

### “*Sursum Cor*” in the Sermons of St. Augustine

The conference theme of “Liturgy and Life” has stimulated me to rethink about the aim of preaching sermons and the function of scriptures and liturgical texts in the sermons. I think St Augustine’s case is worth noting. Augustine, from the beginning of his episcopal career in 396, at forty-two years of age to his death in 430 at seventy-six years of age, continued to preach day after day.

Augustine (354-430) quite often mentions the phrase *sursum cor/corda* “Lift up the heart” in his works. According to the survey of Michele Pellegrino,<sup>1</sup> Augustine uses this phrase in forty-five passages in his whole works. This phrase is easily recognised as the one derived from the liturgical text of the eucharistic dialogue before the preface. He mentions it in his main philosophical writings such as *Confessions* and *City of God*, and in the biblical exegeses on the Psalms and St. John’s Gospel. But more than three quarters of the citations can be found in the *Sermons to the people*. And we can add five citations found in the newly discovered sermons (Dolbeau sermons).<sup>2</sup>

In the fourth century in Africa the practices and prayers in the eucharist itself were treated as a secret among the already baptized believers. Even the Lord’s prayer was given only to the *competentes* (who are ready to

---

<sup>1</sup> Forty-seven citations of *sursum cor*: (\*three times *sursum corda*): *Conf.* 12.16.23; 13.7.8; *De civ. Dei* 10.3.14; 14.13.31; *Tract. in Ioh. Ev.* 18.6.41; 56.9.18; *Enarr. in Ps.* 10.3.29; 148.5.7\*; 39.28.54; 52.2.55\*; 61.16.30; 80.21.2; 90.13.41; 141.15.31; *Enarr. II in Ps.* 31.21.11; 48.2.29; *De vera religione* 5.9; *Ep.* 140.85; 263.8; *Adnot. in Iob* 39; *De bono viduit.* 20; *Serm. de util. ieiunii* 2; *Serm.* 29B (=Dolbeau 8.3 [in 397]); 53.14; 60.7 (on 14/21 May 397); 68 (=Mai 126.6); 86.14\*; 105.11; 110A (=Dolbeau 17.3.6 [in 397]); 114B (=Dolbeau 5.14); 116.2; 159B (=Dolbeau 21.18); 169.16; 177.8; 227; 229 (=Denis 6.2); 229A (=Guelf. 7.3); 233.4; 237.3; 261.1 (in 14 May 397); 263A (=Mai 98.4 [in 396-397?]); 265C (=Guelf 20.1); 296 (=Casin I 133.7); 299A (=Mai 19.2=Dolbeau 4.5); 301.7; 311.15; 330.2 (in 18 August 397); 345 (=Frangipane 3.5); 359A (=Lambot 4); 360C (=Dolbeau 27.2); 372.3. See Michele Pellegrino, “«*Sursum cor*» nelle opera di sant’ Agostino”, *REAug* 3 (1965) 179-206.

<sup>2</sup> Dolbeau 4.5 (=Mai 19.2 [NBA 33,390]); 5.14; 8.3; 17.3.6; 21.18; 27.2;. See François Dolbeau, *Augustin d’Hippone. Vingt-six sermons au peuple d’Afrique*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes Série Antiquité 147 (Paris 1996). Cf. Martin Klöckener, “Die Bedeutung der neu entdeckten Augustinus-Predigten (Sermones Dolbeau) für die liturgiegeschichtliche Forschung”, in G. Madec, ed., *Augustin Prédicateur (395-411)*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes 159 (Paris 1998) 129-170, esp.150-153.

talked to each member of his audience directly.<sup>10</sup> I think that his use of the singular *cor* has not only a rhetorical effect but also some deeper insight into human nature. Augustine faces up to the one reality of the human heart, even though he has coped with various kinds of people and various kinds of readers.

When Augustine treats the liturgical text *sursum cor*, he was never tired of linking it to biblical passages in order to share the meaning of it with the people. The accepted liturgy is reflected in the light of the biblical texts. *Sermo* 53<sup>11</sup> and *Sermo* 116<sup>12</sup> are examples. When people were admonished or invited to lift up the heart (*sursum cor*), what did “upwards” (*sursum*) mean for them? Here Augustine explains this *sursum* in the connection to a passage in Col 3:1-4: “seek the things above” (*quae sursum sunt quaerite*). This biblical text strongly presupposes the ancient cosmology. The things upward are divine, things on earth are not so. The angels and the saints come up and down within this cosmos. This cosmological understanding in the bible appears also in the creed or symbol “On the third day, he rose from the dead, and ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father” as is seen in *Sermo* 227 above. In this cosmology upward and downward, heaven and earth would constitute the liturgical cerebration as one of a sacred space and a sacred time. Participating in it, people could easily feel the atmosphere of their connection to the things above.

But, even if people could enjoy the *sursum cor* in the atmosphere of the solemn liturgy, how was their real “heart” (*cor*) in living a daily life? What is our heart itself? The ancient biblical cosmology answered it only very formally. Augustine here, based upon the liturgical and biblical texts, turns to explore the dimension of the heart itself. His effort is amazing. And it is in the sermons that he ties up cosmology and ethical life in a realistic way.

---

<sup>10</sup> Pellegrino, “Sursum cor”, 187.

<sup>11</sup> Aug., *Serm.* 53.13; NBA 30/1,102: “Nam et sancti ipsi qui in terra habitant, carne terram calcant, corde in caelo habitant. Non enim frustra admonentur *sursum* habere *cor*, et cum admoniti fuerint, ita esse respondent: aut frustra dicitur: *Si consurrexistis cum Christo, quae sursum sunt quaerite, ubi Christus est in dextera Dei sedens: quae sursum sunt sapite, non quae super terram* (Col. 3:1-2).”

