UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
ORIENTAL PUBLICATIONS
25

Origen and the Jews

Studies in Jewish-Christian relations in third-century Palestine

NICHOLAS DE LANGE

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
ORIENTAL PUBLICATIONS
No. 25

Origen and the Jews

University of Cambridge Oriental Publica
published for the
Faculty of Oriental Studies

See page 241 for the complete list

Origen and the Jews

STUDIES IN JEWISH-CHRISTIAN RELATIONS IN THIRD-CENTURY PALESTINE

N. R. M. DE LANGE
Lecturer in Rabbinics, University of Cambridge

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
CAMBRIDGE
LONDON – NEW YORK – MELBOURNE

Published by the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press
The Pitt Buildings, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP
Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London NW1 2DB
32 East 57th Street, New York, NY 10022, USA
296 Beaconsfield Parade, Middle Park, Melbourne 3206, Australia

First published 1976
Reprinted 1978

Printed in Great Britain by offset lithography by
Billing & Sons Ltd, Guildford, London and Worcester

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

De Lange, Nicholas Robert Michael, 1944-

Origen and the Jews.

(University of Cambridge oriental publications; 25)

Based on the author's thesis, Oxford University, 1970.

Bibliography: p. 209.

1. Judaism–Relations–Christianity. 2. Christianity and other religions–Judaism
3. Bible. O.T.–Criticism, interpretation, etc., Jewish. 4. Origenes.
I. Title. II. Series: Cambridge. University.
Oriental publications; 25.
BM535.D44 261.2 75–36293
ISBN 0 521 20542 5

To my parents

οὐ μὲν γὰρ τοῦγε κρεῖσσον καὶ ἄρειον,
ἢ ὅθ' ὁμοφρονέοντε νοήμασιν οἶκον ἔχητο
ἀνὴρ ἠδὲ γυνή

CONTENTS

	Foreword	*Page* ix
1	Introduction	1
2	Origen's Sources	15
3	The Jews	29
4	Judaism	39
5	The Bible and Bible-Study	49
6	Origen and Celsus	63
7	The Church and the Jews	75
8	Debates and Discussions	89
9	The Interpretation of Scripture	103
10	Origen and the Aggadah	123
	Afterword	133
	Note on sources	137
	Abbreviations of reference works and periodicals	141
	Notes	143
	Bibliography	209
	Index of ancient sources	216
	Index of subjects	235

FOREWORD

Every book is a product of its time. Recent years have seen an awakening of interest both in Origen and in the history of Jewish-Christian relations. I have sought to bring these two interests together by setting Origen against his Jewish background, and trying to assess his place in the history of relations between Church and Synagogue. Others have tackled certain details of the subject, but so far there has been no attempt at an overall view. The single exception, Hans Bietenhard's *Caesarea, Origenes und die Juden* (Franz Delitzsch-Vorlesungen 1972, Stuttgart, 1974), unfortunately came to my notice only after the present work was completed. Another book which promises to cover some of the same ground, Lee Levine's *Caesarea under Roman Rule* (Studies in Judaism and Late Antiquity VII, Leiden, 1975), had not appeared at the time of writing. This lack has made itself felt in a number of ways: old myths and misunderstandings are perpetuated, valuable information is ignored, and even the standard works on Origen fail to take due account of this important aspect of his life and work.

I have not attempted, in this short monograph, to say everything that could be said about this large subject. There is room for a good deal of further work, particularly on Origen's debt to Jewish exegesis. What I have tried to do is to provide a general survey of the subject, to set it in its historical background, and to indicate the lines along which I believe it could be profitably developed in the future.

This book is based on a doctoral thesis submitted to the University of Oxford in 1970. I have made some additions and alterations and brought the bibliographical references up to date, but the substance is unchanged. I am aware that a dissertation does not make an elegant book; I have tried, nevertheless, to present the text in a readable form, and to make it intelligible to as wide an audience as possible. Detailed

discussions, references and suggestions for further reading will be found in the notes at the end of the volume. An earlier draft of chapter nine appeared in the *Journal of Jewish Studies* vol.XXII (1971), and I am grateful to the editor for permission to republish it here.

The subject of the work was suggested to me in 1967 by the Very Revd Dr Henry Chadwick, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, at that time Regius Professor of Divinity, and Dr Chadwick kindly agreed to supervise my research. I am more deeply grateful to him than words can express for his inspiring direction, his generous advice and his warmhearted support at every stage of my work. I am also deeply grateful to Dr Geza Vermes, Reader in Jewish Studies in the University of Oxford, for his unstinting guidance and encouragement. There are very many other teachers, colleagues and friends to whom my thanks are due for advancing my work by their suggestions or lightening its burden by their company. I could not possibly name them all; if I single out a few for particular mention it is in the confident hope that the others will be conscious of my enduring gratitude.

In common with all students of Jewish-Christian relations I owe a great debt to the Revd Dr James Parkes: I particularly appreciate his kindness to me while I was Parkes Library Fellow in the University of Southampton. I also owe a deeply-felt debt of friendship and scholarship to Professor Marguerite Harl, of the University of Paris-Sorbonne. Dr S. P. Brock, Dr William Horbury and Dr J. Smit Sibinga read the thesis in typescript; I am grateful to them for their criticism and advice, and also to Professor J. A. Emerton for his constant encouragement and support. I must also express my thanks to the Publications Committee of the Faculty of Oriental Studies for accepting the book for this series, to the Faculty Board as administrators of Tyrwhitt's Hebrew Fund and to the Managers of the Hort Memorial Fund for generous grants towards the cost of its publication, and to all those in the Press and the University Library who have dealt with the difficulties of production with courtesy and admirable efficiency.

I should like to take this opportunity to record my obligation to my revered teacher, Rabbi Dr Ignaz Maybaum, who has been an unfailing source of inspiration and enlightenment. To my parents I owe all that I am. I dedicate this book to them as an inadequate token of my love.

Cambridge
1975

N. R. M. de L.

1

INTRODUCTION

Origen holds a key position in the history of the relations between Jews and Christians. Living in Palestine shortly after the publication in writing of the Mishnah, taking a great interest in the customs and traditions of the Jews and knowing personally the Jewish teachers of his time, he is excellently placed to give a sympathetic outsider's view of the Jews of his day and of their relations with their non-Jewish neighbours. He lived and wrote in a climate of political upheaval and social change which produced in his part of the world a frenzied quest among intellectuals for moral and spiritual values. His teachers, his colleagues and his pupils travelled throughout the Greek-speaking world in search of new and more satisfying teachings; the academies and the courts of private patrons provided the setting for lively discussions between people of widely differing traditions and outlooks. It was a time of debate, of conversion and of polemical and apologetic writing. In this lively intellectual life Origen immersed himself wholeheartedly. He taught at Alexandria, he travelled to Greece, Asia, Syria and even to Rome and Arabia, to lecture, to debate and to study. He was involved in discussions with pagans, heretics and Jews. Eventually he settled in Caesarea in Palestine, where he built up a library and a circle of students drawn from various parts of the eastern world, and where he continued to preach, to lecture, to dispute, to write books and to correspond with his colleagues in other parts of the world.

Caesarea at this time was a remarkable city. It had been for more than two centuries a flourishing sea-port, Palestine's principal gateway to the outside world. Under Severus Alexander, who visited the city around the time of Origen's arrival, it became the metropolis of the province of Syria Palaestina.[1] As a port it was a great commercial centre; as the seat of the Roman administration it played a cardinal part in the life of the province and attracted to itself some of the

outstanding talents of the region. From its association with Peter and Paul it had long held a place in the esteem of Christians; in the middle of the second century it became the seat of a bishop, and when Caesarea became the metropolis of Palestine its bishop became a metropolitan, with jurisdiction even over Jerusalem.[2] On the Jewish side, too, Caesarea was an important place. Though it had always, from its foundation by Herod onwards, been attacked by some Jews as a centre of decadence and corruption, yet it had a thriving Jewish community, and most Jewish teachers and administrators would have visited it at some time or another.[3] In the late third century and in the fourth century it had a brilliant and original school of rabbis,[4] the beginnings of which can be traced back at least to the period of Origen's residence. There was also a considerable Samaritan community.[5]

We should naturally expect, from what we know of Origen's interests and activities, to find in his works some evidence of his association with the Jewish and Samaritan communities of Palestine; and in fact he does mention Jewish teachers whom he consulted and he also makes use of Jewish traditions in expounding the Scriptures. A closer inspection reveals the deep and widespread influence of Jewish ideas on his thought. It is remarkable, therefore, that students of Origen have on the whole been slow to investigate this aspect of Origen's writings. P. D. Huet (1630-1721), in the most thorough and critical study of Origen ever to have been produced,[6] ignores Origen's Jewish contacts and does not seem to entertain the possibility of Jewish influence on Origen's thought, which he analyses in detail. Subsequent writers on Origen have tended to follow Huet's lead; those who admit some Jewish influence have concentrated on Philo rather than on the rabbis. To this general rule there are some notable exceptions. Adolf von Harnack, in *Der kirchengeschichtliche Ertrag der exegetischen Arbeiten des Origenes* (1918), included in his investigations some of the evidence which Origen offers in his exegetical writings about Jews and Samaritans, and G. Bardy, in an article in the *Revue Biblique* for 1925 entitled 'Les traditions juives dans l'oeuvre d'Origène', collected some seventy passages of Origen which he thought represented borrowings of Jewish traditions.

Among historians of the Jews Origen has likewise been largely ignored, although J. Juster, with his characteristic thoroughness, made use of the few passages relevant to his theme in *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain* (1914), and a small number of specific passages recur in the writings of successive recent historians of the period. A new

examination of some of Origen's writings was made for the purpose of comparison with rabbinic remarks about persecution, martyrdom and relations with pagans generally by Y. Baer for an article entitled 'Israel, the Christian Church and the Roman Empire' (published in Hebrew in 1956 and in English translation in 1961). One particular question, the identity of 'the Patriarch Huillus', was discussed in detail by Heinrich Graetz, Wilhelm Bacher and their successors.[7] The only broader aspect of Origen's work to receive serious attention from Jewish scholars is his use of aggadic material. Raised tentatively by Azariah de Rossi (c.1513 - c.1578), this question was considered again after the Enlightenment, notably by Graetz and later by Louis Ginzberg.[8]

The results of these various researches have not yet been brought together, nor have the wider implications of Origen's borrowings from Jewish sources been raised. A new interest in the social history of the ancient world and in the comparative study of biblical exegesis, together with recent archaeological discoveries and new work on the rabbinic traditions, makes the time ripe for a reassessment of Origen's writings as a source for the relations between Jews and Christians in third-century Palestine.

This book is not intended as an exhaustive study of Origen's relations with the Jews. It is rather a collection of *prolegomena*, setting out the main topics of the subject, clearing away some of the 'dead wood', and indicating some profitable lines for future research. The need will undoubtedly remain for a great deal of more detailed enquiry; but this enquiry must be pursued in a correct perspective, and with a proper and full appreciation of the nature of the evidence.

Before proceeding to a definition of the scope of this study, it is necessary to make a few general remarks about the use of Origen as a source. As with every ancient text, a certain amount of caution is necessary in the drawing of inferences. In the first place there is the problem of establishing precisely what Origen said. Much of what he wrote is lost to us; of his surviving works little exists in its original form, and for the rest we have to rely on translations, on quotations in later writers and on scattered fragments. Secondly, care must be exercised in the dating of the works. Thirdly, there is the question of how to interpret the various remarks, produced as they were on different occasions for widely differing audiences. Lastly, one must be aware of the other evidence, which may substantiate or contradict what Origen has to say, and determine how much confidence may be placed in remarks of Origen which are opposed to accepted opinions.

Of Origen's enormous literary output only a tiny fraction survives in

the original Greek. Manuscript tradition has saved the *contra Celsum*, the *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, the short work *on Prayer*, a number of homilies, parts of the commentaries on Matthew and John, and two letters. In addition there are a number of papyri. The most important of these are the two codices of Origen found at Tura, near Cairo, during the Egyptian campaign of 1941, which contain two previously unknown works, the *Dialogue with Heracleides* and a treatise (or two) entitled *peri Pascha*, and excerpts from the *contra Celsum*, the *Commentary on Romans* and a homily.[9] Several short fragments of various commentaries and homilies, not all attributed with certainty to Origen, are preserved in other papyri, some dated as early as the third century.[10]

From later writers, notably Eusebius, a few fragments may be added to this total,[11] and we also have a selection of extracts made in the fourth century by Basil the Great and Gregory the Theologian, the *Philocalia*, which has preserved some important passages in the original.[12] The greater part of the editions of Origen is taken up by later Latin translations. Most of these versions were made by Rufinus, a few by Jerome, and one, part of the *Commentary on Matthew*, is a later work still. Pamphilus' *Apology*, which quoted verbatim from several works now lost, is unfortunately preserved only in a Latin translation. In view of the successive anathemata which the works suffered from the fourth century on, we are fortunate in possessing even this much. The Latin texts of Origen comprise a considerable number of homilies on the Old and New Testaments, commentaries on the Song of Songs, on Romans and, in part, on Matthew, and the important doctrinal work *de Principiis*. Rufinus' translations are not all of a piece. He himself tells us that the homilies on Joshua, Judges and Psalms xxxvi to xxxviii are careful and literal translations, while that of the *Commentary on Romans* is looser and condensed.[13] According to Jerome, Rufinus made considerable alterations in his version of the *Principles*, but Jerome's own literal version is lost. We do, however, have a number of fragments of the original Greek which provide a basis for comparison. It is obvious that care must be taken in using Rufinus' translations; where there is no doctrinal reason for him to have censored Origen's words his translation may be assumed to be fair to the original in broad outline, but not perhaps accurate in detail. Of Jerome's accuracy we have no touchstone. We know that he disapproved strongly of some of Origen's ideas, but he was also lavish in his praise of Origen's scholarship, and saw it as his mission to make the wisdom of the Greek East, and especially of Origen, available to Latin readers.

One work, the Hexapla, raises specialised problems, which have provoked a bulky literature of their own.[14] In addition to a very few actual fragments,[15] it is possible to collect readings from quotations in Origen and later writers, from manuscripts of the Septuagint and from the Syriac version. Collections of the material then available were made by Bernard de Montfaucon (1713) and F. Field (1867), but a new edition of the fragments is still awaited.

We have two further sources, both valuable but more difficult to handle. One is the biblical catenae.[16] These provide us with numerous brief comments extracted from Origen's works, but the attributions of these fragments in the catenae are often open to doubt; they are considerably condensed and rewritten, and even if we can assume that a particular comment is correctly ascribed to Origen we cannot usually tell from which work it is excerpted. It may be a scholion (and so undateable), or it may be taken from a commentary or a homily. There are also problems connected with the textual tradition of the catenae.

The other source is the use of Origen by later scholars who had access to works now lost. The writings of Eusebius and Jerome[17] abound in unacknowledged quotations from Origen. The commentaries of Hilary and Ambrose[18] also lean heavily on Origen, and in the East Origen's writings continued to be read and used for some time. The problems here are similar to those associated with the catenae. We cannot be certain that a passage of Eusebius or of Theodoret is borrowed from Origen, except by comparing it with what we know Origen said. Ultimately our only test is how Origenian the passage sounds, and even so we cannot know how faithful the borrowing or translation is to the original or from which work it is taken. Occasionally these passages correspond to Rufinus' translations, but where these differ in detail we have no way of knowing which is closer to the original.

The order and dates of Origen's works have been discussed at length by Huet[19] and by more recent scholars.[20] Our main evidence comes from Eusebius, but additional clues are provided by other ancient writers, from the internal evidence of the works and from what we know of Origen's life. The various arguments have often been set out; for most of the works they offer no certainty. For the purposes of our subject the most important division is between the works written in Alexandria and those written in Palestine. The principles on which the argument of the present book is based are the following. The first five books of the commentary on John, the *de Principiis,* the fragments of the *Stromateis* and the quotations in the *Philocalia* from the shorter

commentary on the Song of Songs and perhaps from those on Genesis and the first Psalms all belong to the earlier period of Origen's life, before he left Alexandria for Caesarea. The catena fragments on Lamentations and the earlier Psalms cannot with certainty be ascribed to this period, but some of them may be excerpted from works written at this time. The remainder of the exegetical works were composed later, and even in the case of earlier works there is the possibility of a good deal of later revision by Origen himself. The *contra Celsum* has been dated with some confidence to the year 248.[21] Various attempts have been made to show that Origen began writing the Hexapla in Alexandria. Such attempts are vain. Probably, as Huet says, he conceived the idea in Alexandria, set to work collecting the material in Caesarea and completed the work towards the end of his life.

Origen wrote in widely differing *genres,* and any examination of a passage must take into account the occasion on which it was uttered and the kind of audience to which it was addressed. Much of what he has to say is highly tendentious, and in order to understand him fully one must be aware of the views against which he was arguing. The *contra Celsum* is a straightforward work of apologetic, but the commentaries and homilies, too, are full of attacks, explicit or implicit, on ideas and practices current at the time. In attacking one point of view Origen may find himself defending another to which on another occasion he expressed his opposition. Thus in the *contra Celsum,* replying to Celsus' arguments against Christianity, he often finds occasion to defend the ideas and practices of the Jews, while in his extempore homilies, challenging Judaistic tendencies in his audience, he often attacks them. This leads to certain apparent inconsistencies, but even where Origen does not contradict himself his *Tendenz* must be recognised. Again, some remarks are clearly 'asides', which do not form part of his main argument. Sometimes these are valuable as circumstantial evidence, free from any tendency; at others they are thoroughly biased. There may be a grain of truth, but it is exaggerated or distorted. There is always a danger in taking remarks out of their context. When, for instance, Origen says that Jews are not at all well read in Greek literature,[22] this must be read as an 'aside' in Origen's reply to Celsus, and is not to be taken as proof that in Origen's day Jews did not read Greek writings. Again, in a similar context Origen says that he has never met a Jew who admitted that the Logos was the son of God.[23] Elsewhere, however, he quotes a Jew who apparently did hold this belief,[24] and it certainly formed part of Philo's stock-in-trade.

This brings us to the question of external sources which may be

brought to bear on Origen's information. Part of Origen's value as a source for this period is that we have hardly any other Greek sources for the Judaism of the time. Apart from the inscriptions and papyri, which are by no means plentiful for the third century, we have to rely on other writers, some earlier and some later than Origen, whose ideas often reflect the different conditions in which they lived, and who, in so far as they represent a tradition of which Origen is a part, are of use rather when they disagree with Origen than when they appear to substantiate his statements. Furthermore, with the exception of Jerome, no other Church Father knew the Jews so well as Origen, and Jerome wrote at a time when the Jewish community had undergone certain important changes, particularly in its attitude to Christianity. More important for our present purpose are the abundant remains of the writings and teachings of the Rabbis. Because these are written in Hebrew and Aramaic, and because they are not all available in translation or even in modern editions, they have been almost entirely neglected by students of Origen. The importance of these sources for a study of this kind cannot be too strongly stressed. Much of what Origen says cannot be understood without a knowledge of the Rabbis, and some of the arguments which have been produced by modern scholars crumble to dust when the evidence of the rabbinic writings is adduced. A case in point is Origen's interpretation of the Hebrew names in the Bible. Origen tells us that he learnt many of these interpretations from the Hebrews, and the Rabbis often base homiletical remarks on interpretations of names, some of them far-fetched. As in the case of Philo, attempts to show that Origen knew no Hebrew have been based on his apparent ineptitude in translating Hebrew names; yet the same arguments would prove that the Rabbis, too, knew little Hebrew, a conclusion which is patently absurd. The rabbinic interpretations of biblical names have been entirely ignored as a source for Origen's interpretations.

This is not to say that the rabbinic writings are without problems of their own. Once again dating is important. Origen lived at the end of the tannaitic period and the beginning of the amoraic. In his youth the Mishnah had been edited by the patriarch R. Judah and his school, and it is probable that the Tosefta and the tannaitic midrashim (Mekilta, Sifra and Sifre) were compiled in something like their present form in his lifetime or soon afterwards.[25] The tannaitic remarks which survive in the later literature[26] were part of the living Jewish tradition of his time, and the ideas of some of his contemporaries are quoted in the later midrashim and the two Talmuds. The traditions of the school of

Caesarea are particularly important in the Palestinian Talmud, part of which, it has been claimed, was compiled at Caesarea.[27] We can be certain, from the evidence of Origen himself, that he was familiar with some at least of the ideas contained in the Mishnah and the Mekilta. In general it may be assumed that the Tannaitic literature as a whole was available to him, and in a fuller form than that in which it has come down to us. In some respects Origen serves as a useful source for the rabbinic ideas of his time. But the later rabbinic writings are also relevant to the present study, and here we do not stand on such firm ground. The manuscripts of the Talmuds and the midrashim do not always agree on the attribution of particular sayings, and many are anonymous. The late third-century rabbis of Caesarea may have been influenced by Origen and his school, and in any case the debate between Church and Synagogue continued to play a part in moulding rabbinic thought. Neither the attribution of a statement nor its subject-matter, therefore, allows us to bring it with complete confidence into the arena, but nor, on the other hand, can we afford to lose entirely such assistance as these later texts can offer. Where a passage from a later source seems useful it will be introduced, but no conclusions will be drawn about its date. The rabbinic writings embody a living tradition, and the Rabbis themselves, though they were at pains to attribute remarks accurately, saw, much as did the Church Fathers, the tradition as a collection of eternal truths, wending their way, like a river, between opposed banks, being fed here and there by fresh tributaries, but flowing on ever the same.

The present study naturally concentrates on the later Palestinian period of Origen's life. It would be tempting to find references in his early works to Jews in Alexandria. We know hardly anything of Judaism in Alexandria at this time, and any information Origen could offer would be most welcome. He knew the city well, having been born and brought up there, and having lived there for the greater part of his life. In the works produced before he left Alexandria there are some interesting remarks about Jews and Judaism. What is to be made of these? We know that in the great revolt of 115-17 many of the Jews of Egypt were killed.[28] In Alexandria, where the revolt was crushed in its early stages, some of the Jews survived, but Jewish community life appears to have come to an end and the power of the Jews in Alexandria was destroyed.[29] What happened to those who survived we can only surmise. No doubt some who had strong links with Palestine emigrated thither; others will have abandoned Judaism completely, if they were permitted to do so; still others will have joined the Church.

These events, however, occurred two generations before Origen was born. By the fourth century Jewish life in Egypt had begun to show signs of revival, and it is possible that this revival should be dated a little earlier. The evidence is flimsy, but there are Jewish documents from Egypt which have been dated to the second and third centuries. Four Hebrew papyrus fragments discovered in 1922 at Oxyrhynchus together with a Greek or Latin text in Aramaic script with an Aramaic colophon were dated, not conclusively, to the reign of Septimius Severus by Flinders Petrie, who unearthed them.[30] The Hebrew and Aramaic papyrus fragments in the Bodleian Library published by Cowley[31] are all probably much later. A mummy inscribed, in Hebrew, with the words 'Siṭorah the pure, peace be upon her rest. May her soul be (destined) for a life of peace' has been dated, on palaeographical grounds, to the first or second century.[32] Finally, the Hebrew inscription from Antinoopolis, '(This is the grave of N. son of) Lazar. May his soul's rest be in the bundle of life', ought to belong to our period, since Antinoopolis was founded by Hadrian, but this dating too has been challenged.[33] If there were Jewish communities in Egypt in Origen's time we might expect him to know something about them; we might even assert that they are the source of his early information about Judaism, including the knowledge of the Halakhah which he displays in the *de Principiis*.[34] So imperfect is our information, however, that it is safer to leave this question open. Origen had spent some time in Palestine in his early thirties, and while there he could have acquired a considerable amount of knowledge about Judaism. Such knowledge as he displays of non-rabbinic Judaism he may have acquired in Alexandria, or on his travels in Rome, Achaea and Asia, or in Palestine.

The landscape of Judaism in Palestine at this time was for a long time drawn exclusively from the evidence of the rabbinic sources. These are not sufficient, however, for the reconstruction of the social history of third-century Judaism. The Mishnah is a valuable source, but it has its problems. It is a tersely-worded codification of the legal decisions of the previous two centuries or more. It frequently seems to legislate for an ideal, not a real state of affairs, for an autonomous Jewish state with a temple and a Jewish government. It speaks of kings and priests and tithes, rather than governors and patriarchs, rabbis and taxes. Much the same considerations apply to the halakhic midrashim. The Palestinian Talmud, on the other hand, is full of interesting anecdotes which throw a good deal of light on Jewish life in Palestine, but these belong to a later age. Nevertheless, the evidence of the Talmud is valuable. The

conditions it describes are quite different from those mentioned in the Mishnah. In the first place, it is written mainly in Aramaic, in a free style, and with a large number of Greek and some Latin borrowings, as against the Mishnah which is written in obscure, formulaic Hebrew. It describes a way of life which is recognisable as the life of Jews in Palestine at the time. We often catch glimpses of the social and ideological struggles of the time, struggles between rich and poor, between exclusive and more open attitudes to non-Jews, debates between Jews of different religious outlooks, between Jews and Samaritans and between Jews and Christians.[35]

The work of the archaeologists in the last few decades has unearthed more information about Jewish life in Palestine, much of which substantiates and some of which goes beyond what was known from the rabbinic literature. From the Jewish tombs, inscriptions and synagogues of the time we may see how far the Jews were prepared to go in their use of the Greek language and of pagan art-forms and motifs, and how readily they could borrow themes from the religious synthesis of the world around them. That Greek was the common language of Palestine in the third century can no longer be doubted. Other questions are more problematical; we have barely begun to understand the religious ideas of the men who built the synagogue of Chorazin, for instance, with its pagan-style reliefs. The archaeological discoveries in Palestine have been to some extent overshadowed by the discovery of the synagogue of Dura-Europos, whose paintings show a religious syncretism which could hardly be imagined half a century ago. The debate about the interpretation of this new evidence is in full swing, but it is already clear that many of our opinions about third-century Judaism must be drastically revised.

Archaeology has unfortunately revealed very little about Jewish life in Caesarea in the third century.[36] Our evidence for this comes mainly from the rabbinic literature. As one might expect, the picture which emerges is of a thriving commercial centre and important port with a busy Jewish life. Assuredly, as the seat of Roman rule in Palestine, Caesarea is viewed with a certain distaste by the Rabbis. 'You find that before Jerusalem was destroyed no other town was held in any esteem, but after Jerusalem was destroyed Caesarea became a metropolis, Antipolis a provincial centre and Neapolis a Roman colony.'[37] 'Caesarea and Jerusalem are rivals. If someone says to you "both are destroyed", do not believe him; if he says "both are flourishing" do not believe him; if he says "Caesarea is laid waste and Jerusalem is flourishing", then you may believe him, as it says, "I shall be

replenished, she is laid waste" (Ezekiel xxvi.2).'[38] Clearly the scene of the imprisonments and executions of the Bar Kochba revolt and the source of every harsh edict was not viewed happily by some Jews. Yet we know that one rabbi of Caesarea, Abbahu, was on the best of terms with the Roman government of the province.[39] It was said that when the soul of Abbahu went to its rest the columns of Caesarea ran with tears.[40] Abbahu supported against some opposition from his colleagues the teaching of Greek and its liturgical use.[41] There is a story of a rabbi who went to Caesarea and heard the Shema' recited in Greek. He wanted to stop it, but was prevented.[42] That even Abbahu was not completely happy with the Jewish community of Caesarea emerges from another anecdote: Abbahu and Resh Lakish were once on the point of entering the city of Caesarea when Abbahu said to Resh Lakish, 'Why should we go into a city of cursing and blaspheming?' Resh Lakish got down from his ass, scraped up some sand and put it into Abbahu's mouth. When he asked him why he had done it he replied, 'God is not pleased with one who slanders Jews.'[43] If this story is to be taken seriously, it might be taken to imply that the Jews of Caesarea, or some of them, had a reputation for heresy or apostasy of some kind. We may assume that in such a cosmopolitan city as Caesarea the tendency towards syncretism and apostasy was strong. Certainly the opportunities for contact with other faiths were many, and in this lies the particular interest of Origen's association with the Jews.

The non-Jewish population of Caesarea consisted of Samaritans, pagans and Christians. The first formed a clearly-defined community, with their own laws and traditions, holding themselves aloof from their non-Samaritan neighbours.[44] It was probably only after the advent of their great theologian Marqah, in the late third or fourth century,[45] that their heated debates with the Jews became more common and their separatist tendencies found full expression, but this marked no real change in their outlook. Their character and religious principles remain constant in the Gospels, in the rabbinic and patristic literature and in their own writings and traditions.[46] For the Christian tradition about the Samaritans Origen is an important source. His comments were collected by Eusebius and made available to the whole Christian world, East and West.

That Caesarea was an important centre of paganism in Palestine we cannot doubt, though little information has come down to us about the intellectual life of the pagan population, and Origen has nothing to add on the subject. In accordance with the spirit of the time, educated pagans will have taken an interest in the Semitic religions of the region;

we know of the lively curiosity of the imperial family at Antioch, where they encouraged debates with leading Jews and Christians, including Origen, and what we know about Abbahu suggests that at Caesarea a similar situation prevailed.

How large the Christian population of Caesarea was, and how freely tolerated, we can only guess. Christianity was rapidly gaining ground in Palestine at the time; by the early fourth century there were Christians in every part of Palestine, and in some villages the population was predominantly Christian. The Christian scholars of fourth-century Palestine were foreshadowed by Julius Africanus, who lived and wrote in Emmaus-Nicopolis, and perhaps by Theoctistus, bishop of Caesarea, and Alexander of Jerusalem, who recognised Origen's talents and so eagerly encouraged him to settle at Caesarea. The holy places, too, which were thronged by Christian pilgrims from the fourth century, had been visited by Melito of Sardes in the second and later by Alexander and by Origen. No doubt there were others. Presumably many of the Christian communities consisted in large part of converts from Judaism, and the missionary activity continued, with public disputations and catechetical courses. We have some information about this from the rabbinic sources and a good deal more from Origen. The character of Palestinian Christianity was influenced by its Jewish environment, but whether the observance of Jewish customs by Christians was due to external influence or to Jewish Christians who found it hard to abandon the *miṣwoth* is not easy to decide. We do not know how Jewish converts to Christianity were regarded by other Jews, or by other Christians, and what the relation was between these and the Judaeo-Christian sects.

The kind of information which this enquiry aims at extracting from Origen's works thus begins to be defined more clearly. It is not concerned merely to catalogue the total extent of Origen's knowledge of Judaism, of Jewish history and of Jewish ideas. Much of this is derived from sources available to us directly, from the Old and New Testaments, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Philo and Josephus. Much of it also is the common possession of the Fathers of the early Church. Origen's special value as a source lies in his contact with living Judaism, and it is on this that the enquiry must focus. In the first place one must attempt to discover who Origen's informants were; the results of this investigation will tell us something of the intercourse which was possible between Jews and non-Jews. Next we shall consider how much Origen really knew about the Jews of his day, about their institutions, their practices and their beliefs. Some of this information can be

checked with other sources, some of it may shed new light on the Judaism of the third century. Taken together, it will give some idea of how the Jews saw themselves at this time, and how they appeared to an outsider who took an interest in them.

Special attention must be paid to the debate between Church and Synagogue as it manifests itself in Origen's work. Our prime source for this is the *contra Celsum,* but from the other surviving works, too, precious information can be gleaned about the Christian attitude to Judaism and the Jewish attitude to Christianity at this time. Some of the arguments used on both sides recur in the rabbinic writings, and these too must be adduced in evidence. Origen's attitude was in some ways unusual, as, while endorsing the accepted patristic view of Judaism, which was on the whole unfavourable, he recognised at the same time the importance of the Jewish tradition for Christian scholarship, especially the work of Jewish scholars on the interpretation of Scripture. He was at pains to discover as much as he could about Jewish biblical exegesis, and he incorporated in his work numerous Jewish traditions about the interpretation of particular passages and also extra-biblical Jewish legends, *aggadoth,* for some of which he is our only authority. Origen's debt to Jewish biblical scholarship is perhaps the most important aspect of his contact with the Jews, and yet it has hardly been subjected to serious study. This work attempts to indicate the scope and nature of this debt, and to show how both the style and the content of his exegesis, which had such a profound effect on the subsequent hermeneutical tradition of the Church, owe much to the rabbinic schools, which, over the preceding two centuries, had developed a complex and detailed system of techniques for the elucidation of Scripture. All this comes, ultimately, within the scope of Jewish-Christian relations; it is part of the interpenetration of Jewish and Christian ideas.

2

ORIGEN'S SOURCES

For his study of the history and character of the Jews Origen will have had abundant sources, both in earlier writings and in the works and conversations of his contemporaries. Although the prime concern of the present study is with his contact with living Jewish traditions and practices, it will be as well to consider also the other available material.

In the first place there is the Greek Bible, with which Origen became familiar in his childhood, and which permeated the whole of his thought. According to Tertullian[1] the text was available, with the Hebrew original, with the rest of Ptolemy's library in the Serapeum, and besides it was read publicly by the Jews. In addition to the version of the Septuagint there were others more faithful to the Hebrew text, notably that of Aquila,[2] which Origen discovered early and often consulted as a more reliable translation than that of the Seventy. It was almost certainly in common use among the Jews. He also collected other versions, including those attributed to Symmachus and Theodotion, the readings of which he included in the Hexapla.

He also referred to some of the extra-canonical books, such as Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Prayer of Joseph, IV Ezra and several other Jewish apocrypha, including perhaps the Book of Jubilees. According to Harnack,[3] since Origen knew these he ought also to have known all the Jewish apocryphal works listed by Nicephorus in his *Stichometria.* In addition he often quotes from unnamed Jewish apocrypha which do not seem to have survived.

Of the once considerable Hellenistic Jewish literature, thanks to the extinction of Greek-speaking Judaism and the antagonism of the rabbis, who preserve only a few readings from Aquila, nothing now survives except for what passed into the Christian tradition, and we can do little more than surmise which works were available to Origen. Clement of

Alexandria quotes from Demetrius, Eupolemus, Artapanus, Aristeas, Philo the Elder, Theodotus and the tragic poet Ezekiel; but it is likely that, like Eusebius, he knew and quoted these early writers from the work of Alexander Polyhistor *On the Jews*. Jerome mentions that Clement quoted Aristobulus, Demetrius and Eupolemus, but does not seem to have known their works himself at first hand. If Origen did not have direct access to them, at least he could refer to Alexander's useful history.[4] The historian Justus of Tiberias, who was used by Julius Africanus, was presumably also available to Origen.[5] In addition, references to lost Jewish philosophical works have been seen in Origen's writings.[6]

Philo is quoted by Origen in a few places by name,[7] and several more passages have been pointed out in which Origen seems to echo remarks of Philo, sometimes attributed to 'one of our predecessors'.[8] It would appear from this that Origen regarded Philo as part of the heritage of the Church. Later he came to be regarded as a Christian, even as a bishop.[9] We do not know how or when the writings of Philo passed into the Christian tradition, but it cannot have been long before Origen's birth, perhaps after the crushing of the Jewish revolt of 115, when many of his readers may have entered the Church. If more of the Jewish and Christian literature of the time had survived, we might have found much of what is attributed to Philo to have been taken in fact from other writers. The phrase 'our predecessors' at any rate suggests something of the sort. It has been well observed by A. D. Nock[10] that Philo's impact in the wider world of Greek philosophy does not seem to have been profound. Numenius may have known his work, and Plotinus, Nock suggested, may have known of him from Origen or Numenius' writings, but neither of these gives proof of any acquaintance with Philo in his extant writings. Celsus may have known Philo's works,[11] but 'he had a controversial motive for acquiring such knowledge'. 'It is noteworthy', Nock says, 'that Porphyry, apud Euseb. *HE* VI.19.8, accuses Origen of borrowing his allegorical methods from Chaeremon and Cornutus, and does not bring in Philo.' In fact we must recognise Philo, with Christian and perhaps other Jewish allegorists, as the strongest influence on Origen's mystical interpretation of Scripture, but it is certainly true that Philo made little or no impact on Greek thought outside the Christian tradition. Philo's influence on Origen has been much exaggerated by some recent writers.[12]

Among the works which Origen apparently ascribed to Philo was one which has not come down to us, an alphabetical list of Hebrew biblical names with their Greek meanings.[13] The work itself is lost; all that we

have is Jerome's translation, which is so heavily revised as to be virtually a new work, and two small papyrus fragments, both dated to the third or early fourth century, and each listing some twenty interpretations.[14] That this list was compiled by Philo is perhaps unlikely, nor does Origen attribute it to Philo in his extant writings. He quotes it anonymously, under the title *The Interpretation of Names.*[15] Since it is quoted in Book II of the *Commentary on John,* we may infer that he knew it in Alexandria. The questions raised by Origen's use of this work will be discussed later.[16]

A certain historical source was Josephus, whom Origen several times quotes by name.[17] Josephus had been installed at Rome by Vespasian as a resident expert on Jewish affairs, and his works came to be accepted as official histories. Some unattributed remarks which have been referred by modern scholars to Josephus may conceivably, however, come from other sources.[18] It is interesting that in some places where we might expect Josephus to be quoted he is not, as in the references to Jewish false messiahs in the *contra Celsum,*[19] where Origen ignores all the cases not mentioned in the New Testament.

An interesting Greek Jewish document is the midrashic history, perhaps translated into Greek from a Hebrew original in the third century, known as the *Book of Biblical Antiquities.*[20] This work, now preserved unfortunately only in a later Latin translation, raises the whole question of midrashim in Greek, which are *prima facie* a likely source for much of Origen's knowledge of Jewish legends. Since it is the only surviving example, however, there is little that can be said here on the subject, except that Origen does not quote it.[21]

A most important source for Origen's knowledge of Jews, and of Samaritans, in the first century is the New Testament. His use of the terms 'Pharisees', 'Sadducees' and 'Scribes' and many of his remarks about Jewish beliefs stem directly from the Gospels, and his ideas about election and about the shortcomings of Judaism are largely derived from the Pauline letters. In addition to the canonical Gospels he also quotes from the *Gospel According to the Hebrews.*[22] On this, and on its relation with the Hebrew *Gospel of Matthew,* something will be said later. There was a copy in the library at Caesarea.

Turning from Jewish to non-Jewish sources, we find first of all that pagan writers had little to offer. Apart from Alexander Polyhistor, mentioned above, and other writers of works on the Jews, including the polemical writers to whose arguments Josephus replied in the *contra Apionem,* pagans had little to say about the Jews and their religion. Nicolaus of Damascus is a notable exception, a cultivated writer who

had observed at first hand the events of the later part of Herod's reign, but it is doubtful to what extent if any Origen used his writings. Origen did have, like Plotinus, a high regard for Numenius of Apamea, who had at least perused the Pentateuch and found its teaching reconcilable with his purified Platonism, but there is no evidence that Numenius had any original information to offer on the subject of Judaism. The only other pagan writer of whom we know that he had made a close study of Jewish history and ideas is Celsus, but Origen pours such scorn on Celsus' knowledge of Judaism that it is hard to believe he could have considered him a serious source of information on the subject.

There remain the Christian writers, both 'orthodox' and 'heretical'. None of these had written specifically about Judaism, but they had done some useful work on some aspects of Jewish history, notably on the chronology, and in some cases their remarks about Jewish ideas and traditions are based on first-hand knowledge of Jews, in Palestine and elsewhere. Justin, for example, although he knew only a few words of Hebrew and Aramaic, came from the Flavian New Town on the site of the biblical Shechem, and shows himself to have been familiar with Jewish beliefs, and with Jewish biblical exegesis, for which he had a profound contempt.[23] His polemical *Dialogue with Trypho,* in common with other dialogues between a Jew and a Christian, will have been a useful textbook for later Christian apologists, and contained a good deal of information about Judaism.

Melito of Sardes was certainly read by Origen,[24] and had made the pilgrimage to 'the places where the message was proclaimed and the deeds were done',[25] where he recorded the canon of Scripture then current.[26] Attempts have been made to find traces of Jewish influence in Melito, particularly in his *Paschal Homily,*[27] but the enquiry has so far not been very conclusive, and there is no evidence that Melito had anything to say about the Jews, beyond laying almost all the blame for the crucifixion at their door.[28]

The early 'heresiarchs' have been curiously neglected. It has with reason been said that in the second century the 'schools' at Rome, Alexandria, Antioch and elsewhere were almost more characteristic of heresy than of orthodoxy; of Origen's concern to combat heresy we have abundant evidence, despite a later judgement that he was 'the author of all the heresies'.[29] It has been speculated that 'towards the end of the second century it was probably easy for anyone, who so desired, to procure in the bookshops of Alexandria a copy of Basilides' four-and-twenty *Commentaries,* the similar treatises of his son Isidaurus, the collected letters and homilies of Valentinus, the

Antitheses of Marcion or the notorious work of the young and remarkable Epiphanes on "Justice".'[30] Particularly in the realm of the interpretation of Scripture[31] Origen will have learnt something of Jewish ideas from his reading of gnostic books, and he often brackets Jews and heretics together in his attacks on particular interpretations. The Jewish flavour of gnostic thought has little in common with the Judaism of the rabbis, but the extent to which ideas and symbols of Jewish origin pervaded the popular religious synthesis of Alexandria can be easily seen from a glance at the magical papyri.[32] With this religious half-world we are not directly concerned; it is mentioned here because, owing to its profound influence on the thought of Clement and Origen, there is a danger of confusing Jewish and gnostic ideas.

Pantaenus, who settled in Alexandria and taught there perhaps until Origen's early youth, left nothing, it appears, in writing, a fact which may explain Eusebius' vagueness about his activities. Eusebius, following his self-imposed plan of organising the personalities of the early Church in a series of regular successions, makes Pantaenus Clement's predecessor as head of the catechetical school of Alexandria, and Clement Origen's teacher. The historical accuracy of this schematic account has been justifiably challenged.[33] Neither Origen nor his (and Clement's) friend Alexander of Jerusalem knew Pantaenus personally, although they were acquainted with his ideas through Clement,[34] who preserves a comment of Pantaenus on the use of Hebrew tenses in the prophets.[35] He is said to have travelled to 'India' (probably southern Arabia), where he found a Gospel of Matthew in Hebrew, perhaps the same work which Jerome mentions as being in the library at Caesarea. It is possible that Origen owes him something in the matter of Hebrew learning, but impossible for us to judge how much or what.

Clement is a more concrete influence, from our point of view, but Clement's knowledge of Hebrew and of Judaism is tantalisingly difficult to assess. That he knew some Hebrew has been asserted,[36] and equally denied.[37] According to Krauss, Clement derived most of his knowledge of Judaism from Philo and Josephus, but this is to take an unnecessarily narrow view of Greek Judaism. Clement certainly knew these writers, and some of his allegorisations, especially the interpretations of names and numbers, have a Philonic ring, but it may be that these derive from subsequent sources, Jewish or Christian.[38] Clement himself says that he studied under a teacher of Hebrew origin in Palestine.[39] He very occasionally quotes aggadic material,[40] and this makes his influence on Origen important. Unfortunately, we do not have many such quotations, and Origen does not reproduce them in his extant writings.

That Origen studied under Clement is by no means certain,[41] but he may be presumed to have known something of Clement's work.

Another scholar of the time who has received but scant attention is Julius Africanus, celebrated for his correspondence with Origen over the authenticity of the story of Susanna. Africanus was born in the Roman colony of Aelia Capitolina (Jerusalem) and lived at Nicopolis (Emmaus), of which he is said to have been bishop. He flourished, according to Eusebius, under Gordian (238-244).[42] With the help of earlier writers, including no doubt Tatian, he produced a number of chronographical works, the most famous being the *Cesti.*[43] Photius[44] mentions these, together with a work called the *Historicum,* a concise but thorough history from the Creation to the advent of Christ, and brought briefly up to the time of writing, under Macrinus. Photius also mentions a letter to Aristides in which he explained away the apparent discrepancies between the genealogies of Jesus in Matthew and Luke. A considerable excerpt from this letter is preserved by Eusebius,[45] and further confirmation of his historical interests is given by a papyrus fragment from the *Cesti*[46] and a quotation preserved by Eusebius and Jerome about the Hebrews' reckoning of years.[47] It is against this background that we must read his correspondence with Origen; the Book of Daniel must have played an important part in his calculations, and he was concerned to establish the correct text. He was a careful scholar, and Origen takes him seriously, answering his enquiries point by point. Origen could rely on his help in questions of Jewish history.

Much of Origen's knowledge of Judaism came from his contacts with the Jews. A few hints about his motives and about the subject matter of his discussions with Jews are furnished by Origen himself. His interest in the pure exposition of Scripture, apart from any polemical interest, led him to enquire outside the Church for other exegetical traditions. 'Many people', he says, 'attempt to interpret the holy Scriptures, both within the Church and outside it - heretics, Jews and Samaritans - but they are not all right.'[48] The importance of scriptural exegesis for the heretical writers has been briefly alluded to above; the evidence for Origen's knowledge of the Samaritans will be discussed presently. The Jewish traditions were clearly important to him. He says that in expounding a difficult passage of the Bible the churchman will first enquire of Hebrew tradition,[49] and he provides several explicit examples of his own enquiries on specific questions. D. Barthélemy concludes from an investigation of the biblical quotations in certain texts of Philo copied at Caesarea that he had one or more Jews working in his *scriptorium,*[50] and this would help to explain simply how Origen

managed to include the Hebrew text of the Bible with a Greek transliteration in his Hexapla. In any case, he certainly had free access to several Jewish scholars who were prepared to pass on to him Jewish interpretations and traditions. One has the impression that Origen had been present at Jewish lectures or sermons, as, like Jerome, he occasionally prefaces an interpretation with the remark 'I once heard a Jew interpreting this passage and he said . . .'[51] Whether or not he had access to written Jewish commentaries (and if so whether these were in Greek or Hebrew) is impossible to say for certain. There was strong rabbinic opposition to the writing down of the oral Torah, but we know of certain exceptions, and it was in Origen's time that the Mishnah and some of the so-called halakhic commentaries were committed to writing. In several places Origen refers to Jewish *aporrheta* and *apocrypha*, some of which may have been rabbinic-type commentaries. He exercises, however, a good deal of freedom in his use of the terms. According to Harnack,[52] his vocabulary derives equally from rabbinic tradition and from Greek literary criticism.

A problem is posed by the frequent quotation of remarks and interpretations attributed to 'our predecessors'. In some of these places there is a strong presumption that the author was a Jew, in others a Christian origin seems equally likely. To quote Harnack again,[53] 'It is unfortunate that Origen is so vague in referring to his exegetical predecessors: Jewish tradition, Jewish exegetes (or only one), Christian exegetes, among them a converted Jew, can be distinguished, but nothing more.' Only the character of the material quoted can help in determining its origin.

A few words should be said here about Origen's disputations with Jews, which will be discussed more fully in chapter eight. In two separate passages of the *contra Celsum* Origen recollects debates he had had with Jewish sages,[54] and it is possible that his discussion with the Patriarch Huillus[55] had a polemical motive. As we should expect, he had a thorough knowledge of the arguments and counter-arguments of the dialogue between the Synagogue and the Church, and it may be presumed that some, at least, of his knowledge of Jewish interpretations stems from this source.

Before considering in detail the information which Origen gives us about his Jewish teachers, it will be as well to consider briefly the much-argued question of how much Hebrew Origen actually knew, since it bears on his contacts with Jews and the availability of rabbinic material, as well as on his use of the Hebrew Bible. In the first place it ought to be pointed out that this question is not as important as it has

sometimes been made to seem. The lingua franca of Palestine in the third century, as of all the eastern Empire, was Greek, and while there were Jews who spoke Aramaic and Hebrew (and probably even some who spoke Latin), there were probably few Jews in Palestine who could not speak Greek.[56] The rabbinic sources themselves testify to this, and their evidence is confirmed by that of the inscriptions. (The question of spoken Greek is to be distinguished from that of the study of Greek literature and philosophy, which was debated by the rabbis;[57] some rabbis even tolerated the use of Greek in the liturgy by Jews who could not understand Hebrew.[58]) The Mishnah and other legal works of the time are written in scholarly Hebrew, and so far as we know no attempt was made to translate them into Greek for the use of the populace. The rabbis were, we must assume, entrusted with the task of expounding and interpreting the oral law to the people, just as they expounded and interpreted the written law. Origen will thus have had no more difficulty, given his relations with Jewish scholars, in gaining access to the traditions and writings of the rabbis than if they had been written in Greek, no more difficulty, that is to say, than any Greek-speaking Jew. We should suppose that he learned something of the character of the language, and also some vocabulary, from his frequent inquiries and discussions, but it is by no means inconceivable that he relied entirely for his knowledge of Hebrew texts on his Jewish colleagues. The copying of the Hebrew text of the Bible for the Hexapla and its word-by-word comparison with the Greek transliteration and versions may equally be due to a Jewish assistant or assistants. Such an hypothesis exactly fits the evidence as we have it in Origen's surviving works. It is clear that he was interested in the language but that he could not read it easily; he often neglects to consult the Hebrew Bible when we should expect him to have done so, and he appears in some cases to rely on others for the readings he does give.[59] Where he does allow himself a comment or an interpretation based on the Hebrew he is often vague and hesitant, and very often simply wrong.[60] It only requires a cursory comparison of Origen's remarks with those of Jerome, who had a good knowledge of the language, to point the difference in practice. We shall not be far from the truth if we conclude that Origen could not speak or read Hebrew, but that he was fortunate in having acquaintances who did, and who gave him such help as he demanded.[61] It stands to Origen's credit that he took even this amount of trouble.

These conclusions might never have been doubted were it not for the statements of Eusebius and Jerome that Origen made a thorough study

of Hebrew. Eusebius, writing about the Hexapla, says that 'so accurate was the examination which Origen brought to bear on the words of Scripture that he even made a thorough study (*ekmathein*) of the Hebrew language, and made his own the original writings in Hebrew characters which were in use among the Jews'.[62] Those who have taken this statement at its face value have dated Origen's study of Hebrew to the reign of Caracalla,[63] but in fact Eusebius implies no particular date. Jerome[64] speaks of Origen's Hebrew learning as common knowledge. In his letter to Paula on the death of her daughter Blaesilla[65] Jerome says, comparing Blaesilla to Origen, 'ita Hebraeae linguae uicerat difficultates ut in dicendis canendisque psalmis cum matre contenderet', and this has been taken by some as showing, not only that Origen's mother was Jewish, but that she taught him Hebrew at an early age. In fact the subject of the sentence is Blaesilla, and 'cum matre' refers to Paula,[66] but the passage is further evidence of Jerome's belief that Origen had learnt Hebrew. In view of the evidence from Origen himself, Eusebius' and Jerome's remarks must be attributed to an over-enthusiastic assumption based on Origen's quotations of Hebrew words and his incorporation of the Hebrew Bible in his Hexapla.[67]

We must turn now to the question of the Jews whom Origen consulted and whose statements he quotes. It is clear from what he himself says that there were several of these, but his lack of precision makes it difficult to identify them and has generated a great deal of confusion.

Jerome[68] says that Origen mentioned by name the patriarch Huillus, who was his contemporary. Jerome mentions a teaching of this patriarch about certain Psalms, and also says that Origen ended Book XXX of his commentary on Isaiah with his interpretation of Isaiah xxix.1ff. The second of these references is lost, but the former survives in a Greek fragment on the Psalter, perhaps from the introduction to Origen's commentary, in which he recollects a discussion with 'Ioullos the patriarch and one with the title of Sage among the Jews'.[69] It is strange that Jerome should have replaced the name Ioullos by the less familiar name Huillus; perhaps Huillus should be restored in the text of Origen. Neither name suggests that of a known patriarch of the period, the two obvious contenders being Gamliel III and his son Judah II. G. F. Moore[70] thought that 'Ioullos' might be a corruption of 'Ioudas', and proposed identifying Origen's teacher with Judah II, but the corruption is unlikely. H. Graetz[71] proposed another solution to the problem, that 'Ioullos' represents the Hebrew name Hillel,[72] and that

this was a younger son of Gamliel III and brother of Judah II, who was favoured by his father and brought up to succeed him, but debarred from the succession by the rule of primogeniture. It is argued that a similar case is attested in the case of the sons of Judah I,[73] and there is a reference in the letter to Africanus to 'a learned Hebrew, the son of one with the title of Sage among them, brought up to succeed his father'.[74] This suggestion, which has been widely accepted,[75] is hypothetical from beginning to end and is open to several serious objections. In the letter to Africanus Origen speaks of the son of a rabbi, not of a patriarch, while in the other text he refers to a patriarch, not the son of a patriarch. Graetz explains this away as a slip of memory, but the explanation is not convincing, any more than the historical situation envisaged, in which the patriarch is supposed to be unaware of the impossibility of his younger son's succeeding him in office.

If the suggestions of Moore and Graetz are both dismissed, only one plausible possibility remains: that this was not the patriarch who was the titular head of the whole Jewish community of the Empire, but the head of a local community. This solution was proposed by D. Vallarsi[76] as long ago as 1735, but never seems to have been taken up by subsequent scholars. If it is correct, it may explain why Origen uses the term 'patriarch' here, while twice elsewhere he refers to the patriarch as 'ethnarch'.[77]

It might be argued that Huillus or Ioullos was patriarch of the Jewish community of Alexandria, since according to Eusebius[78] the commentaries on the early part of the Psalter were composed there. Again, the tradition ascribed to the 'learned Hebrew' in the passage of the letter to Africanus just mentioned is also reproduced by Jerome,[79] who purports to be quoting from Book X of the *Stromateis,* a work dated by Eusebius[80] to the Alexandrian period on the authority of an autograph note by Origen himself. While it is true that Origen does quote Jewish traditions in his Alexandrian works, it would be unsafe to pursue this line of reasoning. In the first place, the introduction to the commentary on the Psalter must be presumed to have been written after the rest of the work was complete, and it probably belongs to a late period in Origen's life. As for Jerome's quotation, we must be certain that it really comes from the *Stromateis* before any argument can be founded on it; it looks suspiciously as though it may be taken from the letter to Africanus. But even if it is from the *Stromateis* it tells us nothing about 'Huillus', whose identification with the 'learned Hebrew' is extremely dubious.

It is likely that 'Huillus' was the source of several more remarks preserved by Origen, but it must be frankly admitted that it is impossible to pin them down. Teachings are attributed to 'a noted man among the Hebrews',[81] 'the teacher of the Hebrews',[82] and frequently to 'the Hebrew'. This last title will be discussed more fully shortly. In the absence of corroborative evidence, it would be rash to suppose that these are ways of alluding indirectly to 'Huillus'.

No other Jewish teacher is mentioned by name, but Origen himself says that he consulted many Jews,[83] and he sometimes quotes more than one of them in the same passage.[84] Some scholars have seen a reference in the fragment on the Psalter which has just been discussed to two Jewish teachers, 'the patriarch' and 'one with the title of Sage among the Jews', and they have even suggested that this latter rabbi was Hoshaya 'the Great', who lived and taught in Caesarea at the same time as Origen.[85] Whether or not Origen records any teachings of Hoshaya is an open question,[86] but it is highly probable that he was well acquainted with the foremost Jewish teacher of Caesarea in his day. On the other hand, in the passage in question Origen seems to intend both descriptions to apply to one man, since the verb is in the singular.

At least one of Origen's Jewish informants was a convert to Christianity,[87] and it may be that he made use of several converted Jews. It has even been suggested that 'the Hebrew' was a Christian.[88] This line should not be pursued too far. It is clear that Origen prided himself on his contacts with *Jewish* Jews, and that he had a number of such contacts.

There are many passages in which Origen attributes a teaching to 'the Hebrews',[89] 'a Hebrew'[90] or 'the Hebrew'. 'The Hebrew' is mentioned in works from Origen's Alexandrian period,[91] so that he seems to have made his acquaintance early; his remarks are quoted in the remains of the Hexapla and in many catenic fragments,[92] not all of which are ascribed to Origen. Various attempts have been made to unravel the tangled evidence and to discover the identity of this elusive character.

F. Field, in the introduction to his edition of the Hexaplaric remains, distinguished three different references of 'the Hebrew' in the fragments, viz. the second column (transliteration of the Hebrew), the first column (Hebrew text) and an interpreter, often found associated with 'the Syrian'.[93] Field's grounds for distinguishing in Greek quotations between the first and second columns are obscure, but he is certainly right when he says that *ho Hebraios*, like *to Hebraïkon*, refers to the Hebrew text. Field says that in the Syriac version the sign ' or *'b*

always introduces a reading from the Hebrew text, and never an interpretation by 'the Hebrew', who seems to be unknown to the Syro-hexaplar version. When Field comes to speak of 'the Hebrew', whose readings are quoted by several Fathers besides Origen, he argues that since these readings sometimes agree with and sometimes differ from the Hebrew text as we have it now this cannot be 'the Hebrew Bible', nor, since he sometimes explains rather than translates, can the name refer merely to a version of the Bible, as had previously been suggested. Field draws the conclusion that 'the Hebrew' may refer to the Jewish teachers quoted by the Fathers, but that since the term includes the definite article, more probably it refers to one, anonymous, Jew (or Christian) who knew both Greek and Hebrew and made a free and elegant translation of certain books of the Bible. Field rejects the suggestion that it can refer to Aquila's version, and this seems right, for the simple reason that Origen habitually mentions Aquila's name when quoting his version, and sometimes quotes the different readings of Aquila and 'the Hebrew' together.[94] R. P. C. Hanson, like Field, has maintained that all the material derived from 'the Hebrew', readings and traditions, must be taken together.[95] 'We may conjecture', he says, 'that part at least of this store of Rabbinic tradition came from a single Rabbi whom Origen knew personally either in Alexandria, in his later days there, or in Caesarea.'[96] Hanson suggested[97] that 'the Hebrew' might be Resh Lakish, a suggestion which he later withdrew on noticing his interpretation of the two seraphim, an interpretation which he claims must be Christian and cannot be Jewish.[98]

It should be observed that we have three different kinds of information attributed to 'the Hebrew': Hebrew readings, Greek readings and 'traditions'. Field (and Hanson) chose to group the Greek readings with the 'traditions', as against the Hebrew readings, but there is no reason to suppose that they are anything but Origen's translation of what the Hebrew text said, just as Jerome, quoting the Hebrew Bible, frequently gives a Latin translation. These translations show, as we should expect, the influence of the Jewish exegete or exegetes on whose help Origen relied.[99]

The interpretations and traditions related to Origen verbally by 'the Hebrew' are another matter entirely. The use of the definite article suggests that this was one man, who would be familiar to Origen's readers, but it is difficult to acquit Origen of a certain obscurity. Jerome occasionally prefaces an interpretation with the words 'referebat mihi Hebraeus',[100] but more often he speaks of 'Hebraeus

quo Scripturas sanctas instituente perlegi', 'Hebraeus qui me in Scripturis erudiuit', or some such phrase of definite reference.[101] Jerome, of course, also mentions by name his Hebrew teacher, Bar Hanina.[102] In Origen's case there is no such clear reference to one man. The only Jewish teacher mentioned by name is 'Huillus',[103] but, as has been pointed out above, he refers to several different Jews. According to Jerome,[104] Origen, Clement, Eusebius and others, when they want to lend authority to what they say, are in the habit of saying 'referebat mihi Hebraeus', 'audiui ab Hebraeo' or 'Hebraeorum illa sententia est'. This might be taken to mean that, in Jerome's opinion, the phrase was simply a rhetorical device, but the context of his argument, a defence of Jewish scholarship, militates against such an interpretation.

We must conclude that the identity of 'the Patriarch Huillus' and 'the Hebrew' remains a mystery, despite the various ingenious or ingenuous attempts that have been made to identify them with particular Jewish teachers. If we survey the field,[105] we must be struck again and again by the similarities between Origen's ideas and those of the Palestinian rabbis of the third and early fourth centuries. Resh Lakish, whom Hanson was inclined to identify with 'the Hebrew', is only one of a group of such rabbis, most remarkable of whom from this point of view was his younger contemporary R. Abbahu. Resh Lakish was a brother-in-law of the great Palestinian Amora R. Johanan, and both of them are said to have seen R. Judah I.[106] Resh Lakish was involved in the rescue of R. Johanan's pupil R. Issi (or Assi) from 'Sifsifa', where he was imprisoned after a riot, probably in the early 270s under Zenobia. His life therefore spanned the first three-quarters of the third century. Though he was probably too young to have been the author of the remarks attributed to 'the Hebrew' in Origen's earlier works, a connexion with Origen is not ruled out. The same is true of R. Samuel b. Nahman, who was also probably born before the death of R. Judah I.[107] He is said to have met Zenobia,[108] and was an intimate friend of the patriarch R. Judah II, with whom, we are told, he once went to meet Diocletian. R. Abbahu of Caesarea was younger than any of these, although, as we have seen,[109] he visited Caesarea with Resh Lakish. He is said to have been on excellent terms with the Roman provincial government at Caesarea and to have encouraged Greek studies among Jews. We have several accounts of his discussions with non-Jews, including Christians, and he echoes several of Origen's pet themes.[110]

Of earlier rabbis we should note R. Eleazar b. Eleazar ha-Kappar ('Bar Kappara'), a pupil of R. Judah I, who set up the academy of

Caesarea which produced R. Hoshaya, R. Joshua b. Levi and others. Bar Kappara is known for his approval of the study of Greek literature and natural science, for his love of poetry and fables, and for his opposition to asceticism.[111] R. Hoshaya was associated with Origen by Bacher,[112] and has received sufficient notice from subsequent scholars to be passed over briefly here. Rab, perhaps the most remarkable of the Babylonian Amoraim, received his early training in Palestine, but returned to Babylonia early in the third century.[113] He reflects many of Origen's interests, such as the interpretation of names and the symbolic exegesis of Scripture, and several of his dicta coincide with Jewish teachings recorded by Origen.[114] If actual contact with Origen is historically improbable in his case, at least he is a valuable source for various Palestinian Jewish ideas of the time which Origen knew. In the case of the other rabbis mentioned here some kind of association with Origen is at least possible. All of them probably visited Caesarea at some time, and Origen no doubt visited during his life all the important centres of Jewish scholarship in Palestine. Attempts to connect discussions mentioned in the rabbinic sources with Origen are inconclusive, but both the rabbinic literature and the writings of Origen testify to a lively debate at this time between the Church and the Synagogue.

3

THE JEWS

Terminology

Before considering how much Origen knew about the Jews of his day, we should pay some attention to his terminology. Today we speak easily about 'Rabbinic' and 'Hellenistic' Judaism, about 'Jewish Christians' and so forth, but these are modern terms, which would have meant little to the ancients. Origen refers to the Jews by several terms, and the nuances which attach to each particular expression are not easy to disentangle.

The usual Hebrew for 'Jew', in the singular or plural, was 'Israel'. In Greek, too, Palestinian Jews called themselves 'Israel'; their land was the land of Israel, and it is only very rarely that we find a Palestinian Jew calling himself *Ioudaios* ('Jew').[1] Conversely in the diaspora the term 'Israel' is rare, a formal term with heavy religious overtones. This use of the word is borne out by Origen, who uses 'Israel' only in biblical quotations and in arguments depending on such quotations, particularly when he is influenced by Pauline usage. It is not a natural Greek expression to refer to Jews, past or present.

The difference between the two Greek terms *Ioudaios* and *Hebraios* is hard to define precisely. Usage varied considerably from time to time and place to place, but the basic distinctions seem to be as follows:

(i) The ancient Israelites were *Hebraioi,* contemporary Jews *Ioudaioi.* So Josephus says 'the Jews were originally called Hebrews'[2] and Tertullian, 'those who are now called Jews were previously called Hebrews'.[3] Hebrews (*'Ibrim*) is the name used in the Bible of the Israelites in Egypt; it was taken up by Jewish apologists, and plays a part too in Origen's theory of election, as will be seen.

(ii) Although *Ioudaioi* in various places and periods was neutral in its connotations it did easily tend to take on derogatory overtones, in which case *Hebraioi* became the polite word for the Jews.[4]

(iii) The adjective *Hebraïkos* was of course used for the Hebrew language and alphabet,[5] and so *Hebraioi* could refer to Hebrew- or Aramaic-speaking Jews as opposed to *Hellenistai* or *Hellenes.* Thus the Mishnah,[6] referring to witnesses to a writ of divorce, distinguishes between 'Hebrew' and 'Greek' witnesses, according to the language of the signature. In both cases the witnesses must be Jews. Similarly Philo, giving the interpretation of a Hebrew name, can say, 'It is as the Hebrews say it "Phanouel", or, as we would say, "God's turning" '[7], and so *par' Hebraiois* or *hupo Hebraiōn* in Philo can mean simply 'in Hebrew'. We may compare also Acts vi.1, where *Hebraioi* and *Hellenistai* are contrasted. Such texts have been cited in an attempt to prove that *Hebraioi* when used of contemporary Jews always means Palestinian or Aramaic-speaking Jews. This is to go beyond the evidence. The *Hebraioi* commemorated on inscriptions in Rome all apparently spoke Greek (one stone alone is in Aramaic with a Greek translation).[8] 'Makedonios the Hebrew, a Caesarean of Palestine'[9] is certainly a Palestinian who died in Rome, but his name, the language of the inscription and even his city of origin suggest a Hellenized Jew. Another stone[10] is of a 'Hebrew child' who has a Latin name (Caelius Quintus). This is not to say that *Hebraios* cannot have any or all of these possible meanings, only that one must beware of generalising; it is unsafe to draw analogies from one period or from one part of the Empire to another.

Leaving aside for the moment the passages where Origen uses *Hebraioi* in the special sense of ancient Israel or the chosen people, we have a large number of cases where he uses the word of contemporary Jews. This is always in the context of his philological investigations. Origen had Jewish friends and teachers, as we have seen, whom he called *Hebraioi.* The Hebrew language is never far in the background, but this may be as much a consequence of the subject matter as of the meaning of the word. There is nothing to urge, and indeed much to counter, the suggestion that Origen's *Hebraioi* are necessarily 'rabbinic' or Aramaic-speaking Jews, or even that Origen made this distinction. With his use of *Hebraioi* we may contrast that of *Ioudaioi.* If the connotations of *Hebraioi* are philological, those of *Ioudaioi* are polemical. *Ioudaioi* is used in the context of the confrontation of the Church and the Synagogue: in recalling debates or disputations, in condemning the Jews for rejecting and killing Jesus, in criticising Jewish literalism in the interpretation of the biblical law.[11] This practical distinction in the use of the words coincides with the two different

kinds of context in which Origen has occasion frequently to refer to Jews. The connexion of *Hebraios* with the Hebrew language no doubt encouraged the choice of *Hebraioi* in the philological context, but more important than the meaning of the words must have been the nuance usually conveyed by the intonation and the intention of the speaker: *Ioudaios,* in many mouths, was a sneering expression, even perhaps a term of abuse; *Hebraios,* on the other hand, was a liberal's word, leaning over backwards to give no offence. It was Origen's dilemma that as a theologian he must condemn the Jews while as a scholar and exegete he depended on them. The dilemma is not resolved, but concealed, by using a different word in each case for the same people.[12]

There is another use of *Hebraioi,* which is important because it represents a new, completely Christian, development of the term. In the opening chapters of Exodus 'Hebrews' is used for the Israelites. It had been alleged by the Egyptian polemical writers that the Jews were originally undesirable Egyptians who were expelled from Egypt and made their home in Judaea.[13] This allegation Josephus had refuted,[14] but Celsus raised the charge again, claiming that the Jews were Egyptians who left Egypt after revolting against the Egyptian community and the religious customs of Egypt.[15] Origen's reply is that the Jews were in fact not Egyptians but Hebrews, who were driven to Egypt by a famine in Judaea and were there enslaved by the Egyptians; that otherwise they could not immediately on leaving Egypt have formed themselves into a nation and invented a language of their own, but that the fact of their speaking Hebrew and having Hebrew names proves that they were of Hebrew stock.[16]

In thus insisting on the Hebrew origins of the Jews Origen's purpose is not simply to defend the Jews but also to delve back into the origins of Christianity. The Hebrews are the spiritual ancestors of the Christian Church, and the symbolism of the Exodus from Egypt is as important for Christians as for Jews. Eventually, as in the case of 'Israel', the name can actually be removed from the Jews and attached to the Church, and can act retrospectively, so that all Hebrews who have ever lived, even before the advent of Christ, can somehow be counted as Christians. This doctrine is admittedly not thoroughly worked out by Origen; it is more fully realised by Eusebius, who sees the Christian way of life not as something new but as extending back even beyond the flood; in such figures as Enosh, Enoch, Melchizedek and the Patriarchs he saw evidence of a religion free from the Jewish rituals, expressing a purer relationship with God. Such people, he says, cannot truly be called

Jews, but still less are they Greeks, since they were monotheists. The best name for them is Hebrews, 'either from Eber, or from the interpretation of the name: they are called "crossers over" (*peratikoi*), because they set out to cross over from this worldly life to the contemplation of the God of all things'.[17] This etymological approach is earlier than Eusebius; it is found in the rabbinic writings, and also in Africanus and Origen. Africanus rejected the derivation from Eber, son of Salah, Abraham's ancestor,[18] and adopted instead the explanation that the word means 'those who have crossed over'.[19] Origen accepted this explanation: Abraham is called a *peratēs* in Genesis xiv.13 'because from the land of the Chaldeans he crossed Mesopotamia and came to the territory of the Canaanites',[20] and the people of God are called 'Hebrews' because they crossed from Egypt to the promised land, from darkness to light, from death to life.[21] Following Philo, who sees in 'Hebrews' a reference to the ability to reject perceptible in favour of intelligible things,[22] Origen applies the term to the disciples of Jesus, who transcended the visible and corporeal and attained the invisible and eternal.[23] This 'mystical' interpretation of the word 'Hebrew' allows Origen to call the Christian Church the 'crossing over and true Hebrews',[24] just as elsewhere the true *Ioudaioi* are said to be the Christians.[25] Origen has thus prepared the ground for Eusebius' complete repainting of the traditional picture of Jewish history, which finally redefines *Hebraioi*, so that it can stand in contrast to *Ioudaioi*.[26]

Like 'Hebrew' the words 'Israel' and 'Jew' can also be used of Christians and the Church,[27] again with a play on the supposed etymology (*Israel* = '(man) who sees God',[28] *Ioudaios* = 'confessor'[29]). This usage is derived from that of Paul, notably in such passages as Rom. ii.28f. and ix.6f. 'Israel', besides its use to refer to the ancient Israelites, easily develops into a term for the Church, heir to the ancient promises. *Ioudaios*, on the other hand, retains as its commoner meaning 'Jew' as opposed to 'Christian', and comes to be particularly associated with literalism in the interpretation of Scripture,[30] so that the adverb *Ioudaïkōs* can mean little more than 'literally'.[31] It often, though not always,[32] has hostile or derogatory overtones.[33]

Origen also uses as a term for 'Jews' the phrase 'those from the circumcision'. Although this can mean Jewish as opposed to gentile Christians (cf. Acts x.45),[34] it more commonly refers to Jews as opposed to Christians.[35] He also speaks of 'those who live according to the law',[36] and occasionally refers to Jews of rabbinic type as 'Pharisees'.[37] These are the only distinctions which Origen can for certain be said to draw between Jew and Jew. Jewish converts to

Christianity are, as we should expect, referred to as *hoi apo Hebraiōn*.[38] Of *Ioudaïzontes* something will be said below;[39] they were either Christians who affected Jewish ways or Jewish converts who persisted in adhering to the observance of the commandments.

