

## NOTE

### THE LENTEN CATECHETICAL SYLLABUS IN FOURTH-CENTURY JERUSALEM

The evidence as a whole strongly suggests that the syllabus of the Lenten catechesis at Jerusalem, both at the time of St. Cyril's *Catecheses* (ca. 348) and in the year 394, for which there is important evidence from St. Jerome, was simply, or at least substantially, the Creed. It would follow that the well-known account in the *Peregrinatio ad sancta loca* (generally dated to ca. 393–96) is inapplicable alike to the Jerusalem of 348 and of 394.

The exact date of the *Peregrinatio*,<sup>1</sup> whose authoress is now thought to have been named Etheria or Egeria, cannot yet be regarded as definitively settled; nevertheless, the almost unanimous opinion of scholars favors a date within the last twenty years (usually the last decade) of the fourth century.<sup>2</sup> Two other dates have, however, been proposed. In 1948 Dom. E. Dekkers argued for 415–17,<sup>3</sup> and previously Karl Meister had advocated a date as late as the first half of the reign of Justinian (527–65), in spite of the clear evidence in the *Peregrinatio* that the *disciplina arcani* was still in force in the Jerusalem described by Etheria.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The *Peregrinatio* was first edited in 1887 by G. F. Gamurrini from an eleventh-century Arezzo MS under the title, *Peregrinatio s. Silviae Aquitanae*; references to Gamurrini's text or views are to this *editio princeps*. Gamurrini produced a second, improved edition in 1888; far the best text, however, is that edited by Paulus Geyer for the Vienna *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum* (Vol. XXXIX) in 1898. References in this paper to the *Peregrinatio* are to the chapters and sections of Geyer's edition, with the manuscript page, as given by Gamurrini, added in brackets. Hélène Pétré's *Ethérie: Journal de voyage* (Sources chrétiennes, XXI; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1948) contains Geyer's text, with slight alterations, and a French translation.

<sup>2</sup> Gamurrini proposed the years 385–88, and this date appears to be accepted by Canon J. N. D. Kelly, who places the visit to Jerusalem "about forty years later" than the *Catecheses* (*Early Christian Creeds* [London: Longmans, 1950], p. 33). In 1922 Férotin and Leclercq proposed a slightly later date, 393–96, and in 1939 Leclercq reaffirmed this view: "Nous disions (en 1922) vers 393–396; il n'y a pas lieu de modifier ces chiffres" ("Pèlerinages aux Lieux saints," *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, XIV, 100; cf. "Etheria," *ibid.*, V, 552–84). This is also the date given by Canon F. L. Cross in the text of his *St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Lectures on the Christian Sacraments* (London: S.P.C.K., 1951), p. xviii. This, or approximately this, date is also advocated by Deconinck and Duchesne, as well as by McClure and Feltoe (*The Pilgrimage of Etheria* [London: S.P.C.K., n.d.], pp. vii–xiv).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. E. Dekkers, "De datum der *Peregrinatio Egeriae* en het feest van Ons Heer Hemelvaart," *Sacris erudiri*, I (1948), 181–205.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. M. L. McClure and C. L. Feltoe, *op. cit.*, pp. viii–x. For the *disciplina arcani*, cf. *Peregrinatio*, 46, 1, 2, 6 [72–73].

It will be as well, before summarizing Etheria's account of the Lenten syllabus, to quote the relevant passage *in extenso*:

Consuetudo est enim hic talis, ut qui accedunt ad baptismum per ipsos dies quadraginta, quibus ieiunatur, primum mature a clericis exorcizentur, mox missa facta fuerit de Anastase matutina. Et statim ponitur cathedra episcopo ad Martyrium in ecclesia maiore et sedent omnes in giro prope episcopo, qui baptidiandi sunt tam uiri tam mulieres, etiam loco stant patres uel matres, nec non etiam qui uolunt audire de plebe, omnes intrant et sedent, sed fideles. Catechuminus autem ibi non intrat, tunc qua episcopus docet illos legem sic: id est inchoans a Genese per illos dies quadraginta percurrat omnes scripturas primum exponens carnaliter et sic illud soluens spiritualiter. Nec non etiam et de resurrectione, similiter et de fide omnia docentur per illos dies; hoc autem cathecisis appellatur. Et iam quando completae fuerint septimanae quinque, a quo docentur, tunc accipient symbolum, cuius symboli rationem similiter sicut omnium scripturarum rationem exponet eis singulorum sermonum primum carnaliter et sic spiritualiter, ita et symbolum exponet. . . . Ac sic tribus horis docentur ad die per septimanas septem. Octaua enim septimana quadragesimarum, id est quae appellatur septimana maior, iam non uacat eos doceri. . . .<sup>5</sup>

