

## ST. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM AND THE ALEXANDRIAN HERITAGE

A. A. STEPHENSON, S.J.

*Glasgow, Scotland*

THE purpose of this article is, first, to show that St. Cyril's sole surviving sermon, the much neglected *Sermon on the Paralytic*, is characterized by a contemplative warmth and depth, a mystical élan,<sup>1</sup> unmistakably in the Alexandrian tradition, and is at the same time one of the most important keys to an understanding of its author; secondly, to show that St. Cyril's great work, the *Catecheses*, when approached with this clue, reveals important Alexandrian elements as well as striking parallels with the two great masters of the Alexandrian School. Evidence will also be adduced pointing, though less certainly, to the conclusion that the Lenten catechetical teaching at Jerusalem, as exemplified by St. Cyril's *Catecheses*, shows (in spite of obvious and important differences) some remarkable resemblances to the attempt of Clement and Origen to construct a synthesis of revealed truth,<sup>2</sup> and was, in fact, in some degree formally regarded as a gnosis in the Alexandrian manner. It is not here maintained that St. Cyril was a champion of the particular theological doctrines specially associated with Origen.

Since the detection of a marked strain of Alexandrian mystical idealism in the author of the rather pedestrian *Catechetical Lectures* may cause some surprise,<sup>3</sup> it must be premised that from the historical point of view Cyril's contact with the Alexandrian tradition would present no special difficulty. The historical links, indeed, between Alexandria and Palestine are of considerable interest. Origen first

<sup>1</sup> The words "mystical" and "contemplation" are used in this article in a fairly wide sense.

<sup>2</sup> Clement, born about A.D. 150, taught in the Catechetical School in Alexandria (at first as the assistant of St. Pantaenus) from some time after 180 until ca. 202. His pupil, Origen, succeeded him as the head of the Catechetical School and taught in it, with interruptions, until 230.

<sup>3</sup> I have found it convenient to refer to the *Catecheses* indifferently as the *Catechetical Lectures*, the *Lectures*, or the Lenten Lectures. The *Catecheses* have been edited by Dom A. A. Toutée (Paris, 1720) and by W. K. Reischl and J. Rupp (Munich, 1948-60); Toutée's edition was reprinted by Migne in *PG*, XXXIII.

visited Caesarea, the metropolitan see of Palestine,<sup>4</sup> and Jerusalem, at the invitation of their bishops, about the year 216, and later, when expelled from Alexandria, returned to Palestine and settled in Caesarea, where in 232 he founded a brilliant theological school. From Caesarea, where he taught for twenty years, Origen's fame spread throughout the East; St. Gregory of Nyssa later spoke of him as the prince of Christian learning in the third century.<sup>5</sup> At Caesarea itself, according to Prat, the admiration of the learned for Origen became a passion,<sup>6</sup> and there, on his death, Origen's library, which presumably included the works of his master Clement, was preserved. The devotion of Acacius' predecessor, Eusebius of Caesarea, to Origen is well known, and Cyril's own successor, John II of Jerusalem, appears to have been Origen's only too enthusiastic disciple.<sup>7</sup> Again, the *Peregrinatio* of Etheria, with its reference to both creed and Scripture being expounded "first carnally and then spiritually,"<sup>8</sup> suggests a strong Alexandrian influence in Jerusalem at the period—whatever that period may have been—which it describes. But perhaps the most interesting of the early links between Alexandria and Jerusalem is Clement's pupil and friend, St. Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem. Alexander was also the fellow pupil, friend, and admirer of Origen, whom he, jointly with Theoctistus, Bishop of Caesarea, raised to the priesthood. As Alexander was Bishop of Jerusalem for at least sixteen years (216–32)<sup>9</sup> and founded the theological library there,<sup>10</sup> it is not unlikely that it was he who introduced the characteristic teaching, and perhaps methods, of the Alexandrian school into the Holy City.

It must be observed, then, that there were "two Cyrils," and that

<sup>4</sup> The Church of Jerusalem, however, as an apostolic see, enjoyed a special precedency; its rank was recognized by the 7th Canon of the Council of Nicaea, the precise interpretation of which is disputed.

<sup>5</sup> *Panegyric on St. Gregory Thaumaturgus* (PG, XLVI, 905).

<sup>6</sup> F. Prat, "Origen," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, XI, 308.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. St. Jerome's controversial work, *Ad Pammachium, Contra Ioannem Hierosolymitanum* (PL, XXIII, 371–412; in Migne's variant edition of St. Jerome, PL, XXIII, 355–96).

<sup>8</sup> Etheria, Egeria, or Eucheria, *Peregrinatio*, 46, 2–4, ed. P. Geyer (CSEL, XXXIX, 97–98); in G. F. Gamurrini's edition (Rome, 1887), 72–73. The *Peregrinatio* is most commonly dated to 393–96; but Dom E. Dekkers has recently proposed the date 415–17, and previously Karl Meister had advocated a date as late as the first half of the reign of Justinian (527–65).

<sup>9</sup> For about 35 years according to O. Bardenhewer, *Patrology* (Freiburg, 1908), p. 164.

<sup>10</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, VI, 20, 1 (GCS, IX/2, 567).

while it is the catechist who is the more extensively represented by the surviving works, Cyril was also the sacred orator who delighted in the "contemplative" exposition of Scripture and, as Theodoret tells us,<sup>11</sup> captivated the cultivated congregations of Tarsus. In the second sentence of *Cat.*, XIII, 9 St. Cyril says: "We must, then, search out the testimonies concerning the passion of Christ. For we are met together, not now to make a contemplative study of Scripture, but to be further assured of what we already believe."<sup>12</sup> This clearly suggests that while in the Lenten course of instruction the treatment of Scripture was generally, as may be seen from the *Lectures*, apologetical or dogmatic, in the ordinary sermons the exposition of Scripture might take a very different form. It is true that in the Oxford translation the words ἐξήγησιν θεωρητικὴν ποιήσασθαι are rendered "to give a speculative exposition,"<sup>13</sup> but on general grounds "speculative" would be agreed now to be an unsatisfactory translation of θεωρητικὴν in this passage, and the single extant sermon, the *Sermon on the Paralytic*,<sup>14</sup> is presumably the best commentary on the word. One has, indeed, only to read this short sermon to understand what Cyril meant by *theoria*, how the "theoretic" exposition of Scripture differs from the exegesis characteristic of the *Catecheses*, and at the same time to appreciate the "mystical" element in their author. Moreover, the *Catechetical Lectures*, being addressed to candidates for baptism, were primarily didactic, and since their method and manner were largely determined by the nature of the audience and of the task, the *Sermon on the Paralytic* may be a surer clue to Cyril's own cast of mind and spiritual formation.