<sup>12</sup> Aug., *Serm.* 116.2; NBA 30/2,486-488: “Sed quid ait Dominus Iesus? *Quid turbati estis, et cogitationes ascendunt in cor vestrum* (Lk. 24:38)? Si ascendunt in cor vestrum cogitationes, de terra veniunt cogitationes. Bonum est homini, non ut cogitatio ascendat in cor eius, sed ut sursum ascendat ipsum cor eius: ubi uolebat Apostolus ponere corda credentium, quibus dicebat, *Si consurrexistis cum Christo, quae sursum sunt sapite, ubi Christus est ad dexteram Dei sedens; quae sursum sunt quaerite, non quae super terram. Mortui enim estis, et uita uestra abscondita est cum Christo in Deo; cum Christus apparuerit uita uestra, tunc et uos cum illo apparebitis in gloria.* (Col.3:1-4).”

Let us see the text *Sermo* 229A.<sup>13</sup> Surprisingly enough, he points out that the act of lifting up the heart can be sometimes good and sometimes bad. When bad? Augustine points out: “If you yourselves are lifted up, and you threw down the hearts” and argues that such a lifted heart is nothing but a pride or arrogance *superbia*. So, it is needed to return to the Lord intently. He challenges the people to pay keen attention to the Lord, not merely to the upward in a cosmological sense. If they regarded the upward direction as a removal from the earth to the heaven like angels, they were unconsciously trapped in their hidden self-satisfaction.

This point is emphasised in *Sermo* 261<sup>14</sup> and other sermons with plain words; the “upward” means specifically “towards the Lord”. And “towards the Lord” means to avoid the pride. This is the key to his sermons: to free the people from the snare of the cosmological formality and let them turn or return the Lord dynamically.

Of course, these thoughts are clearly seen in Augustine’s main philosophical writings such as *Confessions* and *City of God*. In book 13 of *Confessions* (13.7.8), he develops the very profound philosophical anthropology and crystallises the notion “my weight is my love” (*pondus meum amor meus*) (13.9.10). And this anthropology is strictly motivated with the anxious heart toward You (*cor inquietum ad te*) from book 1 on. In *City of God*, such a claim as “When we lift up our heart to him, our heart is his altar” in book 10<sup>15</sup> is nothing but the claim on our heart we have in this real world. The paradox “exaltation abases and humility exalts” in book 14<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Aug., *Serm.* 229A.3; NBA 32/1,412-414: “Interrogamus enim quodammodo et admonemus, et dicimus: *Sursum cor*. Nolite iusum: cor putrescit in terra, levate illud in caelum. Sed quo *sursus cor*? Quid respondetis? Quo *sursus cor*? *Habemus ad Dominum*. Ipsum enim *sursus cor*, aliquando bonum est, aliquando malum est. Quomodo malum est? In his malum, de quibus dictum est, *deiecisti eos, dum extollerentur* (Ps 72:18). *Sursus cor*, si non sit ad Dominum, non est iustitia, sed *superbia*: ideo cum dixerimus, *Sursus cor*, quia adhuc *sursus cor* potest esse *superbiae*, vos respondetis, *Habemus ad Dominum*. Ergo dignatio est, non elatio...”

<sup>14</sup> Aug., *Serm.* 261.1; NBA 32/2,882: “Resurrectio Domini, spes nostra; ascensio Domini, glorificatio nostra. Ascensionis enim hodie solemniam celebramus. Si ergo recte, si fideliter, si devote, si sancte, si pie ascensionem Domini celebramus, ascendamus cum illo, et *sursus cor* habeamus. Ascendentes autem non extollamur, [nec de nostris quasi de propriis meritis praesumamus]. *Sursus enim cor* habere debemus, sed *ad Dominum*. *Sursus enim cor* non ad Dominum, *superbia* vocatur. *Sursus autem cor* ad Dominum, *refugium* vocatur.”

<sup>15</sup> Aug., *De civ. Dei* 10.3.1; CCL 47,275: “Cum ad illum *sursus est*, eius est altare *cor nostrum*.”

<sup>16</sup> Aug., *De civ. Dei* 14.13; CCL 48,435: “Now it is good to lift up your heart (*sursus habere cor*), and to exalt your thoughts, yet not in the self-worship of pride, but the worship of God. This is the sign of obedience, and obedience can belong only to the humble (*non tamen ad se ipsum, quod est superbiae, se ad Dominum, quod est oboedientiae, quae nisi humilium non potest esse*). Thus, in a surprising way, there is something in humility to exalt the mind, and

performed this gesture as a prefiguring of his death overlooks the fact that it originated neither at the Last Supper, nor with Jesus.<sup>5</sup> It was a normative part of the Jewish ritual that opened the meal and constituted table fellowship.<sup>6</sup> The verbs *take*, *bless*, and *break* are linked as technical terms in rabbinic literature referring to the grace before common meals,<sup>7</sup> and are found in the biblical institution narratives,<sup>8</sup> as well the accounts of the multiplication of loaves in the synoptic gospels, and the Emmaus-event.<sup>9</sup>

Thirdly, we would do well to remember that the titles and sub-titles we use to divide and describe the liturgy are not absolute, but have been imposed largely by us as reflections of the mental framework by which we interpret it.<sup>10</sup> In regard to the Eucharistic Prayers, research into their structures and origins usually treats them as discrete literary pieces detached from the ritual matrix within which they are or were employed. This approach seems to forget both that the very materiality of the elements over which the anaphora is prayed has some effect on the handling of them, which in turn must influence the unfolding of the whole ritual, and that their presence apart from the prayer serves to anchor it as but a part within the whole. Accordingly, research on the Eucharistic Prayers and their origins has overlooked the possibility that the actual breaking of bread played any role in their development.<sup>11</sup> In regard to the action of breaking bread, while it has been realised that allegorical interpretations do not represent the original or essential significance of this action, the tendency to view it as *merely utilitarian* and by implication inconsequential,<sup>12</sup> rather than as *essentially*

---

depuis toujours.” For a survey of various exegetical approaches to Christ’s breaking of bread see Arthur R. Winnett, “The Breaking of the Bread: Does it Symbolize the Passion?”, *Expository Times* 88 (1976-1977) 181-182.

<sup>5</sup> Justin Taylor, “The Breaking of the Bread”, *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 113 (1999) 334.