We learn from an earlier passage in the *Peregrinatio* that Lent lasted for eight weeks in Jerusalem in Etheria's time, but that neither Sundays nor Saturdays, with the exception of Holy Saturday, were fast-days.<sup>6</sup> It is natural to interpret the present passage as stating (1) that catechetical instructions were given every morning by the bishop on each of the thirty-five fast-days of the first seven weeks of Lent, no instructions being given during the week immediately preceding Easter; and (2) that the catechetical instruction fell into two distinct parts, the syllabus for the first five weeks being Holy Scripture together with the resurrection and faith, while the Creed, which was delivered to the candidates only at the end of the fifth week, formed the subject-matter of the instructions only during the sixth and seventh weeks.

It appears to have been fairly widely assumed that Etheria's account of the Jerusalem catechesis is valid for the time of St. Cyril's *Catecheses* (ca. 348). Recently, for instance, Canon J. N. D. Kelly has written of the data supplied by St. Cyril being "confirmed and augmented" by the *Peregrinatio*;<sup>7</sup> and the same writer appears to be drawing on the *Peregrinatio* when he writes that at Jerusalem in the middle of the fourth century "(probably at the end of the fifth week) the creed was delivered to the catechumens. The remaining two weeks before Holy Week were occupied in expounding it."<sup>8</sup> Previously

<sup>5</sup> *Peregrinatio*, 46, 1-4 [72-73].

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 27, 1 [60].

<sup>7</sup> *Early Christian Creeds*, p. 33.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

Fernand Cabrol not only accepted Etheria's account of a double course of pre-baptismal lectures, with two distinct syllabuses, as generally valid for St. Cyril's time, but even attempted a detailed correlation of the *Catecheses ad illuminandos* with Etheria's double course.<sup>9</sup>

It is here proposed to show (1) that Cabrol's attempt to establish a detailed correlation between the *Catecheses* and the *Peregrinatio* fails; (2) that Etheria's double course is wholly and in principle irreconcilable with the *Catecheses*; (3) that Etheria's account is equally irreconcilable with the evidence of St. Jerome bearing on the Jerusalem catechesis in the last decade of the fourth century, i.e., the very time to which the statements of the *Peregrinatio* are commonly supposed to refer; and (4) to consider the evidence of the Old Armenian Lectionary and the possibility of Etheria's account having originated in a mistake.

#### CRITICISM OF CABROL'S THEORY

Cabrol attempted to assign the Procatechesis and the eighteen lectures of Cyril's first series (the *Catecheses ad illuminandos*) to their proper places in the scheme imposed by the *Peregrinatio*. The Procatechesis can almost certainly be assigned to the first Sunday of Lent.<sup>10</sup> As regards the eighteen pre-baptismal lectures, Cabrol concluded that, since the sixth to the seventeenth inclusive deal in order with articles of the Creed, they belong to the second course mentioned by Etheria, and therefore to the sixth and seventh weeks. Only the Procatechesis and the first four *Catecheses*, Cabrol concluded, belong to the first five weeks, the majority of the discourses representing the first course having perished.

Cabrol's arrangement, therefore, is as follows: *Catt.* I-IV belong to the first five weeks; no place is assigned to *Cat.* V; *Catt.* VI-XI were preached on the six days, Monday to Saturday, of the sixth week; and *Catt.* XII-XVII similarly on the six week-days of the seventh week. *Cat.* XVIII is assigned to Palm Sunday with the remark that it is outside the series and belongs with the *redditio symboli*, or formal profession of the Creed, which Etheria appears to place on Palm Sunday.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *Les Eglises de Jérusalem: La discipline et la liturgie au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris—Poitiers, 1895), chap. VIII [misprinted VII], esp. pp. 156-59.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *Peregrinatio*, 45-46 [72-73]; also A. A. Toutée, "Monitum in Procatechesim," *PG*, XXXIII, 327-28. Migne reprinted Dom Toutée's great edition of the *Catecheses* (Paris, 1720). The edition of Reischl and Rupp (Munich, 1848-60) has a slightly better text; there is no modern critical edition. All references to the works of Cyril are to the numbers and sections of the *Catecheses* as given in Migne (*PG*, XXXIII); it is Migne's (i.e., Toutée's) text that is followed.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *Peregrinatio*, 46, 5-6 [73].

Cabrol recognized the difficulty that this arrangement supposes that catechetical instructions were given on the Saturdays of the sixth and seventh weeks, in spite of Etheria's explicit statement to the contrary. He suggested that either Etheria was thinking, when she excluded Saturdays, only of the first five weeks, or that in this point the custom might have changed during the interval between the delivery of Cyril's *Catecheses* and Etheria's pilgrimage to the Holy Places. Cabrol also recognized the difficulty that on his arrangement *Cat. XIV* would have been preached on a Wednesday, whereas it is certain from the words, "yesterday, on the Lord's Day" (*XIV, 24*), that it was delivered on a Monday.

