
Theōria in Theodore's and Theodoret's Commentaries

This chapter provides analysis of primary source material in the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret of Cyrus in order to illustrate and develop a definition of Antiochene *theōria*—or at least *theōria* as understood by Theodore and Theodoret. Primary sources for this research include manuscripts of Theodore's and Theodoret's exegetical works found in the TLG database¹ and in J. P. Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* (PG).² These are supplemented with recent translations such as those in the Fathers of the Church (FC) multivolume series and catenae such as the Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture (ACCS).³

Despite the presence of significant research on Antiochene exegesis, there remains a relative dearth of serious study on Antiochene *theōria* in the primary sources of Theodore and Theodoret. My study builds on the foundation of Bradley Nassif's

dissertation, which, among other concerns, addresses *theōria* primarily in the writings of John Chrysostom.⁴ In this chapter I aim to help fill the first of Nassif's five noted lacunae for research on Antiochene *theōria*—namely, to review other individual Antiochene writings and their use of the term *theōria*.⁵ Regarding such analysis, the Catholic patristic scholar Bertrand de Margerie writes:

The complexity of the material available shows that we still undoubtedly await the definitive work that will give us an exact understanding of the meaning of Antiochian *theoria*, or, better still, of the different meanings of the term found in the authors of the School and even within the same author.⁶

The reader will have to decide if the material in this chapter provides such an exacting definition of *theōria* from the writings of Theodore and Theodoret. But first it is necessary to address a more preliminary issue.

Defining the Antiochene School: Three Approaches

Regrettably, little consensus exists regarding the definition of the “Antiochene school” or its membership.⁷ There are three perspectives and approaches to the issue. The first group of scholars regards practically any theologian or ecclesiastical leader of the fourth or fifth century from the Syrian Antiochene region as a member of the Antiochene school. This is the broad approach. The second or centrist perspective starts with the criterion of the broad approach but includes only those church leaders who generally followed a literal interpretive method as the primary defining sign of the Antiochene school. The third and smallest group of scholars follows a narrow approach. They classify only those ecclesiastical leaders branded Nestorian heretics as from the school of Antioch.

A Broad Approach

Historically, all church leaders trained in the Syrian Antiochene region were deemed part of the Antiochene school. These include Lucian (d. 312), Eustathius, Diodore of Tarsus (d. 390), John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and others such as the Cappadocian three—Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa.⁸ But Johannes Quasten in his modern classic *Patrology* separates the “writers of Asia Minor” like the Cappadocian Fathers from the “writers of Antioch and Syria.” The latter he equates with the “School of Antioch” especially the “most famous of this ecclesiastic province, Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, John Chrysostom, and Theodoret of Cyrus.”⁹ This aligns with the centrist approach.

A Centrist Approach

A mediating perspective excludes the Cappadocian three (and others) because their exegesis reflects more the allegorical methods of the school of Alexandria.¹⁰ D. S. Wallace-Hadrill supports this from the ancient Syriac writings of Barhadbešabba, who “contrast[s] the apostolic school of Antioch with the Jewish-Hellenistic school of Philo at Alexandria, where Scripture ‘was explained allegorically to the detriment of history.’”¹¹ Despite even ancient support for the centrist approach, another more narrow definition arises.

A Narrow Approach

Recently some scholars have proposed a radical perspective suggesting that the hermeneutical method of the Antiochenes cannot be separated from their Nestorian Christology. Therefore, they

include only Nestorius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Diodore of Tarsus in the Antiochene school. The evangelical patristic scholar Donald Fairbairn is among the scholars who take the narrow approach,¹² as is Jaroslav Brož. He does not see opposition between the Antiochene and Alexandrian “systems of exegesis” and believes that “both schools worked on the principle that scriptural texts have two basic senses.” He suggests that “all of the Church Fathers were convinced that inspired Scripture has another aspect that lies beyond the strictly literal sense.” He claims, further:

For the Fathers, the non-literal meaning of a text was always related to the confession of orthodox faith and to the communion of the Church. These two elements were thought to be the *conditio sine qua non* for the discovery of the deeper meaning of inspired Scripture. All of the historical dates connected with a narrative and every detail that helped to clarify the literal meaning of a text were only secondary and relative tools in relationship to Christ and the life of the Church.¹³

But even accepting Brož’s premise does not prove that no “opposition [exists] between the Antiochene and Alexandrian ‘systems of exegesis.’” He is reductionistic, though affirming that the “Antiochenes deepened the understanding of prophetic activity by demonstrating that prophecy simultaneously includes story and contemplation (*theoria*).”¹⁴ Brož appears to make the same mistake that Johann August Ernesti, Friedrich Münter and J. Ch. W. Augusti did about 200 years ago. Namely, Brož makes too little distinction between ἀλληγορία and *theōria*, even for the Antiochenes, despite their own outcries and scholarship to the contrary.¹⁵ Granted that the Antiochenes also looked for a “spiritual sense” in the text, but not as the Alexandrians did.¹⁶ The issue relates to *how* that was (or should be) done.

Donald Fairbairn offers a stronger challenge to accepting Theodoret and Chrysostom along with Diodore and Theodore into

the Antiochene school. Essentially he argues that what separates the former pair from the latter pair is their Christology.¹⁷ Furthermore, Fairbairn argues (as had Wiles and Brož) that theology generally drove patristic exegesis rather than the other way around. He calls their exegesis “the cart” and their theology the “horse”:

Rather than asserting that exegesis was the horse pulling the theological cart, as the older view did, more recent [patristic] scholarship has insisted that to a great degree, theology was the horse and exegesis the cart. More specifically, patristic exegesis, according to recent patristics scholars, was a task of reading all of Scripture in light of a controlling theological idea.¹⁸

But whence comes this “controlling theological idea”? Of course, it must come from one’s own reading and interpretation of the text or from the reading and interpretation by others. This reality leads Fairbairn to hedge on his cart and horse analogy and to replace it with a circling of the wagons, for he then argues that for patristic exegetes “theology and exegesis were involved in a continual interplay.”¹⁹ This seems a more accurate description of patristic and especially Antiochene commentary and homiletical writing. But this will not do for Fairbairn, and soon he returns to his first assertion that “theology really lay behind [all patristic] exegesis.”

This seems necessary to Fairbairn, because he wishes to prove that only Diodore, Nestorius, and Theodore are truly Antiochenes. They were “a tiny minority, and their thought was deemed to be heretical.”²⁰ When determining the true makeup of the Antiochene school, of course the church’s evaluation of orthodoxy and heresy must be acknowledged. The Nestorian condemnations at the Council of Ephesus (431), the anathemas at the synod of the Three Chapters (546),²¹ and the Twelve Anathemas of the Second Council of Constantinople (Fifth Ecumenical Council of 553) should not be ignored, especially since the twelfth anathema condemns all who

defend Theodore's exegesis.²² But consensus on Theodore's role in the controversy was difficult to reach, and scholars even today are divided on whether he is the father of Nestorianism.²³ It is conceded that Theodore sometimes overstates the distinctions between the deity and humanity of the Incarnate One. But he also develops the doctrine of *communicatio idiomatum*—insights deemed orthodox more than a millennium later.²⁴

In *The Case against Diodore and Theodore*, John Behr reacts to support for Antiochenes, whom he believes ought to remain condemned as Nestorians.²⁵ Behr believes that the modern guild's support for Theodore's exegetical methods is based on their own historical-critical biases and "sympathy for all things Antiochene, understood very much in terms of . . . twentieth-century prejudices and set in opposition to all things Alexandrian through . . . oppositions . . . in exegesis, [namely:] *theōria* vs. allegory." Moreover, Behr concludes that this exegetical opposition between *theōria* and allegory "has been dismantled over recent years" by patristic scholars.²⁶ So Behr believes that all support for Theodore is based on anachronisms and historical-critical biases. Furthermore, he believes that the discussion is over regarding differences between Alexandrian and Antiochene exegetical methods.

If Behr, Fairbairn, and the patristic scholars they cite are correct, then is there any "Antiochene school" beyond Diodore, Theodore, and Nestorius? These scholars' assertions place the burden of proof on those attempting to glean valuable insights from Antiochene hermeneutical methods *as distinct* from Alexandrian methods. For if there is no distinction, why trouble with isolating the meaning of Antiochene *theōria* for helpful exegetical methods? So, the narrow definition of the Antiochene school conveniently throws out the Antiochene exegetical baby with the Nestorian theological

bathwater.²⁷ It makes the analysis of Antiochene *theōria* appear pointless, especially if condemned theology drives Antiochene exegesis, as Fairbairn emphasizes. It should be remembered, however, that Theodoret participated in Chalcedon and promoted a Christology that balances Theodore's concern (not to confuse the two natures) with the Alexandrians' concern (not to divide the one person).²⁸ Thus, aspects of Theodore's and Theodoret's (and the Bible's) unconfused two-natures Christology are married with Alexandrians' (and the Bible's) undivided person or *hypostasis* Christology. If this is correct, then it can be argued that Theodore, with Theodoret's help, played a role in affirming at Chalcedon orthodox Christology that is still affirmed today by Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, and Protestants. This reality, if accepted, raises further concerns about Theodore's condemnation 102 years later. And thus is raises questions about Fairbairn's linking that condemnation with the separating of Diodore, Theodore, and Nestorius as the lone Antiochenes.

Thus, I will attempt to show, first, that Theodore in his exegesis does have much in common with Chrysostom and Theodoret, and that these commonalities make all of their exegesis Antiochene and, therefore, distinct from Alexandrian exegesis. Certainly Antiochene exegesis exhibits an interplay between theology and exegesis, but it was also influenced by *other factors* that require discussion. One key factor is the distinction between Antiochene *theōria* and Alexandrian *allēgoria*. In chapters 3–4 I will interact with key patristic scholars (some who reject or nuance the distinction between Antiochene *theōria* and Alexandrian *allēgoria*). And here in chapter 2, I interact with primary sources of two Antiochenes, to make a case that some distinctions remain between Antiochene and Alexandrian exegesis.

The following section provides preliminary conclusions regarding the three (broad, centrist, and narrow) definitions of the Antiochene school, in which the centrist approach is affirmed.

Conclusion: A Centrist Approach

The broad definition of the “Antiochene school” pays too much attention to geographic regions and not enough to primary exegetical sources as evidence for or against a unified method of interpretation. On the other hand, the narrow definition places undue weight on council anathemas, without acknowledging clear historical links (not to mention similarity of exegetical method and support for Theodore’s christological concerns supported by Theodoret even as late as Chalcedon) between those deemed heretical (and therefore Antiochene) and those not deemed heretical (and thereby not Antiochene). For example, Theodore and John Chrysostom both studied under Diodore and exhibit similar exegetical methods, especially an emphasis on the historical nature of the text. Nassif, who effectively chronicles scholarly research of Antiochene *theōria* over the last century notes:

It is very important to emphasize at the outset that in tracing the scholarship, neither those authors nor I wish to advocate a radical revision of the prevailing view of Antiochene interpretation as being marked chiefly by its stress on the historical meaning of the Bible.²⁹

Bertrand de Margerie anticipates this assault on the Antiochene school in his query:

Is it fair to reduce the school of Antioch to its great masters, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodorus of Tarsus? Is not their fellow student and disciple, John Chrysostom, whose authenticity the universal Church recognizes to the point of calling him a Doctor, the chief figure of this school?³⁰

Philip Schaff answers affirmatively. He ably summarizes the relationship between four primary Antiochene representatives: Diodore, Chrysostom, Theodore, and Theodoret:

*Chrysostom belonged to the Antiochian school of theology and exegesis, and is its soundest and most popular representative. It was founded by his teacher Diodor of Tarsus (d. 393), developed by himself and his fellow-student Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 429), and followed by Theodoret and the Syrian and Nestorian divines. Theodore was the exegete, Chrysostom the homilist, Theodoret the annotator. The school was afterwards condemned for its alleged connection with the Nestorian heresy; but that connection was accidental, not necessary. Chrysostom's mind was not given to dogmatizing, and too well balanced to run into heresy.*³¹

There are clear distinctions among these four. Nevertheless, they are all members of the Antiochene school.³² Too much is lost by dismissing Theodore of Mopsuestia along with his interpretive method as a heresiarch, without taking the time to analyze and compare his method with others.³³

Fairbairn claims that others in the region like Chrysostom were not condemned because they were not really Antiochenes. Further, Greek Orthodox Metropolitan Demetrios Trakatellis agrees that recent patristic scholarship has reduced understandings of the distinctions between Antiochene and Alexandrian exegetical method. But when he compares Chrysostom, Eusebius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret, he clearly finds in Chrysostom a disciplined, tightly focused commentator with little foray into the NT and moderate christological application. This reflects some of the key distinctions of the Antiochene school.³⁴

Historically the Antiochene School is defined by its more literal and historical approach to Scripture. While their emphasis on *ιστορία*³⁵ of the Scripture is informed by a Christology that places greater weight on the distinction of the two natures in Christ, it does

not necessitate a Nestorian distinction. For example, Theodore of Mopsuestia understands the typological relationship between Adam and Christ differently from other Antiochenes.³⁶ But this does not necessarily mean that his interpretive method varies so greatly from theirs that they cannot both be called Antiochene.

Furthermore, Theodore's contemporaries did not isolate him (or Diodore). For example, Theodoret of Cyrus writes about the "school of Antioch" in his *Historia ecclesiastica* as well as in many of his epistles from the 430s and 440s. Adam M. Schor summarizes Theodoret's writings as displaying

Antiochene teachers and teaching as part of a larger, Nicene partisan effort—to build a regional coalition, to define a holy community, and to control the Syrian episcopate. Through his [Theodoret's] works one can discern an Antiochene socio-doctrinal network, which linked Theodoret to three generations of Syrian clerics.³⁷

For Schor that socio-doctrinal network does *not* exclude shared exegetical methods among the Antiochenes. Schor rightly includes three shared exegetical methods typical among all of the Antiochenes:

First in works of exegesis, these authors declared an interest in the "literal" (*kata lexin*) and the "historical" (*kath' historian*) meaning of Scripture. Second, in the same commentaries, the authors attacked "allegory" and expressed skepticism about figurative interpretations. Third, these authors pointed to biblical typologies, links between the "prototypes" of Old Testament characters and the "reality" (*alētheia*) of Jesus or the "types" of the Christian sacraments and the "reality" of future salvation.³⁸

Schor's third characteristic of Antiochene exegesis relates most readily to Antiochene *theōria*. But acknowledging these three common expressions of Antiochene exegesis does not imply that their exegesis is monolithic. This is readily visible in the distinctions between

Theodore and Theodoret's commentaries and even between different commentaries of Theodoret.³⁹

All three views (broad, narrow, and centrist) affirm Diodore as a founding Antiochene, who influenced Theodore of Mopsuestia.⁴⁰ But Diodore also trained John Chrysostom. Furthermore, Diodore, Theodore, and Chrysostom influenced Theodoret of Cyrus.⁴¹ It is important to determine who is an Antiochene, because, while some contemporary scholars wish to isolate a handful in the Antiochene school, Theodore's contemporaries (such as Theodoret and Barhadbešabba) did not. Wallace-Hadrill suggests a more evenhanded approach worth quoting at length:

It is easy to portray the biblical exegesis of Alexandria and Antioch in sharply contrasted black and white as though spiritual and historical interpretation were divided by an unbridgeable gulf. There was in fact extensive common territory between the extreme positions, and in much of their work the exegetes of both schools trod the same territory, keeping a wary eye on the enemy's position: presented with an anonymous piece of typological interpretation it might be possible to identify it as coming from the pen of John Chrysostom or Theodoret in Antioch or Cyril in Alexandria or Eusebius between the two at Caesarea. But behind Chrysostom would lie the powerful anti-Alexandrian polemic of Eustathius and Theodore of Mopsuestia and their steady concentration upon the historical event, and behind Cyril would lie the whole range of defences of allegorization and mystical speculation which Alexandria has built up over the centuries. There were real differences between the two schools, even if they overlapped at certain points.⁴²

Thus, this study will follow the centrist view for defining the Antiochene school, while acknowledging a literal-spiritual exegesis by them.

Furthermore, to strengthen the case for consensus between the exegetes of the Antiochene school, it must be shown from their

extant writings. This will follow, after background discussions of Theodore and Theodoret.

Backgrounds of the Two Antiochenes

The previous section makes a case that Theodore and Theodoret share a common training and social network that informs their theology and exegesis. Clearly, they both support Nicene orthodoxy, and Theodoret spans the bridge of theological development to Chalcedon. This section briefly outlines their family backgrounds, education, and especially the specific historical exigencies that influence their exegetical writings. Thereafter, their writings are surveyed with a goal to analyzing their understanding of *theōria*.

Theodore of Mopsuestia's Background

Born in Syrian Antioch in 350, Theodore entered a Roman empire recently transformed by the Edict of Milan (313). That agreement shifted Christianity from an illicit, persecuted sect to a welcomed—and soon dominant—religion of the Roman Empire.⁴³ But the church turned new-found freedom into doctrinal factions so virial that Emperor Constantine demanded the first general council. It occurred in the eastern city of Nicaea (325), where 318 bishops and their assistants addressed some central Christian doctrines as, for example, who is Jesus Christ? And how is he God and man in one person?⁴⁴ Answering these profound questions dominated Theodore's life and writings.

While orthodox Christology prevailed at Nicaea,⁴⁵ the Arians failed to concede. Instead they continued to question the full deity of Christ, how full deity could die on a cross, and how true God could

become human.⁴⁶ This “agitated the Roman empire and the church of East and West for more than half a century,” and gave occasion in 381 to the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople. There the orthodoxy of the Nicene Creed was reaffirmed and bolstered against the older threat of Arius and newer doctrinal threats, such as Apollinarianism. Diodore of Tarsus—the main teacher at Antioch—played a minor role in this council, promoting a Logos-man Christology. But others found his Christology difficult to understand.⁴⁷ Yet Constantinople afforded a christological and trinitarian view that is substantially held in all orthodox churches today.⁴⁸ So this (primarily) christological battle raged from twenty-five years before Theodore’s birth to at least his thirty-first year.⁴⁹

Family and Education

Little is known of Theodore’s childhood other than that he was born to wealthy Christian parents in 350 in the city of Antioch.⁵⁰ It is unclear whether he wanted to become a lawyer or whether his parents pushed this career on him. He received training in philosophy and attended literature and rhetoric lectures under the sophist Libanius during the reign of the pagan emperor Julian.⁵¹ It is known, thanks to John Chrysostom’s letter, that the young Theodore left his studies at the Antiochene school under Diodore of Tarsus to return to the Forum, apparently to continue his legal studies. But by John Chrysostom’s strong encouragement, he returned to the *Asketerion* (Greek: ἀσκητήριον) for monastic training, under the conviction that he could lose his soul for breaking his covenant.⁵² Therefore, Theodore returned at age twenty to the monastic school of Diodore and Carterius, never again manifesting signs of wavering in his calling to the covenant of the ascetic life.⁵³

The Antiochene school emphasized the Bible and also taught dogmatics, apologetics, ethics, and philosophy. Diodore, who studied classics in Athens, promoted meticulous exegesis and sound interpretive methods and was the primary exegetical mentor for Theodore. Diodore taught at the Asketerion until he became bishop of Tarsus in 378. Few of his writings are extant, but he is known for his commentary on the Psalms, which he treated historically.⁵⁴ Theodore studied under Diodore at the Asketerion, apparently from 369–378, expounding Scripture and refuting heresies.⁵⁵ The Antiochene patristic scholar Robert Hill says that Theodore paid Diodore his teacher “the sincerest form of flattery in more closely adhering to his exegetical principles.”⁵⁶

Hill notes that one of those principles

survives in a fragment of his [Diodore’s] *Quaestiones on the Octateuch*, “We (in Antioch) far prefer τὸ ἱστορικόν το τὸ ἀλληγορικόν (as practiced in Alexandria),” and which presumably suffuses his missing work on the difference between Antioch’s favored hermeneutical approach of θεωρία and that of ἀλληγορία.⁵⁷

Church Roles and Adult Life

After Diodore left the Asketerion, the young man Theodore attended the congregation of Flavian, patriarch of Antioch. Flavian replaced Meletius (due to the latter’s semi-Arianism) and remained in that role from 381 to 404. But Alexandria and Rome did not recognize Flavian as patriarch until 399. Flavian and Diodore opposed the Arians and other doctrinal divisions (primarily christological) that occurred in and around Antioch, including stronger and weaker Niceans, and Apollinarians. The rift in Antioch remained from 361 until 415.⁵⁸

In that doctrinal caldron, Flavian ordained Theodore a priest (or presbyter) in 383 “only a few years after the time when Antioch had four rival bishops: Arian, old Nicene, new Nicene and Apollinarian.”⁵⁹ So Antioch was embroiled in christological factions both in the decades preceding Theodore’s birth and throughout his life.⁶⁰

Though Christology dominated the theological landscape, other doctrinal feuds demanded Theodore’s attention. For example, eleven years after the ecumenical council at Constantinople (in 392), Theodore was selected to expound the orthodox view of the deity of the Holy Spirit to a group of Macedonian bishops, who questioned the traditional doctrine. When they refused lectures from a subordinate, Theodore was given the bishopric in Mopsuestia in Cilicia.⁶¹ Theodore served as bishop there peacefully until the end of his life in 428.