Jewish institutions

The most important information Origen has to offer about the Jewish institutions of his day concerns the Patriarchate. The office of Patriarch was in some sense a survival of the monarchy, adapted to suit the needs of rabbinic Judaism and subjection to Roman rule. This is not to be taken as implying a direct succession of personalities. The natural end of the monarchy and of the high-priesthood coincided with the rise of rabbinic Judaism, and after the extinction of Jewish autonomy the rabbis arrogated to themselves those powers of the kings and high priests which were consistent with Roman rule and vested them in one of their number. If the principle of hereditary succession was at first introduced by the Romans,[40] it was accepted and eventually strongly defended by the rabbis. The successor of R. Johanan b. Zakkai as head of the academy of Jamnia, Rabban Gamliel, who was a descendant of Hillel in the direct line, took the title of Nasi, which was used by Ezekiel of the future Davidic king.[41] He may be considered as the first patriarch,[42] and his direct descendants continued to hold the title until, with the extinction of the line, the Patriarchate too became extinct. R. Simeon, the son of Rabban Gamliel, increased the powers and dignities of the Patriarchate, though he met with some opposition, we are told, from the other officers of the Rabbinic court, R. Meir, the 'Sage' (*ḥakam*), and R. Nathan, the head of the court (*ab beth-din*).[43] His son, R. Judah, 'the Nasi', also known simply as 'Rabbi', further added to the dignity of the Patriarch, claiming, as was shown by Israel Lévi,[44] descent from King David. This spurious genealogy was supported with arguments and even, apparently, with documents.[45] According to Origen, there were those who claimed that a descendant of Judah still ruled the people as ethnarch, and that his seed should not fail until the advent of the Messiah.[46] He also remarks, emphasising that he speaks from experience, that the Ethnarch 'in no way differs from a king of the nation'.[47] Origen here adds that 'they also hold secret trials, and condemn some persons to death'; elsewhere, however, he denies that Jewish magistrates have the right to perform executions: 'The Jews may not punish a murderer or stone an adulteress'.[48] The question of capital jurisdiction is a thorny one. Probably Origen is right in both places: the Jews had no right to execute capital sentences, but

in practice the Roman authorities turned a blind eye. As Origen says, the patriarchs act 'neither with the full cognizance of the authorities, nor entirely without their knowledge'.[49]

The title of the Nasi in Greek was either *ethnarchēs* or *patriarchēs*. 'Ethnarch' was the older, Hellenistic, title, which had been borne by Simon Maccabaeus, Hyrcanus II and Herod Archelaus, and by the head of the Jewish community in Alexandria, and no doubt elsewhere.[50] According to Juster,[51] the laws prefer the title 'Patriarch', 'comme d'allure plus latine'. From the fourth century on, in Greek and Latin documents, 'patriarch' is the usual title of the Nasi. Origen three times has occasion to refer to the office: twice he uses 'ethnarch'[52] and once 'patriarch';[53] Rufinus, in his translation of the *Principles,* renders *ethnarchēn* by *patriarcham.* Of the authorities quoted by Juster,[54] only Origen uses the term *ethnarchēs*: it would seem that 'ethnarch', the earlier term, was gradually replaced by 'patriarch', and that the transition occurs in the time of Origen.[55]

In the passage of the letter to Julius Africanus mentioned above Origen aludes to the *didrachmon,* the 'Jewish tax' which was diverted by Vespasian from the Temple treasury to that of Jupiter Capitolinus. This is the latest evidence for the payment of the *didrachmon* in the pagan Empire.[56]

Of the Sanhedrin, the Rabbinic court, Origen makes no mention,[57] but he was acquainted with Jewish rabbis, whom he calls by the equivalent Greek title, *didaskalos,* 'teacher'.[58] He also uses the word *sophoi,* 'sages'. The fact that this is found with the verb *chrēmatizein,* 'to bear the title',[59] suggests that it was a technical term, and we may so take it when it occurs with other, similar verbs.[60] The same usage is found in Jerome, who mentions 'those who are called "Sages" (*sapientes*) among them',[61] and says that 'their teachers (*doctores*) are called *sophoi,* that is Sages, and whenever on certain days they expound their traditions to their disciples, they are in the habit of saying *hoi sophoi deuterōsin,* i.e. "the Sages teach traditions" '.[62]

Jerome further recalls hearing at Lydda a Hebrew 'who was called Sage and *deuterōtēs* among them'.[63] This second term, *deuterōtēs,* translates the Aramaic term *tanna,* an expounder of the oral law (Hebrew *mishnah,* Aramaic *mathnitha*).[64] *Deuterōtēs* is common in both Greek and Latin writers of the fourth century, particularly in Eusebius and Jerome,[65] who are known to have relied on Origen for much of their information on Jewish affairs, but not in any earlier source. *Deuterōsis* (for *mishnah*) is found, in the plural, in Rufinus' translation of the prologue to Origen's commentary on the Song of

Songs;[66] it is probable that Rufinus reproduces Origen's own word - and this would thus be our earliest example of the usage.[67]

Jerome's expression *hoi sophoi deuterōsin* closely resembles the common rabbinic formula *tᵉnō rabbanan,* 'our rabbis teach' (always used to introduce a tannaitic teaching). This suggests that *sophos* translates the Hebrew term *rabbi.* It is worth pointing out, however, that more literally *sophoi* translates *ḥakamim,* which (together with *talmidei ḥakamim,* 'disciples of the sages')[68] is the common designation of Jewish scholars in the rabbinic literature.[69]

Jewish sects

Origen has something to say about the sects among the Jews, both in New Testament times and in his own day. With the older sects[70] we are not here concerned; ample material was available to Origen, especially in the New Testament and the writings of Josephus,[71] so that what he says tells us nothing about his Jewish contacts, nor does it add anything to our knowledge of the period.

A curious feature of Origen's usage is his application of the word 'Pharisees' to literalist, rabbinic Jews of his own day. It is 'those who do everything so as to be seen by their fellow-men, the Scribes and Pharisees' (cf. Matthew xxiii.5), who wear phylacteries,[72] and it is the Scribes and Pharisees, again, who are responsible for the halakhic explanation of the *qorban.*[73] In a fragment on John iii.1,[74] writing in the present tense, Origen says, 'Pharisees are men who belong to the highest class and sect in Judaism, who claim to have a well-balanced way of life and an accurate understanding of the law and prophets. Hence they are brash and arrogant, and this is the origin of their name. For *phares* in Hebrew means 'he who is cut off'; since they, too, cut themselves off from the entire Jewish nation, as holding to a superior philosophy and way of life, they wish to take their name from *phares.*'[75]

Jerome refers to the rabbis as Pharisees in the celebrated passage in which he speaks of the Minim, whom he equates with the Nazarenes, or Christian Jews: 'What should I say of the Ebionites, who pretend to be Christians? To this day throughout all the synagogues of the East there is a sect among the Jews which is called that of the Minaei, and which is even now condemned by the Pharisees, who commonly call them Nazaraei. They believe in Christ as the son of God, born of the Virgin Mary, and say that he it was who suffered under Pontius Pilate and rose again, in whom we too believe. But while they wish to be both Jews and Christians, in fact they are neither.'[76] Jerome often mentions these

Nazaræi, or Nazareni,[77] and he also knows that the Jews call the Christians 'Nazareni'.[78] Origen, though he was acquainted with Jewish converts to Christianity,[79] does not speak of Nazarenes, but he does mention the Ebionites. These are Jews who accept Jesus as the Messiah,[80] but with some reservations. They still keep to the Jewish law and observe its commandments.[81] Some of them think Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary, but the vast majority accept the virgin birth.[82] They reject the Pauline epistles, and malign Paul for his antinomianism.[83] They take their name from *ebion,* the Hebrew for 'poor', because of the poverty of their faith in Christ and their attitude to the law.[84]

Similar in some respects to the Ebionites in their outlook are the Elkesaites, whose doctrine, Origen says, 'has recently reared its head in the churches'. Elkesaism 'rejects some parts of the Bible, and makes use of excerpts from the Old Testament and the Gospels, but rejects the Apostle entirely'.[85] There is no reason to regard it as a Jewish sect, although Epiphanius[86] says that 'Elkesai came from Judaism and was Jewish in his outlook'.

Origen frequently attacks in his homilies the observance by Christians of the Jewish fasts and feasts; what he does not make clear is whether the offenders were Jews who had embraced Christianity or Christians who were attracted to the outward forms of Judaism. One imagines that in Palestine, as elsewhere, such religious barriers were not strong enough to prevent the people from making certain concessions in either direction. Origen was conscious of addressing on Sunday some who had been to synagogue the previous day.[87] It must be conceded that there were Jews who accepted Jesus as the Messiah, but continued to observe the *mişwoth*; it has been strongly argued by Marmorstein[88] that it is these who are referred to in the rabbinic literature by the title *posh'ei Yisrael,* 'Jewish sinners'.

Finally, there are the Samaritans, whose name means 'guardians'.[89] The salient fact about them is that they only accept the five books of Moses,[90] and hold firmly to the Mosaic law, rejecting the doctrine of the survival of the soul after death.[91] The Samaritan teacher Marqah, however, writing not long after Origen,[92] specifically accepts resurrection,[93] and from his time on it seems to have formed a part of Samaritan belief.[94] As J. E. H. Thomson says,[95] Marqah's evidence must be accepted; J. A. Montgomery explains the discrepancy as follows:[96] the Samaritans originally, adopting the 'old-fashioned Sadducean position', denied resurrection, and so were considered as heretics by the rabbis. Later they accepted the notion, but one

Dosithean sect denied it, and continued to deny it centuries later.[97] The Samaritans, according to Origen, are persecuted by the Romans for their illegal circumcision, but nevertheless do not give up being circumcised.[98] Origen consulted their Hebrew Pentateuch, fuller in form than the Jewish, and a version, the *Samaritikon,* which is either the Aramaic Targum of the Samaritans or a Greek version, close to the Targum in its renderings, now lost.[99] He also refers to a Samaritan sect, the Dositheans, who revered Dositheus as the Messiah and treasured his books and the stories about him.[100] He mentions Dositheus' strictness in interpreting the Sabbath laws.[101] The Dositheans, he says, have never flourished; their whole number is said not to amount to thirty.[102] The Samaritans were well distributed throughout the cities of Palestine, and in any case Samaria was less than thirty miles from Caesarea. It is not surprising that Origen was interested in their rich and strange tradition; what is surprising is that he does give them any place in his theology;[103] he does not regard them as a separate nation or religion, but seems to see them as a sect of Judaism. This may speak for easy relations between Jews and Samaritans at the time, or for the lack of importance and articulateness of the Samaritans at this period, before the advent of their great theologian, Marqah.[104]

4

JUDAISM

With such Jewish observances as circumcision,[1] the dietary laws[2] and the festivals,[3] Origen was familiar from a number of sources, from the Old and New Testaments, from Josephus and elsewhere; they were common knowledge, and they played a part in the debates between Jews and pagans[4] and between the Church and Jews and Judaisers.[5] In addition, Origen had a good deal of knowledge about Jewish practices which was acquired at first hand. He was familiar, for example, with the Jewish calendar. He speaks of 'the month of Nisan, when the Passover is held' and 'the following month, Iyar',[6] and he refers in his homilies to the approach of Jewish festivals.[7] He shows a remarkable knowledge of the Paschal 'search for leaven': 'As the dawn of the day of unleavened bread approaches they clear out all the old leaven, inspecting closely every part of their houses in case any leaven should be found there.'[8] Commenting on Matthew xxiii.5, he says that 'the Scribes and Pharisees' write certain passages of the law on two small pieces of parchment and bind one to their head and the other onto their arm, and call them 'phylacteries'. 'Similarly, finding something in Deuteronomy (xxii.12) about fringes, they consider that they are keeping the law by making some sort of fringe on a part of their clothing.'[9]

This information would not have been difficult for Origen to acquire, but it does show his interest in Jewish practices not directly relevant to the debate between Church and Synagogue. It is also useful external evidence for the dating of some of these observances. What is more remarkable is Origen's knowledge of some of the detailed halakhic rules governing the observance of the laws. This is particularly interesting because he wrote so soon after the compilation of the Mishnah and may have learnt of them from pupils of R. Judah I. In some details Origen's information supplements the halakhoth preserved

in the Mishnah. Most of it is to be found in the section of the *de Principiis* which is reproduced in the first chapter of the *Philocalia.* Since the *de Principiis* is dated to Origen's Alexandrian period, his interest in halakhah may have begun early, cultivated perhaps - since one hesitates to speak of 'rabbinic' schools in Alexandria at this time[10] - during his first visit to Palestine. But it is not impossible that he revised the work much later in his life.

The fullest discussion concerns the rules for the observance of the Sabbath. Pointing out the impossibility of observing literally the injunction in Exodus xvi.29, 'Let no man go out from his place on the Sabbath day', Origen adds, 'Therefore those of the circumcision, and those who will admit nothing beyond the literal meaning. . . say that "every man's place" means a distance of 2,000 cubits.'[11] This is a reference to the *'erub,* the Sabbath-limit, within which, with certain limitations, the life of a city could continue on the Sabbath. This had been fixed at 2,000 cubits at least as early as the time of R. Akiba (before 135), who (it is said) on a notable occasion succeeded in harmonising the apparently contradictory verses Numbers xxxv.4 and 5 by ruling that the 1,000 cubits of v. 4 are the 'outskirts' (the area surrounding the city and belonging to it), while the 2,000 of v. 5 are the *'erub.*[12] At the same time the doctrine was developed of a personal *'erub,* a notional space of 2,000 cubits' radius which surrounds a man wherever he happens to be on the Sabbath and gives him the right to move 2,000 cubits, or sometimes even more, in one direction independently of the *'erub.*[13]

The strictness of the rules for the observance of the Sabbath among the Palestinian Jews and the Samaritans may have been well known in antiquity, but probably not in the detail in which Origen quotes them. With reference to the carrying of burdens he says that a sandal with nails is technically a burden, whereas one without nails is not; anything carried on one shoulder is a burden, but not what is carried on both shoulders.[14] According to the Mishnah,[15] 'a man may not go out wearing sandals shod with nails'. As for carrying loads on the shoulders, the rule is[16] that one may not carry anything 'on the shoulder', because this was the way the sons of Kohath carried their load. Any accepted way of carrying burdens was forbidden, but more original ways (e.g. on the back of the hand, with the foot, in the mouth, in the crook of the elbow) were permitted. The Mishnah does not add specifically, although it might have done so, that since the sons of Kohath carried on one shoulder (Numbers vii.9, cf. I Chronicles xv.15), carrying on both shoulders was permitted.

About the dietary laws Origen has nothing to say beyond mentioning the biblical prohibitions and railing at the absurdity of their literal observance.[17] He mentions, on the other hand, the laws of sacrifices as being completely anachronistic and impossible to observe since the destruction of the Temple.[18] The Mishnah legislates at great length for an ideal state of affairs in which the Temple and priesthood function as in the past and sacrifices are possible.

Enquiring into the meaning of the phrase 'it is Korban' (Mark vii.11), Origen obtained some interesting information from a Jew about the use of the phrase in collecting bad debts and renouncing social obligations.[19] In the case of a bad debt the creditor, abandoning all hope of receiving the money himself and anxious that his debtor should not escape, could say 'your debt is Korban', in which case it could only be used for charitable purposes. Similarly a man could dedicate the money out of which his parents would otherwise be supported, so that they could derive no benefit from it. These are both malicious abuses of an artificial, if strictly legal, device, and it is hard to imagine their having been practised at this time. Origen was looking for an answer to a specific problem, and he consulted an expert in Jewish law, who told him what the passage might mean, illustrating his remarks with the theoretical example from the collection of bad debts. The Mishnah, though it frequently speaks of the use of the word *qorban* and its synonym *qonam,* does not envisage our case, which probably belongs, nevertheless, to the artificial legal arguments of the rabbinic schools.[20]

Many of the Jewish beliefs mentioned by Origen can be corroborated from the rabbinic literature, and some of the arguments he uses recur in the accounts of disputations between the rabbis and pagans, heretics and Christians. Others belong rather to a freer and more eclectic Judaism than that represented by the rabbinic tradition, and since most of the literature of 'non-rabbinic' Judaism has been lost, it is not always easy to unravel the different strands. Certain deductions can, however, be made by comparing what Origen has to say in different places and by adducing the evidence of the Rabbis.

The most useful contrast between the ideas and practices of 'rabbinic' and 'non-rabbinic' Judaism is to be derived from a comparison of Celsus' arguments, as quoted in the *contra Celsum,* and Origen's replies to them. Celsus' acquaintance with Judaism, which is surprisingly thorough in some respects, is with a rather hellenized and syncretistic form of the religion, and Origen, by opposing Celsus' words with statements about the more exclusive Judaism of the rabbis, attempts to ridicule Celsus' knowledge of Judaism. The picture he

paints of Judaism in the *contra Celsum* is therefore one-sided, and does not always agree with what he himself says elsewhere.

The theology of Celsus' Jew is highly spiced with ideas derived from Greek philosophy and from other religions. According to Celsus,[21] the Jews worship heaven and the angels who inhabit it. Powers and demons played a large part in the more syncretistic forms of Judaism, but Origen here insists on applying the full rigour of the law, and limits his remarks to 'those Jews who observe the law', a description which neatly characterises the rabbis and their pupils, with their emphasis on halakhah. 'Jews, who follow the law which says, in the person of God, "thou shalt not have any other gods", worship nothing else besides the God who is over all things, who made heaven and everything else. It is obvious that those who live according to the law, since they worship him who made heaven, do not worship heaven together with God. Furthermore, none of those who are in bondage to the law of Moses adores the angels of heaven. Just as they do not worship the sun and the moon, the stars and the universe, so they refrain from worshipping heaven and its angels, in obedience to the law which says, "And lest thou lift up thine eyes to heaven" etc. (Deuteronomy iv.19)'.[22] The repetition of the word 'law' here is surely no coincidence, but shows that Origen is limiting himself consciously to a particular kind of Jew in giving this answer.[23] The rabbis, like the Fathers, were on the whole strict in their condemnation of any practices or ideas which might give rise to a suspicion of idolatry or of polytheism,[24] and this conditioned their attitude to powers and angels. The Greek Jewish literature is freer in its attitude to angels, and this outlook is reflected by Celsus.[25] Jewish powers and angels are prominent in the magical papyri, and it is likely that the angels which appear in the Christian tradition, and which Origen frequently mentions, have a Jewish origin.[26] This is especially true of the 'guardian angels of the nations'. At Babel, it was held, various angels became the guardians of the various nations, and gave them their languages, while Israel, which was God's portion, retained the original language spoken by Adam.[27] Though predominantly a feature of Greek Judaism, these guardian angels are even found in the rabbinic literature.[28]

A curious Jewish idea about spirits is recorded by Origen in a passage of his commentary on John written before he left Alexandria. After proving from Ephesians i.21 the existence of a class of rational beings whose name we do not even know, Origen adds that the Hebrew called one kind of these *Sabai,* and said that their ruler (God) was consequently called *Sabaoth.*[29] This strange tradition, with its violent

etymology of the name *Sabaoth,* would seem to belong to the world of Egyptian gnosticism and the magical papyri, where *Sabaoth* is often found in incantations,[30] except that we have a (probably) contemporary parallel in the *Mekilta of R. Ishmael*: 'What is the meaning of *Sabaoth*? "He is a sign (*'oth*) in the midst of his host." '[31]

Celsus knows of an opponent of God 'called the devil, and in Hebrew *Satan*'.[32] Origen agrees, though he has some minor philological complaints. Satan was a well-known figure, from his appearance in the New Testament, and this is his interest for Justin and Irenaeus, who both give etymologies of his name.[33] The Rabbis occasionally refer to 'the adversary', but they develop no consistent account of the devil and his activities.[34] Celsus also represents his Jew as saying, 'If you say that the Logos is the son of God, we too approve of that', a statement at which Origen affects to appear scandalised.[35] 'I have met', he says, 'many Jews who professed to be Sages, but I have never heard any of them approve the doctrine that the Logos is the son of God.' He suggests that Celsus does not know his Jews. In fact Philo[36] accepts the teaching, and it was 'the Hebrew' who told Origen that the six-winged seraphim in Isaiah vi represented 'the only-begotten of God and the Holy Spirit'.[37] This contradiction has led some scholars to conclude that the Hebrew must have been a Christian.[38] Although Philo does not call the Logos the 'only-begotten of God' he certainly does call it the 'firstborn of God',[39] and he often finds occasion to speak of the holy Spirit. Both the Logos and the Spirit have left their traces on rabbinic thought, but their home was that other Jewish tradition to whose ideas and beliefs Philo is our main guide. How late the belief in the Logos of God survived among people who called themselves Jews is hard to assess, but Celsus' evidence holds good for his own period, and it is at any rate not impossible that Origen's informant was a Jew. His professed ignorance of the idea in the *contra Celsum* is consistent with the general tenor of his replies to Celsus' statements about Judaism, in which he plays rabbinic Judaism off against the hellenised Judaism with which Celsus was familiar.[40]

Origen's remarks about the theology of rabbinic Judaism derive a certain additional interest from the examples preserved in the rabbinic literature of contemporary or near-contemporary debates about the unity of the godhead. Some of the arguments are directed against Jews who assert that two powers, not one, were involved in the creation of the world; others, most of which are attributed to Rabbis who lived or taught in Caesarea in the third century, involved trinitarian Christians. In some cases the opponents of the Rabbis are not clearly identified. To

the Minim, who have been variously described as Jewish heretics or gnostics, hellenised Jews, Judeo-Christians or Christians generally,[41] is ascribed a belief in two or more 'powers',[42] the second being described as God's mediator or assistant in the creation. 'Why was Adam created on the last day?' ask the Rabbis. 'Lest the Minim should say, "God had a partner in his work".'[43] It has been argued[44] that polemic of this kind is aimed against Jewish Christians holding to the theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews (e.g. Hebrews i.2, 'His son . . . by whom also he made the worlds.'). This is a debatable point. There are indications that in the third century the term 'Minim' was still used only of Jews,[45] but it is possible that by the end of the century it was also used of non-Jews. Some of the arguments used presuppose a knowledge of Hebrew, but this consideration does not rule out anti-rabbinist Jews or even Christians, since as we can see in the case of Origen a well-trained apologist was able to base some of his arguments on Hebrew texts. The answer may lie somewhere between the various proposals. The word 'Minim' was a convenient term to refer to different antagonists at different times, and perhaps even at the same time. The Rabbis give no indication of having distinguished between different groups of Jews who rejected their teachings, between Jewish philosophers, let us say, and Jewish Christians. That it was in the latter part of the third century that the term 'Minim' began to be applied to non-Jewish Christians also seems probable.

On the subject of rabbinic theology, Origen says in a homily on Genesis that the Jews, as well as some Christians, think of God in human terms, with human limbs and human faculties.[46] He also speaks[47] of literalists who, reading the words 'The heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool' (Isaiah lxvi.1), imagine that God has such a huge body that he can sit in heaven and touch the earth with his feet. He refers again to those anthropomorphists, among whom he mentions Melito by name, in a comment on Genesis i.26. They speak of God as having limbs, and cite biblical verses where he is described as having eyes, ears, nostrils, a mouth, arms and hands, feet and fingers.[48] Melito wrote a book[49] about the physical nature of God, to which Origen refers in the last-mentioned passage, but he also seems to have Jewish literalists in mind. It is true that the Rabbis occasionally speak as if they took such biblical references literally, but Origen's words here are to be taken as part of the stock arguments against Jewish literalism, for they echo a similar remark by Justin.[50]

A remark about the creation, for which a Jewish origin is not suggested, but which is interesting because it reappears in the rabbinic

tradition, concerns the uniqueness of the creation of this world. The idea that God may have created other worlds before this one, though a commonplace of cosmological speculation, has been compared to the teaching of R. Abbahu, who taught in Caesarea a little later than Origen, that God had created and destroyed many worlds before he found one to satisfy him.[51] This may be an example of Origen's influence on rabbinic thought, but no more can be said of it in this context.

On the subject of rewards and punishments, Origen sometimes attributes to the Jews a very literal acceptance of the words of the Bible. The Jews believe, he says,[52] that honour paid to parents is rewarded literally with a long life 'on the earth which the Lord God gives' to the pious (Exodus xx.12, Deuteronomy v.16), and that God visits the sins of the fathers on the sons to the third and fourth generation.[53] Again, 'the Jews say that because they no longer have the altar, the temple and the priesthood, and therefore do not offer sacrifices, "our sins remain in us and no pardon in vouchsafed us".'[54] He ascribes to the Jews a teaching that illness and physical defects are the punishment for sins,[55] a question which was the subject of a discussion at Jamnia between R. Judah (bar Ilai), R. Jose, R. Simeon and others,[56] which attempted to discover which sins were responsible for which particular diseases.

In the course of this same debate, R. Simeon quoted a statement of R. Gorion (or of R. Joseph b. Shemaiah): 'When there are righteous men in a generation the righteous are seized (by death) for the (sins of the whole) generation; when there are no righteous men in the generation, students are seized for the generation.' The idea of vicarious atonement need not detain us here; it is not characteristic of rabbinic thought, nor does Origen attribute it to the Jews. He does, however, several times mention Jewish teachings about the power of punishment, particularly violent death, in bringing about atonement and eventually a state of blessedness. In the course of one of his discussions of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart,[57] a problem which impressed Origen, as it did his younger contemporary R. Johanan, as important for the challenge it presented to belief in a good God,[58] Origen quotes a teaching of 'the Hebrew', not about Pharaoh but about Joab the son of Zeruiah, to the effect that it was because he had already been punished sufficiently that David charged Solomon to 'allow his hoar head to go down to the grave in peace' (I Kings ii.6).[59] David is here described as an 'imitator of God', and the teaching of 'the Hebrew' is connected with the idea that the hardening of Pharaoh's heart was necessary for

his atonement.[60] Several times Origen quotes a Jewish teaching that Sodom, after three thousand years of punishment, will be restored to its ancient state, so as to be compared 'not only to the land of Egypt but to the paradise of God'.[61] To this group belongs also a tradition quoted, according to Rufinus' version of the *Commentary on Romans,* from 'fathers... who have come to the Christian faith from the Hebrews'. According to this tradition, the three sons of Korach dissociated themselves from the revolt of Korach, Dathan and Abiram (Numbers xvi), and unanimously poured out their prayers of penitence to God. As a reward, they were not only forgiven for their crime (cf. Numbers xxvi.11), but were given the power to prophesy, and to prophesy nothing sad or unpleasant, a statement which is supported by reference to the psalms ascribed to them.[62]

Another teaching about rewards and punishments is ascribed to 'the teacher of the Hebrews'. It is based on the phraseology of I Samuel ii.30, 'them that honour me I will honour, but they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed'. The use of the active voice in the first and the passive in the second half of this sentence (cf. Ezekiel v.10) shows that 'it is God's function to give honour, while it is not due to God's activity, but follows naturally, that he who dishonours God shall in turn be dishonoured'.[63]

About the Samaritan attitude to the resurrection of the dead something has been said already. The rabbinic teaching is equally ambivalent. Resurrection of the dead was one of the points on which Pharisees and Sadducees had disagreed,[64] and many of the early Rabbis went to great lengths to prove, in the face of opposition from Samaritans and others, that the final resurrection could be proved from the Bible.[65] The multiplicity of texts quoted, and the artificiality of the arguments, show how difficult the Rabbis found the proof, and yet how strongly they believed in the idea. Celsus' Jew seems in two minds about the matter. 'We hope', he says at one moment, 'to be resurrected in the body, and to have eternal life',[66] but elsewhere he seems to reject the possibility of bodily resurrection, and doubts that anyone ever has risen bodily.[67] Origen's reply is that no Jew would ever have said this, since Jews believe in the historicity of the accounts of resuscitation in III and IV Kingdoms (I Kings xvii.21f., II Kings iv.34f.). The Rabbis, curiously enough, do not quote these examples much, perhaps because their main concern with resurrection was eschatological.[68] R. Abbahu once quoted, in a debate with a Min about the witch of En-Dor, a tannaitic teaching that 'for full twelve months the body exists and the soul ascends and descends; after twelve months

the body ceases to exist and the soul ascends nevermore to descend'.[69] R. Johanan, on the other hand, a strong believer in resurrection, explained Song of Songs vii.9(10) ('causing the lips of those that are asleep to speak') as meaning that if a rule (*halakhah*) is said in anyone's name in this world, his lips move in the grave.[70] On the question of bodily survival, it was R. Johanan, and not R. Abbahu and his anonymous authority, who represented the main line of rabbinic belief. Though Origen speaks from inference, not experience, he attributes to the Jews a belief in physical resurrection.

A curious sidelight on Jewish ideas about survival after death is cast by a tradition which Origen quotes in connexion with the question put to John the Baptist (John i.21), 'Art thou Elias?' Enquiring into what the Jews of Jerusalem might have meant by this question, Origen stresses the importance for the Christian exegete of finding an explanation which accords with Jewish beliefs. The Jews traditionaly, for some unknown reason, he says, identify Elijah with Phinehas son of Eleazar. Phinehas' immortality was deduced from Numbers xxv.12, 'I give him my covenant of peace'. 'It would not be surprising', says Origen, 'if those who thought, rightly or wrongly, that Phinehas and Elijah were the same person, also identified him with John and with Jesus'.[71] The origin of this midrash, which Origen finds puzzling, has been referred to the polemic between Jews and Samaritans.[72] Certainly Phinehas is surprisingly prominent in Jewish traditions, which mention his immortality and even speculate about his identification with Elijah.[73]

Of the Jewish attitude to the Messiah more will be said in discussing the Jewish-Christian polemic. According to Origen,[74] the Jews of his day malign Jesus and 'approve of the outrages committed against him by the Jews'. Nor do they see any connexion between Jesus and John the Baptist.[75] Though he insists that the Jews believe in a Messiah who will come as prophesied in the Pentateuch and the Prophets, his information about Jewish messianism is largely negative: the Jews do not say that the Messiah is God or the son of God, and he is doubtful as to whether they believe he will provide in himself an example of the resurrection.[76] In common with other Church Fathers, Origen accuses the Jews of persecuting the Church of Christ, but the charge is not often repeated, and it has been argued that his lifetime saw little activity of this kind. The charge was a commonplace of Christian apologetics.[77]

5

THE BIBLE AND BIBLE STUDY

The definition of the canon of the Bible was a major concern of both Christian and Jewish scholars in the first Christian centuries. The motives for such a definition were no less practical than academic. The Bible was, if not entirely a divine revelation, at any rate divinely inspired, and it was a matter of no small importance to determine which works came into this category and to trace, so far as was possible, the history of their publication and transmission. A rabbinic statement on the transmission of the Torah opens the tractate *Aboth*: 'Moses received the Torah from God at Sinai, and transmitted it to Joshua, Joshua to the elders, the elders to the prophets, and the prophets transmitted it to the members of the Great Assembly.' An unbroken chain of tradition was seen to join the revelation of the whole Torah, written and oral, at Sinai to the Rabbis themselves. A rabbinic midrash with a clear apologetic tendency includes in this revelation the whole range of rabbinic traditions besides the written Bible: 'When God revealed himself at Sinai to give the Torah to Israel He communicated it to Moses in order - the Bible, the Mishnah, the Talmud and the Haggadah, as it is written, "And God spake *all* these words" (Exodus xx.1), which includes even the questions which a conscientious student will one day ask his master. When Moses had learnt it all from God, He told him to teach it to Israel. "Lord of the Universe", said Moses, "shall I write it all down for them?" "No", replied God, "I do not wish to give it to them in writing, because I foresee that one day the gentiles will take it from them and despise them, and will translate the Torah and read it in Greek, and say, 'You are not Israel: We are Israel', as it is said, 'I have written for him the great things of my Torah, and even so they are considered as strangers' (Hosea viii.12). But the Mishnah is the *mysterium* of the Holy one, blessed be He, which is only revealed to those who stand in awe of Him (cf. Psalm xxv.14). Therefore do not

ask Me to give the Mishnah in writing, for it is the Mishnah which distinguishes Israel from the gentiles." '[1] It is the purpose of such apologetic to discredit the Greek versions of the Bible at the same time as bestowing a spurious respectability on the rabbinic traditions. The Rabbis persistently deprecated the translation of the Bible into Greek, just as others who relied on the Septuagint tried to show that it was, in its way, an inspired translation. The Rabbis also contrived to give the impression that the canon of the Hebrew Bible was a constant commodity, though from one or two scattered quotations it is clear that they knew of some quite late debates about the exclusion or inclusion of certain books, notably Ecclesiastes, Canticles and Ezekiel.[2] Discussions are recorded, too, about the order of the books of the Bible.

Origen realised early the importance of consulting the Jewish scholars on the question of the transmission and the canon of the Bible. Nor was he the first father to turn to the Jews for help. Melito is said to have travelled to Palestine to ascertain the Jewish canon of his time, and Julius Africanus, in his extant letter to Origen, lays down the principle that 'all the books included in the Old Testament are translated into Greek from the Hebrew'.[3] Origen does not speak, as Jerome did later, of 'Hebraica ueritas',[4] but his respect for the Hebrew text was sufficient for him to include it in his Hexapla, and when he doubts the canonicity of a book or the accuracy of a reading it is often on the grounds of its absence from the Hebrew Bible. In his letter to Africanus he mentions his zeal in collating the Hebrew with the Septuagint. It is important to note variant readings, he says, 'so that in our debates with the Jews we do not quote passages which are lacking in their texts, and so that we can make use of those which are in their texts but not in ours'.[5] This passage has often been taken to show that Origen's purpose in compiling the Hexapla was apologetic.[6] It is true that when he does quote discrepancies in his commentaries and homilies there is often a polemical motive,[7] but this is an insufficient reason to explain the magnitude of the work, and it is equally clear that he used his researches to enrich and to make more accurate his exegesis of scripture.

It is not true to say that Origen fully recognised the primacy of the Hebrew over the Greek versions. Though he is not completely consistent, he is on the whole true to the Alexandrian tradition in accepting the Septuagint as an inspired translation, capable of holding its own and imparting true and edifying doctrine even when it disagrees with the Hebrew. Outside the field of polemics Origen occasionally

quotes the Hebrew merely out of interest, not because he considers it to preserve a truer reading.[8] In this his attitude stands opposed to the more uncompromisingly scholarly approach of Jerome, who was taken to task by Augustine for circulating his versions of the Hebrew, so unfamiliar to Christian audiences.[9] Origen's attitude, like Augustine's, seems to be that the text which belongs to the life of the Church is the text on which he must base his remarks, at least in his homilies. But even if in his commentaries he allows himself more freedom, he is still clearly prejudiced in favour of the Septuagint.[10] Of the other Jewish versions used by Origen, Aquila is of particular interest to the present study, since it was a 'rabbinic' translation, produced, so tradition has it, at the instance of the Rabbis and approved of by them. It was read in the synagogues as late as the sixth century,[11] and fragments of it have been found in the Cairo Geniza. Furthermore, the Rabbis themselves quote Aquila's version in expounding the Bible, so that it was in some sense an 'authorised version', giving to Jews whose Greek was better than their Hebrew a faithful, one might say an over-faithful, translation of the Hebrew Bible. So literal was it that it is incredible that it could even have been understood except by people who were brought up with it and who were familiar with rabbinic exegesis of the Bible. Aquila, together with Symmachus, Theodotion and other, anonymous versions, was used by Origen both in the Hexapla and in his exegesis. Their evidence he considers interesting and useful for exegetical purposes but not authoritative in settling textual problems.

The Rabbis, as we have seen, regarded their oral traditions as of equal authority, in theory, with the written Bible, although in practice a traditional legend or legal decision was usually supported with the Biblical proof-text (*asmakhta*). Origen also had a profound respect for tradition, and he was always willing to quote the traditions of his predecessors. Among these traditions are several Jewish aggadoth which he had learnt from his Jewish friends, or sometimes, perhaps, from written midrashim. In some cases these are introduced as Jewish traditions; others, at any rate in the texts which have come down to us, are not specifically attributed to 'the Hebrews', but their subject matter, and sometimes their presence in the rabbinic literature, betrays their Jewish origin.[12] Despite the expressed rabbinic prejudice against committing the aggadah to writing,[13] it is not impossible that Origen had direct access to Greek midrashim, an example of which survives in Latin translation, falsely attributed to Philo.[14] A casual mention of 'the school of Aquila'[15] may suggest a knowledge of such midrashim; the school of Aquila here quotes a Jewish *apokryphon,* a word which

elsewhere, too, seems to mean 'midrash'.[16] Aquila's version of the Bible is closely connected with rabbinic midrash, and it is quite possible that a Greek midrash or a midrashic compendium was attributed, rightly or wrongly, to his school.

Origen readily quotes from the extra-canonical books. Unlike Clement, he has a notion of a canon (although this has been denied[17]) and he uses the word *endiathēkos*[18] to refer to the Christian or the Hebrew canon of the Bible; he also speaks of the Jewish *apokrypha,* books kept out of general circulation by the Jewish authorities.[19] His idea of a canon is flexible enough to allow him to quote from books of doubtful canonicity, and in the case of some of these it seems that his attitude changed in the course of his life.[20] It is interesting to observe how far his attitude is influenced by his knowledge of the Jewish canon.

The Hebrew canon contains thirty-nine books, but by reckoning as one book each Samuel, Kings, the twelve Minor Prophets, Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles it is possible to arrive at a total of twenty-four.[21] Josephus, on the other hand, reckons twenty-two books, comprising the five books of Moses, thirteen books of the Prophets and four of Hymns and moral maxims.[22] Origen says,[23] quoting a Jewish tradition,[24] that the Jewish canon contains twenty-two books, so as to accord with the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet. The list of books, preserved by Eusebius and Hilary,[25] gives the Hebrew names of the books, with translations of some of them, and their Greek equivalents:

1 *BRĒSITH* ('in the beginning') [Genesis]
2 *WELLE SMŌTH* ('these are the names') [Exodus]
3 *WIKRA* ('and he called') [Leviticus]
4 *AMMES PHEKŌDĪM*[26] [Numbers]
5 *ELLE ADDEBARĪM* ('these are the words') [Deuteronomy]
6 *IŌSUË BEN NUN* [Jesus son of Nauē]
7 *SŌPHTĪM* [Judges + Ruth]
8 *SAMUĒL* ('the God-called') [I and II Kingdoms]
9 *WAMMELCH DAUID* ('David's kingdom') [III and IV Kingdoms]
10 *DABRĒ IAMĪN* ('words of days') [I and II Paralipomena]
11 *EZRA* ('helper') [I and II Esdras]
12 *SPHAR THELLĪM* [Book of Psalms]
13 *MELŌTH*[27] [Proverbs of Solomon]

14 *KŌELTH* [Ecclesiastes]
15 *SIR ASSIRĪM* [Song (or Songs) of Songs]
16 [Twelve Prophets]
17 *IESSAIA* [Esaias]
18 *IEREMIA* [Jeremias + Lamentations + Letter]
19 *DANIĒL* [Daniel]
20 *IEZEKIĒL* [Jezekiel]
21 *IŌB* [Job]
22 *ESTHĒR* [Esther]

'outside these' *S<PH>AR BĒTH SABANAIEL*[28] [Maccabees]

If we disregard the apparent inclusion of two Greek works, II Esdras and the Letter of Jeremias, which may be due to carelessness in comparing the Greek and Hebrew Bibles, it will be obvious that the contents of this list are virtually the same as those of the Masoretic Bible, but that the order of the books is quite different. The Rabbis accepted an older division of the Scriptures into Torah (Pentateuch), Prophets and Writings, which is believed to represent three successive stages in the process of canonisation. The order of the five books of the Torah does not vary in the Hebrew tradition, although some Greek canons have Numbers before Leviticus. The Talmud[29] gives the order of the Prophets as Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah and the Twelve, and of the Writings as Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Lamentations, Daniel, Esther, Ezra, Chronicles, but there is considerable variation in the traditional order, especially in the Writings. Origen's list follows the Hebrew order as far as Kings, but from then on it is quite different, and closer to that found in manuscripts of the Greek Bible. There is no division between Prophets and Writings, and Ruth and Lamentations are attached to Judges and Jeremiah respectively. It might be argued that Origen rearranged the list he received to accord with his preconceptions based on the Greek Bible, but the joining of Ruth and Lamentations to Judges and Jeremiah, which is presupposed by the total of twenty-two, strongly suggests that the list given to Origen did not distinguish between Prophets and Writings, and we must suppose that it represents a divergent Jewish tradition current in his day, which either is influenced by or has itself influenced the arrangement of the Greek Bible. The position of Esther at the end is interesting. Its position in the Church was not at all clear,[30] but it was read annually in synagogues at the feast of Purim, and seems to have been accepted by the Rabbis as canonical, although it was in some respects in a class of its own.[31]

Origen correctly observes[32] that the Jews divide the book of Psalms into five books: Book I, from Psalm i to Psalm xl(xli); Book II, from Psalm xli to Psalm lxxi (lxii); Book III, from Psalm lxxii to Psalm lxxxviii (lxxxix); Book IV, from Psalm lxxxix to Psalm cv(cvi); Book V, from Psalm cvi to Psalm cl. He also offers some interesting remarks about the order of the Psalms. He mentions[33] two theories, one which assumes that the present order is significant and another which holds that Ezra or the Jewish sages collected the Psalms together in a haphazard order. Here the fragment breaks off, but Hilary[34] preserves what may have been Origen's reply to the second theory, namely that the Seventy Elders restored the original order of the Psalms. From the length at which he discusses it, it seems likely that Origen preferred the first theory. One of the problems Origen mentions is that most of the Psalms after Psalm l(li) were (supposedly) composed before it, while Psalm l itself was composed before Psalm iii. Eusebius[35] offers the explanation that the first fifty belong to the period after, and the rest to the period before David's murder of Uriah the Hittite; the chronological order of the two groups is reversed so as to avoid passing from better to worse. This explanation may conceivably go back to Origen; the last part of it has a distinctly rabbinic ring. By a curious coincidence the Talmud[36] relates a discussion between R. Abbahu and a Min (presumably at Caesarea) on precisely this question: the Min had asked Abbahu why Psalm lvi(lvii) was placed after Psalm iii, when chronologically it belonged before it.

As regards the books of the Greek Bible not found in the Hebrew, Origen explicitly says that the Jews do not accept Tobit or Judith.[37] Although he several times quotes from the Wisdom of Solomon as from a canonical work,[38] he states in the preface to his commentary on the Song of Songs that Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs are the only works of Solomon accepted by the Church or by the Hebrews.[39] The Song of the Three Children, the Story of Susanna and the Story of Bel and the Dragon are all mentioned as excluded from the Hebrew Daniel;[40] Origen says, however, in his letter to Africanus that the Hebrews knew the Story of Susanna, but that it was committed to the apocrypha together with other awkward works. The rabbinic attitude to the apocrypha and the New Testament is summarised in the Tosefta: 'The gospels (?) and the books of the Minim are not canonical; the books of Ben Sira and all books written since his time are not canonical.'[41] This is not the place to enquire into Origen's use of material from books outside the Greek canon of the Old Testament, but it is interesting to note that once, in a homily, he refrains from

citing evidence from the 'books of Enoch' on the grounds that 'they do not seem to bear any authority among the Hebrews'.[42]

Origen sometimes attributes the authorship of the Pentateuch to God, sometimes to Moses.[43] Various theories circulated in antiquity about this subject, ranging from the rabbinic insistence that the whole of the Pentateuch, including perhaps even the account of Moses' death, was written by Moses at God's dictation to its condemnation as the work of the Demiurge, as preached by Marcion. Origen accepted the Mosaic authorship of the books, with one modification which enabled him to answer any objections: after the destruction of the Temple, when the Bible was almost lost, Ezra succeeded in writing it down and so preserved it for posterity.[44] The literary form of the Bible is thus later than the original composition, which accounts for any discrepancies. According to Harnack this legend probably stems from IV Esdras xiv.21-5;[45] even if this is not so, Origen was not responsible for introducing it into the Church, since it was known to Clement and Irenaeus. A tradition quoted by Origen credits Ezra with yet another achievement during the Exile, namely the introduction of a new alphabet.[46] This may be a rabbinic tradition: according to a baraitha,[47] Ezra's achievement in introducing the Aramaic alphabet was as great as that of Moses in receiving the Torah.

The book of Joshua, according to Origen, was written by Joshua but, like the Pentateuch, bears the marks of Ezra's recension.[48] Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs are all written by Solomon, and the Psalms are generally attributed to King David, unless they bear a different attribution, as for example those ascribed to the sons of Korach[49] or to Moses. About these Origen received an interesting piece of information from 'the Patriarch Ioullos'. 'I used to think', he writes, 'that there was one psalm which was inscribed "A prayer of Moses the man of God", but later, when I was consulting Ioullos the Patriarch, and one of the people with the title of Sage among the Jews, about some sayings of God, I learnt that throughout the Book of Psalms, from the first two psalms, those which have no title or which have a title but no author's name belong to the author named in the last psalm which has a title. Speaking of this he said that there were thirteen Psalms of Moses... Later I learnt that there were eleven.'[50] The Psalms in question are Psalms lxxxix-xcix (xc-c). This statement is borne out by the rabbinic commentaries.[51] The idea that Ezra collected the Psalms together and committed them to writing has been mentioned above; it is evidently part of the theory, also

mentioned above, about the part played by Ezra in the transmission of the Hexateuch.

Readings from the Bible formed a central part of the synagogue service, on Saturdays and also on Mondays and Thursdays. Origen refers to such readings,[52] and even speaks as if he has had personal experience of them.[53] Whether these readings were in Hebrew or in Greek he does not say, although he mentions in connexion with the version of Aquila that it has a high reputation for accuracy among Jews, and is the one preferred by those who do not know Hebrew, as being the most successful of all.[54] It has already been said that this version enjoyed rabbinic approbation, and that its popularity as late as the sixth century is attested by Justinian and the Cairo Geniza palimpsests. The rabbinic sources, and especially the Palestinian Talmud, show a lively spirit of controvery about the use of translations. The Rabbis knew targumim in various languages (although it should be observed that 'a scroll written in such and such a language' can mean a transliteration), but according to one rabbinic statement, 'The only language into which the Torah can be adequately translated is Greek.'[55] To this is appended the celebrated statement attributed by R. Jeremiah to R. Hiyya bar Abba, 'Aquila the proselyte translated the Torah for R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, and they congratulated him saying, "thou art fairer than the children of men" (Psalm xlv.3)'. There are other references to Aquila and to the fact that he was a proselyte;[56] this text is important because it shows two Rabbis, in the early second century, coming to grips with the problem of Bible-translations. It seems that the Septuagint had fallen from favour, and a new translation was sought which was more faithful to the original (or, in other words, which better conveyed the rabbinic exegesis of the Bible). Several attempts were made to bring the Septuagint up to date, but it was Aquila's version which won acceptance in rabbinic circles, and which is even quoted in rabbinic commentaries. Though there were always some Rabbis who opposed the use of translations, the more liberal and open-minded approved of them; such were R. Johanan and R. Abbahu.[57] In the case of the Scroll of Esther we have preserved a very full discussion of the use of translations and transliterations. The Mishnah knows of targumim in various languages, but prohibits their use;[58] later rabbis permitted the use of translations by Jews who did not know Hebrew.[59] The Mishnah further rules that the cautioning of the suspected adulteress (Numbers v.19-22), the deposition concerning tithes (Deuteronomy xxvi.13-15), the Shema', the Amidah-prayer, grace after meals, the oath of Testimony and the oath concerning a deposit may be said in any

language.[60] Despite the various Tannaitic rulings, the subject continued to be controversial. R. Levi bar Heitha, it is related, once went to Caesarea and heard the Shema' recited in Greek. He wanted to stop it, but R. Jose shouted at him, 'Have I not said that if one does not know Hebrew it is better not to pray at all? But in fact this prayer may be said in any language one understands.'[61] With regard to the reading of the Bible, there was a strong lobby in favour of reading in Hebrew, even if the reading had to be translated because the congregation could not understand Hebrew, and even, perhaps, if a Hebrew text in Greek characters had to be used because no one could be found who could read the Hebrew script.

Transliterated texts are a not uncommon device where biblical readings or prayers must be read in Hebrew by people whose knowledge of the language is poor.[62] The Karaites used an Arabic transliteration,[63] and it has been argued that the rabbis knew and in some cases approved of transliterations into various scripts (although there is a perpetual difficulty in distinguishing between transliterations and translations in the rabbinic texts). Reference is several times made to copies written in Coptic, Medic, Hebrew, Elamic and Greek, which may not be used for public reading but must be saved from a fire.[64] In this context 'Hebrew' (if that is the right reading) is incomprehensible unless the reference is to script (old Hebrew) rather than language. The Rabbis knew texts in old Hebrew script; R. Gamliel held that this was the original script in which the Torah was given, while R. Judah I said that it was given in 'Assyrian' (square letters).[65] According to the Mishnah,[66] a man who reads the Scroll of Esther in translation 'in any language' has not fulfilled his duty, 'but it is read to non-Hebrew speakers in *la'az* (the vernacular), although a non-Hebrew speaker who hears it (read from a scroll written) in Assyrian has discharged his duty'.[67] According to Schwabe's translation of the Palestinian Talmud, Samuel b. Sisarti said that this refers to a Hebrew text written in Greek letters (*graikon*).[68] It is hard to see what else can be meant but a transliteration, although the passage is still not without its problems. The same tractate of the Mishnah says that 'the only difference between "books" (i.e. scrolls of the Torah) and *tefillin* and *mezuzoth* is that the books may be written in any language, while *tefillin* and *mezuzoth* may only be written in Assyrian. R. Simeon b. Gamliel says, 'Even in the case of the books they were only permitted to be written in Greek' (i.e. apart from the 'Assyrian' script).[69]

However corrupt or ambiguous the rabbinic proof-texts,[70] it is likely on general grounds that transliterated texts were in use among

the Jews, and it has been argued that the text which formed the second column of the Hexapla should be seen as an example of such a text.[71] The modern literature provoked by this question is enormous, and need not be described in detail here.[72] Two separate questions must be distinguished, namely the origin of the transcription and the reason for its inclusion in the Hexapla. It is by no means impossible that the origin of the text is Jewish, or that Origen obtained it from Jews. The main problem is why there should have been a transliteration of the whole Bible, and not just of the Pentateuch, the Prophetic readings and the *megilloth.* A possible solution is that the transliteration of the Pentateuch, and perhaps of the Prophets[73] and Scrolls, was already in existence, and that the remainder was transliterated by a Jew at Origen's request. It has been pointed out that Origen's command of Hebrew was insufficient to enable him to divide up the Hebrew text and match it to the several Greek versions. Since we must suppose that he had some help from Jewish scholars, it is not difficult to conclude that this help extended also to the second column. Whether or not some sort of transliterated text was already in use among Jews, it will have been one or more of Origen's Jewish (or Jewish Christian) assistants who undertook the laborious task of writing out the first column (Hebrew) and the second column (Greek transliteration) and fitting them, phrase by phrase, to the Greek versions. Indeed, it is possible that the whole of the Hexapla was compiled by Origen's assistants. The inclusion of the Hebrew in the Hexapla made it possible for a non-Hebraist to see at a glance what was in the Hebrew and what was not; the importance of this exercise is stated explicitly by Origen in his letter to Africanus. The second column provided an invaluable key to the Hebrew, showing the pronunciation of the consonantal text, which had not yet been equipped with vowel signs, and so making it a simple matter to quote what the Hebrew said. In fact, as we can see from Origen's surviving exegetical works, he quoted the Hebrew rarely, contenting himself for the most part with comparing the various Greek versions; he seems to have been happy in general to rely on Aquila for a reliable account of the Hebrew. If, as is by no means certain, the Hexapla were intended for publication, the transliterated text would take the place of the Hebrew, and the work could be copied entirely by Greek scribes. That this is what actually happened is shown by the Ambrosian palimpsest, in which the first column was not copied.

While on the subject of texts of the Bible and Jewish Bible-readings we should notice some important remarks of Origen about the tetragrammaton. He says[74] that the Hebrews have ten names for God,

one of which is *Adonai,* which is translated as *Kurios*. They also have a tetragrammaton, which is ineffable; it is pronounced *Adonai,* although this is not what is written, but among the Greeks (i.e. Greek-speaking Jews) it is pronounced *Kurios.*[75] In the most accurate texts, he adds, the name is written in Hebrew letters - not in the modern Hebrew alphabet but in the oldest one. One likely source for Origen's information about the tetragrammaton is Philo, *Vit. Moys.* II.23(114f.), but presumably he also encountered the practice of pronouncing it *Adonai* or *Kurios* among Jews of his acquaintance. The statement that Greek-speaking Jews pronounced it *Kurios* is confirmed by a fragment of Aquila from the Cairo Geniza, where at one point where there was insufficient space in the line for the tetragrammaton it is replaced by the contraction $\kappa\bar{\upsilon}$.[76] This same text also provided the first confirmation of Origen's statement that in some texts the tetragrammaton was written in Old Hebrew letters, in the form *YHYH.*[77] The practice of transliterating the sacred name rather than translating it is not unparalleled in other contexts: it was the common practice, after all, of the Latin Middle Ages to write the name of Christ in Greek. It has also been convincingly demonstrated that in some Jewish circles the Old Hebrew letter Tau was retained for the name of God, even when its meaning was no longer understood.[78] The editor of the fragment of Aquila suggested that Origen's 'most accurate texts' refers to Aquila, whom Origen frequently commends for his accuracy.[79] Since then other, earlier examples have come to light, notably the Dodecapropheton scroll published by D. Barthélemy,[80] and there is no longer any reason to suppose that Origen was referring exclusively to Aquila.

Finally, mention must be made of Origen's references to the rabbinic education. Study was certainly an important and much-emphasised part of Jewish life in Palestine, not only for children but also for adults, as Origen himself points out.[81] Unfortunately, he has very little information to offer about the details of the organisation of the rabbinic schools or about the subjects which were taught in them. From hints in the rabbinic literature it seems likely that the organisation of the schools was a much-disputed subject in the third century, a good deal of criticism being levelled from some quarters both at the schools and at the people who administered them, notably the patriarch Judah II.[82] If Origen was party to such disputes, he makes no mention of the matter. When he dismisses the Jewish education as worthless,[83] he means that Jewish scholars, who accept the literal force of the Biblical laws, are unable to teach what Christians must regard as the truth; he

did not, as some rabbis did, condemn the schools on their own terms. Nor does he have anything of any consequence to say about the subjects taught in the schools, although from his own accounts of Jewish teachings, particularly in the field of biblical exegesis, it would seem that he must have had some experience of them. Only one passage in his surviving works adds anything to our knowledge of the subject - and that in a work which only exists in a version by Rufinus, who may be suspected of having inserted or doctored the passage himself.[84] Four sections of the Bible are named which are forbidden to be taught to minors: the beginning of Genesis, the Song of Songs and the beginning and end of Ezekiel. It is customary, he says, for the teachers and sages to teach to children the whole of the Bible and the rabbinic traditions, but these four writings are reserved for the end, when they have reached maturity. The reasons for this cautiousness are clear. The creation-story and the book of Ezekiel were the focus points of much mystical speculation which was often a source of embarrassment to the Rabbis and was not considered safe for publication.[85] According to the Talmud,[86] the Rabbis considered 'putting away' the book of Ezekiel because it contained things in conflict with the Pentateuch, and they would have done so but for the labours of Hananiah ben Hezekiah (a Shammaite teacher said to have lived in the generation before the fall of Jerusalem), 'who, supplied with three hundred jars of oil, sat in his study on the roof of his house until he had harmonized them all'. The Song of Songs was obviously not a work to be entrusted lightly to young readers. The Mishnah reports that there had been some who did not consider it suitable for inclusion in the canon of Scripture; its inclusion was said to have been decided at Jamnia on the day on which Eleazar ben Azariah was made president of the academy. The strong language reported to have been used by Akiba in its defence is itself evidence for the hostility of the opposition: 'God forbid! No Jew has ever maintained that the Song of Songs was not canonical, for all history is not worth as much as the day on which the Song of Songs was given to Israel. All the Writings are holy, but the Song of Songs is the Holy of Holies!'[87] (The comparison between the Song of Songs and the Holy of Holies is also made by Origen, in the opening words of his first homily on the Song of Songs.[88]) But although such rabbinic texts help us to understand why these particular portions of the Bible were reserved till last, the information that they were so held back is not to be found in the rabbinic literature.

The content of Origen's borrowings of rabbinic exegeses and traditions will be discussed in chapters 9 and 10. Here we have merely

explored the background to these borrowings. It has been seen how the rabbinic sources can help to supplement Origen's information, and how they often confirm what he says. It has also been suggested that in some cases he betrays the influence of another Jewish milieu, about which, however, we do not have the same means at our disposal of forming an independent impression. The lack of first-hand information about non-rabbinic Judaism in Palestine must not lead us to underestimate such hints; on the contrary, it renders Origen's information all the more valuable.

6

ORIGEN AND CELSUS

As an apologist Origen was well aware of the paradox underlying the Church's attitude to the Jews. On the one hand, Jesus and his disciples were Jews, Paul was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and Christianity, at its inception, was a purely Jewish movement; the teaching of the Church was rooted in the Jewish Bible, and the details of Jesus' life and the triumph of Christianity were thought to have been foretold by the Jewish prophets. But the Jews refused to recognise Jesus as the Messiah, and bitterly attacked the Christians and their perversion, as they judged it, of Jewish teaching. This hostility could not but be embarrassing to the Church, particularly since its propaganda was aimed at that section of the pagan world which was most strongly attracted to the older religion. There was no alternative for the Church but to counter-attack. The Jews had rejected Jesus, had indeed condemned him to death, and by way of punishment they had lost their capital city, their autonomy, their rulers, their rights, their temple and altar, and, expelled from their land, were condemned to be scattered all over the world. Christians, being free from the guilt of killing the Saviour, were heirs to all the blessings promised to the Jews in the Bible, so that while Judaism languished the Church flourished. Such was the Christian case, and it was adorned with evidence from prophecy and from history. Meanwhile there was still hope that the remaining Jews would be converted or at least cooperate in presenting a united front to paganism, the common enemy of both. Later, as this hope became more remote, the Church concentrated on attacking, and eventually on persecuting, rather than on conciliating the Synagogue. In the first half of the third century relations between the two parties were not yet so bad as to dispel all hope of reconciliation, and Origen, at any rate, had the vision not to antagonise the Jews more than was necessary. Although he took part in disputations with Jews and never lost an opportunity of attacking

Jewish unbelief, yet in his great work of apologetic he staunchly defended the Jews from the pagan challenge, while protesting bitterly against the Jews' refusal to side with the Church against the common foe. There are reasons for this. In so far as the polemic against the Church coincided with the polemic aimed at the Synagogue it would have been inconsistent to refute the one while subscribing to the other. In any case, for Origen the ancient history of Israel was also the ancient history of the Church, since the Church is now the true Israel. Antiquity was tantamount to respectability in the ancient world, so the ancient Israelites must be defended by the champion of Christianity from the slurs cast on them by the enemies of Judaism. The *contra Celsum* is unique in the Christian apologetic literature for the mildness with which it treats the Jews. Even compared with Origen's other works, such as the homilies, it is remarkable for the refusal to engage excessively in the denigration of the Jews. Origen clearly felt it inappropriate to stress the divisions between Church and Synagogue in the face of polemic aimed at both.

Celsus' arguments fall into three categories. Firstly, there are the old pagan arguments against the Jews, later to be revived by a triumphant Church, for the moment adapted by Celsus for ammunition against the Christians; second, Jewish arguments against Christianity, for the most part genuine Jewish arguments found also in Jewish writings and reflected in Christian apologetic writing, but including some elements not found elsewhere; lastly, pagan charges levelled at the Church but inapplicable to Judaism. Of these, only the first two interest us here, and it will be useful to quote the arguments briefly.

Celsus opens his attack by referring (I.2) to the barbarian origins of Christianity. Whereas many of the older non-Greek nations have had some insight into the truth (I.14), the Jews have no original or true ideas (I.4, V.41). Moses' philosophy was derivative (and, Celsus seems to imply, false), and his followers were misled into believing it (I.21, 23, 26, etc., cf. V.41). Like all the arguments in this section, this claim goes back to the Egyptian anti-Jewish writers quoted by Josephus in his *contra Apionem,* a work of apologetic which has much in common with the *contra Celsum.* Josephus, too, makes his starting point the proof of the antiquity of the Jews. His eagerness to refute the charge of novelty and the amount of material he adduces show the importance he attached to this part of his argument. To be a new nation was to be historically insignificant and culturally unoriginal, and to challenge this allegation was a top priority for any nation in antiquity (the Romans not excluded: Virgil's epic of the ancient history of Rome from the

Trojan origins is not an isolated example; the subject was a particular hobby-horse of Varro).

Moses' outstanding deception, according to Celsus, was to persuade his ignorant followers to abandon the worship of their many gods and believe in one god (I.23, V.41). And although Moses was a magician who encouraged angel-worship and sorcery (I.26, V.6. cf. I.6), he was also responsible for the reprehensible Jewish and Christian hostility to idol-worship and avoidance of pagan practices (IV.31, I.5, VII.64).[1]

A charge commonly laid in antiquity against the Jews was that they had cut themselves off from common and decent intercourse with their fellow-men, indeed nourished a hatred of the rest of the human race. The argument can be traced from Manetho and Lysimachus through all the anti-Jewish polemic, erupting with particular violence in Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*.[2] Celsus takes it up (V.41ff., cf. IV.32) and levels the charge also at the Christians, condemning their secret meetings and esoteric rites (I.1, 3, 7, etc.).

The Jews, according to Celsus, were originally a band of rebel Egyptian slaves, who revolted against the Egyptian community and the religious customs of the Egyptians (III.5, IV.31). The essential elements of this charge are found, with much elaboration, often contradictory, in the anti-Jewish polemic of the Egyptians Manetho, Lysimachus, Chaeremon and Apion quoted by Josephus,[3] who refutes it in detail. It lies behind the account given by Tacitus[4] of the origin of the Jews. The story, simply told, is that a number of lepers and cripples emigrated in a body from Egypt to Palestine, there to form a separate nation, hostile to the outside world. The charge of leprosy recurs, curiously enough, in a different guise in Origen.[5] Celsus adds that the Jews were then, and have remained since, an unimportant people, who have never done anything of any note whatever, a fact borne out by the absence of any mention of them in Greek literature. This is also an old story. Apollonius Molon had said that the Jews were the most useless of barbarians, which was why they alone had contributed no useful invention to civilised life; Apion, that they had produced no outstanding inventors or sages.[6] Such remarks were met on the Jewish side by quite hyperbolic counter-claims, such as that Abraham taught the Egyptians astrology,[7] that Joseph was responsible for improving agricultural methods, and that Moses was the inventor of alphabetic writing, besides being the father of Egyptian culture and, indeed, of Greek philosophy.[8] When Celsus calls the Jews 'runaway slaves' (IV.31) he echoes Apion, Cicero and Tacitus.[9] The charge that the Jews were originally rebels (III.5) was also old,[10] but Celsus gives it a new twist

by accusing the Christians of rebelling in just the same way against the Jews (III.5, V.33).

Finally, we must note the important indictment that God was not on the side of the Jews. Cicero[11] was not alone in ridiculing the Jewish claim of divine protection by pointing out the disasters which had fallen on the 'chosen people'.[12] Celsus repeats this same charge (VIII.69), including in it not only the Jews, who, instead of ruling the world, are even expelled from their homeland with impunity, but also the Christians, who, for all God's promises, are sought out and killed (cf. also V.41, VIII.39).

Celsus next puts forward, in the person of a Jew, some of the fables about Jesus which were already current, and were later woven together to form the *Sepher Toldoth Yeshu.* According to these, Jesus was the illegitimate son of a soldier called Panthera. His mother was driven out by her husband (or fiancé), a carpenter, and Jesus himself took a job as a labourer in Egypt, where he learnt some magical tricks. Returning to Palestine, full of his new-found powers, he took the title of God (I.28, 32, 39). In reality, says the Jew, Jesus was neither God (I.69ff., II *passim*) nor the son of God (I.39, 41, II.30, etc.). He was a mere man (II.79), a wicked sorcerer, hated by God (I.71) and rightly punished (cf. II.44). In his lifetime he collected a band of followers, few in number and of the lowest sort (II.46), but in time, thanks to his poor leadership, he lost their support (II.12) and they betrayed him (II.11). After his death, stories were invented of his divinity (I.41, II.47) and his powers of prophecy (II.13, 15, 44), and multitudes were won over to his name (II.46).[13]

Origen's replies to the first set of charges, the pagan anti-Jewish polemic, are cool and well-reasoned. He deals with the points one by one, and is conscious of taking part in a debate the arguments on both sides of which had already often been set out, though he is at pains in places to point out the peculiar implications for Christianity of a particular attack on the Jews.

When Celsus says that the Jews are a barbarous, modern people, Origen replies, with Josephus, that, on the contrary, the Jews are among the most ancient and most cultivated of peoples. That this is not a new topic Origen is aware. He refers to 'numerous treatises in circulation among the Egyptians, the Phoenicians and the Greeks which testify to the antiquity of the Jews', and in particular the *contra Apionem* of Josephus and the *pros Hellenas* of Tatian (I.16). Tatian, developing an idea of Justin[14] that Moses was the source of certain Platonic doctrines, had gone so far as to assert that Greek philosophy

was plagiarised from the Bible, and he copied copious chronological tables to prove that Moses lived before the Trojan War. His writings impressed Clement, through whom doubtless Origen became familiar with them. Origen repeatedly returns to the question of Moses' early date, and he rebukes Celsus for not knowing that Moses antedated Homer and Hesiod (IV.11f., 21, 36, VI.43, 47, VII.30f.). The writings of Moses are as reliable as those of other historians (I.14), and as a lawgiver Moses had a greater impact than those mentioned by Celsus (I.16). Celsus refuses to allow an allegorical interpretation of the Bible, although he approves of the allegorisation of the Greek myths, and although other Greek thinkers, notably Numenius of Apamea, have interpreted the Bible allegorically (I.15, IV.51).[15] In fact, when properly read, what Moses has to say about God is far less offensive than what the Greek poets and philosophers say about him (I.17). Moses is less esoteric, more immediate in his appeal, and has had greater success (I.18). His cosmogony is more reliable than that of Plato or the Egyptians (I.19, 20), his legislation is enlightened and provides a blueprint for a more successful *politeia* than Plato's (V.43). If Celsus prefers Plato on stylistic grounds, he ought to know that the Bible was originally written in Hebrew and employs Hebrew literary style, which does not come across well in Greek (VII.59).

If certain themes are common to the Bible and to Greek writers, this is not proof of unoriginality, still less, as Celsus implies, of invalidity (VII.59). In fact Origen several times supports the view that Greek philosophy was, partly if not wholly, derived from Hebraic sources. Justin[16] and his disciple Tatian had hinted at this; Philo and Josephus had tried to show that there could be a common conceptual vocabulary between Judaism and Greek philosophy; Numenius had gone so far as to say that Plato was simply Moses speaking Greek.[17] Origen repeats tentatively the theory that Plato, on his supposed visit to Egypt, came into contact with Jewish ideas, some of which he adopted (IV.39, cf. VII.30). Elsewhere[18] he says that the Greeks took their tripartite division of philosophy into *ēthikē, phusikē* and *enoptikē* from Solomon, and he finds a hint of the Greek notion *gnōthi seauton* in Song of Songs i.8.[19]

In general, Origen replies to Celsus' allegations by insisting on the antiquity of the Jewish people, on the validity of Moses' teaching and on the peculiar care which, despite appearances, God has for his chosen people. By using stock Jewish answers to the pagan charges he manages to endow the Church with antiquity and respectability. But he must go still further, and show precisely how the Church is heir to the promises

made to Abraham and his descendants, and how the New Israel has superseded the Old. His doctrine of election will be discussed below. Meanwhile, it is interesting to notice how he continually mentions the Church in passing in those passages where he is concerned to defend Judaism, pointing to the collapse of the Jewish state, the rapid spread of Christianity and the superiority of Jesus to Moses and the prophets.