<sup>6</sup> Kurt Hruby, “Le geste de la fraction du pain ou les gestes eucharistiques dans la tradition juive”, in *Gestes et paroles dans les diverses familles liturgiques: Conférences Saint-Serge XXIV<sup>e</sup> semaine d’études liturgiques*, A. M. Triacca, ed. (Rome 1978) 123-133; Joachim Jeremias, “Das Brotbrechen beim Passamahl und Mc 14,22 par.”, *Zeitschrift für die Neutestament Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 33 (1934) 203-204; *id.*, *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu* (Göttingen 1960) 44, 102-105, 168-169, and 224.

<sup>7</sup> Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte*, 166-167. Also see below, in material attached to footnotes 17, 20-22, and 25.

<sup>8</sup> Matt 26:26-28; Mark 14:22-24; Luke 22:19 (and 20 if one accepts the long recension); 1 Cor 11:23-26.

<sup>9</sup> Matt 14:19; 15:36; Mark 6:41; 8:6; Luke 9:16; 24:30. On Emmaus, see Arthur A. Just, *The Ongoing Feast: Table Fellowship and Eschatology at Emmaus* (Collegeville 1993).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Robert Taft, “The Structural Analysis of Liturgical Units: An Essay in Methodology”, in *id.*, *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding*, 2nd edn (Rome 1997) 191.

<sup>11</sup> E.g. Ligier, “Origins”; Mazza, *Origins*. Neither considered the actual breaking of bread.

<sup>12</sup> E.g. (emphasis mine): Dix, *Shape*, 513: “[Sarapion’s] fraction is still looked upon as a *mere utilitarian* preparation”; James D. Crichton, *A Short History of the Mass* (London 1983) 22-23:

## *The Breaking of Bread and the Eucharistic Prayer*

*practical* yet symbolic, properly understood,<sup>13</sup> predisposes scholars to overlook or even dismiss possibly relevant material.<sup>14</sup>

The period of specific interest for the purposes of this paper is the first three centuries AD, in which the most fundamental development of the eucharistic liturgy took place. However, the scarcity of material from this era, either because it has been lost or was never recorded, makes this the most difficult to research. Fortunately, a developing body of useful tools are provided by the school of comparative liturgy, the aim of which “is to reconstitute the past from its leftover débris”.<sup>15</sup>

---

“[W]e gather from St John Chrysostom for the East and St Augustine for the West that it was a *purely utilitarian* gesture”; Geoffrey Wainwright, “Recent Eucharistic Revision”, in *The Study of Liturgy*, Cheslyn Jones et al., eds, 2nd edn (London 1992) 333: “*purely ‘functional’* and preparatory”; Edward Yarnold, “The Liturgy of the Faithful in the Fourth and Early Fifth Centuries”, in *The Study of the Liturgy*, 233: “Western writers of the period do not often mention this rite, for it was still regarded *simply as a practical necessity*”; 235: “The fraction is not mentioned by *AC [Ap. cons. 8]*, presumably because it attached no significance to the rite, regarding it *simply as a functional necessity*”; Baby Varghese, *The Syriac Version of the Liturgy of St James: A Brief History for Students*, Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Studies 49 (Cambridge 2001) 40: *Ap. cons.*, *Test. dom.*, and Cyril of Jerusalem’s *Myst. cat.* “do not speak of the fraction, probably considering it a *purely utilitarian* act”.

<sup>13</sup> Louis-Marie Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament: A Sacramental Reinterpretation of Christian Existence*, trans. P. Madigan and M. Beaumont (Collegeville 1995) 397: “When for some reason it [bread] is not [shared in a meal], it still symbolically recalls that for human beings eating is not reducible to a simple utilitarian act”; *ibid.*, 408: “...the breaking of the bread should regularly be given greater prominence in our celebrations. The emptiness of broken bread belongs in an essential and not an accidental way to the Eucharistic *sacramentum* and, as a consequence, to its very mystery”; *id.*, “Le pain rompu comme figure théologique de la présence eucharistique”, *Questions Liturgiques* 82 (2001) 9-33; Robert Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, vol. 5: *The Precommunion Rites*, OCA 261 (Rome 2000) 320: “Surprisingly for so obviously ancient a ritual, some early sources...pass over the fraction in silence, undoubtedly because the breaking of the bread for communion was not only a hallowed ritual that went without saying, but also a ‘soft point’ of the service, action without words, requiring, initially, no textual explication.”

<sup>14</sup> E.g. Ronald C.D. Jasper and Geoffrey J. Cuming, eds, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, 3rd edn (Collegeville 1990) vii, state the aim of indicating “how each rite handles the four main actions of the eucharist: taking, giving thanks, breaking and giving”, yet they made no mention of a breaking in several liturgies for which it was important, e.g. Bucer’s *The Psalter, with complete Church Practice, 1539* (204-212), Calvin’s *The Form of Church Prayers, 1542* (213-218), the *Book of Common Prayer 1549* and *1552* (232-249). The importance for the latter two of the *Order of Communion 1548* (226-231) containing a direction that the wafers “shall be broken” (231) – changed to “could be” in the introduction (227) – was missed. If data for relatively well documented liturgies can be so easily overlooked, how much more so the less documented data from the first centuries.

<sup>15</sup> Robert Taft, “Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (d. 1948): A Reply to Recent Critics”, *Worship* 73 (1999) 522. Future references to the “laws” of comparative liturgy, in the absence of a commonly used synthesis, will follow Taft’s enumeration given in this article, 525-528.

*The Breaking of Bread and the Eucharistic Prayer*

eucharistic formulary,<sup>33</sup> contains a text that may have accompanied the breaking of bread. The absence of an institution narrative and other features expected by moderns in a eucharistic liturgy need not worry us, though it has led many to reject the possibility that this liturgy was a true eucharist or that the eucharist as we know it evolved from just such a structure.<sup>34</sup> It appears to be a Christian adaptation of the Hellenistic Jewish version of the already discussed bread ritual,<sup>35</sup> which makes it relevant as a unique witness to the development of that ritual, irrespective of its perceived sacramental status. The text in question is *Did.* 9.4:

Just as this *bread* lay scattered upon the mountains, and when gathered together became one, so may your Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom. For yours is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever.<sup>36</sup>

It is commonly noted that a significant parallel exists between 9.4 and 10.5,<sup>37</sup> concerning the eschatological gathering of the Church in the kingdom, for which reason they are often studied concurrently. Based on this marked

---

<sup>33</sup> Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary*, trans. Linda M. Maloney, ed. Harold W. Attridge, Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible (Minneapolis 1998) 139.

