთორ გამოაჩინნა, აწ მკუთორ გამოჩინებას მას შეუდგს ძალი-ცა და რომელთა იყო ძუელის მიხედვან, ყოვლის მიმართ ¹ სუგმის სულის მიერ გამოირჩიას და	However, that he says “Song of Songs,” teaches us that he had with him five thousand congregated which [indeed] he represented them by reducing them readily in the one. ^a Now readily their [relative] force also supports ^b a restricted representation ^c and of them there was [...] from ancient time he made a choice through the Spirit for every use.	Ὁὕχ· μὴ γένοιτο. Εἶπε γὰρ ὅτι ἰστόρησεν ἀπὸ τῆς κέδρου καὶ τῆς ὑσσώπου καὶ πετεινοῦ καὶ θηρίου καὶ ἔρπετοῦ καὶ ἕως πατηνωμάτων. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀπειρον ἦν τὸ πλήθος, ὅρα τὸ ἀπειροδύναμον τῆς σοφίας τοῦ πνεύματος.	No, never. For it said that he discoursed upon the cedar and the hyssop plant and birds and beasts and creeping things and beams for buildings. Since therefore the multitude of them was countless, see the incomprehensibility of the wisdom of the Spirit.	σημαίνει γὰρ ὅτι ὅσα περιεῖχον αὐτοὶ ἐκ τῆς πενταχοχλίας ἐκείνων ἔλαβον, ἄλλοι δὲ ἄλλα ἀπέβλησαν ἄσπαστον.	And in the days of Hezekiah they made a selection of some of the books, but the others they left aside.

¹მის ვან, “from him” J.

^aGaritte, “*in uno prompte demonstravit*.” Cp. *In Cant Cat*, σημαίνει γὰρ ὅτι ὅσα περιεῖχον αὐτοὶ πενταχοχλίας φῶσαι ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ θυγαῖστο. Note that the wording of “narration” applied to the books of Solomon in general and Song in particular is immediately taken up in 1:14.

^bOr “establishes” (შეგება) the verb has a range of meaning from “establish, follow, attack.” Against Garitte, who translates *sequitur*, it is best to understand that the extraordinary power of the selected writings did not follow the selection, but led to their being selected.

^cFrom *In Cant Cat* 1.13 should be added “*in the days of Hezekiah some were chosen and others left aside*.” Cp. *CantPar* 1.16, which expands the explanation of the title “Song of Songs” from the selection of Hezekiah’s identifies the Song as “the most lyrical and of the odes, the most musical.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>In Cant Cat</i>	<i>In Cant Cat</i>
რომელნი ერთ-ვე მობარკე არიან ეკლესი- ასაჲს სტუნივითა, ესე მერმე გულოსხ- მის-საყოფელ იქნა. 1.14 ხოლო რაათა- მცა უწყოდეთ კრძალვად სიტყვსა ამისვის, ყოვლითა შეძლებითა და ცოცხლად გამოთქმულ იხილეთ წერილთა მათგან, და რომელნი არა მოკლენებულ იგვთა მათ შინა, რამეთუ იტყვს ესრეთ შორის წიგნთა წერილი იგი:	And [to] those who are completely zealous for the church this later was made intelligible with contemplative study. ^a 1.14 But that you might know prudence toward this Word, contemplate from the Scripture (<i>lit.</i> writings) with all power and sound dogma, ^b even the things which were forgotten among the Proverbs (<i>lit.</i> parables), thus it says in the Scripture (<i>lit.</i> writing),	ῥοσα ἦν ἀναγκαῖα πρὸς ἐκκλησιαστικὸν ὄρον, ταῦτα καὶ μόνον ἐσημειώθη. 1.14 Καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστιν ἔμὸν τὸ ᾄσμα, ἀλλ' ἄκουσον τῆς βίβλου τῶν παροιμιῶν αὐτοῦ που μέσον οὕτως δογματίζουσης· «Ἄνται αἱ παροιμίαι, φησι, Σολομώντος αἱ ἀδिकाῖροι ἄς ἔξελεξαντο οἱ φίλοι Ἐζεκιου τοῦ βασιλέως».	As many things as were necessary for the ecclesiastical sphere, these alone were signified. 1.14 And this is not simply what I say, but hear his book of Proverbs where in some passage he says, "These are the unselected proverbs of Solomon which the friends of Hezekiah the king chose." ^a	1.14 ὅθεν φησὶν ἡ γραφὴ "αὐται αἱ παροιμίαι Σολομώντος αἱ ἀδिकाῖροι, ἄς ἐξεγράψαντο οἱ φίλοι Ἐζεκιου τοῦ βασιλέως".	1.14 This is why the Scripture says "these are the unselected proverbs of Solomon, which the friends of Hezekiah the king wrote down."

^aსტუნივაჲ probably represents θεωρία, "contemplation, speculation." Cf. Philo, *vit. cont.* 28.

^bThe use of δόγμα (similar to Garitte's *edictum* "ordinance, decree") by Hippolytus is also suggested by δογματίζουσης in *CantPar* 1.14.

^aἀδिकाῖροι as "untested, unproven," is likely an Atticism.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>In Cant Cat</i>	<i>In Cant Cat</i>
ესე იგაენი სოლომონ- ისნი გამოუცდელნი, რომელ-იგი გამოირ- ჩიეს საყუარულთა მათ ქუეკია მეფისა- თა”*. და გამოჩეკვა იგი ესე არს შემდგომად ჯღსრულებისა მის სოლომონისა. აჲ ვინაჲ არაან იგავნი ესე სოლომონისნი გამოუძებულ, რომელი გამოიძიეს საყუარულთა მათ ქუეკია მეფისათა? ვინაჲ წიგნთა მათ, რომელთა შინა იტყეს სამ ათასთა იგავთა? parables)?	“These [are] proverbs of Solomon that were not [previously] found that the friends of Hezekiah the king chose” (Pro 25.1) and this selection is after the death of Solomon. Now, where ^a are these these [previously] undiscovered proverbs of Solomon, which were then discovered by the friends of King Hezekiah? Where ^b are the books among which it was said were the three thousand proverbs (<i>lit.</i> parables)?	Εἰ δὲ ἐκείνοι ἀδιακρίτους αὐτὰς εἶπον, τί εἶπωμεν ἡμεῖς οἱ βραχεῖς καὶ ταπεινοί, πλείστα αὐτῶν ἀπολιμπάν- οντες ὅπως τε δυσεργημεντοί εἰσιν. Ἐδόθη γὰρ αὐτῶ, φησί. “χύμα καρδίας” ὥστε μὴ παρεμποδίσ- εσθαι αὐτὸν μηδὲ τὸ τυχὸν φιλοσοφῆσαι. Τὸ δὲ “ἐξελέξαντο” τοιούτων ἔστιν. Τελευτήσαντος Σολομώντος, μετὰ πλείστα ἔτη, ἦλθεν Ἑζεκιᾶς ὁ βασιλεὺς. Σοφοὺς δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ καὶ δίκαιος καὶ εὐγνώμων ἐνώπιον κυρίου θεοῦ αὐτοῦ.	And if these he called “unselected” what shall we say who are insignificant and shallow and humble, who are lacking the greatest number of these as difficult to understand? For to him was given, it says, “largeness of heart” so that he might not be tripped up by philosophy. What “they made a selection” means is this. Once Solomon had died, after many years, came Hezekiah the king. He was wise and righteous and prudent before his Lord God.	πόθεν δὲ ἐξελέξαντο ἀλλ’ ἢ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τῶν ἐγκειμένων ἐν αἷς λέγει τρισχίλιαις παραβολαῖς καὶ πεντακισχίλια ἰς ᾠδαῖς, thousand parables and five thousand songs?	From where were they chosen, except from the books which they had at their disposal in which it says there were three thousand parables and five thousand songs?

^aGaritte correctly suggests ვინაჲ, “where from?” stands for “where” in Hippolytus’ original and should have been translated სდა არინ?

^bSee note a on page 262.

Georgian
 ესე არს რომელ
 მათგან უწებულ არს
 თხრობათა მათგან
 საყურელთა მათ
 ეზუკიასთა, რომელნი
 იგი ბრძენ იყვნეს
 გამო-რამე-
 იდიეს მერმე და
 უესძინეს ძუელთა მათ
 გამოჩრეულთა
 აღსაშებულად
 ეკლესიასა.

In Cant.

These are which have
 been reported to be
 from him from the
 history of the friends of
 Hezekiah who were
 wise men. They sought
 out some afterwards
 and added to the
 [more] ancient
 selection for the
 edification of the
 church.

Greek CantPar

Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ εἶπεν
 ἡ βίβλος ὅτι οἱ φίλοι
 Ἑζεκιᾶ ἐξελέξαντο,
 ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι
 ἀξιοπιστοῦ ὀνόματος
 προσήγαγε
 μάθουρας.

CantPar

Because for this
 reason the book says
 that the friends of
 Hezekiah made a
 selection so that you
 may learn that he
 put forward
 witnesses worthy of
 the the name.

<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>In Cant Cat</i>	<i>In Cant Cat</i>
<p>Πάντως γὰρ οὐκ ἄν αὐτοὺς ἐκέκτητο φίλους, δίκαιος ὢν, εἰ μὴ τῶν τῆς εὐσεβείας ὄρων συμμύσται αὐτῷ καὶ ἰσόφρονες ὑπῆρχον. Καὶ πόθεν φησὶν ἐξελέξαντο; Ἐν αἷς εἶπε πεντα- κισχιλίας ὕδαϊς καὶ τριχιλίας παράβολαις. Σοφοὶ γὰρ ὑπάρχοντες ἀκριβῶς ἐξελέξαντο. Τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἄνευ τῆς οἰκονομίας τοῦ πνεύματος γέγονεν, ἵνα τὸ μυστήριον τὸ μέλλον φανερωθῇ δι' αὐτῶν ἐπ' ἐσχάτων ἀποτελούμενον.</p>	<p>For truly he would not have acquired them as friends, since he was righteous, unless he saw them as fellow initiates in godliness and that they were of the same mind. What was the source?—the five thousand songs and three thousand pro- verbs. Being wise, they made an accurate selection. And this [process] did not occur without the economy of the Spirit so that the mystery to come might be made known through them at the fulfillment of the last days.</p>	<p>Τὰς δὲ βίβλους τοῦ Σολομῶντος, τὰς περὶ τῶν παράβολῶν καὶ ὕδων, ἐν αἷς περὶ φυτῶν καὶ παντοίων ζῶων φυσιο- λογήσας, χερσαίων, πετεινῶν τε καὶ νηπτῶν, καὶ ἰαμάτων πάθους παν- τῶς, γράφει- σας αὐτῷ, ἀφανεῖς ἐποίησεν Ἐφεκίας, διὰ τὸ τὰς θερα- πειῶν τῶν νοσημάτων ἐνθελὲν κομι- ζεσθαι τὸν λαόν, καὶ περιορᾶν εντεῦθεν παρὰ θεῷ τὰς ἰάσεις.</p>	<p>Solomon wrote for himself books about parables and odes in which he carried on discourse on the nature of plants and all sorts of living creatures: lizards and birds and ships and the healing of every passion. And Hezekiah caused them to disappear because the people were providing for the healing of their illnesses in the [books] and overlook- ing that healings come from God.¹</p>

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>In Cant Cat</i>	<i>In Cant Cat</i>
1.15 ხოლო ამისი-ცა მიზეზი ჩას ¹ გამოჩინებოსათვის, რამეთუ იყო რომ- ელიძე გარეწარ, ² და იყო რომელი-მე საჴმრად გამოჩი- ნებულ, რათა ამათ გამო შენება იყოს, რომელი შემძლე- ბელ იყოს სმენად.	1.15 The reason for this is easy to demonstrate. ^a For [they chose] what was somewhat unique and things that were to some extent expressed in a useful manner, that in them there might be edification. Let the one who is capable of understanding hear!	1.15 Δέδεικται οὖν ὅτι τὰ μὲν πλείω ἦν, τὰ δὲ ἀναγκαῖα, ὅσα ἔφθην εἰπὼν μυστηριωδῶς εἰς τε τὸν πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ εἰς τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ πνεύματος, εἰς τε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τοὺς σοφοὺς ἀποστόλους.	1.15 Therefore it is shown that on the one hand was the majority, and on the other the things that were necessary, the things that were the priority, things spoken mysteriously with a view to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and the economy of Christ and the aroma of the Spirit, the church and the wise apostles.	1.15 ἐξ αὐτῶν οἱ φίλοι Ἐζεκίου σοφοὶ ὑπάρχοντες ἐξελέξαντο τὰ πρὸς οἰκοδομίην ἐκκλησίας.	1.15 From them, therefore, the friends of Hezekiah, because they were wise, made a selection for the edification of the church.

¹Anastasius of Sinai, quoting Eusebius of Pamphylia (PG 89:592-593) cp. ANF, 5:176.

²ჩანს “apparent, clear, evident” (J)

³T and J add იყო, but it should be deleted.

^aLit., “But whose reason for the sake of demonstration is evident.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
<p>1.16 აწ მათ ყოფილთათვის ღაცემული ძეს საშუკალ ერთ-ღა¹ სხუა რამე ძუელი თხრობა სულიერად², რამეთუ ღამუკლებულითა მათ თხრობა თანა- ჲც მათ, რომელნი სარწმუნოებით თხრობად³ შემძლებელ არიან. აწ შეასხამს სული⁴ იგი, რომელ გელესათა შინა განწესებულ არს, რამეთუ⁵ პირად-პირადად გჭუნებს სხეთა განყოფასა, რომელითა თანა- გუჲც მითხრობად მათ, რომელნი სარწმუნოებით შემძლებელ არიან სმენად.</p>	<p>1.16 Now the result of occurrence of^a these events [is] a series^b one after another [of books] as an ancient spiritual narrative, because those who are able must narrate by faith the ancient matters. Now the Spirit sings what has been ordained in the church, since in various portions it^c reveals to us the economy in types^d which we must declare to those who are able to listen with faith.</p>	<p>1.16 Ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ ἔσματος ἤκομῆν σοι πειθόμενοι. Διὰ τὴ ἔσιμα ἔσμάτων καλεῖται; Ὅτι δὲ ἐν ὄψ τὰ πεντακισχλῖα ἔσματα ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔσιμα ἐν καὶ βελίτω δηγήσαντο παντὶ γνῶριμον. Ὡσπερ γὰρ φίλος φίλων καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἀνθρώπων εἰς σύγχοισιν τοῦ βελίτωνος, ὄτω φησὶ καὶ ἔσιμα ἔσμάτων, τουτέστι τῶν ἔσμάτων ἔσματικώτερον καὶ τῶν ᾠδῶν ᾠδικώτερον.</p>	<p>1.16 But since we are convinced we depend upon the book of the Songs for you. Why is it called “Song of Songs”? For just as we say “a friend of friends” and “a man of men” to compare the best of a class, so it says “Song of Songs,” the most lyrical of songs and of odes the most musical.</p>

¹ *T* adds ხოლო, “but, however,” which Garitte rightly omits.

² სულიერადი with the -ი written above the line in *T*.

³ სმენად *J* “for hearing, to be heard.”

⁴ (უ)ლი(ებრი) *J*, i.e. “now he sings spiritual[ly].”

⁵ და *J*, “and/even.”

^a Lit. “of these events fallen it lies.”

^b Lit. “a middle one.”

^c Georgian has no gender, nor are pronouns gendered, so Spirit may be thought of as “he, she, or it.”

^d Garitte, *formarum divisionem* but 2.2 he has “typus.” The *განყოფის* or “economy” is a central concept in Hippolytus. It stands for the narrative historical and Trinitarian plan salvation. The Song is said to declare the economy in types.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
2.1 აწ ამისი მოვედით და ვიხილოთ, წინადადებული ესე რას იტყვს: “ამბოვრს-მიყავ ¹ მე ამბორებითა პირისა თვისისათა, რამეთუ შუენიერ არიან ბუბუნე შენი უფროჲს ღვნისა. და სულწელჲჲსა საცხებელისა შენისა უმეტესს ყოველთა საკუმეველთასა. და ვითარცა სულწელჲჲსა საცხებელისა გზვენელ არს სახელი შენი” [*]	2.1 Now come and let us see this proposition of it ^a [him/the book], ^b in which he says. “Kiss me with the kisses of his mouth, because your breasts are lovelier than wine, and [the] aroma of your anointing oil greater than all incense, and as aroma of anointing oil poured out is your name.” ^c	2.1 Ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ προχειμενον τῆς βίβλου προΐεμεν. Φιλησάτω με ἀπὸ φιλημάτων στόματος αὐτοῦ, [Καὶ ἐν τούτοις τὰ πλείστα τῷ πατρὶ τούτῳ συνάδει καὶ ὁ μέγας Ἰηπόλυτος] ὅτι ἀγαθοὶ μαστοὶ σου ὑπέρ ὄϊνον καὶ ὁσμὴ μύρων σου ὑπέρ πάντα ἅλλα, καὶ ὡς ἀρώματα, μύρων ἀνέμενον ἐκπορεύεται ὄνομα σου. Διὰ τοῦτο νεάνιδες ἠγάπησάν σε.	2.1 But we pass on to proposition of the book. Let him kiss me from the kiss of his mouth (And in these matters the great Hippolytus celebrates God to the greatest extent). Because your breasts are above wine and the scent of your anointing oil is above all aromatic spices, your name is anointing oil poured out. For this reason the young women loved you.

¹ამბოვრს-მიყავ (aor. imp. 2nd sg.) *T* and *J* (*J* has ამბორს-), Garrite places in his text ამბოვრს-მიყავ (imp. 3rd sg.).

^a*T* and *J* have ამის, “of it/its/of him/his,” i.e., of this book, cf *CantPar Greek* 1.16 τῆς βίβλου. Garrite leaves ამის untranslated.

^bCf. τὸ προχειμενον τῆς βίβλου προΐεμεν, *CantPar Greek* 1.16b.

^cSong 1:2, 3 φιλησάτω με ἀπὸ φιλημάτων στόματος αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἀγαθοὶ μαστοὶ σου ὑπέρ ὄϊνον καὶ ὁσμὴ μύρων σου ὑπέρ πάντα τὰ ἀρώματα μύρων ἐκμενον ἐκπορεύεται ὄνομα σου. Cp. *CantPar* 2.1.

Georgian

2.2 რა-მე არს ნება სულით, რომლის¹ მიმართ არს ძალი ესე, ანუ რა-მე სასწაულ ზრახვის² მის იყოს? თანაგუც მოუწყებად მათა,³ რომელნი-იგი ისმენდენ,⁴ რამეთუ სახც ესე ეროსა მის არს, რომელი-ესე მკედრები⁵ ზეცისასა მას სიტყუასა, რათთა ამოურს-უყოს, რამეთუ პირი პირსა შეხებად ჰნებაგს, რამეთუ ძალი სულითა თვისა მომართ შეყოფად ჰნებაგს.

In Cant.

2.2 What is the will of the Spirit, for what^a [is its] force,^b or what might be the interpretation (*lit.* indication, sign) of this mystery? We must proclaim to those who will hear,^c for it is the representation (*lit.* type) of the people that entreats the heavenly Word to kiss them, because [the people] wish to join [together] mouth to mouth. For [the people] wishes to join the power of the Spirit to itself.^d

¹ რომლისა-მე *J* “to whichever.”

² ზრახვისა *T* The nominative ending on the genitive ending shows the scribe understood სასწაულ to be the nominative head noun of the phrase.

³ მათად *J* = “to/for them”.

⁴ ისმენენ *J*, pres. 3rd pl. *T* has the conjunctive present (future use).

⁵ *J* adds მიწვენად, “to arrive at.”

^a Lit. “which.”

^b Lit. “this power/force,” representing Greek δύναμις = “meaning.”

^c *J* “those who hear.” See note 4 above.

^d This likely refers to the ritual kiss, which as a sharing of spirit. Justin *Apol.* 1.65; Tertullian, *Or.* 18; Origen, *Comm. Rom.* 10.13; *Trad. ap.* 4.1; 18.3-4; 21.25; *Cp. GPhil* 31; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures* 23.4. *Cf. GPhil* §29b-31 “If he [were born] from the mouth [of God] – where the *logos* comes from —, he would eat from the mouth and he would become perfect. For the perfect conceive through a kiss and give birth. Therefore, we too kiss one another, receiving conception from the grace that is within one another” (trans. van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 52).

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>2.3 და იტყვს: “ამბოვრს-მიყვ” მე ამბორებითა პირისა თუხისათა.” რომელ არს ესე თავადი: მცნებათა მათ მიერ, რომელთა ამცნებს შემოყოფილ ჩემდა ესე, რამეთუ პირისა მაგისგან სიყუარული არს— ლირს-მყვ— რამეთუ იტყვს: “უძვობმს არიან ჩემდა ძუძუნი შენი უფრობს ღვხისა”.</p> <p>რამეთუ, ვითარცა სახედ განამხიარულის ღვზობან გულო, ესე სახედ განამხიარულებენ მცნებათა ქრისტესნი, რამეთუ ვითარცა ჩვენნი, რომელნი გამოწვოვენ ძუძუთაგან გამოწვოვდ სისა, გვრე-ცა სახედ ყოველნი გამოწვოვდენ შუკულისა და სახარებთსაგან მცნებათა, საჭმელისა სამარადისოსა მოიპოვებენ,</p>	<p>2.3 And it says, “Let him kiss me with the kisses of his own mouth,” which is this very thing: through the commandment that he commands let it be applied to me, since from this mouth comes love— [Lord,] make me worthy. Because he says, “Better are your breasts to me than wine,” for [it means], just as wine made the heart glad, so also the commandments of Christ make [the heart] glad. For just as infants suckle from breasts^a to draw out milk, so also all [who] will suckle on commandments from the law and the gospel receive eternal nourishment.</p>	<p>2.3 Διὰ γὰρ τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐντέλλεται, ἵνα σιγῶσῃ τὴν διὰ στόματος ἀγάπην. Τὸ δὲ ἀγαθοῖ μαστοῖ σου ὑπὲρ οἴνου, ὃν τρόπον εὐφραίνει καρδίαν ὁ οἶνος, οὕτως εὐφραίνουσι διαθήκαι Χριστοῦ. Μαστοὶ γὰρ εἰσι αὐτοῦ αἱ δύο διαθήκαι, νόμος καὶ εὐαγγελίον, γάλα δὲ αἱ λευκαὶ ἐντολαί. Ὡστερ δὲ νήπια γαλουχεῖται διὰ τῶν μαστῶν, οὕτω καὶ οἱ πιστοὶ ἀπὸ τῶν δύο διαθηκῶν ἀμείλ-γουσιν ἐντολάς.</p>	<p>2.3 For through the commandments it is enjoined that by the mouth he might stiffen love. But the notion of “your breasts [are] better than wine” [means: as] in the way wine makes the heart glad, so the covenants of Christ. For the breasts are his two covenants, the law and the gospel, but the milk is the white commandments. And as babies draw milk from the breasts, even so the faithful suckle commandments from the covenants.</p>	<p>2.3 In the same way the heart is pleased with wine, the testament of Christ brings delight. For children suckle milk from the breasts, such a one is sucking out of the law of the commandments, out of the gospel, eternal food. Indeed the breasts of Christ are nothing other than both testaments and the milk is their commandments.</p>

¹ამბოვრს-მიყვ, Garitte. *T* has ამბოვრს-მიყვ, *J* has ამბორს-მიყვს (“he will kiss me”).

²Garitte’s punctuation.

^aCp. Later interpreters understandably transfer the breasts from the Logos to the church, viz., Philo of Carpasia, *In Cant.* (PG 40.36), δύο μαστοὺς τὰς δύο διαθήκας ἑπτεύον, ἀφ’ ὧν καὶ θηλάζει τὰ τέκνα ἐκκλησίας . . . τοὺς λόγους τῆς ἀληθείας. Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Cant.* (PG 69:1281-2), Μαστοὺς δὲ φέρει τὰς δύο Διαθήκας ἡ νύμφη, ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς ἀνὰ μέσον αὐλίσσεται . . . Εὐώνυμος ὁ νόμος, δεξιὰ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον. Hippolytus, however, incorporates them with the Sophia-Logos-Christ. The androgyny of the Sophia-Logos image is seen in *In Cant.* 1.7, 8. Thus, the text (as well as the introduction) is seen to begin with a number of riddles, especially appropriate for a banquet setting.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>რამეთუ ძუძუ ქრისტესა არა თუ¹ სხუა რა არს, არამედ ორნი იგი მჯუღნი, და სძმ ესე არა თუ სხუა რა არს, არამედ მცნებანი იგი მჯუღლისანი. აწ მოწუელუ ძუძუთა მოგან სძმ, რათა აღმენებულ და სრულ მოწამმ იყო, 2.4 რამეთუ იტყვს, კითარმედ: “საწაღელ არიან ძუძუნი შენი უფროს ღვნისა, და სულნელუბა სცხებელისა შენისა უფროს მუზავებულთა საგუმეკელთასა-ო”;² ხოლო აწ სცხებელი იგი სულნელი ქრისტესი რაჲ-მე რა არს, [არა თუ სიტყუა,³ რამეთუ სიტყუა იგი უმეტესს საგუმეკელთასა მართლად შერაცხილ? რამეთუ კითარცა სხედ მუზავებულნი იგი საგუმეკელთანი გამოსცემენ სულნელუბას, ესრე-სახელ-ცა სიტყუა გამოსრულ მამისაგან განამხიარულებს მსნენელთა.</p>	<p><i>In Cant.</i> For the breast in Christ is none other than the two laws,^a and this milk is none other than the teachings of the law. Now draw out milk from these breasts, that you may be a witness who is built up and perfected.^b 2.4 For she says, “More desirable are your breasts than much wine, and the scent of your anointing oil than mixed incense.” But now what is the fragrant anointing oil of Christ, [except the Word]? For the Word is rightly esteemed to be greater than any incense. For, just as mixtures of incense give off an aroma, so also the Word once it goes forth from the Father gladdens those who hear it.</p>	<p>2.4 Μύρα Χριστοῦ τίνα λέγει, ἀλλ’ ἢ τὰ λόγια ὑπέρ πάντα ἀρώματα ἡδονῆν χορηγοῦντα.</p>	<p>2.4 To what do the myra of Christ refer, except that the sayings (τὰ λόγια) provide delight above all aromatic spices.</p>	<p><i>Paleo-Slavonic</i> Suckle, proclaiming milk from the breasts, in this way you will become a more perfect disciple.</p>

¹ *J* omits.

² Garitte suggests არამედ სიტყუა, “except the Word,” dropped out of the text.

³ *CantPar* 2:3, Μαστοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν αὐτοῦ αἱ δύο διαθήκαι, νόμος καὶ εὐαγγελίον, γάλα δὲ αἱ λευκαὶ ἐντολαί.

^b Cf. Odes of Solomon 19:1-5.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>2.5 “სულწელეუბა საცხებლის განფენილ სახელი შენი”.¹ მ ახალი განყოფილება და საკრეველთა ზრახვითა სულითა წმიდისა მიერ ქალაქებულთა! რამეთუ არამე კმა-იყო-ა თქუბად “საცხებელ სულწელეუბის სახელი შენი”, არამედ “საცხებელ სულწელეუბის განფენილ სახელი შენი-ო”? რამეთუ ვითარცა სახელე კურჭერსა, რომელსა ნელსაცხებელი დგან, დაკრძალულ² და დაბეჭდულ² კიდრე არნ, არა გამოუტყვის სულწელეუბა, ხოლო აქუნ, არს ძლიერება იგი, ხოლო რაჟამს აღჰკვნან, გამოსცის სულწელეუბა თესი და აღვსნის მახლობელი თესნი და შორიელნი,</p>	<p>2.5 “A fragrance of anointing oil poured out is your name.” O new economy and of the wonderful mysteries preached by means of the Holy Spirit! For it was not enough to say, “your name is a fragrance of anointing oil.” Rather, he said “an aromatic anointing oil poured out [is] your name,” did he not? For, just as a vessel in which there is anointing oil, [which] has been guarded safely and sealed up, does not emit an aroma, nevertheless it continues to contain [the aroma], that is the potential, but when they release it, it emits its aroma both [to] those nearby and those far away [are] filled [with it],</p>	<p>2.5 Ὁν γὰρ τρόπον ἐν ἀγγείῳ μύρον ὄν ἐγχεμένον, οὐδέπω τὴν ὀσμὴν παρῆχει, ἔχει δὲ αὐτὴν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, λυθέντος δὲ ἅπαντας τοὺς ἐγγύς καὶ τοὺς μακρὰν, οὐτῶ τὸ μύρον ὁ λόγος ἐν καρδίᾳ πατρὸς ὧν, τούτέστιν ἐν τῷ ἁδῆσῳ, ἕκκενωθεὶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον εὐαδιδας τὰ πάντα πεπληρωκαε.</p>	<p>2.5 In the way a vial of anointing oil which is shut up, never gives off its aroma, but has it within itself, but once the anointing oil is released it gives delight to all those who are near and those who are far way. In the same way as the anointing oil, the Word was in the heart of the Father. That is, in his breast, [but] once emptied into the world, he has filled everything with his fragrance.</p>	<p>2.5 O the new divine economy, the wonderful mysteries preached by means of the Holy Spirit! For it was not sufficient to say, “your name is an anointing oil,” but rather “a poured out anointing oil is your name.” For, like anointing oil, standing in a sealed container never gives off its aroma, but rather it maintains (has) its power in itself, after the container is smashed and the anointing oil is poured out,</p>

¹დაკრულ J, “tied up; bound up; lashed.”

²J omits და-preverb.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>ესრე¹ სახედ-ცა სიტყუა იგი გულის მამისა იყო. და ვიდრე არა გამოსრულ იყო, არაჲს რას განამხიარულებდა. ხოლო რაჲმს გამოუტევა მამამან სული იგი სულელებისა, მიჰფინა სიტყუამან მან განმხიარულება ყოველია.</p>	<p>so also the Word was in the heart of the Father, and so long as it had not gone forth, no one rejoiced in it all,^a but when the Father sent forth the Spirit of the aroma, the Word spread joy abroad to all.^b</p>	<p>ὁῦτω τὸ μῦθον ὁ λόγος ἐν καρδίᾳ πατρὸς ὧν, τουτέστιν ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ, ἐκκενωθεῖς εἰς τὸν κόσμον εὐώδους τὰ πάντα πεπλήρωσε.</p>	<p>In the same way as the myron, the Word was in the heart of the Father. That is, in his breast, [but] once emptied into the world, he has filled everything with his fragrance.</p>	<p>it makes everything sweet, what is close by and what is far away, so also while the Word was still in the heart of the Father, as long as it did not go forth, it delighted no one; when however it bubbled forth it released the new fragrance, then the Word delighted many.</p>

¹ ესრე J.

^aCf. C.N. 10.1-3; *El.* 10.32

^b*Cp CantPar* 2.5 The Greek paraphrase has no reference to the lack of rejoicing in the Word prior to incarnation.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>2.6 † სიკეთე სულნელები სა ამის, რომელ მოჰფინა, რაათა სოფელი განავსო! ამისთვის იტყვს, ვითარმედ: “საცხებელ სულნელების განვენელ სახელი უენი-ო”. რამეთუ განელი ჰურს მას სიხარულისას, რომელ არს პირი იგი მამული; წარმოლებითა პატრიოსანი იგი სიტყუად მიგან. ამას სულნელებსა ზეცით გარდამოუტევეს. ესე გარდამოსრულ აღვსებდა ყოველთა; ამის მიერ ყოველი უესხმა წინადაწარმეტყუელთა აღვსებდა და² ყოველთა მართალთა მიაქუნდა და იტაცებდეს მტაცებელი, კეთილი სულთა თვისთა თანა დაკრებულ, რაათა აღვსენ³ სულნელებითა ერთობით ყოველნი-ვე.</p>	<p>2.6 O beauty of his aroma, which was poured out that he might fill the world! For this very reason it says: “an aromatic anointing oil [is] your name poured out. For the vessel of joy has been opened, which is the paternal mouth. By bringing forth the esteemed Word from him[self], he caused the aroma to descend from heaven. This descending (ful)filled (or, began to [ful]fill) everything. By means of him all the praise of the prophets began to be fulfilled and all the righteous ones [began to be] brought forth and the destroyers were destroyed. Something good was taken into their own spirits in order that all things might be filled in unity with the aroma.</p>			<p>2.6 How much more beautiful [is] the aroma of the poured out anointing oil. In this way it is able to fill the world! Therefore he also calls it: “A poured out anointing oil is your name.” It was made to be poured for the container of joy, the mouth of the Father, bringing out of himself what was precious, this <i>myron</i>, the anointing oil of heaven into the world [and it] filled all things, descending on all with a aroma. Therefrom the entire glorious choir of the prophets, all taken as righteous, was fulfilled, robbery has been robbed.</p>

¹ მისი J “his.”

² J omits და, “and.”

³ აღვსენ, “to [ful]fill” T.

Georgian

[შთაისსა მუცელსა მას, და დაჰჰადა ახალი კაცი შობილ; დაესსა წყალთა ზელა, და წყალნი განწმინდა; მიეფინა წარმართთა შორის, და წარმართნი შეკრიბნა; მიეფინა ისრაჲლსა ზელა, ხოლო არა თუ რომელნი ურწმუნო იყვნეს, მიიღეს სულნი-ლუბა იგი; აწ მიეფინა ზრახვად იგი ისრაჲლსა შორის, და შეკრიბეს წარმართნი, რომელთა ჰრწმუნა იგი. ამისთვის შესაკრძალველ სიტყუად ესე; არა თუ ესრე იტყვს, ვითარმეც: “საცხებელი დათხეული-ო”, არამედ საცხებელი გარდაფენილ¹. პირად პირადად მრავალთა ზელა მიფენითა მით, რამეთუ დათხეულ შეურაცხ არს, ხოლო მიფენილი არა მოაკლდის ჰურჭერსა-ცა მას და აღავსებნ მახლობელთა მათ². ესეკითარსა ბუნებასა შინა არს საცხებელი ესე. შ სჯეუარულნი, წყარო საზარები არს და მარადის გამოუცემის³ და თვთ თაგადსა არა მოაკლდეზის.

In Cant.

[The Spirit] was sent down over the waters and it purified the waters.^a It was poured out to the Gentiles, and it congregated the Gentiles. [It was poured out over Israel, nevertheless those who were disobedient did not accept the aroma. Now the mystery has been poured among Israel and the Gentiles came together who believed it. For this reason this word is to be avoided, for this reason it does not at all mean, “anointing oil emanated” but “anointing oil poured out.”^b] [It happened] in various ways over many through outpourings because what emanates is contemptible,^b nevertheless what [was] poured out did not diminish from the vessel itself and it filled the ones (or things) nearby. Such is the nature of this anointing oil. O beloved, it is the well-spring of the gospel and it constantly goes forth (or is sent forth⁴) and does not wane.

¹Supplied from *J* The entire passage in brackets, e.g. [...] was omitted from *T* by haplography.

²*J* omits.

³*T* adds მას “it, of it.”

⁴Garitte reads გამოცემის. *T* has the character vowel -ო- in a second hand, which makes the verb passive.

^aThe reference to the Spirit descending over the water to purify possibly echoes the variant reading represented in the *Gos. Eb.* and εὐθὺς περιέλαψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα, “and immediately a great light shone around the place” (according to Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30.13), also known to Justin (*Dial. Tryph.* 88.3) καὶ πῦρ ἀνήθη ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ, “and a fire was kindled in the Jordan.” Witnesses to the Diatessaron also preserve a similar reading. Cf. the Old Latin tradition, viz., a, g1 (6th century), *et cum baptizaretur [Jesus], lumen magnum fulgebat de aqua, ita ut timerant omnes qui congregati erant.* “And when Jesus was being baptized a great light flashed from the water, so that all who had gathered there were afraid.” See, William L. Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship* (SupVC 25; Brill Academic Publishers, 1997), 14–6. More likely it refers to anointing oil poured on the water, as in Cyril, *Procatechesis*, 15 the waters of baptism ὑδάτων χριστοφόρων ἐχόντων εὐωδίας. Cf. idem, *Mystagogical Lectures* 3.1.9–10 Κάκεινος μὲν ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ λουσαμενος ποταμῶ καὶ τῶν ἁερῶτων τῆς θεότητος μεταδός τοῖς ὑδασι.

^bA remark perhaps critical of Valentinian interpretation of the origin of the *Logos*.

2.10 ამაჲ საცხებელმან განამხიარულჲა მართალნი. ესე შეუკურებულ ნოვესა, განმართლდა და კიდობნითა მით განერა*.
 2.11 ესე შეურაცხ-ყოფილ ქამის მიერ და სარც-ხენული მამისა თვისსა გამოაცხადა*.
 2.12 ამის მიერ განმხიარულებულ ნეტარი იგი ეპერ არა შეუდგა¹ მათ თანა, რომელთა-იგი გოდლის საქმც ზრახეს*. 2.13 ესე შეურაცხ-ყოფილ ნებროთისაგან და სზრდელსა დუმზადებდა მკდომთა ღმრთისათა. 2.14 ამისა წადიერ-ყოფილ ნეტარი იგი აბრაჰამ იწრაფა ქუეყანისა მისეგან ქალეკელთათაჲსა მოსლუად სამკვდრებელსა მას*. 2.9 მიიღე ჭურ-ჭერი, შ კაცო, და მოვედ, შემოეახლე, რათა შემძლებელ იყო სცხებელითა მით აღესებად. მიიღე სცხებელი ესე პატოსანი. არა თუ სამასის ღრაჰკნის განჰყილო, არამედ უსსყიდლოდ იცხებდი. ნუ იქმნები იუდაის-ებრ, რათა არა დასწუნენ, არამედ დაისხ თავსა ზედა სარწმუნოებითა ქრისტე, რათა თანამკვდრ იყო.

2.9 Receive the vessel, O man, and come and draw near, that you may be able to be filled by means of the anointing oil. Receive this precious anointing oil. Do not sell it for three hundred *denarii*, but be freely anointed. Do not act like Judas so that you become grieved, but put on^a Christ with faith, that you may be a fellow-heir (John 12:5; Gal 3:26-27).
 2.10 This anointing gladdened the righteous. This [was] dear to Noah and he was justified and through the arc^b he was saved. 2.11 But it was rejected by Ham, and he revealed the nakedness of his father (cf. Gen 9:22). 2.12 By it Eber the blessed was made happy not to go with them, the ones who took counsel concerning the work of the tower [of Babel] (cf. Gen 10:25). 2.13 It was rejected by Nimrod, and he provided food for the adversaries of God (cp. Gen 10:8,9). 2.14 The blessed Abraham, who was made desirous of it and hurried from the land of the Chaldeans so that he might arrive at his inheritance (cf. Gen 12:4,5).

2.10 This anointing oil cheerfully made has made all righteous. It won dear Noah, he was made righteous, he was rescued in the ark. 2.11 It was rejected by Ham and he revealed the nakedness of his father. 2.12 Eber was adorned with it because the blessed Eber was not in agreement with (*or* “did not unite himself with”) the erection of the tower. 2.13 Nimrod neglected it having prepared through the giants a dwelling (?) against God. 14 After the blessed Abraham requested it he hurried out of the country of the Chaldeans to come into the inheritance.

¹შეგა J omits direct object marker -უ-.

^aOr *depone super caput (tuum)* “put upon [your] head” (Garitte).

^bLit., “a box/basket/chest” as in ancient Roman Christian art depictions of Noah standing in a box.

Georgian

2.15 ამის წაღიერ-ყოფილ ნეტარი იგი ისაკი, შეწირვად თავის თვისისაჲ უნდა სოფლისათჳს*. 2.16 ამისოჲს განკრძალულ ნეტარი იგი იაკობ ბრჭვალსა შეგბა-ეყო ესავისსა*. 2.17 ესე შეურაცხ-ყოფილ ესავ [შ]ისგან პირმშობასა მას განეშორა, რამეთუ განიფრდი იგი ჭამადსა მისოჲს* ზელა*. 2.18 ამისი მიტაცებაჲ გულს-იღვინა ნეტარ-მან თამარ და თავი თჳსი ვითარცა როსიკმან გამოაჩინა იუდაჲს მიმართ*. ესე იხილა და დაუკვრდა ყრმისა ამქუმელსა მას, რამეთუ ყრმასა მას ზელა ეწამულსოფერი⁴ ნიში ეღვა და “ვითარ-მე ღონე-ეცა შენდა ზღუდესა მასჲ”*

In Cant.

2.15 The blessed Isaac became desirous of [the anointing] and he wished to sacrifice himself for the sake of the world (cf. Gen 22). 2.16 Because he was very careful toward it the blessed Jacob took hold of the heel of Esau (cf. Gen 25:26). 2.17 Once this it was rejected by Esau, he was separated from his [right of] the first born, since it was sold for his own food (cf. Gen 25:29-34). 2.18 Blessed Tamar was eager to take hold of it, and made herself look like a prostitute toward Judah [to obtain it]. The [anointing] appeared and caused the midwife of the boy (i.e. her son) to be amazed, for on the boy there had been placed a red sign, then she said, “How [has] the way [out] of the breach [been given] to you?” (Cf. Gen 38:13.)

Paleo-Slavonic florilegia

2.15 After desiring it the blessed Isaac wanted to be a sacrificial victim for the world. 2.16 Seeking to get hold of it, holy Jacob took hold of the heel of Esau. Esau neglected it having become the firstborn and he lusted after food. [...]

2.18 Blessed Tamar was eager to seize it; she came even as mistress of Judah. Having seen (the anointing oil), the astonished midwife put a mark on the lad, a red sign she put on him.

¹ განფრდი *J*, “he sold it”, but *T* has the passive form of the verb.

² მის- *T* omits, “it.”

³ ყრმისა ამქუმელსა *T*; ამქუმელსა ყრმისსა *J* (word order difference).

⁴ The electronic version of Satberdis (<http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/ageo/gh/satberd/satbe.htm?satbe195.htm>; 03-06-2009) has შეწამულსოფერი instead of მეწამულსოფერი, “red,” (as in Garitte).

⁵ ზელადეცა *J*, “had been placed over.”

Georgian

2.19 ეჲ შეიყუარა ნეტარმან იოსებ, მოთმიენ იქმნა მისიდასა მას ეგვბტელ. ამის გამო არა უნდა მიხუეჭად და არა თავს-იღვა დელოფლოსად მის, რაფთა-მცა განრუენილ იქმნა განრუენით. ამის საცხებლისათვის მოთმინებად ისწავა იოსებმან¹, მთავრად გამოჩნდა მეგვბტელთა ზედა, 2.20 ამისოვს² მომურენე იქმნა ნეტარი იგი მოსე, თუთ შურის-მეძიებელ და კელმწიფე იქმნა ისრაჲლსა 2.21 ამისა წადიერ-ყოფილ ნეტარი იგი აჰრონ მღელღელ ეცხო. ამას³ შურსა ეძიებდა ნეტარი იგი ფინეჲს და ლასურითთა როსპიკსა მას და ზამბრის დაჰგუემერდა*.

In Cant.

2.19 Blessed Joseph loved it, and he suffered when sold to Egypt. By it he did not wish to steal [anything],^a nor did he give himself to the lady [of his house] so that he would not be tainted with corruption^b (cf. Gen 37, 39, 41). On account of this anointing Joseph practiced patience and then he appeared as lord over the Egyptians. 2.20 Blessed Moses became jealous for it, and he was made the avenger and a mighty one for Israel (cf. Ex 18:13). 2.21 [It] was precious to Aaron, the blessed Aaron was anointed as a priest. Blessed Phineas sought to avenge it, and with a spear he sought to pierce the prostitute and Zambri (cf. Ex 28, 29; Num 25:7, 8, 14).

Paleo-Slavonic florilegia

2.19 Because it became precious to the blessed Joseph suffered having been sold into Egypt. For it he did not wish to lustfully obey in lust his mistress, so that he was not ruined, and was appointed as sovereign in Egypt. 2.20 Blessed Moses became zealous the blessed for it as Judges and Sovereign of Israel. 2.21 By desiring it blessed Aaron was anointed with the priesthood. Having looked upon it with zeal for it, the blessed Phinehas ran through with javelin the mistress of Zambri.

¹J adds და, “and.”

²T adds in the margin, ამის წადიერი, “his temporal (i.e. inheritance).”

³ამისა “of him/it,” J.

^aTranslated *commercari* (=to buy up?) by Garitte. Cp. ADW, “მიხუეჭა,” defines as *rauben*, *wegnehmen*.

^bLit., “that he became corrupt with corruption.”

Georgian

2.22 ამისა წადიერ-ყოფილ მოლოდებთა ნეტარი იგი ისუ, ძმ ნაკესი, მსახურად მოსესა დადგა. აწ იხილეთ, შ კაცნო, შესხმა იგი ყოველთა მართალთა, კითარ წადიერ ივენეს ამისა, ამას საცხებელსა სულელუბისას; შ ნეტარისა მის ისუ ნაკესი, რომელი-იგი ახალსა მას ქვისაგან აწუნებდა, კითარ-მცა საცხებელი იგი გამოაჩინა. ამისა წადიერ* ნეტარი იგი ისუ ნაკესი, მეორედ ქვითა წინადასცუთლ ძეთა მათ ისრაელისათა. 2.23 ესე შეიყუარა ნეტარმან ღვითი. ამისოვს¹ გულის-აგან მამისაჲსა შობილი გამოვიდა. და რაჲ-მე არს სახც იგი ღმრთისა მიერ ნეტარისა ამის ღვითისოვს, კითარმედ “კოფე კაცი ღვითი ძეთა შორის იესესთა, ნებად გულისა ჩემისა?”* რაჲ-მე კვლუბის თქუმად აწუ რაჲ გამოთარგმანება არს?

In Cant.

2.22 In expectation having become desirous of it blessed Joshua the son of Nun became the helper of Moses. Now, behold, O people, the commendation of all the righteous, how they became desirous of it, in this^a fragrant anointing oil. O, blessed Joshua [son] of Nun, he who pointed to the new thing from a stone, that he might reveal the anointing! When he desired it, blessed Joshua once again began circumcising the sons of Israel with stones (Josh 15:3).

2.23 Blessed David loved it. For this reason, begotten from the heart of the Father, he emerged. And one who is a type [put forth] by God of the Blessed One. On account of David, seeing that, “Among the sons of Jesse, I have found a man according to the desire my heart, David” (Acts 13:22), what does he have in mind to say, or what is the interpretation?

Paleo-Slavonic florilegia

2.22 On it Joshua the son of Nun was depending, the follower of the Moses and gave a second circumcision the sons of Israel. 2.23 It had become precious to the holy David made after the heart God.

¹ ამისოვსგან *T*, “since (*or* from) for this reason.”

^a *Sic J T*.

Georgian

შ კაცნო, იხილეთ-ლა, შუენიერად თქუა
 მამამან და უმეტესად შუენიერად,
 რამეთუ: “ვითარცა სახედ¹ სიტყუად იგი
 გულისა ჩემისგან გამოვლად, ესრე სახედ
 ღვითისგანცამცა გამოვალს კაცი იგი-ო”.
 რამეთუ იტყვს: “ვპოვებ ღვით, კაცი
 გულისთადი ჩემი², ჩემმან მან³ გულმან
 სიტყუად შვა და ღვითისგან კაცი”.⁴ შ
 ღვითისო, კაცის მართლისა, რომელ-
 იგი გულის მამისასა შეეზავა! აწ ამიერ-ვე
 ამისგან დიდი ზრად ხვად სცხებულისად ამის
 გამოთქუმის. 2.24 ამის წადიერ ნეტარი
 იგი სოლომონ, სობრანც საუკუნოა
 ღამე კვრად. იხილეთ, შ კაცნო, მართალთა
 მათ შესსმანი, რომელთა ცვალებითი
 ცვალებად მიიღეს სული წმიდა, ვითარცა
 სცხებელი.

In Cant.

O people, look thus far. Beautifully did
 the Father speak, indeed far more
 beautifully, for, “As the Word came
 from my heart, so from David also let a
 man go out.” For, it says, “I have found
 David, a man according to [the desire] of
 my heart^a (cf. Jer 3:14; Acts 13:22). My
 heart brought forth the Word (John
 1:18), and from David a man.”^b O,
 David, righteous man, who had been
 mingled with the heart of the Father!
 Now henceforth is declared the great
 mystery of the anointing oil from him.
 2.24 Once blessed Solomon became
 desirous of [the anointing], he attained
 (cf. 3 Kgds 3:7-12) eternal wisdom.
 Behold, people, the commendations of
 the righteous who each in turn received
 the Holy Spirit as anointing oil.

*Paleo-Slavonic florilegia*2.24 Desiring it Solomon inherited
eternal wisdom.

¹სახედცა *J* “as indeed.”

²ჩემდა *J*, “to us.”

³*J* omits მან, def. art.

^a1 Sam 13:14 ζήτησει κύριος ἔσται ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ.

^bPossibly refers to a *Logos* theology hymn used by the church.

Georgian

2.25 ნეტარი იგი დაიეღ ამის საცხებლისა წადიერ-ყოფილ და მღვმეს მას შინა ლობთას¹ განერა*. 2.26 ანანია, აზარია და მისიელ ამის-ვე საცხებლისა² წადიერებით სწაილდა ცხებად. ამის გამო ოთხად გამოჩნდეს საკუმბოს მას შინა. რამეთუ საცხებელი იგი იყო, რომელი ვითარცა ცუარი ქუეყანას ზედა დამოდიოდა*. 2.27 ამის საცხებლისა წადიერ ნეტარი იგი იოსებ თანა-მზრახველ ღმრთისა იქმნებოდა*. 2.28 ამის საცხებლისთვის⁴ წადიერ-ყოფილ ნეტარი იგი ქალწული მარიამ მუცლად სიტყუას მას მიიღებდა*.

In Cant.

2.25 Having longed for the anointing the blessed Daniel in the den of lions was rescued out it (Dan 4; 1 Macc 2.60). 2.26 Ananias, Azarias and Misael desired the chrism of anointing oil^a so much that for this reason as four they appeared in the furnace with him. For the anointing oil was there as dew flowing down upon the earth.^b 2.27 Joseph, having become desirous of this anointing oil was made a divine consultant (cf. Mat 1:19-25). 2.28 Of this very anointing made desirous, the Blessed Virgin Mary received Word in order to conceive (cf. Mat 1:18).

Paleo-Slavonic florilegia

2.25 Having longed for it the blessed Daniel was rescued out of the throat of the lions. 2.26 Desiring to be anointed with this chrism of anointing oil Ananias, Azarias and Misael remained safe from the fire in the oven. 2.27 This anointing having become precious to the blessed Joseph, he became a picture of God 2.28 striving for this chrism of anointing oil the blessed Virgin received the Word into her body.

¹ ლობთას გან ერერა *J* by dittography, “out of [it] was rescued out.”

² ამითვე საცხებლისა რამერეუ *J* “by the anointing oil because.”

³ მოდიოდა *J* “it was coming.”

⁴ *J* omits თვის, “very.”

^a Lit. “of the anointing oil with desire the desired to be anointed.”

^b See *Comm. Dan.* 2.30.1-5 (SChr 14.176), “But who was the fourth person who was with them, who was walking in the midst of the furnace and singing as with one voice with them the hymn to God? . . . The Logos was with them and was speaking in the midst of them.” The identification of the fourth person in the furnace with the Logos links the *Comm. Dan.*

2.29 შ ახალნი ზრახვანი და ჭეშმარიტნი მართალთა, რომელთა ეჩუნა. ესე საცხებელი წაიღებოდ მიაქუნდა¹ მართას, რომელსა ყოვლითა კედრებითა და ნუგეშინის-ცემითა ქრისტესა ზედა მიაკურებდა. 2.30 ესე საცხებელი მოიძულა იუდა. და ოცდაათის დრაჰკნის ქრისტე განყიდა, რომლისათვის ლაღადებით იტყოდა: “რახსათვის² იყო დაღურა³ ამის საცხებლისა⁴? ღირდა სამასის დრაჰკნის განყიდალ⁵”. 2.31 სახეს რას-მე გჭრუნებს თქუმელი ესე, შ კაცნო. აწ კინ-მე იყო⁶ საცხებელი იგი, არამედ თავადი ქრისტე?

2.29 O new mystery and those truly just to whom it was revealed! With desire Martha carried this anointing oil, which she sprinkled on Christ with all intercession and giving of consolation (cf. Luke 10:38-41). 2.30 Judas hated this anointing oil, and betrayed Christ for thirty *denarii* (cf. Mat 26:14-16), for this reason with a loud voice it was said, “Why was the anointing oil wasted? It was worth selling for three hundred denarii.”^a 2.31 This saying presents us with a type, O people. Now what was that anointing oil, except Christ himself?

30 Because he hated this chrism Judas handed over Christ for thirty pieces of silver.

¹ მოაქუნდა *J*, the preverb მო- puts more stress on the intimacy of the event.

² *J* omits თვის for less emphasis.

³ Varian form of დაღურაჲ *J*, in *ADW* s.v. “დაღურაგა-ჲ / დაღურგა-ჲ.”

⁴ სულსაცხებლისა *J* “fragrant anointing oil.”

⁵ იყოს *J* (aor. subj.), “might/will be.”

directly to the *In Cant*. See Meloni, “Ippolito E II Cantico Dei Cantici,” *Aug* 13: 105.

^a Mark 14:4, 5 εις τή ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῆ τοῦ μύρου γέγονεν; ἡδύνατο γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ μύρον παραθῆναι ἐπάνω θρηασίων τριαικοσίων.

Georgian

არა თუ წინასწარ ვნებათა მათ სასცილელ
 იგი¹ დრაჰმათა მათ მიერ ვნებათა მათ
 მოგუსწავებს? ვნებათა მათ ოცლათ დრაჰ-
 მის განსცილელი იპოვა. რამეთუ ღირღ-
 ვი პერუ ჰემართები სა მის, რათა
 აფვილის სასცილელი განიცილოს და რათა
 გლახკ-თა-ცა აფვილად მოზოვნებად
 შეუქლონ. ესრე იყო, საყუარულნი.
 2.32 ხოლო ამისგან დიდი იგი ზრახვა
 გამოგუქცხალეს. ამისთვის [იტყვს]²:
 “საც-ხებელ სულნელების განფენილ სახელი
 შენი-ი.³ ამისთვის ყრმათა ჭაბუკთა
 ქალწულთა შეგიყუარეს შენ და
 შეიმოსნეს”*. 2.33 ვინ-მე არიან, რომელთა
 შეგიყუარეს შენ, არამედ მკლესათა?
 ანუ ვინ-მე არიან, რომელთა-იგი შთაიცუნეს,
 არამედ მკლესათა სარწმუნოებზე ზეციით
 გარდამო, რათა “მეფინოს სულნელებზე
 ჩემი თქვენ ზედა?”.

In Cant.

Does the anointing oil not teach us the
 passion before the passion through price
 of the *drachmae*? It is found that in the
 passion he was sold for thirty *denarii*.
 For he was worth such in truth that for
 an easy price he was sold and that the
 poor also easily could attain him. So it
 was, beloved. 2.32 But from this the
 great mystery was made clear to us: for
 this reason it says, “Your name is
 aromatic anointing oil poured out. That
 is why the young ones, virgin girls, have
 loved you”^a and they were adorned.^b
 2.33 Who are they, that have loved you,
 except the churches? Or who are they,
 that are adorned, except the faith of the
 churches, come down from heaven —
 “that my aroma might be dispersed over
 you”?

¹ Written above the line in a second hand in *J*.

² *T* omits.

³ *J* omits შენი-ი “your.”

⁴ მის *J* “his.”

^a Song 1:3 και ὅσμη ἴσθρων σου ὑπὲρ πάντα τὰ ἀρώματα ἵσθρων ἐκκενωθὲν ὄνομα σου διὰ τοῦτο νεάνιδες ἠγάπησάν σε.

^b Song 1:4 διὰ τοῦτο νεάνιδες ἠγάπησάν σε ἐνῆμισσάν σε ὀπίσω σου εἰς ὄσμη ἴσθρων σου δρασμοῦμεν. ἀγαλλιασάμεθα καὶ εὐφρανθήμεν ἐν σοί. For ἐνῆμισσάν σε cf.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantIPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
2.34 “ამისთვის ქაღალწულთაა შეგეუარეს შენ”. შეგიძლოს შენ შევფვრებითა კუალსა შენსა, კუალსა სულწელეობისა სცხებელთა შენთასა მივიწვრავდეთ”, რამეთუ შთაცემითა ქრისტესითა წესიყო მწრავლ შევლომად კუალსა მისსა. “შემდგომად სულწელეობასა სცხებელთა შენთასა მივიწვრავდეთ”.*	2.34 “For this reason the virgins have loved you, they adorned you by following your footprints, we will hurry in the path of the aroma of your anointing oil.” For the ones adorned by Christ it is proper to follow his path promptly. “To follow he aroma of your anointing oil with you we will hasten along.”	2.34 Νεάνιδες δὲ οἱ ἀγαπήσαντες, οἱ μακαριστοὶ ἀπόστολοι, οἵτινες ἀφέντες τὸν κόσμον ἠγάπησαν αὐτόν. Ἐἴλωσαν σε· ἐν γὰρ τῷ ἐλκύσει Χριστὸν πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ εἰς ὁσμὴν μύρου αὐτοῦ δραμόντες, ὃ ἐστὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ.	2.34 “The “young ones who loved” him refers to the most blessed apostles who left the world and loved him. It says “they drew you” because by drawing Christ to themselves they followed him running toward the aroma of his myrrh, which is of his teaching.”
2.35 შეუდეგ ქრისტესს, ისინი მცნებათად მათ, იქცეოდნენ განწესებულთა მით, მობმა უყავ მწუკრავლთა მათ, რათა დაეყნოს შენი ეგე გულის-თქუმა!	2.35 Follow Christ, hear the commandments, live in the precepts, be bound to most lofty things, so your desire may be held in check.		

¹ J omits “you.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
3.1 “შეძიყვანა მე მეუფემან საუნჯეთა თესთა* . და ვინ-მე არს მეუფე იგი, არამედ თავადი ქრისტე? ანუ რაჲ-მე არიან საუნჯეკი იგი ¹ , არამედ სამეუფონი იგი? ამას ერო იტიყოდა: 3.2 “კისარებ-ღეთ და ვიშუებღეთ შენდამი”*, რამეთუ ყოველ-თა ესე მიუწესს. პირველ გვთხრობს ყოვილთა მათ, მერმე ყოვალთა მათთვის უამსა სინანულსასა გამოცხადებს: “კისარებღეთ და ვიშუებღეთ შენდა მიმართ” .	3.1 “A king led me to his own inner chambers.” ^a So, who is the king, except Christ himself? Or what are the inner chambers, except the royal palaces? The people said this, 3.2 “We will rejoice and delight in you.” For he called everyone. First he tells us what has happened, then in the future things he appears in a time of repentance, “We will rejoice and delight in you.”	3.1 Εισήνευγέ με, φησὶν, ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸ ταμῆϊον αὐτοῦ. Τί δὲ ταμῆϊον, ἀλλ’ ἢ ἡ ἐκκλησία; Τίς δὲ ταῦτα λαλεῖ ὅτι εἰσ-ήνευγέ με; Πάντως ἡ συναγωγή τῶν πισ-τευσάντων· ἡσφα-λίσατο γὰρ αὐτῆν εἰς τὸ ταμῆϊον ὅ ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία.	3.1 The king took me, he says, into his inner chamber. But what is the inner chamber except the church? Who is the one who says ‘take me in’? In reality it is the congregation (or synagogue) of those who have be- lieved. For it has been made safe in the chamber which is the church.” ^a	3.1 Who is the king? Christ. What is the bedchamber? The church. The Syna- gogue however speaks this. 3.2 “We rejoice and are glad in you.” So he convenes (?) everyone <who> desires salvation. Before he proclaims what should happen; then however he speaks of the time of receiving conversion:

¹საუნჯენი არიან J, “are treasures?” without definite article.

^aSong 1:3 εἰσήνευγέ με ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸ ταμῆϊον αὐτοῦ
“Synagogue is omitted in the Georgian, but likely original; both *CantPar* and *PSflor* have it.

Georgian	In Cant.	Greek CantPar	CantPar	Paleo-Slavonic
<p>3.3 “შეკვიყურენ სასქერნი შენნი უფროჲს ღვინისა”^a. არა თუ რომელი-იგი შეიზავებოს ქრისტეს მიერ, არამედ იგი, რომელითა წინასწარ მორგალობითა დასულბა ნოვე და აცთუნა ლლით. “უფროჲს ამის ღვინის შეკვიყურენ სძის გამოსადინელნი შენნი”^b. რამეთუ სასქერნი იგი ქრისტეს მიერ ორნი იგი მცნებაჲნი იყვნეს. განამზიარულნის, არა თუ ვითარ-მცა შე-ხოლო-სულბნის. ამისოვს-ცა¹ მოციქული იგი იტყვს: “ღვნისა გარდარეულად ნუ სუამთ მორგალობით”^a.</p>	<p>3.3 “I have loved your breasts more than wine.”^a Not that [wine] that is mixed by Christ, but the [wine] that of old made Noah slow witted by intoxication, and which deceived Lot, “more than this wine do we love your fountains of milk,” for the breasts through Christ were the two commandments. It makes one joyful, but not in order to make one confused. Indeed (<i>lit.</i> also) for this very reason the apostle says, “Do not be drinking too much wine to the point of intoxication.”^b</p>			<p>3.3 “We love your breasts more than wine” not speaking of [wine] taken from Christ, but wine that led to the drunkenness of [...] Noah and into the trap that lured Lot. About this wine, do “we love your breasts”? Yes the breasts of Christ are both Testaments, making believers sober. Therefore the voice of the apostle speaks: “Drink wine, but that do not drink wine to excess.”</p>

¹Following Garitte. *T.* reads შე-ხოლო-სულბნის-ამისოვს-ცა.

^aSong 1:2, 4 ἀγαπήσομεν μαστοῦς σου ὑπὲρ οἴνου

^bThe reading of Eph 5:18 in the Georgian NT textual tradition closely follows the Greek καὶ πῆ μεθύσασθε οἴνω. *In Cant.*, however, resembles more closely Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 2.2.28 Μὴ πίνετε οἶνον ἐπὶ μέθῃ; *Const. ap.* 8:44, “Μὴ πίνετε οἶνον εἰς μέθην” and Tobit 4:15, οἶνον εἰς μέθην πῆ πίνης, than Eph 5:18 in either Greek or Georgian text traditions. Ambrose, depending upon *In Cant.*, has a similar text at, *Exp. Ps.* 118, 2.7 (CSEL 62, 23.14-17), *diligamus ubera tua super uinum, sic tamen bibens, ut non absorberetur uino, sed gratia eius laetitiam cordis hauiret, non corporis ebrietate titubaret.* “We love your breasts better than wine,⁷ however, means drinking in such a way as not to guzzle wine, but that by his grace one might imbibe joy of heart, and not drink to drunkenness of the body.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
3.4 აწ ამისგან, საყუარებლო, იტყვს: “შევიყუარებ სასიყუარბო შენი უფროსს ღვინოსა-ო, სიმაართელემან შევიყუარა შენ”*, რამეთუ ერთ-მამრომელნი სიმაართელესა შეუკვამ, ესენი არიან, რომელთა შევიყუარეს შენ. ხოლო ურწმუნოთა მოგოდუ-ღეს შენ და თანა-მღებ არიან მსაჯულთა მის მიბგებელ[ი]სა. ²	3.4 Now for this reason, beloved, it says, “I have loved your breasts more than wine. Justice has loved you.” For those who follow after justice are one, they are those who have loved you. ^a On the other hand unbelievers have hatred toward you and they are debtors of retribution to the judges. ^b	3.4 <Ἀγαλλιασ-θῶμεν>, φησί, <καὶ εὐφρανθῶμεν ἐν σοί, ἀγαπήσομεν μαστούς σου ὑπέρ οἴνον· εὐθύτης ἡγάπησέ σε>. “Ἦδη μὲν οὖν τὸ μὲν προκατα-εἰληπτο, τὸ δὲ ἐνθ-ῆτης, ὅσοι κατ’ εὐθείαν πορεύονται οὗτοι σε ἀγαπῶσι.	3.4 “Let us rejoice,” he says, “and be glad in you, we will love you your breasts more than wine rightly did she love you.” So then [this means] both what has expected, and uprightness. As many as live rightly these love you.	3.4 Let us rejoice, he says, and be glad in you, we will love you breasts more than wine,

¹ესე J “this/these.”

²Garitte reads მიბგებელს, dative rather than genitive.

^aSong 1:4c ἀγαπήσομεν μαστούς σου ὑπέρ οἴνον εὐθύτης ἡγάπησέν σε Cp. Ambrose *Exp. Ps. 118*, 2.7 (CSEL, 62, 23.18-20). *aequitas delixit te, hoc est: non flexuosa itinera te sequuntur, sed solus ad te potest iustitiae trames peruinire*. *qui enim deligit iustitiam non se auertit a Christo; quomodo enim arbitrium iusti remuneratoremque meritorum innocens metuat conscientia?* “Justice has loved you, that is: ‘crooked roads do not lead to you, but only steadfastly continuing in the paths of justice able to lead to you. Therefore whoever loves justice does not turn from Christ. So, does an innocent person fear because of guilt the just judge and executer of things deserved?’

^bCp. Did 1:5 ὁ δὲ μὴ χρεῖαν ἔχων δώσει δίκην.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
4.1 “შავ ვარ და შუენიერ, ასულნი იერუსალჴმისანი” ^a , შეცოდებულ ვარ, ხოლო უფროჲს შუენიერ ვარ, რამეთუ შემოყუარა ¹ ქრისტემან. “შავ ვარ და შუენიერ, ასულნი იერუსალჴმისანი” ² . ყოველნი ნათესავნი შეკერბით ³ და მოვედით და მიხილეთ მე შეყუარებულნი ესე,	4.1 “I am black and beautiful, daughters of Jerusalem.” ^a I am a sinner, but to a greater extent I am beautiful, for Christ has loved me. ^b “I am black and beautiful, daughters of Jerusalem.” All peoples, gather and come and see me the beloved.	4.1 “Μέλαινά εἰμι καὶ καλή, θυγάτερες Ἱερουσαλήμ.” Μὴ βλέπετέ με ὅτι ἐγὼ μεμελανωμένη εἰμὶ, μηδὲ ὅτι παρθεῖδέ με ὁ ἥλιος. Πῶς καὶ μέλαινα φησι καὶ καλή; Ὅτι ἄμαρτωλὴ ἦμην, ἀλλ’ ἐφιλησέ με Χριστός.	4.1 “I am black and beautiful, daughters of Jerusalem.” Do not look at me because I have become black, nor because the sun has looked upon me. How does she say both black and beautiful? Because I was a sinner, but Christ befriended me.

¹ *J* adds the direct object pronoun მე, “me.”

² The electronic version is lacking the string of text from the first occurrence of იერუსალჴმისანი to this point, probably because of homoeoteleuton. I have advised *J. Gippert* about this omission (2/11/07).

³ შეკერბით, so *TJ* for შეკერვით, “gather together.”

^a Song 1:5 μέλαινα εἰμι καὶ καλή θυγάτερες Ἱερουσαλήμ.

^b Ambrose *Exp. Ps. 118*, 2.8 (CSEL, 62, 24.7,8), *fusca sum, quia peccavi, decora quia iam me diligit Christus*. “I am dark because I have sinned, now I am beautiful because Christ loves me.”

Georgian

In Cant.

4.2 “ნუ გიკვრნ ხილუა ესე ჩემი, რამეთუ ვარ დამგებულ და ნუ-ცა ამისოვს, რამეთუ მრუემედ მომხედ და მე მზემან”^a. იხილე სიტყუაჲ შეკრებულთაჲ მათ, რომელთა აღიარეს წარსრული იგი. ნუ დახედავთ შეცოდებულსა ამას და ამისოვს-ცა, [რამეთუ] უკულებელს-მყო^b მე ქრისტემან. და რამეთუ ამას ჭემმართლად მზის-თუალსა იტყვს, რამეთუ იტყვს ესრე: “და თქუნ მოშიშთა სახელისა ჩემისათა გამოგიჩინეს მზე იგი სიმართლისაჲ”^c.

4.2 “Do not marvel at this appearance of mine, for I have become black, nor about this, that the sun gazed (*or* looked) upon me darkly.”^a You saw the word of their congregations,^b who/which [they] confessed the past,^c “do not look upon the sinner,” and “for this reason Christ did not despise me.” And for this reason truly she says “the sun.”^d For it says thus, “And to you who fear my name the sun of righteousness will appear.”^e

¹ *T* omits რამეთუ, “for”; supplied by *J*.

² Following *J*, which omits -ს, which would be a conjunctive (future use).

^a Song 1:6 *μη βλέψωτέ με ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶμαι μεμειλωμένη ὅτι παρεβλέψην με ὁ ἥλιος ὡς ἰσὶ ἡμετέροις μου ἐμαρξέσονται ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔθεντό με φιλῶσι* ὡς ἄπελῶσιν ἄπελῶνα ἐμὸν οὐκ ἐφύλαξα.

^b Or “Word of the congregations.” That is, “synagogues” or “Israel.” Garitte, CSCO, 264.31. The synagogues of Israel are here seen as a type of the church to who Christ came. The two are at times clearly differentiated (e.g. *In Cant.* 25.10).

^c From τὸ πρότερον ὁ τὸ πάλαι, an adverbial nominative, see Fährnich, “Old Georgian,” *Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus*, 1.186.

^d Lit. “the eye of the sun.” According to Garitte, 31, evidence of an Armenian *Vorlage* (viz, *արեգակն, aregakn*). Yet, it appears in Old Georgian Song of Songs 6:9, see Sardshweladse and Fährnich, *ADW*, 670.

^e Mal 3:20 *τοῖς φοβουμένοις τὸ ὄνομά μου ἥλιος δικαιοσύνης*.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
<p>5.1 “ნუ მხეღვთ მე, რამეთუ ვარ დაბავებული და ნუ-ცა ამისთვის, რამეთუ უბუღებულს-მყო მე ძემან”. უბუღებულს-ამისთვის, რამეთუ ჰრწმუნა მისი, რაათა ღებვის მას სინანულთა,</p> <p>5.2 რამეთუ: “უვილი ღელისა ჩემისანი მჯღომ მექმნეს მე*, წინასწარმეტყუელნი იგი უწვიხოდ მანუევლეს მე, ვითარმედ “მოქმც მჯულისა მოსესსა-ო”*. 5.3 “ღამადვინა მე მჯუბილად კენავისა”*.</p> <p>ჰგონებდეს ჩემსა წარწემედ ზეწინარები სათვის მომავლთასა,</p>	<p>5.1 “Do not look (or gaze) upon me, because I have become dark, nor about/ concerning this, that the sun despised me.” “He despised” on account of this, because she believed in him that she might be reconciled through repentance. 5.2 For “the sons of my mother have become enemies to me.” The prophets invited me without weariness, “Return to the law of Moses” (1Kdgs 17:13). 5.3 “He made me keeper (<i>lit.</i>, to keep) of the vine,^a thinking (or supposing) to ruin (or corrupt) me concerning the acceptance (or admission, obedience) of the coming ones.”^b</p>	<p>5.1 Παρεϊδέ με ὁ ἥλιος, τούτέστιν ἔμψροσθεν ὁ Χριστὸς παρεϊδέ με. Παρεϊδέ γὰρ αὐτὴν μὴ πεισθεῖσαν, διαλάσσεται δὲ αὐτῆ μετανοούσῃ. Εἶδες στόμα συναγωγῆς ὁμολογούσης τὰ συμβεβηκότα. 5.2 Υἱοὶ γὰρ, φησί, μητρός μου ἔμαχέσαντό με. Μητὴρ ὁ νόμος, υἱοὶ οἱ προφήται οἵτινες ἐμάχοντο ἐν ἐμοὶ λέγοντες: ἐπίστρεψον ἐπὶ νόμον Μωυσῆ. 5.3 “Ἐθεντό με φυλακῆν ἐν ἀμπελώνι· ἀμπελώνα ἐμόν οὐκ ἐφύλαξα. Τούτέστιν</p>	<p>5.1 The sun looked upon me, that is, before Christ looked upon me. For he looked at her who was not obedient, but he is reconciled to the one who repents. You have seen a mouth of the synagogue which confesses the things that have come to pass. 5.2 For sons of a mother, she says, fought against me. The law is [the] mother, sons are [the] prophets who fought in me saying return to [the] law of Moses. 5.3 They placed me as keeper in a vineyard, but I did not take care of my own vineyard. That is they</p>

^aSong 1:6 ἔθεντό με φυλάκισσαν ἐν ἀμπελώσιν.

^bRichard, “Cantique,” 146, correctly suggests the “coming ones” are proselytes. Garitte, CSCO 264, iii, shows that this mistranslation is evidence of an Armenian Vorlage, *եկամալ, ekamut*, “proselyte, neophyte,” from *եկեալ, ekeal*, aor. ptc. of *գան, gan*, to come has likely been mistranslated. *ძწინო* is “proselyte” in Georgian (Mt 23:15; Ac 2:13; 13:43). Ambrose, following *In Cant.* reads ἐλθόντα not ἐλθόντας. By the fourth-fifth century Ambrose considered the synagogue sought power not proselytes (*Exp. Ps. 118*, 2.12). *შეწინარებო* does not mean “exception” or “ward off” but “receiving” see Sardshweladse and Fährnich, *ADW*, 1402. The text suggests a summary of salvation history: the incarnate Word would turn to the Gentiles and neglect Israel for a time.

^cCp. Ambrose *Exp. Ps. 118*, 2.7 (CSEL, 62, 25.10), *non uidit me sol quia non recepi aduenientem*, “The sun did not look at me because I did not receive the one who comes.” But see *In Cant.* 6.2

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
“ვენაჲ ჩემი ვერ დავიცევ* . და რამეთუ ერი იგი ¹ [ჩემი ვერ დავიცევ, რამეთუ ერი იგი] ² ისრაჲლისა ვენაჲდ თქუბულ არს. მოვედ, ესაჲ, წამე, თუ თქუ: “ვენაჲ უფლის საბოთისა სხლი ისრაჲლისა. კდევ და ველოდე, რათა-მცა გამოიღო ყურბენი და მან გამოიღო კვალთ” ³ “ვენაჲ იტყეს, ვითარმედ ⁴ “ვენაჲ ჩემი ვერ დავიცევ” .	“I have not cared for my own vine[yard].” ⁴ And because I did [not take care of my own people, for the people] ¹ of Israel is said to be a vine, come, Isaiah, testify and say, “The house of Israel is a vine of the Lord Sabaoth. I stood and was hoping that it would bear grape(s), and it produced thorns instead.” Therefore she says that, “I did not take care of my own vine.”	ἔθεντό με ὡς ἄμπελον· οὐκ ἐτήρησα δὲ τὸν ἑμὸν λαόν, τοιτέστι τὰ κλήματα μου. Παρὰ πάσης γὰρ θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς ἀμπελὸν ὁ Ἰσραὴλ λέγεται. “Ἐφύτευσά” γάρ, φησίν, “ἀμπελῶνα καὶ φραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέθηκα” . Καὶ “ἀμπελον ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετήρας” καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα.	placed me as a vineyard; but I did not keep my own people, that is my branches. For by all the inspired Scriptures Israel is called a vineyard. For, “I planted a vineyard,” it says, “and built a hedge around it.” And “you took a vine from Egypt,” and many others like these.

¹ *J* omits და, “and.”

² *T* and *J* omit. Line has dropped out because of homoeoteleuton.

³ *J* omits “that.”

⁴ Song 1:6 ἀμπελῶνα ἑμὸν οὐκ ἐφύλαξα.

^a Line restored by Garitte. See note 2 above.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
6.1 “მითხარ მე, რომელ-კემ უგვიყურას სულმან ჩემმან”*. მარქუ მე, ქრისტე, მომიგე სიტყუაჲ, გმკვდრები “სადა ჰმწესი, სადა განისუენებ შუკა ღლესა?”* ღამეღელ და ღამიღემე მე. წარმართთა მოძართ მიხუედ, ოღლაღ ღვშთი. 6.2 ღიღი ესე, სიგლასაკისა წაღიერ ვიქმენ. “სადა ჰმწესი, სადა განისუენებ”? ნუ-მცა ვიქმნები უგულებელ, ვითარცა წყმელული სამწესო-სოღსაგან”, ნუ იყოფინ ესე ჩემდა! რომელმან პირველ-კე შუკიწყნარენ მომკვალნი, ვითარ-მცა აწ ნასხორი წარმართთა ვიყავ.	6.1 “Tell me, you whom my soul has loved.” Say to me, Christ; respond, O Word, to me I beg you. “Where do you pasture, where do you rest at mid day?” ^a You abandoned me and left me alone, you went away to the Gentiles. I remained behind as an orphan. ^b 6.2 These are great things, I have become desirous of poverty. “Where do you pasture? Where do you rest? Let me not be despised as [one] lost from the flock.” Let that not happen to me, [I] who at first welcomed those who come (or proselytes) so that I may not become a laughingstock of the Greeks. ^c	6.1 Ἀπάγγελιδόν μοι ὄν ἠγάπησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου, ποῦ ποιμαίνεις, ποῦ κοιτάζει ἐν μεσημβρίᾳ; Ἀέγει μοι, Χριστέ, φησί, παρὰκαλῶ, ἐγκατέλιπός με; Εἰς ἔθνη ποιμαίνῃ ἢ ἔπορεύθης ἐκεῖ; Ὀρφανὴ γέγνημαι. 6.2 Ἡ πλουσία πένομαι. <Μήποτε γένωμαι περιβαλλομένη ἐπ’ ἀγέλαις ἑταίρων σου>. Μὴ-ῆταιρ μου, [ἐγώ] ὅτε φησὶν, ἡ πάλαι προσδεχομένη προσήλυτους, νῦν προσήλυτος ἔθνων γένομαι.	6.1 Tell me, the one my soul loves, where do you pasture [your sheep], where do you lie down at midday? Tell me, Christ, she says, I urge you, whether you went among the nation in order to take care of them as a shepherd? I have been left as an orphan. 6.2 I am poor as wealth. Lest I become veiled at the flocks of your friends. Lest, she says, the who received proselytes of old now I may become a proselyte of the Gentiles	6.1 Tell me, O Christ, and I would ask you to answer me: “Where do you pasture [your flock], where do you rest at noon?” You left me, went to the Gentiles, and I became like an orphan.

^aSong 1:7 ἀπάγγελιδόν μοι ὄν ἠγάπησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ποῦ ποιμαίνεις ποῦ κοιτάζεις ἐν μεσημβρίᾳ.

^bCp. Ambrose Exp. Ps. 118, 2.11 (CSEL, 62, 26.15) *reliquisti me, abisti ad gentes, recessisti longe a me et illis propior factus es, a quibus longe eras*. “You abandoned me, you went away to the Gentiles, you withdrew far away from me and to them you became closer than to those with whom you were for a long time.” Christ going away to the Gentiles evoke the Johannine figure who “has other sheep not of this fold” (Jn 10) as well as the familiar figure of Dionysus, who left Ariadne to conquer India and returned with foreign women (Ovid, *Fasti*, March 8).