The theology of Judaism is roundly defended by Origen against Celsus' attacks. Like Josephus,[20] he does not deny the charge of *atheotēs,* but shows the superiority of the Jewish monotheism (I.23, VIII.3ff.) and counter-attacks by pointing to the futility of the pagan pantheon (I.23, IV.48), the indignity of worshipping man-made idols (I.5, III.40, IV.26, 31, VII.64ff.).[21] Christians and Jews alike, he says, in obedience to God's commandments avoid pagan temples, altars and images. His attitude to idolatry is anything but naive; he is aware of the sophisticated arguments for and against, the subtle hair-splittings of the philosophers. He concludes that even to pretend to worship idols is wrong (VII.64ff.), a theme which he develops elsewhere along lines closely paralleled in rabbinic sources.[22] Both Jews and Christians also avoid referring to pagan gods by name, being aware of the power (which for Origen seems almost too real) inherent in names (I.25, IV.48).[23] The much-attacked Christian and Jewish *amixia* is likewise defended, as a most reasonable affiliation against pollution from an ungodly environment (I.1, V.42). When, however, Celsus accuses the Jews of worshipping angels, demons and other powers Origen is quick to rebut the charge. The Jews are specifically prohibited from worshipping 'other gods': how then can they worship angels? (I.26, V.6.)

The taunt that the Jews were a useless and uncultured people Origen likewise refutes. Indeed, he says, the ancient Israelites 'manifested a shadow of the heavenly life upon earth' (IV.31). Nor will he accept the statement that God was angry with the Jews. God cannot be angry. The Bible expresses God's attitude in language comprehensible to the ordinary man (IV.71ff.). Celsus fails to see 'all the care of God for the Jews and for their ancient and sacred society' (VI.80). Of course, as a Christian he must at the same time insist that this care has now passed from the Jews to the Gentiles, but at a future date 'all Israel' will be saved.

In putting his arguments against the person of Jesus into the mouth of a Jew, Celsus had taken a bold and original step, which enabled him to exploit the already well-developed Jewish polemic against the new sect. This part of the debate is interesting for two reasons: it highlights

Origen's mildness towards the Jews and at the same time provides an invaluable insight into the Jewish and Christian polemic of the time. It is an early source for the slanders against Jesus which appear in the *Sepher Toldoth Yeshu* but have left little trace in the tannaitic writings and the earliest of the Church Fathers.[24] We are particularly fortunate in that both Celsus and Origen are well acquainted with the subject matter of the polemic, although it is evident that Origen, with his superior biblical knowledge and his years of experience is defending Christianity against Jewish attacks in Palestine, has a better grasp of the real issues involved. Addressing an educated Greek audience, he rejects the 'Ben Panthera' legends as implausible and unworthy of serious consideration. He is not at all impressed by the figure of Celsus' Jew. When the Jew quotes Euripides (II.34), Origen declares that in his experience Jews are not very well read in Greek literature. Celsus' Jew agrees that the Logos is the son of God, an admission which no educated Jew of Origen's acquaintance would make (II.31). Again, he is made to doubt the possibility of bodily resurrection, even though there are two clear cases of it in the Books of Kingdoms (II.57). Origen hints throughout that Celsus' Jew is a mere rhetorical convenience, a fictitious character putting forward thoroughly un-Jewish arguments (I.49, II.28, 77, IV.2, V.6, 8f.). But Origen takes advantage of the opportunity to introduce 'genuine' Jewish arguments which Celsus does not quote, but which he himself has successfully refuted in his disputations, notably the one about the meaning of the Hebrew word *'almah* in Isaiah vii.[25] A Jew might try to maintain that *'almah* means 'young girl' rather than 'virgin'; Origen is aware that some of the Greek versions, though not the Septuagint, render it by *neanis*, but adduces a parallel passage in Deuteronomy where it means 'virgin'. In fact his argument is fallacious,[26] but it is an interesting specimen of his apologetic method and particularly significant that he reinforces his replies to Celsus' Jew with arguments drawn from his own experience of debates with Jews. Later in the same section he refers to a long debate he has had with some Jewish scholars about the 'suffering servant' prophecies, a debate which has an authentic ring, and which shows, as he no doubt intended, his strength as a debater (I.55).

Not only is Celsus' Jew unconvincing as a Jew, he is even given the wrong lines to speak. Why, for example, does the Jew accuse his brethren who have converted to Christianity of abandoning the laws of their forefathers? This rebuke, Origen thinks, ought rather to be addressed to Gentile converts, since the Jewish Christians did not abandon the Mosaic commandments but clung to a literal interpretation

of the Bible (II.1). In this passage, besides displaying his contempt for Jewish Christians who adhere to the Jewish observances, Origen shows that he is prepared to forget, where it is convenient, the identification of the Church with the true Israel. Elsewhere, addressing a Christian audience, he finds it necessary to discuss at greater length the relevance of the Mosaic law.

The proofs which Origen adduces in favour of Christianity are threefold. They are, in ascending order of validity, miracles, the Old Testament prophecies and the history of the Church.[27] The appeal of miracles is naturally very strong to the primitive mind. Like all techniques of public relations, they only appeal to the popular mind if that mind is already predisposed to accept them. Acceptance of miracles is more likely at times of crisis and emotionalism, less likely in more settled times when rationalism prevails. They play a prominent part in the adventures of Moses and Joshua and of Elijah and Elisha, but thereafter they almost entirely disappear until the turbulent times of the Hasmoneans, which saw the rise of so many popular movements, notably of messianism, of the beginnings of the Pharisaic movement and of the idea of martyrdom. As time went on, the Rabbis found the biblical miracles more and more embarrassing. They did not like to appear to be basing the claims of their religion on myths or magic. They therefore tended to play down the unnatural element in the miracles and to accommodate them in a systematic cosmology, and at the same time they tried to discourage Jews from looking for new miracles.[28] Among the less educated Jews there was certainly a great weakness for magic,[29] a trait which was throughout the period of the Jewish state exploited by popular leaders and opposed by more responsible political and religious forces.[30] At no time did the Rabbis deny that miracles were possible.[31] In answer to the pressing question why miracles were performed in biblical times but not in more recent crises they said that the men of old had by their piety deserved God's help, whereas subsequent generations had by their lack of piety shown themselves unworthy of it.[32]

In the Church the situation was similar. The miracles recorded in the Gospels are set in a time and place which were familiar with the idea of 'signs and wonders'. Jesus' largely uneducated audience was highly receptive to such manifestations,[33] even though he failed to persuade some.[34] The Apostolic Age also abounds in reports of miraculous cures and other wonders, and these again clearly correspond to the condition and outlook of the audience at which the Christian mission was aimed.[35] A sophisticated intellectual as was Origen, writing for other

sophisticated intellectuals, could not but adopt a much more restrained attitude towards miracles and wonder-working. The problems were several, none of them new. In the first place, those who were truly unwilling to believe would not be impressed by alleged miracles.[36] Secondly, the miracles recorded in the Bible, while they were accepted as historical fact by those who believed in the divine inspiration of Scripture, were impossible to authenticate if challenged by an outsider. A third problem was that mentioned above: why, if miracles were possible, and had been performed in such profusion in the past, were they not now an everyday occurrence? Lastly, what does a miracle prove? Miracles are in themselves morally neutral, and if they are adduced by both parties in a dispute what criteria are there for accepting some and dismissing others?[37] Origen, while insisting that miracles are possible, and that the biblical miracles (or most of them) really happened, and that the power to perform miracles still survives in the Church, refuses to make them the cornerstone of his defence of the faith.

To be sure, if they are attacked he will defend them. He repeatedly rejects Celsus' charge that Jesus was a magician or sorcerer (I.6, 46, 68, 71, II.32, 48, VIII.9). If the statements that Jesus opened the eyes of the blind and brought the dead to life are true metaphorically, they are equally true in the literal sense (II.48),[38] and such wonders had the power of persuading the faithful in Jesus' own time and in the time of the Apostles (I.46, II.48, etc.).[39] Indeed, they persist in the Church in Origen's day (I.2, 6, II.8, etc.), but they fail to convince many people, who regard them as *muthoi* (III.27, V.57).[40] He is quick to point out that the miracles in the New Testament are no less credible than the *muthoi* which are believed by many Greeks (I.37, V.57, VIII.45) and in fact can have a perfectly natural explanation. He illustrates this in the case of the virgin birth by reference to vultures, which are said to reproduce without the aid of males (I.37). He is conscious, however, that different people have completely different attitudes to miracles (VI.10), and he ridicules Celsus for putting his criticism of the New Testament miracles into the mouth of a Jew. Jews have no reason for doubting these miracles. They must believe that miracles are possible, since they occur in the Hebrew Bible; nor can they challenge them as unauthenticated historically, since they are more recent and better supported by independent testimony than those in the Hebrew Bible (I.43f.). But there is another weapon in Origen's arsenal, which shows that he did not consider the miracles as strong independent evidence.

If a Jew doubts the authenticity of the New Testament miracles,

how can he explain the fact that the prophecies contained in the Old Testament not only foretell that there will be signs and wonders when the Messiah comes, but describes in detail the important events in Jesus' life and in the early history of the Church? The argument from prophecy is one which Origen frequently relied on in controversies with Jewish sages (cf. I.55, 56); it was as old as Christianity, and occurs also in the writings of the Qumran sect, and it provoked a good deal of apologetic on the Jewish side. But in using it to support the evidence of miracles, Origen cannot help relegating the latter to a lower rung on the evidential ladder.[41]

If it is in the power of bad men to perform wonders from wrong motives or for wrong ends, the Jews must prove that the miracles of Moses and the prophets were wrought through them by God, and this they will do by pointing to the outcome. Miracles being in themselves neutral, those miracles will be divine which bring about beneficial results. The miracles wrought through Jesus were of the same kind as those of Moses, Origen argues, in that their purpose was a good one, and so they were genuine miracles of God; but they were superior to those of Moses in that the appeal of this purpose was more universal. Moses welded the Israelites into one people, but Jesus' people is the whole of mankind; Moses gave the Israelites the literal Torah, while Jesus' message is the spiritual Gospel; finally, that Jesus is superior to Moses is recognised by the prophets, who call him the Messiah and the Saviour of mankind.[42] Origen here provides another criterion to buttress the evidence of miracles, namely the outcome, in the case of Judaism the Jewish people and their faith, in that of Christianity the broadcasting of the Christian message throughout the whole world, the amazingly rapid expansion of the Church, the salvation of the Gentiles. This too had been foretold by the prophets; but whereas, in Origen's view, the argument from prophecy bolstered that from miracles, the argument from history was not supported by, but itself supported, the argument from prophecy. He makes this quite clear in a passage in the *Principles* where he says that the advent of Christ proved the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, by proving reliable prophecies which had previously seemed barely intelligible.[43]

These, then, are the principal lines of Origen's defence of Christianity in the *contra Celsum,* in so far as they touch on the relationship between the Church and the Jews. It is true that he is concerned in this work solely to refute the charges brought by Celsus, but for all that, it can still tell us a good deal about his attitude to the Jews. We see that he has debated with Jews; he is familiar with Jewish

arguments, and he has his counter-offensives ready. At the same time, he sees the Church and the Synagogue standing side by side to face the pagan attack. He sees Christianity as the fulfilment of the best elements in Judaism, and he regrets the fact that there are still Jews who reject the Christian message despite the hardships they are made to suffer in consequence, and that they range themselves in controversy with the pagans against the Church. The *contra Celsum* stands apart from the remainder of Origen's surviving work in being directed self-consciously at a pagan audience. For all the erudition and the dialectical virtuosity which it displays, it tells us less about the real issues at stake between the Church and the Synagogue than do the homiletical works, in which we see Origen addressing his flock, conscious of their weaknesses and their difficulties, and in which, talking about the Bible and about the Church, he finds himself returning again and again to the theme of the Church as successor to the biblical Israel. The evidence of these works will be discussed in the next chapter. What we do see from the *contra Celsum* is how much common ground there could still be in the mid-third century between the Church and the Synagogue, when both faced the same attack from outside.

7

THE CHURCH AND THE JEWS

To return briefly to the three categories of evidence mentioned in the last chapter, it is remarkable that Origen makes little use in his surviving writings of the continuing power of prophecy and wonder-working in the Church or of arguments based on miracles. We know from other Christian apologetic writings and from the acts of the martyrs - and also, by implication, from certain rabbinic traditions - that both formed an important weapon in the Christian armoury in the debate with the Synagogue,[1] and it is not unlikely that if we had written records of Origen's disputations with Jews we should find more emphasis laid on them. It is significant that he introduces into his argument in the *contra Celsum*[2] the miracle of the virgin birth, which Celsus had ignored, and that he dwells at length on the miracle of the resurrection.[3] In both instances we catch authentic snatches of the debate with the Synagogue, in which these two miracles played an important part.

The importance of the Old Testament prophecies in the debate with the Jews is stressed in a passage of the *contra Celsum*[4] in which he argues that it was necessary for Jesus to be born among the Jews, since they were acquainted with the biblical prophecies about the Messiah. In addition to his constant use of the prophecies to demonstrate the authenticity of Jesus and his teaching, we must notice Origen's allegorical interpretation of numerous passages of the Bible not overtly prophetic, but which he interprets as referring covertly to the rise of the Church and to the transference of God's patronage from the Jews to the Gentiles. Neither argument was new. The authors of the Gospels were only too well aware of the power of the old prophecies, and Paul's treatment in Galatians of the figures of Abraham, Ishmael and Isaac paved the way for subsequent typological and allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament.[5]

Particularly important also in the discussion of the triumph of the

Church over the Synagogue is the argument from history which complements and reinforces that from prophecy. In history we see God's will expressed, and in accordance with men's actions and God's love for them he rewards some and punishes others. It is Origen's contention, and he was neither the first nor the last to propound the view, that God's rejection of the Jewish people is manifest in its defeat, expulsion from Jerusalem and subsequent humiliation and persecution. This, like the advent of Christ, had been prophesied, but the event, which serves also to verify the prediction, is of a higher evidential order.

In insisting that Origen was at pains in the *contra Celsum* to defend the Jews we have of necessity presented only one side of the coin. He does not of course completely whitewash the Jews, who had been repeatedly charged with having rejected Christ, been responsible for his death and persecuted his Church. Such sentiments were commonplace; it would be remarkable if Origen did not subscribe to them, but the fact that he does is not evidence of a negative attitude towards the Jews. His remarks about them are on the whole surprisingly free from the ill-informed rancour which pervades much of the literature on the subject which survives from the early Church. But it would be misleading to overlook entirely such traces of acrimony as do appear. What is important is to read each remark in its context and to bear in mind that Origen naturally adapts his tone to suit his audience. Herein lies the significance of his mildness towards the Jews in the *contra Celsum.* Here was a great opportunity to castigate the Jews at length for their deafness to the message of Jesus and for their part in his death, to echo the pagan indictment of everything that was Jewish, and to condemn the contemporary Synagogue for its vicious and slanderous campaign against the Church. Yet whenever he opens his mouth to criticise the Jews, he almost stifles himself in his attempt to remain calm and reasonable. He shows no malice, only amazement at the ingratitude of the Jews, who were especially chosen to witness the divine incarnation which was foretold by their own prophets, and yet refused to accept it.[6] He mentions the Jewish slanders against the person of Jesus and against the Church,[7] but he refers to them calmly as an historical fact without dwelling on them. When Celsus charges the Christians with believing that God has abandoned the rest of mankind and is concerned for the Church alone, Origen replies that this is not a Christian belief, although some Jews might say 'not the words Celsus quotes, but something else equally stupid'.[8] Elsewhere he defends the Jews against the common charge of 'misanthropy'.[9] He uses strong language when he says[10] that all contemporary Jewish beliefs are

muthoi kai lēroi, but he immediately qualifies it by adding that this is because they lack the enlightened understanding of the scriptures. This is in fact his main complaint against the Jews, and we shall return to it below.

The responsibility of the Jews for the death of Jesus deserves more detailed attention. It is fair to say that the New Testament makes little of the guilt of the Jews. Despite their acceptance of responsibility in Matthew xxvii.25, and their sinister presence in the background throughout the account in the Fourth Gospel, the impression persists that the crucifixion was part of the pre-ordained purpose of God,[11] and Luke seems to go out of his way to absolve the Jews from blame.[12] Paul, in an isolated outburst,[13] refers to the Jews 'who both killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets, and have persecuted us, and they please not God, and are contrary to all men', but it was apparently not until later that the cross came to symbolise the rift between Church and Synagogue.[14] In the early years of the Church it was the attitude to the law which seemed to epitomise the gulf between the two; by the second century the focus of the controversy had shifted from the observance of the law to the fulfilment of prophecy in the person of Jesus.[15] To Origen the question of the Mosaic law, which Celsus had brought up, seemed hardly worth dwelling on. Jewish Christians still lived according to the literal law,[16] but for the Church this could only be a shadow of the spiritual law. Expounding the journey of the Israelites, Origen explains the tree thrown into the waters of Marah as an allegory of the Christian spiritualisation of the law of Moses, and he adds, 'the Jews are still at Marah, still dwelling by the bitter waters; for God has not yet shown them the tree by means of which the waters are sweetened'.[17] For Origen the argument is dead. But as the question of the law recedes into the background, the problems connected with the person of Jesus as the prophesied Christ move into the forefront of the dialogue between Church and Synagogue, and outstanding among these is the picture of the Jews as the killers of Christ.

The defeat of the Jews in the war of 66-73, together with the crushing of the revolts of the first half of the second century and the harsh legislation which followed, appeared to support the Christian claim, based on a number of prophecies, that God had withdrawn His protection from the Jewish people. The Old Testament contained both blessings and curses, promises and threats. If the blessings belonged to the Church, the corollary was that the curses applied to the Jews. So ran the argument, and several prophecies could be interpreted to imply that God would in time come to abandon the Jews and transfer his care

to the Gentiles. The recent history of the Jews and the Church appeared to bear out these predictions. It is worth noticing that there are two separate arguments which work independently. It was possible to describe the whole historical process without reference to the alleged crime of the Jews. In two passages of the *contra Celsum*[18] Origen sees the universalisation and spiritualisation of the revelation given to the Jews as an instance of necessary and desirable progress. The Mosaic law needed to be brought up to date, and at the same time it was wrong that it should be limited to one alone of all the peoples of mankind.[19] Elsewhere he says that the Jewish people were destroyed in punishment for the crime of killing Jesus, the culmination of a long history of such crimes.[20] These two arguments both lead up to the advent of Christ and the founding of the Church of the Gentiles. The interrelation of the two is expounded by Origen in the following words: 'He did not come with the aim of bringing about the unbelief of the Jews, but by his foreknowledge he foretold that this would happen and he used the unbelief of the Jews to call the Gentiles.'[21] The sin of the Jews is not essential to the argument for the mission to the Gentiles, but the prophecies cited are warnings to the Jews of what will happen if they persist in earning God's displeasure: the election of the Gentiles is thus linked to the punishment of the Jews. If there are inconsistencies in the argument, they are ignored by Origen. It may seem hard on the Jews that they should be held guilty for an act which, *ex hypothesi,* had been foretold long before, but Origen makes it clear[22] that there is no conflict between prophecy and free will. Similarly, it is not denied that Jesus exercised free will in going to his death as prophesied.[23] This fact is not considered as extenuating the guilt of the Jews.[24]

This was not the first time that the Jews had done wrong. They had a long record of wrongdoing and rebellion, for which they had been punished in the past,[25] including the killing of the prophets.[26] Origen refers[27] to the legend of the martyrdom of Isaiah,[28] which he calls the 'apocryphal Isaiah'.[29] The legend in its present form dates probably from the first century and is of Jewish origin.[30] It recurs in a similar form in the Talmud.[31] Whereas in the original and in the Jewish quotations it is Manasse who puts Isaiah to death, in the Christian tradition, beginning with Justin,[32] it is the Jewish people which is responsible,[33] and it is in this form that Origen quotes it.[34] In a homily on Isaiah[35] he explains that it was because the Jews were in a state of sin that they could not understand Jesus' spiritual teaching and refused to believe in him. Here as elsewhere the previous background of sin plays a part in the account of God's desertion of the Jews.

The responsibility of the Jews for the death of Jesus had thus become inextricably bound up with the argument about the election of the Gentile Church. But it was also important as part of a polemical point in the defence of Christianity against pagan attacks. Twice Celsus, ridiculing the claim that Jesus was God, had argued that we should have expected those who had tortured and killed a god to be punished.[36] Origen points out in passing that the tortured body of Jesus was not itself God,[37] but his main reply is that the culprit was not, as Celsus seems to think, Pontius Pilate, but the Jewish people, and that the whole of this people had been punished for the crime by being crushed in war and scattered all over the world. Origen and Celsus differ fundamentally in their view of history. For Celsus the destruction of Jerusalem was an event wholly explicable in human terms;[38] God does not enter into the matter. For Origen history is the setting for the drama of God's relationship with men, and any historical event may be interpreted as evidence of God's love or displeasure. On this principle Jews and Christians agreed. For Jews and Christians alike, the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple, the dissolution of the Jewish state and the Roman occupation of Palestine signified the passing of an era. True, there were a few voices raised in protest at this interpretation of history,[39] but for the most part Jews, as well as Christians, came to accept that Jerusalem had been destroyed because of the sins of the Jews.

The transference of divine care from the Jews to the Gentiles, whether as a logical development of Judaism or because the Jews had proved themselves unworthy, was for Origen a fact, manifest in the biblical prophecies and in the respective histories of the Church and the Synagogue. In expounding it he constantly makes use of the phraseology of the Old Testament, transplanting it into the new context and giving it a new meaning. His early and thorough acquaintance with the biblical text enables him to exploit its language almost unconsciously, so that in his hands the biblical phrases are not mere polemical instruments but come naturally to life as they had not done in the Church since Paul. His vocabulary is derived in part from the New Testament, but also to a large extent from his own reading of the Old Testament, which he considers capable at every turn of shedding new light on the mystery of God's rejection of the Jews and election of the Gentiles. A few examples will suffice at once to illustrate this point and to sketch in outline Origen's doctrine of election.

The purpose of the Incarnation, Origen says, was twofold; in the

first place to convert the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel', and then, because of their unbelief, to take away 'the kingdom of God' from the former, Jewish, husbandmen and give it to 'other husbandmen'.[40] The parable of Matthew xxi.33ff. was a classic source for the doctrine, expounding, significantly, the rebellion of the Jews.[41] Another important New Testament text was Romans, explaining as it does that the Jews were indeed the chosen people (a favourite point of Origen in the *contra Celsum*), but that through their fall 'salvation is come unto the Gentiles'.[42] Crucial to the whole argument is the paradox that Jews and Gentiles suffer a reversal of roles. The historical Israelites cease to be Israelites, while the believers from the Gentiles become the New Israel. This involves a redefinition of Israel. The characteristic of the Israelites was that they were a nation apart, distinguished almost by definition from the other nations in whose midst they lived. The prime text for this was Numbers xxiii.9, 'he shall not be reckoned among the nations', claimed by Jews as particularly strong evidence since it was delivered by a non-Jew.[43] Commenting on this verse, Origen adds that if Israel abandons his privileged position he is no longer Israel. The words of Paul about the branch of wild olive grafted onto the olive tree (Romans xi.7), which help to explain how the Church becomes part of Israel, also serve to distinguish believing from unbelieving Gentiles, and so the Church, being utterly severed from the 'nations', becomes the true Israel. 'Therefore no one from Jacob or Israel who sins can be called Jacob or Israel, and equaly no Gentile who has once entered the Church of the Lord will ever again be reckoned among the nations.'[44]

The figure of Jacob is thus completely reidentified, with dramatic consequences for the traditional biblical exegesis. Jewish tradition had long identified Esau with the enemies of Israel, and derived satisfaction from the promise the Jacob would prevail over them.[45] Since Jacob now stands for the Church, Esau, the older brother, will represent the Jews. Origen comments on Genesis xxv.23: 'How the one people (the Church) has overcome the other (the Synagogue), and how the elder is the servant of the younger, is known even to the Jews, although they do not believe it.'[46] The implication of the last words is that the argument is familiar to the Jews, but that they do not realise that it works against themselves. Again, reading Jacob as a symbol of the Church, Origen finds a new meaning for the sheep won from Laban.[47]

Before leaving the subject of the sinfulness of the Jews, we should take note of two more charges based on elaborate interpretations of scriptural passages. The first owes a debt to early pagan anti-Jewish invective.[48] It is that the synagogue of the Jews is smitten with leprosy,

here a metaphor for evil-doing. Just as the householder who discovers leprosy in his house reports it to the priest, so the prophets had proclaimed the wrongdoings of the people.[49] The second is the charge of adultery, based on Jesus' taunt to the Pharisees and Sadducees (Matthew xvi.4). They were an 'adulterous generation' because they had deserted the truth and espoused falsehood and sin. 'After this it is written that "he left them and departed"; naturally the bridegroom-Logos left the adulterous generation and departed from it. One might say that the Logos of God left the synagogue of the Jews because it was adulterous, and departed from it and took the Gentiles as a "wife or whoredoms".'[50] These accusations may seem unworthy. They are characteristic of an attitude to the words of scripture having much in common with, and in part derived from, that of the Pharisaic Rabbis. Everything is grist for the exegete's mill.

Lest it should be doubted that God had warned the Jews of what would befall them, there was the prophecy of Moses himself (Deuteronomy xxxii.21), 'I will move them to jealousy with those which are not a people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation.' The Church, composed of elements of various peoples but not itself a people, is clearly a strong candidate for the title of 'those which are not a people';[51] as for the 'foolish nation', the key lies in I Corinthians i.27, 'God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise'.[52] A further prophecy of the election of the Gentile Church was found in Psalm civ(ciii).29f., 'Thou wilt take away their breath (LXX *pneuma*), they will die, and return to their dust. Thou wilt send forth Thy spirit, and they shall be created, and Thou wilt renew the face of the earth'. This is taken to mean that the holy Spirit will be taken away from those who are unworthy, and given to the new people which God will create.[53] With this we should compare the prophecy of the 'days of famine' (Psalm xxxvii(xxxvi).19), 'not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the word of the Lord' (Amos viii.11). This refers to the plight of the Jews, who, because they read the law but did not do it, lost the gift of hearing the word of the Lord, and now have no prophets, wise men or other inspired leaders.[54] As it was prophesied to the Jews that 'by hearing they would hear, and should not understand, and that seeing they should see, but should not perceive' (Isaiah vi.9), so in fact they refused to recognise Jesus as the Messiah, and in consequence they lost not only their sacred institutions but all vestige of divine power. 'They no longer have any prophets or wonders, though considerable traces of these are to be found among Christians.'[55] As Origen says elsewhere, 'the closeness of

God has been removed from them and transferred to the Church of Christ'.[56]

A clear illustration of the way in which Origen seizes on a Jewish interpretation of a biblical passage and adapts it to suit the new dispensation is his handling of Moses' upraised arms during the battle with Amalek. 'Rabbi Eliezer said: Are we to understand that it is Moses' arms which strengthen Israel or shatter Amalek? No, rather when Israel perform the will of God and trust in God's instructions to Moses then God performs for them miracles and acts of valour... R. Akiba said: When Moses raises his arm it is an allusion of Israel's future exaltation of the Torah, and so they prevail; when he lowers his arm it signifies that they will degrade the word of Torah, and they do not prevail.'[57] The usual Christian interpretation of Moses' arms is to see in them a symbol of the Cross.[58] Origen is attracted by the Jewish interpretation, but he cannot resist twisting it slightly so as to read as a condemnation of the Synagogue. Like R. Eliezer he takes the arms to represent men's actions: 'If our actions are elevated and do not rest on the ground, Amalek is defeated... Thus if the people keeps the law, it raises up Moses' arms and the adversary is defeated; if it does not keep the law Amalek is strengthened.' He adds, following R. Akiba's interpretation, and importing the distinction, ignored by Akiba, between the literal and the spiritual observance of the law: 'I think that by this figure Moses also represents the two peoples, showing that one is the people of the Gentiles, which raises Moses' arms and extends them, that is to say elevates what Moses wrote and establishes its understanding on a high level and thereby conquers, while the other is the people which, because it does not raise Moses' arms or lift them off the ground, and does not consider that there is anything deep or subtle in him, is conquered by its enemies and laid low.'[59] That the Jews fail to see the higher meaning of scripture is Origen's principal complaint against the Judaism of his day, and we shall return to it in what follows. Suffice it here to notice how the doctrine of the election of the Gentiles involves the sacrificing by the Jews of every proof of God's special care for them as against the nations: the roles have been reversed.

It is no exaggeration to say that, for Origen, the whole of the debate between the Church and the Synagogue can be reduced to the one question of the interpretation of scripture. 'Jesus is the son of the God who gave the law and the prophets', and 'the religion of Moses and the prophetic writings form the introduction to the faith of the Christians'; Christianity is thoroughly rooted in the Jewish Bible. The difference

between Judaism and Christianity is that Christians perceive the mysteries which are only hinted at in the Bible, whereas Jews are only capable of a strictly literal reading of the text. (It may be thought remarkable that Origen, of all people, who was well acquainted with Jewish exegesis in all its aspects, should have perpetuated this myth of 'Jewish literalism', but perpetuate it he certainly does.) From this blindness spring all the troubles of the Jews. Just as they see only the 'carnal' letter of the law, and fail to grasp the spirit, so they failed to see through the body of Jesus to the spiritual mysteries beyond. Having been vouchsafed 'a shadowy image of the truth'[60] they might have been expected to be the first to believe, but instead they reject the reality and still cling firmly to the shadow. Because they were in sin, which is 'heavy', they could not perceive the 'light' spiritual truth, but 'heard heavily with their ears' (Isaiah vi.10 LXX) the letter, which 'is heavy' and 'kills'.[61] As Paul had remarked - and this was to remain the main text for Jewish blindness to the truth - the Jews still suffer from the veil with which Moses covered his face; they read the Bible with the veil on their hearts, and so their minds are blinded (II Corinthians iii.14f.). The Mosaic legislation was an 'example and shadow of heavenly things' (Hebrews viii.4f.); with the advent of Christ the 'example and shadow' ceased, the earthly Jerusalem fell, and with it the Temple, the veil fell away from Moses' face and the way was opened up to the heavenly Jerusalem.[62]

The Jewish rejection of Jesus is thus closely connected for Origen with the literal interpretation of the law. He develops this point in the fourth book of the *Principles.* Here, having demonstrated that the scriptures are divinely inspired, he turns on 'the hard-hearted and ignorant Jews' who, because they interpreted the messianic prophecies literally, could not recognise Jesus as the Messiah, and crucified him.[63] The clue to the understanding of the scriptures is given, he says, in Proverbs xxii.20 (LXX, 'and do thou portray them triply in counsel and knowledge (*gnōsis*)'. There are accordingly three ways of interpreting scripture, corresponding to the three parts of a man, body, soul and spirit.[64] The simple man is to be edified by the 'flesh' of scripture; he who has climbed a certain way up the ladder can grasp the 'soul', while only the perfect man (*ho teleios,* perhaps 'the initiate') can attain to an understanding of the spiritual law.[65] It follows from this classification that for Origen himself the most important sense of scripture is the third, the spiritual, which includes the allegorical and typological forms of interpretation. The second, the 'moral' sense, is not clearly distinguished from the third, while the 'carnal' (*sōmatikon*) is merely a

pourboire, thrown in free with the spiritual truth; its main purpose is to cover up the latter, as the flesh hides the spirit, but it is endowed with the additional aim of improving the masses.[66] Origen's preoccupation with allegory and typology amounts at times to a mania. Certain associations of ideas, certain conventional symbols are manipulated in a way more suited to a crossword-puzzle than to biblical scholarship. Any tree, any piece of wood is a type of the cross, and any biblical sacrifice prefigures the death of Jesus. The climax of the performance is reached, one feels, when, *mirabili circularitate,* the non-literal exegesis is made to supply its own vindication. The lesson, for example, of the sweetening of the waters of Marah, or of the raising of Moses' arms, when these episodes are subjected to the 'higher exegesis', is that Christianity is saved by its spiritual apprehension of the divine truths, while the Jews are condemned by their literalism.[67] Another proof-text is Joshua xv.15ff., which tells of the capture of Debir by Othniel, the nephew of Caleb, who was rewarded with the hand of Caleb's daughter Achsah. Origen expounds this text allegorically with the help of the Hebrew names: Debir means 'discourse', but it was formerly called the 'City of Letters' or 'Scripture' (Kirjath-sepher). Othniel ('God's reply', the man to whom God replies by revealing His secrets), who smites the City of Letters (the Old Testament) is the brother of Caleb (the law) and the son of Kenaz ('contempt'). This shows how the doctors of the Church, by applying the spiritual understanding to the Old Testament and doing away with the literal observance of the law, destroy the 'letter which killeth' and produce instead spiritual discourses.[68]

Thus, using a technique derived ultimately from the commentators on Homer and from Jewish allegorists such as Philo, Origen sets out to demonstrate that the Old Testament belongs not to the Jews but to the Church, that it is, in fact, when properly understood, a text-book of Christianity, and that it is essentially at one with the New Testament and the whole of Christian teaching. The arguments based on the non-literal interpretation can be used against the unbelief of the Jews, but they are also useful in replying to attacks on the Old Testament from various sources, and in silencing those within the Church who favour a literal interpretation.[69]

Finally, a few remarks must be made on the subject of the practical dangers which the Church might be thought to face from the Jews. Origen is often quoted as a source for the notion that the Jews were in large part responsible for the persecutions of the Church. Also cited as witnesses to this charge are Justin Martyr and Tertullian, among others. Justin accuses the Jews of hostility to the Church, and of killing and

punishing Christians just as the pagans do, whenever they have the chance. He refers to Barcochebas, who, he says, gave instructions for Christians alone (or rather such Christians as refused to deny Jesus and blaspheme against him) to be subjected to cruel punishments. The Roman government now prevent such activities, says Justin, but previously whenever Jews had the opportunity they persecuted the Christians.[70] Tertullian refers to 'the synagogues, the sources of the persecutions',[71] and an anonymous source preserved by Eusebius[72] denies the claim of the Montanists to the name of Christians on the grounds that they had never been scourged or stoned by the Jews.

Although Origen must go on record as subscribing to this idea, he does not give us any specific information, and in fact he does not make much of the charge. The principal passages are three:

Commenting on Romans xi.28, 'according to the Gospel enemies because of you', he calls that the Jews had shouted, 'Away with him, away with him, crucify him!' and he adds the words: 'How could they not be called enemies of God, since they said such things then and still do? But when he says "because of you" he means the people whose salvation they envy, preventing the apostles from speaking to the Gentiles, and persecuting those who proclaim Christ.'[73]

Again, commenting on Psalm xxxvii(xxxvi).1f., he quotes Deuteronomy xxxii.21, 'I will move them to jealousy with those which are not a people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation', a prophecy which, he says, has been fulfilled in the action of the Jews, who do not rage against the pagans who worship idols and blaspheme against God, 'but are moved in insatiable hated against the Christians, who have abandoned idols and turned to God'.[74]

Thirdly, in a homily on Judges Origen says that 'together with pagans and Jews, even heretics persecute the Church of God'.[75]

Considering the many opportunities he had of mentioning the persecutions, it is remarkable that we find so few references. Of these three, the first two are immediately inspired by the need to explain scriptural references to the hostility of the Jews, while in the third the Jews are mentioned only in passing. It could be plausibly argued that there is in none of these three a reference to events occurring in Origen's own lifetime. Certainly in the earliest days of the rift between Church and Synagogue there had been hostile incidents, but we have very little evidence that attacks continued beyond the middle of the second century. What we know of Origen's life suggests that his experience of Jews was anything but unpleasant. The argument is really theological, not historical. 'The hostility of the Jews' had long played a

part in the theory of Christianity and was retained almost from force of habit. Origen's talk of persecution may describe accurately the situation a century and a half before, but we should surely have heard more of any episodes in the third century.[76]

In the same vein are the accusations of hostility levelled at the Jews in the *contra Celsum.* These were based for the most part on events related in the New Testament, although Origen does also mention polemical disputations which he has held with Jews. Two historical details are interesting: Origen knows of the libels of the *Sepher Toldoth Yeshu,* which play a long and important role in the story of the antagonism of Church and Synagogue, and he refers, probably, to the Jewish cursing of the Christians in the Eighteen Benedictions (*Tefillah*).[77]

A more serious threat, resulting from a syncretistic tendency in the age, and by implication refuting the charge of Jewish antagonism, was the danger of the corruption of the Church by the percolation within it of Jewish teachings and of Jewish practices. The Jews, he says, 'wish to subvert the spiritual teaching of Christ'.[78] That this was a serious problem is clear from any number of passages from the homilies in which Origen condemns any tendency in the Church towards the literal observance of the law. It appears that there were those among his flock who were in the habit of going to Synagogue on Saturday and to Church on Sunday. He reminds such people of the instructions for the sacrifices and the eating of the Paschal lamb: the meat must be fresh; it must be killed and eaten on the same day. Similarly, he says, the word of God (for which meat is frequently taken as a figure) must be consumed fresh. The literal interpretation of the Bible is stale; the Christian interpretation is fresh. 'If you produce in church today what you learnt from the Jews yesterday, that is to "eat the meat of yesterday's sacrifice".'[79] Another instruction about the Paschal lamb which Origen finds meaningful in this connexion is 'in one house shall it be eaten' (Exodus xii.46). 'If you eat the words of God in Church and also in the synagogue of the Jews, you transgress against the command "in one house shall it be eaten"... "Thou shalt not carry forth ought of the flesh abroad out of the house" (*ibid.*): The word spoken in church should not be proclaimed outside the Church, since the flesh must not be carried out of the house. (I refer to a synagogue of Jews or heretics.) It is tantamount to "casting pearls before swine".'[80]

It is clear that there was sufficient religious promiscuity to cause alarm. Time and again Origen warns his hearers against being misled into following Jewish practices, such as circumcision, fasting and the

observance of Sabbaths and festivals. Feeling evidently ran high on both sides, and Origen makes it his concern to avoid both extremes. On the one hand he insists that it is a characteristic of Christianity to interpret the law spiritually: it is in this that the originality of the Christian message consists, and anyone, Jew or Christian, who persists in literalism fails to guard against the 'leaven of the Pharisees'.[81] Such institutions as the Sabbath and circumcision belong to a temporary legislation, now superseded, and it is a retrogressive step to return to them.[82] On the other hand, he warns against the opposite excess, that of dissociating the Church completely from the Mosaic legislation. He makes no apology for reading out the rules for sacrifices or Sabbath observance in church, although he knows that some of his hearers are bound to object. He imagines their complaints: 'Why is it necessary for this to be read in church? What good to us are Jewish precepts and the observances of a despised people? They belong to the Jews: let the Jews taken care of them.' To forestall them he points out the importance of arriving at an understanding of the spiritual mysteries which lie beyond the letter of the law, the glorious face of Moses concealed by the veil.[83]

Faced with a situation in which he found a strong Judaising tendency and also a certain reaction against this tendency, Origen could afford to point to a *via media* which stressed the importance for the Church of the law provided it was interpreted spiritually. Possibly the problem was not as grave as that which later confronted John Chrysostom in Antioch, but it is still informative to contrast Origen's mild reasonableness with Chrysostom's hellfire and thunder.[84] The only surprising feature of Origen's standpoint is that he can explicitly forbid any mutual give-and-take between the Church and the Synagogue, notwithstanding his own close association with Jews and his use in these very sermons of material drawn directly from the Synagogue. If there is a contradiction between theory and practice, it is not an unbearable one. Lesser beings than Origen have succeeded in containing multitudes.

8

DEBATES AND DISCUSSIONS

Origen occasionally refers to his disputations and discussions with learned Jews, and although no full record of such dialogues has come down to us it is yet possible to reconstruct from his surviving remarks the form and subject matter of his arguments. From these it is clear that the debates followed the same general outlines as those, such as Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho,* which have come down to us in literary form, and were mainly concerned, like Justin's *Dialogue*, with proving from biblical texts the validity of the Christian teaching. Selections of texts made with this object in view were probably in circulation from an early date; a third-century collection survives in the *Testimonia* of Cyprian,[1] although Cyprian's selection by no means corresponds closely to the texts used by Origen. Origen's principal texts, to which he refers again and again, are few in number. His topics, too, are limited, and correspond, although his arguments are rather different, to those of Justin and of Cyprian: the Mosaic legislation; God's rejection of the Jewish people and his new convenant with the Gentiles; the person of Christ, his divinity, his mission, his earthly life, death and resurrection. These were the main points of difference between the Church and the Synagogue, and the debate is reflected throughout the *contra Celsum.* We are here concerned, however, not with Origen's replies to Celsus' arguments, which represent the dialogue with the Synagogue only at second hand, but with such traces as survive of his actual discussions and disputations with Jews.

The Law

On the observance of the Mosaic law, Origen diverges from the line followed by Justin and Cyprian, who held that the Mosaic legislation was never intended to be a permanent institution, but was given to the Israelites to curb their wanton tendencies until such time as a more

comprehensive, spiritual law could be given: 'A law which is given in contrast to another cancels the previous one, and similarly a later covenant renders the former one void. Christ has been given to us as an everlasting and final law, and this covenant is reliable, after which there is no other law, no ordinance and no commandment.'[2] Origen[3] stresses rather the allegorical interpretation of the laws. Not that he denies that their literal observance ever did have any validity - though he sometimes comes close to this attitude - but he held that the old laws were a type or shadow of the truth, the meaning of which would become fully apparent only later, when the whole truth had been revealed. 'Those ceremonies were a type, while the ultimate reality was that which the Holy Spirit was to teach them.'[4] The allegorical interpreation of the law was by no means new; it is to be found in the Letter of Aristeas,[5] in Philo and in the Epistle of Barnabas.[6] Philo, although he approved of the allegorical interpretation, castigates those in his own day who are so carried away by the symbolic interpretation they they neglect the literal observance of the commandments.[7] Origen, in common with all our other sources, concentrates on three particular features of the traditional observance which were the focus points of the whole debate: circumcision, the Sabbath and the dietary laws.

Circumcision

In the *contra Celsum,* Origen, answering Celsus' charge that the Jews had taken the idea of circumcision from the Egyptians and Colchians, stresses the difference between the 'haphazard' circumcision of the Egyptians, the Colchians and the Arabs and the Jewish circumcision on the eighth day in obedience to God's command to Abraham. The reason may be, he says, that some angel hostile to the Jewish nation was deprived of his power against them by the rite of circumcision, as is implied in the story of Zipporah's circumcision of her son (Exodus iv.24ff.). He adds that when Jesus assumed bodily form and was circumcised the angel lost all his power against those who worshipped God and were *not* circumcised, which is why Paul says (Galatians v.2) 'if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing'.[8] This is a good example of Origen's protective attitude in the *contra Celsum* towards Jewish attitudes and beliefs; elsewhere he inveighs at length against the Jewish practice of circumcision.[9] His main argument, in line with his general attitude to the law, is that 'just as many other things happened as a figure and image of the future truth, so this bodily circumcision bore the form of the spiritual circumcision, in which it was right and proper that the God of glory should instruct mankind'.[10] It is

unworthy of the Lord of heaven and earth, he says, to have made his covenant with the man whom, alone of all men, he has chosen consist in the circumcision of the foreskin, of which the 'masters and doctors of the Synagogue' make so much. Not only is circumcision, taken literally, unworthy of God, but, on one celebrated occasion at least, its observance was manifestly impossible. After the crossing of the Jordan Joshua was commanded (Joshua v.2) to 'make stone knives and circumcise the children of Israel a second time'. How can anyone who is already circumcised be circumcised a second time? Joshua is a type of his namesake Jesus, and the circumcision is to be understood metaphorically of Jesus' twofold purification of the Jews.[11]

The clue to the spiritual meaning of circumcision is to be found, Origen says, in the biblical references to the circumcision of the heart, as in Ezekiel xliv.9, 'no stranger, uncircumcised in heart, nor uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into my sanctuary'. Literal circumcision of the heart is a grotesque idea: it is clearly to be interpreted metaphorically. The Jewish reply to this argument, which Origen quotes, is that, even if circumcision of the heart is not to be understood literally, Ezekiel explicitly mentions here both kinds of circumcision, of the heart and of the flesh. 'There is no room for allegory: both kinds of circumcision are required.'[12] Origen avoids rather than answers the objection by saying that, just as it would be absurd to interpret such biblical phrases as 'their ear is uncircumcised' (Jeremiah vi.10) and 'I am of uncircumcised lips' (Origen quotes Exodus iv.10, which he confuses with vi.12) as of literal, bodily circumcision, so it is perverse to take the references to the circumcision of the foreskin literally. The Scriptural expression alludes, he says, to purification from various kinds of offence, sexual offences, evil or misguided thoughts, foolish and malicious speech and attention to the words of slanderers and blasphemers. When every part of our body obeys God's commands, then we can truly be said to be circumcised and the promise made to Abraham is fulfilled in us. Origen ends his argument by returning to his opening remarks about the inappropriateness of the literal interpretation. 'Does this not seem to you a more fitting circumcision, better suited to God's covenant? Compare, if you will, our words with your Jewish tales and fetid stories and see whether it is in your form or in that which is preached in the Church of Christ that circumcision is observed in a manner worthy of God'.[13] In the last resort, it is to the aesthetic argument, here as elsewhere, that Origen appeals. He does not explicitly deny that Abraham literally circumcised Isaac; if challenged on this point his

answer would have been that before the revelation of the new circumcision the rite had a certain limited validity, but only as a type of the reality which was yet to be made manifest. His attitude differs from that of Justin, who takes circumcision literally but argues[14] that it is unnecessary, since otherwise God would not have created Adam uncircumcised. This very argument was put to R. Hoshaya, who taught in Caesarea in Origen's lifetime. His reply was that everything created in the first six days needs perfecting in some way: mustard needs sweetening, vetches need seasoning, wheat needs grinding, and man too needs to be perfected by circumcision.[15]

The Sabbath

The rules for the observance of the Sabbath are one of Origen's principal objections to the literal interpretation of the law. The day of which the Jews boasted as their greatest contribution to civilisation, which was held by Jews and Christians to point to great moral and spiritual lessons, one of the things, according to Clement,[16] which distinguish men from animals, was completely hedged about with petty and cumbersome rules the literal observance of which would be almost impossible. Origen objects in particular to two of the rules: 'Abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day' (Exodus xvi.29) and 'take heed to yourselves, and bear no burden on the Sabbath day' (Jeremiah xvii.21). Both of these, he says, are impossible to observe, and he goes on to argue that the literal, or 'Jewish', observance of the law is completely misguided. This is a form of argument which Origen commonly uses, and it is rather misleading. The argument is not essentially about whether or not it is possible to observe the law in its literal meaning, it is about the higher value of the spiritual interpretation. Even if it were demonstrated that the law was not impossible to observe in its literal sense, Origen's main argument would not be affected. This is in fact what happened. When Origen says that the command to stay in one's place throughout the Sabbath is impossible to obey, the Jewish reply is that 'place' may be interpreted fairly liberally. At least as early as R. Akiba (before 135) the 2,000 cubits of Numbers xxxv.5 were explained as applying to the Sabbath-limit of the city, within which life could continue as normal on the Sabbath. The freedom to move 2,000 cubits in any one direction was also given to individuals.[17] This will have been the reply which Origen received when he confronted the Jews with the impossibility of observing the law; he dismisses it, unsympathetically, as a 'frigid tradition'.[18] Similarly with the carrying of burdens, Origen is aware of

the rabbinic definitions and limitations of the law. 'Therefore the Jewish teachers have been reduced to endless arguments, holding that one kind of sandal is a burden while another is not, that a sandal with nails is a burden but one without is not, and that what is carried in a certain way on one shoulder is a burden, but what is carried on both shoulders is not.'[19] He refuses to argue with the Jews on their own terms, but dismisses the entire argument, accusing the Jews instead of refusing to see the higher meaning of the Sabbath. 'After all, among them a craftsman, a builder or anyone who does work of that kind rests on the Sabbath day, but a reader of the divine law or a teacher does not cease from his work and yet does not violate the Sabbath.'[20] The true Sabbath-observance consists of a complete break with worldly occupations and a total dedication to spiritual acts. Origen reinterprets the prohibitions mentioned above: 'Burdens' refers to sins, which are compared to heavy burdens in Psalm xxxvii(xxxviii).5, and fire, which is also forbidden on the Sabbath (Exodus xxxv.3), is likewise referred to evildoing, on the basis of Isaiah 1.11.[21] As for the command to stay in one's own place, 'what is the "place" of the spiritual soul? Its place is justice, truth, wisdom, sanctification; everything which Christ is is the place of the soul'.[22] Even so, the true observance of the Sabbath is impossible in this world, where even God does not rest on the Sabbath; the present age is the 'sixth day of Creation', and the true Sabbath is the age to come.[23]

On the rival claims of Saturday and Sunday as the Sabbath day Origen has little to say, though he several times attacks the practice of some Christians of keeping the Sabbath and even attending synagogue services.[24] One fragment of the debate with the Jews on this subject does however survive, and it is interesting because it echoes an argument which survives on the Jewish side in the rabbinic literature. Commenting on Genesis ii.3, 'and God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it', R. Ishmael (early second century) said, 'He blessed it with manna and sanctified it with manna: He blessed it with manna, for on every day of the week there fell one omer, but on the eve of the Sabbath two omers, and he sanctified it through manna, which did not fall at all on the Sabbath' (Exodus xvi.22ff.). R. Nathan (late second century), finding perhaps the second part of this explanation too negative, said, 'He blessed it with manna and sanctified it with a blessing'. R. Isaac said, 'He blessed it with manna and sanctified it through the man who gathered sticks' (Numbers xv.32).[25] Origen took up this apologetic argument and turned it to his own use. In a homily which is heavily spiced with rabbinic material[26] he preached as follows

on Exodus xvi.4f.: 'I should like first of all to take issue with the Jews, and ask what they make of the verse which says "for six successive days you shall collect it, but on the sixth day you shall collect double the quantity". The sixth day appears to be the eve of the Sabbath, which we call *parasceuē*, the Sabbath being the seventh day. I should like to ask on what day the manna began to be given from heaven, and to compare our Lord's day (*dominica*) with the Jews' Sabbath. From the holy Scriptures it transpires that it was on the Lord's day that the manna was first given on earth; for if, as Scripture says, it was collected for six successive days, but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, it ceased, undoubtedly it began on the first day, which is the Lord's day. But if Scripture states that on the Lord's day God rained down manna but on the Sabbath he did not cause it to fall, let the Jews understand that even then our Lord's day was preferred to the Jewish Sabbath, that even then it was made plain that on their Sabbath none of God's grace descended to them from heaven, none of the heavenly bread, which is the word of God, came to them. But on our Lord's day the Lord always rains down manna from heaven.'[27] The observance of Sunday as a day of rest had not yet been made statutory,[28] and there were still Christians who kept the Sabbath after a fashion; but although Origen's words are partly addressed to these[29] it is clear that, as he implies and as the rabbinic sources confirm, this argument formed part of the actual debate between the Church and the Synagogue.

Origen's argument against the Jewish observance of the Passover is as follows. The paschal offering must be sacrificed and eaten in 'the place which the Lord thy God shall choose to place his name in' (Deuteronomy xvi.6f.), that is to say in the Temple in Jerusalem. Now, since the Temple is completely destroyed, so that one stone is not left standing upon another, it is clearly impossible to observe the precept literally. Origen adds that, if the Passover cannot be observed, there is no reason to observe the other festivals either, or even the commandment of circumcision, which, in the case of proselytes, is associated with the Passover (Exodus xii.48).[30] What the Jewish reply to this argument was we cannot say; the Rabbis refrain, almost pointedly, from commenting on the crucial words in Deuteronomy.[31]

In the case of another argument concerning the Passover Origen was apparently compelled, as a result of his disputations with Jews, to revise his ideas. In his commentary on John he distinguishes 'the Passover of the Jews' (John xi.55) from 'the Passover of the Lord' (Exodus xii.11, 27), and he associates the former with the invective of Isaiah i.13f. and Amos v.21, the latter with the Passion of Jesus.[32] If he tried to use this

interpretation in his debates with Jews, however, he was soon disillusioned. In the opening remarks of his Paschal Homily he refers to the widespread currency among Christians of the explanation which derived the word *pascha* from the Greek *paschein,*[33] only to dismiss this etymology with some perfectly sound remarks about the Hebrew word *pesaḥ.* 'If one of our people', he says, 'were rash enough, in conversation with Jews, to say that the *pascha* is so called because of the Passion of our Saviour they would scoff at him for his utter ignorance of the meaning of the word.' It very much sounds as if Origen himself has been made to learn this lesson the hard way, and to put right his ideas about the etymology of *pascha.*

The dietary laws

The subject of the allegorisation of the dietary laws requires only a brief mention. It is too well known to demand lengthy discussion, but too important to be omitted altogether. Little that Origen has to say on the subject can be ascribed to the dialogue with the Synagogue. On the contrary, in one passage where he feels bound to defend the allegorisation of the laws he is clearly concerned to reply to the challenge of the opponents of allegory within the Church.[34] Once again he argues from the impropriety of the laws if interpreted literally,[36] and from the impossibility of observing them. Moses mentions, he says, the 'goat-stag' (*tragelaphos,* Deuteronomy xiv.5, Hebrew *aqqo*) among the clean animals, and the hippogriff (*grupos, ib.* 12, Leviticus xi.13, Hebrew *peres*) among the unclean, both mythical beasts which it is impossible either to eat or to abstain from eating. The Jews, however, and other literalists refuse even to consider the reasons behind these commands[36] - a refusal which is not surprising in the case of the Jews, since the Septuagint's rendering of the Hebrew names is more or less arbitrary.[37]

In his allegorical interpretation of the laws Origen follows, as in his allegorical interpretations of the Old Testament generally, the rules laid down by earlier Jewish allegorists such as Aristobulus, Ps.-Aristeas, Philo and Paul, although his attitude is more imaginative and more critical than that of those other followers of Pauline exegesis, Ps.-Barnabas and Hippolytus.[38] The arguments which he employs are essentially the same as those he uses in favour of the non-literal interpretation of other parts of the Old Testament, some of which are discussed elsewhere.[39] Most of these will have had no force against Jews who rejected his theological premises, which is no doubt why, in this context, he attaches so much importance to pointing out the

impossibility of observing the law if it is understood literally. This argument is similar to those he uses to establish the allegorical meaning of some of the narrative and theological portions of the Bible; in the realm of the law, and used against Jews, it can have had little impact.[40] There was a fundamental difference between the Christian and the rabbinic attitude to the law; the Rabbis were concerned to make the laws practicable, and relevant to the times in which they lived, while Origen had no time at all for the Mosaic law as law, and uncompromisingly rejected the halakhic refinements of the Rabbis. For him it was all or nothing. In the circumstances, the ground for debate cannot have been very fruitful. Ultimately, Origen's argument about the law depends on other arguments, which stressed the coming of a new age, the revelation of a new meaning for the old scriptures and the obsolescence of all the traditional observances.

Election

The passages of the Bible on which Origen draws to prove that God's rejection of the Jews and choice of the Gentiles were prophesied are too numerous to be listed here, and in most cases they tell us nothing about the debate between Church and Synagogue. Sometimes Origen hints that he is quoting texts which he has used against Jews, and the suspicion is confirmed by the presence of the same texts in the lists of *testimonia,*[41] but the majority of examples, though their polemical use may be taken for granted, add nothing to our knowledge of the dialogue with the Synagogue, and may be here passed over. In a very few places, however, Origen does reproduce snatches of his discussions with Jews. From these it is clear that his aim was twofold, to show that the election of the Gentiles as taught by the Church was prophesied in the Hebrew Bible, and to confirm this interpretation of the biblical passages in question by reference to the history of the Jews and the Christian Church since the advent of Christ.[42] Of these two arguments it was the second to which he attached greater importance, and which became the focus-point of the Jewish replies.

In a passage of the *contra Celsum* which deals with this subject Origen quotes a supposed Jewish objection and replies to it. 'The Jews may say, if they speak in criticism of us: "The providence of God and his loving care are indeed amazing to you, seeing that you are liable to punishment, and have been deprived even of Jerusalem and of the so-called sanctuary and most solemn worship." But if they say this in justification of God's providence we will give a stronger and better argument by affirming that God's providence has been amazing in that

he has made use of the sin of the Jews to call the people of the Gentiles into the kingdom of God by Jesus, although they were strangers to the covenants and were not included in the promises. This also was foretold by the prophets'.[43] That Jews should use this argument against Christians is surprising; it could more reasonably be used against the Jews themselves, and indeed Origen commonly uses it in the *contra Celsum,* as a sign of the punishment of the Jews for killing Jesus.[44] His reply, that God used the sin of the Jews to call the Gentiles into his kingdom, is also found elsewhere in the *contra Celsum.* The argument from prophecy is here introduced almost as an afterthought; the historical argument is clearly felt to be the stronger of the two.

One prophecy which was evidently thought to be a particularly strong weapon, especially in conjunction with the argument from history, was the sentence from Jacob's blessing of Judah, 'a ruler shall not be lacking from Juda, nor a leader from his loins, until the things which are laid up for him come (*or* until he comes whose are the things which are laid up), and he is the expectation of the Gentiles' (Genesis xlix.10 LXX). The 'expectation of the Gentiles' is clearly Jesus, says Origen, and history shows that the advent of Jesus coincided with the end of the Jewish kingdom.[45] The messianic interpretation of this verse was by no means restricted to the Church: the rabbinic translations and commentaries all render the problematical word *shiloh* 'the Messiah' or 'the King-Messiah'.[46] According to Origen, some Jews explained the prophecy as referring to the patriarch or ethnarch, who claimed descent from Judah, asserting that his line would never fail until the advent of the Messiah.[47] There are traces of this explanation in the rabbinic sources, too. One interpretation, admittedly later than Origen, refers the verse to 'the exilarchs in Babylon, who rule Israel with a rod', and 'the patriarchs of the house of Rabbi (R. Judah), who teach Torah in public in the land of Israel'.[48] This may explain the curious and abrupt reference in the Midrash[49] to the family tree of Hillel, the founder of the direct line of the patriarchs in Palestine. 'It was asked, What was the descent of Hillel? R. Levi said, A genealogical scroll was discovered in Jerusalem, and in it was written "Hillel is descended from David".' If this explanation is correct, the point of the story is to establish the patriarchs' descent from Judah; the insertion of the story at this juncture seems to bear this out. To the argument that the prophecy referred to the patriarchs Origen replied by quoting Hosea iii.4, 'The children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an altar, and without a priesthood, and without signs'.[50] Origen's argument is that as, since the

destruction of the Temple, there is 'no sacrifice, no altar and no priesthood', Hosea's prophecy has been fulfilled, and so, too, has Jacob's; the 'ruler' has abandoned Judah, and 'the leader from his loins', and so, clearly, he 'whose are the things which are laid up, the expectation of the Gentiles', has come. 'And this is evident from the large numbers of Gentiles who have come through Christ to believe in God.'[51]

The Messiah

The text from Genesis xlix discussed above is one of a series of Old Testament passages quoted by Origen in an interesting section of the *contra Celsum* in which he sets out to prove the Messiahship of Jesus from biblical prophecies, which he calls 'the strongest argument confirming Jesus' authority'.[52] The Jews, he says, admit that the Christ of God is prophesied, though they deny that he is called the son of God. In fact, he continues, 'many prophets foretold in all kinds of ways the things concerning Christ, some in riddles and others by allegories or some other way, while some even spoke out literally'; they foretell 'his birthplace, the passion which he would suffer at the hands of the Jews, his resurrection and the wonderful miracles which he would perform'.[53] He proceeds to 'select a few prophecies out of many more' which he considers to prove irrefutably that Jesus was the Messiah foretold in the Old Testament. He makes it clear, here and elsewhere,[54] that the messianic prophecies were one of the principal battlegrounds between Christians and Jews, and he expresses his admiration for the *Controversy between Jason and Papiscus,* in which 'a Christian is described as disputing with a Jew from the Jewish scriptures and as showing that the prophecies about the Messiah fit Jesus'.[55] He frequently refers to discussions with Jews on this subject, and it is significant that his conversation with the Patriarch Huillus about the Psalms arose out of a discussion of 'some prophecies of God'.[56] Preaching on the opening verses of I Samuel, Origen says, 'When, in refuting the incredulity or perfidy of the Jews, I demonstrate from the law and prophets that Jesus was the Messiah, and when I succeed in every point in refuting the enemies of the truth, then I too may rightly say "My mouth is enlarged over mine enemies" (I Samuel ii.1)'.[57] This then was the method and the aim of an important part of the polemic: to quote the Old Testament prophecies and to show from them that Jesus is the Messiah. This is not the place to list these numerous texts; following Origen's example, we may 'select a few out of many more' which are particularly associated with the debate with the Synagogue.

The argument from the prophecy of the virgin birth in Isaiah vii.10-14 was felt to be especially telling. Origen introduces it into his refutation of Celsus even though Celsus himself had not referred to it.[58] He had apparently met with the reply from the Jewish side that the Hebrew word *'almah* means not 'a virgin' but 'a young woman'. The same objection is raised by Trypho in Justin's *Dialogue.*[59] Origen's answer, which seems to be his own, is that elsewhere in the Bible, in Deuteronomy xxii.23-6, the same word is used applied to a virgin. This argument, however, will not hold water; the word used in Deuteronomy is not *'almah,* but *bethulah.* Jerome's explanation is as follows: 'I know that the Jews are in the habit of objecting that in Hebrew the word *'almah* means not a virgin but a young woman. Indeed, the correct term for a virgin is *bethulah.* A young woman or girl, however, is called not *'almah* but *na'arah.* What, in that case, is the meaning of *'almah*? It means a virgin who is hidden away (*apokryphos,* as in Genesis xxiv.42).'[60] Both Jerome and Origen state explicitly that they are answering a Jewish objection. Jerome's reply is well thought out and well presented; Origen's, on the other hand, as it is expressed in the *contra Celsum,* though impressive is ill-founded and cannot have convinced anyone who knew the Hebrew Bible. Why did he make this mistake? In the passage of the *contra Celsum* Origen does not base his justification on the argument from the Hebrew, which almost seems to have been inserted simply to impress his (Greek-speaking) audience. If this is the case, it is possible that he compressed a longer argument, and in doing so unwittingly rested the burden of his evidence on the one weak link. At any rate, Jerome quotes this same text of Deuteronomy as evidence for the use of *'almah,* together with another text, from I Kings, which, like it, actually reads *na'arah bethulah* in the Masoretic Text.[61] This passage of Jerome's commentary on Isaiah may be a translation or a paraphrase of Origen's full argument, available to him but no longer to us. It is not rare for Jerome to quote Origen verbatim without acknowledgement.[62]

The prophecy of Micah (v.1) that the Messiah would be born in Bethlehem is reckoned by Origen among the most important prophecies in his list.[63] This text was taken by Jews, too, as a Messianic prophecy (the Targum has *m^{e}shiḥa*), and the location of the biblical Bethlehem is the subject of an interesting exchange between Rabbis Jannai and Jonathan (two contemporaries of Origen who taught in Sepphoris) and a Min.[64] Travers Herford[65] supposed that this Min is a Jewish Christian, 'since no one else (except a Jew) would be interested in the interpretation of the texts about Bethlehem'. This assumption is

groundless. In fact the story fits well what we know of Origen's interest in identifying places named in the Bible.

The Jewish allegations about Mary's adultery, which Celsus quotes, certainly formed part of Jewish polemic. They were later included in the *Sepher Toldoth Yeshu,* and according to a baraitha R. Simeon b. Azzai (in the first half of the second century) said 'I found a genealogical scroll in Jerusalem and in it was written "A certain man is the bastard son of a married woman".'[66] Origen passes over these charges, dismissing them as improbable and unworthy.[67] On the other hand he does give his reply to Jews who impugn the appearance of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove at the baptism. His reply, an isolated example of the use of a prophecy to support an alleged historical event, is to quote Isaiah xlviii.16, 'And now the Lord sent me and his spirit.' Though he admits that there is some doubt about the exact meaning of this text, he takes it as saying that 'the Father sent Christ and the Holy Spirit'.[68]

Origen preserves some of the Jewish objections to the fulfilment in the person of Jesus of the prophecy of Zechariah ix.9, 'Behold, thy King cometh unto thee... lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass.' The first line of reasoning, one commonly used by the Rabbis in disputations,[69] was to refer to the context. Jesus may have ridden into Jerusalem on an ass, but in what sense can he be said to have 'cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow' (*ib.*10)? In any case, the journey was a short one; why did he need transport at all, let alone two animals?[70] No doubt many of the debates centred on such passages. The Jews, he says, refuse to allow that Isaiah xlv.13, 'he shall build my city, and he shall let go my captives', was fulfilled in Jesus. 'He neither built the city of God, they say, nor restored the captivity of the people.'[71] On the subject of the passion we have another glimpse of the debate in a passage of the *contra Celsum* in which Origen recollects having used the 'suffering servant' texts in Isaiah in a discussion with some Jews 'whom I considered learned'. 'The Jew said that these prophecies referred to the whole people as though of a single individual, since they were scattered in the dispersion and smitten, that as a result of the scattering of the Jews among the other nations many might become proselytes.'[72] The same discussion, or a discussion with the same Jew, is referred to again in what follows. Origen has quoted Psalm xliv(xlv)3-8, which he interprets of Christ, as proving his divinity and his messianic mission. 'I remember', he says, 'putting the Jew who was thought to be wise into great difficulties with this passage. He did not know what to make of it,

and answered in a way consistent with his Judaism by saying that the words were addressed to the God of the universe when it said "thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a sceptre of equity is the sceptre of thy kingdom"; but that the Messiah was addressed in the words "thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee".'[73]

The Rabbis did not speak of the Messiah as God or as the son of God, but only as the anointed one (*mashiaḥ*) of God. Origen is aware of this, and he adds that 'they often press us with questions on this very title of the son of God, saying that there is no such person, and that the prophets do not mention him'.[74] Origen affects not to be aware of the Logos-theology of Hellenistic Judaism, of which Celsus makes use in his argument. Celsus' Jew says 'If the Logos in your view is the son of God, we too approve of that'. Origen comments, 'Although I have met with many Jews who professed to be Sages, I have not heard any who approved of the opinion that the Son of God is the Logos.'[75]

The role of the prophecies, and also of the New Testament miracles, in the dialogue with the Synagogue is stressed in another recollection of a discussion with some Jews, similar to those mentioned above, in which Origen compares Jesus to Moses: 'I remember that once in a discussion with some Jews, who were alleged to be wise, when many people were present to judge what was said, I used the following argument. Tell me, sirs: there have been two men who have come to visit the human race of whom supernatural miracles have been recorded; I mean Moses, your lawgiver, who wrote about himself, and Jesus, who left no book about himself but had the testimony of his disciples in the gospels. Is it not absurd to believe that Moses spoke the truth, in spite of the fact that the Egyptians malign him as a sorcerer who appeared to do his miracles by means of trickery, while disbelieving Jesus, since you accuse him? Both of them have the testimony of nations: the Jews bear witness to Moses, while the Christians, without denying that Moses was a prophet, prove from his prophecy the truth about Jesus, and accept as true the miraculous stories about him that have been recorded by his disciples. But if you demand that we give a reason for believing in Jesus, first give yours for believing in Moses, since he lived before Jesus, and then we will give ours about him after that. If you shirk and avoid giving the proofs about Moses, for the moment we will do as you do and offer no argument. Admit, none the less, that you have no proof about Moses, and listen to the evidence about Jesus from the law and the prophets. Indeed, what is startling is that it is the evidence about Jesus in the law

and the prophets which is used to prove that Moses and the prophets really were prophets of God.'[76]

The scarcity of comparative material makes it difficult to judge how original or how effective Origen's arguments were, or against what kind of attitudes they were deployed. Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* is useful evidence, but opinions vary as to how authentic Trypho is as a Jewish apologist, and also as to the type of Judaism which he represents. Similar considerations apply to the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila,* which probably contains older elements, although in its present form it is certainly later than Origen.[77] Although Origen uses some arguments which also appear in these works, he does on occasion follow quite different lines of reasoning, some of which, as we have seen, are similar to those used in debates which are recorded in the rabbinic literature. These, like some of the passages of Origen quoted above, and unlike Justin's *Dialogue,* are fragmentary reminiscences of actual debates, not always cited in a polemical context. Unfortunately they are often hard to date and sometimes even to identify. Origen's testimony provides a useful chronological reference point and permits the identification of certain polemical strands in the rabbinic literature.[78] It is tempting to suppose that occasionally both refer to the same debate, that as Origen quotes, anonymously, his rabbinic opponents, so the Rabbis on occasion quote Origen. Origen's arguments, like those of the Rabbis, are one-sided; we cannot know which prevailed at the time. (No doubt, like the Spartans and Argives after the battle for the Thyreatis, each side carried away the impression that it had won the day.) They do, however, provide valuable circumstantial evidence of the actual disputations, they preserve some of the arguments of the other side and they also serve to define for us the principal topics of the debate.