<sup>34</sup> See Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 141-142 for a survey of the various positions held regarding its status. Missing from this survey is John W. Riggs, "From Gracious Table to Sacramental Elements: The Tradition-History of Didache 9 and 10", *Second Century* 4 (1984) 83-101, who, with the more recent Mazza, *Origins*, 12-41; van de Sandt, "Eucharistic Food of the Didache", 223-246; and van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 298-304, considers it to be truly eucharistic. Discussion about any rite's sacramental status at this early period shows an anachronistic concern, and so is not particularly helpful. There is no valid internal reason to reject *Didache* 9-10's belonging to those practices out of which our eucharistic praxis evolved.

<sup>35</sup> Van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 318-325.

<sup>36</sup> *Did.* 9.4; SC 248b,176: <W>sp̄er h̄n̄ t̄out̄o <to>̄ kl̄asmā dieskorpismenon epan̄w̄ tw̄h̄ ōr̄ewn̄ kai; sunacq̄en̄ egenetō ēh̄, Oūt̄w̄ sunacq̄h̄t̄w̄ soū h̄lekl̄hs̄iā apo;̄ tw̄h̄ per̄at̄wn̄ th̄" gh̄" eij'̄ th̄n̄ sh̄n̄ basileian: <Otī sou'̄ ēstin̄ h̄l̄d̄ox̄ā kai; h̄l̄dun̄ami"̄ dia;̄ Ihsou'̄ Cristou'̄ eij'̄ tou'̄"̄ aij̄nā". There has been much discussion over the originality and meaning of *kl̄asmā*. The simplest explanation is given in van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 298. It seems to represent the Hellenistic Jewish usage of mostly translating Hebrew נֶאֱסַף as *kl̄asmā* as seen in the LXX, and would justify translating it as *bread*. Later liturgies use *af̄to*", *bread*.

<sup>37</sup> *Did.* 10.5; SC 248b,180: Mn̄hsq̄hti, kur̄ie, th̄"̄ ek̄kl̄hs̄iā"̄ soū tou'̄ r̄usasq̄aī aūj̄th̄n̄ apo;̄ p̄anto;̄"̄ pon̄hrou;̄, Kai;̄ teleiws̄aī aūj̄th̄n̄ ēh̄ th̄/̄ aḡaph/̄ sou,̄ Kai;̄ sunax̄on̄ aūj̄th̄n̄ apo;̄ tw̄h̄ tessar̄wn̄ ap̄em̄wn̄, th̄n̄ aḡiasq̄eis̄an, Eij'̄ th̄n̄ sh̄n̄ basileian, h̄h̄ h̄toim̄asa"̄ aūj̄th̄"̄ <Otī sou'̄ ēstin̄ h̄l̄dun̄ami"̄ kai;̄ h̄l̄d̄ox̄ā eij'̄ tou'̄"̄ aij̄nā". ("Be mindful Lord of your Church, to deliver it from all evil, and to perfect it in your love, and gather it from the four winds [once sanctified] into your kingdom which you have prepared for it. For yours is the power and the glory for ever.")

similarity, Mazza suggested 10.5 as the source of 9.4, though he carefully stressed that the tripartite structures of 9 and 10 must not be confused.<sup>38</sup> Likewise, Riggs, and later van de Sandt and Flusser, accepted that, based on the probable literary priority of *Did.* 10, the form of 9 is dependent on that of 10.<sup>39</sup> They suggest that a prayer like the tenth of the Eighteen Benedictions was the likely source for 9.4 but that it was adopted in order to echo and parallel 10.5.<sup>40</sup> However, similarity on its own is not sufficient reason to posit the source of one in the other. It takes no account of the differences between the texts, though it may help explain the interplay that would become more important at a later date.

Rather than attempting to locate a source in a particular biblical text, some recognise that both texts are likely to be expressions of a common eschatological tradition, one abundantly manifested in scripture,<sup>41</sup> and Jewish prayers, especially the tenth benediction of the *tefilla*. This is a far more productive approach for identifying passages which may play a role in the later use, development, and interaction of the texts, as later redactions become more literally dependent on scripture.<sup>42</sup> With such a wide range of allusions on hand, redactors could develop the texts in such varied ways that even descendents of the same *Didache* text may appear unrelated.<sup>43</sup>

However, even if a single source were found, it would not answer what appears to me to be the more fundamental and important question: *why was Did. 9.4 used at all?*<sup>44</sup> Every other feature of the *Didache* 9-10 prayers

---

<sup>38</sup> Mazza, *Origins*, 30-35.

<sup>39</sup> Riggs, "Gracious Table", 93; van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 313. The literary priority of *Didache* 10 over 9 is suggested because 10 comes from one coherent Jewish liturgical source, whereas 9 is culled from several. It is presumed that as we get closer to the original Jewish-Christian setting the text is likely to have been composed from a single source.

<sup>40</sup> Riggs, "Gracious Table", 97, 101; van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 313.

<sup>41</sup> E.g. Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 151 suggests: Isa 11:12; Jer 39:37 (LXX); Ezek 11:17; Zech 2:10 (LXX); Matt 24:31; Mark 13:27; John 11:52. Van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 310-311 add: Deut 30:3-5; Isa 27:13; 43:5-7; 56:8; Jer 23:8; 31:8,10; Ezek 28:25; 34:11-16; Mic 4:12; Ps 106:47; 147:2; Neh 1:8-9; 1 Chr 16:35; Sir 36:11; 2 Macc 1:27; 2:7,18; Tob 13:5. To these I would add Ezek 20:41, and Matt 13:24-30, 36-43 though this last is not so obvious.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Law 4: Taft, "Comparative Liturgy", 526.

<sup>43</sup> It is also possible that there were similar prayers or variants of the same prayer used in the tradition to which the *Didache* belonged. Oral tradition redactors likewise had wide scope in developing the prayers, so that later texts descending from the same tradition may appear vastly different.