There are, however, other objections to Cabrol's view. There is, for instance, the difficulty that, while according to Cabrol's scheme *Cat. XI* would have been preached on the Saturday of the sixth week and *Cat. XII* on the following Monday, in fact the words, "Remember what was said yesterday concerning His Godhead" (*XII, 4*), make it reasonably certain that *Cat. XI* and *XII* were delivered on successive days.

Again, it is scarcely possible to explain away the difficulty of finding a suitable place for *Cat. XVIII* by saying that it is outside the scheme envisaged by the *Peregrinatio*. Since the subject of *Cat. XVIII* is the final articles of the Jerusalem Creed—"in one holy Catholic Church, and in the resurrection of the flesh, and in the everlasting life"—it ought (if the schemes of the *Peregrinatio* and the *Catecheses* are related) to find a place in the *Peregrinatio*'s second course (that on the Creed), except for the section on the resurrection of the flesh, which is one of the topics of the *Peregrinatio*'s first course. Nor, in any case, can this discourse be assigned to Palm Sunday; it is clear from the reference to Good Friday in *XVIII, 17* that it was delivered on Holy Saturday.

On Cabrol's supposition, again, baptism and the remission of sins ought, as being contained in the Creed, to come in the second course. But in fact, as St. Cyril himself observes (*XVIII, 17*), they were the subject of the earliest discourses: "The faith which we rehearse [i.e., the Creed] contains in order the following: 'And in one baptism of repentance for the remission of sins; and in the resurrection of the flesh; and in eternal life.' Now of baptism and repentance we have spoken in the earliest lectures."

#### ETHERIA'S ACCOUNT INCOMPATIBLE WITH CYRIL'S

Central in the *Peregrinatio*'s account is the distinction between two courses,<sup>12</sup> together with the statement that the Creed was not delivered until the end of the fifth week. Now the text of the *Catecheses* makes it all

<sup>12</sup> The first on Scripture, the resurrection, and "faith"; the second (covering the sixth and seventh weeks) on the Creed.

but certain that in Cyril's time the Creed was delivered shortly after the beginning of Lent. In IV, 3 Cyril says: "Before delivering you over to the Creed, I think it well now to give a concise summary of the necessary doctrines, to prevent the multitude of things to be said and the interval of all the days of holy Lent from begetting forgetfulness in the minds of the simpler among you." The obvious inference from this, that the Creed is to be delivered without delay, is confirmed by the fact that the Creed is actually delivered to the candidates towards the end of the following lecture (V, 12). On the other hand, *Cat.* IV itself is generally thought to have been spoken towards the beginning of Lent, and the second part of the passage just quoted ("to prevent," etc.) strongly confirms this assumption.

Two other passages indicate that Cyril's whole syllabus in the *Catecheses* was the Creed, and are difficult to reconcile with the double course of the *Peregrinatio*. These are the passages where St. Cyril, at the beginning and at the end of the course, gives a summary indication of the scope of the lectures. First, in the Procatechesis, after explaining that one of the purposes of the catechesis is to arm the candidates with ammunition for controversy with Jews and Gentiles, Samaritans and heretics, Cyril continues: "You must be instructed in the doctrine of the living God, of the judgment, of Christ, of the resurrection."<sup>13</sup> Of the four heads of instruction here mentioned, the last three are doctrines contained in the Creed; the first probably refers to the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity (often called "theology" by the Fathers), which was probably regarded as the centre and essence of the Creed.<sup>14</sup> Certainly nothing is said here about a Scripture course.

In the second passage Cyril, looking back on the course now ending, says: "On the subject, then, of the holy and apostolic faith delivered to you to profess [i.e., the Creed], we have spoken, by the Lord's grace, as many lectures as was possible in these past days of Lent" (XVIII, 32). "Faith" (*πίστις*) here certainly means the Creed; for at this point in his last lecture before Easter Cyril has just concluded his exposition of the last clause of the Jerusalem Creed, "and in life everlasting."<sup>15</sup> The use of the technical

<sup>13</sup> Procatechesis, 11. Translations of the *Catecheses* are sometimes indebted to the Church-Gifford translation in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, VII (Oxford, 1893).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *infra*.