9

THE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE

The fact that Jews and Christians continued to use the same Jewish scriptures even after the break between the two movements had far-reaching effects on the relations between the Church and the Synagogue. Not only in polemical discussions, but even in the day-to-day exposition of the Bible, both camps interpreted the Bible with a sideways glance at the activities of the other side. At the same time, since the ancient texts were by no means easy to understand and to explain, the notable biblical exegetes on both sides cast their nets wide in the search for useful exegetical material. The Church Fathers and the Pharisaic Rabbis were both heirs to the same rich exegetical tradition, of which we know, alas, not enough, and it was natural that they should watch with interest how their colleagues developed this tradition. Unfortunately, on both sides it is the polemical impetus which has prevailed, and the vast majority of cases of mutual influence preserved today are concerned with apologetics. Nor can we expect either the Fathers of the Church or the Rabbis to acknowledge openly their debts to exegetes of the other school. Nevertheless there was a continuing mutual flow of ideas between the two sides, and one of the aims of the present study is to show how this tendency manifests itself in the exegetical work of one Church Father, who was one of the founding fathers of Christian exegesis of the Bible.

Origen's importance as an exegete is sufficiently recognised to need no detailed exposition here. Jerome, one of the outstanding scholars of Origen and at the same time one of his severest critics, wrote, at a time when Origen was much misunderstood and viciously attacked, a glowing testimonial to his biblical scholarship: 'He knew the scriptures by heart, and he toiled day and night at studying their explanation. He delivered a thousand and more treatises in church, and edited innumerable commentaries besides. . . Who of us can read everything he

wrote? Who does not admire his burning zeal for the Scriptures?'[1] Origen's greatest modern scholar gives equal primacy to his biblical scholarship: 'Origen's first and foremost interest, from the tender years of his childhood right up to his death, was to penetrate the inner, hidden knowledge of the sacred writings. His achievement in this sphere is amazing, and no one since has accomplished so much in this field, whether you consider the so-called letter of Scripture, which he committed to memory so that he could recite whole passages by heart at a moment's notice to suit his purpose, or the innermost concealed meanings, which he expounded with such erudition that, as Suidas says, all the subsequent teachers of the Church have taken him as their starting-point.'[2]

Origen, then, was a great exegete, and his works are a milestone in the history not only of the practice but also of the theory of biblical exegesis. We are here concerned, however, not to sing Origen's praises or even to list his shortcomings as a biblical scholar, but to consider one aspect of his exegesis, namely its Jewish origins. Even this definition is too wide. In interpreting the Jewish Bible he naturally relied heavily on earlier Jewish exegetes, such as the New Testament writers and Philo and their predecessors, and on later ecclesiastical traditions which derive ultimately from Jewish sources. Our question is how far Origen is indebted to the Jewish exegetes of his own day, and this is a question which by its very nature is difficult of treatment. Some of the problems have already been mentioned. It is not a simple matter to define the character of Jewish exegesis in Origen's day, although the traditional distinction between Tannaim and Amoraim provides a useful independent chronological guide. Much of the rabbinic exegesis is lost, or is preserved only in later codifications where it cannot be easily isolated and dated. Furthermore, of the 'non-rabbinic' exegesis we know next to nothing, apart from what we learn from Origen. Again, by far the greater part of Origen's work has perished, and the same applies to his predecessors'. There is a strong suspicion that some of these were Jews, but not enough is known about the history of Christian exegesis in the early years of the Church to allow anything more than a tentative and partial account to be given of the sources of Origen's exegesis.

We have at our disposal two means of assessing Origen's reasons for consulting Jewish scholars, besides general considerations of probability. One is his statements about Jewish exegesis, and the other is the impression conveyed by the results of his researches in this direction. Origen often speaks, as we have seen, of Jewish exegesis as

narrowly literalistic, and this has led some scholars to suppose that Origen sought from the Rabbis a literal commentary to the Bible.[3] On the other hand, Origen never speaks of the Jewish interpretation as literal except to condemn it, and it would be strange if he devoted enormous efforts to learning a system of exegesis of which he strongly disapproved. This assessment takes no account of the numerous passages in which Origen borrows non-literal interpretations and even legends and allegories from the Jews, and it must also be convicted of too narrow an attitude to the Jewish exegesis of the time. It has been rightly said that 'by the third century Jewish scholarship is, to those Christian writers who are acquainted with it, a byword for its literalism and dislike of allegory',[4] but all the statements of this view have heavy polemical overtones. This commonly held view is mistaken: despite his commonplace attacks on Jewish literalism, Origen had a keen appreciation of the richness and variety of Jewish exegesis, which in the third century was developing even beyond the peak it had reached in the middle of the second, and he was anxious to incorporate the best of the Jewish scholarship in his own exegetical work.

How does Origen see the role of the Jews in relation to the holy Scriptures? He is fond of quoting Paul's dictum 'unto them were committed the oracles of God' (Romans iii.2), but what he thus bestows he takes away by his interpretation of the verse. Not only are the Jews no longer entrusted with the oracles, which now belong to the Gentiles, but even before they were only vouchsafed a partial revelation. The Jews were only entrusted with the 'letter which killeth' (II Corinthians iii.6); 'but the "oracles of God" are committed to those who, understanding and believing what Moses wrote, also believe in Christ, as the Lord says: "If you had believed Moses you would also believe me, for he wrote of me" (John v.46)'.[5] 'Both Jews and Christians', Origen says, 'believe that the Bible was written by the holy Spirit, but we disagree about the interpretation of what is contained in it. Nor do we live like the Jews, since we consider that it is not the literal interpretation of the laws which contains the spirit of the legislation.'[6] Elsewhere he says, 'We in the Church do not overlook the fact that Jesus is the son of the God who gave the law and prophets, but while we have avoided the mythologies of the Jews we derive practical wisdom and education from the mystical contemplation of the law and the prophets.'[7] Origen often speaks of 'Jewish mythology', a phrase borrowed from Titus i.14, and he describes the Jewish myths as 'useless' and 'fetid'.[8] There is no doubt that he means by 'Jewish myths' the literal interpretation of the law,[9] indeed 'Jewish' can be

used simply as a synonym for 'literal',[10] but this is an exaggerated and one-sided characterisation of the Jewish attitude, which is presented as a contrast to Origen's own, richer interpretation. Indeed, its use is not confined to Jews; he can even apply it to Christians who adopt what is to him a narrow view of the meaning of Scripture. How accurate or inaccurate a picture this was will emerge from a consideration of some aspects of rabbinic exegesis, but first a few words should be said about the use of the word 'literal' in this context.

In the first place, modern work on the literary criticism of the Bible has brought about a complete change in exegetical attitudes. Today the guiding principle in all serious exegesis of the Bible is the question of what the text meant when it was first written or uttered, and it is unlikely that serious scholars will ever go back on this, though popular preachers retain the liberty to exact from biblical passages whatever sense best suits their particular message. For Origen, as for all ancient biblical scholars, Jews and Christians, the Bible contained implicitly every idea believed and propounded by the Church, and he was not bound in his explanation of the Scriptures by any considerations of the intention of the writer or the relative dates of different parts of the Bible. Although, as we have seen, he came closer than any writer up to his time to a critical approach to the transmission of the Bible, and despite his enthusiasm for 'demythologising'[11] the biblical legends, he never freed himself from the common ancient view of the essential unity of the Scriptures and from the belief in their eternal oracular value. Thus, though he admitted a problem in ascribing Mosaic authorship to Psalm xcix, which mentions Samuel, he accepted the solution that Moses could prophesy the name of Samuel, just as the name of Josiah is apparently foretold in I Kings xiii.2.[12] In this respect he subscribes to the rabbinic refusal to recognise chronological distinctions in the Bible.[13] When faced with two contradictory texts, or with a statement which seemed to him irrational or immoral, he refrained on the whole from seeking a solution in historical criticism,[14] but preferred, like the Rabbis, to explain the difficulty away by other means. The idea, then, of a 'literal or literary commentary'[15] on the Bible was entirely alien to his thought. Care must be taken to distinguish between the modern use of 'literal' and Origen's use of the same term: the two will rarely be found to coincide.

The Rabbis, similarly, had no conception of a literal exposition of the Bible, in our modern sense, paying attention to the historical background of the text and to the intention of the author. They regarded the Torah as God-given and inherently consistent, the

prophets and writings as essentially at one with the Torah, and the whole Bible as entirely in accord with the sum of their own traditions and beliefs. Any apparent inconsistency could be explained within the framework of the text, no biblical passage could contradict an accepted rabbinic belief, and the whole of the halakhah could be read back somehow into the text of the Bible. There were, however, two distinct attitudes to the letter of the text, going back to the rival schools of Akiba and Ishmael in the early second century. R. Akiba, following his teacher Nahum of Gimzo, held that every letter of the Torah, every particle, every strange word and every peculiar grammatical construction must be explained in terms of a deeper meaning, a mystery which God refrained from revealing openly but which is available to the scholar who is trained in the rules of exegesis. R. Ishmael, on the other hand, maintained that 'the Torah speaks in human language',[16] and preferred to base his expositions on the sense of the text rather than on the letter. He refused to follow Akiba's method of making deductions from the order of the verses and from the vocalisation, both of which he regarded as open to question.[17] R. Akiba's exegesis has often been described as 'literalistic', because it pays excessive attention to the literal expression, but it should be observed that the tendency of his interpretation is no less free and imaginative than that of R. Ishmael's, and in some respects is more so. Both were equally concerned to read back their ideas into the biblical text, and they differed only in their methods of doing so.

This is not to say that the Rabbis were incapable of distinguishing between an interpretation which was aimed at establishing the plain meaning of a text, when this was in doubt, and a legal or homiletical exposition which went beyond the express letter of the passage. So predominant was the tendency to associate biblical passages with extraneous ideas that they coined the word *peshaṭ*, 'simple meaning', which they opposed to *midrash*, exposition, and eventually it was ruled that, for practical purposes, a text could never lose its *peshaṭ*, no matter to what feats of exegetical acrobatics it was subjected.[18] This was a necessary precaution in view of the universal practice of distorting the meaning of biblical passages for the deduction of moral and legal precepts, but in the commentaries which have come down to us there is no attempt whatever at separating the straightforward from the applied exegesis. Other terms were also used to contrast a simple with a more fanciful interpretation,[19] but the distinction never corresponds precisely to our distinction between 'literal' and 'non-literal', nor did the Rabbis permit themselves the luxury of historical criticism of the Bible.

In the works of two great first-century exegetes of the Jewish diaspora a more specific dichotomy is observable in their attitude to the interpretation of Scripture. Philo distinguishes between *hē rhētē apodosis*[20] and *allēgoria,* the more elaborate exegesis derived in part from his Jewish predecessors (such as Aristobulus, the authors of the *Letter of Aristeas* and the *Wisdom of Solomon,* the Essenes and the Therapeutae), in part from the Alexandrian commentators on Homer, and for the rest the product of his own fruitful imagination. Philo was much concerned to explain away difficulties which were not amenable to straightforward, 'literal' exegesis, what he called *paradoxa, paraloga, atopa* or *aloga,*[21] and to explain apparent omissions or inversions in the text. Like Akiba and his school, he often took as his jumping-off point (*aphormē*) a curious expression in the text, or, very often, the proper names in the Bible.[22] He also used allegory as a means of bringing out what he saw as the deeper spiritual and moral meaning, in other words of using the biblical stories as text books of his own religious and philosophical ideas. He believed that nature has a general tendency to hide away its most valuable gifts,[23] which can be discovered only by those who are worthy to undertake the ascent to higher things, and in this respect he endows his allegorical exegesis with something of the character of the pagan mysteries.[24] His allegorisations of the laws are aimed at removing certain distasteful elements in the biblical legislation, but he does not propose the abolition of the observance of the laws and indeed he criticses those allegorists who have abandoned the observance of the law completely.[25]

Paul on the other hand is concerned precisely to impugn the observance of the Mosaic legislation, to which he opposes his doctrine of 'faith' or 'spirit'. God 'has made us able ministers of the new testament, not of the letter but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life' (II Corinthians iii.6). Moses put a veil over his face, so that the Jews could not clearly see his face, and they persist in reading the Old Testament blindly, hampered by the veil 'which is done away in Christ'. The law, for Paul, is a curse, from which Christians have been redeemed by Christ (Galatians iii.13). To the 'law of works' Paul contrasts the 'law of faith', through which lies the only path of salvation. While rejecting the observance of the biblical law, Paul insists that Christians do not make void the law but establish it (Romans iii.31).

Paul's attitude to the biblical law, which thus stands opposed both to that of the Rabbis and to that of Philo, became the official attitude of the Church, so that for Christian exegetes the exposition of the

meaning of the biblical law came to be superfluous. For Philo, as we have seen, the laws may contain deeper mysteries, but they are not to be done away with. For the Rabbis, too, the laws are eternally valid, though they also modify by interpretation whatever they find repugnant in the Mosaic legislation.[26] For the Christian tradition, dominated by Pauline antinomianism, the Jewish approach to the law is 'literalistic', and this reproach has been levelled against the Jews from the earliest Fathers to the present day. But 'literalism' here means not a blind acceptance of whatever is written in the Bible, but the acceptance of the law as meaningful in everyday life. The same attitude is observable in respect of the historical parts of the Bible. The Rabbis were prepared to deny the historicity of certain passages,[27] but in principle they accepted the biblical account of the history of the Jewish people as accurate, whereas for Christian exegetes those historical passages which were not roundly rejected tended to be seen as types of eternal truths or of later historical events. Here again the Jewish attitude is characterised as 'literalism'.

Origen's so-called 'tripartite division' of the meanings of Scripture, expounded in the fourth book of the *Principles,*[28] is too well known to require detailed discussion here. It has been briefly outlined already, in the discussion of his attitude to Judaism.[29] That it is little more than a neat theory for Origen is abundantly clear from his exegesis. The passages which he interprets strictly according to this schema are few in number; often he reverts to the older distinction between literal and spiritual, and very often he produces a whole string of spiritual interpretations of the same passage. It is interesting that the Rabbis, like Origen,[30] take Proverbs xxii.20 to refer to the Torah. The rabbinic attitude to the derivation of several interpretations from the same text also provides an interesting comparison with Origen's. It was ruled by R. Johanan and others that one verse of the Bible may convey several teachings, but that a single teaching cannot be derived from several different verses.[31] It was accepted that God could utter two ideas or even two words at once (this was the explanation of the discrepancy between Exodus xx.8 and Deuteronomy v.12). In support of this teaching Psalm lxii.12 was quoted: 'God spoke one thing, which we heard as two.'[32] In the same context the school of R. Ishmael would quote Jeremiah xxiii.29: 'Just as the rock (or 'the hammer' - there is a certain confusion in the interpretation of the verse) is shattered into many splinters, so also one biblical verse may convey several teachings.'[33] The fully developed version of the doctrine is as follows: every utterance of God was divided into seventy versions,

corresponding to the seventy nations of mankind. Hence it is written (Psalm lxviii.12(11)), 'The Lord gave the word, those who publish it are a great host.'[34] According to the later rabbinic tradition, there are seventy aspects to every verse of the Torah,[35] but the idea that one verse will stand several interpretations goes back at least as far as a debate between Hillel and Shammai.[36]

In comparing the exegetical styles of different biblical commentators it is never easy to pick out a particular trait and attribute it to a particular source. The text, with its inherent problems, is more or less constant, and the main rules of exegesis are also rules of common sense and logic. Origen's exegesis naturally follows the lines laid down by earlier Greek exegetes, and the principles accepted by these are broadly the same as those accepted by the Rabbis in their expositions of the Bible. For this reason it would be pointless to list the characteristics of rabbinic exegesis and compare it exhaustively with Origen's. Both are concerned to explain the same problems, and both are concerned to show the moral teachings which can be derived from the Bible. In one respect, however, Origen's exegesis is curiously reminiscent of the highly idiosyncratic exegesis of Akiba, and of Aquila's Greek translation of the Bible, and that is his attitude to the verbal text. This is a feature of Origen's exegesis which has been neglected in favour of his allegory, but it deserves a closer inspection. The nature of Akiba's exegesis has been mentioned above: every word of the text, almost every letter, is capable of imparting some deeper meaning. Origen was familiar with the practical results of Akiba's methods from the version of Aquila, of which he made a close study, and he expressly subscribes to Akiba's theory that nothing in the Bible is superflous. Commenting on Exodus xvii.3, 'the people thirsted for water', he says: 'One might think that the statement that the people thirsted for water is pleonastic. It would have been enough to say that they thirsted; why was it necessary to add that they thirsted *for water*? The addition is not superflous. There are various kinds of thirst. . .'[37] Similarly he says elsewhere: 'If we consider carefully we find that hardly anybody anywhere is said to have gone down to a holy place or up to a base one. These observations show that the Bible is not, as many people think written in a rough and unpolished style, but is fitted to the teaching of sacred doctrine.'[38] Other statements of the same theme could be quoted,[39] and in practice Origen often, in his commentaries and homilies, seizes on an apparently superfluous word or on a peculiarity of grammar and uses it as a starting-point for his exposition.[40] Akiba and other Rabbis took an interest in the occurrences of the same word

in different passages, and Aquila was at pains to translate words from the same Hebrew root by related Greek words, even where this meant inventing Greek words. Origen similarly pays close attention to the biblical use of language; like the Rabbis he can select, apparently from memory, strings of examples of the use of a word,[41] and like the Rabbis he draws conclusions from the biblical use of different words with similar meanings.[42] Most striking of all is the occurrence in Origen of Akiba's tendency to see in a repeated word, especially the emphatic repetition of the infinitive in the Hebrew, a reference to the world to come. Why, Origen asks, do we read in Exodus xv.1, 'Let us sing to the Lord for he has been gloriously exalted?' Would it not have been sufficient simply to say 'exalted'? Origen's reply is that there is a difference between simply being exalted and being exalted gloriously: Jesus Christ was glorified in his incarnation and in his crucifixion, but when he returns in triumph he will not merely be 'glorified', he will be 'gloriously glorified'.[43] A similar exposition is given in the case of Genesis xlvi.4, 'I will also surely bring thee up again'.[44] In a comment on Ezekiel vii.26, 'woe upon woe', Origen refers the first 'woe' to this life and the second to the next, in a manner highly reminiscent of Akiba's exegesis.[45]

One general principle of exegesis is explicitly ascribed by Origen to 'the Hebrew'. 'He said that the whole inspired Scripture resembles, because of its obscurity, a number of locked rooms in a single house. By each room is a key, but not the right one. The keys are distributed among the rooms, no key fitting the room by which it is placed, and it is a very difficult task to find the keys and fit them to the rooms which they can unlock. So it is with the understanding of the Scriptures, because they are so obscure; the only way to begin to understand them is by means of the explanation dispersed throughout them.'[46] The comparison of Scripture to a building is found elsewhere in rabbinic and patristic sources,[47] but no exact parallel exists for this 'charming tradition', as Origen calls it. Attempts have been made to identify it with various rabbinic techniques of exegesis, but the point is the general one that one passage of the Bible can be explained by reference to another or others, and that each obscure passage contains the key to its interpretation. As might be expected, abundant evidence for both these ideas can be found both in Philo and in the Rabbis.[48]

As has already been mentioned, Origen does not usually put into practice his distinction between the moral and spiritual interpretations of the Bible. He often, of course, draws practical moral lessons from passages of the Bible,[49] and these have certain affinities with the

lessons drawn by the Rabbis from the same texts,[50] but no weight is to be attached here to what is a common feature of all preaching, Jewish and Christian. More interest attaches to his allegorical interpretation, into which the moral is often absorbed,[51] but this is too large a topic to be dealt with fully here. Nor is such a procedure called for. Origen's theory of allegorical exegesis and the bulk of his interpretations derive not from rabbinic sources but from the application of his fertile genius to the Alexandrian exegetical tradition going back ultimately to Jewish (and pagan) roots, and consequently it is of only limited interest for the present study. The possibility, however, of an immediate Jewish source for some of his allegorical interpretation is not to be dismissed out of hand. The polemical doctrine of 'Jewish literalism', coupled with an only superficial acquaintance with the rabbinic literature, has given rise on occasion to the statement, which is still heard even today, that the tannaitic Rabbis did not practise allegorical interpretation. In fact the rabbinic sources yield a good deal of allegorical interpretation, ranging in date throughout the tannaitic period, and the rabbinic condemnations of allegory which are sometimes quoted point rather to the prevalence of allegory than to its absence from the rabbinic tradition. Indeed, in view of the later hostility to allegory we must account ourselves fortunate to find preserved as much as we do,[52] but not enough survives to provide easy answers to the problems of distinguishing 'rabbinic' from 'Alexandrian' Jewish allegory and of gauging the influence of these on one another and of both on the Christian exegetical tradition before Origen.[53] There are indications, none the less, of a connexion between Origen's allegory and that of the Rabbis. In what follows some general remarks will be made about rabbinic allegory, and some broad lines of investigation into the question of Origen's use of such allegory will be opened up.

The word *allēgoria* apparently came into use in the last century B.C. to describe a literary device by which one thing is made to stand for another.[54] It also came to be used of the interpretation of a text as meaning something other than what it seems to mean.[55] Philo uses it in both senses, and so does Origen. The allegorical interpretation of the biblical laws goes back well beyond Philo; it is attested in the case of Aristobulus, and is present in the *Letter of Aristeas.* The corresponding rabbinic term is *mashal,* which properly means 'parable'. Certain passages in the Bible (e.g. Judges ix.8ff., II Kings xiv.9ff., Isaiah v.1ff.) were accepted as being nothing more than parables. In the case of some other parts of the Bible, too, an allegorical interpretation came to be substituted for the literal sense: the prime example of this is the Song

of Songs. Other examples were more problematical. An early debate about the interpretation of Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones illustrates well the rabbinic use of the term *mashal.* According to one view this was *emeth*, literally true, while according to another it was *emeth mashal,* truth used as a parable. It was objected that it must be either literally true or a parable: 'If *emeth* why *mashal,* and if *mashal* why *emeth*?'[56] To deny the literal sense of a passage was 'to expound as *mashal*', a procedure which R. Ishmael forbade to be applied to the Torah and the commandments.[57] Several examples survive, however, of such treatment of passages in the Pentateuch,[58] and in some cases the interpretation is accepted by the halakhah. R. Eliezer b. R. Jose, in fact, included the method of *mashal* in his list of exegetical rules.[59]

Closely similar to *mashal* in rabbinic usage are two other terms, *rishum* and *ḥomer.* A parallel to the statement quoted above reads 'If *emeth* why *rishum,* and if *rishum* why *emeth*?'[60] and the phrase 'to expound as *mashal*' is paralleled by 'to expound as *ḥomer.*'[61] Much has been written about the meanings of these terms, and about the mysterious exegetes referred to as Dorshei Ḥamuroth and Dorshei Reshumoth. Our texts frequently confuse these two, and it is certain that they were, rightly or wrongly, regarded as synonymous by later rabbinic scholars such as Rashi.[62] Even if the names referred originally to two distinct schools, their methods were probably not much different. Both saw in the words of Scripture signs and symbols going beyond the plain and literal meaning, which they sometimes rejected. What is particularly interesting, and has not previously been pointed out, is that many of the ideas attributed to these exegetes reappear in the works of Origen. A few examples will illustrate the point. In the encounter with Amalek (Exodus xvii.8ff.), the Dorshei Reshumoth said that 'Rephidim' meant 'slackening of hands': 'It was because the Israelites slackened their hold on the Torah that the enemy came upon them'.[63] Origen commonly takes the names of people and places as revealing deeper truths. In Rufinus' version of the relevant homilies he renders Rephidim by 'sanitas iudicii' or 'laus iudicii',[64] but Jerome quotes, among others, the alternative 'remissio manuum'.[65] Again, Origen, like the Dorshei Reshumoth, points out that in Exodus xxi.6, as elsewhere, the word *elohim,* in the Greek versions *theos* or *theoi,* means not 'God' but 'judges'.[66] Thirdly, Origen's exposition of the sweetening of the waters of Marah, in which the water stands for the Bible and the tree for the spiritual interpretation revealed through Christ,[67] is similar to that of the Dorshei Reshumoth, in which both water and tree represent 'the words of Torah'.[68]

If there is one characteristic which more than any other is shared by Origen's allegory and that of the Rabbis it is this habit of seeing in certain key words in the Bible a reference to something else. The key words in both cases are often the same, although Origen's interpretation sometimes bears an undeniably Christian stamp. The similarities can hardly be due to coincidence. Is it simply that both exegetical traditions, patristic and rabbinic, are separate, collateral developments from an older Jewish stock of symbols? It has been rightly observed that the earliest Christian art relies almost exclusively on Old Testament themes, and the suggestion is that the Christian versions are drawn from Jewish originals.[69] Similar conclusions have been drawn from the study of early liturgical remains.[70] It is also true that there are examples in other Church Fathers, before Origen, of symbolic interpretations of Old Testament words and phrases which are also attested in the rabbinic sources. Justin, for instance, interprets the words 'dwelling under his own vine' (Micah iv.4) as meaning 'each enjoying his own wedded wife', an interpretation which he supports by citing Psalm cxxvii(cxxviii).3, 'and his wife as a thriving vine'.[71] The same verse is often used by the Rabbis to justify the symbolic interpretation of 'vine' as 'wife'.[72] Did Justin, and Origen after him, learn such symbolic interpretations from Jews, or is this conclusion unwarranted? Jerome, in interpreting the golden candelabrum of Zechariah iv.2, quotes a symbolic interpretation ascribed to 'the Hebrews, by whom we are educated in the Old Testament', in which the candelabrum stands for the law; he appears to consider the Jews an important, if not the most important, source of such interpretations.[73] We should bear this in mind when we turn to Origen's symbolism; but first a brief look at some examples of similar symbolic interpretation in the Rabbis.

Commonest of all are symbols of the Torah. Two have been quoted already: the Dorshei Reshumoth interpreted 'water' and 'tree' as symbolising the words of Torah. The texts quoted in support are Isaiah lv.1 and Proverbs iii.18 respectively. Another interpretation attributed to these exegetes associates 'life' (Deuteronomy xxviii.66) with the phylacteries; it is likely that the link is once again 'the words of the Torah' (cf. Deuteronomy xxx.15, 20).[74] Possibly they also took the manna as a symbol of the Torah, an identification which is familiar from Philo and elsewhere.[75] At any rate they resisted the traditional translation 'What is it?', which stresses the unfamiliarity of the manna. A comparison is drawn between the manna and the aggadah; both 'attract men's hearts'.[76] The word *'oz,* 'strength', is also taken as a symbol of the Torah, in such passages as Exodus xv.2 and 13, Psalms

xxix.11 and xcix.4, although texts are also quoted to prove that the literal meaning is the correct one.[77] It would seem that the allegorists always met with some opposition. The long list of symbols of the Torah includes 'truth' (Proverbs xxiii.23), 'good' (Proverbs iv.2), 'earth' (Job xi.9), 'fire' (cf. Deuteronomy xxxiii.2, Jeremiah xxiii.29) and 'apples' (Song of Songs ii.5).[78] The significance of this rich crop will be at once apparent when we turn to consider Origen's symbolism. Examples of rabbinic symbolism could be multiplied indefinitely, but to do so would be to labour an easy point, which may be more simply illustrated by quoting one outstanding specimen. This is the exegetical *tour de force* of R. Hama b. Haninah, commenting on Genesis xxix.2f.: 'And he looked, and behold a well in the field, and, lo, there were three flocks of sheep lying by it; for out of that well they watered the flocks: and a great stone was upon the well's mouth. And thither were all the flocks gathered: and they rolled the stone from the well's mouth, and watered the sheep, and put the stone again upon the well's mouth in his place.' R. Hama collected six different interpretations, to which a seventh was added by R. Johanan: (i) This is the famous well of Numbers xxi.16f. The sheep are the people, under the guidance of Moses, Aaron and Miriam, and the water and the stone, like the well, are to be taken literally. (ii) The well is Mount Zion, where the Jews imbibed the holy Spirit three times a year. (iii) The well is Mount Zion, the three flocks the three courts of judgment (cf. B. *Sanhedrin* 86^{b}), where they learned the law (*din* = water). The stone stands for the great court in the Chamber of Hewn Stone. (iv) The well is Mount Zion. The three flocks are the first three world powers, who grew rich on the Temple treasure (the water). The wicked state (Rome) came, and grew rich from the Temple treasure. The stone represents the merit of the Patriarchs, which will prevail in the Messianic age. (v) The well is the Sanhedrin. The three flocks are the three rows of scholars (B. *Sanhedrin* 37^{a}), who learned there the halakhah. 'All the flocks' are the scholars of Palestine. (vi) The well is the synagogue, the 'three' are the three men caled up to the reading, 'all the flocks' are the congregation, who hear the Torah (drink the water). 'The stone' refers to the evil Tempter; as soon as they leave the synagogue he returns to his place. R. Johanan's interpretation is that the well is Mount Sinai, the three flocks represent the Priests, Levites and Israelites, and the water stands for the Ten Commandments. The stone represents God's presence, the *Shekhinah*; the people asked that God should not speak to them directly, so it 'returned to its place' (i.e. heaven, see Exodus xx.19, 22).[79] This is a highly developed form of the interpretation *kemin mashal,* where every

term in a long passage is given a symbolic meaning. The water, which holds a central place in the interpretation, stands in turn for real water, the holy Spirit, the judgement, the Temple treasure, the halakhah, the Torah and the Decalogue. It is but a short step from this to the elaborate interpretation of the Song of Songs, in which every word is given a symbolic interpretation, the thread running through the whole being the identification of the two lovers with God and Israel.

When we turn to Origen's exegesis we find that he uses the same sort of symbolism, and in the same sort of way, although it is conflated with allegorical interpretations stemming from other sources, for example psychological interpretations of Philonic type. Putting aside the allegorical interpretation of the Song of Songs, which would require a study of its own, we find that for Origen, as for the Rabbis, any water in the Bible could stand for God's teaching or the law, and this includes wells, springs, rainwater and dew.[80] The tree of Exodus xv.25, as we have seen, represents the spiritual interpretation of Scripture, and Moses' rod could stand for the word of the law,[81] Moses being, as in Philo, a symbol of the law;[82] both of these, though, like any wood in the Old Testament, could also stand for Christ.[83] This Christological symbolism was nothing new: Justin had collected all the instances he could find of 'rod' and 'wood' in the Bible and interpreted them of Christ.[84] This brings us up against a serious problem: Origen was working within a Christian tradition which had already absorbed a large dose of Jewish symbolism. This was a gradual process, developing over several centuries. It is not even easy to define the relation between rabbinic and Philonic symbolism; when we turn to the Christian tradition it is often impossible to say at what precise point a Jewish symbol is accepted by Christians, when it stops being used by Jews or by what steps it changes its meaning. The sign of the cross, for example, which began as a Jewish symbol, is found in the Jewish catacombs at Rome, in the synagogue at Dura and on Jewish sarcophagi from Jerusalem dated from the last century B.C. to the early third A.D.; after the third century it ceased, understandably, to be used by Jews.[85] Origen stands, historically, in the transitional period, when the Christian symbolism had already become highly developed, but before the triumph of Christianity had brought about the final break between the Christian and Jewish traditions. Some of his interpretations which seem to be Christian may be due to Jews or Jewish Christians; others which seem to be Jewish may in fact belong to the Christian exegetical tradition. It was a Jewish Christian who told him that the 'sign' of Ezekiel ix.4 was the cruciform Old Hebrew letter *tau*.[86] When he

compared the figure of Isaac, carrying the wood for his own immolation, to Christ,[87] was he aware of the rabbinic statement that 'Isaac is like a man carrying his own cross,'[88] or is the rabbinic simile originally Christian? Origen, like Justin, sees Moses' upraised arms (Exodus xvii.11) as a symbol of the Cross, but was he also aware of the tannaitic interpretation of the passage?[89] Or perhaps such coincidences between rabbinic interpretations and those of Origen are accidental. For Origen any reference to bread or meat in the Bible symbolises God's teaching or the incarnate Logos;[90] there is ample precedent for this interpretation in Philo and the fourth Gospel,[91] but by the same token both had long been accepted by Jews as symbols, and continued to be so used, as can be seen from the tannaitic literature and from Jewish religious art.[92] To explain his symbolic usage simply in terms of Philo or the New Testament would be to ignore certain obvious divergences from these earlier works. His interpretation of the manna in the seventh homily on Exodus, with its many parallels in the tannaitic literature and its polemical overtones, suggests that Origen may have been attempting to reinterpret certain important Jewish symbols in Christian terms. This may be the point of his argument that the manna began to fall on a Sunday, and did not fall at all on the Jewish Sabbath.[93] It is in this same homily that he interprets the sweetening of the waters in the same way as the Dorshei Reshumoth, but giving their interpretation a Christian twist by comparing the tree to the Cross, and in the same homily he interprets the twelve wells and seventy palm-trees at Elim, which for the Rabbis symbolised the twelve tribes and the seventy elders, as an allusion to the twelve Apostles and the 'other seventy' of Luke x.1. The symbolic interpretation of wells by the Rabbis has already been mentioned; a painting from the Dura synagogue shows a well with twelve streams of water issuing from it, each flowing to a figure in a booth, probably representing the twelve tribes. When Origen comes to discuss the well of Numbers xx he devotes a great deal of ingenuity to showing that wells and water denote not only God and his teaching, but especially Christ and Christian teaching.[94] Some of his material, for instance the interpretation of 'Rebecca' as 'patience', comes from Philo, but the inspiration behind the whole passage is not Philonic, and it is at any rate possible that Origen is building on a common Jewish symbolic interpretation, which he adapts into a specifically Christian teaching.

One final subject which should be mentioned here is the symbolic interpretation of the proper names in the Bible. Origen, in common with Philo[95] and some pagan thinkers, held that a name conveys the

character of the person or thing named,[96] and, like Philo, he frequently uses supposed etymological explanations of names in his allegorical exposition of Scripture. The interpretation of names has a long history, going back to the earliest strata of the Bible, and in his allegorical use of interpretations of names Origen stands in an Alexandrian tradition which is older than Philo and has parallels in the pagan expositors of Homer.[97] We have seen[98] that Jerome, adducing the testimony of Origen, attributed to Philo a work which listed the Hebrew names in alphabetical order together with their etymologies, a work which Jerome himself re-edited and translated into Latin, and we have also seen that Origen apparently knew this work in Alexandria, although he quotes it anonymously. This work, even if it was not by Philo, belongs to the Alexandrian tradition, and may derive ultimately from the activities of the Greek translators of the Bible. Origen's debt to the older Greek Jewish tradition was considerable; he owes to it the whole idea of using the interpretations of names allegorically, and about one-fifth of his interpretations are also found in Philo or in the various Greek versions of the Bible. But this is a small proportion of the total. For the rest we are entitled to seek another source.

'We learn the interpretation of the names', Origen says in the *contra Celsum,*[99] 'from the Hebrews, who take pride in them and explain them in their ancestral script (or writings) and language.' Elsewhere he attributes particular interpretations to the Hebrews,[100] and more specifically to the Hebrew 'interpreters of names'.[101] The rabbinic writings abound in interpretations of names. They occur most frequently in the late medieval midrashic compilations, such as the *Leqaḥ Ṭob,*[102] the *Sekhel Ṭob*[103] or the *Midrash ha-Gadol,*[104] but examples can also be found in the earlier rabbinic literature, where they are often attributed to rabbis of the second and third centuries. According to the *Mekilta,* for instance, R. Akiba interpreted the place name Sukkoth as 'clouds of glory',[105] and we have already noticed the interpretation of Rephidim as 'relaxing of hands', also found in the *Mekilta.*[106] Although such interpretations are rare in the Mishnah, many examples in the Talmuds and midrashic literature are ascribed to tannaitic and early amoraic authorities. Indeed, we have the statement[107] that R. Meir and R. Joshua ben Qorḥah were 'interpreters of names'. The expression used, *doresh shemoth,* echoes the more familier *dorshei reshumoth,* as well as Origen's *interpretes nominum.*

The history of the rabbinic tradition of the interpretation of names has not yet been written. It deserves study. A comparison of the late medieval sources with the ancient ones will show, I believe, that these

late compilations preserve much that goes back to the earliest phases of rabbinic exegesis, and that the tradition began in the schools of the early second century and reached a peak of activity in the second half of the third. Origen's dependence on this tradition can be seen both in his express statements, quoted above, and from the instances where his interpretations are paralleled in the surviving rabbinic sources.

The possible sources of Origen's interpretations of names are three: the works of Philo (and perhaps other Greek writings), the onomastica, of which no remains have come down to us which are demonstrably older than Origen, and the contemporary Jewish tradition. It is worth observing that not only do Philonic interpretations account for only a small part of those found in Origen's surviving works,[108] but Origen sometimes accompanies Philo's interpretation by another,[109] or else he ignores Philo's interpretation and replaces it by a different one.[110] Thus he is apparently aware of the shortcomings of Philo's etymologies, or at least he is familiar with a plurality of interpretations. At the same time many of the non-Philonic interpretations seem to be sounder etymologically than Philo's. This canon, however, must be used with the greatest of caution. It cannot be used to determine the extent of Origen's knowledge of Hebrew, for instance, since both the biblical authors and the Rabbis often do violence to the language in pursuit of appropriate etymologies, and in any case it is not to be supposed that Origen is the author of his interpretations.[111] By the same token, the philological accuracy of an interpretation cannot be taken as evidence of a 'rabbinic' as opposed to an 'Alexandrian' origin. On the contrary, it is precisely where the etymology is a false or idiosyncratic one that we can most profitably look for parallels. The fact, for instance, that Josephus,[112] Origen[113] and the Rabbis[114] all interpret Deborah as 'bee' and Barak as 'lightning' is proof of nothing: the etymologies are too obvious to deserve consideration. It is when the 'obvious' etymology is eschewed in favour of a more far-fetched or elaborate one that the comparison is most promising. If we can find a few of these less banal parallels we shall be justified, I think, in regarding them as evidence of a process which may have wider ramifications.

I should like to single out five examples which may, I hope, provide this small foundation of evidence.

(i) Pithom (Exodus i.11, etc.).
Philo: 'harassing mouth'.[115]
Origen: 'mouth of failing or mouth of the abyss'.[116]
Rabbis: 'Rab and Samuel disagreed (about the interpretation of "Pithom and Rameses", Exodus i.11). One

said its real name was Pithom. Why was it called Rameses? Because one building after another collapsed (*mithroses*). The other said its name was Rameses. Why was it called Pithom? Because the mouth of the deep (*pi-t^{e}hom*) swallowed up one building after another.'[117]

Origen gives two interpretations of Pithom, both different from Philo's. The first, in the tradition of the onomastica,[118] is not paralleled in the Rabbis, but the second finds a very close parallel in the discussion between Rab and Samuel, two older contemporaries of Origen in Babylonia.[119] The similarity gains in force from the fact that this interpretation involves reading the consonants *PTM* as *PYTHWM*; it is unlikely to be due to mere coincidence.

(ii) Othniel (Joshua xv.17, Judges i.13, etc.).
Origen: 'God's answer'[120] or 'time for me (of) God'.[121]
Rabbis: 'God answered him'.[122]

Origen's second interpretation, from *'eth,* 'time', respects the consonantal form of the Hebrew name; the first interpretation, from *'NH,* does not. The Talmudic parallel, which is echoed in Origen's comment, 'he can be called "God's answer", *whom God answers,* that is to whom He reveals secrets',[123] is attributed to a tannaitic source.

(iii) Jobab (Joshua xi.1, etc.).
Origen: 'enmities'.[124]
Rabbis: 'God's enemy'.[125]

There is some confusion in the Greek Bible and the onomastica between the names Joab and Jobab. The Heidelberg papyrus renders Jobab *'Iō̄* father', presumably an interpretation of Joab.[126] The Oxyrhynchus papyrus has *'Iaō̄* strength' for Joab. Origen's interpretation is different from both of these; it would most naturally suit Job.[127] The root *YBB* means in Hebrew 'break forth', in the *pi'el* 'bewail', in Aramaic (*pa'el*) 'sound the alarm'. The rabbinic interpretation is found in a late source, but that does not preclude its being ancient.

(iv) Migdol (Exodus xiv.2, Numbers xxxiii.7, etc.)
Origen: 'tower'[128] or 'magnificence'.[129]
Rabbis: 'There was the magnificence (*g^{e}dullah*) of Egypt'.[130]

'Tower' is the 'obvious' interpretation of this name. The rabbinic interpretation is found in the *Mekilta,* which, even if it is not a tannaitic compilation,[131] indubitably contains a great deal of tannaitic material.

(v) Zohar (Genesis xxv.9).
Origen: 'noon'.[132]
Rabbis: 'bright as noon'.[133]

The Hebrew form of this name is *Ṣoḥar,* the Greek *Saar.* Origen's interpretation seems more likely to be derived from the Hebrew than from the Greek, which looks more like the Hebrew for dawn (*shaḥar*) than noon (*ṣohorayim*). Even so, like the rabbinic interpretation, it involves replacing *Ḥ* by *H.* Although the rabbinic interpretation is found in late midrashic compilations, the Talmud[134] has a similar interpretation of the same name in I Chronicles iv.7 (Q).

These examples establish a plausible basis for the inference that a fair amount of Origen's interpretations of names derives from the rabbinic tradition. In each case an interpretation which is not found in the earlier Greek tradition is paralleled in the Hebrew sources, and none of them is an 'obvious' etymology. There are some fifty more cases in which the rabbinic literature furnishes a parallel, and even where there is no parallel the form of the interpretations sometimes suggests a rabbinic origin.[135] Wutz, in his *Onomastica Sacra,* exploited a great collection of onomastic material, but he notably omitted to investigate the rabbinic literature, and he consequently overlooked an important source of Origen's, as also of Jerome's, interpretations of names.

There is room for a great deal of further study of the rabbinic sources of Origen's exegesis. What is attempted here is a sketch of the subject in broad outline, and an indication of some of the principal topics,[136] showing that Origen does rely on the Rabbis both for the 'carnal' and for the 'spiritual' interpretation of Scripture. The next chapter will examine one particular aspect of this question in greater detail. There remains the need for a thoroughgoing and minute study of this whole important subject.

10

ORIGEN AND THE AGGADAH

'Aggadah' is a word with many meanings. In the present context it will be taken in its widest sense to include the whole body of non-legal traditions and elaborations of the biblical narrative which formed, or which may reasonably be supposed to have formed, the stock-in-trade of the early Amoraim. That the aggadah of the time included much which is also found elsewhere, in non-rabbinic Jewish sources and in the works of the Church Fathers, is apparent from even a superficial study. The present question is not how much of what is preserved in the rabbinic sources is also to be found in Origen, but rather, given that Origen quotes traditions which he ascribes to 'the Hebrews', and given also that he had the opportunity to acquaint himself with the teachings of the Rabbis, how much in Origen's interpretations and traditions can be demonstrated to derive from rabbinic sources.

This is the negative statement of a problem which in its positive aspects has been thoroughly treated in the past. Several partial and some more exhaustive collections of aggadic material in Origen have been made,[1] and although, no doubt, further investigation would yield even more examples, the instances which have been brought to light already are very numerous indeed. This is not, therefore, the place to draw up yet another such list. Moreover there are serious objections to the approach which is content with a mere catalogue, valuable though the fruits of this research certainly are. Students of the aggadah have perhaps been too ready to assume that, where the same tradition appears in both rabbinic and Christian sources, the Christian writer has borrowed it directly from the Rabbis. Even before the important recent archaeological discoveries, and before the Jewish apocryphal writings came to receive the attention they so richly deserve, a familiarity with the works of Philo should have warned investigators against adopting too all-embracing a view of the rabbinic material. The relation between

the ideas of the Rabbis and those of other contemporary Jewish groups has yet to be satisfactorily defined. In the meantime there is cause for the exercise of all possible caution. Hence the adoption here of what is, if anything, an over-critical attitude.

What is proposed is an examination of Origen's treatment of a few themes from the Pentateuch. The passages treated in each case are those in which Origen either specifically mentions a Jewish source or else quotes material which is also found in the aggadah. While every effort will be made to adduce rabbinic parallels, due consideration will also be given to other possible sources. It is hoped in this way to ensure a more secure basis for any conclusions which may be drawn, and at the same time to broaden the scope of the whole enquiry.

The passages selected are arranged in five groups, each united by a common biblical theme. Each group includes passages in which Origen specifically mentions a 'Hebrew' source, as well as traditions which can be paralleled in the rabbinic writings. The arrangement in groups is adopted purely for the sake of convenience, and is not to be taken to imply any judgment on the question of whether Origen made use of written midrashim, Jewish or Jewish-Christian. The examples chosen by no means exhaust the material allegedly borrowed by Origen from the Rabbis, for which recourse may be had to the studies mentioned in the bibliography.

The Creation

The biblical account of the creation of the world and the story of Adam and Eve not surprisingly received a good deal of attention in every branch of the Jewish tradition. Philo devotes a disproportionate amount of his time to them, and equally they were among the chief objects of speculation of Palestinian mystics, but other sources, such as the pseudepigraphical and gnostic writings, were also freely available to Origen.

We may begin with a specific problem which Origen mentions as troubling the Hebrews, namely the omission in the Hebrew Bible of the words 'God saw that it was good' in the case of the second day of the creation. Origen[2] does not mention any proposed solution, but an answer which may perhaps go back to Origen is given by Jerome: 'The second day could not be judged good by God, because it makes the number which divides from unity.'[3] That the problem really did trouble the Rabbis can be seen from the discussion in the Midrash,[4] where R. Hanina, a near-contemporary of Origen, suggests that it was because the second day saw the creation of *maḥloqeth,* which may be

rendered 'division' (Genesis i.6f.). R. Hanina's answer is surprisingly close to Jerome's; we cannot, however, form any certain notion of what solution Origen had in mind.

On the subject of the creation of the Garden of Eden Origen does record a Hebrew tradition: 'The Hebrews have a tradition that the place in which the Lord God planted the "paradise" or garden is called Edem, and they say it is the middle of the world, like the pupil of an eye; that is why, they say, the river Pheison is interpreted "mouth of a pupil", since the first river flows out of Edem. Their tradition is as follows: Edem, which is interpreted "sweet", existed before the garden came into being, for it was in it that the garden was planted.'[5]

The statement that 'Eden' is the name of the place in which the garden was planted might seem self-evident, but in fact it is the answer to two queries, 'Is Eden really a name?' and 'Was the garden in Eden or was Eden in the garden?' There are several instances in the rabbinic writings where doubts are expressed as to whether names are all they seem (a consequence of the allegorical interpretation of biblical names),[6] but although various interpretations of 'Eden' are suggested, no Rabbi is recorded as having denied that it was a name. The second question, on the other hand, whether the garden was in Eden or vice-versa, is the subject of a discussion in *Genesis Rabba*.[7]

The location of the garden of Eden was a question on which the Rabbis found it hard to agree. At any rate, Eden and Jerusalem (specifically the Temple Mount) were the two contenders for the honour of being the middle of the world, some versions situating Eden not far from the Temple Mount.[8]

The interpretation which Origen gives of the name Pishon is not found in the rabbinic sources, but, more significantly perhaps, it differs from the two interpretations proposed by Philo;[9] unlike one of Philo's interpretations it is based on the Hebrew form of the name, and it argues some knowledge of Hebrew. The interpretation of Eden likewise differs from Philo's,[10] and is in fact to be found among the various rabbinic interpretations of the name,[11] although the etymology is a fairly obvious one.

According to a baraitha,[12] the garden of Eden existed before the creation of the world, and this is Pseudo-Jonathan's rendering of the controversial word *miqqedem*. In fact, the LXX stand almost alone in translating it 'in the East'. R. Samuel b. Nahmani said it meant 'before Adam', and Ephraem that it was created on the third day.[13] Origen's informant, at any rate, stands outside the tradition represented by the LXX.

Origen several times discusses the question of whether the world was created in six days or all at once.[14] Some people before us, he says, thinking it strange that God, like a builder, needs several days to finish his building, say that everything came into being at once, but that the catalogue of days was inserted for the sake of order (*taxis*). Origen's source may be Philo, who also mentions *taxis*,[15] but the same question is discussed by several second-century Tannaim.[16] Since the topic was evidently a well-worn one, there is no profit for the present investigation in speculating about the origin of the remark.

The same considerations apply to Origen's statement[17] that God's words (Genesis i.26) 'Let us make man' are addressed to the angels. It is true that this interpretation differs strikingly from other Christian explanations, and that it was known in antiquity as a Jewish argument,[18] but it is found several times in Philo as well as in the Midrash.[19]

On the same verse, Origen remarks that it might lead some into supposing that God is corporeal and clothed in human form, a conclusion which he strenuously rejects as unworthy.[20] Even if Origen has Jews in mind here, among others,[21] it is probably not to be taken as a serious criticism of rabbinic theology.[22] It was commonly believed in many quarters that Genesis i.26f. and ii.7 refer to two separate creations. Philo, for example, distinguishes actual man, *ho aisthētos*, from the man made in God's image, who in incorporeal and intelligible, and is equated with the Logos of God.[23] The Rabbis, in a curious echo of I Corinthians xv.47f., distinguish two formations, one of a celestial being, the other of an earthly creature.[24] Origen follows various lines of interpretation,[25] but there is nothing to suggest that he is influenced by the Rabbis. On the contrary, the Rabbis are here following the lead of Hellenistic Jewish thought.

There is a rabbinic tradition that the 'tree of the knowledge of good and evil' was the vine.[26] Origen mentions this interpretation, rather than that of Philo, who allegorises it as *phronēsis*,[27] but the same tradition can also be traced in the pseudepigrapha.[28]

Origen states[29] that Adam spoke Hebrew, which would accord with the rabbinic belief[30] that the world was created in Hebrew, but he mentions the fact in connexion with the doctrine of the 'angels of the nations',[31] an idea which is not particularly associated with rabbinic Judaism. The antiquity of the Hebrew language formed, we know, part of the Jewish-pagan polemic.[32]

Finally, Origen mentions a 'tradition of the Hebrews' that Adam was buried at Golgotha.[33] The immediate source of this tradition is

evidently not rabbinic. Harnack[34] says that it is more probably Judeo-Christian. Jerome, at any rate, says that he heard it in Church.[35] He dismisses it in favour of what is certainly a Jewish tradition, namely that Adam was buried with the other patriarchs at Hebron.[36]

Noah

Opinions are divided as to whether or not there existed in antiquity an apocryphal Book of Noah. According to a recent writer on the subject,[37] 'we must conclude that as yet we do not have the Book of Noah and actually that beyond conjecture, we know very little about it; nor are we at all certain that such a book ever existed'. The same writer says of the two Hebrew works on Noah mentioned by R. Eleazar of Worms, 'after the biblical and the Enoch materials have been eliminated... very little remains that cannot be paralleled in the Haggadah'.[38] On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that where Origen and the Aggadah repeat similar traditions, it is equally possible that both are derived from such a common source, now lost.

The well-known rabbinic comment that Noah was righteous and perfect 'in his generation' (Genesis vi.9) but not by comparison with other generations[39] is mentioned by Origen and Jerome alone of Christian writers.[40] This might suggest that it is a rabbinic borrowing, were it not that it also appears in Philo.[41]

In a homily on Noah's ark Origen mentions several traditions, one of which is specifically ascribed to a Hebrew sage. This is quoted in reply to Apelles, a pupil of Marcion, who had criticised the figures given in the biblical account on the grounds that an ark of this size would have been too small to accommodate even four elephants with their food for a year;[42] the reply is that the figures do not represent absolute dimensions but merely proportions.[43] This tradition is not directly paralleled in the Rabbis,[44] but was, in any case, known to Philo.[45]

In the same homily Origen mentions a tradition about the allocation of space in the ark. Origen distinguishes two lower stories and three upper ones. The lowest compartment was reserved for refuse, the second for food; the three upper stories, in ascending order, were for the dangerous animals, the tame ones, and for Noah and his family. This particular arrangement is not found elsewhere; even though it has some distinctive features in common with the various rabbinic arrangements,[46] it could be quite plausibly argued that Origen is drawing on an older tradition with which Philo was familiar.[47]

Again, Origen was acquainted with the rabbinic tradition that the

sexes were segregated in the ark,[48] but the same tradition is found in Philo,[49] and was apparently well known in the third century.[50]

A number of traditions about the drunkenness of Noah can be paralleled from the rabbinic literature. The tradition which identified the tree of knowledge of good and evil with the vine has already been mentioned. It is interesting that Origen, like the Rabbis, mentions Noah in this context,[51] but in view of the appearance of the same idea in the Greek version of III Baruch no conclusions may strictly be drawn.

More important, Origen quotes in some detail a tradition of 'the Hebrew' concerning Canaan, son of Ham.[52] In answer to the question why Ham is described in Genesis ix.18 as 'the father of Canaan' the Hebrew said that it was because he was more like his son Canaan than his father Noah, and he went on to say that it was Canaan who first saw the nakedness of Noah, and that he reported it to his father. In support of this statement he pointed out that Ham was not the 'younger son' (ix.24), and that it was Canaan, not Ham, who was cursed (ix.25). Now, Philo also wonders about the mention of Canaan in ix.18,[53] and he produces a similar answer to that of the Hebrew; on one occasion[54] he says that it was Canaan who reported Noah's drunkenness. On the other hand he does not insist on this,[55] and he definitely interprets the words 'younger son' of Ham, not Canaan[56] (although he does not take the words literally, as Josephus seems to[57]). The Midrash[58] records a disagreement between R. Judah and R. Nehemiah on the subject of why Canaan was cursed. R. Judah held that since Noah and his sons had already been blessed (ix.1) Ham cannot now be cursed. R. Nehemiah, on the other hand, maintained that it was Canaan who saw and told the brothers, and so the curse was pronounced on the actual culprit. Justin[59] had followed the view of R. Judah, and so it is all the more interesting that Origen, under the guidance of the Hebrew, accepts the interpretation of R. Nehemiah. Given that the Midrash also knows of the explanation of the mention of Canaan in ix.18,[60] it would seem that this might qualify as an instance of an authentic echo in Origen of a rabbinic tradition.

Joseph

Commenting on the Joseph-story, Origen raises the question of how Pharaoh knew immediately that Joseph's interpretation of his dream was the correct one, and quotes an explanation offered to him by the Hebrew, who said that when Pharaoh saw the dream he also saw its interpretation, but that he forgot the latter. None of the proffered explanations served to jog his memory until he heard Joseph's, which

he instantly recognised as correct.[61] Although there is no direct parallel to this in the rabbinic literature of the time,[62] it is not dissimilar to the Targum on Genesis xl.5, according to which the butler and the baker 'each dreamed his own dream and the interpretation of his fellow's'. Origen's source might conceivably be Josephus,[63] but there is no verbal dependency, and it is on the whole unlikely that Josephus is 'the Hebrew'.

Equally promising is the explanation of the obscure word *abrech* in Genesis xli.43, the true meaning of which, Origen says,[64] is 'tender father' (*patēr hapalos*). Although not ascribed to the Hebrew, this interpretation is well attested on the rabbinic side. It is found in the Midrash,[65] and also in the Targumim.[66] Origen quotes it side by side with another explanation, 'kneel', which was the interpretation of Aquila.[67]

When he comes, two verses later, to explain the title *Ẓaphenath Pha'neaḥ,* Origen says it is interpreted as 'he to whom the future is revealed'.[68] The traditional Greek explanation seems to have been 'interpreter of dreams' (Philo)[69] or 'revealer of hidden things' (Josephus, Symmachus),[70] both of which Origen implicitly accepts elsewhere, in a homily,[71] but the version found in the *Selecta* is a precise translation of that of Onqelos and Neofiti.[72]

On the same verse, Origen mentions[73] that the Hebrews, in an apocryphon, identify the two Potiphars, the master and the father-in-law of Joseph, and that they say that Asenath betrayed her mother's guilt to her father. The identity of the two Potiphars is asserted by some rabbis[74] but it is also implied in the Pseudepigrapha,[75] and Origen is our earliest source[76] for the legend of Asenath's betrayal of her mother's plot, so that it is impossible to decide for certain what the apocryphon which Origen mentions was. In the writer's opinion it was quite probably a midrash, perhaps in Greek translation[77] (but not the *Romance of Joseph and Aseneth,*[78] although our story perhaps belongs to a similar romantic tradition).

The Exodus

In a homily on the Exodus[79] Origen mentions a tradition (introduced in the Latin by the words 'audiui a maioribus traditum') that separate paths were cut through the Red Sea for each of the twelve tribes. The same tradition is mentioned by Eusebius,[80] who ascribes it to the Hebrews, and it is not unlikely that Eusebius' source is Origen. At any rate the aggadah is well attested in the Jewish sources. There are hints of it in the *Mekilta,*[81] and it is specifically mentioned in the Midrash[82]

and in the Targum.[83] The twelve paths through the sea are also a feature of the picture of the crossing in the synagogue at Dura,[84] which was painted in Origen's lifetime. There is no reason to doubt that we have to do here with a genuine Jewish tradition.

Another Jewish aggadah may well be preserved among the various explanations which Origen cites of the term *tristatai* (*shalishim*) in Exodus xiv.7.[85] The word evidently caused a great deal of difficulty. Origen mentions five different explanations, the *Mekilta*[86] four, and two are the same in both lists. One is that they are warriors who can fight against three men at once; the other, more significant because more recondite, is that it refers to chariots with a crew of three instead of two.

Finally, on the subject of the Exodus, it is worth recalling those texts, which have already been mentioned in the discussion of his exegesis,[87] in which Origen's symbolic vocabulary corresponds closely with that of the Rabbis. It is not surprising, in view of the prominent role played by the Exodus-story in the mythical history of both Judaism and Christianity, that the biblical account should have been subjected to a close scrutiny by Rabbis and Church Fathers alike, or that each side should have been aware of the interpretations developed by the other. Even though Origen claims to reject the Jewish view of the progress through the wilderness,[88] his own interpretation leans heavily on the exegesis of the Hebrew names which we have found reason to believe stems from a Jewish source,[89] and it is no exaggeration to say that his homilies on the Exodus are permeated with Jewish interpretations. Again and again his interest focuses on the same points which exercised the ingenuity of the rabbinic commentators, and not infrequently the same explanations, or significantly similar ones, are propounded by both. A case in point is the sweetening of the waters of Marah, where, as we have seen,[90] Origen adopts the same explanation as the Dorshei Reshumoth, even quoting the same proof text to support the identification of the tree. The interpretation of the manna[91] and of the encounter with Amalek[92] also serve to illustrate the same theme. Even if, in most of these cases, the influence of Philo[93] and Paul[94] is also detected, yet it cannot account for everything. The tradition is never static, and by Origen's time it had developed significantly. Origen's homilies, the *Mekilta* and the paintings in the Dura synagogue all speak for the importance of the Exodus-story in the third century, and it is remarkable to what extent they all share a common exegetical vocabulary.

The Book of Numbers

A striking instance of Origen's adoption of aggadic interpretations is his comment on the image of the ox (or calf in the Greek) licking up the grass of the field in Numbers xxii.4: 'Just as the calf (tears up) the greenery with its mouth, so too the holy people, making war with its lips, has its weapons in its mouth, because of its prayers'.[95] Not only does this interpretation echo various rabbinic remarks,[96] but it would also seem that Origen himself attributed it to a Jewish source - perhaps indeed to 'the Hebrew' - for in three passages in the Homilies in which it is quoted Rufinus ascribes it variously to 'magister quidam qui ex Hebraeis crediderat', 'maiores' and 'quidam de senioribus magistris'.[97]

A more questionable example is the statement that the angel who barred Balaam's way (Numbers xxii.22) was the same angel of whom God says to Moses 'My angel will go before you to guard you on your way'.[98] According to L. Ginzberg[99] this angel was thought to be Michael, and he quotes two rabbinic remarks to this effect,[100] but the identification of angels takes us away from the world of the Rabbis into the kind of *milieu* which produced, say, the *Prayer of Joseph.*[101]

Ginzberg also pointed to another fragmentary comment, which concerns the burial of Moses: the place where Moses was buried was deliberately hidden (Deuteronomy xxxiv.6) to prevent his being worshipped as a god after his death.[102] As Ginzberg observed,[103] this explanation also appears in a late rabbinic source, the *Leqaḥ Ṭob,* a late text which contains some much older material.

The 'Hebrew tradition', quoted by Origen, to the effect that Phinehas was granted immortality (Numbers xxv.11f.) has already been noticed.[104] A. Spiro attempted to show[105] that 'Phinehas' ascension was necessitated by Judaeo-Samaritan polemics' as reflected in Pseudo-Philo. Whether or not Spiro's contention is correct, it is unlikely that Origen's source for the doctrine is Ps.-Philo, since he ignores the details given at that work. In particular, Ps.-Philo distinguishes two persons by the name of Phinehas, one a prophet, the other the son of Eleazar the Priest,[106] whereas Origen, who is also at pains to distinguish two characters named Phinehas, mentions only the two found in the Bible, the son of Aaron and the son of Eli.[107] Origen does say that the teaching is found in *aporrhēta,* but what these were we can merely surmise.

Having reviewed briefly a representative selection of the available material, we are in a position to judge more clearly the issues involved. One conclusion which emerges is that, even granted a good deal of

scepticism, there is enough evidence to prove that Origen does preserve aggadic material not found in earlier Greek sources. In some instances the Hebrew and Aramaic sources do not furnish complete parallels, but one must allow for the fragmentary nature of these documents. On the other hand, in several of the cases cited we do find detailed confirmation in the rabbinic literature, and the cumulative effect of this evidence is probably sufficient to remove the burden of doubt in some of the other instances.

A second conclusion is that, nevertheless, a certain amount of scepticism is justified. Previous writers on the subject have sometimes been too willing to seize on a reference to 'the Hebrews' or on a rabbinic parallel and insist immediately that Origen is quoting a rabbinic aggadah. Several of the traditions which he mentions are also found in other sources available to Origen, especially in Philo. One must also bear in mind the possibility that some material which is not in Philo was borrowed from other non-rabbinic works now lost.

Finally, there remains the question whether those remarks which Origen specifically attributes to 'the Hebrew' or 'the Hebrews' are rabbinic in character, or rather (since our evidence is so incomplete) whether there are grounds for doubting the rabbinic origin of any of these traditions.

To take first the traditions ascribed vaguely to 'the Hebrews', one example of those quoted, the tradition that Adam was buried at Golgotha, is certainly not Jewish in the strict sense. If it is Jewish at all, it comes from the Jewish Christian Church. For the rest, there is no instance in which it is at all safe to insist on a rabbinic origin. On the contrary, some at least of Origen's 'Hebrews' were acquainted with the Story of Susanna,[108] which does not figure in the rabbinic canon. *Hebraios,* as we have already seen,[109] is a term of many applications, which may (but need not) imply a knowledge of Hebrew (or Aramaic), and need not even denote an adherent of the Jewish religion.

The problem of the figure referred to as 'the Hebrew' has already been discussed.[110] Curiously enough, the two traditions attributed to him among those listed above are thoroughly unobjectionable from a rabbinic point of view. One of them, concerning the drunkenness of Noah, is found in the Midrash, and the same is true of the comment on Numbers xxii.4, which may be due to him. On the other hand, he is also the author of the notably un-rabbinic interpretation of the two seraphim in Isaiah vi.3.[111] The problem of the identity of 'the Hebrew' must remain one of the great enigmas connected with the name of Origen.

AFTERWORD

It would be comfortable as well as conventional to conclude with conclusions. But that would imply a certainty, and an end. As I said at the outset, all I have attempted to provide is a beginning. In these closing words I shall try merely to resume what seem to me to be the main points to have emerged from these studies, and to sum up their import.

Origen was the first Christian father to devote himself fully to the study of the Bible. Even his later detractors give him this much credit. His interest in the Bible began in his childhood; it led him to delve into textual problems, to visit the biblical sites, and to cast his net wide in search of exegetical aids. It also led him to the Jews. The Jewish tradition of expounding scripture had a history of centuries, and for well over a hundred years the schools in Palestine had been studying the Bible and the theory of its exegesis systematically and in great detail. There was no comparable Christian tradition. Despite overt hostility between Church and Synagogue, Christians still looked to the Jews for the interpretation of the Scriptures.

Origen aimed at putting Christian biblical studies on a sound scholarly basis. He would establish the biblical text, publish commentaries, found libraries, and preach the Christian understanding of the Old Testament. In this way he would put an end to the humiliating dependence on the Synagogue and the dangerous Jewish influence on the minds of Christians. But to do so he must immerse himself in the Jewish tradition.

Contact with the Jews was not difficult. Religious dialogue was a preoccupation of the age. The rabbis were only too willing to debate their cause in public or discuss it in private. Although Hebrew was the traditional language of prayer and study, they spoke Greek and expounded the Bible in Greek in their synagogues and classrooms.

Moreover, there were Jews within the Church, both recent converts and long-established Jewish Christians, and these, too, could provide Origen with valuable information.

The first task facing him was to establish the text of the Greek Bible and its relationship with the Hebrew. To this end he collected and collated all the available Greek versions, and then had them meticulously compared with the Hebrew, both in Hebrew script and in Greek transliteration. The result of this long and arduous labour was the Hexapla, a synoptic table which permitted him to take account of every possible variant. The addition of the Hebrew text was not an admission of its primacy, but enabled him to avoid the Jewish criticism of excessive dependence on the Greek. For most practical purposes he was content to refer, for an understanding of the Hebrew, to the Greek of Aquila, which he regarded as an extremely accurate version of the Hebrew. Occasionally he would quote the Hebrew itself, from the transliteration in the second column.

Side by side with his work on the text, Origen devoted close attention to the theory and methods of exegesis. In this study he took account of the work of the Greek literary critics, of Hellenistic Jewish and Christian commentators, particularly Philo and Paul, and of the Rabbis. The influence of all these varied sources can be detected in his exegetical terminology, in his studies of hermeneutical theory (preserved in the first section of the *Philocalia*), and in the substance and style of his actual interpretations. Origen's reliance on the living Jewish tradition is one of the most distinctive features of his exegesis, and serves to mark him out from all earlier and contemporary Greek fathers. It is no exaggeration to say that there is not a single aspect of his biblical writings that is not touched by it to a greater or lesser degree. The consequences are far-reaching. Origen was the founder of the science of hermeneutics in the Church. His work became the basis for subsequent Greek Christian exegesis, and through the translations by Rufinus and by Jerome, who was himself profoundly influenced by the rabbinic tradition, its impact was felt in the Latin West as well. If this is correct, the Rabbis of third-century Caesarea unwittingly made an important contribution, through Origen, to the whole Christian exegetical tradition.

Origen does not always admit his debt to his Jewish teachers. His caution is natural. The Church and the Synagogue were rivals, and Origen himself was one of the foremost Christian polemists of his age. Indeed, he often turned his familiarity with Jewish exegesis to good account in disputing publicly with Jews or in preaching to a flock torn

between the two faiths. He could be severe in his condemnation of those who 'fawned on the Jews', and who introduced Jewish teachings and practices into the Church. He lost no opportunity, in his sermons, to attack Jewish literalism, and his powerful invective no doubt made its contribution to the later tragic persecution of Jews by Christians. Yet Origen was not by nature a persecutor: his weapon was reason, not force. He never blinded himself to the fact that Christians and Jews shared a common history, read the same scriptures, worshipped the same Father in heaven. If he attacked the Jews vigorously in Church, he defended them no less vigorously against the abuse of pagans. His attitude owes much to that of Paul, and like Paul his concern is less to condemn the Jews than to persuade them of the need to reform Judaism in the light of the Christian teaching.

It is not profitable to speculate on how different Origen's treatment of the Jews might have been had he lived after the triumph of the Church, at a time when Christians treated the Jews much as they had themselves been treated by the pagans. In his day political power was in the hands of pagans, and the Church vied with the more favoured Synagogue by polemical means to win the minds, hearts and souls of the entire world. In this great and strenuous contest Origen played a cardinal role, by his dedicated devotion to biblical study, by his vigorous defence of orthodoxy, and by his efforts to endow the new movement with intellectual respectability. When the time came he made the supreme sacrifice and gave his life in the cause for which he had lived. A later age squabbled over his teachings and finally desecrated his memory, but by then the fight to which he had dedicated himself had been convincingly won, and the Christian faith reigned supreme in a Christian Empire. Paganism had been vanquished, and Judaism humiliated.

At a time when Church and Synagogue find themselves drawing closer together once more in the face of a new paganism it is edifying and instructive to contemplate an era when, despite powerful antagonisms, Jews and Christians could live in close harmony and derive mutual benefit from their intercourse.

A NOTE ON SOURCES

The abbreviations I have used in referring to ancient sources are conventional and largely self-explanatory. The reader who encounters any difficulty may refer to the *Index of Ancient Sources.* Appended here are some brief notes on the editions used and on the form of Rabbinic references.

Patristic Sources

Origen

References are to *GCS,* where available (the volume-numbers being those of the works of Origen, not the series as a whole), otherwise generally to Migne (*PG* XI-XVII, 1857), who reproduces the text of C. and C. V. Delarue (1733-59). Other abbreviated references are as follows:

Harl M. Harl, *La Chaîne palestinienne sur le Psaume 118* (*SC* 189-90. Paris, 1972).

Rietz G. Rietz, *De Origenis prologis in Psalterium quaestiones selectae* (Jena, 1914).

Robinson J.A. Robinson, *The Philocalia of Origen* (Cambridge, 1893).

For a full bibliography of editions of Origen, see Crouzel, *Bibliographie Critique.*

Other Greek Fathers

References are to *GCS,* by the volume-number of each author, or to *PG.* Other editions are specified.