<sup>44</sup> Taylor, "Breaking of the Bread", 337-339, proposed an imaginative answer. However, the suggestion that the bread was broken before the blessing is both contrary to known practice and unsubstantiated. The linking of *Did.* 9.4 to a proposed rite "in which the broken fragments were re-assembled in order to form once more the one bread, in order to symbolize the gathering of the Church", based on the suggested extension "Just as this fragment was scattered on this table, so your people was scattered on the mountains; and just as this

Having been conformed to Christ's image, an ecstatic bride accompanied by angelic companions, proceeds from the baptistry to the "garden" of eucharist.

Surprising, perhaps, is that Ambrose's choice of *the* verse with greatest nuptial implication was Song 4.2: "Thy teeth are as flocks of sheep that have come up from the washing."<sup>17</sup> The church is compared with a pure flock so joined to Christ, that *his* virtues are reflected in hers. The image of teeth suggests that the bride is totally espoused in the wedding feast of the eucharist. Eucharistic communion is, for Ambrose, the consummation of *agape* by union – a union celebrated through ecclesial *koinonia*.

In summary we can claim that the typology of Ambrose presents the sacramental life of the church as a declaration of the *mirabilia* of God in sacred history – marvelous deeds to be given witness in Christian life.

### The Church and Maternal Imagery

We turn now to the image of the church as mother, introducing this theme via the early Syriac tradition of the motherhood of the Holy Spirit. It appears that this is where the origin of the idea of mother church is to be discovered.

Early Syriac literature depicts the Spirit using feminine imagery. Similarity between the verbal roots of "spirit" (Hebrew *rûhâ*) and the verb "to move" (Syriac *rûhhâpâ*) suggests association with the protective hovering of a mother bird.<sup>18</sup> The "eagle's wings" passage of Deut 32:11 comes to mind as does the frequently-used dove imagery at the moment of creation (Gen 1:2) and its connection with the appearance of the Spirit in the form of a dove at Christ's baptism (Mark 1:10).

Again reference can be made to the *Odes of Solomon* where there are several allusions to the Spirit as Christ's mother in a manner contrasted with the physical life given by Mary. Commentators agree that *the* most extraordinary of all Mother-Spirit passages occurs in *Ode* 19:

A cup of milk was offered to me,  
And I drank it in the sweetness of the Lord's kindness.  
The Son is the cup,  
and the Father is he who was milked;  
and the Holy Spirit is she who milked him;  
Because his breasts were full,

---

<sup>17</sup> Amb., *De myst.* 38; SC 25 bis, 177. Eng. trans. Daniélou, *The Bible and the Liturgy*, 196.

<sup>18</sup> See Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom*, 143.

## *Of Water and Spirit: An Ecclesial Spirituality*

it was undesirable that his milk should be released without purpose.  
The Holy Spirit opened her bosom,  
and mixed the milk of the two breasts of the Father.  
Then she gave the mixture to the generation without their knowing,  
and those who received (it) are in the perfection of the right hand.  
The womb of the virgin took (it),  
and she received conception and gave birth...<sup>19</sup>

Imagery of the Spirit as mother fostered a Christian spirituality of tenderness and warmth in the early church – something recognised in the Syriac version of the *Didascalia* where we read “...the deaconess shall be honoured by you in the place of the Holy Spirit...”<sup>20</sup>

Transference of maternal imagery from the Holy Spirit to the church as “the place where the Spirit flourishes”<sup>21</sup> is a natural progression in theological association. The New Testament looked to the church of Jerusalem as mother (Gal 4:26,31). Maternal features of the church are intimated both in Pauline (Gal 4:19; 1 Thess 2:7-9) and Johannine scriptures (John 16:20-23; 2 John 1:4; Rev 12). Early Christian writers from the church of Africa popularised the motherhood of the church by adding “mother” to the creed: “I believe in holy Mother church”.<sup>22</sup>

In the West, Augustine is remembered for greatly expanding maternal imagery for the church. The theme punctuates his Christmas homilies where coupling between the church as mother and virgin spouse abounds. For Augustine, “The church is a mother with two breasts, the Old and the New Testament, to suckle with the milk of all the sacraments”,<sup>23</sup> she feeds her children with bread from heaven; loves them exceedingly and teaches them truth. She is also a sorrowful mother because of the presence of sin and heresy; nevertheless the church should be revered as mother.

Augustine insists that the maternal function belongs to the church *in toto*:

The presentation of the little ones to receive the spiritual grace is the act not so much of those by whose hands they are borne up... as the

---

<sup>19</sup> *Ode* 19.1-6. Eng. trans. Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2, 752.

<sup>20</sup> *Did. ap.* 2.26.6. Eng. trans. R. Hugh Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum: The Syriac Version Translated and Accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments* (Oxford 1929) 88.

<sup>21</sup> Hipp., *Trad. ap.* 35. Eng. trans. in Gregory Dix and Henry Chadwick, *St. Hippolytus: The Apostolic Tradition* (London 1968) 62.

<sup>22</sup> See Christopher O'Donnell, *Ecclesia: A Theological Encyclopedia of the Church* (Collegeville 1996) q.v. “Mother, Church as”, 312.

<sup>23</sup> Aug., *In Ioan. ep.* 3.1; PL 35,1998. Eng. trans. O'Donnell, *Ecclesia* q.v. “Mother, Church as”, 312.

that which is permitted by the bishop or by one to whom he has entrusted it. Wherever the bishops shall appear, there let the multitude also be, even as wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the catholic church (καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία). One must not baptise without the bishop or celebrate an *Agape*; but whatsoever he approves of, that is also pleasing to God, so that everything you do may be secure and valid (ἀσφαλεῖς ἦ καὶ βέβαιον).<sup>34</sup>