Theodore’s Writings

Though Theodore received his bishopric by way of expediency, he proved faithful, serving the church in his region by writing commentaries on most of the Bible as well as numerous *Catechetical Homilies* and a work on exegesis (found in the time of World War I but disappointingly lost soon after) titled *On Allegory and History*.⁶² He also wrote a *Commentary on the Nicene Creed* and *Commentary on the Lord’s Prayer*, which provide a gold mine of information on his theological perspectives.⁶³ Theodore’s extant biblical commentaries include those on Psalms 1–81 (in Greek and Latin),⁶⁴ on the Twelve (Minor) Prophets (in Greek),⁶⁵ on John (a fragmented Syriac translation and the original Greek),⁶⁶ on some of the Synoptic Gospels and the Pauline Epistles (a fifth-century Latin translation

with some Greek fragments)⁶⁷ as well as fragments of commentaries on Genesis and a little on Exodus.⁶⁸ Perhaps the most complete source of Theodore's extant Greek writings is found in the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae digital database (TLG). It includes material from his commentaries on Genesis, Psalms, Twelve Prophets, Matthew, John, Acts (dubious?), Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Hebrews, as well as several other writings.⁶⁹

Theodoret of Cyrus's Background

Theodoret (also Theodoretus) of Cyrus (also Cyr, Cyros, or Cyrrihus) served as a Syrian Antiochene church leader a generation after Theodore. Theodoret had broad interests as an apologist, philanthropist, spiritual biographer, historian, monk, bishop, exegete, and theologian. This background study briefly outlines his early life, education, and ecclesial roles, with an emphasis on his writings.

Family and Education

Theodoret was born around 393 to a wealthy family in Syrian Antioch.⁷⁰ He autobiographically reported that "even before my conception my parents promised to devote me to God; from my swaddling-band, they devoted the [*sic me*] according to their promise and educated me accordingly."⁷¹ Apparently Theodoret's first language was Syriac, and he acquired Greek later as a literary language. His Attic Greek writing is considered exemplary, and the Cambridge patristic scholar Frances Young is convinced that Theodoret's education included not only religious training but also classical instruction. Still in his early twenties, Theodoret inherited his parents' wealth, which he gave for the care of the poor so as to live the

ascetic life of a monk. Theodoret was “educated in local monasteries and probably was not a pupil of Theodore. Nevertheless, he was deeply committed to the theology of the Antiochene school.”⁷² He claimed Theodore and Diodore as his teachers.⁷³ Theodoret lived and ministered near Apamea for seven years before his appointment to his bishopric.⁷⁴

Church Roles and Adult Life

In 423, Theodoret was appointed bishop of the city of Cyrus—in the district of Cyrrestica (Κυρρηστική)—about seventy-five miles east of Syrian Antioch.⁷⁵ There he served eight hundred parishes, caring for the flocks and protecting them from such heresies as Marcionism, Arianism, and Eunomianism (ultra-Arians).⁷⁶ Theodoret suffered exile from his see in 449, not at the hands of the Alexandrians but instead the Eutychians (monophysites or more accurately miaphysites).⁷⁷ He participated in the Council at Chalcedon, but only after affirming the anathemas on Nestorius and all who did not claim Mary as Θεοτόκος (*Theotokos*).⁷⁸

Theodoret’s Writings

Unlike Theodore (who, with all his writings, was condemned posthumously), the Second Council at Constantinople (553) only condemned a couple of Theodoret’s writings, including *Refutation of Cyril’s Twelve Anathemas*.⁷⁹ Therefore, Theodoret’s extant writings are extensive.⁸⁰ Since the focus of this dissertation is on his exegetical methods, only his biblical commentaries are listed here. TLG lists ten Greek sources for Theodoret (“Theodoretus”), which provide commentaries on forty-four books of the Bible.⁸¹

In the preface to his *Commentary on the Psalms*⁸² Theodoret notes that he had already written his *Commentary on the Song of Songs*.⁸³ He also wrote commentaries on Daniel,⁸⁴ Ezekiel,⁸⁵ Jeremiah,⁸⁶ *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets* (PG, 81:1545–58) prior to his *Commentary on the Psalms*,⁸⁷ and *The Questions on the Octateuch*⁸⁸ as well as a work on the biblical books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles.

Analysis of *Theōria* in the Two Antiochenes' Commentaries

Bradley Nassif uses the TLG database to locate relevant texts from John Chrysostom's homilies in order to analyze his use of *theōria* and *theōreō* in their original context and determine a range of meanings for the terms.⁸⁹ In this section, I provide the same analysis from all of the TLG available writings of Theodore and the commentary TLG sources for Theodoret.

Analysis of *Theōria* in Theodore's Writings

Searching the TLG digital database⁹⁰ under all available sources for "Theodorus Mopsuestenus" reveals fifteen instances of the term *theōria* in its various cases and numbers. The search also reveals thirty-six instances of the verb *theōreō*. The following analysis summarizes mundane uses of these terms in Theodore's writings prior to discussing the significant uses.

*Mundane Instances of *Theōria**

Theodore's uses of the terms *theōria* and *theōreō* often do not enhance one's understanding of Antiochene interpretation. These instances

are deemed mundane. For example, “there is no one *looking*” commenting on Ps. 64:5c; “They said, who *will see* them?” (TLG, 4135.006 Psalm 63: verse 6c line 2).⁹¹ Here, the terms are used to describe physical sight or seeing. At times, Theodore simply quotes his Greek translation of Ps. 72:3 (Eng. Psalm 73:3; TLG, 4135.006 Psalm 72: verse 3 line 1), which contains the participle of *theōreō*, translated as “observing.” In his commentary on Ps. 36:9b (Greek 35:10b), Theodore has a great opportunity to explain how in God’s light one *sees* light with an exposition on *theōria* as discernment, but he does not do it.⁹² Again, commenting on Ps. 69:9, “For zeal for your house has consumed me”⁹³—which many in his day (and ours) view as messianic—Theodore notes that it is instead “foretelling the situation of the Maccabees.”⁹⁴

Significant Instances of *Theoria*

The following analysis focuses especially on Theodore’s commentaries on Psalms, the Twelve Prophets, and the Gospel of John. The primary concern is to locate Theodore’s discussion of *theōria* as an interpretive term.

Commentary on Psalms

Despite Diodore’s use of the term *theōria* many times in the preface to his *Commentary on Psalms*, Theodore does not mimic his mentor.⁹⁵ Theodore never uses the term in his *Commentary on Psalms 1–81*.⁹⁶ In fact, scholars note that Theodore acknowledges christological interpretation only in Psalms 2; 8; 44 (LXX; 45 in the MT and English); and 110.⁹⁷ For example in his *Commentary on Psalms* for Ps. 69:10, Theodore gives not a hint of christological interpretation.

Nevertheless, in his *Commentary on Joel* his interpretation is freer. There he continues to acknowledge a near referent but now adds another, more real (far) referent found in Ps. 69:10:

Blessed David likewise says about the people, “Its soul was not abandoned to Hades, nor did its flesh see corruption,” which cannot be understood at the level of fact [πραγμάτων]; rather, by the use of hyperbole [ὑπερβολικῶς] or metaphor [μεταφορικῶς] he says it was rescued from danger or corruption. The factual reality of the text [ἡ δὲ τοῦ πράγματος ἀλήθεια τῶν εἰρημένων], on the other hand, is demonstrated by Christ the Lord, when it happened that neither was his soul abandoned to Hades, being restored to the body in the resurrection, nor did his body suffer any corruption, so that not only did it remain with its own appearance in which is actually died but it was also transformed into an immortal and incorruptible nature.⁹⁸

Theodore says that the near (that is, Jewish) referent for Ps. 69:10 cannot be understood factually, but must be interpreted hyperbolically (ὑπερβολικῶς) or metaphorically (μεταφορικῶς).⁹⁹ In other words, the passage is not fully actualized in the near, Jewish referent. But the realization of hyperbole in the text leads the interpreter to find “the factual reality of the text” (that is, the true or ultimate referent) in Christ Jesus.¹⁰⁰

Similarly, in his *Commentary on Micah* 5:2, Theodore acknowledges that Ps. 89:30–33 clearly relates hyperbolically to the descendants of David, but in full reality to Jesus Christ. That is, for Theodore the passage cannot be taken literally for David’s descendants, because that would be overstatement of historical realities. But it can be taken literally for Christ Jesus:

You could grasp this more clearly from the eighty-eighth Psalm [LXX], where it indicates that the promises of kingship apply to . . . the future descendants of David. . . . He [the psalmist] proceeds, however, to foretell Christ the Lord according to the flesh, in whose case God demonstrated the true fulfillment of his promise: “I shall establish his offspring forever and ever, and his throne as long as the heavens last.”

. . . Thus you would see the present testimony applying in one case in the true and indisputable proof from experience in the case of Christ the Lord, in keeping with the statement in the Gospels, kings of Israel from David being cited on account of the divine promise.¹⁰¹

Therefore, though Theodore appears to interpret rather literally and within a narrow OT time frame that disallows many messianic or typological readings in his *Commentary on Psalms*, when he comments on the Psalms elsewhere he is more likely to acknowledge those messianic or typological connections. Scholars should therefore acknowledge at least *six* Psalms for which Theodore acknowledges a messianic referent (2; 8; 45; 69; 89; 110).

Commentary on the Twelve Prophets

Theodore affirms Peter's use of Joel 2:28–32

since the Law contained a shadow of the things to come. . . . What happened in their time was all insignificant and like shadow so that the account was given with use of hyperbole rather than containing facts, whereas the reality of the account was found to be realized in the time of Christ the Lord.¹⁰²

Clearly, Theodore is not arguing against the historical reality of OT events, nor denying the truthfulness of the OT narrative. Instead, he emphasizes that when hyperbole is used by an OT author, the OT events are like shadows and insignificant *relative* to their fulfillment in Christ Jesus. Theodore sees such interpretation as requiring *theōria*. His discussion below on Nahum 1:1 bears this out. But first the discussion turns to his brief comments from Obadiah on *theōria*.

Theodore uses the term *theōria* in v. 1 of Obadiah as he discusses the phrase “Vision of Obadiah”:

This differs not at all in its import from the phrase “word of the Lord”:

Scripture calls God's activity "word of the Lord" in reference to the spiritual grace by which the prophets received the revelations of the future, and in the same way by *vision* he refers to the divine revelation by which in fact they received the knowledge of the unknown. Since, you see, they received also some insights [*theōria*] in ineffable fashion through spiritual activity in their own soul, and in response to the activity occurring within them from the Holy Spirit they obeyed the instruction in what was said as though from someone speaking, consequently Scripture calls it both vision and "word of the Lord," and probably also "report," in that they receive knowledge as though by a report of some kind.¹⁰³

Here Theodore explains the prophets' receiving revelation either by way of a direct "word of the Lord" or by way of vision. Apparently both of these means of revelation could be accompanied by an unexplainable (ἀπορρήτως) work of the Spirit in the prophet (any OT writer). This process Theodore calls *theōria*.

Theodore's commentary on Nahum 1:1 contains his densest use of *theōria*. There he uses the term eight times.¹⁰⁴ For example, he notes that the prophets, by receiving such visions, were "thus ... enabled to be attentive completely to the contemplation [*theōria*] of the revelations."¹⁰⁵ For Theodore, *theōria* is a significant aspect of a prophet's musing over a revelation or a vision. He explains by example:

After all, it is not possible for us to gain precise learning from our mentors unless we distance ourselves from everything and with great assiduity give heed to what is said, how would it have been possible for them [OT prophets] to be the beneficiaries of such awesome and ineffable contemplation [*theōria*; PG, 66:401.51] without first being removed in their thinking from reality [*theōria*; PG, 66:401.53] on that occasion?¹⁰⁶

In other words, to contemplate the vision, the prophet could not at the same time contemplate earthly realities occurring around him.

Thus, the Greek has *theōria* (in the plural) twice, but Hill translates it as “contemplation” only the first time and as a more mundane “thinking from reality” the second.¹⁰⁷ Next Theodore illustrates *theōria* in the NT:

This is the way Scripture says blessed Peter was in an ecstatic state and saw the cloth let down from heaven: since the grace of the Spirit first distanced his mind of reality, then it caused him to be devoted to the contemplation [*theōria*; PG, 66:404.1] of the revelations and so, just as we are beyond our normal condition as though asleep when we receive contemplation [*theōria*; PG, 66:404.4] of what is revealed, so in some fashion they were affected by a transformation of mind from the Holy Spirit and became beneficiaries of the contemplation [*theōria*; PG, 66:404.6] of the revelations.¹⁰⁸

Theodore has already used *theōria* for OT prophets (401.47, 51, 53; 404.6). Here he applies it first to Peter (and by extension all NT authors; 404.1, 6, citing Acts 10:11–12), and to his contemporaries (“we”; 404.4). That is, Theodore uses *theōria* to describe not only the OT prophets and NT apostles contemplating a vision received but also for post–New Testament believers contemplating the received revelation of Scripture (“just as we are beyond our normal condition as though asleep when we receive contemplation [PG, 66:404.4] of what is revealed”).¹⁰⁹ “As though asleep” may seem to imply that Theodore promotes ecstatic trances to gain insight to Scripture. But from what is known of his strong emphasis on the rational, it seems more appropriate to understand this phrase as an illustration of the exegete devoted completely to the contemplation of the revelation.¹¹⁰ This emphasis on the rational does not, however, deny for Theodore a role for the Holy Spirit in contemplation (as he already stated above), namely, that the Spirit first distances the mind from mundane reality, then causes one to be devoted to the contemplation.

The Spirit's role in contemplation is seen, for example, as Theodore concludes his commentary on Nahum 1:1 with two uses of the term *theōria* applied specifically to Nahum:

The prophet's mind was suddenly seized by the grace of the Spirit and transformed so as to contemplate [*theōria*; PG, 66:404.47] those things through which he learnt of the fate of Nineveh and that he provided to his listeners as instruction in what was shown to him. Hence the mention of *oracle* and *vision*, in order to indicate by the former the manner of the activity of the Holy Spirit, and by *vision*, the contemplation [*theōria*; PG, 66:404.52] of what was shown to him.¹¹¹

Without the Holy Spirit, apparently Theodore does not see other means for effective scriptural contemplation. While Theodore emphasizes the role of the Spirit in *theōria*, effective contemplation “by the grace of the Spirit” is also, for Theodore, more available to “those thought worthy of such things.”¹¹²

Commentary on John's Gospel

In his commentary on John 12:44–45, Theodore notes, regarding Jesus' words “whoever sees me, sees him who sent me”: “For the one who through this one [Christ Jesus] perceives [*theōreō*] that person [God the Father], through the likeness [Christ Jesus] by *theōria* is introduced [προσάγω].”¹¹³ Philip wants to meet this Father about whom Jesus speaks. But Jesus tells him (and the others) that without discerning (*theōreō*) the likeness of God (Jesus Christ) one cannot be introduced to the Father. How such discernment is possible, Theodore explains in his *Commentary on Zechariah* (1:8–11):

Elsewhere the Lord says more clearly to them, “I have told you this in parables, but I will openly report to you on the Father,” bringing out that they had heard word of the Father obscurely . . . but they would truly know the Son when they know him to be God in his being,

coming from him, and one in being with him. . . . Hence also the Lord says to them, “I have many things yet to say, but you cannot bear them now; when that Spirit of truth comes, however, he will guide you in all truth.”¹¹⁴

So, for Theodore, the disciples cannot know the Father without truly knowing the Son of God. And they know “the Son when they know him to be God in his being, coming from him, and one in being with him.” Such perception for Theodore is possible only when the Spirit of truth comes (John 16:12). Thus, again Theodore shows that such discernment or ability to perceive (*theōria*) requires enabling by the Holy Spirit.

Similarly, in Theodore’s commentary on John 1:32, John the Baptist is said to have seen the Holy Spirit as a dove, according to some spiritual vision or discernment (*theōria*), as did the prophets. Others present did not see because they were not spiritually enabled.¹¹⁵ But perhaps most significant is Theodore’s brief comment on John 14:17. The text is worth quoting in full:

You are destined to partake of the Spirit; and so great is the giving of the Spirit that, if it [the Holy Spirit] does not wish it, the whole *world cannot seize* it to itself. He did not say “receive” but “seize,” as if to get a hold of it. “You see,” He says, “if someone can neither see [θεωρῆσαί] it nor know it, how could it be seized by them? Accordingly, you will come to know the Spirit, and also have it in you, through me.” However, He did not also say, “You will see [ᾧψεοθεῖ]” for this is impossible.¹¹⁶

Theodore understands that the Holy Spirit is incorporeal and therefore invisible. Thus to see (ὄραω) the Holy Spirit is impossible. But for Theodore, neither can one perceive (θεωρέω) Him, unless one is—like those chosen apostles—“destined to partake of the Spirit.”¹¹⁷

In summary, Theodore understands *theōria* as insight by vision; as contemplation of a vision, revelation, or text of revelation; and

as a perceiving of spiritual truths enabled by the Holy Spirit. This concludes the use of *theōria* and *theōreō* by Theodore. The discussion now turns to Theodoret's use of these terms and then a brief comparison of the two Antiochenes' use of these terms.

Analysis of *Theōria* in Theodoret's Commentaries

As discussed above, many more of Theodoret's exegetical writings remain. Therefore, it is not surprising that a search of the biblical commentaries of Theodoret ("Theodoretus") in the TLG reveals seventy-nine instances of *theōria* in its various cases and numbers—considerably more than for Theodore. The TLG also reveals 121 instances of verbal variants of *theōreō* from these same ten sources.¹¹⁸ A far greater percentage of these, however, are mundane and do not offer considerable insight into Antiochene *theōria* as an exegetical method. Nevertheless, Theodoret does significantly use the terms, though not always following the same theoretic process of his Antiochene mentors Theodore and Diodore.