Latin and Syriac Fathers

Reference, unless otherwise specified, is to *CSEL, CC, CSCO,* or *PL, PO.*

Rabbinic Sources

The Talmudic literature

Reference is by tractates of the Mishnah. There is an alphabetical list of the tractates in Danby's translation.

a. Mishnah. The name of the tractate is followed by chapter and verse. [*Yad.* iii.5]
English translation: H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (1933).

b. Tosefta. Abbreviated Tos. The name of the tractate is followed by the chapter and verse of the edition by M.S. Zuckermandel (1880). [Tos. *Sanh.* iv.7]

c. Palestinian Talmud (also called Yerushalmi). Abbreviated J. The name of the tractate is followed by the chapter and verse of the Mishnah and the column in the Krotoschin edition (1866). [J. *AZ* v.4(3) (44^{d})]

d. Babylonian Talmud (also called Babli). Abbreviated B. The name of the tractate is followed by the folio number, which is standard in all editions. [B. *Meg.* 6^{a}]
English translation: I. Epstein (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud* (1935-52).

The Midrashic literature

a. The *Mekilta* (abbreviated *Mek.*) exists in two versions, *Mekilta de R. Ishmael* (abbreviated *MdeRI*) and *Mekilta de R. Simeon bar Yohai* (abbreviated *MdeRSbY*). Reference is by chapter and verse of Exodus, ignoring the traditional divisions of *MdeRI.* I have added the reference to the volume and page of the edition of *MdeRI* by J. Z. Lauterbach (1933-5), which contains an English translation and a concordance of earlier editions. *MdeRSbY* is edited by D. Hoffmann (1905) and by J. N. Epstein and E. Z. Melamed (1955).

b. *Sifra* (on Leviticus), *Sifre* (on Numbers and Deuteronomy). Reference is by the traditional paragraph numbers. I have occasionally added the biblical reference for greater clarity.

c. *Midrash Rabba.* The name of the biblical book (in English) is followed by the abbreviation *R* and the chapter and verse of the commentary. The abbreviation Th.-Alb. refers to the edition of *Genesis Rabba* by J. Theodor and Ch. Albeck (1903-29).

d. Other midrashim. The principal abbreviations and editions used are as follows:

Midr. Ps. Midrash on Psalms, ed. S. Buber (1891).
There is an English translation by W. G. Braude (1959).

Pes. de R. K. Pesiqta de Rab Kahana, ed. S. Buber (1868).
There is a more recent edition by B. Mandelbaum (1962).

Pes. R. Pesiqta Rabbati, ed. M. Friedmann (1880).
There is an English translation by W. G. Braude (1968).

Tanh. Midrash Tanḥuma. Reference is to the older editions, but *Tanh. B.* refers to the edition by S. Buber (1885).

For a general introduction to the rabbinic literature see:
H. L. Strack, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (1945).
E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People,* New English Version I (1973) §3E, with excellent bibliographies.

ABBREVIATIONS OF REFERENCE WORKS AND PERIODICALS

Z. *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*
OS *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves*
. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*
Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique
Bibliotheca Orientalis
V *Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
V *Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
Vic. *Catena Nicephori* (Leipzig, 1772-3)
Corpus Christianorum
J.-B. Frey, *Corpus Inscription Judaicarum*
V. Tcherikover, A. Fuks, M. Stern, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*
Classical Quarterly
Classical Review
, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*
Dictionnaire de la Bible
Dictionary of Christian Biography
Encyclopaedia Judaica
Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte
Harvard Theological Review
4 *Hebrew Union College Annual*
Israel Exploration Journal
Journal Asiatique
Journal of Biblical Literature
Jewish Encyclopedia
Journal of Jewish Studies
Jewish Quarterly Review
Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period
Journal of Semitic Studies
Journal of Theological Studies
'J *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*
Novum Testamentum
New Testament Studies
IR *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*
J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*
K. Preisendanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae*

PL	J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*
PO	*Patrologia Orientalis*
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RE	Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencylopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*
RechSR	*Recherches de Science Religieuse*
REG	*Revue des Etudes Grecques*
REJ	*Revue des Etudes Juives*
ReSR	*Revue de Sciences Religieuses*
Rev. Bén.	*Revue Bénédictine*
RHPR	*Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse*
RHR	*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*
RTP	*Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie*
SC	*Sources Chrétiennes*
SH	*Scripta Hierosolymitana*
SMSR	*Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni*
ST	*Studi e Testi*
SP	*Studia Patristica*
ThLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
TU	*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*
VC	*Vigiliae Christianae*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZDPV	*Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästinavereins*
ZKT	*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

NOTES

Notes to chapter 1

1 See Abel, *Histoire de la Palestine* II.178, *RE* III.1294, Kadman, *The Coins of Caesarea Maritima* p. 24.

2 *RE ibid.*, Kadman, *op. cit.* p. 25. The Christian sights of Caesarea were pointed out to pilgrims in the fourth century - see the Bordeaux Pilgrim and Jerome, *Peregrinatio S. Paulae* V.

3 See Krauss, 'Caesarea', *JE* III.485-8, L. Levine, *Caesarea under Roman Rule* (Studies in Judaism and Late Antiquity VII. Leiden, 1975).

4 See S. Lieberman, *Talmudah shel Qisrin* pp. 9f.

5 There is more satisfactory evidence from a later period, but the Palestinian Talmud frequently mentions Samaritans at Caesarea in the time of R. Abbahu (early fourth century) (e.g. J.*AZ* v.4(3) (44^{d} ll.46ff.)). Two passages in particular have been quoted as testifying to the large number of Samaritans in Abbahu's time: J.*AZ* i.2(3) (39^{c} ll.26f.) 'many Samaritans', J. *Demai* ii.1 (22^{c} l.45) 'the Jews and the Gentiles together outnumber the Samaritans'. Neither of these texts is without its difficulties. The first is translated by M. Schwabe (*Le Talmud de Jérusalem* XI.182), 'R. Abahou demanda, est-ce que le mur, τεῖχος, de Césarée est considéré comme idole? Puisqu'en cette ville, fut-il répondu, il y a beaucoup de Samaritains, on suppose qu'ils adorent en ce mur une idole secrète'. This version, reading טיכוס for טקסיס does not give a very good sense. S. Lieberman (*AIPHOS* VII (1939-44) 406) keeps טקסיס (τάξις = *officium*) and translates, 'R. Abbahu said: "The [members of the] *officium* of Caesarea (i.e. of the proconsul), since many of them are Samaritans, are considered as people who observe the ceremonies [of Saturnalia and Kalendae]." ' If this is the correct interpretation

the passage says nothing about the size of the Samaritan community. Lieberman (*ibid.* 402) takes the second passage as proving that there were more Samaritans than *either* Jews or Gentiles, a possible, but not the only, meaning of the text. The reader will observe that the Palestinian Talmud, while being an invaluable source for Palestinian history, often raises as many questions as it answers.

6 *Origeniana.* First published, apparently, in Huet's edition of Origen's exegetical works (Rouen, 1668), republished together with the collected works of Origen by Delarue, Lommatzsch and Migne.

7 See pp. 23f.

8 See chapter 10. The Jewish ignorance of Origen is still only too apparent. A particularly glaring example is the article 'Origen' in the new *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (1971), which, besides being a tissue of misprints, mistakes and misleading half-truths, mentions nothing of Origen's work except the Hexapla.

9 J. Scherer, *Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide et les évêques ses collègues sur le Père, le Fils et l'Âme* (Publications de la Société Fouad I^{er} de Papyrologie, Textes et documents IX. Cairo, 1949) (also *SC* 67, Paris, 1960); *Extraits des livres I et II du Contre Celse d'Origène* (Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale XXVIII. Cairo, 1956); *Le Commentaire d'Origène sur Rom.III.5-V.7* (*Id.* XXVII. Cairo, 1957). See also O. Guéraud, 'Note préliminaire sur les papyrus d'Origène découverts à Toura', *RHR* CXXXI (1946) 85-108, H. Ch. Puech, 'Les nouveaux écrits d'Origène et de Didyme découverts à Toura', *RHPR* XXXI (1951) 293-329, L.Doutreleau, 'Que savons-nous aujourd'hui des papyrus de Toura?'. *RechSR* XLIII (1955) 161-77, L. Koenen and L. Doutreleau, 'Nouvel inventaire des papyrus de Toura', *RechSR* LV (1967) 547-564. The *Dialogue with Heracleides* is translated by H. Chadwick in J. E. L. Oulton and H. Chadwick, *Alexandrian Christianity* (London, 1954). The paschal treatise is unpublished, but some passages are given in P. Nautin, *Homélies Pascales* II (*SC* 36).

10 For further information about the papyri see J. van Haelst, 'Catalogue des papyrus littéraires chrétiens' (unpublished Sorbonne dissertation, 1973).

11 Most of the fragments are reproduced in the editions of Origen's complete works. For more recent additions, including catena fragments, see Crouzel's *Bibliographie critique.* It is probable that further fragments remain to be identified in the works of other fathers.

12 Edition by J. Armitage Robinson, *The Philocalia of Origen* (Cambridge, 1893). English translation by G. Lewis (Edinburgh, 1911). See also E. Junod, 'Remarques sur la composition de la "Philocalie" d'Origène par Basile de Césarée et Gregoire de Nazianze', *RHPR* LII (1972) 149-56. There is a useful index of the passages of the *Philocalia,* with references to the editions of Origen's works, in Crouzel's *Bibliographie critique.*

13 For bibliography see Crouzel, *Bibliographie critique.* Index *s.v.* 'Rufin, traducteur d'Origène', and add Robinson, *The Philocalia of Origen* pp. xxxi-xxxix.

14 See Crouzel, *Bibliographie critique,* Index *s.v.* 'Hexaples'.

15 Notably the palimpsest published by G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae* (Rome, 1958). See also Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*^{2} pp. 157f. and in *SP* IV (= *TU* 79) 57-67. Some fragments of the hexaplaric Psalter were published by C. Taylor, *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Geniza Palimpsests.* Taylor also reproduces in his *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers* a palimpsest fragment of Aquila's version of Pss. xc and xci (see also B. Capelle, 'Fragments du psautier d'Aquila', *Rev. Bén.* XXVIII (1911) 64-8).

16 Our understanding of the catenae has been immensely advanced by the work of R. Devreesse (see the bibliography). There is much to be learned, too, from M. Harl, *La Chaîne palestinienne sur le Psaume 118* (*SC* 189, 190. Paris, 1972).

17 For bibliography see Crouzel, *Bibliographie critique*, Index *s.v.* 'Jerome (Influence d'Origène sur)', and add M. A. Schatkin, 'The Influence of Origen upon St Jerome's Commentary upon Galatians', *VC* XXIV (1970) 49-58.

18 See Crouzel, *Bibliographie critique,* Index *s.v.* 'Hilaire de Poitiers', 'Ambroise de Milan', 'Influence d'Origène en général'. On Hilary see especially É. Goffinet, *L'utilisation d'Origène dans le commentaire des Psaumes de saint Hilaire de Poitiers* (Louvain, 1965).

19 *Origeniana* III.iv.

20 E.g. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* II, Hanson, *Origen's Doctrine of Tradition,*

Introduction, E. de Faye, *Origène* I. See also Cadiou, *Introduction au système d'Origène* pp. 11-14, *La Jeunesse d'Origène* pp. 85-90.

21 See H. Chadwick, *Contra Celsum* xiv-xv, M. Bourret, *Contre Celse* (*SC* 132) 15-21.

22 *Cels.* II.34.

23 *Cels.* II.31.

24 See p. 50.

25 But see the important study by B. Z. Wacholder, 'The Date of the Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael', *HUCA* XXXIX (1968) 117-44. Wacholder argues that the Mekilta is the work of a single author writing in or around the late eighth century.

26 The so-called *barayatha* (plural of *baraitha*; Hebrew plural *baraithoth* or *beraithoth*), 'outside' or 'apocryphal' traditions. See the articles by L. Ginzberg in *JE* II.513-6 and B. de Vries in *EJ* (1971) IV.189-93. There are many unresolved problems connected with the *baraitha* tradition: see, for example, L. Jacobs, 'Are there fictitious Baraitot in the Babylonian Talmud?' *HUCA* XLII (1971) 185-196.

27 See Lieberman, *Talmudah shel Qisrin.*

28 Tcherikover, *Ha-Yehudim be-Miṣrayim*^{2} ch. 6, *CPJ* I.92.

29 *CPJ* I.93.

30 BM Or.9180. First published by H.Hirschfield in *The Jewish Guardian* (London), 9 June 1922. See Flinders Petrie, *The Status of the Jews in Egypt* (London, 1922) p. 38; U. Cassuto, *Israel* VII (1922) 43; H. Loewe, *JTS* XXIV (1923) 132; A. Neppi Modona, *Aegyptus* IV (1923) 32f., 125ff.; L. Fuchs, *Die Juden Ägyptens* (Vienna, 1924) pp. 115f.

31 *JQR* XVI (1904) 1-8.

32 Euting, *Florilegium de Vogue* p. 235; Fuchs, *op. cit.* p.116: סיטורה הכשרה שלום על משכבה נשמתה לחיי של(ו)ם

33 לעזר נוח נפשו בצרור החיים]. Euting, *Aeg. Z.* XXXIV (1896) 164, Tcherikover, *Ha-Yehudim be-Miṣrayim*^{2} p. 27. Cf. Schürer, *Geschichte* III^4 p. 47, Fuchs, *op. cit.* p. 117. The form לעזר (Lazarus) is Palestinian, but recurs with other Palestinian names in the letter from Egypt published by Cowley in *JQR* XVI (1904), no. 4 (Bodley MS Heb.d.69 (P)). Cf. also Schwabe and Lifshitz *Beth She'arim* II insc. no. 177.

34 See pp. 39f. It is possible that this section of the *de Principiis* (the 'Hermeneutical Treatise') was added or rewritten in Caesarea.

35 See S. Lieberman, 'Palestine in the Third and Fourth Centuries', *JQR* NS XXXVI-XXXVII (1945-7) and 'Jewish Life in *Eretz Yisrael* as reflected in the Palestinian Talmud' in M. Davis (ed.), *Israel: Its Role in Civilization* (New York, 1956) 82-91. (Both these articles are reprinted in Lieberman's *Texts and Studies*, New York, 1974).
36 For a partial bibliography of the archaeology of Caesarea see E. K. Vogel, 'Bibliography of Holy Land Sites', HUCA XLII (1971) 23f.
37 *Lam.R.* I.5.31 (see Buber's note *ad loc.*).
38 B. *Meg.* 6^a, cf. B. *Bek.* 55^a, *Pes.* 42^b.
39 B. *Hag.* 14^a, *Ket.* 17^a, *BK* 83^a, J. *Meg.* iii.2 (74^a).
40 B. *MK* 25^b, J. *AZ* iii.1 (42^c).
41 J. *Peah* i.1 (15^c), *Meg.* ii.1 (73^a). The fact is also recorded by Eusebius, *Mart. Pal.* ix.12 (see Lieberman, *AIPHOS* VII (1939-44) 400).
42 J. *Sot.* vii.1 (21^b). See p.57.
43 *Cant. R.* I.6.1. Since Abbahu is always represented as a resident of Caesarea his strong language is rather surprising. Conceivably the names in the anecdote have become reversed. S. T. Lachs, *JQR* NS LX (1969-70) 197 n. 2, argues on the basis of this passage that Abbahu was not born in Caesarea, and that he made the remark before he went to live there. The deduction betrays excessive earnestness: Abbahu may be scoring a rhetorical point, not seriously proposing a boycott.
44 See above, n. 5.
45 On Marqah's date see below, ch. 3 n. 92.
46 See pp. 36f.

Notes to chapter 2

1 *Apol.* xviii. 8-9: 'Hodie apud Serapeum Ptolemaei bibliothecae cum ipsis Hebraicis litteris exhibentur; sed et Iudaei palam lectitant.'
2 For a brief review of work on Aquila see S. Jellicoe, 'Aquila and his version', *JQR* NS LIX (1968-9) 326-32.
3 *Kirchengesch. Ertrag* I.19.
4 Origen does not specifically quote any of these, but he mentions Aristobulus (*Cels.* IV.51). On these writers see Schürer, *Geschichte* II.iii.33.III.IV. Cf. Jerome, *de Vir.Ill.* xxxviii (*PL* XXIII.653B).

5 His *Chronicle of the Jewish Kings* was used by Julius Africanus, and was read as late as the ninth century by Photius (*Bibl.* xxxiii (6^b)). See Schürer, *History* (New English Edition, 1973) I, pp. 34-7 (with bibliography) and T. Rajak, 'Justus of Tiberias', *CQ* NS XXIII (1973) 345-68.

6 E.g. Harnack, *Kirchengesch. Ertrag* I.23.

7 E.g. *Cels.* IV.51 (*GCS* I.324.11), VI.21 (*GCS* II.91.26), *in Mt.* XV.3 (*GCS* X.354.30).

8 Cels. V.55 (*GCS* II.58.25), VII.20 (*GCS* II.171.32).

9 See J. Rendel Harris, *Fragments of Philo Judaeus* pp. 106f., R. Devreesse, *ST* 201 p. 2, cf. pp. 16ff.

10 *CR* LVII (1943) 78.

11 See E. Stein, *Eos* XXXIV (1932-3) 205ff.

12 R. P. C. Hanson (*Origen's Doctrine of Tradition pp. 146ff.*) says that 'Origen learnt from Philo the habit of expanding and elaborating on Biblical stories'. J. Daniélou is similarly inclined to play up Origen's debt to Philo. See the brief discussion in H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth* p. 281.

13 Jerome, *Lib. Int. Hebr. Nom.*, Preface (*PL* XXIII.815, *CC* LXXII.59): 'Philo, uir disertissimus Iudaeorum, Origenis quoque testimonio comprobatur edidisse librum Hebraicorum nominum, eorumque etymologias iuxta ordinem literarum e latere copulasse.' The work is attributed to Philo, with reservations, by Eusebius, *HE* II.xviii.7.

14 A. Deissmann, *Veröffentlichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung* I no. 5 (pp. 86ff.), cf. *Id., Light from the Ancient East* p. 415; P. Oxy. 2745 (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri* vol. XXXVI), cf. D. Rokeah, *JTS* NS XIX (1968), 70-82.

15 *In Joh.* II. xxxiii (*GCS* IV.90), cf. *in Num. hom.* XX.3.

16 See pp. 117ff.

17 E.g. *Cels.* I.47 (*GCS* I.97.1), II.13 (*fin.*), *in Jerem. hom.* fr. XIII (on Jerem. xxii.24) (*GCS* III.204), *in Lam.* frr. CV, CIX, CXV (*GCS* III. 273-5), *in Mt.* X.17 (*GCS* X.22.7) and fr. 457.I (*GCS* XI.42.20) and II (*GCS* XII.190.2). On Origen's use of Josephus, particularly on the subject of the 'Testimonium Flavianum', see Crouzel, *Bibliographie critique*, Index, *s.v.* 'Josèphe (Flavius)', and add W. E. Barnes, *The Testimony of Josephus to Jesus Christ* (London, 1920) pp. 15-20.

18 E.g. *Cels.* IV.11, on the antiquity of Moses, cf. *c. Ap.* I.13 (70ff.); but also in Tatian 37-8, Theophilus *ad Autol.* iii.21-2.

Cels. V.50: the legend of Alexander and the high priest is also in the rabbinic tradition, but Josephus (Ant. XI.3-5 (317-39)) is a likelier source. A remark on Hebrew metre (*in Ps.* cxviii(cxix). 1-2, Harl, *Chaîne Palestinienne* (p.188) ll.25-37) was thought to be derived from Josephus by J. Ley (*ZAW* XII (1892) 212-7), but this idea is rejected by G. Mercati (*ST* 142 p. 20), who prefers, as does M. Harl (*op.cit.* p. 557) a contemporary Jewish origin. Harnack, *Kirchengesch. Ertrag* II.51f., lists some examples of Origen's use of Josephus (and Philo), and also mentions a reference to those *qui Iudaicam historiam conscripserunt* (*in Mt. Ser.* 41, *GCS* XI.82.13).

19 *Cels.* I.50,57, II.8, cf. VI.11.

20 Also known as 'Pseudo-Philo'. See M. Delcor, 'Philon (Pseudo-)', *DB* Suppl. VII (1966) 1354-75 (with bibliography).

21 M. R. James, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo* (London, 1917), Introduction, pp. 11,73, suggested that Origen quotes Ps.-Philo. According to A. Spiro (*PAAJR* XX (1951), n. 12) this 'need not be taken seriously'. See below, p. 131, and for an example of a Greek midrash, ch. 10 n. 77.

22 *In Joh.* II.xii (87) (*GCS* IV.67.19), *in Jer. hom.* XV.4, *in Mt.* XV.14 (Latin only, *GCS* X.389.16). See ch. 3 n. 77.

23 See B. Z. Bokser, 'Justin Martyr and the Jews', *JQR* NS LXIV (1973-4) 97-122, 204-11.

24 *Sel. in Gen.* i.26 (*PG* XII.93A).

25 Proem to the *Eclogues*, in Eusebius, *HE* IV.xxvi.14. See A. E. Harvey, 'Melito and Jerusalem', *JTS* NS XVII (1966), 401-4.

26 His object, according to D. Barthélemy (*Epektasis* p.250), was to provide a more secure basis for Christian controversies with Jews.

27 On the opening words of the homily and the claim that the Bible was read in Hebrew in Melito's church see G. Zuntz, *HTR* XXXVI (1943) 299-315, challenged by S. G. Hall in *Kyriakion: Festschrift Johannes Quasten* (Munster, 1970), 236-48. See also K. W. Noakes, 'Studies in Melito of Sardis. Some Attempts to set Melito in his Second Century Asia Minor Context' (unpublished Oxford dissertation, 1970), 'A note on the opening sentence of Melito's *Peri Pascha*' (pp. 62-6). For attempts to find parallels between the homily and the Jewish Passover ritual see F. L. Cross, *The Early*

Christian Fathers (London, 1960) 104-9, E. Werner, 'Melito of Sardes, the First Poet of Deicide', *HUCA* XXXVII (1966) 191-210, S. G. Hall, 'Melito in the Light of the Passover Haggadah', *JTS* NS XXII (1971) 29-46.

28 See Noakes, *op. cit.* esp. ch. 5 (pp. 99-111).

29 Michael Psellus, *Accusation* (ed. Brehier pp. 403f.).

30 R. B. Tollinton, *Clement of Alexandria* II.38.

31 If we look for the origin of the commentary-form, a genre of exposition to which Origen was much given, we find scattered instances in the Qumran texts, the Tannaitic literature and the pagan scholiasts, but the closest example to Origen is Heracleon's commentary on John, a work which Origen quotes at considerable length in his own commentary. Nicephorus Callistus (*HE* IV.xxxi, *PG* CXLV.1052D) remarks that Origen copied the commentary-form from Hippolytus, a statement based perhaps on Jerome, *de Vir. III.* 1xi (*PL* XXIII.673A).

32 See *PGM* Index VI *s.v.* Ἀδωναί, Ἰάω, Σαβαώθ; Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols* II.153ff. and Index 3.

33 See Bardy, 'Aux origines de l'école d'Alexandrie', *RechSR* XXVII (1937) 65-90; P. Nautin, *Lettres et Écrivains chrétiens des II^e et III^e siècles* (Paris, 1961) p. 140.

34 Nautin, *ibid.* pp. 128, 139. On Alexander see Abel, *Histoire* II.184f.

35 *Ecl. Proph.* 56, cf. Jerome *in Ephes.* I (on ii.6) (*PL* XXVI.468)

36 Krauss, *JQR* V (1892-3), pp. 134f.

37 Elliott, *DCB* II.855.

38 The influence of Clement's background has been variously assessed. See Collomp, *Rev. de Phil. Litt. et d'Hist. Anc.* XXXVII (1913) 19-46, W. Bousset, *Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Röm* (Gottingen, 1915) and the review of Bousset in *JQR* NS IX (1918-19) 245ff.

39 *Strom.* I.i.1 (*PG* VIII.700). It has been argued (e.g. by Nautin, *op. cit.* n. 33, who renders '... l'autre de Palestine, Juif d'origine. Quant au dernier ...') that this must refer to Pantaenus, since Clement would not omit all reference to Pantaenus at this point. There is no clear reason, however, to identify the Hebrew of Palestine with the teacher whom Clement found in Egypt.

40 E.g. *Strom.* I.23, 'the Mystae say that Moses killed the Egyptian with a word'; cf. *Ex. R.* and Rashi on Ex. ii.14. See Krauss, *JE* IV.82.

41 Bardy, Nautin, *locc. citt.* (n. 33).
42 See Eusebius *HE* VI.xxxi. Cedrenus, however, places him under Pertinax (193). This has inevitably led some to suggest that there were two Africani.
43 J.-R. Vieillefond, *Les 'Cestes' de Julius Africanus. Étude sur l'ensemble des fragments avec édition, traduction et commentaire.* (Publications de l'Institut Français de Florence, 1ère série no. 20. Florence/Paris, 1970).
44 Photius *Bibl.* xxxiv (7[a]). The *Cesti* are also mentioned by Eusebius, Syncellus and the *Suda.*
45 Eusebius *HE* I.vii.2-16.
46 P. Oxy. 412 (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri* vol. III p. 39).
47 Eusebius *PE* VIII.1, Jerome *in Dan.* ix.24 (*PL* XXV.542-4).
48 *Sel. in Ps.* cxviii(cxix).85 (*PG* XII.1601D, Harl, *Chaîne Palestinienne* p. 324). The attribution of this fragment to Origen is not certain (see Harl, *op. cit.* p. 671), but cf. the similar language in *Princ.* IV.ii.1 (*GCS* 306-8, *Philocalia* I.8, Robinson 14f.).
49 *In Joh.* VI.xiii(7) 76. An actual Jewish tradition is quoted at *ibid.* 83.
50 'Est-ce Hoshaya Rabba qui censura le "commentaire allégorique"?', in *Philon d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1967) pp. 45-78.
51 E.g. *in Ezech. hom.* IV.8, *in Matth. ser.* 78 (*GCS* XI.157).
52 *Kircheng. Ertrag* II p. 42.
53 *Ibid.* I p. 30.
54 *Cels.* I.45 Μέμνημαι δέ ποτε ἔν τινι πρὸς Ἰουδαίων λεγομένους σοφοὺς διαλέξει ..., I.55 Μέμνημαι δέ ποτε ἔν τινι πρὸς τοὺς λεγομένους παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις σοφοὺς [ἐν]ζητήσει ταῖς προφητείαις ταύταις χρησάμενος ... (Cf. 56).
55 See p. 23.
56 See B. Lifshitz, *Eshqolot* V (1966) 21ff., challenged by J. Brand, *Tarbiz* XXXVIII (1968-9) 13ff. There may have been Jews in the villages who spoke only Aramaic, but they do not concern the present study. Brand (*ibid.* p. 16) mentions the use of Greek in Jewish homilies, which were heard by non-Jews as well as by Jews (see above, p. 21). The whole question is discussed at length by S. Lieberman in *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (New York, 1942), and see also Schwabe and Lifshitz, *Beth She'arim* II pp. 102ff.
57 See Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*[2] (New York, 1962), esp. pp. 100-14, 'The Alleged Ban on Greek Wisdom',

E. E. Hallewy, 'Concerning the Ban on Greek Wisdom', *Tarbiz* XLI (1971-2) 269-74 (in Hebrew).

58 See pp. 11, 56.

59 Thus, for example, on the opening words of I Kingdoms he compares various Greek versions but makes no attempt to quote or explain the original Hebrew, although he has evidently asked for a Jewish opinion, since he adds on a note of triumph, 'even the Hebrews, who contradict us on other points, agree with us about this' (*in Regn. hom.* I.4, *GCS* VIII.5). He makes no bones about his reliance on expert help, e.g. *Cels.* I.34 (*GCS* I.86.3) *ὡς φασι, in Num. hom.* XIV.1 (*GCS* VII.121.14) *aiunt ergo qui hebraeas litteras legunt, Sel. in Ps.* xxiii(xxiv).10 (*PG* XII.1269B) *οἱ τὰ Ἑβραίων ἠκριβωκότες φασί*. (The last passage may not be by Origen; it reappears in Didymus (*PG* XXXIX.1297C). See Devreesse, *Les anciens commentateurs grecs des Psaumes* p. 12 n. 67).

60 A few examples, out of many more that might be cited: *In Num. hom.* XIV.1 (*GCS* VII.121): Origen should have known, even from his work on the Hexapla, that the tetragrammaton is represented by *κύριος*, not, *θεός*, and indeed in the example he quotes, Dt. vi.4, the Greek has *κύριος*. The point he seems to be reproducing, in a garbled fashion, is that *κύριος* sometimes stands for אדני (as in Ex. iv.10 and elsewhere). There is a similar confusion in *in Ezech. hom.* IV.7 (*GCS* VIII 367.18f.), but Origen has a more accurate comment on the tetragrammaton in *Sel. in Ps.* ii (*PG* XII. 1104B) (see below, pp. 58f.). *Cels.* I.34 (*GCS* I.86): In the passage of Duteronomy *παρθένος* translates בתולה, not עלמה (see below, p. 99). *Sel. in Jud.* xii.6 (*PG* XII.949A): Origen completely misrepresents the difference between שבלת and סבלת, admittedly a difficult point to make in Greek. It seems to me that he has reproduced uncritically a makeshift illustration which he has either received verbally or found in a Greek version. If he had consulted a Hebrew text the difference would have been immediately apparent. (The interpretation is attributed by Theodoret to 'the Syrian'. See J. Bloch in *Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abrahams* (New York, 1927), pp. 66-73.) Many of Origen's mistakes may be due to his reliance on transliterated texts. Thus, what would otherwise be a perfectly satisfactory remark (*Prol. in Ps.*, fr.,

PG XII. 1068B) about the difficulty of distinguishing the Hebrew letters כ and ב is vitiated by the fact that the name in question, Ahimelech (I Regn. xxi.2ff.), is written with a ח, not a כ. Both would be transliterated by χ. Again, in *Ep. ad Afr.* 12 (*PG* XI. 77A) Origen maintains that the Hebrew for 'woman' (אשה) is the same as that for 'I took' (אשא, Ps. cxv(cxvi). 13); both are transliterated *εσσα*. With this text should be read *in Mt.* XIV.16 (*GCS* X.322. 9ff., 31ff.), where again Origen seems to be relying on (transliterated) biblical texts for his account of the Hebrew language. In the last passage, Origen specifically states that he looked at the Hebrew (*τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ τετηρήκαμεν*). It may be possible to deduce that *τὸ Ἑβραϊκόν* frequently, if not always, refers to the second, not the first, column of the Hexapla. But one should not exaggerate the misleading effect of the second column. *Sel. in Ps.* xxvi(xxvii).1 (*PG* XII.1276D), for instance, is not such a case, *pace* Hanson (*Allegory and Event* p. 171); it is the kind of comment (mangled by the catenist) which we might expect from a man who took an interest in the interpretation of Hebrew names, and who numbered converted Jews among his advisers.

61 This estimate agrees approximately with that of most scholars who have looked into the question, none of whom has been able to establish conclusively that Origen knew Hebrew well. See Huet, *Origeniana* II.i.2, who stresses Origen's dependence on others, Elliott, 'Hebrew learning among the Fathers' (*DCB*), Bardy, *RB* XXXIV (1925) 217ff., Barthélemy (*op. cit.*, n. 50) 66f. Those scholars who have inclined to a higher estimate have usually been compelled to lower it at some point (so Bigg, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria* p. 125 (2nd ed. (1913) p. 163), following Redepenning (see Bigg's note), Cadiou, *La Jeunesse d'Origène* pp. 57f., Hanson, *Origen's Doctrine of Tradition* pp. 154f.). G. Sgherri (*Augustinianum* XIV (1974-5) 223-57), while not challenging the accepted view, argues that the case against Origen's knowledge of Hebrew is not proven, that greater credence is consequently to be given to the statements of Eusebius and Jerome, as being primary historical sources, and that Origen walked at least well enough in Hebrew to consult Hebrew manuscripts. While agreeing with much that Sgherri

says, I cannot accept his conclusions. Eusebius and Jerome are not primary, they are secondary sources for Origen's Hebrew knowledge. The only primary evidence comes from Origen himself. It is in the nature of this evidence that it can only serve to discredit Origen's knowledge of Hebrew when he is wrong, not to establish it when he is right. On balance, I believe that there is enough of this type of evidence to show that Origen's knowledge of Hebrew was slight, but we have absolutely no way of telling exactly how much Hebrew he knew. With regard to his alleged consultation of Hebrew biblical texts, it must be borne in mind that part of the purpose of the Hexapla was precisely to enable him to consult the readings of the Hebrew Bible without understanding Hebrew or even being able to read it in Hebrew characters. He nowhere refers unambiguously to a reading in the first column (Hebrew script) as against the second (Greek transliteration). I must reiterate that Origen's lack of Hebrew knowledge has no bearing on the question of his access to Jewish scholarship. It is, in that sense, a red herring.

62 *HE* VI.xvi.1 *Τοσαύτη δὲ εἰσήγετο τῷ Ὠριγένει τῶν θείων λόγων ἀπηκριβωμένη ἐξέτασις ὡς καὶ τὴν Ἑβραΐδα γλῶτταν ἐκμαθεῖν τάς τε παρὰ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις φερομένας πρωτοτύπους αὐτοῖς Ἑβραίων στοιχείοις γραφὰς κτῆμα ἴδιον ποιήσασθαι.*

63 Hanson, *Origen's Doctrine of Tradition* p. 154. Cf. Koetschau introd. to *Princ.* (*GCS* IV p. XI): Andererseits liegen die von Eusebius h.e. VI.16 unter Caracalla erwähnten hebräischen Studien des Origenes schon etwas zurück.

64 *De Viris Illustribus* 54 (*PL* XXIII.665, Richardson (*TU* XIV) 32f.), 'quis ignorat ...', taken up by the *Suda* via the innacurate Greek translation of Jerome.

65 *Ep.* XXXIX (*PL* XXII.465, *CSEL* LIV.294).

66 See G. Kittel, 'Die Abstammung der Mutter des Origenes (die Geschichte eines genealogischen Irrtums)', *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* III (Hamburg, 1938) 235f. and 'Zur Abstammung des Origenes', *ZNW* XXXVI (1937) 157.

67 Eusebius likewise attributes a knowledge of Hebrew to Dorotheus, bishop of Antioch in his youth (*HE* VII.xxxii.2), but the two cases are not entirely comparable.

68 *Adv. Rufinum* I.13 (*PL* XXIII.408).

69 *PG* XII.1056B, Rietz III.1 (p. 13), Ἰούλλῳ τῷ πατριάρχῃ καί τινι τῶν χρηματιζόντων παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις σοφῶν. Cf. Hilary, *Tract. s. Ps.*, instr. 3 (*'antiquorum uirorum ista traditio est'*).

70 *Judaism* I p. 165 n. 1.

71 'Hillel, der Patriarchensohn', *MGWJ* XXX (1881) 433-43, cf. *Gesch.* (1885 ed.) IV.279.

72 Julian (*Ep.* 51) calls the patriarch Hillel II Ἴουλος. Jerome, it should be noted, knew the name Hillel, which he transcribed as Hellel (*in Isa.* III. viii.11ff., *PL* XXIV.118f., *CC* LXXIII.116, l. 43).

73 See B. *Ket.* 103[b].

74 *Ep. ad Afr.* 7 (*PG* XI.61), φιλομαθεῖ Ἑβραίῳ καὶ χρηματίζοντος (Delarue; mss χρηματίζοντι) παρ' αὐτοῖς σοφοῦ υἱῷ. Cf. ch.3 n.60.

75 For example by Bacher, *Ag. Pal. Am.* I.92, Krauss, *JQR* V (1892-3) 140, H. A. Fischel, *Rabbinic Literature and Greco-Roman Philosophy* p. 3. Cf. Bardy, *RB* XXXIV (1925) 223f.

76 In his edition of Jerome II.469 n.(b) (*PL* XXIII.408 n.(d)). Vallarsi suggests he may have been the head of the important school of Sepphoris (Diocaesarea).

77 See p. 34.

78 *HE* VI. XXV. 2 (*GCS* II.572.3).

79 *De Sus.* (*In Dan.* xiii) 5[a], 61[b]-62[a] (*PL* XXV.580, 583, *CC* LXXIV.945, 949). Cf. in Jerem. V.1xvii.3 (on xxix.21) (*PL* XXVA.862, *CC* LXXIV.284), 'aiunt Hebraei'.

80 *HE* VI.xxiv.3 (*GCS* II. 572. 7-10).

81 *In Gen. hom.* II.2 fr. (*GCS* VI.28), τις τῶν παρ' Ἑβραίοις ἐλλογίμων.

82 *Sel. in Ezech.* v.10, ὁ τῶν Ἑβραίων διδάσκαλος (see p. 46). Rufinus uses similar expressions, 'Hebraeus magister' (*Princ.* I.iii.4, *GCS* V.52), 'Hebraeus doctor' (*Princ.* IV.iii.14, *GCS* V.346), apparently to translate ὁ Ἑβραῖος.

83 *Cels.* II.31, πολλοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ σοφοῖς ἐπαγγελομένοις εἶναι συμβαλῶν; *Ep. ad Afr.* 6, οὐκ ὀλίγοις Ἑβραίοις ἀνεθέμην.

84 *Ep. ad Afr.* 7-8, *Sel. in Ezech.* ix.4.

85 Graetz in *MGWJ* XXX (1881) 443, Cadiou, *La jeunesse d'Origène* p. 60. See also D. Barthélemy, 'Est-ce Hoshaya Rabba qui censura le "commentaire allégorique"?'.

86 See A. Marmorstein, 'Judaism and Christianity in the Middle of the Third Century', *HUCA* VI (1929) 141-201, X (1935) 323-63.

87 *Sel. in Ezech.* ix.4, *τῶν καὶ εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν πεπιστευκότων*; *in Num. hom.* XIII.5, 'magister qui ex Hebraeis crediderat', cf. *in Jos. hom.* XVI.5, 'quidam de senioribus magistris'; *in Jer. hom.* XX (XIX). 2, *παράδοσις Ἑβραϊκὴ ἐληλυθυῖα εἰς ἡμᾶς διά τινος φυγόντος διὰ τὴν Χριστοῦ πίστιν* (the same tradition is ascribed to 'quemdam Hebraeum', *in Isa. hom.* IX.1). The first of these may well be a Jewish Christian properly so called. For an example of a Jewish-Christian tradition attributed to 'the Hebrews' see pp. 126f.

88 See p. 43 and n. 38. P. Nautin appears to believe in a single Jewish teacher, a rabbi's son who was converted to Christianity and left Palestine to settle in Alexandria, where Origen consulted him before writing his earliest works (*École Pratique des Hautes Études, V^e section (Sciences religieuses), Annuaire* LXXVIII (1970-1) 257).

89 E.g. *Sel. in Gen.* ii.8, xli.45, *in Ezech. hom.* X.3, *Sel. in Ps.* lxxvii.45, *in Ps.* prol. (*PG* XII.1056, Rietz V, p. 15), *Sel. in Lam.* i.1, *in Joh.* VI.14 (*GCS* IV.123).

90 E.g. *in Gen. hom.* II.2, *in Isa. hom.* IX.1, *in Ezech. hom.* IV.8, *in Mt.* XI.9.

91 *Princ.* I.iii.4 and IV.iii.14 (see p. 43); in Joh. I.31 (see p. 42); Strom X fr. (discussed above); perhaps also *in Ps.* fr. in *Philocalia* II (see p. 111).

92 See G. Karo and J. Lietzmann, *Catenarum Graecarum Catalogus* (Gottingen, 1902), Index *s.v.* 'Hebraeus', R. Devreesse, *Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois* (*ST* 201) p. 22, cf. pp. 33, 58.

93 Field, *Hexapla*, Prolegomena pp. lxxiff.

94 E.g. on Genesis xxxi.7 (*PG* XII.125). Field's grounds for the rejection seem to be that Aquila cannot be the source of the more elaborate interpretations ascribed to the Hebrew. Hanson (*Allegory and Event* p. 174) argues that 'Origen would not have described Aquila as a Hebrew, because Aquila in fact was not a Hebrew by race, but a Jewish proselyte'.

95 *Allegory and Event* p. 174.

96 *Origen's Doctrine of Tradition* p. 154.

97 *Ibid.*

98 *Allegory and Event* p. 174.

99 E.g. on Job ii.5 יברכך: ὁ Ἑβραῖος · βλασφημήσει σε. Cf. B. *Sanh.* 56[a].

100 E.g. *in Isa.* V.xxii.2 (*PL* XXIV.195D, *CC* LXXIII.210).

101 E.g. *in Isa.* V.xiii.10 (*PL* XXIV.157A, *CC* LXXIII.163); *ib.* VII.xxii.18 (*PL* XXIV.273, *CC* LXXIII.306); *in Eccles.* i.14 (*PL* XXIII.1022B, *CC* LXXII.260); *ib.* iii.11 (*PL* XXIII.1038B, *CC* LXXII.277).

102 *Ep.* LXXXV, *adv. Ruf.* 1.13. In one place Jerome seems to quote *Origen* as 'Hebraeus meus' (*Ep.* XVIII.15 (*CSEL* L.V.93), cf. Orig. *in Isa. hom.* VI.1 (*GCS* VIII. 268f.). See Bardy, *RB* XXXIV (1925), no. 32). Jerome often quotes Origen's Hebraeus without mentioning Origen's name.

103 Jerome *adv. Ruf.* I.13. If Jerome had known of another Jewish teacher he would surely have mentioned him here.

104 *Ibid.*

105 The best survey is still Bacher's *Die Agada der palestinensichen Amoräer* (Strassburg, 1892-9).

106 J. *Beṣ.* v.2 (63[a]).

107 *Gen. R.* IX.5; see Bacher, *Ag. Pal. Am.* I.477.

108 J. *Ter.* viii.10 (46[b]).

109 See p. 11.

110 On Abbahu see Bacher, *Ag. Pal. Am.* II. 88-142, *JE* and *EJ* *s.v.* 'Abbahu', S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (1942) 21-33, S. T. Lachs, 'Rabbi Abbahu and the Minim', *JQR* NS LX (1969-70) 197-212, S. Lieberman, 'The Martyrs of Caesarea', *AIPHOS* VII (1939-44) 395-446. According to Lieberman, Abbahu lived from c. 229 to 309.

111 E.g. *Gen. R.* XXXVI.8, B. *Shab.* 75[a]. See Bacher *Ag. Tan.* ii.503-20, Ginzberg, *JE* II.503ff.

112 Bacher, *Ag. Pal. Am.* I.92, 107 n.2; *JQR* III (1890-1) 357-60, taking up the suggestion of Graetz, *MGWJ* XXX (1881), 443. Bacher's argument stems from the initial assumption that Origen must have known Hoshaya, and ultimately the only foundation for this assumption is that both lived at Caesarea at the same time. None of the passages which Bacher quotes serves to connect Hoshaya definitely with Origen, although Barthélemy (*op. cit.* (n. 50), esp. p. 69) is greatly struck by similarities between Hoshaya's sayings and the work of Philo, similarities which lead him to posit a close connexion between Origen and Hoshaya.

113 Probably in 219 (= 530 a. Sel.), but Neusner (*History of the Jews in Babylonia* II.126) suggests 189.

114 Circumcision: B. *Shab.* 108^b, cf. *in Gen. hom.* III.5; B. *Yeb.* 71^b, cf. *in Ep. ad. Rom.* II.13 (see pp. 91f.). The waters of Marah and the Manna: B. *Shab.* 87^b, B. *Yoma* 75^a, cf. *in Exod. hom.* VII (see pp. 84,116). *Bar* (Ps. ii.12) = 'the bread of Torah', *Midr. Ps.* 2.17 (see p. 117). Potiphar, B. *Sot.* 13^b (see p. 129). On his interest in Jewish mysticism, see Neusner *ibid.* II.181ff.

Notes to chapter 3

1 Examples from I Maccabees are limited to speeches or documents originating from or addressed to non-Jews, or in official titles (xiii.42), as on the Hassmonean coins. The evidence for these names, mainly from official documents, is set out by Juster, *Les Juifs* I.172 n. 4. His account is more circumstantial than critical, and contains some errors of judgement: he ignores the Hebrew use of 'Israel', and will not allow that Ἰουδαῖος had pejorative overtones before the fifth century.

2 *Ant.* I.5.4 (146).

3 *Apol.* xviii.6.

4 See Jonah i.9, and IV Macc. and Judith *passim.*

5 Cf. Tertullian *ibid.* 'igitur et litterae Hebraeae et eloquium'.

6 *Gittin* ix.6.

7 *Conf. Ling.* 129, ἔστι δὲ ὡς Ἑβραῖοι λέγουσι Φανουηλ, ὡς δὲ ἡμεῖς ἀποστροφὴ θεοῦ.

8 Leon, *The Jews of Ancient Rome*, no. 291. (The numbering of inscriptions in Leon's book is the same as that in *CIJ*.) See *ibid.* pp. 147ff. on the problem of the 'Synagogue of the Hebrews' in Rome.

9 Leon no. 370, Μακεδόνι<ο>ς ὁ Αἰβρῆος Κεσαρεὺς τῆς Παλεστίνης.

10 Leon no. 505.

11 Examples abound. Debates: *Cels.* I.45,55, II.31. Jewish hostility to the Church: *Cels.* II.29, *In Jud. hom.* VIII.1 (*GCS* VII.509.22f.). Jews suffer for rejecting Jesus: *In Lev. hom.* III.1 (*GCS* VI.301.6), *Cels.* II.8,34, etc. Literalism: *In Exod.* xx.5f. (*PG* XII.289D), *Princ.* II. xi.2 (*GCS* V.186.2),

In Exod. hom. V.1 (*GCS* VI.183.17ff.), *in Joh.* X.42(26) (*GCS* IV.219.25). Cf. Clement *Paed.* I.vi (*GCS* 110).

12 No doubt the problem hardly worried Origen. Nor is his case unique; the same phenomenon recurs among Christians both ancient and modern. So Clement comments on Paul's words ὅτε ἤμην Ἰουδαῖος : Ἑβραῖος γὰρ ἄνωθεν ἦν (*Paed.* I.vi.34.2) That both words can in fact refer to the same people is demonstrable from those passages in which Origen deviates from his normal usage. Compare *in Ps.* (*PG* XII.1056B) Ἰούλλῳ τῷ πατριάρχῃ καί τινι τῶν χρηματιζόντων παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις σοφῶν and *Ep. ad Afr.* 7, φιλομαθεῖ Ἑβραίῳ καὶ χρηματίζοντος παρ' αὐτοῖς σοφοῦ υἱῷ. Other examples are *Cels.* II.31, πολλοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ σοφοῖς (Jews are Ἰουδαῖοι throughout the *contra Celsum*, and Ἑβραῖοι is used for the ancient Israelites, with hints of the apologetic explanation mentioned below) and *in Regn. hom.* I.4, 'etiam Hebraei, qui contradicunt in ceteris'.

13 Manetho *apud* Jos. *c. Ap.* I.26 (229ff.), Apion *ibid.* II.2 (10,23). Cf. Strabo XVI.ii.35f. (p. 761) and *apud* Jos. *Ant.* XIV.7(118).

14 E.g. *c. Ap.* I.14 (75ff.), 16 (104f.), 26 (227ff.), 27 (252f.), 30(278), cf. 25 (223).

15 *Cels.* III.5f., cf. IV.31, where he calls them 'runaway slaves'.

16 *Cels.* III.5,6,8.

17 *PE* VII.8 (309B, *GCS* VIII.373.20ff.). See J. Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée durant la période prénicéenne* (Paris, 1961), and review by M. Harl, *REG* LXXV (1962) pp. 522ff., esp. 528f.

18 *Chron.* 8 (*PG* X.69A), cf. Ps.-Chrys. *Synops.* (VI.316A). Cf.R. Nehemiah, *Gen. R.* XLII.8; Josephus *Ant.* I.6.4(146).

19 *Ibid.*, cf. Chrys. *hom. in Gen.* xxxv.3 (*PG* LIII.326), *Serm. in Gen.* ix.3 (*ibid.* 692), Theodoret *Qu. in Gen.* lxi (*PG* LXXX.165f). *Exod. R.* III.8, *Gen. R.* XLII.8. Cf. Josh. xxiv.2f. בעבר הנהר.

20 *Sel. in Gen.* xiv.13. For a modern study of this verse, see N. A. van Uchelen, *Abraham de Hebreeër* (Assen, 1964).

21 *In Num. hom.* XIX.4 (*GCS* VII.183).

22 *Migr. Abr.* 4(20).

23 *In Matth.* XI.5 (*GCS* X.41), quoting II Cor.iv.18.

24 *Mart. Exh.* 33.

25 E.g. *in Rom.* II.7,11,14, *in Joh.* XIII.13 (*GCS* IV.237).

26 This is a different point from that which is sometimes made, that Ἑβραῖοι can refer to Aramaic-speaking Christians, or to Christians of Jewish origin.

27 This whole topic is set out in *Princ.* IV.iii.6ff. (*Philocalia* I.22ff.), where Origen quotes and expounds the relevant passages of Paul. Cf. also *in Lev. hom.* V (*PG* XII.421, *GCS* VI.332ff. = *Philocalia* I.30, Robinson 35.25-7).

28 *In Gen. hom.* XV.3 (*GCS* p.130), *in Num. hom.* XI.4, XVI.7, *in Jos. hom.* IX.4, *in Joh.* II.31 (cf.I.35), *Princ.* IV.24, *in Cant. prol.* (*GCS* p. 78) cf. *in Cant. B. Virg* (ed. Paris, 1601) pp. 21f., Ἰσραὴλ γὰρ λέγεται πᾶς ὁ νουνεχῶς ὁρῶν καὶ ἀκούων τὰ περὶ θεόν (quoting Rom.ix.6). From Philo, but cf. also Clem. *Paed.* I.vii.9, *Strom.* I.5. (See also J. G. Kahn (Cohen-Yashar), 'Israel – *Videns Deum*', *Tarbiẓ* XL(1970-1), 285-92 (in Hebrew).)

29 Oecumenius *in Apocalypsim* ii.9 (Hoskier 51.4), οἱ ἀληθεῖς Ἰουδαῖοι οἱ Χριστῷ ἐξομολογούμενοι, Arethas *in Apocalypsim* IV (on ii.9) (*PG* CVI.533A). The etymology is found in Origen only in the case of Ἰουδαία (*in Mt.* fr. (*GCS* XII, fr.25), *Sel. in Jerem.* xxxi.23 (*PG* XIII.581D)) and Ἰουδάς (*in Mt. ser.* 78, *GCS* XI.186). It is also found in Philo and the Rabbis (and Clem. *Strom.* VII.16 *fin.*).

30 E.g. *in Exod. hom.* V.1, *in Rom.* fr. xlvi (on viii.7, *JTS* XIV 17f., οἱ κατὰ τὸ γράμμα ζῶντες Ἰουδαῖοι).

31 E.g. *in Joh.* X.42(26) (*GCS* IV.219.25), γραώδως καὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς. Cf. Clem. *Paed.* I.vi (*GCS* I.110).

32 See above, n. 12.

33 E.g. *Cels.* II.29, Ἰουδαϊκῶς ... εἶπε καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐκείνων χολήν.

34 *In Rom.* fr.xi (on iii.1-3, *JTS* XIII(1911-12) p. 218), τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν ... τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς, cf. *in Lam.* iv.17, οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστευσάντες.

35 *Princ.* IV.ii.1 (*Philocalia* I.8, *GCS* V.306.3, Robinson 14.19), *Ibid.* iii.2 (*Philocalia* I.17(18), *GCS* V.326.8, Robinson 25.26), *In Ps.* cxviii.98 (*PG* XII.1605D) (ἐχθρούς · Σημαίνει τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς Ἰουδαίους), *In Job.* xx.28 (*PG* XII.1036) (εἴτε τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς ... εἴτε τοῦ ἑτεροδόξου), *de Orat.* xiv.4, *in Lam.* i.10.

36 E.g. *Cels.* V.6,7.

37 See p. 42.

38 *In Ps., PG* XII.1057B. Cf. *in Num. hom.* XIII.5 (*GCS* VII.114. 17).

39 See pp. 86f.
40 Juster, *Les Juifs* I.395 no. 4.
41 So Graetz and others, but the title may have originated even later, although according to later tradition (see the second letter of Sherira Gaon, ed. Lewin p. 125) Rabban Gamliel I, his son Simeon and R. Johanan b. Zakkai all had the title 'Nasi'. See the discussion in H. Mantel, *Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin* (Cambridge, Mass., 1961) ch. I, 'The Title *Nasi* in Jewish Tradition'.
42 The Romans may not have recognised the office until a little later. 'The office, instituted either in the close sequel of Hadrian's war or not long after, is first attested in the third century' (R. Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford, 1968) p. 62).
43 B. *Hor.* 13^{b}, cf. J. *Bik.* iii.3 (65^{c}).
44 *REJ* XXXI (1895) 202-11. See also J. Liver, *Toldot Beit David* (Jerusalem, 1959).
45 See below, p. 97.
46 See below, pp. 97f.
47 *Ep. ad Afr.* 14(*PG* XI.84A). See Juster, *Les Juifs* I.395, who mentions several rabbinic texts demonstrating the respect accorded to the patriarchs. There is a danger, however, of generalising from insufficient grounds. Not all rabbis, let alone all Jews, had always treated the patriarchate with such reverence.
48 *In Rom.* VI.7 (*PG* XIV.1073). See D. Daube, *SP* II 109ff., U. Becker, *BZNW* XXVIII(1963) 119-24, G. Alon, *Meḥqarim* I.105, *Toldot ha-Yehudim* II.111f., Juster, *Les Juifs* II.150 n. 2 (cf. *Cels.* VII.26).
49 *Ep. ad Afr. ibid.* So Daube, *ibid.*, Juster, *Les Juifs* II.151.
50 E.g. Strabo *apud* Jos. *Ant.* XIV.7(117); Philo *in Flaccum* 10(74), γενάρχης.
51 *Les Juifs* I.394.
52 *Ep. ad Afr.* 14, *Princ.* IV.i.3(*GCS* V.297).
53 *Sel. in Ps.* (*PG* XII.1056B, Rietz fr.III.1, p. 13),'Ιούλλῳ τῷ πατριάρχῃ (so Jerome *adv. Ruf.* I.13(*PL* XXIII.408), 'patriarchen Huillum'). See above, p. 23.
54 *Les Juifs* I.394 n. 4, and add *SHA Quadr. tyr.* viii.4, on which see R. Syme, *'Ipse ille patriarcha'*, in *Emperors and Biography. Studies in the Historia Augusta* (Oxford, 1971) 17-29.

55 But I have suggested (above, p. 24) that the term 'patriarch' in *Sel. in Ps.* may refer to the head of a local community. In an inscription from Argos (*CIJ* no. 719) Aurelius Joses invokes 'the divine and great powers of God, the powers of the Law, the honour of the patriarchs, the honour of the ethnarchs, the honour of the sages (*σοφῶν*) and the honour of the worship which is offered every day to God'. It is tempting to see a reference here to the patriarch, the exilarch or the local patriarchs, and to the rabbis (חכמים). Frey, however, understood 'patriarchs' as referring to the biblical patriarchs, and Goodenough (*Jewish Symbols* vol. II p. 148) has argued persuasively that 'patriarchs', 'ethnarchs' and 'sages' are all synonyms referring to the biblical patriarchs (אבות). (In this case, perhaps *ἡ τιμὴ τῶν πατριαρχῶν* = זכות אבות. Cf. *CIJ* no. 650 (Catana): 'adiuro uos per *honores patriarcarum*, item adiuro uos per licem (sc. legem) quem Dominus dedit Iudeis'.)

56 *Ep. ad Afr.* 14. See Juster II.282-6, Avi-Yona, *Geschichte* p. 49, M. S. Ginsburg, *JQR* NS XXXI(1930-1), 290.

57 An exception may be the *κριτήρια* mentioned in *Ep. ad Afr.* 14, even though Origen here appears to be speaking of secret trials. As Juster says (II.151 n. 2), 'il est peu probable que le Patriarche ait seul exercé la juridiction capitale sans la collaboration du Sanhédrin'.

58 *Sel. in Ezech.* v.10 (*PG* XIII.781). See Juster I.451 n. 1. On the title *διδάσκαλος* in the New Testament and on an ancient ossuary see E. L. Sukenik, 'A Jewish Tomb on the Mount of Olives (B)' in *Tarbiẓ* I.4 (July, 1930), esp. p. 140 (in Hebrew).

59 *Ep. ad Afr.* 7, 'a learned Hebrew, and the son of one with the title *σοφός* among them' (reading *χρηματίζοντος* (Delarue). Or, retaining *χρηματίζοντι*, 'one with the title *σοφοῦ υἱός* (בן־חכם?) among them' (See Alon, *Mehqarim* II.60); *Sel. in Ps.* (*PG* XII.1056) 'one of those with the title *σοφός* among the Jews' (On these passages see also pp. 23-4); *In Jerem. hom.* X.4 (*PG* XIII.361D, *GCS* III 75.1) . *χρηματίζωσων παρ' αὐτοῖς σοφοί.*

60 *Cels.* I.45 (*GCS* I.95.3f.) and I.55 (*GCS* I.106.4) with *λέγεσθαι* (see ch. 2 n. 54), and II.31 (*GCS* I.159.2) with *ἐπαγγέλεσθαι* (see p. 43). In some places, however, it seems to be used in a rather looser sense, e.g. *in Jos. hom.* XX.2 (*GCS* VII.419.19, = *Philocalia* XII.2, Robinson 63.20), *παρὰ σοφοῦ Μωσῆ, παρὰ σοφοῦ Ἰησοῦ, παρὰ σοφῶν τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν*

(where σοφοῦ Μωσῆ may perhaps echo the rabbinic משה רבנו, 'Moses our Rabbi'); *Prol. in Ps.* (*PG* XII.1076B, Rietz 10.22), τῶν παρ' Ἑβραίοις παλαιῶν σοφῶν.

61 *In Ep. ad Tit.* i.14 (*PL* XXVI.575A).

62 *Ep.* CXXI.10 (*PL* XXII.1034, *CSEL* LVI.49.16-19).

63 *In Abacuc* I (on ii.15ff.)(*PL* XXV.1301B, *CC* LXXVIA.610, lines 568ff.).

64 See Juster I.372 n. 6. In the rabbinic literature the term *tanna* is reserved for the teachers of the Mishnaic period (to c.200). J. N. Epstein, *Mavo le-Nosaḥ ha-Mishnah*[2] (1964) p. 676 distinguishes another meaning of *tanna*, viz. a professional memoriser of the halakhah. He maintains that Jerome's δευτερωτής of Lydda was such a *tanna*, and identifies him with a *tanna* by the name of Luda, mentioned several times in the Talmud (e.g. B. *Shab.* 96[b], 137[a]). Since Jerome explicitly says that he was called *sapiens* (i.e. σοφός) as well as δευτερωτής, he will have been a rabbi, not a mere parrot; in any case the identification is preposterous.

65 E.G. Eusebius *PE* XI.5 (*GCS* VIII.ii.11), XII.1.4 (*GCS* VII.ii.88, 90); Jerome *in Isa.* IV (on x.1ff.) (*PL* XXIV.133B, *CC* line 14), IX (on xxix.17ff.) (*PL* XXIV.336, *CC* ll.84f.).

66 *PG* XIII.63, *GCS* VIII.62.25. Later references to δευτέρωσις: Jerome *Ep.* XVIII.20 (*PL* XXII.374, *CSEL* LIV.101.10) (perhaps derived from Origen); Epiphanius *Haer.* xxxiii.9.4 (*PG* XLI.572, *GCS* I.459,25-6) ('The traditions of the elders are called δευτερώσεις among the Jews'); *Apostolic Constitutions* I.vi.3 and II.v.4; Justinian *Novella* 146.i.2.

67 I am indebted for this suggestion to Mr G. Sgherri.

68 Cf. *CIJ* no. 508 (Rome) μαθητὴς σοφῶν (see H. J. Leon, *The Jews of Ancient Rome* p. 193) and perhaps also no. 890 (Caesarea), where E. L. Sukenik (*Zion* I(1926), 19ff.) would read μα[θητοῦ σοφῶν, but M. Schwabe (*IEJ* III (1953), 128) prefers Μα [ναχημ.

69 On σοφοί cf. also *CIJ* no. 719 (n.55, above). According to E. R. Goodenough (*Jewish Symbols* II.148) ' "Sages" or Sophoi was a term taken primarily from Stoicism for those who had achieved the ideal in life. It was ... constantly applied by Philo (and presumably by hellenized Jews in general) to the Patriarchs'. I am inclined to guess that, whatever the meaning of 'patriarchs', 'sages' in this inscription refers to the

rabbis. *Hakam* was also the title of an official, recorded in the case of R. Meir (see above n. 43). The various theories about the title *Hakam* are set out in Mantel, *Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin* pp. 129-35. For an interesting explanation of the same term in a medieval text see I. A. Agus, 'The use of the term *HAKHAM* by the Author of the *SEFER HASSIDIM* and its implications', *JQR* NS LXI(1970-1), 54-62.

70 See, for instance, *Cels.* III.7f. (Zealots and Sicarii?), *in Mt.* X.20 (*GCS* X.26f.) (Pharisees and Sadducees). References to the Sadducees and Pharisees are plentiful in the Gospel commentaries, rare elsewhere. On the sects generally, see A. Hilgenfeld, *Judenthum and Jundenchristenthum, eine Nachlese zu der 'Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums'* (Leipzig, 1886).

71 Origen relies for his information about the various messianic movements at the time of Jesus on the New Testament rather than on Josephus (*Cels.* I.57, VI.11; see above, p. 17). On Jewish sects see *Cels.* I.49, III.12.

72 *In Mt. ser.* 11 (*GCS* XI.21f.).

73 *In Mt.* XI.9 (*GCS* X.48); cf. Jerome *in Mt.* II (*PL* XXVI.106, *CC* LXXVII, 128 ll. 425ff.). See below, p. 41.

74 *GCS* IV.510.

75 This account derives in part from Josephus (see *Vita* 38 (191), Ant. XVIII.1.3 (12-15)). The etymology of the name is common in Origen - cf. *in Joh.* XIII.55 (*GCS* IV.285), *in Mt.* (*GCS* XI.16,35,46). See R. Travers Herford, *The Pharisees* p. 32.

76 *Ep.* CXII, ad Augustinum (*PL* XXII.924 *CSEL* LV.381.23ff.). Cf. Augustine, *Ep.* LXXXII, ad Hieronymum (*PL* XXII.942, *CSEL* XXXIV.365.15): 'haeretici qui, dum uolunt et Iudaei esse et Christiani, nec Iudaei nec Christiani esse potuerunt'.

77 He does not explain what difference, if any, there is between the two. Both come from the same Hebrew word, נוצרים. The Nazaraei use a Hebrew *Gospel of Matthew* (*de Vir. Ill.* 3 (*PL* XXIII.643), *in Isa.* IV.xi.1 (*PL* XXIV.148)), the Nazareni, an Aramaic *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (*adv. Pelag.* III.2 (*PL* XXIII.597)). Copies of both were to be found in the library at Caesarea (*ibid.*). One wonders whether these were the same work. According to Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxx.3 and 13 (*PG* XLI.409,428, *GCS* I.337.9, 349.2), cf. Jerome *in Mt.* II (on xii.13) (*PL* XXVI.78, *CC* LXXVII.90,

lines 366ff.)) the Ebionites used a form of the *Gospel of Matthew* but called it the *Gospel according to the Hebrews,* but this does not seem to have been the *Gospel of Matthew* of the Nazarenes, which he describes as a fuller version, while this is incomplete (see H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* pp. 25-33). The evidence is inconclusive, but has generated a good deal of confusion (e.g. Moore, *Judaism* III.54, Daniélou, *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme* p. 68, Eng. p.56). Daniélou (*ibid.* p. 411, Eng. p. 356) thinks the 'Nazarenes' originated in the circle of the original Jewish Christians who fled to Transjordan 'in A.D.70'. He seems to distinguish them, however, from 'the heirs of the first, Aramaic-speaking Christians who fled to Transjordan after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D.70' (p. 68, Eng. p. 56).

78 *In Isa.* II v.18f., XIII. xlix.7, XIV.lii.4ff. (*PL* XXIV.87,484, 517). For נוצרים see B. *Ta'an.* 27^{b} etc.

79 *In Ezech.* ix.4 (*PG* XIII.801), *in Num. hom.* XIII.5 (*GCS* VII.114.13).

80 *Cels.* II.1, cf. *in Mt.* XI.12 (*GCS* X.52). Origen's remarks about the Ebionites are collected and reproduced by Eusebius (*HE* III.xxvii), who adds to our present information that they use only the *Gospel according to the Hebrews,* and have scant respect for the rest.

81 *Cels.* II.1, Celsus in V.61.

82 *In Mt.* XVI.12 (*GCS* X.513), cf. *in Ep. ad Tit.*, fr. (*PG* XIV.1304), Euseb. *HE* VI.xvii.

83 *Cels.* V.65, *in Jer. hom.* XIX.12 (*GCS* III.167), Euseb. *loc. cit.* Cf. Epiphan. *Haer.* xxx.16 (*PG* XLI.432f., *GCS* I.355.3ff.).

84 *Cels.* II.1, *in Mt.* XVI.12 (*GCS* X.513.2), *Princ.* IV.iii.8 (*GCS* V.334.2 = *Philocalia* I.24, Robinson 30.19). Cf. Moore, *Judaism* 55. Symmachus, according to Eusebius (*HE* VI.xvii (*GCS* II.554.18), followed by Jerome *Vir. Ill.* (*PL* XXIII. 665B, Richardson (*TU* XIV) 33.3), cf. *Praef. in Esdr.* (*PL* XXVIII.1404B)), was an Ebionite, but Epiphanius (*Mens. et Pond.* 16 (*PG* XLIII.264B)) says he was a Samaritan convert to Judaism.

85 *Hom. in Ps.* lxxxii, *apud* Euseb. *HE* VI.xxxviii (*PG* XX.600, *GCS* II, 592).

86 *Haer.* xix.1 (*PG* XLI.261, *GCS* I.218.7).

87 *In Lev. hom.* V.8 (*GCS* VI.349.4), *in Exod.* xii.46 (*PG* XII.285). See p. 86.

88 *HUCA* X(1935), 254ff.

89 *In Joh.* XX.35 (*GCS* IV.374f.), *in Ezech. hom.* IX.1 (*GCS* VIII.407) Cf. Epiphan. *Haer.* ix.1 (*PG* XLI.224, *GCS* I.197.17). The Samaritans refer to themselves as shamerim, 'guardians' (of the faith, or perhaps observers of the law); see M. Gaster, *The Samaritans* p. 5 (cf. an eighteenth-century letter reproduced *ibid.* p. 172, line 54), Alon, *Meḥqarim* II.7.

90 *Cels.* I.49, *in Joh.* XIII.26 (*GCS* IV.250). Cf. Epiphanius *Haer.* ix.2,5 (*PG* XLI 225,232, *GCS* I.198.9ff., 203.8).

91 *In Mt.* XVII.29 (*GCS* X.666), *in Joh.* XX.35, *in Num. hom.* XXV.1 (*GCS* VII.233), cf. Epiphan. *Haer.* ix.2ff. (*PG* XLI.225ff., *GCS* I.198.24ff.). The rabbis too, attribute to the Samaritans the denial of survival after death (*Sifre Num.* 112 (on Num.xv.31), cf. B. *Sanh.* 90^{b}, *Kuthim* 28).

92 On his date see J. A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans* p. 294 (late 4th century), J. E. H. Thomson, *The Samaritans* pp. 175, 197 (3rd century), J. Macdonald, *The Theology of the Samaritans* p. 42 (late 3rd - early 4th century). *Id. BZAW* LXXXIV p. xx (2nd - 4th century). His date depends on that of Baba Rabba, dated in the chronicles to the third century, in fact probably fourth-century (Montgomery p. 102).

93 *Memar Marqah* IV.12. See Montgomery p. 250, Thomson p. 197, Macdonald p. 376.

94 Montgomery pp. 250f.

95 P. 197.

96 P. 250.

97 P. 258. So Macdonald, p. 376 n. 1, who says that 'Origen must have been referring to the then large Dositheanan sect' - a curious remark in view of *Cels.* VI.11 (but see n. 102 below).

98 *Cels.* II.13, *in Mt.* XVII.29 (*GCS* X.666). See Montgomery p. 93, Thomson p. 137. *Memar Marqah* III.3, 'He who cuts the foreskin possesses the faith and is saved from his evils' (see Macdonald, p. 294).

99 See Field, *Hexapla*, Prolegomena pp. lxxxiiff., Montgomery p. 285, Gaster, *op. cit.* pp. 123-9, and also Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*^{2} p. 52 n. 4. Kahle points out (*ibid.* p. 153) that there is no sign of the Samaritan pronunciation of Hebrew in Origen's transliterations.

100 *In Joh.* XIII.27, *in Mt. ser.* 33 (*GCS* XI.59), *in Luc. hom.* XXV (*GCS* IX.150). It seems likely that there were at least two different sects called Dositheans (see Montgomery pp. 254ff.).

101 *Princ.* IV.iii.2 (*GCS* V.326.12 = *Philocalia* I.18, Robinson 25). See Gaster p. 71, Thomson, p. 123.

102 *Cels.* VI.11, cf. I.57. Origen confuses the Dositheans with the Simonians (see Chadwick's note on VI.11).