The study of the Alexandrian strain in Cyril, then, must begin with the *Sermon*, which declares its mode in its opening words, "Where Jesus is, there is salvation." While the generally literal and positive scriptural exegesis in the *Lectures* might appear to associate Cyril with the school of Antioch, the tone of the *Sermon on the Paralytic* recalls the mystical tendencies of Clement and Origen, especially the

<sup>11</sup> Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.*, II, 26, 8 (GCS, XIX, 158).

<sup>12</sup> Quotations of the works of St. Cyril follow the text of Reischl and Rupp.

<sup>13</sup> *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, VII (Oxford, 1894); translation by R. Church, revised by E. H. Gifford.

<sup>14</sup> In the edition of Cyril by Reischl and Rupp, II, 405-26. The *Sermon* has apparently not so far been translated into English.

former's doctrine that the Christian advanced in asceticism and the prayerful study of the Scriptures attains to gnosis, a mystical higher knowledge of God and divine things depending on Christian revelation. The *Sermon* also recalls Clement's picture, at the beginning of the *Paedagogus*,<sup>15</sup> of Christ as at once the physician who cures the sick soul of its passions and the tutor who schools it, first by discipline and then by instruction, in the knowledge of Himself, the eternal Word. In the *Sermon* the Savior is presented, in contrast with the "earthly consultants," as the true physician who by a question leads the sick man to the saving knowledge (gnosis) of His divinity.<sup>16</sup> Origen's gnosis, or enlightened faith, is especially concerned with the divinity of Christ; where simple faith principally regards the humanity and humility of the Incarnate Word, enlightened faith rises to the divinity.

While the most striking single phrase in the *Sermon* is the enigmatic description of our Lord as "the physician of gnosis,"<sup>17</sup> the whole *Sermon* may, from the point of view just indicated, be seen as a systematic attempt to lead the congregation to the contemplation of the God-Man. The *Sermon's* dramatic interest derives from a kind of suspense, and the suspense in turn depends on the enigmatic personality of the healer and the success or failure of the various "characters"—the Jews, the two blind men, St. Peter, and the paralytic himself—in penetrating His disguise. The preacher, by stressing the Savior's supernatural knowledge, by recalling that He is the true bread, the light which enlightens every man, the resurrection, the

<sup>15</sup> *Paedagogus*, I, 1-2 (GCS, Clem. Alex. I, 89 ff.). While the method adopted in this chapter is inevitably that of establishing similarities and parallels between Cyril on the one hand and Clement and Origen on the other, it must not be assumed that the relation between them is necessarily one of dependency. There is also the possibility that both Jerusalem and Alexandria shared in a common tradition. Some of the evidence adduced below would certainly seem to suggest dependence; but the no less marked differences between Cyril and the Alexandrians perhaps favor the second hypothesis, although they might also be explained by modifications of the Alexandrian system suggested by experience, introduced in the passage of time, or imposed by the resistance of a different native tradition. I owe this point to my friend, Prof. T. F. Torrance, who very kindly read this article in manuscript.

<sup>16</sup> *Sermon*, 6. The immediate sequel, introduced by the paralytic's reply, "I have no man," indicates the content of the knowledge, *gnosis*, in question; the divinity of Christ is the theme of chapters 6-9.

<sup>17</sup> *Sermon*, 19. The transliteration, "gnosis," in quoting Cyril in translation, is not intended to beg any questions.

maker of the world, the physician of souls, the great lawgiver,<sup>18</sup> continually reminds his audience that the Man who is the object of sight is God also.

The Alexandrian gnosis was no human learning but the fruit of grace and, at its higher levels, of a special revelation; and Cyril perhaps alludes to this when he represents St. Peter as saying: "If it be Thou whom I know, or rather whom the Father revealed to me, bid me to come to Thee upon the water."<sup>19</sup> Origen's characteristic approach is also detectable in: "Consider not Him who is the object of sight but Him who works through the visible."<sup>20</sup> Toutée is at needless pains to clear from the suspicion of Nestorianism both this passage and another from the *Catecheses*: "Attend not, therefore, to the babe of Bethlehem, but to the Son eternally begotten of the Father."<sup>21</sup> Both passages simply express an invitation not to rest in the sacred humanity, but to rise to the contemplation of the divinity.

In view of the contrast, in the fifth chapter of the *Sermon*, between the spiritual enlightenment of the blind men and the blindness of the Jewish doctors of the Law who had "grown old in ignorance," and bearing in mind Origen's extravagant comparison of simple Christians, who had not advanced to gnosis, with the Jews, it is possible that Cyril was, for once, guilty of a youthful indiscretion when he says in his peroration: "or, if we have grown old in ignorance, let us beg wisdom of Wisdom."<sup>22</sup> There are, however, other conceivable explanations. Cyril may have been inviting aging catechumens to baptism, or his words may have been addressed directly to unconverted Jews in the congregation. Certainly Cyril is, in general, if a disciple of Origen, one of those "best disciples" of whom Lebreton speaks,<sup>23</sup> who avoided his dangerous theses while learning from his mystical ardor. In any case, "let us beg wisdom of Wisdom," like "let us take a wise word from Wisdom,"<sup>24</sup> recalls the conception, shared by Origen

<sup>18</sup> *Sermon*, 3, 19, 8, 9, 5, 2, 15.

<sup>19</sup> *Sermon*, 8; cf. Mt 16:17 and 11:27.

<sup>20</sup> *Sermon*, 9.

<sup>21</sup> *Cat.*, XI, 20.

<sup>22</sup> *Sermon*, 19; cf. *Cat.*, IV, 2: "Those of the circumcision deceive those who approach them by means of the divine Scriptures, which they evilly misconstrue, studying them from childhood to old age and growing old in ignorance."

<sup>23</sup> *Histoire de l'église*, ed. Fliche-Martin; transl. E. C. Messenger, *The History of the Primitive Church* (Burns Oates, 1948), IV, 802.