^cSee In Cant. 5.2 and note c.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
<p>7.1 მუხქუენ-კე მიიწია ჳმა იგი თხვიისა და გამოცხადებულ მიერთებან ქრისტე. ჳმა იგი, რომელი უწეს ერსა მას. “უკუეთუ არა საცნაურ იყო შენ, შუენიერი ღელათა შორის”¹. ხოლო ესე არს: უკუეთუ არა მოიქცე ყოვლითა გულთა შენითა და თუ აღიარნე ცოდვანი შენი, რათა განჰმართლდე 7.2¹ და თუ არა საცნაურ იქმნე შუენიერი ღელათა შორის, რომელ-ეგე იქადოდე და იტყოდე: “შე ვარი მე და შუენიერ, შეცოდებულ ვარ, ხოლო შეყუარებულ ვარ-ი”, კერათ შეწევნა არს შენდა შეყუარება ეგე. ხოლო რამეთუ შემძლებელ არს ღმერთი ქვათაგან-ცა აღდგინებად შეილად² აბრაჰამის, ნუ შეგიტყუებენ შენ აღთქუ-მული იგი წინანდელთა მამათა. არა თუ აღ-კახუნე კაცთა, ხოლო აწ არა თუ იცნა თავი შენი და თუ არა შეინანო, აბრაჰამი</p>	<p>7.1 Suddenly there arrived a voice of petition, and by it Christ was [was] displayed. The voice [is one] which calls the people. “Though you may not be well known, you are beautiful among women.”^{2a} But this means, “if you will not convert with all your heart and unless you will confess your sins, so that you may be justified” (cf. Rom 10:9-10), 7.2 and, O beautiful [one] among women, unless you do not make yourself known, you who boasted and said: “I am dark and beautiful. I am a sinner, but I am beloved,” then of no help is that love to you. Indeed, God is able from stones to raise up children for Abraham, so do not beguile yourself now about the promise of the patriarchs. “For he is no respecter of persons” however, if you do not come to know yourself and repent, behold Abraham</p>	<p>7.1 Ἡ καὶ λέγει συναγωγή· Ἐὰν μὴ γνῶς σεαυτὴν, ἢ καλὴ ἐν γυναίξιν, λέγουσα· Μέλαινά εἰμι καὶ καλὴ, ἀλλ’ ἀμαρτωλὸς, ἀλλὰ φιλοῦμαι, οὐδαμοῦ σε ὄνησει ἢ φίλιστα μου· τοιτέστιν, ἐὰν μὴ ἐπιστρέψῃς ἐξ ὀλῆς τῆς καρδίας καὶ εἴπῃς τὰς ἀμαρτίας σου, οὐ μὴ δικαιωθῆς. Μὴ σε ἀπατάτω ἡ πρὸς πατέρας ἐπαγγελία· Ἀβραὰμ σῶξεται, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲν σε ὠφελήσει.</p>	<p>7.1 And the synagogue says: ‘If you do not know yourself, O beautiful among women, since you say, “I am black and beautiful, but a sinner but I am beloved, my love will not profit you, that is, if you do not return with your whole heart and declare your sins, you will not be justified. Let not the promise given to the fathers deceive you. Abraham is saved, but it profits you nothing.</p>

¹Here following the versification of Garitte.

²გვიღებ “be kin/related” J.

^aSong 1:8 ἐὰν μὴ γνῶς σεαυτὴν ἢ καλὴ ἐν γυναίξιν.

Georgian

აპა კნთილ არს, ხოლო შენ კერად გარგოს, რამეთუ ნათესაობად მისა შესწუგუნელ არნ, რომლისა თანა სარწმუნოვება იპოვის, ხოლო მქონან-მცა საქმენი კეთილნი, რათა მართალთა მთ ნათესავთა გამოარჩევა იყოს. ამისთვის თუ არა ვინმე გიცნას შენ შუენიერი ემე ღელათა მორის, "განვეღ და შეუღებ კუალსა სამწყსოთასა და დამწყსენ თიკანნი შენნი"*,

In Cant.

was saved, but you it avails nothing.^a For generation of that one^b is a help to the one who comes to faith. Let us hold to good works so that there may be an election of the generation of the righteous. So if no one else recognizes you to be beautiful among women, "go away and follow the track of the flock and pasture your kids."^c

Georgian

7.3 რომელი არს ესე: უკამური და შიშუელი მომღვდლე მე, რამეთუ ცხოვარნი რჩეულნი გამოვიჩინე ჩემლა და თიკანთა მორის შერაცხილ ხარ შენ, გარდაწონილი ემე მარცხელ. ხოლო ჩემლა მარჯუენით ცხოვარნი იგი შემირაცხიან. 7.4 არაარა ამიერითგან შენდა ისრამელი სამწყსოდ შეთუალულ, რამეთუ იაკობისა თეთრნი იგი და ფერად-ფერადი

In Cant.

7.3 Which means (*lit.* is) this, follow me bare foot and naked, for I have chosen choice sheep for myself and you are numbered among^d the goat-kids, [the flock] tending toward the left. But I have counted as the sheep on my right. 7.4 From now on Israel is no longer considered as a flock for you, for Jacob had both white

Greek CantPar

7.3 Ἐξελθε σὺ ἐν πτέρλαις καὶ ποδαίμας τὰς εἴφους. Τοῦτέστιν ἀνυπόδητος καὶ γυμνὴ πορεύσου ὀπίσω μου· ῥοῦβατον γὰρ ἵρημαι ἐν αὐτῷ· ἀλλὰ γὰρ εἰς εἴφους σοὶ τὸ ἐναντίον λογίζομαι, οὐκ ἐπὶ εἰς ποικίλῃν» ῥοῦβάτων, ἀλλὰ εἰς εἴφους.

CantPar

7.3 Go out in the footsteps and tend the goat kids. That is, go barefoot and naked behind me. For a sheep has been taken up in him but because for as the goat kids I reckon them to you from now on, never as the flock of sheep, but as goats.

Paleo-Slavonic

7.3 This however means: go after me barefoot and naked. Indeed to my sheep I spoke. The rams however he has placed on the left; but, the sheep are kept on my right. 4 Israel is not classed henceforth with the sheep of the shepherd. He does not separate the "spotted" and "dark" ones from the "white ones" for Jacob to receive for his work, which Laban, however, designated.

^aCp. Ambrose Exp. Ps. 118, 2.14 (CSEL, 62, 28.12-17), . . . *nilhil tibi proderit, etsi dicas: 'Abrahamae sum filiae', quae non credis, quae errorum non corrigis; Abraham quidem saluatur sed te nobilitas generis non iuuabit, nisi fides seruanerit.* ". . . it profits you nothing, if you say, 'I am a daughter of Abraham,' and do not believe and correct your faults. Abraham indeed is saved but [his] nobility of race will not help you, nor will [his] faith work for you."

^bOr "relationship to that one, kinship to that one," i.e. Jewish ancestry through Abraham.

^cSong 1:8 Ἐξελθε σὺ ἐν πτέρλαις τῶν ποιμνῶν καὶ ποδαίμας τὰς εἴφους σου ἐπὶ σπηνωμάσιν τῶν ποιμένων.

^dJ reads "in/with" rather than "among/in."

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>იგი, და ძლიერთა მათ განაშორებდა, რამეთუ აკობს¹ თვისს მას სამწყსოსა განუჩინებს და ლაბანსა მრავალფერნი იგი. ამისთვის თერთი იგი ხოლო თუ შეური აკობისა და მრავალფერი იგი ლაბანსა, რამეთუ ერთკე, რომელ-იგი აღბეჭდულ არს, იგი შესწავებულ არს. 7.5 ხოლო რომელი იგი აღბეჭდულ არს, იგი დამწყსე უკანონობა.² „კუკეთუ არა შეუნიერ იყო შენ, საცნაური³ ღელათა შორის, განხედ და</p>	<p>lams and variegated ones and he constantly separated the mangy ones. For it determines for Jacob his own flock, and for Laban the multicolored one (cp. Gen 30:32-34). For this reason the white and spotless one is Jacob's, and Laban's the multicolored, for only one, the one sealed [is] recognized. 7.5 What however is sealed, that you must pasture barefoot. “Though you were not beautiful, [you who are] known among women, go forth and</p>	<p>7.5 Ἐὰν μὴ γῶς σεαυτὴν, ἢ καλῆ ἐν γυναῖξίν, ἕξειλθε σὺ ἐν πτέρναις τῶν ποιμνῶν σου καὶ ποιμαίνε τὰς εἰρφους σου ἐπὶ σταηρωμάτων τῶν ποιμένων.</p>	<p>7.5 If you do not know yourself, O beautiful among women, go out in the tracks of your sheep and pasture your goats at the tents of the shepherds.</p>	<p>7.5 Pasture the unmarked barefoot.</p>

¹ იაკობს, “(to) Jacob” in *J*. An -o- between -b- and -s is erased in *T*, i.e. იაკობსა, “of Jacob” (gen. instead of dative). *J*. reads იაკობის.

² არს *J*.

³ *J* has the reverse order, არა შეუნიერი იყო საცნაურ, “[though] you were not known, [O] beautiful . . .” cf. CantPar 7.5. See also In Cant. 7.5 lines 13-14 next page.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>შეუღებ შენ კუალს სამწყობას და დამწყეს თიკანნი შენნი სამწყესოს მწყემსობას* . აწ მივედ წარმართთა და იქმენ სახე ყოველთა შარავანდელთა. მეფეთასა მას მწყემსად იტყვს, რომელთა მიმართ მივიდა, ყოველს სოფელსა მიუვიდა, "უკუეთუ არა სჯნაურ იყო შეუხიერი ემე ლეღათა შობის, განვიდ კუალს სამწყობას* ."</p>	<p>follow the track of the flock and pasture your kids in the pasture of the shepherds." Now go to the Gentiles and become a type of all crowns.^a It says the pastors [are] kings, those to whom he went [and] in all the world he has been poured out. "Though you are not known, that beautiful one among women, go in the path marked by the flock."^b</p>			<p>Then go out to the Gentiles and the diaspora of the race, where all congre- gations are. The kings however he names shepherds, and in the entire world dispersing.</p>

^aOr, "crowns for all." See Is 61:1-5 where Israel is betrothed to the Lord and called a "crown of beauty" in his hand. In Rev 12:1 the apostles are a crown of stars. In the *Od. Sol.* 1:1-5; 2:12; 9:8-11; 17:1-5; 20:7, the crown = the glorious relationship with God, the truth, the new covenant and a share in paradise in new creation: perhaps he crown worn at banquet celebrations. Tertullian, *Cor.*, rejected any Christian use of crowns in banquets. Rabbis discussed types of honor as "crowns" among these: the crown of a good name (*Pirke Avot*, 4:17), "R. Shimon says there are three crowns: the crown of Torah and the crown of priesthood and the crown of kingship (civil rule) and the crown of a good name rises above them all." The Dionysus-Ariadne myth (Ovid, *Fasti*, March 8) presents a parallel to the use of the crown here.

^bSong 1:8 ἐὼν ἡμεῖς ὡς ἀρνίον ἢ ὡς ἄρνη ἐν ἡμαθίαις τῶν ποιμένων. *J* adds "and pasture your goat-kids of the flock of the herdsmen." Cp. καὶ ποιμαίνετε τὰς ἐλάθεις σου . . . τῶν ποιμένων. Cp. წა დაძმეყენ თიკანნი შენნი . . . ძმეგბესობათა from Sarjveladze, "Books of the Old Georgian Testament from the Bakar Bible," electronically prepared. (Tbilisi, 1999; TITUS version by J. Gippert Frankfurt 1999-2002), <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/ageo/at/bakarar/bakar.htm>.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
8.1 “სავედარსა მას ჩემსა ეტლთა მათ ¹ შინა ფარაოისთა გამსგავსე შენ, მახლობელი კმე”.*. ჭ დღითა ზრახვითა, ჭ ჭემ-მარტებობა, რომელ მართლად მოგუეთხნა! შეუეთუ მოიქცე შენ ² , ერო, მამინ შგვრავსი შენ თავისა ჩემისო. კითარცა სვედრისა მის ჩემისა, რომელ შეგმულ ეტლთა მათ ფარაოისთა. და ამთ ეამთა სვედარი პატიოსან, და ფარაოს მეფისა მეგვტელთადას ეტლნი; კითარცა სახედესე უთითებრთას შედგომილ დღებულ არს და შეუნიერ, მგრუ-ცა შენ შეუნიერ იყო, შეუეთუ შეინანო.	8.1 “I have compared you, dear, ^a to my steed among the ¹ chariots of Pharaoh.” O great mysteries! O truth that rightly had been revealed to us! If you ² will convert, O people, then I will reckon you as my very own, just as my steeds that are yoked to the chariots of Pharaoh. ^b And at the time [...] an honored steed, and [...] chariots of Pharaoh, the king of the Egyptians [...] just as each one in its turn that followed is glorious and beautiful, so also shall you be glorious, if you repent.	8.1 Τῆ ἵππῳ μου ἐν ἄρμασι Φαραῶν ὠμοῖσά σε, ἡ πλησθον. Ἐὰν μετανοήσῃς. φησί, συναγογῆ, τότε σὲ ὁμοιώσω ἐμαυτῶ ὡς τῆ ἵππῳ ζευγυμένῃν ἐν ἄρμασι Φαραῶν. Διατί δὲ τῶ ἵππῳ, τῶ ἄρματι τοῦ Φαραῶν ὠμοίωσεν; Ὅτι τότε τίμια ἦν παρὰ τῶ Σολομώντι ὁ ἵππος, παρὰ δὲ τῶ Φαραῶ βασιλεῖ. Αἰγύπτου τὸ ἄρμα. Ὅν τοῖσιν τῶ ὄρον ταῦτα οὕτως ἐξευμένεα ἐστὶν ἐνδοξά, οὕτως καὶ σὺ ἐνδοξὸς ἔσῃ, ἐὰν ἄρα μετανοήσῃς.	8.1 “To my mare among chariots of Pharaoh I compared you, neighbor. If you repent, he says, O synagogue, then I will compare for myself as to a mare hitched among the chariots of Pharaoh. But why to the horse or to the chariot of Pharaoh did he compare [her]? Because then the horse was valuable to Solomon and even more so was the chariot to Pharaoh. So in the same way these things yoked together are valuable, in such a way you will be valuable if indeed you repent.	8.1 O the great mysteries, O truth rightly announced! If you convert saying yourself, synagogue, I compare you, my neighbor, to the keen horses at the chariot of Pharaoh. For the chariot horses of Solomon and Pharaoh in Egypt were valuable. So also you will be lovely, be lovely if you do repent.

¹ *J* omits.

² *J* omits, “you (sg.)”; however, the verb form is marked for the second person.

^a Or “my near one,” “neighbor.”

^b Cp. *CantPar* 8.1 παρὰ τῶ Σολομώντι ὁ ἵππος dropped out in transmission, see Richard, “Cantique,” 139.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
8.2 და იხილეთ მერმე ახალი მადლი განყოფილსა. რამეთუ საველარი იგი იყო ერისა მისგანი, ვითარცა ნეტარნი იგი მოციქულნი წარტყევებულ სრბად, ვითარცა საველარნი სოველსა შინა. და ეტლ შესკვრებელი წარმართთად და შებმულ მოციქულნი იგი ეკლესიას შინა ზიდვედ მართლად განგებითა ¹ აღსაუაღთა ზეცისათა.	<i>In Cant.</i> 8.2 And behold a new grace of the economy. For the steed was from the people, just as the blessed apostles [were] sent forth (<i>or</i> were bold) to race through the world like steeds. And the chariot was the congregation of the Gentiles. And the apostles having been yoked (<i>or</i> tied) among the church they hauled [them] up by just ordinance to the stair of heaven.	<i>Greek CantPar</i> 8.2 Ἦ μὲν γὰρ ἵππος ἦν ἐκ λαοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὅθεν οἱ ἀπόστολοι. "Ἐπιβίβασας" γάρ, φοῖν, "εἰς θάλασσαν τοὺς ἵππους σου", καὶ "ἐπιήση ἐπὶ τοὺς ἵππους σου".	<i>CantPar</i> 8.2 For the mare was of the people of the Jews, from where were the apostles. For "you have sent the horses into the sea" it says "and that you may mount your horses." And why does he call the apostles horses? Because pursuing in the world, that is running the race of godliness.	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i> 8.2 Again behold a new economy! For the the peoples were the horses even as the blessed apostles he stirred up to pursue into the entire world. The chariot however is the church is out of the Gentiles. Harnesses however to the church the apostles pull righteously and reverently going up to the gate of heaven.

¹Following *J. T* adds და, "and."

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>და რამეთუ საველარ მოცოქულნი იოქუმიაან, იტყვს წინაასწარმეტყულო: “წარავლინენ წინაასწარმეტყუელნი შენნი და აღარღვენ¹ წყალნი მრავალნი”*. და მერმე იტყვს: “აკვედ შენ ეტლთა შენთა, და მკედლოზა შენი ცხორებას არს სოფელსა”*.</p>	<p>And because the apostles were said to be steeds,^a the prophet says, “You sent out your prophets and stirred up many waters.”^b And then it says, “You went up in your chariot and your horsemanship³ is the life of the world.”</p>	<p>Καὶ διατὶ ἵππους τοὺς τὸ διώκειν ἐν κόσμῳ, τουτέστι τρέχειν τὸν δρόμον τῆς εὐσεβείας, ἄρματα δὲ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι αἱ ἐξ ἔθνῶν, ὑποζευγόμενοι τοίνυν ἵπποι, τουτέστιν ἀπόστολοι, ἄρμα ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία. Ἐλκουσιν αὐτὴν δικαίως προτρέπόμενοι ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς οὐρανίου ζωῆς.</p>	<p>And the horses he calles apostles; on account of which pursuing in the world the race of godliness, but the chariots are the churches of the Gentiles chariots, the yoked horses, that is apostles, the chariot which is the church. They pull her rightly going forward on the heavenly road of life.</p>	<p>Because the apostles are named horses, following the prophet: “You sent your horses, stirring up (“bringing into riot”) many waters,” and again: “You sat on your horses and your ride became salvation.”</p>

¹ ავარღვეჰე J.

² T reads შენ ეტლთა შენთა (=you in your chariot); J reads საველარსა შენსა, “your steed” (dat., cp. LXX ἐπὶ τοὺς ἵππους σου).

³ The word can also be used of “a (mounted) host, army,” from a private written communication with Dr. Jeffrey Childers, 03-19-2009.

^a The allusion is to 1 Cor 9:9, 10 where in the *NTI Paul AB* and CD recensions of the Old Georgian Pauline epistles read ჰარი (ox, steer) instead of საველარი (steed or donkey). From the context (*In Cant.* 8.3), it is clear Hippolytus has horses immediately in mind, but cp. *In Cant.* 8.6. The creatures carrying the chariot of God in Ez 1, 10 and the beasts thought to pull the chariot of the god Dionysus/Helios from ancient legend are also likely in the mind of Hippolytus and his audience.

^b Hab 3:15 καὶ ἐπεβίβασας εἰς θάλασσαν τοὺς ἵππους σου ταράσσοντας ὕδαρ πολὺ. See *In Cant.* 8.3.

Georgian

8.3 ხოლო რომელი-იგი თქუა: “წარავლინენ ჰუნენი უენნი¹, აღარღვენ წყალნი მრავალნი-ო”, აღრღუენა ნათესავთა მრავალთა², რომელნი კითარცა წყალნი ლელვითა აღრღუენულ⁴ დაიმესრუოდეს, რომელნი აღრღუენულ³ ღაუც ხრომელობისგან⁵. აწ საფუერსა მინა-ასარებდეს. რამეთუ ესე ღამწესილ და მცნობელ ქრისტიესა განმარ-თლებულ.

In Cant.

8.3 Nevertheless it said this, “You sent your horses and stirred up many waters.” It is a stirring^a of many peoples who, as waters that were churned up in waves were continually breaking up,^b they were stirred up because of untamedness. Now are cared for in an enclosure and learning Christ^c because they have been justified.^d

¹J adds და, “and.”

²J omits -ო, direct discourse marker.

³J reads აღრღუენვასა ნათესავთა მრავალთას, “of/in a stirring of many peoples.”

⁴აღრუელ, “mixed,” J.

⁵აძრულ, “mixed,” J.

⁶T includes a sign of the passive, “from ceaselessness.” J ღაუც ხრომელებისგან, “from unceasing.”

^aJ reads “of/with a stirring up.”

^bJ reads “disgusted, indignant.”

^cCp. Ambrose *Exp. Ps. 118*, 2.33.3 (CSEL, 62, 40.12-17). *et illius susceptione mansuescunt, sic et congregatio nationum gentilibus indomita moribus se ante iactabat; ubi uero suscepit iugum dicentis: tollite iugum meum . . . et coepit sponsa christi concordia et mansuetudine populorum esse sublimis et toto circumferri orbe, tamquam currus equis velocibus supra mundum rapta ascendit sponsum.* . . . and by taking on his yoke they become tame, so even the congregation of the nations who by custom were untamable among the Gentiles were stirred up before, when he says, ‘Take my yoke . . .’ and the bride of Christ began to be supremely publicized in all the world with respect to concord and gentleness, as a chariot ascends above the world taken up to the bridegroom.”

^d“Justified” is here opposed to “untamedness.” Ambrose properly saw “justification” as “concord and gentleness.” Cp. 25.10 “he brings peace to (i.e. pacifies) the synagogue and the church is glorified.” Peace is a prominent virtue in Hippolytus’ view of the church, e.g. *In Cant.* 8.4; 19.3; 25.5, 9. Note connection of “righteous” and not bearing the sword in 8.4.

Georgian

8.4 # შუენიერი¹ სავედარი, რომელია
 ვლინა სრბით მართალია მიიპოვეს,
 რომელი არა ბრკივლებითა ვრმლისათა,
 არცა ღუაწლით რას აშენებდეს, არამედ
 ყოველსა-ვე მშვიდობით ხარებდეს,
 სვედარი ურთიერთას დაუღლივლ², არცა
 განდრეკილ ურთიერთას და არცა მკლმ, არა
 რა დაშობილ გულის-ვან და არცა
 განმგლებელ უღლისა.

In Cant.

8.4 O beautiful steeds who won for
 themselves by running the race of the
 righteous (*or* just), who neither by the
 flashing of the sword, nor with combat
 (*or* struggle) did they ever build
 anything, but they announced good
 news to everyone with peace! For these
 steeds at the same time (*or* mutually)
 were submitted to the yoke, neither
 turning away from one another, nor
 adversaries, with no deficiency of soul,
 nor casting off the yoke.

Paleo-Slavonic

8.4 O beautiful horses, whose running
 was not by the sounding of a sword nor
 through a sign of conflict, but rather
 each announcing peace! For these
 horses neither harnessed separately
 themselves from one another nor run
 against one another nor do they throw
 off the yoke.

¹ *T* adds “people.” By dittography შუენიერი ერი, *J* omits ერი.
² დაუღლებულ, “yoked,” *J*.

Georgian

8.5 არამედ აჰა, კითარცა გამოცდილნი
 უღელს დამორჩილებულ მოზიდვენ
 ნათესავთა მრავალთა კითარცა ეტლითა
 კნისათვს დაუღლებულნი. აწ სავედარნი
 იგი ათორმეტნი უმწყ<ს>ნი¹ მართალნი
 დაუღლეოდ წარმართებულ იპოვნეს. აღსა-
 გებელითა სიყუარულითათა კითარცა
 ღუედითა განმტკიცებულ და უღელსა მას
 სარწმუნოებესას დამორჩილებულ.
 თხითა რეცა ურმის თუალითა ზრახვასა
 მიმოღებისასა თხითა მათ მსარებელითასა
 უთხრობდეს;

In Cant.

8.5 But, behold, as they experience the
 yoke, they became tame and attract
 many peoples as a chariot yoked for
 salvation. Now these twelve steeds
 were found [are found to be]
 unshepherded, just, subject to the yoke
 [and] going on uprightly. With a burden
 of love secured with a rope and
 submitted to the yoke of faith. As
 though they were announcing by means
 of the four wheels the mystery of the
 preaching of the four evangelists.

Paleo-Slavonic

8.5 But undertaking to carry the yoke
 and the plow (so) with all diligence to
 all peoples, as harnessed to a chariot of
 salvation. For these horses are not
 bound together with a strap, but rather
 with the bond of love, obedient to the
 yoke of the faith. (As) with four wheels
 the mystery of the economy with the
 four.

¹უმწყნი *J T*, with the -ს- it becomes.

Georgian

კეთილსა, ეტლისა წარმამართებელსა,
 სიტყუას მას მიმოღაჰფუნდეს და სრბასა
 სიმართლისათვის აღმასრულებელს,
 ათორმეტთა მათ მიერ აღსაშენებელს,
 ლად სოფლისა, ყოველთა ნათესავთა თვისა
 მიიზიებდეს, კითარცა წყალთა ადრულოთა.
 8. 6 # სანატრელებად¹ ნეტართა მათ
 სვედართაჲ, რამეთუ იყვნეს ამათნი იგი
 ურმის თუალნი,

In Cant.

They went about spreading the good
 Word, director of the chariot, and the
 race of the justice [they] completed by
 means of the twelve for the edification
 of the world. They called all peoples to
 themselves, for the waters were
 agitated. 8.6 O blessedness² of the
 blessed steeds! For they had chariot
 wheels in which

Paleo-Slavonic

O beautiful fourfold economy, har-
 nessed to the just vehicle³. A lion as a
 king was preached by Matthew; an ox,
 the Savior, however was preached by
 Luke, he was shown however to be a
 human being by Mark, however like an
 eagle of the divine John flying upwards
 into the heights; by grace revealing the
 secret to the world. 8.6 O the blessed
 horses which are spiritual! Indeed their
 wheels are like the wheel

¹სანატრელობა J with sign of passive.

²J. reads “blessedness” სანატრელობა; Garitte reads სანატრელებად with no difference in meaning.

³Or, “vehicle of the righteous” or “of righteousness,” see Bonwetch, *Hippolytus Kommentar*, 42.

Georgian

კითარცა შორის უნძის თუალთა, რამეთუ
 იყო ახლო ესე სხარეგმა ძუქელსა მას
 შუკულსა შებულ. ხოლო აწ ცილაჲ
 შუენიერ კტლნი-ცა იგი არიან,

In Cant.

were wheels, for this new gospel was
 put upon the old Law.¹ But now there in
 addition their very handsome chariots,
 that have been pictured in many ways.

Paleo-Slavonic

within wheels. For the New Testament
 is alive in the Old and preached through
 the same.

¹ Ambrose Exp. Ps. 118, 4.28 (CSEL, 62, 40.5-24), adapts much of In Cant 8:3-6, *Siquidem habet equos suos Christus, de quibus dicit propheta: inmisisti in mare equos tuos turbantes aquas multas, eo quod genitium populos, qui mouentur ut aquae multae et excitantur ut fluctus aquarum, euangelizando comouerint apostoli, ut adsurgentes a terrenis idolorum caeremoniis in Christum crederent. et supra ait: ascendisti in equos tuos, equitatus tuus sanitas. o bonorum equorum duodecimum mirabile, quibus frena pacis, habentae sunt caritatis! constricti inter se concordiae uinculis et iugo fidei subiecti, quattuor rotis euangelii mysterium totius orbis finibus inuehentes, bonum aurigam portantes dei uerbum, cuius flagello fugatae sunt inlecebrae saeculares, exermiatus mundi princeps, iustorum cursus impletus est. o rationabilium equorum grande certamen, o mirandum mysterium! rota intra rotam currebat et non inpediebatur, nouum testamentum in ueteri testamento. intra illud currebat per quod admuntiabatur. in quattuor partes ibant rotae et non reuertebantur retrorsum, quia spiritus vitae erat in his qui currebant in quattuor partes totius mundi, et sine offensione currebant, quia bona uita equorum quadrabat. currebant igitur equi, quia non dormiebat que ascenderat equos.* “So, Christ has his horses concerning whom the prophet spoke, ‘You sent your horses into the sea stirring up many waters.’ Oh, the wonderful yoke of twelve horses, whose bridle is peace and whose reins are love! They are bound together by the bond of concord and subject to the yoke of faith, and by four wheels they carry the mystery of the gospel to the ends of all the earth. They carry a good charioteer, the Word of God, by whose lash have been put to flight the allurements of the world, the prince of the world has been banished, and the race of the righteous is completed. O great contest of spiritual horses! O mystery to be admired! It ran by a wheel within a wheel, the New Testament, and was not hindered. By thees what had been announced took place. They went to the four parts of the world and did not turn back because the Spirit of life was in these that went to the four parts of the world. And they ran without offense for by good life they went as a foursome of horses. So the horses were running for the one that mounted them did not sleep.”

Georgian

რამეთუ მრავალ სახედ გამოხატულ იქნეს¹.
 რამეთუ იყო მათ თანა ღობი და კაზი ვენავი
 და კაცი² და ორბი იგი. შ ახლისად პირად-
 პირად სხც სხარებისად მის, მართალთა
 თანა ეტლთა დაუღვიღ³! რამეთუ იყო
 ღობი⁴ იგი ამისა, კითარცა მეუფც მათე
 მსარებლისგან ქაფავებულ. და იყო⁵ კაზი
 იგი კითარცა ვენავი მღველო-მოდლორისა
 ლუკასგან

In Cant.

For there was with them pictured (*or*
 depicted) a lion, a vine shoot⁶, a man,
 and the eagle. O new manifold forms of
 the gospel, with justice subjected to the
 yoked of the chariots. For concerning
 him (*lit.* to this one) has been preached
 from Matthew the lion as a king; and
 has been preached by Luke as

Paleo-Slavonic

Indeed the vehicle was also beautiful,
 for it was fourfold, for it had in itself a
 lion, an ox, a human being, and an
 eagle. O beautiful fourfold economy,
 harnessed to the just vehicle (*or*, of the
 righteous or righteousness). A lion as a
 king was preached by Matthew; an Ox,
 the Savior, however was preached by

¹ გამოხატულ იქნეს, “there had been pictured,” *J*.

² ნავი და written above the line in first hand *T* და, “and,” omitted in *J*.

³ დაუღვიღებულ, “yoked,” *J*.

⁴ ღობი, “lion,” written above the line in *J*.

⁵ *J* adds ამის. “of it/him.”

⁶ *J* read “vine shoot.” Expected: ox, cf. Ez 1:18 cf. *PSfor*. The Georgian reading may represent the translator’s misunderstanding of Hippolytus’ echo of Lk 1:78, which describes Jesus as ἀνατολή ἕξ ἡψους (= “dawn of a new day from on high” cp. “shoot as a vine of a high priest”); the word ἀνατολή can mean either “dawn” or “branch.” The Slavonic *florilegium* glosses with “Savior.”

Georgian

ქალაქებულ და იყო მისა კაცი იგი, ვითარცა ვნებული, მარკოზის მიერ გამოთქმულ და იყო მისა ორბი-ცა იგი, ვითარცა სიტყუა ნეტარისა იოვანეს მიერ ცად აღფრინებულ ამის ზრახვისა მიერ მიმოქადაგების მის ზრახვა უწყებულ იქნა. 8.7 ამას ეტლსა შემოღობილ ურმის თუაღნი, რომელთა არა უკუნ-აქციეს კუალსა, რამეთუ იყო ეტლთა მათ შინა სული სასწაულია. რამეთუ ეზიკეილის მიერ მოგუეთნრა. რამეთუ იყო სასარებასა მას შინა სული იგი-ცა მრავალ თუაღთა სავსე, პირად-პირადთა ნათესავთა მოწოდებითა მცნებათა მიერ.

In Cant.

the shoot as a vine of a priest-teacher. And in the case of Mark he was announced as the man, as one who suffered need. And in the case of John he was the eagle flying ascending to heaven according to the word of the blessed John. By this mystery of proclamation the mystery has been made known. 8.7 The wheels of the chariot following this chariot, from they did not turn back, for there was in the wheels the marvelous Spirit^a for it had been announced to us by Ezekiel. For there was in the gospel indeed the very Spirit full of many eyes calling a variety of peoples through the commandments.

Paleo-Slavonic

Luke, he was shown however to be a human being by Mark, however like an eagle of the divine John flying upwards into the heights; by grace revealing the secret to the world. 8.7 The wheels follow this chariot and do not themselves turn back, for the “the Spirit was in the wheels”; through Ezekiel, a Spirit is announced in the gospels, and it was full eyes, putting together the invitations of the different peoples.

^aExpected: “spirit of the creatures” Ez 1:20.

Georgian

8. 8 აწ ესე არს სავედართა მათ შორის მართალ და ამოსვს-ცა ღაღადებს და იტყვს: "სავედარს მას ჩემსა ეტლთა შინა ფარაოისტთა გამსგავსე შენ, მახლობელი კმე ჩემი"*. შეინანე, შესაკრებელი, რათა შენ-ცა ჰქალაქებდე ქრისტესთვის, კითარცა¹ სავედარი ექმენ² მალე სრზად სოფელსა შინა კითარცა-იგი ჰველე და მწეკმს კითარცა-იგი³ პეტრე, რათა მართალ ქრისტეს მიერ გამოშნდე, ანუ კითარცა სანატრელი მოწაფეთა მათგანი, რათა სავედართა მათ თანა გამოუთქუმელთა აღბეჭდო.

In Cant.

8.8 Now there is among the steeds a righteous one and for this very reason he cries out and says: "I have likened you, my dear, to that steed among the chariots of Pharaoh."^a Repent, synagogue^b so that you too may hasten toward Christ for the race through the world, so that as a steed for him/it you may be made swift for the race as was Paul and like a shepherd as was Peter, that truly from now on you may make Christ known then as the blessed one [was] from the disciples, you may appear then as disciples of the blessed one, that with the ineffable steeds you may be sealed.

Paleo-Slavonic

8. 8 See now in reference to the horses, more a righteous one (or "justly"). Therefore he also calls out saying: I compared you to my horses with the chariot of Pharaoh, my neighbor." Repent, synagogue, so that also you might preach Christ, and would pass through the world quickly as a horse as Paul did after he believed in Christ, and a shepherd as well as Peter, so that you in truth might present the picture of Christ, or of John, thus you learn to make the Word known, or one of the blessed disciples.

¹კითარცა *J T*, "as" should be read კითარმცა, "so that as."

²იქმენ *J*, i.e. omitting "for him/it."

³*J* omits იგი, def. art.

^aSong 1:9 ἢ ἵππῳ μου ἐν ἄρμασιν Φαραῶν ὠμοισσά σε ἡ πλησιῶν μου

^bsynagogue = congregation; see note b on 289.

Georgian

8.9 # ახალთაჲ მათ ზრახვათაჲ! რამეთუ მიაგებს¹ მისაგებელსა მართალსა, კითარმელ²: “სავედარსა მას ჩემსა გამგეგსე შენ, ეტლთა მათ ფარაოჲსთა, მონახლებული ჩემდა”³* უკუეთუ შეინახო, ისწავე, რომლითა შეუნიერებთა შემკულ-ყოფად ხარ.

Georgian

9.1 “რამეთუ განშუენდეს საკეთენი შენი, კითარცა გუოღენი”⁴* რამეთუ გაქუს სიმეწამულ⁵ სარწმუნოებისაჲ, განბაკრძალბელი სიტყვსა მიერ, 9.2 “ქელ შენი კითარცა სეროჲს მისა”⁶*. რამეთუ კადნიერება იგი აზნაურებისა გაქუს. არა ხოლო თუ⁴ თავაკიდებულად ხელგ, არამედ მაღლად ზეცად მიმართ.

In Cant.

9.1 “For your cheeks were beautiful as turtledoves.”^{2a} For you have the blush of believing, having been warned by the word. 9.2 “Your neck is as a <tower> of ivory,^{2b} for you have the boldness of noble birth. You look, not with head bowed down, but rather with head held high in the direction of heaven.

¹მოუგებს “he give to/for him,” J.

²კითარცა, “as,” J.

³სეროჲს მისა is meaningless.

The Georgian text is corrupt. The Georgian text is corrupt. The Georgian text would read გოლოლი ჰილოხიქოსა, “tower of ivory.” See Jost Gippert, ed, *Vetus Testamentum iberice: The Old Georgian texts of the Old Testament from the Oški and the Jerusalem Bible Manuscripts* (electronically prepared text; TITUS <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/ageo/at/oskijer/oskij.htm>) of Cant. 7:5, also cf. Garitte (CSCO 263), 48, following Marr, *Ippolit*, p. XXXIV-XXXVI. Or the text may have read კითარცა გუოღენისანი. *CantPar* 13.1 reads, following the LXX, Ἰσάχρηδος σου ὡς ὀρίμιαχοι.

⁴J omits თუ, “not.”

⁵Song 1:10 τί ὠραιώθησαν σιαγόνες σου ὡς τρυγόνες

⁶Or, “Your neck is as a necklace” (cp. Song 7:5); see Song 1:10b τράχηλός σου ὡς ὀρίμιαχοι=your neck [is] as a necklace. Cp. Song 7:5 (LXX) τράχηλός σου ὡς πύργος ἐλεφάντινος

In Cant.

8.9 O new mysteries! For he gives a just recompense, saying, seeing that [he says]: “I have likened you to my steed among the chariots of Pharaoh, O you who are near to me.” If you do repent, learn with which beautiful things you are to be adomed.

Greek CantPar

9.1 Σιαγόνες σου, φησὶν, ὡς τρυγόνες. Ἐχει γὰρ τὸ ἐρυθρὸν τὸν τῆς πίστεως δισωπομένον λόγον. Ἰσάχρηδος σου ὡς ὀρίμιαχοι. Τοὔτεστιν οὐκ ἐτι κἀτῶ νεύεις· τὸ γὰρ παρρησιαστικὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας λαβοῦσα, εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνάειπες.

CantPar

9.1 “Your cheeks,” he says, “are like turtle doves.” For She has the red impertinent blush of faith with respect to the word. Your neck [is] as necklaces. Which means no longer do you have your head bowed down. For since you have receive the frank demeanor of freedom, you look up to heaven.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
10.1 “შსვაკსი ოქროსაჲ გიქმნეთ უენ ქანქართაგან ვეცხლისთა”*. რამეთუ მათგანი, რომელი ზომად ოდენ უჯულისა მიერ სარწმუნო იქმნა, ხოლო აწ გარღარეულ უქენიერებაჲ ოქროსაჲ მკვდრ-ყოფილ და სსარება. 10.2 რამეთუ ქანქართაგან ვეცხლისთა მსვაკს ოქროსაგან იქმნეს ¹ უენდა, რამეთუ გამსვაკსებს უენ კაცთა მართალთა, რომელნი ვითარცა ოქროჲ გამოცდილ და განწმენ-დილ არიან.	10.1 “We will make you like gold from a talent of silver” ^{2a} for from them is what is ordinary (<i>or</i> for measure) as much as was done faithfully through the law. But now indeed the inheritance and gospel [is] the surpassing beauty of gold. 10.2 For from talents of silver a likeness from gold they will be to you; for [the Scripture] likens you to righteous people (<i>or</i> men) who are like gold tested and purified. ^b	10.1 Ὅτι ὁ νόμος ὡς ἀργύριον ἦν μετρίως παιδεύων, νῦν δὲ τὴν ἕξοχωτάτην τιμὴν τοῦ χρυσοῦ ἀληθοσύνου λαβοῦσα τὸ εὐαγγελίου, ὁμοιωμάτα χρυσοῦ ποιήσεται σοι.	10.1 For the law was like silver giving its training in moderation but now you have received the gospel as an inheritance which is of much greater value than gold, “likenesses of gold I will make you.

¹ იქმნებას pres. ind. *J.*

^{2a} Song 1:11 ὁμοιωμάτα χρυσοῦ ποιήσომέν σοι μετὰ συγγμάτων τοῦ ἀργυρίου

^b Ambrose *Exp. Ps. 118, 3.7.2* (CSEL, 62, 44.9-10), *itaque sicut aurum bonum, ita ecclesia, cum uritur, detrimenta non sentit, sed magis fulgor eius augetur* . . . “As is gold is good, so also is the church, when it is burned, it suffers no loss, on the contrary, its brilliance increases all the more . . .”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
<p>11.1 “ვიდრე¹ მეუფც იგი საინაჰჳესა თჳსსა არს”². რამეთუ ქრისტე მოსრულ და მოწყენულ მეუფებით; ნარდიონ განუქნილ სული მისი; “კურჭერ დაკრბა-ლულ ჩემდა დის-წულაკი იგი ჩემი”³.</p>	<p>11.1 “Until the king is on his own couch”^a for Christ came and arrived reigning,^b his Spirit [was] poured out [as] nard.^c “My nephew is a guarded vessel to me.”</p>	<p>11.1 Ἔως οὗ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐναγκαλισθῆ αὐτοῦς. φησί. Τούτέστιν ἕως οὗ ὁ Χριστὸς παρσθένηται τὸ δευτέρου, θάλαπιν ἄπαντας τοὺς πιστεῦσαντας ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ.</p>	<p>11.1 It says, “until the king takes them in his arms.” This means until Christ appears the second time and warms with his heat all the believers in his kingdom.</p>
<p>12.1 “ნარდმან ჩემმან გამოსკა სულელუბა² თჳსი”³. რამეთუ სცხებელი მაღლისა განუფინა, რათა წინადაცუთილუბადაცა უმძლუბელ იყოს განრინებად. სწულსაცხებლუ კურჭერ ქრისტე, ჳორცთა მათ უემოსითა საბოთთა სიყუარულისათა განმტკიცებულ, რათა ამის გამო, ვითარცა ტყეანთა დაჭყლეტულ.</p>	<p>12.1 “My nard gave off its aroma”: an anointing oil of grace was diffused, that the circumcision might also be able to be saved. A container for spices, a vessel, [is] Christ who put on the garment of flesh and is held fast by means of a binding of a chord of love, that by means of this he may be crushed as grapes.</p>	<p>12.1 Νάρδος μου, φησίν, ἔδωκεν ὀσμὴν αὐτοῦ. Τούτέστιν τὸ μύρον τῆς χάριτος ἔπνευσεν, ἵνα, ἐὰν θείῃ, καὶ περιτομὴ σωθῆται δυναθῆ. Ἀπόδεσμος τῆς σαρκῆς· ἦν γὰρ Χριστὸς σῶμα κειτημένως, ἵνα διὰ τοῦτο ὡς βότρυς ἐκθλασθῆ.</p>	<p>12.1 It says, “My nard gave its fragrance.” This means he breathed the anointing oil of grace so that, if he wishes the the circumcision might also be able to be saved. “A bundle of myrrh” for Christ was created as a body, so that by means of this he might be crushed as a bunch of grapes.³</p>

¹J has ვითარცა, “as, since.”

²J სული, “S/spirit.”

³Cp. also *Antichir*. 11.1

where the same figure and language describe Christ’s crucifixion. “Until the king at table.” *CantPar* 11.1, offers for this difficult LXX reading ἐναγκαλισθῆ αὐτοῦς, “takes them in his arms.” The Georgian text shows that Hippolytus himself bases his interpretation on the traditional LXX reading.

^bLit. “with kingly power.”

^cAmbrose Exp. Ps. 118, 3.7.2, (CSEL, 62, 44.10-15) *donec Christus ueniat in regnum suum et reclinet caput suum in ecclesiae fide. qui cum uenisset ad oves perditas domus Israel, non habebat ubi caput suum reclinaret; nunc autem iam redolet fides ideoque dicit ecclesia: nardum meum dedit odorem suum et dicit cum praesumptione, expectans retributionem.* “. . . until Christ comes in his kingdom and lays his head down in the faith of the church. He who, when he came to the lost sheep of Israel, did not have a place to lay his head, now already the faith by which the church says, ‘My nard gives off its odor,’ and it says so expectantly, hoping for a reward.”

Georgian	In Cant.	Greek CantPar	CantPar	Paleo-Slavonic
<p>12.2 “დისწულაკი ჩემი შორის საბძეუთა ჩემთა ლამკვდრებულ”²; რამეთუ ცხებულ მჯულისა და სასარებისა იყო “ჭურჭერ საწულსაცხებლუ დისწულაკი ჩემი, შორის ძუძუთა ჩემთა ლამკვდ-როს”. 13.1 “ნარდიონ ვითარცა კიპროს-ისა დისწულაკი ჩემი კენაზო-ვანსა შორის ენგად-სასა”³; # შუენიერება იგი კიპროსისა, ველთთა რომლი-ის მიერ შემკობილ ცხე-ბულეზა, რათა ვენაჟოგანი იგი ენგადისა⁴ მართლად შერაცხილ იყოს, ენდაი ადგილი ერთი არს ჰურიას-ტანით კერძო, რომელსა-იგი აპრსამი იპოების⁵.</p>	<p>12.2 “My nephew resides between my breasts”: for he was anointed by the Law and the Gospel. “A vessel that holds spices [is] my nephew. He will rest [as] an adornment between my breasts.” 13.1 “Nard as that of Cyprus” [is] my nephew in the vineyard of Engeddi⁵. “O beauty of Cyprus, through which (<i>lit.</i> by the hand of which) an anointing (<i>or</i> blessing) [was] adorned, that the “vineyard of Engeddi” might rightly be revered. Engeddi is one place near Judea, in which balsam is found.</p>	<p>12.2 Ἀδελφιδός μου ἐμοί, ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν μαστῶν μου 13.1 Νάρδος τῆς κύπτου ἀδελφιδός μου ἐν ἀμπελῶσιν Ἐνγαδδί. Τόπος ἐστὶ γῶρας τινὸς ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ οὕτω καλούμενος ἐν ᾧ τὸ ἀποβάλασμα γίνεται. Εἰσὶν οὖν ἀμπελῶνες ἐκεῖ «ἐπὶ» ξύλων. Ταῦτα τὰ ξύλα ἔχει κνιζόμενα δίδωσι τὸ μύρον.</p>	<p>12.2 My nephew to me, spends the night between my breasts. 13.1 My nephew is nard of henna among the vineyards of Engeddi. The place is a region of a certain part en Judea by this name in which there grows a balsam tree. So there are vineyards there grow on trees. These very trees, when scraped, yield the anointing oil.</p>	<p>12.2 Christ was the mediator of the law and the gospel; “he spends the night between the breasts” [refers] to this.</p>

¹მიერ, “through,” *J.T.* According to Garitte, it should be deleted. Cf. *Le Museon* 72 (1959): 78.

²ენდაადისა *J.* See note 5 on page 311.

³*J* has იპოების, a more common spelling meaning “it is found.”

⁴So Georgian, but LXX βότρυς τῆς κύπτου (bunch of henna blossoms) and Richard, “Cantique,” 13.1 has ναρός κύπτου. The dynamic figure depends upon the connection between the Semitic root כָּפַח, “camphire, henna” and “atone-ment” or “ransom.” Also in later Rabbinic literature see “R. Joshua b. Levi said . . . My beloved is unto me as a cluster [she-ha-kol] of henna-flowers [*kofer*] in the vineyards of [*karme*] En-gedi: He to Whom everything belongs [*she-ha-kol she-lo*] shall make atonement [*mekapper*] for me for the sin of the kid which I stored up [*karamti*] for myself” *TalB Shabbat* 88b.

⁵*T* reads “of Endadi” *J* has “of Endadadi.” Cf. Song 1:14 βότρυς τῆς κύπτου ἀδελφιδός μου ἐμοὶ ἐν ἀμπελῶσιν

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
<p>არან მუნ კენავოვანნი ალტეკეპული ხეთა. ესე მოზონილ გამოსახვითა ხეთა მათგან გამოსცემს ნელსაცხებულს¹ მას. აწ იტყვილს²: “ღისწულაჲ იგი კენავოვანს მას ენღაღისას”. მოგუასწა- კებს ამას³: ძლიერ იყო ძელს მას ზელა ვნებითა, და გუმერთა⁴ გუერღს ძელს მას ზელა გამოუტე- კებს სულნელებას, კითარცა აზრს მისსა. კითარცა⁵ სიტყუა პირის მისსა-გან გამოუცემოდა, ესრეთ⁶ ქრისტემან გამოსცა სულნელუბა თვისი.</p>	<p>Vineyards are cultivated^a there among the trees. This [balsam] extracted figuratively from those trees yields the anointing oil. Now it said, “the nephew, among the vineyard of Engedi,” teaches us this because^b he was mighty in his sufferings on the wood,⁷ and with wounding in the side while on the wood⁷ he emits an aroma of balsam, just as the Word was being sent from his mouth, so Christ gives his aroma.</p>	<p>Εἶπεν οὖν ἡδελφοῖδός ἐν ἀμπελῶσιν Ἑγγεδδι¹, σημαίνων τὸδε· ἰσχυρὸς μὲν γὰρ ἦν, φησίν, ἐπὶ ξύλου πάσχων ὁ κύριος, νυττόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ ξύλου δίδωσι τὴν εὐωδίον.</p>	<p>Therefore it said, “My nephew among the vineyards of Engeddi” signifying this: on the one hand it means the Lord was strong when he suffered on the on the cross, but while being pierced on the cross, he gives off the aroma.</p>

Еггедди.

¹საცხებულს “anointing oil,” *J*.

²იტყვს *J* (pres. =says).

³*J* adds რამეთუ, “because.”

⁴და ღაგუმერთა, “wound,” *J*.

⁵*J* კითარცა იგი, “the which.”

⁶ესრეთ, Garitte, 49.

⁷Lit. “wood = cross,” cf. ξύλον. Cp. Ambrose *Exp. Ps. 118*, 3.8 (CSEL, 62, 44.16-45.24).

^aLit. “mixed, blended.”

^bFollowing *J. T* omits.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
13.2 ხოლო, საყუარებლო, ვიდრემლის ღგენ ნაყოფნი ¹ იგი ძელსა მას ზელა კენავსა შინა, კიდრუ არა დაჭყყლიემულ, არა გამოსცის სულზელება თვისი. ხოლო რაჯამს ველოვნისაგან მსველითა დაისხლის, მუნქუს-კე აღრუ-აღრუ ცრემლი გამოსკის რამეთუ ქრისტე-ცა მამონ ერსა მას ზელა ცრემლო-ოღა, რამეთუ შემძლებელ იყო მათი ზელა მიფენად სულზელებიას,	13.2 However, beloved ones, as long as the fruits will stand on the wood, in the vine that is, as long as [the fruit is] not crushed, it does not give off its aroma; but when it is harvested by the craftsmen with a knife, very quickly it begins to emit a drop of liquid, ^a for then indeed Christ was weeping over the people, for he was able to spread out over them an aroma,	13.2 Ηνίκα δ' ἄν ὑπὸ τοῦ τεχνίτου ὄπλω νυγῆ τὰ ξύλα ἐκείνα, παρσυνίκα τὸ δάκρυον ἀποστᾶξει, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐγγύς αὐτοῦ ποῦ τοῦ τόπου τὸν λαὸν ἐδάκρυεν, ἵνα ἀπολοῦσαι δυνήθῃ, τὴν παρ' ἑαυτοῦ εὐωδίαν δι' εὐσπλαγγίαν δηλῶν. Τότε μὲν ἐπὶ ξύλου ἐνύσσετο ὡς ἐν ἀμπελῶνι, ἵνα τὸ καλὸν μύρον τῆς εὐωδίας διεξῆι.	13.2 And whenever those trees are pierced by the instrument of the artisan it immediately begins to form the tear drop, just as even Christ somewhere near this very place wept for the people, in order that he might be able to wash [them], showing the aroma which he had through mercy. When upon the cross he was being pierced as happens in the vineyard, in order that he might show the good fragrant anointing oil.	13.2 However, beloved, while the fruit remains unharmed in the tree, it gives off no aroma. But if it is pierced by a skillful one with a knife, immediately it lets pour tear drops. Because Christ cried at that time over the people, thus he could send out that from himself a aroma, but I speak [concerning] mercy.

¹ ღგენს ნაყოფნი, sing. verb., pl. sub. *J*

^a Lit., "tear drop."

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
<p>შეწვნის ყოფითა განცხადებულად, რამეთუ ქელს მას ზელა დაიწვლა კენავიანს მას, რათა კეთილი სულნელეზა ნელსაცხებელსა გვრუნოს 13.3 და რამეთუ სიტყუა იგი, სყუარუნო, მერმე-ცა უორცთა მათ მინა დაემკვდრა და რამეთუ დიდი იგი რეცაოუ დამცირებული გამაჩნდა, რათა გამოჩინებულ იყოს; და ახალს მაღლსა განყოფიასა უჩუენებდა.</p>	<p>by making manifest a help[er].² For on the wood he was wounded in the vine, that he might reveal the good aroma of the anointing oil for us. 13.3 And so the Word, beloved, when he dwelt a body,³ because he was great, though he appeared abased that he might be revealed, he was indeed revealing the new grace of the economy.</p>	<p>13.3 Ὁ δὲ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ σάρκα σώματι ἐσφύργετο καὶ μέγας ὢν μικρὸς ἐγένετο· ἐντεῦθεν κρημασθέντος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ ξύλου τὸ καλὸν μύρον τῆς εὐωδίας ἀπεκαλύπτετο.</p>	<p>13.3 But the Word of God according to the flesh was bound to a body and though he was great, he became small from which condition when hung on the cross, the excellent anointing oil of good aroma was revealed.</p>

¹J omits “and.”

²Garitte translates lit. “making manifestly a help.” According to the context, one may guess that the text behind the Georgian translation suggests the Paraclete, a thread, however, not picked up in either *CantPar* or Ambrose. See, *CantPar* 13.2 ἡν ἀπολοῦσαι δύστην, τὴν παρ’ ἑαυτοῦ εὐωδίαν δι’ εὐσπλαγγίαν δηλῶν, “that he might be able to cleanse [them], manifesting his own aroma because of his good heart.” Cf. Ambrose *Exp. Ps. 118*, 3.8.2 (CSEL, 62, 45.3-6) *cum autem compunctum fuerit artificis manu, tunc lacrimam destillat; sicut et Christus in illo emptationis ligno crucifixus inlacrimabat populum, ut peccata nostra dilueret, et de uiceribus misericordiae suae fundebat unguentum* . . . “But whenever it is pierced by the skillful hand, then it distills a sap (tear). This did Christ weep for the people when crucified in that tree of temptation, that he might wash away our sins, and from his bowels of compassion he poured forth an anointing oil . . .”
³Cf. Jn 1:14 But cp. *CantPar*, 13.3 σώματι ἐσφύργετο, “he was bundled up/bound up in a body”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
<p>მდიდარი იგი დავლსაკნა ჩუენთუს, რათა ჩუენ სიმდიდრითა მისითა განემდიდრეთ. აწ ამიერიოგან, საყუარელნი, დამოკიდებულ ესე ძელსა, კეთილი სულბელება ნელსაცხები საა გამოჩნდა. რამეთუ დამდაბლა თავი¹ და წარმომართიებულ წარმომღერან² სიტყუამან მან და მას ჟამსა აღესნა; გამოფენილ სულბელება იგი, რათა მეწმე-ცა მოწყალებად განყოფისა გამოჩნდეს მარადის სცხებელის სულბელების მიფენითა განსამზიარებულ რამეთუ გამოეცა მამისა გულისაგან და ახარა ქუეყანასა.</p>	<p><i>In Cant.</i> The rich was made poor for us, that by his wealth we might be made rich.³ Then, beloved, from that time suspended there on wood, he gave off a good aroma of anointing oil. For he humbled himself and having stood up, the Word began to sing forth and in that time filled [the people]; the aroma was poured out that also the mercy of the economy might always appear bringing joy in the outpouring of the fragrant anointing for it was sent from the heart of the father and made known good news to the earth.</p>		

¹So *JT* for თავი თვის, “himself.”

²So *JT*, “was stood up.”

³Cf. 2 Cor 8:9, δι’ ὑμᾶς ἐπτώχευσεν πλοῦσιος ὄν, ἵνα ὑμεῖς τῆ ἐκείνου πτωχεῖα πλουτήσητε.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
13.4 თუთ აღმაღლდა ქუეყანით და გამოჩნდა კითარცა სულნელუბა სც სებელისა და აღისწრაფა ზეცად: ცით ¹ მოუენილ ქუეყანით ზეცად აღვიდოლა, რამეთუ ცუარი ნაყოფის გამოძლებელი მაღლით გარდამოვდა, რათა ქუეყანისანი ესე ცხორებად აღიბეჭდნენ, რომელ არს ესე: სიტყუად იგი გარდამოსრულ, რათა კაცნი ცად აღსლუად უმძიმლებულ იყვნენ. ესე სახეთა მთ მსგავსებაჲ გამოჩინებულ სიტყვთა მით, კითარბედ: “დისწულაკი ჩემი კენავოვანსა მას ენღადისასაო” ² .	13.4 He was lifted up from the earth and appeared as the aroma of the anointing oil and hurried to heaven. [That is] having been diffused from heaven, he was ascending from earth to heaven. For a dew was brought out from fruit and descended from on high, that terrestrial creatures might be sealed for life which is this: the Word descended that men might be able to ascend to heaven. This parable of types [is] clearly suggested in such words as: “My niece, in the vineyard of Engeddi.” ²	13.4 Λέγει οὖν· <Ἀδελφίδος μου ἐν ἀμπελώσιν Ἐγγεδδι>. nephew among the vineyards of Engeddi.”	

¹ზეცად J “to heaven.”

²Song 1:14 ἀδελφίδος μου ἐμοὶ ἐν ἀμπελώσιν Ἐγγεδδι.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
14.1 და მუწქუეს-ვე მოუგებს და იტყვს: “აჰა, მე შეუნიერ, მახლობელი ჩემო, აჰა მე შეუნიერო”*. ამას-ვე მოუგებს მეგრე- ცა: ¹ “ხოლო ² აღმარე მე ³ კეთილად, ამის სახისათვის უმეტესად აღვარო შენ შეუნიერო”.	14.1 And immediately he/she responds and says: “Behold, you are ^a beautiful, my dear, you are beautiful,” this likewise he/she repeats again. ^b [...] “But well have you confessed me, for this reason I declare all the more that you are very beautiful.”	14.1 Ἄντιφωνεῖ καὶ λέγει πάλιν ἐκείνος· Ἴδοὺ εἶ καλή, ἢ πλησίον μου, ἰδοὺ εἶ καλή [ἀδελφίδός μου]. Ὑπὸ πάντων γὰρ πεφίλησαι καὶ τῶν μὴ γινωσκόντων σε. Ἴδοὺ εἶ καλὸς ἀδελφίδός μου. Ὡμολόγησάς με καλόν, διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν ὁμολογῶ σε κάγῳ καλήν.	14.1 And Again he responds and says, “Behold you are beau- tiful, my neighbor, behold you are beau- tiful [my niece]. For by all you are loved even those who do not know you. Behold you are handsome, my nephew. Well have you confess me, for this very reason I also will confess you as beautiful.	14.1 Again he calls out: You have known me well. Also I know you.

¹So *TJ* but should read ხარ, “you,” according to Garitte.

²*J* adds რამეთუ, “for, because.”

³*J* omits, “me.”

^aSee textual note 3 above. “Behold I am,” *J T*. Should be read, following Garitte, as “behold you are.” Armenian *bu*, *es* = “you are” or “I,” has likely been incorrectly translated from Armenian *Vorlage* (so, Garitte, 264.36). However, the confusion in this text may arisen earlier in Hippolytus’ own comment in Greek on Song 1:15 ἰδοὺ εἶ καλή ἢ πλησίον μου ἰδοὺ εἶ καλή, “Well have you confessed me.” The original text is here preserved in *CantPar*. The line preserved in *CantPar* probably dropped from *In Cant*. 14.1 by homoeoteleuton: Ὑπὸ πάντων γὰρ πεφίλησαι καὶ τῶν μὴ γινωσκόντων σε. Ἴδοὺ εἶ καλὸς ἀδελφίδός μου. “You have been loved by all, even those who do not know you. Behold, you are handsome, my nephew . . .” Once this line dropped out of the text, it became difficult to know who was speaking to whom.

^bThe paraphrase reads, ἀντιφωνεῖ.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
14.2 აწ უბუე რაჲ-მე არს იგი, რომელსა-იგი ქრისტე იტყვს, კითარბმელ “მუნეიერი ეგე-ო”, არა-მედ დისოვს თუ “მკნდე, ასულო, მიგეტენენებ შენ ცოდუანი შენნი?”*.	14.2 Now therefore, what is this that Christ says, “that beautiful one,” except this: “Have courage, daughter. Your sins are forgiven you.” ¹	14.2 Τι δὲ ἦν τὸ εἰπεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν· Καλὴ εἶ, ἀλλ’ ἦ· "Θάρσει, θύγατερ, ἀφέωνται σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι”.	4.2 And what does the thing Christ says, “You are beautiful,” mean except, “Take courage, daughter, your sins are forgiven.”	14.2 Of whom, however, is it that Christ speaks: “Beautiful ones”? Have courage, O daughter, your sins are forgiven.

Georgian

15.1 მოუგო მერმე-ცა და თქუა: “აჰა მე² კეთილ, დის-წულაკო ჩემო, და მუნეიერ”*, რამეთუ ყოველთა მე³ სყუარელ და მათა-ცა, რომელთა არა გიცინ შენ, რამეთუ მას ჟამს, რომელთა-ცა არა იცოდეს, მიუწეებულ იქმნეს ქრისტეს მიერ. მაშინ კეთილად ბულისბნის-მყოველ წამონ. და თქუა: “მ ბრძენ ვინმე არს კაცი ესე და დიდ და არა ცნობილ, კითარბმელ ღმერთი არს! აწ ამიერთობან, მ კაცნო, ბულისბნსა-ყავთ, რაჲ-ესე წინა-გვც.

In Cant.

15.1 She answered again and said: “Behold you³ are good, my nephew and beautiful.”^{2,4} For you are⁵ beloved by all, even by who have not known you.⁶ For in that time, those who indeed did not know were given the good news^a through Christ. Then, knowing well,^b they will testify and say, “O, how wise and great is this man, who was not known as God!” Now henceforth, O people, you were made to know the one that before was made known to us.

¹Mat 9:22b; *CantPar* 14.6, Τι δὲ ἦν τὸ εἰπεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν· Καλὴ εἶ, ἀλλ’ ἦ· “Θάρσει, θύγατερ, ἀφέωνται σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι.”

²So *T J* but should read ხარ, “you,” according to Garitte. See 14.1 n. 3 above, 18.2 n. 1 below.

³*J T* read “I,” but, as Garitte suggests, “me” should be read “you.”

⁴Song 1:16 ἰδοὺ εἶ καλὸς ὁ ἀδελφιδὸς μου καὶ γε ὠραῖος.

⁵See note a on page 317.

⁶Cf. Ps 78.6; Jer 10:25, ἔπαυον πῖν ὀργῆν σου ἐπὶ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ γινώσκοντά σε. And *Vetus Testamentum iberice: codd. Oshki & Jerusalem* Part No. 316, <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/ageo/at/oskijet/oskij.htm?os-kij325.htm>: გარდაასნ როსგაჲ შენი წარმართთა ზელა, რომელთა არა გიცინან შენ. *CantPar* 14.1, Ὑπὸ πάντων γὰρ πεφύλησται καὶ τῶν μὴ γινωσκόντων σε. See *In Cant.* 2.33.

^aGaritte, *edocti facti*, Lit. *notificati facti*. The Georgian word მოუწეებულ is the passive participle of მოუწეება, “to evangelize.”

^bGaritte, *bene intelligentes*.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
15.2 “აჰა მე შუენიერ, ღოს-წულაკო ჩემო, და გაკეთებულ-ცა, ცხე-ღარსა მას ჩემსა მაგრილობელ” ^a . რაჲ-მე ეკულების თქუმაღ სამკვდრებელისა მისთვის? რამეთუ იტყვს, ვითარმედ ^b “ცხედარსა მას ზედა კეთილად მავრილობელ” ^c . მოგუასწავებს გულისასა მას მაღლსა, რომელ მაგრილობელ არს ყოველთა, რომელთა ხორმაკი შემთხვოს,	15.2 “Behold you are beautiful, my nephew, and also handsome, casting a shadow on my couch.” ^a What does he mean to say concerning his residence ^b ? For he says, “upon the couch you are casting a shadow well” teaches us the grace of the Spirit, that overshadows all who will encounter burning heat. ^c	15.2 Ἐπεφώνησε πάλιν ἡ ἀντὴ καὶ λέγει· Ἴδοὺ εἶ καλὸς ἀδελφιδὸς μου καὶ γε ὠρφανὸς πρὸς κλίνην ἡμῶν σύσκιος, δοκοὶ οἴκων ἡμῶν κέδροι. Τίνα δὲ βούλεται λέγειν τὴν κατοικίαν; Λέγει γάρ· πρὸς κλίνην ἡμῶν σύσκιος· πάντως τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος χάριν σκᾶπτῃν γενομένην πᾶσι τοῖς κασσουμένοις.	15.2 Again she herself called out and says, “Behold you are handsome, my nephew, and fair indeed you cover our bead with shade. The beams of our house are cedar. But what does he mean concerning the dwelling place? For he says, you cover our bead with shade. In every way the grace of the Spirit has become a covering to all who are burning up with heat.	5.2 “Upon my resting place is a shadow.” What might this mean? It means the grace of the Spirit, which is a protection (canopy) for those who are in the heat. Because as in the heat someone hurries to rest in the shade, so also each one overcoming (laid down) sin hurries under those arms of the Lord, around whom the protection (“the canopy”) of the Spirit casts a shadow, “our couch shaded.”

¹Garitte suggests this should be read as “you.” See note a on page 317.

²ვითარმედ written above the line in a second hand in *J*.

^aSong 1:16 ἰδοὺ εἶ καλὸς ὁ ἀδελφιδὸς μου καὶ γε ὠραῖος πρὸς κλίνην ἡμῶν σύσκιος.

^bOr “inheritance, dominion.”

^c*CantPar* 15.2 πᾶσι τοῖς κασσουμένοις. Cp. *Dan. Com.* 1.16, “those destined for the flames” are baptized and anointed with fragrant oil by Faith and Love.

Georgian

15.3 რამეთუ ვითარცა სახედ, რომელნი ხორშკისაგან საგრილთა აღვილთა მიივლტიედ განსუენებ საოგს მას¹ ქუეშე, ესრე სახედ-ცა ბე caught up in sin may gladly hurry to the shelter of Christ, მიიხწრავედ საგრილსა მას ქრისტესსა, რათთა საგრილსა მას სულსა წმიდისასა მიიწიოს.² “ცხედარსა მას ჩუენსა ზელა კეთილად მგრილობედლ”³.*

In Cant.

For in the same way as those who [endure] flee from the fire to a shady place to rest under them^a so also those who might be caught up in sin may gladly hurry to the shelter of Christ, that they might seek the shadow of the Holy Spirit. “Upon our couch” well “do you cast your shadow.”

Georgian	In Cant.	Greek CantPar	CantPar	Paleo-Slavonic
16.1 “კელ სახლთა ჩუენთა ხეთაგან ნაძუ-თაისა” ⁴ * აწ ვინ არიან ესე, არამედ მამანო? ⁵ რამეთუ ვითარცა სახედ ნაძე არა დღობის, ესრე სახედ დიდებამ იგი მამათაო არა დფარულ.	16.1 “The beams (or woodwork) ^b of our houses are from spruce trees.” ⁴ Now, what are these but the fathers? For in the same way a spruce does not decay, so also the glory of the fathers is not hidden.	16.1 Δοκοὶ οἴκων ἡμῶν κέδροι. Τίνας δοκοὶ κέδρινοι, ἀλλ’ ἢ πατέρες καὶ πατεράρχαι; Ὅν γὰρ τρόπον ἡ κέδρος οὐ σήπεται, οὕτω καὶ δόξα πατέρων οὐκ ἀπολείπεται. Πατρῴματα ἡμῶν κητήριστοι.	16.1 Our beams are cedar. What are these cedar beams, but the ancestors and the : For in the same way that cedar does not rot, neither is the glory of the ancestors destroyed.	16.1 “The beams however are Cedar, ours are Cypress.” What are these however if not the fathers? Rather just as the Cedar does not rot, so also the fame of the fathers will not die.

¹ *T J* read მას, “him/it” according to Garitte, მათ “them” should be read.

² მიიწიოს “he might seek” *T J*, according to Garitte, მიიწიონ, “they might seek,” should be read.

³ *J* adds იგი.

⁴ Song 1:17 δοκοὶ οἴκων ἡμῶν κέδροι, “the beams of our houses are cedar.”

^a *T J* read “it.” See textual note 1 above.

^b Lit. “hand[work].”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
16.2 “სათხეველ ¹ ჩუენდა საროსავან ² ”: რამეთუ სათხეველსა ყოველი იგი მოქმნილუბა უტვროავს. ჰ სუუარუნო, საროსა ყუავილი არასდა ² მოაკლდები ³ , არამედ აქუ მსგავსება ⁴ იგი თუსი სმარადისოდ და ეგრე-ჰმ ჰგიენ ზაფხულსა და ზამთარსა. ეგრე-ცა სახედ მოციქულინი არასადა დამცირდიან, სათხეველ და სამტკიცებელ ეკლესიათა არიან. ხოლო აქუს ძალი სულისა წმიდისა უძლეუბითა და რომელი იგი მას ზელა არნ, უქმძლებელ არნ ჰყრობად. “სათხეველ ჩუენდა საროსავან”.	16.2 “A pillar ^a for us of cypress” ¹ : for a pillar supports the entire structure (<i>or</i> is supported). O beloved, the flower of the cypress never diminishing, but has its likeness forever, and remains in the same state both in spring and winter. In the same manner the apostles are never diminished. They are a beam and mainstay of the churches; moreover they have power by ability of the Holy Spirit, and the one who is above it is able to hold [it] fast. “A pillar for us of cypress.”	16.2 Πατνώματα γὰρ εἰσὶν οἱ ἀπόστολοι, τὴν πᾶσαν ὀροφὴν ὑποβαστάζοντες. Ὡστερ δὲ ἡ κυπάρισσος οὐκ ἀποβάλλεται ποτε τὸ ἀνθος, ἔχει δὲ ἐν ἑαυτῇ πάντοτε τὴν μορφὴν καὶ χειμῶνος καὶ θέρους, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι οὐ λείπτουσι πατνώματα κυπρίσσου ἐκκλησίας ὑπάρχομετες.	16.2 For the roof beams are the apostles, supporting the whole ceiling. And just as the cypress does not ever loose its flower, but always maintains its form in both winter and summer, in the same way also the apostles are not missing, since they are the cedar ceiling beams of the church.	16.2 But our framework is holding the whole roof. Because the Cypress, beloved, never loses its flower, rather it always keeps its same shape in the winter and in the summer; in the same way the apostles always [are] the roof rafters of the church.

¹სათხეველ, “wood attachment in brick-work” *J*. The ὰ and Ⴑ are easily confused.

²არასდა, “never” Garitte reads არა სდა “no where.”

³მოაკლდეს, “was becoming weak,” imp. *J*.

⁴From here to 20.3 *J* has a lacuna of one folio. See note at 20.3.

^aOr, “reinforcing wall beam,” CDEG, s.v. “სათხეველი.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
17.1 ოწყვბს ამიერთგან ქებად თავის თვისსა გამართლებითა და იტყვს: “მე ყუვილ ველის” * რამეთუ არა ¹ სივრცესა ქუეყანისასა განვენოდ არს, რამეთუ შენდა სარწმუნოებითა აპა, ყუვილ კარ ყოველითა კაცთა, და არს ესე მსგავს, რამეთუ რაჟამს წინა- დაცუეთილოთგანსა კის-მე პრწმენეს ქრისტესი და ყუვილის სახედ გამონდთან, ძუელისა და ახლისა შემბლუბელ არს.	<i>In Cant.</i> 17.1 She begins from this place to praise herself by justifying herself, and says, “I am a flower of the field” ^{2a} : for she is already (<i>or</i> not) ^b spread out over the breadth of the earth. For by faith in you behold I am the flower for all people. And this is a likeness, for when someone from the circumcision believes in Christ they will appear as a flower, able [to bring forth] both new and old.	17.1 Ἄρχεται λουπὸν ἑαυτὴν ἐπ᾿αἰνεῖν καὶ λέγειν δικαιουμένη· Ἐγὼ ἄνθος τοῦ ἄγρου ὡς κριθὸν τῶν κοιλιάδων, ὡσεὶ κριθὸν ἐν μέσῳ ἄκανθῶν. Ἐγὼ πλάτος τοῦ κόσμου ἦδη σχορπιζομένη, σοὶ πιστεύουσα ἅνθος γεγένημαι παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις. Καὶ γὰρ ἔστι θεωρηῆσαι ἴνα, ἕαν τις ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστεύσῃ Χριστῷ, πῶς ἄνθος ἔσθι παλαιὰ καὶ νέα φθεγγόμενος.	17.1 Next the church begins to put itself forward and to with justification to say, “I am a flower of the field as a lily of the valleys, as a lily in the midst of thorns. I who am already scattered over the breadth of the world, believing in you, have become a flower to all people. For it is [remarkable] to see that, if someone from the circumcision believes in Christ, he is as a flower that whis- pers both new and old things.	17.1 (The church) begins to actually praise itself and speaks righteously. Because it is to be seen, if someone from circumcision believes in Christ that person is “a flower”, which is able to unite “old and new.”

¹ *TJ* read რამეთუ არა, should be read as რამეთუ .. უპიპე.

^{2a} Song 2:2 ἔγὼ ἄνθος τοῦ πεδίου.

^b The Georgian (or Armenian) translator has perhaps misread ἦδη γὰρ=უპიპე as οὐδε γὰρ = რამეთუ არა. Garitte translates, *non in latitudine*, “not in the breadth.” See *CantPar*, 17.1, Ἐγὼ πλάτος τοῦ κόσμου ἦδη σχορπιζομένη, σοὶ πιστεύουσα ἄνθος γεγένημαι παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις. “I am already scattered over the breadth of the earth, I have become to you a faithful flower for all humanity.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>17.2 “მე ყუკვილი, ვითარცა შრომანი ღელეთაჲ და ვითარცა შრომანი შროის ეკლოვანთა”*. # მართლის მის პიროსანი განცხადებულნი ზრახვანი, რომელ იგუთა ამათ შინა გამოჩნდეს! რამეთუ იტყვს, ვითარმელ; “მე ყუკვილ კელის, ვითარცა შრომანი ღელეთასა და ვითარცა შრომანი შროის ეკლოვანს”. სულწელებას მას შრომნისას სახედ გვჩუენებს წმიდათა, რამეთუ ვითარცა სახედ არს შრომანი მრწინეაჲლჳ შუენიერებისა გამოცემულ, ესრე სახედცა საქმენი მართალნი ბრწინევენ და ღელეხსა ყუკვიან. ეგრეცა სახედ დამცირებულთა მიმართ მალნი იგი აღორძენებიან და ვითარცა შროის ეკალთა ქუეყანასა საქმეთა არა დაიშენიან.</p>	<p>17.2 “I am a flower as a lily of the valleys and as a lily among the thorny [bushes].” O the manifested mysteries of the mouth of the righteous which appeared in these parables! For it says that, “I am a flower of the field, as a lily of the valley and as a lily among the thorns.” The aroma of the lilies as a type exhibits to us [that] of the saints. For just as the lilies are brought out glorious in beauty, in the same way the righteous works are brilliant and flourish in the valleys, in the same way to those who are humbled (<i>lit.</i> made small) will graces increase and are not suffocated as among the thorns¹ of earthly works.</p>	<p>17.2 Τὴν εὐώδταν τοῖσιν τοῦ κρῖνου παρῆβαλε τῆ ὁμοιότητι τῶν ἀγίων. Ὅν γὰρ τρόπον τὸ κρῖνον εὐωδιδάξει, οὕτω καὶ οἱ ἄγιοι, τῶν ἐν τῷ βῆρ ἀνθρώπων ὡς ἀκανθῶν ἀποπυργομένων, μὴ σφραγισοῖσι.</p>	<p>17.2 Accordingly she emits the fragrance of the Lord in the likeness of the saints. In the same way the lily emits a aroma, so also the saints produce anointing oil, while people by life are choked as by thorns.</p>	<p>17.2 “I am a flower of the field; like a lily of the valleys in the midst of thorns. From the mouth of the righteous (or “from a righteous mouth) secrets in allegories are clearly made known. He puts forth the aroma of the lily as a picture of the just because of the brightness of the lily. So also the works of the righteous are illuminated. In the valley however the flowers are as among thorns. <So> grace sprang up, as “in the midst of of the thorns” the works (actions) of this life.</p>

¹ Ambrose *Exp. Ps. 118*, 5.7.2 (CSEL, 62, 86.4-7), expands this figure of Hippolytus.

Georgian

17.3 და პირად-პირადი, კითარცა¹ სახც შრომნისა, გვრუნა სახედ ჳემართებისა. თავსა თვისსა გამოაჩინებს, რამეთუ არს მას შინა ოქროს ფერ-ცა, რამეთუ დაფლვითა ველთა მიერ განშუენებითა გამოლესულ და შეპყრობილ, კითარცა ჳორცნი იგი ქრისტესნი სულსა მიერ დაცკულ, გინა თუ რომელთა-მე ველნი ურწმუნოვებითა² შებღალულ, ხოლო რომელსა პრწმენეს, სულელუებითა სცხებლისა მისისათა გამხიარულდენ. რამეთუ თეთრსა მას განრეულ არს ოქროს ფერი-ცა. რამეთუ სულსა მას შინა გვრუნებს ჳორცთა მათ კნებას, რათა ზრახვად იგი მიმო-ფენისა გამოჩნდეს ყოველთა მართალთა აღსარებითა და ბრწყინ-ვალებასა სულსასა მოგებითა. “მე ყუავილ ველის, კითარცა შრო-მანი ღელეთად და კითარცა შრომანი შორის ეკლოვანს”.

In Cant.

17.3 And in various ways the form of lilies has revealed to us a type of the truth. It demonstrates itself because there is in it also the color of gold. For through planting with equipment³ it is brought forth and taken, even as the flesh of Christ made secure by the Spirit lest it [be taken] by anyone whose hands are stained by unbelief. On the other hand, [the lilies] gladden the one who believes by means of the aroma of his anointing oil. For the color of white is also mixed with gold, which in the Spirit reveals to us the passion of the flesh, that the mystery of the diffusion might appear to all the righteous by confessing and glorifying the acquisition of the Spirit. “I am a flower of the field like a lily of the valley and like a lily among thorns.”³³

¹ According to Garitte, it appears this word should be deleted. It probably entered the text mechanically with სახც.

² ურწმუნოვებითა T. Garitte reads ურწმუნოებითა.

³ Song 2:1-2 ἐγὼ ἄνθος τοῦ πεδίου κρίνον τῶν κοιλιάδων ὡς κρίνον ἐν μέσῳ ἀκανθῶν οὕτως ἡ πληροῖον μου ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν θυματέων

³³ Or “furnishing/ornamentation.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
18.1 აწ რომელთა სულნელეება ეჲ ეჲოწნარეს, ეტყეს: “აჰა მე შუენიერ, მახლობლო ჩემო” და მერმე-ცა იტყეს, ვითარმედ: “აჰა მე შუენიერ”. და ამას ქრისტესთვის იტყეს: “და აჰა მე ¹ გაკეუბულ, დის-წული ჩემო, ვითარცა კაშლი ხეთა მანდარისთაჲ”*. 18.2 რამეთუ ვითარცა სახედ, საყუარედნო, ვამლისეგან გამოეცემის სულნელეება უმეტეს ყოველთა ხილთას, ეგრე-ცა ქრისტე შორის ყოველთა წინააღმდეგობ-ყუელთა ზედ ძელს მას მოკიდებულ სულნელეებას, ვითარ-ცა კამლისას, გამოსცემდა.	18.1 Now to those whom received this aroma he says: “Behold you are beautiful, my dear” (Song 1:15). And once again (<i>or</i> then also) he says the same thing: “Behold you are handsome, ²² and she says this of Christ, and “Indeed, behold you are a handsome one, my nephew, as an apple tree among the trees of the forrest.” ²³ 18.2 For just as, beloved, the aroma is wafted from an apple tree more than that of all the fruits, so also is Christ among all the prophets suspended on the wood was sending forth an aroma like [that of] the apple tree. ⁴	18.1 Τῆς οὖν εὐωδίας ταύτης μετέχων λέγει αὐτῇ· Ἴδοὺ εἶ καλὴ ἢ πλησίον μου, ἰδοὺ εἶ καλή. Ἡ δὲ πρὸς Χριστόν· Ἴδοὺ εἶ καλός· 18.2 οὕτω καὶ Χριστὸς ἀνὰ μέσον πάντων προφητῶν ἐπὶ ξύλου πηγνύμενος τὴν εὐωδίαν ὡς μῆλον παρδείχeto. ὡς μῆλον ἐν τοῖς ξύλοις τοῦ δρυμοῦ οὕτως ἀδελφιδός μου. Ὅν γὰρ τρόπον, ἀγαπητοί, ἐν μῆλῳ πάρεστιν εὐωδία παρὰ πᾶν ἀκροθρυον, οὕτω καὶ Χριστὸς ἀνὰ μέσον πάντων προφητῶν ἐπὶ ξύλου πηγνύμενος τὴν εὐωδίαν ὡς μῆλον παρδείχeto.	18.1 Partaking in this aroma, therefore, he says to her: “Behold you are beautiful, my neighbor, behold you are beautiful.” And she says to Christ, “Behold you are handsome. 18.2 And she says to Christ, “Behold you are handsome. As an apple tree among the trees of the forrest so are you my nephew. In the same way, beloved, that in the apple tree there is present a aroma that is better than any fruit tree, so also is Christ among all the prophets upon the cross he gives forth his aroma as an apple tree. My nephew answers and says to me: Come, my neighbor, you are beautiful, my dove.”