103 Origen openly doubts that the Samaritans have been granted any revelation at all, *in Rom.* II.13 (*PG* XIV.916).

104 'Samaritans recognised as a distinct religious community, that suggests the epoch of the Christian princes, and not the earliest of them. They happen thus to be specified for the first time in the *Codex Theodosianus*, in an enactment of the year 390', R. Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford, 1968) p. 62. See *C. Theod.* XIII.5.18 ('Iudaeorum corpus ac Samaritanum'). Twice in the *Historia Augusta* we have Jews, Samaritans and Christians mentioned in the same breath: *Elagabalus* iii.5 ('Iudaeorum et Samaritanorum religiones et Christianorum deuotionem'), *Quadr. Tyr.* viii.3 ('nemo illic archisynagogus Iudaeorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum presbyter'). See also Syme, *The Historia Augusta. A Call of Clarity* (Bonn, 1971) p. 74, Thérèse Liebmann-Frankfort, 'Les Juifs dans l'*Histoire Auguste*', *Latomus* XXXIII (1974), 591 and n. 44. Each time the same point, the same reference to the Theodosian Code. Cf., however, Origen(?) *in Ps.* cxviii.85, *καὶ τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν ἐξω ταύτης αἱρετικῶν τε καὶ Ἰουδαίων ἢ καὶ Σαμαρειτῶν* (see ch. 2 n. 48). The argument from silence demands caution, yields no certainty.

Notes to chapter 4

1 *Cels.* I.22, V.47f., *Princ.* IV.iii.2 (*GCS* V.325.9 = *Philocalia* I.18, Robinson 25). With *Cels.* V.48 cf. Jos. *Ant.* I.12.2(214).

2 *Cels.* V.49, VIII.29, *Princ. ibid.*

3 Sabbath: *Princ. ibid.*, *in Num. hom.* XXIII.4 etc. The Three Pilgrim Festivals: *In Lam.* i.4 (*GCS* III.240). Passover: *In Joh.* XXVIII.25, *in Ezech. hom.* I.4 (*GCS* VIII.329). New Year: *ibid.*

4 E.g. Celsus in *Cels.* V.41. See p. 90.

5 See pp. 89-96, and the list of texts mentioning Jewish practices among Christians in ch. 7 n. 80.

6 *In Joh.* XIII.39 (*GCS* IV.264). (The biblical laws (Ex.xxiii.15, xxxiv.18, Dt.xvi.1) speak of Abib, not Nisan.)

7 *In Ezech. hom.* I.4 (*GCS* VII.329) (New Year), *in Jer. hom.* XII.12 (*GCS* III.100) (Passover).

8 In I Cor. (v.7) fr.25 (Jenkins, *JTS* IX, 365).

9 *In Mt. Ser.* 11 (*GCS* XI.21f.) Also mentioned by Justin, *Dial.* 46. Cf. Jerome *in Ezech.* VII.xxiv.15ff. (*PL* XXV.229f.), *in Mt.* IV.xxiii.5 (*PL* XXVI.168). See Bardy, *Rev. Bén.* XLVI (1934), 159.

10 Daniélou (*Origène* p. 176, Eng. p. 175) seems to think otherwise, on what grounds it is not clear.

11 *Princ.* IV.iii.2 (*GCS* V.326.7ff. = *Philocalia* I.18, Robinson 25), *Διόπερ τωὰ μὲν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς καὶ ὅσοι θέλουσι πλέον τῆς λέξεως δηλοῦσθαι μηδέν, οὐδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ζητοῦσω ... εἰς τωα δὲ φλυαροῦσω εὑρεσιλογοῦντες, ψυχρὰς παραδόσεις φέροντες ... φάσκοντες τόπον ἑκάστῳ εἶναι δισχιλίους πήχεις.*

12 *Sot.* v. 3. Cf. Acts i. 12, *ἐγγὺς Ἱερουσαλήμ, σαββάτου ἔχον ὁδόν.*

13 *Erub.* iv.3,5,7,8, v.7,9. The authorities mentioned here are R.Akiba and his contemporaries R.Johanan b. Nuri and R.Hananiah (Hanina) b. Antigonos, but there is an earlier reference in Damascus Rule XIII.14. Cf. Jerome *Ep.* CXXI.10 (*PL* XXII.1033f., *CSEL* LVI.49): the Jews say, 'Barachibas et Simeon et Hellel magistri nostri tradiderunt nobis ut bis mille pedes ambulemus in Sabbato'. See further J. Rosenthal, 'The Sabbath Laws of the Qumranites or the Damascus Covenanters', *Biblical Research* VI (1961).

14 *Princ. ibid.*

15 *Shab.* vi.2.

16 *Ib.* x.3.

17 *Princ. ibid.*

18 *In Rom.* VI.12. O. Guéraud and P. Nautin argue ('Origène et le rite de la dédicace de l'Agneau Pascal', *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* LX (1960), 1-8) that a fragment (*Sel. in Exod.* xii.3 (*PG* XII.284B)), whose source they identify as the *peri Pascha* (see p. 4), describes a contemporary practice connected with the Passover sacrifice: a lamb is selected on the 10th of Nisan and those participating in its offering are named with the formula 'this lamb is sacrificed on behalf of so and so', with a maximum of ten (or eighteen) names. They admit that the sacrifice was not made in Palestine in Origen's day, but claim that it continued in the Diaspora, quoting the testimony of Augustine

(*Retractationes* I.x.3 (*PL* XXXII.600.2-4)). This is a mistake. Sacrifices ceased definitively with the destruction of the temple, but in some places it was customary to commemorate the paschal offering by eating roast meat at the Passover meal. The Mishnah (*Pes.* iv.4) permits this practice where it is established but forbids its introduction elsewhere, and it was viewed with disfavour by some authorities in the Talmud (B. *Pes.* 53[a], 'Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: A man is forbidden to say, "This meat shall be for Passover" because he may appear to be sanctifying his animal and eating sacred flesh outside the temple'). If the Mishnah frequently employs a present tense when speaking of sacrifices, no one familiar with the rabbinic literature would mistake that for proof that they continued after the destruction (see p. 9 and Schürer I (1973) § 21). Augustine is properly cautious about calling the Passover lamb a sacrifice (*loc. cit.*: sicut eos et nunc uidemus sine sacrificiis remansisse, nisi forte quod per pascha immolant ouem hoc in sacrificio deputetur); Jerome is even more insistent on this point (*Ep.* LII (*PL* XXII.536): nec immolemus agnum, nec mysticum pascha celebremus, quia haec absque templo fieri lege prohibentur). Origen is thus speaking, like the Mishnah, of past events in the present tense, as the words (in Basileensis 1) *καὶ τοῦτο μὲν κατὰ τὸ αἰσθητὸν ἐγίνετο* suggest. The passage is still interesting, as a possible rabbinic borrowing. On the selection on the 10th of Nisan see J. B. Segal, *The Hebrew Passover from the Earliest Times to A.D. 70* (London Oriental Series, London, 1963), Index *s.v.* 'Pesah victim to be chosen on tenth day'. The maximum of ten or eighteen is extraordinary. According to the Mishnah (*Pes.* viii.3) there is no limit to the number of participants, provided there will be an olive's-bulk of meat for each, and R. Nathan (probably the second-century Tanna) waives even this restriction (B. *Pes.* 78[b], 'How do we know that all Israel can fulfill the commandment with one Passover offering?', etc.). Possibly Origen misunderstood the minimum (of ten men) as a maximum.

19 *In Mt.* XI.9 (*GCS* X.48).

20 The rabbinic attitude to the responsibility of children for their parents' maintenance is well summarised by J. D. M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament* (London, 1970) pp. 104ff.

21 V. 6, cf. 4.

22 *Cels.* V. 6. Cf. F. Michelini Tocci, ' "Il Principe del Volto" ', *Oriens Antiquus* II (1963), 269-73. On the Second Commandment see *in Ex. hom.* VIII.2. Baer, *SH* VII p. 96, compares what Origen says in *Mart. Exh.* vi with the similar distinction between bowing down and worshipping in the Mekilta (on Ex. xx.5) and Talmud (B. *Sanh.* 60^b-63^a).

23 Cf. also *in Ex.* xx.5.

24 Compare *Cels.* VII.64 (cf. I.25, IV.48) with the baraitha in B. *Sanh.* 63^b, *Mek.* on Ex. xxiii.13 (Laut. iii.180f.), Tos. *A.Z.* vi.11. Baer, *SH* VII pp. 91f., mentions also Tert. *de Idol.* x, xx, xxi and *Didasc. Apost.* xxi.

25 *Cels.* I.26, V.34 and V.6. Cf. LXX Dt. xxxii.8, xxxiii.2.

26 See Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols* vol. II ch. 6. Origen gives a long quotation concerning angels from 'an apocryphal writing current among the Hebrews, called *The Prayer of Joseph'* (*In Joh.* II.31 (188ff.) (*GCS* IV.88); see Harnack *Kircheng. Ertrag* I.18 (no. 4)). See also p. 131.

27 *In Num. hom.* XI.4 (*GCS* VII.84), quoted by Azariah de' Rossi, *Me'or 'Eynayim, Yemei 'Olam* 57 (ed. Kassel p. 459). See Daniélou, 'Les sources juives de la doctrine des anges des nations chez Origène', *RechSR* XXXVIII (1951), 132-7.

28 E.g. *Mekilta* on Exodus xv.1 (Lauterbach ii.20): 'and so you find that God will not eventually punish the kingdoms until he has first punished their ministering angels (שרי הם)'.

29 *In Joh.* I.31 (215) (*GCS* IV.38), ... λογικά, ὧν ἔν τι γένος ἐκάλει Σαβαὶ ⟨ὁ⟩ Ἑβραῖος, παρ' ὃ ἐσχηματίσθαι τὸν Σαβαώθ, ἄρχοντα ἐκείνων τυγχάνοντα, οὐχ ἕτερον τοῦ θεοῦ. The same verse of Ephesians supports the same argument, but with no mention of the Hebrew, in *Princ.* I.v.1 (*GCS* V.69) and Jerome *c. Joh. Hier.* 17 (*PL* XXIII.369).

30 *Cels.* VI.31-2 and Chadwick's note on VI.27. 'Sabaoth' is not part of the vocabulary of the apocrypha or pseudepigrapha; in Egypt it became powerful magic (J. Barbel, *Christos Angelos* (Bonn, 1964); Fr. Cumont, *Comptes Rendus Acad. Inscr.* 9 Feb. 1906, 63ff. and *Musée belge* XIV (1910), 56ff.; Preisendanz *PGM*; Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols* II etc.), and may perhaps be involved in the curious phenomenon of non-Jewish Egyptians called Sabbataeus and Sabbation (*CPJ* III, § xiii, pp. 43ff.).

31 *Mek.* on Ex. xv.1 (Laut. ii.10), מהו צבאות? אות הוא בתוך צבא שלו. The same passage explains Dt. xxxiii.2, ואתא מרבבות קדש-אות הוא בתוך רבבות קדש שלו. It is not clear in Origen whether Σαβαι is singular or plural. On the date of the Mekilta see the caveat in ch. 1 n. 25.

32 *Cels.* VI.42, cf.ib.II.47, 57, in *Jos. hom.* XV.6 (*GCS* VII.392. 8).

33 Justin *Dial.* 103: σατᾶ is the Aramaic for ἀποστάτης, νᾶς means 'snake'; put together they make σατανᾶς. This is a form of the technique of interpretation known to the Rabbis as *notariqon*. Iren. *adv. Haer.* V.xxi.3(fin.): 'satana' = 'apostata' in Hebrew. Celsus: διάβολος. Origen: Satan = ἀντικείμενος. The LXX regularly use Σατάν, etc. for Heb. שטן, except for I Regn. xxix.4 and Num.xxii.32 (ἐπίβουλος), Job.i.6f. and Zach.iii.1 (διάβολος).

34 See L. Blau, *JE* XI.69.

35 *Cels.* II.31.

36 E.g. *de Agric.* 12 (51). See n. 39.

37 *Princ.* I.iii.4 (*GCS* V.52.17ff.), IV.iii.14 (*GCS* 346.11ff.). The former passage is preserved in Greek. For further references see Koetschau's note *ad loc.* (*GCS* V.52f.). On the whole topic see G. Kretschmar, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 21. Tubingen, 1956), esp. ch. 3 §1, 'Die alexandrinische Tradition, die zwei Seraphim und Philo'.

38 Hanson, *Allegory and Event* p. 174, Cadiou, *La Jeunesse d'Origène* p. 59. Cf. Krauss, *JQR* V(1892-3), 154.

39 E.g. *de Agric.* 12 (51), *Conf. Ling.* 28 (146), *Somn.* I.37 (215).

40 It is noteworthy that he here used the word σοφός (see pp. 34f.).

41 See G. Vermes, *BZAW* CIII (1968), 237-40.

42 E.g. *Sanh.* iv.5, 'In the beginning God created (only) one man, lest ... the Minim should say "there are many ruling powers (רשויות הרבה) in Heaven" '.

43 Tos. *Sanh.* viii.7.

44 Travers Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* 255ff.

45 B. *Hullin* 13^b, *Shab.* 116^a.

46 *In Gen. hom.* III.1 (*GCS* VI.39).

47 *In Gen. hom.* I.13 (*GCS* VI.15, 17).

48 *Sel. ad loc.*

49 Eusebius *HE* IV.xxvi. See Harnack, *Kircheng. Ertrag* I.21.

50 *Dial.* 114.3.

51 *Princ.* II.iii.1, *Gen. R.* III.7 (IX.2). Cf. R. Loewe, *SP* I.499. Moore, *Judaism* I.382, calls this 'a surreptitious piece of Greek wisdom'.

52 *In Ephes.* (vi.1-3) fr. xxxi, *JTS* III (1901-2), 569.

53 *Sel. in Exod.* xx.5f., Jews and Samaritans.

54 *In Num. hom.* X.2. See Marmorstein, *REJ* LXXI (1920), 190-4. Cf. *Midr. Ps.* v.4(27[a]) (R. Isaac): 'We now have no prophet or priest or sacrifices or temple or altar which can make atonement for us.'

55 *In Joh.* fr.72 (*GCS* IV.540).

56 B. *Shab.* 33[b].

57 *Comm. in Exod. apud Philocaliam* XXVII.7 (Robinson 249.26ff.). For the topic cf. *Princ.* III.i.7ff. (*GCS* V.204ff., = *Philocalia* XXI.6ff., Robinson 157ff.). According to M. Harl (*SMSR* XXXVIII (1967), 268), Origen's interpretation is 'appuyée sur l'exégèse juive des morts envoyées par Dieu'.

58 Ex. R. XIII.3 (on Ex. x.1), א"ר יונתן מכאן פתחון פה למינין לומר לא היתה ממנו שיעשה תשובה שנא' כי הכבדתי את לבו וכו'.

59 Origen's text omits the *οὐ*, and so gives a sense opposed to that of our present texts, Hebrew and Greek. See Rahlfs, *Sept.-Stud.* I (1904) p. 78: B *ου*.

60 On Pharaoh's atonement and his reward, see *Mek.* on Ex. xiii.17.

61 *In Ezech. hom.* X.3 (*PG* XIII.743B, *in Gen. hom.* V.1 (*GCS* VI.59), *in Num. hom.* XV.3 (*GCS* VII.134). Cf. Jerome *in Ezech. com.* v.16 (*PL* XXV.157). See Bardy, *Rev. Bén.* XLVI, 1934) 158f., Ginzberg *Legends* V.242 n. 184, Rappaport *Agada und Exegese* n. 101 and addenda, pp. 137f.

62 *In Rom.* X.7, *in I Regn. hom.* I.1 (*GCS* VIII.2.18ff.) ('a prioribus nostris'). Cf. B. *Meg.* 14[a], 'A Tanna taught in the name of our Teacher: A special place was fenced off for them in Gehinnom and they stood in it.' Cf. also B. *Sanh.* 110[a] (*ad fin.*), *Sifre Num.* 157. See Krauss, *JQR* V(1892-3), 152f.

63 *In Ezech.* v.10, (*PG* XIII.781f.).

64 Acts xxiii.8. Orig. *in Mt.* X.20 (*GCS* X.27).

65 B. *Sanh.* 90^{b} (R. Simai, R^{n} Gamliel, R. Eliezer b. R. Jose, R. Ishmael, R. Akiba, R. Meir), cf. *Eccl. R.* V.12 (See Daube *HUCA* XXII (1949), 243 n. 16). Cf. B. *Ber.* 15^{b}, *Sifre Num.* 112; *Mek.* on Ex. xv.1 (R. Judah I). Whether 'Minim' in these debates stands for Sadducees or Samaritans is a moot point. Travers Herford votes for 'Cuthim' (Samaritans) or for Christians; Daube (*ibid.*) speaks of troublesome Alexandrians (cf. B. *Nid.* 69^{b}ff.), and 'Romans' (B. *Sanh.* 90^{b}) has been referred to the Jewish community at Rome. In *Ber.* ix.5 some texts read 'Sadducees' (see Lauterbach, *JQR* NS VI (1915-16), 314).

66 *Cels.* II.77.

67 *Ib.* II.57, cf. Celsus in V.14.

68 Similarly, as S. Sandmel has pointed out (*The First Christian Century*, p. 28), they never quote Daniel to prove the general resurrection, perhaps as he suggests, because the canonicity of the book was still in doubt in the first century. The dialogue with the Sadducees and the Samaritans, and a certain bias of the Rabbis themselves, made for an emphasis on proof-texts from the Pentateuch. Ezekiel's resurrection in the valley of dry bones is accepted, however (B. *Sanh.* 90^{b}), and in the paintings from Dura it seems to be regarded as a type of the final resurrection.

69 B. *Shab.* 152^{b} (*ad fin.*)

70 B. *Sanh. ibid.*

71 *In Joh.* VI. xiv (84) (*GCS* IV. 123). See J. D. M. Derrett, *Law in the N. T.* p. 188.

72 A. Spiro, 'The ascension of Phinehas', *PAAJR* XXII (1953) 91ff.

73 Ecclus. xlv.23; I. Mac.ii.26,54; Ps.-Philo *LAB* XLVIII; Ps.-Jonathan Num.xxv.10ff.; *Sifre Num.* 131; *Num. R.* XXI.3; *P. de R. El.* 47. Cf. *Yalqut Num.* 772. See Krauss, *JQR* V(1892-3), 153f., Ginzberg, *Die Haggada in den pseudo-hieronymianischen 'Quaestiones'*, pp. 3f., 19, 76ff., *Legends of the Jews* VI.220 n. 25, 317 n. 3, S. R. Hirsch, 'Phinehas-Eliyahu', in *Judaism Eternal* (ed. and trs. I. Grunfeld, 1956) II.291-300.

74 *Cels.* III.1.

75 *Ibid.* I.48, *fin.* On the possible significance of this remark, see G. R. S. Mead, *Did Jesus Live 100 B.C.?* (London & Benares, 1903) p. 130 (cf. pp. 43f.). E. Bammel ('Origen *Contra Celsum*

i.41 and the Jewish Tradition', *JTS* NS XIX (1968) 211-3) quotes some Aramaic fragments of the *Toldoth Yeshu* to support Celsus against Origen on this point.

76 *Ibid.* I.49, II.77, IV.2.

77 See below, pp. 84-6, and cf. Parkes, *Conflict of Church and Synagogue*, ch.4, esp. pp. 148f.

Notes to chapter 5

1 This midrash has here been pieced together from slightly differing versions in *Ex. R.* XLVII.1 (on Ex. xxxiv.27), *Tanh.* (Buber), *Ki Tissa* 17, *Pes. R.* v.1 (Friedm.p.14^{b}), J. *Peah* ii.6, 17 and *Tanh. Wayyera* v (on Gen. xviii.17).

2 *Yad.* iii.5, *Sifre Num.* 119 (*fin.*), B. *Shab.* 13^{b}, *Hag.* 13^{a}, *Men.* 45^{a} (see below p. 60).

3 Or possibly 'taken over by the Greeks from the Hebrews', as Barthélemy (*Epektasis* 248) and others take it. Afr. *Ep. ad Orig.* 1, cf. *Dial. Tim. et Aq.* fol. 77r.

4 See G. Jouassard, *SP* I.309 n. 2. But cf. *Ep. ad Afr. 5,* τ᾽ ἀληθῆ παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς ἀναγεγραμμένα.

5 *Ep. ad Afr.* 5.

6 See S. P. Brock, 'Origen's aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament', *SP* X (1970), 215-18.

7 E.g. *in Lev. hom.* XII.5 (*GCS* VI.464.14), *in Gen. hom.* III.5 (*GCS* VI.45.8). See H. Crouzel, 'Origène et le sens littéral dans ses "Homélies sur l'Hexateuque" ', *BLE* LXX (1969) 257.

8 E.g. *in Num. hom.* XVIII.3 (*GCS* VII.172.9), 'in Hebraeorum uero codicibus ... quibus quamuis non utamur, tamen agnoscendi gratia dicemus etiam ibi quae legimus.'

9 Augustine *Epp.* XXVIII, LXXI, LXXXII and Jerome's reply, *Ep.* LXXV (= *Epp.* LVI, CIV, CXVI, CXII in the collections of Jerome's letters) (*CSEL* XXXIV, 103, 248, 351, 280 or *CSEL* LIV 496, LV 238, 397, 367).

10 P. Benoît, 'L'inspiration des Septante d'après les Pères', in *L'Homme devant Dieu. Mélanges offerts au Père Henri de Lubac* I (Théologie 56. Paris, 1963) 169-87. See also M. Wiles, 'Origen as Biblical Scholar' in *Cambridge History of the Bible* I (1970) 455ff.

11 Justinian *Nov.* 146.

12 This question is dealt with more fully in ch. 10.

13 E.g. B. *Tem.* 14^{b}, *Git.* 60^{a} (where, however, it is said that R. Johanan and R. Simeon ben Lakish used written collections of aggadoth, cf. J. *Ber.* v.1 (9^{a}))
14 See above, p. 17.
15 *οἱ περὶ Ἀκύλαν*, *Sel. in Gen.* iv.8 (*PG* XII.101).
16 *Sel. in Gen.* xli.45 (*PG* XII.136).
17 Hanson, *Origen's Doctrine of Tradition* ch. 8.
18 *In Ps.* i fr. (*PG* XII.1084) in *Philocalia* III (Robinson 40.27) and Eusebius *HE* VI.xxv.1.
19 E.g. *Ep. ad Afr.* 9, 13. The idea was familiar from IV Esdr. xiv.46.
20 On the whole subject see the articles by J. Ruwet listed in the bibliography.
21 See W. Robertson Smith, *The OT in the Jewish Church* p. 149 and n. 1, O. Eissfeldt, *The OT* (Eng. 1965) pp. 563f., 569.
22 *C. Ap.* I.8 (38ff.).
23 *In Ps.* I fr. (*PG* XII.1084, *Philocalia* III (Robinson 20), Eusebius *HE* VI.xxv.1 (*GCS* II.572), cf. Ps.-Athanasius, *Scripturae Synopsis* (*PG* XXVIII.289B), *Cat. Nic.* v.16, *Suda s.v.* Origen); *in Lam.* fr.3 (*GCS* III.236). See Barthélemy, *Epektasis* p. 251.
24 Since the Rabbis count 24 books, they do not associate them with the alphabet, but cf. *Midr. Ps.* i (Buber 5^{a}): 'R. Joshua b. Qorḥa and R. Judah (second century) say: אשרי occurs 22 times in the Psalms, like the letters of the alphabet'; *Leqaḥ Ṭob* Gen. xlix.8 'Why is the name David written with a *yod*? Because of the 24 books' (דויד = 24 in *gematria*). According to Hilary, some Greeks included Tobit and Judith, so as to make the total of books up to the number of letters in the Greek alphabet. Origen's 'Jewish tradition' is to be connected with a mystical Jewish theology which ascribes a central role in the creation to the alphabet. This is alluded to in a statement attributed to Rab (B. *Ber.* 55^{a}), and is already well developed in the *Sefer Yeṣirah*, which Scholem (*EJ* (1971) X.507) dates tentatively to the third century. This idea may be related to the school of exegesis which pays minute attention to each letter of the text: see *in Ps.* I fr. in *Philocalia* II.4 (Robinson 39). On the alphabet as the foundation of moral instruction see *in Ps.* cxviii, Proem (Harl p. 182), and Harl, *Chaîne palestinienne* p. 545. The play on the double meaning of *στοιχεῖον* in these texts is, of course,

Greek, but Scholem (*Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* ch. 2 n. 129) has also detected it in the *Sefer Yeṣirah.*

25 Eusebius *HE* VI.xxv.2 (*GCS* II.572-6); Hilary, *Tractatus super Psalmos*, Instr. 15 (*PL* IX.241, *CSEL* XXII.13. See Goffinet, *L'utilisation d'Origène* pp. 18-20); cf. Jerome, *Prol. Gal.* The list as given by Eusebius omits the Twelve Prophets and tries to include Maccabees so as to make up the total. I have restored the Twelve in the position they occupy in Hilary's list, but cf. P. Katz, *ZNW* XLVII (1956), 197.

26 I.e. חומש הפקודים. See *Yoma* vii.1, *Sot.* vii.7, *Men.* iv.3.

27 MSS μελωθ. Schwartz (*GCS ad loc.*), 'man verlangt Μεσλωθ'.

28 MSS σαρβηθσαβαναιελ. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament* p. 577, suggests σφαρ βηθ σαβαναιελ, but comments that 'it is textually uncertain and the second half has not yet been explained'. See Alon, *Meḥqarim* I.20.

29 B. *BB* 14f.

30 It is missing from Melito's list. C. C. Woog, *De Vita et Meritis S. Melitonis* (Leipzig, 1774 and in *PG* V), argues that it was originally present, probably at the end, since the books in the surviving list total, on the method of enumeration adopted here, only twenty-one. Zahn and others prefer to reckon Ruth as a book, and suppose that Esther was never in the list. Cf. Ps.-Athanasius, *Scripturae Synopsis* (*PG* XXVIII.289CD): 'Some of the ancient writers say that the Hebrews count Esther, too, as a canonical book; they say that Ruth is joined to the end of Judges and counts as one book (with it), and that Esther counts as another book. In this way the number of their canonical books is brought up again to the total of twenty-two'. The exclusion of Esther in the *Synopsis* is singular, and demonstrates once again, at an even later date, the doubts which were felt about it. Esther is also mentioned last in Epiphan. *de Mens. et Pond.* 23 (*PG* XLIII.237f.), and in the eleventh-century MS in Jerusalem which lists ὀνόματα τῶν βιβλίων παρ' Ἑβραίοις. The original of this list was in Hebrew and Aramaic. According to J.-P.Audet (*JTS* NS I (1950), 135-54) it is an old list (late first or early second century). Epiphanius' list has the same order for the Later Prophets as Origen's, except that Daniel follows Ezekiel. The placing of Daniel among the Prophets is taken by Audet (p. 145) as a sign of early date, since R. Judah I (B. *BB* 14^{b} - 15^{a}) numbered it among the Writings.

31 See the baraitha in J. *Meg.* ii.1(73[a]), B. *Shab.* 115[b], 'The difference between scrolls of the Scriptures and of Esther is that the former may be copied in any language, the latter only in Hebrew.' R. Samuel, as late as the third century, is reported as having denied that Esther was sacred (B. *Meg.* 7[a]).

32 *In Ps. Prol.* (*PG* XII.1056, Rietz fr.V, p.15), cf. Hilary *Tr. s. Psalmos* Instr. 1 (*PL* IX.233, *CSEL* XXII.3, see Goffinet, *L'utilisation d'Origène* 21f.). For other patristic references see Devreesse *ST* 264, xvii.

33 *In Ps. Prol.* (*PG* XII.1076, Rietz I.16, pp. 9f.).

34 *Tr. s. Psalmos*, Instr. 8 (*CSEL* XXII.9f., Goffinet 26-30).

35 *In Ps.* li.3 (*PG* XXIII.445).

36 B. *Ber.* 10[a]. S. T. Lachs (*JQR* NS LX (1969-70) 209-11) thinks the Min here is a Marcionite, because he disparages the Old Testament. The texts I have quoted from Origen, Eusebius and Hilary show that the question can be put perfectly seriously by an orthodox Christian. It is the weakness of much writing on the Jewish-Christian polemic that it displays a one-eyed knowledge of the sources.

37 *Ep. ad Afr.* 13. *de Orat.* xiv.4. On Origen's use of Judith see A. M. Dubarle, 'La mention de Judith dans la littérature ancienne, juive et chrétienne', *RB* LXVI (1959) 540f. Dubarle argues that Origen was acquainted with a version of the Judith story which also appears in the Midrashim.

38 E.g. *Cels.* III.72 (Sap.vii.25f.), ὡς ὁ θεῖος λόγος ὁρίζεται.

39 *Prol. in Cant.* (*GCS* VIII.75, 87). Some say, says Origen, that Cant. is only one of the many songs of Solomon mentioned in I Kings v.12 (1005 Heb., 5000 LXX). Cf. *Cant. R.* I.i.10 (*fin.*), R. Hiyya Rabba: These 1005 songs are the Song of Songs. *Ib.* 11, another view: These songs have nothing to do with the Song of Songs.

40 *De Orat.* xiv.4, *Strom.* x fr. *apud* Jerome *de Susanna* (*in Dan.* xiii.54, xiv.17, *PL* XXV.582, 584, *CC* LXXVA. 948, 950), *in Lev. hom.* I.1, *Ep. ad Afr.* 9.

41 Tos. *Yad.* ii.13; cf. Tos. *Shab.* xiii(xiv).5. The meaning of גליון is not known for certain, but the suggestion that it derives from εὐαγγέλιον makes good sense.

42 *In Num. hom.* XXVIII.2, 'quia libelli ipsi non uideantur apud Hebraeos in auctoritate haberi'. In *Princ.* (IV.iv.8

(*GCS* V.358.32 and 359.4) and I.iii.3 (*GCS* 51.8)) Origen had three times quoted Enoch without comment. In *in Joh.* VI.xlii (25) 217 he seems to have doubts (εἴ τῳ φίλον παραδέχεσθαι ὡς ἅγιον τὸ βιβλίον), while in *Cels* V.54 he says ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις οὐ πάνυ φέρεται ὡς θεῖα τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα τοῦ Ἐνωχ βιβλία.

43 E.g. *Cels.* I.14, 17-22, 26, 53, *et alibi saepe*.

44 *Sel. in Jos.* vi.26 (*PG* XII.824B).

45 *Kircheng. Ertrag* I.13f. Harnack also cites Iren. *Haer.* III.21.2, Tert. *Cult. Fem.* I.3, Clem. *Strom.* I.xxii.149, Porph. *adv. Christ.* (ed. Harnack no. 68) and Priscillian *Tract.* III.68 (Schepps).

46 *Sel. in Ps.* ii (*PG* XII.1104). For the old Hebrew alphabet cf. also *in Ezech.* ix.4.

47 J. *Meg.* i.9(8) (10[a]); Tos. *Sanh.* iv.7.

48 *Sel. in Jos. ibid.*

49 *In I. Regn. hom.* I.1 (*GCS* VIII.2).

50 *In Ps. Prol.* (*PG* XII.1056, Rietz III.1-2, p. 13), cf. Hilary *Tr. s. Psalmos* Instr. 3 (*CSEL* XXII.4, Goffinet, *L'utilisation d'Origène* 22-6), Jerome *adversus Rufinum* I.xiii (*PL* XXIII.408).

51 *Pes. de R. K.* 198[a] (Buber), *Midr. Ps.* xc.3, *Yalqut Ps.* and Rashi on Ps. xc.1, cf. *Midr. Ps.* on Ps. xc.4. See Krauss, *JQR* V (1892-3), 156f.

52 *Cels.* VI.23. Cf. Tert. *Apol.* xviii (*ad finem*), 'sed et Iudaei palam lectitant; uectigalis libertas uolgo aditur sabbatis omnibus'.

53 *In Jos. hom.* VIII.7, 'haec cum legunt Iudaei'.

54 *Ep. ad Afr.* 2.

55 J. *Meg.* i.9(8) (10[b]).

56 See F. C. Burkitt, *JQR* X (1898), 207-16.

57 B. *Meg.* 8[b]. But the remark of R. Simeon b. Gamliel on which this is based (*Meg.* i.8) is very probably about transliterations. According to R. Judah (Babli, *ibid.*), Greek may only be used for the Pentateuch.

58 *Meg.* ii.1.

59 J. *Meg.* ii.1 (73[a]), cf. J. *Sot.* vii.1 (21[b]).

60 *Sot.* vii.1 and Yerushalmi *ad loc.* Cf. B. *Sot.* 32[b]: a baraitha says that the Shema' may only be recited in Hebrew; Rabbi agrees, but the Sages dissent. *Ibid.* 33[a], the Amidah may be said in any language, but R. Judah said, 'A man should never

pray for his needs in Aramaic, since R. Johanan declared that if a man prays for his needs in Aramaic the ministering angels, who do not understand the language, pay no attention.' The argument is rejected by the Talmud on two grounds: Jews do not need the mediation of angels, and in any case angels do understand Aramaic.

61 J. *Sot.* vii.1 (21^b) and cf. the preceding note. The word אלינסטין has been variously interpreted (see J. A. Emerton, *JTS* NS XXI (1970), 19ff.).

62 In present-day Greece a Greek transliteration of the Aramaic Kaddish is included in the prayer-book. Cf. Bodley MS 3582 (3074), a 13th-century English MS including the Lord's Prayer and Nicene Creed in Greek transliterated into the Roman alphabet. On the other hand, I am informed by Rabbi H. Gryn that among the Bene Israel in Bombay the scrolls are read in Hebrew, even by children, but that it is considered wrong to understand them. Cf. S. Strizower, *The Children of Israel: The Bene Israel of Bombay* (Oxford, 1971) 117: 'Most children read so fluently and accurately that it is difficult to believe that they are not aware of the meaning of what they read.'

63 See Gaster, *The Samaritans* pp. 120f.

64 Baraitha in B. *Shab.* 115^a היו כתובין גיפטית מדית עברית עילמית יוונית אע"פ שלא ניתנו לקרות בהן מצילין אותן מפני הדליקה and another in B. *Meg.* 18^a קראה גיפטית עיברית עילמית מדית יוונית לא יצא. Cf. *Soferim* i.7 (Baraitha), *Sefer Torah* i.8. Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*^{2} p. 159.

65 J. *Meg.* i.9(8) (10^{ab}). 'When Israel sinned, the writing was changed to *ra'aṣ* ('jagged' letters; Old Hebrew or Samaritan), and when Israel became law-abiding again under Ezra the characters received their old Assyrian form once more'. On the meaning of אשורי (ת) see Emerton *JTS* NS XXI (1970) 17f. There is an obvious connexion between this and what Origen says about Ezra's introduction of the square alphabet. On the adoption of the square script for biblical MSS see A. Neubauer, 'The Introduction of the Square Characters in Biblical MSS', in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica* III (Oxford, 1891) 1ff., A. Spiro, 'Samaritans, Tobiads, and Judahites in Pseudo-Philo' (*PAAJR* XX (1951), 280-355) n. 22, D. Diringer, 'Early Hebrew Script Versus Square Hebrew

Script' (*Essays and Studies presented to S. A. Cook*, (Cambridge Oriental Series no. 2. London, 1950) pp. 35-50) and *The Story of the Aleph Beth* (London, 1958).

66 *Meg.* ii.1.

67 קראה תרגום בכל לשון לא יצא. אבל קורין אתה ללועזות בלעז והלועז ששמע אשורית יצא. For the identification of לעז with Greek, cf. B.*Meg.* 18[a], בלעז יוונית.

68 J. *Meg. ad loc.* The text is hopelessly corrupt. M reads גיגנטון. Jastrow would read בגופנן, 'It must be written in our characters (though in a foreign language)' (cf. B. *Meg.* 9[a] בגופן שלנו 'in Hebrew characters', בגופן שלהן 'in foreign characters'). See Emerton, *JTS* NS XXI (1970) 24ff. Emerton argues not only that it is impossible to reconstruct what Samuel b. Sisarti said, but that we have no evidence for the use of transliterated texts among Jews before Origen.

69 *Meg.* i.8. The Babylonian Amoraim found difficulty in understanding this passage (B. *Meg.* 8[b]). Although the Talmud takes it to refer to language, the reference is probably to script.

70 Cf. Ludwig Blau, *Zur Einleitung in die heilige Schrift* (Budapest, 1894), quoted by Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*[2] p. 159, and Halévy and J.-B. Chabot in *JA* Sér. ix.XVII(1901). *Contra,* Emerton (*opusc. cit.*).

71 So Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*[2] p. 162: 'This text, like all the others assembled in the Hexapla, was adopted by Origen from the Jews.' G. Mercati, however, argues at length (*Biblica* XXVIII (1947) 177-212) that the second column originated with Origen.

72 See the list of articles in Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament* pp. 711f. (n. 64).

73 See B. *Git.* 60[a].

74 *Sel. in Ps.* ii (*PG* XII.1104), cf. *in Num. hom.* XIV.1 (*GCS* VII.121), *Sel. in Ezech.* viii.1 (*PG* XIII.796). The notion that there were ten names of God, which recurs in Jerome (*Ep.* XXV, *PL* XXIII.228ff., *CSEL* LIV.218-20) and an anonymous Greek treatise on the subject, thus goes back to Origen (*in Ps.*). The use of the opening words of the Shema' as an example (*in Num. hom.*) suggests that this was a Jewish explanation. No doubt τετραγράμματον

ἀνεκφώνητον was the term used by Greek Jews to refer to the name. For a prohibition on pronouncing the name see *Sanh.* x.1.

75 Some Jewish circles seem to have avoided writing the tetragrammaton entirely; thus it is missing from some parts of the Hebrew Bible, from most texts of the Greek Bible and from the Zadokite Documents. See I. Lévi, *REJ* LXVIII (1914), 119-21. On the form IAΩ and other Greek transcriptions of the tetragrammaton see A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies* (Edinburgh, 1901) pp. 321-36, A. van Hoonacker, *Une Communauté Judéo-Araméenne à Éléphantine, en Égypte, aux VI^e^ et V^e^ siècles av. J. C.* (Schweich Lectures 1914. London, 1915) pp. 67ff., L. Traube, *Nomina Sacra* ch. 3.

76 IV Regn.xxiii.24, fol. 2v, col. a, line 15. (See Burkitt, *Fragments*, Introduction p. 16).

77 So too Jerome *Ep.* XVIII.7 (*CSEL* LIV.74), 'iod he iod he' Jacob of Edessa and the Syro-Hex. It is not unlikely that the Greek form *ΠΙΠΙ* was transcribed from יהיה rather than יהוה (see Ceriani, *Monumenta Sacra et Profana* II.106ff.). Ceriani thought that it was Origen or Eusebius who first transcribed יהיה as *ΠΙΠΙ*, but more probably the transcription was first made by Jews. The Palestinian Talmud (J. *Ned.* xi.1(42^c^) refers to Jews who use *ΠΙΠΙ* (אי פיפי ישראל) (but see Emerton, *JTS* NS XXI (1970) 19).

78 See M. Beit-Arié and G. J. Ormann in *Kiryat Sefer* XLIII (1967-8) 411ff., 583ff.

79 *Ep. ad Afr.* 2, *in Ps.* iv.5 (*PG* XII.1144), *in Cant. hom.* II.4, cf. Field, *Hexapla*, prol. p. xxi, Burkitt, *Fragments*, Introduction p. 15.

80 *RB* LX (1953), 18-29, *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (1963), esp. p. 168. This text is dated to the first century AD, as is a small unpublished Oxyrhynchus fragment of Job, in an unidentified Greek version, which twice has the tetragrammaton in Old Hebrew letters. The Dead Sea Scrolls also provide examples of the tetragrammaton in Old Hebrew letters: see J. P. Siegel, 'The Employment of Palaeo-Hebrew Characters for the Divine Names at Qumran in the Light of Tannaitic Sources', *HUCA* XLII (1971) 159-72.

81 *In Rom.* II.14, 'uidemus enim plurimos Iudaeorum ab infantia

usque ad senectutem semper discentes ...' On Jewish education see T. Perlow, *L'éducation et l'enseignement chez les Juifs à l'époque talmudique* (Paris, 1931).

82 See Marmorstein, 'La réorganisation du doctorat en Palestine au III[e] siècle', *REJ* LXVI (1913), 44-53.

83 *In Rom.*, *ibid.*, '... et numquam ad scientiam ueritatis peruenientes'.

84 *In Cant.*, prol. (*GCS* VIII.62f.). Cf. Jerome *in Ezech.* Prol. (*PL* XXV.17A, *CC* LXXV.3f.), 'Nam nisi quis apud eos aetatem sacerdotalis ministerii, i.e. tricesimum annum, impleuerit nec principia Geneseos, nec Canticum Canticorum, nec huius uoluminis exordium et finem legere permittitur.' On the term δευτερώσεις in the prologue to *in Cant.* see pp. 34f. Cf. also Greg. Naz. *Or.* II.xlviii (*PG* XXXV.456f.), though Gregory does not specify the biblical passages in question.

85 See G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (1941) p. 41.

86 B. *Shab.* 13[b], *Hag.* 13[a], *Men.* 45[a]. In *Meg.* iv.10 there are prohibitions on the reading of Ezek.i and xvi in synagogue.

87 *Yad.* iii.5, cf. Tos. *Yad.* ii.14. The phrase 'making the hands unclean' is here, for the sake of simplicity, rendered as 'canonical'. G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*, ch. 6, maintains that, since the Song of Songs 'was considered a legitimate text for study for all groups', another reason must be found for its inclusion in this list, and connects it with the doctrine of the mystical 'body of God', *Shiur Komah.*

88 *GCS* VIII.27.

Notes to chapter 6

1 Cf. Manetho in Jos. *c. Ap.* I.26 (239); Apollonius Molon *ibid.* and in Diod. Sic. xxxiv.1 (Photius 524); Apion in Jos. *c. Ap.* II 6 (65ff.), etc.

2 Jos. *c. Ap.* I.26 (248), 34 (309); Philostratus *Vit. Ap.* V.33; Hecataeus Abd. in Diod. Sic.xi.3 (Photius 244); Poseidonius Ap. in Diod. xxxiv.1 (Photius 524); Apollonius Molon in Jos. *c. Ap.* II.14 (148), 36 (258); Trogus Pompeius xxxvi.2.

3 *C. Ap.* I.24 (219) to II. 3 (32).

4 *Hist.* V.3.

5 *In Lev.* xiv.35. See below, pp. 80f.
6 Jos. *c. Ap.* II.14 (148), 12 (135).
7 Artapanus and Ps. -Eupolemus in Eusebius *PE* IX.17, 18, Josephus *Ant.* I.7 (156). Cf. R. Eleazer of Mod'in in B. *BB* 16^b (on Gen. xxiv.1).
8 Artapanus in Euseb. *PE* IX.18,23,27; Eupolemus *ibid.* 26, cf. Clem. *Strom.* I.23, 153; Aristobulus in Euseb. *PE* ix.6, cf. XIII.12 and Clem. *Strom.* 1.22.150.
9 Apion in Jos. *c. Ap.* II.11 (125); Cicero *Flac.* 28; Tacitus *Hist.* V.8, and cf. the speech of Titus in Jos. *BJ* VI.1.5 (42).
10 Apion in Jos. *c. Ap.* II.5 (68).
11 Cic. *pro Flacco* 28 (69).
12 Cf. Apion in Jos. *c. Ap.* II.2.11 (125), Poseidonius in Diod. Sic.xxxiv.1 (Photius 524).
13 For some genuine (if late) Jewish arguments against the person of Jesus, surviving in a Geniza fragment, see Krauss, *REJ* LXIII p. 63.
14 *Apol.* I.59f.
15 There is an excellent study of Celsus' and Origen's attitudes to allegory in J.Pépin's *Mythe et Allegorie* (1957).
16 *Apol.* I.59f.
17 Clem. Strom. I.22, *Suda s.v.* 'Numenius'.
18 *Comm. in Cant. prol.* (*GCS* VIII.75.24).
19 *In Cant.* II (*GCS* VIII.141).
20 See *c. Ap.* II.22(188ff.).
21 Jos. *c. Ap.* II.33(236)-35(254) and often, as also the rabbinic literature.
22 *Mart. Exh.* 6, cf. *Mek.* on Ex.xx.5 (Laut. ii.243f.); B. *Sanh.* 60^b-63^a.
23 Cf. the patristic parallels, Tert. *de Idol.* x, xx, xxi and *Didasc. Apost.* xxi, and the baraitha on Exod.xxiii.13 recorded in B. *Sanh.* 63^b, *Mek.* on Ex.xxiii.13 (Laut. iii.180), and Tos. *AZ* vi.11.
24 But see Tertullian *de Spectaculis* xxx, Eusebius *Ecl. Proph.* iii.10, Epiphanius *Panar.* lxxviii.7.5. Cf. H. J. Schonfield, *According to the Hebrews* (1937) ch. 7, 'The "Toldoth" and the Jew of Celsus', D. Rokeah, 'Ben Stara is Ben Pantera', *Tarbiz* XXXIX (1969-70), 9-18 (in Hebrew). See below p. 100.
25 See below pp. 98f., and on this passage see the sage remarks of D. Barthélemy in *Epektasis* 250.
26 See below p. 99.

27 This subject is discussed by H. Chadwick, *SP* II, pp. 331ff. On the argument from history see also F. Blanchetière, *RHPR* LIII (1973), 373ff.
28 Miracles allowed for in the Creation: *Gen. R.* V. 4 and parallel, *Exod. R.* XXI. 6; baraitha in B. *Pes.* 54[a], *Aboth* v. 6 and parallels. Reliance on miracles discouraged: B. *Pes.* 50[b] and parallels, B. *Shab.* 53[b].
29 Cf. I Cor. i. 22.
30 E.g. the story of Simeon ben Shetaḥ and Onias the Wonder-worker in *Ta'an.* iii. 8.
31 Even magical powers could be genuine, in which case their abuse was to be more strongly condemned. See R. Akiba (quoting a decision of R. Joshua), *Sanh.* vii. 11.
32 B. *Ber.* 4[a], 20[a], *Sanh.* 94[b].
33 Mt. viii. 27, Lk. v. 8f., vii. 16, Jn. ii. 11, 23, vi. 14.
34 Jn. xi. 46, xii. 37.
35 One has only to peruse the writings of the valetudinarian Aelius Aristides to appreciate the appeal of miraculous cures in the second century. Other documents, mostly second-century, are mentioned by Nock, *Conversion* ch. 6. The same considerations apply in the third century to the mission of Origen's pupil Gregory-Theodore 'the Wonderworker'.
36 Cf. Lk. xvi. 31.
37 Dt. xiii.2-4 (1-3 AV), II Thess. ii.9; cf. *Cels.* II.51.
38 Cf. *in Gal.*, Latin fr. in Pamphilus, *Apologia* (*PG* XIV.1297A).
39 Cf. *in Joh.* II.xxxiv (204) (*GCS* IV.92).
40 Cf. in *Joh. ibid.*
41 *C. Cels.* VIII.9, 48, cf. in *Joh. ibid.*
42 *C. Cels.* II.52, cf. I.43, IV.4, *Princ.* IV.i.1 (= *Philocalia* I.1).
43 *Princ.* IV.i.6 (= *Philocalia* I.6). Cf. *ibid.* 3, Τί δὲ δεῖ λέγειν καὶ ὅτι προεφητεύθη ... σαφῶς γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ἱστορίας δῆλον....

Notes to chapter 7

1 And with paganism. Origen insists (*Cels.* II.50) that the miracles associated with Moses were genuine miracles, not mere trickery like those of the Egyptians.
2 *Cels.* I.34ff.
3 *Cels.* II.55ff.
4 *Cels.* VI.78.

5 Not that Paul is here claimed as the founder of such exegesis. There are examples in the Bible itself, in the Qumran texts and in the rabbinic tradition.
6 *Cels.* II.38, III.1f.
7 *Cels.* II.29, III.1, VI.27.
8 *Cels.* IV.28. Ἰδιωτικά might mean 'particularistic', but this would be a unique use of the word.
9 *Cels.* IV.32, V.43.
10 *Cels.* II.5.
11 Mt. xxvi.53ff., Lk. xxiv.7, 46f., Jn. xii.23ff., etc.
12 Lk. xxiii.34, Acts iii.17.
13 I Thes. ii.15.
14 'Quamuis enim salus gentibus sit per crucem eius et iustificatio, Iudaeis tamen interitus est et condemnatio' *In Lev. hom.* III.1. Cf., however, I Corinthians i.23.
15 The messiahship of Jesus must have been an issue from the outset, but the mission to the Gentiles thrust the problem of the law into the foreground (Acts xv, Galatians ii). The issue of the person of Jesus re-emerged in the course of the second century: the transition can be seen in Justin's *Dialogue.*
16 *Cels.* II.1.
17 *In Exod. hom.* VII.3.
18 *Cels.* IV.32, VII.26.
19 Cf. also IV.22 *ad fin.*
20 *Cels.* II.8,34, IV.22,32, V.43, VII.8, VIII.42, 69, etc.
21 *Cels.* II.78, cf.VI.80.
22 *Cels.* II.20.
23 Cf. *Cels.* II.10,23.
24 In *Cels.* II.25, Jesus is seen as praying that, if possible, the Jews will not be deserted by God in consequence of his death (Mt. xxvi.39).
25 *Cels.* IV.32, VIII.69. Cf. *de Orat.* 31.7, *Princ.* I.iii.7, *in Mt.* XII.4.
26 *Cels.* V.43 (cf. Heb.xi.37).
27 *In Isa. hom.* I.5, *in Jer. hom.* XX(XIX).9 (*GCS* III.192.30), *in Mt.* X.18, *in Mt. Ser.* 28, *in Ps. xxxvii hom.* I.1, *Ep. ad Afr.* 9.
28 Ed. and trs. R. H. Charles (1900). Trs. in Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT* II pp. 155-62.
29 *In Mt.* X.18.
30 Charles, *Ap. and Ps.* II.158. Origen calls it 'traditionem Iudaeorum' (*in Isa. hom.* I.5).

31 B. *Yeb.* 49^{b}, cf.J. *Sanh.* x.2 (28^{c}) and Tos., Targ. Isa. lxvi.1.
32 *Dial.* cxx.
33 See Graetz, *MGWJ* III(1854) 315f.
34 And cf. Tert. *Scorp.* viii, *Pat.* xiv, Ps.-Cypr. *adv. Jud.* (*CSEL* III.iii.135).
35 *In Isa. hom.* VI.6.
36 *Cels.* II.34f., VIII.41f.
37 *Cels.* VIII.42.
38 Cf. *Cels.* IV.73.
39 See, for instance, *Princ.* IV.i.3 (*GCS* V.297.5ff. = *Philocalia* I.3, Robinson 10).
40 *Cels.* IV.3.
41 Cf. *Cels.* II.5, V.58.
42 *Cels.* VI.80, cf.II.78.
43 See B.*Sanh.* 39^{ab}.
44 *In Num. hom.* XV.3. See pp. 31f.
45 Gen. xxv.23. Cf. the tendentious rendering of Isa. xliii.4, 'Therefore will I give Edom into your power', B. *Ber.* 62^{b} and parallels.
46 *In Gen. hom.* XII.3. Cf. *in Rom.* II.7.
47 *Cels.* IV.43. Paul had similarly identified the Jews with Ishmael, the Church with Isaac (Gal. iv.21-31).
48 References in Juster, *Les Juifs* I.48 n. 20. See also J. G. Gager, 'Moses and Alpha', *JTS* NS XX(1969), 245f.
49 *Sel. in Lev.* xiv.35.
50 *In Mt.* XII.4. Cf. B. *Yeb.* 102^{b}, 'A Min said to R. Gamliel: (You are) a people whose Lord (*or* husband) has departed from them.
51 Cf. *Sifre ad loc.*
52 E.g. *Cels.* II.78, *Princ.* IV.i.4, *in Ps. xxxvi hom.* I.1.
53 *Princ.* I.iii.7.
54 *In Ps. xxxvi hom.* III.10.
55 *Cels.* II.8.
56 *In Lev. hom.* XI.5. Cf. *in I Cor.* fr.XLVII (*JTS* X (1908-9) 30, on I Cor. xii.3), *in Joh.* XXVIII.xxiv (*GCS* IV.421) (similar conclusion drawn from Jn. xi.54).
57 *Mekilta* on Exod.xvii.8-11. Cf. *RH* iii.8 and *Yerushalmi, ad loc.*
58 So Ps.-Barnabas xii.12, Justin *Dial.* xc, xci, cxii, cxxxi, Irenaeus *Dem.* xlvi, lxxix (*Haer.* IV.4.2, IV.50), *Dial. Tim. et Aq.* fol. 100r, Origen *in Ex. hom.* III.3 (*GCS* VI.170.20ff.), *in I Regn. hom.* I.9 (*GCS* VIII. 16.24), Ephraem *ad loc.* (Ben. I.219D, Tonneau xvii.2).

59 *In Ex. hom.* XI.4 (*GCS* VI.255.26-256.25), cf. *in I Regn. hom.* I.9 (*GCS* VIII.16.11ff.), *in Joh.* XXVIII.5 (*GCS* IV.394.35-395.3), *in Ps.* xxiv.4 (Pitra, *Anal. Sacra* II.481f.). T. W. Manson, *JTS* XLVI(1945), 129ff., mentions this as an example of an OT theme exploited by the Church and deliberately given a different meaning by the Rabbis. The Jewish interpretation is actually the older (see Philo, *Leg. All.* III.186, Ps.-Philo *LAB* XI.1).

60 *In Lev. hom.* XII.1 (*GCS* VI.455.9).

61 *In Isa. hom.* VI.6 (*GCS* VIII.277.25f.).

62 *Cels.* IV.50, V.60, VI.70, *in Ex. hom.* XII.1 (*GCS* VI.262f.), *in Lev. hom.* IV.7 (*GCS* VI.326.29ff.), *in Jos. hom.* XVII.19 *et alibi.*

63 *Princ.* IV.ii.1 (*GCS* V.306.2ff. = *Philocalia* I.8, Robinson 14.19ff.), cf. *in Jer. hom.* XII.13 (*GCS* III.99f., esp. 99.31-100.2).

64 Cf. *in Lev. hom.* V fr., *Philocalia* I.30 (Robinson 36.11ff., *GCS* VI.335). The origins of this trichotomy are obscure, but cf. I Thes. v.23 and Josephus *Ant.* I.1.2(34) (Gen. ii.7 LXX). See further F. E. Brighton, 'Soul, Body, Spirit', *JTS* II (1900-1), 273f. There is no reason (*pace* R. P. C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event* p. 237) to connect it with Plato's tripartite division of the soul.

65 *Princ.* IV.ii.4 (*GCS* V.312.8ff. = *Philocalia* I.11, Robinson 17.31ff.).

66 *Princ.* IV.ii.8 (*GCS* V.320.15-321.2 = *Philocalia* I.15, Robinson 22.25-8).

67 *In Ex. hom.* VII.1 (*GCS* VI.206.9-11), *ibid.* 3 (208.16-18), *ibid.* XI.4 (256.19-25). See above, pp. 77, 82.

68 E.g. *in Jos. hom.* XX.

69 On these see *Princ.* IV.ii.1 (*GCS* V.308.4 = *Philocalia* I.8, Robinson 15.24), *in Lev. hom.* X.1 (*GCS* VI.440.22), *in Jos. hom.* VII.5, in Mt. X.14.

70 *Apol.* I.31, *Dial.* xvi.

71 *Scorp.* x.

72 *HE* V.xvi.12 (*GCS* II.464).

73 *In Rom.* VIII.12(13) (*PG* XIV.1199).

74 *In Ps. xxxvii(xxxvi) hom.* I.1 (*PG* XII.1321), cf. *Cels.* VI.27.

75 *In Jud. hom.* VIII.1 (*GCS* VII.509).

76 For further discussion of this subject see Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue,* ch. 4.

77 *In Ps. xxxvii(xxxvi) hom.* II.8 (*PG* XII.1387) 'cum ... Christus

usque in hodiernum diem a Iudaeis anathema fiat'. Cf. *in Mt.* XVI.3 (*GCS* X.469) and also Justin *Dial.* xvi, xlvii, xciii, xcvi, cvii, cxvii, cxxxvii; Epiphan. *Haer.* xxix.9; Jerome *in Isa.* XIV. lii.4f. (*CC* LXXIIIA.578), 'qui diebus ac noctibus blasphemant saluatorem, et sub nomine, ut saepe dixi, Nazarenorum, ter in die in Christianos congerunt maledicta'.

78 *In Joh.* XXVIII.xii (*GCS* IV.404.10-11). On second-century discussions of this problem see F. Blanchetière, *RHPR* LIII (1973), 385ff.

79 *In Lev. hom.* V.8 (*GCS* VI.349.4-5).

80 *Sel. in Exod.* xii.46 (*PG* XII.285).

81 *In Jos. hom.* XX.6 (cf. *Ib.* VII.5, 'qui Christiani quidem dicuntur'), *in Mt.* XII.5 (*GCS* X.76.10), *in Jer. hom.* XII.12(13) (*GCS* III.99f.), *in Lev. hom.* VII.5 (*GCS* VI.388.9f.), *ibid.* X.2, *in Joh.* fr.8 (*GCS* IV.489f.), fr.114 (*GCS* IV.565). Cf. *in Mt. ser.* 79(Ebionismus).

82 See below, pp. 89f.

83 *In Num. hom.* VII.2 (*GCS* VII.40.19ff.). Cf. *in Jer. hom.* XII.13.

84 *PG* XLVIII.843ff.

Notes to chapter 8

1 *Testimonia,* or *ad Quirinum,* also called *Testimoniorum libri adversus Judaeos* (I & II), *PL* IV, *CSEL* III.i.

2 Justin *Dial.* xviii; cf. Cyprian *Test.* I.8-17. Both quote Jer. xxxviii(xxxi). 31ff.

3 But not always; cf. *in Rom.* fr.X (*JTS* XIII(1911-2), 217f.).

4 *Cels.* II.2, quoting John xvi.13. Cf. *in Lev. hom.* VII.4 (*GCS* VI.383.2f.), where Origen quotes from Col. ii.17, 'umbra futurorum'.

5 Ps.-Arist. cxxviiiff.

6 Ps.-Barn. x.

7 *Migr. Abr.* 16(89-93). On the Jewish background to the debate see L. Ginzberg's article 'Antinomianism' in *JE*, and S. Stein, *SP* II pp. 141-54.

8 *Cels.* V.48. The reference to the circumcision of Ishmael may be inspired by Jos. *Ant.* I.12.2(214). Celsus' arguments are to be found in *Cels.* I.22 and V.41.

9 Notably *in Gen. hom.* III (on Gen. xvii.3) and *in Rom.* II.13 (*PG* XIV.900f., on Rom. ii.26f.).
10 *In Gen. hom.* III.4 (*GCS* VI.43. 19-22).
11 *In Rom.* II.13 (*PG* XIV.909f.), *in Jos. hom.* V.5 (*GCS* VII.317f.). Justin (*Dial.* cxiiif., cf. xxiv) takes the word 'stone' here as a reference to Christ.
12 *In Gen. hom.* III.5 (*GCS* VI.44).
13 *In Gen. hom.* III.6 (*GCS* VI.48.24-49.1).
14 *Dial.* xix, cf. Cyprian *Test.* I.8
15 *Gen. R.* XI.6. Cf. *Pes. R.* 116^{b} (R. Judah) and parallels. The context is polemic about the Sabbath. For other sources for the debate about circumcision see Marmorstein, *HUCA* X (1935), 254 and *Theolog. Tijdschr.* XLIX (1915), 360-83.
16 *Strom.* IV.iii.8.
17 See p. 40.
18 *Princ.* IV.iii.2 (*GCS* V.326, *Philocalia* I.18 (Robinson 25.29)). Cf. *in Rom.* I.10 (*PG* XIV.856).
19 *Princ. ibid.* See pp. 40f.
20 *In Num. hom.* XXIII.4 (*GCS* VII.215) Origen quotes Mt. xii.5, where Jesus applies the same argument to the priests in the Temple. Cf. *in Joh.* fr.66 (*GCS* IV.535f.).
21 *In Num. hom., ibid.* Cf. *in Rom.* V.1 (*PG* XIV.1020), and for the interpretation of Isa. 1.11 cf. *in Lev. hom.* IX.8 (*GCS* VI.432f.), *in Num. hom.* XII.2 (*GCS* VII.98f.), *in Ezech. hom.* III.7 (*GCS* VIII.355).
22 *In Num. hom., ibid.* (*GCS* VII.216).
23 *Ibid.*, cf. *in Ex. hom.* VII.5 (*GCS* VI.212.14ff.) and *in Apocal.* fr.28 (*JTS* XXV (1924) 1).
24 See pp. 86f.
25 *Gen. R.* XI.2. Cf. *Tanh. B.* p. 67, on Ex. xvi.29, 'See': 'R. Isaac said, "See" how you should reply to the Gentiles, when they say to you "Why do you keep the Sabbath? What miracles have been performed for you (on it)?" "See, that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath": say to them that on every day one portion came down, but on the eve of the Sabbath two portions, as it is said (*Ibid.* 5), "And it shall come to pass, that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in: and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily".' See also *Pes. R.* xxiii.6 (117^{b}).
26 See p. 130.

27 *In Ex. hom.* VII.5 (*GCS* VI.210.26-211.14, 16f.). The identification of manna with Torah is found in both the Jewish and the Christian tradition: Philo *Mut. Nom.* 44 (259f.), John vi.32f., *Mek.* on Ex. xiii.17 (Laut. i.171). See further P. Borgen, *Bread from Heaven.*

28 This was not to come about until Constantine's decree of 321. The name Κυριακή, 'Lord's Day', has a long history (it is found in the Apocalypse (i.10) and in various second-century sources, and Melito (Euseb. *HE* IV.xxvi) wrote a treatise περὶ Κυριακῆς), but Sunday was not originally a day of rest.

29 See above, pp. 86f.

30 *In Rom.* II.13 (*PG* XIV.906f.) and fr.X (*JTS* XIII(1911-2), 217f.). Cf. Justin *Dial.* xl, and Trypho *ibid.* xlvi.

31 The *Book of Jubilees* (xlix.17-21) interprets the words quite as literally as Origen, and so, in their way, did the Samaritans. Even if the Rabbis took מקום to include the whole of Jerusalem their task will have been no simpler.

32 *In Joh.* XXVIII.xxv.

33 Text in *SC* 36 p. 35 n. 1. See Iren. *Haer.* IV.x.1 (*PG* VII.1000) (*Dem.* xxv, *PO* XII.769), Tert. *adv. Jud.* x, Hippol. *apud Chron. Pasch.* (*SC* 27 pp. 52f.).

34 *In Lev. hom.* VII.4 (*GCS* VI.382f.).

35 *Ibid.* 5 (*GCS* VI.388).

36 *Princ.* IV.iii.2 (*GCS* V.325f., *Philocalia* I.18, Robinson 25f.).

37 See further, and in particular on the possible identification of the τραγέλαφος with the כוי, Stein, *SP* II.141ff.

38 See further J. Pépin, *Mythe et Allégorie.*

39 E.g. pp. 83f., 105.

40 Origen indeed complains that when he tries to argue with the Jews about the reasons behind the biblical laws they refuse to be drawn: 'Absoluta nobis responsione satisfacient, dicentes "ita uisum est legem danti; nemo discutit Dominum suum" ' (*in Lev. hom.* IV.7).

41 E.g. Gen. xxv.23: *in Gen. hom.* XII.3 (see p. 80); Cypr. *Test.* I.19, cf. Hippol. in Gen. fr.VII (*GCS* I.54). Dt. xxxii.21: *Cels.* II.78, *Princ.* IV.i.4 (*Philocalia* I.4), *in Ps. xxxvi hom.* I.1; Justin *Dial.* cxix, Clem. *Strom.* II.ix.43 (*GCS* II.135). I Sam. ii.5: *In Regn. hom.* I.18 ('patroni litterae Iudaei uelim uidere quomodo asserunt'); Cypr. *Test.* I.20. Isa. lxv.1: *Cels.* II.78 (where Origen quotes a Jewish counter-argument); Cypr. *Test.* I.21, cf. Justin *Dial.* cxix, Clem. *Strom.* II.ix.43.

42 See ch. 7, and below, p. 98.
43 *Cels.* II.78.
44 See above pp. 77-9.
45 *Cels.* I.53. Cf. Ps.-Orig. *in Gen. hom.* XVII.6. Cypr. *Test.* I.21, Hippol. *in Gen.* fr.XXI (*GCS* I.59), Justin *Apol.* I.32, *Dial.* cxx, *Const. Apost.* VI.iii.11, iv.23, *Clem. Hom.* III.48, *Clem. Recog.* V.xi, Euseb. *HE* I.vi.
46 Onq. משיחא; Ps.-Jon., F. T., Neof. מלכא משיחא; *Gen. R.* XCVIII.8 (XCIX in MSS, Th.-Alb.p. 1258) מלך המשיח.
47 *Princ.* IV.i.3. See above p. 33.
48 *Gen. R.* XCVII (revised numbering).10 (Th.-Alb. p. 1219). Cf. *ibid.* XCVIII (XCIX).8 (Th.-Alb. pp. 1258-9), the Sanhedrin and its two judges.
49 *Gen. R.* XCVIII (XCIX).8, also in J. *Ta'an.* iv.2 (68^a).
50 For this prophecy see also *in Ex. hom.* VII.5 (*GCS* VI.211.14-17) Justin *Dial.* lii and cxx.
51 *Princ.* IV.i.3 (*GCS* V.297, *Philocalia* I.3, Robinson p. 10).
52 *Cels.* I.49.
53 *Cels.* I.50.
54 E.g. *Cels.* II.28, 38.
55 *Cels.* IV.52. J. E. Bruns, *Theological Studies* XXXIV(1973), 287-94, claims to have discovered a part of this work in the *Hodegos* of Anastasius the Sinaite (*PL* LXXXIX, 244-8).
56 *In Ps.* prol. (*PG* XII.1056, Rietz III.1, p. 13).
57 *In I Regn. hom.* I.10 (*GCS* VIII.19).
58 *Cels.* I.34f. Cf. Cypr. *Test.* II.9.
59 *Dial.* xliii, lxvii. Cf. *Dial. Ath. et Zach.* 32.
60 Jerome *adv. Jovin.* I.32 (*PL* XXIII.266); cf. *in Isa.* III.vii.14 (*PL* XXIV.110, *CC* LXXIII.103).
61 Jerome *in Isa. ibid.* In *Dial. Tim. et Aq.* (111) the Christian quotes Dt. xxii.25 to show that *νεᾶνις* and *παρθένος* are synonymous.
62 See Bardy, *Rev. Bén.* XLVI (1934) 145ff., R. Reitzenstein, 'Origenes und Hieronymus', *ZNW* XX (1921) 90-4, M. A. Schlatkin, 'The influence of Origen upon St. Jerome's Commentary on Galatians', *VC* XXIV (1970) 49-58.
63 *Cels.* I.51. Cf. *in Joh.* XIX.xvii (104-5) (*GCS* IV.317). See also Justin Dial. lxxviii, Cypr. *Test.* II.12.
64 *Gen. R.* LXXXII.10 (in printed editions only - see Th.-Alb. p. 988n.).
65 *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* p. 255.

66 B. *Yeb.* 49b.
67 *Cels.* I.32f.
68 *Cels.* I.46, cf. *in Mt.* XIII.18. (In *in Joh.* II.xi(79) (*GCS* IV.66) the alternative interpretation is adopted.)
69 E.g. *Gen. R.* VIII.9 (R. Simlai, third century): 'Whenever you find a text supporting the Minim, you find its refutation by its side.'
70 *In Joh.* X.xxvii (163ff.) (*GCS* IV.199f.).
71 *In Rom.* VIII.7(8) (*PG* XIV.1182f.).
72 *Cels.* I.54f.
73 *Cels.* I.56. On the christological interpretation of the Psalms in the debate with the Synagogue see Justin *Dial.* xxxiii, xxxiv, xxxvi, lxiv, lxxvii, lxxxiii, lxxxv.
74 *Cels.* I.49, cf. IV.2.
75 *Cels.* II.31. See p. 43.
76 *Cels.* I.45. Similar argument, *Cels.* II.50-55. The superiority of Jesus to Moses, *Cels.* IV.4, *Princ.* IV.i.1 (*Philocalia* I.1).
77 A. Lukyn Williams, *Adversus Judaeos* p. 68, dates it before Clement of Alexandria, on the grounds that the Apocalypse is omitted from the canon of the New Testament (fol. 77v), but in what goes before (77r) the author draws on an account of the Hexapla similar to that in Euseb. *HE* VI. xvi (but in which Nicopolis is identified, plausibly, with Emmaus, not, as in Eusebius, with the town of the same name in western Greece).
78 See R. Loewe, 'Apologetic Motifs' p. 174, E. E. Urbach, 'Homiletical Interpretations'.

Notes to chapter 9

1 Jerome, *Ep.* LXXXIV.8 (*PL* XXII.750, *CSEL* LV.131).
2 Huet, *Origeniana* II.i.1.
3 See, for example, Cadiou, *La Jeunesse d'Origène,* p. 56.
4 Hanson, *Allegory and Event,* p. 35.
5 *In Rom.* II.14 (*PG* XIV.916, cf. 915). Cf. also *In Rom.* fr. XI (*JTS* XIII (1911-12), 218) *οὐκ ἐν τῷ βιβλία καὶ γράμματα πιστευθῆναι χαρακτηρίζεται, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ τὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς νοῦν καὶ τὰ ἐναποκείμενα μυστήρια γινώσκεσθαι.*
6 *Cels.* V.60.
7 *Cels.* II.6.
8 *In Lev. hom.* III.3 (*GCS* VI.306.11), 'Iudaicae hae sunt et

inutiles fabulae'; *in Gen. hom.* III.6, 'cum uestris Iudaicis fabulis et narrationibus foetidis'; *in Ps.* cxviii(cxix).85 (*PG* XII.1601D, but see ch. 2 n. 48), *τοὺς γραώδεις μύθους τῶν Ἰουδαίων* (cf. I Tim. iv.7).