<sup>15</sup> It is, of course, the Jerusalem Creed that is spoken of in this study. Much of the actual wording of the Jerusalem Creed is quoted by Cyril; a comparison of the text with the titles of the *Catecheses* leaves no doubt about the substance of the remaining articles. The reconstruction of the Jerusalem Creed in sufficient detail for the purposes of this study presents no problem. For the reconstruction, cf. Toutée, *PG*, XXXIII, 533-34; E. H. Gifford, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, VII, xlvii; Le Bachelet, *Dict. de théol. cath.*, III, 2539-40; Kelly, *op. cit.*, pp. 183-84.

words, *παράδοσις ὑμῖν εἰς ἐπαγγελίαν*, puts the matter beyond doubt. Cyril regularly refers to the Creed as "the faith" (*ἡ πίστις*), either simply or in some periphrasis; he never, as Toutée noticed,<sup>16</sup> uses *σύμβολον* for the Creed. Cyril's statements here, then, while perfectly natural if the Creed had been the syllabus throughout Lent, would be very strange if the Creed had been delivered only at the end of the fifth week and had formed the subject of only two weeks' instructions.

Two other passages in the *Catecheses* provide further evidence against the alleged Scripture course in Cyril's time. First, it is remarkable that there is no hint of a Scripture course for the *φωτιζόμενοι* in the passage (IV, 33-36) where Cyril gives his formal teaching on such matters as the canon of Scripture and the place of the Scriptures in the Christian scheme. The second passage seems positively to exclude such a course; there, just before the delivery of the Creed, Cyril says: "For since all cannot read the Scriptures, some being hindered by a want of learning and others by a want of leisure, to prevent the soul perishing from ignorance we comprise the whole doctrine of faith [i.e., the Creed] in a few lines" (V, 12). The assumption here seems to be that the Jerusalem Christian's chief source of knowledge of the Scriptures, apart from the Creed regarded as a summary of Scripture, was private study. Although one cannot press such an extreme conclusion, since ordinary sermons, for example, normally contained exegesis of Scripture, yet it is difficult to suppose that these words of Cyril were addressed to an audience which either had just attended, or was about to attend, a five-weeks course of lectures on Scripture. This passage does, on the other hand, imply that a course on the Creed was, in Cyril's view, inevitably also a course on Scripture. Passages to be quoted presently put this beyond doubt.

While, then, the very conception of a sharp distinction between Creed and Scripture is not without its difficulties, these difficulties would have arisen in an acute form for Cyril on account of his explicit awareness of the intimate connection between Creed and Scripture. Such a separation of Creed and Scripture as Etheria's account would appear to entail is utterly alien to the *Catecheses*. In the *Catecheses* Scripture and doctrine are closely interwoven, the preacher constantly appealing to Scripture for the proof or illustration of doctrine. Altogether there are more than 1300 quotations of Scripture—not one of them, incidentally, being introduced by the remark that the passage had already been discussed in a Scripture course.

Apart from Cyril's practice, we have in the *Catecheses* clear statements of his theory of the relation between Creed and Scripture. In IV, 17 Cyril asserts the practical impossibility, in preaching, of separating doctrine from Holy Writ: "For concerning the divine and holy mysteries of the faith not

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *PG*, XXXIII, 525-28.

even a casual statement must be delivered without the Holy Scriptures." At the moment of the delivery of the Creed (V, 12) he states explicitly his view of the Creed as a summary of the central doctrines of Scripture:

At the proper season expect the confirmation out of Holy Scripture of each part of the contents [of the Creed]. For the articles of the faith [i.e., the Creed] were not composed as seemed good to men, but the most important points collected out of all the Scriptures make up one complete teaching of the faith. Just as the mustard seed in one small grain contains many branches, so also this faith [the Creed] has embraced in a few words all the knowledge of godliness in the Old and New Testaments.

Anyone who took this view of the relation of Creed and Scripture would surely have felt such a separation of the two as is postulated by Etheria's two courses to be in the highest degree artificial and embarrassing.

#### EVIDENCE OF ST. JEROME

Etheria's account, therefore, of the Lenten teaching, with its twofold course and delivery of the Creed only after the fifth week, is irreconcilable with the *Catecheses*. It is of even greater interest, since the date most generally favored for the *Peregrinatio* is 393-96, to find in St. Jerome's controversial work, *Ad Pammachium, contra Ioannem Hierosolymitanum*, evidence that Etheria's account is equally inapplicable to the Jerusalem of 394.