Mundane Instances of *Theōria*

Theodoret uses *theōria* to mean spectacle or sight, for example, in his *Commentary on Jeremiah* 39:6–10 and Jeremiah 52.¹¹⁹ He uses the term *theōria* most often for the prophetic vision. For example, he uses it in this way at least twenty-two times in his *Commentary on Ezekiel*. In at least sixteen of these he does not elaborate. Similarly, another six examples are found in his *Commentary on Daniel*.¹²⁰ These are not mundane per se but do not add significantly to what is found in Theodore. Similarly, when Theodoret uses a form of the verb *theōreō*, he often is describing a spiritual, prophetic perception of a

vision. This occurs about forty-four times in his commentaries, close to thirty just in his *Commentary on Ezekiel* and *Commentary on Daniel*. At other times Theodoret uses *theōreō* to mean a physical perception with the eyes, or a mental perception, as in discerning.

Though these are classified as mundane uses of the terms *theōria* and *theōreō*, it is difficult to separate the mundane from the significant, insofar as the Antiochene understanding of the physical is inextricably linked to the spiritual—for those who have eyes to see. Thus, Theodoret comments on Ps. 94:10, “He who teaches human beings knowledge: it was he, in fact, who created human nature with reason, and brings about greater knowledge through the things observable [θεωρουμένων] in creation and happening every day.”¹²¹

Significant Instances of *Theōria*

For Theodoret, physical eyes are not sufficient to perceive or discern spiritual truths—though the former can provide a stepping stone to the latter. So physical eyes (and discerning minds) may provide insight from the resulting calamities for people who do not live holy lives.¹²² And a holy life grants greater insight into God and God’s Word.¹²³ Theodoret’s use of *theōria* and *theōreō* is organized by commentary as follows.

Commentary on the Psalms

Theodoret uses the term *theōria* seven times in his *Commentary on the Psalms*. For example, commenting on Ps. 19:1, he compares the sight (*theōria*) of a painting with the sight of creation. As the former brings to mind the painter, so the latter brings to mind the creator.¹²⁴ This may seem to be a usage distinct from that in his *Commentary*

on *Ezekiel*, where he emphasizes repeatedly that a spiritual sight or vision (not to mention God the Father or Spirit) is incapable of being viewed by natural eyes. But, for Theodoret, though the natural eyes cannot see the invisible (namely, God), they do provide the ability to see the visible, which images or points to the invisible.

Theodoret uses the term *theōria* in his comments on Ps. 81:11–12 (Greek 80:12–13), writing, “The truth of the inspired composition is available for the discernment [*theōria*] of those ready for it.” So grasping the thrust of the passage comes only for those prepared.¹²⁵ Robert Hill views such use of *theōria* as that which “enables the reader of the psalm to find a fuller sense in reference to the Jews of [Theodoret’s] day.”¹²⁶ He apparently draws this conclusion from Theodore’s introduction to “this Psalm [which] prophesies the recall of the Jews.” But Theodoret also sees this psalm as prophesying Jewish “estrangement [from God] occurring after that” as well as “the calling of the nations.”¹²⁷ Thus, Hill’s notion of a “fuller sense” for *theōria* seems foreign to Theodoret’s use of the term here. Instead, Theodoret appears to see these all as multiple referents of the one meaning of the passage.¹²⁸

Regardless of the fuller sense versus multiple references debate, Theodoret clearly sees *theōria* as integral to interpretation of the passage. And this use of *theōria* and especially the verb *theōreō* appears a few other times in his *Commentary on the Psalms*. For example, after his comments on Ps. 68:28–29, Theodoret concludes, “Eyes that perceive [*theōreō*] the realization of the prophecy are witnesses to this.” Theodoret—finding encouragement in the translation from Symmacus “your temple, which is *above* Jerusalem” (instead of “your temple *in* Jerusalem”)—links the temple of v. 29 with Jesus’ humanity from Eph. 1:21. Thus, for Theodoret, Ps. 68:29 prophesies of the incarnate Christ—for those with “eyes that perceive” Christ there. But

Theodoret implies that all do not perceive this,¹²⁹ and those who do require assistance by the Holy Spirit.

Theodoret, commenting on “In your light we shall see light” in Ps. 36:9, writes:

illuminated by the all-Holy Spirit we shall perceive [*theōreō*] the rays of your Only-begotten: Scripture says, “No one can say Jesus is Lord except by the Holy Spirit.” We have consequently come to a precise knowledge of the three persons in the one divinity through the inspired words.¹³⁰

Thus, Theodoret affirms the need for illumination by the Holy Spirit in order to perceive Jesus as Lord and the Trinity “through the inspired words.” Theodoret’s understanding of *theōria* as interpretive perception seems connected to a canonical reading of the text. So, for example, commenting on Ps. 102:27, “You, on the contrary, are the same, and your years will not fail,” Theodoret writes:

so you remodel creation as you wish, O Lord; you have an immutable nature, proof against change. The divine Apostle, of course, attributes these verses to the particular characteristic of the Son in the Epistle to the Hebrews; yet likewise we discern [*theōreō*] the Father in the Son: for whatever he does the Son likewise does, and sameness of nature is recognized in each, for the operation of the Trinity is one, as we know.¹³¹

Theodoret refers here not only to Heb. 1:10–12 but also to Jesus’ words that if you have seen me you have seen the Father (John 14:9).

But Hill’s comment—that Theodoret looks for a “fuller sense” by way of the process of *theōria*—rings most true in the latter’s commentary on Ps. 46:8–9:

The verse, *bringing wars to an end as far as the ends of the earth. He will break the bow, smash weapons, and burn shields in fire*, was thus fulfilled in a historical [κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν] sense; but if you wanted to understand it in a more figurative way [τροπικώτερον], you would have

regard for the cessation of hostilities against the Church and the peace provided them from God, and you would perceive [θεωρήσει; *theōreō*] the realizations [ἀλήθειαν] of the prophecy.¹³²

Theodoret, like Theodore before him, views all of the psalms as prophetic.¹³³ But Theodoret freely suggests to his readers prophetic referents not only in the postexilic period but also postapostolic.¹³⁴ *Theōreō* is necessary to achieve Theodoret's "more figurative" (τροπικώτερον) prophetic referent. But while Philo uses τροπικώτερον, translated "metaphorically" (or "more figuratively") regularly in his writings, this term is a *hapax legomenon* in Theodoret's extant writings.¹³⁵

Commentary on Song of Songs

In the *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, his first exegetical work, Theodoret understandably displays more dependence on the works of others. Yet he often eschews the Antiochene approach of his schooling.¹³⁶ He provides several pages explaining why in his preface. He gives "thanks to the Spirit" for "entrance in spirit" to an interpretation of the Song that allows one to "behold the glory of the Lord with face unveiled" rather than by "a corporeal interpretation . . . [being] drawn into . . . awful blasphemy."¹³⁷ Theodoret also points to the figurative nature of the OT requiring figurative interpretation, in keeping with his rhetorical training.¹³⁸ Perhaps the echoes of anathemas from the Council of Ephesus (431) along with his ascetic sensibilities overcame his Antiochene historicism—leading to his most allegorical biblical exegesis.¹³⁹ Such motivation results in considerable divergence from Theodore in Theodoret's use of the terms *theōria* and *theōreō* in his *Commentary on the Song of Songs*.

Theodoret starts his preface with a description of prerequisites for the exegetical task that are not so foreign to Antiochene norms:

The explanation of the divine sayings requires, on the one hand, a purified soul that is also rid of every uncleanness; on the other hand, it requires as well a mind that has wings, capable of discerning [*theōria*] divine things and prepared to enter the precincts of the Spirit.¹⁴⁰

Thus, a pure heart and Antiochene *theōria*—described as a combined mental and Spirit-driven endeavor—are necessary prerequisites to interpretation. Theodoret readily admits his reliance on God for the work, and in particular for the illumination of the Holy Spirit, citing David’s Ps. 119:18: “Take the veil from my eyes and I shall understand the wonders of your Law.”¹⁴¹

With Antiochene precision (ἀκρίβεια) Theodoret explains the title “The Song of Songs” rather than a Song, because nothing in God’s Holy Word is superfluous.¹⁴² Yet Theodoret’s remarks in the body of his commentary reveal an atypical Antiochene approach. While Theodoret makes connections to antecedent OT theology (for example, promises made to Abraham and Moses’ prophecies concerning the Bridegroom), never does he intimate that the bridegroom is other than the Lord, the Father’s “Only-begotten Son.” Theodoret also makes use of later prophets such as Hosea to support his immediate referencing of the bridegroom to the Son of God.¹⁴³ And this is typical throughout his commentary. He is just as comfortable making direct links to the NT. For example, Theodoret hesitates only briefly, interpreting “your name” in Song 1:3 to “Christ, as it were” and “your anointing oils” immediately refer to the Lord anointed with the Spirit.¹⁴⁴

He finds in Song 1:6 not a woman left in the vineyards too long—thus darkened from the sun who fears rejection by her lover—but a reference to “an alien” who “because of her former

superstition . . . had contracted a black colour.” And thus “those who gloried in the Law and exalted themselves under the Old Covenant” despised her. Theodoret finds a comparison in Moses’ marriage to a Cushite woman in Num. 12:1–2.¹⁴⁵

Often Theodoret’s comments are unsupported by any biblical passages. For example, rather than the beloved bride in Song 1:8 receiving an invitation to pasture her young goats at the tents of her bridegroom, Theodoret has the bride (who seeks her desire in the Lord) “examin[ing] the lives of the saints . . . in the tents of those shepherds, that is, in the Apostolic churches, [where she is encouraged to] feed thy kids.” Apparently this is a reference to a new believer’s children. And in Song 1:9 the pharaoh is, for Theodoret, “the persecutor of our nature, our wicked and common enemy,” namely, the devil. This devil the Bridegroom “drowned in the sacred waters of Baptism. Therefore He says, *My steed*, which I used when I plunged into the sea the chariots of Pharaoh, and set thee at liberty.”¹⁴⁶

Theodoret admits more hesitancy in his comments at times. For example he prefaces his comments on Song 1:11 with “they seem to signify,” and he explains “our bed” in Song 1:16 as follows: “He appears to intend Holy Scripture, in which the Bridegroom and Bride reposing have spiritual intercommunion.”¹⁴⁷ Elsewhere he offers two interpretations, apparently unsure which is correct.¹⁴⁸ All in all, allegorization fills the commentary, where in 3:4 the “city” is the “church”; “streets and ways” are the Holy Scriptures; “keepers of the city” refers to the “Holy Prophets and Apostles”; and “mother’s house and chamber” is heavenly Jerusalem.¹⁴⁹

In his comments on Song 4:9—“You have captivated my heart, my sister, my bride; you have captivated my heart with one glance of your eyes”—Theodoret refers to *theōria*. He comments, “Both thine *eyes* are indeed admirable and spiritual, and to be called like

dove's, but that one amazes me which contemplates [*theōria*] Divine things, which is skilled in researches of God, and sees the hidden mysteries."¹⁵⁰ Here Theodoret finds the Bridegroom favoring the bride's eye "which contemplates divine things." His use of *theōria* becomes still more questionable. For example, in his commentary on Song 4:14 for the phrase "orchard of pomegranates," he ventures the following explanation:

in my view pomegranate is to be taken figuratively [τροπικῶς] as love, since countless seeds are contained together within the one skin, pressed together without squeezing or ruining one another, remaining fresh unless one of the seeds in the middle goes bad.

Then to his figurative (allegorical) interpretation, Theodoret now recommends "insight" (*theōria*) by interpreting each seed in the pomegranate as a class of people in the church.¹⁵¹

Theodoret does seek to gain some discernment (*theōria*) "not only from the translation of the word, but also from the word itself" and so recommends for Song 7:2 inquiry "into the identity of Nadab."¹⁵² This use of *theōria* seems more in keeping with typical Antiochene emphases on ἱστορία and precision (ἀκρίβεια).

Commentary on Isaiah

Theodoret uses the term *theōria* three times in his *Commentary on Isaiah*. The first two are located in his comments on Isa. 12:5–6. There he references Moses' raising of the bronze serpent for the healing of the sinful Israelites (Num. 21:5), as well as Jesus' discussion of it in John 8:28: "When you have lifted up the Son of Man, then you will know that I am he." And again, "just as Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert, so must the Son of man be lifted up" (John 3:14). To these verses he adds the comment, "And we who have believed in

him look up in order that just as the Jews with the sight [*theōria*] of the bronze serpent dulled the work of poisonous snakes, so we with a vision [*theōria*] to him may be healed.”¹⁵³ All of this comes first from the verb ὑψώθη¹⁵⁴ in the latter part of the Greek of Isa. 12:6.

Theodoret comments on Isa. 23:14–18: “The *theōria* testifies indeed to the prophecy of the events.”¹⁵⁵ What does he mean here if not that the contemplation of his commentary fits with the prophecy?¹⁵⁶

Commentary on Ezekiel

Theodoret untiringly explains the nature of Ezekiel’s visions as spiritual and imperceptible with the human eye. For example, in Ezek. 1:2 he comments, “Now, he said ‘the heavens opened,’ not in actual fact but in a spiritual insight [*theōria*].” This relates to Theodoret’s high view of the transcendence of God’s essence. Unlike Theodore, Theodoret displays a much looser interpretation, linking Ezekiel’s receiving a vision by the river Chebar (Ezek. 1:3) with NT regeneration of all peoples.¹⁵⁷ On the other hand, Theodoret’s use of *theōria* in his comment on Ezek. 3:22 is especially reminiscent of Theodore’s comments on Nahum 1:1. Theodoret writes, “Isolation is suited to the vision [*theōria*] of divine things: the mind is rid of external distractions and no longer caught up in this direction and that, concentrating on itself and capable of closer appreciation of divine things.” Clearly, Theodoret himself has experienced this way of studying the Scripture.¹⁵⁸

Along with quiet contemplation (*theōria*), Theodoret appeals to his readers for purity of life in keeping with the subject of these contemplations. For, he notes (in his comments on Ezek. 11:24b), that though Ezekiel was seated with the elders,

only the prophet received the spiritual vision [*theōria*]. May we, too, be

zealous to attain this purity and ask for it, so that freed from every stain we may in the present life . . . constantly carry . . . the memory of God, and . . . be found worthy . . . to see him with confidence.¹⁵⁹

Theodoret links *theōria* to his readers (similarly to Theodore when commenting on Nahum 1:1, and applying *theōria* to OT prophets, then to the Apostle Peter and finally to Theodore's contemporaries).¹⁶⁰ For Theodoret, such elevated visions cannot be attained without purity of life, neither for the prophet nor for the modern reader.¹⁶¹

Theodoret uses *theōria* to find applications for his contemporaries from the text. But in so doing he does not always give up the literal reading of the text for the theoretical. So, for example, commenting on Ezek. 39:29, Theodoret questions the "Jewish" interpretation that "the incursion of Gog and Magog did not already happen." Such interpreters "ought realize, firstly, that this man's prophecy is associated with the recall from Babylon; then, that in it he said that the nations would come to know God's power." He continues, that from God's teaching "we discern [θεωροῦμεν] the three persons in the one nature."¹⁶² Theodoret shows concern for both a historical and a spiritual reading.

Commentary on Daniel

When Theodoret uses the term *theōria* in his *Commentary on Daniel*, he generally means vision.¹⁶³ But he uses *theōria* here as insight, which can also be understood as perception or "understanding . . . like the gods"—words Belshazzar's queen uses to describe Daniel in Dan. 5:11. Theodoret comments that this is akin to Daniel having "insight [*theōria*] into what escaped many."¹⁶⁴

Pauline Commentary

Theodoret describes Paul's words "because we have become a spectacle to the world" in 1 Cor. 4:9 as "our situation lies exposed to the scrutiny [*theōria*] of everybody," according to Hill's translation.¹⁶⁵ In characteristic Antiochene brevity, Theodoret moves on. But he may imply more here than he realizes (or that Hill translates), for Paul's situation now lies exposed to the *contemplation* of everybody who would have a mind to read the Scriptures. But Theodoret's more helpful uses of the term *theōria* are in his *Commentary on Hebrews*.

There Theodoret significantly uses the term *theōria* twice and the verbal form *theōreō* more often. For example, Heb. 8:5, "They serve as a shadow and copy of the heavenly things," raises a question in Theodoret's mind. "If the priesthood according to the Law . . . came to an end . . . and made further sacrifices unnecessary, why do the priests of the New Covenant perform the sacramental liturgy?" This is a weighty question not of OT types but of NT antitypes. Theodoret answers, "It is clear to those versed in divine things . . . that it is not another sacrifice we offer; rather, we perform the commemoration [μνήμη] of the one, saving sacrifice." This is as the Lord requires "so that we should recall with insight [*theōria*] the type of the suffering undergone for us, kindle love for the benefactor [God] and look forward to the enjoyment of the good things to come [heaven]."¹⁶⁶ So, for Theodoret, the purpose of the Lord's Table is to commemorate Christ's work on the cross. But this requires insight (*theōria*).¹⁶⁷ And this insight, for Theodoret, comes by faith.

Similarly, commenting on Heb. 10:19–22, Theodoret says that approaching the "invisible . . . innermost sanctuary of the tabernacle . . . [is properly] discerned [*theōreō*] only through the eyes of faith." And again on Heb. 11:1: "through it [faith] we see what is unseen, and it acts as an eye for discernment [*theōria*] of what is hoped for."¹⁶⁸

Is such discernment simply a Greek patristic way of speaking, foreign to Scripture? Actually, the uses of the terms *theōria* and *theōreō* are limited in the NT. But the author of Hebrews does use *theōreō* in Heb. 7:4. “See how great this man was to whom Abraham the patriarch gave a tenth of the spoil!” The verb “see” (“notice” in Hill’s translation) is an imperative of *theōreō*. And, like the biblical author of Hebrews, Theodoret—commenting on Heb. 13:11–12—actually commands his readers to “look at the type, compare it with the reality and perceive [*theōreō*] the similarity.” He follows this with a description of the similarities.¹⁶⁹ Theodoret wants his readers to turn their attention to the type, with the result that they perceive the intended comparison between the type (in the OT) and antitype (Christ in the NT). With such a command in the Bible, it is not surprising that Antiochene *theōria* has been linked to typology.¹⁷⁰

In summary, for Theodoret *theōria* and *theōreō* describe a physical sight: discernment of or insight into usually a typological link, or (other times) an application; and spiritual perceiving usually requiring faith, Holy Spirit enablement, or both.

Comparing Theodore and Theodoret

The amount of material available for all of Theodore’s writings (mostly exegetical) is one-third of the extant exegetical material for Theodoret.¹⁷¹ Yet Theodoret uses the word *theōria* almost twice as much as Theodore, relative to the total word count for each.¹⁷² This likely relates to the fact that Theodoret’s commentaries on OT apocalyptic books like Daniel and Ezekiel remain, while those from Theodore do not. Their uses of the term *theōreō* are comparable with only a 10 percent relative increase for Theodoret’s use over Theodore’s.¹⁷³

Both Theodore and Theodoret use *theōria* to describe a spectacle, visual observation, mental discernment, contemplation, and spiritual or prophetic perception (usually of a vision or some other revelation). Both acknowledge the role of the Holy Spirit, as well as the necessity of the perceiver's complete attention for effective contemplation. Theodoret develops the importance of the perceiver's spiritual condition far more, but this may be due to the fact that three times more material is available to reveal his views on *theōria*. Nothing in Theodore's writings indicates that he would disagree with Theodoret here.

Both Antiochenes affirm *theōria* as a contemplative and interpretive process for OT prophets, NT apostles, and also for the Antiochenes' contemporaries. Similarly, both Theodore and Theodoret use *theōreō* as the act of discerning or contemplating truth in visions (for OT prophets especially), in biblical events and in the biblical text itself.