<sup>24</sup> *Sermon*, 15.

and Clement, of Christian perfection as a supernatural wisdom; it recalls also Clement's insistence that the knowledge of God can be taught neither by man nor by angel, but only by the one teacher, the Son who is Wisdom, so that the Christian, as the real "lover of Wisdom," is the true philosopher.<sup>25</sup>

Clement's doctrine that the true gnosis drives out passion and induces a sort of insensibility (*apatheia*), the purified soul's invulnerability to passion, is recalled by Cyril's sentence: "This is not the love of woman, but of Wisdom. . . . Not passions (*pathe*) but wise thoughts house with Wisdom."<sup>26</sup> Indeed the whole of the long allegorical digression (10-12) on a passage from the Cantic of Canticles, together with the insistence that the language of the Cantic is "nymphic,"<sup>27</sup> and the ascent to its understanding gradual, is clearly in the Alexandrian tradition. The Alexandrian allegorical exegesis, which sometimes, while not denying the literal and historical meaning, regarded the sensible as at the same time a symbol of the spiritual, is apparent also in Cyril's comment on Christ's question, "Wilt thou be healed?" "The question," Cyril explains, "is double," referring to the sickness of the soul as well as to that of the body.<sup>28</sup>

The whole *Sermon*, indeed, is, in a wide sense, allegorical in its method and mystical or contemplative in its tone. The symbolization of sin, particularly of unbelief, by disease is established as early as the second chapter, and the Savior is presented throughout as the physician who offers a better gift than bodily health.

The marked contrast between the *Sermon* and the rather staid and pedestrian style of the *Catecheses*, with their generally Antiochene treatment of Scripture, might seem to cast doubt on the Cyrillian authorship of the *Sermon*. This inference would be unsound. The general method of the *Catecheses*, apart from the parenetic and devotional passages, would be described by a modern theologian as partly apologetical and partly dogmatic.<sup>29</sup> Their aim being didactic, their

<sup>25</sup> *Stromateis*, VI, 7, 57-58 (GCS, XV, 460-61).

<sup>26</sup> *Sermon*, 10. For Clement's doctrine on *apatheia* cf., e.g., *Paed.*, I, 2, *ad init.*, and *Strom.*, VI, 9.

<sup>27</sup> *Sermon*, 10. The Greek is *nymphica*, i.e., concerned with mystic bridals.

<sup>28</sup> *Sermon*, 4.

<sup>29</sup> Cyril does not appear always to have adverted to the distinction; such a position is very much in the vein of Clement, who regarded Scripture as in some sense self-authenticating.

method was the proving of the faith, point by point, by an accumulation of texts from Sacred Scripture, especially from Old Testament prophecy; in such a demonstration allegorical exegesis, generally in some degree arbitrary and subjective, would be out of place, and *theoria* would only occasionally be appropriate. But the sentence already quoted from *Cat.*, XIII, 9 prepares us for just such a difference in the ordinary sermons as we find in the *Sermon on the Paralytic*.

The points of difference between the Cyril of the *Catechetical Lectures* and either Clement or Origen are numerous and important, and at the same time so manifest as not to require emphasis. Yet it was to be expected that a preacher personally attracted to *theoria*, to the mystical or contemplative exposition of Scripture, would, even in his instructional sermons or lectures, occasionally betray his natural bent. We in fact find in several passages of the *Catecheses*, generally where the theme is some mystery of our Lord's life especially inviting to contemplation in the manner of the illuminative or unitive way, that Cyril's tone changes. A striking instance is the splendid passage on the good thief.<sup>80</sup> In such passages, by no means necessarily marked by allegory, certain characteristic words and ideas tend to appear: here, spiritual blindness and light; the eternal light leading to the light; darkness, again, and enlightenment; the presence of the King bestowing His favors; a passage, finally, from the Canticle of Canticles. The two chapters are a very beautiful example of *theoria*.

Another Alexandrian passage in the *Catecheses*, so strikingly exact a parallel to the *Sermon* as almost alone sufficient to guarantee the authenticity of the latter, occurs in X, 13. There in a short paragraph, introduced by the remark that the name Jesus means in Greek "one who heals," almost all the leading themes of the *Sermon* appear: the doctor of souls and bodies, the physician of spirits, the healer of the physically blind, the physician who leads minds to the light. Then, as if to point the parallel with the *Sermon*, Cyril introduces the paralytic of John 5 and our Lord saying to him, "Sin no more," and, "Take up your pallet and walk." Next come the themes of the origin of disease in sin, sin as an ailment of the soul, and, finally, the suggestion that the victim of bodily affections or sicknesses should seek a cure and so attain to the knowledge that Jesus is the Christ. This

<sup>80</sup> *Cat.*, XIII, 30-31.

remarkable parallel, which suggests incidentally that Dr. Caroline Spurgeon's account of the associative and "streamy" character of Shakespeare's imagery has a relevance beyond its immediate subject,<sup>31</sup> illustrates the underlying continuity between the *Sermon* and the *Lectures* in spite of their general contrast in point of subject, style, and method.

Cyril, like Clement and Origen, makes fairly frequent use of the *aisthetos-noetos* distinction employed by Plato to discriminate between the earthly world, the object of sense experience, and the spiritual or real world revealed by intelligence. In Origen's system the distinction played an important part in his allegorical exegesis, the *aistheta* being regarded as symbols of the *noeta*. For Clement the *noeta* were the objects of faith and hope<sup>32</sup> and of the higher *theoria*. In the *Sermon* the words hardly occur at all, but the substance of the distinction they express is kept constantly before the audience or the reader by the recurring contrast between the visible and invisible, body and soul. In the *Lectures*, beginning with the first sentence of the Pro-catechesis where the implication is that the *Catecheses* are wholly concerned with heavenly realities, *noetos* occurs frequently and *aisthetos* occasionally.<sup>33</sup> One gets the impression, however, that the words have lost in Cyril something of their systematic character and of the fullness and precision of their content. Incidentally, *pneumatikos*, not *noetos*, is the word repeatedly used of the consecrated species in the fourth mystagogical catechesis.

For Clement, in whose system the Logos played a predominant role, Christ is the bestower of gnosis, just as He, and the Father as revealed through Him, is its object.<sup>34</sup> This appears to be the point of view of Cyril's *Sermon*, which is an early work; there it is Christ who

<sup>31</sup> C. Spurgeon, *Shakespeare's Imagery* (Cambridge University Press, 1925); cf., earlier, E. E. Kellet, *Suggestions* (Cambridge University Press, 1923). The analogy cannot be pressed.

<sup>32</sup> *Strom.*, V, 3, 16 (GCS, XV, 336). Clement does not use the words a great deal, but Plato's distinction, as well as his descriptions of the Form of the Good, are germane to much of Clement's thought.

<sup>33</sup> *Aisthetos* occurs in I, 4; IV, 27; X, 13; XIII, 33; XV, 11; *Cat. myst.*, I, 2; IV, 9. *Noetos* occurs (the list is not exhaustive) in Procatechesis, 1; *Cat.*, I, 4 (three times); II, 17; III, 1 (twice); IV, 16, 27 (twice); XIII, 34.