¹So *T J* but should read ხარ, “you,” according to Garitte. See above chap. 14.1 n. 3-15.1 n. 1.

²*T* reads “I.” See note a on page 317.

³Song 2:3 ὡς μῆλον ἐν τοῖς ξύλοις τοῦ δρυμοῦ οὕτως ἀδελφιδός μου

⁴Echoed also in Ambrose *Exp. Ps. 118*, 5.9.1 (CSEL, 62, 86.25-27), *Christus ergo adfixus ad lignum, sicut malum pendens in arbore, bonum odorem mundanae fundebat redemptionis, quia peccati grauis detergit factorem et unguentum potus uitalis effudit*. “Christ therefore fastened to the cross, as an apple hanging from a tree, gave off a good aroma of redemption, which swept away the perpetrator of oppressive sin and, once absorbed, spread out the anointing oil of life.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
19.1 და იტყვს, ვითარ- მედ: “აჰა ესერა დის- წულაკი ჩემი მომიგებს და იტყვს: ‘მომეახლე, მახ- ლობლო და მუხიერებო ჩემო, ტრედაკო ჩემო, განსრულებული ჩემო.’” ¹ აწ კუმპროიტად ამას ტრე- დას იტყვს დასახლეულე- ბით, რამეთუ მოუწეს მას წადიერებით და იტყვს: “მოველით ჩემდა ყოველნი ეგე მსმურალნი და ტვრთ- მძიმენი” ² . აწ ვინ-მე არს ტვრთ-მძიმე იგი, არათუ შესაკრებელთა მათ, რომელთა მიმართ იტყვდა?	19.1 And indeed she says: “Behold my nephew responds and says: ‘Come near to me, my dear neighbor and my beauty, my little dove, my perfect one.’” ^{1a} Now in truth he says to her, “dove” with gentleness [...] Because he calls her with desire, saying: “Come to me all you who are weary and heavy-burdened.” ² Now who is this person who is heavy-burdened if not the synagogues, ^b to whom it was said?	19.1 <Ἀδελφιδὸς μου ἀποκρινεται καὶ λέγει μοι: Ἐλθέ, ἡ πλησίον μου, καλή μου, περις- τερά μου>. Δικαίως ταύτην λοιπὸν περιστερῶν καλεῖ εἰς ἡμερότητα τρεπομένην.	19.1 My nephew responds and says to me, “Com, my neighbor, my beauty, my dove.” Rightly does he call her dove from now on in order for her to be turned toward tameness.	19.1 With truth he calls her “dove”, comparing her with meekness. “Beautiful one” he calls her, saying: He names (calls) her beautiful, saying: “Come everyone striving and burdened and I will give you rest.” Who, then, was burdened, if not the synagogue, to whom he speaks?

¹Lit. “with gentleness.” Garitte suggest that there is a lacuna in the text. Cp. *CantPar* 19.1, Δικαίως ταύτην λοιπὸν περιστερῶν καλεῖ εἰς ἡμερότητα τρεπομένην. “Rightly he calls her “dove” hereafter as one that is being tamed.”

²For “burden-heavy,” see Stanslas Lyonet, *Les origines de la version arménienne et le Diatessaron* (Biblica et orientalia 13; Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1950), 17-19, 161. The phrase appears in Mat 11:28 various versions of Old Georgian Gospels. And elsewhere in the Shatberd ms., e.g. *Ben. Mos.* (Georgian) 21.39 აწ რომელთა-მე ძმათა იქნა შეწყნარებულ, არამედ ნათესავთა შორიელთა მოწოდებულთა, რომელთა მიმართ-ცა იტყვოდა: “მოველით ჩემდა ყოველნი ეგე მსმურალნი და ტვრთ-მძიმენი და მე განვისუენო თქვენ. მიიღეთ უღელი ჩემი, რამეთუ წმიდა ვარ და მდაბალ გულისა. და მიიღოთ განსსუენებელი თავთა თვისთა, რამეთუ უღელი ჩემი ტკბილ არს და ტვირთი ჩემი სუბუქ?” “Now, which of the brothers were accepted, except those invited from the distant relatives, indeed toward these it was said, “Come to me all those who are tired and burden-heavy and I will give you rest. Take my yoke, for I am holy and meek of soul. And you will receive a resting place for yourselves, for my yoke is sweet and my burden is light.” See <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/ageo/gh/satberd/satbe.htm?satbe173.htm>.

^aSong 2:10 ἀποκρινεται ἀδελφιδὸς μου καὶ λέγει μοι ἀνάστα ἔλθέ ἡ πλησίον μου καλή μου περιστερά μου
^bLit. “congregations.” See note b on page 289.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
19.2 მახლობელად დამენას მას უწესს ამას. და აწ დამენად იგი რაა-მე არს, საყუარუნდო, არამედ, კითარცა მარჯულ ზღუდეს თანა? რამეთუ შესვედრებულ წინაშე ზღუდეს იგი არს. მოვედ, შემბეკებულ სხარეგას, რათათა თანა- სწორ მართათა იპოვო მახლობელად დამენათა მით.	19.2 Near the grafting ¹ he calls her. And now, what is the grafting, beloved, except as if right of the wall? For there is [for us] a refuge near the wall, “Come, come near to the gospel that you might be found truly with the righteous near the grafting.” ^{2a}	19.2 Ἐχόμενα τοῦ προστεύματος προσκαλεῖ ταύτην. Προτεύματα δὲ προμαχρὸν ἐστὶ τειχῶν. Ἐλθέ, φησὶν, ἐγγὺς ἀσφαλείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης τοῦ προστεύματος, ἵνα δικαίων κοινωνῶς γένηι.	19.2 She calls to her while she is close to the outwork of the wall. And the outwork is a bulwark/defensive construction of walls. “Come near,” he says, “to security and righteousness of the outwork, so that you may be a friend with the righteous.”	

¹ Cf 2:14 Ἐχόμενα τοῦ προτεύματος. This is a clear case of mistranslation based on Armenian interference or *Vorlage*. Garitte follows Marr, *Ippolit*, p. LVII-LVIII, reading *ლაყნა* as “alcove” assuming a connection with an Armenian *Vorlage*. *ყაჟაჟაჟი* (*patuast*) = “to graft” while *ყაჟაჟაჟი* (*patuar*) = bulwark, rampart. The word, in Georgian means “grafting,” and is not an architectural term. See *ADW*, s.v. “ლაყნა,” as in *NTI Paul AB Rom 11.17* უკუეთუ ვინმე რჭოთა მათგანი გარდასტყედეს, ხოლო შენ ვეკლუნი ზეთისხილი იყავ და ლაყენ მათ ზედა და თანა-ზიარ ძირის მის და სპობის ზეთისხილის იქენ . . . “While some branches were broken away, but you were a wild olive tree and you were grafted upon them and in (their) place of the root . . .” The meaning “outwork” on a wall must be due to Armenian influence.

^{2a} Cf. Rom. 11:17-24.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
19.3 “მჩუენე პირი შენი და მასინე ვმა შენი, რამეთუ ძველ არს პირი შენი და ვმა შენი შეუენიერ”*. “მჩუენე მე პირი შენი და მასინე ვმა შენი”. კადნიერებით აჩუენე შენ ქრისტეანება აღეჭლ-ვითა შეჯღას ზელა. “მასინე ვმა შენი”. ათარე გამოთქუმით ჭემპართება.	19.3 “Show me your face and let me hear your voice, for your face is peaceful and your voice is beautiful.” ^a “Show me your face and let me hear your voice,” [means] show your Christianity with boldness, with a seal ^b on the forehead. “Let me hear your voice,” [That is] speak out by professing the truth. “Show me your face and let me hear your voice, for it is peaceful and sweet.” He says this concerning [the one] whom has confessed Christ. And [her] face is beautiful who one who has boldness through him.	19.3 Δεῖξόν μοι τὴν ὄψιν σου καὶ ἀκούσόν με τὴν φωνήν σου· ὅτι ἡδεῖα ἢ φωνή σου καὶ ἡ ὄψις σου ὠραία. Ἀκούσθεισος γὰρ ψυχῆς, μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς συναγωγῆς, καὶ ὁμολογησάσης Χριστὸν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, ἡδεῖα ἢ φωνή, χαροποιὰ ἢ ὄψις τῆς πίστεως, παρρησιαζομένη δὲ ἀποκρίνεται καὶ λέγει· Μυστήριον γὰρ μυστηριωδῶς σοι βούλομαι φράσαι ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ὅσα ἐπιχειρημένως εἰς τὰ μέλλοντα ἡμῖν ἐκφύεσθαι ἐξηγήσατο.	19.3 Show me your countenance and hear my voice because your voice is pleasant and your countenance is fair. For once the soul has been made to hear, rather the synagogue, and having confessed Christ in truth, his voice is pleasant, the countenance of faith is bright, and she is made bold he answers and says, “For a mystery I wish to speak mysteriously to you from now as many things as in a hidden way to be born for the future have been explained.	19.3 “Show me your face and let me hear your voice”: With boldness (frankness) you must show the “seal” of Christianity carrying [it] on the forehead. “Let me hear your voice”: confess, speaking the truth. Because “sweet” is your voice, confessing Christ and “beautiful” is your appearance, which is bold for him.

^aSong 2:14 δεῖξόν μοι τὴν ὄψιν σου καὶ ἀκούστίσόν με τὴν φωνήν σου ἡδεῖα καὶ ἡ ὄψις σου ὠραία.
^bChappuzeau, “Auslegung,” *JAC* 19: 63, suggests this is the sign of the cross, which boldly signifies faith by which the devil is destroyed. This sign of the cross is likely place on the believer at the postbaptismal anointing. This interpretation is supported by Ambrose *Exp. Ps. 118*, 6.33.3 (CSEL, 62, 125.14-15), who borrows Hippolytus’ figure and specifies the “seal” as the sign of the cross, *ostendit ergo faciem suam signalacum crucis praeferens et insinuat uocem suam auctoritatem praedicationis adsumens*. “She shows her face bearing the sign of the cross and insinuates by her voice a claim of authority.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
20.1 და მიუკვებ და იტყვს: “გვყრებით მელნი განმრეულნი კენასისანი, რამეთუ კენასნი ჩუენნი ყუვიან” [*] # სანატრელსა ჳმისაჲ, # ჳემართებესა სიმართ- ლოთ მიმოღებულ. რომ- ლისა ჳელითა მწკალუ- ბელნი შეკრობილ. შეგვ- ყრებით მელნი მცირენი, ვიდრე ჩველ-და იყვენ ¹ ; შეიკობალებით, რათა არა იყვენ განსრულე- ბულ; ზაკულეობითა კენასუკანნი, ვიდრე ყუვილსა შინა არიან, ალაკსენ. რომელსა სწავლოთ იტყვს. ²	20.1 And she answers and says: “Catch for us the foxes that are spoi- ling the vines, for our vines are bearing flow- ers.” ^a O blessed voice! O truth widely known by righteousness, by the hand of which the heretics are caught! Catch for us the little foxes while they are yet young. Be on your guard, lest they grow up; [lest] they fill the vines with evil things while they are in bloom. Which he says teaching.	20.1 Εἰπούσης γὰρ αὐτῆς ὅτι ἀκούουσόν με τὴν φωνήν σου, ἐπάγει λέγουσα· Πιάσατε ἡμῖν ἀλώπεκας μικροὺς ὁ ἀφανίζοντας ἀμπε- λώνας καὶ ἀμπελώνες ἡμῖν κωπρίζουσιν. Οἶδά σε δὲ πυθόμενον με καὶ περὶ τοῦ Σαμ- ψὸν πολλὰ καὶ τί φησι τὰ ἄλλωποὺς ἐκράτησε κέρκον πρὸς κέρκον διήσας”;	20.1 Once she said, “Cause me to hear your voice, she proposes saying, “Catch for us the little foxes that are destroying the vines and our vines are in bloom.” I know you who inquires of me even concerning Samson often why he says these things : “take hold of the foxes and join them tail to tail.”	20.1 He ("she"?) an- swers however and says: [“Catch us the foxes, which spoil the vineyard there our vineyards flower.”] O blessed voice and (?) the truth which right- eously is widely made known, by which the heretics are driven out like foxes in the narrow place! Catch for us the small foxes, which spoil the vineyards! As they are still small, catch them, let them not grow up and fill the vineyard (with) evil.

¹ *T* reads იყვენს but it should be read იყვენ; ს and ნ are easily confused.

² *J* resumes here after a lacuna of one folio from chapter 16.

^a Song 2:15 πιάσατε ἡμῖν ἀλώπεκας μικροὺς ἀφανίζοντας ἀμπελώνας καὶ αἱ ἀμπελοὶ ἡμῶν κωπρίζουσιν

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
რამეთუ იტყვს: ¹ “გვკყენით ჩუენ მელნი მცირენი”, არა სხუასა რას იტყვს, არამედ ამას, კითარებელ: “წკალუბაჲ აღილეთ შორის თქუენსა-ო”, რაჲთა წმიდად ნამწუარევი იგი გამოჩნდეს, უკუეთუ გინდეს გულისხმის- ყოფად, შ კაცო, რამეთუ მელ მწკალუბელთასა იტყვს.	When (<i>or</i> For) he says, “Catch for us the little foxes,” indeed he means nothing other than this: “Destroy heresy among yourselves,” so that what is burned ² will appear holy (Cf. 1 Cor 5:7; 3:12, 13.), if you wish to understand, O man, for [he says] “foxes” meaning heretics.	Μυστηριωδῶς δὲ τὰς μελλούσας ἀνακνήπειν αιρέσεις προεσημή- νατο ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡ βίβ- λος αὐτῆ ἀλώπεκας τοὺς ψευδοπροφήτας λέγει καὶ ψευδο- χριστοὺς. Τὶ δέ φησι μαρτύς: Ὡς γὰρ ἔτι, φησί, νηπιάζουσι, σλλάβετε αὐτάς, ἵνα μὴ αὐξήσαντες τοὺς ἀμπελώνας κακίας ἐμπλήσωσι τοὺς καπρῶζοντας τὸ ἄνθος τῆς πίστεως.	He was indicating in a mystery the heresies that in the future would raise their heads in which even this very book calls the false prophets foxes and false christis. Why does he say “little”? For he means take hold of them while they are yet young, so that they may not grow up and fill with evil the vines that are in the bloom of faith.	But this, he says, as a warning: “Catch for us the small foxes,” meaning nothing other than: Take heresy away from you, so that the lump of dough would be pure.” Understand, O people that he shows the heretics rightly as foxes. For the false prophets are nothing other as the heretics; the heretics are false teachers and lying preachers.

¹J adds კითარებელ.

²Garitte suggests ნამწუარევი იგი, “what is burned/scorched,” is the dough of the passover loaf, following Marr, *Ippolit*, XLIX. See Bonwetch, *Hippolytis Kommentar*, 53 and PS.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>რამეთუ ცრუ წინააღმდეგობა მტყულები იგი არა თუ სხუა რამე იყვნეს, არამედ მწვალებელ. რამეთუ რომელნი-იგი ნაცელისა ასწავებენ და ცილს ქაღალტებენ, იგინი მწვალებელ არიან, რამეთუ იერემიას რამეთუ იერემიას ღალატებს და იტყვს: "აჰ, ცრუ წინააღმდეგობა მტყულები იგი უკნნი, იერუსალიმ, ვითარცა მელნი ვურელსა შეცნებულ არიან"*. და მეომე მოუგებს თვთ ქრისტე კეროლეს და ეტყვს: "არქუთ მელს მას: აჰ, კსოა დეუს და ხვალი ბაღსა აღვასრულებ და მესამეს დღესა ვითდო"*. 20.2 და რასამე ს[ქ]ესონ" ახალსა ზნაზვასა მელთა მიმართ აღასრულებდა,</p>	<p>For false prophets were really nothing other than heretics, for those who teach error and preach falsehood, they are heretics. For Jeremiah cries out and says, "Behold your false prophets, Jerusalem, are as foxes in shut up in a pit."² And then also Christ himself answered Herod and said to him: "Tell that fox, 'Behold, today and tomorrow I will work a miracle, and on the third day I will be glorified."³ 20.2 And certainly Samson was performing a new mystery against foxes.</p>	<p>Ὅτι δὲ ἄλλοι οἱ εἰσὶν οἱ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ αἰρετικοί, ἄκουσον ἱερεμίου λέγοντος· "Ἴδοὺ οἱ ψευδοπροφῆται σου, Ἰερουσαλὴμ, ὡς ἀλώπεκες ἐνεδρεύοντα σοί". Τοῦτο δὲ καὶ Χριστὸς ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις ἐδήλωσε πρὸς Ἡρώδη εἰπόν· "Εἶπατε τῇ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ· Ἴδοὺ σήμερον καὶ αὐτίον θανάμεις ἐπιτελῶ καὶ τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ δοξασθήσομαι". 20.2 Τοῦτοίς δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Σαμψὼν τοὺς τ' ἄλλοι τοὺς κέρκον πρὸς κέρκον δήσας, λαμπάδα ὀπίσω αὐτῶν τὰς αἰρέσεις τὰς μελλούσας ἀναφύειν ἠντίτετο, ὡν τὰ ἔσχατα πῦρ φλέγον.</p>	<p>Listen to Jeremiah about the fact that the false prophets and heretics are foxes. He says, "Look, your false prophets, Israel, are lying in wait for you." But even Christ pointed this out to Herod in the gospels, "Tell that fox, 'behold, today and tomorrow I complete miracles and on the thirds day I will be glorified.'" 20.2 With these Samson himself after binding the foxes tail to tail, firebrands behind them, was figuratively indicating the heresies that would afterward spring up whose destiny is burning fire.</p>	<p>For Jeremiah cries out and says: "See, your prophets" O Jerusalem, hunting "like foxes." Christ himself answers Herod: "Tell that fox: see, today and tomorrow I fulfill miracles and on the third day, I will be glorified." 20.2 Which a new miracle (secret) also Samson again is fulfilling with regard to the foxes.</p>

¹Following *J.*; *T* reads სავსონ.

²Ez 13:4; Lam 5:18? Cf. Ambrose, *Exp. Ps. 118*, 11.24.2 (CSEL, 62, 251.24-252.11).

³Hippolytus loosely cites Lk 13:32.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>რამეთუ რაჟამს მისეან მიელო ცოლი იგი, შეიპყრნა სამასნი მეღნი და შეკიცუნა ურთიერთას და ყოვლისა მის კულებსა გამოაბმიდა მუკუ ზებსა და ყოველსა მას ყაზობირსა და კესაჟოფანს¹ დასწუვიდა². და ესე იყო სასწაულ, რამეთუ რიცხუსა მას იტყვს ვითარმედ: სამასნი მეღნი შეკიცუნა ურთიერთას-ო, რომელთა უკუანადსენელ ცმცხლი აღვ ზებულ დასწუვიდეს-ო. ამას გვწუენებს³, ვითარმედ მწკალუბელ⁴, იყვნეს-ო, რამეთუ კნებათა მათ ქრისტესთა ვითარცა სამასნი აღიარებდეს. ხოლო ძლიერება არაჲ⁵ მოგებულ იყო⁶ მათა.</p>	<p><i>In Cant.</i> For, when his wife was taken from him, he caught three hundred foxes and tied them to one another and to the tails of all he tied torches, and all the cultivated and vineyards fields were burned up (Jg 15:4-5). And this was a sign when he said the number, since he tied three hundred foxes together, after which having set fire they were to be burned. This shows us that they were heretics, for the sufferings of Christ are acknowledged to be about three hundred, nevertheless no power was won by them.^a</p>			<p>When his wife was stolen “he seized three hundred foxes” and having tied their tails to one another, fastened lit torches/flares behind them (it) and sent them all, being and the vineyards (or “all beings vineyard”) it. However, it was a sign of those which the last fire burns. This shows that they were the heretics.</p>

¹ ვენაჯოანსა *J.*

² *J T* read დასწუვიდესო, but should be read დასწუვიდა.

³ გვწუენებს *J.*

⁴ მწკალუბ(ე)ლს *J.*

⁵ So Garitte, *J.* reads არა.

⁶ *J* omits.

^a I.e., the foxes or heretics.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
20.3 ხოლო კუდი კუდსა რომელსა-იგი შეკკრიდა, რათა შეუმგავსებელი და ვდომისა იგი გამოაჩინოს, რამეთუ ივინი-ცა უროიერთა ვდომილ ¹ სიტყუა ² არიან. და იყო კუდეზსა მათსა ლამპრები აღთებული, რამეთუ აღსასრულისა მათისა სშჯელო ³ -ცეცხლ შეშუუქველ.	20.3 Rather, the tail to tail which he joined together so that it might make a demonstration ^a of the[ir] dissimilarity and contrariness, for they also are enem[ies] to one another in word. ^b On each of their tails are lit torches burning with fire, for the end of their judgment ⁴ [is] burning fire.	20.3 Κέρον δὲ πρὸς κέρον δήσας, τὸ ἀνόμοιον ἔδειξεν αὐτῶν ὅτι καὶ αἱ αἰρέσεις ἀλλήλαις ἀντιλέγουσι.	20.3 After binding them tail to tail, he demonstrated their contradictoriness because indeed the heresies contradict one another.	20.3 He binds, however, from tail to tail, so that he might destroy their lawlessness but that the torches at their tails burning them with the flaming fire at the last judgement.

¹ვდომის, “of controversy” *J.*

²So *J T* adverbial nominative.

³სატანჯელო *J.*

⁴*J* reads, “torture.”

^a“Making a demonstration” (რათა . . . გამოაჩინოს = εἰς ἀποδείξασθαι?) may refer here to a apodictic rhetorical form of refutation (ἐλεγχος) against heresies used from the time of Justin. Cp. *CantPar* 20.2.

^bOr, perhaps, “with respect to the Word.” Both Iranaeus (*Adv. haer.* 1.1-9; 1.11.1) and Hippolytus #1 (*Haer.* 4.35.5-7) argue against the Valentinians as “a” false doctrine that was essentially multiform and contradictory.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
20.4 აწ ამისთვის იტყვს სული იგი: “გვკერებიო, მეღნი მცირენი-ო, განზრუნენღნი ვენაკთან” ^a . რომელნი - მე ვენაკნი, არამედ იგი ვენაკი, რომელი ახალნერგ იყო და ვუკვილსა-ვე შინა ნაკოფის გამოცემის უნდა, განზრუნის და განზრუნის, დავსნის, არა უფლობს, რათა კრისტეს მიერ ტევანი იგი და მწიფე მითხოვოს? “აწ ვენაკი ჩუენნი ვუვიან”, 21.1 მიუგებს და ეტყვს: “აკა, დის-წულაკი ვლდი-მით მოიწია და მოვიდა” ^b . ჟ სანატრელი კმა: რამეთუ რაჟამს მერმე შუროს-გებამ იყოს ვენაკისაჲ მის, რათა შეიწუნენ მეღნი იგი,	20.4 Now for this reason the Spirit says: “Catch for us the little foxes who are ruining the vines.” ^a What are the vines, except that vine which was the newly planted and in bloom that desired to give fruit, and became corrupt and spoiled and was destroyed, and does not permit that mature grape be harvested by Christ. “Now our vines are in bloom.” 21.1 She responds and says to him: “Behold, [my] nephew arrived and came leaping.” ^b O blessed voice! For when there there be retribution for the vines and the foxes be burned,	20.4 Τοῦτον κηρατουμένων, οἱ ἀμπελῶνες κηρατίζουσι καὶ καρπὸν πέπειραον τῷ θεῷ προσφέρουσαι.	20.4 While they are controlled, the vines bloom and bear ripened fruit for God.	21.1 O the blessed voice, if he enters into the retribution of the vineyard, therewith the foxes are taken. Rightly she calls out and says: “See, my brother comes jumping over the mountains and leaping on the hills. My brother is like a deer or a young deer on the mountains

^aSong 2:15.^bOr lit. “with leaping.”^cHippolytus takes the φωνῆ of Song 2:8 as the voice of the beloved.

სამართლად ღალატებს და
 იტყვს: “აჰა დის-
 წულაკი ჩემი კლდობით
 მოიწია ზედა თავთა
 მთათა¹ გარღვევლიმსღ
 ზელა ბორცუთა.” მსგავს
 არს დის-წულაკი ჩემი
 ქურციკსა და ნუკრსა
 მისსა ზელა
 ლელეთა მთათასა
 სწოლსა ჩემსა”².

[then] righteously she
 cries out and says:

“Behold, my nephew,
 leaping on the mountain
 tops even jumping
 across the hills. My
 nephew is like a gazelle
 and a hind of a gazelle,
 upon the brooks of the
 mountains² in my
 bedroom³.”

¹Following *J*; *T* reads მთათა.

²Song 2:8-9 ἀδελφιδού μου ἰδοὺ οὗτος ἦκει πηδῶν ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη διαλλόμενος ἐπὶ τοὺς βουνούς ὁμοίός ἐστιν ἀδελφιδός μου τῆ δορκάδι ἢ νεβρώ ἑλάφων ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη Βαυθῆλ. Cp. *CantPar* 21.1.

³Song 2:17-3.1a ὁμοιώθητι σύ ἀδελφιδέ μου τῷ δόρκωνι ἢ νεβρῷ ἑλάφων ἐπὶ ὄρη κοιλωμάτων ἐπὶ κοίτην μου. *CantPar* 21.1 neglects a reference to the bedroom here. Cyril of Alexandria, however, depending upon Hippolytus#2, offers an explanation of this reference, cf. *Fragments in Canticum canticorum*, (PG 69: 1285.33-37) Τὰς γυναῖκας δηλοῖ, τὰς ἐλθούσας μὲν Σαββάτων ὄρθρου βαθέως ἐπὶ τὸ μνήμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ μὴ εὐρούσας αὐτόν. Τὸ οὖν, ἐπὶ τὴν κοίτην, ἢ ἀπὸ κοίτης φησὶν, ἢ κοίτην ἑαυτῆς τὸ τοῦ Κυρίου μνήμα καλεῖ, καθ’ ὃ συνθραπτόμεθα αὐτῷ. ‘It is clear that the women, who came early on the first day of the week to the tomb of Jesus and did not find him. Therefore it says “on the bed,” or “from the bed”, or “bed” itself referring to the bed of the Lord, where we are buried together with him.’ After introducing the women of the resurrection scene (see *In Cant.* 24.1ff.). The bed of the Lord, then is the tomb, which is reminiscent of baptism. The later image of the κλίνη (*In Cant.* 26-27) is of resurrection and festivity. In the thought of ancient Christians “tomb” and “couch” and “festivity” were concepts that belonged naturally together. Dumbabin, *The Roman Banquet*, 101-141.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
21.2 # ახლოს მადლოს გაქოვდა! # დიდ-დიდოს ¹ მათ ზრახვთაჲ! “ჰა დის- წულაკი ჩემი კლდობით მოიწიას და მოვიდა-ო” რამ-მე არს კლდობის მის სიტყუაჲ? ვარდმოვლდა ზეცით სმოს მას ქალწულსას, აღვლდა მუცლის გან წმიდისა ² ზედა ძელს მას, კლდა ძელსა [!] მისგან ჯოჯობეთა, აღმოვლდა მიერ კაცობრივითა ამით კონცითა ქუეყანაჲ.	21.2 O economy of new grace and of enormous mysteries! “Behold, [my] nephew arrived and came leaping” (Song 2:8.) What does the message about leaping mean? He leapt down from heaven into the womb of a virgin; he leapt from the holy belly and mounted the wood. He leapt from the cross into the underworld, ³ he leapt up in human flesh to the world.	21.2 Τι τὸ πηδημα; Τοῦ λόγου τὸ ταχῶ. Ἐπίδα γὰρ ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς μήτραν παρθενικῆν, ἀπὸ μήτρας εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου εἰς τὸν ἄδην, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄδου ἀνεισι πάλιν εἰς γῆν, ἀπὸ γῆς εἰς οὐρανούς, ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν σῶσαι, νῦν δὲ κρίναι τὸν κόσμον.	21.2 “What is the leaping? It is of the swift Word. For he leapt from heaven to the virgin womb, from the womb into the world, from the world to the Cross, from the Cross to Hades, from Hades he ascended again to Earth, from Earth to the Heavens. From Heaven [he will leap] again to the Earth. Then it was to save, but now it will be to judge the world.”	21.2 O the new economy! O the great mysteries! “See, my brother, comes jumping”. What is the jumping? The Word leapt from heaven into the body of the virgin, he leapt out of the womb onto the tree, he leapt from the tree into the Hades, leapt up to the earth again. O the new resurrection! Again he leapt and from the earth so sat down in heaven at the right hand of the father. Again however he will come with with glory to the earth and is able to make a reward of recompense.

¹ *J* დიდოს.² *J* omits.³ The Syriac fragmentary text reads: “The Word leapt from heaven into the body of the virgin, it leapt from the womb to the cross and from the cross into Hades.” See I. Rucher, *Florilegium Edessenum anonymum*, (SBAW, PHA; Munich: C.H. Beck, 1933), 8 and Pitra, *Analecta Sacra* 4 (Paris, 1878): 36, 40 with English translations.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>‡ ახლის აღვლინა! მერმე აღვლა ქუეყნით ზეცად. ესე ღაჯღობილ მარჯულ მამისა და მერმე გარდამოვლდეს ქუეყანად, რათა ნაცვალთ მისგე- ბელი მთავოს. 21.3 “აჰა ესერა ესე ვლდობით მოი- წია ზელთ თავსა¹ მთათას გარდამოვლომოდ ზელთ ბორჯუთა”, რამეთუ იგინი, რომელნი მალად ზრახვენ, არა დაღვას ფერვი მთ ზელთ, არამედ ვლდობით თანა-წარ- ჰვალს, არა დაღვრომილ მთ თანა.</p>	<p><i>In Cant.</i> O new resurrection! Then he leapt from earth to heaven. He [is] seated at the right hand of the Father, and from there he will leap again to the earth, that he may meet out appropriate recompense.² 21.3 “Be- hold this is he who comes leaping upon the tops of the mountains, even to skip upon the hills.” For he does not set his foot upon those who think pridefully, but [as he is] leaping, he passes them by, not remaining (<i>or</i> sitting) upon them.</p>	<p>21.3 Ἐπὶ γὰρ τοῖς τὰ ὑψηλὰ ὡς ὄρη φρονοῦσι πατεῖ μὲν, διάλλεται δέ· οὐκ ἀναπαύεται γὰρ ἐπ’ αὐτήν.</p>	<p>21.3 For indeed over these consider who consider the heights as mountains he treads, but he leaps over them and does not come to a stop upon it.</p>	<p>21.3 Behold, “he comes jumping on the mountains and leaping on the hills.” But I say, “on the heights” he does not tread upon them, but leaps over them, not resting upon them.</p>

¹თავთა J.

²Cp. *CantPar* 21.2 The “leaping” of the Word recalls Wis 18:15 Hippolytus’ words became a topos of patristic biblical interpretation, viz., Ambrose, *De Isaac et anima Or.* 4.31 (PG 14.539) and Ambrose *Exp. Ps.* 118, 6.6 (CSEL, 111,20). Hippolytus had a significant impact on Ambrose’s exegesis. According to Jerome, *Ep.* 84, 7 (PL 22.749), Ambrose com-
posed a Hexameron that used more statements of Hippolytus than of Basil, Bonwetch, *Hohenlied Studien*, 10.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
22.1 “მსგავს არს ღის- წულოკი ჩემი ქურციკსა და ნუქოსა მისსა”*, რამეთუ სიმალე ¹ იტყვესა მის განახლებული და აფვილი კის ერთისა ზელა იქალვა. იხილ, # კაცო, კითარ აფვილი იყო სრბა იგი; აღმოსავალით დასავალითა გამოჩნდა და დასავალით სომხრად მიწეწულ იპოვა; სამხრით ეტლსა მას ქალწულისა შინა სარწმუნოდა გამოჩნებულ.	22.1 [It says] “My nephew is like a gazelle and hind of a gazelle” ² because of the swiftness ³ of the word newly and easily ^a proclaimed over everyone. Look, O person, how easy was the course [it took]. From the East to the West it appeared, and reaching from the West it managed to get to the South. From the South in a chariot, by a virgin, faithfully [it was] revealed.			22.1 “My brother is like the gazelle or the young deer.” It indicates the easy and nimble speed of the Word. See, O man, how swiftly [he] runs (or “the running”). From east to west he appears, from west to mid-day he appears and from mid-day to midnight he is believed.

¹ *T* სიმალე; *J* სობალეუ. but Marr, Garitte, Giginešvilma, and Giunašvilma all agree that სობალეუ should be read, see Garitte, 16.42, who cites Marr, *Ippolit*, LXXVII-LXXIX. Cp. *CantPar* 22.1 Το γὰρ ὄξυ τοῦ λόγου καινὸν καὶ εὐκόλον εὐήματα· θαύματα δὲ, ἃ ἀνθρώποι, τοῦ θεοῦ ὀξύτητα δὲόμασιν. “He symbolizes the new and easy swiftness of the Word. But marvel, O human being, while he runs with God’s speed.”

² Song 2:9, 17 ὀμοιὸς ἔστιν ἀδελφιδὸς μου τῇ δοξαίᾳ· ἢ νεβέρῳ ἐλάφου.

³ Instead of “swiftness,” *J* read “in the height.”

^a Adverbial nominative (?), lit. “renewed and easy.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
22.2 იხილენით სრბანი სომართოსანი; ქუსეკენ- ლად შთავიდოდ და ზეცად ათსწრაფდა რამეთუ არა დაიყენა ბნელსა ამის ქუსეანისასა, არამედ ნათლად გამოჩინე- ბულ აღვიდოდა ზეცად, და მერმე-ცა აღფრინებულ, კითარცა კარსკულავი ლოდი გამობრწყინებულ და მზის-თუალ სომართოს გამოჩინებულ, საყდართა მამის თანა დიდებულ. 22.3 ჰ სიმენც და დოდად სომალის მის სრბაჲ! სიყმით-ვე ყოველთა წართქრომილ, რათთა ოღეს-მე ვითარცა ქურციკი და სალა-მე კითარცა ირემმან გამო- ჩინოს სომალც ¹ ფერჯთა თქსთაჲ.	22.2 Consider the courses of righteousness, it descended into the underworld and hurried to heaven, for [it] was not retained in the shadows of this earth, but appearing as a light, it ascended to heaven, and flying forth from there also, shining as a great, brilliant star and the appearance of the sun of righteousness (Mal 4:2), on the Father's throne he is glorified. ² 22.3 O valor and race of great speed! Indeed from childhood he has gone forth to all, that, at times like a gazelle and at others like a stag, he might demonstrate the swift- ness of his feet.	22.1-2 Ὅμοιος, φησί, τῇ δορκάδι. Το γὰρ ὄξυ τῶν λόγου καινὸν καὶ εὐκόλον ἐσήμανε· θαύματος δέ, ὃ ἄνθρωπος, 22.3 τοῦ θεοῦ ὀξύτητα δρόμων, ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἐπὶ δύσιμ, ἀπὸ δύσεως ἐπὶ μεσημβρίαν, κἀτω καὶ ἄνω σπεύδοντος, ἵνα ποτὲ μὲν ὡς δορκάς, ποτὲ δὲ ὡς ἔλαφος δειχθῆ, τῷ ὀκειτῶν ποδῶν τὸ εὐταργέλιον σημαίνων. Ἀμφότερα δὲ διχτηλῆ καὶ μαρμακάρται.	22.1-2 "Like the gazelle," he says. For he indicated the new and easy/agile swiftness of the Word. But be amazed, o human, 22.3 At the swiftness of the ones who run, from the east toward the setting of the sun, from the setting of the sun to the midday. From the midday hurrying down and up, so that a certain times as gazelles, and at others he might be manifested as a deer, symbolizing the gospel with the swift- ness of feet. Both animals have cloven hooves and chew the cud.	22.3 O the beautiful speed of foot being everywhere always! For swift as he is shown (he appears) like a deer, however a swift deer, designating the speed of his feet. See now the Christ quick as a deer, quick however like a running deer. Both have split hooves and (are) chewing the cud.

¹See previous note.

²T reads, "together with the Father he is glorified on the throne."

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
აწ იხილე ქრისტე საღამო- ვითარცა ქურციკი სრბად მალც და საღამო ვითარცა ირემი რქა-შუენიერი, და ორნი-ვე ჭლაკნი განჰე- ბულ არიან და აღმოიციონ- ნინან. 22.4 და ამას შჯუ- ლი წმიდად გამოცხა- ლებულად გჰრუნებს, რამეთუ სიწმიდც გამოც- ხადებულ იყო; ქრისტე ორთა მათ შჯულთა სარწ- მუნოვებას გამოაც- ხადებს, შჯულისა და სახარების სიმბოციკისა მარადის აქებს, გამოც- ხადებულთა და წრველთა სიტყვსა მის აღთქემითა ესე მოუფინა რომელ ზე- და, რომლისთვის ესრე იტყვს: “აკა დის-წულაკი ჩემი ემსგავსა ქურცი- კისა და ნუკროსა მისს”.	Now see Christ some- times swift as a gazelle for the race and some- times as a stag with beautiful horns, and both have cleft hooves and chew the cud. 22.4 And this the holy Law clearly makes known to us, for holiness had been mani- fested. Christ reveals the faith reveals the faith of two laws. He always praises the truth of both of the Law and the Gospel. The Word, by means of manifest and sincere covenants, has poured out ² what [is] above. On account of which it says thus: “My nephew is like a gazelle and hind of a gazelle.”	22.4 Ταῦτα μόνος καθαρός γὰρ ἐσημαίνετο Χριστός, τῶν δύο διαθηκῶν πίστιν ἐπιφερόμενος. Μαρκᾶται γὰρ τὸ σαφές τοῦ λόγου, τῆς δυναμείως τὸ ἰσχυρὸν ἀναφέρον.	22.4 He alone preached these pure things. For Christ showed himself pure, bringing out the faith of the two covenants. For he chews the cud with respect to the clear truth of the Word, bringing forth its full strength.	22.4 In such a way the law indicates pure preaching. Christ is shown pure indeed through both Testa- ments which reveal the faith through the law and gospel. Indeed he pours [it] forth making manifest the powers of the Word bringing [it to] memory. Therefore he says (“she”?) also: “See, my brother is equal to a deer and young deer.”

¹On the basis of its omission in *CantPar*, Garitte, 16.42, suggests that “what [is] above” should be omitted; nevertheless, the Georgian text as it stands is probably a literal rendering of τὸ/τὰ ἄνω and should be retained as in Griginešvili and Giunašvili, 262.

²Lit., მოუფინა <მოუფინა> “to unfurl, spread out, shed abroad.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
23.1 მერმე-ცა ¹ ლაღებს: “აჰა ღის-წულაკი ჩემი სარკუმლით გამართ ხელავს, გარდახელავს სატრით ღის-წულაკი ჩემი: მოვედ მახლობელი ჩემი, მუენი-ერი და ტრედი” * # ახლისა მიმოქაღებოხა მის! და მერმე გაცხადებულად სიწოდოებით ღაღაღებს სული იგი: “ღისწულაკი ჩემი ჰხელავს გარდამართ სარკუმლით” * . ხოლო აწ სარკუმელთა მთ კეთესა- მი იტყვს? მოვედ, წარმოდეგ, წინასწარმეტყუელი, წამე და თქუ: “სარკუმელი განესუნეს ცათა შინა-ო” * . და კეთესა-მი იტყვს სარკუმელს, არამედ წინასწარმეტყუელთასა, რომელთა მიერ გამოღებულ სიტყუა იგი მიმოღაღებულ ამიერ?	23.1 Next he also cries: “Behold, my nephew looks from the window there, my nephew looks intently through the lattice-work. ² Come, he says, my dear, beautiful and a dove.” ³ O new declaration! To manifest it with sincerity, the Spirit cries out, “The son of my sister looks down from the window ⁴ .” Now, however concerning whose windows does he speak? Come, stand, [O] prophet, testify and say: “The windows in heaven are open” (Is 24:18). Now, of whose windows does he speak, except [those] of the prophets, from whom the Word issued forth being spread here?	23.1 Εἶτα ἰδοὺ ἀδελφιδὸς μου παρακύπτων διὰ τῶν θυρίδων, ἐκκύπτων διὰ τῶν δικτύων. Λέγει μοι: Ἐλθέ, πλησίον μου, καλή μου, καὶ δίκτυα τοῦς προφῆτας καλεῖ, ἐξ ὧν διακύπτων ὁ λόγος κηρύσσεται Διὰ τοῦτων τῶν θυρίδων παρακύπτων λέγει μοι· Ἐλθέ, ἡ πλησίον μου. Διὰ πάντων γὰρ τῶν προφητῶν προσακαλεῖται ταύτην, καθὼς καὶ ὁ προφῆτης λέγει· “Θυρίδες ἠνεῶχθησαν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ” .	23.1 Then behold, my nephew looking intently through the window, looking out through the lattice work. He says to me, “Come, my neighbor, your are beautiful, my dove. But he calls the prophets the windows and the lattice work. From the ones who look out through them the Word is preached. Through these windows looking intently he says to me, “Come, my neighbor. For through all the prophets he summons this one, even as the prophet says, “Windows were opened in the heaven.”

¹ღა მერმეცა J., “and next . . .”

²Lit., “coin” confusing δικτύων with διδραχμων? Or does the translator understand the coin-lattice of a woman’s headress?

³Song 2:9; *CantPar*, 16.42 Garitte notes that both “neighbor” and “dove” are in the nominative.

⁴Song 2:9 παρακύπτων διὰ τῶν θυρίδων ἐκκύπτων διὰ τῶν δικτύων.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Armenian</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>
24.1 აბისოვს-ცა მერძე ღალაღებს ღა იტყვს: “ღამე ვეძიებდი, რომ- ელი შეიყუარა სულმან ჩემმან; ვეძიებდი მას ღა ვერ კპოვმ. მპოვეს მე მცველთა, რომელნი სცვიდეს ქალაქსა. ერ- თი ¹ , რომელი შეიყუარა სულმან ჩემმან, [ღა აპა აწ კითარკა ² წუთ გან- რე-ვე შორე, კპოვმ, რომელი-იგი შეიყუარა სულმან ჩემმან ³ .]	24.1 For this reason she also cries out and says, “By night I was seeking the one whom my soul loved. I was seeking him and did not find him. The watchmen that were guarding the city found me. Have you not seen ^a the one whom my soul loves? And behold now I went on a short distance (from them), I found the one whom my soul loved.	24.1 “By night I sought the one my soul loves. I sought him and did not find him. The watchmen guard- ing the city found me. Have you seen the one my soul loves, have you? And behold I withdrew a little further from them, I found the one my soul loved. I held him and did not let him go until he led me to my mother’s storehouse of the one who conceived me.”	24.1 Ἐν νύξϊ, φησίν, ἐζήτησα ὄν ἠγάπησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου· ἐζήτησα αὐτὸν καὶ οὐκ εἶδον αὐτόν. Εὗρόν με οἱ φρουροῦντες τὴν πόλιν. Μὴ ὄν ἠγάπησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου εἶδετε; Ἐξάρτησα αὐτὸν καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκα αὐτὸν ἕως οὗ εἰσήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν, εἰς τὴν οἰκὸν μητρὸς μου καὶ εἰς ταμειὸν τῆς συναβούστου με.	24.1 In the nights, she says, I sought the one whom my soul loved and did not find him. The men who guard the city found me. “Have you seen the one whom my soul loves?” I took hold of him and did not let him go until I lead him into the house of my mo- ther, into the treasury of the one who con- ceived me.

¹ *J T* both read ერთი, “one.” Garitte, following Marr, suggests that the Georgian represents a mistranslation of an Armenian *Vorlage*, misunderstanding of *ერთ(ებ)* which is either a negative question opener or “one” in Armenian. However, the mistranslation may have already been in the Armenian, arising from a confusion in Greek between MH and MIA.

² In *J* added in a second hand.

³ ღა აპა . . . სულმან ჩემმან omitted in *T*. Cf. 25.1.

^a *J T* read “one, whom my soul loves” but *T* omits “have you seen?”

I found and do not let him go until (he) makes me go into my mother's house and into the treasuries [of] her who conceived me.^{7a} 24.2 O blessed voice! O blessed women in previous times revealed as a type! On account of this she even cries out and says, "By night I was searching for the one whom my soul loved" (Song 3:1). See this is fulfilled in Martha^b and Mary.

ვპოვე და არა გარეუტეო, ვიდრე მითს მივაწიო სახედ დედისა ჩემისა და საუხუჯეთა, რომელმან მუცელად მიიღო ძემ^{7a}. 24.2 ჭ სანატრელისა მის ჳმისაჲ! ჭ სანატრელთა დელათაჲ წინაბდელთაჲ მათ, წინა სწარ სახედ გამოჩინებულთაჲ! ამისთვისცა ღალადებს და იტყვის: "ღამე ვეძიებდი, რომელი-იგი მკვიწყარა სულმან ჩემმან-ო". იხილეთ ესე აღსრულებული მართაჲს და მარიაჲს ზედა.

24.2 Ἦν τῶν ἀποκαρῶφων πιστηρίων τοῦ θεοῦ. Θεώρησον τοῦτο πληροῦμενον ἐν Μάρθᾳ καὶ Μαρίᾳ.

24.2 O mysteries hidden by God. Behold this is fulfilled in Martha and Mary.

24.2 O the blessed voice, O the wonderful women, long prefigured. Therefore she cries out and says: "By night I sought him, whom my soul dearly loves."

^a Song 3:1-4 ἐν νυκτὶν ἐζήτησα ὃν ἠγάπησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐξήγησα αὐτὸν καὶ οὐχ εὗρον αὐτόν . . . εὐροσάν με οἱ τηροῦντες οἱ κρυπτοῦντες ἐν τῇ πόλει μὴ ὃν ἠγάπησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου εἶδετε ὡς μικρὸν ὅτε παρήλαθον ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἕως οὗ εὗρον ὃν ἠγάπησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐκείνη αὐτὸν καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆσα αὐτόν ἕως οὗ εἰσῆγαγον αὐτόν εἰς οἶκον μητροῦς μου καὶ εἰς ταμείον τῆς σκευοθήκης μου.

^b See note 3 on page 345. According to Hippolytus, Martha both anoints Christ (*In Cant.* 2.29) and is primary witness of the resurrection to the apostles, personally vouchsafed by the resurrected Christ (*In Cant.* 25).

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Armenian</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>მათ თანა შესაკრებელი კულ-მოღვიბით ეძებდეს¹ ქრისტეს² მკუდარს, რომელსა- იგი ცხოველად არა ჰგონებდეს, რამეთუ ესრე მოუკაწავებს³ და იტყვს: "ღამე⁴ ვეძიებ და ვპოვე, რომელი-იგი შეიყუარა სულმან ჩემმან-ო"⁵</p>	<p><i>In Cant.</i> With them the synagogue^a diligently sought the dead Christ^b whom they did not think to be alive. For so she teaches us and says, "By night I was seeking, and I found the one whom my soul loved" (Song 3.1b).</p>	<p>With them the synagogue^a diligently sought the dead Christ^b whom they did not think to be alive. For so she teaches us and says, "By night I was seeking, and I found the one whom my soul loved" (Song 3.1b).</p>	<p>With them the synagogue^a diligently sought the dead Christ^b whom they did not think to be alive. For so she teaches us and says, "By night I was seeking, and I found the one whom my soul loved" (Song 3.1b).</p>	<p>With them the synagogue^a diligently sought the dead Christ^b whom they did not think to be alive. For so she teaches us and says, "By night I was seeking, and I found the one whom my soul loved" (Song 3.1b).</p>	<p>See this is fulfilled in Martha and Mary, who themselves sought the dead Christ, not believing he was alive. For this indicates it (it) and speaks: By night I sought the one whom my soul loves."</p>

¹ ეძიებს *J*.

² *J* adds რამეთუ ეძიებს მუნ ქრისტესს. "For one seeks Christ there."

³ მოუკაწავეა *J*, "taught."

⁴ ღამე *T*.

⁵ *J* omits.

^a Lit. "congregation." See note b on page 289.

^b *J* adds a parenthetical statement, "For one seeks Christ there."

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Armenian</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
24.3 იტყვან წეროლნი იგი სსარებისანი: “მოვიდეს დღიანი იგი ღამე ძიებად საულოვსა ² მას”*: “კვიტიუბდ მას და არა კპოვეო”. “რაიასა მებრ-ვე კძიებთ ცხოველსა მას მკუღართა თანა”*	24.3 The books of the Gospels say, “The women came by night to seek in the tomb” (Lk 24:1, 5, 22). “I was seeking him and did not find him.” “Why do you seek the living among the dead?”	24.3 As it says in the book of the gospel, “The women went by night to seek [for his body] in the sepulcher, and they did not find [it there]. “And why, therefore, are you seeking the living among the dead?”	24.3 Τῇ νυκτὶ γὰρ ἐζητήσαν τὸν ζῶντα. ὡς νεκρόν. Ἄκουσον γὰρ τοῦ ἀγγέλου· “Τίνα ζητεῖτε;”	24.3 For by night the sought the living one as if he were dead. For hear the angel, “Whom do you seek?”	24.3 The writing/book of the gospel says: The women came in or by night, seeking in the tomb and did not find him. For the grave was not his dwelling, but rather heaven: “Why do you seek the living among the dead,”

¹ღ მივიდეს J, “and they went.” Garitte follows J but omits და.

²სამარეს J “in the grave.”

³The canonical gospels agree that among the women who first saw the risen Christ and told the news to the apostles were two Maries: Mary of Magdala (Mat 28:1; Mk 15:47; 16:9; Lk 24:10; John 20:1, 18), and another Mary, who is variously called “the mother of James and Joseph” or “the mother of James” (Mk 15:47; Lk 24:10, cp. 16:1 which in Mark could be referring to two different Maries). Besides these two or three Maries, other women also are mentioned, but never Martha. However, the tradition of an apostolic Martha is ancient (early 2nd century) and widespread. Martha is a resurrection witness in the Ethiopic version of the *Epistula Apostolorum*, the *Ambrosian Missal*, the *Syrian Catholic Feiqitho*, an early Easter hymn preserved partially on a wooden tablet in Cologne and partially in an unpublished manuscript in the Bibliothéque Nationale in Paris (MS Copte 129), and in Christian iconography. See Cornelia Römer, “Osterhymnus,” in *Kölner Papyri* (ed. B. Kramer, C. Römer, D. Hagedorn; Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1982), 4:57-90. See also Allie Ernst, “Martha from the Margins: an Examination of Early Christian Traditions about Martha,” unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Queensland, 2006.

Georgian

და არავინ იპოვა თვის მუც, რამეთუ არა იყო მის შირიმი იგი სპკვდებელ¹, არამედ - ცანი. რაჲს ეძებთ ქუცყანას ზელა, რომელი-იგი აღმალუბული სყდართა² ზის? რაჲს ეძებთ დიდებულთა³ უდიდებულესს მას⁴ შეურაცხს სამარეს შინა? რაჲს ეძებთ აღსრულებულს მას შირიმს შინა? აჰა ლოდის მის წარმოგვებულის; რაჲს ეძებთ სამარეს მას, რომელი აჰა⁵ ცათა შინა მადლითა ავსებულ? რაჲს ეძებთ განჯსნილს მას, ვითარცა შეკრულს და მანდა ვითარცა შეყენებულს საპყრობილეს შინა?

In Cant.

And nothing of his^a was found there, for the tomb was not his inheritance, but heaven. Why do you seek on earth the one who sits exalted upon a throne? Why do you seek the most glorious one in a inglorious tomb? Why do you search for the perfected in a grave? Behold, the stone has been rolled away. Why do you seek the perfected one in the tomb? Behold, the stone is rolled away; why do you seek the righteous one who, behold in the heavens full of grace? Why do you seek the One who has been set free, as one who is yet bound there^b, as one who is trapped in a prison?

Armenian

He is not found here, for the same reason that the sepulcher will not be his home, but in heaven. Why do you seek on earth the one who, behold, once he departs, will sit on the throne of glory? Why are you seeking the one who has been glorified in a humble tomb? Why are you seeking the one who has been perfected in the rock? Behold, the stone is rolled away. Why are you seeking in this tomb the one who, behold, has obtained grace in heaven? Why are you seeking the one who has been released as if he were [yet] bound?

Paleo-Slavonic

the one who is already on the throne? Why do you seek the Glorious One in the inglorious grave? Why do you seek the Perfect One (as) with the still covered with the stone? Why do you seek the living in the tomb, the one who is in the heaven? What do you seek the the One who has been loosed as one who has been bound?

¹სამკვდრებელად J “as an inheritance.”

²J adds ზელა.

³დიდებულს მას J.

⁴J omits.

⁵J omits.

⁶J omits.

⁷A Syriac fragment reads, “The women came by night seeking for him in the tomb. She says, ‘I sought for him and did not find him.’ ‘Why do you seek the living among the dead?’ We did not find him here. For the tomb is not appropriate for him, but heaven. So, why do you seek on the Earth the one who sits above the Cherubim?” See note 3 on page 336.

^aOr, lit. “and no one of his was found there”; according to Garitte, *nemo inventus est ei proprius ibi*, “nothing [that belongs] to him was found there.”

^bLit. “bound and/even there.” Cf. Garitte, *colligatum et illic*.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Armenian</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
24.4 იხილეთ ახალი ზნახვა აღსრულებულ მუნ; რამეთუ ესრე იბრძის და იტყვს: “კეძიებდ მას და არა ვპოვე იგი-ო, მპოვეს მცემლა, რომელნი სცვიდეს ქალაქს”. ვინ იყვნეს, რომელთა-იგი ვპოვეს, არამედ ანგელოზთა მათ, რომელნი-იგი სხდეს მუნ?	24.4 See the new mystery perfected there, for so she calls and says, “I sought him and did not find him. ³ The watchmen guarding the city found me” (Song 3:3). Who were those who found her, but the angels who were sitting there?	24.4 Behold the new mystery is fulfilled here. For she cries out and says, “I sought and did not find him. Those who were guarding the city found me.” Who were the watchmen if not the angels who were sitting there? And which city were they guarding, except the new Jerusalem, the body of Christ?	24.4 Εὐθρόν με οἱ φρουροὶ εὐντες τὴν πόλιν. Τίνας οὔτοι; Οἱ ἀγγελοὶ οἱ εἰς τὸν τάφον καθήμενοι. Οὐκέτι γὰρ τάφος ἦν, ἀλλὰ πόλις, ὅτι τὸν οὐρανίου βασιλεία ἐχώρησεν.	24.4 Those who guard the city found me. Who are these? The angels who were sitting at the tomb. For it was no longer a tomb, but a city. For the heavenly kingdom had come near.	24.4 See the new mystery! For so it cries out and says: “I sought him and did not find him. The guardians of the city found me.” Who are the guardians not if the angels who sat there? And what was the city they watched <if not> The New Jerusalem of the flesh of Christ?

¹Not legible in *T*.

²მუნ სხდეს *J*.

³Cp. Ambrose, *Or. 5.42* (PL 42.542), *et quoniam per evangelium interris videmus caelestia mysteria figurata, veniamus ad illam Mariam, veniamus et ad Magdalenam. consideremus quemadmodum Christum in cubili corporis sui in quo defunctus iacebat in noctibus quaesiverint, quando dixit illis angelus: “Iesum qui cucifixus est quaeritis; non est hic, surrexit enim. quid igitur quaeritis viventem cum mortuis?” quid quaeritis in sepulchro eum qui iam in caelo sit? quid quaeritis in vinculis sepulturae universorum vincula solventem? non sepulchrum huic sedes, sed caelum est. ideo dixit una ex his: quaesivi eum et non inveni eum”. And since by the gospel we see celestial mysteries fashions in earthly things, let us go to that Mary, and also to the Magdalene. Let us consider the way in which they sought for Christ during the night in the bead where his body lay after death. When the angel said to them: “You seek Jesus who was crucified. He is not here, for he has arisen. Why then do you seek the living among the dead? Why do you seek in the tomb the one who is in heaven? Why do you seek in the bonds of the tomb the one who has destroyed the bonds of death of the whole world? The tomb is not home for him, but heaven. Then one of them said, “We were looking for him but did not find him.” Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *Fragmenta in Canticum canticorum*, (PG 69: 1285.33-46).*

და რომელსა-მე ქალაქსა,
 არამედ ახალსა
 იერუსალიმსა ჯორცთა მათ
 ქრისტესთა? “მპოვებს მე
 მცველთა მათ, რომელნი
 სცვიდეს ქალაქსა”.¹ ჰკითხვენ
 ლეღბი ესე: “ნუთუ რომელი-
 ესე¹ შეიყუარა სულმან,
 იხილუ² [თი]* ხოლო³ მათ
 ჰრქუეს: “ვის ეძიებთ? იესუს
 ნაზარეტელსა? აჰა აღდგომილ
 არს”*. 25.1 “და კითარცა
 წუთ ერთ გან-რე-კე-შორე
 მათგან”*. და კითარ უკუნ-
 იქცეს და წარვიდეს, შეეძობსა
 მათ⁴ მკნული; მაშინ
 აღსრულებოდა თქუმული
 იგი: “აჰა კითარცა გან-რე-კე-
 შორე წუთ ერთ, კპოვე,
 რომელი-იგი შეიყუარა სულმან
 ჩემმან”*.

And what city [were they
 guarding] except the New
 Jerusalem, the body of
 Christ? “The watchmen
 who were guarding the
 city found me.” These
 women ask them, “Have
 you not seen the one [our]
 soul has loved?” (Song
 3:3) “They, however, said:
 Whom are you seeking?
 Jesus of Nazareth? Behold,
 he is risen” (Mk 16:6).
 25.1 “And I withdrew a
 little from them.” And as
 they turned back and were
 leaving, the Savior met
 them (Jn 20:4); then the
 saying was fulfilled:
 “Behold as I withdrew a
 little from them, I found
 him, the one whom my
 soul loves” (Song 3:4).

“The watchmen
 who guard the
 city found me.”
 The women ask,
 “Have you not
 seen the one
 whom my soul
 loves?” In
 response they
 say, “Whom do
 you seek? Jesus
 of Nazareth?
 Behold he is
 risen.” 25.1 And
 beheld she
 withdrew a little
 on from them, the
 Savior meets
 them. Then is
 fulfilled that say-
 ing, “I found the
 one whom my
 soul loved.”

25.1 Then,
 when she
 departed
 from them,
 she says, “I
 found the
 one whom
 my soul
 loved.”

25.1 Εἶτα, ὡς
 ἀπέστη ἀπ’
 αὐτῶν, φησὶν·
 Εὑρον ὃν
 ἠγάπησεν ἡ
 ψυχὴ μου.

25.1 And as
 they had gone
 on a little
 farther, Jesus
 met them. There
 the saying was
 fulfilled: “I
 found the one
 whom my soul
 loves.

¹ *J* omits “this [one].”

² იხილუ, “you saw,” *T*.

³ Following *J* and Garitte ხოლო, “however, but.” *T* რამეთუ, “for, because.”

⁴ მას, “him,” *T*.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Armenian</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
25.2 ხოლო მკსნელმან მიუკო და პრეუა: “მართა! მარიამ! და მათ პრეუეს: “რაბუნი” ¹ რომელი გამოითარგმანების “უფალი ჩემი”. “კოუე იგი, ² შევიყუარე. და აჰა განუტევეო იგი” ³ *. რამეთუ მას ეჰმსა ფერუთ-მოხუევით შეიტციცებს, და იგი ღალაღე- ბით ეტყეს: “ნუ შეკომეხები მე, ³ რამეთუ არა აღსრულ კარ მაისა ჩემისათო” ⁴ . და მას შეგმა-ეყო და იტყოდა: “არა ღგიტევეო, ვიდრემდოს ⁴ შევიყვანო” და შეგავლონო გულსა”. “არა ღალუტევეო, ვიდრემდოს არა შევიყვანო	25.2 But the Savior answered and said to them: “Martha, Mary.” And they said, “Rabboni.” (Jn 20:16) which means “my Lord.” “I found the one I have loved, and would not let him go.” For in that moment, with [his] feet embraced, she holds fast to him. And he with a loud cry says to her, “Do touch me, for I have not yet ascended to my father” (Jn 20:17) Indeed she held on to him and it was said, “I will not let you go, until I take you in and I bring you into my heart.” “I will not	25.2 “I found him, I held on to him and did not let him go.” For also she was drawing his feet close [with her arms] wrapped around them. And Jesus said, says to her, “Do not hold on to me, for I have not yet ascended to my Father. And she, still holding on, says, “I will not let you go until I take you and introduce you into my heart.”	25.2 Ἴδού γάρ, φησίν, Ἰησοῦς ἀπήντησεν αὐτάις. Ἐχράθησα αὐτὸν καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκα αὐτόν. Πρῶσ-ελθοῦσαι γάρ εἰς αὐτὸν τοῦς πόδας. Οὐκ ἀφῆσαι αὐτόν, ἕως εἰσῆγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκον μητροῦς μου καὶ εἰς ταμειὸν τῆς συλλαβοῦσθαι με, τῆς καρδίας μου ἔνδον	25.2 For behold, it says, “Jesus met them.” “I took hold of him and did not let him go. For they went and took hold of his feet not to let him go, it says, until I lead him into the house of my mother and the chamber of she who conceived, within my heart	25.2 However he called to them saying: “Mary and Martha!” But they held on to his feet. And he says to them: “Do not hold on to me, I am not yet am ascended to my father.” But they held him firmly while they said: “I will not let you until I lead you into my heart.”

¹ Thus *JT*, but რომელი იგი should be read.

² *J* omits იგი, “the, he, it.”

³ *J* omits მე, “me, I.”

⁴ ვიდრემდე, “until,” *J*.

⁵ მივიყვანო *J* “bring.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Armenian</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
სახლსა დედისა ჩემისასა და საუჩუკეთა, რომელმან მუცლად მიღო მე”*. მუცელსა დაკრებულ სიყვარული იგი ქრისტესს, არა უნდა განეუებოს; ამის სახისათვის ზახებით იტყვს: “კოვგე იგი და არა განუტევო”. ¹ ჟ ნეტარისა მის დედაკაცისა, რომელსა უბმა-ეყო ფერუთა მისთა, რათათა ჰყერთა უძებლელად იყოს აღფრენად!	let you go, until I take you into my mother's house and the chamber, [of] the one who conceived me” (Song 3:4). In her womb she treasured the love of Christ, she did not wish to be moved. ² For this reason (or form) with a cry she says, “I found him and will not let him go.” O blessed woman, who held on to his feet, that she might be able to fly up in the air!	For in every way setting up the storehouse in her inner person she confirmed the love of Christ, and did not wish to be separated. For this reason she cries out and says, “I found and did not let him go.” O happy wo- man, who held to the feet of the Lord, that she might be able to fly to the sky!	καὶ τῶν σπλάγχων καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς τῆν ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ ἔγνω[...]	and my vis- cera and my soul have I known his love.	not wanting separated from their “the Lover,” Christ. For this reason she cries out: “I found him and would let him go.” O the bless- ed women that hold on to at his feet so that he might not fly up into the air!

¹კანუტეო J T should be read კანუტეეო.

²Cp. Ambrose, *De Isaac et Anima Or.* 5.43a (PL 14.542). *tamen dum vadunt apostolis nuntiare miseratus quaerentes occurrit eis Iesus dicens: avete. illae autem accesserunt et tenuerunt pedes eius et adoraverunt eum. tenetur ergo Iesus, sed delectatur sic teneri, quia fide tenetur denique delectavit eum et ella mulier quae tetigit eum et curata est sanguinis fluxu, de qua dixit: “tetigit me aliquis, nam sentio virtutem de me exisse”. tange ergo et fide tene eum et constringe fideliter pedes eius, ut virtus de eo exeat et sanet animam tuam. et si dicat: “noli me tangere”, tu tene. “nondum enim ascendi ad patrem meum”, dixit semel. dixit “noli me tangere” quando resurrexit: aut forte illi dixit quae putabat furto esse sublatum et non virtute propria resuscitatum. “But while they were going to tell the apostles, he took pity on those seeking him, “Jesus appeared to them and said, “Greetings.” The women came near and took hold of his feet and worshipped him.” They took hold of Jesus for he wanted to be taken hold of this way. Since faith takes hold of him, it pleased him also that woman who touched him was cured of the flow of blood. He said about her, “Someone touched me, for I felt power go out from me.” Therefore touch and by faith take hold of him. Hold faithfully to his feet, that power may go from him to heal your soul. And if he says, “Don’t touch me,” hold on! “I have not yet ascended to my father” he often said. He said, “Don’t touch me,” when he arose: rather firmly he said it to her who thought he would be stolen away and not raised up by his own*

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Armenian</i>	<i>Greek CantiPar</i>	<i>CantiPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
25.3 აბას ეტყოილეს მართა ლა მართამ. მართაჲსსა მას ზრახვასა წინაჲსწარ აჩუქებლად ¹ სოლომონის მიერ: არა გიფლობთ შენ აღფრინებად-ო. აღუკლ მამ- ისა და შეწირე ახალი მსხუერპლი. შეწირე ეკა ² და არღარა შეცთომილ, არამედ ხესა მას ცხორე- ბისასა კელთ-მობით წა- იერებთ. აჰა, შეგმა-მი- ყოფთა მუკლთა არა ვით- არცა ბაღისინი ვითარ-მცა განწყვდა. არამედ შეგმა- მიყოფთა ფერუთა ქრისტეს- თა. ნუ დამაგდებ მე ქუეყ- ნასა ზელს, რათთა არა შეე- სცოე, აღმიტაცე მე ზეცად,	25.3 Martha and Mary said this to him. The mystery of Martha ³ was being shown beforehand through Solomon. “We do not let you fly up. Go up to the Father and offer a new sacrifice. Offer Eve indeed no longer errant, but eagerly holding with her hand to the tree of life. Behold, I have clung to your knees, not as the cord which may be severed, but I have held to the feet of Christ, do not abandon me on earth! So that I may not stray, take me up to heaven!”	25.3 This did Martha and Mary cry out, showing the righteous mystery earlier [given] through Solomon. He went to the Father, and obtained a new sacrifice from Mother Eve who now no longer wanders astray, but wishes to hold on to the tree of life.	25.3 μυστηριωδῶς ὁ Σολομῶν πρὸ τοσοῦτων γενεῶν τῶν γυναικῶν τὸ μυστήριον αἰνυτόμενος.	25.3 In a mysterious way before so many generations ago Solomon spoke enig- matically of the women.	25.3 Maria and Martha announce this righteous mystery through Solo- mon again. “I will not let you go” to fly up “I am going to my father.” Carry upwards a new sacrifice, indeed carry Eve upwards, she desires no longer to be tempted, but rather to hold to the tree of the life. See <through> her holding fast to the feet Christ: “Do not leave me back on the earth, so that I may not be tempted (would go astray). Lest the serpent trap me again strives through me to place (to prevent) a trap,

power.”

¹ აჩუქებლად *J*.

² ეკა *J* has between *ვ* and *ა* one erased letter.

³ So *JT*. Garitte, CSCO 264: 46, n. 19 rightly corrects მართაჲსსა, *martayssa* “of Martha” to მართაჲლს, *martalsa* “of right-
eousness.” Cf. the agreement of both Armenian and Paleo Slavic texts, “righteous mystery.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Armenian</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>მ ნეტარისა მის ღვლკა- ციხა¹, რომელსა-იგი ქრისტესგან² განეყნება აა უნდა! 25.4 ამის სახისათვის იტყვს: “კითარცა წუთ ერთ გან- რე-ვე მორე, კპოე³, რომელი⁴ -იგი შეიყუარა სულმან ჩემმან”.</p>	<p>O blessed woman, who did not wish to be separated from Christ.⁵ 25.4 For this reason she says: “When I withdrew a little [...] I found him, the one whom my soul loves” (Song 3:4)</p>				<p>against Adam. Lead me into heaven! O the blessed woman must not be separated from Christ! 25.4 And for that reason he calls out: When I went on a little further, I found the one whom my soul loves.”</p>

¹ღვლკაცისა J.

²J omits -გაი.

³კპოე J.

⁴რომელი J.

⁵Ambrose, *De Isaac et Anima Or.* 5.43b (PL 14.542) *denique in alio libro habes, quia tenentibus pedes et adorantibus dixit: “noli timere”. tene ergo et tu anima, sicut tenebat et Maria et dic: “tenui eum et non dimittam”, sicut dicebant ambae: teneamus te. vade ad patrem, sed non relinquas Evam, ne iterum labatur. “tecum eam ducito, iam non errantem, sed arborem vitae tenentem. rape tuis pedibus inhaerentem, ut tecum ascendant: noli me dimittere, ne iterum serpens venena sua fundat [see In Cant 25.7], ne iterum quaerat femineum mordere vestigium ut supplantet Adam. dicat ergo anima tua: teneo te et “inducam te in domum matris meae et in secretum eius quae concepit me, ut cognoscam mysteria tua, ut hauriam sacramenta tua.* “In fact you have it in another book, for he said to those holding his feet and worshipping him, ‘Fear not.’ Be encouraged, just as Mary was encouraged and say, ‘I have taken hold of him and will not let him go.’ Just as both women said, ‘Let us hold on to you. Go to the Father, but do not abandon Eve lest she fall a second time. Lead me with you. I will no longer stray but hold on to the tree of life. Take away the one cleaving to your feet that she may ascend with you. Don’t send me away so that the serpent will not spread his venom lest he seek again to bite the seed of the woman that he may trip up Adam. So let your soul say: I have hold of you, and I will lead you to my mother’s house, and in the inner chamber of the one who conceived me, that I may know your mysteries, and that I may draw upon your sacraments.’”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Armenian</i>	<i>Greek CantiPar</i>	<i>CantiPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>მითღე, გულო ჩემი, შეზავე სულს, დაამტ- კიცე, აღსრულო, რათა ვორცთა მათ-ცა ზეცისათა შეყოფად შეუძლოს. შეზა- ვენ ზეცისასა მას ჩემნი ესე ვორცნი. სუ, ვითარცა ღვთო, აღიღე, აღაწიე ცად მერმე ახალი სასუმელო, განზაგებულო, შედგომად რომელსა ჰნებავს და არა შეცორომად, არღარა ნახვი გამოტყფოღვილ და არა ძელსა მეცნიერებისასა შესებულ. ხოლო აქა¹ ამიერიოგან ძელსა ზელა სიკუდილითა ძღუელ- ყოფილ, 25.5 შეიწყნარე ვეა, რათა არღარა კუნესით მშობელ, რამეთუ განიღვენეს საღმობანი, კუნესანი და მწესარებანი.</p>	<p><i>In Cant.</i> Receive, O my heart! Be mixed with the Spirit, strengthen it, perfect it, so that it also may be able to join with the heavenly body. Mix this my body with [the] heavenly body. Drink it as wine, taken it, make it go up to heaven then a newly mixed cup, that [the woman] may follow the one she desires and not go astray, no longer with a bruised heel nor having touched the wood³ of knowledge (Cf. Gen 3:15). But from now on [she is] victor^a over the tree through death. 25.5 Receive Eve, that no longer gives birth with sighs, for pain has been driven out, as well as sighing and distress (Is 35:10).</p>	<p>Armenian</p>	<p>Greek CantiPar</p>	<p>CantiPar</p>	<p><i>Paleo-Slavonic</i> The soul expects that it would connect with the spirit that by virtue of the Spirit the body would be mixed with it! Mix my body like wine! Receive it, carry [it] upwards into heaven! Mix once more a new cup, [and] a woman saved and seduced no more nor one bitten in the heel, neither touching the tree of knowledge, the tree that is able to put to death!</p>

¹ *J* omits.

² 338a *J* In *T* a letter is erased between 3 and 5.

³ Or “tree” not collective.

^a Lit. “having conquered” or “one who has conquered.”

Georgian	In Cant.	Armenian	Paleo-Slavonic
<p>შეიწყნარე ამიერთგან კვა, წესიერებით მაგაჲლ¹, მიიღე და იცან ესე ძღუენი, რომელ მიპყრობილ მამის, ახლად შეწირე, არღარა² განშიშულუბულად კვა, არღარა² ფურცელი ლელვსა მისა სამოსელ. არამედ სულისა წმიდისა მიერ შემოსილ, რამეთუ კეთილი სამოსელი შთაუცუემს, რომლის განრეუნს არა არს.</p>	<p>From now on receive Eve who now walks in proper order,³ receive her and know this offering which has been provided to the Father. Make Eve a new offering, no longer is she naked, no longer clothed with the fig leaf. No, but clothed through the Holy Spirit, she has put on a good garment, of which there is no corruption.⁴</p>	<p>25.5 For when Adam was de- ceived, then it was discovered that he was naked. But now becoming aware [of the de- ception], he has turned back clothed in garments.</p>	<p>25.5 Take Eve, who no longer brings to birth with pain! So she⁵ has escaped pain and sor- row and sighing.” Receive. Eve once more, the one living firmly (“strongly”) and hence- forth not naked and clothed with fig leaves, but rather clothed with the Holy Spirit and covered with a good robe which does cannot not be ruined, and, who, while</p>

¹Following *J* მაგაჲლ, *T* has the non-sensical ძრეჲლ, “much.”
²არღ, “not yet,” *J*.

³For წესიერებით, *c' esierebit*, Garitte translates *in-ordination*, “in [proper] order.” Cp. PS, “one living firmly.” Given the immediately following discussion of nakedness and clothing, Hippolytus likely wrote ἐν καταστολή (or perhaps) ἐν ὑποταγή. The Georgian *NTI Paul AB 1 Tim 2.9* represents ἐν καταστολή as წესიერების, *c' esierebisa* = “appropriate.” *In Cant.* 25.6 Martha and Mary are called “apostles to the apostles,” but this title is not connected with the “*in-ordination*” of this passage. The combination of *in-ordination* . . . *munus* in Garitte’s translation has led to the idea Hippolytus is speaking of female ordination. But female ordination to apostleship is highly unlikely during this period. On the early history of ordination, see Maier, *Social Setting of the Ministry*, 199-201; Stewart-Sykes, “Ordination rites and patronage systems” VC, 115-130.

⁴Ambrose, *De Isaac et Anima Or.* 5.43b (PL 14.542-3), *suscipe igitur Evam iam non ficulneae foliis adoptam. sed sancto amictam spiritu et nova gratia gloriosam, quia iam non tamquam nudata absconditu, sed tamquam circumdata vestimenti splendore fulgentis occurrit, quia vestit eam gratia. sed nec Adam primo nudus erat, quando eum innocentia vestiebat.* “Receive, therefore, Eve no longer covered by fig leaves, but with the clothing of the Holy Spirit, and a new grace. For no longer does she hide as if nude, but runs to meet him as robed in gloriously shining garments. And neither was Adam at first nude when he was clothed with innocence.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Armenian</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>ქრისტე არა თუ განმშულებულს აქუნდა; დაათუ მჩუარნი იგი სამარეს მას ისხნეს, და შიშუელ¹ არა იყო? რამეთუ ადამ-ცა პირველ მიშუელ იყო, განახლებული სამკაული³ შთაეცუა უცოდველებსა და სიმშვიდისა და უხრწნელებსა, რომლისგან გარდაცთომილ მიშუელ იპოვნეს, ხოლო აწ განცხადებულად შემოსილ მერმე იპოვნეს. 25.6 და ამისა შემდღობად ზახებით აღიარებს შესაკრებელი ამით ღელათა მიერ. კითხლს წამებას გვჩვენებენ,</p>	<p>Indeed she (<i>or</i> they) would not have Christ unclothed; though the clothes were lying in the grave, nevertheless he was not naked (Jn 20:7). For neither was Adam at first naked, but [at that time] dressed with a fresh adornment of purity and peacefulness and and of incorruption, from which when he was seduced he was found naked, but now truly once again he has been found clothed. 25.6 And after this with a cry the synagogue expresses a good testimony for us through the women,</p>	<p>25.6 Now, since these things happened, in answer he cries out the confession, he giving his assent to this good testimony [given] through the women to the synagogue.</p>	<p>holding on to Christ cannot be unclothed; since he while lying in the grave was not naked. There also Adam before was not naked before, made wonderfully with lack of conceit, from which when he deviated he became transformed pallid (naked). Now however having recognized [himself], he is clothed again. 25.6 25.6 After this happened however, he again calls out a confession through these women to the synagogue, the good testimony;</p>

¹ შიშუელ *J.*

² Garitte reports that a likely lacuna in the manuscripts produced the reading with out *სა*. The electronic texts makes no note of this omission.

³ სამოსელი *J.* “clothing.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Armenian</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>რომელნი-იგი მოციქულ მოციქულთა იქმნებოდეს, მივლინებულ ქრისტეს მიერ, რომელთა მათ პირველ ანგელოზნი იგი ეტყოდეს: “მივედით და უთხაროთ მოწავეთა მათ; წინა გიძღვს კალილეად, მუნ იხილოთ იგი”¹*. ხოლო რათა არა ანგელოზთა მათ გამომოციქულნი² შეორეულდენ³, შემთხვა თუთ ქრისტე მოციქულთა მათ, რათა ღელანი იგი ქრისტეს მოციქულ იყენ და დაკლებული იგი ძუელისა მის ეკასი მორჩილებითა აღკოს. ამიერიგან მორჩილებით მსმენელ აღსრულებულად გამოჩნდინ.</p>	<p>those who were made apostles to the apostles, having been sent by Christ: those to whom first the angels said, “Go and announce to the disciples, ‘He has gone before you into Galilee. There you shall see him’” (Mark 16:7). But in order that the apostles might not doubt [that they were sent] from the angels, Christ himself met with the apostles, in order that the women might become apostles of Christ and might complete through obedience the failure of old Eve. For this reason [she] listens obediently that she may be revealed as perfected.</p>	<p>The women are apostles among the apostles sent by Christ, concerning which and angel said, “ ‘Go,’ he says, ‘to his disciples and say that, behold, he has risen. But that [the disciples] might not disbelieve that they were sent by the angel, Christ himself sends them, that the women might be apostles of Christ and that they might absolve and put an end to both the defect and the disobedience of old Eve, since the women were now the obedient ones in attention and subjection [to Christ],</p>	<p>and they were sent by Christ as apostle of the apostles. To which the angels spoke: “Goes and tell the disciples” : “He goes before you to Galilee.” But if they had been sent by an angel they would not have believed, but when Christ met them as sending them so that also women might be apostles of Christ and made the lack of the disobedience obvious by the current obedience bringing Eve into a right relationship.</p>

¹ J omits იგი.

² მოციქულნი იგი J.