St. Jerome's *Contra Ioannem* is a kind of open letter directed against that John of Jerusalem who, on Cyril's death in 386, succeeded him as Bishop of Jerusalem and ruled the see until *ca.* 417. It was written *ca.* 396-99, probably towards the end of 396 or early in 397; its evidence about the Lenten teaching refers to the year 394.<sup>17</sup> The origin of this work was as follows. St. Jerome, besides suspecting John of Origenism, had criticized him for dealing in a single sermon with "the whole circle of doctrine" and "all ecclesiastical questions."<sup>18</sup> John, in a letter addressed to Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, had defended himself on both counts; and the *Contra Ioannem* is Jerome's

<sup>17</sup> Migne reprinted Vallarsi's edition of St. Jerome; the text of the *Contra Ioannem* is in *PL*, XXIII, 371-412 (in Migne's variant edition of Jerome, XXIII, 355-96). For the passage here discussed, cf. cols. 379-82; in Vallarsi's original edition (Venice, 1767), II, 419-20. English quotations follow, in the main, Fremantle's translation in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, VI, 424-47; the only words, however, which Fremantle punctuates as a quotation of John are "stir you up." For the dates, cf. Fremantle, *op. cit.*, p. 424; J. Forget, *Dict. de théol. cath.*, VIII, 899-900 and 916. F. Cayré, *Précis de patrologie*, I (Paris—Tournai—Rome, 1931), dates it to 396 in one place (p. 560, n. 6) and to 397 in another (p. 483; the English translation has 387 instead of the original 397; cf. *Manual of Patrology*, I [Paris—Tournai—Rome, 1936], 495).

<sup>18</sup> *Contra Ioannem*, 10-11. This and further references to the *Contra Ioannem* are to the chapters in Migne's edition, reproduced in Fremantle's translation.

rebuttal of John's excuses. Jerome accuses his opponent of disingenuousness in that he had pleaded inconsistently both that his sermon had been preached extempore, prompted by the lesson for the day, and that it had been a deliberate recapitulation of his Lenten preaching to the candidates for baptism. What gives extraordinary value to Jerome's testimony is the fact that he is frequently actually quoting, in Latin translation, passages from the letter of the Bishop of Jerusalem. This is apparent from the work as a whole, and Jerome's possession of the text of John's letter is certain from the words: "And first, before I translate and insert in this book the letter which you wrote to Bishop Theophilus . . ." (chap. 4).

The passage in the *Contra Ioannem* in which important evidence concerning the Lenten catechesis appears incidentally is worth quoting in full:

Is there any man in his right senses who would declare that in a single sermon he had discussed "the faith and all the doctrines of the Church"? Pray show me that lesson. . . . But . . . you promise one thing and present another. "Our custom is" [you say] "for the space of forty days to deliver the doctrine of the holy and adorable Trinity to those who are to be baptized." But if the lesson for the day stimulated you to discuss all doctrines in a single hour, what necessity was there to repeat the instruction of the forty days?<sup>19</sup> If, on the other hand, you meant to recapitulate what you said during the whole of Lent, how could one lesson "stir you up" to speak of all these doctrines? But even here his language is ambiguous; for possibly he took occasion from the particular lesson to go over summarily what he was accustomed to deliver in the Church to the candidates for baptism during the forty days of Lent.<sup>20</sup>

To take a small point first: Since John's sermon, as Toutée noticed,<sup>21</sup> appears to correspond to Cyril's *Cat. IV*, "On the Ten Dogmas," it is probable that there had been no significant change between 348 and 394 in the custom, apparently peculiar to the Church of Jerusalem, of summarizing "the faith and all the doctrines of the Church" in a single sermon.

What is of far greater interest, however, is the fact that we have here from the pen of Jerome—or rather of John, Cyril's successor—a direct description of the syllabus of the Lenten teaching in the phrase, "the doctrine of the Trinity." The passage also contains an *indirect* description of the Lenten teaching; for since it is stated that the sermon was a recapitulation of the Lenten teaching, descriptions of the subject-matter of the former are

<sup>19</sup> So Fremantle; but, as the sense required appears to be, "why was it necessary to drag in the alternative explanation about recapitulating the Lenten teaching?", the translation perhaps should be: "what was the point of the 'recapitulating the instruction of the forty days?'"

<sup>20</sup> *Contra Ioannem*, 13.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *PG*, XXXIII, 451–52.



also descriptions of the latter. It is true that Jerome questions John's *intention* to recapitulate the teaching of "the forty days of Lent"; but whatever the real motive of the sermon, there was agreement about the ground it covered, and consequently there would have been no point in describing the sermon as a recapitulation of the Lenten teaching unless it was so describable.