<sup>34</sup> *Strom.*, VI, 7, 54 and 61 (GCS, XV, 459, 462); VI, 1, 2 (GCS, XV, 423)



as Light and Wisdom bestows wisdom,<sup>85</sup> which Clement identifies with gnosis, and invites to the gnosis of His divinity. The *Catechetical Lectures* mark an advance in this respect. In the *Lectures* Cyril's theology of the third Person is very developed, and we are not surprised to find that there it is the Holy Ghost who enlightens souls and implants gnosis. In *Cat.*, XVI, 16 Cyril emphasizes that the Holy Ghost is the true light-bringer; rays of light and knowledge flash from Him, heralding His coming. Cyril then proceeds to describe the supernatural powers of this gnosis: it operates at a distance; house walls are no obstacle to its possessor's vision; the man enlightened by the Holy Ghost and gifted with this gnosis sees, with Isaias, the Lord enthroned; with Ezechiel, Him who sits above the Cherubim; he beholds Daniel's "myriads of myriads." In IV, 16 the gnosis has for its (not exclusive) object the Holy Ghost, who "knows the mysteries," and whose sanctification every spiritual nature needs. In XVII, 19 gnosis is implicitly associated with the Holy Ghost and Christ together; there Cyril, commenting on Acts 2:13, says that the Apostles were drunk with draughts of the spiritual (*noetes*) vine, and that this "sober drunkenness" confers gnosis of things unknown.

Although in the *Catecheses* the scriptural exegesis is usually, as the subject demanded, literal and positive, there are several instances of allegorical and typical interpretation.<sup>86</sup> These passages, however, often differ from the allegorical interpretation of the Cantic of Canticles in the *Sermon* (10-12) in that, while in the *Sermon* the applied meaning is arbitrary and has only a tenuous connection with the letter, the accommodations in the *Catecheses* are usually natural and warranted by tradition. Yet it is perhaps noteworthy that where Cyril, offering a mystical interpretation of John 19:34, invokes the authority of "our fathers the exegetes," Toutée, while remarking that the symbolic application of this passage to the twofold baptism

<sup>85</sup> In its general sense; in *Strom.*, VII, 10, 55 (GCS, XVII, 40-41) wisdom is regarded as a particular intellectual virtue imparted by teaching and consequently inferior to gnosis; but this is rather exceptional.

<sup>86</sup> Cf., e.g., *Cat.*, XIII, 17-21; XV, 20. The significance of the few passages of "allegory" in the *Lectures* should not be exaggerated; it must, indeed, be remembered throughout this discussion that there was a good deal of blending and cross-fertilization between the different "schools"; not that there was much "Antiochene" literature before the fourth century.

is common among the Fathers, cites, among earlier Greek writers, only Origen.<sup>37</sup> Here also Cyril observes that "nothing has been done at haphazard," which is the principle underlying the typical interpretation of Scripture. The symbolical explanation of the sacramental ritual in the *Lectures on the Mysteries* has something in common with the typical or figurative interpretation of Scripture. Symbolism, however, belongs to the idea of a sacrament, and when Cyril finds types of the sacraments in the Old Testament, his treatment is again natural and traditional rather than arbitrary or subjective.

It is so far clear, then, that Cyril's personal mystical tendencies sometimes overflowed into the *Catechetical Lectures*, and that the *Lectures* contain something of the manner and ideas characteristic of the Alexandrian school. It remains to ask whether there is any evidence that the instruction imparted in these Lenten lectures was, at least to some extent, formally regarded as a gnosis, and whether there is any marked affinity between the Jerusalem catechesis and the Alexandrian system of instruction.

The scale and thoroughness of the pre-baptismal instruction at Jerusalem, to which there is no attested parallel in any contemporary church, itself recalls the general conception of Clement and Origen. The very institution of the catechumenate, of course, while effectively antiquating any idea, always repugnant to Catholic instinct, of a caste system in the very bosom of the Church, had canonized the conception, characteristically Alexandrian, of a graduated education and progressive initiation. The restrictions,<sup>38</sup> again, which hedged around the publication of the *Catechetical Lectures* provided in Jerusalem the answer to the same sort of dilemma as that which Clement faced when he deliberated "whether it is worse to give knowledge to the unworthy or to fail to transmit it to the worthy."<sup>39</sup> Again, the repeated insistence, in the *Lectures*, on sincerity,<sup>40</sup> especially when this insistence is coupled with the name of Simon Magus, a native of Samaria and commonly regarded by the Fathers as the fountainhead

<sup>37</sup> *Cat.*, XIII, 21 and Toutée, *ad loc.*

<sup>38</sup> Cf. the Note which follows the Procatechesis; its date and authority are uncertain, but its prescriptions are, in any case, already implied by Procatechesis, 12.

<sup>39</sup> *Fragments*, "Propheticae," 27, lines 20-23.

<sup>40</sup> E.g., Procatechesis, 2, 3, 4, 17; *Cat.*, XVII, 35-36.

of the Gnostic heresies, suggests that Cyril was concerned about the danger of the enrollment among the candidates for baptism of persons who, lacking faith and an appreciation of the unique and transcendent character of Christianity, desired merely esoteric knowledge and mystic experience.

It was the Alexandrian ambition to overcome the false gnosés and rival systems by presenting Christianity as a transcendent revealed synthesis; we find a certain parallel to this conception in Cyril's emphatic assertion in the Procatechesis that the Lenten teaching forms a single systematic whole, a body of doctrines as interlocked and unitary as a building.<sup>41</sup> It is in this passage that Cyril first refers to the Lenten catechesis as a gnosis.<sup>42</sup> For the Alexandrians, the object of gnosis was primarily the revelation contained in Scripture; thus for Clement Christ Himself is both the teacher and the object of gnosis, but He teaches us "through the prophets, the Gospel, and the Apostles," so that the whole gnosis, from A to Z, is contained in the Old and New Testaments.<sup>43</sup> It is, therefore, highly significant that Cyril in V, 12 speaks of the gnosis of Scripture being supplied, for the busy and the unlearned, by the creed, and of the creed as "enfolding all the gnosis of the religion of the Old and New Testaments." Cyril viewed the creed as a summary of the dogmatic content of Scripture,<sup>44</sup> and the syllabus of the Lenten catechesis was, precisely, the creed demonstrated and expounded at large from Scripture. Origen similarly held that, since a Christian synthesis must be based on revelation, its construction must be primarily a work of exegesis.

On this question, whether the Lenten catechesis was regarded as the imparting of a gnosis, a particularly instructive lecture is the fourth, *On the Ten Dogmas*, in form a summary of Christian doctrine and a

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Procatechesis, 11.

<sup>42</sup> "We bring you the stones of gnosis."

<sup>43</sup> *Strom.*, VII, 16, 95 (GCS, XVII, 67).