³ Following J, შეორეულდენ T.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Armenian</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>25.7 # ახალთა წუგეშინის- ცემთაჲ! ეკა¹ მოციქულ იწოდებო². აჰა, ამიერთგან გუელისა მის ძმა-ცუკულგაჲ გულისხმა-ყოფილ და არღარა შესცების³, რამეთუ რომელსა- იგი დახელა, ამიერთგან მოიძულა და მტერად შეჰრაცხა, რომელმან გულის-თქუმითა იგი აცუნა. არღარა ამიერთგან აცუნოს ესე ხელან მან შეცთობილუბი ამან. აჰა ცხოვრებითა მით ამიერთგან განმზიარულეზულ ხითა აღსარებითა. ხი ს მის გამო გემოდ იხილა ქრისტესგან, ღირს იქნა კეთილსა და გულმან უთქუა ჭამადსა.</p>	<p>25.7 O new consolations! Eve is being called^a an apostle! Behold from now on the fraud of the serpent is understood and [Eve] no longer goes astray. From now on [she understood] the one she saw from that moment she hated and considered as an enemy who seduced her through desire. From now on that tree of seduction would not seduce her. Behold, from now on she is made happy through the tree of life and through the confession. From that tree, she tasted Christ. She has been made worthy of the good and [her] heart desired its nourishment.</p>	<p>25.7 O new admonition! Eve has been made and apostle! Behold from now on recognizing the deception of the Serpent, she is separated no longer [from rightful role], for from now on she despises satanic precepts, she does not accept that which because of desire had conquered her. No longer does the seductive tree seduce her for from now on she exulting in the Tree of Life and receiving it she has tasted of the promise of the wood.⁴ She is honored by Christ, having taken nourishment from eternal food, she leaves the Murderer behind!</p>	<p>25.7 O wonderful advisers. Eve [has] become an apostle,¹ Already recognizing the cunning of the snake, and henceforth not being tempted by the tree of the knowledge, but rather having tasted the tree of the promise. The honor of Christ is praised, he is a desired food.</p>

¹ ეკა T has a letter erased between ჰ and ა.

² იქნების, “becomes, is made” J.

³ და არღარა შესცების is written twice and erased once in T.

⁴ Lit. “wood = cross,” cf. ἕῤῥος.

^a Or “has become,” J.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Armenian</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
25.8 არღარა ამიერთვან ჰმოოდს და არცა მიუპყრას კაცთა ჭამადი განსარეუნიელი; მიუღებეს განუერუნიელება; ერთობით არს! ამიერთვან და შემწე, რამეთუ აღამი ევას უძღვს. ჟ კეთილსა მის შემწისა, სხარებითა. ² ქმრისა მის მიმართ შეწირვითა! რომლი სთავს-ცა ლეთათა მათ მიახარეს მოწაფეთა მათ.	25.8 From now on she will no longer either crave or proffer to men food that corrupts; she has received incorruptibility; from now on she is in unity and [is] a helper, for Adam leads Eve. ^a O good helper, with the gospel offering (or sacrificing) [it] to her husband! ^b This is why the women evangelized the Disciples.	25.8 From now on neither does she crave [it], nor does she give corruption to the man any longer; she receives together with [him] incorruptibility. She now shares a single purpose and is a helper for her husband. O beautiful helper, offering to him the Gospel, on account of which even the women evangelized the disciples.	25.8 She does not hunger any longer nor thirsts again after the human corrup- tibility after she received the fellow- ship of the incorrup- tibility. Now Eve has become an helper to Adam. O the beau- tiful helper by means of the gospel! There- fore the women also announced the Gospel.

¹ განუერუნიელება ერთობით არს written twice in *T*.

² სხარებითა *T J* but Garitte suggests it should be read სხარებობს.

^aBonwetch, *Hippolytus Kommentar*, 69 translates: “Adam ist Führer für Eva”; Garitte, *Traitées d’Hippolyte* (CSCO 264), 48, translates “*Adam Evam ducit*,” as in *NTI John Ap Rev 7:17* უძღვს წყარითა მიმართ წყლის, “he leads them to springs of living water.” The verb in this case is a common verb ძღვს. I am grateful to Dr. Jeffrey Childers for this reference. Less likely, but also possible is that უძღვს is derived from a rarer verb, ძღობს, and functions like verbs of love, perception, feeling, having, and the English subject appears as the Georgian indirect object, in the verb expressed by the indirect personal object, often in cooperation with the character vowels *o* / *u*, *a* and *y*. In contrast the direct object of the English is marked in these verbs by the sign of the personal subject. With these verbs nominative refers to the subject which corresponds to the English direct object, e.g. მამას ჩემსა უკუყართ თქვენ, “My father (dative) loves you (nominative). In this case the translation would be: “Eve satisfies Adam.”

^bLit. “with the gospel to husband an offering (or with offerings).”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Armenian</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>25.9 და ამისთვის შეპრაცხნეს ივინი, ვითარცა ცთომილნი, რომლისთვის ორგულუბედეს. ხოლო მიზეზ ესე იყო, რამეთუ ჩუენულებად ესე იყო ეკვადსი მითხრობად [!]? საცთურისა და არა ჭემ-მართლებისა. რაჲ-მე არს ესე ახალი თხრობად, შ ღედანო, აღდომისა და მისთვის შეპრაცხნენს ივინი ვითარცა ცთომილნი³, რაათა არა გამოჩნდენ ვითარცა მაცთურნი, არამედ ჭემმართლებისა მეტყუელ. მას უამსა ქრისტემ გამოცხადებულ მათა⁴. და პრემუ: “ემგლობად თქუენ თანა* ამას მოსწუგებითა, ვითარმედ: “შე, რომელ-ესე ღელათა ამათ ვერუენე, და თქუენ მოციქულთა მიმართ მივლინებად ვინეზე .”</p>	<p>25.9 And because of this they regarded them as deceived, because they doubted. But the reason was that it was the custom of Eve to report deception and not truth. What is this new announcement of the resurrection, O women? This is why they reckoned and (i.e. even) them as deceived. But in order that they might not appear as deceivers, but as speaking the truth, Christ was displayed to them at that time and said to them: “Peace be with you,” (Jn 20:15) by this he taught that, “It was my desire, I who appeared to these women, to send them also as apostles to you.”</p>	<p>25.9 And for this reason the thought the were mistaken, for this reason they were afraid. The reason is this, it seems the tale was a falsehood, not the truth. What are these new things among you, women, that you declare the resurrection? On account of this the considered that they were mistaken. But that it might not again be shown that the women were wrong, but speaking the truth, at that moment Christ appears and says, “Peace to you,” this means that, “I am he who appeared to the women and sent them to you, because I wished to send [them as] apostles to you.”</p>	<p>The reason for this is however, that the Eve was in the habit of announcing error, not truth. What is this, that here women announce the resurrection as a gospel? — Then Christ appears to them <and> says: “Peace be with you!” For I appeared to the women and sent them to you as an apostles.</p>

¹ესე იყო *T* non-sensical scribal mistake.

²Expected: მოხრობად, “to report.”

³ცთომილნი is written above the line in *J* in a second hand.

⁴მათა. და Garitte reads without the full stop მათა და, while *J* reads მათდა.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Armenian</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
25.10 აწ ყოველთა მათოცს, რამეთუ, საყუარედნო, ამიერიოგან აწ აპა ღამშვლებს შესკრებელს მას და ეკლესიათ იღოლებს.	25.10 Now, beloved, it is clear from these things that he pacifies (or brings peace) the synagogue and the church is glorified. ¹	25.10 Now, since these things happened, O beloved, behold, he makes peace, causing the synagogue of the Jews to cease and glorifies the mystery of the resurrection. We are those who worship every day in so far as we are making very glorious the holy festival, rejoicing with the angels.	25.10 After this however it so happens, O beloved, boasts still further after the church breaks from the synagogue.

¹Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *Fragments in Canticum canticorum*, (PG 69: 1285.33-46). Τὰς γυναῖκας δηλοῖ, τὰς ἐλθούσας μὲν Σαββάτων ὄρθρου βαθέως ἐπὶ τὸ μνήμα καλεῖ, καθ' ὃ συνθαπτόμεθα αὐτῷ. Τὸ οὖν, ἐπὶ τὴν κοίτην, ἢ ἀπὸ κοίτης φησὶν, ἢ κοίτην ἑαυτῆς τὸ τοῦ Κυρίου μνήμα καλεῖ, καθ' ὃ συνθαπτόμεθα αὐτῷ. Ἀλλ' οὐχ εὐθὺν αὐτὸν, ἢ ἀπὸ ἀκούσασα· “Οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε· ἠγέρθη γάρ.” Καὶ εὐθὺν αὐτὴν οἱ τηροῦντες ἀγγελοὶ, οὓς καὶ ἐρωτᾷ· “Ποῦ τεθείκατε τὸν Κύριον;” Ἀλλὰ παρελθούση τοὺς ἐρωτηθέντας, ὑπήντησε λέγων· “Χαίρετε.” Διό φησιν ὡς μικρὸν παρηλθὼν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἕως εὐθὺν, καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆσω αὐτὸν. Ἐκράτησε γὰρ οὗτος πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἤκουσε· “Μή μου ἄπτου.” Οἶκον δὲ μητρὸς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἀποστόλων φησὶ, εἰς ἣν ἀπελθούσα εὐαγγελίζετο τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν ἀνάστασιν. Τεθυμαμένη σιμόναν καὶ λίβανον. “He indicates the women who found him very early on the first day of the week to the tomb of Jesus and who did not find him. What, then does ‘on the bed’ mean? Either she is speaking from a bed she speaks or she calls the Lord’s tomb, according to which we are buried together with him, a bed. but he did not find him, because she heard, ‘He is not here, for he has arisen.’ And the guarding angels found her, them she also asks, ‘Where have you laid the Lord?’” But when she went on by the ones she had asked, he met her saying, ‘Greetings.’ This is why it says I went on a little further from them until I found [him] and I will not let him go. For she held so to his feet and she heard ‘Do not touch me.’ She speaks of the house of the gathering (synagogue) of the apostles as the house of her mother to which she went and preached the gospel of the resurrection of Christ, having offered myrrh and frankincense.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>26.1 და რასა-მე იტყვს: “ვინ არს ეცი. რომელი გამოვალს უღბნოთ, ვითარცა ბურქუად-ბურქუად კუამლისა აღსვლავ, საკუბეკელისა სულწილგამა აღტეკებულო, მური და გუნდრეკი ყოვლითულო სულწილგბითა მესსაზვებულთა.”¹ მ ახლოსა მის ჳმოსა! მ საკვრეკელთა მათ ჳრახვთა! მ ეკლესია, რომელი უღბნოთ გამოვალს, ამისოვს, რათა მოქალაქე ქრისტესა იყოს, “ვინ არს ეცი, რომელი გამოვალს უღბნოთ? რამეთუ მრავლით უამითგან წარმართნი უღბნო-ქმნულ ღმრთის მიმართ. სოლო ამიერთგან მაღლითა ღმრთისათა მოქალაქეთა.² წმიდათა თანა შერაცხელ, კინათი-გან ეკლესია შექმნო, გამოჩინებულ სულწილგბითა ხელსაცხებულთა შემკვეთთა.</p>	<p>26.1 And what does it say, “Who is this who goes out from the desert, as billows^a of smoke [are] ascending,^b sending up the aroma of incense, myrrh and frankincense, mixed with all aromas^c”?³ O the new voice! Oh the amazing mysteries! O church that approaches from the desert, for the reason that it might be citizen (<i>or</i> a neighbor) to Christ! “Who is this, who approaches from the desert?” because for a long time the Gentiles became a desert toward God. But, from now on they are citizens esteemed in holiness by the grace of God, whence the church adorned appeared in the aroma of mixed anointing oil.</p>	<p>26.1 Εἶτα μετὰ τοῦτο· Τίς ἀνήη ἡ ἀναβαίνουσα ἀπὸ τῆς ἐρήμου ὡς στελέχη καπνοῦ τεθυμιαμένη, σμύρναν καὶ λίβανον ἀπὸ πάντων κωνιοειδῶν μυρεψοῦ. Πάλαι γὰρ τὰ ἔθνη ἔρημα θεῶ ὑπῆρχομεν, νυνὶ δὲ χάριτι θεοῦ πολίται καὶ συγκληρονομοὶ Χριστοῦ. Τὴν οὖν ἐξ ἔθνων ἕκκλησίαν λέγει τὴν ἔρημον ἣτις ἐγένετο πόλις τοῦ θεοῦ.</p>	<p>26.1 Then after this, who is this that comes up from the desert as a smoking pillar of smoke, myrrh and frankincense of a preparer of incense. For from long ago we the nations have been desolate toward God, but now by the grace of God we are citizens, fellow heirs of Christ. Therefore the church of the Gentiles he calls the desert place has become a city of God.</p>	<p>26.1 O the new voice! O the wonderful mysteries! O the church “from the desert climbing” so that she would become a companion of Christ! “Who” now is this of the upwards path from the desert? The Gentiles were left (desolate) by Christ before now, but now through the grace of God, they are “fellow citizens with the saints” by which the church traveling upwards are adorned with well mixed <i>myra</i>.</p>

¹ Corrected by a second hand from სრლითა თო საკვრეკელთა.

² მოქალაქეთა J; მოქალაქე T.

³ Song 3:6 τῆς ἀνήη ἡ ἀναβαίνουσα ἀπὸ τῆς ἐρήμου ὡς στελέχη καπνοῦ τεθυμιαμένη σμύρναν καὶ λίβανον ἀπὸ πάντων κωνιοειδῶν μυρεψοῦ;

^a ბურქუა is an otherwise unknown word.

^b Garitte, “with clouds, smoke.” See *ADW*, s. v. “ბურქუად-ბურქუად,” “კუამლი” “making billows of smoke.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
26.2 და იტყვს: “აწ ვინ-მე ¹ არს ესე, რომელი გამოვალს უღაბნოთ, ვითარცა კუამლი საკუმევევლითა აღტყვებული?”* # კეთილითა მათ საკუმევევლითა, სულნელთა საკუმევევლითა უმზავებულთა! რამეთუ რომელსა-იგი იტყვს: “ვითარცა კუამლი სულნელი საკუმევევლითა აღტყვევული”, რამეთუ კუამლი ცმცხლოსგან გამოსრულ და ჰაერთა აღიწიის და აღსა მას, ვითარცა ეტლითა წარმმართველსა, გჳრუნებს და გამოწნებოს; ეგრე-ცა ქრისტეს ზრახვაჲ კეთილი მიმოღებულ, მოუწყებულ, აღმაგულ ქუმეყანით ზეცად;	26.2 And she says, “Now who is this, that goes out from the desert, like smoke of incense ascending” (Song 3:6)? O excellent incenses, mixed aromatic incenses! For concerning whom does it say: “as fragrant smoke of incenses ascending” (Song 3:6)? As smoke from fire comes out from a fire and is taken up into the air, and a flame as a leader of chariots, shows it to us and appears, so the good mystery of Christ was spread abroad giving notice, going up from earth to heaven	26.2 <Ως στελεχη καπνοῦ τεθυμιαμενη>. Διὰ τι καπνοῦ; Ὅτι καπνὸς ἐκ πυρὸς πρὸς ἐρχόμενος εἰς ἀέρα ἵπταται. Τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τῶσπον τοῦ Χριστοῦ μυστηρίον κατήγγειλεν ἡ οἰκονομία εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς, εὐδοκίαν ἡμᾶς τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνερχόμενον.	26.2 “As one producing a smoking pillar of smoke.” Why of smoke? Because smoke goes up into the air as it comes from the fire. In the same way that the mystery of Christ announce the economy to the ends of the earth, sending us up from the earth into heaven by the flame of divinity.	26.2 “Who” now, he said (having announced), are these coming upwards from the desert as palm trees of the smoke of frankincense?” O the beautiful incense, the adornment full of aroma! And saying: “Like palms of smoke of the incense.” For the smoke of fire flies upwards into the air, in which manner Christ promising the mysteries of the economy, from the earth upwards to heaven. Now well the Palm tree, promising the mystery of the resurrection.

¹ აწ ვინ-მე “now who,” T ; J omits აწ, “now.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
რამეთუ შუენიერთა საკუმეკელთა აღმოაცენებლად ზრახვის აღდგომისაჲსა მოუწეებთა, ვითარცა ბურქულ-ბურქული კუამლი აღზავალი საკუმეკელთა;	For he was sending forth beautiful aromas of the mystery by making known the resurrection as billows of incense smoke going up.	26.3 For in this way, having been found in the likeness of an aroma, not only did he put his aroma ^a to what was below, but also arrived in heaven, as a flame of fire sending up incense. “Myrrh and frankincense with all mixed [aromas] through the seller of cosmetics and unguents ^b ” (Song 3:6) O twice exceedingly great mystery! O righteous message! For with myrrh was both the annunciation of the passion and the burial of Christ made.	26.3 For he pointed to the cross as a pillar of wood, by which the church is guarded, and myrrh and frank- incense the burial in which it is burned. For these things [are] the sweet smelling offerings of the church. But after these, he says, a cloud of the incense maker. For the sufferings ga- thered together from his conception to the resurrection all emit a sweet fragrance.	26.3 “Myrrh and frankincense, all manner of prepa- ring of aromas”. Again the great mysteries and the righteous announcement! The myrrh now proph- esies the suffering of Christ to the burial; frankincense how- ever smoke suspen- ded to the glory of God.

¹ ქუე კამე T (with a small line marking an abbreviation; კ is partially erased so that it appears similar to გ, as if the words were to be read ქუეგანამან, which does not fit the context. In J ქუე კუამე (w/o abbreviation line).

^aSee Garitte, CSCO, 264, 50 n. 23 კუამე from the verb კუმას < კუმეკას “to [burn] incense.”

^b“Cosmetics and unguents” lit. “the mixers.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
<p>ხოლო გუნდროუკი სალიდებულად ღმრთისა მიერ აღკუმეულ. არამედ ყოველით- ურთ შეზავებულ შემზავე- ბელთა მათ მენელსაც ხებელ- თაათა. ხოლო ყოველი ერთად შეკრებულ სულდებულა ქრისტესსა, იგი რომელ მცნებათა და სზარებისგან ქადაგებულ. ამისთვის ღალადებით იტყვს: “მური და გუნდროუკი ყოველთა მიერ” შემზავე- ბელთა მათ მენელსაც ხებელ- თაათა⁴. 27.1 “ჰჰა ესერა ცხედარი⁵ იგი სოლომონის⁶ და სამეოცნი ძაღნი გარე- მობუკულ” მისა ძლიერთა მათგან ისრაჲლისათა,</p>	<p><i>In Cant.</i> But frankincense is an incense to the glory of God, but with all unguents mixed by the sellers of cosmetics and unguents. But all is congregated into one aroma for Christ, he is the one who was announced by the commandments and the gospel. For this reason, crying out he says, “Myrrh and frankincense mixed with every aromatic of the sellers of cosmetics and unguents” (Song 3:6). 27.1 “Behold there the couch of Solomon, and sixty strong ones (<i>lit.</i> forces) surrounding^a it from the strong [men] of Israel,</p>	<p>Μυρεψὸν δὲ τὸ ἐναργέλιον ἀνόμια- σεν· ἐν ἐκείνῳ γὰρ ἀπόζεινται πάντα τὰ εὐώδη μυστήρια. Διὰ τοῦτο λέγει· Σμύρναν καὶ λίβανον ἀπὸ πάντων κομιορτῶν μυρεψοῦ. 27.1 Εἶπά φησιν· Ἴδοὺ ἡ κλίνη τοῦ Σολομῶν, ἕξή- κοντα θυσιατοὶ κύβη- τοι ἀπὸ θυσιατῶν Ἰσραήλ,</p>	<p>He called the gospel incense maker, for in the gospel lie all the sweet smelling myr- series. This is why it says “myrrh and frankincense from all the clouds of the incense maker.” 27.1 Then he says, behold the couch of Solomon, seventy mighty men around it from the mighty ones of Israel.</p>	<p>By all this, beloved, gathered together, is announ- ced the aroma to Christ following the commandment of the law and gospel. Therefore he calls out and says “myrrh and frankincense.” 27.1 O blessed mouth! O the couch of peace!</p>

¹ According to Garitte, should be read as რომელ იგი.

² თვს written above the line in *J*.

³ According to Garitte, should be read as ყოველით ურთ.

⁴ *J* omits მათ მენელსაც ხებელთაათა.

⁵ ცხედარი *J* (plural).

⁶ სოლომონისნი *J* (plural).

⁷ გარემობუკულ *J*

^a Lit. “covered round about.”

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
თითოეულად მახელი ბარკაღსა მათს, სწავლულნი ლუაწულს ¹ *. † სანატრელისა მის პირისა! ჰოი ცხედრისა მის განსასუენებელისა! რამეთუ ცხედარსა სოლომონისსა არა თუ სხუას ¹ მას გამოაც- ხადებს, არამედ თავადსა ქრისტესსა. რამეთუ კითარცა სახელ ² დამსურალი ვინ მრავლითა ღაშრომითა აღ- დეს განსუენებად ცხედარსა ზედა,	each one trained for fighting with his sword on his thigh, ” (Song 3:7-8). O blessed mouth! O the couch, O the resting place! For it explains the couch of Solomon as nothing other than Christ him- self. For in the same way an exhausted person climbs upon a couch in order to recuperate from many cares,	ἕκαστος ῥομφαίαν ἐπὶ τὸν μηρὸν αὐτοῦ βαστά- ζων. Κλίνη τοῦ Σολομῶν- τος οὐκ ἄλλη τρανὴ ἐκηρύττετο, ἀλλ’ ἡ ὁ Χριστός. Ὅν γὰρ τρόπον ἐκ πολλοῦ κόπου τίς καὶ καμιάτου ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ κλίνης ἑαυτὸν ἐπιρρίπτει τὸν καμιάτων ἀποσοβῆσαι καὶ ἀναπαύσασθαι,	Each one carrying a sword on his thigh. Another different couch of Solomon was not preached, except Christ. For this is the way that anyone exhausted from much labor, when he repents and throws himself upon the couch to hurry from from exhausting labor and to rest,	For (through) the couch of Solomon is an- nounced nothing other than Christ. Even as after someone has worked and returned from great labor, and throws himself on the couch,

¹სხუას J.

²Following J.; სახელ კითარცა, “for this reason also,” T.

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
რახთა მამუკრალობა იგი განიმოროს განსუენებითა მით, ეგრე-ცა ჩუენ, მოქც- ეულ ამის სოფლისა ამოეებისაგან, ტვრთისა მას-მცა განვიმორებთ, რომელ ზელა მკართა გუეღვა სიმბიმც ცოდუათა, შეკვდომითა ჩუენითა ქრისტესა განსასუენებელსა კპოვებთ ვითარცა ცხელარს.	so that the weariness of his labor may pass with the rest, in the same way also we [have been] converted from the vanity of this world that we might remove what was placed upon our shoulders: a heavy load of sins. By us falling [on]to Christ, we have found a place of rest like a couch. ^a	οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐπιστρέψαντες ἐκ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ματαιότητος καὶ τῆς τούτου πλάνης, τὸν τε κόπον τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ὡς φορτίον ἐπὶ τὸν ὄμω ἐγκείμενον ἀπορρίψαντες, ἀνεπαυσάμεθα μυστικῶς ἐν τῇ κλίνῃ ταύτῃ, ἣτις ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ λέγων· "Δεῦτε πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες πρὸς με, καὶ ἐγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς".	so even we when we turn from the vanity of the world and from the deception of it, with the labor of sins as a load upon our shoulder, have cast it off and taken rest as initiates upon this same couch, which is Christ, who says, "Come all who are laboring to me and I will give you rest."	abandons work, so also we having turned from this world of vanity, and once we put aside the burden of sin that lay on our shoulders, we lie down on Christ (and) find rest as on a couch.

^aOr "sepulchre."

<i>Georgian</i>	<i>In Cant.</i>	<i>Greek CantPar</i>	<i>CantPar</i>	<i>Paleo-Slavonic</i>
27.2 ესრე-ვე სახედ ყოველი ნათესავნი მამათანი სრულია მის განსუენების დამკვიდრებად შეკმლუბელ, არათუ სხვთ რაით განსუენებულ იქმნებოდეს, არამედ ქრისტეს მიერ ¹ . მ კეთილთა განსასუენებელთა. სახითა ზრახვისათა ყოვლისა-ვე შეკრებად შემძლებულ! ამას ცხელარსა სომანიტელი იგი განუმზადებდა ნეტარსა მას ელისეს. ამას ცხელარსა ზედა შესუენებელნი იგი ² მკულარნი აღდებოდეს. ძმ იგი ქურივისა მის მომადლებულ ღა ყრმა იგი სომანიტელია მის აღდგომილ.	27.2 In the same way all the past generations of the fathers were able to inherit the rest. Certainly by no other were they made to rest, except through Christ. O the good places of rest! By the type of mystery capable of congregating everyone! The Shunamite prepared this couch for blessed Elisha (2 Ki 4: 10-34). The dead coming to their end upon this couch were arising. The widow's son was weighted down and the child of the Shunamite was raised.	Ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν κλίνην ἀνεπαύσαντο οἱ προφῆται, οἱ πατρὸς νόμου καὶ μετὰ νόμον λάμψαντες, πρὸς δὲ καὶ οἱ πατριάρχαι. <Ἐξηκοντα γὰρ δυνατοὶ κήληφ αὐτῆς ῥομφαίαν ἐπὶ τὸν μηρὸν αὐτοῦ βαστάζων ἕκαστος>, τούτεστι σπέγμα εἰς Χριστὸν ψηφίζόμενοι ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ μέχρι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐξηκοντὰ εἶσι προπάτορες αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ καταβολῆς τοῦ κόσμου, τούτεστιν, ὡς ἔφθην εἰπὼν, ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδάμ καὶ καθ' ἑξῆς μέχρι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.	27.2 Upon this couch rested the prophets, who shone before and after the law. Toward it went the patriarchs as well. For sixty mighty men surround it each carrying a sword on his hip. This is the seed to Christ, selected from Adam to the Christ, that is, there are sixty of his forefathers from the foundation of the world, as has been said, from Adam and each in order until the Christ.	27.2 All the fathers take up beautiful and richly mysterious couches. This couch was a fleshly shade for the blessed Elisha. Resting on this couch the dead rise; the son is given the widow, the lad of the Shunamite arises.

¹ მამათ, “to, toward,” *J.*

² *J* omits, “it.”

Georgian

27.3 ესე ცხედარი განდებულნი მიჰქუნდა და ვიდრე არა განსრულ იყო ბჭეს მას, შეგმა-ყოფილ ქრისტე გამოჩნდა და თუთ თავის თვისს აღდგომის მის მჩუენებელ და ველმწიფედ მტყოდა, რომელთა-იგი აღულო; “დავით ტვითი ეგე, ნუ აღიღებთ, რომელს-იგი ვერ შემძლებელ ხარი ტვითად”. მუნქეს-ვე, კითარცა დაიდგნეს ცხედარი, ველი უბყრა ყრმას მას და მისკემდა ქურივს მას. 27.4 ზედა ამას-ვე ცხედარს დავდო-ილი იდვა ასული მოავრისა მის. რომელი იყო ათორმეტის წლის. მას ჟამს შევიდა სხლს მას წინამე მოწამების მის და აღდგინა ქალი იგი*. 27.5 ამის ცხედრის მიისწრაფდა დელაკცი იგი, რომელი დელათა შჯულს ზედა მრავლით ჟამითგან ვერ განეურნებულ, ფესუს მას ველს შეახებდა*. !

In Cant.

27.3 When this couch was being carried out and before it^a had gone out the gate, Christ appeared^b and revealed himself, being shown by his own resurrection that he was capable, he said to the ones carrying [the child], “Put down that burden, do not carry what you are not able to carry.” As soon as they the couches were put down, he took the hand of the child and returned [him] to the widow¹ (Lk 7:12-15). 27.4 Upon this couch laid prostrate the leader’s daughter, who was twelve years old. She was lying [sick] on this same couch, then [Jesus] entered into the house in the presence of witnesses and raised his daughter up (Mk 5:22-24; 35-43). 27.5 To that couch hurried a woman who for a long time had an issue of blood^c and had not been able to be healed. And with her hand she grasped the fringe [of his garment] (Mk 5:25-34).

Paleo-Slavonic

27.3 The carriers in the gate Christ himself instructed to put down this couch; he shows himself for salvation: Do not carry a load, which you are not able to bear! And grasping the hand (holding) he gave the widow. 27.4 Also the daughter of the ruler (sovereign) who was 12 years old was put; then Jesus with three witnesses present, directed then toward the girl. 27.5 On this couch the one with the issue of blood strove but could not touch the seam.

¹Cp. Ambrose, *De Isaac et anima Or.* 5.45 (PL, 14.543), cited by Bonwetsch, *Hohelied Studien*, 11.

^aLit. “when not yet.”

^bLit. “made to grasp.”

^cLit. “above the law of women.”

Georgian

27.6 იხილენით ცხელარნი საკრევლნი, რამეთუ ყოველნი, რომელნი ამას ჰხედვენ, მართლისა ქოჩილისა ჩინებულ, წყლისა ღვინო გარდაქმევად გემოის ხილვითა. ჰსანაჭრელისა ცხელარისა, რომელსა ზედა აბრაჰამს ინავ-უღვამს, რომელსა ზედ ისაკი შეიწირვის, რომელსა ზედა იაკობი განდიდებეს, რომელსა ზედა მოსე კელმწიფე-ყოველ¹, რომელსა ზედა აჰრონ ლოცვის შექმირველ 27.7 ჰს ნეტართა შვილთა, რომელნი მართლად მამათა სამკვდრებელსა ღაიმ კვდრებელს, იხილენით პირად-პირადნი ცხელარნი, რომელსა ზედა სამეოცნი ძალნი გამჩინებულ ესე ცხელარნი მართალსა ნათესავსა მამათასა მიიჩინეს² თვისა, შეკრებოთა ყოველთა მართალთა ქრისტეს მიმართ, რამეთუ ყოველთაგან გამოიშვების, რამეთუ იტყვს წერილი: ესე არიან სამოცენი იგი ათასეული და არა თუ ტყუილ არს, გამოითქმის სამეოცნი ძალნი გარემოის მის ერისა მისგან ისრაელისა³, რამეთუ ყოველისა მისგან ერისა ისრაელისა* უძლიერენი ესე⁴ გამოჩრევით მომღებელ, რომელნი-იგი მამად გამოჩინებულ,

In Cant.

27.6 See these marvelous couches^a, for all who see [them] are called to the righteous nuptials, tasting the water become wine. O blessed couch, by which they sit at table with Abraham, upon which Isaac is offered, [and] upon which Jacob increases, upon which Moses was appointed leader, upon which Aaron offered a blessing! 27.7 O blessed children, who righteously inherit an inheritance from the Father. Behold the various couches, upon which appeared sixty mighty ones (*lit.* forces). These couches having appeared through a righteous generation of the fathers were called to himself, congregating (*or* gathering) all the faithful to Christ, because is begotten from them all. For Scripture says: “Sixty strong men (*lit.* forces) [were] around it from the people of Israel” (Song 3:7), for [the] strongest from all the people of Israel these are selected, received who as appeared as fathers,

Paleo-Slavonic

27.6 See the wonderful couch on which the one going out to a righteous marriage prepare themselves! They drank water changed into wine. O the blessed couch on which Abraham laid himself down, on which Isaac was offered, on which Jacob was enriched, on which Moses was introduced to the sovereign (prince), on which also Aaron as priest! 27.7 O blessed children inheriting the economy from righteous fathers! See the variety of the couch, on which “sixty mighty ones” appear! That couch comprises itself the family of the righteous fathers and on it meet all the saints in (?) Christ. For he is born from all of them. For the Scripture says: “Sixty mighty ones are around mighty ones of Israel.” For of all the families of the sons of Israel the strongest ones were those who appeared as approved fathers

¹ *J* adds და, “and.”

² მიიჩინებს *J*, “he calls”

³ *J* omits.

⁴ ესენი *J* (plural).

^a Garitte translates “marvelous couch,” despite the plural in the text of In Cant. 27.

Georgian

რომელნი მახვლსა ბარკაღ-სხვლთა შეგბად
შემძლებელ არიან. და რაჲ-მე არს მახვლი იგი
ბარკაღ-სხვლს, არამედ სიტყუა იგი.
რომელმან განგლო შორის მამათა მათ,
წვეილთაგან გამოსრულ, რათა მის, რომელ-
იგი წვეილთაგან გამოშობად შემძლებელ
იყოს?¹ 27.8 რამეთუ აღმოთგან კიდრე
ქრისტესამდე აღესრულებთან სამეოცჯერ
ათასეულნი იგი ცხედარსა მას ზედა
განსუენებულნი, რომელთა მიერ სიტყუა იგი
მიფენილ; წვეილთა მათგან გამოსულას²
მოგუსწავებს. ამისთვის აბრაჰამ ჯელთა ეზოს-
მოდლორისთა მათ წვეილთ თვსთა დაღებად
სცემდა, რამეთუ სიტყუა იგი წვეილთა მათგან
გამოსულად იყო. და იაკობ ფიცით ბარკაღ-
სხვლთა თვსთა ზედა დაღებად სცემდა
ჯელთა იოსები სთა*.

In Cant.

who are able to wield a sword on their
thigh. And what is the sword on the thigh,
except the Word, which moves among the
fathers, having proceeded from [their]
loins, to him who from loins had been
generated might be able [to arrive]? Now
these are sixty thousand, and indeed this
is not a lie. 27.8 For from Adam until
Christ there were indeed perfected sixty
thousand resting upon the couch, through
whom the Word was poured out. He
teaches us while proceeding⁶ from their
loins. For this reason Abraham made the
steward^a place^b his hand on his loins (Gen
24:2). For the Word was to come forth
from loins. And with an oath Jacob made
Joseph place^b his hand on his thigh (Gen
47:29).

Paleo-Slavonic

after the selection, who are able to
carry the sword “at the loins.”
What however is “at the loin”
except the Word, which coming
through the fathers, it goes from
the loins to be born by virtue of
the loins. These are the sixty
fathers. And it does not lie. 27.8
Then from Adam to Christ there
are sixty fathers resting on the
couch, through which the Word
appears, from the loins he later
makes his appearance. Therefore
Abraham put the hand of the lad
on his loins to make an oath [in
the place] where the Word which
comes forth out of the loins. So
Jacob put the hands of Joseph on
his loins.

¹ყოს, “will be” J.

²J T გამოსულად. Garitte suggests გამოსლად=exitum, “come/gone out”

^aGaritte, *procuratoris=aulae magistri*, “master of the hall.”

^b“To give to put” meaning “to make [one] put” is not standard Georgian but an Armenian idiom. See Garitte, CSCO 264, 52 n. 44.

Georgian

27.9 შ სანატრელთა მათ წვევილთა¹, სანატრელსა მის სიტყვსა შემძლებელ გამოშობად, რომელსა-იგი მამაა გულით გამოშობს! ამას წვევილთა მთვან გამოსრულსა ეხელავთ. სამართილად ამის გამოცხადებულისა ზრახვისა მომთზრობელ სიტყუა იგი იქნების, და რამეთუ სამეოცნი მამანი არიან ესე² აღამითვან კიდრე ქრისტესამდე აღსრულბულ და ზრახვა იგი ჰქმნარიტები სა განცხადებულად მიმოღებულ, და ცხედარნი იგი სოლომონისნი გამოჩნდებიან, 27.10 რამეთუ არა თუ სოლომონ იყო ცხედარ, არამედ სოლომონისგან ცხედარნი გამოჩინებულ, რათა³ ყოველთა განსუენებისა ზრახვა და ფიქლით გარდართულ სიყუარული გამოჩნდეს, იხილუ ნათესავი მამათა მათ დასაბამითვან სოფლისათ მიმოღებულ, ნათესავნი მართალნი გამოჩინებულ, და დაუნჯებული მამათა მათ გამოცხადებულ, და ცხედარი იგი განსასუენებელი⁴ მიმოღებულ

In Cant.

27.9 O blessed loins, blessed Word [they] were was able to generate, what the Father generated from [his own] heart! We see the one brought forth from these loins. By his righteousness the Word became the interpreter of the mystery put on display, and because there are (*lit.* these are) sixty fathers perfected from Adam until Christ and the mystery of the truth was spread abroad, and the couches of Solomon appear. 27.10 For nevertheless Solomon was not the couch, but from Solomon the couches [were] revealed, that he might (*or* will) manifest the mystery of resting for all and love adorned with a banner. Behold the generation of the fathers made known from the beginning of the world, righteous generations revealed and a treasury of the fathers put on display, and those couches are a righteous resting place.

Paleo-Slavonic

27.9 O blessed loin that could show forth the blessed Word! Which the Father brings forth out of his heart, we see the same one coming out of the loins. In truth, the Word came by this economy and the mystery of the Narrator. And as there appear sixty fathers perfected from Adam to Christ, and the mystery of the truth was announced; the couch Solomon was revealed. 27.10 Solomon was not this bed rather Solomon comes from the bed.

¹წვევილთა J.²ესენი J.³რ(ათ)ა J რ(ამეთუ) T.⁴განსასუენებელი J.

Georgian

27.11 და ვინ-მე არიან ესენი მამათა მათგანნი?
 მოვედით და ვიხილოთ¹. აწ შენ იხილე-ღა,
 რამეთუ პირველ აღამს ესუა სეთი და
 სეთი ესუი და ენუსს - კაიან, კაიანანს -
 მაღელი, მაღელი - იარედ. იარედ[ს] - ესუქი,
 ესუქს - მათუსალა, მათუსალას - ლამექი,
 ლამექს - ნოვე, ნოვეს - სემი, სემს - არფაქსადი,
 არფაქსადს - სალლა, სალლას - ებერ, ებერს -
 ფალეგი, ფალეგს - რაგავი, რაგავს - სერუქი,
 სერუქს - ნაქორ, ნაქორს - თარა, თარას -
 აბრაჰამ, აბრაჰამს - ისაკი, ისაკს - იაკობი,
 იაკობს - იუდა, იუდას - ფარეზ, ფარეზს -
 ესრომი, ესრომს - არამი, ესრომს - არამი,
 არამი² ამინადამ, ამინადამს - ნასონ, ნასონს -
 სალმონ. სალმონს - ბოოზი, ბოოზს -
 იობედ, იობედს - იესე, იესეს - დავითი, დავითს
 - სოლომონ, სოლომონს - რობოამ, რობოამს -
 აბია, აბიას - ასა, ასას - იოსაფატ, იოსაფატს -
 იორამ, იორამს - ოზია, ოზიას

In Cant.

27.11 And who then are these from the fathers?
 Come and let us see. Now you^a look, for first
 Adam had Seth and Seth - Enos and Enos -
 Cai(nan)an, Cainanan - Mahalaleel, Mahalaleel -
 Jared. And Jared - Enoch, Enoch - Methuselah,
 Methuselah - Lamech, Lamech - Noah, Noah -
 Shem, Shem - Arphaxad, Arphaxad - Shela, Shela
 - Eber, Eber - Peleg, Peleg - Reu, Regeu - Serug,
 Serug - Nahor, Nahor - Terah, Terah - Abraham,
 Abraham - Isaac, Isaac - Jacob, Jacob - Judah,
 Juda - Perez, Perez - Hesrom, Hesrom - Aram,
 Aram - Aminadab, Aminadab - Nahshon,
 Nahshon - Salmon, Salmon - Boaz, Boaz - Obed,
 Obed - Jesse, Jesse - David, David - Solomon,
 Solomon - Rehoboam, Rehoboam - Abias, Abias-
 Asa, Asa - Jehosaphat, Jehosaphat - Joram,
 Joram - Ozias, Ozias-

Paleo-Slavonic

27.11 We see every one of
 these fathers . Now the
 first, Adam, has produced
 Seth; then the line follows
 as the evangelist Matthew
 has written.

¹ იხილეო, "See!" J.

² In J a second hand corrects by placing the letters in brackets in the margin.

^a Sing. pron.

Georgian

- იოთამ, იოთამს - აქაზ, აქა[ზ]ს - ეზეკია. ეზეკიას - მანასე¹, მანასეს - ამოსი, ამოსს - იოსია. იოსიას - იეკონია და მმანი მისნი, მკვდრობისა მისგან ადრულ ბაბილონს². და შემდგომად წარტყუნვისა მათისა ბაბილონდ იეკონია შვა სალათიელ, სალათიელ - ზორობაბელ. ზორობაბელ - აბიოდ, აბიოდ - ელიაკიმ, ელიაკიმ - აზორი, აზორი - სალუკი. სალუკი - ზაკინი, ზაკინი - ელიოდ, [ელიოდ]⁴ - ელიაზარ. ელიაზარ - მატათანი, მატათანი - იაკობი, იაკობი - იოსეზი. იოსეზის მითხოვილ მარიამი ქალწული. ამისგან იშვა უფალი ჩუენი იესუ ქრისტე⁵.

In Cant.

Joatham, Joatham - Ahaz, Ahaz - Hezekiah, Hezekiah - Manaaseh, Manaaseh - Amos, Amos - Josiah, Josiah - Jeconiah and his borthers, after those who were aroused from living in Babylon, and after their captivity in Babylonia, Jeconiah begat Salathiel, Salathiel - Zorobabel, Zorobabel - Abiud, Abiud, Abiud - Eliachim, Eliachim - Azor, Azor - Zadoc, Zadoc - Achim, Achim - Eliud, Eliud - Eleazar, Eleazar - Matthan, Matthan - Jacob, Jacob - Joseph was married to the virgin Mary; from her was born our Lord Jesus Christ (Mt 1:1-16; Lk 3:34-38).^a

¹Following *J* მანასე *T*

²ბაბილონდ, adverbial case rather than dative *J*.

³Following *J*, *T* ზაკინი, საკინი “Zakini, Sakini” for “Achim, Achim” *T*.

⁴ელიოდ, [ელიოდ omitted in *T*]; ელიოდ, ელიოდ *J*.

⁵ამისგან იშვა უფალი ჩუენი იესუ ქრისტე *T*. “from her was born our Lord Jesus Christ”; გამოშობს ქრისტესა, “she produces Christ” *J*.

^aSo *T*; *J* has “she produces Christ.”

Georgian

27.12 ესე არიან წმიდანი ცხედარნი, რომელთა ზედა მიიკრებს წმიდათა მართალთა, რომელთა გარე-მოღვდილ მახვლოსანნი სამეოცნი იგი განღეუნითა მაცთურისა მის, რათა¹ ზედა-მისებად ვერ ველოწიფოს². ამას ზედა უმოკრებულ წარმართთაგანი განმართლუბულ განსუენებით, მაღიღებულ ღმრთისა, რომლისა ღიღებად და ძლიერებად უკუნითი უკუნისამდე, ამენ.

In Cant.

27.12 These are the holy couches upon which the righteous saints came together,^a around which are standing the sixty sword carrying soldiers, who expel the seductor, that he might not be able to come near. Upon this [couch were] congregated the Gentiles who were justified with rest, glorifying God, whose is the glory and the virtue for ever and ever. Amen.

Paleo-Slavonic

27.12 Surrounding that holy couch stand the family of the fathers, “carrying at their loins the sword,” to drive away the impostors who cannot rest upon it. The righteous from the Gentiles gather to rest upon it praising the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit to whom be glory in eternity. Amen.

¹რომლს “which” J.

²ველოწიფობს “he is not capable of” J.

^aGaritte translates *hoc est sanctum lectulum super* . . . “this is the holy couch upon which.”

CHAPTER 4
THEMES AND HERMENEUTICAL APPROACH

Introduction: Invective, Community Boundaries, and the Inner Chamber

Tending the Boundaries

Chapters One and Two surmised that in the *In Cant.* Hippolytus, a Roman church leader, presents a series of speeches designed to introduce newly baptized believers into certain mysteries of the faith in the context of Paschal or Easter initiation. The current Chapter presents a study of the hermeneutic process of the commentary and salient themes. Hippolytus uses the symbolism of the Song to explore the doctrine of the Trinity, the procession of the *Logos* from the Father and especially to discuss the symbolic value of the anointing with the Holy Spirit. The discussion of these topics includes a narrative about the importance of repentance, the reception of Gentiles into the church and Israel's protestations and rejection of Christ. Women and heretics also figure prominently in the interpretation of the Song.

As is the case with other catechetical and mystagogical instruction, a primary concern is that new believers enjoy their participation in the inner sanctum of the church while they avoid the dangers at the margins. To this end, the *In Cant.* presents an idealized, typological vision of Christian community, including both human and divine participants of varying status, its holy books and rituals, its mythical connectedness, and superiority, to both Israel and the polytheistic environment of the

church. The community is, in a sense, presented as the best of all possible worlds because it represents the promise of a New World. Hippolytus make certain statements of the beloved on lament the failure of the synagogue to embrace Christ (*In Cant.* 5.3). Hippolytus urges the synagogue to repent (*In Cant.* 8.8), based on the fact that God first took his message of salvation to the Jews (*In Cant.* 7.1-3). Believers must no longer consider Israel as a flock for God's beloved (*In Cant.* 7.4) The failure of Jews to accept Christ and the new economy of the *Logos* of God does not, however, present an insurmountable obstacle for the believing community. When a Jew "repents" and accepts Christ, it is a blessing for both community and world (*In Cant.* 17.1). Meanwhile the ongoing obstinacy of Israel confirms the identity of the believing community and the prophetic hope for the renewal of Israel provides exciting topics of discussion for future hope.

Hippolytus shows less charity toward the heretics. Their doctrines are "contemptible" (*In Cant.* 2.8), they are the false prophets predicted in Scripture, like little foxes (*In Cant.* 20.1, 2) that spoil the harvest of grapes in the Song. The heretics betray and undermine the community by challenging its explanations about the exchange relationship between the human and divine participants of the community. They undermine the community by challenging its established leadership, thus calling into question its very foundations. Since, however, Hippolytus also finds them inscribed as characters in the Song, all will be well in the end. Meanwhile the church-school must be vigilant against the seducer (*In Cant.* 27:12), that is the serpent (*In Cant.* 27:7). The seducer brought lies and corruption (*In Cant.* 25.6). This resulted in nakedness for Adam (*In Cant.* 27.7) and complicated the relationship between Eve and her rightful leader. The "tree of seduction" had been the undoing of Eve (*In Cant.*

27.7), but Christ has now transformed her and she brings the gospel, not corruption to her husband. Behind the references to the seducer lurks the menace of heresy.

Always present, in the instruction is the issue of the social boundaries of the church: Jews¹ and heretics are excluded.² New Christians are a source of agitation (*In Cant.* 2.7) to their families and social networks; therefore, the converts are taught to be bold (*In Cant.* 19.3) and are taught to expect to suffer persecution for their faith (*In Cant.* 3.4). Such *protherapeia* was a recognized type of consolation.³ Hippolytus is allusive and his attitude toward the Roman Empire is ambivalent and measured. In regard to the relationship between women and men he shows himself to be remarkably conservative of imperial values. An uneasy relationship exists between the church-school and the Jewish and polytheistic environment of the Roman Empire, yet an openly hostile attitude is displayed toward Christian heretics.

Hippolytus supports crucial aspects of the laws of the Empire that maintain the status quo, i.e. the prohibition against marriage between patronesses and male slaves. Hippolytus, however, commends the slave women who must endure the sexual advances of their owner. Women such as these are like Tamar, who made herself look like a prostitute for the sake of the anointing. Nevertheless, he condones, the radical destruction of the concubine of Zambri by Phineas. Women on the margins of society were a potential danger to the church-school.

¹Physical relationship to Abraham is useless apart from faith in Christ (*In Cant.* 7.2)

²See *In Cant.* 20.1, “destroy heresy from among yourselves”; 20.2, heretics are foxes.

³A Cyrenaic device, Cicero, *Tusc.* 3.14.29 that attempts to reduce mental anguish by preparing for inevitable suffering.

Though harsh invective found in *In Cant.* is reserved for the heretics outside the boundary of the community, at least some of the themes used by Hippolytus can be shown to have been developed among creative souls formerly recognized as members of the community who subsequently were branded as heretics and driven from the church-school. One heretic in particular, Valentinus, may well have given the original impetus both for Hippolytus #2's use of the Song in Christian initiation as well as Hippolytus' particular development of *Logos* Christology.

Revealing the Inner Chamber

The *In Cant.* makes several backward and forward references⁴ to various aspects of Christian initiation rites so that almost all the rites otherwise mentioned in Tertullian, or elsewhere in Hippolytus, are read into the Song of Songs in the course of the commentary. Such is the mode of mystagogy, it is intended to lead the newly baptized into an appreciation of the hidden, secret doctrines and rites of the faith. These are conceived as an "inner chamber" as opposed to an "outer chamber" and the explanation of the mysteries holds the promise of a more intensely felt experience of Christ. The "chamber" of mysteries is a corollary to the chamber of the heart where the believer embraces the resurrected Christ (*In Cant.* 25.2). Thus in *In Cant.* 3.1, 2 what seems an unintelligible reference to "what has happened" and the "future things . . . in a time of repentance," in the Georgian text is elucidated by the agreement of the Greek and the PS. "What has happened" refers to the saving events that have been explicated in previous preaching, baptism, and catechetical instruction. The appearance of Christ in a time of repentance is a revelation of Christ in the mysteries:

⁴See above, pages 179-209.

In Cant.

3.1 “A king led me to his own inner chambers.” So, who is the king, except Christ himself? Or what are the inner chambers, except the royal palaces? The people said this, 3.2 “We will rejoice and delight in you.” For he called everyone. First he tells us what has happened, then in the future things he appears in a time of repentance, “We will rejoice and delight in you.”

CantPar

3.1 The king took me, he says, into his inner chamber. But what is the inner chamber except the church? Who is the one who says “take me in”? In reality it is the congregation (or synagogue) of those who have believed. For it has been made safe in the chamber which is the church.”⁵

Paleo-Slavonic

3.1 Who is the king? Christ. What is the bedchamber? The church. The Synagogue however speaks this. 3.2 “We rejoice and are glad in you.” So he calls everyone <who> desires salvation. Before he proclaims what should happen; then however he speaks of the time of receiving conversion:

The inner chamber or bed bedchamber is the church and Hippolytus is apparently using the Songs text to mark the difference between catechetical instruction and the joyous explanation of the mysteries of faith. Cyril of Jerusalem, at the end of his first mystagogical lecture makes use a similar *topos*: Ταῦτα ἐν τῷ ἐξωτερῶ ἐγένετο οἴκῳ. Θεοῦ δὲ θέλοντος, ὅταν ἐν ταῖς ἐξῆς μυσταγωγίαις εἰς τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων εἰσέλθωμεν, ἐκεῖ εἰσόμεθα τῶν αὐτόθι ἐπιτελουμένων τὰ σύμβολα. “And these things were done in the outer chamber. But if God will, when in the succeeding lectures on the Mysteries we have entered into the Holy of Holies, we shall there know the symbolical meaning of the things which are there performed.”⁶

Previously baptized believers in the audience were expected to experience the “consolation” of the explanations that represented an idealized image of the

⁵Synagogue is omitted in the Georgian, but likely original; both *CantPar* and *PS-flor* have it.

⁶Cyril of Jerusalem, *Mystagogical Lectures* 1:11 (NPNF² 7:146).

community in the context of a world understood as hostile.⁷ The world is the “gathering place” (synagogue) of darkness (*In Cant.* 1.5).

Thus the commentary, as mystagogy, is an occasion for exploring the boundaries of the Christian community and what lies within the limits of community. In this way, it shares this function with the community meal. The context of the community meal, then, is a very appropriate one in which to draw the boundary lines of community identity: who is in and who is out. As an introduction to the territory of the new convert’s faith, the commentary carries this function by warning of heretics and pointing out the difference between the synagogue and the church-school.

Of course the teaching concerning the divine participants in the community is crucial. These protagonists include: God the Father, the *Logos* (or Wisdom) who became fully personal only as Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit as well as angels and the spirits of past saints, especially the patriarchs of old. The divine participants in the community also include at least one antagonist: the Evil One, the serpent. The teaching about divine participants (or theology) will be a major focus of this Chapter. In social terms, the explanations of this sort represent central and powerful concerns of the community. At the same time, the theology guides the moral life of the community,⁸ shapes the formation of its identity, and symbolizes the community.

The interpretation of the Jewish Song of Songs by Hippolytus was not conditioned by various contextual restraints ranging from oral tradition to the art that surrounded the hearers on the walls of their homes. Previous to his time the Song was

⁷Consolation is a repeated theme in Egeria’s report of her experiences of the Easter rites conducted in Jerusalem by Cyril, *Intin. Eger.* 36.

⁸See Rodney Stark and Roger Finke, *Acts of Faith: Explaining the Human Side of Religion* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 136-62.

used and interpreted in various ways in diverse contexts. Hippolytus not only had oral traditions of Christian catechesis from the variety of Christian traditions (including the gnostic tradition) to draw from, but also a rich and diverse Jewish oral interpretive tradition. Further, Hippolytus shows a willingness to experiment with both Jewish and polytheistic traditions, drawing on popular images from myth and Greco-Roman art in his reading of Scripture and the Song in particular. Hippolytus also appears to have been attracted by the mesmerizing images of the Song for his purpose, perhaps because of previous use of the Song in Valentinian circles. It should not be surprising Hippolytus draws upon the richness of Christian interpretations that are out of the mainstream of the third-century church-school. This Chapter will explore the way Hippolytus used and shaped these traditions for his mystagogical and theological purposes.

Still, Hippolytus #2's commentary is a *written* distillation of oral performance. The production of a written commentary is a powerful rhetorical move in its own right. In its various forms, the early Christian book, and especially the commentary on Scripture, served "as a means of drawing boundaries and defining Christian identities."⁹ The book can produce a "heightened contrast" at the borders between "imagined communities" where distinctions between heresy, polytheism, Christianity, and Judaism might seem to be vague.¹⁰ Hippolytus used his book to make boundaries clear and to invite his hearers or readers to explore a "space" or an

⁹Catherine M. Chin, "Through the Looking Glass Darkly: Jerome Inside the Book," in *The Early Christian Book* (ed. William E. Klingshirn, and Linda Safran; CUA Studies in Early Christianity; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2007), 101.

¹⁰Ibid.

imaginary terrain opened up through the interpretation of Scripture. Making use of *topoi* familiar to his audience, Hippolytus invited his audience to invest familiar myths, legends, and artistic expressions with Christian meaning, always under his own guidance as authoritative teacher or guide.

Hermeneutical Starting Points

A close connection exists between what the exegete imagines lying behind the image and the interpretive process.¹¹ The contents of the interpretation are also connected with both. As a result, Hippolytus #2's points of departure must be carefully noted in order to fully grasp his explanations of individual words and sentences. As will emerge in the thematic presentations below, a primary point of departure for Hippolytus is his indebtedness to Irenaeus and the *Logos* teachers such as Athenagoras, Justin, and Hippolytus #1, the enigmatic author of *Against all Heresies*. Hippolytus #2 is bearer of these traditions, but he transforms them to fit his context. For Hippolytus, Irenaeus' interpretation of the New Testament, explicated in Irenaeus' *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* (= *Epid.*) and *Haer.* represent the ground of reality to which the events of Israel's history move and which the Scripture prophetically announces.

Precedents in Jewish Interpretations of the Song

Jewish tradition contributed significantly to Hippolytus #2's theology in general and his interpretation of the Song in particular. Even Hippolytus #2's doctrine of the generation of the *Logos* is calculated to preserve his commitment to

¹¹Chappuzeau, "Auslegung," *JAC* 19: 41.

monotheism. Intermediary figures between the spiritual world and the created order were already a major feature in Jewish understanding of the cosmos, as Philo's exegesis of the Law and John's Gospel attest. Hippolytus #2 inherited a received canon of Scriptures that was quite well defined. In addition, as has been seen above, he received a number of celebratory practices that had their roots in Judaism. At the same time, the Jewish influences were themselves received as part of the environment in which other Greco-Roman religious groups flourished.

Due to textual difficulties and the poor state of preservation of the *In Cant.* in non-western languages, this small commentary has suffered from neglect. After the nineteenth century, the few critical studies that mentioned the *In Cant.* largely focused on the sources of Hippolytus #2's interpretation. Wilhelm Riedel argued that Hippolytus derived his rhetorical style and much of the interpretive process and content from previous Jewish traditions.¹² Several subsequent scholars followed Riedel in this approach,¹³ which, on the whole, approached post-third-century Jewish sources as a means to access previous traditions. Chappuzeau's own important study of the *In Cant.* employed a more acceptable critical approach to Rabbinic sources than had her predecessors to confirm Riedel's conclusions.¹⁴ Chappuzeau's study shows that rabbinic scholars datable to the second and third centuries followed similar lines of allegorical exegesis. Further, she points to Hippolytus #2's lack of any

¹²Riedel, *Auslegung*, 48-50.

¹³Johannes Quasten and Angelo di Berardino, *Patrology* (Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, Inc., 1986), 2.174. The methodology and approach to Rabbinic materials lacks the historical framework presumed by scholars after Neusner.

¹⁴Chappuzeau, "Auslegung," *JAC* 19: 48-50 ; Chappuzeau, "Die Exegese von Hohelied 1, 2 A, B und 7," *JAC* 18 (1975): 90-143.

quotations of other Christian interpretations of the Song as a support for a derivation from Jewish oral tradition.¹⁵ On the other hand no evidence exists to suggest that Hippolytus #2's interpretations themselves influenced Rabbinic interpretations.¹⁶ The discussions of the rabbis in the Mishnah, Tosephta, Song of Songs Rabbah, and the Talmud about the canonical status of the Song point to an early diversity in views and interpretive processes regarding the Song.¹⁷

Three examples illustrate that diversity. During the same time period (193-235 C.E.) in which Hippolytus wrote his commentary on the Song, R. Judah the Patriarch was compiling and editing the Mishnah in Palestine (ca. 200).¹⁸ In a well-known passage (*Yedayim* 3.5. O-S, Neusner, 1127 = *Song of Songs Rabbah* 1. 6. 20. B) the Rabbis of the early Tannaitic period discuss the sanctity (inspiration, canonicity) of the Song. The Mishnah represents R. Aqiba (ca. 100 C.E.) vehemently vindicating the Song of Songs. He insists that not only is the Song holy, like the rest

¹⁵Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 143, rightly points out that *In Cant.* is in the contemporary mainstream of Judeo-Christian understanding about the authorship of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song.

¹⁶On the other hand, good evidence suggests that Origen and third century Rabbis in Palestine were in contact concerning the interpretation of the Song; see Reuven Kimelman, "Rabbi Yokhanan and Origen on the Song of Songs: A Third-Century Jewish-Christian Disputation," *HTR* 73 (1980): 567-95.

¹⁷Josephus, *Ap.* 1.8 apparently included the Song among "four books of hymns to God" among the inspired Scriptures. His view is representative of the view dominant during time of Hippolytus #2. It is significant that Hippolytus #2 has a very similar view of the function of the Song as "praise" inspired by the Holy Spirit (*In Cant.* 1.5-9). The passage in Josephus, however, can only support the notion of an early allegorical interpretation in a general sense.

¹⁸Shaye J. D. Cohen, "Judaism to the Mishnah: 135-220," in *Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism* (ed. Harold Shanks; Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society 1992), 216-17.

of the Scriptures, but “the Holy of Holies.” Though R. Aqiba favored a symbolic interpretation, he plays on the title for his argument in favor of the holiness of the Song. He validates his statement by placing a high value on the significance of the Song, perhaps even the prophetic significance: “the entire age is not worth the day on which the Song of Songs was given to Israel” (*Yedayim* 3.5.P).

Another example indicates an early diversity in allegorical interpretations. For example 4 Ezra to the Song (4:37 [on Song 2:7; 3:5; 8:4], and 5:26 [on Song 2:14; 5:2])¹⁹ both support the notion that the Mishnah’s attribution of an allegorical approach to Aqiba has verisimilitude. These passages also show that an allegorical approach distinct from the mishnaic tendency also existed from the early second century. Despite the fact that Aqiba is credited with allegorical interpretation in Song of Songs Rabbah and other sources (Song of Songs Rabbah 1:12.3 B), and 4 Ezra illustrates another, eschatologically-oriented type of allegorical interpretation. Such interpretations do not seem to have been the only options available.

The Babylonian Talmud (*T. Sanhedrin* 12.10) attributes a censure to Aqiba

¹⁹Michael E. Stone, “The Interpretation of Song of Songs in 4 Ezra,” *JSJ* 38 (2007): 229-33, remarks that 4 Ezra belongs “to a different allegorical interpretation, conceivably of an eschatological cast, in which the love is redemption or the Redeemer.” He concludes:

It follows, therefore, that in the first century C.E. at the latest, allegorical explanation of Song of Songs was current, as is clear from the Aqiba material. If we give 4 Ezra 4:37 appropriate weight, there may have been competing allegorical explanations, of which the pseudepigraphical apocalypse preserves a different or variant form from that dominant in rabbinic circles. Insufficient evidence is available at present for us to sketch the structure of that allegorical explanation, but its very existence in an apocalypse contemporary with Rabbi Aqiba opens up exegetical and religion-historical perspectives not generally in the purview students of the apocalyptic or of Jewish mystical literature.

on a use of the Song as a type of entertainment at a Greco-Roman style banquet: “Rabbi Aqiba says, ‘Whoever sings the Song of Songs with tremulous voice in a banquet hall and (so) treats it as a sort of ditty has no share in the world to come.’”²⁰ This bit of tradition supports the notion that a literal or even bawdy interpretation and even a profane use of the Song existed at the same time as figurative interpretations.²¹ Apart from the issue of interpretive process, however, is the condemnation in the Talmud of the use of the Song of Songs in the banquet *context*. If one is to trill one’s voice in singing the Song, it should be in the context of the scholar’s *bet-ha-midrash*. Pertinent for the contextualization of Hippolytus #2’s *In Cant.* is that the Talmud may attest to the use of the Song in the context of banquet entertainment, of which Hippolytus #2’s interpretation of it as a baptismal and eucharistic text would be a type.

The correspondence between Hippolytus #2’s interpretation of the Song and Rabbinic sources has been well researched, and will be noted from time to time in the discussion below. Nevertheless, specific dependence is difficult to assess, given the state of ancient Jewish sources. What may be said is that *In Cant.* provides evidence of a good measure of cross border pollination from the non-Christian Judaism to Gentile Christianity via Jewish Christians.²²

²⁰Quoted in Samuel Dean McBride and Roland Edmund Murphy, *The Song of Songs* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990), 13.

²¹This is true at least from the third to fifth centuries, if not earlier. From the passage in the Mishnah, Alexander Altmann, *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations Vol. 1906* (Studies and Texts 3; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), 251, mistakenly argued that the Mishnah proposed an allegorical interpretation. It seems more likely, however that the Mishnah is admitting the previous existence of both interpretations and favoring the allegorical.

²²See Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*

Greco-Roman Mythical Connections

The imagery of Hippolytus' interpretation of the Song bears a resemblance to visual representations on wall paintings, mosaics, and vases displayed in Greco-Roman houses of the first and second centuries.²³ Greco-Roman religious practices of the social institution and the ideology of the banquet also shaped Hippolytus #2's interpretation of the Song. Greco-Roman polytheistic mythology and art informed the set of assumptions Hippolytus and his audiences brought to their understanding of Song. This claim is true since the audiences Hippolytus addressed were largely polytheist in background.²⁴ It seems reasonable, then, that his typical arguments and commonplaces would include Greco-Roman myth as well as Jewish traditions.

The charge of accommodation to "paganism" against Hippolytus #2 is not a new one. Long ago Döllinger suggested that Hippolytus' Christology²⁵ took much of its inspiration from polytheistic thought,²⁶ and Brent has argued a similar case.²⁷ Hippolytus is prepared to draw upon polytheistic thought and images in his explanation of the *In Cant*.

(Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion) (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).

²³See discussion above page 215-204.

²⁴The positive references to the Gentiles suggests a gentile audience, *In Cant*. 2.7 (x2); 6.1; 7.5; 8.2; 26.1; 27;12. It reasonable to assume that only a minority of his audiences were lapsed Jews and members of Christian "heretical" groups.

²⁵Döllinger assumed Hippolytus #1 and Hippolytus #2 were identical.

²⁶Döllinger, *Hippolytus and Callistus*, 211-12.

²⁷Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 361.

Hippolytus #2's Use Various Mythical Themes

The Image of Ariadne as a Symbol of the Unbelieving Synagogue

The myth of the marriage of Dionysus and Ariadne was well known in the ancient world. The celebration of this myth was endemic to Athens in the *Anthesteria*,²⁸ and memorialized in Rome (Ovid, *Fasti*. 3. 459 ff. on the *fastus*, or date, of March 8). Ariadne was often depicted alongside Dionysus in Greek vase painting: either among the gods of Olympus, or in Bacchic scenes surrounded by dancing Satyrs and Maenads. Dionysus' discovery of the sleeping Ariadne on Naxos was also a popular scene in both vase painting and mosaic. The large Roman house at Nea Paphos on Cyprus is contemporary with Hippolytus and is decorated with Dionysiac mosaics, including the image of Ariadne (as Akme) and Dionysus.²⁹ The mosaics especially show Italian influence, though a comparison with the mosaics of the third century House of Dionysus and Ariadne reveals Antiochian influence as well. The local artisans also gave unique expression to their work.³⁰ Graphic representations of Dionysus and Ariadne were popular in Italy.³¹ The most notable example are the images as early as the first century murals in the Villa of the

²⁸Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 237-42.

²⁹See figure 111 in Kondoleon, *Domestic and Divine*, 173-175.

³⁰Dunbabin, *Mosaics of the Greek and Roman World*, 229; Kondoleon, *Domestic and Divine*, 8-9, passim and 332. Italian influence is marked, especially the presence of Italian sigillata, designs, etc.

³¹Emeline Richardson, "The Story of Ariadne in Italy," *Studies in Classical Art and Archaeology* (1979): 189-95. See the multiple examples in Balch, *Roman Domestic Art and Early House Churches*, listed above, page 77.

Mysteries, house of Fronto, house of the Vetti, in Pompeii³² and the third-century Severan house of Dionysus and Ariadne in Antioch.³³ Its broad use in homes as an iconic representation of the consolation of familial love,³⁴ divine joy of the hearth, etc., in oral tradition and literature (Philostratus, *Imagines* 1.5) validates the assumption that Hippolytus and his audience would readily recall images and themes of the myth at the reading of the Song of Songs.³⁵

Several versions of the myth circulated. The rhetorician Philostratus the Elder (a Greek rhetor of the Severan period) referred to the story as a well-known nursery tale and popular object of painting:

That Theseus treated Ariadne unjustly—though some say not with unjust intent, but under the compulsion of Dionysus—when he abandoned her while asleep on the island of Dia [i.e., Naxos], you must have heard from your nurse; for those women are skilled in telling such tales and they weep over them whenever they

³²John R. Clarke, *The Houses of Roman Italy, 100 B. C. -A. D. 250: Ritual, Space, and Decoration* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 157. See also Roger Ling, *Roman Painting* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 102-4.

³³Donald E. Strong, *Roman Art* (Pelican Histories of Art Revised; Hartford, CT: Yale University Press, 1988), 240-1, figure 178; Kondoleon, *Domestic and Divine*, 56, figure 28.

³⁴It may strike as odd that Dionysus and Ariadne should be considered icons of familial love. The consolation it provided was androcentric, as the literary references suggest. It is an icon that upholds familial loyalty despite the dalliances of the husband, in the same vein as Plutarch's *Conj. praec.* 15-16.

³⁵It is possible Hippolytus #2 named one of his heresiological treatises the *Little Labyrinth*, which would call to mind the myth of Theseus. Ariadne and her hideous half brother, the Minotaur. Hippolytus #1 the author *Haer.* (according to Brent and Stewart-Sykes, the predecessor of Hippolytus #2) does refer to part of his work as a λαβυρινθος των αιρεσεων (*Haer.* 10.5.1). On the *Little Labyrinth*, see Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 121-33. Theodoret ascribes it to Origen; Photius apparently ascribes the same book to Gaius of Rome. A quotation of the book appears in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.28.

will. I do not need to say that it is Theseus you see there on the ship and Dionysus yonder on the land, nor will I assume you to be ignorant and call your attention to the woman on the rocks, lying there in gentle slumber.

Nor yet is it enough to praise the painter for things for which someone else too might be praised; for it is easy for anyone to paint Ariadne as beautiful and Theseus as beautiful; and there are countless characteristics of Dionysus for those who wish to represent him in painting or sculpture, but this Dionysus the painter has characterized by love alone. Flowered garments and *thyrsos* and fawn-skins have been cast aside as out of place for the moment, and the Bacchae are not clashing their cymbals now, nor are the *Satyroi* playing the flute, nay, even Pan checks his wild dance that he may not disturb the maiden's sleep. Having arrayed himself in fine purple and wreathed his head with roses, Dionysus comes to the side of Ariadne, "drunk with love" as the Teian poet says of those who are overmastered by love. As for Theseus, he is indeed in love, but with the smoke rising from Athens, and he no longer knows Ariadne, and never knew her, and I am sure that he has even forgotten the labyrinth and could not tell on what possible errand he sailed to Crete, so singly is his gaze fixed on what lies ahead of his prow. And look at Ariadne, or rather at her sleep; for her bosom is bare to the waist, and her neck is bent back and her delicate throat, and all her right armpit is visible, but the left hand rests on her mantle that a gust of wind may not expose her. How fair a sight, Dionysus, and how sweet her breath! Whether its fragrance is of apples or of grapes, you can tell after you have kissed her! (Philostratus, *Imagines*, 1.15)³⁶

In its general contours, Ariadne, daughter of King Minos, falls in love with Theseus, son of Aegeus and helps him kill her hideous half-brother and escape the labyrinth by giving him a ball of string. She is carried off by her lover to the island of Naxos. There he abandoned her while she slept, on the favorite island of Dionysus/Bacchus. While she mourned her fate, Dionysus found her, consoled her, and made her his wife. As a marriage present he gave her a golden crown, decorated with precious stones. The crown is an element common to many versions of the myth,

³⁶Philostratus et al., "Imagines," from LCL 256 (1969). Cited 10-16. Online: <http://www.theoi.com/Text/PhilostratusElder1A.html>.

since it portrays the etiology of the Corona Borealis. Some versions contain the discovery of a dalliance when Dionysus (Liber) traveled to India and brought back a dark skinned wife (Ovid, *Fasti*. 3.459-516), against whom she (Ariadne/Libera) complained bitterly. Ovid's entry for March 8 is:

As soon as night falls you will see the Cretan Crown:
 Through Theseus' crime Ariadne was made a goddess.
 She'd already happily exchanged that faithless spouse for Bacchus,
 She who'd given the ungrateful man the thread to follow.
 Delighting in her wedded fate, she said: 'Why did I weep
 Like a country-girl, his faithlessness has been my gain?'
 Meanwhile Bacchus had conquered the straight-haired Indians,
 And returned with his riches from the Eastern world.
 Among the captive girls, of outstanding beauty,
 One, the daughter of a king, pleased Bacchus intensely.
 His loving wife wept, and treading the curving shore
 With dishevelled hair, she spoke these words:
 'Behold, again, you waves, how you hear my complaint!
 Behold again you sands, how you receive my tears!
 I remember I used to say: "Perjured, faithless Theseus!"
 He abandoned me: now Bacchus commits the same crime.
 Now once more I'll cry: "Woman, never trust in man!"
 My fate's repeated, only his name has changed.
 O that my life had ended where it first began.
 So that I'd not have existed for this moment!
 Why did you save me, Liber, to die on these lonely sands?
 I might have ceased grieving at that moment.
 Bacchus, fickle, lighter than the leaves that wreath
 Your brow, Bacchus known to me in my weeping,
 How have you dared to trouble our harmonious bed
 By bringing another lover before my eyes?
 Alas, where is sworn faith? Where the pledges you once gave?
 Wretched me, how many times must I speak those words?
 You blamed Theseus and called him a deceiver:
 According to that judgement your own sin is worse.
 Let no one know of this, let me burn with silent pain,
 Lest they think I deserved to be cheated so!
 Above all I wish it to be hid from Theseus,
 So he may not joy in you as a partner in crime.
 I suppose your fair lover is preferred to a dark,
 May fair be the colouring of my enemies!

Yet what does that signify? She is dearer to you for that.
 What are you doing? She contaminates your embrace.
 Bacchus, be true, and do not prefer her to a wife's love.
 I am one who would love my husband for ever.
 The horns of a gleaming bull captivated my mother.
 Yours, me: but this is a love to be praised, hers shameful.
 Let me not suffer, for loving: you yourself, Bacchus,
 Never suffered for confessing your desire to me.
 No wonder you make me burn: they say you were born
 In fire, and were snatched from the flames by your father.
 I am she to whom you used to promise the heavens.
 Ah me, what a reward I suffer instead of heaven!
 She spoke: Liber had been listening a long while
 To her complaint, since he chanced to follow closely.
 He embraced her, and dried her tears with kisses,
 And said: 'Together, let us seek the depths of the sky!
 You'll share my name just as you've shared my bed,
 Since, transmuted, you will be called Libera:
 And there'll be a memory of your crown beside you,
 The crown Vulcan gave to Venus, and she to you.'
 He did as he said, and changed the nine jewels to fire:
 Now the golden crown glitters with nine stars. (Ovid, *Fasti*, March 8)³⁷

It is significant that Hippolytus presents an image of Christ similar to Dionysus in Ovid's version of the Ariadne myth. Dionysus speaks tenderly with his wounded wife. Hippolytus #2's presentation of Christ's approach to the synagogue never becomes invective. Again, the myth of Ariadne and Dionysus appears to provide a *topos* for the kind of complicated relationship envisioned between Christ, the synagogue and the Gentile church-school.

One detail otherwise unexplained in the *In Cant.* is the exhortation to the synagogue, "Now go to the Gentiles and become a type of all crowns." (*In Cant.* 7.5). Hippolytus does not otherwise refer to wearing a crown or connect a crown with his

³⁷Ovid, "Fasti," (2004): Cited 10-16. Online: <http://www.tonykline.co.uk/klineas-fasti.htm>.

baptismal rites. Crowns were a status indicator, but also generally adopted for use in celebrations and festivals, including crowns for both bride and groom at weddings. Tertullian rejected the use of crowns by Christians (Tertullian, *Cor.* 13). The eastern *Odes of Solomon* associates crowning with baptism, as do other eastern mainstream documents and non-mainstream groups, perhaps depending upon an ancient eastern royal understanding of baptism as an imitation of the baptism of Jesus.³⁸ Hippolytus, with more similarity to the usage of Tertullian, only speaks of the synagogue becoming a “type of all crowns.” According to Ovid’s version of the Ariadne myth, Dionysus consoles his wife with the promise of deification. Ariadne “is transformed”; she will be known as Libera. Dionysus promises to memorialize their love by making a constellation of her crown in the heavens.³⁹ As it rose into the sky, the gems grew brighter and, transformed into stars, they preserve the form of Ariadne’s crown fixed forever in the sky as a constellation between the kneeling Heracles and the man who holds the serpent (Ovid, *Met.* 8. 152). As a result Ariadne herself is transformed and

³⁸Tertullian assumes that Christians use the bridal crown in weddings, “Marriage, too, decks the bridegroom with its crown; and therefore we will not have heathen brides, lest they seduce us even to the idolatry with which among them marriage is initiated” (*Cor.* 13). The *Odes* allude to baptism as a crown. The bridal crown is a prominent allusion to baptism and the relationship with the Lord effected by baptism (*Ode* 1.5.9). Other elements include sprinkling with water, immersion in running water, the seal, signing the name, the metaphor of circumcision, filling with the Holy Spirit, new garments, fragrance, milk and honey or a cup of mixed milk, drinking living water, and taking the Lord as nourishment. The crown as a symbol of baptism is also seen in Ephrem *Hymns on Epiphany* 7. Crowning is also apparently a part of eastern Valentinian and Sethian baptismal rites van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 117.

³⁹The timing and consequences of the death of Ariadne vary greatly in the versions of the myth.

becomes a divine figure worshipped in her own right.⁴⁰ “. . . And golden haired Dionysus made brown haired Ariadne, the daughter of Minos, his buxom wife: and the son of Cronos made her deathless and ageless for him. . .” (Hesiod, *Theog.* 945).

In correspondence with some forms of the myth of Ariadne and Dionysus, Hippolytus constructs in the *In Cant.* a spiritual narrative of a love triangle among Christ, the synagogue and the church of the Gentiles. The image of the beloved is complex, sometimes representing Israel, sometimes the church-school of the Gentiles, sometimes the believing synagogue, sometimes the unbelieving synagogue. When the words of the beloved permit an interpretation of jealousy, she becomes Israel jilted by Christ for the Gentiles: “‘Tell me, you whom my soul has loved,’ [means], ‘tell me, Christ; respond, O Word, to me I beg you.’ ‘Where do you pasture, where do you rest at midday? You abandoned me and left me alone, you went away to the Gentiles. I remained behind as an orphan’” (*In Cant.* 6.1). The paraphraser captured the essence of this distinction: “The Song of Songs is the oracle of the Spirit so that it provides the song and the singing and the different gifts and how the church of the Gentiles, blackened as it was with transgressions, became clean and he united it to himself after making it brilliant with differing gifts” (*CantPar* 1.8). It is not likely that these words are authentic, since they are out of place (in the introduction). Thus they appear to be the paraphraser’s own partial summary of the *In Cant.*: Nevertheless the interpretation is confirmed by comparing *In Cant.* 4.1 with 7.2:

⁴⁰Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 239-40.

In Cant. 4.1-2

4.1 "I am black and beautiful, daughters of Jerusalem." I am a sinner, but to a greater extent I am beautiful, for Christ has loved me. "I am black and beautiful, daughters of Jerusalem." All peoples, gather and come and see me the beloved.
 4.2 "Do not marvel at this appearance of mine, for I have become black, nor about this, that the sun gazed (*or* looked) upon me darkly." You saw the word of their congregations, who/which [they] confessed the past, "do not look upon the sinner," and "for this reason Christ did not despise me." And for this reason truly she says "the sun." For it says thus, "And to you who fear my name the sun of righteousness will appear."

In Cant. 7.1-2

7.1 Suddenly there arrived a voice of petition, and by it Christ was [was] displayed. The voice [is one] which calls the people. "Though you may not be well known, you are beautiful among women." But this means, "if you will not convert with all your heart and unless you will confess your sins, so that you may be justified" (cf. Rom 10:9-10), 7.2 and, O beautiful [one] among women, unless you do not make yourself known, you who boasted and said : "I am dark and beautiful. I am a sinner, but I am beloved," then of no help is that love to you. Indeed, God is able from stones to raise up children for Abraham, so do not beguile yourself now about the promise of the patriarchs. "For he is no respecter of persons" if, however, you do not come to know yourself and repent, behold Abraham was saved, but you it avails nothing. For generation of that one is a help to the one who comes to faith. Let us hold to good works so that there may be an election of the generation of the righteous. So if no one else recognizes you to be beautiful among women, "go away and follow the track of the flock and pasture your kids."

The beloved of the Song, in the interpretation of Hippolytus, is two different women, one believing and one unbelieving. Thus, as Chappuzeau observed, the synagogue is a complex image. Christ, who has multiple Dionysiac features (see below), is cast in the role of the god. The play on the blackness of the beloved in 4.1-2 and the insistence in 7.1-2 that the beloved must admit blackness reverse the striking play on blackness in Ovid's renditions of the myth. It is not necessary to insist that Hippolytus knew Ovid's *Fasti*, though it is not difficult to imagine he was

acquainted with it. Ovid was the most popular author painted on Pompeian walls, including his narrative of Dionysus and Ariadne.⁴¹ Given Hippolytus #2's intense interest in calendrical interpretation, one might well imagine Hippolytus was acquainted with the poem. Nevertheless, the Ariadne myth formed part of the cultural material ready in the oral environment for use in the interpretation of the Song.⁴²

Later readings of Hippolytus (represented in the Armenian and the paleo-Slavonic traditions) intensify in places the negative rhetoric of Hippolytus against the synagogue:⁴³

<i>In Cant.</i> 25.10 Georgian	<i>In Cant.</i> 25.10 Armenian	<i>In Cant.</i> 25.10 Paleo-Slavic
Now, beloved, it is clear from these things that he brings peace to the synagogue and the church is glorified.	Now, since these things happened, O beloved, behold, he makes peace making the synagogue of the Jews to cease and glorifies the mystery of the resurrection. We are those who worship every day even as we keep gloriously holy festival, rejoicing with the angels.	After this, however, it so happens, O beloved, he boasts still further after the church breaks from the synagogue.

⁴¹From a private communication with David Balch, 11-19-2008. Ovidian influence is also noted in the late second century House of Dionysus at Nea Paphos, Cyprus, see Kondoleon, *Domestic and Divine*, 34, 50, 116, 136, etc.