Here, Ignatius does not only campaign for a leading position for the ἐπίσκοποι, but also brings it into connection with the eucharist. In fact, it seems justified to regard this letter as evidence for episcopal authority and leadership in liturgical matters, be it baptism or the eucharist. Ignatius clearly wants the bishops to be indispensable for the life of a Christian community, and they are without a doubt awarded the most prominent status. However, can we derive from this text the certainty of the episcopal leadership of worship, of the bishops being “the first liturgists” in actual fact? First of all, Ignatius demands episcopal control of conditions and circumstances of worship, especially the supply of food and drink for eucharist and *agape*, and also of water and the correct environment for baptism. These were anything but marginal matters; both pagan and Jewish sources place great importance on, for example, the importance of certain kinds of water not to be used for religious rituals for fear of ritual contamination, or certain food to be avoided by all means in this context (pagan sacrificial meat etc.). Indeed, Ignatius uses exactly the vocabulary that is normally employed in this context: “rightful”, “secure”, “valid” (βεβαία εὐχαριστία, ἐξὸν ἐστίν, ἀσφαλής, βέβαιος). This fits in nicely with our other sources which picture the bishop as an οἰκονόμος, responsible for organising the community’s resources; in fact, Ignatius’ interest in advancing the bishop’s overall authority might be explained by this, without necessarily providing evidence for an *existing liturgical* authority of the ἐπίσκοποι of Asia Minor and Rome. In a different passage, Ignatius actually identifies the ἐπίσκοπος with an οἰκονόμος:

---

<sup>34</sup> Πάντες τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε, ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις· τοὺς δὲ διακόνους ἐντρέπεσθε ὡς θεοῦ ἐντολήν. μηδεὶς χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου τι πράσσῃτω τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. ἐκεῖνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω, ἢ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον οὐσα ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ. 2. ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω, ὡσπερ ὅπου ἂν ἦ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. οὐκ ἐξὸν ἐστίν χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν· ἀλλ’ ὅταν ἐκεῖνος δοκιμάσῃ, τοῦτο καὶ τῷ θεῷ εὐάρεστον, ἵνα ἀσφαλεῖς ἦ καὶ βέβαιον πᾶν ὃ πράσσετε. Ign., *Smyrn.* 8.1; *Schriften des Urchristentum* 1,210.6-14.

Listen to the bishop so that God also listens to you. May my life be given for theirs, those that are submissive to the bishop, to the presbyters, and to the deacons, and may my portion be along with you to hold it in God! Labour together with one another; fight together; run together; suffer together; sleep together; and awake together, as the economists (οἰκονόμοι), associates (πάρεδροι), and servants (ὑπηρέται) of God.<sup>35</sup>

Thus, the bishops are called “God’s οἰκονόμοι” by Ignatius, and the term οἰκονόμος and his attempt to secure them a prominent position within the community’s organisation go hand in hand – without mentioning any *liturgical* role reserved for the bishop.

Allow me to mention one last letter from Ignatius. He seems to make an explicit association between liturgical celebrations and the office of ἐπίσκοπος in his epistle to the Magnesians:

It is fitting, then, not only to be called Christians, but to be so in reality: as some indeed call somebody “bishop”, but do everything without him. Now, such persons seem to me to be not of a good conscience, seeing they are not steadfastly joined together (συναθροίζεσθαι) according to the commandment (ἐντολή).<sup>36</sup>

This text has also served as evidence for a prevalent liturgical leadership of the episcopate in Ignatius’ time. Apart from the aforementioned basic difficulty of concluding historical facts based on Ignatius’ demands, there are three additional problems here:

1. Ignatius actually says that many communities manage without any ἐπίσκοποι — a statement that should make us sceptical about any claims of a widespread liturgical presidency of bishops.

2. The community he refers to “does everything without the bishop”, more precisely they do συναθροίζειν without the bishop. This is an

---

<sup>35</sup> Τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε, ἵνα καὶ ὁ θεὸς ὑμῖν. ἀντίψυχον ἐγὼ τῶν ὑποτασσομένων τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, πρεσβυτέρους, διακόνους· καὶ μετ’ αὐτῶν μοι τὸ μέρος γένοιτο σχεῖν ἐν θεῷ. συγκοπιᾶτε ἀλλήλοις, συναθλείτε, συντρέχετε, συμπάσχετε, συγκοιμάσθε, συνεγείρεσθε ὡς θεοῦ οἰκονόμος καὶ πάρεδρος καὶ ὑπηρέται. Ign., *Polyt.* 6.1; *Schriften des Urchristentum* 1,220.10-14.

<sup>36</sup> Πρέπον οὖν ἐστὶν μὴ μόνον καλεῖσθαι Χριστιανούς, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἶναι· ὥσπερ καὶ τινες ἐπίσκοπον μὲν καλοῦσιν, χωρὶς δὲ αὐτοῦ πάντα πράσσουσιν. οἱ τοιοῦτοι δὲ οὐκ εὐσυνείδητοί μοι εἶναι φαίνονται διὰ τὸ μὴ βεβαίως κατ’ ἐντολήν συναθροίζεσθαι. Ign., *Magn.* 4; *Schriften des Urchristentum* 1,164.4-7.

Rist explains Augustine's understanding of the weakness of the will as an extension of Aristotle's use of the concept of incontinence (*ἀκρασία*) in the *Nichomachean Ethics*, i.e. the state of being without command over oneself and one's passions.<sup>9</sup> For Aristotle, some people are acratice, or incontinent, in a moral sense, some of the time, and some all of the time. But for Augustine, we are all acratice all of the time.<sup>10</sup> Will, for Augustine, is a move toward or away from God, an inherent ambivalence that cannot be resolved in this life.<sup>11</sup> It is important to note, however, that for Augustine the nature of human beings after the Fall, while defective, remained fundamentally good, "...since no one is evil by nature, but anyone who is evil is evil because of a perversion of nature".<sup>12</sup>

What then is the point of striving for knowledge of the good in our spiritual life, if our will is fundamentally flawed so that even when we know what path we should follow, we turn away, drawn instead towards selfish desires? Virtue for Augustine consists in loving rather than knowing. If love, the highest of the passions, is directed towards God, virtue will follow. As Harrison observes, "Love, operating through the passions, therefore takes the place of reason in directing man's will towards God."<sup>13</sup> As Augustine directs his readers: "Love and do as you will."<sup>14</sup> The God-given order in reality also enables the fallen will to direct itself towards God.<sup>15</sup> Thus he defines virtue in *City of God* as "rightly ordered love".<sup>16</sup> This capacity for virtue or

---

<sup>9</sup> s.v. ἀκράτεια, H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. edn (Oxford 1996) 54. The same concept is used by Maximus the Confessor, e.g. *Car.* 4.56, *Massimo Confessore. Capitoli sulla carità*, Verba seniorum. Collana di testi e studi patristici N.S. 3, ed. A. Ceresa-Gastaldo (Rome 1963): "The whole purpose of the Savior's commandments is to free the mind from *incontinence* and hate and bring it to the love of him and of one's neighbor..."; Eng. trans. G.C. Berthold, "The Four Hundred Chapters on Love", in *Maximus Confessor. Selected Writings*, Classics of Western Spirituality (London 1985) 81 (emphasis mine).