<sup>44</sup> Cyril, however, like Origen, recognized also the importance of tradition and the role of the teaching church, from which the Christian receives both creed and Scripture; cf. *Cat.*, IV, 33-36; V, 12; XVIII, 23-28. In *Cat.*, XVIII, 23 Cyril significantly says that the Catholic Church is so called because she universally and unfailingly teaches all the doctrines that ought to come to the knowledge (*gnosis*) of mankind concerning things visible and invisible, things in heaven and things on earth, and because (one recalls his teaching on the heavenly physician) she universally doctors every kind of sin committed by soul or body.

preliminary recapitulation of the whole Lenten course. This lecture falls into two parts, the subject matter of the first (3-17) being the directly trinitarian articles of the creed. The main theme of the second part is the true doctrine of human nature: the soul, created by God, free and immortal; the body, created, essentially good; virginity and marriage; the body's food and clothing, its resurrection and immortal life (18-31). Now, in IV, 18 Cyril speaks of the first part of the lecture (that specifically concerned with the three Persons) as a gnosis, and in IV, 3 he speaks of the teaching already imparted to the baptized, and therefore by implication of the whole of the doctrine summarized in this lecture, as a gnosis. Lecture IV, therefore, would appear to be, in the Alexandrian tradition, a summary presentation of Christianity as the authentic, revealed gnosis or world view, outmoding the false rival gnoses, the content or object of which was precisely the cosmos and the self.<sup>45</sup> If IV, 18 appears to suggest that the object of the gnosis was primarily and essentially the three divine Persons, it must be remembered that the essentially trinitarian character of Christian doctrine was clearly recognized, a fact reflected in the trinitarian pattern of the creed and its description by Cyril's immediate successor as "(the doctrine of) the Holy Trinity."<sup>46</sup> The lecture concludes with some general teaching on Holy Scripture which, as "the oracles of God," contains the gnosis.<sup>47</sup>

Since the fourth lecture imparts a bare outline of the faith and lacks the "demonstration from Scripture" which is the characteristic of the fuller course which it anticipates,<sup>48</sup> Cyril's description of it (IV, 3) as a mere introduction, "milk for babes," presents a certain parallel to Origen's doctrine that simple faith, excellent as it is, is elementary, milk for babes, while enlightened faith is distinguished from it by its possession of the specifically Christian demonstration from miracles and prophecy.<sup>49</sup> Clement likewise conceived of gnosis as not only a

<sup>45</sup> Cf. especially the first sentence of *Cat.*, IV, 18.

<sup>46</sup> Jerome, *Contra Ioannem*, 13 (*PL*, XXIII, 382).

<sup>47</sup> *Cat.* V, 12, *ad fin.*, and IV, 37.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. *Cat.*, IV, 17; this chapter contains the clearest account of what the *Catecheses* are.

<sup>49</sup> Origen, *Contra Celsum*, I, 2; cf. I, 13 (*GCS*, Origenes I, 57; cf. 65-66); cf. Jules Lebreton, *Hist. Prim. Church*, IV, 827-28. For both Origen and Clement, gnosis (or "enlightened faith") appears to be sometimes intellectualistic, sometimes mystical, the latter character being more prominent in Clement. For the "milk and meat" comparison (Heb 5:12-14;

higher religious knowledge of a mystical type, but also as a scientific elaboration of the dogmas of faith, at once built on faith and validating it. In X, 6 Cyril makes explicit the distinction between the mere acceptance of doctrines on faith and their demonstration from Scripture, the work of the Lenten catechesis. There is, finally, a close parallel between Cyril's description (IV, 3) of this fourth lecture, essentially a brief exposition of the creed, in relation to the whole Lenten course, as "an abridged summary" or "concise recapitulation of the necessary doctrines" and Clement's statement that "faith is a sort of concise gnosis of the essentials, while gnosis itself is a firm and solid demonstration of the truths received through faith, being built upon faith by means of the Lord's teaching."<sup>60</sup> Since for Clement "the Lord's teaching" is the Bible, this passage reflects exactly Cyril's insistence that the various articles of the creed must get their warrant and "demonstration" from Scripture.

That the summary in the fourth lecture, although itself described as a gnosis, is really only an introduction to the gnosis proper, is already clear from its place in the general scheme of the *Lectures* as indicated in IV, 3; and Cyril will again (V, 12) insist that the creed contains the gnosis of Scripture only in a seminal form. The "demonstration" with which Clement identifies the gnosis itself, is the subject of the *Catechetical Lectures* as a whole.

---

6:1) cf. Origen, *Contra Celsum*, III, 52-53 (*GCS*, Origenes I, 248-49); Clement, *Strom.*, V, 10, especially section 66: "If, then, milk is said by the Apostle to be the food of babes, and meat the food of the perfect, the 'milk' must be the catechetical instruction. . . and the 'meat' mystic contemplation" (*GCS*, XV, 370). Transposed into the terms of the Jerusalem system, Clement's "milk" would appear to be the first, or elementary, catechesis (comparable to Cyril's summary in *Cat.*, IV), while his "meat" would correspond rather with the "illumination," or advanced instruction, imparted to the candidates for baptism during Lent. Cyril's description here (IV, 3) of "those who have the gnosis" as "those of a more perfect habit, who have their senses exercised, etc.," shows that he also is thinking of Heb 5:12-14, and therefore implies that he too identifies the "strong meat" as the gnosis. At Jerusalem, it is suggested below, the gnosis had two levels, the lower level being the intellectualist Lenten "demonstration" of the faith from Scripture, and the higher the post-baptismal "contemplation" or *theoria*. This would imply that at Jerusalem the classes had been downgraded, so that the catechumens of the higher class (the candidates for baptism) received the lower gnosis, while at Alexandria not even all the faithful were "gnostics."

<sup>60</sup> *Strom.*, VII, 10, 57 (*GCS*, XVII, 42). Both *pistis* and *gnosis* appear to be susceptible of a subjective and objective meaning, the former designating either "knowledge" or "a body of knowledge," and the latter either "faith" or "the faith (or creed)."