⁴²Xenophon, *Symp.* 9.2-7, shows that the Ariadne myth was part of the common stock of symposia entertainment. In the course of the meal, two dancers portray Dionysus and Ariadne as lovers. Although intended as entertainment, the dance itself functions in a setting in which "love"(ers) had been a topic of conversation. Dionysus would always be considered present symbolically as god of the vine in such settings. Xenophon concludes his story with a practical application: "At last, the banqueters, seeing [Ariadne and Dionysus] in one another's embrace and obviously leaving for the bridal couch, those who were unmarried swore that they would take wives for themselves, and those who were already married mounted horse and rode off to their wives that they might enjoy them." See Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 117, 118.

⁴³The increased anti-synagogue rhetoric in these two adaptations of the *In Cant.* is seen in the increased number of appearances of the word "synagogue."

The differences between these adaptations aside, what appears to be clear is that Hippolytus paints the picture of a love triangle, similar to that found in some versions of the Ariadne myth. Drawing further from the Ariadne myth, Hippolytus encourages the unbelieving synagogue to believe and to take up the apostolic example and “go to the Gentiles and become a type of all crowns.” (*In Cant.* 7.5). The abrupt appearance of the image of the crown is explained by Hippolytus drawing it from the familiar world of myth. Chappuzeau has no explanation for the appearance of the crown; she assumes that the abruptness of the appearance of the crown is a result of mistranslation.⁴⁴ While it is true that neither the Greek paraphrase nor Paleo-Slavonic florilegia mention the crown, the latter makes a similar point about mission among the Gentiles, “Pasture the unmarked flock barefoot. Then go out to the Gentiles and the diaspora of the race, where all the congregations are” (*PS* 7.5).⁴⁵

Chappuzeau recognized an almost complete lack of antagonism and animosity expressed toward the synagogue in the rhetoric of the *In Cant.* She was thus led to believe that Hippolytus practices no polemic against the synagogue; nor is the synagogue despised, hated, or accused of ignorance and disobedience.⁴⁶ On the contrary, she is “rich in fulfillment of the law” (*In Cant.* 25:5; cf. 10.1).⁴⁷

⁴⁴Chappuzeau, “Auslegung,” *JAC* 19: 66.

⁴⁵The following comment in *PS* 7.5b, “The kings however he names shepherds, and ones who disperse them throughout the world,” is likely a gloss by the compiler of the florilegia.

⁴⁶Chappuzeau, “Auslegung,” 67.

⁴⁷ἱερωσύνη, *cesirebit* has a semantic range including: “orderliness, propriety, decorum, lawfulness,” See Fähnrich and Sarjveladze, *ADW*, 1520, who do not list the meaning “ordination.” Cerrato’s notion that this alludes to female ordination has no support in the translation tradition. It is based on the (mis)translation of Garitte, CSCO 264:47 “*in-ordinationem*.” Bonwetsch, “Hippolyts Kommentar,” was correctly

Chappuzeau suggested that Hippolytus offers no exhortation to the synagogue concerning the need of turning away from the vanity of this world.⁴⁸ She must merely recognize the new economy of God and do penance, she must repent of failing to believe in the revelation of God in Christ.⁴⁹ If she does this, she will be loved and justified like the patriarchs.⁵⁰ By disregarding of the new commandment, the synagogue lost its share in the salvation-working Spirit of Christ and thus its role as the effective bringer of salvation to the world. In Hippolytus #2's vision of the Song, the reversal of the disaster of Eve leads potentially to the conversion of the world, both Jews and Gentiles. With the liberation of Eve, the path way of eternal life lies through Jesus. Thus, Hippolytus points to the paradigmatic nature of the women as good witnesses:

In Cant.

25.6 “And after this with a cry the synagogue expresses a good testimony for us through the women, those who were made apostles to the apostles, having been sent by Christ . . .”

Armenian

25.6 Now, since these things happened, in answer he cries out the confession, he giving his assent to this good testimony [given] through the women to the synagogue.

Paleo-Slavonic

25.6 After this happened however, he again calls out a confession through these women to the synagogue, the good testimony; and they were sent by Christ as apostle of the apostles.

In the resurrection sequence the women experience a transformation, which it the “good testimony for us.” The sense of the passage in the Georgian translation is quite

dissatisfied with the reading of *T* and preferred PS (“Receive Eve once more, *the one living firmly* [‘strongly’] and henceforth not naked.”) as the “right meaning.” With the discovery of *J*, the nonsensical “much” could be read as “walks.” See the textual note on მკვლ at 25.5.

⁴⁸Chappuzeau, “Auslegung,” *JAC* 19: 67.

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰Ibid.

opaque, but it seems they all agree that a good testimony comes through the women. The PS and the Armenian are in agreement that the testimony is given to the synagogue, that is, so that they may believe. Their own transformation is paradigmatic for the hoped-for transformation of the synagogue.

Accordingly, “when someone from the circumcision believes in Christ they begin to come forth, it might be said, as a flower,⁵¹ one able to bring forth both new and old” (*In Cant.* 17.1).⁵² But what is the rhetorical function of the restraint

⁵¹The description of “one from the circumcision” as “a flower” is based on Hippolytus #2’s Christological interpretation of the flower in Isaiah 11:1. Hippolytus #2 links the blessing of Judah in Gen 49:9 “from a shoot, my son, leap up!” with Is. 11:1 “he will sprout up as a shoot from the root of Jesse and a flower from the house of David.” The flower is Christ born from the shoot of Mary who sprang up from the roots and the stock of the patriarchs:

He did not keep silent either concerning his generation according to the flesh, but he says: “from a shoot, my son, you will go up” (Gen. 49:9). For Isaiah says: “he will go forth as a shoot from the root of Jesse “and a flower from the root” will go up (Is 11:1). The root of Jesse was the stock of the patriarchs, as a root planted in the earth, and the shoot which sprang up from this and appeared visibly was Mary, by the fact that she was from the house of the family of David. The flower that germinated in her was the Christ, as Jacob has prophesied when he said, “from a shoot, my son you will go up.” (*Ben. Jac.* 16 [PO 27.76-78])

Because of a their common physical ancestry, the person of Jewish birth is able to represent Christ in a unique way.

⁵²Chappuzeau, “Auslegung,” *JAC* 19: 79 points out what appears at first glance to be an important contrast here between Irenaeus and Hippolytus #2 in their attitudes toward Jews. In *Adv. Haer.* 4.24, according to Irenaeus, Israel was released previously by the prophets from both idolatry and indecent conduct and in this way was prepared for Christ. Then, however, he concludes from this fact that the faith of the Gentiles has even greater value than the faith of the Jews, because Gentiles lacked this very preparation. This notion, one which betrays a certain disdain towards Jews, is quite distant from the thought found in Hippolytus #2 throughout the *In Cant.* (Chappuzeau claims the attitude is found throughout the Hippolytan corpus). It is true that Hippolytus #2 does not polemicize against the synagogue in the *In Cant.* On the con-

Chappuzeau notes in Hippolytus #2's approach to the synagogue? Clearly Hippolytus is capable of invective against the synagogue. (See note 52 on page 399.) Hippolytus implicitly contrasts the complaining and unbelieving beloved to the kindness of Christ,⁵³ thus casting a shadow of scorn on the synagogue. Throughout the *In Cant.* the more pointedly the intimate relationship of Christ to the church is stressed, the more sharply the disobedience of the synagogue comes to light.⁵⁴ Interactions

trary, at the places in the commentary where the voice of the synagogue's own disrespectfulness is expressed in her speech, in the replies of Christ there appears a certain "heilsgeschichtliche" sadness. And on the basis that the first appeal of God went out to the synagogue, Hippolytus #2, unlike Irenaeus, often points to the necessity of repentance and conversion. The ethos presented by Hippolytus #2 thus contrasts to the anti-Jewish Christian polemic of second and third centuries. A similar ethos is noted in *Haer.* where the Gentiles are told: "Learn from us, the Hellenes, Egyptians, Chaldeans and you whole human race!" (*Haer.* 10.31.5 GCS 26.288.1-2) but Jews are not held up for invective and scorn. One might add to Chappuzeau's assessment the brief statement of *Noet.* that merely states, without invective, "Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν γὰρ ἐδόξασαν Πατέρα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἠγάπησαν· Ἰὼν γὰρ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν," Nevertheless, Chappuzeau's somewhat positive portrayal of Hippolytus #2's attitude toward the Jews must be properly contextualized. Hippolytus #2 is certainly capable of invective against the Jews. In *Comm. Dan.* 1.14-19 he accuses Jews of wanting to excise the story of Susanna from Scripture (14), spying on Christians (15) and of antagonism to Christians (15), of being full of the power of the devil (19). Hippolytus #2 further notes that Jews may not agree with Gentiles (non-Christian polytheists), but in terms of "worldly matters" they come together in common cause (15). The Antichrist will also be a Jewish king, or at least a king that is for the Jews (4.49.4), so Hippolytus #2's position on the Jews is complicated. Hippolytus #1 has a similarly complicated position concerning Jews (*Haer.* 9.13-25). He detracts attention from Christian diversity by describing Jewish diversity as the result of degeneration from one original unity. In addition, he describes the future hopes of all Jews as Messianic and war-like. The Messiah expected by the Jews in *Haer.* bears marked resemblance to the Antichrist described by Hippolytus in the *Antichr.* and *Comm. Dan.*

⁵³On praise, blame and amplification, see Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.9.33-41 and [Cicero] *Her.* 3. 15; 4.53.

between Christ and the synagogue serve to exalt Christ and the Gentile church. The tactic itself appears to have been suggested by Hippolytus #2's use of the Ariadne myth.

The audience, many of whom knew the etiological tale of the Corona Borealis, and had seen, perhaps in their own homes, the stock images of Dionysus and Ariadne as images of dutiful but complicated married love, would get the picture.⁵⁵ Urging the repentance of the unbelieving synagogue is a major theme in the *In Cant.*, even as in the *Const. ap.* 5.19.3 part of the Easter vigil, apart from baptizing catechumens, is to pray for the conversion of the Jews. Hippolytus elsewhere holds out the hope that a repentant Israel/synagogue would imitate the apostles and participate in the vigorous apostolic mission to the world:

Repent, Synagogue so that you too may hasten toward Christ for the race through the world, so that as a steed for him/it you may be made swift for the race as was Paul and like a shepherd as was Peter, that truly from now on you may make Christ known then as the blessed one [was] from the disciples, you may appear then as disciples of the blessed one, that with the ineffable draft animals you may be sealed. (*In Cant.* 8.8)

By using a pop-culture mythical, framework Hippolytus #2 attempts to make his teaching and his text relevant to his audience.⁵⁶

⁵⁴Chappuzeau, "Auslegung," *JAC* 19: 78.

⁵⁵Christine Kondoleon, "Mosaic of Dionysos and Ariadne," in *The Arts of Antioch: Art Historical and Scientific Approaches to Roman Mosaics and a Catalogue of the Worcester Art Museum Antioch Collection* (ed. Lawrence Becker and Christine Kondoleon; 2; Princeton University Press, 2005), 189, suggests that the presence of the divine couple (Dionysus and Ariadne) in a third-century bust mosaic from the House of the Sundial underscores the invitation to dinner.

⁵⁶The fact that the version of the myth that most resembles Hippolytus #2's mythical *topos* is a western form of the tradition found only in Ovid's *Fasti* should be con-

Hippolytus' Use of the Mythical Tale of Heracles' Eleventh Labor

The episode of the myrrhophores is the most puzzling of all the interpretive sequences of the *In Cant*. As noted above, the cast of characters that intrudes upon the text of the Song, speaking of the search of the beloved for her lover by night becomes, in typological transformation, the narrative of Martha and Mary in search of the saviour at the tomb. The interpretation switches back and forth from Song to gospels. However, the third intrusive element is the introduction of Eve and Adam, the serpent, “tree of seduction,” and “tree of life” (*In Cant*. 25.7). It has suggested that the cast of characters in the interpretation has a corollary in popular representations of the eleventh labor of Heracles. Apollodorus, in *Library (Lib.)* 2.5.11 briefly tells the story and alludes to other versions of it. It is a tale of trickery by which Heracles liberates the apples of eternal life that are guarded by a serpent in the garden. If he obtained the apples, he would become a “son of Zeus.” The garden is attended by three nymphs, the daughters of Atlas. Ovid also refers to a version of (*Metam.* 4.637; 11.114; 9.190). The scenario of the scene as pictured by Hippolytus is strikingly similar to some representations of the myth in mosaic. Justin, in his first Apology recognized the existence of parallels between the earthly life of Jesus and gods and heroes such as Heracles,

“In saying that the Word , who is the first offspring of God, was born for us without sexual union, as Jesus Christ our Teacher, and that he was crucified and died and after rising again ascended into heaven we introduce nothing new beyond [what you say of] those whom you call sons of Zeus (*Apol.* 1.21.1 trans. Hardy).

sidered in assessing the provenance of the commentary.

In his Dialogue with Trypo (*Dial.*), Justin argued, however that the similarities between the portrayal of Jesus in the gospels and Heracles was a result of imitation of the prophecies about Christ:

And when they tell that Hercules was strong, and travelled over all the world, and was begotten by Jove of Alcmene, and ascended to heaven when he died, do I not perceive that the Scripture which speaks of Christ, “strong as a giant to run his race,” has been in like manner imitated? And when he [the devil] brings forward Æsculapius as the raiser of the dead and healer of all diseases, may I not say that in this matter likewise he has imitated the prophecies about Christ? (Dial. 69.3, ANF 1)

As Aune has shown, in the second and third centuries, both Christians and Greco-Roman polytheists saw Christ and Heracles as rivals. Celsus, for example, argued that the Dioscuri, Heracles, Asclepius, and Dionysus were also originally mortals who became divinities (Origen, *Cels.* 3.22).⁵⁷ Why would Hippolytus tell the story of the resurrection with multiple elements of Heracles’s labor? Guthrie suggested that Heracles was an important deity in popular myth because his life of toil and suffering led to his divinity. Heracles “offered new hope to the ordinary” person.⁵⁸ Another reason that Hippolytus may have used the myth to preach Christ in his mystagogy, is that the images were on the walls or on the floors. One should imagine a painting like that found in the first-century triclinium of the Casa del Sacerdos Amandus in Pompeii⁵⁹ or a mosaic on the floor? Images of the labors of Heracles

⁵⁷Aune, “Heracles and Christ,” 3.

⁵⁸William K. Guthrie, *Greeks and their Gods* (Ariadne Series; Beacon Press, 1971) 239.

⁵⁹See Balch, *Roman Domestic Art and Early House Churches*, CD # 208, 208a (an image of Heracles as a child strangling a snake!), 269 (painting of Heracles in the garden of the Hesperides, the image is in the triclinium of the Casa del Sacerdo Amandus (I 7, 7; PPM I 590-97).

were ubiquitous. Christians were required to reinterpret and subvert such images, just as Justin and Origen did, to counter the supposition that Christ was simply another form of the Heracles myth.⁶⁰

Christ and Dionysus-Orpheus

The myth of Orpheus, the quintessential singer whose new bride Eurydice died, bitten by a snake, has several points of contact with Hippolytus #2's interpretation of the Song. The theme of Orpheus with the animals, especially a sheep (6.1.2; 7.5; 8.1-3), is well attested in third-century Christian iconography as a depiction of Christ.⁶¹ The Song of Songs, though it comes through Solomon, is ultimately an expression of the *Logos*-Christ (*In Cant.* 1.1-8). In the myth, Orpheus fails to recover his dead bride from Hades, because she looks back. Some of the pathos of the call for the synagogue expressed in the *In Cant.* derives from the parallel with the Orpheus myth. Also, the choice to bring into his interpretation of the Song a reference to the "fraud of the serpent" perpetrated on Eve may have suggested itself to Hippolytus on the basis of the myth. Hippolytus, then is once again drawing on mythical frameworks as a silent partner in his interpretation.

Hippolytus encourages the believer to suckle from the twin breasts of Christ or the Word (*In Cant.* 3.3, 4), his breasts representing the commandments of both old and the new laws. The source of this image is a biblical text, though refracted through a Greco-Roman mythical imagination.⁶² In essence, Hippolytus is using the text to

⁶⁰This is a topic for further research.

⁶¹Robin Margaret Jensen, *Understanding Early Christian Art* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 7, 14, 62.

⁶²Through union with Christ, the church also is blessed with the breasts of the Law

subvert the popular image of the androgynous Dionysus, who is presented in Pompeian wall paintings as an effeminate figure, sometimes with large breasts and distinctly feminine features.⁶³ In the same passage Christ is described as the mixer of wine, as a kind of Dionysus. Hippolytus says:

“I have loved your breasts more than wine.” Not however [referring to] that wine which is mixed by Christ, but to the wine which in the past made Noah slow-witted by intoxication, and which deceived Lot, “we love your sources of milk more than this wine,” for the breasts through Christ were the two commandments. It makes one joyful, but does not wish to make one slow witted. For this very reason also the apostle says, “Do not be drinking too much wine to the point of intoxication.” Now for this reason, beloved, it says, “I have loved your breasts more than wine.”

Distinct from Dionysus, however, the wine Christ mixes does not lead to drunkenness. Such features, apart from possible scriptural precedents,⁶⁴ raise an important issue: what made it possible for Hippolytus to represent Christ as symbolically offering milk from his breasts and mixing wine for a party? As did later Christian artists, Hippolytus seems to be drawing upon the androgynous image of

and the Gospel (*In Cant.* 12.1). Hippolytus #2 probably derived this image from Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 3.24.1), who taught that the church, as mother, can alone nourish the faithful from her breasts. The church, as the body of Christ (and as mother of the faithful) is in view here. Mixed metaphors did not bother Hippolytus #2.

⁶³See especially Balch, *Roman Domestic Art and Early House Churches*, CD image # 246.

⁶⁴The image of suckling on the breast of Christ (instead of “love-making” or “kisses”) is striking and comes from the LXX reading of the consonantal Hebrew text of Song 1:1 יָדָד with patach instead of cholem. In addition to this image is Isaiah 66:11-13, where post-exilic third Isaiah symbolizes the comfort of the people of Judah with the gloriously endowed Jerusalem, who suckles and comforts her children on her breasts, but it is Yahweh who says, “As a mother comforts her child, so I will comfort you; you shall be comforted in Jerusalem.”

Dionysus to describe Christ.⁶⁵ The image of nursing was a central theme of the cult of Dionysus, part of the symbolic grammar of the mysteries of Dionysus. During the Roman period, the religious role of nursing was apparently not limited to the ancient purpose of accelerating the fertility of nature. Some cult images involve followers of Dionysus nursing representatives of nature (such as the woman nursing a deer).⁶⁶ As a god who had undergone two births, natural as well as divine, Dionysus accordingly represented the goals of happiness promised by the prosperity and patronage of the Roman Empire sought by participants in the mysteries. Many examples from various locations in the Roman Empire could be produced that underscore the importance of nursing among the various aspects of the mysteries that honored this god.⁶⁷

Hippolytus #2's audience would have been familiar with such images that represented a significant commonplace between Hippolytus #2's biblical world, the celebration of Christian mysteries, and the culture of his every day life.

The evidence for of understanding the background of this image in this way increases upon consideration of Hippolytus #2's exploration of the meaning of the Song's reference to the unbelieving synagogue as a mare or steed yoked with the chariots of Pharaoh (*In Cant.* 8.1). That comparison prompts Hippolytus to make a connection with what appears to be a graphic image of a four wheeled (*In Cant.* 8.5) chariot pulled by horses (representing the apostles, *In Cant.* 8.2) riding over the sea

⁶⁵Jensen, *Understanding Early Christian Art*, 124. See also Emmanuel Friedheim, "Who Are the Deities Concealed Behind the Rabbinic Expression 'a Nursing Female Image'?" *HTR* 96.2 (2003): 239-50.

⁶⁶Thus the Villa of the Mysteries in Pompeii portrays a well-known satyr and a woman worshipping Dionysus while a female (?) satyr nurses a fawn.

⁶⁷Henri Seyrig, *La triade héliopolitaine et les temples de Baalbek*, extracts from *Syria*, 10 (1929): 314-56.

and stirring up the waters “for the gathering of the Gentiles” (*In Cant.* 8:2).⁶⁸ The chariot itself is also decorated with the image of four living creatures (a lion, an ox [or a vine!],⁶⁹ an eagle, and a human being), representing the four evangelists (8.6). The apostles are said to be a yoke of twelve, and yet four.⁷⁰ On profile, one sees a “wheel within a wheel” which represents the Old and New Testaments, according to Hippolytus (8.6).⁷¹ The charioteer, a righteous one, is only mentioned at the end (8.8). Hippolytus emphasizes the unity of the horses and the world-wide scope of their mission. The image is complex and composite. It is ostensibly drawn by Hippolytus from Ezekiel 1 and 10 (yet that vision has no horses!). It has elements of the chariot of Ezekiel carried by four living creatures, the chariot of Helios carried by four horses, and the chariot of Dionysus, pulled by a panther, a bull and a griffin.⁷² Since,

⁶⁸As scriptural precedent for this image Hippolytus #2 adduces Hab 3:15.

⁶⁹So the Paleo-Slavic florilegium, which has “ox.” The Georgian text has “the shoot as the vine of a high priest,” that could be based upon a misunderstanding of the Greek text of Hippolytus #2. An original reading ὡς μωσχάριον ἀνατολῆς ἐξ ὕψους might account for both the Georgian and Paleo-Slavic readings. Paleo-Slavic dropped ἀνατολῆς ἐξ ὕψους while the Georgian text lost or dropped μωσχάριον and tried to make sense of the resulting text by interpreting ἀνατολῆς as “vine-shoot.” On the other hand, the image of the vine was common in early Christian iconography as a symbol of Messiah and church (perhaps echoing passages like Jn 10; Is 27:3-6).

⁷⁰The Georgian text consistently makes the apostles twelve; Paleo-Slavic only gives their number as four, and Ambrose gives their number as both twelve and four: *o bonourm equorum duodecauigum mirabile, et sine offensione currebant, quia bona uita equorum quadrabat, currebant igitur equi, quia non dormiebat que ascenderat equos*. Ambrose here is likely nearer the original text.

⁷¹The marvelous Spirit inhabits both the wheels and the living creatures, a symbol of biblical inspiration.

⁷²Cf. the famous fourth century mosaic image of Christ-Helios in the dome of the Mosauleum M (of the *Julii*) of the Vatican Necropolis. See the discussion of the image in Jensen, *Face to Face*, 147-8. The image of the four horses drawing a chariot

however, Hippolytus emphatically connects this image to the synagogue (*In Cant.* 8.1, 8) and uses the image as the basis of an appeal for the synagogue to repent and join Christ in his mission. It seems possible that Hippolytus is giving a *Christian* interpretation of a *Jewish* image, which in turn is taken from polytheistic mythical images.⁷³ Yet Clement of Alexandria also referred to this same image in his *Protrepticus* 11 with no apparent connection at all to Judaism:

For “the Sun of Righteousness,” who drives his chariot over all, pervades equally all humanity, like “his Father, who makes his sun to rise on all men,” and distills on them the dew of the truth. He has changed sunset into sunrise, and through the cross brought death to life; and having wrenched man from destruction, he hath raised him to the skies, transplanting mortality into immortality, and translating earth to heaven—he, the husbandman of God.

‘Pointing out the favorable signs and rousing the nations
To good works, putting them in mind of the true sustenance.’⁷⁴

(Clement of Alexandria, *Protr.*, ANF 11)

with Helios as the driver was a pervasive, living image in the late antique world, promoted by church, synagogue and empire with differing interpretations. See Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 572-5. The chariot of Dionysus is known in various forms, see vase paintings from the Pasithea Painter, K12, 8 the Chariot of Dionysos, Louvre NMB 1036 (400 - 390 B.C.E.): Beazley Archive Number 230398, Cited 08-21-2008 »<http://www.theoi.com/Gallery/K12.8.html>«.

⁷³See Steven Fine, *Art and Judaism in the Greco-Roman world: Toward a New Jewish Archaeology* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 89-91, 197-8. The fourth century synagogue in Hammath Tiberius depicts the zodiac and Helios chariot with charioteer, as do others. No images of this type survive from the third century. Hippolytus #2’s *In Cant.* is good indirect testimony that such images were employed as early as the second/third century.

⁷⁴ *ANF* 2.203, Clement cites Aratus, *Phaen.* 1.7 ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ γεωργός, «δεξιὰ σημαίνων, λαοὺς δ' ἐπὶ ἔργον» ἀγαθὸν» ἐγείρων, μιμνήσκων βιότοιον» ἀληθινοῦ, Arati, *Phaenomena: Fragmentum (e codicibus)* (ed. J. Martin; Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice, 1956), 2.

Clement's charioteer is also reminiscent of the god Apollo.⁷⁵ Interestingly, as Hippolytus, so also Clement equates this image of Christ with the *Logos*, which supports the notion that the Helios-chariot image is a *topos* within the tradition of *Logos* christology. What is more, Clement also points out that *Logos*-Christ is androgynous. He represents a new ἄνθρωπος, neither male nor female:

“And the one whole Christ is not divided: ‘There is neither barbarian, nor Jew, nor Greek, neither male nor female, but a new ἄνθρωπος,’ transformed by God’s Holy Spirit. Further, the other counsels and precepts are unimportant, and respect particular things,—as, for example, if one may marry, take part in public affairs, beget children; but the only command that is universal, and over the whole course of existence, at all times and in all circumstances, tends to the highest end, that is, life, is piety,—all that is necessary, in order that we may live for ever, being that we live in accordance with it.”

The Christian use of *graphic* images of Christ with androgynous, Dionysiac or Apollonian characteristics has been long documented.⁷⁶ Christ appears in images with protruding breasts and long, curly hair in images of fourth and fifth century

⁷⁵Other references in Clement show a deliberate tendency to interpret Christian initiation in the terms of Hellenistic “mystery” religion: Clement of Alexandria, *Prot.* 12 (*ANF* 2.205, Greek text in *GCS* 12, 1:84, 23. Online: Clement, “Clemens Alexandrinus,” *GCS* 12.1 (1905): Cited 10-16-2008. Online: [http://books.google.com/books](http://books.google.com/books;).; PG 8.241A). See G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit: a Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers* (2nd ed.; London: S. P. C. K. 1967), 10.

⁷⁶On the secondary literature, especially see especially Jensen, *Understanding Early Christian Art*, 202, n. 52; Michael Jameson, “The Asexuality of Dionysus,” *Masks of Dionysus* (ed. Thomas H. Carpenter and Christopher A. Faraone, Myth and Poetics; Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 44-64. The historian Diodorus, in commenting on Dionysus’ ambiguous age and sex concludes that there were actually two Dionysi the one ancient and masculine with a long beard and the other appearing youthful and effeminate (Diodorus *Hist.* 4.5.2; cp. Ovid, *Met.* 4.13.20; Seneca *Oed.* 420).

iconography, leading some scholars to think they were depictions of women in some cases.⁷⁷ Irenaeus, reports that such images can be shown been used by at least one type of Christian group in Rome from the late second century at the latest.⁷⁸ Some scholars have suggested that this type of image emerged in heterodox circles.⁷⁹ Nevertheless, as Clement of Alexandria illustrates, the image of the androgyne had a an honored place in Christian teaching appears as an important symbol of the restoration of original humanity in Christ, beginning with Paul and the Pauline churches (Gal 3:25-27).⁸⁰

Specifically here, as Jensen summarizes, “Apollo and Dionysus iconographic types . . . share feminine attributes seen in . . . youthful Jesus images, including the round shoulders, small but obvious breasts, wide hips, and full cheeks of the nearly hermaphroditic figures described by Euripides, Ovid, Diodorus, and Seneca or portrayed in classical iconography.”⁸¹ As Jensen suggests, these representations of Jesus were used because they were consistent with the portraiture of savior deities in

⁷⁷See Jensen, *Understanding Early Christian Art*, 117-25.

⁷⁸See Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 75, Plate 13, who suggests that a seated “Christ-Serapis” with long ringlets, feminine features, and seated in the posture of a teacher is a Carpocratian teacher. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.25.6 reports that Marcellina, a female teacher with some relation to Carpocrates, is said to have gone to Rome during the time of the presbyter-bishop Anicetus (155-160 C.E.). She and her followers apparently used images, including images of Christ, and gave them honor with ceremonies including garlanding. Irenaeus does not offer any description of these images.

⁷⁹Thomas F. Mathews, *The Cash of Gods: a Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art* (Rev. ed.; Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), 135-8.

⁸⁰Wayne A. Meeks, “The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity,” *HR* 13 (1974): 167.

⁸¹Jensen, *Understanding Early Christian Art*, 125.

the Hellenistic mystery cults.⁸² Hippolytus #2's depiction of Christ in these terms represents his attempt at relevance for his audience. He was also likely borrowing from well-known iconography. Perhaps the iconography was on the walls of the place where he taught the Song to the newly baptized. He was also borrowing from tradition of these gods; in essence Christ was co-opting and transforming the commonly assumed attributes of divinity.

Some important preliminary conclusions can be drawn from Hippolytus #2's use of polytheistic motifs used in service of Christian mystagogy. They illustrate a similar approach to the Christian application of such motifs in the pictorial art that begin to appear in Rome in the third century. On that basis, a comparison to Hippolytus #2's attitude in the *In Cant.* and the community icon of the so-called "statue of Hippolytus" is warranted. Most interpretations agree that the statue was understood as a symbolic representation either of *Logos-Sophia* or of the community itself as the Roman Church, a representation, perhaps, of the queenly bride of Christ. The Guarducci-Brent posits that the statue began existence as the portrayal of a female philosopher. Vinzent argues that it began existence as a representation of the Amazon Hippolyta. Reinterpretation of the original image would have been achieved in two ways. One was through physical space and use. The image contextualized in different spaces speaks a different message. The second way the statue was reinterpreted was through the inscription of works by a Christian author or authors. Similarly, the mythical elements of the Ariadne myth in the *In Cant.*, the Christ described variously in terms of Dionysus, Orpheus, Apollo, Helios, or Heracles are ways of praising Christ by a favorable comparison to the traits of god-men or

⁸²Ibid.

divinities. As Aristotle said, when praising someone, “you must compare him with illustrious personages for it affords grounds for amplification and is noble, if he can be proved to be better than men of worth.”⁸³ Hippolytus could be confident in making use of themes borrowed from mythological figures because of his certainty that the resurrected Christ was far superior to the gods. In the same way, the community in Rome, under Hippolytan influence, could reinterpret a statue they knew had represented many cities of the East and in Rome represented Roma, its divine genius, because of a sense of confidence that, despite their ancestral origins in non-Roman peoples and places, they were Roman nonetheless *and* citizens of a New Jerusalem.

Valentinian Precedents of Hippolytus #2's Interpretation

Jewish tradition and Greco-Roman polytheistic myth shaped the interpretation of the Song. Moreover, the thought and practice of diverse kinds of Christians were an important part of the matrix that formed the set of interpretive assumptions and results in Hippolytus #2's *In Cant*.

Following Döllinger,⁸⁴ Brent and others argue convincingly that Hippolytus made use of Valentinian and Christian theological categories that would later be understood as heretical in his fight against Monarchianism.⁸⁵ In view of Hippolytus

⁸³Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.14.6; Cicero, *Inv.* 1.16.23; Quintilian, *Inst.* 4.15.

⁸⁴Döllinger, *Hippolytus and Callistus*, 201-2.

⁸⁵See Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 358. Indeed, it may well be that gnostic thought made a significant contribution to the development of the doctrine of the Trinity. See Alistair H. B. Logan, *Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy: A Study in the History of Gnosticism* (Hendrickson Publishers, 1996), 32. Hippolytus #2's focus on making Christian use of Old Testament Scriptures also involves a reaction to debates with Marcion of Sinope and his followers on the status of the Jewish Scriptures,

#2's touchy defense against the charge of Valentinianism in (*Noet.* 10.3-4),⁸⁶ it is appropriate to probe more deeply and ask whether any evidence exists to suggest additional Valentinian influences⁸⁷ in his *In Cant.* Valentinian influence is especially interesting because, during the later Arian controversy, Hippolytus was brought up in support of the Arian side of the controversy.⁸⁸ It is quite possible that in 347 the bishops of Philopolis, referring to events about a century earlier, reflect a tradition that Hippolytus was maligned as *Valentinian*, because of the way eastern bishops used their tacit acceptance of the ouster of "Novatian, Sabellius and Valentinus" by the Roman Church.⁸⁹ If *In Cant.* is properly contextualized in Rome, a charge from Monarchian Christians of Valentinianism against Hippolytus, while not fair to his

Pelletier, *Lectures du Cantique des Cantiques*, 215.

⁸⁶The reason he even mentions Valentinus in *Noet.* is a defensive move.

⁸⁷Döllinger, *Hippolytus and Callistus*, 202.

⁸⁸Ibid. 198. One of the anathemas of the Council of Nicea was directed against what is, essentially, the position of Hippolytus #2, Ibid., 201-2

⁸⁹The grouping of Valentinus with the other two is odd, since he was likely excommunicated in the second century, yet it may simply be a rhetorical amplification. See Hilary of Potiers, *Ex operibus historicis frag.* 2.1.2 662 (PL 10); Socrates *Hist. eccl.* 2.15 (PG 57) makes it clear that Novatian had been expelled with no objection from the East, as the bishops meeting at Antioch (341 C.E.) reminded the Roman Church. The council in Macedonia (347 C.E.) strengthened the claim Rome should respect their condemnation of Marcellus because eastern bishops had supported Rome in the ouster of "Novatian, Sabellius, and Valentinus." Döllinger, *Hippolytus and Callistus*, 203, conjecture that the "Valentinus" condemned by Callistus was in *reality* Hippolytus #2. Brent suggests, rather, that a folk legend of a Valentinian Hippolytus condemned by Callistus persisted till that time. Cerrato, on the other hand, suggests a "real" Valentinian Hippolytus, otherwise unknown, would be just as likely. Döllinger's intuition would seem to be supported by the contents of *In Cant.* It has enough points of contact with Valentinian practice and theology to create the impression that Hippolytus was a Valentinian, though he saw himself as an enemy of the Valentinians.

theological outlook, would be, nevertheless, understandable.

Several features of the *In Cant.* show a marked connection with gnostic, especially Valentinian Christian *practice*. Not that Hippolytus advocated a second baptism, but he may well have borrowed the nuptial interpretation of baptism and even elements of a Valentinian baptismal interpretation of the Song of Songs to enliven his own baptismal rites. Here one must remember the words of Pelletier, that the Song was more than a “marginal scriptural document or simply a curious text.”⁹⁰ Rather, it was a text which had a precious link to a lived, experiential reality in the early church. That reality was no less precious among heretical groups like the gnostic Christian Valentinians.

The nomenclature regarding gnostic streams of Christianity is a battle ground.⁹¹ Entering the fray, one could characterize gnostic Christians as most often globally less socially cohesive⁹² and yet more restrictive concerning sexuality due to radical ontological dualism,⁹³ and more anti-Jewish, than the traditionally organized

⁹⁰Pelletier, *Lectures du Cantique des Cantiques*, 215.

⁹¹See Stark, *Cities of God*, 141-5, who cites the recent study of the category of “gnosticism,” Michael A. Williams, *Rethinking “Gnosticism”: an Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 27, 40, who argues that the only category common to all varieties of “gnostics” is the category “heresy” applied to them by monoarchians and *Logos* Christians. Yet, as Stark, *Cities of God*, 144-54 and Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 265-73 have shown, many features were common to many of these groups. Williams suggests “biblical demiurgic” as a label.

⁹²However, gnostic groups did spark mass movements that developed global organization, as in the case of the followers of Marcion.

⁹³Some, however, were radically permissive with regards to sexuality, though this seems to be the exception.

church.⁹⁴ On the other hand it appears likely that “heresy” was productive of theological and liturgical innovation among other Christian groups, including that of Hippolytus.⁹⁵

The contours of the ritual framework presupposed by the *In Cant.* (baptism as *nuptials* connected with *Passover*, and post-baptismal *anointing* in preparation for a *banquet* or “couch” with nuptial connotations) did not originate with Hippolytus. On the contrary, it is very likely that this framework for interpreting Christian initiation was originated with child of Valentinus.

Irenaeus, discussing a number of diverse heterodox practices summarizes:

For some of them prepare a nuptial couch, and perform a sort of mystic rite (pronouncing certain expressions) with those who are being initiated, and affirm that it is a spiritual marriage which is celebrated by them, after the likeness of the conjunctions above. (*Adv. Haer.* 1.23.3)

The “nuptial couch” refers to the regular Greco-Roman banquet, but presented with the added interpretation of the celebration of a marriage. This practice is very likely a reflection of Valentinian practice, which appeared strange to Irenaeus. That these initiatory rites were also connected to baptism is logical, given that a bath would have preceded the banquet. Still, baptism could have been celebrated without a

⁹⁴See Stark, *Cities of God*, 145-54. This sentence should not be taken to imply a centralized hierarchy like that of the present Roman Catholic Church. The variety of mechanisms of power (synod, pope or patriarch, canon, creed and, in Rome, even the monepiscopacy) were not yet fully developed. Nevertheless, positions staked out in the larger church concerning Scripture, creed, hallowed habits of liturgical practice, apostolic writings, teachers and apostolic succession provided a cover of authority to which church leaders appealed in matters of dispute. See van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 4, “In all cases an appeal to ‘tradition’ was an essential element in church disputes” among the emerging mainstream.

⁹⁵This was the theory of Lampe, *Seal of the Spirit*, 101-48.

banquet by certain groups,⁹⁶ which seems to be Irenaeus' meaning. He immediately adds to his presentation of initiation rights the topic of baptism among heretical groups: "Others, again, lead them to a place where water is, and baptize them, with the utterance of [certain mysterious words]. After this they anoint the initiated person with balsam; for they assert that this unguent is a type of that sweet odor which is above all things" (*Adv. Haer.* 1.21.3).

Other groups, according to Irenaeus, rejected baptism, while retaining ritual anointing, or combining water and oil in the anointing as a substitute:

But there are some of them who assert that it is superfluous to bring persons to the water, but mixing oil and water together, they place this mixture on the heads of those who are to be initiated,⁹⁷ with the use of some such expressions as we have already mentioned. And this they maintain to be the redemption. They, too, are accustomed to anoint with balsam. Others, however, reject all these practices, and maintain that the mystery of the unspeakable and invisible power ought not to be performed by visible and corruptible creatures, nor should that of those [beings] who are inconceivable, and incorporeal, and beyond the reach of sense, [be performed] by such as are the objects of sense, and possessed of a body. These hold that the knowledge of the unspeakable Greatness is itself perfect redemption.

The varieties of practices of baptism and anointing were particularly connected with Valentinian groups. Furthermore, it appears that the utterance of mysterious words to which Irenaeus points is a type of mystagogy, like that represented in the *In Cant.* Irenaeus, however, appears to be more disturbed about the gnostic rejection of baptism and heterodox, incomprehensible words spoken over

⁹⁶Or, conversely a banquet could have followed baptism without a specific nuptial interpretation.

⁹⁷This seems to suggest baptism by pouring. The addition of oil to the water is also attested in the *In Cant.* 2.8.

baptism and anointings than about the order of events themselves. Nevertheless, he appears to consider their post-baptismal unction as somewhat of a novelty.⁹⁸ As Lampe concluded, “Irenaeus is not to be cited as an upholder of a theory of any ‘sealing’ administered with a rite of unction. Where such anointing was certainly practiced in the second century, and held to be a means of sealing the believer for future redemption, is among Gnostic sects.”⁹⁹ It is likely that if Irenaeus had seen the

⁹⁸Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 3.9.3 unites the giving of the Spirit with baptism, in imitation of the baptism of Jesus. See Lampe, *Seal of the Spirit*, 119-20; Winkler, “The Original Meaning of the Prebaptismal Anointing and Its Implications,” in *Living Water, Sealing Spirit: Readings on Christian Initiation* (ed. Maxwell E. Johnson; Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1995), has argued, against Lampe, that broad, early practice of eastern churches was pre-baptismal anointing signifying the presence of the Spirit (not exorcism). See her original article Winkler, “Original Meaning of the Prebaptismal Anointing,” 24-45, and Serra, “Syrian Prebaptismal Anointing and Western Postbaptismal Chrismation,” 328-41. In Winkler’s pioneering study, she argued that the ancient Syrian rite had originally emphasized the pre-baptismal anointing of the head alone as the crucial aspect of pre-baptismal anointing. Its meaning was quite distinct from post-baptismal, pre-banquet anointing. Rather, it was in imitation of the kingly/sacerdotal anointing of Jesus at his baptism, which signaled the gift of the Spirit and inaugurated his Messianic kingship. As such, it was a symbol of rebirth (cf. John 3) and not death and resurrection (Rom 6). Others, viz., Alistair Logan, “Post-Baptismal Chrismation in Syria: The Evidence of Ignatius, the Didache and the Apostolic Constitutions,” *JTS* 49 (1998): 92-108, following Bradshaw who argued that Christian practice began in haphazard diversity and only later became unified, Bradshaw, *Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*, 163-74, have attempted to argue that the eastern practice was as early as the second century included post-baptismal anointing as in the West. Nevertheless, the evidence for such early diversity in Syria and the East is weak Joseph G. Mueller, “Post-Baptismal Chrismation in Second-Century Syria: A Reconsideration of the Evidence.” *JTS* 57 (2006): 76-93. See also Kilian McDonnell, “Jesus’ Baptism in the Jordan.” *TS* 56 (1995): 209-36, on theological development surrounding the baptism of Jesus in both the eastern and western church from the event, considered of central in the early mainstream Christian understanding of redemption.

⁹⁹Lampe, *Seal of the Spirit*, 120-1.

practice of baptism as envisioned by his disciple Hippolytus, he would have been struck by the similarities with Valentinian rites. This state of affairs is explained by the fact that for quite some time Valentinus was a respected teacher in the church in Rome, and demarcating one group of Christians from another, later considered heretical did not become clearly drawn until the time of Irenaeus. By the time Irenaeus saw Valentinian rites in Gaul, they were probably practiced by a number of non-Valentinian groups in Rome in different ways.

Heracleon, the disciple of Valentinus, also links baptismal imagery, Passover, and nuptial imagery. Origen quotes him in discussing the Passover.

Heracleon, however, says.

This is the great feast, for it was a type of the Savior's passion, when the sheep was not only killed but also provided rest when it was being eaten. In being sacrificed it signified the passion of the Savior in the world, but in being eaten it signified the rest at the wedding.¹⁰⁰

Heracleon in this passage likely refers to baptism here under the image of rest, a well known image dear to the early church,¹⁰¹ especially in the East.¹⁰² The notion of rest connected to baptism is also a prominent feature of the *In Cant.* 26-27. It is worthy of note, therefore, that in Heracleon, a representative of western Valentinianism (*Haer.* 6.30.3-7), the essential elements of Hippolytus #2's contextualization of the Song also

¹⁰⁰Origen, *Comm. Jn* 10.117 (trans. from Origen, *Commentary on the Gospel according to John Books 1-10* (FC 80, trans. and ed. Ronald E. Heine; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1989), 281.

¹⁰¹Kilian McDonnell, "Jesus' Baptism in the Jordan." *TS* 56 (1995): 225-6.

¹⁰²See the *Gospel of the Hebrews* fragment preserved in Schneemelcher and Wilson, eds., *New Testament Apocrypha*, 1.177, "My Son, in all the prophets I was waiting for thee that though shouldst come and I might rest in thee. For thou art my rest; thou art my first-begotten Son that reignest for ever."

come together: Passover, baptism, feast, and nuptial interpretation.

Peter Lampe argues that Valentinus and Valentinian leaders, like Heracleon, who followed him belonged to the educated circles of their day.¹⁰³ He argues, however, that they could have had a considerable following among people of little or no education. The evidence suggests that Valentinians launched a mass movement of socially stratified groups based upon normal patron-client relations. They became a force that rivaled other church groups in many areas.¹⁰⁴

Lampe's study of a Valentinian inscription on the Via Latina, dated paleographically to the middle of the second century,¹⁰⁵ is pertinent to understanding the *In Cant.* and the typological interpretation of Hippolytus in that it suggests a nuptial interpretation of baptism in Rome previous to Hippolytus' time. Lampe's reconstruction of the text yields the translation:

Co(brothers/sisters [συνάδελφοι])¹⁰⁶ of the bridal chambers, celebrate with torches the (ba)ths (λούτρα) for me.

They hunger for (ban)quets (ειλαπίνας) in ou(r rooms [ἡμετέροισι δόμοισι]),¹⁰⁷

(La)uding the Father, and praisin(g) the Son;

¹⁰³Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 297.

¹⁰⁴Here Stark, *Cities of God*, 171, finds evidence of Valentinian groups in 75% of the larger cities of the Roman world where there is evidence of non-Valentinian churches.

¹⁰⁵The evidence suggests the period of the Antonines (139-180 C.E.). See Margherita Guarducci, "Valentiniani a Roma," *MDAI* 80 (1973): 169-89.

¹⁰⁶This could just as likely represent συντέκνοι.

¹⁰⁷This could also be ἡμετέροισι ἀναγαίσις, our dining rooms, cf. Mk 14:15.

Oh, may there be flow(ing [ῥύσις εἴη]) of the only (sp)ring (πηγή) and of the truth in that very place (or: then).¹⁰⁸

Lampe sums up the Christian reading of this text as reflecting a patron/host opening up his/her home for Christian rituals,¹⁰⁹ which the host asks to be observed “for me” (i.e., in my honor or remembrance). The congregation celebrates baptisms and looks forward to eucharistic meals afterwards, which are celebrated with song in praise of the Father and the Son. Wherever the rituals are observed the patron hopes that there is the “flowing of the spring of truth.” The combination of Father, Son, and bridal chamber occurs in *GPhil* 82; further, the *GPhil* 95 teaches that the Valentinians received the anointing from the apostles, which Christ received “in the bridal chamber.” The bridal chamber, in *GPhil*, is a symbol of baptism:

§90 Those who say that they will die first and (then) will rise are in error. If they do not first receive the resurrection, while they live, they will receive nothing when they die. This way too when they speak about baptism, saying ‘Baptism is great,’ as if they who receive it will live.

...

§95 The chrism is lord over baptism. For because of the chrism we are called ‘Christians’, not because of baptism. Also Christ was called (thus) because of the chrism. For the Father anointed the Son, and the Son anointed the apostles, and the apostles anointed us. He who is anointed has the all. He has the resurrection, the light, the cross.

¹⁰⁸Greek text given in L. Moretti, “Iscrizione greche inedite di Roma,” *Bullettino comunale* 75 (1953-55): 83-6; M. Raoss, “Iscrizione cristiana-greca di Roma anteriore alterzo secolo?” *Aevum* 37 (1963): 11-30; Guarducci, “Iscrizione cristiana del II secolo nei Musei Capitolini,” *Bullettino comunale* 79 (1963-64): 117-34; Lampe, “An Early Christian Inscription in the Musei Capitolini,” *ST* 49 (1995): 79-92. Guarducci was the first to publish following a suggestion by M. Simonetti that the inscription was Valentinian.

¹⁰⁹Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 305.

§96 As to the Holy Spirit, the Father gave him this in the bridal chamber (and he received (him)). The Father came to be in the Son, and the Son in the Father. This is the kingdom of heavens.

Van Os has shown that Valentinian practice of baptism included stripping of garments, going down into the water (*GPhil* 101), baptism (*GPhil* 90), chrismation and receiving the Holy Spirit (*GPhil* 101) following the baptismal ceremony salutation with a kiss (*GPhil* 31)¹¹⁰ and a eucharistic meal (*GPhil* 98, 100).¹¹¹ Though these rites are interpreted in ways differing from a non-gnostic Christian like Hippolytus, nevertheless, they are the same in terms of their physical reality and order. Van Os points out further that in *GPhil* 98 and 100 there are two references to the cup. In the first, the saying presents bread, wine and oil. In the second reference is only to a “cup of prayer” that is filled with water and wine. This outline conforms to the normal order of the Greco-Roman banquet¹¹² in which a first course of wine and food—represented in the first reference as “bread”—is followed by the symposium in which wine mixed with water, prayers, songs and conversation or other entertainment followed. According to *A Valentinian Exposition* (NHC 10.2), the Valentinians in the group represented by that document had two prayers centered on a communal meal or “banquet,” much like Lampe’s inscription.¹¹³

A few more examples from *GPhil* completes the picture. Van Os suggests

¹¹⁰As argued by Michael P. Penn, *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church* (Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion; University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), the kiss was an important boundary marker in early Christianity.

¹¹¹van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 121.

¹¹²Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 13-46.

¹¹³van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 122.

that those waiting for baptism could see their reflections in the water because oil lamps were brought near to illuminate the place of baptism (*GPhil* 75), in accordance with the Valentinian inscription on the Via Latina, which mentions “celebration with torches.”¹¹⁴ Van Os resolves the contradiction that arises in *GPhil* 122, which states that the spiritual marriage takes place in the light and during the day. He notes, however, that *GPhil* 126 and 127 indicate the light/day should be understood metaphorically,¹¹⁵ since the light is received in the bridal chamber, even as Justin, *Apol.* 1:24-25 speaks of those who are baptized as “those illuminated.”¹¹⁶

Van Os argues convincingly that the entire *GPhil* is a combined manual of catechesis for instructing those preparing to be baptized and then mystagogy following baptism, giving instruction after baptism about the anointing and Christian living. In the same vein as the *Didache*, a final pre-baptismal instruction given just prior to baptism, the *GPhil* offers 7 units of instruction.¹¹⁷ The fourth century Cyril of Jerusalem will offer 21 units of instruction.¹¹⁸ He points to *GPhil* 6-8 and 109 as indicating a preferred time of year for baptism, which is symbolized as the transition from winter to summer, i.e., spring. He points out that *GPhil* contains many references to the crucifixion, the cross, and one to the Paschal lamb. While this does not require Easter baptism, the discourse fits Easter time better than any other. The

¹¹⁴This mention also is in line with the *Lucernarium* eucharistic meal in *Trad. ap.*

¹¹⁵van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 129.

¹¹⁶If the waters themselves were anointed with oil, as seems to have been a practice of some Valentinians (See above note 97 on page 416.) and of Hippolytus himself (*In Cant.* 2.8 n. a) the lights of the lamps would have flashed brilliantly in the darkness.

¹¹⁷van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 129.

¹¹⁸During the forty days prior to Easter, van Os suggests this might correspond to an instruction period of a week.

first reference is not as clear as the second, since it speaks indirectly and metaphorically:

§6 In the days that we were Hebrews,¹¹⁹ we were orphans, having our mother. But when we became Christians¹²⁰ we received father and mother.

§7 Those who sow in the winter, harvest in the summer. The winter is the cosmos; the summer is the other aeon. Let us sow in the cosmos, so that we shall harvest in the summer. Therefore it is necessary for us not to pray in the winter. Out of the winter the summer (comes forth). And if someone harvests in the winter, he will not harvest but he will pluck out, §8 like that sort that will not yield fruit [to him]. Not only does it come out [in the winter], but in the other sabbath, [his field] is without fruit.

The second is more obvious.

§109 As Jesus fulfilled the water of baptism, so he has poured out death. Therefore, we indeed go down into the water, but we do not go down into death, so that we are not emptied in the spirit of the cosmos. When he blows, it becomes winter. When the Holy Spirit blows, it becomes summer.¹²¹

The nuptial language, reminiscent of the Song of Songs is a remarkable feature of Valentinian initiation that indicates the power of the teaching and practice of a charismatic, influential leader in the early church. That he was later called a “little fox” by Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 1.31.4; cf. *In Cant.* 20.1, 2) may indicate that the Song was an important text for Valentinians.

A further reference in *GPhil* that seems to reflect a ritual elaboration of the Song of Songs is the interpretation of the kiss of believers given in the context of the Eucharist, *GPhil* 31:

¹¹⁹I.e., unenlightened, baptized, psychic Christians (!).

¹²⁰I.e., Fully initiated into the nuptial rites, i.e. enlightened by Valentinian teaching.

¹²¹Van Os, “Baptism in the Bridal Chamber,” 88.

For the perfect conceive through a kiss and give birth. Therefore, we too kiss one another, receiving conception from the grace that is within one another.”

This is quite similar to the instruction about the kiss given by Hippolytus (*In Cant.* 2.1):

In Cant.

2.1 Now come and let us see this proposition of it [him/the book], in which he says. “Kiss me with the kisses of his mouth, because your breasts are lovelier than wine, and [the] aroma of your anointing oil greater than all incense, and as aroma of anointing oil poured out is your name.” 2.2 What is the will of the Spirit, for what [is its] force, or what might be the interpretation (*lit.* indication, sign) of this mystery? We must proclaim to those who will hear, for it is the representation (*lit.* type) of the people that entreats the heavenly Word to kiss them, because [the people] wish to join [together] mouth to mouth. For [the people] wishes to join the power of the Spirit to itself.

CantPar

2.1 But we pass on to proposition of the book. Let him kiss me from the kiss of his mouth (And in these matters the great Hippolytus celebrates God to the greatest extent). Because your breasts are above wine and the scent of your anointing oil is above all aromatic spices, your name is anointing oil poured out. For this reason the young women loved you.

Despite Valentinian influences, Hippolytus is essentially opposed to Valentinus and his followers because of their distinct views of history, salvation, and the flesh. Valentinus was a speculative theologian and biblical interpreter with keen spiritual insight, if the gnostic *Gospel of Truth* bears any resemblance to his original teaching.¹²² For Valentinus, the divine world and the physical, created world have nothing to do with one another in any direct way. The physical world is the result of an “error” in a spiritual being, *Sophia*, who sprang from various generations in a chain of divine entities from the primordial female-male duality called “fullness” or πληρωμα. *Sophia* was lacking in understanding and became filled with desire or revolt. Thus the “error” that leads to ignorance, sin, suffering, and death took place in

¹²²This summary of the *Gospel of Truth* is largely taken from Karen King, “Valentinus (f. 120-160),” *EEC*, 1155-56.

the divine realm. The being who shaped the physical world, the God of Genesis or the demiurge, is also part of the physical creation and not even a spiritual being of the pleroma. As *Sophia* attempted to separate her desire from the darkness outside the pleroma, little bits of her spiritual nature became trapped in flesh. From this thought came the Valentinian notion that humanity was separable into three classes: spiritual, *psychic* (soulish), and *choic* (material). The heavenly Christ sent down the savior Jesus to teach the lost souls about their true nature and destiny so that in death they might ascend to their true home above. Valentinus' teaching reveals a deep appreciation of the human desire to escape ignorance and attain mystical knowledge of God. According to Lampe, Valentinians seem to have been effective recruiters of women who were able to offer patronage to the community.¹²³

In terms of theology, what Hippolytus (and other *Logos* theologians) appreciated in Valentinus' teaching was his notion of the generation of divinity.¹²⁴ Hippolytus latched on to this notion as a way of holding to the oneness of God from all eternity, yet allowing for divinity in the *Logos* and in the Son, Jesus Christ. For Hippolytus, the *Logos* is a power or potential within God (who is neither Father nor Son before creation). At creation, the *Logos* and the Holy Spirit, not clearly distinguished from the *Logos* in Hippolytus, is generated from the mind (νοῦς) of God as a separate person, but still only a παῖς θεοῦ—in the sense of having the status of a servant of God), nevertheless “God of God.” Apparently Hippolytus was also prepared to see feminine attributes ascribed to *Sophia* as part of the manifestation of

¹²³Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 296, 312, 319 n. 3. Irenaeus accuses the Valentinian Marcosians of pursuing mostly women *Adv. haer.* 1.13.2ff., 7; 1.6.3

¹²⁴See Orbe, *Hacia la primera teologia de la procesion del Verbo*, 611-16.

the *Logos*. In other words, the androgyny of *Sophia-Logos-Christ* was likely a way of affirming the connection between Christ and the *πληρωμα* and denying that the physical world was a result of “error” on the part of *Sophia*. For Hippolytus, the “error” resulting in the chaos of sin and separation from God in death took place in the physical world, due to the failure of human beings. In Hippolytus’ understanding, the *Logos* becomes perfect Son at the completion of the incarnation, that is, at the cross. It is in his dual nature as the human face of the *Logos* that the Son has the power to open the way of salvation for human beings (cf. *In Cant.* 13.1; *Noet.* 6.4; 16.6)

In Hippolytus #2’s conception, distinct from that of Valentinus, creation is an expression of the perfect wisdom of God. Sin is the result of temptation from another spirit being, the Evil One, represented by the Serpent in Genesis. For Hippolytus, then, the problem of humanity is that they are under the rule of the Evil One and the path of salvation takes place through a historical process, for the Spirit and the *Logos* were at work in the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament, preparing the flesh to receive the incarnation of the *Logos*. With the coming of the *Logos* in Jesus Christ, the God of the Old Testament is vindicated and the way of return to God, a process of divinization, is opened up through the undoing of the effects of sin by the Son of God and his followers. In the *In Cant.* Eve and women are shown to have a central, vital role in the outworking of this restorative process. It appears that the *In Cant.* represents an attempt to co-opt Valentinian success by adopting features of Valentinian initiation for the advancement of the Hippolytan community.

Hermeneutical-Theological Process: Typology, Mystery and Divine Economy

As discussed in Chapter Two, Scripture reading performed with allegorical and typological interpretation as practiced in Jewish circles at least from the time of Philo (Cf. *Vit. cont.* 65-75 and his own allegorical interpretation of the Torah)¹²⁵ provides the closest surviving historical parallel of the sort of social practice represented by the *In Cant.* Something of the allegorical is present in Hippolytus in his understanding of the world and the synagogue of darkness. For the purposes of this dissertation, allegorical interpretation refers to the practice of seeking eternal truths (in a Platonic sense). These truths do not depend upon what happens within the passing sphere of time, but are before and transcend all time. Origen and the Valentinian Ptolemy are primary Christian exemplars of this type of exegesis.¹²⁶

Hippolytus' works have little of this type of interpretation. Like Origen, Hippolytus sees another meaning in Scripture outside its literal meaning, and often the disagreeableness or awkwardness of the literal meaning is a sure sign that it must mean something else.¹²⁷ Since for Irenaeus the "error" that results in the chaos of sin and death took place in the physical world, the deeper meaning of Scripture points to the process of redemption that takes place in the physical world through human history. The other meaning of the narratives of Israel and Song of Song concerns events that occur in the course of history through the incarnation of *Logos* in Christ. He expressly speaks of typological meaning (*In Cant.* 1.16; 2.23, 31; 7.4-5; 13.4;

¹²⁵And in Qumran with the peshar commentaries (viz., the elusive 4Q240).

¹²⁶See González, *Christian Thought Revisited*, 52.

¹²⁷Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church*, 29.

17.2; 24.2; 27.2). And the obvious typologies are well-known: bridegroom/Christ; Yahweh and Israel/Christ and the church (*In Cant.* 1; 2; 3.7). The fragrance of the bridegroom is the *Logos* and the darkness of the bride her past sins. The ridge poll of the roof of the dwelling of the lovers (i.e. the heaven) are the apostles, the walls are the patriarchs (*In Cant.* 16.2-3). Foxes are heretics (*In Cant.* 20.1).

Hippolytus is fond of using the phrase, “What does this mean except . . .” and then he fills in the blank either with some event of the gospel or some aspect life in Christ or in the church. For Hippolytus the progression of salvation history from creation to consummation is the primary plane in which the program of God is worked out. Thus, Israel and the physical generations of the Patriarchs participate in the plan of salvation even through the physical process of begetting children, because they generate the flesh that was taken up by the *Logos* (*In Cant.* 27). Part of the progression of the story is from the nation of Israel to the nations; for Hippolytus the church of the Gentiles has displaced unbelieving Israel. In the *In Cant.* that relationship is described as a complicated love triangle and the ideal to which Hippolytus seems to move is two churches that are part of the same family: one church of the Circumcision¹²⁸ and one of the Gentiles,¹²⁹ both one with Christ. Such an image is at home in the “fractionalized” church in Rome. Hippolytus holds firmly to the idea that there is continuity in the story from Israel to the church to the end of time: “the Gentiles became a desert toward God. But, from now on they are citizens esteemed in holiness by the graces of God, whence the church adorned appeared in

¹²⁸*In Cant.* 2.22, “Joshua, i.e. Jesus brings a second circumcision”; 12.1; 17.1; someone who comes to Christ from the circumcision is able to unite old and new, etc.

¹²⁹*In Cant.* 1.7.

the aroma of mixed anointing oil” (*In Cant.* 26.1). Now, however, that continuity is expressed not only by unity of progression, but also by the movement of recapitulation seen in the theology of Irenaeus so that the salvation narratives of the Gospels record the reversal or systematic undoing of the effects of the fall that brought sin and death upon humanity. Thus Hippolytus reads the gospel narratives themselves as anti-typologically related to the redemption of Adam and Eve by the reversal of the fateful events of the fall.

These interpretations in the *In Cant.* are also social practices. They encode a certain way of relating to outsiders (Jews and heretics), and they should be seen as part of the social history of a larger Greco-Roman set of practices surrounding and including the banquet. The early church carried on and transformed these traditions. As seen above, the testimony of Justin (*Apol.* 1.67.3-6), the Sunday eucharistic assembly comprised a reading of the Old Testament joined to that of the Gospel, Acts and apostolic Letters. Some have held that perhaps the proper contextualization of Hippolytus #2’s commentaries is non-eucharistic meetings that were held during the week, taking readings from the Old Testament Scriptures,¹³⁰ similar to the homiletic cycles practiced by Origen in Caesarea.¹³¹ Concerning the *In Cant.* this comparison is not appropriate, even if Hippolytus #2’s other commentaries may well have originated as homiletic performances in non-eucharistic settings. Origen taught and lectured his students in Caesarea as a sophistic teacher of philosophy.¹³² Eventually he

¹³⁰Pelletier, *Lectures du Cantique des Cantiques*, 215.

¹³¹Ibid, 383-9.

¹³²Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Panegyric* 6-8. See John McGuckin, ed. *The Westminster Handbook to Origen* (Westminster Handbooks, Louisville KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 89.

preached regularly during the week and on Sundays and, for seasons, every day of the week.¹³³ Hippolytus #2's commentaries may be the written residue of a similar, if less liberal, curriculum; it appears that his program was less comprehensive and more narrowly ecclesiastical and catechetical than Origen's Caesarean program. Still, the massive output of Hippolytus, as seen from the lists in Eusebius and Jerome, points to significant patronage and the help of secretaries like those who supported Origen, some of whom had connections to the imperial court.¹³⁴ It also indicates that outsiders would have seen the church as a house-school. To a large extent the commentary became a primary teaching activity by the of the third century in circles like those of Hippolytus and Origen.¹³⁵

Typology and the Mystery of the Divine Economy

Hippolytus #2's approach to Scripture owes a great debt to Irenaeus. For both

¹³³Simonetti, *Origene esegeta*, 79, "Origine cominciò a predicare regolarmente in chiesa molto più tardi di quanto avesse cominciato a insegnare a scuola, e le raccolte di omelie rimontano agli ultimi anni della sua attività," Simonetti discussed the written evidence (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.36.1) that allows the conclusion that only after he was 60 years of age (that is from 245 C.E.) was Origen afforded the use of tachigraphists for recording his public discourses. The church historian Socrates (*Hist. eccl.* 5.22) attests, however, that Origen regularly preached on Wednesdays and Fridays. From the Homilies on Genesis 10.3, it becomes clear that Origen preached, at least during part of the year, every day. The meetings were held in the morning and dedicated specifically to the reading and explanation of Scripture. The regularity of such meetings and the use of tachigraphists permitted Origen the resources necessary to produce systematic commentaries on entire books of Scripture homiletically. Gregory, cited in the previous note, shows that Scripture study was for Origen the pinnacle of learning in liberal arts.

¹³⁴Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 313.

¹³⁵Pelletier, *Lectures du Cantique des Cantiques*, 216.

Irenaeus and Hippolytus, the fundamental vision of God is familial and pastoral. For Hippolytus, God is a father who is beneficent and concerned that his children find their joy in the bond of family and imitation of the father's nature.¹³⁶ Even more important in the *In Cant.*, God is a shepherd God and is leading people through history toward the ultimate goal of leading humans to become god-like.¹³⁷ The typology used by Hippolytus is not an erudite procedure, rather it is a Christian pastoral impulse that takes the Scripture seriously as a narrative because it bears witness to the work of God as it unfolds in history.¹³⁸ For Hippolytus, the Spirit inspired Solomon to produce the Song, so the Song is prophecy just as were the various blessings of the patriarchs. They relate, however, not primarily to the experience of Israel in the context of the original message, but above all to the future that the incarnation of the *Logos* opens for humanity.¹³⁹ Like Irenaeus, Hippolytus conceived of the faith as essentially typological and, because of that stance, his public teaching is an exegesis of the Jewish Scriptures, rooted in the assumption that the creator God is the architect of a good plan. For Hippolytus the Song points to the relationship of the incarnate Word of God to Israel, both believing Israel (as is usually the presupposition of Rabbinic exegesis) but also to unbelieving Israel. The Song, therefore, becomes a justification for the substitution of unbelieving Israel by the church of the Gentiles.¹⁴⁰ Essentially, Hippolytus interprets the Song as a

¹³⁶See González, *Christian Thought Revisited*, 54.

¹³⁷*Ibid.*, 54-5.

¹³⁸*Ibid.*, 55; Pelletier, *Lectures du Cantique des Cantiques*, 216.

¹³⁹Chappuzeau, "Auslegung," *JAC* 19: 51.

¹⁴⁰*Ibid.*

complicated, three way relationship.¹⁴¹

The Divine Economy in the In Cant.

The subject of the *In Cant.* is the love relationship between Christ and his followers despite its dependence on previous Jewish interpretation.¹⁴² The *In Cant.* is a work of praise in admiration of the divine economy of God revealed in Jesus Christ for the salvation of the world. It is the Spirit that sings the Song of Songs and in a prophetic way, reveals beforehand what has been ordained to take place through the church.¹⁴³ The Scripture, then, reveals (*In Cant.* 1.16) the “new economy” “in various portions” and “typologically” and that theological deposit of understanding has been given to spiritual patrons of the church—the “we” signifies leaders like Hippolytus—to “declare to those who are able to listen with faith.”¹⁴⁴

¹⁴¹See page 388.

¹⁴²Chappuzeau, “Auslegung,” *JAC* 19: 43

¹⁴³Meloni, “Cantico dei Cantici,” 98-9,

Tema centrale è il mistero dell’economia. Questa espressione, che manifesta il desiderio di comprendere il mistero della Trinità nel suo rapporto con la vita dell’umanità, ritorna varie volte nel Commento per definire la medesima realtà che essa esprime nel *Contra Noetum* 7.

A central theme is the mystery of the economy. This expression, that shows the desire to understand the mystery of the Trinity in its relationship with human life, appears various times in the commentary to define the same reality that it expresses in the *Contra Noetum*.

¹⁴⁴Thus Irenaeus says:

Thus it was, too, that God formed man at the first, because of His munificence; but chose the patriarchs for the sake of their salvation; and prepared a people beforehand, teaching the headstrong to follow God; and raised up prophets upon earth, accustoming man to bear His Spirit [within him], and to hold communion with God: He Himself, indeed, having need of nothing, but granting communion with Himself to those who stood in need of it, and sketching out, like an architect, the

Scripture for Hippolytus does not simply set forth divine laws with punishments and rewards. The commandments, however, do have an important nutritive function (*In Cant.* 2.1-3). Nor does Scripture simply reveal a series of eternal truths in allegory that could have been distilled apart from the history of God's relationship with human beings. Rather, the history of God's relationship in Scripture reveals God's οἰκονομία (economy). The economy is the spiritual narrative of God's relationship with people that moves from the expression of the *Logos* and the *Spirit* from the heart of the Father, the creation of the physical world and human beings, the disaster of sin, the prophetic revelation of *Logos* in the history of Israel, the incarnation of the *Logos* in Christ culminating in the crucifixion and the sending of the Spirit. Finally the economy, through the Spirit, leads to divinization of humans. It is the story of salvation.

The mode of theologizing that Hippolytus follows depends upon a narrative in time and space that has to do with the redemption of physical beings of flesh and blood. Accordingly, he transforms the love poems of the Song into a spiritual narrative that has to do with the economy as he conceives it. He even sees the canonical arrangement of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs received by him in the Scripture codex that belongs to the community as a spiritual narrative of the economy:

plan of salvation to those that pleased Him. And He did Himself furnish guidance to those who beheld Him not in Egypt, while to those who became unruly in the desert He promulgated a law very suitable [to their condition]. Then, on the people who entered into the good land He bestowed a noble inheritance; and He killed the fatted calf for those converted to the Father, and presented them with the finest robe. Thus, *in a variety of ways. He adjusted the human race to an agreement with salvation.* (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 4.14.2 ANF 1.479)

He assigns for them a certain three-fold division (*or* economy), since these three books were expounded by the will of [the] Holy Spirit and through [his] blessed mouth declared by the Holy Spirit. For it is [the] Holy Spirit that would give utterance to [the] Trinity in order that the grace of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit might be spread abroad. (*In Cant.* 1.3).

And (*In Cant.* 1.16) Hippolytus says:

Now the result of occurrence of these events [is] a series one after another [of books] as an ancient spiritual narrative, because those who are able must narrate by faith the ancient matters. Now the Spirit sings what has been ordained in the church, since in various portions it reveals to us the economy in types which we must declare to those who are able to listen with faith.

The narrative of the Trinity is revealed in the order of the economy of the Father, the economy of Christ,¹⁴⁵ and the economy of the Holy Spirit (*In Cant.* 1.7):

So therefore Wisdom by means of the manifold grace of the Father was making manifest to us the adornment [of the world] by the command of the Father. At the time of Wisdom's dwelling in the world with Solomon she said to him, "I, Wisdom, have lived with you as counsel (*or* mystery) and knowledge." Now since knowledge [is] blessed by the will of the faithful, [Wisdom] makes proclamation to us by the counsel (*or* mystery) of the Father.

The mystery of the Trinity, clearly announced in *In Cant.* 1.1-8, has as its goal the salvation of humanity.¹⁴⁶ In the *In Cant.* Hippolytus develops the idea of the

¹⁴⁵The phrase "economy of Christ" is only found in the Greek paraphrase, *CantPar* 1.15; however, it is clearly seen in the passages dealing with the incarnation.

¹⁴⁶Meloni, "Cantico dei Cantici," 99. According to *Noet.* the very duality of Father and *Logos*, comes into existence, with the *Logos* as a separate person out of God's desire to create the world, *Noet.* 10, "God, being alone and not having anyone contemporaneous with himself, wished to create the world." Here it may be seen that Hippolytus #2 is careful to make creation the work of the original Dyad, in distinction from Valentinus. Like Valentinus, however, the creation comes about by will (θέλημα), similar to desire.

Trinity as “God for Us”¹⁴⁷ by means of various images in the Song such as the “*myron*” or “anointing oil that is diffused” (Song 1:9), “the vines of En-geddi” (Song 1:14), “the leaping lover” (Song 2:8) and the “couch of Solomon” (3:7-8).¹⁴⁸

Incarnation, Crucifixion, and Resurrection of the Incarnate Word

The incarnation represents a transition from the economy of the Father to the economy of the Holy Spirit. It is a new step in God’s plan and an expression of a new grace/gift of the divine economy:

And so the Word, beloved, when he dwelt a body, because he was great, though he appeared abased that he might be revealed, he was indeed revealing the new grace of the economy. The rich was made poor for us, that by his wealth we might be made rich. Then, beloved, from that time suspended there on a tree, he gave off a pleasing aroma of anointing oil. For he humbled himself and having stood up,¹⁴⁹ the Word began to sing forth and in that time filled [the people]; the aroma was poured out that also the mercy of the economy might always appear bringing joy in the outpouring of the fragrant anointing for it was sent from the heart of the father and made known good news to the earth. (*In Cant.* 13.3).

The incarnation of the Word, *Logos* or Wisdom is the saving event *par excellence* in Hippolytus, as it was in Irenaeus. In the *In Cant.* Wisdom is the *Logos* generated by the Father that comes to meet humanity to guide humanity back to the Father.¹⁵⁰ It signals the beginning of the reversal of the effects of sin and the liberation of the entire world. Meloni draws attention to several stages in the mystery of the

¹⁴⁷See Catherine M. Lacugna, *God for Us: The Trinity and Christian Life* (HarperOne, 1993).

¹⁴⁸Meloni, “Cantico dei Cantici,” 100.

¹⁴⁹Referring to the resurrection.

¹⁵⁰Meloni, “Cantico dei Cantici,” 100. See below, this process is also described as divinization.

economy as developed by Hippolytus in his interpretation of the Song.¹⁵¹

- a. The *Logos* is in the Father (as a power or potential, not as a person).
- b. The *Logos* is sent from the heart of the Father and from the mouth of the Father.
- c. The *Logos* himself creates the world along with the Father.
- d. The *Logos* acts in the world by means of the prophets.
- e. The *Logos* becomes flesh.
- f. Christ pours forth his divinity from his flesh (this work is consummated on the cross.)
- g. Christ resurrected infuses divine life into the church.
- h. Hippolytus, as in a, above expresses the mystery of the existence of the *Logos* in the mind of the Father before the creation of the world. For him, the *Logos* exists only in potential and in silence until the will of the Father brings him forth:

For, just as a vessel in which there is anointing oil, [which] has been guarded safely and sealed up, does not emit an aroma, nevertheless it continues to contain [the aroma], that is the potential, but when they release it, it emits its aroma both nearby to it and places far [are] filled [with it], so also the Word was in the heart of the Father, and so long as it had not gone forth, no one rejoiced in it all, but when the Father sent forth the Spirit of the aroma, the Word spread joy abroad to all. (*In Cant.* 2.5)

The above description is not meant to foster speculation about the status of the *Logos* but to prepare for the joy of the going forth of the *Logos*. That joy, most likely, is the joy connected with the creation of all things, which signals a deeply important theme that Hippolytus shares with Irenaeus, the goodness of the created

¹⁵¹Ibid.

order. Hippolytus does speculate for his audience about the status of the *Logos* internal to the Father, he did in *Noet.* before an audience when he was defending his own doctrine and urging the condemnation of the Monarchian doctrines of Noetus.

There (*Noet.* 10) he says:

“God, being alone and not having anyone contemporary to him, wished to create the world, but, though being alone, he was multiplex. He was not in fact lacking in *logos*, nor wisdom, nor power, nor will, but all was in him (ἐν αὐτῷ) and he was the All.”

For Hippolytus, however, the multiplex nature of the All in God clearly does not mean that the *logos* did not have the potential to be a distinct person or πρόσωπον. In fact, in the *logos* within the heart of the God, the entire universe exists as a potential. This becomes clear in *In Cant.* 2.23 where David is said to emerge born from the heart of the Father, a type of the Blessed One. This notion arises from the words “I have found a man after the desire of my heart, David”¹⁵² (Acts 13:22). The Word came forth from the mouth of the Father, with the implication that David came forth from the Word, and then a man (Christ) came forth from David. King David himself was “mingled in the heart of the Father” before he came forth and from him comes the mystery of the anointing (the Word made flesh). By this example Hippolytus is eager to show his commitment to strict monotheism, which he restates

¹⁵²David is an important type for Hippolytus #2, worthy to become a type of Christ because he was “chosen by the heart of God” (*Dav.* 4.6, Garitte, CSCO 264) Since he was chosen, he “announces the great mystery of the anointing (*In Cant.* 2.23). From childhood he “pondered in his heart the mysteries of Christ” (*Dav.* 1.2). He is a prophet “similar to his Lord in both word and deed” (*Dav.* 2.1). David is now “glorified in the heavens by God who was produced from him and is now incarnate in the heavens and glorified together with the Father” (*Dav.* 16.5). See Meloni, “Cantico dei Cantici,” 102.

perhaps because his language about the *L/Logos* coming from the mouth of the Father would open him up to the charge of ditheism. It is tortuous logic indeed.

“The release of the *Logos* from the mouth of the Father corresponds to Meloni’s point “b.” above:

For this very reason it says: “an aromatic anointing oil [is] your name poured out.” For the vessel of joy has been opened, which is the paternal mouth. By bringing forth the esteemed Word from him[self], he caused the aroma to descend from heaven. This descending (ful)filled (*or*, began to [ful]fill) everything. (*In Cant.* 2.6)

The image of the anointing oil (or the *myron* according to *CantPar*) is similar to the physical metaphors used elsewhere by Hippolytus to describe the procession or expression of the *Logos* from the heart of the Father. The Word is “light from light,” “a ray of the sun,” “water from a fountain” (*Noet.* 11). According to the *Noet.* the *Logos* is not fully *Son* until the incarnation.¹⁵³ The Sonship of the *Logos* is bound up with his taking on flesh and experiencing the full range of cycle of life and death. In Hippolytus #1 the *Logos* is *παῖς* (*Haer* 10.33.11; Marcovich, PTS 25 412.50-51), not *υἱός* before the incarnation, which amounts to the same thing as what the *Noet.* says, the *Logos* before incarnation is “not yet perfect Son.” And yet, in the development of the economy during the period of the patriarchs, the *Logos* is preparing the way for his perfect Sonship, the paradigm of all perfect Sonship with the Father. Thus in Hippolytus the very notion of the “Sonship,” as also the “*Logos*” as separate person is part of the economy of salvation, not speculation about the ontological reality of God, which does not seem to have been Hippolytus #2’s concern.

¹⁵³For neither was the Word, prior to incarnation and when by Himself, yet perfect Son, although He was perfect Word, only-begotten (*Noet.* 6.4; cf. 16.6 trans. YWS).

Several different images describe the sending of the *Logos* (*In Cant.* 2.4, 5, 6, 7, 23). According to Hippolytus, the *Logos* is generated from the Father in order to fill the World, “By bringing forth the esteemed Word from him[self], he caused the aroma to descend from heaven. This descending (ful)filled (*or*, began to [ful]fill) everything.” (*In Cant.* 2.6). The beginning of the filling is brought to completion only with the incarnation (as in *Noet.* 16.6). The same idea is stated in a way reminiscent of the language of the *In Cant.* in the Blessings of Judah,¹⁵⁴ though the appearance that it gives of attributing Sonship to the pre-incarnate *Logos* is only that, the *Logos* has Sonship here only in potential:

“A whelp of a lion, Judah, from a shoot, my son, you shall go up” (Gen 49:9). Saying, therefore, “lion” and “young lion” shows clearly the two persons, that of the Father and that of the Son. And he said, “from a shoot, my son, you shall go up,” to indicate the generation of Christ according to the flesh, who, incarnated by the work, who in the womb of the Virgin took root and grew [i.e., germinated] in her and he was manifested as a flower and a sweet smell once he went forth into the world. Since, therefore, it says a whelp of a lion, he indicated

¹⁵⁴*Ben. Jac.* 16 (*PO* 27.76), Hippolytus, *Sur Les Bénédictiones d’Isaac, De Jacob Et De Moïse* (*PO* 27, ed. Louis Maries, B. Ch. Mercier, Maurice Briere; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1954).