To take the description of the sermon first: It suggests (if we remember that the sermon was a recapitulation of the Lenten teaching) that the syllabus of the pre-baptismal teaching was the Creed, or at least that it covered doctrine only; there is no suggestion of a Scripture course or of any double course. The sermon is three times described as being "de fide et omnibus ecclesiasticis dogmatibus."<sup>22</sup> This phrase may refer generally to the whole of Christian doctrine, of the main points of which the Creed is a summary. It is, however, not improbable that *fides*, presumably a translation of John's *πίστις*, means, as *πίστις* so often does in the *Catecheses*, the Creed. In that case the addition, "de omnibus" etc., if it is not simply an explanatory expansion of *fides*, was probably added to cover the minor doctrines which we find treated after the Creed in *Cat. IV*. *Cat. IV*, indeed, which Cyril likewise describes as a summary of the whole Lenten teaching,<sup>23</sup> is the best commentary on the description of John's sermon. *Cat. IV*, the discourse "On the Ten Dogmas," first (1-17) expounds briefly those articles of the Creed which concern the three Divine Persons: God, Father and Creator; the Son, His Incarnation, virgin birth, passion, descent into hell (incidentally), resurrection, ascension, second coming; the Holy Ghost. Cyril then treats briefly (18 ff.) of man, meats, apparel, the resurrection of the flesh, baptism, and Scripture (the canon, etc.). This agrees fairly well with Jerome's presumably incomplete list of the topics covered in the sermon: "the Trinity, the assumption of our Lord's body, the cross, [the descent into ?] hell, the nature of angels, the condition of souls, the Savior's resurrection and our own."<sup>24</sup> The only clearly new item here is "the nature of angels," and this may be due to John's Origenistic interests.<sup>25</sup>

If the parallel with *Cat. IV* is sound, it is likely that, while subsidiary matters were included in John's sermon (as in Cyril's *Cat. IV*), *fides*, or the Creed, alone was the subject of his Lenten teaching—just as the Creed is the basis of the *Catecheses*, and the other topics occurring in *Cat. IV* do not reappear in the later lectures.

The general argument of this essay, however, is not tied to this detailed interpretation, however probable, of the phrase, "de fide et omnibus ec-

<sup>22</sup> *Contra Iohannem*, 11, 12, 13.

<sup>23</sup> *Contra Iohannem*, 10.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *Cat. IV*, 3.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, 7, 17, 19.

clesiasticis dogmatibus." On any interpretation this phrase would be a natural description of the syllabus of the *Catecheses*, while it is hardly applicable to the syllabus described in the *Peregrinatio*.

The direct description of the Lenten syllabus is contained in John's statement, quoted above in English, that their custom at Jerusalem was "ut iis qui baptizandi sunt per quadraginta dies publice tradamus sanctam et adorandam trinitatem." It can hardly be doubted that the reference here is to the Creed. The Jerusalem Creed, after all, like our Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, was, in its scheme and its substance, primarily a confession of faith in the Blessed Trinity. The Creed is about God in Himself, triune, and the two principal works of God, the creation and the redemption, in both of which the three Persons cooperated. Moreover, there are clear signs in the *Catecheses* that the essentially trinitarian character of the Creed was clearly recognized in the Jerusalem tradition. In *Cat. IV*, immediately after the first or trinitarian part of his discourse, Cyril says: "Next to the knowledge of this venerable, glorious, and all-holy faith [the Creed], learn further . . . ." And yet, although it is only the trinitarian part that is described as credal, the topics of the second part of *Cat. IV* include such articles of the Jerusalem Creed as the resurrection of the flesh, baptism unto the remission of sins, and life everlasting. That is to say, the appellation of "the faith," or "Creed," is reserved for those articles alone (listed above) which expressly concern the Divine Persons.

The identification of "the delivery of the Holy Trinity" as the delivery and exposition of the Creed is also confirmed by the plainly trinitarian "short form" of the Creed which the candidates twice repeated during the baptismal ceremony (*Cat. XIX*, 9 and *XX*, 4).

In another striking passage Cyril, speaking of the *disciplina arcani*, says: "To hear the Gospel is permitted to all; but 'the glory of the Gospel'<sup>26</sup> is reserved for Christ's true disciples . . . It is not the custom to expound to the Gentiles these mysteries which the Church now reveals to thee. For we do not reveal to the Gentiles the mysteries of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost" (*VI*, 29). While the precise logical form of the concluding argument is not fully explicit, it is natural to understand this passage as implying that "the mysteries of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost" are identical with the mysteries expounded in Cyril's Lenten course. Now evidence has been produced above that Cyril's syllabus was the Creed, which, like the whole doctrine of the *Catecheses*, was subject to the *disciplina arcani*.<sup>27</sup> Vallarsi apparently thought the identification of the "doctrine of

<sup>26</sup> Cf. II Cor. 4:4.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Procatechesis, 12; *Cat.*, V, 12 (for the Creed).

the Holy Trinity" as the Creed obvious; for he glossed the phrase, without comment, *fidei symbolum*.<sup>28</sup>

By this phrase, then, St. Jerome meant the Creed, and there is every indication that he was thinking of the *whole* of Lent when he spoke of the Creed as the syllabus; for in the relatively short passage quoted he speaks three times of "the forty days" and once of "the whole of Lent."