The lesson heading the fourth lecture might be expected to provide a clue to the context and tradition to which the Lenten teaching at Jerusalem belonged; all the more as Cyril's successor, John II of Jerusalem, when rebuked by St. Jerome for summarizing in a single sermon, which may well have corresponded to Cyril's fourth lecture, "the faith and all the doctrines of the Church," pleaded not only custom but also the provocation of the lesson for the day.<sup>51</sup> The lesson heading Cyril's fourth lecture begins at Col 2:8: "Beware lest any man cheat you by philosophy and vain deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the rudiments of the world, and not according to Christ." The Epistle to the Colossians, together with the account of the two wisdoms in the first three chapters of I Cor, seems to have held an important place in Alexandrian thinking. Certainly nowhere else does St. Paul more effectively demolish the false philosophies and spurious gnoses, or construct with such systematic splendor the true, revealed synthesis, showing that both the profoundest philosophical problems which perplexed mankind and the highest aspirations of man's religious consciousness find their answer in Christ: in the mediatorial office of the Word in the physical creation, and in the moral order in the Word Incarnate as the Redeemer, the Light, and the revelation of the Father.<sup>52</sup> This had, moreover, been one of the scriptural passages from which Clement derived his conception of a "philosophy according to Christ," that is, a Christian synthesis based on revelation.<sup>53</sup> The verse could indeed be interpreted with a different emphasis, and Tertullian had seen in it only an occasion for denouncing philosophy. But the response of Cyril, or of the Jerusalem tradition, was, like Clement's, positive; he found in the lesson a challenge to expound systematically "all the blessings of sure insight, to the full knowledge of the mystery of God, even Christ, in whom lie hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."<sup>54</sup> Christianity, being a religion of both transcendence and immanence, is necessarily also a philosophy, the

<sup>51</sup> Jerome, *Contra Ioannem*, 13 (PL, XXIII, 382).

<sup>52</sup> Cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (2nd ed.; London, 1876), pp. 73-125, especially 113-19.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. *Strom.*, VI, 8, 62 (GCS, XV, 463), where Cyril quotes Col 2:8 twice and Heb 5:12.

<sup>54</sup> Col 2:2-3 (Westminster Version, Small Edition; Sands & Co., 1947).

true *Weltanschauung*; and the Procatechesis.<sup>55</sup> together with *Cat.*, IV and the very title of the Lenten course,<sup>56</sup> suggests that the knowledge imparted to the "candidates for enlightenment" was regarded, in the spirit of St. Paul and of Clement, as a world view, a profound revealed system which, antiquating heathen philosophies and religions, provided the key to cosmic and personal problems and admitted the initiates to sublime mysteries.<sup>57</sup>

It is here relevant to note that the Lenten lectures, whether as shaped by Cyril himself or by the Jerusalem tradition of which he was the heir, include passages which appear to be a counter-teaching to the sort of Judaeo-Gnostic heresy which St. Paul combated in the Epistle to the Colossians. Anticipating many of the tenets of the Gnostic heresies of the second and third centuries, the Colossian heretics stressed the related problems of creation and of evil. Their teaching, theosophic as well as Judaic in character, was fundamentally dualist; they held that the material principle is antagonistic to God, and that God can be reached, if at all, only via a hierarchy of aeons or angelic mediators. A distinction between Jesus and Christ was taught perhaps by them, certainly by their successor Cerinthus.<sup>58</sup> In the *Catecheses*, apart from the extended anti-Gnostic polemic in VI, 12-36, we find four chapters devoted to the origin of evil;<sup>59</sup> the absolute freedom of God is taught,<sup>60</sup> as well as the essential goodness of matter<sup>61</sup> and of the human body;<sup>62</sup> also the freedom of the human will.<sup>63</sup> The tenth lecture is one of the most instructive from this point of view. There Cyril stresses that in the sphere of gnosis no less than in the physical and moral orders Christ is the one Mediator; he twice refutes the heresy that "Jesus is one, Christ another," and insists that the one Lord Jesus Christ was Lord before His incarnation, that He is Lord of all, including the angels, and that this universal lordship is based on His role in creation.<sup>64</sup> Cyril also takes occasion to mention

<sup>55</sup> Especially 6 and 10-12.

<sup>56</sup> *Lectures to the Candidates for Enlightenment.*

<sup>57</sup> That the "mysteries" were not only the sacramental mysteries is clear from *Cat.*, VI, 29, *ad fin.*

<sup>58</sup> For the Colossian heresy see J. B. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-113.

<sup>59</sup> *Cat.*, II, 1-4; cf. XII, 5.

<sup>60</sup> *Cat.*, IV, 5.

<sup>61</sup> *Cat.*, IX, 4-5; cf. IV, 4; VI, 13; IX, 7.

<sup>62</sup> *Cat.*, IV, 22-33.

<sup>63</sup> *Cat.*, IV, 19-21.

<sup>64</sup> *Cat.*, X, 1, 4, 5, 6, 10, 14.

the dependency of the angels in X, 12, and their ignorance of "the deep things of God" in XI, 13.

One final parallel between Cyril and Clement may be cited. In a passage which incidentally throws light on his view of the relationship between faith and gnosis Clement quotes Rom 1:17 ("from faith unto faith") and proceeds: "The Apostle clearly proclaims that faith is twofold, or rather is a single thing which admits of growth and perfecting. Common faith is at the base as a foundation. . . . 'Your faith has saved you.'<sup>65</sup> Excellent faith, built on this foundation, corresponds to the faith which results from discipleship and from fulfilling the commands of the Gospel; such were the Apostles, of whom it is said that their faith could move mountains." Clement then goes on to compare faith to a grain of mustard seed.<sup>66</sup> To this passage there is a striking parallel in Cyril's fifth lecture: "The word 'faith' is one, but two kinds of faith must be distinguished: one kind, dogmatic faith, is an assent of the soul" and it saves. "The second kind of faith is bestowed by Christ as a free gift: 'To one, indeed, by the Spirit is given the word of wisdom; and to another the word of knowledge according to the same Spirit; to another, faith.'<sup>67</sup> This faith bestowed by the Spirit is not only dogmatic, but also has superhuman power. The man who has this faith 'shall say to this mountain, Remove from hence thither, and it shall remove.'<sup>68</sup> . . . Of this faith it is said: 'If you have faith as a grain of mustard seed. . . .'<sup>69</sup> The soul enlightened by faith beholds God, . . . ranges around the borders of the universe, and before the consummation of this world already sees the judgment."<sup>70</sup> Both Clement and Cyril, therefore, distinguish two kinds of faith, describing both kinds in very similar terms; and, when the passages are read in their wider contexts, both roughly equate the higher faith with gnosis. The parallel is completed by the *Letter to Constantius* in which Cyril, arguing that the apparition of the heavenly cross at Jerusalem is both a miracle and a fulfilment of Gospel prophecy,<sup>71</sup> urges the Emperor to "build gnosis on the good foundation of faith."<sup>72</sup>

<sup>65</sup> Mt 9:22.

<sup>67</sup> I Cor 12:8-9.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>71</sup> *Letter*, 1 and 6. The text of the *Letter* is in Reischl and Rupp's edition of Cyril, II, 434-41.

<sup>72</sup> *Letter*, 5.

<sup>66</sup> *Strom.*, V, 1, 2 (*ad fin.*) and 3 (*GCS*, XV, 327).