»Σκύμνος λέοντος Ἰούδα ἐκ βλαστοῦ, υἱέ μου, ἀνέβης», λέοντα οὖν καὶ σκύμνον λέοντος εἰπὼν σαφῶς τὰ δύο πρόσωπα ἐπέδειξεν, τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ, τὸ δὲ εἰπεῖν· «ἐκ βλαστοῦ, υἱέ μου, ἀνέβης», ἵνα τὴν κατὰ σάρκα γέννησιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ δείξῃ, ὃς ἐν κοιλίᾳ παρθένου ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου σαρκωθεὶς ἐβλάστησεν ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ ὡς ἄνθος καὶ ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας εἰς κόσμον προελθὼν ἐφανερώθη, ἐπεὶ οὖν σκύμνον λέοντος εἶπεν, τὴν κατὰ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ γέννησιν ἐκ θεοῦ, ὡς ἐκ βασιλέως βασιλέα γενόμενον ἔδειξεν, οὐκ ἐσιώπησεν δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν κατὰ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ φησιν· «ἐκ βλαστοῦ, υἱέ μου, ἀνέβης», Ἡσαΐας γὰρ λέγει· «ἐξελεύσεται ῥάβδος ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης Ἰεσσαὶ <καὶ ἄνθος ἐξ αὐτῆς> ἀναβήσεται», ἢ οὖν ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ ἦν τῶν πατέρων γενεὰ ὡς ῥίζα ἐν γῆ πεφυτευμένη, ἢ δὲ ῥάβδος ἢ ἐξ αὐτῶν φανερωθεῖσα ἦν ἡ Μαρία, διὰ τὸ εἶναι ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατριᾶς Δαβὶδ, τὸ δὲ ἄνθος τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ βλαστῆσαν ἦν ὁ Χριστός, ὅπερ προφητεύων ὁ Ἰακώβ ἔλεγεν· «ἐκ βλαστοῦ υἱέ μου ἀνέβης».

the spontaneous generation [of Christ] from God according to the Spirit, as a king generated from a king. [The text] is not silent either concerning the generation according to the flesh, but says, “from a shoot, my Son, you will go up.” (*Ben. Jac.* 16 [*PO* 27.76])¹⁵⁵

So, the language about “Father and Son” as well as the language of “lion and lion’s whelp.” (*Gen* 49.9), and Christ according to the Spirit and the flesh, is used for the purpose of directing the reader’s/hearers attention to the incarnation, and not meant to make a statement about the nature of the pre-incarnate Word. As Meloni states, “The generation according to the Spirit is the road toward the generation according to the flesh, that is manifested to the world”¹⁵⁶ and that generation results, after the incarnation in a “sweet perfume” from the Father that diffuses over mankind.¹⁵⁷

It did not bother Hippolytus that his conception of the *Logos* implied that there was when the *Logos* was not. It is understandable how Hippolytus could have been quoted in support of the Arian party a century after his death. Hippolytus merely affirms the statement of Scripture: “Now Wisdom was brought forth by the Father ‘before all the mountains,’ by means of Wisdom the beauty of this world was arranged” (*In Cant.* 1.6). Thus, the *Logos* is eternal because he was “generated before all hills” (*Prov* 8:25).¹⁵⁸ This last passage affirms Meloni’s point “c.”

¹⁵⁵Trans. YWS.

¹⁵⁶Meloni, “Cantico dei Cantici,” 103, “La generazione secondo lo spirito è la strada verso la generazione secondo la carne, che la manifesta al mondo.”

¹⁵⁷The “sweet perfume” is also an image developed in the *Ben. Is.* 7; Hippolytus, *Sur les benedictions d’Isaac, de Jacob et de Moïse* (Louis Maries, et al.; *PO* 27.1-2 Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1954).

¹⁵⁸Hippolytus #2, *Antichr.* 2.18.21, the Son of Man is king and judge of the celestial world, “because the *Logos* had been generated from the heart of the Father before all things.”

Meloni's point "d." is abundantly demonstrated in the *In Cant.* Besides the references to the prophetic Spirit, a manifestation of Wisdom in the introduction, Hippolytus repeatedly affirms that the *Logos* is operative in the prophets, just as he was in David. The *In Cant.* affirms that the lover "looks intently through the window" (Song 2:9; *In Cant.* 23.1). That window is a "window in the heavens that is open." The window is the prophets through whom the Word is made known and through whom the Word looks at the world and says to his beloved, "Come, my neighbor, come!"¹⁵⁹

The central theme of the incarnation, Meloni's point "e." is that the *Logos*, generated from the heart of God, his "generation according to the spirit" in turn results in the patriarchs and matriarchs who generate Christ according to the flesh (*In Cant.* 27.7-9). The human body that is formed from Mary participates in the flesh of all the humans who generated his physical body from Adam to Mary, (*In Cant.* 27.7)¹⁶⁰ In the *In Cant.* Hippolytus teaches that the patriarchs offered their own flesh in order to produce the "flesh of Christ" in the womb of Mary. Hippolytus gives a round number of progenitors, sixty (seventy in the *Greek CantPar*), which corresponds to the sixty strong men who surround the couch of Solomon (Song 3:7-8).

A similar theme is used in the *Antchr.* 4, where the flesh of Christ is also described with the image of nuptial robes in which the *Logos* is dressed. The prophets and patriarchs weave on a loom the flesh of Christ by means of the thread of grace

¹⁵⁹That the *Logos* who from the beginning of the world was at work through the prophets is also present in both *Antchr.* 2.5.20-6.2 and *Noet.* 12.17. It is a Hippolytan commonplace.

¹⁶⁰Meloni, "Cantico dei Cantici," 113

“that comes from the love of Christ” and the shuttle of the “power of the Spirit.”

Finally, the Virgin dressed the *Logos* in the robe, but the weaving process was not complete until the “sufferings of the Cross”:

For then the *Logos* of God, that was without flesh, put on the holy flesh of the holy virgin as a husband dresses himself in a robe, he finished weaving it for himself in the suffering of the cross, so that, uniting our mortal body with his power and having mixed the corruptible with the incorruptible and the weak with the strong, he might save humanity that walked in ruin. The fabric of the Lord is the suffering which occurred on the cross, the shuttle or needle within this is the power of the Holy Spirit, that weaves it and the holy flesh is knitted together with the Spirit, the thread is the grace that comes from the love of Christ, that binds and joins the two realities in one, the bobbin is the *Logos*, those who operate it are the patriarchs and the prophets, that knitted the beautiful garment slowly until penetrating the feet and the perfect robe of Christ like the spool, the *Logos* by means of them knitted all that which the Father had willed.¹⁶¹

The culmination of the incarnation in Meloni’s point “f.” in which the saving force of the cross is that Christ pours forth his divinity from his flesh, consummating the incarnation on the cross. The power of the death and resurrection of Christ is the release that brings glorification and the hope of vindication for believers in the future:

¹⁶¹ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄσαρκος ὢν ἐνεδύσατο τὴν ἁγίαν σάρκα ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου ὡς νυμφίος ἱμάτιον, ἐξυφήνας ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ σταυρικῷ πάθει, ὅπως συγκεράσας τὸ θνητὸν ἡμῶν σῶμα τῆ ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμει, καὶ μίξας τὸ φθαρτὸν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ καὶ τὸ ἀσθενὲς τῷ ἰσχυρῷ σώσει τὸν ἀπολλύμενον ἄνθρωπον, ἔστι μὲν οὖν ὁ ἰσθὸς τοῦ κυρίου ὡς τὸ πάθος τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ σταυρῷ γεγεννημένον, στήμων δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ ἢ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος δύναμις, κροκὴ δὲ ὡς ἡ ἁγία σὰρξ ἐνυφαινομένη ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, μίτος δὲ ἢ δι’ ἀγάπης Χριστοῦ χάρις σφιγγουσα καὶ ἐνοῦσα τὰ ἀμφότερα εἰς ἓν, κερκὶς δὲ ὁ λόγος, οἱ δὲ ἐργαζόμενοι πατριάρχαι τε καὶ προφῆται οἱ τὸν καλὸν ποδῆρη καὶ τέλειον χιτῶνα ὑφαίνοντες Χριστοῦ, δι’ ὧν ὁ λόγος δικνούμενος κερκίδος δίκην ἐξυφαίνει δι’ αὐτῶν ταῦθ’ ἄπερ βούλεται ὁ πατήρ. Hippolytus, *Antichr* 4.1-13 (Achelis, GCS 1.2).

O economy of new grace and of enormous mysteries (*lit. counsels*)! “Behold my nephew leaping arrived and approaches” (Song 2:8.) What does the message about leaping mean? He leapt down from heaven into the womb of a virgin; he leapt from the holy womb and mounted the cross. He leapt from the cross into the underworld; he leapt up in human flesh to the world. (*In Cant. 21.2*)

The death of Christ on the cross is the occasion for the release of the power of the *Logos*, the final step of the work of the incarnation. Only with the crucifixion, symbolized by the wounding of balsam tree upon which hangs a bunch of grapes, brings the full release of God’s mercy and the full measure of joy to the world:

Then, beloved, from that time suspended there on a tree, he gave off a pleasing aroma of anointing oil. For he humbled himself and having stood up, the Word began to sing forth and in that time filled [the people]; the aroma was poured out that also the mercy of the economy might always appear bringing joy in the outpouring of the fragrant anointing for it was sent from the heart of the father and made known good news to the earth. (*In Cant. 13.3*)

The result of that consummation, Meloni’s point “g.,” is that the resurrected Christ infuses divine life into the church. This is the point of Hippolytus #2’s intricate, symbolic exploration of the mystery of the Trinity from start to finish. He does not demonstrate an interest in an eternal hierarchy of divine beings, but clearly is concerned about the salvation of the world through the revelation of the economy. That salvation comes concretely through the congregations of believers and its qualified leaders (like himself). Christ has become one with humanity in the flesh, so that he can share his divine life, the perfume of the *Logos*. And that comes about through a recognition of this man as God (*In Cant. 15.1*). Salvation consists in the gathering, or reunification of all people, Jews and Gentiles with Christ.

The World-wide Proselytizing Mission: the Grace of the Economy

From the outpouring of mercy and the gathering of the nations, the church of the last days participates in the economy of the Spirit through the manifestation of the economy in fulfillment of the mystery of Scripture:

And this [process] did not occur without the economy of the Spirit so that the mystery to come might be made known through them at the fulfillment of the last days. (*CantPar* 1.14)

. . . from ancient time [Hezekiah] made a choice [of proverbs and songs] through the Spirit for every use. And [to] those who are completely zealous for the church this later was made intelligible with contemplative study (*In Cant* 1.13d)
. . . They sought out some afterwards and added to the [more] ancient selection for the edification of the church (*In Cant.* 1.14d)

In Cant. 1.13-14 has suffered greatly in transmission, however, the words expressing *CantPar* 1.14 and *In Cant.* 1.13d, 14d seem to express the main point, that the Scriptures the church possesses are the best exemplars of the wisdom expressed by the prophetic figures like Solomon. The process of selection itself was also guided by the Spirit. Thus the Scriptures provide types and symbols in Israel that point to the new economy of the Spirit. For this reason, the new economy is celebrated in preaching and in celebrations of the mystery revealed in Scripture that recapitulate the story of salvation by prayers, rituals, and simple representative objects that make the economy (analogous to the myths and rituals of the mystery religions) capable of being ritually experienced by the initiate. One representative object was oil of anointing,¹⁶² representing Holy Spirit/*Logos* present through senses of touch and

¹⁶²Others are “the books” (1.4-8); “the waters” (2.5); “the kiss” (2.1 ff.); “the wine” (2.3); “the cross” “the knife,” (13.1 ff.); “the couches” (27).

smell (*In Cant.* 2.5):

“A fragrance of anointing oil poured out is your name.” ¡O new economy and of the wonderful mysteries preached by means of the Holy Spirit!

The scope of the economy, however, far more than personal enlightenment, is deeply communal and broadly applicable. For Hippolytus, then the key “grace” or “gift of the new economy” is a world-wide reach of the proselytizing mission initiated by the incarnate, crucified and resurrected Righteous One, the righteous one and perpetuated by the apostles:

And behold a new grace of the economy. For the steed was from the people, just as the blessed apostles [were] released (*or* were bold) to race through the world like steeds. And there was a chariot gathering the Gentiles. (*In Cant.* 8.2)

The chariot represents the church on its mission through the world. The gift or grace given in the economy of the Spirit is world mission, unity of the Spirit in emulation of the apostles, and imperial, regal presence and authority of Christ. This mission is seen as the fulfillment of the hopes of Israel as signaled in this context by the exposition of the great Helios chariot that known from earlier domestic decorations,¹⁶³ later Synagogue mosaics,¹⁶⁴ and in contemporary Christian funerary decoration,¹⁶⁵ races through the world to gather the peoples.¹⁶⁶ There may be some blending of motifs in the image of the chariot, since the “gathering of the peoples” is more reminiscent of the chariot of Dionysus on his return from conquest.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶³Dunbabin, *Mosaics of the Greek and Roman World*, 218, 230.

¹⁶⁴Ibid, 189-192.

¹⁶⁵Ibid., 251.

¹⁶⁶See page 406 above.

¹⁶⁷Dunbabin, *Mosaics of the Greek and Roman World*, 227. The chariot is some-

Divinization: the Goal of the Divine Economy

Perhaps the central focus of Christian teaching about human beings and salvation in the early church is the doctrine of θεωσις.¹⁶⁸ For Hippolytus, this teaching refers to the transforming effect of the grace of God in body and soul. As used by Hippolytus in the *In Cant.*, it means that humans are infused with divine grace and thus share in divine nature. This basic theological outlook continues from Irenaeus and Hippolytus #1, the author of *Haer.* The later concludes his demonstration of the true doctrine with as clear a statement of the vision of divinization as is possible:

This comprises the meaning of the proverb, “Know yourself;” that is, discover God within yourself, for he has formed you after his own image. For to the knowledge of self is linked being an object of God’s knowledge, for you are called by the Deity himself. So, do not be inflamed. O people, with enmity one towards another, nor hesitate to find your way back quickly. For Christ is the God above all, and He has arranged to wash away sin from human beings, bringing life again to the old human. And God called the human being his likeness from the beginning, and has put forward in a figure his love towards you. And provided you obey his solemn commands, and you become a faithful follower of him who is good, thou shall resemble him, inasmuch as be honored by him. For when Deity comes down to us, he does not diminish the divinity of his divine perfection in any way; even when he made you God to his glory! (*Haer.* 10.34.5)¹⁶⁹

In the *In Cant.* Hippolytus #2’s also makes use of the theme of divinization expressed in multiple symbols such as the diffusion of the aroma of the *Logos*, the outpouring of the divine life upon humans at the resurrection, and the mystery of the

times ridden by Ariadne, as in the fifth-century Terrace House in Ephesus, *Ibid.*, 251.

¹⁶⁸The normal term in Greek patristic thought for the transforming effect of grace. See David Balás, “Divinization,” *EEC*, 338-40.

¹⁶⁹Trans. YWS.

production of the flesh of the *Logos* by the patriarchs and matriarchs, the assumption of human flesh in the physical body of Christ, filled the divine life of the *Logos* and with the Holy Spirit, was motivated from start to finish by divine love:

A container for spices, a vessel, [is] Christ who put on the garment of flesh and is held fast by means of a binding of a chord of love, that by means of this he may be crushed as grapes. (*In Cant.* 12.1)

Divinization is clearly expressed as the goal of the divine love expressed in the incarnation that culminated in the crucifixion:

He glorified himself in the earth and appeared as the aroma of the anointing oil and hurried to heaven. [That is] having been diffused from heaven, he was ascending from earth to heaven. For a dew was brought out from fruit and descended from on high, that terrestrial creatures might be sealed for life which is this: the Word descended that men might be able to ascend to heaven. This parable of types [is] clearly suggested in such words as: “My sister, my child, in the vineyard of Engeddi.” (*In Cant.* 13.3)

The allusions to the divine couple Dionysus and Ariadne as a *topos* to create a basis for explaining the relationship between the incarnate *Logos*, Israel, and the Gentile church also suggest divinization as the goal of the new mystery of the economy. The love of Dionysus for Ariadne resulted in her divinization. By this mechanism, Hippolytus #2 the mystagogue makes use of known quantities in the polytheistic outlook of his audience to explain the mysteries of the faith. The understanding he expresses of the goal of salvation and the rhetoric he employs are profoundly shaped by Greco-Roman polytheistic categories; however, divinization is denied to Solomon, who had wisdom but was not himself Wisdom (*In Cant.* 1.1).

The use of polytheist categories is heightened if the reader is aware of the connection of the interpretation of Song 3.1ff. in terms of the myth of Heracles in the

garden of the Hesperides. In that myth, Heracles is in search of the apples of eternal life and the nymphs of the garden are deities themselves. Heracles, according to the version of the story in Apollodorus desires to become a son of Zeus. But in the “retelling” by Hippolytus, it is the women who yearn for eternal life and Jesus who is already glorified in an immortal body. The story is turned on its head. Hippolytus similarly transforms the concept of divinization implicit in the Heracles myth. No longer is it the reward for a life of suffering and hard work, available to those willing to make the sacrifice. Rather, it is given to those who repent and believe in Christ. Christ himself does not earn divinization, but begins as the expression of divinity. Such a concept, however, was already part of the pagan myth in some of its forms. Indeed, Cornutus declared that Heracles was “the Logos, permeating everything, giving nature its force and cohesion.”¹⁷⁰ Seneca the Stoic, and also contemporary of Cornutus, who wrote two tragic plays with Heracles as the central protagonist remarks that Heracles had a divine pre-existence. He claims that the *divina ratio* who is author of the world, called by many names, is also known as Heracles (*De Beneficiis* 4.7.1-8.1). Seneca, then implies that Heracles was the *Logos* incarnated.¹⁷¹ Thus, the audience of Hippolytus must be imagined as needing the kind of transformation of myths through the gospel. One may surmise that devotion to Heracles was part of the problem of the rhetorical situation faced by the mystagogue.

The yearning for and hope of divinization is poignantly and touchingly expressed in the episode of the myrrhophores (*In Cant.* 24-25), where Martha offers

¹⁷⁰Cornutus, *Theologiae graecae compendium* 31 (Cornutus, *Theologiae graecae compendium*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1881).

¹⁷¹For further references, see Aune, “Heracles and Christ,” 14.

her flesh to be mingled with the body of the Son of God in eucharistic terms, and asks to be taken to heaven with him. Her counsel, or “the mystery of righteousness” is to commend Eve as a new sacrifice, since *her* flesh has been redeemed in the flesh of Christ and ascends to heaven in his resurrected body as well as in the ecclesiastical body of Christ.¹⁷² Martha’s counsel to Christ (or the mystery shared with Christ) is appropriate because Martha enacts the recapitulation of the deceitful sin of Eve, when she bore the news of the resurrection to the apostles. The issue is not a theology of female redemption,¹⁷³ separate from that of males, but laying the appropriate groundwork for the theme of the offering of the flesh of all the patriarchs (*In Cant.* 26-27).

The *In Cant.* insists that all the patriarchs had offered their “flesh” so that the “flesh of Christ” could be formed in the womb of the virgin. In order to explain the significance of the “couch of Solomon surrounded by sixty strong men” (as in Song 3:7-8), Hippolytus affirms that this image prefigured the flesh of Christ, prepared by sixty progenitors of Jesus listed in the biblical genealogy from Adam to Mary mother of Jesus.¹⁷⁴ The symbol is complex, but it is a eucharistic symbol in which the gathered community of women and men celebrating the offering of the body and blood of the Lord also see in that symbol an offering of their own flesh to God in the company of all the faithful of all generations through the body of Christ.

¹⁷²On this theme, see below, page 452.

¹⁷³As in Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 184.

¹⁷⁴Mat 1:1-17 has three cycles x 14 generations each from Abraham to Mary; Lk 3:23-38.77 arranged in inverse order from Mary to Adam. In the patristic tradition the number is fluid, resulting in diverse symbolic interpretations, Meloni, “Cantico dei Cantici,” 113.

Such a complex symbol presupposes divinization that is depicted in terms of the resurrection and ascension, in which Christ rises from death and ascends as smoke rising from incense. The incense of the column of smoke in Song 3:6 represents the path of divinization through the resurrection:¹⁷⁵

<i>In Cant.</i> 26.2 Georgian	<i>CantPar</i> 26.2 Greek	<i>In Cant. PSFlor</i> 26.2 Paleo-Slavic
<p>26.2 And she says, “Now who is this, that comes out from the desert, like smoke of incense ascending” (Song 3:6)? O excellent incenses, mixed aromatic incenses! For concerning whom does it say: “as fragrant smoke of incenses ascending” (Song 3:6)? As smoke from fire comes out from a fire and is taken up into the air, and a flame as a leader of chariots, shows it to us and appears, so the good mystery of Christ was spread abroad giving notice, going up from earth to heaven. For he was sending forth beautiful aromas of the mystery by making known the resurrection. As billows of incense smoke going up.</p>	<p>26.2 “As one producing a smoking pillar of smoke.” Why of smoke? Because smoke goes up into the air as it comes from the fire. In the same way that the mystery of Christ announces the divine economy to the ends of the earth, sending us up from the earth into heaven by the flame of divinity.</p>	<p>2 “Who” now, he said (having announced), are these coming upwards from the desert as palm trees of the smoke of frank-incense?” O the beautiful incense, the adornment full of aroma! And saying: “Like palms of smoke of the incense.” For the smoke of fire flies upwards into the air, in which manner Christ promises the mysteries of the economy, from the earth upwards to heaven. Now as the Palm tree, promising the mystery of the resurrection.</p>

The Greek version explicitly alludes to divinization, which is also the meaning of the image given in the Georgian text. The pillar of smoke rising from the burning incense of the entourage of Solomon represents the way Christ ascended to the sky (cf. *In Cant.* 13.3). The Paleo-Slavic has misinterpreted its *Vorlage*, reading Palm-tree rather than column of smoke. The chariot rising to the sky upon the death of a famous king was a common image of divinization. (The biblical Elijah was also

¹⁷⁵For the echo of imperial apotheosis in this passage, see page 104.

caught up into the sky in a chariot.) Such images were common in Greco-Roman houses¹⁷⁶ and could readily be interpreted by Christians in biblical terms, effectively undercutting the ideology of the polytheistic image. Recalling the image of the Helios chariot from *In Cant.* 8, this image could be associated with the Helios chariot or with the apotheosis of Heracles. Christ points the way to heaven and, even as he was caught up to heaven—Hippolytus adds what is natural—in a chariot, so he points the way for those who trust in him: the way to divinization.

Selected Theme: Women and the Synagogue in the In Cant.

A rehearsal of the content of the *In Cant.* like that discussed previously,¹⁷⁷ while important, cannot depict the originality and creativity of the interpretation of “the new divine economy¹⁷⁸” of the Spirit developed by Hippolytus. The *In Cant.* begins with an introduction that conforms to the expectations of readers or hearers approaching a text deemed important enough and difficult enough to merit treatment in a commentary.¹⁷⁹ Spiritually interpreted, the Spirit sings in the Song of Songs the economy that was later to become ordained in the churches (*In Cant.* 1.16), and that economy is the recapitulation of creation under the headship of Christ. Hippolytus, as a mystagogue, teaches new converts to participate in the new creation by means of

¹⁷⁶See Balch, *Roman Domestic Art and Early House Churches*, 19, 182, 203, 206.

¹⁷⁷See above on page 172.

¹⁷⁸The economy of salvation is a central theme of the commentary, signifying especially the relationship between the Old Testament “church” or Israel and the New Testament church and the change of relationship between them both and God as a result of the incarnation of the *Logos*. See Bonwetsch, “Kommentar zum Hohenlied,” 81.

¹⁷⁹This form, the *schema isagogicum*, is discussed in Chapter 2. See page 168.

faith and repentance, love and hope, ritual and mystery. Hippolytus develops this theme in remarkable ways, especially as regards women. The Spirit's song reveals the "new economy" to the teachers of the community ("us"). Behind all Hippolytus #2's instruction is the established hierarchy of the teachers of the community. Such teaching is given by developing intricate typologies corresponding to the connections he sees between the Old Testament Scriptures and their fulfillment in the new economy of Christ, the explanation of which believing teachers must give believing listeners.¹⁸⁰

The Myrrhophores and the Synagogue in the In Cant.

How may one characterize the attitude Hippolytus displays toward women in the *In Cant.*?¹⁸¹ The theology of the myrrhophores Martha and Mary in the *In Cant.* 24-25 is clearly idiosyncratic, and a repeated theme the author injects into his interpretation of at least one other text (*In Exodum*).¹⁸² Both the "mystery of Martha" (*In Cant.* 25.3) as well as the reference to Martha in Hippolytus' *In Exodum* are eucharistic texts. Whatever other associations this passage may generate, Hippolytus' applies the resurrection narrative with the two women to the synagogue and the church (*In Cant.* 25.10).

Cerrato's analysis of the literary structure of the episode of the myrrhophores

¹⁸⁰Bonwetsch, "Kommentar zum Hohenlied," 81. This same idea is developed in *Antichr.* 2.

¹⁸¹See above 127-136.

¹⁸²Sebastian Brock, "Some New Syriac Texts Attributed to Hippolytus," *Le Museon* 94 (1987): 177-200. While Brock doubts the attribution to Hippolytus #2, Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 180, mentions that Mary and Martha as primary witnesses of the resurrection attested in this text is a strong indicator of authenticity.

is sound.¹⁸³ Furthermore, unless further evidence should surface to establish the original Greek text, his interpretation of the text (*In Cant.* 2.29; 24.2; 25.1) is quite correct.¹⁸⁴ Scholars unfamiliar with the textual tradition of the *In Cant.* have rejected the reading “Martha” in these texts, they have apparently been led astray by commitments to the figure of Mary Magdalen as “the apostle to the apostles.”¹⁸⁵ The pair Martha and Mary occur throughout the narrative, in all versions (Georgian, Armenian, Paleo-Slavonic) and the pair Mary and Martha also occur as witnesses of the resurrection in a Syriac fragment of Hippolytus’ *In Exodum*.¹⁸⁶ Nevertheless, Cerrato’s reading of *In Cant.* 25.3 must be emended, following Garitte, to read “mystery of *righteousness*” rather than “counsel of Martha.”¹⁸⁷

¹⁸³Ibid., 184. The following outline is adapted from Cerrato.

¹⁸⁴Ibid., 179-83.

¹⁸⁵Chappuzeau, “Auslegung,” 56 n. 80 suggested that here Hippolytus’ text is corrupt because neither Mat 28:1 nor any other canonical gospel names Martha among *the* women at the tomb, rather “Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary.” Rosemarie Nurnberg, “Apostolae Apostolorum: Die Fraen Am Grab Als Erste Zeuinnen Der Auferstehung in Der Väterexegese,” in *Stimuli: Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum; Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann*. (eds. G. Schöllgen et al.; JAC 23; Münster: Aschendorff, 1996), 228, and Susan Haskins, *Mary Magdalen: Myth and Metaphor* (HarperCollins, 1994), 63 argue that Hippolytus has either fused or mixed the identities of the women. The fact that Mary Magdalene has become such an important figure in current feminist research should inspire caution in reading her into a text where she is not once named, see Ernse, “Martha from the Margins,” 153.

¹⁸⁶Sebastian Brock, “Some New Syriac Texts Attributed to Hippolytus,” *Museon* 94.1-2 (1981): 199: “the angels to both Mary and Martha gave the news that the Bread had been sent from the resurrection.”

¹⁸⁷Garitte corrects the “mystery/counsel of Martha” to the “mystery of righteousness” by amending the Georgian *martayssa* (of Martha) to *martalsa* (of righteousness). This is a likely emendation, since the parallel Armenian and Paleo-Slavic texts both read “righteous mystery” (‘das gerechte Geheimnis,’ Bonwetsch, “Kommentar,” 64; “*justum mysterium*” Garitte, CSCO 264: 46). The phrase “great mystery”

He notes that Hippolytus quotes nearly the entire text of Song 3:1-4 in *In Cant.* 24-25.¹⁸⁸ The exposition may be analyzed in three parts, which are expanded to better represent the flow of thought. Cerrato leaves several contextual details unclear in his presentation that must be integrated properly to arrive at a more accurate understanding of the text.¹⁸⁹

- Martha and Mary represent the synagogue-church in search of body of Christ and meet with angels at the tomb.
- The women encounter the risen Christ at the tomb.
 - The women try to delay the ascension by clinging to his feet.
 - The women beg for Christ to allow spiritual union with him and to be taken to heaven with him.
 - Martha warrants their request by asking Christ to present Eve as a new sacrifice.
 - Hippolytus comments that Eve is now purified of deception (represented by the fig-leaf), and that she is clothed with an incorruptible garment through the Holy Spirit.
 - Christ, the New Adam, was also dressed in his resurrection with peace and incorruptibility.
 - He was not naked.
 - The synagogue makes its confession through the

and “righteous mystery” appear elsewhere (*In Cant.* 2.29; 2.32; 8.1; 17.2; 26.3). See also Ernst, “Martha from the Margins, 160.

¹⁸⁸One important omission, noted by Cerrato, is the phrase “on my bed” from Song 3:1, Ἐπὶ κοίτην ἐν νυξίν ὃν ἠγάπησεν . . .

¹⁸⁹*Ibid.*, 185.

In Cant. 25.4
Georgian

25.4 For this reason she says: “When I withdrew a little ... I found him, the one whom my soul loves” (Song 3:4). Receive, O my heart! Be mixed with the Spirit, strengthen it, perfect it, so that it also may be able to join with the heavenly body. Mix this my body with [the] heavenly body. Drink it as wine, taken it, make it go up to heaven then a newly mixed cup, that [the woman] may follow the one she desires and not go astray, no longer with a bruised heel nor having touched the wood¹⁹⁰ of knowledge (Cf. Gen 3:15). But from now on [she is] victor¹⁹¹ over the tree through death.

In Cant. PSflor 25.4
Paleo-Slavic

25.4 And for that reason he calls out: When I went on a little further, I found the one whom my soul loves.” The soul expects that it would connect with the spirit that by virtue of the Spirit the body would be mixed with it! Mix my body like wine! Receive it, carry [it] upwards into heaven! Mix once more a new cup, [and] a woman saved and seduced no more nor one bitten in the heel, neither touching the tree of knowledge, the tree that is able to put to death!

In the Syriac fragment of *In Exodum*¹⁹² commenting on the “quails and manna” of Exodus 16, Hippolytus says that he gave the news to both Mary and Martha that the Bread, that is Jesus, had been sent from the resurrection (*In Ex* 3.19). That section of the commentary ends up with an encouragement about receiving the bread at the Eucharist: “Recognize this bread when you take it, O faithful, as the heavenly [bread].” Cerrato is correct to suggest that, “The commentary is homiletical in character and may well have been composed for use in the course of the liturgy of the Eucharist.”¹⁹³

Based on both canonical and non-canonical sources the interchange between

¹⁹⁰Or “tree” not collective.

¹⁹¹Lit. “having conquered” or “one who has conquered.”

¹⁹²Brock, “Some New Syriac Texts,” 199.

¹⁹³Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 181, n. 21

Christ and the myrrhophores, then, it may be said that Hippolytus #2 establishes a theological basis for praising the myrrhophores as examples of the apostolicity of women in recapitulating¹⁹⁴ the disastrous narrative of the deception of Eve with the truth of the gospel of Christ.¹⁹⁵ Cerrato goes further and claims, based on Garitte's Latin translation of the Georgian *In Cant.* 25.5,¹⁹⁶ that Hippolytus also uses this episode to provide theological warrant for the practice of ordaining women to ministry, and, for female redemption as well.¹⁹⁷ For Cerrato, the commentaries [of Hippolytus] display an attitude quite distinct on this particular point from Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and other patristic sources, who did not seek to elevate women.¹⁹⁸ Indeed, Cerrato goes on to suggest, “[w]hile the commentaries are not exempt from the culture in which they were composed, signs of an attempt to transcend elements of patriarchy appear.”¹⁹⁹ In support of this statement, Cerrato uses the reference in the *Comm. Dan.* 1.26 “women and virgins” (as well as men) in his audience.²⁰⁰ He alludes to the positive view of human equality in relation to the *Logos* (*Antichr.* 3), where male and female, with people of all social stations, have equal

¹⁹⁴“Recapitulate” used in the sense of “give a new head.”

¹⁹⁵*Ibid.*, 184.

¹⁹⁶*Excipe abhinc Evam in-ordinationem ambulantiem*, Garitte, CSCO 264.

¹⁹⁷According to Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 193, n. 21, the expression “counsel of Martha” elevates Martha as the central figure of female redemption ([*In*] *Cant.* 25.3). The redemption of woman transpires in the post-resurrection events as divine and pre-planned “counsel” (cf. “the economy of Martha”), actualized through the obedience of Martha and Mary and their vocation as “apostles to the apostles” ([*In*] *Cant.* 25.3).

¹⁹⁸*Ibid.*, 210.

¹⁹⁹*Ibid.*

²⁰⁰*Ibid.* Cerrato does not, however, note that here they are seen as the particular prey of heretics.

access to the *Logos*. Finally, he suggests that the definition of the status of women in the mission of the church truly sets the commentaries apart from their environment, that *In Cant.* in its Georgian version, affirms the apostolicity of women (*In Cant.* 24-25).²⁰¹ Cerrato's claims that the *In Cant.* elevates the status of women and accords well with the milieu of Montanism, which, for him, must be Asia Minor.²⁰²

The claim about the Montanist milieu is difficult to assess, since Montanists were to be found in Rome and in North Africa as well as other places besides Asia Minor during the second and third centuries. The claim, however, about the status of women in the *In Cant.* can be either confirmed or disproven.

On the whole Cerrato's discussion is remarkable and ground breaking. The application to the provenance of the *In Cant.*, however, is weakened because he fails to integrate the episode of the myrrhophores into the rhetorical and theological framework of the whole of the commentary and to the rhetorical situation in which the commentary was likely used, which, Cerrato rightly surmises, is a part of the setting involving the Eucharist in the context of initiatory rites.

In the discussion above in Chapter Two on the probable audience of the commentary,²⁰³ it was argued that women of varying status are held up for comment by Hippolytus as a way of helping his audience (which included men and women) connect with his exposition of the biblical text. Female characters in the exposition

²⁰¹Ibid.

²⁰²In some circles, the Adam-Eve, Eve-church, and Mary-church typology that appears in the early patristic period has occasioned a stir in recent years as a legitimate topic of theological reflection on the role of women in ministry today. Without detracting from the importance of this theme, it is necessary to examine the claims of Cerrato about this text.

²⁰³See page 127 ff. above.

are quite numerous: Wisdom (though *Sophia-Logos* ought to be seen as strictly *androgynous*), the Beloved, the mother of the Beloved, Tamar, the midwife, the virgin Mary, Martha (who anoints Jesus in the *In Cant.*), young girls (“the congregations” who are said to love the Lover), Martha and Mary (the myrrhophores), the Shunamite woman, the widow, and the woman with the issue of blood. The differing status of these women accords well with the assumption that Hippolytus had in mind a mixed audience of women and men of varying status. Nothing particularly negative about women is stated in these cases. Nor is anything said which indicates Hippolytus was attempting to elevate women or transcend the historical horizon of his time in any way beyond what was common in Christian groups. Again, the assumed context is a eucharistic meal and such meals responded in some ways to the general practice of banqueting in the ancient world. Topics for discussion at meal time often included women, whether virtuous or not,²⁰⁴ and occasions for giving an encomium of women in general or a woman in particular might present themselves during funerary banquets, wedding banquets, or when men discussed the topic of love, which was a banquet *topos* as well.²⁰⁵ The *In Cant.* quite naturally and easily moves to this topic.

Eve and the Myrrhophores, Martha and Mary

Two major objections, then, may be directed against Cerrato’s application of

²⁰⁴See Athanaeus, *Deipn.* 13; Livy 1.57.8.

²⁰⁵For the evidence from Philo see above page 122; Katherine Dunbabin, “Ut Graeco More Beberetur: Greeks and Romans on the Dining Couch,” in *Meals in a Social Context*, 81-101; *eadem*, *The Roman Banquet: Images of Conviviality* (Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 117-118.

his otherwise sound interpretation of the episode of the myrrhophores. One is a translation issue. The Latin translation upon which Cerrato based his interpretation has misrepresented the meaning of the Georgian text that reads:

შეიწყნარე ამიერთგან ევკა, წესიერებით მავალ, მიიღე და იცან ესე ძღუენი, რომელ მიპყრობილ მამისა, ახლად შეწირე, არლარა განშიშულებულად ევა, არლარა ფურცელი ლელვსად მისა სამოსელ.

From now on receive Eve who now walks in proper order,²⁰⁶ receive her and know this offering which has been provided to the Father. Make Eve a new offering, no longer is she naked, no longer clothed with the fig leaf. (*In Cant.* 25.5)

This translation may be compared with the reading of the Paleo-Slavic tradition:

Receive Eve once more, the *one living firmly* (“strongly”) and henceforth not naked and clothed with fig leaves.²⁰⁷

Cerrato interpreted Garitte’s “*Excipe abhinc Evam in-ordinationem*”²⁰⁸ *ambu-*

²⁰⁶See trans. n. 3 *In Cant.* 25.5

²⁰⁷The Armenian adaptation does not represent this text and rewrites it or summarizes rather completely.

²⁰⁸Cerrato’s argument seems to presuppose a particular view of ordination. However, the language of ordination in ancient Christianity is difficult to pin down. All the language has to do with ascribed honor. The difficulty of the issue of when official, sacramental ordination arises out of the diversity of Christian thought and practice on this topic is illustrated by the scholarly understanding of χειροτονεία. On this issue, see Madigan and Osiek, *Ordained Women in the Early Church*, 5, 10, who note that Charles H. Turner, “Cheirotoneia, cheirothesia, cheirōn (and the Accompanying Verbs,” *JTS* 24 (1922/23): 496-504, argues that χειροτονεία was a general word for appointment, while χειρῶνθεσία was more specific, while Cipriano Vagaggini, “L’ordinazione delle diaconesse nella tradizione greca e bizantina,” *Orientalia christiana periodica* 40 (1974): 146-89, argues the opposite case. See also Tertullian, *Treatises on Marriage and Remarriage: To his wife, An Exhortation to Chastity, Monogamy*

lantem” to mean “Receive Eve who from now on walks in ordination.”²⁰⁹ To support this translation, Cerrato cites the text that follow several lines below, “O new consolations! Eve has been called an apostle!” Against this translation is the consideration that the word translated *in-ordinationem* (წესბერებობა, *c’esierebit*) has the usual semantic range: “orderliness, propriety, decorum, lawfulness.”²¹⁰ On *prima facie* grounds, the comparison with the Paleo-Slavic tradition appears to discount the translation “*ordinationem*,” especially since what immediately follows is the discussion of the clothing of the naked Eve with a beautiful garment of incorruption by the Holy Spirit. Looking more closely at the lexical issue, the Georgian text of 1 Tim 2.9 (*NTI Paul AB*) translates ἐν καταστολῇ as წესბერებობა, *c’esierebisa* = “appropriate” referring to the modesty of the woman’s dress.²¹¹ That is, a text that

(Translated by Le Saint, W. P. Westminster, Md: Newman Press, 1951), 122. Tertullian used appointment language and speaks of “ordination” of widows “*cum uiduam adlegi in ordinem nisi uniuiram non concedit*” (*Ad. ux.* 1.7) but the honor of their selection or recognition by was not a rite conferring grace and office. Conversely, *Trad. ap.* 11.1-5 speak of “widow” being “appointed [but] not ordained (χειροτονεῖν) but she shall be chose by name . . . Let the widow be instituted by word only . . . But she shall not be ordained, because she does not offer the oblation nor has she a liturgical ministry (λειτουργία). But ordination is for the clergy on account of their liturgical ministry. But the widow is appointed for prayer, and this is a function of all Christians.” Similarly, the confessor is said to not have need of “having hands laid” upon him in order to be either deacon or presbyter. The case of Callistus himself, in *Haer.* 9.7, conforms to this tradition. When released from Sardinia, he ceases to be a slave and passes directly into freed status and becomes a salaried deacon for Zephyrinus, taking care of one of his residences and then later, under Victor, director of the cemetery.

²⁰⁹This translation may be a misunderstanding of Garitte’s Latin translation may also mean “in regulation.” Note that McConvery, “Hippolytus’ Commentary,” 219, corrects this translation to “walks in order.”

²¹⁰See note 47 on page 397.

speaks of man-woman relations compared with the Adam-Eve typology used the same word, but with no hint of “ordination.” The Georgian text of Hippolytus speaks of Eve’s full restoration to her status as a lawful, non-deceptive helper of her husband, Adam. Martha and Mary are called “apostles to the apostles,” but this title is not connected with the “*in-ordinatione*” of this passage in the way Cerrato imagined. The combination of *in-ordinatione ... munus* in Garitte’s translation led to the idea Hippolytus is speaking of female ordination. If, as has been argued throughout this dissertation, a western provenance in the decades 210-220 the kind of ordination Cerrato imagines may well be anachronistic. Clearly, women as patronesses of the church in the Rome could have functioned in the roles of deacon or presbyter for the churches meeting in their private homes as long as the over-all organizational structure of the Roman church remained more or less an informal communion of house-church schools. The Roman church order the *Apostolic Tradition*, however, makes a clear distinction between the office of presbyter and bishop. Nevertheless, it is a composite document, and it may well be doubted that the church order imagined in the various strata of the document represent both earlier and later formulations.²¹² The kind of ordination that Cerrato assumes, that is, to professional clergy status, even for men, is thus likely anachronistic for the early third century Rome.²¹³ Ordination to a professional presbytery as occurred later in North Africa seems out of the question. What is to be made to the ordination to apostleship? It is something

²¹¹I am indebted to Dr. Jeff Childers for alerting me to this reference.

²¹²See Stewart-Sykes, *Apostolic Tradition*, 1-25; Bradshaw et al., *The Apostolic Tradition*, 1-50; Metzger, “Nouveles Perspectives,” 242-259.

²¹³See Stewart-Sykes, “Ordination rites and patronage systems” *VC*, 115-130.

highly unlikely during this period.²¹⁴

Nevertheless, the text does speak of an appointment to a return to good order. The myrrhophores fulfill their function as “apostles to the apostles.” Hippolytus is quick to glorify and exalt the role of the women as bearers of the truth, rather than bearers of falsehood and deception.²¹⁵ They are said to have “been sent by Christ, reveal to us a beautiful testimony,” and “become apostles of Christ and might complete through obedience the failure of old Eve” (*In Cant.* 25.6). Because the women accepted the truth and chose to bear it to the male apostles, a reversal of Eve’s sin has taken place. First for herself, for

From now on [she understood] the one she saw from that moment she hated and considered as an enemy who seduced her through desire. From now on that tree of seduction would not seduce her. Behold, from now on she is made happy through the tree of life and through the confession. From that tree, she tasted Christ. She has been made worthy of the good and [her] heart desired its nourishment. (*In Cant.* 25.7)

As the myrrhophores believed in and begged for spiritual union with Christ, Eve, through them, “tasted,” in their participation in Christ, of the tree of life. The intensity demonstrated in the act of clutching the feet of Christ, the prayer for spiritual union, the cry to be taken up to heaven with Christ represents a reversal of the distance between God and Old Eve, here consorting with the serpent and falling into sin. The image in the *In Cant.* gives a glimpse into the kind of warmth and intensity that early Christian adoration of Christ entailed. The relationship depicted is

²¹⁴On the early history of ordination, see Maier, *Social Setting of the Ministry*, 199-201.

²¹⁵Sadly, however, the hyperbolic nature of the honor given the women seems to be more of a consolation than a recognition of special status and liturgical function.

anything but mundane. Something of the depth of that emotion is captured by the sense that their cry unites them in Christ with primordial depths. Hippolytus blesses this intensity by saying that Eve, through the women, at long last, makes her approach to Christ. Still, the language of intercession in prayer here does not go beyond the restriction on the honor (of ordination) given to women in *Trad. ap.* 11.5 to the honor that is a “a function of all Christians.” Eve, in the person of the myrrhophores, takes the fruit of the tree of life and gives it to the male disciples, who represent Adam.

From now on she will no longer either crave or proffer to men food that corrupts; she has received incorruptibility; from now on she is in unity and [is] a helper, for Adam leads Eve. O good helper, with the gospel offering (*or* sacrificing) [it] to her husband! This is why the women evangelized the Disciples. (*In Cant.* 25.8)

Hippolytus is at once keen to justify the skeptical response of the apostles. Even the doubt of the disciples fulfills a typological function in the recapitulation of the fall in Eden.

And because of this they regarded them as deceived, because they doubted. But the reason was that it was the custom of Eve to report deception and not truth. (*In Cant.* 25.9)

Adam’s gullibility is now replaced by apostolic skepticism. But all is as it should be, for Christ appears to confirm the testimony of the women.

What is this new announcement of the resurrection, O women? This is why they reckoned and (i.e. even) them as deceived. But in order that they might not appear as deceivers, but as speaking the truth, Christ was displayed to them at that time and said to them: “Peace be with you,” (Jn 20:15) by this he taught that, “It was my desire, I who appeared to these women, to send them also as apostles to you.”

The conclusion of the episode of the myrrhophores takes an odd turn. It

suggests the notion that the manner in which Hippolytus applies this narrative concerns the issue of the relation between the synagogue and the church and the risen Christ and not, ultimately, the issue of the relationship between men and women in the church. The synagogue-church relationship sits obscurely in this episode, as Cerrato notes more than once,²¹⁶ and appeared to him to have the character of a redactional, Hippolytan addition, to a earlier tradition. It is, however, an important theme in the commentary as a whole. The world is said to be a “synagogue” or “gathering place” of “darkness comprehended through the proclamation of the Son” (*In Cant.* 1.5). The churches are described as the young virgins who love Christ and are dressed or adorned by order of Christ (*In Cant.* 2.32-34). The myrrhophores going to the tomb represent the “synagogue” who walk in the night, or darkness to the tomb, because they did not recognize that the Christ was alive. Song 3.1b applies to them, then, as a description of their unbelief, “By night I was seeking the one whom my soul loves” (*In Cant.* 24.2). The failure, then, of the women to find the resurrected one (*In Cant.* 24.3) is attributed to unbelief, which the angel who appears to the myrrhophores rebukes in a series of sharp questions:

“I was seeking him and did not find him.” “Why do you seek the living among the dead?” And nothing of his was found there, for the tomb was not his inheritance, but heaven. Why do you seek on earth the one who sits exalted upon a throne? Why do you seek the most glorious one in a inglorious tomb? Why do you search for the perfected in a grave? Behold, the stone has been rolled away. Why do you seek the perfected one in the tomb? Behold, the stone is rolled away; why do you seek the righteous one who, behold in the heavens [has] obtained grace? Why do you seek the One who has been set free, as one who is yet bound there as one who is trapped in a prison? (*In Cant.* 24.3)

²¹⁶Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 188, 191.

The story of the myrrhophores is the mystery of conversion. The *In Cant.* shows the synagogue is sharply contrasted with the church. One is the “Old Eve” while the other is the “New Eve.” Maja Weyermann, taking her cue from Constantina Peppas, gives the most cogent interpretation of this passage in Hippolytus.²¹⁷ The mystagogue interprets Song 3.1-4 in the light of the Easter message of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, and the double image of the synagogue versus the church are two who seek Christ “in the dark.”²¹⁸ The synagogue approaches the tomb in the persons of Martha and Mary as representatives of the Old Eve and the world, the “gathering place” or “synagogue” of darkness. The women who go in search of the resurrected Christ, whom they think is dead, are a type of the Old Eve (Song 3.1); the women who encounter the risen Christ are the New Eve (Song 3.4), now filled with the knowledge of the mystery of the resurrection.²¹⁹ Together they represent the church and renewed synagogue as witnesses of the resurrection. The apostles, for their part, also represent the synagogue before coming to faith. Through the now believing women, they experience the resurrected Christ as well. These are hopeful, upbeat images. They present a positive attitude toward the hopes embodied in the unbelieving synagogue that encounters the message of the resurrection.

The consolation of Israel or the synagogue in this incident is that the

²¹⁷Maja Weyermann, “The Typologies of Adam-Christ and Eve-Mary, and Their Relationship to One Another,” *ATR* 84 (2002): 622-23, citing Constantina Peppas, “Die Töchter der Kirche Christi und die Frohe Botschaft des Sohnes Gottes: eine Studie über die Aktive Präsenz der Frauen Und Ihre Besonderen Dienste in Frühchristentum und Gemeinden der Ungeteilten Alten Kirchen,” (Athens: Epektasi, 1998): 69-76.

²¹⁸Weyermann, “Typologies of Adam-Christ and Eve-Mary,” 622-23.

²¹⁹*Ibid.* 623

myrrhophores (as representatives of the synagogue), then, are indeed enabled to find the resurrected Christ by only going “a little further” (*In Cant.* 25.1) and finding grace. The implication is that the Jews of the synagogue walk in darkness, seeking the Messiah. They are not vilified in the *In Cant.* for their condition, only encouraged to go a little further to meet the resurrected Christ. Hippolytus’ hearers would have been quick to sense the honor given to them as those who were in the very process of going a little further in baptism, anointing, and communing with the saints. Thus the essential message of the episode, as redacted or adapted by Hippolytus has to do, on one level, with the recapitulation of all humanity under the New Eve-New Adam typology. The women cling to the “tree of life” (made present through the resurrected Christ). In this way Hippolytus allows his audience to look in on the moment in time in which the New Eve, now the church, takes the place of the Old Eve, the synagogue.²²⁰ The episode functions in a more restricted way to recapitulate the synagogue under the headship of Christ and the apostles.

Thus, it is over-interpretation to consider Eve in this passage as “symbolic of womankind”²²¹ or that Martha and Mary are “agents of female salvation.”²²² Such an idea demands too much of the mental horizon of Hippolytus and, at any rate, Hippolytus does not apply the image in this way.²²³ Therefore, the women do become “apostles to the apostles,” and they, in their turn, experience a similar re-orientation from Old Adam to New Adam through the proclamation of the myrrhophores. The women reverse the actions of Old Eve by their obedience. By bearing the truth, the

²²⁰Ibid.

²²¹Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 190, 209.

²²²Ibid., 193.

²²³See Scholten, “John A. Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*,” 85-92.

New Eve becomes a helper, restored to appropriate subordination, that is to the leadership of the New Adam (represented by Christ and the male apostles). They announce the truth of the resurrection instead of deception, error, and death.

Hippolytus, in this way, draws a sharp contrast between the negative role of “woman” in the law and the positive role of “woman” in the gospel.²²⁴

Hippolytus describes Martha and Mary of *In Cant.* 24-25 as indeed primary witnesses of the resurrection. It is best to understand that Hippolytus sees them, as Cerrato argued, as the sisters of Bethany. Elsewhere in the *In Cant.* 2.29, Martha anoints Jesus. As seen above, Hippolytus used the same tradition of Martha and Mary as witnesses of the resurrection as found in the *In Exodum*. This is enough to assert that Hippolytus was making use of a tradition, either written or oral, that, for him at least, supplemented the tradition of the four gospels, which he reverences in the *In Cant.*²²⁵ Hippolytus on several occasions argues from the basis of non-canonical traditions for the believability of *canonical* traditions.²²⁶ The presence of Martha in

²²⁴Similarly, Maja Weyermann, “The Typologies of Adam-Christ and Eve-Mary,” 263.

²²⁵See *In Cant.* 8, 7; 24, 3. An extra-canonical tradition of Martha and Mary *Magdalene* as apostles to the apostles appears in the *Ep. ap.* 9-12, and another related tradition, connected perhaps with a *Gospel of Bartholmeaum* cited by Jerome, is found in a seventh century coptic fragment, “the book of the resurrection of a Mary and another Mary in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ,” Schneemelcher and Wilson, eds., *New Testament Apocrypha*, 1:555; Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, 652-3. These witnesses point to the existence and persistence of popular, extra-canonical traditions Hippolytus #2 used and interpreted for his audience in conjunction with the explanation of the text of the Song. Whether this tradition was completely oral or derived from a written source such as the *Logia of the Lord* by Papias, it functioned on the level of canonical Scripture and provided a basis considered sufficient to effectively re-write the scriptural tradition of the four canonical gospels.

²²⁶Hippolytus #2 made use of either the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* or oral traditions

this tradition is striking. She filled a more significant role in early Christian tradition than has been recognized before.²²⁷ Hippolytus is at home in the world of popular tradition and, evidently, sees these traditions as a matrix surrounding and even revising the written, canonical documents, in much the same way as Papias of Hierapolis (*Hist. eccl.* 3.39) was inclined to trust the living voice of the elders and apostles rather than the written gospels.

It has been argued above in Chapters One and Two that the episode of the myrrhophores takes place with an awareness of or in the presence of graphic images of Heracles in the garden of the Hesperides. Unfortunately, this linkage to graphic representations was discovered by the author too late to be fully integrated into this discussion.²²⁸

that were later collected into that work to substantiate the plausibility of the canonical story of the supernatural preservation of Daniel in the Lion's den, *Comm. Dan.* 3, 29, "When therefore the angel appeared in the pit, the ferocious beasts were appeased, and manifested their joy to him by wagging their tails as if they wished to submit to a New Adam. They licked the holy feet of Daniel, they rolled in his footprints, desiring to be trampled by him. If we believe that, when Paul was condemned to the beasts, the lion that was released against him prostrated himself at his feet and licked him, why they would we not believe such a miracle with Daniel?" (trans., YWS). See Schneemelcher and Wilson, eds., *New Testament Apocrypha*, 2.215. It is logical to assume that Hippolytus #2 know the entire API and did not repudiate it.

²²⁷Ernst, "Martha from the Margins," vii-ix, and passim, discusses numerous artistic and textual references to Martha as a witness to the resurrection in the *Ep. ap.*, *In Cant.*, the Ambrosian Missal and the Syrian Feniqitho to show that Martha as a witness to the resurrection is both early and widespread and could even be contemporary with the writing of the Gospel of John. Unfortunately, I became aware of her dissertation too late to incorporate her findings into my work as fully as I would have liked.

²²⁸But see above pages 446-451.

Anti-gnostic Polemic

Cerrato argues that the episode of the *In Cant.* should be understood as representing anti-gnostic critique.²²⁹ As has been argued, a specific anti-Valentinian thrust is discernible, taken over as a way of thinking from Irenaeus.²³⁰ The suggestion that Hippolytus polemically replaces the revealer Mary with Martha against the tradition of *The Gospel of Mary*²³¹ is tantalizing, but no real evidence exists. Cerrato also suggests a very close correspondence between the *In Cant.* and the *First and Second Apocalypse of James*. These links have been shown to be non-existent, however.²³²

²²⁹Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 194-200.

²³⁰See page 51.

²³¹Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 196. See James M. Robinson, ed. *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (3rd completely rev. ed. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988), 487

²³²He assumes that Martha is part of the text, but this is very doubtful. See Hans-Martin Schenke et al., *Nag Hammadi deutsch* (2nd ed., GCS 8, KGS 2; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 417, n. 36, cited in Scholten, “*Hippolytus between East and West*” *VC* 59.1: 106. Further, “offering” in *1 Apoc. Jas.* 40, 6 is speaking of burnt offerings, not “self-offering,” *1 Apoc. Jas.* 40, 15 refers to the conversion of femaleness to maleness, and Cerrato uses this passage to assert, paradoxically that Hippolytus #2 is “resisting” such a conversion. However, it is not even clear that such an image is operative in the text or as a subtext. Concerning *2 Apoc. Jas.*, Cerrato simply asserts that Hippolytus #2 knew the doctrines of this tractate, if not the text itself. He argues that Christ is portrayed as “he who stripped himself and went about naked” (NHC V, 4:46, 15); as “the first who will strip himself” (NHC V, 4, 56, 11) and “naked, and there was no garment clothing him” (NHC V, 4:58, 21-22). Cerrato passes by *2 Apoc. Jas.* 56, 6-14 where “stripping” is done by James and has nothing to do with Christ at all, “Stripping” does not refer to clothing, rather it is a metaphor for ascending to the Pleroma (NHC V, 4, 4610-20), or, conversely, descending from the Pleroma (NHC V, 4:58, 21-22). It is, apparently, a metaphor for the non-physical na-

What then may be said about Hippolytus #2's attitude toward women? The *In Cant.* simply does not support the weight of the proposition advanced by Cerrato, that Hippolytus sympathized with the New Prophecy on the issue of the status of women or that he differed at all in his attitude from Hippolytus #1 in *Haer.* 8.19.1; 10.25.1, where the author was critical of women leaders among the Montanists.²³³ Given the right set of circumstances, the author of the *In Cant.* could have been just as critical.

Summary on Hippolytus' Attitude toward Women in the In Cant.

In order to understand Hippolytus #2's statements on women it is necessary to employ a certain amount of ideological critique informed by a poststructuralist theoretical perspective.²³⁴ This use of theory, or "any standpoint from which we might challenge a text's self understanding"²³⁵ fills in gaps left by a general historical-social

ture of Christ. In contrast, the metaphor in *In Cant.* is about the recovery of the state of paradise enjoyed by Adam and Eve: in the beginning they wore, although nude, a "garment of virtue" which they recovered, instead of the transient fig leaves through Christ. As far as the resurrected Christ is concerned, he did not lie naked in the grave. Nakedness/stripping/fig leaves appear in *In Cant.* as part of the state of the sinful people, stripping in *2 Apoc. Jas.* is either putting on or removing the physical body. If any connection exists between *In Cant.* and 1 and *2 Apoc. Jas.*, it is very tenuous.

²³³See McConvery, "Hippolytus' Commentary," 222: "Trying to locate such a community in time and space is difficult. Cerrato is tempted to detect influences from the Montanist movement and pleads the need for a more nuanced reading of this movement. His inference that the women of the movement were 'bookish, composing and publishing literature' and that 'they appear to have been concerned with the interpretation of Scripture, perhaps including exegetical commentary,' that they developed a high view of the ecclesiastical status of women, as presbyters, bishops and ministers of other ranks, runs the risk of making them just a little too modern!"

²³⁴ Elizabeth A. Clark, *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 176-81.

²³⁵ Paul Strohm, *Theory and the Premodern Text* (Minneapolis MN: University of

approach and to contextualize the surprising, daring, but ultimately conventional statements of Hippolytus (*In Cant.* 25-27). One must recall the banquet setting for the discussion of the text of the Song and the conventional role of the praise of women in such contexts. In that context, Hippolytus makes use of a *topos* of Christian preaching and the universalizing and naturalizing concept of “woman.” Ironically Martha and Mary *qua* women (for they are also a symbol of the synagogue) lose composure and grasp the feet of Jesus, asking him for spiritual union and a passage straight to heaven. This conforms to a stereotypical view of women as hysterical. The male apostles respond to the witness of the women as stereotypical males in the Greco-Roman world would: with unbelief—and Hippolytus defends them for it! It is precisely their stereotypical posture that leads to the recapitulation of humanity under the New Eve (the church) and the New Adam (Christ). Thus, Hippolytus saw woman’s subjection to man as natural and the amalgamation of all women with Eve is a prime example of this *topos*.²³⁶ Just as 1 Tim. 2:11-15 blames Eve for limitations placed upon women’s activities and authority, the patristic writers “appeal to the identification of women with Eve as a justification for their submission to men and exclusion from priesthood and public teaching office.”²³⁷ For all his praising of women in the *In Cant.* ultimately this attitude also characterizes Hippolytus. It is true, that his statement about Eve contrasts with Tertullian:

Minnesota, 2000), xiv.

²³⁶Clark, “Ideology, History, and the Construction of ‘Woman’,” 155-84; eadem, ed. *Ascetic Piety*, 31-2; Weyermann, “The Typologies of Adam-Christ and Eve-Mary,” 623.

²³⁷Clark, *History, Theory, Text*, 177.

You [woman] are the Devil's gateway; you are the unsealer of that tree; you are the first forsaker of that divine law; you are the one who persuaded him whom the Devil was not brave enough to approach; you so easily crushed the image of God, the man Adam; because of your punishment, that is, death, even the Son of God had to die. And you think to adorn yourself beyond your "tunics of skins" (Gen 3.21)?²³⁸

Both Tertullian and Hippolytus #2 produce texts that must be nuanced with an appropriate application of rhetoric and socio-historical contextualization. What they give with one hand, they are capable of taking with the other.

Chapter Summary

In drawing attention to hermeneutical issues and a few selected themes, this Chapter has emphasized the Greco-Roman context of the commentary. The neglect of the Jewish context should not be taken as a suggestion that the Jewish context is unimportant. What has emerged in this study is the importance of the implicit, contentious dialogue between Hippolytan Christians and Valentinian Christians. It has been argued that Valentinian practice and theology has influenced Hippolytus, who received a Roman tradition of initiation already influenced by second-century Valentinian practice. Hippolytus drew freely yet critically on this tradition of Old Testament interpretation and Christian initiatory practice.

The patronage of wealthy woman was an important part of the growth of the church, and this study supports that notion by drawing attention to the implicit tension between some of the roles of women portrayed in the commentary and the role taken by Hippolytus as interpreter and regulator of the community. It has been argued that a close reading of the *In Cant.* indicates that Hippolytus does not support the ordination

²³⁸*Cult. fem.* 1.1.2, in *ANF*, 4.14.

of women in the church. Nonetheless, Hippolytus and the Roman churches were dependent upon the help of patronesses. The ascription of the title “apostle to the apostles” to the myrrhophores Martha and Mary represents a way of ascribing honor and recognition without granting official status within the community. Nevertheless, women were present; women were leaders, and women were needed for the growth and flourishing of the Christian community.

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSIONS

Commentary writing was a special feature of the Severan age (193-235 C.E.), with its concern for the consolidation of classical knowledge. The early Christian movement, mostly centered in house-churches, also developed a keen interest in producing such texts. Among Christians, commentaries began as collections of notes on the interpretation of sacred texts first used as helps for teachers in the house-churches. The *In Cant.* is an example of a more or less developed set of speakers notes on the Song of Songs. Collections such as these were called ὑπομνήματα. As the name implies, they were an aide to memory. Memory itself was commonly conceptualized by Greco-Roman authors of rhetoric around the theme of the house and the art work in it. The use of the commentary genre became an appealing vehicle for the perpetuation of Christian instruction as the church attracted more and more members of the Greco-Roman elite.

This dissertation presents the first English translation, with annotations, of the Georgian text of the commentary *On the Song of Songs* by Hippolytus, one of the earliest surviving Christian commentaries on Scripture. The Introduction and Chapter One set the stage by introducing the scholarly debate concerning the authorship and provenance of the commentary, arguing for the traditional assumption that Hippolytus was a culturally eastern writer in Rome. In it, evidence both old and new from allusions to symbols in the commentary that appear so often in ancient Christian art led to the argument that Hippolytus is using Scripture to exegete art and vice-versa.

For example, the appearance of Peter and Paul as symbols of fraternal unity and mission probably made their way into the commentary from pictures of Castor and Pollux present on the walls of Greco-Roman homes. The image of Castor and Pollux is ubiquitous in the Roman Empire. Interpretation as Peter and Paul is more likely western. Both eastern and western traits that make their appearance in the *In Cant.* This is one of several indirect and allusive indicators of provenance in the West.

Evidence for the provenance of the *In Cant.* is mixed and allusive. The attempt by scholars like Simonetti and Cerrato to decouple the evidence of the so-called statue of Hippolytus, the *Codex Chronography of 354* and to ignore or minimize western aspects the commentaries of Hippolytus is not sufficient to establish an eastern provenance for Hippolytus' commentaries. If Hippolytus is culturally eastern, but living in the West, a mixture of both eastern and western features should be expected. This is precisely what we find in Hippolytus, especially with his preference for Passover baptism and for the Johannine chronology for Passover, as seen in the Hippolytan fragments preserved in the fifth century *Chronicon Pascale* and on the Paschal computations of the so-called "statue of Hippolytus" itself. A more detailed look at the contents of the writings of Hippolytus in the light of their social context is needed. It was demonstrated that recent advances in Greco-Roman social history, archaeology and art history will be helpful for future research.

Chapter Two considered the genre, rhetoric, and social context of the commentary. It supports previous musings by some scholars that the *In Cant.* is a work of mystagogy created for use during initiation rites conducted during Passover. A primary feature of the commentary is its teaching on the anointing with oil to

receive the Holy Spirit. The resulting liturgical (Passover baptism and post-baptismal anointing) supports the western provenance theory.

A social-rhetorical approach to the commentary was used to attempt a description of its function within its context. The central claim was that, rather than reading the commentary as a work in isolation, its audience would have “heard” the commentary in a particular oral context: the celebration of Passover or Easter and during the initiation of new converts to Christianity. This chapter suggests that, for this early commentary, its oral use in a liturgical setting is an important part of understanding its genre.

It was found that the commentary consists of an introduction and three homilies for a Passover celebration interpreting the rites following baptism in preparation for a Paschal banquet. A comparison of similar literature such as *Gospel of Philip*, the fourth century works *De Mysteriis* by Ambrose of Milan and the *Mystagogical Instructions*, likely by Cyril of Jerusalem, as well as the instructions for Passover celebration in *Apostolic Constitutions* 5 contextualize the instruction and explain why the topic of the conversion of the Jews appears so prominent.

The contextualization of the commentary as part of a meal-time celebration also explains certain elements of the commentary. The focus on riddles and playful imagery suggests a meal time contexts. The rich selection of biblical characters that have no relation at all to the Song, shows the influence of Greco-Roman symposium literature as well as the art work that was often found in triclinia and other parts of the Greco-Roman peristyle home. The instruction in the *In Cant.* on the use of wine and rich eucharistic symbolism in a scene in which Martha and Mary encounter the resurrected Christ suggest a meal time context. The topic of love, and a critique of

Plato's concept of love were also discussed at the banquet of the *Therapeutae*, and the use of allegorical interpretations of sacred texts are parallels to Hippolytus' interpretation to the Song.

The allegorical or typological function of the art ubiquitous in Greco-Roman homes provides the background against which many of the images of the commentary make sense. One could argue that the art is an expression of an allegorical or typological culture and that the art itself encourages such an interpretation of traditions. Roman Christian funerary art and banqueting practice also provide a key to interpreting the difficult passage about Martha and Mary as myrrhophores and witnesses to the resurrection.

In Chapter Two also sought to establish the thesis that Hippolytus makes significant use of symposium themes and images in the *In Cant.* and the symposium shape the ethos, the narrative, and the themes of the commentary raising the sympotic references to the level of a central motif. The question arises, however, whether these themes and symbols amount to evidence that the *In Cant.* was intended to be read or performed at a banquet or whether themes and images of the symposium find their way into the commentary written to be read at any time. The argument of this dissertation has been that the sympotic motif also deeply shapes Hippolytus' characterization of his audience. If this assertion is true, then the likelihood is that Hippolytus indeed wrote the commentary for banquet performance; however, it was written, not as a finished product, but as a series of notes on the text, like the *Gospel of Philip*. Unlike the *GPhil* it seeks to use one central, continuous biblical text for its exposition, whereas the *GPhil* demonstrates little or no coherence with one central text.

The three perorations in the *In Cant.* (2.9-35; 22:1-20; 26.1-27.10) suggest three homilies. The first of three perorations in the commentary ends with a call to receive the anointing of the Spirit (*In Cant.* 2.1-35). A rousing rehearsal of biblical characters who desired the anointing serves as a powerful inducement for the audience to join the biblical story of redemption. This first part of the commentary seems appropriate as a post-baptismal homily (*In Cant.* 1-2; cp. Cyril *Mystagogical Instructions*, homily 2). On the basis of the breaks at 1:16; 2:35; and 22:10, it is suggested that the commentary is composed of three homilies to be delivered after the baptismal rites and during the Passover celebration that culminated in a feast.

The liturgical context in a house-church is important for three reasons. First, it greatly increases understanding and enjoyment of the commentary by providing a way of connecting and organizing what would otherwise be a chaotic series of typological comments on the Song. Second, if the *In Cant.* was written for use both in the celebration of mystagogy in connection with a meal, its potential as a source for the social history of church and liturgy at the beginning of the third century is enhanced. This point is especially important because many scholars have argued, either on the basis of archaeological evidence or the reading of texts, that the practice of full-scale eucharistic banquets was in the process of disappearing by the third century, and that indications suggest that by the beginning of the second century the use of the full-scale banquet. Following Klinghardt and Balch, I question the idea that a strict distinction could be made at this time between the Eucharist and the “Agape feast.” This study of *In Cant.* suggests that meals were still being practiced as central religious rituals. Still, it may be expected that the practice died a slow death, particularly in connection with certain high festivals such as Passover. A close

reading of the commentary itself turns up certain other western features, especially the practice of post-baptismal anointing representing the Holy Spirit.

In Chapter Three, the text and annotated translation were then presented. A brief introduction discusses the textual history of the *In Cant.* and follows the generally accepted scholarly assumption that the Georgian text is dependent upon a previous Armenian translation, as often happened in the period of from the seventh to the tenth century in Georgian monasteries. Text and translation notes help guide the reader in understanding and appreciating of the commentary.

Chapter Four analyzed the hermeneutical approach of the commentary, drawing particular attention to its Greco-Roman context and the presence of Valentinian influence, for which there is both documentary and archaeological evidence in Rome during the second and third centuries. It is argued that the teaching of Valentinus and Valentinian commentaries (attested in Irenaeus) provided the impetus for the writing of commentaries by Hippolytus.

The dissertation drew particular attention to the Greco-Roman context of the commentary. The focus on Greco-Roman rather than upon the Jewish context should not be taken as an indication that the Jewish context is unimportant. On the other hand, what emerges in this study is the importance of reinterpreted polytheistic symbols and stories that were a part of daily life of Christians in their own homes, the homes of their patrons, and even in house-churches.

Hippolytus, for example makes use of the Ovidian version of a love story of Dionysus and Ariadne as a template for interpreting the triangular relationship he sees between Christ, the beloved (as Israel) and the church or churches of the Gentiles. In addition, the contentious debate between Hippolytan and Valentinian Christians

appears to shape the theology and practice of Christian initiation as it is visualized through the commentary. Valentinians in Rome believed that their allegorical, spiritual teaching could help lower-level psychic Christians achieve a greater sense of freedom from spiritual bondage. They urged such Christians who had not experienced their deeper, more meaningful initiation to read their commentaries on Scripture and press on to an initiation into nuptials with Christ. Valentinian practice and theology influenced Hippolytus, who received a Roman tradition of initiation already influenced by second-century Valentinian practice. Hippolytus drew freely yet critically on this tradition of Old Testament interpretation and Christian initiation.

Finally the commentary addresses Hippolytus' attitude toward women as displayed in the commentary. The patronage of wealthy women was an important part of the growing church, and this study illustrates that idea by pointing out the implicit tension between some of the roles of women portrayed in the commentary and the role taken by Hippolytus as interpreter and regulator of the community.

Hippolytus' commentary has recently attracted attention because of its possible advocacy of female ordination. This study began intending to discover finding additional support for and a greater appreciation of the theology of female ordination. A closer reading of the *In Cant.*, however, revealed that Hippolytus did not support the ordination of women in the church. When Hippolytus ascribes the status of apostles to the apostles to Martha and Mary, he is not providing a theological basis for official female leadership in the church. Rather, he is indirectly extolling the women who embody the virtues of the myrrhophores.

The consolation of the church in hoping for the future conversion of Israel or the Synagogue is the main point in this incident of typological interpretation. The

myrrhophores (as representatives of the Synagogue) then are indeed enabled to find the resurrected Christ by only going a little further (*In Cant.* 25.1) and finding grace. The implication is that the Jews of the Synagogue walk in darkness, seeking the Messiah. They are not vilified in the *In Cant.* for their condition, only encouraged to go a little further to meet the resurrected Christ. Thus the essential message of the episode, as redacted or adapted by Hippolytus has to do, on one level, with the recapitulation of all humanity under the New Eve-New Adam typology. The women cling to the tree of life (made present through the resurrected Christ). In this way Hippolytus allows his audience to look in on the moment in time in which the New Eve, now the church, takes the place of the Old Eve, the Synagogue. The episode functions in a more restricted way to recapitulate the Synagogue under the headship of Christ and the apostles. It is going too far to consider Eve in this passage as exclusively and directly symbolic of womankind or that Martha and Mary are “agents of female salvation.” Such a notion demands too much of the mental horizon of Hippolytus and the image is not applied in this way.

However, Hippolytus and his church were of necessity dependent de facto upon female leadership and patronage. The ascription of the title “apostle to the apostles” to the myrrhophores Martha and Mary represents a way of ascribing honor and recognition to women revered in the community without granting them official status within the community. The commentary is a testament to an underlying tension. If, as has been suggested, the figure of Heracles and the Hesperides nymphs lies behind the scene of Christ/Adam and Martha, Mary and Eve, then the shape of and interpretation of the narrative is more complex and interesting than has been thought.

Finally, the question arises, of course, why is Martha said to be a witness of the resurrection in contradiction of the canonical Gospels. Where is Mary Magdalene? A recent doctoral dissertation by Allie Ernst of Queensland, “Martha from the Margins” argues that the Johannine oral traditions preserved by the Hippolytan community included stories of Martha and Mary as bearers of the apostolic teaching. Ernst gathers evidence from various sources (textual and non-textual) to conclude that the oral traditions of Martha as primary witness to the resurrection was early as the writing of the Gospel of John itself, widespread and persistent. It is an interesting topic for further study. This study does not resolve the issue, further study is needed.

The *In Cant.* is oral literature, written to be performed. It points to a rich valuation of the Song of Songs as a text of Christian spirituality. Mature Christian leaders, including Hippolytus, sought to introduce their new converts to their new life in Christ using the Song. Liturgical studies have shown that the Song of Songs featured prominently in baptismal catechesis from the latter part of second century and well into the fourth. If such a project seems strange to those who now read the Song as erotic poetry, it is a measure of one way Christian identity has changed through the centuries. The experience of life in a postmodern, postcolonial world perhaps opens the Song once again to ancient polyvalent playfulness—the hints and shadows of which we have found in Hippolytus.

The exploration of patristic writings in the context of ancient Christian art is a promising and exciting field of study. It is hoped that further study in this field will correct and extend the brief comments made on this topic in this dissertation. Connections in the *In Cant.* and both eastern and western works of Christian and

Greco-Roman art truly indicate that Hippolytus indeed should be studied as a figure
“between East and West.”

APPENDIX 1 EUSEBIUS AND JEROME ON HIPPOLYTUS

Both Eusebius and Jerome link the writer Hippolytus with a narrative about the influential figures in the life of Origen.¹ Both accounts are possibly derived from a common earlier source.² Eusebius mentions Hippolytus as a writer whose correspondence bishop Alexander of Aelia, a benefactor and admirer of Origen, gathered in his library that served as one of the primary depositories of material that the church historian used for his narrative on Origen.

At that time also many eloquent churchmen flourished, whose letters to one another are still preserved and can be found in abundance, [letters] which had been kept to our time in the library of Aelia, prepared for Alexander, who then administered the affairs of the church there, [a library] from which we were able to gather the materials for the work at hand. Of these [men] Beryllus, along with letters, left different collections of compositions. He was a bishop of the Arabians at Bostra. Hippolytus likewise (ὡσαύτως) [i.e. left letters and compositions], and was himself the president [αὐτός προεστώς] of another church somewhere.³ (Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 6.20)

¹See Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 27, 57-8.

²Ibid., 37-8; Simonetti, *Origene esegeta*, 315, as well as other scholars suggest the lost *Apology on behalf of Origen* of Pamphylus. Jerome is clearly dependent on Eusebius, but has access to other historical sources from the period of Hippolytus #1 and #2 as well as, perhaps, Eusebius' source.

³Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 6.20: Ἦκμαζον δὲ κατὰ τοῦτο πλείους λόγοι καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ ἄνδρες, ὧν καὶ ἐπιστολάς, ἅς πρὸς ἀλλήλους διεχάρατον, ἔτι νῦν σωζομένας εὐρεῖν εὐπορον· αἱ καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐφυλάχθησαν ἐν τῇ κατὰ Αἰλίαν βιβλιοθήκῃ, πρὸς τοῦ τηλικάδε τὴν αὐτόθι διέποντος ἐκκλησίαν Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐπισκυσασθείσης, ἀφ' ἧς καὶ αὐτοὶ τὰς ὕλας τῆς μετὰ χειρὸς ὑποθέσεως ἐπὶ ταῦτον συναγαγεῖν δεδυνήμεθα, τούτων Βήρυλλος σὺν ἐπιστολαῖς καὶ συγγραμμάτων διαφόρους φιλοκαλίας καταλέλοιπεν, ἐπίσκοπος δ' οὗτος ἦν τῶν κατὰ Βόστραν Ἀράβων· ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Ἰππόλυτος, ἑτέρας που καὶ αὐτὸς προεστὼς ἐκκλησίας.

The mention of Hippolytus at this juncture, during the reign of Caracalla (211-217 C.E.) and the episcopate of Zephyrinus (199-217 C.E.), in association with Beryllus of Bostra and Gaius of Rome, appears to be based mainly upon dating.⁴ And Eusebius' reports of Origen's travels, as well as Jerome show that Origen was in Rome perhaps near the end of the episcopate of Zephyrinus:

It turns out that he, before he moved to Caesarea, went to Rome when Zephyrinus was bishop, and then soon after returned to Alexandria when Heraclas was presbyter, who maintained the demeanor of a philosopher. He became an assistant to Heraclas as a catechetical instructor, and also after Demetirius took control of the church.⁵ (*Vir. ill.* 54)

This visit to Rome must have taken place between 211 C.E. and 217 C.E.⁶ Eusebius also mentions this visit:

Adamiantus himself, Origen's other name, writes that he stayed a while in Rome during the time Zephyrinus was leading the church. He says, "I had prayed to be allowed to see the ancient church of the Romans." He did not spend much time there and returned again to Alexandria.⁷ (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.14.10)

In his second reference to Hippolytus, Eusebius lists eight of Hippolytus #2's works, while Jerome fills out the list with thirteen additional works. Jerome more clearly refers to *In Cant.*⁸ He omits *On Parts of Ezekiel*, and adds a sermon to

⁴Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 32.

⁵*Constat eum, antequam Caesaream migraret, fuisse Romae sub Zephyrino episcopo, et statim Alexandriam reversaum, Heraclan perbyterum, qui sub habitu philosophi preserverabat, adiutorem sibi fecisse κατηκήσεως, qui quidem et post Demetrium Alexandrinam tenuit Ecclesiam* (Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 54).

⁶See Marcovich, *Refutatio*, 9 and John McGuckin, ed. *The Westminster Handbook to Origen* (Westminster Handbooks; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 8.

⁷Victor Saxer, "Ippolito di Roma, scrittore e martire," *Nuove Ricerche su Ippolito* (SEA 30; Roma: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1989): 55, connects this visit of Origen to Rome to his visit in which he was said to have been recognized by Hippolytus in a sermon (*Vir. ill.* 61).

⁸*Hippolytus, cujusdam Ecclesiae episcopus nomen quippe urbis scire non potui, rationem Paschae temporumque Canones scrpsit, usque ad primum annum Alexandri imperatoris, et sedecim annorum circulum quem Graeci ἑκκαίδεκαετηρίδα vocant,*

the list, *On the Praise of our Lord and Saviour* perhaps a panegyric like those dedicated to emperors.⁹ With this last work Jerome reports: “[Hippolytus] indicates that he is speaking in the church in the presence of Origen” (*Vir. ill.* 61). Since, in Eusebius’ second reference to a Hippolytus, he does not refer back to his previous mention of Hippolytus, some scholars argue that these are two different Hippolyti.¹⁰ Jerome, however, understands both as the same Hippolytus. Furthermore, the time in which the Hippolytus of *Hist. eccl.* 6.22 flourished is very near the Hippolytus of the previous reference.

At that time Hippolytus also, besides many other commentaries [ὑπομνήματα], wrote a work *On the Passover*. He gives in this a chronological table, and presents a certain paschal canon comprising a sixteen year [cycle], for¹¹ the first year of the Emperor Alexander. Of his other writings the following have reached us: *On the Hexaemeron*, *On the Works after the Hexaemeron*, *Against Marcion*, *On the Song of Songs*, *On Portions of Ezekiel*, *On the Passover*, *Against All the Heresies*; and you can find many other works preserved by many.¹²

reperit, et Eusebio, qui super eodem Pascha Canonem, decem et novem annorum circulum, id est, ἑννεακαιδεκαετηρίδα composuit, occasionem dedit. Scripsit nonnullos in Scripturas commentarios, e quibus hos reperi: in ἑξαήμερον, et in Exodum, in Canticum Canticorum, in Genesim, et in Zachariam: De Psalmis, et in Isaiam, de Daniele, de Apocalipsi, de Proverbiis, de Ecclesiaste, de Saul et Pythonissa, de Antichristo, de Resurrectione, contra Marcionem, de Pascha, adversum omnes haereses, et Προσομιλίαν de laude Domini Salvatoris, iqua, praesente Origine, se loqui in Ecclesia significat. In huius aimulationem Ambrosius, quem de Marcionis haeresi ad veram fidem correctum diximus, cohortatus est Origenem, in Scripturans commentarios scribere, praebens ei septem et eo amplius notarios, eorumque expensas, et librariorum parem numerum, quoque his maius est, incredibili studio quitidie ab eo opus exigens. Unde in quadam epistola ἐργοδιώκτην eum Origenes vocat.

⁹See page 206 below.

¹⁰Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 34.

¹¹Or, “down to the.”