Theodoret, however, uses the terms far more freely to promote figurative (τροπικῶς) and at times allegorical (ἀλληγορικόν) interpretation—seen most acutely in his *Commentary on the Song of Songs*. This is clearly the strongest difference between Theodore and Theodoret.¹⁷⁴ Theodore did not write a full-length commentary on that biblical book. His comments are limited to a letter “which indicates that he regards the Canticle of Canticles as Solomon's reply to the opponents of his marriage with the Egyptian princess and refuses to grant it any allegorical significance.”¹⁷⁵ Instead, Theodore describes allegorical interpretation as “overturning the meaning of the divine Scriptures” and “fabricat[ing] from themselves . . . foolish fictions and . . . folly.” Theodore rejects allegorical interpretation by the authority of Paul's comments in Gal. 4:24–30, because allegorical interpretation “dismiss[es] the entire meaning of divine Scripture . . . [while] the apostle does not do away with the narrative [ἱστορία] nor does it do away with what happened long ago.”¹⁷⁶

Does Theodoret's *Commentary on the Song of Songs* betray a fundamental Antiochene hermeneutic? At times, yes it does. But as a mature bishop, writing his *Commentary on the Letters of Saint Paul*,¹⁷⁷ Theodoret appears to return to his Antiochene roots. Commenting on Gal. 4:24a, "This is meant allegorically," Theodoret writes:

The divine apostle said *meant allegorically* to suggest it is to be understood differently: without cancelling the historical sense, he brings out what is prefigured [προτυπωθέντα] in the historical sense. (PG, 82:489.45–48)¹⁷⁸

Theodoret's understanding of Paul's "This is meant allegorically" might correspond best to what biblical scholars today call typology. In his comments on vv. 24–30 Theodoret uses the term τύπος ("type") four times, describing Paul's "allegory" and concludes, "He [Paul] quotes Sarah's words [in v. 30], Scripture's words to bring out Scripture's purpose, that this was written so that the type might be revealed even after the facts."¹⁷⁹ So for Theodoret, Paul is not allegorizing but typologizing.¹⁸⁰

Typologizing does not deny that the original events occurred. It does not demand that the type be (fully) realized initially in the Scripture, though it lies there latently as a "prefigure." The original text has its own σκοπός (objective) that a type should not disintegrate. But the type is revealed "after the facts" of OT Scripture. The types are revealed in the OT by the Christ-event, about which Paul the inspired author writes in Galatians 4. Now the OT passages are as foreshadows (σκιά) in comparison to the NT realities. And now the reader with discernment (*theōria*) can see the relationship between the Testaments.¹⁸¹

Theodore is uncomfortable with figurative interpretation (τροπικῶς), but Theodoret employs it regularly—with a goal of showing the connection between the Testaments (especially as

related to Christ or the Trinity or sometimes the church). But simultaneously Theodoret endeavors to affirm the σκοπός and ἱστορία along with Theodore, especially in his later writings. Thus, Peter Gorday calls Theodoret “the archrepresentative of Antiochene exegesis.”¹⁸² So Theodoret wanders furthest from a normally historical reading (that is, Antiochene reading) in his *earliest* commentary, while Theodore expresses more freedom in seeing christological referents in OT passages *later* in his writing ministry.

It is not surprising that this synchronic analysis of the use of the terms *theōria* and *theōreō* in the commentaries of Theodore and Theodoret has led to some divergent semantic ranges. Nassif suggests that such might be the case; otherwise the study could have ended with his one contribution from the writings of John Chrysostom.¹⁸³ Furthermore, Schor reminds us that “even when scholars have original Greek terms, they find plenty of variation in word choice. And [even] word consistency may mask shifts of meaning between people and over time.”¹⁸⁴ Nevertheless, this study has led to a relatively consistent understanding of the term for Theodore and Theodoret.

This chapter primarily paid attention to primary sources on Antiochene *theōria*. Therefore, in the next chapter the conclusions of this chapter are briefly compared with those of Nassif on Chrysostom’s understanding of *theōria*. Then the bulk of chapter 3 reviews and interacts with other secondary literature on Theodore’s and Theodoret’s use of *theōria*—particularly that developed since Nassif’s 1991 dissertation.

Notes

1. The Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG) is a digital library of Greek literature

from the time of Homer (850 B.C.E.) to about 1450 C.E. located at the University of California, Irvine and online at www.tlg.uci.edu.

2. J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus (Series Graeca)*, 162 vols. (Paris: Migne, 1857–66).
3. The Fathers of the Church series is published by Catholic University of America; the Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, by InterVarsity. See bibliography for details. Catenae are a series of commentaries made up of excerpts from multiple (usually patristic or medieval) ecclesiastical leaders.
4. Bradley Nassif, “Antiochene ‘*Theoria*’ in John Chrysostom’s Exegesis” (PhD diss., Fordham University, 1991).
5. Nassif suggested five lacunae two years after writing his dissertation. The other four are (2) attention to Syriac sources of these Fathers; (3) Antiochene theoretic influence on Irish exegesis of the seventh to twelfth centuries; (4) the double historical sense found in Thomas Aquinas and Nicholas of Lyra’s writings, as well as impact of Antiochene *theōria* on the Reformers; and (5) “contemporary biblical scholars will need to determine the extent to which *theōria* may enrich their interpretive methods by evaluating the recent advances made by patristic experts in this field” (Bradley Nassif, “The ‘Spiritual Exegesis’ of Scripture: The School of Antioch Revisited,” *Anglican Theological Review* 75, no. 4 [Fall 1993]: 469–70).
6. Bertrand de Margerie, *An Introduction to the History of Exegesis*, vol. 1, *The Greek Fathers* (Petersham, MA: St. Bede’s, 2002), 170.
7. Furthermore, consensus is weak on what constitutes the Antiochene school’s method of biblical interpretation, though most agree that the Antiochenes placed a lower value on allegorical interpretation than on literal interpretation. This section seeks to define *who* is in the Antiochene school. Chapter 3 will interact with scholarly discussion on *what* exegetical methods define the Antiochene school.
8. For example, Frederic William Farrar, *History of Interpretation: Eight Lectures Preached before the University of Oxford in the Year MDCCCLXXXV on the Foundation of the Late Rev. John Bampton* (London: Macmillan, 1886), 210–22; Louis Berkhof, *Principles of Biblical Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1950), 21. R. P. C. Hanson affirms Lucian of Antioch and Paulinus, bishop of Antioch, prior to Nicaea as key contributors to Antiochene interpretation (R. P. C. Hanson, “Biblical Exegesis in the Early Church,” in *Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 1, *From the Beginnings to Jerome*, ed. P. R. Ackroyd

- and C. F. Evans [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970], 441–42; and, in the same volume, Maurice F. Wiles, “Theodore of Mopsuestia as a Representative of the Antiochene School,” 489–90). *Contra* the Eastern Orthodox scholar John Behr, who argues that Lucian of Antioch was not the father of the Antiochene school, with its characteristic literal, historical exegesis. He points to “Athanasius [who] preserves a passage from Athanasius of Anazarbus, a disciple of Lucian, in which he allegorizes the parable of the hundred sheep” (John Behr, *Formation of Christian Theology*, vol. 2, *The Nicene Faith* [Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2006], 52, citing Athanasius of Alexandria, *On the Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia*, 17; see H. G. Opitz, ed., *Athanasius Werke*, vol. 3, pt. I, *Urkunden zur Geschichte des Arianischen Streites* [Berlin: De Gruyter, 1934], 11).
9. Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. 3, *The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature*, 4th ed. (Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1984), 190–527, esp. 302. Similarly, Alberto Viciano limits his research survey of Antiochene exegetical methods to “the four great masters of the school—Diodor of Tarsus, Theodor of Mopsuestia, John Chrysostom and Theodoret of Cyrus,” while affirming that others in the Antiochene “school” “including those Greek, Syrian and Latin authors, who carried the Antiochian hermeneutic on, will also not be forgotten: Eutherius of Tyana, Isho’dad of Merv, Julian of Eclanum, Junilius Africanus and Cassiodor” (Albert Viciano, “Das formale der antiochenischen Schriftauslegung,” in *Stimuli: Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann*, ed. Georg Schöllgen and Clemens Scholten [Münster: Aschendorff, 1996], 372).
 10. This position is held by patristic scholar Charles Kannengiesser and the editors of the Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture. See Charles Kannengiesser “Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church,” in *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Donald K. McKim, (Downers Grove, IL, and Nottingham, UK: InterVarsity, 2007), 1–13; Thomas C. Oden, ed., *Introduction and Biographical Information*. ACCS (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2005); cf. Ronald E. Heine, “Gregory of Nyssa’s Apology for Allegory,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 38, no. 4 (December 1984): 360–70; Nassif, “Antiochene ‘Theoria’ in John Chrysostom’s Exegesis,” 40).
 11. D. S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 64, citing “Sancti Ephraem Syri” in *Genesim et in Exodum Commentarii*, Syr. 71 (Louvain: Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 1903–5), 25.

12. Donald Fairbairn, “Patristic Exegesis and Theology: The Cart and the Horse,” *WTJ* 69, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 1–19. The Eastern Orthodox scholar John Behr would likely agree with the narrow view (John Behr, *The Case against Diodore and Theodore: Texts and Their Contexts* [Oxford Early Christian Texts; Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011]). And at least one scholar has suggested that there was *no* Antiochene school (Elizabeth A. Clark, *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity* [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999]).
13. Jaroslav Brož, “From Allegory to the Four Senses of Scripture: Hermeneutics of the Church Fathers and of the Christian Middle Ages,” in *Philosophical Hermeneutics and Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Jan Roskovec and Petr Pokorný, WUNT, 153 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 303–4.
14. By “story” Brož refers to the history in the narrative. He continues, “Opinions regarding the concept of *theoria* vary among different authors. For example, according to Vaccari, there are four characteristics of *theoria*: a) the author of the inspired text presupposes the historical reality of the narrated facts; b) beyond this first level of reality, the facts support another, ontologically posterior interpretation; c) the relation between these two realities is like the relation between a picture and a person or an outline and a complete painting; d) both realities are direct objects of the cognitive activity of the author, but are of different types; the lesser object functions as a medium that enables knowledge of the greater, more noble reality to be achieved. . . . The Antiochene School identifies the first and second meaning of the text in terms of the timeline of the history of salvation:

littera	fulfillment
(the past)	(present/future time)

“Even for the multiplicity of Scriptural senses that were identified later, the movement of the timeline of the history of salvation is quite important. It allows the present meanings of the text to extend into the future, even into eternity or to a final eschatology (the so-called ‘anagogic sense’)” (Brož, “From Allegory to the Four Senses,” 304–5). The collection edited by Roskovec and Pokorný, comprising various European authors’ essays, never returns to the topic of *theōria*, except to discuss Gregory’s (Alexandrian) use of it in his preface to the *Life of Moses*. One of the authors defines *theōria* as

“an application of the story by means of contemplative reading to discern its spiritual import” while respecting the ἱστορία (Ivana Noble, “The Apophatic Way in Gregory of Nyssa,” 334). A contemporary vernacular might be applying the passage to one’s life.

15. Bradley Nassif, “‘Spiritual Exegesis’ in the School of Antioch,” in *New Perspectives on Historical Theology: Essays in Memory of John Meyendorff*, ed. Bradley Nassif (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 345–46; and Heinrich Kihn, “Über Θεωρία und Ἀλληγορία nach den verloren hermeneutischen Schriften der Antiochener,” *Theologische Quartalschrift* 20 (1880): 554–55.
16. As to what that spiritual sense is, Brož implies that it relates to the application for today from God. “The Church Fathers were not interested in the ‘objective’ meaning of the text. They search for the meaning that a particular text might have for the historical, theological, or spiritual context (i.e., for the ‘today’) in which it was being read” (Brož, “From Allegory to the Four Senses,” 303). Paul Noble rightly notes the lack of precision in terminology that has plagued dialogue on various biblical senses. “Discussions . . . have produced numerous designations of the various ‘senses’ of the Bible which different schools have either commended or condemned: the literal sense, the plain sense, the historical (or grammatical, or historical-grammatical) sense, the original sense, the spiritual sense, the allegorical, anagogical, and mystical sense, etc.” (Paul R. Noble, *The Canonical Approach: A Critical Reconstruction of the Hermeneutics of Brevard S. Childs*, Biblical Interpretation Series 16 [Leiden: Brill, 1995], 323). Even the Eastern Orthodox John Breck agrees that there is confusion on these various terms and argues that it really comes down to two: the literal sense and the spiritual sense (John Breck, “Theoria and Orthodox Hermeneutics,” *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 20, no. 4 [1976]: 216). Nevertheless, Kannengiesser claims that “a constant and universal canon of patristic interpretation [not just for the Antiochenes but for *all* patristic commentators and preachers] is the insistence on the intimate connection between the *littera* [the literal meaning of biblical statements—πρὸς ῥητόν] and any ‘spiritual’ comments generated by it.” (Charles Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, 2 vols, Bible in Ancient Christianity 1 [Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004], 175). This assertion seems difficult to maintain for at least two reasons. First in light of the Antiochene arguments which designate a significant distinction between *allēgoria* and *theōria*. And second, Kannengiesser’s approval of J. G. Kahn’s assessment of Philo on the *littera*. Kahn writes, “Philo parallels the biblical narrative . . . though he completely neglects the

concrete chronology and spatial frame of the events on which he relies” and Philo “honestly admits that the literal method is true in its own right” yet Philo confusingly refers to the results of the literal method as the “apparent meaning” (ibid., 177, citing Philo of Alexandria, *De confusione linguarum*, ed. J. G. Kahn [Paris: Cerf, 1963], 19). Perhaps Kannengiesser would argue that Philo was pre-patristic (though some patristic interpretation follows Philo closely). Nevertheless, Kannengiesser’s quotation helps with a definition, albeit vague, of the “spiritual sense” as the “spiritual comments generated by” the literal meaning of biblical texts, that is, that which encourages spiritual or Godward development. Thus, the spiritual sense is often akin to the application of the passage. Some would say (including Theodoret; see chap. 4 heading on Theodore on Illumination) that the spiritual sense can be discerned only by those illumined by the Spirit. But others, who reject a spiritual interpretation as distinct from a literal interpretation, seem to imply complete accord between the human author’s intentions as written in the text and the intention of the divine author (see chapter 4 under Does Antiochene Theōria Promote Polyvalency?). They might also object to the “spiritual sense” and prefer instead “application,” “spiritual implication,” or “significance.” Nevertheless, the phrases “spiritual sense” or “spiritual interpretation” are employed regularly by patristic authors, who do not make clear-cut distinctions between meaning and application as some moderns do. Felix Thome summarizes that “Diodor and Theodore as the starting point for their anti-allegorical interpretation of Scripture directed adherence to the historical content of the written word. Any further interpretation and greater insight into an author, which they describe as *Schau* (θεωρία), has its foundation in the primary (first-tier) historical sense.” (“Diodors und Theodors Ausgangspunkt ihrer antiallegorisch ausgerichteten Schriftauslegung ist das Festhalten am geschichtlichen Gehalt des geschriebenen Wortes. Jede weitere Deutung und höhere Einsicht in eine Schriftsteller, die sie als *Schau* (θεωρία) bezeichnen, hat ihr Fundament im erstrangigen geschichtlichen Sinn”) (Felix Thome, *Historia contra Mythos: Die Schriftauslegung Diodors von Tarsus und Theodors von Mopsuestia im Widerstreit zu Kaiser Julians und Salustius’ allegorischem Mythenverständnis* [Bonn: Borengässer, 2004], 217). While Thome does not refer to this “greater insight into the author” as the “spiritual sense” (*geistigen Sinn*), he does conclude that, for Theodore and (especially) Diodore, “this peculiarity of the biblical writings, beyond history to have an added sense of value and surplus is a result of the working of the Holy Spirit.” (“Diese Eigentümlichkeit der biblischen Schriften, über die Geschichte hinaus einen Mehrwert und Sinnüberschuss

zu besitzen, ist Folge des Wirkens des Heiligen Geistes“ (Thome, *Historia contra Mythos*, 217–18). Furthermore, some evangelicals affirm two levels of understanding. For example, “Erickson supports a two-level view of understanding, which stresses both the cognitive and experiential dimensions of truth. These dimensions are complementary, not antithetical. The ‘deeper level of perception’ is available to those whose hearts are spiritually sensitive to the mind of God” (David J. McKinley, “John Owen’s View of Illumination: An Alternative to the Fuller-Erickson Dialogue,” *BSac*, 154, no. 613 [January 1997]: 96, citing Millard J. Erickson, *Evangelical Interpretation: Perspectives on Hermeneutical Issues* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993], 47, 54). McKinley lists “others who agree with Erickson’s position” including Donald Bloesch, *A Theology of Word & Spirit: Authority & Method in Theology*, Christian Foundations (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1992), 59; Arthur Walkington Pink, *The Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1970), 63; Clark Pinnock, “The Role of the Spirit in Interpretation,” *JETS* 36, no. 4 (December 1993): 491–97; and Roy B. Zuck, *Teaching with Spiritual Power! Developing the Relationship That Makes All the Difference* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1993), 60 (McKinley, “John Owen’s View of Illumination, 96 n. 14). See also the discussion on illumination in chapter 4.