<sup>69</sup> Mt 17:20 (17:19 in Douay Version).

<sup>70</sup> *Cat.*, V, 10-11.



The reference to I Cor 2:4 ("not in the persuasive words of human wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit and of power")<sup>73</sup> also points to the Alexandrian context of Cyril's *Letter*; for Origen used this verse to justify his conception of the specifically Christian demonstration, characteristic of his "enlightened faith," from prophecy and miracle.<sup>74</sup>

In the passage just quoted from the *Lectures* Cyril's second, "charismatic" faith is apparently to be identified with the gnosis bestowed by the Holy Ghost, the true Enlightener, the supernatural powers of which are described in XVI, 16: the man thus enlightened "sees in a superhuman way things which he did not know. While his body is on earth, his soul mirrors the heavens. With Isaias, he sees the Lord. . . . Little man sees the beginning and the end of the world."

It is by no means the purpose of this article to maintain the paradoxical position that Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures* constitute an exact parallel at Jerusalem to the Alexandrian gnosis, but only to argue that the *Sermon on the Paralytic* shows that St. Cyril owed his spiritual formation to the mystical Alexandrian tradition, and that the *Catecheses*, besides containing patches of *theoria* and some characteristically Alexandrian ideas, exhibit in their general conception and method some important analogies to the aims and technique of the school of Alexandria. On the other hand, Cyril takes occasion to reject quite a number of views associated with the name of Origen (he never mentions that name), and his attitude to philosophy strongly contrasts, on the whole, with that of both Clement and Origen, even though these allowed it no more than a propaedeutic function. Cyril could never, like Clement, have spoken of philosophy as "the vestment of the Logos." Cyril's insistence, indeed, on speaking of theological, especially trinitarian, doctrine in the very language of Scripture is almost Miltonic, except that Milton's quotation of Scripture is marked by a selective tendentiousness, while Cyril's is traditional and Catholic. Again, Cyril never refers to the baptized as "gnostics," a term which had become in some degree suspect even in Origen's time. The word "gnosis" itself, even if used by Cyril in a quasi-technical sense, has lost in the *Lectures* something of the systematic character it possessed in Clement. Most

<sup>73</sup> *Letter*, 4, *ad fin.*

<sup>74</sup> *Contra Celsum*, I, 2; cf. I, 13 (GCS, Origenes I, 57, 65-66).

remarkable of all, whereas for Clement and Origen the distinction between Christians of simple and those of enlightened faith (gnostics), even though it marked a difference of degree rather than an essential distinction,<sup>75</sup> was a distinction among the baptized, in Jerusalem the gnosis—assuming that the Lenten teaching was so regarded—was imparted in view of baptism. This contrast, however, is considerably softened, first, by the presence of a scientific as well as a mystical element in the Alexandrian gnosis (and intellectual distinctions among the faithful are inevitable); secondly, by the fact that Clement stressed the ideal or *de jure* inseparability of faith, enlightenment, and perfection,<sup>76</sup> while on his side Cyril must have recognized, in spite of his statement that the fifth of the *Lectures on the Mysteries* completes the spiritual edifice,<sup>77</sup> that even after the illumination imparted in the higher catechesis and culminating in the Easter initiation, there were further spiritual mansions to be gained. Cyril would have accepted Clement's view of baptism as the seed of perfection, a seed which must develop and flower; the baptized Christian has yet to "become what he is." Nevertheless, the Jerusalem system contrasts more obviously than the Alexandrian with the heretical Gnostic doctrine of an intellectual and spiritual élite favored with an esoteric superior wisdom. In the Jerusalem system it was clear beyond cavil that faith of its very nature aspires, and is ordered, to perfection; that all Christians form an élite, "a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people," possessing the supreme wisdom revealed in Christ; and further, that in this wisdom all men without distinction are called to share.

Exactly how, then, did Cyril regard the further phase of spiritual

<sup>75</sup> So F. Cayré, *Manual of Patrology*, I (transl. H. Howitt; Paris, 1936), 185, Cayré continues: "This doctrine is taken from St. Paul . . . and those critics are in error who reproach Clement with it." In view of the Alexandrian distinction between "believers" and "gnostics," the question whether, as Toutée (with some hesitation), de Puniet, and G. Bareille held, the candidates are regularly called *pistoi* ("believers") in the *Catecheses*, takes on a new significance in the present context. Cf. Toutée, *PG*, XXXIII, 145, 149, 343; de Puniet, *DACL*, II/2, 2594, *s.v.* "Catéchuménat"; Bareille, *DTC*, II/2, 1976, *s.v.* "Catéchuménat." The relevant passages in the *Catecheses* include Procatechesis, 6, 12, 13, 17; *Cat.*, I, 1 and 4; V, 1; X, 16; XI, 9; XVIII, 26; *Cat. myst.*, III, 1 and 5. Cf. also Etheria, *Peregrinatio* (ed. Geyer), 38, 1; 46, 2, 4, 6; 47, 2.

<sup>76</sup> Cf., e.g., *Paed.*, I, 6, 25 and 29 (*GCS*, Clem. Alex. I, 104–5, 107–8). The fact that Clement sometimes, like most Eastern Fathers, calls baptism "enlightenment" is significant in this context.

<sup>77</sup> *Cat. myst.*, V, 1.

progress and enlightenment appropriate to the years after baptism? and how was the more advanced, post-baptismal stage related to the sort of instruction and study of Scripture that belonged to the Lenten enlightenment? The sentence in XIII, 9 is not the only passage in the *Catecheses* where Cyril hints that the character of scriptural exegesis was different in the ordinary sermons. In XVI, 31 he remarks that he cites the Susanna episode only for its evidential value, "as this is not the occasion for exegesis"; it may well be, however, that there Cyril is simply excusing the brevity of his treatment. In XII, 17 we read: "The prophet Moses says: 'The Lord will raise up to you a prophet out of your brethren, like unto me'; let that phrase, 'like unto me,' be reserved for discussion on the proper occasions." The phrase is nowhere discussed in the *Catecheses*, and it is remarkable that, had Cyril been thinking of its literal or simple figurative sense as a reference to the human nature of the Savior, that topic had already been discussed earlier in the lecture. Moreover, why, on this hypothesis, should "like unto me" be singled out to the exclusion of "out of your brethren"? The explanation may be that in the theoretic or contemplative exegesis "like unto me" would have been explained, on the ground that a prophet is a mouthpiece or spokesman of God,<sup>78</sup> as signifying the divine nature of Christ.