If this is a correct interpretation of the passage in the *Contra Iohannem*—and assuming that the John-Jerome statement is itself accurate—it follows that Etheria's account of the Lenten syllabus is inapplicable even to the time (*ca.* 394) of which she is generally supposed to have been writing.

#### SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions so far reached are as follows. First, St. Cyril's Lenten syllabus in the middle of the fourth century was, at least substantially, the Creed.

Secondly, there is no reason to think that the extant *Catecheses* is incomplete. The completeness of the *Catecheses* follows from the first conclusion taken together with the fact that the Creed appears to be fully expounded in the extant *Catecheses*. It is confirmed by the fact that, while there are in the *Catecheses* many references to other discourses, all but a very few of these references are either recognizably to other discourses in the extant series or are expressly to sermons preached on Sundays; the three exceptions<sup>29</sup> *could* be references to ordinary sermons.

Thirdly, the syllabus of the extant *Catecheses* is, at least substantially, the Creed. This conclusion follows from the first two conclusions and is confirmed by simple inspection.<sup>30</sup> That *Catt.* VI–XVIII deal in order with articles of the Creed is obvious. But Cabrol's assumption that, because the Creed is only delivered at the end of *Cat.* V, therefore the earlier discourses must have had some different subject-matter, is refuted by St. Cyril himself in the passage already quoted: "Now of baptism and repentance we have spoken in the earliest lectures" (XVIII, 22). This clearly refers to *Catt.* I–III which, although they differ somewhat in character, having a more practical and moral bearing, from the later lectures, yet have for their subject the topics mentioned in the article of the Jerusalem Creed, "in one baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Only two lectures, IV and V, are left.

<sup>28</sup> Vallarsi, *op. cit.*, II, 419–20.

<sup>29</sup> *Cat.*, XII, 18; XIII, 9; XIII, 16.

<sup>30</sup> The question of the syllabus of the *Catecheses* is distinct from the problem, with which this paper is principally concerned, of Cyril's Lenten syllabus. This second question cannot be settled by inspection, since it cannot be initially assumed that the *Catecheses* is complete.

The first half of *Cat.* IV is a summary exposition of the directly "divine" or trinitarian articles of the Creed; the second part contains some extra credal matter. *Cat.* V deals with "faith" in both of the Jerusalem senses: first with the virtue of faith and then with the general character of the Creed. Even the first part is concerned with the Creed in so far as it is equivalently an exposition of the first work of the Creed, *credo*; in the second part the Creed itself is delivered.

Fourthly, Etheria's account of the Lenten syllabus is consequently inapplicable to the *Catecheses* and to the middle of the fourth century.

Fifthly, the passage in the *Contra Ioannem* indicates that in the year 394 the Lenten syllabus was still simply the Creed; it also witnesses to the constancy of the Jerusalem tradition even in such minor matters as the discourse "On the Ten Dogmas," and perhaps also in the continued use of *πίστις* for the Creed.

#### EVIDENCE OF THE OLD ARMENIAN LECTIONARY

Since Etheria's pilgrimage is commonly dated to the last decade of the fourth century, this last conclusion is of considerable interest. The obvious inference might appear to be that the *Peregrinatio's* account of the Lenten catechesis, incompatible as it is with the *Catecheses* and the *Contra Ioannem*, constitutes internal evidence for the view that the *Peregrinatio* belongs to some time after the fourth century, perhaps to the date, 415-17, advocated by Dom E. Dekkers.

The solution of the problem, however, appears not to be so simple. The Old Armenian Lectionary,<sup>31</sup> which claims in its preface to give the order of services for the Jerusalem Church, gives nineteen lessons for the Lenten catecheses. The first eighteen of these Scripture readings, introduced by the words, "for the holy Quadragesima," and followed by the rubric, "Here ends the canon of them that are going to be baptized," correspond exactly with the lections at the head of the eighteen *Catecheses ad illuminandos*, lections which are in many cases confirmed by the text of the lectures. The nineteenth lection is twice adduced by Cyril in XVIII, 25. The Old Armenian Lectionary is probably to be dated to about 440; it was certainly composed before 530, and it is later than 417, the date of the death of John of Jerusalem, who is commemorated in it on March 29.

The evidence of this Lectionary is clearly difficult to reconcile either with the double course alleged by Etheria or with her statement that there was a

<sup>31</sup> For this paragraph, cf. F. C. Conybeare and J. A. Maclean, *Rituale Armenorum* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), esp. p. 518.

daily catechesis during the first seven weeks of Lent. It strongly suggests, on the contrary, that the syllabus and general scheme of the Lenten catechesis had remained essentially unchanged since the time of the *Catecheses*. With the exception of the *Peregrinatio*, indeed, all the evidence agrees, presenting a consistent picture with which it seems impossible to reconcile the statements of Etheria.