17. Fairbairn, “Patristic Exegesis and Theology,” 10–11. Fairbairn *rightly* notes that biblical scholars have not kept up with the developments of patristic scholars with regard to the idea that Antiochene and Alexandrian exegetical methodologies overlap significantly and that the schools are not always “uniform internally.” Fairbairn apparently means in their exegetical methods, theological orthodoxy, and thereby their worthiness for emulation. “Does Chrysostom *actually* belong with his fellow student Theodore?” (Fairbairn, 3). I agree with Fairbairn that it is incorrect universally to label the Antiochenes the “good guys” as representatives of (nascent) historical-grammatical interpretation and the Alexandrians as the “bad guys” who incessantly allegorized (Fairbairn, 4, 8–9).
18. Fairbairn, “Patristic Exegesis and Theology,” 10.
19. Fairbairn, “Patristic Exegesis and Theology,” 14. Though, he continues, “to some degree, theology was the horse and exegesis was the cart.”
20. Fairbairn, “Patristic Exegesis and Theology,” 14–15.
21. “By the ‘Three Chapters’ (τρία κεφάλαια) are meant (a) the person and works of Theodore of Mopsuestia, (b) the letter of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa (d. 457), to Maris, Bishop of Hardaschir (in Persia), and (c) the polemic of Theodoretus

- against the twelve anti-Nestorian anathemas of Cyril and the Council of Ephesus, and in defense of Theodore and Nestorius” (Milton V. Anastos, “The Immutability of Christ and Justinian’s Condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 6 [January 1951]: 129 n. 13; cf. Leo Donald Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325–787): Their History and Theology* [Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990], 235–38).
22. “If, then, anyone shall defend this most impious Theodore and his impious writings, in which he vomits the blasphemies mentioned above, and countless others besides against our Great God and Savior Jesus Christ, and if anyone does not anathematize him or his impious writings, as well as all those who protect or defend him, or who assert that his exegesis is orthodox, or who write in favor of him and of his impious works, or those who share the same opinions, or those who have shared them and still continue unto the end in this heresy: let them be anathema” (NPFN2 14:315 (emphasis mine).
23. The bishop of Rome, Vigilius, initially wanted to condemn only fifty-four statements in Theodore’s writings and not the man and all of his works. Furthermore, Vigilius did not want to condemn any of Theodoret’s writings because he was “acquitted” at Chalcedon. This can be seen in Vigilius, *Constitutum ad Imperatorem* of May 14, 553 (de Margerie, *Greek Fathers*, 182; Joseph Cullen Ayer, *A Source Book for Ancient Church History: From the Apostolic Age to the Close of the Conciliar Period* [New York: Charles Scribner, 1913], 547–51). The longer form of the Latin work is *Constitutum (I) ‘Inter innumeras sollicitudines’ de tribus Capitulis ad Justinianum imperatorem* (‘Among the many concerns’ regarding the Three Chapters to the Emperor Justinian). P. Woolley also finds questionable the nature of the materials used to condemn Theodore and Theodoret: “Justinian’s Edict of the Three Chapters in 543 was unfair to the School of Antioch in its condemnations of the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret. The Council of Constantinople of 553, called the Fifth Ecumenical Council, condemned writings of the Antioch school, but on the basis of falsified and mutilated quotations” (P. Woolley, “Antiochene Theology,” in EDT2, 73; cf. Harry S. Pappas, “Theodore of Mopsuestia’s Commentary on Psalm 44: A Study of Exegesis and Christology” [PhD diss., Yale University, 2000], 151 n. 15, 154). Furthermore, George Kalantzis in the preface to his translation of Theodore’s *Commentary on the Gospel of John* argues from Continental researchers of the last century that Theodore’s later commentaries display a strong Nicaea-Constantinopolitan Christology and that many of the fragments attributed to Theodore in PG 66 actually belong to Diodore or others. Further, the

commentary on John displays but one potentially Nestorian comment, and that only if read out of context (George Kalantzis, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on the Gospel of John*, Early Christian Studies 7 [Strathfield, NSW: St. Pauls, 2004], 16–23, 26). Surprisingly, Kalantzis notes, “Characteristic of the Greek fragments [for Theodore’s *Commentary on John*] is the absence of any mention of the *homo assumptus*, a term and a concept that permeates the Syria version” (p. 28). The term *homo assumptus* expresses separation of the πρόσωπον of the incarnate Lord Jesus. For example, fragment 78 (commenting on John 10:18) clearly counters Nestorianism. “To say that the body of the divine Logos also had a soul does not suggest the divinity of the soul ... Christ, being one and not two, composed of divinity and humanity, says that He lays down His soul, which belongs to Him and is part of Him (although He was God by nature, assuming flesh—which had soul—and uniting it to Himself)” (Kalantzis, 28). Eight other fragments are listed and discussed supporting Theodore’s view on the unity of the Christ (pp. 28–29; *contra* W. Devries, “Der ‘Nestorianismus’ Theodors von Mopsuestia in seiner Sakramentenlehre,” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 7 [1941]: 92–93, cited in Pappas, “Theodore of Mopsuestia’s Commentary on Psalm 44,” 151). But it is beyond the scope of this book to analyze the intricacies of the controversy from the anathemas at Justinian’s synod of the Three Chapters (Edict of Three Chapters of 546) and those of the Twelve Anathema in the Council of 553. See Robert C. Hill, ed. and trans., *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on Psalms 1–81*, Writings from the Greco-Roman World 5 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), xxxiii n. 52.

24. While it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to analyze the intricacies of this christological doctrine, nevertheless, it proves difficult to separate the christological debates between the Antiochene and Alexandrian schools from their hermeneutical debates. By way of summary, Cyril of Alexandria in his *Twelve Anathemas* (NPNF2, 14:201–17) enshrined in ecclesial authority by the Fifth Ecumenical Council (NPNF2, 14:315) claims that Theodore rejected the *communicatio idiomatum* between the divine Logos and the man Jesus. This doctrine states that the attributes of divinity and humanity were shared between the natures of the theanthropic Christ. (Nevertheless, even today Lutheran and Reformed theologians differ on the details of this sharing of attributes between the humanity and divinity of the Incarnate One [cf. EDT2, 277]). Yet Theodore, in a critical reconstruction of his Greek *Commentary on John*, seems to surpass the orthodoxy even of the christological writings of his Alexandrian accusers. For details on the history of this

reconstruction, see Kalantzis, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on the Gospel of John*, 11–16. Theodore’s accusers claimed that Christ (even in his humanity while on the earth) was not only immutable and incorruptible but also *impassible*. While acknowledging a true humanity, the Alexandrians held to a “*communicatio idiomatum in abstracto*,” while Theodore held a “*communicatio idiomatum in concreto*” (Kalantzis, 31–34, cf. 16). That is, the Alexandrians claim a *communicatio idiomatum* that goes both ways, but when it comes to divine impassibility, suffering really does not communicate from the Incarnate One’s humanity to his divinity (cf. Gerald L. Bray, “Christology,” in *New Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Sinclair B. Ferguson and J. I. Packer [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2000], 137–39). Kalantzis supports *communicatio idiomatum in concreto*, for example, from Theodore’s comments on John 17:1. There Theodore argues that “the suffering of the humanity is [really] assumed by the divinity” (Kalantzis, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on the Gospel of John*, 32–33, 129; cf. Frederick G. McLeod, “Theodore of Mopsuestia’s Understanding of the Two *Hypostaseis* and Two *Prosopa* Coinciding in One Common *Prosopon*,” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 18, no. 3 [2010]: 408). McLeod is among those who believe that Theodore’s Christology is most likely orthodox and deserves another look (Frederick G. McLeod, “The Christology in Theodore of Mopsuestia’s Commentary on the Gospel of John,” *Theological Studies* 73, no. 1 [March 2012]: 115–38). Returning to Kalantzis’s arguments for reconsidering the orthodoxy of Theodore’s Christology, he claims that thirty-one passages in the extant portions of Theodore’s *Commentary on John* describe “the divine Logos . . . as the one who suffered, died, and was resurrected by his own power.” He lists or interacts with fourteen of the fragments (Kalantzis, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on the Gospel of John*, 32–34). For example, in fragment 132 on John 17:1 “*Glorify me, Father, in the time of the Passion, as is fitting to my superiority. Show that I am your Son by nature, even being on the cross, for which you will glorify me, so that all may know that I do not suffer this deservedly, nor in vain, but so that I may become the cause of the greatest good for all people*” (Kalantzis, 32–33). Theodore not only appears thoroughly to overwhelm any accusations of Nestorianism, but for Kalantzis he also appears to be way ahead of his times, rejecting a doctrine of impassibility in the divine Logos, holding a “*communicatio idiomatum in concreto*” rather than the Alexandrian “*communicatio idiomatum in abstracto*” (Kalantzis, 34; cf. Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994], 563; Millard J. Erickson,

Christian Theology, 2d ed. [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998], 740–47, 750–55; Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church: Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity A.D. 311–600*, vol. 3 [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978], §142). But later Erickson reverses his position, seemingly agreeing with process theologians that the *communicatio idiomatum* is meaningless (Millard J. Erickson, *The Word Became Flesh: A Contemporary Incarnational Christology* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000], 269). For Theodore, the *communicatio idiomatum* goes both ways, from the Logos to the humanity and vice versa. That is, for Theodore “the divine Logos shared in the passion and suffering of humanity through his human element. Humanity, then, also participated in the acts of the Logos and the body was, ultimately, transformed to incorruptibility. This is not, therefore, an incarnation of ‘inhabitation’ but of truly ‘becoming’” (Kalantzis, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on the Gospel of John*, 34). For further discussion of *communicatio idiomatum* from an analysis of *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Nicene Creed*, see Simon Gerber, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und das Nicänum: Studien zu den katechetischen Homilien*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 51 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 151–57. For more discussion of works both supporting and questioning Theodore’s christological orthodoxy, see Pappas, “Theodore of Mopsuestia’s Commentary on Psalm 44,” 152–79. Pappas makes four observations about the secondary literature on Theodore’s Christology, namely, that (1) critiques of Theodore’s Christology anachronistically compare him with Chalcedon rather than Nicaea or Constantinople; (2) scholars emphasize Theodore’s Christology from a philosophical perspective; (3) no consensus has accrued from the scholarly debate; and, perhaps most important, (4) *too little attention has been given to Theodore’s exegesis as it relates to his Christology* (Pappas, 180–81). Pappas concludes regarding Theodore’s christological orthodoxy: “Finally, given his strong exegetical perspective and scriptural orientation, it is safe to say that Theodore does not *intend* to divide the one person of the incarnate Lord by distinguishing divinity and humanity. The basic problem of his Christology remains, then, how to speak adequately of the union of divine and human in Christ” (Harry S. Pappas, “Theodore of Mopsuestia’s Commentary on Psalm 44 (LXX): A Study of Exegesis and Christology,” *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 47, no. 1–4 [January 2002]: 73; cf. Pappas, “Theodore of Mopsuestia’s Commentary on Psalm 44,” esp. 204). As to Theodore’s “strong exegetical perspective and scriptural orientation,” Dimitri Z. Zaharopoulos notes that “Theodore dealt with the [christological] problem by using biblical language which excluded

any metaphysical implications” (*Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Bible: A Study of His Old Testament Exegesis*, Theological Inquiries [Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1989], 19–20). Theodore’s “exegetical method focuses on interpreting Scripture on its own terms rather than by a pre-conceived theological system” (Pappas, “Theodore of Mopsuestia’s Commentary on Psalm 44,” 167; cf. Rudolf Bultmann, *Die Exegeses des Theodor von Mopsuestia*, ed. Helmut Feld and Karl Hermann [Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1984], 97). Though, indeed, Bultmann later questions whether any exegesis can be accomplished without presuppositions (Rudolf Bultmann, *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann* [New York: Meridian, 1960]; cf. Jacques Guillet, “Les exégèses d’Alexandrie et d’Antioche: conflit ou malentendu?” *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 34 [1947]: 257–302). Theodore’s *Commentary on the Gospel of John* is one of his last exegetical works and that on Psalms one of his first. If both display a Christology in line with Nicene and Constantinopolitan orthodoxy, why not the others?

25. Behr mimics the title of Cyril of Alexandria, *Contra Diodorum et Theodorum* 17. Behr, however, never interacts directly with the evidence for Theodore’s christological orthodoxy, which Kalantzis develops in his preface (Kalantzis, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on the Gospel of John*, 3–37). Kalantzis offers a helpful commentary, and he adds substantially to the arguments refuting Theodore as a father of Nestorianism. First Kalantzis interacts with critical sources (both ancient and modern), which debate the topic of Theodore as a father of Nestorianism. Second, and more fundamentally, Kalantzis translates the appendix of R. Devréesse’s 1948 work *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste*, Studi e Testi 141 (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1948), which is the fragments of Theodore’s *Commentary on the Gospel of John the Apostle*. Kalantzis’s argument is twofold. First, he shows that those accusing Theodore used a limited florilegium, much of which comes not from Theodore but from Diodore or others. Second, Kalantzis’s interaction with secondary sources shows that they lack access to Theodore’s *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, which contains significant christological references consistent with Nicene and Constantinopolitan orthodoxy. Theodore’s commentary is characteristically brief, literal, and historical. He generally paraphrases the passages, makes comments on a word or phrase, or comments on the historical background.
26. Behr, *Case against Diodore and Theodore*, ix. Nevertheless, Behr appears unaware of fellow Orthodox scholar Bradley Nassif, who contends that *distinctions remain* between Alexandrian and Antiochene exegesis with the

support of *seven* patristic and biblical scholars who have extensively studied the topic from 1880 to 1991. One of those, Jesuit Paul Ternant comments, “In some sense . . . it was true that the opposition between Antioch and Alexandria was artificially created, but only partially so. A real difference in exegesis still existed in the two Schools and a proper understanding of *theōria* could help explain it” (Nassif, “‘Spiritual Exegesis’ of Scripture,” 447). Similarly, Fairbairn seems to dismiss exegetical distinctions between Antiochene *theōria* and Alexandrian *allēgoria* despite his acknowledgment of Nassif’s essay (“‘Spiritual Exegesis’ in the School of Antioch,” 343–77; cited by Fairbairn, “Patristic Exegesis and Theology,” 9). But Fairbairn is more concerned to use Nassif to affirm his view that “Antioch, like Alexandria, favored spiritual exegesis over literal” (Fairbairn, 11). Fairbairn is quite close to correct, arguing that “Theodore is averse to the *theology* that leads the Alexandrians to use spiritual interpretation in the way they do” (p. 11). This is apparently a reference to a theology of separation between the divine and the human that corresponds to Theodore’s two-ages view separating the OT from the NT; so that from Fairbairn’s perspective “Theodore refused to relate OT passages to the second age or the NT” (p. 15). But this is overstated. While Theodore is admittedly reticent to acknowledge such relations between the Testaments, the times he most readily does so is when he uses *theōria*, the concept that Fairbairn seems to brush over from the one article, which he cites from Nassif. Instead, Fairbairn depends on the genuinely useful scholarship of Rowan Greer. But Greer also exhibits in his publications next to no knowledge of Nassif or the seven scholars on Antiochene *theōria*, whom Nassif chronicles. And it is Theodore’s use of Antiochene *theōria* that allows him at times to affirm (rather than refuse) christological or messianic referents in the OT. For another view on why Theodore supports the two-age view based more on rhetorical training than on theological issues, see Robert C. Hill, “Sartor Resartus: Theodore under Review by Theodoret,” *Augustinianum* 41 (2001): 465–76. See also the discussion of this article in chapter 3 under Robert Hill.

27. For an analysis of this thesis, see Jules Grisham, “Felled by ‘Good Pleasure’: An Examination of the Condemnation of the Grammatical–Historical Method of Interpreting Scripture, as It Was Developed in the Exegetical School of Antioch,” *Third Millennium Magazine Online* 4, no. 30 (November 2002): 1–32. Grisham challenges the idea of a genetic link from “Antiochene, and especially Theodore’s, exegesis and the emergence of heresies.” He sees instead a link between a high view of God’s otherness, as well as a high

view of human free will coalescing in a “partial-dynamical’ view of scriptural inspiration” all resulting in Theodore’s wrong Christology and soteriology (pp. 7, 23). See chapter 3 for a fuller description and chapter 4 for an analysis of this view of inspiration by the Antiochenes.

28. James Leo Garret Jr. “A Reappraisal of Chalcedon,” *Review and Expositor* 71, no. 1 (Winter 1974): 38–39; cf. Robert V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon: A Historical and Doctrinal Survey* (London: SPCK, 1953), 132–81.
29. Nassif, “‘Spiritual Exegesis’ of Scripture,” 438.
30. De Margerie, *Greek Fathers*, 165.
31. NPNF1, 9:18 (emphasis mine).
32. By “school” is meant that these people shared a particular line of thought, that is, a similar way of interpreting the Scriptures. It is not meant to say that they all studied at the same facility under the same faculty.
33. A heresiarch is the father of a heresy. Fairbairn shows objectivity when he takes the same approach with Origen’s exegetical methods. Namely, because Origen’s eschatological view of universalism (ἄποκατάστασις) was condemned at the Fifth Ecumenical Council at Constantinople, therefore, his exegetical method ought also to be rejected. Fairbairn writes, “Given that Origen was condemned by the church, what right do we have to call him the Alexandrian *par excellence*?” (Fairbairn, “Patristic Exegesis and Theology,” 3; cf. Hermias Sozomen, *A History of the Church in Nine Books* [London: Samuel Bagster, 1846], 395–96). Frances Young offers a nuanced study comparing Antiochene and Alexandrian exegetical methods. She makes a statement that seems to challenge Fairbairn’s separating Chrysostom from Theodore. “I have argued, then, that Antiochene exegesis is not simply according to the letter, nor was it an anticipation of historical criticism. Rather they used the standard literary techniques in use in the rhetorical schools to protest against esoteric philosophical deductions being made in what they regarded as an arbitrary way. One thing Eustathius was keen to show was that Origen appealed to other Scriptures which were inappropriate and unconvincing while ignoring genuinely relevant passages. In other words Origen’s methods were arbitrary and his conclusions unreliable: this story [note her use of the term *story* rather than *history*], he rightly insisted, is not about the resurrection. To prove this Eustathius interprets according to the *to methodikon* and *to historikon*—not historically in the modern sense, nor literally, but according to the rationalistic literary-critical methods current in the contemporary educational practice of *grammaticus* and *rhētōr*. In this he was the precursor of Diodore,

- Theodore, Chrysostom and Theodoret, and perhaps the successor of that shadowy but influential biblical scholar, Lucian of Antioch” (Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997], 182–83).
34. Demetrios Trakatellis, “Theodoret’s Commentary on Isaiah: A Synthesis of Exegetical Traditions,” in *New Perspectives on Historical Theology: Essays in Memory of John Meyendorff*, ed. Bradley Nassif (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 313–42.
 35. McLeod believes, “When Theodore uses the term *historia*, it refers not to what one understands today as an event that has been established by the critical historical method. It simply means a narrative story that is recounting something that has happened” (Frederick G. McLeod, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, Early Christian Fathers* [London and New York: Routledge, 2009], 19). Rowan Greer concurs, adding, “Theodore does . . . insist that the ‘narrative’ is a true one.” Greer cites from a Latin translation of Theodore to support this. “First, ‘the apostle does not do away with the narrative [*historiam*], nor does he get rid of what happened long ago [*res dudum factus*]” (Rowan A. Greer, trans., *Theodore of Mopsuestia, The Commentaries on the Minor Epistles of Paul, Writings from the Greco-Roman World 26* [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010], xiv–xv, citing H. B. Swete, ed., *Theodori episcopi Mopsuesteni, In epistolas beati Pauli commentarii*, vol. 1, *Galatians–Colossians* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1880] 73–74). Greer, however, quibbles with Theodore’s discussion of ἱστορία, preferring instead the Latin term *narratio*. The French scholar Jean-Noël Guinot continues the discussion of allegory versus *theōria* (in the form of typology) in the article “The Line between Allegory and Typology,” offering a balanced definition of ἱστορία as “le pur récit d’un événement passé,” “the pure narrative (or account) of past events” (Guinot, “La frontière entre allégorie et typologie: École Alexandrine, École Antiochienne,” *Recherches de science religieuse* 99, no. 2 [2011]: 213). Godfrey W. Ashby rejects the notion that the Antiochenes viewed history as “a dispassionate science [which] belongs to our age, not theirs. History [for the Antiochenes] has an aim, an eschaton” (Ashby, “Theodoret of Cyrrhus as Exegete of the Old Testament” [PhD diss., Rhodes University, 1972], 23). In today’s postmodern environs, most would question whether any scholars view or interpret history dispassionately, that is, objectively. For a broader understanding of history in the perspective of patristic and medieval exegetes as opposed to historical-critical scholars, see Matthew Levering,

- Participatory Biblical Exegesis: A Theology of Biblical Interpretation* (South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008).
36. See Frederick G. McLeod, *The Roles of Christ's Humanity in Salvation: Insights from Theodore of Mopsuestia* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 2005).
 37. Adam M. Schor, "Theodoret on the 'School of Antioch': A Network Approach," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 15, no. 4 (Winter 2007): 519. For Schor's analysis and evaluation of Theodoret's writings, see pp. 534–62.
 38. Schor, "Theodoret on the 'School of Antioch,'" 520–21. Later in his article (as he reviews recent scholarship on what defines the Antiochene school), Schor seems to reverse his view: "The Antiochenes cannot be said to have possessed a single coherent doctrinal system, or a consistent set of exegetical methods." But then he acknowledges, "The deconstruction of the school of Antioch, however, may have progressed too far" with historical grounds from those (e.g., Theodoret) willing to support Diodore and Theodore's doctrines and exegesis prior to Chalcedon even at the price of exile (pp. 522–26). Literal interpretation in this dissertation is generally defined as according to the plain sense of the words, context, history, and grammar of the passage, while not denying or ignoring a biblical author's use of figures of speech.
 39. See discussion below and cf. Jean-Noël Guinot, *L'exégèse de Théodoret de Cyr*, *Théologie Historique* 100 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1995), chapter 6.
 40. Little of Diodore's commentaries remain, but, where they touch on *theōria*, they are discussed in this chapter in the sections below.
 41. Donald McKim, ed., *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1998), 571, 972; Erwin Fahlbusch and Geoffrey W. Bromiley, eds., *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, 5 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 82–83. Though Theodoret is known to write commentaries, "[f]ollowing the footsteps of [both] his illustrious Alexandrian and Antiochene predecessors," Guinot acknowledges as well that "Theodoret definitely bears . . . the legacy of the great Antiochene exegetes, and, like them, shows little inclination toward an interpretation that neglects or denies the 'reality' of the text" (Jean-Noël Guinot, "Theodoret of Cyrus: Bishop and Exegete," in *The Bible in Greek Christian Antiquity*, ed. Paul M. Blowers, Bible through the Ages 1 [Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997], 163, 169).
 42. Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch*, 29–30. Cf. Guillet, "Les exégèses d'Alexandrie et d'Antioche," 257–302.