<sup>10</sup> J.M. Rist, *Augustine* (Cambridge 1994) 184.

<sup>11</sup> Even the martyrs, for Augustine, "...spoke heart to heart to every believer of a struggle that they also had experienced – the struggle between the love of God and the deep fierce love of the soul for its own body and for the present life", as Peter Brown puts it, in "Enjoying the Saints in Late Antiquity", *Early Medieval Europe* 9 (2000) 1-24; here 12.

<sup>12</sup> Aug., *De civ. Dei* 14.6, CCL 48,421.17-19: "Et quoniam nemo natura, sed quisquis malus est, uitio malus est." Eng. trans. H. Bettenson, St Augustine, *Concerning the City of God against the Pagans* (London – New York repr. 1984) Emphasis mine.

<sup>13</sup> Harrison, *Augustine*, 95.

<sup>14</sup> Aug., *In ep. Iohannis ad Parthos tractatus decem* 7.8; PL 35,2032: "Semel ergo breue praeceptum tibi praecipitur, Dilige et quod uis fac."

<sup>15</sup> Harrison, *Augustine*, 97.

<sup>16</sup> Aug., *De civ. Dei* 15.22; CCL 48,488.33-34: "Vnde mihi uidetur, quod definitio breuis et uera uirtutis ordo est amoris." Trans. Bettenson, 637. Cited by Harrison, *Augustine*, 97. Similarly, in Aug., *De doc. chr.* 1.27.28; CCL 32,22.1-3: "Ille autem iuste et sancte uiuit, qui rerum integer aestimator est; ipse est autem, qui ordinatam habet dilectionem..."

divinisation is a gift of God, and the direct result of the incarnation, as Augustine says explicitly in *Sermo* 192.1: “In order to make gods of those who were merely human, one who was God made himself human...”<sup>17</sup>

### Maximus’ Conception of the Will

Like Augustine, Maximus viewed our capacity for deification as contingent upon Christ’s *kenosis* in the incarnation: “By emptying ourselves of the passions, we lay hold of the divine to the same degree as that to which the Logos of God, deliberately emptying himself of his own sublime glory, became truly human.”<sup>18</sup> Augustine’s concept of the action of vices and virtues in the soul is in many respects compatible with the psychotomy or “taxonomy of the soul” deployed in Maximus’ early work, the *Libri ambiguum*, in which he offered interpretations of difficult passages from Gregory of Nazianzus and ps-Dionysius the Areopagite. Chapter 10 of the “second” *Liber ambiguum*<sup>19</sup> was written to combat the Origenist notion that the mind can reach union with God through reason alone, without the necessity of the ascetic struggle.<sup>20</sup> In section 44,<sup>21</sup> Maximus adapted his exposition of the passionate part of the soul from that outlined in the middle-Platonic treatise *De natura hominis* by Nemesius of Emesa,<sup>22</sup> the late fourth-century Syrian bishop (fl. AD 390). In Nemesius’ account, the soul is divided, following Aristotle’s *Nichomachean Ethics* 1.13, into two faculties or “parts”, the rational and the irrational, or “passionate” (*De nat. hom.* 34). The passionate part can be in turn divided into that which is obedient, or at least susceptible, to reason, and that which is not (*De nat. hom.* 35). The part that is not obedient to reason controls our bodily appetites, which affect the nourishing and living (or “natural”) forces of the soul. Another division is made of the part which can be brought under the control of reason, into two major passions: the desiring (ὀρεκτικόν) and incensive (θυμικόν), which

---

<sup>17</sup> Aug., *Serm.* 192.1; *Sant’Agostino Discorsi* 4/1 (184-229/v), ed. Maurini, Ital. trans. P. Bellini, F. Criciani, and V. Tartulli (Rome 1984) 50: “Deos facturus qui homines erant, homo factus est qui Deus erat...”.

<sup>18</sup> Max., *Exp. orationis dominica* 102-106; CCG 23,32-33 ed. P. Van Deun (Turnhout – Leuven 1991).

<sup>19</sup> Max., *Ambig.* 10; PG 91,1105C-1205C. *Ambigua ad Ioannem* was written in 628-630, that is before the “first” book dedicated to Thomas in c. AD 634, *Ambigua ad Thomam*.

<sup>20</sup> See the introduction to *Difficulty* 10 by A. Louth, *Maximus the Confessor*, *The Early Church Fathers* (London – New York 1996) 94-95.

<sup>21</sup> PG 91,1196C-1197D.

<sup>22</sup> *Nemesii Emeseni De natura hominis*, ed. M. Morani, *Biblioteca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana* (Leipzig 1987); Eng. trans. W. Telfer, *A Treatise on the Nature of Man*, Nemesius of Emesa, *Library of Christian Classics* 4 (London 1955) 224-453.

boyhood of Jesus as a particular stage in the economy of Christ: a *locus* which invests ܠܠܘ with a technical sense when pertaining to the life and work of Jesus.<sup>20</sup> Given this circumstance, plus the improbability that any one of Thomas' Greek copies would have read καὶ ὁ παῖς, it is reasonable to assume that PHIL<sup>EX</sup> read ܠܠܘ in Luke 2:52.<sup>21</sup> Consequently it appears to follow that the marginal gloss comprises a rejected PHIL reading which was exhibited in the H margin so as to advise the reader that at this juncture the narrative has the boyhood of Christ (with all that connotes) in view.