In itself, Etheria's account, with its first course on Scripture, the resurrection, and faith, and its second on the Creed, presents some puzzling features. Taken strictly, some of its statements are contradictory. Before the mention of the second course it is twice stated that the first course, or Scripture alone, occupies the whole forty days. Again, whether "the resurrection" in the first course means the resurrection of Christ or the resurrection of the flesh (or both), it is included in the Creed. Why, again, is "faith," if it means the virtue of faith, grouped with the resurrection and Scripture rather than with the Creed? Another odd feature of the passage is the statement that the Creed, like the Scriptures, is expounded "primum carnaliter et sic spiritualiter"; as applied to the Creed, this phrase seems to have remained so far unexplained.

The most curious feature, however, of this passage in the original text has disappeared in Geyer's and subsequent texts. In the MS Etheria reports the bishop's allocution as follows: "Per istas septem septimanas legem omnem edocti estis scripturarum necnon etiam de fide audistis; audistis etiam et de resurrectione carnis, sed et singuli omnem rationem ut potuistis tamen adhuc cathecumeni audire" (46, 6). In this summary of the Lenten syllabus there is no mention of the Creed, which the candidates had just formally rendered to the bishop, unless it is referred to under one or both of the headings, *legem scripturarum* and *fide*. If, however, it is so referred to, the question inevitably arises whether in the main passage also "Scripture," "the law," "faith," and the Creed (*symbolum*) did not, for Etheria's informants, all mean much the same thing. Geyer, however, emended *singuli* to *simboli*, an unquestionably pretty emendation which may well be right, although it is not altogether without difficulty.

In any case, it is a striking fact about the *Peregrinatio's* account of the syllabus that, when it is interpreted according to Cyrillan terminology, the distinction between the two courses breaks down almost completely. All three constituents of the first course would be included in the second. *De fide omnia*, reminiscent of such phrases in the *Catecheses* as τὸ πᾶν δόγμα τῆς πίστεως (V, 12), would refer to the Creed; Scripture would be the Creed writ large; and the resurrection is included in the Creed.

## A HYPOTHESIS

What, then, are the chances of this passage being due to a mistake by Etheria? The languages spoken at Jerusalem in Etheria's time were Greek and Syriac, some of the natives speaking Greek, some Syriac, and some both. The bishop always preached in Greek and a priest simultaneously interpreted in Syriac. *Graeco-latini* either interpreted or gave a running commentary in Latin for the benefit of the pilgrims from the West.<sup>32</sup> Etheria, coming from Galicia in Spain, is unlikely to have known much, if any, Greek before her arrival in the East. She must have picked up some Greek in the course of her extensive travels, but whether this was much more than a smattering is not altogether clear. Some writers rate her Greek quite highly. If, however, Geyer is right in his unfavorable estimate of her knowledge of Greek,<sup>33</sup> Etheria would have been largely dependent for her information about the Lenten syllabus on the interpreters, to whom, coming from the Latin Church, she might have listened with false expectations and as a stranger to their terminology.

In view, then, of the apparent impossibility of reconciling Etheria's with other accounts of the Lenten syllabus at Jerusalem, it seems possible that Etheria in this passage was reporting an oral statement which she had not fully understood, and that her informants, in speaking of "Scripture, the resurrection, and faith" as well as of "the symbol," were making so many attempts to describe the unchanged syllabus of the *Catecheses*, i.e., the Creed; and that what they really told her was that the Creed was delivered, not after the fifth *week*, but—what would have been very surprising to a Westerner—early in Lent, at the end of the fifth *lecture*, as in the *Catecheses*.<sup>34</sup>

Glasgow, Scotland

A. A. STEPHENSON, S.J.

<sup>32</sup> For the languages spoken at Jerusalem and the arrangements for interpreters, cf. *Peregrinatio*, 47, 3-5 [73-74].

<sup>33</sup> "Vix mediocriter gnara" (*op. cit.*, p. xiv).

<sup>34</sup> If Conybeare's view that the Lectionary is the lectionary used in Jerusalem in "the last half of the fourth century" (*Rituale Armenorum*, p. 181, note a) is correct, the explanation of the discrepancy between the *Peregrinatio* on the one hand and the *Catecheses*, the *Contra Iohannem*, and the Armenian Lectionary on the other may be that the *Peregrinatio* belongs to the early fifth century, perhaps to the date, 415-17, advocated by Dom E. Dekkers. If Abbot Cappelle and others are right in assigning the Lectionary to ca. 432, its evidence strengthens the suspicion that Etheria's account originated in a mistake.