43. David F. Wright, “The ‘Edict of Milan,’” *Christian History* 9, no. 4 (1990): 9.
44. Bruce L. Shelley, “The First Council at Nicea,” *Christian History* 9, no. 4 (1990): 10–11.
45. Namely, Nicene Christology affirms the coeternality of the Father and the Son, who are of the same essence (ὁμοούσιος; consubstantial).
46. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church: Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity A.D. 311–600*, vol. 3:§124.
47. Davis, *First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 104.
48. The Chalcedonian Definition finds its exegetical roots in the Second Ecumenical Council at Constantinople some seventy years earlier (David, *First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 122). I am indebted to Bradley Nassif, who helped me to clarify this footnote.
49. “The . . . Arian controversy . . . falls into three stages: 1. From the outbreak of the controversy to the temporary victory of orthodoxy at the council of Nicaea; A.D. 318–325. 2. The Arian and semi-Arian reaction, and its prevalence to the death of Constantius; A.D. 325–361. 3. The final victory, and the completion of the Nicene creed; to the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. Arianism proceeded from the bosom of the Catholic church, was condemned as heresy at the council of Nicaea, but afterwards under various forms attained even ascendancy for a time in the church, until at the second ecumenical council it was cast out forever. From that time it lost its importance as a politico-theological power, but continued as an uncatholic sect more than two hundred years among the Germanic nations, which were converted to Christianity under the Arian domination” (Schaff, *History of the Christian Church: Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity A.D. 311–600*, vol. 3, §119). Despite another council (only Western, though the Eastern bishops were invited) at Sardica in Illyria (in 343) and the victory of the Nicene party, the new or compromised Arians prevailed throughout the empire! “Thus Arianism gained the ascendancy in the whole Roman empire; though not in its original rigorous form, but in the milder form of *homoi-ousianism* or the doctrine of *similarity* of essence, as opposed on the one hand to the Nicene *homo-ousianism* (*sameness* of essence), and on the other hand to the Arian *hetero-ousianism* (*difference* of essence).” Numerous local councils were held, some repudiating Nicene orthodoxy by Arian dominance, but they could not maintain unity, dividing into “right-winged Eusebians or Semi-Arians, who maintained that the Son was not indeed of the *same* essence (ὁμο-ούσιος), yet of *like* essence (ὁμοι-ούσιος), with the Father. To these belonged many who

at heart agreed with the Nicene faith, but either harbored prejudices against Athanasius, or saw in the term ὁμο-ούσιος an approach to Sabellianism [modalistic monarchianism]; for theological science had not yet duly fixed the distinction of substance (οὐσία) and person (ὑπόστασις), so that the *homoousia* might easily be confounded with unity of person.” One of these councils was held at Antioch (in 358). “The proposed compromise of entirely avoiding the word οὐσία, and substituting ὅμοιος *like*, for ὁμοιούσιος *of like essence*, and ἄνόμοιος, *unlike*, satisfied neither party. Constantius vainly endeavored to suppress the quarrel by his imperio-episcopal power. His death in 361 opened the way for the second and permanent victory of the Nicene orthodoxy” (Schaff, vol. 3, §121). In addition to these profound doctrinal developments at the general councils of Nicaea and Constantinople (not to mention many other local councils), several other profound events occurred during Theodore’s early life. When Theodore was only seventeen years old, Athanasius defined the New Testament (in 367) as known today in his 39th Festal Letter. Thus, issues of canon remained unsettled until later in Theodore’s life. And in 386, only five years after the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople, Augustine converted to Christianity. While some see no interaction between Augustine and Theodore, there is evidence that Theodore followed the Pelagian discussions closely and wrote on them in his catechetical writings and elsewhere (see Joanne Dewart, *The Theology of Grace of Theodore of Mopsuestia*, Studies in Christian Antiquity 16 [Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1971], 69–73).

50. “John Chrysostom informs us that Theodore was a man of noble birth and an heir to large estates” (Zaharopoulos, *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Bible*, 9).
51. See Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, 171–76, for key features on the Greco-Roman rhetorical approach. She argues that this played a major role in the differences between Alexandrian and Antiochene exegesis. Cf. Christoph Schäublin, *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der Antiochenischen Exegese*, Theophania 23 (Cologne and Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1974), 111–47.
52. Zaharopoulos, *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Bible*, 10. This appears to be an expression of monastic asceticism still popular sixty years after the Edict of Milan.
53. Carterius taught ascetics at the Asketerion, which is rarely emphasized in the scholarly literature reviewed. Asceticism likely assisted Theodore in living a simple life and disciplining and focusing his analytical mind on the exegesis of

- the Scriptures and addressing the heresies of his day (see Joel C. Elowsky, *John 1–10*, ACCS, NT 4a [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2006], xxxiii; Donald K. McKim, ed., *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters* [Downers Grove, Ill, and Nottingham, UK: InterVarsity, 2007], 376).
54. For Diodore, Psalm 2 was prophetic but Psalm 22 was not (see Robert C. Hill, trans., *Diodore of Tarsus: Commentary on Psalms 1–51*, *Writings from the Greco-Roman World* 9 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005], xxxiii–xxxvi, 7–10, 69–74). For a negative assessment of Antiochene exegesis of the Psalms, see John J. O’Keefe, “‘A Letter That Killeth’: Toward a Reassessment of Antiochene Exegesis, or Diodore, Theodore, and Theodoret on the Psalms,” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8, no. 1 (2000): 83–100. But O’Keefe, who in his title quotes the apostle Paul, “in classing Antiochene exegesis as ‘a backward-looking project that failed’ . . . seems unaware he is quoting Theodoret’s criticism of Theodore’s literalism” (Theodoret of Cyrus, *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, trans. Robert C. Hill, *Early Christian Studies* 2 [Brisbane: Centre for Early Christian Studies, Australian Catholic University, 2001], 11 n. 33 [Hereafter, Hill, trans., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Song of Songs*]).
55. Zaharopoulos, *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Bible*, 12.
56. Hill, *Diodore, Commentary on Psalms 1–51*, xi.
57. Hill, *Diodore, Commentary on Psalms 1–51*, xi–xii. Hill, however, is convinced that Diodore both misunderstood Alexandrian ἀλληγορία and was imprecise in his distinctions between ἱστορικόν and ἀλληγορικόν (pp. xii, xxv). But Hill’s seeking refuge under Young’s contention that ἱστορικόν “was not ‘historical’ in the modern sense” seems to miss the point (Hill, p. xxv n. 42, citing Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, 168). Namely, for Diodore the narrative (ἱστορικόν) stood on its own as coherent revelation that really occurred without need for symbolic embellishment (ἀλληγορικόν). For moral benefit (that is, to move from historical meaning to application for his readers), Diodore uses the term θεωρία ten times in the preface to his *Commentary on Psalms* (TLG, 4134.004 lines 127, 128, 131–33, 135 [2x], 137, 154, 156; for an English translation see Hill, *Diodore, Commentary on Psalms 1–51*, 4–5). Various translations of Diodore’s distinction between *theōria* and *allēgoria* found in this preface are regularly cited by scholars as the key (albeit usually the only) explanation of Antiochene *theōria* (see J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 5th ed. [San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1976], 76–77; Zaharopoulos, *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the*

- Bible*, 111; Schäublin, *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese*, 84, 156; Rowan A. Greer, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, Exegete and Theologian* [Westminster, UK: Faith Press, 1961], 93; Ashby, “Theodoret of Cyrrhus as Exegete of the Old Testament,” 22; Frances Young, “Alexandrian and Antiochene Exegesis,” in *A History of Biblical Interpretation*, vol. 1, *The Ancient Period*, ed. Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003], 347; McLeod, *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, 21; Karlfried Froehlich, ed., *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984], 85; Anthony C. Thiselton, *Hermeneutics: An Introduction* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009], 110; Guinot, “La frontière entre allégorie et typologie,” 213). Perhaps this was encouraged by Migne’s Latin work on Theodore. There Migne begins his *De Duobus Theodori Libris Argumenti Hermeneutici*, with a discussion of the hermeneutical distinction between allegory and *theōria* in Theodore and Diodore’s writings (PG, 66:25–26).
58. F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed. (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 86, 99, 100, 483, 1068. Cf. “List of Patriarchs of Antioch,” http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Patriarchs_of_Antioch (accessed November 11, 2008) and John Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 2 vols., Formation of Christian Theology 2 (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2004).
59. Zaharopoulos, *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Bible*, 12; Wiles, “Theodore of Mopsuestia,” 491. Athanasius exemplified the old Nicene view, according to which οὐσία, φύσις, and ὑπόστασις are all basically synonyms. Basil of Caesarea helped to distinguish between οὐσία as being and ὑπόστασις as person, which was affirmed at Chalcedon (cf. Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto* [NPNF2, 8:1–50]; and Iain R. Torrance, “Monophysitism,” in *The Dictionary of Historical Theology*, ed. Trevor A. Hart [Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000], 379–80). New Nicene ultimately became Chalcedonian.
60. Theodore’s comments in his *Catechetical Homilies* written later in his life: “[We are] divided in the way we look at things and inclined to discussions, disputes, to envy and to jealousy” (Dewart, *Theology of Grace of Theodore of Mopsuestia*, 32). Viciano notes that Lucian of Antioch and his successors (Diodore, Theodore, Chrysostom, and Theodoret) battled consistently against Arianism and Apollinarianism (Viciano, “Das formale der antiochenischen Schriftauslegung,” 371–72).
61. Dewart, *Theology of Grace of Theodore of Mopsuestia*, 135–36.

62. Zaharopoulos, *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Bible*, 42 n. 69.
63. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Nicene Creed*, ed. and trans. Alphonse Mingana, Woodbrooke Studies (Cambridge: Heffer, 1932); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer, Baptism and the Eucharist*, ed. and trans. Alphonse Mingana, Woodbrooke Studies (Cambridge: Heffer, 1933). These documents were fortunately found in the public domain along with other rare early works of Church Fathers (Roger Pearse, ed., "Early Church Fathers—Additional Texts," <http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/> [accessed November 11, 2008]). Some other fragments of Theodore's doctrinal writings remain, for example, *On the Incarnation*, in PG, 66:972–92. See translation in McLeod, *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, 126–47.
64. Facundus of Hermianae, *Pro defensione trium capitulorum* 3.6 (PL 67:602); PG, 66:648–96; cf. Hill, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on Psalms 1–81*; Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, trans. Robert C. Hill, FC 108 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2004), 3 n. 12.
65. PG, 66:124–632; Hans Norbert Sprenger, *Theodori Mopsuesteni Commentarius in XII Prophetas*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, 5th series, Biblica et Patristica 1 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1977); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*.
66. PG, 66:728–86; Kalantzis, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on the Gospel of John* is based on the Greek.
67. Matthew (PG, 66:705–13), Mark (PG, 66:713–16), Luke (PG, 66:716–28), Romans (PG, 66:787–876), 1 Corinthians (PG, 66:877–94), 2 Corinthians (PG, 66:894–98), Galatians (PG, 66:898–912), Ephesians (PG, 66:912–21), Philippians (PG, 66:921–25), Colossians (PG, 66:925–32), 1–2 Thessalonians (PG, 66:932–36), 1 Timothy (PG, 66:936–44), 2 Timothy (PG, 66:945–48), Titus (PG, 66:948–49), Philemon (PG, 66:49), Hebrews (PG, 66:952–68). Cf. Swete, *Theodori Mopsuesteni in epistolas beati Pauli commentarii*, vol. 1, *Galatians–Colossians*; vol. 2, *Thessalonians–Philemon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1880–82); and Greer, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: The Commentaries on the Minor Epistles of Paul*. And for fragments on Romans, 1–2 Corinthians, and Hebrews, see Karl Staab, ed. *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 15; Münster: Aschendorff, 1933), 113–212. And on the four Gospels ("Les fragments grecs du commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste

- sur le quatrième évangile,” in *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste*, ed. Robert Devréesse, Studi e Testi 141 [Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1948]).
68. For Greek fragments on Genesis and Exodus, see PG, 66:636–48. For a full listing of Theodore’s writings, many not extant, see Ebedjesus, *Catalogue des livres ecclésiastiques syriens*, in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* III, ed. J. S. Assemani (Rome: Typis S. C. de Propaganda Fida, 1926), 30–35. For those extant, see Zaharopoulos, *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Bible*, 1–2, 27–35.
69. TLG for “Theodorus Mopsuestenus” offers twelve primary sources in Greek including *Expositio in psalmos* (in catenis) TLG, 4135.006 in Robert Devréesse, *Le commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes (I–LXXX)*, Studi e Testi 93 (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1939); *Commentarius in xii prophetas minores* TLG, 4135.007, in Sprenger, *Theodori Mopsuesteni commentarius in XII Prophetas; Fragmenta in Matthaëum* (in catenis) TLG, 4135.009, in Joseph Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche* (Texte und Untersuchungen 61; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957), 96–135; *Commentarii in Joannem* (e catenis) TLG, 4135.013, in Robert Devréesse, *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste*, Studi e Testi 141 (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1948), 305–419; *Fragmenta in Acta apostolorum* [Dub.] TLG, 4135.014, in Ernst von Dobschütz, “A Hitherto Unpublished Prologue to the Acts of the Apostles (Probably by Theodore of Mopsuestia),” *American Journal of Theology* 2, no. 2 (1898): 357–62; *Fragmenta in epistulam ad Romanos* (in catenis) TLG, 4135.015, in Staab, *Pauluskommentar aus der griechischen Kirche*, 113–72; *Fragmenta in epistulam i ad Corinthios* (in catenis) TLG, 4135.016, in Staab, 172–96; *Fragmenta in epistulam ii ad Corinthios* (in catenis) TLG, 4135.017, in Staab, 196–200; *Fragmenta in epistulam ad Hebraeos* (in catenis) TLG, 4135.018, in Staab, 200–212; and *Theodori lapsi responsio* TLG, 4135.025, in Jean Dumortier, *Jean Chrysostome. À Théodore* (Sources chrétiennes 117; Paris: Cerf, 1966), 220–38; *Adversus criminationes in Christianos Iuliani imperatoris*, TLG, 4135.030, in Augusto Guida, *Replica a Giuliano Imperatore: adversus criminationes in Christianos Iuliani imperatoris*, Bibliotheca Patristica 24 (Florence: Nardini Centro Internazionale del Libro, 1994); *Fragmenta in Genesim* (in florilegio e cod. marc. gr. 573) TLG, 4135.031, in Franchise Petit, “L’homme créé ‘à l’image’ de Dieu quelques fragments grecs inédits de Théodore de Mopsueste,” *Le Muséon* 100 (1987): 269–81. For more details on the chronology of Theodore’s writings, see J.-M. Voste, “La chronologie de

- l'activite de Theodore de Mopsueste au II Council de Constantinople," *Revue biblique* 34 (January 1925): 54–81.
70. Frances M. Young and Andrew Teal, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and Its Background*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010), 323. Cf. NPNF2, 3:2.
 71. Theodoret, *Epistle 81* (NPNF2, 3:277).
 72. Brevard S. Childs, *The Struggle to Understand Isaiah as Christian Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 134.
 73. Theodoret, *Epistle 16* (NPNF2, 3:2).
 74. NPNF2, 3:3; Young and Teal, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon*, 323–24. Apparently Syrian Apamea on the Orontes River about sixty-five miles south of Syrian Antioch.
 75. NPNF2, 3:4; Quasten, *Patrology*, 3:536.
 76. The ultra-Arians argued for the complete “intelligibility of the Divine Essence,” that is, God without mystery, and so denied the deity of the Holy Spirit (along with the Son). But they adhered to the full humanity of Christ, unlike the Apollinarians (NPNF2, 14:175).
 77. And this despite his *Refutation of the Twelve Anathemas* of Cyril of Alexandria. Cf. Samuel Macauley Jackson, ed. *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge: Embracing Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal, and Practical Theology and Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Biography from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*. New York; London: Funk & Wagnalls, 1908–1914, 11:325.
 78. NPNF2, 3:8–11; See Hart, *Dictionary of Historical Theology*, 540; Young and Teal, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon*, 324–26.
 79. NPNF2, 14:300, 302–24; Tony Lane, *A Concise History of Christian Thought*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006), 54; de Margerie, *Greek Fathers*, 182.
 80. TLG includes twenty-five Greek sources. Cf. NPNF2, 3:14–24, for a fuller list of Theodoret’s writings.
 81. *Commentaria in Isaiam* TLG, 4089.008, in Jean-Noël Guinot, *Théodoret de Cyr, Commentaire sur Isaïe*, 3 vols., Sources chrétiennes 276, 295, 315 (Paris: Cerf, 1980–84): 1:136–330; 2:12–478; 3:12–350; *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos* [Dub.] TLG, 4089.016, in A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Θεοδώρητου ἐπισκόπου πόλεως Κύρρου πρὸς τὰς ἐπενεχθείσας αὐτῷ ἐπερωτήσεις παρά τινος τὸν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐπίσκοπον ἀποκρίσεις (St.

- Petersburg: Kirschbaum, 1895), 1–150; *Quaestiones in Octateuchum* TLG, 4089.022, in N. Fernández Marcos and A. Sáenz-Badillos, *Theodoretī Cyrensis quaestiones in Octateuchum*, Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 17 (Madrid: Poliglota Matritense, 1979); *Quaestiones in libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon* TLG, 4089.023, in PG, 80:528–858; *Interpretatio in Psalmos* TLG, 4089.024, in PG, 80:857–1997; *Explanatio in Canticum canticorum* TLG, 4089.025, in PG, 81:28–213; *Interpretatio in Jeremiam* TLG, 4089.026, in PG, 81:496–805; *Interpretatio in Ezechielem* TLG, 4089.027, in PG, 81:808–1256; *Interpretatio in Danielelem* TLG, 4089.028, in PG, 81:1256–1546; *Interpretatio in xii prophetas minores* TLG, 4089.029, in PG, 81:1545–1988; and *Interpretatio in xiv epistulas sancti Pauli* TLG, 4089.030, in PG, 82:36–877; cf. Quasten, *Patrology*, 3:538–54.
82. Robert C. Hill, trans., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Psalms, 1–72*, FC 101 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2000), 40.
83. Theodoret, *The Song of Songs, Translated into English Verse: With an Introduction from St. Athanasius, Notes from Theodoret, and Appendix from St. Bernard* (London: Rivingtons, 1864). But a better translation is found in Hill, trans., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Song of Songs*.
84. PG, 81:1255–1545; Robert C. Hill, ed., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on Daniel*, trans. Robert C. Hill, Writings from the Greco-Roman World 7 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006).
85. PG, 81:807–1254; Robert C. Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus, Commentaries on the Prophets*, vol. 2, *Commentary on the Prophet Ezekiel* (Brookline, Ma: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2007).
86. Robert C. Hill, trans., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentaries on the Prophets*, vol. 1, *Commentaries on Jeremiah, Baruch and the Book of Lamentations* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2007).
87. PG, 80:857–1998; Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Psalms, 1–72*; Robert C. Hill, trans., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Psalms, 73–150*, FC 102 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2001).
88. Theodoret of Cyrus, *The Questions on the Octateuch*, vol. 1, *On Genesis and Exodus*, ed. John F. Petruccione, trans. Robert C. Hill, Library of Early Christianity 1 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007); Theodoret of Cyrus, *The Questions on the Octateuch*, vol. 2, *On Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth*, trans. Robert C. Hill, Library of Early Christianity 2 (Washington, DC: Catholic University

of America Press, 2007). For a summary of the dating of all Theodoret's earlier works, see Guinot, *L'exégèse de Théodoret de Cyr*, 62–63.