The best clue, however, to the nature of the advanced or mystical enlightenment remains the second sentence of XIII, 9, on which the extant *Sermon* may be regarded as an illustrative comment. The slight evidence available suggests that Cyril regarded the way of perfection as *theoria* (contemplation), and that *theoria* was the prayerful study of the *Verbum incarnatum* as His eternal personality is revealed in inspired Scripture, the *verbum scriptum*. It is unlikely that *theoria*, for Cyril, had any essential connection with the allegorical interpretation of Scripture in the ordinary sense. The three chapters of allegory in the *Sermon* (10–12) appear as a blemish in this exercise in *theoria*, and it has been remarked above that the allegorical exegesis in the *Catecheses* shows a distinctive discipline. Cyril's younger contemporary, Diodorus of Tarsus, wrote a work entitled, *The Difference between Theoria and Allegory*. This work is unfortunately lost, but it may be surmised that, unlike allegory, *theoria* always presupposed the literal

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Procatechesis, 6: "The Psalmist said in the person of God . . ."; and *Cat.*, X, 12 "The prophet says in His person. . ."

meaning, and, where allegory tended to a distraction and dispersal of interest, *theoria* (at any rate for Cyril), finding the ideal in the real, the infinite and eternal in the historical event, was characterized by centrality, concentration, and a high degree of organization; if we may judge from the *Sermon*, it combined activity and rest in gazing on the Person of Christ. For *theoria*, that is to say, the Gospel is both historical and timeless; at once past and actual, the record of fact and the vehicle of values, it is relevant to each age's present predicament;<sup>79</sup> in the terms of Martin Kähler's distinction, it is *Historie* and *Geschichte* together.<sup>80</sup>

Since Diodorus of Tarsus ruled, with Caterius, a monastic community in or near Antioch,<sup>81</sup> and since the (very weak) tradition that Cyril had been a monk in his younger days is supported by some internal evidence,<sup>82</sup> it is probable that Cyril learnt *theoria* from the monks. That contemplation was in general the prerogative of monachism seems to be implied by St. Gregory Nazianzen's statement that it took Athanasius to combine the priesthood with the *philosophia* of the men of the desert.<sup>83</sup> One recalls also how, towards the end of the century, St. John Chrysostom "planned to revive the monastic ideal in the Christian family by the spirit of prayer, to transform the house of the Christian into an 'academy of philosophy.'" <sup>84</sup>

The fact that Diodorus of Tarsus, who appears to have been a fore-runner of the new school of Antioch, was the author of a work on *theoria* may seem to cast doubt on the assumption that Cyril's interest in *theoria* argues an Alexandrian influence. But it appears to be beyond question that the term, even though mediated by the monks, came to Cyril from the school of Alexandria. The article, "Contemplation," in the *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* states that the word *theoria* is absent

<sup>79</sup> The "actuality" of the words and works of the Savior is stressed in the *Sermon*, 17-19; e.g., " 'Sin no more': the word is a sermon addressed to all [or, "the Word is preaching to all men"] and teaching many through one."

<sup>80</sup> Cf. M. Kähler, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus* (1892, and recently republished). Rudolf Bultmann and other contemporary theologians have adopted the distinction, but probably not in the proper sense of Kähler.

<sup>81</sup> Socrates, *Hist. eccl.*, VI, 3 (PG, LXVII, 665-68); Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.*, VIII, 2 (PL, LXVII, 1516).

<sup>82</sup> The relevant passages are *Cat.*, IV, 24; XII, 33; XVI, 22; in themselves they prove no more than a marked sympathy with monachism.

<sup>83</sup> Greg. Naz., *Orat.*, XXI, 19 (PG, XXV, 1101-4).

<sup>84</sup> Cayré, *op. cit.*, I, 488; cf. Chrysostom, *In Ioannem hom.*, LXI, 3 (PG, LIX, 340).

from the Apostolic Fathers, and occurs only seven times in the Apologists; "par contre, à partir de Clément d'Alexandrie et d'Origène, il se met à pulluler."<sup>85</sup> Origen viewed the Christian's progress as an ascent from simple to enlightened faith (or gnosis) and divine wisdom, this being the goal or end.<sup>86</sup> Clement's perfection consisted of three elements, *apatheia*, gnosis, and charity, or union with God. Gnosis, therefore, he says, "comes with enlightenment, and the end of gnosis is repose in the Lord, which is the last goal of desire."<sup>87</sup> *Theoria*, however, is prominent in his writings, especially in the sixth book of the *Stromateis*. There Clement says that the wise man's end is *theoria*, an end which mere philosophy never attains, and that gnosis, or wisdom, ought to be practised until it becomes perpetual *theoria*.<sup>88</sup> Clement's *theoria* appears to be closely related to his *anapausis* (rest in the Lord); perhaps *anapausis* is *theoria* plus *agape* (charity), or, alternatively, *theoria* may be active, and *anapausis* passive, contemplation.<sup>89</sup>

It would appear, then, that in Cyril's Jerusalem the primarily intellectual Lenten enlightenment, accompanied by penance and the practice of virtue, was followed by a more mystical gnosis associated with *theoria*, *apatheia*, and *sophia* (wisdom). It is possible that Cyril never systematized the terms in which he thought of the spiritual ascent; but if, viewing the goal as already present in the way, he conceived of it as *theoria*, it is clear from the *Sermon* that he understood this not as merely speculative knowledge, but, in the spirit of St. John's Gospel, as the contemplation of the concrete Supreme Good; if, like Origen, he thought of it as *sophia*, both he and Origen would probably have accepted Bengel's definition of this as "visus cum sapore."<sup>90</sup>

<sup>85</sup> *Dict. de spir.*, II (1953), 1762. <sup>86</sup> *Contra Celsum*, VI, 13 (GCS, Origenes II, 83-84).

<sup>87</sup> *Paed.*, I, 6, 29 (GCS, Clem. Alex. I, 107-8). <sup>88</sup> *Strom.*, VI, 7, 61 (GCS, XV, 462).

<sup>89</sup> These terms, however, have the disadvantage of suggesting greater precision and technicality than are intended. In *Strom.*, VI, 12, 98 (GCS, XV, 481) Clement appears hardly to distinguish *theoria* from gnosis; probably his *theoria* is the better part of gnosis and merges into *anapausis*. Cayré (*op. cit.*, I, 186) follows J. Lebreton in distinguishing Clement's gnosis from simple faith, which it perfects, from theological speculation, which lacks the mystical light, and from properly mystical or infused contemplation; and identifies it with his own "perfect contemplative meditation" or "perfect meditative contemplation," an active contemplation (if the term is allowable) which he defines, *op. cit.*, Introduction, pp. 26-27.

<sup>90</sup> Commenting on I Cor 12:8; quoted by J. B. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 174.