9 Cf. H. de Lubac, *Histoire et Esprit,* p. 118.

10 E.g. *in Joh.* X.xlii (GCS IV.219.25), *γραωδῶς καὶ Ἰουδαικῶς*. Cf. Clem. *Paed.* I.vi.34.

11 Daniélou, *SP* I p. 284.

12 *Sel. in Ps.* (*PG* XII.1057C).

13 אין מוקדם ומאוחר בתורה. Attributed to the School of Ishmael; see Bacher, *Terminologie* I. 167f., *Ag. Tan.* I^2 240f.

14 Of which he was certainly capable. See the discussion of the historical background of Susanna and Tobit in *Ep. ad Afr.* 13f.

15 Cadiou, *La Jeunesse d'Origène,* p. 56.

16 *Sifre Num.* 112.

17 B. *Sanh.* 4^{ab} and Tos., B. *Hul.* 72^a and Tos.; *Sifre Num.* 131.

18 B. *Shab.* 63^a etc. אין מקרא יוצא מידי פשוטו. See R. Loewe, 'The "Plain" Meaning of Scripture', pp. 164ff.

19 E.g. מַשמע. See R. Loewe, 'The "Plain" Meaning of Scripture', and 'Midrashim and Patristic Exegesis of the Bible'.

20 *Migr. Abr.* 36(200), cf. *Vit. Cont.* 3(28), *Conf. Ling.* 5(14).

21 Aristobulus defends Moses against the charge of *ἀλογία* in a fragment preserved by Eusebius (*PE* VIII.x.6), and Philo follows Aristobulus in allegorising the anthropomorphic biblical references to God.

22 E.g. *Quod Det.* 6-7 (15-17).

23 *Fug. et Inv.* 32(179), *Mut. Nom.* 8(60), *Somn.* I.2(6).

24 See J. Pépin, 'Remarques sur la théorie de l'exégèse allégorique chez Philon'.

25 *Migr. Abr.* 16(89-93).

26 Note, for instance, the rabbinic interpretation of the *lex talionis, Mek.* on Ex. xxi.22 (Laut. iii.65), *BK* viii.1 and Babli (83^b) etc. The Rabbis were also prepared to set aside certain commandments in times of crisis. Their authority for this was Ps. cxix.126, '(because) it is time to work for the Lord, they have made void thy law' (R. Nathan, *Ber.* ix.5 (*fin.*), cf. J. *Ber. ad loc* (14^{cd}), B. *Yoma* 69^a (*fin.*), *Tamid* 27^b, *Git.* 60^a, *Tem.* 14^b).

27 E.g. the Book of Job, B. *BB* 15^a; Ezek. xxxvii (the dry bones), B. *Sanh.* 92^b.

28 *Princ.* IV.ii.4 (*GCS* V.312ff., *Philocalia* I.11, Robinson 17ff.), cf. *Sel. in Ex.* xvi.23, *in Ex. hom.* VI.3.

29 Above p. 83.

30 *Princ. ibid.* (*GCS* V.312.5, Robinson 17.28), *in Lev. hom.* X.2 (*GCS* VI.442.24), *in Num. hom.* IX.7, *in Jos. hom.* XXI.2. Clement, *Strom.* I.ix (45.3, *GCS* II.30. 8), quotes the verse with διισσῶς for τριισσῶς; cf. Orig. *in Num. hom.* I.1 (*GCS* VII.5), 'dupliciter et tripliciter'.

31 B. *Sanh.* 34a.

32 *MdeRI* on Ex. xv.11 (Laut. ii.62) and xx.8 (Laut. ii.252), and *MdeRSbY ad loc.*

33 *Mek. ibid.*, B. *Sanh.* 34a, מה פטיש זה מתחלק לכמה ניצוצים אף מקרא אחד יוצא לכמה טעמים.

34 B. *Shab.* 88b, *Tanh., Lek* 23 (Buber 40a) (where the number 70 is associated with the seventy souls of Dt. x.22 and the seventy elders of Num. xi.16, and by *gematria* with the word סוד (*μυστήριον*) in Ps. xxv.14), *Midr. Ps.* lxviii.6, xcii.3.

35 *Num. R.* XIII.15, שבעים פנים לתורה. Derived by *gematria* from יין. In *Otioth de R. 'Aqiba* 87 this is again associated with the seventy languages of mankind.

36 B. *Erub.* 13b, אלו ואלו דברי אלהים חיים.

37 *In Ex. hom.* XI.2 (*GCS* VI.253.11-14).

38 *In Gen. hom.* XV.1 (*GCS* VI.127.7-12).

39 E.g. *in Num. hom.* XIV.2, 'nihil otiosum apud Deum'; *in Joh.* II.vii, *in Cant. hom.* I.8, *in Jer. hom.* XXXIX.2 (*Philocalia* X, Robinson 59).

40 *Sel. in Gen.* vi.9 (*PG* XII.104B) (ἄνθρωπος δίκαιος ὤν); *Sel. in Gen.* vii.6 (*PG* XII.105C) (ὕδατος); *in I Regn. hom.* I.10 (*GCS* VIII.17.9ff.) (gladness 'in God'); *in Ezech. hom.* I.7 (*GCS* VIII.331.12ff., 332.16-18) (plural forms); *sel. in Ezech.* viii.1 (*PG* XIII.796BC) and *in Ezech. hom.* III.8 (*GCS* VIII.355.22ff.) (repetitions).

41 As in the example about ascending and descending quoted above. It is not clearly established, in the case either of Origen or of the Rabbis, whether or not concordances were used. It is tempting to think of them as trained to quote from memory different examples of the same word (it is significant that the common rabbinic argument by analogy, *gezerah shawah,* is based normally on similarities not of context but of vocabulary), but cf., for Origen, R. Cadiou, 'Dictionnaires antiques dans l'oeuvre d'Origène', *REG* XLV (1932), 270ff. See also W. S. Towner, *The Rabbinic 'Enumeration of Scriptural Examples'* (Studia Post-Biblica XXII. Leiden, 1973).

42 E.g. the difference between *νόμος, πρόσταγμα, δικαιώματα, κρίσματα, μαρτύρια* and *ἐντολαί*, *Sel. in Ex.* xxi.1 (*PG* 293B), cf. *in Ex. hom.* X.1 (*GCS* VI.245.7ff.), *in Num. hom.* XI.1, *Sel. in Ps.* xviii(xix).8ff. (*PG* XII. 1244C), *Sel. in Ps.* cxviii(cxix).1 (*PG* XII.1585D). His distinction (*in Ex. hom.* VIII.4 (*GCS* VI.223.7ff.+ Greek fr.), *Mart. Exh.* vi (*GCS* I.7.13ff.)) between *προσκύνησις* and *λατρεία* is directly paralleled in the rabbinic literature (*Mek.* on Ex. xx.5 (Laut. ii.243-4), cf. B. *Sanh.* 60^{b}-63^{a}); see Baer, *SH* VII(1961), 96.

43 *In Ex. hom.* VI.1 (*GCS* VI.193.2), 'tum non solum glorificatur Dominus, sed et gloriose glorificatur'.

44 *In Gen. hom.* XV.5 (*GCS* VI.133.15-134.16), *Sel. in Gen.* xlvi.4 (*PG* XII.140C). MT גם־עלה אעלך. Both the repeated verb and the particle will have attracted the attention of Akiba, but the LXX have *καὶ ἐγὼ ἀναβιβάσω σε εἰς τέλος*. Origen is perhaps influenced here by Aquila's version. Philo, like Akiba, finds the repeated verb significant (e.g. *Qu. in Ex.* II.16,17), but the eschatological interpretation is more characteristic of Akiba. Origen's words (*πρὸς τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς πενταteύχου ζητοῦντας τὴν μετὰ ταῦτα ζωήν*, *Sel.*) are reminiscent of the rabbinic debates on the same topic. For the preoccupation with the Pentateuch cf. *Sanh.* x.1, 'he who says that the quickening of the dead cannot be proved from the Torah', and see ch. 4 n. 68.

45 *Sel. ad loc.* (*PG* XIII.793C).

46 *In Ps.* fr. in *Philocal.* II.3 (*PG* XII.1080, Robinson 38). Cf. Hilary, *Tract. s. Ps.*, instr. 24 (*PL* IX.247).

47 E.g. Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps. ciii*, III.2 (*PL* XXXVII.1358); Rabba b. R. Huna (early fourth century in Sura), B. *Shab.* 31^{ab}; Rab Nahman, *Cant. R.* I.i.8. Baer, *Zion* XXI(1956), 16 n. 69, attempts, without notable success, to find a Hebrew parallel. Urbach, *Tarbiẓ* XXX (1961), 148 n. 2 (English, *SH* XXII (1971), 247 n. 2), compares a commentary on the Song of Songs attributed to Saadya Gaon: 'The Song of Songs is comparable to locks whose keys have disappeared'.

48 The keys suggest Philo's *ἀφορμαί* (*Plant.* 9(36), *Conf. Ling.* 38 (190f.)), the signs which point to the need for a deeper interpretation, but a closer parallel is perhaps the rabbinic *gezerah shawah* (Bacher, *Terminologie* I.13ff.). See Cadiou, *La jeunesse d'Origène*, p. 61. The Rabbis agree with Origen that 'cognata est sibi scriptura diuina' (*in I Regn. hom.* I.5 (*GCS* VIII.8)),

and they quote in this connexion Job xxxvi.33, read, as it is by some Greek versions, as 'its fellow gives information about it' (*Gen. R.* XVI.2 (*ad fin.*), R. Aibu).

49 Such moral and practical deductions are often introduced in the commentaries by the word לְלַמֵּד. Origen uses the word *μανθάνειν* similarly in *in Joh.* V (*GCS* IV.101.2, *Philocalia* V.2, Robinson 43.16). But he frequently uses it in a more general sense, e.g. *in Joh.* XIX.v (32) (*GCS* IV.304.27), *ibid.* xxi (138) (*GCS* IV.322.14), of any scriptural lesson.

50 An obvious example is the use of the prayer of Hannah as a model for the correct manner of praying by both Origen (*de Orat.* ii.5, iv.1, xiii.2, xiv.4, xvi.3 (*GCS* II.303, 307, 326, 332, 337)) and the Rabbis (e.g. R. Hamnuna, B. *Ber.* 31^{ab}).

51 See Hanson, *Allegory and Event* pp. 242f.

52 Some scholars have expressed surprise at the abundance of rabbinic allegory, e.g. Hanson, *op. cit.*, pp. 26f. Cf. J. Bonsirven, 'Exégèse allégorique chez les Rabbins Tannaïtes'. Bonsirven's conclusions, that there is little allegory in the Rabbis, and that it is literalistic and of poor quality, are belied by the examples which he himself quotes.

53 A generous estimate of the rabbinic allegory and its influence on Christian exegesis is that of R. P. C. Hanson in *Allegory and Event.* Hanson's knowledge of the rabbinic sources appears, however, to be entirely second-hand.

54 E.g. Heraclitus, *Quaestiones Homericae* 22, *ὁ γὰρ ἄλλα μὲν ἀγορεύων τρόπος, ἕτερα δὲ ὧν λέγει σημαίνων, ἐπωνύμως ἀλληγορία καλεῖται.* Cf. Demetrius, *Eloc.* 99ff.

55 E.g. *Cels.* IV.51, *τὰς τοῦ νόμου ἀλληγορίας.* In this context Origen mentions both Philo and Aristobulus by name. Paul uses *ἀλληγορούμενα* (Gal. iv.24) in the sense of 'allegorical writing'.

56 B. *Sanh.* 92^{b}. The authorities quoted belong to the end of the first century and the beginning of the second.

57 With three exceptions. See Bacher, *Terminologie* I.122, *Ag. Tan.* I^{2} 239.

58 A useful collection of these is to be found in the article by Bonsirven referred to above (n. 52).

59 No. 26. This method is to be distinguished from the common rabbinic habit of explaining a passage by means of a parable, often introduced by the phrase מָשָׁל ל־. See Bacher, *Terminologie* I.121f., II.121.

60 J. *Yeb.* xii.6(13[a]), *Gen. R.* LXXXI.2. See Bacher, *Terminologie* I.183f., Lauterbach, *JQR* NS I (1910-11) 302.

61 דרש כמין חומר. See J. Perles, *REJ* III (1881) 109ff., Bacher, *Terminologie* I.61f.

62 Lauterbach, *op. cit.* pp. 294ff.

63 *MdeRSbY* on Ex. xvii.8. *MdeRI* ascribes the teaching to 'others', the Talmud (B. *Bek.* 5[b]) to R. Joshua. R. Eliezer (or Eleazar) contends that 'Rephidim' is to be taken simply as a place name, כמשמעו.

64 *In Ex. hom.* XI.1, *in Num. hom.* XXVII.12.

65 *Ep.* LXXVIII.13 (*PL* XXII.706f., *CSEL* LV.62.18f.).

66 Origen *Sel. in Ex.* xxi. 6, θεοὺς δὲ τοὺς κριτὰς ὀνομάζουσι (so Theodoret *Qu. VIII in Dt.*, Schol. on Syro-Hex. Ex. xxii.9(8)). *MdeRSbY* on Ex. xxii.27f. (Dorshe Reshumoth), cf. *MdeRI* on Ex. xxi.6, *Midr. Ps.* lxxxii.1, etc. So taken by Onqelos and Peshitta. Contrast Philo, *Qu. in Ex.* II.5.

67 *In Ex. hom.* VII.1 (*GCS* VI.205.7-19). See above, p. 77.

68 *MdeRI* and *MdeRSbY ad loc.* Both Origen and the Rabbis quote the same verse, Prov. iii.18, in support. It is significant that Philo (*Post. Cain.* 45(156f.), *Congr.* 29(166)) has a different exposition of this passage.

69 Investigation along these lines was pioneered by D. Kaufmann, in his article 'Sens et origine des symboles tumulaires de l'Ancien Testament dans l'art chrétien primitif', *REJ* XIV (1887), 33-48, 217-53. For a review of more recent work on the subject, see M. Simon's Postscript to his *Verus Israel*[2] (1964). Simon points out (p. 481) that as yet we have no Jewish paintings which are certainly earlier than the earliest Christian ones.

70 The intricacies and uncertainties of the comparative study of liturgy are not understated in C. W. Dugmore: *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office* (1944) and E. Werner: *The Sacred Bridge* (1959). See also O. S. Rankin, *JJS* I (1948-9), 27-32.

71 Justin, *Dial.* cx.3.

72 *Gen. R.* LIII.3, *Ex. R.* XVI.2, cf. *Num. R.* VIII.9, XVIII.15. In B. *Ber.* 57[a] the same point is made in the interpretation of dreams (but a 'choice vine' suggests the Messiah, see Gen. xlix.11).

73 Jerome *in Zach.* I.iv.2ff. (*PL* XXV.1442, *CC* LXXVIA.778f.).

74 B. *Ber.* 24[a], see Lauterbach, *JQR* NS I (1910-11), 307ff.

75 P. Borgen, *Bread from Heaven,* B. J. Malina, *The Palestinian*

Manna Tradition, G. Vermes, 'He is the Bread', in *Neotestamentica et Semitica* (M. Black Jubilee Volume).

76 *MdeRI* on Ex. xvi.15 and xvi.31 (Laut. ii.114, 123). Cf. B. *Yoma* 75^{b}, where the manna is also said to whiten the sins of Israel, and where it is called 'the bread of the angels' by R. Akiba.

77 *MdeRI* on Ex. xv.2 and 13 (Laut. ii.22 and 70).

78 E.g. J. *RH* iii.8, 59^{a}, *Lam. R.* Proem II, *Gen. R.* XCVIII.12. See also G. Vermes, 'The Torah is a Light', *VT* VIII(1958), 436-8.

79 *Gen. R.* LXX.8, 9. For a similar example, three parallel interpretations of Cant. ii.12, attributed to R. Johanan, see Urbach, *SH* XXII (1971), 269.

80 E.g. WATER: *In Gen. hom.* VII.5 (*GCS* VI.75f.), *ibid.* XIII.2 (*GCS* VI.115.1ff.), *in Ex. hom.* VII.1 (*GCS* VI.205.7ff.), cf. *in Ex. hom.* IV.6 (*GCS* VI.177f.), XI.3 (*GCS* VI.254.26). WELL: *Sel. in Gen.* xxiv.62 (*PG* XII.120A), cf. *ibid.* xxvi.19 (*PG* XII.121C), *in Gen. hom.* VII.6 (*GCS* VI.76.24), *in Num. hom.* XII.1, *in Joh.* fr.55 (*GCS* IV.528f.). RAIN: *In Lev. hom.* XVI.2 (*GCS* VI.494.20ff.). DEW: *In Jud. hom.* VIII.4, cf. Eusebius *in Ps.* lxvii.8 (*PG* XXIII.1103), *Sel. in Isa.* xxii.10f. (*PG* XXIV.248-9), xli.17f. (*PG* XXIV.380-1), xlix.10 (*PG* XXIV.436).

81 *In Ex. hom.* V.5, cf. *in Num. hom.* XII.1 (*GCS* VII.97.20), 'Moysen autem legem accipi debere saepe ostendimus'.

82 *In Ex. hom.* II.4 (*GCS* VI.160.10), III.2 (*GCS* VI.165.3ff.), IV.6 (*GCS* VI.177.8), V.4 (*GCS* VI.188.11), *in Num. hom.* VI.4 (*GCS* VII.36.6), XII.1 (*GCS* VII.97.20), *in Cant.* II (*GCS* VIII.118.1).

83 E.g. *in Ex. hom.* IV.6 (*GCS* VI.177.11).

84 *Dial.* lxxxvi.

85 See E. Dinkler, *Signum Crucis*, and G. J. Ormann, *Kiryat Sefer* XLIII (1967-8), 583f.

86 *Sel. ad loc.* (*PG* XIII.801A). See above, p. 25 and n. 87. On *tau* as the seal of God see *Zohar* Genesis, Proem 2^{b}.

87 *In Gen. hom.* VIII.6 (*GCS* VI.81.6).

88 *Gen. R.* LVI.3.

89 See above, p. 82.

90 E.g. *in Ex. hom.* VII.5 (*GCS* VI.211.13), VII.8 (p. 214.20,24), XI.3 (p. 254.25), *in Joh.* X.xvii(13) (*GCS* IV.187.34, 188.4f.,14)

91 See P. Borgen, *Bread from Heaven.*

92 See above, p. 114, and E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols, passim.*

93 See pp. 93f.
94 *In Num. hom.* XII.1 (*GCS* VII.95ff.).
95 E.g. *Qu. in Gen.* I.20.
96 See the discussion in *Cels.* I. 24f., and cf. *Sel. in Gen.* xvii.5 (*PG* XII.116), *in Num. hom.* XXV.3 (*GCS* VII.235.19ff.), XXVII.5 (p.262),13 (pp. 279f.), *in Jos. hom.* XIII.2 (*GCS* VII.372), XXIII.4 (p. 445.10), *in Joh.* VI.xl-xli (GCS IV.150.1ff.), *de Orat.* xxiv.2, *Mart. Exh.* xlvi.
97 See J. Tate, 'Plato and Allegorical Interpretation', *CQ* XXIII (1929), 142-54.
98 See above, pp. 16f.
99 *Cels.* IV.34 (*GCS* I.304.30ff.).
100 E.g. *in Cant. hom.* I.6 (Kedar) (*GCS* VIII.38.2).
101 *In Ex. hom.* V.2 (*GCS* VI.185.17), cf. *in Gen. hom.* XII.4.
102 A homiletical commentary on the Pentateuch and Five Scrolls by Tobias ben Eliezer of Castoria (late eleventh century).
103 Only the commentaries on Genesis and Exodus survive. By Menahem ben Solomon (1139).
104 A thirteenth-century Yemenite compilation of Amoraic comments on the Pentateuch, now attributed to David ben Amram of Aden.
105 *MdeRI* on Ex. xii.37.
106 See above, p. 113.
107 *Ruth R.* II.5, *Gen. R.* XLII.5.
108 E.g. Abraham, *πατὴρ ἐκλεκτὸς τῆς ἠχοῦς* (*Cels.* V.45), cf. Philo *Gig.* 14(64), *Cher.* 2(7), *Mut. Nom.* 9(66), *Qu. in Gen.* III.43. Hannah, *χάρις* (*in Mt.* XII.31 (*GCS* X.138.28f.), cf. *in Gen. hom.* XI.2, *in I Regn. hom.* I.5, *gratia*), cf. Philo *Ebr.* 36(145), *Mut. Nom.* 25(143), *Somn.* I.43(254), *Quod Deus* 2(5). Balaam, *μάταιος λαός* (*Sel. in Num.* xxiv.1, cf. *in Num. hom.* XIV.4 (*GCS* VII.126) *populus uanus*), cf. Philo *Cher.* 10(32). Edom, *terrenus* (*in Ex. hom.* VI.8, cf. Pamphilus, *Apol.* (*PG* XII.1215C) *terrigeni*), cf. Philo *γήϊνος*, *Quod Deus* 30(144), *Qu. in Gen.* IV.171.
109 E.g. *Ἀμορραῖοι*: Philo *λαλοῦντες* (*Leg. All.* III.82(232), *Quis Heres* 60(302)), Origen *in amaritudinem adducentes uel loquentes* (*in Num. hom.* XII.4 (*GCS* VII.104), cf. *in Jos. hom.* XIV.2, *amarascentes, Ibid.* XXIV.1, *amarus uel amaritudo*). *Βαθουηλ*: Philo *θυγάτηρ θεοῦ* (*Fug.* 9(50f.), cf. *Qu. in Gen.* IV.97, 243), Origen *ἔνοικον θεοῦ ἢ θυγάτηρ θεοῦ* (*Sel. in Gen.* xxii.20ff.). *Ραγουηλ*: Philo *ποιμασία θεοῦ* (*Mut. Nom.* 17(105)),

Origin φίλος ἰσχυρὸς ἡ ποιμα(ν)σία θεοῦ (*Sel. in Gen.* xxv.1). Φινεες: Philo στόματος φιμός (*Post. Cain.* 54(182)), Origen *oris obturatio uel ori parcens* (*in I Regn. hom.* I.6).

110 E.g. Βενιαμιν: Philo υἱὸς ἡμερῶν (*Mut. Nom.* 15(92f.), *Somn.* II.5(36)), Origen υἱὸς δεξιᾶς (*in Jer. hom.* XIX(XVIII).13 (*GCS* III.168) and fr. XI (p. 202)). Σαμουηλ: Philo τεταγμένος θεῷ (*Somn.* I.43(254), *Quod Deus* 2(5), 3(11), *Ebr.* 36(144), cf. *Migr. Abr.* 36(196), Origen *ibi ipse deus* (*in I Regn. hom.* I.5). Σηων: Philo διαφθείρων (*Leg. All.* III.81(228), 82(233), Origen *arbor infructuosa siue elatus* (*in Num. hom.* XII.4). Χαλεβ: Philo πᾶσα καρδία (*Mut. Nom.* 21(123)), Origen *quasi cor* (*in Jos. hom.* XVIII.2).

111 Although no doubt a certain facility could be developed with experience, and it is likely that, as Jerome says, Origen supplied the interpretations of New Testament names, which were not interpreted in any of his Jewish sources. This process can be seen at work in his explanation of the name John, *in Joh.* II.xxxiii (*GCS* IV.90.18ff.). Apart from one notable slip, when 'Zebedee' is interpreted 'thunder' (*in Mt. ser.* 141 (*GCS* XI.294), cf. Mark iii.17) Origen's NT interpretations are proficient and of a piece with his OT ones.

112 *Ant.* V.52(200f.).

113 *In Cant.*, prol. (*GCS* VIII.82.1,3), cf. *in Cant. hom.* I.1 (p. 28.10).

114 'He was called Barak because his face was like lightning', *Yalquṭ Shim'oni, Judges* 42. 'There were two haughty women, and both have unpleasant names; one is called 'Bee' (Deborah), the other 'Weasel' (Huldah)', B. *Meg.* 14[a].

115 Στόμα ἐκθλῖβον, *Post. Cain.* 16(55).

116 *Os defectionis uel os abyssi, in Ex. hom.* I.5 (*GCS* VI.152.17).

117 B. *Soṭah* 11[a], *Exod. R.* I.10.

118 For *TM* = *defectio*, ἔκλειψις cf. Θαμαν: ἐκλειψις αὐτῶν (*Sel. in Gen.* xxv.1), Thamna: *defectio commota* (*in Num. hom.* XIX.1), Philo ἔκλειψις σαλευομένη, Congr. 12(60)).

119 See J. Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia* II(1966) chapters 4 and 6; on Rab see also above, p. 28.

120 *In Jos. hom.* XX.6 *responsio dei* (Procopius ἀπόκριοις θεοῦ).

121 *In Jud. hom.* III.2 (*GCS* VII.482.23) *tempus mihi deus* or *dei* (Procopius καιρός μοι θεοῦ).

122 B. *Tem.* 16[a], cf. *Yalquṭ Shim'oni, Joshua* 27.

123 *In Jos. hom., ibid.*

124 *In Jos. hom.* XIV.2 (*GCS* VII.378.2); *inimicitiae.*
125 אוירבו של מקום, *Sekhel Ṭob* on Gen. xxxvi.33.
126 Joab is derived from אב, 'father', in *Gen. R.* XCIV.9.
127 On the confusion between אילוב and אוילב see B. *Nid.* 52[a,b] and Rashi on Job xxxix.1.
128 *Turris, in Ex. hom.* V.3 (*GCS* VI.186.25).
129 *Magnificentia, in Num. hom.* XXVII.9 (*GCS* VII.269.22).
130 *Mekilta* (both versions) on Ex. xiv.2.
131 See chapter 1 n. 25.
132 *Sel. in Gen.* xxv.1ff.
133 מצהיר כצהרים, *Sekhel Ṭob* on Gen. xlvi.10.
134 B. *Soṭah* 12[a].
135 E.g. Tarshish: *κατασκοπὴ εὐφροσύνης καὶ χαρᾶς* (*Sel. in Ps.* 1xxi.9 (*PG* XII.1524D), based on the common rabbinic technique of *noṭariqon,* from תור 'spy' and שש 'rejoice' or שמחה וששון 'gladness and joy'. This catena fragment has also been ascribed to Evagrius, but it is not unlikely to go back to Origen.
136 Doubtless there are others. On number symbolism see O. H. Lehmann, 'Number-symbolism as a Vehicle of Religious Experience in the Gospels, Contemporary Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls', *SP* IV.125-35.

Notes to chapter 10

1 See the bibliography, under Bardy, Ginzberg, Graetz, Krauss, Marmorstein, Murmelstein, Rahmer, and also the bibliographical study by É. Lamirande, *VC* XXI (1967), 1-11.
2 *Ep. ad Afr.* 4 (*PG* XI.56B).
3 *In Agg.* I (*PL* XXV.1389). According to Ephraem (*In Gen.,* Ben. I.15 BC, Tonneau I.20) God did not praise the second day because it was not complete; He waited until the luminaries, etc. were created and then praised the whole of heaven. See Graetz, *MGWJ* III (1854), 316f., Ginzberg *MGWJ* XLIII (1899), 18, *Legends,* I.15 and n. 54 (V.18f.).
4 *Gen. R.* IV.6.
5 *Sel. in Gen.* ii.8 (*PG* XII.100A). Cf. Eusebius of Emesa *ad loc.,* in Devreesse, *ST* 201.59.
6 E.g. *Gen. R.* LVII.4 (*ad fin.*); *ibid.* LXI.4; *Mek.* on Ex. xii.37 (Laut. i.108); *Ruth R.* II.5.

7 *Gen. R.* XV.2.

8 That Eden was the centre of the world is implied, but not stated, in *Enoch* xxvi.1,2 (Charles thinks this refers to Jerusalem) Cf. *Jub.* viii.12,19. Rabbinic discussions on the site of Eden, B. *Erub.* 19[a], *Midr. Ps.* xxi.3. See Z. Vilnay, *Legends of Palestine* (1932) pp. 3, 7, 14, 23f., Ginzberg, *MGWJ* XLIII (1889), 68f., Krauss, *JQR* V (1892-3), 148, Rappaport, *Agada und Exegese* p. 69 (on Jos. *BJ* III.3.5(52)).

9 *Leg. All.* I.20(66) and *Qu. in Gen.* I.12 (on ii.10), *Leg. All.* I.24(74). It also differs from Josephus' etymology (*Ant.* I.1.3(38)) - see Rappaport, *Agada und Exegese* p. 2 and n. 11.

10 *Leg. All.* I.14(15).

11 *Cant. Z.* 1. Cf. Ephraem *ad loc.* (Tonneau II.6).

12 B. *Pes.* 54[a], *Ned.* 39[b].

13 *Gen. R.* XV.3, Ephraem *ad loc.* (Tonneau II.5). Besides the Greek and Aramaic versions (except the LXX), cf. IV Esdr. iii.6, Jerome *Heb. Qu. in Gen.* ii.8 (*PL* XXIII.940f., *CC* LXXII.4) (see Rahmer, *Die hebr. Trad.* I (1861), 17).

14 *Sel. in Gen.* ii.2 (*PG* XII.97BC), cf. *Cels.* VI.50, 60, *Princ.* IV.iii.1 (*GCS* V.323, *Philocalia* I.17, Robinson 24), *in Mt.* XIV.9. See Ginzberg, *Hagg. bei den Kirchenv.* II(1900) p. 24, *Legends* V.34(n. 98), *REJ* LXVII (1914) 148, Harnack *Kircheng. Ertrag* I.23.

15 *Op. M.* 3(13), cf. *Leg. All.* I.2,8(20). According to Procopius (*ad loc.*) some say that the six days refer not to time but to the special qualities of the number six, which symbolises perfection.

16 R. Judah and R. Nehemiah, *Gen. R.* XII.4; R. Jose b. Halafta and a *matrona, Tanh. B.* I.2 (p.2). See also *In Principio* (Paris, 1973), esp. the summing up by Ch. Touati, p. 306: 'Très rares sont les auteurs qui prennent au pied de la lettre les "Six Jours" de la Création. Une quasi-unanimité se dégage pour considérer cette consécution temporelle comme l'image d'un ordre idéal.'

17 *In Joh.* XIII.1(331) (*GCS* IV.278). See H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth* p. 274, 'perhaps derived from some rabbinic tradition'.

18 It is put forward by the Jew in both the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila* (fol. 79r) and the *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchaeus*(5), and perhaps also, if we may make the inference from its mention in Maximus' *contra Judaeos* (see Conybeare's introduction to his edition of the *Dial. Ath. et Zach.* p. xlii), in the *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus,* with which Origen was

acquainted. Cf. Tert. *adv. Prax.* xii, 'aut numquid angelis loquebatur, ut Iudaei interpretantur'. Procopius mentions it (*ad loc., PG* LXXXVII.113C), but only after a different interpretation which he ascribes to the Jews (*ib.* 108C).

19 Philo *Conf. Ling.* 33(168ff.), cf. *Op. M.* 24(72f.), *Fug. et Inv.* 13f.(68-71). See R. McL. Wilson, *SP* I.422f. Rabbis: *Gen. R.* VIII.4, 8, XVII.4, cf. B. *Sanh.* 38^{b} (R. Judah in the name of Rab), Ps. Jon. *ad loc.*, etc. But there was a strong rabbinic tendency, especially in arguments with Minim, to play down the plural verb. See also Moore, *Judaism* I.447. For some alleged discussions between Origen and R. Hoshaya (and Bar Kappara) on the creation-story, see Bacher, *JQR* III(1891), 358ff.

20 *In Gen. hom.* I.13.

21 *In Gen. hom.* III.1 (*GCS* VI.39.7), 'Iudaei quidem, sed et nostrorum nonnulli'.

22 On the treatment of biblical anthropomorphisms in the Targum, see Moore, *Judaism* I.420f. Philo (*Op. M.* 23(69)) warns strongly against an anthropomorphic interpretation of the verse.

23 *Op. M.* 46(134), cf. *Qu. in Gen.* I.3(on ii.7), *Leg. All.* I.12(31). See Wilson, *SP* I.435f.

24 *Gen. R.* XIV.3, cf. VIII.11. Schonfield, *According to the Hebrews* p. 116, associates this doctrine with the Jewish Christians.

25 E.g. *in Gen. hom.* I.13 (*GCS* VI.15ff.), *in Jer. hom.* I.10 (*GCS* III.8f.), *in Cant. prol.* (*GCS* VIII.64). See H. Crouzel, *Théologie de l'image de Dieu chez Origène* (Paris, 1956).

26 *Sifre Dt.* 323 (138^{b} Fr.), B. *Ber.* 40^{a} (*fin.*), *Sanh.* 70^{a} (*fin.*), *Gen. R.* XV.7, *Zohar* Gen.73^{a} etc. See Ginzberg, *MGWJ* XLIII(1899), 122f.

27 Origen *Sel. in Gen.* ix.20f. (*PG* XII.109C). Philo *Qu. in Gen.* I.11 (on ii.9).

28 E.g. III Baruch iv.8 (Charles II. 535n.).

29 *In Num. hom.* XI.4.

30 *Gen. R.* XVIII.4 (R. Phinehas and R. Hilkiah in the name of R. Simon). See Marmorstein, *EJ* I.977, Harnack, *Kircheng. Ertrag* I.47. Cf. Augustine *Civ. Dei* XVI.11 (see Wolfson, *Religious Philosophy* (1969) pp.229f.). Cf. *contra,* B. *Sanh.* 38^{b} (Rab Judah in the name of Rab): 'The first man spoke Aramaic'.

31 See Daniélou, *RechSR* XXXVIII (1951), 132ff. Cf. P. Winter, *ZAW* LXVII (1955), 292.

32 With *Cels.* III.6-8 compare *Cant. R.* iv.12.1 (Rab Huna in the name of Bar Kappara).

33 *In Mt. ser.* 126. The reference to Hebrews is found in a catena-fragment (fr. 551.II, *GCS* XII.225). This is an example of the tendency, well attested in the Palestinian Targums, to localise biblical events; what is remarkable is to find a Jewish topographical tradition Christianised at such an early date, before the great upsurge of interest in Christian topography under Constantine. It reappears in a number of later eastern Christian sources, e.g. Ethiopic Synaxarion for 3 Paguemen (*PO* IX.451: 'When Melchizedek was fifteen the Lord told Noah to send his son Sem with the body of Adam, to place it in the centre of the world, at Calvary. He showed him that the Saviour of the world would be sacrificed there and that he would redeem Adam with His blood.').

34 *Kircheng. Ertrag* II.47f. Ginzberg, however, thinks (*MGWJ* XLIII(1899), 19) that a Jewish origin is likely, and mentions *P. de R. El.* xi (cf. *Zohar* Gen. 57^{b}). Cf. Vilnay, *Legends of Palestine* p. 23, and, on the rabbinic tradition that Adam was created from dust from the future site of the altar, R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam* (Oxford, 1966) pp. 51f.

35 *In Eph.* III (on v.14) (*PL* XXVII.526). Cf. Paula and Eustochium, *Ep. ad Marc.* (= Jerome *Ep.* XLVI.3, *PL* XXII. 485, *CSEL* LIV.332), Epiphan. *Haer.* xlvi.5 (*PG* XLI.844f.), etc. Epiphanius says he found it in 'books'; Bardy (*Rev. Bén.* XLVI (1934), 162f.) suggests Origen's commentary on Ephesians. Ambrose (*in Lk.* X.114 (*PL* XV.1832, *CSEL* XXXII.498) attributes it to 'Hebrews', but this might mean simply that he found it in Origen.

36 *In Mt.* IV (on xxvii.33) (*PL* XXVI.209, *CC* LXXVII.270), *de Loc. s.v.* 'Arboc' (*PL* XXIII.862, *GCS* Euseb.III.7) (the reference to Adam is an addition by Jerome), *Heb. Qu. in Gen.* xxiii.2 (*PL* XXIII.972B, *CC* LXXII.28). Cf. B. *Erub.* 53^{a}, *Gen. R.* LVIII. See Ginzberg, *MGWJ* XLIII (1899) p. 70, Vilnay, *Legends of Palestine* 170f.

37 J. P. Lewis, *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (1968) p. 15.

38 *Ibid.* pp. 13f.

39 *Gen. R.* XXX.9.

40 Orig. *in Num. hom.* IX.1 (*GCS* VII.56.1-4), Jerome *Heb. Qu. in Gen.* vi.9 (*PL* XXIII.997, *CC* LXXII.10). See Ginzberg, *Die Haggadah* II (1900) p. 78, Rahmer, *Die hebr. Trad.* I (1861) 23f., Lewis, *Noah and the Flood* p. 159.

41 *Abr.* 7(36).

42 Compare the rabbinic speculation as to whether the ראם, a huge mythical beast, was among the animals in the ark, *Gen. R.* XXXI.13, B. *Zeb.* 113^{b}. The authorities mentioned are mostly mid-second-century Tannaim.

43 *In Gen. hom.* II.2, with Greek fragments (*GCS* VI.28f.).

44 But cf. *Gen. R.* XXXI.10.

45 *Qu. in Gen.* II.5 (on vi.15f.).

46 Especially the refuse in the hold, for which see *Gen. R.* XXXI.11. Cf. B. *Sanh.* 108^{b} (a baraitha), where Noah is likewise at the top, the animals beneath him. The Rabbis distinguish clean from unclean, rather than dangerous from tame, animals.

47 See *Qu. in Gen.* II.7 (on v.16). The details are not the same as in Origen, but the comparison between the ark and the human body (*Ib.* II.1) may be behind Origen's account. The *Book of Adam and Eve* (iii.2, cf. Hippolytus, *GCS* I.ii.87; for other references see Lewis, *Noah and the Flood* p. 36 n. 2) has three stories, animals, including ostriches, at the bottom, then birds and reptiles, finally Noah and his family at the top.

48 *Sel. in Gen.* vi.11f., cf. *Gen. R.* XXXI.12, *ibid.* XXXIV.7, B. *Sanh.* 108^{b}, *Tanh. B.* Noah 17, etc. See Ginzberg, *Die Haggadah* II (1900), 81f. (*MGWJ* XLIII (1899), 415), *Legends* V.188 (n. 54), Belkin, *JQR 75th anniversary vol.*, 98f.

49 *Qu. in Gen.* II.49 (on viii.18). See P. Wendland, *Neu entdeckte Fragmente Philos* (Berlin, 1891) pp. 110f.

50 Julius Africanus *Chron.* 4 (*PG* X.68), Hippolytus on Gen. vii.6 (*GCS* I.ii.88). Cf. Ephraem *in Gen.* (Ben. I.150C), *Book of Adam and Eve* iii.8 and 11, etc.

51 But the legend that Noah's vine came out of Eden (Ps.-Jon. Gen. ix.20, *P. de R. El.* xxiii) seems to be later.

52 *Sel. in Gen.* ix.18 (*PG* XII.108), see Barthélemy, 'Est-ce Hoshaya Rabba...' p. 72.

53 *Qu. in Gen.* II.65. See Wendland, *Fragmente* pp. 111f.

54 *Leg. All.* II.16(62).

55 Cf. *Qu. in Gen.* II.77, *Virt.* 37(202).

56 *Sobr.* 2(6), *Qu. in Gen.* II.74. Cf. *Gen. R.* XXXVI.7, Ps.-Jon. Gen. ix.24.

57 *Ant.* I.4.1 (109). Most Jewish sources make Japheth the eldest, Shem the youngest (see Ginzberg, *Legends* V.180(n. 30), *MGWJ* XLIII (1899), 467), and Origen is quite exceptional in following the biblical order. Philo says (*Qu. in Gen.* II.79) that the order is immaterial.

58 *Gen. R.* XXXVI.7. See Graetz, *MGWJ* III(1854), 317, Ginzberg, *MGWJ* XLIII (1899), 463f.

59 *Dial.* cxxxix. Origen does not seem to have known this interpretation, else presumably he would not have given his own, highly artificial explanation. Ephraem (*in Gen.* VI.3 (Tonneau) records both explanations.

60 *Gen. R., ibid.* see Ginzberg *ibid.* p. 462.

61 *Sel. in Gen.* xii.8 (*PG* XII.133). See Harnack *Kircheng. Ertrag* I.24, Rappaport *Agada und Exegese* no. 101 (p. 23).

62 For some rabbinic answers see *Gen. R.* LXXXIX.6, *Tanh. ad loc.* Rappaport (*ibid.* n. 114 p. 111) cites *Midr.Ha-Gadol* on Gen. xli.15 (Schechter p. 625) etc.

63 Ant. II.5.4 (75). See Rappaport *ibid.* p. 23.

64 *Sel. in Gen.* xli.43 (*PG* XII.133D). Cf. Jerome *Heb. Qu. ad loc.* (*PL* XXIII.998, *CC* LXXII.47).

65 *Gen. R.* XC.3, cf. *Sifre Dt.* 1.

66 Onqelos, in common with the Peshitta and Rashi, has 'father of the king' (cf. B. *BB* 4[a]), but the Jerusalem Targum, Ps.-Jonathan and Neofiti conflate the two versions.

67 Cf. Ibn Ezra *ad loc.*

68 *Sel. in Gen.* xii.45 (*PG* XII.136A, *Cat. Nic.* i.462).

69 'Ονειροκρίτης (see *Cat. Nic.* ad loc.). In *Mut. Nom.* 15 (91) Philo explains it as *ἐν ἀποκρίσει στόμα κρῶον*.

70 Jos. *Ant.* II.6.1(91), *κρυπτῶν εὑρετής* (see Rappaport, *Agada und Exegese* no. 102, p. 23, and n. 115 p. 111). Symmachus *κεκρυμμένα ἀπεκάλυψε* (*Cat. Nic.*). So also R. Johanan (*Gen. R.* XC.4) and others, צפונות מופיע.

71 *Num. hom.* XXV.3 (*GCS* VII.236), 'cognominauit eum Psonthomphanec, quod lingua sua Pharao de secretorum uel somniorum reuelatione composuit'.

72 Onq. גברא דמטמרין גלין ליה, Neof. גברא דטמירתא גליו ליה. See also Ginzberg *Legends* V.345 n. 187, Rahmer *'Qu. in Gen.'* no. 39 p. 51.

73 *Sel. ibid.* (*PG* XII.136AB, *Cat. Nic.* i.463). Cf. Jerome *Heb. Qu. ad loc.* (*PL* XXIII.995, *CC* LXXII.45). Harnack *Kircheng. Ertrag* I.24.

74 *Gen. R.* LXXXVI.3 (anon.), B. *Sotah* 13[b] (Rab).
75 *Jub.* xl.10, *Test. Jos.* xviii.3, etc. See Ginzberg *Legends* V.337 nn. 100, 101.
76 See Ginzberg *Legends* V.345 n. 189. Cf. Krauss *JQR* V(1892-3), 148-51.
77 For an example of a Joseph-midrash in Greek, see Milne, *Catalogue of Literary Papyri in the British Museum* nos. 226 and 227 (6th or 7th C. MS).
78 See M. Philonenko, *Joseph et Aseneth* (Leiden, 1968) p. 39 and pp. 129f. (n.). Philonenko does, however, see (pp. 38f.) a connexion between *Joseph and Aseneth* and the *Prayer of Joseph* quoted by Origen.
79 *In Ex. hom.* V.5 (*GCS* VI.190.1). See Krauss, *JQR* V (1892-3), 151f.
80 Euseb. *in Ps.* lxxvii.13 (*PG* XXIII.913), Φασὶ γοῦν Εβραίων παῖδες. For the expression, cf. Orig. *in Mt.* XV.5 (*GCS* X.360.12), *in Jerem. hom.* XIII.2 (*GCS* III.103.20).
81 *Mek.* on Ex. xiv.6 (Laut. i.220) (R. Eleazar b. Judah of Kfar Tota, who, like Origen, quotes Ps. cxxxvi.13) and again *ibid.* (Laut. i.224) (the ten miracles). Cf. *Gen. R.* LXXXIV.8.
82 *Deut. R.* XI.10.
83 Ps.-Jon. Ex. xiv.21.
84 See *Dura Final Report* VIII, Part I, pp. 85 (cf. p. 81) and 352ff.
85 *Sel. ad loc.* (*PG* XII.288CD).
86 *Mek. ad loc.* (Laut. i.202f.).
87 Pp. 113ff.
88 *In Ex. hom.* V.1 (*GCS* VI.183.17ff.). Cf. *in Ex. hom.* VII.3 (*GCS* VI.208.2ff.), IX.1 (*GCS* VI.234.21ff.).
89 See above, p. 121.
90 P. 113, cf. p. 77.
91 See pp. 93f.
92 See p. 82.
93 See Daniélou, *Sacramentum Futuri* pp. 183f., 195f., Hanson, *Allegory and Event* p. 252.
94 *Ex. hom.* V.1. See J. Guillet, 'Le thème de la Marche au desert dans l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament', *RechSR* XXXVI (1949), 161-81.
95 *Sel. in Num.* xxii.4 (*PG* XII.577B).
96 See *Num. R.* XX.4: 'Just as an ox's strength is in his mouth, so too their strength is in their mouth... as an ox gores with his horns, so they gore with their prayers'. Cf. *Mek.* on Ex. xiv.10

(Laut. i.207): 'Just as the worm has nothing but its mouth with which to smite the cedar, so Israel have nothing but prayer.'

97 *In Num. hom.* XIII.5, *in Ex. hom.* XI.4, *in Jos. hom.* XVI.5. See Harnack, *Kircheng. Ertrag* I.28, Krauss *JQR* V (1892-3), 153. Some Christian scholars have played down the importance of this aggadic borrowing (Cadiou, *La Jeunesse d'Origène* p. 60, Bardy *RB* XXXIV (1925), 233).

98 *Sel. in Num.* xxii.22 (PG XII.580). On the figure of Balaam, especially in *in Num. hom.* XIII and XIV, see Urbach, *Tarbiz* XXV (1956), 272-89.

99 *Die Haggadah* IV (*Freidus Mem. Vol.*, 1929), 511.

100 *Ex. R.* II.3, *Tanh. B. Wayyesheb* 17. See Ginzberg *Legends* V.334 n. 86.

101 See p. 42, and Daniélou, *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme* ch. 5 (Eng. ch. 4), W. Lüken, *Der Erzengel Michael* (Marburg, 1898).

102 *Sel. in Num.* xx.10 (*PG* XII.577B). The same explanation is mentioned by Theodoret and Aphraates.

103 *Die Haggadah* IV.517, *Legends* V.362 n. 345. See also Rappaport, *Agada und Exegese,* addendum to n. 184 (p. 139).

104 p. 47.

105 'The Ascension of Phinehas', *PAAJR* XXII (1953) 91-114.

106 *LAB* XXVIII.1. See Spiro *ibid.* p. 113.

107 *In I Regn. hom.* I.7 (*GCS* VIII.12). On Origen's alleged knowledge of Ps.-Philo see ch. 2 n. 21. It is noteworthy that Ps.-Philo (XLVIII) does not mention Elijah by name (see James *ad loc.* (p. 210), Spiro *ibid.* p. 102).

108 *Ep. ad Afr.* 7f. See p. 54.

109 See pp. 29ff.

110 Pp. 25-7.

111 See p. 43.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A complete bibliography of a subject such as this would be a monumental undertaking. All that is attempted here is a list of the principal works bearing on the subject, including those cited in an abbreviated form in the notes. For further bibliographical information, recourse may be had to the following:

Crouzel, H. *Bibliographie critique d'Origène* (Instrumenta Patristica VIII). The Hague, 1971. (*To 1969*)

Farina, R. *Bibliografia Origeniana 1960-1970* (Biblioteca del 'Salesianum' 77). 1971.

Lamirande, É. 'Étude bibliographique sur les pères de l'Église et l'aggadah', *VC* XXI (1967) 1-11.

Abel, F.-M. *Histoire de la Palestine depuis la conquête d'Alexandre jusqu'à l'invasion arabe.* 2 vols. Paris, 1952.

Alon, G. *Meḥqarim be-Toldot Yisrael* (*Studies in Jewish History*), 2 vols. Tel Aviv, 1957.

– *Toldot ha- Yehudim be-Ereṣ Yisrael bi-Tequfat ha-Mishnah ve-ha-Talmud* (3rd edn.) 2 vols. Tel Aviv, 1958.

Avi-Yonah, M. *Bi-Yemei Roma u-Vizanṭion.* 2nd edn. Jerusalem, 1952. *Geschichte der Juden im Zeitalter des Talmud, in den Tagen von Rom und Byzanz* (Studia Judaica II). Berlin, 1962.

Bacher, W. *Die Agada der babylonischen Amoräer.* Strassburg, 1878. (2nd edn. Frankfurt, 1913).

– *Die Agada der Tannaiten,* 2 vols. Strassburg, 1884-90. 'The Church Father Origen and R. Hoshaya', *JQR* III (1890-1) 357-60.

– *Die Agada der palästinensischen Amoräer,* 3 vols. Strassburg, 1892-9.

– *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditions- literatur,* 2 vols:
I. *Die bibelexegetische Terminologie der Tannaiten.* Leipzig, 1899.
II. *Die bibel- und traditionsexegetische Terminologie der Amoräer.* Leipzig, 1905.

Baehrens, W. A. *Überlieferung und Textgeschichte der lateinisch Erhaltenen Origeneshomilien zum alten Testament* (*TU* XLII.1). Leipzig, 1916.

Baer, Y. 'Israel, the Christian Church, and the Roman Empire from the Time of Septimius Severus to the Edict of Toleration of AD 313', Hebrew in *Zion* XXI (1956) 1-49, English in *SH* VII (1961) 79-149.

Bammel, E. 'Origen *Contra Celsum* i.41 and the Jewish Tradition', *JTS* NS XIX (1968) 211-3.

Bardy, G. 'Les traditions juives dans l'oeuvre d'Origène', *RB* XXXIV (1925) 217-52.
– 'Saint Jérôme et ses maîtres hébreux', *Rev. Bén.* XLVI (1934) 145-64.
– 'Aux origines de l'école d'Alexandrie', *RechSR* XXVII (1937) 65-90.
Barthélemy, D. 'Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire des LXX', *RB* LX (1953) 18-30.
– *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (*VT* suppl.X). Leyden, 1963.
– 'Est-ce Hoshaya Rabba qui censura le "commentaire allégorique"?' *Colloques Nationaux du CNRS, 'Philon d'Alexandrie'* (Lyons, 1966). Paris, 1967.
– 'Origène et le texte de l'Ancien Testament', in *Epektasis. Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou* (Paris, 1972) 247-61.
Bell, H. I. *Jews and Christians in Egypt.* London, 1924.
Biet, F. J. *Essai historique et critique sur l'école juive d'Alexandrie.* Paris, 1854.
Bigg, C. *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria.* Oxford, 1886. (2nd edn. 1913).
Blanchetière, F. 'Aux sources de l'anti-judaïsme chrétien', *RHPR* LIII (1973) 354-98.
Bloch, R. 'Note méthodologique pour l'étude de la littérature rabbinique', *RechSR* XLIII (1955) 194-227.
Bonsirven, J. 'Exégèse allégorique chez les Rabbins Tannaïtes', *RechSR* XXIII (1933) 515-41, XXIV (1934) 35-46.
Bordes, G. *L'apologétique d'Origène d'après le Contre Celse.* Cahors, 1900.
Borgen, P. *Bread from Heaven* (*NT* Suppl. X). Leyden, 1965.
Bousset, W. *Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Röm.* Göttingen, 1915.
Brand, J. 'Concerning Greek culture in Palestine during the Talmudic Period' (in Hebrew), *Tarbiẓ* XXXVIII (1968-9) 13-17.
Brock, S. P. 'Origen's aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament', *SP* X (1970) 215-8.
Büchler, A. 'Über die Minim von Sepphoris und Tiberias im zweiten und dritten Jh.', *Judaica* (H. Cohen Festschrift, 1912) 271-95 (English in *Studies in Jewish History* (1956) 245-74).
Burkitt, F. C. *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila.* Cambridge, 1897.
– 'Aquila', *JQR* X(1898) 207-16.
Cadiou, R. 'Origène et les "Reconnaissances clémentines" ', *RechSR* XX (1930) 506-28.
– *Introduction au système d'Origène.* Paris, 1932.
– 'Dictionnaires antiques dans l'oeuvre d'Origène', *REG* XLV (1932) 271-85.
– *La jeunesse d'Origène.* Paris, 1935.
Capelle, B. 'Fragments du psautier d'Aquila', *Rev. Bén.* XXVIII (1911) 64-8.
Chadwick, H. *Origen: Contra Celsum.* Cambridge, 1953.
– 'The Evidences of Christianity in the apologetic of Origen', *SP* II, 331-9.
– 'Rufinus and the Tura Papyrus of Origen's Commentary on Romans', *JTS* NS X (1959) 10-42.
– *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition.* Oxford, 1966.
Charles, R. H. (ed.) *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English.* 2 vols. Oxford, 1913.
Crouzel, H. *Origène et la connaissance mystique.* Paris, 1961.
– 'Origène et le sens littéral dans ses "Homélies sur l'Hexateuque" ', *BLE* LXX (1969) 241-263.

Cumont, Fr. *Lux Perpetua.* Paris, 1949.
Daniélou, J. *Origène.* Paris, 1948. (English: London, 1955).
– *Sacramentum Futuri.* Paris, 1950 (English: London, 1960).
– 'Les sources juives de la doctrine des anges des nations chez Origène', *RechSR* XXXVIII (1951) 132-7.
– 'Origène comme exégète de la Bible', *SP* I, 280-90.
– 'Origène', *DB* Suppl. VI (Paris, 1960) 884-908.
– *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme.* Tournai, 1958. (English: London, 1964).
Daube, D. 'Origen and the Punishment of Adultery in Jewish Law', *SP* II (1957) 109-13.
– 'Alexandrian methods of interpretation and the Rabbis', in *Festschrift H. Lewald* (Basle, 1953).
Deissmann, A. 'The Greek Transcriptions of the Tetragrammaton', *Bible Studies* (1909) 319-36.
Devreesse, R. 'Chaînes exégétiques grecques', *DB* suppl. I. 1120ff.
– *Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois (Fragments tirés des chaînes)* (ST 201). Vatican, 1959.
– *Les anciens commentateurs grecs des Psaumes* (*ST* 264). Vatican, 1970.
Dinkler, E. *Signum Crucis.* Tübingen, 1967.
Eissfeldt, O. *The Old Testament, an Introduction.* English: Oxford, 1965.
Elliott, C.J. 'Hebrew Learning among the Fathers', *DCB* II. 850-72.
Emerton, J.A. 'Were Greek Transliterations of the Hebrew OT read by Jews before the time of Origen?', *JTS* NS XXI (1970) 17-31.
Field, F. (ed.) *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt,* 2 vols. Oxford, 1875.
Frankel, Z. *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik.* Leipzig, 1851.
Frey, J. B. *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum,* 2 vols. Vatican, 1936-52.
Fuchs, L. *Die Juden Ägyptens.* Vienna, 1924.
Gaster, M. *The Samaritans.* London, 1925.
Gerhardsson, B. *Memory and Manuscript.* Uppsala, 1961.
Ghedini, G. *Lettere cristiane dai papiri del III° e IV° secolo.* Milan, 1923.
Ginzberg, L. *Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern und in der apokryphischen Literatur:*
I. *Die Haggada in den pseudo-hieronymianischen 'Quaestiones'.* Amsterdam, 1899.
II. (Genesis) In *MGWJ* XLII (1898) and XLIII (1899), also published separately (Berlin, 1900).
III. (Exodus) *Livre d'hommage à la memoire du Dr Samuel Poznánski* (Warsaw, 1927) 199-216.
IV. (Numbers and Deuteronomy) *Studies in Jewish Bibliography and related Subjects in Memory of A. S. Freidus* (New York, 1929) 503-14.
– *The Legends of the Jews.* 6 vols. Philadelphia, 1909-28. (And Index by Boaz Cohen, 1938.)
Goodenough, E. R. *By Light, Light.* New Haven, 1935.
– *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period,* 13 vols. New York, 1953-68.
Grabar, A. 'Recherches sur les sources juives de l'art paléochrétien', *Cahiers Archéologiques* XI (1960), 41ff.
Graetz, H. *Geschichte der Juden,* 11 vols. Leipzig, 1853-76 (various revised edns. since. English, 5 vols., 1891-2).

– 'Hagadische Elemente bei den Kirchenvätern', *MGWJ* III(1854) and IV(1855).
– 'Hillel, der Patriarchensohn', *MGWJ* XXX (1881) 433-43.
Guéraud, O. and P. Nautin. 'Origène et le rite de la dédicace de l'Agneau Pascal', *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* LX (1960) 1-8.
Hanson, R. P. C. *Origen's Doctrine of Tradition.* London, 1954.
– 'The Interpretation of Hebrew Place-names in Origen', *VC* X (1956) 103-23.
– *Allegory and Event.* London, 1959.
Harduf, D. M. *Millon u-Mafteaḥ le-Midreshei ha-Shemot ha-Tenakhiyim ba-Aggadah* (*Dictionary and Key to the Exegesis of Biblical Proper Names in the Talmud and Midrash*). Tel Aviv, 1960.
– *Yalquṭ ha-Shemot ha-Praṭiyim sheba-Tanakh u-Midrasheihem* (*Biblical Proper Names*). Tel Aviv, 1964.
Harl, M. 'La mort salutaire de Pharaon selon Origène', *SMSR* XXXVIII (1967) 260-8.
– *La Chaîne palestinienne sur le Psaume 118* (*SC* 189-90). Paris, 1972.
Harnack, A. von. *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten,* 5th edn. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1924.
– *Der kirchengeschichtliche Ertrag der exegetischen Arbeiten des Origenes,* 2 parts (*TU* XLII.3 and 4). Leipzig, 1918-19.
Heinemann, I. *Altjüdische Allegoristik.* Breslau, 1936.
Herford, H. Travers. *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash.* London, 1903.
Hersman, A. Bates. *Studies in Greek Allegorical Interpretation.* Chicago, 1906.
Hody, H. *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus.* Oxford, 1705.
Honeyman, A. M. 'A Tannaitic Term for Christians', *JQR* NS XXXVIII (1947-8) 151-5.
Huet, P. D. *Origeniana.* Rouen, 1668. (Republished in collected works of Origen: Delarue vol. IV, *PG* XVII and Lom. XXII-XXIV.)
Juster, J. *Les Juifs dans l'Empire romain,* 2 vols. Paris, 1914.
Kämpf, J. 'Genealogisches und Chronologisches bezüglich der Patriarchen aus dem Hillel'schen Hause bis auf Rabbi Jehuda ha-Nasi, Redacteur der Mischna', *MGWJ* I (1852) 201-7, 231-6.
Kahle, P. 'Die in August 1952 entdeckte Lederrolle mit dem griechischen Text der Kleinen Propheten und das Problem der Septuaginta'. *ThLZ* LXXIX (1954), 81-94 (English in *Opera Minora* (1956) 112-37).
– *The Cairo Geniza,* 2nd edn. Oxford, 1959.
– 'The Greek Bible Manuscripts used by Origen', *JBL* LXXIX (1960) 111-18 (German in *SP* IV (1961) 107-117).
Katz, P. 'The OT Canon in Palestine and Alexandria', *ZNW* XLVII (1956) 191-217.
Kittel, G. 'Zur Abstammung des Origenes', *ZNW* XXXVI (1937) 157.
– 'Die Abstammung der Mutter des Origenes (die Geschichte eines genealogischen Irrtums)', *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* III (Hamburg, 1938) 235f.
Kraeling, C. H. *The Excavations at Dura-Europos.* Final Report VIII, pt.I, *The Synagogue.* New Haven, 1956.
Krauss, S. 'The Jews in the Works of the Church Fathers', *JQR* V (1892-3) 122-57, VI (1893-4) 82-99.
– 'Zur Topographie von Caesarea', *JQR* XIV (1902) 745-51.
Lachs, S. T. 'Rabbi Abbahu and the Minim', *JQR* NS LX (1969-70) 197-212.
Lauterbach, J. Z. 'The Ancient Jewish Allegorists in Talmud and Midrash', *JQR* NS I (1910-11) 291-333, 503-31.

Leon, H. J. *The Jews of Ancient Rome.* Philadelphia, 1960.
Lehmann, J. 'Les Sectes juives mentionnées dans la Mischna', *REJ* XXX (1895) 182-203, XXXI (1895) 31-46.
Levene, A. 'Pentateuchal Exegesis in Early Syriac and Rabbinic Sources', *SP* I, 484-491.
Lévi, I. 'L'origine davidique de Hillel', *REJ* XXXI (1895) 202-11.
Lewis, J. P. *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature.* Leyden, 1968.
Lieberman, S. *Talmudah shel Qisrin* (The Talmud of Caesarea) (*Tarbiẓ* Suppl. II). Jerusalem, 1931.
– 'The Martyrs of Caesarea', *AIPHOS* VII (1939-44) 395-446.
– 'Palestine in the Third and Fourth Centuries', *JQR* XXXVI (1945-6) 329-70, XXXVII (1946-7) 31-54.
– *Greek in Jewish Palestine.* New York, 1942.
– *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine,* 2nd edn. New York, 1962.
Loewe, R. 'Midrashim and Patristic Exegesis of the Bible', *SP* I, 492-514.
– 'The "Plain" Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis', *Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies, U.C. London,* vol.1 (ed. J. G. Weiss) (Jerusalem, 1964) 140-85.
– 'Apologetic Motifs in the Targum to the Song of Songs', *Studies and Texts III, 'Biblical Motifs'* (Harvard, 1966) 159-96.
Lubac, H. de. *Histoire et Esprit.* Paris, 1950.
Macdonald, J. *The Theology of the Samaritans.* London, 1964.
Manson, T. W. 'The Argument from Prophecy', *JTS* XLVI (1945) 129-36.
Marmorstein, A. 'La réorganisation du doctorat en Palestine au 3^{e} siècle', *REJ* LXVI(1913) 44-53.
– 'Agade und Kirchenväter', *EJ* I 972-9.
– 'Deux renseignements d'Origène concernant les Juifs', *REJ* LXXI (1920) 190-9.
– 'The background of the Haggadah', *HUCA* VI (1929) 141-83.
– 'Judaism and Christianity in the Middle of the Third Century', *HUCA* X (1935) 223-63.
Martin, J. 'La critique biblique chez Origène, II. L'allégorisme', *Ann. de Philos. Chr.* CLI (1905-6) 235-58.
Mazar (Maisler), B. *Beth She'arim* vol. I: *The Catacombs I-IV.* 2nd ed. Jerusalem, 1957.
Mead, G. R. S. *Did Jesus Live 100 B.C.*? London and Benares, 1903.
Mercati, G. *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae,* I. Rome, 1958, 1965.
Montgomery, J. A. *The Samaritans.* London, 1907.
Moore, G. F. *Judaism in the First Three Centuries of the Christian Era,* 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1927-30.
Murmelstein, B. 'Agadische Methode in dem Pentateuchhomilien des Origenes', *Zum vierzigjehrien Bestehen der Israel. theol. Lehrenstalt* (Vienna, 1933) 13-122.
Nautin, P. *Lettres et Écrivains chrétiens des II^{e} et III^{e} siècles* (Patristica II). Paris, 1961.
Neusner, J. *A History of the Jews in Babylonia* (Studia Post-Biblica IX, XI, XII, XIV, XV). 5 vols. Leiden, 1965-70.
Nock, A. D. *Conversion.* Oxford, 1933.
Oesterley, W. O. E. *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy.* Oxford, 1925

Parkes, J. W. *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue.* London, 1934.
Patrick, J. *The Apology of Origen in reply to Celsus, a chapter in the History of Apologetics.* London and Edinburgh, 1892.
Pépin, J. *Mythe et Allégorie.* Paris, 1957.
– 'Remarques sur la théorie de l'exégèse allégorique chez Philon'. In *CNRS Philo-Colloquium* (1967).
Petuchowski, J. J. 'Halakhah in the Church Fathers'. In *Essays in Honour of Solomon B. Freehof* (1964) 257-74.
Prat, F. *Origène, le théologien et l'exégète.* Paris, 1907.
Preisendanz, K. *Papyri Graecae Magicae,* 3 vols. Leipzig, 1928-41.
Rahmer, M. *Die hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken des Hieronymus. I. Die 'Quaestiones in Genesin'.* Breslau, 1861.
Rahner, H. 'Antenna Crucis, V. Das mystische Tau'. *ZKT* LXXV (1935) 385-410.
Rappaport, S. *Aggada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus.* Frankfurt, 1930.
Redepenning, E. R. *Origenes, eine Darstellung seines Lebens und seine Lehre,* 2 vols. Bonn, 1841-8.
Rietz, G. (W.) *De Origenis prologis in Psalterium quaestiones selectae.* Jena, 1914.
Rokeah, D. 'Ben Stara is Ben Pantera - Towards the clarification of a philological-historical problem' (in Hebrew), *Tarbiẓ* XXXIX (1969-70) 9-18.
Rougier, L. *Celse, ou Le conflit de la civilisation antique et du Christianisme primitif.* Paris, 1925.
Ruwet, J. 'Les "Antilegomena" dans les oeuvres d'Origene', *Biblica* XXIII (1942) 28-42, XXIV (1943) 18-58.
– 'Les apocryphes dans les oeuvres d'Origène', *Biblica* XXV (1944) 143-66.
Schoeps, H. J. *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums.* Tünbingen, 1949.
Schonfield, H. J. *According to the Hebrews.* London, 1937.
Schürer, E. *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi,* 3 vols. 3rd/4th edn. Leipzig 1901-9 (English 2nd edn., 1885-90).
– *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135).* A New English Version revised and edited by G. Vermes and F. Millar, Vol. I. Edinburgh, 1973.
Schwabe, M. and B. Lifshitz. *Beth She'arim* vol. II: *The Greek Inscriptions.* Jerusalem, 1967. (For vol. I see Mazar, B.)
Sgherri, G. 'A proposito di Origene e la lingua ebraica', *Augustinianum* XIV (1974-5) 223-57.
Shroyer, M. 'Alexandrian Jewish Literalists', *JBL* LV (1936) 261-84.
Siegfried, C. *Die hebräischen Worterklärung des Philo und die Spuren ihrer Einwirkung auf die Kirchenväter.* Magdeburg, 1863.
Simon, M. *Verus Israel.* Paris, 1948 (reprinted with a postscript, 1964).
– 'Les sectes juives chez les pères', *SP* I. 529-39.
Smalley, B. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages.* Oxford, 1941.
Spiro, A. 'Samaritans, Tobiads, and Judahites in Pseudo-Philo', *PAAJR* XX (1951) 279-355.
Stein, E. *Die allegorische Exegese des Philo aus Alexandria.* Giessen, 1926.
– *Philo und der Midrasch (BZAW* 57). Giessen, 1931.
– 'Zur apokryphen Schrift "Gebet Josephs" ', *MGWJ* LXXXI (1937) 280-6.
Stein, S. 'The Dietary Laws in Rabbinic and Patristic Literature', *SP* II, 141-54.
Sukenik, E. L. *Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece.* London, 1934.
Taylor, R. E. 'Attitudes of the Fathers toward the Practices of Jewish Christians', *SP* IV. 504-11.

Tcherikover, V. 'Jewish Apocalyptic Literature Reconsidered', *Eos* XLVIII(1956) 169-93.
– *Ha-Yehudim be-Miṣrayim ba-Tequfah ha-Helenisṭit-ha-Romit le-Or ha-Papirologiah* (*The Jews in Egypt in the Hellenistic-Roman Age in the Light of the Papyri*) 2nd edn. Jerusalem, 1963.
– 'The Decline of the Jewish Diaspora in Egypt in the Roman Period', *JJS* XIV(1963) 1-32.
Tcherikover, V., A. Fuks, and M. Stern. *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1957-64.
Testa, P. E. *Il simbolismo dei Giudeo-cristiani.* Jerusalem, 1962.
Thomson, J. E. H. *The Samaritans.* Edinburgh, 1919.
Thorbecke, H. *De Judaeis Aegyptiis.* Detmold, 1870.
Turner, H. E. W. *The Pattern of Christian Truth.* London, 1954.
Urbach, E. E. 'Homilies of the Rabbis on the Prophets of the Nations and the Balaam Stories' (in Hebrew), *Tarbiẓ* XXV (1956) 272-89.
– 'The Homiletical Interpretations of the Sages and the Expositions of Origen on Canticles, and the Jewish-Christian Disputation', Hebrew in *Tarbiẓ* XXX (1960-1) 148-70, English in *SH* XXII (1971) 247-75.
Vermes, G. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (Studia Post-Biblica IV). Leiden, 1961.
Walter, N. *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos* (*TU* 86). Berlin, 1964.
Weiss, J. H. *Dor Dor ve-Dorshav*, 4 vols. 4th edn., Vilna, 1904.
Westcott, B. F. 'Origenes', *DCB* IV (1887) 96-142.
Wilde, R. *The Treatment of the Jews in the Greek Christian Writers of the First Three Centuries.* Washington, D.C., 1949.
Wiles, M. 'Origen as Biblical Scholar', in *The Cambridge History of the Bible* I(1970) 454-89.
Williams, A. Lukyn. *Adversus Judaeos.* Cambridge, 1935.
Wogue, L. *Histoire de la Bible et de l'Exégèse biblique jusqu'à nos jours.* Paris, 1881.
Wutz, F. *Onomastica Sacra* (*TU* XLI, 1 and 2). Leipzig, 1914-15.