89. Nassif limits his study to the use of these Greek terms and their cognates in Chrysostom's NT homilies, despite his realization that "one would normally expect to find the best examples of Antiochene theōria at work in commentaries on the OT because of its literary diversity and extensive prophetic material." Nassif turns for support of this delimitation to Johannes Quasten, who "identifies only three extant works of Chrysostom on the Old Testament" (Nassif, "Antiochene 'Theoria' in John Chrysostom's Exegesis," 196–200). These include commentaries on Genesis, selected Psalms, and Isaiah 1:1–8:10. Nevertheless, today the TLG includes many more of Chrysostom's OT commentaries including *Commentarius in Job* (D. Hagedorn and U. Hagedorn, *Johannes Chrysostomos: Kommentar zu Hiob*, Patristische Texte und Studien 35 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990], 1–200); *Fragmenta in Job* (PG, 64:505–656); *In Ecclesiasten* (S. Leanza, *Procopii Gazaei catena in Ecclesiasten necnon Pseudochrysostomi commentarius in eundem Ecclesiasten*, Corpus Christianorum: Series Graeca 4 [Turnhout: Brepols, 1978], 67–97); *Visio Danielis* (A. Vassiliev, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina*, vol. 1. [Moscow: Imperial University Press, 1893], 33–38); *Interpretatio in Danielem prophetam* (PG, 56:193–246); *Fragmenta in Proverbia* (PG, 64:660–740); *Fragmenta in Jeremiam* (PG, 64:740–1037); *In Eliam prophetam* (PG, 56:583–586); as well as his *De beato Abraham* (*Blessed Abraham* in PG, 50:737–46); *De Melchisedech* (PG, 56:257–62); *In poenitentiam Ninivitarum* (PG, 64:424–33); two homilies on the obscurity of prophecies (*De prophetiarum obscuritate* in PG, 56:163–92), and three more in *De Davide et Saule* (PG, 54:675–708); *Synopsis scripturae sacrae* (*Synopsis of Scripture* in PG, 56:313–86); and *Laus Diodori episcopi* (*Praise to Bishop Diodore* in PG, 52:761–66). In these additional sources, there are another 127 instances of the verb *theōreō* and its cognate *theōria*. Therefore, more sources exist for analysis of Chrysostom's use of *theōria*, though it is fraught with difficult source analysis as the following review example displays. Nassif notes that, in his survey of the NT homilies, John Chrysostom never employs the phrase *kata theōrian*, which may be used to introduce a theoretic interpretation (Nassif, "Antiochene 'Theoria' in John Chrysostom's Exegesis," 200–201). However, a search for this phrase (among the additional 127 instances in the above listed TLG Greek sources) reveals four hits in John Chrysostom's OT sources. At least one is significant for this study. I translate Chrysostom's commentary on Prov. 22:20 from PG, 64:728.46–47 as, "Therefore, according to spiritual

discernment (*theōrian*), he understands (or apprehends spiritually) humanity.” But the editors of *Proverbs* in the ACCS offer a more extended translation of Chrysostom’s commentary for Prov. 22:20, which promotes a three-sense interpretation of texts. “As human beings consist of body, soul and spirit, so also Scripture consists of the body of letters, by which the ignorant man is benefited; and that is called ‘manual instruction.’ Second, it consists of soul, that is, a higher meaning, [Greek *anagōgē*] which the one who is higher in learning understands. It also consists of spirit, that is, a more sublime and spiritual contemplation which those who are perfect understand and speak. *Commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon, Fragment 22.20*” (J. Robert Wright, *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon*, ACCS, OT 9 [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2005], 141). They also cite PG, 64:728. Nevertheless, Robert Hill, in his translation of Chrysostom’s *Commentary on the Proverbs* does not show any of this explanation of threefold sense. Instead he gives a most abbreviated comment from Chrysostom for Prov. 22:20: “*Inscribe them on yourself threefold* (v. 20)—repeatedly, he means” (Robert C. Hill, *St. John Chrysostom, Commentaries on the Sages: Commentary on Proverbs and Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, vol. 2 [Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2006], 155). Furthermore, Hill includes a footnote just prior to this verse which states, “The following direction about threefold inscription, we are told by editor Bady, *Origen* [and not Chrysostom] had cited to support his development of three senses of Scripture” (Hill, 2:230 n. 4). Clearly this is a reference to Prov. 22:20. So G. Bady rejects the above threefold senses of Scripture included in the ACCS (from PG, 64:728) as authentically from John Chrysostom (G. Bady, “La method exégétique du commentaire inédit sur les Proverbes attribué à Jean Chrysostome,” *Studia Patristica* 37 [2001]: 319–27). It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to unravel this textual source issue. It does display, however, that many source issues remain to be unraveled in critical editions of John Chrysostom’s works and that readers should not take the ACCS catenae for granted without checking sources.

90. Note that TLG takes Theodore, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets* from Sprenger, *Theodori Mopsuesteni commentarius in XII Prophetas*. Hill uses this source as well as PG, 66:124–632 (Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 108:5). Throughout Hill’s translation, he references only the pages from PG rather than Sprenger. This at times makes it difficult to cross-reference the TLG version with PG.
91. Hill, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on Psalms 1–81*, 825; cf. similarly p.

- 827 for Ps. 64:8 (Greek 63:9b), pp. 638–39 for Ps. 49:10 (Greek 48:11a), pp. 466–67 for Ps. 39:3b (Greek. 38:4b).
92. Hill, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on Psalms 1–81*, 958–59, 404–8; cf. 850–51 for Ps. 66:18 (Greek Ps. 65:18), pp. 660–61 for Ps. 50:18 (Greek Ps. 49:18a), and pp. 882–83 and 1028–29 for quotations of Ps. 68:24 (Greek Ps. 67:25).
93. This and all other Bible quotations are from *The Holy Bible: English Standard Version* (Wheaton, IL: Standard Bible Society, 2001) unless otherwise noted.
94. Hill, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on Psalms 1–81*, 895, 901 for Ps. 69:9 (Greek 68:10a).
95. For an analysis of Diodore’s use of *theōria* (German: *Schau*) in his exegesis and the preface to his *Com. on Psalms*, see Thome, *Historia contra Mythos*, 89, 97–101, 113–19. Unfortunately, Thome provides little explicit treatment of *Schau* in Theodore’s writings in this work.
96. As noted above, Theodore’s uses of the verbal form *theōreō* are confined to the semantic range “seeing” and “observing.” See Hill, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on Psalms 1–81*, xxxii–xxxiii, 911 n. 4, where the term is used by Hill (the editor) only in his preface and in a footnote of Hill’s translation of Ps. 69:21, as an interpretive method Theodore did not use.
97. Since Psalm 110 in Theodore’s commentary is not extant, we must rely on secondary sources for this information. Scholars such as Zaharopoulos do not give us a source (Zaharopoulos, *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Bible*, 168). Hill, however, points to Diodore as the source (Robert C. Hill, “His Master’s Voice: Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Psalms,” *Heythrop Journal* 45, no. 1 [January 2004]: 45).
98. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 118–19. See discussion below.
99. This is because these events did not happen to David or any other Jew of his day.
100. Theodore uses the term ὑπερβολικῶς eleven times in his writings: Ps. 57:4a, line 7; Joel 2:28–32, lines 34, 44, 72; Zeph. 1:3, line 1; Zech. 9:9–10b, lines 1, 9; and 14:1–2, line 20 (TLG). Of these Zech. 9:9–10 is most significant and similar to his treatment of Ps. 69:10. There he also treats the third promise of the Abrahamic covenant (Gen. 26:4) and God’s promise in the Davidic covenant (Ps. 89:36–37) similarly. That is, they are only hyperbolically or metaphorically realized in their near referents (the nations of Israel and

David's line, respectively), but "the factual reality of the text"—the true or ultimate referent—is Christ Jesus. See Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 367; cf. 172; Alberto Vaccari, "La Θεωρία nella scuola esegetica di Antiochia," *Biblica* 1 (January 1920): 18–19; and Nassif, "Spiritual Exegesis' of Scripture," 443–44, 77, 52–54. However, Theodore uses other forms of ὑπερβολ* forty-four more times. And, not surprisingly, Theodore uses the term μεταφορικῶς less—only six times: in his commentaries at Ps. 41:8b, line 3; 73:13c, line 3; Joel 2:28–32, lines 44, 53, 71; and Gospel of John fragment 35 line 14 (TLG). A search for ὑπερβολ* near θεωρ* within ten lines for Theodore found instances only in Theodore's commentary following Hos. 2:2. But it proves to be a mundane use of *theōreō* (cf. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 45–46). In contrast, Theodoret uses the term ὑπερβολικῶς only seven times in all of his TLG writings: Ps. 118:10 (PG, 81:812.37), theoretical—Israel and church; Heb. 5:7–10 (PG, 82:713 lines 3 and 7), in relation to the Incarnate One suffering; Ezek. 31:3 (PG, 81:1117.50); Hab. 2:11 (PG, 81:1821.26); 1 Cor. 13:1 (PG, 82:332.46); 1 Cor. 13:3 (PG, 82:333.31), all hyperbole without any theoretic prophetic interpretation. Only in Ps. 118:10 does Theodoret explicitly describe his interpretation as partially applying to a near referent (in this case Israel) but fully to a later referent (in this case the church). So, relative to the number of words in each corpus, Theodore uses the term 1.7 times more often. But Theodoret uses other forms of ὑπερβολ* 230 more times, too many to analyze here. For Theodoret, the same search (ὑπερβολ* near θεωρ* within tenlines before or after) reveals three instances: Ezek. 5:7–10 (PG, 81:865.5); Psalm 30 (PG, 80:1081.25), but *theōreō* is from the biblical verse there; and Psalm 58 (PG, 80:1309.6), but προθεωρία (preface) in one verse and ὑπερβολή in the next (*Pauline Epist.* [PG, 82:608.47]). That is, these are all mundane uses the *theōria* or *theōreō*.

101. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 226–27; cf. Nassif, "Antiochene 'Theoria' in John Chrysostom's Exegesis," 54; and Vaccari, "La Θεωρία nella scuola esegetica di Antiochia," 19–20. Theodore shows himself to be a contemplative historian in this passage, comparing the lives of David's descendants to Jesus.
102. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 118. Theodore also gets this idea of shadow versus substance from Col. 2:17; Heb. 8:5, and 10:1, since the Antiochenes sought to follow the interpretive (and theological) examples of the NT authors, especially Paul.
103. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 176–77. Robert

Hill in his translations will italicize (rather than place in quotation marks) words that are part of the biblical text. They will be italicized herein without further comment.

104. Thus, more than half of the instances of *theōria* in Theodore’s extant Greek writings on TLG are located in TLG, 4135.007 (cf. PG, 66:401.47, 51, 53; 66:404.1, 4, 6, 47, 52).
105. οὕτω δυνηθῆναι τῇ τῶν δεικνυμένων θεωρίᾳ προσανέχειν μόνη (from PG, 66:401.46–47). Hill translates it in the larger context, “It was by ecstasy, therefore, that in all likelihood they all received the knowledge of things beyond description, since it was possible for them in their minds to be quite removed from their normal condition and thus capable of devoting themselves exclusively to contemplation [*theoria*] of what was revealed” (Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 249).
106. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 249; cf. Nassif, “Antiochene ‘*Theoria*’ in John Chrysostom’s Exegesis,” 82.
107. Those who have spent time laboring over research for a dissertation, however, may well understand the sense of being disconnected from the perception of mundane realities around them in order to focus their attention solely on their research.
108. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 249–50 (PG, 66:401.54–404.6).
109. Patristic and biblical scholars point to the preface to Theodore’s *Commentary on Jonah* as illustrative of his Christian or theoretical interpretation. In a manner quite similar to my observation of the threefold (OT prophet, NT author, postcanonical interpreter) aspect of Antiochene *theōria*, Charlotte Köckert writes: “Theodore bietet somit im Proömium Kommentars einerseits eine lehrhaft-moralische, andererseits eine christologisch-typologische Deutung der Jona-Geschehen als historisches Ereignis auf und leitet aus ihm einen dreifachen Nutzen ab: Im historischen Kontext Jonas bewirkt es Umkehr und Rettung für die Bewohner Ninives; für die Zeit des Alten Bundes bietet es Unterweisung und Seelsorge für die Propheten; in der Zeit nach der Ankunft Christi dient es zur Mahnung, Unterweisung und Glaubensstärkung für christliche Leser.” (“Theodore therefore offers in the preface of the commentary, on the one hand, didactic and moral, on the other hand, a christological and typological interpretation of Jonah. It occurred as a historic event, from and out of which leads to a triple benefit: [1] In the historical context, Jonah brings to repentance and salvation for the

inhabitants of Nineveh; [2] for the time of the Old Testament, it provides instruction and pastoral care for the prophets; [and 3] in the period after the coming of Christ, it serves as a reminder, training and faith-strengthening for Christian readers”) (Charlotte Köckert, “Der Jona-Kommentar des Theodor von Mopsuestia: Eine christliche Jona-Auslegung an der Wende zum 5. Jahrhundert (mit einer Übersetzung des Kommentars),” in *Der problematische Prophet: Die biblische Jona-Figur in Exegese, Theologie, Literatur und bildender Kunst*, ed. Johann Anselm Steiger and Wilhelm Kühlmann, *Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 118 (Berlin and Boston: de Gruyter, 2011), 15.

110. τῇ τῶν δεικνυμένων θεωρίᾳ προσανέχειν μόνῃ (PG, 66:401).
111. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 251.
112. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 248 [PG, 66:401]). Theodore uses the term *theōria* twice more, in his commentary on Zech. 1:8–11 and on Zech. 4:1–2a (cf. TLG, 7135.007 Zechariah chap. 1, section 8b–11, line 161, but not found in PG, 66:509.24; and for Zechariah 4, see PG, 66:528.28; and Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 331, 346). Theodore cites again Peter’s vision in Acts 10:11–12, as well as Joseph’s and Pharaoh’s dreams with their accompanying “tokens of certain realities . . . each of which carried a clue to some coming event. In exactly the same way the prophet also sees these things by divine revelation, and each of the things shown him contained some sign or indication of a reality. Likewise blessed Peter also saw a cloth let down from heaven . . . and the vision contained a clue to some other thing” (Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 327 [PG, 66:501]). Theodore then turns his critique on those who claim that “the angel of the Lord” in Zech. 1:11 is the “Son of God.” He first simply claims that none “living in that [OT] time understood God the Father to be Father of the Son of God.” And then he finds “sufficient demonstration of this” in John’s Gospel, to which the discussion now turns (cf. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 366–67).
113. My literal translation, with the main verb translated as a passive (not a middle), while the dative of *theōria* is translated adverbially or as a dative of manner (cf. TLG, 4135.013 fragment 112, column 1, lines 15–17). Kalantzis has, “For, clearly, whoever sees that One through this One, is clearly led to see because of the likeness” (Kalantzis, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on the Gospel of John*, 104). Kalantzis’s translation flows better, but does not

- underscore as strongly the necessary nature of *theōria* to perceive the deity of Christ.
114. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, 329 (PG, 66:505).
 115. TLG, 4135.013 fragment 14, lines 2–3; cf. Kalantzis, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on the Gospel of John*, 51–52.
 116. Kalantzis, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on the Gospel of John*, 118 (italic is in the original as emphasizing the biblical text). The translation of the neuter pronoun as “it” does not display in Theodore a low view of the Holy Spirit as the Third Person of the Trinity but perhaps a zealotry by the translator to keep with the Greek (πνεῦμα being neuter).
 117. If the apostles who walked with Jesus could not perceive that he is God without a work of the Holy Spirit and the completion of Jesus’ work on the earth, how can any other interpreter hope to perceive Christ as God in life or in the Bible without the Holy Spirit? For a comparison of the methods of theology and exegesis in representative Antiochene (Theodore) and Alexandrian (Cyril of Alexandria) interpreters from their commentaries on the Gospel of John, see Luigi Fatica, *I commentari a “Giovanni” di Teodoro di Mopsuestia e di Cirillo di Alessandria: Confronto fra metodi esegetici e teologici* (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1988), 6, 7, 13, 70, 129, 174, 285, 288.
 118. TLG includes ten Greek sources for Theodoretus (of the geographic epithet Cyrrhensis), which contain his commentaries on forty-four books of the Bible.
 119. PG, 81:692.22; 81:757.32; cf. Robert C. Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentaries on the Prophets*, vol. 1, *Commentaries on Jeremiah, Baruch and the book of Lamentations*, 131, 167.
 120. If the term προθεωρία is included, another seven instances are found in these ten sources of Theodoret. The term προθεωρία is translated “preface” but can be understood as “foresight” (prevision) or perhaps *contemplation* (θεωρία) of a book *before* (προ-) the book (see LSJ, 1481; Theodoret of Cyrus, *The Questions on the Octateuch: On Genesis and Exodus*, 48–49, Q. xix).
 121. Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Psalms*, 73–150, 119 (PG, 81:1633.16).
 122. For example, see Theodoret’s comments on Pss. 40:3; 64:7–8; Ezek. 20:40–42; 26:15–16; and 39:23–24.

123. For example, for Moses in Theodoret's comments on Question 68 for Exodus in Theodoret of Cyrus, *Questions on the Octateuch: On Genesis and Exodus*, 337.
124. Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Psalms, 1–72*, 134–35 (PG, 80:992–93).
125. In the context Theodoret discusses the impiety of the Jews not only in pre- and postexilic times but also in Theodore's own day—when the people refuse to see Jesus Christ in the Scriptures as an example of such lack of preparation for discernment (Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Psalms, 73–150*, 54 [PG, 80:1525]).
126. Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Psalms, 73–150*, 54 n. 8. Later Hill claims that, generally, for Theodoret to “to grasp their [the Psalms’] fully meaning, *theōria* is required, as the verb here indicates.” The verb there in Theodoret's *Commentary on Psalms* 150:6 is θεωροῦμεν (pp. 374–75 n. 7 [PG, 80:1997.7]).
127. Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Psalms, 73–150*, 51 (PG, 80:1520). *Contra* Theodore, who sees this psalm as David “foretelling the people's return from Babylon” and what state of heart brought them there to begin with (Hill, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on Psalms 1–81*, 1113, 1119–21).
128. Furthermore, it can be argued from the research on Antiochene *theōria* by Heinrich Kihn that “by *allegoria* [ἀλληγορία] the Antiochenes meant ‘arbitrary exegesis,’ whereas *theōria* drew a distinction between allegory and the justified higher sense” (Nassif, “‘Spiritual Exegesis’ of Scripture,” 440. Nassif translates and cites from Heinrich Kihn, “Über Θεωρία und Ἀλληγορία nach den verloren hermeneutischen Schriften der Antiochener,” *Theologische Quartalschrift* 20 [1880]: 536). For further analysis, see the discussion of Gal. 4:24 in chapter 4 below.
129. Hill notes, “Theodoret in this psalm and almost consistently throughout the whole Commentary is anxious to take an eschatological and at times anagogical interpretation, seeing the psalmist's words realized at a later stage—*provided the reader follows the requisite process of* θεωρία (occurring here in verb form, as often). . . . As in his preface, he implies here that many fail to achieve it” (Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Psalms, 1–72*, 391 n. 41 (emphasis mine)).
130. Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Psalms, 1–72*, 221; PG, 80:1124.42. The verb for “illuminated” is a present passive participle of φωτίζω.

131. Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Psalms*, 73–150, 153–54.
132. Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Psalms*, 1–72, 272 (PG, 80:1205.39–47).
133. Apparently because David is seen as a prophet and Jesus made so much use of the Psalms to point to his day or himself (Quentin F. Wesselschmidt, *Psalms 51–150* (ACCS, OT 8; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2007), xvii–xix; cf. Lee M. McDonald, *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, rev. ed. [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995], 119–20). Or perhaps, simply because Peter refers to David as a prophet (Acts 2:25–30). Furthermore, Viciano notes that the Antiochenes “read the Bible not just as a literal book but also as a God-inspired text θεόπνευστος (2 Tim. 3:16) so that its own and unmistakable quality is manifested. With this quotation from 2 Timothy, Diodore opens his commentary on the Psalms because they are a book full of instruction (*Unterweisung*). Through historical example, David instructs, moving the reader of the Psalms to read them with him. And in so doing he fulfills the especially high standard of the teaching office of all the prophets” (Viciano, “Das formale der antiochenischen Schriftauslegung,” 388). Apparently, then, even the Psalms were deemed prophetic because they are inspired, thus instructive. And how could they be instructive unless they refer not only to their own time but that of others’ as well?
134. Hill comments, “Theodoret is returning to his original principles in this closing hermeneutical review. He can be satisfied he has not devoted the bulk of his commentary to ancient history. While admitting the validity of looking for a historical application, he has not allowed this to be made exclusively of the history of the Jews but has encouraged his readers to look for another level of meaning (not κατὰ ἀναγωγήν, as Chrysostom would say, but τροπικώτερον). And as an Antiochene he recognizes in this distinction of levels of meaning in a psalm text the process of θεωρία (his final verb here being θεωρέω)” (Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Psalms*, 1–72, 272 n. 14 (emphasis mine). In this observation Hill appears to switch between the terms “application” and “meaning” quite freely.
135. Peder Borgen, Kåre Fuglseth, and Roald Skarsten, *The Works of Philo: Greek Text with Morphology* (Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, 2005), passim. A search for τροπικώτερον in all of Theodoret’s extant writings compiled in the TLG database (not just the ten exegetical works) reveals PG, 80:1204.44 as the only location of the term. Theodoret does, however, use the term τροπικῶς (meaning “figuratively” or “in a figurative sense”) 129

times in all the TLG sources, and all but one of the occurrences are in his commentaries. Figurative interpretation is defined herein as an explanation of a passage that assumes or understands the word or phrase not in its plain or literal sense but as representing something else. (See definition of literal interpretation above.) Some would argue that the literal sense *includes* the figurative if that is the author's intent, and thus they would tend to call figurative interpretation *misinterpretation*.

136. Hill, trans., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Song of Songs*, 9, 12, 23. There is in the public domain another translation of Theodoret's *Commentary on the Song of Songs* from an unknown translator, though several editorial notes throughout refer to "Parkhurst" (Theodoret, *Song of Songs*; *Translated into English Verse*, 15).
137. Theodoret of Cyrus, *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, 24 (PG, 81:32–33).
138. He uses Ezekiel 16–17 as an example of OT allegory demanding allegorical interpretation in his preface (*Commentary on the Song of Songs*, 25–28 [PG, 81:33–41]).
139. Cf. Theodoret, *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, 57.
140. Theodoret, *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, 21.
141. Theodoret, *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, 21–22; cf. 33.
142. Theodoret, *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, 33; PG, 81:49. Though Theodoret first surveys the songs of David and others in the OT comparing them with this one song of Solomon, he then turns to themes of general delivery, then delivery from the devil, and adoption, that is "to designate and make us His Bride." And so Theodoret concludes that the book is titled "Song of Songs" because it teaches "us the highest forms of the goodness of God, and the most inward and secret things, and revealing to us the most holy mysteries of the Divine philanthropy" (Theodoret, *Song of Songs: Translated into English Verse*, xv–xx). If one understands Song of Songs typologically, then these are themes perhaps latent to its text, but certainly native to the NT text.
143. Theodoret, *Song of Songs: Translated into English Verse*, 2–3. He cites Hos. 2:19–20 and Prov. 8:11 in this context. For other examples of antecedent theology, see Theodoret, *Song of Songs: Translated into English Verse*, 17 n. 2.
144. He supports this with Col. 2:9 as well as Isa. 11:1–2.
145. Theodoret, *Song of Songs: Translated into English Verse*, 6–7. Is this a more Antiochene historical approach, or a reference to Jews contemporary to

- Theodoret's readers? It is apparently contemporary Jews, for according to Theodoret, she cultivated her former vineyard "before the Christian Faith." That is, apparently before she embraced the Christian faith.
146. Theodoret, *Song of Songs*, 9. His text reads, "Unto a steed, well yoked with Me; In Pharaoh's chariot, I thee will, O My love compare" (p. 8). The ESV (English Standard Version) reads "mare" instead of "steed." The desire to maintain a grammatical explanation for "my" strains the credulity of the interpretation, and the allegorical interpretation apparently keeps Theodoret from making reference to 2 Chron. 1:17. The MT and the ESV exclude "me" or "my."
147. Theodoret, *Song of Songs: Translated into English Verse*, 13 n. 3.
148. Theodoret, *Song of Songs: Translated into English Verse*, 25 n. 1.
149. This is an allusion to Gal. 4:26 (Theodoret, *Song of Songs: Translated into English Verse*, 25).
150. Theodoret, *Song of Songs: Translated into English Verse*, 35 n. 2; PG, 81:140.23–27.
151. "You can also gain a different insight [*theōria*] from the sections in the middle: we see many ranks also among the saved, one of virgins, one of ascetics, one of those drawing the yoke of marriage, and of the affluent," and so on (Hill, trans., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Song of Songs*, 84–85 [PG, 81:144–45]). Cf. his continuing comments on pomegranates and contemplation (*theōria*) in *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, 102 (PG, 81:181.8).
152. Hill, trans., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Song of Songs*, 105; cf. PG, 81:188.7. Hill translates *theōria* here as "fuller sense," but it seems unnecessary.
153. TLG, 4089.008; translation mine.
154. Aorist indicative passive, third person singular from ὑψόω, "to lift high, to raise up" (LSJ, 1910).
155. TLG, 4089.008, section 7, line 180; translation mine.
156. See Paul Ternant's discussion on a triple prophetic reference in Theodoret's *Com. on Isaiah* 60:1 as an example of *theōria*, but where the term is not used (Ternant, "La 'theōria' d'Antioche dans le cadre des sens de l'Écriture [Part I]," *Biblica* 34 [1953]: 146–49; Nassif, "Antiochene 'Theoria' in John Chrysostom's Exegesis," 77; John Breck, *The Power of the Word in the Worshipping Church* [Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1986], 90–91).

157. “Now, he accords him the vision near water to imply that salvation of all people, and to suggest the knowledge of God by regeneration through water that would come to the devout.” This appears to be an example of a nonliteral/spiritual interpretation (PG, 81:820.45; cf. Robert C. Hill, trans., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentaries on the Prophets*, vol. 2, *Commentary on the Prophet Ezekiel*, 35, 36, 292 n. 6; PG, 81:821.17; Cf. comments on Ezek. 1:26 in PG, 81:832.40; Ezek. 3:22 in PG, 81:852.28; and Ezek. 8:3 in PG, 81:881.36).
158. PG, 81:852.28; Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentaries on the Prophets*, vol. 2, *Commentary on the Prophet Ezekiel*, 54; cf. 296 n. 12.
159. PG, 81:904.17–28; cf. Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentaries on the Prophets*, vol. 2, *Commentary on the Prophet Ezekiel*, 83. Theodoret cites Matt. 5:8, “Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God,” to support his appeal. Theodoret uses the term *theōria* similarly twice in Exodus, Question 60 (answering why God had them construct a tabernacle). “Since the people of that time [the exodus] were quite materialistic and incapable of attaining to spiritual realities, the Lord, in his great wisdom, devised a way of helping them through physical symbols. We, on the contrary, understand by the declaration [λόγιον] contemplation [*theōria*] of the intelligible, and by the shoulder cape the practice of virtue. We take the close fit of the declaration and the shoulder cape as the harmony of faith and virtuous behavior and understand the prior donning of the shoulder cape and the subsequent clasping of it to the declaration to signify that virtuous behavior is the foundation of contemplation” (Theodoret of Cyrus, *Questions on the Octateuch: On Genesis and Exodus*, 325, lines 158 and 165). The Greek text of Exodus from which Theodoret works uses the term λόγιον (“declaration”) where the MT has צִדְיָוֶת (“breastplate”).
160. See discussion on Theodore’s commentary on Nahum 1:1 above.
161. For a far more rigorous process of purification in order to achieve a mystical *theōria* from a Syrian contemporary of Theodoret, see David Allen Michelson, “Practice Leads to Theory: Orthodoxy and the Spiritual Struggle in the Word of Philoxenos of Mabbug (470–523)” (PhD diss., Princeton University, 2007). I am indebted to Jean Michelson, the Circulation Coordinator at Huntington University library for this connection.
162. Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentaries on the Prophets*, vol. 2, *Commentary on the Prophet Ezekiel*, 262.
163. E.g., PG, 81:1356.35; 81:1493.32.

164. PG, 81:1384.24; cf. Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on Daniel*, 140–41. In Theodoret’s *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, he uses the term *theōria* only three times in his *Commentary on Hosea*, once in his *Commentary on Jonah*, and nine times in his *Commentary on Zechariah*. The uses of *theōria* and *theōreō* in Theodoret’s *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets* do not add materially to the discussion.
165. PG, 82:257.24; Robert C. Hill, trans., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on The Letters of St. Paul*, vol. 1, 1st ed. (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2001), 174.
166. Robert C. Hill, trans., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on The Letters of St. Paul*, vol. 2, 2nd ed. (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2007), 169–70 (PG, 82:736). Theodoret, like most in his day (except for the Arians and those who followed Origen) believed that Paul wrote Hebrews.
167. What kind of insight and where does it come from? Is it simply a matter of human contemplation? Or does Theodoret affirm a perception that comes by a gift of the Holy Spirit, as Theodore does? For an answer, see Theodore’s comments on John 14:17 above.
168. Hill, *Theodoret’s Commentary on The Letters of St. Paul*, 2:178, 181 (PG, 82:752.31, 82:757.14). One may also ask Theodoret, from where comes faith?
169. “The Law required a red heifer to be sacrificed, and the high priest to take some of its blood and sprinkle the mercy seat seven times with his finger. Burning the heifer itself outside the camp, they took the ashes and with them purified those people called impure. This acted as a type of the saving passion: the word red here means the body from Adam in the Hebrew language; he was fixed to the cross outside the gate; his blood purifies our souls; in place of the dust we have the life giving body” (Hill, *Theodoret’s Commentary on the Letters of St. Paul*, 2:194–95 [PG, 82:781.41–43]).
170. Typology or type is generally defined in this dissertation as that which “at least ties an event, a person or a thing to another event, person or thing within the framework of historical revelation.” Paul Feinberg rightly notes that some view types as meaning outside a passage read into it (and thus not exegesis), while others see it as the primary means of linking the OT and NT. (Some see it as different from allegory and others as similar to it. The former see a later writer describing “events in salvation history in light of OT events” while the latter are more inclined to a spiritual interpretation locating the fuller meaning.) Still others view types as “intended by OT writers” and “discernible by historical–grammatical principles of hermeneutics.” Thus,

typology includes “historical correspondence,” “escalation,” and certainly “divine intent” (and some would add divine “designation”) between type and antitype (Paul D. Feinberg, “Hermeneutics of Discontinuity,” in *Continuity and Discontinuity: Perspectives on the Relationship between the Old and New Testaments. Essays in Honor of S. Lewis Johnson Jr.*, ed. John S. Feinberg (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1988), 120–21. This definition is held, despite the claims of some that the ancients did not distinguish between allegory and typology (see, for example, Peter Williamson, *Catholic Principles for Interpreting Scripture: A Study of the Pontifical Biblical Commission’s The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church*, *Subsidia Biblica* 22 [Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001], 194). See the end of chapter 3 below and especially the section in chapter 4 on the Antiochenes’ interpretation of Gal. 4:24 for their view on typology.

171. For Theodore, 303,980 words versus 891,901 for Theodoret as determined from analysis on the TLG digital database. While the entire TLG database of sources for Theodore is used in this study (which includes 9,000 words in three non-commentary sources), Theodoret’s non-commentary TLG sources with an additional 341,000 words are excluded from the study.
172. Theodore uses the term *theōria* 15 versus 79 instances for Theodoret in the extant sources of TLG as discussed above.
173. Theodore uses the term *theōreō* 36 versus 121 instances for Theodoret in the extant sources of TLG.
174. Jeanne M. Heisler makes note of this distinction, while not specifically commenting on how Theodore and Theodoret used *theōria* (Heisler, “Gnat or Apostolic Bee: A Translation and Commentary on Theodoret’s Commentary on Jonah” [PhD diss., Florida State University, 2006], 15; http://etd.lib.fsu.edu/theses/available/etd-07102006-125349/unrestricted/jh_Dissertation.pdf). Viciano, reviewing the nineteenth-century research of H. Kihn, F. A. Specht, L. Pirot, and H. B. Swete, summarizes that “Theodoret uses the same hermeneutic as Theodore. He recognizes very similar linguistic and theological questions. . . . However, these researchers unanimously emphasize Theodoret’s originality . . . because when interpreting the OT he combines Antiochene *θεωρία* with the allegorical method” (Viciano, “Das formale der antiochenischen Schriftauslegung,” 374).
175. Mansi, ix, 225–27 cited in Quasten, *Patrology*, 3:406; cf. Hill, trans., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Song of Songs*, 7 n. 22; Henry Barclay Swete, “Theodorus of Mopsuestia,” in *A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature,*

- Sects and Doctrines*, ed. William Smith and Henry Wace, 4 vols. (London: John Murray, 1887), 4:940; and Adolf Von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. 3, electronic ed. [Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library, 2005], 129–130 n. 329, <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/harnack/dogma3.html>).
176. Greer, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: The Commentaries on the Minor Epistles of Paul*, 113. Scholars argue over the meaning of ἱστορία (“history” versus “narrative”). Either meaning is possible (LSJ, 842). But the question of whether Theodore was talking about history as events that really took place seems moot, since he follows the term ἱστορία with the phrase “what happened long ago.” See discussion above on ἱστορία.
177. “Theodoret’s [extensive] correspondence furnishes statements that enable us to date the Pauline Commentary to the mid-440s” when he had been a bishop for approaching twenty-five years (Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on The Letters of St. Paul*, 1:2).
178. Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on The Letters of St. Paul*, 2:17. Ἀλληγορούμενα εἶπεν ὁ θεῖος Ἀπόστολος, ἀντὶ τοῦ, καὶ ἑτέρως νοούμενα. Οὐ γὰρ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀνεῖλεν, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐν τῇ ἱστορίᾳ προτυπωθέντα [aorist passive participle, nominative/accusative plural from προτυπώω; LSJ, 1537] διδάσκει. Whether Theodoret sees this as a higher sense, he does not say. He states only that in Paul’s use “it is to be understood differently” (ἑτέρως νοούμενα).
179. PG, 82:492.42–45; Hill, *Theodoret’s Commentary on the Letters of St. Paul*, 2:18.
180. Christoph Schäublin, who wrote a seminal work on Antiochene exegesis (*Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese*) is definitive that when Paul uses the phrase ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα he means typology (Christoph Schäublin, “The Contribution of Rhetorics to Christian Hermeneutics,” in *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, ed. Charles Kannengiesser, 2 vols., Bible in Ancient Christianity 1 [Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004], 1:162 n. 50). For a suggestive essay on the modern use of Antiochene rhetoric, see Lauri Thurén, “John Chrysostom as a Modern Rhetorician,” in *Rhetorics and Hermeneutics: Wilhelm Wuellner and His Influence*, ed. James D. Hester and J. David Hester, Emory Studies in Early Christianity (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 218–40.
181. Even Hill (who often translates *theōria* as “higher sense” in both Theodore and Theodoret’s works) affirms *theōria* as integral to Theodoret’s hermeneutic. “Theodoret is brought at this early state by Hosea’s marriage to lay out (with Cyril’s help) Antioch’s terminology for its hermeneutical approach to biblical

texts. It is essential to recognize the purpose, *skopos*, of the text whether a simple narrative or one that is but an outline, *skia* [σκιά], foreshadowing the reality. Instead of having recourse to allegory, one should turn to discernment, *theōria*, of what is recounted or—in the case of Hosea’s contemporaries—observed as happening before their eyes” (Robert C. Hill, trans., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentaries on the Prophets*, vol. 3, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets* [Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2006], 301 n. 8). It is unfortunate that the original Greek version of Theodore’s commentary on Galatians is not extant. His comments on Gal. 2:25–30 from the Latin are translated several times as “discern” or “perceive,” but there is no way to be sure that is a translation of the Greek. The texts read: “And if their [the allegorists’] view is true and what is written does not preserve an account of what really happened but points to something else profound and that must be understood intellectually—something spiritual, as they want to say, which they can *discern* since they are themselves spiritual people—where have they acquired this knowledge?;” and “He [Paul] wants to demonstrate that Christ’s dispensation is greater than that of the law and that our righteousness should be *perceived* as far more excellent than that found in the law” (Greer, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: The Commentaries on the Minor Epistles of Paul*, 115, 117 (emphasis mine).

182. “The commentary of Theodoret of Cyr on St. Paul, strongly dependent on that of Chrysostom, has been preserved for us in its entirety in a continuous tradition from the time of the early church, probably because Theodoret was viewed as a kind of synthesis or high point of Greek exegesis by later generations. Composed in the decades immediately preceding the Council of Chalcedon, that is, between A.D. 420 and 450, it is dry, scholarly and periphrastic. He is the *archrepresentative of Antiochene exegesis with its emphasis on a literal, rather than allegorical, interpretation of the biblical salvation history and with the use of typological figurative explanations of passages in order to link the Testaments in a scheme of prophecy and fulfillment. . . . He demonstrated a remarkable concern for sorting out the chronological course of Paul’s work. Each commentary on one of the epistles is preceded by a preface that discusses its setting and unifying themes*” (Peter Gorday, *Colossians, 1–2 Thessalonians, 1–2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon*, ACCS, NT 9 [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2000], xxi (emphasis mine); cf. Guinot, *L’exégèse de Théodoret de Cyr*, 71–76; and Gionot, “Theodoret of Cyrus: Bishop and Exegete,” 163–93).
183. Nassif, “Antiochene ‘*Theoria*’ in John Chrysostom’s Exegesis.”

184. Schor, "Theodoret on the 'School of Antioch,'" 522. Schor speaks in the context of Antiochene christological terminology, but I apply the same principle to exegetical terminology.