¹²Τότε δῆτα καὶ Ἰππόλυτος συντάττων μετὰ πλείστων ἄλλων ὑπομνημάτων καὶ τὸ Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα πεποιήται σύγγραμμα, ἐν ᾧ τῶν χρόνων ἀναγραφὴν ἐκθέμενος καὶ τινα κανόνα ἐκκαιδεκαετηρίδος περὶ τοῦ πάσχα προθεῖς, ἐπὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἔτος αὐτοκράτορος Ἀλεξάνδρου τοὺς χρόνους περιγράφει· τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων τὰ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐλθόντα ἐστὶν τάδε· Εἰς τὴν Ἑξαήμερον, Εἰς τὰ μετὰ τὴν

This Hippolytus who drew up a method of computing the Passover based on a sixteen-year cycle “down to” or “for” the first year of the reign of Alexander Severus (222 C.E.)¹³ is so near, in both historical time and the story line of Eusebius, that they do not require the historian to make any additional comment. It is best to understand that Eusebius and Jerome both referred to the same Hippolytus.

Origen and Hippolytus #2 are both *Logos* trinitarian theologians, who lived in a period when some bishops and church leaders were uneasy with the rather speculative approach of Logos theology. Origen appears also to have doubted the benefit of the increasing power of his own monarch bishop at the expense of the role of the presbyter. Origen and Hippolytus #2 seemed also to have been willing to curry favor with the imperial elite of their time. And if, as many scholars argue, the author of *Haer.* and the Hippolytus of the commentaries are the same person or closely connected,¹⁴ Hippolytus #2 was also involved in disputes over the increasing power of the monarch bishop in Rome. Origen, then, would have had reasons to visit him. On the other hand, Eusebius, who was interested in promoting the theology of Origen, would have had sufficient motivation to suppress any controversy surrounding one of Origen’s principal spiritual mentors.

The following figure lists the works of Hippolytus given by both Eusebius and Jerome in synoptic fashion. The lists show that Jerome, while dependent upon Eusebius, also relies on others sources. Conversely, Eusebius, if he relied upon a source which Jerome had at his disposal, may have abbreviated their common source.

Ἐξαήμερον, Πρὸς Μαρκίωνα, Εἰς τὸ Ἄϊσμα, Εἰς μέρη τοῦ Ἰεζεκιήλ, Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα, Πρὸς ἀπάσας τὰς αἰρέσεις, πλεῖστά τε ἄλλα καὶ παρὰ πολλοῖς εὐροις ἄν σωζόμενα.

¹³I suggest that the meaning is causal, “because of [the good news of] the first year of Alexander Severus.”

¹⁴Simonetti, “Nuova Proposta,” *Aug* 36: 45; Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, passim.

Chart 3: Works of Hippolytus Listed in Eusebius and Jerome

Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα (the eight-year/sixteen year cycle <i>rationem Paschae temporumque Canones computus</i>)	
Εἰς τὴν Ἑξαήμερον	<i>In ἑξαήμερον</i>
Εἰς τὰ μετὰ τὴν Ἑξαήμερον	
Πρὸς Μαρκίωνα	<i>In Exodum</i>
Εἰς τὸ Ἄισμα	<i>In Canticum Canticorum</i>
Εἰς μέρη τοῦ Ἰεζεκιήλ	<i>In Genesim</i>
Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα	<i>In Zachariam</i>
Πρὸς ἀπάσας τὰς αἰρέσεις	<i>De Psalmis</i>
	<i>In Isaiam</i>
	<i>De Daniele</i>
	<i>De Apocalipsi</i>
	<i>De Proverbiis</i>
	<i>De Ecclesiaste</i>
	<i>De Saul et Pythonissa</i>
	<i>De Antichristo</i>
	<i>De Resurrectione</i>
	<i>Contra Marcionem</i>
	<i>De Pascha</i>
	<i>Adversum omnes haereses</i>
	<i>Προσομλίαν de laude Domini Salvatoris</i>

Both lists refer to the works given besides the Paschal tables as “commentaries.” Jerome explicitly refers to them as *scriptural* commentaries: “*Scripsit nonullos in Scripturas commentarios, e quibus hos reperi.*” Eusebius calls all his works ὑπομνήματα. This term has a broad range of meaning. It may refer to anything from “aides to memory,” “note books,” to a specific interpretive genre meant to be copied and read aloud to an audience or by an individual. The full-blown Scripture commentary was meant to guide a community in reading a text or group of texts that were too difficult for the uninitiated to understand and yet important enough to warrant explanation for didactic purposes. Thus, the greek term “commentary” used by Eusebius could cover a composition like Πρὸς ἀπάσας τὰς αἰρέσεις *On All the Heresies* as well as systematic Scripture commentaries. Neither Eusebius nor Jerome identify where Hippolytus was a church leader.

The impression of a western Hippolytus is confirmed in large part by the manuscript tradition of Hippolytus’ works. His works were better in the East known than his life.¹⁵ Still, the earliest manuscripts of Hippolytan works in the East largely attribute his works to a Roman Hippolytus.¹⁶ Apollinarius of Laodicea (315-392

¹⁵Saxer, “Ippolito di Roma, Scrittore e Martire,” *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito*, 46.

¹⁶Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 83, 92.

C.E.) quotes Hippolytus #2's *Comm. Dan.* ascribing it to "Hippolytus the most holy bishop of Rome."¹⁷ Hanssens and Cerrato dismiss this evidence, assuming that a distinguished scholar like Appollinarius was not ignorant of the succession in Rome.¹⁸ Without textual evidence Cerrato asserts that it must be a scribal addition. Appollinarius would certainly have known of the succession in Rome, but perhaps had a copy of the *Comm. Dan.* by Hippolytus as bishop. As Brent has argued, Eusebius likely had access to the same information, but failed to mention it, because it did not make sense in the post-Cyprianic understanding of the Roman succession of bishops.¹⁹

The manuscript of the *Noet.*, a work accepted as Hippolytan by most scholars,²⁰ is preserved in a dogmatic florilegium collected originally by the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, Timothy Aelerus (d. 477). The florilegium describes the work as a homily of "Hippolytus archbishop (ἀρχιεπισκόπου) of Rome and martyr."²¹ The addition of the prefix ἀρχη is anachronistic;²² but ignoring the

¹⁷Appollinarius of Laodicea, *frag. Dan.*: Εὐσέβιος ὁ Παμφίλου καὶ Ἰππόλυτος ὁ ἀγιώτατος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥώμης ἀπεικάζουσι τὴν προκειμένην τοῦ Ναβοθοδόσοιο ὄρασιν τῆ τοῦ προφήτου Δανιὴλ ὄπτασια, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e Vaticanis codicibus* (ed. Angelo Mai, vol. 1-2; Rome: Burliacum, 1825), 2:173; Brent, "St. Hippolytus," 207-31.

¹⁸Jean Michel Hanssens, *La liturgie d'Hippolyte: ses documents, son titulaire, ses origines et son caractère* (OCA 155 2nd ed.; Roma: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1965), 305; Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 84.

¹⁹Brent, "St. Hippolytus," 224.

²⁰Pace "Hippolyte De Rome (Saint)," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique doctrine et histoire* 7: and Josef Frickel, "Hippolyts Schrift Contra Noetum: Ein Pseudo-Hippolyt," in *Logos: Festschrift für Luise Abramowski* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993). See the definitive analysis of Pietro Meloni, "Ippolito e il Cantico Dei Cantici," *Aug* 13 (1989): 97-120, demonstrating the numerous formal, theological and linguistic features that confirm the attribution of the *Noet.* to Hippolytus #2. See also the introduction and full notes in Manlio Simonetti, *Contro Noeto* (BP 35 Bologna: EDB, 2000), 1-135, as well as the older treatment of Robert Butterworth, *Contra Noetum* (HM 2; London: Heythrop College, University of London, 1977).

²¹Butterworth, *Contra Noetum*, 43, Ἰππολύτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ῥώμης καὶ μάρτυρος.

²²It is in line with the tendency to elevate great figures of the past; nevertheless, Theodoret makes Hippolytus #2 "bishop and martyr" as well as "high priest," and

entire superscription is unwarranted.²³

In Rome, the memory of a Hippolytus who was presbyter and martyr was constantly venerated and the biographical references to him, though few, are of exceptional quality.²⁴ In *Liberian Catalogue*,²⁵ Part 12 of the almanac known as the *Codex-Calendar of 354*, the chronographer indicates that the presbyter Hippolytus was sent to Sardinia along with Bishop Pontianus.²⁶ In the same almanac, the *Depositio-martyrum* shows that Hippolytus was celebrated as a martyr in the Tiburtine Cemetery while Pontianus was celebrated in the Cemetery of Callistus on the same day, the thirteenth of August.²⁷ This date likely had a symbolic significance to the ancient Roman Christian community. The thirteenth of August had well-known resonances in Roman history as a date of reconciliation. As Brent argued:

does the author of *Haer.* also considers himself of “high priestly” status, *Haer.* 1.1.1-5.

²³Butterworth, *Contra Noetum*, 223. Pope Gelasius of Rome (d. 496) quotes the *Noet.* in *De duabus naturis in Christo* as of “Hippolytus bishop and martyr of the capital city of the Arabians.” He refers to the work as “*In memoria haeresium.*”

²⁴Saxer, “Ippolito di Roma, Scrittore e Martire,” *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito*, 46.

²⁵A section of the ancient almanac known as the *Codex-Chronography of 354*, its list of Roman bishops is known as the *Liber Pontificalis* or the “*Liberian Catalogue*,” since it terminates with Bishop Liberian.

²⁶*Pontianus ann. V m. II d. VII. fuit temporibus Alexandria cons. Pompeiani et Peligniani. Eo tempore Pontianus episcopus et Yppolitus presbiter exoles sunt deportati in Sardinia in insula uocina [sc. nociva?] Severo et Quintiano cons. in eadem insula discinctus est IIII kal. October, et loco eius ordinatus est Antheros XI kal. Dec. cons. ss.* “Pontianus 5 years, 2 months, 7 days. He was in the time of Alexander, from the consulate of Pompeianus and Pelignianus [231 C.E.]. In that time the exiled bishop Pontianus and the presbyter Hippolytus were deported to Sardinia on the island of Vocina [usually read “an unhealthy island”], Severus and Quintianus being consuls [235 C.E.]. On the same island he died on the fourth day before the Kalends of October and in his place Antheros was ordained on the 11th day before the kalends of December, the emperors being consuls [235 C.E.]” Texts and translation available online »http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/index.htm#Chronography_of_354«. See also the valuable discussion of the Chronographer as a source for late antique Roman society in Salzman, *On Roman Time: the Codex-Calendar of 354*, 1-61.

²⁷*idus Aug. Ypoliti in Tiburtina, et Pontiani in Callisti.*

[It was] a patriotic feast to Diana as protectress of Rome, and also the festival commemorating the incorporation of the Italian allied cities into the Roman Federation. This date, with its pagan, festive associations for the healing of division and the achievement of imperial unity and concord, had associations too for the healing of the ecclesiastical division between *Pontianus episcopus* and *Yppolytus presbyter*.²⁸

Furthermore, both the *Liberian Catalogue* and the *Depositio Martyrum* reveal a concern for presbyters who opposed the canonical bishops of Rome.²⁹ The only other presbyters mentioned in conjunction with bishops on the list are those who were involved in strife with the bishop.³⁰ Brent suggests that behind the *Liberian Catalogue* and the *Depositio Martyrum* is a narrative of division and reconciliation. The year of Hippolytus #2's and Pontian's exile and their death, according to this source, would be 235 or 236 C.E., when Maximinus Thrax rose to power at the end of Alexander's reign. The policy of Maximinus was to persecute "only the heads of the churches" (*Hist. eccl.* 6.28), which explains why only Hippolytus presbyter and Pontianus bishop were exiled to their deaths to "*Sardinia in isla nociva*" around 235 C.E.³¹ Both Pontianus and Hippolytus were venerated by the Roman Church and, for that reason, honored in the *Depositio martyrum*, presumably with the assent of Bishop Fabian. Pontian's place of burial became known as the tomb of the popes. Hippolytus was buried in the Cemetery on the Via Tiburtina.³²

²⁸Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 380.

²⁹The term "schismatic" is anachronistic when referring to either Hippolytus #1 or #2. See Brent, "St. Hippolytus," 219.

³⁰*Ibid.*, 219-22.

³¹διωγμὸν [sc. Μαξιμίνοιο Καίσαρος] ἐγείρας, τοὺς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἄρχοντας μόνους ὡς αἰτίους τῆς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον διδασκαλίας ἀναιρεῖσθαι προστάττει.

³²Saxer, "Ippolito di Roma," *Nuove Ricerche* (SEA 30):46, "Questi punti incontrovertibili devono servire da punto di partenza ad ogni tentativo di ricostruzione, soprattutto quando si tratta, non più di fonti genuine, bensì di documenti alterati, dai quali si deve enucleare un fondo di verità."

"These incontrovertible points should serve to provide a point of departure for any attempt at reconstruction, above all [the reconstruction] no longer concerns genuine sources, but rather altered documents, of which it is necessary to define some vestige of truth."

APPENDIX 2 A HOUSE-CHURCH STATUE OF HIPPOLYTA/ROMA

Archaeological Evidence Linking Hippolytus to Rome

The So-called “Statue of Hippolytus” and the Passover Tables

Both Eusebius and Jerome commemorate Hippolytus #2’s link to Alexander and his period by a reference to a Pascal table based on a sixteen-year cycle beginning¹ with the first year of Alexander Severus. Brent argued that Eusebius and Jerome described Hippolytus #1 who was the author and included works from both men in their lists. For Brent, Hippolytus #2 is the editor of the works of Hippolytus #1, and the writer of the commentaries. Brent also argues that the “statue of Hippolytus” was a community icon with the works of the two church leaders inscribed in the list on the back of the statue’s chair.

The discovery of the broken statue in Rome in 1551 C.E. near the gate of the Via Tiburtina with a list of Greek Christian literary works and sixteen-year Pascal *computus* starting from the first year of Alexander’s reign, led Ligorio to restore the statue some years later as a figure of Hippolytus. The inscriptions on the statue are authentic. They belong to the third century C.E. and were engraved shortly after 222 C.E.²

Since the Pascal tables would have resulted in a clear miscalculation of the date of Passover by the time the presbyter Hippolytus was exiled to Sardinia, the inscriptions on the statue were made during the same time period the presbyter

¹Or, according to Jerome, the calendrical cycle “ended with” the first year of Alexander. Cerrato suggests that the two works “On the Passover” represent different compositions. One was a historical listing of the Passovers and concurrent historical events up to the first year of Alexander Severus. The other calculated future Passovers from the same year. Eusebius has in mind the second work, Jerome the first. See Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 57.

²Margherita Guarducci, “La Statua di ‘Sant’ippolito,” in *Ricerche su Ippolito* (SEA 13 Roma: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1977), 18. See also Marcovich, *Refutatio*, 12.

Hippolytus known from the *Codex-Chronography of 354* was alive in Rome. Indeed, the same presbyter is said in the *Depositio martyrium* of the almanac to have been buried “*in Tiburtina.*”

The Paschal computational chart on the statue, beginning from the same year of Alexander’s reign as that referenced in Eusebius is a thread connecting Hippolytus the writer to Rome. In the minds of many that thread refuses to break.³ The table on both sides of the chair calculates a yearly date for Passover. On the left hand side of the statue, a first column gives the Julian dates on which the fourteenth day of the month of Nisan should fall. The last entry is based upon a cycle that assigns dates from the date of the passion of Christ, the eighth day before the Kalends of April, that is 25 March.

The evidence is clear that the author of the table understood this date as the fourteenth of the lunar month, Nisan and so also the day of the Preparation for the Passover.⁴ Two texts in the *Chron. Pas.* cited by the Byzantine author of that composite work and ascribed to Hippolytus show that Hippolytus presumed the Johannine chronology of the gospel events. The first passage is taken from Hippolytus’ lost *Syntagma adversus haereses* and the second passage comes from his lost work *On the Pascha.*⁵ According to this chronology, Jesus was crucified at the time the lambs were slain for Passover. The second passage attempts to cut the Gordian knot of the Quartodeciman controversy by saying that Christ at Passover “did not eat it, but suffered it.”⁶

Tertullian also bears witness to the same identification of 25 March with the 14 Nisan in the year of Christ’s passion. In *Adversus Iudaeos* 8.18 (usually attributed to Tertullian), the passion is on 25 March and connects that date with the sacrifice of the lambs of 14 Nisan:

The passion of Christ was perfected within the time of seventy hebdomads under Tiberius Caesar, in the consulates of Rubellius Geminus and Fufius Germinus in the month of March at the time of Passover, on the eighth before the Kalends of

³Another connection is the work listed on the statue Περί τοῦ παντός and a work by the same name mentioned in *Haer.* 10.32.4 as the author’s own.

⁴Thomas J. Talley, *The Origins of the Liturgical Year* (2nd, emended ed.; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 9-11 are the major source for the material on the next two pages. See also DACL, 2423-26.

⁵Ludovicus Dindorfius, ed. *Chronicon Paschale* (CSHB 1, 1832), 1:13-14, (=PG 92.81).

⁶Talley, *Origins of the Liturgical Year*, 10.

April, the first day of unleavened bread,⁷ on which they killed the lambs at even as Moses had taught. (Tertullian, *Adv. Iud.* 8.18 ANF 3.160)⁸

The alternative synoptic chronology on which Christ celebrates a Passover meal on the 14 Nisan and dies on 15 Nisan was controversial in the second century. The *Chron. Pas.* reports that both Apollinaris of Hierapolis and Clement of Alexandria argued against it (*Chron. Pas.*, 13).

The above evidence suggests that Hippolytus #2, the community of the statue inscription, and some western Christians like Tertullian in North Africa shared the view that Christ died on the vernal equinox of the Julian date of 25 March in the year of his death. This same view was held by some Christians in the East with Clement of Alexandria and Apollinaris of Hierapolis in Phrygia. It was believed by those like Hippolytus who rejected Quartodeciman practice but retained its chronology that the occurrence of the solar day 25 March with the vernal equinox on 14 Nisan was of crucial importance in calculating the yearly celebration of Christ's death. So for him the festival celebrated by Christians was not a Jewish Passover, *per se*. Rather, Christ himself was the Passover. Thus in the third-century author of the table was either unconcerned or unaware of how to shift the date from year to year following the equinox itself. The table establishes Julian equivalents for 14 Nisan in every year but no correspondence was established with the equinox. This move effectively created a counter-Jewish 14 Nisan date for Easter and decoupled the Christian calendar from the Jewish, with the crucifixion date of 25 March as a zero point.

Though this solution created a solar Easter freed from the Jewish lunar Passover on 14 Nisan of the lunar calendar, it was a mistaken solution. As the date of Easter slipped away from the equinox, the mistake was more keenly felt. This solution did succeed, however, in one sense. From Hippolytus onward, the Christian Passover is restricted to the night between Saturday and Sunday.⁹

⁷This day is erroneously called the first day of unleavened bread; however, it is an otherwise clear reference to Passover.

⁸On the basis of the synoptic chronology, other texts of Tertullian (*Adv. Mar.* 4.40.1-3 CC Lat., 1.655f) and other North African writers of the late second and third centuries (viz. Ps. Cyprian, *De Pascha computus*, 2, ed. Hartel, CSEL 3.3.250) argue that Jesus and his disciples celebrated the last supper as a Passover meal, and that the crucifixion took place on 15 Nisan. Cyprian, *Ep.* 63.16.2 (Bayard, *Saint Cyprien: Correspondence*, 2.210-211). Tertullian did not fully harmonize the conflicting information in his sources.

⁹Even so, variation abounded. According to Epiphanius, *Panarion* 50.1.8, one

A Paschal calendar like the one on the statue and mentioned by both Eusebius and Jerome served various functions. Calendars defined distinctions and gave identity to communities. A calendar like the one on the statue served to mark a ritualized boundary between Christians and Jews in Rome. With a way of computing Easter, not correctly based on the Jewish lunar calendar, the author of the calendar was establishing a boundary marker between the Christian and Jewish communities. More directly, its point of departure from the first year of the reign of the new Emperor was no mere coincidence. Such a move, enshrined on stone for the church, might seem to be the hopeful expression of a legitimate place within the imperial world, if not a direct evidence of the celebration of patronage within the imperial household.¹⁰ In this way the statue might have functioned similarly to the dedications of synagogues to Ptolemaic rulers in Hellenistic Egypt.

The Paschal calendar adjusting the Jewish lunar calendar to the Roman solar calendar indicated a previous disavowal of the Quartodeciman practice of celebrating Easter on 14 Nisan in favor of the Roman practice forced upon Roman churches earlier by Victor.¹¹ The tables of Hippolytus, however, would not have pleased anyone. Yet the Paschal table based on the 14 Nisan was a silent testimony to the validity of the ancient Asian practice, while demonstrating the community's acceptance of the western form of Paschal celebration advocated by Victor.

So, Hippolytan texts and the inscriptions on the statue in Rome on the statue agree on accepting a Johannine chronology for the death of Jesus. The Hippolytus of the *Chronography of 354* was present in Rome during the same time the statue was in

Quartodeciman group in Asia Minor accepted the 25 March date as the true date of the passion and celebrated Passover always on that date, while the Montanists celebrated Passover on the 6 April, following the apocryphal *Acts of Pilate*. See Talley, *Origins of the Liturgical Year*, 11, 71.

¹⁰That Christians had found a place of influence in the imperial household is very likely based on Eusebius' comment on the reason for Maximinus' "persecution": "ἐκ πλειόνων πιστῶν συνεστῶτα [sc. in the imperial household], διωγμὸν ἐγένετο. . ." Part of his general destruction of the Severan family was the destruction of political allies of the family, which, judging from the evidence of the statue, and *Codex-Chronography of 354*, included Hippolytus #2.

¹¹Victor was one of several church leaders in Rome who attempted unsuccessfully in various ways to unify the fractured Roman churches. Culturally eastern churches in Rome that celebrated Easter in the Quartodeciman fashion had to give up their practice or face excommunication. The result was a near total rupture between the churches of Rome and Asia Minor.

use. This evidence suggests that the writer of the commentaries and the author of the Paschal computational calendar were either the same person or shared a common community ethos. It is just possible, however, that Hippolytus writer of the commentaries influenced the community of the statue in Rome from a distance, as Cerrato suggests.¹² Nevertheless, it will require more compelling evidence than he has supplied to establish probability the eastern provenance of the commentaries.

The List of Christian Literary Works on the Statue

The list of writings on the statue and those in Eusebius and Jerome differ. This is not, however, a major hurdle. At least one of the works in the list, *On the Universe* (Πρὸς Ἕλληνας καὶ πρὸς Πλάτωνα, ἢ καὶ περὶ τοῦ παντός), is referenced in *Haer.* as a work of Hippolytus #1. The list on the statue is probably not intended to be a complete list of anyone's works. Also, part of the original inscription has been lost.¹³ The position of the list of works on the back of the statue shows that the Paschal computation is the most important inscription on the chair and that the works listed on the back are a sort of footnote. Figure 1.2 is a list of the works found on the statue.

¹²Cerrato admits that the Paschal chronology in the “statue of Hippolytus” suggests Hippolytan influence, but he is skeptical about a direct link between the statue and Hippolytus #2. See Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 103.

¹³Adolf von Harnack and Kurt Nowak, *Adolf von Harnack: Christentum, Wissenschaft und Gesellschaft: wissenschaftliches Symposium aus Anlass des 150. Geburtstages* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 2:607-10, lists several possibilities: for line 1: , εἰς τοὺς μετανοίας ψαλμούς, κατὰ Ἰουδαίους, ἀπόδειξις πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους; for line 2, εἰς παροιμίας, περὶ κόσμου συντελείας, περὶ κοσμογονίας, περὶ ζωογονίας, περὶ ἡγεμονίας, περὶ τῆς κοσμογονίας, καὶ περὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς πρὸς νέαν διαθήκην συμφωνίας.

Chart 4: Statue List Compared with Lists in Eusebius and Jerome

Statue	Eusebius	Jerome
[-----]ους [-----]νίας [Εἰς τοὺς ψ]αλμοὺς, [Εἰς ἐγ]γαστριμυθον, [Τ]ὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάνην εὐα[γ]γελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως, Περὶ χαρισμάτων ἀποστολικῆ παραδόσεως, Χρονικῶν, Πρὸς Ἑλληνας καὶ πρὸς Πλάτωνα, ἢ καὶ περὶ τοῦ παντός, Προτρεπτικὸς πρὸς Σεβηρεῖναν, Ἀπόδειξις χρόνων τοῦ Πάσχα [κ]αὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ πίνακι, Ὡδαὶ ἰς πάσας τὰς γραφάς, Περὶ Θε(εο)ῦ καὶ σαρκὸς ἀναστάσεως, Περὶ τὰγαθοῦ καὶ πόθεν τὸ κακόν,	Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα (the eight year/ sixteen year cycle <i>computus</i>) Εἰς τὴν Ἑξαήμερον Εἰς τὰ μετὰ τὴν Ἑξαήμερον Πρὸς Μαρκίωνα Εἰς τὸ Ἄισμα Εἰς μέρη τοῦ Ἰεζεκιήλ Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα Πρὸς ἀπάσας τὰς αἰρέσεις	<i>rationem Paschae temporumque Canones In ἑξαήμερον In Exodum In Canticum Cantorum In Genesim In Zachariam De Psalmis In Isaiam De Daniele De Apocalipsi De Proverbiis, De Ecclesiaste, De Saul et Pythonissa De Antichristo De Resurrectione Contra Marcionem De Pascha Adversum omnes haereses Προσομιλίαν de laude Domini Salvatoris</i>

A full treatment of the lists in Eusebius, Jerome, and on the statue is beyond the scope of this dissertation.¹⁴ Clearly, the statue list indicates a Greek community that used scriptural commentaries in Rome during the early third century. Several of the titles on the statue resemble those in the list of Eusebius and Jerome, or may be recognized as by Hippolytus. The precise reading of the titles is the subject of scholarly discussion.¹⁵ The third line of the statue, [Εἰς τοὺς ψ]αλμοὺς¹⁶, could very

¹⁴See Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 200-367.

¹⁵Caroline P. Bammel, "The State of Play With Regard to Hippolytus and the *Contra Noetum*," *HeyJ* 31 (1990): 195-8; Josef Frickel, *Das Dunkel um Hippolyt von Rom: ein Lösungsversuch die Schriften Elenchos und Contra Noëtum* (GTS 13; Graz: Institut für Ökumenische Theologie und Patrologie an der Universität Graz, 1988), 84-5.

¹⁶Pierre Nautin, *Le dossier d'Hippolyte et de Mélicon dans les florilèges*

likely be a match with the *De Psalmis* of Jerome. Line 4, [Εἰς ἐγ]γαστριμυθον¹⁷, is a very close match with the work listed by Jerome *De Saul et Pythonissa*. Line 6, [Τ]ὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐα[γ]γελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως, is a close match with the work *De Apocalipsi*.

Most scholars have accepted the identification of Πρὸς Ἕλληνας καὶ πρὸς Πλάτωνα, ἢ καὶ περὶ τοῦ παντός on the statue with the περὶ τοῦ παντός οὐσίας mentioned by the author of *Haer.* at the end of the same book (*Haer.* 10.5.1;10.32.5). Photius describes this work in *Bibliotheca* 48 as (mis)ascribed to Josephus, and notes that in the margins of some manuscripts, it was ascribed to a certain Gaius, presbyter of Rome. He notes that this is confirmed by Gaius himself at the end of his treatise called the *Labyrinth*, who says that he wrote περὶ τοῦ παντός οὐσίας. Many scholars accept the attribution of both works to Hippolytus of Rome, though not necessarily to the author of the commentaries, *Noet.* and *on the Antichr.* From the similarities between the document described by Photius and book 10 of *Haer.* it is reasonable to assume that Photius read this treatise and noticed the similarities in content with *Haer.*; however, the identification of Περὶ τοῦ παντός with *On Hades* (*PG* 10.796-801), though commonly assumed, should now be rejected.¹⁸

The title listed in line 13, Περὶ Θ(εο)ῦ καὶ σαρκὸς ἀναστάσεως, is a very close match with *De Resurrectione* in Jerome's list. Most scholars follow Hans Achelis who argued that Περὶ Θ(εο)ῦ καὶ σαρκὸς ἀναστάσεως should be identified with a work *On the Resurrection* that Hippolytus addressed to the empress Mamaea.¹⁹

dogmatiques et chez les historiens modernes (Paris: Cerf, 1953), 166-7 convincingly argues for attribution to Hippolytus #2. However, Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 334-338, argues that theological differences between *De psalmis*, *Noet.*, and *Haer.* point to a third author in the Hippolytan school. Other reconstructions of the line on the statue include [εἰς ψ]αλμούς, [τὰ εἰς τοὺς ψ]αλμούς, [διήγησις εἰς ψ]αλμούς.

¹⁷The title could have lacked the preposition.

¹⁸See Whealey, "Hippolytus' Lost 'De Universo' and 'De Resurrectione:'" *VC* 50: 250; Charles E. Hill, "Hades of Hippolytus Or Tartarus of Tertullian: The Authorship of the Fragment De Universo," *VC* 43 (1989): 105-26.

¹⁹Hans Achelis, *Hippolytstudien* (TU 16.4, NF 1.4; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897), 189-93; Johannes Quasten and Angelo di Berardino, *Patrology* (vol. 2; Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1986), follows Achelis' theories about Hippolytus #2's work on the resurrection; idem, *Patrology*, 2:196-7. See Whealey, "Pseudo-Justin's de Resurrectione: Athenagoras or Hippolytus," 420-30, for a strong argument in favor of attribution of the *On the Resurrection* to Hippolytus #2.

Two excerpts are preserved in a two quotations in the *Eranistes* of Theodoret and securely identified Syriac fragments. Theodoret calls the work “a letter to a certain queen.” According to the title of the Syriac fragments, the letter to Mamaea drew especially from Paul’s letters to the Corinthians. Nevertheless, the “letter to Mammea” is much more likely to be represented on the statue by the Προτορεπικὸς πρὸς Σεβηρηεῖναν. Theodoret’s quotations of the letter support this notion. A very brief quote from a florilegium of Ochrid is also extant.²⁰ The letter is remembered in all the fragments as being addressed to a woman and not with an abstract title like *On the Resurrection*. In two important articles, Whealey has argued on the basis of style and content comparisons with the authentic works of Hippolytus that the unassigned “On the Resurrection” (ascribed previously as pseudo-Athanasius or pseudo-Justin) is Hippolytus’ lost *De Resurrectione*. This argument merits further research.

Some have argued that Περὶ τὰγαθοῦ καὶ πόθεν τὸ κακόν should be identified with Πρὸς Μαρκίωνα and *Contra Marcionem* listed by both Eusebius and Jerome. The double listing of Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα in Eusebius seems to match the reference on the statue τοῦ Πάσχα [κ]αὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ πίνακι as well as a discursive word on the same topic. Jerome also lists *De Pascha*.

The absence on the statue list of important Hippolytan works like *Haer.*, the *Syntagma*, the *Comm. Dan.*, the *In Cant.*, and the *Antichr.* is curious but not really surprising. Hippolytus lived more than ten additional years after 222 C.E. We do not know what principle governed the choice of the books on the list. Besides, it is a mere addendum²¹ to the more central Paschal calendar, and the engraver may have only listed works that to the patron or patroness who commissioned the statue considered representative at the time.²² Notice should be taken that a statue of this type could have been quite expensive. Even allowing that it was purchased at second or third hand, it is likely that persons of considerable means made it available to the community.²³ As such, the statue is an indicator of the new kind of status conscious

²⁰The Syriac fragments with Latin translation are in Jean Baptiste Pitra, “Fragmentum S. Hippoliti ineditum,” *AnBib* 4 (1883): 61-4; 330-1. The fragment from Ochrid can be found in M. Richard, “Les difficultés d’une édition des oeuvres de S. Hippolyte,” *SP* 12 (1975): 69. See Whealey, “Hippolytus’ Lost ‘De Universo’ and ‘De Resurrectione,’” 256, n. 32.

²¹Marcovich, *Refutatio*, 13.

²²Ibid.

²³The monument is a testimony to a network of culturally eastern and increasingly wealthy believers. From the time of Septimius Severus, increasing numbers of citizens from the East were welcomed into the Roman Senate. The number of Christian

and wealthy followers the Christian movement in Rome was beginning to attract at the beginning of the third century. One of the works on the list is a *protreptic* treatise dedicate to Severina, perhaps one of the patronesses of the community.

The list on the statue is distinct enough to suggest that the lists in Jerome and Eusebius are independent of its direct influence. Despite this independence, the similarities are striking. This has not prevented skepticism about the connection of the statue list to Hippolytus; nevertheless, to expect exact correspondence in independent lists of titles of ancient works is not realistic, since the same work could be known by various titles.

The Statue as Representation of Roma

Ironically, Ligorio's original sketches of the statue (*Naples ms* 13.424) and especially those of a contemporary, Fulvius Ursinus, in a codex of the Vatican Library (*Vat. lat.* 3439.124a) reveal that the statue originally represented a female figure.²⁴ Guarducci theorized, on the basis of leonine features of the chair feet, that the female statue was originally an Epicurean female philosopher, Themista of Lampsacus.²⁵ Though Guarducci ridiculed the notion that a Christian church leader would have been represented directly by such a statue, she suggested that the statue could have had a place in the Pantheon Library constructed by Julius Africanus for Alexander Severus. On the basis of Ligorio's reports of the place of the statue's discovery, Brent correctly rejected Guarducci's account of the placing of the statue as improbable. Ligorio's original report of the site of the statue's discovery in the vicinity of a cult center dedicated to Hippolytus (not excavated till the nineteenth century)²⁶ was enough to convince Brent that the statue was originally located in a

women of wealth women who joined the church probably outstripped the number of wealthy men. Nearly 40 named individuals, two thirds women, of senatorial class are known to have been Christians before the time of Constantine (Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 118). There were certainly more than the number whose names have been preserved. Senatorial class women who became Christians were also mostly from the East (Ibid., with references); however, individuals of senatorial class were required to have a residence in Rome (Ibid., and citing; *Dig.* 1.9.11) and to invest substantial amounts of their wealth in Italian property. Growing numbers of wealthy and influential women would have had a subtle affect upon the social structure of the church.

²⁴Margherita Guarducci, "La Statua di 'Sant'ippolito," 18.

²⁵Ibid. 19.

²⁶Gabriel Bertonière, *The Cult Center of the Martyr Hippolytus on the Via*

house-school used by the Hippolytan community for worship and instruction. Brent, following Guarducci, understood that the statue must have had an allegorical meaning as a representation of *Sophia* or the *Logos*.²⁷ Brent takes pains to show the appropriateness of the use of an Epicurean statue for use as a cultic symbol in a Johannine community. The argument is suggestive, though many others have followed Guarducci as well. The essence of the Guarducci-Brent thesis, that the statue originally represented a female figure and must have had allegorical, not literal, significance, is an important breakthrough. It allows for analysis of the evidence of the statue in a way that fits the ancient Roman Church in the context of Severan Rome in a much more satisfying way than Ligorio's reconstruction of the statue as the representation of a Roman presbyter-bishop.

Building on the Brent-Guarducci hypothesis, Vincent showed, on art-historical grounds, that this type of statue, a female figure with an exposed breast, seated on a throne with leonine features much more likely represents a seated Amazon Queen. Such figures were well known in the first to the third century as representations of the goddess Roma.²⁸ He argues that Christians could accept the Amazonian figure of Roma as a representation of the Roman Church, since Roma was not part of the Olympic pantheon but a goddess representing a city. Indeed Roma lived on, even as an Amazon, when the Roman Empire became Christian. From the fourth century onward Christians used the name Amazonius, or Amazonias.²⁹ The beginning of the reign of Alexander Severus, moreover, was a particularly appropriate time for demonstrations of allegiance to the city of Rome.³⁰ Such demonstration may have served the purpose of expressing loyalty to the city. Despite the possibility that ancient historians exaggerated the abuses of Elagabalus, the end of his reign is marked by a wounded sense of Roman civic pride centering around the poor treatment the Emperor gave the civic cult, especially that of the Vestal Virgins.³¹ As Nock remarks, "One of the first events in the reign of Severus Alexander was the

Tiburtina (BAR IS 260 Oxford, England: BAR 1985).

²⁷Guarducci, "La Statua di 'Sant'ippolito," *Ricerche su Ippolito*, 61-74; Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 8.

²⁸Cornelius Vermeule, *The Goddess Roma in the Art of the Roman Empire* (London: Spink, 1959), Plate X; Vincent, "Hippolyt," *Zeit Oder Unzeit*, 129.

²⁹Vincent, "Hippolyt," *Zeit Oder Unzeit*, 132.

³⁰Arthur D. Nock, "A Diis Electa: A Chapter in the Religious History of the Third Century," *Harvard Theological Review* 23.4 (1930): 258.

³¹Ibid.

return of the black stone of the god Elagabalus to Emesa and the restoration to various temples of the *sacra* taken from them to glorify [the god Elagabalus'] shrine." The life of Alexander Severus in the *Historia Augusta*, apologetically modeled on the later Julian, may conserve an authentic remembrance:

[Alexander] wished to appear to bring back for the people the origin of the Romans because he was ashamed to be called a Syrian, mostly because during festive occasions, resident Antiochenes, Egyptians, and Alexandrians had been in the habit of harassing him with taunts, and calling him a Syrian *archisynagogue* and high priest. (*Hist. aug.* 28.7)³²

During this period, numismatic evidence points to a surge in prominence of the previously rare epithet of *Roma aeterna*.³³ Coins marked with *Perpetuitas* (*Aug. or Augg.*) make their appearance in the third century with Alexander Severus.³⁴ This was a time when civic feeling brought increased patriotism and a return to civic Roman pride and older traditions. Christians, especially with their elite members in high profile, would have felt called upon to make overtures to attest to their Roman sympathies. The "statue of Hippolytus" could very well have been a symbolic representation of Rome but at the same time a covert symbol of the church. To insiders it could represent the church or, perhaps, *Sophia*.

If a church in Rome adopted a statue of Roma as a representation of itself or of the spirit of wisdom (*Sophia/Logos*)³⁵ that filled the church as the bride of Christ, then it might have been a sign of the times. The Roman Church, as early as the third century, had the same expansive, empire-wide inclusive sense of itself as queen among the churches as Rome the city had as queen among the cities of the Roman Empire. It is not surprising that Christians from elsewhere in the empire were more or less willing to go along with this attitude.

³²Latin text: "volebat videri originem de Romanorum gente trahere quia eum pudebat Syrum dici, maxime quod quodam tempore festo, ut solent, Antiochenses, Aegyptii, Alexandrini lacessiverant conviciolis, et Syrum archisynagogum eum vocantes et archiereum."

³³See the evidence cited in MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order*, 333.

³⁴Ibid., citing Harold Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the Brit. Mus.* (vol. 4 (London, Spink & Sons: 1968), (4:34 [Pius]; 5:26, 80, 84, 87, 97, 138f [Severus]).

³⁵Guarducci's suggestions, see Guarducci, "La Statua di 'Sant'ippolito," 17-30; eadem, *San Pietro e Sant'Ippolito: storia di statue famose in Vaticano* (Roma: Istituto poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, Libreria dello Stato, 1991).

Numerous recent studies document the relations of the Severan dynasty with the emerging Christian movement.³⁶ The Paschal calendar of Hippolytus to which the sixth book of Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* refers appears to be in harmony with practice of dedicating Christian works to the Emperor Alexander, since it begins with the first year of the Emperor's reign. The Paschal calendar suggests that it was, in part at least, a kind of public ritual of deference to the imperial household. If not evidence of a completely positive attitude of Christians toward the Roman Empire and vice-versa, it appears to be evidence of a search for space for some Christian elites and members of the imperial court to interact. The statue and its inscription served much as synagogue inscriptions in Rome under the Caesars and in Egypt under Hellenistic overlords did. Such inscriptions suggested a desire for patronage, protection or consideration from patrons who were to some extent broker imperial influence. Such dedications indicate a literary and cultural ambience of measured deference.³⁷

These faint indications suggest that between the end of the second and the beginning of the third century the relations between the church and the Roman Empire were anticipating, in some respects, the so-called "Constantinian shift."³⁸ In particular it appears that Severan tolerance permitted the church in Rome to better define its structure, especially the authority of the bishop and the relation between clergy and laity.³⁹

³⁶Enrico dal Cavolo, "I Severi e il Cristianesimo," *Aug* 8: 48; Osvalda Andrei, "La formazione di un modulo storiografico cristiano: dall'esamerone cosmico alle *Chronographiae* di Giulio Africano," *Aevum* 69 (1995), 147-170.

³⁷See Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*, 25; Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 88. On synagogue dedications in Rome and Egypt see Harry J. Leon, *The Jews of Ancient Rome* (ed. with new introduction by Carolyn Osiek; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995), 135-166; Peter Richardson, *Building Jewish in the Roman East* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2004), 116 respectively. See also Jean Baptiste Frey, *Corpus of Jewish Inscriptions: Jewish Inscriptions from the Third Century B. C. to the Seventh Century A. D.* (LBS; New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1975); Victor Tcherikover and Alexander Fuks, *Corpus papyrorum Judaicarum* (Cambridge, MA: Published for the Magnes Press, Hebrew University by Harvard University Press, 1957), 3.1532A.

³⁸This trend is further seen in the generation after Hippolytus when the Christians of Antioch appealed to emperor Aurelian to intervene in an internal church dispute over the control of church property during the dispute with monarchian bishop Paul of Samosata (272 C.E.).

³⁹Though Brent rightly criticizes an over exuberant attitude about the "Severan tol-

Hippolytus #2's view of the Roman Empire of his day is complex. In his *Comm. Dan.* and the closely associated work, *Antichr.*, Hippolytus presents himself as affirming an apocalyptic Christian hope for the future while at the same time supporting a traditional interpretation of *Logos* theology⁴⁰ of the restraining, unifying value of the iron rule of Rome (*Comm. Dan.* 4.21.2).⁴¹ Just as Irenaeus did before him, Hippolytus felt Christians were indebted to the Roman Empire as the foundation of the *Pax Romana*. Hippolytus contrasts sharply with the kind of radical Christian voices like that of the Sybil who predicted the doom of Rome in 195 C.E.⁴² Hippolytus was also aware of the radical, anti-Roman *Acts of Paul* (= *APL*).⁴³ Though he does not repudiate *APL* directly, the ethos of his teaching does not support the radical views of marriage, household, and empire that characterize *APL*. Rather, while

erance,” nevertheless his narrative of an early third-century Roman Church moving toward mono-episcopacy supports the thesis of both Enrico dal Cavolo, “I Severi e il cristianesimo: un decennio di ricerche (1989-1996),” *Aug* 8 (1999): 44, and Manlio Simonetti, “Una nuova proposta su Ippolito,” *Aug* 36 (1996): 13-46, that the closer relationship between some sectors of the church and the Roman elite as well as the relative tolerance to Christianity at this time led to a consolidation of power structures in the church.

⁴⁰See Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 238-44.

⁴¹Hippolytus interprets ὁ κατέχων of 2 Thes 2:7 as the Roman Empire. That he also sees the Roman Empire as sowing the seeds of its own destruction is not necessarily in itself staunchly anti-Roman. See David S. Potter, *The Roman Empire at Bay: AD 180-395* (RHAW; London New York: Routledge, 2004), 3-5.

⁴²Ramsay MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order: Treason, Unrest, and Alienation in the Empire* (London New York: Routledge, 1992), 155.

⁴³Hippolytus was aware the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* and referred to it to support belief in the canonical story of the supernatural preservation of Daniel in the lion's den, *Comm. Dan.* 3.29: “When therefore the angel appeared in the pit, the ferocious beasts were appeased, and the manifested their joy to him by wagging their tails as if they wished to submit to a New Adam. They licked the holy feet of Daniel, then rolled in his footprints, desiring to be trampled by him. If we believe that, when Paul was condemned to the beasts, the lion that was released against him prostrated himself at his feet and licked him, why then would we not believe such a miracle with Daniel?” (Trans. YWS). See Schneemelcher and Wilson, eds., *New Testament Apocrypha*, 2.215. It is logical to assume that Hippolytus knew the entire *APL* and did not repudiate it.

Hippolytus forecasts the eventual destruction of the Roman Empire in the distant future, his eschatology provides ample room for the continued existence of household living. The on-and-off persecution of Christians during this period⁴⁴ brought diverse reactions from Christians. Nevertheless, Hippolytus, reflecting on times of persecution, in the *Antichr.* and the *Comm. Dan.*, did not harden the positive, acquiescent, and accommodating posture he received from Irenaeus. He did not forecast an immediate end to the world, which had been allotted 6000 years. The coming of Christ had marked the last 500 years and so the coming judgement and destruction of the world lay a comfortable three centuries ahead.

The polyvalent nature of such a symbolic representation would have represented the ethos of Hippolytus and his church well, with its identity bound up in the cultural exchanges of East and west. That the Queen of the Amazons was “Hippolyta” and her son “Hippolytus” need not detract from the symbolic meaning of the statue, in keeping with other representations of Christian art in the early third century.⁴⁵ It was a symbol of a community with eastern cultural roots wishing to demonstrate its Christian pro-Roman feelings. Even before Vinzent’s recent interpretation of the statue,⁴⁶ the remarkable convergence of archaeological and literary evidence was enough to convince many scholars, if not all, that at least some of the works there inscribed are Hippolytan, a church leader and writer of eastern Greek cultural ancestry living in Rome at the beginning of the third century.⁴⁷

⁴⁴Sporadic and localized persecutions of Christians in Severus’s reign were sometimes enthusiastic, trickling off after 212 C.E. See W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 293-4; however, either in Severus’s lifetime or very soon after his death (as shown by inscriptions in Rome *ILCV* 3872 *CIL* 6.8987), a number of imperial slaves and freedmen in Rome apparently believed it was possible to put up explicitly Christian grave-inscriptions without fear of reprisals. The famous inscription *ILC* 5.2807 (about 234 C.E.) suggests that for the time being the emperor’s slaves and freedmen remained out of the reach of potential persecutors. As is shown by McKechnie, “Christian Grave-Inscriptions From the Familia Caesaris,” 427-41, their influence began at that time to lead other Christians to assert themselves by commissioning similar gravestones. On the relevance of *ILCV* 2807 to the *In Cant.*, see below page 133.

⁴⁵Markus Vinzent, “‘Philobiblie’ Im Frühen Christentum,” *Das Altertum* 45 (1999): 116.

⁴⁶Vinzent, “‘Philobiblie’ Im Frühen Christentum,” *Altertum* 45: 117.

⁴⁷Friedrich William Bautz, “Bibliographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexicon,” 2 (1990): 888-93, Online: »[http://www, bautz, de/bbkl/h/hippolytos, shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/h/hippolytos.shtml)«.

Vinzent's interpretation of the statue strengthens that argument considerably.

The Statue of Hippolyta

The statue reconstructed by Pirro Ligorio as Hippolytus was, according to Brent, the monument of a church-school that clashed with the group lead by Callistus, but was reconciled with one of his successors, Pontianus. Brent, treats the statue in detail in his extensive work,⁴⁸ relying on Guarducci. He rightly criticizes her, however, that no similar statue of Themista or other Epicurean philosophers have been found. Moreover, he rightly finds it difficult to imagine that such a monumental figure of a non-Christian philosopher with a Jewish-Christian, would have been able to stand in a polytheistic library.⁴⁹ Brent is prepared, however, to accept that such a statue would be appropriate in the garden of a Johannine church-school representing *Sophia-Logos* as a kind of representation of the spirit of the community and sustains this case by drawing out important similarities between Epicureanism and Johannine Christianity.⁵⁰ If Vinzent's reappraisal of the statue is correct, the connection with Hippolytus would imply that the statue represented not only the spirit of the community but also showed that in some way that the owner of the statue was prepared to demonstrated proper respect for the city of Rome.

Significantly, based on earlier Greek models, an Amazon figure was used as a symbol of Dea Roma in second and third-century Roman art.⁵¹ The representation of Rome in this manner had multiple meanings and representations that varied according to time, place, and audience.⁵² In addition to appearing as an armed warrior, a Trojan heroine and enthroned queen, she was often represented as, and conflated with, *Virtus*, Victory, Minerva and other female divinities and personifications. During the second and third centuries, allegorical representations of Rome were common, but other types of city icons were not.⁵³ Given the enormous respect

⁴⁸Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 51-114.

⁴⁹Ibid., 55-59.

⁵⁰Ibid., 61-69.

⁵¹Mary C. Sturgeon, "The Corinth Amazon: Formation of a Roman Classical Sculpture," *AJA*, 99.3 (Jul., 1995), 483-505; Pamela Webb, *Hellenistic Architectural Sculpture: Figural Motifs in Western Anatolia and the Aegean Islands* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996), 110-112.

⁵²Dian Favro, "The Iconicity of Ancient Rome," *Urban History* 33.1 (2006): 36.

⁵³Ibid., 21-38.

afforded Rome in the Greek east, represented by Amazonian images on coins, in temples,⁵⁴ and on various monuments, it is conceivable that some eastern Roman Christians co-opted a symbol of the city of Rome as an allegorical representation of the church and that the so-called “statue of Hippolytus” was such a symbol.

Does the statue, then represent direct homage paid to a church leader? Not necessarily. It may well have originally been simply a pagan statue erected in honor of Roma belonging to Hippolytus or his family and only later reinterpreted as a Christian symbol of the church led by Hippolytus. Taken this way, the statue would be like other pagan representations (of Helios, Dionysus, Heracles, nymphs, Endymion, etc) that Christians reinterpreted as symbols of Biblical characters or virtues.

The Greek-speaking community of the statue inscriptions and Hippolytus #2 use commentaries on Scripture. They also make use of the symbolism of the church as a queen (Susanna in the *Com. Dan.* and the so-called “statue of Hippolytus” as Roma or Amazon queen). The Scripture interpretation in both would appear to be a type similar to that represented by Irenaeus. Apart from the likely symbolic reinterpretation of the female figure of the statue itself, additional indicators point to an affinity with Irenaeus. Both in one way or another were adapting eastern Paschal practice to western practice. Both statue list and Hippolytus the author exhibit an intense interest in biblical history and chronology as the outworking of the divine purpose in creation. Both statue list and author have a similar interest in eschatology. They both have a fierce anti-heretical stance.

The statue is evidence of an interest in the relevance of the Jewish Greek Scriptures for the defense of the church against heresy and Judaism. An anti-Valentinian and anti-Jewish stance is strong in the *In Cant.* The list of the works on the statue seems to defend the canonical status of the Gospel of John and the Apocalypse. The Gospel of John figures prominently in the theology of the *In Cant.* as well as in the rest of the Hippolytan commentaries.

If the re-interpretation of the statue by Brent and Guarducci, corrected by Vinzent is accurate, then a number of considerations follow. Hippolytus was a Roman Church leader of considerable importance. He was honored by the list on the statue. The statue shows this person to have had an interest in biblical history and eschatology as the outworking of the divine plan. He turns out to have an interest in Paschal chronology and relating the Christian community and message to the imperial

⁵⁴See Ronald Mellor, *Thea Roma: The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), and idem, “The Goddess Roma,” *ANRW* 2.17.2 (ed. Wolfgang Haase; New York: de Gruyter, 1981), 950-1030.

family. The Hippolytus of the list shows a strong interest in Scripture commentary, probably with a typological interpretation. This author demonstrates a strong interest in defending his Christian community against perceived attacks from heresy and philosophy and reabsorption into the Jewish community.

That so-called “statue of Hippolytus” with its list of works commemorating an author of commentaries and other scriptural compositions supports the idea that a Greek writer of commentaries lived in Rome. Certainly several of the writings listed on the statue would qualify as Scripture commentaries of the sort otherwise known as by Hippolytus. Once the Guarducci-Brent hypothesis that Ligorio’s statue was an allegorical female symbol of the Christian community in Rome is accepted, the possibility is open to see the statue not only as a symbol of the community led by Hippolytus, but also a symbol of its positive view of the possibilities to be exploited in pursuing patronage within the imperial household. It also may indicate an expansive view of the relevance of the Roman Church for the church throughout the Roman world. The figure of Roma as Amazon⁵⁵ Queen (Hippolyta) could certainly represent *Virtus*,⁵⁶ or *Sophia*. By extension Christians could re-interpret the figure as *Sophia-Logos* in such a context. She is the one restraining and guiding the ruling power through the benign presence of the saints in the background. As Vinzent remarks:

⁵⁵An important point in this development is the installation of standing Amazon forms as a cult statue in the Hadrianic double temple of Venus and Roma (near the Colosseum), around 136-137 C.E. and, presumably, however, only under the rule of Antoninus Pius was it completed. See Vinzent, “Hippolyt von Rom und Seine Statue,” in *Zur Zeit Oder Unzeit*, 131. This huge complex settled the meaning of the figure for the subsequent period.

⁵⁶Though figure of the Amazon had rich valuation as a symbol of East-West relations, representing eastern cities forging alliances with Rome (Ibid., 130). As personifications of the towns, play the role of the peace which was reached between these towns and powerful Rome. They also were quickly co-opted as a symbol of Roma itself and by the 3rd century C.E. had become an allegorical figure of *Virtus* or a symbol of the city of Rome itself. Various forms existed, some with short chiton, some with long, some with weapons, some without, some with phrygian cap, some with tower crown, some with helmets. However, the essential trait was the bared breast, Pierre Devambe and Aliko Kauffman-Samaras, “Amazones,” *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* vol. 3 (1981): 622-35, see also 586-653, 586.

Returning, finally, to the statue of Hippolytus: with respect to its time and place, its pagan origin and Christian re-use, it should be related as corresponding precisely with the Amazon fashion in Rome from the first to the third century. The human figure with a naked breast and female garment, as Ligorio sketched it, seen iconographically at first as an Amazon, the *Virtus*, Roma and, in explanation of this symbolism, also represents courage, luck and wisdom. In this regard our allegorical interpretation would not differ substantially from that which have suggested Guarducci and Brent. However, the iconography of the seated Amazon for this allegory is quite evidently different from that suggested by Guarducci as an Epicurean Themista of Lampsacus. Moreover, the content of the connection between Roma and Virtus depicted as an Amazon is more easily made to Hippolytus and the Christian church than to Themista of Lampsacus.⁵⁷

The allegorical turn of mind, even for Christians, was particularly appropriate for a garden setting, where one might well expect to see such a statue. In such a setting, ideas are pictured as spiritual beings.⁵⁸ Such a statue in an ancient Christian cult setting might be compared to the modern use of a national flag side by side with the flag of the church. Further, the picture of the Hippolytan community seeking recognition in the imperial court fits well the comment in Eusebius, that Christian connections in the imperial household was the reason for the persecution of Christians when Maximinius purged Rome of the Severan family and their suspected allies.

More Archaeological Evidence Linking Hippolytus to Rome

Other archaeological evidence from as early as the fourth century is intriguing, but not definitive. By that time artists were producing portraits of local saints and martyrs. Fourth-century gold glass medallions represents Paul, Timothy, and the Roman martyrs Sixtus, Lawrence, and Hippolytus.⁵⁹ More intriguing still is a fourth-century fresco in the Catacomb of Praetextatus, which pictures Peter and Paul on either side of the vaulted ceiling of the niche. Also pictured within the niche is

⁵⁷Vinzent, "Hippolyt von Rom und Seine Statue," in *Zur Zeit Oder Unzeit*, 133.

⁵⁸E.g., Hippolytus himself personifies "Faith" and "Love" attending and anointing the baptizands in the garden setting of baptism (*Comm. Dan.* 1.16). For allegorical representation and Roman pictorial art, see Gilles Sauron, *La peinture allégorique à Pompéi: Le regard de Cicéron* (Editions A&J Picard, 2007).

⁵⁹See the image in Jeffrey Spier, *Picturing the Bible: the Earliest Christian Art* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007), 13, figure 6.

Sixtus, who was martyred and buried in the same catacomb in 258. On the *loculus* itself is pictured a lamb flanked on either side by two wolves. The lamb bears the inscription Susanna and the wolves, *Senioris* or “elders.” Immediately outside the niche are pictured pope Liberius on the right side and a damaged male figure on the left whose name is lost. The presence of Susanna between wolves along with Roman bishops and theologians of the first, third, and fourth centuries suggests that the wolves allude to the Arian controversy of the fourth century.⁶⁰ The significance of Susanna to early Christians varies; however, in the catacomb fresco she seems to represent the church. In his *Comm. Dan.*, Hippolytus developed a similar allegorical interpretation of the Susanna story.⁶¹ Until Liberius later condemned Arianism, many doubted his orthodoxy when he returned from two years of exile under Constantius II. Placing *Hippolytus* opposite Liberius would have been a powerful, graphic commentary on the orthodoxy of Liberius. So, for good reason Bisconti proposed that the damaged figure is Hippolytus, who by that time had become an icon of apostolic orthodoxy restoring Liberius in the face of lingering doubts.⁶²

Further archaeological evidence is found in the inscriptions dedicated by Bishop Damasus I honoring Hippolytus, incorrectly identified as a follower of Novatian. Because presbyter-bishop Hippolytus opposed presbyter-bishop Callistus and maintained more rigorous views on marriage than he, Hippolytus anticipated the views of Novatian on the nature of the church.⁶³ The inscriptions of Damasus reflect a development in the oral tradition concerning Hippolytus. The *Liberian Catalogue* of the *Codex-Calendar of 354* keeps Hippolytus and Novatian separate, yet, in that source they are both presbyters who opposed a bishop for similar reasons.⁶⁴ In the light of later developments Hippolytus was easily confused as a Novatianist.

⁶⁰Spier, *Picturing the Bible*, 267,

⁶¹Asterius, likely of Syrian origin, in a late fourth-century homily compares Susanna to a lamb being attacked by wolves. See *ibid.*, who cites Marcel Richard, ed. *Asterii Sophistae, Commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt accendunt aliquot homiliae anonymae* (Oslo: Brøgger, 1956).

⁶²Fabrizio Bisconti, *Temi di iconografia paleocristiana* (Sussidi allo studio delle antichità cristiane 13; Vatican: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 2000), 284.

⁶³Cerrato attempted to link the Hippolytus (of Alexandria? Rome?) mentioned in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.46 with a Novatianist church leader, but the passage itself is obscure and it cannot bear the weight Cerrato tries to make it carry.

⁶⁴Since the other presbyters mentioned the catalogue of bishops of Rome in the *Codex-Calendar* were opposed to their contemporaneous bishops, it is likely that Hippolytus is listed as an opponent of the bishop who was later reconciled.

APPENDIX 3 EUCHARIST AND AGAPE IN TRAD. AP.

The Eucharist or Lord's Supper was celebrated weekly, on the first day of the week (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor 16:1ff; Justin, *Apol.* 1.65-67). Part of the practice of Sunday Eucharist was the welcoming of the newly baptized into the fellowship of believers with a holy kiss and community meal (*Apol.* 1.66). By Justin's time, this kind of meeting was conducted with predictable regularity. It served the purposes of mutual encouragement, social solidarity with the poor, teaching, worship, and giving recognition to members of varying spiritual and social status. Justin had experienced Christian meetings in other parts of the Roman Empire, such as in Asia Minor. And he was writing as a representative of Christians throughout the empire, so it is likely that he emphasized what he felt to be generally representative of Christians. When he describes the Christian meeting, he does so in terms of the activities that could be expected to occur at the meeting of a school or social club that upheld the highest standards of the ideals of the Greco-Roman Symposium. Indeed, as is argued below, all the specific activities Justin describes are also found in Philo's description of the community meals of the *Therapeutae*, which was written in conscious criticism of the abuses of Greco-Roman drinking parties. Among Christians, set forms and variations in practice were from early times a point of contention (*Did.* 11.7-12). As Klinghardt argues, the practice of set forms or liturgical order should not be taken as an indication that a full meal was not a part of these celebrations.

The Evidence of Justin

Writing in Rome around 150 C.E., Justin provides the earliest post New Testament evidence of Christian liturgical meal practices there.¹ Though Justin's text is often exploited for information the history of worship,² scholars have debated whether his depiction of Christian liturgy in the first *Apology* includes a full meal in a household context. Justin's description of the meal he explicitly calls the Eucharist

¹After Rom 14, if admissible as evidence of practices in Rome.

²Ferguson, "Justin Martyr and the Liturgy," 267-278; Bradshaw, *Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*, 98-99.

may well be one that takes place in a *domus ecclesiae*, like the one in Dura-Europos. According to White such a structure was a “private residence architecturally adapted to make room for a larger group of people . . .”³ Various arrangements would have been possible to accommodate dining in such a structure. Yet, White argues that the larger meeting area could no longer accommodate a household type meal where the people reclined for a banquet. He suggests that in such a structure they no longer partook of an entire meal.⁴ The use of portable furniture (such as the bed carried by the lame man in the baptistery at Dura-Europos⁵) allowed for varied use of open space. Either sitting or reclining is implied in Justin’s text, because he says “we all arise to send up prayers,” ἔπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν (*Apol.* 1.67.5). Dining halls of rather large size existed in the ancient world. For example in the *Bakcheion* of the *Iobakchi*, a building similar in type to the basilica later adopted by Christians contains a large dining hall or *aula*.⁶ That dining hall in Athens was twice the size of the large meeting area in the *domus ecclesiae* of Dura-Europos. White admits that the courtyard could have been used to accommodate communal meals, but he appropriately doubts that they did, because no provision seems to have been made for other types of communal dining in most of the known archaeological evidence; however, the absence of regular provision for other types of dining does not preclude the use of the facility for *eranos* or “pot-luck” style dining. So, White’s conclusion that “The original meal symbolism has been retained in the central place of the Eucharistic ritual; however, actual dining has disappeared”⁷ does not necessarily follow from the evidence of Dura-Europos. Special occasion meals, such as Easter or baptismal celebrations would still have been possible. Still, White’s

³Osiek and Balch, *Families in the New Testament World*, 211; White, “Regulating Fellowship,” *Meals in a Social Context*, 193.

⁴See Osiek and Balch, *Families in the New Testament World*, 211; Johannes Kirchner, ed. *Decrees and Sacred Laws* (2nd ed. Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriores, 3, Berlin: 1913), 644. The negative argument in White, “Regulating Fellowship in the Communal Meal,” 177-205, however, has much against it. As Dunbabin shows, dining in large groups was possible in both out door and in door facilities. Dunbabin, *The Roman Banquet*, 95-102.

⁵For images, see Carl H. Kraeling and C. Bradford Welles, *The Christian Building* (The Excavations at Dura-Europos: Final Report 8.2; New Haven : Locust Valley, N.Y: Dura-Europos Publications, distributed by J. J. Augustin, 1967), pl. XXV.

⁶Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 123.

⁷White, “Regulating Fellowship,” *Meals in a Social Context*, 193.

discussion of the evidence of *Trad. ap.* is still valid. Its “eucharistic” and “non-eucharistic” celebrations reflect a situation in which “this emerging liturgical function under ecclesiastical control”⁸ exists in tension with households that continue to celebrate meals that have a liminal quality between “eucharistic” and “non-eucharistic.”

Scholars often read Justin’s account of the “baptismal eucharist” as a merely symbolic, liturgical Sunday morning meeting with meal elements. However, this implies a number of questionable assumptions. Bradshaw has rightly pointed out that scholars often assume a single prayer was pronounced over both the bread and wine together, because they read Justin in the light of later sources. It is also often assumed that the entire event described in 1 *Apol.* 64-65 occurred in the morning and has only ritual, symbolic meaning. Justin, however, gives only an outline of the events and does not include a discussion of all the details that his reader could have assumed from his narrative, so it is significant that he uses the plural in this case, “and when he has concluded the prayers and thanksgivings” (*Apol.* 1.65.5).⁹ Further, assuming that Justin’s president offered a prayer over bread and wine, the narrative of the “baptismal eucharist” does not rule out that a more substantial meal following the ritual and then ending with the giving of *apophoreta* gifts.¹⁰ The timing of the bringing of “bread and cup, water and mixture” by the family of believers “to the president” may well describe an *eranos* meal in celebration of the baptism.¹¹ The words describing what takes place after the blessing of bread and cup are usually taken as a general description of the Christian life:

⁸Ibid., 196.

⁹Bradshaw, *Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*, 99.

¹⁰Beate Wagner-Hasel, “Presents,” *Brill’s New Pauly* (2005): Electronic encyclopedia. Cited 08-08, Online: <http://www.pauyonline.brill.nl>.

¹¹See Peter Lampe, “The Eucharist: Identifying with Christ on the Cross,” *Int* 48 (1994): 36-49. The *eranos* described by Lampe is simply a variation on the typical symposium that allowed for a more or less intensely defined patron-client exchange, with more focus on community solidarity. Such an arrangement fits Justin’s words nicely, Osiek and Balch, *Families in the New Testament World*, 199-201. See also Gerhard Thür, “Eranos”; Andreas Gutsfel, “Cena”; Andreas Gutsfel, “Meals”; Heinz Felber et al., “Banquet”; idem, “Hospitality”; Pauline Schmitt-Pantel, “Kline”; Beate Wagner-Hasel, “Presents,” *Brill’s New Pauly* (2005): Electronic encyclopedia. Cited 08-08. Online: »<http://www.pauyonline.brill.nl>«.

“And afterwards we (μετὰ ταῦτα) continually remind each other of these things. And the wealthy among us help the needy; and we always keep together; and for all things wherewith we are supplied, we bless the Maker of all through His Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Ghost” (*Apol* 1.67.1, 2, *ANF* 2.185-186).¹²

“Continually reminding each other” does fit well as a description of normal after-dinner conversation. Sharing among members of varying status was a regular feature of banquets. Such behavior was common in a festive meal celebration at which participants discussed topics of moral interest. According to usual practice, this meal would have taken place in the evening. Thus, strong arguments can be made that support the idea that Justin’s descriptions of liturgical practices in *Apol.* 1.65-66, i.e., the Eucharist celebration following baptism, took place in the context of a community meal.¹³ In the same way the “regular” Eucharist was described as taking place on

¹²This description of conversation after the meal does not preclude a reading and sermon before the meal, or before the “second tables” or dessert. Philo describes a similar order of events: reading, interpretation, meal, spiritual conversation, dessert and singing/dancing in the *Vit. cont.* 66-81. See above page 122, and below page 517.

¹³Klinghardt concedes that the Eucharist in connection with baptism (*Apol.* 1.65) could well have been a merely symbolic bread and wine, symbolic meal. Justin’s words, however, do not necessarily represent a separation of Eucharist and meal. See Klinghardt, *Mahlfeiern*, 501, who says:

Jedoch ist schon die Voraussetzung dieses Rückschlusses fraglich, da die bildlichen Darstellungen 4 der Mithrasmäher auch andere Speisen als nur Brot und Wein zeigen. Die Ausgangsthese dieser Überlegung, daß nämlich im Mithraskult der Brot-/Wasserkommunion bei der Initiation die regelmäßig abgehaltenen Versammlungen als regelrechte, sättigende *Syssitien* gegenübergestanden hätten (aus die sich dann die bildlichen Darstellungen beziehen würden), ist selbst schon eine höchst fragliche Vermutung. Vor allem aber läßt sich gerade für die Initiationseucharistie - um die es Justin in 66.4 geht - zeigen, daß sie selbst dann noch Spuren einer regelrechten Mahlzeit enthielt, als die sonntägliche eucharistiefeyer selbst schon kein Mahl mehr war: der Zusammenhang der Taufeucharistie mit den Mithrasmysterien darf nicht so eng gezogen werden und kann nicht als Argument für eine nichtsättigende eucharistiefeyer dienen.

The premise, however, of this conclusion is questionable from the start because the graphic representations of four of the Mithras meals show other foods than just bread and wine. The main thesis of this idea, that in the cult of Mithras was held a communion of the bread and water at the initiation of a regularly held assembly, is indeed an already questionable supposition. It has had to face a full *syssitium* (to

Sundays (*Apol.* 1.67). Was the Eucharist/*Agape* held as a celebration of baptism? Or was baptism held as precursor to the Eucharist meal? Drawn into the orbit of a meal, baptism becomes analogous to normal bathing in preparation for a banquet, now filled with deeper ritual meaning. After baptism, the initiate is taken to the “place where the brothers and sisters have assembled” (ἐπὶ τοὺς λεγομένους ἀδελφοὺς ἄγομεν, ἔνθα συνηγμένοι εἰσὶ). Baptism seems to take place in a different part of the same location, perhaps exemplified in the separate baptistry and meeting hall at the Dura-Europos *domus ecclesiae*. The assembly (described as being in progress at the point in which the newly baptized person enters) is likely the same Sunday meeting described in *Apol.* 1.67.2 ff.

In both *Apol.* 1.64 and 67, then, Justin describes the regular meeting of all Christians, “whether they live in the country or in the cities,” on the first day of the week, the “so-called Sunday” (*Apol.* 1.67.3). One of these descriptions focuses on an order of events that occurs when a baptism is conducted. The other has the meeting as a whole in view *sans* baptism. The assembly has the following elements:

- 1.) The memorials of the apostles are read “or the prophet by the reader” (ἀναγινώσκων), and the reading takes “as long as is needed” (μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ). This last phrase does not likely refer to any fixed rules or pericopes.
- 2.) The president (προεστώς) gives a speech to admonish the believers to imitate the excellent [examples]” (and shun the negative ones) derived from Scripture (67.4). The epideictic speech is the substance of the discourse based on the reading.
- 3.) Then all together (κοινή) “send prayers sent [upwards to God]” (εὐχὰς πέμπειν 67.5).
- 4.) Only after this common prayer, the food is brought in—Justin mentions bread, wine, and water—and then the president speaks prayers and thanksgivings (εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι), to which the Assembly—with the name (λαός)—gives a response.

which the illustrations would refer). Above all, it is just applicable to the Eucharist of Initiation—which is what Justin’s 66.4 indicates—which still contained even then traces of a regular meal, since the Sunday Eucharistic celebration meal was in itself no longer connected to the Baptismal Eucharist. The comparison with the mysteries of Mithras should not be so narrowly drawn and can not be used as an argument for a Eucharistic celebration that is not a full meal.

5.) Then, the food is distributed (διάδοσις) and eaten (67.6a μετάληψις). The following information concerning the *apophoreta* to those who are absent, the collection for different groups of needy, and about the appointment on Sunday (67.6b.7) are no longer part of the actual course of the meeting, but further clarify aspects of community life related (more or less) to the meal.

The Sunday meeting, described from start to finish *sans* baptism in *Apol.* 1.67, can be supplemented with the additional information from chapters 65-66 and vice-versa from chapter 67. As Klinghardt has shown, the meeting described in chapter 67 is remarkably similar to Philo's representation of the meal of the *Therapeutae* in *The Contemplative Life*, a comparison that seems to have escaped scholars before Klinghardt.¹⁴ The following comparison (Chart 5) is modified from Klinghardt with the addition of the pertinent data from chapters 65-66.

¹⁴Klinghardt, *Mahlfeiern*, 502.

Chart 5: The Community Meals of the *Therapeutae* and Roman Christians

Philo, <i>The Contemplative Life</i>	Justin, <i>Apology</i> 1.67	Justin, <i>Apology</i> 1.65-66
1. Elders (πρεσβύτεροι) pray for the feast to be conducted as it should (66),	1. [No opening prayers mentioned].	1. [Baptism (<i>Apol.</i> 1.61)].
2. The group reclines according to status, young stand and serve διακονουτας (75). Women and men recline apart, but in the same room.	2. [No taking of places mentioned].	2. [No taking of places mentioned].
3. The president (προεστώς) offers an interpretation or thematic treatment of a problem of Scripture, interpreted allegorically. He continues as long as he feels it appropriate (75-79).	3. A reading from the “Memoirs/ὑπομνήματα of the apostles” or the Prophet, followed by a speech from the president for as long as time permits (ἀναγινώσκεται, μέχρις ἐγχορεῖ)(67.3 f).	3. [No reading or speech mentioned]
4. All rise, the leader sings hymn, then all the others (80).	4. All rise to common prayer (εὐχὰς πέμπειν 67.5).	4. The newly baptized person is presented before common prayer (κοινὰς εὐχὰς ποιησόμενοι ὑπὲρ τε ἑαυτῶν καὶ τοῦ φωτισθέντος. 65.1). Salutation with kiss (65.2).
5. The meal is served by διακονοῦντες (the meal itself 81, consists of bread, salt, water, and hyssop).	5. Bread, wine and water are introduced (67.5).	5. Bread and cup (of water and mixed [wine]).
6. [Supper prayers or benedictions not specifically mentioned].	6. The president then offers prayers and thanksgiving (εὐχὰς καὶ εὐχαριστίας, i.e., for the meal); assembly responds with the Amen (67.5).	6. Praise to God and thanks offered (αἶνος, εὐχαριστίας) for these things from him.
7. The meal consumed (assumed, not mentioned).	7. Distribution of food (διάδοσις. 67.6 a) to those present.	7. διάκονοι distribute the food, carrying away gifts to those not present.
8. After dinner singing of hymns, dancing, “drunk” on God’s love in an all night vigil.	8. [No after dinner discussion mentioned].	8. Conversation, “afterwards continually remind each other of these things.”
9. [No distribution mentioned].	9. The deacons send (διάδοσις καὶ ἡ μετάληψις. 67.6 a) to those absent/wealthy contribute (money) to the needs of the poor (67.6); president administers distribution.	9. The deacons send (ἀποφέρουσι) bread and wine gifts to those absent/wealthy share with the poor (67.1).

Viewing these accounts in parallel fashion highlights remarkable similarities and incidental differences. The comparison also allows the following arguments. First, the programmatic nature of the event of Justin's liturgical meal does not necessarily preclude a meal or indicate that only a perfunctory, symbolic meal was practiced. Second, it emerges that Justin's order has a history and, in view of the background of the older Jewish, Hellenistic, and Christian evidence, the "Sunday morning show" usually attributed to Justin would have been a radical change.¹⁵ For that reason, the burden of proof rests upon those who advocate a Sunday morning interpretation of this passage in Justin. Third, as Klinghardt argues, the influence of Jewish forms of meal fellowship and worship, as many have suspected, is more profound, going far beyond the wording of this or that prayer or type of scriptural interpretation. Rather, it includes the shape itself taken by the Christian meeting described by Justin. No wonder Christians like Justin (and later Hippolytus) felt such a strong impulse to draw a distinction between Jews and Christians precisely in the context of the celebration of their meals.

The writings of Justin contain significant evidence of social stratification in the Roman Church, and his description of the eucharistic meals alludes to the provisions the Roman churches made for sharing between wealthy and poor (cf. *Apol.* 1.31.1 as well).¹⁶ In Lampe's summary of the data, it is clear that the *προεστῶς*, who is also described as a "caregiver" (*κηδεμῶν*) is probably the same as the *πρεβύτερος*. He is in charge of disbursing the contribution of the community on behalf of the poor: "For [the] needy, for orphans, for widows, for imprisoned Christians, and for the strangers in the Christian community who are staying in Rome as guests for a time, there is—in every house church-school in Rome—a cash box set up."¹⁷ The level of cooperation between these house churches was such that they were able to pool their funds and help churches in the outlying provinces (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.23.10).¹⁸ Rome, then, had a surplus budget. When Marcion made a contribution of 200,000 *sesterces* to the Roman community of churches, the church-school was quickly able to pay back the large sum after his excommunication (Tertullian, *Praescr. haer.* 30; cf. *Adv. Marc.* 4. 4).

The above comparison of the evidence from Justin and Philo has important implications for Hippolytus #2's *In Cant.* The elements of initiation to which the *In*

¹⁵Klinghardt, *Mahlfeiern*, 503.

¹⁶Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 101-103.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 100.

¹⁸Eusebius here quotes Dionysius of Corinth thanking Bishop Soter (ca. 166-175 C.E.) for gifts sent to his church.

Cant. alludes: baptism (2. 8), anointing (2. 1), kiss (2. 1), and meal (27, i.e., “couches”) taken in a reclining position appear a development elements provided by Justin, who has the order: baptism, kiss, meal, with the addition of anointing. Though Justin has no mention of anointing, a fact often noted by liturgical scholars, it could have actually been present. No justification, however, exists for assuming that, during this time, Rome was a single church-school with a single way of conducting assemblies.¹⁹

Hippolytus also has a curious remark about the thirty silver coins Judas received for betraying Christ, “It is found that in the passion [Christ] was sold for thirty *denarii*. To tell the truth, it is noteworthy that for such a *low price* he was betrayed so that any poor person also could easily attain him. So it was, beloved” (2.30).²⁰ In the interim between the death of Jesus and the *In Cant.* the sum of thirty “silver” coins had become a symbol of the cheapness of the price accepted by Judas. In the Roman economy, even the poor could be expected to have a few coins like that.²¹ This may indicate that the Roman Church could count on contributions from among the urban poor in the form of coin. Justin himself refers to the monetary contributions regularly taken up at the eucharistic gatherings.

The Evidence of the Apostolic Tradition

A good half-century after Justin, the *Apostolic Tradition* offers very detailed prayers, forms, and agendas for liturgical meals. In the *Apostolic Tradition* is the most important, comprehensive, extensive, but also the most complex and controversial information.²² If Justin’s focus was more coherent and universal, the *Trad. ap.* is a composite, multi-layered document.²³ It is much more local and less clear in its

¹⁹Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*; La Piana, “The Roman Church At the End of the Second Century”; Adabert G. Hamman, “Valeur et Signification des Renseignements Liturgiques de Justin,” *Studia Patristica* 13 (1975); Paul F. Bradshaw, *Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*, 99.

²⁰See Harl, *Coinage in the Roman economy* 125-128.

²¹On the relative value of the *denarius*, see Alexander Mlasowsky, “*denarius*,” *Brill’s New Pauly* (2005): Electronic encyclopedia. Cited 08-08. Online: »<http://www.paulyonline.brill.nl>«.

²²Klinghardt, *Mahlfeiern*, 510.

²³The chapter numbers are those given in Bernard Botte, *La tradition apostolique de Saint Hippolyte: essai de reconstitution* (LQF 39; Münster: Aschendorffsche

meaning. Its connection with Rome and Hippolytus is disputed.²⁴ Even scholars who do not accept a Roman provenance for the rest of *Trad. ap.*, however, are forced to recognize that the material in *Trad. ap.* 40 concerning cemeteries “fits well with a third-century Roman context for this material as it is preserved in the Sahidic version.”²⁵ Concerning the rest of *Trad. ap.*, opinion is divided on the issues of the date and provenance of its traditions. Thus the value of these traditions for reconstructing a social history of the church-school in Rome (or any third-century church-school, for that matter) has been called into question.²⁶ Bradshaw and others, then, follow Metzger²⁷ in abandoning attempts to discern an original version of *Trad. ap.*²⁸ Most scholars, however, accept that much Roman material may be teased from

Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966). Stewart-Sykes, *Apostolic Tradition*, 18, 52, based his reconstructed text on the basis of Botte. The edition of Gregory Dix and Henry Chadwick, eds., *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome, Bishop and Martyr* (2nd ed. London: SPCK, 1968), has slightly different chapter numbers. Bradshaw, et al., *Apostolic Tradition*, do not reconstruct the text in their translation and commentary, but place each version in side by side columns for the purpose of comparison.

²⁴ John A. Cerrato, “The Association of the Name Hippolytus with a Church Order now Known as the Apostolic Tradition,” *StVTQ* 48 (2004):194, however he is prepared to accept the ascription of the core of the *Trad. ap.* to Hippolytus as genuine.

²⁵This material is missing in the Latin version, which Bradshaw, et al. represents as the earliest layer of the *Trad. ap.*, Bradshaw, et al., *Apostolic Tradition*, 191-192.

²⁶See the criticism of this commentary by Stewart-Sykes, “Quomodo,” *StVTQ* 48 (2004): 233.

²⁷Marcel Metzger, “Nouveles Perspectives pour la Prétendue *Tradition Apostolique*,” *Ecclesia Orans* 5 (1988): 242-259; idem, “Enquêtes Autour de la Prétendue Tradition Apostolique,” *Ecclesia Orans* 9 (1992): 7-36.