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

The index is divided as follows:

A. Biblical and intertestamental writings
B. Origen
C. Rabbinic literature
D. Other sources

Figures in italic type refer to the note number

A. Biblical and intertestamental writings

i. Hebrew Bible

Genesis
i.6f 124f.
i.26 44, 126
ii.3 93
ii.7 126
ii.8 125
vi.9 127
ix.1 128
ix.18 128
ix.24f. 128
xiv.13 32
xvii.3 189.*9*
xxiv.42 99
xxv.9 121
xxv.23 80; 186.*45*, 190.*41*
xxix.2f. 115
xli.37 128f.
xli.43 129
xli.45 129
xlvi.4 111; 195.*44*
xlix.10 97f.
xlix.11 197.*72*

Exodus
i.11 119
iv.10 91
iv.24ff. 90
vi.12 91
xii.11 94
xii.27 94
xii.46 86
xii.48 94
xiv.2 120
xiv.7 130
xv.1 111
xv.2 114
xv.13 114
xv.25 77, 84, 113, 116, 117, 130
xvi.4f. 93
xvi.5 189.*25*
xvi.22ff. 93
xvi.29 40, 92; 189.*25*
xvii.3 110
xvii.8ff. 82, 84, 113, 117, 130
xvii.11 117
xx.1 49
xx.8 109
xx.12 45
xx.19 115
xx.22 115
xxi.6 113
xxiii.15 107.*6*
xxxiv.8 167.*6*
xxxv.3 93

Leviticus
xi.13 95

Numbers
v.19-22 56
vii.9 40
xi.16 194.*34*
xv.32 93
xx.11 117
xxi.16f. 115
xxii.4 131, 132
xxii.22 131
xxiii.9 80
xxv.12 47, 131
xxvi.11 46
xxxiii.7 120
xxxv.4 40, 92
xxxv.5 92

Deuteronomy
iv.19 42
v.12 109
v.16 45
x.22 194.*34*
xiii.2-4 184.*37*
xiv.5 95

xvi.1 167.*6*
xvi.6f. 94
xxii.12 39
xxii.23-6 99; 152.*60*
xxii.25 191.*61*
xxvi.13-15 56
xxviii.66 114
xxx.15 114
xxx.20 114
xxxii.21 81, 85; 190.*41*
xxxiii.2 115; 171.*31*
xxxiv.6 131

Joshua
v.2 91
xv.15ff. 84
xv.17 120
xxiv.2f. 159.*19*

Judges
i.13 120
ix.8ff. 112
xii.6 152.*60*

I Samuel
ii.1 98
ii.5 190.*41*
ii.30 46
xxi.2ff. 153.*60*

I Kings
i.2 191.*61*
ii.6 45
v.12 177.*39*
xiii.2 106
xvii.21f. 46

II Kings
iv.34f. 46
xiv.9ff. 112

Isaiah
i.13f. 94
v.1ff. 112
vi.3 132
vi.9 81
vi.10 83
vii.10-14 69, 98f.
xliii.4 186.*45*
xlv.13 110
xlviii.16 100
l.11 93
lv.1 114
lxv.1 190.*41*
lxvi.1 44

Jeremiah
vi.10 91
xvii.21 92
xxiii.29 109, 115
xxxi.31ff. 188.*2*

Ezekiel
v.10 46
vii.26 111
ix.4 116
xxvi.2 11
xxxvii 193.*27*
xliv.9 91

Hosea
iii.4 97f.
viii.12 49

Amos
v.21 94
viii.11 81

Jonah
i.9 158.*4*

Micah
iv.4 114
v.1 99

Zechariah
iv.2 114
ix.9f. 100

Psalms
ii.12 158.*114*
xxv.14 49; 194.*34*
xxix.11 114
xxxvii.1f. 85
xxxvii.19 81
xxxviii.5 93
xlv.3 56
xlv.3-8 100
lxii.12 109
lxviii.12 110
xc.1 55
xcix.4 114
xcix.6 106
civ.29f. 81
cxvi.13 153.*60*
cxix.126 193.*26*
cxxviii.3 114
cxxxvi.13 207.*81*

Proverbs
iii.4 114
iv.2 115
xxii.20 83, 109
xxiii.23 115

Job
xi.9 115
xxxvi.33 196.*48*

Song of Songs
i.8 67
ii.5 115
ii.12 198.*79*
vii.10 47

I Chronicles
iv.7 121
xv.15 40

ii. Greek Bible
See also above, Hebrew Bible
For New Testament, see below
Genesis
ii.7 187.*64*
ii.8 125; 202.*13*
xli.43 129
xlvi.4 195.*44*
Numbers
xxii.32 171.*33*
Deuteronomy
xxxii.8 170.*25*
xxxiii.2 170.*25*
I Reigns
xxix.4 171.*33*
III Reigns
v.12 177.*39*
xi.14 171.*33*
xi.23 171.*33*
Job
i.6f. 171.*33*
Wisdom of Solomon
vii.25f. 177.*38*
Wisdom of Sirach
xlv.23 173.*73*
Zacharias
iii.1 171.*33*
Jeremias
xxxviii.21ff. 188.*2*
I Maccabees
ii.26 173.*73*
ii.54 173.*73*
xiii.42 158.*1*

iii. Intertestamental literature
Adam and Eve
iii.2 205.*47*
iii.8 205.*50*
iii.11 205.*50*
III Baruch
iv.8 128; 203.*28*
Damascus Rule
xiii.14 168.*13*
I Enoch
xxvi.1f. 202.*8*
IV Ezra
iii.6 202.*13*
xiv.21-5 55
xiv.46 175.*19*
Jubilees
viii.12 202.*8*
viii.19 202.*8*
xl.10 207.*75*
xlix.17-21 190.*31*
Testament of Joseph
xviii.3 207.*75*

iv. New Testament
Matthew
viii.27 184.*33*
xii.5 189.*20*
xvi.4 81
xxiii.5 35, 39
xxvi.39 185.*24*
xxvi.53ff. 185.*11*
xxvii.25 77
Mark
iii.17 200.*111*
vii.11 41
Luke
v.8f. 184.*33*
vii.16 184.*33*
x.1 117
xvi.31 184.*36*
xxiii.34 185.*12*
xxiv.7 185.*11*
xxiv.46f. 185.*11*
John
i.21 47
ii.11 184.*33*
ii.23 184.*33*
iii.1 35
v.46 105
vi.14 184.*33*
vi.32f. 190.*27*
xi.46 184.*34*
xi.54 186.*56*
xii.23ff. 185.*11*
xii.37 184.*34*
xvi.13 188.*4*
Acts
i.12 168.*12*
iii.17 185.*12*
vi.1 30
x.45 32
xv 185.*15*
xxiii.8 172.*64*
Romans
ii.26f. 189.*9*
ii.28f. 32
iii.2 105
iii.31 108
ix.6f. 32; 160.*28*
xi.7 80
xi.28 85

I Corinthians
i.22 184.*29*
i.23 185.*14*
i.27 81
xv.47f. 126
II Corinthians
iii.6 105, 108
iii.14f. 83, 87, 108
iv.18 159.*23*
Galatians
ii 185.*15*
iii.3 108
iv.21-3 186.*47*
iv.24 196.*55*
v.2 90
Ephesians
i.21 42
Colossians
ii.17 188.*4*
I Thessalonians
ii.15 77; 185.*13*
v.23 187.*64*
II Thessalonians
ii.9 184.*37*
Titus
i.14 105
Hebrews
i.2 44
viii.4f. 83
xi.37 185.*26*
Revelation
i.10 190.*28*

v. Aramaic Bible
Genesis
i.26 203.*19*
ii.8 125; 202.*13*
ix.20 205.*51*
ix.24 205.*56*
xl.5 129
xli.43 206.*66*
xli.45 206.*72*
xlix.10 191.*46*
Exodus
xiv.21 207.*83*
Numbers
xxv.10ff. 173.*73*
Isaiah
lxvi.1 186.*31*

B. Origen

Contra Celsum
I.1 65, 68
2 64, 71
3 65
4 64
5 65, 68
6 65, 71
7 65
14 64, 67; 178.*43*
15 67
16 66, 67
17 67
17-22 178.*43*
18 67
19 67
20 67
21 64
22 167.*1*, 188.*8*
23 64, 65, 68
24f. 199.*96*
25 68; 170.*24*
26 64, 65, 68; 170.*25*, 178.*43*
28 66
32 66
32f. 192.*67*
34 152.*59, 60*
34f. 191.*58*
34ff. 184.*2*
37 71
39 66
41 66
43 184.*42*
43f. 71
45 151.*54*, 158.*11*, 162.*60*, 192.*76*
46 71; 192.*68*
47 148.*17*
48 173.*75*
49 69; 164.*71*, 166.*90*, 194.*76*, 191.*52*, 192.*74*
50 149.*19*, 191.*53*
51 191.*63*
53 178.*43*, 191.*45*
54f. 192.*72*
55 69, 72; 151.*54*, 158.*11*, 162.*60*
56 72; 151.*54*, 192.*73*
57 149.*19*, 159.*71*, 167.*102*

68 71
69ff. 66
71 66, 71
II.1 62; 165.*81*, 84, 185.*16*
2 188.*4*
5 185.*10*, 186.*41*
6 192.*7*
8 71; 149.*19*, 158.*11*, 185.*20*, 186.*55*
10 185.*23*
11 66
12 66
13 66; 148.17, 166.98
15 66
20 185.*22*
23 185.*23*
25 185.*24*
28 69; 191.*54*
29 158.*11*, 160.*33*, 185.*7*
30 66
31 69; 146.*23*, 155.*83*, 158.*11*, 159.*12*, 162.*60*, 171.*35*, 192.*75*
32 71
34 69; 146.*22*, 158.*11*, 185.*20*
34f. 186.*36*
38 185.*6*, 191.*54*
44 66
46 66
47 66; 171.*32*
48 71
50-55 192.*76*
51 184.*37*
52 184.*42*
55ff. 184.*3*
57 69; 171.*32*, 173.*67*
77 69; 173.*66*, 174.*76*
78 185.*21*, 186.*42*, 52, 190.*41*, 191.*43*
79 66
III.1 173.*74*, 185.*7*
1f. 185.*6*
5 65
5f. 159.*15*, *16*
6-8 204.*32*
7f. 164.*70*
8 159.*16*
12 164.*71*
27 71
40 68
72 177.*38*
IV.2 69; 174.*76*, 192.*74*
3 186.*40*
4 184.*42*, 192.*76*
11 148.*18*
11f. 67
21 67
22 185.*19*, *20*
26 68
28 185.*8*
31 65, 68; 159.*15*
32 65; 185.*9*, 18, 20, 25
34 199.*99*
36 67
39 67
43 186.*40*
48 68; 170.*24*
50 187.*62*
51 67; 148.*4*, 149.*7*, 196.*55*
52 191.*55*
55 148.*8*
71ff. 68
73 186.*38*
V.4 170.*21*
6 65, 68, 69; 160.*36*, 170.*21*, 22, 25
7 160.*36*
8f. 69
14 173.*67*
31 65
33 65
34 170.*25*
41 64, 65, 66; 167.*4*, 188.*8*
42 68
43 67; 185.*9*, *20*, *26*
45 199.*108*
47 4.*1*, 167.*1*
48 167.*1*, 186.*41*, 188.*8*
49 167.*2*
50 149.*18*
54 178.*42*
55 148.*8*
57 71
60 187.*62*, 192.*6*
61 165.*81*
65 165.*83*
VI.10 71
11 149.*19*, 164.*71*, 166.*97*, 167.*102*
21 148.*7*
23 178.*52*

27 170.*30*, 185.*7*, 187.*74*
32 170.*30*
43 67
47 67
50 202.*14*
60 202.*14*
70 187.*62*
78 184.*4*
80 68; 185.*21*, 186.*42*
VII.8 185.*20*
26 148.8
26 161.*48*, 185.*18*
30f. 67
59 67
64 170.*24*
64ff. 65, 68
VIII.3ff. 68
9 71; 184.*41*
29 167.*2*
39 66
41f. 186.*36*
42 185.*20*, 186.*37*
45 71
48 184.*41*
69 66; 185.*20*, *25*

Commentaries, Fragments and Selecta
Selecta on Genesis
i.26 149.*24*, 172.*48*
ii.2 202.*14*
ii.8 156.*89*, 201.*5*
iv.8 175.*15*, 201.*2*
vi.11 205.*48*
vii.6 194.*40*
ix.18 205.*52*
ix.20 203.*27*
xiv.13 159.*20*
xvii.5 199.*96*
xxii.20 199.*109*
xxiv.62 198.*80*
xxv.1 200.*109*, 118, 201.*132*
xxvi.19 198.*80*
xli.8 206.*61*
xli.43 206.*61*
xli.45 156.*89*, 175.*16*, 206.*68*, *73*
xlvi.4 195.*44*
Commentary on Exodus – *see Philocalia* XXVII
Selecta on Exodus
xii.3 168.*8*
xii.46 165.*87*, 188.*80*
xiv.7 207.*85*
xvi.23 194.*28*
xx.5 158.*11*, 170.*23*, 172.*53*
xxi.1 195.*42*
xxi.6 197.*66*
Selecta on Leviticus
xiv.35 183.*5*, 186.*49*
Selecta on Numbers
xx.10 208.*102*
xxii.4 207.*95*
xxii.22 208.*98*
xxiv.1 199.*108*
Selecta on Joshua
vi.26 178.*44*, *48*
Selecta on Judges
xii.6 152.*60*
Fragments on Psalms: Preface and Ps.i (*see also Philocalia* II, III)
PG XII
1056A (= Rietz V) 156.*89*, 177.*32*
1056B (= Rietz III) 155.*69*, 159.*12*, 161.*53*, 162.*59*, 178.*50*, 191.*56*
1057B 160.*38*
1057C 193.*12*
1068B 153.*60*
1076AB (= Rietz I.16) 163.*60*, 177.*33*
1080BC 181.*91*, 195.*46*
1084A 175.*24*
1084BC *5*.18, 23, 175.*18*, *23*
Selecta on Psalms
ii 152.*60*, 178.*46*, 180.*74*
iv.5 181.*79*
xxiii.10 152.*59*
xxiv.4 187.*59*
xxvi.1 153.*60*
lxxi.9 201.*135*
lxxvii.45 156.*89*
cxviii Proem 175.*24*
cxviii.1 195.*42*
cxviii.1f. 149.*18*
cxviii.85 151.*48*, 167.*104*, 193.*8*
cxviii.98 160.*35*

Commentary on the Song of Songs
Preface 160.*28*, 163.*66*, 177.*39*, 182.*84*, 183.*18*, 200.*113*, 203.*25*
II 183.*19*, 198.*82*
Selecta on Job
xx.28 160.*35*
Selecta on Jeremiah
xxxi.23 160.*29*
Fragments on Lamentations
3 175.*23*
105 148.*17*
109 148.*17*
115 148.*17*
Selecta on Lamentations
i.1 156.*89*
i.4 167.*3*
i.10 3.*35*, 160.*35*
iv.17 3.*34*, 160.*34*
Selecta on Ezekiel
v.10 155.*82*, 162.*58*, 172.*63*
vii.26 195.*45*
viii.1 180.*74*, 194.*40*
ix.4 155.*84*, 156.*87*, 165.*79*, 178.*46*, 198.*86*
Commentary on Matthew
X.14 187.*69*
17 148.*17*
18 185.*27*, *29*
20 164.70, 172.*64*
XI.5 159.*23*
9 156.*90*, 164.*73*, 169.*19*
XII.4 185.*25*, 186.*50*
5 188.*81*
31 199.*108*
XIII.18 192.*68*
XIV.9 202.*14*
16 153.*60*
XV.3 148.*7*
5 207.*80*
14 149.*22*
XVI.3 188.*77*
12 165.*82*, *84*
XVII.29 166.*91*, *98*
Fragments
25 160.*29*
457.I 148.*17*
457.II 148.*17*
551.II 204.*33*
Commentariorum Series
9 164.*75*
11 *4.9*, 164.*72*, 168.*9*
20 164.*75*
27 164.*75*
28 185.*27*
33 166.*100*
41 149.*18*
78 151.*51*, 160.*29*
79 188.*81*
126 204.*33*
141 200.*111*
[Scholia on the Magnificat] 35
Commentary on John
I.31 4.*29*, 156.*91*, 170.*29*
35 160.*28*
II.7 194.*39*
11 192.*68*
12 149.*22*
31 160.*26*, 170.*26*
33 148.*15*, 200.*111*
34 *6*.39, 40, 41, 184.*39*, *40*, *41*
VI.13 151.*49*
14 151.*49*, 156.*89*, 173.*71*
40f. 199.*96*
42 178.*42*
X.17 198.*90*
27 192.*70*
42 159.*11*, 160.*31*, 193.*10*
XIII.13 159.*25*
26 166.*90*
27 166.*100*
39 167.*6*
50 202.*17*
55 164.*75*
XIX.17 191.*63*
XX.35 166.*89*
XXVIII.5 187.*59*
12 188.*78*
24 186.*56*
25 167.*3*, 190.*32*
Fragments
8 188.*81*
55 198.*80*
66 189.*20*

72 172.*55*
114 188.*81*
Commentary on Romans
I.10 189.*18*
II.4 181.*81*, 182.*83*
7 159.*25*, 186.*46*
11 159.*25*
13 158.*114*, 167.*103*, 189.*9, 11*, 190.*30*
14 159.*25*, 192.*5*
V.1 189.*21*
VI.7 161.*48*
12 168.*18*
VIII.7 192.*71*
12 187.*73*
X.7 172.*62*
Fragments on Romans
10 188.*3*, 190.*30*
11 160.34, 192.*5*
46 160.*30*
Fragments on I Corinthians
25 168.*8*
47 186.*56*
Fragments on Galatians
184.*38*
Fragments on Ephesians
31 172.*52*
Fragments on Titus
165.*82*
Fragments on Revelation
28 189.*23*
Exhortation to Martyrdom
vi 170.*22*
viii 195.*42*
xxxiii 159.*24*
xlvi 199.*96*

Hexapla
Genesis xxxi.7
156.*94*
Job ii.5 157.*99*

Homilies
Homilies on Genesis
I.13 171.*47*, 203.*20*, *25*
II.2 156.*90*, 205.*43*
Greek fr.
155.*81*, 205.*43*
III 188.*5*
III.1 171.*46*, 203.*21*
4 189.*10*
5 174.*7*, 189.*12*
6 189.*13*, 193.*8*
V.1 172.*61*
VII.5f. 198.*80*
VIII.6 198.*87*
XI.2 199.*108*
XII.3 186.*46*, 190.*41*
4 199.*101*
XIII.2 198.*80*
XV.1 194.*38*
3 160.*28*
5 195.*44*
[XVII.6] 191.*45*
Homilies on Exodus
I.5 200.*116*
II.4 198.*82*
III.2 198.*82*
3 186.*58*
IV.6 198.*80*, *82*, *83*
V.1 159.*11*, 160.*30*, 207.*88*, *94*
2 199.*101*
3 201.*128*
4 198.*82*
5 198.*81*, 207.*79*
VI.1 195.*43*
3 194.*28*
8 199.*108*
VII 158.*114*
VII.1 187.*67*, 197.*67*, 198.*80*
3 185.*17*, 187.*67*, 207.*88*
5 190.*27*, 191.*50*, 198.*90*
8 198.*90*
VIII.1 207.*88*
2 170.*22*
4 195.*42*
IX.1 207.*88*
X.1 195.*42*
XI.1 197.*64*
2 194.*37*
3 198.*90*
4 187.*59*, *67*, 208.*97*
XII.1 187.*62*
Homilies on Leviticus
I.1 177.40
III.1 158.*11*, 185.*14*
3 192.*8*
IV.7 187.*62*, 190.*40*
V 160.*27*
V.8 165.*87*, 188.*79*
VII.4 188.*4*, 190.*34*
5 188.*81*, 190.*35*
IX.8 189.*21*

X.1 187.*69*
2 188.*81*, 194.*30*
XI.5 186.*56*
XII.1 187.*60*
5 174.*7*, 201.*2*
XVI.2 198.*80*
Homilies on Numbers
I.1 194.*30*
IV.1 175.*24*
VI.4 198.*82*
VIII.2 188.*83*
IX.1 205.*40*
3 198.*82*
X.2 172.*54*
XI.2 195.*42*
4 160.*28*, 170.*27*, 203.*29*
XII.1 198.*80, 81, 82*, 199.*94*
2 189.*21*
4 199.*109*, 200.*110*
XIII.5 156.*87*, 160.*38*, 165.*79*, 208.*97*
XIV.1 152.*59, 60*, 180.*74*
2 194.*39*
4 199.*108*
XV.3 172.*61*, 186.*44*
XVI.7 160.*28*
XVIII.3 174.*8*
XIX.3 152.*60*
4 159.*21*, 199.*109*, 200.*110*
XX.3 148.*15*
XXIII.4 167.*3*, 189.*20, 21, 22, 23*
XXV.1 166.*91*
3 199.*96*, 206.*71*
XXVII.5 199.*96*
9 201.*129*
12 197.*64*
13 199.*96*
XXVIII.2 177.*42*
Homilies on Joshua
V.5 189.*11*
VII.5 187.*69*, 188.*81*
VIII.7 178.*53*
IX.4 160.*28*
XIII.2 199.*96*
XIV.2 199.*109*, 201.*124*
XV.6 171.*32*
XVI.5 156.*87*, 208.*97*
XVII.19 187.*62*
XVIII.2 200.*110*
XX 187.*68*
XX.2 162.*60*
6 188.*81*, 200.*120, 123*
XXI.2 194.*30*
XXIII.4 199.*96*
XXIV.1 199.*109*
Homilies on Judges
III.2 200.*121*
VIII.1 158.11, 187.*75*
VIII.4 198.*80*
Homilies on I Samuel (I Reigns)
I.1 172.*62*, 178.*49*
4 152.*59*, 159.*12*
5 195.*48*, 199.*108*, 200.*110*
6 200.*109*
7 208.*107*
9 186.*58*, 187.*59*
10 191.*57*, 194.*40*
18 190.*41*
Homilies on Psalm xxxvi
I.1 186.*52*, 187.*74*, 190.*41*
II.8 187.*77*
III.10 186.*54*
Homilies on Psalm xxxvii
I.1 185.*27*
Homily on Psalm lxxxii
165.*85*
Homilies on the Song of Songs
I.1 182.*88*, 200.*113*
6 199.*100*
8 194.*39*
II.4 181.*79*
Homilies on Isaiah
I.5 185.*27, 30*
VI.1 157.*102*
6 186.*35*, 187.*61*
IX.1 156.*87, 90*
Homilies on Jeremiah
I.10 203.*25*
X.4 162.*59*
XII.12 168.*7*
13 187.*63*, 188.*81, 83*
XIII.2 207.*80*
XV.4 149.*22*
XIX.12 165.*83*
13 200.*110*
XX.2 156.*87*
9 185.*27*
XXXIX.2 194.*39*
Fragments
11 200.*110*
13 148.*17*

Homilies on Ezekiel
I.4 167.*3*, 168.*7*
7 194.*40*
III.7 189.*21*
8 194.*40*
IV.7 152.*60*
8 151.*51*, 156.*90*
IX.1 166.*89*
X.3 156.*89*, 172.*61*
Homilies on Luke
XXV 166.*100*
Letter to Africanus
2 178.*54*, 181.*79*
4 201.*2*
5 174.*4*, *5*
6 155.*83*
7 155.*74*, 159.*12*, 162.*59*
7f. 155.*84*, 208.*108*
9 175.*19*, 177.*40*, 185.*27*
12 153.*60*
13 175.*19*, 177.*40*, 185.*27*
14 161.*47*, *49*, *52*, 162.*56*, *57*
De Oratione
ii.4 196.*50*
xiv.4 160.*35*, 175.*24*, 196.*50*, 177.*37*, *40*
xxiv.2 199.*96*
xxxi.7 185.*25*
Philocalia
I.1 184.*42*, 192.*76*
3 161.*52*, 178.*43*, 184.*43*, 186.*39*, 191.*47*, *51*
4 186.*52*, 190.*41*
6 184.*43*
8 151.*48*, 160.*35*, 187.*63*, *69*
11 187.*65*, 194.*28*, *30*
15 187.*66*
17 202.*14*
18 160.*35*, 167.*101*, *1*, *2*, *3*, 168.*11*, *14*, *17*, 189.*18*, *19*, 190.*36*
22 160.*27*
24 160.*28*, 165.*84*
26 155.*82*, 156.*91*, 171.*37*
30 160.*27*, 187.*64*
II.3 156.*91*, 195.*46*
4 175.*24*
III 175.*18*, *23*
X 194.*39*
XII.2 162.*60*
XXI.6ff. 172.*57*
XXVII.7 172.*57*
De Principiis
I.iii.3 178.*42*
4 155.*82*, 156.*91*, 171.*37*
7 185.*25*, 186.*53*
v.1 170.*29*
II.iii.1 172.*51*
xi.2 158.*11*
III.i.7ff. 172.*57*
IV.i.1 184.*42*, 192.*76*
3 161.*52*, 178.*43*, 184.*43*, 186.*39* 191.*47*, *51*
4 186.*52*, 190.*41*
6 184.*43*
ii.1 151.*48*, 160.*35*, 187.*63*, *69*
4 187.*65*, 194.*28*, *30*
8 187.*66*
iii.1 202.*14*
2 160.*35*, 167.*101*, 167.*1*, *2*, *3*, 168.*11*, *14*, *17*, 189.*18*, *19*, 190.*36*
6ff. 160.*27*
8 160.*28*, 165.*84*
14 155.*82*, 156.*91*, 171.*37*
iv.8 177.*42*
Selecta – see under Commentaries
Stromateis
X fr. 156.*91*, 177.*40*

C. Rabbinic literature

Mishnah
Berakoth
ix.5 173.*65*, 193.*26*
Shabbath
vi.2 168.*15*
x.3 168.*16*
'Erubin
iv.3, 5, 7, 8 168.*13*
v.7, 9 168.*13*
Pesaḥim
iv.4 168.*18*
Rosh Hashanah
iii.8 186.*57*
Yoma
vii.1 176.*26*
Ta'anith
iii.8 184.*30*
Megillah
i.8 178.*57*, 180.*69*
ii.1 178.*58*, 180.*66*, *67*
iv.10 182.*86*
Giṭṭin
ix.6 158.*6*
Soṭah
v.3 168.*12*
vii.1 178.*59*
vii.7 176.*26*
Baba Qamma
viii.1 193.*26*
Sanhedrin
iv.5 171.*42*
vii.11 184.*31*
x.1 173.*65*, 181.*74*, 195.*44*
Aboth
v.6 184.*28*
Menaḥoth
iv.3 176.*26*
Yadaim
iii.5 174.*2*, 182.87

Tosefta
Shabbath
xiii.5 177.*41*
Sanhedrin
iv.7 178.*47*
viii.7 171.*43*
'Abodah Zarah
vi.11 170.*24*, 183.*23*
Yadaim
ii.13 177.*41*
ii.14 182.*87*

Palestinian Talmud
Berakoth
v.1 (9^{a}) 175.*13*
ix.5 (14^{cd}) 193.*26*
Peah
i.1 (15^{c}) 147.*41*
ii.6 (17^{a}) 174.*1*
Terumoth
viii.10 (46^{b}) 157.*108*
Bikkurim
iii.3 (65^{c}) 161.*43*
Rosh Hashanah
iii.8 (59^{a}) 186.*57*, 198.*78*
Beṣah
v.2 (63^{a}) 157.*106*
Ta'anith
iv.2 (68^{a}) 191.*49*
Megillah
i.9 (10^{ab}) 178.*47*, *55*, 179.*65*
ii.1 (73^{a}) 147.*41*, 177.*31*, 178.*59*, 180.*68*
iii.2 (74^{a}) 147.*39*
Yebamoth
xii.6 (13^{a}) 197.*60*
Sotah
vii.1 (21^{b}) 147.*42*, 178.*59*, *60*, 179.*61*
Nedarim
xi.1 (42^{c}) 181.*77*
Sanhedrin
x.2 (28^{c}) 186.*31*
'Abodah Zarah
i.2 (39^{c}) 143.*5*
iii.1 (42^{c}) 147.*40*
v.4 (44^{d}) 143.*5*

Babylonian Talmud
Berakoth
4^{a} 184.*32*
10^{a} 177.*36*
15^{b} 173.*65*
20^{a} 184.*32*
24^{a} 197.*74*
31^{ab} 196.*50*
40^{a} 203.*26*
57^{a} 197.*72*
62^{b} 186.*45*
Shabbath
13^{b} 174.*2*, 182.*86*

31ab 195.47
33b 172.56
53b 184.28
63a 193.18
75a 157.111
87b 158.114
88b 194.34
108b 158.114
115a 179.64
115b 177.31
116a 171.45
152b 173.69

'Erubin
13b 194.36
19a 202.8
53a 204.36

Pesahim
42b 147.38
50b 184.28
53a 169.18
54a 184.28, 202.12
78b 169.18

Hagigah
13a 174.2, 182.86
14a 147.39

Mo'ed Qatan
25b 147.39

Ta'anith
27b 165.78

Yoma
69a 193.26
75a 158.114
75b 198.76

Megillah
6a 147.38
7a 177.31
8b 178.57, 180.69
9a 180.68
14a 172.62
14b 200.114
18a 179.64, 180.67

Yebamoth
49b 186.31, 192.66
71b 158.114
102b 186.50

Kethubboth
17a 147.39
103b 155.85

Gittin
60a 175.13, 180.73, 193.26

Nedarim
39b 202.12

Sotah
11a 200.117
12a 201.134
13b 158.114, 207.74
32b 178.60
33a 178.60

Baba Qamma
83a 147.39
83b 193.26

Baba Bathra
4s 206.66
14b-15a 176.29, 30
15a 193.27
16b 183.7

Sanhedrin
4ab 193.17
34a 194.31, 33
37a 115
38b 203.19, 30
39ab 186.43
56a 157.99
60b-63a 170.22, 183.22, 195.42
63b 170.24, 183.23
70a 203.26
86b 115
90b 166.91, 173.65, 68, 70
92b 193.27, 196.56
94b 184.32
108b 205.46, 48
110a 172.62

Horayoth
13b 161.43

Zebahim
113b 205.42

Menahoth
45a 174.2, 182.86

Bekoroth
5b 197.63
55a 147.38

Hullin
13b 171.45
72a 193.17

Temurah
14b 175.13, 193.26
16a 200.122

Tamid
27b 193.26

Niddah
52ab 201.127
69bff. 173.65

Mekilta
Exodus
xii.37 199.*105*, 201.*6*
xiii.17 172.*60*, 190.*27*
xiv.2 201.*130*
xiv.6 207.*81*
xiv.7 207.*86*
xiv.10 207.*96*
xv.1 170.*28*, 171.*31*, 173.*65*
xv.2 198.*77*
xv.11 194.*32*
xv.13 198.*77*
xv.22 197.*68*
xv.25 197.*68*
xvi.15 198.*76*
xvi.31 198.*76*
xvii.8 197.63
xvii.8-11 186.*57*
xx.5 170.*22*, 195.*42*
xx.8 194.*32*
xxi.6 197.*66*
xxi.22 193.*26*
xxi.27f. 197.*66*
xxiii.13 170.*24*, 183.*23*
Sifre
Numbers
112 166.*91*, 173.*65*, 193.*16*
119 174.*2*
131 173.*73*, 193.*17*
157 173.*73*
Deuteronomy
1 206.*65*
320 186.*51*
323 203.*26*
Other Midrashim
Genesis Rabba
III.7 172.*51*
IV.6 201.*4*
V.4 184.*28*
VIII.4 203.*19*
VIII.8 203.*19*
VIII.9 192.*69*
VIII.11 203.*24*
IX.2 172.*51*
IX.5 157.*107*
XI.2 189.*25*
XI.6 189.*25*
XII.4 202.*16*
XIV.3 203.*24*
XV.2 202.*7*
XV.3 202.*13*
XV.7 203.*26*
XVI.2 195.*48*
XVII.4 203.*19*
XVIII.4 203.*30*
XXX.9 204.*39*
XXXI.10 205.*44*
XXXI.11 205.*46*
XXXI.12 205.*48*
XXXI.13 205.*42*
XXXIV.7 205.*48*
XXXVI.7 205.*56*, 206.*58*, *60*
XXXVI.8 157.*111*
XLII.5 199.*107*
XLII.8 159.*18*, *19*
LIII.3 197.*72*
LVI.3 198.*88*
LVII.4 201.*6*
LVIII.4 204.*36*
LXI.4 201.*6*
LXX.8-9 198.*79*
LXXXI.2 197.*60*
LXXXII.10 191.*64*
LXXXIV.8 207.*81*
LXXXVI.3 207.*74*
LXXXIX.6 206.*62*
XC.3 206.*65*
XC.4 206.*70*
XCIV.9 201.*126*
XCVII.10 191.*48*
XCVIII.12 198.*78*
XCVIII (XCIX).8 191.*46*, *48*, *49*
Exodus Rabba
I.10 200.*117*
I.29 150.*40*
II.3 208.*100*
III.8 159.*19*
XIII.3 172.*58*
XVI.2 197.*72*
XXI.6 184.*28*
XLVII.1 174.*1*
Numbers Rabba
VIII.9 197.*72*
XIII.15 194.*35*
XVIII.5 197.*72*
XX.4 207.*96*
XXI.3 173.*73*
Deuteronomy Rabba
XI.10 207.*82*

Song of Songs Rabba
I.1.8 195.*47*
I.1.10 177.*39*
I.6.1 147.*43*
IV.12.1 204.*32*
Song of Songs Zuṭa
1 202.*11*
Ruth Rabba
II.5 199.*107*, 201.*6*
Lamentations Rabbathi
Proem II 198.*78*
I.5.31 147.*37*
Ecclesiastes Rabba
V.12 173.*65*
Midrash on Psalms
i.8 175.*24*
v.4 172.*54*
xxi.3 202.*8*
lxviii.6 194.*34*
lxxxii.1 197.*66*
xc.3, 4 178.*51*
xcii.3 194.*34*
Pesiqta de Rab Kahana
xxxii 178.*51*
Pesiqta Rabbathi
v.1 174.*1*
xxiii.4 189.*15*
xxiii.6 189.25
Midrash Tanḥuma
Wayyera v174.*1*
Miqqeṣ iii
179.*62*
Midrash Tanḥuma (Buber's edition)
Bereshith ii
202.*16*
Noaḥ xvii 178.*48*
Lek Leka xxiii
194.*34*
Wayyesheb xvii
208.*100*
Beshallaḥ xxiv
189.*25*
Ki Tissa xvii
174.*1*
Leqaḥ Ṭob
Genesis xlix.8
175.*24*
Midrash Haggadol
Genesis xli.15
206.*62*
Othioth de R.'Aqiba
1xxxvii 194.*35*
Pirqe de R.Eli'ezer
xi 204.*34*
xxiii 205.*51*
xlvii 173.*73*
Sekhel Ṭob
Genesis xxxvi.33
201.*125*
Genesis xlvi.10
201.*133*
Yalquṭ (Shim'oni)
Numbers 772
173.*73*
Joshua 27
200.*122*
Judges 42
200.*114*
Psalms 841
178.*51*
Zohar
Proem 2^{b} 198.*86*
Genesis 57^{b}
204.*34*
Genesis 73^{a}
203.*26*

D. Other sources

Ambrose
In Lucam 204.*35*
Apion
Fragments, in Josephus, *contra Apionem* 159.*13*, 182.*1*, 183.*9*, *10*, *12*
Apollonius Molon
Fragments 182.*1*, 183.*6*
Apostolic Constitutions 163.*66*, 191.*45*
Arethas
In Apocalypsim 160.*29*
Aristeas
[*Letter*] 128ff. 188.*5*
Aristobulus
Fragments 183.*8*, 193.*21*
Artapanus
Fragments 185.*7*, *8*
Athanasius
[*Synopsis scripturae sacrae*] 175.*23*, 176.*30*
[*Dial.Ath.et Zach.*] - *see below, under Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchaeus*
Augustine
De Ciuitate Dei 203.*30*
Enarrationes in Psalmos 195.*47*
Epistulae 164.*76*, 174.*9*
Retractationes 169.*18*
Barnabas
[Letter] x 188.*6*
xii.12 186.*58*
Celsus
Consult the index to Origen above
Clement of Alexandria
Eclogae 56 150.*35*
Paedagogus I.6 159.*11*, 150.*35*, *12*, 160.*31*, 193.*10*
I.7 160.*28*
Stromateis I.1 150.*39*
I.5 160.*28*
I.9 194.*30*
I.22 178.*45*, 183.*8*, *17*
I.23 150.*40*, 183.*8*
II.ix.43 190.*41*
IV.iii.8 189.*16*
VII.16 160.*29*
Clementines
Homilia III.48 191.*45*
Recognitiones V.11 191.*45*
Cicero
Pro Flacco 28 183.*9*, *11*
Cyprian
Testimonia I.8 189.*14*
I.8-17 188.*2*
I.19 190.*41*
I.20 190.*41*
I.21 190.*41*, 191.*45*
II.9 191.*58*
II.12 191.*63*
[*Aduersus Iudaeos*] 186.*34*
Demetrius Phalereus
De Elocutione 196.*54*
Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchaeus
5 202.*18*
32 191.*59*
Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila
77^{I} 174.*3*
77^{IV} 192.*77*
79^{I} 202.*18*
100^{I} 186.*58*
111 191.*61*
Didascalia Apostolorum
21 170.*24*, 183.*23*
Ephraem Syrus
In Genesim 201.*3*, 202.*11*, *13*, 205.*50*, 206.*59*
In Exodum 186.*58*

Epiphanius
De mensuris et ponderibus
16 165.*84*
23 176.*30*
Panarion IX
166.*89, 90, 91*
XIX 165.*86*
XXIX 188.*77*
XXX 164.*77*, 165.*83*
XXXIII 163.*66*
XLVI 204.*35*
LXXVIII 183.*24*
Eupolemus
[Fragments]
183.*7, 8*
Eusebius
Comm. in Isaiam
198.*80*
Comm. in Psalmos
177.*35*, 198.*80*, 207.*80*
Eclogae propheticae
183.*24*
Historia ecclesiastica
I.vi 191.*45*
I.vii 151.*45*
II.xviii 148.*13*
IV.xxvi 149.*25*, 172.*49*, 190.*28*
V.xvi 187.*72*
VI.xvi 154.*62*, 192.*77*
VI.xvii 165.*82, 83, 84*
VI.xix 16
VI.xxiv 155.*80*
VI.xxv 155.*78*, 175.*18*, 176.*23, 25*
VI.xxxi 151.*42*
VI.xxxviii
165.*85*
De martyribus Palestinae
147.*41*
Preparatio euangelica
151.*47*, 159.*17*, 163.*65*
Gregory Nazianzene
Orationes 182.*84*
Heraclitus
Questiones Homericae
196.*54*
Hilary
Tractatus super Psalmos
155.*69*, 176.*25*, 177.*32, 34*, 178.*50*, 195.*46*
Hippolytus
[Fragments]
190.*33, 41*, 191.*45*, 205.*47, 50*
Historia Augusta
161.*54*, 167.*104*
Irenaeus
Aduersus haereses
171.*33*, 178.*45*, 190.*33*
Demonstratio
186.*58*, 190.*33*
Jerome
Aduersus Iouinianum
191.*60*
Aduersus Pelagium
164.*77*
Aduersus Rufinum
154.*68*, 157.*102, 103, 104*, 161.*53*, 178.*50*
Commentarii
in Isaiam
155.*72*, 157.*100, 101*, 163.*65*, 165.*77, 78*, 188.*77*, 191.*60, 61*
in Ieremiam
155.*79*
in Ezechielem
168.*9*, 163.*61*, 182.*84*
in Danielem
151.*47*
in Susannam
155.*7* 177.*40*
in Abacuc
163.*63*
in Aggaeum
201.*3*
in Zachariam
197.*73*
in Ecclesiasten
157.*101*
in Matthaeum
164.*73, 77*, 168.*9*, 204.*36*
in Ep.ad Ephesios
150.*35*, 204.*35*
in Ep.ad Titum
163.*61*
Contra Iohannem Ierosolymitanum
170.*29*

Epistulae
XVIII 157.*102*, 163.*66*, 181.*77*
XXV 180.*74*
XXXVI 190.*41*
XXXIX 154.*65*
XLVI 204.*35*
LII 169.*18*
LXXVIII 197.*65*
LXXXIV 192.*1*
LXXXV 157.*102*
CXXI 163.*62*, 168.*13*
de Interpretatione nominum 148.*13*
de Locis 204.*36*
Praefatio in Ezram 165.*84*
Prologus Galeatus 176.*25*
Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim 202.*13*, 204.*36*, 205.*40*, 206.*64*, *73*
de Viris illustribus 147,*4*, 150.*31*, 154.*54*, 164.*77*, 165.*84*
John Chrysostom
Homilia in Genesim 159.*19*
Sermo in Genesim 159.*19*
[*Synopsis Scripturae sacrae*] 159.*18*
Josephus
Antiquitates Iudaeorum
I 158.*2*, 159.*18*, 167.*1*, 183.*7*, 187.*64*, 188.*8*, 202.*9*, 206.*57*
II 206.*63*, *70*
V 200.*112*
XI 149.*18*
XVIII 164.*75*
Bellum Iudaicum 183.*9*
Contra Apionem
I 149.*18*, 159.*14*, 175.*22*, 182.*1*, *2*, *3*
II 182.*1*, *2*, 183.*6*, *9*, *10*, *12*, *20*, *21*
Vita 164.*75*
Julian
Epistula LI 155.*72*
Julius Africanus
Chronicon 159.*18*, *19*, 205.*50*
Epistula ad Origenem 174.*3*
Justin
Apologia I 183.*14*, *16*, 187.*70*, 191.*45*
Dialogus cum Tryphone 168.*9*, 171.*33*, 172.*50*, 188.*2*, 189.*11*, *14*, 190.*30*, *41*, 191.*45*, *50*, *59*, *63*, 192.*73*, 196.*59*, 197.*71*, 198.*84*
Justinian
Nouella 146 163.*66*, 174.*11*
Manetho
Fragments 159.*13*, 182.*1*
Melito
Fragment 149.*25*
Memar Marqah 166.*93*, *98*
Nicephorus Callistus
Historia ecclesiastica 150.*31*
Novation
[*Aduersus Iudaeos*]
- *see under* Cyprian
Oecumenius
In Apocalypsim 160.*29*
Pamphilus
Apologia 199.*108*
Paula and Eustochium
Epistula ad Marcellum - *see* Jerome, *Ep.* XLVI
Philo
de Abrahamo 205.*41*
de Agricultura 171.*36*
de Cherubim 199.*108*
de Confusione linguarum 158.*7*, 171.*36*, 193.*20*, 195.*48*, 203.*19*

de Congressu
197.*68*, 200.*118*
de Ebrietate
199.*108*, 200.*110*
in Flaccum
161.*50*
de Fuga et Inuentione
193.*23*, 199.*109*, 203.*19*
de Gigantibus
199.*108*
Legum Allegoriae
I 202.*9*, *10*, *15*, 203.*23*
II 205.*54*
III 187.*59*, 199.*109*, 200.*110*
de Migratione Abrahami
159.*22*, 188.*7*, 193.*20*, *25*, 200.*110*
de Mutatione nominum
190.*27*, 193.*23*, 199.*108*, *109*, 200.*110*, 206.*69*
de Opificio mundi
202.*15*, 203.*19*, *22*, *23*
de Plantatione
196.*48*
de Posteritate Caini
197.*68*, 199.*109*, 200.*115*
Questiones in Genesim
I 199.*95*, 202.*9*, 203.*23*, *27*
II 205.*45*, *47*, *49*, *53*, *55*, *56*, 206.*57*
III 199.*108*
IV 199.*108*, *109*
Questiones in Exodum
195.*44*, 197.*66*
Quis Heres
199.*109*
Quod Deterius
193.*22*
Quod Deus immutabilis
199.*108*, 200.*110*
de Sobrietate
205.*56*
de Somniis I
171.*39*, 193.*23*, 199.*108*, 200.*110*
II 195.*48*
de Virtutibus
205.*55*
de Vita contemplatiua
193.*20*
de Vita Moysis
59
[*Antiquitates biblicae*]
173.*73*, 187.*59*, 208.*106*, *107*
Philostratus
Vita Apollonii
182.*2*
Porphyry
Aduersus Christianos
178.*45*
Poseidonius
Fragments
182.*1*, 183.*12*
Priscillian
[*Tractatus*]
178.*45*
Procopius
Fragments
200.*121*, 202.*15*, *18*
Strabo
Geographica
159.*13*
Fragment 159.*13*, 161.*50*
Suda
Numenius 183.*17*
Origen 175.*23*
Tacitus
Historiae V
182.*4*, 183.*9*
Tatian
Oratio ad Graecos
148.*18*
Tertullian
Aduersus Praxean
203.*18*
Apologeticum
147.*1*, 158.*3*, *5*, 178.*52*
de Cultu feminarum
178.*45*
de Idololatria
170.*24*, 183.*23*
de Patientia
186.*34*
Scorpiace 186.*34*, 187.*71*
de Spectaculis
183.*24*
[*Aduersus Iudaeos*]
190.*33*
Theodoret
Quaestiones
159.*19*, 197.*66*

Theodosian Code
167.*104*
Theophilus
ad Autolycum
148.*18*
Trogus Pompeius
182.*2*

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Abbahu, 11, 27, 45-7, 54, 56; 143.*5*, 147.*43*
Abraham, 32, 65, 75, 90-1
Adam, 42, 44, 124-6, 132
Adonai, 59; 152.*60*
adultery, 81
Africanus, *see* Julius Africanus
aggadah, 13, 19, 49, 51, 114, 123-32
Akiba, 40, 60, 82, 92, 107, 110-11, 118; 168.*13*, 173.*65*, 184.*31*, 198.*76*
Alexander of Cappadocia, 12, 19
Alexander Polyhistor, 16-17
Alexandria, Jews in, 8-9, 16, 24, 40
allegory, 16, 19, 67, 75, 77, 84, 90-1, 95-6, 108, 112-18
alphabet: 'Assyrian', 55, 57; Greek, 57; Hebrew, 52, 55; 175.*24*; Old Hebrew, 57, 59, 116; 178.*46*
Amalek, 82, 113, 130
'Amidah, see Tefillah
angels, 90, 126, 131; seventy a., of nations 42, 109-10, 126, 194.*35*; a. understand Aramaic 178.*60*; worship of a. 42, 65, 68
anthropomorphism, 44, 126; 203.*22*
anti-Judaism (Alexandrian), 64-6, 80
Apion, 65; 182.*1*, 183.*9, 10, 12*
Apocrypha, 54
apocrypha (Jewish) 15, 21, 51-2, 129; 170.*26*
Apollonius Molon, 65; 182.*1, 2*
aporrheta, 21, 131
Aquila, 15, 26, 51-2, 56, 58-9, 100, 129; 145.*15*, 195.*44*
Aramaic language, 22, 30; 151.*56*, 178.*60*, 203.*30*
Aristeas, Pseudo-, 15, 90, 95, 108, 112
Aristobulus, 16, 95, 108, 112; 147.*4*, 183.*8*, 196.*55*
art, Jewish and Christian, 114, 117
Artapanus, 15; 183.*7, 8*
asmakta, 51
Assumption of Moses, 15
atonement, 45

Balaam, 80, 131; 199.*108*
Bar Kappara, *see* Eleazar ben Eleazar ha-Kappar
Bar Kochba, 11, 84
baraitha, 146.*26*
Barnabas, Pseudo-, 90, 95
Ben Sira, 54
Bene Israel, 179.*62*
Bethlehem, 99
Bible, 49-61, 103-21 *and passim*; difficulties in B., 91, 95, 106, 108, 124, 127, 128; Greek B., 15, 37, 49-50, 53, 58 (*see also* Aquila, Hexapla, Septuagint, Symmachus, Theodotion) Hebrew B., 21-3, 26, 49-53; B. inspired, 83, 105-6; interpretation of, *see* allegory, exegesis, interpretation of Scripture; public readings of B., 56-8; 182.*86*; style of B. 67-8, 107, 110-11
Biblical Antiquities, see Philo, Pseudo-

Caesarea, 1-2, 8, 10-12, 57; library of C., 17, 19, 20; 164.*77*; Rabbis of C., 2, 8, 27
Cairo Genizah, 51, 56, 59; 145.*15*, 183.*13*
canon of Scripture, 49-55, 60
capital jurisdiction, 33-4
catenae, 5, 6, 25
Celsus, 16, 18, 31, 41-3, 46, 64-71, 79, 99, 101

Christian Jews, 35-6, 44, *see also* Jewish Christians
Cicero, 65-6
circumcision, 32, 37, 39, 40, 86, 87, 90-2, 94
Clement of Alexandria, 15, 16, 19, 20, 27, 52, 55, 67, 92
commentary, origin of, 150.*31*
creation, 43-5, 60, 124-7
cross as anti-Jewish symbol, 77, 82; c. as Jewish symbol, 116-17
Cyprian, 89

Daniel, Book of, 20, 53, 54; 173.*68*
David, 45, 54, 55; D. as ancestor of Patriarchs, 33, 97
Demetrius (Jewish writer), 15-16
demons, 42, 68
deuterosis, 34-5
Devil, *see* Satan
didaskalos 34; 162.*58*
dietary laws, 39, 41, 90, 95-6
disputations, 12, 21, 22, 30, 41, 43, 63, 69, 71, 75, 89-102; 203.*19*
Dorshei Ḥamuroth, 113
Dorshei Reshumoth, 113, 114, 117, 130; 197.*66*
Dorshei Shemoth, 118
Dositheans, 37
dualism, 43-4
Dura-Europos, synagogue at, 10, 116, 117, 129, 130

Ebionites 35-6; 188.*81*
Ecclesiastes, Book of, 50, 52-5
Eden, 125
Egypt, 8-9, 43, 46, 64-5; 170.*30*
elders (Jewish), 49, 54, 117
Eleazar ben Eleazar ha-Kappar 27-8; 203.*19*, 204.*32*
election, 17, 29, 78-84, 96-8
elephants, 127
Eliezer (ben Hyrcanus), 56, 82; 197.*63*
Eliezer ben Jose, 113; 173.*65*
Elijah, 47
Elim, 117
Elkesaites, 36
emeth (literal interpretation), 113
Enoch, Book of 15, 55
'erub, 40, 92
Esau, 80
Esther, Book of, 53, 56, 57
ethnarchs, 24, 33-4, 97; 162.*55*
Eupolemus, 15, 16; 183.*7*, *8*
Eusebius of Caesarea, 4, 5, 11, 16, 19, 20, 22-4, 27, 31-2, 34, 52, 54, 85, 129; 153.*61*, 154.*67*
evidences of Christianity, 63, 70-9
exegesis, 13, 16, 19, 20, 28, 82-4, 103-21
exilarch, 97
exodus, 31, 32, 129-30
Ezekiel, Book of, 50, 53, 60; 182.*86*
Ezekiel (tragic poet), 16
Ezra, 54-6; 179.*65*; Apocalypse of E., 15, 53, 55

Field, F., 5, 25-6
fire (as a symbol), 93, 115
fringes, *see ṣiṣith*

Gamliel I, *3*.41
Gamliel II, 33, 57; 173.*65*, 186.*50*
Gamliel III, 23
gematria, 175.*24*, 194.*34*, *35*
genealogical scrolls, 33, 97, 100
gezerah shawah, 194.*41*, 195.*48*
Gnostics, 18-19, 43, 44, 124
gnothi seauton, 67
Golgotha, 126-7, 132
Gospels, 17, 36, 54, 70, 72; *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, 17, 165.*77*; Gospel of Matthew (Hebrew), 17, 19, 165.*77*
Greek language 10, 11, 22, 30, 56, 57

haggadah, *see* aggadah
ḥakam, 33, 35; 164.*69*; *see also* sages
halakah, 9, 39, 40, 42, 47, 92-3, 96, 107, 115-16
Hananiah ben Hezekiah, 60
Haninah (ben Hama), 124-5
Harnack, A. von, 2, 15, 21, 55, 127; 149.*18*
'Hebrew' (meaning of), 29-33, 132
Hebrew, the, 25-7, 42, 43, 45-6, 111, 128, 129, 132
Hebrew language, 21-3, 30-1, 42, 44, 56-8, 126
Hebrews, 25, 51, 54, 55, 114, 118, 123, 129, 131, 132; Epistle to the H., 44
Hellenistic Judaism, 15, 19, 29, 30, 41-4, 57, 61, 101, 112, 126
heretics, 18-20, 41, 44, 85, 86
Hilary of Poitiers, 5, 52, 54; 145.*18*, 175.*24*

Hillel 33, 97, 110; 168.*13*
hippogriffs (not kosher), 95
history (evidence of), 70, 75-9, 96-8, 100
Hiyya bar Abba, 56; 177.*39*
holy Spirit, 43, 81, 90, 100, 115-6
Homer, commentators on, 84, 108, 118
ḥomer, 113
Hoshaya of Caesarea, 25, 28, 92; 203.*19*
Huet, P. D., 2, 5, 6, 104; 144.*6*, 153.*61*
'Huillus', 21, 23-5, 27, 55, 98

idolatry, 42, 65, 68, 85
immortality, 47, 131
incarnation, 76, 79
inscriptions, Jewish *3*.8, 9, 10, 55, 68, 69
interpretation of Scripture: moral, 83, 111-12; spiritual, 82-4, 87, 92, 109, 111-12; symbolic, 113-21, 130; *see also* allegory, *emeth*, *ḥomer*, literalism, *mashal*, *midrash*, *peshaṭ*, *rishum*
Irenaeus, 43, 55
Isaac: amora, 93; 172.*54*, 189.*25*
patriarch, as type of Christ, 116-17
Isaiah, martyrdom of, 78
Ishmael, tanna, 93, 107, 109, 113; 173.*65*, 193.*13*
'Israel' (meaning of), 29, 31, 32, 80
Israel, Church as true, 64, 70, 80
Iullos, *see* 'Huillus'

Jacob, 80
Jannai, amora, 99
Jason and Papiscus, Controversy of, 98, 202.*18*
Jerome, 4, 5, 7, 16, 19-27, 34-6, 50-1, 99, 103, 113, 114, 118, 124-5, 127; 145.*17*, 153.*61*, 155.*72*
Jerusalem, 10, 20, 125
'Jew' (meaning of the term), 29-32, 105
Jewish calendar, 39
Jewish Christians, 12, 25, 29, 32-3, 44, 46, 58, 69, 77, 99, 116, 126, 132; 149.*26*, 203.*24*
Jewish festivals, 36, 39, 86, 94
Jewish influence on Christianity, 12, 33, 39, 86-7, 94
'Jewish myths', 76, 91, 105; 192.*8*
Jewish tax, 34
Jewish wars: First (66-73), 77; Second (115-17), 8, 16, 77; Third (133-5), 11, 77
Jews: antiquity of, 64, 66, 67, 126; origin of, 31, 65; paradox of Church's attitude to, 63; persecute Christians, 76, 84-6; rebellion of, 65, 80; rejected and killed Jesus, 18, 30, 47, 63, 76-9, 83, 85, 97, 98; rejected by God, 76, 79, 89
Joab, 45, 120
Johanan (bar Nappaha), 27, 45, 47, 56, 109, 115; 175.*13*, 178.*60*, 198.*79*, 206.*70*
Johanan ben Zakkai, 33; 161.*41*
John the Baptist, 47
Jonathan, amora, 99; 172.*58*
Jose, amora, 57
Jose (ben Halafta), 45; 202.*16*
Joseph, 65, 128-9
Joseph and Aseneth, 129
Josephus, 17, 19, 29, 31, 35, 39, 52, 64-8, 119, 129; 148.*17*
Joshua, 49, 91; Book of J., 52, 55
Joshua (ben Hananiah), 56; 184.*31*
Joshua ben Levi, 27
Joshua ben Qorha, 118; 175.*24*
Jubilees, Book of 15
Judah: ancestor of Jewish kings, 97-8; name means 'confessor' 32
Judah I, patriarch, 7, 23, 27, 33, 39, 57, 97; 173.*65*, 175.*24*, 176.*30*, 178.*60*, 189.*15*
Judah II, patriarch, 23, 27, 59
Judah (bar Ilai), 45, 128; 202.*16*
Judith, Book of, 54; 158.*4*, 175.*24*, 177.*37*
Julius Africanus, 12, 16, 20, 32, 50; 148.*5*
Justin, 18, 43, 44, 66, 67, 78, 84-5, 89, 92, 99, 102, 114, 116, 117, 128
Justus of Tiberias, 16, 148.*5*

Korah, sons of 46, 55
Kurios 59; 152.*60*

Latin language, 22, 30
law, 36, 39, 42, 69-70, 77-8, 82-3, 86, 87, 89-96, 107-9
leaven of the Pharisees, 87; search for l., 39
leprosy, 65, 80-1

Leqaḥ Ṭob, 118, 131; 199.*102*
Levi, amora, 57, 97
literalism, 30, 32, 40-5, 51, 59, 69, 83-7, 95, 104-9, 112; 190.*41*
Logos, 6, 43, 69, 81, 101, 117, 126
Lysimachus, 65

Maccabees, First Book of, 53; 158.*1*
magic, 65, 66, 70, 71; 170.*30*
Manetho, 65; 182.*1*
manna, 93-4, 114, 117, 130
Marah, 77, 84, 113, 116, 117, 130
Marcion, 18, 55, 127; 177.*36*
Marqah, 11, 36-7; 166.*92*
mashal, 112-13, 115
meat, as a symbol, 86, 117
Meir, tanna, 33, 118; 173.*65*
Mekilta, 7, 8, 43, 118, 120, 129, 130; 146.*25*
Melito, 12, 18, 44, 50; 176.*30*
Messiah, 33, 47, 72, 75, 77, 81, 83, 89, 97-101
messianism, 70; 164.*71*
mezuzah, 57
midrash, 107
midrashim, 7-9, 51-2, 118, 129; Origen's knowledge of m., 21, 51-2, 124, 129
Minim, 35, 44, 46, 54, 99; 186.*50,* 192.*69*, 203.*19*
miracles, 70-2, 75, 101
mishnah, 34
Mishnah, 1, 7-10, 21-2, 30, 39-41, 49, 56-7, 60, 118; 169.*18*
miṣwoth, 12, 36
Moses: as author, 55, 101, 106; as controversial figure, 64-6, 101; his arms as symbol, 82, 84, 117; his rod, 116; receives revelation, 49; as shepherd, 115
muthoi, 71; *see also* 'Jewish myths'
mysteries, 82-3, 107-9
mysterium, 49; 194.*34*

names: allegorical interpretation of, 7, 16-17, 19, 28, 30, 32, 84, 108, 117-21, 125, 130; of God, 58-9; 152.*60*; 181.*75* (*see also Adonai, Kurios, Sabaoth*); power of, 68, 117
Nasi (title), 33-4
Nathan, tanna, 33, 93; 169.*18*, 193.*26*
Nazarenes, 35-6; 187.*77*
Neapolis, 10, 18
Nicopolis, 12, 20; 192.*77*
Noah, 127-8, 132
noṭariqon, 171.*33*, 201.*135*
numbers: interpretation of, 19, 124; symbolism of, 175.*24*, 201.*136*
Numenius of Apamea, 16, 18, 67

Onomastica, 16-17, 119-21; *see also* names, allegorical interpretation of
Origen, works of, 3-6; *Commentary on Isaiah,* 23; *Commentary on Psalms,* 6, 23, 24; *Contra Celsum* 13, 41-3, 63-73, 75-80, 86, 89-90, 97-100; Hexapla, 5, 6, 15, 21-3, 25, 50, 51, 58; 152.*60*, 154.*61* *Letter to Julius Africanus,* 4, 24, 34, 54, 58; *Peri Pascha,* 4, 95; 144.*9*, 168.*18*; *Principles,* 4, 5, 9, 39-40; 146.34; *Stromateis,* 5, 24; *see also Philocalia*
Origen's Jewish teachers, 23-8, 30, 131; *see also* Hebrews, Hebrew, the, 'Huillus', 'predecessors'
Origen's mother, not Jewish, 23
Othniel, interpreted, 84, 120

paganism, 11-12, 17-18, 63-8
Pantaenus, 19; 150.*39*
Panthera, 66, 69
papyri, 4, 7, 9, 17, 19, 20, 42-3, 120; 144.*9*, *10,* 148.*14,* 151.*46*, 181.*80,* 207.*77*
pascha, 95
paschal lamb, 86, 94
Passover, 39, 94-5
patriarchs: biblical, 31; *3*.55, 69; merits of biblical p. 115; 162.*55*; in Roman period, 23-4, 33-4, 97
Paul: his attitude to Judaism, 77; his influence on Origen, 17, 29, 32, 80, 83, 90, 130; his interpretation of Scripture, 75, 95, 108-9
peshaṭ, 107
Pharaoh's heart, hardening of, 45-6
'Pharisees', Origen's use of the term 17, 32, 35
Philo: his exegesis, 124-30; allegory, 16, 84, 90, 95, 108-9, 116-17;

of names, 16-17, 117-20
his impact, 16, 19; his influence on Origen, 16, 32, 95, 104
Philo the Elder, 16
Philo, Pseudo-, 17, 51, 131
Philocalia, 4, 5, 40; 145.*12*
Philostratus, 65; 182.*2*
Phinehas, 47, 131
Photius, 20; 148.*5*
phylacteries, *see tefillin*
pilgrimage, 12, 18; 143.*2*
Plotinus, 16, 18
Posh'ei Yisrael, 36
Potiphars, the two, 129
powers, 42, 68; two p., 43-4
Prayer of Joseph, 15, 131; 170.*26,* 207.*78*
'predecessors', Origen's, 16, 21, 129, 131; 172.*62*
promises, 63, 67, 77
prophecy, as evidence, 70-2, 75-9, 96-101
Proverbs, Book of, 52, 55
Psalms, Book of, 52-5

qorban 35, 41

Rab, 28, 119-20; 168.*18,* 175.*24,* 203.*19, 30,* 207.*74*
'Rabbi' (the title), 34-5
'Rabbinic' Judaism, 29-35, 41-4, 51, 56, 112; R. literature, 7-11, 41-5, 51, 56, 59-61
Resh Lakish, *see* Simeon ben Lakish
resurrection, 36, 46-7, 69, 75
rewards and punishments, 45-6
rishum, 113, *see also Dorshei Reshumoth*
Romans, 10, 11, 27, 33-4, 85, 115
Rome, Jews in, 30; 173.*65*
Rossi, A. de' 3; 170.*27*
Rufinus, 4, 34-5, 46, 60, 131; 145.*13*

Sabaoth, 42-3
sabbath, 37, 40, 86, 87, 90, 92-4
sabbath-limit, *see 'erub*
sacrifices, 41, 86, 87; 169.*18,* 172.*54*
Sadducees, 17, 46; 164.*70,* 173.*65, 68*
'Sage' (the title), 23, 25, 33-5, 55; 162.*55, 60,* 163.*68, 69,* 171.*40*
sages, Jewish 21, 23, 25, 34, 43, 54, 55, 60, 72, 101; 178.*60*
Samaritans, 2, 10, 11, 17, 20, 36-7, 40, 46, 47, 131; 143.*5,* 173.*65,* 190.*31*; their version of the Bible, 37
Samuel, amora, 119-20; 177.*31*
Samuel bar Nahman, 27, 125
Samuel ben Sisarti, 57; 180.*68*
sanhedrin, 34, 115
Satan, 43, 115
'Scribes', 17, 35
sects, 35-7
Sekhel Ṭob, Midrash, 118; 199.*103*
Septuagint, 5, 15, 50, 51, 56, 125; *see also* Bible, Greek
Seraphim, 26, 43, 132
sexes segregated in the ark, 127
Shema', 11, 56-7; 180.*74*
shi'ur qomah, 44; 182.*87*
Simeon ben Azzai, 100
Simeon ben Gamliel II, 33, 57; 178.*57*
Simeon ben Lakish, 11, 26, 27; 175.*13*
Simeon bar Yohai, 45
sins, 45, 93; s. of the Jews, 78, 80, 83
ṣiṣith, 39
Solomon, 45, 54, 55, 67
Song of Songs, 50, 52-5, 60, 112, 116
sophos, see ḥakam, Sage
spirits, 42-3; *see also* holy Spirit
students, 45, 49, 59-60
'Suidas', 104
Sunday, 86, 93-4, 117
Susanna, Story of, 20, 54, 132
Symmachus, 15, 51, 129; 165.*84*
synagogue, Christians attend, 96, 93
Syrian, the, 25; 151.*56*
Syro-Hexaplar, 5, 26; 181.*77*

Tacitus, 65
Talmud, 8, 49, 78; Palestinian T. 8, 9, 10, 56; 143.*5*
tanna (*deuterotês*), 34; 163.*64*
Targum, 125, 129
Tatian, 20, 66, 67
tau, 59, 116; 198.*86*
Tefillah, 56, 86; 178.*60*
tefillin, 35, 57, 114
Tertullian, 15, 29, 84-5
Testimonia, 89, 96
tetragrammaton, 58-9; 152.*60,* 181.*75, 77*
Theodotion, 15, 51
Theodotus, 16
Timothy and Aquila, Dialogue of, 102, 192.*77*
Tobit, Book of, 54; 175.*24*
Toldoth Yeshu, 66, 69, 86, 100; 173.*75*
Torah: opposed to Gospel, 72; oral, 21, 22, 34, 49, 51, 60; symbols of,

114-6; written, 49, 51, 55, 60
Tosefta, 7, 54
traditions, Jewish, 34, 49, 51, 52, 55, 131
translation, 49-51, 56
transliteration, 56-8, 152.*60*
tree, as a symbol, 77, 84, 113, 114, 116, 117

veil on Moses' face, 83, 87, 108
vine, interpreted, 114, 126, 128
violent death, 45
virgin birth, 35-6, 71, 75, 98-9

water, as a symbol, 113-7
Wisdom of Solomon, 54, 108
wood, as a symbol, 84, 113, 114, 116

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

ORIENTAL PUBLICATIONS PUBLISHED FOR THE

FACULTY OF ORIENTAL STUDIES

1 *Averroes' Commentary on Plato's Republic*, edited and translated by E.I.J.Rosenthal
2 *FitzGerald's Salaman and Absal'*, edited by A.J.Arberry
3 *Ihara Saikaku: The Japanese Family Storehouse*, translated and edited by G.W.Sargent
4 *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra*, edited and translated by Ilya Gershevitch
5 *The Fusūl al-Madanī of al-Fārābī*, edited and translated by D.M.Dunlop (out of print)
6 *Dun Karm, Poet of Malta*, texts chosen and translated by A.J.Arberry; introduction, notes and glossary by P.Grech.
7 *The Political Writings of Ogyu Sorai*, by J.R.McEwan.
8 *Financial Administration under the T'ang Dynasty*, by D.C.Twitchett
9 *Neolithic Cattle-Keepers of South India: A Study of the Deccan Ashmounds*, by F.R.Allchin
10 *The Japanese Enlightenment: A Study of the Writings of Fukuzawa Yukichi*, by Carmen Blacker
11 *Records of Han Administration.* Vol. I *Historical Assessment*, by M.Loewe
12 *Records of Han Administration.* Vol. II *Documents*, by M.Loewe
13 *The Language of Indrajit of Orchā: A Study of Early Braj Bhāsā Prose*, by R.S.McGregor
14 *Japan's First General Election, 1890*, by R.H.P.Mason
15 *A Collection of Tales from Uji: A Study and Translation of 'Uji Shui Monogatari'*, by D.E.Mills
16 *Studia Semitica*, Vol. I *Jewish Themes*, by E.I.J. Rosenthal
17 *Studia Semitica*, Vol. II *Islamic Themes*, by E.I.J. Rosenthal
18 *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts.* Vol. I *Syriac Text*, by Luise Abramowski and Alan E.Goodman
19 *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts.* Vol. II *Introduction. Translation, Indexes*, by Luise Abramowski and Alan E.Goodman
20 *The Syriac Version of the Pseudo-Nonnos Mythological Scholia*, by Sebastian Brook
21 *Water Rights and Irrigation Practices in Lahj*, by A.M.A.Maktari
22 *The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimḥi on Psalms cxx-cl*, edited and translated by Joshua Baker and Ernest W.Nicholson
23 *Jalāl al-dīn al-Suyūṭī.* Vol. I *Biography and Background*, by E.M.Sartain
24 *Jalāl al-dīn al-Suyūṭī.* Vol. II *"Al-Tahadduth bibi'mat allān"*, Arabic text, by E.M.Sartain
25 *Origen and the Jews: Studies in Jewish-Christian Relations in Third-Century Palestine*, by N.R.M. de Lange
26 *The 'Visaladevarasa': A Restoration of the Text*, by John D.Smith
27 *Shabbethai Sofer and His Prayer-book*, by Stefan C.Reif
28 *Mori Ogai and the Modernization of Japanese Culture*, by Richard John Bowring

CAMBRIDGE ORIENTAL SERIES

1 *Modern Arabic Poety: an Anthology*, by A.J.Arberry
2 *Essays and Studies presented to Stanley Arthur Cook*, edited by D.Winton Thomas (out of print)

continued overleaf

3 *Khotanese Buddhist Texts*, by H.W.Bailey (out of print)
4 *The Battles of Coxinga*, by Donald Keene
6 *Studies in Caucasian History*, by V.Minorsky

(This series was first published by Taylor's Foreign Press and then by Vallentine, Mitchell & Co. There was no number 5.)