Luke 6:4 recalls that David and his companions entered the Tabernacle “and the bread of the presence he took and ate” (καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως...), which H renders by “and the loaves of the setting before” (ܠܠܘܐ ܕܠܠܘܐ ܕܠܠܘܐ).<sup>22</sup> The H margin supplies an alternative reading, “(and the bread) of the Lord's table” (ܠܠܘܐ ܡܝܢ ܡܝܢܐ ܕܠܠܘܐ).<sup>23</sup> The gloss may well be a rejected PHIL reading and it is not difficult to suggest an expositional reason for its exhibition in the margin. References to

<sup>20</sup> See *Com. Mt. Luke* (ed. Watt) 48.20-25; 49.14 – 51.30; 53.2-11; cf. Fox, 281, n. 320. There are some indications that, possibly, ܠܠܘ may have been occasionally employed by the Syriac versions from similar theological motives. E.g., in Luke 2:21, albeit with a number of Byzantine witnesses, the *Vetus Syra* and P read τοῦ περιτεμεῖν τὸ παιδίον rather than τοῦ περιτεμεῖν αὐτόν, the Majority reading (inc. Å A B) reflected by H (ܠܠܘܐ). Or Ps. 110:3: P renders לך טל ילדותי “to you as dew your young men”, by ܠܠܘܐ ܠܠܘܐ, “you, O child I have begotten;” but cf. M.P. Weitzman, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament*, University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 56 (Cambridge 1999) 242.

<sup>21</sup> Unfortunately, although *CPJ* 71.25-26 quotes Luke 2:52 PHIL, the start of the verse was omitted. It may be observed also that Philoxenus read ܠܠܘ *pro* τὸν υἱὸν in Luke 2:7; see *Sancti Philoxeni Episcopi Marbugensis, Dissertationes Decem de Uno e Sancta Trinitate Incorporato et Passo Dissertationes*, M. Brière and F. Graffin, eds, vol. 4, PO 183 (1982) *Diss.* 9, §82.

<sup>22</sup> Similarly Matt 12:4 and Mark 2:26; cf. 1 Sam 21:7 (1 Regn 21:6). The reading of the textline is not a mirror translation but comprises a Græcism which occurs in the margin of SYH at Exod 25:30; not in the textline which renders ἄρτους ἐνώπιους ἐναντίον μου by ܠܠܘܐ ܕܠܠܘܐ, but in the margin (Symmachus) which glosses ܠܠܘܐ ܕܠܠܘܐ.

<sup>23</sup> I.e., the reading is not a textual plus (“the bread of presence of the Lord's table”), nor does it render the putative *Vorlage*, τράπεζης τοῦ κυριοῦ, suggested by *IGNTP*. “The Lord's-table”, here probably derives from the development which saw τῶν ἄρτων τῆς προθέσεως (LXX *par* לחם הפנים and המדכת; but cf. J.W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 30 [Atlanta 1990] 405 and 640), recast as ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων, “the setting forth of the loaves” (Heb 9:2), and which in turn acquired “a concrete usage, the furniture for the presentation of the bread, the table for the sacred bread, despite the presence of τράπεζα in the immediate context with which it is identical”, W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2nd edn, revised and augmented by F. W. Gingrich and F.W. Danker from Walter Bauer's 5th edn [Chicago 1979] 706a [authors' emphasis]. P employs ܠܠܘܐ ܠܠܘܐ to render לחםהני in 1 Sam 21:7 and elsewhere, but ܠܠܘܐ ܠܠܘܐ *par* המדכת, e.g. 1 Chr 9:32; 23:29 and 2 Macc 10:3.

“bread” and the “Lord’s table” immediately suggest an association with Holy Communion, and the pericope was specifically associated with the eucharist in patristic exegesis.<sup>24</sup> Hence it seems quite likely that Thomas intended the marginal gloss to alert the reader to the sacramental connotations of the passage.

### **Readings in the Textline**

Notwithstanding the constraints imposed by the translation technique employed by Thomas, there are places in the textline where it possible to posit an expositional tendency in his lexical choices. This is especially apparent in instances where an expression appears which comprises an exception to a given lexical equivalence. Two examples will have to suffice.

The first is found in Thomas’ treatment of the phrase, εὐρες χάριν παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ (Luke 1:30). The phrase turns on the force of παρὰ with the dative, which has been said to be used “in the metaphorical sense,” and therefore, to mean “in the sight of.”<sup>25</sup> On this reading of the text the angel is telling Mary that she has “found favour in the sight of God,” meaning that God is pleased with her. But this was not how Thomas read the phrase. Η renders παρὰ by a double preposition, ἀπὸ ἐκ, “from the presence of,” even though it regularly renders παρὰ with either the accusative or dative by ἀπὸ. As it happens, the use of παρὰ with the dative to mean “from the presence of” is not without literary parallels but,<sup>26</sup> more importantly, it conveys the idea which accords with Thomas’ concept of grace. In the Eastern tradition which maintains the distinction between God’s essence and energies, grace is quintessentially participation in the divine energies. Accordingly, Thomas would have thought the χάριν bestowed upon the Mother of God to be much more than divine approval. Rather, he would have understood it to denote the uncreated and deifying self-giving of God.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> “But by the loaves (of the shewbread), there is clearly indicated to us the bread that cometh down from heaven to be set forth upon the holy tables of the churches: and all the furniture of the table, used for the performance of its mystical service, was a plain type of the divine treasures”, Saint Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on the Gospel of Saint Luke*, trans. R. Payne Smith, (Oxford 1859; repr. Studion Publishers 1983) 121.

<sup>25</sup> C.F.D. Moule, *An Idiomatic Book of New Testament Greek*, 2nd edn (Cambridge 1959) 52.

<sup>26</sup> Arndt and Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon* 610b cite Synesius: “philosophy has her abode παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ.”

<sup>27</sup> Note that in Luke 1:28 Thomas mirrored (alliteratively) the angel’s salutation (χαίρε, κεχαριτωμένη) by כַּחַמְנָה, “Hail, favoured one”, rather than glossing “full of grace” (כַּחַמְנָה מְלֵאָה P; cf. the Vulgate’s *gratia plena* ). Doubtless he understood the appellation, “favoured one”, to connote the idea of “full of grace” because, by definition, the favour described was the plenitude of indwelling grace.