²⁸Scholars are divided about the date and provenance of the traditions in this composite document. Reconstructed from several sources, *Trad. ap.* contains a mixture of both eastern and western traditions. This is to be expected in a document preserving traditions of an eastern community of Greek origin in a western context. See Stewart-Sykes, *Apostolic Tradition*, 105 and Brent, “St. Hippolytus,” 207-231. These authors argue that much of *Trad. ap.* derives from Roman practice. Neither argues that either Hippolytus #1 or #2 was alone the author of *Trad. ap.*. Rather, in agreement with Paul F. Bradshaw, “Who Wrote the Apostolic Tradition? A Response to Alistair Stewart-Sykes,” *StVTQ* 48, 2-3 [2004]: 195-206), they argue that *Trad. ap.* is a document of

Trad. ap.,²⁹ and good arguments can be made for the Roman, third-century provenance of several of these traditions. The difficulty, however, is finding much that is certifiably and *exclusively* Roman.³⁰ Methodologically, Bradshaw proceeds on the assumption that most material in the *Trad. ap.* is from the fourth century and not Roman. Material not independently verified as third-century material and only material that can be shown to be exclusively Roman should be considered as of Roman provenance. On the other hand Stewart-Sykes, Brent, and Lampe admit the composite nature of the *Trad. ap.*, but are much more positive that many authentic third-century details reflecting the social setting of the church-school in Rome may be gathered from it.³¹ Given this set of affairs, the most responsible course of action is to bracket the evidence from the *Trad. ap.*, without prejudging its contribution either to the question of the provenance or authorship of *In Cant.* or the rest of the Hippolytan corpus. To leave it aside entirely would be irresponsible, and so judicious use is made of the material throughout this dissertation.

The *Trad. ap.* describes eucharistic celebrations in conjunction with baptism and ordination³² for the regular Sunday Eucharist (*Trad. ap.* 22). This information,

living literature that various communities both eastern and western used and adapted to fit their liturgical needs. While all these scholars admit that certain features of *Trad. ap.* represent Roman practice, Bradshaw is skeptical that any traditions before the fourth century can be derived from the document. Brent and Stewart-Sykes are considerably more positive about the presence of second and third-century traditions and argue that much of *Trad. ap.* derives from Rome in the third century. *Trad. ap.* may only be used with caution as an historical source for certain parts of the Roman Church in the third century.

²⁹See, Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 127-137. Even Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West*, 107, admits, "Latin characteristics are present in the baptismal liturgy of the text." He is inclined to accept the Hippolytan origin of *Trad. ap.*, but denies Hippolytus #2 has any connection with Rome. See John A. Cerrato, "The Association of the Name Hippolytus With a Church Order Now Known as the Apostolic Tradition," *StVTQ* 48 (2004): 536-538.

³⁰Klinghardt, *Mahlfeiern*, 500-521 simply assumes a Roman provenance for the *Trad. ap.*

³¹Stewart-Sykes, *Apostolic Tradition*, 18; Stewart-Sykes, "Quomodo," *StVTQ* 48 (2004): 233-248; Brent, "St. Hippolytus," 207-231; Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 137-150.

³²The information is variously distributed: the Eucharist celebrated in conjunction with the consecration of the bishop is not celebrated until the end of the actual conse-

however, is very unclear, only specifying the regulations for and manner of distribution. Almost nothing of prayers or times of celebration is mentioned.³³ A Eucharist for the sick and the widow's supper³⁴ along with other private meal arrangements take place in the context of the church-school community as well (*Trad. ap.* 28).

The baptismal liturgy, as outlined in the *Trad. ap.*, is particularly interesting as a possible contextualization of the *In Cant.* Baptism, however, is not followed immediately by a full meal. One cannot simply assume that *Trad. ap.* 17-21 provides the outline of events that would have provided the ritual context of *In Cant.* It is a regular baptismal liturgy and not necessarily what was practiced in the Paschal context! One may assume, that something like it took place in conjunction with baptisms held during Easter vigil.

The rituals that provided the context for baptism are described in chapters 17-21:

- Anyone who wants to become a Christian first goes to the bishop, before the community assembles. If accepted he or she receives catechetical instruction from a teacher for three years, but this period may be shorter if the catechumen shows earnest perseverance. When a group of catechumens is chosen for baptism, their past lifestyle is examined. After admittance, they attend daily to hear the gospel, receive the laying on of hands to be exorcised of evil spirits. The bishop only has to perform at least one of the exorcisms. Each Sunday they are also instructed by a teacher and pray apart from the rest of the congregation "in the church-school."³⁵ They do not yet give the kiss of peace, since their kiss is not yet "holy." The women and men pray separately.

cration, then the Eucharist is celebrated with specific forms following for the anaphora gifts. See *Trad. ap.* 9, (Botte, 28.14ff.). The baptismal Eucharist for the baptizand is celebrated followed by a carefully choreographed sharing of ritual food. There is no accompanying prayer form for the eucharistic meal connected with baptism (*Trad. ap.* 21, Botte, 54.14 ff.); the ceremony for the appointment of confessors does not seem to have been provided with a eucharistic celebration" (*Trad. ap.* 9, Botte, 28.14 ff.).

³³Klinghardt, *Mahlfeiern*, 510.

³⁴The Eucharist for the sick is only mentioned in the Ethiopic text and the "widow's supper" is transmitted also in the Latin text (*Trad. ap.* 30 Botte, 74).

³⁵We should imagine for this context a house, like the one in Dura Europos, or perhaps like the house of Marcellus in *Acts of Peter* 19, converted for use as a church. See Stewart-Sykes, *Apostolic Tradition*, 105.

Men are not allowed to greet a woman, and women are to be completely veiled.³⁶

- On Thursday before baptism the candidates bathe themselves; if a woman is menstruating her baptism must be postponed. From Friday onwards the candidates are required to fast.
- On Saturday they assemble with the bishop for prayer, worship, and exorcism. After exorcism, the bishop breathes on them (a sign of the Spirit) and then “seals” their foreheads, ears and noses to keep any demons from returning through these orifices.³⁷
- They spend the night preceding baptism together in vigil, reading Scriptures and listening to instructions. They cannot bring any food with them, except what they have prepared for the communal meal of Eucharist on Sunday morning.
- At cockcrow they come for baptism to the water. Prayers are said over the water. Prayer also consecrates the oil for exorcism and the oil for thanksgiving. Children are baptized first with parents answering for them. Men and women are baptized separately for the sake of modesty, since the candidates remove and discard all their clothes and ornaments, come forward, renounce the devil, his service, and works and are anointed for exorcism. The candidates then enter the water naked, confess faith in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (in answer to three portions of the ancient creed) and are immersed after each confession. Coming up from the water, the newly baptized are anointed with the oil of thanksgiving, dry their bodies, and put on their new clothes.
- After baptism, the new converts come together with the other believers in the assembly hall. The bishop lays his hands on each of them, prays for the Holy Spirit to fill them and anoints them with the solemn pronouncement: “I anoint you with holy oil in God the Father Almighty and Christ Jesus and the Holy Spirit.” He seals their forehead (apparently with the sign of the cross) and gives the kiss of peace.
- The newly baptized are then able to join the faithful in prayer and afterwards exchange the kiss of peace with the other believers. Then they celebrate their first eucharistic meal. The meal starts with thanksgiving over bread and the cup of wine mixed with water, milk mixed with honey, and water. Each element is explained. When the bread is broken, the bishop gives each a

³⁶Tertullian *The Veiling of Virgins* 17 also criticized some women who reduced the size of the veil to a small piece of linen.

³⁷Stewart-Sykes, ed. *Apostolic Tradition*, 109.

fragment with the words “The bread of heaven in Christ Jesus.” Then each of them walks up to the presbyters and deacons to drink from the cups they offer: first water, then milk, and lastly the wine.

- The above summary of events connected with baptism shows that what was likely a full meal in Justin *Apol* 1. 65-67 has now become a “vestigial symposium,”³⁸ held in the morning after baptism.

It has been suggested, that these cups of milk and honey, and of water, which feature along with bread and wine in this baptismal Eucharist of the *Apostolic Tradition*, might be the remnant of a (solid) meal that was also the original setting of a separate ritual of the specifically eucharistic elements of bread and wine.

Consideration of the broader meal evidence suggests in fact that three cups after the main part of a meal is quite to be expected; to use more than one on the Paschal feast is, apart from anything else, an appropriate marker of the occasion. The cups are, therefore, probably a vestigial symposium. The whole of this procedure, including the eucharized bread and the multiple cups, is the Eucharist, the remnant of a meal, rather than two sets of essentially separate acts.³⁹

The *Trad. ap.*, however, also describes an evening eucharistic meal with catechumens present but participating at a different table than the baptized, that is, apparently taking part in a full meal (25-26). The catechumens eat, but only “exorcized bread (i.e. food)” as guests with lower status in the meal (27); “they do not sit at the Lord’s Supper.” This meal is sometimes called the *Lucernarium* (*Trad. ap.* 25⁴⁰), from the opening ceremonial bringing in of a light by a deacon. Tertullian describes a similar tradition in connection with the *Agape* meal in *Apol.* 39. 15. The bishop is not necessarily present at this meal, which may indicate that the meal is a private celebration.⁴¹ If he is present, he greets the community and invites a prayer of thanks to be given.⁴² It includes a prayer of thanks for the light that is distinguished

³⁸Andrew B. McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists: Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals* (OECES; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 110.

³⁹McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists*, 110.

⁴⁰Botte, 64; Bradshaw, et al., *Apostolic Tradition*, 29C.

⁴¹Klinghardt, *Mahlfeiern*, 512.

⁴²The phrase “hearts lifted up [to the Lord]” (*Trad. ap.* 25.6, Botte, 64) is expressly not said, presumably because the blessing of the *light* is not considered part of the eucharistic meal by *Trad. ap.* See Stewart-Sykes, ed. *Apostolic Tradition*, 135. This point is debated. Bradshaw, et al., *Apostolic Tradition*, 159 is non-committal; Ernst Jungklaus, *Die Gemeinde Hippolyts dargestellt nach seiner kirchenordnung* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1928), 106, argues that the entire meal is non-eucharistic. However,

clearly from both the prayer of consecration at the Eucharist for the inauguration of the bishop and the baptismal Eucharist. Next follows the meal. Prayer of thanks for the meal is not mentioned, however. Following the meal, the community arises for prayer.⁴³ After prayer the children and young women sing Psalms (the names of which are not mentioned), a deacon brings a cup of wine mixed with water and recites a *Hallel* Psalm, then either a presbyter or the bishop sing another *Hallel* Psalm after offering the cup of wine with the community responding by saying every “Hallelujah” out loud.⁴⁴

Some scholars, however, are inclined to assume that the text of *Trad. ap.* at this juncture is corrupted, because in this way—as a framework for the course of the meal—the remark “after the psalm is finished” seems incomprehensible. The two possibilities generally arguable are that either the words “after the psalm is finished” refer to the ἀποφορῆτα that is separately blessed and distributed at the end of the meal of *Trad. ap.* 25. This would be unusual, because ἀποφορῆτα are considered remains of the dishes of the food eaten and were already blessed. Or, it could be that

“eucharistic” should be applied to all the elements of the meal or “banquet of God” (in Tertullian’s words) which would include everything considered part of the “offering” (*oblatio*) along with the bread and wine including oil (*Trad. ap.* 5), cheese and olives (*Trad. ap.* 6), water (*Trad. ap.* 21), firstfruits (*Trad. ap.* 31), flowers (*Trad. ap.* 32), the cup offered by catechumens (*Trad. ap.* 26), and the *apophoretum* taken to the poor or those unable to attend the eucharistic meal (*Trad. ap.* 28; 25 Botte, 64).

⁴³Botte, 64.16.

⁴⁴The following remark is very difficult to decipher, that *after* the psalms are sung and the cup is blessed then pieces of bread are distributed to everyone present. The distribution of bread is strange because the meal has already taken place. If, however, one considers that in a symposium part of what comes with the *secunda mensa* or “second table” is a dessert. The dessert consisted of “munchies” which would normally have been salted fruits and nuts, Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 30. Athenaeus comments on the nature of the dessert: “Aristotle in his treatise *On Drunkenness* uses the term “second tables,” even as we have in our text. Thus, ‘In general, dessert [τραγήματα] must be distinguished from the meal in that the one consists of eating, the other of munching [τρογγαλιος]. This last is the traditional word among the Greeks, since they serve the things to be eaten in the form of things to chew [τραγήμα]. Hence the first man to term this a ‘second table’ was probably right; for as a matter of fact the eating of the ‘munchies’ course [τραγηματισμός] makes a kind of subsequent meal, and the ‘munchies’ themselves [τραγήματα] are served as a second dinner (Athenaeus, 14.641d-e, as adapted in Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, 30).”

the remark is not portraying the *end* of the *Lucernarium* meal, but should be considered a provision for the *beginning* of a meal for the community in *Trad. ap. 26*. On this reading, the phrase “after the psalm is finished” would not refer to the Psalms singing *after* the meal, but to the *prayer of thanks* that goes *before* the meal. The Psalm as a blessing at the beginning of a separate meal would make sense, but it is not clear that *Trad. ap. 26* is describing a different meal setting at all. Even though the text differentiates the food given to catechumens and believers (the catechumens consume only “exorcized bread [or food]”), which may simply be a way of referring to the dessert. The difference in status between believers and catechumens in *Trad. ap. 26* is expressed similarly at the first part of the meal (*Trad. ap. 25* Botte, 64, 16). Thus the Eucharist continues right on through as meal and dessert, or second tables, together. Understanding the text in such a way includes the provision that follows in *Trad. ap. 27* (Botte, 68.8), which means that the meal in *Trad. ap. 25* is specifically called “the Lord’s Supper” (*cena dominica*). There the ban on the participation of the catechumens is the same, although stated more comprehensively. It should be understood that the catechumens would be present, but would not participate at the same table, or perhaps in another triclinium, depending on the size and nature of the physical space. Thus there is no difference between the *Lucernarium* and the Eucharist with regard to the participants.⁴⁵

Klinghardt is correct to argue that there is no evidence that the Eucharist would have normally taken place in the morning as the baptismal Eucharist apparently did. Nor is it possible to affirm that there were two separate meetings: one for catechumens and another for the faithful. The Eucharist of baptism takes place in the morning because of the previous night’s vigil, just as it would have occurred during Passover. The separation of catechumens and believers would not require the dismissal of the catechumens, rather it could refer to a dinner taking place at the same time in separate rooms, such as different triclinia.⁴⁶ Based on his reconstruction, however, he is forced to assume that the Eucharist has no reading or Psalms connected with it, and that it is a meal more like that known in 1 Corinthians rather

⁴⁵Klinghardt, *Mahlfeiern*, 511, takes the view that two different meals are described here. However, the general thrust of his argument would be strengthened by noting the progression to dessert rather than assuming two different meals. He says, “It is possible, if not likely, that the regular Sunday Eucharist, in *Trad. ap. 22*, only briefly mentioned, has the identical form as the *Lucernarium*: prayer, supper, singing of Psalms, teaching by the bishop (obviously at the symposium).”

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, 512.

like a “supper club.”⁴⁷ Given the scholastic orientation of the church-school described in *Trad. ap.*, it is more likely that biblical interpretation was a part of the meal, just as it was in the celebration described by Justin and by Philo’s *On the Contemplative Life*. Nevertheless, the baptismal Eucharist points to an arrangement that will become more prevalent in the future.

From a social point of view, the *Trad. ap.* attests a process of momentous changes in the practice of liturgical meal celebrations in the ancient church-school. The evidence of Justin already shows that the president (προεστώς) of the house church-school had the responsibility of collecting and distributing the funds gathered by the church-school at their eucharistic celebrations (*Apol* 1. 64. 7; 67. 5). Justin also remarks, in a much debated passage, that the president “offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability (ὄση δύναμις αὐτῷ), and the people assent, say the [customary] ‘Amen.’” That ability or power to which Justin alludes seems to be more than a mere intellectual power. Instead, it seems to be a pneumatic quality, or grace of the Spirit to represent the Lord Jesus, which he possesses by virtue of his office.⁴⁸ As Klinghardt argues, this passage is best understood as a development of the earlier understanding in the *Didache* 10:7, in which the prophets are given freedom to conduct the blessing of the Eucharist “as they wish” (Τοῖς δὲ προφήταις ἐπιτρέπετε εὐχαριστεῖν, ὅσα θέλουσιν.) in accordance with the prophetic spirit. Nevertheless, Justin only has a two-fold ministry order, προεστώς and διάκονοι.

By the time of the *Trad. ap.*, however, the orders of bishop, presbyter, and deacon are clearly understood as normative. In *Trad. ap.* 9, the bishop is empowered to pronounce a eucharistic blessing “*secundum potestatem suam*”⁴⁹ without having to follow a prescribed prayer. That is, he has liberty of expression. Just as in *Didache* 10:7, the problem of why some pray according to a set form and others extemporaneously is resolved according to the gift of the Spirit that each one possesses, since the bishop has, in accordance with the blessing of consecration, “the power of the high priestly Spirit.” Among other things, this gift enables him to present the offerings as “fragrant and well pleasing” (*Trad. ap.* 3. 5).

Just as in Justin *Apol.* 1. 65-67, the προεστώς leads the prayers over the Eucharist and distributes the gifts to the poor, in the *Trad. ap.* a similar function falls to the bishop. The role of the bishop and deacon is a problem, since the deacon may take the place of the bishop on certain occasions. Thus, as the Eucharist developed, official church-school leaders, as representatives of the Lord Christ, became the

⁴⁷Ibid., 513.

⁴⁸Ibid., 505.

⁴⁹Botte, *Tradition apostolique*, 28.

mediators or brokers of patronage between wealthy members of the church-school and those with less status. Thus *Trad. ap.* 27-29 may provide evidence concerning the complex social relations in the practice of the eucharistic meal in the third century.

The text (*Trad. ap.* 28) portrays the social difficulties involving the acceptance of dinner invitations among members of the church-school and the patronage that such invitations naturally implied.⁵⁰ Common Roman dining customs are operative in which clients of lesser status hope⁵¹ for an invitation to dinner or at least a food gift as consolation, failing to receive an invitation to a dinner.⁵² This fact is especially noteworthy in the light of the characterization by Lampe of the earlier Pauline Eucharist as an *eranos* “pot luck” meal.⁵³ The reciprocity of patronage relationships sustained through invitations to dinner (as conceived in the *Trad. ap.*) could be seen as a potential threat to the status and leadership role of the religious professionals represented by the bishop, presbyters, and deacons. Nevertheless, the *Trad. ap.* emphasizes the respect and gratitude owed to the patron while at the same time denying him or her the absolute leadership of the feast. Thus, “we can see in the text itself the process whereby [the wealthy members] are being replaced by church-school authority.”⁵⁴ Nevertheless, the meal is still called the Lord’s Supper and the oblation, indicating it is a eucharistic meal held in the household context. The interests of the *Trad. ap.* lie in regulating but not entirely suppressing these meals. Rather, *Trad. ap.* uses association of these meals with the Eucharist to inject the participation of official church-school leaders. The church-school leaders cannot stop these meals because they were an important means of supporting the poor. Nevertheless, they are the only ones allowed to “perform the blessing” (*benedictionem facere*), meaning that they either pronounce the blessing over the meal and the wine or they were in charge of the distribution of food or both. That is, individual patrons are denied key leadership roles which transformed an ordinary event of social patronage into a sacred ritual of the church-school, the *Lord’s Supper*.

⁵⁰Bobertz, “Role of Patron in the *Cena Dominica* of Hippolytus,” 170-184.

⁵¹The desire for dinner invitations is a *topos* of symposium satire (Athenaeus 1.4-8); see L. R. Shero, “The *Cena* in Roman Satire,” CP 18 (1923): 126-30 for descriptions of dinner parties as lampooned by the Roman satirists.

⁵²The word used in *Trad. ap.* is a Latinized Greek term, *apoforetum*. Bobertz, “Role of Patron in the *Cena Dominica* of Hippolytus,” 171, 180-2.

⁵³Peter Lampe, “The Eucharist: Identifying with Christ on the Cross,” *Int* 48 (1994): 36 - 49.

⁵⁴Osiek and Balch, *Families in the New Testament World*, 211.

Thus patrons (including presbyter-patrons) are in the process of losing control over the celebration of the Eucharist in favor of the bishop, who is patron to all and broker between those of differing status in the church-school. Indeed, his role as arbitrator was likely one of the more important religious goods provided by the church-school in the open market of religious goods and services of the time. One whole chapter of the *In Cant.* is dedicated to an encomium of the Lord's Supper, represented by the "couch" or κλίνη of Solomon and Christ. At that feast come rich and poor alike to take part in the blessings of Christ.

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources

- Ambrose. *Expositio Psalmi Cxviii: Pars V*. Ambrosius. Opera: Ambrosius 5. Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1999.
- Ambrose. *Des sacrements*. SC 25. Edited by Bernard Botte. Paris: Cerf, 1961.
- Brock, Sebastian. "Some New Syriac Texts Attributed to Hippolytus." *Le Museon* 94.1-2 (1981): 177-200.
- Clement of Alexandria. *Clemens Alexandrinus*. Edited by Otto Stählin. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten drei Jahrhunderte 12.1. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1905.
- Chronicon Paschale*. Edited by Dindorfius, Ludovicus. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantina 1. 1832.
- Cornutus. *Theologiae graecae compendium*. Edited by Carol Lang. Leipzig: Teubner, 1881.
- Diehl, Ernst, Jacques Moreau, and Henri Irénée Marrou, eds. *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*. Berolini: Apud Weidmannos, 1925.
- Diogenes, Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Edited by Robert Drew Hicks. London New York: W. Heinemann G.P. Putnam's sons, 1925.
- Egeria. *Egeria: Diary of a Pilgrimage*. Ancient Christian Writers. Edited by S.T.D. Walter, J. Burghardt Johannes Quasten, S.J. and Thomas Comerford Lawler. Translated by George E. Gingras. Newman Press, 1970.
- Frey, Jean Baptiste. *Corpus of Jewish Inscriptions: Jewish Inscriptions From the Third Century B.C. To the Seventh Century A.D.* The Library of Biblical Studies. New York: Ktav Pub House, 1975.
- Gellius, Aulus. *The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius*. Loeb Classical Library, 195; 200; 212. Edited by John C. Rolfe. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960.

- Hippolytus. *Epigrafia greca iv. Epigrafi sacre pagane e cristiane*. Edited by Margherita Guarducci. Rome: Istituto Poligrafico, 1978.
- Hippolytus. *Hippolytus Werke*. Volume 4. Second edition. Edited by R. Helm (post A. Bauer). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1955; Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 46.
- Hippolytus. *Commentaire sur Daniel*. Sources Chrétiennes 14. Introduction by Gustave Bardy. Text and translation by Maurice Lefèvre. Paris: Cerf, 1947.
- Hippolytus. *Contra Noetum*. Heythrop Monographs 2. Edited and translated with introduction by Robert Butterworth. London: Heythrop College, University of London, 1977.
- Hippolytus. *Hippolyte De Rome Sur Les Bénédictiones D'isaac, De Jacob Et De Moïse*. Volume Patrologia orientalis, 27, fascimilie 1-2 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1954).
- Hippolytus. *Hippolyt's kleinere exegetische und homiletische Schriften*. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 1.2. Edited by Hans Achelis. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897.
- Hippolytus. "Hippolyt's Kommentar zum Hohenlied auf Grund von N. Marrs Ausgabe des Grusisinischen Textes." *Texte und Untersuchungen*, NF 8.2c (1902): 1-108 *Texte und Untersuchungen*, NF. Text and translation by Nathaniel G. Bonwetsch.
- Hippolytus [pseudo-Justin Martyr/Athenagorus]. *De resurrectione*. Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi. Volume 3. Third edition. Otto, J.C.T. Jena: Mauke, 1879, Reprinted 1971.
- Hippolytus. *La tradition apostolique de Saint Hippolyte: essai de reconstitution*. *Litigiewissenschaftliche Quellen and Forschungen* 39. Edited by Bernard Botte. Translated by Bernard Botte. 3. Aufl. ed. Münster Westfalen: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966.
- Hippolytus. *La tradition apostolique d'après les anciennes versions*. Sources chrétiennes 11. Edited by Bernard Botte. 2e éd. rev ed. Paris: Cerf, 1984.
- Hippolytus. *On the Apostolic Tradition*. Edited by Alistair Stewart-Sykes. Popular

- Patristics Series. Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001.
- Hippolytus. *Refutatio omnium haeresium*. Patristische Texte und Studien. Volume 25. Edited by Miroslav Marcovich. Berlin; New York: W. De Gruyter, 1986.
- Hippolytus. *Sur Les Benedictions d'isaac, De Jacob et De Moise*. Patrologia orientalis 27. Edited by Louis Maries, B. Ch Mercier, and Maurice Briere. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1954.
- Hippolytus. *Traité d'Hippolyte sur David et Goliath, sur le Cantique des cantiques et sur l'Antéchrist*. Edited by Gérard Garitte. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalis; Scriptorum Iberici 15 263. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1965.
- Hippolytus. *Traité d'Hippolyte sur David et Goliath, sur le Cantique des cantiques et sur l'Antéchrist*. Edited and translated into Latin by Gérard Garitte. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalis; Scriptorum Iberici 15 264. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1965.
- [Hippolytus]. *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome, Bishop and Martyr*. 2nd ed. London: SPCK, 1968.
- Iamblichus. *On the Pythagorean Way of Life*. Edited by John M. Dillon, and Jackson Hershbell, P. Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Garitte, Gérard, ed. *Traité d'Hippolyte sur David et Goliath, sur le Cantique des cantiques et sur l'Antéchrist*. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalis; Scriptorum Iberici 15 263. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1965.
- , ed. *Traité d'Hippolyte sur David et Goliath, sur le Cantique des cantiques et sur l'Antéchrist*. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalis; Scriptorum Iberici 16 266. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1965.
- . "Une Nouvelle Source du 'De Fide; Géorgien Attribué à Hippolyte.'" *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 63.3-4 (1968): 835-48.
- Les Constitutions Apostoliques*. Sources chrétiennes 320, 329, 336. Edited by Marcel Metzger. Paris: Cerf, 1985.
- Lucian and A. M Harmon. *Lucian*. LCL. 8 volumes. Cambridge, Mass London: Harvard University Press, 1959.

- Mommsen, Theodor “Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae ad C. Caesaris mortem.”
Editio altera pars prior. Berlin: George Reimer 1893, 254-79.
- _____ “Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae ad C. Caesaris mortem,” editio altera pars
prior. Berlin: George Reimer, 1893, 254-79.
- Mileto of Sardis. *Meliton de Sardes: Sur la Pâque et fragments*. Sources chrétiennes
123. Edited by Othmar Perler. Paris: Cerf, 1966.
- Origen. *Commentary on the Gospel according to John Books 13-32*. The Fathers of
the Church 89. Edited and translated by Ronald E. Heine. Washington, D.C:
Catholic University of America Press, 1993.
- Origen. *Contra Celsum*. Edited by Henry Chadwick. New York: Cambridge
University Press, 1980.
- Patrologia graeca. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857–1886.
- Patrologia latina. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 217 vols. Paris, 1844–1864.
- Plutarch, *Moralia*. Loeb classical library. Volume 2. Translated and edited by Frank
C. Babbitt. London New York: W. Heinemann G. Putnam’s, 1927.
- Ovid. *Fasti*. Edited by Roger D. Woodard, and A. J. Boyle. London: Penguin, 2000.
- Prott, Hans Theodor Anton von, and Ludwig Ziehen. *Leges Graecorum Sacrae e
Titulis Collectae, Ediderunt et Explanaverunt Ioannis de Prott, Ludovicus
Ziehen. 2*. Lipsiae: Teubner, 1896.
- Robinson, James McConkey, ed. *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. Third
completely revised edition. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.
- Richard, Marcel. “Quelques Nouveaux Fragment de Pères.” Pages 3 v in *Opera
Minora*. 1. Turnhout: Brepols, 1976.
- Richard, Marcel, Ed. *Asterii Sophistae, Commentariorum in Psalmos Quae Supersunt
Accendunt Aliquot Homiliae Anonymae*. Oslo: Brøgger, 1956.
- Roberts, Alexander, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe. *The Apostolic
Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*. The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the
Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325 1. American reprint of the Edinburgh

edition ed. Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmanns, 1978.

Schenke, Hans-Martin, Hans-Gebhard Bethge, and Ursula U. Kaiser. *Nag Hammadi Deutsch: Studienausgabe. Eingeleitet und Übersetzt von Mitgliedern des Berliner Arbeitskreises für Koptisch-Nostische Schriften* (Gruyter-. Schriften (De Gruyter Texte). Gruyter, 2007.

Scourfield, J. H. D, and Jerome. *Consoling Heliodorus: A Commentary on Jerome, Letter 60*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford New York: Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, 1993.

Seneca, Lucius Annaeus and John W Basore. *Moral Essays*. The Loeb classical library. London: Heinemann, 1928.

Simplicius. *Commentaire Sur Les Catégories*. Edited by Ilsetraut Hadot. *Philosophia antiqua*. Volumes 50-51. New York: E. J. Brill, 1989.

Tcherikover, Victor, and Alexander Fuks. *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*. Cambridge, MA: Published for the Magnes Press, Hebrew University [by] Harvard University Press, 1957.

Zahn, Theodor. *Der Evangeliencommentar des Theophilus von Antiochien*. Forschungen Zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons und der Altkirchlichen Literatur. Erlangen: Deichert, 1883.

Secondary Sources

Abraham, William J. *Canon and Criterion in Christian Theology: From the Fathers to Feminism*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2002.

Achelis, Hans. *Hippolytstudien*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, Band 16, Heft 4 (neue Folge, 1 Bd., Hft. 4). Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897.

Aichelle, George. *The Control of Biblical Meaning: Canon as Semiotic Mechanism*. Trinity Press International, 2001.

Altmann, Alexander. *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations*. Vol. 1906.

Studies and Texts 3. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Andrei, Osvalda. "L'esamerone cosmico e le *Chronographiae* di Giulio Africano." Pages 169-83 in *Atti del XXIII Incontro di studiosi dell'Antichità cristiana: Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 50. Rome: Instituto Patristico Augustinianum, 1994.

———. "La formazione di un modulo storiografico cristiano: dall'esamerone cosmico alle *Chronographiae* di Giulio Africano." *Aevum* 69 (1995): 147-70.

Aune, David E. "Heraclès and Christ: Heraclès Imagery in the Christology of Early Christianity." Pp. 3-19 in *Greeks, Romans and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. Ed. David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Balch, David L. *Roman Domestic Art and Early House Churches*. WUNT 228. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Balch, David L., Everett Ferguson and Wayne Meeks, eds. *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. Fortress Press, 1991.

Baldovin, John F. "Hippolytus and the Apostolic Tradition: Recent Research and Commentary." *Theological Studies* 64.3 (2003): 520-42.

Bammel, Caroline P. "The State of Play With Regard to Hippolytus and the Contra Noetum." *Heythrop Journal* 31 (1990): 195-99.

Bardy, Gustave. "Le écoles romaines du second siècle." *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* (1927): 501-32.

Bardy, Gustave and Maurice Lefèvre eds. *Hippolyte. Commentaire sur Daniel*. Sources Chrétiennes 14. Introduction by Gustave Bardy. Text and translation by Maurice Lefèvre. Paris: Cerf, 1947.

Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft, and Gerhard Krodel. Translated by Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel. First paperback edition. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

Bautz, Freidrich William. "Bibliographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexicon." 2 (1990): 888-93. Online: <http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/h/hippolytos.shtml>.

- Beauvoir, Simone de, and H. M. Parshley. *The Second Sex*. New York: A.A. Knopf, 1953.
- Becker, W. A, and Karl Friedrich Hermann. *Charikles. Bilder Altgriechischer Sitte, Zur Genauerem Kenntniss der Griechischen Privatlebens*. Leipzig: F. Fleischer, 1854.
- Bertonière, Gabriel. *The Cult Center of the Martyr Hippolytus on the Via Tiburtina*. Bar International Series 260. Oxford, England: B.A.R, 1985.
- Bisconti, Fabrizio. *Temi di Iconografia Paleocristiana*. Sussidi allo studio delle antichità cristiane; 13. Città del Vaticano: Pontificio istituto di archeologia cristiana, 2000.
- Bitzer, Lloyd. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 1-14.
- Blumenfield, Bruno. "Classical and Hellenistic Sources for a Political Paul." Ph. D. diss., Columbia University, 1997.
- Bobertz, Charles A. "The Role of Patron in the *Cena Dominica* of Hippolytus' Apostolic Tradition." *Journal of Theological Studies* 44.1 (1993): 170-84.
- Bokser, Baruch M. *The Origins of the Seder: The Passover Rite and Early Rabbinic Judaism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Bonwetsch, G. Nathanael. "Studien Zu den Kommentaren Hippolyts zum Buche Daniel und Hohen Liede." *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*. Volume 16.2 (Neue Folge, 1.Bd., Hft.2). Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897.
- . "Hippolyts Kommentar zum Hohenlied auf Grund von N. Marrs Ausgabe des Grusisinischen Textes." *Texte und Untersuchungen*, NF 8.2c (1902): 1-108.
- Botte, Bernard. "Le Baptême dans l'Eglise Syrienne," *L'Orient Syrien* 1 (1956): 135-54.
- . *La Tradition Apostolique de Saint Hippolyte: Essai de Reconstitution*. Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen; Heft 39. 3. Aufl. ed. Münster Westfalen: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966.
- , ed. *La Tradition apostolique: d'après les anciennes versions*. 2. éd ed.

Sources Chrétiennes 11. Paris: Cerf, 1968.

Boyarin, Daniel. *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*. Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Bradley, Keith. "The Roman Family At Dinner." Pages 36-55 in *Meals in a Social Context: Aspects of the Communal Meal in the Hellenistic and Roman World*. Edited by Inge Nielsen, and Hanne Nielsen. Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity 1. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1998.

Bradshaw, Paul F. "Redating the *Apostolic Tradition*: Some Preliminary Steps." Pages 3-17 in *Rule of Prayer, Rule of Faith: Essays in Honor of Aidan Kavanagh*, Osb. Edited by John Baldovin, and Nathan Michell. Collegville, MN: Pueblo Liturgical Press, 1996.

———. *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

———. "Other Acts of Worship." Pages 61-3 in *Essays on Hippolytus*. Edited by Paul F. Bradshaw, Edward Charles Whitaker, and G. J. Cuming. Grove Liturgical Series 15. Bramcote, Notts: Grove books, 1978.

———. "Diem Baptismo Sollemniorem!: Initiation and Easter in Christian Antiquity." Pages 41-51 in *Eulogéma: Studies in Honor of Rober Taft, S. J.* Edited by E. Carr, S. Parenti, and A. A. Thiermeyer. Rome: 1993.

———. "Jewish Influence on Early Christian Liturgy: A Reappraisal." (2008): Cited 07-01. Online: <http://jcrelations.net/en/?area=Articles>.

Bradshaw, Paul F, and Lawrence A Hoffman. *Passover and Easter: The Symbolic Structuring of Sacred Seasons*. Two liturgical traditions; v. 6. Notre Dame, Ind: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999.

Bradshaw, Paul F, Maxwell E. Johnson, L. Edward Phillips, and Harold W. Attridge. *The Apostolic Tradition: A Commentary*. Heremeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2002.

Bradshaw, Paul F. "Who Wrote the Apostolic Tradition? A Response to Alistair Stewart-Sykes." *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 48.2-3 (2004): 195-206.

Braund, David and John Wilkins, eds. *Athenaeus And His World: Reading Greek*

Culture in the Roman Empire. Classical Studies and Ancient History. University of Exeter Press, 2000.

Brent, Allen. *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension Before the Emergence of a Monarch-Bishop*. Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*; v. 31. Leiden; New York; Köln: E. J. Brill, 1995.

_____. "St. Hippolytus, Biblical Exegete, Roman Bishop, and Martyr." *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 48.2-3 (2004): 207-31.

_____. "Review of: *Hippolytus between East and West: The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus*." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55 (2004): 342-43.

Brock, Sebastian. "Studies in the Early History of the Syrian Orthodox Baptismal Liturgy." *Journal of Theological Studies* 23 (1972): 16-64.

_____. "Studies in the Early History of the Syrian Orthodox Baptismal Liturgy." *Studia Liturgica* 12 (1977): 177-83.

_____. "The transition to a post-baptismal anointing in the Antiochene rite," in *The Sacrifice of Praise: Studies in honour of A.H. Couratin* (ed. B. Spinks; Ephemerides Liturgicae, Subsidia 19, 1981), 215-25.

_____. *The Holy Spirit in the Syrian Baptismal Tradition*. Gorgias Press Studies 4. Piscataway, NJ: 1979.

_____. "Some New Syriac Texts Attributed to Hippolytus." *Le Museon* 94.1-2 (1981): 177-200.

Brown, Peter Robert Lamont. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. Lectures on the history of religions; new ser., no. 13. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

Burkert, Walter. *Greek Religion*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.

_____. *Ancient Mystery Cults*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Butterworth, Robert. *Contra Noetum*. Heythrop Monographs 2. London: Heythrop College, University of London, 1977.

Cantalamessa, Raniero. *L'omelia in S. Pascha dello Pseudo-Ippolito di Roma*.

Ricerche sulla Teologia Dell'asia Minore Nella Seconda Metà Del Ii Secolo.
Milano: Vita e pensiero, 1967.

Cantalamessa, Raniero, James M. Quigley, and Joseph T. Lienhard, eds. *Easter in the Early Church: an Anthology of Jewish and Early Christian Texts.* Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1993.

Carcopino, Jérôme, Henry T. Rowell, E. O. Lorimer, and Mary Beard. *Daily Life in Ancient Rome: The People and the City At the Height of the Empire.* Yale Nota bene. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Carpenter, Thomas H., and Christopher A. Faraone, eds. *Masks of Dionysus.* Myth and Poetics. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Carter, Warren. *Households and Discipleship: A Study of Matthew 19-20.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement series; 103. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1994.

———. *The Roman Empire and the New Testament: An Essential Guide.* Abingdon Essential Guides Abingdon Essential Guides. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2006.

———. *John and Empire: Initial Explorations.* Continuum International Publishing Group, 2008.

———. "Vulnerable Power: The Roman Empire Challenged By the Early Christians." Pages 453-88 in *Handbook of Early Christianity: Social Science Approaches.* Edited by Anthony J. Blasi, Jean Duhaime, and Paul-André Turcotte. Walnut Creek, CA; Oxford: AltaMira Press, 2002.

Dal Covolo, E. "I Severi e il Cristianesimo: un Decenio di Ricerche (1986-1996)." *Augustinianum* 8 (1999): 43-51.

Cerrato, John A. *Hippolytus between East and West: The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus.* Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.

———. "The Association of the Name Hippolytus with a Church Order now known as the Apostolic Tradition." *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 48 (2004): 179-94.

- Chapa, Juan. *Letters of Condolence in Greek Papyri*. Papyrologica Florentina; v. 29. Firenze: Edizione Gonnelli, 1998.
- Chappuzeau, Gertrud. "Die Auslegung des Hohenliedes durch Hippolyt von Rom." *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 19 (1976): 45-81.
- Chappuzeau, Gertrude. "Die Exegese von Hohelied 1, 2 A.B und 7 bei den Dirchenvätern von Hippolyt bis Bernhard. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis von Allegorie und Analogie." *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 18 (1975): 90-143.
- Chesnut, Glenn F. "The Ruler and the *Logos* in Neopythagorean, Middle Platonic and Late Stoic Political Philosophy." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 16.2:1310-32. Part 2 Principat, *Principat*, 16.2. Edited by H. Temporini, and W. Haase.
- Childers, Jeff. "Funerary Practices." Pages 443-44 in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. Second edition. Edited by Everett Ferguson. New York: Garland, 1999.
- Chin, Catherine M. "Through the Looking Glass Darkly: Jerome Inside the Book." Pages 101-16 in *The Early Christian Book*. Edited by William E. Klingshirn, and Linda Safran. CUA Studies in Early Christianity. Washington, D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 2007.
- Christ, Alice. Review of Catherine Brown Tkacz, *The Key to the Brescia Casket: Typology and the Early Christian Imagination*. *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 11.2 (2003): 249-50.
- Church, F. Forrester. "Sex and Salvation in Tertullian." *The Harvard Theological Review* 68.2 (1975): 83-101.
- Clark, Elizabeth. "Ideology, History, and the Construction of 'Woman'." Pages 155-84 in *A People's History of Christianity*. Vol. 2. Edited by Virginia Burrus. Late Ancient Christianity. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- , ed. *Ascetic Piety and Women's Faith: Essays on Late Ancient Christianity*. Studies in Women and Religion 20. Lewiston: Mellon Press, 1986.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn*.

- Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Clarke, John R. *The Houses of Roman Italy, 100 B.C.-A.D. 250: Ritual, Space, and Decoration*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Otto Stählin. *Clemens Alexandrinus*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten drei Jahrhunderte 12.1. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1905.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. "Judaism to the Mishnah: 135-220." Pages 194-223 in *Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism*. Edited by Harold Shanks. Washington, D.C.: 1992.
- Connolly, R. H. "Eusebius H. E. V. 28." *Journal of Theological Studies* 49 (1948): 73-9.
- Conybeare, Catherine. "Tertullian on Flesh, Spirit, and Wives." Pages 430-9 in *Severan Culture*. Edited by Simon Swain, Stephen Harrison, and Jas' Elsner. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Cribiore, Raffaella. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Cunningham, Mary B, and Pauline Allen. *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*. New history of the sermon; v. 1. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1998.
- D'Anna, Alberto, ed. *Pseudo-Giustino. Sulla Resurrezione: Discorso cristiano del II secolo*. Brescia: Editrice Morcelliana, 2001.
- D'Arms, J. H. "Slaves At Roman *Convivia*." Pages 171-83 in *Dining in a Classical Context*. Edited by William J. Slater. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991.
- Daniélou, Jean. *The Bible and the Liturgy*. Notre Dame, Ind: University of Notre Dame Press, 1956.
- . *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*. Translated by Austin, John. London Philadelphia: Darton, Longman & Todd Westminster Press, 1973.
- . *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres Supplement*. Berolini: Apud

Weidmannos, 1967.

Denzey, Nicola. *The Bone Gatherers: The Lost Worlds of Early Christian Women*. Beacon Press, 2008.

Dix, Gregory, and Henry Chadwick, eds. *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome, Bishop and Martyr*. 2nd ed. London: SPCK, 1968.

Döllinger, Johann Joseph Ignaz von. *Hippolytus and Callistus; Or, the Church of Rome in the First Half of the Third Century, With Special Reference to the Writings of Bunsen, Wordsworth, Baur, and Gieseler*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1876.

Doval, Alexis James. *Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogue: the Authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses*. Patristic Monograph Series; volume 17. Washington, D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 2001.

Drijvers, Jan Willem. *Cyril Of Jerusalem: Bishop And City* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae). Brill Academic Publishers, 2004.

Elliott, J. K. *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2005.

Ernst, Allie M. "Martha from the Margins: An Examination of Early Christian Traditions about Martha." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Queensland, 2006.

Fähnrich, Heinz, and Zurab Sarjveladze. *Altgeorgisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Lexicographia orientalis. Vol. 5. Hamburg: H. Buske Verlag, 1999.

Felber, Heinz, Schmitt-Pantel, Pauline and Binder, Gerhard. "Banquet." *Brill's New Pauly* (2005): Electronic encycloedia. <http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=bnp_e230040. Cited 08-08. Online: <http://www.paulyonline.brill.nl>.

Felber, Heinz, Wiesehöfer, Josef and Wagner-Hasel, Beate. "Hospitality." *Brill's New Pauly* (2005): Electronic encycloedia. <http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=bnp_e230040. Cited 08-08. Online: <http://www.paulyonline.brill.nl>.

Feldman, Louis H. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World Attitudes and Interactions From Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Ferguson, Everett, ed. *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. Second edition. New York: Routledge, 1997.

_____. "Catechesis, Catechetical Instruction." *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. Second edition. Edited by Everett Ferguson. New York: Garland, 1999.

Ferguson, Everett. "Wine as a Table-Drink in the Ancient World." *Restoration Quarterly* 13.3 (1970): 141-53.

_____. "Irenaeus' Proof of the apostolic Preaching and Early Christian Catechesis," *Studia Patristica* 18.3 (1989): 119-140.

_____. "Justin Martyr and the Liturgy." *Restoration Quarterly* 36 (1994): 267-78.

_____. *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003.

Fine, Steven. *Art and Judaism in the Greco-Roman World: Toward a New Jewish Archaeology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Finn, Thomas. "Agape (Love Feast)." Pages 16-17 in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. Second edition. Edited by Everett Ferguson. New York: Garland, 1999.

Fitzgerad, John T, ed. *The Function of Friendship Language in Philippians 4:10-20*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 82 Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament. Leiden/New York/Köln: E. J. Brill, 1996.

Fowler, David B, L. Gregory Bloomquist, and Duane Frederick Watson, eds. *Fabrics of Discourse: Essays in Honor of Vernon K. Robbins*. Harrisburg, PA; London: Trinity Press International, 2003.

Frickel, Josef. *Das Dunkel um Hippolyt von Rom: ein Lösungsversuch; die Schriften Elenchos und Contra Noëtum*. Grazer Theologische Studien 13. Graz: Institut für Ökumenische Theologie und Patrologie an der Universität Graz, 1988.

_____. "Ippolito di Roma, Scrittore E. Martire." *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 30 (1989): 23-41 Nuove ricerche su Ippolito.

_____. "Hippolyts Schrift Contra Noetum: Ein Pseudo-Hippolyt." Pages 87-123 in

- Logos: Festschrift für Luise Abramowski*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993.
- Friedheim, Emmanuel. "Who Are the Deities Concealed Behind the Rabbinic Expression 'a Nursing Female Image'?" *Harvard Theological Review* 96.2 (2003): 239-50.
- Führer, Arnold. *Tod, Trauer und Trost in Ciceros Tusculanischen Schriften und Malebranches Schrift Entretien Sur la Mort: Eine Phänomenologische Untersuchung*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2002.
- Gamble, Harry. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. Yale University Press, 1997.
- Gonnet, Dominique. "La Pâque de Pères de L'église." *La Maison-Dieu* 240 (2004): 33-57.
- Gonzalez, Justo L. *Christian Thought Revisited: Three Types of Theology*. Orbis Books (USA), 1999.
- Goodenough, Erwin R. "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship." *Yale Classical Studies* 1 (1928): 55-101.
- Gorman, Michael J. *Elements of Biblical Exegesis: A Basic Guide for Students and Ministers*. Hendrickson Publishers, 2001.
- Gould, Graham. "Hippolytus between East and West: The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus." *Journal of Theological Studies* 54 (2003): 312-14.
- Gregg, Robert C. *Consolation Philosophy. Vol. 3 Patristic Monograph Series*. Cambridge, MA: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1975.
- Guarducci, Margherita. "La 'Statua di Sant Ippolito e la Sua Provenienza.'" *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito. Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 30 (1989): 61-74.
- . "Valentiniani a Roma." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen archäologischen Instituts* 80 (1973): 169-89.
- . "La Statua di 'Sant'ippolito.'" Pages 17-30, 164 in *Recerche Su Ippolito. Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 13. Roma: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1977.

- Gutsfel, Andreas. "Cena." *Brill's New Pauly* (2005): Electronic encycloedia. <http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=bnp_e230040. Cited 08-08. Online: <http://www.paulyonline.brill.nl>.
- . "Meals." *Brill's New Pauly* (2005): Electronic encycloedia. <http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=bnp_e230040. Cited 08-08. Online: <http://www.paulyonline.brill.nl>.
- Hadot, Ilsetraut. *Simplicius: Commentaire Sur Les Catégories*. Philosophia antiqua, v. 50-51. New York: E. J. Brill, 1989.
- Hamman, Adabert G. "Valeur et Signification des Renseignements Liturgiques de Justin." *Studia Patristica* 13 (1975): 364-74.
- Hanson, K. C. and Douglas E. Oakman. *Palestine in the Time of Jesus: Social Structures and Social Conflicts*. Fortress Press, 2008.
- Hanssens, Jean Michel. *La Liturgie d'Hippolyte: Ses Documents, son Titulaire, Ses Origines et son Caractère*. Orientalia Christiana analecta; 155. Second edition. photolithographique ed. Roma: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1965.
- Harl, Kenneth W. *Coinage in the Roman Economy, 300 B.C. To A.D. 700*. Ancient society and history. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Harland, Philip. *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- . "Connections With Elites in the World of Early Christianity." Pages 385-408 in *Vulnerable Power*. Edited by Anthony J. Blasi, Jean Duhaime, and Paul-André Turcotte. Walnut Creek, CA; Oxford: AltaMira Press, 2002.
- Harnack, Adolf Von, and Kurt Aland. *Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur Bis Eusebius*. 2. erweiterte Aufl., mit einem Vorwort von Kurt Aland ed. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1958.
- Harvey, William Wigan, ed. *Sancti Irenaei, episcopi Lugdunensis, Libros quinque adversus haereses*. Cantabrigiae: Typis Academicis, 1857.
- Heeren, John. "Another View of Easter and Passover." *American Sociological Review* 49 (1984): 581-82.

- Heimgartner, Martin, and Pseudo-Justinus. *Pseudojustin, über die Auferstehung: Text und Studie*. Patristische Texte und Studien; Bd. 54. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.
- Heine, Ronald. "Hippolytus, Ps.-Hippolytus and the Early Canons." in *Hippolytus, Ps.-Hippolytus and the Early Canons*. Edited by Frances Young, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Beard, Mary and John Henderson. *Classical Art: From Greece to Rome*. Oxford History of Art Series. Oxford University Press, USA, 2001.
- Hill, Charles E. "Hades of Hippolytus Or Tartarus of Tertullian: The Authorship of the Fragment De Universo." *Vigiliae christianae* 43.2 (1989): 105-26.
- Holloway, Paul A. *Consolation in Philippians*. Society for New Testament Studies 112 Monograph series. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Jensen, Robin Margaret. *Understanding Early Christian Art*. London ; New York: Routledge, 2000.
- . *Face to Face: Portraits of the Divine in Early Christianity*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2005.
- Johann, Horst-Theodor. *Trauer und Trost; Eine Quellen- und Strukturanalytische Untersuchung der philosophischen Trostschriften über den Tod*. München: W. Fink, 1968.
- John, Chrysostom. *Catecheses Baptismales = Taufkatechesen*. Fontes Christiani 6. Edited by Reiner Kaczynski. Freiburg; New York: Herder, 1992.
- Johnson, Maxwell E. *The Rites of Christian Initiation: Their Evolution and Interpretation*. Revised and expanded ed. Liturgical Press, 2007.
- Jones, Cheslyn, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold, eds. *The Study of Liturgy*. Revised edition ed. London: SPCK, 1978.
- Jungklaus, Ernst. *Die Gemeinde Hippolyts Dargestellt nach Seiner Kirchenordnung*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1928.
- Kennedy, George Alexander. *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical*

- Criticism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- . *Classical Rhetoric & Its Christian & Secular Tradition From Ancient to Modern Times*. 2nd ed., rev. and enl ed. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- Kienast, Dietma. *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer Römischen Kaiserchronologie*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990.
- Kimelman, Reuven. "Rabbi Yokhanan and Origen on the Song of Songs: A Third-Century Jewish-Christian Disputation." *The Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980): 567-95.
- Kirchner, Johannes, ed. *Decrees and Sacred Laws*. 2 ed. Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriores, 3. Berlin: 1913.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. *The Religious Context of Early Christianity: A Guide to Graeco-Roman Religions*. Studies of the New Testament and its world. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000.
- Klinghardt, Matthias. *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft: Soziologie und Liturgie Frühchristlicher Mahlfeiern*. Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter; 13. Tübingen; Basel: Francke Verlag, 1996.
- Kraeling, Carl H. and C. Bradford Welles. *The Christian Building*. The Excavations at Dura-Europos: Final Report 8.2. New Haven : Locust Valley, N.Y: Dura-Europus Publications, distributed by J. J. Augustin, 1967.
- Krause, Martin, and Pahor Labib. *Gnostische und Hermetische Schriften Aus Codex II und Codex VI*. Glückstadt: J. J. Augustin, 1971.
- La Piana, George. "The Roman Church At the End of the Second Century: The Episcopate of Victor, the Latinization of the Roman Church, the Easter Controversy, Consolidation of Power and Doctrinal Development, the Catacomb of Callistus." *Harvard Theological Review* 18.3 (1925): 201-77.
- Lacugna, Catherine M. *God for Us: The Trinity and Christian Life*. HarperOne, 1993.
- Lampe, G. W. H. *The Seal of the Spirit: A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers*. S.P.C.K. Paperbacks. 2nd

- ed., with corr. and new intro. and additional bibl ed. London: S.P.C.K, 1967.
- Lampe, Peter. "The Eucharist: Identifying With Christ on the Cross." *Interpretation* 48 (1994): 36-49.
- . "Das Korinthische Herrenmahl Im Schnittpunkt Hellinistisch-Roemischer Mahlpraxis und Paulinischer Theologia Crucis (1 Kor 11, 17-34)." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Alteren Kirche* 82 (1991): 183-213.
- . "The Corinthian Eucharistic Dinner Party: Exegesis of a Cultural Context (I Cor. 12:17-34)." *Affirmation* 4 (1991): 1-16.
- . *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians At Rome in the First Two Centuries*. Edited by Marshall D. Johnson. Translated by Steinhauser, Michael. 1st Fortress Press ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Larson, Jennifer. *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Lawson, R. P, ed. *The Song of songs. Commentary and Homilies*. Ancient Christian Writers 26. Westminster, Md: Newman Press, 1957.
- Lee, Clarence L. "The Catacombs and the Colosseum; the Roman Empire as the Setting of Primitive Christianity." Pages 121-38 in *The Catacombs and the Colosseum; the Roman Empire as the Setting of Primitive Christianity*. Edited by Stephen Benko, and John J. O'rourke. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1971.
- Leon, Harry J, and Carolyn Osiek. *The Jews of Ancient Rome*. (pbk.) ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995.
- Levine, Lee I. *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Leyerle, Blake. "Meal Customs in the Greco-Roman World." Pages 29-61 in *Passover and Easter: Origin and History to Modern Times*. Edited by Paul F. Bradshaw, and Lawrence A Hoffman. Notre Dame, Ind: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999.
- Lightfoot, Joseph Barber. *The Apostolic Fathers*. 5. London and New York:

- Macmillan and co, 1885.
- Ling, Roger. *Roman Painting*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Logan, Alastair H. B. *Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy: A Study in the History of Gnosticism*. Hendrickson Publishers, 1996.
- Logan, Alistair, H. B. "Post-Baptismal Chrismation in Syria: The Evidence of Ignatius, the Didache and the Apostolic Constitutions." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 49.1 (1998): 92-108.
- Loi, Vincenzo. "L'identità Letteraria di Ippolito di Roma." *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito. Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 30 (1989): 67-88.
- . "La problematica storico-letteraria su Ippolito di Roma." Paper presented at *Ricerche su Ippolito*. Rome, 1977.
- Macmullen, Ramsay. *Enemies of the Roman Order: Treason, Unrest, and Alienation in the Empire*. London; New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Maier, Harry O. "Religious Dissent, Heresy and Households in Late Antiquity." *Vigiliae Christianae* 49.1 (1995): 49-65.
- . *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement, and Ignatius*. Studies in Christianity and Judaism 1. Waterloo, Ont: Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion/Corporation Canadienne des Sciences Religieuses by Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991.
- Mansfeld, Jaap. *Prolegomena: Questions to be Settled Before the Study of an Author Or a Text*. *Philosophia antiqua*, v. 61. Leiden; New York: E. J. Brill, 1994.
- Mansfield, Herbert W. "A Society in Aldersgate Street." *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society* 19 (1934): 77-80.
- Marcovich, Miroslav, ed. *Refutatio omnium haeresium*. Patristische Texte und Studien, Bd. 25. Berlin; New York: W. De Gruyter, 1986.
- Martin, J, ed. *Arati phaenomena: Fragmentum (e codicibus)*. CD TLG 653 ed. Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice, 1956.
- Martin, Josef. *Symposion, die Geschichte einer Literarischen Form*. Paderborn: F.

Schöningh, 1931.

- Matthews, Thomas F. *The Clash of Gods: A Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art*. Rev. ed., rev. and expanded ed., rev. pbk. ed. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Mattingly, Harold. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum: Antonius Pius to Vitellius*. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the Brit. Museum* 4. 2005 (reprint) ed. London: Spink & Sons Ltd, 1923.
- Mattingly, Harold, and R.A.G. Carson. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum: Severus Alexander to Pupienus*. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the Brit. Museum* 4. 2005 (reprint) ed. London: Spink & Sons Ltd, 1923.
- Mcbride, Samuel Dean, and Roland Edmund Murphy. *The Song of Songs*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990.
- McConvery, Brendan. "Hippolytus' Commentary on the Song of Songs and John 20: Intertextual Reading in Early Christianity." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 71 (2006): 211–22.
- McDonnell, Kilian and George T. Montague. *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries* (Michael Glazier Books). Michael Glazier Books, 1990.
- McDonnell, Kilian. "Jesus' Baptism in the Jordan." *Theological Studies Theological Studies* 56 (1995): 209-36.
- McGowan, Andrew Brian. *Ascetic Eucharists: Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals*. Oxford early Christian studies. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- . Andrew Brian McGowan, "Food, Ritual, and Power," in *Late Ancient Christianity* (ed. Virginia Burrus; A People's History of Christianity 2; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005)..
- McGuckin, John, ed. *The Westminster Handbook to Origen*. Westminster Handbooks. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.
- McKechnie, Paul. "Christian Grave-Inscriptions From the Familia Caesaris." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 50 (2000): 427-41.

- McNeil, Brian. "Avircius and the Song of Songs." *Vigiliae christianae* 31.1 (1977): 23-34.
- Meeks, Wayne A. "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity." *History of Religions* 13 (1974): 165-208.
- Meloni, Pietro. "L'Influsso del Commento al Cantico di Ippolito sull'Expositio Psalmi CXVIII di Ambrogio." Pages 865-930 in *Letterature comparate, problemi e metodo: studi in onore di Ettore Paratore*. Bologna: Pàtron, 1981.
- . "Ippolito e il Cantico Dei Cantici." *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 13 (1989): 97-120.
- Merkelbach, Reinhold. *Isis Regina, Zeus Sarapis: die Griechisch-Ägyptische Religion nach den Quellen Dargestellt*. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1995.
- Metzger, Marcel. *Les Constitutions Apostoliques*. Sc 320, 329, 336. Paris: Cerf, 1985.
- . "Nouveles Perspectives Pour la Prétendue Tradition Apostolique." *Ecclesia Orans* 5 (1988): 242-59.
- . "Enquêtes Autour de la Prétendue Tradition Apostolique." *Ecclesia Orans* 9 (1992): 7-36.
- Mlasowsky, Alexander. "denarius." *Brill's New Pauly* (2005): Electronic encycloedia. <<http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=bnp_e230040. Cited 08-08. Online: <http://www.paulyonline.brill.nl>.
- Mueller, Joseph G. "Post-Baptismal Chrismation in Second-Century Syria: A Reconsideration of the Evidence." *Journal of Theological Studies Journal of Theological Studies* 57 (2006): 76-93.
- Nautin, Pierre. *Le Dossier d'Hippolyte et de Mélicon Dans Les Florilèges Dogmatiques et Chez les Historiens Modernes*. Paris: Cerf, 1953.
- . *Lettres et Écrivains Chrétiens des I et II Siècles*. Patristica 2. Paris: Cerf, 1961.
- . *Origène*. Christianisme antique 1. Paris: Beauchesne, 1977.
- . *Hippolyte et Josipe Contribution a L'histoire de la Litterature Chretienne du*

- Troisieme Siecle*. Paris: Cerf, 1947.
- Neuschäfer, Bernhard. *Origenes als Philologe*. Schweizerische Beiträge Zur Altertumswissenschaft 18. Basel: F. Reinhardt, 1987.
- Newby, Zahra. "Art At the Crossroads? Themes and Styles in Severan Art." Pages 201-49 in *Severan Culture*. Edited by Simon Swain, Stephen Harrison, and Jas' Elsner. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. *Christ and Culture*. New York: Harper, 1951.
- Nielsen, Inge, and Hanne Nielsen. *Meals in a Social Context: Aspects of the Communal Meal in the Hellenistic and Roman World*. Aarhus studies in Mediterranean antiquity; 1. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1998.
- Nock, Arthur Darby. "A Diis Electa: A Chapter in the Religious History of the Third Century." *The Harvard Theological Review* 23.4 (1930): 251-74.; 1930.
- Noy, David. *Foreigners at Rome: Citizens and Strangers*. Cardiff: Classical Press of Wales, 2000.
- Nussbaum, Martha Craven. *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*. Martin Classical Lectures; New Series 2. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Ogg, George. "Hippolytus and the Introduction of the Christian Era." *Vigiliae christianae* 16 (1962): 2-18.
- Oller, Gary H. "Tamar." Pages 315 in vol. 5 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Orbe, Antonio. *Hacia la Primera Teologia de la Procecion Del Verbo. Estudios Valentinianos, Vol. I*. Roma: Universitas Gregoriana, 1958.
- . *Commentary on the Gospel According to John Books 1-10*. The Fathers of the Church 80. Edited by Ronald E. Heine. Translated by Heine, Ronald E. Washington, D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 1989.
- Scholia in Canticum canticorum*. Patrologia graeca 17. Edited by J.-P Migne. Paris: 1857.

- van Os, Lubbertus Klass. "Baptism in the Bridal Chamber: the Gospel of Philip as a Valentinian Baptism Instruction." University of Groningen, 2007.
- Osborn, Eric Francis. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Osburn, Carroll D. "The Text of the Pauline Epistles in Hippolytus of Rome." *Second Century 2* (1982): 97-124.
- Osiek, Carolyn and David L. Balch. *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches*. The Family, Religion, and Culture. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.
- Osiek, Carolyn and Helmut Koester. *Shepherd of Hermas: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.
- Osiek, Carolyn, Margaret Y. Macdonald and Janet H Tulloch. *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006.
- Osiek, Carolyn, Tulloch, Janet H. "Women Leaders in Family Funerary Banquets." Pages 164-93 in *A Women's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity*. Edited by Carolyn Osiek and Margaret Macdonald. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006.
- Osiek, Carolyn. "Roman and Christian Burial Practices and the Patronage of Women." in *Commemorating the Dead: Texts and Artifacts in Context: Studies of Roman, Jewish and Christian Burials*. Edited by Laurie Brink. Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- _____. "The Bride of Christ (Ephesians 5:22-33: A Problematic Wedding." Pages 371-92 in *Sacred Marriages: The Divine-Human Sexual Metaphor from Sumer to Early Christianity*. Edited by Nissinen Martti and Risto Uro. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- Pahls, Michael J. "The Institutional History of the Catechumenate From 236-430 C.E. A Select and Annotated Bibliography." *reformedcatholicism.com* (2006): 1-30. Cited 05-06. Online: <http://www.reformedcatholicism.com/?p=838>.
- Paratore, Ettore, ed. *Letterature comparate, problemi e metodo: studi in onore di*

- Ettore Paratore*. Bologna: Pàtron, 1981.
- Pasithea [Painter]. "K12.8 the Chariot of Dionysos." Louvre NMB 1036 (400-390 B.C.E.): Beazley Archive Number 230398. Cited 08-21-2008. Online: <http://www.theoi.com/Gallery/K12.8.html>.
- Pelletier, Anne-Marie. *Lectures du Cantique des Cantiques: de L'enigme du Sens aux Figures du Lecteur*. Anbib. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1990.
- Penn, Michael Philip. *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church (Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion)*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.
- Perler, Othmar, ed. *Meliton de Sardes: Sur la Pâque et fragments*. Sources chrétiennes 123. Paris: Cerf, 1966.
- Petsalis-Diodimidis, Alexia. "Landscape, Transfiguration, and Divine Epiphany." Pages 250-89 in *Severan Culture*. Edited by Simon Swain, Stephen Harrison, and Jaś Elsner. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Philostratus, Philostratus, Sophista Callistratus, and Arthur Fairbanks. *Philostratus, Imagines; Callistratus, Descriptions*. The Loeb classical library. London New York: Heinemann G. P. Putnam's sons, 1931.
- Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2007.
- Pitra, Jean Baptiste. *Analecta biblica* 4 (1883): 61-64; 330-1.
- Porter, Stanley E, ed. *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997.
- Potter, David S. *The Roman Empire At Bay: A.D. 180-395*. Routledge History of the Ancient World. London; New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Powell, Jonathan. "Unfair to Caecilius? Ciceronian Dialogue Techniques in Minucius Felix." Pages 177-89 in *Severan Culture*. Edited by Simon Swain, Stephen Harrison, and Jas' Elsner. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Quasten, Johannes. *Initiation aux Pères de L'église*. Paris: Cerf, 1955.

- Quasten, Johannes, and Angelo di Berardino. *Patrology*. 2. Westminster, Md: Christian Classics, Inc, 1986.
- Raes, Alphonse. *Introductio in Liturgiam Orientalem*. Rome: Oriental Institute, 1947.
- Rhee, Helen. *Early Christian Literature: Christ and Culture in the Second and Third Centuries (Routledge Early Church Monographs)*. Routledge, 2005.
- Richards, E. Randolph. *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing: Secretaries, Composition and Collection*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- Richardson, Cyril C. "The Quartodecimans and the Synoptic Chronology." *The Harvard Theological Review* 33.3 (1940): 177-90.
- Richardson, Emeline. "The Story of Ariadne in Italy." Pages 189-95 in *The Story of Ariadne in Italy*. Studies in Classical Art and Archaeology. J. J. Augustin, 1979.
- Richardson, Peter. *Building Jewish in the Roman East*. Waco, Tex: Baylor University Press, 2004.
- Riedel, Wilhelm. *Die Auslegung des Hohenliedes in der Jüdischen Gemeinde und der Griechischen Kirche*. Leipzig: Deicher, 1898.
- Robbins, Vernon K. *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society, and Ideology*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Robinson, James McConkey, ed. *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. 3rd completely rev. ed. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.
- Robinson, James McConkey, and Richard Smith. *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. 4th rev. ed. Leiden; New York: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Robinson, William C. "Exegesis on the Soul." *Novum Testamentum* 12 (1970): 102-17.
- Salzman, Michele Renee. *On Roman Time: The Codex-Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity*. The Transformation of the Classical Heritage; 17. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Sandys, John Edwin, and Sidney George Campbell. *Latin Epigraphy; an Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions*. 2d ed. Cambridge, UK: The University press,

1927.

- Saxer, Victor. "Ippolito di Roma, Scrittore e Martire." *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito*. *Studia ephemeridis Augustinianum* 30. Roma: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1989: 43-59.
- Schäublin, Christoph. *Untersuchungen Zu Methode und Herkunft der Antiochenischen Exegese*. Köln: P. Hanstein, 1974.
- Schenke, Hans-Martin, Hans-Gebhard Bethge, and Ursula U. Kaiser. *Nag Hammadi Deutsch: Studienausgabe. Eingeleitet und Übersetzt von Mitgliedern des Berliner Arbeitskreises für Koptisch-Nostische Schrifteu* (Gruyter-Schrifteu (De Gruyter Texte). Gruyter, 2007.
- Schenke, Hans-Martin, Hans-Gebhard Bethge, and Ursula Ulrike Kaiser. *Nag Hammadi Deutsch*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Jahrhunderte. Neue Folge Bd. 8, Etc Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften 2. Berlin/ New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.
- Schmitt-Pantel, Pauline. "Kline." *Brill's New Pauly* (2005): Electronic encycloedia. <<http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=bnp_e230040. Cited 08-08. Online: <http://www.paulyonline.brill.nl>.
- Schneemelcher, Wilhelm, and R. McL. Wilson, eds. *New Testament Apocrypha*. Vol. 1914. Louisville, KY: Clarke & Co/Westminster John Knox Press, 1991.
- Schöllgen, Georg, Clemens Scholten and Ernst Dassmann, eds. *Stimuli: Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum; Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann. Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 23. Münster: Aschendorff, 1996.
- Scholten, Clemens. "Hippolytus between East and West: The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus." *Vigiliae christianae* 59.1 (2005): 85-92.
- Schürer, Emil, Géza Vermès, and Fergus Millar. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1973.
- Scott, James C. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Serra, Dominic E. "Syrian Prebaptismal Anointing and Western Postbaptismal

- Chrismation.” *Worship* 79 (2005): 328-41.
- Seyrig, Henri. *La triade héliopolitaine et les temples de Baalbek*. Extracts from *Syria*, 10 (1929): 314-356.
- Shero, L. R. “The Cena in Roman Satire.” *Classical Philology* 18 (1923): 126-43.
- Siegert, Folker. “Rhetoric in Practice: Homily and Panegyric Sermon.” Pages 421-44 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B. C. -a D. 400*. Edited by Stanley Porter. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997.
- Simonetti, Manlio. “Nuove Ricerche Su Ippolito.” *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito*. *Studia ephemeridis Augustinianum* 30. Roma: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1989: 45-65.
- . “Aggiornamento Su Ippolito.” *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito*. *Studia ephemeridis Augustinianum* 30. Roma: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1989: 75-130.
- . “Una Nuova Proposta Su Ippolito.” *Augustinianum* 36 (1996): 13-46.
- . *Contro Noeto*. Biblioteca patristica; 35. Bologna: EDB, 2000.
- , ed. Simonetti, Manlio, ed. *Ricerche su Ippolito*. 13. Rome: Institutum patristicum Augustinianum, 1977.
- . *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*. Edited by Bockmuehl A, Markus N, Bergquist Anders, and William Horbory. Translated by Hughes, John A. T. & T. Clark, 1994.
- . *Origene Esegeta e la Sua Tradizione*. Letteratura Christiana Antica Nuova Serie 2. Brescia: Morcelliana, 2004.
- Sluiter, Ineke. “Commentaries and the Didactic Tradition.” Pages 173-205 in *Aporemata: kritische Studien zur Philologie: Commentaries—Kommentare*. Edited by Glenn Most. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.
- Smith, Daniel A. “Irenaeus and the Baptism of Jesus.” *Theological Studies* 58.4 (1997): 618-42.
- Smith, Dennis Edwin. *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early*

Christian World. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.

Smith, Jonathan Z. *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity*. Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion 14. London Chicago: School of Oriental and African Studies University of London University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Snyder, Graydon F. *Ante Pacem: Archaeological Evidence of Church Life Before Constantine*. Mercer University Press, 2003.

Snyder, Harlow, Gregory. "Justin Martyr's in the City of Rome." *Harvard Theological Review* 100 (2007): 335-62.

Sokolowski, Franciszek. *Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques*. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1969.

Speidel, Michael P. "Commodus the God-Emperor and the Army," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 83 (1993): 109-114.

Spier, Jeffrey. *Picturing the Bible: The Earliest Christian Art*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007.

Spinks, Bryan D, ed. *The Sacrifice of Praise: Studies on the Themes of Thanksgiving and Redemption in the Central Prayers of the Eucharistic and Baptismal Liturgies: in Honour of Arthur Hubert Couratin*. Bibliotheca Ephemerides liturgicae. Subsidia 19. Edited by M. Melrose. Roma: C.L.V, 1981.

Stark, Rodney. *The Rise of Christianity: a Sociologist Reconsiders History*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1996.

_____. *Cities of God: The Real Story of How Christianity Became an Urban Movement and Conquered Rome*. San Francisco: Harper, 2006.

Stark, Rodney, and William Sims Bainbridge. *A Theory of Religion*. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers University Press, 1996.

Stark, Rodney, and Roger Finke. *Acts of Faith: Explaining the Human Side of Religion*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Stein, S. "The Influence of Symposia Literature on the Literary Form of the Pesah

- Haggadah." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 8 (1957): 13-44.
- Stewart-Sykes, Alistair. "Hermas the Prophet and Hippolytus the Preacher: the Roman Homily and its Social Context." Pages 33-63 in *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*. Edited by M. B. Cunningham and P. Allen. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- , ed. ed. *On the Apostolic Tradition*. Popular Patristics Series. St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002.
- . "Ordination Rites and Patronage Systems in third Century Africa." *Vigiliae Christianae* 56.2 (2002): 115-30.
- . "Tradition Apostolica, the Liturgy of Third-Century Rome and the Hippolytean School Or *Quomodo Historia Liturgica Conscribenda Sit*." *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 48 (2004): 233-48.
- . "Mimesis and Typology and the Institution Narrative: Some Observations on Tradition Apostolica 4 and Its Afterlife." Pages 106-19 in *Wilderness: Essays in Honour of Frances Young*. Edited by Frances M. Young, and R. S. Sugirtharajah. Jsntsup 295. London; New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2005.
- Stone, Michael E. "The Interpretation of Song of Songs in 4 Ezra." *Journal for the Study of Judaism: In the Persian Hellenistic & Roman Period* 38 (2007): 226-33.
- Strohm, Paul. *Theory and the Premodern Text*. Medieval Cultures; v. 26. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.
- Strong, Donald Emrys. *Roman Art*. Pelican Histories of Art. Edited by Roger Ling, and Jocelyn M. C. Toynbee. Revised ed. Hartford, CT: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Sturgeon, Mary C. "The Corinth Amazon: The Formation of Roman Classical Sculpture." *American Journal of Archaeology* 99.3 (1995): 483-505.
- Swain, Simon, Stephen Harrison, and Jas' Elsner, eds. *Severan Culture*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Taussig, Hal. "Greco-Roman Meals and Performance of Identity: A Ritual Analysis."

Unpublished Seminar paper in Society of Biblical Literature, Meals in the Greco-Roman World (2004): Cited 6-6. Online: »<http://www.philipharland.com/meals/GrecoRomanMealsSeminar.htm>«.

Testini, Pasquale, ed. *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito*. *Studia ephemeridis Augustinianum* 30. Roma: Institutum Patristicum "Augustinianum," 1989.

Thesaurus linguae graecae: Canon of Greek Authors and Works. Edited by L. Berkowitz and K. A. Squitier. 3d ed. Oxford, 1990.

Thomassen, Einar. "Orthodoxy and Heresy in Second-Century Rome." *Harvard Theological Review* 97.3 (2004): 241-56.

Thür, Gerhard. "Eranos." *Brill's New Pauly* (2005): Electronic encycloedia. <http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=bnp_e230040. Cited 08-08. Online: <http://www.paulyonline.brill.nl>.

Tkacz, Catherine Brown. *The Key to the Brescia Casket: Typology and the Early Christian Imagination*. Collection des études augustinienes. Série Antiquité; 165. Notre Dame, Paris: University of Notre Dame Press Institut d'Etudes Augustiennes, 2001.

Tolluch, Janet. "Women Leaders in Family Funerary Banquets," in *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity*. Carolyn Osiek and Margaret Y. MacDonald. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006, 273- 313 including images.

Too, Yun Lee. "The Walking Library: The Performance of Cultural Memories." Pages 111-24 in *Athenaeus and His World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*. Edited by D. Braund and J. Wilkins. Classical Studies and Ancient History. University of Exeter Press, 2000.

Torjesen, Karen Jo. "Social and Historical Setting: Christianity as Culture Critique." Pages 181-99 in *Social and Historical Setting: Christianity as Culture Critique*. Edited by Frances Young, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Trapp, Michael. "Philosophy, Scholarship, and the World of Learning in the Severan Period." Pages 470-88 in *Severan Culture*. Edited by Simon Swain, Stephen Harrison and Jaś Elsner. Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Unger, Christoph. *On the Cognitive Role of Genre: A Relevance-Theoretic*

Perspective. 2001.

- Valentini, Roberto, Giuseppe Zuchetti. *Codice topografico della città di Roma*. Volume 1. Fonti per la storia d'Italia 91. Rome: Tipografia del Senato, 1940, 63 ff.
- Vermeule, Cornelius. *The Goddess Roma in the Art of the Roman Empire*. London: Spink, 1959.
- Vinzent, Markus. "‘Philobiblie’ Im Frühen Christentum." *Das Altertum* 45 (1999): 115-43.
- . "Hippolyt von Rom und Seine Statue." Pages 125-34 in *Zur Zeit Oder Unzeit*. Edited by A. M. Ritter, W. Wischmeyer, and W. Kinzig. Texts and Studies in the History of Theology 9. Mandelbachtal: Edition Cicero, 2004.
- . "Rome." Pages 397-413 in *The Cambridge History of Christianity*. Volume 1. Edited by Margaret Mitchell, and Frances M. Young. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Wagner-Hasel, Beate. "Presents." *Brill's New Pauly* (2005): Electronic encycloedia. <http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=bnp_e230040. Cited 08-08. Online: <http://www.paulyonline.brill.nl>.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. "Domus and Insulae in Rome: Families and Households." Pages 3-18 in *Early Christian Families in Context: an Interdisciplinary Dialogue*. Edited by David L. Balch and Carolyn Osiek. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Walzer, Richard. *Galen on Jews and Christians*. London: Oxford University Press, 1949.
- Webb, Pamela A. *Hellenistic Architectural Sculpture: Figural Motifs in Western Anatolia and the Aegean Islands*. Madison, Wisc: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1996.
- Weyermann, Maja. "The Typologies of Adam-Christ and Eve-Mary, and Their Relationship to One Another." *Anglican Theological Review Anglican Theological Review* 84 (2002): 609.
- Whealey, Alice. "Hippolytus' Lost 'De Universo' and 'De Resurrectione': Some New

- Hypotheses.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 50 (1996): 244-56.
- . “Pseudo-Justin’s de Resurrectione: Athenagoras Or Hippolytus?” *Vigiliae Christianae* 60 (2006): 420-30.
- White, L. Michael. “Regulating Fellowship in the Communal Meal: Early Jewish and Christian Evidence.” Pages 177-205 in *Roman Family At Dinner*. Edited by Inge Nielsen, and Hanne Nielsen. Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity 1 Meals in a Social Context: Aspects of the Communal Meal in the Hellenistic and Roman World. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1998.
- Whitmarsh, Tim. “Prose Literature and the Severan Dynasty.” Pages 29-51 in *Severan Culture*. Edited by Simon Swain, Stephen Harrison, and Jas' Elsner. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Wilken, Robert. “Collegia, Philosophical Schools, and Theology.” Pages 268-91 in *Collegia, Philosophical Schools, and Theology*. Edited by Stephen Benko, and O'Rourke. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1971.
- Wilken, Robert L. “Early Christian Chiliasm, Jewish Messianism, and the Idea of the Holy Land.” *Harvard Theological Review* 79 (1986): 298-307.; 1986.
- Williams, Michael A. *Rethinking “Gnosticism”: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Winkler, Gabriele. “Original Meaning of the Prebaptismal Anointing and Its Implications.” *Worship* 52.1 (1978): 24-45.
- . “The Original Meaning of the Prebaptismal Anointing an Its Implications.” Pages 58-81 in *Living Water, Sealing Spirit: Readings on Christian Initiation*. Edited by Maxwell E. Johnson. Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1995.
- Winterbottom, Michael. “Cyprian’s Ad Donatum.” Pages 190-99 in *Severan Culture*. Edited by Simon Swain, Stephen Harrison, and Jas' Elsner. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Woodhall, Jonathan A. “The socio-religious role of women according to Hippolytus in the light of the early Christian fathers.” Ph.D, Fordham University, 1980.
- Yoder, John Howard. *Authentic Transformation: A New Vision of Christ and Culture*.

Abingdon Press, 1995.

Young, Frances M. *The Theology of the Pastoral Letters*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Yubal, Israel J. "Easter and Passover as Early Jewish-Christian Dialogue." Pages 98-124 in *Passover and Easter: Origin and History to Modern Times*. Edited by Paul F. Bradshaw, and Lawrence A Hoffman. 5. Notre Dame, Ind: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999.

Zani, Antonio. *La Cristologia di Ippolito*. *Ricerche di Scienze Teologiche* 22. Brixiae: Morcelliana, 1984.

Zerubavel, Eviatar. "Easter and Passover: On Calendars and Group Identity." *American Sociological Review* 47 (1982): 284-89.